UNITED STATES  OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 96—PART 2

FEBRUARY 3, 1950, TO MARCH 4, 1950
(PAGES 1407 TO 2830)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1950

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

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

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

O God, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, amid the tragedy of a broken world in deep humility of spirit we ascend the altar stairs of this wayside shrine the fathers reared. In this testing day establish Thou our hearts, as we strive not in enmity against men, but against the evil which enslaves and degrades them. Startle us with the deep meaning for all mankind that a decisive hour has struck in the old story of our planet.

We thank Thee for men and women of good will under all skies, the saving salt of the tortured world, upon whose integrity of character and whose understanding sympathy for other nations and races the hopes of tomorrow rest. As great ideas whose day has come beckon us to be their servants, save us from giving ourselves to the dead past rather than to the living future. We ask it in the name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 2, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3001. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills; and

H. R. 6616. An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was granted leave to be absent from the Senate from 3:30 o'clock this afternoon for the remainder of the day.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Millikin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Morse
Benton	Hill	Mundt
Brewster	Hoey	Murray
Bricker	Holland	Neely
Bridges	Humphrey	O'Conor
Butler	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ives	Pepper
Cain	Jenner	Robertson
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C	Schoeppel
Connally	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Darby	Kerr	Sparkman
Donnell	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Taft
Downey	Lodge	Taylor
Dworshak	Lucas	Thomas, Okla
Ecton	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McCarthy	Tobey
Ferguson	McClellan	Tydings
Frear	McFarland	Watkins
Fulbright	McKellar	Wherry
George	McMahon	Wiley
Gillette	Magnuson	Williams
Graham	Malone	Withers
Gurney	Maybank	Young

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. LEAHY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for insertion in the RECORD and the Appendix of the RECORD, without speeches and without debate.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Food and Drug Administration, for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF ST ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of St. Elizabeths Hospital, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth and final report of the Federal Works Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A petition of sundry citizens of New Port Richey and St Petersburg, both in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance, to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Forrest Watson Post, No. 3333, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Kenton, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Senate Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution requesting the return of certain property for exhibition at the Appomattox Surrender Grounds Park

"Whereas certain furniture which was in the surrender room of the McLean House near Appomattox at the time of the surrender by Gen. Robert E. Lee is now owned and exhibited by the Smithsonian Institution; and

"Whereas the surrender grounds at Appomattox are being restored and facilities for the exhibition of historical material are now available; and

"Whereas it is fitting that the furniture from the McLean House should be housed at the surrender grounds. Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of delegates concurring), That the trustees of the Smithsonian Institution and the Congress of the United States are respectfully requested to take such action as is necessary to enable the following furniture from the McLean House to be placed on permanent exhibition at the surrender grounds:

"One arm chair, used by General Lee.

"One desk or swivel chair, used by General Grant.

"One small spool table General Grant wrote out the surrender terms on this table.

"One large secretary, and further

"Resolved, That the Congress and such trustees are requested also to take such action in order to permit such furniture to be exhibited at the dedication of the surrender grounds in April 1950."

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr President, I am in receipt of another letter from Mrs. Nora B Powell, State Legislative Director, WCTU, New Castle County, Del, transmitting a fourth petition signed by 120 citizens of New Castle County, Del, in support of legislation now pending before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages over the radio. This brings the total number of signers of the petitions sent in by Mrs. Powell to 2 311. I ask that this petition also be referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for its consideration

The VICE PRESIDENT The petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

Mr. LEHMAN Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Business and Professional Group, American Jewish Congress, South Shore Division, of Far Rockaway, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for a fair employment practice commission.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAR ROCKAWAY, N. Y., *January 27, 1950.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas discrimination against persons on account of race, creed, or color in the matters of employment and civil rights constitute a degrading insult and affront to the people who have fought and died in the defense of American democracy; and

Whereas these continued practices are inimical to the best interests of the American people and are in direct contradiction to the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas endless demagogy and outright racial hatred have thwarted passage of any decent civil-rights legislation in the Congress of the United States.

We, the business and professional chapter of the American Jewish Congress, South Shore Women's Division, do hereby resolve that every effort be made to secure passage at this session of Congress of the McGrath-Powell FEPC bill.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL GROUP, SOUTH SHORE DIVISION, AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS.

RESOLUTIONS OF CONVENTION OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a fine booklet containing resolutions adopted at the Thirty-first Annual Convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation held in Chicago, Ill., in last mid-December 1949. As we are all aware, the American Farm Bureau Federation is composed of 1,409,000 farm families. They represent the cross section of all phases of United States agriculture. The Farm Bureau Federation has active member organizations in 45 States, including, of course, splendid representation in my own State of Wisconsin.

These resolutions represent the grassroots views of Farm Bureau members throughout the Nation, and were based upon discussions held in local communities and at county and State meetings.

The booklet was sent to me by Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer of the federation.

I wish that it might be possible to arrange for the printing of all of the resolutions adopted by the federation, but unfortunately that is not possible. I know that my colleagues will be interested in the bureau's position on international cooperation, on Federal taxation, in opposition to taxation of cooperatives, in opposition to monopolies and restrictive trade practices, in opposition to activities in the field of labor harmful to the public welfare, and so forth I was particularly delighted to see the fine resolutions adopted by the federation in connection with decentralization of the Federal Government and turning over to the States and localities functions which can best be handled by them. This is a matter in which I have long been interested.

Naturally, the position of the bureau with regard to the agricultural price-support program is the one which is perhaps of deepest interest to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the resolutions adopted by the House of Delegates at the Farm Bureau convention on the subject of agricultural adjustment programs be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS

General prosperity is essential to a successful and prosperous agriculture At the same time, a prosperous and productive agriculture is necessary for general prosperity. The two are interdependent.

High production per man in the rest of the economy and a high well-distributed real income are of the utmost importance to farmers. Those furnish the goods for which farmers trade; and purchasing power to our consumers. High production per man is also of vital importance in securing a high per capita income to farmers. As farmers, we have two great jobs to do. One is to earn a reasonable share of the national income through high per capita production on the farm. The other is to get the share which our productive efforts earn.

A postwar readjustment in prices such as has followed other wars has already brought farm prices down to the parity level for the first time since 1941. As usual, farm costs have failed to decline as rapidly as farm prices.

GENERAL POLICIES

If we are to maintain a prosperous economy, of which a prosperous agriculture is an integral part, we must, among other things, do the following:

1. Work out and make effective methods of bringing greater stability to our general price level;

2. Foster policies which will stimulate the maintenance of a full employment economy; and

3. Promote international understanding and international trade on a basis consistent with world peace and prosperity.

Over the years the American Farm Bureau Federation has developed and sponsored policies designed to attain these broad objectives We shall continue to do so. Our resolutions on these subjects and, in fact, all of our resolutions are parts of our program to assure American agriculture of its proper place in our national and world economy

While the lines of action enumerated above are of utmost importance to permanent agricultural prosperity, we need to supplement them by various programs designed to bring about specific adjustments within agriculture and between agriculture and the rest of the economy. It is these adjustment programs which we ordinarily refer to as the farm program

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

If farm programs are to make the maximum contribution to the development of a sound, prosperous, and well-balanced American economy, they must be developed and carried out on a long-range basis At the same time we must continually strive to improve existing programs and be prepared to recommend changes on the basis of experience.

To endure, farm programs must be developed on a bipartisan basis They also must be based on sound fundamental principles worthy of support by urban as well as farm people. Farmers cannot hope to maintain any program unless they can demonstrate to other groups that it is sound and in the national interest

A fundamental principle of our price-support and production-adjustment programs is the parity concept, which measures a fair exchange relationship between the price of commodities the farmer sells and the price of the things he buys.

While farm programs should be directed toward the maintenance of parity, it is not the responsibility of the Government to guarantee profitable prices to any economic group. Instead, we view farm-price supports as an appropriate and necessary protection against unreasonable price declines. If price supports are to be used to guarantee farmers profitable prices rather than as a protection against unreasonable price declines, it follows that the Government will determine what is a fair level of income, both to agriculture and to each and every individual farmer. Eventually this would result in a reduction of the farmer's capacity to earn and to get a fair income.

Farm income cannot be protected by price-support policies which—

1. Cut us out of badly needed export markets or reduce our domestic markets by unduly restricting the use of products or by encouraging the use of substitutes;

2. Stimulate unneeded or uneconomic production, thereby forcing ever-increasing Government controls over production and marketing; or

3. Result in the accumulation of excessive stocks in the hands of the Government, as

such stocks tend to convert price supports into price ceilings and may result in the Government assuming complete control of marketing, processing, and distribution of agricultural commodities.

Price supports should be flexible. The level of support should be related to farm supplies and market requirements and should be used as one of the important factors in guiding farm production.

Due consideration should be given to providing sufficient flexibility in acreage-adjustment programs to meet changing needs in production and consumption and to provide greater flexibility in adjusting individual production plans so as to facilitate efficient land use and not freeze acreage allotments in rigid historical patterns.

The utilization of acreage diverted from the production of commodities for which acreage allotments are established presents a problem in the successful operation of a long-range farm program. The effects which such diversion may have upon the producers of other commodities are recognized. On the other hand, it is realized that there are administrative problems involved in controlling the use of such acreage. It is recommended that the board of directors make a study of this problem to determine the most feasible means whereby such diverted acreage may be used in such manner as to prevent adverse influence upon the producers of other commodities.

A program to upgrade the diet, properly coordinated with existing agricultural programs, should aid in diminishing unmanageable surpluses of certain agricultural commodities and conserve the fertility of our soils. A relatively small increase in the consumption of meat and other animal products, or poultry, generates demand for considerable quantities of grain. In developing such a program, which will likely mean expanded production of livestock and livestock products and expanded consumption of fruits and vegetables, consideration should be given to the producers of other commodities. Programs adopted should supplement the existing agricultural programs designed to stabilize agriculture.

We urge more aggressive efforts to stimulate increased consumption of agricultural commodities through—

1. Research, education, and improvements in production and marketing techniques;
2. Reduction in costs of production, processing, and marketing;
3. Development of new and expanded outlets for agricultural commodities in domestic and foreign markets;
4. Diversion of surpluses into byproduct uses;
5. Disposal of surpluses in export markets at competitive world prices, including the use of export payments when necessary;
6. Study and use, where practicable, of international commodity agreements; and
7. Support of adequate, wisely planned, economically administered programs designed to utilize a maximum of surplus agricultural commodities.

We recommend the establishment of self-supporting price-stabilization programs by the producers of those farm commodities for which such programs are feasible and administratively practical. In establishing such programs, use should be made of such mechanisms as surplus-diversion programs, quality control, orderly distribution, and payments through funds contributed by the producers of these commodities.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Based upon the action of the voting delegates in December 1948, the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at its June 1949 meeting, reached unanimous agreement on revisions in the Agricultural Act of 1948, which it was felt would clarify and improve it. This agreement included endorsement of flexible price supports on basic commodities ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity instead of 72 to 90 percent of parity as actually provided in the Agricultural Act of 1948. It further provided for allowing the total supply of cotton and peanuts to reach 108 percent of normal supply before any adjustment in support levels would become operative. These provisions are included in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

In three principal respects the Agricultural Act of 1949 differs from the unanimously agreed to position of the American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors:

1. It includes the cost of hired farm labor in the calculation of the parity formula. Historically, the application of this provision would have raised parity during periods of relatively high farm prices and would have lowered it during periods when farmers most needed farm prices raised;

2. It provides for a continuation of wartime 90-percent price supports for so-called basic commodities during 1950; and

3. It contains a conference committee amendment providing that during the period 1950–53 basic commodities are permitted to use the higher of the old or the modernized parity formula.

Each of these three changes currently raises materially the level of price support and increases the inflexibility in operation of the act in comparison with the recommendations of the American Farm Bureau Federation. This has important implications inasmuch as we are convinced that the higher the level of price supports, the greater the controls and regimentation.

However, the Agricultural Act of 1949 was developed and enacted by the Congress on a bipartisan basis; it provides for a permanent-type price-support program. It retains, but postpones full application of, the principles of flexibility and modernized parity which the American Farm Bureau Federation has consistently sought in recommendations for a long-range price-support program. These basic principles are sound and in the best interests of American agriculture and the general welfare.

We encourage farmers to cooperate with worth-while programs developed under the Agricultural Act of 1949. We urge efficient administration of the act. We intend to be prepared to take the initiative in making any necessary revisions on the basis of our experience after the act has been given a fair trial.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H. R. 2895. A bill to authorize the sale of select base material, at the Fort Benning Military Reservation, to Muscogee County, State of Georgia, for use on county roads; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1248); and

H. R. 5361. A bill for the relief of Charles G. McCormack, captain, Medical Corps, United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1249).

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

S. 2681. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the battle of Lexington, to be held at Lexington, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 1250).

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

S. 2855. A bill to extend the time limits for the award of certain decorations, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1252).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 2845. A bill to enable the President to obligate funds heretofore appropriated for assistance in certain areas in China until June 30, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 1251).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Roy Victor Peel, of Indiana, to the position of Director of the Census, which nomination was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MURRAY:

S 2982. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Henry Gonda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S 2983. A bill for the relief of Miss Nene Baalstad; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S 2984. A bill to provide for the development and improvement of aircraft intended for industrial or personal use, and adaptable for military service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2985. A bill for the relief of Francis C. Pollard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S 2986. A bill to provide for the design and construction of highway bridges near certain dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr MAYBANK (by request) introduced Senate bill 2987, to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

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

S. 2988. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to improve credit services available to farmers seeking to change or diversify their farming operations or adjust and improve their farming practices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK AND NATIONAL HOUSING ACTS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

I may state the purpose of introducing the bill. Two days ago the House passed a bill concerning the Federal Home Loan Bank. The bill has come over from the House, and was referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. It is the desire of that committee to have the bill I have now introduced before it, so both bills may be considered together. I introduced the bill by request in order that it may be considered together with the bill which has just come from the House, so that adequate and proper hearings may be held.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the legislative draft of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred,

and, without objection, the summary presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2987) to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The summary presented by Mr. MAYBANK was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE DRAFT OF DECEMBER 22, 1949

Section 1. Liquidity requirements: This section would prohibit any member of a Federal home-loan bank from making loans at any time when it did not hold cash and obligations of the United States in an amount prescribed by the Home Loan Bank Board, which amount would not be less than 5 percent nor more than 15 percent of withdrawable account liability. The Board would be authorized to prescribe by regulation different amounts within the limitations specified for different classes of member institutions. Failure to comply with the provisions of this subsection would be ground for removal from membership.

Section 2 Retirement of bank stock: This section would increase members' holdings of Federal home-loan bank stock from 1 percent of unpaid principal of home-mortgage loans to 2 percent of unpaid principal of home-mortgage loans, home-purchase contracts, and similar obligations, retaining the existing $500 minimum. The excess over 1 percent supplied by members would be used to retire Government stock but not so as to reduce the capital stock, reserves, surplus, and undivided profits to less than $200,000,000.

Section 3. Investment of bank-stock receipts: This section would require Federal home-loan banks to have invested at all times an amount equal to current deposits received from members invested in specified obligations and advances At present banks are required to so invest an amount equal to the sums paid in on outstanding capital subscriptions of members plus the amount of current deposits.

Section 4 Treasury purchase of bank obligations. This section would give the Secretary of the Treasury discretionary authority to purchase obligations of Federal home-loan banks. However, his holdings of such obligations may not exceed $1,000,000,000 at any one time. This section would also subject the Federal home-loan banks to the Government Corporation Control Act even after Government capital stock is retired.

Section 5. Retirement of capital stock of FSLIC: This section would require the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to annually retire at par an amount of its capital stock equal to 50 percent of its net income for the fiscal year. The Board could authorize retirement of a smaller amount if it determined it feasible. All dividends on the capital stock, past, present, and future, would be waived and in lieu thereof the Secretary of the Treasury would be paid a return, on the average amount at par, of the capital stock outstanding during each fiscal year at a rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the sixth month of each such fiscal year.

Section 6. Treasury loans to FSLIC: This section would authorize borrowing by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from the Secretary of the Treasury, on such terms as may be agreed upon, such funds as in the judgment of the Board are from time to time required for insurance purposes, but not exceeding the aggregate of $750,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6000) to extend and improve the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, to amend the public-assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. RUSSELL submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2440) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R 3001. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills; and

H R 6616 An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy.

JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner address delivered by the Vice President at Raleigh, N C., January 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

THE GLOBAL CHALLENGE TO THE GOP—ARTICLE BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Global Challenge to the GOP," written by Senator MORSE and published in the February 1950 issue of United Nations World Magazine, which appears in the Appendix]

REPUBLICAN PROGRAM — EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A True Orthodoxy," published in the February 2 issue of the New York Herald Tribune, together with excerpts from a policy statement framed by the New York Young Republican Club entitled "Blueprint for a Better America," which appear in the Appendix]

MODERATE-PRICED HOUSING—LETTER FROM SENATOR LEHMAN TO COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated January 30, 1950, addressed by him to Senator MAYBANK, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, on the subject of moderate-priced housing, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROOSEVELT DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY BENJAMIN V. COHEN

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Benjamin V. Cohen at the second annual Roosevelt Day dinner, Chicago, Ill., January 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED-PERSONS LEGISLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Closed Door," regarding displaced-persons legislation, from the Washington Post of February 3, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR CAPEHART'S RECORD—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Businessman Senator," from the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

WARDS OF THE GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY DEAN RUSSELL

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Wards of the Government," delivered by Dean Russell before the Convention on Individual Liberty held in Billings, Mont., on January 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

CONTROL OF FLOODWATERS IN THE TENNESSEE, CUMBERLAND, AND OHIO RIVER BASINS—STATEMENT BY ARMY ENGINEERS

[Mr HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by United States Army engineers in the Tennessee Valley Authority regarding the operation of flood-storage reservoirs in the Tennessee, Cumberland, and Ohio River Basins, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRIVATE CAPITAL FOR SMALL BUSINESS

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD articles from the New York World-Telegram of February 2, the New York Times of February 3, and the Wall Street Journal of February 3, dealing with the bill introduced by him to authorize the establishment of a private system of capital banks to provide both debt and equity capital for independent business, which appear in the Appendix]

THE ROAD TO PEACE—ARTICLE FROM THE MAGAZINE PREVENT WORLD WAR III

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Road to Peace," published in the January-February 1950 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, which appears in the Appendix]

GERMANY'S RELATIONS WITH EASTERN AND WESTERN EUROPE—ARTICLE FROM THE MAGAZINE PREVENT WORLD WAR III

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Made in Germany," published in the November-December 1949 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, which appears in the Appendix.]

MINISTRY OUTWEIGHS THE LAW FOR HIM—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ministry Outweighs the Law for Him," by Richard L. Neuberger, special writer for the Oregonian, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED NATIONAL BOARD OF EDUCATION—LETTER FROM HOLLIS P. ALLEN

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter recom-

mending the establishment of a National Board of Education, from Dr. Hollis P. Allen, professor of education at Claremont College, California, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED CHANGE IN COUNTING ELECTORS—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Proposed Change in Counting Electors," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of February 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAPEHART VERSUS ACHESON—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON (IND.) HERALD

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "CAPEHART versus Acheson," published in the Washington (Ind.) Herald of January 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CODDLING COMMUNIST AGENTS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON (IND.) HERALD

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Coddling Communist Agents," published in the Washington (Ind.) Herald of January 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POTATO PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Potatoes: Shocking Example of Wasteful Program," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 3, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ALGER HISS CONVICTION

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Liar and a Spy," published in the January 23, 1950, issue of the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two letters, and appendices, written on February 1, 1950, by Frank Pace, Jr., Director of the Budget, to the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior, respectively, relating to the development of the Columbia River Basin, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE ALGER HISS CASE

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter and a summary of the Alger Hiss case prepared by him, which appear in the Appendix.]

WHY NOT AN ANTICOMINFORM?—ARTICLE BY SIEGFRIED WAGENER

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why Not an Anti-Cominform?" written by Siegfried Wagener, and published in Plain Talk for January 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TVA UNFAIRLY ATTACKED BY EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me in answer to charges appearing in the New York Times of February 2, 1950, that the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority have resulted in a loss.

There being no objection, Mr. KEFAUVER's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the private power lobby, speaking through the Edison Electric Institute, in an article appearing in the New York Times of February 2, 1950, charges that the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority have resulted in a total loss of nearly $120,000,000 since 1933, and a loss of over $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

This is the same argument that we have been hearing for years; that the people of America are paying out money which benefits only those American citizens residing in the TVA area.

There is no cause to reiterate the multiple answers which have been made to this charge. Congress has answered it adequately a number of times.

I do think it proper, however, to point out in a general manner the errata that has crept into the computations of the Edison Electric Institute, in making these latest sensational, but entirely erroneous charges.

The Institute attacks the method of allocation of cost of the multiple purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority. These allocations were made, at the direction of Congress, by the Tennessee Valley Authority. The method employed by TVA in breaking down the TVA costs and charging each cost to the proper purpose is, of course, a choice of methods. This would be necessarily so in any undertaking which provided several benefits as a result of one over-all operation. But, the allocation method devised and utilized by TVA has been reviewed by both the Federal Power Commission and the Corps of Engineers, both experts in this field, and—while FPC and the Corps of Engineers might have employed somewhat different allocations—these agencies seemed to find no particular fault with the TVA method.

Even if another method were employed, the only result would be to reduce or increase the return on the over-all TVA investment.

The Edison Electric Institute shows its insincerity by refusing to acknowledge that the people of the United States receive any benefits whatsoever from the common cost of controlling the Tennessee River system on a multiple-purpose basis. This is contrary to the expression of Congress. Congress directed the Tennessee Valley Authority to allocate its costs proportionately to navigation, flood control, and other purposes. Other purposes include electric power, research, the fertilizer program, work in the wildlife and fisheries fields, and so forth. These other purposes, with the exception of the allocation for electrical energy, are based on specific appropriations by the Congress.

If we take the Edison Electric Institute argument, as it was reported in the newspapers, it means we must say that there is no value in navigation and flood control, and charge these items off as "zero." In addition to the secondary benefits of flood control to the people in the TVA region, I think the people of America who live along the lower Ohio River and in the lower Mississippi River Valley find a great deal of flood-control value in TVA. Had the TVA system of dams not been holding back billions of gallons of water last month, the most disastrous flood in many years would have resulted on the lower Ohio and lower Mississippi. Yet, the Edison Electric Institute would have the American people believe there is no value in the flood-control activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

To accept the private power trust's version, we must say that the power consumers in the TVA region should pay the entire cost of flood control and navigation, made possible by TVA, for the American citizens who work and live downstream. That is a preposterous allegation and conclusion, and Congress rejected it flatly when the private power lobby brought it up previously.

The Edison Electric Institute averments include the statement that the nonpower operations of TVA, such as work in forestry, regional planning, research, fertilizer, wildlife and fisheries, and the like, are rendered almost free of charge and the loss made up by donations from the rest of the United States.

Actually, these services are provided completely—not almost—free of charge. They are expenses, just as the service of the Weather Bureau is provided on a dead expense proposition, free of charge to all Americans who desire to avail themselves of the service. But, may I repeat, all these nonpower activities are controlled by specific appropriations of the Congress.

These activities, to some extent, have enabled the TVA section to improve its economic position. In 1933, before this wonderful regional development, the TVA section paid only 3 percent of the national income tax; now, we are paying a little over 6 percent.

I think, Mr. President, the private power lobby is beginning to stir again in its effort to assure that the South maintains the status quo in economic development: that this great one-third of a nation remain the economic problem No. 1 of America.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT RELATING TO REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate a protocol dated in London, August 31, 1949, Executive G, Eighty-first Congress, second session, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1949, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar at London on May 6, 1937.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the protocol, that the protocol and the President's message of transmittal be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message from the President and the protocol were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message of the President was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol dated in London August 31, 1949, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1949, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar signed at London on May 6, 1937.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Secretary of State with respect to this matter.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1950.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) certified copy of protocol of August 31, 1949.)

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I report favorably certain nominations for promotions in the Army, the Navy, the Air Force and the Marine Corps, and ask for their present consideration and confirmation, and that the President be notified. These nominations come from the Armed Services Committee with a unanimous report. No complaint has been filed against any of the nominees. The nominations have been before the committee for the prescribed period of time, without dissent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the reports will be received and, without objection, the nominations will be confirmed, and the President notified.

CODIFICATION OF THE ARTICLES OF WAR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr LUCAS. Mr. President, yesterday the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] gave notice that he would make a motion to refer the pending measure to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] submitted certain amendments to the bill. I made a brief statement last evening before the Senate took a recess, in the hope that we might be able to finish consideration of the bill this afternoon. I wish to advise Senators that the session will run rather late. I do not wish to hold a night session. I hope that later perhaps we may be able to obtain an agreement to vote at a certain hour on the pending measure and all amendments thereto. I merely make that statement so as to advise the Senate that probably we shall vote late this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no motion or amendment now pending except the committee amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute, to which amendments may be offered.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that, but the Senator from Nevada advised the Senate last night that at the appropriate moment he would make a motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order that there may be no charge of delay or waste of time on this bill, I now move that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order that it may be fully understood by the Senate that this is not a motion made in haste, nor for the purpose of delaying the consideration of a bill of grave importance, I desire to read to the Senate a copy of a letter which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, and which was written by myself to the able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. TYDINGS] on July 1, 1949:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
July 1, 1949.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C

MY DEAR SENATOR. H R. 4080, the so-called Code of Military Justice, was reported to the Senate from the Committee on Armed Services on June 10, 1949.

In many of its provisions this bill deals with matters which I believe to be properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, therefore, I believe it to be my duty to attempt to enforce what I consider to be the jurisdiction of the committee of which I have the honor to be the chairman. Therefore, I intend to move that the bill (H. R. 4080) be taken from the Senate Calendar and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I hope you may feel it will not be necessary to oppose my motion, for I should like to have your cooperation in this matter.

I do not wish to burden you now with a detailed discussion of this question, but let me cite some of the more compelling instances of provisions in the bill which I feel should have the scrutiny of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Article 2 of the proposed new Code of Military Justice makes it clear that those to whom the code applies (in addition to Regular and Volunteer personnel) include:

"(1) * * * all inductees from the time of their actual induction into the armed forces of the United States, and all other persons lawfully called or ordered into, or to duty in or for training in, the armed forces, from the dates they are required by the terms of the call or order to obey the same; * * * (2) Reserve personnel while they are on inactive-duty training authorized by written orders which are voluntarily accepted by them, which orders specify that they are subject to this code; * * * (10) in time of war, all persons serving with or accompanying an armed force in the field; (11) subject to the provisions of any treaty or agreement to which the United States is or may be a party or to any accepted rule of international law, all persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the armed forces without the continental limits of the United States and the following Territories: That part of Alaska * * *, the Canal Zone, the main group of the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

The above provisions greatly broaden the scope of authority and jurisdiction of military courts In fact, those civilians who would thus be brought within the jurisdiction of military justice appear to include Mr McCloy and all personnel of the Allied Military Government, as well as, no one knows how many, persons in Hawaii, since article 5 provides that this code shall be applicable in all places.

Article 3 of the proposed code lays the jurisdiction to try former personnel for offenses committed while subject to the code, if they cannot be tried in the United States courts and if the sentence could be 5 years or more.

This provision, like the provision above referred to, is extremely important when it is realized the code does not provide for bond, arraignment, or any of the usual rights accorded to even the worst type of civilian defendant.

Article 76 of the proposed code seeks to make the administrative action taken final and binding upon all departments, courts, agencies, and officers of the United States.

This seems to me an extremely dangerous provision and subject to serious question on constitutional grounds. It is questionable whether an act of Congress could thus rob the Supreme Court of appellate jurisdiction. I do not believe all civilian courts should be closed to anyone with respect to all matters which may have been tried before a military tribunal or administratively determined by the military. I question the wisdom of conferring absolute finality upon the decisions of an alleged court, the members of which are subject to removal by an administrative officer.

I believe the above is sufficient to show the reasons for my conviction that this bill should have the most serious consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary before being enacted into law.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

There was a reply to that letter by the able Senator from Maryland, the chairman of the committee, to which I replied on July 19, 1949, as follows:

JULY 19, 1949.

Hon MILLARD E TYDINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I have your letter of July 13, with regard to the motion which I have advised you I intend to offer, to refer the bill H R. 4080 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I do, indeed, recall our earlier conversations on this subject. They began with discussion of resolutions pending before the Committee on the Judiciary for the investigation of military justice. You pointed out that similar resolutions were pending before the Committee on Armed Services, and that the committee was also working on a new code of military justice; and, as I recall it, you suggested that I allow the matter to rest with the Committee on Armed Services until you had concluded your deliberations on this bill, with the thought that then we could discuss the matter further.

In conformance with this agreement, the Judiciary Committee has taken no action on the resolutions pending before it for the investigation of military justice, and the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services to consider and deal with the bill H R 4080 has not been challenged. I am not challenging that jurisdiction now, and I have no intention of challenging it. All I am doing is asserting that the bill includes subject matter clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, and asking that now, after the Committee on Armed Services has had its say, the bill may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration of those matters which do lie within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

While it is true that, in a spirit of cooperation, I submitted to you, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, a very lengthy letter expressing some of my personal views with regard to the bill H. R. 4080, it must be clear that this did not amount to action or consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary, and I cannot feel that the opportunity given me personally to express my views, and the consideration given by the Committee on Armed Services to the views so expressed, should operate to divest the Committee on the Judiciary of its jurisdiction.

Because I know there is not and will not be any acrimony between us with respect to

this matter, I do not wish to attempt a point-by-point traverse of your letter. However, in fairness, I believe I should make one or two comments.

Article 2, subdivision (3), may be a "restricted version of the authority heretofore provided for the Navy" but it cannot be denied that it expands jurisdiction to members of the Army and Air Force Reserve. Furthermore, one must bear in mind that, under article 3, such personnel may be recalled to duty without their consent for trial of offenses committed while on such duty with a questionable statute of limitations applicable and limited only (as to military offenses) by the 5-year sentence proviso. This latter limitation is in turn limited only by article 56 which grants the President authority (which he may delegate under art. 140) to prescribe limits.

In arriving at your conclusions with respect to subdivisions (10) and (11) of article 3, you have evidently not considered the decision rendered in *McCune* v. *Kilpatrick* (53 Fed. Supp. 80), where a civilian cook, hired to provide meals for a merchant-marine crew and armed guard, was held amenable to trial by court martial on charges of desertion, when he quit his job after learning that he was also supposed to cook for about 500 Army troops being transported overseas.

As to the Hirshberg and Durant cases, it can just as reasonably be argued that Congress should confer jurisdiction on civilian courts to try such cases as that we should further expand the authority of military tribunals.

The fact that extant laws provide or do not provide remedies for certain offenses is not the basic question here. It is rather the limit to which we have permitted or will expand the jurisdiction of military courts over the lives and fortunes of our ordinary citizens and nationals. There can be no denial of the power of Congress to confer jurisdiction on our inferior courts to consider all matters relating to military offenses. The pattern to be followed by military courts in times of emergency was set in Hawaii following December 7, 1941.

I do not doubt that careful consideration was given to every word of the bill by both the Senate and House committees, but I submit that the viewpoint from which the consideration is given is most important. Although the committee reports state that it was not the intention to foreclose petitions for writs of habeas corpus, I believe you will agree that the proposed language of the bill is clear and unambiguous and would, therefore, never be required to be interpreted by reference to the committee report. Under this language, even if it should be held that the writ might lie—which is doubtful—the action of a military court would not be subject to challenge, and therefore the writ could provide no real relief.

I cannot agree that "the whole subject of military justice is one which falls wholly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services." The Legislative Reorganization Act specifically commits to the Committee on the Judiciary jurisdiction over "judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally," and over "civil liberties." Where the rights and liberties of civilians are concerned, I believe the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary should stand unquestioned; and there is no doubt such rights are involved in the bill H. R. 4080.

I certainly do not wish to enter into a controversy with you over this matter; and I assure you that if the bill is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary it will be considered most promptly, and most promptly reported back to the Senate.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

Mr. President, there is involved in this bill so much that impinges upon human liberties and human rights that it certainly could not be objectionable to have the bill considered by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, when, as a matter of fact, human rights and human liberties are involved in the law which is the subject matter of the jurisdiction of that committee.

What harm could there come by referring the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary? I wish to assure the Senate here and now that it is my fervent desire to vote for the bill if it can be brought in line with what I consider to be the proper procedure. I think a bill of this kind has a proper place and should be considered by the legislative department of the Government. Although the bill undoubtedly has received the diligent attention of the Armed Services Committees of both Houses, it can do no harm to have the bill reviewed by the Committee on the Judiciary, with a view to determining whether human rights or human liberties are so affected that some changes should be written into the bill.

Again I assure the Senate that I do not make the motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary for the purpose of delaying action on the bill or for the purpose of defeating the bill. If that had been the case, I certainly would not have called the matter to the attention of the able chairman of the committee having the bill in charge, nor would I have drawn his attention to matters which I think are vital to the whole situation.

Mr. President, House bill 4080, a bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and to establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice, was reported to the Senate from the Committee on Armed Services on June 10, 1949, and the bill is now the unfinished business before this body. I wish to call attention to the fact that my communication with the able Senator from Maryland was on the 1st of July, following the reporting of the bill by the Committee on Armed Services, and when it was pending on the calendar.

Many of the provisions of the bill deal with matters which I believe to be properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. By way of illustration, the code provides, among other things, that the jurisdiction of the military courts shall be extended to a great many civilians who may be "serving with, employed by, or accompanying the armed forces without the continental limits of the United States," as well as civilians in the Canal Zone, the main group of the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. It is obvious that all civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments who happen to be stationed overseas, as well as all employees of the allied military government, would be included within the new jurisdictional boundaries. The bill further provides, in article 5, that the code shall be applicable in all places.

The caution with which such an expansion of jurisdiction to civilians should be approached is indicated by regulations issued by the Department of the Army on March 8, 1949, pertaining to the practice of law by United States lawyers in the United States area of control of Germany, which appear in the Federal Register issued Friday, May 20, 1949, at page 2662. These regulations indicate that the Army desires to exercise a strict control over the terms and conditions under which counsel may represent both military and civilian personnel as well as foreign nationals in the occupied area. Admission to practice and expulsion therefrom are absolutely in the hands of an attorneys supervisory board, composed entirely of either military personnel or civilians subject to military orders.

Article 3 of the proposed code establishes the jurisdiction to try former armed forces personnel for offenses committed while subject to the code. It will be noted that this provision of the bill directly affects the civil rights of our citizens, when it is realized that persons arrested by the armed forces cannot be admitted to bond, arraigned, or brought before the grand jury. The hardships that can be the result of such action may be illustrated by three incidents which have been brought to the attention of Congress comparatively recently.

The first is a case of an honorably discharged sailor who was arrested by Naval authorities at his home in Los Angeles and taken 6,000 miles to the Philippine Islands where, bereft of friends and funds, he was held for about 6 months awaiting trial on charges, which were finally nolle prossed, and was then returned by the Navy to San Francisco and left to make his return to Los Angeles and his ruined business as best he could under his own power.

We recently read in the newspapers of the case of the ex-soldier from Indiana who was arrested in his home at night by Army authorities and immediately flown to Berlin, Germany, to face charges brought against him there.

A third incident was the subject of a private relief bill recently approved by the Senate, involving an honorably discharged soldier who was arrested at his home in Georgia on a warrant issued by Army authorities and taken to Fort McClellan, Ala., to face charges of desertion, even though he had in his possession and exhibited to Army authorities an honorable-discharge certificate. He was thrown into the stockade and held there for about 2 weeks, during which time he was not permitted to consult counsel, while the responsible Army officers groped through their files to determine whether or not the charges brought against him were, in fact, based on sound grounds.

Most important of all, the proposed code provides that the quondam court of military appeals—in fact, an administrative body—in its decisions shall bind "all departments, courts, agencies, and officers of the United States." When it is noted that the only absolute right of appeal to this supreme court is granted to admirals and generals alone, very careful scrutiny should be given the bill to determine whether or not an administrative agency can thus rob the

Supreme Court of its appellate jurisdiction.

Based on these considerations, and mindful of the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee with respect to civil rights I now move that the bill, H. R. 4080, be taken from the Senate Calendar and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Has the Senator read the report of the Committee on Armed Services, submitted by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], on the pending bill which establishes a Uniform Code of Military Justice? If he has, he will note on page 32 a discussion of article 76, which the Senator from Nevada has just been discussing. It very clearly says the committee's idea is that—

> Subject only to a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in Federal court, it provides for the finality of court-martial proceedings and judgments.

So the question was directly considered by the committee, and the committee believes the point is covered, particularly in view of the decision by Mr. Justice Black in the case of Humphrey against Smith, decided April 25, 1949.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is in the report, but why is it not in the bill?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the language about the finality of the finding of the court martial is identically the same as the language which has been in the law previously. It was in the Kem amendment to the bill passed by Congress in 1948; so that there is nothing new about the language in the proposed Uniform Code.

Mr. McCARRAN. Assuming for the sake of argument that the Senator's statement is correct—which I must assume, but only for the sake of argument—it does not militate against the motion I am now making. It is a matter for review by the committee which has jurisdiction over that phase of the law.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The point I am trying to make is that the pending bill adds nothing new in the matter of the finality of court-martial proceeding. As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts stated yesterday, in the case of Humphrey against Smith, decided April 25, 1949, it was held that the language did not take away the right of review by the Supreme Court of habeas-corpus matters, but that the Court could still review the jurisdiction of the court-martial proceedings.

Mr. McCARRAN. What does the bill mean when it says "binding on all departments, courts, agencies, and officers of the United States"? Does not that attempt to bind the courts?

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I said, it is the same language as that which was in the Kem amendment in 1948. It attempts to bind the courts on all matters except jurisdictional matters.

Mr. McCARRAN. Why does it not say "all matters except jurisdictional matters"?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Humphrey case, of course, decided that the Congress, through its enactment, did not, and could not, under the ninth amendment to the Constitution, intend to take away the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court or of other courts in habeas corpus matters. It was the decision in the Humphrey case that the courts still have jurisdiction, and that the law does not take away the jurisdiction of the courts in habeas corpus proceedings.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the Congress, when it enacts a law, makes the law. The Supreme Court may reverse a decision the next day, or the next week, as a matter of fact, but Congress, when it enacts a statute, makes the law. The points which are raised here relate to matters which brought courts-martial proceeding into such disrepute in times past that there has been pending before the Committee on the Judiciary for many months a resolution to investigate the administration of military justice.

Mr. President, there are many things in the bill which are meritorious, and I am not standing here to argue against the principle of the bill. What I am arguing for is that Congress within its power shall take the most necessary steps to see to it that no bill is passed which has not been reviewed by a committee which claims jurisdiction of the subject matter. In behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and under the Legislative Reorganization Act as it is now binding upon us, I certainly claim that the Committee on the Judiciary has jurisdiction over certain phases of the pending bill.

I do not propose to vote to deny the right of review by a committee which, under the law creating the committee, has jurisdiction. Why deny that committee jurisdiction? Are Senators afraid of the 13 men of whom the able Senator from Tennessee is one?

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, answering the last statement of the distinguished Senator from Nevada, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I wish to point out that over a period of more than 2 years the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives and the Armed Services Committee of the Senate have been wrestling with this problem. They have held very extensive hearings. Those committees have always had jurisdiction of every question encompassed in this bill. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, 3 months after the bill was introduced by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. TYDINGS], wrote to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee on April 30, 1949, a 36-page letter suggesting certain matters which the committee thought should be incorporated in the bill, and the committee, after lengthy hearings, considered carefully all the recommendations made. The bill is now before the Senate with really only two or three points of dispute to be settled by the Members of the Senate. I assume those points of dispute would be present, no matter how many committees had worked on the bill. We are fearful that unless some action is taken at this time, the great accomplishments in the matter of unification and codification of two complicated military acts may go by the board.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Nevada has the floor. If the Senator from Tennessee has concluded his statement, I shall be glad to yield. I should like to say, before I yield, that human rights and human liberties are the foundation stone of this Government, no matter where the human being may be, whether in military forces or in the civil life of the Nation. Regardless of whether the bill may have been held for 3 years, or how long it may have been held, or how much study may have been devoted to it, still, if a committee, to which, by law, is assigned the jurisdiction of certain subject matters embraced within the bill, requests the right to review the bill, that it may give its views or perhaps its sanction to the provisions of the bill, what harm can result by referring the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary? If the Senate wants to limit the time within which it will consider the bill and require the Committee on the Judiciary to report within a given period, we shall do the best we can. But the jurisdiction is, by the Reorganization Act, conferred upon the Judiciary Committee, and I certainly cannot remain silent when I feel that the jurisdiction rests in that committee.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall first yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to inquire if this measure has not been pending in the Congress for some time, and why it becomes a matter of the utmost urgency at this time, when it has been pending for months and when no effort has been made on the part of the Senator from Tennessee or on the part of the majority to bring it to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield in order that the Senator from Tennessee may answer that question, if, by so doing, I do not lose the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator from Missouri means that the committee has not been diligent——

Mr. KEM. I did not mean that. I wondered why the urgency had become so great.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator did make that inference, and I want respectfully to answer the Senator on that point. It was agreed that the subject would first be considered in the House of Representatives. A House bill was passed and sent to the Senate on May 5, 1949. Even anticipating the House bill coming over to the Senate, a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services held a hearing on April 27, 1949; also on May 4, 1949, one day before the House bill was passed, and on May 9, and on May 27. Then, with reasonable dispatch and as quickly as possible, the matter was referred to the full Committee on Armed Services, and on June 10, within 13 days after the subcommittee had completed its hearings, the full Armed Services Committee acted upon the bill and a clean bill in the nature of an amendment was reported to the Senate which had also taken into account the 36-page memorandum, a very useful one, which the distinguished Senator from Nevada had submitted to the committee. Since that time, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and the chairman of the subcommittee have written a number of letters and have spoken very frequently to the majority leader with regard to bringing the bill up for consideration by the Senate. We have certainly not acted without diligence. I think we have shown unusual diligence in the matter.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to conclude my remarks, but I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to say, Mr. President, that I did not mean to infer that there had been any lack of diligence on the part of the Senator from Tennessee, for he is diligent about everything he undertakes. But it is difficult for me to understand the necessity for immediate action on the bill, and why it has become a matter of such great urgency just at this time. It has been pending for many months, and it is difficult for me to understand why any harm can be done to the public interest by having the subject deliberately considered by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, my motion is not for the purpose of delay. I believe in the principle of the bill. My motion is not meant to delay consideration of the bill. It is made in good faith, so that the Committee on the Judiciary may give consideration to certain phases of the bill. Nothing emphasizes my position more than does the reference made by the able Senator from Tennessee to a Supreme Court decision. Undoubtedly, in the case to which he has referred, the Army was arguing that a writ of habeas corpus would not lie. There was no question about that. If they argued it at that time, they will argue it again. Are we going to enact laws which will set aside the rights of civilians in the armed services, rights which are fundamental to the democracies of the world? It seems to me that we would be placing those rights in jeopardy. It seems to me that that question should be considered from a viewpoint other than the military viewpoint. It should be considered from the civilian viewpoint as well.

That is one of the reasons why I say the bill should go to a committee which is not charged strictly with military thoughts and military ideas, because human liberties run through all life.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would say, most respectfully, to the Senator from Nevada that our effort—and I was a member of the subcommittee which considered this matter—was to protect the liberty of the individual within the armed services and to accord him the greatest possible justice as a soldier, and, at the same time, to have regard for the purpose of our armed services—to fight and to win wars and to protect the national security. This is not an emergency measure. Any bill which comes to the floor of the Senate must at some time or other be debated.

This bill has been delayed because of the desire to make it as nearly perfect as possible. It is now before the Senate for consideration and debate. I say to the Senator that I would not argue to him for a moment the question of there being an emergency, but I do argue to him most sincerely that the bill has been carefully considered for more than 2 years by the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Except in a few instances, which I should be glad to point out to the Senator, there is no extension of authority over the jurisdiction of courts martial as it has existed over the period of years. There are a few exceptions, as I have said.

I do not wish to give the Senator the impression that there are no changes, but I say that such as there are have been considered carefully and we believe the rules and regulations of the Army and the Navy, under the Constitution, are within the questions that are to be considered by the Committee on Armed Services. We have carefully considered the bill. There is no effort to take away any of the responsibility of the Committee on the Judiciary, but I most respectfully say that I do not think the bill belongs in that committee, any more than do many other subjects. When one committee which has jurisdiction has considered and reported a bill, it should come before the Senate and be either voted up or voted down.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in reply let me say that if the principle which the able Senator from Massachusetts advocates were adhered to in this body, there would be no occasion for the Committee on Banking and Currency to seek now to discharge itself from the consideration of a bill pending in that committee because there is a certain phase of the bill which belongs to the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. That is one question which is pending here now. When the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce passed upon the basing point measure and brought back its report to the Senate, it asked, on the request of the Committee on the Judiciary, that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and this body did not hesitate to do that.

Both those measures were important. The one now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency, which the committee is about to ask the Senate to refer to the Committee on the Judiciary, is an important bill. The bill that involved the basing-point question was certainly an important bill. It has taken the time of the Senate for many, many days. All these bills were important measures. The bill which came from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, is an emergency bill. The country is calling for legislation on the subject it covers. If the principle advocated by the able Senator from Massachusetts were to be adopted by the Senate, then some committees would be entirely shorn of jurisdiction because a certain bill had been assigned to another committee.

However, Mr. President, this argument is likely to lead us into a wrong channel. I am not arguing regarding the diligence exercised in the consideration of the pending bill by the committee which handled it. I think they have done a fine piece of work. But there are matters in the bill which they looked upon with a certain slant and in a certain light, which I believe should have the impartial consideration of those who look upon it from a different viewpoint. The military is one thing, and the train of thought of the members of the military is along a certain line, and that is fine. But civilian life and civilian law are another thing.

In all fairness, I say to the Senate that it cannot afford not to refer this bill to the Judiciary Committee, in view of the contention which has arisen, in view of the voluminous correspondence we have received in the Committee on the Judiciary, not with reference to this bill alone, but with reference to injustice practiced by military courts. They are reeking with injustice, if we are to believe the charges which have been made. I do not make them, because I have no right to, but I say that if we believe the charges which have been filed with my committee, military justice has gone far afield from real justice.

If that be true, Mr. President, or if there is a group in this country which suspects it to be true, can there be any argument to the effect that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate cannot have the bill; they cannot consider it.

Is it desired that Senators who, like myself, favor something of the kind designed by the bill shall vote against the bill? I certainly shall vote against it if it comes to a vote and my committee is denied the right of review.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The statement made a moment ago by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] causes me to ask the Senator from Nevada to yield in order that I might try to answer his inquiry with respect to the speed with which the pending bill has been brought up.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope that will not be brought into this argument.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the Senator may proceed if he desires.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make a short statement in the Senator's time, if I may.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. On June 10 last year the Committee on Armed Services reported the pending bill. I may say to the Senator from Missouri that thereafter during the last session, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the chairman of the committee, asked me several times if he could not bring it up for consideration. We were unable to do that He also has asked the Democratic policy committee during this session to arrange to have the bill considered as soon as possible, and the Democratic policy committee, after considering a number of bills, believed that it was proper to bring this bill to the floor of the Senate.

I knew nothing about the fact that the Senator from Nevada would make a motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary. That was not suggested to the policy committee, and I knew nothing about it. I believed the bill would be debated on its merits and be voted up or down without a motion to refer it to another committee.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say, in that connection, as I said to the Senator from Tennessee, that I am sure there has been no lack of diligence on his part, and I am sure there has been no lack of diligence on the part of the able majority leader, the Senator from Illinois. But the fact is that the bill has already been pending on the calendar for many months, and it is passing strange that it should be argued now that there will be such great public harm if it is considered deliberately for a few weeks, let us say, by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not arguing that question. This is a House bill.

Mr. KEM. It is unnecessary for the Senator to argue anything else in that connection, because I am sure he has been as diligent as he could be.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, again I wish to emphasize that this motion is not made for the purpose of delay, but is made for the purpose of affording an opportunity for careful study. I again say that if the Senate wishes to limit the time which the Committee on the Judiciary shall have to consider the bill, I am entirely content, but I certainly cannot without protest see this bill go through, after the history of the bill as made on the floor here this morning, showing that as early as July 1, 1949, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary drew the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to certain phases of the bill and told him he would make this motion; that reply was made to my letter, and my answer again emphasized the fact that I would make the motion. All of that drew the attention of the Committee on Armed Services to the vital questions involved in the bill. There are at least eight points in the bill which should be reviewed by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President, if it be the will of the Senate that one of its standing committees which has jurisdiction, under the law governing, shall be deprived of jurisdiction, then I have nothing further to say, and I shall have done my duty so far as I have been able to see it. I shall certainly vote against the bill, and I shall ask for a record vote on it, if our committee is not permitted to have jurisdiction. I again say that if the Senate desires to limit the time within which the Judiciary Committee may consider the bill, I shall agree to such an amendment to my motion.

Mr. President, I ask for a quorum at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Anderson	Hoey	Morse
Benton	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Neely
Bridges	Ives	O'Conor
Butler	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chapman	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kem	Schoeppel
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Lehman	Stennis
Douglas	Lodge	Taft
Dworshak	Lucas	Taylor
Ecton	McCarran	Thomas, Okla
Ellender	McCarthy	Tydings
Ferguson	McClellan	Watkins
Fulbright	McFarland	Wherry
George	McKellar	Wiley
Gillette	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Withers
Hayden	Malone	Young
Hendrickson	Maybank	
Hill	Millikin	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to commit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to correct a misstatement of fact. This is not a motion to recommit; it is a motion to refer. If it were a motion to recommit, the bill, if the motion carried, would go back to the committee from whence it came.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair said "commit," which is substantially the same as to refer.

Mr. McCARRAN. I simply wish to point out that it is a motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is what it is; that is true.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me state for the information of the Senate that should the motion to refer prevail, the bill will come back to the Senate with any changes, if any changes shall be made by the Judiciary Committee, as amendments to the bill. I wish to state emphatically that, so far as I am concerned, control of the bill will not be taken out of the hands of the Senator who now has control of it, but the bill will be reported with the action of the Judiciary Committee.

Again I say that if the Senate desires to limit the time within which the Judiciary Committee shall consider the bill and report it to the Senate, I shall have no objection.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was going to ask, when does the able chairman of the Judiciary Committee think he will be able to report the bill, with such changes as his committee might desire to make?

Mr. McCARRAN. I state this as conjecture: I say within 30 days.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. McCARRAN asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] who is detained on official business, is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who is also detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—33

Benton	Hendrickson	Morse
Brewster	Ives	O'Conor
Bricker	Jenner	Schoeppel
Butler	Johnston, S C	Stennis
Cain	Kem	Taft
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Watkins
Donnell	McClellan	Wherry
Dworshak	McKellar	Wiley
Ecton	Magnuson	Williams
Ferguson	Malone	Withers

NAYS—43

Anderson	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	Neely
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Kefauver	Robertson
Douglas	Kerr	Russell
Ellender	Knowland	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
George	Lodge	Sparkman
Gillette	Lucas	Taylor
Gurney	McFarland	Tydings
Hayden	McMahon	Young
Hill	Maybank	
Hoey	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—20

Aiken	Green	Myers
Darby	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Downey	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Langer	Thye
Flanders	Leahy	Tobey
Frear	Long	Vandenberg
Graham	Martin	

So Mr. MCCARRAN'S motion was rejected.

AGRICULTURAL PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was somewhat surprised this morning to see in a newspaper a headline reading "Truman blames 'spud' deficiency on Hill," and to read in the second paragraph of that news story the following:

Specifically, Mr. Truman blamed the potato mess upon the Agricultural Act of 1949, often referred to as the Anderson farm bill, for its author, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico.

I was aware that the President had had some unpleasant things to say about the actions of the Eightieth Congress, but so far as I knew, he had had very little to say which was uncomplimentary of the Eighty-first Congress, and I was so surprised at the quoted statement that I took the liberty of calling the official reporter at the White House, who makes a clear record of what is said at press conferences, and asked to have the exact wording repeated to me. I do not guarantee that what I repeat is completely accurate, but it was taken down slowly from the President's official reporter. The official text was not available at the time I desired it. The question came from May Craig, representing some Maine newspapers. The question was as follows:

Mr. President, do you have any comment on the present crisis relating to the surplus of potatoes?

The President's reply was as follows:

I think the lady from Maine ought to know more about potatoes than anybody in the United States. She ought to understand that this Farm Act, which was amended last year, puts us in the position to place those potatoes in the condition in which they are. And that whole thing is a sectional thing for the benefit of the potato growers of Maine—as well as the potato growers in the United States, but that is how it came about. I suggest you talk to Senator BREWSTER about it.

I submit to the Members of the Senate that that is something quite different from saying that the President blames the potato situation upon the Agricultural Act of 1949, because I think everyone should recognize that not 1 bushel of potatoes now causing difficulty in the market was grown or produced or supported under the Agricultural Act of 1949. Whatever program there may be for those potatoes arose as the result of the Agricultural Act of 1948. As to whether the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is responsible for that, I am not able to say. I know that the distinguished Senator from Maine is quite able to take care of himself, but I have understood that on the particular occasion when the bill passed, he was away on official duties, probably in another part of the world, and I am glad to know that his influence extends as it does across the waters in such remarkable fashion.

Mr. President, I desire to review briefly some things which I think should not be forgotten. They are brought to my mind again by a cartoon which appeared on February 1 in the same newspaper containing the story to which I have referred. It showed a hot potato which Congress was juggling, and beside it was a figure which I assumed to be a representation of me, and the label on it was "The Anderson Farm Act," indicating, quite clearly, the belief that the surplus was acquired because of some farm legislation in which I had had a part.

Mr. President, I wish time would permit me to review in detail some of the things of a similar nature which have appeared recently, but I know of a story to the effect that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was discussing the desirability of adding $2,000,000,000 to the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I took some part in the discussion. The closing paragraph of the newspaper story was that at that time I indicated that I held the Department's policies responsible for the huge potato loss, and predicted that such losses would continue until those policies were changed.

Mr. President, fortunately there is a transcript of every word I said in that hearing, and I suggest that there is not a word of truth in that paragraph. I did not blame the policies of the Department of Agriculture. I made it entirely clear that I thought the responsibility was solely with the Congress of the United States. In support of that, I desire to submit two or three things which perhaps might otherwise be forgotten.

On November 29, 1946, I addressed a letter to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, Senator Capper, then ranking minority member of that committee. I also sent it to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and to the ranking minority member of that committee.

The letter which I should like to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point pointed out that a surplus of potatoes existed in 1946. The letter showed that the surplus was going to cost the Government of the United States approximately $20,000,000, and it pointed out that with the 1945 problems in mind we had tried to reduce the 1946 cost.

We found we were able to reduce acreage, but were not able to reduce the over-all production, because additional fertilizer had been used, the growing weather had been somewhat favorable, and we found we had a surplus of from 92,000,000 to 100,000,000 bushels.

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

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, November 26, 1946.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: The basic relationship between our agricultural price-support commitments and production levels for the various crops involved is one of the most fundamental questions before us at this time. As you know, farmers have been promised price support at not less than 90 percent of parity on many important agricultural commodities for two full calendar years after the formal declaration of the end of hostilities. While this congressional provision is very sound, giving farmers deserved protection during the transition from wartime to peacetime operations, it is obvious that under certain conditions, and for certain commodities, this support can serve to prevent the development of production patterns in line with peacetime needs.

While this situation will have more serious implications for the future, if domestic or foreign demand for the products of our farms falls off materially, it is also of immediate concern We are having very real trouble with potatoes this year. In calling this whole question to your attention, I should like to review the potato program—in light of the difficulties we are having in carrying out price-support commitments with this first of the major postwar surplus crops.

We had a surplus of potatoes even in 1943 and also in 1945. Potato production in 1945, for example, was 425,000,000 bushels—then the third largest crop on record, despite the fact that harvested acreage was 200,000 acres less than the 1934–43 average. Price-support operations on the 1945 crop resulted in a net cost to the Government of about $20,000,000.

With 1945 problems clearly in mind, we set 1946 potato-production goals which called for material reductions. When the potato price-support program was announced later in the fall, levels were calculated on the low side of the possible price-support range. We were trying to keep support prices from being an incentive to excessive production, but we were criticized rather severely for this action. As a matter of fact, in April the price-support levels were increased by about

15 cents a hundred pounds, largely to compensate for increases in the parity index.

Despite the downward adjustment in production goals and efforts to hold price supports at the lower levels, the situation in 1946 is much worse than it was in 1945. The Department is now engaged in price-support operations of the largest scale yet experienced for this commodity.

Potato goals recommended by the Department for 1946, based on historical production figures and prospective demand, were expected to result in a production of approximately 378,000,000 bushels. Instead, production soared to 478,000,000 bushels, giving us a surplus of between ninety and one hundred million bushels.

While the total national acreage was only about 1 percent above the established goal, three factors contributed to the overproduction in 1946: (a) reductions in acreage in low-yield areas, and increases in high-yield areas; (b) ideal growing weather throughout the high-yield areas; and (c) wider-spread use of newly developed, more efficient insecticides such as DDT.

With this huge crop in prospect, the Department was committed to support potato prices, under provisions of the Steagall amendment, at 90 percent of parity.

I want to repeat that the Department anticipated the potato surpluses and that from the outset every effort was made to assist all branches of the distributive trades in moving potatoes through normal channels of distribution into human consumption. But despite comprehensive and consistent sales-promotion efforts by both Government and cooperating industry, the Department has been compelled to purchase or otherwise remove from regular trade channels approximately 40,000,000 bushels of 1946 crop potatoes to carry out its price-support obligations Approximately 55,000,000 bushels, now under temporary or permanent loan, still remain for removal from ordinary trade channels.

The task of diverting the potatoes purchased by the Government has been attacked vigorously and continuously throughout the season. Here are the diversion outlets which the Department has exploited to the fullest extent feasible:

1 Direct distribution: Approximately 1,000,000 bushels of potatoes have been distributed directly to school-lunch programs and to approved public institutions free of charge (Purchases started in May, only a month before schools closed for the summer, and schools reopening in September have not yet had a chance to absorb any appreciable amount)

2. Diversion to starch mills and livestock feed: Despite continuing shortages of boxcars, potatoes have been shipped to every practical outlet About 2,000,000 bushels have been diverted to starch mills. Another 1,500,000 bushels have been sold, most of them at 20 cents per hundredweight f. o. b., to farmers for use as livestock feed.

3. Diversion to alcohol manufacture: Distillers have taken 20,000,000 bushels for distillation of beverage alcohol—the largest of the diversion outlets. Shortages of grain this year for normal distilling operations opened this special outlet for surplus potatoes. An additional 6,100,000 bushels of potatoes have gone to distillers of industrial alcohol for ultimate use in the manufacture of synthetic rubber, antifreeze, and other products. With better grain supplies in 1947 and future years, the beverage alcohol outlet will not be available.

4. Export outlets: A total of about 525,000 bushels.

The question immediately arises as to why potatoes were not exported in any appreciable volume. Early in the production season, the Department sent letters to all international agencies and foreign countries known to be in need of food supplies, calling attention to the very large United States potato supplies and offering to make them readily available. However, because of the high water content of fresh potatoes, shipping charges are relatively high per unit of net food value. They also require special handling. They must be protected from rotting in summer and from freezing in winter. Hence, it has not been possible to arrange large-volume shipments for export. So far potatoes have been exported only to Belgium, though the Department is continuing to follow up any possible opportunity to ship potatoes at the competitive world price not only on a government-to-government basis, but even on a government-to-individual basis.

UNRRA and foreign governments have not been willing to purchase dehydrated potatoes at a cost of 25 to 30 cents a pound when they could purchase flour at 5 or 6 cents per pound. This held true even when the Department offered to supply the potatoes free of charge except for the processing costs.

Since early May, we have geared our program to continuous and aggressive effort to utilize the potatoes which, under the mandate of the Steagall amendment, we are compelled to support. In all sincerity, I cannot conceive of any practical step which we have overlooked.

But, despite all our efforts, best current estimates are that there still may be as many as 20,000,000 bushels of potatoes for which we shall be unable to find any practical outlet or use at all, and which are likely to be a total waste. These potatoes are now largely in temporary storage, the larger percentage of them in the northeastern section of the country. It has been necessary to leave many of the potatoes in the field, simply covered with straw or other material. The storage is not the type which will protect them from freezing this winter. Reports will soon begin to appear, telling how potatoes are rotting in the fields or going to waste in other places. This is an unpleasant situation, but it is a stark reality we must face.

The over-all cost to the Government for the 1946 potato-support program is estimated at $100,000,000 Of this amount the Department will recover, roughly, $20,000,000, leaving a net cost to the Government of approximately $80,000,000.

Remaining action with regard to 1946 potatoes will center around continuing efforts to move every possible bushel into some useful diversion, thus holding costs and wastage to a minimum. The problems of the 1947 crop, however, are already squarely before us.

The approved production goal for 1947 is set at a figure which, with the presently assumed yields, would produce a potato crop nearly 100,000,000 bushels below this year's total. The national goal is now being broken down to county and farm levels within the States.

Price-support commitments under the Steagall amendment are, of course, in effect for 1947. In an effort to avoid a repetition of the excessive costs and waste which have accompanied the very high 1946 production, the Department has announced that only those farmers who keep within allotted potato-acreage goals will be eligible for price support under the 1947 price-support program. While details of this support program have not yet been worked out, the proposal has resulted in a great deal of discussion among farm leaders. This is a good thing. All who are concerned with the interests of American agriculture should assist in reaching the soundest possible solution of the problems involved.

It is generally agreed in the Department that something of the nature of the proposed program is necessary if we are to cut tremendous costs to the Government and also eliminate the accompanying waste of food.

Because the problems we are already facing with regard to potatoes may arise for other commodities in the not far distant future, it is obviously imperative that the whole question of price-support policy, to accomplish the underlying objectives of the legislation, be given prompt and thorough consideration. Leaders in the poultry industry, for example, have already expressed serious concern over the possible effect of existing price-support legislation on orderly transitions within their industry I therefore hope that a joint conference with the Senate and House Agricultural Committees can be arranged at an early date to consider this problem.

I am sending similar letters to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and the ranking minority members of both committees.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

Mr. ANDERSON. During that entire time, Mr. President, I tried to point out to the Congress that we could not expect to be fortunate in the disposition of agricultural surpluses at all times. It will be remembered that in 1945 and 1946 the United States was desperately short of food grains. We were trying to meet commitments to send food abroad, and it was difficult to meet them and, at the same time, to permit the distilling of alcoholic beverages. At that particular time the distillers, cooperating with the Government, felt that if they could use surplus potatoes they could make neutral spirits to blend with other alcoholic beverages and produce something for the consuming public, even if it were not quite so good as my distinguished friend from Kentucky would say was the top brand from his State. Neutral spirits are not a very satisfactory substitute for the finest product from distilled grains, but at that particular time the situation of the distillers was so desperate that we required them to put into their product certain quantities of neutral spirits made from potatoes, and although the program of supporting potatoes cost a great deal of money, it was more than offset by alcoholic-beverage tax receipts into the Treasury of the United States. Therefore, the potato program was not quite so harassing in 1945 and 1946, and even in 1947, because there was available a product requiring a certain quantity of potatoes. Even if there had not been, so long as the distillers would use potatoes, there was money coming to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, the letter which I have placed in the RECORD shows that in 1946 I called upon the Congress to enact legislation which would control the production of potatoes, and pointed out the dangers which might exist if such legislation were not promptly enacted.

In May 1947 there appeared a very vicious criticism of the Government's potato price-support program, sponsored by a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield before he goes into that subject?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. In the letter which the Senator has now introduced into the RECORD, does he advise the Congress as to the type of control which should be used in connection with the potato program?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it is a suggestion that we adopt the same methods which were put into effect for the control of tobacco, corn, wheat, and other products, by acreage limitations and quotas upon production, but it does not suggest whether we should have a limitation upon bushels or a limitation upon acres. It merely suggests that our agricultural program, particularly, let us say, concerning tobacco, cotton, and peanuts, has been effective, that the farmers' reduced acreage, and therefore the assumption was that these things might be done for crops which were getting out of control. The desire was that some step might be taken to cure the situation.

In newspaper stories which appeared in May 1947, a Member of the House of Representatives had been very critical of the Department of Agriculture concerning its disposition of potatoes. It was a common practice to take a photograph of a pile of potatoes which were being destroyed, and hold that up as an example of Government waste, saying that people wanted to eat those potatoes, and yet the Government would not let the poor people eat them.

Mr. President, there was more to the situation than that. There was a legislative prohibition against making the potatoes available. So on May 26, 1947, I addressed a letter to the Representative in question, and if it is not improper, under the rules of the Senate, to include the name of the Representative, I should like to have the letter in full introduced into the RECORD at this point. If it violates the rules of the Senate as to comity between the two branches, the name of the Representative to whom the letter was written can be deleted. But I wish to point out that again early in 1947, as Secretary of Agriculture, I was pleading with the Congress to do something to bring potatoes under effective controls, as other agricultural commodities had been brought under controls.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

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

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 26, 1947.

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR AUGUST: Your discussion of the potato support-price problem which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 21, 1947, coming from one who has for so long been closely associated with farm problems and farm legislation, does not, I hope, reflect your true knowledge of the situation. You surely could not be ignorant of the fact that on November 26, 1946, I addressed a letter to the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House and Senate Agricultural Committees, in which I pointed out the responsibilities of this Department under the price-support legislation and the inevitable difficulties of administering this legislation, with particular reference to price supports for potatoes.

I included in that letter an estimate that there would be as many as 20,000,000 bushels of potatoes for which we would be unable to find any practical outlet and which would likely be a total waste. I asked that the whole question of price-support policy be given prompt and thorough consideration by the Congress. A copy of that letter was mailed to you, and yet, knowing that I am powerless to make any change in price-support responsibilities, you now "call upon the Secretary of Agriculture to halt the Department of Agriculture's wanton destruction of potatoes as it goes on today." In my letter of November 26 I pointed out that this Department had sent letters to all international agencies and foreign countries known to be in need of food supplies, calling attention to the very large United States potato supplies and offering to make them readily available. I related how this Department had offered to supply potatoes free of charge to UNRRA and foreign governments for dehydration for relief feeding and that they had not been willing to pay the processing cost of about 15 cents a pound now and 25 to 30 cents a pound earlier when they could purchase flour at 5 or 6 cents a pound. Despite these facts, which you scarcely could have forgotten, you now deplore the destruction of potatoes "at a time when food prices are high and people abroad are starving."

You claim to have in your possession bills of lading and tags proving that potatoes are being imported for sale in the very territory where farmers are being paid not to harvest their crops. In the first place, there is now no territory in which farmers are being paid not to harvest their crops. So I suggest that you reexamine your bills of lading and tags. Potatoes are being imported from Canada and some of the imported seed stock goes into the South, where it is sometimes sold for table use if it will bring a higher price than for seed or if seed needs have been met.

You are, no doubt, familiar with the fact that the reciprocal-trade agreement with Canada provides for the importation of 1,500,000 bushels of seed stock at a reduced tariff rate and a million bushels of table stock at a reduced tariff rate. As a matter of fact, quotas for both seed stock and table stock since the beginning of the quota period, September 15, have been exceeded, and Canadian potato importers are now paying the regular tariff rate of 75 cents per hundred. Imports since the beginning of the quota period have totaled nearly 4,000,000 bushels. When speaking of imports of Canadian potatoes, however, it would be only reasonable to refer also to exports of potatoes from this country to Canada.

For the 12 months ending August 31, 1946, exports of potatoes from this country to Canada totaled nearly 8,000,000 bushels. From September 1 through the end of March exports of potatoes to Canada were only a little over 32,000 bushels. However, the normal period of heavy movement is through the months of May, June, and July. California potatoes are now moving in volume to the western provinces of Canada. The city of Vancouver, for example, received during the month of April 23, 400 bushels of potatoes from the United States. We do not expect exports of potatoes to Canada this year to be as large as last year, but we do expect a substantial movement to Canada.

In your reference to the letter received from a farmer living in North Carolina reporting that the Government has paid this farmer for not digging his potatoes this year, I assume that you misspoke, since potatoes are not yet being harvested in North Carolina. The farthest north, I believe, in which potato harvesting is going on is South Carolina.

Perhaps it would be well for me to review again at this point our price-support operations for the 1946 crop. We are coming out surprisingly close to the estimates I made in my November 26 letter. The 1946 crop was nearly 100,000,000 bushels over the goal. From this crop nearly 3,000,000 bushels were distributed through the school-lunch program and to charitable institutions. About 10,500,000 bushels, or more than 10 percent of the total surplus, have been exported. This was accomplished by offering the potatoes for export for relief feeding abroad at token prices as low as 4 cents per hundred pounds. Approximately 11,000,000 bushels were diverted to livestock feeding, and this was made possible again by making them available at token prices. Another 10,500,000 bushels were made available to starch mills manufacturing starch in this country for relief abroad. The greatest diversion of potatoes that otherwise would have been wasted was to distillers for beverage and industrial alcohol—a total of around 30,000,000 bushels. Outlets have been found for approximately 65,000,000 bushels of the surplus.

In my letter of November 26 I estimated that about 20,000,000 bushels would be wasted. Actually, we now believe that this total will be more nearly 22,000,000 bushels.

In the absence of any action or advice from Congress following my letter of November 26, I have taken the initiative in dealing with the potato problem for 1947 by reducing the goal by a little more than 150,000 acres below the goal of last year and by setting up acreage quotas within which potato growers must remain in order to be eligible for price support

In 1947 the potato price-support program emphasizes the removal of lower grade and inferior quality potatoes from food channels. We anticipated that there would be some local surpluses in early and intermediate potato growing areas, especially because of adverse spring weather delaying potato harvests tending to make the harvest in some areas bunch up and overlap instead of coming on in an orderly manner. This has been true in Alabama where, up to now, there was a surplus of about 28,500 bushels. Of this amount 21,000 bushels have been distributed through school-lunch programs and to institutions. For the remaining 7,500 bushels of lower-grade potatoes no practical use was found. No dehydration facilities were locally available, and farmers in the peak of the pasture season were not interested in feeding these potatoes to livestock. These early potatoes, which are thin-skinned and with high water content, are not desirable for export. Freight charges are too great to ship these potatoes to northern starch plants. Alcohol plants were not interested. Therefore, since we were required to support potato prices, and because there was no other place to put the surplus of lower-grade potatoes, they have been destroyed.

However, if as you state, new potatoes are being sold in Washington and in eastern cities at 5 to 10 cents a pound, it is not because farmers are getting a price anywhere near this amount. Our support price in Alabama, for example, for May is 2 7 cents per pound for No. 1 potatoes. This price, incidentally, is about 35 cents per 100 pounds higher than for May of last year because support prices, as directed by Congress, are based on 90 percent of parity for potatoes, and parity has increased considerably in recent months due to the increase in the cost of things farmers buy.

I can only say again now what I said in my letter of November 26—that because the problems we are already facing with regard

to potatoes may arise for other commodities, it is obviously imperative that the whole question of price-support policy, to accomplish the underlying objectives of the legislation, be given prompt and thorough consideration by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on the 26th day of February, 1948, I addressed a letter to the Congress of the United States, sending similar letters to the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture, urging that they give early and careful consideration to the question of legislative price-support provisions, with particular reference to the potato situation. That letter again pointed out that the country was going to be in trouble on the question of potato production if something did not happen, and if some legislation were not passed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 26, 1948.

HON ARTHUR CAPPER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR. Once again I find it necessary to call to the attention of Congress certain basic problems involved in the mandatory price-support provisions for farm commodities, and the administration of programs to carry out these legislative provisions. Potatoes are the crop of most immediate concern, but the basic principles apply to the other commodities which are covered by the Steagall amendment and related legislation.

In November 1946, I addressed a letter to the then chairmen and ranking minority members of the agricultural committees in both the Senate and the House. In this letter I brought up the whole question of price-support policy, with specific reference to the troublesome potato situation, and urged that the subject be given prompt and thorough consideration.

In January 1947, in testimony before the Senate and House committees, I went into more detail regarding the problems involved. At that time I outlined the probable difficulties ahead of us in carrying out price supports, and estimated the costs which might result. Again I urged early legislative action, suggesting the establishment of a timetable which would permit prompt consideration of the more immediate questions. It was pointed out that the farmers needed to know the answers in time to plan their future operations.

Unfortunately, no legislative action has yet been taken. We are still operating under the same inflexible provisions which held 18 months ago. I am not suggesting at all that the price-support provisions should have been revoked. Congress was farsighted in granting our farmers basic-price protection for the postwar period of necessary readjustment to peacetime-production schedules. Farmers deserved this protection, and it would have been unthinkable to go back on the promise. At the same time, our farmers do not want production to continue under a frozen pattern which results in waste of production effort, money, and soil. And it is obvious that the present inflexible price supports, under certain conditions and for some commodities, can encourage this sort of wasteful production. What I suggested a year and more ago, and am repeating now, is action to achieve those adjustments in price-support provisions which would be generally beneficial, while staying within the spirit of the price-support commitments.

As I said before, potatoes offer our most pressing current problem. We had serious troubles with potato-price support for the 1946 crop. Through a combination of factors, production that year was very large. It was necessary to remove nearly 100,000,000 bushels from normal channels of trade, in order to follow legislative direction on price assurances to farmers. Net cost of the price-support operations for 1946 crop potatoes ran to about $89,000,000. More than 25,000,000 bushels were lost entirely, when no useful outlets could be found before spoilage set in.

As you know, the Department of Agriculture took direct steps to minimize price-support costs and waste for the 1947 crop. Supports were limited to those farmers who stayed within potato-acreage goals. Other provisions channeled better-quality potatoes into the commercial market, with any necessary diversion concentrated on the lower grades. These efforts were partly successful. When the year's marketings are completed, the total we will have been forced to remove from commercial markets will be far below the figure for the 1946 crop. And less than 500,000 bushels have been lost because no useful outlet could be found in time.

In spite of these favorable developments, however, the net cost of price-support operations for the 1947 crop is running far higher than anyone likes. With the parity index up, support-price levels have been correspondingly above those of the year before. Handling costs have been higher. The effort to channel every possible bushel of surplus potatoes into some useful diversion, cutting wastage to a minimum, has added to these handling costs. Our best current estimate is that the net cost for price-support operations on 1947 potatoes, when the marketing year ends, may be about half the cost a year ago—or around $45,000,000.

The fact that the current program may cost this much, even for a year when production was only a few million bushels above the goal, and when all practicable steps were taken to minimize costs and waste, underlines the continuing problem.

The time has now come when we must give potato growers an indication of what to expect with regard to the 1948 crop. In the absence of any action by the Congress, this is the situation at present: The Department of Agriculture will of course continue to support potato prices at 90 percent of parity until December 31, 1948, the end of the 2-year support period following the termination of hostilities, as provided by the Steagall amendment. This is simply a matter of carrying out existing law, which offers no alternative. After that date, however, the Department does not plan to continue the price supports which are specified in the Steagall amendment unless directed to do so by the Congress.

I am well aware of the fact that termination of potato-price supports at that time of year would create very difficult problems. The late crop, produced generally in northern States, is harvested and placed in storage by the end of October or early November. It is then normally marketed throughout the winter and spring. Termination of price supports on December 31, in any year when we did not have potato shortages, would naturally result in a tendency for growers to sell the bulk of their late crop to the Department before that date, in order to assure themselves the protection afforded by the program. The consequences of such an abnormal situation are obvious.

Since the Congress has not indicated its willingness to continue Steagall price support after December 31, the Department would be very reluctant to carry out price support after that date without specific direction with respect to both authority and minimum-support levels.

Price support and farm production plans for the early and intermediate portions of the 1948 potato crop will not be affected by the December 31 cut-off date. It is the late crop which will be directly affected. Planting of the late crop customarily begins about April 15, and in order to assure just and equitable treatment for all growers definite announcement of just what price supports will apply to the late crop, and for what period, should be made well before that date.

I therefore respectfully request that the Congress give early consideration to this problem. It is important for all crops which are under price support; it is urgent for potatoes. The need for greater flexibility of methods and price levels should be considered. The question of what comes after December 31 should be answered.

If legislation along these lines is not deemed possible or advisable at this time, the Department stands ready to proceed under present authority, guided by such directives or specific suggestions as the Committees on Agriculture may give us. Our position is that we want to serve farmers and the public interest with maximum efficiency and least cost. To this end, the Department is anxious to cooperate with the committees in every possible way. Our information and technical services are, of course, available to you on call.

I am sending similar letters to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and the ranking minority members of both the House and Senate committees.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, with that sort of a history, one can imagine my surprise at being accused, inferentially at least, of being opposed to effective controls upon potatoes. As a matter of fact, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture which was considering price-support legislation last summer and fall proposed several tentative drafts of bills which might be passed by the Congress to support agricultural prices.

On the fifth day of August the committee issued a committee print which represented its latest thinking, and probably almost its final draft. A great many drafts were prepared, and a great deal of hilarity developed over the fact that the committee could not seem to make up its mind, but at that time the committee was carefully exploring the possibilities not only of what was desirable, but of what was likely to be accepted by the Congress, and therefore enacted into law. The committee moved somewhat cautiously. It would try one procedure, and if that seemed to be improper, would try something else.

In the committee print of August 5, 1949, there was a section of the bill, section 2, on page 7, lines 3 to 10, reading as follows:

Price support for any kind of Irish potatoes (whether storable or not) shall be

made available to the producers at not more than 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of the parity price for such kind of Irish potatoes as of the beginning of its marketing season.

Then this interesting clause was included:

Except that, if the Secretary—

Meaning the Secretary of Agriculture—

determines such action to be necessary in order to avoid excessive losses, he may provide for a lower level of price support.

Mr. President, that clause was in the bill because we recognized that there was not at that time an effective measure for the control of acreage or production of potatoes. It was felt that if the growers were not cooperative with the Government, the Secretary of Agriculture could strike out all provisions for price support—could drop the support price to 50 percent, to 40 percent, to 10 percent, or to zero, if need be, in order to make them realize that there must be compliance with reasonable acreage goals.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator referring to a draft of a bill which was prepared by the subcommittee, and which never reached the full committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. This is a subcommittee draft, which the subcommittee had hoped would be its final version.

After this was prepared, it invited the Secretary of Agriculture to meet with the committee on August 6, in executive session, to decide whether the bill was satisfactory in all details, and then it was to be submitted to the full committee. It contained the language I have read, "except that if the Secretary determine such action to be necessary in order to avoid excessive losses, he may provide for a lower level of price support."

The committee met with the Secretary of Agriculture on August 6, 1949. I have a memorandum in my office as to what happened at that time, but in order that there might be no possible misunderstanding, I checked this morning with the clerk of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and I find that his notes are exactly the same as mine, namely, that at that meeting on August 6 this clause was removed from the language at the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I am not critical of that decision, because all of us realize that the best way to control agricultural products is not simply to drop support prices to zero. We were trying to establish decent support levels, and perhaps it was harsh treatment to suggest that if potato growers refused to cooperate, the Secretary should have autocratic power to drop the support levels to an absolute minimum. Following our discussion and at the suggestion, I must say, of other members of the committee, but with the advice of the Secretary that provision was removed from the draft, and the final bill as it came to the full committee did not contain that language.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say, by way of preface to my question, that I have a great deal of respect for the ability of the Senator from New Mexico, and I admire him for the work he has done in trying to get before the Senate a good piece of farm legislation. But I have a thought to which I wish to have the Senator's reaction at some time during his remarks.

As the Senator knows, there are being piled up at this time enormous quantities not only of potatoes, but also of eggs and butter, which are three of the staple food products.

I have a bill, which I have prepared and have ready for introduction either today or tomorrow, which will provide for a food-stamp plan. It is more or less of an abbreviated Aiken bill. The Aiken bill, as the Senator knows, provides for a food-stamp plan covering all commodities. My bill would cover merely commodities which are in surplus. It would provide that whenever any edible food product was in surplus, food stamps would be issued to the families in the lower-income brackets, so that instead of destroying potatoes, instead of having eggs spoil in the limestone caves of Kentucky, instead of having butter stored up and becoming rancid, people would be able to obtain and consume those products. I should like to know what the Senator would think about such a proposal, and whether he could go along with that type of program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I dislike to demand the regular order, but the Senator from New Mexico was making a very orderly address upon the potato question. Now we are getting something else into it. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will wait until the Senator from New Mexico has completed his statement relative to potatoes, before embarking on the subject of eggs, cream, butter, and milk. Let us stay with the one subject, because I think what the Senator from New Mexico has to say is of real importance.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest to the very able majority leader that the Senator from Wisconsin needs no advice from the Senator from Illinois on this subject.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Wisconsin——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin is asking the Senator from New Mexico a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico can yield only for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am asking the Senator from New Mexico a question at this time. The Senator yielded for that purpose. My question is whether the Senator would favor the type of food-stamp plan to which I have referred, which I think would solve not only the surplus-potato problem but the surplus-egg problem, the surplus-butter problem, and other surplus-food problems. I think they are tied up. We do not have a number of different problems. The entire surplus problem is one problem. I ask the Senator from New Mexico the question because I have so much respect for his judgment. I am sure he can throw considerable light on that subject.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I had hoped to proceed in an orderly way, but I may say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that I have previously, in a public capacity, reported upon the Aiken food-stamp bill. There are a great many things in the Aiken bill which greatly appeal to me. I have felt that the whole scope of the bill is at the present time too great; but we are making headway with the school-lunch program, which I hope we all support, and we might extend it gradually by experimenting with the food-stamp plan.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that the author of the food-stamp plan, Milo Perkins, discussed the food-stamp plan with me, and I became very much interested in it. I may say that if we can use potatoes as a testing ground for the food-stamp plan, we may learn some lessons. We may learn how difficult it is to determine the families which are in real need. Perhaps the most difficult part of the relief program was the application of a means test to the people. So I say to the Senator, without discussing the matter in detail, that while I think a great deal of benefit can result from the use of the food-stamp plan for the disposal of surplus products, a tremendous amount of spade work must be done slowly, in order to find out what can be accomplished.

The Department of Agriculture has not been unconscious of the need for a change in the program and for the inclusion of proper controls. Under date of September 2, 1949, there was addressed to me as chairman of the subcommittee dealing with this problem a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan In that letter the Secretary very clearly sets forth that the Department itself recognizes that the present potato program needs overhauling and strengthening. I quote directly from the letter from Secretary Brannan to me, as follows:

The present potato program needs overhauling and strengthening, but the answer does not lie in withdrawing price supports from the commodity. Last November—

I am still quoting from the Secretary's letter—

when I announced the general price-support plan for 1949 crop potatoes, I said, "I have been extremely reluctant to approve the lowering of the support price for potatoes to 60 percent of parity. Controlling excess production by dropping price supports

sharply is not a desirable way to get adjustments, no matter how necessary these adjustments may be."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understand that is a letter from the present Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. It is a letter from the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, to me as chairman of a subcommittee considering price-support legislation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is not the clear implication of that statement that reducing the support price was one method, although, as I understood, he said not the most desirable method of securing control of production?

Mr. ANDERSON. I prefer to use his exact language, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Maine. He said:

Controlling excess production by dropping price supports sharply is not a desirable way to get adjustments, no matter how necessary these adjustments may be.

Mr. BREWSTER. That would be a rather clear indication, the Senator from Maine would think, that it would be calculated to reduce production. I wanted the record to be clear, because when the Secretary appeared before the committee on Monday or Tuesday, I understood him then apparently to qualify that statement considerably. I make that statement so his position may be clear in the record.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from Maine that at the same session it was pointed out that when the price support was dropped from 90 percent to 60 percent, the production of potatoes dropped from 450,000,000 to 402,000,000 bushels, which is a rather substantial drop.

Mr. BREWSTER. That would be a rather significant indication, would it not, that certainly the support-price reduction did have a very material effect in connection with the acreage allocation as well?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I think that is true. But I believe credit should also be given to those growers who cooperated by trying to reduce their acreage and trying to reduce their production of potatoes.

Mr. President, there are many other items in the letter, and in a report, which the committee received at that time which indicate that there was recognition of the difficulties in connection with the potato program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point there be incorporated in the RECORD the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture on the subject of repeal of the potato-price-support program. They are carried at page 11 of the hearings on Senate bill 2482 and Senate bill 1751. Those recommendations suggest the desirability of a complete revision of the potato program. But the main thing suggested by the Department is that there must be a limitation on acreage and the establishment for potatoes of definite marketing quotas, backed by penalties comparable with those now authorized for the so-called basic crops. I ask that the recommendations as they appear in the hearings, beginning on page 11 and ending near the middle of page 12, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

Reviewing our present situation, as the basis for recommendations, several fundamental weaknesses are obvious in the potato program and in the authority under which the program must be developed. We do not have the authority to put positive and effective production and marketing controls into effect. Purchase of surplus potatoes is the only workable price-support mechanism available to us under present legislation. The need to find some form of diversion outlet for these acquired surplus stocks, because of the insistence that we must avoid commodity waste, adds greatly to the over-all cost of the price-support operation. And indications are that the drying up of diversion channels will inevitably force a return to some dumping of potatoes in the future if the present type of program is continued, in spite of the pressure to avoid waste.

One of the greatest weaknesses of the present program is that it serves to benefit the noncooperators—the growers who ignore acreage goals and produce as they please—as much as it does the cooperators who reduce acreage in order to comply with established allotments. We are forced to take enough potatoes off the market to hold prices of all potatoes at or near the support level. It therefore makes little financial difference to the grower as to whether he sells to the Government or in the open market. The price is about the same. This is a situation which in fact results in penalizing the cooperator. He has fewer potatoes to sell now at the support price than his noncooperating neighbor, and he may have a lower acreage base for some future production or marketing quota calculation.

A program under which market prices were permitted to adjust themselves downward on the open market, backed by production payments, would correct this basic weakness. The noncooperator would get only the market price. The cooperator would have price protection at established fair levels through the production payments. Such a plan would obviously give consumers the benefit of lower prices when the supply-and-demand situation warranted lower prices. At the same time, it would offer one of the most effective possible incentives for compliance with an equitable production and marketing schedule in line with established needs.

Another fundamental program need is the authority to establish definite marketing quotas for potatoes, backed by penalties comparable with those now authorized for the so-called basic crops. Experience has shown that the voluntary acreage goals are not enough. Even when acreage is adjusted, yields can be stimulated to abnormal levels. And there is at present no effective way of assuring compliance even on an acreage basis.

It should also be specifically provided that the Department has the authority to condition price support upon the adoption of marketing agreement and order programs in areas where these are feasible. These agreement and order programs help stabilize marketing, keep lower grades out of commercial channels, and assure consumers the better quality potatoes.

In addition to the provisions just mentioned, a sound potato program should also include the authority to continue purchase, loan, and other customary measures in carrying out price support. The potato problem is very complex, and yields are not predictable. It is therefore essential that authority for the various types of programs mentioned be provided so that producers may be able to adjust and adapt programs to meet changing conditions. Such programs should minimize Government costs, reduce or eliminate waste, seek improvement in marketing practices, and at all times protect the basic interests of producers while assuring good quality potatoes at fair prices for consumers.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, we did not stop with that. The Senate committee considering this matter appreciated the recommendations contained in the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture and the report of Mr. Ralph Trigg and Mr. Frank Woolley, representing the Department. So at a hearing on Senate bill 2482 on September 19, 1949, I requested the Department to submit its recommendations concerning potato legislation. On September 28, 1949, the Secretary of Agriculture sent a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] in which he refers to that request and does submit the legislation. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, not that the legislation suggested be printed in the RECORD, but that the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting that information be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

SEPTEMBER 28, 1949.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: At the hearing on S. 2482 on September 19, 1949, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON requested the Department to submit its recommendations concerning potato legislation. In accordance with this request we have prepared the enclosed bill which is designed to carry out the recommendations and proposals for improving the potato program which the Department has made on several occasions.

The major feature of the bill is the establishment of mandatory price support for potatoes whenever producers demonstrate that they are willing to undertake effective adjustment of supplies to market demands. The price support would be extended to producers by means of purchases, loans, production payments, or other operations. By providing the Department a choice of the means of extending price support, it will be possible for it to devise a program which will effectively further the interests of the producers and of the general public. Adjustment of supplies to demand would be attained when needed through the use of farm marketing quotas, acreage allotments, and marketing agreements and orders. The legislation would not permit price support for any crop of potatoes with respect to which producers had disapproved marketing quotas and would authorize the Department to deny price support if producers refused to put into effect marketing orders which were deemed by the Department to be essential to the efficient operation of the program.

The devices contained in the enclosed bill for potatoes are contained, in the main, in

S. 1971 which the Department has recommended, but in S. 1971 they are applicable to agricultural commodities generally.

The proposed legislation would provide the Department with the means for an effective and unified attack upon the potato problem which we recognize as one of the more serious now affecting agriculture. We would be glad to appear and furnish to your committee such additional information or assistance as you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

Mr ANDERSON. I wish to point out that on the fourth day of October 1949, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma introduced Senate bill 2634, which was a bill to provide price supports for potatoes and to regulate the marketing thereof. Some Senators may not agree with all the provisions of the bill, but I suggest to the Senate that the bill affords an opportunity for careful consideration of this problem, and promises hope of a solution.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER Do I correctly understand that the bill was introduced by the senior Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I had sent a letter to the Department of Agriculture requesting suggested legislation. The Department of Agriculture sent to the distinguished chairman of the committee its idea of what should be introduced as proper legislation, and the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma promptly introduced the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Did the bill represent the views of the Department of Agriculture and of the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture at that time as to what might be a constructive solution of this problem?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe so.

Mr. President, I submit that the Congress of the United States should proceed immediately to deal with this problem. I do not know whether Congress should deal with it in the way suggested a day or two ago by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. LUCAS], by repealing all price supports on potatoes, or whether it should follow the suggestion of the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of trying to find a method of control which would be effective. I should like the Senate to realize that the question of price supports is important to all the people.

We are now concerned with supporting the price of potatoes. Some may say that the support level is too high. The average of the support level in all States in 1949 is $1.10. It is estimated that it will be $1.01 for 1950. Many may quarrel with that level. I think it is a rather low level. I submit to the Senate that the level contained in Senate bill 1971, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and commonly understood to incorporate the Brannan plan, provides an income support standard which, if applicable to potatoes, would give a support level of $1.59. I assume that it might be applicable to potatoes, because that figure was used in the testimony at the hearings before the committee. Surely, if it was not intended to be a price that the farmers would receive, it would not have been used.

The support level on potatoes at the present time is $1.10. So we have a difference of 49 cents between the level proposed in the so-called Brannan plan, as incorporated in Senate bill 1971, and the level actually given to the farmers at this time. I do not believe that the support level given to the farmers on potatoes is excessive.

I agree that there have been some disagreeable experiences and I agree to a limited extent with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who pointed out that weather conditions had been extremely good. Favorable weather conditions have resulted in an increase of millions of bushels of potatoes, but I wish to point out that the farmers are not always going to get the benefit from these factors. I have a figure which I should like to introduce into the RECORD, though I have not had an opportunity to check it completely.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator made the statement that he does not believe that the support price for potatoes is too high.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I say that I do not believe that the support level is too high. I realize that the Senator from Illinois has properly interrupted me, because I neglected to say that there must be effective controls of potato production. If effective controls were in play we would not be bothered by the support-price situation.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator with respect to that, but so long as we continue the present program, with no acreage controls or limitations and no quotas, and no bag limits or bushel limits—in other words, with no controls whatever—we shall continue to have the potato problem in our laps, so to speak. The potato situation is giving an extremely dark eye to the entire farm program. As the Senator well knows, producers of the basic commodities can get the support price only if they comply with certain conditions with respect to control. I was one of the Senators on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last year who were constantly talking about taking potatoes out from under the mandatory price-support program. We did not do it. It seems to me that the time has come when we must do something drastic about the potato situation if we are to continue to maintain the confidence of the American people in the entire farm program, which is so vital to corn, wheat, cotton, and tobacco, which are subject to absolute acreage controls, quotas, and allotments.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree completely with the distinguished majority leader. In my opinion there is no possibility whatever of bringing this program under control until we have established some effective means of restricting production. We do not have that at the present time. However, at the time the agricultural legislation was under consideration, testimony was given to the committee time after time, both by potato growers and by the Department of Agriculture, that the approximate loss from the program would be in the magnitude of from forty to forty-five million dollars for the crop of 1949. It now appears that the loss may be between $80,000,000 and $100,000,000. The result is that there is far more interest, as well as more agitation, on this subject than there would have been if the calculations of the growers and the Department of Agriculture had been borne out. What prevented the calculations from being borne out was to a great degree extremely fine growing weather. Therefore, we must realize that the committee felt that when the loss was to be $225,000,000 in 1 year and could drop to $45,000,000 in a year, apparently the growers were trying to cooperate, and we might be able to get this done voluntarily. If we could get it done voluntarily, I am sure we all agree that that would be a better method of doing it than by burdensome controls.

Mr. BREWSTER rose.

Mr. ANDERSON. Before I yield to the Senator from Maine, I should like to say that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] came to me when the agricultural price bill was on the floor and when a great many amendments were being suggested to it. He said he wanted to propose an amendment to strike potatoes from the list of crops receiving support. I asked the junior Senator from Illinois to withhold his amendment. I explained to him what I have now explained to the Senate. I explained to him that the cost had been $225,000,000 for 1 year and that we were assured by the Department that it promised to be somewhere in the neighborhood of $45,000,000 the next year. I said that in my opinion it was a trend in the right direction and we ought to give the farmers a chance to work out their own salvation without regimentation. It now appears that the information I gave to the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois was not reliable. It was the best we could do at that time. I am, indeed, sorry that I misled the junior Senator from Illinois by telling him that the cost of the program would be lower than it was, and that conditions would not be so burdensome as they have proved to be.

I should like to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, first referring to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I regret that I should almost have to say, "Et tu Brute," since the Senator from Illinois was raised near to the heart of the greatest and finest potato-growing region in the world, and I have no doubt that his magnificent physique is in substantial measure a result of eating those potatoes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt, in order to reply?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAPMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Illinois for that purpose?

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois, to permit him to propound a question to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say, in reply, that I am not ashamed to have grown up on eating small potatoes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is not a small-potato himself in any way, I would say. [Laughter.]

I think perhaps this is the proper point at which to clear the record, in the absence of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who was chairman of the committee, I believe, at the time when the 1948 act was passed.

Since I understood the Senator from New Mexico to point out that whatever was done in 1949 was done under the provisions of the 1948 law, which is quite correct, I ask whether the provisions which were finally incorporated in the 1949 law were a practical replica of the provisions contained in the 1948 law.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I am glad to say they were. The reason why they were carried forward, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Maine, was the feeling I have just expressed, which was prevalent in the committee, namely, that if a group of growers, having cost the Treasury $225,000,000 in 1 year, had come forward voluntarily and had said, "We will try to handle this thing ourselves," and had succeeded in lowering the cost to approximately $45,000,000, then I and others felt that the Congress could say, "We like that; that is the way to get the job done. If it can be done that way, we shall be glad to have you do it voluntarily."

All of us know that acreage limitations and marketing quotas are not satisfactory methods for handling these problems. All of us realize that all sorts of things can happen to marketing quotas.

Some of these days, perhaps, we shall have before us a bill providing for making some changes in cotton acreages. When that happens, the question will immediately arise as to how much an increase in acreage will mean in terms of total production. Of course, it will depend entirely on where the extra acreage is allowed. If the extra cotton acreage is allowed only in the State of Georgia, it might mean an average production of 180 or 190 or 200 pounds to the acre; but in the State of California it could mean as much as 600 pounds or even 1,000 pounds to the acre. Therefore, I say that acreage limitations in themselves are not a very satisfactory procedure.

I am sure the Senator from Maine realizes that the committee in its deliberations was guided very largely by what appeared to be a downward trend and what seemed to indicate that in another year the cost would be negligible, insofar as the Treasury was concerned.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask the Senator for his permission to insert at the end of his remarks the actual statistics, under date of November 10, 1949, covering the production per acre per State, for the 1949 potato crop. I do that in order that the statistics may be available to show the reductions which have been made in this program. That is how there was brought about the reduction from 452,000,000 bushels to 386,000,000 bushels, as shown by the report, which is some 14,000,000 or 16,000,000 bushels under what it later developed they produced.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the last figure is some 402,000,000 bushels.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should be very glad to have the statistics inserted in the RECORD. I would appreciate it if the Senator would insert them at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be very glad to do so.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President——

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wished to say that the reduction which has been made, under present estimates, in total amount of more than 125,000,000 bushels, or a total of more than 50 percent, is not the least encouraging indication of the progress which has been made under the—if I may term it so—Aiken-Anderson provisions regarding potatoes which now are extant.

Mr. ANDERSON. Again, I say, I claim no responsibility for the present situation of potatoes, but I also say that I am not trying to dodge the fact that under the bill which now is the Agricultural Act we would have, and without acreage legislation will have this year if conditions continue as they are, a bad potato-surplus situation.

I only say that I had hoped the acreage-limitation bill might have been considered, and I hope it may still be considered. But I say to the Senator from Maine, who has a great burden on his heart in this respect, that I believe if something is not very quickly brought about in the way of regulating acreage and controlling and limiting output, there will be a great deal of popular support for the suggestion made by the distinguished majority leader that the potato program be entirely scuttled.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am quite aware of the distress which is occasioned throughout the country when we have this potato situation. I warmly appreciate the action of the Senator from New Mexico in clarifying the record and the responsibility in this case.

We have made great progress. I think the Senator from New Mexico referred, did he not, to the fact that the Lord apparently did help out, in this case, not exclusively the sinners to whom the Senator from Florida referred. I think he will find that in almost all the States there was compliance in substantial measure with the acreage goals. Certainly in the State of Maine there was, I think, approximately 80 or 90 percent compliance.

There was, however, an increase in the yield per acre. Would the Senator from New Mexico agree that we might well be approaching the limit of productivity per acre, so that the producers cannot go on indefinitely increasing the yield per acre, even with the help of the Lord, which has seemed to enter the picture at times.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I agree with the Senator that a point is reached when the increase in the production of potatoes per acre stops. But I wish to remind him that when the increased production stops in the rain-belt sections of the country, there always comes into the situation the irrigation-belt potatoes. Although the average production of potatoes years ago was approximately 160 or 170 bushels an acre, 1 year a 40-acre area in California produced 1,100 bushels an acre.

So I do not believe we can count on natural processes alone to bring the production of potatoes under control, but must have a type of limitation which not only controls acreage but also contains a marketing allotment or marketing quota based on bushels. When that is done, I believe it will take away the incentive to use extremely high-powered fertilizers and to put the hills somewhat closer together in the rows.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad the Senator from New Mexico has clarified the point concerning the relative ineffectiveness of mere acreage limitations as such. Is it not true that in many States, including the State of the distinguished Senator from Maine, the rows have been placed so close together that the potatoes are literally bumper to bumper, and that therefore while there are acreage limitations, the yield per acre has been increasing, and Uncle Sam has paid the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, I should prefer that the Senator from Maine at some later date explain the agricultural situation and the very fruitful yields the farmers of Maine have had. But I believe it is fair to say that to some degree the hills have been placed somewhat closer together in the rows, and occasionally the rows have been moved somewhat closer together. The main thing, however, is that the producers have had the finest type of seed and the most productive fertilizers, and they have greatly benefited by two additional factors: One, the use of new types of insecticides which were developed during the war, which have been very effective; and the other, the Lord has not only continued to smile at them, but in the case of Maine he has laughed out loud at them, with the result that there has been a tremendous outpouring of potatoes.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I ask whether that does not seem to be a very clear indication of divine favor upon Maine policies and practices, in this instance?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, I think it is only an exemplification of the shrewdness of the Yankee traders. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not wish to row with the Senator from Illinois about rows, but I think the Senator from New Mexico has stated the matter much more accurately in respect to the nearness of the hills, rather than the rows, because of cultivating problems with which the Senator from Illinois was familiar in his youth when he had to hoe the rows by hand.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, regardless of what we do in regard to acreage control or any other type of control for the year 1950, I believe it is now obvious that unless something is done, more than 50,000 bushels of potatoes will spoil.

Mr. ANDERSON. Fifty million bushels, I believe.

Mr. McCARTHY. So, unless something is done, some 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes will spoil. As the Senator knows—and I see on the floor of the Senate the two Senators from Illinois, who can answer for their State—in my own State of Wisconsin, in the city of Milwaukee, there are literally thousands of families who would eat many more bushels of potatoes if they could get them. I wonder whether the Senator will agree with me that it would be well, thinking solely of the disposal of the 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes which would otherwise spoil, to apply the Aiken food-stamp plan, if we may call it that, to potatoes, as a test run, to see what would happen if we were to say to the families of the lower-income groups—'These potatoes, instead of being allowed to spoil, will be made available for food." Will the Senator say it might be well to make a test run on potatoes? Of course, if his answer to the question is "Yes," I think we then could expand the stamp plan so as to include other edible food products, such as eggs and butter.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, I should greatly prefer to have the matter considered by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma; and if it developed that the project was desirable, well and good. But I call his attention to the fact that in the 1949 Farm Act, there is provision that commodities in danger of spoiling can be handled in several specific ways. The amendment was inserted by the distinguished chairman of the committee the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. The amendment provides, first of all—I may state the order incorrectly, and I apologize in advance to the Senator if I do—but first of all, it provides that such commodities shall be available to Indians and other needy persons within the United States, the school-lunch program and welfare and charitable institutions. We went way beyond what anyone had ever contemplated, by making it possible that all sorts of institutions could participate. It strikes me as strange that there does not seem to be any interest in these potatoes in connection with the school-lunch program on the part of welfare institutions, State charitable institutions, or among the Indians. But the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma went further than that. He provided they might become available to orphans' homes and institutions of that character. It seems to me it might be possible to make potatoes available to some of those groups under the terms of that very liberal amendment to the act, and to dispose of a great deal of the surplus.

I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin I should like to see that provision of the act tried, and tried vigorously, before we turn to the alternative of seeking at this late date to establish a stamp plan, which has tremendous administrative difficulties. I do not wish to dissociate myself, however, from the idea that a stamp plan is an effective way of handling surpluses, because I believe that it is. But I know there must be some sort of means test, otherwise it would bring down the farmer's normal market for his potatoes, which must not be done

It was suggested to the committee recently that if some of the scientists of the Department of Agriculture could devise a way of making potatoes nonfattening, it would accomplish more than all the other programs put together. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator from Idaho will permit me to sum up in the RECORD at this point, as I desire to do, I shall then yield to him.

HAVE PRICE SUPPORTS FORCED CONSUMERS TO PAY UNREASONABLE PRICES?

In the case of many foods, the relatively high prices which have prevailed at various times since the end of the war have been entirely unrelated to the price-support program. When consumers complain of high food prices, they are usually thinking of meat prices. There is not and never has been a support price on beef, veal, or lamb. There is a support price on hogs, but it has had little effect on pork prices, since almost no governmental action has been necessary to keep hog prices above the support level.

In 1935–39, consumers spent 23 percent of their disposable income for food. Currently, they are spending 27 percent; however, they are eating better. The food, which cost consumers 23 percent of their income in 1935–39, would cost them only 19 percent of their income today.

Food prices have already come down substantially. At the prices prevailing in July 1948, the annual retail cost of a market basket of food for a family of three average consumers was $712. In October of 1949, the same quantity of food could be purchased for $637. During this period, when the retail cost of an annual food supply for a family of three was falling $75, the farm price of this food fell $69 while charges made for services performed after the commodities left the farm declined a modest $6. Thus we have had a decline of almost 11 percent in food prices since July 1948 and this decline has been largely at the expense of the farmer despite the farm price-support program.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, in view of the tremendous surpluses of potatoes, the support-price program does not wholly account for the cost. The farmer has been receiving currently an average of $1.40 per bushel for potatoes, and if the price is extravagantly high, as certain people have claimed, perhaps the costs that enter into the marketing of potatoes might be worth checking into. I regret I have taken so long. I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not want to let any discussion of potatoes go by without saying a word, in order that the people of Idaho might know I was at least in attendance on the floor of the Senate at this very important moment in the history of our Nation. [Laughter.]

I should like to say that in the State of Idaho we do not dump as many potatoes as do the people in the State of Maine. Our potatoes are more in the nature of consumer potatoes, instead of being of the dumping variety. [Laughter.]

Strange as it may seem, I read in an Idaho newspaper only yesterday that the Idaho Potato Growers' Organization was demanding or suggesting that we do away completely with the potato program. The suggestion was accompanied by a proviso, of course, that Idaho would not be willing to forego any benefits, unless other sections of the Nation agreed to do likewise. However, I feel that I should say, I take the pronouncement by the Idaho Potato Growers' Organization with a grain of salt. I have found that, generally speaking, it seems the Republicans get control of the various organizations representing potato growers, wool growers, and cattlemen. More than once I have found definitely that they have made public pronouncements for political purposes, when, if they had thought anyone would take them seriously and do away with the support program, they would probably have fainted; certainly they would not have issued the statement in the first instance. Perhaps my colleague from Idaho, who is on the floor, and who is a Republican, could give us his idea of whether the potato-growers' association actually meant what it said when it offered to forego any benefits, in order to aid in doing away with the potato support-price program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, before the junior Senator from Idaho moves into the discussion, and unless there are questions, I should like to close briefly what I have to say. I have tried to point out that the potato surplus is not, I think, solely the fault of any piece of agricultural legislation. A great many people have believed we should have acreage limitations and marketing quotas upon potatoes. It is unfortunate that we do not have them, and I say that the potato growers of the country must face this alternative: Either they must suggest the type of control legislation

which can be passed by the Congress, and passed very quickly, or, in my opinion, they will face a rider on the cotton bill, if it comes to the floor of the Senate, or upon some other bill, which will wipe out entirely the potato support program.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. In a moment.

The Secretary of Agriculture has clearly indicated that he does not think that extreme slashes are good. Therefore, I think there should be brought forward a proper and effective type of legislation. He will, of course, speak for himself, but for whatever value my experience has, I suggest that we do need to have potato-control legislation If it is not passed within, probably, 2 or 3 weeks, there will be a rider on some bill which will wipe out supports altogether.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the scholarly and accurate discussion of the subject by the Senator from New Mexico. Would he not agree that in view of the history of this subject, a hearing by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the pending proposal of the Department would be in order before there should be what might seem to be in some respects a meager mention of the potato program without the formality of any hearing or opportunity for those concerned with a crop affecting 48 States, and that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should hold hearings to see whether, in the light of all the developments to which the Senators from New Mexico and Illinois have referred, there can be evolved what further steps are necessary to reach the goal which the Senator suggests?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. But I want to say that sometimes when industries or persons happen to be in jeopardy they are far more agreeable to legislation than they otherwise would be; and this "sword of Damocles" which the majority leader displayed may have a good effect, for it may help the Senator from Maine and other Senators interested in potatoes to join with Senators who do not have such a problem in their States to see if they cannot get before the Congress at the earliest possible date the type of control suggested to the Congress in 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, and which may not be out of place in 1950.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not true that the potato growers themselves were the ones who, if they do not claim authorship, at least sponsored the proposals for a cut of 60 percent in the support price? That was a most remarkable proposal, coming from the producers of a great crop, indicating their own recognition of the fact that the problem must be met. I am sure they all recognize that there is still ground to be covered, and they want to make their full contribution to the solution of the problem.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from Maine that I fully recognize that the potato growers suggested a reduction, and the Secretary dropped the level to 60 percent. There was some reduction in the crop, but, quite obviously, it was not sufficient, and we must go a step farther.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I am reluctant to project myself into the discussion of potatoes, in view of the fact that the question of partisan politics has been raised. But it might be appropriate to refer to an Associated Press dispatch which appeared in Washington newspapers and, I assume, elsewhere in the country, day before yesterday, emanating from Miami Beach, Fla. I read from that dispatch:

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., February 1.—The Political League of the American Federation of Labor said today a growing farm revolt against Republican policies will help elect a Congress next fall to insure Taft-Hartley law repeal

Joseph D. Keenan, the league's director, said Midwest farmers have grown increasingly fearful of GOP price support in view of falling farm prices and prospects for more farm surpluses

I invite attention to that item because, apparently, some of those who would engage in partisan politics outside of farm circles are trying to continue their misrepresentation of the entire farm support-price program so as to make it appear that Republicans in the Congress and in the Department of Agriculture are entirely responsible for the administration of the entire program. Certainly Mr. Keenan, of the Political League of the American Federation of Labor, as well as are other Americans, is fully aware of the fact that Congress is dominated and controlled completely by the Democratic Party and that the Department of Agriculture and Secretary Brannan have the authority, under existing law, including the law which was passed last fall, to administer the program in an efficient manner, and that if there is a current revolt on the part of midwestern farmers or the potato farmers in Maine, in Idaho, or in the Red River Valley, or elsewhere, certainly there is no justification for claiming that the dissatisfaction stems from the fact that there is a lack of public confidence in the GOP price-support program, because the facts are that the Republican Party currently is not in control of the executive branch of Government, and neither does it have the majority control on Capitol Hill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to say in response to what has been said by the Senators from Idaho that I have tried very hard in all my political life, not to get my politics and my farm programs mixed up. I have enjoyed working with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and all the members of the committee from both sides of the aisle, and I hope nothing I have said can be regarded as having a political implication.

Some time ago the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont permitted me to see a newspaper article, which I returned to him, dealing with the question of politics. It came as a surprise to me, because I think I can be just as partisan next November in speaking on political issues as can any other Member of the Senate, and I hope to be; but, so far as farm legislation is concerned, I have tried not to be partisan.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I certainly do not want the inference to be drawn that I was directing my remarks toward the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. During his incumbency as Secretary of Agriculture I had an opportunity to work very closely with him in solving many agricultural problems, and I wish to reiterate what I have said on many occasions, that during his term as Secretary of Agriculture he rendered outstanding service to the agricultural industry of the Nation. I pay that tribute to him at this time.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from New Mexico will agree that no law should be condemned, no matter whose name it bears, until there has been an earnest and sincere effort to apply it properly. I am surprised to learn that many institutions in the Nation have not known until the fact was recently publicized that they could have surplus potatoes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator is doing a fine service in calling attention to it. There might go out from the press gallery a notice that potatoes are available upon the payment of freight, under the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], whereby orphanages, hospitals, public-welfare agencies, school-lunch programs, and Indians might be able to obtain potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is particularly unfortunate that inaccurate releases from the Department of Agriculture receive wide publicity through the press, whereas a correction of inaccuracies made before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has not received anywhere near the same coverage, if it has received any coverage at all.

There is one newspaper which apparently recognizes this attack on the potato surplus for what it really is, namely, a political move, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a story by Josephine Ripley, in the Christian Science Monitor of February 2, 1950, which I think accurately describes the situation, and the motives for dramatizing the destruction of fifty or sixty million bushels of potatoes, which, in my opinion, are likely to be needlessly destroyed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

POTATO GROWERS DISMAYED AT PUBLICITY ON SURPLUSES

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—Potato growers are dismayed to find themselves the helpless victims of power politics, as the administration now seeks to publicize rather than hush the prospective destruction of millions of bushels of surplus potatoes.

Why all this fuss, they ask, about a potato surplus which has been reduced to one-half what it was last year, with the cost cut proportionately?

As for dumping the surplus and leaving it to rot or be burned, as is now planned by Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan, instead of selling to industrial users as has been customary, the National Potato Council argues that there is no more reason for dumping this year than there was last.

Moreover, it is claimed that the Government already has a bidder for nearly all of the surplus for industrial use.

POLITICS BLAMED

The reason for the sudden fuss and publicity is put down to politics—to an administration move to hold up this scandal of food destruction as an argument for its new farm panacea, the Brannan plan, under which this couldn't happen here

Potato Council spokesmen point out that Government agitation over this year's surplus is not consistent with the facts. This year's surplus, regrettable as it may be, they say, is only 65,000,000 bushels or so, compared with 134,000,000 last year.

Attention is also called to the fact that the cost of price supporting the 1948 crop was $225,000,000, while Mr. Brannan's estimate places this year's cost at less than half of that—between $80,000,000 and $100,000,000.

Why isn't the Government jumping at the opportunity to sell this year's surplus for industrial use, as in previous years? And is all this fuss being made over the mere $15,000,000 extra it would cost to make these potatoes available for use when the administration is dealing in terms of billions in its over-all price-support program, potato farmers are asking.

But the question is rhetorical. It is all too painfully clear to them, caught as they are themselves in the vise of power politics of the administration farm program—the Brannan plan

Under the Brannan plan, there would be no buying and no dumping All potatoes go to market, with the consumer getting lower prices and producers collecting price support in the form of production payments.

Since the public scandal of potato burning some years ago, the Government has carefully avoided dumping, even though it is the cheapest way of disposal But the extra cost of handling has been paid without a murmur in order to steer clear of public criticism.

EFFECTIVE ARGUMENT

Now, suddenly, caution is being thrown to the winds, and the prospective destruction is being deliberately publicized

For the scandal of planned food destruction no longer holds any embarrassment for the administration, since it can be used as an effective argument for the Brannan plan

Maine potato growers are particularly dismayed over the unpleasant and unpopular prospect of this potato dumping They feel they are being put in a most unfair light, according to spokesmen here, including Senator OWEN BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine.

They point out that Maine producers have the highest record of compliance with Agriculture Department production regulations of any State Maine farmers not only cut potato acreage back as directed, but also adopted a voluntary marketing agreement limiting the marketing of eating potatoes to the top, No. 1, grade.

Under these circumstances, they feel they do not deserve to have the spotlight of such unfavorable publicity turned in their direction, as it will be when the dumping begins, for the major part of the surplus happens to be in Maine this year.

TOTAL MAINE STOCKS

Total potato stocks in Maine now total around 45,000,000 bushels, it is reported. About half of these would normally go to market, leaving between 20,000,000 and 25,000,000 as surplus for Government purchase and disposition.

The unexpectedly large surplus developed as a result of exceptionally good growing conditions, good fertilizer, and closer plantings.

Moreover, stocks are larger right now, it is claimed, because the Government has not been buying as many surplus potatoes for school-lunch programs and for welfare institutions as in other years.

Senator BREWSTER also has called attention to the fact that despite a prospective potato surplus in this country of some 70,000,000 bushels, between 12,000,000 and 15,000,000 bushels still are imported from Canada.

These are potatoes coming in under reciprocal trade agreements, with potato imports balanced by United States exports of other commodities to Canada.

WIDER MARKET

If these extra potatoes were not coming down over the border, Maine growers figure that they could dispose of that many more of their own stock, and thus come out with a much smaller surplus which could be handled without much cost or difficulty under the program.

Meanwhile, the Government is reported going ahead with dumping plans, although desperate efforts are being made by potato-council officials to head off the prospect, if possible But little hope is held that it will be possible to change Mr. Brannan's mind about this

And more trouble loomed on the potato horizon, as Senator SCOTT LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, threatened to knock mandatory price support out from under potatoes entirely in an amendment to the cotton bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Senator from New Mexico, or the Senator from Oklahoma, who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, what the Secretary of Agriculture said, when he appeared before the committee a few days ago, with respect to the distribution of the surplus potatoes under the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, and which was enacted by the Congress? Unfortunately, I was unavoidably absent from the meeting of the committee, and I am anxious to know what the Secretary said about it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have with me the statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture on January 31, 1950, which covers some eight mimeographed pages. I do not desire to burden the RECORD with it, but I should be very glad to have the Senator observe it and study it. I do not think he will find there that to date there has been much interest in the distribution of the potatoes.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire whether or not the Secretary was interrogated on the points which have been raised in the debate today by the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Vermont as to what should or could be done with the surplus potatoes under the Thomas amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that under the present circumstances I should prefer to have the record speak for itself. There was interrogation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. In the Secretary's press release, given out prior to his appearance before the Senate committee, he claimed that under the Anderson Act of 1949 he could not pay any transportation at all on any of the potatoes to get rid of them other than to an alcohol plant, or some such place as that. One of the Members of the Senate—I do not recall who it was—asked him if that was not inaccurate, and he said, "Well, I have my lawyer here. We will refer it to him."

The attorney, Mr. Ed Shulman, then rose and told the committee that the Secretary did have the authority, or at least that there was no prohibition against doing the thing which he claimed he could not do in the release which he had given the press That is what I referred to when I said that the inaccurate statement in the release was given wide publicity in every newspaper in the country, but the correction, and, if I remember correctly, an apology for making the statement made by the Secretary, never received any coverage anywhere.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, regarding surplus potatoes, at the present time it is common to blame the existence of a surplus on what is called the Anderson Farm Act, but, as I developed in the questions to which the Senator has referred, I believe it would have been possible to avoid some of the criticism of the act.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that the representative of the Solicitor's Office of the Department of Agriculture sustained the Senator from New Mexico, and did not sustain the contention of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. In any event, the desirable thing to do is to get these potatoes rolling. I do not care how it is done, or what happens thereafter. If it is impossible to move them, then some legislative steps should be taken. All I want to point out is that moving these potatoes to alcohol plants, distributing them to charitable institutions, or passing them to hospitals, does not solve the underlying problem, namely, that we cannot have a support price on potatoes unless we have a control over the production of potatoes, and we must move in that direction. I have been saying that since 1946.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make an observation or two in the Senator's time.

After listening to the colloquy among various Senators it does seem to me that this question of the distribution of the surplus potatoes should be further explored to determine whether or not we can do more than has been done under the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Oklahoma last year and enacted by the Congress.

If money is needed in order to ship surplus potatoes to the different charitable institutions, or to whatever organization is outlined in the law, we can

supply it. It seems to me we should examine this matter before our committee a little further, and perhaps the Secretary of Agriculture could come forward with some further suggestion as to what is necessary to make disposition of the surplus potatoes without dumping or destroying them.

I am not going to condemn the Secretary of Agriculture at this point for what he has failed to do with respect to the surplus potatoes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have tried very hard, in what I have said today, to indicate that I am not condemning the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. I know the Senator is not, but an inference has been left in the colloquy that the Secretary of Agriculture is the sole person responsible for not disposing of the surplus potato crop. I am not so sure that he is responsible for not making proper distribution of the potatoes under the Thomas amendment. I think the matter should be further examined. I believe that if the Secretary of Agriculture can find a way to dispose of the potatoes, as is suggested under the Thomas amendment, he will do it. I am sure he does not want to destroy potatoes, any more than anyone else does. But that is the inference which has been left by some in this debate.

Like the former Secretary of Agriculture, now the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, I too am interested in what we should do with the surplus potatoes, but I am more interested in the cause which produces this surplus crop. Mr. President, year after year we have had the surplus potato problem before us. This is not the first time potatoes have been destroyed, or there has been a threat to destroy them, because the growers could not market them. I recall that potatoes were destroyed in Alabama and Florida a few years ago. They were destroyed because they were of a certain type and kind which had to be shipped to New York or Chicago in refrigerator cars, or they would be spoiled when they reached the market place. Yet, because those potatoes were dumped and burned, much criticism came forth throughout the country about the destruction of food. What was done at that time was the only thing that could have been done, and the evidence before the committee so indicated.

The main problem which the Senate and the House of Representatives must solve is as to what we are going to do with the problem of control of the potato crop. It is not a political question with me. I never mix politics and corn and potatoes. All through the Midwest Democrats and Republicans alike, from the day when McNary and Haugen came forward with farm bills, have been working closely together in the attempt to do something to give the farmers some legislative relief. That has been the course year after year. Since 1935 we have had an excellent program, a program, if you please, which has saved the economic life of this Nation, because if there is not a prosperous agriculture, there will not be a prosperous America. If the farmer does not make a good, decent living, the laboring man and all others cannot make a living.

The time has now come when something drastic must be done with respect to the control of the production of potatoes. We have lingered along year after year, through Congress after Congress, thinking something is going to be done with potatoes and a few other crops which are not under controls, giving subsidies to many individuals who are growing potatoes, not for the market, but it would seem for the Government as a result of the exorbitant loss year after year. So long as human nature is what it is, they will continue to grow potatoes for the Government rather than for the market, if the Congress of the United States does not clamp down upon them with severe and drastic legislation. I have made this argument before. I repeat the time has come to act once and for all, that we must tell the potato growers of this country that they cannot continue to take from the Treasury of the United States the taxpayers' money without absolute control cooperation by the grower. Every Senator familiar with our farm legislative progress dealing with the support and control program of our basic commodities, knows that the potato program is gradually weakening the foundation stones of a great agricultural program. Mr. President, the American people will not continue on and on in the support of that kind of a program, when they see what is happening year after year with respect to potatoes and a few other crops. The potato program to date alone has cost more than all the basic commodities put together. The fact of the matter is that up until this very moment the Commodity Credit Corporation has made money on cotton, corn, tobacco, and wheat. I do not say that the Corporation will not lose some money on some of these commodities in the future. But it is the potato program which is causing all the trouble.

Mr. President, as one Member of the Congress who is vitally concerned about continuation of a program which will keep agriculture where it belongs, which will keep America where she belongs, namely, on solid economic feet, I am sick and tired of continuing to subsidize certain specialized groups which will not play ball on the same basis with the farmers producing the basic commodities. And I propose to do something about it, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment, if I may comment on something the Senator from Illinois just said.

Mr. President, it is not my contention that the situation with respect to potatoes is due to any failure on the part of the Department of Agriculture. I should think, however, it would be of value to call attention to a procedure that takes place on the cattle ranges of the country. When the cook, out on the range with his chuck wagon, has completed his work in preparing a meal he yells out "Come and get it." I think it might be well for the Department of Agriculture to invite the welfare organizations and similar institutions to come and get the 50,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes. I may say that the responsible governing board of an orphanage, a hospital, or a welfare institution which did not pinch its pennies and try to get some of these cheap surplus potatoes ought to be called up for questioning by the proper authorities to find out why it did not do so. Here is an opportunity for such organizations to get a considerable part of the food needed by such organizations. Potatoes are a good and satisfactory form of nourishment. It is a shame that the surplus potatoes cannot be used.

If the governing boards of welfare organizations cannot pay the freight on the potatoes, that is, if it is not cheaper for them to pay the freight and obtain the surplus potatoes, then they can notify the Department of Agriculture that they cannot pay the freight, and the Department of Agriculture can come before the Congress and ask for additional funds, if it needs additional funds, with which to pay the freight on the potatoes. Certainly every effort ought to be made to persuade people to pay a few cents in freight for a few dollars' worth of potatoes. That seems to me the only sensible thing for the charitable institutions of the country to do.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Regardless of who might be responsible for our present potato surplus, does the Senator from New Mexico agree with me that the most constructive step which the Congress could take toward establishing a sound agricultural program and at the same time provide the best solution to our problems of huge surpluses, would be to advance the effective date of the flexible provisions of the Anderson Act from January 1, 1952, to read "effective immediately"?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator from Delaware will agree that many of us had opinions with respect to the measure to which he refers which were not in agreement with the opinions of many other Members of the Senate or of the House. We did the best we could under the circumstances, and so far as I am concerned, the majority having acted, I will stay with the majority until we have occasion to consider the subject again.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator from New Mexico agree with me that the most effective step we could take would be to reduce price supports across the board on all commodities on which we are piling up surpluses?

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator from Delaware should try to get that type of legislation considered he might find that he will get something which is worse than what we have now. We came near to having a permanent 90-percent support-price program. It was only with some difficulty that we finally achieved

the bill, which I think has some possibilities.

The Senator knows I am wedded to the idea of flexible price supports. I advocated that principle while I was in the Department. I testified in favor of it before committees of the Senate and the House. I was glad to see it written into the platforms of both political parties in 1948. I am not going to desert that principle now. However, I am perfectly willing to allow the Congress to set the time of the effective date of the flexible provisions of the act. Having gone through the late unpleasantness, I shall be glad to see the Congress take whatever action it desires to take.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think I quite understand the Senator from New Mexico. The Senator is not opposed to any amendment of the Anderson Act until 1952, is he?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, but I think there should be consideration of such legislation in orderly fashion. When the legislation comes up for consideration we may consider this problem. After we had days and days and days of the most prolonged and difficult negotiations to get any farm bill at all, I do not want to discuss the desirability of trying to change its provisions now. The Senator will recognize that during those negotiations I learned many things about myself that I had not theretofore suspected. I do not care to go through the same type of experience again at once, unless there is a possibility of reaching an agreement, and I think there is very slight possibility of reaching an agreement to advance the effective date of the flexible provisions of the act.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we were to assume that there was a possibility of arriving at an agreement respecting the desirability of advancing the effective date, does the Senator think it would be a wise step to take?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have always considered that the flexible provisions of the act represented a wise step. Therefore the earlier they can become effective, the better I think it will be. We are not at that point, however. We had difficulty in getting as far as we did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will agree with me, will he not, that it would solve to a large extent our problem of huge accumulation of surpluses in the so-called basic commodities at this time?

Mr. ANDERSON. It would not solve the problem of the surpluses or accumulations of potatoes which is now harassing us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. The potatoes are on hand. Therefore we cannot solve that problem immediately. Perhaps it can be solved by the adoption of one of the measures representing the two extremes, the one advocated by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the other by the majority leader of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was not trying to infer that it would solve the problem of the 50,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes with which we are now confronted. I realize that we are confronted with this situation, regardless of what action we may take. But I think we should profit by the mistakes made by which we have accumulated this surplus. It could alleviate the possibility of having to destroy the potatoes as well as other commodities later.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I suggest what is a more fruitful field of endeavor? There was passed by the House of a few days ago a bill to correct inequities in Public Law 272, the so-called cotton-acreage limitation legislation. That bill is now pending before the Agricultural Committee of the Senate and may come shortly to the floor of the Senate of the United States. If it comes to the floor of the Senate in the same shape it left the House of Representatives it will contain a provision which alone will add 1,400,000 acres, and a second provision which I regard as a wide-open invitation to increase other limitations on cotton acreage by permitting the committees in various States to review the cases and open up the situation as to individual farms. In my opinion the passage of the bill in that form could easily give us 2,500,000 acres of additional cotton in a year when we will produce at least one and a half million and probably two million bales more than we can possibly use. Those additional two or two and a half million acres could give us another one and a half million bales of cotton. We do not need those extra million bales of cotton. If we hold that legislation down to reasonable limits which will correct inequities and not go as far as I think the House has gone—and I think it has gone too far—then I think we shall perform a very useful service.

The statement was made on the floor of the House that not only was this measure designed to correct inequities so far as cotton and peanuts were concerned, but that when the wheat and corn growers came in they would be taken care of too. The whole basis upon which the pressure was on for high levels of price supports this year was that we were reducing acreages on every crop, and that therefore we had to give the producers high income for one more year in order to permit a gradual readjustment. But if we proceed to give away all that we gain by acreage limitation and have high prices too, then those high prices serve as incentives to production, and we get far more of the crop than we can possibly take care of.

While I would be very much interested in going along with the distinguished Senator at some time, perhaps, in trying to speed up the time when the flexible price supports might become effective, I hope he will join in the drive to see to it that we do not lose what little ground we have gained by attempting to put limitations on some of these crops.

EXHIBIT A

POTATOES [1]

Group and State	Yield per acre (bushels)			Production (thousands of bushels)		
	Average 1938-47	1948	Preliminary, 1949	Average 1938-47	1948	Preliminary, 1949
Surplus late potato States:						
Maine	292	380	435	52,758	73,340	65,685
New York, L. I.	251	320	220	15,108	18,880	11,440
New York, Upstate	123	225	220	15,480	19,125	16,500
Pennsylvania	128	185	180	19,275	19,425	18,540
3 Eastern States	198 1	295 9	294 4	102,591	130,770	112,165
Michigan	105	150	153	19,054	16,350	16,983
Wisconsin	88	125	150	13,292	10,875	12,600
Minnesota	98	155	150	18,648	16,740	14,250
North Dakota	117	165	160	17,787	20,295	17,440
South Dakota	78	125	56	2,390	2,500	952
5 Central States	101 4	149 4	149 6	71,172	66,760	62,225
Nebraska	142	215	155	10,329	11,395	8,060
Montana	117	160	130	1,884	2,400	1,820
Idaho	234	290	235	35,048	42,630	32,900
Wyoming	154	200	170	2,087	2,400	1,870
Colorado	198	265	265	15,500	20,670	17,755
Utah	173	195	180	2,579	2,944	2,610
Nevada	192	200	185	515	300	278
Washington	222	290	295	8,449	11,600	10,325
Oregon	227	280	265	9,569	11,480	11,395
California [1]	312	360	395	11,418	14,400	14,220
10 Western States	208 7	271 6	244 5	97,385	120,219	101,233
Total, 18 States	160 8	238 6	227 6	271,147	317,749	275,623
Other late potato States:						
New Hampshire	160	215	210	1,120	968	861
Vermont	136	185	185	1,519	1,295	1,184
Massachusetts	155	215	205	2,997	3,548	2,800
Rhode Island	200	215	200	1,148	1,462	1,200
Connecticut	192	225	225	3,315	3,352	3,172
West Virginia	101	95	105	3,062	2,090	2,100
Ohio	113	165	165	8,600	6,765	6,270
Indiana	121	180	170	4,756	4,140	3,570
Illinois	87	103	100	2,458	1,133	900
Iowa	98	110	100	4,062	1,430	1,100
New Mexico	78	90	82	290	270	246
Total 11 other late States	120 5	162 6	160. 2	33,326	26,453	23,553

[1] Early and late crops shown separately for California; combined for all other States.

POTATOES—continued

Group and State	Yield per acre (bushels)			Production (thousands of bushels)		
	Average 1938-47	1948	Preliminary, 1949	Average 1938-47	1948	Preliminary, 1949
Other late potato States—Con						
29 late States	155 4	230 3	220 3	304, 473	344, 202	299, 176
Intermediate potato States						
New Jersey	178	231	173	10, 793	13, 629	8, 131
Delaware	86	80	95	372	216	247
Maryland	109	131	118	2, 037	1, 965	1, 569
Virginia	123	183	173	8, 808	11, 529	9, 688
Kentucky	91	82	91	3, 750	2, 542	2, 639
Missouri	107	136	129	3, 702	3, 128	2, 580
Kansas	93	123	94	2, 084	1, 476	1, 034
Arizona	202	330	295	914	1, 749	1, 268
8 intermediate States	126 7	171 7	148 2	32, 509	36, 234	27, 156
37 late and intermediate States	152. 0	223. 1	211. 7	336, 982	380, 436	326, 332

Group and State	Yield per acre (bushels)			Production (thousands of bushels)		
	Average 1938-47	1948	Preliminary, 1949	Average 1938-47	1948	Preliminary, 1949
Early potato States.						
North Carolina	110	148	127	9, 128	10, 508	7, 874
South Carolina	110	88	120	2, 684	1, 408	1, 800
Georgia	67	64	74	1, 573	1, 024	1, 184
Florida	133	158	244	4, 240	3, 745	5, 539
Tennessee	82	86	88	3, 273	2, 322	2, 288
Alabama	91	104	105	4, 382	3, 640	3, 465
Mississippi	67	71	70	1, 676	1, 207	1, 190
Arkansas	82	91	76	3, 202	2, 366	1, 824
Louisiana	59	59	56	2, 580	1, 416	1, 232
Oklahoma	60	73	67	1, 775	1, 022	938
Texas	85	99	97	4, 419	4, 356	3, 686
California [1]	334	405	440	17, 430	32, 400	29, 480
12 early potato States	116 0	166. 2	169. 6	56, 422	65, 414	60, 500
Total, United States	145. 5	212 4	203 8	393, 403	445, 850	386, 832

SWEETPOTATOES

New Jersey	133	170	160	2, 068	2, 550	2, 560	Florida	67	64	70	1, 164	960	980
Indiana	104	110	105	188	143	136	Kentucky	84	80	83	1, 304	960	913
Illinois	87	95	95	282	190	190	Tennessee	95	100	107	3, 565	2, 000	2, 247
Iowa	98	95	110	192	171	165	Alabama	78	85	80	5, 709	4, 505	4, 160
Missouri	94	105	95	730	735	618	Mississippi	88	100	94	5, 499	4, 300	3, 948
Kansas	110	115	105	208	161	147	Arkansas	79	93	95	1, 796	1, 395	1, 235
Delaware	120	90	110	228	72	88	Louisiana	84	95	97	8, 616	7, 315	7, 178
Maryland	152	145	140	1, 337	1, 232	1, 120	Oklahoma	65	68	75	639	408	450
Virginia	113	135	130	3, 364	3, 510	3, 120	Texas	85	65	100	5, 220	3, 250	5, 500
North Carolina	106	115	111	7, 714	5, 635	5, 994	California	107	110	105	1, 204	1, 100	1, 155
South Carolina	93	102	100	5, 430	4, 284	4, 400							
Georgia	77	85	92	7, 100	4, 930	5, 980	United States	89 7	96 9	99 9	63, 626	49, 806	52, 284

[1] Early and late crops shown separately for California, combined for all other States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I prefer to yield the floor, but I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico that when the bill to which he refers comes to the floor of the Senate, I shall be on the floor and join with him in opposition to that bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator does not join in opposition to all bills in this field. I think that particular bill goes too far.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall join in opposition to the bill to which you have referred. I hope that when my bill to advance the effective date of the provisions of the Anderson Act is before the Senate, the Senator from New Mexico will join with me in supporting that measure

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation in connection with the suggestion of the junior Senator from New Mexico with respect to potatoes. It seems to me that he has ar excellent suggestion to the effect that charitable institutions, hospitals, and other institutions operated in the interest of the needy should take advantage of the surplus free potatoes for the people in need, by taking such free potatoes and either providing the necessary transportation for delivery to such institutions or paying the cost of such transportation when they would be getting the potatoes free rather than let them go to waste when food is so necessary.

At this time I should like to commend the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico for the nonpartisan position he has always taken on farm matters. I have always found him extremely fair.

CODIFICATION OF THE ARTICLES OF WAR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the subject upon which I wish to address the Senate today is to me a painful one. It is painful because I had always thought that there was one point upon which the thinking people of this country were in accord, and that is the proposition that every man or woman charged with a crime or offense in this country is entitled to a fair trial by a free and impartial court.

I now find that that is not true. We have pending before us H. R. 4080, "An act to establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice for the Armed Services of the United States." This bill is the result of the able labors of a committee appointed by the late Secretary of Defense James E. Forrestal. The chairman of this committee was Prof. Edmund M. Morgan, of the Harvard University Law School. The executive secretary was Felix Larkin, of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the three other members were representatives respectively of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. H. R. 4080, as reported by the Senate Committee on the Armed Services, substantially reflects the work of the Forrestal committee, although it has been altered in several important respects, which it is my purpose to refer to at this time.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon is a member of the Committee on Armed Services and was a member of the subcommittee which conducted hearings on the pending legislation. As a member of that subcommittee and as a member of the Armed Services Committee, he dissents from the recommendations which are made in the form of the pending bill.

It is a matter of regret to the junior Senator from Oregon that this bill was not committed to the Judiciary Committee for at least the advice and consideration which that committee could give to the Armed Services Committee with respect to what I consider to be very serious defects in the pending legislation. I wish to say, however, that I have had the finest relations with my colleagues on both the subcommittee and the Armed Services Committee. Our differences in regard to this legislation are entirely professional differences, and not personal in any way. I wish to extend to the very able chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], my sincere compliments for the fairness he showed throughout our discussions, both in the subcommittee and in the Committee on Armed Services in regard to this particular measure.

I find to my regret that H. R. 4080 represents a compromise between justice, as I have always thought we understood it in this country, and a so-called military idea of justice advanced by many honorable and well-intentioned officers of our armed services who, however, feel that justice for the civilian is one thing but justice for a member of this country's armed services is something different. I find myself unable to agree with this rather startling thesis.

The advocates of the military point of view start with the fundamental idea that the function of the armed services is to win wars. With that premise I heartily concur. They proceed with

the unassailable statement that in order for an army to win a war it must have discipline. They further assert that the system of military justice being one of the essential aids of command in enforcing discipline, control of this system must be vested in the commanding officers who lead the forces. They further assert that the power to appoint the military courts, the prosecuting officer and even the defense counsel must be within the powers and duties of these commanding officers. It is at this point that I feel we must part company.

Throughout this debate, Mr. President, my difference with my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee is over that very premise or assumption. In order to do justice in the armed forces to those charged with offenses and brought before courts martial we must put a stop to command control. That is the heart and the essence of my argument this afternoon on this part of the bill, namely, that I do not think we can have justice in courts martial, as experience has already demonstrated, so long as we permit the commanding officer to exercise the control over courts martial which he now exercises and which this bill permits him to continue to exercise.

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

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say to my good friend from Tennessee that I cannot yield to him at this time because I had made an appointment with the Secretary of State for 3:30 on a very important matter, and he has kindly postponed the appointment until later this afternoon. I should like to say that the Senator from Tennessee is well aware of my views on this subject, and I am sure that the Senator can perform a great courtesy to me if, after the conclusion of my remarks, he will take sufficient time on the floor to discuss the points I raise, and give me time to keep my appointment with the Secretary of State and return to the Senate.

So I shall continue uninterrupted, Mr. President, because I should like to get my remarks into the RECORD in continuity for future reference, because I am satisfied that no matter what the outcome of the vote is this afternoon—and I am inclined to think that once more the junior Senator from Oregon will find himself on the losing side of the issue—the vote this afternoon will not settle this issue. We shall come back to it in the future. The particular provisions of the bill which I am going to criticize this afternoon will not work justice within the Military Establishment, and, therefore, veterans' organizations and lawyers' organizations interested in the amendments which I am offering this afternoon, will continue to carry on the fight to break the command control of commanders in respect to military justice until the fight is won. Until we break the control of commanders we jeopardize the doing of justice within the court-martial system of our Military Establishment.

Mr. President, I do not want anyone to have any doubt as to where I stand on that issue. So far as my amendment is concerned, I propose to strip the commanding officers—as they should have been stripped years ago—of the control they now have over the court-martial system.

Mr. President, as a background, let me sketch in a little ancient as well as modern history. Some of us may remember that following the close of World War I, a public outcry developed against the system of military justice then in effect in the Army of the United States. Cases of tyrannical oppression, arrogant miscarriages of justice, disregard of the rights of the individual, and a wholly inadequate system of review came to light. Significantly, one of the chief critics of the Army court-martial system was Maj. Gen. S. T. Ansell, who had for a period been the Acting Judge Advocate General of the Army. Opposed to him, as a defender of the existing system, was the then Judge Advocate General, Maj. Gen. E. H. Crowder. Senator Chamberlain appeared on the floor of this body as the advocate of a court-martial reform measure known as the Chamberlain bill, which sought to provide adequate representation for the accused, to insure impartiality of the courts martial by removing them from the influence of the line commanding officers, which provided for the services of enlisted men on courts martial, and which further set up an adequate system of review. Then, as now, the opponents of the bill resorted to the military maxim that "discipline is a function of command," in order to justify the retention of control over the courts by the line commanding officers. I regret to say that the efforts of these gentlemen were successful, and the Chamberlain bill was killed. Nevertheless, the force of public opinion was such that in June 1920, a new statute for the government of the Armies of the United States was enacted. That statute has governed the trial of Army personnel from 1920 until passage of the Elston Act in 1948. It did not affect the Navy, and the Articles for the Government of the Navy today exist in substantially the same form as they have existed since Civil War times.

Under the 1920 Articles of War, the basic set-up of the Army courts remained unchanged. As in World War I, and to this very moment, every officer and enlisted man, every nurse and member of the Women's Army Corps, who is charged with an offense is tried by a court appointed by a commanding officer from the personnel of his command—the same commanding officer who has directed the trial of the accused, and in many cases the same commanding officer who has instructed his junior officer to prefer the charges against the accused. In other words, the officer who appoints the court is in a real sense of the word the prosecutor. This same commanding officer also is charged with the duty of appointing counsel for the accused, limited only by the requirement of article 27 (b) that the defense counsel must at least be a person who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest bar of a State, and be certified as competent to perform such duties by the Judge Advocate General.

It must be remembered that the members of the court, being under the command of the appointing officer, are dependent upon him for their promotions, their efficiency ratings, their assignments of duty, and their leaves of absence. We must remember also that it is amazingly easy for a commanding officer, without ever putting his wishes into the form of a direct command to the members of the court, to make clear to them that he desires the conviction of the accused and the imposition of a severe sentence. Such a suggestion may be made as well from a sincere belief that an example must be made of the accused in order to prevent others from following his example as from any personal pique or ill will. In fact, it is well-intentioned but misdirected zeal which has most frequently led to the exertion of pressure by the commanding officer upon the members of the court appointed by him.

Would any Member of the Senate care to place the responsibility of determining the guilt or innocence of his son or his daughter in the hands of such a court, the members of which are entirely dependent for their careers and their happiness upon the good will of the officer who has indicated to them that they must convict the accused who is on trial before them?

This is no mere theoretical danger. The influencing of the courts by the appointing officer has been an abuse which has persisted through World War I and through World War II. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 15, 1919, which reports the following colloquy between Senator Norris and Senator Chamberlain:

> Mr NORRIS. One of the evils, as I understand it, is that all the men, not only the members of the court but the prosecuting officer, as well as the attorney for the defense, are selected by the man who makes the charge in reality, and from whom every one of these officials, if they get a promotion, must secure it Is that right?
>
> Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Absolutely.
>
> Mr NORRIS Of course, that surrounds the young man with an air of injustice to begin with
>
> Mr CHAMBERLAIN There is no question about that The commanding officer appoints the court, he appoints the prosecutor, he appoints the counsel for the defendant, * * * he approves or disapproves the sentence when it is rendered.

So much for the problem in 1919.

As to World War II, let me refer the Senate to the work and the conclusion of the War Department Advisory Committee on Military Justice, appointed by the then Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, on March 25, 1946, the chairman of which is the present chief justice of the Court of Errors and Appeals of New Jersey, Arthur T. Vanderbilt. This group held full committee hearings in Washington, and regional public hearings in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Raleigh, Atlanta, Chicago, St. Louis, Denver, San Francisco, and Seattle. The testimony adduced from the witnesses filled more than 2,500 pages of transcript. The witnesses included the Secretary of War, the Under Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the commander of the Army Ground Forces, the Judge Advocate General, the

Assistant Judge Advocate General, general officers, as well as those of lower grade, and civilian witnesses who had served as officers or enlisted men during World War II.

The War Department Advisory Committee, as its conclusion drawn from the evidence before it, found that—

Although the innocent were not punished, there was such disparity and severity in the impact of the system on the guilty as to bring many military courts into disrepute both among the law-breaking element and the law-abiding element, and a serious impairment in the morale of the troops ensued where such a situation existed.

The committee said:

The committee is convinced that in many instances the commanding officer who selected the members of the courts made a deliberate attempt to influence their decisions.

Mr. President, that was in World War II; that is the record the committee found in regard to the action of commanding officers in World War II, in many instances. I say it is a serious indictment of military justice, and I say also that it is the clear duty of the Senate to see to it that there cannot be a repetition of the type of undue influence which was exercised over military courts by commanding officers in World War II.

The committee further said:

It is not suggested that all commanders adopted this practice but its prevalence was not denied and, indeed, in some instances was freely admitted. * * *. Not infrequently the members of the court were given to understand that in case of a conviction they should impose the maximum sentence provided in the statute so that the general, who had no power to increase the sentence, might fix it to suit his own ideas.

In view of this finding by the War Department committee, it cannot be argued seriously that command control of the courts is a mere phantom conjured up by the civilian mind.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the primary recommendation of the War Department's Advisory Committee was, therefore, the elimination of command control of the courts; and this recommendation has been the keystone of the court-martial reforms advocated in well-considered studies and reports presented by the American Legion, the American Bar Association, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, New York County Lawyer's Association, the War Veteran's Bar Association, and other bar and veterans' groups. To the best of my knowledge, every member of the committees on military justice of the groups mentioned had not only military or naval experience but experience in the actual workings of the court-martial system in the field. Most of these associations stated bluntly that court-martial reform without the removal of command control would miss the major cause of the injustices perpetrated during the past two World Wars.

Mr. President, because of their findings and because the record they made satisfied the junior Senator from Oregon that they were right in their recommendations and conclusions, I have found it impossible to join in support of the pending measure.

One would think that in view of these statements, the primary reform incorporated in any legislation seeking to amend the system of military justice would be the elimination of command control by placing the power to appoint the courts in some hand other than that of the officer who is the real prosecutor and who has it within his power so successfully to dominate the court which he appoints. But the Elston bill, which was passed by both Houses of the Congress in 1948, and which included many needed reforms, among them the establishment of an independent Judge Advocate General's Corps for the Army, responsible for the performance of its duties only through its own chain of command, failed to effect the divorcement of command and the Army courts. And now we have H. R. 4080 which, though it forbids any attempt to influence or coerce the courts, still leaves a system by which the courts are appointed precisely as that system has existed since prior to World War I.

I have yet to hear a single individual suggest that the accused before a military court was not entitled to an impartial trial. Yet, many respected officers of high rank, and even some individuals not in the armed services, have opposed depriving command of its power to appoint the courts. I find it impossible to understand the logic in this position. If the courts are to be impartial, then why should command insist upon its power to appoint them? If, on the other hand, command believes that it must dictate the findings and sentences of the courts in order to preserve discipline, then why not abandon the sham, abolish the court-martial system, and make each individual in the armed services subject to such punishment as his commanding officer sees fit to impose? Only in one of these alternatives may logic be found.

What, then, are the arguments of those who demand the preservation of command's right to appoint the courts?

The first argument has been that the elimination of command's power to appoint the courts would subvert discipline and interfere with the armed services' primary duty of winning wars. If this is true, it must be because granting a fair trial to an accused person will derogate from discipline. The best answer I can give is the statement of one general who testified before the War Department Advisory Committee on Military Justice that—

Discipline is maintained by many means, outstanding of which is the proper administration of justice. There is no such thing as a choice between maintenance of discipline and proper administration of justice by the courts-martial system. Justice is administered through courts martial in the interest of maintaining proper disciplinary standards.

Those of the Members of the Senate who have served, not in the exalted ranks of the generals and admirals, but in the lower echelons of the military, naval, and air forces, know that nothing will arouse the resentment of the men and women in the services as quickly and in such degree as the feeling that one of their number is receiving a raw deal from a court martial, and they will also know, as the rest of us must realize from our human experience, that a resentful individual is an inefficient individual and one who is far less amenable to discipline than those who have faith in their superiors.

A second argument has been made that the problems of military justice are peculiar to the armed services and that civilian methods and standards of administering justice are not appropriate. The fact is that with the exception of such offenses as absence without leave, desertion, and insubordination, the great majority of cases brought before courts martial are for precisely the same offenses as civilian courts include within their jurisdiction—such offenses as drunkenness, disorderly conduct, larceny, fraud, rape, murder, and the like. And as to the so-called military offenses, what is there about them which makes inapplicable the principle that every accused person is entitled to a fair trial? Bear in mind, that I would reserve to command the right to order to trial any person whom his commanding officer believes guilty of an offense. All that I ask—all that the bar and veterans' groups request—is that when the man is placed on trial, he shall be tried by a free and impartial court, not under the influence or coercion of the commanding officer, either directly or indirectly. If this is not the right of every American citizen, it is time that the Senate make it the right of every American citizen.

A further argument is made that it would be impracticable to place the appointing power elsewhere than in the commanding officers. This objection has been met and disproved in testimony given at the hearings on this bill and on the Elston Act. I have proposed amendments to H. R. 4080 which represent a practicable, workable method of eliminating command control without impairing the functions of command, which I will offer at the proper time. These amendments will leave to command the power to appoint the prosecuting officer and to order the trial of any person subject to court-martial jurisdiction whom command believes should be tried. In other words, the purpose of these amendments is not to dictate to command which persons shall be tried, but only to assure the accused of a fair trial.

The fact is that we are faced with a stubborn although well-intentioned refusal of some of the military men to admit that during World War II we had a break-down in the system of military justice and that the administration of military justice should be placed in the hands of that branch of the armed services best qualified to administer it; that is, the Judge Advocate General's Department. Each branch of the armed services is jealous of its prerogatives—and one has but to sit on the Armed Services Committee in order to realize that, frequently—that condition is founded in part upon the traditions of the particu-

lar branch and the very human unwillingness of its spokesmen to admit its past failures. But we cannot afford to let this type of opposition, understandable though it may be, defeat such changes as may be necessary to secure justice—as we Americans have always known justice—for those of our fellow citizens who are serving in the armed forces.

The arguments now presented by those opposed to the divorcement of the military courts from command control have been advanced by their predecessors for some 30 years in justification for the present system, with the result that the same injustices which were perpetrated in World War I were repeated in World War II. It is the duty of the Senate to effect a change.

Mr. President, in this, as in all other debates, I try to be exceedingly fair in seeing that the record includes whatever information I have in my file on the opposite point of view from the one which I have taken. I want to say at this point that I have the highest regard for the great professor at the Harvard Law School, Eddie Morgan. It was never my pleasure or privilege to be one of his students, but I have sat at his feet at a distance, in that, as a teacher of law for a great many years, I have, may I say, eaten and tried to digest the scholarly writings of Eddie Morgan, particularly in the field of evidence I have taught from many of his writings. In my judgment, in spite of his scholarship and his great ability, in this particular instance, the great Harvard professor, Mr Morgan, is dead wrong in the position he has taken in regard to the command-control issue. But in fairness to him, I want to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter which I received from him under date of June 24, 1949, in which he sets forth his point of view in regard to command control. I ask also that my reply to the letter may be inserted at this point

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

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO,
Boulder, Colo , June 24, 1949.

DEAR WAYNE The newspapers tell me that you objected to the passage of the uniform code by unanimous consent. And it has been suggested to me that you are going to urge the Spiegelberg-Farmer-Wells panel proposal as an amendment This makes me doubly sorry that you were unable to be present at the meetings of the subcommittee of which you were a member. I think I was able to convince the other members, as well as the members of the House subcommittee of two things:

1 The plan is impracticable Take the example which the three proponents used. An army of six divisions has an army headquarters with a staff judge advocate attached to the staff of the Army commanding officer. The commanding officer of each of the six divisions is to furnish the Army staff judge advocate with a list of officers and enlisted men assignable for general courts martial. Since each court must have five members, and two of these may or may not be enlisted men, and since the division commanding officer is not to choose the court in any case, he must furnish a list of at least 10 officers and 4 enlisted men. Must he set these persons aside so that they can be called at any time? If so, he cannot assign them to any other duties which cannot be dropped instantly by them. Is he going to select men of any ability for such a detail? How would you like to be a commanding officer of a division and have your officers subject to call by a staff judge advocate at Army headquarters? And how could this plan work in time of war?

2. The plan will not eliminate command control All three of the sponsors concede that in at least 90 percent of the cases the court for a division will consist of officers and men from that division. All the complaints of "skin letters" and other interference by command have been by members of a court for their conduct on the court, and not at all in the proceedings for their selection. So long as the commanding officer wants to make it uncomfortable for one of his officers or men on account of conduct as a member of a court in his division, it won't matter a whit who selected that member Where the Army staff judge advocate selects officers or men from division 6, for service on a court in division 1, are you so naive as to believe that the commanding officer of division 1, who is assumed to be hell-bent on convicting the accused, will not communicate with the commanding officer of division 6? And what do you think of the idea of having the Army staff judge advocate given authority to tell the commanding officer of 6 that he must detail officers and men for service in 1? And particularly since this is to prevent the commanding officer of 1 from getting convictions? It seems to me the whole idea is fantastic as a means of eliminating command control or even lessening it

The Uniform Code has, I submit, much more effective provisions. First, the CO must always consult his staff JA as to the sufficiency of the charges and of the available evidence before a trial is ordered Second, when a conviction is reviewed, the staff JA must submit an opinion as to its validity, which becomes a part of the record. Third, if the sentence is as severe as a year's confinement, the record must be reviewed by a board of review in the JAG office, the members of which are lawyers They are far removed from all semblance of control of the CO of the division or army in which the court sat They review law, facts, and sentence, and can make new findings—but they cannot increase the sentence or make findings more detrimental to the accused than those made by the court. Finally there is review on the law by the Court of Military Appeals

All this is in addition to the protection given the accused by requiring that the counsel at the trial be lawyers, that the court have a lawyer as a law officer who acts like a civilian judge, with the court members acting like a civilian jury. And the accused also is entitled to be represented by a defense appellate counsel before the Board of Review and before the Court of Military Appeals.

I submit that, if these in addition to the provisions which expressly forbid command interference and make it a punishable offense do not furnish aquequate protection, certainly the device of the panel won't do so.

I regret that I cannot see you personally; I trust that you will give personal attention to this letter, and not be satisfied with a word from your secretary as to its content.

With regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EDDIE,
Edmund M. Morgan,
Professor of Law.

JULY 5, 1949.

Prof. EDMUND M. MORGAN,
School of Law, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.

DEAR EDDIE: Thanks a lot for your letter of June 24 Although I wasn't able to attend very many meetings of the subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I did read every word of the hearings that were typed, and I am sure I've given the matter as conscientious study as those members of the committee who did attend the meetings.

I objected to the passage of the Uniform Code by unanimous consent for two reasons: First, because I have not completed to my own satisfaction my study and analysis of the issue; and, second, because I am satisfied that legislation as important as this should not be passed in the Senate of the United States by unanimous consent.

You may be sure, Eddie, that I not only will give your letter and all letters that come to my office on this subject my personal attention but I am going to give this entire issue the most careful study of which I am capable Your work and views on it are certain to have tremendous influence with me because of my deep admiration for your scholarship and your deep intellectual honesty However, I am not going to vote for the proposal until I am thoroughly convinced on it, and I hope to find the time to complete my analysis of it within the next week or 10 days.

As you well know, for weeks past I have been deeply involved in an intensive study and debate on various labor issues, and now we are taking up the North Atlantic Pact matter Still I am reasonably certain to be able to devote my time to the military justice matter before many more days

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr MORSE Mr. President, after receiving Professor Morgan's letter, I discussed its contents with representatives of certain of the bar groups who had appeared before our committee in opposition to Professor Morgan's particular recommendation in respect to the command control issue. One of the bar representatives was Mr. Arthur E Farmer, of the firm of Stern & Reubens, of New York City I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks Mr. Farmer's letter to me under date of July 25, 1949, in which he covers point by point the matters raised in the Morgan letter to which I previously referred.

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

NEW YORK, N Y., *July 25, 1949*

HON WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE This letter may aid you in combating the arguments as to the impracticability of the amendments to H. R. 4030 which Mr Spiegelberg and I drew in order to eliminate command control of courts martial.

Under date March 4, 1949, Professor Morgan wrote to Mr. Spiegelberg as follows, with permission to quote him.

"As to the plan which you propose for eliminating command control, I agree that if each division commander is required to furnish a list of officers for court-martial duty to the Army commander, and if there is a statutory provision that the local judge advocate general will select the court for any division from officers of other divisions, you

will secure much more freedom from command control of the trial court; otherwise, 'I am still from Missouri.' And I have some doubts whether such a plan would be workable, whether officers on the list wouldn't become unavailable, etc."

Morgan's letter to you, which I return with this letter, shows clearly that between March 4 and June 24, he was sold a bill of goods by those who advocated retention of command control, which, of course, was only possible because he is not familiar with the practical workings of either military justice or the Army line of command. Let me take each of his objections in the same order as he states them.

1 "The plan is impracticable."

Morgan assumes that each division commanding officer must furnish a list of at least 10 officers and 4 enlisted men to serve on courts martial. From this assumption he concludes that he must set these persons aside so that they can be called at any time; that he must therefore lose the services of this personnel for other purposes; that the consequence will be that he will select men of no ability, and that it is unthinkable that the commanding officer of the division could have his officers subject to call by a staff judge advocate at Army headquarters

The fact of the matter is that under the present system a general court martial usually consists of nine officers, selected by the division commanding general. These officers perform their usual duties and are subject to call for service on courts only when there are cases ready for trial. Even in wartime, these courts generally sat not more frequently than once every 10 days to 2 weeks, and if other duties required their attention during the day, the court convened at night

The officers would be no less available under our plan than under the present system. The only difference would be that the cases assigned to the courts would be assigned to them by the staff judge advocate at Army level instead of by the division commanding general Again in practice, it was generally not the commanding general who determined when the court would sit, but the staff judge advocate If any of the officers was needed for other important duties, he was excused from service at that particular session of the court The arrangements would be no different under the system which we propose.

Furthermore, the amendments forwarded to you by Mr. Spiegelberg add to article 25 of H R. 4080 a new subdivision (c), the last sentence of which reads as follows:

"Such commanding officers may withdraw names from such lists and may substitute others therefor"

In other words, not only by implication, but specifically, the power to withdraw officers and to substitute others is reserved to the division commanding general, so that the argument that he will lose the services of the selected personnel, is nonsense.

2 "The plan will not eliminate command control."

Morgan argues that inasmuch as we state that at least 90 percent of the cases will be tried by the court of the division of which the accused is a member, command control will not be eliminated. He then accuses us of being naive in assuming that the commanding officer of division 1 will not communicate with the commanding officer of division 2, if division 1's personnel is tried by a court from division 2, in order to secure a conviction. He scoffs at the idea that an Army staff judge advocate have authority to tell the commanding general of division 6 that he must detail officers and men for service in division 1. With due respect to Professor Morgan, this paragraph shows an extraordinary and lamentable failure to understand the plan proposed.

The reason why we say that in at least 90 percent of the cases tried by general courts martial, the accused will be tried by the court consisting of officers from his own division, is that unless there are indications that the commanding general of a division has been seeking to influence the decisions of his courts, the Army judge advocate, as a matter of convenience, will refer cases arising in division 1 to the panel of officers selected by the commanding general of division 1. We do not intend by the proposed amendment to require that an accused be tried by a court consisting of officers and men from a division other than the one of which he is a member. Our purpose is to check command control by interfering only where the commanding general shows that he is intent on influencing his courts.

In saying this, I am not referring solely to a situation where there is evidence sufficient to convict the commanding general of the offense of attempting to coerce the court; I am referring more especially to the typical case in which the commanding general lets it be known that he considers a conviction necessary—a matter which cannot escape the attention of the staff judge advocate in the command. You know, as well as I do, that as a practical matter, this type of information runs through the staff—and considerably beyond—with the speed of light. If, as happened in a case in which I sat as law member, the commanding general, instead of verbally ordering the accused officer into arrest, placed him in arrest by published special order, the staff judge advocate at division level would pass the word along directly to the Army judge advocate (under the Elston Act he has a direct line of communication with superior authority in the Judge Advocate General's Department), and the Army judge advocate would order the officer to trial before a court composed of officers of a different division

Furthermore, the Army judge advocate would not tell the commanding officer of division 6 that he must detail officers and men for service in division 1, as Professor Morgan asserts. What he would do would be to order the case of the accused in division 1 to trial before the division 6 court. It would be the accused and the witnesses who would go before the division 6 court; it would not be the division 6 court which would sit in the area of division 1. Why this should cause any perturbation on the part of the Army, I don't understand. As I testified before the Senate subcommittee, during the latter part of World War II all cases pending in the Sixth Service Command were tried before a general court sitting in Chicago, the witnesses and the accused being transported to the court As an alternative method, in the North African theater traveling teams consisting of a trial judge advocate, defense counsel, and law member covered large areas of the theater in the trying of general court-martial cases.

Finally, I am afraid it is not Colonel Spiegelberg and ex-Lieutenant Farmer who are naive in believing that the commanding general of division 1 will not communicate with the commanding general of division 2 in order to get the latter to instruct his court to convict. No commanding general, under whom either of us ever served, would have stuck his neck so far out as to ask another two-star general to aid him in violating an article of war (A. W. 37). I am sure that a commanding general would not hesitate, if he desired to secure a conviction in his own command, to drop a hint to his staff; I am equally sure that he would not care to communicate his wishes to the commanding general of another division.

Professor Morgan puts much faith in the fact that the appointing authority must always consult his staff judge advocate as to the framing of the charges and the available evidence before a trial is ordered. We do not share in this faith. Not only is the CG not bound by his staff judge advocate's recommendations, but I know numerous instances in which the CG asked his staff judge advocate to change his recommendation, and, I am sorry to say, several instances in which the staff JA acceded to this request.

And what good does it do an accused to have the staff JA's recommendation a part of the record? What we are talking about here is the pressure which a commanding general may put upon members of a court appointed by him. I fail to see the relevance of Professor Morgan's comment respecting the staff JA's recommendation.

Professor Morgan also argues that under the system of review provided by H. R. 4080, the possibility of injustices resulting from command control is virtually eliminated. This contention simply is not true. In many cases the court might legitimately find either way, and the Board of Review could not say that its finding was against the weight of the evidence. This is because the determination of issues of fact is largely dependent upon the view which the court takes of the credibility of the witnesses. And that is precisely why the system of review does not solve the problem of command influence upon the courts. Where the evidence is conflicting and the court finds in accordance with the wishes of the commanding general, neither the Board of Review nor the Court of Military Appeals can upset the conviction.

These are the only arguments advanced by the opposition, in addition to those covered in the material which I sent you a few days ago, of which I am cognizant. If others should be presented, I will be glad to analyze them for you. You see, Senator, the Morgan letter represents the very situation that I had in mind when I wrote you some weeks ago, asking whether it would be possible to bring the proponents and the opponents of the command-control amendments before your committee. Unless a person has had sufficient military service, plus complete familiarity with the processes of military justice, he is at a tremendous disadvantage when faced by the Judge Advocate General or others equally experienced.

Cordially yours,

ARTHUR E. FARMER.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also wish to include at this point in my remarks what I consider to be an exceptionally able writing on this subject by Mr. Arthur John Keeffe and Mr. Morton Moskin, which appeared in the Cornell Law Quarterly for the fall of 1949, under the title "Codified Military Injustice." Were I in court at this moment, Mr. President, I should ask to have this particular article marked for identification purposes, and I should offer it as one of my key exhibits in support of the premises I am defending and advancing here this afternoon.

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

CODIFIED MILITARY INJUSTICE—AN ANALYSIS OF THE DEFECTS IN THE NEW UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

When the newly inducted GI bids farewell to his family and friends, little does he realize that he is also saying good-by, in large measure, to his rights as a citizen. It is a matter of regret that the Uniform Code of Military Justice,[1] already passed by the House of Representatives and approved by a Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, makes no substantial change in this unhappy situation.

[1] S 857 and H. R. 4080, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949).

"If we are going to handle this court-martial business, I say," said Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, during the Senate hearings on the proposed Code,[4] "let us do a thorough job; let us not take our present system and just make a little addition or two here. If we are going to do the job that I think this committee ought to do, I think we have just got to start at the beginning and go to the finish, and make changes wherever we can make a change that will bring the military system in direct line with civilian justice and, at the same time, not interfere with what we can all agree is necessary military organization in order to have an effective fighting force."

But the Senator's enlightened stand failed to sway his fellow committee members. Such, it appears, has always been the case whenever radical revision of what is paradoxically termed "military justice" has been suggested. The last real attempt at reform, the Chamberlain bill,[5] an aroused public's answer to the flagrant miscarriages of justice permitted under the guise of discipline during World War I, was killed in committee. Its advocates, Maj Gen. S. T Ansell [6] and Senator George Chamberlain, like Senator MORSE, a dauntless legislator from Oregon, had sought to divorce military justice from command control, provide trained legal representatives for the accused, and insure adequate review procedures.

It is time the services came to realize that courts martial are more than instruments for the maintenance of discipline.[8] They are criminal courts, enforcing a penal code, and applying highly punitive sanctions. As such, considerations of law and justice become paramount The drafters of the new reform legislation have overlooked this underlying postulate A scrutiny of the code's provisions will make this clear

HOW UNIFORM IS "UNIFORM"?

The legislation professes to be uniform, yet article 1 which merely defines the terms used throughout, reveals the perpetuation of three separate and distinct Judge Advocate Generals Upon these officers, as now constituted, rests the responsibility for the legal sufficiency of every case, because it is in their offices that the records of trial are reviewed To achieve true uniformity of policy, and to bring about a more efficient and a more economical administration it is imperative that the three Judge Advocate General offices be merged into one department. Three individuals in three separate departments doing the work of one is ridiculous

Furthermore, only by merging the three departments into one can we hope to have Army, Navy, and Air Force sentences approach a degree of uniformity. The fortuitous induction into one branch of service rather than another during the last war determined whether one who perpetrated a capital offense would live or die. We should not again see capital punishment present in the Army but abolished in the Navy, or have absences from boot camp in the Army punished more severely than like absences in the Navy.[9]

The arguments for combining the Judge Advocate Generals in one department are indisputable. Why then has not such action been taken? The best reasons Prof. Edmund Morgan, chairman of the committee which drafted the legislation, could offer the Senate subcommittee were:

"Well, that, of course, is very nice theoretically, after you once get the thing thoroughly unified, but there again we felt that we had to keep off that because of the different organizations of the Judge Advocate General's office.

"For example, if you had a single Judge Advocate General, what should he be, an Army man, an Air Force man, a Navy man, or a civilian? That is the first question.

"Second, the functions of the Judge Advocate General are so different in the different services, if you had a single Judge Advocate General, how and what functions would you take away from him?" [7]

CIVILIANS IN GUAM AND OTHER POSSESSIONS SUBJECTED TO COURTS MARTIAL

Article 2 (11) deprives the civil populations of Guam, American Samoa, and the trust territory of the Pacific of their basic civil rights by subjecting them to military justice. The article does this by implication in that it extends the code's jurisdiction to all persons under the supervision of the armed forces outside of certain designated areas At the present time the Navy Department has control over these islands,[8] none of which are within the territory specifically excepted by the code.

Significantly, in *Duncan* v. *Kahanamoku* [9] the Supreme Court overruled the Government's contention that Hawaiian civilians were subject to the jurisdiction of military tribunals The Court, speaking through Mr Justice Black, said that the people of Hawaii are entitled to constitutional protection to the same extent as the inhabitants of the 48 States.

Hawaii, it must be admitted, is an incorporated Territory,[10] while Guam, American Samoa, and the trust territory are not, nor should we lose sight of the fact that under article IV, section 3, clause 2, of the Constitution, Congress has "power to * * * make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory * * * belonging to the United States" Two Supreme Court cases have held that under this provision such rights as trial by jury in criminal cases [11] and indictment by a grand jury [12] are statutory matters rather than constitutional rights when applied to Territorial possessions Nevertheless, there can be no compelling policy reason for altering the standard of justice applicable to these lesser islands if we bear in mind that the protection afforded by the due process and equal protection clauses of the fourteenth amendment is not confined to citizens, but extends to all natural persons. In *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* [13] the Court said:

"The rights of the petitioners, as affected by the proceedings of which they complain, are not less, because they are aliens and subjects of the Emperor of China. * * * The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution is not confined to the protection of citizens. * * * These provisions are universal in their application, to all persons within the Territorial jurisdiction, without regard to any differences of race, of color, or of nationality."

REVIVING JURISDICTION AFTER DISCHARGE

Article 3 (c) provides that "any person who has deserted from the armed forces shall not be relieved from amenability to the jurisdiction of this code by virtue of a separation from any subsequent period of service." In theory, this is meant to apply to deserters who later reenlist in another branch of service or in the same branch under a different name, serve faithfully, and procure honorable discharges

The provision was designed to circumvent two well-established rules of law. First, that a person is amenable to military jurisdiction only during the period of his service.[14] Second, that an honorable discharge is a formal and final judgment passed by the Government on a man's entire military record.[15]

The danger in depriving a discharged serviceman of his rights to trial in a civilian court is pointed out by Mr. Justice Black's decision allowing habeas corpus in *United States ex rel. Hirshberg* v. *Cooke*.[16] Chief Petty Officer Harold E. Hirshberg had been granted an honorable discharge in 1946. The very next day he reenlisted, and about a year later he was served with charges directing his trial by a general court martial for alleged offenses committed during the prior enlistment Had the Navy been right in its contention that the subsequent reenlistment revived jurisdiction that had concededly been lost upon discharge, then "punishment of the gravest nature might be imposed on a naval volunteer or draftee which no court martial could have imposed but for such a voluntary or [in the case of subsequent draft] forced entry into the Navy. * * * Jurisdiction to punish rarely, if ever, rests upon such illogical and fortuitous circumstances."

True article 3 (c) applies only to deserters, but in light of the fact that over 75 percent of all court-martial cases involve desertion or absence without leave [17] its far-reaching effect becomes evident

The ease with which a mere unauthorized absence can be transformed into a charge of desertion for purposes of receiving jurisdiction can be illustrated by the trial of John Jones, machinist's mate, second class, United States Naval Reserve, a case in which the ac-

---

[2] Hearings before subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services on S. 857, 81st Cong , 1st sess. 84 (1949).

[3] S. 64, H R. 367, 66th Cong , 1st sess. (1919).

[4] Ansell, Military Justice, 5 Corn. L. Q. 1 (1919).

[5] This was the traditional view. 1 Winthrop, Military Law and Precedents 53–54 (1886).

[6] The Army executed over 100 men in World War II. The Navy has not executed a man since 1842, the year in which Midshipman Philip Spencer and two others were hanged at sea for conspiring to mutiny. Midshipman Spencer was a nephew of the Secretary of War, John C. Spencer. He was a graduate of Hobart and when Andrew D. White, the first president and cofounder of Cornell University, entered Hobart, he took his room See Keeffe, Universal Military Training With or Without Reform of Courts Martial? (33 Cornell L. Q 465, 469 (1948)).

[7] Hearings before subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services on S. 857, Eighty-first Congress, first session, 319 (1949).

[8] The Navy and Interior Departments have agreed on a plan to replace Navy personnel on Guam with civilians by July 1, 1950. If Guam's government is shifted to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, pursuant to an Executive order of the President, civilians on Guam will not be subject to the code provision. However, the Senate Appropriations Committee is threatening to block the change because of the added expense involved See Washington Evening Star, September 13, 1949, p. 12, col. 2.

[9] 327 U. S. 304 (1946).

[10] See Gettys, The Law of Citizenship in the United States 149 (1934).

[11] *Dowdell* v. *United States* (211 U. S. 325 (1911)).

[12] *Ocampo* v. *United States* (234 U. S. 91 (1914)).

[13] 118 U S. 357, 368 (1886).

[14] *United States ex rel. Hirshberg* v. *Cooke* (69 Sup. Ct. 530 (1949)); *United States ex rel. Viscardi* v. *MacDonald* (265 Fed. 695 (E. D N. Y. 1920)), Naval Courts and Boards, § 334, p. 92 (1937 ed, 1945 reprint); Winthrop, Military Law and Precedents 89 (2d ed , 1920 reprint) But cf. *United States ex rel. Pasela* v. *Fenno* (76 F. Supp. 203 (*D. Conn.* 1947) aff'd, 167 F 2d 593, *United States ex rel. Hironimus* v *Durant* (168 F. 2d 288 (4th Cir. 1948)).

[15] *United States* v. *Kelly* (15 Wall. 34 (U S 1872)).

[16] 69 Sup Ct. 530 (1949).

[17] Report of the General Court Martial Sentence Review Board to the Secretary of the Navy, sec. XI (1), p. 329 (January 1947).

cused's avowed dislike for the Navy was distorted into an intent never to return.[18] This, despite the fact that his testimony indicates he had worn his uniform at all times during his absence and had purchased a return bus ticket 3 or 4 days before being apprehended.

Civilians are entitled to trial in civil courts with all the constitutional safeguards, including jury trial, which the fifth and sixth amendments guarantee. The failure or inability of the services to act during that time when jurisdiction could have legitimately attached should not be allowed to change this.

PRESERVATION OF DOUBLE JEOPARDY

Under article 14, "a member of the armed forces accused of an offense against a civil authority may be delivered, upon request, to the civil authority for trial." This is well and good, but the code, despite a loosely worded prohibition against double jeopardy in article 44,[19] fails to protect an individual so tried in the courts of a State or foreign country from subsequent trial by court martial for the same offense. Such subsequent trial does not legally constitute double jeopardy, inasmuch as the constitutional protection against double jeopardy[20] extends only to courts which derive their jurisdiction from the same source, namely, the Federal Government.[21] Thus, only if the act or omission with which the accused is charged is prohibited both by this code and the Criminal Code of the United States, and is committed in an area within the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, is trial by either the military or civil courts a bar to trial by the other.[22]

The type of manifest injustice this code condones can be readily illustrated by a case which arose during the late war.[23] The prisoner had been jailed for 125 days by a civil court for committing a battery. Upon his release he was placed in military custody and charged with and convicted of 125 days' absence over leave and scandalous conduct. The Judge Advocate General found the conviction legal.

Double jeopardy in court-martial cases may take still another form, as evidenced by the case of *Wade* v. *Hunter*.[24] There, a court martial was dissolved by the convening authority after both sides had presented their cases but before a decision was rendered, because the tactical situation had made the summoning of certain witnesses inexpedient. A conviction by a second court, subsequently convened, was upheld by the Supreme Court on the tenuous ground that this was not the type of oppressive practice at which the double-jeopardy prohibition is aimed

Had Gen. Edwin C. McNeill, Assistant Judge Advocate General, not referred the original case back with an endorsement to the effect that tactical conditions made it impossible to proceed with the trial, Wade might well have won his double-jeopardy argument. Even under the code (article 44c), when a proceeding is dismissed for failure of available evidence or witnesses without any fault of the accused, he cannot be tried a second time for the same offense. However, with General McNeill's endorsement the familiar legal doctrine of imperious necessity entered the case. If, for example, a courthouse burns down during the course of a trial, or a juror is disqualified, under this doctrine the trial judge is permitted to stop the proceedings and order a new trial.

Gen. Franklin Riter, speaking on behalf of the American Legion, explains it thusly:

"Well, General McNeill, in his endorsement, points out that this situation with regard to the rapidly advancing Seventy-sixth Division (to which Wade belonged) and the Third Army in military justice processes produced an emergent or imperious necessity, and, therefore, the action of the commanding general of the Seventy-sixth Division in withdrawing those charges was equivalent to the trial judge ordering a new trial when the courthouse burned down, and burned all the records." [25]

Riter pungently decried this distortion of "imperious necessity" before the House committee, saying:

"The Wade case is a classical example of what will happen in allowing the convening authority to take two bites at the cherry.

"It was obvious there because Wade was charged with another soldier and the other soldier was acquitted, and it was obvious what was going to happen in the Wade case. There was going to be an acquittal." [26]

Conceivably, difficulties in proof might lead a commanding officer to dissolve three or four such courts before a finding is ultimately reached. Such practice, under the guise of emergent necessity, would not be at variance with the Uniform Code. But, as Mr. Justice Murphy pointed out in his dissenting opinion in the Wade case:

"The harassment to the defendant from being repeatedly tried is not less because the Army is advancing. The guaranty of the Constitution against double jeopardy is not to be eroded away by a tide of plausible-appearing exceptions. The command of the fifth amendment does not allow temporizing with the basic rights it declares. Adaptations of military justice to the exigencies of tactical situations is the prerogative of the commander in the field, but the price of such expediency is compliance with the Constitution."

Applicability of the prohibitions against double jeopardy ought to be broadened as a matter of express statutory policy to cover situations such as these. Civil jurisdictions have tended in this direction.[27] It is time the military did likewise.

NONJUDICIAL PUNISHMENT

An analogous problem is raised by article 15. Should a commanding officer's nonjudicial punishment for minor offenses operate as a bar to subsequent trial by court martial if a more serious crime grows out of the same act or omission? Subdivision (e) answers this question in the negative. Here the code is on firmer ground. While no exact parallel exists in civilian life, comparable situations are handled in much the same way.

Courts of law have long recognized that a defendant convicted of assault may, if death of the person assaulted supervenes, be prosecuted for homicide. The new fact, death, creates a different offense from the one for which the accused was put in jeopardy on the first trial.[28]

While article 15 is not deficient in this particular it is by no means free from defects. Subdivision (a) (2) (F) permits a commanding officer to impose, as nonjudicial punishment, confinement on bread and water for 3 days. This is in conflict with the spirit of article 55 which prohibits a court martial from meting out cruel and unusual punishments. Listed in this category are flogging, marking, branding, and tattooing. No less cruel and unusual than any of these is starvation or its near equivalent, a bread-and-water diet. No civil court can inflict such barbaric punishment on offenders. Why then should a commanding officer, who has not even afforded the accused a trial, be permitted to do so?

Top military observers regard the punishment as the only effective deterrent to unwieldy men aboard ship. Even conceding the validity of this tenuous argument, there is no reason why punishment cannot be less savage or even, on occasion, deferred until the ship docks. Brutality is not a sine qua non to effective discipline.

Subdivision (d) grants a person who deems his disciplinary punishment unjust the right of appeal to the next superior authority. In the meantime, however, he must undergo the punishment adjudged. How can a punishment such as 3 days on bread and water ever be remitted? Who, for that matter, would dare make such an appeal from punishment for a minor offense over the head of his commanding officer—an officer under whose charge he will remain and to whom he must look for favorable fitness reports, promotions, assignments, and furloughs? None but the intrepid or the insane.

SPECIAL COURTS PERMITTED TO AWARD BAD-CONDUCT DISCHARGES

A classification of courts martial is undertaken by article 16. General courts martial are at the top of the hierarchy. The subordinate courts martial are designated "special" and "summary." The summary court martial, consisting of one officer, is relatively unimportant, inasmuch as, for all practical purposes, the right to refuse trial by such a body is made absolute by article 20. The jurisdiction granted to special courts martial by article 19 is considerably broader, such

[18] General Court Martial Sentence Review Board of the Navy No. 167 (August 1946).

This was the board of which Professor Keeffe was president from April 9, 1946, to June 12, 1947, and will hereafter be cited as "G. C. M. S. R. B.".

[19] "No person shall, without his consent, be tried a second time for the same offense."

[20] *U. S. Const. Amend.* v. *Turner's Case* (16 Charles II (1676)), first laid down this rule.

In *Feldman* v. *United States* (322 U. S. 487 (1944)), in which the court concluded that the fifth amendment did not prohibit the admission against Feldman upon his trial in the Federal court of the earlier testimony given by him in the State courts under a State immunity statute, Justice Black's excellent dissent lays bare the fallacy of legalized double jeopardy. He writes: "Holding that the defendant can be so convicted cuts into the very substance of the fifth amendment. And it justifies this result not by the language or history of the Constitution itself, but by a process of syllogistic reasoning based upon the broad premises of 'dual sovereignty' stated in previous decisions by the Court relating to immunity statutes." (See note, 30 Cornell L. Q 255 (1944).)

[21] *Moore* v. *Illinos* (14 How. 13 (U. S. 1852)); *United States* v. *Marigold* (9 How. 560, 569 (U. S. 1850)); *Fox* v. *Ohio* (5 How. 410, 434) (U. S. 1847)); (6 Ops. Atty. Gen. (506, 511 (1854)).

[22] *Grafton* v. *United States* (206 U. S. 333 (1906)); *United States* v. *Block* (262 Fed. 205 (D. Ind. 1920)); *Naval Courts and Boards* (sec. 338) (1937 ed., 1945 reprint). Compare *United States* v. *Bayer* (156 F. 2d 964 (2d Cir. 1946)), reversed on other grounds (331 U. S. 532), rehearing denied (332 U. S. 785); *Ex parte Benton* (63 F. Supp. 808 (N. D. Cal. 1945)), with *United States* v. *Clark* (31 Fed. 710, 715 (C. C. E. D. Mich. 1887)); *United States* v. *Cashiel* (25 Fed. Cas. No. 14744 (1863)).

[23] G. C. M. S. R. B. No. 136 (Aug. 1946).

[24] 69 Sup. Ct. 834 (1949).

[25] Hearings before subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services on S. 857, 81st Cong., 1st sess., 170 (1949).

[26] Hearings before subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services on H. R. 2498, 81st Cong., 1st sess., 671 (1949).

[27] See note, 16 A. L. R. 1243 (1922); 8 R. C. L. 2200 (Perm. Supp. 1929).

[28] *Diaz* v. *United States* (223 U. S. 442 (1912)); *State* v. *Wheeler* (173 La. 753, 138 So. 656 (1931)); *Commonwealth* v. *Rammuno* (219 Pa. 204, 68 Atl. 184 (1907)); *State* v. *Littlefield* (70 Me. 452, 35 Am. Dec. 335 (1880)); *Curtis* v. *State* (22 Tex. App. 227, 3 S. W. 86 (1886)); *Johnson* v. *State* (19 Tex. App. 453, 53 Am. Dec. 385 (1885)).

bodies being privileged to award bad-conduct discharges. The consequences flowing from a bad-conduct discharge are not substantially different from those resulting from a dishonorable discharge.[29] Both operate as a bar to Government employment and either may deprive a man of benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.[30]

A body which may adjudge so serious a punishment ought certainly to be provided with rigid safeguards. Yet a great many of the protective measures required of general courts martial are not available in special courts. Article 26 makes mandatory the presence at all general courts martial of a law officer, a duly constituted member of the legal profession whose duty it is to rule on points of law. No such person is required on special courts; nor, for that matter, need the prosecutor and defense counsel on special courts be persons with any legal training,[31] as they must be on general courts.

Either the power to award bad-conduct discharges must be taken from special courts, or the safeguards necessary to the granting of full justice must be provided.

PRETRIAL INVESTIGATION

Article 32 appears to be a very salutary section in that it gives to the accused the right to be represented at a pretrial investigation. However, subdivision (d) takes the teeth out of the provision by foreclosing any possible review by the civil courts on this point It makes failure to comply with the article directional only.[32] Such failure should be held to be jurisdictional, guaranteeing to the defendant the procedural safeguards of the fifth amendment.

But the drafters of the code state:

"Subdivision (d) is added to prevent this article from being construed as jurisdictional in a habeas corpus proceeding. Failure to conduct an investigation required by this article would be grounds for reversal of a reviewing authority under the code and an intentional failure to do so would be an offense under article 98.[33]

In rebuttal, Senator PAT MCCARRAN remarked:

"While failure to conduct the investigation would be an offense under article 98, it is difficult to see how this will benefit the accused who must depend upon a nebulous right of review by a whole maze of reviewing authorities and tribunals.[34]

"To those in the military or naval service of the United States, the military law is due process.[35] To this might be added the logical conclusion that it is due process only when complied with."[36]

UNDUE INFLUENCE

The avowed purpose of article 37 is to break down the domination and control exercised over courts martial by commanding officers. The article expressly interdicts such practices as reprimanding members of the court with respect to the results they reached or the manner in which they conducted the proceedings. But the article is ineffective to accomplish its purpose. The mere exercise of administrative discretion in giving of leaves or furloughs, in making recommendations for promotions, in assigning men to various jobs and details, and in preparing fitness reports gives the commanding officer ample opportunity to manifest his displeasure at the manner in which those under his control have handled a case. Such interference does not appear in the record on appeal. Consequently, it can never be detected by subsequent reviewing bodies.

Only by removing from command the power to influence the court can the prohibition of article 37 be made effectual. The American Bar Association set out to do this by suggesting that the Judge Advocate General's area representative select members of the court from rosters supplied by the commanding officers of other echelons in the vicinity.[37] The ill-fated Chamberlain bill had a somewhat similar provision.[38] An alternative theory was advanced by the American Legion.[39] That body proposed a strengthening of the penalty in the hope that a really severe chastisement would discourage such devious practices. The code, in article 98, goes no further than to make violations of article 37 an offense. The Legion would substitute civil indictment with a penalty of $5,000 fine or 5 years in prison.

Neither of these solutions may be the panacea we seek, but both are to be preferred to the culpable indifference the code exhibits toward the problem.

Perhaps the most vicious way to influence a court unduly presents itself in the illusory language of article 38. This article gives the accused the right to be represented by military counsel of his own selection "if reasonably available." "If available" has been recently construed by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to mean if militarily available and not if physically available.[40]

John J. Finn, who spent 33 months in the office of the Navy Judge Advocate General during World War II, gave the House subcommittee some insight into how this article will work in practice when he said:

"If counsel has been reasonably successful in defending culprits, his availability ceases or, in some instances, he has been made what is in this code called trial counsel, and thus obviously has been unavailable to defend cases."[41]

As a consequence the accused is almost invariably represented by the officer appointed by the commanding officer under article 27. The result is not always as deplorable as that in *Beets* v *Hunter*,[42] but the fact that such practices are possible under the Uniform Code speaks for itself. In granting Beets a writ of habeas corpus, Judge Murrah unfolded the details of the case:

"When Captain Morgan called upon him (Beets, the accused petitioner), as the appointed defense counsel, Captain Morgan was informed that he (Beets) wished to have Lieutenant Fox represent him, whereupon Captain Morgan left him and went back, leaving the impression at least that he would have Lieutenant Fox call him. Lieutenant Fox did not see this petitioner, instead Captain Morgan returned and on the day before the trial was furnished a copy of the charges. He confesses on the witness stand that he was wholly incompetent to represent him, and he also makes it plain, manifestly plain, too plain for mistake, that he did so only on orders—acting under orders as a soldier."

Not always is the defense counsel appointed by the commanding officer so remiss in his duties A Lieutenant Shapiro tried conscientiously to represent an American soldier of Mexican descent before a court martial during the last war. Shapiro, in order to destroy the credibility of the prosecuting witnesses' identification of their assailant, substituted for the accused another

[29] A dishonorable discharge can be imposed only by sentence of a general court martial, while a bad-conduct discharge may be imposed by either a general or special court. The bad-conduct discharge is peculiar to the Navy. It was first created by act of Congress, March 2, 1855, in "An act to provide for a more efficient discipline for the Navy," as a mode of punishment to be imposed upon enlisted men by special, then called summary, court martial (10 Stat. 627 (1855)). See Report of the General Court Martial Sentence Review Board to the Secretary of the Navy (sec. X (3), p 322 (January 1947)).

[30] 58 Stat. 301, 38 U. S. C., sec. 697 (c), title I, ch. VI, sec. 1503 (1944); Regulations and Procedure, Veterans' Administration, sec. 1604 (a).

[31] Uniform Code of Military Justice (art. 27 (1949)).

[32] *Humphrey* v. *Smith* (69 Sup. Ct. 830 (1949)); *Waite* v. *Overlade* (164 F. 2d 722 (C. C. A. 7th Cir. 1948)); *cf. Reilly* v. *Pescor* (156 F. 2d 632 (8th Cir. 1946)), *cert. denied*, (329 U. S. 790 (1946)). See *Antieau, Courts Martial and the Constitution* (33 Marq. L. Rev. 25, 30 (1949)).

[33] Commentary to art. 32, Uniform Code of Military Justice (1949).

[34] Hearings before subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services on S. 857, 81st Cong., 1st sess. 109 (1949).

[35] *Reaves* v. *Ainsworth*, 219 U S 296 (1911); *United States* v. *Weeks*, 232 U. S 383 (1914).

[36] Hearings before subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services on S. 857, 81st Cong, 1st sess. 110 (1949).

[37] "The remedy suggested is a simple one: the power to convene the court, to appoint assigned defense counsel and to order the sentence executed would be taken from the commanding officer and vested in the Army Judge Advocate General's Department or its equivalent in the other services. Commanding officers who under existing law convene the court would be required to make available to Army or higher headquarters a panel of officers available and qualified for court-martial service. From such panel the Judge Advocate General at Army or higher headquarters (or equivalent echelons in other services) would select the general court to adjudicate the cases in a particular division. That court could, of course, be composed of officers selected entirely from divisions other than the division in which they are assigned to preside." Spiegelberg, Hearings before Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services on H. R. 2498, 81st Cong, 1st sess. 728 (1949).

[38] "Art. 10. General and Special Courts, How Organized: The appointing authority of a general or special court shall designate a panel, which he shall increase as may be found necessary, consisting of those who are by him deemed fair and impartial and competent to try the cases to be brought before them, and from such a panel the court shall be constituted, as hereinafter provided "

The Chamberlain bill placed another weapon at the disposal of the accused in the form of an affidavit of prejudice Article 27 provided in part:

"If the accused shall file in the proceedings an affidavit of prejudice, accompanied by a certificate of counsel of record that such affidavit is made in good faith, alleging specific grounds to show that the officer appointing the court has bias or prejudice against him or that the court, by reason of any matter touching its constitution or composition cannot do justice, the court shall proceed no further until the judge advocate shall decide whether it is able to proceed with absolute impartiality in the present case, and if he decides that the court cannot proceed with absolute impartiality the court shall not be competent for the trial of the pending case, and he shall so report to the appointing authority; thereupon the next superior authority may appoint a court for the trial of said case. And whenever an accused shall file a like affidavit alleging bias or prejudice of the judge advocate, such judge advocate shall proceed no further in the case, but another shall be appointed."

S. 64, H. R. 367, 66th Cong, 1st sess. (1919). See note, 62 Harv. L. Rev. 1377, 1379 (1949).

[39] Hearings before subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services on H. R. 2498 81st Cong., 1st sess, 665 (1949).

[40] *Henry* v. *Hodges* (76 F. Supp 968 (S. D. N. Y. 1948)).

[41] Hearings before subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services on H. R. 2498, 81st Cong, 1st sess, 685 (1949)

[42] 75 F. Supp. 825, 826 (D. C. Kan. 1948).

American soldier of Mexican descent. The substitute was readily identified as the culprit and was convicted.

Satisfied that he had destroyed the prosecution's case, Shapiro informed the court of the ruse he had employed. These vertiginous repercussions followed. The real defendant was brought to trial, also identified as the guilty party and convicted. Lieutenant Shapiro was arrested. Upon arrest he asked to be represented by a Captain Mayfield. A day or two thereafter he was charged with effecting a delay in the orderly progress of the general court martial and was ordered to stand trial that afternoon. At the same time he was informed that Captain Mayfield was no longer available, having been named as the trial judge advocate. Thereupon, the lieutenant hastily selected as his defense counsel two lieutenants, neither of whom were lawyers When the court martial convened 80 minutes later Shapiro moved for a continuance of 7 days on the ground that his counsel had not had sufficient time to prepare his defense. Needless to say, this motion was denied. Three and one-half hours later, Lieutenant Shapiro was sentenced to be dismissed from the service. Less than 5 hours had elapsed from the time charges were served to the time sentence was pronounced.

Subsequently, Shapiro brought suit in the Court of Claims [41] for his back pay, contending that his conviction was void and his dismissal illegal. He won—scant compensation to the former officer for the disgrace and chagrin he had suffered.

SENTENCES NOT PREDATED

Article 57 (b) reads: "Any period of confinement included in a sentence of a court martial shall begin to run from the date the sentence is adjudged by the court martial" This provision gives no credit for time the accused may have spent in confinement before sentence. On the other hand, civil penal codes often require that time so spent before sentence is pronounced be deducted from the term of sentence imposed [42] It would seem no more than right that the military likewise give credit in whole or in part from the date of arrest depending upon whether the defendant was confined to quarters or the post or imprisoned in the brig or guardhouse The point is important, because in many cases delay of trial for proper preparation is in the defendant's interest. An adequate defense cannot be assured if the accused must regard delay as added punishment.

REVIEW PROCEDURES

Articles 59 through 76 concern themselves with the procedure for review of courts martial

Review begins in every case with the convening authority's initial action on the record. When the convening authority has taken final action in a general court-martial case, he forwards the entire record to the appropriate Judge Advocate General. The Judge Advocate General is required to refer certain cases to a board of review and ultimately to a judicial council. Other cases are reviewed in the office of the Judge Advocate General and then, if necessary, by a board of review.

It has been suggested that the two most serious difficulties with the court-martial system are the method of review and the control by commanding officers over court proceedings [43] It is at the stage of initial review by the convening authority, as provided in articles 60–64, that these two difficulties come most sharply into focus.

There appears to be a basic inconsistency between these articles and article 6 that the simple expedient of placing fifty-some-odd other provisions between them cannot resolve The purpose of article 6 (a) is to place judge advocates and law specialists under the control of the Judge Advocate General. To make these law officers independent of the convening authority in this manner, and then to subject the court's proceedings to review by the convening authority is incongruous, to say the very least

Indeed, there are such serious objections to this system of initial review by the convening authority that several of the committees appointed in the past few years to study existing court-martial systems have recommended either complete elimination or severe limitation of the power [46] The French have entirely eliminated such review from their court-martial procedure and have made the sentence of the court self-executory, subject, however, to higher departmental review [47]

The Navy General Court Martial Sentence Review Board report summarized the objections to the old system, none of which have been rectified by the code, as follows: [48]

"(i) The reviewing authority is usually the same officer who convened the court and referred the case to trial There is a certain anomaly in having the same officer review a case which he has considered at some length before it went to trial. It is humanly impossible for a person, no matter how high his purpose, to dissociate himself from his prior actions and opinions on a particular matter and to view it later as though he were seeing it for the first time. This is recognized in the rules which prescribe the qualifications for members of courts martial, and in the rules followed everywhere with respect to disqualification of judges in civilian appellate courts It is anomalous not to recognize it in the single case of the authority who reviews court-martial cases. * * *

"The difficulty is not cured by requiring that the case be referred to a legal officer for his opinion. For exactly the same problem presents itself The legal officer who reviews the case is usually the same officer who studied the case beforehand, drafted the charges, and recommended trial in the first place.

"(ii) The review of a court-martial case is not really analogous to an appeal. Although counsel for the accused has the privilege of submitting a brief, he does not often do so, and rarely, if ever, resorts to oral presentation of the case to the convening authority or his legal officer. Although theoretically each objection to evidence and rulings of the court is weighed as though on appeal, and the record is carefully scrutinized for jurisdictional or other error, it is difficult, on such a procedure, to detect all the errors which may exist, sometimes serious ones.

"(iii) The practical result of the present system is that the reviewing authority, rather than the court, fixes the sentence. Theoretically, the court can impose whatever sentence it deems fit. But it is directed to impose a sentence 'commensurate with the offense' and to leave matters of clemency to the reviewing authority. Of course the members of the court may, and frequently do, recommend clemency. Occasionally a court invades the reviewing authority's prerogative of clemency. But in the vast majority of cases the court merely fixes a maximum limit to the sentence, and the sentence is actually set by the reviewing authority, within that maximum The clemency extended by the reviewing authority in most cases consists merely in reducing the sentence to something approaching what it should have been in the first place. * * *

"(iv) The convening authority's power of review carries with it a large measure of indirect control over the court and its actions. If the convening authority does not agree with the findings of the court, or believes that the sentence is inadequate, even though he may be powerless to change the result in the particular case, he can express his opinion in his action or in a letter to the court. This cannot but have its effect on subsequent cases. The mere knowledge that it can take place is apt to influence a court, without any expression of disapproval or nonconcurrence ever being made by the convening authority.

"(v) Finally, difficult law points in court-martial cases are practically nonexistent. If the judges of the Military Court of Appeals are to receive the pay of circuit judges they should do the work of circuit judges There should be no difficulty at the present time in their reviewing all court-martial convictions. And in time of war, their number could always be temporarily increased"

The code not only provides for such review by the convening authority, but after the case has passed him, under article 66, it may be reviewed by boards of review in the offices of the three Judge Advocate Generals. Yet the defects are not such that they can be cured by higher appellate review, for any subsequent reviewing body must, of necessity, rely heavily on the action of the court and the initial reviewing authority. "They are the parties closest to the accused, the offense, and the scene" [49]

In any event, review by boards of review as constituted by this code seems to be an unnecessary step and a waste of time and money. It cannot be expected that such boards, appointed by the Judge Advocate General, will give the disinterested impartial review necessary. Just as the trial court has been shown to be under the domination of the convening authority, so too will the boards of review come under the domination of the Judge Advocate General. The Judge Advocate General is not, and by the nature of his office and appointment cannot be, an impartial judicial officer. He is to enforce discipline and he is to give defense.

In an effort to resolve this conflict the English have separated the prosecution and defense sides of the office of their Judge Advocate General. They have further provided that the Judge Advocate be a civilian appointed on the recommendation of the Lord Chancellor and be responsible to him [50] Thus, the English reforms have freed the

[41] *Shapiro* v. *United States* (69 F. Supp. 205 (Ct. Claims 1947)).

[42] E. g., N. Y. Penal Code, sec. 2193.

[43] Report of the General Court Martial Sentence Review Board to the Secretary of the Navy, sec VII (1) (D), p. 206 (January 1947).

[46] See report of the General Court Martial Sentence Review Board to the Secretary of the Navy, sec. VII (1) (D), p. 206 (January 1947); report of War Department Advisory Committee on Military Justice to the Secretary of War, sec III A5, p. 9 (December 1946); report of the General Board, USFET, "Military Justice Administration in Theater of Operations," File: 250/1, Study No. 83, par. 55, pp. 45-46; report of the House Military Affairs Committee, H. R. 2722, 79th Cong., 2d sess. (1947). Neither the report of Ballantine committee to the Secretary of the Navy (April 1946), nor the report of the McGuire committee to the Secretary of the Navy (November 1945) specifically mention the important question of review by the convening authority.

[47] McNeil, French courts martial, pp. 6 et seq. (1946).

[48] Report of the General Court Martial Sentence Review Board to the Secretary of the Navy, sec. VII (1) (B), pp. 101-194 (January 1947).

[49] Report of the General Court Martial Sentence Review Board to the Secretary of the Navy, sec VII (1) (C), p. 194 (January 1947).

[50] London Letter, A. B. A. J. 75 (January 1949).

Judge Advocate General from the control of the Secretaries for State and Air. This is in sharp contrast to the American reforms which have served only to compound the inherent infirmity in the Department.

Still another opportunity for the Judge Advocate General to exert his influence suggests itself in article 67. This article admirably creates a Court of Military Appeals, a civilian body of three attorneys appointed by the President for 8-year terms, each to receive compensation and allowances equal to those paid to a United States Court of Appeals judge. This court is, in a limited number of cases, to be the final reviewing authority of courts martial.

As has been suggested above, to all intents and purposes there is no difference between the Judge Advocate General and a district attorney in civilian life Yet, despite this basic conflict of interests, subdivision (b) (2) provides that the Judge Advocate General may order forward to the Court of Military Appeals for review such cases as he pleases. Under this provision, only if your case interests the Judge Advocate General can you hope to have an appeal.

But there is another way. If you have been sentenced to death or are an admiral or a general, subdivision (b) (1) gives you an unqualified right to bring your case before the Court of Military Appeals. To state this provision is to show its injustice Everyone, regardless of rank, should have his case automatically heard before this top civilian court.

There is a third way in which a case can be reviewed by the Court of Military Appeals. Subdivision (b) (3) provides that upon petition of the accused and on good cause shown, the Court of Military Appeals can grant a review. The code significantly does not tell us who is to make this petition. Experience has shown that the great majority of defendants in court-martial cases are far from mental giants. They are primarily very young men, and in most cases very poorly educated men. They are men who are in trouble largely because of bad home environment. They are the children of divorced parents, and the real poor and neglected in America. These men, if they are to exercise the right to file such a petition, will have to have assistance. The only ones who will not require assistance are the wicked and the well-connected. This method of providing an appeal by petition will result in the wrong kind of cases going to the Court of Military Appeals and the right kind being buried in the board of review in the office of the Judge Advocate General.[51]

Another defect in article 67 is that it limits the Court of Military Appeals to review of questions of law and chains this body to the facts as found by command. Not even busy civil courts are limited to a review of the law in criminal cases.[52] If the task of reweighing the evidence should become too arduous, the court can always be expanded. It is worth the added expense if as a result even one innocent American boy is spared the vilification of an unjust sentence.

Nor is it ever desirable to throw any court's jurisdiction into the controversy inherent in the metaphysical distinctions between fact and law. For example, is the obtaining of a confession by torture a question of fact or a question of law? Cases of that sort are bound to be difficult to review and the statute should be drawn so that the Court of Military Appeals has an unlimited right to review questions of fact as well as questions of law.[53] Can we be sure that the code, as it is now written, guarantees review of tragedies like the Sugar Cane Rape Cases?[54]

Early in 1944 the rapes in Hawaii of several civilian women resulted in a public clamor for retribution. The Navy responded to these remonstrations by herding some 40 to 50 Negro sailors into confinement. No charges were pressed No counsel was provided. Once incarcerated, marine guards "convinced" six of the unfortunates that they should confess to the crimes. Beatings with billy clubs and blackjacks, threats of death, deprivation of sleep, the application of lighted cigarettes to bare flesh, and the pushing of broom straws under fingernails were among the most cogent arguments employed. So persuasive were these appeals to reason that the Navy found itself with one more confession than there had been crimes The extra confession was discarded. Undaunted, the general court martial found these specious admissions of guilt, coupled with the most equivocal of identifications, sufficient evidence upon which to sustain the prisoners' pleas of guilty Dishonorable discharges and confinement in Federal penitentiaries followed

It is well settled that Federal courts will review court-martial records to see if basic constitutional guaranties have been denied petitioners[55] If such is found to be the case, the courts will grant a writ of habeas corpus on jurisdictional grounds. The reasoning seems to be that in a case where constitutional guaranties have been flouted, jurisdiction was defective ab initio[56] But this is no help to unfortunates like these who have neither the intelligence nor the knowledge nor the money to pursue such a course.

Before the advent of the Uniform Code there was no way that their convictions could be reviewed There is still no effectual way. Could Mr. Justice Black have been mistaken when he wrote.

"The Constitution of the United States stands as a bar against the conviction of any individual in an American court by means of coerced confession. There have been, and are now, certain foreign nations with governments dedicated to an opposite policy; governments which convict individuals with testimony obtained by police organizations possessed of an unrestrained power to seize persons suspected of crimes against the state, hold them in secret custody, and wring from them confessions by physical or mental torture. So long as the Constitution remains the basic law of our Republic, America will not have that kind of government."[57]

WHY NO CHIEF DEFENSE COUNSEL?

To be sure that every case is presented to the Court of Military Appeals, it was the suggestion of the General Court Martial Sentence Review Board, based on their experience in reviewing court-martial cases, that there should be created a chief defense counsel.[58] Such an officer, and not the Judge Advocate General, would have the responsibility of appealing cases to the top appeals court. Instead of following this suggestion, the drafters of the code have required, in article 70, that the Judge Advocate General appoint appellate counsel. It is too much to expect any Judge Advocate General, no matter how well intentioned and capable, to act in two such conflicting capacities like Pooh Bah. It is like asking the district attorney to appeal the case of a defendant that he has convicted

COLLATERAL ATTACK

Article 76 restates the existing law as to finality of court-martial judgments.[59] Following such review as the code provides, court-martial judgments "shall be final and conclusive."

Presumably they will still be open to collateral attack, either by petition to a Federal district court for a writ of habeas corpus or by suit in the Court of Claims to recover such back pay as may have been withheld by way of punishment. To carry such appeals to the top of the Federal hierarchy of courts is so slow and cumbersome a process as to be of little practical value.

The remedy of habeas corpus is of doubtful utility in any event. Only last April[60] the Supreme Court reiterated its earlier holding in *Carter* v. *McClaughry*,[61] that such proceedings do not permit the reviewing court to pass on the guilt or innocence of persons convicted by courts martial.

There are only four traditional grounds for review by the civil courts. Such courts may inquire whether the military court

---

[51] Contrast this with the corresponding provision in the Chamberlain bill, S 64, H R. 367, 66th Cong., 1st sess., art. 52 (1919):

Unless the accused, when sentence is pronounced upon him, shall make the statement in open court that he does not desire that his case be reviewed by the Court of Military Appeals, which statement shall be made a matter of record by the Judge Advocate, or unless he shall thereafter notify said court of appeals in writing that he does not wish his case reviewed, said court shall review the record of the proceedings of every general court or military commission which carries a sentence involving death, dismissal, or dishonorable discharge, or confinement for a period of more than 6 months, for the correction of errors of law evidenced by the record and injuriously affecting the substantive rights of an accused without regard to whether such errors were made the subject of objection or exception at the trial.

[52] E. g., *People ex rel. Higley* v. *Millspaw* (281 N. Y. 441 (1939)).

[53] See Morgan, Atlantic Monthly, December 1946, pp. 97–102; Report of the General Court Martial Sentence Review Board to the Secretary of the Navy, sec. VII (2) (C) (5) (vi), p. 226 (January 1947).

[54] G. C. M. S. R. B. Nos. 61, 742, 58, 697, 57 (August 1946).

[55] *Sanford* v. *Robbins* (115 F. 2d 435 (5th Cir. 1940)). See *Brown* v. *Sanford* (170 F. 2d 344 (5th Cir. 1943)).

[56] *Schita* v. *Cox* (139 F. 2d 971 (8th Cir. 1944)).

[57] *Ashcraft* v. *Tennessee* (322 U S. 143, 155 (1944)).

In *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U S 332 (1943)), the Supreme Court had occasion to review a similar record of illegal arrest, delay in arraignment, and questioning of prisoners who had been held incommunicado without advice of counsel. It held that confession gained under such circumstances was involuntary as a matter of law, and inadmissible in the Federal courts. See, e. g., *Anderson* v. *United States* (318 U. S. 350 (1943)); *Ward* v. *Texas* (316 U. S 535 (1942)), *Lomax* v. *Texas* (313 U. S 544 (1941)); *Vernon* v *Alabama* (313 U S 547 (1941)); *Canty* v. *Alabama* (309 U S. 629 (1940)); *White* v. *Texas* (310 U. S. 530 (1940)), *Chambers* v. *Florida* (309 U S. 227 (1940)).

Nor is a defendant's claim that the use of his involuntary confession deprived him of due process foreclosed by the finding of a court or the verdict of the jury or both. *Lisenba* v. *California* (314 U. S 219, 237–238 (1941)).

If such a coerced confession is introduced as evidence for the prosecution at the trial, the judgment of conviction will be set aside even though the proof apart from the confession might have been enough to sustain the jury's verdict. *Malinski* v. *New York* (324 U. S 401, 404 (1945)); *Lyons* v. *Oklahoma* (322 U. S. 596, 597 (1941)).

[58] Report of the General Court Martial Sentence Review Board to the Secretary of the Navy, § VII (5) (1), p. 254 (January 1947).

[59] *In re Grimley* (137 U. S 147 (1890)).

[60] *Humphrey* v. *Smith* (69 Sup. Ct. 830 (1949)).

[61] 183 U. S. 365 (1902).

was properly convened and constituted,[62] whether it had jurisdiction over the person,[63] whether it had jurisdiction to try the offense charged,[64] and whether it imposed a sentence in excess of its power.[65] The recent tendency, however, has been to go further and to grant habeas corpus on jurisdictional grounds if basic constitutional guaranties have been violated.[66] At least two Federal courts have gone over the entire record in making this determination.[67]

This trend toward increased civil review poses a problem. Is such practice advisable? The answer must depend on the extent to which full justice can be dispensed in military courts. The reforms made by this Uniform Code are so negligible that the question must, of necessity, be answered in the affirmative. With the coming of adequate reform, however, such broad appeal to a civil judicial tribunal will be neither desirable nor practicable, except in those cases where difficult judicial points are involved. Most court-martial cases involve offenses against discipline, and these are better handled by persons thoroughly familiar with service discipline and its ramifications.

In the final analysis, all substantial questions of jurisdiction and due process must, of course, be answered by the United States Supreme Court. Collateral attack can never accomplish this. During the last war there were no cases appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States with respect to any American serviceman. It was not until 1949 that the first such case was heard by the High Court.[68] The privilege apparently exists, but to insure appeal to the Supreme Court a more swift and effective procedure must be provided. There was no delay in passing on the validity of the military convictions of Japanese Generals Homma[69] and Yamashita.[70] Likewise, immediate action was taken by the Supreme Court in testing the jurisdiction of the military commission which tried the German saboteurs who disembarked on our shores in 1942.[71] Should we be less willing to grant effective civil appeal to our own service personnel than to our enemies?

PUNISHABLE OFFENSES

Article 88 makes the use of contemptuous language against the President, Vice President, legislators, Cabinet members, governors, and certain other officials a court-martial offense.

In light of the unfavorable public reaction to the recent "Dierdorff incident,"[72] the wisdom of such a provision, at least without some qualification limiting it to time of war and degree of disrespect, is questionable.

Last February, Naval Capt. Ross A. Dierdorff replied to Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE'S slur on the captain's superior officer by calling the Senator "a politician" not fit for an admiral "to wipe his shoes on." Almost immediately, the captain was relieved of his duties and transferred pending retirement. In an effort to forestall the more serious punishment of official reprimand which nevertheless followed, Senator MORSE remarked:

"I wonder how many people in Government service, in and out of the armed forces, would be free of disciplinary action by their superiors if we ever started to adopt the policy of disciplining Government officials, including Cabinet officers and Assistant Secretaries, for every bit of critical figurative language they have spoken about Members of Congress in what they thought was private conversation."[73]

Another serious failure of the code is in the matter of definitions.

Article 106 subjects spies to court-martial jurisdiction. Unfortunately, "spy" is not clearly defined, so that the article applies by its terms to "any person" who in time of war is "in or about any shipyard, any manufacturing or industrial plant, or any other place or institution engaged in work in aid of the prosecution of the war by the United States." During the last war it would have been difficult to find anyone in the United States not subject to this broad and dangerous language. With double jeopardy the vogue under this code, most civilians in wartime appear to be subject to both civil trial and court martial.

Article 120 defines "rape" in such a way that many types of rape are not offenses under the code at all. For instance, carnal connection without force with a woman of unsound mind,[74] or with a woman intoxicated to insensibility,[75] or penetration by surprise or after the victim has been rendered unconscious by the blow of a third person,[76] or submission by the victim under the belief that the act was a surgical operation,[77] are examples of the crime of rape in civil jurisdictions. Yet none of these acts conform to the code's definition of rape as an act of sexual intercourse with a female other than the wife of the actor "by force and without her consent." To obviate the difficulties set forth above, the word "or" should be substituted for "and."

CONCLUSION

From our study of this Uniform Code of Military Justice, we draw the following conclusions:

1. The code creates three Judge Advocate Departments where we formerly had two. There should only be one. A requirement that the three Judge Advocates General follow the same procedure is not enough. One could operate with less expense and more efficiency. What price must we pay for the interservice jealousy of military lawyers?

2. There is no excuse for article 2 (11) of the new code which subjects the entire civilian population of Guam, American Samoa, and the trust territory of the Pacific to court martial. The provision is both unnecessary and undesirable.

3. The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Hirshberg case was desirable. Article 3 (c) of the code, in effect reversing that decision, is undesirable. It permits the services to withdraw honorable discharges. Yet at this stage the considerations of discipline are no longer controlling. There is therefore no excuse for military jurisdiction. If a service gives an honorable discharge it should be forced to a civil court to void it.

4. When a serviceman has been tried by a civil court, the service to which he is attached should be made to accept the result. Accordingly, articles 14 and 44 of the Uniform Code should be changed. The changes should be broad enough to reverse the Wade decision. The Congress should not subject a citizens' army to double jeopardy, legally or illegally. Double jeopardy is nonetheless double jeopardy even though to date the Supreme Court of the United States has not struck it down, as some day it surely will.

5. Whether on land or sea, no provision such as article 15 which approves a bread and water diet as a form of punishment should stand. It is cruelty, and as such has no place in our American way of life.

6. Article 19 should be changed so as to rob special courts of the power to give a discharge. The protection of counsel and the new law officer established by the code makes trial by general courts martial a valuable right. It is not sufficient protection that a stenographic record is to be made of the proceedings of a special court that gives a bad-conduct discharge. If a special court has to use some of the procedures of a general court to give a bad-conduct discharge it is much more sensible to take the power away from special courts entirely.

7. Article 32, requiring a pretrial investigation, should either make such investigation a jurisdictional requirement or be eliminated. As article 32 is drawn, if the services do not hold a pretrial investigation as 32 purports to require, it is their own affair and not a subject into which our civil courts can inquire by habeas corpus.

8. The pious protests of article 37 against improper command influence in the selection of court and counsel avail nothing. The code should be amended to require the establishment of panels from which the court is to be selected. The Chamberlain bill yesterday so provided and the American Bar Association today urges the same provision. There should be a trial judge advocate who is a judge and not an advocate, and he should be given the sole right to select the members of the court from the established panels and the sole right to select counsel. In addition, the civil penalties asked by the American Legion should be written into the bill.

9. Sentences under the new Uniform Code are to run from the date of sentence. This is a vicious provision under which a man is denied credit in whole or in part for time spent in the brig or guardhouse or confined to quarters.

10. It is not so much that innocent men are convicted by military courts as that outrageously long sentences are given by trial courts. There will never be any correction of this practice until the review power of the convening authority is eliminated as was proposed in the Chamberlain bill and as was recommended by the General Court Martial Sentence Review Board of the Navy. Only if the members of a court martial

---

[62] *United States* v. *Smith* (197 U. S. 386 (1905)), *McClaughry* v. *Deming* (186 U. S. 49 (1902)).

[63] *Ex parte Reed* (100 U. S. 13 (1879)); *Mosher* v. *Hunter* (1943 F. 2d 745 (10th Cir. 1944)), *United States* v. *MacDonald* (265 Fed. 695 (E. D. N. Y. 1920)), *In re Craig* (70 Fed. 959 (C. C. D. Kan. 1895)); *McCune* v. *Kilpatrick* (53 F. Supp. 80 (E. D. Va. 1943)).

[64] *Smith* v. *Whitney* (116 U. S. 167 (1886)); *Dynes* v. *Hoover* (20 How. 65 (U. S. 1857)); *Rosborough* v. *Rossell* (150 F. 2d 809 (1st Cir. 1945)).

[65] *Swaim* v. *United States* (165 U. S. 553 (1897)), *Ex parte Mason* (105 U. S. 696 (1881)); *Cf. Bishop* v. *United States* (197 U. S. 334 (1905)), holding that the civil courts will also look into the question whether there has been an illegal delegation of the power to pass on the sentence.

[66] *United States ex rel. Innes* v. *Riatt* (1941 F. 2d 664 (C. C. A. 3d 1944)); *Schita* v. *Cox* (133 F. 2d 971 (C. C. A. 8th 1944)), cert. denied (322 U. S. 761 (1944), rehearing denied (323 U. S. 810 (1944)), *Romero* v. *Squier* (133 F. 2d 528 (9th Cir. 1943)), cert. denied (318 U. S. 785 (1942)); *Sanford* v. *Robbins* (115 F. 2d 435 (5th Cir. 1940), cert. denied (312 U. S. 697 (1941)), *Hicks* v. *Hiatt* (64 F. Supp. 238 (M. D. Pa. 1946)).

[67] *Schita* v. *King* (133 F. 2d 283 (8th Cir. 1943)); *Schita* v. *Cox* (139 F. 2d 971 (8th Cir. 1944)), cert. denied (322 U. S. 761 (1944)), rehearing denied (323 U. S. 810 (1944)); *Hicks* v. *Hiatt* (64 F. Supp. 238 (M. D. Pa. 1946)).

[68] *United States ex rel. Hirshberg* v. *Cooke* (69 Sup. Ct. 530 (1949)).

[69] *In re Homma* (327 U. S. 759 (1946)).

[70] *In re Yamashita* (327 U. S. 1 (1946)).

[71] *Ex parte Quirin et al.* (317 U. S. 1. (1942)).

[72] New York Times, February 19, 1949, p. 3, column 6.

[73] New York Times, February 20, 1949, p. 26, column 3.

[74] *People* v. *Palvino* (216 App. Div. 319, 214 N. Y. Supp. 577 (4th Dept. 1926)).

[75] *People* v. *Quinn* (50 Barb. 128 (N. Y. 1867)).

[76] *State* v. *Atkins* (292 S. W. 422 (Mo. Sup. 1926)).

[77] *Regina* v. *Flattery* (13 Cox C. C. 388 (1877)).

know that the convening authority will not review their sentence can the court be depended upon to do its duty by fixing the sentence at the proper length.

11. More cumbersome even than having three Judge Advocate Generals instead of one is the provision in article 66 requiring that boards of review in the office of each Judge Advocate General shall review every case. This is not only an unnecessary step, but, since the Judge Advocate on appeal is like the district attorney, it fails to provide disinterested review.

12. While a Court of Military Appeals consisting of three civilian lawyers is an excellent contribution by the new code, the court parallels the similar court proposed in the Chamberlain bill in name only. Unlike the Court of Appeals in the Chamberlain bill, this court cannot hear every case. The provision permitting a man to petition for an appeal does not cure the evil, because it presupposes an intelligence that most prisoners do not have. Letting you appeal only if sentenced to be shot is small comfort. Letting generals and admirals appeal as of right is an outrage. Since no one knows what is law and what is fact, confining the Court of Military Appeals to questions of law only robs them of power to decide the very cases they are created to hear.

13. Because of the basic conflict in the duties of the Judge Advocate General on appeal, provision should be made to lodge defense on appeal with a chief defense counsel. The new code leaves the Judge Advocate General to protect the accused as well as to present the Government's case.

14. There is still no effective way to appeal a court-martial sentence to the Supreme Court of the United States. Not only is the present habeas corpus procedure through the Federal hierarchy cumbersome, but worse, when the Supreme Court finally does hear a case it is limited to an inquiry as to a deprivation of constitutional rights. It still cannot inquire as to guilt or innocence.

15. Article 88, permitting conviction for use of contemptuous language, should be eliminated as an unjustifiable limitation on free speech.

16. The code is careless as to its definitions. The definition of "spy" in article 106 should be torn out by the roots as a danger to our whole civil population. The definition of "rape" in article 120 condones more varieties of the act than it includes as punishable.

PER ORATIO

From the above analysis we submit that the new Uniform Code of Military Justice retains and compounds flagrant errors of commission and omission.

If time permits, the Senate of the United States should make the corrections before the bill is enacted into law. If not, the chances are good that the corrections will never be made.

The only hope in the code, itself, lies in article 67 (b) which provides:

"The Court of Military Appeals and the Judge Advocate Generals of the armed forces shall meet annually to make a comprehensive survey of the operation of this code and report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Departments the number and status of pending cases and any recommendations relating to uniformity of sentence policies, amendments to this code, and any other matters deemed appropriate."

In our judgment there is little likelihood that these three powerless, buried judges in the Department of Defense will correct the obvious defects outlined above. Nor can we expect these judges and Judge Advocate Generals to supply omissions such as investigation of treatment of prisoners, equality of treatment of men and officers, consolidation of the offices of the three Judge Advocate Generals into one, establishing court-martial rules in lieu of this primitive code.

In the first place, though receiving the pay of judges of the United States courts of appeals, the civilian judges to be appointed to the Court of Military Appeals will not, like their civil-court counterparts, be appointed for life. At the ends of their 8-year terms they will need the good will of admirals and generals to be reappointed. In the second place, the history of many administrative agencies is that, beginning zealously alive to the public interest, they quickly begin to think of the public only in terms of the litigants who appear before them. We have seen the best of administrative agencies disintegrate for lack of disinterested civilian criticism. In court-martial procedure governing civilian soldiers and sailors the armed services should welcome the creation of a strong civilian advisory council. Wasn't it Roscoe Pound who long ago pointed out that codes are rigid, codify errors, and make changes more difficult? The only hope for improvement is to condition passage of the code upon the appointment of an advisory council—and this is what was suggested by the Navy's General Court Martial Sentence Review Board in 1947.[78]

Such a body can be relied upon to follow this court-martial reform to the bitter end. In its permanent advisory capacity it can do all the things article 67 (g) only hints at, and considerably more.

The opponents of reform rely upon the present pressure easing and civilian lawyers losing interest. The stakes are too high. Let us hope that the Senate will establish such a council. True reform lies that way.

ARTHUR JOHN KEEFFE.[79]
MORTON MOSKIN

Mr. MORSE. While I am on this subject, Mr. President, I want to point out that not all military men, even in active service today, disagree with the junior Senator from Oregon on this point, because I refer to the hearings on the bill, to the testimony of General Harmon, Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, appearing at page 290 of the hearings. Listen to what he says:

Well, you have the two extremes. You have the preservation of discipline on the one hand and the elimination of command influence on the other, and you do not want to sacrifice discipline to accomplish this other. I do not go as far as some articles I have read, where they go to the *n*th degree to eliminate all control. I do not go that far at all.

I think, however—

This is the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force testifying, Mr. President—

I think, however, that the administration of military justice generally should be completely taken away from command so that the Judge Advocate General and his office does have the sole right to administer justice after the man has committed the offense and the commanding officer has decided that he is to be investigated for it and various steps going up to court martial after that.

I think the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force is to be commended for the testimony he gave on that subject, not because it happens to coincide with the point of view of the junior Senator from Oregon, but because the point of view which he expressed was not shared in the testimony of other officers of the Military Establishment in regard to the desirability of breaking command control in respect to the administration of military justice. I am inclined to believe, as I previously indicated, that in the years to come the position taken by General Harmon in the hearings will be sustained on the basis of experience and future action which I think the Senate and the House of Representatives will necessarily have to come to in respect to this issue.

I turn now, Mr. President, to another feature of the bill.

The purpose of House bill 4080 which is now before the Senate is, of course, to create a Uniform Code of Military Justice for all the services. While there is common agreement upon the need for uniformity in the administration of the judicial system of the armed forces, there is considerable divergence of opinion concerning the propriety of bringing to military justice certain of the concepts of civilian justice, and an even greater difference of opinion as to the advisability of creating a court of appeals for the Military Establishment, the members of which shall be appointed from civilian life. I refer, of course, to article 67 of the pending bill which creates a Court of Military Appeals consisting of three judges appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, located for administrative purposes in the National Military Establishment.

This court is a direct outgrowth of the Judicial Council constituted by section 226 of the Elston Act, Public Law 759, in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Army. By amendment to article 50 of the Articles of War, which apply only to the Army, the Judicial Council is composed of three general officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department. It performs the function of a supreme court of the Army, but being composed of officers under the command of the Judge Advocate General it lacks those elements of independence which any court with its powers should have. The Judicial Council has the power to review only such cases as require action by the President, or where a board of review or the

[78] Introduction, p. 3 (January 1947). Mr. Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo characterized such advisory bodies in his celebrated law review article advocating what were to become the New York State Law Revision Commission and the Judicial Council. He wrote: "Recommendations would come with much greater authority, would command more general acquiescence on the part of legislative bodies, if those who made them were charged with the responsibilities of office. * * * Such a board would not only observe for itself the workings of the law as administered day by day, it would enlighten itself constantly through all available sources of guidance and instruction; through consultation with scholars; through study of the law reviews, the journals of social science, the publications of the learned generally; and through investigation of remedies and methods in other jurisdictions, foreign and domestice. * * * Reforms that now get themselves made by chance or after long and vexatious agitation, will have the assurance of considerate and speedy hearing. Scattered and uncoordinated forces will have a rallying point and focus." Cardozo, A Ministry of Justice, 35 Harv. L. Rev. 113, 114–125 (1921).

[79] Professor of law, Cornell Law School.

Judge Advocate General deems that a finding of guilty or sentence should be modified, or the Judge Advocate General and the Board of Review disagree. It has no power to order a new trial, that power being vested in the Judge Advocate General. The Uniform Code takes this power from the Judge Advocate General and vests it in the Court of Military Appeals. It has no power to accept jurisdiction of an appeal upon petition of the accused. The Uniform Code specifically provides that in all cases reviewed by a board of review, the court of appeals may grant a review upon petition of the accused on good cause shown. Needless to say, the Judicial Council, being a creature of the Judge Advocate General, has no authority to investigate his administration of military justice or to recommend to the Congress necessary revisions affecting military justice. Subdivision (g) of article 67 of the Uniform Code charges the Court of Military Appeals and the Judge Advocate General of the armed forces with the duty of making a comprehensive survey of the Uniform Code of Military Justice annually, and to report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the House and to the Secretary of Defense and Secretaries of the Departments the number and status of pending cases and recommendations relating to uniformity of sentence, policies, amendments to the code, and any other matters deemed appropriate.

It is obvious that article 67 represents a drastic reallocation of the power to review the findings and sentences of military courts, not only in the Army but in the Navy and Air Force as well, and for the first time creates a method whereby injustices and weaknesses in the system may be explored and reported to the Congress and to the responsible heads of the Department of Defense for necessary action.

As might be expected, these concepts are not wholly palatable either to those officers who do not like civilian checks being exercised on the military, or to the Judge Advocate General of the Army, who understandably is opposed to limitations upon his judicial powers and the creation of a Military Court of Appeals, which not only is not responsible to him, but which is in a measure clothed with the responsibility of examining the conduct of his corps insofar as it relates to military justice. It is to the credit of the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force that he has welcomed the salutary changes embodied in the proposed Uniform Code.

Two objections have been interposed to the enactment of article 67. The first is that it places final appellate power of cases tried by military courts in a civilian body, the members of which are not familiar with problems peculiar to the maintenance of discipline in the armed services. The powers of review of the proposed Court of Military Appeals are limited to matters of law. It would seem, therefore, that the court would not be required to pass upon questions which involve technical military knowledge. But the Judge Advocate General of the Army in his statement before the Senate Armed Services Committee insisted that many questions which must necessarily come before the court would involve mixed questions of fact and of military law and, indeed, cited several examples of such questions. However, the answer to this argument is implicit in the contention itself. If the question is not a pure question of law, then by the express provisions of article 67 (d), the Court of Military Appeals has no power to pass upon it. If it were argued that the provisions of article 67 (d) deprive the Court of Military Appeals of jurisdiction necessary to the best functioning of the court by limiting its power of review to legal questions only, there might be validity to the argument, but to contend that a court which has jurisdiction only to decide questions of law might be required to decide mixed questions of fact and law is an absurdity.

The Judge Advocate General asserted in his statement that there is no need to change the present system of review, but, on the contrary, "the remarkable success of the military-appeals system is attested to by the fact that of more than 200 habeas corpus cases arising since World War II only one accused has been released from confinement as the result of final court action on his petition."

This is, indeed, a specious argument The fact of the matter is, as the Army's Judge Advocate General should well know, that under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States the Federal courts have no power to free an accused in a habeas corpus proceeding if the tribunal which convicted him in the first instance had jurisdiction of the accused and of the offense, unless it could be said that there was an abuse of due process. No matter how great the miscarriage of justice, no matter how inordinate the sentence, no matter how contrary to conscience the action of the military tribunal may have been, the Federal courts are powerless to intervene unless the military court either acted without jurisdiction or without due process.

Mark this, Mr. President, the fact that the clemency boards appointed by the Secretary of War found it necessary to reduce or remit sentences in 27,500 cases, or 85 percent of all the cases reviewed by them, is in itself a complete refutation of the claim of the effectiveness of the present military-appeals system. The record is a sorry record, and it stands on its face in complete rebuttal to the Judge Advocate General of the Military Establishment.

I certainly do not mean to imply that all cases tried by the military courts resulted in injustices, but I believe that it is fairly obvious that any system of justice which can result in such miscarriages of justice requires revision. In justice to the Army's boards of review, I should like to make the point which the Judge Advocate General did not make, namely, that until the passage of the Elston Act, which became effective on February 1, 1949, the boards of review had no power to pass upon the weight of evidence, so that if there was any evidence in the record sufficient to support a finding of guilty, the board of review was compelled to affirm the conviction. The Elston Act for the first time gave the boards of review the power to set aside a finding of guilty if they felt it was contrary to the weight of evidence.

I wish to say, although he is not on the floor at the present time, that I think the country is indebted to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] for the fight he put up on the floor of the Senate at the time these amendments with respect to the Elston Act were adopted by this body.

What was done through the Elston Act does not, however, remove the need for a court which can function independently as a court of appeals for all the services. The suggestion made by the Judge Advocate General of the Army that a Court of Military Appeals composed of the Judge Advocate Generals of all the services should be established does not fill the need. What we need is a court which will be concerned primarily with justice and not a court which will merely reflect the individual views of the Judge Advocate Generals as to the requirements of the services. The opportunity for give and take among the services in a court composed of the three Judge Advocate Generals—and I say this without any intention of impugning the present Judge Advocate General—is too great to assure public confidence in its decisions

It must be remembered, Mr. President, that it is as important for the personnel of the armed services and those at home who are dear to them to feel that their rights as American citizens are not lost when they enter their country's service as for these rights to be preserved in actuality. I can think of no greater assurance of justice to them than a supreme appellate court comprised of civilians appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate—a court to which they will have the right of appeal—a court which will function outside the particular branch of the service by which they were convicted.

But to maintain public confidence such a court must be free of the slightest imputation of political or military pressure. For this reason, I believe that the Senate amendments to H. R. 4080, by which the terms of the members of the court are reduced from life or during good behavior to 8 years, are inadvisable. Under article 67 of the Senate version of H. R. 4080 not only are the terms of the judges limited to 8 years but their pension rights do not accrue until they have served at least 10 years—in other words, unless they have been reappointed. This provision permits pressure to be placed upon the judges during their initial term of office.

By reason of the limitation upon the tenure of the judges, individuals with outstanding qualifications may be unwilling to give up larger incomes in order to accept appointment to the court. Further, this limitation destroys the standing of the Court of Military Appeals as "a court of the United States" as defined in section 451 of the Judicial Code (U. S. C. title 18).

Finally, as it would seem from the general provisions of article 67 that it was the intendment of the Senate to place the Court of Military Appeals on a parity with the United States Courts of Appeals, the judges of which serve for life or during good behavior, the Senate amendment is inconsistent with this primary purpose.

While I am on the subject of the qualifications for personnel of the Court of Military Appeals, I should like to advert to a section of the Senate version of H. R. 4080 which deals with the qualifications of the Judge Advocate Generals of the services. The House version of section 13 of article 140 provides that the Judge Advocate Generals exclusive of the present incumbents "shall have at least 8 years' cumulative experience in a Judge Advocate's Corps, Department, or Office, the last 3 years of which, prior to appointment shall be consecutive." The Senate version omits this requirement limiting the requirement of service to "not less than a total of 8 years' experience in legal duties as commissioned officers."

The omission of this provision would make eligible for appointment as Judge Advocate General an officer who had never been a member of a Judge Advocate's Corps so long as he had had 8 years' experience in legal duties—even though his experience had been obtained early in his career in the performance of limited and relatively unimportant duties wholly unrelated to the courts-martial system, and the officer had had no contact with the work of a judge advocate for a score of years or more. Surely such an officer should not be vested with the powers reposed in the Judge Advocate General of the Army or of the Navy or of the Air Force.

If we now consider the matter of eligibility for service on the Court of Military Appeals in connection with eligibility for service as a Judge Advocate General, we find this startling result: The Judge Advocate General shall be required to have but 8 years of legal experience in the services, of a nature unspecified. The Court of Military Appeals, it is urged by the Army's Judge Advocate General, should be composed of the Judge Advocate Generals of the three services. Therefore, the Court of Military Appeals, if this point of view were to be heeded, could consist of three officers none of whom need have had more than 8 years' military experience, so long as they had been admitted to practice in a Federal court or the highest court of a State or Territory. If this is the type of court which is to have the final word in disposing of the cases of our fellow citizens in the armed services, we had best abandon any pretense to competent military justice.

I strongly urge the retention of article 67, amended to provide life tenure for the judges of the Court of Military Appeals, and the amendment of article 140 (13) so as to restore the House version of this article.

Mr. President, I have sought in this brief time this afternoon to set out my major reasons for dissenting from the report of the Armed Services Committee in respect to the pending bill. It will be most unfortunate if the Senate of the United States this afternoon hastens to take a vote on this measure before Senators have had ample opportunity to study and consider the objections I have raised this afternoon. I say that not because of any pride of authorship in these objections, Mr. President, because in the first instance the objections were not mine. They are objections which I came to adopt after I heard the able representatives of the bar groups and veterans' groups point out to me in testimony and in letter and in memoranda the weakness of the bill in its present form.

The amendments which are on the desk which I have presented are not my amendments in the sense that I, in the first place, proposed those amendments. Those amendments, I repeat, were proposed by the veterans' organizations, by the veterans' groups, by the bar-association groups, to which I have referred, who are very much concerned about what they consider to be some serious defects in this particular bill.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary wants to have the bill referred to his committee for the purpose only of affording that committee the opportunity of going over the bill so it can give its advice and opinions to the Armed Services Committee in respect to the objections. The reason for this position is, I understand, that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary also has come to the conclusion that at least a prima facie case exists in favor of the objections and the proposed amendments which I am offering here this afternoon.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senate of the United States will not rush into a vote on the bill this afternoon. I sincerely hope that the majority leader will at least permit the bill to go over until next week for a vote so that the Members of the Senate over the week end will have the opportunity to study and analyze the objections of the committee of the American Bar Association, of the group in the New York Bar Association previously referred to in my remarks, and the objections of the veterans' organizations. I think they are entitled to a much more careful consideration than can possibly come to them in the short few minutes they will receive this afternoon if the Senate now rushes into a vote.

Mr. President, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, it is necessary for me to hasten immediately to a conference with the Secretary of State. I am sure I will be back in the Senate Chamber by 5 o'clock. I sincerely hope that if a vote is to be taken this afternoon, I be extended the courtesy of a postponement of a vote until 5 o'clock, so that I can get back here and call up my amendments for a vote on them.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that I desire very much, in behalf of the various veterans' organizations and bar groups who are behind the amendments I have offered this afternoon, to have a record vote on the amendments. It is only fair that Members of the Senate stand up and be counted on the record as to whether they want to go on record as supporting a continuation of command control over the military courts of justice within the Military Establishment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, before the Senate from Oregon leaves the Chamber, I wish to ask him a question.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall speak briefly in response to the very able presentation by the Senator from Oregon, but if no other Senator wishes to speak, and the Senator shall proceed to vote, does the Senator from Oregon desire that I offer, on his behalf, the amendments he has presented?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall appreciate it very much if the chairman of the subcommittee of which I am a member will offer the amendments in my absence, if the Senate comes to the point of voting in my absence. Mr. President, it is a matter of very much embarrassment to me that I have an appointment which conflicts with consideration of the bill on the floor of the Senate, and which may cause me to be off the floor at a time when a vote may be taken on the amendments I have presented. However, I assure the Senate that the conference I have spoken of with the Secretary of State at 4:30 o'clock is of such vital importance that I must keep the appointment, even if it means that I shall miss the opportunity to vote on my amendments.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the situation of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the necessity for him to keep his appointment for a conference, and I shall offer the amendments on his behalf when the time comes, if the Senator is not then present.

Mr. President, most of the matters which have been discussed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon have been thoroughly considered and gone over time after time in the history of this proposed legislation. First the whole question was considered at great length by the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, where hearings were had over a period of 5 weeks. That committee received expert advice from various bar associations, service associations, and representatives of the armed services themselves.

The matter of command control was fully presented to the members of the House committee. The House committee, after considering the subject fully, by unanimous vote determined against the proposal of the American Bar Association which is incorporated in one of the amendments of the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Very briefly, Mr. President, this is the issue in that connection. The present system and the system provided for in the bill under consideration, House bill 4080, provide that a commanding officer shall have the right to convene a court martial. That has been the law for a long time. Then the accused has a right

of one peremptory challenge. The accused has the right to legal counsel to represent him. Under the provisions of the pending bill the legal counsel must be a lawyer.

After the case has been determined, if the accused has been convicted, then the case must be judged by the commanding officer as to legal sufficiency. Then under the provisions of the bill there is an automatic appeal to a board of review, where the case must be dismissed if the board finds that legal evidence is not sufficient.

Mr. President, the bill gives a great many more rights and protections to the accused than he has at the present time. For instance, the Kem amendment to the Selective Service Act of the Eightieth Congress provides that the accused shall have legal counsel to represent him only if available, and on many occasions legal counsel has not been found available to represent him. The bill makes it mandatory that his counsel be a lawyer.

Furthermore, Mr. President, in that portion of the Kem amendment which is included in House bill 4080 as article 37, it is provided that it shall be unlawful for the commanding officer to try to influence the outcome of a case, or to reprimand a court for its action.

In article 98, we have included another protection to prevent interference by the commanding officer in court proceedings. Under that article it is not only improper and illegal for him to try to influence the decision of the court, but article 98 makes it an offense which would make the officer subject to court martial That is an added protection.

The difficulty in trying to have a panel to try anyone accused in military proceedings comes about in this way: If there should be a panel, it would mean that a large number would be immobilized for any other purposes. If selection is to be made of someone from a panel, the panel will have to remain and be unavailable for other military service, because an accused will have the right to select someone from that panel. That would not be so bad in the case of the Army But in the case of the Navy it would, according to the naval authorities who testified before the House committee and the Senate committee, be absolutely unworkable.

Let us consider a case which is to be tried on shipboard. The law provides, and correctly so, that the service members of a court must not be in the same unit with the accused, so that they would not be particularly buddies of his. If a panel were required for a court martial to try someone who might be accused of an offense, I do not know where it would come from. An accused would have to be incarcerated perhaps over a period of many weeks and, in some cases, many months, before he could be brought back to shore, where a panel would be available to try him.

The amendments suggested by the American Bar Association and proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] provide that the commanding officer shall select the panel and that from the panel so selected and immobilized from other service during the time the members of the panel are waiting to try a court-martial case the judge advocate shall select the particular court to try an accused. It does not seem to me and to the services—and most of the witnesses took the same position—that there is very much difference between having an accused tried by a panel selected by the commanding officer and having a commanding officer select the particular court which is to try the accused.

Under the provisions of the Articles for the Government of the Navy an accused has no peremptory challenge. That privilege would be extended to the accused by the bill. So taking it all in all and considering the advice of those who have intimate knowledge of military service, the fact that there would be a considerable burden in having a large number of persons immobilized and kept from other duty during the time they constitute a panel to try infractions, and the difficulty of applying this system to the Navy, in view of the other protections which are provided in H. R 4080, the committee came to the conclusion that it should not upset the present situation with respect to command control, but that we should give the added protections provided in the pending bill. I am certain that the outcome will be a great deal better and more satisfactory than it has been in the past.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr TYDINGS I should like to ask the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill if it is not conceded by everyone who has gone to any trouble to investigate the provisions of this bill, as they were investigated by the House of Representatives and by the Armed Services Committee, and others who are interested in the measure, that from beginning to end the bill is an attempt to liberalize the provisions of the old Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy dealing with courts martial and to protect to a degree never before written into the law individuals who may be charged with infractions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is definitely correct. The bill contains at least 10 improvements in the law which give additional protection to a serviceman who is accused of a violation of the code.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The improvement flows from an investigation and examination into alleged complaints against the old system, the causes for which complaints the bill attempts to correct, so that they will not arise in the future.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is exactly correct. That is the sentiment of everyone.

Mr. TYDINGS. The only reason the system was not put on a completely civilian basis similar to that prevailing in civilian courts was that the peculiar circumstances of some of the cases, particularly cases involving persons who wear the uniform, would not permit it, because it would be so foreign to the whole theory of discipline that it would not be feasible to carry the system to the point where accused servicemen would be tried in civilian courts. Obviously there would have to be military courts to try many of these offenses.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I agree with the distinguished chairman of the committee. I believe the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] admitted that we must have a different system for the trial of military offenders.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it fair to state also to the Senate that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has stated to the committee, and perhaps to the Senate, that the bill is a distinct improvement on the existing system, and that there are only certain phases with respect to which he would like to amend it. Basically he is not opposed to much of the bill and approves much of the bill as it has come from the committee. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; that is correct. The Senator from Oregon believes that there are about 10 or 12 points which represent great improvements in courts martial, and there are only two or three respects in which he disagrees. He thinks the committee should have gone further. Those two or three points are not backward steps. They represent largely a retention of what is already in the law.

The Senator from Oregon was most complimentary with respect to the provision for a Court of Military Appeals, by which, on matters of law and on matters referred to the court by the Judge Advocate General uniformity will be brought about among all the services and in all theaters of activity in court-martial procedure and in the punishments which may be imposed. It is true, as was stated by the Senator from Oregon, that in 27,500 cases since the end of World War II various boards changed the decisions. That would be impossible under the proposed procedure because the general supervision, unification, and direction of the cases from all the services will be in the Court of Military Appeals, which is a great step toward civilian influence in our military justice. So we have gone all the way with the distinguished Senator from Oregon except with respect to the removal of military control. We have made it a court-martial offense for a commanding officer to attempt to influence the court or to reprimand the members of a court for their actions. We have given a great many protections to the accused. In the light of the testimony of representatives of the services, representatives of most of the service associations, and of the Judge Advocate Generals who have testified, and in the light of the studies of the Morgan committee, as well as the unanimous conclusion reached by the House committee, the committee did not feel justified at this time in abandoning provision for the selection of the court by the commanding officer.

Mr. President, while the American Bar Association recommended a panel from which the court would be selected, the New York State Bar Association made exactly the opposite recommendation. So even the bar associations are not unanimous on this point.

I hope that the amendments of the Senator from Oregon will be voted down.

In line with my agreement with the Senator from Oregon, I now offer the various amendments which he has submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire that the amendments be read at this point or only printed in the RECORD?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not think the Senator from Oregon would want all the amendments read. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The amendments offered by Mr. KEFAUVER for Mr. MORSE are as follows:

On page 107, between lines 5 and 6, insert two new paragraphs as follows:

"(15) 'Appointing authority' shall be construed to refer to a commanding officer authorized to appoint a summary court or a panel of military personnel from whom shall be designated the members of general or special courts martial.

"(16) 'Convening authority' shall be construed to refer to those persons and officers authorized to designate the military personnel to serve as members of general or special courts martial. Wherever in these articles reference is made to an officer exercising general or special court-martial jurisdiction, such reference shall be construed to mean the convening authority with power to designate the members of such court martial."

On page 112, line 4, strike out "Convening" and insert in lieu thereof "Appointing"

On page 117, beginning with line 10, strike out all down to and including line 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) if imposed by an officer authorized to exercise appointing authority with respect to general court martial, forfeiture of one-half of his pay per month for a period not exceeding 3 months,".

On page 118, line 3, strike out the word "or"

On page 118, line 7, strike out the period and insert "; or."

On page 118, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

"(G) if imposed by an officer authorized to exercise appointing authority with respect to special court martial, forfeiture of one-half of his pay for a period not exceeding 1 month"

On page 123, beginning with line 7, strike out all down to and including line 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) the senior member of the Judge Advocate General's Corps attached or assigned to a territorial department, an army group or an army, and such other member of the Judge Advocate General's Corps as may be designated by such senior member;

"(4) the senior legal specialist attached or assigned to a fleet or to a naval station or larger shore activity of the Navy beyond the continental limits of the United States;

"(5) the senior judge advocate attached or assigned to an air command or an air force, and such other judge advocate as may be designated by such senior judge advocate;

"(6) such other members of the Judge Advocate General's Corps, legal specialist or judge advocate as may be designated by the appropriate Secretary of a Department; or

"(7) any other member of the Judge Advocate General's Corps, legal specialist or the judge advocate in any of the armed forces when empowered by the President."

On page 123, line 22, strike out "commanding officer" and insert in lieu thereof "convening authority."

On page 124, beginning with line 12, strike out all down to and including line 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) the commanding officer of an army corps, a division, a brigade, a regiment, detached battalion or corresponding unit of the Army;

"(4) the commanding officer of an air division, a wing, group, or separate squadron of the Air Force;".

On page 126, line 3, strike out "Who may serve on courts martial" and insert in lieu thereof "Qualifications and appointment of members of courts martial."

On page 127, beginning with the word "Where" in line 1, strike out all down to and including line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Where such persons cannot be obtained the court may be convened and the trial held without them, but the appropriate commanding officer, whether the appointing authority or the convening authority, shall make a detailed written statement, to be appended to the record, stating why they could not be obtained."

On page 127, beginning with line 14, strike out all down to and including the word "temperament" in line 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) The President of the United States, the Secretary of a Department, and commanding officers, shall appoint as members of courts martial, and of panels from which general and special courts martial shall be designated, such persons as, in their opinion, are best qualified for the duty by reason of age, education, training, experience, length of service, and judicial temperament."

On page 127, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following new subdivision:

"(e) The commanding officers enumerated in subdivisions (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of article 23 (a) shall appoint qualified military personnel in their commands available for service as members of general and special courts martial and shall forward a list of such personnel to the convening authority having general court-martial jurisdiction of their command, and such personnel shall constitute a panel from which the convening authority shall from time to time designate the members of general and special courts martial. Such commanding officers may withdraw names from such lists and may substitute others therefor, subject to the provisions of article 29 (a)"

On page 128, beginning with line 13, strike out all down to and including line 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) (1) For each general court martial the authority convening the court shall appoint a defense counsel together with such assistants as he deems necessary or appropriate. Each appointing authority, or if the court be convened by the President of the United States or the Secretary of a Department, then such person shall appoint a trial counsel, together with such assistants as he deems necessary or appropriate, who shall prosecute the charges originating in his command.

"(2) For each special court martial the authority convening the court shall appoint a trial counsel and a defense counsel, together with such assistants as he deems necessary or appropriate.

"(3) No person who has acted as investigating officer, law officer, or court member in any case shall act subsequently as trial counsel, assistant trial counsel or, unless expressly requested by the accused, as defense counsel or assistant defense counsel in the same case. No person who has acted for the prosecution shall act subsequently in the same case for the defense, nor shall any person who has acted for the defense act subsequently in the same case in the prosecution."

On page 134, lines 16 and 17, strike out "to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction" and insert in lieu thereof "to the appointing authority for the command."

On page 134, beginning with line 21, strike out all down to and including line 2 on page 135, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Before directing the trial of any charge by general court martial, the appointing authority for the command shall refer it to his staff judge advocate or legal officer for consideration and advice. The appointing authority shall forward the charge to the convening authority, who shall thereupon refer the charge to the trial counsel appointed by such appointing authority, for prosecution before a general court martial designated by the convening authority The convening authority shall not refer a charge to a general court martial for trial unless it has been found that the charge alleges an offense under this code and is warranted by evidence indicated in the report of investigation."

On page 137, line 3, after "any", insert "appointing"

On page 153, beginning with line 14, strike out all down to and including line 3 on page 154, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) After every trial by a general court martial, and after every trial by a special court martial convened by a member of the Judge Advocate General's Corps, a legal specialist, or a judge advocate, the record shall be forwarded to the convening authority, and action thereon shall be taken by him or by his successor. The convening authority shall, unless he shall disapprove the sentence or order a rehearing, forward the record, and if the record be of a trial by general court martial, then with his written opinion and review thereof, to the appointing authority who forwarded the charge to him, or to such officer's successor in command, and the latter may mitigate, remit, or suspend the whole or any part of the sentence.

"(b) After every trial by a court martial, except as specified in subdivision (a), the record shall be forwarded to the convening authority and action thereon may be taken by the officer who convened the court, an officer commanding for the time being, a successor in command, or by any officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction."

On page 154, beginning with line 5, strike out all down to and including the period following the word "authority" in line 8

On page 156, beginning with line 14, strike out all down to and including line 5 on page 157, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) When the convening authority and the appointing authority have taken final action in a general court-martial case, the appointing authority shall forward the entire record, including the action and the opinion and review of the convening authority, and any order which the appointing authority may have made pursuant to article 60 (a) to the appropriate Judge Advocate General.

"(b) Where the sentence of a special court martial as approved by the convening authority includes a bad-conduct discharge, whether or not suspended, and such discharge shall not have been remitted by the appointing authority, the record shall be forwarded to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the command to be reviewed in the same manner as a record of trial by general court martial or directly to the appropriate Judge Advocate General to be reviewed by a board of review. If the sentence as approved by an officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction includes a bad-conduct discharge, whether or not suspended, the record shall be forwarded to the appropriate Judge Advocate General to be reviewed by a board of review."

On page 166, line 16, before "officer" insert "commanding"

On page 166, beginning with line 20, strike out all down to and including the word "probationer" in line 23, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The record of the hearing and the recommendations of the commanding officer having special court-martial jurisdiction shall be forwarded for action to the commanding officer exercising general court-martial appointing authority for the command."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum and that proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on behalf of the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment. Without objection, they will be considered en bloc. [Putting the question.]

The amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment B, which comprises a group of technical amendments to the language and a slight rewording in order to make changes in the references to statutes. I ask that the amendments be considered as having been read, and that they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments lettered B, offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended. [Putting the question.]

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, may we have a vote on the committee amendment, as amended, without having the absence of a quorum suggested?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended, not on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Then I temporarily withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask that we may have the vote without a quorum call. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator will withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and let us vote.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to accommodate the distinguished Senator, but on a bill of this importance, I think a quorum should be present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will it not be possible, in line with the request of the Senator from Tennessee, to have a show of hands on a request for the yeas and nays, in order to bring the matter to a head; then, if the yeas and nays are ordered, a quorum will be developed on the vote.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Of course, Mr. President, that is a possible procedure, but I do not think it is well to follow it under the circumstances in the case of a bill of this importance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Humphrey	Mundt
Brewster	Hunt	Murray
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Bridges	Jenner	O'Conor
Butler	Johnson, Colo	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S C	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Darby	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Smith, N J.
Douglas	Lehman	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lodge	Stennis
Ecton	Lucas	Taft
Ellender	McCarran	Taylor
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McClellan	Tobey
George	McFarland	Tydings
Gurney	McKellar	Watkins
Hayden	McMahon	Wherry
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Wiley
Hill	Malone	Williams
Hoey	Maybank	Withers
Holland	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. McCARRAN and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—62

Aiken	Hoey	Maybank
Brewster	Holland	Mundt
Bricker	Humphrey	Murray
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Jenner	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Tex	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S C	Russell
Cordon	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Darby	Kem	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Kerr	Smith, N J
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lehman	Stennis
Ecton	Lodge	Taft
Ellender	Lucas	Taylor
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tydings
Fulbright	McClellan	Watkins
George	McFarland	Wherry
Gurney	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	Withers
Hill	Magnuson	

NAYS—9

Hendrickson	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Ives	Morse	Tobey
McCarran	Schoeppel	Williams

NOT VOTING—25

Anderson	Gillette	Millikin
Benton	Graham	Myers
Byrd	Green	Pepper
Cain	Hickenlooper	Thomas, Okla
Chavez	Kilgore	Thye
Downey	Langer	Vandenberg
Eastland	Leahy	Young
Flanders	Long	
Frear	Martin	

So the bill (H. R. 4080) was passed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the motion of the Senator from Tennessee be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2440, Calendar No. 926. If the motion is agreed to, I shall then propose an amendment to the bill in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2440) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for other purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield before he speaks?

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the bill before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to have the motion acted on, and then I shall be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2440) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for other purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the bill in the nature of a substitute. I ask that the clerk read it, but first I yield to my colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, sitting for the time being in the chair of the acting minority leader, I desire to ask the chairman of the Commitee on Armed Services a question. I know what is in the bill, and I know what the Senator's motion will be, and I agree with him in his position, but does he know of any opposition, or any feeling on the part of any member of the minority party against the proposed authorization of public works for the Military Establishment?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not, and if the Senate will bear with me, I should like to make a brief statement about the bill. But I can answer the Senator now that I know of no opposition on either side of the aisle to the bill as it stands.

Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement about the bill for the information of my colleagues.

The Committee on Armed Services, after extensive hearings by the full committee, unanimously reported S. 2440, the military construction authorization bill. This bill was reported to the Senate on August 15 of last year and has been on the Senate Calendar since that date.

As indicated by the title, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the construction of specific public works facilities required by the Department of Defense at military installations in the continental United States and at oversea locations, and to authorize the appropriation of funds with which the facilities can be constructed.

This bill represents the first unified construction legislation developed and presented by the Department of Defense. For the first time the Congress is able to review the first priority public works requirements of the three military services as a whole in a single bill.

I may say that heretofore each of the services presented its program without any particular relationship to the other services. The pending bill represents a relativity in the importance of projects in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Title I of the bill includes the facilities authorized for the Army, title II for the Navy, title III for the Air Force, and title IV provides the general provisions of the bill applicable to all three services.

All these projects were carefully screened in the office of the Secretary of Defense prior to their submission to Congress. The Research and Development Board, a high-level group concerned with this most vital function of our defense establishment, reviewed all research and development facility projects to insure that each is critically required, that there is no duplication, and that each facility can be utilized to the maximum after construction.

The following is important, and I hope Senators will listen to it.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff were consulted as to the strategic and operational requirements of the projects. The Chairman of the Munitions Board, as the personal representative of the Secretary of Defense, developed this integrated program of facility construction. I am informed that no consideration was given to the service origin of any project and it was a case of the necessity and justification measured one against the other.

During the war practically no permanent construction was accomplished by the military. The urgency of their requirements for facilities, the scarcity of materials and labor, and the essentiality of economy made permanent construction neither desirable nor feasible. The temporary facilities built during this period with a 5-year expected life still today constitute the bulk of the military physical plant. Most of these facilities have already passed their economic life, are expensive to maintain and inefficient to operate on a permanent basis. However, where these facilities are available and can be used, they are not being replaced. Since the end of the war only relatively minor amounts of new construction have been authorized to the services so that there is no backlog of authorizations to allow the services to carry on their permanent construction programs.

Housing is still in critical need by all the services. I am informed that the Wherry bill, which I joined in sponsoring during the first session, has and will materially assist in the reduction of this shortage. It is not, however, the complete answer to military housing, and the construction of additional permanent public quarters at some installations in the United States and most overseas locations is necessary. There is a considerable amount of money authorized for housing in this bill, all of which is needed and cannot be provided under Public Law 211.

As I have stated to the Senate on many occasions, research and development is one of the most important functions of the military services. Nothing would be so disastrous as being second best in our offensive and defensive weapons of war. There are numerous projects in the bill for research and development facilities. The Research and Development Board, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of Defense have told the Armed Services Committee that these facilities are necessary, not 1 or 2 years from now, but at once. If we delay, it may mean that we will be second best in the development of these highly strategical and scientific weapons.

As originally introduced the bill provides a total monetary authorization of approximately $634,000,000. It will be recalled that near the end of the first session, when it was apparent that S. 2440 would not be enacted prior to adjournment, at the urgent request of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, some of the authorizations provided in this bill for Alaska and Okinawa were submitted in a new bill which was enacted by the Congress and became Public Law 420. Thus, some of the authorizations for Alaska and Okinawa have been provided. In addition, the Secretary of Defense has recently reviewed S. 2440, in view of the decreased military budget for this coming fiscal year, and has recommended reduction or deletions in the amount of approximately $19,000,000. The Armed Services Committee have considered these recommendations and have reported an amendment to S. 2440 in the nature of a substitute carrying the reductions heretofore referred to. This amendment eliminates the authorizations for Alaska and Okinawa which have already been enacted and includes the reductions or deletions recommended by the Secretary of Defense. There are no additional projects included in the amendment. The total authorization provided in the amendment is approximately $500,000,000 which is a reduction of $135,000,000 from the original bill. That has been achieved by additional screening, among other things.

It is not the intent of the Department of Defense to request the appropriation of this total amount for the next fiscal year. Funds will be requested for those facilities most urgently needed. The balance will be requested in future years and will allow the services to plan their permanent construction in an orderly manner—I may say parenthetically—while using the temporary structures now in existence, so long as they are fit to be used before new construction begins.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to section 408 of the bill

which provides that authorizations once granted by the Congress and for which appropriations are not granted will be reviewed periodically by the Armed Services Committee This section provides that all public works authorizations granted by the Congress and for which appropriations have not been granted are rescinded.

I hope I make that plain. If projects have been authorized in the past, as many have, and if the authorizations are still in existence, and there is no money appropriated, the bill rescinds all those authorizations, so that no one has the authority, if there is still some loose money retained, to proceed with anything except the bare essentials of national defense.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the Senator whether the statement just made pertains to some of the installations which were deactivated by the military not so long ago.

Mr. TYDINGS. It would apply to them if authorizations were passed for their improvement or retention and no money was appropriated. The authorizations are wiped off the books by the bill.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I have only one more paragraph. If the able Senator from Missouri would mind if I finish, then I shall be glad to yield to him.

It is further provided that the Secretary of Defense at the beginning of each session will submit to the Congress a list of all public-works authorizations for which appropriations have not been made, together with the justifications for the continuing need of these authorizations. The committee put that provision in the bill with the thought that we should have the Secretary tell us every year respecting authorizations made by Congress of which he was not able to take advantage, why they should be continued and not wiped out. These will be reviewed by the Armed Services Committee and only those authorizations required in the light of conditions at that time will be retained. This will provide the Congress a continuing review of all public-works authorizations granted to the military.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I understood the Senator, in one sentence, in regard to the rescissions affected by section 408, to use language which, unless I misunderstood him, is somewhat broader than he probably intended. The language, as I understood him, was not limited by any particular date or Congress. As I understand, the authority rescinded by section 408 is that which is conferred by any act of Congress enacted prior to the beginning of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that is correct, because it has not been possible, in some few cases, because of conditions which need not be described, to carry out an authorization for which money is available.

Mr. DONNELL. The sole purpose of my inquiry was to make it perfectly clear that the bill contains the provision that the authority which is rescinded was that which was conferred by any act of Congress enacted prior to the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. I stand corrected. The Senator from Missouri is correct, and I thank him for calling that to my attention.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. There is a discussion going on now with regard to the removal of the Watson Laboratories in New Jersey, and their consolidation with a project in New York. Is that involved in this bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it is. I will say to the Senator that the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee had in his State one of the three largest camps in America, Camp Bainbridge, which was comparable to the Great Lakes camp and the San Diego camp. He has lost that camp, 5 miles from his home.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We had understood that the Watson Laboratories issue was to be postponed pending further investigation. I wonder if that is possible

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sympathetic with the request of the two New Jersey Senators for a further review of that question.

When the bill goes to the House it will be reviewed in its entirety, and I shall be glad to take it upon myself to write to the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the House, calling his attention to this specific situation, and asking that the two Senators from New Jersey and any others who desire to be heard be given an opportunity to be heard; also that the House give the question further study.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. At the present time this particular transfer is involved in the proposed legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is authorized, but no money is appropriated for it. This is only an authorization. There will be an opportunity for review in the House It will also be in conference. So we shall have two cracks at the authorization, and one at the appropriation. I will say that the rights of the Senators from New Jersey will be protected when the matter comes before the House Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask a question somewhat along the same lines as the question asked by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. The Senator from Maryland promised the Senator from New Jersey that when this question is taken up the rights of the Senators from New Jersey will be protected.

Mr. TYDINGS. The same right will be extended to the able Senator from New York, so that he may look after his interests while other Senators are looking after theirs.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland whether he intends to press for a vote on the bill this afternoon?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to conclude consideration of the bill today. I do not know of any opposition to it. I am hoping that it will be passed in the next 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me express to the distinguished Senator from Maryland my sincere hope that he will not press for a vote this afternoon. In particular, I should like to invite his attention to section 405 of the bill, on page 23. By section 405 there is permitted a cost of $14,000 for construction of a family unit, plus a cost of $2,500 for site development and outside utilities, or a total of $16,500 per unit. No limit is placed on the number of such family units which can be constructed.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the Senator that the figure he has mentioned is simply a top figure. These installations will be built in various places. The costs will vary greatly, depending upon the location. Before the Armed Services Committee evidence was produced as to the type of house which is to be built. No matter where it is to be built, the type will be uniform. It is a composite of the architectural designs of many concerns which cooperated in an effort to design the smallest, most economical house which could be built for a small sum of money.

The reason for establishing the top figure is that if some of these houses are to be built in Alaska or in other places where costs are high, it is necessary to set the figure at the highest cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is aware, of course, that under the provisions of the latter part of section 405 the costs in Alaska may be double the costs under the first part of the section. The cost may go up to $33,000 a unit in certain areas.

Mr. TYDINGS. That illustrates my point, which I was coming to. We cannot fix a ceiling for all the projects in the United States on a basis of equality for each community, any more than we can fix a ceiling in Alaska, where the transportation costs of lumber and cement are prohibitive, and the difficulties are very great. However, I may say to the Senator that the type of house which is to be built will cost very much less than $14,000 practically anywhere in the United States. We set a top figure to take care of those places where otherwise the cost would make impossible the erection of an adequate house.

The type of house to be built is relatively small. I think it contains only six rooms. A ceiling was established so that there would be a top limit. We could not fix it on the basis of equality as between the various States and localities.

The committee went thoroughly into the subject. We had before us models

of the houses. For example, possibly seven of them will be built in a row. There will be a heating plant in one end, and all seven houses will be heated from the same plant. The laundry facilities will be consolidated, so that in many cases the families in the seven houses will use one laundry. The house itself is of a modest type. We examined the plans and saw the models. I can assure the Senator that there is no ground for his fear that these are to be elaborate houses. That fear is not supported by the facts, although his question is very pertinent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to the able Senator that I saw some figures on the cost of military housing in my own State at Scott Field and at Chanute Field. I was shocked at the estimates of cost which were made. I am very much afraid that there is a general tendency in government to treat a maximum figure as a common or prevailing figure.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order to avoid that contingency, we asked for information as to the type of house which the Army is to build on all reservations. There will be some slight modifications because of the difference in thickness of walls in cold climates as compared with the thickness of walls in warmer sections. Various other factors are involved in connection with houses in a cold climate as distinguished from houses in a warm climate.

Basically, the house to be built is only a six-room house of very modest dimensions. Every facility is to be centralized for use by all seven of the families in the row, whereas in the case of the houses to which the Senator refers there is the same equipment in practically every one of them.

In my judgment—and the testimony before the committee substantiated it—most of these houses will be built at a cost far below the figure which is established as the top figure which might have to be spent to build a house in a climate or in a community where such a house could not be built for $8,000 or $10,000, as could be done in some other community.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As the Senator well knows, there is a gradation in the quality of housing, dependent upon the rank of the family of the person to be housed.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no gradation here.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the same house is to be constructed for a general officer as for an enlisted man?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I would not say that. However, there is not a great deal of difference. If the Senator could see the models and plans showing the type of house which is to be constructed under the provisions of this bill, he would not consider it very much of a house. As a matter of fact, I did not think it was very much of a house, and questioned in my own mind whether we were not really being penny-wise and pound-foolish to some extent in confining the quarters in many cases to the type of house which I have indicated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When a similar bill was before the Senate last summer I offered an amendment which I believe was accepted, and was in the bill when it went to conference, providing differing ceilings dependent upon the rank of the person to be housed. No one wants better housing for enlisted men than does the junior Senator from Illinois, having been an enlisted man himself. But I think it is true that in many cases, if we authorize $16,500 for a six-room house, and that amount is spent, it will provide about as expensive housing as I know of anywhere in the country. It would be far more expensive, as a matter of fact, than current costs in many areas justify.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will turn to page 23, section 404, he will find that the committee tried to control the cost of the houses by the following restriction:

> No family quarters shall be constructed under the authority of this act which are in excess of a net floor area of 1,080 square feet per unit.

If the Senator will take the square root of 1,080, roughly, he will find that that would provide a house approximately 30 feet by 30 feet. A house 30 feet by 30 feet is not a very large house. If there are three rooms on each floor, the house is smaller in floor space than the average reasonably priced residential house in Washington occupied by the ordinary wage earner.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a difficult subject upon which to pass judgment quickly.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator to permit me to finish this statement first, please.

It seems to me there is a contradiction between section 404 and section 405. Section 405 authorizes costs per family unit within continental United States of $16,500, including the cost of the land. Section 404 limits the floor space of such houses to 1,080 square feet per unit.

I should like to get the comparative figures on costs for different sections of the country assembled; but it seems inconceivable to me that there can be legitimate costs of $16,500 for a house of only 1,080 square feet, with only six rooms. I wonder whether the Senator from Maryland would consider including a lower ceiling—not a lower ceiling for the houses, but a lower ceiling in the authorization.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Gladly.

Mr. TYDINGS. When the witnesses came before our committee, we were inclined to fix the ceiling at less than that set forth in the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which now is before the Senate. We likewise were inclined to fix the ceiling for the cost of each lot at less than the $2,500 figure now set forth in the amendment in the nature of a substitute. Some of these quarters are to be built on land which is more expensive, understandably than the land on which other quarters are to be built. So what we had to do in this measure was provide for the maximum. But in order to follow the same reasoning which the Senator from Illinois is now pursuing, the committee felt that we could nevertheless keep the project within reason by limiting the amount of floor space.

Further than that, we asked a great many questions concerning the type of construction in various parts of the country, what would go into the houses, and how much they would cost when built here, there, and the other place.

The only reason the ceiling is included in this measure is that it represented the highest price, probably which would have to be paid anywhere in the United States for a lot and the highest price, probably, which would have to be paid for a house built anywhere in the United States.

But not being satisfied to leave that figure in the measure, for fear it would be seized upon by everyone as the amount which could be spent, we then conceived the provision to limit the amount of floor space; and we saw the models, and were assured by the Army that the houses would be uniform.

The houses are not to be built for high-ranking Army officers; they are to be built for low-ranking Army officers and enlisted men. They are to be row houses. Practically all of them, where the situation will permit, are to be built in units of seven, with the heating equipment or furnace installed in only one house, and with the laundry machinery in only one house, and the facilities are to serve all the people who live in the row of houses.

The Senator can see from that description that every conceivable way to obtain more housing for the same amount of money has been adopted in this measure and in this program.

I can assure the Senator from Illinois that we went into this matter most thoroughly, pursuing the very philosophy he expresses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that the maximum figure of $16,500 per unit——

Mr. TYDINGS. That is for both the land and the house.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; with a floor space of 1,080 square feet. That comes to an average cost, assuming the maximum is used, of $15 a square foot. Although I do not have in mind the detailed figures for FHA construction and VA construction, my memory is that in general such housing is constructed at a cost of not far from $10 a square foot, whereas in the measure now before the Senate there is provision for a 50 percent greater cost.

I think those of us who in the past have watched the costs of construction of military and naval installations know that the figures for such construction have been extraordinarily high, I may say shockingly high. I do not believe sufficient safeguards are included in section 405 to prevent the payment of higher costs than are justified in particular localities.

I would appreciate it very much if the Senator from Maryland would be willing

to let this measure go over until tomorrow, so that we may see whether we can arrive at language which will more adequately protect the Treasury.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Maryland thinks the Senator from Illinois has a good point and a good case. But does the Senator from Illinois really believe that if a house contains only 1,080 square feet of floor space, it is likely to cost $14,500, exclusive of the land?

Let me say to the Senator that the houses provided for by this measure represent about 10 percent of the total requests for projects which came to the board which reviewed them. Many of the requests were in respect to housing. The projects were screened twice. Then they were reviewed by the committee. But not being satisfied to take the word of the authorities that they would build as many houses as they could with the money provided for them, we asked them to bring the models and the plans and the blueprints before us and put them on the committee table. That was done, and we looked at them and calculated on them. After we had inserted the amendment providing the top limit of $14,500, because some of the houses would cost that much, when built in particular localities where the costs of transportation and other costs may be very expensive, we then searched around for a formula which would compel the authorities in charge of the work to build the houses according to the models and plans and blueprints they showed us. Therefore, we hit upon the floor-plan provision which will compel them to build a small house, such as was exhibited to us by means of the models and plans and blueprints.

This measure will not take care of all the housing needs of the armed services, of course. I am as certain as I can be that the entire purpose of the men who came before us and who urged this appropriation is to build the kind of reasonably safe house they can build for the money appropriated, rather than to build a few extraordinarily good houses. This measure is for the construction of quarters for low-ranking officers and enlisted men. The bill does not cover the construction of any large, separate houses

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to say to the able Senator from Maryland, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that I am very much in favor of his bill. I personally know of the need for many of the projects provided for in this measure, and I know the construction of such projects has been long delayed.

But I likewise share the concern expressed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is a very able and diligent member of the subcommittee on housing. Of course, as the Senator from Maryland knows, we have encountered these problems a great many times.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wonder whether it would meet with the approval of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Alabama, in order that the Senator from Maryland may cooperate with them, if I were to propose a unanimous-consent agreement to have the Senate vote at 1 o'clock next Monday on the bill and on all amendments thereto, so that the two Senators and any other Senators who are interested in the matter could pursue it and could draw up and present appropriate amendments. If that is done, with the result that tighter, more restrictive language can be placed in the measure in order to safeguard the American taxpayers, the Senators will not have the opposition of the Senator from Maryland, but he will speak for, and will request the adoption of, such an amendment

However, I do not wish to let the bill continue indefinitely, over the week end, because it has been on the calendar since last August. The pressure on me for the passage of this measure has been terrific, and I do not wish to let the bill remain on the calendar for months more without some action.

With such an understanding as I have suggested, I should be glad to meet the viewpoint of the Senator from Illinois

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I was not going to request a postponement In fact, I was going to ask the Senator from Maryland a question which I hoped would clear up this matter.

For instance, when we were considering the public-housing bill, even though we there had a maximum limitation, just as this measure has, we knew how many units would be built, and therefore we knew what would be the average cost. I was going to ask the Senator from Maryland whether he could assure us what the average cost of the housing would be.

Mr. HUNT. Nine thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. TYDINGS. I could not do that, because we do not have figures for the whole country that would give a fair answer.

Mr. GURNEY rose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say, merely as an analogy, that in the case of public housing, where the floor space is approximately the same as the maximum here provided, we know that those houses must be built at an average cost of $8,500. Those houses I think will represent better housing——

Mr. TYDINGS. What is the floor space in those houses?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Approximately the same as in those provided for by this bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it more or less?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it varies, but the average would be approximately the same.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator from South Carolina will first allow me to yield to my colleague on the committee, I shall then yield to him.

Mr. GURNEY. I think I might make an observation on the question raised by the Senator from Alabama. Under the Wherry bill, a number of agencies are having houses built for certain units on a different basis. At present their program contemplates the building of about 50 sets of houses at that many bases. I believe that is the program of the Air Force. In continental United States, they have a top limit of $8,100, which has to include the cost of the land and facilities.

Mr. SPARKMAN. From that statement I gather that the top limit of $16,500 would be the exception rather than the rule.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct, and I think we can see that they are operating within a very reasonable limit I know we received information during the last few days that at 50 bases at which they were going to build houses, 12 or 14 houses have already been approved at an $8,100 limit

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Before I yield further, I should like to say this is a Senate bill and must go to the House. I am willing to err on the side of economy, and, if we hit upon too low a figure. I assume the House will make revision of it in due course, and we shall have another chance to consider it. I should be glad to accept an amendment, or to propose one, myself, fixing the ceiling at $9,000. I do not feel at liberty to fix a ceiling on the lots at lower than $2,500, because I believe that in some cases where the lots are in cities it is possible that their cost may be such that houses cannot be built on them, within a lower limit, even after we appropriate the money. At any rate, the matter will go to conference, where it can be reviewed by the House, and, later on, by the Senate

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina, who has been on his feet a long while, asking me to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted to make a brief statement. The Senator from Maryland knows that last year when the bill was being considered I discussed it with him. It was then that the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Maryland, and myself introduced a bill, the so-called Wherry-Tydings bill, to let the armed services, on a 90-percent basis, build certain houses and give certain concessions.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my judgment that the armed services have not used the bill as much as they should have. I am not opposed to the Senator's bill, but I merely want to make my position clear. In many instances, if whoever was in charge of the housing under that bill had gone ahead, I think the housing construction would have been much further advanced than it is. On the other hand, when the last bill on the subject was under consideration by the Appropriations Committee, we found that the engineers had approved apartments to be built in the Canal Zone at a cost of $50,000 each. That was brought out at that

time in the presence of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I am, first, last, and always, in favor of adequate housing for the Army, but I should like to make sure that the taxpayers of the country get the same treatment as that which the Army and the Navy receive. That is all I wish to say.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before yielding to anyone else, knowing this is a Senate bill which will have to go to the House, I am going to propose that the figure "$14,000" be stricken out and the figure "$9,000" inserted. But I want to be perfectly candid with my colleagues. It may be that in certain sections of the country that figure will be prohibitive, but, inasmuch as the bill must go to the House Armed Services Committee for further determination, they will have an opportunity to determine whether it should be raised. If, however, the houses can be built for $9,000, no one will be happier than I.

Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Washington, who has been wanting me to yield for a long while.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It seems to me the entire question can be solved very simply, if we are going to put ceilings on military housing. When the military undertook to build the housing units themselves, they went hog-wild in certain cases, as the Senator from Illinois has mentioned. But now, most of this construction work, in fact, all of it, with rare exceptions, is done on bids. The contractors who are vitally interested in the housing are going to bid the prevailing price.

Mr. TYDINGS. The contract will, of course, be let to the lowest bidder.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It will be let to the lowest bidder, and in line with the price prevailing in the community. With respect to section 404, if it costs but $9,000 to build a house in Illinois, that is what the bid will be. Contractors are scrambling for the contracts. The problem will solve itself, on the basis of the bids.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois is a very worthy and timely one, and I am willing to reduce the amount from $14,000 to $9,000, knowing the matter will be restudied in the House. If the cost can be held that low, I shall be as happy as the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HENDRICKSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, then I shall yield to the two Senators on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say I am greatly pleased at the courtesy of the senior Senator from Maryland in being willing to reduce the amount, but I should like to suggest that the important consideration is not the maximum but the average cost.

Mr. TYDINGS. If it is fixed at $9,000, the average is going to be something less than that, certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I should like to see placed in the section is a provision that the average cost shall not exceed a given figure. It would then be possible to have a variation between localities, but the maximum would not be used as the minimum, which may sometimes happen. I may say that, while I am very young in this body, I have noticed frequently that when clauses are taken to conference they are sometimes stricken out on the insistence of the other body, and the final conference figure comes back with a much higher cost figure than we had originally intended. Therefore, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether he will not give most careful consideration to the idea of an average cost figure, which would be included in section 405.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield, in a moment. That would be a little difficult, because, first of all, none of the houses have been built. The second point is that it would be pretty hard to average the projects for all the various localities from Okinawa to Hawaii and all the way round, some of them having already been authorized in Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may call the attention of the very able Senator from Maryland to the fact that so far as Okinawa and Alaska are concerned, they are already given a limit twice that fixed for the continental United States. So it is unnecessary to bring in the high cost of construction in Alaska and Okinawa to justify high cost inside the continental United States.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. HENDRICKSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I promised to yield to the Senator from New Jersey, next, and I shall yield to the Senator from South Carolina next, after that.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, both the senior Senator from New Jersey and the junior Senator from that State are very much concerned about the proposed removal of the Watson Laboratories from New Jersey to Rome, N. Y. We are therefore very much interested in the idea of a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Monday. That would give us time to confer with important members of our House delegation and make necessary inquiries, as we should like to do, in order to be prepared to vote properly on the bill. I wish the Senator from Maryland would renew the proposal of a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at 1 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment. I hope the Senator from Illinois will remain while we are on this subject. There are many projects in the bill for Alaska. As a matter of fact, Alaska gets almost more money than any other place mentioned in the entire bill, outside California. In view of the fact that Alaska and many outlying places are on the list, including even Greenland, I do not know how much the average cost will be. I think we may defeat our own purposes if we tie ourselves too tightly.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to remind the Senator that last year we passed the Alaska housing bill which was sponsored by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. I am for the Senator's bill. I am hoping that a satisfactory provision can be worked out. I think the Senator made a most reasonable request when he suggested a vote be taken at 1 o'clock on Monday, and in the meantime we study the bills and, if necessary, prepare amendments.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say, before I yield to the Senator from New York, that the hearings were held approximately 8 or 9 months ago, and as I speak many things come to mind of which I did not originally think. One of the things we did—I have forgotten the formula we used—was to figure how we could hold the unit costs down to the lowest possible point and, at the same time, construct houses which would not be a disgrace to the country. We placed a limit on the cost of a six-room house to be built in places other than Alaska and Greenland, and then fixed the floor space. We had the architects come before us, and all the houses are to follow a specific, definite pattern. The heating unit is not placed under each house. There is a heating unit under the seventh house, and it heats all seven houses. There is not a wash tub under each house. There are wash tubs and other laundry arrangements in the basement of one house, and the occupants of all seven houses use that equipment.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am beginning to get a little suspicious of this bill, because I find that the authorization asked for is something less than $600,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; and we have nearly that much in sensitive and valuable equipment which is deteriorating in many places. I shall be glad to bring photographs, if the Senator wants to see them, of some very expensive equipment, costing millions of dollars, which is exposed to the weather, and if it is allowed to remain as it is much longer it will be useless and will have to be replaced.

Mr. CAPEHART. My point is that the bill covers approximately $600,000,000, and the only portion of the bill in which Senators seem to be interested is the human element—housing the soldier or the marine or the Navy man. I want to see some money taken from the appropriation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Where?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am wondering if we should take it away from the housing.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has not heard a bit of the testimony with reference to any one of these projects. What does he want to take out?

Mr. CAPEHART. Why do we talk about the small end of it, which is the provision for housing for the armed services, whereas we do not seem to be at all interested in whether barracks are going to cost too much, whether the warehouses are going to cost too much, or whether a dozen and one other things will cost too much. We simply talk of the houses we are going to build for our soldiers. I do not quite understand the reasoning.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe the Senator was present when I made my opening statement and told the Senate that a great many of these proposals came from the Research and Development Board.

Mr. CAPEHART. I appreciate that. I am for the bill, but I cannot quite understand the reasoning of Senators who would vote for an expenditure of $600,000,000, and then talk about—what? What is the total housing cost involved?

Mr. TYDINGS. The committee sat for a month. The Senator can well understand that the projects were taken up one at a time, and the question was asked, "Why do you have to have that?" The man who was responsible for that particular activity had to make out a case.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the total amount for housing for the personnel?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a small amount compared with the total?

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it seems to me, in view of all the questions asked, we should try to agree upon a time to vote on Monday, let us say, at 2 o'clock. I hope we can do that and take a recess until that time A number of Senators are on their feet and a number of them desire to interrogate the Senator from Maryland, and the first thing we know we shall be here for another hour. Many Senators are anxious to go home, and I want to accommodate everyone

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr President, I may say to the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from Maryland will be glad to accommodate, with any reasonable extension of the time, those Senators who want to prepare amendments or who want to inquire further into the subject, but it would be appreciated if the requests did not encompass too long a time, because I should like to have the bill passed in whatever shape it is to be passed, because there is immediate need for many projects which it contains.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it seems to me the main difference at the moment is whether the figure which the Senator has named is to be $9,000 as the top, or whether we should follow the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that the figure be $9,000 on the average.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or some average figure.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would accept the $9,000 average.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator places a top figure of $9,000. The average would be less than $9,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not necessarily agree to $9,000 average. It might be less.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that I would not make that proposal if this were a House bill and this were our last chance at it, but, being a Senate bill, there will be hearings on it, and the $9,000 figure will be reexamined. I thought if I were willing to go along with the Senator to the point of fixing a $9,000 top, which would be $9,000 under the present top, certainly it could not be less than that, unless the intention is to build the houses for nothing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the distinguished Senator from Maryland also address his remarks to the site development and outside utilities which are fixed at $5,200? I am not sure whether that would include the cost of the land.

Mr. TYDINGS. It includes sewerage and lights.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does it include the cost of the land?

Mr. TYDINGS. No

Mr DOUGLAS. Without the cost of the land, that figure is certainly excessively high.

Mr. TYDINGS. I misunderstood the Senator's question. It does include land, sewerage, water, lights, and all the other site necessities.

Mr DOUGLAS. How many houses of this type could be placed on an acre of land?

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe the Senator is a pretty good expert on housing, but we cannot take housing alone and not consider the sewerage, water, and other facilities It will be found that in many localities that is a very expensive undertaking We are not building all these houses on the outskirts of Baltimore and Washington, but at some places far removed from the source of supply, where sewage disposal is not always as easy as it looks to be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In those cases the cost would be less.

Mr. TYDINGS. From the Senator's experience, what would he suggest?

Mr. DOUGLAS. At this hour of the day, obviously one cannot suggest a definite figure, but I would suggest to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that he also take into account the cost of site development as well as the cost of construction, and make some effort to fix a lower maximum which will better protect the taxpayers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana

Mr. CAPEHART. The total cost of the housing is a hundred million, or something in that neighborhood, and the total appropriation in this bill is in excess of five hundred million. My question is, Why are we more interested in questioning the housing in which the servicemen are to live than in the warehouses in which, for instance, barrels of oil are to be stored? Here is authorization for $450,000,000, or a sum in that neighborhood, for warehouses and material things, and a hundred million or a little over for housing for the servicemen.

Mr. TYDINGS. No one wants to get a dollar taken off more than does the Senator from Maryland, but I do not want to defeat the purpose of the bill by cutting so much off that it will be impossible to do the work which ought to be done. In the event the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois is followed, if any Senator will come forward with an amendment, which is founded on common sense and reason, and which will protect the taxpayers and the Government, he will have not only my cooperation, but, if it is permitted, under the rules of the Senate, my applause.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL As a member of the Senator's committee, and working with him on this matter, I wish to say that some months ago we went into the question of the housing, very carefully.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my memory that we got the costs down as low as possible.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr SALTONSTALL. Perhaps we can get them lower, but I say to the chairman, respectfully, that I think he should not agree to any amendment tonight, until we really have a chance to study the matter further.

Mr. TYDINGS If the Senate is to recess until Monday, I should wish to withdraw my amendment, because I know the House will go over the matter. Therefore I withdraw the amendment and yield the floor, and I hope the proposal of the majority leader for a vote on the bill at some hour on Monday, which will give us all a chance to prepare amendments, will be accepted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in the hope that I may get a unanimous-consent agreement, I shall place one before the Senate. I see the Senator from Oregon on the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am a member of the committee, and I am for the unanimous-consent agreement, and for the bill, but there is a matter of policy to which I think we should conform. I think in this particular instance no Senator, if he were present, would want to object, but the policy the junior Senator from Oregon has consistently followed will be followed now, namely, I shall ask for a quorum call before the agreement is entered into.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rules of the Senate it is necessary to have a quorum called for the submission of a unanimous-consent agreement of the kind proposed, unless there is a waiver by unanimous consent.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I cannot get a waiver by unanimous consent, as a result of what the junior Senator from Oregon has said, and therefore I shall

not try to secure an agreement. Consequently, the bill will have to go over until Monday. As it has been agreed with the two Senators from Arizona to take up Senate bill 75 Monday morning, we will have to come back to the bill now pending some other time. If we are to resume consideration of the bill on Monday, no one knows how much time it will take. I was sure, from what the Senator from Maryland said, that the bill could be passed in 25 minutes, and that is why I consented that it be taken up at 5 o'clock. Now it is 5 minutes past 6, and more questions have been asked about the bill than about any bill we have had before us for a long time, and I daresay it might take two more days to pass the bill, judging from the questions which have been asked. So it seems to me we should follow the order of business we have heretofore discussed. I do not believe the Senator could get a vote on his bill tonight, and I am going to ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 75.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before the Senator makes the motion, I should like to be recognized.

Mr. LUCAS. I withhold the motion.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the action proposed by the leader were taken, it would displace the bill now pending, which has been on the calendar since last August, and as it cannot be passed on the consent calendar, it would mean that no one could know when it would come up again. We should not shed too many tears about the servicemen in Alaska, and the conditions under which they are living, and the conditions under which other servicemen are living, without the full knowledge that they will continue to live under those conditions if we postpone final action on this bill.

I should like to suggest to my colleagues that the bill has been on the calendar since last August. Three or 4 days ago notice was given by the leader on the majority side that the bill would be taken up, and, with all due respect to Senators who have taken part in the colloquy, it seems to me that, with that knowledge, they should be prepared with amendments to support whatever contentions they think are appropriate in connection with the consideration of the bill.

I am not worried about the cost limit, because I know that when the bill goes to the House of Representatives all the matters which have been submitted to us will have to be reproved, and it seems to me that in the case of housing, if I were to offer an amendment myself for a $9,000 limit, the Senator from Illinois should be satisfied with that, because the House of Representatives will have to reconsider it, and if the House disagrees with the Senate, the question will be in conference. I was going to suggest that I reframe my amendment, which the House will have to consider anyway, to read, "not more than an average price of $9,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator say "not more than an average construction cost of $8,500"?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I will settle for $500 less.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Maryland will not accept the amendment with the idea he can get an immediate vote.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am trying to dispose of one phase of the matter only.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the very cooperative spirit of the Senator from Maryland. I now wonder if he would be equally cooperative in dealing with the question of site development and outside facilities.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will name his price, I will settle. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate that the Senator is in a yielding and in a genial mood, but I call his attention to the fact that I am afraid he is going to make some of the proposed developments completely impossible if he yields too much on the point raised.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator from Florida that if this were a House bill I would be unable to yield, in light of the information at my disposal. But I know that the House Armed Services Committee is going to give the bill high priority, and that the figures in the bill will be reviewed in the light of present-day evidence If the figures are too low, I know the House will raise them, and that we will get back to what it is possible to do with the money that is fixed in the limitation.

Mr. HOLLAND If the Senator will permit me to complete my statement, there is one project in the bill about which I know something. It is not one about which I appeared before the committee, but I presume it was asked for by the Air Force.

Mr. TYDINGS. It was.

Mr. HOLLAND. It has to do with Eglin Field. That is a community far remote from any town or city Those interested prefer to have the housing on the reservation rather than in the nearby town. They are going to have to build a water tank and water-distribution facilities, and are going to have to do such paving as will be necessary to reach and afford access to the houses. They are going to have to bring in electric power lines, and other utilities, besides doing the things which have been mentioned here already, in the way of providing central laundry stations, central-heating plants, and the like.

I do not desire to see the Senate do something which will make the necessary construction, or construction which the Air Force says is necessary, an impossibility. I do not claim to know about other projects, there may be many in the same condition, and there may be some that are in even more desperate condition——

Mr. TYDINGS. There are.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should not like to see the snap judgment of the Senate substituted for the mature judgment and reasoning of the committee, which I am sure has passed very deliberately and justly on the request. I should dislike very much to see such a yielding by the Senator from Maryland as would make impossible some of these projects, which, as I say again, have not been asked for, certainly so far as the one I mentioned is concerned, and I am sure that is true as to every other project, except by the services involved, and they have asked for them because they need them, and need them badly. I hope the Senator will not yield on this point.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois. In the event the motion is adopted and the bill is displaced, when in his judgment can it be brought up again for action by the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I cannot tell the Senator that. It seems to me this is probably one of the bills which would be objected to on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. TYDINGS. It has been objected to each time it has been reached on the call of the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. It has been objected to each time it has been reached on the call of the calendar. The Senators on the other side of the aisle are getting ready to go away to celebrate Lincoln's birthday, and try to raise a little money and elevate the spirits of the members of their party. During the time they are away we probably will not be able to bring up the bill. So I cannot say when it can be brought up. I have made a definite agreement with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that Senate bill 75 shall be brought up for consideration on Monday. It is apparent we cannot have action taken on the pending bill now, so I am in favor of taking a recess at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wanted the Senator from Illinois to give me a reply to the question.

I should like to say something while I have the floor. Mr. President and Senators, it is perfectly apparent to me that some of us are not really interested in our great armed services. We love them in time of war when the shells are flying all around, and the wounded are coming back, and we get a mournful thrill when visiting the graveyards of our great heroic soldiers, and reflect upon the sacrifices they have made. We stand with bowed heads at their graves.

We have soldiers in Alaska who are living in such conditions, that, if the son of any Senator were there we would hear some of the finest oratory we ever have listened to on the floor of the Senate. They are living in most crude conditions there, far away from all amusements, in the Arctic night, which is very long. They are living there without proper housing, without proper recreational facilities. Photographs brought before the committee show that millions of dollars' worth of valuable and sensitive equipment are there unprotected. Such photographs were exhibited to the members of the committee.

It is all right, Mr. President, to go forth at election time and tell the men who wore the uniform, members of the American Legion, or the Veterans of Foreign Wars, or the Disabled Veterans, how we love them, but in my opinion it is better for us to put some time on this bill and build up in the men who stand between

us and a possible attack by some great instrument of destruction the morale which comes from having a decent place in which to live.

Here we are quibbling 6 months after a bill has been reported to the Senate by the Armed Services Committee, a bill reported unanimously by that committee, which has a membership of six Republicans and seven Democrats, one of them being HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, who certainly does not have a reputation of being a spendthrift with Government funds.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Yet every time the calendar is called and the bill is reached we hear "I object." The chairman of the committee, or whoever is in charge of the bill, is sometimes not even given the courtesy and privilege of making a 5-minute explanation.

Mr. President, we are sitting here warm and well clothed in an air-conditioned Chamber. Our soldiers in Greenland and Alaska have natural air conditioning. There we find two of the most aggravated situations which are taken care of by the bill.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Now let us cease the talk about our love for the servicemen. I think it is an outrage to put men in the neighborhood of the Arctic Circle or above it and not give them decent places in which to live and not afford them reasonable recreation. They are standing on the frontier of civilization prepared to fight the battle for all mankind. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] knows that to be so. He has brought up that subject many times in the committee. I think the time has come when we should face this situation and not put off consideration of the bill. We should stay here tonight, if necessary, to work out the bill upon the anvil of the legislative process.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe we are loyal to these men to the degree we should be if we pass this bill over and let it take its chances of passage on some future date. We are here now. We can legislate now. Amendments can be offered now. They can be voted on now. For 4 or 5 days notice has been served that the bill would come up today. Anyone who is critical of the bill should be prepared, in my judgment, to have the facts and amendments available so we will not need to put off consideration of the bill any longer. Arctic blizzards cannot be put off. Servicemen in the far north are living under Arctic blizzard conditions now.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that I completely agree with the Senator from Maryland that the bill should not be displaced. There are two ways of proceeding, under either one of which the bill can be acted upon. There are now 30-some Senators in the Chamber. I think a quorum of 49 Senators can be produced and we can dispose of the bill tonight. However, if we cannot dispose of it at this time in that way, I do not see why on Monday, at the opening of the session, the majority leader cannot ask for unanimous consent to vote on the bill at 2 o'clock on Monday.

It seems to me it is merely a matter of procedure. I believe the rules of procedure of the Senate should be rigidly adhered to, namely, that if a request for unanimous consent is made, there should be a quorum call. A quorum should be ascertained to be present before request for unanimous consent is made. I am in favor of staying here tonight and acting on the bill, or having the majority leader, the first thing after the Senate convenes on Monday, make a unanimous-consent request to vote on the bill at 2 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon.

I think we have reached the Rubicon. In the future it ought never to be offered as an excuse in this body that legislation must be postponed merely because some Senator is not present. A Senator is elected and paid to be present here on the floor. Days go by, weeks go by without action being taken on some measures because Senators have said they will be away from the Senate Chamber for 2 or 3 days. When they accept engagements they must take the risk of action being taken on pending legislation while they are away. We have too large a calendar to keep delaying bills when they are reached on the calendar, particularly bills dealing with the defense of the Nation, in view of the new developments which take place every 24 hours.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who is it that held up the bill this afternoon?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am not naming any names. I am not being personal I am speaking in the abstract, not in the concrete.

Mr. President, I think the bill before us is of transcendental importance. It ought to remain before us until we dispose of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator has been addressing himself to this side of the aisle with respect to the bill. My suggestion is that he address himself to the other side of the aisle, when speaking of the bill having been held up this afternoon.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am facing toward the other side of the Chamber, because there are more desks toward that side of me than there are on the other side of me. I do not wish to turn my back on the majority of the desks in the Chamber.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The senior Senator from Arizona [Mr HAYDEN] is present. The junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is also present. The question I address to the Senator from Maryland is as follows: Is he willing to ask the two Senators if they will agree to give at least 2 hours for discussion of the bill on Monday, thus releasing the majority leader from that much of the agreement he has made?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am willing to enter into any reasonable agreement, which will not result in the bill being thrown again into the wastebasket.

Senators, I do not want to be emotional about this matter, but there are men in the service waiting on this legislation. We are sitting in this Chamber and are quite warm. At the same time, other men are quite cold.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to ask the majority leader if he is willing to ask the Senators from California and Arizona if they will release him from the agreement that has been made, at least to the extent of 2 hours on Monday being made available for consideration of the pending bill?

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure we can be afforded 2 hours on Monday for that purpose if we can secure a unanimous-consent agreement. That, however, cannot be reached tonight, and I do not know whether it can be secured on Monday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senate could recess tonight with no understanding respecting a unanimous-consent agreement, but, as I understand the rules, the Senate can, by unanimous-consent agreement, displace the bill which it is proposed to consider on Monday. Thus we can recess at this time with the idea of endeavoring to secure unanimous-consent agreement for at least an hour or 2 hours of discussion of the bill on Monday, and thereafter be guided by circumstances.

Mr. LUCAS. As I said before, I am sure the distinguished Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. MCFARLAND] and the distinguished Senators from California [Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. KNOWLAND] would agree to do that. I have not talked with the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. He has a problem, too.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have the floor, but I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me suggest that a motion be made to take up Senate bill 75 not later than 2 o'clock on Monday. That would be agreeable to us. That would allow the 2 hours desired. Promptly at 2 o'clock the Senate could begin the consideration of our bill. If consideration of the pending bill is not concluded today, the majority leader could ask unanimous consent on Monday to conclude it by 2 o'clock.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I will accept that arrangement. I shall do something which probably has not heretofore been done in this body. I ask my colleagues if we cannot have a gentlemen's agreement or understanding rather than a unanimous-consent agree-

ment, that we shall finally act on the bill prior to the hour of 2 o'clock, when the majority leader will make a motion to take up the other bill. That would not bind any Senator. We all want the bill to go through. Such an arrangement would conform to the point of view of the Senator from Oregon. It would not bind any Senator. It would not be a precedent. I should like to hope that we could obtain a gentlemen's agreement, and that at the proper time on Monday we could proceed to vote on the bill and all amendments. I would rather have a gentleman's agreement than a unanimous-consent agreement.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In view of the rule, and in view of the feeling of some Members on this side of the aisle, I hope the Senator from Maryland, who is the chairman of the committee, will not press his suggestion, but will leave the situation as it was before.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not pressing it. I am merely making an observation. There seems to be a spirit of good humor in the Chamber at this time. I am hoping that it will prevail on Monday, and that we can get together, pass the bill, and send it to the House, where it must go through the mill.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield

Mr DONNELL. I appreciate the fine spirit of the Senator from Maryland in making this suggestion, but it seems to me that it would be a mistake for this body, with only approximately 30 Senators in the Chamber, to enter into any such understanding. Sixty-six Senators are absent.

Mr. TYDINGS. I assume that the absentees are gentlemen.

Mr. DONNELL. I have no doubt that they are. Also there is one lady, but she is present. It seems to me that a gentleman's agreement, if it means anything, means just as much as a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. TYDINGS. It means more.

Mr. DONNELL. I think it would be very unfortunate to place any Member of the Senate who is absent this afternoon under the obligation of a gentleman's agreement. I think we ought either to have a unanimous-consent agreement, or not have a unanimous-consent agreement.

A moment ago, before the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] spoke, I was about to make a suggestion. Perhaps my suggestion is now out of order, but I should like at least to mention it.

We are proceeding here on the theory that we must take a recess from today until Monday. There is one more day this week. Personally I would have no objection to taking a recess until tomorrow, instead of Monday, so as to continue consideration of the pending bill. However, if the Senators from Arizona and the Senators from California are willing to agree to some other course of action, I shall not press the suggestion. If they are not willing to do so, I shall offer the suggestion that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am satisfied that they could not accept the suggestion, because under the practice which has prevailed they could not do so without consulting Senators who are absent. Again we defer to absent Senators. Why do we do so? Why must we always consult Senators who are not in their seats? When I expect to be absent from the Senate I never ask that proposed legislation be laid aside or deferred. I am absent more than perhaps any other Member of this body, because Maryland is next door. I take my chances. When I am present in the Chamber I do not like to have a rule applied to me which does not apply to every other Senator.

Mr. DONNELL Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Do I correctly understand the statement of the Chair to be that a unanimous-consent agreement of this type cannot be entered into without a quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER That is the statement of the Chair.

Mr. DONNELL. In view of the statement of the Senator from Maryland, I respectfully suggest that the majority leader consider the advisability of recessing until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, at which time we may resume consideration of the pending measure

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, this is probably one of the most important bills which will come before this Congress. The amount of money it authorizes is large. The extent of it is large Its relationship to our national defense is large The men who need it are considerable in number. It is very odd, Mr. President, that during the consideration of a bill of this magnitude so few Senators are present in the Chamber, and that we cannot act on the bill because of the absence of Senators. That is a rather sad commentary.

Mr DONNELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr DONNELL. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I now most respectfully suggest to the distinguished majority leader that we take a recess at this time until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not want to lose the floor at this time, but I will yield to allow the Senator from Missouri to ask the majority leader a question, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if I make that kind of motion, the absentee Senators whom the Senator is now discussing will be here tomorrow and I shall be charged by them with holding Saturday sessions when I should not do so, and when some Senators have made arrangements to be absent. Senators will talk all day long if they do not want to vote on the bill. I do not believe it can be done by simply coming back here in the morning at 11 o'clock.

I talked informally with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I do not believe he will let us vote on Monday at 2 o'clock. I am not sure about that. At any rate, he has submitted an amendment to the bill and he will have something to say about it. As other Senators enter the debate on the bill, apparently they will have much to say about it. I should not like to recess until tomorrow and have to listen to debate all day long without getting anywhere in connection with a vote, and then have Senators charge me with Simon Legree tactics.

Mr. TYDINGS I shall not press the suggestion further. It is perfectly apparent that we have reached an impasse and that nothing is going to be done. I will offer this amendment to every bill the Senate considers from now on until the end of the session. I will get some consideration for it.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator permit me to ask the distinguished majority leader whether or not there is any commitment to any Member of the Senate that a session will not be held tomorrow?

Mr LUCAS. I have made no commitment

Mr. DONNELL. In order to test the sense of the Senate——

Mr. LUCAS I hope the Senator will not do that. I do not want him to take the leadership away from me.

Mr. DONNELL. I am not going to take the leadership away from the majority leader, but I know of no other way of testing the sense of the Senate.

Mr LUCAS Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. DONNELL I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. TYDINGS Mr. President, it is perfectly apparent that we cannot dispose of this bill tonight. It is going back on the calendar. The Senator from Maryland will offer the bill as an amendment to every single, solitary piece of legislation in this session of Congress, and I hope one way or another to get consideration for it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Maryland will not carry out the suggestion he has made. Not long ago we had a Democratic conference and we virtually agreed that nongermane amendments would not offered to any legislation pending before the Senate. I am sure that we can pass this bill sooner or later. The House has not acted on it as yet. It is a Senate bill. Apparently the House has not been too much disturbed about the provisions of this measure, or they would have acted on a similar measure before this time.

Mr. President, I am willing to have the Senate recess until Monday at noon and to leave this bill on the calendar. Perhaps between now and Monday we can obtain an agreement to vote on the bill by 2 or 3 o'clock. I shall take that chance with the Senators from Arizona and the Senators from California, with whom I have a definite agreement to take up Senate bill 75. I will not permit the Senator from Missouri to move that we recess until tomorrow. I propose to control that myself. I now move that the Senate take a recess——

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

Mr LUCAS. I will yield for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think the Senator could yield for some remarks, without losing the floor.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to ask the Senator if he thinks it is possible that within the next week, under the agenda now before the Senate, we could dispose of this bill. I pose the question for reasons similar to those set forth by the Senator from Maryland. I pose the question for the further reason that last year the same thing happened in reference to the Alaskan housing bill. After it got out of committee, it took us until the end of the session finally to pass the bill. All that time the troops in Alaska had been living in tar-paper shacks, with outside lavatories—conditions under which we would not have a dog live.

If this is going to be the same situation——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yielded for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask that question, and I preface it by saying——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois yielded only for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask the Senator if he realizes—and I know he does—that if we do not pass this measure within the next 2 weeks, the same situation as the one I mentioned in regard to the Alaskan housing bill last year will develop, because the season is short, and there will be no opportunity for the building of quarters for our troops in Alaska.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think I am as cognizant of what goes on around the Senate as is any other Senator, and I realize the implications of this measure.

But I wish to say that I am not going to be rushed from here on, on an important bill involving a half billion dollars, on the theory that it can be passed in 20 minutes. We are going to take our time on a measure of this kind. I thought probably we could dispose of it in that length of time, and that is the reason why we took it up at 5 o'clock today. But we have not been able to pass it within that period of time.

There are a number of important considerations involved in this bill, as is apparent from the questions which have been asked by Senators on both sides of the aisle.

I do not think any Senator is trying to delay the measure for the sole sake of delaying it. Senators have a right to ascertain what is provided by the bill. They have a right to interrogate the members of the committee. They have a right to offer amendments from the floor, if they so desire. I do not believe any Senator on either side of the aisle is attempting to pursue dilatory tactics merely for the sake of delaying the bill.

A moment ago suggestion was made that perhaps it would be possible for the Senate to consider this measure following the disposition of Senate bill 75. As I now recall, perhaps there was some discussion of that in the meeting of the policy committee last week. If we cannot dispose of it on Monday, I should be happy to try to take it up following——

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to say that I think the Senator from Illinois is eminently fair in the position he takes. In my judgment, it would have been a mistake to have passed a bill of this magnitude in 20 or 25 minutes. It is an extremely important bill.

Although I am for the bill and although I support it, and supported it in the committee, yet there are some amendments which I hope the Senator will consider adding to the bill. We are not considering here, today, the bill reported by the committee last summer, and lying upon the calendar all last fall, but we are considering the substitute, which was printed only on February 2. I have observed the substitute, and I see that some items in the committee print have been eliminated and others have been changed.

Certainly I should like to have time to look into projects in my State which are covered by this measure. I think they are likewise vital to the national defense, and involve the care and welfare of the soldiers of the Republic.

I also intend to look into the provisions of the substitute for the Marine Corps, because I do not think either the bill or the substitute takes proper cognizance of the Marine Corps. I had to go to the unusual length of requesting, over the heads of the Department, that the Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps be permitted to come before the committee to make a case for an item which I thought much more meritorious than many others provided for in this measure.

I do not think it is at all possible to obtain a vote on the bill by 2 o'clock on Monday. This measure can be considered in order, after the consideration of other measures. I do not recall that any Member of the Senate pressed for action on this measure until the meeting of the policy committee on Tuesday of this week. This bill can be considered in due time.

I hope the Senator from Maryland was speaking in jest when he said he intended to offer this measure as an amendment to every bill which comes along, because if the Senate were to pass it under such circumstances, it would not go to the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, but would go to some other House committee.

The bill should be considered and should be passed, but it should receive the consideration which its importance demands.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to be permitted to make a brief statement, in view of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

I am well aware of the keen interest the Senator from Maryland has in providing proper housing for our military personnel. I wish to pay tribute to him, not only for his ability but for his zeal in behalf of and his interest in the members of the armed services. I hope he did not draw the inference from what I said that those of us who are presenting amendments pertaining to the costs of construction meant to delay the passage of the bill or to force officers or enlisted personnel to live in improper quarters.

I wish to assure the Senator from Maryland that I have, I hope, these causes as much at heart as he has, and I have no desire whatever to slow up the passage of the bill.

Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to stay here until midnight tonight, but I also have a concern for the taxpayers of the United States. I do not think it is improper to raise questions regarding the expense in connection with items of military installations or any other items in the budget.

I may say that my attention was first called to this matter last summer when, in House bill 4766, authorization was requested in the amount of $1,167,000 for 48 units at Scott Air Force Base, in my own State. I may say that this same item seems to be carried on page 19 of the substitute reported by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, and it is also contained on page 20 of the bill as reported by the committee last summer.

At the time when this matter came up last summer, I analyzed the estimate in some detail. I found that of the estimated cost of $1,167,000, $375,000 was set aside for land and $792,000 for construction and utilities for 48 units. A total of 650 acres was to be acquired; the average cost of acquisition per acre was something over $500.

I paid a visit to Scott Field, at Belleville. I inspected the field; I went about the surrounding countryside, and took informal testimony from a number of persons in Belleville. It was my conclusion that a cost of $500 an acre was greatly in excess of the fair value of the land. Furthermore, I was not at all certain that we should buy as much as 650 acres for the initial construction of only 48 units—or an average of nearly 14 acres per unit.

I found that the cost for land alone, at least as it was proposed to be acquired so far as the 48 units was concerned, was $7,800 per unit, and that there was an allowance of $2,500 per unit for outside utilities, making a total of $10,300 for land and outside utilities per unit. When this is added to the $14,000 cost of construction, the initial construction cost would come to $24,300 a unit. To put it quite mildly, this seems to me to be entirely too extravagant.

There are many questions connected with this installation and similar installations all over the country.

I simply wish to ask the Senator from Maryland whether, upon more mature reflection, he does not think it proper for a Senator of the United States to try to protect the taxpayers in these matters, as well as to hasten construction of the installations. I ask the Senator from Maryland with all kindness to him and with all respect for his distinguished ability and his great service to the coun-

try, whether a Senator should be branded on the floor of the Senate as trying to interfere with installations merely because he is trying to save the taxpayers some money?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LUCAS I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am absolutely astounded at the remarks of the Senator from Illinois. I have never branded him or anyone else on the floor of the Senate for improper conduct in attempting to save the taxpayers' money. I associated myself with him, and I cannot understand where the Senator's hearing is, if he drew any different inference from what I had to say. I tried to cooperate with him by making suggestions, the merit of which I doubted, in order to associate myself with his effort. But I want to say to the Senator, I do not take second place to any one in this Chamber in trying to save the taxpayers' money. I want the Senator from Illinois to know it, and not to assume that I am attacking him because he is trying to save money.

I also want the Senator from Illinois to know that my remarks were directed primarily to the absentees, whom I mentioned several times, because we could not get a unanimous-consent agreement, because we could not get a sufficient number of Senators on the floor to pass the bill. It seems to me, with men on guard on the very frontiers of civilization, in Alaska and Greenland, in the prevailing cold, lacking heating facilities, and compelled to run from their little shacks to outhouses across the snow, that on Friday night at 6 o'clock enough United States Senators could show up to legislate on a matter of this importance. My remarks were not directed to anyone on this floor, by reason of anything he said. I resent the imputation, because it is purely assumed and has no basis in fact. I repeat my statement, I think it is an outrage that a bill of this significance should be delayed because, at 6 o'clock on Friday night, there are not enough United States Senators in the Capitol to transact business, while housing is needed everywhere on our far-flung line of defense.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Illinois will allow the bill to retain its present status and will now move a recess of the Senate until Monday. I assure the Senator from Maryland, as one member of his committee—and there are four members of his committee on this side of the aisle—that we have the same feelings he has with respect to getting the bill through in an orderly and proper way. I do not think we can do it tonight. I do not know whether we can do it Monday. But I hope it will retain its present status, and I hope the majority leader will let us go home to our suppers as soon as possible.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 6, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 3 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS

Roy Victor Peel, of Indiana, to the position of Director of the Census.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 3 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE

John Hallowell Ohly to be Deputy Director, Mutual Defense Assistance.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Maj Gen Edward Fuller Witsell, O3455, for appointment as The Adjutant General, United States Army, and for appointment as major general in the Regular Army of the United States

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen William Edward Bergin, O7127, for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for appointments in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947

To be major general

Maj Gen Robert Battey McClure, O10356.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen Edward Elliott MacMorland, O4653
Brig. Gen. Joseph Pescia Sullivan, O5328.
Brig Gen Kirke Brooks Lawton, O6805.
Brig. Gen. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, O7042
Brig Gen. John Kay Christmas, O7144.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Aaron Bradshaw, Jr., O5290.
Brig. Gen. Laurence Bolton Kelser, O5316.
Brig. Gen. Willard Wadsworth Irvine, O5838.
Brig. Gen. Ward Hale Maris, O6718
Brig. Gen. Ralph Julian Canine, O7154.
Brig. Gen. John Kirkland Rice, O7183.
Brig. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246.
Brig. Gen. Edward Elliott MacMorland, O4653.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Pescia Sullivan, O5328.
Brig. Gen. Kirke Brooks Lawton, O6805.
Brig. Gen. John Kay Christmas, O7144.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Selby Harney Frank, O3546.
Col. Joel Grant Holmes, O5272
Col. Alfred Marston Shearer, C6772
Col Ray Maxey Hare, O6943.
Col Everett Busch, O7260.
Col. Norman E. Waldron, O7331.
Col John Hamilton Hinds, O12106
Col Bertram Francis Hayford, O12272
Col Edward Haviland Lastayo, O12660.
Col Rex Van Den Corput, Jr., O12700
Col. Leslie Earl Simon, O15567.
Col Luke William Finlay, O288773

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 15, 1950, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification

Frank W Abernathy
Franklin E Allard
Olin J Baird, Jr., O960299
Clyde E Bantz, O978818.
Gilbert M Beatty
Bruce K Begasse
Howard J Blumhardt.
Lawrence C Bogenschutz.
Clarence A Bohleber
Gordon R Borcherding, O972375
William F Branigan
Walter I Brent, O930894
Adrian W Brown.
James L Brown.
Louis Brown
Robert L Brown, O974178
Robert F Burt
Rodney T Carlson
Richard L Cary
Dan C. Cavanaugh, O971021
Charles N Childers
Bruce N Christy
James J Clark, Jr.
Charles L Clifton.
Junie L Clough.
Leonard J Corsentino
Frank R Costello
Donald W Coulter
Charles E Cunningham
Howard C Current
Frank W Cushing, Jr.
L Conrad Davis
Richard F Daykin.
Thomas J DePasquale
Charles R. deZafra, O975140
John F Dickson, Jr.
Richard J Dobmeier.
John G Dowd
Neil B. Downey.
Robert C Ebersberger, O966973
Jack Elliot, Jr
George H Ensley.
Albert J Fiorella
Edward M Ford, Jr
Traverse S Foster, Jr.
Eugene J Friedmann
Maurice A Gainey, Jr., O966928
William C Gallivan
Richard E. Galvan, O968712.
Jerry R Germaine, O972637.
John D Giannini, O972640
Joseph Glickel.
Raymond L Gloeckler
Newcomb Green, O973336
Albert G. Greene, Jr.
Conrad A. Grondin
Robert H Gulley, O960111
Richard N. Hammond
James D Harvey
Ferdinand H. Hauser.
William D Haven
Robert T. Hayes, O948460
Richard F Hirsh.
Bruce K Houston.
Robert R Howard
James A Howden, O960057.

Carl H. Hudson.
John E. Hudson, O978517.
Robert C Hunt.
Lorus D. Jewkes.
Edward L Johnson.
Rodney W Johnson.
William E Johnson, Jr.
James A Jolley.
Carlton A Judice.
Robert S Keller
Preston J Knight, Jr
Charles A. Kray.
Benjamin S. Lancaster
Fred M. Lang, Jr
William J Latzko.
James M. Leahy, O978626.
Robert L Leighton, Jr.
John L Lillibridge
John R Longenecker.
Edwin K Lucas
James E. Marck
Royce L McClure.
Claude L. McIntyre.
James E McNiff.
Thomas F Meagher.
Philip H Mecom, Jr.
Edward H Metzger, Jr
Walter C Moorman.
Kevin J Murphy.
Henry C Newell.
Donald L Niehaus.
Leo W. Nielsen, O967223
Emanuel Nobile, Jr
Robert P. O'Beirne
Charles D. Parker, Jr
Frank M Pender, O955683
Alvin A Pong, Jr., O974881.
Norman G Pohler.
Albert G Ponte
John F Porter, Jr.
Richard J. Potter.
Charles D Pratt, Jr
Loren E Radford.
James A Ralph.
George Regas
Rodney R Rehfeld
Richard T. Replinger, O967290
Robert W Rettger
William A Ritchey.
Charles R Roberts, O967679
Walter R. Roemer.
Aubrey L Romine.
Al S Rosin
Richard W Ruehe, O973632
Gordon C Russell
Homer E Schott, Jr.
Lionel Z Schubert.
Donald G Schuerman.
Sherman M. Seltzer
Richard P Shyvers, O978734
John W Simmons.
William P Smyth
Robert E Soden, O957738
Wallace H. Spaulling, Jr
Daniel C Stamer
Charles D. Stampley, O971389
Robert G Steinhoff
John A Stevenson.
James W Stewart, O954516
Hans W Stiehm
Berlyn K Sutton.
Bobby R Sykes.
Hugh P Tomlinson.
Ralph S. Treadwell, O954126.
Harry E. Ulmer.
Edmund L Upp, O917395
Joseph W. Urbanek, O1848201.
Paul D. Van Gelder.
Spencer B. Vay, O977887.
Charles G. F. Wahle, O968719.
Charles Waldon.
James W. Ward.
Solomon Weinberg.
Rex G. Welty, Jr., O977634.
Landon P. Whitelaw.
Howard D. Wilson.
Wallace L. Wilson.
Marion T. Wood.
Francis J. Woods.
Leigh S. Woodward.
John F. Wortman.
Bruce C. Young, Jr., O968054.
Fletcher R. Young, Jr.
Harold D. Yow.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Clarence E Apple, O978925.
Erwin F. Bauer, O973641.
Phillip C. Bowser.
John A Bryan.
Charles W. Cadrecha.
James J. Cassidy
George W. Curran
James H Davis, O978303
John P. Dobbins.
William H Drisko, O969163
John W. Ekey, O970762
Charles G. Ferguson, O967459
William E. Franklin, O956147
Cecil R. French
William W. Gilleland.
George B Harvey, Jr.
James B Hatch.
Harry C Henkhaus, Jr.
Fred S. Jones, O976745.
Frank S. Klein.
Robert A Lettas, O973647.
Henry J. Nachtsheim, Jr., O966817
Frederick T. O'Neill.
Donald J Opitz
Russell Perry, O96_930
William M. Perry, O975749.
William D Walker
George W. Weider, O955674.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

William L Brown.
James F Exley.
Harry S Hover, Jr
James C. Rives, O412993.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, WITHOUT SPECIFICATION OF BRANCH, ARM, OR SERVICE

First Lt George Raymond Krough, O33580, Medical Service Corps, United States Army.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Louis Russell Delmonico, O17287, and other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 25, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 909 with the name of Louis Russell Delmonico and ending on page 911 with the name of Frances Mary Yoniack, L157.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Henry Eugene Abbott, Jr., and others, for promotion in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 25, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Henry Eugene Abbott, Jr., on page 911, and ending with the name of Mary L. Boman, AJ10, on page 919.

IN THE NAVY

Admiral William H. P. Blandy, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list of the Navy with the rank of admiral.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Dale E. Barck and others for promotion in the Navy and in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 23, 1950, and appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Dale E. Barck, which appears on page 767, and ending with the name of William R. Lemmon, which appears on page 768.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

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

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

Almighty and everliving God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and the eternal, confirm our abiding faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which the fathers laid, lest in foolish futility we attempt to build on sand instead of rock. May we match great days with spacious thinking. Through the lips that speak in this forum of freedom, above all differences may there be heard by a listening world the solemn summons to men of good will, of all colors and all nations, to a new commonwealth of all peoples in which power shall be administered as a sacred trust dedicated to the common good In the Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 3, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GRAHAM was excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate this week, because of official business.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Donnell	Hayden
Anderson	Douglas	Hendrickson
Brewster	Downey	Hill
Bricker	Dworshak	Hoey
Bridges	Ecton	Holland
Butler	Ellender	Humphrey
Byrd	Ferguson	Hunt
Cain	Flanders	Ives
Capehart	Frear	Jenner
Chapman	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Chavez	George	Johnson, Tex.
Connally	Gillette	Johnston, S. C.
Cordon	Green	Kefauver
Darby	Gurney	Kem

Kilgore	Martin	Sparkman
Knowland	Maybank	Stennis
Leahy	Millikin	Taft
Lehman	Mundt	Taylor
Lodge	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Lucas	Myers	Thomas, Utah
McCarran	Neely	Tobey
McCarthy	O'Conor	Tydings
McClellan	O'Mahoney	Watkins
McFarland	Robertson	Wherry
McKellar	Russell	Williams
McMahon	Schoeppel	Withers
Magnuson	Smith, Maine	Young
Malone	Smith, N. J.	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained because of a temporary illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). A quorum is present

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MAYBANK, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to hold a hearing during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate this week.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business before the Senate is Senate bill 2440, to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last Friday before the Senate took a recess we were debating Senate bill 2440. From conversation since that time with the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and other Senators, it is now apparent that it will be impossible to make proper disposition of this measure before late in the afternoon. Under those circumstances, it is more or less agreed that we shall proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 75, as heretofore announced by the Senator from Illinois, and that following the disposition of Senate bill 75 we shall then return to Senate bill 2440.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to thank the majority leader, and also to express my appreciation for the cooperation of the minority leader in trying to bring Senate bill 2440 before the Senate at an early date. I concur in the majority leader's statement that in view of the many items in the bill and the discussion on Friday it is doubtful whether we could dispose of it in the next 2 or 3 hours. Therefore I think his suggestion is timely, and I hope Senators will all agree to go along with the program he suggests.

Before taking my seat I wish to thank the Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. MCFARLAND], as well as the Senators from California [Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. KNOWLAND], who were kind enough, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement to proceed with Senate bill 75 today, to agree to a postponement of their bill. It was not practical to give proper legislative approval to the military bill. Nonetheless, I want them to know that I appreciate their cooperation.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 75.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand that that is the bill to which the distinguished Senator from Maryland has just referred, and that there is complete agreement among all members of the Armed Services Committee, so there will be no objection on my part.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and offer other routine matters for the RECORD and the Appendix, without debate and without speeches.

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

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO 464)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 6, 1950.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate of the United States.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Securities and Exchange Commission has recommended to the Congress an amendment to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 which would extend to investors in certain unregistered securities the protections now enjoyed by investors in securities which are registered by their issuers with that Commission.

I believe that the reports on this subject made by the Commission on June 20, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 672, 79th Cong.), and on January 9, 1950, clearly demonstrate a need for the proposed legislation. The value of the protections afforded investors in registered securities has been thoroughly proved since 1934. There is no good reason why these protections should continue to be denied to investors in other companies which do not list their securities on the exchanges.

I hope that the Congress will give favorable consideration to the legislation which has been recommended by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

PROTESTS AGAINST COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE LEGISLATION

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, two leading societies in the field of dentistry—the Maryland State Dental Association and the Southern Maryland Dental Society—have gone on record in resolutions opposing enactment of legislation containing the principles of compulsory health insurance.

Along this same line there has come to me a joint resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the Maryland Legislature and a resolution from the Baltimore Association of Accident and Health Underwriters which expresses the opposition of the members of the association to any form of compulsory disability benefits, medical care, and hospital care programs, under Federal control.

I send the resolutions to the desk and ask unanimous consent that they be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on

Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American dental and medical professions have established the world's highest standard of dental and medical care, thereby helping the United States to become the healthiest major nation in the world; and

Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of dental and medical services has shown that there has been a progressive deterioration of health care to the detriment of the people; and

Whereas this problem was adjudged so serious by the people of Maryland that the State legislature, in its last session, instituted Joint Resolution No 11, to memorialize the Congress of the United States not to federalize the practice of medicine; and

Whereas the great advances which have been made in the profession of dentistry under the stimulus of private practice would be impeded by enactment of a Federal system of compulsory health insurance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved That the Southern Maryland Dental Society does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance; and

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative now in the Congress of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

RUSSELL P KILCER, D D. S., *President.*
HAROLD H. CONNER, D. D. S., *Secretary.*

Silver Spring, Md., dated this 5th day of December 1949.

Whereas the American dental and medical professions have established the world's highest standard of dental and medical care, thereby helping the United States to become the healthiest major nation in the world; and

Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of dental and medical services has shown that there has been a progressive deterioration of health care to the detriment of the people; and

Whereas this problem was adjudged so serious by the people of Maryland that the State legislature, in its last session, instituted Joint Resolution No. 11 to memorialize the Congress of the United States not to federalize the practice of medicine; and

Whereas the great advances which have been made in the profession of dentistry under the stimulus of private practice would be impeded by enactment of a Federal system of compulsory health insurance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Maryland State Dental Association does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance; and

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative now in the Congress from this State and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

B. S. WELLS, D. D. S., *President.*
E. L. PESSAGNO, Jr., D. D. S., *Secretary.*

Baltimore, Md., dated this 6th day of December 1949.

Joint Resolution 11

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States not to federalize the practice of medicine

Whereas the American people now enjoy the highest level of health, the finest standards of scientific care and the best quality of medical institutions thus far achieved by any major country in the world, and

Whereas the great accomplishments of American medicine are the results of a free profession working under a free system unhampered by Government control; and

Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical care has been progressive deterioration of the standards of that care to the serious detriment of the sick and the needy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized not to enact legislation that has been proposed the effect of which will be to bring the practice of medicine in this country under Federal direction and control; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Maryland in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the secretary of state of Maryland, under the great seal of this State, to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from this State.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE BALTIMORE ASSOCIATION OF ACCIDENT AND HEALTH UNDERWRITERS AT THEIR MONTHLY MEETING, DECEMBER 13, 1949

Whereas under the American voluntary enterprise system there has been developed the highest standards of health and medical care of any world nation; and

Whereas medical and hospital facilities have been made available to the people of the United States on a budget basis through voluntary income replacement, medical-care, surgical-care, and hospital-care insurance; and

Whereas there is nothing which Government can do for the American family in the realm of insurance protection which voluntary commercial carriers cannot do better and at less cost; and

Whereas compulsory disability income, medical-care and hospital-care insurance, oftentimes grouped together under the term "compulsory health insurance," would destroy the existing plans of voluntary commercial insurance carriers, which plans render the best service for the least cost: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Baltimore Association of Accident and Health Underwriters does hereby go on record in opposition to any form of compulsory disability benefits, medical-care and hospital-care programs or any allied system of political medicine or political health care designed for Federal bureaucratic control.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative in Congress, and that such individuals be and are hereby respectively requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

T. KENNETH MERSEREAU, *President.*
F. C. CHANEY II, *Secretary.*

Dated this 15th day of December 1949.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2989. A bill to provide an accelerated program for surveying and mapping of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. TYDINGS. At the request of the Department of Defense, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

S 2990. A bill for the relief of Amy Louisa Shier; and

S 2991. A bill for the relief of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Co; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2992. A bill exempting admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2993 A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, to restore to certain persons who were in a furlough status with respect to carriers on August 29, 1935, their eligibility for annuities under such act, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 2994. A bill for the relief of Jacob F. Hutt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2995. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey for the construction of a breakwater for Hull, Mass, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2996. A bill to authorize loans to make available in any area or region credit formerly made available in such area or region by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

S. 2997. A bill to authorize an annual appropriation to aid the Arctic Institute of North America in its scientific research activities in North American Arctic areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. McCARTHY introduced Senate bill 2998, to remedy the existing waste in Government purchases of surplus food commodities; to provide adequate diets for those who are in need; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 2999. A bill to amend the act to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special statistical studies upon payment of the cost thereof, and for other purposes, ap-

proved May 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 292, 15 U. S. C. 189a, 192, 192a), as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN SURPLUS FOODS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill entitled "A bill to remedy existing waste in Government purchases of surplus food commodities." Very simply stated, Mr. President, this bill embodies a plan for the disposal of all foods which are in surplus supply under the farm price-support program, having in mind especially, of course, surplus potatoes, surplus butter, surplus eggs, and the other edible surplus products.

The bill provides that instead of permitting those products to go to waste, they shall be made available to families in the lower-income groups, the amount to be made available to each family to depend upon the size of the family. By such means, for example, instead of having eggs spoil in the limestone caves of Kentucky, and subsequently be dumped into the ocean, they will be used by the families who need them.

There being no objection the bill (S. 2998) to remedy the existing waste in Government purchases of surplus food commodities; to provide adequate diets for those who are in need; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 225), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration

Resolved, That the fifty-second annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ending April 1, 1949, be printed as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT"

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 226), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Employment and Unemployment," prepared for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, be printed as a Senate document.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill (S. 2440) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which is on the Senate Calendar. The amendments deal exclusively with the situation of the so-called white Russians or non-Communist Russians who were on the island of Samar and were forced to evacuate from Shanghai.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "THE FEDERAL BUDGET IN BRIEF" (S DOC. NO 131)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "The Federal Budget in Brief," fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, transmitted to the Congress by the President of the United States on January 3, 1950.

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

GOVERNMENT FINANCING AND SPENDING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRD

[Mr BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the National Industrial Conference Board in New York, January 26, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BENTON BEFORE CONNECTICUT EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator BENTON before the Connecticut Editorial Association at Waterbury, Conn , on February 4, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

MINNESOTA WELCOMES THE PRESIDENT—SPEECH BY SENATOR HUMPHREY AT TRUMAN DAY CELEBRATION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

[Mr HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by him at the Truman Day celebration at the Lowry Hotel, St Paul, Minn , on November 3, 1949, which appears in the Appendix]

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN POLITICS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Employees in Politics," published in the Washington Post of February 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

PRICE SURVEY COMPARISON

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a study by the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade, of New York, on the subject of fair trade laws, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COAL SITUATION AND 1952 POLITICS—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA EVENING WORLD-TELEGRAM

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Into 1952 Politics," published in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of February 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELATIONS BETWEEN COAL OPERATORS AND COAL MINERS—LETTER FROM THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the negotiating representatives of the United Mine Workers of America, by John L Lewis, to the President of the United States, regarding conditions in the coal mines, which appears in the Appendix]

TRIBUTE TO HARRY HOPKINS BY WINSTON CHURCHILL

[Mr McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Harry Hopkins by Winston Churchill, published in the New York Times of January 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

PROPOSED FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES LEGISLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK JOURNAL-AMERICAN

[Mr STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding Fair Employment Practices Commission legislation, which appears in the Appendix]

POLICY STATEMENT BY NEW YORK YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB

[Mr IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the sections on labor, health, old-age pensions, education, and housing, from a policy statement by the New York Young Republican Club, which appear in the Appendix]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON THE HISS CASE

[Mr CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD four editorials on the subject of the suggested resignation of the Secretary of State, namely, an editorial entitled "Acheson Should Resign," from the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, January 27, 1950, an editorial entitled "They Must Be Impeached," from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune, January 28, 1950, an editorial entitled "A Dramatic Scene From the 'Inside' at Yalta," from the Wheeling (W Va) Intelligencer, January 27, 1950, and an editorial entitled "How Naive You Can Be" from the Indianapolis (Ind) Star, January 29, 1950, which appear in the Appendix]

WELCOME TO WHITE COUNTY—ARTICLE FROM THE WHITE COUNTY DEMOCRAT

[Mr CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Welcome to White County," published in the White County Democrat, of Monticello, Ind , September 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix]

VALUE OF HIGH DAMS—EDITORIAL FROM THE PARIS (TENN) POST-INTELLIGENCER

[Mr KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Value of High Dams," published in the Paris (Tenn) Post-Intelligencer of January 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

TRIBUTE TO LT. COL. ALBERT L. VREELAND

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an announcement of a presentation of the Army's commendation to Lt. Col. Albert L. Vreeland, of the Organized Reserve Corps, which appears in the Appendix.]

COOPERATIVE NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM OF THE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the great issue of how adequate

medical care can be made available to all Americans is still before us. It has long been my conviction, and that of many other Senators, that the final answer to that question depends not simply on the action of the Federal Government but also—indeed, primarily—on the action of the States, the local communities, and the voluntary and professional groups of the Nation. I am also convinced that the only wise Federal legislation in this field will be that which seeks to stimulate, not to replace, the creative and inventive capacities of the people.

It is, therefore, a particular pleasure to me to note that the Medical Society of New Jersey, which, incidentally, is the oldest State medical society in the United States, issued on January 30 a cooperative national health program recommending 12 specific, positive lines of action in the field of health. By announcing this program I feel that the Medical Society of New Jersey has made a distinct contribution to the consideration of this vexing problem and has shown that it is willing to assume its share of responsibility in devising an over-all solution.

I call attention to the fact that the New Jersey program is based primarily on the extension and improvement of voluntary nonprofit prepayment plans. It is my belief that this rapidly growing and evolving voluntary system is a major national asset in our attack on the health problem, an asset which must be extended and perfected and not frustrated or replaced by a Federal compulsory system.

Without endorsing in detail each of the recommendations of the New Jersey plan, I wish to express my hearty approval of its general approach. It affords concrete evidence of the constructive interest which the medical profession is taking in the economic problems of national health. I commend it to the careful attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, in behalf of my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the New Jersey Medical Society's announcement be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

PROPOSALS OF THE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF NEW JERSEY FOR A NATIONAL HEALTH AND MEDICAL CARE PROGRAM

A 12-point cooperative health program, in which National and State governments may participate without endangering individual initiative, personal freedom, or scientific progress was set forth on January 30, 1950, by the Medical Society of New Jersey.

The program was revealed by Dr. James F. Norton, of Jersey City, president of the State Medical Society and vice president of the American Medical Association. In introducing the Medical Society's proposals, Dr. Norton said:

"We believe this positive cooperative health plan constitutes a standard to which all men of good will can repair. We propose to seek endorsement and active support of this program from every private and public organization in the community.

"We are convinced that people working together can solve their social problems, acting through the many volunteer organizations that already have accomplished so much in making life safer, healthier, and happier for everyone.

"Government—local, State, and National—has a part to play, but it should seek to promote and supplement the efforts of free citizens, not to supplant or supersede those efforts. We have tried in this statement to define the proper role of government and to show how voluntary agencies, including the medical profession, can exert the leadership that the public expects of us."

Text of the society's statement follows:

"The Medical Society of New Jersey favors, and always has favored, a constructive approach to the solution of the national health problem, particularly as it applies to the citizens of New Jersey. The solution of medical and health problems should be undertaken in a realistic, scientific spirit Moreover, since the health of the people transcends all political considerations, it must be considered on a nonpartisan basis.

"In view of the fact that the Congress of the United States and the State legislatures are considering various extensions of the health program, the Medical Society believes that the following statement, presented as a definite and comprehensive program of action, will be helpful at this time.

"The Medical Society of New Jersey believes there are large areas in which government may beneficially cooperate with the citizens, individually or acting through voluntary associations, in furthering a health program—in the interest of all the people, and without jeopardy to individual liberty. It is generally recognized that voluntary cooperative effort should have priority at all times. Government should seek to promote and supplement the efforts of free citizens—not to supplant or supersede voluntary action—whenever voluntary cooperative effort can meet the need

"Any constructive approach to solution of the health problem must take into account the several classifications of those who require medical care, namely:

"1. Those not employed, but able to sustain the full cost of providing for hospital and medical care.

"2. Those who are employed.

"3. The medically indigent, whose income does not suffice to meet the costs of catastrophic illnesses

"4. The totally indigent, who are on public assistance rolls.

"5. The chronically ill.

"Any adequate program to meet health needs should include medical and hospital care. Insofar as possible, such care should be so inclusive that everyone may budget in advance against the financial burden of sudden illness. In addition, the program should assure every community of basic health protection through well-organized professional public-health departments.

"No matter what program is devised, it should be experimental, flexible, and evolutionary in character. It should be sufficiently concrete as to be readily understood and practically adaptable everywhere.

"The Medical Society of New Jersey, therefore, offers the following proposals for a cooperative health program, in which National and State Governments may participate, without endangering individual initiative, personal freedom, or scientific progress. The sequence in which this program is set forth does not necessarily indicate the relative importance of its parts.

"1. Voluntary nonprofit organizations should be used as the best means of budgeting hospital and medical service for the individual and his family.

"(a) The Blue Cross movement, providing for hospital care on a nonprofit, minimum cost basis, is recognized as the outstanding development in this direction. First established in New Jersey less than 20 years ago, Blue Cross has extended to nearly every part of the United States. There are now 96 Blue Cross organizations with a combined enrollment of more than 35,000,000 people. In New Jersey, approximately one-third of the population now enjoys this protection.

"(b) the Blue Shield movement, launched within the past decade, has made possible the prepayment of medical care on a budget basis, which in some areas means that the doctor's bill for eligible care is covered in full for 80 percent of subscribers and their dependents, of whom there are now more than 12,000,000 persons enrolled throughout the United States. Blue Shield in New Jersey has enrolled 350,000 people in only 7 years.

"2. For persons not employed, but able to meet the cost of enrollment in such voluntary nonprofit organizations, we propose that the premiums be made eligible for deduction for income-tax purposes, regardless of the financial status of the subscriber or the amount of the premium paid.

"Such deduction is equitable, inasmuch as employers who pay or contribute to the enrollment cost for their employees are already permitted to deduct these costs for income-tax purposes, in cases where the latter enters into the computation of Federal-income tax.

"3 For employed groups, it is encouraging to note the growing practice of the employer contributing toward the cost of health and welfare programs for his employees and dependents. As mentioned, such payments are usually tax deductible as part of the cost of production, and are being increasingly recognized as a legitimate part of that cost.

"4. As an immediate encouragement toward employer contribution toward the enrollment cost of hospital and medical protection, Government, at every level from municipal to national, should promote the program of such protection for its own employees, by assuming either a part or all of the cost of enrollment in voluntary prepayment plans.

"5. As rapidly as possible, consistent with actuarial experience and sound administration, the services eligible under such voluntary nonprofit organizations should be extended to cover all nonchronic ailments on an inclusive basis. An encouraging step in this direction is the decision of the Blue Shield plan in New Jersey to provide complete coverage (within the $5,000 annual income limitation) for maternity services, including delivery and pre- and post-partum care, in the hospital, the home, or the physician's office.

"6. After sufficient enrollment is attained, we recommend that consideration be given the practicability of providing medical-care protection on an inclusive basis to subscribers in voluntary, nonprofit plans, regardless of the financial status of the subscriber, and with no salary limitation for over-all inclusive service.

"7. We propose that immediate study be given the possibility of providing voluntary, nonprofit protection for those who are medically indigent though not on public assistance rolls, through the use of State and local funds for the purchase of such protection. As a rule of thumb to determine medical indigency, the criterion might be the question whether one's taxable income is such as to exempt him from payment of Federal income taxes.

"8. For the medical and hospital care of persons on public-assistance rolls, we recommend the providing of service through State-county-municipal funds, with such Federal aid as may be found necessary or may be provided from time to time, perhaps utilizing on a cost basis the voluntary nonprofit organizations for the actual provision of the required services.

"9. There is no actuarially sound basis yet established for treating the chronically ill as an insured group. We suggest, therefore, that study be given to providing care for needy

persons suffering from chronic illness, on a cost basis at State level, again with the possibility of utilizing the facilities of voluntary nonprofit organizations.

"10. The need for better local public health service in most areas of the United States has long been recognized, but progress in providing it has been discouragingly slow. We recommend that every State government—particularly our own in New Jersey—adopt such legislation as may be needed to permit consolidation of local health jurisdictions into districts having sufficient size and resources to support at least a minimum staff and facilities for complete modern basic public health protection.

"11. There are numerous areas in certain States where the private practice of medicine is economically or professionally impractical, because the areas will not sustain a sufficient number of capable physicians on a fee-for-service basis, or because hospital facilities are inadequate or lacking. Progress is being made under the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act toward meeting the deficit of hospital accommodations We suggest exploring the possibility of the United States Public Health Service providing competent physicians to such areas when requested by State or local agencies

"12 Such a cooperative health program as is here envisaged may require a considerable increase in the number of physicians, health officers, nurses, and other medical personnel Ideally, every qualified person desiring to enter the field of medicine and public health should be able to do so. We support a program of Government subsidy, where needed, to assist qualified individuals in obtaining professional training and to expand professional training facilities where it is found possible to expand existing schools or to establish new ones. In this connection we renew our plea for early action looking toward establishment of a medical school in New Jersey. We believe that any governmental subsidy that may be provided for these purposes should be granted unconditionally to approved institutions

"The Medical Society of New Jersey submits that through such voluntary cooperative action, the problem of attaining an adequate national health program can and will be solved. This suggested program is not intended as a nebulous proposal for the indefinite future, but might well be inaugurated within the present year"

INJUSTICE IN TRIAL AND IMPRISONMENT OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, just 1 year ago today, freedom-loving people of the world were shocked by revelations of the trial in Hungary at that time of the honored and beloved Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of that country. As the sequel to that trial on trumped-up charges, Cardinal Mindszenty was sentenced to life imprisonment. In the intervening year, according to reliable reports, he has suffered untold indignities, humiliations, and mental torture.

Every well-informed American, if questioned on the subject, would declare his or her abhorrence of communism. Nevertheless there is not the deep-seated detestation of Communist aims and practices that such aims and practices deserve. Why? Simply because, sheltered as Americans are, so far from any real effects of war or attack of any kind, and blessed by divine providence as we have been more than have other peoples of the world, with material benefits and conveniences, our people simply find it impossible to envisage what it would mean to be subject to Communist domination.

Lest we ignore, by reason of our dangerous oversupply of material benefits, the very real danger to the personal freedoms and even the lives of every individual American inherent in communism, I think it appropriate to recall that just 1 year ago today the whole world was aroused over this evidence of Communist savagery and terrorism.

The Cardinal Mindszenty trial was an absolute travesty of justice, as has been clearly shown by the record. The charges, as a high representative of the Department of State declared at the time, were "patently false." The special tribunal which had been set up for the trial was composed entirely of judges whose hopes for advancement rested solely upon their subservience to the Communist regime. Furthermore, the sentence of life imprisonment which quickly followed had been determined, the record again has shown, at a meeting of influential Communist leaders before the trial began. The official publication from the Communist regime, which has since come into my possession, printed before the trial began, clearly indicates that the fate of the cardinal was sealed in advance of the mock trial.

The treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty, before the alleged trial and subsequently, was denounced by Protestant clergy and other leaders of the various religious groups working in Europe. As was the case in the arrest of other religious leaders of different faiths throughout Communist-dominated countries, it was then asserted, and the record has proven, that all these acts were consistent with the policy of the government in question to dominate and control not only religious but every phase of living among their citizens.

The world is prone to forget even the rankest injustices when they do not touch immediately home. The indignation and disgust which our own people here in America felt and gave voice to at that time have subsided. Yet the Communist hordes which admittedly have as their final objective the extermination of religion and the imposition of such indignities upon the people of our own country are rolling ever onward. If stopped in Europe, they redouble their efforts and their achievements in Asia.

Unless our people can keep in mind symbolic events such as the arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty, communism never will be stopped, because the deep-seated determination to go all out to halt its spread will not be found in the hearts of our countrymen.

America may be too prosperous for its own good at the present time. As long as our citizens can overlook the wrongs being suffered by other peoples in other parts of the world, so long will we be in danger of facing ultimately the same indignities and injustices ourselves.

Cardinal Mindszenty in prison is as much a challenge to the security and the freedoms of freemen everywhere as was Cardinal Mindszenty on trial. The people of America would do well to remember and to resolve anew that whatever it takes, America will willingly do and give, to stop and finally to destroy the dread fungus which has fastened upon the ideological life of the world.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND Mr. President, Senate bill 75 authorizes the construction of a multi-purpose project known as the Bridge Canyon project, or the central Arizona project, which includes a dam and other works on the Colorado River in northwestern Arizona and central Arizona, and a dam and works in New Mexico. The primary purposes of the proposed legislation are to provide urgently needed supplemental irrigation water for more than 725,000 acres in Arizona and New Mexico, and to furnish an installed capacity of approximately 770,100 kilowatts of hydroelectric power needed for domestic, commercial, and pumping purposes, thereby reducing a present power shortage in that area.

Mr KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to ask the Senator if the 770,100 kilowatts of hydroelectric power to which he has referred is prime power.

Mr. McFARLAND. I presume the Senator means firm power. It is not firm power to the extent to which the Senator is referring It would be firmed by other dams

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thought that point should be cleared up.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, this project was approved by the Department of the Interior, and has been exhaustively studied by the committee during 15 days of testimony in the Eightieth Congress on a predecessor bill and joint resolution (S. 1175 and S. J. Res. 145), and 20 days of additional testimony in the present Congress, as well as exhaustive hearings in the House of Representatives on the same subject. In the Senate committee hearings alone, more than 100 witnesses were heard; and the printed record comprises several thousand pages of testimony, tables, charts, and diagrams. After careful consideration, the project was recommended by the committee by a vote of 9 to 3. These hearings convinced the committee not only that the project proposed to be authorized represents one of the most important reclamation programs in the entire United States, but that the economy of much of the State of Arizona is largely dependent upon its completion. Thousands of farmers live on the 725,000 acres in Arizona, practically all of which would receive irrigation water from the project. Additional thousands of families, merchants, suppliers, and workers on these

farms are directly dependent for their very existence on the continued production of these areas.

Senate bill 75 authorizes the construction of a dam and incidental works, including a generating plant, at a dam site known as Bridge Canyon, which is just above Hoover Dam and Lake Mead on the Colorado River; also a related system of conduits and canals for the transportation of water to the project area. It includes a tunnel and main canal from the reservoir above the dam at Bridge Canyon to the Salt River above Granite Reef Dam; a canal from the Salt River to the Gila River above the town of Florence, Ariz.; and canals and laterals to supply the water to the lower Gila area; a dam at what is known as the Hooker site in New Mexico; and such other dams, canals, and other works as may be necessary for the transportation of water and the effectuation of exchanges of water between the users in the lower regions of the Salt and Gila Rivers and the users on the higher elevations of such rivers which cannot be reached by the gravity flow of the Colorado River. These exchanges would permit the supply of Colorado River water to lower lands now receiving water from the Salt and Gila Rivers and their respective tributaries, thereby releasing the demands upon such latter waters in the lower areas, and making the released water available for use on the higher lands. An increased water supply would thereby be made possible for most of the lands now being irrigated in central Arizona and the lands irrigated from the Gila River in New Mexico.

The bill also provides for the construction of complete hydroelectric plants, transmission lines, and incidental works suitable for the fullest economic development and delivery of electric energy for use in the operation of the project and for sale in accordance with Federal reclamation law.

The construction of the tunnel and that portion of the main canal from the reservoir above the dam at Bridge Canyon to a point of junction with an aqueduct provided for in the bill is specifically deferred until Congress expressly determines that such construction is justified by economic conditions. The bill authorizes the construction of an aqueduct for the transportation of water from Lake Havasu, above Parker Dam, to the main canal, and incidental pumping plants required to raise the water from the lake to flow by gravity through the aqueduct. The pumping plants and the aqueduct would constitute an adequate interim means for the diversion of water, and would be appropriate supplemental and stand-by works after construction of the tunnel.

The objectives of Senate bill 75 are best understood if considered against the background of the long and toilsome battle Arizonians have waged to reclaim desert land and to convert it through the magic of irrigation to productive abundance. To preserve and maintain the rewards of this monumental struggle, we are now in mortal necessity of a supply of water wherewith to supplement such inadequate stores as nature and terrain have made available, which stores are depleted to an extremely critical point.

THE NEED OF WATER FOR CENTRAL ARIZONA

We in Arizona have a high appreciation of the value of water and its proper and conservative use. Probably no State in the Union has produced more with the amount of water available than has Arizona. There are approximately 725,000 acres of irrigated land in central Arizona, practically all of which would receive supplemental water from this project. In addition, Arizona has irrigated from the Colorado River approximately 60,000 acres of the original Yuma project lands, and certain other small areas which would not be benefited by this bill.

As pointed out in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation, the central Arizona project is "essentially a 'rescue' project designed to eliminate the threat of a serious disruption of the area's economy."

The existing agricultural development in Arizona has made it a rich agricultural empire, founded upon irrigation, playing a considerable part in the economy of the Southwest. The remains of irrigation facilities found by early settlers are evidence of an extensive prehistoric agricultural development, which was abandoned because of water shortage. Our present irrigation work started in Arizona as far back as the 1860's.

I should like to state at this time that when I served on the superior court bench in Arizona I tried water cases which involved, directly, or indirectly, practically all the water rights of the State. I heard witnesses tell the story of the pioneers coming to Arizona. They did not come equipped with modern machinery such as is available today, but employed horsepower; and with little more than their bare hands they pioneered the irrigation of the fertile valleys which are now cultivated. It is the results of the work and toil of those pioneers of the State which we are trying to save through the pending legislation.

In general, we think of our principal irrigation systems as falling within two areas traversed by the Gila and Salt Rivers and their respective tributaries.

Our present sources of water supply for central Arizona consists of gravity water from the Salt and Gila Rivers and their tributaries, and water pumped from underground. The first major dam for the storage of water to be built in Arizona was the Roosevelt Dam, on the Salt River, which dam has a storage capacity of approximately 1,637,000 acre-feet of water. Its construction was begun in 1903 and was completed about 1910 or early in 1911. Since that time, there have been constructed three other storage dams on the Salt River and two storage dams on the Verde River, a tributary of the Salt River. The resultant total capacity of all reservoirs for the Salt River is somewhat in excess of 2,000,000 acre-feet of water. Within the borders of the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association project, there are 242,000 acres of irrigated lands. Adjoining this project there are several smaller ones. Some of these lands are irrigated entirely by gravity water, some by pumped water, and some both by gravity and pumped water. The total irrigated area of these smaller projects, some of which are below the confluence of the Salt and Gila Rivers, is about 200,000 acres.

On the Gila River, we have the San Carlos project which comprises about 100,000 acres, half of which are Pima Indian Reservation lands. It is irrigated in part by pumped water and in part by water impounded at the Coolidge Dam, which has a storage capacity of 1,200,000 acre-feet of water. There are also in Pinal County, adjoining the San Carlos project more than 100,000 acres of land irrigated entirely by means of pumped water.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. For the benefit of Senators who are listening to the fine argument being made by the Senator from Arizona, I think it would be proper to identify the Pima Indians who will be beneficiaries of a part of the waters impounded by the dam of the San Carlos project. The people residing in that particular area had been irrigating the lands locally for years before the white man came, and they are now making their living from the soil by means of irrigation. They are good citizens.

We remember the heroism of our Marines in the taking of a hill at Iwo Jima. A very fine photograph of the Marines in action on that occasion raising the American flag has been made the basis of a monument to them. One of the heroes of Iwo Jima was a Pima Indian from Arizona. The Pimas are the people who are to benefit by this project.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator for his remarks, and for his helpfulness in this regard. The Pima Indians have always been a friendly people. They have always tried to assist the white man in every possible way, particularly in the early days of the settlement of my State. They are deserving of every possible consideration. Their need of water today cannot be overemphasized.

Further upstream on the Gila River, there is the Upper Gila project, in Graham and Greenlee Counties, comprising some 40,000 acres, which are dependent entirely upon the normal flow of the river and upon pumped water.

It is essential to bear in mind that although the capacity for the storage of water is commensurate to the need thereof, the supply of water required for these areas is woefully inadequate.

The need for additional water for this area arises from an overdevelopment, which has resulted from two causes:

First. In the early days of the Bureau of Reclamation, it was estimated that the annual per-acre requirement at the farms was 3 acre-feet, and the water supply was estimated accordingly. This

was based upon general farming practices at that time. The chief crops were grain and alfalfa. Grain requires a relatively small amount of water. But with the development of irrigation, it was found to be more profitable, because of highly fertile soils and the long growing seasons permitted by favorable climatic conditions, to grow specialized crops out of season to most of the Nation, and multiple crops per year. This provides fresh foods to the Nation at times they are otherwise not available. However, it requires a high duty of water, and it is now found that 4 acre-feet of water per acre at the farm is required to maintain such production.

Second. Pumping first started principally because some of the lands were waterlogged; but with the increased efficiency of pumping and lower power costs, pumping increased because it was very profitable for irrigation. The net result is that pumping has been overdeveloped, and the underground water supply is being exhausted. This overpumping from the basins underlying the central Arizona project area was estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation to be 468,400 acre-feet a year from the period 1940 to 1944, inclusive.

Even with the water developed from overpumping, much of the land in some seasons, has been out of cultivation. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that between 1940 and 1944 an average of 115,790 acres was out of cultivation due to water shortage. The number of acres irrigated each year depends upon the water supply. The farmer must make this determination from the amount of water in storage in the reservoirs at the beginning of the season, and, where supplemental pumped water is used, the amount he can reasonably expect to pump during the season. In some years this condition was even worse in some of the areas than it was in 1944 to 1946. For instance, according to the testimony of K. K Henness, a farmer and county agricultural agent, of Casa Grande, Ariz., during the year 1947 there was only one-fourth enough water for the irrigation of land in the San Carlos project, and up to June of that year, at the time of the hearings on Senate bill 1175, only eighty-five one-hundredths of an acre-foot of water had been allotted to the farmers. This meant that the farmers could not adequately count on irrigating more than 25 percent of their land, which was about the percentage farmed in that area in 1947.

While the Salt River Valley water-users' project, which has the more adequate water supply, was not in as bad a condition, it likewise was very short of water. Mr. Victor I. Corbell testified in behalf of the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association in the 1947 hearings:

The history of the project has been that the amount of water available in any given year may range from a full supply down to 2 acre-feet per acre per annum, such as has been the case in the year 1947. In only 2 years in the past 25 years has a full supply been available. Based on rainfall records, tree-ring records, and other records and data available, it can be said that the rainfall has been normal the last 25 years, therefore, the unescapable conclusion is that there is more land within the project than that for which there is an adequate supply of water.

The need for the central Arizona project is shown by paragraph 9, page 2, of the Report of the Bureau of Reclamation, which reads as follows:

In spite of the developments now available, there is an acute water shortage in the project area. The 1940–44 average annual surface water supply was 1,676,600 acre-feet. This figure includes some reuse of surface water. To supplement the surface water supply an average of 1,163,000 acre-feet annually was pumped from the ground-water basin during the same period This pumpage is estimated to be about 468,000 acre-feet in excess of the safe annual yield of the underlying ground-water basins Oviously continued pumping at the present rate will lower the water table to such a point that many of the wells will become dry. The wells on the edge of the water basin could not be rehabilitated by deepening because the perimeter of the water-bearing strata will be constricted as this process continues.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the surface-water supply, which is estimated by the Bureau at 1,676,600 acre-feet per annum, includes reuse water, and, according to the report, this amount is comparable to the average over longer periods of time. For example, generally all the water in the river is diverted at Granite Reef for irrigation of Salt River Valley Water Users' Association lands. There is a return flow to the river, all of which is rediverted for the Buckeye project lower down the river, and the water which returns to the river from irrigation in the Buckeye project is again rediverted for the Arlington project, and the return flow from the Arlington project is rediverted at Gillespie Dam for irrigation below that dam.

The Bureau of Reclamation in its report on the central Arizona project, page 4, estimates that in order to obtain the needed water for the project it will be necessary to divert 1,200,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water, which will deplete the main stream flow 1,077,000 acre-feet.

The balance will be returned to the river. This, together with a small development from other dams, would make up the supplemental water supply for the central Arizona project. This new water made available for diversion at the headgates of the irrigation districts each year would be sufficient to, first, replace the overdraft on the ground-water basins; second, permit the drainage of excess salts out of the areas and maintain a salt balance; third, provide supplemental water supply for practically all the 725,000 acres, which do not have an adequate supply; and fourth, increase the water supply for the city of Tucson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the tables and reports of the Bureau of Reclamation with reference to the present supply and the supply which is needed.

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

Table 5, found on page R-31 of the Bureau of Reclamation Report, shows the new surface water needed at the district head gates to be 1,082,000 acre-feet, which needs are set forth in the following table:

Water needed—Ultimate development

	Acre-feet a year
New surface water at district head gates	1,082,000
Pumpage in excess of safe annual yield	468,000
Increase in safe annual yield of ground water due to Colorado River water diverted to area	400,000
Net reduction in pumping	68,000
Outflow to maintain salt balance	376,000
Net reduction in pumping available for irrigation	444,000
Reduction in water at farm head gate, assuming a 15-percent loss for pumped water	377,000
Surface diversions required to replace 377,000 acre-feet a year, assuming losses of 30 percent for diverted water	539,000
Supplemental water required for lands now irrigated	113,000
Water required for municipal supply	12,000
Subtotal	664,000
Water available for lands formerly irrigated but now idle for lack of water	418,000

The new surface water to be developed to meet these needs is set forth in table 4, p. R-28, of the Bureau of Reclamation Report, as follows:

New surface water developed by Central Arizona project—Ultimate development

	Acre-feet a year
New water available:	
Diverted from Colorado River	1,200,000
Developed by Horseshoe Dam enlargement	42,000
Developed by Buttes Reservoir	64,000
Developed by upper Gila River developments	19,000
Channel losses conserved by Charleston Reservoir	7,000
Gross new surface water	1,332,000
Losses Granite Reef aqueduct	200,000
Losses Salt-Gila aqueduct	50,000
Total aqueduct losses	250,000
New surface water at district head gates	1,082,000

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the need for this additional water for irrigation in Arizona cannot be overemphasized; and the only remaining source is the main stream of the Colorado River; all other sources have been exhausted. As has been shown by the Bureau of Reclamation tables, Arizona is overpumping her present underground water supply to the extent that if she does not get relief, it will mean disaster. The underground water supply is dropping lower each year, and with the use and reuse of this water its salinity has become greater—to the extent that in a matter of time much of it will not be usable.

I should like to point out the fact that this is not a simple proposition of taking a part of the land out of cultivation.

That cannot be done; and without this supplemental water, the farmers would continue to farm their lands with an inadequate water supply. The water they would have available would be of high salt content, and under these conditions they could not produce anywhere near the maximum amount of crops their land is capable of producing. So, practically all the farmers of the State would in time become bankrupt and those dependent upon them would be unable to pay their portion of the bonded indebtedness for the schools and other improvements built upon the present economy.

It would mean that thousands of people would lose their homes, and this would affect the bankers and businessmen and break down the whole economy of the State of Arizona. But that is not all. It would mean that all these people, farmers and businessmen, would lose their buying power. They could not continue to purchase manufactured articles and supplies from other sections of the United States; and perhaps most significant of all, it would mean that the present sum of bank dollars paid annually in income taxes to the United States Government would dwindle to practically nothing. The mines and other industries of the State would be saddled with all the bonded indebtedness of the State and its subdivisions and the added burden of all the costs of State government including the support of the schools. Thus, the whole economy of Arizona would be seriously affected. It has been estimated that a quarter of a million people would actually have to leave the State.

There can be no question that Arizona needs this water to maintain her economy. Witnesses representing California interests acknowledge the existence of Arizona's needs, but question the extent of water necessary to meet such needs.

In addition to the need for water, there is likewise a need for hydroelectric power. There is unanimity as to the need for additional electric energy in this area. The situation is well summarized by excerpts taken from the Report of the Regional Director of the Third Region of the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Report of the Bureau of Reclamation, respectively.

Mr President, I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts from the report be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

There is an urgent and measurable need for additional electrical energy in Arizona, southern California, southern Utah, and southern Nevada. Studies by the Federal Power Commission, power distributing agencies, and the Bureau of Reclamation indicate that the present power load in this area, already taxing existing facilities, will double in the next 10 or 15 years. The major potential sources of electrical energy to serve these requirements are hydroelectric developments on the Colorado River and steam or Diesel developments. Steam and Diesel generating power plants consume natural gas, oil, or coal. Diminishing natural gas and oil supplies in southern California have already caused major concern. There are no sources of inexpensive coal available to the power-market area. These natural resources should be conserved by utilizing hydropower whenever practicable (p. 115, H. Doc. No. 136).

An examination of the marketing possibilities in the lower basin power-market area for energy produced by the potential power developments of the central Arizona project indicates that an ample market would exist for the output of these plants when they are completed. As previously noted, the rapidly expanding economy of the area has created a tremendous demand for electric energy. This condition, combined with the drought of recent years and the lag in the installation of new generating facilities during the war, has caused a power shortage in the area. This shortage is particularly acute in Arizona and seems likely to continue for some time. Generating equipment planned for installation in the near future will eliminate most of the deficiency, but large-scale additions to the system will be needed to continue meeting the rapidly growing load.

The two most important factors causing the rapid increase in total energy requirements have been industrial expansion and population increase. During the war the growth in these phases of the economic life was very rapid. In the postwar period the growth has continued, with the result that total energy requirements in the area are greater than during the last year of the war. The States of Nevada, California, and Arizona are among the States experiencing the greatest percentage increase in population during recent years. Both Arizona and California have recorded gains exceeding 25 percent. Postwar building construction and industrial expansion in the urban areas of southern California has been unprecedented in the market area. The metropolitan area of Los Angeles is now rated as the second largest manufacturing center in the Nation.

TABLE E-8.—*Summary of power features*

Power plants	Installed capacity in kilowatts	Gross average power head in feet	Annual firm energy at plant in million kilowatt hours		
			Initial conditions	Average during first 40 years of operation	Ultimate conditions
Bridge Canyon	750,000	612	4,675	4,395	1,114
Horseshoe	10,000	141	40	40	40
McDowell	4,100	54	23	21	19
Buttes	6,000	144	35	35	35
Total	770,100	.....	4,773	4,491	4,208
Energy replacement at Stewart Mountain	.....	.....	25	28	31
Total	.....	.....	1,748	4,463	4,177
Energy requirements Havasu and McDowell pumping plants	.....	.....	1,154	1,393	1,633
Firm commercial energy	.....	.....	3,594	3,070	2,544

In addition to the growth in population and industry, several other fields of activity have contributed to the increased demand for electric energy. Among these are agricultural expansion and new industrial uses. Increased irrigation pumping, added farm use, and the use of electrometallurgical processes in the mineral industry have all caused an increase in the total requirements. Residential use of electricity has greatly increased in recent years not only because of the increased population but also because of the trend of increased per capita use (pp. 180-181, H. Doc. No. 136).

The demand for electric energy in Arizona, southern California, and southern Nevada is increasing at an estimated rate of 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. The area is looking to the Colorado River for energy to meet that increasing demand, and to forestall the requirements for burning oil and natural gas reserves in meeting those demands (p. 191, H. Doc. No. 136).

Mr. McFARLAND. Witnesses testifying as to Arizona's need for additional electric energy have stated that there will be a demand in the State for all the electricity generated by the project by the time it is completed, and they introduced as evidence an application of the Arizona Power Authority for the acquisition of all such electricity.

FEASIBILITY OF THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

It is estimated in the Bureau of Reclamation's report on this project, on factors prevalent July 1, 1947, that the project here recommended would cost $708,780,000, which cost is broken down in the table of items found on page 15 of the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Construction costs

Coconino Dam and Reservoir	$7,487,000
Bridge Canyon Dam and Reservoir	191,939,000
Bridge Canyon power plant	73,419,000
Havasu pumping plants	25,973,000
Granite Reef aqueduct	131,716,000
McDowell pumping plant and canal	3,346,000
McDowell Dam and Reservoir	16,326,000
McDowell power plant	1,012,000
Horseshoe Dam (enlargement) and Reservoir	7,078,000
Horseshoe power plant	2,628,000
Salt-Gila aqueduct	34,585,000
Buttes Dam and Reservoir	29,037,000
Buttes power plant	1,159,000
Charleston Dam and Reservoir	9,270,000
Tucson aqueduct	6,401,000
Safford Valley improvements	4,000,000
Hooker Dam and Reservoir	15,434,000
Irrigation distribution system	54,036,000
Drainage system for salinity control	9,973,000
Power transmission system	83,771,000
Total	703,780,000

Mr. McFARLAND. The report of the Bureau of Reclamation definitely shows that the central Arizona project is both engineeringly and financially feasible under the provisions of Senate bill 75, and that it could be reasonably expected to repay the reimbursable portions of the construction costs well within the useful life of the project. It has been found that $4.75 per acre-foot, which local interests have indicated they are willing and able to pay, would more than pay the operation and maintenance costs and replacement costs allocated to irrigation and part of the construction cost. It has also been found that a charge of 15 cents per thousand gallons for municipal water would fully repay all costs allocated to that purpose and would be equally advantageous to the municipal water users. The power rate necessary to accomplish a repayment of all reimbursable costs assigned to be repaid from power revenues would be extremely reasonable. Such low-cost power would represent a distinct advantage to power users in that area—pages 7 and 8, report.

The project represents a sound investment in that the tangible benefits of the project would exceed the total cost in the ratio of 1.63 to 1.

Furthermore, there would be innumerable intangible benefits accruing to the State of Arizona and to the Nation as a whole as a result of the central Arizona project—pages R-73 to 77, report.

AVAILABILITY OF WATER FOR THE PROJECT

When speaking of the availability of water, one must remember that there is the separate item of the physical quantities which may be available, and the distinct but related item of legal entitlement to the use of water.

I say with positive assurance that there is adequate water in the Colorado River fully to supply the central Arizona project and that Arizona is clearly entitled, as a matter of right and justice, to the exclusive use of that water. Moreover, such use will not interfere with or burden any other right of use existing in law.

The long-term—1897-1943—average annual flow of the Colorado River under virgin conditions at Lee Ferry was 16,270,000 acre-feet; at the international boundary it was 17,720,000 acre-feet.

The feasibility of any project naturally depends on the availability of water for the project. In this case, the question of availability of water involves mixed considerations of law and fact The computation of the Bureau of Reclamation—page 151, House document No. 136—plainly shows the presence in the river of a sufficient quantity of water to supply the central Arizona project.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this computation be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEAHY in the chair). Is there objection?

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

	Acre-feet a year
Division between upper and lower basins and Mexico.	
Virgin flow of Colorado River at international boundary	17,720,000
Apportioned to the upper basin by art III (a) of Colorado River compact	7,500,000
Apportioned to lower basin by art III (a) and (b) of Colorado River compact	8,500,000
Allocated to Mexico by terms of Mexican treaty	1,500,000
Subtotal	17,500,000
Total surplus to be allocated under the terms of art III (f) of Colorado River compact	220,000
Water available to Arizona:	
Apportioned to lower basin under art III (a) and (b)	8,500,000
Apportioned water for California under Limitations Act	4,400,000
Nevada contract	300,000
Lower basin uses by New Mexico and Utah	130,000
Subtotal	4,830,000
Remainder	3,670,000
Water available to Arizona—Con.	
To be allocated to Arizona under art. III (f) of the compact	55,000
Available to Arizona	3,725,000
Disposition of water available to Arizona (present irrigation depletions):	
Little Colorado River Basin	59,000
Virgin River and Kanab Creek Basins	5,000
Williams River Basin	3,000
Gila River Basin	1,135,000
Colorado River Indian Reservation	15,000
Gila project	34,000
Yuma project	157,000
Subtotal	1,403,000
Losses from reservoirs on or benefiting main-stream developments of Colorado River present and future; estimated total losses 900,000 acre-feet a year, Arizona charged with proportion based on ultimate use of main-stream Colorado River water	313,000
Increased depletion by potential projects:	
Snowflake project	10,000
Hurricane project	12,000
Hassayampa project	20,000
Colorado River Indian Reservation	285,000
Gila project	566,000
Central Arizona project	1,077,000
Unassigned water	34,000
Subtotal	2,004,000
Total, all uses	3,725,000

Mr McFARLAND. Mr. President, these figures cannot be successfully challenged or disputed. The testimony clearly establishes the fact that this quantity of water is now flowing in the river wasted and unused. Arizona would only be using her just share of the eight to ten million acre-feet now annually flowing and wasting into the ocean.

We now come to the question of Arizona's legal right to use this water. This phase of the case may be much more readily presented and grasped by a review of matters leading to our present situation.

In the year 1922, the States of the geographical area described in the testimony as the Colorado River Basin, were striving among themselves to arrive at an agreement leading to the beneficial use of the waters of the Colorado River for irrigation and the generation of electric power. The delegates from these States proposed the now renowned Colorado River compact. A controversy arose over the inclusion of the waters of the Gila River within the Colorado River system and hence with those to be apportioned by the compact, a move unalterably resisted by the Arizona delegation because the waters of the Gila had long been put to beneficial use by the citizens of our State, and because the waters of the Gila enter the Colorado at a point so southerly as to prevent the enjoyment thereof by any of the basin States other than Arizona.

In fine, Mr. President, the Gila was no part of the Colorado waters which were the proper subject of apportionment. The Arizona delegates were agreeable, however, to the provisions of article III (a) of the compact, which proposed the annual apportionment to the upper basin, and a like apportionment to the lower basin, of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River if the waters of the Gila were reserved for Arizona. As a consequence, and in order to compensate Arizona for the inclusion of the Gila waters in the Colorado River system, the delegates agreed upon article III (b) of the compact, which reads as follows:

(b) In addition to the apportionment in paragraph (a), the lower basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of such waters by 1,000,000 acre-feet per annum.

This quantity of 1,000,000 acre-feet per annum corresponds to the then estimated annual flow of the Gila River at its mouth where it empties into the Colorado

That this 1,000,000 acre-feet of water provided for in article III (b) of the Colorado River compact was intended by the framers of the compact for the use of Arizona to compensate her for the inclusion of the Gila waters in the Colorado River system is established by the testimony of witnesses who testified at the hearings, such as Ralph Meeker, who was engineer adviser for the State of Colorado, and who was present at the compact sessions and of his own personal knowledge is familiar with the background of the compact. At the hearings he quoted from statements made by Frank C Emerson, commissioner for the State of Wyoming, and from a citation by Reuel Leslie Olson showing that this was understood by L. Ward Bannister, special representative for Colorado at the negotiations. A letter to W S. Norviel, from the Honorable Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, who represented the Federal Government and presided at the compact sessions, which was placed in the record of the hearings; statements of Thomas E. Campbell, former Governor of Arizona, W. S. Norviel, Arizona's commissioner at the compact sessions, and C. C. Lewis, another of the Arizona members at such sessions, which were placed in the record during the hearings on S. 1175 and S. 75, disclosed the same understanding. Many other witnesses corroborated this view in their testimony.

When Arizona's delegate signed the compact in November 1922, he did so with the clear understanding and agreement that the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada would enter a tri-State agreement which, among other things, would apportion to Arizona the exclusive beneficial use of all water of the Gila River, the equivalent of the 1,000,000 acre-feet of water apportioned in article III (b) of the compact—see pages 222, 225-226, 228-229, hearings on S. 1175. Thereafter, California would not agree to a just division of the water of the Colorado River which had been apportioned to the lower basin; so the

people of Arizona would not ratify the compact at that time.

The Colorado's uncontrolled flow proved increasingly harmful as well as wasteful of potential benefit. California's anxiety to avoid floods along neighboring California lowlands and to procure water and electric energy for her coastal communities made her especially anxious to harness and utilize the Colorado. Further interstate negotiations having proved unavailing, congressional action for the construction of Boulder Dam was inaugurated. This led to the passage of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat 1057, Public Law 642, 70th Cong.) on December 21, 1928.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to reiterate the long history of this fight, as I think that the act itself is plain in its terms, and that, coupled with the California Self-Limitation Statute, it clearly establishes Arizona's right to the use of this water.

I should like to call attention to the fact that the act by its own terms—section 4 (a)—was to become effective upon either of two conditions. The first of these was ratification of the Colorado River compact within 6 months by all seven of the States affected. The second was ratification of the compact by six of the interested States, including California, and the irrevocable and unconditional enactment by the legislature of the latter State of a statute in conformance with the Boulder Canyon Project Act. I now quote the exact language of section 4 (a) of that act:

shall agree irrevocably and unconditionally with the United States and for the benefit of the States of Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, as an express covenant and in consideration of the passage of this act that the aggregate annual consumptive use (diversions less returns to the river) of water of and from the Colorado River for use in the State of California, including all uses under contracts made under the provisions of this act and all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist, shall not exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet of the waters apportioned to the lower basin States by paragraph (a) of article III of the Colorado River compact, plus not more than one-half of any excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact, such uses always to be subject to the terms of said compact.

California promptly enacted a statute—act 1492, California Statutes, 1929, page 38—sometimes spoken of as the Self-Limitation Act, the pertinent part of which is verbatim the language just quoted from the Boulder Canyon Project Act. In view of the extremely liberal quantity of water specified as a maximum, and in view of her need for flood control, water, and electrical energy, California's willingness to adopt her Self-Limitation Act is quite understandable.

Section 4 (a) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act also unequivocally voiced the permanent intention of the Congress to define and limit California's maximum rights, and California irrevocably and unconditionally agreed to that limitation.

Having limited California to 4,400,000 acre-feet per annum of the 7,500,000 acre-feet apportioned by article III (a) of the Colorado River compact, as I have already shown, and having further limited California to half of any excess or surplus waters unapportioned by that compact, Congress further provided that—

The States of Arizona, California, and Nevada are authorized to enter into an agreement which shall provide (1) that of the 7,500,000 acre-feet annually apportioned to the lower basin by paragraph (a) of article III of the Colorado River compact, there shall be apportioned to the State of Nevada 300,000 acre-feet and to the State of Arizona 2,800,000 acre-feet for exclusive beneficial consumptive use in perpetuity, and (2) that the State of Arizona may annually use one-half of the excess or surplus waters unapportioned by the Colorado River compact, and (3) that the State of Arizona shall have the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of the Gila River and its tributaries within the boundaries of said State, and (4) that the waters of the Gila River and its tributaries, except return flow after the same enters the Colorado River, shall never be subject to any diminution whatever by any allowance of water which may be made by treaty or otherwise to the United States of Mexico.

The foregoing factors plainly define the congressional purpose.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that this provision is an interpretation of the Self-Limitation Act which California enacted before the Boulder Canyon Project Act became effective. It was an interpretation that the specified amount of water was to be left available for the other States; otherwise Congress would not have placed such a provision in the measure which provided for the ratification of a compact for that amount of water.

Congress manifestly intended that of the 7,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water apportioned by article III (a) of the compact, Nevada is to receive 300,000 acre-feet; Arizona not less than 2,800,000 acre-feet; and California not to exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet. It is also clear that Arizona should receive, in addition, all the waters of the Gila River, both because of the previously mentioned insertion in the compact of its article III (b)—which apportions 1,000,000 acre-feet per annum to the lower basin to compensate Arizona for inclusion of the Gila in the Colorado River system—and because of the specific authorization (in sec. 4 (a) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act) of the agreement whereby Arizona is to receive all the water of the Gila and its tributaries within Arizona's boundaries.

From the mere reading of the language of the Boulder Canyon Project Act it is evident that Congress proposed to California the terms of a contract for the explicit benefit of Arizona, Nevada, and the other interested States. The contract thus proposed was as follows: Of the 7,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water apportioned to the lower basin by article III (a) of the compact, California should have not to exceed 4,400,000 and that California could use not more than one-half of any water in excess of or surplus to the water apportioned by the compact, which might be available in the lower basin. California, by adopting its Self-Limitation Act, unequivocally and unconditionally accepted this proposal and thereby completed a binding contract. As California may not have more than 4,400,000 acre-feet of the water apportioned by article III (a) of the compact, the remainder is for Nevada and Arizona; and Congress has in terms indicated its intent that Nevada have 300,000 acre-feet and Arizona not less than 2,800,000 acre-feet. This intent has been executed. The water involved in article III (b) of the compact not only is apportioned water, but is in effect apportioned to Arizona for the reasons shown. The Colorado River water which is available in the lower basin in excess of, or surplus to, that apportioned by articles III (a) and III (b) of the compact is to be equally divided between California and Arizona.

This contract between the State of California and the United States—for the benefit of the States of Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming—just as completely settled California's rights as any compact could do. Congress, by approving in advance a compact between Arizona, California, and Nevada, definitely gave its interpretation of the California Self-Limitation Act, which is the one Arizona now relies upon; and California by adopting the act accepted and agreed to this interpretation.

Arizona, relying on the protection thus afforded her, adopted and ratified the Colorado River compact. A large number of people of Arizona believed that Congress had not required California to limit herself to a small enough quantity of the waters of the Colorado River. However, Arizona had little choice, as the rights of the States were well defined in the Boulder Canyon Project Act. She has entered into a contract with the Secretary of the Interior, which contract calls for delivery of 2,800,000 acre-feet of Colorado River main-stream water per year, plus one-half of the excess or surplus water unapportioned by the compact which may be available in the lower basin, less one twenty-fifth of such surplus water, to be used by Nevada. The contract appears at pages 240–243 of the hearings on S. 1175.

California admits that she is bound by the California Self-Limitation Act and is not entitled to more than 4,400,000 acre-feet of III (a) water and one-half of any excess or surplus water unapportioned by the compact. However, in an effort to procure more so-called surplus waters, thereby in actuality reducing the quantity of apportioned water to which Arizona is rightfully entitled. Certain witnesses representing some California interests have elected to pursue a stratagem based largely upon two patently strained and inequitable constructions of the wording of the Colorado River compact. In a general way, these false constructions may be stated as follows:

(a) The water described in article III (b) of the compact is water unapportioned by the compact.

(b) A definition of "beneficial consumptive use" which would charge Arizona with the total water reaching the Gila watershed rather than with the amount by which she depletes the waters

of the Colorado River at the mouth of the Gila.

I should like to invite attention to the fact that these two strained constructions are particularly beneficial to the State of California, because she has no tributary to the Colorado River. She has no watershed. She furnishes no measurable amount of water to the Colorado River. Therefore, some of the witnesses from California would like to place these strained interpretations upon the interstate compact. California is already getting more than the lion's share of the water.

Neither of these contentions is supported by the intentions of the framers of the compact or by those of the Congress.

As to the contention that the water embraced in article III (b) of the compact is not apportioned, and therefore falls within the class of surplus or unapportioned water, of which California may have half under the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, I think I have pointed out sufficient facts to demonstrate its utter fallacy. Congress, in effect, has indicated its intention as to the division of the waters apportioned by article III (a) of the compact, namely, California, not more than 4,400,000; Nevada, 300,000; Arizona, not less than 2,800,000; total, 7,500,000. As shown, the ultimate purpose of article III (b) was to apportion the waters of the Gila to the lower basin for use by Arizona, and Congress explicitly recognized this apportionment by express language in the Boulder Canyon Project Act. It is therefore clear to anyone who cares to see, that the waters upon which article III (a) of the compact is effective, namely, 7,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water and those upon which article III (b) is operative, that is, in final effect, the 1,000,000 acre-feet of the Gila which was thought to be substantially all thereof, are apportioned water. The excess or surplus waters above such apportioned water are for equal division between California and Arizona.

The record abounds with proof, both within the context of the compact and of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, as well as in collateral circumstances, thoroughly establishing Arizona's position.

There is nothing more indicative of a stubborn intention to gobble up much more than the lion's share of the water than the stand taken by certain witnesses representing some California interests upon the question of evaporation losses. That State contributes nothing to the Colorado, as I have previously pointed out, and she is far and away the greatest beneficiary thereof. Yet they would have California bear none of the loss by evaporation, and would foist that, too, upon her sister States. Arizona favors an equitable distribution of these losses in proportion to the beneficial interests.

The record of the hearings shows that Arizona's position on these three principles is supported by the disinterested witnesses from other States. I call attention to the testimony of such eminent lawyers as Judge Clifford H. Stone, director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board and commissioner for Colorado for the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact Commission; Fred E. Wilson, member of the Colorado River Basin States Committee, representing New Mexico; Jean S. Breitenstein, of the Colorado Water Conservation Board; and Judge J. A. Howell, of Utah, chairman of a special legal committee of the Colorado River Basin States Committee.

Arizona's position is also supported by the Colorado River Basin States Committee, an organization composed of official representatives of the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, and Arizona.

I wish particularly to emphasize the concluding remarks of the Honorable Clifford H. Stone, during the hearings on S. 1175, in which, after minutely refuting the arguments of California, he used the following language:

> Then, in conclusion, the Congress, we believe, will not approve an unconscionable position in interpreting the Colorado River compact for the purpose of proposed legislation. Nor would a court give approval to any interpretation of a solemn agreement among States which would be inequitable. It cannot be assumed that the compacting States intended to apportion water between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River by terms and conditions the interpretation of which would limit one of the States to its existing uses of water when the compact was made, with a comparatively small opportunity for future development. We submit that the States did not do so.

These are the words of Judge Stone, an eminent lawyer from the State of Colorado and an outstanding authority on water law.

It is our contention that these rights are fully established and fully settled by Congress, and that it is the duty of Congress to protect them and not to permit a State, because of her size and power to take the very lifeblood of her neighbor.

Certain witnesses representing some California interests have used these strained constructions in order to set up a claim for this water, and in order to prevent the enactment of this legislation. On the last day of the hearings on S. 1175, they had introduced a resolution calling for litigation upon this subject. It was developed by the testimony of able and recognized lawyers, including witnesses from Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, who came before Congress opposing such resolution, that there does not exist at the present time a justiciable issue; that the only effect of the passage of resolutions such as Senate Joint Resolution 4 and its predecessor, Senate Joint Resolution 145, would be to delay action, until the water could all be put to use in certain areas in southern California so that they could use the additional argument that we cannot take water away from the people who are now using it.

The courts have held that there must be an existing injury of serious magnitude, or an immediately threatened injury of the same type, before there can be a justiciable controversy. Neither California nor Arizona is using the amount of water to which they are respectively entitled. It is therefore clear that there is no present injury. It is equally clear that there is no threatened injury.

There is no project under construction or authorized in any part of the Colorado River Basin which would in any way threaten to reduce or diminish the flow of the river so as to make less water available to California. The only project which has thus far been tangibly put forward is the central Arizona project. But unless and until the project is authorized, it cannot be said that such project constitutes a threat to the State of California.

A threat, not coupled with an actual, or apparent, or probable ability to effectuate such threat is in law no threat at all.

Without the authorization of the central Arizona project, Arizona has absolutely no physical means whatsoever wherewith to divert water to an extent which would in any way impinge upon rights claimed by California. The converse is true in regard to California. Without the passage of this bill authorizing the central Arizona project, there is no Arizona project which would be threatened by California's immediate or future use of the water.

So, the committee in considering both S. 75 and Senate Joint Resolution 4, in authorizing the central Arizona project bill as amended, has found that no justiciable issue exists which would merit the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 4. On the other hand, the committee has taken the position that this project should be authorized. But in fairness to the States of California and Nevada, the committee felt that those States should have an opportunity to present claims to the Supreme Court, and that in deference to the allegations that the United States is a necessary party, consent should be given to the joinder of the latter to the litigation. As a tangible expression of its views, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] was adopted by the committee. This amendment provides that if any State or States within 6 months after the effective date of this act shall begin a suit or suits in the Supreme Court of the United States to determine the right to the use of the water for diversion from the main stream of the Colorado River for the central Arizona project, consent is given to the joinder of the United States of America as a party to such action or actions.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose, without jeopardizing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and

that proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have previously shown that the report of the Bureau of Reclamation indicates that this project is a rescue project for the State of Arizona, and that if it is not approved and if the bill does not become law, approximately 725,000 acres of land will suffer a water shortage to the extent that there will be disaster in the State I represent here. I have shown that this project, according to the reports and the thorough investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation, is feasible and that it will pay out.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that there had been raised by certain witnesses representing interests in California a strained construction of the law which is not borne out by the disinterested lawyers and witnesses who testified with reference to this project, and who maintained that no justiciable issue existed. Yet on the last day of the hearings on Senate bill 1175 there was introduced by the Senators from California and Nevada Senate Joint Resolution 145, the only effect of which would be to delay the consideration of the project while some of the interests in California proceeded to try to put the water to use in that State. No resolution of the type referred to was proposed before the pending bill and its predecessors were introduced. It was an afterthought, a scheme, or a device to defeat worthy legislation.

I have tried to point out to the Senate the reason why no justiciable issue exists at this time. The Supreme Court has held that in order to have a justiciable issue over which that Court will take jurisdiction there must be a threat that an imminent danger exists. Without the authorization of this project, Arizona has no physical means or ability to take water out of the Colorado River which would create any threat. Likewise, unless and until this project be authorized, there is no project in Arizona that would threaten any water use in another State. Therefore, the only thing that would happen would be that there would be a lawsuit for a few years, and then all of the engineering data would be out of date, and we would have to consider this matter all over again. That is what the people in the State of California would like to have happen.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that the committee, in considering both Senate bill 75 and Senate Joint Resolution 4, authorizing the central Arizona project bill, as amended, has found that no justiciable issue exists which would merit the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 4. On the other hand, the committee has taken the position that this project should be authorized; but, in fairness to the States of California and Nevada, the committee felt that those States should have an opportunity, if they desired, to present their claims to the Supreme Court and that consent should be given to the joinder of the United States as a necessary party to the litigation.

As a tangible expression of its views, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] was adopted by the committee. This amendment provides that if any State or States within 6 months after the effective date of the act shall begin a suit or suits in the Supreme Court of the United States to determine the right to the use of the water for diversion from the main stream of the Colorado River for the central Arizona project, consent is given to the joinder of the United States of America as a party to such action or actions.

The amendment further provides that no moneys shall be appropriated or expended for the construction of works authorized by this act which are required solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona, during the period of 6 months after the enactment of this act and during the pendency of any suit or suits in which the United States shall be joined as a party under and by virtue of the consent granted in this act.

Mr. President, this amendment is a compromise offered by these distinguished Senators. I have felt, and the people of my State have felt, that Congress having given its interpretation of the compact and the California Self-Limitation Act and the rights of the respective States, and particularly inasmuch as the net result of the Boulder Canyon Project Act has been to give to the State of California more than the lion's share of this water, it was the duty of Congress to give to Arizona her just share of the Colorado River water without requiring litigation. On the other hand, I recognize that our colleagues were trying to find a solution to this controversy which has existed throughout all of these years. I am convinced, and those associated with me in this struggle for Arizona's existence are convinced, that right will prevail in the Supreme Court of the United States. So, we were willing to accept these amendments.

These amendments were submitted to and approved by the Department of Justice as to form and were held sufficient to protect the rights of all the interested States. So there can be no question that their rights are thereby fully protected.

Another amendment would eliminate a dam which was contemplated at Bluff Canyon on the San Juan River in Utah, the principal functions of which were to control silt and to afford river regulation and flood control. However, more extensive and much more beneficial works at Glen Canyon in the Colorado River in Utah, would not only fully protect the Bridge Canyon works from silt but would render the facility at Bluff Canyon unnecessary. These dams are both in the upper Colorado River Basin. It was estimated from the hearings and record before the committee that the Glen Canyon works would be authorized and constructed as a part of the upper basin development at an early date, and for this reason all authorization for development in the upper basin was eliminated from this bill.

The last amendment was that suggested and submitted by the Department of the Interior for the protection of the rights and properties of the Indians, which amendment was accepted by the committee.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who have so patiently listened to the testimony on this bill.

The bill, as reported, protects the rights of all of the interested States. It gives to Arizona the opportunity which she has long sought—to have this matter finally settled. There have been several cases in which Arizona has attempted to go into court to have her rights adjudicated; but at every cross of the road she has been fought by California; and the Supreme Court has held that there does not exist a justiciable issue.

Members of Congress have been flooded with propaganda from California interests in regard to this project. They have tried to make our colleagues believe that this act would take water to which California is justly entitled. The amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is a full answer to that argument. In making the argument, an effort has been made to stress the great need for this water in California. Even if there were a need as claimed, such need alone would certainly not give California any right to water which belongs to and is needed by the State of Arizona. However, inasmuch as they have flooded Congress with such propaganda, I desire to point out various facts which demonstrate that the need does not in truth exist, and that the claim in this respect is not supported by the evidence.

To begin with, California herself admits that her present annual use of the Colorado River water is "something like 3,000,000 acre-feet," well within that of her limitation of 4,400,000 acre-feet. Certain witnesses from that State also admit in their testimony that they desire to place into cultivation an additional 300,000 acres of the areas known as the east and west mesas in the Imperial Valley, Calif. They do not deny that if this land were not placed into cultivation, California would have all of the water she claims she needs, present and future. I desire to make it clear that California's asserted need is for the future to permit her to grow and expand; Arizona's need is immediate, not for growth and expansion, but for the maintenance and support of the property and livelihood which our people now have and are in jeopardy of losing.

In connection with the proposed irrigation of this 300,000 acres in the east and west mesas of the Imperial Valley in California, I would like to call attention to the fact that a land classification development report and an economic repayment capacity report have been made by the Bureau of Reclamation on the lands of the east mesa, which reports

were based upon soil surveys conducted cooperatively by California's own university and the United States Department of Agriculture. These reports clearly show that the lands are not practicable of irrigation and reclamation. The Secretary of the Interior has so affirmatively declared. In this connection, he stated:

In view of land classification and repayment feasibility reports, irrigation development of public lands on the east mesa by either the Government or the district "would be inimical to the public interest."

Think of it, Mr. President, that is what the Secretary of the Interior said about those lands to irrigate which certain witnesses from California would take water from Arizona. It would not be in the public interest to irrigate them. I now continue the quotation:

The east mesa area lies within the Imperial irrigation district served by the All-American canal in southern California

While the lands were originally withdrawn from public entry in the hope that they could be successfully developed, detailed investigations which have since been made revealed them to be not practicable of irrigation and reclamation. The detailed land investigations were made by the Department of Agriculture, the University of California, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

While reports have not been made on the west mesa, it is admittedly no better land. I wish further to call attention to the fact that practically all of these lands are owned by the Federal Government.

I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter to Mr. Evan T. Hewes from the Secretary of the Interior in regard to this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

MY DEAR MR. HEWES: The Commissioner of Reclamation has brought to my attention the correspondence between your district and Regional Director Moritz, concerning assumption by the district of the care, operation, and maintenance, under the All-American canal contract of December 1, 1932, of the common section of the Coachella canal between engineer station 0 and approximately station 2603.

Particularly, your letter of December 6, 1948, suggests the necessity for clarification of the position of this Department with respect to the desire of your district to install turn-outs in the common section of the Coachella canal at such locations, with such capacities, and at such time or times as the district may determine, following transfer of the canal to the district.

The district's expressed desire for a free hand in constructing turn-outs in the common section of the Coachella canal necessarily raises the question of whether the district may have the consent of the United States, express or implied, to construct turnouts designed to serve public lands on east mesa In view of the conclusions reached in the land-classification and development report of April 1947, and in the repayment-feasibility report issued in March 1948, both of which you have received and which I have approved, it is evident to me that the irrigation development of public lands on east mesa, either by the United States or by Imperial irrigation district, would be inimical to the public interest, inasmuch as such lands are not "practicable of irrigation and reclamation." Accordingly, after full consideration, I am compelled to advise you I do not contemplate that any public lands on east mesa will be opened to reclamation, homestead entry, and settlement, and, therefore, I could not approve the construction of canal turn-outs designed to serve these lands. In reaching this conclusion, I am not unmindful of the provisions of article 23 of the contract of December 1, 1932, insofar as they relate to east mesa lands I have been advised by the Solicitor of this Department concerning the legal issues raised by this article. A copy of the Solicitor's opinion is enclosed.

This decision has been made with reluctance, insofar as it may disturb the existing contractual relationship with your district, but I am sure that my responsibility under the reclamation and public-land laws permits me no choice in the premises I assure you that I am prepared to consider a proposal from your district for a modification and equitable adjustment of the contract of December 1, 1932, in order to bring the contract into accord with the facts as we know them today, and to join with the district in submitting to the Congress appropriate recommendations to this end.

Sincerely yours,

J A KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr McFARLAND. Mr. President, I would particularly call attention to the following portion of Secretary Krug's letter:

In view of the conclusions reached in the land-classification and development report of April 1947, and in the repayment-feasibility report issued in March 1948, both of which you have received and which I have approved, it is evident to me that the irrigation development of public lands on east mesa, either by the United States or by Imperial irrigation district, would be inimical to the public interest, inasmuch as such lands are not practicable of irrigation and reclamation.

So here, Mr President, we have a situation where the United States Government owns the land, where it says that the land is not worth irrigating—that is what the Secretary of the Interior said, speaking for the United States Government—and for this reason refuses to permit its irrigation, and yet these certain witnesses come before Congress and say they need and want water to irrigate this land.

Think of it, with the economy of the whole State of Arizona at stake, they would like to take water and irrigate land which has been held by their own university not to be fit to be irrigated

Mr. President, this clearly proves beyond any question that California does not need this water; and I wish to state further that if she succeeds in preventing Arizona from using water for the central Arizona project, it will either be used in Mexico, in addition to that amount provided for in the treaty, or be allowed to continue to waste into the ocean. I would like further to call attention to the fact that California is now wasting approximately a million acre-feet annually into the Salton Sea that could be put to beneficial use.

In conclusion, Mr. President, may I say that we have no objection to California's growing and expanding. The record, as I have just pointed out, clearly shows that she has ample water to grow and to expand, and I certainly have no objection to her doing so. On the other hand, Arizona is here fighting for her very existence. We are not asking to grow or expand. All we want the Congress of the United States to do is to help us save our present economy. If our economy collapses, as I have previously pointed out, the result will be felt all over the United States. All we ask of Congress is to give us the legislation which will permit us to use that to which we are rightfully entitled. Enact S. 75 into law, with the proposed amendments, and it will give us that opportunity.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

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

Mr. President, at the beginning of my remarks I pointed out that there are now in existence in Arizona evidences of prehistoric development long before the white people came there, evidenced by ruins of canals and buildings. Those ruins show that the people had to abandon the cultivation of the soil in Arizona because of the lack of water. The people who started our modern irrigation came to Arizona in the 1860's. Construction of the first irrigation canal was begun in 1867.

As I previously pointed out, when I was on the bench in Arizona witnesses came before the court to testify as to the water rights of the State. They described the development of Arizona. They told of the hardy pioneers who came to the State and dug irrigation ditches. The pioneers of Arizona did not have machinery comparable to our modern machinery. They used horse power and hand power. The witnesses told of the hardships endured by the pioneers. They told of the lands being cleared, not with such machinery as we have today but by hand. With the sweat of their brows they built a great agricultural empire.

Some of the witnesses who testified at the committee hearings bore names identical with those of witnesses who came before me and testified while I was sitting as a judge in Arizona. Their fathers and grandfathers were the hardy pioneers who developed Arizona in its early days. The witnesses who appeared before the Senate committee were the sons and grandsons of those hardy pioneers. The empire built by the pioneers is the empire we are today endeavoring to save.

I see my distinguished colleague from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] sitting here. His father was one of the men who helped pioneer and develop the State of Arizona. We are endeavoring to save the economy which was built in Arizona by Senator HAYDEN'S father and by the fathers of the people who are now living there.

During the last war the Government of the United States needed important fibers as well as foods to help win the war. The Government appealed to the people of Arizona to plant long-staple cotton, so necessary to carry on the war. The people of the State of Arizona responded. We are endeavoring to save what we have developed and our economy.

The hardy pioneers of the early days of Arizona builded an agricultural empire; made "the desert blossom as the rose," to use a familiar Biblical expression. They made its soil produce important food products needed to sustain life and important fibers needed to help win the war.

This great agricultural empire must be safeguarded by the passage of the pending bill.

The early pioneering in the State of Arizona was not all directed to the field of agriculture. Men went into the hills, developed important mines, and brought forth precious metals, which were likewise needed to win the last World War. How would the pending legislation affect them?

We have built in Arizona an economy based upon a farm area in the central portion of the State of 725,000 acres. Suppose those farmers should become bankrupt? What would happen to the bonded indebtedness of the State, and the overhead cost of the State government and the subdivisions thereof, as well as the schools? The cost would all fall upon the mining industry and other industries of Arizona. At this time some of them are having a hard struggle to survive.

The central Arizona project, as I said in the beginning of my statement, and as has been pointed out by the Secretary of the Interior, is a rescue project, and would not put one additional acre of land into cultivation. As has been shown, at least 250,000 persons would have to leave Arizona if the bill were not enacted. Those who would remain in that agricultural area would be barely able to eke out an existence. Where are 250,000 persons to be placed? There is not room for them in California. California says there is already unemployment in that State. Is there room for them in Connecticut? Is there room for them in Maryland? They would be displaced persons just as truly as are any people in Europe

Mr. President, the proposed legislation which is before the Senate today deals with a most serious problem. We are considering a bill which would help to save the economy of a State. Distinguished lawyers and Senators have drafted amendments which will afford protection to the various States involved, and yet present a justiciable issue which will make possible the decision of the subject in the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is true that the population of Arizona is small when compared to the population of other States It is true that we have always been at a disadvantage when fighting against a powerful State like California. That was particularly true when the Boulder Canyon Project Act was before Congress for consideration. All we ask of the Senate is the opportunity afforded by this bill, which has been found by the committee by a vote of 9 to 3 to be the only way to settle this controversy and the only way to save the economy of a State which represents the symbol of the pioneers of the West.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Arizona for yielding at this time. All of us recognize that this is an important piece of legislation. I am a little sorry to hear the Senator find fault with some of the California witnesses. I assure the Senator that no California witness who testified has any animosity toward the State of Arizona. The fact is that water is the lifeblood of all Western States. We have a very serious problem. I am sure that there is no one in the State of California who does not sympathize with the problems, not only of Arizona, but of all the other Western States.

In connection with a great project which calls for the authorization of $750,000,000, and which contains provisions which will call for the expenditure of another $500,000,000, or perhaps a total of $1,250,000,000, it is important that the legislation should be carefully analyzed before it is acted on by the Congress. I am sure the Senator from Arizona would want that to be done.

I invite the Senator's attention to page 6, line 3, of the pending bill, which provides, as follows:

> Before any construction work is done or contracted for, the Secretary shall first determine that costs allocated to power, municipal water supply, irrigation, or other miscellaneous purposes as herein provided will probably be returned to the United States: *Provided*, That the repayment period for costs so allocated shall be such reasonable period of years, not to exceed the useful life of the project, as may be determined by the Secretary

I should like to ask the Senator this specific question: Insofar as this project is concerned, does that not in fact circumvent the existing reclamation laws, which provide that the irrigation features of a reclamation shall be repaid in 50 years?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I believe the reclamation law provides for a 40-year period. There is no question that this bill extends the time for repayment for this project. But this is not the first time that that has been done. Projects have been approved which extended the period for more than 60 years. This is not a new feature. If we are to have any more projects developed in the West, that will have to be done. Every member of the committee who would like to see further development of irrigation projects knows that the easy projects have already been built. There is no question that this would extend the period of repayment. The report of the Secretary of the Interior shows that the cost can be repaid well within the life of the project.

Mr. President, I did not accuse the witnesses from California of any animosity toward us. Of course they are fighting for what they think will put a little money in their own pockets. I do not say that they are not sympathetic, but if we are to save 750,000 people in Arizona, it will take more than sympathy to do it. It will take water to do it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is quite possible, as the Senator points out, that many of what he calls the easier projects have been built. As one Senator who has supported the general theory of reclamation, both on the floor of the Senate and long before coming to the Senate, I would have no great objection to Congress extending the period from 50 to 55 or 60 years. I can see some equity in it. A good case might be made for extending it to 65 years. The only point I make is that the Senate is entitled to know that in this situation, instead of maintaining the basic law, so that we may continue to have a yardstick, as we have had in the past, within which all projects must fit themselves, we are breaking up the yardstick and throwing it away. I invite the Senator's attention to that situation. I should like to ask the Senator if that is done in this case, how with equity and fairness we could apply the yardstick in all future cases?

I should like to ask this further question: If we break up the yardstick and throw it away and do not apply it to this project or to future projects, does the Senator believe that it is equitable to continue to require projects which are now under construction or which have been built to keep within the 50-year limitation?

Mr. McFARLAND. In answer to the distinguished Senator's questions, I should like to say that we are not departing from any past procedure. As I pointed out, we have already authorized projects with longer periods than 60 years. I wish further to point out that these projects should be repaid in as few years as possible. It is best for the economy of the United States. It helps us get money for future developments. We cannot apply a strict yardstick measurement to these projects. Each one must stand on its own merits. In the past few years we have authorized projects for longer periods of time. All we ask for is what has been done in the past. We ask for the same consideration which has been given to other projects.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS rose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I know the Senator from Maryland wants to proceed on another subject. This is the opening debate on a three-quarter-billion-dollar project, which may total a billion and a quarter dollars. I believe we are entitled to have some clarification.

I invite the Senator's attention to the language on page 4 of the bill, as follows:

> *Provided further*, That construction of the tunnel and that portion of the canal hereinabove described from the reservoir above the dam at Bridge Canyon to a junction with the aqueduct hereinafter authorized shall be deferred until Congress by making appropriation expressly therefor has determined that economic conditions justify its construction.

I have been informed that the estimated cost of construction of such tun-

nel is $550,000,000. It may be $500,000,000 or $550,000,000. Perhaps it would be only $450,000,000 or $500,000,000. Regardless of what the amount may be, does the Senator——

Mr. McFARLAND. Let us use the figure $200,000,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the sake of argument, let us take $200,000,000.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I have already yielded to the Senator's colleague. I can yield to only one Senator at a time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to complete the question. Whatever the amount may be, it is X dollars greater than the $708,000,000 reported by the committee. It may be anywhere from a minimum of $200,000,000 to $550,000,000. Is it not correct to say that under the language of this bill, without coming to the Congress for further authorization, the Appropriations Committee, by making an appropriation perhaps as small as a few hundred thousand dollars, once they said it was specifically to get this work under way, would automatically authorize this large amount, which will run anywhere from $200,000,000 to $500,000,000? If that be so, does not that give to the Appropriations Committee power to almost double the amount of the authorization in the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. In answer to the Senator's question, let me point out that under existing law if the Bureau of Reclamation files a report, it can ask for appropriations for the project without getting a special authorization. That is all that this provision of the bill does. But the Appropriations Committee must first have the report of the Bureau of Reclamation to the effect that economic conditions justify the building of the tunnel. With regard to the tunnel, I personally feel that it should be built at some time. I do not know when economic conditions will justify it. The present costs of construction are such that it would not be justified. It may well be that in the future, when employment is needed, the cost will go down so much and there will be such a demand for power in the West that everyone will wish to see this tunnel built. When that condition arises, they will have to show that the power which would be saved from not having to pump into the aqueduct would pay for the tunnel, before it can be constructed.

It is not a complicated matter; it is no more complicated than approval of a project under basic irrigation at the present time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator an additional question. During the course of his remarks, I believe he said that unless the bill authorizing this work is passed, and unless the work proceeds, disaster will come to the State of Arizona. I should like to ask the Senator how soon disaster would come to the State of Arizona, if the bill is not passed and if the work is not authorized.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, that is a very difficult question to answer, because the disaster would grow year by year. We cannot simply say that it would be in existence one year but not the preceding year or that it is not here today, but will be here tomorrow. It would be a gradual development. It might start next year or the following year, and gradually grow worse. But I hope it will be possible for us to secure the enactment of this authorization bill and I hope the litigation can be completed in time to save the economy of my State.

Today in Arizona we are borrowing on our underground water supply. I pointed that out earlier in my remarks. We might continue to do so for a few years longer; but the time will come when we must take some action as set forth in the pending bill, or we know, according to the advice of the best engineers in the West, that disaster will come. It will not come in any particular year; conditions will simply grow a little worse year after year.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senator's attention to pages 10 and 11 of the bill, dealing with the matter of the litigation before the Supreme Court. I should like to ask him a question about the portion of the bill beginning in line 17 on page 10, reading as follows:

Provided, That no moneys appropriated under the authority of this act shall be expended for the construction of works authorized by this act which are required solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona, during the period of 6 months after the enactment of this act and during the pendency of any suit or suits in which the United States shall be joined as a party under and by virtue of the consent granted in section 12 of this act. The pendency of a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint shall be considered pendency of a suit or suits for the purposes of this act.

I am not an attorney, but I should like to ask the able Senator about that provision. As I read it, construction of the project could not be commenced during the pendency of the suit. But let us assume that the suit went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court rendered a decision adverse to Arizona, and then the case was decided; it was no longer pending. Is it the Senator's interpretation that the Authorization Act would still be valid?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me say that it would be ridiculous to assume that if the Supreme Court held that no water was available for this project, the Congress of the United States would appropriate for it, notwithstanding. In fact, I shall state the matter in stronger terms than that. It is an insult to the Congress of the United States for anyone to insist in any way that under such circumstances the Congress would appropriate one dime for the construction of a project for which the Supreme Court had held no water was available.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, that was not my question. My question was whether the Senator now takes the position that in the event the Supreme Court decided adversely to Arizona, then in fact there would be no authorization?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, there would be an authorization, but in effect it would be killed by the Supreme Court's decision, if it so held.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is all I wish to ask for the moment, Mr. President.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have concluded my remarks at this time.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1282) to authorize grants under the Federal Airport Act for minor projects at major airports, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4106) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

THE H-BOMB

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the attention of all the peoples on earth has been directed recently to a new instrument of destruction, popularly called the H-bomb. Its described potentialities are so great that it is difficult, even for those who serve on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and for others who have had some contact with the development of the atom bomb and, more latterly, the H-bomb, really to comprehend what it all means to civilization. Rumor has it that if one of these bombs is perfected, a single one of them dropped on New York City would kill every man, woman, and child in that city. In other words, so we are told by rumor, it would be sufficient in its destructive power to wipe out everyone living in an area of 100 square miles—10 miles long and 10 miles wide. We are likewise told that our own country and Russia are launched upon the undertaking of building the new H-bomb.

Therefore, all of us must, whether we like it or not, come face to face with the grim reality that there are in the course of construction weapons so gigantic and so terrible in their destructive possibilities that not merely one city but civilization itself is in jeopardy.

When the atom bomb was fashioned, we departed from the orthodox type of warfare—warfare by means of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—as we had known it, and we used that bomb as a mass weapon to bring Japan to its knees. The two bombs which were dropped on Japan, at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, as I have said before, according to the official statistics, killed 135,000 men, women, and children in the fraction of a second. That bomb was very crude. It employed a new principle in warfare, to wit, atomic fission and its use to kill people.

Everyone who had been associated with the development of atomic energy knew instantly that the first bombs were what might be termed crude. The discovery was new. The inventive genius applied to it had no yardsticks, and so the first bombs were fashioned as quickly as possible to do a particular thing which they accomplished. But all of us then knew, as we were told by the scientists who appeared before the committee,

that the atomic bomb of the future would be many times greater than the atom bombs of which we had heard. Indeed, I think I may say without violating any secrecy there is practically no end to the inventive and scientific genius that can be applied to building bigger and bigger and bigger bombs for the destruction of humanity.

For a long while I have been thinking on this whole question. For a long while I have realized that armies are not the answer to the settlement of international disputes. They are a necessary transitory thing that we and other peoples adopt because there is no alternative in the existing state of international affairs except to be strong and to try to be stronger than the other man, no matter what the field of activity into which this may carry us and the world.

Now, with the coming of the H-bomb, Mr. President, many people have been seeking to apply the same formula to it as was attempted to be applied to the atom bomb, namely, control of atomic- and hydrogen-bomb activities, with proper inspection. It is an appealing idea and for a moment seems to attain the objective we all desire. But I think I can show that even were it possible—and I certainly should not disapprove of all efforts toward that result—in my judgment, it would be an illusory rather than a real attempt to control these weapons.

Let us assume that tomorrow morning the United States and Russia agreed firmly that neither country would make or possess the atom bomb or the hydrogen bomb or have the means with which to make the atom bomb or the hydrogen bomb. Let us assume that there was the proper type of inspection inherent in the agreement which would keep these two nations, and all others, from embarking upon the making of either of the two bombs. Let us then suppose that war came, and that the war happened without either nation having the bomb, but that other conventional means of destruction were employed. No sooner would the war break out than all international inspection would be wiped out in an instant. The moment inspection was wiped out each belligerent nation would immediately have to start building a plant in which to make the atom bomb, or building a plant in which to make the hydrogen bomb, for fear the other belligerent nation was doing it behind its own battle lines. All that would result from atomic or H-bomb control would be a truce between wars, with almost the certainty of the bomb's being built by either or both belligerents in any future conflict, as soon as the new war started. All that would be gained, therefore, would be a little time.

If it is logical to outlaw the atomic bomb, as I believe it is logical to do, and if it is logical to outlaw the hydrogen bomb, as I believe it is logical to do, it is then just as logical to outlaw the conventional bombing and all forms of warfare. It is impossible to outlaw any of them without opening ourselves to the risk of reinstituting them all again as soon as a new war breaks out on the face of the earth. Therefore what we need, if we want the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb controlled, and if we want a world in which these two instruments cannot be manufactured, is not only an agreement which encompasses these two great destructive weapons, but we must go further than that and have disarmament all the way down the line to rifles. In my judgment, rifles might conceivably be needed to maintain law and order in any country, or in any group of countries on the globe. But unless all things above the rifle are outlawed, we get back to the hydrogen bomb and the atomic bomb when war comes.

I do not think it possible to escape the conclusion, assuming the efforts to outlaw the hydrogen and atomic bombs, with proper inspection, have been successful, that if war comes, with such an agreement in existence, the parties to the war will immediately commence the construction of the proper plants in which to build the two outlawed instruments of death, because they are so completely decisive in modern warfare that we could not afford to run the chance of assuming, without inspection—and with a war going on there would be no inspection—that all the parties to the contract were living up to their agreements.

A little more than 4 years ago, namely, on January 28, 1946, anticipating the march of atomic energy, the improvement, if I may use the word, in the destructive potentialities of the atomic bomb, I offered a simple resolution in the Senate, which I intend to reoffer today. I read it, as follows:

That the President is authorized and requested to invite the governments of all nations to send representatives to a conference, which shall be charged with the single duty—

I underscore "single duty"—

of entering into an understanding and agreement to achieve world disarmament on land, on sea, and in the air by January 1, 1950, except only for such actual occupying forces, with appropriate weapons, and for such agreed period of time, as will be necessary to police the defeated and occupied nations as a result of the recent war—

That is an obvious exception—

and except only for such armed forces and for such weapons as are to be placed exclusively under the jurisdiction of the Security Council of the United Nations Organization—

It seems to me, in the present circumstances, that is an obvious exception—

and except only—

And here is the meat of the coconut—

and except only for such limited forces and limited small arms as are needed to keep law and order within each country, and directly prohibiting the manufacture, storage, and possession of all other weapons, ammunition, and munitions of war, and providing further for the international inspection force authorized and instructed to see that the terms of such world disarmament are rigidly adhered to and carried out, and thereafter maintained by all the countries of the earth.

Some will say, "That is too large an objective to be accomplished." Perhaps it will be said, "You are trying to bring utopia on the face of the earth." To that, I say there is just as much of a possibility of securing world disarmament on the terms of the resolution as there is of securing atomic and hydrogen bomb control, and that the former proposition has additional merit because, if atomic and hydrogen-bomb control were obtained, it would only be efficacious in the interim period between wars, and as soon as war came, if it lasted long enough, both bombs would likely be built and used, and we would be back where we were when we started.

Mr. President, it is my belief that the peoples of the whole world want peace. They want an end to devastating wars, and they will want it more and more as the full import of the hydrogen bomb and its successor bomb is made public. There is not a member of the Atomic Energy Committee or of the Armed Services Committee, or a man holding high office in the Pentagon, who does not know that when the hydrogen bomb is built we can build still another super-hydrogen bomb which we may call the P-bomb, the T-bomb, the X-bomb, or the Z-bomb. There is no limit, except the limitations of mechanical know-how and scientific application, to the size of the bombs which can be built to destroy mankind. If we are entering an era in which a single bomb can be built which will kill 10,000,000 people in the fraction of a second, it but proves my point, for only a couple of years ago we were talking about a bomb which could kill 100,000, 200,000, or 300,000 persons. No sooner will the hydrogen bomb be built than the great nations which are able to do so will start in on a bigger bomb which will devastate a larger territory and kill a greater number of persons.

The peoples of the earth do not want to live under the perpetual cloud and weight of this horrible fear which is so real, so close, and so avoidable.

It seems to me that our great leader, the President of the United States, has, at this moment, an opportunity to try to bring the question of world peace to the attention of all mankind, Americans, Russians, Chinese, and all others.

What great nation on earth will oppose it? I do not believe the people of Russia would oppose it. I am speaking of the masses of the people of Russia. I do not believe the masses in China would oppose it. I cannot conceive that the masses of the people in any country would oppose it. I offer it because it goes to the whole length of the problem and toward the only solution of the problem that will hold, in my judgment, reasonable hope of success.

I cannot go along with the attempts which deal only with atomic-bomb control or hydrogen-bomb control, for it is only a truce between wars. As certainly as that the sun rises and sets, the hydrogen bomb will be used in any great war, all agreements to the contrary notwithstanding. The minute the first shot is fired, the minute the first enemy town is attacked, the great nations of the earth will immediately start the manufacture of this weapon for fear that the other side of the controversy, the other nations which are opposing any powerful nation, will also start to manufacture

the hydrogen bomb behind the cloak of military secrecy, and at some point in the war, as it continues, this new weapon will be dropped upon the cities of enemy countries. We cannot escape the logic of that statement. It is as certain as is tomorrow morning's sunrise. It is as certain as is anything in human nature.

I think we must lay aside the futile attempts to outlaw these new weapons by dealing with them alone. This problem calls for sterner stuff. It calls for imagination on a wider horizon. It calls for thinking it through until we reach the point where the hydrogen bomb and the atomic bomb will really be outlawed. If we follow that logic, we shall be back to the point where we must disarm on land, on sea, and in the air.

Understand, Mr. President, I am not advocating disarmament by example. We had some of that in 1922 when the naval-disarmament conference was held in Washington. I am not advocating that this Nation shall disarm while every other nation shall remain armed. I am advocating that all nations enter into an agreement to disarm gradually over a period of years, on a schedule agreed to, under the eyes of each other, with constant world-wide inspection to see that disarmament is progressively carried out. That is the only way we can ever disarm, the only way in which we can successfully outlaw the hydrogen and atomic bombs.

Let us assume for the moment that I am wrong about it. Let us assume we can control atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs by international agreement and inspection. Let us assume that war comes, and let us assume, for the moment, at least, that neither the hydrogen bomb nor the atomic bomb is used in that new war. What will happen? We shall have a conventional bombing with TNT. Take an airplane flight over Europe, Mr. President, and look at the cities, the towns, the bridges, the railroads, the factories, the yards, and the graveyards. The only difference between the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb, and the conventional bomb is that the hydrogen bomb and the atomic bomb do the same thing, only more quickly. That is all.

Do we realize that in France alone nearly 300,000 homes were entirely destroyed in the course of the war and that more than 800,000 were partially destroyed? Do we realize that in France, without the atomic bomb or the hydrogen bomb, 6,000 bridges, large and small, were destroyed during the war? Do we realize that 80 percent of the machinery in the great industrial plants of France was either destroyed by bombing or removed by the enemy and melted up for munitions of war? Do we realize that France lost more than half of her merchant marine during the war? Do we realize that several thousand miles of railroad track was destroyed and that hundreds of locomotives and thousands of boxcars and freight cars were destroyed? Do we realize that 600,000 Frenchmen lost their lives in World War II either by death on the battlefield or as the result of bombing, together with thousands who were impressed into service by Germany and never returned? To kill 600,000 people at once would require four atomic bombs of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki type. Only 135,000 persons were killed in Japan with two bombs. Six hundred thousand were killed in France without such bombs.

What kind of a nice agreement and compromise it is in one's thoughts, heart, and conscience that we are ready to settle for 600,000 lives, provided it extends over a period of 4 or 5 years? We do not mind that; we will agree to that—killing 600,000 people in 4 years. But what we do not like is to have killed 150,000 persons in 4 days. We can stand it if it is stretched over a long enough period, but if it is condensed into a short period of time it becomes too horrible. Mr. President, that is silly. It was just as bad to kill those 600,000 Frenchmen in the period I have described, as it was to kill 135,000 Japanese by the use of atomic bombs.

Mr. President, if there is a desire to outlaw the hydrogen bomb and the atomic bomb, there is only one way to do it, namely, by a program of world disarmament. We cannot temporize with this problem. We cannot divide it up into segments and keep the world armed to the teeth, with millions of men marching, and if a new war breaks out hope that our agreements will stick. The war will not be 1 hour old before the belligerents on either side of a new series of hostilities will immediately begin, agreement or no agreement, the building of the atomic bomb and the building of the hydrogen bomb. They can do nothing else. No holds are barred in warfare. The only reason why anything we or another nation has is not used in a war is because its military contribution to victory is doubtful, considered from both sides. But when there is a weapon so terrific as the hydrogen bomb, if a nation has it, we may rest assured it is as certain to be used as anything in the ken of human experience is certain.

If the desire is to do away with the hydrogen bomb and the atomic bomb, we must have a period of world disarmament, with inspection before the disarmament period, inspection during it, and inspection after it. I do not believe anything else will suffice.

As I stated a moment ago, I do not know how long it would take Russia or the United States to build a hydrogen bomb, but assuming it would take 2 years, that great bomb would no sooner be built than immediately Russia or ourselves, or both, would start the building of another bomb more powerful than the hydrogen bomb, just as the hydrogen bomb now is superior to the old atomic bomb.

Men are taking the universe apart; they are breaking the universe up into elements, they are finding out how they can use those different elements to destroy vast numbers of mankind. No one knows what the final answer will be, but if civilization and humanity are to find security on this earth, they cannot find it by partial disarmament, they must find it by complete disarmament, plus inspection before, during, and after disarmament.

I should like to see our President, difficult though this matter is, fraught though it is with possibilities of failure, undertake to invite the nations of the world to sit down for the single purpose of accomplishing world disarmament, not mixed up with tariffs, currencies, immigration, or any of the other things which we may settle afterward, but with nothing in mind but disarmament, devoting ourselves exclusively to disarmament, with the problems like occupation and the like, which followed the last war, considered in conjunction therewith.

Let us suppose such a conference is called. Let the proposals for disarmament made by us and the opposition's proposals be published. Let us assume that we cannot agree. If we cannot agree, we will know why we cannot agree, whether the reason is a genuine or spurious one, whether there is any real desire for peace in the world on the part of certain peoples Then we will know what to do in this country.

Mr. President, I do not like being in a twilight zone, playing tick-tack with the hydrogen bomb and the atomic bomb as if the matter were that simple, and as if a solution looking to the control of these two weapons would bring about the result which we desire. It would not, because even though we did control them, no sooner would a new war come than the armament plants would start manufacturing the weapons all over again.

Mr. President, in the proposed conference, with the full floodlight of world publicity upon it, where men would sit down to solve the destiny of the millions of people of this earth, if it were an open conference—and that is what I would advocate—the proposals of every nation would be known, and all mankind would be put on notice whether or not the nations assembled were acting in good faith.

Some say the Russians would never agree to the proposals we would outline. I think that is a defeatist attitude. I do not think we know what the answer will be until the Russians act upon such an invitation. But I assume that the people of Russia, very much like the people of the United States, are anxious to survive, to stay alive, to try to make an end to warfare. I assume they would rather have the resources of Russia not turned into tanks, ships, guns, and bombs but into those things attached to the home which raise the standards of living of the people of Russia. I assume they would welcome the lifting of the great weight of fear which either now hangs or eventually must hang over their heads, as it hangs over the heads of most of the other people of earth.

Mr. President, I am not willing to admit that a fair proposition submitted to the Russians touching this matter would receive their complete veto, for I believe that, by and large, it would be difficult for the representatives of any nation to resist the appeal of the President of the United States, or to turn down a proposal for real disarmament, with real inspection, if it were made in the open, and made on an honest and fair basis. It would at least arouse a great deal of discussion in every country on earth. If we go into such a conference with clean hands, with an honest proposition, we have some hope of its acceptance.

But suppose the conference should fail. We would not be any worse off than we are now. We would not have lost anything. On the other hand, we would have made a great gain, for we would have told the people of our own country and the peoples of the world that we were ready to call an end to all the waste of the natural resources and the wealth of the nations and the manpower of the nations entailed in an armaments race, and we would have made our offer in complete good faith, even though it were rejected.

If we tell the American people that is our attitude, we will see a new America. We will then know what the issue is. We will then know what is ahead of us, and we can gear our Government to face conditions.

Of course, some will say, "This should be done in the United Nations." I wish it were done there, but I do not believe the United Nations is the place for doing it, for the reason that the United Nations has too many other problems, with disputes lapping over into too many fields, questions over Palestine, China, Greece, and all the other problems which it considers from time to time.

What we want is a conference devoted to the greatest single problem before all of Christendom, namely, disarmament. It is greater than taxation, it is greater than any other problem, for until we get an atmosphere in which men can think and act and compose their differences without fear, we are inviting attack by atomic bomb, as a result of some accident, or some incident, or the unfolding of some policy which will eventually bring all of these new weapons into play.

Mr. President, I do not make these remarks today because of fear. I am not speaking because I am afraid. I am not afraid. There is presented to us a challenge to our generation, and we must meet it. I am making this address because I cannot see any logic in tackling the problem piecemeal, knowing that even if we are successful in solving a part of it piecemeal, it will not settle anything, as in the case of control of the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb. Both of them will be back in the picture, anyway, just as soon as the next war begins. There is no escape from that conclusion.

The situation requires bold treatment. We are not faced with a flood or a famine or a typhoon or a tidal wave. We are faced with the extinction of all human beings on the earth as the march of events and of science proceeds on its way down the roadway of the future.

If what I say is true—and who is there to doubt it?—shall we be like dumb driven cattle waiting for the butcher's knife? Or shall we take firm, aggressive action in good faith backed up by the logic of the situation, with an appeal to all mankind to come forward and act in an effort to put an end to what now causes so much fear, a fear which will darken and still further darken the atmosphere with the passing of the hours, and the passage of the days?

If the solution I propose is not the best—and I do not offer it as the panacea for all the ills of mankind—then let some one come forward with a better one, and I shall be glad to join in it. But I think all the conversation about controlling atomic energy and controlling the hydrogen bomb is merely so much sawdust. In my opinion there is not on the face of the earth a military man of any stature who will take issue with me in the statement that even though an agreement is reached for control and for inspection, if any war between the great powers begins the hydrogen bomb will be used, and the atomic bomb will be used, anyway. The minute such a war breaks out the great nations of the earth capable of doing so will commence the manufacture of such bombs because they cannot trust each other, and because if they do not have the bombs, they will be at the disadvantage of quickly losing a war which they otherwise might conduct successfully for years, if necessary.

Mr. President, I am very hopeful that we can rise to meet this emergency.

Here is the United States, without question the strongest, the most powerful nation in Christendom. Here is civilization, threatened as it never has been threatened before in all its long history. Here are people in our great cities who more and more, and more and more, will feel a fear in their hearts and breasts as they contemplate, as they must sooner or later, the possibilities inherent in hydrogen-bomb warfare. Have Senators ever considered what would happen if the hydrogen bomb were used in modern warfare, and if it should live up to its advance notices? Let us assume for a moment that the frequently published statements that it can kill 10,000,000 people are true. Very well. Let us assume that another Pearl Harbor incident occurs. If we had never had a Pearl Harbor that might be considered to be a silly assumption. But we have already had one. We were all strutting around this Chamber on the 6th of December 1941, more or less confident, in spite of the threats, that Japan would not do anything particularly. We wakened on the 7th of December and found that the American Fleet was at the bottom of Pearl Harbor, and we had to start out from scratch, start all over again and build a fleet.

Let us profit by that lesson, and assume that in this day of speed we may have another similar experience to that of Pearl Harbor. Let us assume that coming from somewhere, from X country, our listening posts to the north report that an enemy fleet of 25 or 30 or 50 or 100 planes has been noticed flying toward the United States, apparently headed for the eastern seaboard. Let us assume that word to that effect is quickly flashed to the people of our great cities along the Atlantic seaboard. I do not know what would happen in a city like New York, which is surrounded by water on three sides, and whose people have to rely on very crowded communication ways to get out of the city, and on limited transportation facilities to get over the rivers. Certainly 10,000,000 people could not get out of there, in my opinion, in a couple of days, even if complete law and order should prevail.

People would have no regard for red lights, for speed limits. The policemen themselves would want to get out of New York. The firemen would want to get out. I imagine a good many fire trucks would leave the fire stations for the environs of New York City without any fire alarm being sounded to call them to any particular destination. That place would be a shambles. Even after drills had been conducted, even though safety organizations had been set up, even though good order should be maintained, perhaps only a few hundred thousand could be evacuated in the 50 or 60 minutes which would intervene from the time the planes were first sighted until they were over New York, in the event that they were not shot down en route.

What I have stated by way of illustration with respect to one city can be multiplied by the other great cities along the Atlantic seaboard.

That is the kind of world we are starting to live in, Mr. President. It is not the kind of world I want or that you want, but it is the world of coming reality if we should have another world war.

Many of us have seen Hiroshima and Nagasaki, either in the form of pictures or by visiting those cities in Japan. There were exhibited before the Atomic Energy Committee three or four hundred slides of views of those cities after the bomb had fallen. Of course, those two cities were not constructed like American cities, of stone and steel or of durable wood. Many of the houses of Japanese construction are relatively flimsy. But when it was all over those two cities were practically level plains all the way across. They were destroyed by the crude first atomic bomb ever fashioned by man.

We are told that in destructive ability the new bomb may be 1,000 times more powerful than the atomic bombs we knew. Picture one of them over some city in Europe, or over some city in America. Picture 12 of them over 12 cities in Europe or 12 cities in America. Certainly the Russian people have just as much to gain by a plan of complete disarmament, save for such forces as are necessary to keep law and order in each country, under proper inspection, as have the people of any other country on the face of the earth.

The Russians have today 200 divisions under arms; probably three or four million men Under such a plan as I suggest those men, or most of them, could return to their homes, help to develop the rivers, help to turn the great timber resources of Russia into materials for homes and factories, help to dam her great rivers for electric power; and all the wealth which Russia is now pouring into her military machine on land, on sea, and in the air, could be used to better the lot of the Russian people.

Likewise, in these United States, the same thing would apply. Here we are spending for our national defense, including the interest on the national debt, which is largely military, including provisions for our veterans, which is a military outlay, and including the Marshall plan, which is largely military, almost the sum of $30,000,000,000. Out of a budget of $42,000,000,000, we are spending practically $30,000,000,000 of the wealth of the American people, of their energies, of their resources, and necessarily spending it, in my opinion, by reason of wars, past, present, or future,

in the present international situation. But we ought not merely to sit down and throw away $30,000,000,000 every year and be content to say, "Oh, well, we will do it just so long as the other fellow does." He is probably saying, too, "Oh, well, we will do it so long as that fellow does."

It seems to me the time has come when both countries have everything to gain and nothing to lose by attempting to take this great burden of expense, this great weight of fear, this tremendous realistic hallucination, from the vision of men, women, and children, and put it forever away. If we do not do it, and we have another war, Mr. President, after that war is over I care not who has the preponderance of hydrogen bombs or who has the preponderance of atomic bombs; in my opinion that war, with the modern instruments which are now made or are in the making, will be so devastating that all we shall have fought for will be lost anyway. So terrific, both on the battlefield and upon our economy, will be the impact of another great world war fought with modern weapons, that those who survive—and they may not be too numerous—will ask themselves, "What did we fight for, anyway?"

We should stop and think what one bomb would do to this great Capital in which we live. A freighter might come into one of our great harbors with an atomic bomb in its hold. The freighter could be loaded with lumber. It could be loaded with furs. It could be loaded with fertilizer. To all appearances it would be legitimately approaching one of our great harbors. It could have one or two hydrogen bombs equipped with time fuzes fastened in its interior, well out of sight and unknown to us. The freighter might anchor out in the harbor. The crew would go ashore and go out into the country for a day or two. Then the bomb would explode.

Mr. President, such a plan is perfectly feasible. It is much easier to do that than it would be to make another attack similar to that at Pearl Harbor from the air. Such ships might sail into several of our harbors, each of them loaded with an atomic bomb. Are we to sit by, in the face of what no one on this floor or in the world will deny is a perfectly feasible and possible arrangement, with all that it can mean to civilization, to our country, to our children, to our children's children, and to the people of the world, and be content to nibble at a part of this problem, knowing that even if we solve only a part of it we shall get back in the end to what we tried to solve, but did not solve at all, because these instruments of destruction will be used?

If I wanted to make a war, if I thought war was coming, if I thought war was inevitable, and if I were in command of one of the other great nations which was likely to fight the war, and I had the hydrogen bomb, I would be sorely tempted to put one of the bombs in each of four or five ships and send the ships into some great ports of America, all the bombs to be exploded more or less simultaneously by time fuze, thus destroying the people who live in the ports.

I hope that as the years unfold I shall not have made a prophecy. Unless we face up to the possibilities of the situation, the things which I have described are perfectly likely to happen.

It may be that some nations will refuse to come to such a conference. If so, we shall know their attitude. We shall have the consciousness, at least, of having asked them. If they refuse, we shall know where we stand. It may be that some nations will come to the conference, and, even though the plan be a fair one to them and to ourselves, will refuse to adopt it. We shall know that. We shall know where we stand. It may be that nations will come to the conference, that some plan will be agreed to, and some kind of a real disarmament program will be started—the kind of disarmament which is worthy of the name, and not a truce kind of disarmament which is good only between wars, when it does not make any difference anyway, but is not good during war, which is the real purpose for which all of the control proposals are made.

I believe there is more than a faint hope that the great nations of the world will be attracted to the President's invitation to world disarmament, and world disarmament alone, at a conference. I believe that other nations will be attracted to it because they, no less than we, must see what the alternative is eventually. I believe that other nations will want to devote their energies and resources to the upbuilding of their own countries rather than to squander them on numerous armaments. I believe we can assume that the people of every nation, with very few exceptions as to individuals, long for peace, for relief from the tax burden, for relief from fear, and that they long for the opportunity to utilize the sweat of their brows and the toil of their hands for reclamation, water power, roads, schools, health, and all the other things which we could have so easily if we did not have to support the weight of this great burden and the fear hanging over us all.

Mr. President, when I submitted this resolution 4 years ago some men thought the proposal was not feasible. They said, "If we can just get atomic control that will be wonderful. War is bad enough. But if we can just eliminate the bomb, perhaps we can survive with the other weapons, aside from the bomb."

I believed then, and I believe now, that even if we and the Russians and others had agreed to outlaw the bomb, and the inspections had been perfect and the bomb had been outlawed, if war were to come, both we and the Russians would start immediately to build plants to make the bomb. They could not afford to do otherwise.

With that same logic—and I think it is logic—I come to the subject of the hydrogen bomb. Any agreement simply to outlaw the hydrogen bomb means an agreement to outlaw it in the time between wars, with no real effective hope that it will not be used if war comes. I believe the only way we can have any prospect of preventing world war III, and perhaps stopping the use of these weapons, is to have some measure of real world disarmament, to which all the other countries in the world agree, with adequate inspection before, during, and after.

Therefore, I am submitting another resolution, hoping that it may challenge those who have thought along different lines to feel that there may be some merit in it, and that it may be communicated to the peoples of lands who may long for a world where great weapons such as the hydrogen bomb and the atomic bomb will be outlawed under proper inspection.

I compliment my colleague the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] for speaking the other day with the same objective in mind. No one has a complete patent on the correct solution of this problem. All proposals are worthy of deepest thought. I know how he feels about the subject. He has been chairman of the great Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of which I have the honor to be a member. I know that he is carrying in his own mind a great deal of confidential and secret information with which it is not pleasant to live, please believe me.

If someone has a better plan, let him come forward. But let us have more prognosis and less diagnosis. There is too much of an atmosphere of sitting around and finding fault. This situation calls for strong action, and we cannot take it 250 years from now, either.

I have offered my own small contribution, not as a perfect answer to the problem, but as the best one with which I have been able to come forward. I do not say it does not have faults; I cannot guarantee that it will be effective; but I have been unable to find a better solution which appeals to me, in light of the information I have. I am not willing, however, to sit around and twiddle my thumbs until the world sets itself on fire and all of us are incinerated. It seems to me we have come to the time when we must take the initiative, must seize the banner of world civilization and go forward with it, must throw off defeatism, must possess the courage of our ancestors to meet adversity, must meet the direct challenge and, facing it boldly, must study it and tear it to pieces until we do find the solution.

Mr. President, 4 years ago, on January 28, 1946, I concluded my remarks in the Senate with these three paragraphs, which I wish to read again today.

The voices of all mankind, if they could be registered, would, I believe, support the proposition of world disarmament. The millions of brave dead who lie in the scattered graves of World Wars I and II died for this ideal of real peace on earth The mothers and fathers, the widows and orphans of those who are no more want this enduring monument as partial compensation for their great and irretrievable loss. The tens of millions who still carry the yoke of misery, fear, and want imposed by war want this new day of permanent peace to dawn quickly.

The continuance of civilization itself is in the balance.

That is no overstatement.

I also said:

The sands in the hour-glass grow less and less and less with each passing second.

That is absolutely true, Mr. President.

Then I said:

Let the United States, the impregnable fortress of freedom, the lover of peace, the hope of oppressed people the world over, take the lead in summoning all the nations

of the earth to a world disarmament conference, and bring into reality the fervent hope, the earnest prayers, and the longing of men through all the centuries for the untroubled security of a just, unbroken, and enduring peace.

One final word, Mr. President. If we have such a conference, let us pray to God that it will be successful. If it fails, we shall be no worse off than we are now.

I now send the resolution to the desk for appropriate reference.

The resolution (S. Res. 227), submitted by Mr. TYDINGS, was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the President is authorized and requested to invite the governments of all nations to send representatives to a conference, which shall be charged with the single duty of entering into an understanding and agreement to achieve world disarmament on land, on sea, and in the air by January 1, 1954, except only for such actual occupying forces, with appropriate weapons, and for such agreed period of time, as will be necessary to police the defeated and occupied nations as a result of the recent war, and except only for such armed forces and for such weapons as are to be placed exclusively under the jurisdiction of the Security Council of the United Nations Organization, and except only for such limited forces and limited small arms as are needed to keep law and order within each country, and directly prohibiting the manufacture, storage, and possession of all other weapons, ammunition, and munitions of war, and providing further for the international inspection force authorized and instructed to see that the terms of such world disarmament are rigidly adhered to and carried out, and thereafter maintained by all the countries of the earth.

Mr. MALONE obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Maryland?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYDEN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad to have the Senator ask me a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was very much impressed by what the Senator from Maryland had to say today. Like himself, I do not know whether what he proposes is the answer. He gave some figures relative to cost, over and above the cost of these terrible instruments of warfare to which he has referred. I know he will want the RECORD to be clear.

In the present budget approximately 71.6 percent is devoted to the stupid business called war.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Here in the Senate we have just been talking about a project that would help many people live peacefully and happily. It is worth pointing out that that entire project could be built for the cost of one task force.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator. The figures are very conclusive that, as he has said, about 70 or 75 percent of all the money our Government takes from the people, in every conceivable way, must be used for war, either past, present, or to come; and as a result we have only 25 or 30 percent of our budget remaining for all the other activities in which our Government is engaged.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to ask the Senator a second question. Of course, we hear a great deal about price supports for farmers in relation to taxes and budgets. The whole price-support program can be operated for the cost of one task force.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. Not only that, but unless we solve this problem we shall have a world war III in which these new weapons will be used. Then we shall not be bothered very much about any other matters, because there will be very little left of anything.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Exactly.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me, to permit me to comment on what has just been said?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The other day, when I spoke about this matter on the floor of the Senate, several Senators were kind enough to say to me that they thought it well the discussion had begun. I am sure that many of those who said that did not agree with everything I said, nor did they disagree with everything I said.

In the same vein, I should like to say to the Senator from Maryland that I am very much pleased with the address he has made to the Senate today. I know, from my conversations with him over the past 5 years, of the deep thought he has given to this problem and how strongly he realizes the necessity for some kind of peaceful solution. I also know that the Senate of the United States is a place for the discussion of this question.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Maryland for living up to that high necessity and for fulfilling the best traditions as a Senator by making his contribution to the cause of peace.

I should like to make a further comment, with the Senator's permission: The Senator from Washington has talked about cost. Some comment was made the other day about the $50,000,000,000 which the Senator from Connecticut said might well be taken off our military budget if we were successful in our aims relative to disarmament, and might be devoted to the causes of peace.

I should like to point out that the last war is estimated to have cost a trillion dollars. The lives lost in that war are not to be translated into terms of cost, because we cannot do that. But in material terms alone, the cost of that war would mean a five-room house for every family in the entire world, and enough money left over to build a hospital in every town of over 5,000 people, and to operate the hospital for a period of 10 years. That is what a trillion dollars means in terms of material uses for the good of mankind.

So, Mr. President, when we begin to talk about various costs and sums of money, it is well to keep that in mind.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut. I do not wish to compliment him unduly, and what I shall say is rather limited to the encomiums which I think he is entitled to receive. Since he has been chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I know of no more diligent chairman of any committee in the Congress, nor do I know of one who has devoted himself more unselfishly and untiringly to this problem, the greatest of all problems before us, than has the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut, who has been prompt in his attendance at all meetings of the joint committee, has gone over the country examining the atomic plants, has conferred with Army officials and with the Atomic Energy Commission over and over again, and has carried a terrific load. I only hope the people of the United States will appreciate his unselfish devotion to the cause of peace and the protection of his own country, which I know is well appreciated by every member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I am sure every member of the joint committee well realizes the great service the Senator from Connecticut has performed in that respect.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield, to permit me to make a brief statement at this point?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr TAYLOR. Mr. President, recently I complimented the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut on the statesmanlike address he made. I wish now to compliment the great senior Senator from the State of Maryland. I believe that in these two addresses I have found more of statesmanship than I have found in all the other talk which has occurred in the Senate of the United States during the 5 years that I have been a Member of the Senate.

Believe me, Mr. President, I am deeply interested in the problem of bringing peace to the world. In October of 1945, shortly after the first atomic bombs had been dropped in Japan, I introduced a joint resolution calling for the creation of a world republic. I have done other things in the interest of world peace. Some persons have thought that my actions in that respect were brash; some persons thought they were stupid or idiotic. However, Mr. President, I knew what I was doing on each occasion; I felt that something should be done. Although I realized I was a new Senator and did not have the prestige of long service in the Senate, I was unwilling to wait until such time might come. What I have done in that connection has been done because I felt more than justified in running whatever risks such action might involve to my political career or to me personally, even if it resulted in bringing my political career to an end. I felt that the risk involved was more than worth while, for I was acting in the hope of trying to bring to the attention of the people of the country and of the world the terrible problem which confronts us, and them, and I was attempting to find some solution for it.

So I am very happy to see these statesmen attack this problem in a realistic manner.

To be perfectly frank about it, Mr. President, of late I have adopted a rather fatalistic attitude. I knew I had done

everything I possibly could do, and it had come to naught. I really did not see what else could be done about the matter. I am happy to see these able Senators and statesmen rising to the occasion. I merely want to assure them that I shall certainly do everything I can to back them up in the very worthy and realistic approaches they have made to the problem.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his generous remarks.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Can the Senator tell us approximately how long he intends to speak this afternoon?

AN AMERICAN DOMESTIC NATIONAL POLICY

Mr. MALONE. I may say in answer to the question of the senior Senator from Washington that I shall speak for perhaps 50 minutes.

Mr. President, on January 24 I made a short address to the Senate, outlining the lack of an international or foreign policy. At that time I said that I planned to take the floor early the following week, to speak on the subject of a domestic policy. I have been somewhat delayed. At that time I said I would discuss whether we should have a policy under which the people of the United States would be permitted to have access to their own domestic markets equal to the access that foreign countries have been given under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. I referred to the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended, under which foreign nations are now given greater access to the American markets than are American manufacturers and American labor themselves.

I advocated at that time that the flexible-import-fee principle should be substituted for the Trade Agreements Act, and that the United States signature of the proposed International Trade Organization legislation should be withheld In a short summary of the address, I called for an American foreign policy, asserting that we had not had a world policy since the end of World War II, but that the administration had made a series of unrelated, random decisions, and had projected financial programs based largely upon European propaganda, for the zigzag course and the double dealing which it has continued to follow since the end of the war.

COLD WAR AND COMMUNISM

I said that the executive department of our Government is charged by the Constitution of the United States with determining foreign policy and that Congress can accept or reject any treaty or formal arrangement presented to it; that it was high time the President and the State Department inform the Congress and the people of the Nation whether or not we are still waging a cold war with Russia, and whether or not the spread of communism is dangerous to our ultimate peace and safety.

I said further that if the President and the State Department decide that we are waging such a war, and if they decide that the spread of communism is dangerous to our ultimate peace and safety, then we should forthwith stop all assistance to the ECA nations which have made the 95 trade treaties with Russia and the iron-curtain countries. The ECA nations are helping Russia to consolidate her gains in eastern Europe and in Asia, and to arm her for world war III against us. If we are not waging such a cold war and if the spread of communism is not dangerous to us, that we should immediately restore normal trade relations with Russia, just as the European nations did immediately following World War II.

The joint resolution which I introduced at that time would prohibit financial aid to any foreign country engaging in trade with Russia, her satellite countries, or any other area dominated or controlled by Russia.

In any case we should make a decision and quit fooling the American people, and stop the double dealing which has become the common practice of the State Department since World War II.

Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with what the senior Senator from Maryland has just said, that it is time we took cognizance of these matters. It is time that we recognize now, if only belatedly, that Mr. May, who was in Canada at that time, was a British citizen, who betrayed atomic secrets to the Russians and who apparently funneled the information into Russia just as fast as we could discover new processes. It is time, Mr. President, that we realize that such a man as Klaus Fuchs, who was sent over here by England, and whose security status was apparently cleared by England, was allowed to come and pry into our secrets. The doors were opened to him, as has just been explained, by all our atomic energy experts. Klaus Fuchs, according to the newspapers, was not even checked by the FBI.

Mr. President, everyone will remember that a serious question arose as to whether we should at all times take England into our confidence and give England our atomic secrets and store atomic bombs in that country. That would have been a dangerous thing to do, with a man whom England had cleared funneling the information directly into Russia.

This morning's newspaper carries an article showing what little examination had ever been made of Fuchs. His German parents say he has always had Communist leanings.

COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM

Mr. President, we all know there is little difference between the ultimate objectives of socialism and communism. We are supporting Socialist nations in Europe, and we are becoming Socialist ourselves. The objective of both, socialism and communism, is the perfect state, in which the individual owns nothing. The principal difference between the two lies in the method of attaining the objective. The Communist will shoot a man in order to convert him to his kind of government. The Socialist will spend a country into socialism. That is what we are doing, Mr. President. A Communist is merely an impatient Socialist.

Having summarized the high lights of my speech of January 24 on foreign policy, I may reiterate that the State Department and the executive department have the responsibility of determining foreign policy and of announcing to the Congress and to the American people objectives of that policy. They have never done it. We are simply continuing the policy of floundering, so that with England, India, Czechoslovakia, and all these other nice comrades of ours, recognizing Communist China, we then float into a policy thoroughly confusing to the American people. The American people do not know what the State Department wants to do. Some of us believe a deal was made last fall at a conference involving England, Canada, and the United States to confuse the issue during the debate on the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. This conference succeeded in confusing the issue as far as the American people were concerned. And the State Department and the Executive have never yet declared openly whether communism is a threat to our ultimate peace and safety, or whether we are still in a cold war. On January 24, I submitted a list of 95 trade treaties made by the ECA nations with certain other countries subsequent to World War II, which treaties are now in full force and effect. The trade treaties enable the ECA countries to ship the Russians everything she needs to wage a third world war and to consolidate Communist gains in eastern Europe and in Communist China.

WE SHOULD NOT ARM RUSSIA

Many persons believe that these trade treaties are dangerous to our ultimate safety. Russia cannot manufacture and process materials in amounts large enough to keep her people satisfied and consolidate her gains in eastern Europe and Communist China, and those subjugated people may become dissatisfied and will start pushing off the yoke of communism. Not helping Russia to consolidate her gains is the only alternative, Mr. President, which many informed persons can see to a shooting war toward which we are moving with frightening rapidity.

Mr. President, I said, in a sort of preview for today's address, that the fate of the jobs and the investments of the American people had been placed in the hands of an industrially inexperienced State Department. Through the Trade Agreements Act the Congress of the United States put into the hands of the Secretary of State the fate of practically every workingman's job and every investment in the United States of America. The Congress of the United States must take full responsibility for the results when it yields its constitutional responsibility to the executive department of the Government.

The list which I referred to earlier is found on page 818 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1950, with three or four treaties printed in some detail, including a treaty between Belgium and Rumania, on page 824 of the RECORD.

This treaty lists many things which we were and will be unable to get in time of war, including tin products, copper and copper alloys, cobalt, aluminum, rolling-mill cylinders, rolling-mill equipment, electrical equipment, machinery and apparatus, Diesel locomotives, electrotechnical equipment, particularly industrial electric equipment and apparatus, telephone equipment, household electric equipment and practically everything necessary to go right on and consolidate gains in those areas to prepare for world war III.

OUR DOMESTIC POLICY

Mr. President, I now intend to discuss our domestic policy. On September 13, 1949, I offered a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended. I suggested a flexible import-fee principle, so we could hold our standard of living while helping and assisting foreign nations to raise their own standards. Since we have extended the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, many industries have been further injured, and merely a start has been made in the effect this act will have on America.

I want the RECORD to show that I have submitted, in the form of a suggestion, to the Republican Party for a declaration of policy a plan for the promotion of world trade through the principle of fair and reasonable competition, assuring that foreign goods produced by under-paid foreign labor shall not be admitted to this country on terms which remove the floor under our wages and investments, and reduce the living standards of the American workingman, the American farmer, and the productivity of American industry.

On January 19, in a letter addressed to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I said:

It is my deep conviction that the Republican Party, through the Policy Committee of both your Republican Senate Policy Committee and the Policy Committee appointed by the national chairman from the National Republican Committee, should come out "flat-footed" on a platform of substituting the flexible import-fee principle for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended, and for the defeat of the International Trade Organization, as the spearhead plank in our national (domestic) policy.

ENDORSEMENTS OF THE FLEXIBLE IMPORT-FEE PRINCIPLE

At that time, Mr. President, I submitted to the Senator from Ohio a resolution adopted by the Nevada State Executive Committee of the Republican Party, an official resolution adopted on November 15, 1949, offering the flexible import-fee principle as a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as amended, calling for the defeat of the International Trade Organization legislation, and for definite conditions governing further gift-loans to Europe. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the selective free trade policy adopted by the State Department, based upon the Trade Agreements Act, is removing the floor from under wages and investments—causing unemployment and loss of taxable property; and

Whereas the proposed International Trade Organization, consisting of 58 nations, each with one vote, to which it is suggested that this Nation assign all of its right to adjust tariffs and import fees for the protection of the working men and investments in the United States of America, would complete the job of wrecking our economy; and

Whereas the policy of making up the trade-balance deficits of the European nations (16 ECA nations) in cash each year without definite conditions for its utilization is simply reestablishing the century old feuds and rivalries among such nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Republican State Executive Committee of Nevada hereby adopts and recommends to the National Republican Committee for adoption an American domestic and foreign policy:

1 A domestic (national) policy

A. The flexible import fee principle, based upon fair and reasonable competition, administered by a reorganized experienced tariff commission, to be known as the Foreign Trade Authority, in the same manner as the long-established Interstate Commerce Commission adjusts freight rates for the carriers on a basis of the principle laid down by Congress, of a reasonable return on the investments, to be substituted for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended

Under the flexible import fee principle a market is immediately established for the goods of foreign nations on a basis of fair and reasonable competition with our own—they cannot in good conscience ask for more

2. A foreign (international) policy—as a condition of further aid to Europe

A Integrity of private investments

B A United States of Europe—including Germany without trade barriers of any kind.

C Free convertibility of the European currencies in the terms of the dollar

D Equal access to the trade of the nations of the world—subject only to the action of such individual nations; be it further

Resolved, That the so-called bipartisan policy, including the support of the administration's three-part free-trade program has destroyed our traditional floor-under-wages policy and has contributed materially to the defeat of the Republican Party, and

That the haphazard lowering of the import fees and tariffs, without regard to the differential of the cost of production due largely to the difference in living standards of this country and the foreign competitive nations, has severely injured the mining, petroleum, agricultural, textiles, pottery, lumber, precision instruments, and many other industries, thereby causing unusual unemployment and loss of taxable property; and

That we are, by our own actions, removing the floor under wages and investments in this Nation and in effect transferring American jobs to foreign soil.

This is a resolution passed officially by the Nevada State Executive Committee of the Republican Party on November 15, 1949.

On December 2, 1949, at the thirtieth annual meeting of the Nevada State Farm Bureau at Ely, Nevada, Resolution No. 17 was passed, dealing with domestic and foreign policy, which resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the selective free-trade policy adopted by the State Department, based upon the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as lowering the American living standards through the lowering of wages and is causing unemployment and a subsequent decline in the demand for agricultural products: Therefore be it

Resolved That the Nevada State Farm Bureau adopts and recommends that the American Farm Bureau Federation support a domestic and foreign policy containing the following features:

I. Foreign policy:

(a) Protection of private investments in foreign countries.

(b) Free convertibility of European currencies in terms of dollars

(c) Consolidation of the European nations into a United States of Europe, and the erasing of all present trade barriers

(d) Equal access to the trade of all nations of the world subject only to the action of the individual nations.

II. National policy:

(a) Set up a flexible import fee which would be based upon fair and reasonable competition administered by a reorganized, experienced tariff commission in the same manner as the long-established Interstate Commerce Commission adjusts freight rates for the carriers on a basis of the principle laid down by Congress, of a reasonable return on the investment Under a flexible import-fee principle, a market is immediately established for the goods of foreign nations on a basis of fair and reasonable competition with our own—other nations in good conscience cannot ask for more By so doing, America's domestic agricultural market would be greatly stabilized and cease to be a dumping ground for world surpluses. We are a land of agricultural abundance striving to maintain a standard of living unparalleled by any other nation in the world. Be it further

Resolved, That the lowering of import fees and tariffs without regard to the differential of the cost of production due largely to the difference in living standards of this Nation and of foreign competitive nations has a demoralizing effect on our agricultural markets as well as those of other industries, thereby causing unemployment and loss of revenue to the American farmer.

Mr President, on January 17, 1950, the Pioche Union, Local No 407, of the CIO, passed a similar resolution, signed by Thomas L Hutchings, president. In that resolution this local resolved, as disclosed in their telegram to me:

DEAR SIR By unanimous vote Pioche Union, Local No 407, CIO, disapprove part 4 plan of the President which includes the International Trade Organization agreement and urge that you do everything possible to substitute flexible import fee as outlined in your talk at Pioche, Nev, on December 15, 1949

Yours truly,

THOMAS L HUTCHINGS,
President, Local No 407.

Mr. President, that union local represents southern Nevada in mining. They belong to the mine, mill, and smelter workers, a well-known union in the United States.

Mr. President, on January 18, 1950, the White Pine County Central Labor Council, located at East Ely, Nev., passed a resolution, as disclosed in a telegram addressed to the junior Senator from Nevada, as follows:

We call your attention to the following resolution adopted by the White Pine County Central Labor Council. Whereas the selective free-trade policy is removing the floor from under American wages and investments, causing unemployment and loss of taxable property, and whereas the haphazard lowering of the import fees and tariffs without regard to the differential of the cost of production due largely to the difference in living standards of this country and foreign competitive nations, has severely injured the nonferrous mining industry.

This is another mining industry in Nevada, Mr. President.

Therefore be it resolved, that a telegram be sent to each of our national Senators ask-

ing them to do what they can toward correcting this deplorable situation.

DOUG HAWKIN,
President, White Pine County Central Labor Council.

On September 16, 1949, Local Lodge No. 705, International Association of Machinists, of Sparks, Nev., sent me a telegram. This International Association of Machinists represents a section of a great national union. This particular section happens to be located on the Southern Pacific Railroad, at Sparks, Nev. In a letter addressed to the junior Senator from Nevada they state:

SIR: The legislative committee of local lodge No. 705, International Association of Machinists, Sparks, Nev., reported favorably on the matter of the flexible import fee. Whereupon the membership unanimously instructed the legislative committee to inform you that local lodge No. 705, International Association of Machinists, Sparks, Nev., has gone on record in favor of the flexible import fee.

The legislative committee wishes to commend the Senator for his hard work and initiative.

Yours truly,

SATIRIOS SOUKAROS,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.
GEORGE H SHELTON,
JOHN L. ROBERTSON,
Legislative Committee.

Mr. President, on January 12, 1950, the Property Owners' Associations, Inc., of Clark County, Nev., telegraphed their junior Senator as follows:

Urge you to support a flexible import- and export-tariff bill for protection of our domestic industries and curtailment of foreign spending.

Mr. President, recently I made an address at Portland, Oreg., before the Multnomah Chapter, which is the larger and controlling section of the Oregon Republican Club, at its annual meeting. Following my address the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] received the following telegram, dated the 31st of January:

The executive committee, Multnomah Chapter Oregon Republican Club meeting, after speech by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, heartily endorses flexible import-fee principle as a substitute for 1934 Trade Agreements Act as amended and recommends the defeat of the International Trade Organization.

ROBERT H. GRAYSON,
President.

AMERICAN JOBS ARE AT STAKE

Mr. President, the workingmen of this country are the first to suffer through free trade if this trade is based on unfair, low-cost labor competition. In my humble opinion, no Senator or Representative can vote for free trade of this kind and conscientiously vote against free immigration, because there is no practical difference between the importation of low-cost laborers and importation of the products of low-cost labor from countries where labor receives anywhere from 40 to 50 cents a day, as do the laborers in the Far East and Africa, or when they receive 40 cents up to $2, or $2.50, or a maximum perhaps of $3, as they do in Europe, and perhaps $2.50 or $2.25 in the South American countries.

There is no difference between free immigration and dishonest free trade, particularly when our machinery and our know-how are freely available to them.

I hear it said that we do not fear competition because of our great know-how and our inventive genius, especially in the line of machinery. I point out to the Senate that through acts passed by the Congress, we are making available the machinery and the know-how of America to people anywhere in the world, and not only making them available, but paying the freight and the cost. That is also the way the material is being sent, with the help of the 95 trade treaties, to Russia, to the iron-curtain countries, and to China. I want to point out to the President of this body that even if we were not giving it away, this machinery would be available anywhere on earth, and so would our know-how be freely available anywhere.

Mr. President, I have been in the engineering business 30 years, the last 15 years mainly devoted to industrial engineering. Engineers like me have been coming out of the colleges of this country for 50 years so fast that there are not enough positions for them, so that many of them have even gone into other lines of activity. Therefore there are many men who have the know-how and the necessary information, who are foremen and workmen in industrial plants.

Mr. President, I was in South Africa in the latter part of 1948. I talked to General Smuts while I was there. I also talked to many of South Africa's financial leaders. We spoke of manganese and chromite and other minerals which are rather scarce in this country, although they could be produced on the basis of our standard of living, if unfair free trade did not interfere. One can fly in an airplane over the veins of ore in South Africa and follow the outcropping for several miles. In conversation with General Smuts I said to him, "If I were 20 years younger, and not in the United States Senate, I would come here, get some people on the telephone in the United States of America who want these minerals, and if you would give me a lease with a term long enough so I could get out the money I invested on a reasonable amortization basis, and pay for my machinery, and make some money on my investments, we could get more minerals out of this section of South Africa than anyone would know what to do with.

Mr. President, what kind of machinery would I install there? I would be able to install the identical kind of machinery in South Africa for mining maganese and chromite ore that I could use in California and Nevada where I have worked with engineers for 30 years.

Why are we told that the technical advice, know-how and machinery are not available to other peoples? They are available to every nation in the world that will turn honest and respect the integrity of private investment. The Republican Party in Nevada, through its executive committee, and the Farm Bureau in Nevada has asked, in official resolutions adopted by them, that we place conditions on further loans abroad, I should call them gifts rather, for that is what the so-called loans to Europe are. What do we ask for? We ask for integrity of private investments. We ask for a United States of Europe. With more than half the area of the United States, and 16 Nations, Europe has nearly twice the population of the United States. Each one of those nations or states has a complete government, each one with jealously guarded sovereignty.

WE PICK UP THE CHECKS

Mr. President, I believe I have said before on the Senate floor, and I know I have said so in other places, that I have no objection to those countries in Europe each having a sovereign government, so long as they pay for their government. But when they get on our pay roll—and, Mr. President, they are in our budget now, just the same as is the Department of the Interior—so long as they are on our pay roll, it behooves this body to study and determine just what the money we pay out is used for.

I have no objection to the King of England drawing a salary of a million and a half dollars a year. A statement to that effect was contained in a newspaper report published not long ago. There is no use going into what every ruler of every state in Europe draws, but if a ruler draws a million and a half dollars a year, so long as the nation can pay that amount, and we do not have to pick up the check, in other words, make up the deficit each year, I am perfectly willing for them to pay such a sum to their ruler. But when we start picking up the check of a nation which is paying its sovereign one and a half million dollars each year, then I have considerable curiosity as to just what they are doing with our money elsewhere.

CONGRESS ABDICATED ITS DUTIES

Mr. President, I believe the Senate of the United States has been very derelict in describing to the country what has happened. The Constitution of the United States of America gives to the Congress of the United States authority over the economy of this country. The Constitution gives Congress the authority to fix import fees, tariffs, and excise taxes—that means control over the economy of the country. I point out that for 75 years we have had protection in some form or another. We have had what we call a tariff, a fixed tariff, which did not work quite as well, perhaps, as the flexible import fee we are now suggesting. We learn as we go along. But fixed or not, it was at the approximate differential of cost of production and the living standards between this Nation and the nation or nations in which the competition is located.

Traditionally, Mr. President, the Republican Party has been for protection of the workingman's job and his wages, and the investments made by the people of the United States in this country. Traditionally, the Democratic Party has been a free-trade party. It is only necessary to look up the record to verify that.

In 1914 we had the Underwood tariff bill. Then came the war in Europe, and free trade made no difference, because we could sell everything we wanted to

sell. The same was true in 1939, when the last war in Europe began. We got into the first war in 1917. Many of those who are now Members of the Senate and whom we ordinarily see on the Senate floor, took part in that war. Many Senators also took part in the last war, World War No. 2. From 1917 until the armistice of November 11, 1918, everything anyone could produce could be sold abroad. Therefore, a tariff or import fee was not necessary. But within 2 or 3 years after the end of the war, I think it was in 1922, it became necessary to call a special session of Congress to reestablish the tariffs and the import fees in order to protect the American jobs and American industry.

STATE DEPARTMENT NOT A FIT CUSTODIAN

Mr. President, the same battle is coming on again. After the depth of the depression, in 1934, in all the exuberance and enthusiasm of a new administration, the Congress passed the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. What was that 1934 Trade Agreements Act? Through that act, which has been extended several times and is still in force, having been extended the last time in September 1949, the Congress of the United States abdicated—I was going to say "abrogated," but I will use the expression "abdicated," for it is a better word—its authority over the national economy of this country, its constitutional authority, if you please, and gave this authority to an industrially inexperienced State Department, which has no interest in the industry of the United States, as I shall show in a few minutes. The State Department has its eyes fixed 3,000 or 10,000 miles away from the American shores, trying to make agreements of various kinds, and entering into treaties which have nothing to do with the economy of this country. Therefore, the State Department is willing to trade the living standards of our country to gain its ends, whatever they are, and which, moreover, it has never made clear.

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States gave into the hands of the executive department the authority to fix foreign policy. Congress by its own action, by the action of the Senate right here, tied together the national economy and the foreign policy of this country. The Senate abrogated the authority which the Constitution gave it to regulate the national economy. What is the result? The result is that the State Department has tied these two policies together, through the three-part free-trade program of the administration, and tied it tightly, Mr. President. The first two parts are already in operation. I shall describe them in a minute.

The ITO, the International Trade Organization, is on the President's "must" program. What did the Senate of the United States do right here on this floor? It abrogated its authority over the national economy, and made errand boys of its Members.

What can we do here now? All we can do is to accept or reject, or rearrange the myriad of appropriations sent up here for what is called domestic and foreign policy but which is really tied together. We appropriate $5,500,000,000 each year to make up the trade-balance deficits to Europe. The World Bank, the Export-Import Bank, and other trick financial institutions established by Congress over a period of 15 to 18 years have arranged things so that many million dollars can be sent to foreign countries without the necessity of coming back to Congress except for more appropriations. All we can do is to accept or reject the appropriation bills. We have passed the act. So perhaps instead of $5,500,000,000, $6,000,000,000, or $7,000,000,000 is going to foreign countries annually through these various institutions, most of it into the ECA nations.

THE THREE-PART SYSTEM

The first part of the three-part program which ties together the national economy and the foreign policy was the Trade Agreements Act, passed in 1934, and extended from that time until now. The original act placed in the hands of the President, so in effect in the hands of the State Department, the right to raise or lower, to the extent of 50 percent, the tariffs and import fees which were in effect at that time. In extending the act in 1945 for 3 years Congress increased by another 50 percent the amount by which tariff and import fees could be lowered, making a total of 75 percent of the tariff and import fees as in force under the Tariff Act of 1930.

What does this mean? That is virtually free trade. Whenever we ignore the differentials of cost due to the difference in standards of living there is only one possible result. Either the people of this country will lower their standard of living to meet this situation or they will become unemployed.

THE MARSHALL PLAN

The second part of the three-part free-trade system is the Marshall plan, or ECA, as it is now called, providing $5,500,000,000 in cash to make up the trade-balance deficits of each of the European nations. Our chief export is cash, industrial machinery, and other things for which we pay cash out of the taxpayer's pocketbook.

Those are the two parts. The Marshall plan, or the ECA, provides five and a half to six billion dollars each year to make up the trade-balance deficits until such time as the State Department can, through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, divide the markets of this country with the other nations of the world, to the point where our standard of living is reduced to theirs. At that point, the Marshall plan would no longer be necessary.

It was thought that the desired result could be accomplished by 1952. It is now found that it is impossible to accomplish the result by then. A distinguished Senator recently suggested that we appropriate $50,000,000,000 more in a lump sum and have it over with for 4 or 5 years. I think that makes just as much sense as what we are now doing. The ECA appropriations were to be continued until 1952. At that time we were supposed to be clear. We would then divide our markets with the other nations of the world.

CAN WE RAISE LIVING STANDARDS?

It is said that we are going to raise the standards of other nations up to ours. Let us see what it sounds like. There are 2,250,000,000 people in the world. We hope we have about 160,000,000 of them, as the estimates would seem to show. When we start doing what is proposed, it is just like dividing what wealth we have with the rest of the 2,250,000,000 people in the world. It is just as though I were to use this glass of water in an attempt to raise the level of water in the city reservoir by dumping it into it. I would have no water left in the glass, but the level of water in the reservoir would not be appreciably raised.

THE ITO

What is the third part? The third part of the free-trade program is the International Trade Organization. It is on the "must" list of the President's legislation for this year. What is it? It is an act, or a treaty, or whatever we wish to call it. Probably it would have been brought before us as a treaty if its proponents thought they could get a two-thirds vote to pass it. They realize a two-thirds vote could not be obtained. So it will be a legislative act, to be passed by a majority. If we pass it, we cannot get out of the ITO for 3 years. Then 6 months' notice is necessary to leave the organization. By that time we shall be like a man who has gone through a corn sheller or a threshing machine. We shall not be in any shape to get out. What we are doing is making permanent what we have attempted to do with the other two acts: leveling our standard of living with that of the rest of the world.

What is the International Trade Organization? While I am about it I shall describe it. The International Trade Organization will be composed of 58 nations. That is the number of nations expected to join. There are 52 now who have signed, and one has ratified. In averaging the standard of living no foreign nation can do anything but win, and we can do nothing but lose. They will all join the organization. There will be at least 58 nations with 58 votes. There will be 57 foreign votes to our 1 vote. We shall have one vote. Siam will have one vote. Siam is a little nation which lives mostly along canals, in rice fields, and in congested towns. These people live on sampans. I was there in 1948. I went down the canals to see how the people lived. The canal serves as their sewer and the source of their drinking-water supply. They bathe in the canal, wash their clothes in it, and use the water for their cooking. They weigh about 110 pounds each, wringing wet, and have no energy. A regiment of American marines could probably take the whole nation in 24 hours. Certainly they would have no trouble taking it in a week. But Siam has the same vote as the United States of America in this organization.

What would this organization do? It is given certain authority in the Habana charter, which contains 155 or 156 pages written in all kinds of double-talk. The substance of it is simply that to the

organization is assigned the authority to suggest the tariffs and the export fees for its member nations. That is only half of it. It is almost unbelievable. The more legislation I see coming to this floor the more I am convinced that Hitler had something when he said that the more preposterous anything is, the sillier it is, if one will only say it often enough and positively enough, many persons will believe it.

Mr. President, it has become the habit of the administration to turn out tons of propaganda every day. The newspapers print it, because very little has been said about the subject. We cannot blame the reporters for taking it, because that is about all they get.

This is a great thing we are going to do. We are going to enable everyone to live as people live at the Mayflower, the Willard, or the Shoreham. Within 6, 7, or 8 months everyone will be living alike. That is a great thing. All of us would like to see it. The administration has formed the habit during the past 18 years of taking anywhere from 3 to 18 months to propagandize its proposals Mr. President, I know what I am talking about. I have been coming here since 1927, although I have been a Member of the Senate only since 1947. For approximately 25 years I have watched this process operate. This propaganda has been going out from 3 to 18 months in advance, to sell the people, who have had very few other sources of information, a bill of goods on any particular thing the administration wishes to pass, before it is allowed to come to the Congress Then it is brought to the floor of the Senate and House That is what happened with the ITO charter

The great International Trade Organization goes one step further than any other legislation I can think of. Congress abrogated its authority over tariffs and gave it only to the State Department. This proposal moves the authority from the State Department to 57 foreign nations, each with one vote. That moves the authority a long distance away from home.

Why was that done? The reason is very evident. It was done on the theory that if the people are temporarily sold on a proposal of this kind a Senator will not have the guts to stand up and debate and vote against it. One day a couple of newspaper men said to me, "We agree with most of the things you say." But in a few minutes they asked, "When do you come up for reelection?" I said, "In 1952." They held out their hands and said, "It is nice to have known you."

Mr. President, I suppose I shall run for reelection in 1952, and I suppose I shall want very much to be reelected. But not at the sacrifice of the standard of living of the working men of America. I do not want a seat in the Senate that badly.

Mr. President, let me give a few citations dealing with the surrender of the tariff-making power to the ITO:

THE AUTHORITY OF THE ITO

Each member shall, upon the request of any other member or members—

Mr. President, I am reading from article 17, entitled "Reduction of Tariffs and Elimination of Preferences" which is to be found on page 46 of the Habana Charter for an International Trade Organization, dated March 24, 1948. Copies of it have been very scarce since that time. Talk about this charter has been going on for 3 or 4 years, but only recently has the charter gone to the committee. At least, this is the first time the President of the United States has said the Charter of the International Trade Organization must be ratified by the Senate. He must think the country is sold on it. If necessary, I shall mail him a little of the written or printed comment about the reaction of the labor organizations to it, or perhaps he will read about these matters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If so, that will be helpful.

I read now from article 17, entitled "Reduction of Tariffs and Elimination of Preferences":

1. Each member shall, upon the request of any other member or members, and subject to procedural arrangements established by the organization, enter into and carry out with such other member or members negotiations directed to the substantial reduction of the general levels of tariffs and other charges on imports and exports

It is to be noted that the provision is "shall"; the charter does not use the word "may" at that point.

That is the first paragraph of article 17.

In paragraph 2, a portion of subparagraph (a) reads as follows:

Members shall be free not to grant concessions on particular products and, in the granting of a concession, they may reduce the duty, bind it at its then existing level, or undertake not to raise it above a specified higher level.

That is also contrary to some of the other provisions of the proposed treaty; but it provides that foreign nations which, as we know, have been in the habit not only of raising their tariffs but of using quotas, embargoes, specifications, and manipulations of currencies and every other known device and contrivance to keep our goods from European markets, now may resort to the methods specified in the treaty. Apparently Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Acheson think the United States and its people are sufficiently "sold" on that deal. I shall come to that point in a few minutes, and shall present newspaper articles with respect to what Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Acheson have said regarding this matter since 1948, when the matter of this gift to foreign nations first came before the Congress, and when they said, in effect, "Just see what it will do for the American businessman. It will establish markets for his goods all over the world."

But, Mr. President, what do they say now? They frankly say that foreign nations must stop buying our goods, and that we must buy foreign goods. They know, at last, what any marketing specialist would know before he graduated from college, namely, that production is not the problem, but the market is the problem, whether locomotives, automobiles, or any other products are involved. So suddenly we find there is overproduction in Europe, not only of various commodities such as steel, but of lemons, for instance, in Italy; and let me say that lemons are now coming into California, as is well known to the junior Senator from California [Mr KNOWLAND], and they are also coming into the great State of Florida. Not long ago I was at Miami, Fla., to address the National Cattlemen's Association. The citrus fruit growers of Florida are crying their eyes out because of the importation of citrus fruits into the United States. There is no tariff protection against such importations; there is no tariff to take care of the difference between the cost of production of citrus fruits in the United States and the cost of production of citrus fruits in foreign countries Regardless of the differences in labor costs and other costs, foreign citrus fruits are being imported into the United States without tariff protection of any kind for our citrus industry.

I read further from the International Trade Organization's charter, subparagraph (b) of paragraph 2 of article 17 reads as follows:

(b) No member shall be required to grant unilateral concessions, or to grant concessions to other members without receiving adequate concessions in return.

Mr. President, let us see who is to be the judge of these matters. What are the adequate concessions we are to receive? Are we receiving any? Not so that you could notice it, Mr. President. And we still are the judges under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. But the International Trade Organization as an organization will be the judge in the future of adequate concessions, and we have been bad judges ourselves.

I read now subparagraph (d) of paragraph 2 of article 17:

(d) The binding against increase of low duties or of duty-free treatment shall in principle be recognized as a concession equivalent in value to the substantial reduction of high duties or the elimination of tariff preferences.

That is also contrary to subparagraph (b), which I just read. Not increasing a duty is a concession, according to the ITO.

Mr. President, the ITO would outlaw import and excise taxes on petroleum and copper. This is the paragraph of the charter for the International Trade Organization, to be found in article 18, paragraph 2 thereof:

2. The products of any member country imported into any other member country shall not be subject, directly or indirectly, to internal taxes or other internal charges of any kind in excess of those applied, directly or indirectly, to like domestic products.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to say to the Senator that I hope he does not construe the small number of Senators now on the floor of the Senate as an indication of a lack of interest on the part of other Senators in what the Senator from Nevada is discussing. As he knows, this afternoon many of us have jobs which cannot be postponed. I myself would like very much to remain here and hear the Senator from Nevada discuss the subject he is presenting, on which I think he is more of an authority than is any other Member of the Senate. I assure the Senator that I shall read his remarks tomorrow in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with a great deal of interest, and I am sorry to be compelled to leave the floor at this time.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I realize that the Republican caucus is in session, drawing up a program. So I understand the absence of Senators.

I read further from article 18 of the International Trade Organization's charter:

5 No member shall establish or maintain any internal quantitative regulation relating to the mixture, processing, or use of products in specified amounts or proportions which requires, directly or indirectly, that any specified amount or proportion of any product which is the subject of the regulation must be supplied from domestic sources.

Mr. President, I now call attention to an article appearing in the Journal of Commerce of January 27, 1950. The article refers to the request of the administration for an extension of the rubber policy bill for 10 years, I believe. It reads as follows:

FEDERAL AGENCIES STUDY TRUMAN RUBBER POLICY BILL

WASHINGTON, January 25.—A final draft bill, covering all the administration's recommendations for a new synthetic rubber law, is circulating through Federal agencies preparatory to formal introduction in Congress.

Introduction will come, it was reported, by the time a seven-man House Armed Services subcommittee sits down, probably about February 6, to conduct hearings on the President's request for authority to continue Government production of GR-S, the tire synthetic, for 10 years and Government controls requiring industry to use the material.

EXPLAIN NEW PROPOSALS

Four members of the President's committee which drew up his rubber recommendations last night appeared at a special session of the Washington Rubber Group—an American Chemical Society affiliate composed of Government and industry rubber men to shed further light on the administration's proposals.

With some 200 members and guests attending, questions from the floor and official responses revealed on both sides an acknowledgment that the proposals are at times contradictory.

The administration, though not hopeful of quick disposal of a substantial number of the Government-owned plants, does believe it can sell at least one plant to a "nondominant" company or group of companies in the rubber products industry.

The President's recommendations would require that the first disposal of a copolymer plant (GR-S) to a big tire firm be accompanied by simultaneous sale to a smaller firm or group of small firms to avoid concentration of the industry by its leaders.

Industry representatives contended that the request for continued usage controls for 10 years would impede development of improved tire synthetics by private interests. They said the proposals provide no assurance that a new tire rubber would be granted parity with Government rubber in filling required usage.

It is time some of these things were brought out about certain administration proposals.

Mr. President, I simply point out that even before we start, the President's recommendation would be nullified by passage of the ITO proposal.

I also point to an article published in the Journal of Commerce, January 23, 1950, headed "Habana charter for ITO called aid to cartels." It is dated Akron, Ohio, January 22. The first paragraph reads as follows:

Provisions of the ITO's Habana charter relating to intergovernmental commodity agreements would encourage the formation of cartels, restrict rather than expand trade, and lessen competitive enterprise, John L Collyer, president of the B. F. Goodrich Co., said here today.

I ask unanimous consent to place the remainder of the article in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

"The rubber industry has had more opportunity than any other American industry," Collyer said, "to observe first hand the stultifying effects of commodity agreements formed by groups of foreign governments in the crude rubber field. Under these cartels, production was restricted, prices raised, and normal expansion of rubber consumption retarded. For the United States to ratify the International Trade Organization charter would countenance formation of similar commodity agreements and would not be in the best interests of our competitive economy or of the American people."

Collyer did not criticize the stated objectives of the Habana charter, which he said include increased production, consumption, and exchange of goods to contribute to a balanced and expanding world economy, the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers on a mutually advantageous reciprocal basis, and the elimination of discretionary treatment in international commerce.

"However," he said, "the reciprocal trade agreements in effect today were designed to accomplish the objectives of the Habana charter and are currently a part of our foreign policy. Since these agreements have failed to prevent independent contrary action by other signatory countries, we see no reason to believe that a new charter will be any more effective than present agreements

"It is strongly recommended that every effort be made to insure that existing agreements be observed by all participating nations before undertaking to design even more comprehensive international agreements," Collyer said.

Mr. MALONE. Now, article 57. I do not want to spend too much time on the ITO, because I really intend to discuss it at some length when it comes to the floor of the Senate, if the Senate is really serious about considering the recommendation. Article 57 is headed "Objectives of intergovernmental commodity agreements." From article 57, I read:

The members recognize that intergovernmental commodity agreements are appropriate for the achievement of the following objectives:

* * * * *

(b) To provide, during the period which may be necessary, a framework for the consideration and development of measures which have as their purpose economic adjustments designed to promote the expansion of consumption or a shift of resources and manpower out of overexpanded industries into new and productive occupations, including as far as possible in appropriate cases.

All it says there is that this organization shall have the authority to suggest quotas to the nations of the world; that is, to the member nations. If we are getting too much rubber, the ITO can assign some of it to the Far East or to Africa or to some other place, wherever convenient, and wherever it would help another nation, regardless of our security. We now know that if we had not been able to manufacture synthetic rubber during World War II we would have lost the war. At this time, if we should discontinue the manufacture of synthetic rubber, or allow allocations to be made in such manner as is suggested, we could be put right back where we started from when we established a synthetic-rubber program to assure our security.

Under article 60, section 2, it is provided:

The members, including members not parties to a particular commodity agreement, shall give favorable consideration to any recommendation made under the agreement for expanding consumption of the commodity in question.

In other words, Mr. President, although a nation may not be a party to the commodity agreement, it must give "favorable consideration" to accepting it anyway.

Article 61, paragraph 2:

2 Subject to the provisions of paragraph 5, a commodity control agreement is an intergovernmental agreement which involves

(a) the regulation of production or the quantitative control of exports or imports of a primary commodity and which has the purpose or might have the effect of reducing, or preventing an increase in, the production of, or trade in, that commodity, or

(b) the regulation of prices.

Mr. President, I think that is enough for the present. It will prove to have been merely a start, if the subject ever comes to the Senate floor. But I have some other material I desire to insert in the RECORD. I merely wanted to show that the International Trade Organization will represent almost complete foreign control of the national economy of the United States of America, much greater control than we allocated to the State Department, which could only fix tariffs and import fees, which alone is important control over the economy.

But, Mr. President, the ITO takes over the allocation. I call attention to the term "fixed prices."

1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS; THE ESCAPE CLAUSE

I now call attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1948, where, I said, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] having yielded to me:

The escape clause as worded is no answer.

These are the escape clauses included in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended. I continued:

Simply because other countries are allowed, under the agreement as pointed out by the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], that all other countries could take a compensatory escape under the multilateral agreement if the United States were to invoke the escape clause.

I am reading from my statement which I made at that day, appearing at page 8055 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 14, but paraphrasing the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Therefore, there is no escape without overcoming the condemnation and the greater penalty, and being worse off than we were before the agreement was made.

I point out at this time that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is often referred to as a "Reciprocal Trade Act." I may say the phrase "reciprocal trade" does not occur in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. It is not reciprocal; it was never intended to be reciprocal, and it does not operate in that way.

One other thing, at this point, Mr. President. We have never made a trade agreement under the act. They are called trade agreements, but they are not trade agreements. A trade agreement is a contract for the interchange of commodities. What we agree to is a general agreement to lower tariffs and import fees. The United States trade agreements are tariff-reduction agreements. And, even as is not often the case, if we had a corresponding reduction in a tariff from the country with which we are negotiating such trade agreement, through the most-favored-nation clause every concession we give that one country is automatically extended to every other country in the world.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION CLAUSE OPERATES TO OUR DISADVANTAGE

Therefore, the 57 countries, or 56 remaining countries in the United Nations, let us say, excluding all others, would not give anything, but they would have the advantage of taking advantage of the same reduction accorded by us to the original contracting nation. There have been very many advantages taken of this principle. I shall not go into them, but for instance a trade agreement affecting tungsten is made with some country; we agree to lower our tariff on tungsten from 50 cents a pound to 38 cents a pound. We do not get very much tungsten from the original country, but we do from Burma, China, and Mexico, which are major producers of tungsten. Those latter nations, without giving any concessions, get the benefit of our concession and send us all the tungsten we need. The effect of this, as I could go on to show in the case of other commodities, is to close every mine in the United States of America. The trade agreement concessions to the original contracting country would not have been dangerous, in many cases. The engineers in this country took no notice of it, knowing that the original country did not produce much tungsten; but they overlooked the multilateral clause that, the moment the agreement was made, the concession became available to every other country in the world, which meant the major tungsten producers. The effect of it, as I have said, is to close every tungsten mine in America.

I read further from my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14:

Since the compensatory escape by other nations—the exact nature of which the United States could not foresee—makes the adverse repercussions of the escape clause totally disproportionate. In other words, since we have already agreed that if we invoke the escape clause that the 22 other nation participants may each separately avail itself of a compensatory escape clause on items of their own choosing. It is clear that the State Department has agreed to something which they would not dare to invoke.

The State Department has simply made a bad deal and we are stuck with it

Mr. President, we would be stuck for the 3 years unless we resort to quotas and to many other things, just as so many other nations throughout the world do. It would be impossible for a free economy to operate. As we all know, in most of the nations, including England, there is bulk buying and bulk selling, and the cost of production and the price have no relation to each other.

As we all know, the colored boys in Africa are still slaves. I took occasion to travel the full length of the Nile to the Sudan, where they are planting peanuts, but not very successfully The governor was with me. I went to the lake country, and to Johannesburg, and came back through the Belgian Congo, the Gold Coast, and the Ivory Coast. The wages paid are anywhere from 45 to 75 cents a day, but the wage earners work like slaves. The highest paid laborer receives not much over one-fifth of what we pay for the same work with the same machinery and the same know-how. The foreign producer takes what the traffic will bear in this country. The American people frequently do not even get the advantage of the low-cost production.

Mr. President, I point out that the flexible import fee would take care of that situation. I shall not go into this further, except to say that my suggestion provides for the Tariff Commission to be converted into a foreign-trade authority so that it would more nearly represent what it would actually do, namely, exercise authority in that field, to fix import fees and tariffs up or down, on its own motion, or on the request of Congress, or an industrialist, or a foreign country, on a basis of fair and reasonable competition.

How is that to be determined? Some persons say that we cannot find out the true costs. It would do very little good if we did find the costs, because, in many cases, they have no relation to the sale price. It can be compared to a railroad commission fixing freight rates. I served on the Railroad Commission of Nevada for 8½ years. Perhaps 100 factors—possibly 7 or 8 principal factors—are taken into consideration in fixing freight rates and are given various weights by the commission in accordance with the facts of the case. So, the Tariff Commission would have, among other things, to consider whether there was a fair and reasonable competitive basis and to see that competition was kept on that fair and reasonable basis in connection with American products.

What does that mean? It means that a textile manufacturer in New England, a miner in Oregon, or a crockery manufacturer in Ohio would have the same access to American markets as would a competitive country, regardless of wages or anything else. That is covered by the flexible import fee bill which I introduced in 1948 and again in 1949, and which I debated at some length, offering it as a substitute for the Trade Agreement Act in September of last year. It would take into account, as two of the factors to be considered, the declared customs value of goods imported into this country, and the offered-for-sale price.

In connection with the bulk buying and selling and the subsidizing of industry, one country was able to underbid our own manufacturers in the production of certain electrical equipment for Seattle, Wash They bid $500,000, and the lowest bid in this country was approximately $750,000.

Engineers are convinced that a great deal of the difference lies in wages and working conditions, but to a large degree the lowness of the bid was due to subsidies. Who subsidizes England, Mr. President? I leave that to the imagination of Senators when we vote on the five and one-half billion dollar proposition within a month or so. Our firms are paying $18 or $20 a day to skilled labor and English firms are paying approximately $3 or $4 a day, food production is subsidized there, and then we are asked for another appropriation. Uncle Sam picks up the final check.

I quote from a statement I made in an address on June 14, 1948:

We would not dare, under these agreements, to invoke the escape clause, even though it did injure an American industry.

The reason I agree with the distinguished Senator from Colorado—and again I say he deserves the congratulations of this body because he has worked out a formula which will bring the whole question into focus next year, or a year from this time, when the other two important questions come before the Senate for consideration.

This was on June 14, 1948—

Mr. President, the advocates of the Marshall plan did not say that the International Trade Organization and the so-called reciprocal trade arrangement were necessary for the Marshall-Bevin plan's success. They have since said that reciprocal trade agreements are necessary to the success of the Marshall plan.

So I say, just as my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] said, with whom I agree, that so long as we are considering another appropriation for ERP a year from now, and so long as the International Trade Organization will come before this body officially next year, a 1-year extension of the act is highly proper, so that all three of these subjects mentioned by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr SMITH] should be considered together.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that we did extend the act 1 year, with

the understanding that the three would be considered together. We extended the Trade Agreements Act for 3 years, but no mention was made of the other factors at all.

Mr. President, to end the discussion on whether the escape clause of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act could possibly operate in a fair manner, I said, on page 8056 of the RECORD:

The selective free-trade method of dividing the production of this country with the nations of the world through the Trade Agreements Act, known by the catchword "reciprocal trade," is the second step in the economic one-world plan. Through the Trade Agreements Act industries selected by the State Department are frankly traded to one or more nations for a fancied advantage in furnishing them a market for their goods to secure money—dollar exchange—presumably to buy our processed and manufactured products.

Third The International Trade Organization—ITO—through which 57 nations, each with one vote, will meet each year and frankly allocate the production and markets of the world between such nations, presumably finally on population and cost of production, without regard to the differential of production cost due to the difference in the standards-of-living basis, thereby completing the job of the international redistribution of the wealth of this Nation.

This organization is to be the final leveler of the wage living standards of the world.

International conferences and world wars are incidents, and even time is unimportant in the plan of the internationally minded "one economic world" group.

The one-economic-world group prematurely launched the one-political-world idea in the 1940 presidential campaign. The emphasis has now shifted back to economics through the three definite policies; and when the one-economic-world goal is reached, the one political world is expected to follow in the natural course of events.

Mr. President, I now wish to refer to a dispatch to the New York Times dated the 21st of January. I described to a manufacturers' association what I thought about the three-part, free-trade system, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the New York Times dispatch.

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

MALONE URGES END OF TRADE PACT ACT—SENATOR CALLS FOR ADOPTION OF IMPORT FEE PLAN INSTEAD IN L..CE ASSOCIATION TALK

Pointing out that the lace industry is now facing the same low wage competition from Europe which forced many plants out of business in 1938 to 1940, Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, yesterday called for adoption of the flexible-import-fee principle to replace the Trade Agreements Act.

Senator MALONE spoke at the annual meeting of the American Lace Manufacturers Association in the Commodore Hotel. The principle which he advocates and which has been engendered in a bill before Congress would stipulate that any rise in living standards abroad would be recognized through a corresponding lowering of tariffs. When wage standards abroad approximate ours, he said, the common objective of free trade would be the immediate and automatic result.

The Senator said that he has appeared before the national policy committee of the Republican Party and urged that the import fee principle be included in the 1950 and 1952 platform of the Republican Party. There is every evidence, he added, that such a plan would be approved.

In another phase of foreign policy, Senator MALONE revealed that he will introduce a resolution on January 30 calling for cessation of assistance of any kind to any foreign nation that was trading with or furnishing goods to Communist-controlled areas.

Along with the resolution, Senator MALONE said he would submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 95 trade treaties that had been made by 16 ECA nations subsequent to World War II with Russia and iron-curtain countries. These resulted in shipments of everything from locomotives, freight cars, tool steel, ball bearings, electrical equipment, heavy farm machinery, and road equipment.

Harold G. Truman, of the New England Lace Mills, Pawtucket, R. I., was reelected president of the association. Also reelected were George E. Taylor, Washington, R. I., treasurer; Richard Bloch, New York, secretary; and Edward F. Walker, Providence, executive director. Gordon Bucknam, of Alton, R. I., was elected vice president. Elected as new directors were Harold G. Bechtel, Bridgeport; Horace Chettle, Washington, R I., and John T. Godfrey, Washington, R. I.

In his report to the association, Mr. Truman predicted good business for American lace mills in the next 4 or 5 months. "I believe that about August 1, as fall market activities get under way," he said, "we can look for increased business. Present indications are that it is reasonable to expect garments for holiday selling will continue to be embellished profusely with lace."

"Prices of laces should remain firm," he added, "because of healthy demand and current stiffening of prices of French laces, which are the chief competition of the American product. Because of shortage of nylon fabrics, current demand for nylon lace shows a falling-off at the moment. This situation will be improved by fall," he predicted.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the RECORD at this point an article from the Washington Times-Herald of January 15, 1950, by Walter Trohan, under the headline "Labor-industry group fights to uphold living standards. Meeting here Tuesday to map attack on administration's trade program."

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

LABOR-INDUSTRY GROUP FIGHTS TO UPHOLD LIVING STANDARDS—MEETING HERE TUESDAY TO MAP ATTACK ON ADMINISTRATION'S TRADE PROGRAM

(By Walter Trohan)

Labor, agriculture, and industry are uniting to defend American economy against the mounting threat of cheap foreign goods under Democratic trade programs.

Representatives of more than 16 AFL unions and management representatives of interested industries are meeting here Tuesday to form a permanent organization to defend standards of living of American workers.

Farm groups and industry organizations have passed resolutions warning that trade policies are injuring America's domestic and foreign markets and calling for substitution of flexible tariffs. Senate spearhead of the crusade is Senator MALONE (Republican) of Nevada.

BEGUILED INTO SUPPORT

"For the first time in 18 years, workers, farmers, and industrialists are joining to fight the consequences of the Democratic administration's unsound trade and aid programs," MALONE said. "Labor, agriculture, and industry are beginning to realize that they were beguiled into support of programs that menace our high wage standards and our markets.

"Labor was induced to support the reciprocal trade program in return for being allowed to write labor legislation. Farm support was enlisted through payment of huge subsidies. Industry was influenced by the vast purchases of various aid programs.

"Now the chickens are coming home to roost. America faces importing unemployment with all resulting economic chaos. American living standards will be lowered, foreign nations will divide up world markets, and this country will be flooded with products of cheap foreign labor if we do not act at once."

MALONE said danger can be averted by ending reciprocal trade agreements, curbing foreign aid, and by refusal to enter the International Trade Organization, together with the positive action of substituting flexible import duties to protect every man's job and every investment dollar.

WOULD HAVE ONE VOTE

Under the ITO program the United States would have 1 vote among 59 nations. The ITO agreement would commit the United States for 3 years to a program which MALONE declared will bring economic ruin.

The plan would place the United States on an equality with Siam in a global political and economic federation. At the end of the year when nations would divide up world markets the United States would have but one vote to protest against decisions which would be injurious to American labor, agriculture, and industries.

"Congress has, over a period of years, delegated to bureaus and commissions, over which they have little or no control, the authority to dry up or retard any industry in this country on the theory that the product might be imported at a lower cost from one or more of the low-wage Asiatic and European countries," MALONE said.

"Our domestic and world markets are now being lost and dissipated through the substitution of subsidies by Executive order and reciprocal trade treaties in place of utilization of the 1930 flexible tariff by law; by our sufferance of empire preferential rates established by empire-minded nations in the areas we are committed to defend; by giving money and goods to low wage living standard competitive trade nations, and a complete lack of American constructed international air and merchant marine bases to promote the balance of trade and promote peace.

"URGES CUT IN AID

"We must strike at the jugular vein. We must refuse to join ITO; we must stop the reciprocal-trade program and we must slash foreign aid and substitute flexible tariffs. This will kill the threat to American jobs and to American dollars."

Last month the Nevada farm bureau passed a resolution calling for enactment of this program. The Nevada Republican State Executive Committee adopted the program. Various farm, industry, and labor groups joined the drive.

Labor took the first step in organizing to protect American jobs. More than 100 representatives of labor and management will attend the Tuesday meeting called by O. R. Strackbein, executive secretary of the AFL Wage Earners Protective Conference.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I desire to read now from an article in the New York Times of January 31, 1950. The headline is:

Recovery rests on United States prosperity, ERP council report will stress—Annual data to Hoffman to reveal dollar gap will persist—Tariff relief asked as way to narrow export-import loss.

Mr. President, I read a portion of this dispatch in the New York Times:

The forecasts for Europe's trade in the next 2 years made in the report that will be given to the Economic Cooperation Administrator are based upon the assumption that the United States business activity will remain at least as high as in the second and third quarters of 1949. It points out that even small set-backs in the United States economy would have disproportionately large consequences for western Europe, whose reserves are not great enough to sustain much strain.

EUROPE'S TROUBLES NOT SOLVED

I do not have the exact statistics here, but I call attention to the fact that our national income dropped about $15,000,000,000 in the last half of 1949, and that is causing the various dislocations in Europe which are referred to. People in foreign countries believe that by next fall, September or October 1950, there will be the greatest economic debacle in Europe up to date. In other words, all the contributions of UNRRA, the special loan of $3,750,000,000 to England, the World Bank loans, the Export-Import Bank loans, together with $5,500,000 a year, $15,000,000,000 to $17,000,000,000 for a 5-year period, through the Marshall plan, for the ECA, will have all gone by the board. I am not sure that perhaps the $50,000,000,000 suggestion by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut might not have some connection with the debacle that is expected in Europe.

The people of Europe have discovered that production is not their problem, and it never has been their problem. I have statistics, and I think I shall put the statistics in the RECORD before I conclude this address, to show that the countries of Europe have more than 100 percent recovered. Some have said there was a recovery of 107 percent in England. The lowest I have noted was 99 percent of the industrial index of 1937–38, before Congress passed the Marshall-plan legislation.

What are we trying to do? We are trying to increase production so that those living in foreign countries can raise their standards of living. What will happen to our standards of living when we import all the materials and products of foreigners which they are unable to use themselves? That is the basis of the three-part, free-trade system, which will level us with the rest of the countries.

I read further from the New York Times article:

The report analyzes the measure of recovery attained and what remains to be done to solve the dollar problem. Here again the report insists that this is not a task for western Europe alone. It contends that the close integration of the European economies will be a source of strength in the long run but that it cannot in itself contribute decisively to the immediate dollar problem, which is described as a joint problem of Europe and the United States.

THE MYTHICAL DOLLAR SHORTAGE

Mr. President, I should like to say one further thing at this point. There is no dollar trouble in Europe. There is no dollar shortage that has not been experienced by every man in the United States and every nation in the world—the trouble which results from trying to buy more than productivity will justify. The dollar shortage they are experiencing is from overpricing the pound, overpricing the franc, overpricing the guilder in the Netherlands, overpricing the currency of practically all the 16 Marshall plan nations, anywhere from 10 to 90 percent.

Let me give one illustration, and the same is true of others. The pound was valued at $4.03 before the great devaluation debacle, but no few people in foreign trade were paying more than $2.66 for the pound, to be spent anywhere in the world. In Hong Kong there was a central exchange, as there was one in Europe. One could take a silver dollar or a paper dollar and go to Hong Kong and buy $6.10 in Hong Kong money, take $15 in Hong Kong money and buy a British pound and spend it anywhere in the world, and it cost $2.66. We have been holding up the artificially high value of a $4.03 pound and even now of a $2.80 pound with our dollar aid.

If, as the executive committee of the Republican Party of Nevada asked in a resolution, if, as the State Farm Bureau of Nevada asked in an official resolution passed by it, if, as the labor organizations in Nevada, including a section of the CIO, asked in a resolution they passed, other nations would let their money go on the market with free convertibility in terms of the dollar, there would be no dollar shortage. But they manipulate the market, and profit at the expense of their neighbors, and ultimately have Uncle Sam pick up the check for the difference.

Mr. President, I owned a business for 30 years, and I assert that any business can be successful if someone will pick up the check for the deficit at the end of a month or the end of a year. It is not hard to be successful under those circumstances.

Mr. President, I would just as soon have a pound in my pocket as the amount of money one can get on the gray money markets of New York, or Chicago, or San Francisco, but I certainly would not want to be caught with many of them in my pocket at $2.80, because I can get them anywhere in the world for $2.40, and they can be spent almost anywhere in the world. In some markets pounds can be obtained for as low as $2.

One may compare the dollar shortage to a person going to a grocery store with a dollar and saying that he wants 40 pounds of sugar. The storekeeper looks at the customer a little strangely, and finally he is on the street without the sugar. One dollar will just not buy that much sugar. So one can go around complaining about the shortage. That illustrates the kind of a dollar shortage there is.

We now hear it said that the dollar shortage is our responsibility and that when other nations overvalue their currencies and talk about a dollar shortage, we must pick up the check, as we did after World War II and World War I. But foreign nations do not have enough patience, as our Nation must have, to buy what can be produced by a nation's productive capacity. That is all that can be spent month after month, until one winds up talking to his banker, and that is not very pleasant. I have had that happen to me.

OUR DEFICIT AND OUR DEBT

I understand the administration admits that we are going to have a five-and-a-half-billion-dollar deficit by next year. Last year it was about a billion and a half dollars. I predict it is going to be about eight billion or even more this year. Bonds will be sold for whatever the deficit amounts to. Then money will be printed. That money will go out throughout the United States. The result will be that the purchasing value of the dollar will be decreased. Eventually there will be another round of strikes for more money, because the workers cannot pay their grocery bills with the amount of money they are receiving. So there will be inflation. Finally we will reach the point other nations have reached, when there is no one else to pick up the checks. More bonds will be issued and our debt will be increased.

I read further from the New York Times article:

The report contends that there is no single solution to the dollar problem, that a two-way balance of trade will be unnecessary because of the expected earnings of dollars on invisible account and from the nondollar world Yet the report concludes that western Europe's dollar deficit cannot be eliminated unless this region's exports to the United States amount to 75 percent of its imports from the United States in value.

Mr. President, let us see what that means: I prepared a table which is, I believe, now in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, placed there during my September 13 address before the Senate. In that table I showed, in billions of dollars, the exportable surplus produced in this country over a period of about 30 or 35 years. Then I showed what is actually exported. I gave the percentages, and they ran from 6 to 11 percent.

Then there was another table placed in the RECORD which showed the billions of dollars we gave the various nations throughout the world as of that year. Then that amount was subtracted from the exportable surplus, and we arrived at another percentage. Mr. President, that last percentage came right back to the 50-year average of 5½ percent, and, I think one year it was 6 percent, out of all those years. In other words, our regular exports, excluding those paid for with our own money, has been a fairly steady percentage of our production of exportable goods. In other words, we are furnishing six or seven billion dollars through all our financial institutions, including the $5,500,000,000 we toss to European countries every year, in addition to our legitimate trade. The legitimate trade, that amount and kinds of goods provided by imports which they cannot conveniently produce for themselves. No nation and no individual ever buys goods from another nation or another individual which they can conveniently produce for themselves.

If these goods cannot be produced domestically then nations buy the goods where they can buy them the cheapest, and of the quality they want. We are finding that out now when other nations are not trading with us. So, in addition to that legitimate trade, the difference must be made up how? By allowing imports such as lemons, which we produce in California and in Florida, and shoes from Czechoslovakia and textiles from the ECA nations, and lumber and timber and various other products to take away the jobs of men in America, and putting our workers on relief and unemployment insurance.

When this body first took the tariff off of copper I said on the Senate floor that if we extended the free trade provision to copper, the international price of copper would drop below the cost of production, and every copper mine in the United States would close. The price did drop, and the mines closed.

And we are only starting. We find propaganda printed in a paper like the New York Times. It goes all over the country.

Western Europe's dollar deficit, $8,500,000,000 in 1947, is now estimated to be slightly less than $4,500,000,000, and is expected to be $2,225,000,000 at the end of the Marshall plan.

In an introductory chapter, the report is summarized under these headings:

PRODUCTION

Western European farm production is estimated at 95 to 100 percent of the prewar output.

The objective was 115 percent, Mr. President.

We have the unique experience of seeing France export wheat when we ship wheat to France, and we try to increase the shipment of wheat to France while France is already exporting wheat.

Industrial production 6 months ago was put at 15 percent above the prewar level or above the highest recorded prewar level. There are now no critical bottlenecks, no commodity shortages that can disrupt the industrial effort.

Where are we headed, Mr. President? As I said, when they increased their production capacity 15 percent over prewar level, we suddenly found, that is, the so-called specialists in our State Department found, that production was not the problem. It was necessary to sell the production to somebody. The European countries cannot sell it to each other for two reasons. One reason is that traditionally the countries of Europe have quotas and barriers against each other. We are simply piling these hundred-year-old walls higher and higher by financing each one of the countries.

The next reason is that they are trying to go faster than they naturally can go in the effort to develop a market in their own country as we do in this. Then they find there is only one place in the world where 10 cents' worth of chewing gum can be sold and the 10 cents received for it. That is in the United States of America. Nowhere else can hard money be received for such a product, unless we have previously given the money with which to buy it.

Mr. President, I attended the United Nations conference in San Francisco, not as a representative, but with credentials from the Senate Military Affairs Committee. I had been its special consultant throughout the war. At that moment there was only one thing in sight. I was interested particularly in South America and in Asia, because I think our trade future is not in old Europe, whose people are mostly processors. Our trade future is in South America and in Asia. I was in San Francisco for 3 months. I had representatives of most of the Asiatic countries and the countries of South America as my guests at breakfast or lunch or dinner. After the perfunctory greetings, the first question asked me was, "How much are we going to sell in America?" On my return east I stopped at Denver, and a reporter there asked me, "What do you think of this great conference in San Francisco?" In a short sentence I told the reporter, "There were 49 nations represented there. Forty-eight of them had market baskets on each arm, and America was the only nation that had anything to put into the baskets." And without paying for the goods, too. And now the idea is to divide the markets of the United States.

GREAT HARM IN THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

It has required 3 or 4 years to sell the American people on this great International Trade Organization, and on the idea that we must open our markets, that we must have an international economic trade organization, and transfer our markets to it. That is a Tinker-to-Evers-to-Chance play. First, the constitutional authority of this body was transferred to the State Department, by action of Congress. Now we are transferring it to an International Trade Organization, consisting of at least 51 votes against 1 of ours, and probably 57 to 1, with the smallest nation on earth having the same vote we have. We are assigning to that organization authority over the economy of the United States.

What does it mean? It simply means that that organization can fix our tariffs and import fees, and make it difficult for us if we do not abide by its rulings. We shall be tied to the organization for 3 years. We cannot get out for 3 years. After that time it will require 6 months to get out.

That is only half of it. As I said earlier this afternoon, the International Trade Organization can suggest quotas. I have read from the International Trade Organization Charter itself. If we are raising too many lemons in California, or producing too great a quantity of minerals in Michigan, or too many shoes or textiles in New England, or too much wheat in the Middle West, such production can be assigned to some other nation. It is a very simple thing. The small nations of Europe represented in the International Trade Organization all know a year or two ahead what the world needs. So they will be assigned quotas. The only way some of them could ever invest in a business would be for the Congress of the United States to give them that business. The chances are that they have never operated a business of their own, and do not know anything about the consequences of not making both ends meet.

As to the dollar shortage, if no solution can be found for the dollar problem, the whole economic structure of western Europe will collapse, says the report. I have already said that this is a January 31, 1950, dispatch to the New York Times. I have already said that in my opinion the greatest economic debacle will take place in western Europe this fall. It will make everything up to now look like chicken feed. As the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] said, we may need $50,000,000,000 to save the nations of Europe this time; and I suppose there will be Senators who will advocate that.

We have the spectacle of Mr. Churchill and several leading newspapers in England saying that if we keep our hands off for a little while the nations of Europe will get together in the United States of Europe. It is said that they will unite, just as we did in the 6 or 7 years following the Revolutionary War because there was no one to pick up our check. When we could not make a go of it with States operating separately, with tariff walls between the States, we sat down and looked at our cards and made the union work.

We cannot possibly pay the expenses of all the 16 Marshall plan or ECA nations from now on. We shall soon find out that we cannot do it by dividing our markets. Our situation is just like that of an individual in a community. Of course we are the most prosperous nation in the world. I have heard the slogan, "We cannot be prosperous in a starving world." The position of the junior Senator from Nevada is that someone had better remain prosperous in a starving world if we are to continue to help anyone, or to continue to help ourselves.

If no solution can be found to the dollar problem, the whole economic structure of western Europe will collapse, says the report. I continue to read from the dispatch:

The experience of the last 2 years has shown that the solution is at least as difficult as it was believed in 1947. The report calls for action extending far beyond the fields of the responsibility of the Marshall plan countries.

That is where the $50,000,000,000 suggestion came from. It was no idle thing.

I have watched Congress operate for the past 18 years. We get used to these appropriations. The first time a billion dollars was mentioned it scared the country to death. But after it had been mentioned four or five times the people got used to the sound of it. We mentioned $17,000,000,000. That is the cost of the Marshall plan for 5 years. Now we can talk about $50,000,000,000 and there is very little excitement.

Mr. President, at one time I said on the floor of the Senate "The junior Senator from Nevada does not know how much $41,000,000,000 is." That is the amount we have paid out to foreign countries or have committed to them since World

War I. But I shall estimate it. It is $5,000,000,000 more than the combined assessed valuation of 11 Western States, including the great State of California, so ably represented by my friend the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]; Oregon and Washington; and the 14 Southern States, including Texas. That is how much it is.

We hear it said that the process has only started. So when $50,000,000,000 is mentioned we are getting used to it. Someone will bring it up again in a few months. When we come back in 1951 we shall have a bill in Congress. It is just like putting a bridle on a mustang in the corral in Nevada. Perhaps he has never had a hand laid on him. First we get a rope on him and let him drag the rope around. That does not hurt him very much. Then we snub him up to a post and rub the bit over his nose a couple of times. Then we let him run loose. The next day we do it again, and on the third day we have the bit in his mouth. He does not know the difference. That did not hurt very much. In a couple of days we are riding him. That is how we do it on the Senate floor. Mr. President, we are punch drunk. The people of the United States are punch drunk with proposed appropriations of $50,000,000,000 in one chunk. That is about what it is going to take, according to this dispatch.

The experience of 1949 showed how vulnerable the western European dollar deficit was to even a small shock from the outside But on the favorable assumptions about the course of the world economy and of United States business activity, the report contends that the Marshall plan countries can continue their recovery if they receive, in the year 1950–51, 75 percent of the dollar aid that they received in 1949–50 and if they receive in the year 1951–52 50 percent of that amount.

Mr. President, where do they think the markets are that will take up what they sell to us? Where do they think we are getting the money to buy their products? We are getting the money now by holding the source of our income intact. What is the source of our income? It is the markets which the United States has built up for hundreds of years. It is just like a man's own income. He may have an income of $5,000, $2,000, or $10,000. That is his earning power. The Red Cross may assess him $50 or $200 a year. He may growl about it, but he has the money and he pays it. But let him divide his income 57 different ways, and he does not have the money. Neither will we have the money. Income comes from markets. That is the way we make our money. That is the source of it.

Because of these developments and the imports into this country, our income fell off $15,000,000,000 in the last half of last year. That is the income which we used in part to lend to foreign countries. So when we divide it with them, where is the money coming from to continue to buy their exports and to continue the gift loans if we divide the markets?

This means that a serious problem will exist after 1952. The report contends that this problem can be "generally manageable," if the assumptions made above about the world economy and United States business activity are fulfilled, and if "appropriate policies are vigorously pressed" by the Marshall plan countries and by the United States and other non-European countries.

We have the spectacle of our director of the Marshall plan, Mr. Hoffman, who is a very capable man and one of the ablest men in this country in managing a business, such as the Studebaker business, being notably unsuccessful in getting cooperation from the 16 Marshall plan countries in forming a United States of Europe, or in a free interchange of their currency and the dollar. England and France have always stopped at that free interchange, because once that is done every nation in Europe will have to assume its regular place in the firmament of nations, and it could no longer take advantage of its neighbors by overvaluing its currency. Sixteen or eighteen nations could trade with each other and build up the strongest economy which it is possible to build in Europe. Spain should be in it. Germany should be in it. When they build the strongest economy and reach the standard of living represented by the limit of what they can produce, that is all that can be done, unless we keep them in our budget from now on, just as they have been since World War II. As I said before, they are in our budget, just as much as the Department of the Interior.

OIL IMPORTS

Mr. President, I wish to cover another element of this subject. I wish to read a paragraph from a letter dated December 19, 1949, addressed to the East African Government at Nairobi by the British Secretary of State. The third paragraph of this letter is very interesting to me, because it indicates that they were going to stop all importation of dollar oil. They were going to import oil only from sterling countries. I now read a part of the letter:

3. United States Government has now been informed of proposals for substituting this surplus production by British companies for dollar oil imported into the sterling area by United Kingdom companies.

Note this, Mr. President:

The Americans have, as expected, not gone beyond expressing regret at proposals and steps have now been taken to put scheme into effect in United Kingdom and to obtain cooperation of Dominion governments.

Mr. President, I call especial attention to the statement that—

The Americans have, as expected, not gone beyond expressing regret at proposals and steps have now been taken to put scheme into effect in United Kingdom and to obtain cooperation of Dominion governments.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that last year the Argentine oil market was taken over by the sterling bloc, through a bilateral trade agreement, not by means of multilateral trade agreements, such as we have made. Incidentally, let me say that the ECA nations have now made 95 bilateral trade agreements with Russia and with the other iron-curtain countries. That is all known to us, but we have not made serious objection; and Britain has also tied up Argentina concerning the sale of various kinds of machinery and other goods to Argentina. Of course, only recently there was an attempt by a British firm to sell generators and other electrical equipment to the city of Seattle. If the British firm had been successful in selling that equipment to Seattle, thereafter the repairs and maintenance of such equipment woud have been done with equipment coming from Britain, not equipment produced by American labor.

All these activities simply result in removing American goods from circulation. Many persons in our country express profound surprise that such treatment should be received at the hands of one of our allies.

Mr. President, this matter is of such importance that I shall read again the statement to which I have previously referred, as found in a letter by the British Secretary of State:

The Americans have, as expected, not gone beyond expressing regret at proposals and steps have now been taken to put scheme into effect in United Kingdom and to obtain cooperation of Dominion Governments.

That is exactly what appears in the letter of the British Secretary of State; and exactly what is stated there is what occurred in the United States, so far as our Secretary of State was concerned. He expressed regret, but did nothing more.

I now ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter dated December 19, 1949, addressed to the East African Government at Nairobi, by the British Secretary of State, printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

DECEMBER 19, 1949.

LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE EAST AFRICAN GOVERNMENT AT NAIROBI BY THE BRITISH SECRETARY OF STATE

OIL SUPPLIES

Following the meeting of ministers in Washington in September, a special group of officials was formed in Washington to consider oil problems. In this group United Kingdom representatives explained in detail how the dollar drain in oil arises and made it plain that in the immediate future United Kingdom would be obliged to adopt a policy of substitution in sterling for dollar oil to reduce the drain. In this it is hoped to secure the cooperation of sterling commonwealth countries.

2. Until recently cost of dollar oil which British companies had to buy in order to meet the gap between their supply and demand represented a dollar outgoing over and above the dollar expenditure incurred in producing their own oil. These "deficit" purchases, apart from specialty oils, have now ended and in the coming year it is expected that British companies' availability of fuel oil and possibly of other products will exceed their normal trade requirements. In the immediate future the surpluses are not expected to be substantial except in the case of fuel oil (which does not (repeat not) include gas oil or diesel oil).

3. United States Government have now been informed of proposals for substituting this surplus production by British companies

for dollar oil imported into the sterling area by United Kingdom companies. The Americans have, as expected, not gone beyond expressing regret at proposals and steps have now been taken to put the scheme into effect in the United Kingdom and to obtain cooperation of Dominion governments. It is now desired to arrange full substitution of sterling fuel oil for dollar oil at present imported into east Africa for inland consumption. It is not (repeat not) intended to substitute sterling oil for fuel oil imports destined for use in ships' bunkers.

4. By "substitution" is meant replacement of dollar oil imports by equivalent imports from British controlled sources. It is not intended to interfere with United States companies' internal distribution business. For this purpose "dollar oil" means the oil which United States controlled companies obtain from Standard (New Jersey), Standard Vacuum, Socony, Standard (California), Tex Oil Corp., and Caltex, or any of their associates such as Bahroin Petroleum Co. In this category there is not included oil which any of these American companies purchase and ship from British controlled companies' sources, such as the Abadas and Curacao refineries.

5. United States controlled companies would be left to decide whether they would make good the reduction in their imports of dollar oil by purchases from nondollar sources. Assurance has been given by British companies that they are in principle willing to sell their surplus fuel oil to American companies, but these arrangements can be left to commercial negotiations between British and American companies. Should an American distributing company decide to curtail its trade, British companies or, indeed, other American companies should have little difficulty in taking over the additional business. Anything more than minor curtailment of this kind appears unlikely judging by the attitude of the head offices of United States companies in the general discussions Ministry of Fuel and Power have had with them.

6. British companies are not expected to have any appreciable surpluses in the near future of products other than fuel oil. In the case of fuel oil, there will be more than enough available from British controlled companies' production in 1950 to take the place of all dollar imports of fuel oil for inland consumption in the Commonwealth. Failure to dispose of this fuel-oil output may well result in a reduction in British companies' output of other products. On this account and because of the important dollar saving that can be achieved United States controlled companies importing into the United Kingdom have been informed of intention to introduce fuel-oil substitution in respect of all their imports from dollar sources as from the 1st of January 1950. I hope that the East African Governments will be able to operate fuel-oil substitution from the same date, though some postponement may have to be accepted, e. g., to enable the companies to adjust their shipping programs.

7. United States companies with whom Ministry of Fuel and Power have discussed arrangements for substitution in the United Kingdom may be warning their subsidiaries in East Africa that similar arrangements may be applied to their imports.

8. I must leave it to the Colonial Governments to decide how substitution can best be administered. Should there be difficulty in controlling the source of fuel-oil imports by a system of cargo licensing, etc., it should be possible to insure sterling origin on imports by ad hoc arrangements agreed with the companies on whom will rest the onus of proof.

9. Any fuel-oil imports by United States companies which are already being bought by them from British controlled companies will, of course, rank as sterling oil, but oil supplied from Bahrein although invoiced in sterling ranks as dollar oil for the purposes of substitution, since Bahrein is fundamentally a dollar source.

10. Please inform me as soon as possible of the action being taken.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a dispatch published in the Journal of Commerce of January 20, 1950. The headline reads: "Oil price cut called answer to British curb. Some United States aides prefer private competition to official pressure."

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

OIL PRICE CUT CALLED ANSWER TO BRITISH CURB—SOME UNITED STATES AIDES PREFER PRIVATE COMPETITION TO OFFICIAL PRESSURE

WASHINGTON, January 19.—Some Government officials would like to see American oil producers abroad get over their apparent timidity toward a possible "price var" with the British as a means of forcing some relaxation of Britain's current discrimination against dollar oil.

These officials believe outright and substantial price reductions by American producers overseas—or perhaps just the threat of them—would make the British much more willing to offer concessions.

NOT YET OFFICIAL POLICY

This attitude does not yet represent an official United States policy and reportedly has not been broached by our representatives in the on-again, off-again discussions with British oil experts that were begun here in September. The discussions currently are in recess, pending the return from London of the leaders of the British delegation.

The attitude does, however, represent by reaction of some financial and oil experts here to demands by American producers that our Government brings greater pressure to bear on Britain.

Many of the companies operating abroad have indicated they are willing to cover to an exclusive sterling basis, operating subject to British taxation, if that will enable them to retain at least a part of the market now being shut off.

Our Government is pressing this viewpoint on the British but with less force than some producers would like.

ECA SEEKS CLARIFICATION

In the meantime, the Economic Cooperation Administration evidently believes it has gone as far as it should at present by making it known that the agency will approve Marshall aid for no additional British refinery construction or expansion projects until Britain's discriminatory policy is "clarified."

This implied ultimatum might be made considerably stronger, it is believed, should American producers indicate a willingness to reduce prices, despite the profit losses that would entail, as a means of strengthening their competitive position against the British.

To be effective, this price cut might have to be as high as 10 to 15 percent. At the same time, it is pointed out, American producers should move further into nonsterling markets by indicating a willingness to accept 20 or 30 percent of payment in local currencies.

AGGRESSIVE PROGRAM NEEDED

An aggressive program of this sort, its advocates assert, would make the British less eager to grab off markets in sterling and other soft-currency areas if the profits to be received would not be large enough to offset the dollar cost (royalties, equipment, etc.) that would have to be incurred by British companies to produce the additional oil.

It is conceded, however, that an all-out price war could well result in no gain at all if Britain fails to react to American reductions as anticipated.

From the ECA viewpoint, price cuts would be beneficial in reducing dollar expenditures for European oil purchases and in building Europe's over-all power potential.

This viewpoint may be expressed before Congress shortly in hearings planned but not yet scheduled by the House Small Business Subcommittee on Oil Imports.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I now hold in my hand a dispatch appearing in the Journal of Commerce of December 28, 1949. The headline reads: "Oilmen report United Kingdom seeking to freeze them out of Japan."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OILMEN REPORT UNITED KINGDOM SEEKING TO FREEZE THEM OUT OF JAPAN

If the British have their way, American oil companies may be frozen out not only from the sterling area but even from Japan, oil executives stated here yesterday.

Recently the British Government suggested that Japan should use part of the £10,000,000 sterling balances it has built up from sales to the British by purchasing crude oil for its refineries.

SCAP HELD AGREEING

The Supreme Command of Allied Powers (SCAP) in Tokyo is understood to have agreed to the proposal but to have suggested that American producers be allowed to participate in supplying such crude oil if they were willing to be paid in sterling.

Several American companies are reported to be ready to accept sterling.

However, cable advices from Tokyo received by oil companies here yesterday stated that the British Trade Mission has now notified SCAP that American companies may not offer to sell their own crude to Japan for sterling unless the crude is purchased from sterling sources (British companies) and the sterling is then used to purchase Japanese goods for export to the sterling area.

WOULD FREEZE OUT UNITED STATES

This would freeze American oil producers out of the Japanese market to all practical purposes, leaving them only the alternative of acting as distributors of British oil.

American companies here take the position that they should be allowed to supply any crude they desire to Japan as long as they are willing to accept payment in either sterling or Japanese yen and to use such payment for purchases of goods in Japan for export to dollar areas.

They point out that the sterling balances built up by Japan came primarily from sale of textiles to the British which were manufactured from cotton supplied from this country.

DAILY VOLUME ESTIMATED

The volume of crude oil shipments to Japan involved in this controversy was estimated in oil circles here to total approximately 44,000 barrels per day.

This action follows shortly on the heels of Britain's recent decision to bar shipments of fuel oil from dollar sources to the sterling area starting January 1, and to restrict by one-third gasoline shipments by American companies to the United Kingdom.

Similar actions have already been taken by India, Australia, and the British Crown Col-

ony of Kenya. In these cases, too, American companies are to be allowed to sell only oil purchased from British supply sources.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article appearing in the Journal of Commerce of December 20, 1949, under the title "Petroleum Comments," by W. M. Jablonski, petroleum editor. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PETROLEUM COMMENTS

(By W. M. Jablonski)

FIRM STAND NEEDED

This Nation's foreign oil position is rapidly going from bad to worse

The latest in the chain of events whereby American-owned oil is being cut off from market after market by British sterling oil deals has come in the United Kingdom itself in the past few days.

The British Ministry of Fuel and Power notified marketing subsidiaries of American companies that it was canceling their fuel-oil import quotas from dollar sources and cutting their gasoline quotas by one-third for 1950.

The companies were told that some 75,000 barrels daily of oil will become available in 1950 from sterling sources—British refineries in Latin America and the Middle East—to replace dollar oil sales in the sterling area. The supply may increase by an additional 50,000 barrels daily if the Haifa refinery is reopened.

This is only the beginning. Increasing quantities of both crude oil and refined products will be available from British sources in the Middle East and Latin America as their current expansion program—with the aid of ECA dollars—is pushed ahead By 1951 to 1952, companies were informed, an additional 250,000 barrels daily may be available.

The next step may well be to require all refineries in the sterling area, American as well as British, to purchase crude from British sources

The issue raised is not Britain's action in cutting down dollar payments for oil No responsible oil executive argues that England is unjustified in conserving dollars.

What American oil companies want, however, is equal sterling treatment with British companies—that is, the right to sell for sterling and to use such sterling.

At present, American companies are discriminated against, the British Treasury prohibits purchase of American-produced oil for sterling—even for nonconvertible sterling—and also restricts use of sterling by American companies. It does so even in nonsterling areas by preventing transfer of sterling from the account of a foreign country to an American company.

The issue is a basic one. These currency restrictions leave American oil companies no fighting chance to adjust to a sterling basis where necessary in order to save their established markets against expanding British oil output in the next few years. This, coupled with such barter-type agreements as made by the British to supply oil to Argentina and Sweden, leaves little hope for maintaining important American markets overseas

Actually, so-called British sterling oil in South America has almost as large a dollar cost component—for royalties, taxes, equipment, etc.—as dollar oil produced in the same area by Americans. British dollar costs are lower in the Middle East, but still substantial.

When British oil is sold for sterling, thus, it also constitutes a dollar drain on the British Treasury. It might be questioned, therefore, whether the British are entirely justified in using dollar aid from the United States to build up oil production which they sell for sterling to the exclusion of similar American-produced oil

The United States Government recently sent a so-called White Paper to London requesting that American oil companies be given equitable treatment. It said that if American companies are permitted to trade in sterling they should be allowed to use the sterling in the same manner as British companies.

It is understood that this Government did not ask the British to guarantee convertibility of any part of such sterling income into dollars. Presumably it felt that any such deals to cover minimum dollar costs and a small profit as sought by some companies would have to be worked out by individual negotiations.

No official answer has been received yet from London. However, it is understood that Britain has indicated that it intends to stand firm, if possible, on its present restrictions.

The time has come for our Government to put the issue squarely to London.

It is not merely a question of the unfairness of British discrimination against American companies, nor of the loss of private American investments abroad. These are serious enough considerations.

The question is much more grave American oil concessions in the Middle East and Latin America are an integral part of our foreign policy and defense. They cannot be maintained without market outlets Royalties from their production provide the chief sources of revenue for the countries concerned. Sharp cutbacks would be bound to result in political and economic unrest and could have serious repercussions on this Nation's prestige and influence in those key, strategic areas.

Nor can a situation be long maintained where revenues dwindle sharply from American concessions in one Arab state while they rise from British concessions in an adjoining state. The King of Arabia is already said to be restive at the reduced outlets facing his oil while the Shah of Iran's are increasing steadily.

Nor would it be to the American—nor British—interest to see the situation reach the point where these vast oil resources might come under the control of a hostile power.

And finally, the American oil industry is the keystone of the President's Point 4 program, representing by far the largest source of private capital for investment in backward foreign areas.

British reluctance to have sterling balances pile up in the hands of American companies and their preference to have foreign countries use sterling for purchases from the British rather than American oil companies is understandable

In view of the grave issues at stake, however, this Government must insist on some compromise. While we are aiding Britain through ECA funds to restore her economy, we cannot afford to have our vital national interests scuttled in the process.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, a further article appeared in the Journal of Commerce under the headline "Britain offered compromise plan on United States oil. Standard of New Jersey would transfer operations in exchange arrangement."

The article appeared in the New York Journal of Commerce of February 2, 1950, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BRITAIN OFFERED COMPROMISE PLAN ON UNITED STATES OIL—STANDARD OF NEW JERSEY WOULD TRANSFER OPERATIONS IN EXCHANGE ARRANGEMENT

(By W. M Jablonski)

A proposed compromise plan for maintaining American oil sales in the sterling area and in other markets where United States companies are being frozen out as a result of recent British action has been put before the United Kingdom Government by Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey).

The plan was presented to London in a formal memorandum dated January 25, the Journal of Commerce learned yesterday.

TO FORM BRITISH ENTITY

In it, Jersey Standard offers to transfer its oil supply and distribution operations in the affected area to a new British entity or corporation

The New Jersey unit, it is proposed, would sell in sterling and have the right to use sterling in the same manner as any other British corporation—and be subject to British taxation. In turn, Britain would be asked to convert into dollars 50 percent of the sales proceeds of this British entity after taxes.

Involved in the plan would be an estimated $80,000,000 of Jersey Standard's gross trade in 1950.

MARKETS COVERED

The proposal covers trade only in those markets where the company is unable to continue in business unless it can sell for sterling.

This applies not only to the sterling area but to other markets such as Argentina, Japan, Finland, etc., which are being lost as a result of British sterling trade pacts combined with British Treasury regulations which prohibit sterling payments for oil produced by American companies.

DOLLAR-SAVINGS MEASURE

This proposal, the third offered by this company during the long-drawn-out negotiations between American oil firms and the Labor government, was presented by Jersey as an alternative dollar-saving measure to the British Government's recent drastic action.

Last month, London adopted a policy of substituting in the sterling area all oil produced by American companies with oil produced by British companies as rapidly as the latter becomes available. The immediate effect of the new policy was a ban on all fuel-oil imports from American companies starting January 1, and a one-third reduction on gasoline imports.

Jersey maintained that its new plan would save the United Kingdom nearly as many dollars as the ban against American oil when taking into account the dollars that would have to be spent by the British Treasury to produce and acquire so-called sterling oil for substitution purposes.

NO REACTION YET

No indication of the British Government's reaction has been received yet. Since the proposal was only presented last week, it is doubtful that London has had sufficient time to study it carefully.

The plan would, of course, require the approval of the United States Government which has been informed of the proposal.

In its formal memorandum to London, Jersey Standard described the proposal as entirely its own and not necessarily reflecting the position of any other American oil companies.

Its plan differs somewhat from the various proposals made by Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. and California-Texas Oil Co. (owned by

Standard of California and the Texas Co.) for putting their operations on a sterling basis similar to British companies in order to eliminate England's dollar drain None, however, have been accepted yet by the Labor government.

PRICE PROPOSALS

Under Jersey's plan the proposed British entity that would be set up, subject to British taxation, would purchase its oil from various Jersey producing affiliates in the Middle East and Latin America at a price below the going market, distribute and resell the oil to the final destination at the full price.

Involved would be oil supplies from three sources: Arabia, Iraq, and Venezuela.

In the case of Arabia and Iraq, where Jersey owns only a part interest in the local producing companies, the new plan is understood to provide for sale of oil to the proposed British entity at the established take-off price, that is, at the price at which Jersey and other partners in the local enterprises purchase the oil for their own use. This is usually substantially below the market price.

In the case of Iraq the take-off price is reported to be cost plus a gold shilling per ton.

VENEZUELA CASE

The problem is more complex in the case of Venezuela where the local government has 50–50 profit-sharing arrangements with oil producers and does not confine its income simply to royalties on production as is done in the Middle East.

For this reason, Jersey is understood to have informed London that it could not sell Venezuelan oil to the proposed British entity at much below market prices. The company is reported to have suggested purchases from Venezuela at the going market price minus 1 percent commission.

However, it pointed out that British companies in Venezuela similarly have to pay 50 percent of their profits to the local government in dollars and have similar operating and other dollar expenses, even though their oil is classified as sterling oil.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in reference to the article to which I have just referred, I wish to point out that the dispatch indicates that our oil companies are willing to become resident companies of the sterling bloc countries, in order to get some kind of an entrée into the markets which we said the Marshall plan and the ECA were opening for United States industries.

Mr. President, the New York Journal of Commerce for February 2, 1950, also carries an article under the following heading: "Socony follows other firms in cutting 1950 oil imports."

I ask unanimous consent that that dispatch may be made a part of the RECORD at this point, for the reason that it shows how foreign oil can cut down the production of oil in the United States.

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

SOCONY FOLLOWS OTHER FIRMS IN CUTTING 1950 OIL IMPORTS

Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. yesterday announced it will cut its foreign oil imports by 5,000 barrels a day from its previous estimate that 1950 imports would average 74,000 barrels a day.

FOLLOWS PROTESTS

The company's action follows announced import cuts by several other leading oil companies, including the Texas Co., Standard of New Jersey, and Gulf Oil, prompted by increasing protests from independent oil producers here.

B. Brewster Jennings, Socony president, sent the following telegram to Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN (Democrat, Texas), chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, Washington, D. C.

SOCONY TELEGRAM

"The sources of supply for our scheduled petroleum imports of approximately 28,000 barrels a day are about equally divided between a long-term purchase contract and our foreign producing operations. The contract was made during the winter of 1947–48 when the United States was short of crude and when we were unable to purchase from domestic sources sufficient crude to meet the needs of our customers. Our increase in imports during 1949 and in scheduled imports for 1950 was due almost entirely to this contract. We already have exercised the option granted under the contract of reducing the stipulated quantity from 40,000 to 36,000 barrels a day, the maximum reduction permitted, amounting to 10 percent, which reduction was reflected in the data submitted to your oil subcommittee.

"In addition to the foregoing action we will reduce our takings from our controlled foreign sources of supply, thereby permitting a reduction in our imports of 5,000 barrels a day below the figures given your oil subcommittee, commencing at the earliest day consistent with the required revision of our tanker schedules. This figure is equivalent to about 13 percent of our scheduled imports from controlled sources of supply."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in reference to the article to which I have just referred, I wish to say that I saw, I believe, every oil well in the Middle East, all the way from Abadan, where the British have been conducting operations since 1890, and where there are large cavities in a type of disintegrated granite filled with oil, down to Kuwait and the gulf below it, and through the area where the American companies are operating in southern Arabia. I spent some time with ibn-Saud, the King of Arabia, and I flew over the full length of the proposed thousand-mile pipe line to Palestine. I say to the Senate that the oil in that area has only begun to be blocked out. When I was there, it was estimated that 50,000,000,000 barrels of it were available. There will be one hundred billion barrels, or perhaps more, available there, before operations conclude, because there are very few dry holes in that country. That oil can be transported to the United States, so I am advised, at a price of around $1.75 or $1.85 a barrel. The future results of such a situation would indeed be disastrous to our oil and coal industries, and already the importation of such oil is resulting in the closing of many of the oil wells and coal fields in the United States which furnish fuel, often for consumption at a considerable distance from the places where they are located, for use in providing steam power, for use in furnaces, and for use in other ways. As of today, the importation of that Middle East oil is closing large numbers of our oil wells in the United States. The Texas wells are cut back; the Pennsylvania wells are cut back; California production is cut back. Middle East oil took the Hawaiian market away from the California oil wells last year. I hear the distinguished senior Senator from Texas complaining furiously about the cut back in oil production in Texas, all due to the importation of Middle East oil. But that importation has only begun. Perhaps John L. Lewis is a great deal smarter than many persons believe him to be or give him credit for being, when he does not want an overproduction of coal, and wants, perhaps, a 3-day week, or even a no-day week at certain periods. So long as oil comes freely into this country from the Middle East and from Venezuela, there will never be a complete reopening of the coal mines and the oil fields in the United States in the way they have been operated in the past. Yet only a start has been made so far with the importation of oil from the Middle East.

Mr. President, a moment ago I mentioned the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I hold in my hand a dispatch from the Journal of Commerce of February 1, 1950, under the headline: "CONNALLY calls ban on United States oil 'act of hostility.'"

Mr. President, I shall read no more of the article than that. I ask unanimous consent to have all of it printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CONNALLY CALLS BAN ON UNITED STATES OIL "ACT OF HOSTILITY"—ASSAILS BRITISH MOVE TO EXTEND EMBARGO TO ENTIRE STERLING AREA

WASHINGTON, January 31.—Senator CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas, today accused the British Government of an act of hostility to United States economy in planning to extend an embargo on dollar oil imports to the entire sterling area.

Mr. CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said such an action is most remarkable, when the United States has made, and is making, stupendous gifts to Britain to build her economy.

Other Government officials accused the British of aiming at long-term commercial advantages at the expense of the American oil industry. The National Petroleum Council made public a letter from the British Colonial Secretary to the East African Government at Nairboi disclosing the British plans.

STATE DEPARTMENT AROUSED

One section of the British letter, saying the embargo was being extended because the United States had not protested vigorously against the proposals, aroused resentment among State Department officials.

A State Department official told a reporter this is a bad blunder which misrepresents our position on the oil question and it is bound to stir up trouble. He added that this is not a correct interpretation of the American view.

The State Department said that when the British oil restrictions first were mentioned in December the Department had expressed concern at the British action. It said talks were begun to see if some changes could be made to prevent hurting American companies.

Copies of the British letter were in the hands of Chairman CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and other Congress Members.

JERSEY STANDARD MEMO

In an analysis of the situation provided Mr. CONNALLY and other Texas Congress Members, Standard Oil Co., of New Jersey, said that under the British action the foreign

business of American oil companies might be liquidated in a relatively short period of time.

The Jersey Standard memorandum went on to say:

ENCOURAGED BY BRITISH

"The British (principally Anglo-Iranian Oil Co.) and the British-Dutch (Shell group) oil companies are continually expanding their capacity to produce and refine oil in amounts substantially in excess of the volume they could reasonably expect to sell on a competitive basis. Nevertheless, the entire volumes produced by those companies are not short of market outlets—at the expense of volumes which the American oil companies could reasonably expect to sell on a competitive basis—by discriminatory trade and exchange control practices of the British Government."

This expansion is encouraged by the British Government, the Jersey Standard memorandum continued, even though the facilities duplicate those owned by American oil companies.

Standard contended that this expansion is a waste of British and American economic resources since Marshall-plan aid is involved.

A report adopted by the National Petroleum Council charged that the British policies were actually designed to obtain long-term commercial advantages for the British and British-Dutch oil companies at the expense of the American industry.

The council said it was asking the United States Government to take steps to allow American oil companies to compete without the obstacles of British controls.

BRITISH LETTER

A key section of the British letter said:

"United States Government have now been informed of substance of proposals for substituting surplus production by British companies for dollar oil imported into the sterling area by United Kingdom companies.

"The Americans have, as expected, not gone beyond expressing regret at proposals, and steps have now been taken to put scheme into effect in United Kingdom and to obtain cooperation of Dominion governments."

It was this section which stirred resentment among State Department officials. The British letter went on to say:

"It is now desired to arrange full substitution for sterling fuel oil for dollar oil at present imported into east Africa for inland consumption."

NOT FOR SHIP'S BUNKERS

"It is not intended to substitute sterling oil for fuel oil imports destined for use in ships' bunkers."

The letter explained that "substitution" means replacing dollar oil imports by equivalent imports from British-controlled sources. It continued:

"For this purpose dollar oil means the oil which United States-controlled companies obtained from Standard (New Jersey), Standard Vacuum, Socony, Standard (California), Tex Oil Corp., and Caltex (or any of their associates such as Bahrein Petroleum Co).

"In this category there is not included oil which any of these American companies purchase and ship from British-controlled companies' sources, such as the Abadan and Curacao refineries.

"United States-controlled companies would be left to decide whether they would make good the reduction in their imports of dollar oil by purchases from nondollar sources.

"Assurance has been given by British companies that they are in principle willing to sell their surplus fuel oil to American companies, but these arrangements can be left to commercial negotiations.

"Should an American distributing company decide to curtail its trade, British companies or, indeed, other American companies should have little difficulty in taking over the additional business."

The letter said there will be more than enough fuel oil available from British-controlled companies in 1950 to take the place of all dollar imports of fuel oil for inland consumption in the Commonwealth.

"Because of the important dollar saving that can be achieved, United States-controlled companies importing into the United Kingdom have been informed of intention to introduce fuel-oil substitution in respect of all their imports from dollar sources as from January 1, 1950," the letter said.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal of February 1, 1950, under the headline "House group to quiz United States officials on British dollar oil embargo."

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

HOUSE GROUP TO QUIZ UNITED STATES OFFICIALS ON BRITISH DOLLAR OIL EMBARGO—TO SEEK VIEWS OF STATE DEPARTMENT, ECA CHIEFS ON PLAN TO EXTEND IMPORT BAN TO COMMONWEALTH

WASHINGTON—State Department and Economic Cooperation Administration officials will be called before a House committee to give their views on Britain's plan to extend its embargo on dollar oil imports to the entire British Commonwealth.

On January 1, Britain put into effect a ban on imports of oil produced by United States companies. The ban now affects Britain and its colonies, but not the rest of the Commonwealth.

Representative KEOGH, chairman of the House Small Business Subcommittee on Oil Imports, disclosed yesterday his group will open hearings February 7 on the British ban. Top officials of the State Department and the ECA will be the lead-off witness, he said.

He made the disclosure as British officials arrived here to resume talks, interrupted 3 weeks ago, on the British oil import ban. Since the talks were broken off, the two chief British delegates, Victor S. Butler, Under Secretary of the Ministry of Fuel and Power, and Sir Leslie Rowan, Economic Affairs Minister, have gone to London for instructions and have returned here. They have reportedly brought little in the way of a short-term compromise settlement but have some proposals for a long-term accord.

CONNALLY ASSAILS BRITISH PLAN

Representative KEOGH said his committee had refrained from questioning State Department officials previously because it did not wish to jeopardize their negotiations on oil imports with the British. But now, he asserted, the committee wants to know what the State Department intends to do "to relieve the position in which American companies find themselves in British markets."

The ECA officials will be asked if the British ban on dollar oil imports has changed the ECA's attitude toward financing expansion of foreign refinery capacity.

Yesterday Senator CONNALLY (Democrat), of Texas, accused Britain of "an act of hostility" to the United States economy by planning to extend its embargo on dollar oil imports.

Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said such an action "is most remarkable when the United States has made and is making stupendous gifts to Britain to build her economy."

The National Petroleum Council made public a letter from the British Colonial Secretary to the East African Government at Nairobi disclosing the British plans.

A council report contended that the British policies, if continued, could compel the American oil industry to surrender the international oil trade to the British.

STATE DEPARTMENT RESENTFUL

One section of the British letter, saying the embargo was being extended because the United States had not protested vigorously against the proposals, aroused resentment among State Department officials.

A State Department official told a reporter: "This is a bad blunder which misrepresents our position on the oil question, and it is bound to stir up trouble." He added that this is "not a correct interpretation of the American view."

The State Department said that when the British oil restrictions first were mentioned in December the Department had "expressed concern" at the British action. It said talks were begun to see if some changes could be made to prevent hurting American companies.

JERSEY STANDARD MAY BE HIT

The American oil company that stands to be hardest hit by the British plan to shut out dollar oil from the Commonwealth is Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

This company has informed United States Government officials that "the foreign business of American oil companies might be liquidated in a relatively short period of time. The British (principally Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., Ltd.) and the British-Dutch Shell group of oil companies are continually expanding their capacity to produce and refine oil in amounts substantially in excess of the volumes they could reasonably expect to sell on a competitive basis."

The expansion of British-owned petroleum production facilities is encouraged by the British Government, the Jersey Standard statement continued, even though the facilities duplicate those owned by American oil companies.

LONDON—The British Colonial Office neither confirmed nor denied the authenticity of the letter in the hands of the National Petroleum Council.

The office stated yesterday it had not received any copies of correspondence which may have passed into the hands of the NPC, and therefore could not make any comment on the subject.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a dispatch from the Journal of Commerce of October 11, 1949, showing a large group of commodities which, according to the headline of the article, are "affected in new agreement."

The first sentence of the article reads as follows:

A partial list of tariff concessions made by the United States in negotiations at Annecy, France, and released yesterday by the State Department, is published below.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed at this point in the RECORD.

(The foregoing omitted from the RECORD.)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point another dispatch by Ray Cromley, staff correspondent of the Wall Street Journal of October 31, 1949, which shows certain of the tariff cuts by our country. I shall furnish this particular dispatch to the Official Reporter a little later.

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

TRADE TROUBLE—EXPORTERS FACE PROSPECT OF TOUGHER SLEDDING IN FOREIGN SELLING EFFORTS—BARTER DEALS GROW, TARIFF WALLS RISE IN SOME SPOTS, IMPORT CURBS TIGHTENED—STRANGE IRONY OF ANNECY

(By Ray Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—The men who are trying to open more foreign markets for United States businessmen are fighting a losing battle. Every time State Department experts hack through one trade wall, they find a maze of others

In the next 3 to 6 months, American exporters will find it harder than ever to sell their goods in the world's lush but tightly-chaperoned markets.

Says one official: "They'll bump up against more red tape, more restrictions against American goods, and even higher tariffs on imports from the United States."

Right now, 77 of the world's 85 principal trading countries tell their merchants how much trading they can do with other nations. They do this by two methods: The governments require import licenses, which means their businessmen must get official permission to bring goods into their own country. Or the governments control foreign exchange. This means a foreigner who wants to buy goods in the United States must ask his government to change his currency—say, French francs—into dollars.

TIGHTENING THE STRINGS

European, Latin American, and Asiatic governments are busy tightening these controls and adding new ones.

"They're still running short of dollars." explains one trade expert. "The shorter they get, the tighter they make restrictions on goods from America."

Officials here expect a new dollar pinch in foreign countries next spring if United States aid declines.

Many new barriers to United States exporters announced this year by foreign nations are just now going into effect. The $400,000,000- to $600,000,000-a-year cut-back in purchases with dollars announced by England and British dominions several months ago, for example, will really be felt here late this year or early in 1950. And only last week Prime Minister Attlee announced further cuts.

Of the new foreign restrictions on trade, United States experts fear most the barter-type agreements. These have sprung up like mushrooms in the past half year.

BARTER BUSINESS

These barter-trade arrangements are usually between two countries. Each nation pledges preferred treatment to some goods the other wants to sell. Each promises to take a certain amount of the other's commodities or manufactures. Both guarantee to issue export licenses and the foreign currency necessary for the trade. Goods from other countries, such as the United States, are admitted only if one treaty member doesn't supply as much of a particular item as the other member country wants.

United States Embassy officials at New Delhi, India, report one typical agreement. In August, Austria and India signed a 1-year pact. Under it, Austria is to export to India $18,000,000 worth of merchandise and import an equivalent value of Indian goods in exchange. Austria's major exports to India are to consist of steel, paper, textiles, chemicals, machinery, and apparatus in return for Indian deliveries of cotton, wool, hemp, hides, furs, teas, and spices.

"That's a much more effective barrier to United States exports than tariffs ever were," says one United States analyst. He explains that an American exporter would have little chance to sell similar wares to these countries while this swapping agreement is in effect. An Austrian, for instance, who wanted to buy cotton from the United States might be told he'd have to buy from India.

FORTY-TWO DEALS IN 6 MONTHS

There were more than 42 such barter treaties among nations announced during the 6 months ended October 1.

These mounting trade barriers are very frustrating to foreign policy makers in the State Department. Ever since the end of World War II they've been negotiating, pleading, offering United States aid, and cutting United States tariffs in a drive toward "free world trade."

Their dreamed-of ideal would be a world in which businesses in all countries bought and sold goods among each other just as, for example, a Texan and a New Yorker trade with each other. There would be no trade barriers at national boundaries and no difficulty changing one country's money for another.

Though the experts know this type of trading world is not feasible any time soon, they keep trying to work toward it. They promoted the International Monetary Fund, which was supposed to make different currencies interchangeable. They backed the International Trade Organization, which was supposed to eliminate trading barriers. And they've negotiated mutual tariff cuts among important trading nations.

ONE FORWARD, TWO BACKWARD

"But," one State Department trade official says, "for every step of this sort we take forward we slip two backward"

The sad story of what's happened in the free-trade drive by the United States this year can be told by the following course of events·

For 5 months earlier this year, United States tariff men wrestled with bureaucrats from 10 other nations in a conference at Annecy, France. They strove to persuade these other countries to cut their import duties and lower other trade barriers in return for sizable cuts in United States tariffs on imports.

During this 5-month period while Americans were busy talking lower tariffs with these 10 nations, the powers-that-be in at least 35 lands announced they were erecting higher walls to keep out things the United States produces and sells.

The list may not yet be complete. Officials here aren't always officially informed of such actions by other nations. Frequently they learn of new restrictions only through studying foreign pronouncements or reading embassy reports. Usually restrictions don't mention United States articles directly. For example, a country may ban imports of all left-hand-drive cars. Since the United States is the largest maker and exporter of left-hand-drive autos, such a ban would hit chiefly this country while not mentioning the United States.

THIRTY-FIVE NATIONS

The 35 countries acted thus:

Thirty-two of them announced new barter deals that discriminate against imports from United States producers.

Spokesmen for six nations said their countries would tighten restrictions on the amount of American goods that would be allowed to cross their borders.

Five increased tariff levels.

Several said they would put on new import-discouraging taxes. They didn't make clear just what form these penalties would take.

All this happened while the Annecy talks were going on. Afterward, the negotiators spent 2 months getting the Annecy agreements ready for diplomats to sign early in October. And during this 2-month period, the following happened:

India informally stopped granting any more permits for imports which cost dollars. The Indian Government then issued new regulations cutting imports.

IRISH AND ARABIANS

The Irish set limits on how much woolen piece goods could be brought into their country.

The Saudi Arabians began requiring official permission for wheat and flour imports. Brazilians did the same for sugar, rice, and oats.

The Colombians and the Ceylonese made it harder for their buyers to get licenses to import goods.

The Indonesians increased an import surtax on tobacco by 200 percent and on cigars and cigarettes by 350 percent.

The Peruvians made the importing of penicillin a government monopoly so their businessmen couldn't buy directly from foreign suppliers.

The Austrians and Swiss, the Peruvians and the Argentines, the Finns and the Argentines, and the Hungarians and Yugoslavs signed two-way barter-type agreements.

It will still take 2 to 8 months more to put the Annecy trade concessions into effect. In those months ahead, says one expert here, foreign officials throughout the world will announce dozens of new restrictions on how Americans can trade abroad.

IRONY OF ANNECY

And, ironically, it turns out that even the labor with the 10 nations—Nicaragua, Sweden, Italy, Finland, Denmark, Uruguay, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Liberia, and Greece—at Annecy brought very meager benefits to this country. There were slight cuts (and, actually some increases) in tariffs on United States goods. In return, United States negotiators gave very liberal reductions in United States import duties.

An analysis of the Annecy concessions shows the 10 countries cut their tariffs on only a small fraction of all they import from the United States.

The Danes cut duties on 1 percent of their United States imports; Uruguayans on 3 percent; the Dominicans on 4 percent; the Haitians on 2 percent.

The Nicaraguans cut on 3 percent of imports from this country, but said they may increase duties on more than 9 percent of the commodities brought in from the United States.

The Swedes reduced on 8 percent of United States imports but indicated they might boost levies on a range of goods later.

The Finns raised most of their duties over the current rates on United States goods. Many increases were hidden in a shift from duties that charge so much an item or so much a pound to duties that charge a percentage of the value of goods.

Italy used a neat device to raise her duties. Most of the Italian concessions were made from a set of tariffs which the Italians told the United States delegates they were planning to put into effect. So Italy agreed to cut these proposed tariff rates drastically, but the final effect was to increase her existing real tariff rates greatly.

Not enough data is available here to figure what reductions Greece and Liberia made. Each country, however, cut only a few tariffs. Greece raised a number of her 1949 duties.

On the other hand, the United States slashed its levies, frequently as much as 50 percent, on most dutiable imports from these same 10 countries.

An analysis shows that for the Danes, the United States cut levies on 89 percent of the dutiable goods they sell here; for the Dominicans, on 75 percent; for the Finns, on 98 percent.

For the Greeks, tariffs were lowered on 98 percent of the goods they sell here which are charged a duty; for the Haitians, on 87 percent; for the Italians, on 71 percent; for the

Nicaraguans, on 99 percent; for the Swedes, on 93 percent; for the Uruguayans, on 99.2 percent. The United States charges no duties on 99.9 percent of its imports from Liberia.

Mr. MALONE. On February 2, 1950, an article appeared in the Journal of Commerce under the headline, "Acheson slams British curbs on United States oil firms," which is what was referred to in paragraph 3 of the letter from the British Secretary of State, one of the other nations, simply saying that a perfunctory objection had been made. I ask unanimous consent to have the dispatch included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be placed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHESON SLAMS BRITISH CURBS ON UNITED STATES OIL FIRMS

WASHINGTON, February 1—Secretary of State Acheson said today the British Government decided on restricting American oil companies in Britain without adequate consultation with the companies concerned.

Acheson told a news conference the United States views the British action with serious concern. He added that the State Department plans to press discussions looking to a solution of the problem.

BRITISH PLANS DISCLOSED

The United States National Petroleum Council made public yesterday a letter written by the British Colonial Secretary disclosing plans to extend an embargo on dollar oil imports throughout the British Commonwealth and the sterling area.

Acheson said in a statement:

"It is our view that measures can be adopted which will meet the necessity of the United Kingdom and sterling area to save dollars on oil accounts and at the same time protect the legitimate interests of the countries and companies concerned."

He said his department was aware some time ago of the letter written by the British Colonial Office to the East African Government concurring oil restrictions.

This letter, he said, "does not accurately reflect the serious concern with which the United States Government viewed and continues to view the British action of reducing dollar oil imports into the sterling area and the manner in which the action was put into effect."

The British letter got into the hands of the National Petroleum Council, an American group which advises the Interior Department on oil and gas questions.

The letter said in part that "the Americans have, as expected, not gone beyond expressing regret at proposals and steps have now been taken to put the scheme into effect in the United Kingdom and to obtain cooperation of the dominion governments."

Acheson said the State Department told the British last December that their hasty action did not give American oil companies time to find out if they could help Britain save dollars by adjustment in their operations.

The State Department, he said, intends to press forward with discussions looking to such a solution

The United States believes, Acheson said, that if American oil companies cannot adjust their operations to help Britain save the amount of dollars she wants that restrictions "should only take place gradually and in a manner that would enable the United States companies to adjust with minimum hardship to the new situation."

CURB ON IMPORTS

The British oil restrictions, which curbed the right of American oil companies to import fuel oil and gasoline which they must buy with dollars, were announced last December 21. They were to go into effect January 1, but Acheson noted that the British had agreed to postpone the effective date to February 15.

After receiving a copy of the British letter, released by the Petroleum Council, Senator CONNALLY, Democrat, of Texas, said he planned to ask the State Department to investigate.

He said he viewed the British plans as an act of hostility to American economy.

In London today, the British Colonial Office said it is certainly not engaged in trying to control the market of the world. A spokesman said: "The Colonial Office is not framing oil policies. We are not in the oil business."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have before me a table entitled "Some Examples of Reductions of Duties Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act," showing the section and the date of such reduction, and the completely modified tariff at this time. I ask unanimous consent to have the table, with the supporting data, printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table, together with the supporting data, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Some examples of reductions of duties under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act

Paragraph of Tariff Act of 1930	Article	1930 rate	Modified rate	Modified rate
302 (a)	Manganese ore (including ferruginous manganese ore) or concentrates, containing in excess of 10 percent of metallic manganese	1 cent per pound on the metallic manganese content	1½ cent per pound on metal contained (1936)	¾ cent per pound on the metallic manganese content (1948)
302 (b)	Molybdenum ore or concentrates	35 cents per pound on the metallic molybdenum content		17½ cents per pound on the metallic molybdenum content (1943)
302 (c)	Tungsten ore or concentrates	50 cents per pound on the metallic tungsten content		38 cents per pound on the metallic tungsten content (1948)
302 (g)	Tungsten metal, tungsten carbide, and mixtures or combinations containing tungsten metal or tungsten carbide, all the foregoing in lumps, grains, or powder	60 cents per pound on the tungsten content and 50 percent ad valorem		42 cents per pound on the tungsten content and 25 percent ad valorem (1948)
228 (a)	Prism binoculars, frames and mountings therefor, and parts of any of the foregoing, all the foregoing, finished or unfinished	60 percent ad valorem	45 percent ad valorem (1936)	30 percent ad valorem (1948).
228 (b)	Photographic lenses, finished or unfinished, not specifically provided for	45 percent ad valorem	30 percent ad valorem (1939)	25 percent ad valorem (1948).
	Opera or field glasses (not prism binoculars), frames and mountings therefor, and parts of such glasses, frames, or mountings, all the foregoing, finished or unfinished, not specifically provided for	do	35 percent ad valorem (1936)	20 percent ad valorem (1948).
236	Watch crystals or watch glasses, finished or unfinished Round	60 percent ad valorem	30 percent ad valorem (1936)	15 percent ad valorem (1948).
353	Electrical cooking stoves and ranges	35 percent ad valorem	17½ percent ad valorem (1939).	10 percent ad valorem (1948).
375	Metallic magnesium	40 cents per pound		20 cents per pound (1948).
376	Antimony, as regulus or metal	2 cents per pound		1 cent per pound (1948)
389	Nickel and alloys (except those provided for in par 302 or 380) in which nickel is the component material of chief value. In pigs or ingots, shots, cubes, grains, cathodes, or similar forms.	3 cents per pound	2½ cents per pound (1939)	1¼ cents per pound (1948).
391	Lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kind Effective 30 days after the termination of the emergency proclaimed on May 27, 1941, the rate for lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds shall be—	1½ cents per pound on lead content		¾ cent per pound on lead content (1945).
412	Spring clothespins	20 cents per gross	15 cents per gross (1935)	10 cents per gross (1943).
603	All other tobacco, manufactured or unmanufactured, not specifically provided for.	55 cents per pound	35 cents per pound (1939)	17½ cents per pound (1948)
701	Beef and veal, fresh, chilled, or frozen	6 cents per pound		3 cents per pound (1948)
702	Sheep and lambs	$3 per head		$1.50 per head (1943)
713	Eggs of poultry, in the shell. Eggs of chickens	10 cents per dozen	5 cents per dozen (1939)	3½ cents per dozen (1948)
719	Fish, pickled or salted Salmon	25 percent ad valorem	20 percent ad valorem (1936); 12½ percent ad valorem (1939).	10 percent ad valorem (1948).
729	Wheat	42 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.	Note quota	21 cents per bushel of 60 pounds (1948)
734	Apples: Green or ripe	25 cents per bushel of 50 pounds.	15 cents per bushel of 50 pounds (1936).	12½ cents per bushel of 50 pounds (1948).
743	Lemons	2½ cents per pound		1¼ cents per pound (1949).
771	White or Irish potatoes Other than such certified seed potatoes	75 cents per 100 pounds	Note quota	37½ cents per 100 pounds for a quota quantity to be determined annually.
802	Whisky	$5 per proof gallon	$2.50 per proof gallon (1939)	$1.50 per proof gallon (1948).
919	Shirts of cotton, not knit or crocheted	45 percent ad valorem		25 percent ad valorem (1948).
920	Lace window curtains, nets, nettings, pillow shams, and bed sets, and all other fabrics and articles, by whatever name known, plain or jacquard-figured, finished or unfinished, wholly or partly manufactured, for any use whatsoever, made on the Nottingham lace-curtain machine, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber.	60 percent ad valorem	50 percent ad valorem (1939)	40 percent ad valorem (1948).

Some examples of reductions of duties under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—Continued

Paragraph of Tariff Act of 1930	Article	1930 rate	Modified rate	Modified rate
1205	Woven fabrics in the piece (exceeding 30 inches in width), wholly or in chief value of silk, not specifically provided for: Jacquard-figured, with fibers wholly of silk, bleached, printed, dyed, or colored, valued at more than $5.50 per pound	55 percent ad valorem	No data (1936)	25 percent ad valorem (1948).
1519 (a)	Dressed furs and dressed fur skins (except silver or black fox): Beaver, caracul and Persian lamb, chinchilla, ermine, fisher, fitch, fox, kolinsky, leopard, lynx, marten, mink, nutria, ocelot, otter, pony, raccoon, sable, wolf. All the foregoing.			
	If not dyed	25 percent ad valorem	12½ to 15 percent ad valorem (1939–41).	7½ percent ad valorem (1948).
	If dyed	30 percent ad valorem	20 percent ad valorem (1939)	10 percent ad valorem (1948).
1733	Crude petroleum	On free list	½ cent per gallon (IRC) 1932	¼ cent per gallon [1]
1658	Copper ore, regulus copper, and copper in plates, bars, ingots, or pigs, not manufactured or specially provided for.	do.[2]	4 cents per pound (IRC 1932).	2 cents per pound.[3]

[1] Trade agreement with Venezuela (1939), and with Mexico (1943).
[2] Bound, Geneva, 1948, binding not made effective on Jan. 1, 1948, pursuant to art. 27 of the Geneva agreement, but became effective on Mar. 16, 1949.
[3] Tax on copper scrap suspended from Mar. 14, 1942, to June 30, 1949, inclusive (Public Law 497, 77th Cong., and Public Laws 384 and 613, 80th Cong.) Tax on all products listed (including scrap) suspended from Apr. 30, 1947, to June 30, 1950, inclusive (Public Law 42, 80th Cong., and Public Law 33, 81st Cong.) The reduced tax will have no application with respect to imports, however, so long as the import excise taxes remain suspended.

NOTE.—In the trade agreement with Venezuela, the excise tax on imports of crude petroleum, topped crude, fuel oil, and gas oil, imposed in June 1932, was reduced from 21 to 10.5 cents a barrel, subject, however, to an annual tariff quota, for the 4 commodities combined, equal for each year to 5 percent of the quantity of crude processed in domestic refineries during the preceding calendar year. There was no limitation on the quantity that could enter by paying the statutory rate of tax. In the trade agreement with Mexico, the quantity limitation on imports at the reduced rate was discontinued.

Sources. Publications of the U. S. Tariff Commission.

Imports and exports of petroleum products—selected years

[Average daily figures in barrels]

Year	Imports			Exports, total	Net imports, total
	Crude petroleum	Products	Total		
1937	75,000	82,000	157,000	473,000	−316,000
1938	73,000	76,000	149,000	531,000	−382,000
1939	91,000	71,000	162,000	517,000	−455,000
1947 [1]	267,000	170,000	437,000	451,000	−14,000
1948	353,000	160,000	513,000	369,000	144,000
Preliminary 1949	426,000	214,000	640,000	329,000	311,000
Estimated first quarter, 1950	467,000	300,000	767,000	267,000	500,000

[1] Denotes time of tariff cuts.

Source. Department of Commerce.

Domestic crude production

	Average daily
1937	3,505,000
1938	3,472,000
1939	3,466,000
1947	5,088,000
1948	5,509,000
1949 (preliminary)	5,044,000
1950 (anticipated first quarter)	5,133,000

Imports of tungsten ore and concentrate—selected years—Imports for consumption, in short tons

1938	162,744
1939	1,485,157
1947	6,018,005
1948 [1]	7,548,101
January–November 1949	6,158,802

[1] Denotes time of tariff cut.

Source: Bureau of Mines.

United States production

1938	3,044
1939	4,287
1947	3,094
1948	4,210
1948, estimated	3,000

United States imports of copper for selected years, 1938–49

[In short tons]

Years	Metal		Regulus	Ore and concentrate
	Refined	Unrefined		
1938	176,798	1,802	2,519	69,732
1939	245,130	16,264	2,828	68,329
1947 [1]	167,378	149,482	5,223	85,858
1948	155,836	249,124	3,657	89,300
11 months, 1949	124,007	258,217	2,077	104,052

[1] Denotes time of tariff cuts.

Source Bureau of Mines.

Domestic production (mine production, United States)

(Recovered metal, in short tons)

1938	557,763
1939	728,320
1947	847,563
1948	834,814
1949 (11 months)	741,400

United States imports of lead for selected years, 1938–49

(In short tons)

	Lead ore
1938	45,370
1939	30,842
1947 [1]	50,751
1948	64,170
1949 (estimated)	100,000

[1] Denotes time of tariff cuts.

Source: Bureau of Mines.

Domestic production from domestic ores

	Lead ore
1938	331,964
1939	420,967
1947	381,109
1948	390,476
1949 (preliminary)	404,032

United States imports of magnesium metal for selected years, 1938–49

(In short tons)

1938	Less than ½ ton
1939	Less than ½ ton
1947	201
1948 [1]	678
1949 (estimated)	300

[1] Denotes period when tariffs were cut.

Domestic production

1938	3,217
1939	3,350
1947	12,344
1948	10,003
1949 (estimated)	11,600

Imports of spring clothespins—selected years

	Gross
1938	17,750
1939	7,047
1947 [1]	876,299
1948	1,064,688
January–November 1949	707,463

[1] Indicates time of tariff cut.

Source—Tariff Commission.

Domestic production

	Gross
1937	1,151,624
1939	1,335,114
1947	2,748,124
1948	3,237,267
1949	3,087,843

United States imports of eggs (in the shell)

Years:	Dozens
1937, 1938, 1939: Average 1937–39 (including small amount of duck eggs)	360,000
1947 [1]	559,000
1948	1,403,000
1949 [1] (11 months)	3,207,000

[1] Denotes time of tariff cuts.

Source: Department of Commerce.

Domestic production

	Dozens
1937, 1398, 1939 average	3,160,000,000
1947	4,604,000,000
1948	4,597,000,000
1949 (11 months)	4,311,000,000

The following three tables (on antimony, nickel, and molybdenum) are not significant:

Imports of antimony metal or regulus—selected years

[In short tons]

Year:	
1938	821
1939	1,045
1947	5,879
1948 [1]	3,176
1949 (estimated)	2,320

[1] Denotes time of tariff cut.

Source: Bureau of Mines.

Domestic production: From antimonial lead and secondary antimony only.

Imports of nickel—selected years

[Metallic nickel content in pounds]

Year:	
1938	52,400,000
1939 [1]	116,400,000
1947	161,435,000
1948 [1]	193,760,000
January–November 1949	163,855,000

[1] Denotes time of tariff cuts.

Source: Bureau of Mines.

Domestic production: Only a byproduct from copper production.

Imports of molybdenum—Selected years

	Pounds
1938	25
1939	26,347
1947 [1]	None
1948	none
January–November 1949	48,148

[1] Denotes time of tariff cuts.

Source: Bureau of Mines.

Domestic production

	Pounds
1938	33,297,000
1939	80,324,000
1947	27,047,000
1948	26,705,600
1949 (9 months)	17,119,400

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the indices of industrial production, 1946 to 1949, of the 12 Marshall-plan countries, have been the subject of some debate. These indices are taken from the Statistical Bulletin of United Nations. I ask unanimous consent to have them inserted in the RECORD.

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

Twelve Marshall-plan countries—Indexes of industrial production, 1946-49

[Source: Statistical Bulletin of the United Nations]

Country	Base year of index	1946	1947	1948	Highest, 1949	Latest, 1949
Austria	1937	(1)	51	78	106	106 August
Belgium	1937	74	86	93	98	87 August
Denmark	1937	101	116	129	150	150 November.
France	1937	73	87	102	120	110 October.
Germany (bizone)	1936	34	40	60	91	91 August
Greece	1939	54	67	74	93	93 October.
French Morocco	1938	153	171	192	254	254 August.
Ireland [2]	1937	109	113	130	140	138 August
Italy	1938	(1)	93	98	116	108 September
Netherlands	1937	75	95	114	133	133 October
Norway	1937	100	115	125	142	139 October
Sweden	1937	137	139	144	148	146 September
United Kingdom	1937	90	98	109	121	121 October.

[1] Not available.
[2] Indices for Ireland are compiled quarterly instead of monthly.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, concluding my remarks on domestic policy—I shall continue on another subject—I want to say that apparently the only cure for the administration's free-trade policy, and the only way it can be stopped, is simply to substitute a flexible import fee for the Trade Agreements Act, and prevent the enactment of the International Trade Organization legislation. It is not a thing that can easily be amended, because it is simply like a football player running in the wrong direction. He can be tackled and diverted, but unless stopped he is still going to the goal post. We have simply to stop, turn around, reverse the action, and go the other way. So, Mr. President, we may give, through the flexible import fee and tariff action, into the hands of a nonpartisan group such as I have suggested, the right and authority and latitude in that field to fix tariffs and import fees, considering such factors as the offered-for-sale price, the declared customs value, and many other factors which may be available, and at the same time fixing the tariffs and import fees so that it will no longer be to the advantage of foreign nations, particularly the empire-minded nations of England, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium, to hold down slave labor and slave wages in the Far East and in Africa, then to sell to us at what the traffic will bear, and to live off the difference. Let them come here a few times and hit a tariff import fee, gaged to make up that difference, and have the United States customer pay it into the United States Treasury. I think even the colonial nations who have operated as colonial powers for from 100 to 300 years will then know that they may as well go home and charge us a fair price, receive a better price, and pay their labor more, to raise their own standard of living and to increase the income of their own people.

Then, Mr. President, as the world raises its living standards, with our help, while we hold our economy on a level, our flexible import fees would go down, and when they had reached approximately our standard of living, then free trade, which is the objective of every one of us in the United States, would be reached automatically.

There is a difference between what I suggest and the way the State Department is now proceeding under the three-part, free-trade system. It is the difference between a man's jumping off the roof to the ground to join his friends, or putting a ladder up to let him come up where you are. Mr. President, I submit, if these dangerous policies continue, the now widespread unemployment will become even worse, and our living standards will tumble.

It is already lower than it was, but we take the difference out of the till, just as we are taking the money out of the till to send to foreign nations; so no wonder we cannot get out of the red. We are going further into debt even now, at what is called the height of prosperity. If we cannot get along now, the system had better be reexamined, and then, as I say, Mr. President, an incentive will be afforded to the other nations to raise the standards of living in their satellite countries as well as in their own. They have no incentive for raising them now.

WE SUPPORT LOW LIVING STANDARDS

Mr. President, just one other thing for the RECORD at this moment, which I think gets close to the heart of this. In China we buy rice at $1 a bushel, let us assume. It is about $1 a bushel. A bushel of wheat is of about the same food value. A bushel of rice is produced by a man getting 20 cents, perhaps, or 25 cents a day. With a bushel of rice selling at $1 it takes the rice grower 4 days' work to buy a bushel of rice. Two-dollar wheat in this country, for a $10-a-day man, buys 5 bushels of it with a day's work; so what is the answer? Each day's work of a man in this country is worth 20 days in China. We think we are a great people when we can hold the price of rice down, but we had better figure on paying more for the rice and for the work involved in producing it, and there will not be that differential. But so long as there is free trade colonial nations can press it down, and it is to their advantage to do so in Hong Kong, and in the Malay States, and other areas.

I was in Singapore and Indochina, Mr. President, and it will be a miracle if Indochina is not in the possession of the Chinese Communists in from 60 to 90 days. All they have to do is to move in.

We have the spectacle of the United States and England recognizing a French ruler, and we see Russia recognizing Communist rulers. When I was there, Mr. President, I could hear shooting going on. Someone is killed every once in a while there. Three of our own people have been killed within the past few months. Many people live in the middle of Saigon. Outside of that small, hard core persons are shot. That is the way Indochina is being run today, and we are furnishing the money to keep the people under the colonial yoke. Russia is promising them relief from the yoke. It takes only one guess to know which country will win.

Mr. President, I expect to continue after I yield briefly to the junior Senator from Massachusetts, who wishes to address the Senate on another subject.

CLOSING OF THE WALTHAM WATCH CO.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement concerning a tragic emergency which has taken place in Massachusetts, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] shall not lose the floor while I address the Senate on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYDEN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on last Saturday, the doors of the Waltham Watch Co., in Massachusetts, were closed, throwing out of work all that company's employees. The decision was made without notice, without giving anyone an opportunity to prepare for it, and it prompted the sending to the President of the United States of a telegram by Mr. Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president of the American Watch Workers' Union. It is that telegram which I desire to read into the RECORD. It is addressed to the President of the United States, and reads as follows:

Mr. President, 2,358 Americans yesterday, with less than 3 hours' notice, lost their jobs working for the world's oldest precision watch-making firm, the 100-year-old Waltham Watch Co. Their jobs were lost because the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a part of your administration, refused to allot the company an additional $1,500,000 in working capital out of a pledged $6,000,000 loan promised to the company last spring. Four million dollars only has been lent to Waltham Watch Co. by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which took as collateral all of the company's assets, including building, real estate, machinery equipment, accounts receivable, finished inventory, and work in process. But this $4,000,000 was disbursed by the company by paying the bank $3,250,000 in full payment for all loans of the bank, $600,000 to pay to the debtors and the cost of reorganization, and the remaining $150,000 was all the company received out of this loan for a working capital. Federal Judge George C Sweeney and his three appointed court trustees, Daniel J. Lyne, C. Keefe Hurley, and Judge Jacob Kaplan, did an outstanding job in the reorganization of this company. They took the water out of

the stocks and bonds, supplied competent engineering advice to the company, and obtained competent, efficient, productive management to guide the company. Waltham Watch Co. today is in far better financial condition and led by as good a management as possibly could be obtained in the fields of production, merchandising, and accounting. Waltham Watch Co. has less money today than it did when a petition was filed for reorganization in the Federal court on December 28, 1948

Waltham Watch Co. has adequate management and a sales organization was really making headway. In the month of January 1950 alone more watches were sold by the Waltham Watch Co. than in any January in the previous 4 years, in spite of the fact that all watch sales have slowed down tremendously by all companies. Mr. President, unless you act immediately, a company essential to the national defense of the United States will die. It is unfair to the stockholders who have invested their money to let this company die. It is unfair to 2,358 human beings who depend on Waltham Watch Co. for their livelihood to let this company die. It is unfair to the American people to allow this company, only one of three left in the United States capable of making precision instruments in time of w r in the timing mechanism field, to die. If this company is allowed to die, and it will die unless you act immediately, the 1,231 persons who were left on the company pay roll when it closed yesterday will go on unemployment compensation and the relief roll. The cost of this relief will far exceed a million and a half dollars to the Federal, State, and city governments. And none of this money can ever be recouped once it is paid out in unemployment compensation or relief. Out of these 2,358 persons there are many hundreds in the age brackets of 45 to 65 who will be unable to obtain employment elsewhere. They are too young to obtain social-security benefits and many of them are frugal persons who have purchased their own homes and have small equities in them. They will be unable to obtain relief while they own whatever equity they possess in these homes The cost of hardship through unemployment to these families in human misery cannot be measured Mr. President, the Waltham Watch Co. is one of three companies making jeweled watches in the United States. The other two, the Elgin National Watch Co. and the Hamilton Watch Co., have in the past year both curtailed their production schedules. Hamilton Watch Co. has 400 less employees than it had a year ago. The Elgin National Watch Co has reduced its working hours 10 percent and, in addition, is closing one of its three plants, the one in Aurora, Ill. The economic factors which caused this retrenchment are the Swiss watch imports which have flooded this country during the past 10 years, during 5 of which these three companies produced no watches for civilian use—a timing mechanism for all of the armed forces of the Allies. The Defense Supply Corporation spent no money to build plants to produce timing mechanisms. Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham produce them all. While these companies were at war helping the United States, an average of 10,000,000 watches per year came into the United States at one-third to one-fourth of what they could be produced for in the United States. None of these watches were for military use. Over 100,000,000 watch movements have come into the United States during the last 10 years.

The tariff revenue for the United States Treasury must have been well in excess of $250,000,000 obtained by the entry of goods into the United States that were detrimental to the well-being of the Waltham Watch Co. and its employees. The Government of the United States, under your Democratic administration, should be willing to lend, and I emphasize lend, an additional million and a half dollars to the Waltham Watch Co. for working capital. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation can easily do this by using the going-concern value of the company instead of the liquidation value which it used to turn down the loan. The Democratic administration which you head, Mr. President, has been responsible for refusing to curtail these Swiss watch imports. The Democratic administration which you head, Mr. President, refused the additional million and a half dollars necessary to give Waltham Watch its new lease on life. The Democratic administration professes to be for human welfare. Its campaigns are based on human rights. It advocates minimum wages, paid holidays, paid vacations, pension plans, group insurance for sickness and accident, and yet at the same time the Democratic administration which you head, Mr President, advocates the entry and permits the entry of foreign goods into the United States manufactured under conditions which we would not permit in the United States to the detriment of American workmen. When these imports cause manufacturers to drown, employees lose their jobs, and not one contract, regardless of what its contents are, is of any value to the employees. Mr. President, there is only one person in the world who has the authority and the opportunity to save the Waltham Watch Co That person is you. There is time for you to act. The Federal court is not going to act on whether or not to accept the petition of the company for reorganization until after 4 p. m on Monday, February 16. If the RFC reconsiders its action and grants the company the necessary million and a half dollars to continue operation there will be no need for the company to have its petition heard I urge you, Mr. President, as the head of the Democratic administration, to call in the board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and request them to loan Waltham Watch Co. this necessary working capital. Mr. President, you have the time to act. Won't you please, in behalf of 2,358 men and women, all good Americans who seek the opportunity to work, instruct or urge the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to grant Waltham Watch Co. the necessary working capital. If this is done you will have contributed much to the well-being of the New England community If you do not act you will have dealt a death blow to one of America's oldest corporations and the job opportunities of 2,358 Americans. Each of our members when they go to church tomorrow morning will say their prayers that you will pay heed to this request. I trust their prayers will be answered. Thanking you for your consideration of this request, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

WALTER W. CENERAZZO,
National President of the American Watch Workers' Union.

That, Mr. President, is the telegram which Mr. Cenerazzo sent to the President of the United States.

I express the hope that action will still be possible to enable this company, which was not only a large employer of labor, but which was such an essential part of the national defense of America, to continue operations.

I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding to me in order that I might place the telegram in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, when the loan in connection with the Waltham Watch Co. was first considered by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Hamilton Watch Co., a Pennsylvania corporation, asked if I would urge the granting of the loan, because it was felt that while the Waltham Watch Co. was a competitor, it was for the good of the United States that the Waltham Watch Co. continue in business, because there are only three great American watch manufacturing concerns, the Waltham Watch Co., the Hamilton Watch Co., and the Elgin Watch Co.

In case of an emergency, and in case of war, the men working in these factories are the men who must do the work in the manufacture of precision instruments. Workers cannot be developed for the precision instrument factories short of a couple of years of training, according to those in charge of the Hamilton Watch Co.

I hope that the President of the United States, in his wisdom, for the good of the men who work in these factories, and also for the good of the national defense, may instruct the directors of the RFC to assemble and grant the loan asked for.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his observations. They will be noted and read with interest and approbation in Massachusetts. I am glad to have the Senator support my appeal that the President act while there is yet time.

DOMESTIC POLICY

Mr. MALONE Mr. President, I wish to add a couple of statements to my address on domestic policy which I have been making.

In comment, and closing my address on domestic policy, I wish to say that I have just witnessed, for the second time in my life, an appeal from a distinguished United States Senator to the Government of the United States to save an industry. I know of many other like incidents. When I was special consultant on strategic materials to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, a request was made of me by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], then the acting chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic and Critical Minerals of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] was the chairman, but the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] was the acting chairman. He asked me to go to one of the departments here to appear before a committee that was set up to hear complaints about the closing of some industries on account of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. He said, "Will you go there, and if I cannot get there by the time they meet, ask them to remain in session until I arrive? I want to talk about the tungsten industry."

Mr. President, I had the mortifying experience of seeing a great Senator, a Member of this body—and I was merely his special consultant—stand before that body of men, none of whom would I have hired in my engineering business, because in my judgment they knew so little about the subjects they were con-

sidering, but they sat there like the Supreme Court, and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], great man that he is, with his hat in his hand, looked up and begged them not to shut down the tungsten industry of the United States.

Word came afterward that they had nothing to do with it; that they were only hearing the facts; that they passed the evidence on to somebody else, whom they could not disclose, even if they knew, who passed on the subject. Of course, one glance at the committee itself would have satisfied anyone that if they did have the authority to pass judgment, they were not competent to do so. But they closed down the industry. They paid no attention to it.

Mr. President, I witnessed another incident involving another great Senator from Massachusetts, the grandfather of the present junior Senator, one of the great Senators of this body in the long ago past. Somehow we have witnessed the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], both of whom voted at different times for the 1934 trade agreements, taking their hats in their hands, figuratively, today, and begging the President of the United States, or begging a committee, not to close an industry which is vital to their States.

Mr. President, I stated a little earlier that the Senate of the United States, together with the House of Representatives, passed an act abdicating their authority over the national economy, an authority given to them by the Constitution of the United States, shirking their responsibility, and turning it over to an industrially inexperienced State Department which has no interest in industry in this country. At least, all of their actions indicate that they have no interest in it, and do not understand it. The Congress of the United States passed the act, and one by one great Senators go up with their hats in their hands saying, "Will you please save an industry?"

Mr. President, it is enough to make one break down and cry to see such things done, when this body today has no control over the economy of this country, which the Constitution delegated to Congress, which kept it until 1934, when it abdicated—I was going to say "abrogated," as I said earlier in my address, but abdicate is a better word—because somebody told them there was log-rolling in this body. Somebody told them they were not competent to fix tariffs, under which they had brought the standards of living of this country from the days of the axe and hoe, which were used when the people landed on this continent, up to the present height of industrial development. It was said Congress was no longer competent.

I wish to remark that the idea of flexible tariffs is not a new idea In 1923 it was mentioned, but not clarified. In 1933 it was clarified, and it was provided that the Tariff Commission could raise or lower tariffs 50 percent, on the basis of what I have been discussing, on the basis of a comparison of standards of living.

The occasion was taken, in the great depression of the 1930's, to say that the Congress had failed in its duty, so that the State Department must take the matter over, because there would be no log rolling there. Of course, there has been no log rolling, at least with us. There must have been plenty some place else, but there have been horse-trading methods, just as Secretaries of State have often said, shotgun methods, with no thought whatever of the difference between the standards of living in our Nation and those in competitive countries.

Mr. President, the adoption of fixed tariffs is not the most successful way of proceeding. Of course, there was log-rolling in this body, but under what was proposed in 1930 there could have been no logrolling, and there could be none under the flexible system now being proposed, because the matter would be put in the hands of a nonpartisan Tariff Commission. Let them fix an import fee or tariff to represent the difference, in general, of living standards, unless there is manipulation and everyone in this Chamber knows there has been manipulation of the currencies, embargoes, quotas, and specifications to prevent our selling in Europe, while the European countries made a one-way street into our markets.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada wants to go on record. He has seen this situation coming for 15 years. I insisted on coming before this body and addressing it, because in my opinion we are headed for the greatest economic debacle this country has ever seen, if the present tendency is followed.

Mr. President, the present drift has gone to such a point that more industries will come to the RFC, more industries will write the President of the United States, or send tear-jerking letters or telegrams, like that read by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, because every industry in the United States is threatened as I have said on the Senate floor more than once in the past 3 years, by the passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—humorously called the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Those words do not occur in the act, and there is no reciprocal trade, and no reciprocal trade agreements have been made. I should be glad to debate that with any Senator who desires to debate it, at any time.

Now, what we are coming to is that every industry in the United States must come to the RFC or to the President of the United States to save itself. What will we then have in this country? We will have the same kind of socialist government which now exists in England. Some may like such a form of government. I do not like it. England may have such a government if its people want to support it. But when we are supporting them, and they are paying one and a half million dollars to their King, who once a year reads to Parliament a message written by someone else, and who visits the United States when there is a little difficulty about securing a loan here—when we are supporting them, then I say I do not like such a government. Every country among the ECA nations is doing the same. We do not want such a form of government here.

Mr. President, why cannot venture capital be secured today? Venture capital cannot be secured because the tax structure is such that people will not invest venture capital in business, and today every business in the United States is a venture, a greater venture than it has ever been. What happens if one invests venture capital in a business? If the one who makes the investment makes any money, it belongs to Uncle Sam; if the investor loses, the loss is his.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I now desire to discuss briefly a matter on which I feel very strongly and which I think is thoroughly misunderstood in the United States of America, and little help has been given toward making it understood. I refer to Senate bill 75, introduced by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr MCFARLAND] for himself and the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

I have known the senior Senator from Arizona from 1927 when he first came to this body. We have had many pleasant relationships and discussions of mutual help. We do not always agree on everything, but everything between us is up and up and on the square. I have not known the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] as long as I have known the senior Senator from Arizona, but I have just as high a regard for him.

Mr. President, I am for the proposed project in Arizona. I am for such a project when the Secretary of the Interior has found it to be feasible, and after the Bureau of Reclamation has made its full investigation.

I listened very carefully to the junior Senator from Arizona today. He did not clarify the subject. He impressed the Senate with the fact that the project is a very important one to Arizona. I know it is. As a matter of fact, my son-in-law and my daughter live in Arizona. I visit them every once in a while when I can be absent from the Senate floor in vacation time. I am very fond of the people of Arizona.

I say again without equivocation, that when the precedent respecting reclamation has been set for 50 years—and it has lasted that long—and when that precedent is followed, I am for the project.

In the short time of 30 years that I have been in the engineering business I have seen land in reclamation areas of the Rocky Mountains which could have been purchased for only $20 an acre and which has increased in value until now it cannot be bought for less than $300 an acre. I know not what we will have to pay for new land 20 or 30 years from now. I am not asking the cost of the project. We will leave that to someone

else. But, Mr. President, I want to say one thing to lay a foundation.

Of course, in the Eastern States, in the humid areas, the idea is to get the water off the land. There is too much water. Control of the water is needed. Drainage is provided. For such purposes money is appropriated. We know that millions upon millions of dollars have been appropriated by Congress during the past 50 years to get the Mississippi River water off the land and back into its channel and into tributary rivers, so that crops can be raised on the flooded land.

The opposite is true where the present Presiding Officer, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and I live. We try to get the water out of the streams and onto the land. That is our problem. That is the problem of the Senators from Arizona now, and with respect to it I am in complete sympathy with them. But I wish to say for the benefit of the record what I have said probably a hundred times in the past 30 years, and for which I take no credit.

I was raised in an arid region, and still live there. The development of any State where the rainfall is less than required to raise a crop is limited by the State's water supply. That is why water litigation in the West has come to the Supreme Court so often. That is the reason why precedents have been set. A precedent was set in the spring of 1927 when I appeared before the Senate Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation, which is now the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The distinguished senior Senator from Arizona was a member of that committee. Former Senator Ashurst, who has not been a Member of the Senate for some time, was a member of that committee. Senators Pittman and Oddie, two great Senators from the State of Nevada, were members of that committee. I stood at the end of the committee table and had my say. The committee was kind enough to invite me to appear before it, as State engineer of Nevada and as a Colorado River commissioner. We wanted amendments placed in the bill then pending. We finally secured adoption of the amendments. Without going into detail on that point, suffice it to say that the committee finally accepted them.

At that time I had entered into the problem, having inherited it from someone else. I took over the office of State engineer of Nevada, and became secretary of the Colorado River Commission. The problem there was for Nevada to become identified with the matter. The State of Nevada had never been mentioned in a headline or in print that I know of until 1927.

What was the nature of the fight? The great fight was between California and Arizona. That is all that was heard at that time. The Governor of Arizona had been elected seven times to seven 2-year terms on the proposition of saving the water of the Colorado River for Arizona. He saved it all right. He never entered the compact. Arizona never made a proposition. Arizona never joined anything. We finally had to get six States the hard way to agree to the Colorado River compact, and divide the water between the upper and lower basins. No attempt whatever had been made previously to divide the water between the States of the lower basin and the upper basin.

Mr. President, Delph Carpenter used to be called the Silver Fox of the Rockies. He was half paralyzed at that time. He is still living in Greeley, Colo. He cannot feed himself. He cannot talk. But he was the brains of the Colorado River compact, as the present Senators from Arizona will now admit. They know it full well. I used to chide Delph Carpenter. I realized the brains he had and the little experience I had in 1927, having returned 7 or 8 years previously from World War I. I returned to my engineering business, but my experience in State affairs and in water law was very limited. Delph Carpenter was one of the greatest water lawyers who ever lived in the United States of America. He is a "dead man" today, still living. He wrote the Colorado River compact in Santa Fe, N. Mex., in 1922, at the time Herbert Hoover was the Chairman of the Commission. The members of the Commission all agreed to it. Arizona, however, pulled out. Let us not discuss the merits of that matter. Arizona has since recognized the compact. Seven States have signed the compact.

Arizona at different times has claimed that the Gila River is not a part of the compact. I shall simply quote Delph Carpenter, who wrote the compact, who says the Gila River is a part of the compact. I am not a lawyer, and I will not tell the Senate tonight that the Gila River is a part of the compact. What I shall say to the Senate is that if there is a dispute now over where the Gila River belongs, that dispute belongs in the Supreme Court of the United States, which must determine the question, as it did of the seven States, after only six had signed the Colorado River Compact. As a result Boulder Dam was built, we got the withdrawal on power, for which I take the credit. I take the credit for getting the withdrawal on power, 36 percent of the firm power at Boulder Dam for Arizona and Nevada, that is 18 percent apiece. None of the Representatives of the State of Arizona came along. Arizona would not agree to anything.

We also secured a percentage of the revenues in lieu of taxes, which would now amount to $2,500,000 for each of the two States annually, if our own people could have signed their names. They took $300,000 apiece, however, and called it square. But they say it is not chicken feed. They have collected 8 or 10 million dollars apiece out of the little bit of work the junior Senator from Nevada did at that time.

Mr. President, the Colorado River compact is clear. That is to say, the wording is clear. The meaning is certainly not clear, because California, Arizona, and perhaps some other States, so far as I know, question its meaning. I am not questioning what it means. I am assuming that we have it. My State is included among the six States in the basin which have accepted it. The compact has been signed, and that is the end of it. It is just as though an individual had made a contract. We have signed a contract. It is no longer a question of how we want to change it, unless we mutually agree. If we do not mutually agree, there is no place to go but the court. Delph Carpenter says that the Gila River is a part of the watershed, and included in the compact. I will not discuss that question further. When I come to it I will insert in the RECORD what he said.

Mr. President, to my mind, this is where the whole thing hinges: To my knowledge—I might be mistaken—the Congress of the United States has never appropriated money to divert water from an interstate stream system for the benefit of one State and away from the interstate group interested in that stream in the absence of an interstate agreement signed by all the States interested in the particular basin or an adjudication by a court of competent jurisdiction. It has never been done, to my knowledge; and I have watched this body operate since 1927, over a period of 24 or 25 years.

Mr. President, I am now a member of the committee before which I appeared in 1928 with my heart in my mouth. It was the first time I had ever appeared before a committee. I thought I knew what I was talking about. I had taken my time. I understood where the power revenues were going and where the water was going. I went there and took the fire. Now I am a member of that committee, and I am in the position of judging other people's problems. Oftentimes it makes one feel his inability to pass on another man's problem when that man rises with tears in his eyes, as the Senator from Arizona almost did this afternoon, to say, "My State is suffering. Unless we get this water, a large area in my State is going out of cultivation."

I am familiar with the area, and I think the Senator may be correct. I know of large areas in Nevada which have gone out of cultivation because the water table has gone beyond the economic lift for a pump; but I know of other areas which have never gone under cultivation because we have not had a project out of the Colorado River.

Much has been said about what is included in the Boulder Dam Project Act. Of course, it is now called the Hoover Dam. However, the act is referred to as the Boulder Dam Act. It is still known by that name. I sat in the conference as the State engineer of Nevada, advising the Nevada Senators when the deal was made for advance consent of the Congress for a three-State compact with regard to water. What did it mean? It is not unusual for the Congress, which must ratify interstate compacts, to give consent in advance and write the compact, which is what was done in that instance.

What did that compact do? It allocated 2,800,000 acre-feet of water to Arizona. It said nothing about where it was to come from, whether from the Gila River or somewhere else. It allocated 300,000 acre-feet to Nevada. It limited California to a certain amount of water. It gave consent to such a compact.

Mr. President, I am leaving tonight on official business for about a week. I

shall try to obtain a pair against the bill, unless it is properly written, but I must have my say now, because I want it to be a matter of record.

There are two reasons why the compact is not effective. The matter of 2,800,000 acre-feet of water has been sold all over the West, with no explanation as to what it means.

In the first place, the three States which have been mentioned did not agree to it. No agreement has ever been made. Therefore it is ineffective for that reason, just as though it were entirely obliterated.

I am not a lawyer. I do not know what the effect would be if it had been signed. But there are five States in the lower basin, not three. Not one of them was ever mentioned on the floor of the Senate. None of them was ever mentioned in the news dispatches. The fight is between the great overbearing State of California and the little State of Arizona. As I have said, I have had some experience with Arizona. When they got ready to go they finally signed, but it represented blood money. The agreement was never changed. Yet for 7 years the Governor of Arizona was reelected on the basis that he had saved the Colorado River for Arizona.

We never run our Government on that basis. I do not know much about that system. But the States of Nevada, Utah, and New Mexico have never come into this discussion and they do not appear in the dispatches. Five States are members of the lower basin. There are two different divisions of the river. There is the lower division, which includes three States. Those States are Arizona, Nevada, and California. The lower-basin States are New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, and California. It is my opinion that even if the three States had agreed to this, which they never did, the project would not be legal unless the other two States of the basin were taken into consideration. We cannot change the Colorado River compact. I cannot change it. You, Mr. President, cannot change it. All we can do is to say that we want this compact to be interpreted in its entirety by a court of competent jurisdiction, and the water rights to be adjudicated by a court of competent jurisdiction, before an appropriation is made to take water which may belong to other States in the basin out of an interstate stream for the benefit of one State.

There may be a misunderstanding so far as the Gila River, or any other river, is concerned. The Muddy River ran out of Nevada into the Virgin River coming from Utah, draining parts of both States and running into the Colorado River. Now, the dam backs the water up and covers the junction of the two rivers and they both drain into Lake Mead.

The point I make is that not one of the lower-basin States—and I defy anyone to show the contrary—has any definite amount of water allocated to it. The only State with reference to which it could be said that there is any limit whatever is the State of California. Their legislation, by virtue of the Boulder Dam legislation, could be effective only if they accepted the limit. We could not appropriate any money until California accepted the limit of 4,400,000 acre-feet. I am not arguing that that is legal, or that there is not verbiage that could be questioned. The committee was informed that a question was to be raised in that connection. Whether that can be done successfully, I do not know. I do not intend to pass on that question. It is not necessary for me to do so. But what I say, Mr. President, is that there is not one iota of evidence to show that there has been an agreement between the five States or between the three States. I sat in every one of these conferences from 1927 until I resigned, late in 1935. My deputy engineer, Mr. A. M. Smith, took my place at that time. I spoke to him on the telephone and he read me a telegram which he is sending me, and which I shall read. Tom Smith has sat in every conference since then. He assures me that there has not been any semblance of an agreement between the five States of the lower basin. If there had been an agreement between the lower-basin States, we would have it before us. It must be approved by the Congress before it is effective. So we know that no such agreement was ever made.

Mr. President, for 3 years I have sat as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Many times an appropriation has come before that committee. What is the first question the chairman of the committee asks? The one exception is with reference to S. 75. The chairman asks if the Governor and the State engineer of each of the States have agreed to the proposal. He asks whether there has been an interstate agreement. He asks if the legislature has ratified it, and whether there has been an adjudication of the water rights. If there has not been, nothing is done. There is no argument. I have heard the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], ask those very questions. I will name a specific instance. There is a river which affects both Wyoming and Colorado. I think it is the North Platte. I am not sure. The record will show what it is. They wanted an appropriation made for the project or they wanted an appropriation to complete the project.

After Senate bill 75 had been reported, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] asked whether the State engineer and the Governor of each of the States had agreed to it. He was assured by the representatives of each State that that was so. The Senator from Wyoming asked whether an interstate agreement had been entered into. He was assured that it had been and that the legislatures of the States affected would approve it. So the Senator from Wyoming said we would consider it.

However, they have been turned down time after time, since I have become a member of the committee. I heard Boulder Dam turned down. I read the record for the period between 1922–27, when I myself got into the fight. It was turned down, not because they did not care about making an appropriation to build Boulder Dam, now Hoover Dam, but because there was no agreement between the upper basin States and the lower-basin States on the division of the water.

Mr. President, I spent 8½ years on that project, and I have watched it ever since. What would have been the effect if Boulder Dam could have been constructed by Government funds, but without an interstate compact? I will tell you what the effect would have been, Mr. President—and that is the reason that Delph Carpenter did yeoman service to his State and to the upper-basin States. If that project had been built without an interstate compact, California and Arizona could have taken practically all the water of the Colorado River, because in the lower-basin States the elevations are lower, whereas in the higher elevations citrus fruits do not grow as well as they grow in California and Arizona, and also the long growing season is not available in the upper-basin States. Therefore, only a limited amount of money can be spent to advantage on such projects in the upper-basin States, and a longer period of use is required before an adequate return can be obtained on the investment.

So I joined with Delph Carpenter, Mr. President. I admired him very much. He was so fair in everything, and such a master of the situation so far as legal ideas and interpretations and verbiage were concerned. I used to travel with him to the conferences in Santa Fe, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Denver. I traveled with him, I helped undress him, I helped dress him, I helped feed him, because I was getting experience from him, experience that only Delph Carpenter had. I joined with him in saying that the appropriation should not be made until such time as there was an adjudication of the water rights or an interstate agreement which would protect the upper basin.

Mr. President, when we came to Washington at the beginning of 1927, Mr. Hoover, who later became President of the United States, then was Secretary of Commerce, and a great Secretary of Commerce he was. I wanted to meet him. A man by the name of Ray Baker was here in Washington at that time. He has long since died. He said he would take me to meet Mr. Hoover.

Mr. President, I was not afraid to meet Mr. Hoover. After all, I was an engineer myself, as he had been for many years. So I said I would like to meet Mr. Hoover. Mr. Baker said, "Don't be surprised if he does not talk very much to you. He is very short in his conversation; and, of course, he knows what he is talking about, and is rather impatient."

I said, "I will take a chance on that."

So Mr. Baker took me to meet Mr. Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce. The first question I asked him, after I met him was: "Mr. Hoover, how many States do we have to have ratify the seven-State compact before the Boulder Dam Project Act can be passed?"

He replied: "You have to have five, and you ought to have six."

So Mr. Hoover and I proceeded to talk, and we talked for half an hour or more. Finally, after we concluded our conversation and after Mr. Baker and I left Mr. Hoover and got outside his office Mr. Baker said he had nearly had heart failure, that he had never known Mr. Hoover to talk as long and as interestingly to anyone else as he had talked to me.

But, Mr. President, Mr. Hoover knew that the States had to ratify the compact.

Finally, ratification of the compact by six States was obtained. I lost 15 pounds in that process. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, it would not hurt me to lose that much weight now.

But the pact was ratified, and Boulder Dam was built.

A few years later Arizona came in, after the dam was completed. Arizona is now taking full advantage of the power withdrawal we got at that time and of the money paid in lieu of taxes.

Now we come to the present proposal. I say again—and I wish to go on record so emphatically that there can be no doubt about it—that I am not opposing the Arizona project, as such. I am opposing breaking that long-term precedent of the Congress of the United States. To my knowledge, Congress has never appropriated money for an important project which would take an important amount of water out of an interstate stream which might be considered as belonging to other States, in the absence of an interstate agreement or an adjudication by a court of competent jurisdiction. This is the first time I have ever heard such a proposition seriously urged in the absence of such an agreement or adjudication.

Mr. President, I should like to say at this time that I had occasion to sit with the Senate Committee on Public Works with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. I am a member of that committee. In my opinion, it is a very important committee. It passes on authorizations for appropriations in regard to all flood-control and navigation projects and other types of development. It also deals with matters with which the Army engineers are concerned. Their criterion now is feasibility. That committee is acting on such matters today in the same way that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has always considered matters relating to the Bureau of Reclamation.

On the committee we have been talking about the Rio Grande flood-control project. I shall favor it if all the technicalities can be worked out because the Army engineers say it is feasible.

Mr. President, Albuquerque, N. Mex., is built in the river bed of the Rio Grande. It is a very large city, with a population of over 200,000 people, having grown tremendously in size in the last 25 years. When I first visited Albuquerque, it was just a small town, but today it is very large and is still growing. Albuquerque simply must have this flood-control project. So we have the proposal for the Rio Grande River project.

Of course, Mr. President, when we consider the use of the water of the Rio Grande River, it is obvious that Mexico is entitled to a certain amount of water and Texas is entitled to certain amount of water. However, under the treaty it planned to turn over 1,500,000 acre-feet of water to Mexico, whereas in the past Mexico has never used at any one time more than 750,000 acre-feet. I shall not go into the details of that matter, but it is obvious that in drawing up the treaty someone got very much mixed up, with the result that Mexico was allowed a great deal more water than she ever would be entitled to.

As I just said, there never was a time when Mexico used at any one time more than 750,000 acre-feet of water, and Mexico is not using more than that amount now. Nevertheless, the treaty gives Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet of water, and that was done without the lower-basin States and the upper-basin States knowing anything about it.

I was with Sid Osborne at that time, and we presented President Roosevelt an industrial report from the 11 western States. He was very happy to have it. Just as we were leaving, he said: "Governor, I want to tell you that I signed a treaty today giving Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet of water."

Sid Osborne jumped about a foot. It was the first he had ever heard of it, just as it was the first that I had ever heard of it. Of course, there was no particular reason why I should have heard of it, because at that time I was in a private engineering position. But I had warned the commissions of California and Arizona and Nevada that they had better look out for the Boundary Commission down there because, as I said to them—

It is a sleeper. No one ever hears anything about it, but it has three members who live on it and may die on it, and they have the power to make the treaty. You had better watch out, or some day you will be hurt.

Mr. President, today we are short three-quarters of a million acre-feet of water. Without the treaty giving a million and a half acre-feet of water to Mexico, we probably would have plenty of water today. That is just a personal opinion on my part, and of course I want the court to pass on that question.

As the witnesses paraded to the stand at the hearing down there—and I have before me the transcript of the testimony of only two of the witnesses—such men as Mr. Hill gave their testimony. Mr. Hill's father was Louis Hill, whom all of us knew years and years ago. He was consulting engineer for the Bureau of Reclamation, along with A. J. Wiley, of Idaho. The favorable opinion of those two men was almost indispensable, so far as the Bureau of Reclamation was concerned. If those two men did not pass favorably on a proposal, it simply was not feasible, so far as the Bureau of Reclamation was concerned; that was all there was to it.

In later years young Mr. Hill has taken his father's place, and has gone a long way, and has gained a very fine and wide reputation in the Southwest for being able to pass an projects. I highly respect his engineering opinion. I would ride a long way with Mr. Hill without question.

As he got through testifying in regard to the Rio Grande proposal and regarding the necessity for the ratification of the interstate pact, and after he had expressed the opinion that the proposal would not violate any legal rights—although, as a matter of fact, one dam did violate the compact, so California and Texas were objecting, and, of course, that part of the project will not be built; only the parts which fit in with the compact will be built—but as Mr. Hill was about to leave the stand I said to him:

Mr. Hill, from your testimony, you generally say that before Congress appropriates any money for a project at a certain site on an interstate stream, you would strongly favor interstate agreement or adjudication so that you know what each State is entitled to prior to any such proposition?

Mr. HILL. Very definitely, yes, because why build something that when you get all through you don't know whether you have a right to use it or not?

The CHAIRMAN—

That was the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]—

Thank you, Mr. Hill. Is Mr. Tipton available for one more question from Senator MALONE?

I wanted to call him back, because he had finished. Mr. Tipton is a consulting engineer for many projects in the West, and for Colorado, for their intrastate commission. I said to Mr. Tipton:

It is your definite opinion alon with Mr. Hill and, so far as I know, in general, that Congress should not appropriate funds for a project for interstate streams in the absence of interstate agreements?

Mr. TIPTON. Yes; that is my very definite conclusion providing such a project would result in conflict. Colorado for 50 years was unable to get authorized in the Congress the construction of projects that it needed throughout that 50 years, because there was not an interstate agreement Immediately there was consummated an interstate agreement there was approved the project Colorado needed all those years.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, aren't you having trouble with Nebraska on some of these works?

Mr TIPTON. No, sir; we now have a contract. Every single stream of Colorado has been in controversy, because we not only furnish water for Colorado but to the surrounding States. May I say with pride every stream is covered by compact or Supreme Court decision?

Mr. President, I know about this. I have been through this thing for 25 years, operating with these men. But, Mr. President, remember what he said, that for 50 years they needed the projects but could not get them in the absence of an interstate agreement. They needed some of them and did not ask for them seriously, because they did not have an agreement. He said every stream is covered by an agreement or an adjudication. Mr. Tipton further said:

Unfortunately Supreme Court decisions have not been so satisfactory as the compacts. Some of them are still working on an attempt to iron out difficulties.

Senator MALONE Very definitely with all of you, especially in Colorado—and I have worked with many of your people on interstate streams—you are definitely in favor that Congress do nothing for appropriating money for a project for any State on interstate streams system that does not have an interstate agreement or Supreme Court decision such as you mention?

Mr. TIPTON. I would insofar as the State of Colorado is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Tipton.

Mr. President, I do not want to prolong this argument, though probably I shall not be able to make any further arguments, because this will be my only chance of making a statement. First, let me say that on March 1, 1935, the engineering committee appointed by the Colorado River Conference, in Salt Lake City, rendered a preliminary report on this stream system. I was a member of that Commission—I was State engineer of the State of Nevada at that time—together with Ed Hyatt, who is still the State engineer of the State of California, and is now retiring, as I understand, and with Mr. M. G. Hinderlider, who is still State engineer of Colorado. I shall not attempt to read the short report which was made after careful study, but I want to point out to the Senate that after this engineering study, the total used by the State of Nevada was allocated at 900,000 acre-feet, not 300,000. Nothing had ever been agreed to, and a study had been made by my State engineer's office and the Colorado River Commission, of which I was secretary, which determined that that was the amount of water Nevada could beneficially use consumptively. That does not mean what is withdrawn, but what is consumptively used, and does not return to the stream system.

Mr. President, the remainder of the allocations we determined at that time are shown. We determined that Mexico should be allotted 750,000 acre-feet annually. I myself went to old Mexico in 1927 before testifying before the committee here. Being in the engineering business I have a habit of doing that, for it is hard to write about anything or express an opinion unless one has seen it. So we went over a large part of that land to see what they were doing. They had about 200,000 acres of land in cultivation, but they had never used anything like 750,000 acre-feet, mostly because the water was not in the river often enough. It used to go down to 1,500 second-feet, sometimes, and that affected the great 500,000-acre project in Imperial Valley, as well as the 200,000 acres in Mexico. Of course, the water was not there before Boulder Dam was constructed and stabilized the flow in the Imperial Valley. We said in our report:

ASSUMPTIONS

1. Consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet annually in the upper basin as apportioned by the Colorado River compact.

2. Complete reservoir development in lower basin as set forth in the Debler report.

3. That Mexico will be allocated 750,000 acre-feet annually.

Without, so far as I know, consulting anyone in the lower basin, there was 750,000 acre-feet allocated to Mexico, That 750,000 acre-feet has got to come from some place, and it cannot be taken from thin air, and the atmosphere. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed from the hearings of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Senate Resolution 75 and Senate Joint Resolution 4, March 31 to May 2, 1949, an excerpt beginning with the heading "Preliminary report of the engineering committee appointed by Colorado River Conference in Salt Lake City, Utah, March 1, 1935," on page 412, down to, but not including, the words "Carson City," on page 14 of the same document.

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

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE ENGINEERING COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY COLORADO RIVER CONFERENCE IN SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, MARCH 1, 1935

A study of the water ultimately available in the lower basin of the Colorado River including all tributaries, based on the report of E. B. Debler, December 1934; analysis of commitments thereon; and an assumed distribution thereof.

ASSUMPTIONS

1. Consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet annually in the upper basin as apportioned by the Colorado River compact.

2. Complete reservoir development in lower basin as set forth in the Debler report

3. That Mexico will be allocated 750,000 acre-feet annually.

I. Ultimate usable water supply

	Acre-feet
1. Net supply for use from main stream below Boulder Dam	8,370,000
2. Net supply for use from Gila River	2,259,000
3. Net supply available for lower-basin use above Boulder Dam	240,000
4. Waste crossing international boundary and usable in Mexico	200,000
Total	11,069,000

NOTE.—Items (1) and (2) are exclusive of waste into Mexico.

II Present commitments on lower-basin supply (including total Gila River vested rights and contracts)

	Acre-feet
1. Arizona:	
Total of Gila River	2,259,000
Vested in Colorado River below Boulder Dam	600,000
2. California contracts	5,362,000
3. Present lower-basin uses above Boulder Dam in Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah	90,000
Total	8,311,000

III. Assumed distribution

Additional assumptions:

(a) Use in Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah above Boulder Dam	240,000
(b) Total use by Nevada	900,000
(c) Allocation to Mexico	750,000

DISTRIBUTION

1. Arizona:		
(a) Gila River		2,259,000
(b) Rights below Boulder Dam		600,000
(c) Total above Bouder Dam		30,000
(d) Remaining water in main stream		[1] 988,000
		3,877,000
2. California contracts		5,362,000
3. Nevada:		
(a) Above Boulder Dam	30,000	
(b) Balance of proposed contract	870,000	
		900,000
4. New Mexico above Boulder Dam		30,000
5. Utah above Boulder Dam		150,000
6. Republic of Mexico		750,000
Total		11,069,000

AVAILABLE TO ARIZONA FROM MAIN STREAM OF COLORADO RIVER

	Acre-feet
Present uses from Colorado River below Boulder Dam	600,000
Assumed ultimate uses above Bouder Dam	30,000
Remaining water below Boulder Dam	988,000
Total	1,618,000

[1] Total available quantity for use in lower basin less allocations, contracts, and assumed distributions.

REMARKS

1. It is herein understood that water used or to be used above Boulder Dam as above listed is assumed to come from tributaries of the main stream of the Colorado River. The Nevada contract for water deliveries proposed to the Secretary of the Interior for 900,000 acre-feet includes both present and proposed uses.

2. It is assumed that the water used by New Mexico from the Gila River is included in the Gila River commitments

3 It is also assumed that Utah will use 150,000 acre-feet of the 240,000 acre-feet of the lower-basin water to be used above Boulder Dam, as determined by the Debler report. If as indicated by Utah, that State may require a total of 300,000 acre-feet, the additional amount must be deducted from the net supply listed as available for use below Boulder Dam.

4. It is not necessarily assumed that all members of the Commission agree in all particulars to the accuracy of the Debler report, but this report is a preliminary analysis of the water supply available for use in the lower basin, based on that document.

EDWARD HYATT.
M. G. HINDERLIDER.
GEO W. MALONE.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *March 1, 1935*

Senator MALONE. I do not want it understood that the 900,000 acre-feet is the limit of what Nevada is claiming at this time, because I am having our State engineer come here with reports available since 1935.

I asked the State engineer to review the reports Before I left the State engineer's office I made a report covering 8½ years' work and data secured on the Colorado River. That report has become somewhat of a standard document in Nevada, like Senate Document No. 186, my report which the Seventieth Congress, second session, has published and which became a standard document on the entire Colorado River Basin States

At that time we made an industrial survey within a 250-mile radius around the dam. I directed the survey from the State engineer's office in Nevada. The Bureau of Mines of the States of California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah assisted me with the help of my own director of the Nevada State Bureau of Mines, who at that time was John Fulton, and who was also the head of the Makay School of Mines at the University of Nevada It is an industrial survey which has stood up and which has been very helpful. The purpose of it was to show how the power and water from Hoover Dam could be utilized.

I have a wire from Mr. A. M Smith, State engineer, that I request permission to read into the record. This wire is in response to my inquiry on the amount of water needed.

Mr. MALONE. I also wish to have included in the RECORD at this point a communication addressed to me as United States Senator from Nevada. It is a communication from Mr. A. M. ("Tom") Smith, State Engineer of Nevada. The excerpt I desire to have printed ends with the words uttered by me, "Mr. Chairman,

that completes my preliminary statement," on page 415.

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

"CARSON CITY, NEV.

"Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,

"*United States Senator From Nevada:*

"Approximately 150,000 acres of land in southern Nevada irrigable from Colorado River by pumping lift not over 800 feet. Information in report of Colorado River Commission of Nevada, 1927-35, prepared from data assembled by you—meaning me—when Nevada State engineer as to areas may be a little conservative. See pages 119, 120, 121. This report does not include 60,000 acres west of Searchlight, mostly first-class land which can be irrigated by 1,500- to 2,000-feet lift from Davis Reservoir. Rapidly increasing population and future outlook will no doubt justify inclusion in areas along river that were omitted from early estimates. Bureau of Reclamation estimated cost of reclaiming 15,000 acres in Las Vegas Valley would be under $400 per acre with operation, maintenance, and amortization 40 years at $33 per year per acre. See John N. Kerr, Bureau report, dated February 1936. Any of this land seems better economical investment than Arizona land at $2,000 or more per acre for supplemental irrigation only. Nevada water duty in this area is about 5 acre-feet per acre If Arizona project is to be ratified the entire Colorado River downstream water set-up should be revamped in order to give Nevada more water on a comparable basis."

My preliminary statement as of now is in line with my former request for the Bureau of Reclamation report, and I again request that the chairman of this committee write an official letter to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and request the information from that Bureau on the acreage which could be irrigated in Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah under the approximately same conditions as to cost per acre and lift, as contemplated under the Arizona project.

"The population of the Hoover (Boulder) Dam area in southern Nevada has doubled at least four times in the 21 years since the Boulder Dam Project Act was passed

"There is every reason to suppose that with the complete utilization of the more than 200,000 horsepower to which Nevada is entitled from Hoover (Boulder) and Davis Dams, and the irrigation of approximately 150,000 acres of land in that area together with the almost unlimited recreation facilities, the population could easily reach 150,000 in the foreseeable future.

"The demand for domestic irrigation and domestic purposes could run well over 1,000,000 acre-feet annually, instead of the 300,000 acre-feet formerly accepted as due the State of Nevada by California and Arizona.

"GEORGE W. MALONE."

Mr Chairman, that completes my preliminary statement.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have here a letter from the Governor of Nevada, Hon. Vail Pittman, the attorney general of Nevada, Alan Bible, and the State engineer of Nevada, Alfred Merritt Smith. The purport of the letter is to describe the project, and in a later paragraph it says:

Nevada was allocated 300,000 acre-feet of water per year from the Colorado, but the diversion of downstream water has not been fixed by interstate compact.

That verifies what I stated a while ago with regard to there being no definite amount of water for any State. Whether that would hold in court I shall not discuss, but California must have acted by legislative approval before the construction of Boulder Dam could be begun.

I read further:

For 15 years Nevada has spent time and money in trying to effect an agreement on the terms of the tri-State compact without avail. The downstream water situation is in chaos, yet the requirements of California and Arizona are urgent and imperative and should be served without delay. A prompt determination of respective rights is necessary, and the ambiguous wording of the Boulder Canyon Project Act should be cleared up. All negotiations have been futile, and it is our opinion that a solution can be effected by lawsuit and with the aid of the Supreme Court. It is our opinion that prior to a determination of available water the high cost of the detailed studies of this project should be authorized by Congress below Lee Ferry on the Colorado. We are of the belief, based upon observation and study, that there is not enough water in the Colorado to satisfy this colossal project and at the same time serve the established existing irrigated lands and authorized projects in Arizona and California.

Furthermore, it seems to us that the computations for the project should have been based upon the present reclamation law. As set up it contemplates changes in the law which are purely speculative.

The Boulder Canyon Project Act authorized Arizona, California, and Nevada to compact upon an estimated 7,500,000 acre-feet apportioned on the basis of 300,000 acre-feet to Nevada, 2,800,000 acre-feet to Arizona, 4,400,000 to California. Arizona and California and Nevada were also given the right to increase their use 1,000,000 per annum under article III, section (b), of the compact. This has been referred to as "b" water.

The letter goes on to say:

Rapid increases in population and development in southern Nevada since 1935 show that Nevada can beneficially use 900,000 acre-feet, and can reclaim and irrigate at least 130,000 acres of new land and in addition will require at least 105,000 acre-feet for industrial, suburban and domestic uses by the year 1960

Mr. President, that would mean 1,005,000 acre-feet.

I read further:

Reclamation of this new land can be made at one-sixth of the cost per acre calculated for supplemental irrigation only on the Arizona project

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point the complete letter of the three gentlemen whom I have named, the Governor, the attorney general, and the State engineer of the State of Nevada. The State engineer is also the secretary of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada.

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

MAY 12, 1949.

Hon JOHN R MURDOCK,
Chairman, Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee.

STATEMENT OF VAIL PITTMAN, GOVERNOR OF NEVADA; ALAN BIBLE, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEVADA; ALFRED MERRITT SMITH, STATE ENGINEER OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

The House Committee on Public Lands now has under consideration a bill identical to S. 75, to authorize the construction of a project to deliver 1,200,000 acre-feet of water per year into the Salt River Valley of central Arizona from the Colorado River for supplemental irrigation use. Two alternate plans have been surveyed and studied by the Bureau of Reclamation. Both plans require a dam at Bridge Canyon. The first plan calls for a gravity diversion above the dam through some 77 miles of tunnel conduit into natural watercourses. The second plan could divert water at Parker Dam by pumping through an elevation of about 1,000 feet to a canal which will convey the water to the Phoenix area. The second plan is preferred as of somewhat lower cost. Power for pumping at Parker would be 1,393,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year The Bureau estimates a cost of $730,000,000 to the Government. The project appears incapable of repayment of capital costs.

The capital cost of supplying irrigation water to this project will be about $1,500 per acre, to which will be added operation and maintenance No new lands are to be reclaimed. The water is to be used for supplemental irrigation of existing cultivated lands and does not provide for new population or new farms which is the principal object of the reclamation law.

The project calls for the construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam to supply power for pumping. Bridge alone seems unwise as it can store only 3,720,000 acre-feet, and if unprotected will fill up with silt in 40 years. Glen Canyon Dam above Bridge should be built at the same time for both storage and silt control as it will have 8,600,000 acre-feet capacity, but has low power head Glen is necessary to protect the firm power output of Bridge. The Arizona project will require one-third of the power from Bridge and probably should be charged with one-third the cost of Glen, for safe continuous operation, which would place it still further in the realm of fantastic planning

Nevada was allocated 300,000 acre-feet of water per year from the Colorado, but the diversion of downstream water has not been fixed by interstate compact For 15 years Nevada has spent time and money in trying to effect an agreement on the terms of the tri-State compact without avail The downstream water situation is in chaos, yet the requirements of California and Arizona are urgent and imperative and should be served without delay A prompt determination of respective rights is necessary; and the ambiguous wording of the Boulder Canyon Project Act should be cleared up. All negotiations have been futile, and it is our opinion that a solution can be effected by lawsuit and with the aid of the Supreme Court. It is our opinion that prior to a determination of available water, the high cost of the detailed studies of this project should not have been incurred and no project should be authorized by Congress below Lee Ferry on the Colorado. We are of the belief, based upon observation and study, that there is not enough water in the Colorado to satisfy this colossal project and at the same time serve the established existing irrigated lands and authorized projects in Arizona and California.

Furthermore, it seems to us that the computations for the project should have been based upon the present reclamation law. As set up it contemplates changes in the law which are purely speculative.

The Boulder Canyon Project Act authorized Arizona, California, and Nevada to compact upon an estimated 7,500,000 acre-feet apportioned on the basis of 300,000 acre-feet to Nevada, 2,800,000 acre-feet to Arizona, 4,400,000 to California. Arizona and California and Nevada were also given the right to increase their use 1,000,000 per annum under article III, section (b) of the compact. This has been referred to as "b" water.

During the preliminary negotiations in 1935, Nevada requested 900,000 acre-feet as her share, but upon representations made by the Bureau of Reclamation that less than

300,000 acre-feet could be beneficially used Nevada did not press her claim. Rapid increases in population and development in southern Nevada since 1935 show that Nevada can beneficially use 900,000 acre-feet, and can reclaim and irrigate at least 130,000 acres of new land and in addition will require at least 105,000 acre-feet for industrial, suburban, and domestic uses by the year 1960. Reclamation of this new land can be made at one-sixth of the cost per acre calculated for supplemental irrigation only on the Arizona project.

The adamant stand of Arizona to accept no interpretation of existing documents excepting her own, and her emphatic refusal to arbitrate, negotiate, or submit to a Supreme Court analysis and adjudication and the determined fight by that State in Congress to prevent such a procedure would close the door to a satisfactory solution by preferred methods. California and Nevada, equally firm in support of their rights, have nevertheless been and are now willing to submit the matter to the courts.

With these facts in mind we urge that the bill to authorize the Arizona project be unfavorably considered by your committee and that support be given to the legislation to submit the Colorado River controversy to the Supreme Court.

Respectfully submitted.

VAIL PITTMAN,
Governor of Nevada.
ALAN BIBLE,
Attorney General for Nevada.
ALFRED MERRITT SMITH,
State Engineer for Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have another communication, signed by Alfred Merritt Smith, Nevada State engineer and secretary of the Colorado Commission of Nevada. It describes the location of the lands and their feasibility from an irrigation standpoint. I ask unanimous consent to have that communication inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. It is found on page 420 of the hearings and is addressed to the junior Senator from Nevada, dated Carson City, Nev., May 11, 1949.

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

CARSON CITY, NEV., *May 11, 1949.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

Incomplete list irrigable lands as follows: Las Vegas area, 15,000 acres; Mormon Mesa and Littlefield areas, 30,000 acres, mainly in Tps. 13, S. R. 68 E., and 13 S. 69 E. and 14 S. 68 E. and 14 S. 69 E.; Davis Dam area, 50,000 acres mainly in T. 30 S., R. 65 and 66 E. and 31 S. 35 and 66 E.; and 32 S. 65 and 66 E. and 33 S. 65 and 66 E.; Meadow Valley, Wash., 7,000 acres mainly in T. 14 S. R. 66 E; Dry Lake area, 20,000 acres mainly in Tps. 23, 24, and 25 S. R. 62 and 63 and 64 E.; Moapa Valley, 4,000 acres, scattered areas east of Lake Mead, 4,000 acres; total lands, 130,000 acres minimum water duty 6 acre-feet equals 780,000 acre-feet for irrigation to which add probable additional uses by year 1960 Las Vegas and Henderson industrial, 50,000; military installations, 5,000; Las Vegas including suburban and area to south to State line domestic uses, 50,000; grand total water, 885,000 acre-feet. Surveys would change these areas somewhat but would probably show more irrigable land. Present population of area 40,000. Population by 1960 estimated 100,000.

ALFRED MERRITT SMITH,
Nevada State Engineer and Secretary, Colorado River Commission of Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have reached a point where I made a rather complete statement for the RECORD in 1948 and 1949, and the statement has been reprinted in the hearings on Senate bill 75 and Senate Joint Resolution 4. I wish to pick out certain excerpts from the RECORD. I do not wish to have the entire statement included in the RECORD, because it is rather lengthy, and it is available to everyone.

I read from page 421 of the hearings:

THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN—STATUS OF WATER DIVISION AND COMPACTS IN THE SEVEN STATES OF THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

(Excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the Senate of the United States. Statement of Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, August 5, 1948)

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 8, p 9826]

Statement on the current status of water division and compacts in the seven States of the Colorado River Basin, including a definition of the terms "lower and upper basins," "lower and upper divisions, Colorado River compact," and "the Boulder Dam Project Act" in support of Senate Joint Resolution No. 145, introduced to facilitate the continued development and beneficial use of the water and power of the Colorado River system.

Before I start on the quotations and inclusions which I wish to have placed in the RECORD for immediate reference, I want to say that the references which I shall make are from official documents of this body. I have quoted from Senate Document 186, which was printed in the latter part of 1948. I think it was in November or December. It is readily available, and it reviews the subject rather carefully. I read briefly from that document:

The Colorado River compact divides the water of the Colorado River system between the upper and lower basins.

I want to mention in particular some men who were in that fight from the beginning. One was in your own State, Mr. Chairman--

The chairman to whom I referred was my good friend the Senator from Colorado (Mr. MILLIKIN)—

Mr. Delph Carpenter.

I have already described Mr. Carpenter.

The next heading, Mr. President, is "Basins and divisions," from which I read as follows:

BASINS AND DIVISIONS

The first is an arbitrary division and the next is a drainage division. The lower basin then, instead of only meaning just the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, means those parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system below Lees Ferry.

Note that difference, please—the States from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system below Lees Ferry—

So, there are five States interested in the division of the waters of the lower basin, instead of only three States, which further complicates this situation and, as a matter of fact, the advance consent given by the United States Senate in the Boulder Dam project for a water-division treaty could not be binding upon all of the States of the lower basin even if it had been agreed upon and ratified by the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, since Utah and New Mexico were excluded.

I have already described the advance approval. In other words, if it had been ratified and ruled to be legal, even though the other two were omitted, we would have had something; but it has never been ratified by anyone.

The lower division was Arizona, California, and Nevada. The upper division comprised the four States of Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Utah. There is nothing in the whole project, in the interstate agreement, that has anything to do with the divisions, because the upper basin was supposed to turn down each year at Lee Ferry 7,500,000 acre-feet, or a total of 75,000,000 acre-feet every 10 years. If they do that, they fulfill the Colorado River compact. The rest is to be interpreted by a court whenever there are disagreements, as there apparently are in many instances. Whether the Gila River is included or not is simply a difference of opinion of the States themselves, but all the States have signed the compact, and we cannot make the interpretation which each State now would like to make. The matter must go to a court when there is a serious difference of opinion.

I now read excerpts from the report of the interpretation of the Colorado River compact made by Delph E. Carpenter:

Total water available in the entire basin for apportionment, out of which would come this unallocated surplus and the water for any international treaty, is estimated in the beginning on page 38 on the "Disposition of the waters of the Colorado under the Colorado River compact," by Delph E. Carpenter. The water is supplied, reading from his explanation:

"The river is supplied by its tributaries from the Green to the Gila. Without tributaries there would be no river."

That is Delph E. Carpenter speaking, the one who wrote the interstate compact, not GEORGE MALONE, the junior Senator from Nevada, although Nevada signed the compact thinking that was true. But regardless of what the Supreme Court finally says, we have signed the compact beyond any withdrawal, as have all the other six States. Delph Carpenter says:

The river supplied by its tributaries from the Green to the Gila. Without tributaries there would be no river.

Of course, anyone can understand that. I quote further:

The water supply of the river consists of all water which, of nature and undisturbed by works of man, would pass Yuma, the point below the last tributary. It is impossible to tell the exact amount of this total supply in any year, owing to interference by diversions.

Naturally, on the Little Muddy River in Nevada, some does return. When man started to add to the works of God, he took the situation as he found it, so as Delph Carpenter says:

The water supply of the river consists of all water which, of nature and undisturbed by works of man, would pass Yuma, the point below the last tributary. It is impossible to tell the exact amount of this total supply in any year, owing to interference by diversions, but it has been estimated at

from 20,000,000 to 24,000,000 acre-feet average.

That settles once and for all, if we are to believe Mr. Carpenter, where the Gila River belongs. But I am not passing on any legal question connected with the matter, and I am not arguing it. I say that when these questions arise there is only one place for them to go, namely, to a court of competent jurisdiction. I read further from Delph Carpenter's exact language:

This aggregate natural water supply may be divided into (1) that part entering the river above Lees Ferry and contributed by those streams which drain the upper basin; and (2) that part entering the stream between Lees Ferry and Yuma and contributed by streams which drain the lower basin.

That Mr. President, is the basis of the upper and lower basins. It cannot possibly be interpreted in any other way.

Now this is my own language, my testimony:

You see, he again emphasizes that basins mean drainage, and drainage above Lees Ferry is the upper basin and the lower basin means that area draining to the river below Lees Ferry. Divisions mean an arbitrary division of the four States above Lees Ferry and the three States below Lees Ferry.

It is an arbitrary division, and has nothing whatever to do with drainage areas. But in order to write the compact, there had to be these designations, or at least it was thought so. I read further from my testimony:

Any subsidiary compact of the lower basin would be, according to Mr. Carpenter, "the water available to the lower basin, water there originating and Lees Ferry delivery, is to be used in the lower basin to care for the lower-basin allocation. Eight million five hundred thousand acre-feet—

That is, seven and a half million acre-feet turned down by the upper-basin States through the compact, and one million additional water, if it is available.

Eight million five hundred thousand acre-feet, and the entire international burden—

Which must be deducted—

unless there is a deficiency for international supply, in which case the waters allocated to each basin are to be called upon to the extent of one-half of the deficiency."

As a result of allocating a million acre-feet to Mexico, in my humble opinion as an engineer dealing with this river for 25 years, and 8½ years sitting in on every conference, it is very likely that sometime the upper basin will be called upon to make up a part of the extra 750,000 acre-feet which was gratuitously awarded to Mexico without any right whatsoever.

I read further from Delph Carpenter's statement:

The States of the lower basin should enter into a subsidizing compact making (1) local allocation of the aggregate 8,500,000 acre-feet (out of the whole river supply) allocated to the lower basin by the compact; (2) provision for supplying the entire international burden, if, when, and for the amount by treaty determined; and (3) disposition of the unallocated surplus pending and subject to future allocation between the seven States.

That is, if every allocation is satisfied, and there is still additional water—as now there is no chance whatever of there ever being, unless the climate should change entirely, and there shall be more rainfall in the Intermountain States—the remaining allocation, I think, in a certain number of years, would be subject to division between the upper- and lower-basin States. But that is so far-fetched that it will never happen, in my opinion. I read further:

They should also make provision for temporary use of allocated water escaping from the upper basin, without prejudice to the rights of the upper basin.

That is, the five lower-basin States.

Mr. President, I call attention to this document which I have heretofore identified, pages 411 to about 437, which completes my statement in the testimony. I put myself in the role of a witness because I have had experience with all these matters, and I feel very strongly on this subject. Therefore I made a complete explanation. It is really a reference work, and no one has ever questioned it. I testified twice before the committee, and made statements which have never been questioned. Mostly I quoted Delph Carpenter and other authorities. If there are any questions to be advanced as to the authenticity of what I have said, I hope some Senator will propound them, because I shall not be here for the next 4 or 5 days. I asked the majority leader if he would not put off a vote on this question until I could return. My engagements were made several weeks ahead, and it is almost impossible to break them. I understood there would not be an immediate vote on any controversial bill, and I assure my colleague this is a very controversial piece of legislation.

I wish to call attention to some of the propaganda which goes out in this matter from the city of Washington. We can find experts on every subject. At one time I said that there is no one who can talk quite so convincingly on a subject as someone entirely unhampered by the facts.

We have the distinction of having a write-up under the headline, "Arizona-California water war takes new spurt." The reporter, whose name is Mr. John W. Ball, writes for the Washington Post. I know him. I am a member of the National Press Club, and have been for 25 years, and I know these press boys work hard, but all they can tell is what appears in the propaganda that goes out, and that is what this gentleman is stating. This article was published in the Washington Post of Sunday, February 5, 1950. The reporter in his article said:

Arizona, which boasts it is a man-made State, tangles with its neighbor California in the Senate tomorrow—

That is today, Mr. President. I guess they are going to tangle all right. I had hoped we could keep the proceedings out of that category. The reporter proceeds to speak of the number of millionaires who will be benefited, the historically irrigated areas, the money involved, and that water is the lifeblood of seven States. It is a great piece of literature, or would be so considered if one had never been mixed up in such matters and did not know that water was the lifeblood of those States. I find more education and less common sense in Washington today than I have ever found in any town in all my life. I find more completely inaccurate information coming out of here than from anywhere else. I say it is not the reporter's fault. The reporters have been fed this propaganda for the past 18 years, and what are they going to believe? This reporter, who no doubt had all the information he could secure, although I did not see him, says:

This issue involves the Gila River in Arizona. It is what is known as a wasting river. It is a main tributary of the Colorado. In the last 100 miles before it joins the Colorado, its bed is wide, sandy, flat, and subject to the desert heat.

Mr. President, I do not know of any river in that area which is not subject to desert heat. That, however, sounds good in print. I have slept in most of these river beds, or on the rocks on their banks, or laid out a bedroll, when the supply camp was established for the night, and in the morning picked up with my crew and proceeded on.

Between Phoenix and its juncture with the Colorado the Gila loses more than half its water to evaporation and seepage.

Of course, that statement settles that matter.

Near Phoenix, Ariz., takes about 2,300,000 acre-feet of water from the Gila. If this amount were permitted to flow on down to the Colorado, about half, or 1,200,000 acre-feet, would disappear before entering the main stream

Now that is a great piece of information. I do not suppose engineers, such as the great engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation of the past 40 years, whom I revere and respect, some of them dead and some still living, such as I named, Louis Hill and A. J. Wiley, who slept on the ground out there when they made camp overnight, knew as much. Of course, nowadays the engineers have it a little better. There are houses provided for them. Both the men I named are dead. Their reports are available on this matter. But the Post settles the whole question in one article:

I continue to read from the article.

Arizona contends she should be charged only for 1,200,000 acre-feet of Gila River water—the amount that would empty into the Colorado from the Gila in the ordinary course of nature.

California contends that Arizona actually takes 2,300,000, and should be charged for that amount.

Now, Mr. President, we have this great quarrel between Arizona and California all over again. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who now occupies the chair, went through that quarrel. It was Arizona and California, Arizona and California. Those headlines appeared in the newspapers all over the United States. Most people believed Boulder Dam site was in California, until the junior Senator from Nevada got into that fight, and we soon settled the location of that dam site.

Lake Mead is the immense reservoir behind Hoover Dam. Under the compact, California limits itself to 4,400,000 feet of 8A water, plus not more than half the 3B water, and any other surplus.

There are large evaporation losses in Lake Mead. Arizona insists that California must deduct these losses from its apportioned water. California says the water allotted to it is a net amount.

This is another question California wants decided by the Supreme Court.

The row has been in and out of the courts for years. Arizona tried to prevent construction of Hoover Dam. At one time she ordered out the National Guard to stop work on the Parker Dam.

Mr. President, having been present at nearly all these conferences I say it is not a matter which has been in and out of the courts as the article says. Some people tried to get into court but never could make it. Arizona for years tried to get into the courts, but never got into them. I do not blame the reporter. Any neophyte who might read this article would believe it to be well documented. It is, however, an entirely misleading piece of propaganda. That is not the reporter's fault. I should like very much to talk to him, because I know he is a good reporter and he is a hard worker. Reporters who belong to the National Press Club sit here day after day listening to the debates which take place in the Senate Chamber. Some of them are sitting here now although it is 7:30 o'clock p. m. I sympathize with them.

In 1922, an agreement known as the Colorado River compact was signed by all the States in the vast Colorado Basin, except Arizona.

The States were divided into two groups. The first was known as the upper basin. It included Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona, the last named with a very small interest in this section. The task of dividing the water among the States in each basin was left to those States. Only last year—a quarter of a century later—were the States in the upper basin able to reach an agreement.

The second group, or lower-basin States, included California, Nevada, and Arizona. The controversy in this group over division of the waters has continued since 1922, with mounting fervor.

Mr. President, it has not continued since 1922. It started when we signed the upper-basin compact. Then there are two sovereign States of America not even mentioned in the dispatch, in other words, lending weight to the suggestion that the Boulder Dam project divided the water between the three States; and therefore the fight is all over.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arizona has been a Member of this body since 1927, or 1926, whenever it was, and he was a Member of the House for many years before that. I respect his judgment and I would follow him as far as I would follow any other Senator. The Senator knows, as I do, that the Senate of the United States cannot divide water between the States at all. It has no authority to divide water. All it can do is to approve an interstate compact when it is laid on the desk of the Senate. The Senator has no right to say anything about it except as it has—as I described previously—often given advance consent to an interstate compact, but that interstate compact must go to the letter, and to the period, and to the comma, as put down by this body. If it deviates in one word it must be returned to the States. This one never was signed by anyone, and two States were left out.

Mr. President, I want to say a few words in closing. I am sorry it was necessary to make this long address, and keep the Senate of the United States here so late. I must leave now to keep a previous appointment. We heard here this afternoon a statement made by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], whom I admire and for whose integrity I have the utmost regard. He made no mistake that I know of. I think he told the truth. But he stood on the Senate floor and told the Members of the Senate that the poor little State of Arizona had to have this water because it had so many people who required it. He said they were pumping water. He said if they could not obtain more water they would be obliged to move.

I agree with all that. If it is true I am sorry. But the little State of Nevada, in the matter of population, is even smaller. The little State of Nevada, I think the census to be taken this year will show, has about 160,000 people. It is the sixth largest State in area in the Union. There are more than 70,000,000 acres in the State. More than 60,000,000 acres in the State are owned by the United States Government. We are a part of the great American desert. It reaches from Utah over into the State of Nevada.

About one half of 1 percent of the land of the State of Nevada is under cultivation. The limit of the water supply of the State of Nevada is the limit of the water supply for cultivation, just as it is in Arizona.

Mr. President, I do not intend to make a tear-jerking speech this afternoon. I know that the junior Senator from Arizona probably did not mean to do so. He has fought his way, as I have fought my way in Nevada and in the West. I have been consulting engineer for many of the large projects, including the Central Valley project of California, the Los Angeles flood-control project, and many others. I went with Dr. Mead and Mr. Walters and examined the Grand Coulee, the Wenatchee, and the Columbia River, in 1930 and 1931. When I fly over some of these projects, as I shall do in the next few days, or when I go visiting, it will be a matter of great pride to me to reflect that I had at least a minor part in the development of practically all these projects. I hope I can say, a few years from now when I go to Arizona—as I often do; I visit Tucson, Phoenix, and other places—"I am proud that I could help Arizona get her share of the water out of the river." I hope we can say the same thing about Nevada. I hope the junior Senator from Arizona and the senior Senator from Arizona can say, "We helped Nevada get her share of the water,' whatever that share is, whether it be 900,000 acre-feet or 1,005,000 acre-feet, whether the Governor is right or whether I am right. I hope the junior Senator from Arizona and the senior Senator from Arizona can say that they helped us get that water.

I hope we can say the same thing for Utah. I hope we can say the same thing for New Mexico and California. I am not against these projects. I am for them. All I ask is that the Congress of the United States not break the 50-year precedent under which it has refused to appropriate money, or even to report a bill out of the committee, without an interstate agreement or an adjudication. I have sat there for 3 years and heard the chairman of that committee—a Republican for the first 2 years, and a Democrat last year—turn those projects back and tell the proponents to go home and get an interstate agreement or an adjudication.

In closing, let me say that the limit of Nevada's development over the years ahead is the limit of the water supply of that State. That applies to every State in the Colorado River Basin. It applies to every one of the 11 Western States known as the arid States. It applies along a line drawn through the meridian at about the center of Kansas, to the western half of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, and the two Dakotas. There is no difference. Whenever there is a rainfall which is less than is required to mature a crop, the limit of development will be the limit of the developed water supply.

Mr. President, I am not arguing the cost of this project, whether it be $1,500 or $1,700 an acre. The President says he is going to try to see to it that everyone receives $4,000 a year. All he is going to have to do is to keep printing money. Eventually it will require a wheelbarrow load of money to buy an order of ham and eggs. Then everybody will be getting about $50,000 a year.

The estimates on this project are different now than they were when they were made There is a cost index in the Bureau of Reclamation. I shall not attempt to say exactly what it is, but I looked it up. The cost index is based upon 1935. As inflation comes along and the price of material goes up, no recalculation is made. There is a cost index, similar to the cost-of-living index of the AP, and other authorities. So now, instead of $750,000,000, or whatever the figure is, the cost is nearer $800,000,000, according to the estimate of the Bureau of Reclamation. The process of inflation and the natural course of the spiral which we are sending up every year by our own action will help the President to make his own prediction come true. The only difficulty is that as we increase the daily pay and annual pay, we make the price of a pair of shoes jump from $6, $10, or $15, depending upon the grade of shoe one buys, to twice that amount. Then, of course, the cost of the project goes up. In the next 10 years, if we continue irresponsible appropriations for nations all over the world, without any control over what they do with them, and uncontrolled appropriations even for our own people, it may be that this project will cost $2,000,000,000, and be just as feasible as it is now, I will say to the junior Senator from Arizona. However, I will still be for the Arizona project. I will be for additional projects in California. I will be for the project in Nevada. I will be for the project in New Mexico. I will be for the project in Utah, whenever the water has been

divided by an interstate compact or adjudicated by a court of competent jurisdiction, and the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation say it is feasible.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in a few moments I shall make a motion to recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow. However, before doing so, I wish to express my appreciation and thanks to the junior Senator from Nevada for the kind things he has said about my colleague the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is now presiding, and about myself. I wish to state also that I agree with what the Senator said in regard to the late Senator Pittman, of Nevada. He was an able and distinguished Senator, and a statesman. It makes me happy to hear words of praise for him from the lips of the junior Senator from Nevada. I am also happy that Arizona recognizes Nevada's right to the amount of water which the distinguished Senator from Nevada had helped place in a compact which was agreed to in advance for the State of Nevada. I only wish that the other States would recognize Arizona's right to the amount of water which the Senator from Nevada at that time agreed to.

I wish further to express my appreciation for the very kind things which my good friend, the junior Senator from Nevada, said about Arizona. The Senator knows that I hold him in the same high esteem in which he holds the senior Senator from Arizona and the junior Senator from Arizona. The feeling of friendship is mutual.

The reclamation engineers have said that this project is feasible. I hope that the junior Senator from Nevada will stay with us and that I may be able to persuade him to vote for this project. But the hour is now 7:30, and I am afraid it is too late for me to do so at this time.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I appreciate the remarks of the junior Senator from Arizona and his yielding to me for the purpose of making a further statement.

Mr. President, there is one more point which I had intended to discuss. In my anxiety to take as little time as I could, I overlooked it. There is a provision in the bill that if a suit is filed no money shall be appropriated or used to build diversion works as long as the suit is in court.

I should like to point out that if this project is authorized by the Congress in the absence of an interstate agreement or adjudication by a court of competent jurisdiction, construction of the dam can begin immediately. I have no objection to that. But there is no stopping point. A diversion work can be built without coming back to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and without coming back to the Congress. They can continue to build that project. If the Supreme Court refuses to take jurisdiction or in the event it takes jurisdiction, and the suit is filed, the project can continue, regardless of the verdict. That is the way the bill is written.

Mr. President, nothing of that kind has ever been enacted by the Congress in the last 50 years, so far as I can determine. I may have overlooked some instance of that sort, but I do not think I have. I know it is not the sentiment or the conviction of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that that be done, because I have heard the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who now is chairman of the committee, call a halt in the middle of a hearing, and ask: "Has the Governor and has the engineer for the State agreed to this?"

Mr. President, I have put into the RECORD the part of the proceedings which shows that the Governor and the engineer, Mr. Smith, are violently opposed to this proposal, and that no agreement has ever been made in that respect.

I read now from Senate bill 75:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of controlling floods, improving navigation, and regulating the flow of the Colorado River, providing for storage and for the delivery of the stored waters to provide essential supplementary supply of water to irrigated lands, for municipal and domestic uses, and for the irrigation of public and other lands within the United States, and for the generation, use, and sale of electrical energy as a means of making the project herein authorized a self-supporting and financially solvent undertaking, and other beneficial purposes, the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, subject to the terms of the Colorado River compact and the water delivery contract between the United States and the State of Arizona, executed February 9, 1944, is hereby authorized to construct, operate, and maintain (1) a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, which dam shall be constructed to an elevation of not less than 1,877 feet above sea level; (2) a related system of main conduits and canals, including a tunnel and main canal from the reservoir above the dam at Bridge Canyon to the Salt River above Granite Reef Dam, a canal from the Salt River to the Gila River above the town of Florence, Ariz., and thence a canal to Picacho Reservoir, and thence a canal to the Santa Cruz River flood plain; (3) such other canals, canal improvements, laterals, pumping plants, and drainage works as may be required to effectuate the purposes of this act; (4) complete plants, transmission lines, and incidental structures suitable for the fullest economic development of electrical energy generated from water at the works constructed hereunder for use in the operation thereof and for sale in accordance with Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto); and (5) such appurtenant dams and incidental works, including interconnecting lines to effectuate coordination with other Federal projects, flood-protection works, desilting dams, or works above Bridge Canyon and a dam on the Gila River in New Mexico and such dams on the Gila River and its tributaries in Arizona as may be necessary in the opinion of the Secretary for the successful operation of the undertaking herein authorized and to effect exchanges of water to insure an adequate supplemental supply to lands presently or heretofore irrigated from the Gila River including and below Cliff Valley in New Mexico and from the tributaries of the Gila River by supplying water from the main stream of the Colorado River to lower lands now receiving water from the Gila River or its tributaries, thus releasing Gila River and tributary water for use and exchange on other lands served by the Gila River and tributaries and other exchanges of water which may be agreed upon by the users affected.

Mr. President, at this point in the bill we find the amendment which was put in the bill by the committee; it is the amendment to which the junior Senator from Nevada did not agree. It may be that, leaving out the Glen Canyon site, there was unanimous agreement by the members of the committee in regard to this provision:

Provided, That this authorization shall not include (a) any works, dam, or reservoir at the Glen Canyon site or any other site in the upper Colorado River Basin, or (b) any dam, reservoir, or works in the lower Colorado River Basin which would flood the Glen Canyon site: *Provided further*, That construction of the tunnel and that portion of the canal hereinabove described from the reservoir above the dam at Bridge Canyon to a junction with the aqueduct hereinafter authorized shall be deferred until Congress by making appropriation expressly therefor has determined that economic conditions justify its construction, and in order to provide a means of diversion of water from the Colorado River to the main canal pending the construction of said tunnel and said portion of the canal and for use thereafter as supplemental and stand-by works the Secretary is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate from appropriations authorized by this act an aqueduct from Lake Havasu to and connecting with the main canal in the vicinity of Cunningham, Wash., and pumping plants to raise water from Lake Havasu to such elevation as may be required to provide gravity flow of such water to the main canal.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator like to have the entire bill printed at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. MALONE. No; I would not. I wish to make this point—and I read now section 2 of the bill:

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall have the authority to acquire, by purchase, exchange, condemnation, or otherwise, all lands, rights-of-way, and other property necessary for said purposes: *Provided*, That, anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding, the Secretary shall not have the authority to condemn established water rights or the water to the use of which such rights are established, or works used or necessary for the storage and delivery of such water to the use of which rights are established, or the right to substitute or exchange water without the consent of the holders of rights or those entitled to the beneficial use of such waters as may be involved in the proposed exchange.

SEC. 3. The estimated cost of the construction of the said works shall be determined by the Secretary. The Secretary shall also determine (a) the parts of said estimated cost that can be properly allocated to flood control, silt control, navigation, river regulation, recreation, fish and wildlife conservation, general salinity control, respectively, and any other purposes served by the project which may hereafter be made nonreimbursable by law, the sums so allocated, together with the expenses of operation and maintenance attributed by him to such purposes, to be nonreimbursable, and (b) (1) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to irrigation and probably be returned to the United States in net revenues from the delivery of water for irrigation purposes; (2) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to irrigation and probably be returned to the United States by revenues derived from

sources other than the delivery of water for irrigation purposes; (3) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to power and probably be returned to the United States in net power revenues; and (4) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to municipal water supply or other miscellaneous purposes and probably be returned to the United States.

Mr. President, here is where the amendment was suggested by the several Senators to whom I have previously referred, to cover Senate Joint Resolution 145, introduced by the California and Nevada Senators jointly.

Mr. President, in the absence of an interstate agreement, we asked for an adjudication by the Supreme Court before such works were commenced. This is the provision which was included:

SEC. 12. If any State or States within 6 months after the effective date of this act shall begin a suit or suits in the Supreme Court of the United States to determine the right to the use of water for diversion from the main stream of the Colorado River through aqueducts or tunnels to be constructed pursuant to this act for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona, and to adjudicate claims of right asserted by such State or States or by any other State or States, under the Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the California Self-Limitation Act (Cal. Stat. 1929, ch. 16), and the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), consent is hereby given to the joinder of the United States of America as a party in such action or actions. Any State of the Colorado River Basin may intervene or be impleaded in such suit or suits. Any such claims of right affected by the project herein authorized and asserted by any defendant State, impleaded State, or intervening State under said compact and statutes, or by the United States may be adjudicated in such action. In any such suit or suits process directed against the United States shall be served upon the Attorney General of the United States.

SEC. 13. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That no moneys appropriated under the authority of this act shall be expended for the construction of works authorized by this act which are required solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona, during the period of 6 months after the enactment of this act and during the pendency of any suit or suits in which the United States shall be joined as a party under and by virtue of the consent granted in section 12 of this act. The pendency of a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint shall be considered pendency of a suit or suits for the purposes of this act: *Provided further*, That power sales contracts shall be made with a view to the reservation of generating capacity sufficient for the operation of all features of the project and that rates for power shall be fixed in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws; and that revenues derived from the sale of power shall be credited in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 291, 318).

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that although this bill includes permission for the States to file suit, it further provides that while suit is pending in the Supreme Court, the works authorized by the bill may be constructed, if the bill is passed by the Congress and signed by the President, provided that no money shall be appropriated and no work shall be constructed for diversion purposes only, meaning that Bridge Canyon Dam can be constructed. But I call attention to the fact that if the Supreme Court of the United States refuses to take jurisdiction, or even after taking jurisdiction, no matter what the Court's decision might be, the work could proceed without further action by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs or by the Congress of the United States. In other words, the bill would simply authorize the work on the project to proceed at any time, although a certain amount of time would be provided to enable suit to be brought in the Court. But regardless of whatever judgment might be rendered, the work could proceed. I submit that is a dangerous precedent, and one which has never been established by the Senate during the last 50 years, so far as I have been able to ascertain.

Mr. President, I return to my premise: I am in favor of any project anywhere in the United States that will develop lands, conserve water, and furnish a place for people to live, something that will create new wealth, a project that the Bureau of Reclamation's engineers or the Army engineers say will repay the money spent, so far as the repayable parts of the project are concerned. Of course, flood control and navigation projects long since have been decided by the Congress as not being repayable. But the investments for any commercial projects, such as power projects, should be repaid with interest. I see no provision in the bill for the repayment of interest, but I am not making a point of that. However, it has been long since established that irrigation projects must repay the money, without interest, over a period of years. Then the ownership of the projects goes to the people who repaid the money, or the people where the projects are located. Now, of course, it is sought to change that. It is sought to have the money repaid to the Bureau of Reclamation, which would still own the power projects and still rent the water. Of course, I think we can stop that. But that is another argument.

My point is that it is changing a policy, and it is misleading. It is misleading to say that Senators agreed on a certain amount of water for the several States. They merely agreed they would submit it to the States. The great former Senator from Nevada, Key Pittman—I say it again—had no knowledge of how much water was needed in the State of Nevada. I have been away from the problem in Nevada for some time, but A. M. Smith, now secretary of the Colorado Commission and State engineer, is in close touch with it, and he is in close touch with me. I have a telegram which I want to place in the RECORD. It was dated only today, and is probably lying on my desk in my office at this moment. I received it by telephone a moment ago. It is stamped "2:15 p. m., February 6, 1950." It is a telegram signed by Vail Pittman, Governor of the State of Nevada; Alan Bible, attorney general; and A. M. Smith—we call him "Tom"—State engineer and secretary of the Colorado River Commission. It may be subject to correction of a word or two, but, as transcribed through a telephone conversation, it reads:

> We have consistently and still oppose Senate bill 75. We urge enactment of separate legislation for construction of Bridge Canyon Dam for power purpose alone at earliest possible date.

In other words, they have no objection at all to a bill being introduced and passed, even without an agreement, if it does not provide for water allocation which has never been made by interstate agreement or through a court of competent jurisdiction. They would like to see a dam built for power purposes alone, but then the Congress would be on record as appropriating money for a power project alone, which would be another consideration which should, of course, originate in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate or in the Public Lands Committee of the House.

In closing, Mr. President, I merely wish to emphasize that I have the highest regard for the junior and senior Senators from California and for the junior and senior Senators from Arizona, but I want five States to be included in this project. That is why I joined with California. I am not against Arizona. I know it has been represented in some places in the Southwest that I have joined California against Arizona. What I want to do is to disabuse the mind of anyone who thinks there are but two States in the basin. Once more, 25 years later, after I had to do it in 1927 single-handed, I am trying to show that there are five States in this basin, not two. When I came into the argument in 1927, there were headlines all over the United States, "California fights Arizona" and "Arizona fights California." There were those who thought the dam was located in Arizona and California. We soon determined its true location. It is in Arizona and Nevada. We then divided the hydroelectric power which was in controversy, and passed the bill, but we got a compact protecting the upper basin States, before we did that. I was for that, Mr. President, just as I am, at this moment, for the project in Arizona, if the Bureau officials say it is feasible, once the water is adjudicated by a court of competent jurisdiction or once an interstate agreement is arrived at.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, again I thank the junior Senator from Nevada and express regret that he could not remain here so I could convince him that the pending bill fully protects the rights of all the States. But all I can do under the circumstances is to wish for him a wonderful trip and to express the hope that he will not talk politics on his trip.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 7, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 6 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Matthew E Welsh, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana vice B. Howard Caughran, term expired. (This is to correct the nomination sent to the Senate on January 17, 1950, and confirmed on January 31, 1950.)

Ernest A. Tolin, of California, to be United States attorney for the southern district of California, vice James M. Carter, elevated.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Craig Pottinger, of Nogales, Ariz., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Noga'es, Ariz. (Reappointment)

Louis T. Rocheleau, of Woonsocket, R I., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R. I. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of the act of June 10, 1949 (Public Law 96, 81st Cong.):

To be colonel

Victor Z. Gomez, O14876.

To be lieutenant colonel

Jose E. Olivares, O15377.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong), Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, and Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be majors

Charles S. Finch, Jr., MC, O350284.
Marcus H. Flinter, MC, O336929.
Everett G. King, MC, O333584.
Edward S. Miller, MC, O367335.

To be captains

William P. Blocker, Jr , MC, AO1774757.
Edward S. Bres, Jr., MC, O282417
William O Dougherty, DC, O483429.
Aldo E. Gillotte, DC.
Richard G. Hamill, MC, O444052
James B. Hampton, MC, O470678.
Mary E. Kelly, WAC, L702220.
Leo Korchin, DC, O466196.
David E. MacQuigg, MC, O367814.
Dante Salera, DC, O52017.
Lillian Singer, WAC, L202122.

To be first lieutenants

Alexander W. Ashford, MC, O935756.
Bruce C Babbitt, JAGC, O416671
Victor D Baughman, JAGC, O455846.
Herbert R Boyd, Jr., DC, O978077.
John L. Child, JAGC, O1117577.
Charles R. Counts, JAGC, O1313341.
George C. Eblen, JAGC, O549053.
Warren C. Evans, MC.
Joe Frisch, DC.
Donald R. Korst, MC, O962702.
Alfred Lubart, MC, O963146
Bernard J. Nielander, Jr., DC, O831775.
Alois Peczenik, MC, O1691917.
Walter S. Price, MC, O1726466
James F. Senechal, JAGC, O1325143.
Lee S. Serfas, MC, O961437.
Joseph L. Shomo, DC, O395550.
William C. Vinet, Jr., JAGC, O1336291.
Richard A. Walsh, MC, O964463.
Matthew J. Weir, MC, O977165.

To be second lieutenants

Eleanor A Anderson, ANC, N765360.
Elizabeth M. Camp, ANC, N792242.
Anastasia A. Chaponis, ANC, N792714.
Maxine Douglas, ANC, N792153.
Marie L. Lilly, ANC, N764809.
Myrtle J. Lucey, WMSC, M2443.
Jean A. Mulraney, ANC, N792559.
Frances C Register, ANC, N792675.
Ruth J. Vanderburg, ANC, N792503.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1950, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Lodwrick M Cook, O974145
Wilford J. Hoff, Jr.
Holcombe H Thomas.
William A. Wells.
John T. Wood. Jr., O954464.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1950, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong), subject to designation as a distinguished military graduate, and subject to physical qualification:

Thomas J. Muldowney

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification

John S. Culpepper, Jr., O973085.
Barry M Dietrich.
Murray H. Falk.
Herbert J. Hedrick, O957860.
Andrew B Kirkpatrick, Jr
Wilburn V. Lunn, Jr., O980879.
Terrence S Meade, O978762.
Luther S Orr, Jr
Clarence W. Pratt.
Kenneth Watson, Jr , O964182.
Rudolph L. Yobs.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong), subject to physical qualification:

Edwin W. Allen, Jr , AO56167.
Eldon L. Ballinger, O412373.
Jean R Barnes, O1339597
William C. Bowen, Jr., O417294.
Charles E. Brannon, O1330378.
John D. Burrer, O1342047
Herbert E. Clark, O953799
Louis R. M. DelGuerico, O971421.
Lawrence B. Farnum, O854551.
Leslie R Forney, Jr.
William R. Frost, Jr , O1340876.
William L. Gaillard, AO1904234.
Alonzo J. Golden, O393003
Benjamin F. Harmon, O964129.
John L. Hofues, Jr., O973738.
Roy C. Jones, O968776.
William J. Joosten, O1342382.
Thomas W. Kelley, O2017869.
Harold C. Kinne, Jr., O1826156.
James M Leer, Jr., O537266.
William B. Lindsay, O505588.
Samuel E. McCann, O412217.
John D. Meredith, O967481.
Daniel L. Miller, O2065809.
Knute R. Nelson, O423117.
John J. O'Brien, O976216.
Henry A. Pate, Jr., O965674.
John F. Risk.
James H. Tate, Jr., O445748.
Charles P. Walthour.
Marcus L. Whitfield, O965500.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and title III of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. All officers have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion as required by law:

To be lieutenant colonels

Della Josephine Angst, AL80067.
Martha Leola Cross, AL80206.
Mary Lois Kersey, AL80016.
Kathleen McClure, AL80200.
Virginia Justin Phelps, AL80020.
Marie Louise Ray, AL80119.
Emma Jane Riley, AL80056
Margaret Johanna Steele, AL80199.

To be majors

Pauline Estelle Abell, AL80053.
Evaline May Absalom, AL80041.
Margaret Andrews Bacchus, AL80031.
Laurie Marie Ball, AL80047.
Ruth Lucile Blind, AL80033
Anna Lee Briggs, AL80052.
Margaret Goodman Brown, AL80063.
Charlotte Gage Butterfield, AL80050.
Lucille Caldwell, AL80027.
Virginia Christina Dietz, AL80030.
Kathryn Grace Ecke, AL80062.
Mary Elma Elrod, AL80054
Anna Marie Frost, AL80061.
Wilma Rebecca Hague, AL80034
Elizabeth Tunstall Hickson, AL80231.
Marjorie Ostrander Hunt, AL80049.
Rachael Ann Johnstone, AL80037
Kathryn McConnell Ludlow, AL80044.
Dorothy Page Martin, AL80028
Margaret Elizabeth McEnerney, AL80051.
Gladys Emma McManimie, AL80040.
Mary Elizabeth McPherson, AL80224.
Willa Mae Mizell, AL80058.
Jacquelin Mozelle Mooneyham, AL80043.
Gladys Myrabelle Nelson, AL80494.
Genevieve Kelly O'Brien, AL80213.
Helen Emeline O'Day, AL80068
Maimie Pauline Oliver, AL80488.
Rose Ethel Panowski, AL80223.
Bernice Cecelia Philipps, AL80032.
Margaret Louise Philpot, AL80048.
Bertha Pinckes, AL80038.
Elizabeth Ray, AL80214
Myrl Dean Stiles, AL80482.
Marion Eliza Swan, AL80046.
Mildred Elsie Thomas, AL80036.
Edith Margaret Toffaletti, AL80479
Janna Tucker, AL80039.
Frances Works Van Pelt, AL80029.
Kathryne M. Walls, AL80495.
Margaret Mary Werlein, AL80045.

To be captains

Jean Doris Armstrong, AL80106.
Joan Elizabeth Bennett, AL80084.
Virginia Marie Blanchard, AL80086
Carolyn Elizabeth Boatwright, AL80083.
Madelen Cassidy, AL80105.
Alberta Marie Courchene, AL80080.
Elizabeth Narcissus Cox, AL80082.
Doris Dee Diamant, AL80109
Elsie Ovedia Ellingson, AL80097
Harriet Marion Fivenson, AL80099.
Mary Elizabeth Flannagan, AL80104.
Virginia Spence Gary, AL80107.
Elizabeth Guild, AL80096
Alice Hoyt Hartley, AL80079
Verdia May Hickambottom, AL80084.
Bonnie Turnbull Martin, AL80190.
Virginia Eloise Martin, AL80075.
Ruth McCraw, AL80078.
Muriel May Moran, AL80103.
Shirley Theone O'Dell, AL80093.
Rita Elizabeth O'Donnell, AL80085.
Frances Oppenheimer, AL80076.
Viola May Peschel, AL80087.
Ruth Ramee, AL80100.
Lillian Tombacher Robinson, AL80091.
Cora Edra Sharon, AL80081.
Albina Helena Shimkus, AL80088.
Mary Ellen Shull, AL80095.

Flora Mary Smothers, AL80101.
Mary Helene Strong, AL80092.
Ruth Ellen Vorkoeper, AL80090.
Ruth Lamar Williams, AL80089.
Jean Smollen Wilson, AL80102.

NOTE.—Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. S. R. Pitts, S. J., principal of St. Joseph's College High School, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Recalling the inspiring words of the Declaration of Independence, we beseech Thee, O Lord, to enlighten our minds and move our wills with a deeper appreciation and respect for the truth that all men are endowed by Thee, their Creator, with certain inalienable rights, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Daily give us, O God, the mind and will to live with a firm reliance on the protection of Thy divine providence in order that we may mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 2, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4080. An act to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice.

THE CHRISTOFFEL CASE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 the House passed a resolution regarding a subpena from the district court that was served on me. I appeared this morning and delivered the House resolution. The attorneys for Christoffel yielded and said they did not need the minutes of the Eighty-first Congress but insisted that the House deliver the minutes of March 1, 1947. I told the court that I would cooperate and deliver the message to the Speaker of the House, and that whatever orders were issued by the House would be complied with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not quite stated a parliamentary inquiry. I assume he has made a statement for the RECORD.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is right.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FURCOLO (at the request of Mr. STAGGERS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and insert an article.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on Alaska-Hawaii statehood by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CHESNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech given by Lawrence M. Kocinsky, national commander of the Polish Legion of American Veterans of the United States, at the grave of Gen. W. Krzyzanowski, at Arlington Cemetery, Va.

Mr. MAGEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from St. Louis he received and his reply thereto.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD concerning the death of Msgr. Maurice W. Chawke and include therein an article from the Detroit News.

Mr. FUGATE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Louis Johnson, Secretary of National Defense.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Times-Herald of this morning.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming (at the request of Mr. D'EWART) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EATON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by George K. Batt on our national economic situation.

DONALD RICHBERG

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, a loyal American, a profound logician, statesman, and scholar, who is unselfishly struggling to preserve for America and her citizens those God-given rights originally guaranteed to them under our Constitution made a speech in my district last Thursday evening that merits the attention of all loyal Americans, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

LUXURY TAXES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I have purchased a ticket for the Republican get-together party to be held out at the Uline Arena tonight. I notice there is a 20-cent Federal excise tax on the ticket.

I am wondering whether the Jackson Day $100-a-plate banquet will also carry the same tax? May I say also that while they have not submitted their menu to me I am assuming it will consist largely of potatoes.

BE NIFTY AND THRIFTY IN FIFTY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, be nifty and thrifty in fifty. If not, we are a socialist Nation before sixty with the Fair Deal.

Two hundred and fifty-six billion debt; seven billion deficit.

I would rather be a broken record than a SOB.

The state of the Nation is good.

Acheson—Hiss and Hiss. Thanks to Un-American Committee. A red herring? Oh, my.

Social security from cradle to grave.

Coal supplies dwindling, mills close down, men have no jobs.

Fact-finding board shunned.

Taft-Hartley law could be used, but T-H will not work if H. T. will not work it.

State of the Nation is good.

Ben Franklin once said, "He who trades freedom for security will lose both."

He was right.

Debt two hundred and fifty-eight billion; deficit seven billion.

More taxes and more spending is the Fair Deal program. Why then $50,000 nontaxable salary to the President and $10,000 each to Vice President and Speaker?

It seems to me like a raw deal to country's citizens.

More taxes to pay this injustice from the hard workers.

Has a soap manufacturer the ability to understand and manufacture atomic bombs or would a scientist be better?

State of the Nation is good.

There are a lot of questions coming before us these days that we should consider very intelligently. It seems to me that the Fair Deal is on the road to ruining America. Wake up, America, before you lose your freedom, your liberty, your form of government, and your home. High time get busy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt.

Mr. GOLDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the January issue of Successful Farming.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 15 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

CENSUS ENUMERATORS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had an opportunity to catch up on some newspaper reading. Among the editorials, I found one that commented on what, to me, likewise seems to be a very timely and practical suggestion. Namely, that unemployed persons, otherwise qualified, be given the job of census enumerators.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this would not cure unemployment but it certainly would make a sizable contribution in my district, the State of Connecticut, where there are approximately 100,000 unemployed. The same suggestion can be useful, effective, and beneficial in every State in the Union since unemployment and increased welfare expenditures are not confined to Connecticut.

The editorial to which I had reference is from the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of January 26. It follows:

CENSUS TAKING AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Robert H Hausman, candidate for the Republican nomination for mayor of New Britain, has made an interesting suggestion to Governor Bowles. Noting the Governor's intense interest in unemployment, Mr. Hausman has sought to correlate this with the impending creation of several thousand jobs for census takers. He has suggested that the Governor take steps to see that these census-taking positions are given to men and women who are unemployed, if they are otherwise qualified.

This would not cure unemployment, but it would make a sizable contribution. In New Britain, for example, it would result in 70 jobs In Hartford it would probably provide thrice that number. Hartford's welfare director, David H. Keppel, is at present combing the lists trying to reduce the heavy outgo for public assistance If several hundred jobs were made available to him, he could doubtless make good use of them. And the taxpayers would profit accordingly.

From an administrative point of view this could easily be handled. The Governor would merely notify his State chairman, Mr. Bailey, to get his list of eligible appointees from each local welfare director instead of from the local Democratic town chairmen. It would merely involve substituting worthy people who need work for worthy Democrats who may or may not need the job.

Local directors of public welfare, those who have exhausted their unemployment compensation, and all others who would like to see these jobs distributed to persons who need them most, might get in touch with Governor Bowles to urge such a program. This should be of particular interest to the various leaders of organized labor, who have been especially concerned with unemployment. There are doubtless hundreds of members of the CIO and AFL who are unemployed. These members could also help to make the program effective by informing their leaders that they are ready and willing to take over as census takers until regular work comes along

Mr. Hausman has made an excellent suggestion. Mr. Bowles' concern about unemployment is well known. And through such a program he could put himself on record as being opposed to the back-room distribution of several thousand jobs to political hangers-on, while thousands of their neighbors, needing work, are given the go-by.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, city dwellers are beginning to ask some very embarrassing questions about continuing high food costs in view of Secretary Brannan's statement on Friday that the Government will have to jettison, burn, or otherwise waste 70,000,000 bushels of potatoes in connection with the 1949 potato price-support program. This is the culmination of a series of other statements on all kinds of farm commodities from wheat to dried eggs. It is especially noteworthy that this statement comes side by side with evidence of rising relief costs in the big cities. For instance, in my own New York City the public assistance case load now provides for 328,469 persons with 387,324 estimated for 1951, and the Federal Government's share of this public assistance relief budget is $44,046,625.

Agricultural policy now obviously is not just a problem for farmers. It is time we had a department of consumers in the Federal establishment and consumers legislative committees in both Houses of the Congress to deal with just such problems as that raised by Secretary Brannan in connection with potatoes. Pressure and special interest groups will then have finally brought on their appropriate countereffort in the synthesis of all groups into one—for we are all consumers. Farmers should have a particular interest in aiding consumers at this point because opposition is mounting to the whole agricultural policy in spite of the fact that some farm price support is essential to the country's economy. It is excesses that city dwellers are worrying about now as shown by the potato, dried egg, and similar programs which have piled up vast surpluses side by side with the existence of vast unsatisfied human needs in our own and other free countries.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SHOULD MAKE PROPER DISPOSAL OF PERISHABLE SURPLUS COMMODITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it appears the Department of Agriculture has finally, after many months of consideration, gotten around to a point where it will make plans to dispose of dried eggs and dried milk on hand, costing millions and millions of dollars.

I am informed the Commodity Credit Corporation has approximately 73,000,000 pounds of eggs in storage that are not earmarked for use or disposal, and approximately 170,000,000 pounds of dried milk. Putting it another way, the CCC has on hand, for which it is paying storage, 36,500 tons of dried eggs and 85,000 tons of dried milk.

It seems to me that long ago the Department of Agriculture should have arranged and made plans to dispose of these surplus food commodities in an orderly manner. They should be allocated to welfare organizations, school-lunch programs, and all other groups where such commodities are being used at the expense of the taxpayers of this country.

There is no excuse or reason why the millions of bushels of potatoes under the control of CCC should not have been allocated to people who are in need of them for food. It is inexcusable and absolutely wrong that food should be destroyed when there are thousands of people in this country who would be glad to have them for food.

Mr. Speaker, we are sending millions of dollars' worth of food to foreign countries under the Marshall plan. Is there any good reason why quantities of these items of food should not be included, and thereby relieve the taxpayers of at least a part of this burden?

I am informed that officials in the Department of Agriculture are now, after months and even years, suggesting they are not sure whether they have authority to make such disposal of this food. It is my opinion they have such authority, but if they do not, they can certainly get it. I wonder why they have not requested it. It seems to me that somebody has gone to sleep on the job.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances: In one to include a letter appearing in yesterday's New York Times, and in the second an invaluable contribution on the subject of electoral reform. I am informed by the Public Printer that the latter will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated to cost $410, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extensions may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from

the Church Federation of Greater Chicago and his reply thereto.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous matter.

WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, upon reading an article by George Fielding Eliot entitled "Do Women Make Good Officers?" which appeared in a recent issue of McCall's magazine, I was amazed to learn that in all of the legally established corps in which women hold permanent commissions the highest permanent commissioned rank attainable is lieutenant colonel or commander in the United States Navy, except that each of the corps is authorized a director or chief, who is entitled to hold temporary rank of colonel or captain, United States Navy, while serving in this capacity. This is as high as any women officers can now rise.

I must confess I did not know before, that this situation existed.

Today I introduced a bill which will, in effect, increase the temporary ranks to brigadier general or rear admiral—lower grade—as the case may be.

These officers are capable of acting as heads of their corps and they are entitled to rank commensurate with their responsibility.

I am profoundly grateful to be in a position to introduce legislation affecting these remarkable women serving in the armed services who are so justly deserving of this recognition. To honor the heads of these corps in such a way would in my opinion reflect the admiration and respect that the American people feel for all of the women in our armed forces.

SURPLUS COMMODITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on Friday 4 Members of the House, and I understand today 24 additional Members, all from the Republican side, have introduced bills directing the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available surplus foodstuffs to the school-lunch program and welfare agencies.

I want to point out that this measure, if considered favorably and adopted, will not cost the taxpayers of this country a cent. The savings in storage charges alone will many times offset the nominal advances for handling and transportation costs.

As for the cost of the food commodities themselves, the administration has already written off their cost. It has not only reduced the prices to a fraction of their cost for export but is financing these exports with ECA dollars.

In addition to the outright outlay of funds, they have to pay storage charges. Many of these commodities have been in storage for from 1 to 2 years. The time is not too far distant when it will be necessary to hire men to dump and dispose of what is now good food. The time to act is now.

FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4106) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "there is authorized to be appropriated, and there is hereby appropriated" and insert "the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE POTATO CRISIS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, this potato crisis is a most peculiar crisis. It is one which the Congress of the United States could have prevented.

We will remember that the reason we have this crisis is that the Congress did not take the action it was required to take in order to prevent this huge surplus from being accumulated.

If my memory serves me correctly, Congress passed an amendment which made it impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture to pay freight charges to those points where we have school-lunch programs and welfare agencies which would have been able to put those surplus potatoes to good use.

The Secretary was authorized to pay freight charges for surplus potatoes going to alcohol and starch producers.

I think the Congress ought to reexamine its conscience and remember that it voted down the Brannan plan last year. If we would pass such a plan, we would not be accumulating these surpluses in the first place.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a column by Lowell Mellett.

Mr. BARING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the RFC.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, the friends of the Taft-Hartley law show the nature of their mind by their constant opposition to all congressional effort to pass laws that will protect labor against the predatory traits of their masters. This nature is seen in their blind opposition to the repeal of any part of that infamous law; in their slavish opposition to the passage of a more adequate and just social-security law; in their shameful opposition to a Federal national-health program; and in their illogical opposition to put teeth in the coal-mine inspection law.

The blood of the 534 miners who in 1949 went down to the coal mines and never came back alive——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr Speaker, the friends of the Taft-Hartley law show the nature of their mind by their constant opposition to all congressional effort to pass laws that will protect labor against the predatory traits of their masters. This nature is seen in their blind opposition to the repeal of any part of that infamous law; in their slavish opposition to the passage of a more adequate and just social-security law; in their shameful opposition to a Federal national-health program; and in their illogical opposition to put teeth in the coal-mine inspection law.

The blood of the 534 miners who in 1949 went down to the coal mines and never came back alive——

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see anything in that except an argument for the repeal or amendment of a law.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania will proceed for the remainder of his 1 minute.

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

Mr. CAVALCANTE. I will yield as soon as I finish.

The blood of the 534 miners who in 1949 went down to the coal mines and never came back alive because of the inadequate coal-mine inspection law; the blood of the man, woman, and child that died because of inadequate medical and hospital care; and the blood and suffering of those who died so that labor unions might subsist, is all heaped upon the heads of this opposition.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] has expired.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE AND PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House and also a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 2, 1950, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE], after obtaining unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, addressed the House.

His remarks are found on page 1376 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Those remarks, which, for obvious reasons, are not now quoted, but which are before the Speaker and the Members of the House, reflect upon the House as a whole; upon the integrity, in his official capacity, of more than two-thirds of the Members of the House, as well as upon the integrity of the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

Those remarks, by innuendo, also reflect upon the integrity of a Member of the other body.

Those remarks, when read in connection with other official records of the House and of the other body, falsely charge that more than two-thirds of the Members of the House and of the other body were guilty of improper conduct.

They also charge, Mr. Speaker, that the blood of 534 miners who were killed in accidents in the mines during the first 11 months of 1948 are upon the hands of those Members of the House and of the other body who voted in support of the Taft-Hartley Act.

It is my contention that those remarks do reflect upon the integrity of the Members of the House, and the House as a whole.

My resolution is to the effect that they be stricken from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman desires to make a motion, the Chair will entertain it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Am I not entitled to an hour?

The SPEAKER. If it is a question of the privilege of the House, the gentleman would be.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that not a question of the privilege of the House?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman submits a resolution or a motion, the Chair will entertain it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have submitted it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE], which appear on page 1376 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, February 2, 1950, captioned "The Taft-Hartley Act," and ending with the words, "Taft-Hartley law," falsely charge the House with improper conduct, reflect upon the integrity of the House, and upon the integrity of at least two-thirds of the Members thereof: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House, That said remarks, as so indicated, be, and the same hereby are, stricken from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that if the RECORD is going to be protected against language like this it ought to be done at the time the words are uttered, the words taken down, and a motion made to strike them from the RECORD; otherwise, the House might find itself in a situation like this any day when some Member who was not on the floor at the time the words were uttered would like to open up the RECORD that had already been approved several days before.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I be heard on the point of order before the Chair rules?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Were these words uttered on the floor of the House or inserted as an extension of remarks?

Mr HOFFMAN of Michigan. They were uttered on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, there are precedents to the effect that a point of order need not necessarily be made at the time the words are uttered. I was present when the words were uttered, but I did not hear them all, sitting over on this side of the aisle.

The precedents are to the effect that the remedy of having the words taken down is not an exclusive remedy; moreover, today, when the gentleman was making practically the same charge, that the blood of those miners was upon the hands of the Members of the House, I called attention to that and asked that the words be taken down, but the ruling was against me. I have nothing left now except the matter of appeal from the ruling of the Chair, which I do not care to take. I call the Speaker's attention, however, to the fact that I have made the point, now, in both ways; that is where the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] today repeated his statement to the effect that the blood of 534 miners was upon the hands of Members who supported the Taft-Hartley Act. I asked that the words be taken down. They were. The Speaker ruled that the words were not out of order. I also call the Speaker's attention to the fact that the remarks that were in the RECORD last Thursday, keeping in mind matters of common knowledge to all the Members of the House, reflect upon a Member of the other body, a Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Before the Chair rules, may I ask that the Chair consider the last sentence of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which, if not stricken, would impute insanity to the President of the United States where it states: "Men of honest minds rejoice in the sane decision of the President not to use the infamous Taft-Hartley law," in view of the fact that he has used it within the hour? I think that the Chair should take that into consideration in making the Chair's ruling.

The SPEAKER. The Chair every day hears worse things said about the President than that, right here.

The Chair will read the rule:

If a Member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the Member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Clerk's desk and read aloud to the House; but he shall not be held to answer, nor be subject to the censure of the House therefor, if further debate or other business has intervened.

The Chair, in the interest of orderly procedure, is forced to hold that after the Journal has been read and approved and the RECORD read and approved, it would be bad practice to go back and open it up.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to cite precedents in connection with the statement I made.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Under the unanimous consent given to revise and extend my remarks and to cite precedents bearing upon the Speaker's ruling, permit me to add:

It has always been my understanding that the House had the power to protect itself from false charges which adversely reflected upon the integrity of the House.

Likewise, it has been my understanding that, when more than two-thirds of the Members of the House or, as in this case, more than two-thirds of the Members of both Houses, voted affirmatively on a question, such action was the action of the House.

It follows, therefore, that, where such action is characterized as resulting in the enactment of an, and I quote, "infamous" law—in this case, the Taft-Hartley law—and where those Members of the Congress who voted for such a law have, and again I quote, "upon their heads the blood of 534 of these, our fellow men, who went down to the collieries never to return," those charges reflect upon the integrity of the House itself.

The words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] if they mean anything at all, mean that those Members of this House, and of the other body as well, who advocated and who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act, were guilty of conduct which resulted in the death of 534 of their fellow men.

Not by the wildest stretch of the imagination can it be logically or truthfully charged that the Taft-Hartley Act was in any way responsible for the death of any miner who was killed in a mine.

I do not care to repeat the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. They will be found on page 1376 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The gentleman today repeated a similar charge from the Well of the House. When I asked that the words be taken down, and they were taken down, the

Speaker ruled that they were not out of order. The ruling stands on the record.

If the Speaker, in the exercise of his wisdom and discretion, saw fit, as he did, to permit that untrue charge to stand, that was his prerogative.

When the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] are quoted, if they are hereafter quoted, in the CIO News, or in the Communist press, and comment is made that they would not have been permitted to stand had they been out of order the responsibility will not be mine.

Nor will the responsibility rest upon me if those words are used in connection with the comment that they must have been true, otherwise the charge would not have been permitted to remain in the RECORD.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] also, in the statement hereinbefore referred to, uttered words which reflected upon the integrity, in his representative capacity, of a Member of the other body.

It has always been my understanding that it was a violation of the rules of orderly debate for a Member of this body to criticize a Member of the other body.

I am familiar with subdivisions 4 and 5 of House Rule 14, which provide a method for calling a Member to order by having his words taken down.

I am also familiar with the fact that there are precedents, although I do not have them at hand, which hold that the remedy of having the words taken down is not an exclusive one, that the matter may later be called up by introducing a privilege resolution claiming that the privilege of the House has been violated.

In this particular instance, I did that, and I also claimed personal privilege for the reason that the gentleman's words cast a reflection upon my integrity as a Member of the House, one who supported and voted for the Taft-Hartley Act.

On page 481, section 926 of the House Rules and Manual, Eighty-first Congress, will be found this statement:

Where a Member had uttered disorderly words on the floor without objection, the House yet decided that it was not precluded from action when the words, after being withheld for revision, appeared in the RECORD, and struck them out (V, 6979, 6981; VI, 582; VIII, 2538, 3463, 3472)

The House has also ordered stricken from the RECORD printed speeches condemned as unparliamentary for reflections on Members, committees of the House, the House itself (V, 7017, and the Senate (V, 5129)).

It is my contention, and I hope, if and when the Members read these remarks, they will have before them the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the words he uttered are a violation of the privilege of the House, do raise a question of the privilege of every individual Member of the House who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act. In support, I cite the following:

The following statements made by Members were held to be not in order in that they cast reflections either on the House or its membership, or its decisions. It is not in order in debate to cast reflections on either the House or its membership or its decisions whether past or present. So held when the following statements were made.

Mr. Claiborne, of Mississippi, said:

Talk not to me of vindicating your insulted dignity by the prosecution of Whitney. You have no dignity to vindicate.

Mr. Hogan, of Mississippi, said:

They have their agents here upon this floor; they have their interested stockholders here to vote upon this measure; they have their feed attorneys here to vote upon this measure and rob the people of the West of the great God-given right to navigate freely the great Mississippi River.

Where the Member pronounced opinions on decisions of the House to be damnable heresies:

I say here and now, and stand ready to make it good before the tribunal of history and the great tribunal of the American people, that the proposition pretended to be set up here of the right of the minority to stay indefinitely the right of the majority to legislate is as disgraceful, as dishonorable—

The reason why the House was not more dignified was because its Members sat here tamely, acting as the passive instruments and tools of the aspirants for the Presidency in the other body. This was the truth.

And whoever commends himself to the affections of the rebel element there commends himself equally to the affections of their rebel brethren on this floor.

See also the following:

HINDS' PRECEDENTS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, VOLUME 3

2637. The publication by a Member of alleged false and scandalous charges against the House and its Members, which he also reiterated in debate, was held to involve a question of privilege.

The House took action as to a Member who reiterated on the floor certain published charges against the House, although other business had intervened.

Instance wherein testimony taken before a committee and relating to the conduct of a Member was not reported to the House at once.

On July 29, 1892, Mr. Charles J Boatner, of Louisiana, as a matter of privilege, submitted the following resolution, and demanded immediate consideration thereof, to wit:

"Whereas on page 216 of a book purporting to have been written by Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, a Member of the House of Representatives, the following charge appears.

" 'Drunken Members have reeled about the aisles, a disgrace to the Republic Drunken speakers have debated grave issues on the floor, and in the midst of maudlin ramblings have been heard to ask: "Mr. Speaker, where was I at?" ' and

"Whereas the publication of such charges, if untrue, is a grave wrong to this body, and if true the responsibility should be placed where it belongs; and

"Whereas the said Watson has reiterated the same on the floor of the House. Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House*, That a committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker to investigate and report to the House whether such charges are true, and, if untrue, whether the said Watson has violated the privileges of the House and their recommendations relative to the same. That said committee have leave to sit during the sessions of the House, to send for persons and papers, to swear witnesses, and to compel their attendance."

Mr. Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, submitted the question of order, whether, the House having failed to take action respecting the remarks of Mr. Watson at the time he reiterated the charges on the floor of the House, and having passed to other business, it was not now too late to hold him to account therefor.

Mr. Louis E. Atkinson, of Pennsylvania, made the further point of order that the pending business before the House was a conference report, which was itself a matter of the highest privilege.

The Speaker held that the resolution submitted by Mr. Boatner presented a question of privilege, and that whenever the Speaker is of opinion that a question of privilege is involved in a proposition, he must entertain it in preference to any other business.

The Speaker also held that the pending business was the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 752, and that no conference report was pending. Both points of order were therefore overruled.

On August 8, 1892, Mr. Boatner submitted the report of the select committee authorized by the adoption of the resolution, and of which he had been made chairman.

This report stated that the committee summoned Mr. Watson and such witnesses as he indicated, and very soon the fact was developed that the charge as to drunken speakers referred to Mr. J. E Cobb, of Alabama. The committee thereupon went on and examined testimony as to Mr. Cobb, no point of order being made that the testimony implicating a Member should first be reported to the House

The committee concluded that the charge was a libel upon the membership, and recommended the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the charges made by Thomas E. Watson in his book against the House of Representatives, viz, 'that drunken Members have reeled about the aisles, a disgrace to the Republic,' and 'drunken Members have debated grave issues on the floor,' etc , are not true, and constitute an unwarranted assault upon the honor and dignity of the House, and that such publication has the unqualified disapproval of the House."

This report was made in the last hours of the session and does not appear to have been acted on

SEC 2649 A proposition to censure a Member presents a question of privilege

Early instances wherein the Speaker passed on questions presented as of privilege instead of submitting them directly to the House

On January 24, 1842, Mr. Thomas W. Gilmer, of Virginia, presented the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That in presenting for the consideration of the House a petition for the dissolution of the Union the Member from Massachusetts [Mr. Adams] has justly incurred the censure of this House "

Mr. Joseph R Underwood, of Kentucky, objected to the reception of the resolution at this time, as not within the established order of business, and consequently not now in order.

The Speaker said that he considered this a matter of privilege, and referred to a precedent that occurred in 1836, in which the gentleman from Massachusetts offered a petition from certain slaves near Fredericksburg, Va., and on which occasion a resolution was offered by a gentleman from Virginia that the gentleman be brought to the bar and censured Under this precedent the Chair did not feel at liberty to arrest the proceeding.

SEC. 2652. A charge that a Member had been holding intercourse with the foes of the Government was investigated as a question of privilege On July 15, 1861, Mr. John F. Potter, of Wisconsin, offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Committe on the Judiciary be directed to inquire whether the Honorable Henry May, a Representative in Congress from the Fourth District of the State of Maryland, has not been found holding criminal intercourse and correspondence with persons in armed rebellion against the Government of the United States, and to make a report to the House as to what action

should be taken in the premises, and that said committee have power to send for persons and papers and to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation, and that said Hon. Henry May be notified of the passage of this resolution (if practicable) before action thereon by said committee."

Mr. Henry C. Burnett, of Kentucky, made the point of order that the resolution was not in order as a question of privilege.

The Speaker submitted the question to the House, and the House decided that the resolution was in order as involving a question of privilege.

By a vote of 56 yeas to 82 nays the House refused to lay the resolution on the table. It was then agreed to.

SEC. 2653. A resolution directing an inquiry into alleged treasonable conduct on the part of a Member was admitted as a question of privilege.—On December 19, 1865, Mr. John F. Farnsworth, of Illinois, as a question of privilege, submitted the following:

"Whereas it is alleged that Benjamin G. Harris, a Representative in this House from the Fifth District of the State of Maryland, was, in the month of May last, before a very respectable and intelligent court martial tried, and by said court convicted, upon charge and specifications, to wit: 'Violative of the sixth article of war,' by giving aid and comfort to the public enemy and inciting them to continue to make war against the United States, declaring his sympathy with the enemy and his opposition to the Government of the United States in its efforts to suppress the rebellion, and

"Whereas it was proved at such trial (as is alleged) that the said Harris expressed his regret that the assassination of President Lincoln came too late to be of any use to the rebels, and at the same time declared that Jefferson Davis was a great and good man, all of which acts on the part of said Harris are inconsistent with the oath which he has taken as a Member of this House; and

"Whereas the said court martial sentenced the said Harris (among other things) to be forever disqualified to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States, which sentence was approved by the President: Therefore

"*Resolved*, That the Committee of Elections be directed to inquire into the facts of the case and that they report the same to the House, together with such action as said committee shall recommend; and in making their investigations said committee to have power to send for persons and papers."

Mr. Charles A. Eldridge, of Wisconsin, raised the question of order that no question of privilege was involved.

The Speaker held that the question raised was a question of privilege, and of the very highest kind, since it involved the right of a Member to his seat.

The resolution was then agreed to, yeas 138, nays 21.

Among other precedents which tend to show that the gentleman's remarks raised a question of privilege are 2 Hinds, section 1246; 3 Hinds, section 2628

It should be noted that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE], not satisfied with the charge he made which reflected upon the House as a whole, and the individual Members thereof, on last Thursday, today again repeated those charges. He repeated those charges after and notwithstanding the fact that the President of the United States today proceeded to invoke the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. A law which the gentleman characterized as infamous.

What the gentleman's charge now amounts to is that the President of the United States is proceeding under an infamous law—a law which the gentleman charges, inaccurately, was responsible for the death of 534 miners.

Of late, it has become the custom to criticize the Congress, to charge its individual Members and the Congress as a whole, with reprehensible conduct.

Unless the House itself takes steps to protect itself from unfounded charges by frowning upon such charges when made by its own Members, it should not complain if others vilify and smear it.

THE COUNTRY'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that beginning February 27, the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold some hearings concerning transportation matters in this country. We all recognize the importance of a strong and healthful transportation system, in both war and peace

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has sought constantly to make worth-while contributions toward keeping our transportation system great and strong. It is hoped the hearings we shall hold, to which I have referred, will enable the Transportation Subcommittee and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to have a clearer picture of current transportation problems, and thereby to be in a better position to help solve transportation problems.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the Reverend James Shera Montgomery.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

MESSRS. GREED AND SELFISHNESS COME TO WASHINGTON TO LOOK UPON A DOLLAR DINNER BASKET

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leaders of the Nation in solemn conclave assembled, are staging a dollar-a-basket dinner tonight to try to capture the imagination, if not the votes of the common "guys"—not Guy Gabrielson, however.

The national slogan has now been changed from a full dinner pail to a full basket for a dollar which shows that prices are not so bad after all.

This whole silly eating fiasco may be thoroughly understandable, if as some people claim, a goodly number of those attending are really going there to sober up and not to eat as a casual check of the wine, women, and song receipts of Washington and the other sin centers hereabouts would most probably disclose.

If many dollar-a-basket dinners are really consumed it will be by the good, liberal men and women whom the big fellows have brought along with them to do their coarse eating.

Leaving out of consideration for the moment their natural aversion to such cheap grub. I truly believe they actually do not have much appetite left to eat anyhow after five national trouncings in a row, and maybe that is what really drives them to drink and dollar-a-basket dinners, because they want the food to nauseate them too.

They claim that they are going to release a 2,000-word declaration of party policy—a platform, if you please—for 1950 and 1952, maybe. That appears to be a bit useless, or to my mind a very idle political gesture, because they already have five national platforms left over from the Hoover, Landon, Willkie, Dewey, and "Deweyer" national campaigns which have never been used at all and are really just as good as new right now.

In substantiation of this contention of course you remember that the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress, when called back into extra session by President Truman in 1948, after they had been armed with a spanking new platform, right hot from the intellectual griddle, had no real appetite whatsoever for it neither at that time nor at this session of Congress.

No, old Abe Lincoln was right, you cannot even fool the people three times let alone six times.

Beside the moral expressed by Aesop in one of his fables, is as true today as it was then, "The truth itself is not believed from one who often has deceived."

If you normal Republicans really want to get some place nationally, why do not you chase the extreme right winged reactionaries out of poor old Abe Lincoln's once liberal party and quit leaving his great spirit wailing at every crossroad throughout the Nation about how the Republican Party has double-crossed him and his ideas and ideals.

Come on, get your gumption up or both you and your gumption are going down for the last time in 1950 and not in 1952. You know you have been pretty lucky after all to be privileged to come up five times and get a sixth try. A lot of people, just get to come up the usual and customary three times.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

MAKING FOOD SURPLUSES AVAILABLE TO NEEDY PEOPLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentlewoman from California criticized the Congress for not making these foods and surpluses available to needy people. She claimed that we had refused to furnish transportation for these surplus goods.

An official of the Department of Agriculture is reported to have informed Congress that they have the authority to use funds provided under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to pay handling and transportation charges to move the surplus food to welfare agencies. Why then has not the directive of this Congress been followed? The Agricultural Act of 1949 was signed by the President on October 1, 1949. Four months have passed and to date only potatoes have been recognized by Secretary Brannan as being in surplus supply. Is it the intention of the author of that double-edged CIO-Brannan plan to wreck our agricultural legislation and force the Congress to accept his scheme because of the accumulation of surplus food stocks?

It seems strangely inconsistent for the Secretary of Agriculture to bemoan the declining farm income of our farmers, while by hoarding food stocks he forces further cuts in the farmer's income through acreage allotments and marketing controls. Also inconsistent is his policy of making it difficult for the needy to get badly needed food while he advocates and promotes lower food prices for all, at the expense of all.

Mr. Speaker, it would help solve our Nation's problems considerably if we raised instead of lowered tariffs on farm products to stop at least some of the great flood of farm products now coming into our ports, especially such as are already in surplus supply, such as corn, wheat, potatoes, and so forth.

A LOST TRIBE OF INDIANS OF NORTH CAROLINA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which in effect will recognize what might be called a lost tribe of Indians in North Carolina. The story of these Indians is both interesting and tragic.

James Alexander, who is a constituent of mine, has made a very thorough study of this problem and has written a story in reference to these Indians which I am today inserting in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Constantine Brown.

Mr. STOCKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Ernest L. Kolbe, chief forester of the Western Pine Association.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Admiral Blandy.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] be granted leave of absence this week on account of official business.

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

There was no objection.

BALLOT REFORM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I have just obtained consent to include in the RECORD two articles on a very important subject which I think will be very enlightening to the Members of this House if they can find time to read them tomorrow. They have to do with the Lodge-Gossett resolution concerning reform of the method of electing the President of the United States. The articles are by two very distinguished Princeton scholars, Professor Corbin and Mr. Lucius Wilmerding. They both advocate election of electors in the same mode as Members of the Congress. I introduced a resolution for such purpose as an alternative to the Lodge-Gossett resolution several months ago providing for the election of electors in the congressional districts and two at large for each State. This was the system contemplated by the framers of the Constitution, and was in effect for some years. In my opinion the Lodge-Gossett resolution, while appealing in theory, may be appalling in fact. It may be the decisive step in establishment of a one-party Government in the United States.

I intend to offer my resolution as a substitute for the Lodge resolution.

SURPLUS COMMODITIES

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

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

There was no objection

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the prompt consideration and support of the bill to make available to the school-lunch program and welfare agencies the surplus foods now owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Those whom we are seeking to help are our own people—deserving Americans. They particularly need our help at this time. The continuing inflationary policies of the administration have materially reduced the purchasing power of the dollar. No group has been as seriously affected as those who must look to the few dollars granted them in the form of welfare assistance. It is far better, and in keeping with the best traditions of this country to help those who really need it, than to promise a lower grocery bill to everyone.

In the newspapers over the week end, I have noted that some officials of the Department of Agriculture have promised that other food commodities, dried eggs and dried milk may be added to surplus potatoes and will be made available to welfare agencies Here again is another example of ineffective administration in a clumsy piecemeal attempt to solve a serious set of problems.

COMMUNISM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the morning press stated that our intelligence corps expects the Reds to attempt to seize Berlin in May. We might have anticipated that. We tucked our tails and ran in China. The statements of our State Department are such that the Kremlin may well anticipate that this great and powerful Nation will tuck its tail and run again before Red puppets elsewhere.

SURPLUS COMMODITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let us get this surplus food

proposition straightened out. My observation has been that many departments of the Government can find a law to do most anything they want when they wish to do it, and they cannot find any authority when they do not wish to do it.

In the conference on the agricultural bill, the amendment was put in there so that these surplus foods could be distributed to the needy through the welfare organizations. That is what is in the law at the present time. Technicalities of trying to get around it on the basis that we have to wait until the products are in danger of spoiling before we can get rid of them have been the order of the day.

I happen to know that our distinguished colleague from Maryland, as a result of what is happening down in Cumberland, Md., has for several weeks been trying to get some of those surplus foods for the people in that particular town. Mr. Frank Edwards on the radio has called attention to it several times. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] has introduced a bill [H. R. 7125] to that effect. It is hoped that hearings on this bill will be held shortly, and if the law is not clear it can be changed in conformity to the wishes of the Congress.

INTERNATIONAL INSPECTION OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACTIVITIES

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in order to repeat here certain remarks which I made to the press on February 4, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on February 4 I made the following remarks to the press:

It should be quite clear now that Russia already has "international inspection" of atomic energy activities. Her agents and the democracies' traitors roam the United States and Britain almost at will.

Therefore, the only reason Russia could have for giving us the right freely to inspect Soviet territory and the atomic energy installations there would be to avoid an atomic war and assure world peace.

If that be true, then it would appear either that the Politburo may fear the internal consequences of free inspection more than it fears atomic war, or it is confident of its ultimate conquest of the rest of the world at all events. Add the fact that Marxian dogma dictates that peace can exist only in a totally Marxian world, and reach your own conclusions.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement passed by the Republican conference this morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Andrews	Hale	O'Brien, Mich.
Bailey	Hand	Passman
Baring	Harden	Patman
Barrett, Wyo.	Heffernan	Patterson
Bland	Heller	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Boggs, Del.	Herlong	Potter
Bolton, Ohio	Herter	Powell
Brown, Ga.	Hobbs	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley, N. Y.	Howell	Ribicoff
Bulwinkle	Jennings	Richards
Byrne, N. Y.	Kearns	Rivers
Camp	Kelly, N. Y.	Sabath
Celler	Kennedy	Sadowski
Chatham	Keogh	Scott, Hardie
Chiperfield	Kirwan	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Chudoff	Klein	Secrest
Davenport	Kunkel	Smathers
Davies, N. Y.	Lane	Smith, Ohio
Dawson	Larcade	Taylor
Dollinger	Lichtenwalter	Teague
Dolliver	Lyle	Towe
Doughton	McDonough	Wadsworth
Durham	McGrath	Whitaker
Elliott	Madden	White, Calif.
Fellows	Miller, Md.	White, Idaho
Furcolo	Monroney	Whittington
Gamble	Morgan	Wilson, Ind.
Gary	Murphy	Withrow
Gilmer	Nelson	
Granahan	Nixon	
Granger	Norblad	
Green	Norton	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 339 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to address the House today for 20 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, concerning one of the articles I received permission to insert in the RECORD today, the Government Printing Office advises me that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $229.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PROVIDE FOR RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2988) to provide for a Resident Commissioner from the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

BENEFITS OF ANNUITANTS WHO RETIRED PRIOR TO APRIL 1, 1948

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4295) to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been on the Consent Calendar since June 1949. It appears to be a very meritorious bill and one that I believe should pass the House, and would pass the House if a rule were granted. However, it calls for an expenditure of about $27,000,000. The rules of the Consent Calendar Committee are that no bill that calls for more than $1,000,000 should be passed by unanimous consent. I am advised that the chairman of that committee is seeking a rule from the Committee on Rules. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

OPERATION OF A MUSEUM AT KLUKWAN, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2012) to authorize the erection and operation of a museum at Klukwan, Alaska.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PROTECT PUBLIC WITH RESPECT TO PRACTITIONERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4446) to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will withhold that for a moment.

Mr. GROSS. No.

Mr. WALTER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

FORT LOGAN, COLO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4548) to provide for the utilization as a national cemetery of surplus Army Department-owned military real property at Fort Logan, Colo.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PUBLIC AIRPORTS SERVING NATIONAL PARKS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1283) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports in, or in close proximity to, national parks, monuments, and recreation areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL LABOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5557) to provide for coordination of arrangements for the employment of agricultural workers, admitted for temporary agricultural employment from foreign countries in the Western Hemisphere, to assure that the migration of such workers will be limited to the minimum numbers required to meet domestic labor shortages, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARSHALL. I object, Mr. Speaker.

NATIONAL FORESTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2419) relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I object, Mr. Speaker.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5965) to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN PARTS OF ALASKA BY WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4424) to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

GRANTS FOR MINOR PROJECTS AT MAJOR AIRPORTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1282) to authorize grants under the Federal Airport Act for minor projects at major airports, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., that section 8 of the Federal Airport Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. At least 2 months prior to the close of each fiscal year, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress a request for authority to make grants, during the two fiscal years immediately following the fiscal year in which such request is submitted to the Congress, for those of the projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports included in the current revision of the national airport plan which, in his opinion, should be undertaken during that period, and for which grants have not previously been authorized as provided herein, together with an estimate of the Federal funds required to pay the United States share of the allowable project costs of such development: *Provided*, That a grant or grants of funds for the development of any class 4 or larger airports, in a total amount not in excess of $50,000 during any fiscal year, may be made without prior submission of a request for and grant of authority pursuant to this section. In determining what development to include in such a request, the Administrator shall consider, among other things, the relative aeronautical need for an urgency of all such development included in the plan and the likelihood of securing satisfactory sponsorship of projects for the accomplishment of such airport development. Any subsequent appropriation of funds pursuant to section 5 of this act shall be deemed to grant the authority requested, unless a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress by law or by concurrent resolution. No grant of funds in excess of $50,000 in any one fiscal year for development of any class 4 or larger airport shall be made unless authorized as provided herein."

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

ALASKA AIRPORTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2436) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska."

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

TRAINING OF VETERANS UNDER READJUSTMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a rule has been granted on this bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOE GRAHAM POST NO. 119, AMERICAN LEGION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R 33) to authorize Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the lands conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act providing for the sale to Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, of the lands lying within the Ship Island Military Reservation in the State of Mississippi," approved June 15, 1933 (48 Stat. 150), is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Such corporation is authorized to lease all or part of such lands for mineral (including oil and gas) development notwithstanding such conditions: *Provided*, That the money received under any such lease shall be used by the corporation for the maintenance of the reservation as a national recreational park."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after "at the end", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "of the sentence ending with the words 'United Daughters of the Confederacy for the sole use of that organization and the erection and maintenance of a memorial to veterans of the Civil War', the following: 'Notwithstanding such conditions such corporation is authorized to lease any part of such lands for mineral (including oil and gas) development, except those areas actually planned for development as memorial and recreational sites: *Provided*, That all that portion of land lying west of the west line of the lighthouse property shall be excluded from the leasing authority herein provided: *Provided further*, That the money received under such lease shall be used by the corporation for the maintenance and development of the reservation as a national recreational park, and for no other purpose: *And provided further*, That any leases entered into pursuant to the foregoing authority shall reserve to the United States all source materials essential to the production of fissionable material in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order No. 9908, dated December 5, 1947.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

FORT LEWIS MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5101) to provide for the transfer to Pierce County, Wash., of certain surplus land in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to donate and convey, by quitclaim deed, to Pierce County, Wash., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to two triangular parcels of land, which are surplus to the needs of the armed forces, in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation, Wash., more particularly described as follows:

(1) All of that triangular parcel of original Fort Lewis comprising a part of section 14, township 18 north, range 3 east, Willamette meridian, and situated northeasterly of State Highway No. 5 (Mountain Road); and

(2) That triangular portion of section 19, township 19 north, range 3 east, Willamette meridian, situated northeasterly of the Military Road, being a part of original Fort Lewis.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Conveyance of land described in section 1 shall not be made until appropriate action has been taken by the State of Washington and Pierce County, Washington, to the end that such conveyance shall not jeopardize, in any way, the title of the United States in and to the remainder of the land donated by Pierce County, Washington, to the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5503) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to release and quitclaim a portion of a right-of-way easement to Langley Air Force Base, Va.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to release and quitclaim to the Commonwealth of Virginia, subject to such conditions as are deemed advisable by him, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the westerly 43 feet of an easement 70 feet in width and approximately three-quarters of a mile in length, together with the road located thereon, situate in Elizabeth City County, Virginia, between the southwest prong of Back River and the Little Back River Road, said easement being that set out on sheet numbered 2 of a map entitled "Langley Air Force Base, Railway and Access Road" dated February 5, 1948. Drawing No. NAD 49, on file in the office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army.

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

PROCEDURE FOR CLAIMANTS OF MINING CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6406) providing procedure for claimants of mining claims in the United States obtaining credit for assessment work performed during the year ending July 1, 1949, under the provisions of Public Law 107, Eighty-first Congress.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That every claimant of a mining claim in the United States who wishes to obtain the benefits conferred by the second proviso to the first section of the act of June 17, 1949 (Public Law 107, 81st Cong.), may file, or cause to be filed, in the office where the location notice or certificate is recorded, on or before 12 o'clock meridian on the 1st day of July 1950, a statement of the labor performed or improvements made on any such mining claim during the year ending July 1, 1949, or such statement may be included as part of the annual notice of the performance of assessment work for the year ending at 12 o'clock meridian on the 1st day of July 1950.

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

TERMINATING LUMP-SUM BENEFITS TO CERTAIN RESERVE OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5921) to terminate lump-sum benefits provided by law to certain Reserve officers of the Navy and Air Force.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question of some member of the committee. Am I right in my interpretation of this bill that it intends doing away with all lump-sum payments for those who entered into naval aviation?

Mr. KILDAY. It would repeal the provision now in the law, but suspended, under which those in naval aviation and the Air Force who hold Reserve commissions are entitled to a lump-sum payment of $500 for each year completed of active duty. No Reserve officers are now accruing this benefit at this time because it is suspended by the Selective Service Act. If the Selective Service Act is not to be extended, then of course the members of the Reserve would begin to accrue the $500 lump sum. It is the opinion that it is no longer necessary as an inducement. Many Reserve officers who were slated for relief from active duty were desirous of remaining and we feel it is the proper time to eliminate this lump-sum payment.

Mr. FORD. May I say to the gentleman from Texas I agree with the objective of this proposal. I would like to make certain, however, that those who stayed in naval aviation after the war and who have not as yet collected their lump-sum payments under the original act will be taken care of. I would not like to see any unfair discrimination.

Mr. KILDAY. It is not intended that they would be able to accumulate anything in addition. All sums accumulated before the suspension will be paid. In 1942 in naval aviation, by Executive order, the lump-sum payment was suspended, and then in 1948 it was suspended under the Selective Service Act as to both services. The maximum to be collected is $500 a year for 7 years.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That no further credit shall be allowed for any period of active service performed after June 24, 1948, in computing lump-sum payments to Air Force Reserve officers or their beneficiaries, under section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1524), as amended, nor to Reserve officers of the Navy or Marine Corps or to their beneficiaries, under section 12 of the act of August 4, 1942 (56 Stat. 738), as amended.

SEC. 2. This act shall not be construed so as to deprive any individual of any benefits heretofore accrued under the acts cited in section 1 of this act, including the prorating of payments thereunder for additional fractional parts of years of active service as provided for by section 13 (c) of the act of June 24, 1948 (Public Law 759, Eightieth Congress): *Provided*, That hereafter the release of an officer from active duty shall not be construed as a release from active duty upon his own request within the meaning of section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936, supra, as amended or section 12 of the act of August 4, 1942, supra, as amended.

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

PROVIDING A CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4499) to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING A SINGLE SUPPLY CATALOG SYSTEM

The Clerk called House Concurrent Resolution 97, to provide for a single supply catalog system.

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

Whereas the Congress believes that the development of a single supply catalog system for the National Military Establishment is of vital necessity to the national security and to the civilian economy; and

Whereas the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recommends that a declaration of congressional policy be made to insure the development of uniform property identification; and

Whereas the Federal Supply Task Force of that Commission, among other recommendations, stated that action by the Secretary of Defense should be taken to see that a single supply catalog system shall be speedily prepared and adopted; that, after its preparation, it must be used in all supply operations of all bureaus, technical services, and commands without modification; and that each bureau, technical service, and command must assist in the preparation of the catalog system by accepting and promptly completing catalog "assignments" by the Catalog Agency in whatever commodity classes it is made the cognizant body; and

Whereas a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee has carried on extensive hearings on this subject: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) The Secretary of Defense shall expedite the development and completion of the single supply catalog system, in order that there shall be published and put into use at the earliest practicable moment a single supply catalog system to be used by all departments of the National Military Establishment; and

(2) In order that these purposes may be achieved it is deemed essential that such authority be vested in qualified personnel of the National Military Establishment with respect to cataloging and related supply activities as is needed to insure the establishment of programs and priority schedules for property identification and description work, and to insure that operations in each bureau, technical service, or command are carried on in accordance with established uniform policies and approved priority schedules, and to provide the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget with periodic reports showing the progress of the program as a whole as well a the progress made by each bureau, technical service, or command with the assignments made to it; and

(3) In the single supply catalog system each property item shall have but one name and one description and one item identification number; and

(4) The single supply catalog system shall provide a classification system or systems suitable for all supply purposes; and

(5) The single supply catalog system shall identify, classify, and describe the millions of items of personal property used by all military agencies and will provide a standard reference language or terminology to be used by all persons engaged in the processes of supply (computation of requirements in relation to inventories and operating programs, procurement, storage, disposal, budgeting and accounting); and

(6) Reports and records of military agencies concerning supply operations and property management, including production, export, import, procurement, distribution, utilization, and disposal of commodities shall be made in terms of the nomenclature of the single supply catalog system, and

(7) In order to prevent duplication of functions, of responsibility, and of publication costs, each item of supply or descriptive title for an article or closely related family of articles serving the same supply need shall be assigned to a single technical service, bureau, or command for the development of complete identification data for items assigned to it and for development of the material thereon for inclusion in the supply catalog system in accordance with the uniform single supply catalog system; and

(8) The Secretary of Defense shall develop a coordinated publication plan, which will insure that identification and description data, wherever developed, shall be published in a uniform manner, but each technical service, bureau or command shall utilize pertinent uniform identification or description material for inclusion in its own operating catalogs, unit publications, or technical handbooks.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out the whereas clauses, and all after the enacting clause down to and including line 11 on page 4, and insert

"Whereas the Congress believes that the development of a single supply catalog system for all agencies of the Federal Government, both civilian and military, is of vital necessity to the national security and to the civilian economy; and

"Whereas the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recommends that a declaration of congressional policy be made to insure participation and cooperation of the military and civilian agencies in the development of uniform property identification; and

"Whereas the Federal Supply Task Force of that Commission, among other recommendations, stated that 'the interests of national defense and effective personal property management demand that a single standard Federal Commodity Catalog be developed * * *' and that action by the Secretary of Defense should be taken to insure that, after its preparation, it is used in all supply operations of all bureaus, technical services, and commands without modification and that each bureau, technical service, and command must assist in the preparation of the catalog system by accepting and promptly completing cataloging assignments made to it by competent authority; and

"Whereas a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee has carried on extensive hearings on this subject: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

"(1) The Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of General Services shall, based on their respective responsibilities, expedite the development of a coordinated plan looking to the completion of the Federal Catalog System in order that there shall be published and put into use at the earliest practicable moment a single supply catalog system to be used by all departments of the National Military Establishment and by all civil agencies, and

"(2) In order that these purposes may be achieved, it is deemed essential that such authority be vested in qualified personnel of the National Military Establishment and the General Services Administration with respect to cataloging and related supply activities as is needed to insure the establishment of programs and priority schedules for property identification and description work, and to insure that cataloging operations in each bureau, technical service, command, or civilian agency are carried on in accordance with established uniform policies and approved priority schedules, and to provide the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget with periodic reports showing the progress of the program as a whole as well as the progress made by each bureau, technical service, or command with the assignments made to it; and

"(3) In the Federal Catalog System each property item shall have but one name and one description and one item identification number, and

"(4) The Federal Catalog System shall provide a classification system or systems suitable for all supply purposes, and

"(5) The Federal Catalog System shall identify, classify, and describe the millions of items of personal property used by all agencies and will provide a standard reference language or terminology to be used by all persons engaged in the process of supply (computation of requirements in relation to inventories and operating programs, procurement, distribution, storage, disposal, budgeting, and accounting); and

"(6) Reports and records of Federal agencies concerning supply operations and property management, including production, export, import, procurement, distribution, utilization, and disposal of commodities shall be made in terms of the nomenclature of the Federal Catalog System; and

"(7) In order to prevent duplication of functions, cataloging tasks will be assigned to technical services, bureaus, commands, and civilian agencies by a central cataloging authority. Effectuation of the purposes of this resolution will require that each technical service, bureau, command, and civilian agency accept and promptly complete cataloging task assignments. In discharging its responsibility under the program, each technical service, bureau, command, or civilian agency shall consult with other interested services, bureaus, commands, or agencies as it deems appropriate or as directed by central authority, and

"(8) The Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of General Services shall develop a coordinated publication plan which will insure that identification and description data, wherever developed, shall be published in a uniform manner; but each technical service, bureau, command, or civilian agency shall utilize pertinent uniform identification or description material for inclusion in its own catalogs, unit publications, or technical handbooks."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING LIMITING PARTICIPATION UNDER NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1941) to provide for limiting participation as beneficiary under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will some Member explain the objections which were apparently raised by the Veterans' Administration to this legislation?

As I understand it they advised that it would create some considerable difficulty so far as the administration of the provisions is concerned and that there would also be a considerable expense in administration. Can the gentleman explain that situation?

Mr. RANKIN. This bill was introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. It excludes from the definition of the terms "parent," "father," and "mother," in the National Service Life Insurance Act, any parent who shall have abandoned or deserted his family for a period of 7 years and who shall remain in such desertion at the time the insurance matured.

An identical bill to this one was passed in the Eightieth Congress. There will be no additional cost. It applies only to insurance which matured prior to August 1, 1946.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Would the gentleman explain whether the veteran himself would have an opportunity to change the beneficiaries, for instance, if he had been abandoned? That would be his right to do that, would it not? This would take care of the situation where he did not take action; is that not correct?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Sometimes the veteran does not realize his rights. He should be protected. I think this gives more protection to the veteran.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In other words it is your feeling and the feeling of the committee that notwithstanding the possibility of greater administrative difficulties the rights of the veteran himself really require that this be done.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, we should protect the veterans, also. That is the reason we passed the legislation for the veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. And it was passed out of the committee unanimously.

Mr. TEAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. There are many cases where the veteran did not have a chance to change his insurance.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, I will withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 601 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended effective as of October 8, 1940, to read as follows:

"(f) The terms 'parent,' 'father,' and 'mother' include a father, mother, father through adoption, mother through adoption, persons who have stood in loco parentis to a member of the military or naval forces at any time prior to entry into active service for a period of not less than 1 year, and a stepparent, if designated as beneficiary by the insured: *Provided*, That if either parent shall have abandoned his or her family for seven or more years, and shall have remained in abandonment as of the date on which national service life insurance matured by reason of the death of his or her child, such person shall not be considered as the 'parent,' 'father,' or 'mother' of such child and shall not be entitled to participate in such insurance."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this act to section 601 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, shall not be construed (1) to require the discontinuance of any insurance award, for any period prior to the receipt in the Veterans' Administration of evidence of such abandonment, or (2) require duplicate payments of benefits in any case.

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

AMENDING SECTION 3 OF THE ORGANIC ACT OF PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5282) to amend section 3 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting in the first proviso after the word "Ponce" a comma and the word "Arecibo."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "word 'Arecibo'" and insert "words 'Arecibo, Rio Piedras'."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

TO CORRECT A CLERICAL ERROR IN CIVIL-SERVICE LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R 6552) to correct a clerical error in section 2 of the act of January 16, 1883, an act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, as amended by Public Law 425, Eighty-first Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of the third paragraph of the second clause of section 2 of the act of January 16, 1883, entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the words "legal voting residence" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "legal or voting residence."

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

MINIMUM RATE OF COMPENSATION FOR WORLD WAR II VETERANS WHO HAVE ARRESTED TUBERCULOSIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6559) to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide a minimum rate of compensation for World War II veterans who have arrested tuberculosis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will not do that. This merely puts World War II veterans on the same footing as World War veterans who have contracted tuberculosis. It is most necessary that these tuberculosis cases be provided for, not only for themselves but also to enable them to protect the public against the spread of tuberculosis. I hope the gentleman will not object to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. FORD. Was this a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it was.

Mr. FORD. I notice the Bureau of the Budget advises the enactment of this bill would not be in accord with the President's program.

Mr. RANKIN. I doubt if the President ever saw the bill, and I have some doubts whether the Bureau of the Budget ever saw it or not. But whether the Bureau of the Budget likes it or not, it is our duty to take care of these tuberculosis cases and protect the country against the spread of tuberculosis as much as possible. That is what this bill does. It merely puts these World War II tubercular men on the same footing as veterans of World War I.

Mr. FORD. I notice that for the first year the additional cost is estimated to be $475,000. Is there going to be an increased cost every year?

Mr. RANKIN. I doubt it. My opinion is that there will not be. In addition, it will probably save many times that much to the American people.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Could the chairman of the committee tell us what the President's program is in that regard?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is very difficult for these tubercular men to secure jobs. If an employer knows they have tuberculosis they will not employ them. Also, this will take a great many men off the relief rolls, if the legislation is passed.

Mr. RANKIN. Just the other day I saw a person whom I know who had tuberculosis. And one of his children contracted tuberculosis because of its contact with him. This bill enables those men not only to live but to protect the public against the spread of tuberculosis insofar as they are able to do so. I think it is not only legitimate and just, but I think it is absolutely necessary.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Were these cases of tuberculosis contracted after termination of the service?

Mr. RANKIN. No. They are service-connected cases, but they have become arrested. If they have to go out and do heavy work, the chances are it will recur. This bill has a great deal of merit insofar as it protects the people of the country from a recurrence and spread of tuberculosis.

Mr. JUDD. But the point is that the disease was contracted while they were in the service.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. Even though it was peacetime service.

Mr. RANKIN. Peacetime service gives them 80 percent of the rate. That is in the law; that is already the law.

Mr. FORD. This affects only service-connected tuberculosis cases, is that correct?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. FORD. In the light of the gentleman's statement, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new subparagraph (q) thereto to read as follows:

"(q) If the disabled person is shown to have had a service-incurred disability resulting from an active tuberculous disease, which disease in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has reached a condition of complete arrest, the monthly compensation shall be not less than $60."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective from the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this act.

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

EXTENDING CERTAIN VETERANS' BENEFITS TO HUSBANDS AND WIDOWERS OF FEMALE VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6561) to extend certain veterans' benefits to or on behalf of dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not object. This is very necessary if we are going to treat those women who were taken into the service on an equality with the men with whom they served.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, this is too far reaching, extending to widowers and husbands benefits under this law. Until we ascertain the cost, I object.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS REGULATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6562) to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for the loss or loss of the use of a creative organ.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to, this is an extremely meritorious bill; it is one that should be passed, and I believe every Member of the House will vote for it. It would, however, call for an expenditure the first year of about $8,500,000. The rules of the Committee of Objectors on the Consent Calendar require that any bill involving the expenditure of more than a million dollars may not be passed by unanimous consent. I am wondering if the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, would not be able to get a rule on this measure or ask that it be called up under a suspension of the rules at the close of the call of the calendar today.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that the million-dollar-limitation rule is, long since, extinct by reason of the failure of Congress to comply with it. I think it should not be called into operation in this instance. I believe these are meritorious cases.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi; it is an extremely meritorious bill, but my question was whether he could not secure recognition to call it up under a suspension of the rules this afternoon so as not to violate the rule of the Committee of Objectors.

Mr. RANKIN. I see the Speaker shake his head, which indicates the negative.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announced last week that there would be no suspensions recognized today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Would the gentleman not be able to secure a rule from the Committee on Rules?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman will remember that the House virtually abolished the Committee on Rules the other day. Where would I go? This is about the only chance we have to get this bill up.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING TITLE III OF THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, TO PROVIDE FOR TREBLE-DAMAGE ACTIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6673) to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by providing for treble-damage actions.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the Committee on Veterans' Affairs a question regarding this bill. I notice that it will provide that if a piece of property is sold to a veteran—I assume a GI of World War II—for any amount of money in excess of the value fixed for the property by an authorized appraiser of the Veterans' Administration, then the seller would be liable treble damages in a suit. I can see the purpose that the committee had in mind recommending such a bill—to prevent the sale to veterans of properties in excess of their actual value. The passage of the bill, however, would make the appraisers of the Veterans' Administration the arbiters or the sole judges of the value of the property, and if they fail to appraise it at an amount near the market value or actual value in the respective community, it would work as a detriment to the GI and make it impossible for him in many instances to secure any loan whatever.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that I introduced this bill, as he will see by looking at it, at the request of the Department of Justice. I understand that these appraisers will be local men and not be employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The appraiser appraises for loan purposes rather than for sale purposes, and it might not work to the best interest of the veteran in many cases in being able to take advantage of the loan title of the GI bill of rights. I fear it will make it impossible for him to purchase a property at all in many instances.

Mr. RANKIN. He only appraises the sale value of the property

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No. He appraises a big part of it for loan purposes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to support my chairman on this bill. It is a very meritorious piece of legislation and has the unanimous approval of the Department of Justice and the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman feel that the interest of the veteran will not be interfered with by the passage of this bill?

Mr. EVINS. No; I do not think so. On the contrary, I think the interest of the veteran will be protected.

Mr. RANKIN. Whenever the Department of Justice, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Veterans' Administration get together on anything, you need not have any fears

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the length of the statute of limitations?

Mr. RANKIN. I think it is 3 years. At least, that is my recollection.

Mr. FORD. I do not see anything in the bill about that.

Mr. RANKIN. The regular statute of limitations in the State would apply.

Mr. FORD. For any civil action?

Mr. RANKIN. It would not be retroactive.

Mr. FORD. Does the gentleman from Tennessee know about that?

Mr. EVINS. The statute of the State applies. There have been many cases in which real-estate operators have charged an excessive price to veterans to purchase homes. The purpose of this bill is to prevent that underhanded practice. It is left to the Department of Justice to determine whether or not the case shall be prosecuted through the office of the district attorney. There is no cost attached to this legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would this be retroactive in any way?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 503 the following new section:

"RECOVERY OF DAMAGES

"SEC. 503A. Whoever knowingly makes, effects, or participates in a sale of any property to a veteran for a consideration in excess of the reasonable value of such property as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator, shall, if the veteran pays for such property in whole or in part with the proceeds of a loan guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration under sections 501, 502, or 503 of this title, be liable for three times the amount of such excess consideration irrespective of whether such person has received any part thereof.

"Actions pursuant to the provisions of this section may be instituted by the veteran concerned, in any United States district court, which court may, as a part of any judgment award costs and reasonable attorneys' fees to the successful party. In the event the veteran shall fail to institute any action hereunder within 30 days after discovering he has overpaid, or having instituted an action shall fail diligently to prosecute the same, or upon request by the veteran, the Attorney General, in the name of the Government of the United States, may proceed therewith, in which event one-third of any recovery in said action shall be paid over to the veteran and two-thirds thereof shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

"The remedy provided in this section shall be in addition to any and all other penalties imposed by law."

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

AMENDMENT TO TITLE III OF THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6553) to provide for the promotion of carriers in the rural delivery service in recognition of longevity of service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the chairman of the committee can advise us as to the difference in the cost estimates here? I understand the committee does not feel the cost will be as much as that set forth by the Department; is that correct? What would be the cost of this bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I think the Post Office Department has stated the cost of this legislation correctly. Let me say that this is a bill to clarify subsection (e) of section 2 of Public Law 428 passed by the Congress and signed by the President on October 28, 1949. In that bill Congress gave its approval to this section, which reads as follows:

Each officer or employee in the postal field service shall have credited to him for purposes of promotion to any of the meritorious or longevity higher grades of his position

established under this act or such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, all periods of service performed by him prior to July 1, 1945, for which he has not heretofore received credit for purposes of promotion.

It was clearly the intent of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the intent of the Congress when that legislation was passed to provide that all postal employees shall have credit for all past service as employees performed before July 1, 1945. The report on the bill included this additional cost. The Comptroller General held after this bill became law that because the rural carriers did not have any automatic annual raises prior to July 1, 1945, they should only receive credit for service from July 1, 1945, on their longevity or meritorious grades. Congress intended unquestionably to give the rural carriers credit for all their service. This does not call for an additional appropriation. We passed the bill with this understanding and included the cost of the legislation in the report on this bill at that time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In other words it is the position of the chairman that this bill is really a clarifying bill to correct an oversight

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Exactly.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In reality, when Public Law 428 was before the Congress, it was intended that the purpose of this bill was included in that legislation, is that right?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Exactly so This bill merely clarifies and spells out the express intent that Congress had in passing Public Law 428 last October.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Would the gentleman at this time also tell us whether there is the same situation in connection with Calendar 436, H. R. 6603, which is coming up in just a few minutes? Does the same situation exist there?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is practically the same situation. However, there is this difference. That bill refers to custodial employees and those in the mail equipment shops. In October 1933, the President, by Executive order, transferred all custodial employees from the Treasury Department to the Post Office Department. They became, by Executive order, regular employees of the Postal Service. However, Congress did not pass legislation carrying out this Executive order until October 1943. Therefore the Comptroller General held that because Congress did not make these custodial employees by law regular employees until July 1, 1943, they should receive no credit before July 1, 1943 for such service on their longevity credits.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I notice that the department has registered somewhat of an objection to both of these bills on the basis that other employees are also involved in a similar situation to that which exists so far as rural carriers and custodial employees are concerned, and they say it would seem that any legislation should cover all employees similarly affected and not a single group or class. What other class now will still need consideration?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Consideration should be given to special delivery messengers and to some third class post office clerks. However, there is no unanimity of opinion as to how that legislation should read, and your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service thinks it best to handle these two bills separately.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I understand that the committee is working on legislation affecting those other categories.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman a question. Is it the intention of the committee to report out legislation taking care of some of these other groups, such as special delivery messengers, and so forth?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct. We have some bills pending already to take care of other groups.

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman say that special delivery messengers will be taken care of in this session?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I think consideration will be given to them.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. Those matters are under consideration before the committee. It is a question of what the committee may do.

Mr. FORD. Surely, but committee action will be taken, will it?

Mr. REES. It will be considered. But, the gentleman cannot bind the committee as to what it may report or not report.

Mr. FORD. No, but if there is not going to be any promise of action by the committee on these other categories, there is some argument for not permitting this to go through.

Mr. REES. Well, as I see it, and I am a minority Member, the committee will promise to give consideration to those matters. After all, it is for the committee to determine what it wants.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I assure the gentleman from Michigan that all these other groups will receive consideration at the hands of our committee. There will be some question about some of those groups, and we want to present satisfactory legislation to the House for consideration.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, my understanding is that there is an all-inclusive bill which has been introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and we are awaiting reports from the various departments before action is taken on it.

Mr. FORD. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide additional compensation and other benefits for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service," approved October 28, 1949, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) In recognition of longevity of service, carriers in the Rural Delivery Service who (1) were in such service on June 30, 1945, or (2) are in grade 11 or above on or after the effective date of this subsection shall be promoted to grade 12 upon completion of 13 years of service; to grade 13 upon completion of 18 years of service; and to grade 14 upon completion of 25 years of service. The provisions of section 17 (a) of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, relating to the promotion of carriers in the Rural Delivery Service to grades 12, 13, and 14 shall hereafter apply only to such carriers who are in grade 11 or above on the effective date of this subsection and who elect to have such provisions apply to them.

"(e) For the purposes of subsections (c) and (d), all service heretofore or hereafter rendered in the postal field service by any person entitled to the benefits of either of such subsections shall be credited."

(b) The last sentence of subsection (c) of the first section of such act of October 28, 1949, is hereby repealed.

SEC 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act to such act of October 28, 1949, shall take effect as of November 1, 1949.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "subsections" and insert in lieu thereof the word "subsection."

(b) Page 2, strike out lines 9 to 15, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "to have such provisions apply to them. For the purposes of this subsection, all continuous service heretofore or hereafter rendered in the postal field service by any carrier entitled to the benefits of this subsection shall be credited."

(c) Page 2, strike out lines 16 to 18, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC 2 The amendment made by the first section of this act to such act of October 28, 1949, shall take effect as of November 1, 1949, and shall apply only to carriers in the Rural Delivery Service on or after the date of enactment of this act."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

AMENDING IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917 AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4634) to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WALTER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we have this bill explained?

Mr. WALTER. Under the provisions of existing law, the Attorney General is empowered to adjust the status of aliens in this country and to stay the deportation in certain hardship cases. Under the proposed legislation, 5 years is set up as the period during which the Attorney General may, upon receiving additional information, proceed with the deportation of certain aliens whose deportation

is stayed. This gives the Attorney General five more years within which to proceed against certain types of aliens.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I wish the gentleman would let it go over. I should like to study this bill. I am concerned with the implications in giving the Attorney General this power.

Mr. WALTER. We have given to the Attorney General the power to stay the deportation of certain aliens.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is right.

Mr. WALTER. It has been learned that, since their deportations have been stayed, in some cases after acquired evidence has been made available in view of which, if it had been called to the attention of the Attorney General, he would not have stayed the deportation. This merely gives him 5 years within which to proceed with deportations which ordinarily would have taken place but for the law that this seeks to amend.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman let it go over?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice

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

There was no objection.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6603) to provide that certain service performed in the custodial service and in the mail-equipment shops of the Post Office Department shall be credited toward promotion to the meritorious and longevity grades established for the postal field service.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That service performed (1) in the custodial service of the Post Office Department on and after October 1, 1933, and before October 18, 1943, and (2) in the mail-equipment shops of the Post Office Department before July 1, 1945, shall be considered postal field service for purposes of promotion to the meritorious and longevity grades established under the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), and under the act of October 28, 1949 (Public Law 428, 81st Cong.)

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect as of November 1, 1949.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "1949" and insert "1949, and shall apply only to persons in the postal field service on the date of enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

NAVAL RESERVE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6077) to clarify the status of inactive members of the Naval Reserve relating to the holding of offices of trust or profit under the Government of the United States.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1176), as amended (34 U. S. C. 853b), is hereby amended further by substituting a comma for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "and the Congress hereby grants its consent to officers and enlisted members of the Naval Reserve, while not on active duty, except those entitled to receive retainer pay or retired pay under any provision of law, to accept, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy or such officer as he may designate, civil employment with, and compensation therefor from, any foreign government or any concern which is controlled in whole or in part by a foreign government."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "entitled to receive" and insert "in receipt of any."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

RETIRED NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1151) to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 310 of the laws of the Sixty-ninth Congress, Public Law 713 of March 3, 1927 (title 10, 604a U. S. C.), is hereby amended by adding two new sections at the end thereof as follows.

SEC. 2. Noncommissioned officers on the retired list of the Regular Army placed in second grade; all other sergeants (first class) retired as such and all other sergeants (first class) who were changed to staff sergeants by the act of June 4, 1920, and who continued as such or who continued as staff sergeants or who became technical sergeants until retirement in either the second grade or the third grade before July 1, 1922.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the first of the month following the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That chapter 310 of the laws of the Sixty-ninth Congress, Public Law 713 of March 3, 1927 (title 10, 604a U. S. C.), is hereby amended by adding thereto the following:

"'SEC. 2. The following noncommissioned officers on the retired list of the Regular Army are placed in the second grade (now sixth pay grade under Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress). All other sergeants (first class) retired as such and all other sergeants (first class) who were changed to staff sergeants pursuant to the act of June 4, 1920, and who continued as such or who continued as staff sergeants or who became technical sergeants until retirement in either the second grade or the third grade before July 1, 1922.'

"SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the first of the month following the date of its enactment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 441 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 88) to amend section 60 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which might well be handled by unanimous consent, as it does not appear that there is any opposition, or at least none has been evidenced thus far, so far as I am concerned.

It is a matter on which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] have been working for a long time. The legislation is made necessary because of conflicting interpretations of the original Bankruptcy Act of 1898 made by the courts. The purpose is to clear up this confusion and to better insure proper and fair administration of the bankruptcy laws of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, there have been no requests for time on this side. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] has made a general statement correctly explaining the situation The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], members of the subcommittee, are very familiar with the details of the legislation and will explain it in debate on the bill which this rule makes in order.

Mr. COX. Yes, that is right. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] has given a great deal of time and attention to this as well, I might add, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. MICHENER. Well, everyone on the committee, let us say.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we have no requests for time on this side.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 88) to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United

States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", as amended by the act of June 22, 1938 (52 Stat. 840, 869), is hereby amended by striking out all of subdivision (a) of said section and substituting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) (1) A preference is a transfer, as defined in this act, of any of the property of a debtor to or for the benefit of a creditor for or on account of an antecedent debt, made or suffered by such debtor while insolvent and within 4 months before the filing by or against him of the original petition initiating a proceeding under this act, the effect of which transfer will be to enable such creditor to obtain a greater percentage of his debt than some other creditor of the same class: *Provided, however,* That this section shall have no application to proceedings under chapter IX of this act.

"(2) For the purposes of subdivisions (a) and (b) of this section, and subject to the provisions of paragraph (3), a transfer shall be deemed to have been made or suffered at the time when it became so far perfected that no creditor obtaining under applicable law by legal or equitable proceedings on a simple contract a lien on such property, without a special priority (whether or not such a creditor exists), could acquire, after such perfection, any rights in the property so transferred superior to the rights of the transferee therein, and if such transfer is not so perfected prior to the filing of the original petition initiating a proceeding under this act, it shall be deemed to have been made immediately before the filing of such original petition: *Provided, however,* That where real property is transferred for or on account of an antecedent debt, the transfer shall be deemed to have been made at the time when—became so far perfected that no bona fide purchaser from the debtor could acquire, after such perfection, any rights in the property so transferred superior to the rights of the transferee therein.

"(3) A transfer, wholly or in part, for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration shall, to the extent of such consideration and interest thereon and the other obligations of the transferor connected therewith, be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of the transfer, unless the applicable law requires the transfer to be perfected by recording, delivery, or otherwise, in order that no creditor described in paragraph (2) could acquire, after such perfection, any rights in the property so transferred superior to the rights of the transferee therein. A transfer to secure a future loan, if such loan is actually made, or a transfer which become security for a future loan, shall have the same effect as a transfer for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration. If any requirement specified in this paragraph (3) exists the time of the transfer shall be determined by the following rules:

"I Where (A) the applicable law specifies a stated period of time of not more than 30 days after the transfer within which recording delivery, or some other act is required, and compliance therewith is had within such stated period of time; or where (B) the applicable law specifies no such stated period of time or where such stated period of time is more than 30 days, and compliance therewith is had within 30 days after the transfer, the transfer shall be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of the transfer.

"II. Where compliance with the law applicable to the transfer is not had in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph I, the transfer shall be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of compliance therewith, and if such compliance is not had prior to the filing of the original petition initiating a proceeding under this act, such transfer shall be deemed to have been made or suffered immediately before the filing of such original petition."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States', approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That subdivision a of section 60 of the act entitled 'An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States,' approved July 1, 1898, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'a. (1) A preference is a transfer, as defined in this act, of any of the property of a debtor to or for the benefit of a creditor for or on account of an antecedent debt, made or suffered by such debtor while insolvent and within 4 months before the filing by or against him of the petition initiating a proceeding under this act, the effect of which transfer will be to enable such creditor to obtain a greater percentage of his debt than some other creditor of the same class.

"'(2) For the purposes of subdivisions a and b of this section, a transfer of property other than real property shall be deemed to have been made or suffered at the time when it became so far perfected that no subsequent lien upon such property obtainable by legal or equitable proceedings on a simple contract could become superior to the rights of the transferee. A transfer of real property shall be deemed to have been made or suffered when it became so far perfected that no subsequent bona fide purchase from the debtor could create rights in such property superior to the rights of the transferee. If any transfer of real property is not so perfected against a bona fide purchase, or if any transfer of other property is not so perfected against such liens by legal or equitable proceedings prior to the filing of a petition initiating a proceeding under this act, it shall be deemed to have been made immediately before the filing of the petition.

"'(3) The provisions of paragraph (2) shall apply whether or not there are or were creditors who might have obtained such liens upon the property other than real property transferred and whether or not there are or were persons who might have become bona fide purchasers of such real property.

"'(4) A lien obtainable by legal or equitable proceedings upon a simple contract within the meaning of paragraph (2) is a lien arising in ordinary course of such proceedings upon the entry or docketing of a judgment or decree, or upon attachment, garnishment, execution, or like process, whether before, upon, or after judgment or decree and whether before or upon levy. It does not include liens which under applicable law are given a special priority over other liens which are prior in time.

"'(5) A lien obtainable by legal or equitable proceedings could become superior to the rights of a transferee or a purchase could create rights superior to the rights of a transferee within the meaning of paragraph (2), if such consequences would follow only from the lien or purchase itself, or from such lien or purchase followed by any step wholly within the control of the respective lien holder or purchaser, with or without the aid of ministerial action by public officials. Such a lien could not, however, become so superior and such a purchase could not create such superior rights for the purposes of paragraph (2) through any acts subsequent to the obtaining of such a lien or subsequent to such a purchase which require the agreement or concurrence of any third party or which require any further judicial action, or ruling.

"'(6) The recognition of equitable liens where available means of perfecting legal liens have not been employed is hereby declared to be contrary to the policy of this section. If a transfer is for security and if (A) applicable law requires a signed and delivered writing, or a delivery of possession, or a filing or recording, or other like overt action as a condition to its full validity against third persons other than a buyer in the ordinary course of trade claiming through or under the transferor and (B) such overt action has not been taken, and (C) such transfer results in the acquisition of only an equitable lien, then such transfer is not perfected within the meaning of paragraph (2). Notwithstanding the first sentence of paragraph (2), it shall not suffice to perfect a transfer which creates an equitable lien such as is described in the first sentence of paragraph (6), that it is made for a valuable consideration and that both parties intend to perfect it and that they take action sufficient to effect a transfer as against liens by legal or equitable proceedings on a simple contract: *Provided, however,* That where the debtor's own interest is only equitable, he can perfect a transfer thereof by any means appropriate fully to transfer an interest of that character: *And provided further,* That nothing in paragraph (6) shall be construed to be contrary to the provisions of paragraph (7).

"'(7) Any provision in this subdivision a to the contrary notwithstanding if the applicable law requires a transfer of property other than real property for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration to be perfected by recording, delivery, or otherwise, in order that no lien described in paragraph (2) could become superior to the rights of the transferee therein, or if the applicable law requires a transfer of real property for such a consideration to be so perfected in order that no bona fide purchase from the debtor could create rights in such property superior to the rights of the transferee, the time of transfer shall be determined by the following rules:

"'I. Where (A) the applicable law specifies a stated period of time of not more than 21 days after the transfer within which recording, delivery, or some other act is required, and compliance therewith is had within such stated period of time; or where (B) the applicable law specifies no such stated period of time or where such stated period of time is more than 21 days, and compliance therewith is had within 21 days after the transfer, the transfer shall be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of the transfer.

"'II. Where compliance with the law applicable to the transfer is not had in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph I, the transfer shall be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of compliance therewith, and if such compliance is not had prior to the filing of the petition initiating a proceeding under this act, such transfer shall be deemed to have been made or suffered immediately before the filing of such petition.

"'(8) If not such requirement of applicable law specified in paragraph (7) exists, a transfer wholly or in part, for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration shall, to the extent of such consideration and interest thereon and the other obligations of the transfer or connected

therewith, be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of the transfer. A transfer to secure a future loan, if such a loan is actually made, or a transfer which becomes security for a future loan, shall have the same effect as a transfer for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration.'

"SEC. 2. Subdivision c of section 70 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'c. The trustee may have the benefit of all defenses available to the bankrupt as against third persons, including statutes of limitation, statutes of frauds, usury, and other personal defenses; and a waiver of any such defense by the bankrupt after bankruptcy shall not bind the trustee. The trustee, as to all property of the bankrupt at the date of bankruptcy whether or not coming into possession or control of the court, shall be deemed vested as of the date of bankruptcy with all the rights, remedies, and powers of a creditor then holding a lien thereon by legal or equitable proceedings, whether or not such a creditor actually exists.'

"SEC 3. a. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with any provisions of this amendatory act are hereby repealed.

"b. If any provision of this amendatory act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this amendatory act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this amendatory act are declared to be severable.

"SEC 4 Effect of this amendatory act· a. Nothing herein contained shall have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under any act or acts of which this act is amendatory.

"b The provisions of this amendatory act shall govern proceedings so far as practicable and applicable in cases pending when it takes effect; but proceedings in cases then pending to which the provisions of this amendatory act are not applicable shall be disposed of conformably to the provisions of said act approved July 1, 1898, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of inquiring of the chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill, about the failure to provide for the recording of accounts receivable. I have had a great many objections to this measure from credit representatives of various companies who point out there is no way of extending credit to a company and being assured that they have not already assigned their accounts receivable unless there is some provision for recording. To leave that out does not seem to give unsecured creditors a fair break in the event of bankruptcy. I fear it may result over the years in losses to them running into many thousands of dollars. The success of American business is so dependent upon sound credit laws that every effort should be made to recognize and incorporate in our laws the best possible provisions for the protection of all creditors with equally due regard to the interests of all debtors.

I had prepared an amendment to the committee amendment to insert the provisions of a bill originally introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]—H. R. 2691—containing the necessity for the recording of these accounts; but I hesitate to offer that amendment because my understanding is that the committee intends to take that up as a separate problem, and as a practical matter, I know I cannot succeed in securing passage of such an amendment if the members of the committee oppose it here on the floor. Furthermore, I do not want to interfere with the orderly processes of the committee. I would be grateful if the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] would give the House an expression of what is intended in that regard, and what his own position is, as chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. HOBBS. I will be delighted to comply with the request of the distinguished colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary.

I introduced H. R. 2691, which provides due notification to the general, unsecured creditors when accounts receivable and similar secret preferences, or which may become secret preferences, have been assigned; but that bill, after 4 years of almost constant study in our committee, and after conference with the National Bankruptcy Conference, was decided to be handled, if handled at all, as a separate measure. Therefore, it was left out of the amended bill which was adopted by a small majority of the members of the National Bankruptcy Conference.

I have the highest regard for both sides of the dispute in the National Bankruptcy Conference, and for the distinguished members of that body who have given almost 12 years of continuous free work to our committee in collaboration, ever since we began consideration of the Chandler Act. I know that they are sincere and honest, and that there is a strong diversity of opinion, adequately presented and cogently argued, that substantiates the bill which I believe in with all my heart.

I believe that we ought to give this House and the Senate an opportunity to consider that on its merits, but I doubt if there is the slightest possibility of getting an act passed in either body with that inclusion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Therefore, as strongly as I am committed to my own bill, I have gone along with my friends on the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and have agreed to sidetrack that issue for the time being.

Let me say, if the gentleman please, that we have never had the slightest political activity in our committee, as he so well knows, and that we have as wonderful a subcommittee as has ever sat under the aegis of this body. I challenge anyone to dispute that. The men who are selected and the men who have been selected to work on that subcommittee are, as nearly as we can ascertain, the best-posted men on the subject of bankruptcy that there are in the Congress on this side of the Capitol. I want to call the roll: The distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Hon. EARL C. MICHENER, ranking member of the subcommittee; has served on that committee except for the period when he was chairman of the full committee, for upwards of 20 years. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED, and I went on the committee 16 years ago and we have served on it ever since, alternating as chairman in the latest Congresses. Without his able and diligent work, committee administrative success would be impossible. Our outstanding colleague from Ohio, Hon. WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, came on later and he is very much in the situation that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I are with regard to this very measure. I believe I am quoting him correctly when I state that he preferred the engrafting of the provisions the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] plans to engraft by amendment onto this bill, but he and I both have agreed that that should not be done at this time for the reasons that have been assigned by the gentleman and by me. The late lamented gentleman from Illinois, Hon. Martin Gorski, who for 8 years was Master in Chancery of Cook County, and as such handled all the State bankruptcies in that great constituency, has just been succeeded by another distinguished Member, Hon. PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey. The gentleman from Texas, Hon. FRANK WILSON, and the gentleman from Oklahoma, Hon. DIXIE GILMER, who happens to be ill at the moment in a hospital. The late lamented Martin Gorski is gone, but there is no interruption of the flow of business or the consideration of bankruptcy work in that committee. We have not the slightest hesitancy in submitting anything to each other.

The most efficient, experienced, and accommodating clerk of our subcommittee is indispensable. She is Miss Velma Smedley.

This is a bill which has been brought from that kind of atmosphere, that kind of subcommittee, through the full committee of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is a distinguished member. It has been unanimously approved all the way through, and we are living up to the written pledge that we made in the Eightieth Congress that some such action would be taken in the Eighty-first; so that if we could not get together on anything else we would give relief to a business that amounts to $11,000,000,000 a year which is crippled by the limitation of credit which we need sorely to go ahead with the refinancing of automotive paper and similar business. I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that this is the answer at the moment; and I appreciate the gentleman's expression of willingness not to offer his amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of the able and distinguished gentleman from Alabama. I, of course, entertain for him and for the members of this subcommittee the high regard which he has voiced. It is because of that and because of the practical situation which I realize would cause the defeat of any amendment at this point unless it did have the support of the gentleman and other members of the committee that I am inclined to refrain from offering this amendment. Most of all, I would not desire to take precipitate action here which would result in the defeat of my amendment and thereby foreclose for the foreseeable future the favorable consideration of legislation which I happen to feel is badly needed requiring the recordation of assignments of accounts receivable in order to validate them in the event of bankruptcy. I believe it would be a fair conclusion to draw from the gentleman's remarks—if not I would appreciate it if the gentleman would correct me—that this question of the recording of assignments of accounts receivable is not foreclosed by the passage of this bill. If I felt it were I would oppose the bill. It is still a continuing matter which will receive the careful attention of his subcommittee and upon which either one way or the other we may expect in the near future some kind of action. Would that be a fair conclusion to draw?

Mr. HOBBS. In all candor and honesty—and I am challenged by the gentleman's remarks—I would say that I do not think there can be a consideration immediately at this session of that particular matter for the reason that in the Eightieth Congress we gave a written report to the House and to our full committee promising to take action of this kind in the Eighty-first Congress. Now I understand that the leadership, wisely, wishes to terminate this particular session of the Congress as speedily as possible; so I would be less than candid if I answered the gentleman's question in the affirmative. I do not believe we can get action or consideration at this session but I believe that the fight for a fair recordation statute will go on.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate deeply the gentleman's candor which is most commendable, but the answer he has given leaves me no alternative except to oppose the passage of this legislation which admittedly contains many desirable provisions but which seems to me fatally defective in failing to provide for the recordation of assignments of accounts receivable.

If this bill passes in its present form it means that each state must pass a separate recording statute to protect unsecured creditors against a trustee in bankruptcy. That seems to me a cumbersome and unnecessary result which could be obviated by the adoption in this measure of protective provisions.

I realize, however, the utter futility of any attempt at amendment here with regard to such a highly technical measure and can only record my opposition to passage.

Mr. HOBBS. This is the subcommittee's report to the House Committee on the Judiciary, which has been referred to:

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY AND REORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization begs to submit to the Committee on the Judiciary this final report for the Eightieth Congress on the three pending House bills—H. R. 2412, H. R. 5834, and H. R. 5693.

Hearings have been held and careful study given to each of these measures.

Your subcommittee is unanimously and cordially in favor of H. R. 5693, which was carefully drawn by our chairman, Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED, so as to include only noncontroversial amendments of the Bankruptcy Act. These amendments were helpful and clarifying. This bill was reported favorably by our full committee and passed the House. We sincerely hope that Senate concurrence may be had.

Your subcommittee is in hopeless disagreement as to the advisability of reporting favorably either H. R. 2412 or H. R. 5834, each of which is highly controversial.

Your subcommittee has been informed that the Committee on the Restatement of the Law and the National Bankruptcy Conference are giving careful study to the subject matter of these bills and that during the remainder of this year they may be able to report their recommendations as to the revision of the Bankruptcy Act which would accomplish the desirable changes which the decade of experience with the Chandler Act indicates.

So it is the hope and pledge of your subcommittee that a careful restudy of the Chandler Act in the light of experience may be undertaken early in the Eighty-first Congress and that we may be able to report a workmanlike bill that may be thus produced upon which we may be able to agree unanimously.

For the present, however, our report is that no piecemeal revision or amendment other than the noncontroversial H. R 5693 can be advocated by your subcommittee.

Respectfully submitted.

CHAUNCEY W REED,
Chairman.

The report of the full committee is as follows:

AMENDING AN ACT ENTITLED "AN ACT TO ESTABLISH A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES," APPROVED JULY 1, 1898, AND ACTS AMENDATORY THEREOF AND SUPPLEMENTARY THERETO

Mr. HOBBS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 88) to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That subdivision a of section 60 of the act entitled 'An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898, as amended,' is amended to read as follows:

"'a. (1) A preference is a transfer, as defined in this act, of any of the property of a debtor to or for the benefit of a creditor for or on account of an antecedent debt, made or suffered by such debtor while insolvent and within 4 months before the filing by or against him of the petiton initiating a proceeding under this act, the effect of which transfer will be to enable such creditor to obtain a greater percentage of his debt than some other creditor of the same class.

"'(2) For the purposes of subdivisions a and b of this section, a transfer of property other than real property shall be deemed to have been made or suffered at the time when it became so far perfected that no subsequent lien upon such property obtainable by legal or equitable proceedings on a simple contract could become superior to the rights of the transferee. A transfer of real property shall be deemed to have been made or suffered when it became so far perfected that no subsequent bona fide purchase from the debtor could create rights in such property superior to the rights of the transferee. If any transfer of real property is not so perfected against a bona fide purchase, or if any transfer of other property is not so perfected against such liens by legal or equitable proceedings prior to the filing of a petition initiating a proceeding under this act, it shall be deemed to have been made immediately before the filing of the petition.

"'(3) The provisions of paragraph (2) shall apply whether or not there are or were creditors who might have obtained such liens upon the property other than real property transferred and whether or not there are or were persons who might have become bona fide purchasers of such real property.

"'(4) A lien obtainable by legal or equitable proceedings upon a simple contract within the meaning of paragraph (2) is a lien arising in ordinary course of such proceedings upon the entry or docketing of a judgment or decree, or upon attachment, garnishment, execution, or like process, whether before, upon, or after judgment or decree and whether before or upon levy. It does not include liens which under applicable law are given a special priority over other liens which are prior in time.

"'(5) A lien obtainable by legal or equitable proceedings could become superior to the rights of a transferee or a purchase could create rights superior to the rights of a transferee within the meaning of paragraph (2), if such consequences would follow only from the lien or purchase itself, or from such lien or purchase followed by any step wholly within the control of the respective lien holder or purchaser, with or without the aid of ministerial action by public officials. Such a lien could not, however, become so superior and such a purchase could not create such superior rights for the purposes of paragraph (2) through any acts subsequent to the obtaining of such a lien or subsequent to such a purchase which require the agreement or concurrence of any third party or which require any further judicial action, or ruling.

"'(6) The recognition of equitable liens where available means of perfecting legal liens have not been employed is hereby declared to be contrary to the policy of this section. If a transfer is for security and if (A) applicable law requires a signed and delivered writing, or a delivery of possession, or a filing or recording, or other like overt action as a condition to its full validity against third persons other than a buyer in the ordinary course of trade claiming through or under the transferor and (B) such overt action has not been taken, and (C) such transfer results in the acquisition of only an equitable lien, then such transfer is not perfected within the meaning of paragraph (2). Notwithstanding the first sentence of paragraph (2), it shall not suffice to perfect a transfer which creates an equitable lien such as is described in the first sentence of paragraph (6), that it is made for a valuable consideration and that both parties intend to perfect it and that they take action sufficient to effect a transfer as against liens by legal or equitable pro-

ceedings on a simple contract: *Provided, however,* That where the debtor's own interest is only equitable, he can perfect a transfer thereof by any means appropriate fully to transfer an interest of that character: *And provided further,* That nothing in paragraph (6) shall be construed to be contrary to the provisions of paragraph (7).

" '(7) Any provision in this subdivision a to the contrary notwithstanding if the applicable law requires a transfer of property other than real property for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration to be perfected by recording, delivery, or otherwise, in order that no lien described in paragraph (2) could become superior to the rights of the transferee therein, or if the applicable law requires a transfer of real property for such a consideration to be so perfected in order that no bona fide purchase from the debtor could create rights in such property superior to the rights of the transferee, the time of transfer shall be determined by the following rules:

" 'I Where (A) the applicable law specifies a stated period of time of not more than 21 days after the transfer within which recording, delivery, or some other act is required, and compliance therewith is had within such stated period of time, or where (B) the applicable law specifies that no such stated period of time or where such stated period of time is more than 21 days and compliance therewith is had within 21 days after the transfer, the transfer shall be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of the transfer.

" 'II. Where compliance with the law applicable to the transfer is not had in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph I, the transfer shall be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of compliance therewith, and if such compliance is not had prior to the filing of the petition initiating a proceeding under this act, such transfer shall be deemed to have been made or suffered immediately before the filing of such petition.

" '(8) If no such requirement of applicable law specified in paragraph (7) exists, a transfer wholly or in part, for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration shall, to the extent of such consideration and interest thereon and the other obligations of the transferor connected therewith, be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of the transfer. A transfer to secure a future loan, if such a loan is actually made, or a transfer which becomes security for a future loan, shall have the same effect as a transfer for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration.'

"SEC. 2. Subdivision c of section 70 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'c. The trustee may have the benefit of all defenses available to the bankrupt as against third persons, including statutes of limitation, statutes of frauds, usury, and other personal defenses; and a waiver of any such defense by the bankrupt after bankruptcy shall not bind the trustee. The trustee, as to all property of the bankrupt at the date of bankruptcy whether or not coming into possession or control of the court, shall be deemed vested as of the date of bankruptcy with all the rights, remedies, and powers of a creditor then holding a lien thereon by legal or equitable proceedings, whether or not such a creditor actually exists.'

"SEC. 3 a. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with any provisions of this amendatory act are hereby repealed.

"b. If any provision of this amendatory act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this amendatory act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this amendatory act are declared to be severable.

"SEC. 4. Effect of this amendatory act: a. Nothing herein contained shall have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under any act or acts of which this act is amendatory.

"b. The provisions of this amendatory act shall govern proceedings so far as practicable and applicable in cases pending when it takes effect; but proceedings in cases then pending to which the provisions of this amendatory act are not applicable shall be disposed of conformably to the provisions of said act approved July 1, 1898, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto."

Amend the title to read as follows:

"A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States,' approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto."

I INTRODUCTORY

The bill is jointly sponsored by the American Bar Association, the National Bankruptcy Conference, and the Chicago and New York City Bar Associations, and is supported by a number of other groups hereinafter in this report enumerated.

In the Eightieth Congress bills with the same general effect and containing essentially the same substantive provisions were introduced (S. 826 (which passed the Senate), H. R. 2412, and H. R. 5834), and in the Eighty-first Congress (S. 88, H. R. 272, and H. R. 2691).

Hearings on one or more of these bills were held before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate in 1948; before the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives on May 7, 1948 (printed hearings, serial No. 19); and before Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on March 14, 16, and 18, 1949 (printed hearings, serial No 7).

Purposes of the bill

(a) With respect to section 1 of the bill, dealing with section 60a, its purpose is to clarify the provisions of that section of the Bankruptcy Act; eliminate confusions that have been created by reason of certain court decisions discussed below; and remove the resultant serious doubts that now exist among banks, factors, and other extenders of credit upon the validity of security taken in good faith and for present value The present language of the act tends to impede and choke the flow of credit, principally to small-business men, and the object of the bill is to free its channels.

(b) Section 2 of the bill amends section 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, dealing with the general rights of a trustee in bankruptcy, and is essentially correlative to the amendment to section 60a, effected by section 1 of the bill. Under existing law, a trustee, as to all property in the possession or under the control of the bankrupt at the date of bankruptcy, is deemed vested, as of the date of bankruptcy, with all of the rights of a creditor then holding a lien by legal or equitable proceedings, and, as to all other property, with the rights of a judgment creditor then holding an unsatisfied execution.

In view of the amendment made to section 60a, as well as intrinsically, it is deemed wise to place the trustee in bankruptcy in the position of a lien creditor with respect to all of the bankrupt's property, and section 2 of the bill so amends section 70c.

II. STATEMENT

Traditionally, it is the primary office of the Bankruptcy Act to protect creditors, both secured and unsecured; to marshal the bankrupt's assets; and to distribute them among his creditors equitably and ratably, in accordance with their respective rights and interests.

It follows from these broad general principles, as well as from the basic provisions of the Bankruptcy Act itself, that—

(A) A trustee in bankruptcy occupies the position of a "universal" judgment or lien creditor, with all such a creditor's remedies (Bankruptcy Act, sec. 70); and

(B) Except as may be necessary to avoid preferences or fraudulent transfers, he takes the bankrupt's assets subject to all valid liens and encumbrances, thereon, as conferred by applicable State law (Bankruptcy Act, secs. 57 (e) and (h), sec. 67 (b), and sec. 70).

This consistent pattern would probably never have been disturbed, but for a series of decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the earlier decades of this century. In *Sexton* v. *Kessler* ((1912) 225 U. S. 90), the Supreme Court, under the language of the Bankruptcy Act prior to the 1938 amendment, recognized as valid a pledge of stocks and bonds consummated within the 4-month period, at a time when the pledgor was insolvent, because a promise to make a pledge had been made before the commencement of the 4-month period. This result was reached on the doctrine of "relation back."

Similarly, in *Carey* v. *Donohue* ((1916) 240 U. S 430), the Supreme Court recognized as valid an unrecorded deed to real estate, on the ground that the applicable State statute did not make such a deed invalid as against judgment creditors. The Carey case, accordingly, became known as the "pocket lien" case

Other cases, substantially to the effect of one or the other of these two, are *Bailey* v. *Baker Ice Machine Co* ((1915) 239 U S. 268); *Martin* v *The Commercial Bank* ((1918) 245 U. S. 513); and *Bunch* v. *Maloney* ((1918) 246 U. S 658)

In 1938 the Bankruptcy Act was amended to obviate the effect of these cases, which were regarded with disfavor by the great majority. But, in so doing, the authors of the amendment went further than was necessary, and it brought about results which they did not anticipate. The amendment placed the trustee in the position of an artificial potential bona fide purchaser, and, by so doing, unintentionally invalidated many types of liens acquired in good faith and for value, in normal and accepted business and financial relationships.

The matter was first brought to a focus in 1943, in the case of *Corn Exchange National Bank & Trust Company* v. *Klauder* (318 U S 434, 63 Sup. Ct. 679, 87 L. Ed. 884), in which the Supreme Court, because of the new language, felt constrained to strike down an assignment of accounts receivable taken by a bank long prior to the beginning of the 4-month period and for value, because it had failed to comply with the requirement of notifying the account debtors, which, under the applicable State law, was necessary in order to cut off the rights of a possible second assignee. And this, despite the fact that no second assignee was involved in the case at all.

The difficulty was emphasized by the decision of the United States district court in *In re Vardaman Shoe Company* ((1943) 52 Fed. Supp. 562), where the law of two States (Illinois and Missouri) was involved. In the Vardaman case, the court went even further than in the Klauder case. (The Vardaman decision was, unfortunately, not appealed)

Although the Third Circuit Court of Appeals in the later case of *Matter of Rosen* ((1946) 157 Fed. (2d) 997 (cert. den. 330 U. S. 835)), expresses its disagreement with the theory of the Vardaman case, the law thus remains in conflict, and there are 8 judicial circuits out of the 10 which have not ruled on this question.

The resultant confusion has cast grave doubt upon the validity of normal business security, in all of the areas covered by trust

receipts, factors liens, oil leases, cattle loans, airplane-equipment financing, chattel mortgages, assignments of accounts receivable, conditional sales agreements for resale, etc. Indeed, a bank officer, who appeared as one of the witnesses at the subcommittee hearing, testified that the situation had come to such a pass that his institution was compelled to regard all such types of transaction as unsecured loans, and to rule on them, as to the terms which his bank was willing to enter into them, accordingly.

In 1945, the American Bar Association addressed itself to the problem, and created a special committee to consider it. The committee consulted with a number of both disinterested and interested groups, and evolved an amendment which was approved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association at its annual convention in 1946. This amendment subsequently became S 88 and H. R. 272.

In the meantime, the National Bankruptcy Conference also interested itself in the problem, at meetings held in 1946 and 1948, expressed support, in principle, of the bar association's amendment, but felt the necessity for several refinements in language and limitations in scope. Accordingly, the representatives of both groups met in joint sessions, resulting in final agreement upon the language of H. R 5933. The text of this bill is the amendment substituted by the committee for the provisions of S 88, as passed by the Senate and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

The committee on bankruptcy and corporate reorganizations of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has collaborated with them and joins in support of the measure.

The objectives of section 1 of the bill are as follows:

(A) To retain unimpaired the basic object of the 1938 amendment, which eliminated the relation-back doctrine of *Sexton* v. *Kessler*, and the pocket-lieu doctrine of *Carey* v. *Donohue*, referred to above;

(B) To eliminate the evil of allowing a trustee in bankruptcy to take the position of a potential and artificial bona fide purchaser, and to restore him to the position of a lien creditor, in harmony with his functions under the Bankruptcy Act; and

(C) in effectuation of said policy, to provide that no transfer made in good faith, for a new present consideration, shall constitute a preference to the extent of such consideration actually advanced, if the provisions of applicable State law governing the perfection of such transfer are complied with, with an appropriately rigid time limitation (21 days) for such perfection if such limitation is not itself prescribed by the applicable State law.

At the hearings held on these several bills, the following groups all favored their objectives, by written statement; the oral testimony of their representatives; and (in most instances) both: American Bankers Association; California Bankers Association; Illinois Bankers Association; Massachusetts State Bankers Association; Michigan State Bankers Association; Minnesota State Bankers Association; New Jersey State Bankers Association; New York State Bankers Association; American Finance Conference; Factors Legislative Committee; New York County Lawyers Association; National Conference of Commercial Receivable Companies, Inc.; Midwest Conference of Accounts Receivable Companies; Association of Commercial Discount Companies, Inc. (of New York); Minnesota Association of Sales Finance Companies; Bank of America (Los Angeles); First National Bank of Boston; First National Bank of Chicago; Bankers Trust Company of New York; Commercial Investment Trust.

III. COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

As above stated, the measure, as originally drafted by the American Bar Association committee, has already passed the Senate as S. 88. Therefore, for the information of the House, the following analysis and comparison of it with the bill as amended is submitted.

(1) Subdivision a (1) of both bills is virtually identical, and substantially reenacts the first sentence of section 60a of the present act.

(2) Subdivision (2) of S. 88 and subdivisions (2), (3), (4), and (5) of the committee amendment have the same general objective; namely, to effectuate the purposes enumerated as (A) and (B) above. The committee amendment spells out the matter in greater detail, and in language that is regarded as more definite. In addition, subdivision (5) makes it clear that the hypothetical lien or purchase (to which the trustee succeeds) protected by the preference section must be one obtainable upon the entry of a judgment or decree, or attachment, garnishment, execution, or like process, based upon a simple contract and by steps within the control of the lien holder or purchaser, as such, with or without the aid of ministerial action by public officials. In other words, for illustration, it excludes, as it should, special priority liens or rights that may be acquired only by the agreement or concurrence of a third party or further independent judicial action.

(3) Subdivision (6) of the committee amendment does not appear in S. 88 as passed by the Senate. Its purpose is to make it certain that the amendment will not validate, in the hands of a secured creditor, equitable liens where available means of perfecting legal liens have not been employed by him. The matter is, perhaps, covered by inference in S. 88, but subdivision (6) of the committee amendment spells it out.

(4) Subdivisions (7) and (8) of the committee amendment are essentially the same as subdivision (3) of S. 88. Both would effectuate object (C) above stated. The only difference is that, where the applicable State law specifies no specific time for perfection by the recording of a secured lien, the permissible period for one claiming security to comply with a State recording provision is shortened from 30 to 21 days.

Subdivision (8) is a restatement of the second sentence in paragraph (3) of S. 88, and has been placed in a separate subsection for clarity of draftsmanship and language

(5) Sections 2, 3, and 4 of the committee amendment are new. Section 2 is the amendment to section 70c of the act above referred to, which has been placed in the bill for the protection of trustees in bankruptcy as correlative to the amendment to section 60, and also to simplify, and to some extent expand the general expression of the rights of trustees in bankruptcy.

Sections 3 and 4 are purely formal provisions.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

As a result of the hearings held and after giving extensive consideration to the oral testimony adduced thereat, and the written statements of the responsible bodies filed in connection therewith, your committee is of the conviction that the bill constitutes a much needed amendment to the Bankruptcy Act; that it will facilitate the extension of credit upon fair and reasonable terms; and that its provisions are equitable to the interests of secured and unsecured creditors alike.

The committee, accordingly, unanimously recommends that the bill do pass.

Changes in existing law

In compliance with clause 2a of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, there is printed below in roman existing law in which no change is proposed, with new matter shown in italic, and with matter proposed to be omitted enclosed in black brackets:

"SECTION 60A OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT (52 STAT. 840, 869)

"(a) (1) A preference is a transfer, as defined in this Act, of any of the property of a debtor to or for the benefit of a creditor for or on account of an antecedent debt, made or suffered by such debtor while insolvent and within four months before the filing by or against him of [the petition in bankruptcy, or of] the *original* petition *initiating a proceeding* under [chapter X, XI, XII, or XIII of] this Act, the effect of which transfer will be to enable such creditor to obtain a greater percentage of his debt than some other creditor of the same class: *Provided, however, That this section shall have no application to proceedings under chapter IX of this Act.* [For the purposes of subdivisions a and b of this section, a transfer shall be deemed to have been made at the time when it became so far perfected that no bona fide purchaser from the debtor and no creditor could thereafter have acquired any rights in the property so transferred superior to the rights of the transferee therein, and, if such transfer is not so perfected prior to the filing of the petition in bankruptcy or of the original petition under chapter X, XI, XII or XIII of this Act, it shall be deemed to have been made immediately before bankruptcy.]

(2) For the purposes of subdivisions (a) and (b) of this section, and subject to the provisions of paragraph (3), a transfer shall be deemed to have been made or suffered at the time when it became so far perfected that no creditor obtaining under applicable law by legal or equitable proceedings on a simple contract a lien on such property, without a special priority (whether or not such a creditor exists), could acquire, after such perfection, any rights in the property so transferred superior to the rights of the transferee therein, and if such transfer is not so perfected prior to the filing of the original petition initiating a proceeding under this Act, it shall be deemed to have been made immediately before the filing of such original petition: Provided, however, That where real property is transferred for or on account of an antecedent debt, the transfer shall be deemed to have been made at the time when it became so far perfected that no bona fide purchaser from the debtor could acquire, after such perfection, any rights in the property so transferred superior to the rights of the transferee therein.

"(3) A transfer, wholly or in part, for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration shall, to the extent of such consideration and interest thereon and the other obligations of the transferor connected therewith, be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of the transfer, unless the applicable law requires the transfer to be perfected by recording, delivery, or otherwise, in order that no creditor described in paragraph (2) could acquire, after such perfection, any rights in the property so transferred superior to the rights of the transferee therein. A transfer to secure a future loan, if such loan is actually made, or a transfer which becomes security for a future loan, shall have the same effect as a transfer for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration. If any requirement specified in this paragraph (3) exists the time of the transfer shall be determined by the following rules:

"I. Where (A) the applicable law specifies a stated period of time of not more than thirty days after the transfer within which recording delivery, or some other Act is required, and compliance therewith is had within such stated period of time; or where (B) the applicable law specifies no such stated period of time or where such stated period of time is more than thirty days, and compliance therewith is had within thirty days after the transfer, the transfer shall be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of the transfer.

"II. Where compliance with the law applicable to the transfer is not had in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph I, the transfer shall be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of compliance therewith, and if such compliance is not had prior to

the filing of the original petition initiating a proceeding under this Act, such transfer shall be deemed to have been made or suffered immediately before the filing of such original petition.

"COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

"SECTIONS 60A AND 70C OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT (52 STAT. 840, 869)

"SEC. 60. PREFERRED CREDITORS.—a A preference is a transfer, as defined in this Act, of any of the property of a debtor to or for the benefit of a creditor for or on account of an antecedent debt, made or suffered by such debtor while insolvent and within 4 months before the filing by or against him of the petition [in bankruptcy, or of the original petition under chapter X, XI, XII, or XIII of] *initiating a proceeding under* this Act, the effect of which transfer will be to enable such creditor to obtain a greater percentage of his debt than some other creditor of the same class. [For the purposes of subdivisions a and b of this section, a transfer shall be deemed to have been made at the time when it became so far perfected that no bona fide purchaser from the debtor and no creditor could thereafter have acquired any rights in the property so transferred superior to the rights of the transferee therein, and, if such transfer is not so perfected prior to the filing of the petition in bankruptcy or of the original petition under chapter X, XI, XII, or XIII of this Act, it shall be deemed to have been made immediately before bankruptcy.]

"(2) *For the purposes of subdivisions a and b of this section, a transfer of property other than real property shall be deemed to have been made or suffered at the time when it became so far perfected that no subsequent lien upon such property obtainable by legal or equitable proceedings on a simple contract could become superior to the rights of the transferee. A transfer of real property shall be deemed to have been made or suffered when it became so far perfected that no subsequent bona fide purchase from the debtor could create rights in such property superior to the rights of the transferee. If any transfer of real property is not so perfected against a bona fide purchase, or if any transfer of other property is not so perfected against such liens by legal or equitable proceedings prior to the filing of a petition initiating a proceeding under this Act, it shall be deemed to have been made immediately before the filing of the petition.*

"(3) *The provisions of paragraph (2) shall apply whether or not there are or were creditors who might have obtained such liens upon the property other than real property transferred and whether or not there are or were persons who might have become bona fide purchasers of such real property.*

"(4) *A lien obtainable by legal or equitable proceedings upon a simple contract within the meaning of paragraph (2) is a lien arising in ordinary course of such proceedings upon the entry or docketing of a judgment or decree, or upon attachment, garnishment, execution, or like process, whether before, upon, or after judgment or decree and whether before or upon levy. It does not include liens which under applicable law are given a special priority over other liens which are prior in time.*

"(5) *A lien obtainable by legal or equitable proceedings could become superior to the rights of a transferee or a purchase could create rights superior to the rights of a transferee within the meaning of paragraph (2), if such consequences would follow only from the lien or purchase itself, or from such lien or purchase followed by any step wholly within the control of the respective lien holder or purchaser, with or without the aid of ministerial action by public officials. Such a lien could not, however, become so superior and such a purchase could not create such superior rights for the purposes of paragraph (2) through any acts subsequent to the obtaining of such a lien or subsequent to such a purchase which require the agreement or concurrence of any third party or which require any further judicial action or ruling.*

"(6) *The recognition of equitable liens where available means of perfecting legal liens have not been employed is hereby declared to be contrary to the policy of this section. If a transfer is for security and if (A) applicable law requires a signed and delivered writing, or a delivery of possession, or a filing or recording, or other like overt action as a condition to its full validity against third persons other than a buyer in the ordinary course of trade claiming through or under the transferor and (B) such overt action has not been taken, and (C) such transfer results in the acquisition of only an equitable lien, then such transfer is not perfected within the meaning of paragraph (2). Notwithstanding the first sentence of paragraph (2), it shall not suffice to perfect a transfer which creates an equitable lien such as is described in the first sentence of paragraph (6), that it is made for a valuable consideration and that both parties intend to perfect it and that they take action sufficient to effect a transfer as against liens by legal or equitable proceedings on a simple contract: Provided, however, That where the debtor's own interest is only equitable, he can perfect a transfer thereof by any means appropriate fully to transfer an interest of that character. And provided further, That nothing in paragraph (6) shall be construed to be contrary to the provisions of paragraph (7).*

"(7) *Any provision in this subdivision a to the contrary notwithstanding if the applicable law requires a transfer of property other than real property for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration to be perfected by recording, delivery, or otherwise, in order that no lien described in paragraph (2) could become superior to the rights of the transferee therein, or if the applicable law requires a transfer of real property for such a consideration to be so perfected in order that no bona fide purchase from the debtor could create rights in such property superior to the rights of the transferee, the time of transfer shall be determined by the following rules:*

"I Where (A) the applicable law specifies a stated period of time of not more than twenty-one days after the transfer within which recording, delivery, or some other act is required, and compliance therewith is had within such stated period of time, or where (B) the applicable law specifies no such stated period of time or where such stated period of time is more than twenty-one days, and compliance therewith is had within twenty-one days after the transfer, the transfer shall be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of the transfer.

"II Where compliance with the law applicable to the transfer is not had in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph I, the transfer shall be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of compliance therewith, and if such compliance is not had prior to the filing of the petition initiating a proceeding under this Act, such transfer shall be deemed to have been made or suffered immediately before the filing of such petition.

"(8) *If no such requirement of applicable law specified in paragraph (7) exists, a transfer wholly or in part, for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration shall, to the extent of such consideration and interest thereon and the other obligations of the transferor connected therewith, be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of the transfer. A transfer to secure a future loan, if such a loan is actually made, or a transfer which becomes security for a future loan, shall have the same effect as a transfer for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration.*

"SEC 70c. The trustee may have the benefit of all defenses available to the bankrupt as against third persons, including statutes of limitation, statutes of frauds, usury, and other personal defenses; and a waiver of any such defense by the bankrupt after bankruptcy shall not bind the trustee. The trustee, as to all property [in the possession or under the control] of the bankrupt at the date of the bankruptcy [or otherwise] *whether or not* coming into [the] possession [of the bankruptcy court] *or control of the court*, shall be deemed vested as of the date of bankruptcy with all the rights, remedies, and powers of a creditor then holding a lien thereon by legal or equitable proceedings, whether or not such a creditor actually exists [: and, as to all other property, the trustee shall be deemed vested as of the date of bankruptcy with all the rights, remedies, and powers of a judgment creditor then holding an execution duly returned unsatisfied, whether or not such a creditor actually exists]."

Mr HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama what action his committee may be taking in connection with the section relating to farm bankruptcy? As I understood it, there are some very difficult situations existing in the country, largely by virtue of catastrophes to farm orchards and products of various kinds.

Mr. HOBBS. We are keenly alive to the necessities of that situation, particularly in California I may say to the gentleman that, of course, it is a separate and distinct matter and is the only one of the six composition settlement bills that has not become law. We are very anxious to close that up as soon as we can and write it into law I hope that that can be done at this session

Mr. HINSHAW I thank the gentleman and I hope it can too. There are some very vital parts to it.

Mr HOBBS. I realize that is true, particularly of California

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama just what this bill proposes to do? In his remarks to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] he has stated the background of the legislation during the Eightieth Congress, but as a new Member of Congress and as one confronted with this report on the bill for the first time, I find it is rather difficult to comprehend its full implications. It presents a very technical approach to amend the Bankruptcy Act, and therefore I would appreciate a delineation by the gentleman of the purposes of the legislation

Mr. HOBBS. It is exceedingly technical and is the result of a thoroughgoing microscopic examination of every word in the Bankruptcy Act which was passed in 1938 and now after 10 years of experience has been brought up again today. This has one object in view, to try to safeguard the rights of creditors as opposed to the overriding of those rights in too many instances by the bankrupts. We wish an honest administration of the bankruptcy law, and what this does is to delineate carefully with the advice of the very best minds in the bankruptcy world, and I mean by that the members of the

National Bankruptcy Conference, not of the subcommittee. All I am saying for the subcommittee is that we worked hard and have done it honestly with their consideration and help. But here is the point, and I think I can answer the gentleman to his entire satisfaction very quickly.

The sole object is to kill crooked preferences and to see to it that a man who has an honest account receivable, or mortgage, or any other paper that entitles him to a preference, gets it, but that the crook who has no right to preference over the regular run of creditors does not get an unfair advantage.

Mr. YATES. What will be the position of the trustee in bankruptcy as the result of the passage of this legislation?

Mr. HOBBS. The trustee in bankruptcy is removed from the position of a bona fide purchaser for value without notice and given an adjudicated lien as a judgment creditor. I think that that is a fair statement of the act.

Mr. YATES. In other words, then, the trustee in bankruptcy's position as a secured creditor will be lessened as the result of the passage of this bill, will it not?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, but the question is: What was the intent of the law that we passed? We never intended it to go as far as the Klander case and three other cases have gone. The distinctive feature that is inveighed against, and I think rightly, is that we set up a hypothetical process, whether it was followed or not, and I do not think that we ought to follow the Klander case to the extent of saying that we suppose that something happened, although it never did, and are required to give the trustee in bankruptcy a supposititious preference. All that the trustee needs is a judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction giving him his lien as a preference to the rank and file of unsecured creditors, and that is what this bill does, instead of giving him a lien as a bona fide purchaser for value without notice.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will bear with me a moment, is not, however, the possibility of the evil toward which this legislation is directed still likely to continue in view of the fact, as I understand the gentleman's explanation, a recording of a chattel mortgage or of some instrument showing a secured debt within the 4-month period will be given preference over the trustee in bankruptcy's rights, might there not be a spurious recording which would compel the trustee in bankruptcy to bear the burden of proof to set that aside?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir. This bill never rewards fraud in any particular. Here is the point. We cannot suppose that anything happened which never did, and in the act we set up that supposititious status which in many cases never arose.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. I think you will find, sir, that this has been carefully considered and that there is no disposition whatsoever otherwise. I perfectly agree, if this were a matter of first impression, and if we had not considered it and argued it with the bankruptcy world for 4 years, that I would like to have considered the bill that I introduced which provides for recordation. However, I think the amended House bill H. R. 5933, which we are substituting for the Senate bill by amendment, improves the Bankruptcy Act.

This is the point I want to drive home. In 17 States there has already been passed what they call a validation statute, which could not be upset by anything we might do, so that situation needs further consideration before we pass a recordation statute.

Mr. YATES. I notice in the report that a very distinguished list of associations has approved this legislation. Can the gentleman tell us whether there are any comparable persons or associations which are opposed to its passage?

Mr. HOBBS. There is only one association that is on record opposing it, as far as our information goes. That is a very distinguished and a powerful group, with some 30,000 members.

Mr. YATES. Which group is that?

Mr. HOBBS. That is the National Association of Credit Men. They are represented by one of the ablest lawyers in the field, Hon. Randolph Montgomery, who has worked with us for 12 years.

I will say to the gentleman that there are five or six other distinguished lawyers, master minds in the bankruptcy field, who agree with me, but in spite of the fact that we agree perfectly on everything else, they cannot agree with this amendment. Our committee has the highest respect for these gentlemen of the minority of the National Bankruptcy Conference and for any opinion they espouse, yet we have felt constrained to report the pending amended bill to the House unanimously asking its passage.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to interrogate the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] on this bill. Has this been taken up with the Judicial Conference?

Mr. HOBBS. Does the gentleman mean the National Bankruptcy Conference?

Mr. STEFAN. Has the gentleman discussed it with the bankruptcy referees?

Mr. HOBBS. Oh yes, sir. Many of them testified before us many times.

Mr. STEFAN. Has it been discussed with the Federal courts?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir. The gentleman means the Judicial Conference that is under the Chief Justice?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; the Judicial Conference.

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir; although Chief Judge Orie L. Phillips of the tenth circuit, as chairman of its bankruptcy committee, I believe, was very helpful.

Mr. STEFAN. But you have discussed it with the bankruptcy referees?

Mr. HOBBS. The National Bankruptcy Conference, the bankruptcy committee of the American Bar Association, and every other one of the 40 important groups that speak on bankruptcy matters.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that legislation like this is necessary if it is going to strengthen the arm of our bankruptcy courts.

The gentleman will probably recall that our Committee on Appropriations for the Department of Justice and the Federal courts made the bankruptcy referees officials of the court, taking them off a commission basis and putting them on a salary basis. This year when they appeared before us, we found that the cost of referees is now more than self-liquidating.

I believe that the Members of the House would be interested to know that a report coming to us indicates that bankruptcy cases are on the increase. If this bankruptcy increase is any indication for future business it is not at all bright.

The peak of the bankruptcy cases following the First World War numbered 70,000. Today there are approximately 20,000 bankruptcy cases in the United States. The prediction is that in another year or so the number will be close to 40,000. The prediction is also made that the number of bankruptcy cases in the United States will equal the peak following the First World War about 15 years after World War II. However, the number of bankruptcy cases is increasing by leaps and bounds and any legislation to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy is very timely indeed. I am merely serving notice on the Membership of the House to watch that prediction made by our Federal referees in bankruptcy that it will not be many more years before we again reach the peak of bankruptcy cases in the United States which may number 70,000 cases, as was true following World War I. This prediction should put American business on guard against coming events.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist the temptation to say to the House that the distinguished gentleman who has just spoken was chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which enabled us to put into effect the placing of referees in bankruptcy on a salary basis. The House of Representatives ought to be proud of the fact that for the first time in history we are running at a net profit to Uncle Sam of over $1,500,000 a year and that we are paying every cent which comes in in the form of bankruptcy costs or fees into the Treasury of the United States rather than into the pockets of the referees as in the past. As I said, the gentleman was the chairman of the subcommittee which gave us the pump priming to start and enabled us to start the good work. You gentlemen and the Senators voted unanimously to write into law that very salutary reform which struck from our statutes the last vestige of the old and unlamented fee system. Again, we congratulate you.

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

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 88. The bill proposes amendments to sections 60a and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act. It has been rig-

orously examined by both the House and Senate in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, and has undergone perfecting amendments to eliminate objections made by witnesses and perceived by the committee members who have considered the bill. A word as to the need for the bill:

In 1938, the Congress enacted amendments to the Bankruptcy Act designed to offset the unfortunate consequences of several earlier Supreme Court decisions enlarging unduly the degree of protection extended to preferential liens against estates in bankruptcy. In an effort to correct these consequences, the 1938 amendments had the unintended effect of operating in such a restrictive fashion that many types of liens acquired in good faith were invalidated, contrary to accepted custom and usage in business and financial circles. Recent Supreme Court decisions have brought the deficiency in the 1938 amendments to focus and, because of an even later decision of a circuit court which was not appealed and which went further than the Supreme Court decisions, a state of uncertainty exists in the courts of the land as to what the law is, and doubt attaches to the validity of many bona fide business transactions.

Others to speak on the measure will describe its technical features. I merely wish to lend my support to the bill because I am familiar with the background circumstances impelling its passage. From close study, I can assure my colleagues in the House that the amendments proposed will correct the shortcomings of the law without endangering the rights of creditors of bankrupt estates.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States,' approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, may I supplement that by asking unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks immediately preceding the passage of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

REPEAL OF EXCISE TAXES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I voice disappointment over some omissions on the subject of repeal of excise taxes in the recommendation made by Secretary of the Treasury Snyder to the Committee on Ways and Means.

At the outset let us get this fact straight: That if and when 3 or 5 or 10 or more of the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and when scores and scores of the majority Members of this House voice their judgment that wartime excise taxes should be repealed, we are not joining with the Republican Party nor following Republican leadership. Let us get that fact straight. For example, last session, when the question of imposing the obnoxious and atrocious sales tax of 2 percent in the District of Columbia was debated and voted on, on the floor of the House of Representatives, it was votes of the majority Members of the House which were cast against that, and very few votes from the minority side were against that obnoxious tax which now oppresses all of us in the District of Columbia and all of our constituents who visit here. It is a fact that the Democratic national platform has time and again voiced disapproval of the national sales tax. There are on the Committee on Ways and Means majority members, such as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and others, who time and time again have expressed disapproval of the wartime excise taxes and expressed themselves in favor of repealing them. As a matter of fact, in January 1947, President Truman recommended to the Congress that it continue the wartime excise taxes for a period of 1 year only. That was during the Republican Eightieth Congress, and the Eightieth Congress denied the President's request. Instead, the last Republican Congress voted for legislation continuing permanently the wartime excise taxes which have proved so oppressive to our people. We are not joining the "Johnnie come lately's." Many minority Members are going along with us. We propose to eliminate some excise taxes and greatly reduce others commencing next July 1.

In particular I denounce the war-imposed 20-percent tax on movie admissions. This tax bears heavily on amusement, relaxation, and recreation costs of our people. This tax is responsible for a decline in attendance of movies. It is responsible for huge losses in a heretofore profitable business. It is responsible for the dismissal of employees in moving-picture theaters.

This particular tax is not only restrictive of business but it is an indefensible tax on the poor man's entertainment and the pleasure of children. Attending movies is the principal form of relaxation and recreation in many of our communities. I cannot believe the financial solvency of the United States will be impaired by removing this 20-percent tax paid on admissions and, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I expect to vote in committee to remove these excise taxes on admissions or at least cut them in half.

I denounce them as restrictive, regressive, obnoxious, and atrocious.

During World War II excise taxes were imposed upon 40 products. Excise taxes are sales taxes. They were imposed upon transportation to bring in revenue and to discourage travel, upon communications to discourage long-distance telephoning and sending of telegrams which might delay necessary wartime communications. In addition, excise taxes were imposed upon baby oil, powder, movie admission tickets, leather goods, photographic supplies, furs, jewelry, and so forth. These taxes, now that the war is over, are unfair and discriminatory. They are restrictive of business and have been the cause of unemployment in the jewelry, entertainment, fur, and other industries. If Congress were to repeal all these taxes the net revenue falling off would approximate $2,000,000,000, but the actual loss in tax revenue to our Government would be but a fraction of this sum. Employment would be increased. Therefore, more income taxes would be paid by more individuals. Also, there would be increased corporate taxes. Corporations now pay out substantial amounts in excise taxes. Their net earnings would go up as these taxes went down. We must eliminate this wartime hang-over of burdensome excise taxes. Sometimes they are spoken of as luxury taxes. Is having a baby a luxury? Is it a luxury for children to attend a movie?

This Congress owes a duty to the American people to eliminate or greatly reduce troublesome wartime excise taxes.

Women have good reason to feel aggravated over the taxes levied on cosmetics and handbags. Businessmen have reason to complain about taxes on telegraph messages, railway travel, and telephone calls. These are troublesome taxes and the cost of collection cuts deep into the amount obtained. Such taxes are unsound from an economic standpoint.

It is unfortunate that more people are not conscious of how burdensome high taxes are, and the threat this situation raises to our national economy. Many who pay little, or no, income taxes are disinterested, because they erroneously believe they do not contribute and, therefore, are not affected. But they do contribute and their welfare is affected.

Do you drive a car? If you do, you pay a Federal tax of 1½ cents on every gallon of gasoline you buy, plus whatever State tax your State demands. In some States this runs as high as 4 or 5 cents per gallon. Not much, you say? How many miles do you drive in a year? Now figure up how many gallons of gasoline you use, and you will be surprised at how much the Federal and State governments take from you for the privilege of driving.

Do you smoke? Every time you buy a pack of cigarettes, you pay Uncle Sam 7 cents for the privilege. How many packs do you smoke yearly? Figure it out.

Every time you go to a ball game, Uncle Sam demands a 20-percent tax on each ticket. Your children have to pay the same 20-percent tax when they go to the movies.

Every time you ride a train, or intercity bus or airplane, you pay a Government tax in addition to the price of your

ticket. Every time you send a telegram or make a long-distance call, in addition to the regular charge you pay an extra 25 percent for the Government's tax.

In addition, there are sales taxes and special excise taxes in many States on some of the same items on which Congress has imposed a Federal excise tax.

Where will it end? Taxes are necessary, of course, to maintain Government, whether it be Federal, State, or city. But there is a limit to the tax burden people can stand. I favor reducing expenditures and cutting taxes.

Except for taxes imposed before the war on liquor, cigarettes, tobacco, and gasoline, all other excise taxes should be greatly cut or eliminated altogether. Having a baby, or going to the movies are not luxuries. Your Government will remain solvent if we remove taxes on movie admission tickets, baby powder, baby oil, and so forth. I voted against imposition of a 2-percent stales tax in the District of Columbia. Sales taxes such as we have in Ohio and such as these Federal excise taxes place the heaviest burden upon the poorest people. They are the opposite of income taxes. Excise taxes and sales taxes against the necessities of life burden most those who have least.

The tax on transportation costs our citizens $600,000,000 a year, yet this tax was never intended as a revenue measure. It was passed as a war measure to discourage unnecessary travel, to free the railway systems for the transportation of troops and supplies. No one objected to the transportation tax in time of war. We have been at peace since 1945 and yet this burdensome nuisance tax still exists as a hangover from the war. The Eightieth Congress should have repealed it. It failed to do so. In fact it extended it permanently.

Excise taxes, or sales taxes, are regressive. They fall hardest upon the poor. They increase in their burden with the number of children in the family. They reduce the family purchasing power. The much ballyhooed ease of administration is greatly exaggerated. Alleged low-collection costs overlook industry-compliance costs.

These are not luxury taxes. Goods of universal consumption can hardly be correctly labeled luxuries. A fur coat costing possibly $200, which the purchaser intends to wear for 5 years or longer, can hardly be considered a luxury.

Imposing a tax burden at the same rate on poor and rich alike is unjust. Poor people spend a major portion of their income on the necessities of life. The more children there are in a family the more likely it is that the total income will go for bare necessities. Persons on relief, the unemployed, young veterans, newly married or about to be married, retired employees, all would be especially burdened by a sales tax. Instead of exempting amounts considered necessary for subsistence, as the income tax does, the retail sales tax exempts amounts saved and taxes what is spent for subsistence. It is in effect a tax with no exemptions, except for the rich who are exempt on what they save.

So-called luxury taxes are misnomers now. The movies, automobiles, electricity, radios, electric-light bulbs, clocks, telegrams, long-distance telephone calls, and so forth, have long since passed out of the luxury class. Whatever has become standardized and of universal consumption by the bulk of the population is no longer a luxury. Taxes such as these are not levied with the thought that consumption of the commodities taxed will be reduced.

A 20-percent sales tax on admissions is indefensible and one that bears heavily on the amusement costs of the people. As applied to the legitimate theater, musical concerts, and the like, it places the United States in a position of taxing an industry that other nations consider a proper subject of state subsidy. As for taxing the circus and the movies—the chief form of relaxation many people in rural areas have—the tax is on the poor man's entertainment and the pleasure of children. The tax is in part responsible for the decline in theater attendance. In failing to distinguish between the low-priced suburban or country movie and the big high-priced first-run city theaters, an injustice is worked to the masses, the laboring people, the women and children. Taxing admissions to agricultural fairs is to put a tax on education of farmers.

The tax on furs has thrown many businesses into bankruptcy and has caused the dismissal of some 8,000 employees in the fur industry. This tax discriminates against one article of clothing, which certainly is no luxury, at least in the North. It has severely hurt the industry, which has suffered a greatly reduced volume of sales. An expensive coat, even though it has no fur, is tax-exempt. Serious problems of equity have developed. The clothier making nontaxed articles has been able to take a higher mark-up in tax-exempt but inferior garments.

There are those who defend the 20-percent tax on jewelry, stating that jewelry is clearly a luxury. Examination of this tax shows in a large measure that tax becomes one on wedding gifts, graduation presents, and so forth. Are clocks jewelry? They are taxed as such yet are they not in fact in the category of household furniture? If oriental rugs and expensive bric-a-brac ornaments are tax-free, how can one justify singling out clocks for taxation? To apply the tax, as the Bureau of Internal Revenue does, to ornamental buttons on women's dresses has gone far beyond the intent of Congress. The 20-percent rate on retail sales of jewelry discriminates in favor of much lower rates on jewelry's principal competitors such as dealers in radios, musical instruments, and so forth. It is indefensible discrimination against such items as fountain pens, compacts, and so forth, simply because they have a little gold or silver in them. This tax and the tax on luggage, leather goods, purses, toilet cases, and so forth, should be eliminated.

A lady wrote me the other day, "Are your pants pockets a luxury?" She purchased a leather handbag and was compelled to pay the exorbitant tax. One cannot blame this lady for being angry. Handbags are essential items for women's wear. Women are paying $48,000,000 yearly in taxes and the leather-pocketbook industry has suffered terrific losses. Seven thousand employees have been thrown out of employment. Our Government has lost the pay-roll taxes they would have paid as industrial workers.

Beardsley Ruml, author of the pay-as-you-go income-tax system now in use, urged repeal of excise taxes, which most people agree are obnoxious. Beardsley Ruml's proposal merely echoes views held by many progressive forward-looking Congressmen. Excise taxes, such as those imposed upon sales of electric bulbs, cosmetics, baby powder, transportation, and so forth, burden most those who have least.

Whether you call it tax evasion or tax avoidance, as long as income taxes have to be high as they now are it is essential that everybody pay his fair share. If loopholes in the present law permit some to evade paying the proper amount of taxes, Congress must correct this. It is also our job to see that fraud in the filing of dishonest-tax returns is summarily punished. This we can do by expanding the enforcement staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

In 1947 President Truman recommended to the Congress that it continue wartime excise taxes for the period of 1 year only. The Republican Eightieth Congress denied his request. Instead it voted up legislation continuing permanently the wartime excise taxes which have proved so oppressive to our people. My predecessor as Ohio Congressman at large, who incidentally is a candidate seeking to defeat me this November, voted in favor of making these obnoxious and atrocious Federal excise taxes permanent. I condemn him for voting for the permanent extension of these indefensible taxes on the necessities of life.

Although the Republican Eightieth Congress was willing to pass a rich man's income estate and gift-tax reduction bill, the only action taken with respect to excise taxes was to make these wartime levies permanent.

The Democratic Party is committed to opposition to a general Federal sales tax; and these excises on many of the necessities of life directly conflict with our party platform.

These taxes must be repealed as of next July 1. In my opinion we can do this without complicating our problem of maintaining the fiscal solvency of the Nation. By making sure that we collect all taxes due, we will strengthen the equity and fairness of the income-tax system, in addition to repealing these onerous, unfair, and regressive excise taxes.

It is certain that the committee bill, which we hope to enact into law, will embody many of the excise tax reduction provisions in H. R. 6641, introduced by me on January 6, 1950.

My bill gives top priority to the repeal of war taxes on toilet preparations, furs, leather goods, jewelry, passenger fares, and telephone and telegraph bills. It provides for complete repeal of the excise taxes imposed against baby oil, baby powder, and toilet preparations used for the care of infants, women's handbags, electric-light bulbs, cooking and heating stoves, matches, and trailer coaches used

by many low-income families as residences.

It provides cutting in half movie admissions and other burdensome taxes and greatly reducing many others. I favor elimination of all wartime imposed excise taxes but know this is impossible of achievement during the present session.

Enactment into law of the provisions of my bill will save American taxpayers approximately $999,000,000 this year.

Next year we can make further examination of excise-tax problems and provide elimination of other of these burdensome taxes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am delighted to hear the statement of the gentleman from Ohio. I wish to ask him if he does not agree that we have got to act very early on these excise taxes or we will defeat the very ends we seek. At the present time, as the gentleman from Ohio I am sure well knows, factories are closing. People are not buying many of these so-called luxury items because they hesitate to purchase under present conditions. I hope the gentleman from Ohio will join with the Republicans on that committee and bring this bill out quickly. If the committee would divorce the tax revenue feature suggested by the President that feature could be considered later. I suggest this inasmuch as the President does not, as the gentleman well knows, expect to get any revenue from it this year. We ought to, therefore, act on the question of excise taxes first and bring up the revenue measure later.

Mr. YOUNG. What the gentleman says regarding a buyers' strike being in effect is probably true. My view is that even with the exercise of the utmost diligence the earliest we can reasonably expect elimination of the most obnoxious excise taxes such as taxes on transportation, baby oil, baby powder, leather goods, admissions, and so forth, is commencing next July 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

URGENT: CALL A PSYCHIATRIST FOR UNCLE SAM

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that we immediately call a psychiatrist for Uncle Sam unless steps are taken at once to restore him to sanity.

Uncle Sam is buying great quantities of foodstuffs with your tax dollars, and is inaugurating a program to destroy them. Billions of bushels of potatoes, tons and tons of dried eggs and milk, butter, and many other foods unknown to the taxpayers. Is this not a crazy idea? I am unalterably opposed to the destruction by our Government of any edible foods needed by our people to sustain life. Millions of aged and disabled are in dire need of these food products to sustain life. Let us demand that these foods be made available to the needy, the aged, the disabled, and the handicapped.

Worst of all, Uncle Sam is now planning to dump or destroy 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes. He has spent some $100,000,000 buying up potatoes under the potato program to be taken out of the market for human food, and thereby boost the price to the consumers. Last June the Commodity Credit Corporation's price-support inventories amounted to a billion dollars plus, and by next June they are expected to be two and two-tenths billion for purchases of other commodities such as corn, cotton, flaxseed, and dairy products. Uncle Sam has no program or sane course of action as to what he will do with these immense stores of necessities of life, which he has gone out into the market and purchased with your tax dollars in order to take the products out of the market so that the housewife and other consumers will have to pay increased prices for these necessities. The taxpayer is the fall guy because his tax pays for these products to be destroyed or wasted and his money pays for the increased prices of similar products in the market which he has to buy. Furthermore, the aged and those depending on annuities or small incomes are penalized by having to pay the artificial high prices forced upon them by Uncle Sam himself with the use of their tax money.

Uncle Sam has expended overseas in the 4 years after VJ-day through June 30, 1949, through 22 programs $27,100,000,000 which averages $18,500,000 per day or $750,000 per hour, or $12,500 per minute, or $200 every time your watch has ticked since the last gun was fired. Uncle Sam is now proposing to spend in this fiscal year under the budget of the President $42,000,000,000 plus, the biggest peacetime budget in all history, some five or six billions more than will be taken in in taxes, it is estimated. The public debt is increasing by leaps and bounds, now being over $252,000,000,000.

Uncle Sam under the ECA and other foreign programs is using your tax dollars to purchase flour, lumber, and other products produced in Canada and other foreign markets. Similar products are produced in America and are now in surplus supply and are being bought up under the suport program with your tax dollars. Thus Uncle Sam is playing both ends against the middle.

I have received many wires and communications from my congressional district in Oregon stating that the flour mills will have to close down and throw out of employment thousands of laborers unless this foreign-aid program is modified so as to permit American millers to compete on an equal basis with foreign producers of similar products. I include as a part of these remarks two telegrams I received just today urging immediate action to prevent closing of the flour mills:

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1950.*

The Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL,
United States House
of Representatives,
House Office Building:

Most urgent subsidy on flour be granted to countries outside International Wheat Agreement to prevent flour mills from shutting down in Pacific Northwest and relieve surplus wheat piling up. Why cannot something be done to help immediately? Please do your utmost to relieve situation.

CROWN MILLS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1950.*

The Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL,
United States House
of Representatives,
House Office Building:

Reference our wire of January 25, why must we wait indefinitely for some action by the Secretary of Agriculture and his board in granting some relief to grain and milling interests of the Pacific Northwest to enable us meet Canadian and Australian competition? We have lost a large portion of our export trade already through the inactivity of our Department of Agriculture and will have our flour mills completely out of production, with the loss of jobs to several thousand millworkers, and a resulting accumulation of wheat which must move in volume before another harvest.

W. H YOUNGER,
President, Terminal Flour Mills Co.

In the Northwest lumber trade disaster is facing the mills as their export trade is being wrecked by the ECA program. Under it American tax dollars are being supplied to purchase lumber in Canada to the extent of 95 percent of the purchases whereas only 5 percent go to American exporters. In the administration of the program the bids of the exporters are so manipulated as to put out of the running the American producers. I am just in receipt of a letter from a heavy exporter of lumber products from the Northwest, a resident of my district, in which he sets forth clearly the effects of the ECA program in wrecking the lumber business not only of the Pacific Northwest but of the Nation. I quote from this letter, as follows:

The compilation you sent recently from the ECA relative to lumber transactions was not a list of the bids and bidders. It is simply the excuse that the British make for placing the business in Canada. In order to make a fair comparison between the American and the Canadian bids, we should have the exact prices per 1,000 feet f. a. s. vessel British Columbia ports and f. a. s. vessel American ports for each individual item and species. Until we have this we have no accurate basis of comparison.

We cite below a glaring example of discrimination, in item 517, timbers.

Name of firm	Quantity quoted	Price quoted	Quantity awarded
	Feet		*Feet*
Seaboard, MacMillan & Alaska Pine	9,000,000	$47.32	9,000,000
Morrison Export Co.	1,400,000	48.09	1,400,000
East Asiatic Co.	1,400,000	48.23	1,400,000
Dant & Russell, Inc.	14,000,000	47.15	2,200,000

All the above except Dant & Russell, Inc., are Canadian bidders. The Canadian cartel should not be entitled to 1 foot of this lumber business as it is our understanding that Congress is opposed to cartels participating in ECA business. The reason given for not awarding the total amount to Dant & Russell, Inc., was that the cost of loading in Canada was presumed to be $2 per 1,000 feet less than in the United States of America. The cost of loading is only part of the cost of freighting lumber, and freight rates to all parts of the world from British Columbian ports have always been the same as from United States North Pacific ports. This can easily be checked with the Pacific Coast European Conference, whose freight rates to all of Europe with the exception of United Kingdom ports are the same from either British Columbia or United States North Pacific ports. Canadian funds may be used for payment of freight, but in this event the money is at the current discount rate. The only reason that United Kingdom rates have

been thrown open on direct instruction from London is to further the opportunities for finagling by the British.

Not one more cent of ECA money should be given to England for the purchase of any commodity, because the funds are used in discrimination against American interests. If Congress is going to continue to permit this misuse, then American industry should be relieved of the taxation required to support ECA allocations. I am aware that this may seem a ridiculous conclusion, but I am definitely of the opinion that the whole ECA program is directly forbidden by the Constitution of the United States. The idea that American firms may be taxed to death to support socialistic Governments in Europe is beyond all reason. Congress should immediately declare an end to the emergencies under which the robbery of American taxpayers is carried on, and payment should be refused for the British lumber purchases presently authorized by the ECA.

If the ECA insists on paying for this last British order and for the previous one, which is even more indefensible, then such action should be taken against the ECA as is prescribed in the laws under which ECA exists. A further violation is that apparently not 1 foot of the British lumber order is going to be shipped by American tonnage. This certainly is contrary to the intent of Congress, and the provision for shipping 50 percent of all ECA commodities by American tonnage should in itself assure at least 50 percent of the lumber ordered coming from the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time for the Members of Congress who represent the people and who provide Uncle Sam with the tax dollars, the machinery, and the power to wreck our own American economy as shown by the instances I have cited—is it not time for Congress to act? I most sincerely urge that the Congress without delay put into effect a commonsense forthright program, based on established American doctrines, to plug up the holes in the Treasury, cut out the enormous waste and profligate spending, reduce the budget, do away with the wartime excise taxes and bring our expenditures and receipts into balance, and help Uncle Sam to show to the world that he is mentally sound and that his affairs need not be put under the control of a spendthrift trust.

UNCLE SAM HAS BILLIONS FOR WAR AND WASTE—NOTHING FOR THE AGED

Mr. Speaker, again I want to call the attention of the House to the utterly indefensible position of this great Government in failing to provide for the aged of our Nation. We have spent $27,100,000,000 overseas since war ended in foreign programs, averaging $18,500,000 per day, $750,000 per hour, $12,500 per minute or $200 per second.

Uncle Sam has a $100,000,000 plan for buying up potatoes in order to prevent their use as human food, forcing up the price of the remaining potatoes to the consumers. The American consumer is hit twice by this program—first he pays high taxes to the Government to buy the potatoes and secondly he pays higher prices to the merchant for the potatoes he needs for his own use. The President is proposing to spend over $42,000,000,000 for 1951 fiscal year which it is estimated is over $6,000,000,000 more than he will receive. The Federal debt is now in excess of $252,000,000,000 and is increasing by leaps and bounds.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding these enormous expenditures, many of them sheer waste, the United States continues to refuse to provide a program that will permit the aged of America to have annuities affording a minimum for food, shelter, clothing, and medicine to keep body and soul together in their declining years. Their meager income has been split in two by reason of the inflationary period we are in with a dollar worth only 50 cents and as a result many are in dire need for the bare necessities of life.

I call to your attention Discharge Petition No. 15 to bring up for consideration the old-age security program set forth in H. R. 2135 and my companion bill, H. R. 2136, which would provide adequate annuities for the aged of America. As you know H. R. 6000 providing for the amendment of the Social Security Act was considered in the House under a gag rule and we were not permitted to make any amendments to it. If amendments had been permitted we would have offered the provisions of H. R. 2135, the Townsend plan, as amendments to this bill.

With a number of other of our House colleagues, I recently appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and urged that that committee include the provisions of H. R. 2135 as amendments to H. R. 6000 and I repeat here some of the arguments I presented to the committee in support of this proposal.

I am urging that the provisions of H. R. 2136 and its companion bills be embodied as amendments to H. R. 6000. If this were done we believe that many of the social-security problems for the aged and disabled would be solved.

It is conceded by all that the existing social-security program is not meeting the needs of America's aged, neither in coverage of the needy aged nor in the amounts of the monthly annuities being provided to the recipients. In a letter to the distinguished chairman of this committee on April 6 last, ex-President Hoover, Chairman of the Commission for the Organization of the Executive Departments, said:

I wish to say at once that I strongly favor Government provision for protection of the aged and their dependents.

The problem before the Nation is to obtain a workable system, with a minimum of bureaucracy, adjusted to the economic strength of the country which gives an assurance of security to this group. In my view, we have not yet found that system.

The testimony of Mr. Arthur J. Altmeyer, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, before this committee shows that the present system is woefully lacking in providing adequate protection to these worthy citizens who, by reason of age or disability, are unable to receive sufficient funds to meet their minimum needs.

The fact-finding board appointed by President Truman recently, to consider the wage dispute between the United States Steel Corp. and its workers, reported as follows:

The concept of providing social insurance and pensions for workers in industry has become an accepted part of modern American thinking. Unless Government provides such insurance in adequate amount, industry should step in to fill the gap. Government * * * has failed to provide social insurance for industrial workers generally, and has supplied old-age retirement benefits in amounts which are not adequate to provide an American minimum standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, the Advisory Council on Social Security to your own Senate Committee on Finance reported that it found three major deficiencies in the old-age and survivors insurance program which I quote verbatim:

1. Inadequate coverage—only about three out of every five jobs are covered by the program.

2. Unduly restrictive eligibility requirements for old workers—largely because of these restrictions, only about 20 percent of those aged 65 or over are either insured or receiving benefits under the program.

3. Inadequate benefits—retirement benefits at the end of 1949 averaged $26 a month for a single person.

In fact, almost without exception qualified experts who have examined into this old-age security problem facing our Nation have reported the deficiencies of the present system and the need for major overhauling or substitution of a new system therefor.

We in America can be justly proud of our achievements in the development of our industrial production which enables us to stand in the forefront of all nations in the ability to produce food, clothing, shelter, and other necessities of life in abundance, not only for our own people but to help other nations in need. This was a major factor in winning the war. However, with machine labor and mass production, we have found that the elderly people of America, by reason of the very success we have achieved in production, are outcasts and have been deprived of remunerative employment in their declining years and many of them are in dire need.

Existing social and economic conditions force upon us the complex question of security for the individual in our modern industrial civilization. Since 1919 the number of self-employed individuals in the United States, including farmers, has remained fairly constant at about nine or ten million. During the same period the number of employees in the American labor force has risen from 32,600,000 to over 60,000,000, almost double. Since population has been increasing during this entire period, the percentage of self-employed persons in the United States has declined from about 22 percent in 1919 to about 17.2 percent in 1949. In other words, we are facing an age-old problem under rapidly changing conditions.

The young and vigorous are on the pay rolls of this machine age and the elderly citizens are relegated to the side lines. As a result of this maladjustment, we find the aged unemployed increasing in numbers and in want, and we are faced with the problem of social security to meet the needs for livelihood of this large group. To meet this problem the Seventy-fourth Congress passed Public Law 271 setting up a social-security program not only for the aged, but for the blind, dependent, crippled children, and with certain assistance to maternal and child welfare and public health. The Seventy-sixth Congress made extensive

amendments to the law, and as a result we now have two major programs governing social security—title I providing grants to States for old-age assistance, and title II setting up a program for Federal old-age and survivors-insurance benefits. For over 10 years now these laws have been in operation and we find that they fail, in many important particulars, to meet the problems we are seeking to solve in providing adequate social-security for the aged and disabled.

In order to remedy these deficiencies, your advisory council recommended that the coverage be extended to include the self-employed, farm workers, household workers, employees of nonprofit institutions, Federal civilian employees, railroad employees, members of the armed services and employees of State and local governments, all of which are now excluded from the benefits of the act. The council further recommended extending greater liberality in eligibility and increased benefits and survivors protection. H. R. 6000 contains some of these recommendations. The findings of this council clearly disclose that the present social-security program is basically inadequate and must be completely overhauled or supplanted by a more effective program.

There were more than 100 bills pending in the Eightieth Congress proposing changes in the social-security law. Several sought to increase old-age and survivors insurance. Forty-one urged increases in old-age assistance, 13 dealt with aid to dependent children.

The problem of caring for the aged, the disabled, and dependent children, as seen today in the eyes of proponents of the Townsend plan and others, is that there are millions of such persons in need among us who are not now, and cannot in the future, be cared for in an honorable and just way by the present system of social security. Under this system, millions of old people receive either no support or hopelessly inadequate support. The system which has been set up is extremely complicated and its administration costly. To rectify these deficiences we propose H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136.

The philosophy and objectives of the Townsend proposal as compared with the existing system have much in common, but there are marked differences. Our proposal would give recognition to the past labors of the aged and would offer them dividends from the wealth they helped to create. It would give this as a matter of right without any direct relation to specific monetary contributions. The existing old-age and survivors insurance program gives benefits as a matter of right but ties them to a principle of insurance—something that each prospective annuitant and his employer buys as he participates in the productive processes of the country. Finally, old-age assistance is provided to the aged who, because of the lateness of starting the program of old-age and survivors insurance or because of inadequate coverage or benefits, are in need and should be helped.

We believe that annuities should be offered with neither the stigma of charity nor of poverty. They should be offered as a matter of right as dividends from the national wealth the aged have helped to create. A system should be adopted to replace the complicated, arbitrary, and inequitable provisions of the existing law. It should be one which will have a stimulative effect upon our economy and one which will help to make available jobs to all the young who will replace the aged as the latter move into retirement at a decent standard of living.

Only a noncontributory plan will meet the needs of those now grown old who are in need because of past neglect in providing an adequate contributory retirement system. Since, at the time the system was adopted, most of the States were financially unable to assume the burden of so many aged who moved on to Federal relief rolls, it was deemed proper to continue to provide Federal aid to States to provide relief to those aged who were in need.

Much of the argument in support of the Townsend plan stems from the limited coverage and inadequate benefits of the present system. For example, most of today's aged who are not working left the labor force before they could build up rights to benefits under OASI. And even among the young and still employed, under the present OASI system, there is no coverage for jobs in agriculture, domestic service in private homes, Federal, State, and local government employees, and workers in religious, charitable, and certain other nonprofit organizations, the self-employed, and others as well. About one-third of the workers engaged in employment are not covered by the system; and of the 78,900,000 living persons with OASI wage credits at the end of 1949, about 35,500,000 were neither fully nor currently insured on the basis of their wage records, and hence were not protected under the programs. In the Federal Security Agency, Social Security Administration Annual Report, 1947, section 1, page 7, it is said:

> Under our present provisions it would be possible for an individual to work at some time during the course of his working life in jobs covered by Federal old-age and survivors insurance, the Railroad Retirement Act, the Civil Service Retirement Act, and the retirement plan of a State or locality. According to the length and timing of such employments he might become eligible to receive retirement benefits under one or more or all of these plans. Another man, with similar earnings under several of the programs, may go through a working life without ever acquiring retirement rights under any. Conceivably the survivors of a worker who dies might be eligible for benefits under a Federal old-age and survivors insurance system as well as under a State workmen's compensation law and under general veterans' legislation. Another family, equally in need of income to replace the father's earnings, may have had no opportunity to gain protection under any of these programs.

No Federal provision is made to care for the disabled other than the needy blind. In the same report, pages 21 and 22, it is said:

> The United States is unique among major industrial nations in its lack of a general disability-insurance system. Compensation for wage loss due to incapacity is confined in this country to work-connected accidents or diseases in industry and commerce, to service in the armed forces, and to employment in the railroad industry or by Government. Two States provide benefits for temporary disability under arrangements similar to unemployment insurance and with the same coverage. In June 1947 these special systems, in the aggregate, reached very few of the 2,000,000 to 2,500,000 persons disabled on an average day and recently in the labor force, who but for their incapacity would be working or seeking work.

Under the existing law under old-age and survivors insurance the average benefits are about $26 per month according to the latest data available from social-security records. To obtain this payment the worker and the employer would have to make contributions over a long period of time. On the other hand the average of old-age assistance—not available to those under the retirement plan but given only on a claim of need is about $16 more per month than the old-age and survivors insurance payments. According to late figures payments in Colorado reached $78.29, in California $61.25, and in Washington $60.33. It is thus shown that those receiving assistance who did not contribute to the program received very substantially more than those who through the years contributed taxes based on monthly incomes. Recipients of relief exceed by nearly 1,500,000 the insured workers who are drawing benefits, according to recent reports.

This experience is directly opposite to that contemplated when the Social Security Act was enacted. It was believed that gradually all old-age beneficiaries would come under the provisions of the old-age and survivors insurance program and those receiving assistance on the basis of need would be gradually reduced and eventually eliminated.

A major defect in the present system is the smallness of individual payments and their inadequacy in providing a decent standard of living. The old-age insurance program is based, in respect to the payments to the recipients, upon the contributions made by the workers, the employees, and their employers. A vast actuarial plan has been set up, requiring the attention of highly trained actuaries. Almost endless files are required to house the data collected. At the end, the average worker comes out with about $26 a month, far less than he would get if he were under the old-age assistance program. This plan actually contemplates that these actuarial calculations will become effective against a worker 16 years of age who is in a covered occupation, and that for 50 years until 65 years of age is reached the Social Security Board will keep track of the employers and of the tax payments made from wages; as a result of those calculations, it will determine what the worker will receive 50 years from now. The sad and pathetic aspect of it is that these payments will amount to only approximately $10 a month, which is the minimum, or up to approximately $60 a month, which is the maximum under the existing law. As a matter of fact, these payments are so meager the recipients are unable to sustain their lives in decency and health.

We are experiencing today, with the depreciated dollar, the futility of attempting to determine a fixed dollar income for retirement pay 10, 20, or 50 years in advance. The dollar today will purchase little more than half what it did when these payments were scheduled. Annuitants with fixed income based on prewar values are able to buy only about one-half of the food, clothing, and other necessities their meager annuities would provide before the war. It is rash to attempt to fix by statute and provide through reserves the payments that will be paid many years hence. Changes in the purchasing power of the dollar are so great that attempts of one generation to set minimum decent standards of living for succeeding generations cannot but prove fruitless and just wasted motion.

The Townsend plan is flexible and would change with the changing conditions and purchasing power of the dollar. It would also do away with the endless bookkeeping and statistical work and filing routine and office space needed to keep the accounts of 75 to 100 million workers.

It is not possible to estimate definitely the per capita annuity that would be available under the Townsend proposal should it be enacted. Its virtue is its elasticity, the monthly payments keeping pace with the purchasing power of the dollar. The tax formula could be changed by the Congress from time to time to meet the existing needs. Since the amount of the monthly payments for the beneficiaries depends upon the tax collected and the number of eligible citizens who apply for the annuities, it is not possible to determine with any degree of accuracy what these payments would be without knowing the national gross income and the number of recipients. However, amounts payable under the Townsend plan will be found by subtracting administrative costs from tax receipts and dividing the remainder by the number of beneficiaries.

A major objection to the public-assistance programs now in operation is that, being State administered, amounts paid vary greatly not only as between States but also as between localities within the same State.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue is to collect the tax under the proposed Townsend plan law. Every person having a personal income in excess of $250 and all other persons or corporations having any gross receipts would be required to make monthly returns. Much of this work of collection could be eliminated if some method of collection at the source were devised. Another administrative problem would be the sending out of the checks each month to the pensioners. A similar problem is now being met under the Social Security Act.

Under old-age and survivors insurance, the Social Security Administration in the Federal Security Administration administers the payment of benefits, while the Bureau of Internal Revenue collects the tax. The cost of administering this program is now running around $53,000,000 per year. Total costs through 1949 were about 12 percent of benefits paid out and a little more than 2 percent of total receipts—taxes plus interest on assets. For the fiscal year 1949, administrative costs were 3.1 percent of receipts and 9 percent of benefit payments. Part of the administrative chore is keeping the wage records of 78,900,000 living persons and determining the amount of benefit each—and his family—is entitled to, if and when he or they become eligible for a benefit payment.

Though old-age and other public-assistance plans are State administered, the Federal Government contributes to the administrative costs. The Federal contribution is one-half the cost of these programs. The total Federal and State administrative costs in the fiscal year 1949 ran approximately as follows: Old-age assistance, $66,028,000; dependent children, $31,918,000; needy blind, $3,046,000.

The tax proposed to finance the Townsend plan is a gross income tax. Practically every argument that can be raised against this tax can be raised against nearly every other tax in force today. Two strong counter arguments, however, do exist against the so-called regressive nature of the proposed tax. The first is that no tax should be considered apart from the use to which the revenues derived are to be put. While sales taxes are objectionable the laudable purpose of this tax overcomes the objections. Second, experience demonstrates that the people of more than half the States have sales taxes dating back to the depression of the thirties. But to return to the first argument, it is apparent that persons in low-income groups will receive annuities in their old age at small cost. Persons in upper- and high-income brackets will have paid more for their annuities than the low-income groups. Yet, all will receive the same annuity. Therefore, instead of being regressive, the tax is in effect progressive. And further, it is not improper to suppose that the burden of the tax—to the extent they are not dissipated by the positive stimulus that currently paid annuities will have on the economy, will be borne willingly by all in the realization that by paying a tax today they will guarantee themselves an honorable and just annuity when they, too, are disabled or reach the age of 60. All wages in excess of $250 a month would be taxed 3 percent. There would be no other deductions. The tax on wages and other income would be justified by this direct benefit of an annuity to every taxpayer upon qualifying.

The thought behind this proposal is that in the years before the war people in general tended to hoard their earnings. Consumption did not keep pace with the ability of the economy to produce. The result was that we had underproduction, underconsumption, and unemployment. Today we produce more goods that the market will absorb. The Townsend plan would help to utilize this oversupply, such as we now have in eggs, meats, cotton, and other staples. There will be no incentive for elderly people of limited income to hoard their meager earnings as the haunting fear of old age and destitution will have been removed. The proceeds of the tax will go to people who will move out of employment. They will be required to spend the proceeds of their annuities within 30 days. This will stimulate production, production will promote employment, the younger will move into jobs vacated by the aged, and we will have prosperity.

The old-age and survivors insurance program, being a contributory plan based upon contributions by both employers and employees, each paying a tax of 1½ percent on the first $3,000 of wages to be increased to 2 percent in 1952. Wages must be based on take-home pay if families maintain an adequate standard of living. The plan gives inadequate relief to those covered and is unjust to those not covered. These taxes go into what is called a trust fund which, on December 31, 1949, amounted to $11,815,921,753.51. The Government spends the trust funds as received for the regular expenses of government, and replaces the funds with Government securities bearing interest paid by the Government, which encourages deficit spending. It follows that when these funds are needed, in lieu of the bonds, the Government will be obliged to levy another tax on all taxpayers to meet the demands upon the fund. Notwithstanding this huge balance in the trust fund on December 31, 1949, there had been paid to beneficiaries under the program up to that date only $2,995,769,618.86.

The old-age assistance program under the present social security law is also wholly inadequate to provide a decent annuity to old people of our Nation who come within its provisions. It is a starvation allowance. There is little uniformity in the payments made in the several States. Many old-age annuitants are suffering from malnutrition and starvation.

If we are to preserve the American way of life and our economic and democratic processes under free enterprise, we must find a solution not only for our unemployment problems but also for the problems of providing adequate care for the aged and disabled. With an accelerating advance in technology in the postwar era, and with the commercial development of atomic energy presaging more rapid transitions in mass production, the social risks and hazards of unemployment and old age are increased. Rather than see workers pushed from active labor force, hit or miss, the logical policy to follow is one of selection. The older group has earned retirement. Many of them are not covered by the Social Security Act. By covering the entire group, the whole process of business activity will be stabilized. Retirement payments will provide continuous buying power, will provide the needed balance in market demand, and will help to provide mass consumption without which our mass-production economy cannot function successfully.

The aged, through no fault of their own, through the fiat of industry, are denied a part in production. They toiled the longest in production and should not, when old, be deprived of taking part in consumption. They are the victims of an industrial system for which they are not responsible. Society owes a duty to these old folks, and it can only perform this duty by establishing a national an-

nuity system providing against the hazards of old age and disability. There are millions among us, 60 years of age and over, who are not now being cared for in an honorable and just way by the present system of social security, and are receiving no support from any source or hopelessly inadequate support.

I most sincerely and respectfully urge that this great committee give heed to the needs of this large segment of our population by adopting the provisions of H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136 as amendments to H. R. 6000.

Mr. Speaker, I most respectfully urge all of my colleagues who are interested in providing for our aged in a manner that is in keeping with the American standards of life and which will enable them to live in decency and health in their declining years, to sign discharge petition No. 15 and bring this legislation on the floor of the House for consideration and passage.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to postpone his special order for today until tomorrow to address the House for 20 minutes following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HAND (at the request of Mr. HESELTON), for today and tomorrow, on account of death in family;

To Mr. PASSMAN (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana), for Monday and Tuesday, February 6 and 7, on account of official business;

To Mr. ALLEN of California, for 10 days, beginning February 9, 1950, on account of official business and other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 7, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1202. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Co."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1203. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Tenth and Final Annual Report of the Federal Works Agency, covering the fiscal year July 1, 1948, through June 30, 1949, to the Committee on Public Works.

1204. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revision of a proposed provision relating to an appropriation of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year 1950, in the form of an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1951 (H. Doc. No. 462); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1205. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $30,000 for the legislative branch, House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 463); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1206. A communication from the President of the United States, recommending favorable consideration to the legislation recommended by the Securities and Exchange Commission providing for an amendment to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 which would extend to investors in certain unregistered securities the protections now enjoyed by investors in securities which are registered by their issuers with that Commission (H. Doc. No. 464); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed

1207. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1208. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of St. Elizabeths Hospital, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1209 A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the United States Maritime Commission for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1948 and 1949 (H. Doc. No 465); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1210. A letter from the secretary, National Park Trust Fund Board, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report covering the fiscal year 1949 pursuant to provisions of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to create a National Park Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes," approved July 10, 1935 (49 Stat 477, 16 U. S. C. 19); to the Committee on Public Lands.

1211. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 28, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Guamani River and tributaries, Puerto Rico, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1212 A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a copy of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7146. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States," so as to provide that moneys received from the disposal of material from reserved school section lands in Alaska shall be credited to the Territory, to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 7147. A bill to change the effective date of the act of June 19, 1948, relating to the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 7148. A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the "Agricultural Act of 1949"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 7149. A bill to authorize loans to make available in any area or region credit formerly made available in such area or region by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 7150. A bill to prohibit commercially sponsored radio broadcasts on streetcars and busses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 7151. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H R. 7152. A bill to provide that the highest temporary rank of the commissioned officers directing the various women's corps of the armed forces of the United States shall be "brigadier general" or "rear admiral lower half," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POULSON:

H R. 7153 A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept voluntary conveyances of lands owned by Waccamaw Indians in North Carolina and to issue trust patents for such lands, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SIKES:

H R 7154. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cigar-wrapper type 61 tobacco and cigar-wrapper type 62 tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H R 7155 A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest landowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture

By Mr SMATHERS:

H R 7156 A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, in order to provide more effective financial assistance for small business, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr STOCKMAN:

H R 7157 A bill to provide for the design and construction of highway bridges near certain dams, to the Committee on Public Works

Mr ZABLOCKI:

H R 7158 A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H R. 7159. A bill to prevent military personnel from replacing civilians in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R 7160. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in helping to establish and maintain an adequate minimum program of education and in attempting to more nearly equalize educational opportunities in public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H R. 7161. A bill to authorize an annual appropriation to aid the Arctic Institute of North America in its scientific research activities in North American Arctic and sub-Arctic areas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J Res. 414. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. Res. 461. Resolution authorizing a survey of the feasibility of constructing a conveyor belt between the House Office Buildings and the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, requesting the return of certain property for exhibition at the Appomattox Surrender Grounds Park; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R 7162. A bill to exempt from customs duty the cembalo of Reed College, Portland, Oreg., and to provide for the refund of customs duty previously paid thereon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT.

H R 7163. A bill for the relief of Marshall B. Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R 7164. A bill for the relief of Edward E Harriman, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. BREEN:

H R. 7165 A bill for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H R 7166. A bill for the relief of Amy Louisa Shier, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHESNEY:

H. R 7167. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rozalia Sutor-Hozak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H R 7168 A bill for the relief of Mrs. Radigunde Gruber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R. 7169. A bill for the relief of Anna Jarfas, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD.

H R. 7170. A bill for the relief of Tryntje Bierema; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R 7171 A bill for the relief of Rocco Giannetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7172. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Pick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 7173. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Ono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H R. 7174. A bill for the relief of Jakub Wolf, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 7175. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko Yano Kingman and William Leo Kingman, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H R. 7176. A bill for the relief of Domenica Fontana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1789. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Pennsylvania Motor Truck Association, Inc., protesting Government invasion and dictation of the conduct of business as proposed against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1790. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of several residents of Worcester and Westford, N. Y., advocating passage of H. R. 2428, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising and stop its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1791. By Mr. PETERSON: Petition of Mrs. G. C. Meyer and other citizens of New Port Richey, Fla., in support of House Joint Resolution 181; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1792. Also, petition of W. E. Page, of Wauchula, Fla., and approximately 40 other citizens of that area, in support of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1793. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ambassador V. K. Wellington Koo, Chinese Embassy, Washington, D. C., transmitting a statement by the Control Yuan of China requesting and appealing for aid against Soviet Union imperialist aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1794. Also, petition of Chayhin Martinez, agent, Moro war-damage claimants, Jolo, Sulu, Philippine Islands, requesting immediate and favorable action on a list of 25 Moro claimants for war-damage payments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1795. Also, petition of Graciano Abad, Pantabangan, Nueva Ecija, Philippine Islands, requesting action be taken on his claim for materials furnished guerrilla or armed forces of the United States during the Japanese occupation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1796. Also, petition of J Kennedy Can and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1797 Also, petition of Mrs T. J Bryan and others, Lakeland, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means

1798 Also, petition of John Paul Chapman and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1799. Also, petition of J P Fleming and others, Montverde, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1800 Also, petition of C. C Clifton and others, New Smyrna, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1801. Also, petition of Mrs Minnie Newhart and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1802. Also, petition of Mrs Josephine Hudson and others, Sarasota, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1803 Also, petition of Mary R. Dowling and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

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

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

Father of all mercies, away from Thee all is darkness and death. In the midst of world conditions that baffle us, swift social currents which sweep away our strongest bulwarks, we confess that the world in which our lot is cast is too much for us; we must find a strength not our own or our feet will slip in this whelming flood. To Thy sustaining grace we would lift up, in this hallowed moment, the thronging duties which haunt us day and night, the grievous problems affecting Thy children in all the world for which our human wisdom finds no answer.

Heal the divisions which shorten the arm of our national might in this momentous hour. Spurning and scorning the unworthy may we rejoice only in the fair and fragrant virtues of an honor untarnished. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. DOWNEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 6, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 88) to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H R 33. An act to authorize Joe Graham Post, No 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the lands conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933;

H R 1151. An act to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers;

H R. 1941. An act to provide for limiting participation as beneficiary under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes,

H. R 5101. An act to provide for the transfer to Pierce County, Wash., of certain surplus land in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation;

H R 5282. An act to amend section 3 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

H R 5503. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to release and quitclaim a portion of a right-of-way easement to Langley Air Force Base, Va.;

H R 5921. An act to terminate lump-sum benefits provided by law to certain Reserve officers of the Navy and Air Force;

H. R. 6077. An act to clarify the status of inactive members of the Naval Reserve relating to the holding of offices of trust or profit under the Government of the United States,

H. R 6406 An act providing procedure for claimants of mining claims in the United States obtaining credit for assessment work performed during the year ending July 1, 1949, under the provisions of Public Law 107, Eighty-first Congress;

H. R. 6552. An act to correct a clerical error in section 2 of the act of January 16, 1883, an act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, as amended by Public Law 425, Eighty-first Congress;

H. R. 6553. An act to provide for the promotion of carriers in the rural delivery service in recognition of longevity of service;

H. R. 6559 An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide a minimum rate of compensation for World War II veterans who have arrested tuberculosis;

H. R. 6603. An act to provide that certain service performed in the custodial service and in the mail equipment shops of the Post Office Department shall be credited toward promotion to the meritorious and longevity grades established for the postal field service; and

H. R. 6673. An act to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by providing for treble-damage actions.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 97) to provide for a single supply catalog system, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1282. An act to authorize grants under the Federal Airport Act for minor projects at major airports, and for other purposes; and

H R. 4106. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point the statement of principles and objectives adopted by the Republican Members of the Senate and House of Representatives on February 6, 1950, with the concurrence of the Republican National Committee.

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

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES ADOPTED BY THE REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF THE SENATE, AND CONCURRED IN BY THE MEMBERS OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 6, 1950

To win lasting peace, to build a country in which every citizen may make the most of his skill, initiative, and enterprise, and to hold aloft the inspiring torch of American freedom, opportunity, and justice, assuring better and happier life for all our people, we dedicate our efforts and issue this statement of principles and objectives supplementing the Republican platform of 1948.

We shall not passively defend the principles stated here, but shall fight for them with all the vigor with which our forefathers fought to establish what we now seek to advance and perpetuate—human liberty and individual dignity.

We pledge that in all we will advocate and in all that we will perform the first test shall be: Does this conduct enlarge and strengthen or does it undermine and lessen human liberty and individual dignity.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The American people face the hard fact that though they won the war nearly 5 years ago they have not yet won the peace. We offer them leadership in new efforts to achieve this vital end.

We favor a foreign policy in which all Americans, regardless of party, will join to assure peace with justice in a free world while maintaining the independence and the rights of the American people.

We insist upon restoration of our foreign agreements to their proper place inside the Constitution and we insist that the United States shall not be bound to any course of action unless the spirit and letter of our constitutional procedure are followed.

We oppose secret commitments and we denounce the refusal of the administration to furnish accurate and adequate information to the Congress.

Under our indispensable two-party system, we shall be vigilant in critical exploration of administration foreign policy. We favor consultation between the Executive and members of both major parties in the legislative branch of Government in the initiation and development of a united American foreign policy, and we deplore the tragic consequences of the administration's failure to pursue these objectives in many fields, particularly in the secret agreements of Yalta, subsequently confirmed at Potsdam, which have created new injustices and new dangers throughout the world.

We favor full support of the United Nations and the improvement of its Charter so that it may be an effective international organization of independent states prepared to mobilize public opinion and the armed forces of the world against aggression. We favor full support of the inter-American system as an integral part of the international organization and of our treaty obligations in the North Atlantic community.

We advocate a strong policy against the spread of communism or fascism at home and abroad, and we insist that America's efforts toward this end be directed by those who have no sympathy either with communism or fascism.

We support aid to those states resisting communism, but such aid should be given only if it is essential to our national security, if it is within the total limits which the American economy can afford, if it will be effective, if it is beyond the ability of the aided nation to supply for itself, and if there is a program for progressive reduction.

The Republican Party has always believed in a strong national defense. We must maintain our armed forces at a strength completely adequate for the security of our people.

We favor the promotion of world trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, and we assert that this can be done within the republican principle that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to this country on terms which imperil the living standards of the American workman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry. A strong American economy is a vital factor for our security.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

The major domestic issue today is liberty against socialism: Whether we shall remain in this country a free people in constant control of our governments, or whether we shall delegate to an all-powerful Federal Government with unlimited power to tax and spend, the rights to direct and operate our agriculture, industry, labor and local communities and the daily lives of our citizens. We believe there is no frontier beyond which devotion to the American system may not increase our knowledge, character, and material welfare; but we believe these goals can only be secured in a framework of liberty, equality and justice, with adequate incentive and rewards to workmen and to industry for ability, knowledge, character, hard work, daring, and genius.

Basic American principles are threatened by the administration's program for a planned economy modeled on the Socialist governments of Europe, including price and wage control, rationing, socialized medicine, regional authorities, and the Brannan plan with its controls, penalties, fines, and jail sentences. This program is dictated by a small but powerful group of persons who believe in socialism, who have no concept of the true foundation of American progress, and whose proposals are wholly out of accord with the true interests and real wishes of the workers, farmers, and businessmen.

As the iron curtain descends on half the globe, and as nation after nation samples the drug of totalitarianism, the Republican Party is the champion of human liberty and the essential dignity of the individual. To it falls the task of offering not only its opposition, but of proposing a program to restore faith in free institutions, and bring about stability, opportunity, and progress.

We hold that government can use its just powers to foster national health, promote real security for the aged, develop sound agricultural and labor-management policies, and advance civil rights. These ideas are in keeping with the earliest and finest Republican traditions, and can be achieved without establishing socialism or discipline or dependence. The Democrats have also professed these ideals, but the stark truth is that after 18 years of Democratic control and endless talk, they have reduced this whole field to confusion and futility The administration is seeking to make demagogic appeals rather than enact sound legislation. It seeks to keep glittering goals intact to lure votes in anticipation of favors to come. Such a cynical procedure raises the naked issue of sincerity, of responsibility, and of achievement.

To achieve our objectives, we offer certain fundamental proposals, and constructive undertakings to rebuild a prosperous and progressive America:

I. The economy

Liberty cannot breathe the air of bankruptcy and live.

Reckless and extravagant spending by the Federal Government, as now advocated by the Democratic administration, with recurring annual deficits or continually increasing taxes, can result only in disaster and ruin for our country. It will further cheapen the dollar, rob the wage earner, impoverish the farmer and destroy the savings, pensions, insurance, and investments of millions of people. Therefore we urge:

A. An end of deficit spending and a return to a balanced budget.

B. That Federal spending be materially reduced.

C. The achievement of efficiency and economy in Government especially by adoption of measures along the lines of the Hoover Report.

D. A policy of general tax reduction to be accomplished as rapidly as reduction in Federal expenditures will permit. We favor immediate repeal of oppressive wartime excises and reduction of taxes on small business to stimulate new industry and growth. This will create new jobs, new wealth, and eventually greater tax revenue. It will provide opportunity for youth, furnish incentives for stable employment and retention of older employees, and encourage lower prices.

E. Strict enforcement of the laws against monopoly and unfair competition.

F. Establishment of a nonpartisan commission to study and recommend a sensible redistribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue between the Federal, State, and local entities, to secure the sovereignty of the several States with as much decentralization as is compatible with the national welfare.

II. Agriculture

A prosperous agriculture is fundamental to a prosperous America. We join farm organizations in condemning the Brannan plan

which would regiment our farmers, cost untold billions of the taxpayers' money, and would mean the ultimate nationalization of agriculture. Its inefficiency and increased costs would adversely affect both the producer and the consumer. It would place every farmer in a state of complete dependency on Government for a large part of his income from uncertain annual congressional appropriations. We deplore the maladministration for political purposes of the present agricultural law by the Department of Agriculture.

We will continue to work with the farmers, farm organizations, and all friends of agriculture to bring about a sound solution of the many problems confronting the farmers of this country. Such farm policies must be developed in the interest of the farmer, the consumer, and the national economy Agriculture is a growing and dynamic industry undergoing constant change and improvement. No farm program can succeed which is not in harmony with this concept. Specifically we propose the following:

A. A program to provide a fair price for the farmers' products in the market place aided by a system of price supports and by protection against the dumping of competitive commodities produced by underpaid foreign labor, to the end that the farmer's standard of living will be in line with the contribution he makes to the national economy.

B. Continue and enlarge programs of research and education, both in production and marketing, with particular attention to cheaper and more effective production, a better and more effective marketing system especially for perishable commodities, sound cooperative marketing, and the development and expansion of industrial uses for agricultural products and byproducts

C. Continued development and restoration of our soil and water resources through soil conservation and reclamation

D Expansion of animal agriculture as a means of reducing surpluses, rebuilding the soil, and providing a better diet for our people.

E Special encouragement for the development and ownership of family-sized farms, improvement of rural living conditions, and completion of the rural-electrification program.

F. Development of export markets for the surplus crops which can be efficiently produced in this country

III. Labor-management relations

Industrial harmony and justice are essential to the country's well-being. To that end, government should encourage and promote free collective bargaining. On management and unions falls an equal responsibility to act in good faith toward each other and toward the country. We favor:

A. Continuation of the Taft-Hartley law because it has restored equality between employer and employee, guaranteed the right of collective bargaining, the recognition of unions and the right to strike, while protecting the rights of the public and the union members. Under this law union membership has increased to new highs, wages have risen to record levels, and strikes have decreased.

B Continuation of our efforts to enact such improvements in the law as have been shown to be necessary to accomplish its purposes more effectively. We deplore the action of the administration in playing politics in this vital area of human relations, thereby blocking the enactment of necessary amendments to the law—many of them proposed by labor organizations.

IV. Civil rights

The right of equal opportunity to work, to vote, to advance in life and to be protected under the law should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. Therefore, we shall continue to sponsor and support legislation to protect the rights of minorities.

V. Social responsibility

The obligation of government to those in need has long been recognized. Recognizing the inequities and injustices of the present program of social security, we urge:

A. The extension of the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program, reduction of eligibility requirements and increase of benefits to a more generous level, with due regard to the tax burden on those who labor.

B. A thorough-going study of a program of more nearly universal coverage including the principle of pay as you go.

C. Federal aid, where the need is clearly demonstrated, to States and through States to their subdivisions, to assist them in affording subsistence, shelter, and medical care to their citizens who are unable to provide for themselves. Such aid, including unemployment compensation, must be based on State and local initiative, operation, contribution, and responsibility, without Federal bureaucratic interference. It must avoid socialization of the medical profession or of any other activity. Federal aid must be in amounts which do not impose an unreasonable burden of taxation on the American people who pay the bills.

VI. Veterans

A grateful Nation demands that those who fought in its defense, their widows and orphans, must never be forgotten We urge.

A Continuing and sympathetic consideration of the rights and deserts of the veterans and their dependents

B Prompt and efficient handling of claims and other problems of veterans.

VII. Loyalty

Communism is an international conspiracy aiming at world-wide dictatorship and the suppression of religious, political, and economic freedoms throughout the world. It corrupts ideals, corrodes basic religious teachings, destroys the fiber of man and denies the existence of God. It is imperative that the nations of the world develop new methods to offset this frontal attack on civilization.

We condemn the failure of the administration to recognize the full implications of this threat to our security. We deplore the dangerous degree to which Communists and their fellow travelers have been employed in important Government posts and the fact that information vital to our security has been made available to alien agents and persons of questionable loyalty. We denounce the soft attitude of this administration toward Government employees and officials who hold or support Communist attitudes. We pledge immediate action to bring about:

A The complete overhaul of the so-called loyalty and security checks of Federal personnel.

B The prompt elimination of all Communists, fellow travelers, and Communist sympathizers from our Federal pay roll.

C. Closer coordination between our intelligence agencies, with full use of the facilities of the FBI for protecting our security.

CONCLUSION

To this program we subscribe, confident that the overwhelming majority of Americans cherish our heritage of freedom and will join us in this crusade to see that it shall not perish from the earth.

Our people must arouse themselves to preserve our precious liberties and freedoms—the right to worship God in our own way; to speak freely our minds without fear; to conduct our lives and our affairs without officious meddling by too powerful government. We must revivify those qualities of diligence, economy, courage, initiative, and patriotism which enabled our forefathers to make this Nation great.

This Republic is the custodian of human liberty. The Republican Party will endeavor to see to it that we are worthy of this guardianship.

REJECTION OF FORMER PRIME MINISTER SPAAK TO BE HEAD OF THE OFFICE OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in common with most American observers of the European scene, I was startled to read the other day in the newspapers that former Prime Minister Spaak had been rejected for the position of head of the Office of European Economic Cooperation. It is said that the Labor Government of Great Britain is responsible.

In common with most Americans, I feel that Mr. Spaak is certainly one of the ablest, if not the very ablest, political leader in western Europe today. I had applauded the report that President Truman had decided to advance his name for this position of leadership. In fact, on returning from Europe myself, in September, I had made a similar suggestion. It seemed to me that Mr. Spaak was the man who could provide the dynamic leadership necessary to the integration of western Europe. I cannot, therefore, resist the feeling that the objections to him cast a cloud over the whole future of economic cooperation. I hope I may be wrong.

Because of the importance of the subject, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD an illuminating editorial entitled "The Case of Mr. Spaak," which appeared in the Washington Post on February 2, 1950.

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

THE CASE OF MR. SPAAK

The British explain their rejection of Paul-Henri Spaak as head of the OEEC in Paris as due to Mr Spaak and not to the idea of giving OEEC a direction. What is Mr. Spaak's offense? So far as we can make out, it is some plain talking in which he indulged while he was recently in America. The former Belgian Prime Minister spoke in Philadelphia on January 14 on the British attitude toward continental Europe. It was a repetition of a speech he had already given in London. The pith of his address was this:

"There is, today, no really great power in Europe. A balance-of-power policy has become impossible. Great Britain can no longer be the beam of a balance of the scales which no longer exist; she must be herself, a positive and active element in Europe.

"Dare I say it, with all the admiration and friendship I feel for her. She must beware. If Great Britain turns away from continental Europe it will be a great misfortune for the latter, but, in the long run I am convinced that it will be a misfortune for Great Britain, too.

"The Europe I am speaking about is a mutilated Europe. We no longer have any contact with eastern Europe, nor with the greatest part of central Europe. We cannot, therefore, deprive ourselves of all that represents the Anglo-Saxon influence. If Europe has to be made without Great Britain, I believe she will be made, nevertheless, but she would be nothing more than a caricature.

"In that Europe, Germany will play a considerable part, I do not hesitate to say, too considerable. I am ready to look at the German problem with an open mind, and to forget everything it is possible to forget, but to make in Europe the necessary coun-

terbalance to the inevitable German influence, Great Britain's presence is more than indispensable.

"Those who hesitate in Great Britain, often mention their ties with the Commonwealth to support their attitude. Reason or pretext, I do not know."

This is merely an excerpt from a speech in which Mr. Spaak dealt with the problem of Europe. It was the excerpt which the newspaper reporters used and upon which the copyreaders built their headlines. The British are giving the impression in their umbrage that Mr. Spaak is anti-British. Only a person who has been asleep for the last 20 years would dub Mr. Spaak antipathetic to Britain. The evidence of his distinguished career—as a Socialist leader, as Belgium's Premier, as a European figure—is all to the contrary. Mr. Spaak in his visits to America has gone out of his way to speak with sympathy and understanding of Britain and of the problems of its Labor government. Many Washingtonians can testify to the readiness and persuasiveness with which he gratuitously comes to the support of Britain's Labor Government in conversation.

Mr. Spaak spoke in Philadelphia as a European. This is what he is, first and foremost. He is entitled to think that his record as a statesman and his prestige as a European should both have saved him from the narrowmindedness of nationalistic touchiness. The fact is that the Belgian statesman is, after Mr. Churchhill, the most eloquent and stanchest champion of a real instead of a phony organization of Europe. He was a pillar of strength before and during the convocation of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg in behalf of a united Europe. By acclamation he was made the first president of the European Consultative Assembly, the moral parliament of Europe. He still is its president.

The British, to absolve themselves from the reproach of turning their backs on Europe, have proposed in place of Mr. Spaak the Dutch Foreign Minister, Mr. Dirk U. Stikker. And Mr. Stikker has now been appointed. For the Dutch minister we entertain the highest respect. But Mr. Stikker is not Mr. Spaak. Mr. Stikker is an officeholder in his own country, and can give only part of his time to the job which is now called, of all things, "political conciliator" of OEEC. Mr. Spaak, however, no longer holds office in Belgium. He would have been able to devote all his time, as well as his talents and his passion, to the economic organization of Europe. His role was to be the director-general of OEEC, viz, its coordinating and driving force; and in this capacity he would have been empowered to talk to the governments of Europe free of any affiliation except to Europe. It is impossible to escape the conclusion that Mr. Spaak was vetoed not because he is anti-British, but because he is too strong a man and too ardent a European to trust in a job that looked as if it might acquire significance in the task of pushing integration. ECA has been put in jeopardy by British action in turning down an architect of Europe.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Capehart	Dworshak
Anderson	Chapman	Ecton
Benton	Chavez	Ellender
Brewster	Connally	Ferguson
Bricker	Cordon	Flanders
Bridges	Darby	Frear
Butler	Donnell	Fulbright
Byrd	Douglas	George
Cain	Downey	Gillette
Green	Leahy	Robertson
Gurney	Lehman	Russell
Hayden	Lodge	Saltonstall
Hendrickson	Lucas	Schoeppel
Hickenlooper	McCarran	Smith, Maine
Hill	McCarthy	Smith, N. J.
Hoey	McClellan	Sparkman
Holland	McFarland	Stennis
Humphrey	McKellar	Taft
Hunt	McMahon	Taylor
Ives	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Jenner	Martin	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Colo.	Maybank	Tobey
Johnson, Tex.	Millikin	Tydings
Johnston, S. C.	Mundt	Watkins
Kefauver	Murray	Wherry
Kem	Myers	Williams
Kerr	Neely	Withers
Kilgore	O'Conor	Young
Knowland	O'Mahoney	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business.

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

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

Mr SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained because of a temporary illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FERGUSON was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from tomorrow until Monday of next week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. AIKEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Wednesday of next week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. DOWNEY (for Mr. CONNALLY), and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will take the liberty of suggesting that, without objection and without speeches or debate, the Chair will recognize Senators who wish to present matters for the RECORD or introduce bills or resolutions.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT AND FINDINGS ON IMPROVEMENTS IN COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on proposed improvements in the Columbia River Basin for the development of the Pacific Northwest (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, dated February 1, 1950, together with drafts of proposed amendments to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF NATIONAL PARK TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the Secretary of the National Park Trust Fund Board, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

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

ALLEGED AGGRESSION BY SOVIET UNION AGAINST CHINA—LETTER AND STATEMENT FROM CHINESE AMBASSADOR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from V. K. Wellington Koo, Chinese Ambassador, transmitting a statement of the Control Yuan of China, relating to alleged imperialist aggression by the Soviet Union against China, which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by Horace F. Ortt Post, No. 540, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Dixon, Ill., favoring the discharge of the Committee on Finance from further consideration of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children, and urging its prompt enactment; to the Committee on Finance

A resolution adopted by the women's board of Huron Road Hospital, East Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

S. 1510. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of James I. Bartley; with amendments (Rept. No. 1254);

S. 1838. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to fees of United States marshals; without amendment (Rept. No. 1255;

S. 2338 A bill for the relief of J. M Arthur, without amendment (Rept. No. 1256);

S 2807 A bill for the relief of Sgt Blaine W Hughes, without amendment (Rept No. 1257),

S 2664. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1258);

H. R 1056. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased; with amendments (Rept. No. 1259);

H R. 3536 A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1260);

H R 3769. A bill for the relief of Doris M. Faulkner, without amendment (Rept No. 1261); and

H R 4411 A bill for the relief of Mrs Elizabeth Mary C Mangle; without amendment (Rept. No. 1262)

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 73), submitted a report (No. 1253) thereon, and the concurrent resolution was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

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

A-6294779, Bertagni, Hugo or Ugo Bertagni.

A-2651565, Bochicchio, Cristino or Nick De Mario or Nick DiMario or Nicola De Maria.

A-6321689, Clarisse, Abraham Anthonie.

A-4568634, Dietl, Marta Maria or Martha Maria Dietl

A-6570621, Dolan, Hilda Ena Louise (nee Phang), formerly Orinitcheff.

A-5661548, Ehlers, Mary Helen.

A-5324917, Harvey, Fredrick Herbert or Frederick (or Fredrick), Herbert Harvey or Fred Harvey.

A-1731581, Hriczo, Yanos Ferencz or John Frank Hriczo or Janos Hriczo or John Kriszo.

A-6989303, Latoff, Catherine Hage

A-3448878, Lyras, George Nicholas or Georgios Nicholas Lyras.

A-5569906, Lyras, Angeliki George, or Angela Lyras (nee Angela Joan Lyras).

A-4638126, Kong, Leet Tung or Lee Chung Kwong

A-5316626, Lee, Mary Anne or Kwan Chong Yen (maiden name).

A-6214506, Mercer, Clare Nelson.

A-6887754, Moran, Mary Joyce (nee Rooney)

A-6825230, Nowitsch, Silvia Marianna

A-6799368, Prideaux, Charles Stephen Anstice

A-1812178, Siiskonen, Evert.

A-6389051, Szefner, Feliks or Felix Shafner.

A-6389052, Szefner, Paulina or Pauline Shafner (nee Geszychter).

A-4324669, Tang, Doris or Chu Pui-Fong or Tang Pui Fong.

A-5995999, Tang, Harry, Tang Kim Man or Tang Kim-Man.

A-5995002, Tang, Ruth or Tang Wan Yin or Tang Wan-Yin.

A-4324670, Tang, Paul or Tang Sik-Pui or Tang Sik Pui.

A-5994998, Tang, Peggy or Tang Wan-Yon.

A-5995001, Tang, Helen or Tang Wan-Yim.

A-5995000, Tang, Andrew or Tang Sen-Man.

A-5903987, Tigeleiro, Jose.

A-6018586, Wojciechowska, Zofia Jadeiga.

A-6018587, Wojciechowska, Maria Teresa.

A-6018588, Wojciechowska, Christopher Richard.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 228), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on March 1, 1950, and ending on January 31, 1951, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC 2 The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $80,000, in addition to any unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 177, Eighty-first Congress, first session, agreed to October 13, 1949, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary

David L Bazelon, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit;

Clarence U Landrum, of Minnesota, to be United States Attorney for the district of Minnesota,

J Vincent Keogh, of New York, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York;

John A. Carver, of Idaho, to be United States attorney for the district of Idaho;

Edward Lawrence Burke, of Vermont, to be United States marshal for the district of Vermont; and

Everett M. Evans, of Idaho, to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho.

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary

H Nathan Swaim, of Indiana, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

(Mr. ANDERSON introduced Senate bill 3000, to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S 3001 A bill to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3002. A bill for the relief of the Inland Petroleum Transportation Co., Inc.; and

S. 3003. A bill for the relief of Howard Roy St. Vincent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 3004. A bill for the relief of Nabiha Elias Audi; and

S. 3005. A bill for the relief of Olga Haddad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3000) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, 80th Cong.; 62 Stat 1240), as amended, be amended by striking therefrom part 4 of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof: "(4) Parents (in equal shares) if there is no widow, dependent husband, or child."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF BILL PROPOSED BY SENATOR ANDERSON TO AMEND WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

The purpose of the bill I have just introduced is to amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, 80th Cong., July 3, 1948), as amended, by substituting a new subsection (c) (4) in section 6 Such an amendment would have the effect of removing the requirement of dependency, upon which entitlement of parents to benefits under section 6 of the act is now predicated. This legislation would, if enacted, also expedite and facilitate the work of the Commission in the adjudication of claims under section 6 of the War Claims Act by eliminating the necessity of proof of dependency of surviving parents.

Section 6 of the War Claims Act is that section which authorizes the payment of compensation to any regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the military or naval forces of the United States who was held as a prisoner of war for any period of time subsequent to December 7, 1941, by any government of any nation with which the United States has been at war subsequent to such date. Such compensation is payable at the rate of $1 a day for each day of imprisonment on which such enemy government failed to furnish such prisoners of war the quality and quantity of food to which they were entitled as prisoners of war under the terms of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929.

It should be noted that not only is dependency difficult to prove, but it also consists of varying elements such as the health of the individual, his ability to earn a living, the opportunity which he may have to exercise that ability, the location in which he lives, and his general economic status.

Moreover, a large percentage of the military personnel imprisoned by the German or Japanese Governments or their allies, were young, unmarried men, whose only survivors are parents. It seems inequitable, therefore, to require such surviving parents of those men to prove their dependency. This argument is made yet more forcible by the fact that surviving widows of deceased prisoners of war do not have to prove dependency and yet in many instances these widows may have remarried or be more qualified to support themselves than the surviving parents.

In considering this proposal, it should be remembered: (a) That claims are now being received by the Commission from persons who may be affected by this amendment; (b) that many surviving parents are unable to file due to lack of proof of dependency, and (c) there is a statute of limitations on the time for filing such claims with the Commission.

STRENGTHENING OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. KEFAUVER) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the United Nations is the world's best hope for the maintenance of international peace, security, and justice; and

Whereas in the 4 years of its experience the United Nations has both demonstrated strength and revealed weaknesses; and

Whereas in the light of this experience the United Nations can be made stronger by development of its powers, its procedures, its facilities, and policies of its members: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)—

1. That the Congress reaffirms its faith in the United Nations as the cornerstone of the international policy of the United States, and that the President be advised that it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should cooperate with other governments for the strengthening of the United Nations, by interpretation of the Charter, by action taken or usages developed under the Charter, by supplementary agreements among nations who desire thus to further the purpose of the Charter, or ultimately, if necessary, by amendment of the Charter.

2. That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should cooperate with other governments in steps for the strengthening of the United Nations, in particular:

(a) "Voluntary agreement to remove the veto from all questions involving pacific settlements of international disputes and situations, and from the admission of new members," Senate Resolution 239, June 11, 1948.

(b) effort to achieve immediate membership of all states qualified for membership under article 4 of the Charter to the end of making the United Nations universal.

(c) elimination of the reservations made by the United States to its acceptance of the optional clause of the Statute of the International Court of Justice; and acceptance by all states of the optional clause without reservations, so as to give the Court compulsory jurisdiction in legal disputes as defined in article 36 of the statute.

(d) further development of the armed guard force and field service under the Secretary-General in order to assure adequate protection and assistance to missions of the United Nations in the normal course of their operations.

(e) renewed efforts at a political level to secure agreements for the contribution of forces and assistance under the provisions of article 43 of the Charter.

(f) utilization by all members of the United Nations of suitable measures for collective self-defense under article 51 of the Charter as necessary to maintain peace and security.

(g) direct administration by the United Nations of certain disputed areas where such direct administration would contribute to the peace of the world.

(h) passage of appropriate legislation to facilitate the provision of independent sources of revenue for the United Nations in addition to the revenue provided by contributions made by members.

(i) support the principles of the United Nations Charter respecting fundamental freedoms.

(j) preparation by the International Law Commission of the United Nations of an international criminal code and of a statute for an international criminal court.

(k) carry out as far as possible, through the United Nations, the program of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUNT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GREEN (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. BENTON, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 33. An act to authorize Joe Graham Post No. 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the lands conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933;

H. R. 1151. An act to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers;

H R 5101. An act to provide for the transfer to Pierce County, Wash., of certain surplus land in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation;

H. R. 5503. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to release and quitclaim a portion of a right-of-way easement to Langley Air Force Base, Va.;

H. R. 5921. An act to terminate lump-sum benefits provided by law to certain Reserve officers of the Navy and Air Force; and

H. R 6077. An act to clarify the status of inactive members of the Naval Reserve relating to the holding of offices of trust or profit under the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1941. An act to provide for limiting participation as beneficiary under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H R. 6559. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide a minimum rate of compensation for World War II veterans who have arrested tuberculosis, to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 5282. An act to amend section 3 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; and

H. R. 6406. An act providing procedure for claimants of mining claims in the United States obtaining credit for assessment work performed during the year ending July 1, 1949, under the provisions of Public Law 107, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6552. An act to correct a clerical error in section 2 of the act of January 16, 1883, an act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, as amended by Public Law 425, Eighty-first Congress;

H. R. 6553. An act to provide for the promotion of carriers in the rural delivery service in recognition of longevity of service; and

H. R. 6603. An act to provide that certain service performed in the custodial service and in the mail equipment shops of the Post Office Department shall be credited toward promotion to the meritorious and longevity grades established for the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R 6673. An act to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by providing for treble damage actions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 97) to provide for a single supply catalog system, was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

THE STORY OF BOSTON—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to Boston, Mass., entitled "Only the Big Ones," from the Boston Post of February 1, 1950, which appears in the appendix.]

IMPLEMENTATION OF HOOVER COMMISSION REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS—REPORT OF STAFF OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum prepared by the staff of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, dated February 3, 1950, on the subject of implementation of the Hoover Commission Reports and Recommendations, which appears in the Appendix.]

BUDGET PRUNING—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Budget Pruning," published in the Washington Post of February 7, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

THE NATION'S CAPITAL AND THE MAN WHO PLANNED IT—ARTICLE FROM FREEDOM FAIR NEWS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Nation's Capital and the Man Who Planned It," published in the Freedom Fair News, issued by the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

FAIR DEAL MATHEMATICS—ARTICLE BY VERMONT ROYSTER

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "2×2=6," by Vermont Royster, from the Magazine of Wall Street, which appears in the Appendix]

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I was not surprised yesterday to hear the eloquent junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] express the deep sense of gratitude of himself and his colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] to the people of the State

of California for the proposed authorization which is now pending before the Senate. This bill, in my opinion, would, if enacted—and I believe I can corroborate it by facts—constitute the greatest present ever given by one person to any other person. It would place a burden of a billion or two billion dollars upon the taxpayers of the United States and the power users of the Southwest. The Senators from Arizona may well express their gratitude to the committee which reported the bill for the munificent gift which is contemplated.

Unfortunately, gifts must be paid for by someone. I do not think that the Treasury of the United States or the taxpayers of the United States are in any condition to give improvident and extravagant sums to any State or to any person. However, we may love the senior Senator and the junior Senator from Arizona, I do not believe that love is enough to justify a gift in the sum of a billion or two billion dollars.

I should like very briefly and quickly to review the costs which are involved in this incredible and fantastic proposal. The Bureau of Reclamation postulates the sum of $738,000,000, both for power and for irrigation. This amount is almost wholly to be used for the irrigation of a meager amount of land which is not worth one-twentieth or one-fortieth as much as the sum involved. It is ordinary land, producing principally grain and cotton. It produces crops which can be produced only by virtue of a further subsidy from the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. President, the sum which is suggested here—and it is only the beginning—is $738,000,000. According to the Bureau's own figures, there will be irrigated only 225,000 acres. Therefore, we have a per acre cost at the very beginning, according to the Bureau's own figures, of from three to four thousand dollars an acre. Similar land can be bought in the Mississippi Valley and in the Delta of the South for $150 or $200 an acre

Mr. President, there are many hidden costs. Under the Bureau of Reclamation's formula, which I myself support and which I believe to be all right in a proper case, the Treasury of the United States pays the interest on the total investment during the period of construction. Ordinarily the interest on the investment, while the project is being built, is not a very large item; but here we are dealing with an admitted figure of $738,000,000, which I think will mushroom into a figure of $1,500,000,000 or $2,000,000,000.

We are dealing with a project which will take substantial proportions of the amount of money provided for reclamation and irrigation in the West. We are dealing with complicated financial and legal conditions. So if we assume—I think it is a fair assumption—that it will take 20 years to build this project, and if we assume a 2 percent interest rate on the average amount of the outstanding investment, and figure the 2 percent for, not 2 years, but 20 years, or a total of 40 percent on the investment during the course of construction, we get a figure of $150,000,000, and that is $600 an acre for land which can be purchased today for $100 or $150 or $200 an acre. One hundred and fifty million dollars will merely be the interest on the investment during the course of construction. Is any of that money to be paid by those who will use the power generated at the project? No. Is any of that money to be paid by the farmers in the State of Arizona who will benefit from the project? No. There is an item of $150,000,000 which will come directly out of the Treasury of the United States. How the committee could justify even the $600 an acre, representing the interest on the investment during the course of construction, remains beyond my comprehension; and we have not even yet begun to compute the cost of the project.

Mr. President, I must admit that I am not one of the older Members of the Senate, but I have been here 11 years. In all my experience I never have seen litigation and vast sums of money dealt with so carelessly and so casually as they are dealt with in this measure. In this bill there is an authorization, additional to that for the $738,000,000, for a tunnel 80 miles long, with canals and facilities. We do not know how much they will cost, because the committee approving those tunnels never got a report from the Bureau of Reclamation as to their cost. It is our belief that the cost for the tunnels and the allied facilities will go at least to $550,000,000. That is the best figure we can arrive at from the reports of the Bureau. But, Mr. President, in the record there is not one word about that from the Bureau or from the proponents of this scheme. We are left with an authorization which, so far as we can tell, is bounded only by the blue sky above.

What a strange thing is this authorization. We first approve a plan which, adding to the $738,000,000 the $150,000,000 of accumulative interest, will cost approximately $1,000,000,000. We first approve that, and then we give a blanket authorization for the tunnels, which alone will cost somewhere in the neighborhood of $2,500 an acre to irrigate land worth $150 or $200 or $250 an acre.

Mr. President, later I shall attempt to be a clairvoyant and to express my ideas as to why the Bureau has slipped into this bill this kind of an authorization for another half billion dollars.

Mr KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). Does the senior Senator from California yield to the junior Senator from California?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield, gladly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yesterday when the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] had completed his address to the Senate, as set forth at page 1472 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, I raised this point with him, namely, that instead of being a $708,000,000 bill, as reported by the committee, or a $738,000,000, as introduced by the Senator from Arizona, actually it was greatly in excess of those amounts, because without any further congressional authorization, and merely by the appropriation of a nominal sum, the authorization would jump, by a chain reaction, so to speak, another $550,000,000. In response to that question, I think the Senator from Arizona clearly admitted that the amount would jump, but he used a figure of $200,000,000. I did not have handy at that moment any specific figures; but I have been told that the only available figures—which were not presented to the committee, but which had been presented at other times—showed that the big, main tunnel would cost approximately $489,500,000 and the miscellaneous tunnels would cost approximately $60,500,000, or a total of approximately $550,000,000.

I wonder whether the Senator can enlighten us on that point.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; and I may say it is a somewhat ambiguous situation. I cannot agree with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], but I can understand his viewpoint. The surveys for this tunnel and the allied facilities were made in 1942, 1943, and 1944. The Bureau of Reclamation in computing at that time the cost for this particular undertaking, reached a figure of approximately $225,000,000. Applying the Bureau's formula to present-day prices, that tunnel as of today would cost approximately $550,000,000.

Let me very briefly advert to the rather mysterious explanation of this entire matter, which I shall later cover at some length. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I invite interruptions or questions or corrections; and I stand prepared, I think, to present from the record corroboration of every statement I shall make.

Mr. President, why is there such vagueness about this matter? What is the mystery about it? At a cost of approximately $400,000,000 it is proposed that the Government build this immense pumping plant, which will pump 1,200,000 acre-feet of water out of the Colorado River, with a 300-mile aqueduct to Arizona. That will cost in the neighborhood of $400,000,000.

The bill contemplates, and the junior Senator from Arizona corroborates this, that probably that will be merely a temporary arrangement, and that later on, when it is deemed that the time is economic, the plan is to build the 80-mile tunnel, a tunnel so much longer than any other irrigation tunnel in the United States that it will simply stand in a unique class, by itself. Why is that? Mr. President, here is the reason: 1,200,000 acre-feet of water is a body of water covering an acre in area, and rising 1,200,000 feet into the air—a tremendous body of water, which is to be lifted approximately 1,000 feet. It is immediately apparent that only a tremendous volume of electric power can, day after day, year after year, lift that immense body of water 1,000 feet into the air.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President—and I now challenge contradiction—the evidence shows that the hydroelectric power, 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours, required to pump that water would be worth five times as much in the State of Arizona in the creation of employment and wealth as would the crops of grain and cotton which will come from a very modest acreage. Yes, Mr. President, what we are proposing to do by this proj-

ect is to dedicate 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours to the irrigation of a rather small area of land. We are proposing to dedicate power which, in the production of wealth and labor, would be worth five times as much as would the crops themselves to be grown on the land thus to be irrigated. We are in this bill very much like the man who burned down his mansion to roast a pig. The dedication of that immense block of power to the production of a rather insignificant amount of cotton and grain is so ridiculous that it is surprising any committee would give its approval to it.

But, having gotten the authorization for that, and presumably having erected this immense pumping plant, we are then going to junk all that investment; we are going to build gravity tunnels which will bring the water from the reservoir by gravity down to Phoenix; and then we are also going to have 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric current to use cheaply in Arizona. The only unhappy part about it is that here is another $550,000,000, giving the project a cost which is so incredible that I hate even to state it, of $5,000 or $6,000 an acre for common ordinary cotton and grain land. Yet that is the authorization reported by the committee.

Mr. President, at some later point I shall present statements from the Federal Power Commission and the Bureau of the Census showing the tremendous value of this power in mining, municipal uses, manufacture, and transportation—uses so much more valuable than the meager irrigation use that, as I have said, it exceeds it more than five times over. But Arizona and the Bureau of Reclamation have worked out this method of giving one immediate authorization for $750,000,000, and then later, expecting to add to that by the expense of the construction of the canals.

Mr. President, let me say that besides these items of cost, there are many other concealed items which will place an additional burden upon the taxpayers of the United States. According to the calculations of the Bureau of Reclamation and the proponents of the bill the development of Bridge Canyon will produce 4,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] yesterday brought out by questioning that it is not firm power. As a matter of fact, it is very infirm power. That power, standing by itself, would do none of the things anticipated, but would be practically worthless, because it could not be relied upon. That power would be produced only by the intermittent and uncertain flow of the Colorado River. It would not be firm power on which industries and municipalities could rely. It could be made of great value by firming-up the power. That could be done by integration with Hoover or Boulder Dam, but only at a considerable cost, running into many tens of millions of dollars, and the purchase of large amounts of new machinery, together with the building of additional transmission lines. There is not one word in the testimony or in the evidence of the Bureau of Reclamation as to what that additional cost would be. We do not know whether it would be borne by the taxpayers or by the power users. It would not be borne by Arizona or the farmers of the Salt River Valley. But here again is another hidden, uncertain, but very substantial cost that some day someone will have to pay, before the project ever works out into solvency.

Mr. President, there are many, many ways by which to figure the cost to the taxpayers and the power users of the United States of this project, if it is ever undertaken. Let us, Mr. President, if you please, start with the most moderate estimate. According to the Bureau of Reclamation—and I shall later read statements into the RECORD to this effect—the total amount of land which will be irrigated by the entire project, including not only the water of the Colorado River but also water from local sources, will be 225,000 acres. If we divide the total amount of the cost of the project, $738,000,000 by 225,000, we get a cost per acre of between $3,000 and $4,000. The Bureau does not calculate that way. The Bureau takes the $738,000,000 and allocates about $400,000,000 against irrigation and $300,000,000-plus against power. It then divides the $400,000,000 of farm benefits by 225,000, which gives a cost of about $1,735 an acre on the most modest calculation which can be made, on the Bureau's own figures—$1,700 or $1,800 an acre, on their own admission, to produce cotton and grain on land worth $150, $200, or $250 an acre.

Yes, Mr. President; the cost per acre, on the most moderate basis, is approximately seven or eight times as much as the commercial value of the land. I am wondering if we have reached a point in the financial condition of the Nation when we can afford to irrigate grain and cotton land at a total cost of seven or eight times the amount the land is commercially worth or could be purchased for at any place in the Mississippi Valley where the bulk of our American cotton is grown. In making that comment, I am taking the figures of the Bureau of Reclamation showing a cost of between $1,700 and $1,800 an acre to irrigate land. But I say, Mr. President, that when this whole incredible plan is revealed we are not justified in merely limiting the cost per acre to the irrigation benefits. We have to figure the entire cost of $738,000,000, which amounts to an acre cost of approximately $3,500. Why do I say in this particular case that, morally, equitably, and logically, we must charge the Arizona farmers for the whole cost? Let us see. The farmers will not pay $1 of principal or interest on any of this vast sum of money. They will not even pay enough money per acre to pay their irrigation and maintenance costs. So far as the farmers are concerned, not $1 of the interest or principal of the $738,000,000 will be repaid by them.

Let us see what will happen to the power end of the investment. As Senators know, under the reclamation law, the principal of the money advanced to farmers for farm use only is repayable without any interest. In other words, under our reclamation projects in the West, if the Government advances $100,000,000 for irrigation benefits, the farmer is supposed to repay the principal over the course of 40 or 50 years, but without any interest. The taxpayers of the United States lose the interest. We in the West—I do not know whether we have had the statutory authority to do it—have supplemented that, and now we take the vast sum that will come in as interest on the power end of the investment, and over the period of time it may run — in this case approximately 75 years—that huge sum of 2 percent on the power investment is likewise turned into the general fund to help pay the cost of the undertaking.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Does the senior Senator from California yield to the junior Senator from California?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is some misunderstanding regarding some of the projects. The Senator has mentioned 2 percent interest on certain of the power developments. Is it not a fact that under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, in accordance with the terms of which the great Hoover Dam was constructed, before the construction was undertaken it was required that there be firm contracts for the power, and that both the municipalities and the privately owned companies had to guarantee to take the power, whether they had use for it or not—at that time the situation was a very serious one, and now there is a shortage of power generally—and the interest rate was 3 percent? Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct. Under that act the entire principal of the power investment is being repaid, together with, originally, 4 percent interest, and now 3 percent interest. But in the projects which are now being proposed in the West the interest upon the power investment no longer goes into the United States Treasury, but is turned into the general fund to help finance the farmers' costs. In this case, Mr. President, it is admitted that it will take approximately 70 years to pay out. That is the estimate of the Bureau of Reclamation. We think it will take 100 or 150 years, but in any event the 2-percent charge upon the power investment will not go into the Treasury of the United States, but will be turned into the general fund to help pay out the farmers' costs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield, if he does not mind the interruption?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield. I invite interruption.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator has made it very clear that the former yardstick, under the reclamation law, provided that 40 years' time—or, taking the additional time they now have, 50 years' time—was allowed for the repayment of interest. Bearing in mind that no interest is paid, that yardstick is completely thrown away in the bill which is now pending before the Senate. There is no yardstick. It is left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. He can make the time 70 years, or he can make it 80 years, or, perhaps, 100 years. The only limitation, apparently, is that it

shall be paid during the lifetime of the project.

A year or two ago I happened to be in Italy and saw certain of the old Roman highways and aqueducts which have been in existence for many hundreds of years. Under some such theory the Bureau might extend the period of time for this particular project. Does not the Senator agree that if this bill shall be passed, destroying, as it would, the only yardstick we have heretofore had, it will be difficult for the Congress of the United States to turn down future projects and attempt to apply a yardstick?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes. I am very much in agreement with the Senator's statement. It is my hope that the Commission which has been appointed by the President of the United States to investigate these issues will formulate some general rules and principles under which we can determine how long a time irrigationists shall be given to amortize projects.

Mr. President, to sum it up briefly, the taxpayers of the United States will be compelled, either out of taxes or through increasing deficits, to meet the 2 percent interest upon the total investment of $738,000,000, except to the extent that the Government assumes directly certain of the costs as reimbursable. That accumulating interest over the period of 70 years suggested by the Bureau, I think, as to both power and irrigation, goes up to approximately $700,000,000. Let us not delude ourselves in this matter. The power users are not going to pay that titanic sum. That sum of remitted interest is going to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, I am therefore still making the point that practically this entire project, including irrigation and power, amounting to three-quarters of a billion dollars, according to the Bureau's own figures, is dedicated wholly to the conservation of this very modest acreage of grain and cotton land. Not only will the farmers not pay one cent upon principal or interest of the great investment, but they will hardly even pay their own operation and maintenance. How is the balance of the project to be paid out? It is to be paid out of profits on the sale of power to commercial interests, and those profits, which are added to the cost of what might otherwise be cheap hydroelectric power, will probably make it expensive hydroelectric power, and will thus pay for at least a period of 75 to 100 years not only all the great interest upon this sum, but likewise all of the profits that may be made.

Mr. President, that is why I say that if we wish to deal in realities, if we do not want to blind ourselves by specious reasoning, let us realize that here is a gigantic investment, all of which, in effect, for the first 75 or 100 years at least, will go for the benefit of 225,000 acres, principally of cotton and grain land.

Mr. President, the mind immediately inquires, under what sort of formula are we operating the Bureau of Reclamation in the west? How can we find any justification for a cost to the taxpayers and the power users to irrigate land at ten or twenty times its commercial value? How is that done? We have a formula in the west. If it were properly applied, it would protect us against improvident and grandiose transactions such as the one now proposed.

Mr. President, my reason for delaying when the presiding officer is engaged in conversation is because outside of my colleague and my distinguished opponent, the junior Senator from Arizona, there is no other Senator on the floor, and I like to have the attention of at least one other Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would yield so that I might suggest the absence of a quorum. The question before the Senate is a vital one. I daresay many Senators are under the misconception that the bill relates only to the States of California and Arizona. Of course, as my colleague knows, it is far more significant than that. If the bill were enacted it would open the door to many unsound projects. It would break down the standards under the Reclamation Act. It would burden the taxpayers for this one particular project to the extent of more than $700,000,000, possibly a billion and a quarter dollars, and it might open the door to untold billions of dollars of unsound projects. The two Senators from California, as well as the Senators from Arizona, and, indeed, Senators from other reclamation States, have been interested in establishing a basis of sound reclamation in the west. I say most reluctantly that I think nothing could be more detrimental to the future of sound reclamation in the west than to have unsound projects reported to the Senate and passed by the Congress.

For this reason, and without disturbing the right of the Senator to the floor, I wonder if he would yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, with such a unanimous consent agreement, I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	Lucas
Anderson	Gillette	McCarran
Benton	Green	McCarthy
Brewster	Gurney	McClellan
Bricker	Hayden	McFarland
Bridges	Hendrickson	McKellar
Butler	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Byrd	Hill	Magnuson
Cain	Hoey	Martin
Capehart	Holland	Maybank
Chapman	Humphrey	Millikin
Chavez	Hunt	Mundt
Connally	Ives	Murray
Cordon	Jenner	Myers
Darby	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Donnell	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kefauver	Robertson
Dworshak	Kem	Russell
Ecton	Kerr	Saltonstall
Ellender	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Ferguson	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Lehman	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lodge	Stennis
Taft	Tobey	Williams
Taylor	Tydings	Withers
Thomas, Okla.	Watkins	Young
Thomas, Utah	Wherry	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in the main the facts or alleged facts I have been stating are not denied. It is true there is a certain disagreement or, rather, a certain difference in regard to the way the facts are stated, and that difference tends to produce some confusion.

I should like now very briefly to address myself to the only important variation in the facts, as seen by the proponents and the opponents of this measure. The distinguished Senators from Arizona repeat and repeat and repeat, endlessly, as indeed they must if they are to save face, that this huge expenditure of money is proposed to be made to irrigate 750,000 acres of land. Mr. President, that simply is not true. I challenge the Senators from Arizona to support their statement regarding that matter, and I will affirmatively take the burden of proving that the acreage which will be irrigated by this entire project is admittedly 225,000 acres, almost wholly grain and cotton land.

I hold in my hand, Mr. President, the report on the central Arizona project filed by the Bureau of Reclamation, and I shall read from page R-78, from the first paragraph of the conclusions which were drawn up after an entire review of this subject, and in which, beyond any doubt, the Bureau of Reclamation was trying to make the worst appear the better cause in favor of Arizona. At that point this statement is made:

> Unless additional irrigation water is made available to the project area, the equivalent of a 30-percent reduction in the presently cultivated lands in the area must be eventually effected. The central Arizona project is needed to sustain the existing agricultural economy of the area.

Mr. President, as will be seen by a more detailed examination of the report, that percentage of reduction translates itself into the failure to irrigate about 75,000 acres of land that is not now irrigated and 150,000 acres of land which it is said will go out of cultivation if this water is not provided.

Inasmuch as the statement I am about to read from the testimony of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is in sharp contradiction to what he has said on the floor of the Senate; I regret that he is not now present. In his testimony, on page 16, the junior Senator from Arizona said:

> The Bureau of Reclamation's reports show that if this project is not built, there will have to be about 230,000 acres of land go idle or be put out of cultivation, land which has already been previously under cultivation. Part of that land is already out.

On page 80 of his testimony the junior Senator from Arizona said:

> But I do not want to go into that discussion at this time. What I wanted to correct the Senator on was one thing. He spoke of 150,000 acres of land in Arizona which would be redeemed by this project. Of course, this is a rescue project, a pro ect for supplemental water. But the correct amount is 226,000

acres of land which have been or are now being irrigated, that will have to be thrown out of irrigation permanently.

Then on page 410 the Senator from Arizona said:

Mr. Chairman, there was just one thing I wanted to say. I do not want to take the time of the committee to ask questions. But the project report does not show that just 150,000 acres less land will be irrigated if the project is not developed. It shows that 230,000 acres less land will be irrigated if the project is not developed. I believe the record should be clear on that point.

Mr. President, I certainly agree with the Senator on the statement that the record should be made clear. I think it is most unfortunate that in the committee hearings and also on the floor of the Senate, in a matter of this titanic importance, confusion has been introduced into the minds of Senators by the suggestion that Arizona will lose the use of 750,000 or 650,000 acres of land if this project is not developed.

As a matter of fact, the statement in regard to 220,000 or 230,000 acres of land is again somewhat favorable to Arizona. Of that amount, as the testimony of the Senator from Arizona shows, approximately 75,000 acres has been out of irrigation for the past 10 years or longer. We think it is nothing more than the average 10 percent which usually lies idle in any reclamation project.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I presume the Senator is referring to my testimony.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I read three excerpts from it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am sorry I was not here at that time. I should like to have heard how it sounded as someone else read it.

Mr. DOWNEY. It was very succinct and very accurate, I may say.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is fine.

But, Mr. President, the statement that 75,000 acres is generally out of cultivation is not accurate. That is not the way the farmers in that area generally farm their land. Perhaps one year one piece of land will be out of cultivation, and then in another year the farmers will farm all their land. The water supply available for any particular year is the factor which controls the amount of land which is farmed. The farmers have to farm their land in accordance with the amount of water available for farming use in a particular year. These figures are all averages over a period of time.

I should like to make a further statement while I am on my feet if I may have the Senator's permission to encroach upon his time to that extent.

Mr. DOWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not want the Senate to think that I agree with the Senator's statements. I shall answer them in my own time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have no difference with what the Senator has said. As a matter of fact, I must admit that I do not know. We endeavored to have the Bureau of Reclamation identify the 75,000 acres of land. The testimony was unequivocal that 75,000 acres, perhaps in different tracts, have not been irrigated for 10 years, and that the water furnished by the proposed project would be sufficient to irrigate the 150,000 acres of land which might otherwise lack water, plus 75,000 acres of new land. Again, I say, the 75,000 acres is nothing more than the usual average 10 percent which lies idle in an irrigation district. One farmer may want to let half his land lie fallow for a year; another may have a mortgage foreclosed and be out of crop for a year; another may have a bad piece of alkali land, or some other piece of land which for some reason he does not want to cultivate within the district. It amounts to about 10 percent of the total. I think the 10 percent to which the Senator refers is nothing more than the usual 10 percent, though I cannot prove it. When we endeavored to interrogate representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation on this particular subject, they were so vague that, in my opinion, no one could get any meat out of what they said. But the point I now want to reiterate in the presence of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona is that his own unequivocal statements, repeated many, many times, and the statements of the Bureau of Reclamation, repeated many, many times and in many forms, show that this grandiose $1,000,000,000 proposition is one in effect to irrigate the equivalent of 225,000 acres, and that if the project is not completed, that amount of acreage will not be irrigated, which otherwise would be. That is the fact. How that land may go out of irrigation, whether it will be under the conditions which have developed throughout the United States, where soil has failed or water has failed or floods have come, I do not know. Repeatedly in the United States hundreds of communities have been faced with the same supreme disaster as that which is faced here.

The truth is the farmers of Arizona knew they were overusing their water. They cultivated huge amounts of cotton land as a result of the war. They mined their water. It was perfectly obvious to everyone, from the Governor and the Senators on down, as to what was happening, that Arizona was using up its water improperly. It has created such a situation that arrangements must now be made to let 150,000 acres go out of cultivation, or some other satisfactory arrangement must be made.

Let me say that, first, we deduct from the 225,000 acres the 75,000 acres which have been out of cultivation for at least a decade. That reduces the rescue project to about 150,000 acres. Besides the Colorado River, the project calls for local development of the Gila and Salt Rivers, and that will take care of another 30,000 acres; so it reduces the rescue to 120,000 acres of common, ordinary, grain and cotton land.

Mr. President, we asked the committee to consider the report of the United States Geological Survey. The report shows, in terms that are unmistakable, that if Arizona is more provident of its water, handles it better, makes certain developments locally, it in all probability can develop enough water in the Gila Basin, and at a cost that will be infinitesimal compared to that involved in this project. Having read the reports of the Department of Agriculture and the United States Geological Survey, it is my own belief that if the farmers and public leaders of Arizona would bestir themselves, line certain canals, erect certain facilities, use their water to better advantage, reduce the crops which take excessive water, they would not need to call upon the taxpayers and power users of the United States for $1,000,000,000 or $2,000,000,000—$2,000, $3,000, or $4,000 an acre—to rescue land worth $150 or $200 an acre.

Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona almost had his audience weeping on the Senate floor—and when one can cause a Senator to weep, he certainly must be eloquent—as he described the 250,000 Arizonians whose condition will become worse, he said, than that of the displaced persons in Europe; Arizonians who, he says, are going to be driven out of the State, if this project is not authorized and completed, for all of them will be brought into insolvency and bankruptcy. That was the Senator's statement. It left me cold. In the State of California 20 or 30 cities and subdivisions, as a result of the war, are experiencing real troubles. The United States Government came into the city of Long Beach—and I am not criticizing the Government—and it was given a site there worth $75,000,000, on a practical guaranty it would become a permanent naval base. About 10,000 men were employed at the naval base, many of them coming from all over the United States, many of them having purchased homes there. The Navy now discovers it does not need the base, and it is closing it down. There will shortly be 10,000 men in Long Beach unemployed, and, indirectly, through a lack of purchased materials and other causes, another 10,000. It has created a relief load, an unemployment burden, difficulties with taxes, and, beyond anything I can describe, Long Beach is now in the critical area of unemployment. The Government had said, "Give us the land; we want to build a naval base." The Government said to the workers, "Come to Long Beach to live." It was all done at the instigation of the Government. We did not promote it. Mr. President, I am not criticizing the Government of the United States, nor am I suggesting that the poor taxpayers of the United States should give us $1,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 to compensate for the injury resulting in the most desperate condition which presently exists.

If one goes to Phoenix, he will find a great and expanding tourist trade, remarkable manufacturing development, dude ranches operating heavily. He finds one of the most prosperous cities in the United States, and, because a comparatively meager amount of grain and cotton land is going out of production, as I shall show, as such land is going out of production all over the

United States, here comes the sad and sorrowful wail, "The diminution of this meager acreage is going to bring 250,000 of our poor citizens into the desperate category of displaced persons and bankrupt the whole State."

I wish my friend could go to Richmond, Calif.—and I speak of California merely because I know it. There are hundreds of cities in the United States which have been brought into far greater difficulty as the result of the war than has the Phoenix area. Come to Richmond, where Henry Kaiser employed 100,000 men in shipbuilding, after which he totally abandoned the town. Let me show the Senator a tax rate which is now breaking the backs of the taxpayers; crime so rampant it cannot be controlled; a relief roll of huge proportions; difficulties with housing, sanitation, schools, and churches. Yes; I have been in Phoenix. I have seen that beautiful, prosperous city, rated as one of the most prosperous in the United States. After I think of what has happened to various war cities all over the United States, I am unable to shed any tears upon hearing this eloquent plea for $1,000,000,000 to help Arizona.

Mr. President, all over the United States lands have gone out of production because the water supply has been exhausted, because the soil has been exhausted or has been blown away, because the timber has been cut down. If the Government of the United States wants to undertake a rescue project, it can go into any of the cut-over timberlands, at $100 or $150 an acre—not $2,000, $3,000, or $4,000 an acre—and extend relief.

Anyone can go to the South and get, for an investment of $100 or $150 an acre, at the very top, just as good cotton and grain lands in the delta of the Mississippi River as those in Arizona. But here we are, the Senate of the United States, in this desperate hour of deficiency and huge expenditures, actually contemplating this expenditure of 5, 10, 20 times the commercial value of land in order to supply water.

Let us see what kind of land it is. I have in my hand table No. 2 from the report of the Bureau of Reclamation, page R–11, Acreage and Gross Value of Crops, 1940–44, indicating a total of 566,000 acres. Of the 566,000 acres, the Bureau and the Senators from Arizona claim 150,000 acres will go out of irrigation if they do not get the water which would be provided by this project. According to the Commission's report, it will bring the total to 639,680 acres.

The first category is sorghums, 62,000 acres, with an average acre yield of $40.

Other cereals, 123,595 acres, with an average acre yield of $32.

Alfalfa hay and seed, 123,051 acres, with an average acre yield of $70.

Grain hay with alfalfa, 83,879 acres, with an average acre yield of $20.

Alfalfa hay after grain, 83,879 acres, with an average acre yield of $45.

Cotton, 158,245 acres, with an average yield of $95.

Citrus fruits, 24,545 acres, with an average acre yield of $150.

Other fruits, and nuts, 3,513 acres, with an average acre yield of $600.

Vegetables, 80,068 acres, with an average acre yield of $240.

Miscellaneous crops, 81,562 acres, with an average acre yield of $500.

Farm gardens, 2,179 acres, with an average acre yield of $400.

Part-time pastures, 206,024 acres, with an average acre yield of $12.

Mr. President, when we consider the meager returns from 75 percent of this land, the idea that we should expend annually, in different amounts, many times the gross value of all the crops, it is so incredibly shocking that it becomes a greater and greater amazement to me that this bill could solemnly be reported to the floor of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, before the last quorum call I had expressed amazement that under the former laws governing reclamation, the Bureau of Reclamation had been able to make a prima facie case by which it could, in effect, say, "In order to save 120,000 acres of ordinary grain and cotton land we are going to spend two or three or four thousand dollars an acre."

How is it possible that any human mind, operating under any restraint at all, could reach a conclusion of that kind? Under the reclamation law we have what is called the cost-benefit formula, and the Bureau of Reclamation is supposed, on one side, to compute the benefits which will come from a project, and, on the other side, to compute the costs, and only if the benefits exceed the costs is a project considered to be feasible. The Bureau of Reclamation, with the most phony, despicable figures the human mind could imagine, has worked out a formula to its satisfaction.

Mr. President, let me show the Senate what has been done. I appeal to the very highly intelligent Senators who are upon the floor, to say if these figures are not phony to the *n*th degree.

The Bureau allocates as a benefit a total annual amount of $41,000,000. It says, in effect, "It is our belief that the construction of this project will increase the benefits going to the Nation as a whole by the sum of $41,000,000, and, from irrigation, $25,000,000."

Mr. President, let me show the Senate how the Commission arrived at the sum of $25,000,000. At the present time in the Phoenix area there is one of the important vegetable-growing sections of the United States. There are three in California and Arizona which are well known—Salinas, Calif., where immense amounts of lettuce, particularly, and carrots, tomatoes, and other vegetables are raised; the Imperial Valley, in southern California, and the Phoenix area in Arizona. The Phoenix area has stabilized its vegetable production for many years into 40,000 acres. That 40,000-acre area is a very great benefit to the Phoenix area, because the gross returns from vegetable lands are approximately $250 or $275 an acre, compared with $25 or $35 an acre from some of the ordinary grain crops. As a matter of fact, vegetable land brings in approximately five times as much gross, for vegetables, as the average of the field crops. It can be stated in another way. One acre of vegetable land will bring as much gross return as will possibly 5 acres of grain land or perhaps 3 acres of cotton land.

Mr. President, it happens that at this time the situation in Salinas, Imperial Valley, and Phoenix is highly critical. The Texas Rio Grande Co. is bringing in heavy acreages of vegetables which compete for quality and time with those produced in the West to such an extent that our big vegetable growers, most of whom operate at Salinas, Imperial, and Phoenix, were compelled to plow up thousands of acres of their vegetable lands. They are not fortunate enough to have any price support. Growing vegetables is a great gamble. A man growing vegetables may make a great amount of money, or he may lose a great amount of money. I have been talking with vegetable growers in the West, and they are very much concerned that they may not be able to hold out against the Texas entrance into the present vegetable markets in the East. Texas has cheaper land, and, in that particular area, cheaper water, and it ships its vegetables a far less distance to the markets. Texas is the colossus of our vegetable industry. That is all right. That is the law of competition operating. If people in the East can get cheaper and better vegetables from Texas than they can from the West, that is all right.

But, Mr. President, let me show what the Bureau of Reclamation did. In assigning the crops to this 73,000 acres of the new land, they assigned 40,000 acres to vegetables, so that in lieu of having 40,000 acres of vegetables, as at present, their prognosis shows 80,000 acres. Inasmuch as every acre of that vegetable land brings in five or ten times as much as is brought in from the grain lands and three to five times as much as from the cotton lands, oh, certainly, they had a beautiful-looking report, the kind a promoter prepares when he is going to tell how much money he can make from breeding rabbits, or some other quick-rich device of that kind.

Mr. President, what does that amount to? It amounts to this, that the Bureau shows that the crops there will be increased, in their gross yield in money, by $18,000,000, and about $11,000,000 comes from this shift of 40,000 acres from the cheap grain land into vegetables. Nothing could be more fallacious. If 40,000 acres more of vegetable lands are going to be cultivated there, which I very much doubt, it will be because the vegetable growers believe they have a market. If the big operators in the West thought they could sell vegetables from 10,000 more acres, 20,000 more, or 40,000 more, they would put them in. There is plenty of fine land there already for raising vegetables, and fine water.

The very fact that the Bureau of Reclamation would stoop to such a thing as this to pad out their report by showing that this project would result in 40,000 acres more devoted to raising vegetables, indicates ignorance, or something of the kind. Agricultural experts believe there is little likelihood that the vegetable areas of the Southwest can even be maintained as at present. To think that

they can be doubled is certainly optimism, and then to ascribe that doubling to the building of the proposed project, instead of to competitive conditions, certainly makes no sense at all.

Mr. President, if we assume to be true the statement of the Bureau of Reclamation, that central Arizona will plant 40,000 acres more of vegetables, the gross receipts from that vegetable land would more than make up for the 150,000 acres of poorer grain land that would go out of use. In other words, if we assume that 40,000 acres are going to be utilized for vegetables, the high gross results and activities and labor involved in that operation would give to the central Arizona project the same kind of return they have now. So here in one item alone the wholly improper and indefensible placing of this 40,000 acres of vegetable land in the prognosis takes out of the financial statement more than one-half of the estimated gross increase because of this project, and leaves the whole project totally unfeasible.

But let us pass on to another point, so that we can see how fallacious and specious, and Mr. President, I dislike to say it, but how dishonest are the figures of the Bureau of Reclamation. They cannot have done this thing through ignorance or neglect. The men who prepared these figures knew they were doing something which, if they had done it as a private operator, and circulated their results through the mails, would have them in collision with the criminal power of the United States Government. Let me show my colleagues to what I refer.

Mr. President, it is expected and accepted by the figures by the Bureau of Reclamation that the commercial power generated at Bridge Canyon can be sold at approximately 5 mills a kilowatt-hour, and those are the figures used by the Bureau in calculating the benefits which will flow from the power project.

Of the titanic production of 4,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours, about the same amount that is produced by Boulder Dam—and it is a huge block of power—one-third is set over for the operation and maintenance of a pumping project for the farmers of the central Arizona area at about one-half mill a kilowatt-hour. The commercial power will be sold at 10 times that amount, or about 5 mills a kilowatt-hour.

What does the Bureau do? In estimating the national benefits and the national costs of this project, does the Bureau say, "more crops are going to be produced, and here are the gross figures. But in order to produce that amount we have to sacrifice 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours by giving that power to the farmers to pump this water up a thousand feet?" No. That cost is entirely omitted. That debit item is not here at all. If the United States Government, the Treasury, the power users, had that power to use, they could sell it for $7,500,000 in the commercial market. That amount of power is literally wiped out because it is used almost without charge for pumping this huge body of water.

The committee paid no attention to the reports of the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Agriculture, or the United States Geological Survey. They suggested that we should survey the alternative methods of using that power, and then to the extent there was a loss in giving it to Arizona, under any common-sense rule that should be regarded as a cost.

From page 30 of the minority views filed on the central Arizona project, I now quote from a letter from the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

> The actual relation of benefits to costs is still further obscured by what appears to be a failure to use the market value of power in estimating, for evaluation purposes, the cost of pumping the water supply. Market value must be used in economic evaluation because the power has alternative uses.

So, Mr. President, we have this condition: The Bureau of Reclamation gives as one of the items of benefit the gross value of the crops to be produced upon the land, padding their figures by putting in an extra and improper 40,000 acres of vegetable land, and they take no account of the fact, as a national item, that the farmers of Arizona have used up a billion and a half kilowatt-hours of power.

Mr. President, if those two corrections were made, which any of the other departments in Washington would make, which I think any accountant or engineer would make, it will be seen that the cost-benefit formula is not only fallacious, but when truly exposed, the project is revealed as extravagant, improper, yes, impossible, almost beyond belief. Among all the other enormous costs running into the hundreds of millions of dollars or billions of dollars which will grow out of this project, 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power are to be used up each year.

We in the Southwest are not so fortunate as is that portion of the country represented in part by the present occupant of the chair, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], in having a Columbia River Basin, in having such a tremendous potential of cheap power to develop Beyond any doubt, unless we get water from the Columbia River, we in the Southwest are never going to have as much cheap hydroelectric power as we should have.

Earlier today during the course of my statement, I said that the men who design to use this immense potential of power to pump that great volume of water up a thousand feet could fairly be likened to the man who wanted to roast his pig by burning down his house.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to his colleague?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I fully understand that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is having a very important meeting. The Senate Committee on Appropriations is meeting. I received notice of a very important meeting of the Senate Appropriations Committee which is being held at the present time with Mr. J. Edgar Hoover appearing before it. I have not been able to attend that meeting today. I know that other meetings of Senate committees are now being held.

I stated only a short time ago to the Senator from Arizona that I hoped some method might be devised so the Senate could meet, say, 3 days a week for sessions of the Senate, and devote 2 or 3 days a week to committee meetings, so there would not be these conflicts with which all of us are constantly faced.

But I most respectfully say that we now again have the situation where the two Senators from Arizona and the two Senators from California and the Presiding Officer of the Senate, who now happens to be the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], are the only Senators present on the floor of the Senate. The matter under discussion is a vital one. It entails an authorization of $1,250,000,000. It would open the way and set a precedent whereby countless billions of dollars could be expended from the Federal Treasury, and the yardstick, which we have always used on sound reclamation projects in the past, would be thrown away. For that reason I ask if the Senator from California will permit me, without jeopardizing his position on the floor, to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very happy to yield to my colleague for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Martin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Maybank
Benton	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Brewster	Hill	Mundt
Bricker	Hoey	Murray
Bridges	Holland	Myers
Butler	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Hunt	O'Conor
Cain	Ives	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Darby	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Kerr	Sparkman
Douglas	Kilgore	Stennis
Downey	Knowland	Taft
Dworshak	Leahy	Taylor
Ecton	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lucas	Tobey
Flanders	McCarran	Tydings
Frear	McCarthy	Watkins
Fulbright	McClellan	Wherry
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	Withers
Green	McMahon	Young
Gurney	Magnuson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 570. An act for the relief of Donald Francis Wierda;

S. 736. An act for the reimbursement of Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.;

S. 753. An act for the relief of Sisters Antoinette Cometti, Mary Gibin, Angela Pelosin, Emma Ghisleni, Elisabetta De Caterin, and Onorina Franzina;

S. 777. An act for the relief of Calvin D. Lynch & Son; W. Thomas Lockerman; Sudlersville Supply Co.; George C. Moore and H. A. Moore, J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc.; Hobbs & Jarman, C. S Thomas; and Royse R. Spring;

S. 1003. An act for the relief of Emory T. Wales,

S. 1019. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of personal injuries sustained by Carl J. Freund and Pauline H. Freund, his wife, of Seattle, Wash.;

S 1048. An act for the relief of Saul Phillips;

S 1054. An act for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.;

S 1088. An act for the relief of Milton Buechler;

S. 1096 An act for the relief of Abe Lincoln and Elena B. Lincoln;

S. 1166 An act for the relief of Toriko Tateuchi;

S. 1353. An act for the relief of G. H. Lazarus, Jr., and Jesse F. Bewley;

S 1446. An act for the relief of James Hung Loo;

S. 1534. An act for the relief of Harry Comber;

S 1702 An act for the relief of Riyoko Sato;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Mrs. Effie S. Campbell;

S. 1915. An act for the relief of Niktor A. Kravchenko;

S 1924. An act for the relief of the estate of William Walter See,

S. 2031. An act for the relief of the Willow River Power Co;

S 2100. An act for the relief of Penelope Corolyn Cox;

S 2114. An act for the relief of Mitsue Shigeno;

S 2119. An act for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co.; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to provide unrestricted entry privileges for Sister Elizabeth Kenny.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 587) for the relief of the estate of Dick Walook, Alfred L. Woods, and Edward Kimoktoak.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 627) for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BYRNE of New York, Mr. DENTON, and Mr. KEATING were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens;

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 7, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1282) to authorize grants under the Federal Airport Act for minor projects at major airports, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement for the benefit of Senators who now are present and those who are absent, but who probably will read the RECORD in the morning: Following the disposition of the pending business, Senate bill 75, we will immediately revert to the consideration of the unfinished business, Senate bill 2440, a bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes. Following the disposition of that measure, we shall then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1082, the bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes, a bill reported by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think the report was submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. I read from the wrong column. It was the Senator from Wyoming who had once objected to taking up the bill on a call of the calendar. I understand that the Senator from Wyoming will offer certain amendments to the bill. I apologize to the distinguished Senator, and I thank him for the correction.

Following that bill, we shall take up Calendar No. 1139, Senate bill 501, repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948, which has been reported from the Committee on Finance.

Following that, we shall take up Calendar 1220, the bill (H. R. 5486) to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, for the transfer and redistillation of spirits, and for other purposes, which was reported from the Committee on Finance unanimously.

Following that we shall proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 810, the bill (H. R. 4406) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments, which has been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I may make a statement relative to that measure. We all know the Members on the opposite side of the aisle are going to be out on the hustings for a few days to discuss the problems which confronted Abraham Lincoln in his day and the problems which confront the Republican Party at the present time. Perhaps it is going to require a little longer than they had anticipated, for them really to convince the people about the situation. I have attempted to cooperate with my distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle by advising them that I shall not proceed to the consideration of any measure which is highly objectionable to them. In other words, we want all the Members of the Senate to be present when we start discussing some of the highly controversial questions.

I may say that the bill (H. R. 4406) is one which I submitted to the minority leader. It is one which he hoped we would not take up. But it is an important measure, and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is pressing me pretty heavily to have it considered. He appeared before the Policy Committee earlier today. I believe we shall have to consider the bill, if we can reach it, before Senators return from their trips across the country.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought I had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], yielded, with the understanding that he would not lose the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. What is the nature or import of the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. The bill provides for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States, on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals, against foreign governments. I think it primarily grows out of claims which originated in Yugoslavia. It is an important measure, and the money is ready to be paid. It is only a question of the Congress taking action upon it.

Mr. DOWNEY rose.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from California desire me to yield to him for a question?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am somewhat confused about the precise nature of the agreement between the distinguished majority leader and the Republicans, that there shall be no controversial votes taken between certain dates. What are those dates?

Mr. LUCAS. There is no particular date fixed at all. What I am trying to do is to provide for the consideration of bills to the consideration of which during their absence the minority raises no serious objection. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. DOWNEY. If I may inquire, what are the dates between which the agreement will be effective?

Mr. LUCAS. As I recall, I think most of the Members on the other side are starting out some time this week, to be gone about a week or 10 days. I think there is pending sufficient legislation, including the bill which the Senator has been discussing today, to occupy the Senate probably that long.

I was going to follow that by saying we shall take up Calendar Order No. 596, a resolution (S. Res. 58) to amend the Senate rules by creating a standing committee on small business. The resolution was submitted by the Senator from

Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I have talked with the Senator from Nebraska. He said he had no objection to our taking it up in his absence, although I had hoped we would not reach it until the Senator returns.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Nebraska is not present at this time. I had been under the impression that an understanding had been reached between him and the able majority leader, in keeping with what has been done in previous years, both during the Lincoln Day period and also during the Jackson-Jefferson Day period, namely, that during the time from the ninth through the sixteenth, controversial matters would not be taken up or votes had upon them. I think it is important, because, as the Senator from Illinois will recall, the Senator from Nebraska was prepared, if necessary, to advise Republican Members to cancel all their speaking engagements during the week. I think the Senator from Illinois indicated that that would not be necessary. Quite frankly, the pending measure, which we hope can be expedited, is in my judgment a highly controversial subject.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. We must finish that, regardless of anything else, because we have started on it. We must finish it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I very much doubt whether that proposed legislation can be finished prior to the time Members on this side of the aisle will be back. I certainly understood from the Senator from Nebraska that if the pending bill could be finished prior to that time, that would be one thing; but if it could not be finished, it certainly would come in the classification of highly controversial legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator, it is highly controversial, but it is my understanding that probably by Wednesday of this week the bill will be out of the way.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not believe that the pending bill will be out of the way by Wednesday of this week, I may say to the able Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly should not like to carry the bill over for 2 or 3 weeks after we have started on it. I should not object, if it were possible to reach some agreement with the Senators from Arizona, who are vitally interested in the bill. We had agreed to take it up, and I had thought that when we took it up we would probably finish it. I submitted to the Senator from Nebraska, the minority leader, a list of bills which we thought we might be able to take up which would not create any considerable amount of controversy. On four of the bills the Senator reported back favorably. The only one of which I am doubtful is the one concerning which I made some remarks a moment ago, the bill (H. R. 4406) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I can assure the Senator from Illinois there is no desire on the part of the Senator from California unnecessarily to delay the pending bill. But I think that a measure which is so crucial as this, involving, as it does, perhaps $1,250,000,000, and proposing to change our whole reclamation policy, a bill in which Members on both sides of the aisle are vitally interested, either for or against, should not be acted upon when a substantial number of the Members on this side of the aisle have left the city or are in the process of leaving, with the understanding that there will be no highly controversial measure taken up in their absence. I should feel that it would be most inequitable and unfair to do it under all the circumstances.

Mr. LUCAS. In reply to my good friend from California, I may say I agree with him that it is a very important measure, one which I think should be debated at some length. However, I doubt whether any words which may be said on the floor of the Senate are going to change a single vote with respect to the controversy. I think most of the Senators have practically made up their minds now as to how they are going to vote, whether one way or the other.

The very fact that Senators are not on the floor when this great question is being debated is a pretty clear indication that either they know how they are going to vote or they are not interested in the proposition.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on these matters I agree to a great extent with my friend, the able majority leader. I do not think, however, upon reflection, that he has made quite a fair statement. As the Senator knows, under the existing operations of the Senate and as they have been for some time, there are important committee meetings during the time the Senate is in session. I know that many Senators who would otherwise want to be present on the floor are now attending subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, the Foreign Relations Committee, and other committees which are meeting. I cast no reflection upon them, because if it were not for the proposed legislation which we have just been discussing, and the fact that I intend to speak upon it, I myself would have to attend a very important meeting of the Committee on Appropriations. I hope, and most earnestly request, that both the majority leader and the minority leader will endeavor to get together and work out some program so that the Senate can meet perhaps 3 days a week on legislative matters, and 3 days on committee sessions. At countless times matters of great national or international importance are debated on the floor, with only a handful of Senators present. The absence of Senators is not caused by a lack of interest or lack of desire to be educated on the subject, but because of the constant pressure under which they are working.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator from California, and I should like to make an observation for the benefit of those who are in the galleries at this particular time. Many visitors come here from all over the United States as guests of the Senate, and those who come here for the first time and who do not thoroughly understand or appreciate the problems confronting the United States Senate, cannot understand why Senators are not on the floor. The basic reason, for that, Mr. President, as the able Senator from California said a moment ago, is that Senators are busy working in committees. They not only work all morning, but all afternoon. Until a committee takes action on a bill and the bill finally finds its way to the Senate Calendar, we cannot do anything on the floor of the Senate. Many of my constituents in Illinois have asked me why there were so few Senators on the floor when they have been in the galleries and have looked down into the Senate Chamber. The difficulty is that never before in the history of the Nation has the Senate had upon its shoulders so many national and international problems affecting not only mankind in America but mankind throughout the world.

Moreover, when a Senator is away from a committee or from the floor he has a vast amount of work to do in his own office. I cannot answer all my mail. It is coming in by the bag load. Some persons believe that all they have to do is to write their Senators or Representatives and get their problems solved. Under the Constitution, every individual citizen of the country has a right to petition his Senators and Representatives upon any grievance existing in his community. But I am afraid, Mr. President, that if we had 3 days of action on the floor of the Senate and 3 days of committee work, on even those 3 days when Senators are presumed to be present, two-thirds of them would be compelled to be in their offices answering mail and taking care of the problems of their constituents. Between now and 5 o'clock I have five appointments with persons from Illinois who are here on important business. I have to leave the floor to take care of those engagements if I am properly to perform my duty, as I understand it, as a United States Senator.

I merely mention that in passing, Mr. President, because I think it is worth while for the Nation to know that Senators of the United States are not loafing on their jobs. I know of no other group of men who put in more time than do Members of the United States Senate. Their job is not an 8-hour or a 6-hour proposition, and it is not an overtime proposition even if we remain on the floor until 9 o'clock. It is an all-the-time proposition, day and night. I am often called at home in the evening. I receive at least half a dozen calls every evening from people from my State who are here on important business. I am not objecting to that, because one in public life must take the consequences, and his responsibilities must be performed. That is expected of us by our constituents. I merely mention it in passing in order to advise the country that we are on the job and are not sitting around doing nothing from 8 o'clock in the

morning until approximately 8 o'clock at night.

I now yield to the senior Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am thoroughly conscious of the heavy responsibilities and the many difficulties confronting our beloved majority leader. I dislike, by any suggestion or argument of mine, to add to them, but the Senator appreciates, of course, that to us in the West, what is involved in the pending bill is vital.

Mr. LUCAS. Precisely so.

Mr. DOWNEY. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that perhaps a large majority of Senators have already made up their minds. One of the things that concern me is that some Senators have expressed their opposition to the bill and hope it will not be voted upon until they have an opportunity to be present. So the situation becomes very disturbing. Most of the time yesterday was occupied by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] and other speakers. I think the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] also spoke. We have occupied only an hour and three-quarters today. Despite that fact, we shall end our main presentation today. There are five or six very technical and difficult amendments which have been presented by the committee which are of a highly vital nature, and I hope we shall be successful in changing or reshaping some of them. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is vitally interested in one of the amendments, as is the Senator from Colorado. After the committee amendments are disposed of—and I do not see how it can be done tomorrow—there are seven or eight other amendments, all of which involve hundreds of millions of dollars and important rights. I must admit, as a poor Democrat carrying a very heavy responsibility——

Mr. LUCAS. What does the Senator mean by a "poor Democrat"?

Mr. DOWNEY. Literally and absolutely. I am an ardent Democrat, but, nevertheless, I remain a rather humble and unfortunate Democrat, carrying a very heavy burden. I must admit that it would be a most unhappy position for me personally in my own State, and it would be just as unhappy a position for my Republican colleague, if this measure should come up for a vote when a large number of Senators are absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the situation, and I shall yield the floor and let the California Senators complete their statements and perhaps accomplish something before all the Senators on the other side of the aisle move to the hinterlands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I understood that the distinguished junior Senator from New York wished to take the floor at this time.

AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD CHINA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in all the years since Secretary of State John Hay first established and defined American policy toward China, that policy has never been under such intense public scrutiny and the subject of so much public concern as during the last 6 months. That scrutiny and concern are due to the fact that the vast bulk of the Chinese people have come under the control of a Communist regime, a regime which is admittedly in the closest liaison with, if not under the full and tyrannical control of, Soviet Russia and its masters, the Politburo.

On January 5, 1950, President Truman, and on the same day Secretary of State Dean Acheson, redefined American policy toward China, with specific regard to the island of Formosa. This was by no means the first definition of American policy toward China in recent years. In December 1945 President Truman defined American policy toward China in the light of the struggles that were already raging between the Communists and the Nationalist regime of Chiang Kai-shek. At that time the United States expressed itself as committed first of all to the territorial integrity of China. Nor was that a new policy. That was the same policy which Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson proclaimed in 1932. It was exactly the same policy the United States has maintained toward China during all the years since the First World War. In January 1915, when Japan made its infamous 21 demands on China, the United States Government expressed its shock and opposition to any such claims which, in effect, would have completely violated the territorial integrity of China.

Thus the declaration made by Secretary of State Acheson on January 12 this year represents no revolutionary policy. The United States promised in the Cairo Declaration of 1943 that Formosa would be reunited with China as it had been during all the centuries before 1894. Formosa was turned over to the Chinese Government in furtherance of that promise, which was no more or less than carrying out the policy we had supported for half a century. When Secretary of State John Hay made his declaration on the territorial integrity of China in 1899, and when Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson made his declaration on the territorial integrity of China in 1932, we did not attach to those declarations a proviso that this integrity was to be protected only if the Chinese Government conformed to our ideas of what a Chinese Government ought to be, or if it satisfied or pleased us.

Now we are faced with a situation in which almost the whole of the mainland of China is under Communist control, as I have said, and Formosa is practically the only part of China which remains under the control of the Nationalist regime. My fervent wish and hope would naturally be that the Chinese people and all China would be freed from the control of any totalitarian form of government, and certainly from that of Moscow-dominated tyranny. We must encourage and give support to those elements of the Chinese people who, I have no doubt, are striving toward this end. I think that would include the vast majority of the Chinese people. But we do not move in that direction by seeking by our own might and power to maintain one particular regime in Formosa in order that our own rights may be protected, or by standing on a legalistic point and insisting that Formosa is still part of Japan, and hence subject to our occupation.

I felt so strongly about this matter that some weeks ago, when this subject was being debated in the press and on the floor of the Senate, I addressed a letter on the subject to Secretary of State Acheson. A few days ago I received a reply to that letter. Excerpts of my letter and the reply were printed in the press. I ask unanimous consent to print at this point the full text of the letter from the distinguished Secretary of State, and my letter to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

JANUARY 14, 1950.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
The Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you would know, I have been following the developments in China and in our policy toward China with deep concern. I have studied the recent statement by President Truman and your own two statements within recent days. These are historic statements. I am confident that you are on sound ground.

During my short time in the United States Senate, I have received an enormous amount of mail on the subject of China. The American public seems more aware of China and of the Pacific generally than at any time in recent years. There is, of course, good reason for this. But the purpose of this letter is not to state the obvious or to make complimentary remarks. My purpose is to express my own great concern over the implications of the recent developments, especially the implications of recent statements and charges made in the press and even in the Congress.

You have wisely decided, I think, to maintain on a high moral plane, the policies of the United States in the Far East, and thus, in a much broader sense than the critics of our policies will see, protect the real interests of the United States. I think that in this, the policies decided upon will have the firm support of the overwhelming majority of the American people. The American people are idealists at the same time that they are practical and hard-headed. It is that combination which has given us world leadership. No cynical people would have come into a position of world leadership. No cynical people could long retain that leadership. It was not a cynical people who supported UNRRA. It is not a cyncial people who are supporting the European-recovery program.

Yet there are cynical ones among us who would exchange long-term advantage for short-term profit. These are the people who would have us occupy Formosa, or send the Navy to protect it, or establish a condominion over it. Who has asked us to do this? By what right would we do this? Did we fight the recent war against Japan only to claim, as some would have us claim now, that because our forces occupy Japan, we have the right to occupy Formosa, too? And if Formosa, why not Hainan, and then Shanghai, and Canton and Amoy, and then all of China? Where shall we stop?

The first principle of the American people in foreign policy today is to search for peace, justice, and the well-being of all peoples. It is not to maintain a particular battle line somewhere along the Asia coast or to resist by force those ideologies which are not reconcilable with ours. We dislike sovietism, whether in Russia or in China, because it is aggressive and uncompromising, because it

disturbs world peace and because it would undermine and destroy our form of government if it could. But what some partisans advocate today is that we should imitate sovietism and adopt its practices in order to halt its spread. Those who would fight the devil with fire are themselves consumed in the end. We must not invite war in order to avoid it. We must not practice evil in order to halt it. There is a slower and harder but surer way

The Chinese people know of our record of enlightened fairness and friendship. They have not forgotten UNRRA, nor the thousands of missionaries who through the decades did for the Chinese people what UNRRA did, on a mass scale, in more recent years. Whatever the hymn of hate being chanted in the Communist press in China, the Chinese people are wise in the ways of a wisdom much older than ours, and certainly much older than that nurtured in the Kremlin.

I do not know what can be done of a positive nature in the present situation. It deeply troubles me that no positive course suggests itself. But I do know that clinging to the dead hand of a regime which has completely lost the confidence of the Chinese people and in defense of which that people raises not a finger, could be a fatal error. I assume that we must seek the closest possible contact with the Chinese people, and show them that our desire is, as it ever was, the advancement of their welfare and their interest, and the extension to them of an opportunity to gain not only freedom but a chance to live in peace and enjoy a decent livelihood.

I assume, Mr Secretary, that all this is under study, and that some way will be found to steer between the obvious dangers of the present situation. But the course will not be clearer for the clamor of those who would serve selfish political ends by irresponsible denunciations and attacks The President and you deserve the gratitude of the country for your recent display of courage and forthrightness. I trust that you will persevere until a constructive policy can be evolved.

I have written at this great length because I feel deeply about this matter and am troubled about the future as well as about the recent past. I would like to help in whatever way I can

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 2, 1950.

MY DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I have read your letter of January 14 with deep interest and am gratified to learn that we view the problems of Asia, and of China in particular, in very much the same light. If, as you believe and I believe, our present approach to those problems will have the firm support of the American people, then we are indeed on solid ground.

Certainly one of our principal sources of strength in the world today is the faith which we ourselves and free people everywhere have in our integrity of purpose. The heartening support which we receive in the international community is freely given because foreign peoples have this faith in us and know whence any threat to their independence arises. This position of moral leadership places upon us a heavy responsibility. We must not destroy the faith which others have in us. And we shall surely destroy it if we permit possible momentary advantage to obscure the great moral principles to which we are dedicated.

This is particularly true with respect to Asia, for the peoples of Asia, having recently emerged from a colonialism which is passing, stand now at the crossroads. Consciously and unconsciously, they are appraising two antithetical ways of life. In the long run, whether these peoples move in the direction of the free peoples of the west or whether they move in the direction of Soviet communism will be determined by this appraisal. It is for us during this period to extend with tact and understanding a helping hand where we can and a guiding hand where this will not be resented and, above all, to see that the peoples of Asia have a true picture of us and a true picture of Soviet communism and a clear understanding of what each stands for. In a sense, we are thus on trial before the peoples of Asia. In this connection we must have ever in mind that a hasty or ill-considered action on our part may do irreparable harm. In the same connection, the public expression of views such as your own can do much good.

I fully understand your uneasiness that no positive course for us to follow within China suggests itself. You have gone on to suggest, however, what, I think, is a positive course and, in the long run, a most important one—we should seek to maintain the friendliest relations with the peoples of Asia, and we should show the Chinese people that our desire is, as it ever was, the advancement of their welfare and interest Beyond this, we should lose no opportunity to insure their being fully aware of the threat to their national independence and territorial integrity which arises from Soviet communism.

I earnestly hope that your other duties will not interfere with your continuing interest in the Far East and our relations with that important part of the world, and that I may continue to have the benefit of your comments and suggestions.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should also like to have printed in the RECORD a recent editorial from the New York Post on the same subject. It is the interesting conclusion of this editorial, printed on January 17 of this year, that Stalin and the Russian Communists would have no greater satisfaction than to see the United States try to carry out the policy which some few of our people would have us carry out, namely, to seize or occupy Formosa or otherwise interfere in the Formosa situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

THE BATTLE FOR ASIA

If all his opponents were conservative Republicans, Josef Stalin would be sitting on top of the world.

Under the guidance of Herbert Hoover, Senator KNOWLAND, Republican, of California, and other "Formosa Firsters," we would now be absorbed in a frenzied, futile island adventure. We would be feuding with India's Nehru and Indonesia's Soekarno because they do not sing the glories of free enterprise to their hungry followers. We would be totally missing the point of Asia's restlessness and thereby making that huge sector of the world safe for Stalin's battalions; nothing could more quickly consolidate the Soviet international machine—and discourage Titoist heresies—than for us to act like Marxist caricatures of "bloated, warmongering imperialists." Instead, we have defied the form charts prepared by the Moscow bookies. Secretary Acheson has refused to be stampeded into Operation Formosa; while shutting down our Peiping consulate (an inevitable protest against the Chinese seizures), he has tenaciously retained what the Alsops yesterday called freedom of maneuver in the Chinese crisis. Obviously we are playing for time—and Titoism.

There is no certainty of a Titoist break in Stalin's Asiatic fortress; but neither is it inconceivable. The biggest Far Eastern story, almost buried beneath inspired war cries from MacArthur headquarters, may be the rift between the Japanese Communist Party and the Cominform (a development which has visibly unnerved the cable editors of the Daily Worker). The Cominform has opened fire on Sanzo Nosaka, key Japanese Communist leader, who also happens to be a long-time friend and associate of China's Mao. Thus far the other Japanese Communist leaders have declined to excommunicate Nosaka, an act of insubordination worthy of Tito himself. This curious episode coincides with reports that Mao's future relations with Moscow are still ambiguous despite the fanfare surrounding his Moscow journey.

We do not regard Titoism as the hope of the world, but we see infinitely greater hope for the world if Stalin's global army is split into independent nationalist blocs. In this transition era freemen have one clear, affirmative course of action which may simultaneously intensify the struggle within the Cominform. We must dramatize our concern for the welfare of Asia's long-oppressed, impoverished millions. We must provide tangible aid for the prodemocratic native governments of India and Indonesia—funds, surplus food, and technical assistance. We must make point four a real-life program comparable to the ERP effort which has stemmed the Communist advance in Europe. Such steps, boldly undertaken and proudly proclaimed, offer a far more effective counterattack against Stalin's legions than the hollow, strident belligerence of the know-nothing contingent on Capitol Hill.

Secretary Acheson plainly recognizes both the strength and weakness of the Soviet thrust. He understands—as most of his critics do not and as Chiang never did—the fateful link between bread and freedom He knows that Asia's multitudes are marching left and will not pause to read leaflets written by the National Association of Manufacturers. He knows we are doomed in any conflict with Stalin if we try to reconstruct Asia's wretched past. He is aware that the disintegration of the Kremlin's monolithic international column can only be hastened by men responsible to the universal drive for security as well as liberty

These are the things the know-nothings have never learned, that is why Stalin undoubtedly wishes that Senator KNOWLAND and his on-to-Formosa commandos were running American foreign policy.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to take more time of the Senate in discussing this matter, but I do believe it is one which we cannot cease to study, just as the entire situation in China continues to be a matter of unending concern to the United States.

The objective of our policy must be a prosperous China, under a government representing the Chinese people, working with us and with the other peoples of the Far East for a just and peaceful world, but devoted primarily, as our own Government is, to the interests of the Chinese people. We must not require that the Government of China be devoted primarily to the policies of the United States, except insofar as those policies carry a promise for the well-being of the people of China.

But to keep the confidence of the Chinese people, and to look forward to the day when we will be able to work in concert with them, and with their Government, we must not begin by supporting the claims of Japan to Formosa, or by

asserting our own rights, under whatever guise, to Formosa.

It is not easy to chart in all details a correct and satisfactory policy toward China. But it certainly is easy to see what we must not do. I am glad that Secretary Acheson has avoided the dangerous pitfalls of expediency.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to permit me to make a brief statement on the subject discussed by the Senator from New York?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to take just a few minutes to reply to the able Senator from New York, who has put into the RECORD his communications with the Secretary of State. I think it is important that the record be very clear in regard to the Formosa situation.

So far as I know, there has not been a responsible American commander in the Far East, or anyone on the floor of the Senate, who has advocated that the island be seized and held by the United States, and certainly the Senator from California, who has taken considerable interest in this matter of Formosa, has not advocated that course. To the contrary, when I returned from the Far East, and on the 5th of January opened the debate on the floor of the Senate dealing with our far eastern policy, with particular reference to China, I think I made it abundantly clear that our competent observers in that area of the world did not feel that it was either necessary or desirable for the United States to seize the island, or to have either naval or air bases on the island of Formosa. But there was a very strong feeling among those who had some responsibility in that part of the world that while we did not need Formosa ourselves, it was detrimental to the ultimate security of this country and the peace of the world for Formosa to fall into unfriendly hands, because the American defensive position in the far Pacific extends from the Japanese Islands where at the present time, we have occupation responsibilities, through the island of Okinawa, upon which we have air bases, down through the Philippines. For Formosa to be in unfriendly hands would drive a wedge in that defensive position, and would outflank us both to the north and to the south. It was on that basis that the Senator from California made his remarks when he returned.

The fact of the matter is that on the 23d day of December last year there was issued by the American Department of State a document which was sent to our representatives abroad, which stated, in effect, that Formosa had no strategic value. I was very much interested in that statement, and it was so contrary to the information I had theretofore had that I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State. I might say that I was less able to get a prompt reply from the Secretary than was the able Senator from New York, and to this day I have not gotten the text of the document which was sent out. But one of the very able American press associations, which, fortunately, due to the alertness of the press, many times not only does the country but also the Congress a service, learned for the first time of this document. This press association—in the particular case it was the United Press—broke a story from Japan which gave in substance the text of the State Department document.

Mr. President, that was made public on the 23d of December. It is interesting for both the Senate and the country to note that the document which was put out on the 23d of December saying that the island of Formosa had no strategic value, was issued 6 days before the National Security Council was scheduled to meet to determine that very issue. Presumably the State Department had prejudged the case.

I also made an inquiry of the State Department as to who had issued the instructions, what group had assembled and discussed the situation that would warrant them to say that the island of Formosa had no strategic value. I was informed first by telephone and later by a letter from the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, that he took sole responsibility for what went on in the State Department, and therefore that he did not feel it was advisable to inform the Senator from California or the Senate of the United States who constituted the group who said the island of Formosa had no strategic value.

I think it is also important for the Senate to know, however—and I today charge—that that committee, whatever its name, in the Department of State of the United States, which issued a document saying that the island of Formosa had no strategic value, had no competent advice whatsoever from the American supreme commander in the Far East, from CINCPAC, commander in chief of the naval forces in the Pacific, from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or from any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, indicating that the island of Formosa had no strategic value.

To the contrary, I say on my responsibility as a Senator of the United States that all the advice they had received up to that time clearly indicated that the island of Formosa did have strategic value. The only question was: Did it have strategic value sufficient to warrant the spreading of American equipment or forces more thin than they were already spread? I say that is a great difference from the flat-footed statement that the island of Formosa had no strategic value.

I think it is important that the country and the Senate of the United States know who in the State Department compiled this document. From whom did they receive military advice that the island had no strategic value?

I will say to the able Senator from New York—and I am glad the Senator raised the issue in this body today—that I think the Senate of the United States has a responsibility in foreign policy. I do not believe we can discharge our obligation in foreign policy by continuing to permit ourselves to be spoon-fed only such information as the Department of State wishes to give us.

Mr. President, I repeat it is important that the Senate of the United States know who compiled that document.

For a period of time the Government of the United States, through the State Department, was urging the National Government of China to take Communists into a coalition with them. Coalition with communism has never worked. It did not work in Poland; it did not work in Czechoslovakia, it did not work in Bulgaria or in Rumania, or in any other country where it has been tried. It will not work in Korea, and it would not have worked in China.

The Republic of China refused to take Communists into a coalition. When it refused to do so, this Government, through the State Department, endeavored to bring pressure upon the Republic of China. We placed an embargo upon them for a period of 10 months. We did that at precisely the same time the Soviet army of occupation in Manchuria was turning over to the Communist forces in China arms and ammunition estimated to be sufficient to equip a million men for 10 years. This was being done precisely at the time we were imposing a boycott and an embargo upon the forces of the Republic of China, and the civil war in that country changed very drastically from that period on.

Not only did that happen, Mr. President, but at a time when the National Government of China was fighting with its back to the wall, we issued the so-called famous, or infamous, American white paper. I have been told, not only by those in the Government of China, but by soldiers in the ranks, by officers, by those who were critical of the Government of China, by people on the Island of Taiwan—Formosa—who desire a degree of autonomy greater than they now have, that there was nothing which was more detrimental to the morale of the people of China than was the American white paper.

Now, how did it happen that the Russians were in Manchuria where they could turn over vast quantities of Japanese arms to the Communist forces in China? They were there by virtue of the Yalta agreement, which we agreed to, without the knowledge or consent of the Republic of China. We did not do the Republic of China the courtesy of even informing it that we were selling it down the river. We did it without the knowledge of the Republic of China. We did it without its consent. It was done without the knowledge or consent of the American people or of the American Congress. So the Russian army of occupation was in Manchuria largely as an outgrowth of the Yalta agreement, and it was there by reason of their having been given some of the railroad rights in Manchuria, and the port of Dairen. It put them in a position to aid the Communist forces in that country.

It so happens that sitting at Yalta as one of the chief advisers to the American delegation was Mr. Alger Hiss, who has just recently been convicted of perjury in connection with the charge of turning over secret documents to espionage agents of the Soviet Union.

We have had people who were connected with this Government, who served in China, who constantly urged, in the messages that they sent back to this Government, that Communists be taken into a coalition.

I think it becomes a very important point, and one in connection with which the Senate of the United States is entitled to ask the question and is entitled to have an honest and frank answer: "Who issued the State Department document that said the island of Formosa has no strategic value?"

I say to the Senator from New York—and I speak as one Senator of the United States who feels that he also has some responsibilities in the matter of foreign policy, and as one who serves on the Committee on Appropriations—that I am becoming sick and tired of the executive branch of the Government lowering an iron curtain between the executive branch and its functions and the Congress of the United States, and depriving us of information to which we are entitled, upon which to make our judgments. So far as I am concerned, I think it is time the Congress of the United States should exercise the powers it has in the control of the purse strings, to see to it that we obtain the information to which we are entitled, and if the executive branch wants to get tough and say, "You are not going to get it," the Congress of the United States can be just as tough and say, "All right, until we do get it, you are going to have a considerable amount of trouble in operating on your present scale."

I think the time has come when the Congress of the United States must assume its responsibilities under the Constitution, and must determine that we are no longer going to abdicate the responsibilities which are ours under the Constitution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I must say that I am amazed to hear the distinguished Senator from California deny that in any public discussion or on the floor of the Senate there was any suggestion made by any responsible official or personage that we send a fleet to Formosa or occupy Formosa. I think that if the distinguished Senator from California will take the trouble to study the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the proceedings in this House he will find that his statement is not entirely accurate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from New York, I am thoroughly familiar with the fact that there were people who urged that the United States fleet in the Far East be increased, and that if necessary the fleet be used not to permit the island of Formosa to fall into unfriendly hands.

In my judgment that is an entirely different situation from the occupation of the island of Formosa by American troops or having American bases, either naval or air, on the island of Formosa.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, if my recollection is correct—and I believe it is—a very distinguished American suggested and recommended that the American Government send a fleet to Formosa. I refer to the only living ex-President of the United States, and very distinguished American, Herbert Hoover. I believe the Senator will find that statement was carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am familiar with the letter which Mr. Hoover wrote. As a matter of fact, Mr. Hoover wrote the letter to me. The letter was released by me with the consent and approval of Mr. Hoover. If the Senator from New York will read the letter, I think he will agree with me that Mr. Hoover was making it perfectly clear that in his judgment it would not be in the best interests of the people of China or of the peace of the world or of the security of this country to have Formosa fall into unfriendly hands. Only as a last resort, in the event the people of Formosa could not defend themselves, does he indicate, in my judgment, that America should say, "We will not tolerate the invasion of the island of Formosa by unfriendly forces." I believe he had some very valid reasons for saying that. I do not happen to agree with the theory that Formosa can still be considered a part of Japan. I happen to more nearly agree with the Senator from New York, that as a result of past history and as a result of the Cairo Conference, we have a moral, if not a legal, commitment that Formosa is an integral part of China. I certainly believe it is. I believe it is an entirely different situation. On the island of Formosa there is a legal government, which was our wartime ally, which is now recognized by us, which maintains an ambassador in this country, which is a permanent member of the United Nations, which occupies a seat as a permanent member of the Security Council of the United Nations. That government is asking us for additional aid to prevent the country from being taken behind the iron curtain, in the same way as the legal Government of Greece asked us for aid. That certainly was a civil-war situation. In the same way, the Government of Korea asked us for aid. That certainly was a threatened civil-war situation. We have both the legal and the moral right and obligation to give assistance to the legal Government of China in order to permit her to defend the island of Formosa.

I have been on the island of Formosa, and I have seen some of the able leadership of the Government, including General Sun Li-jen, who is a graduate of the Virginia Military Institute, and Governor K. C. Wu, who is a graduate of Princeton University. They are capable leaders. They are men who have the western point of view, men who know something of free institutions, men who definitely do not want their country taken behind the iron curtain. When these people ask for our help, I think we have the same right to give it to them as we had to give aid to the Government of Greece and to the Government of Korea, or as we have given it under the North Atlantic compact to the western European countries, which are also trying to preserve their freedom.

I do not know how the Senator from New York feels, but to me communism is just as detrimental to human liberty in Asia as it is in Europe. Communism is just as ruthless. It is just as destructive of human liberty in China or Korea as it is in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, or Yugoslavia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, or in any other country.

I believe it is not necessary to point out again that the great democratic leader in Bulgaria, Petkov, was hanged; that Masaryk, who commanded our respect and the respect of the people of the world, either was killed or committed suicide when he found that a coalition with communism could not be made to work. As one prominent Chinese said to me when I was in China just a little less than 2 months ago, "Senator, you cannot have a coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the tiger. It is impossible to have a coalition with communism unless you are prepared to be absorbed by communism."

I believe the time has come when we must make it perfectly clear whether we are really interested in maintaining a free world of freemen or whether we are drawing a color line in maintaining a free world of freemen. Are we any less concerned about the hundreds of millions of people in China being brought behind the iron curtain than we are about the people of Europe being brought behind the iron curtain? I think not.

I happen to represent a Pacific coast State, which saw this country become involved directly in World War II in the Pacific. It was done through a relatively small country, Japan, with a population of some 70,000,000 or 80,000,000 people. I happen to have seen at Pearl Harbor, when I was there just a few months ago, what is left of the battleship *Arizona*. In her hull there are still the bodies of 900 American sailors which have never been taken out.

I cite that fact to show that a relatively small nation of 80,000,000 people drove us out of the Philippines, drove us out of Wake, drove us out of Guam, drove the British out of Hong Kong and out of Singapore, drove the French out of their area, and drove the Dutch out of most of their area. They attacked the Chinese, who were then a much stronger nation than they are today, and drove them back into the inland part of China. That was done by a nation of some 80,000,000 people. Today there have already been taken behind the iron curtain some 450,000,000 people on the continent of Asia, in China alone. I regret to say to the Senator from New York that according to present indications, it is not unlikely that within a year from the time that he and I are standing on the floor of the Senate, 125,000,000 more people in southern Asia will be taken behind the iron curtain. That is a greater aggregation of power than Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini had at the height of their power. I do not believe that we can be unconcerned with what has taken place in the Far East. I think we have had a bankrupt policy in China. I think we have had a bankrupt policy in the Far East. I think that today there is not a competent American diplomat in that part of the world who can tell us what our far eastern policy is.

The Secretary of State in his speech before the National Press Club drew a line of his own volition which left Korea on the other side of the line. It eliminated Formosa, which is a strategic island in the defense of the far Pacific. Certainly he does not indicate what our policy is today in Indochina, Burma, Siam, India, or Pakistan. If the Senator from New York is well advised—and perhaps he has more information than has the Senator from California—I hope he will tell us what our policy is in the Far East. I do not know what it is. I doubt if there are very many persons in the country who can tell us what the policy of this Government is in the Far East. What would we do if Korea were attacked tomorrow by the Communist force in North Korea? What would we do if the Chinese Communist forces were to cross the border into Burma, Indochina, or Siam?

I believe it is high time that we begin to understand some of the practical applications of this situation. We have drawn a line in Europe. We have stood up to communism in connection with the Berlin airlift. Communism has retreated. Wherever free elections have been held, communism has shown a loss.

In the Far East, have we stood up to communism? We have not. We have cringed before communism.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California said he did not know where I stood on communism. Let me inform him. I have fought communism for more than 15 years. My public papers as Governor of the State of New York for a period of 10 years will plainly show my position. But I have done something more than fight communism. I have also fought fascism and nazism which in my opinion have been and may again be a very grave threat to the peace and security of this country and of the world. I remind the distinguished Senator from California that the threat which came to his State in 1941, when Pearl Harbor was attacked and California was threatened, was not a threat of communism, but a threat and an attack launched by the forces of fascism.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I should like to complete my statement, as did the Senator from California.

So I have fought and I shall continue to fight communism with all my strength, and I shall also fight and continue to fight nazism and fascism, which in my opinion are by no means dead, even now.

Previously I referred to President Hoover in order to refresh the Senator's mind and to correct the statement he made earlier in the discussion that no responsible person or public official had suggested or advocated the sending of a fleet to Formosa or the ocupation of Formosa.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that if he will refer to the RECORD, I think he will see that the statement of the Senator related to the occupation of Formosa.

Mr. LEHMAN. On this floor two statements or suggestions were made with regard to the occupation of Formosa. I am under the impression that in a statement or a speech or a letter the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who I regret is not now present on the floor of the Senate, made that statement and suggestion. I believe that statement was inserted into the RECORD by my good friend, the able and brilliant Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on January 9. I value the senior Senator from New Jersey as a good and true friend, one in whose friendship I delight; but I cannot fail to derive from the statement he made and from similar statements he has made in the Senate the distinct impression that he favors the occupation of Formosa by the United States Government in whatever form that occupation was to be carried out.

But let me tell the distinguished Senator from California that I am very glad that a minute ago he said he endorses the conclusion contained in my statement, namely, that under no circumstances should we ever consider that Formosa is a part of Japan, and that it is only if we do consider that Formosa is part of Japan that we would have any legalistic right or technical right to intervene in that situation.

Let me tell my distinguished colleague from California one other thing before I close: He has talked about our strategy being based on a line which includes the island of Formosa, which may or may not have strategic value; I have no knowledge on that subject. I recall that in the case of Korea, which the Senator mentioned as one of the danger spots, only a little while ago, through a tragic alliance of members of his party and members of my party, I am sorry to say, in the House of Representatives, the aid which we wanted to give to Korea, upon recommendation of the administration, was defeated. Furthermore, Mr. President, when the Senator from California asks, "Why do we not give help to the Nationalist Government of China?" and when he tries to make it appear that we turned our backs on that Government a long time ago and have given it no help, I wish to point out that over a period of years we provided that Government with more than $3,500,000,000 in appropriations or grants of various kinds.

I believe that what will tell the story of our fight against communism—and I know it is a fight; I have no delusions whatsoever about that—is not an imaginary line or a strategic line alone, important as that might be. Of course, we have seen the fallacy of depending on a Maginot line or a Siegfried line or the line which we had set up in the Pacific before 1941. However, our best hope for combating communism is to gain and to hold the confidence and respect of all the peace-loving and freedom-loving people of the world. Our strength will lie very largely in making them believe and know that when we talk about democracy, we mean democracy; that when we talk about human rights and the dignity of the individual, whether in China or in the United States, we mean just that, and we are willing to make sacrifices for just that.

I say to my esteemed colleague from California that the fight is not going to be won on any imaginary line alone. It is going to be won when all these people, in China and elsewhere, believe in us sufficiently—believe in our good faith, in our love of freedom and democracy—to follow us, both in the countries which, thank God, still remain free, and, in increasing numbers, in the countries which lie behind the iron curtain. I believe with all my heart, based upon some knowledge, that today, because of the example of the United States for right thinking, for humaneness, for love of freedom, our country has far more friends than is generally believed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I simply wish to say to the able Senator from New York that I know of his interest in American institutions and his feeling against communism and fascism, and I have no less feeling against both types of isms. I happen to have served in the Army of this country for 3 years during the last war, and I also know of the able service the Senator from New York performed both as Governor of New York and later as head of UNRRA.

I wish to say to the able Senator that since coming to the Senate in 1945—I was appointed on VJ-day to take the place of my late distinguished predecessor, Senator Hiram Johnson—to the best of my ability I have supported the foreign policy of this country because I felt that in Europe it made sense. Not only did I support the United Nations and the UNRRA appropriations at that time, but I have also supported the Marshall plan because I recognize the fact that communism thrives on economic and political chaos, and that if there were an economic collapse in Europe the only beneficiary would be international communism.

I supported the North Atlantic Pact without reservation, because I recognize the fact that an attack upon free institutions anywhere in the world must be of concern to law-abiding nations everywhere in the world.

I supported the arms-implementation legislation to implement that pact, because I believe we cannot continually retreat in the face of communism and still hope to hold any part of the world free.

I do not favor appeasement of communism. I think that when Mr. Chamberlain returned from the Munich Conference, perhaps he honestly felt, when he waved over his head a slip of paper bearing the signature of Adolf Hitler and the signature of Benito Mussolini, that he was buying peace in our time; but now we know that he was doing no such thing. I think that appeasement then or appeasement now is but surrender on the installment plan. So I have supported our policy in Europe because I think it makes sense to the American Congress and to the American people. But I say with the utmost respect that while we have closed the door to communism in Europe, the American Government at the same time has left the door to communism wide open in Asia. We have not only left the door wide open, but, by the policies we have followed, we have accelerated the spread of communism in Asia, until today it

threatens the peace of the world and the security of this country. I say most respectfully to the Senator from New York it simply does not make sense to me, and I do not believe it makes sense to a good many other American people.

The Senator mentioned some imaginary line. I do not think it is an imaginary line. I think there is a very definite threat to this continent and to the peace of the world, if communism leaves the Continent of Asia and moves into the Pacific islands, whether it be a move of 100 miles to Formosa, or of a few hundred miles to the Philippines, or ultimately, on to the islands of Japan. I do not think communism moving on to any of those islands will be beneficial to us. To the contrary, I think it will be most detrimental to the peace of the world and to the security of this country. So I believe that the American people are entitled to know soon just what our policy in the Far East is.

We have a great responsibility in Korea. As the able Senator from New York knows, we joined in agreeing to the division of Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel, which permitted the Russian occupation forces to occupy north of the thirty-eighth parallel, and ours, to occupy south of the thirty-eighth parallel. After that was done, we agreed that both our troops and the Russian troops would move out. We agreed to and participated in the United Nations decision to permit the people of Korea to hold a free election to set up a form of government.

The Communist groups who had been left in North Korea would not permit the United Nations even to go into their area, much less to supervise the election. Since about two-thirds of the people live in South Korea, it was finally decided by the United Nations Commission that they would go ahead and hold the election there. I have talked with several of the newspaper men who were there at the time, and with American representatives. They say it was a free election, it was an honest election. The people of Korea, south of the 38 parallel, selected a non-Communist government. Yet, constantly since the time that government was established, they have been threatened by the Communist forces from the north. I went up to the 38 parallel when I was there. I was told by the Koreans and by our own advisers that the North Koreans have made 350 incursions of greater or less extent across the border of South Korea, which the Korean Republic has had to force back, and which it has successfully forced back. But how has it done it? Because we also sent them a mission, and we sent them certain equipment. We helped them train their men. They have some very fine soldiers, and I am personally convinced that if it is only an invasion from the indigenous forces of North Korea, the Republic of Korea will be able to withstand that type of invasion. But I say to the Senator from New York, the $64 question is, after the Chinese Communist forces have liquidated the opposition, if they can, in the remainder of China, and have moved some of their forces and some of their equipment back, can the Republic of Korea withstand that type of reenforced North Korean Communist army? I think it is highly dubious that they can.

We have some responsibility. We permitted the division of the country. We have sent them a mission. Are we to abandon them, if their liberty is threatened in South Korea? I think they are entitled to know the answer to that question. I think the American people are entitled to know the answer to it. Are we concerned with the freedom of the people of South Korea? I have been there. I know there is a fine group of people there who want to have a free life, who know enough about what has taken place behind the iron curtain to want no part of it. Are we any less concerned with human freedom in the Republic of Korea than we are in human freedom in Austria, Greece, Turkey, or any other country on the face of the globe?

Many of our people think the island of Formosa is merely a little dot in the ocean. As a matter of fact, on Formosa today there are more people than there are in Greece, where we have sent a mission and much equipment. There are approximately as many people on the island of Formosa as there are on the continent of Australia. It is not an inconsiderable number. Moreover, most of the Chinese who are there are definitely determined to maintain their way of life against communism. I am convinced that with a little help, not by troops, not by a navy from the United States, but with certain types of arms and ammunition which they need, they will be able to defend their own human freedom. But I do not believe they should be thrown to the wolves of communism; nor do I believe that the people of South Korea should be thrown to the wolves of communism.

I join with the Senator from New York in regretting the action taken by the other body in not passing the Korean aid bill. I supported the Korean aid bill on the floor of the Senate. I intend to support it again when it comes before this body.

I have talked to as many Members of the House of Representatives as I have been able to contact, pointing out the importance of Korea. But I want to say to the Senator from New York I think it is somewhat understandable, because when a large group of people lose confidence in the recommendations of the Department of State of the United States, as they did in its handling of the Chinese situation, I think it is entirely understandable that they should also lose confidence in its recommendations affecting Korea. It so happens that the Senator and I believe that the recommendations with regard to Korea were correct, and I hope that in the very near future the House will rectify what I believe was a mistake.

Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. HENDRICKSON rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). The Senator from California.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. DOWNEY. For what purpose?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. So I may correct the statement of the junior Senator from New York with respect to the senior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. DOWNEY. I shall certainly yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. A moment ago, as I understood the distinguished junior Senator from New York, he said the senior Senator from New Jersey, in the debates on Formosa, stated that he recommended the occupation of Formosa. To correct any wrongful impression which may have grown out of the remarks of the senior Senator from New Jersey on this subject, I should like to read from volume 96, page 800, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, January 24, 1950, the statement made by the senior Senator from New Jersey on this important subject. I read:

> Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in Formosa the United States has a priceless opportunity to take peaceful action in support of democracy and economic reform, and against the further encroachment of communism in the Pacific I believe that we can find a way of making our ideal effective in the Formosa situation without involving ourselves in a vast and unpredictable military commitment. As I have said repeatedly, I see no need to send a single American soldier to Formosa I still hold to my belief set forth in my report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on December 1, that one of the crucial errors of recent American policy in China has been the conclusion that the only alternative to further military aid was complete abandonment or at least temporary inaction
>
> The future of Formosa is an unwritten page of history. There is today a possibility that an independent republic can eventually be established there There is today a strong possibility for a peaceful development on that island which will implement the ideals which America holds in common with the vast majority of far eastern peoples—national independence, economic development, and personal freedom It is up to the United States to face the ruthless ideological power of communism by exerting itself in this area, everywhere in the world, in support of the precious human values, which we Americans believe in.

The senior Senator from New Jersey then inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a lengthy letter addressed to Mr. Arthur Krock, under date of January 18, in which he explained in great detail his well-known position on the Formosa issue. If the junior Senator from New York had read that letter carefully, he would have known that the senior Senator from New Jersey made no statement about a military occupation of Formosa.

Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California has gone out, temporarily, but he understood the Senator from Indiana desired to speak.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be very happy to yield to the junior Senator from New York for a statement.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the junior Senator from New

Jersey whether the statement of the senior Senator from New Jersey, which he has just quoted, was in reply to an inquiry or a statement from either the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] or the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That statement represented a summation of all the views of the senior Senator from New Jersey on the subject of Formosa in respect to any possible occupation thereof.

Mr. LEHMAN. My recollection of the use of the word "occupy" was that it was made in an earlier statement. I may be mistaken.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I recall that in the earlier debates there was some confusion of mind, and as I remember, that confusion was purposely developed by Senators participating on the other side of the question from that of the senior Senator from New Jersey. I should like to have it understood on the floor today that I am not expressing any of my own views with respect to the Formosa issue, but I felt it my duty as the junior Senator from New Jersey to see that the senior Senator from New Jersey was not misquoted.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask the junior Senator from New Jersey whether the senior Senator from New Jersey ever denied using the word "occupy" in connection with Formosa in some statement, letter, or article which predated the statement which the Senator has just read? I may be wrong. I do not believe I am, but I can assure the Senator from New Jersey that if I am wrong, I shall see that a correction is made. But my very definite recollection is that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] did not deny having used the word "occupy."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Whether the senior Senator from New Jersey used the word "occupy" is not of great importance, because in his statement he clarifies, amplifies, and sums up his entire position on the subject of the occupation of Formosa.

THE ISSUE OF SOCIALISM

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to talk on the subject of socialism. I think most of the newspapers throughout America have today set forth in their headlines the fact that the Republican Party has declared that one of the chief issues in the coming elections is liberty versus socialism. I concur in that, and I congratulate the Republican Party for bringing before the American people what I believe to be a burning issue in America today. Every night, Mr. President, when we go to bed, we are one day nearer to state socialism in the United States. Let us not say it cannot happen here, because it can happen. In my opinion, it is happening each and every day. There are many persons who say that such a thing as the Alger Hiss incident could not happen. Others have said that the latest spy incident, that of Dr. Fuchs, could not have happened in America.

I hold in my hand, Mr. President, an editorial dated January 27, 1950, printed in the ADA World, which is the official publication of Americans for Democratic Action. Before I read that editorial I want to give to the Senate the names of some of the officers of that organization.

The chairman of the organization is our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The chairman of the executive committee of the ADA is Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.

Vice chairmen: George Edwards; Emil Rieve; Hugo Ernst; Chester Bowles, Governor of Connecticut and formerly a Government official; William H. Hastie; Franklin D Roosevelt, Jr., and Murray D. Lincoln.

Treasurer: Leo A. Lerner.

Secretary: David Ginsburg.

National director: Charles M. LaFollette.

National executive secretary: James Loeb, Jr.

Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a history of the PCA, the ADA, and Henry Wallace.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should prefer that if the history of the organization of which I happen to be the national chairman is to be offered for the RECORD, the Members on the floor be given the benefit of its wisdom and understanding through oral presentation, because the national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, being present on the floor, might want to make a comment as we proceed, and I should prefer to make it at the moment rather than to wait until it is in printed words.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do I correctly understand that the Senator objects?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota reserves the right to object and asks the Senator from Indiana if he would prefer to read the history, so that I may be given the benefit of the new information as to the history of Americans for Democratic Action and Mr. Wallace.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall possibly read it later. I shall not take the time now, because it has all been previously published in newspapers and in the hearings of committees of the Congress of the United States. I might well take the time to read it, but it seems to me that we might save time if the Senator will permit me to place it in the RECORD. I assure the able Senator from Minnesota that there is not anything in the statement other than what has been previously printed. But I shall not ask permission at this time to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana if it is not a rather unusual procedure, in view of the common Senatorial courtesy and comity which exist in this body, that when a request is made to have a document printed as a part of the remarks of a Senator, objection is made? In the 5 years during which I have served in the Senate I have never known an objection to be raised heretofore. It establishes a new precedent in this body, and one which I certainly hope the able Senator from Minnesota will reconsider. The Senator from Indiana has made a request such as is commonly made in the Senate. If we are to establish the precedent that everything that goes into the RECORD must be read, I think it would bring about an unusual situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. I assure the Senator from Minnesota that there is not anything in it that he should be ashamed of, and there is not anything in it that has not previously been printed. But at the moment I shall not read it into the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The junior Senator from Minnesota was not objecting to the document being placed in the RECORD, but was requesting the Senator to read it. If he does not desire to read it, I have no objection to its being placed in the RECORD. The Senator has referred to an organization of which I am an officer, of which the distinguished Senator from Illinois is a member, of which the distinguished junior Senator from New York is a member, of which the senior Senator from Pennsylvania is a member, and of which the senior Senator from Connecticut is a member. I thought it would be well to have it read, but, since the Senator has no desire to read it, I have no objection to its being placed in the RECORD.

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps I shall read it later. If I change my mind I shall ask later that it be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I did not know that the able junior Senator from New York and the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania were members of the ADA. I do not have a list of the membership. I do know, however, that the official organ of ADA, under date of January 27, 1950, ran this editorial on the British elections, which I wish to read:

THE BRITISH ELECTION

Without minimizing the importance of the British elections to Britain herself, we think the results will have more impact on Europe and the rest of the world than they will at home.

A Conservative victory certainly would mean that British trade-unions would have less confidence in their government. This would tend to increase strikes and social tension. But because of the great weight of British tradition, the British Tories are probably the most responsible conservatives in the world, and they admit that they would rescind few of the social gains of the last 5 years.

But a Labor defeat would have a demoralizing effect on the essential elements of the third force—

I do not know what is meant by "third force"—

or the democratic Left on the European continent.

I do not know what is meant by "democratic Left." Of course, I know what we

mean in the United States when we talk about the "left."

These forces, the strongest of which are the democratic socialists—

I shall repeat that—

These forces, the strongest of which are the democratic socialists, look to their British counterparts for moral and material sustenance. A Conservative victory in Britain would give an enormous boost to the Continent's conservatives, most of whom lack the feeling of responsibility that characterizes all British parties. A Conservative victory furthermore probably would mean eventual incorporation of Franco Spain into all the political, economic, and military arrangements of western Europe.

I gather from that, Mr. President, that they are against anyone giving any aid to Franco or to Spain.

Bear in mind, that this is the ADA talking; and that the able junior Senator from Minnesota, is its chairman, I believe, and other able Senators who sit on the floor of the United States Senate, a governor of one of the States of the United States, Mr. Bowles, and a Member of the House of Representatives are members. I read further:

Despite his great political talents, Mr. Churchill was never chosen to lead his country prior to the last war, and this was due mainly to his intransigent imperialism, notably in regard to India With southeastern Asia becoming increasingly important in world politics Churchill's reputation has perhaps become less savory to the democrats of that great area

As for the United States, a Churchill victory would strengthen the American isolationists.

"As for the United States, a Churchill victory would strengthen the American isolationists." I do not know whether I am an isolationist or not, but I know one thing, that I am for America, and that I am for the American system of government. And I make no apologies for that.

I read further:

The most passionate hope of our most stubborn reactionaries is for a smashing Conservative victory, with all its implications for our own election this year and in 1952.

Let us read that again:

The most passionate hope of our most stubborn reactionaries is for a smashing Conservative victory, with all its implications for our own elections this year and in 1952.

A tragic aspect of postwar development is the polarization of forces between the extreme right and left. Any development that encourages this polarization, with a consequent weakening of the vital center or the democratic left, is a set-back for democracy Just as President Truman's victory in 1948 was a smashing blow to the European Communists, so would be a British Labor victory in 1950.

Mr. President, let us take a look at the Socialist Government in England. Let us take a look at the Labor Party in England. In England the Socialists go under the name of the Labor Party. It is not necessary to call a party a "Socialist Party" in order that it be a Socialist Party. In Germany it is called the National Socialist Party. I think the short name was the Nazi Party. Mussolini had a Socialist Party, and the short name for it was the Fascists, I believe. In Russia it is called communism; nevertheless, it is socialism. It is possible to have socialism under any name. It is not necessary to call Socialists by a socialistic name.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article written by Fulton Oursler, author of The Greatest Story Ever Told, in the February issue of Look magazine. Let us take a look at the Government in England, the Labor-Socialist Government, which the ADA wants to win in England. We have already established some of the membership of ADA Let us take a look at the record. What is it the ADA is supporting in England? What is it the ADA is so anxious to have win in England? What makes that organization feel that the world will come to an end if the Labor-Socialists do not win in England?

The headline of the article is, "'Socialize everything'—That's the plan of British Labor Party."

Where does socialism stop? "It doesn't," says Prime Minister Attlee, whose book, The Labor Party in Perspective —and Twelve Years Later, outlines the Labor Party's plan to abolish capitalism

Mr. President, we find in America an organization made up of United States Senators, a Member of the House of Representatives, Governors of States, and of I do not know how many other people in the United States, called the ADA. I shall not question their sincerity, but I certainly question their judgment. In their official organ, their official newspaper, they are advocating the election of a socialistic government in England. Birds of a feather flock together. Does their advocacy of the election of a socialistic government in England mean that they also are advocating or would advocate a socialistic government in the United States? If it is good for England, why is it not good for the United States?

Now let me read possibly all, or at least a portion, of this article:

Unless there is an upset in the elections this year, Great Britain is going to abolish capitalism within its borders. There will be no more individual business, no private enterprise. Instead, there will be a collectivist state.

All other impressions to the contrary, total socialism has been the intention of the Labor government from the beginning

These facts I learned one forenoon not long ago, as I sat in the historic cabinet room of No 10 Downing Street and talked with Clement R Attlee, the Prime Minister.

"Many American taxpayers," I began, "are worried They approved our previous loans or gifts to your country."

This is Mr. Oursler talking to Mr. Attlee.

Now you are asking for more and we are all anxious to know how much further the nationalizing of private industries is to go. Mr. Attlee, when does socialism stop in England?

That is the question Mr. Oursler asked the Prime Minister of England, Mr. Attlee. What was Mr. Attlee's answer? His answer was:

"It doesn't," replied Mr. Attlee "It goes right on. Nothing can stand between a nation and its goal."

Those are the words of the Prime Minister of England. That is the policy which some United States Senators and Representatives and some governors of States of the United States evidently want to maintain in England.

I continue to read:

I ventured the belief that the great majority of Americans still did not understand or believe an all-out socialist government was being planned In fact, one cabinet minister had assured American businessmen in my hearing that they had nothing to fear; there were to be no radical changes, except in a few key industries.

Mr. Oursler made that statement to Mr. Attlee.

Mr Attlee shook his head.

"I don't know what others may have told you," he said, "but no one has any cause to misunderstand. Twelve years ago, long before our party came to power, I gave a specific warning. You had only to read my book."

I think Hitler, too, once wrote a book; did he not? He told us what was going to happen throughout the world. Now Mr. Attlee tells us that he wrote a book in 1937, and that all we have to do is to read his book. He says he told us in his book that when the Labor Party took over control of England, they were going to nationalize and socialize England. Yet, there are United States Senators, there are United States Representatives, there are governors of States, and there are those who call themselves liberals in the United States, who are supporting that sort of a party in England. Again, I say, I do not question their sincerity, but I certainly question their judgment.

I continue to read:

The Prime Minister was speaking of a book called "The Labour Party in Perspective," originally published in 1937. Last year it was republished in England with this addition to its title, "And Twelve Years Later" Had I studied that book, Mr. Attlee declared, I would have known the answers to most of the questions that troubled me. Now that I have read the book—

This is Mr. Oursler speaking—

Now that I have read the book, I can testify that he was right.

Mr. Attlee wrote a book in 1937, in which he said that, "When the Labour Party gets control of England we are going to socialize all of England. There is no backing up," he said; "no halfway measure." Yet in the United States there are responsible men and women who support the socialization of England. Is it any wonder that we who love the American system, is it any wonder that we who know what made us the greatest Nation in the world, our form of government, are worried? When we look around and see those who are supporting socialism in England is it any wonder that the Republican Party yesterday declared that the big issue in the coming election is the socialization of our country?

I continue to read from Mr Oursler's article:

Take the first query I put to Mr Attlee. Why was England socializing more and more private business while prosperity withered in the land and the country squirmed in a series of crises? Anticipating that question, 12 years before, Mr. Attlee had boldly asserted that the Labour Government, on coming

into power, would have for its fervent objective * * * "the establishment of the Socialist Commonwealth * * *. The plain fact is that a Socialist party cannot hope to make a success of administering the capitalist system because it does not believe in it. * * * Socialists believe in a classless society and the plan which they put forward will envisage a steady progress toward greater equalization of wealth * * *. Henceforth," Mr. Attlee added, "the issue that confronts the electorate of this country will be socialism versus capitalism."

That is Mr. Attlee, head of the Labor-Socialistic Government of England, speaking. I shall read the last sentence again:

"Henceforth," Mr. Attlee added, "the issue that confronts the electorate of this country will be socialism versus capitalism."

Yet, Mr. President, there are United States Senators, there are United States Representatives, there are governors of States, there are men and women in high public office in the United States, who are supporting that sort of a party, that sort of a regime in England. I read a moment ago the editorial in their official magazine in which they so state.

I continue to read:

Does Mr. Attlee believe that a labor party must be a socialist party? Yes, beyond any question. A trade-union, as he sees it, has two purposes: "It is, in the first place, an organization of the wage-earners working within the framework of capitalist society in order to defend its members from injustice and to gain for them advantages. On the other hand, it is also in opposition to the existing system of society which it seeks to alter."

I continue to read from Mr. Oursler's article:

Did the British people, when they voted the Labor Party into power, realize that its Socialist program would be started, regardless of recovery of trade and commerce, and all other problems? What has been done is exactly what Mr. Attlee promised in his book; it was a socialistic blueprint, in which he proposed what he called a short program of changes to be made. The principal points were the following:

BANK OF ENGLAND NATIONALIZED

1. Nationalization of the Bank of England, control of the credit policy of joint-stock banks and total control of the direction of long-term investment. Mr. Attlee gave these measures first place in his book. At once, after the elections of 1945, the Bank of England was nationalized and the Government took monopolistic control over the major machinery of finance.

We certainly can see some resemblance between what is happening in our own country and what has happened in England.

I continue to read:

How could inexperienced British officials hope to run this enormous banking business successfully? Well, Mr. Attlee promised, they would seek sound counsel, of course, but actually the government doesn't care if its affairs are run at a loss. As Mr. Attlee put it, "It might fix its prices at such a level as to show no profit at all, or even a loss, which might be made up from some other source. It would not affect the main issue, which is whether or not the public is provided with the services it requires."

We can quite understand that, can we not, when we note that in the United States we have a Government which maintains that it is a virtue to run a deficit.

I continue to read from Mr. Oursler's article:

2. Power for the compulsory purchase of land for social purposes. This now is also the law. The government can take "whatever land it requires for whatever purpose." The words are Mr. Attlee's. This land can be seized without recourse to the courts; an owner has no rights in his land any longer. Eventually, this law will apply to the whole soil of England, Scotland, and Wales; no individual will be allowed to own a spadeful.

Mr. President, does anyone here want to deny that that is the aim of the Socialists of England when at the moment they have practically all the laws they need in order to reach it? They promise that if they are reelected they will reach it. Yet that is the party which able United States Senators and able United States Representatives and governors and men and women in high public office in this land are supporting, and say should be reelected. It makes one wonder.

EVERYTHING OWNED BY THE COMMUNITY

3. The nationalization of coal, gas, and electricity industries. These proposals also have been put through. Coal, gas, and electricity came quickly into government hands; steel is next on the list. Afterward will come the Sun and Prudential companies, the insurance giants of Great Britain; then cement and other trades. When the Sun and Prudential are seized, it will mean much more than just insurance being taken over; enormous funds for policyholders are invested in private business and industry. Because of those investments, the government will acquire a voice in a thousand and one private firms. Eventually, Mr. Attlee says, "All the major industries will be owned and controlled by the community."

That is Mr. Attlee speaking. He is the head of the Labor Government in England, the Socialist Government of England. Possibly there is one thing we can admire about the people of that country. They are honest enough to call it a socialistic government. They admit it is socialism. Too many people in the United States are advocating the same policies, but they are not honest enough to say that those policies are socialistic and that the end result in this Nation will be socialism. So let us give them credit at least for being honest.

4. The nationalization of transport, including railroad, road, canal, and air. This has been done—including even the taking over of Thomas Cook & Sons, travel agents. At times, the effect of the social gospel on Cook's employees is quite startling, as when one American recently tried to arrange for a private car to meet him at a Dutch airport. "What's the matter?" asked a clerk. "Aren't your fellow passengers good enough for you to ride with on a bus? We're all as good as anybody else, you know." And he refused to arrange for the service.

5. A far-ranging program of agricultural development. In this farm planning, the new government has also tried to follow the blueprint.

Blueprint meaning that it was written in Mr. Attlee's book in 1937.

It was promised that a program of expansion would increase domestic production by $400,000,000. Today, the meat ration is shorter than ever before. The British food problems are more acute than at any time since the war, the farmers are disappointed, and an ordinary cigar retails at $5.50—for one cigar. Yet all is exactly as Mr. Attlee warned; the Government subsidizes, buys, fixes prices, makes allotments, and has everybody spending hours waiting in line. With the new agricultural program in effect, England is hungrier than ever.

They have less food in England today than they have ever had. Socialism has never worked, and it will never work. All it does is to divide up poverty. It does not enrich anyone. In England under socialism they have less to eat and less of everything else. Yet there are those in high positions in the United States who say that the Socialist Party in England should be reelected.

Let us go on:

Many other Socialist schemes were forecast in Mr. Attlee's book. The author pledged amelioration of all social ills. From this promise emerged the welfare state's now notorious free health program. He also promised adequate housing, a promise not yet redeemed. It has been found easy to nationalize dwellings already in existence; but another matter to build new ones.

That brings me to this point. Socialists sit around waiting until someone else is successful or someone else builds a successful society or a successful nation. We have built our Nation by the private-enterprise system, by the savings and the work and ingenuity of the American people; just as the people in England have built their nation. Then the Socialists step in and say, "No gooders." They say, "We must divide this up. We can do it better. Let us step in and run it."

It has never worked, Mr. President, and it never will work. Yet, Senators, Representatives, governors, and other men in high public office in this Nation are advocating the reelection of a socialistic government in England. The irony of it is that we in Congress have been taking from the taxpayers of America money made through private industry and turning it over to the Socialists in England, who are socializing the entire nation. Thank God, I never voted to do that. I sometimes wonder if we have forgotten how to think.

I continue to read:

He also promised a shorter working week, without reduction in pay. This promise, I have it on the highest authority, is soon to be repudiated.

Of course they will repudiate all their promises. A little later we shall talk about what has been given to the laboring men since the power-greedy fellows have obtained control.

"Any short program," declared Mr. Attlee, "to be acceptable to Socialists, must contain measures which will take the country a long way on the road to the desired goal * * * those which are really vital for the transformation of society. * * * Next, there must be a development of the control of the community over trade and industry which runs counter to the will of individualism.

Yet, they are going to regiment them. They are going to give them a number. They do not want any individualism. They want everything run by the State. They want to give everybody a number, so that the people will do exactly what they tell them to do.

They will get away with it. At least they will not starve, so long as the taxpayers in the United States support them. They will not starve so long as they can live off what was built up in England before they took over. They will gradually, day by day, have less to eat, less prosperity. We know that is going to happen. Socialism has never worked. Yet men in high positions in the United States are advocating the reelection of the Socialists to the Government of England.

Does not this intention mean the end of individual liberty? Mr. Attlee disagrees:

"The aim of British socialism is to give greater freedom to the individual. * * *

"The liberty which, it is feared, socialism will restrict is the liberty of the few * * * It is true that in the Socialist state people will be deprived of the right of living in idleness at the expense of the community."

But will not the increasing authority of socialism also mark the end of liberty of worship, since Marx called religion "the opiate of the people"? During our interview, Mr. Attlee was most emphatic about this question "You may quote me as saying that religious liberty will be wholly secure under our system, which has little to do with Marxism and sprang instead from religious origins."

And in his book he had written:

"England in the nineteenth century was a nation of Bible readers To put the Bible into the hands of an Englishman is to do a very dangerous thing

This is Mr. Attlee speaking; this was written in his book, and is quoted in the article from which I now read:

The Bible is full of revolutionary teaching and it is not surprising that in a country where thought is free, many men and women have drawn from it the support which they needed for their instinctive revolt against the inhuman conditions which capitalism brings * * * There are probably more texts from the Bible enunciated from Socialists' platforms than from those of all other parties * * * Many clergy and laymen found that the capitalistic system was incompatible with Christianity. It is possible in Britain for a person to declare himself a Communist."

Mr. President, that part of the article quotes from Mr. Attlee's book. I read further:

LABOR GOVERNMENT OFFERS PANACEA

But how is it possible for a truly religious man to follow communism, which teaches and practices the destruction of religion? That is one of the questions for which I could not find any answer in the book. But it is plain that many well-intentioned Englishmen expect the Labor Government to cure all social ills; just as equally well-intentioned Americans worked for prohibition on its promise to produce sobriety.

Again, how can religious Socialists reconcile the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God with the increasing nurture of class hatred, the exaltation of envy as a chief virtue, and the constant waging, in strikes and out, of class warfare? There is a sharp echo of triumph in the Government's latest promise that, if reelected in 1950, it will give every citizen a free travel vacation, with a stay in some stately castle from which the owners have had to flee, impoverished by the new regime.

There it is, Mr. President, promises, promises, promises! Yet there are those in high public office in the United States who are supporting it. I read the editorial to the Senate a moment ago. In their official magazine they say something terrible will happen to the world if the Labor Party in England who have already socialized that nation are not reelected.

I read further:

Throughout our interview, Mr. Attlee expressed himself on a level of valiant idealism. He declared his willingness to abide by the will of the people as expressed in democratic elections. But how long will his views be supported by his associates or his successors?

WILL OF THE PEOPLE IGNORED

At the time I raised this question, a shocking thing had just happened in London. There had been an election of the County Council, and many Laborites had been defeated. Where, the day before, the Laborites had a powerful majority, there was now a tie of 64 to 64. The deadlock made it necessary for the old majority, as its final act, to elect an extra member to break the tie. In plain defiance of the voters, the expiring Socialist majority chose a Socialist who had just been rejected at the polls. In this case, the will of the people, expressed in a democratic election, had been set aside. Mr. Attlee is rumored to have wept when he heard this But to me his book's most fearsome fallacy is his confidence that all Socialists will play the game according to rules he believes in.

Mr. Attlee sees Socialism as an irresitible world-wide force

Let me read that again, Mr. President. I wish all 96 Senators were on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I shall read that part of the article again:

Mr Attlee sees Socialism as an irresistible world-wide force· "The Labor Party may be considered as part of a great international movement and as a British political party * * * A true Socialist cannot allow his sympathies to be bounded by anything so narrow as a nation, for nationalism is only egotism writ large"

There it is, Mr. President.

In the United States, who are the counterparts of the Socialists in England? I know the counterparts are not the Republican Party and not the old Democratic Party. The counterparts are the left-wingers, the pressure groups, the Communists, the Socialists, and all other groups in the United States that are bound together by what I have just read, namely, the desire to socialize the world. We have been trying to stop communism; we have been fighting communism. I have been fighting it for years. Yet the same thing is happening to us, Mr. President: While we are fighting communism, the Socialists are creeping in the back door, just as when we were spending billions upon billions of dollars to stop the Communists from going into Europe, they went in the other direction and took over practically all of Asia and China. Mr. President, I say to you that is what is happening in the United States today and throughout the world: They are working under the cover of a different name; they call themselves anything but Socialists or they go under the name of the Labor Party, as is the case in England.

Perhaps I should read again that statement by Mr. Attlee, as printed in the article:

A true Socialist cannot allow his sympathies to be bounded by anything so narrow as a nation, for nationalism is only egotism writ large.

Think of that, Mr. President; just think of it.

Mr. President, there is no question in my mind that the Labor Socialists of England would like to socialize America. There can be no question about that. The statement I have just read from the article is proof of it, I think.

Mr. President, why do we have in this Nation big men and little men, men in high positions in this land, who support, by editorials, the reelection of a Socialist government in England, knowing that that government and that party intend to socialize all of England, and knowing that the head of that party, Mr. Attlee, in 1937 wrote a book in which he blueprinted the whole thing—just as Hitler wrote a book. Are not we ever to learn anything from history? Are we Americans going to continue to fall for every foolish scheme that is developed throughout the world? Our record in international affairs, so far as I personally am concerned, over the past 30 years, has been a complete blank, for I know of no scheme we have gone into that has accomplished the purpose for which it was intended.

Mr. President, I shall read further from the article:

Workers taught to hate owners.

Mr. President, that has been done in England, and it has been done in the United States also. That has been done for many, many years, the same pattern and the same scheme have been followed. If one reads what has happened in England during the past 30 years, he will find exactly the same pattern as that which has been developed in the United States. All he has to do is to study the history and the movements on the part of our own Government and the movements of those in this Nation who would ruin our Government. The pattern is exactly the same. Some years ago there were in England the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party. All the discontents and malcontents, the left-wingers, the Fabians, and the Socialists went into the Liberal Party, step by step, step by step. Mr. Attlee made the blueprint in 1937 when he wrote his book. Step by step, all the left-wing organizations and parties of discontent went into the Liberal Party, until they took it over completely. They then elected what they called the Labor Government, which in reality was a socialistic government. The same thing is happening in the United States. All such groups in the United States have bound themselves together, and they are, day by day, taking over the Democratic Party. Thank God, there have never been any of them in the Republican Party. The executive director of the ADA, Mr. La Follette, is a former Republican Representative in Congress from Indiana. He got out of the Republican Party. The editorial indicates the ADA are now advocating the reelection of the Socialist Party in England. The headline of the article I will resume reading is, "Workers taught to hate owners."

The article continues:

There were other questions I wanted to ask. How, for example, could cooperation in

industry now be restored? For years, loathing for the owners was preached to British laborers. Now the workers are themselves the owners, and their dire need—and England's—is for increased production. In the past, the workers were schooled by their leaders to slow down. How can disciplined sloth now be changed to industriousness?

It is a question which Mr. Oursler asked Mr. Attlee. Ah, it is the same pattern—Workers taught to hate owners, to slow-down strikes. The same pattern has been adopted in the United States. Yet we find United States Senators, Representatives in Congress, a governor, and other men in high public office, now saying the socialistic government in England should be reelected. What does it mean, Mr. President? I again ask, are we never to learn that the greatest asset we have is our form of government?

The article continues:

How can you get a man to work hard, anyway, when he feels secure in a welfare state where the government is bound to keep him fed, sheltered, and clothed? For these questions, Mr. Attlee had no answer, neither privately nor in his book. But he agrees that answers must be found.

LET'S CALL A HALT

Finally, I began to ask some questions of myself. Since England is now in a most serious financial crisis, isn't it time for American taxpayers to get good and worried? They have had to pay the bills of the socialistic program, which is to go right on to the complete annihilation of the private business tradition in which America believes. Why should not the lenders or, rather, the givers of billions of dollars—you and I—call a halt unless and until the borrower agrees to postpone utopia until he can pay for it himself? And before we, the capitalistic financiers of their program, ourselves go broke?

Here is a big headline in the Financial Post, Toronto, Canada: "Britain to ask United States new dollar loan?" and yet the head of the British Socialist Government says, "Socialize everything." This article is headed, "Socialize everything." Under the caption is the following:

That is the plan of the British Labor Party. Where does socialism stop? "It does not," says Prime Minister Attlee, whose book, The Labor Party in Perspective—and 12 Years Later, outlines the Labor Party's plan to abolish capitalism.

That is good, is it not? The American taxpayers' money is given to a government, and to its head, Mr. Attlee, who got the idea he is now developing, not yesterday, not 2 weeks ago, but who wrote in 1937 that they were planning to abolish capitalism. Yet we take the American taxpayers' money and give to that kind of man, with that kind of philosophy, and to that kind of government. He has already told us that he is going to abolish capitalism in England and that everything in England is going to be socialized. He also told us:

The Labor Party may be considered as a part of a great international movement and as a British political party. * * * A true Socialist cannot allow his sympathies to be bounded by anything so narrow as a nation, for nationalism is only egotism writ large.

There it is. And yet United States Senators, Representatives in Congress, governors, and other people in high public office in this land not only vote to give American dollars to that kind of a government, but desire to further what I have just been describing, for in their official publication they urge the reelection of the Socialist government of England.

Mr. President, I know that other Senators, possibly, are going to speak on this subject. I know there are those who will rise to say, "You have got to take care of the people." They will rise to talk about poor housing in the United States. They will talk about the ill-fed and the ill-clad. They will paint pictures of slums in America. They will go back to 1931 and 1932, when prices in the United States were low and when there was a depression. I know all that. I know they will use all such things as an argument for the socalistic state, and I know they will point the finger and say—if they do not say it out loud, they will be thinking it, or saying it under their breath—"The able Senator from Indiana is merely a reactionary, a conservative, a man who does not have the interests of anyone at heart." I know the story. I have listened to it for five long years. I know it forward and I know it backward; and I say to you, Mr. President, that there is under way an international conspiracy to socialize America. Socialism is the first step toward communism. The only difference between the two is that under socialism an effort is made for a period of time to maintain a semblance of liberty for the people and, for a time, to maintain free elections; whereas, under communism, there is a dictator, and the dictator runs the nation. Under socialism, however, as time goes on, economic conditions of the nation become so bad that they are forced to do—what? They are forced to put into effect regimentation; they are forced to name a dictator. That is always the net result It always has been.

What do such nations give their people? They give them a redistribution of poverty. They do not give them a higher standard of living; they give them poverty, as is being done in England today. There is no question that the Government of England would have fallen long ago if it had not been supported by American taxpayers' dollars earned under the great American system of government, the private-industry type of government, the capitalistic type of government which they wish now to destroy.

Mr. President, it does not make sense. I hope I am mistaken. I hope that the editorial which I read to the Senate this afternoon does not mean what I think it means. I pray that it does not mean what I think it means. I hope that Senators who are members of the organization to which I have referred will stand on the floor of the Senate, or go on the radio, or will write and say, "The Senator from Indiana was wrong. The editorial which he read did not mean what he thought it meant." In the name of our country and for the good of our country, I hope that is true, but I cannot help but come to the conclusion, after reading the editorial, that it does mean what it says.

There are many parties in the United States, splinter parties and groups. There is the ADA about which I have been speaking. There is the CIO Political Action Committee. There is the A. F. of L. Political Action Committee. There is the New Deal Party, the Fair Deal Party, and the American Labor Party.

There are in the United States more splinter parties with funny names than we need. They are all bound together for the same cause, the same purpose. They scratch each other's back in the United States and they scratch the back of every other similar organization in every other nation of the world. They are for the Socialists in England. They are against Franco.

If I had time I think I would read a brief editorial which was published in the same magazine from which I read the other editorial. It is against Mr. Franco, against Spain. The preamble to the organization's constitution is, in effect: "We are against sin. We love everybody. We are for increasing the standard of living of the peoples throughout the world, regardless of who they are." Yet, in the ADA magazine they say: "We want no part of Spain. We want no part of Franco." They are for everyone, certainly. They are for everyone who agrees with their philosophy, which is what? Their philosophy is, I presume—I do not know; all I know is what I read in the editorial—to support the Socialists of England.

Mr. President, I again say that there is very little difference between socialism and communism. Hitler called his party the National Socialist Party. I think the Communist Party in Russia is called a Socialist Party. I forget the official name of the party in Italy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the February issue of America, entitled "Mr. Acheson on Spain."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Is there objection?

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

MR. ACHESON ON SPAIN

One of the elementary facts of life which a Secretary of State must learn is to come in out of the rain. From his January 19 letter to Senator TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, it looks as if Secretary of State Dean Acheson had finally learned that our policy toward Spain was giving him a good dousing. Resorting to the wisdom of the common man, Mr. Acheson is ready to get out from under.

The Secretary began by expaining that it was traditional American policy to recognize foreign governments despite our disapproval of the ideology they represent and of the domestic policies they pursue. The criterion we have generally applied, he now admits, is whether recognition serves the interests of the United States. Presumably, we may add, these interests are legitimate, and in many respects identical with the interests of all nations in establishing world prosperity and peace.

In the case of Spain, Mr. Acheson confesses that the 1946 resolution of the UN General Assembly to withdraw chiefs of diplomatic missions from Madrid has failed. The policy has strengthened rather than weakened General Franco. The American Government, according to Mr. Acheson's revised judgment, is now prepared to vote in favor of a UN

resolution "which will leave members free to send an ambassador or minister to Spain if they choose." This reversal of our policy, he adds, is a mere recognition of the facts in the case, and is not to be mistaken for approval of the Spanish regime.

This decision of the Secretary of State to run for cover has not been taken all of a sudden. In fact, the history of his mental operations in regard to Spain during the past 8 months makes a rather intriguing story.

If we look back to last May, when the United Nations Assembly was considering a resolution to do what our Secretary of State now says we would favor doing, where did he stand? On May 11 he explained why we would abstain from voting on the resolution to lift the embargo on full diplomatic representation in Madrid. His first reason was that Spain failed to provide civil protections and failed to uphold freedom of association and of religion (America, May 28, 1949, p. 279, "Spain at Lake Success"). His second reason, which had more weight, was that our western European allies refused to enter into "an intimate working partnership" with Spain as presently governed. This statement was supposed to answer the contention of Senators GURNEY, CONNALLY, VANDENBERG, and TAFT that our Spanish policy, in view of the cold war and of our traditional practice (actually followed in our relations with Communist countries), simply did not make sense. The United Nations, by a rather close vote, stuck to its 1946 resolution.

Then the clouds burst on Mr. Acheson. As the Chinese Communists swept on toward complete control of China, the problem of recognizing another ruthless totalitarian regime became extremely vexing. In addressing the Pan-American Society of the United States on September 19, Mr. Acheson took occasion to explain that our practice in recognizing foreign governments should not always be based on our approval of them. America, having taken note of this glance toward a place of shelter (October 1, 1949, p 683), later observed that Mr. Acheson might be preparing the way toward eventual recognition of Communist China (October 8, 1949, p 1). Moreover as the split between Tito and Stalin widened the Secretary was hard pressed to justify making a loan to Dictator Tito after his May 11 statement (America, September 24, 1949, p. 653).

The symbolism of our policy of recognition, which the Secretary of State last May took very seriously, has now lost its glow. Recognition no longer connotes approval of a foreign government, but merely that it belongs to the family of nations and is prepared to carry out its international obligations Spain meets these qualifications. If all this is intended as a prelude to our eventual recognition of Communist China, however, we hardly need remind Mr. Acheson that Peiping does not meet them.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the ADA World, the official publication of Americans for Democratic Action, dated January 27, 1950, and entitled "About Franco."

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

ABOUT FRANCO

At this point in the world-wide struggle of democracy against totalitarianism, friendly American gestures toward General Franco could conceivably undo much of what has been accomplished. As James Loeb points out, Fascist Spain is a "symbol and a touchstone" to millions. Anybody who wants a thorough comprehension of the factors involved in United States aid to Spain should read ADA's new pamphlet, What Does Stalin Want Us To Do About Franco? Compiled from authoritative sources and endorsed by several respected journalists, this document should help prepare us to act wisely when the bedrock question of economic aid to Franco comes up, as it surely will.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a document entitled "The PCA, the ADA, and Henry Wallace." It is a documented history—I believe it to be true—showing the historical background of the National Citizens Political Action Committee and the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which has been called the Progressive Citizens of America, and now the ADA. I might say that the ADA, if I correctly understand the situation—and if I am wrong I hope some Senator will correct me—was the outgrowth of the NCPAC and the ICCASP, liberal groups. Many members withdrew from those organizations because they thought they were too communistic. I congratulate them for getting out.

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

THE PCA, THE ADA, AND HENRY WALLACE

PCA IS "FRESH TITLE FOR TWO STALE ONES"

In a 2-day convention at the Hotel Commodore in New York City on December 28-29, 1946, 300 delegates from 21 States voted to merge 10 liberal organizations—principally the National Citizens Political Action Committee and the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions—into a new group entitled the Progressive Citizens of America.

Harold Ickes, himself fresh from an inside track as recent executive chairman of the ICCASP—from which he resigned on November 11, 1946, for reasons variously reported as disaffection over his salary and/or communism in ICCASP—observed acidly in his syndicated column of January 3, 1947, that "there was little new about this organization—the newly formed PCA—except the substitution of a fresh title for two stale ones."

"Moreover," he added, "no liberal movement can prosper that, from its very start, will be called upon to defend against the charge of communistic taint. The cornerstone of the organization should have been a stern injunction that no Communist or sympathizer with communism would be admitted to membership." [1]

At the organizing convention, Dr. Frank Kingdon and Sculptor Jo Davidson, former chairmen, respectively, of the NCPAC and the ICCASP, were chosen as cochairmen of the new PCA.

Henry Wallace was the mentor and principal speaker at the convention, where he placed primary emphasis on the role of liberals in the national scene, and secondary emphasis on Russian-American relations. William R. Conklin of the New York Times reported on the convention that:

"The applause was unenthusiastic when Mr. Wallace told the gathering that 'we should have no allegiance outside this country of any sort,' but it swelled into respectable volume when he added: 'except to one world, peaceful and prosperous.'" [2]

WALLACE NOT A MEMBER OR OFFICER OF PCA

At the same time that Henry Wallace (along with Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida) is the darling of the PCA, he made it clear from the beginning in an editorial printed in the January 27, 1947, issue of his New Republic that he is "not a member or an officer of the PCA." [3] Apparently he still is not, for on October 29, 1947, the office of the New Republic (of which Wallace is editor) told a New York newspaper that Wallace is not cochairman, and to their knowledge, is not even a member of the PCA [4]

BOTH NCPAC AND ICCASP COMMUNIST FRONTS

Both of the principal foster-parents of the new PCA ("by ICCASP out of NCPAC"—as the San Francisco Chronicle described the new group [5]) had already earned a reputation for Communist sympathies even before their merger into PCA.

On June 11, 1946, Representative GEORGE DONDERO, Republican of Michigan, arose on the floor of the House, "to expose what I believe to be a Communist fraud which is being perpetrated upon the people of the city of Washington through the guise of a so-called School of Political Action Techniques to be conducted by the National Citizens Political Action Committee. * * * The faculty of this school is largely composed of individuals who have rendered yeoman service to the Communist Party and its front organizations. * * * This project * * * is actually an attempt to establish in the city of Washington a branch of the chain of Communist schools to be found throughout the country." [6]

DONDERO continued for 30 minutes to expose the Communist-front connections, sympathies, and affiliations of more than 30 of the sponsors and faculty members of this PCA (School of Public Action Technique). [7]

Even more extensive evidence is available of the active Communist sympathies and ties of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

On March 6, 1946, Representative JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD extensive evidence of the unquestionable tie-in between ICCASP and the Communist-fronters. Before listing the numerous Communist-front connections of individual leaders and officers in the ICCASP, RANKIN said:

"The Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions is one of the rankest Communist-front organizations in the whole country.

"According to Samuel Sillen of the Communist Daily Worker, the official Communist organ in the United States, this organization changed its name in December 1944 from the Independent Voters Committee to the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Investigation reveals that this organization today includes many sincere liberals who have been misled into joining it * * *

"However the core of this organization is composed of a group of admitted Communists and a long list of fellow travelers who have given their support to Communist-front organizations dedicated to one or more of the following purposes:

"First. Defense of the Communist Party and its members.

"Second. Support of Communist publications.

"Third. Support of the Soviet Union and its foreign policy.

[1] Philadelphia Record, January 3, 1947.
[2] The New York Times, December 30, 1946.
[3] See New York Herald Tribune, January 24, 1947, or New Republic, January 27, 1947, p. 23.
[4] New York Sun, October 29, 1947.
[5] February 1, 1947.
[6] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol 92, pt. 5, p. 6699.
[7] Ibid., pp 6699-6702.

"Fourth. Support of special campaigns under Communist initiative.

* * * * *

"Documentary evidence to prove the Communist affiliation of the organizations which I name is available

* * * * *

"On August 10, 11, and 12 of 1945, the New York State convention of the Communist Political Association [8] held secret sessions at Manhattan * * *.

"During this convention June Hoffman, of the cultural section of the Communist Party, addressed the members, saying:

" 'We built the independent citizens' committee of the arts, sciences, and professions. It is a great political weapon'." [9]

RIVAL GROUP OF NON-COMMUNIST LIBERALS FORM ADA

Probably the most conclusive evidence of the Communist tinge within the PCA is the fact that a rival set of liberals felt it imperative within a week's time of the formation of the PCA, to form a separate organization as a non-Communist haven for the more respectable American liberals who could find no stomach for the Red-tainted PCA.

Led by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Chester Bowles, Elmer Davis, Wilson Wyatt, David Dubinsky, Russell Davenport, Mark Ethridge, Bishop Oxnam and a number of other prominent "liberals" [10] who resented the Communist taking over their movement, an organizational meeting was called during the first week in January 1947 by the Union for Democratic Action, resulting in the formation of the new Americans for Democratic Action [11] Wilson Wyatt and Leon Henderson were named cochairmen [12]

This group publicly announced that it rejected "any association with Communists or sympathizers with communism" as well as "any association with Facists or their sympathibers" [13] Later, on March 29, 1947, a constitution barring Communists from membership was adopted unanimously by delegates to a conference in Washington which permanently organized Americans for Democratic Action [14]

ROOSEVELT FAMILY IN BOTH CAMPS

Among the families split up by this cleavage in the left-wing ranks, incidentally, is the Roosevelt family. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., and Mr. and Mrs John Boettiger are active supporters of the ADA;[14] while Elliott Roosevelt and his wife, Faye Emerson Roosevelt, are active sponsors of the PCA.[15] (Faye Emerson Roosevelt was one of the "Pinks in minks" who performed as a speaker at a PCA Women's Division fashion show in New York where a Scripps-Howard writer observed sardonically that "mink is the latest come-on used by the women to recruit for left-wing politics" [16]) As for James Roosevelt, the other "liberal" in the family, he is understood to have ended what Ickes described as his "well-paid" allegiance to ICCASP (he was national director of political organization for the committee [17]) when he was elected Democrat Party chairman in California [18], and to be siding now with his mother and brother Franklin in ADA.[18]

WILL ROGERS, JR., SAYS PCA IS COMMUNIST FRONT

On January 31, 1947, at Los Angeles, Calif., Will Rogers, Jr., former Representative who lost out in his effort to become Democratic United States Senator from California, announced that he had declined to become a sponsor for the Progressive Citizens of America, because it was what he termed nothing but "a reshuffling of the same old Communist line-following organizations."

Speaking of the ICCASP and the NCPAC which merged into the PCA, Rogers said in his newspaper, the Beverly Hills Citizen:

"Both of these organizations contained Communists. I will join no liberal group unless it contains an anti-Communist plank in its platform.

"American Communists have no place in the liberal movement. They work for Russia's foreign policy. Until the PCA cleans them out, true American liberals should have no part of it." [19]

LEON HENDERSON SCORES PCA AS RED HAVEN

On April 20, 1947, Leon Henderson, cochairman of the ADA, told a reporter for the Los Angeles Times that—

"The ADA has safeguards to keep Communists from its ranks and mechanisms to delouse them if they get in. In this connection, we are not to be confused with the Progressive Citizens of America, which definitely does accept Communist members and does work with them." [20]

ROSCOE DRUMMOND SEES REDS IN PCA

One of the most impartial and highly respected of Washington observers is Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor. In his column, State of the Nation, which he devoted to the PCA on January 21, 1947, Drummond observed:

"The most fundamental and explicit difference between the Progressive Citizens of America and the Americans for Democratic Action is that the latter totally rejects any association with Communists, with communism, with party-line followers, or with totalitarians from either the left or the right.

"The Wallace-led Progressive Citizens of America hedges on this question, but those who know the facts are aware that it is used by American Communists to achieve Communist ends. The two organizations which melded into the PCA—namely, the National Citizens Political Action Committee and the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions—were visibly used by Communists at every opportunity they could get, and they got numerous opportunities; and the new facade has not changed the fact. The PCA does not bar Communists; it prides itself on the absence of what it calls 'traditional "left-right" quibbling,' which is another way of saying 'Communists are welcome.' " [21]

COCHAIRMAN DAVIDSON ADMITS COMMUNIST MEMBERSHIPS

When the PCA was first set up, a number of reporters queried its leadership about the Communist question. On January 31, 1947, a writer for the San Francisco Chronicle reported on a "Four Roses-and-soda press conference" held by Jo Davidson in a downtown hotel there. One of the newsmen commented to Mr. Davidson that, "looking over the names of members and officers it seems a number of them have been attacked as Communists. Would Mr. Davidson say this group has any Communist leaning?"

" 'We don't screen our membership,' said one of the feminine backers tartly. 'That's the easiest thing in the world to do and the hardest to avoid.'

"Well, wasn't it true that Davidson's ICCASP had been a target on some Hollywood red-baiting recently?

"Mr. Davidson couldn't recall The atmosphere grew a little charged" [22]

But a few days later, Mr. Davidson opened up considerably more to a Los Angeles press audience called to meet him in a downtown hotel there. Quoting Mr. Davidson, according to a reporter for the Los Angeles Times:

" 'We must do something about it all,' he says, rather too mildly, as he pushes his spectacles back grandfatherwise on his head. 'As for those Communist charges, I suppose every organization has some Communists in it and we are no exception. But our bylaws say we are for democratic reform under the Constitution.' " [23]

SAME OLD CROWD OF REDS IN PCA

While the list of known Communists and Communist sympathizers who are PCA members and tune callers is obviously too extensive to be here incorporated, it is sufficient to note that the No. 1 Communist in Hollywood as exposed by the recent Congressional hearings—John Howard Lawson—is an active PCA'er in Beverly Hills. Upton Close described a meeting there last September 1947 which was little more than a small edition of a Communist Party rally under the sponsorship of the PCA—the same old crowd of Reds were there, he said, while "the same old cliches were repeated in the same old stereotyped routines." [24] Robert Kenny, who was defense counsel for the 10 Communists cited for contempt of Congress in November 1947 [25] after Kenny had advised them to refuse to answer "Yes" or "No" as to whether or not they were Communists,[26] was elected cochairman of the Progressive Citizens of America on June 28, 1947, to succeed Jo Davidson, who resigned due to business abroad.[27]

KENNY SEES WALLACE AS ARTICULATE CONSERVATIVE

Mr. Kenny has a curious line. He is currently Henry Wallace's campaign director. In a Washington interview on November 1, 1947, Kenny blandly told a news writer:

"Wallace is not a red or pink, but an articulate conservative" and represents "America's best chance to succeed as a land of peace and security." [28]

TO PCA'ERS, COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IS NOT THE ISSUE

Typical of the PCA attitude of confusing the issue is a statement made by Ben Margolis, an attorney, who traveled to Philadelphia on November 1, 1947, with the Hollywood pinks to address a specially called PCA rally at Independence Hall for their benefit (although the rally was soon broken up by a mob of angry veterans and other Americans). Quoting a Philadelphia Inquirer report of the incident:

"Margolis, who said he had been named spokesman for the group (of Hollywood screen writers and directors summoned before the House un-American hearings), was

[8] Now renamed the Communist Party, U. S. A. Cited, of course, in the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations released to the press on December 4, 1947 (Washington Post, December 5, 1947)

[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, pt. 9, pp. A1150–1151.

[10] Jay Hayden, Detroit News, December 31, 1946

[11] Washington Post, January 5, 1947.

[12] Associated Press, Washington Star, January 6, 1947.

[13] Washington Post, March 30, 1947.

[14] Christian Science Monitor, January 15, 1947.

[15] Lyle C Wilson, United Press, Washington Daily News, April 1, 1947.

[16] Frederick Woltman, Washington Daily News, July 7, 1947.

[17] Lyle C. Wilson, United Press, Washington Daily News, April 1, 1947.

[18] Baltimore Sun, March 11, 1946.

[18] Frank Van Der Linder, Charlotte Observer, April 24, 1947.

[19] Associated Press, San Francisco Chronicle, February 1, 1947.

[20] Los Angeles Times, April 20, 1947.

[21] Christian Science Monitor, January 21, 1947.

[22] Stanton Delaplane, San Francisco Chronicle, February 1, 1947.

[23] Los Angeles Times, February 4, 1947.

[24] New York Journal American, September 26, 1947.

[25] Washington Post, November 25, 1947.

[26] Richard L. Strout, Christain Science Monitor, October 28, 1947.

[27] Chicago Tribune, June 30, 1947.

[28] Gustaf A. Nordin, North American Newspaper Alliance, Providence Journal, November 2, 1947.

asked whether its membership included Communists, as charged at the recent hearings.

" 'This is not the issue,' he replied. 'The issue is our national fight to maintain freedom of speech and of the press. We do not wish to becloud the issue with matters of politics or of conscience.' " [30]

PCA PROGRAM FOLLOWS PARTY LINE

If sympathy with communism is not the issue, then it is difficult to describe the program of the Progressive Citizen , of America, which contains the following points:

1. One of its first lines was to demand abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee and its probings

2. On March 29, 1947, it sent an open letter to President Truman urging immediate revocation of the Executive order for review of the loyalty of Federal employees. "Not since the infamous sedition laws of 1798 has such a blow been struck at the individual liberties of every American," the PCA maintained in its letter.[30]

3. On March 31, 1947, the PCA at a Madison Square Garden rally bitterly attacked the Trumar doctrine of all-out aid to the anti-Soviet Greek and Turkish Governments, thus lining themselves up squarely in opposition to the ADA's foreign policy stand [31]

4. On June 29, 1947, at a meeting in Chicago, Ill., the PCA directors endorsed a program of complete reversal of the Truman foreign doctrine, and in the domestic field advocated public ownership of coal mines, railroads, and electric power [32]

5 On October 4, 1947, the national board of directors of the PCA, meeting in Philadelphia, called for public ownership of the steel industry It also condemned the current investigation of the cooperative movement by Representative Walter Ploeser, Republican, of Missouri, as a "shameful effort to pin a 'Made in Moscow' label on a deeply-rooted American institution," and renewed its call for public ownership of coal mines, railroads, and electric power.

Its 9-point emergency inflation program called for the following action:

(1) Immediate special session of Congress.

(2) Restoration of price-control machinery, following OPA model, and adequate enforcement funds

(3) Price roll-back of cost-of-living items to the maximum feasible percentage.

(4) Extension of Federal rent control law to February 28, 1949, with action on Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

(5) Rationing of scarce necessities.

(6) Subsidies to prevent marginal producers, especially among farmers and small-business men, from bearing too great a cost burden.

(7) Reimposition of the excess-profits tax.

(8) Extension of regulations governing consumer credit and installment buying beyond November 1, 1947.

(9) Legislation regulating and controlling transactions on commodity exchanges to prohibit speculation in basic necessities.[33]

6. On October 5, 1947, the national board of directors urged formation of a world construction fund by the United Nations with no political strings attached, as a substitute for the Marshall plan, which they said, "bears within it the same dangers as does the Truman doctrine." Their statement attacked the Marshall plan to rebuild the industrial Ruhr as the inevitable consequence of our cold war and contain-Russia approach to foreign policy. This idea is taken over in its entirety from Herbert Hoover as he outlined it in his report to President Truman last year, the statement added.[34]

[30] Philadelphia Inquirer, November 2, 1947.
[31] New York Times, March 30, 1947.
[32] New York Post, April 1, 1947.
[33] New York Times, June 30, 1947.
[34] New York Times, October 5, 1947.
[35] Baltimore Sun, October 6, 1947.

7. On October 26, 1947, abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee, revocation of President Truman's loyalty order, and repeal of the Taft-Hartley Labor Management Relations Act were demanded in 3 of the 39 resolutions passed at the closing session of the PCA conference in New York.[36] The conference on cultural freedom and civil liberties had been opened the day before with indignant outcries against incipient fascism as represented particularly by the current hearings in Washington against un-American activities.[36]

PCA PICKS WALLACE AS THIRD-PARTY CANDIDATE IN 1948

On December 15, 1947, the executive committee of the Progressive Citizens of America, meeting in New York City, agreed to back Henry Wallace on a third-party ticket for the 1948 elections. This action is scheduled to be ratified by the board of directors of PCA at a Chicago meeting on January 16 and by the national convention of the PCA January 17 and 18

Warren Moscow of the New York Times reported:

"After that a call is expected to be issued by the PCA for a national nominating convention of a Progressive Party, if that is the name finally selected While Mr. Wallace can still decline to make the race, and has several months to announce his decision, the fact that he just finished touring upstate New York under PCA auspices links his attitude closely to the action announced yesterday." [37]

In announcing the decision to back Wallace, the PCA isued the following statement:

"The executive committee of PCA has voted overwhelmingly late Monday night to urge Henry A Wallace to run as an independent candidate for the Presidency of the United States

"The committee announced that its action grew out of the conviction of PCA State chapters who had expressed their support for this position and had urged the national organization to action.

"Finding himself in disagreement, PCA cochairman, Dr. Frank Kingdon, who cast the sole dissenting vote, resigned from the organization. His resignation was accepted with regret." [37]

PCA STARTS MACHINERY TO BACK WALLACE ON THIRD-PARTY TICKET

Meeting in Chicago on January 17 and 18, 1948, the national convention of the PCA approved the mechanics for affiliation or merger with Henry Wallace's third-party movement, but stopped short of fixing the date and place of an official organization meeting. The year-old PCA, which described itself as a fighting people's political machine,[38] said it would serve as the core of Wallace's unnamed third party and help plan for a national convention in the spring. It is possible that the next conference tentatively scheduled for April 12 may develop into an actual nominating convention which would present Mr. Wallace as a full-fledged candidate with organized party backing; however, details were not arrived at in final form [39] A 2-day session of State PCA directors followed the regular convention for the purpose of discussing strategy in getting Mr. Wallace on the ballot throughout the Nation.[40]

[36] New York Sun, October 27, 1947.
[36] New York Herald Tribune, October 26, 1947.
[37] The New York Times, December 17, 1947.
[38] United Press, Washington Post, January 18, 1948.
[39] Dewey Fleming, Baltimore Sun, January 19, 1948.
[40] Clayton Knowles, the New York Times, January 19, 1948.

COMMUNIST JOHN HOWARD LAWSON LEADS ENDORSEMENT

The resolution endorsing Wallace was read to the convention by John Howard Lawson,[38] Communist card holder and alleged leader of all Communist activities in the Hollywood area (recently indicted for contempt of Congress for refusal to answer, on the advice of Attorney Robert Kenny, the question of a congressional investigating committee as to whether or not he is a Communist). Lawson, currently free on bond while he awaits trial on the contempt charge, is chairman of the PCA's political committee. The resolution endorsing Wallace was accepted by the convention unanimously.[38]

WALLACE PLATFORM ADOPTED BY PCA

The January 17-18 convention, besides reelecting Robert Kenny national chairman of PCA and electing a slate of 200 other officials,[41] also adopted an extensive program which promises to become the basic platform of the new third party once it is organized. This program set forth in detail the views expounded by Henry Wallace in his address to the convention on January 17 As enumerated by Gould Lincoln of the Washington Star, it called for the following:

"1 The junking of the Marshall European recovery program and the substitution of an aid program to be handled through the United States, with special stress given to aiding those nations which suffered most from the Axis attack in the recent war This means aid to Soviet Russia.

"2 The immediate withdrawal of military personnel and military aid from Greece and Turkey.

"3. The withdrawal of all support of the Chiang Kai-shek government in China

"All three of these proposals are in the interests of Soviet Russia The PCA prefers to say they are in the interest of peace between the United States and Russia.

"4. The support of the partition of Palestine—through the United Nations—into Jewish and Arab states.

"5. The lifting of embargo against shipment of arms to the Jews in Palestine—until the United Nations acts to bring about the peaceful participation of Palestine.

"6 Halting the manufacture of atomic bombs and scrapping existing stock piles of atomic bombs. 'We support international control of atomic energy,' the report said.

"7. The reduction of American military expenditures to an absolute minimum consistent with a peace policy and no universal military training.

"8. Public ownership of the steel industry, the coal mines, the public utilities, and the railroads.

"To deal with the inflation program:

"9 An immediate price freeze and roll-back of prices, and rationing of goods

"10. Reimposition of the excess-profits tax.

"11. An increase of the minimum wage to $1 an hour. President Truman has proposed 75 cents and the existing law is 40 cents.

"12. A cost-of-living wage increase for all Government workers.

"13. Increasing subsistence payment for student veterans to $100 a month and $125 for married veterans.

"14. Supporting wage increases for American workers in coming negotiations

"15. Repealing the Taft-Hartley labor law and the portal-to-portal law

"16. Exempting from income taxes of families and individuals whose income now falls below 'the minimum standard budget.' This is $3,152 a year for a family of four.

"17. Elimination of many excise taxes and the increase of corporate-income taxes, with

[38] United Press, Washington Post, January 18, 1948
[41] Gould Lincoln, Washington Star, January 19, 1948.

exemptions at lower levels, to encourage new investment.

"The program includes many other proposals. Three are directed particularly to the interests of Negroes and call for the enactment of antilynching, anti-poll-tax and FEPC laws. There also are proposals to bar all segregation because of race or color.

"The people of the District of Columbia are not overlooked. The program proposes: 'Establish universal suffrage for the residents of the District and outlaw all discriminatory practices in the Nation's Capital.'

"Many proposals are made to aid the farmers and farm workers, and for an enlarged social-welfare program.

"This the PCA calls a program for peace, security, and freedom

"'Under the leadership of the Truman government,' the program said, 'both parties (Republican and Democratic), united in their bipartisan policies, have embarked upon a campaign to destroy all of our hard-won liberties. They have shackled labor, set aside the Bill of Rights, and embarked upon a foreign policy which, if unchecked, can lead only to war and unthinkable destruction.'"

WALLACE CONVINCED HIS THIRD PARTY "NOT A TEMPORARY PHENOMENA"

In his opening statement to the PCA convention in Chicago on January 17, Candidate Henry Wallace said:

"One thing I have become increasingly convinced about is that this is not a temporary phenomena; nor will it blow over as a third party did in 1912 or 1934.

"But rather I'm convinced it will be greater than in 1854 (when the Republican Party was organized), although this movement was later betrayed.

"More than this, I believe it will be something like 1790, when Thomas Jefferson led the way."

MORE PRESS-CONFERENCE REMARKS ON COMMUNISM

Scripps-Howard Staff Writer Charles T. Lucey provided a neat description of the convention's flavor in the following words:

"CHICAGO, January 19.—Henry Wallace's 'Gideon army' folded its tents today after 4 days of fervid evangelism, and many observers agreed on these chief points in relation to the third-party movement:

"Although the Wallace-for-President undertaking has many objectives favored by nearly everyone else, the real amalgam binding it together is dissatisfaction with United States policy toward Russia.

"Although the movement includes sincere progressives, plus a fringe of panacea-discoverers, cause-pleaders, starry-eyed dilettantes, and writers of bad poetry, the pro-Russian apologists seem likely to run the show.

"Although Mr. Wallace and company will try to draw the mantle of Franklin Roosevelt about them, they have ripped off only a small piece of it. Mr. Wallace was almost alone among the prominent old New Dealers who showed up here.

"Aside from playing the Russia-can-do-no-wrong line, the leftists will resort to all kinds of appeals on domestic issues, some demagogic, to entice other liberal groups into their pink parlor.

"All these points were developed in speeches, resolutions, or press-conference replies during the meeting of the Progressive Citizens of America just ending. Some were underscored emphatically yesterday at a press conference of PCA leaders. Numerous answers to questions coincided interestingly with the Communist Party line.

"Among those interviewed were Dr. Howard Shapley, Harvard Observatory director; Lillian Hellman, playwright; Edith Atwater, actress; Paul Robeson, Negro singer; Howard Koch, Hollywood scenarist who worked on Mission to Moscow and who was one of those cited by the House Un-American Activities Committee; and Dr. F. D. Matthiessen, Harvard literature professor.

"The whole press conference, to the annoyance of Miss Hellman and representatives of the leftist press, swung quickly to the subject of Russia. Mr. Robeson contended the United States was bent on imperialism, that there was lack of political freedom in this country, that he received better treatment as a Negro in Russia than he did here in Chicago, that the chief blame for preparation for war rested on this country.

"Someone asked if Mr. Robeson thought he could get political freedom in Russia and whether there could be a third-party movement there. Articulate on other points, Mr. Robeson faltered on this and Miss Hellman jumped in. Why was everyone talking about Russia, she wondered. She was concerned with the United States Government.

"Dr. Shapley said the third-party movement stood for many things besides a different foreign-policy attitude. He listed education first.

"But nobody ever got around to answering the question whether anything like the present opposition-party movement could happen in Russia

"Mr. Robeson went further than the others in explaining where he stood politically. 'At certain times where I think fascism should be destroyed I will accept the opposite dictatorship if necessary,' he said.

"Then came the blunt question: 'Are any of you members of the Communist Party?'

"Mr Robeson replied first: 'It's none of your business.'

"Dr. Shapley amended that answer to include the adjective 'damned'.

"At only one point was there criticism of Russia—when Dr. Shapley referred to 'Russia's stupidity' in failure to cooperate in programs for educational and cultural exchanges

"Mr Robeson pegged Admiral William D. Leahy, Chief of Staff to President Truman, as a principal architect of present foreign policies with which he disagrees strongly. In recent weeks Admiral Leahy has been a target of Communist propaganda out of Moscow.

"The third-party intellectuals opposed universal military training because it conditions people for war, they said, and is opposed to United States traditions. Asked whether such military training in Russia was a conditioner for war, Dr. Shapley said any military program did that.

"Mr. Robeson stressed a belief that the United States had been throwing its weight around in Panama and that Negroes there had been ill-treated."[42]

Also present at the press conference, according to Gould Lincoln's account, were Dr. Frank Oppenheimer, atomic scientist, and writer Louis Adamic, among others. As Lincoln reported the interview with the group of 10 representatives of the Association of Arts, Sciences, and Professions:

"To a long list of questions, they replied that the present course of the American Government was leading to war. None of them would admit that Soviet Russia, by its actions, was moving also toward war. They condemned the proposal to have universal military training in the United States, but made no effort to condemn Soviet Russia for already having installed such a system.

"An inquiring reporter asked Paul Robeson if he or any other members of the ASP at the interview was a Communist.

"'It's none of your business,' Mr. Robeson replied.

"Dr. Shapley amended this. He said: 'It's none of your damn business.'

"However, Mr. Robeson a moment later said:

"'I am a violent anti-Fascist. I would accept the other and opposite dictatorship if necessary to get rid of Fascist government.'

"And Dr. Shapley more mildly characterized himself as a 'fellow traveler' in many respects.

"Dr. Oppenheimer said that 'Wallace has had the courage to speak out about those things which were leading this country to war.' Mr. Koch declared: 'I would rather lose with Wallace than win with any other.'"

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, in closing, I reiterate that our form of government is the greatest asset we have. It is what has made us the greatest Nation in the world, as I believe it to be. I love our form of government. Many persons have their own opinions as to what made this Nation great. Some say it has been due to our location, far away from the prejudices of Europe. Others say that it has been due to our natural resources. Other nations have had natural resources equal to our own. Still others say it is because we are Americans, meaning that we are a nationality, and are a little more intelligent and a little more wise than are the peoples of other nations. Mr. President, that is not the reason. It is our form of government. The only difference between two Americans is the length of time their ancestors have lived in this country. There is no such thing as an American. The United States is made up of every nationality in the world. What has made America great has been her form of government, under which we have enjoyed the private-enterprise system, the form of government which has permitted the most humble citizen of the land to become successful; the form of government which has permitted literally millions of poor immigrants, arriving on our shores with nothing except themselves and possibly a suit of clothes, to become great Americans, to become prosperous, and to enjoy the blessings of freedom. Yet there are those in this country today who would change our form of government. There are those who are supporting governments of foreign countries which are directly opposed to our kind and type of government.

Mr. President, I do not know how anyone can advocate the reelection of a government which has not only promised, but has carried by a vote of two-thirds, the process of national socialization, which has also promised that if reelected it will finish the job, and whose leader makes the statement that there is no end to socialism, that it goes on and on and on.

One of the interesting statements in the editorial which I read, written by the ADA, was that the Conservatives, if they win in England, promise not to undo that which has been done. That is the sad part, Mr. President. Of course, they cannot do much about it. How is it possible to unscramble a scrambled egg? When the government takes over all the mines, all the railroads, all the insurance companies, all the means of transportation of the nation, how is it possible to unscramble them? To whom could they be returned, or sold?

That illustrates why it is so dangerous to enter into these socialistic schemes. It is because, once taken, it is not pos-

[42] Charles T. Lucey, Washington News, January 19, 1948.

sible to retrace the steps which have brought misfortune. A government never backs up. It cannot back up. Of course, the Conservatives in England will have to do the best they can, but they cannot unscramble the mess. That is why I ask, in the name of the good Lord, that we be careful in this Nation and not embark upon socialistic schemes. Let us not socialize one industry in America, because if we do we will be unable to unscramble it. There will be no one to whom to sell it. The Government will have to continue to own it.

Mr. President, I do not desire to criticize those who believe in that kind of a government, I do not want to criticize those who sponsor the editorial I have read. I feel sorry for them. I do not question their sincerity, but I certainly question their judgment, as I have said. I wish there were something I could say or do, I wish there was something you could do or say, Mr. President, or that others could say or do, which would stop what I consider to be the false thinking of literally tens of thousands of people in the United States, and so influence the dozens and dozens of pressure organizations which exist in the United States, as to cause them to appreciate the American system of government, and to appreciate that if we lose that system of government, if we lose the private-enterprise system in this Nation, we will have lost everything.

Mr. President, we have always said that we were not a part of the prejudices of Europe. We have always prided ourselves on our form of government, the freedom, and the liberty, and all the other blessings we have in this land. I shall not take the time to describe them, because all Senators know them as well as I do. But as a result of the policies followed during the past 25 years, we are no longer a free America, we are no longer the great Nation our forefathers thought we were going to be, but we are now a part and parcel of all the age-old prejudices of Europe. Every little thing that happens in any one of the small countries, or great countries, of Europe affects us. We are tied in with it. We are a part of the European and Asiatic economy and society, with all their problems, confusions, and troubles.

There are those in this Nation who would change our form of government. I read a speech not long ago made by the president of one of our universities. The title of the speech was, "Is democracy on trial?" When I got into the speech I discovered that what he was talking about was, Is the American form of government on trial? When I think of a trial, I think of someone who has violated the law, or committed a sin of some sort, and I ask, "What sin has the American form of government committed?" Today the private-enterprise system of America is supporting practically all the other nations. It is supporting socialistic England, whose leader says they are opposed to capitalism, and would put a complete stop to it.

What are we thinking about? When are the leaders of America, the Governors, the Senators, the Members of the House of Representatives, yes, the President of the United States and the Vice President of the United States, the leaders of this great Nation, going on the radio, when are they going to stand on the floor of the United States Senate, when are they going forth and make speeches, praising the great American system of government, instead of doing what they have been doing for years and years, finding fault with it, saying that everything is wrong and nothing is good. What we need is a champion of the American system of government to teach the American people, men, women, and children. Instead of that we have just the opposite.

As I said a moment ago, in the situation we face in America today all these left-wing, discontent organizations are in the Democratic Party, stealing it day by day, taking it over. The day will come, just as it did in England, when there will be no Democratic Party here, just as there is now no Liberal Party there. We will wake up with a socialistic party in America.

Gentlemen may smile about that, they may laugh about it, they may say, "It can't happen here," but I assert that if the present trend is not stopped, it will happen here, because stranger things have happened in America during my lifetime.

There are today those in the administration who still do not think Alger Hiss is guilty. I suppose there will be some, some of these days, saying that the German, Dr. Fuchs, who has just been caught in England, is not guilty.

Mr. President, I cannot say too often that the greatest asset we have is our form of government. I make no apologies for undertaking always to protect it. I make no apologies for being opposed to socialism or communism. I shall fight for our form of government with all the strength at my command, because I know in my own heart and soul that if we lose our American system of government—and we will lose it if we do not put a stop to the international conspiracy that is under way to communize and socialize the world—we shall lose our greatest asset.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would be somewhat remiss in my duties as the national chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action, as a Senator from Minnesota, and a member of this body if I did not reply, to the best of my ability, to the comments made by the Senator from Indiana.

First of all, I express my gratitude and appreciation to the Senator from Indiana for the extremely clarifying statement which he has given as to the policy, the purposes, and the objectives of the Republican Party. The statement on the part of the Senator from Indiana sheds a great deal of light and clarification upon the gobbledygook which we found in the pronouncement released as of 5 p. m. eastern standard time of February 6, 1950, entitled "A Statement of Principles and Objectives Adopted by the Republican Members of the House of Representatives, the Republican Members of the Senate, and as Concurred in by the Members of the Republican National Committee."

I feel that the country owes the Senator from Indiana a real expression of thanks, and as one of his colleagues I want to be the first to express it, because I was somewhat dubious as to just what this document meant. Now I have at least some sort of an idea what it drives at, and it will be helpful in the days to come properly to evaluate the programs which may come from the Republican National Committee and its long repudiated leadership.

I should like now to make a few comments in reference to the organization which yearly seems to be given the noble privilege of being brought to the attention of the United States Senate. I refer, of course, to none other than Americans for Democratic Action.

I recall that it was about a year ago that the ADA, as it is commonly called, was the subject of some debate, colloquy, and conversation on the floor of the Senate. Again we have been privileged, just at the time we are about to hold our national convention, to have our fine organization brought to the attention of this most wonderful forum of public opinion, this great parliamentary body. Again I wish to express my thanks. It is seldom that an organization is given so much attention and, may I say, such an analysis. I will not say "careful analysis." I will not say an analysis that is based upon fact, but rather such a fictitious and superficial analysis as has been made this afternoon.

In order to make the story of Americans for Democratic Action complete, I am happy to aid in informing the Senate with the facts as to its membership, its purposes, its officers, its objectives, and its statement of political philosophy.

First of all, Mr. President, I am sure that every American would like to know that this organization is exactly what its title says it is—Americans for Democratic Action—Americans in the best sense of the term. Not Americans who, somehow or other, think they have a monopoly upon wisdom and virtue; not Americans who set up their self-appointed standards of righteousness, but the kind of Americans exemplified by a Samuel Adams, or a Thomas Paine, or a James Madison, or a Thomas Jefferson, or an Andrew Jackson—men who were willing to argue the issues of the day and were willing to have truth established on the basis of its own merits.

We are Americans for democratic action in the sense that we believe in the free processes of democracy, the processes of argumentation, experiment, and debate; of action in the sense that we do not believe that the good of society, and the protection of our freedom and our liberty can be maintained merely by meditation, but that there is also required the reality of political action, and of political participation. Therefore, one who wishes to be a member of this organization signs a membership card upon which is printed the following statement:

Americans for Democratic Action is an organization of progressives, dedicated to the achievement of freedom and economic security for all people everywhere, through education and political action.

We believe that rising living standards and lasting peace can be attained by democratic planning, enlargement of fundamental liberties, and international cooperation. We believe that all forms of totalitarianism,

including communism, are incompatible with these objectives. In our crusade for an expanding democracy and against fascism and reaction, we welcome as members of ADA only those whose devotion to the principles of political freedom is unqualified.

I emphasize the full character of the language on the application card for membership in this organization. ADA is proud of its reputation as a non-Communist, liberal, political force in American politics.

Permit me to make one or two comments in reference to the officers of Americans for Democratic Action. Needless to say, it would not be appropriate for me to speak of its national chairman. I need only say that the national chairman has been spoken of in glowing terms by such great oracles of prejudice as Westbrook Pegler, George Sokolsky, and Fulton Lewis, Jr. No greater tribute could come to a living American than the carping criticism and rasping irrationalities of some of the pundits of political fiction. I have had that privilege. I think that is sufficient to establish my reputation amongst decent, God-loving, self-respecting, freedom-loving Americans, and they are the ones who are important.

The second among the officers of Americans for Democratic Action, is a young Washington lawyer, Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, Jr. It is appropriate to say that he is a very fine attorney with a record of excellent service with the Government. His loyalty is beyond question and is a matter of Government record.

One of the other members of this organization is the distinguished Governor of the State of Connecticut, the Hon. Chester Bowles. Chester Bowles is a businessman as able as the businessmen who have the privilege of serving in the United States Senate, a man who has met with great success, whose loyalty is beyond question. His patriotism has never been challenged. His intellectual integrity has been proved. I am sure that his record in the future will be as illustrious as in the past, and even more so.

The next gentleman who is an officer of Americans for Democratic Action, is a young man, former president of the City Council of the City of Detroit, Mich. His name is George C. Edwards. Mr. Edwards has served with honor and distinction in city government. He is a noted attorney. He has served in the American Municipal Association in very key and important positions.

The next gentleman I shall refer to is Mr. Hugo Ernst, international president of the Hotel and Restaurant Workers, AFL. Mr. Ernst has been a respected labor leader for years, a man of deep religious conviction, a man of democratic heritage and democratic conviction.

The next gentleman, who is an officer of Americans for Democratic Action, is a distinguished judge of the courts of the United States. I speak of William H. Hastie, former Governor of the Virgin Islands, now a Federal judge, serving the cause of justice for our people and dispensing the justice of our courts.

The next gentleman, who is a vice chairman of our organization, is Murray D. Lincoln, of Ohio, one of the great agricultural leaders of the United States. He heads one of the largest insurance companies in the Midwest. He is a respected leader in the cooperative movement, national president of the Cooperative League of the United States, and respected by the farm groups of the Nation.

The next member is Mr. Emil D. Rieve. Mr. Rieve is the president of the Textile Workers Union, CIO. Mr. Rieve's reputation, character, and loyalty have never been questioned. I understand that Mr. Rieve is considered to be one of the most able and dynamic anti-Communist leaders in the world. He is performing a great service to his country in cleaning from the ranks of labor what Communist infiltration there has been.

Men like Emil Rieve, men of the character of David Dubinsky, Walter Reuther, and Phil Murray have done more to get rid of communism than all Senators across the aisle put together. These men have been doing the work in the vineyards of democracy. While we have talked about communism as an issue, they have done something to rid it from our midst.

The next gentleman is the vice chairman of Americans for Democratic Action. He is a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

I shall not continue the parade of the many fine statements and sentiments about Mr. ROOSEVELT, except that he has proved himself to be a very capable young man in politics, and is proving himself a good and efficient legislator. He surely has proved that he knows how to win an election. His loyalty has never been questioned. I am sure that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would not say that FRANKLIN D ROOSEVELT, JR., is a Socialist. As a matter of fact, he believes in the free-enterprise system and is acting to protect it.

The next gentleman who is referred to as treasurer is Mr. Leo A. Lerner, of the State of Illinois. I am sure that the majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] and the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] can say much more about Mr. Lerner than I can. I know he is a man who is respected in his own State and city, a man of good, clean character, and one who is known as a very civic-minded citizen.

David Ginsburg is the secretary of ADA. He is none other than the administrative assistant of my friend and colleague who sits at my right, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. Mr. Ginsburg served his Government and his country with honor. Now he is serving a great Senator.

Mr. James Loeb, another officer of the ADA, has served for years in the labor movement. Then, Mr. Charles LaFollette, former distinguished Congressman from Indiana, who served his State as a Republican, is national director. Recently he has served with General Clay in American military government in Germany.

One of the great English poets, Pope, said, "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." We have an exemplification of that in our time. For example, it is said that the ADA is an offshoot of the National Citizens Political Action Committee. This is not only false but the statement reveals a startling lack of information on the part of the Senator from Indiana. One who presumes to be an authority on communism and socialism surely should know something about the political movements in his own country.

To assume that the ADA is an offshoot of the NCPAC is to live in the kind of dream world where reality is nonexistent and truth is meaningless. I should like to commend to my colleagues a little honest history. It seems to me that when one speaks on political subjects of such importance, when a man's character is brought under observation and when the character of an organization is brought into question, or at least under scrutiny, it would be well to know the background.

The background is simply this: The NCPAC is the organization which was recently headed by the present chairman of the National Progressive Party, Mr. Elmer Benson, of the State of Minnesota, the head of the Wallace group. Yet, the Senator from Indiana said that the ADA, which has been the inveterate enemy of the Progressive Party, which had the courage to stand up and fight communism and Communist-front organizations, even before the Democratic Party and long before the Republican Party, is an offshoot of NCPAC.

I do not recall that the Republican Party leadership actually fought against these commie-front groups. I recall that the Republicans just talked against Roosevelt and Truman. I recall that the Republican leaders were quite pleased to see the Progressive Party and the Dixiecrats threaten the strength of liberal government.

The statement that the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts and Sciences, which was another organization in the preliminary stages of the Progressive Party, was the background of ADA, is almost incredible. It is as incredible as the statement that capitalism and communism are one and the same thing. That surely is not the truth. It is as incredible as the statement which some have made that socialism and communism are one and the same thing.

I should like to remind my colleagues that this is a time when there should be a clear understanding of the political dynamics which are at work in this world. This is a time when Senators and Members of the House of Representatives should speak clearly and weigh their words. This is a time when we ought not to be talking about socialism and communism unless we know what we are talking about. To some extent we are listened to by the world, if not by our own constituents. Some of the peoples of the world would like to know just what we mean, and if we know what we are talking about. I wonder what the governments of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland would think if they were to read the speech which has just been delivered by one of the distinguished Members of this body, in which he said, "The democratic left? I do not know what it is." That is the same as saying to the people of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland that we

do not know what their government represents. The people of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden know what the democratic left is. They talk about the democratic left. They identify their government as the democratic left.

Is it not interesting that every time anyone wants to castigate the Democratic Party he refers to the Socialists? No one was scarcely interested in socialism before it was used as a club to beat the Democratic Party. We had Socialists in the world for many years. Today the American Socialist Party could hold a caucus in a telephone booth. But, all at once socialism becomes a great issue. Why? In order to get at Harry Truman His opponents have not been able to find anything else with which to attack him. His record, his program, his personal character, and leadership are admired and supported by the people. In desperation, the Republican leadership cries "socialism," and points to the Fair Deal and the President. Such tactics are not only ineffective and moth-eaten, they demonstrate the political bankruptcy of the President's opposition. Yes, the purpose of all this socialism bogeyman is to attack the Democratic Party—a party that has done more to save, protect, and extend freedom of enterprise and opportunity, than any political party in the history of the Nation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does not the Senator agree with me that it is rather strange that the question of socialism arises overnight among our good Republican friends? It seems to me that it is almost grasping at the last straw. They have tried the issue of regimentation, the issue of dictatorship, the issue of communism, and the issue of the welfare state. In New York only a few months ago they tried the issue of statism. Now they have finally found a slogan—"Liberty or Socialism." That is the weakest reed I have seen in a long time. That slogan is used by distinguished men who are presumed to be leaders of the great Republican Party.

As the Senator says, socialism has been around for a long time. It has been advocated by a few, headed by a very distinguished gentleman, Mr. Norman Thomas. Now the Republicans have just discovered that the great issue in this country is liberty or socialism. I should like to know just what liberties are being taken away from the American people under the present Democratic administration. The truth of the matter is that the people of America have more liberties today under a Democratic administration than they have had at any time in history of the political parties of the country. Under a Democratic administration the people have more happiness, more enjoyment, more of the good things of life, more money in the bank, and more of everything else than they have ever had under any previous administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished majority leader. He has emphasized exactly the point with which I opened the discussion. The recent interest in the term "socialism" has become a convenient political weapon. I might say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that if they had half as many programs or half as many votes as they have slogans, we could never beat them. They have a different slogan every month. As a matter of fact, they have so many slogans that we cannot keep up with the one we are supposed to be talking about next week. It might be well for them to remember that persistency sometimes wins, that perseverance, rather than mere expediency and dexterity, has its merits.

But let me refer again to the "democratic left." It is very interesting to hear statements of this kind come from Senators on the other side of the aisle Apparently some are unaware that we have had two World Wars; some seem to be unaware of what is taking place in Europe or in Asia or elsewhere in the world. It is also very interesting that every time they talk about labor governments, they talk about Britain.

Mr. President, let me here say a few words about Britain. Of course, many Americans do not like Britain. That is the special privilege of every Irishman, and also the privilege of every American. It is part of our American tradition It is a great American pastime to denounce Britain. First it was Tory Britain, now it is Labor Britain.

But, Mr. President, I wonder why the Midwest Republicans do not talk about the labor government of Norway. I will tell you why, Mr. President: it is because if they did, the American voters of Norwegian descent would leave them so fast that they would not know what had happened to them. Why do not the Republicans who criticize labor governments talk about socialism in Norway or in Sweden or in Denmark or in Finland. These countries have undertaken great programs of nationalization—as much or more than has been done in Britain.

But politicians do not dare criticize those four great little democracies, because it has been found that the labor parties in those countries have gained the respect and confidence of their people, and developed some of the finest living conditions in the world. These nations have some of the finest people that God ever put on the face of the earth. If a labor government saps the moral strength of the people, if a labor government and a little touch of what are called government control, government regulation, and government ownership ruin the character of the people of a country, then I ask my Republican colleagues whether they are willing to say that the Norwegians are without morals and character, and the Swedes are without morals and character, and the Finns are without morals and character, and the Danes are without morals and character. Are the Republicans willing to say that? Of course, they are not willing to say it. Yet in those countries there are health programs that go far beyond anything we have ever dreamed of. They have nationalized housing and nationalized railroads and nationalized public utilities. These countries have cleaned out their slums and have had social programs which go far beyond anything we have ever known. They represent the "democratic left" of Europe—they represent the finest of European culture and character.

But do the Republicans say that the Socialist programs in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland have ruined the people of those countries? No; they do not. First, the Republican propagandists know that it would not be true, and secondly, there are too many good American voters of Norwegian or Danish or Swedish or Finnish descent in Indiana and in other States of the Union.

Mr. President, I am amazed to hear the question asked on the floor of the Senate, "What do they mean by 'vital center'?" By "they," the Senator from Indiana refers to ADA. Of course, Mr. President, they—ADA—mean the forces of the freedom-loving peoples of Europe who are neither Communists nor Fascists. Mr. President, the forces known as the vital centers are fighting for the liberties of the people of the world. Yet on the floor of the Senate, where we are supposed to be making appropriations for freedom and where we are hoping to make other peoples understand that we Americans are fighting for freedom and liberty for all the world, we hear responsible Senators ask, "What is 'the vital center'? What is 'the democratic left'?"

Mr. President, if we do not know, we had better find out quickly, because the Congress is appropriating a great deal of money for them. It is the vital center of Europe, the democratic left of Europe that stands united with us in the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Pact, and the United Nations. It is the strength of the political forces of the vital center that holds back the tyranny of communism and fascism. The vital center, the democratic left is our ally—our friend. These liberal political forces dared to defy Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco. They live and die for freedom Yet, a distinguished Senator says, "What is the democratic left?"

Mr. President, again, in regard to the freedom-loving people of Belgium, of the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland, let me say that unless those freedom-loving people can hold their governments together in what is commonly known as the democratic left, what is commonly known in Europe as the vital center, unless they can hold together in that way, Europe will be lost and freedom will fall to communism and fascism. After all, Mr. President, when a man is dead, he is dead; when he is in a concentration camp, he is in a concentration camp. It makes no difference whether he was put there by storm troopers or by the GPU. Yet on the floor of the Senate some Senators say they have not heard of the democratic left or of the vital center. Mr. President, it is about time they heard of them. It is about time they found out that in Europe the people in the labor movement, the

people in the cooperative movement, and some of those who have been what are called the peasants and small shopkeepers, are the ones who are fighting the battle for freedom and liberty. They are our allies.

One of the things that has been wrong with our foreign policy, which the opposition has not yet gotten around to talking about, but which would be sensible if they did, is that certain persons in our Government, particularly some in the State Department, have known in other countries only the so-called best people, the people in the top hats and the nice suits, when they should have known the people in the mines and the people working on the railroads and the people in the shops and the farmers. Similarly, that has been our problem in the Asiatic area. Our representatives have failed often to know the needs of the people; they have known only the needs of some of those who have been the so-called leaders, the self-appointed leaders of their people.

Mr. President, let me say a little more about the fear of socialism. I should like to have my Republican friends go to the Congressional Library and check up on one of their great Republican leaders who was indeed a great Republican leader, but who was so great that he had to leave his party. As a matter of fact, there have been two great Republican leaders—one of them Abraham Lincoln, the other Theodore Roosevelt—and both of them had to leave the Republican Party Theodore Roosevelt said at one time, in a speech which he delivered in the campaign of 1912·

If socialism ever comes to America, the Republican Party will bring it.

I do not wish to argue about the words of Theodore Roosevelt. He was a great American, far greater than the junior Senator from Minnesota ever hopes to be I accept his statement that—

If socialism ever comes to America, the Republican Party will bring it

Let us keep in mind that the only time the free institutions of this country have ever been threatened was when there were men in political power in our country who were unaware of human needs I remind this honorable body that the only time the currency system of the United States and the only time its credit system were threatened was when the captains of finance were in control—the two great Secretaries of the Treasury, Andrew Mellon and Ogden L Mills. They knew all about money—they knew that primarily the people should not have any of it The only time this country has ever been in great financial distress, the only time the entire financial structure of our country was threatened, was under Republican leadership. That is a matter of record.

If I need to document that statement, I will buttress it a little more. The greatest scandals in the history of this country have come under the leadership of the Republican Party The Harding administration tops them all, and running a close second is the Grant administration. That is a matter of history. It might be worth while for some of us to look into history a little more than we have been doing.

So, Mr. President, as I was saying, the Republicans have been talking about socialism, and have been saying that socialism is coming in America. They came as close to bringing it as it is possible without success. What were the conditions which brought farm mortgage moratoriums? What were the conditions which closed the banks? What were the conditions which brought about the break in the stock market? Who was in control then? Were the Socialists then in control in the United States? Was socialism running the ticker tape? Was the ADA—the Americans for Democratic Action—creeping around, running the country? Who was running the country then? The great master minds of privilege were running the country then, Mr. President. It required the New Deal Democratic Party to rescue the people from ruin. When it comes to the matter of a program, the Republican Party is much like the old Bourbon kings. They never seem to forget anything and they never seem to learn anything.

Mr. President, I have before me some very wonderful material on the Republican Party's platform. I think I had better talk about it for a few minutes. I have never seen so many people talk so long and produce so little as the statement which is to be found on this paper the new program of the Republican Party.

The elephant went up to the mountain and gave birth to a mouse. This is the Republican National Party's Stromboli. What do we find when we look at it? We find that they are against everything that is Democrat or Fair Deal They are, of course, against price and wage control, rationing, socialized medicine, regional authorities, and the Brannan plan.

This program they say is "dictated by a small but powerful group of persons who believe in socialism"

I merely want to say to the distinguished Members who prepared this paper, that before they call someone a Socialist, they had better be able to back it up. I am proud of my religion, proud of my politics, proud of my family, and proud of my name, and before anyone starts to malign any of them, I want him to be able to document his statements. Since "socialism" and "communism" are used as synonymous terms by some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, it may be well to remind them that if someone calls a man a Communist, he must be able to prove it. But let us continue with the statement. They say, "We are against all these things." Then we come to another paragraph. Is not this a honey? This is what gets the people. This is what the people will like, because they will know how to vote, when they read it.

The statement continues:

We hold that the Government can use its just powers to foster national health, promote real security for the aged, develop sound agricultural and labor-management policies, and advance civil rights. These ideas are in keeping with the earliest and finest Republican traditions and can be achieved without establishing socialism or discipline or dependence.

In every other paragraph they get that in—the socialism angle.

Then, again:

The Democrats have also professed these ideals, but the stark truth is that after 18 years of Democratic control and endless talk, they have reduced this whole field to confusion and futility

In reference to the last three words, "confusion and futility," that field has been preempted by the leadership of the Republican Party. We do not want to have a jurisdictional dispute about it. We give to the opposition "confusion and futility" They have that It is part and parcel of the Republican dogma

Now, let us go on to another. What is meant by "to foster national health"? Of course, I imagine they are for the Red Cross, too, and I may say we join with them in that great bipartisan move.

Promote real security for the aged

What is meant by that? What kind of double talk is it? How, I ask, do the Republicans wish to "foster national health"—how, to "promote real security for the aged"—what does the Republican leadership mean by "real security"—how much pension and for whom?—where are the answers?

Then what is meant by saying to "Develop sound agricultural and labor-management policies."

Of course, people may have a suspicion of what is meant by that statement, because, if my memory serves me correctly, when the Republican Party was in power—let us go back to 1920—since 1920, they have had a chance to do something for the farmers on several occasions. They had a chance to pass the old McNary-Haugen bill. Twice a Republican President vetoed it Yes; that was great help for the American farmers, and I know American farmers are going to be delighted to see that the Republican Party still believes in "a sound agricultural policy in keeping with the earliest and finest Republican traditions." The "earliest and finest Republican traditions," insofar as the agricultural policy is concerned, are these: Large surpluses, large mortgages, and plenty of foreclosures That was the policy. Those are "the earliest and finest Republican traditions" when it comes to a farm policy. The record of the Republican Party insofar as the farmer is concerned is zero.

Put now let us go on a little further. What happened in the Eightieth Congress? We had the Hope-Aiken bill It was short on "hope" and long on "achin'." The Hope-Aiken Act gave support prices of from 60 to 90 percent. Yes; the farmer was to get 60 percent of a fair price—he was, in the Republican tradition, at least worth 60 percent consideration. This was the program that the farmers repudiated in 1948. The farmers remember the Republican agricultural policy in the earliest and finest Republican traditions. Yes; in 1946 the Republican Party got its chance to develop a great agricultural program. It had complete control of the Congress. It is reported, and I think authentically,

that the Republican farm program was written in the little room, P–26, just around the corner, late in the night on the last day of the session. The Republican agricultural policy of the Eightieth Congress was developed in 18 to 20 hours in the dying moments of the session. It was very kind of the Republican Party to offer that much service to the farmers. Yes; the farmers were so appreciative that they responded in the typical, good American way in November 1948.

So I am pleased to note that the Republican Party is going to carry out a farm program in keeping with the earliest and finest Republican traditions. At least we know what that means. It means bankruptcy, insolvency, low prices. That is the record, right down the line.

Now, let us proceed a little further. They are going to carry out a fine labor program, in keeping with the earliest and finest Republican traditions. I do not think we need to talk much about that. I think the labor movement of America knows what those traditions are, and I should gather they are going to act accordingly.

So let us talk about the economy. We have here some nice comments on the economy. Here is what the Republican Party says it is going to do about the economy:

Therefore we urge an end of deficit spending and a return o a balanced budget.

How? My 7-year-old son can say that. I want to know how. And I want to know, with respect to the next line:

That Federal spending be materially reduced.

How? Where? When?

Very well. "Materially reduced" means a balanced budget, if we are to consider the first line, and I gather we are supposed to read these lines one after another. I want to ask how and where? Where is it they are going to reduce $5,000,000,000 from the budget? Will it be a reduction in foreign aid? Will it be taken from the domestic programs? Where is the opposition going to reduce $5,000,000,000 from the budget?

A little later on in the program, page 7, with reference to the old people, they offer them greater pensions by means of—

The extension of the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program, reduction of eligibility requirements, and increase of benefits to a more generous level.

That is the biggest amount of double-talk that ever was put out in an eight-page epistle.

On page No. 4, the Republican Party proposed to "balance the budget" and "materially reduce expenditures."

On page 7 they increase pensions. On page 4 they take care of the folks who have been writing the economy letters. This is the creed. This is the ritual of the Republican Party. We assuredly do not want to crowd in on it. Every lodge should have its own ritual. I am for it. Every one of them can have its own secrets. But now we come to something else, and what do the Republicans say? They say we have got to recognize the inequities and injustices of the present program of social security. We must have the extension of the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program, reduction of eligibility requirements—that means, to reduce the age a little so that more people can come under the program—and increase the benefits to a more generous level. Then, my colleagues, all this is to be done with due regard to the tax burden on those who labor. That represents a lot of crocodile tears about those who labor. I submit it is impossible to increase pensions and have this great reduction in expenditures.

Proceeding a little further, the Republican Party asks for a thoroughgoing study of a program of more nearly universal coverage. Universal coverage? There has been testimony before the Senate Finance Committee that universal coverage will cost an additional $5,000,000,000, and some estimate as much as $14,000,000,000. But why worry about a little thing like that? That is on page 7, and previously, on page 4, they were balancing the budget.

Then we come down to Federal aid. They are not going to do away with Federal aid. No; "the need is clearly demonstrated." It is interesting to note that on the floor of the Senate the Federal aid programs which are going to increase the budget are the very Federal aid programs which have been sponsored by some of the distinguished members of the opposition party. Federal aid to education in the amount of $300,000,000 has the authorship of none other than the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Federal aid to health for school children, another item to increase the budget, has the authorship of some of the distinguished members of the Republican Party. Mr. President, in the case of almost every bill of this character one of the key leaders of the Republican Party will be found backing it. Of course, they have got leaders for all things. They have a certain group that is for economy on Monday. They have another group that votes for grants-in-aid on Tuesday; another one that is for labor on Wednesday; another one that thinks the labor law ought to be made stronger on Thursday. That is not a policy; it is confusion confounded and political expediency unsurpassed.

But now let me come down to the pronouncement on civil rights. This is the statement of all things to all men. These knights in shining armor are crying their eyes out over the injustices and inequities inflicted upon the American people. Look at the statement on civil rights in this great pronouncement, this modern epistle of hope and pity. This is a new manifesto of freedom. They give to the subject of civil rights three and three-quarter lines. It would make a magnificent recitation for children's day. It is an excellent little statement for some nice little third-, fourth-, or fifth-grade play. It does not say what the Republican Party said in 1940. Here is the party which is going ahead by walking backwards. It does not say what it said in 1944 and 1948. Oh, no. It says what the junior Senator from Ohio said not long ago, that possibly the Republican Party and the Dixiecrats ought to make it legal.

The right of equal opportunity to work, to vote, to advance in life, and to be protected under the law should never be limited to any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. Therefore we shall continue to sponsor legislation to protect the rights of minorities.

What did the Republicans say in 1948? They spoke out quite clearly. They did not indulge in such nebulous talk.

By the way, Mr. President, this is the language which was rejected by the Democratic Party. This is practically what the Democratic Party platform contained in 1940. In fact, the Democratic platform of 1944 was even more specific than this.

Now we come to 1948. This Republican statement is what we turned down in the Democratic convention. The drafting committee would not accept this language. Our Dixiecrat friends would have accepted it. They said, "O. K., give us this, and we stay put." But we did not give it to them. We did not compromise.

What did the Republican Party platform say in 1948? It said:

Lynching or any other form of mob violence anywhere is a disgrace to any civilized state, and we favor the prompt enactment of legislation to end this infamy.

Mr. President, no one can doubt what that language says. That is the platform to which the party is committed in the Congress.

They went on to say in their platform:

One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States; it was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic. This right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic.

I leave it to all sincere and honorable persons if the Republican Party's latest statement is not a retreat from the pledges of 1948. I have never seen any statement which so plainly means, "We have given up and do not mean what we said in 1948." I want to know from the Republican Party which platform they stand for, the one of 1948, or this "box-lunch special," particularly on the issue of civil rights.

We have heard a great deal about what the Democrats have not done with regard to civil rights. Our southern friends never kidded anyone. They have stated from the very beginning where they stood. I disagree with them and they disagree with me, as an individual, but our southern friends have made their position amply clear. They have not used "weasel words." The Dixiecrats walked out of the party convention on an issue which they thought was of great importance. They were not hypocritical in their position.

I want to know where the great standard of truth in the Republican pronouncement lies. Are the Republicans for FEPC, as they stated in their 1948 platform? Are they for the elimination of the poll tax? We cannot tell from this refined language which says all things to all people.

I thought I might say a word or two about this platform. It reminds me of what was said about a man who was always able to discover yesterday today, but was never quite able to understand what was going on today and had no idea about tomorrow.

There is one thing we can say about the statement of objectives and principles of the Republican Party as outlined in this program. They are now about up to 1934—not quite, but just about ready to recognize that Roosevelt was President. Other than that, the mysteries of mathematical budgetary mechanisms have been revealed. They advise balancing the budget by materially reducing expenditures, without ever telling where they can be reduced, and at the same time demand more Federal aid for States, more armed services appropriations to protect our national security, more money to the nations of Europe, more social security; in fact, universal coverage It is just wonderful. It is amazing what some political imaginations can do.

The Democratic Party is not trying to say that we do not have a deficit. We are not trying to say to the people of the world that we can fight a war—and that is what we are doing now—and have normal peacetime fiscal policies. I heard a Republican say sometime ago, "We are either at war or we are at peace." The answer should be quite obvious, when we know that the world is on fire, and when we know what is going on in the world. But perhaps some of us do not know what is going on, but all of us should know by this time that there is a cold war going on, and whether the war is cold or hot, it costs money That means we cannot have a normal fiscal policy.

Some of the persons who have been talking about extravagant budgets are the first to want to send our Navy some place. We cannot keep the "Mighty Mo." stuck in the mud without its costing money. If we are going to send the Navy cruising around Formosa, it will cost more money. Whether the Navy should be sent there is another subject. We cannot have our Navy cruising the Pacific unless we appropriate more money. So let us make up our minds. If we want a balanced budget, where do we want to balance it? What specific programs shall we vote down? We cannot go around the country saying we are for housing if we are going to vote to reduce appropriations for that purpose. We cannot be in the show and out of the show; we have got to make up our minds. We are either in the church or out of it; we are either in the act or we are out of it. We cannot simply place our names on the program and never turn up for the performance.

Mr. President, the hour is late, but I feel that further comments should be made about Americans for Democratic Action. First of all, this organization is interested in other elections in the world. It is interested in how they come out in Norway, in Finland, in Italy, in France, and in Britain.

The ADA does believe it is important for the Labor government of Great Britain to win the election. I am not apologizing for the Labor government. I am not a Socialist and I never want to be one. I believe strongly in real private enterprise—free enterprise, not monopoly enterprise.

I am also proud of the fact that I come from a State where we do not have all the public ownership the people in Nebraska have. We have free enterprise, lots of it We are a good, substantial, free-enterprising people

Let us go on to see what is the relationship of all this to what goes on in Socialist Britain. The fact is the people of Britain are going to decide the kind of government they want, and they are going to decide it in a free election, and decide it in a free election after a labor government has been in power.

Free elections are not possible in a Communist state, and to intimate that socialism and communism are identical is political ignorance Communism is the denial of liberty, communism is the police state, communism is brutality, communism is outright materialism, communism is the denial of God and human liberty To say that the Christian Socialists, or the Catholic Socialists, deny God and human liberty is infamy bordering on the obscene.

What the Socialists of Europe want to do is their business, so long as they are guarding the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Some people in the United States Government talk of property and life as if they were one. Some talk of special privilege and liberty as if they were one. The real, fundamental, basic ideological problem of the Republican leadership is the fact that they cannot differentiate between liberty and license, between liberty and exploitation.

I repeat, there are no freer people in this world, in terms of their own souls, their own minds, their own economy, their own government, than the people of Sweden, the people of Norway, the people of Denmark, the Scandinavian people; people who have cherished their liberty, and have fought and died for it; people who are our allies.

Mr. President, I wish to inform my colleagues as to some of those who have been identified with some of the most recent activities of this organization, of which I am proud to be a member, and of which I am the chairman. Let me read the names of the Members of the Senate who belong to the organization.

There is Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, who just a short time ago made one of the grandest speeches ever delivered on the floor of the Senate, a masterful, statesmanlike presentation. He is one who can see beyond tomorrow, one who has conviction of philosophy.

There is Senator MYERS, the distinguished whip, who is a member of the Americans for Democratic Action.

Senator FRANK GRAHAM is a member of the ADA.

There is Senator LEHMAN, of New York.

There are Senator MURRAY, Senator NEELY, and Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, all members of the ADA.

On the House side there are: MCKINNON, of California; HOLIFIELD, of California; CROOK, of Indiana; YATES, of Illinois; SABATH, of Illinois; GENE MCCARTHY, of Minnesota; RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri; CHARLES HOWELL, of New Jersey; JACOB JAVITS, of New York; EDWARD BREEN, of Ohio; THOMAS BURKE, of Ohio; DAVENPORT, of Pennsylvania; HENRY JACKSON, of Washington; HUGH MITCHELL, of Washington; ANDREW BIEMILLER, of Wisconsin; FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT, of New York; WILLIAM GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania

Those are the Members of the Congress who are in the Americans for Democratic Action. I wanted my colleagues to know who the Members of this body were who were in the ADA These men are fully cognizant of the purposes, the programs, and the platform of the ADA. They are not only cognizant of, they are proud to be affiliated with the organization.

Recently the ADA sponsored Roosevelt Day dinners in the month of January all over this Nation, some 27 of them. The cochairmen were Gov. Chester Bowles, Senator Herbert Lehman, and the great playwright and author, Robert Sherwood.

The vice chairmen were: Francis Biddle, Helen Gahagan Douglas, Frank P. Graham, William Green, William Hastie, Leon Henderson, Hubert H. Humphrey, Murray D. Lincoln, Howard Lindsey, Henry Morgenthau, Jr , Philip Murray, Judge Samuel Rosenman, former Senator Robert Wagner.

The labor committee consisted of Cochairmen David Dubinsky, of the International Ladies' Garment Workers; Hugo Ernst; A. J. Hayes, president of the Machinists' Union; W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen; Walter P. Reuther; Emil Rieve.

Mr. President, I shall name some of the Roosevelt Day speakers who spoke under the auspices of the Americans for Democratic Action. Does the Senator from Indiana think that these people are all dedicated to the program of socialism? Nothing more absurd could be uttered These are the speakers:

Columbus: Secretary Tobin; William Hannah, former Assistant Secretary of Labor; Gov. Chester Bowles, Victor Reuther vice Walter Reuther.

Pittsburgh: Judge Samuel Weiss.

Chattanooga: Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

Baltimore: Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Francis Biddle.

Cleveland: Mrs Eleanor Roosevelt, Dr. Henry Busch.

Philadelphia: Joseph S. Clark, Jr., city comptroller; James E. Finnegan, Democratic chairman; Richardson Dilworth, Enquirer-Bulletin; James L. McDevitt, AFL, State.

Washington: Senator Herbert Lehman, Reinhold Neibuhr, Dr. A. Powell Davies.

Chicago: Secretary Oscar Chapman, Benjamin Cohen, Adlai Stevenson.

Boston: Archibald McLeish; Elmer Davis; Victor Reuther vice Walter

Reuther; Paul Dever, Governor; Murray D. Lincoln.

New York: Paul A. Porter, chairman; Frank Graham; Dr. Harold Urey; Marc Connally; Howard Lindsey; Eric Severeid; Quincy Howe; Martin Ogronski.

Flint: Andrew Biemiller.

Providence: Elmer Davis; Lt. Gov. John S. McKiernan; Mayor Dennis J. Roberts.

Syracuse: Arthus Schlesinger, Jr.; Mayor T. J. Cochran.

Louisville: Senator Estes Kefauver; Wilson Wyatt, chairman.

Jersey City: Paul H. Douglas.

Lansing: Charles Lafollette.

I call attention to the fact that one of the speakers in Philadelphia was Joseph S. Clark, Jr., city comptroller, recently elected, who recently broke the Republican machine in Philadelphia. Another was Richardson Dilworth, recently elected treasurer in the city of Philadelphia, both men endorsed by the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Philadelphia Bulletin, and both elected by overwhelming majorities.

Reinhold Neibuhr, who spoke in Washington, is one of the greatest theologians of this generation, one of the greatest teachers of our time, a man devoted to the principles of Christianity and freedom.

I conclude, Mr. President, by challenging the opposition party, the Republican Party, to present to the American people something but their witches' brew and the smoke and vapor of statism, regimentation, collectivism, welfare state, and socialism. A political party that coins slogans like a soap opera will soon be washed up. The people do not believe in ghost stories or fairy tales, particularly when they are so dull and undramatic as the dog-eared catch phrases of the Republican propagandists.

The Democratic Party would welcome an enlightened opposition. I worry that the Democratic Party might not have the kind of opposition it needs. It needs constructive criticism. But it does not need criticism which looks and sounds as if it were a political doctrine, from the era of the dinosaurs. We need the kind of constructive criticism which is going to point out where we ought to go in foreign policy, what better program we can have, what better we can do to conserve our soil and preserve our natural resources, not how we can exploit them or leave them alone, but how we can improve them.

Where do we go from the proposals of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]? Do we sit idly by and let them stop here, or do we follow them up? Where do we go from the reports of Lilienthal-Acheson Commission on Atomic Energy? Why does not the Republican Party urge the President to appoint a new commission to study the whole matter of weapons of mass destruction, instead of trying to get the Navy out of moth balls to go to Formosa? This is not a matter of the Navy any longer, it is a matter of life and death to the world. The Republican Party, and its leadership cannot seem to get away from the type of inadequate pronouncements that have characterized that party.

The Democratic Party needs constructive criticism. My, how it needs it! It needs to have a political party, the Republican Party, challenging it on the issue of civil rights, not walking out on us. We need to have the 35 votes that were promised by the minority leader at the time of the filibuster over the rules; rather than having them take a powder when the day of battle arrives. We need to find out what better farm program we can get—one that is going to take care of the perishable commodities. It is not good enough to condemn the waste in potatoes, in eggs, and in other farm products. What are we going to do? It is not good enough for the Republican Party to say these things cost too much. It is their responsibility to point to a better direction, and to do so without the name-calling, without the innuendo, without the scare-words of political bogeymen which seem to be the quite convenient weapon of those who carry on the battle for the opposition.

I now again want to thank my friend, the Senator from Indiana, for making these issues quite clear. I want to thank him for his gracious remarks about the ADA. I want to refer him to the analysis of the ADA World on the congressional voting record. I know that he was not motivated in his attack on the ADA by the fact that there are a number of minus signs against the names of certain Members of Congress, showing that the ADA think they voted wrong on some issues. I want the Senator from Indiana to look into the three chapters of ADA located in his own State, at Terre Haute, Indianapolis, and South Bend, Ind. I want him to find out how many Socialists there are there. I want him to find out if the ADA has anything to offer for the good of that great State of the Union, Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall take only a few minutes of the Senate's time. It took the able junior Senator from Minnesota about an hour and a half to answer the charge I made, namely, that the ADA, of which he is the chairman, and of which a number of United States Senators are members, is advocating the reelection of the Socialist Government in England. I did not know there were so many Senators who are members of his organization. I thank him for adding, as he did to the roster, the names of Senators whom I did know belonged to it.

Mr. President, it took the Senator from Minnesota an hour and a half to deny the charge I made that the ADA is encouraging, and that they wrote in their magazine an editorial expressing the hope that the Socialist Government in England would be reelected. The Senator from Minnesota took an hour and a half to talk about everything under the sun except that point.

He spoke of the Republican platform which was brought forth yesterday. Of course, the able Senator does very well when talking about that subject. He went clear around the barn, and then around and around the barn again, talking about the Republican platform of yesterday. If he wants to be fair, as I am sure he does, he himself might well like to correct the statement he made respecting the platform. I know he can read. I am sure of that. Had he read the Republican platform of yesterday, and I shall read a statement from it, he would have found that we pledged ourselves to win lasting peace, and so on, and then said:

> We dedicate our efforts and issue this statement of principles and objectives supplementing the Republican platform of 1948.

Now what the able Senator from Minnesota read is simply supplementing the platform of 1948, and I am certain he knew that, because I know he can read.

I was in South Dakota not long ago in the town where the Senator from Minnesota was born, and I made inquiry, and was told he was an exceptionally bright student, exceptionally good in English, but poor in arithmetic. Now he tried to mislead the United States Senate. I am certain he did not mislead the press, because the members of the press know that the statement issued by the Republican Party at 5 o'clock last night said that what we issued was a supplement to, meaning an addition to, our 1948 platform.

The Senator from Minnesota spoke a great deal about civil-rights legislation. Let me say to the able junior Senator from Minnesota that it would not make any difference what the Democrats said in their platform respecting civil rights. They would never enact the laws. They have been in control of Congress now for 18 years, and for 18 long years they have been promising the people of America to give them "civil rights." Not more than 2 weeks ago on the floor of the United States Senate the able Senator from Minnesota had an opportunity to vote to bring up the FEPC bill—and where was he? Looking out of the window. He had a chance to vote for antilynching legislation. Where was he? In the cloakroom, I guess. He voted against it—yes; I guess he voted against it. He had a chance a couple of weeks ago to vote on the anti-poll-tax legislation, and where was he? Where were all the Democrats he speaks of?

So I say it does not make any difference what the Democrats put in their platform; they never live up to their platform promises anyway. They have had an opportunity for 18 long years now to pass civil-rights legislation, and they have not passed such legislation. I am surprised that the able junior Senator from Minnesota would even mention civil-rights legislation after having voted against taking up FEPC legislation 2 weeks ago, after having voted against taking up antilynching legislation a couple of weeks ago, and after having voted a couple of weeks ago against taking up anti-poll-tax legislation.

Mr. President, I stated earlier today that the ADA in its official publication—and it is an organization made up of many United States Senators on the Democratic side—many United States Representatives and governors was advocating the election of a socialistic government in England. Now the able junior Senator from Minnesota, who is the president of the ADA, says he is proud to be advocating the election of a

socialistic government in England. He calls it a labor government. It is a labor government I presume. But the Labor government of England is honest. It calls itself by its right name. It admits that it is a socialistic government.

I placed in the RECORD, this afternoon, an article by Mr. Oursler in which was a statement by Mr. Attlee saying exactly what the purposes of his party were. Senators heard that article read. Senators heard Mr. Attlee's statement read. Mr. Attlee said his party was going to socialize everything in England. He said, "I wrote a book in 1937. In that book I gave the blueprint of our program. We are going to socialize everything in England."

My question now is, Mr. President, Do those who support the socializing of everything in England by advocating the reelection of the Socialist government in England, likewise advocate the same form of socialism for the United States? That is the question I want them to answer. If socialism is good for England, why is it not good for the United States? If they are supporting it in England, why do they not support it in the United States? Why do they not tell the American people that they support socialism in the United States?

As I said, Mr. President, the able junior Senator from Minnesota talked for an hour and a half, but he simply went round and round the barn. He would go around one way for a while, and then he would reverse himself and go around the barn the other way.

He said he rose to answer my speech. Instead of that he talked about everything else under the sun except what I discussed. Finally, after an hour and a half he came around to saying, "I am proud of the fact that I am a member of the ADA, and if the able Senator does not know it, I will give him the names of more New Deal United States Senators who are members of ADA, and I will also give him the names of Representatives who belong to the ADA. Why, yes, we are for the reelection of the Socialist Party in England."

I presume they believe in it or they would not advocate it. I know that they are not hypocrites. They must believe in it. They must believe in socialism. They must believe in socialism for the United States.

I invite attention to the fact that the able junior Senator from Minnesota says that the Communists are terrible and that the Nazis are terrible. He says not one word against the Socialists. As I said in my speech, we are getting socialism in America through the back door. Let us not say, "It can't happen here." We have the example of Senators and Representatives and governors who advocate the reelection of Socialists in England. The head of the organization itself rose in his place on the floor of the Senate and said he was proud of the fact that he was a member of the ADA. He said that they were supporting the Socialist government in England and hoped that it would win the election.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the junior Senator from Arizona acting for the majority leader?

Mr. McFARLAND. Just before he left, the majority leader requested that the junior Senator from Arizona make a motion to recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make such motion?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not yielding for that purpose. I am inquiring of the acting majority leader if he has conversed with the majority leader as to whether or not a commitment could be made relative to legislation which would be taken up on the 9th and continuing through until the 16th of February, and whether or not any controversial bills would be taken up during that period. From the discussions I have had with the majority leader, I was led to believe that we might be able to make a satisfactory arrangement. I do not want to detain the Senate any longer. I should like to ask the acting majority leader if he thinks he could obtain such an understanding.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no authority to speak for the majority leader in regard to legislation. There is pending and under discussion Senate bill 75. Inasmuch as I have been in charge of this measure, and had been directed to make the report for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I had hoped that we would be able to complete consideration of the bill tomorrow. I spoke for probably an hour and a half yesterday. I had thought that the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] would go ahead and make his presentation. However, yesterday there was a long speech on the other side on a different subject, and we remained in session late. This afternoon the distinguished senior Senator from California yielded the floor. He mentioned that there were a number of amendments to be presented. They have not been printed and ordered to lie on the table. The Senate has not been afforded the courtesy of knowing their contents.

I do not know what their plans are. So far as we are concerned, we are ready and willing to vote tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from Nebraska be willing to have the Senate recess now and consult the majority leader later?

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that suggestion, Mr. President. I do not want to be at all noncooperative. I should like to help carry forward the program. Many Senators on this side of the aisle are just as eager to vote on this measure as is the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

The arrangement which I was suggesting has been discussed in the Senate for more than 2 days, and was discussed long before this proposed legislation came up. I have been led to believe that no matter what bill was under discussion, commencing with the 9th day of February and continuing through to the 16th of February, no votes would be taken on controversial measures. If the pending bill is voted on tomorrow, there is no apprehension on my part about the request I have made. If the bill is not to be voted on tomorrow—and I am just as eager and just as willing and ready to vote on it tomorrow as is the distinguished Senator from Arizona—I certainly must have some advance notice of that fact in order to give assurances to Senators who expect to leave on Thursday, so that they may feel free to leave.

I am very sorry that the majority leader is not now present, because some Senators would like to leave tonight, if they could have the assurance that no controversial measures will be taken up between the 9th and the 16th of February. I should like to cooperate with the distinguished Senator from Arizona if he could give me that assurance. If he cannot give me that assurance, the only thing left to do is to wait until tomorrow and discuss it with the majority leader.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Consideration of this bill was postponed for a week, not at our request, but at the request of its opponents. I want the distinguished minority leader to understand that this situation is not our fault. We were ready and wanted to proceed with the consideration of the bill as originally planned and so amended so that as large an attendance of Senators as possible would be assured. I am anxious that Senators be present. However, I believe that if we are not to vote tomorrow, but are to postpone the vote, we must have a definite stipulation for the time to vote.

When this program was announced the majority leader distinctly stated that he hoped that pairs could be obtained, and that we would not have to take long recesses. That was the understanding stated in the RECORD. I had hoped that Senators could obtain pairs so that we would not be required to take long recesses. If Senators who are opposing the bill wish to postpone its consideration, I think it is up to them to propose some reasonable stipulation in regard to the time for voting, and also submit their proposed amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I still have the floor. I have not surrendered the floor.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In connection with the remarks made by the junior Senator from Arizona, let me say, in the first place, that I did not have the original discussions with the majority leader, but some time ago my colleague [Mr. DOWNEY], who is not now present in the Chamber, was given to understand that it would probably be 40 to 60 days before this proposed legislation was brought up. When the word came that it was to be set for consideration at the time it was, that was quite different from his original understanding. It is true that he asked

for a weeks' postponement, which I think was most modest under all the circumstances.

I had hoped that this situation might come to a head sooner than it did. The fact of the matter is, however, as the able Senator knows, that this project calls for an authorization which amounts to $1,250,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not know that. The Senator should not say that I know it, because it is not true.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator does not know it, I think we shall be able clearly to demonstrate that that is what it calls for. It also tends to break down the reclamation laws of the country. It will require some time to develop the facts so that the Senate may have the information.

I think the question is of sufficient importance to call for as near a full attendance of the Senate as possible when the bill is voted upon. It is really an important piece of legislation.

The only point I wish to stress under the circumstances is that over a long period of years there has been a customary courtesy between Democrats and Republicans. When the Democrats held their Jackson Day and Jefferson Day dinners and meetings and were required to be absent, controversial legislation was not taken up during that period of time. Reciprocal arrangements have been made with respect to the Lincoln Day affairs.

It so happens that this year Lincoln Day falls on Sunday. There will be approximately as many gatherings this week, in advance of Sunday the 12th, as there will be following that date. I think it is only a matter of courtesy, if this measure cannot be disposed of before tomorrow afternoon, to have it go over until the full membership of the Senate can be present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think it is unnecessary to go further with this discussion. I wish to make clear my position, so far as concerns the negotiations for arrangements between the majority leader and the minority leader. It is simply that as long as 10 days ago I took up with the majority leader the matter of having the Senate continue in session during this part of the month of February. I do not ask that the Senate take a recess for a certain number of days. So far as I am concerned, I wish the Senate to proceed with the consideration of proposed legislation. I know nothing about the arrangements made between the majority leader and the sponsors of the proposed legislation, and I do not wish to take any part in them; but long prior to the time when this measure was made the order of business, the minority leader was led to believe that some such arrangement could be worked out, and not by means of pairs. At the time when the suggestion about pairs was made by the majority leader, I said that personally I did not believe in pairs. I do not believe in them, generally speaking, Mr. President; I think people want to know how Senators vote. Although I think it is true that sometimes live pairs are a convenience, yet I believe the people of the country wish to know how Senators vote. Ever since I have been in the Senate, I have believed that the way for Senators to proceed in regard to various legislative proposals is to vote on them, not to pair on them. It is true that other Senators hold a contrary view, and of course they have a right to their opinions.

But with that in view, I suggested to the majority leader that perhaps he would inform the Senate of the bills and other measures on the calendar which could be taken up between the 9th and 16th of February, and I suggested that there would be no objection to having the Senate proceed to consider noncontroversial legislation. The majority leader was very cooperative. He said to me, "Take up this matter with your steering committee and see what measures your group is willing to have the majority leader ask the Senate to take up during that period of time."

I think the RECORD should be very clear about this matter. The minority leader now suggests that the majority leader might have the Senate take up Senate bill 2440, Calendar 926; House bill 5839, Calendar 1082; Senate bill 501, Calendar 1139; House bill 5486, Calendar 1220; House bill 4406, Calendar 810; and Senate Resolution 58, Calendar 596. There is plenty of material there to keep the Senate busy from the 9th to the 16th of February. But I am quite satisfied that those measures are not generally regarded as controversial ones.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment at this point?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. While the Senator from Nebraska was out of the Chamber earlier in the day, the issue arose on the floor of the Senate, and the able majority leader stated a list of measures which he would propose to have the Senate take up after the pending measure is disposed of.

It was at that point that I raised the question that my understanding had been that from the 9th to the 16th of February, controversial measures would not be taken up, and that, of course, the pending bill is highly controversial. The Senator from Illinois admitted that it is a controversial measure, and expressed the hope that it could be disposed of before tomorrow night.

My colleague from California the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] pointed out, first, that there were a number of highly technical and controversial amendments which had not yet been acted upon, and that, in addition, he was preparing a number of other amendments of extreme importance. My colleague has not completed his remarks. I intend to speak tomorrow. There are other Senators who will speak on the subject. I expressed to the majority leader the opinion that it would not be possible to reach a final vote on this measure prior to adjournment tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank my colleague the junior Senator from California, for his observations.

No doubt the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader relative to the measures appropriate for consideration during this period is in keeping with the proposals which were made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was about to suggest to the Senator, a while ago, that the majority leader had made such a statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair; I so understand.

Mr. President, I appreciate that we are attempting to continue the Lincoln Day tradition. Regardless of whether the pending legislation is finally acted upon tomorrow or whether an arrangement can be made for a time certain for the final vote on it—and I am perfectly willing to have such an arrangement made—I respectfully submit to the majority leader that we have proceeded on the assumption that from the 9th to the 16th of February there would be no votes on controversial measures. If we cannot proceed on that theory, some Members of the Senate will have to be notified and will have to change their plans, so as to be in the Senate for votes on controversial measures.

I think the Senator from California and the Senator from Arizona will agree with other Members of the Senate that this measure is highly controversial.

So I suggest to the distinguished acting majority leader that he confer with the majority leader and see whether the Senate can accommodate itself to this program, namely, that from the 9th to the 16th of February, no votes will be taken on controversial measures; that the measures which have been proposed for consideration during this period—and the proposition was not made in a dictatorial fashion at all, but at the suggestion of the majority leader—can be brought up for discussion and consideration; and that in the case of any other proposed legislation which the majority leader might wish to have taken up or might suggest to have taken up, we shall be glad to have it taken up, so long as we protect the Senators who are leaving on the 9th against the taking of votes on controversial measures between the 9th and up to and including the 16th of February.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the acting majority leader about to move that the Senate take a recess?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall do so in a moment, Mr. President.

The junior Senator from Arizona wishes to accommodate Senators on the other side of the aisle in every way possible. It is my desire that they have all the time they wish to have. Of course, I think it will take a great deal of time, and 10 days is a very short period for them to try to convince the people of the country that the Republican Party should be placed in power.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that 10 days is not asked for; the time requested is a week. I think we can do it in a week.

Mr. McFARLAND. Well, Mr. President, a week is a very short time, indeed.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the Republicans will need a much longer time.

Mr. WHERRY. We shall take a week, if our colleagues will give it to us.

Mr. McFARLAND. But as the one who is in charge of the pending legislation, I wish to say that we have proceeded in good faith with the understanding that we would dispose of this measure this week. I am willing to work day and night in order to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. So am I.

Mr. McFARLAND. On the other hand, I am willing to accommodate my friends on the other side of the aisle. If the opponents of this bill—the distinguished Senators from California—wish to enter into some kind of an agreement in regard to a time for a final vote disposing of this measure, I am willing to cooperate with them.

Otherwise, I must say frankly that I shall have to insist upon its disposition and that it not be displaced.

I am willing to do everything I can to cooperate with the distinguished minority leader if he will get in touch with the absent Senators and try to work out some such arrangement. I will try to accommodate them, of course. But in fairness to my State, I cannot agree to have this measure displaced, without an agreement for a time certain to vote upon it.

Does the distinguished minority leader wish to reply?

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President; but I should like to have the Senator yield to me for a moment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, let me say that for 10 days I have been proceeding under the assumption, that regardless of what bills were before the Senate, no votes on controversial measures would be taken between the 9th and the 16th of February. Now for the distinguished Senator from Arizona to say that unless an agreement is reached to vote on a day certain on the measure we have been discussing, he will not agree to this arrangement, places us in a very difficult situation.

I hope the Senator will reflect further on the situation and will try to arrive at a program in accordance with what has been done over a period of years, so far as such arrangements for this period of time are concerned.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think it is a constructive program. It is a program which, a little over a year ago the then majority leader, who is now the distinguished minority leader, followed in trying to obtain stipulations and agreements. There is no reason in the world why we cannot enter into a unanimous consent agreement. If the Senators from California will not agree then the only thing we can do in fairness to our States is to insist that we continue the consideration of this measure until a vote is reached.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not want the Senator to misunderstand, and to think I was in favor of obtaining a unanimous-consent agreement. I should be glad to help in any way I can. But I said, in the event an agreement could not be had tomorrow, then it seems to me the observation made by the distinguished Senator that he would insist upon the legislation being kept before the Senate and voted upon, in view of what has been the custom for the past 10 years, places us in a very difficult position.

Mr. McFARLAND. Frankly, I think the amendments the senior Senator from California stated on the floor this afternoon would be offered by the Senators from California in fairness to the Senate should have been submitted to the Senate to be printed and to lie on the table, so the Senate would have an opportunity to study them. It has been said they will require considerable time, and that we have tomorrow in which to discuss them. But the sponsors of the amendments have not been fair enough to submit them, so the Senate might know their contents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 8, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1950

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal God, Thou art the supreme intelligence, far beyond the comprehension of our finite minds but always within reach of simple and child-like faith.

We pray that our hearts may be enlarged with a greater faith in the reality of moral and spiritual forces and in the power of righteousness and the strength of justice.

May this faith never be eclipsed by doubt or extinguished by despair as we strive to solve our difficult national and international problems.

Grant that at the close of each day we may receive the benediction which Thou dost bestow upon the faithful who do justly love mercy and walk humbly with the Lord.

In Christ's name we bring our petition. Amen.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by a group of ministers in the Buffalo area.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

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

CRIME COMMITTEE

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the District of Columbia be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WAGNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer entitled "Korea Is a Must."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a transcript of a Nation-wide broadcast by Bert Andrews in an interview with Whittaker Chambers.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an editorial and a letter.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include newspaper articles.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include the speech of Commander Craig, of the American Legion, last night regarding the Hoover Commission.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "As the Twig Is Bent," by Mr. Fay George Child, publisher of the Maynard News, of Maynard, Minn. Mr. Child will be remembered as the secretary to Congressman HAGEN.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was give permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday next and on the following Monday at the conclusion of the legislative program of those days and following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to transfer the special order granted him for today to tomorrow.

SOUTHERN FIREPROOFING CO.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 627) for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BYRNE of New York, DENTON, and KEATING.

ESTATE OF DICK WALOOK, ALFRED L. WOODS, AND EDWARD KIMOKTOAK

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 587) for the relief of the estate of Dick Walook, Alfred L. Woods, and Edward Kimoktoak, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "$263.75" and insert "$166.25."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

JAMES HUNG LOO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1446) for the relief of James Hung Loo.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, James Hung Loo, of Washington, D. C., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

RIYOKO SATO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1702) for the relief of Riyoko Sato.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, or any of the other provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens ineligible to citizenship, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit the entry into the United States for permanent residence of Riyoko Sato, the Japanese fiancée of William F. Corkery, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Riyoko Sato is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to William F. Corkery and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Riyoko Sato, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156).

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

VIKTOR A KRAVCHENKO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1915) for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to record the admission to the United States on August 18, 1943, at Niagara Falls, N. Y., of the alien Viktor A. Kravchenko, as a lawful admission for permanent residence. In the administration of the immigration laws, the said Viktor A. Kravchenko shall not be regarded as having been at any time prior to the enactment of this act a person within the provisions of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 137), or those parts of sections 3 and 19 (a) of the act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 8, secs. 136 and 155 (a)), which relate to aliens who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property, or anarchy, or the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law or the assassination of public officials, or similar classes, and he may be naturalized, if otherwise eligible, regardless of the provisions of section 305 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 705).

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall reduce by one number the quota of the alien's nationality for the fiscal year then current or next following.

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

PENELOPE COROLYN COX

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2100) for the relief of Penelope Corolyn Cox.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Penelope Corolyn Cox, who is presently residing in Canada and who was born in India of British parents, shall be deemed to have been born in Great Britain.

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

MITSUE SHIGENO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2114) for the relief of Mitsue Shigeno.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Mitsue Shigeno, Tokyo, Japan, the Japanese fiancée of Carrol Louis Klotzbach, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Mitsue Shigeno may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Mitsue Shigeno is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Carrol Louis Klotzbach, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Mitsue Shigeno, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156) In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Mitsue Shigeno, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Mitsue Shigeno as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head taxes.

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

MRS. WALTER K. MIYAMOTO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1862) for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto, formerly Miyoko Takahashi.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the fact that T/5 Walter K. Miyamoto, RA-30126399, died in Japan on April 8, 1948, while serving in the United States Army, his wife, Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi), and her daughter, Margaret Michiko Miyamoto, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi), a native and citizen of Japan, the widow of T/5 Walter K. Miyamoto, who died on April 8, 1948, while serving in the United States Army, and, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, she shall be immediately issued an immigration visa upon application hereafter filed.

"SEC. 2. Upon the issuance of the visa, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper

quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of Japan."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MASAMI HIROYA AND AIKO HIROYA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6093) for the relief of Masami Hiroya and Aiko Hiroya.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of law excluding persons of races ineligible to citizenship from admission to the United States, Masami Hiroya and Aiko Hiroya, who are the child and common-law wife, respectively, of William Lee Henry, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States as nonquota immigrants for permanent residence upon meeting all the other requirements of the immigration laws

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That in the administration of the immigration laws the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Masami Hiroya and Aiko Hiroya, natives of Japan, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, they shall be granted admission into the United States as nonquota immigrants for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JOHNY NIELSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6283) for the relief of Johny Nielsen.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Johny Nielsen shall be considered to be the natural-born son of Mr and Mrs. Peter Leth-Nissen, United States citizens.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 4, after the name "Johny Nielsen", insert the following ", a native and citizen of Denmark "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

FORT BELVOIR, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4502) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain easement near Fort Belvoir, Va., in exchange for another easement elsewhere on the same property.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to O. K. Normann, all the right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a certain easement for road right-of-way across the following-described lands in Fairfax County, Va

A parcel of land 40 feet in width, lying 20 feet on each side of a center line, particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the north boundary line of Fort Belvoir Engineer Board Testing Area, Va., said point of beginning being south eighty-four degrees twenty minutes no seconds west one hundred and seventy feet from an iron pipe monument located at the southeast corner of land belonging jointly to Charles W. Prisk, William P. Walker, and O K Normann and shown as parcel 4 on the Plat of Bonniemill Gardens, Fairfax County, Va., and certified to by L R R Curtis, a certified surveyor of Fredericksburg, Va., on the 4th day of January 1949; thence north five degrees thirty-one minutes no seconds west one thousand three hundred and thirty-four feet to a point on the north line of parcel 2 as shown on the Plat of Bonniemill Gardens, said point being south eighty-four degrees twenty minutes no seconds west one hundred and seventy feet from the northwest corner of said parcel 2, containing one and twenty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less; in exchange for the conveyance to the United States of America by the said O K Normann of an easement for road right-of-way *Provided*, That the said easement will cease and be automatically extinguished at such time as an acceptable plat dedicating this right-of-way to public use has been presented to and accepted by the appropriate authorities of Fairfax County, Va., in the following-described parcel of land: Being all that certain parcel of land fifty feet wide, lying twenty-five feet on either side of a center line particularly described as follows.

Beginning at a point on the north boundary line of land belonging jointly to Charles W Prisk, William P. Walker, and O. K Normann, as shown on the Plat of Bonniemill Gardens, Fairfax County, Va., and certified to by L R R. Curtis a certified surveyor of Fredericksburg, Va., on the 4th day of January 1949, said point of beginning being south eighty-four degrees twenty minutes no seconds west one hundred and seventy feet from the northeast corner of parcel 2 as shown on said Plat of Bonniemill Gardens; thence southwesterly one hundred eighty-seven and seventy one-hundredths feet along the arc of a curve to the right, with a radius of four hundred and twenty-one feet, the bearing and length of long chord being south seven degrees fourteen minutes fifty-three seconds west one hundred eighty-six and sixteen one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning of a curve to the left; thence continuing in a southwesterly direction one hundred eighty-seven and seventy one-hundredths feet along the arc of a curve to the left, with a radius of four hundred and twenty-one feet, the bearing and length of the long chord being south seven degrees fourteen minutes fifty-three seconds west one hundred eighty-six and sixteen one-hundredths feet to a point of tangency; thence south five degrees thirty-one minutes no seconds east three hundred and twenty-five feet to the point of beginning of a curve to the left; thence southeasterly one hundred twenty-eight and thirty-three one-hundredths feet along the arc of said curve to the left, with a radius of four hundred and sixty-eight feet, the bearing and length of long chord being south thirteen degrees twenty-two minutes eight seconds east one hundred twenty-seven and ninety-three one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning of a curve to the right; thence in a southeasterly direction one hundred twenty-eight and thirty-three one-hundredths feet along the arc of said curve to the right, with a radius of four hundred and sixty-eight feet, the bearing and length of long chord being south thirteen degrees twenty-two minutes eight seconds east one hundred twenty-seven and ninety-three one-hundredths feet to the point of tangency; thence south five degrees thirty-one minutes no seconds east two hundred and fifty feet, more or less, to a point on the most southerly point of course numbered 17 as shown on said Plat of Bonniemill Gardens said point being south eighty-four degrees twenty minutes no seconds west two hundred and twenty-five feet and north five degrees thirty-one minutes no seconds west one hundred and fifty feet, more or less, from the southeast corner of parcel 4 as shown on said Plat of Bonniemill Gardens.

And conveyance to the United States by O K. Normann of a perpetual easement for road right-of-way across the following-described land. A parcel of land fifty feet wide, lying twenty-five feet on either side of a center line, particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the north boundary line of Fort Belvoir Engineer Board Testing Area, Va., said point of beginning being south, eighty-four degrees twenty minutes no seconds; west, two hundred and twenty-five feet from an iron pipe monument, located at the southeast corner of land belonging jointly to Charles W. Prisk, William P. Walker, and O. K Normann and shown as parcel 4 of the Plat of Bonniemill Gardens, Fairfax County, Va., and certified to by L. R. R Curtis, a certified surveyor of Fredericksburg, Va., on the 4th day of January 1949, thence north five degrees thirty-one minutes no seconds; west, one hundred and fifty feet, more or less, to a point in the most southerly line of course numbered 17 as shown on the Plat of Bonniemill Gardens, and containing seventeen one-hundredths acre, more or less.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, after the word "convey", add the words "without cost."

On page 1, line 4, after the name "O K. Normann", add a comma and the following: "Charles W. Prisk, and William P. Walker,".

On page 2, line 16, strike out the word "northwest", and substitute in lieu thereof the word "northeast "

On page 2, beginning on line 18, strike out the semicolon and the words "in exchange for the conveyance to the United States" and all of lines 19 through 24 inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided, however*, That the above conveyance shall be of no force and effect unless (a) O K. Normann, Charles W. Prisk, and William P Walker, within 6 months after the date of this act, shall present to and have accepted by the appropriate authorites of Fairfax County, Va., a plat dedicating a right-of-way to public use in the following—."

On page 4, line 25, strike out the period and substitute in lieu thereof a semicolon.

On page 5, strike out line 1 and the first appearance of the word "of" in line 2, and substitute in lieu thereof "and (b) shall convey without cost, to the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ANNA HELMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1275) for the relief of Anna Helman.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Anna Helman, of New York City, as of the date of her arrival at Baltimore, Md., July 30, 1942, if she be found admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 875, U. S. C., title 8, section 136).

With the following committee amendment:

On line 9, between the words "than" and "section", insert the words "the second category of"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS KATSUKO NAKAHARA HUNTLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4857) for the relief of Mrs. Katsuko Nakahara Huntley.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs Katsuko Nakahara Huntley, a native and citizen of Japan, of the Japanese race, the wife of Lawrence Huntley, a United States citizen who is an honorably discharged veteran of the United States armed forces during World War II, and that if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws she shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

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

MRS. TSUNEKO SHIMOKAWA GUENTHER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R 5580) for the relief of Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding from admission into the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther, Japanese wife of Morgan W. Guenther, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed and without presenting an immigration visa or other travel documents, if she is otherwise admissible under immigration laws. Upon the admission of the said Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther to the United States for permanent residence, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Japanese quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 11, strike out the remainder of line 11 after the period and all of page 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JANIS SHIMADA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5704) for the relief of Janis Shimada.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Janis Shimada, the Japanese fiancée of Gordon Leslie Page, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Janis Shimada may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Janis Shimada is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Gordon Leslie Page, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Janis Shimada, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Janis Shimada, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Janis Shimada as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head tax.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That in the administration of the immigration laws the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Janis Shimada, the wife of Gordon Leslie Page, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. EIVOR ANNE-BRITT JEDLUND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6282) for the relief of Mrs. Eivor Anne-Britt Jedlund.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 8, sec. 136 (e)), shall not hereafter apply to Mrs Eivor Anne-Britt Jedlund (nee Nilsson), Swedish wife of Russell M. Jedlund, Elbow Lake, Minn., a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "States", insert "insofar as concerns any conviction or admission of the commission of a crime by her of which the Department of Justice and the Department of State have knowledge on the date of enactment hereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SISTER ELIZABETH KENNY

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 299, to provide unrestricted entry privileges for Sister Elizabeth Kenny.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute an exactly similar Senate resolution (S. J. Res. 105).

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Elizabeth Kenny, also known as Sister Elizabeth Kenny, a native of Warrialda, New South Wales, Australia, and a resident of Australia, be, and hereby is, granted the privilege of entering the United States as a temporary visitor as often or as frequently as she may desire to enter, notwithstanding that under the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, she would be classed an "immigrant," and notwithstanding that at the time of such entry or entries she does not possess an immigration visa, passport visa, transit certificate, or other document entitling an alien to present himself for admission to the United States

SEC 2 That, inasmuch as the said Elizabeth Kenny was registered and fingerprinted on four occasions, in accordance with the provisions of title III of the Alien Registration Act, 1940, as amended, and, in view of the exemption from the presentation of certain documents granted to the said Elizabeth Kenny by this act, none of the provisions of title III of the Alien Registration Act, 1940, shall apply, henceforth, to the said Elizabeth Kenny.

SEC. 3. That the provisions of section 2 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, relating to the levying, collection, and payment of a tax of $8 for every alien entering the United States, shall not apply to the said Elizabeth Kenny.

SEC 4. That the provisions of section 15 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, respecting the duration of stay and the maintenance of exempt status of a temporary visitor, shall not apply to the said Elizabeth Kenny.

SEC. 5. That nothing in this act shall relieve the said Elizabeth Kenny from complying with all of the other laws of the United States respecting the admission of aliens to, the exclusion of aliens from, and the departure of aliens from, the United States.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read

the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 299) was laid on the table.

DONALD FRANCIS WIERDA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 570) for the relief of Donald Francis Wierda.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Donald Francis Wierda, a citizen of California, the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States (1) for compensation for permanent personal injuries sustained by him as a result of an automobile accident which occurred on November 22, 1945, near Antwerp, Belgium, when an automobile driven by him was struck by a United States Army vehicle, and (2) for reimbursement for medical, hospital, and other expenses or losses incurred by him as a result of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in the act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

EMORY T. WALES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1003) for the relief of Emory T. Wales.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Emory T. Wales, of King George, Va., the sum of $1,934, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for damage caused to his house by gunfire on the A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Bowling Green, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

NORTHWEST MISSOURI FAIR ASSOCIATION, BETHANY, MO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1054) for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000 to Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damage and destruction by fire of certain buildings, while occupied by and under the exclusive control of the Seventeenth Field Artillery, Third Battalion, of the United States Army, on September 13, 1931: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

F. DuWAYNE BLANKLEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1604) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of F. DuWayne Blankley.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of F DuWayne Blankley, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., for compensation for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by him and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by him as a result of an accident, which occurred when the motorcycle upon which he was riding collided with a United States Army vehicle at or near the intersection of Mountain Road and North Second Street in the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., on March 8, 1944.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 1346.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "New Mexico", insert "((1) on the question of liability of the Government and (2) on the question of the amount of the recovery)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. EFFIE S. CAMPBELL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1801) for the relief of Mrs. Effie S. Campbell.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Effie S. Campbell, of Colorado Springs, Colo., the sum of $950.42, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained, and reimbursement of expenses incurred, and property damages to her automobile as the result of a collision between her car and an Army Red Cross ambulance from Peterson Field at Colorado Springs, Colo., in the service of the United States, on October 17, 1943, at the intersection of Tejon and Vermijo Streets in the city of Colorado Springs, Colo.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000

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

WILLOW RIVER POWER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2031) for the relief of the Willow River Power Co.

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

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bertha A. Burkhardt, Helene E. Schultz, and Hugh F Gwin, as trustees and successors to the Willow River Power Co, a Wisconsin corporation, the sum of $25,000, together with interest on such sum at the rate of 4½ percent per annum from August 12, 1938, to the date of payment, representing the amount of damages found by the United States Court of Claims (Congressional No. 17851, decided June 6, 1949, in response to S. Res. 231, 80th Cong.), to have resulted from diminution of the generative capacity of such company's hydroelectric plant located near the confluence of the Willow River and Saint Croix River, due to a rise in the waters of the Saint Croix River beginning August 12, 1938, caused by the erection by the United States of a dam across the Mississippi River, near Red Wing, Minn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

FRANCO-ITALIAN PACKING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1293) for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Franco-Italian Packing Co., Terminal Island, Calif., the sum of $32,375.89. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States on account of losses sustained as the result of seizure in December 1941 by the United States Navy of two fishing boats owned by such company which were, at the time of such seizure, engaged in fishing for tuna off the Pacific coast of Costa Rica: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be

paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "Notwithstanding the statute of limitation, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Franco-Italian Packing Co. ((1) on the question of liability of the Government and (2) on the question of the amount of the recovery) for losses sustained as the result of the seizure in December 1941, by the United States Navy of two fishing boats owned by such company, which at the time of seizure were engaged in fishing for tuna off the Pacific Coast of Costa Rica. *Provided*, That the passage of this act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to

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

JOHN J. FRANKLIN ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3351) for the relief of John J Franklin, James H. Bradford, William M Orr Co, and Alex Maier

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

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,674 55 to John J Franklin; to pay the sum of $5,513 to James H Bradford, to pay the sum of $74 50 to William M. Orr Co; and to pay the sum of $450 to Alex Maier, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Mrs. Johnnie Mae Franklin and the death of Mrs. Sarah Bradford, and property damage of William M. Orr Co. and Alex Maier sustained as a result of accidents involving a United States Army truck on Taylor Street and Federal Street, Pittsburgh, Pa, on March 22, 1946, driver of such v hicle not acting within the scope of his employment *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000

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

CALVIN E. CRANFORD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4100) for the relief of Calvin E. Cranford.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Calvin E Cranford, formerly aviation machinist's mate second class, United States Navy, of Little Rock, Ark., the sum of $220. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims on the part of the said Calvin E. Cranford against the United States arising out of the fact that, as a result of the failure of his commanding officer to forward his request that his family allowance be terminated and copies of his divorce decree, $22 a month was deducted from his pay from June 1945, through March 1946, as his contribution for family allowance benefits: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000

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

DR T F HARRISON

The Clerk called the bill (H R 3924) for the relief of Dr. T. F Harrison.

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

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement of all claims against the United States, the sum of $500 to Dr T F Harrison, compensating the said Dr T F Harrison for travel allowance and for pay for terminal leave upon cancellation, effective June 30, 1944, of his contract as contract surgeon *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, through the word "surgeon" in line 10 and insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. Thomas F. Harrison, of Maud, Okla., the sum of $226 04, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for travel allowance from Fayetteville, Ark., to Maud, Okla., upon the cancellation of his contract on June 30, 1944, as a contract surgeon of the United States Army, and for pay and allowance for 23 days, which represented the leave that had accumulated to his credit at the time of the cancellation of said contract"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JOHN E. WHITE

The Clerk called the bill (H R. 6003) for the relief of John E. White.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $14,000 to John E. White, of Washington, D. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for extra compensation for night differential and overtime, including Sundays and holidays, for services performed while an employee of the Post Office Department as a driver mechanic and dispatcher assigned to the White House Garage during the period from August 1, 1935, to August 1, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$14,000", insert in lieu thereof "$7,009 53"

Page 1, line 6, after the word "to", insert "Beulah L White, widow of"

Page 2, line 2, strike out "1941" and insert "1940"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Beulah L. White, widow of John E. White."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATENT IN FEE TO B M (BUD) PHELPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5609) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to B M (Bud) Phelps, of Pryor, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont: Section 26 and the south half of the northwest quarter and the southwest quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 27 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 880 acres.

With the following committee amendments

Page 1, line 7, after the words "southwest quarter", insert the following: "southwest quarter of southeast quarter and the northwest quarter of southeast quarter and the southwest quarter of northeast quarter"

Page 1, line 9, strike out "880 acres" and insert in lieu thereof the following "1,000 acres: *Provided*, That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Crow Tribe, or any Indian who is a member of said tribe, shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMMA PHELPS GLENN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5610) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Emma Phelps Glenn, of Pryor, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to her on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The west half of the southwest quarter of section 9 and lots 3 and 4, the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter, the east half of the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter and the west half of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 16, township 7 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian; the south half of section 10, the west half of the southwest quarter of section 11, the west half of section 14, the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter and the north half of the northwest quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 27 east, Montana principal meridian, containing one thousand twenty-two and seven one-hundredths acres more or less.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out everything following the colon and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The east half of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 9, township 7 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian; the south half of section 10, the west half of the southwest quarter of section 11, the west half of section 14, the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter, and the north half of the northwest quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 27 east, Montana principal meridian, containing eight hundred sixty acres more or less: *Provided*, That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Crow Tribe, or any Indian who is a member of said tribe, shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

CHARLES W. PHELPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5611) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles W. Phelps.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Charles W. Phelps, of Pryor, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 2; the north half of the northeast quarter of section 3; the northwest quarter of section 11; and the north half and the north half of the north half of the southeast quarter of section 35, township 6 south, range 27 east, Montana principal meridian; the south half of the northwest quarter and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 33, township 5 south, range 27 east, Montana principal meridian; the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 11; the west half of the northwest quarter and the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 12, township 7 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian, containing nine hundred and sixty acres.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the initial "W." and insert in lieu thereof the initial "M."

Page 1, line 5, following the words "allotted to" insert the words "and purchased by."

Page 1, line 6, strike out all language following the colon and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'Lot 4 of section 2; lots 1 and 2 of section 3; the northwest quarter of section 11; and the north half and the north half of the north half of the southeast quarter of section 35, township 6 south, range 27 east, Montana principal meridian; the south half of the northwest quarter and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 33, township 5 south, range 27 east, Montana principal meridian; the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 11, the west half of the northwest quarter and the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 12, township 7 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian, containing nine hundred twenty-four and sixty-five one-hundredths acres: *Provided*, That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Crow Tribe, or any Indian who is a member of said tribe, shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles M. Phelps."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK PHELPS

The Clerk called the bill (H R. 5860) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Frank Phelps.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Frank Phelps, of Billings, Mont., a patent in fee to the following described lands allotted to him on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont: The south half of the southeast quarter of section 20, the south half of the south half of section 21, the north half of section 28 and the northeast quarter of section 29, township 6 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 720 acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: Upon the filing of a written application by Frank Phelps, Crow Indian allottee No. 2171, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell to a Crow Indian, or to the Crow Tribe under existing regulations, the homestead and other land of said Frank Phelps, described as the south half of the southeast quarter of section 20; the south half of the south half of section 21; the north half of section 28; the northeast quarter of section 29, township 6 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 720 acres, the status of such land with respect to taxability to remain unchanged."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of Frank Phelps under existing regulations."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. T. MELSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 597) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. T. Melson, Craddockville, Va., against the United States for losses sustained as a result of the burning of timber and damage to marshland caused by fire started by a flare used in maneuvers by the United States naval forces August 6, 1943.

SEC 2 Proceedings for the determination of said claim shall be had in the same manner as in cases of which said court has jurisdiction under the provision of section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended: *Provided*, That suit hereunder shall be instituted within 4 months after the enactment of this act: *And provided further*, That this act shall be construed only to waive the immunity from suit of the Government of the United States with respect to the claim of said J. T. Melson, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, and not otherwise to affect any substantive rights of the parties.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "States", insert "(1) on the question of liability, and (2) on the question of the amount of recovery."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "marshland", insert "allegedly."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "145" and insert "1346."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "the Judicial Code, as amended" and insert "title 28, United States Code."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ESTATE OF SUSIE LEE SPENCER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1026) for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,500 to the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said Susie Lee Spencer sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Navy locomotive while removing cars from the rear of building 384, Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Va., on December 11, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account

of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MICHAEL A DRISCOLL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1479) for the relief of Michael A. Driscoll.

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

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Michael A Driscoll, East Boston, Mass., the the sum of $218. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Michael A. Driscoll against the United States for damages resulting from an accident which occurred on October 14, 1944, when a United States Coast Guard car struck a car owned and driven by the said Michael A. Driscoll at the intersection of Kingston and Essex Streets, Boston, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$218" and insert "$207.75."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ESTATE OF JULIUS ZAFFARENI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1481) for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Julius Zaffareni, late of Boston, Mass, the sum of $2,559.05. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said estate against the United States arising out of the death of the said Julius Zaffareni on November 16, 1939, when he was pinned between the side of a building in Boston and the back of a truck being operated by an employee of the Work Projects Administration acting within the scope of his employment as a truck driver for such Administration. The said estate brought suit against such employee in the Superior Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in and for the county of Suffolk, and on July 29, 1941, obtained judgment, including costs, in the amount of $2,559.05, which judgment is now unsatisfied because of the inability of such employee to pay such judgment. Such sum of $2,559.05 shall be paid only upon the assignment to the United States of all rights of the estate under such judgment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

ARTHUR S. HORNER ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2230) to reimburse Arthur S. Horner, Leah B. Horner, and Maude Brewer, partners composing a firm, doing business as A S. Horner Construction Co.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss, if any, sustained by Arthur S. Horner, Leah B Horner, and Maude Brewer, partners composing a firm, doing business as A S Horner Construction Co., of Denver, under Reclamation Bureau Contract No 12r-15632 arising out of or attributable to the alleged failure of the Government to supply materials as provided for in said contracts

SEC 2 The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to Arthur S Horner, Leah B Horner, and Maude Brewer, partners composing a firm, doing business as A. S. Horner Construction Co.

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

ALLEEN L. SHERWOOD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Alleen L. Sherwood.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alleen L. Sherwood, of Port Washington, N. Y., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and expenses as a result of being struck in her home at Port Washington, N. Y., on May 15, 1944, by a stray bullet shot from a machine gun located on an Army target range: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,087.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to correct the Christian name of the person involved in this bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Page 1, line 5, strike out "Alleen" and insert in lieu thereof "Aileen."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIO ROJAS VÉLEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3306) for the relief of Antonio Rojas Vélez.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,500 to Antonio Rojas Vélez, who was injured on July 1, 1944, at Bayamón, Puerto Rico, when a vehicle in which he was riding was struck by a United States Coast Guard tank truck. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be demed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,250."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the bill down to the colon on page 1, line 10, and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Coast Guard tank truck, at Bayamón, Puerto Rico, on July 1, 1944."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ESTATE OF OVIDIO VÁZQUEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3309) for the relief of the guardian of Ovidio Vázquez.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,000 to the guardian of the late Ovidio Vázquez, who was fatally injured on October 29, 1942, when struck in Road No. 2, kilometer 70, Arecibo, Puerto Rico, by a United States Army car.

The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident. *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$3,000" and insert "$2,530"

Page 1, line 5, strike out "guardian" and insert "estate."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Ovidio Vázquez"

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEJO PADILLA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3315) for the relief of Alejo Padilla.

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

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,500 to Alejo Padilla, who was injured on November 19, 1944, when struck in Vega Alta, Puerto Rico, by a United State Navy truck. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,000"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JUANA PAGÁN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3319) for the relief of Juana Pagán.

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

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,500 to Juana Pagán, who was injured on November 19, 1944, when struck in Vega Alta, Puerto Rico, by a United States Navy truck The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

WILLIAM T. ORTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5682) to authorize Public Housing Administration to pay charges awarded against it by judgment of the Sixtieth District Court of Jefferson County, Tex., and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of the Public Housing Administration be authorized to pay to R E. Cowan, clerk of the District Court of Jefferson County, Tex., or his successor in office, the principal sum of $9,500, together with accrued interest thereon in the sum of $665, in satisfaction of the judgment of the Sixtieth District Court of Jefferson County, Tex., in cause No. 58,209, styled William T. Oren against National Housing Agency et al., as same appears of record in volume 27, page 537, of the civil minutes of said court, said payment to be placed in the registry of said court and distributed under orders of the court to the person or persons entitled to the proceeds thereof as provided by the laws of Texas. The Administrator of the Public Housing Administration is further authorized to pay directly to R. E Cowan, clerk of the District Court of Jefferson County, Tex., or his successor in office, the court costs adjudged against the said Public Housing Administration in said judgment, not to exceed $250.

In the distribution of the proceeds of said judgment the court may award such attorneys' fees as he may ascertain were contracted for and earned by attorneys in connection with the prosecution of said suit in the courts.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "Administrator of the"

Page 1, line 3, strike out "Administration" and insert "Commissioner."

Page 2, line 5, after the period, strike out the bill down through line 10.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of William T. Orton."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMOND B WHITE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6323) for the relief of Raymond B. White.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $161.27 to Raymond B. White, of 2423 Good Hope Road Southeast, Washington, District of Columbia, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle on October 1, 1942, near the intersection of Good Hope Road and Twenty-fourth Street SE., Washington, D. C.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

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

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

A-9606359, Andresen, Ole Arnt, or Ole Art Andesen

A-6296097, Arey Eugenia (nee Eugenia Szynarewski or Szynarewska)

A-4227948, Banse, William Otto (alias Willi Otto Banse or Willy Banse)

A-1019559, Borst, Isabelle Helen.

A-3139019, Bravo, John.

A-1705789, Cameron, Marion Elizabeth (nee Sutherland).

A-4832240, Chabrian, Jacob or Jakov, or Jack Chabrian.

A-1798152, Damson, William Joseph.

A-2372212, De Garza, Inez Gutierrez

A-6296064, Delfino, Adriano Garcia.

A-6766826, De Soto, Jessie Lopez, or Jesus Lopez de Soto

A-5385346, De Torres, Josefina Carares.

A-2442178, Dickson, Jacob Wlue.

A-2445513, Fendez, Peter Angel, or Pedro Jose Mercedes Fernandez.

A-5530855, Fonda, John George, or Giovanni Fonda.

A-6072721, Garcia, Antonio Saad.

A-4747745, Ginsberg, Henry, or Chaim Ginsberg

A-6199198, Goetz, Abelina Felicitas.

A-5754758, Gordon, Kate Mary, or Mary Kate Pieschuk

A-4022531, Gutierrez-Garza, Urbano.

A-2372213, Garza, Gutierrez, Ismael.

A-6251138, Harken, Johannes Theodoor.

A-3491071, Henn, Georg Rudolf.

A-5980869, Hine, Margaret Regina (nee Moffit) alias Mrs. Ivan M. Hine alias Ina Black (alias Mrs. William John Black alias Lizzie Walker).

A-4669655, Kern, George Warden (alias George Washington Kern).

A-7687721, Mar, Beatriz Castro.

A-2506746, Mar, Francis.

A-2525130, Mejia, Lopez Fidel, or Fidel Mejia-Lopez.

A-6009711, Munroe, John Charles.

A-5056185, Paveglio, Pietro, or Peter Paveglio.

A-3874152, Ranier, Romeo, or Romeo Zagievich.

A-2934175, Schwartz, Bessie.

A-1602923, Smith, Harold Hilgrove, or Harold Smith or Harold H. Smith.
A-5210469, Uong, Li Lai (nee Chu).
A-4635148, Vallee, Arthur Joseph, or Arthur Valley (alias Arthur Joseph Valley alias Albert J Valley alias Phillip Trottier alias Henry Trottier).
A-5961272, Wriedt, Adolf Wilhelm.
A-6508363, Xantheas, George Panagiotis.
A 6074143, Orozco-Ybarra, Jose.

The Senate concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk read the resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) for the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months
A-2657830, Alaimo, Gaspare (alias Antony Curto)
A-6392821, Arroz, Benjamin Floro.
A-4875449, Garibay-Barron, Pedro.
A 5945921, Barden, Bernard James
A-7584849, Barden, Else Elisabeth (nee Wielputz)
A-7584852, Barden, Ingrid Elisabeth
A-6761884, Barry, Catherine Maxwell Geraldine (nee Catherine Maxwell Geraldine Fitzgerald).
A-6258481, Bick, Norbert Simon
A-4783695, Biggest, Bernadine Margaret (nee Mathers).
A-2073409, Bing, Kwan Shun, or Mrs. Lawrence Jong
A-6318466, Burke, Lilian Victoria (nee Mortley)
A-3043699, Caramanis, Joseph Kyriacos, or John Kyriacos Caramanis
A-3077041, Cardona, George
A-3542405, Ching, Mrs Wah Chong, or Lin Shu Ying (Grace) (alias Grace L Ching).
A-4583006, Crist, Maria Ragnhild (nee Maria Ragnhild Hindersson).
A-1127635, Cuschieri, Anthony Joseph.
A-910203, Damsleth, Bjorn Robert.
A-6311602, Damsleth, Randi (nee Clifton).
A-1481188, Di Meglio, John or Giovanni.
A-3713017, Di Nardo, Gennaro (alias Jerry Di Nardo)
A-3530018, Faria, Maria Simplicio, or Maria Souto Machado.
A-6481284, Fisher, Lena Eileen (nee Dodd).
A-3686479, Ford, Newton Isaac, or Newton I. Ford or Newton Becker or Leonard Lee Isaac Newton Ford.
A-6458413, Fretwell, Glenda Joyce.
A-6765814, Genet, Micheline Marguerite Louise Marie (nee Calsat)
A-6594937, Genet, Jean Marie Gabriel.
A-6552977, Hansen, Desley Helen
A-6552978, Hansen, Robin Naomi.
A-6278065, Henry, Muriel (formerly Muriel Rose and Muriel Harris).
A-4917143, Hinkkuri, Veikko Armas.
A-4040790, Hoffmann, Zoltan Alex, or Zoltan A. Hoffman or Zoltan Alex Hoffman.
A-6344960, Joachim, John.
A-3399584, Lacys, Elsa (nee Sturm).
A-4942450, Langfeldt, Paul Johan.
A-4497419, Leslie Mabel (nee Kellett).
A-3438538, Murphy, Patrick Joseph, or Joseph Murphy.
A-6285929, Ochoa, Maria Concepcion Quintero de (nee Quintero).
A-7540761, Paneral y Bertini, Camilo Orestes Rafael.
A-6322618, Parker, Martha (alias Martina Rivera Lopez).
A-4181269, Perez, Arturo Garcia, or Arture Perez
A-1208046, Pernice, Antonio
A-4734405, Ptucka, Stephan, or Steve Ptucka.
A-6396323, Racelis, Elisa
A-6396324, Racelis, Mary
A-6457162, Racelis, Ramo
A-2676821, Redka, John
A-2098470, Renner, Florence May (nee Bailey).
A-2454691, Renteria, Jose Anival.
A-3475471, Roetto, Gemma, or Gemma Minarelli
A-5800711, Sang, Wong, or Sang Wong.
A-3081085, Sartori, Linda (nee Ret).
A-3980008, Schlander, Arthur George.
A 1236239, Sestan, Arthur, or Stephen (Stephan) Voronoff
A-1025773, Spongia, Frederico Dominick, or Fred Spongia
A-2387594, Szedula, Barbara (nee Kiefer).
A-2387595, Szedula, Jacob.
A-3497501, Tomczak, Antonina, or Antonette Tomczak (nee Sobczok).
A-1204388, Van Den Berghe, Jeanette.
A-1204387, Van Den Berghe, John
A-1281125, Wagner, Hartie Mary Pretoria Thompson (nee Thompson).
A-6562827, Wardlow, Ada Rodriguez, or Ada de Las Mercedes Rodriquez Pego de Wardlow
A-2084639, Yiannatos, George G

The Senate concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (S Con. Res 39) for the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months
A-6199026, Arrate, Eusebio Garate.
A-2450463, Arsenio, Damiano
A-2160439, Bailey, Joseph Benjamin, or Benjamin Bailey
A-6145949, Bayot, Margarita Chuidian.
A-6151545, Bayot, Raymond Mario.
A-6151544, Bayot, Teresita Maria
A-6380365, Bolis, Rolando Guiseppe (alias Rolando or Dino Bolis)
A-6846177, Clausen, Lars Ole
A-5580935, Covarrubias-Padilla, Jose Anastacio, or Anastacio P. Cuburriaz
A-3216396, David, William Andrew.
A-5225705, Di Filippo, Irene Madeline.
A-6259257, Drozdibob, Joseph
A-2802280, Edelsbrunner, Caroline.
A-6265454, Engonopulos, Vasil George (alias Basil George Engonopulos).
A-3475015, Falconer, Leslie Stewart Arthur.
A-3475018, Falconer, Sarah Jane (nee King or Sally Falconer).
A-2486073, Fazakerley, Frederick Precival
A-6701963, Gage, George Martin, or Georg Martin Strobl.
A-6701967, Gage, Kathleen Kalliope Josephine, or Kalliope Josephine Strobl.
A-6780509, Gallardo, Jose.
A-2688840, Gallo, Salvatore
A-6261623, Georgalas, Maria Grigoriou (alias nee Goudelia).
A-4399192, Gonzalez, Angelina Morones De
A-4370168, Grossman, Morris, now known as Edward Milton Gross.
A-6261618, Hadgis, Kaliope, or Calliope Hadgis (nee Zias).
A-4829582, Heid, Michael or Mihaly.
A-6827148, Hernandez, Alberto Ruiz.
A-7009803, Hernandez, Hilaria.
A-2150100, Hoffman, Anthony, or Antoni Hoffmann
A-1526789, Huala, Rudolph.
A-5159601, Huerta-De La Cruz, Victoriano.
A-3423608, Iglesias, Manuel Antonio.
A-5751650, Jay, Gee, or Gee Jay Ngon.
A-4132920, Johnson, Carl Oscar, or Karl Oscar Jonsson or Charles Johnson.
A-5582883, Kashkin, Anna (nee Litman).
A-6080991, Kay, Constance
A-1843482, Kurzweil, Katharina.
A-1629087, Kurzweil, Joseph.
A-5771081, Leader, Josephine Freida, or Josephine Freida Forster (maiden name).
A-4073996, Leriget, Leopoldo
A-3969614, Licos, Harry or Charalambos.
A-5217397, Lidowitz, Betty (nee Silverberg alias Betty Anenberg).
A-66544060, Livadas, Nicolaos, or Nick Livadas or Nicolas Livadas.
A-2151223, Matiatos, Kostas Anastasios, or Gus Matheios or Gus Mathews or Constantinos Matiatos
A-3449928, Meyer, Eva (nee Preminger).
A-6810173, Michaud, Jean Antoine.
A-4578274, Nadler, Augusta Julian Marie Pallfelt, or Augusta Juliane-Marie Pallfelt.
A-3390860, O'Donnell, Murdock, or Morton O'Donnell or Merton O'Donnell.
A-2180993, Olivo-Alvarado, Pedro.
A-3990676, Perez De, Maria Perez, or Maria Perez
A-5803759, Pernstich, Guisseppe, or Joseph Eduard Pernstich or Joseph Eduard Pernet.
A-4015208, Petroff, Lulu, or Lulu Bishop or Mary Lulu Baldwin Bishop or Lulu Saunders
A-3987370, Pettersen, Nils Christian.
A-6343137, Psipsikas, Elisabet (nee Manda)
A-6731207, Ramirez-Hernandez, Clemente, or Clemente Ramires-Hernandez
A-3990675, Reyes, Lupe Perez
A-3456521, Salgado, Paz Paguia (nee Paz Parias Paguia)
A-3098893, Sherman, Rose (nee Schwartzbaid)
A-4025778, Steen, Mary (nee Mewha)
A-3887129, Steevels, Barend Bernardus.
A-6377728, Tai, Bobbish Pao-Kuang Soong.
A-6272112, Tai, William Kitong.
A-3875078, Verfaillie, Lucien Andrew
A-6799298, Vion, James Alfred Laurent
A-6207280, Vitalis, Georgios Kyriacos (alias George Vitalis)
A-6877269, Weisz, Margarete Henriette
A-5422164, Wong, Tong, or Lum Wong or Wong Tong or Wang Tang
A-5962228, Zelger, Alfred Wilhelm.
A-5962227, Zelger, Margarit.

The Senate concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) for the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:
A-4331685, Albanese, Ruggiero
A-4197547, Antepligil, Osman Hayrettin.
A-5724044, Antoniazzi, Matilde Fadelli
A-6219459, Ayvalopoulos, Hariclia (nee Chariclia K Helzanoglou).
A-1323072, Balzan, Nicola
A-5338260, Callahan, Catherine Mary, or Catherine Mary Dowd (maiden name).
A-6151538, Calloway, Nieves Buena.
A-4895570, Campagnoli, Romildo.
A-6642567, Canales-Hernandez, Armando, or Armando Hernandez-Canales.

A-6636580, Carriaga-Alvarez, Hilarion, or Hilarion Alvarez-Carriage or Hilarion Careaga.
A-6650117, Carrillo, Baldomero.
A-6650116, Carrillo, Jose.
A-1936991, Chaparro, Epifania.
A-1534268, Chatzikostantin, Costas, or Gust Stelles
A-6709236, Clay, George Robert, or George Mczes
A-6577754, Contreras-Vargas, Julio.
A-6865971, Correa, Junior, Alejandro Maximo
A-6178549, Dahlseide, Shirley Delores.
A-6677647, D'Atri, Lise Claire.
A-6261871, De Anda, Cayetano Jimenez.
A5594947, De Araujo, Jose
A-5171994, De Arredondo, Rosaria Banda, or Rosaria Banda
A-6834476, De Flores, Josefina Pena, or Josefina Pena Villegas (maiden name).
A-2691031, Del Vecchio, Michele (alias Michael Del Vecchio).
A 3046860, De Martinez, Fermina Espinose (nee Mejia or Fermina Espinosa De Cruz former marriage)).
A-6683087, Dewdney, Juliette
A-3343962, De Zuniga, Maria Garza, or Maria Garza-Flores
A-2746308, Divitaroff, Hristo Pavloff, now known as Christ D Paul.
A-4985191, Doerschler, Arthur Ferdinand.
A-3707306, Eberhardt, Felipa Maria Lopez de, or Felipa Eberhardt, or Phillipa Mary Eberhardt
A-5118174, Edward, Phillis Vivian, or La Belle Bogart or Farmer or Phyllis V. Anderson or Phyllis V La Belle.
A-6811190, Fago, Vincenzo Tommaso (alias Thomas Vincent Fago).
A-2778955, Fantini, Arturo, or Arthur Fantini
A-5305711, Ferguson, William.
A-6307699, Fernandez, Enrique Romo, or Enrique Romo or Enrique Garraci Fernandez.
A-4862365, Figlioli, Mario.
A-4150490, Flores, Julia Delfina (nee Torres)
A-62 8100 Flores, Jesus, or Jesus Flores Sanchez
A-6238101, Flores, Pablo, or Pablo Flores Sanchez or Pablo Flores.
A-5535019, Flores-Soto, Alfredo, or Alfredo Flores or Alfredo Soto Flores.
A-6343699, Floru, Stergiani.
A-6350824, Frangopoules, Chrisi or Frank (nee Fourkalidos (Fourklidou)), or Chrisi Frank
A-6400942 Futris, John George.
A-6240456, Gardikis, Ourania (nee Economou)
A-2484437, Giovara, Alfredo.
A-6288108, Goldstone, Anna (nee Leitner).
A 2326179, Goum, Gaston Etienne Joseph.
A-6380637, Goyan, Eugenia Jean Jennie.
A-5401984, Grenzow, Richard Wilhelm (alias Richard Grenzow)
A-6405590 Hamilton, Edward Herbert (alias Archibald Edward Valentine).
A 6170336, Hamm, Remedios Tamayo.
A-6557126, Han, Maolin, or Mao Lin Han or Kiu Yueh Han
A 1823731, Hansen, Victor Andrew.
A-2895693, Hanttu, Lydia.
A-4451747, Harris, Andre Thomas, or Andre Horace or Andre Toussaint Harris.
A-6212903, Heiden, Violet Delores.
A-6323057, Hernandez, Juan, or Juan Medina Hernandez.
A-1835493, Hidalgo, Hilario Marzann.
A-5969818, Hipp, Doris Amy Louise (nee Gilvear, formerly Faucett or Fawcett).
A-6322459, Hoiman, Teunis Baan.
A-6816865, Hoy, Martha Smiley (alias Martha Hoy).
A-5811774, Issenmann, Adriana.
A-6811623, Johnson, John Oran, or Andrew John Johnson.
A-6671906, Jung, Marlene, or Marlene Yung.
A-4796715, Kellegian, Dorothy Michelle, or Elisa Horaks Rodriguez or Elisa Morales.
A-6162954, Kernkraut, Charles (Chaim).
A-6045024, Keyes, John William.
A-1012102, Kowrkounakis, George Konstantinos.
A-6429788, Kuoppamaki, Liisa.
A-6261597, Lambouris, Constantina (nee Kostanos).
A-6715868, La Motte, Goetz Walter de.
A-4176832, Lee, Mew Tin, Mrs. (alias Yin Fung Leong alias Siu Bing Bing).
A-3310474, Leonard, Mary Frances (nee Industrious).
A-3875481, Liang, Mary (alias Liang Mah Lee).
A-6024662, Lilland, Torolf Johan.
A-6385160, Luana, Ignacio
A-1252627, Lutkes, Mary or Lutkevicus (nee Venik).
A-6509112, Madamba, Helen Marie.
A-3164260, Marethe, Indu (nee Indu Hari Lewate or Indu Shankar Marathe).
A-6397726, Markogiannis, Georgia (nee Pappas).
A-9635770, Markogiannis, Michael George, or Mike Markogiannis.
A-6166166, Martinez, Mariana, or Alfonso Y Diaz.
A-3092340, Marulis, John Efstathios, or John E Marulis or Ioannis Maroulis.
A-5470955, Matthias, Christophena (nee Sparks).
A-6855173, Melendrez-Colunga, Francisco.
A-6827607, Mertikas, Constantinos.
A-3152201, Mezzina, Giovanni.
A-5304110, Mika, Jessie Air (nee Jessie Wilkie Air).
A-6048520, Mococain, Juan Guillermo (Clark), or John William Mococain.
A-7593654, McCann, Doris.
A-6316401, McCarthy, Mary Ellen (nee Shallow).
A-5137396, McDade, Emma Theresa (nee McNamara).
A-5262105, McMurray, Lorenza Cecile.
A-6326677, Nolan, Ada Phyllis.
A-6827000, Noriega-Bonilla, Blas.
A-6050604, Pietrolaj, Heronima.
A-3708197, Palatin, Julia (nee Julia Schauer or Julia Polatin alias Elizabeth Kocisz).
A-6491634, Paneth, Eidel (nee Eidel Moscovici).
A-6288475, Panteleakis, Nicolas Panagiotis.
A-7707086, Patino, Jesus Maria Rodriguez y, or Jesus Rodrigue.
A-1573671, Patrik, Jan Mike, or John Petrik or Patrick.
A-5817429, Pelleck, Jennie (nee Jennie Piala).
A-6827105, Pena, Adan Flores.
A-5622568, Pesce, Attilio.
A-6143858, Pinto, David Edison Maddox.
A-6690315, Ramirez, Maria.
A-3886946, Rauch, Anita (nee Steil, alias Starick and Antonina Rozalja Steil).
A-5190183, Regis, Adelina Ramirez Luna.
A-6437512, Robinson, Julienne Marie (nee Devincke).
A-1450969, Ryan, Daniel James, or Daniel James O'Ryan.
A-6303971, Sanchez, Clara, or Sara Sanchez or Clara Sanchez de Mendoza.
A-3167966, Santoro, Salvatore, or Salvatore Aniello Santoro.
A-3726899, Schaumburg, June Hadfield (alias nee June Hobson).
A-4588739, Schooff, Wilhelm Emil, or Willie Schoof or Schooff.
A-6268892, Shunda, Olimpia Babu (nee Olimpia Babu).
A-6054882, Silva-Pena, Jose Diego Cecilio De Jesus, or Cecilio Silva-Pena.
A-6054860, Silva, Marciala Calderon Parra De.
A-2726809, Simon, Gladstone Emanuel.
A-5613177, Skytte, Jenny Margrethe (nee Jenny Margrethe Marcussen).
A-6837715, Smales, Thomai, or Thelma Thomai Smales or Thelma Thomai Papacosta (maiden name).
A-6839267, Smith, Ronald George.
A-1233170, Swaleh, Abdu Ibn, or Edwin Gourick Bey.
A-1990120, Tomecek, Gabriel Vincent.
A-4540102, Vda. De Ruiz, Juana Cristan, or Juanita Tristan.
A-6263031, Villa, Maria Ester Medrano de.
A-6782677, Viner, Gladys (nee Robinson).
A-2749887, Wing, Chew, or Gueng Lai or Siu Hoo or Siu Hoo Wing or Jew Shee or Chew Gee.
A-6145607, Wise, Consuelo Emilia.
A-5468253, Wolfel, John, or Mike Deal or Joan or Johann Wolfel.
A-6610614, Wong, Lee Wai Lan (nee Wai Lan Lee or Wong Lee Shee).
A-5971920, Wong, Lok-Yee Lois (nee Wang or Lois Lok-Yee Wong Nee Wang).
A-6354313, Woods, Colette Levy (nee Colette Marthe Nelly Levy).
A-1689915, Woszczynski, Konstanty, or Konstant Woszczynski.
A-2400433, Tso, Chee Wah, or Gin Lung Tso.
A-2079296, Young, Hew Som.
A-2976738, Yuan, Hyan Yu.
A-1397613, Zajic, Louis, or Ladislaw Zajic.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4, line 14, strike out the registration number and the name: "A-6170336, Hamm, Remedios Tamayo."

On page 9, preceding line 1, insert the registration number and the name: "A-5468253, Wolfel, John or Mike Deal or Joan or Johann Wolfel."

On page 9, immediately following the above amendment, insert the number and the name: "A-6610614, Wong, Lee Wai Lan nee Wai Lan Lee or Wong Lee Shee"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER:

On page 1, after line 8, insert the registration number and name: "A-6080769, Assali, Nicolau Salim or Nick Assail."

On page 6, after line 9, insert the registration number and name: "A-1865724, Matsukata, Miyeko, also Miye Matsukata"

On page 6, after line 20, insert the registration number and name: "A-6391186, McIlhattan, Adriana or Adriana Catri."

Page 8, after line 16, insert the registration number and name: "A-6388576, Tarabishy, Said Hassan or Tarabichi"

On page 8, after line 24, insert the registration and number and name: "A-601587, Wojciechowska, Maria Teresa."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER J. O'TOOLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3462) for the relief of Walter J. O'Toole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walter J. O'Toole, of Berwyn, Ill., the sum of $213.66. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Walter J. O'Toole against the United States for payment of the cost of moving his household furnishings from Winthrop, Mass., to Middletown, Ohio, in July 1943, in connection with

an official transfer of the said Walter J. O'Toole while serving with the Civil Aeronautics Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

JOYCE VIOLET ANGEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 485) for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel.

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

Be it enacted, etc, That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, Joyce Violet Angel, a resident of Alexandria, Egypt, shall be deemed to be a native of Great Britain

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Miss Joyce Violet Angel, of Zephyrhills, Fla., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on November 5, 1949, the date of her lawful entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of a visa fee of $10 and a head tax of $8."

"SEC 2 Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category from the first available immigration quota for Egypt."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SISTERS ANTOINETTE COMETTI AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 753) for the relief of Sisters Antoinette Cometti, Mary Gibin, Angela Pelosin, Emma Ghisleni, Elisabetta De Caterin, and Onorina Franzina.

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

Be it enacted, etc, That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sisters Antoinette Cometti, Mary Gibin, Angela Pelosin, Emma Ghisleni, Elisabetta De Caterin, and Onorina Franzina, who were admitted to the United States on temporary visas, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the dates of their last entries, on payment of the required visa fees and head taxes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct six numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available quotas for nationals of Italy.

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

TORIKO TATEUCHI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1166) for the relief of Toriko Tateuchi.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Toriko Tateuchi, Tokyo, Japan, the Japanese fiancée of Richard D. S. Kwak, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Toriko Tateuchi may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Toriko Tateuchi is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Richard D S. Kwak, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Toriko Tateuchi, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S C., title 8, secs 155 and 156) In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Toriko Tateuchi, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Toriko Tateuchi as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head taxes.

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

LT. (SG) GIACOMO FALCO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1487) for the relief of Lt. (SG) Giacomo Falco.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Giacomo Falco, late a lieutenant in the Italian Navy who rendered meritorious service to the United States, and who entered the United States as a visitor February 5, 1947, at New York, shall, upon payment of the required head tax, be considered for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the Italian quota for the first year the Italian quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "required", insert "visa fee and"

Line 9, after "residence", insert "as of the date of his last entry."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

LOUISE AHTING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4747) for the relief of Louise Ahting.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 404 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (8 U. S. C. 804), Louise Ahting may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act by taking the naturalization oath of allegiance before any United States consular officer abroad.

SEC. 2 From and after naturalization under this act, Louise Ahting shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

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

MRS. RAYMOND SCHAFFER, JR., AND BARBARA ANN SCHAFFER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6345) for the relief of Mrs. Raymond Schaffer, Jr., and Barbara Ann Schaffer.

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

Be it enacted, That, for the purpose of immigration and naturalizatizon laws, the Japanese wife of Sgt. Raymond Schaffer, Jr., of York, Pa., and their daughter, Barbara Ann, are to be considered eligible for permanent residence in the United States, and the Secretary of State is directed to issue the proper visas.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following. "That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Raymond Schaffer, Jr, a native of Japan, who is the wife of Raymond Schaffer, Jr., of York, Pa., an honorably discharged veteran of World War II and a citizen of the United States. If otherwise admissible under the immigration laws the said Mrs. Raymond Schaffer, Jr., shall be granted the status of a nonquota immigrant."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Raymond Schaffer, Jr."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUGET SOUND BRIDGE & DREDGING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 736) for the reimbursement of Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy, out of funds heretofore appropriated for public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, is hereby authorized to pay to the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co., as one of the contractors under contract NOy-3570, an amount not to exceed $9,789 63 as reimbursement for, and in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of, the loss of its supplies aboard the dredge Everett on or about September 24, 1942, and the loss of its scow No. 11 on or about November 16, 1943, without negligence or fault in either case while in transit upon the open sea for the purposes of the contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or

received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

CALVIN D LYNCH & SON AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 777) for the relief of Calvin D. Lynch & Son; W. Thomas Lockerman; Sudlersville Supply Co.; George C. Moore and H. A. Moore; J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc.; Hobbs & Jarman; C. S. Thomas; and Royse R. Spring.

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

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Calvin D Lynch & Son, Ridgely, Md., the sum of $340 29; to W Thomas Lockerman, Denton, Md., the sum of $300, to Sudlersville Supply Co , Sudlersville, Md , the sum of $1,310, to George C. Moore and H. A. Moore, trading as Moore Bros , Queen Anne, Md , the sum of $1,056; to J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc , Easton, Md , the sum of $1,921.39; to Hobbs & Jarman, Greensboro, Md., the sum of $735; to C S. Thomas, Centerville, Md , the sum of $1,219; and to Royse R. Spring, Easton, Md , the sum of $584. Such sums represent the amounts the above-named grain dealers were required by the Office of Price Administration to pay to the United States on account of alleged overcharges by them for services rendered in connection with grain handling on Commodity Credit Corporation loans to farmers for the year 1944 Such alleged overcharges were made for new services at rates approved by the Commodity Credit Corporation which the Office of Price Administration subsequently refused to recognize.

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

CARL J. FREUND AND PAULINE H. FREUND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1019) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of personal injuries sustained by Carl J. Freund and Pauline H. Freund, his wife, of Seattle, Wash.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the jurisdiction conferred upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington by subsection (b) of section 1346, title 28, United States Code, is hereby extended to a civil action, which may be commenced not later than 1 year after the enactment of this act, asserting any claim or claims of Carl J. Freund and Pauline H. Freund, his wife, of Seattle, Wash., against the United States for money damages arising out of personal injuries sustained by them in a collision between their automobile and a United States Army truck at the intersection of Olga Street and Thirty-eighth Avenue Southwest, Seattle, Wash., on April 23, 1944. Except as otherwise provided in this act, all provisions of law applicable in and to such subsection, and applicable to judgments therein and appeals therefrom, are hereby made equally applicable in respect of the civil action authorized by this act: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act does or shall constitute an admission of liability on the part of the Government of the United States of America.

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

SAUL PHILLIPS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1048) for the relief of Saul Phillips.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Saul Phillips, of Albany, N. Y., the sum of $869.76, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for overtime compensation as an employee of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Department of Agriculture, during the period December 1, 1942, to June 30, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

MILTON BUECHLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1088) for the relief of Milton Buechler.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Milton Buechler, of Norfolk, Va , the sum of $270. The said Milton Buechler, under contract numbered N-151s-76187, dated August 20, 1946, purchased a Fordson tractor and harrow from the Navy Department, and the amount above specified represents loss suffered by him by reason of the fact that such equipment was so rusted, broken, or lacking in parts as to be beyond repair for any use: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

ABE LINCOLN AND ELENA B. LINCOLN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1096) for the relief of Abe Lincoln and Elena B. Lincoln.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Abe Lincoln, of Albuquerque, N. Mex , the sum of $1,003, and to Elena B Lincoln, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., the sum of $686.33, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for reimbursement of amounts withheld from their salaries as employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs at Fort Defiance, Ariz., for living quarters for the period from August 1, 1925, to April 30, 1931, during which period they occupied privately owned living quarters.

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

G. H. LAZARUS, JR., AND JESSE F. BEWLEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1353) for the relief of G. H. Lazarus, Jr., and Jesse F. Bewley.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to G. H. Lazarus, Jr., and Jesse F. Bewley, of Bowling Green, Ky., the sum of $15,991 15, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for services rendered during the period beginning on May 13, 1941, and ending on December 5, 1944, at the request of certain officers of the United States Army, in the manufacture, transportation, and testing of a gun mount, and for reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection therewith: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

HARRY COMBER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1534) for the relief of Harry Comber.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry Comber, of 1531 East Wilson Avenue, Glendale, Calif., the sum of $488.05, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States as compensation for use of his automobile during the years 1933 and 1934, in the State of California, under the direction of the Public Works Administration and/or the Civil Works Administration and/or F. E. Trask, State engineer of California, and/or an advisory board composed of Hamilton H. Cotton, Franck Havenner, E. F. Scattergood, and Justus Wardell: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF WILLIAM WALTER SEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1924) for the relief of the estate of William Walter See.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal representative of the estate of William Walter See, deceased, late of Norwalk, Calif., the sum of $5,561.30 The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said William Walter See which occurred when a United States Navy airplane crashed into the barn in which he was working, on September 3, 1943, at Norwalk, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

ALAMO IRRIGATION CO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2119) for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co.

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

Whereas Alamo Irrigation Co., of Alamo, Nev., under date of August 7, 1946, executed its promissory note to the United States for $46,200 for moneys advanced on that date by the United States for the purpose of lining its irrigation canals and installing therein certain turn-out structures pursuant to an act of August 28, 1937, entitled "An act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes" (50 Stat. 869); and

Whereas Alamo Irrigation Co. was not permitted to use the funds advanced unless countersigned by a duly authorized representative of the Secretary of Agriculture, and

Whereas Alamo Irrigation Co. was unable to obtain bids within the limits of available funds for lining the canals and was further delayed from the use of such funds by the necessity of transporting irrigation water until the 1947 crops were matured: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That interest which accrued on said note from August 7, 1946, to June 17, 1947, in the sum of $1,193.50 is hereby waived and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause the proper entries to be made in the accounting records of the Department of Agriculture to effect such waiver.

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

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the bills on the Private Calendar.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN AREAS IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 458 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2319) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 36]

Allen, Ill	Gilmer	Potter
Andrews	Halleck	Powell
Bailey	Hand	Reed, N. Y.
Barrett, Pa	Harrison	Ribicoff
Barrett, Wyo.	Heller	Sabath
Bland	Kirwan	Sadowski
Bolton, Ohio	Kunkel	St George
Brown, Ga.	Lichtenwalter	Scott, Hardie
Bulwinkle	McDonough	Shafer
Burdick	McGrath	Short
Camp	Madden	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	Monroney	Smathers
Christopher	Morrison	Smith, Ohio
Davies, N. Y	Murray, Wis.	Smith, Va.
Dawson	Nelson	Stockman
Dingell	Nixon	Taylor
Dollinger	O'Konski	Towe
Dolliver	Pace	Wadsworth
Fernandez	Passman	White, Idaho
Fogarty	Patman	Wilson, Ind.
Furcolo	Patterson	Withrow
Gary	Plumley	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter from a former Member of the House, Hamilton Fish.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in connection with the fifth anniversary of Yalta.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him on Monday, February 6, 1950, before the Mississippi Valley Association at St. Louis, Mo., on rivers and valleys.

Mr. RAMSAY (at the request of Mr. KEE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some letters.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN AREAS IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr HERTER] and now yield 4 minutes to myself.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 458 makes in order S. 2319, the Korean aid bill. This bill was debated at considerable length in the House some 2 or 3 weeks ago. I believe most of the Members are familiar with it. However, there have been some changes made. The bill has been reported out by a vote of 17 for and 1 against, with 1 Member voting "present" There was no opposition to the bill in the committee. The changes made are reductions in the amount authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the reduction being from $150,000,000 to $60,000,000 Also the advance to be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was reduced from $50,000,000 to $30,000,000.

This resolution calls for 2 hours of general debate and waives points of orders.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HERTER Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New York says, this rule makes in order S. 2319. However, all of the bill S 2319 has been stricken out and a committee amendment put in its place. That committee amendment, under the rule, is open to amendment as if it were an original bill. The changes that have been made are fairly substantial. There has even been a change in the title. While the figures given vary from those in the previous bill, the bill actually carries the same amount of aid to Korea as in the previous act. But the most important change that has been made is in allowing the China Aid Act of last year to be extended until the middle of June of this year, thereby allowing a continuation of aid to those parts of China which are still free of Communist domination.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill which goes way beyond the mere question of helping a friendly republic that we assisted in setting up. In my opinion, it is of very grave import to our entire standing in the Far East. I therefore hope that the

rule will be adopted and that the bill will be passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] has expired.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this proposal to continue aid to Korea, turned down by the House several days ago, comes back to us coated in sugar, and in a form that makes it more acceptable to me. However, I hope the inclusion of Formosa for some help means more than bait for support for Korea, and that it is not just sugar to make the bill more palatable.

I voted for the bill to extend aid to Korea, but I did so with some feeling of misgiving, because of the policy of the State Department toward China heretofore pursued, I felt that in all probability it would be money wasted. I now support the pending measure with some degree of enthusiasm. I do so for this reason: I assume that the inclusion of Formosa for aid was done upon the recommendation of the State Department, and that it represents a change of policy in the Department as regards China. If this is not so, then the Committee on Foreign Affairs handling the measure would know, and knowing, would make known that fact, as they would not want to win support for the bill on the basis of a false assumption.

The record that we have made as regards China has not been such as to reflect credit upon our own country. I think we ran out on an old friend, but this is an indication of a willingness on the part of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the State Department to recognize what I take to be the overwhelming desire of this House; that is, that we do something to manifest an interest in the nearly one billion Asiatic people not already drawn behind the iron curtain.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, these people are worthy of an all-out effort on our part to assist them in their resistance to being fed into the ravenous maw of the Russian bear.

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

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. RICH. You say you have changed your mind because of the attitude of the State Department. What has the State Department done now that would cause you to change your mind?

Mr. COX. I did not say that I had changed my attitude. I supported the Korean bill when it was here a few days past. Putting in Formosa strengthens the measure but I do not think we could afford to reject it if the Formosa provisions were eliminated.

If the gentleman is seeking to elicit from me my opinion of the State Department, I say to him very frankly that my lack of confidence is complete.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this bill is of the utmost importance; it is very important that we dispose of it without further delay. I get that opinion from the fact that the House this morning met at 11 o'clock when ordinarily we meet at 12; also from the ruling of the Speaker which he made in his wisdom and discretion—where he dispensed with 1-minute talks from the Members, including Republican, during which we might otherwise have had occasion to compare the $1 box chicken dinner we had last night with the soon to be held $100-a-plate Jackson Day dinner to be held by the New Fair Dealers. I hope at some future time we Republicans will be granted an opportunity to comment on that wonderful patriotic meeting last night, a very enthusiastic and worth-while meeting.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this bill has the same purpose as the bill which we rejected a few weeks ago. They have put some sugar in the bill, included a bit for Formosa; and I notice that they have changed the title to the Far Eastern Economic Act of 1950. Then I read further and note in another section that it provides funds for the assistance of certain areas in China.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This bill also contains, of course, under the last section the gentleman referred to, an authorization which I understand will give the State Department an opportunity to grant $10,500,000 worth of aid to Formosa. It is a rather high price to pay for the few votes that may be necessary to enact this legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. At the proper time I am going to ask what the certain portions of China are. I hope some member of the committee may be able to answer that.

I have every sympathy not only for Korea but also for Formosa and other areas of the world which may need our help But I think my colleagues ought to get it straight in their minds that this does not include military assistance to Korea. I read into the RECORD a few weeks ago, when we had this matter under discussion, a letter from the President of the Korean Assembly. I had the opportunity of visiting with him last November.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 37]

Allen, Ill.	Burdick	Gillette
Andrews	Byrne, N. Y.	Gilmer
Arends	Camp	Granger
Bailey	Celler	Gwinn
Barrett, Pa.	Christopher	Halleck
Barrett, Wyo.	Crawford	Hand
Biemiller	Dawson	Hart
Bland	Dingell	Hébert
Bolton, Ohio	Dolliver	Heller
Bosone	Doughton	Hobbs
Brown, Ga.	Furcolo	James
Bulwinkle	Gary	Johnson
Kirwan	Patman	Short
Kunkel	Patterson	Simpson, Pa.
Lichtenwalter	Phillips, Calif.	Smathers
McDonough	Plumley	Smith, Ohio
McGrath	Potter	Smith, Va.
Madden	Poulson	Taylor
Magee	Powell	Towe
Marshall	Reed, N. Y.	Wadsworth
Monroney	Sabath	Whitaker
Murdock	Sadowski	White, Idaho
Nixon	St George	Wilson, Ind.
O'Konski	Scott, Hardie	Withrow
Passman	Shafer	Wood

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 356 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN AREAS IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As I was saying before the quorum call was made, the Chairman of the General Assembly spoke to a group of four Members of this House who visited Korea last November. His plea was for military assistance. This bill does not contain military assistance. It does contain aid to Korea in the form of electric-light plants, dams, fertilizer plants, and similar aid, putting in permanent improvements and installments in Korea. I think it should be stated that the difficulty with Korea began at Yalta when our beloved President had at his right hand a man by the name of Hiss, who helped draw up secret commitments which divided Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel, Russia being responsible for the northern half of Korea, and the United Nations for the southern half of Korea. This was dividing up a country without its knowledge.

The committee that visited Korea was divided in its support for the bill a few weeks ago. Two of us voted against Korean aid, two voted for the Korean aid. So it is a controversial question and one that I think you should consider very, very carefully.

Our State Department's policy in the Far East has been a sickening one. I have no confidence in what the State Department proposes to do. I note, in section 2 of the bill, that the State Department proposes to aid certain parts of China. Have they changed their tune? How do you Democrats feel who have up to this opposed this action? You have been talking against such aid. Now they propose to throw a little sop to China. Some of you have been making speeches against it and supporting the State Department. Now they turn around and run the other way and mix you up in your signals.

Another thing I would point out is that inflation is the thing in Korea that will bring them to ruin. I happened to be in Korea in 1935, and part of 1936. The yuan then was worth about 4 to the dollar. Today you can go out on the streets of Korea and get 900 yuan to the dollar. That is inflation. They are doing nothing about it. Korea has no national debt. So I say to you that the thing that is going to bring about the downfall of Korea is not the money in this bill but their inflation. This bill provides $60,000,000 to end June 30, 1950. I understand there is another bill in the

hopper to provide another $130,000,000 or $140,000,000 for Korea.

I point out to you that the resources of this country are not unlimited. I would like to help Korea. I would like to help all the free nations of the world. I wish we were rich and I wish we could do it. But Joe Stalin would like to destroy this country by spending us into destruction. Is that not part of their policy?

Now, we have the H-bomb, the hell bomb, being manufactured by Russia and this country. Perhaps this $60,000,000 had better be spent in the defenses of our own country. Our resources are limited. We can spend ourselves into destruction. I am not going to vote for any of this foreign spending. We can not afford to destroy our economic system. It is not for food for Korea. If it were for food, I would say, let us send them food. But Korea is exporting huge amounts of rice. They do not need food. They do need some fertilizer. I am willing to see that they get fertilizer. If this bill carried some money for military assistance, I would feel better about it. We have a military attaché in Korea, General Roberts. He said, "It is not a question of if the Communists move in but when they do move in." And when they do move in South Korea will last about 8 or 10 days.

Are we going to establish all of these fertilizer plants, electric light plants, and dams, bringing thousands of acres under cultivation, and let the Communists move in and take it over? Is that what you want? Korea wants military assistance; not the type of assistance she will get under this bill.

Freedom is being threatened all over the world; it is threatened in this country. But our friends all over the world ought to remember that if we spend ourselves into destruction—and there is danger of that—there will be no one to come to our assistance. The Bureau of Labor Statistics says that we have nearly 5,000,000 people unemployed now. I remind you that the Democratic administration from 1932 to 1940 had an average of 8,000,000 unemployed in this country, and it took a war to cure it. Look at the record. Are we going that way again? A debt of $260,000,000,000, and then proposing $60,000,000 for Korea. I would like to do that; I wish we could; I have every sympathy for the Koreans. But let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this might be the straw that will break the camel's back as far as the economy of this country is concerned.

I expect to vote against the bill.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the measure under consideration in the House today is something quite unlike the measure which was considered by this body some days ago. It has been changed in several respects, not the least of which was a change in the title of the bill which is now called the "Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950."

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield briefly.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It does provide $60,000,000 aid for Korea, the same as the other bill.

Mr. JACKSON of California. The gentleman is quite correct.

I believe the greatest difference in the measure under consideration here today, as has been pointed out by several Members, is the fact that the bill currently under consideration adds a new section which provides for continuation of economic aid to those areas of China which are not now under Communist domination. In practical terms, that means, of course, Formosa and Hainan. It is estimated that with respect to section 2 a sum up to $10,000,000 may be expended in Formosa between now and the 30th of June 1950.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. On page 4 of the report, if I read it correctly, it indicates that there are $45,000,000 remaining as an unobligated balance. Does the gentleman mean that $10,000,000 of that amount is likely to be spent?

Mr. JACKSON of California. That is my understanding. My further understanding is that there are no definite and well-defined plans for the program at the present time. This new proposal comes so suddenly in some respects that it has not been found possible to shape up a firm and comprehensive program for that area.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that there is a rather firm program for about $5,500,000 or $6,000,000?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I think the gentleman is correct. Roughly half of the likely expenditure is in a state of advance planning at the present time. As I recall the estimates given the committee, the sum involved is in the magnitude of $5,000,000.

Mr. JUDD. That is right; that much would be spent almost certainly. Whether any additional amount could be well spent is still to be determined.

Mr. JACKSON of California. The gentleman is correct.

In actual fact, the Korean hook has been baited with a very succulent and attractive lure. In adding aid to Formosa and aid to Chiang Kai-shek and those elements of the National government on Formosa and Hainan, the administration has made a very astute move. There will undoubtedly be an effort made to remove section 2 from the bill but that, of course, will be a hurdle which will have to be met at the time it is proposed. Certainly, this measure creates a new situation in which it is not easy to make a decision. In my case I have opposed, and upon grounds which I considered to be very sound, any economic assistance at this time to Korea. Those considerations which resulted in the defeat of the aid to Korea measure a week or so ago are still, in my opinion, entirely valid as far as the Korean aid feature of the measure under consideration is concerned. Those considerations had to do with the vast distances involved, had to do with the nature of the aid unsupported as it is by any military program which would render it possible to defend the frontiers of South Korea against aggression from the north; considerations as to the internal conflict that is taking place in the Republic of South Korea; considerations of the external force and the external pressures which are constantly being brought to bear against that Republic.

As I say, to my mind and in my humble opinion, those arguments were valid some days ago. They are still valid today. However new considerations brought into focus in section 2 must enter into the consideration of the new bill by the Members of the House.

I cannot acknowledge that the administration is in any way sincere in its inclusion of aid to Formosa and Hainan in the present bill. Certainly there has been nothing in recent months which would indicate that the administration has taken any substantially different view of the chaotic situation in the Far East than that originally advocated and espoused by Alger Hiss and his associates. Nor has it taken any concrete steps which might eventually lead to the formulation of a foreign policy for that portion of the world.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In section 2 there is nothing, as I read it, which would insure that the administration will do anything, even if we adopt this measure; am I correct?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I believe the gentleman's premise is correct. There is a partially firmed-up program which is permissive and which might or might not be effectively implemented.

This is in effect a major foreign policy decision and one which in all frankness and in all honesty places the question of aid to Korea upon an entirely different basis than we found in the last measure.

In common with many millions of American citizens I feel a deep and personal feeling of shame with respect to the conduct of American foreign policy in the Far East. The Secretary of State may choose not to turn his back upon Alger Hiss as revolving with his head in the sands of unreality he waits for the dust to settle over Asia. Our preoccupation is rather with the practical question as to whether this Congress will turn its back upon a half billion people in the Far East if it fails to pass this measure. This is a confusing problem we have here, and one which must be answered by each Member out of the depths of his own conscience. If I felt that aid to Korea coupled with assistance to non-Communist China represented a step toward a sound and sane policy in the Far East, I would not hesitate to vote for the program. But enthusiastic implementation of the Korean program coupled with a reluctant, hesitant, or unwilling program for non-Communist China

can do nothing but further aggravate the world situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There are two questions I should like to ask. First, I understood the gentleman to say that the administration or someone had put a bait in this bill, a very attractive bait as I gathered from the gentleman's statement; is that right?

Mr. JACKSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I also understood the gentleman to say that was carried in section 2, perhaps, but that he thought that section 2 would be stricken; is that right?

Mr. JACKSON of California. No, I do not believe that. I said that I thought probably an effort would be made to strike section 2. I believe that effort will fail.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman means they are going to try to do that?

Mr. JACKSON of California. So I have been informed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Take the bait away while you are on the hook?

Mr. JACKSON of California. It could be viewed in that light.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. For one, I do not want to get on that hook.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Each Member is going to have to tailor his actions to fit his own conscience in this matter. That is not something that is entirely black or entirely white. It is a field in which there is a great gray area of doubt. If I vote for the measure now under consideration it will not represent an expression on my part of any confidence whatever in the Department of State or in its ability to properly administer any program in the Far East. Any department which cannot tell a cloud of dust from the shadow of disaster certainly cannot rate very highly in the opinion of the American people today.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who was paired in the negative on this measure when it was last before the House. I am not at all sure as yet how I shall vote on it when we get to a roll call. Certainly, from my standpoint, the addition of Formosa is by no means a profitable addition, and if the Formosa provision, the bait on the hook, should be removed by amendment, my inclination to vote for the bill would be substantially strengthened.

My only reason for inclining to alter my position is because of a realization that came to me after the last appearance of the bill, before the House, that representatives of the United States had, in fact, while perhaps making no commitments, given ground to the Korean Government for reasonable expectation that it was going to get the full amount of $120,000,000 for fiscal 1950. In fact, it already has got $60,000,000 or one-half. So, I am inclined to refrain from cutting the Koreans off in the middle of a program of economic rehabilitation for the current year for which they were led to believe they would receive the sum of $120,000,000. Further aid for an additional period is not here involved.

But, that is not the reason for my taking this time. I am taking this opportunity to take the floor, because I do not know whether I shall get time on the bill itself or not, to raise what seems to me a very much more fundamental point, a point that everyone of us in this House should take very closely to heart.

The most important problem that confronts the United States today is the problem of foreign policy, the problem of the physical security of the United States. It is a problem of national life or death. All that we have seen in the last 5 years in the matter of foreign policy has been unremitting and uninterrupted failure, abysmal and tragic failure. The keystone of our foreign policy has been the containment doctrine. That has utterly and completely failed. I do not have to review what has happened in the Far East. Everyone knows that. We have not even any assurance that our western European position is secure. There is good reason to doubt that if Russia were to attempt to move into western Europe now or in the foreseeable future there would be any effective resistance.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that we here are confronted with the simple question, what are the limited objectives at which American security can be achieved? What are the lines within which we can sufficiently concentrate our existing resources to successfully resist attack? Our policy of universal containment goes on today, it is perfectly obvious that war with Russia is inevitable. Our whole policy is geared to ultimate war with Russia. Yet we are expending our resources all over the world without apparent rhyme or reason, without any apparent coordination, and certainly with no assurance that proper concentration of available effort and energy and armament will be available when the time of trial comes. And our domestic policies are framed almost without thought of the realities of war. Certainly the President has not suggested that real preparation should necessitate some measure of domestic limitation upon the fuller life.

Now, it does not answer this question to call people names like isolationist or internationalist. Those epithets merely excite emotion, and emotion means confusion, and confusion makes clear thinking impossible. We must think this one through. We must make up our minds whether we are going to stick to the containment policy, which means war, whether we are prepared to make the sacrifices at home to turn this country into an armed camp in order to be really prepared for war within a reasonably near future, or whether we are going to determine at what point and within what limits we can so concentrate our available military resources so that perhaps within this great Western Hemisphere, with some bases outside, we may be in a position to exercise reasonably defensive measures so as to secure the physical integrity of the United States. In short, are we to continue a policy of unlimited objectives with limited resources, or are we to formulate a policy of limited objectives, within the limits of our means?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the bill that will soon come before the Committee of the Whole and later the House is substantially a different bill than that which was acted upon by the House a few weeks ago. We all know what the vote was then. We are aware of the results that have followed that vote.

On that occasion I made remarks which I shall not repeat now but which showed my conviction that the bill then should have been passed by the House. The remarks I made on that occasion are just as applicable to the bill before the House today.

This bill also provides for a continuance of economic relief to Formosa.

I think it is only fair to say that all of us are more or less disturbed at the world situation, and justifiably so. I recognize there can be an honest difference of opinion. I want any of my colleagues who differ with me to know that I not only thoroughly but deeply respect their views in disagreement, and I know they will have the same feeling of respect for the views I entertain.

My good friend from New York [Mr. COUDERT] in his temperate remarks—and I construe them as very temperate—stated that "our whole policy is geared to war with Russia." My friend made that observation extemporaneously, but I am sure that upon reflection he would want to clarify it. Therefore, any remarks I make in relation to that observation are not to be construed as a criticism.

When a man reads from a manuscript I place one interpretation upon his remarks, because he has reduced his thoughts to writing, but when one speaks extemporaneously I place a different interpretation at times on his remarks. I recognize that in talking extemporaneously myself I might make a short observation which would not completely portray or convey my full state of mind.

If we are in disagreement, I respect his views, but my view is that our whole policy is not geared to war with Russia. Our policy, as well as the policy of other nations that want to be free and have their people select their own form of government, is largely made up as the result of the aggressive policies of Russia, the Soviet Union. The United States and any other nation must take that fact into consideration.

To the extent that my friend meant that by way of reaction to the aggressive policy of the Soviet Union we have to give consideration to the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union, I think I would agree with him, and probably that is what he meant.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I gather that the distinguished gentleman is apparently not

in accord with the remark I made that under the present American foreign policy war with Russia is inevitable. Is that the point? I was out of the Chamber for a moment when the gentleman's opening remarks were made.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am discussing the observation which the gentleman made extemporaneously when he said that "our whole policy is geared toward war with Russia."

Mr. COUDFRT. May I comment on that?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would be very glad for the gentleman to do that. If the gentleman had been here he would have heard me say that I was not in any way making any criticism of the statement made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr COUDERT. I understand. It is merely a matter of a difference of opinion. But, Mr. Speaker, if there be any doubt of what I have in mind, I should certainly like to set such doubts at rest, as exist in the mind of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts. I mean simply this: That the policy to which we stand committed today of resistance to Russia's advance everywhere, either by military force or internal operation, can in my humble judgment only lead to war with Russia unless Russia quits first.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is different. I felt that is what the gentleman meant.

Mr COUDERT. I was contemplating, Mr. Speaker, the utter failure of that policy to date, through which we have lost throughout the Far East.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I remind the gentleman that I yielded to him to clarify the observation which he made, which he has done.

Mr. COUDERT. Will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. If the containment policy continues to result in failure so that the western-held line continues progressively to move backward, is there not some point at which the United States will be compelled to fight to maintain that policy or do we yield all the way down the line and surrender? Is there any other alternative but war?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has explained to my satisfaction the remark which he made which, taken by itself, is capable of another construction. My view is that I cannot see how we can enter into an understanding relationship, never mind a compatible relationship, with the Soviet Union as long as the Soviet Union persists in its attempt through any means, revolution, if necessary, to undermine the peoples of free nations or any nation for the purpose of overthrowing their government and imposing a Communst state upon those people and later making that government a satellite of the Soviet Union, and ultimately when they have consolidated sufficiently to even eliminate the satellite status, make them a province of the Soviet Union.

As I see the world situation there is a challenge of our way of life on the part of communism, and not of governments. Communism is a civilization. Its origin is in hate. It is anti-God and antinatural law. Seeing the mind of a Communist who starts out with the origin of hating God—how can his next thought or step be to love man? The next step is to hate man. I can understand the mind of a Communist, having that origin, who believes that the grave is the end and that there is no accountability to any Supreme Being for the way in which he performs his trust. The end justifies the means—that is the next logical thought—and if he is in a position of power he is going to use it and squelch and destroy anyone who interferes with him. I can understand that developing into the modern totalitarian state represented now by the Soviet Union, and in recent years by Nazi Germany. They were both essentially the same. The form was different, but the substance of both governments was the same. I can understand then that the destruction of the dignity of the individual is inevitable and is bound to result. We are on the other side, and we believe in God. We have different ways of believing in God; but Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, we believe in God. The next thing is, we do not hate our fellowmen. We love them. The brotherhood of man. That is our way of life. This is no sermon. Either we believe or we do not. Believing as we do, it affects our entire life, in our journey through life.

The next step is the dignity of man; respect for ourselves; some place where we have a little freedom, at least; some place where we obtain some of the benefits of our efforts.

The next step is that government is the servant of the people, not the master. So there are the two charts. They are ways of life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now we come to Korea. Let us get back to this and fit it into the picture. We helped establish the Republic of Korea. The Republic of Korea may not be a perfect government such as we would like it to be, but what other government is perfect? Our Government is not perfect, yet there is no better representative of decent government that exists in the world of today. There is none better. There is none better than our form of government. We have many things to do even in our own Government to bring about justice to our people, but it is a great Government, and none of us would want to be a citizen of any other government. Certainly none of us would want to be a citizen of the Soviet Union or of any of its unfortunate satellites.

Poland is 95 percent against the Soviet Union. Czechoslovakia is 90 or 95 percent against it. But what can the people do? They are controlled by a Communist regime that has control of the police and the internal military establishment, backed up by a powerful nation, the Soviet Union. In order to live what can those unfortunate people do? When the opportunity presents itself there is no doubt in my mind but that they will oust the Communist gang that have temporarily got control of their government.

We established the Korean Republic. It is capable of maintaining internal order. It is capable of resisting any aggression from northern Korea. Of course, if Russia should move in, that is a different proposition. Let us be practical. If Russia does that, she is serving notice to the world that she is on the march. There is no question about that. Having Korea as it is, a free people, an independent nation where it is, is a matter of national interest to the United States, as I view the world picture. I do not want to see the day come, if I can prevent it, when all of the world outside of the United States, Canada, or South America becomes dominated by Communist governments, because that situation would not be in the interest of our own Government.

The national interest of our own Government comes first. Of course, I do not like to appropriate money as we are doing. I can see what is running through some of my colleague's mind on that question. I do not like to do it. But then I say to myself, "What will happen if we do not do it?" What will happen? Where do you think the still free governments of Europe are going to turn if we fail them? What effect will that have upon the United States of America?

As I view the question, it is first, Why should we appropriate money? That is one thing. But then I say to myself, if we fail to do it, what is likely, in all probability, to happen, and what effect will that have upon the national interest of the United States of America?

That is the thought that is running through my mind.

I know my colleagues in disagreement have just as much love of America as I have, and just as much patriotism, but, as I see the world picture, we have got to do something to help these people. Of course, it has to be within our capacity. I understand that. But we have got to do something; otherwise the natural and probable consequence of our failure to do so will be harmful to the national interest of our own country.

There is one respect that a Communist or the Communist Government has, and that is respect based on fear. It is unfortunate; I regret it, but I have got to face it. I wish our Army, I wish our Navy, I wish our Air Corps were stronger than they now are, powerful though they be; I should like to see them more powerful because with all we are doing to try and rehabilitate other countries and to have friends in the future world—and our country needs friends just the same as an individual needs friends. I repeat, I would like to see a powerful force not for imperialistic reasons, because we do not stand for imperialism, but for the protection of ourselves. It is the one thing, in my opinion, that will restrain the Soviet Union from attacking and from aggression—fear in their hearts predicated upon the power of America and other free nations to defend themselves in case of attack and to defeat any attackers. So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House in

the consideration of this bill coming before us today, will pass it. I believe that failure to do so will have far-reaching effects throughout the world adverse to the best interests of the United States.

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

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the colloquy between the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] points up the inherent weakness in announcing a policy of containment. When that policy was announced there was pressure at Trieste, then it shifted to Greece and to Turkey, and when we plugged that hole in the dike, got our finger down there, then the pressure came on in Berlin, and when sufficient commitments of American strength had been made to guarantee success of the airlift, the pressure starts in China, or in Korea, or in India, and who knows where next. Today it is Berlin again.

Mr. Speaker, the basic fallacy in announcing a policy of containment is that it gives the initiative to the other side. In this instance the Soviet operates on an internal line; we operate on the periphery, and just as long as we fail to adopt a policy that will select for us time and place, Russia will continue to try to run us ragged all around the globe.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2319) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2319) to provide economic assistance to certain areas of the Far East, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, with some hesitancy today I undertake again the explanation of a bill for the relief of the Republic of South Korea. It will be recalled by all present that this bill in different form was before the House a short time since. We went along fairly well for 2 or 3 days, then the bill was defeated by one vote.

A similar bill to this had, during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, been passed by the Senate. However, that bill was quite different from the one we were at the time considering. The Senate bill provided for the authorization of an appropriation of $150,000,000 and also provided an advance on the part of the RFC of $50,000,000. It also set out a policy statement of the United States toward the Republic of Korea. It made no provision whatever for any extension of the time in which aid could be rendered to China; neither did the bill that was considered in the House and defeated, as I have stated, by a single vote.

At the time we took the vote on the bill on the former House measure the Senate had passed the bill (S. 2319) of which I have spoken. That bill was then lying on the Speaker's desk. It is that same bill, with amendments by the reporting committee, that is now before the House. Had the bill, then before the House, passed at that time instead of meeting defeat, it was my intention to ask unanimous consent to take the Senate bill from the Speaker's desk, strike out all after the enacting clause, and substitute the bill we had passed. The bill failing of passage, of course, that could not be done.

Therefore, shortly after we had considered the House measure and it failed of passage, the Senate bill having been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the committee in a few days took it up for consideration. We prepared a draft of a new bill. I am frank to say the suggestion that a provision be included in the bill extending the time in which we could expend the unexpended balance of the former appropriation made to China was made by the gentleman now addressing you. I discussed the matter with the Secretary of State and he was agreeable.

Shortly before the committee undertook consideration of this new bill my friend and beloved colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, had introduced a resolution in this House authorizing an extension of the time for expenditure of the China appropriation. The gentleman from New Jersey was well aware of the importance of that action, because we had been very bitterly criticized because of a mistaken idea that the United States had entirely forsaken Formosa and that it was no longer the intention of the Government of the United States to render any further aid to Formosa. That was a mistake, because, at the time we were discussing the bill on the floor of the House a few weeks ago, and before that time and since that time, our country, through the instrumentality of the ECA, has been steadily and continually rendering economic aid to Formosa. It is still rendering economic aid to Formosa, and if this bill is approved today it will continue to give Formosa aid as long as you extend the time for the expenditures of this unexpended balance; and if further appropriations are made, that aid under our policy will be continued to Formosa as long as conditions in that island will permit the agency of the United States Government to proceed with its program.

As you know the appropriation for aid to China, when originally made, amounted to about $400,000,000, of which amount $125,000,000 was for military aid and $275,000,000 was for economic aid. Of that amount we have expended in China, and only in those sections not under Communist domination, all of that money with the exception of approximately $104,000,000. That is the money that is now unexpended, and for which this bill will extend the time for expenditure to the 30th day of June of the present year. At that time the extension will expire. The entire matter will then be subject to review by the Congress. If Congress sees fit to further extend the time within which the money can be expended, it will do so; if it does not, then the unexpended balance will revert to the Treasury.

In the meantime I can say this, that it is intended to continue this aid to Formosa under this extension until the 30th day of June, and it is expected that not exceeding, at the outside, $10,000,000 of this $104,000,000 unexpended balance will be spent for this continuing aid. It is really anticipated, however, that actually not over $5,000,000 or $7,000,000 can possibly be expended in Formosa to advantage during that time; therefore, that is the total amount of money involved in the measure before you today, so far as China is concerned.

Now, turning to the question of Korea, I hardly think it is necessary for me to go into an extended explanation of the bill as it affects Korea. When you come to the reasons for the Congress adopting a measure of this kind, then I can say to you that the Republic of South Korea was a child not only of the United States of America, but of the United Nations. A commission was appointed by the United Nations which acted jointly with a commission appointed by the United States. States. The commission went into Formosa at a time when the Russians had come in from the north and had taken the surrender of Japanese troops to a point far south of the thirty-eighth parallel. The representatives of the United States Government protested this penetration of the Russians to the south. After insisting that the Russians return, at least to the thirty-eighth parallel, which they did, both commissions finding it was impossible to set up a government over all of the country as we desired most earnestly, it was determined that the only thing that could possibly be done was to set up a democratic government in South Korea. Therefore, with the United Nations, we proceeded to establish the Republic of South Korea along democratic lines and upon democratic principles. It will be remembered that when that government was established we placed an American alongside of every officer and of every legislator in the Korean Assembly or legislative body to show them the know-how in the conduct of a democratic government; and within less than a year the Americans were practically withdrawn from all action and from any actual participation in the new Korean Government. It was turned over to the Korean people, and they have been administering it ever since. They have been and are today making a success of it. On the floor of this House doubt has been expressed as to the ability of the Government of South Korea to defend itself in the event of in-

vasion from the north, that is, from that part of the Korean section lying north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

I can say to you that the testimony before our committee was that the Republic of South Korea is today in a condition where it has the power and ability to take care of that situation insofar as any invasion from the country north of it is concerned. Of course, it is a matter self evident to all of us that if the North Korean Communist government should be joined by that much more widespread and greater power farther north, the Russian Government, and it should throw all its power into an invasion of Korea, that would be a different proposition. But we have no reason whatever to anticipate that Russia will join with the North Korean Communist government. As long as it does not, we are assured that the present government, the only real, genuine democracy in that section of the world, to which we have pledged our aid, which we originated, which we established, and which we have assisted down to this time, will grow in strength and power.

May I express the hope that the measure before you today will meet with your approval. A fine people and a newborn but healthy and promising democratic nation are looking to us for further aid, encouragement, and guidance. So far it has been the United States in which this new government and its people have placed their faith. Let us not, at this critical time in world history, betray that trust. Let us by our action today give renewed hope to the peoples of Korea and Formosa.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the bill now before the House, S. 2319, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The purpose of the bill, as passed by the Senate, is to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to Korea. The scope of the bill as it came to the House from the Senate has been enlarged, so as to include an extension of an existing authorization to use funds already appropriated for economic assistance in non-Communist areas of China. The title to the act has accordingly been amended so as to read "An act to provide economic assistance to certain areas of the Far East."

The bill, as reported by the committee, contains two principal provisions, namely, extension of existing authorization of assistance to areas of China not under the dominance of Communist forces, and a new authorization for economic assistance to the Republic of Korea. Unless this legislation is adopted, the economic assistance programs for both China and Korea will be without funds on February 16, 1950. The bill under consideration will extend the authorizations in each instance to June 30, 1950. It is expected that before this session of Congress adjourns, further legislation may be proposed based upon subsequent study of the situation.

Notwithstanding this bill does not propose anything other than economic aid, it nevertheless brings up for consideration the entire situation that now exists in the Far East with respect to what should be the American policy in that section of the world.

The underlying reason for legislation of this sort has been the desire to stem the tide of communism. We have spent billions of dollars in the form of economic and military aid to the countries of western Europe. We have done so for the sole purpose of rehabilitating the economic condition of those countries following a disastrous war that severely weakened their economic structures, and, furthermore, to give some assurance of security against any aggressive military move that might be made against them by the Soviet government or its satellites. Insofar as this aid from our country has enabled these countries to become stabilized and made stronger to resist the inroads of communism it has been money well spent. Even though we may feel that the accomplishments resulting from our aid have not been as great or far-reaching as we would like, yet the fact remains that up to the present communism has been contained to the countries behind the iron curtain.

However, though we have given substantial aid to the countries of western Europe to withstand the ravages of communism, yet we have been exceedingly lax in pursuing the same policy in the Far East. We have stood by and permitted the forces of communism to sweep through China without a word of protest or the giving of the necessary aid to Nationalist China to resist. We seem to have forgotten that China was our ally who fought so valiantly against Japan during the last war. The policy of our State Department "to let the dust settle" before we do anything is tragic. It now is apparent that the Communist forces in China do not intend "to let the dust settle." They are on the move not only in China, taking it over entirely, but are spreading out into the countries southeast of China. It would now seem to be only a question of time before all this part of Asia will be under the domination of communism with satellite governments under the control of Moscow. How long can the republican government of South Korea withstand the infiltration of communistic doctrine or, even worse, the onslaught that may come upon it from the North Korean government that is already under the domination of Moscow? I repeat that the policy our State Department has pursued in Asia is a tragic mess.

If it is our concern as a nation to stop the spread of communism in western Europe, then it should be equally our concern to stop it wherever it shows its ugly head. Everyone is aware that communism is determined to spread its ideology throughout the world. It seeks world domination. We must fight it on every front.

I give my support to this bill, insufficient though its provisions may be, because it is right in principle as far as it goes. It is my hope, however, that it will be no distant day when those who direct our foreign policy will awaken to the fact that it is important to fight communism with all the vigor at our command. To do less is only to create danger for America and the other democracies of the world.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall anxiously await this afternoon Members who will take the well of this House and plead with eloquence for the American taxpayer. It is strange how that individual is forgotten in all of these attempts to spread our dollars all over the world.

I think the Members are becoming more conscious of the dollar shortage in this country. With a deficit of some $257,000,000,000, with no money in the Treasury, where are you going to get the money?

Mr. Chairman, I am in complete sympathy with the people in Korea and with the free people of China. I think, however, we ought to keep our eye upon the doughnut and not upon the hole. We are wrestling with a matter of foreign policy in this bill. The real effort that is being made in this bill today is to get aid for Korea. The State Department has changed its position. This bill was defeated 2 or 3 weeks ago on the floor of the House. Now it comes back with the proposition that it will extend aid to China—oh, just a little, not very much—$4,000,000 maybe or $10,000,000.

Now, the State Department does not like China any more today than it did 6 months or 2 weeks ago. It still hates the Chiang Kai-shek government Why? Because the State Department has done Chiang Kai-shek and the free people of China a grave wrong, a great injustice that it cannot retrieve.

I was interested in the remarks by the distinguished majority leader a while ago when he spoke out against the hate philosophy of communism. We all agree with him. But is it not strange that the free people of China have been sold down the river because this same State Department was insisting that Chiang Kai-shek organize a coalition government with the Communists? Do not forget that this same State Department during the administration of the military government in Korea was sending directives to the lieutenant general then in command insisting constantly that the South Koreans organize a coalition government with the Communists. How do we reconcile that position with the position taken by administration leaders in this House today? Obviously there is a wide difference of opinion between Mr. Acheson and Mr. MCCORMACK.

Let us forget about Formosa. That is not the important part of this bill. The distinguished chairman of our committee, who has worked hard on this legislation states there is not much danger that the South Korean Government will fall. I call your attention to a statement in the report which would seem to indicate there is great danger that the South Korean Government might fall because of the tie-up between the North Korean

Government and the Soviet Republic. I read from page 12 of the report:

> The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, set up in the northern part of the peninsula, has develop.d its ties with countries in the Soviet Union's bloc.

Then it goes on to name them. When the Soviet deems the South Korean Government ripe for picking it will move. And what a rich prize it will be.

Now, what are we doing if we give this money to Korea? What kind of an inducement do we provide to the Communists to take it over? I am again referring to the report. Here are the objectives of the recovery expenditures for fiscal 1950, as indicated on page 19 of the report. This is what we are going to give them. We will provide money so that there may be coal-carrying vessels; the money is going to help establish a fishing fleet; it is going to go into railroad construction, into the development of coal mines, irrigation, and reclamation projects, steam-generating plants, bridge construction, communication equipment. What a temptation to take over South Korea by the Communists. Are we going to take that chance? We are going to pour $60,000,000, between now and the end of June, into those permanent improvements. Is that what the American taxpayers expect of us? I do not believe it. And, while there is no termination date in this bill, do not forget we are working on a 3-year program, and before you get through you will be appropriating $320,000,000. That is what this legislation means, and do not be fooled by other arguments that it is only $60,000,000.

Sixty million dollars is a lot of money when you do not have it. It is a lot even when we have it.

I say to you in all frankness that I think the risk we are taking is too great; that the improvements we make are too great an enticement for the Communists to take over. Oh, they will not take over tomorrow, after we pass this legislation. No. They will wait. They will wait maybe a year. But do we not set up a beautiful proposition for them? When the plum is ripe, and when the Communists take it over all that we have done in behalf of a fine people will go for naught.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I would like to ask the gentleman regarding subsection (b) of section 3, on page 4 of the bill, wherein it states that in the event there is a coalition government, which includes one or more members of the Communist Party, or of the party now in control of the Government of North Korea. On what basis and how are we going to determine the political affiliation of individuals who may appear as a part of the Government in Korea. Who makes that decision?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would not know, to be frank, and I think that provision was inserted by a member of the committee in an effort to avoid setting up a coalition government which the committee members knew was in the minds of the State Department.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It seems to me, if the gentleman will yield further, there has been some confusion in the minds of some people in the State Department regarding just who is and who is not a Communist over in that part of the world.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I do not think there is any doubt about it. They are still changing every day. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill and I shall vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr SMITH] has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment on a statement made by the gentleman who just preceded me to the effect that, if we help Korea, sooner or later the Communists will come in and take over. To me that is an attitude of defeatism that we could take toward anything that America might attempt. If the men who fought in the armed forces had taken that attitude we would not have won the war. I believe the facts do not warrant that statement. We find that our Government had something to do with making the thirty-eighth parallel the dividing line between North and South Korea, and since the Korean Government has been set up, hundreds of thousands of North Koreans have come into the southern part of Korea because they did not like communism, and they did not want any part of it. I cannot understand the reasoning of the opponents of this bill. We hear the statement made time and time again that they desire aid for Formosa and China. Why under the sun do they not desire aid for Korea? The Korean people have proved themselves to be respectable, diligent people; and I just cannot understand it. So many of the Members speaking in opposition say they are in sympathy with these people, but I remind them that sympathy does not amount to a thing unless it is backed up by some aid, and we must take this into consideration. I heard statements made several times about military aid and other types of aid. If those Members would take into consideration the fact that all the industry of Korea practically is in the northern part they would realize that this bill is intended to help build up the industry of South Korea to make it self-supporting not only in the matter of fertilizer, as they have mentioned, but in the matter of practically everything they use.

Several times today I have heard statements made about the fight against communism. Is there a man here who opposes this bill who says that South Korea is not fighting communism? Are we going to aline ourselves with the forces that you say were against the democracies? I heard one speaker say that he hoped the argument of internationalism and isolationism would not be raised today in conjunction with this bill, yet in the very next breath he made the statement that we should bring our forces back to this country and build up America and have just a few outlying bases. As I read the dictionary that means isolationism and nothing else. I do not see how they can escape that logic or how they can fail to know what has been our attitude along those lines in the past. I heard several other comments but I will not notice them at this time.

I am compelled by my conscience to vote for this bill. From all the information I can gather our Government made a definite commitment to the people of southern Korea and if we are to keep faith with other nations we must stand by our commitments.

As my banker at home once told me, if you have the smallest obligation, to remain an honorable person, you must meet that obligation, even though it takes the shirt off your back, and that is the way I feel about America's relations with Korea today.

This newborn small nation is fighting its battle for freedom under great and tremendous odds. It is now the hour of destiny for them. Shall we stand by and not lend a helping hand knowing that a small amount of aid now will save these people from slavery—yes, even worse—by abandoning them to the four horsemen of Apocalypse—conquest, slaughter, famine, and death.

We lent a helping hand to Turkey and Greece, two small nations fighting communism, why not Korea? We hear a lot of talk about our far-eastern policy so those who are genuinely interested in the east should keep this outpost of democracy strong and on guard.

Industrial and social development has progressed tremendously since the government of occupation has gone out of Korea. They have plenty of labor—all Korea needs is more equipment and material with which to work.

We do not want Korea to go along the road the rest of the Asiatic countries have. I feel—and it is the opinion of men who should know—that if Korea is given this aid now, she will be able to withstand the onslaught of the Communists and will be able to stand as a first line of defense in the far-eastern waters.

Korea is industrious. She has proved her loyalty, and Korea is most appreciative of the help which has been given. There is no sign of her weakening.

With adequate aid Korea could be considered a strong and secure frontier of freedom and decency in a chaotic world.

I urge each and every Member of this House who believes in the inherent rights of mankind to enjoy the rights of liberty and freedom on this earth, the right to decent and humane living and a place under the sun, to vote for this bill.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, last month I told the House that launching a permanent policy for continued assistance to Korea, while retreating everywhere else in Asia, was a "strictly rat-hole-money" operation. I still think so.

Today, however, I am supporting the bill S. 2319, a similar bill from the Senate, provided the committee amendment is adopted. This amendment strikes out the whole bill and proposes to amend the title. It is now the far-eastern economic assistance bill. It includes both Korea and Formosa. It ex-

tends the extensions to the China Aid Act of 1948 until June 30 in non-Communist dominated areas, and that means Formosa. I think that the continuation of friendly Chinese control of Formosa is very important to our security. If we are to stand in Formosa, it would be unfortunate to fall back now in Korea.

This is not a commitment. In today's Washington Post is a letter by a Mr. Joseph G. Colgan, formerly Chief, Visual Propaganda, Office of Civil Information, United States Army Forces in Korea. In this article it is stated:

> Representative VORYS' contention that there is no promise, no commitment, no obligation, is bewildering. One can only assume that Mr. VORYS, in some strange way, has been denied knowledge of the American liberation and occupation of southern Korea.

He says further:

> Anyone conversant with these events must agree that there were promises, there are commitments and, above all, there is a moral obligation

Well, all I know on that is what I learned from the State Department. This is what Mr. Philander P. Claxton, Jr., of the State Department said, and you will find this on page 182 of our hearings:

> Mr. CLAXTON There is not a commitment in the sense of an international treaty or international agreement or anything that could be enforced in any world court or otherwise
>
> Mr. VORYS Or with the Government of Korea, either, there is no such commitment?
>
> Mr. CLAXTON. No, sir.
>
> Mr. JUDD. I think I used the word "promise."
>
> Mr CLAXTON. It is not as much as a promise

Therefore whatever we do here is not based on any prior commitment, promise, or obligation, according to the Department of State.

As to military aid, the President already has available almost all of the $102,640,000 appropriated last October for military aid to China and Korea and the Far East generally, including something for Iran and the Philippines.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff are out there now, so is Jessup, our trouble-shooting ambassador at large. With this bill the administration's high command can implement anticommunistic resistance while they are making up their minds on a far-eastern policy. This is a stopgap measure. It only runs for less than 5 months. It is broader, but shorter, than last month's bill. If administered along with other existing laws, it will be of direct security benefit to us. It is not strictly rat-hole money, not solely for charity, not any commitment for anything after June 30. In fact, it is not much of anything, but it seems to be the best we can do at this time toward getting this administration to make a stand against Communist aggression in the Far East.

Secretary Acheson came before our committee last week on this bill. I was not present. What I say today on this bill is not based on anything he told the committee. I do not want action on this bill to depend upon a vote of confidence or lack of confidence in Secretary Acheson for what he says or fails to say.

I want to tell the House very seriously what I think about the Acheson situation. In spite of differences in party and many disagreements on policies, Dean Acheson has been a personal friend of mine for many years, but his statement on Alger Hiss has made me search my conscience, too. I believe in standing by friends, but I think loyalty to the Government we have both sworn to uphold and defend comes ahead of my friendship for Dean Acheson, and should come ahead of any other friendship he has. I think any friend of mine who is proven disloyal to his country betrays my friendship and has turned his back on me. I hope Dean Acheson feels this way, too, but he has not said so This raises a question of his judgment as to when to talk and when to keep silent on questions of loyalty. He is not a private citizen; he is a very high official of this Government. His slightest word, the way he says it, is searched for meaning and for omissions by people all over the world. The Hiss statement was deliberate, at an official press conference. Secretary Acheson is the supreme administrative officer of his Department, with vastly increased powers under the State Department Reorganization Act passed last year. He has ultimate responsibility for security in the State Department. How much proof of disloyalty does he need before he reacts? What does he do or say when he learns about disloyalty? Does he think he can be silent on all this now and still have us listen when he speaks on security questions that involve his judgment, his conscience? Mr Acheson owes something to his other friends besides Alger Hiss. Meanwhile I am not turning my back on Dean Acheson, but I am turning a deaf ear on much that he says.

Meanwhile we must legislate for the best interests of the country, bearing in mind the type of administration we have now and are likely to have for 2 years more. I do not know what this administration will do with this bill. They have said they will keep Korea and Formosa going. This is a fragmentary start on the mutual aid policy for the free peoples of the Far East laid down by Congress last October in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. I hope a real plan is developed by next June. At best this is a stopgap. At least it is a continuation of the bipartisan congressional policy for the Far East. At least it means that Congress is not retreating in Asia.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the subject before us today is not the personal feelings of any one man, no matter what position he may hold. The question is, what are we going to do in Korea primarily, and incidentally in China or Formosa.

I have been very interested in some of the observations made here today regarding the cost of this program and the possibilities of its success or failure. Under the bill now before you, we are asking for $60,000,000 to carry on the program for aid to Korea to June 30, 1950. The total amount which will be used in this fiscal year if this bill is passed will be $120,000,000. Sixty million dollars has already been appropriated and obligated.

Some question has been raised as to where this $60,000,000 came from. I call to the committee's attention the pertinent information covering that question. Congress provided $12,500,000 by a joint resolution in June 1949, an additional $5,000,000 in August, $12,500,000 made available in a deficiency bill passed on October 12, 1949, and $30,000,000 provided on October 23, 1949, making a total of $60,000,000 which had been requested, appropriated, and allocated to date.

You all know that as far as Korea is concerned we have a commitment to the Republic of South Korea. It does not make any difference whether it is down on paper or whether or not a promise has been made. The real facts are that we moved into Korea up to the 38th parallel, that we encouraged the establishment of the present government, that we have there at the present time a military mission, and that it is to the best interests and the security of the United States that we do everything we can to see that the Republic of South Korea is maintained.

Of course we know we are taking a chance. Maybe the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct when he says that it may cost us much but we must recognize the fact that if South Korea falls it will bring communism in that country right up to the shores of American-occupied Japan. The only barrier, then, will be a narrow strait, the Strait of Shimonoseki, between South Korea and western Japan.

We have a commitment there. If we let this Government down, I think we will be going back on that commitment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said, I believe, that it was stated in the committee and in the record that South Korea could defend itself against any kind of an invasion from the north.

I think the record will clearly indicate that what was said was that if it comes to a conflict of any kind between northern and southern Korea that the southern Koreans will be well able to take care of themselves, but if the U. S. S. R. enters into the conflict on the side of the North Korean Republic, the so-called people's republic, then of course it will be a horse of another color. So we can see that insofar as the Republic of South Korea is concerned, an American-supported and American-approved republic, a republic in which we have invested a good deal in the way of money and which in turn has staked its future partly upon our help that in that area we do have a commitment even if it is not written down in black and white.

I wish this bill was purely a Korean aid bill so that we could discuss and vote on the question of Korean aid by itself.

I am sorry certain individuals have seen fit to include in this measure section 2, which provides continued assistance to Formosa, because I believe that likewise should be considered by itself.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Not being a member of the committee, I ask this question as

a matter of information. The gentleman has referred to certain persons including section 2. Was not that the recommendation of the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may have used the wrong word there. Let me put it this way. I think it was put in as a sop to people who are more interested in our China policy than in what we are trying to do in Korea. What it constitutes is the result of bills which have already been introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] in the House, and Senator SMITH and Senator KNOWLAND in the other body. My contention is, may I say to the gentleman from New York, that both of these subjects should stand or fall on their own merits and they should not be included here in an effort to get votes for a project which should be considered on its merits alone.

Mr. KEATING. I am interested in knowing who is trying to get these votes. Did the Secretary of State recommend the inclusion of section 2, or did he not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the Secretary of State did. However, about 2 or 3 weeks ago the Secretary of State told the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body, and perhaps our own committee in the House, that it was the intention of the administration to continue assistance to China. My point is that this should have been considered by itself.

Mr. KEATING. If we pass the bill with section 2 in it, is it your understanding that the administration will implement section 2 by actually extending aid to Formosa?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no question about that, as the gentleman knows if he has read the report. It is the intention of the ECA, I am informed, to spend somewhere between five and one-half and ten and one-half million dollars to carry on the ECA aid program in Formosa primarily in the rural reconstruction program until June 30 of this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, let us reason together. I feel when we vote for this bill today we will vote for our national defense—for our home and the protection of our Nation at a point where we are most vulnerable and where defense is most essential and required for our entire west coast defense and Pacific possessions. I wish to state I was in Korea as late as December 1. Before we went to Korea we were in Tokyo. I also wish to state that while in Tokyo we were informed by General MacArthur's headquarters that Formosa and Korea were the key to the defense of our Pacific possessions and our mainland on the Pacific coast.

While I am not quoting any general, I will say that 50 of the generals and officers who will have to defend this great Nation of ours if we get into war with Russia are of the opinion that Formosa and Korea must be defended by America. We were informed that Formosa must never be permitted to fall into the hands of an enemy and that it is and should remain part of Japan until the peace treaty is signed.

Let us go a little further. As far as surrendering Formosa is concerned, that is still an open question. Just because Dean Acheson wants to give it to the Communists is no reason that the American people will stand for it. I am sure the President will finally find out what the facts are. I am sure the President is considering the question of Formosa very seriously and I hope if our committee goes to see him he will consider it far more.

We owe a moral responsibility and obligation to Korea. We, the American people, divided her and gave the northern part to Russia, and with it the hydroelectric power and their coal mines. Korea is self-sustaining as far as food and clothing is concerned, but she needs help to reestablish these hydroelectric plants and coal mines that we, the American people, gave away when we divided her.

I have consistently opposed all authorizations and appropriations to any inefficient and sponging European nations infested by communism; but we have no such situation in Korea. Their people are patriotic and united against communism, and they can defend themselves unless Russia steps in. They are our friends. When Russia steps in, if she ever loses her head to that extent, then the conflagration, the world fire, will start, and we will be lucky to have Korea withstand them or withhold them even for a few weeks so that we can get ready, because it is in the Pacific where the conflagration is going to start, if it does start.

At Tokyo we were further told by General MacArthur's headquarters that we have General Roberts in Korea with 500 Army officers of the United States of America drilling the southern Koreans. We were told that Russia was arming North Korea and that we were keeping pace in South Korea. Get that. We have 500 officers under General Roberts training the Koreans.

Then, while I was in Korea—and I was there later than my friend Miller; and if Mr. Miller got the correct impression of what General Roberts said, then General Roberts had changed his opinion, because when I was there General Roberts asked us not to withdraw from Korea, but to give him more top officers from the United States Army with which to train the Korean army for the possible conflict. In Tokyo we were told that that conflict may not be too far distant, unless there is a change of public opinion in Russia.

Again we were told that Sakhalin was being fortified by the Russians; that they were working night and day. What for? That is the island half of which we gave to Russia together with the Kurile Islands. Every act of Russia shows that she is preparing not only to take Korea but to subdue the civilization of the world. Korea and Formosa are two of the strategic points that we need badly in case of this conflict. I still hope that Russia has brains enough to avoid it, but you cannot make peace with a man-eating tiger nor with a tiger that is eating up nations. We must take a firm stand.

Again, in Honolulu I met Admiral Radford. Our committee had met many admirals and other officers under him before that. He and the other admirals and officers were in perfect accord with the position of General MacArthur's headquarters that both Formosa and Korea are key positions and necessary for our defense on the west coast.

But my friends say that Russia can take Korea overnight. They will do nothing of the kind; but if they try to, then world war III is on. Then we can be happy if we have somebody to defend or to help us in the Pacific. About the only friends we have in the world today are perhaps the Japanese, the Koreans, and Filipinos.

Admiral Radford did a great deal of fighting in World War II. Are we going to dismiss as lightly as Mr. Acheson does the opinion of the men who will defend this Nation on the water and on the land in case of trouble? I will say that the American people and this Congress will not so lightly take the views of Acheson. As far as General Roberts is concerned, let me say that we reviewed the Korean Army on parade with the general and the President of the Republic of Korea.

General Roberts expressed no fear that North Korea even if helped by Communist China, would be able to take South Korea overnight. Of course, if Russia stepped in, that would change the situation. If she does, then I repeat world war III is on. I hope this will not happen, but if it happens and it will happen if we keep running away, then we will have to face the issue and we will need not only Korea but Formosa as well.

Let me assure you also that it is not too late to save both Formosa and Korea. The American people have the final say in that, and why should we be so niggardly with Korea when just recently—get this, now—the ECA and the RFC financed the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. with the taxpayers' money to build a new car to the extent of $44,400,000. More recently still, the same Federal setup, the ECA and the RFC, promised the Ford Motor Co. $22,600,000 of the taxpayers' money for its subsidiary plant in England. That alone makes up the $60,000,000 that Korea is entitled to have, and those two big corporations ought to be able to take care of themselves; they have got enough American dollars.

Again, the ECA has recently handed $5,963,000 to the Reynolds Mining Co. for bauxite-mining operations in Jamaica. Here again helping out the British whom we have already given something more than $60,000,000,000 since World War I. In addition Great Britain is asking for another $8,000,000,000. Most of you who are so critical of this $60,000,000 for which we owe a moral obligation to Korea I am sure will be found voting for that $8,000,000,000 for Britain.

There is no reason for deserting Korea now; she is our ally, she is our friend. I repeat we are under a moral and a legal obligation to support a nation that we set up and whose deplorable conditions we have created. Again if we are intelligent we will listen to the defenders of our Nation, General MacArthur and

his staff, and General Roberts, who is in Korea, and also Admiral Radford and his staff.

In conclusion, permit me to express the hope that we will vote today for our own national defense. This is a bill for our national defense; it is a bill that will protect us in case of attack in the Far East, and there is where it is going to start if we ever get into world war III.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I merely wanted to say that I am glad the gentleman has clarified his position and as to why he voted. I am sure he did not try to vote both ways last time.

Mr. LEMKE. I will say that unfortunately I was away to attend my brother's funeral, and that I was paired for the bill while I was here; and I voted "No" on recommittal and I do not believe there is any question as to how I voted or where I stand on this issue.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. KRUSE].

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Chairman, I shall speak for just a few minutes in support of this bill. I had not intended to speak at all in view of the fact that I expressed my support of this legislation when it was before us a few weeks ago.

Insofar as the question of economic assistance generally is concerned, we have been spending billions of dollars to assist nations all over the world. For various reasons I cannot subscribe to all the expenditures that have been made while, at the same time, I do subscribe to the laudable purpose behind our assistance. Among justifications for our assistance, insofar as our foreign-aid program is concerned, there is one which I feel stands out clearly over and above all others, a principle or criterion which should be clearly established prior to any such aid. I am referring to the necessity for an absolute determination and willingness in all respects of the recipient nations to help themselves; in short, let us thoroughly examine the character of the people whom we propose to aid. If there is no such willingness or determination on the part of the receiving nations, then certainly we can hope for little results no matter how good may be our own intentions. I am also constrained to say that I do not believe that some of the people who have been receiving our aid have been cooperating as they should have in order that they might put their own houses in order and thereby also help to relieve the American taxpayer.

However, I like a fighter and I am willing to help those who will fight for themselves. I can assure you that the Korean nation is a nation that is willing to fight its own battles and to help itself to the best of its ability.

While I was in Korea recently I made a trip to the thirty-eighth parallel, the Communist battlefront, with a member of our Military Advisory Commission, a colonel from the State of Ohio. I saw the Korean people in the countryside and in the trenches. We traveled in a jeep with no previous announcement of our trip so there was certainly no prearranged plans to give us a false impression. May I say to the American people that we have no greater friends anywhere, at least in the Far East, than the Korean people. Even the little children along the countryside waved at us and recognized us as Americans. The Korean troops were well trained and their morale was high. They reminded me of a group of American marines and to me there is no greater tribute that can be paid. A few weeks before we arrived at the thirty-eighth parallel, several of the Korean troops had strapped dynamite on their backs and plunged headlong into Communist pill boxes and destroyed them. That is typical of the spirit in Korea today. These people are ultra-nationalistic; they believe in freedom, a democratic form of government and are ready and willing to sacrifice and fight toward achieving their goal.

This legislation deserves our support, and I trust and hope that we will demonstrate by our action that we are willing and determined to stand by this gallant nation, a nation of fighters and a nation willing to help itself.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the House is taking a second thought on Korean aid and from all appearances it is fixed in its determination and will pass this bill. Perhaps the occasion can be improved, because we have debated the Korean aid matter pretty thoroughly already, by taking a look generally at where our foreign policy is taking us and understanding that this particular bill is fitted into a very much larger framework and is not quite as isolated as some would have us believe.

We have heard a lot of expressions here, including "pouring money down a rat hole," and about our policy of containment. Not too often has American foreign policy been put in terms of a word which people could feel. I would say now that American foreign policy as we see it developing, and as this Korean aid bill demonstrates it to be developing, is a human policy.

It is a fact that in Korea as in Berlin, in Korea as in Trieste, in Korea as in any other place in the world where America's interests are concerned and where the forces of freedom fight, the Soviet Union could if it desired, if it wished to mount all of its power by air and on land, roll back the forces of freedom right there on the spot, crush them and take over. As it could also take over western Europe, we might argue that there should be no European recovery program, that there should be no Mutual Defense Assistance Act, because the Russian legions could roll over these areas any time they wished to. Indeed, they probably can do so. But the Soviet Union knows that the minute it does that, it is taking on another world war.

So, we have one of two choices: Either we do nothing about those areas and let the totalitarian forces of what we consider to be the reaction, which is communism, triumph in those areas by default, because the people in them are starving, because they are in despair, because they have been completely infiltrated—just exactly what would be true in South Korea if we do not pass this bill—and we lose them by default, or we help them, and if we do that and take the chance, if the Communists want war, they must come and ask for it. We will have to first lend these people our support based on the human policy by rehabilitating their countries and their institutions, and that is the fundamental decision we come to. But we do not make it blindly. We already have had a precedent in the Atlantic Pact, and I believe it must necessarily be followed by a Pacific Pact, our precedent is this: We say that until these countries are built up to the point where they can run their own military policy, to the point where they can maintain their internal defense against the present land might of the Soviet armies, until that time we will cover them with our pledge, with our commitment, with our armies, with our air force, and that our armies will come to their defense if the Soviet should attack.

Now, that is a very wise policy. We are already committed to a great military establishment, and we can undertake to utilize that great military establishment, in the defense of the Atlantic, and I believe we must do it in the Pacific as well. We know very well that if the Soviet Union should move into the Pacific, we would have to oppose, so that we might as well say so, and give the Pacific nations this commitment. Having given them this commitment, which is the best we can do, we leave free the necessary resources which we are not using to militarize them, but to rehabilitate them and give them both the moral, political, and economic advantages from which they can grow to a stature which will enable them to participate adequately and effectively if need be in their own military defense.

It is a cohesive world policy. We may falter, we may make many mistakes, as we did in China, but we must, first and foremost, recognize the totality of our policy and see that it is going in one direction in an organized and orderly way.

In my opinion, the reason the House is having a second thought on the Korean aid bill is because many a Member who voted against the bill before now sees that he was voting against the policy out of context; that we could not go in any other direction; that we were so firmly committed in this direction; and, what is more, that this direction had been successful—that we could not deviate. And let us never forget that the policy of helping economic recovery has been successful. Western Europe is in better shape today than it has been since the war ended; and if we pass this bill and also go forward on the point 4 policy, we will continue to find the free world in better and better shape than it has ever been before.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement. I wonder whether it does not follow from what the gentleman has said in regard to Berlin, for instance, and Korea, that

the reasons we were given for withdrawal of our troops from Korea do not now hold up; in other words, we were told that it was an indefensible position and therefore we should retire. Obviously, the gentleman is quite correct that our forces in Germany could be overwhelmed also. Would it not have been rather helpful to the Koreans if we had left some of our troops there, as we did in Germany?

Mr. JAVITS. The difficulty with answering that question is that the United Nations asked that troops be withdrawn, and I say that though the gentleman may be right, our policy in following the lead of the United Nations I believe should even be paramount to the consideration which the gentleman has named. I think we face a unique situation, and I believe we must get to the point where we will have a Pacific Pact. I do not think there is any question about the fact that the whole world must know that if the Soviet Union is going to move aggressively with her armed forces, that we would react in kind. That is the best we can give the free peoples of the world now. We must realize that under present circumstances they must have military cover. They must know, too, that our policy is a human policy; that we intend to build up the lives and fortunes of people to the point where they can defend themselves, and that our responsibility in the world, as we see it, is not to drive them, which is what the Soviets do, and keep them poor for our own benefit and aggrandizement. That is the whole and consistent policy in which this Korean aid bill fits, as a necessary and essential part, and therefore I believe that is the fundamental reason for the House's second thought about it. Members of the House have finally realized just how important this was to the whole future of our Nation and to the whole future of the freedom which we are fighting for in the world which is left to us.

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

Mr. JAVITS I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman made a very significant statement a moment ago when he said that western Europe was in better shape than it had ever been before. Did the gentleman mean that literally?

Mr. JAVITS. Europe is in better shape than it has been since the end of the war in 1945, is what I mean to emphasize; in fact, since the beginning of the war in 1939.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was sure the gentleman had misspoken himself.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman. The reality of the situation remains a fact, however. We are not face to face with the glories of Europe in the days before Napoleon, we are face to face with the misery and the decay and the difficulty and the destruction of Europe which resulted from World War II, and which faced us in 1945.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under what conditions or what pressure did the United Nations ask that we withdraw our troops from Korea?

Mr. JAVITS. It was not pressure. On the contrary, it was a very wise political decision, for this reason: The only part of Korea which had free elections for the election of a democratic government was South Korea. The United Nations, which had urged and which had fought for and worked for free elections, felt that in all good faith it had to follow through on the sequel of free elections. Having recognized that the government in South Korea was a free and democratic government, it was only right that occupying troops be withdrawn from there. The United Nations asked as well that troops be withdrawn from North Korea. Of course, for all practical purposes the forces in North Korea remain the direct agencies of the Soviet Government and obey its orders. In my opinion, our withdrawal from South Korea served as grist for our mill, to show to all the people of Asia, who are constantly worried about the good faith of the great powers like the United States, that we do have good faith, that we do mean what we say, that we do not intend to be a colonial power, and that when the conditions for withdrawal are right, indeed we do withdraw.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We still have troops in Germany?

Mr. JAVITS We do.

Mr CRAWFORD. Have they had any free elections, so-called, in western Germany?

Mr. JAVITS They have.

Mr. CRAWFORD Why did not the United Nations ask that we withdraw our troops from there?

Mr. JAVITS. Because Germany is a conquered country which has on three occasions been the aggressor and broken the peace of the world, and she still has a very long way to go to assure those she almost destroyed of her future, no one in the United States or the United Nations yet knows just how the situation in Germany will turn out.

Mr. GORDON. Mr Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr BURNSIDE].

Mr. JONAS Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present

The CHAIRMAN. Obviously a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 38]

Abbitt	Carroll	Gross
Allen, Ill.	Case, N. J.	Gwinn
Andresen, August H.	Celler	Halleck
Andrews	Christopher	Hand
Bailey	Cole, N. Y.	Hébert
Barrett, Pa.	Cooley	Heller
Barrett, Wyo.	Dague	Herter
Bates	Davies, N. Y.	Holifield
Biemiller	Dawson	Hope
Bland	Dingell	Jennings
Bolling	Dolliver	Keogh
Bolton, Ohio	Engel, Mich.	Kirwan
Brooks	Engle, Calif.	Kunkel
Brown, Ga.	Fogarty	Lichtenwalter
Buckley, N. Y.	Gary	Lovre
Bulwinkle	Gathings	McDonough
Camp	Gillette	McGrath
	Gilmer	McSweeney
Monroney	Potter	Smathers
Morton	Powell	Smith, Ohio
Nixon	Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Va.
Pace	Sabath	Towe
Passman	Sadowski	Vursell
Patman	St. George	Wadsworth
Patterson	Scott, Hardie	White, Idaho
Plumley	Short	Wilson, Ind.
Poage	Simpson, Pa.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 2319, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 352 Members responded to their names, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I was one of a committee of five from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that examined the use of Government funds in the Far East. This committee was especially interested in checking the economy and the political conditions as they affect the military situation in the Far East. I wish now to answer with that background some of the questions that have been raised.

A few of the men that have been opposing this bill would give us the only alternative of immediate war. As to the military position in South Korea, it is decidedly sound, unless Russia should throw the whole weight of her force against South Korea. In South Korea they have 60,000 well-trained troops. We reviewed those troops. They have 60,000 second-line troops. They have 2,000,000 in the Youth Corps They have more than 10,000 in the cities who are well trained to handle arms.

Still another question has been raised, as to cotton. The southern Members might be interested to know that $14,000,000 has been assigned to purchase cotton, an item that is very much needed in South Korea. Some $10,000,000 is needed for oil, and that is also in this list.

I might say here that the most God-fearing nation in all of Asia is vitally affected by this program that we are trying to get passed here today.

Mr. Chairman, the issue of Korea is not a distant issue. Korea may be thousands of miles away, but it is close to the interests of every American. It is close to our interests because it is one of the many complicated situations which affect the peace of the world, and whether we are to have peace in our time, or war in our time, is a question that no American can treat with indifference.

In previous debate on aid to Korea we heard some gentlemen of the House argue that the money asked for Korea could be better spent for worth-while projects in the United States. Their argument seems to be that no money should be appropriated to back up our foreign policy until enough money has

been appropriated at home to take care of everyone's pet domestic project. The fallacy in that argument is obvious. How much good would any of our domestic policies do us if war should come, with all the horrors that recent scientific advances can produce? If war comes, none of us will escape the dangers of bullets and bombs, H-bombs and biological warfare, and perhaps other weapons not yet dreamed of. We cannot ignore the possibility of war, withdraw into a shell of ignorance, and concern ourselves only with our internal affairs. One of our first considerations must be how to conduct ourselves so as to prevent the outbreak of war and at the same time preserve our ability to live our own lives the way we want to and conduct our own affairs without dictation from a conquering superpower.

The question is, then, will aid to Korea help us attain our twin objectives of peace and freedom?

Those who oppose the bill under consideration will probably say "No," pointing to the obvious fact that Korea could not defend itself in the face of an attack from China and Russia. But these people seem to forget that we are trying to preserve the peace, and talk as though we were already at war and are only trying to establish military positions. That attitude is entirely wrong, and it is dangerous. Military positions are not the only consideration. When we are trying to preserve the peace, other factors are just as important or even more important.

I do not believe the argument should end with the military value of Korea, though I believe it will be of some assistance to have these 21,000,000 loyal, intensely patriotic people on our side in any struggle. The argument is, Can we withdraw and throw this nation to the arms of a waiting Russia, or shall we take a stand for people who still believe in peace and not in aggression?

The southern Koreans are friends of ours. They trust us because we have befriended them and encouraged every effort they have made to establish a true democracy.

On May 10, 1948, more than 90 percent of the voters went to the polls and voted to elect their national assembly, despite a Communist campaign of terrorism designed to keep them from the polls. From a slate of 942 candidates they elected 192 members to the assembly. An ancient nation was reborn. Here is an example of true democracy that we would like to see become an example to all the people of Asia. How can we justify a blow to their morale such as the defeat of this aid bill would be?

Korea is the farthest outpost in the world-wide struggle of democracy and liberty against communism and tyranny. What effect would it have on the rest of the world—and on the countries of Asia—if we were to abandon this struggling young nation to internal chaos and external pressures and threats? The non-Communist nations of the world would feel that they could not expect any help from us, and would lose the will to resist the advance of communism. We would soon find ourselves isolated and unable to resist Russian aggression anywhere.

It is true that we probably could not hold Korea in event of an overt attack by Russia. But if such an attack occurred it would be such a breach of the law of nations that it would mean total war. It is not likely that Russia would risk such a war in the near future—at least not until she felt that the rest of the world was so weak that she could conclude it quickly and successfully. The danger to Korea comes more from Communists within the country itself, and perhaps from the Communist troops of North Korea. These are the dangers that economic aid to Korea is designed to combat. A strong republic in southern Korea with a stable economy will have a good chance of withstanding these dangers successfully. Without economic aid from the United States, it is doubtful that it could do so.

President Rhee himself told me that he could not build a parliament building, but he could blow it up. The reason communism has been so effective in Asia is that it is much easier to tear down than to build. That is why the task of Korean leadership is so difficult. They must build and we must assist.

The question, Mr. Chairman, is not one of altruism and idealism; it is a question of vital concern to every one of us. Our own interests are at stake, for it is in our interests to see that free, peace-loving nations can maintain their independence in the face of internal Communist terrorism and external Communist threats. If such nations can remain free, our position in the world will be much more secure and the chances for peace will be much brighter.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot abandon Korea without betraying ourselves and the entire world.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I represent the Twenty-second District of Pennsylvania where some 300,000 residents depend wholly on an economy based on two large industries, coal and railroads. Frankly, we who reside in central Pennsylvania are very much worried over the future of coal mining and our anxiety extends to related industries.

We are worried because the coal market is losing ground to other fuels such as oil and natural gas. With each work stoppage in the coal fields the industry loses customers some of which are never regained. According to the National Coal Association in the last 10 months of 1949 the coal industry lost better than 15,000,000 net tons of railroad fuel and nearly 7,000,000 net tons in the production of electric energy. These losses make a total of 22,000,000 net tons of coal. In wages the loss of 22,000,000 net tons of coal represents a loss in wages to coal miners of $56,000,000, which is equivalent to 15,000 coal-mining jobs at about $3,800 a year.

Looking at the consumption of coal in general, in addition to the loss of railroad fuel and electric energy, many industries have converted from coal to natural gas and thousands of private homes have likewise converted to natural gas with the result that in the past 10 months bituminous coal has lost in round figures about 100,000,000 tons of its markets.

For example, let us consider the replacement of coal as a fuel on class I railroads. The following table tells the story of the gradual decline in the consumption of coal on the class I railroads.

TABLE 1.—*Fuel and power for locomotives (class I steam railways)*[1]

[Total coal equivalents (net tons)]

	1939		1948		August 1949	
	Tons	Percent of total	Tons	Percent of total	Tons	Percent of total
Coal	85,132,845	76.7	102,190,437	53.6	4,876,199	38.8
Fuel oil	18,559,365	16.7	30,282,370	15.9	1,565,600	12.5
Diesel fuel	2,319,430	2.1	50,393,013	26.4	5,477,445	43.6
Electric power	4,988,795	4.5	7,820,300	4.1	634,942	5.1
Total	111,000,435	100.0	190,686,120	100.0	12,554,186	100.0

[1] Includes all quantities purchased and produced whether for locomotives, station, shop, or other use.

Source: Interstate Commerce Commission

You will note from the table above that in 1939, 76.7 percent of fuel and power for steam locomotives of class I railways was obtained from using coal; while in 1949 the percentage dropped to 38.8 percent or in actual tons a decrease of more than 80,000,000 tons of coal.

I also call attention to the fact that Diesel fuel which in 1939 represented 2.1 percent of the fuel used by class I railroads, increased in 1949 to 43.6 percent. In other words Diesel fuel has been substituted for coal to an alarming degree.

In the field of electric energy it is interesting to note that the consumption of coal decreased 15 percent during 1949 over 1948; while consumption of natural gas increased 15.4 percent and fuel oil increased 46.4 percent.

The total production of electric energy increased 3.3 percent during 1949 over 1948.

The following table will give some idea of the consumption of coal for the production of electric energy:

TABLE 2.—*Consumption of fuel for production of electric energy*

	Jan 1 to Oct 31		Ratio 1949 to 1948
	1948	1949	
			Percent
Coal (net tons)	82,184,075	69,852,630	85 0
Fuel oil (barrels)	34,877,386	51,047,730	146 4
Natural gas (M cubic feet)	401,166,173	463,070,634	115 4

Source: Federal Power Commission

Your attention is called to the fact that the table shows a loss of about 12,500,000 tons of coal for the period from January 1, 1948 to October 31, 1949. During this same period the increase in the use of fuel oil and natural gas reached new heights.

When speaking of the substitution of fuel oil and natural gas for the production of electric energy, let us consider what has happened in 38 public-utility plants in the United States where conversion from coal to other fuels has occurred.

The following table shows the quantities of the various fuels used in the 38 plants where there has been either partial or complete change from coal to other fuels during the first 9 months of 1949:

TABLE 3.—*Fuel consumption in 38 electric utility plants in the United States where conversion from coal to other fuels has occurred*

	Jan 1 to Sept 30		Ratio, 1949 to 1948
	1948	1949	
			Percent
Coal (net tons)	19,960,536	13,570,110	68 0
Fuel oil (barrels)	9,586,428	23,347,458	243 5
Gas (M cubic feet)	44,719,520	70,601,456	157 9

Source: Federal Power Commission

The table also shows the amount of coal consumed at these 38 plants has decreased 32 percent, while natural gas increased 57 9 percent and fuel oil increased 143 5 percent during 1949 over 1948. In net tons better than 6,000,000 tons of coal have been replaced by fuel oil and natural gas.

The cement industry provides another example of what is happening to the use of coal as a fuel. In the first 8 months of 1949, as compared to the same period in 1948, coal decreased 4.1 percent, fuel oil decreased 2 5 percent, and natural gas increased 20.7 percent.

The following table provides further information on the consumption of fuels in the cement industry:

TABLE 4.—*Consumption of fuels in the cement industry*

	Jan. 1 to Aug 31		Ratio, 1949 to 1948
	1948	1949	
			Percent
Coal (net tons)	5,484,426	5,261,022	95.9
Fuel oil (barrels)	3,061,566	2,985,316	97.5
Natural gas (M cubic feet)	45,780,157	55,250,519	120.7

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines.

So far our discussion has confined itself to the consumption of fuels by railroads, by the cement industry, and the production of electric energy.

Now let us discuss the trend with respect to converting from coal to oil and natural gas on the part of industry and domestic consumers. A check with the Census Bureau shows that from January 1 to September 30, 1949, total shipments of oil burners in units were 393,756. A break-down of this figure shows 376,404 residential burners and units and 17,352 burners and units for commercial users. Comparable figures for the same period in 1948 are total shipments 293,537 of which 273,199 were for residential use and 20,338 for commercial use.

While shipments of oil burners and units show a substantial increase in 1949 over 1948 consumption of fuel oil for the first 10 months of 1949 amounted to 651,000,000 barrels, a decrease of 32,000,000 barrels from the 683,000,000 barrels used in 1948. This decrease is attributed to mild weather, and conversion to natural gas.

If you convert the 651,000,000 barrels of oil to coal, it represents a loss of 109,000,000 tons of coal market.

A study of the 1949 Report of the American Gas Association reveals that natural gas enjoyed its greatest year and looks to 1950 to spark the greatest advance in the industry's history.

According to the report natural gas pipe lines, which now approximate 260,000 miles, furnish gas to the heavily populated northern and eastern sections of the United States in a volume of 3,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas annually. For the calendar year of 1950 the industry plans to spend $1,800,000,000 for an extension of its pipe lines.

It may be well to mention at this point that the pipe-line network of the gas industry is now longer than the Nation's point-to-point railroad lines. As the result of this amazing expansion of the gas industry, the report shows that 6,600,000 American families are now using gas for space and house heating. It is estimated that 693,000 new gas-heating customers will be added in 1950.

During the past year, according to the Report of the American Gas Association, gas-furnace sales were 35 percent greater than in 1948, gas-heating boilers 30 percent greater than in 1948, and gas conversions were 500 percent greater than in 1948. At the moment unfilled orders for conversions from coal to gas are 20 times greater than in 1948.

In summarizing this analysis of the American Gas Association report, the total number of customers in 1949 was 23,746,000, or an increase of 75 percent over 1948.

In revenues the industry enjoyed a 7.3-percent increase over its income of 1948.

Using the industry's delivery of 3,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas during 1949, and converting it to coal we have the equivalent of 123,000,000 tons of coal. The expansion of the gas industry in 1949 as compared to 1948 has destroyed in 1 year's time 123,000,000 tons of coal market.

In my opening remarks I stated it was safe to say that in the past 8 or 10 months bituminous coal has lost in round figures about 100,000,000 tons of its markets.

One hundred million tons of coal represents $257,000,000 in wages of 67,632 coal miners, whose average wage is $3,800 a year.

The effect on railroad employment, because of the conversion to gas and oil, is revealed by the fact that the 84,722 jobs of railroaders have been destroyed. The loss in wages to these railroad employees, who earn on an average of $300 monthly, amounted to a total of $305,000,000 annually.

Those of us who live in the great bituminous coal fields of Pennsylvania truly understand what the loss means of $257,000,000 in miners' wages and the loss of $305,000,000 in the wages of railroaders. Frankly, the loss of these earnings on the part of the coal miner and railroader is so destructive that the future of our communities alarms all of us.

Using my home town, Altoona, Pa., as an example, let us see thet effect of the loss of the wages of coal miners and railroaders.

The table which follows shows the monthly earnings and the number of employees of the Pennsylvania Railroad at the Altoona Works during the year 1949.

TABLE 5.—*Number of employees and pay roll, Altoona works, 1949*

Month	Number of employees	Earnings
January	12,299	$3,403,712 26
February	11,563	2,924,389 49
March	11,120	1,891,179 46
April	11,101	3,043,143 80
May	11,081	2,288,188 09
June	5,303	2,625,085 29
July	5,628	1,728,378 63
August	7,444	2,136,925 77
September	7,538	1,721,041 76
October	1,751	547,673 14
November	2,825	799,956 63
December	6,912	1,985,356 44

You will observe that in January 1949, 12,297 employees were on the pay roll earning $3,403,712.26. In succeeding months the number of persons employed decreased greatly until October when only 1,751 employees were on the pay roll earning $547,673.14. At the close of the calendar year 1949 about 50 percent of those working in January were on the pay rolls. The loss of earnings to Pennsylvania Railroad employees in Altoona during 1949 naturally was reflected in the economic life of Altoona. According to the general business indicators compiled by the Bureau of Business Research of the Pennsylvania State College the retail volume of business in Altoona for the first 11 months was far from being normal as evidenced by the following table:

General business indications from the month of January through November 1949

January	+6
February	+1
March	−7
April	−5
May	−3
June	−21
July	−16
August	+9
September	−34
October	+4
November	−35

What I say about Altoona can be applied to other communities in my congressional district and to Pennsylvania in general. During the course of my discussion I have tried to point out how coal is losing its market. I feel I would be remiss in my duty if I did not try diligently to find a solution to this pressing problem.

In my study of the problems that confront the coal industry I found that there are three principal factors that have led to present-day conditions. These factors are as follows:

First. A natural trend on the part of consumers to convert from coal to substitute fuels.

Second. The lack of dependability on the production of coal due to continued work stoppages in the industry.

Third. Increased cost of coal due to wages, transportation, and so forth, is responsible for commercial and residential users to convert to oil and natural gas.

Fourth. Government subsidization of substitute fuels such as hydropower furnished by the Tennessee Valley Authority commonly called TVA.

In addition to the above factors, we have the menace of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. If this project is constructed, it will permit the shipment of foreign-mined coal to inland cities of the United States, including Buffalo, Erie, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, Chicago, and several other cities.

As part of the St. Lawrence seaway project, the hydroelectric plant proposed to be constructed at Messina, N. Y., will furnish hydroelectric energy that will displace the coal now used by industries in various cities in up-State New York.

We cannot forget the thousands of railroaders who will lose their jobs as the result of foreign ships carrying to inland cities freight now handled by American railroads from such coastal ports as Norfolk, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston.

The factors I have outlined present a real challenge to the coal industry. It is my hope that this discussion will awaken the present administration, Congress, coal operators, coal miners, and the American public to the menacing future of this bituminous-coal industry. Unless coal regains its markets, Pennsylvania is destined to have many ghost towns and thousands of coal miners, railroaders, and employees of related industries face the destruction of their jobs and the means of earning their livelihood.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both sections of this bill; both section 2, which continues aid to Chiang Kai-shek, and section 3, aid to the rulers of South Korea.

On page 8 of the report we are told by the committee that the expenditure that may be involved here will be anywhere from five to ten million dollars in aid to Chiang Kai-shek. Let us consider that a moment before we go to the section on Korea.

We have spent more than $3,000,000,000 since VJ-day to save Chiang Kai-shek when Chiang Kai-shek was on the mainland of China. We spent over $3,000,000,000 when Chiang Kai-shek had full control of the Government of China, its resources, and held tyrannical rule over its people. Three billion dollars failed to save Chiang Kai-shek on the mainland of China. Now it is proposed that, with $10,000,000 at most, we may save Chiang Kai-shek on the island of Formosa. It seems to me that we fail to realize the real causes for our failure. We failed to save Chiang Kai-shek because the people of China, people everywhere in Asia, are throwing off the shackles of foreign control, exploitation, and tyranny, and are establishing for themselves, through their own native revolutions, if you please, their own governments. I say that this Congress has failed to recognize fundamental principles; that the people of China are entitled to their revolution just as much as the people of the United States were entitled to their revolution back in 1776.

What has been the result? The people of China have established their revolution and are now consolidating it. We are not going to halt it. We are not going to stop it either with hydrogen bombs or with the $10,000,000 to Chiang Kai-shek on the island of Formosa. The corrupt, tyrannical government of Chiang Kai-shek is something of the past. It is finished. It has been done in by the people of China. We in the United States must not forget what history has taught us, that never has the defense of tyranny and corruption anywhere in the world been in the interest of the people of the United States. We here are continuing the defense of tyranny and corruption by going to the aid of Chiang Kai-shek. In doing so we continue to ally ourselves with a crooked Fascist dictator against 400,000,000 Chinese people, their nation, and their friends all over Asia.

What I have said about China is equally applicable to section 3 of the bill. We have heard talk about the defense of democracy in Korea. We are told that this $60,000,000 must be used for the rulers of South Korea in the defense of democracy. First of all, what is the situation with respect to the people of Korea? I wish the Members of this House, before voting on this so-called Korean aid bill, would read both volumes I and II of report of the United Nations Commission on Korea. That Commission had for its aims and was established to bring about the unification of North and South Korea. That purpose was in complete conformity with the will of the people of all Korea, for you can well recognize that you cannot just go into a country, draw a line, and divide the country in two; the United Nations recognized it, and they recognized that what the people of North and South Korea wanted was independence and a unified nation. This Commission therefore went into Korea. It has made a report consisting of two volumes. I read to you just what it found with respect to the attitude of the present government that we are here now seeking to aid toward the fundamentals that the people of Korea want, namely, unification of their country and independence. They said:

The government—

Referring to the government of South Korea—

has not only made it clear that they would not participate in official discussions with the north looking to unification, but has also indicated that it frowned on unofficial efforts in this behalf. It has made clear that it views any suggestions for north-south discussion, even of an unofficial and most tentative kind, as a form of disloyalty.

Then, on page 34 of the report, volume 1, under D—

The people of Korea * * * have a passionate longing for unity and independence and have a profound desire for the peaceful unification of their country. The division of Korea has resulted in adverse economic consequences in the south. The aftermath of World War II would have made the need for outside aid urgent in any case. But if the country were united, the south would not require such aid in the same degree.

This is the United Nations Commission speaking. But are we aiding democracy in Korea? Are we not doing the same in Korea as we did in China, aiding tyranny and corruption?

Let me at this time cite an article from the very conservative New York Times, an article that appeared as recently as February 1 in the New York Times by an on-the-spot reporter of the New York Times, a very eminent reporter, Walter Sullivan. The article reads:

POLICE BRUTALITY IN KOREA ASSAILED—TORTURE, WHOLESALE EXECUTIONS OF REDS HELD DRIVING PEOPLE INTO ARMS OF COMMUNISTS

(By Walter Sullivan)

SEOUL, KOREA, January 25.—Some observers here believe the police of South Korea are the chief obstacle to the success of the Government—that they are driving the common people into the arms of the Communists.

Many Americans are horrified by the deaths by torture and wholesale executions of Communists. Yet the police must be viewed within the perspective of Korea. Forty years of oppression by the Japanese taught the Koreans the ways of a police state.

It is an oversimplification to say that most able Koreans who remained here during those years either collaborated or joined the Communist underground. But there is some truth to this, and the South Korean regime leans heavily on the leadership—even in the army and the police—of those who held positions of rank under the Japanese.

EXPERIENCE RELATED

A case in point is the experience told this correspondent by a well-educated Korean now working for the American Military Advisory Group. He had been imprisoned and tortured during the war for his anti-Japanese activities. One day, on his way to work at American headquarters, he saw the police officer who had presided at his inquisition. He now wore the uniform of a police captain.

The chiefs of staff of the Army have, in general, been officers who gained their experience under the Japanese. The United States advisers report, however, that some of the younger American-indoctrinated officers are reaching sufficient maturity for high command.

The police in this land of about 18,000,000 number 50,000, while the fighting army is put at 100,000. In 1948 more than half the

officers above the rank of lieutenant had served in the Japanese police.

Generally, the top Government leaders are former exiles who were free of any ties with Communists or Japanese. They have been away from Korea so long, however, that some of them speak Korean with a foreign accent. This makes it easier for their enemies to link them with foreign domination

Torture appears to be an accepted practice, although President Syngman Rhee has publicly attacked it as barbaric In December, however, the Home Minister warned that "the torturing of Communists by the police is not to be criticized," according to the local press. The police come under the jurisdiction of this Ministry.

A few weeks earlier the National Assembly had raised a hue and cry over the number of prominent people who were dying under police and army torture. Cases cited included a former professor of law at Chosun Christian College, who died in a Seoul police station a few hours after arrest. Cause of death was given as electric shock.

A professor of botany at the Normal College died at the police station. The provost general said it appeared he had been beaten to death

According to United States observers here there is considerable ill-will between certain assembly members and the police. The former have on occasion demanded that the police be purged to elements who served under the Japanese.

On January 17 several assemblymen brought their grievances against the police into the open—an action that today demands courage One referred to what critics of the police call the human-flesh-distribution case that occurred last September at Mokpo, seaport at the southwest corner of Korea.

Escaped and recaptured prisoners allegedly were shot on the doorsteps of various citizens and left there, apparently as an object lesson.

"EVERBODY SCARED"

"Assemblyman Kang Sun Myung discovered one of the prisoners on his doorstep," the speaker said. "But everybody was so scared of the police that none of them could speak up publicly."

A pro-Government speaker declared:

"What is the idea of calling this case the human-flesh-distribution case without asking what kind of people these dead are? They are the most vicious Communists "

Another assemblyman said that in his district the son of a blind farmer had been shot during an armed rice collection by the police. The official explanation, he added, was that the policeman had meant to shoot the farmer's dog.

The press was warned by the Government Information Office not to publish an account of the debate, according to Korean reporters.

Wholesale arrests have caused the jails to overflow and forced the Government to establish "reeducation camps" The official capacity of South Korea jails is listed at 15,000. On August 15, 1948, there were 14,000 prisoners. Last month the official figure was 40,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield me a little time?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Forty thousand people in jails intended to accommodate fifteen thousand. This Government of Fascist Korea cannot long endure as our $60,000,000 are not going to save it from the wrath of the Korean people. All civil liberties have been completely suppressed. Let me read to you what the chairman of the Assembly of Korea said recently about democracy in Korea, as reported in the New York Times of January 26, 1950. He holds a position which is similar to that of our Speaker. He said, accusing the Government:

> Our Government here has no conception of democracy.

The same story as Chiang in China is repeated in South Korea by its Fascist rulers. Corruption on top of corruption is the basis of the South Korean Government. I shall place in the RECORD press reports as to what has been done with articles that have been sent to it by us. To give you an idea of what is happening to their currency let me remind you that in 1945 the national currency, the won, was 400 to a dollar; today it is 4,000 to a dollar. Won in circulation were 4,000,000,000 in 1945; 40,000,000,00 in 1948.

So that the story of South Korea is a repetition of Chiang Kai-shek's tyranny in China. It is the story of tyranny, it is the story of corruption, it is the story of suppressing the national aspirations of the people for a united and independent country.

We tried to help this tyranny in China. We failed. We are now repeating the same interference in Korea. We are going to fail there too. I oppose this bill not only because the program is a failure but because it is contrary to the best interests of the American people in supporting tyranny and corruption.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York two additional minutes to be interrogated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to accepting this time. It is so rarely yielded to me that I will accept it even under the onerous conditions of being interrogated by such an interrogator as the one who desires to interrogate me.

Mr. FULTON. I did not know the gentleman was on our side of the question. I understand that in South Korea one of the gentleman's complaints is that under the Japanese the South Koreans learned the methods of a police state. If that is the gentleman's criticism of the South Korean Government does he not have the same criticism of the Soviet Government and of their satellite states because they are certainly police states?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. We are not asked here to appropriate money for the satellite states or for the Soviet Government. We are asked to appropriate money for a nation which the gentleman is ready to admit is now a police fascist state. That is the issue before the House. Let us stick to it.

Mr. FULTON. The next question is this: When the Greek-Turkish aid bill came up for consideration and passage, and even the Marshall-plan bill, the gentlemen was one who stood in the Well of the House and said: "Why do you not turn this over to the United Nations so that the United Nations can handle it instead of doing it on a unilateral or bilateral basis?" If that is so, why does not the gentleman say with respect to Formosa that the United Nations should establish a trusteeship over there and then there would be no supporting of Chiang and the gentleman would not have any complaint in reference to the Chiang Government?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman has distorted my position so much that even he has become confused. I at no time advocated taking territory away from any nation and establish it as a trusteeship under the United Nations. Never have I advocated the violation of any country's territorial integrity. The record bears me out. You may stand up here and argue all you please, but the fact, nevertheless, remains that Formosa is just as much a part of China as Staten Island is a part of New York. You cannot come around and either directly or by indirection take Formosa away from the Chinese people, and then stand up here and try to proclaim your friendship for democratic rights and for the principles of independent nations. It is a false argument and you know it.

Mr. FULTON. Would the gentleman agree to a plebiscite in Formosa, finally?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I agree in supporting the people of China and their territory in their revolution just as much as we expected France and other countries to support the United States and our territory when we had our revolution.

Here are some more facts on South Korea which demonstrate that we are giving aid not to a democracy but to Fascist corruption against the interests of the people of Korea and against the interests of the American people:

The New York Times reported on January 24, 1950:

> United States officials here have been concerned over the unchecked printing of money and inflationary expenditures without the authority of the legislature or of the Premier.

Again, from the New York Times we learn that the trend toward authoritarianism has deprived the National Assembly and even the Premier Lee Bum Suk of much of their power.

As for the freedom of the press, it is to be remembered that President Syngman Rhee warned newspapermen he would close newspapers printing rumors "harmful to the Government."

According to the New York Times report of January 13, 1950, even our Ambassador Jessup is reported to have stated to the Korean officials, "There are certain other things which are within your power to accomplish which have not been done."

He had in mind the Korean financial situation which the United States experts described as "deteriorating" in the face of unchecked deficit spending as well as the suppression of civil rights.

Again, from the New York Times of January 7, 1950, we find that during the first 8 months of the fiscal year 1949–50, deficit expenditures of the Government exceeded the entire budget for the year. Chief spenders were the Ministry of National Defense and the Home Ministry.

The latter pays for a police force of army proportions. The office of the Prime Minister spent more than three times its entire budget on intelligence activities alone. Most of the deficit money was obtained either from printing presses or overdrafts on the Bank of Korea. There has been an abrupt rise of currency circulation during the last few months. December 31, forty-three billions; on January 7, 1950, seventy-four billions.

The New York Herald Tribune of January 21, 1950, reports that spending is being done without the approval of the legislature and without normal procedure of accounting.

The Korean Government's fear that the world might learn the facts is evidenced by the Korean ruler's actions toward the United Nations Commission on Korea. This Commission was put off limits by the Korean Government. No citizens were permitted to approach the Commission except through the foreign office. Rhee and his henchmen were fearful that Korean nationals might have told the Commission the truth.

Employment conditions in Korea are deplorable. According to the New York Times of September 14, 1949, there were between 889,000 to 1,500,000 unemployed. Farm population of Korea is 11,500,000 out of a total population of 19,000,000.

In foreign trade the total imports of the first half of 1949 as against exports of $79,624.

Here is what one of the Korean papers stated editorially as to conditions prevailing in South Korea. The newspaper, Donga Ilbo, is an anti-Communist publication:

"Despite the necessity of controlling the Soviet-inspired subversive elements, uneasiness is increasing rather than abating. The people and the Government must cooperate more closely than ever." Asserting that security authorities are imprisoning or shooting law-abiding citizens, the newspaper declared: "Sometimes even those known as passionate patriots are accused as leftist subversive elements without material evidence."

Incidentally, according to the United Nations Commission over 89,000 people were arrested from September 4, 1948, to April 30, 1949.

Here is an example of what happens to some of the goods we send to Korea. It is merely a sample of the gross graft and corruption that exists there. I quote from an editorial in the Kuk Che Shin Mun—the International Times—which contends that United States Army relief goods became the object of profiteering during September 1948:

On September 3, 1948, the United States Civil Affairs Section handed over 2,745 pairs of boots, 1,296 pairs of shoes, and a great amount of aluminum, some 200 items. The Bureau of Industry and Commerce of the Provincial Government of Kyonggi-do sold them to the New Korea Industrial Development Co. at 810,000 won, on the supposition that the relief materials amounted to about 81 truckloads and that one load was worth 10,000 won. The company sold 2,235 pairs of boots and 15 different kinds of goods to the Yongwol power plant for about 1,500,000 won and later got 3,500,000 won for the goods distributed to the Department of Home Affairs and other Government agencies. It is hard to understand—

Said the paper—

why the Provincial Government decided to sell the goods at 10,000 won a truck. Further it is a matter of regret that the Government agencies bought them at a higher price than they sold them to the company.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make one comment on the remarks of the gentleman from New York. Too often in dealing with the Far East, Americans tend to judge peoples and governments there by our standards. Because they seldom come up to the standards of honesty, efficiency, competence, democracy, and civil rights that we have or at least hope and work for in our own country, we conclude those governments are hopelessly bad and we denounce them accordingly. We do not realize that our choice in Formosa and Korea, for example, is not between the existing governments and something better; it is between those governments and seizure by Communists, which is infinitely worse. I talked to a man this week who has just returned from North China, and he reports there are twice as many political prisoners in jail now as there ever were before. Thus, regardless of how many there may have been in jail under the Nationalist Government, which the gentleman called a corrupt tyranny, the number in jail increases rather than decreases under the peoples' democratic dictatorship—which is the Communist regime's description of itself. The Chinese Government, weakened and exhausted at the end of the war, was not a good government by our standards, but in refusing to help effectively and thereby helping the Communists to destroy that Government, we got something infinitely worse, not only for the Chinese but for ourselves. The first was a proved friend of the United States; the Communists a proved enemy. In a choice between friend and enemy it ought to be easy to decide where our own interests lie.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day attention was called to the need for the immediate passage of this legislation. On page 2 of the report, at the bottom of the page, I find this statement:

Without the legislation here proposed, both the Chinese and the Korean economic-assistance programs would be without funds as of February 16, 1950.

That is pretty soon now.

You will all recall that we met at 11 o'clock in order to get about our business and get this bill through. Then later on the Speaker exercised his discretion, as you will remember, just denied to the Republicans the opportunity to call the attention of the Members on the right—the Democratic Members—to the grand success of that party last night—that $1 box social. You have been bragging all the time about your $100-plate dinner. We just had that little $1 plate where the people were so anxious to come that they not only filled the hall but they sat on the steps and on the floor. There was only one thing that you could have found wrong with that party. I was there; the building was crowded; they could not all get in. Some accustomed to high diplomatic life might have found fault because there was not the slightest evidence that anyone had been drinking champagne; nor any liquor of any kind. What do you know about that, now? Was not that too bad? Not at all like some of these official doings in high Government circles. So you cannot take it. The Speaker was in so great a hurry he could not have the usual 1-minute talks. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] was handing it out here, giving it to us the other day, and he had time aplenty. But when it comes along and we get a chance—it only comes to us, my friends, once in a long, long time—when we get a chance to celebrate or brag about something, the Speaker, in his discretion, using his judgment, saying we are pressed for time, he cuts out the 1-minute speeches. But you have an agreement, as you have today, to adjourn earlier to go up to New York to one of those big parties. You are in no hurry today to get the aid to Korea if the program interferes with your little party. Oh, say, are you not ashamed of yourselves now, gentlemen, for what you did to us today?

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I listened a little bit ago to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. I listened very carefully, and though he condemned roundly the action that America is taking in the field of foreign relations and international cooperation to preserve the peace, condemned our policy in Europe and in the Pacific, as usual I did not hear one word of condemnation of the activities and the machinations of the Russian Government in the tragic arena of the world today. The gentleman from New York, who believes so strongly in democratic government and freedom and democratic processes, claims and contends that we have no right to aid the Korean people, because the government there does not represent the people. He mentions the United Nations position and responsibility in the premises, but he does not say that the existing government in Korea today is a child of the United Nations. He does not say that the United States first sponsored the existing government in Korea. He does not say that a commission was appointed by the United Nations over the opposition of Russia to conduct a fair, democratic election in Korea. He does not tell you that 75 percent of the eligible voters in South Korea registered for this election nor that 95.2

of these cast their ballots. It seems that neither the gentleman nor Russia approves of this kind of election. He does not tell you that over 2,500,000 of the people of northern Korea—there are left only 10,000,000 there—fled the confines of that Russian-dominated section of Korea and came to South Korea, where there are already 20,000,000 people, to enjoy the blessings of the free, democratic government, that the United States has sponsored and the United Nations has sponsored. He does not tell you that the Koreans under this government have actually fought the North Koreans for their liberty.

The gentleman from New York and others here freely predicted only last year that the Korean Government could not stand up more than 6 weeks. It is standing today. The South Korean Government has turned back the army of the North Korean Government, sponsored by Russia, the nation in which, I assume from his remarks, the gentleman from New York has great confidence. The Korean Government, without the aid of American troops, has turned back the troops backed by Russia in northern Korea, and Russia has not had the nerve to come in.

I am not trying here to argue that if Russia brought her own army into northern Korea and attacked southern Korea, they would not succeed. Probably they would. They might succeed some other places in the world where the cold war rages. But they dare not take the chance.

The underlying principle of American aid abroad in this cold war is to help those who believe in democratic institutions and who exhibit an inclination to help themselves.

We might just as well admit there is no use spending good money for bad. Money spent that way is wasted. But here in Korea we have the one point in the whole Asiatic picture where we can reasonably expect success for democratic government and democratic forces against the Communist-backed forces. The evidence is here. The Koreans are willing to do and have done something for themselves. Given a chance, it is a self-sustaining country. It is a patriotic people, fiercely devoted to the kind of liberty in which we believe.

I know that sometime, somewhere, somehow, the United States Government, facing the financial difficulties with which we are confronted, must curtail our expenditures abroad. We must only continue to spend where we can expect a reasonable return on the investment. That investment must be in our own national interest. I think Korea today is a good field for long-range investment in sound Asiatic policy.

So far as Formosa is concerned, I want to be frank with you about that. I have grave doubts that there will be a return on the investment there. It has already been testified that out of the $103,000,000 authorized and appropriated by the Eightieth Congress for the Pacific area not more than $10,000,000 of this money can be spent on Formosan aid for the period February 15 to July 1. That is the extension period. This money has already been appropriated and authorized. It is just a question of extending the time in which it can be spent.

There may be some hope that the Chiang Kai-shek government will succeed in Korea. I hope it does. Certainly geographical conditions there are just as favorable for success as can be found anywhere in the China area. Chiang has an island there of 6,000,000 people with over half a million of the democratic forces, the Nationalist forces, the cream of the crop, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] said, to help him. They have a large, well-equipped army. They control most of the Chinese Navy and Air Force. If the Chiang Kai-shek government is ever going to make a successful stand against the rising tide of communism, they have the chance to do it right there. I favor allowing them to use $5,000,000 or $10,000,000 of the remaining $103,000,000 appropriation in an effort to show the world whether or not this branch of the great Chinese race under these favorable circumstances will rally behind the Nationalist Government. If they do not, then we must look for a new leader of the democratic forces in China.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, here we are at it again. Here comes our Committee on Foreign Affairs with this legislation, when 2 or 3 weeks ago they were against it. Today they turn around and are for it. Sometimes I cannot understand how in the world we go in through one door and come out the other. It is just about as much sense as the situation in the State Department under Acheson, Hiss and Hiss. If you are going to continue to give the money of the taxpayers of this country away, as you have been doing, and as you propose in this bill to give $60,000,000 away, from now until the 30th day of June, which means $400,000 a day, which you are going to waste, then you will drive the country into bankruptcy. I shall tell you what you can do. The other day I had the pleasure of listening to Frank Laubach, a Congregational missionary. He said that he can stop communism in any country in the world if you just give him aid and assistance in trying to convert these people to the realization that communism is wrong and unwise, by Christian deeds and teachings.

Give him $400,000, and he will do more than Acheson, Hiss and Hiss will do with $60,000,000; and he will do it in just as short a time.

I want to help the Koreans, because I have always been taught, ever since my mother took me to Sunday school, to try to support missionaries in Korea and China and other countries. I am a believer in that. But if you want to help these people and keep them from starving, this is not the way to do it. This administration is the greatest squandering administration in the world. Instead of taking some $80,000,000 worth of potatoes and throwing blue vitriol on them and destroying them, send them to Korea and China and try to help those people in that way. Another thing, you Members on the other side of the House can learn a lesson from our dollar luncheon, which we had yesterday. It was a dollar luncheon where we had chicken and all the things that go with it. And we paid 20 cents on the dollar in the form of taxes to help run this Government of ours. You New Dealers come along, and you are going to have a $100 plate dinner, and you are not going to pay any taxes, because you have enough pull with the administration to get out of paying your taxes, which would amount to $20 on every ticket for that dinner of yours. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. I would withdraw this legislation and try to go about it in the right way, in a common-sense way. The missionaries of America—Protestant, Catholic, and Jew—can do the job for a million dollars and do it in the right way.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield for a question.

Mr. HALE. The reason their dinner is tax-exempt is that it is not entertaining.

Mr. RICH. Well, they had some entertainment. They had some songs. They have a right to pay taxes on the dinners that they have. They are only short-changing the American taxpayer. They are only taking the money from the American taxpayers and making them believe that they have to pay the taxes and that they will enjoy the dinners. Get rid of the New Deal or America is lost. America will go Socialist with any more New Deal or any Fair Deal. It will be a raw deal.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, it is always a real pleasure to follow my distinguished friend my very able colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

I wanted to talk for a moment about the report that I submitted to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] on my return from Europe. This is what I said about economic recovery and the ECA:

> While matters in these fields are more clearly within the purview of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I believe that the other members of this committee are, like myself, interested in the results which our numerous and very substantial programs of aid have obtained. Since the end of hostilities in Europe Congress, by means of UNRRA, interim aid, United Nations welfare and relief organizations, funds for the government and relief of occupied areas, loans and credits to Britain, and the Economic Cooperation Act have made available very large sums for the relief, rehabilitation, and recovery of the European economy. According to a Commerce Department report carried in the press on January 3, the United States has laid out nearly $30,000,000,000 in postwar aid to foreign nations, including $3,385,000,000 subscribed to the World Bank and Monetary Fund, and $24,802,000,000 in aid furnished directly to foreign countries.

For a moment I want to talk about Austria, which is a comparable situation, because that is within the Russian sphere or Russian orbit:

> Despite the spirited and efficient efforts of the Army and the Department of State, in the rehabilitation of Austria and the recovery thus far achieved, the future of that country

as an independent nation, it would seem, depends on continued United States subsidies. Austria lost her empire in World War I and is now located within the Russian orbit. While United States funds for economic recovery will alleviate distress, they can scarcely alter the basic situation. The Russians have taken over the Danube River shipping and control the only oil field in that country, which they are exploiting in a manner which is certain to reduce its life. From the oil production they take a significant proportion prior to refining and a large output from the refineries. They also requisition substantial amounts of wheat and beet sugar. In addition, they claim as an extraterritorial status for a number of industries and plants as German assets. The relative amounts of Russian requisitions as compared to United States aid is not known; but I fail to see how we can ever place that country on its feet, no matter how much money we pour in, so long as the present drain continues.

Now in view of the fact that these areas which are being considered in this legislation are within the Russian sphere, I cannot see how you can possibly improve conditions in these countries, no matter how much money you pour in. The question before the House is, how long can the economy of this country stand this terrific drain on our finances and our natural resources, without eventually going into bankruptcy. Let me impress upon the Members of the House that no bankrupt countries ever won a war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to continue expenditures abroad, as I suppose we must—and I have an open mind on the bill, I am not yet convinced that the additional sugar coating designed to convert some of my colleagues here, on the Republican side of the House, is more than just bait or whether it is actually a sufficient reason for changing one's opinion on the entire bill—of one thing I am certain, that we must find means to effect some savings in our economy, and we must strengthen our economy at home if we are going to continue to pour out these millions all over the world. Therefore on Thursday last I introduced a bill, H. R. 7135, which would direct the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan—who as is well known, has done everything he could to sabotage the Anderson bill—recognize that situation. This bill would direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation to distribute the surpluses which are accumulating over the country to Federal welfare agencies, the school-lunch program, State welfare agencies, private welfare agencies at home, and then in later priority to welfare agencies abroad, and to advance as against the cost of transportation a sum equivalent to not more than 6 months' storage. The cost of storing these commodities is running between 10 and 15 millions a month. The Secretary claims that he cannot distribute them because he cannot pay transportation. This bill would remove that obstacle, would cause him to stop faking on the application of that section in the bill, would give him an opportunity of getting the food to the needy and to those who are in greatest distress. It would lower the tax bill to the American people, would reduce the cost of storing the commodities, of crating, cooperage, and additional personnel. I am very happy to say that 28 Members on the Republican side of the House have joined in support of the proposals contained in this bill. We solicit your earnest attention to it on both sides of the House.

But if you are going to pay this Korean aid bill you will need tax money to help you much as we helped you last night at the Lincoln Day box supper. We only charged a dollar for entertainment that was worth a lot more, but we added 20 cents on every ticket, to pay to the Federal Government. That 20 cents paid by each one of 10,000 or 12,000 people goes to the Government of the United States. We did not invite people down here under false pretenses. We told them about the tax and we will pay it. You Democrats do neither when you charge $100 a plate for your evening's entertainment. Each $100 ticket should have paid an additional $20 into the Federal Government. When you folks invited people to come down here as guests of the Government, as you called it in the letters inviting them, when they were in reality guests of the Democratic Party, you were guilty of hypocrisy. When you invited them as guests of the Government you meant as guests of your party, as guests of the Democratic National Committee. Then, as I say, on each $100 admission there should have been a $20 tax paid to the Government. Otherwise, you are gypping the taxpayers $20 on each admission paid.

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman will remember that the Democrats tried to do the same thing with regard to the inauguration, escape taxation.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. As the gentleman knows, there is apparently one tax law for Republicans but another one for Democrats. This is known as the Fair Deal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe it must be obvious that Pennsylvania is interested both in Korea and in economy.

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

Mr. FULTON. Gladly.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia for granting me a little time, because I was unable to secure time from my own side. I am very grateful to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman suggest that aid to Korea be administered as effectively as the dollar dinner last night was administered? It was a wonderful job.

Mr. FULTON. Yes; if Korean aid is administered as effectively as the dinner was, Korea will be safe and the economy will be sound.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman, my good friend from Pennsylvania with whom I sometimes disagree.

Mr. RICH. Let us see whether the gentleman does or not. Why is it that you would turn over $60,000,000 to the Chief Executive of the United States through the Department of State to spend in order to help any nation in the world, I do not care what nation it is, when we are trying to save and when the gentleman knows that the administration is as extravagant and reckless in its expenditures as the gentleman knows them to be? Now answer that one.

Mr. FULTON. May I say that the President of the United States, although I did not vote for him, is my President too, and the Secretary of State and the Department of State, although I did not put them in office, represent me and I am going to try to see that they carry out any policy efficiently, if the policy is needed. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania were on his feet asking for real economy and saying to all the subsidy seekers including the wool growers of this country, "Do not come in here and ask us for your subsidy," I would have more confidence in the correctness of his present opposition.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman think for a moment I asked for a subsidy for wool growers and manufacturers?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Permit me to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that while we very seldom agree in our votes, I hope that the next time he goes home he will express the appreciation of the Republicans on this side of the aisle to those people who elected him, because we would rather have him down here than any Democrat in his district.

Mr. FULTON. Thank you. I happen to be a Republican representing a very large industrial district in south Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, Pa.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman remember the time he and I had a conversation in which he said that if I were representing his district they would ride me out on a rail? And I said, "I would rather stay on the rail in order to get out"?

Mr. FULTON. Yes, we laughed a good bit over your quick turn of the comment. Now, may we go back to the subject of Korea and Formosa?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KEE Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In view of the gentleman's comment to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] about a protection on wool, I am wondering if the gentleman is in favor of a little protection for steel produced in the United States?

Mr. FULTON. In this time of necessity for drastic economy, I am in favor of cutting subsidies on everything, subsidies on wool, high subsidies on every kind of food and agricultural products, and reexamining the reciprocal trade agreements in the light of current business and budgetary conditions. I am in favor of an optional or a discretional bill which will give the Secretary of Agriculture a discretion on these agricultural price-support programs for the protection of the farmer instead of what we have today.

In the last session of this particular Congress five of us wanted to speak against the present farm-subsidy program, saying the same thing would happen to the potato-subsidy proposition as is now happening There were 59 minutes given for the proponents and only 1 minute against the agriculture lobby. That is lobbyism at its height and running roughshod over the American people, including many farmers who likewise felt the present bill was not correctly written.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Is the gentleman also against a subsidy for the merchant marine, airplanes, and so forth, which amounts to more than the agricultural subsidy?

Mr FULTON. Anything that is reasonably necessary for the national defense, in order to keep a good national defense, I will try to help along for defense purposes, but it must be done as a defense measure purely. But I think unless you gentlemen here on the floor start balancing the budget and cutting where it hurts, you will never balance the budget and that applies to Members on both sides of the House.

Now, may I go back to Korea?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman made reference to the wool situation. Any declaration so far as the farmers are concerned should be on a Nation-wide basis

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if there will be a half minute left after this gentleman gets through?

The CHAIRMAN. All time will have expired at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman permit me to interject a remark?

Mr. FULTON. Yes, I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman, my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. I would like to recall to the House that we are supposed to be engaged in discussing relief and help to Korea and Formosa, if the gentleman will deal with that for a few minutes.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have listened to 1 hour's debate on the rule and 2 hours of general debate this afternoon, and nobody has yet told me what our American foreign policy is in this regard. The question I want to ask, which I think is the whole crux of the American foreign policy, is how far are we willing to go beyond economic aid to support the democratic government of Korea.

Mr. FULTON. We are not at this time going beyond economic aid, because we have withdrawn our military forces.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. All time has expired The Clerk will read the committee substitute.

(The Clerk read the first section of the bill.)

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2319) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea, had come to no resolution thereon.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF YALTA CONFERENCE

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, we are now marking the fifth anniversary of the conference of the Big Three at Yalta, where they conferred from February 4 through February 11, 1945.

Neither this anniversary nor any other anniversary of the Yalta Conference is anything which the American people care to celebrate. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the fervent and unfulfillable thought of most Americans at this time is that the world would have been infinitely better off had such a conference never taken place. When the Yalta Conference took place in February 1945, we were on the brink of winning World War II. And it was also at Yalta at the same time that we unnecessarily bartered away the peace.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that since 1945 we have not been nearly so much engaged in the making and maintaining of peace as we have in trying to undo the secret agreements entered into at that small Crimean seaport. One of the results of the Yalta Conference came very near fulfillment at the end of 1949, with the loss of China to a Communist government.

Another result of the Yalta agreement was the dismemberment of Poland and the subjugation of her freedom-loving people to a foreign totalitarian state. It should be recalled, too, that it was to protect the territorial integrity of this same Poland that Great Britain and France went to war in 1939. Thousands upon thousands of the sons and daughters of Poland fought and died for the principles of freedom and a democratic form of government. Such principles might reasonably have been achieved except for the agreements reached at Yalta.

It is for these and many other reasons that I state today that most Americans, and certainly all of those who are of Polish descent, wish without hope that this conference had never taken place. Consequently, we must continue to strive to overcome and to rectify the grave injustices which resulted from the Yalta Conference and which deprived millions of people of the freedom which they cherished and for which they fought so valiantly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Dr Edgar Fuller.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances

Mr SHORT (at the request of Mr. SHAFER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report submitted by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Mr. Don Eva.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. NOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr COX. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Mr Donald Richberg in my district on Thursday of last week. The speech was returned to me by the Government Printer because it was one-third page longer than the rules

allow. The cost is $191.34, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SHELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS dealing with the water situation in California and paying tribute to his predecessor, the late Richard Welch.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include remarks of Mr. WERDEL.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, President Truman yesterday dropped the Taft-Hartley hell-bomb on the heads of the coal miners and their families. By it he will spread the hunger and starvation that exists in the coal fields. With it he has announced that he joins with the coal operators and the steel trust in their campaign to smash the unions. With it he has made a mockery of his campaign pledges to outlaw Taft-Hartley.

Four hundred thousand coal miners were pushed to the Taft-Hartley wall to be sprayed with all the lead at the command of Truman, Denham, and the coal and steel magnates.

And though the miners today are the immediate target of the giant financiers and their political valets, it is the wrecking of the entire labor movement that is their end objective.

It is to sound a dire warning of this gigantic plot to break the American labor movement that I take the floor today.

Only because United States Steel, National Steel, and their controlled coal companies refuse to bargain with the United Mine Workers are the miners and the country faced with the situation which exists today. Only because United States Steel and its billionaire owners are determined to smash the mine workers union are the miners on a 3-day, and no-day week.

And only because the mine workers union refuses to bow its head before this vast financial power is there still time for the 15,000,000 other members of the American labor movement to save their unions and the miners.

For 8 months the miners and operators have been locked in this titantic struggle—the power of organized, unified strength of workingmen on the one hand, and the power of money and property and the greed for more profits of bloated money bags on the other.

Plain and simple, the men who dig coal out of the darkness and danger of the earth, want 95 cents more pay for their day's labor. They want 15 cents more for their welfare fund, for the widows and orphans of the miners, for old-age benefits, and for medical care in the event of the inevitable accident. And they want to maintain their union free of any and all restrictions imposed on them by the mine operators through Federal and State laws.

To this, the mine operators, sitting as dummies on the knees of the steel financiers, have said "No" for 8 months. This is the same chorus the steel workers heard last fall. It is the same "No" now being intoned to the telephone workers, and the Chrysler auto workers.

And why should it not be the same chorus? It is the policy of the J. P. Morgan Co., the du Ponts, the Mellon banking family, the vast Cleveland bank holding chain, the auto works. It is they who decreed in their directors meeting months ago that John L. Lewis and the mine workers' union must be ground to dust and the rest of the labor movement, the A. F. of L. and CIO, must be split, ripped, and chipped to pieces by any means.

They had the perfect weapon at their command—the Taft-Hartley law. They had a Denham as overseer for the law. And they had a President who would order use of the law. Today, months after their plan was adopted, hunger and starvation have been wrought in the coal fields, to the miners, their wives and children. The plan has brought increased suffering to the thousands of broken miners who today should be receiving medical care through the welfare fund. It has increased the misery of aged miners subsisting on pennies because the coal operators have reneged on their payments to the welfare fund.

It is the most calloused, deliberate campaign to torture, sicken, and destroy one group of people this Nation has seen since the great depression. It is akin to the mass-murder chambers created by Hitler.

And along with this rule-or-ruin plan of the financiers against the miners, is the concomitant financial ruin to small, independent mine owners, independent storekeepers, and professional people depending on miners to exist. It has meant the loss of jobs to thousands of railroad workers and other distributive workers. It has injected the germ of paralysis into every blood stream of American life.

This is the result of the relentless determination of the Wall Street money bags to smash the miners' union and all unions, to make every mine and mill an open shop, a sweatshop. It is Ben Fairless and Irving Olds, of United States Steel and J. P. Morgan Co. who are to blame for the Nation's coal dispute—not John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers.

Lewis and the miners behind him solidly are fighting to increase the $14.05 minimum wage to $15 a day. No one can say that even $15 is enough for the miners. No one can dispute the necessity of the welfare fund, and the fact that the miners would never have gotten the fund or anything like it, just through the great love the operators are now piously proclaiming for the miners. No one can dispute the right of the miners to strike, and have their only weapon at their command at all times.

Some 1,700 mine operators have already signed agreements with the United Mine Workers, according to John L. Lewis. The contract adds about 15½ cents to the previous cost of a ton of coal, after all tax deductions. These operators have found that the 15½ cents added cost can be absorbed without any loss of profit to them.

Yet United States Steel, which just announced its highest profit in 20 years, pleads poverty to the public as it continues to reject the miners' demands for living wages. In 1949, United States Steel made $165,958,806. This was divided among stockholders at $5.39 a share, several months after this giant corporation split its shares three for one. In other words, the dividend amounted to $16.17, as compared to the $4 dividend in 1943.

In addition to being the largest steel producer in the world, United States Steel is one of the biggest mine operators. The captive mines owned by the steel companies produce over 52,000,000 tons of coal a year, over 10 percent of the coal produced a year. Tied up directly with the steel companies is the giant Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., the largest commercial producer. Together they produce over 100,000,000 tons a year.

Another large mining group is controlled by the Island Creek Coal Co., which in turn is controlled by the Cleveland Trust Co. This control is extended to the entire Southern Coal Producers Association. The Mellon banking family, through the Koppers Co., operates mines producing 14,000,000 tons of coal a year. The Stone and Webster engineering combine, owned by the steel trust, owns large mines in Illinois. A number of other large mines in Indiana and Illinois is owned by Hubert Howard, now chairman of the Munitions Board in the Department of Defense and a close personal friend of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson.

Thus the control of the Nation's coal mines has been taken over by a handful of financial tycoons. This handful has enlisted the aid of President Truman and

the Taft-Hartley board against the miners and all labor.

This financial combine has for years made known its callous disregard of the lives and safety of the men who work in the mines. In 1949, exactly 593 men were killed in the mines, and 38,200 were injured. This is a low figure in the mines and is due to the reduced workweek in effect since July. In 1948, there were 1,013 men killed, and 54,045 injured.

But in all the years, the financial moguls have fought every attempt to improve the conditions in the mines. They have deliberately consigned men to horrible deaths. In the last 5 years, more than half of the men who work in the mines, 262,372, have been injured, and 4,797, killed.

Is it any wonder that the miners fight for what they believe is right? Is it any wonder that the men who face death every day are not afraid of the dollar-backed power of the steel plutocrats, and the Taft-Hartley-backed power of their willing servant in the White House?

The miners have justice and right on their side. Now they need the backing and support of all people, especially the officers and members of the A F. of L. and CIO who have in the past benefited from the miners' struggles.

If ever there was a time for the unity of labor, the time is now. The coal and steel magnates have created their own kind of hell-bomb and Truman has dropped it on the coal fields. A. F. of L. and CIO members joined with the miners can pull the fuze and prevent the bomb from going off to destroy the labor movement.

I call upon A. F of L President William Green and CIO President Philip Murray to cast aside their differences to lead this necessary movement in support of the miners. I call upon them to urge a Nation-wide movement to demand that the Taft-Hartley hell-bomb be stopped, not dropped on the miners. I call upon them to use their strength of offices to insist again and again until it is accomplished that Simon Legree Denham be fired.

And I call upon them to renew their demands that the Taft-Hartley law be repealed in this session of Congress. The law can be repealed in a matter of days with their help. It can be repealed if every professed friend of labor in this House joins in signing discharge petition No 2 which can bring up the bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley law in a short time. Certainly there are 218 friends of labor in this House. It is about time these friends came forward.

All working people know that President Truman can no longer be counted as a friend of labor. All working people now know that his kind of friendship breeds hunger and starvation in the coal fields and steel towns. All working people now know that Truman serves the steel oligarchy. Labor will remember this in 1950 and 1951.

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1950.

HON HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We represent great numbers of men. They are citizens and taxpayers. They are men with family responsibilities. They perform an essential service. They serve a harsh and brutal industry. Its toll of broken men and its usage of human flesh are without parallel in modern industry. Their employers are, in a controlling sense, greedy, grasping, and devoid of ordinary compassion.

The mine workers have the same ideals and dreams as other Americans. They wish to provide for their families and serve their God and their country without reserve. To do so, they must eat and have shelter to face the menace of the years and to retain the courage to combat the terrifying vicissitudes of their toil.

The industry contract expired June 30, 1949. For 8 months, the organized coal operators have refused to execute a successor agreement For 8 months, the operators have gloried in the protection given them by an oppressive Federal statute. For 8 months, Mr. President, they have boasted that the abomination, known as the Taft-Hartley Act, rendered it unnecessary to concede anything, and that in the end your high office, wielding Taft's club, would beat the mine workers into submission.

So now it comes to pass, Mr. President, that as a penalty for refusing the coal operators' dictated terms your office offers arbitration by three strangers, who know not of the industry nor the human beings who delve in it.

With due respect, Mr President, the mine workers do not wish three strangers, however well-intentioned but necessarily ill-informed, to fix their wages, decree their working conditions, define their living standards, and limit the educational opportunities of their children. Such strangers cannot see into a mine worker's home, nor peer into the hearts of his loved ones. The mine workers believe that as free citizens in a free country they have an inherent right to pass upon these vital considerations themselves, and that no stranger, however situate, should be given such power over their lives.

It is no answer, Mr. President, to suggest that your plan, as set forth in your telegram of January 31, permits acceptance or rejection by either party, after rendition of judgment by your agents The mine workers know that any rejection of your agents' findings, after issuance, would cause them to face the oppressive legal sanctions of Taft's bill of attainder against labor unions. The mine workers know also, Mr. President, that the heavy hand of Government would not be laid concurrently on the shoulders of the coal operators as they make wassail in the privacy of their exclusive clubs.

For 7 months since the expiration of the agreement, the mine workers have made personal sacrifices to insure the country sufficient coal It is a travesty upon justice that they should now be slugged by a legal blackjack to satisfy the overweening avarice of their reactionary employers.

To use the power of the state to drive men into the mines, on the terms and for the profit of private employers, is involuntary servitude, violative of the spirit, and perhaps of the literal text, of the thirteenth amendment. It is questionable whether one could postulate that such mass coercion would insure enthusiastic service from grateful men.

Respectfully submitted.

NEGOTIATING REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
By JOHN L. LEWIS.

(Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include letters sent to the President by John L. Lewis.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM FOR POTATOES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, our Government calls it a price-support program for potatoes

Sounds good.

We are led to believe that something constructive will come from it.

After all, hundreds of experts and hundreds of millions of dollars are tackling the problem.

But how does it actually work out?

We know that 5,000 potato farmers in Aroostook County, Maine, are getting an average of $13,000 each from the United States Treasury for raising more tubers than we can consume.

The general idea is to keep these farmers happy at all costs.

The Government started out on the theory that the price of spuds must be kept up to guarantee the farmers a fair return for their labor and investment so that they would continue to be good customers of industry.

But even Einstein cannot figure out how you can reduce a surplus by rewarding the growers for raising an even greater surplus.

Meanwhile, several million Americans are unemployed.

Their unemployment compensation checks, in many instances, have run out.

Unfortunately, they cannot postpone their appetites

They could use these surplus potatoes in the way that God intended that they should be used—primarily to sustain human life

But they have not the money to buy them.

And they famish in the face of bulging harvests.

Now one would think that a benevolent government like ours, so bountiful in its payments to the farmers, would give away the 50,000,000 extra bushels to the needy in distressed areas.

But the Government is horrified by such a simple and humane solution.

Lost in a maze of artificial rules and afraid to offend the fattening growers, the Government would rather see these potatoes rot than feed them to the needy.

Five hundred million dollars have been thrown away on the price-support program for this one commodity alone during the past few years and what do we have to show for it?

The bankruptcy of a plan founded on preferential treatment for the growers as against the consumers.

Let us abandon this extravagant failure and replace it with a program that will meet the needs of both city dwellers and farmers before the American public loses what lingering faith it may still have in the whole agricultural set-up.

Here is the sorry situation:

Eighteen hundred growers on Long Island collected checks averaging $13,000 each from the Government.

In Connecticut they did better, to the tune of $15,625.

In Rhode Island they raised the take to $25,000 apiece.

Because Uncle Sam guarantees the price, growers are choking their fields with plants.

In their zest for overproduction, they might try lighting up the fields at night

to accelerate growth or subject the poor struggling potatoes caught in a traffic jam to hurry-up injections.

Who knows?

When Government encourages the surplus it is trying to curb, everyone wants to get in on the pay-off.

Even Canadian growers, envious of the gold in "them thar spuds," are smuggling theirs into Maine in order to get lush profits while the getting is good.

Meanwhile, up and down the Atlantic seaboard, we have a number of industrial cities and towns classified as, distressed areas, because of unemployment conditions.

No jobs, no paychecks, no unemployment compensation, no relief.

Hungry mouths and surplus potatoes, with the Government standing inbetween.

And what does the all-wise and kindly Government do at this critical time?

It begins to dump the unwanted spuds back on the farm.

It paid $1.25 a bushel for them, but is going to sell them for 1 cent per 100 pounds to the very farmers from whom it bought them.

Strange business, no matter how you look at it.

When the round robin is over, the Government is the loser by many millions of dollars, while the farmer welcomes back his prodigal potatoes to be used as fertilizer and livestock feed.

The rest will be dumped into the ocean or left to rot just to get rid of them.

But wait, wait a moment, the Government steps in to offer a part answer to the problem.

It will help to distribute some of the surplus through the school-lunch program.

But whoever heard of children eating a substantial food like potatoes for a light lunch.

The grown-ups, the unemployed breadwinners of the family, will not have a chance to get this sustenance because the Government will dye the potatoes to prevent their sale for human consumption.

Because the Government prefers to keep them away from the needy and to let them go to waste just to keep prices up.

Fantastic?

Criminal?

Sinful?

These and other words have been used to describe an experiment in the field of economics which has been expensive, ineffective, and inhuman.

In plain words, the average American is disgusted with, and resentful of, such tragic failure.

He demands a change in the Agricultural Act of 1949, which considers the feeding of surplus potatoes to livestock as more important than distributing them to unemployed human beings who are in need of food.

In the winter of 1947, the Government buried—yes, buried—millions of bushels of choice U. S. No. 1 potatoes because it did not know what to do with them.

Last year, Ralph Trigg, key figure in the price-support program, minced no words when he spoke at the Maine potato-blossom festival.

He warned that— and I quote—

> The whole farm price-support program is threatened by the extravagance of Government potato purchases.
>
> We simply cannot go on indefinitely with any program which results in excessive waste and which costs the taxpayers of the country too much.

The trouble seems to be that potatoes are being grown for the Government, and not to meet market needs.

In view of the fact that over-all demand for this commodity has been declining for years, the Government is now on the hook.

It is supporting a parasite group which should no longer be encouraged to live off the Public Treasury.

Potato farmers should turn their efforts toward the production of useful crops for which there is a demand in the free market.

If the potato mess opens the eyes of the American people to the fact that over $7,000,000,000 are involved in the whole agricultural price-support program, then urban housewives, workers, and the unemployed throughout the Nation may well rise up in protest against any subsidies to farmers.

In some ways that would be unfortunate, but the blame for it could be placed squarely on the hideous waste revealed in the operations of the potato price-support plan.

A major surgical job must be performed without further delay if we are to save the potato industry itself from its own excesses.

My immediate concern, however, is to save the present surplus from destruction and to make it available to the needy people of our country.

Conscience and common sense leave us no other choice.

At present, welfare outlets can secure this surplus commodity by paying transportation costs from shipping points.

Most cities and towns in Massachusetts, for instance, could obtain such stores at an average shipping cost of 30 cents per 100 pounds.

It is obvious that a preponderant number of communities in the United States do not have welfare or unemployment problems of a size where extra allotments of potatoes are needed to meet local relief demands.

There are some industrial areas which are hard-hit, and it is the problem in such localities that I have in mind.

In discussing the matter with Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan last week, he indicated his disapproval of the willful destruction of this commodity and expressed an interest in any plan that would divert potatoes to those human beings who are in need.

It is my belief that dried eggs and dried milk from surplus stocks should also be distributed to worthy cases.

How?

By legislation to amend the Agricultural Marketing Administration and reinstate those functions of the old Surplus Commodity Corporation whereby surplus foods would be given free to needy people instead of the worms.

The Federal Government would pay transportation costs to the local public welfare outlets or to those private relief agencies duly approved by the welfare departments of the individual States.

Provided that such allotments be made only those distressed employment areas as designated by the Department of Commerce.

Of 33 classified as such in October 1949, New England had 15.

In view of the fact that a majority of these substandard areas, plagued by unemployment, are in or near the principal potato-producing region, transportation costs would be held to a minimum.

Local wholesalers or retailers who sell to State institutions or to the welfare departments of the cities and towns need not raise the cry of "unfair competition" on this score.

In the first place, the needy are seldom able to buy potatoes in the free market.

Secondly, under the terms of the bill I am introducing, allotments will be approved only in excess of the monthly rate of purchases made by State, municipal, and private agencies to meet their normal welfare loads as averaged over the past 13 years.

In some quarters it is suggested that we ship our surplus overseas, but I am firmly opposed to this as impractical, and as ignoring the needs of our own people.

It is sickening to think of the millions of bushels of potatoes being wantonly destroyed when so many unemployed could get temporary life-support from them right here in the United States.

The problem as I see it is not how to get rid of them but how to put them to the good use for which they were intended.

And I think that the question of a perishable surplus food should have priority over other issues.

The American people want to share in the goods and commodities which they produce.

They will not excuse those who throw them away.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an address delivered by Mrs. Timothy A. Buckley, department vice president, department rehabilitation chairman, American Legion Auxiliary, Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last night I heard the commander of the American Legion, George N. Craig, deliver a very powerful protest at a rehabilitation banquet against the Hoover suggestions. I agree with him thoroughly in everything that he said. If this Hoover report should go into effect we would have a socialization of many activities of the people of the United States. It would be a decentralization and a recentralization into different departments, and very expensive, and all at the expense of the veterans.

I am going to read a part of Commander Craig's address:

I regret to say that the campaign that has been conducted by the citizens' committee has attempted to bring into disrepute the veteran. And while it has only been a few short years since the last shots were fired, which terminated the slaughter of our friends, an attempt is being made to villify the veteran, to charge him with being a Treasury raider. Why even in the press if a crime is committed it's not a lawyer who committed assault; if he has had service it is as a veteran that he is charged. If civil suit is brought against a person it isn't a truck driver who is being sued, it is a veteran who is being sued, an attempt to defile the status. For those who did their best in time of emergency to preserve our Government, I ask the American people in your name not for special privilege, not for premium, I only ask them for that which is equitable, right, and just.

I told Commander Craig when he appeared before our Committee on Veterans' Affairs that I wholeheartedly agreed with him. By the way, the other veterans' organizations are united in opposition to the Hoover Commission Report. It is an insult to the veterans, and there would be no possible economy that I can see to the taxpayer.

MIDDLESEX COUNTY COUNCIL TALK BY MRS. TIMOTHY A. BUCKLEY, DEPARTMENT VICE PRESIDENT, DEPARTMENT REHABILITATION CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY, SATURDAY, JANUARY 28, 1950, MEETING HELD IN LOWELL, MASS.

Madam Director, district officers, department officer, county commander, post commander, distinguished guests, and members of Middlesex County, it is indeed very nice for me to be with you, the members of my own district once again after having had to be absent from the past district meetings this year. I have attended all district meetings throughout Massachusetts and today is my last. I am always happy to be with you all once again.

As chairman of rehabilitation, I am going to speak to you today on a legislation program which is a part of rehabilitation known as the Hoover Commission pertaining to veterans.

First, I should like to remind units and hospital chairmen to keep records of hospital service hours and send them along to me as soon as possible so that I may have them to incorporate in my report for the area A conference which will be held on March 8 and 9, 1950, at the Bond Hotel, Hartford, Conn. The opening session of this conference will be at 10 a. m. devoted to a panel discussion for department rehabilitation chairman. The afternoon session will be devoted to volunteer hospital worker program in Veterans' Administration hospitals. A bulletin giving information relative to reservations will be mailed to all unit presidents during the coming week.

Maximum service for those who served is the rehabilitation goal of the American Legion Auxiliary. Our purpose is to improve, expand and expedite American Legion Auxiliary service to veterans of World Wars I and II, and their dependents, who are sick, disabled, or in need.

I have here for all to see, the new uniform which will be worn by all volunteers of the American Legion Auxiliary throughout the Nation. I realize very well, that inasmuch as we all started our volunteer service by wearing the orchid uniform, it will be hard for many of us to get accustomed to the new color. However, just as the Red Cross volunteers wear the gray uniform throughout the Nation, so shall we of the American Legion Auxiliary wear the blue uniform, regardless of State.

We are not serving as volunteers because we wish to be glamorous, our service is one for the sole purpose of bringing just a little of the outside world to those veterans who are still fighting the war, those young lads who left home as they were about to complete high school educations or about to enter college, and others who had completed their education and were on the threshold of a business career or some profession. They served this grand Nation of ours willingly, because they felt that by their service, America would be a better place in which to live. Those who came back whole or otherwise, know now how mistaken they were, how little the general Mr. and Mrs. Public care of their condition.

In all business firms, in all States, cities, or towns, the people are governed by those elected to a particular office, either because they are popular or because the public feel they have the necessary leadership ability necessary, or because they have proven their fitness for such an office You and I must obey the laws as they are presented to us or suffer the consequence. So it is with the new blue uniform of our volunteers. Regardless of whether or not we like the color, which I personally feel is becoming to everyone, we should accept the new uniform as given to us by our national officers. There is nothing that I as rehabilitation chairman for Massachusetts can do, nor can any other department officer change the ruling made by our national organization

And now we come to the Hoover Commission of which the part pertaining to veterans is of interest to us.

Our beloved Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS has just arrived and I feel sure that she will have an inspiring message to present to the members of this council today. We all know that she has always been a most sincere friend to all veterans and has always stood ready to be of service in the best interests of our veterans. We are very honored having her with us today.

I attended the conference of the American Legion held in the Gardner Auditorium of the statehouse and was privileged to hear John Thomas Taylor speak on the Hoover Commission. His talk was inspiring as well as educational and I believe I may say that it was the first time I have heard a speaker on legislation make clear every phase of the legislative program. I only wish that each and everyone of you here today might have been there to have heard him.

Our interest in and concern about the Hoover Commission report, as it affects our veterans, must now become the major phase of the rehabilitation program of the American Legion Auxiliary throughout this Nation. It is the obligation of the American Legion and Auxiliary to fight for the rights and proper privileges of our disabled and needy veterans.

Many of us remember that disgraceful condition after World War I when veterans were forced to stand on street corners selling apples, polishing them while there and also selling pencils. Never again should our veterans be subjected to such a condition.

After World War I totally disabled veterans received only $30 per month. A 50-percent-disabled veteran received $15 per month. Widows and orphans received nothing. Nor until the American Legion brought about a bill to give widows a small amount did they receive $40 per month. Today, because of the continued interest and hard work, disabled veterans receive $150 per month. Until the last Congress, this amount was $138. Paraplegics receive as much as $360 per month. World War II veterans are particularly affected by the Hoover Commission report which is now before Congress.

The Veterans' Administration administers all laws relating to benefits or services to former members of the armed forces and their dependents. These benefits are as follows:

1. Disability compensation.
2. Death compensation.
3. Disability pensions.
4. Death pensions.
5 Medical hospital service.
6. Domiciliary care.
7. United States Government and national service life insurance.
8. Vocational rehabilitation and education.
9. Guaranty of loans for purchase of homes, farms, business properties.
10. Unemployment allowances.

The last three named services apply exclusively to World War II veterans.

Following is how the Hoover Commission would split up major functions of the VA among the Federal agencies:

1. All hospital medical attention would be under a United Medical Administration; i. e., the Hoover Commission proposes that the hospital care and medical treatment presently available to veterans under direction of VA be taken over by a new colossal Federal agency, this to be known as the United Medical Administration. This is definitely the beginning of an attempt to divide the veteran from his identity as a veteran. Because many other branches of service, civil and Government, personnel and their families would be included in this medical treatment.

After World War I veterans were placed in poorhouses, almshouses, and even in jails until the VA hospitals were constructed

Do any of you here today feel that after a young man serves his country in time of war to protect those left at home should be subjected to a jail when he is ill? I don't think so

2. All hospital construction would be under the Department of the Interior, which means hospital construction of all Government agencies. Only one is familiar with the needs of veteran hospital construction. The one experienced in this work is the Veterans' Administration.

If recommendations of the Hoover Commission pertaining to veterans were followed this all important and specialized work would be transferred to the Department of the Interior.

As I understand it, this committee is saying that there are empty beds in our VA hospitals. At the present time let us consider Cushing VA Hospital: As of December 12, 1949, the capacity of the hospital was 1,100 patients. The number housed as of this date was 801, with 186 World War I and 596 World War II, Spanish-American 16, and 2 peacetime veterans. There are 23 women patients and 1 other not classified.

There are 68 TB patients, 349 GMS, and 384 NP. At the present time there are 8 service-connected patients waiting admission and 408 nonservice connected waiting admission

At Bedford, the capacity is 1,651, but at the present time as of December 27, 1949, the patients were numbered 1,868 with 1,006 World War I and 655 World War II; 46 Spanish-American and 161 peacetime; 76 women patients. All patients are N. P. condition with a waiting list of 30 service connected and 201 nonservice connected.

These figures will show whether or not our Veterans' Administration hospitals have empty beds as is claimed by the Hoover Commission.

3. All insurance matters would be under a veterans insurance corporation, which means briefly that the Hoover Commission states that the Insurance Division of the VA is inefficient. Yet it proposes to correct this alleged inefficiency by creating an additional experimental corporation to handle this tremendous job—a new Veterans Insurance Corporation.

4. All home loans and veterans housing would be under a Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Hoover Commission wants to

take from the VA the handling of all home loans made possible under the GI bill of rights which the American Legion fought so tirelessly to enact The Commission fails to mention administration of farm and business loans which remains unexplained.

5 All other benefits, if there are any, would be under the VA. The Veterans' Administration would be merely a shell.

If this bill goes through pertaining to veterans, the "pushing around" plight of our veterans in 1920 would be only a circumstance to the bewildering chaos into which our veterans of today and tomorrow would again be plunged. A veteran could not go to one place, but would be forced to go from one agency to another. He might have to visit 4 or 5 agencies and go through the same red tape time after time. Not a pretty picture for sick veterans.

There would exist competition for beds, then the question, What if veterans were unable to afford private hospital treatment? There should be no competition

Must our veterans once again be the targets in a vicious attack similar to the heartless Economy Act of 1933? The Hoover Commission report as far as the section pertaining to veterans is concerned is a ruthless campaign to send our veterans down the river.

As members of the American Legion Auxiliary, we must support the American Legion in its stand regarding this Hoover Commission bill pertaining to veterans We must not sit back and let Johnny do the writing. Numerical strength is what counts. Send letters, cards, and get members not present here today to do the same

Tell your Senators and Representatives, Congressmen, in no uncertain terms that you as a member of the American Legion Auxiliary are emphatically opposed to the Hoover Commission Report pertaining to veterans We all realize that we must economize, but why single out our American veteran who offered his life for his country as the target

In 1920 and 1930, the American Legion thwarted a full betrayal of American veterans.

Let us all get behind the American Legion and help them put over this bill to the benefit of our veterans who offered their lives for their country, for those who paid the supreme sacrifice and for those who still are suffering the ravages of war

Let each of us offer up a prayer and ask God's help in guiding the citizens who vote to so use the privilege of voting in the right and just way

What better way to show and demonstrate our appreciation to those who have given so much for this grand country of ours

We all want good, sound and honest economy, but we do not want dishonest economy such as the part of the Hoover Commission as pertains to veterans

Write, write, write, and tell your representatives in Washington that you are opposed to any changes in the present law affecting the rights and benefits to veterans. Write and tell them that you feel that the Veterans' Administration is efficient in handling veterans' affairs. Write and ask them to vote against the so-called Hoover Commission bills wherein they affect veterans Write also and tell them you are opposed to veterans losing their preference in civil service. Then sign your name and address.

In closing may I just say:

"Life is a story in volumes three,
The past, the present and the yet to be
The first is finished and laid away
The second we are reading day by day
Third and last of the volumes three
Is locked from sight. God keeps the key."

For past deeds and kind services, history has been made recording the happiness and comfort you have brought into the lives of others

The present volume, we are living day by day and giving continued service to those who have known and still are suffering the ravages of war.

And for the yet to be, only God can foresee, so let us all put our trust in Him and ask Him to give us the health and guidance to carry on for God and country.

LUTHER E. ELLIS

Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week an employee of the Veterans' Administration retired after 30 years of faithful service. That in itself is a noteworthy event, but it is not unusual, for there are many workers in that Government agency who have labored steadily in the interests of veterans since the First World War and now are reaching a point where they must make way for younger and stronger, if not more capable, successors.

I want to call attention to the retirement of Luther E. Ellis, who was the director of the Veterans' Administration coordination service, a position of importance and trust, and only one of the many he has occupied during the 30 years of his service.

Ellis was a brave soldier in World War I. He was the holder of the Distinguished Service Cross for bravery while serving as a captain and company commander with the Twenty-sixth Division, the National Guard outfit from our New England States. He is a very modest and reticent veteran when it comes to talking about his service. He simply will not talk about himself I wanted to say something here about his accomplishments before the enemy, but the only way I could obtain the facts was through the Adjutant General at the Department of Defense. There I received the following very sketchy, very curt, account of a deed of valor that was outstanding:

Ellis, Luther E., captain, One Hundred and Second Infantry, Twenty-sixth Division In Bois d'Ormont, France, October 23, 1918. He personally led his company against a strongly held enemy machine-gun position. During the advance he was shot through the lung. When wounded his men halted to render first aid, but he ordered them forward. His example of gallantry contributed greatly to the success of the attack.

Prior to this he had received a citation for bravery in the Battle of Belleau Wood.

The wound he received in the Bois d'Ormont engagement was a very serious one, a machine-gun bullet passing through his body. That wound has never healed. All through the 30 years of devotion to veterans and their needs it has been open and has required almost daily dressing. The condition brought about complications that required frequent operations. Through all this pain and suffering Ellis has worked on his nerve, performing his daily tasks in spite of handicaps that would have stopped a man of lesser courage and determination.

He is an old friend of mine. I recall the long hospitalization he had at Walter Reed General Hospital in 1919 and 1920, when so many of our boys were fighting to get back to normal health and living. He was a favorite among the disabled men; his cheerfulness and his willingness to help the other fellow made him an outstanding figure in the hospital.

After his discharge from the hospital Ellis had several tours of duty as a training officer for the Federal Vocational Education Board in Chicago and Grand Rapids, Mich. In 1921 he transferred to the newly organized Veterans' Bureau in Detroit, where he became manager of that office.

On August 1, 1931, he was transferred to the central office of the newly organized Veterans' Administration in Washington, as administrative officer in the Solicitor's office. On January 1, 1939, he became executive officer of the regulations and procedures division of the Solicitor's office, and on July 1, 1945, he became executive officer of the coordination service, from which position he was promoted to director of the service on February 6, 1949.

Ellis was born September 29, 1889, in Butler, Ky. He attended grade school in Liberty Center, Ind., and high school in Bluffton, Ind. Then he went to Wabash College, at Crawfordsville, where he received his A. B. degree after starring in athletics.

From 1914 to 1915, he was an instructor in Lafayette (Ind.) High School, and from 1915 to 1917, he taught mathematics and coached athletics in Hammond High School, where he met his wife-to-be, Dorothy H. Gorman, also a teacher there.

When World War I broke out in 1917, he entered an officers' training school and was commissioned a first lieutenant. After serving 21 months overseas as lieutenant and captain—10 months at the front—he was separated from the Army on December 17, 1920.

Ellis married Miss Gorman January 14, 1920, in Chicago. The couple have two children, a daughter, Mrs. William T. Lane, Jr., of Richmond, Calif., and a son, Kent, now a senior student at Yale Medical School. Both children are members of the Phi Beta Kappa for scholastic excellence. Mrs. Lane is a graduate of Northwestern University. Mr. and Mrs. Ellis reside at 1621 Montague Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. Ellis is a member of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Order of the Purple Heart, the Legion of Valor, the Military Order of the World Wars, and several Masonic orders

It is my hope, and I know that it is the hope of all his friends, that the future will be good to him and that he will finally, through rest and change of atmosphere, gain a little of the comfort and recreation he is entitled to enjoy. Just now he is having one of those frequent sojourns in the hospital, out at Mount Alto, but we know that his courage will assure for a long time to come the possibility of continued association with the many friends he has made.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my remarks may appear in the RECORD as a separate speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCSWEENEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE WALTHAM WATCH CO.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I could not help but think as

the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] spoke of the enormous sums that are being spent to pay the growers for potatoes that will be just thrown away, and I listened to his very fine suggestion as to what could be done with these potatoes so that they could be put to good use; as I said, I could not help but think of the thousands of hard-working people who are now unemployed. I refer to the workers, the highly trained precision workers, of the Waltham Watch Co.

That company has made a remarkable record through the years. It made a remarkable record through the war. It is a company which is vitally needed today, I am told by people who ought to know about our national defense. They are needed to make precision instruments which are necessary for our national defense more today than at most times during the past years. I could not help but think that the Government which has spent so much in subsidizing potatoes which are not used is not going to spend money to keep these workers employed in the Waltham Watch Co.

Why the Reconstruction Finance Corporation refused to lend the necessary money to the Waltham Watch Co. I do not know, because I am positive that the Waltham Watch Co., under the terms of legislation which we have enacted, could secure Government orders which would keep these precision workers employed.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DONOHUE. I compliment the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for her untiring efforts in trying to keep the Waltham Watch Co. open as well as for her efforts to preserve the watchmaking industry of our country. Is it not true that during the war these watch manufacturers were devoted entirely to the making of precision instruments for the successful prosecution of the war?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. DONOHUE. And is it not also true that during that time the Swiss watch makers imported practically all of the watches which were sold in this country, thereby cornering the market of watches in this country?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is correct. I would like to remark at this point how tirelessly the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE], in whose district the Waltham Watch Co. is, has worked. When I came back to Congress this session I really did not know the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] because he looked so serious—he almost never smiles.

Mr. DONOHUE. Is it not the consensus of opinion of all those in charge of our national security and our national defense that the domestic watchmaking industry is most vital?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. If this company is not kept open and if our watchmaking industry is not kept alive, the workers will go away and we will lose these precision workers.

I would like to say that in this whole picture there has been a foreign connivance toward shutting down in some way or another, I cannot find out, but it seems there has been connivance that shut down the Waltham Watch Co. The attacks on the Waltham Watch Co. and the people employed there have been extremely vicious by the foreign countries. I understand that the Government has not been cooperative either, in demanding that foreign countries send their machinery to the Waltham Watch Co., or at least sell it to the Waltham Watch Co. so that they could make these precision instruments. I feel very sure that something will be done. Something must be done. As the gentleman knows, of course, he and some of the rest of us tried very hard to get a much better division of imports from Switzerland than we were able to secure.

A complete stoppage of all of our watch companies will take place if this is not done. I will not mention names, but I understand other American watch companies will have to close their doors if the Swiss importations continue.

Mr. DONOHUE. I wholeheartedly agree with the gentlewoman in her observations.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know what the gentleman has done, and I know his great anxiety.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question but what in time of emergency, such as war, in particular, the country on one side of the conflict that does not have a watch industry and workers who can produce precision instruments, is at a severe disadvantage. It is my understanding that the only two countries that have watch industries are the United States and Switzerland. If it were not for the three American watch companies, Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham, during the last war, our country and our allies would have been at a very serious disadvantage. Not only are those precision workers of vital importance in connection with the manufacture of accurate watches, but they are also important in making the instruments used in bombs, submarines, and such things. A watch industry is of vital importance in the national defense of the country, particularly a large country. I understand that England recognizes it and is trying to build up a watch industry. I understand that the Soviet Union, difficult as it is to get any information, is developing a watch industry. So that the watch industry in a nation is important not only in time of peace, to give employment, but it is vital in time of war, and it is amazing how important it is as a part of the national defense.

We had three watch companies, Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham. It seems to me, from the angle of national defense, that the matter should be very carefully inquired into, to ascertain just how important the American watch industry is.

I was talking with our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] only a few minutes ago, and he suggested to me that this is a matter that the Armed Forces Committee should look into. I think that is a very excellent suggestion. The gentleman suggested that we take up with the chairman of that committee the appointment of a subcommittee to look into the importance of the American watch industry in the national defense of our country.

I was also talking to our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], who is a member of the committee, and he is wholeheartedly enthusiastic about that suggestion. I am sure that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will concur in it, that it is a matter of vital importance that complete information be obtained as to the importance of the American watch industry, not only during the last war but, in case of any future conflict, in our national defense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the lady may continue for five additional minutes, because we have taken up all of her time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to say to the gentleman that for months I have been working on that angle. The National Defense has told me that it was very vital. I have been very much puzzled and baffled because more requests from the Waltham Watch Co. have not gone to the National Defense. I talked to them even yesterday. Some of the persons told me there that they are vitally concerned in having the Waltham Watch Co. continue, for the very reason of making these precision instruments. I have talked to the White House. I have talked to Dr. Steelman a number of times about it. Under the law it is perfectly possible for the National Defense and the Munitions Board to give orders to these vital industries. Why this is not done before the doors of the Waltham Watch Co. are closed, I am at a loss to understand. My feeling is that the RFC will do something about it, but it should have been done long ago instead of putting these workers out on the street.

Mr. McCORMACK. A subcommittee holding public hearings would establish a record and the public could be acquainted with the importance of the American watch industry in time of emergency. Does the gentlewoman agree with that?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that is a splendid idea. My only desire is to see immediate action so that these workers in desperation will not go somewhere else for employment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Immediate action, of course, is contemplated. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] made what I thought was a very excellent suggestion and I shall cooperate with him to the fullest extent, as I know will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then later on if the RFC chooses to recognize the reorganized Waltham Watch Co., or the present company for that matter, there will be these additional facts to go on.

Mr. McCORMACK. It might develop that we should consider legislation to in-

clude the watch industry as one of the factors of our defense.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that is very important.

If I might make another suggestion it would be that our Committee on Foreign Affairs investigate the State Department as to its attitude toward national defense, because at times it has seemed very positive that the State Department has gone contrary to our national defense interests, yet they are as much concerned with national defense as the military. I think the gentleman should introduce a resolution asking the committee to look into the State Department and find out the reason they have not done more to protect the watch industry of our country, why they have been so very favorable to the Swiss interests.

I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE]; and I see the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] sitting there. I know how much interested he has been in helping the Waltham Watch Co. In fact, the entire Massachusetts delegation has done a lot of work on it. If the administration would arouse its interest or become conscious of the realities of the situation I am sure relief would be forthcoming. The State Department, in connection with the reciprocal trade agreements, has the responsibility to protect our national defense and our vital defense industries, and I believe they have been entirely negligent concerning the United States watch companies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

THE HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, the Hoover Commission, composed of 12 members, met first on September 27, 1947. For almost 2 years they worked to develop plans for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. About 400 experts, in and out of the Government, assisted the Commission in preparing 18 reports containing 277 specific recommendations for changes in governmental organization. Over 100 of these changes could be made effective by administrative action. Over 100 required legislation by the Congress and the balance were to be submitted by the President, subject to a veto by Congress.

No doubt the most important of these recommendations was the unification of the armed forces, which has largely been carried out. It is agreed that in 1951 we will have the best military force that we have had in any year since the war and the cost will be more than a billion dollars less than in 1950.

Six large reorganization plans have already been submitted to Congress and approved. The reorganization programs already in effect should save about $2,000,000,000 in the coming fiscal year. No doubt many other recommendations will be adopted and many are now being installed by various executive agencies.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

For many years the veterans of the United States worked hard to get their activities centered in one organization to which they could turn with their many problems. As a result, the Veterans' Administration was established. Every major veterans' organization in the United States has full-time representatives at the central office here in Washington and at the many offices throughout the United States. These representatives handle millions of individual cases, often in cooperation with the veteran's Congressman.

The Hoover Commission made 4 recommendations out of 277 which every veterans' organization and the great majority of veterans oppose. The objection is based on the fact that these changes will cost more and will give the veteran less efficient service.

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

Mr. SECREST. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Is it not true that this proposed reorganization of the Veterans' Administration would not tend toward greater efficiency? I am very conscious of the gentleman's great work and interest in veterans' affairs, that he is one of the best friends the ex-serviceman has in Congress. I am sure he is going to fight to take care of the interests of the veterans even if it does cost just a little more, because it will result in economy in the end.

Mr. SECREST. The gentleman is correct, and I will deal with that subject just a little later.

No one in America is more anxious for a reduction of the national debt than the veteran because every pension of every veteran is dependent, in the future, upon the financial condition of the United States Government. So is hospitalization and other needs of the veteran.

The first vote I ever cast in Congress was against the so-called economy bill. Because of their experience with this legislation, veterans feel they may be called upon to bear an unfair share of the burden in a future depression. With the objectives of the Hoover Commission and with the great majority of its recommendations any veteran, who has had the opportunity to study them, will agree.

Of the many recommendations, the veterans' organizations are principally concerned with four:

First. The Hoover Commission recommends that hospitalization and medical services be taken from the Veterans' Administration and placed in a great new medical bureau to be called the United Medical Administration. Those familiar with the situation are convinced that this is an attempt to make the veterans a pawn in the effort to establish complete socialized medicine in the United States.

Furthermore, veterans' hospitals in general are entirely different from other hospitals. In an Army or Navy hospital a soldier is treated for a limited time. The vast majority are returned to active duty, the rest are given medical discharges. Some return home, others go to veterans' hospitals. Army hospitals as well as private hospitals are constructed to serve the temporary needs of patients. Tens of thousands of the patients in veterans' hospitals will spend their lives there. Many are helpless. They must have movies and other entertainment to make the years endurable. They must keep their minds occupied and, where possible, their hands. Rehabilitation is an essential part of the treatment. To merely furnish X-ray facilities, operating rooms, medical treatment, and beds would be downright cruelty to permanently hospitalized veterans. When it comes to need or purpose, comparing the average hospital with a veterans' hospital is like comparing a pumpkin to a plum. We can make a good pie out of both, but we cannot grow them on the same tree.

Second. The Hoover Commission would have the Department of the Interior construct veterans' hospitals. Under the present arrangement the Army engineers build many hospitals for the Veterans' Administration. In time of peace we have to maintain a corps of engineers in order to be ready for war. I have always believed that economy will result if we work these engineers instead of compelling them to loaf between wars. For this reason the Army engineers have been given the peacetime duty of constructing flood-control dams, veterans' hospitals, and many other types of public works. To have them continue will not only bring economy but will give them experience vital to greater efficiency in war. The Army has just closed several large hospitals. It may be possible to convert some of these for the use of veterans.

Third. The Hoover Commission has recommended the creation of a Veterans' Insurance Corporation. The creation of the Corporation is not the issue, but veterans feel that it should continue as a part of the Veterans' Administration.

Fourth. The fourth recommendation opposed by veterans is the proposal to transfer the home-loan program set up under the GI bill of rights to the Housing Administration, an agency that has been, and will continue to be, a political football.

ECONOMY

If these four activities are left with the Veterans' Administration, I believe that as much economy will result as if they are transferred. I know that the veterans will be given better service. Today there is a representative of the Veterans' Administration in Zanesville, Cambridge, and Marietta. Veterans in my district can go to one of these offices if he wants to be admitted to a veterans' hospital, or needs medical care. He can go to one of these offices to discuss his veteran's insurance or a loan on his home. Every individual veteran can bring any problem to one of these representatives of the Veterans' Administration. If the four activities are transferred to four separate agencies of the Government, each, at tremendous expense, would have to set up a local office in most of the counties of the United States, or deprive the veterans of someone reasonably close to home to whom

they can take their problems. By having his activities in one organization, he has been able to eliminate some of the red tape that binds nearly every citizen in his contacts with the Government.

Let me cite an example of the merry-go-round the veteran fears. On December 22, 1949, a young man from Ohio was injured in the post office here in Washington. On the 23d he filed claim for compensation. The local postmaster had to fill out a form which had to be taken to the Employees' Compensation Bureau. He was then compelled to go to the Federal Security Agency for a medical examination and continued treatment of a fractured arm. From the Federal Security Administration he had to return to the post office to get another signature from the postmaster. This he took to the Employees' Compensation Bureau who approved his claim and sent it to the Treasury Department from where the check is mailed. During the duration of his injury this young man must go through all these steps every 2 weeks. He did not receive his compensation for the first 2 weeks of injury until the 3d of February, in spite of the fact that I made numerous telephone calls in his behalf. I do not want to see the veteran thus tossed around on a sea of bureaucracy as he surely would be if the activities which affect him are scattered in various branches of the Federal Government.

The American Automobile Association will mark a route for a motorist from Washington to San Francisco. If the driver finds a bridge washed out in Kansas, the sensible thing to do is to detour around it and go on. In the same way the recommendations of the Hoover Commission are a suggested route to economy and efficiency in government. We have already traveled half the journey. Common sense dictates that we bypass the destruction of the Veterans' Administration and proceed to the destination all of us want—a balanced budget and reduction of the debt.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) until February 15 on account of official business.

To Mr. SAYLOR, for February 9 and 10, on account of death of a friend.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. IRVING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4106. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1282. An act to authorize grants under the Federal Airport Act for minor projects at major airports, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 3, 1950, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 322. An act to transfer funds to the town of Craig, Alaska;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of August Michela, a minor;

H. R. 2585. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain metallic impurities in tin ores and concentrates when such impurities are not recovered;

H. R. 4387. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Treasury Department; and

H. R. 6212. An act to amend section 5 of the Federal Firearms Act.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 8, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1213. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a request for the return of the case of Michele Pennino, file No. A-3546502 CR 25827, submitted on January 16, 1950, with other cases involving suspension of deportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1214. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal in accordance with provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1215. A letter from the Director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council, transmitting a letter stating his earnest plea that the bill H. R. 4846 be brought up for consideration by the Congress on February 27, 1950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1216. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report listing the tort claims approved for payment for the fiscal year 1949 and setting forth the name of each claimant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1217. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 677. A bill for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Honorio Canciller Evangelista; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2705. A bill for the relief of Martin Kenneth Ikeda; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3018. A bill for the relief of Camilla Fabris; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4015. A bill for the relief of Kate Laursen; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1581). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4532. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ta Fu Wu; without amendment (Rept. No. 1582). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5566. A bill for the relief of Dr. Agostino DeLisi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1583). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6271. A bill for the relief of Hamako Amano; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6344. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William Y. Imanaka; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6414. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chikako Mary Ohori Hori; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6589. A bill for the relief of Mitsue Miyamoto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6689. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko Uemura; without amendment (Rept. No. 1588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6756. A bill for the relief of Arthur Chen Shu Jee; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6787. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kyoko Nakamura Kornhauser; without amendment (Rept. No. 1590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6894. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nobuko Eto Heard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7035. A bill for the relief of Hisako Sakata Ikezawa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 7177. A bill to prevent military personnel from replacing civilians in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 7178. A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7179. A bill to amend section 811 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 7180. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall make annual reports to the Congress of tax inequities or loopholes which have come to his attention in the administration of the internal-revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 7181. A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H R. 7182. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 7183. A bill to amend section 82 of the act approved April 30, 1900 (31 Stat. 157; 48 U. S. C., 1946 edition, sec. 632), entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R 7184. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, in order to provide more effective financial assistance for small business; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 7185. A bill to amend Public Law 359, chapter 287, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 7186. A bill to authorize the Public Printer to furnish copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the Department of State for distribution to all United States missions aboard; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 7187. A bill to relieve postmasters and other paying employees of the postal service from accountability for wrong payment of money orders in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 7188. A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the Agricultural Act of 1949, to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. R. 7189. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and authorize a stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 7190. A bill for the relief of dependents of persons killed in collision of airplanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7191. A bill for the relief of dependents of persons killed in collision of airplanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 7192. A bill to provide benefits for the widows of certain persons who were retired or are eligible for retirement under section 6 of the act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 7193. A bill to exempt amounts paid for admissions to museums from the Federal tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. J. Res. 415. Joint resolution designating the calendar year 1950 as "American Enterprise Centennial Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 462. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate and study the extent to which subversive activities in the Department of State have influenced, and are influencing, the foreign policy of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 463. Resolution to encourage a peaceful, prosperous, and united Ireland, but without imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 7194. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rei Yamada Munns and Edward Lee Munns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7195. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Takino Kajikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7196. A bill for the relief of Sumie Kira Sakamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 7197. A bill for the relief of Stanley Stringham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H R. 7198. A bill for the relief of Victor Antos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7199. A bill for the relief of Nobuko Maeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARST:

H R 7200. A bill for the relief of Chu Bud Yick, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H R 7201. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Pia DiLaura; to the Committee on the Judiciary

H R. 7202. A bill for the relief of Alexander Newman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 7203 A bill for the relief of Vito Manzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H R. 7204. A bill for the relief of Maria Cristina D'Angelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7205 A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Ling (or Lin) and their two children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H R. 7206. A bill for the relief of Johan Wilhelm Adriaans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1804. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. Glen Ostrander and 17 others, from Oelrichs, S. Dak., protesting enactment of legislation to reduce and limit the size of parcel-post packages; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1805. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of Mrs. J. O. Ralph and 34 others, of Sac City, Iowa, requesting passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1806. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, advocating that recognition of the Communist government of China by the United States be withheld; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1807. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging repeal of the wartime excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1808 By Mr. RICH: Petition of the Columbian Literary Society of Mansfield, Tioga County, Pa., in opposition to proposed compulsory health-insurance legislation or any Government medicine known to many as socialized medicine, and favoring the extension of public and private health services and the preservation of a free medical profession; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1809. Also, petition of the Woman's Club of Ulysses, Potter County, Pa., member of the Pennsylvania Federated Women's Clubs, in opposition to any form of socialized medicine or compulsory health-insurance legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1810. Also, petition of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Williamsport, Pa; expressing opposition to compulsory Government-provided medical care; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1811 By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to withhold recognition of the Communist government of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1812. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation repealing the wartime excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1813. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Memorial of the Mississippi Legislature, condemning statements of Secretary Acheson of loyalty to Alger Hiss, and requesting investigations as to loyalty, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1814. Also, memorial of the Legislature of Mississippi, to prevent Federal liquor licenses in dry States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

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

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

God of all mercy, bowing at this noontide altar may we be vividly conscious that we need not turn back to bygone centuries to hear Thy voice, as if Thou dost speak to men no longer in the living present. Give us ears to hear Thy imperial imperatives, above the noise of crashing systems, yea, in and through the change and confusion of our day. So hearing and heeding the voice divine, may our devotion and compassion help to heal the open sores of the world, as we serve the present troubled age. In these days freighted with destiny, keep us true to our highest and to Thy unceasing challenge to our best. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 7, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Anderson	Hoey	Millikin
Benton	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Myers
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Darby	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Downey	Leahy	Stennis
Ecton	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Lodge	Taylor
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tobey
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wiley
Gurney	McKellar	Williams
Hayden	McMahon	Withers
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Young
Hickenlooper	Martin	
Hill	Maybank	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is necessarily absent.

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

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DWORSHAK was granted leave of absence beginning today and continuing through next Monday.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DONNELL was granted leave of absence from 5 o'clock this afternoon until Monday, February 13.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate from the close of business today until February 17, in order that I may make some Lincoln Day speeches and incidentally talk a little politics.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator's request to be absent will be granted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I was thinking seriously of objecting to the request, but knowing how forceful the Senator from Indiana is in all his speeches, I cannot object to his request to go to the hustings at once.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I simply wished to be honest in describing what I was going to do.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator need not make that observation; all of us know that he is honest at all times.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and offer other routine matters for the RECORD and the Appendix, without debate and without speeches.

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

ATTENDANCE OF UNITED STATES MARINE BAND AT CELEBRATION COMMEMORATING BATTLE OF LEXINGTON

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at this time I ask the majority leader if, pursuant to the request he has just made, I may carry out a suggestion which I took up with him, to which I believe he agreed. I should like to ask unanimous consent at this time for the consideration of Calendar 1261, Senate bill 2681, to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington. I know there is no objection to it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am delighted to accommodate the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and suggest that he ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 2681.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2681) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington, to be held at Lexington, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and give concerts at a celebration to be held April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950, at Lexington, Mass., commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying expenses of such band in attending and giving concerts at such celebration there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to cover the cost of transportation and pullman accommodations for the leaders and members of the Marine Band, and allowance not to exceed $8 per day each for additional traveling and living expenses while on duty, such allowance to be in addition to the pay and allowance to which they would be entitled while serving their permanent station.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the state of the finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administration for the period July 1 through December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS

Petitions were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation repealing the wartime excise taxes

"Whereas the purpose for which the wartime excise taxes were imposed is no longer in existence; and

"Whereas these taxes penalize the people who have to buy baby oil, toiletries and cosmetics, electric bulbs, telegraph and telephone service, transportation, theater tickets, furs, luggage, sporting goods, jewelry, silverware, some appliances, and many other items; and

"Whereas these taxes retard business in that not so much merchandise or services are sold because of them: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to repeal the said excise taxes, so that people will be relieved of this sales-tax burden and business otherwise given new life; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth."

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to withhold recognition of the Communist Government in China

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to abstain from the taking of any action which would result in the recognition of the Communist Government in China by the United States, and to take

such affirmative action as may be necessary or desirable to prevent the recognition of said government by the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth."

In house of representatives, adopted January 25, 1950.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, January 31, 1950.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

DEMOCRATIZATION OF GERMANY—STATEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement, including the signatures, recently made by the Committee on National Affairs concerning the democratization of Germany. There is included in it an appeal for governmental action.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, including the signatures, as follows:

We recently emerged victorious from the second of two great wars fought within a single generation to defend democracy. We are still imperiled by German antidemocratic elements as well as by Russian Communist aggression—these threats are not unrelated.

A major failure to date in the fight against totalitarianism by the democracies has been the lack of success in developing a democratic Germany essential to the security of the democratic world. While the Russians are building a totalitarianism of the Left in eastern Germany, there is danger of the rebirth of a totalitarianism of the Right in western Germany. Both are antidemocratic. An undemocratic Germany, potentially an ally of the forces of Communist aggression, is now and will remain a continuing threat to the peaceful world freemen seek

The minimum objectives proclaimed necessary to assure a democratic Germany have not yet been attained.

1. The German economic war potential has not been brought under effective international control.

2. German industry has not been decartelized.

3. The German federal and state governments have not been effectively denazified as they include many former Nazis and Nazi supporters in key positions, and the all-important civil service has not been liberalized to permit greater employment of existing democratic elements.

4. German educational and cultural institutions have not been democratized.

We seek no Carthaginian peace. We believe that the natural, industrial, and human resources of Germany are necessary to the development of a balanced European prosperity and are therefore essential to the maintenance of international security. But we also firmly believe that these resources threaten world peace unless they are brought within the framework of international control and direction.

We therefore call upon the Government of the United States to take the following measures:

1. Forbid the creation of a national army or national police force in western Germany in accordance with the requirements of the occupation statute and the Bonn accord.

2. Declare that it will continue to maintain occupation forces in western Germany until minimum democratic objectives have been attained and until our withdrawal would clearly not hazard the peace.

3. Insist upon continued and effective international control of the Ruhr and Rhine industries to insure their peaceful utilization, and provide for the decartelized integration of the German economy into that of western Europe.

4. Proceed vigorously to support and assist the democratic elements in Germany in the long-term task of democratizing the economic, political, and cultural institutions of that country.

5. Seek the restoration of German participation in nonmilitary international organizations at the earliest practicable time as one means of integrating Germany so that it becomes a member in good standing of the family of democratic nations.

Committee on National Affairs, 100 East Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.: Samuel Hopkins Adams, New York; Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, New York; Roger N Baldwin, New York, William H. Baldwin, New York; Courtenay Barber, Jr., Illinois; G. M. Bellanca, Delaware; Russell G. Bellezza, Maryland; Alfred M. Bingham, Connecticut, Dr. L. M. Birkhead, New York; Jacob Blaustein, Maryland; Raymond B. Bowen, New York; Mrs. Aida Breckinridge, New York; Percy S. Brown, New Hampshire, Struthers Burt, Wyoming; H. H. Butler, New York; Henry B Cabot, Massachusetts; Samuel Cabot, Massachusetts; A. G. Cameron, Ohio; Dean Harry J. Carman, New York; Carl Carmer, New York; Delbert Clark, New York; Rufus E Clement, Georgia; William T. Cobb, New York; William F. Cochran, Maryland; Morris L Cooke, Pennsylvania, Albert S. Coolidge, Massachusetts; Emmett Corrigan, New York; Frank R. Crosswaith, New York; C. Suydam Cutting, New York; J. Clarence Daniels, Jr, New York; A. Powell Davies, District of Columbia; J. Lionberger Davis, Missouri; Joseph M. Dawson, District of Columbia, Dr. Stephen Duggan, Connecticut; Charles P. Eisenhauer, Ohio; Thomas H. Eliot, Massachusetts; John Ellis, New York; Irving M Engel, New York; Hugo Ernst, Ohio; George Field, New York; Prof. D. F. Fleming, Tennessee; Hugh L. Gaddis, Ohio, Truman K. Gibson, Jr, Illinois; Arthur J. Goldsmith, New York, Sylvan Gotshal, New York; D Samuel Gottesman, New York; Herman A. Gray, New York; William Green, District of Columbia; Frederick P. Gruenberg, Pennsylvania; Edward O. Hascall, Jr., Michigan; August Heckscher, New York; William H. Hessler, Ohio; Tracy Higgings, New York; Melvin D. Hildreth, District of Columbia, Gen. John Hilldring, District of Columbia; Rt. Rev. Henry W. Hobson, Ohio; Dr. Bryn J. Hovde, New York; B. W. Huebsch, New York; Miss Alice W. Hunt, Rhode Island; Dr. Horace M. Kallen, New York; Dorothy Kenyon, New York; Prof. Hans Kohn, New York; Charles M. LaFollette, District of Columbia; Andrew M. Law, South Carolina; Goodhue Livingston, Jr., New York; Mrs. Burnett Mahon, New York; Frederick C. McKee, Pennsylvania; J. A. Migel, Rhode Island; Newbold Morris, New York; Edgar A. Mowrer, District of Columbia; Lewis Mumford, New York; P. G. Mumford, New York; William C. Murray, New York; Charlton Ogburn, New York; Harry A. Overstreet, California; Rt. Rev. G. Bromley Oxnam, New York; E. W. Palmer, Tennessee; James G. Patton, Colorado; Lewis Perry, Massachusetts; Prof. Ralph Barton Perry, Massachusetts; Henry V. Poor, New York; Arthur Upham Pope, New York; Richard de Rochemont, New York; Mrs. Tobe D. Rosenblum, New York; Richard B. Scandrett, Jr., New York; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Massachusetts; F. E. Schuchman, Pennsylvania; Aaron Schoen, New York; Mrs. William Marston Seabury, New York; Eric Sevareid, District of Columbia; Henry Noble Sherwood, Indiana; Mrs. William Dick Sporborg, New York; Admiral William H. Standley, California; Mark Starr, New York; Meier Steinbrink, New York; A. G. Stieglitz, New York; Rex Stout, New York; Clarence Streit, District of Columbia; Herbert Bayard Swope, New York; Telford Taylor, New York; Barent Ten Eyck, New York; F. R. Von Windegger, Missouri; Westmore Willcox, New York; Justice James H. Wolfe, Utah; Max Zaritsky, New York.

TRANSFER OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE OUT-PATIENT DISPENSARY

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Rex Wheeler, Jr., chairman, Port Committee Steamship Trade Association, of Baltimore, Md., transmitting a resolution adopted by that association, protesting against the proposal to transfer the United States Public Health Service out-patient dispensary from the customhouse in Baltimore to the marine hospital. I present the letter and resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

ALCOA STEAMSHIP COMPANY, INC.,
Baltimore, Md., January 3, 1950.

Hon HERBERT R O'CONOR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'CONOR: Under date of December 6, 1948, you wrote to Mr. Stevenson Masson, who was then executive vice president of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore, acknowledging receipt of Mr. Masson's letter which enclosed a resolution against a proposal to transfer the Public Health Service's out-patient dispensary from the customhouse to the marine hospital.

Together with his letter, Mr. Masson sent you a copy of the resolution adopted by the Steamship Trade Association. It was unanimously approved that this out-patient dispensary remain in the customhouse.

The Steamship Trade Association now learns that the move to transfer this department is again under way, and we earnestly request that you use your good offices to do whatever you can to prevent the moving of the out-patient dispensary from its present offices in the customhouse. Your assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated by all members of the association.

Respectfully yours,

REX WHEELER, Jr.,
Chairman, Port Committee,
Steamship Trade Association.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE STEAMSHIP TRADE ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 9, 1948

Resolution against proposal to transfer United States Public Health Service's out-patient dispensary from custom house to marine hospital, Wyman Park Drive

Whereas the administrative functions of local shipping firms have been conducted from offices established since early 1800 in the vicinity of the United States customhouse; and

Whereas these locations were selected because of the concentration of allied interests, including the United States Public Health Service's out-patient dispensary; and

Whereas this dispensary has been located in the United States customhouse since the opening of this building in 1907; and

Whereas the United States Shipping Commissioner, United States Coast Guard Inspection Bureau, Civil Service Examination Board, union shipping halls are all located in this general area, and

Whereas the number of visits to this dispensary approached 19,000 during recent fiscal year; and

Whereas it is reported this dispensary will be moved to United States Public Health Service's Marine Hospital, Wyman Park Drive: Be it

Resolved, That the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore, Inc., go on record with the Surgeon General that, in the best interest of all concerned, the out-patient dispensary remain in the customhouse Be it further

Resolved, That copy of this resolution be sent to Surgeon General, Maryland Members of Congress, and the mayor of the city of Baltimore, requesting that they use their good offices so no changes are made to interfere with the efficient operation of United States Public Health Service's out-patient dispensary at its present location.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Study Group of the Maryland Committee for Representative Government, Baltimore, Md., urging the Congress to make effective the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

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

Whereas Congress clearly recognized the necessity for government reorganization when it unanimously created the bipartisan Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government in July 1947; and

Whereas Chairman Herbert Hoover and the members of the Commission admirably and efficiently performed their duties of investigation and made specific recommendations concerning—

1. The elimination of expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance. The elimination of duplications and overlappings, and the consolidation of services, activities, and functions of a similar nature.

2. The elimination of services, activities, and functions unnecessary to efficient government.

3. Definition and limitation of executive functions, services, and activities; and

Whereas there is a universal demand for such economy and efficiency in government by thoughtful, public-spirited men and women throughout the United States; and

Whereas the Commission's report promises lasting benefit to all citizens not only in terms of economy and efficiency but also in terms of the effective use of our resources, human and material, in the cause of world peace and progress; and

Whereas an educational program to acquaint the public with the findings of the Commission report and to stimulate the interest of all citizens in continuous participation in the affairs of government on a bipartisan, voluntary basis has been undertaken by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the study group of the Maryland Committee for Representative Government at its meeting on the 31st day of January 1950 urges the Congress to make effective the recommendations of the Commission by enacting appropriate legislation;

That cooperation be given to the educational program of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

That copies of this resolution be sent to appropriate legislative representatives and to the Maryland Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, 636 Equitable Building, Baltimore 2, Md.

ELIZABETH C. GRIMES,
Chairman.

PROTEST AGAINST FEDERAL AUTOMOTIVE EXCISE TAX

Mr O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, a petition adopted by the Maryland Highway Users Conference, consisting of six of the Maryland organizations in the field of automotive transportation, the Baltimore Association of Commerce, and the Maryland State Grange, branding the Federal automotive excise tax as unfair and discriminatory.

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

To the Maryland Members of the Congress of the United States:

The Federal automotive excise taxes were imposed as emergency taxes for general revenue purposes, for a temporary period. Levied in the depths of the depression, 1932, they have been continued as emergency defense taxes and were increased in 1940, 1941, and 1942 as war-revenue measures.

These Federal automotive excise taxes are unfair and discriminatory. This group of Maryland highway users respectfully petitions the Maryland Members of Congress to repeal these excise taxes because—

1. They are particularly burdensome to the small-income group

2. They are imposed upon products vital to modern transportation.

3. They result in multiple taxation.

4. One type of transportation is selected for taxation to be used for general tax purposes

The Maryland Highway Users Conference—Maryland State Grange, Keystone Automobile Club, Automobile Club of Maryland, Maryland Petroleum Industries Committee, Maryland Motor Bus Operators Association, Maryland Motor Truck Association, Automobile Trade Association of Maryland, Baltimore Association of Commerce: J. C. Darrell, Secretary.

PICKETING OF COURTS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from William C. Walsh, Maryland delegate of the American Bar Association, of Baltimore, Md., transmitting a resolution unanimously adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association at its annual meeting in St. Louis, Mo., in September 1949, protesting against the picketing of courts. I present the letter and resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 26, 1950.*

Hon HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing herewith copy of recommendation opposing the picketing of courts, which recommendation was unanimously approved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association at the association's annual meeting in St. Louis in September 1949.

It goes without saying that I personally am very much opposed to the picketing of the courts, and am in favor of taking whatever steps may be necessary to prevent such activities, including the passage of S. 1681, and I will deeply appreciate your doing everything you can to having this bill brought before the Senate and considered at the earliest possible time, and supporting it when it does come up.

I am writing this letter as the Maryland State delegate of the American Bar Association, but I am also personally interested in seeing that steps are taken to prevent any attempt to intimidate or otherwise improperly influence the courts by means of picketing or other activities.

Thanking you for your help in this matter, I am, with kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C WALSH.

RECOMMENDATION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, IN SEPTEMBER 1949

1. That the picketing of the courts constitutes in itself an attempt to intimidate the courts or to influence their action and is a contempt of court.

2. That under their power to protect themselves from acts of contempt the courts have power to punish for contempt those who are guilty of picketing and should not hesitate to exercise that power.

3. That picketing of the courts is punishable both summarily and as a crime; and any legislation which specifically applies to picketing should expressly recognize and preserve the power of the court to punish such conduct summarily in a contempt proceeding.

4. That the association approves and recommends S. 1681 as a clarification of what it conceives to be the present power to punish for contempt any interference with the orderly administration of justice.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 3006 A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to compensate members of the military and naval forces of the United States for losses sustained as a result of Japanese sequestration of bank accounts in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 3007. A bill for the relief of Stefanie Pfister and Hildegarde Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 3008. A bill for the relief of Lee So Young Miskimen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr MYERS:

S 3009. A bill for the relief of Rev. Paul Chan (Paul Chi-Look Ting); and

S. 3010 A bill for the relief of Evelyn Wilbraham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S 3011. A bill for the relief of John E. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 3012. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Oso J. Petty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S 3013 A bill for the relief of Toshiko Ono, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HUMPHREY introduced Senate bill 3014, to extend and protect the rights of Federal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LEHMAN introduced Senate Joint Resolution 152, to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

RIGHTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend and protect the rights of Federal employees, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3014) to extend and protect the rights of Federal employees, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby recognizes that (a) the opportunity of Federal employees to participate actively in local political activities is essential to the vigor of local government and to the strengthening and preservation of democratic institutions in America, and (b) the extension of the opportunity for such participation must be accompanied by stronger protections against political intimidation, coercion, and discrimination.

EXTENSION OF RIGHTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 2. (a) The prohibition in the act of August 2, 1939, against the active participation by Federal employees in political management or in political campaigns shall apply only to (1) political activities relating to the election or nomination of any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives, Delegates or Commissioners from the Territories and insular possessions, Governor of any State, or any State officer elected by the voters of the State as a whole and (2) political activities on behalf of any party organization which requires a Federal employee, as a condition of becoming a candidate for office, to vote for or support any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives, Delegates or Commissioners from the Territories and insular possessions, Governor of any State, or any State officer elected by the voters of the State as a whole.

(b) Nothing contained herein shall be construed as relaxing in any manner the provisions of law against the solicitation of political contributions, political coercion, and political discrimination.

PROTECTION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 3. (a) In addition to the other prohibitions contained in title 18 of the United States Code, it shall be unlawful for any official in the executive branch of the Federal Government to discriminate against any applicant for a position or against any employee because of his political affiliations or political activities, except as such affiliation or activity as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. Any person violating this prohibition shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such person

(b) The Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to acquaint Federal employees with the provisions of law protecting them against intimidation, coercion, and discrimination on account of political activities.

(c) The Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to establish an appeals and complaints procedure whereby any Federal employee who feels that, in contravention of Federal law, he has been intimidated into political activities or discriminated against because of his political affiliations or activities, may lodge an appeal or complaint with the Civil Service Commission without jeopardizing his future employment.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY UPON INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO EXTEND AND PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The first purpose of this bill is to allow Federal employees to participate as freely as all other American citizens in the processes of local government No matter where they may live—whether in the immediate vicinity of the District of Columbia, at Oak Ridge, Tenn., or in the cities and towns of Minnesota, Iowa, or Mississippi—Federal workers should have the right to participate actively in local political affairs. Under the proposed measure I now introduce, the Hatch Act limitations on political activities by Federal employees would be fully applicable to Presidential, congressional, and State-wide elections.

The second purpose of the bill is to provide additional protection for Federal workers against intimidation, coercion, and discrimination Under this bill it would be unlawful for any executive official to discriminate against any applicant for a position or against any employee because of his political affiliations or political activities This provision would supplement existing legal protections.

The Civil Service Commission would also be directed to acquaint Federal employees with the various provisions of the law protecting them against intimidation, discrimination, and coercion on account of political activities.

Finally, the Civil Service Commission would be directed to establish an appeals and complaints procedure to assist in the enforcement of such protective laws. The very existence of such a procedure would go a long way toward dissuading supervisory officials from attempting to dragoon Federal employees into political activities against their will.

In a sense, the proposed measure is a substitute for a provision in the pending Hatch Act amendments which deals with the same subject in a fragmentary manner. The pending amendments to the Hatch Act (H. R. 1243) are now before a Senate-House conference committee. When H. R 1243 passed the House it dealt with another subject only, but in the Senate committee a new section was added lifting Hatch Act restrictions for Federal workers in the vicinity of the District of Columbia and in one or two other areas throughout the country. Various citizen and Federal-worker organizations in Virginia and Maryland have asked for an opportunity to present their views on this subject at a public hearing before final action is taken If this section is dropped from the conference committee bill, it will then be possible to deal with the entire question of the political rights of Federal workers in an open and orderly manner through the consideration of my proposed measure.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1· This section sets forth a declaration of policy to serve as the foundation for sections 2 and 3 This declaration consists of a congressional recognition that (1) Federal employees have the right to engage actively in local political activities, and (2) stronger protections are needed against political intimidation, coercion, and discrimination.

Section 2· Under section 2 Hatch Act limitations upon political activity are made applicable only to the election or nomination of any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of Congress, Delegates or Commissioners in the Territories and insular possessions, and State officials elected by the voters of the State as a whole. The Hatch Act limitations are also applicable wherever local political-party regulations require a Federal employee, as a condition of becoming a candidate for office, to vote for or support any candidate for the above offices

Section 3 This section provides three types of protection for Federal employees. First, existing legal protections are supplemented by making it unlawful for any executive official to discriminate against Federal employees because of political affiliations or political activities. Second, the Civil Service Commission is directed to acquaint Federal employees with their rights under the various provisions of law that protect them against intimidation, coercion, and discrimination. Third, the Civil Service Commission is directed to establish a special appeals and complaints procedure to make statutory protections for Federal employees more meaningful Under such a procedure any Federal employee who felt that he was being illegally coerced or discriminated against would be able to lodge an appeal or complain without jeopardizing his future employment

STAMP COMMEMORATING BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution providing for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the birth of the great Czech patriot, Thomas G. Masaryk. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution and an explanation by me be printed in the RECORD

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the joint resolution and explanatory statement will b printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 152) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post

Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance, on as early a date as practicable during the calendar year 1950 a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of an appropriate design, which shall include a likeness of Thomas G. Masaryk, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and first President of Czechoslovakia.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A STAMP COMMEMORATING THE BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK

On March 7, the Czechoslovak people will celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and the first president of the Republic of Czechoslovakia. Millions of Czechoslovakians who for the second time in a generation have become victims of a foreign and tyrannical dictatorship, can do little else than offer a silent prayer for liberation on the anniversary of the birth of this great statesman and idealist.

Thomas Masaryk had close ties with us. He lectured in our universities and worked closely with President Woodrow Wilson during the First World War. He proclaimed the independence of his country on American soil on October 18, 1918, here in the city of Washington.

I first knew him when he was a frequent visitor to the Henry Street Settlement where I, as a young man, worked. I shall always value my close friendship with this man whom I regarded as one of the most just and noble statesmen of this century. His son, Jan, was also my good friend and we worked very closely during the time I was director general of UNRRA. Because of his deep loyalty to the ideals of his father, Jan, the late Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, lost or gave up his life in the aftermath of the Communist coup d'état. We shall probably never know the full story of his tragic death.

Today the Masaryk ideals of democracy, of humanism and liberalism—the very name of Thomas Masaryk are suppressed in his native land. Even his books are banned.

I feel most deeply that we should do our utmost to encourage Masaryk's people in their continuing struggle to regain their lost liberties and to reestablish their democracy.

I am therefore introducing a joint resolution calling for the issuance of a Masaryk centennial stamp here in the United States. I believe it would enable the million Americans of Czechoslovak origin to let their friends in the old country know that our great democracy is joined with them in the fight for freedom.

I hope that this resolution will meet with the speedy approval of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress.

I have written to the Postmaster General urging that the stamp be issued so that it may be available on March 7. I have also deemed this matter important enough to write to the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, asking him to endorse this project as consistent with our policies of encouraging the growth of freedom throughout the world.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'CONOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6000) to extend and improve the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System, to amend the public assistance and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

PENSIONS OF CERTAIN VETERANS AND THEIR WIDOWS AND CHILDREN—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARTHY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4617) to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMERICA'S EXPANDING ECONOMY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator KILGORE, before the congressional district meeting of the West Virginia Petroleum Association, in Charleston, W. Va., on February 2, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

AWARD OF POOR RICHARD MEDAL OF ACHIEVEMENT TO PAUL G. HOFFMAN—ADDRESSES BY SENATOR MYERS AND MR. HOFFMAN

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses delivered by him and by Mr. Paul G. Hoffman on the occasion of the award of the Poor Richard Medal of Achievement to Mr. Hoffman at the annual Franklin Day celebration in Philadelphia, January 17, 1950, which appear in the Appendix]

ROOSEVELT DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Roosevelt Day dinner address delivered by Senator HUMPHREY, national chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action, at Pittsburgh, Pa., January 24, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

JACKSON-JEFFERSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY HON. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner address delivered by Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, at Los Angeles, Calif., January 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

FREEDOM THROUGH THE MARSHALL PLAN AND THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Freedom Through the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine, delivered by him at the mass meeting of the Ahepa Chapters at the Pythian Temple in the city of New York, which appears in the Appendix]

MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING—NEWS LETTER BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a news letter by him to the people of Pennsylvania discussing middle-income housing, which appears in the Appendix.]

HARMONY IN THE ARMED SERVICES—INTERVIEW WITH GENERAL EISENHOWER

[Mr. McCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Harmony in the Armed Services, an Exclusive Interview With General Eisenhower," from the United States News and World Report, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SECURITY AND INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM—STATEMENT BY RESEARCH AND POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on national policy entitled "National Security and Our Individual Freedom," issued by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, on December 14, 1949, which appears in the Appendix]

FIFTY MILLION BUSHELS OF POTATOES

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Harold K. Burt and others dated February 3, 1950, on the subject of the potato surplus, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLICY STATEMENT OF NEW YORK YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the sections on rent control, agriculture, wasteful big Government, private enterprise, public regulation of business, taxation, and the citizen in politics, from a policy statement entitled "Blueprint for a Better America" issued by the New York Young Republican Club, which appears in the Appendix]

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD—ARTICLE BY GEORGE DIXON

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column entitled "Washington Scene," by George Dixon, from the Washington Times-Herald of February 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR ON RUSSIA'S SIDE—ARTICLE BY T. H. TETENS

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "New German Blueprint: War on Russia's Side," written by T. H. Tetens, and published in the United Nations World of December 1949 which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL YOUTH REHABILITATION CENTER OF JERUSALEM HEBRON YESHIVAH

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement from the Journal of Jerusalem Hebron Yeshivah, to be published on March 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF MATTHEW E WELSH TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President correcting the name of a nominee whose nomination has already been confirmed, and calls it to the attention of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. The message will be read.

The message was read, as follows:

I nominate Matthew E. Welsh to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana, vice B. Howard Caughran, term expired.

This is to correct the nomination sent to the Senate on January 17, 1950, and confirmed January 31, 1950.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the nominee in this instance is one and the the same person as the one whose nomination was previously confirmed. The nomination was considered by the Judiciary Committee, but, unfortunately, an error crept into the initials, changing an "E" to a "B." I ask unanimous consent,

as in executive session, for the present consideration of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] if this nomination is approved by Republican Members. I understand there is no objection.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, we are delighted to approve the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—ARTICLE BY BERNARD M. BARUCH

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have in my hand a short article entitled "International Control of Atomic Energy," written by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, which will be published in the spring, 1950, issue of Air Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

(By Bernard M. Baruch)

Since the President's announcement of an atomic explosion in the Soviet Union, there has been much talk of the need for a new approach to the control of atomic energy. Some persons have urged outlawing the atom bomb, others that a truce be declared halting the making of atomic weapons in both Russia and the United States. At a recent meeting in New York, the United Nations General Assembly urged the Atomic Energy Commission to explore anew the possibilities of atomic agreement.

The failure to control atomic energy is not a pleasant prospect. Still, in considering new approaches to the problem, both those already suggested and those which will be proposed in the future, there are certain principles we dare not lose sight of, unless we are to expose ourselves and the world to destruction.

From the outset the essential issue of atomic control has always been real and effective international control. Partial and ineffective control is more dangerous than none at all.

In creating the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, the General Assembly charged it with devising specific proposals not only "for the control of atomic energy necessary to insure its use only for peaceful purposes" but also "for effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions." Those instructions, to which the Soviet Government agreed, were our charter in preparing the American plan for the International Control of Atomic Energy.

This emphasis on adequate safeguards was well-considered. First, it was always recognized that the United States' monopoly in the field of atomic energy could be only a temporary one. Instead of waiting until some other nation had acquired the art of making atomic weapons, the American people, through their Government, immediately took the lead in pushing for effective, international control.

Second, atomic weapons, being peculiarly suited to surprise attack, were clearly more appropriate to totalitarian than to democratic countries. Being answerable to their people and bound by constitutional processes, democratic governments cannot unloose surprise attacks as dictatorships have done in recent years. If the democratic powers were not to make themselves a target for some future atomic Pearl Harbor, the control of atomic energy had to be so effective that no nation could accumulate atomic weapons secretly.

Third, there was the unique nature of atomic energy, unlike any other form of energy. Coal, oil, electricity are mighty generators of industrial power but not weapons in themselves. Atomic fuel can serve both as a source of power or as a bomb. The same fissionable material which can be tapped for peaceful constructive purposes can be diverted quickly—and secretly—into a dread weapon of destruction.

Atomic energy available for peaceful purposes, in short, is inescapably available for military uses as well. Mr. Vishinsky's boast during the recent General Assembly debate, that the Soviet Union is using atomic energy to level mountains, proved to be a garbling of Russian propaganda. Still, he did register a significant fact about the nature of atomic energy. It is only the intention of the possessor which determines whether atomic energy is to be used to level mountains—or cities.

In any control system, nations should not be permitted to possess devices of such power, even if they have promised not to use them. I rather doubt that their consciences could stand the strain, under pressure of seeming necessity which knows no law, or treaties.

To eliminate national rivalries and suspicions in this most dangerous of fields, it seemed clear that no nation should have unbridled use of either atomic weapons or the means of producing them And so we proposed the creation of an international authority which would have physical possession and full operational and managerial control over all dangerous materials and activities in the atomic field. This international authority would control all atomic ores as well as all facilities producing fissionable materials. The authority was also to have sufficiently broad powers of inspection to be able to detect with certainty any unauthorized or illegal attempts to produce atomic energy or atomic weapons.

The criterion for violation which we envisioned was a simple one. The very existence of an unauthorized activity or facility in any country, or the seizure of an international facility, would be unmistakable evidence that a violation had occurred.

Nor did we feel that any nation should be able to obstruct the operation of this international authority by a veto or be able to escape punishment for treaty violations simply by entering a plea of not guilty. We proposed no change in the veto in the Security Council, let there be no misunderstanding on that score. What we did propose is that any atomic treaty, once agreed to by all parties and enacted, should have the binding effect of international law upon all its signatories. We could not accept a treaty which reserved to each nation the right to veto its observance at will.

Given these conditions the United States offered to turn over to the international authority all the materials, facilities, and know-how in our possession, as well as the disposal of all atom bombs and other atomic weapons. Never in history has any nation made so generous an offer as to volunteer to give up the most destructive weapon known, seeking nothing in return but assurance that no other nation be free to make the weapon we had given up.

Let me stress that this American plan did not ask the rest of the world to believe in American promises, nor did it ask mere promises of any other nation. It set up standards and procedures of performance by which we were as willing to be bound and judged as we insisted that other nations be bound and judged.

Except for Soviet Russia and her satellites, practically every nation in the world has accepted the American plan as fair, generous, and workable. The original American proposals, which I was privileged to present to the United Nations, have been expanded and elaborated by the many nations who have served on the UN Atomic Energy Commission during the last 3 years and approved by the overwhelming majority of UN members. At its most recent session, 49 nations voted to endorse this majority plan, with only Russia and her satellites in the opposition.

The Soviet representatives, it is worth bearing in mind, have rejected the majority proposals in entirety. This is an important consideration in weighing the possibility of compromise. The Soviet objection is not to some one feature or two of the majority plan but to the whole plan. The only counter-proposals which the Soviets have thus far brought forward have been rejected by both the UN Atomic Energy Commission and the General Assembly as worse than no agreement at all.

In the matter of international inspection, for example, Soviet proposals are hedged with so many restrictions and vetoes as to mean inspection when, how, and if the Soviet Government should wish it. Certainly no nation can be expected to notify the world that it plans to produce and use atomic weapons in violation of a treaty it has signed. An inspection system which gives a nation the right to decide when and how it is to be inspected must prove the most dangerous of illusions.

The reported atomic explosion in Soviet territory does not lessen the need for a truly effective, enforceable system of control. Nor does it alter the conditions which must be met to achieve that control. To the contrary. If we are to presume that more than one nation knows how to make an atomic weapon, that fact argues all the more forcefully for really effective control as against an illusory control which would penalize those nations which observed their agreements to the advantage of those which might not.

To destroy all existing stocks of atomic bombs, as some have urged, would not reduce the danger of atomic war. As long as nations possessed sizable quantities of fissionable material, they could speedily convert that material into new weapons. Again, it has been suggested that a halt be called to any further manufacture of atomic weapons; or that a line be drawn outlawing large-scale atomic facilities, as militarily dangerous, while permitting small, nonmilitary atomic developments. But how would the nations complying with such a truce be sure that other nations were not violating the truce by secretly building and stock-piling atomic weapons, unless there were a foolproof system of inspection?

In drafting the American proposals on atomic-energy control, it was my hope that success in this endeavor might lead to similar plans for the control of other weapons of mass destruction—even to the elimination of war itself. But no form of disarmament can have reality or security unless accompanied by an effective system of international inspection, control, and punishment

The Kellogg-Briand Pact, it will be recalled, outlawed war. Noble as were the intentions of its sponsors, the pact only exposed those nations which had a conscience to the aggression of those which were conscienceless.

Notwithstanding the experience of the past, there are some who now propose outlawing the atom bomb as if it were another form of poison gas. Under this scheme the United

States and Russia—and presumably all other nations which develop atomic weapons—would retain their stock piles of atomic weapons but would agree not to use them. Whichever nation did use an atom bomb first would stand condemned as an aggressor before world opinion. The effectiveness of such a treaty, it is contended, would not rest on the mere pledged word of nations but on the fear of retaliation, since both sides would possess their own atomic weapons. But how would this proposal add to our security and lessen the risk of atomic warfare? The fear of retaliation already exists. No treaty is necessary to brand any nation which uses an atom bomb first as an aggressor. Nor would outlawing the bomb in this fashion halt the atomic arms race. If the fear of retaliation were to be kept alive, the United States, the Soviet Union, and other nations would have to continue to press their efforts in competition for ever more destructive atomic weapons. The danger is that in outlawing the bomb the American people might become victims of the delusion that the atomic arms race had been halted—when it had not been.

If there must be an atomic arms race, let us at least face it with open eyes. Let us not blind ourselves with meaningless verbal formulas which may sound reassuring but which would expose us and most of the world to those who would like to destroy us.

As to the moral value of outlawing the atom bomb, why condemn some one form of aggression? More persons were killed in the fire raids on Tokyo of March 9, 1945, than by the explosion of the atom bomb over Hiroshima. Even without an atom bomb, Russia was laid waste, the cities of Germany reduced to rubble and those of England terrorized before that. Under the charter of the United Nations, all member nations have pledged themselves not to commit acts of aggression against one another. If the objective is to put additional moral force behind this obligation, which the nations have already assumed, why not specifically define what is meant by aggression—and proceed to enforce that definition? Thus all unprovoked attacks, whether by atomic or other weapons, would be outlawed.

The American position has never been that there could only be one way of controlling atomic energy. What we put forward represented our best thinking. After more than 3½ years of universal examination and discussion, it remains the one sound and workable plan so far submitted. In the circumstances the position enunciated by President Truman in his speech on United Nations day seems eminently sound—to stick to the American plan unless and until a better and more effective plan is put forward.

And until safe and sure control is obtained every effort must be pressed to maintain our present overwhelming advantage in the development of atomic weapons—of both those already known and those of a more frightful nature. Some potential atomic developments are so frightening that we instinctively shrink from them, but then we must ask Will this dread knowledge be less menacing if discovered by others? Nor is it our security alone which is at stake. What nation in Europe or Asia would have its freedom today if it had been the Soviet Union and not the United States which held an atomic monopoly these last few years?

Any Soviet proposals for the effective control of atomic energy should be welcomed and studied to make certain that they are truly effective and enforceable. But the mere hope of negotiation should not delude us into slowing our own atomic efforts. Harsh and unpleasant as it is, the fact is that an atomic arms race is going on—forced by the Soviet refusal to agree to effective international control. Only as such control is achieved can this atomic race be halted—not by shutting our eyes to reality, however grim.

Nor should any time be lost in proceeding to develop the best possible system of atomic civilian defense as part of a general plan of mobilization readiness against the danger of possible war.

One final thought as to secrecy of atomic information. I sympathize deeply with the scientists in their desire to spread the knowledge they acquire as rapidly as possible for the use of all mankind. I also appreciate the special problem which arises out of the fact that scientists have been accustomed to look to the publication of scientific papers as a means of gaining professional recognition and of sharing their discoveries with their fellows. It would be well to devise some substitute means for recognizing the achievement of scientists working on atomic and other security projects. However, atomic energy was born of the efforts not alone of the nuclear physicist, but of chemists, engineers, business and industrial managers, our military and political leaders. In fact, all of us contributed to a greater or lesser extent to the huge and costly development. Control of atomic energy transcends the question of the freedom of scientific inquiry (important as that is) to political, military, social, and moral issues which involve the very survival of our civilization.

American progress in atomic energy might be speeded through the widespread dissemination of scientific information. By the same token, such publication must be expected to speed progress in Russia as well. How much was Russian progress spurred by the publication of the Smyth report or by the sale of strategic equipment necessary for atomic development? The advantages of releasing any specific piece of atomic information must be weighed against the risks, with the doubts resolved in favor of American and world security.

Science cannot be set completely free in a world that is not really at peace. The cold war requires all of us to forego some of the ways of peace. No one can say now how long the present struggle will endure, but until peace does come we must hold our resources together, with each of us conscious of the obligations we must bear.

It may well be that no atomic energy agreement will be possible until there is an over-all peace settlement. We may have to live with the failure to control atomic energy for the rest of our lives. If that is to be our lot, let us face it steadfastly and resolutely with faith in the civilization we defend. The acid test of the strength of any society is the self-discipline of its adherents.

THE DISPLACED-PERSONS PROGRAM

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks, not on the subject of the displaced-persons bill, but on the general subject, an article entitled "Maryland Committee Blasts DP Program, Then Resigns," published in the Washington Post of February 8, 1950.

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

DP PROGRAM IN MARYLAND UNDER ATTACK

(By John W. Ball)

Widespread dissatisfaction among farmers in the Washington area over the resettlement of displaced persons on nearby farms was given pointed expression in Anne Arundel County, Md., yesterday.

There the three-man committee, appointed by Gov. William Preston Lane, Jr., to direct the resettlement program, resigned. A stinging criticism of the conduct of the DP program, which the three called slovenly as well as wholly inefficient and uncoordinated, accompanied their resignation.

"We have been bitterly disillusioned," Benjamin Watkins 3d, of Davidsonville, chairman; Charles B. Lynch, and J. Irving King wrote. "Our experiences force us to the conclusion that the program as now operated is not in the best interests of the Maryland farmer, not indeed in the best interests of the United States."

The DP situation in Maryland and Virginia has been the subject of scores of complaints. The Maryland Farm Bureau on January 11 registered bitter disappointment and asked for stiff laws governing DP's now here.

On December 31, a total of 402 families listing 196 persons had been brought into Maryland, records show.

Anne Arundel got fewer than most counties. The records a month earlier showed Queen Anne County with 41 families and 11 persons the largest. Howard had 36 families and 88 persons; Carroll 31 families and 78 persons; Charles County 15 families and 67 persons, Prince Georges 13 families and 46 persons, Anne Arundel 2 families and 36 persons, Montgomery 9 families and 30 persons, Calvert 8 families and 35 persons, and St. Mary's 2 families and 9 persons.

In January State officials estimated that 40 percent of the DP's had left their sponsoring farms within a week of their arirval.

A recent congressional report showed Virginia, Maryland, and Mississippi as the only three States dissatisfied with operation of the DP program.

Maryland farmers, according to David L. B. Fringer, Maryland Employment Service director said, suffer from chronic shortage of skilled farm labor. At the same time there is a surplus of unskilled labor. When the DP program started, it was thought Maryland offered a great opportunity to skilled farm hands.

Instead, all types of workers, from dentists and doctors, to butchers, shoemakers, and even a 10-year professor of civil engineering in a large European college, were imported as skilled farm hands.

The majority in Maryland were Ukrainians, brought by the United Ukrainian-American Relief Association. Other agencies bringing in DP's were the National Catholic Welfare Society, the Lutheran League, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid, Church World Service, United Service for the New Americans, and the Friends Society.

UKRAINIANS TOP THE LIST

"We felt that in giving asylum to the oppressed and needy refugees we would be giving new hope to people desperately in need of assistance," the Anne Arundel committeemen wrote.

"We assumed that they would be carefully screened, and that we would be opening the door of opportunity to people who were qualified for the work that they had represented themselves competent to do * * * and who desired, above all things, to attain citizenship.

"DEVOID OF GRATITUDE

"It has been our experience that while some are giving a high degree of satisfaction, many who have had extraordinarily fine placements have not only been unqualified for the work they had represented themselves capable of doing, but have proved themselves devoid of gratitude or a sense of moral obligation.

"It is an uncontestable fact that no agency of the Federal Government has any clear idea of the whereabouts of thousands of refugees who have recently entered the United States," the letter continued.

The program, the three wrote, "as now administered, is of such dubious value that we can no longer conscientiously participate in it."

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARIES OF TADEUSZ KOSCIUSKO, ABRAHAM LINCOLN, FREDERIC CHOPIN, AND GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared in connection with the forthcoming birthdays of four great citizens of the world: Kosciusko, Abraham Lincoln, Chopin, and George Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOSCIUSKO, CHOPIN, COPERNICUS—A TRIBUTE TO SONS OF POLAND BORN IN FEBRUARY

"Jeszcze Polska nie zginela"—Poland is not yet lost.—Joseph Wybicki, Dombrowski, March 1797.

Mr. President, I should like to invite attention to the fact that by a heart-warming coincidence of history, the month of February is dear to the hearts of the people of Poland and of their friends in the United States. Why? Because this month saw the birth of many famous sons of Poland just as it saw the birth of America's greatest Presidents. Yes, this month is rich with history of those who proclaimed proudly, "Poland is not yet lost."

On February 12, we celebrate the birth of Abraham Lincoln, founder of the Republican Party and sixteenth President of the United States. Abe Lincoln, who emancipated the Negro people from slavery; Abe Lincoln who saved the Union.

On February 12, too, we celebrate also the birthday in 1746 of Tadeusz Andrzej Bonawentura Kosciusko. This great soldier battled heroically for the freedom of Poland. Later, he was instrumental in the emancipation of the American people from slavery to Great Britain, and he performed great services in the establishment of the American Union.

THE FAMOUS BIRTHDAYS ON FEBRUARY 22

Two weeks later, on February 22, we will celebrate the birth of the father of our country, our first President, George Washington. But on that day, too, all Americans, all friends of Poland, all music lovers throughout the world will honor the birth in 1810 near Warsaw of the great Frederic Chopin, the man whose one hundredth anniversary of death we commemorated last year.

The music of Frederic Chopin, the deeds of Tadeusz Kosciusko like other great contributions of sons and daughters of Poland, are the type that are universal to all freedom-loving, culture-loving citizens of America and the world.

In addition, I should like to point out that later on in the month of February—on the 19th—in the year 1473, occurred the birth of Nicholas Copernicus, founder of modern astronomy.

When we recall these great descendants of Poland, when we recite the names of Ignace Jan Paderewski, Marie Sklodowska Curie, and other outstanding Poles, it is not as a mere tribute to the great past of a people; rather it is with firm confidence in the future freedom of sons and daughters of Poland.

PREVIOUS TRIBUTE TO GENERAL PULASKI

In previous issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have reviewed the history of Poland. On October 11, 1949, the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of his death, I stated in tribute to Gen. Casimir Pulaski:

"The pages of Polish history from its earliest beginnings with Mieszke Miecislaw I (who was converted to Christianity and who reigned from 962 to 992) are full of patriotic sagas of sacrifice and achievement. At one time Poland was the most powerful state in eastern Europe, being composed of Cracovia, Silesia, Cuyavia, Masovia, and Lithuania. As early as 1400 the University of Cracow was a century of world culture. In 1569 Poland reached her greatest territorial expansion—around 380,000 square miles with 15,000,000 people.

"But 200 years later, beset by perpetual foreign intrigue, on August 5, 1772, came the first partition of Poland—with a loss of one-third of her territory to other powers. A second partition ensued in 1793—with a loss of more than half her remaining territory and more than 4,000,000 population. This is why the great Kosciusko organized the Polish patriots to regain the soil of the motherland. But hopelessly outnumbered, Kosciusko met defeat on October 10, 1794, and a weakened Poland suffered a third partition on October 24, 1795. Thus, Poland ceased to exist as an independent political entity."

I continued at that time with this further summary of history:

"From that unfortunate date in 1795 until the outbreak of the First World War, Poland's sons and daughters bled for freedom time and again. With the spirit of Pulaski and Kosciusko, the patriots rose in revolution after revolution—in November 1830, in February 1846, in 1848, on January 15, 1863—only to be defeated by the foreign enslavers. The years passed, but not Poland's hunger for freedom. At long last, in November 1918, an independent Poland was reborn as a partial fulfillment of Wilson's 14 points, including 'self-determination of people.'

"No one need be told of Poland's more recent history, with which we are all familiar, culminating in the so-called Soviet-Nazi nonaggression pact of August 1939, which led to the Second World War."

HOW DEMOCRATS SOLD CATHOLIC POLAND DOWN VOLGA RIVER

No, my friends, nor need we retell the infamous story of what happened to our heroic ally after the end of the Second World War.

We know that Poland was dismembered at Yalta when 47 percent of her territory was given to Red Russia and the ground work was laid for the fraudulent election through which Russia took over the Government of Poland under a puppet regime.

So Poland, which was the first to fight for freedom—Poland which lost 6,000,000 souls killed on the battlefield, shot in street executions, starved to death, beaten to death in forced labor—Poland whose cities were bombed to rubble, was the first to lose her hard-won freedom at the hands of her alleged friend in the White House.

The Democratic administration in our country which had pretended to be Poland's friend sold Poland down the Volga River. The Democratic Party which eagerly sought the friendship of Polish-Americans had the gall to praise the infamous stab in the back at Yalta. But no friend of Poland will ever forget the treachery.

The Democratic Party which knew Catholic Poland's deep, unwavering devotion to the church, sold this God-fearing nation at the auction block to the Red antichrist.

The Democratic administration, riddled with Red rogues whom it excused and promoted, performed this service for international communism and executed this betrayal of world religion.

Those are not partisan accusations. Those are the facts of history.

What a shameful stain on the history of Polish-American relations. What a foul assault on the memory of Pulaski and Kosciusko.

HOW KOSCIUSKO AIDED AMERICA

Let us take a brief look at Tadeusz Kosciusko. Exiled from his beloved homeland, he arrived in Philadelphia in August 1776, but a few short months after the Declaration of American Independence. He drew up plans for fortifying the Delaware River. He erected fortifications which contributed to the brilliant victory of American forces over General Burgoyne at Saratoga. On October 13, 1783, Congress made him a brigadier general. The sacrifices which Kosciusko made for liberty recall to one's mind the sacrifices which Poles throughout their history have made for freedom. Tadeusz Kosciusko did not so much as possess a blanket when he first entered the Army. All during the war years, for example, while he was erecting fortifications at West Point and elsewhere, out of his own meager pay and his own inadequate food supply he sent provisions to English prisoners whose misery was itself extreme.

There is a man of whom any people could well be proud.

TRIBUTE TO THE GENIUS CHOPIN

But let us now turn to another famous Polish son of February.

The facts of Frederic Chopin's life are even more well known, because in the 39 short years that this genius lived he created musical masterpieces which have become a part of the heritage of western civilization. But patriotism was also in the blood of the Chopins. Frederic Chopin's father, Nicholas, joined the ranks of defendants of Warsaw after Poland lost her independence and the first insurrection led by Kosciusko broke out in 1794. That Kosciusko insurrection, we recall, was directed against czarist domination of Poland. It proclaimed the high ideals of freedom and equality which had been inspired by the French and American Revolutions. The uprising was unfortunately suppressed as we have seen, but the ideas behind it could never be vanquished.

Neither could there be vanquished the zeal of Frederic Chopin for the freedom of his homeland. He poured out immortal music to that cause and gave his very life in endless work for it. At last when Frederic Chopin went to his eternal reward, there was scattered on his coffin the Polish soil from a silver goblet which he had faithfully kept all through the years of exile. Shortly afterward, Chopin's heart was returned to Poland. It is enshrined there in the Church of Holy Cross in Warsaw.

Mention of Chopin brings to mind another musical colossus, Ignace Jan Paderewski, whom we recall we saw for the last time in Milwaukee in 1939 at a concert at the auditorium. Only superlatives can describe him—greatest pianist of his generation, composer, soldier, statesman, Polish patriot—who died June 25, 1941, still serving his beloved land.

REMEMBERING THESE IMMORTALS BY OUR DEEDS

Deeds, rather than mere words, count most in true tributes.

The greatest tribute that we can pay to these and other sons of Poland, like the greatest tribute we can pay to George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, is by living as they would have us live, acting as they would have us act.

Here in the Congress, for example, we have pending before us a new displaced persons bill. One of the necessary features of this bill is to allocate 18,000 visas to veterans of the heroic Polish army in Great Britain. On previous occasions, I have called attention to the magnificent contributions of that Polish army to freedom. It is only fitting that these stalwart battlers for liberty should enjoy liberty on our shores. It is only fitting moreover, that we make further necessary revisions to liberalize the present displaced persons statute.

Basically, however, the greatest tribute we can pay to a free Poland is by establishing a policy of firm realism with the Soviet Union which now enslaves Poland.

We must end the shameless, wretched policy of appeasement which is symbolized by the treachery of Yalta, when under the cover of secrecy, the freedom of an entire people—a holy people, a valiant people—was bartered away.

COMMENT FROM A WISCONSINITE TO SENATOR WILEY

I should like to quote now from at least one message which I have received from a constituent in my State commenting upon the problems of present-day Poland and some of my previous comments on them. I believe that this message from Milwaukee, like other expressions which I received from Stevens Point and elsewhere in Wisconsin, bespeak the true patriotism of our Polish-American citizens, and bespeak, too, their unwavering devotion to the cause of American liberty and independence and Polish liberty and independence. This kind message came to me from the president of a Polish organization in Milwaukee:

"Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SIR: It was a real pleasure to receive a copy of your tribute to Casimir Pulaski and a free Poland which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Tuesday, October 11, 1949.

"We thank you for the care you have taken in presenting the story of Casimir Pulaski in the light of the past, the present, and the future. To Count Pulaski, an exile from his own country, freedom meant more than life itself; and his one life he did give in the cause of American freedom. The folk tales of Princess Vanda, the pageant of the Little Horse, and the story of the Hejnal were stories of the love of freedom which Poles have cherished for generations. The heroism of the millions of Poles in World War II is full evidence to the world that Poland stands behind its heritage of freedom. The present tragic dismemberment of Poland and the hold of the Communist state are but further trials that Poland must endure and conquer to merit the blessings of liberty, independence, and sovereignty.

"The exemplification of the love of freedom which the Polish people have always had for their own country and have shared with the United States from the earliest years through the present is a heartening recollection of the undying will for freedom which prevails in the heart of every Polish-American.

"We feel highly privileged that our story has been told again in the Halls of the Congress of the United States to once again enlighten the leaders of our Government of the singleness of our desire for our homeland * * * freedom."

Mr. President, I say in conclusion: "Jeszcze Polska nie zginela."

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the pending business is the consideration of Senate bill 75. In view of the fact that a number of Republican Members are now getting ready to move into various sections of the country to appraise and praise the memory of the patron saint of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln, and also to mend a few political fences which are down, being a very charitable and considerate soul, I desire to cooperate as much as possible with my Republican friends.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am going to present to the Senate a unanimous-consent request with respect to the pending measure, which is highly controversial. Of course, I do not desire to take any advantage of the situation while these distinguished Members of the Senate are away.

I ask unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Tuesday, February 21, 1950, at not later than the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon amendments to the bill S. 75 authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, and upon the final passage of said bill, provided, first, that no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received; second, that no vote on any amendment or motion shall be taken prior to the hour of 1 o'clock p. m. on said day; and, third, that no amendment shall be in order which has not been formally offered or submitted as a proposed amendment prior to the said day of February 21.

Ordered further, that the time between 11 o'clock a. m. and 4 p. m. on said day be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said bill and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the senior Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished majority leader think it might be advisable to change the hour of first voting from 1 o'clock until 12?

Mr. LUCAS. If that is acceptable to the Senators from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; that is agreeable.

Mr. LUCAS. That is agreeable to the majority leader, and I modify the request accordingly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the junior Senator from California wishes to try to work out the situation in a satisfactory manner to all concerned. I do not intend to object to the request, but I should like to reserve the right to offer a motion to recommit the bill, and I think it would be entirely in keeping with the idea of germaneness that we not be foreclosed from offering a motion to recommit. It might not be necessary for us to make such a motion if some of the amendments are adopted; in such case, it might be that some Senators who are opposing the bill in its present form might not desire to make a motion to recommit.

On the other hand, if some of the amendments are not adopted, we would not wish to be foreclosed from offering a motion to recommit.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not believe the unanimous-consent request forecloses the offering of a motion to recommit. However, I should like to have a ruling from the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest that under the precedents, unless there is a provision in the request that a motion to recommit will be in order, it would be foreclosed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then I wonder whether we can have an understanding that we will not be foreclosed from offering a motion to recommit.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I submitted to the parliamentarian the original unanimous-consent agreement, as proposed. In it a motion to recommit is mentioned. I assumed that that had been included in the present unanimous-consent request, because it refers not only to amendments but to motions, as well. Certainly I wish to accommodate the Senator from California and, of course, in the original unanimous-consent proposal we had included such a provision.

If the proposed agreement as now before the Senate forecloses the offering of a motion to recommit, I shall modify my unanimous-consent request so that it will include what the able Senator from California suggests.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request, as modified, submitted by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat the date specified in the proposal?

Mr. LUCAS. On Tuesday, February 21, at not later than the hour of 4 o'clock p. m.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. As I understand the unanimous-consent request, it provides that no amendments shall be offered unless they are germane.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct in this understanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request, as modified? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

The unanimous-consent agreement is as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, February 21, 1950, at not later than the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon amendments to the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, and upon the final passage of the said bill: *Provided,* (1) That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received; (2) that no vote on any amendment or motion shall be taken prior to the hour of 12 o'clock noon on said day; (3) that no amendment shall

be in order which has not been formally offered or submitted as a proposed amendment prior to said day of February 21; and (4) that a motion to recommit the said bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be in order.

Ordered further, That the time between 11 o'clock a. m., and 4 o'clock p. m., on said day be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said bill and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to have the present parliamentary situation thoroughly understood. I think it goes without saying that certainly all the time between now and the 21st of February will not be consumed in debating or discussing Senate bill 75, the measure now pending before the Senate. In the meantime, when we run out of speeches upon the bill in question, I shall not hesitate at such time to request unanimous consent or, if I cannot obtain consent, to move to lay the pending bill temporarily aside, with a view to having the Senate consider other measures which we have agreed can be debated and voted one way or the other during the time when some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are absent from the Senate.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. From the statement the majority leader has just made, I understand that he refers to the five measures he mentioned by bill number or resolution number and by calendar number yesterday. So far as I can determine from inquiries among Senators on this side of the aisle, it will not be objectionable to have the majority leader proceed in the way he has just suggested. Am I correct in my understanding that the Senator from Illinois has reference to those measures?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. Yesterday I made the announcement for the benefit of the Senators who then were present, and also for the benefit of those who might read the announcement this morning in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those who desire to know the measures we shall take up at one time or another during this period can ascertain them by reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator from Illinois be willing at this time, or is he ready, to tell the Senate, and particularly the Members on this side of the aisle, whether he intends to have the Senate hold a session on Friday of this week or whether he intends to have the Senate recess from Thursday of this week until Monday of next week or from Friday of this week until Tuesday of next week, or just what his plans are?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot tell the Senator whether we shall make that sort of an arrangement or not. I seriously doubt it. If there is any business to be done in the Senate, we shall go ahead with it, just as we have in the past.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the only business will be either Senate bill 75, which is now under discussion, or the measures the Senator mentioned yesterday by calendar number; is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is my understanding that so far as the parliamentary situation is concerned, regardless of what business may be pending on the 21st of February, it will be laid aside automatically, under the unanimous-consent agreement, and Senate bill 75 will be taken up at that time.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand the parliamentary situation to be as just described by the Senator from Arizona.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, make the RECORD clear on one further point in connection with the procedure? I have in mind the matter of conference reports. There are two conference reports in which there may be considerable interest, the one being the report on oleomargarine and the other the report on the amendment to the Hatch Act. I should merely like to have the majority leader make it clear that those will not be brought up, let us say, next week, or prior to February 20.

Mr. LUCAS. If there is any serious objection on the part of anyone to the conference reports, obviously they will go over, along with other controversial matters.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand there is, of course, a great deal of interest in the subject of oleomargarine and in the form the conference report may take; so I hope that report in particular will not be brought up before February 20.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not oblivious of the situation respecting the conference report on oleomargarine, and I am sure the report will not be brought up until there are present as many Senators as possible.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I have the assurance with respect to February 20? Will that be the date?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I agree with the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois will be willing to withdraw his objection to Senate Resolution 219, in view of the amendment or modification which I have offered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the modification of the resolution in the way the Senator from Arkansas suggested to me a moment ago.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator mean, also, that he has no objection to the adoption of the resolution as thus modified or amended?

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection to the adoption of the resolution as modified, if the Senator desires to have that done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make this statement with respect to the Senator's resolution: I objected to it the other day when it came up during the call of the calendar. I said in substance that it called for an investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and that money was requested for the purpose of investigating. In my opinion, the word "investigate" implies that something is wrong with the RFC.

After talking with the Senator from Arkansas, it is now my understanding that he desires to make a thorough study of the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with a view, probably, to securing the passage of legislation, later on, which may help the situation one way or another.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the body of the resolution did not contain that language. The title, which was not written by the Senator from Arkansas but by the parliamentary clerks, had left that impression; but that actually was not the language of the resolution itself.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection to the resolution as amended, but certainly there have been no allegations of fraud, corruption, or chicanery involving the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. All the Senator desires to do is to have a study made of the principal activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with a view to subsequent legislation. That is the regular course which is followed in the Senate. I, of course, have no objection to that. I was objecting to the implications attaching to the word "investigate."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar Order No. 1254, Senate Resolution 219.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the resolution.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 219) to investigate the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the pending business, and to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 219. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, is it the Senator's intention to request adoption of the resolution at the present time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I may say to the Senator the resolution was called on the recent call of the calendar. The only objection was as stated a moment ago by the majority leader. The resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution (S. 219) to investigate the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 1, after the article "a", to strike out "full and complete inquiry into" and insert "thorough study of"

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. Without objection, the resolution, as amended, is agreed to.

The resolution as amended and agreed to is as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and its subsidiaries, with special attention given to the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government with respect to such Corporation and its subsidiaries.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 1, 1950.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The title will be amended to correspond to the resolution.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, yesterday I expressed certain observations on the pending measure, the authorization of the central Arizona project. I desire now to continue my remarks, which I believe will be comparatively brief. First, if Senators will pardon a personal observation, I am not happy in being in aggressive opposition to the central Arizona project. I have a devotion to Arizona, where I have spent much time, and to its people. I particularly have a deep affection and admiration for the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who, by reason of his position on the Appropriations Committee, has been unfailingly courteous and friendly to the people of California, and in every proper and reasonable way has endeavored to assist our people in their many problems which have come before him. So I find myself in not a very happy situation in opposing a project affecting his State. So far as the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is concerned, I entered the Senate at about the same time he did. I have for him admiration and affection, and I hope at some time I may be working with the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona to a common purpose and common end for the great Southwest.

Mr. President, I should like very briefly to state in more compact form a few isolated items of my argument, before I continue with the closing portion thereof. Something has been said by way of comparison about Central Valley, Calif., which comprehends the valleys of the Sacramento and the San Joaquin Rivers, in comparison with or in contrast to the central Arizona project. It is true the project in the Central Valley, Calif., is one to relieve lands which presently need supplemental waters, for the reason that the underground water supply is being diminished. In that respect our project in Central Valley, Calif., is very much parallel to the one in central Arizona. Certainly I should be the last one to object to such a project as the one in central Arizona, if I conceived it to be a just and proper one for the taxpayers and all the people of the United States. I could take an hour on this one item, probably, but without enlarging it by argument I merely want to make the statement that, so far as the present project in California's Central Valley is concerned, it will be completed for about $400,000,000 or $500,000,000, say approximately one-half the minimum sum expected to be spent in central Arizona. I believe our California project will provide irrigation for 750,000 acres or three times the acreage that will be irrigated, or the equivalent of it, in central Arizona. So right at the beginning, we have, at half the cost, in the Central Valley, three times the acreage; which makes a differential of 6 to 1. I do not believe the Senators from Arizona would seriously deny that Central Valley lands, on an average, are worth two or three times as much as the lands of central Arizona. The great bulk of the lands in the Central Valley are in orchard and vineyards, which cost $1,000 to $1,500 to produce, and which are selling at that amount in the open market. There is the valuation of those lands, as compared with the valuation of $150, $250, or $300 an acre for, let us say, 90 percent of the central Arizona lands. They have a small amount of grapefruit and other orchards in central Arizona, but it is a comparatively minor amount. In the Central Valley we have vast benefits from flood control, salinity control, and navigation. So while there is a parallelism between the two important projects, I am safe in saying that, all factors involved—valuation, yield, ability to pay, and acreage—the benefits in the Central Valley of California are from 7 to 10 times as great as those in central Arizona, with only half the expenditure anticipated.

Mr. President, I wish to read only two short paragraphs from a letter, dated February 3, 1950, from Ralph S. Trigg, Administrator of the Production and Marketing Division of the Department of Agriculture:

DEAR SENATOR DOWNEY: The acreage of cotton in Arizona in 1949 was estimated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics as 374,000 acres. This estimate was as of December 1, 1949. The allotment established for 1950-crop cotton in Arizona in 1950 is 232,266 acres.

So, Mr. President, there will be a necessary diminution in that type of cotton approximating 150,000 acres in the Central Arizona cotton crop.

There is additional material in relation to what is called the Egyptian or long-staple cotton, which is not under proration of acreage, but which is under the support-price program. It is anticipated that to a certain extent Arizona may turn to Egyptian cotton for planting. I should like at this point in the RECORD to have inserted the complete letter from which I have quoted, so that it may be available to anyone.

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

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1950.

Hon. SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DOWNEY: Reference is made to our telephone conversation in regard to certain information with respect to cotton.

The acreage of cotton in Arizona in 1949 was estimated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics as 374,000 acres. This estimate was as of December 1, 1949. The allotment established for 1950-crop cotton in Arizona in 1950 is 232,266 acres.

We have no estimate of the possible acreage to be planted in American-Egyptian cotton in 1950 in Arizona, New Mexico, and west Texas. However, information being received by the Department indicates that there is a possibility that there may be a substantial increase in the acreage of American-Egyptian cotton in all of these States. A representative of the cotton branch attended a meeting in El Paso early in January 1950. This representative was informed that there were an estimated 3,200,000 pounds of American-Egyptian seed available for planting. However, it is assumed that about 25 percent of this seed will not meet requirements for exemption under the marketing-quota regulations. If this is true, the available seed would plant around 150,000 acres. We have no way to determine a break-down between the three States.

The following table shows the acreage of American-Egyptian cotton harvested in Ari-

zona, California, New Mexico, and Texas since 1941:

Crop year	Acreage harvested				
	Arizona	California	New Mexico	Texas	United States
1941	101,000	280	19,250	15,600	136,130
1942	129,000	2,100	26,600	23,000	180,700
1943	95,000	1,000	19,000	24,000	139,000
1944	9,000	100	1,070	4,500	14,670
1945	5,000	-------	400	1,200	6,600
1946	2,000	-------	275	780	3,055
1947	300	-------	160	1,000	1,460
1948	1,600	-------	800	1,600	4,000
1949 (estimated)	2,900	-------	900	2,500	6,300

We trust this is the information you desire, and if we can supply anything further please inform us.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator have the figures for the acreages of cotton planted in the Central Valley?

Mr. DOWNEY. I regret to say that I do not have them in mind. I believe the reduction there is approximately 300,000 acres, but I am not sure. If the Senator so desires, I shall procure the exact figures and place them in the RECORD at this point, by unanimous consent. We have raised more than twice as much cotton in the Central Valley, California, and our cut in acreage consequently is much heavier than that in central Arizona.

Mr. DOWNEY subsequently submitted the following memorandum:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

MEMORANDUM WITH REFERENCE TO CALIFORNIA COTTON ACREAGE

In a report to Senator DOWNEY'S office on February 8, 1950, the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture stated that the acreage in cotton in the Central Valley of California in 1948 was 806,220 acres. No figures are yet available by counties for the 1949 cotton crop, but the California State total of acreage in cultivation on July 1, 1949, was 963,000 acres.

The allotment to the Central Valley of California for the 1950 crop is 621,646 acres, out of the State total of 642,599 acres.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it may be of help, as a yardstick, to realize that the central Arizona project will cost substantially more than the TVA project, more than the Panama Canal, and more than the amount which it is estimated will be spent upon the St. Lawrence seaway, if that seaway is ever built. I do not mean more than all of those projects combined, but substantially more than any one of them. Again I do not desire, in my address, to impose upon the Senate with specific figures, but a careful study extending over a few days has convinced me that the expenditures in connection with TVA, which are at this time substantially less than the amount which would be spent for the central Arizona project, will bring benefits to that great southern area from 25 to 50 times greater than would be the benefits which may reasonably be expected to accrue from the central Arizona project.

Mr. President, the first cost of this project as estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation is $738,000,000, and we have accepted that figure in our argument as being correct. If we can judge of the future by the past, we must expect the cost to far outrun that amount. In my experience in the Central Valley, almost every estimate of cost made by the Bureau of Reclamation, since Mr. Straus became Commissioner, is being exceeded 25, 50, or 100 percent.

I could fill the RECORD full of projects now being initiated as to which, within a very few years after the authorization, the Bureau has increased by heavy sums the amounts stated to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when the authorization was approved. One of the most notable of these is well known to the distinguished Senators from Arizona. I refer to the Gila project and to the Welton-Mohawk division. In 1946 the cost was estimated at $325 an acre. When Mr. Straus and his fellow travelers appeared before the Appropriations Committee the estimate had increased by approximately 70 percent, to a cost of $530 an acre. The Commissioner stated a figure of $325 an acre before the authorizing committee, and within 2 years, without any explanation, without any apology, without coming back to the authorizing committee, he asked the Appropriations Committee for $530 an acre.

So I say, Mr. President, let us not dare to presume that this project will not cost 10 or 25 or 35 percent more than the figures with which we are dealing. Those figures are of such magnitude as to shock any man who has a sense of financial responsibility. In my opinion, if the Bureau is ever given this authorization and the money, the costs will far exceed the amount which is here predicted.

Let me say, Mr. President—and again I apologize for a personal word—I have been fighting the waste and extravagance of the Bureau of Reclamation and of Mr. Straus and his cohorts for the past 5 or 6 years. I have fought the wasteful, grandiose, and dishonest schemes of those men in my own State. I say to the Senate that if Michael Straus were unchecked in the Central Valley he would secure huge sums of money from the Federal Treasury to waste in impossible and fantastic schemes. I can recall one project which Mr. Straus and his associates endeavored to get through our standing committee and through the House—fortunately, unsuccessfully—which would have revealed, on one small project, a waste of $100,000,000.

Mr. President, I desire to state that I shall fight these grandiose schemes which are emasculating the Federal Treasury, not only in my own State but in Arizona and in the other States.

Mr. President, yesterday I stated that the dedication of a billion and a half kilowatt-hours in connection with the irrigation of this meager acreage of land to produce surplus crops which will have to be supported by the Treasury was like a man burning his home down to roast a pig, because that vast potential power is worth five times as much in the State of Arizona and elsewhere in the generation of employment as would be the water irrigating that scanty acreage near Phoenix.

I wish to make a further statement so that we may have a clear understanding of the matter. It is a mere coincidence that the whole State of Arizona, in its municipalities, its manufacturing, its mines, its power, and its pumping, is using approximately the same amount, a billion and a half kilowatt-hours. It is a mere coincidence that here in Washington, D. C., we are using about the same amount of power. Yes, Mr. President, the vast power that runs the streetcars in Washington, provides refrigeration and air conditioning, illuminates the homes, serves for cooking and manufacturing, lights the streets and businesses is the amount of power which is being wasted to help irrigate a meager acreage of ordinary cotton and grain land in central Arizona.

Mr. President, I now come to perhaps the most important segment of my statement. The junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] will, I anticipate, follow me, and he will reveal certain facts relating to this issue upon which I have not spoken, but, so far as I am concerned, except for a few incidental remarks, I shall address myself only to one further issue.

Apparently the Bureau of Reclamation and the Senators from Arizona realize, and impliedly admit, that the proposed expenditure of this huge sum of money to irrigate land at a cost of two or three or four thousand dollars an acre cannot at all be justified under any conventional or reasonable rules of irrigation and reclamation. I think the junior Senator from Arizona made that crystal clear to the Senate when he reiterated and emphasized that this is a disaster or a rescue project. He painted a rather horrifying picture of what would happen to the people of the State of Arizona if Colorado River water were not brought into Arizona at the cost of a billion dollars or so.

Mr. President, if the statements made by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona are correct, and if we assume there is no cheaper and more feasible way of relieving conditions in Arizona than by the expenditure of a billion dollars, we might reasonably consider what he has said. But I wish to test his generalizations, his emotions, his dogmatic assertions of opinion concerning what will happen in the State of Arizona if this project is not placed in operation.

I state it only as my opinion, of course, that the Senators from Arizona have not adduced one item of proof of the truth of their extraordinary statements. The junior Senator from Arizona was highly eloquent, he was highly emotional, he was certainly dogmatic in stating the ultimate conclusion which he wanted, but, so far as I can recall, Mr. President,

not by one single concrete fact did he corroborate the opinion he expressed.

I think the Senator would himself admit, if he were here on the floor, that his emotions had carried him too far. Said the Senator, in effect: "Unless this project is undertaken, 250,000 of our citizens will be brought to complete ruin and misery by the necessity of abandoning their State of Arizona and their homes and farms and going forth into the world," as the Senator said, "in as distressed a condition as the displaced persons in the concentration camps of Europe."

He stated there were 750,000 people in Arizona. Then, with this land idle, and this quarter of a million persons driven into desperation and misery, the other 500,000, he said, would face complete ruin of every kind, the tax structure would fail, businessmen and farmers would be unable to pay their debts, and insolvency and bankruptcy would sweep the State, and complete ruin of the splendid Commonwealth of Arizona would eventuate.

I hope that at some time during my remarks the junior Senator from Arizona will attempt to refute some of the facts, set forth by me, or at least, will attempt to show to the Senate the basis of his remarks.

Mr. President, what are the facts? As has been repeatedly stated by the junior Senator from Arizona himself in his remarks, and repeatedly stated in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation, if the Colorado River water is not brought into Arizona and a local plan developed for additional water, 225,000 acres which would otherwise be irrigated will not be irrigated. The Bureau expresses it this way: Assuming about 676,000 acres which could be irrigated, if the project were completed, approximately 30 percent would not be irrigated, in specific figures, 225,000 acres. Let us now proceed from there. Of this 225,000 acres, 75,000 acres are not now cultivated, nor have they been for the past decade, nor for an indefinite period. It is stated that the 75,000 acres are comprised of various parcels, which change from year to year, but there is the clear statement that the project would irrigate 75,000 acres of land which had not been irrigated for 10 years or more, bringing in that much additional new acreage.

Here we have a condition which existed long before the war. That land has not been irrigated. Does the junior Senator from Arizona want to face his fellow Senators and say that the State of Arizona has not adjusted its economy to that acreage which is not being irrigated?

Phoenix, Ariz., has, during the past decade, had one of the greatest booms in the United States. It has grown rapidly. As I shall show, a remarkable degree of prosperity exists there now and has existed for the past decade. Of course, the fact that the 75,000 acres have not been irrigated was not and could not be used as an argument that any chaos or collapse would result if additional water is not now provided and 75,000 more acres of land are put under irrigation. No rational argument can be made respecting those 75,000 acres.

Mr. President, we come now to the remaining 150,000 acres. That land is now in cultivation, according to the statement of the Bureau of Reclamation. The great bulk of it is in cotton and grain. Some of it produces as low as a gross of $30 an acre, compared to the land on which vegetables are grown, which produces $266 an acre on the average. The 150,000 acres of land will still be cultivated if the project is not put into operation.

But, Mr. President, there is another deduction to be made. The project not only embraces the Colorado River, but it embraces local projects in the Gila River and Salt River entirely independent of the Colorado River project. No one objects to those local projects. They would cost about $40,000,000. The water would be rather expensive, but I think such projects would be well justified, and so far as I know everyone would acquiesce in them. Those projects would irrigate 30,000 acres of land.

So we come then to the net figure of 120,000 acres of land presently cultivated which, according to the Bureau, will have to go out of operation if the Colorado River water is not brought in.

Mr. President, I emphasize the point that this land is of a very great variety, so far as quality is concerned. Some of the land has hardpan close to the surface Some is alkaline, or for other reasons it is not good soil. Certainly anyone can assume that if 120,000 acres of land are to be taken out of cultivation in central Arizona, by leadership of the State, or the Bureau of Reclamation, or the farmers themselves by cooperative action, the land thus taken out will be the poor land, of course, and ultimately over the course of a few years, if there is not enough water there, the poorer land which only produces a small amount of revenue, will be that which will go out of existence.

Mr. President, the 120,000 acres, the total amount that will go out of irrigation if the Colorado River water is not brought in, constitutes about 20 percent, almost exactly, of the present acreage. But if the poorer 150,000 acres of land go out, it will be land of poor yield and low quality. I say, Mr. President, that any agricultural expert who is given the opportunity to testify here will say that on the very facts presented by the Bureau of Reclamation, if the Colorado River water is not made use of, the farm production of that area may be presumed to be reduced by about 10 percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if my colleague is willing to yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, if he does not lose his rights to the floor by doing so.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I will yield for that purpose, if the Senator desires, and if I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am very, very grateful for the large audience to which I am now addressing my remarks. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator means the very select audience he has.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am reminded that at times the Senate floor would have been a magnificent place for Hamlet to have delivered his soliloquy. He would have been remote and alone, and he would have had proper reporting to preserve it for history. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have reached the point in my journey along the long road to central Arizona where it would seem apparent that, if the Colorado River water is not brought to that valley, at a cost of a billion dollars or so, more or less—and we shall not quarrel over a quarter of a billion dollars or half a billion dollars, more or less, because all of us here are good friends—the actual diminution in the productivity of the land now in crop, although it would amount to approximately 20 percent in acreage, would amount to approximately 10 percent in value. That statement is based upon the assumption that the farmers and citizens of Arizona, being of very high intellectual caliber, would, of course, let the poor-quality land, which brings in the meager returns, go out of production.

However, Mr. President, there are two other factors of very great importance in connection with our consideration of this matter. There are four main conduits which bring income into the Phoenix area. Mr. President, in order that you may be rapidly briefed upon the point I am now attempting to make, I may say that, according to the California figures, although the failure to bring the Colorado River water to the Central Valley of Arizona would reduce the cultivated acreage in central Arizona by approximately 20 percent—and I speak now according to the figures of the Bureau of Reclamation—yet we can assume that the citizens of Arizona, being highly intelligent, would take out of cultivation their poor-quality, low-income, low-yield land. So, upon any basis, it would not seem that the productivity of that area, in total terms of gross return from the crops, would be diminished more than 10 percent.

But, Mr. President, there are other factors to consider in this matter, as I was about to say. There are four main sources of income or purchasing power for Gila and Maricopa Counties. One is the tourist business, which now—although the figures are not wholly certain—probably brings more money to the Phoenix area than do all the crops from the entire 600,000 or 700,000 acres.

Mining brings in a rather minor amount, approximately $8,000,000 or $9,000,000 a year.

Manufacturing, by means of the value added by the manufacturing processes, brings in about the same amount as the crops do.

The Bureau of Reclamation assumes that, with this project in operation, the average annual production of crops in the area would amount to approximately $65,000,000 a year. The other three items I have mentioned—the tourist business, the value added by manufacturing, and mining—bring in approximately $100,000,000 a year.

So when we estimate the effect upon Arizona's economy of the reduction of 10 percent in the production of her crops, we should remember that that particular item of income to Phoenix is only a minor one, and probably the actual reduction of wealth because of the failure to have this water would not be more than 2 or 3 percent of the very great amounts of income flowing in from the tourist business, manufacturing, mining, and the cultivation of the five hundred thousand or six hundred thousand acres of land for which there is ample water.

So, Mr. President, I am at a loss to understand how the Senator from Arizona can declare, with emphasis and high emotion, that the failure to bring water from the Colorado River into that area will mean the complete ruination of the State.

Phoenix is, and will remain, one of the great winter resorts of North America. I have been there many times. It is very much like Palm Springs. Palm Springs and all the other Southwest area resorts are growing rapidly without any agriculture. There are no farms in the proximity of Palm Springs; yet it has had an immense growth in tourist business. Tucson, 90 miles from Phoenix, over the last decade has shown a tremendous growth, due almost wholly to the tourist business. There is very little farming—only a few thousand acres—in Pima County.

So, Mr. President, I think the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona is too much alarmed. I think the tourist business will continue to flow in, so long as we remain a prosperous Nation. In my opinion, the tourist business will bring ever-increasing amounts of income to that area. It is also, I think, on the threshold of increased mining, and I believe the industries there will continue to increase.

So all this high emotion and high-pressure talk about the ruination of a great State if it does not get into cultivation a comparatively meager amount of poor land, principally in grain and cotton production, does not make sense to me.

Mr. President, yesterday I said, and I now repeat, that the talk about the ruin and collapse of the Arizona and the Phoenix economy leaves me cold. All over the United States hundreds of communities have had difficult experiences because of the exhaustion of their timber, dust storms, the playing out of mines, the overuse of their water, and the shutting down of manufacturing establishments.

The distinguished Senator now presiding over the Senate [Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair] knows what keen, critical problems confront the Pacific coast at this time, as a result of the diminution of the pay rolls of the United States Government, which were paid to the people there during the war. The Senator is fortunate that the Bremerton yards are still operating at almost full capacity. I hope they will continue to do so, for the sake of the Pacific coast and particularly for the Senator's State.

Long Beach, Calif., is almost completely shut down. The discharge of 10,000 men and an indirect loss probably of another 10,000 will leave Long Beach with a critical unemployment situation, with a relief load, with housing problems, and with the anguish of the unemployed, which will constitute a serious problem.

When one goes to Phoenix, Ariz., he there sees one of the most beautiful, cleanest, and finest cities in the United States, a city enjoying high prosperity. Almost anywhere in the Southwest it will be found that its wonderful climate is attracting in ever-increasing numbers settlers, who draw incomes from the East, and tourists, who come to spend their money. The plea by the junior Senator from Arizona that the taxpayers and power users should burden themselves to the extent of $2,000, $3,000, or $4,000 an acre, on the claim that the project is in the nature of a rescue or disaster project, is without foundation.

As I said before, Mr. President, I shall be delighted to be interrupted if any Senator thinks I am making a misstatement of fact or distorting any conclusion throughout my argument.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. DOWNEY. Very happily.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely wanted the Senator to know that I should be happy to interrupt him, but I believe the only Senators on the floor, other than the Presiding Officer, are the two Senators from California. I doubt whether I could convince them. I should be happy to interrupt the Senator to reiterate my plea, if I thought it would do any good. As it is, I believe I shall merely let the Senator proceed, and then answer in my own time.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the junior Senator from Arizona for his clever and gracious reply. I certainly can understand that he would be reluctant to defend this proposition even to empty benches. I only wish there were a large group of Senators present to hear both of us and to judge of the merits of the question. But, of course, a record is being written.

I do not believe the American people will ever allow to be undertaken projects involving such an amount of money per acre. I assert it would be an unhappy and disastrous thing for western reclamation. There are, largely in the Columbia Basin and the Missouri River Valley projects, under which land can be reclaimed at a cost of $150, $250, or $500 an acre, within certain reasonable limits. Does any Senator from the West think it would help his own cause or the cause of western reclamation to throw open the door to a project of this kind? I say that ultimately, when the facts are known, and the Senate of the United States realizes that it is solemnly considering paying $1,000, $2,000, or $3,000 an acre in order to save grain land and cotton land, thereby creating a greater burden upon the Treasury in support prices, the cause of western reclamation is not going to be helped.

I further say I think it regrettable that in the Colorado River Basin we do not have left other feasible projects; but we do not. Most of those from now on are going to cost from $1,000 to $3,000 or $4,000 an acre.

A majority of the members of the committee are from the Colorado River Basin. Mr. President, why do you think they are favoring this $1,000,000,000 authorization? It is because they have similar projects within their own States. Those projects will be put forth, upon what claim? It will be said, "The distinguished Senators from Arizona were given a project of this kind, and therefore we are entitled to them."

It is said collapse and ruination of the economy of Arizona would result from the withholding of the $1,000,000,000. As I view the situation, knowing the Bureau of Reclamation and the meager gross amount of money which will be available for division among the 17 States of the West, I say Arizona will be lucky if she gets enough money within 20 years to complete the project. I showed to the Senate yesterday that, assuming a 20-year period, the interest paid upon the investment in that time by the taxpayers of the United States would amount to $650 an acre for the Arizona lands.

I think I am safe in saying it will take 20 years to complete the project. If the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona wishes to say, "We are going to build it in 10 years," then let every other Western State tremble when it considers where it is to continue to get irrigation money, if Arizona is to build the project with appropriations extending over a period of but 10 years. I do not believe it can be done. I ask you, Mr. President, and I would ask my colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona, except that he has vanished, if this terrible disaster is to occur, in the event the authorization is not made, is it not going to come within 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 years?

The junior Senator from Arizona says it is beginning now. The entire State will be ruined and abandoned before the project is completed, according to the Senator from Arizona. If 250,000 miserable citizens are to be thrown into poverty and misery, and driven from Arizona into a worse condition than that of displaced persons, what are they to do for the next 20 years? The Senator is silent and makes no answer. Mr. President, long before the project can be built the problem will have been solved, either by some kind of cooperative arrangement among the farmers, by local improvement, or in some other way.

I have, therefore, argued the question of its being a disaster or rescue proposition, as contended by the Senator, upon the assumption there would be possibly

120,000 acres of poorer land which would go out of cultivation. We have reports, scientific and honest reports, which were presented to the committee, indicating that the Department of Agriculture, the Geological Survey, and the Federal Power Commission believe that by the inauguration of proper economies within central Arizona, by restricting water to the amount strategically to be used on the land only, by lining the canals, and by the variation of crops, central Arizona probably could solve its own problem.

Mr. President, I tried to get the committee to consider a dignified, scientific, persuasive statement by representatives of the United States Geological Survey who have been studying water conditions for years. Those representatives stated it would take 3 years to make a complete evaluation. They said there was involved a difficult salinity condition, and pointed out various methods by which they believed there was a possibility that the water could be so controlled and so handled as to solve the problem in central Arizona. By the use of one method which they suggested and which noted experts favored, they believed that by the destruction of desert vegetation alone, along the canals and along the river, from 300,000 to 400,000 acre-feet of water could be saved which is now used up in supporting that desert growth. But the committee had not the slightest interest in calling for further investigation or reports by any of the other governmental agencies—all of which, in effect, denounced this project.

The Senate of the United States and the committee by dealing carelessly and casually with this kind of an expenditure of the taxpayers' money are not going to raise the stature of the Senate of the United States. I say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that if we validate the proposition of paying 10 or 20 or 30 times as much for irrigating land as the land is commercially worth that action will come back to plague the Senate. If we start embarking upon this kind of project, when the matter comes up in some other form through some other Senators who are not perhaps so popular and effective as are the proponents of the pending measure, the result will be disastrous to the reclamation program.

I say the same thing regarding the Central Valley. I know that if the waste and extravagance of the Bureau of Reclamation there are not exposed and the truth brought out western reclamation will not be helped at all. It is a complex and a far-flung problem with many, many facets. If it involved a trial before a learned judge and a jury, the consideration of all the great issues in it would probably take 2 or 3 years.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I gladly yield to the junior Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think my able colleague from California has made a very important point which needs to be emphasized and reemphasized and to be called to the attention of Senators not only from the reclamation States, but all the other Members of this body. For a long time we have had a sound system of reclamation laws whereby certain yardsticks were established by which projects might be measured as to their feasibility. In that way the Federal Treasury was protected against unsound projects. From a practical point of view, the Federal Government had agreed that it would advance money, without interest, for a period of 40 years, with a 10-year period of grace, which makes a total of 50 years, in order that irrigation projects could be constructed. They had to come within that yardstick, at least, and there were standards by which to measure the projects.

It has been pointed out by the junior Senator from Arizona that there have been some exceptions. In some cases the time has been extended to 55 years or perhaps to 60 years. I am not aware of any projects going beyond that period of time. But if the proponents of this or other measures had come frankly before the Congress and said, "In our judgment, the project cannot be built under the existing 50-year limitation and we believe there is equity in extending the time 5 years or 10 years," the Senate and the country would then have had some standard by which to measure various other projects. But, as the senior Senator from California has so ably pointed out, when a project reported by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee throws away the yardstick, once that is done in connection with the central Arizona project, I do not believe we can reestablish the yardstick, because, with equal validity, other proponents can say, "You have thrown away the yardstick in the central Arizona project; you have given them 70 or 80 or 100 years, and we want to be treated in the same way." Moreover, it will open up the Treasury to the greatest raid it has ever known. If we establish this precedent of throwing away the measuring yardstick, I do not see how, with equity, we can say, as to projects which have already been built or which are now being built, that they will be held to a 40-year period and be treated differently from the way we are asked to treat the central Arizona project.

Mr. President, I know it is difficult, and perhaps dangerous, to look into the crystal ball, but I predict that if this bill receives the approval of the Senate of the United States, and we throw away the yardstick for this vast project, there will be many projects now in construction in connection with which Senators, with considerable equity, can say, "We no longer want to be held down to the 50-year yardstick. We want the yardstick thrown away and have it left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wholly agree with that statement. If we are going to inaugurate projects which will require 100 to 150 years to pay out, undoubtedly any project which is in difficulty will be petitioning, and probably effectively, for redress.

I am reminded of one item which I should like briefly to review. The distinguished junior Senator from Arizona expressed some concern about the attitude of California, mentioning the fact that the metropolitan water district, in taking water into Los Angeles from the Colorado River, actually pumped the water a total height of 1,600 feet. He made the point that we were saying it would not be feasible to pump this great body of water 1,000 feet into the air while we ourselves had pumped water and were pumping it 1,600 feet. Mr. President, the Metropolitan water district was built by the taxpayers of the region which it serves. They did not borrow the money from the Government. They have spent two or three hundred million dollars of their own on that project, and they are transporting not irrigation water but water for industry and residence use, which is worth 10 or 20 times as much as is water for irrigation. If a man pays $75 a month rent for his home, whether he pays 75 cents a month or $: for water does not make very much difference. But if a man has to pay $20 or $30 an acre-foot for water in order to farm, he cannot stand it. To compare a high-class use of water for domestic and industrial purposes, and use of water for irrigation, is to be totally irrational and on an improper basis.

The junior Senator from Arizona was unhappy over what we had had in California. Let us compare. Central Arizona is asking for 1,200,000 acre-feet of water, almost exactly the amount the metropolitan water district has. They are not going to pay the interest or the capitalization or any part of the facilities, costing hundreds of millions of dollars necessary to get the water to central Arizona. All they are going to pay is a portion of the operation and maintenance costs.

In the metropolitan water district, as I have said, the Government had nothing to do with the building of the facilities. The district assumed all the cost. It built the transmission lines down to the pumping dam.

More than that, Mr. President, the metropolitan water district pays the full commercial value for that pumping, or approximately 4½ mills. In this case, for water to be used for cotton and grain land, this tremendous block of power is to be furnished for practically nothing, about one-fourth or perhaps one-tenth of what it can be produced for in the Bonneville area, substantially less than a mill a kilowatt hour.

Mr. President, it is easy to make such an improper and misleading comparison as has been made between the proposed project and the metropolitan water district. The metropolitan water district is a project to provide manufacturing, utility, and residential water, paid for wholly by the taxpayers and the residents. It cannot be compared at all with a project to pump and transfer irrigation water, so huge in its cost that it is almost impossible to take in the picture.

Mr. President, I regret I have had to impose upon the empty seats in the Senate as long as I have. I am reminded of a story which Herndon, the law partner of Abraham Lincoln, tells in his biography of Lincoln. Before telling the story, I wish to say that I am only quoting Abraham Lincoln. I certainly am not comparing myself with the Great Emancipator.

At one time it was argued for hours on the floor of the Senate whether the word "hell" was a profane or blasphemous word. It was finally decided that it was not, and it was held proper to use it in a quotation. So, with that preliminary observation, I wish to say that at one time when Abraham Lincoln, the man who will be so highly extolled by Republicans next week, was running for Congress, was going around his district, he went into a meeting and waited until about 9 o'clock. The only persons who were present were his partner, Herndon, who was presiding, and one dismal-looking soul in the audience. Abraham Lincoln turned to Herndon and said, "Herndon, I know why you are here." Then he turned to the other man and said, "Why the hell are you here?"

Mr. President, I know why the Presiding Officer is here, I know why the Senators from California and Arizona are here, but I do not know why the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is here. I suppose my story applies to him. [Laughter.]

Fortunately, we will have an opportunity to renew this argument sometime next week, and we hope that at that time western reclamation Senators will be present to learn something about the facts of life. They should be educated about the central Arizona project, although they are all very busily engaged with their own affairs. I have no criticism of any Senator who is not in the Chamber. Every one of us is working on matters of importance to his State and Nation. We occupy all our time far beyond our capacity, and if someone were here arguing the St. Lawrence seaway, or some other great national problem, I might not be here. I probably would be doing what the other Senators are doing, absenting myself because of necessary affairs.

I hope that when we come to vote on the amendments, and upon a motion to recommit the bill to the committee, a sufficient number of Senators will be in attendance, and that they will realize the profound implications involved in this proposal, and the career of extravagance and prodigality which may be initiated by the enactment of the extraordinary bill now pending.

INVESTIGATION OF SPIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have before me a very brief article which I should like to read into the RECORD. It is from the Chicago Herald-American, and the headline is: "High court judge front for Red spy."

This is an article by Mr. Victor Riesel, noted labor authority. The subhead is: "Agent recommended by justice for union's legal post."

The article reads:

HIGH COURT JUDGE FRONT FOR RED SPY—AGENT RECOMMENDED BY JUSTICE FOR UNION'S LEGAL POST

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK, February 4.—Arrest of that British scientist as an atomic spy only scratches the tip of the international espionage ring.

When the ring is finally uncovered, it will be revealed that Russia's American spies got so high up in their contacts with United States officials that their ringleader and braintruster used a Supreme Court Justice as a front.

JUDGE RECOMMENDS HIM

And I don't mean Justice Frankfurter here.

The judge I refer to actually made possible the spy's operation by innocently recommending the foreign agent for the post of national attorney to one of America's most important unions, headed by a world-renowned labor chief.

This spy's specialty was naval secrets—and there's an ex-bank president around who can prove all this, if it needs proving.

WHY IS SPY LOOSE?

Why doesn't the Government haul the agent in? He's around loose. And our security forces know all—but all—about him.

How long do we wait?

Or why don't we just deliver the hydrogen bomb secrets by uniformed messenger?

Mr. President, this article was called to my attention by one of the outstanding newspaper men of the Middle West, Mr. Charles Finston. He suggested that I take the matter up with the chairman of the special Senate investigating committee, and invite Mr. Riesel to come and give us further facts on this issue. I took the matter up with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the chairman of the special investigating committee, and we agreed that our committee would have no jurisdiction of this particular subject, and no jurisdiction to investigate the facts.

I am putting this article into the RECORD to call it to the attention of the proper committee, and suggest that Victor Riesel, who I understand is a fine newspaper man, be asked to come before the committee and give what information he has. I am not suggesting that he be subpenaed to come and testify. I think it is a dangerous thing to subpena a newspaper man who has written a story and force him to testify. I am inclined to think however that Mr. Riesel would be glad to give the information to the proper committee.

I might say that I think it has been proved in past years that a sizable number of newspaper men have rendered very valuable service in the way of tips and information which they have given to Senate committees.

I thank the gentleman from Chicago, Mr. Finston, for calling this matter to my attention. I am sorry our committee does not have jurisdiction to investigate it, but I hope the proper committee will look into the matter.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FORMOSA SITUATION

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday in this Chamber there took place an important exchange on the subject of American policy in the Far East, particularly with respect to the Formosa situation. I note in the RECORD that my esteemed friend, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], in stating his position against American action in Formosa, cited me as one who had advocated American military occupation or seizure of that strategic island.

I regret, Mr. President, that because of my attendance at a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee I was not able to be on the floor at the time, and I am indebted to my loyal colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] for bringing once again to the attention of the Senate an earlier statement of mine in which I sought to make my position entirely clear.

I should like to pay a tribute to a Senator who will stand up on the floor and defend his colleague when his colleague is absent. It is a splendid example of cooperation between two Senators coming from the same State.

In my judgment, these discussions we have had in the Senate have been of great value in airing the tremendous issues of our far-eastern position, which as all Senators know is very perilous. I hope the real issues will not be clouded by too much debate over the meaning of words. It is true that in the course of developing my thoughts in past months I have used the word "occupation" with respect to Formosa. But I have never been an advocate and am not now an advocate, of forcible occupation or of sending any American soldiers to Formosa. What I am still vitally interested in is a peaceful and constructive American policy throughout the Far East and particularly in Formosa, which is still the vital center of Chinese resistance to the alien tide of communism. It is my conviction that the aspirations of all far-eastern peoples for national independence, personal freedom, and economic development cry out for an affirmative American answer.

As I have repeatedly said, in my view we can begin to give that answer in Formosa. The prophets of doom who predicted the early collapse of the remaining Nationalist forces on that island

through internal corruption and incompetence have been proved wrong by the recent course of events.

In this connection I should like to call the Senate's attention to three recent articles in the New York Times by the Times far-eastern correspondent, Burton Crane, whom I know well and who is an extremely able observer. These dispatches from Formosa, dated January 30, February 2, and February 3, are a part of a flood of testimony concerning the great spirit of confidence which is rising under the new K. C. Wu regime there. They show military competence; they show strong measures of economic and political reform; and they show the hearty support of the native Taiwan people for the policy of resisting communism and building democracy.

I emphasize here that the native Taiwan people, of whom there are nearly 7,000,000, or one-third more than the population of the State of New Jersey, have nothing to do with this trouble. They were formerly a part of Japan; but there they are, the victims—if this island is taken over by the Communists.

Let me cite in particular one sentence from Mr. Crane's dispatch of January 30, which to my mind is very significant. He says:

Every authority with whom this correspondent has spoken agrees that Nationalist China's main problem is not military but economic.

I stress that because, as I have repeatedly said, I feel that our past policy in China has been tragically hampered by an overemphasis on military might and an utter failure to concentrate on the economic and ideological factors which are the heart and soul of the present cold war.

I submit to the Senate that the people of Formosa are ready and willing to help themselves and to advance the cause of freedom in the world. They have a strong Nationalist contingent to maintain that position. To my mind, they need and deserve American aid and support, and I earnestly hope that Congress will give it to them without delay.

In this connection I invite attention to the bill which the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and I introduced a short time ago, which was unanimously approved by the Foreign Relations Committee and is now on the calendar. It is Senate bill 2845, a bill to enable the President to obligate funds heretofore appropriated for assistance in certain areas in China until June 30, 1950. The bill extends the time from February 15 to June 30. We simply want that question to be left open. I can see no objection to the bill, and I hope that it may be passed immediately, so that it may go to the House for prompt action in order to take care of the crisis in Korea and the crisis in Formosa with ECA aid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three articles by Burton Crane from Formosa which I mentioned a moment ago be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times of January 31, 1950]

FORMOSA PROBLEM SEEN AS ECONOMIC—UNITED STATES $3,500,000 BID MONTHLY HELD NEEDED TO SAVE ISLAND BASTION FROM COLLAPSE—ARMY BELIEVED TOO LARGE—AMERICANS FEEL CHIANG REGIME SHOULD CONCENTRATE ON DEFENSE, NOT BLOCKADE

(By Burton Crane)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA, January 30.—About $3,500,000 of nonmilitary United States aid monthly would save this island from economic collapse and prevent Communist inroads, according to Loris Craig, Economic Cooperation Administrator for Formosa.

This figure is considerably smaller than those suggested by Chinese officials. It is based on the assumption that the present determined efforts by the Chinese to help themselves will continue

Mr. Craig believes Nationalist China can get by on about $10,000,000 monthly. For some time, perhaps as long as 7 months, the Formosa regime could use the gold reserve now held by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek at the rate of $4,500,000 monthly This would provide time to prepare for the approaching financial crisis and adjust military expenditures to cut the monthly outgo. With United States aid of $3,500,000 monthly the Chinese would have to provide another $2,000,000 by their own efforts. Mr. Craig believes they can do so.

CHINESE FIGURES DIFFER

Chinese estimates range between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000 United States aid. One official asserts that $3,500,000 in commodity aid and $1,500,000 to $2,000,000 in industrial rehabilitation aid would see the nationalist government through its current troubles.

All speak somewhat wistfully of the $75,000,000 of military aid appropriated and then frozen and the $90,000,000 to $105,000,000 of nonmilitary aid that suffered the same fate. In the past 13 months ECA aid to China aggregated $13,000,000 and only about $1,500,000 worth is on order for shipment before February 15 when all aid will end unless the United States Congress acts.

Every authority with whom this correspondent has spoken agrees that Nationalist China's main problem is not military but economic. Americans and Chinese alike feel that the people, despite early mistakes, now are pretty solidly behind the regime and will continue so unless economic difficulties become so great as to cause general discontent.

Everybody is certain, since there is virtually no danger of disaffection within the island, that any attack by the Chinese communists alone can be successfully beaten off, although they admit loans of Russian ships and planes to the enemy would change this appraisal. But the economic factor is troublesome.

Inflation here is perfectly natural. The national government is trying to make a population of 7,230,000 support 600,000 troops. One-third of these are here, the balance are defending the Chushan Islands, Hainan Island and other remnants of Nationalist territory.

Among Americans here the view generally is held that this force is entirely too large. They quote Gen. Sun Li-jen, deputy commander, as saying that 300,000 troops are enough to defend Formosa. They call for reductions in the Air Force, which has 100,000 men, including 5,000 pilots, and only 300 planes. They feel the same way about the Navy, with 45,000 on the pay rolls and no ship larger than a destroyer.

It should be noted, however, that there is a definite clash in ideas over what nationalist China's future course should be. The bulk of the Americans feel the Chinese should concentrate on island defense and stop expending money and men on blockading the mainland coast. They doubt whether an invasion now could succeed but believe time and inevitable Communist mistakes will soften up the opposition.

Chinese leaders argue, however, that if they can continue to disrupt Communist economy with air raids and the blockade they can aggravate mainland discontent with the Communist regime and hasten the day when they can make a successful return. Moreover, an early invasion would permit the Nationalists to make effective use of some 140 bands of loyal guerrillas they have left in areas nominally Communist.

NEW ESTIMATE OF AID

Experts such as Mr. Craig feel that the island's economy with nominal aid could be made to support an army of 300,000. If the army reductions are not made, therefore, a new estimate of needs must be made when Generalissimo Chiang's gold reserve—which, incidentally, he has not yet agreed to use—is exhausted.

Meanwhile, inflation has taken a strong hold. Between June, when the currency was reformed, and the end of December retail prices here rose 90 percent. Over the same period the Bank of Formosa note issue jumped from 13,000,000 to 194,000,000 Formosa dollars Although the currency is backed by 800,000 ounces of gold with an official value of 280 Formosa dollars an ounce, the official currency issue limit is 200,000,000 Formosa dollars.

When Michigan-educated K C. Wu became governor on December 21, 1949, he started a campaign that played hob with ancient Chinese traditions.

It has been customary for Chinese generals to take the pay rolls for their men in lump sums. The number of names on the register generally was considerably above the number of men in the ranks. This was petty graft, however, compared with the generals' perquisites in inflation times. It became common practice for a general to take the entire pay roll to a private bank which would hoard commodities, forcing up prices. The general would delay pay day until the goods could be sold at a profit.

Governor Wu and Jen Hsien-chuen, his finance commissioner, first forced through pay at the regimental level, then ordered all government funds deposited with the Central Bank. The second move cut the note issue $23,000,000 (Formosa) immediately.

LIBERTY LOAN HITS LUXURIES

Next came a liberty loan, intended to raise 19,000,000 Formosa dollars monthly for 3 months. This forced the loan upon luxuries. The man who buys a motor car, for example, must buy a $2,500 bond.

Tax increases, mostly upon luxuries such as house lighting and feasts and increased monopoly profits on wines, beers, cigarettes, and salt have been announced. These are intended to balance both provincial and military budgets and remove the necessity for printing more money. Few experts believe the actual yields will approach estimates.

There is evidence the Government will find itself with a shortage of 50,000 tons before the next rice crop comes in. Black market prices are double the official. Governor Wu and Mr. Jen are making determined efforts to end hoarding and fight speculation in order to drive supplies onto the market. However, there are indications the Government will be obliged virtually to adopt the black market price for rice before June and then try to readjust the economy to fit.

[From the New York Times of February 3, 1950]

FORMOSA SMASHES BLACK MARKET IN RICE AND UNITED STATES DOLLAR SPECULATION—PRICE OF FOOD STAPLE BROUGHT DOWN IN 2 DAYS BY ARMY PAY-ROLL REFORMS AND OUTLAWING OF TRUST ACCOUNTS

(By Burton Crane)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA, February 2.—Members of the young and vigorous provincial government that has been battling not only inflation but the politically powerful elements that benefit from it today are chalking up their first major victory.

They have smashed the black-market rice price. In 2 days it has fallen from $70 (Formosa) a picul (133⅓ pounds) to $65 (Formosa). They have cracked the black market in United States dollars, which has dropped from 9.95 to 8.80 Formosa dollars to the United States dollar in a week.

Those primarily responsible are Gov. K. C. Wu and his finance commissioner, Jen Hsien-chuen, who stand in the forefront of the group of United States-trained executives who have swum to the top of the Nationalist China's governmental flood in these critical days. They have slashed red tape (simple approval of routine papers that used to take 131 days now consumes 48 hours) and have made relentless war upon many an old Chinese custom that lowered efficiency or promoted corruption.

Around the heads of these men storms have been raging ever since Governor Wu took office December 21, 1949. Every pressure has been exerted to force them to call off their campaign. They have not budged. National Government officials who could remove them have backed them up, perhaps from the realization that reform had to come now or there would not be any Nationalist China to reform.

Messrs. Wu and Jen attacked the high rice price by making speculation and hoarding more difficult. They stopped speculation with army pay rolls by paying thrice monthly at regimental levels and forcing all Government funds into the Formosa Bank.

They outlawed trust accounts that had been lending black marketeers funds at rates as high as 18 percent monthly for speculation. Such rates dependent upon the rapid continued advance of black-market prices. Abolition of the trust accounts, therefore forced the speculators to liquidate their holdings, threw rice onto the market, and started the price decline.

Police raids over the week end resulted in the arrest of 17 operators in the dollar black market who were arraigned quickly. Four were sentenced to 3 months in the vagrants camp when they waived formal trials; others were admitted to bail. Since then the market has been virtually nonexistent, with dollar traders well under cover and a further slip in the quotation considered likely.

The general offensive against smuggling has long been overdue. A large proportion of this island's private foreign-currency holding has been frittered away on luxury goods brought in from Hong Kong and Japan without paying duty.

A stroll along the main shopping streets shows how general this has been. Shops display almost every American toothpaste brand, candy, and cosmetics from Hollywood, expensive American radios, British telephone instruments, all American chewing gum and cigarette brands.

Also on display are British suitings at prices ranging from $7 to $14 (United States) a yard, American fountain pens and special inks for them, foreign pencils, American typewriters, English knitgoods, American phonographs and cameras and virtually a complete range of American groceries from coffee to canned soups.

The first move against smuggling was made in December when the Army and Navy pay was virtually doubled so servicemen would not have to smuggle in order to live. Officials have made a special appeal to military personnel to support the economy by stopping such activities.

The second move was quaint and typically Chinese. Shopkeepers were told that what smuggling had been done in the past would be overlooked but that after the Chinese New Year, February 16, no more smuggled goods must be sold. After that date they must report their unsold stocks of duty-free goods and notify their trade associations whenever anyone offers them contraband.

The strangest part about this appeal is that it probably will work since most shopkeepers are native Formosans who became accustomed to obeying laws when under Japanese control.

Incidentally, food and cigarette stalls are exempted from the antismuggling order "because they are run by old women who could not get along otherwise."

[From the New York Times of February 4, 1950]

DELAYS NOW SEEN ON HAINAN ATTACK—MAO'S TRIP AND MORE EFFECTIVE NATIONALIST FORCES HELD SLOWING MOVES BY REDS

(By Burton Crane)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA, February 3.—Nationalist intelligence reports filtering through from the mainland indicate great changes in the military situation.

Strategists no longer expect the Communists to launch an attack upon Hainan Island within this month. They say there are reasons to believe that any attack anywhere may be delayed until Mao Tse-tung returns from Moscow and then the attack may come elsewhere.

Communist plans were influenced beyond any doubt by the realization that these latter-day Nationalists can actually fight effectively. No longer is a Red advance merely a question of saying boo and giving chase. Taipei still thrills to the story of the final retreat from Fukien Province on the mainland where a single Nationalist regiment held an entire Communist army long enough for other Nationalists to get away—and then was left behind. This was followed by highly successful Tinghai and Quemoy Island actions. In the former battle the Reds held the northeast top for some time but were cut off and forced to surrender.

One measure of the changed Nationalist spirit came from prisoners taken then who declared although they had been in the Red front lines since the Suchow campaign this was the first time they had fired rifles.

There are four areas along the coast where Red attacks are expected. The first area is the Chusan Islands, including Tinghai, from which the Nationalists have been blockading and bombing Shanghai. The second, Quemoy, also is called Kingmen and if held can prevent the Reds from using the Amoy area as a springboard for the invasion of Formosa. The third is Hainan, which holds the Orient's largest and best iron-ore deposits. They could become the supporting arch for rebuilding the Nationalist economy needed before a return to the mainland would be possible. Fourth, of course, is Formosa, but it now seems far down the schedule.

Resumption of the Red offensive now is expected to come in the Chusan Archipelago, probably on islands other than Tinghai, which proved so expensive. Nationalist strategists base this conclusion on intelligence reports that the Communists have not yet started amphibious training anywhere near Hainan. Although they are busily engaged at it opposite both the Chusan and Quemuy positions only their force at the former is anywhere near adequate for the effort. There they are reported to have five armies or about 100,000 men—incidentally fewer than the Nationalists—but at Quemuy they have only three armies.

The Hainan attack, when and if it comes, will be a test run for both sides for a possible future assault upon Formosa.

The actual number of invasion craft already collected is uncertain because the Reds have been gathering them in river mouths and inlets and camouflaging them with trees. The Nationalists believe the number of self-propelled boats and junks certainly is below 500, so many would need towing, meaning an average speed of about 6 knots. Thus at least 20 hours would be consumed in passage and the Nationalist Air Force and Navy would have many daylight hours for attack.

Thus far the Nationalist Air Force is dominating the skies. The Communists are believed to be holding their small air force—estimated at 50 planes of which only 30 are fighters or bombers—in reserve until the last-minute order to provide some air cover.

The Nationalists have been making periodic attacks upon Kweilin, Liuchow, Chihkiang, and other hinterland fields where these planes presumably are hidden and steadily wrecking coastal strips which would serve as invasion air bases. Strategists cannot verify a report that the Reds are getting 200 planes from the Czechs but comfort themselves with the consideration that training crews for them would take time, even if they do arrive.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following remarks made earlier in the day by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who also placed some articles in the RECORD dealing with Formosa, an article entitled "Formosa's Weaker Thread," by the able foreign correspondent Clyde Farnsworth.

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

FORMOSA'S WEAKER THREAD

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA, February 8.—The fate of Formosa hangs by two threads—economic and military. They are intertwined. If one breaks, the other also will snap. Of the two, the economic thread appears to be the weaker.

The Chinese Nationalist strength for military defense isn't determined yet, but it seems to be growing. There are signs of heightened morale in the armed services, of cooperation between islanders and mainland newcomers and of ingenious self-help against communism.

Meanwhile, there are national and provincial budgets to balance, agricultural production to be increased, foreign exchange to be won and conserved and expenses of defense to be met, if Formosa is to survive.

Life could be squeezed out of Formosa's resistance by economic pressures, and it looks as if the Communists may be counting on that to win this rich and strategically placed Pacific island.

While the armies are being trained better than they ever were in China, while shore defenses are being raised, and while materials and weapons of war ingeniously are being extracted from Japanese left-overs, as well as

from rusting piles of Pacific war junk sold to the Nationalist Government by the United States, the economic problem has emerged to haunt the Nationalists

A grant of $28,000,000 from the Economic Cooperation Administration will not solve this problem The assistance would last until June. But Formosa needs more than the gradual effects of rural rehabilitation, the shipments of fertilizer, and the lift in basic commodities which that $28,000,000 is expected to provide.

According to Formosa's hard-driving Governor, K. C. Wu, the island needs revival of the ECA industrial rehabilitation plan which was shelved last spring for Formosa as well as for China's mainland.

Many of the Nationalist arguments have been directed at gaining release of about $100,000,000 for industrial rehabilitation which, although allocated to China by the ECA, is now frozen. (Congress is considering a bill to extend the expiration date to June 30.)

Mr. Wu feels that if such an allocation is spent on the rehabilitation of Formosa's industries, transport, and power supply it probably would make Formosa self-sufficient within 2 years—and Formosa could get off the American dole

Formosa's economy is basically agricultural. The Nationalist Government has driven through a firm program of rural rent reduction and provided most of the know-how for agricultural rehabilitation. But in return it now must draw substantially all of its revenues from Formosa or go broke.

TAX RATES ON EMPLOYEES UNDER RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEMS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the body of the RECORD a tabulation prepared by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., making a comparison of the respective tax rates on employees under the Railroad Retirement and Social Security Systems and the respective retirement benefits provided for employees under those two Systems.

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

EXHIBIT A.—*Social-security versus railroad-retirement tax payments—a comparison*

Year	Social Security tax rate on $250 maximum earnings per month or $3,000 per year, and total cost		Railroad retirement tax rate on $300 maximum earnings per month or $3,600 per year, and total cost		Rail workers paid—		
	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Times more	Dollars more	Percent more
1937	1	$30	2¼	$99	3 30	$69	230
1938	1	30	2¼	99	3 30	69	230
1939	1	30	2¼	99	3 30	69	230
1940	1	30	3	108	3 60	78	260
1941	1	30	3	108	3 60	78	260
1942	1	30	3	108	3 60	78	260
1943	1	30	3¼	117	3 90	87	290
1944	1	30	3¼	117	3 90	87	290
1945	1	30	3¼	117	3 90	87	290
1946	1	30	3½	126	4 20	96	320
1947	1	30	5¾	207	6 90	177	590
1948	1	30	5¾	207	6 90	177	590
1949	1	30	6	216	7. 20	186	620
13 years [1]		390		1, 728		1, 338	
1950 [2]	1½	45	6	216	4 80	171	380
PROPOSED TAX RATE ON $300 MAXIMUM PER MONTH OR $3,600 PER YEAR							
1950	1½	$54	6	$216	4 00	$162	300
1951	2	72	6	216	3 00	144	200
1952	2	72	6¼	225	3 125	153	212½
1953	2	72	6¼	225	3 125	153	212½
1954	2	72	6¼	225	3 125	153	212½
1955	2	72	6¼	225	3 125	153	212½
1956	2	72	6¼	225	3 125	153	212½
1957	2	72	6¼	225	3 125	153	212½
1958	2	72	6¼	225	3 125	153	212½
1959	2	72	6¼	225	3 125	153	212½
1960	2½	90	6¼	225	2 50	135	150
1961	2½	90	6¼	225	2 50	135	150
1962	2½	90	6¼	225	2 50	135	150
1963	2½	90	6¼	225	2 50	135	150
1964	2½	90	6¼	225	2 50	135	150
1965	3	108	6¼	225	2 08	117	108
1966	3	108	6¼	225	2 08	117	108
1967	3	108	6¼	225	2 08	117	108
1968	3	108	6¼	225	2 08	117	108
1969	3	108	6¼	225	2 08	117	108
1970 (and after)	3¼	117	6¼	225	1 93	108	93
21 years [3]		1, 809		4, 707		2, 898	
34 years [4]		2, 199		6, 435		4, 236	

[1] From 1937 through 1949, rail workers paid almost 4½ times more, 343 percent more than those covered by social security.
[2] Present tax rates, now in effect.
[3] From 1950 through 1970, rail workers paid 2 60 times more, 160 percent more, than those covered by social security.
[4] From 1937 through 1970, rail workers paid 2.92 times more, 192 percent more—almost 3 times more than those covered by social security.

Source: Rail Pension News, published by National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Pl., Chicago 43, Ill.

The above exhibit A has been submitted to the Senate Finance Committee now holding hearings on H R 6000, for their study and consideration that rail workers should receive the same increase in benefits now proposed for those covered by social security, and has been submitted by Mr Thomas G. Stack, president of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc (a voluntary organization of union and nonunion rail workers), February 1950.

EXHIBIT B.—*Social-security benefits versus railroad retirement—a comparison*

Year	Social security, maximum possible	Railroad retirement, maximum possible	Rail workers received—		
			Times more	Dollars more	Percent more
1937	(1)	$1,440	0	$1,440	0
1938	(1)	1,440	0	1,440	0
1939	$1,020	1,440	1. 41	420	41. 1
1940	1,020	1,440	1 41	420	41. 1
1941	1,020	1,440	1. 41	420	41. 1
1942	1,020	1,440	1. 41	420	41. 1
1943	1,020	1,440	1. 41	420	41. 1
1944	1,020	1,440	1. 41	420	41 1
1945	1,020	1,440	1 41	420	41. 1
1946	1,020	1,440	1. 41	420	41. 1
1947	1,020	1,440	1 41	420	41. 1
1948	1,020	[2] 1, 584	1. 55	564	55 1
1949	1,020	1, 728	1 69	708	69 4
13 years [3]	11, 220	19, 152	1 70	7, 932	70. 6
1950	1, 020	[4] 1, 728	1 69	708	69. 4

Year	Proposed maximum possible	Rail workers receive	Times less	Dollars less	Percent less
1950	$1, 800	$1, 728	1 04	$72	4 16
1951	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4 16
1952	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4 16
1953	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4. 16
1954	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4. 16
1955	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4. 16
1956	1, 800	1 728	1 04	72	4 16
1957	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4. 16
1958	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4. 16
1959	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4. 16
1960	1, 800	1, 728	1. 04	72	4. 16
1961	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4. 16
1962	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4. 16
1963	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4 16
1964	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4. 16
1965	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4. 16
1966	1, 800	1, 728	1 04	72	4 16
17 years [5]	30, 600	29, 376	1 04	1, 224	4 16
1967	1, 800	2, 016	1. 12	216	12
1968	1, 800	2, 016	1 12	216	12
1969	1, 800	2, 016	1 12	216	12
1970	1, 800	2, 016	1. 12	216	12
4 years [6]	7, 200	8, 064	1 12	864	12

[1] No benefits until 1939
[2] 20 percent increase, July 1, 1948—before, $720, after, $864, total, $1,584
[3] From 1937 through 1949, rail workers received less than ¾ more than those covered by social security.
[4] Present law.
[5] From 1950 through 1966, rail workers receive over 4 percent less than those covered by social security.
[6] From 1967 through 1970 rail workers receive less than ⅛ more than those covered by social security

Source: Rail Pension News, published by National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago 43, Ill

The above exhibit B has been submitted to the Senate Finance Committee now holding hearings on H. R 6000, for their study and consideration that rail workers should receive the same increase in benefits now proposed for those covered by social security, and has been submitted by Mr. Thomas G. Stack, president of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc (a voluntary organization of union and nonunion rail workers), February 1950.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the pending legislation, Senate bill 75, dealing with the central Arizona project is of far-reaching importance not only to the three States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, which are directly con-

cerned, but to all the States. Their people, as Federal taxpayers, must be concerned not only with this three-quarters-of-a-billion-dollar project which also has in it a provision whereby, by mere appropriation action, the cost is increased by another $550,000,000, making it in all a project which may entail a cost of a billion and a quarter dollars. But also with the other uneconomic projects that will follow in the wake of this one, if it is approved by the Congress.

As is the case with most public questions, there is an honest difference of opinion regarding this legislation. The unfortunate fact is that there is not sufficient water available in the Colorado River to meet the future needs of all the lower-basin States or of the three States which are entirely within the lower basin.

Of the three States which are entirely within the lower basin, two of them, California and Nevada, are opposed to this legislation. One of them, Arizona, is for it. The Senate should not overlook this basic fact.

Mr. President, the other day the opening remarks of my able colleague from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] tended to give the impression that this was a case of the large State of California versus the small State of Arizona. His argument in that regard does not hold water at all, because, as the Senator from Arizona knows, each of the States is represented in this body on the basis of equality, and the smallest State of the Union has as much of a voice in the vote as does the largest and most populous State of the Union. So that is not the issue at all.

Before he had to leave on official business, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] made it very clear that he was opposed to this bill in its present form. Nevada is even a smaller State than Arizona. So of the three States which are in that division of the lower basin, two of them, Nevada and California, are opposed to this bill, and one of them, Arizona, is in favor of it.

The Arizona project is not financially feasible under present reclamation laws. To make it feasible the laws would have to be changed and extended. Revenues would have to be taken out of one Federal pocket and put into another Federal pocket, instead of being returned to the United States Treasury to pay interest on the Federal debt that would be incurred to build the project.

The Bureau of Reclamation says that Arizona farmers can pay $4.50 an acre-foot for water, but the cost of delivering an irrigation supply of water to the Arizona project over a 50-year period under the present law would be about $18 an acre-foot, annually, or approximately four times the charge of $4.50 as estimated by the Bureau. The price of $4.50 would not even be sufficient to pay the operation, maintenance, and replacement expenses chargeable to irrigation. Even under Arizona's proposed modifications of the reclamation laws, the repayment period for irrigation costs would have to be extended to something like 97 to 114 years, or from 47 to 64 years longer than the 50 years now permitted under our reclamation laws.

The Bureau of Reclamation recommends a charge of 4.82 mills per kilowatt-hour, at the end of transmission lines, for power from the proposed Arizona project. The Bureau's power figures are very vague and needed specifications are lacking. But the proposed power charge and the proposed charge of $4.50 per acre-foot for irrigation water are far too low to pay the project costs.

The price of Hoover Dam power at Los Angeles, including steam stand-by, is from 3.50 to 3.75 mills.

In order to provide sufficient revenue to secure full repayment in the required 50 years, one of the following alternatives would be needed for the Arizona project:

(a) With irrigation water priced at $4.50, the commercial power rate would have to be increased to 8.14 mills, which is ridiculously high; or

(b) A power rate of 5.17 mills would be required to cover fixed and operating costs chargeable to power; and at this rate for power the charge for irrigation water would have to be $17.80 an acre-foot, which water users could not afford to pay; or

(c) With a power rate of 5.17 mills and a water rate of $4 50 an acre-foot, a subsidy from the United States Treasury of $423,605,000 would be required. The Nation's taxpayers would have to pay this to rescue 170,000 acres of privately owned land in Arizona.

So the Bureau of Reclamation, which would build the proposed Arizona project, states that unless the reclamation laws are changed to meet Arizona's proposals, the project cannot be built, nor can it be built if California's contentions in the Colorado River controversy are sustained.

It is interesting to compare the proposed central Arizona project with the Hoover Dam project, and also with the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

Hoover Dam and power plant cost approximately $160,000,000. Before it could be built, California's municipally owned and private power companies were required to sign electrical energy contracts at rates sufficient to repay the entire cost, with interest, within 50 years. They are paying, and the American taxpayer is making money on the deal, as the interest rate is 3 percent. I may say that originally the interest rate was fixed at 4 percent, and later it was made 3 percent, which is more than the rate the Government has to pay today. So a profit is actually being made on the interest rate charged on the Hoover Dam construction.

The estimated cost of the St. Lawrence seaway is $720,000,000. Of this amount, $322,000,000 would be allocated to power, and $398,000,000 to navigation. The power would be sold, and toll charges would liquidate navigation costs. The entire project is designed to be self-liquidating at the expense of the beneficiaries, returning the original investment to the Government, with interest.

From these facts it may be seen to what extent the American taxpayer is being called upon to underwrite the proposed Arizona project, carrying with it a potential authorization of $1,200,000,000.

Water is the lifeblood of our Western States, without an adequate and dependable supply, much fertile agricultural land would revert to desert, and industrial expansion would come to an end. While the Colorado River has a long historical record, a realization of its potentialities is of but recent acquisition.

The Secretary of the Interior has officially told the Congress that there is not enough water in this interstate, international stream system to satisfy all claimants. Certainly the unfortunate difference of opinion between the State which I have the honor to represent in part and Arizona, over their respective rights to use the waters of the river, is known to many Members of the Senate. It is, of course, the insufficiency of the water to satisfy the aspirations of the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California that has led to this controversy. There are three ways such differences of opinion might be settled. One, negotiation; two, arbitration; three, judicial determination. The Governors of California and Nevada have attempted time and time again to get a settlement agreed upon by negotiation or arbitration. Arizona has declined.

Big stakes are at issue. California thinks its position is correct, and has backed its belief with the expenditure or commitment of about $550,000,000 by the people of our State and by the various localities in our State. Arizona is just as sure it is correct, and asks this Congress to back her belief with the expenditure of $738,000,000, and possibly $1,250,000,000, out of the Federal Treasury. This is important money on both sides; but the difference is that Arizona does not seek to spend its money to back up its belief in the correctness of its position, but, rather, seeks to get the Federal Government to put it up—and this before the rights of three States have been firmly, finally, and judicially determined.

For bear in mind, Mr. President, that the rights of Arizona, Nevada, and California, to a large part, at least, stem from the apportionment of use of Colorado River system waters, as made by the Colorado River Compact in 1922. That compact did not make any apportionment to any individual State; and for 26 years the contest has raged, to the point that neither side, apparently, can recede from its political and publicly stated position. Each State honestly interprets that document differently.

The Boulder Canyon Project Act, adopted by the Congress in 1928, required that California adopt an act of limitation if Arizona failed to ratify the compact. Arizona at first did fail to ratify, and California adopted its limitation act; and each State has its separate interpretations of the Project Act and of the limitation act.

The Project Act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to make contracts for the storage and delivery of Lake

Mead water, and contracts have been made by the Secretary with Arizona and California and Nevada. But each of these contracts declares that the specified water shall be delivered only if it is available to the State under the compact and the Project Act.

So, Mr. President, the controversy goes on. None of the States has a certificate of title to its claimed water; and it is but natural that the longer the controversy lasts the hotter the fires of antagonism flame. California contends that, under the Constitution of the United States and the law, the United States Supreme Court is the proper forum for a settlement of this type of dispute between the lower-basin States.

The American way to settle this dispute is to leave it to the courts. Our Federal Constitution—article III, section 10—gives the United States Supreme Court original jurisdiction in such an interstate controversy. However, approval by the Congress would be needed in order that the United States may be made a party to such judicial action.

Yet, before a judicial determination has been made, Arizona seeks, by means of Senate bill 75, to have the Congress authorize a three-fourths-of-a-billion-dollar project, as the Senators from Arizona themselves admit in reporting the bill from the committee; but we intend to show that the bill will open the door to an authorization for $1,250,000,000. The proponents of this measure propose to do that in a case in which the rights to the water needed to serve the project are in dispute.

We all know what the Secretary of the Interior said in 1948. I quote from his letter:

> The water which California projects, Federal or other, now in existence or under construction will require when they are in full operation is a great deal more than the amount which that State is entitled to use if all of Arizona's contentions are taken to be true
>
> Similarly, the water which Arizon projects now in existence, under construction, or authorized will require when they are fully developed is much more than the supply available to that State if all of California's contentions are taken to be true.

So said Mr. Krug, then Secretary of the Interior, in his letter to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] on May 13, 1948. That is the situation without the central Arizona project, which is not yet authorized. It will be worse if that project is added to those bidding for the water which is not there.

I personally deplore this quarrel, which can only be aggravated if either State claims more water for more projects, and makes even greater overdrafts on the water account of the already insolvent lower Colorado River. Three-quarters of a billion dollars, which can be expanded into an authorization for $1,250,000,000, is a great deal of money to be spent on any project. That is more than the Panama Canal cost; it is more than TVA cost; it is about the estimated cost of the St. Lawrence seaway. It is a great deal of money, even if backed up with a gold bond title policy of insurance. Certainly, Mr. President, the project cannot be built if there is the slightest question as to Arizona's rights to the necessary water to serve it. When, as, and if the court says that Arizona's claims are valid, then will be time enough to consider the authorization of so huge an expenditure, or the authorization of any expenditure which the Congress of the United States might regard as feasible and as sound economically.

Any project that is authorized should be financially feasible under the reclamation laws. With emphasis, I say to the Senators from the reclamation States that we endanger our whole reclamation policy when unsound projects are brought to the Senate floor.

The present law applying to other projects requires repayments within 50 years. That is half a century, and it provides a liberal, interest-free use of funds supplied by the Federal Treasury for irrigation projects.

Mr. President, I wish to expand on that point a little, as I did in the discussion I had with my colleague from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

The fact of the matter is that the Congress very wisely established certain yardsticks in dealing with projects of this kind. From the point of view of the Federal Government, from the point of view of the national economy, I think a very strong case can be made for the use, over a reasonable period of time, of interest-free money for the building of irrigation projects. They develop the various States; they bring people into farming and into industry and into other types of business and activity. In turn, those people become taxpayers; they add to the national income.

But I think it is possible to ride even a good horse to death; and if we throw away the yardstick and no longer have a sound basis upon which to judge the various projects, then I think we endanger the whole future of Western reclamation projects and other projects which might be comparable to them.

It may well be, as some of my colleagues from other Western States have said, that 50 years is now too short a time, that the easier projects have already been built, and that the more difficult and more costly projects cannot be kept within a limitation of 50 years. I pointed out the other day to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], who now is in the Chamber, and also to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I believe, for as I recall he was on the floor at that time, that I personally would have no objection, if the facts are as stated—namely, that additional time is needed for some of the more complicated projects—if the period were extended from 50 years to 55 years, or perhaps a case might even be made for an extension to 60 years. There might even be a slightly increased period of time, beyond that.

But we should do so by means of general legislation which would apply to all future projects, and we should also consider whether in equity the same privilege should be extended to the projects which already are under construction or already have been built. That should be done after full and free debate on the floor of the Senate and before the committee, so that the Members of this body might know the implications of what they were doing. Again, that would still require a substantial subsidy from the Federal Treasury, by reason of the fact that while the principal would be repaid, the interest would not be repaid, though I think a very strong case can be made for doing that, providing a yardstick is maintained. But one of my principal objections to the central Arizona project is the fact that the bill throws away the yardstick. It does not limit the repayment period to 50 years; indeed, it does not limit it to 55 years, it does not limit it to 60 years, it does not limit it to 65 years. As a matter of fact, the authors themselves and the sponsors of the bill admit it will take at least from 70 to 78 years, and we contend that by the loose language of the bill, the interpretation is left entirely to the Secretary of the Interior. If he should so determine, he could extend the period for 100 years, 150 years, or even longer.

It is true there are certain practical limitations. He is supposed to make his determination based upon the useful life of the project, but that is a very wide-open barn door, I submit. Some of the old Roman aqueducts and some of the old Roman roads lasted over a period of many hundreds of years. Some Secretary of the Interior might take it upon himself to give a very liberal interpretation to the provision and extend it, as I say, for a very much longer period of time; which would thereby greatly increase the hidden Federal subsidy in the case of a project of this kind.

Mr. President, I know that the able junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who now sits in the Presiding Officer's chair, is interested in maintaining a solvent Federal Government, that he is concerned with the fact that the Government is now operating in the red by over $5,000,000,000, and is concerned that we now have a Federal debt in excess of $250,000,000,000. So, I am sure that he must be of the opinion that any projects of this nature should be feasible, should be within reasonable limitations, and should be on a sound economic basis. I believe that he will give the implications of the pending bill the careful study it deserves. Unfortunately, with the busy program of the Senate, with the many committee sessions which are now being held, there are very few Senators who come to the floor during the debate on this important piece of legislation. It is not legislation applying alone to the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, as I fear so many of our absent colleagues may believe. To the contrary, it is the old story of the camel's getting his nose under the tent. Once a precedent established under the terms of the bill is allowed to have the stamp of approval of the Senate, I predict there will not be a single great reclamation project brought to the attention of the Senate in the future which ever again carries the yardstick laid down by the Federal reclamation laws. I predict that Senators will demand—and there will be considerable equity in their demand—that their sections of the country be treated just as generously as the central Arizona project is treated. I predict that, if this precedent is established, there will hardly be a project whose sponsors will not, with some equity, come

forward to say, "Why should you tie our people down by the requirement to pay back the principal in 50 years, when you are giving Arizona 78 years, or perhaps 80 or 100 years in which to pay it back? We want to have what is called in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the Tariff Act a most-favored-nation clause, so that we shall be entitled to the same most-favored treatment you extend to the State of Arizona." I predict to the able Senator who sits in the Presiding Officer's chair at the present time, the junior Senator from Illinois, if that happens the doors of the Federal Treasury will be open to the greatest raiding that has ever taken place in the long history of the Congress of the United States, far surpassing the old-time pork-barrel raids about which the Senator from Illinois, who is such an able student of history, knows and which used to plague the Congress of the United States. In those days when it was asked to authorize great projects there would be a reciprocal understanding, "You back my project and I will back yours." So, with this precedent, projects would snowball and roll on until they would actually involve, not the $1,250,000,000 incident to this project, as we are undertaking to point out now to the Senate of the United States, while there is still time, but literally would involve billions upon billions of dollars to come out of the Federal Treasury for projects which could not meet the yardstick requirement of a fair and reasonable basis. That is why I am so vitally concerned.

I have a very high regard for both Senators from Arizona. The senior Senator from Arizona, who has had a long and distinguished record in this body, happens to have served in the House of Representatives with my father, who served in that body from 1903 to 1915. There is no Senator upon the floor for whom the Members on both sides of the aisle have a higher regard or greater affection than they have for the senior Senator from Arizona. During the period I have been here, my relationships with the junior Senator from Arizona have been very pleasant. He has extended me every courtesy on occasion, and every assistance when I have requested it.

I tell the Senators from Arizona that in no sense is there any animosity on the part of either Senator from California toward the great State of Arizona. I am sure I can speak with authority when I say there is no animosity toward Arizona upon the part of any witness from my State of California who appeared in opposition to the bill, before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I sincerely wish I could join with the Senators from Arizona today in supporting a sound project in their State. If this project measured up to being a sound and economical project, I should like to be on their side of the fence. But, after the most careful study not only of the project itself, but of its implications and the prospect of opening the door to future raids upon the Treasury, in good conscience I cannot support the bill in its present form.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the report of the Bureau of Reclamation predicates a period of 78 years in which to pay the indebtedness. During the 78 years, as my junior colleague has already stated heretofore, all interest, upon the investment both for power and agricultural purposes will have been paid by the taxpayers of the United States. If that sum is figured at 2 percent for 80 years, on an anticipated investment of $1,000,000,000, and if there is then added to it $120,000,000, which will be the accumulated interest wholly borne by the taxpayers, if it takes 20 years in which to complete the project, the interest alone that will have to be borne by the taxpayers of the United States as the result of this project will amount to almost exactly $1,000,000,000. It is anticipated and expected that the profits from the sale of power will liquidate the principal of the power and irrigation indebtednesses.

I should like to ask my distinguished colleague, considering the dynamic era in which we live, the rapid advancement of technology, and the advancement in the use of atomic energy, has anyone the assurance today, looking ahead 25 or 50 years, that hydroelectric power will still have the potentiality it now has, compared with other forms of power which may come into existence prior to that time? I should like then to ask the Senator further, What should we anticipate? Who will bear the burden of this tremendous investment and the others which indubitably will follow if hydroelectric power should become less valuable than it is at the present time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think my able colleague has raised a timely question. Of course, it would be difficult for anyone to answer it with any assurance of being right. I will say, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, that there can be no question that in the offing there is to be a great change in the development of electric power, perhaps with the use of nuclear fuel. How soon that will come about no one knows. Events have been moving so rapidly in the world from the time of the first explosion of the atomic bomb at Alamogordo, N. Mex., in 1945, up to the more recent developments, that no man can predict what the future will hold 5, 10, or 20 years from today. But I think there is a general belief among many persons who are competent to judge such matters that certainly within a decade, or two decades at the most, atomic energy very possibly may become a major source of fuel for the generation of electric power. So I think the Senator's point is very well taken.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to make this observation: Certainly, if the Federal Government assumes the risk of that power for a period of 50 years, it is a very hazardous risk, because no one looking ahead can be assured what will be the form of power used in this technological civilization. To project that risk another 50 or 80 or 100 years, as may be done under this bill, certainly would be casting a very heavy hazard upon the Government of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the able senior Senator from California knows, in addition to that, the other side of the story is that this great dam, built alone, unless other works are built above it, may itself become silted up within a far shorter period. I think some estimates say 30 years. The Senator, who serves on the committee, can correct me if I am in error. From that point of view, there are grave questions as to whether it could last to the end of the period of the existing reclamation law, unless other major works are constructed on the river. Is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. The reports of the agencies clearly indicate that, due to the nature of the silt flow of the Colorado River, unless large reservoirs are built above this project, the whole dam would silt up within 25 or 30 years, with progressively increasing inefficiency from the very beginning. All agencies recommend that other great projects must begin, concurrently with this project, in order to prevent silting. I think it is well to point out that in order to protect this investment, the investment of hundreds of millions of dollars additional must necessarily be anticipated, or the whole thing becomes folly. As to what extent the additional investments to protect the dam from silting up, so it can take of the Central Arizona project, should be charged against the Central Arizona project, is something which has not yet been discussed, but which must be discussed in the future.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The present law applying to other projects, as I previously pointed out, requires payments within 50 years. There is a stated 40-year period, but there is a 10-year period of grace, so that, for practical purposes, we can call it 50 years.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I heard a part of the discussion by the senior Senator from California yesterday and the remarks of the junior Senator from California today, and I have read the entire RECORD of yesterday with regard to this project. I am aware of the discussion which was had regarding the number of acres to be affected and brought into production, but it still is not quite clear in my own mind. I should like to ask the Senator if he can give me with reasonable accuracy the approximate number of acres of land which would be brought into production as a result of the proposed legislation, over and above the acreage, either historically or at present, in production, in the area to be supplied by this proposed project.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to yield to my senior colleague from California who, I think, can supply the information more accurately than I can supply it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This is no reflection on the discussion of yesterday. There was considerable dispute back and

forth regarding the number of acres, 75,000 to 225,000 or more, but the point in which I am interested is an accurate estimate as to the additional acres which will be served by this project, as it is proposed in the bill, which are not now under production with existing facilities or existing water supply.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the facts are very simple and are not in dispute. The facts show 75,000 acres of land not now in production will be brought into production, and that, additionally, 150,000 acres of land which would in future go out of production will be maintained in production.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe the Senator referred to the cost per acre involved in this bill. Will he please repeat that statement?

Mr. DOWNEY. The Bureau of Reclamation allocates $400,000,000 of the $738,000,000 against irrigation. If we adopt that allocation we get a cost of between $1,700 and $1,800 an acre. We believe that all the costs should be considered, because the Central Valley farmers will get the investment from the power. They have the interest given them, and if we figure that cost against the whole $738,000,000, we then get a cost of approximately $300 per acre. If we add to that the $500,000,000 which is anticipated for future tunnels and facilities and apply it against the 225,000 acres, we shall have another $2,500 an acre. The very minimum figure we can anticipate is approximately $1,730 an acre. The top figure would be $4,000 or $5,000 an acre.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senators from Oregon do not concede that the benefits to be received will be confined to a minor part of the land now irrigated in Central Arizona. We do not concede that any quantity of land which has not heretofore been under cultivation will be brought under irrigation with water from the Colorado River. I want to make that fact perfectly clear. There will not be one new acre of desert land brought into cultivation What we are primarily concerned with is the establishment of a supplemental water supply for land which has heretofore enjoyed water and needs to continue to enjoy it, but not to supply water for lands which have not yet been cultivated. I shall develop that subject hereafter, and I hope the Senator from Iowa will listen to me at that time

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In projects of this kind I am fully aware of the desirability of developing economically the necessary public works. I am mindful of the fact that in my own State of Iowa, where we have not yet dared to ask for hundreds of millions of dollars of public aid, the topsoil, which is the most valuable topsoil in the world today, is washing away at the rate of millions and millions of dollars worth a year. I often wonder if perhaps my own State would not better be thinking about a billion-dollar appropriation, or something of the kind, to save the topsoil which remains. I am concerned about that particular phase of this matter. We are losing possessions we already have by erosion and other processes. Therefore, I am interested in clarifying, as much as possible, at least, the number of new acres which may be brought into cultivation under the proposed project.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am highly pleased that the Senator from Iowa has been able to be here during a part of the discussion. I hope he will be here during at least a part of the discussion of my able colleague from Arizona. I am, frankly, quite willing to let the Senate be the jury as to whether this is a sound and economic project. My only regret is that the pressure of committee hearings which are in progress, and the other heavy obligations of Senators, make it a little difficult to present the case and get it to those who will have to be the jury, particularly when so many of them will be so occupied that they may not even have a chance to read the RECORD. I am, therefore, grateful to the Senator from Iowa for being here during a part of the discussion. I think the point he raises is a very valid one. I think there is a wide matter of public policy which, as I have before said, affects not only the western reclamation States, but, indeed, is a vital policy to the Senators from everyone of the 48 States of the Union.

Mr. President, the present yardstick in the reclamation law provides for a half century of noninterest money. This, I think, is a liberal interest-free use of funds supplied by the Federal Treasury for irrigation projects. There is no established limitation on the time for the repayment in regard to the proposed project. It is left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. He may make it 70, 80, or 100 years If that is done in this case, as I have previously pointed out, a precedent will be established for countless future projects With justification projects already constructed might also claim the same liberal treatment.

Mr. President, I wish to reiterate that if after proper hearing it were decided that the present general limitation of 50 years in the reclamation law was not sufficient, then legislation should be proposed extending the period for 5, 10, or 15 years, or whatever period of time the proponents of the change feel would be justified. But we should not throw away the yardstick. If it is necessary to change the measuring means we now use, let us change it, but let it apply to future projects, as well as to the one we are now considering. I believe that this evasion of reasonable feasibility will tend to destroy confidence in all reclamation projects on the part of our colleagues from the nonreclamation States.

Again I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that, as introduced, the pending bill would authorize a $738,000,000 project, with an elastic provision which could expand it to a billion and a quarter dollars. As reported by the committee, the amount was reduced to $738,000,000, but it still contains the elastic expansion provision, which would still bring it up to a billion and a quarter dollars.

Mr. President, this is not all. If we take the bill and look at page 4 we will find this language:

> That construction of the tunnel and that portion of the canal hereinabove described from the reservoir above the dam at Bridge Canyon to a junction with the aqueduct hereinafter authorized shall be deferred until Congress by making appropriation expressly therefor has determined that economic conditions justify its construction.

Here is a bill which the junior Senator from Arizona apparently says is only an authorization for $708,000,000, as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He apparently wants to brush aside this provision which we find on page 4 of the bill. Yet, I am sure there is not a Member of this body who, if he reads that language, does not understand that it provides that, once Congress acts by appropriation of so much as a single dollar for this specific project, it will thereby authorize what has been estimated to be another $550,000,000. This is authorization by the back door, through the Committee on Appropriations and by the Congress. I think there is not a Senator who does not realize that, with the very complex appropriation bills which now come to this body, and with the uniform appropriation bill which this year and hereafter will come, it might be entirely possible that a very small item of perhaps only a few thousand dollars could be put into the bill in the future which would specifically relate to the tunnels involved, and that thereafter it would be just as securely authorized, with $550,000,000, as is the original $708,000,000. For that reason, I think we are amply justified in saying that this is not a $738,000,000 bill, it is in fact an authorization of $1,250,000,000.

Mr. President, I intend to discuss at a later date certain other features of the bill. Again, as my colleague the senior Senator from California found earlier, it is difficult to keep Senators in attendance on the floor of the Senate, but for the RECORD I wish to insert certain information relating to the Presidential and budget messages referring to this project and certain other projects.

The central Arizona bill—Senate bill 75 and House bill 934—embodies, in aggravated form, all the objectionable features pointed out by the messages of the President and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to other projects, which culminated in the appointment on January 3 of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, and this statement in the President's budget message of January 1950:

> Some changes in present Federal legislation can and should be made at this session of the Congress, but major changes should be deferred until the Commission's recommendations are available.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that it would certainly seem that in a major project of the kind we are considering, rather than rushing in and establishing new precedents, the Senate would be amply justified in recommitting the bill to the committee, so that the President's Policy Commission

might report and perhaps advise us as to certain changes in the yardstick which would be reasonable.

The background of the Executive order of January 3, 1950, appointing the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, with particular reference to the issues embodied in the central Arizona project, is as follows:

The President's explanatory covering letter said:

On several occasions, during the recent session of Congress, I called attention to the need for developing a consistent and comprehensive policy with regard to our whole water resources program. In many cases, piecemeal or partial approaches to a problem as broad as water resources development tend to confuse, rather than clarify, many of the basic, underlying issues. It is essential in my judgment that a comprehensive study and review be made of all existing water resources legislation and policies and that recommendations be made in the full knowledge of national needs and objectives.

The text of the Executive order stated:

The Commission shall give consideration in particular to (a) the extent and character of Federal Government participation in major water resources programs, (b) an appraisal of the priority of water resources programs from the standpoint of economic and social need, (c) criteria and standards for evaluating the feasibility of water resources projects, and (d) desirable legislation or changes in existing legislation relating to the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources.

The budget message of January 1950 stated (p. M65):

Some changes in present Federal legislation can and should be made at this session of the Congress, but major changes should be deferred until the Commission's recommendations are available.

The instances referred to by the President's covering letter to Mr. Cooke and the piecemeal approaches to which he referred were apparently the following, taking them in chronological order:

A. CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT LETTER OF FEBRUARY 4, 1949

On February 4, 1949, Frank Pace, Jr., Director of the Budget, wrote the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the central Arizona project, saying, inter alia:

The life of certain major parts of the project is appreciably less than the recommended 78-year pay-out period The work could be authorized only with a modification of existing law or as an exception thereto. Furthermore, there is no assurance that there will exist the extremely important element of a substantial quantity of Colorado River water available for diversion to central Arizona for irrigation and other purposes.

The foregoing summary and the project report have been reviewed by the President. He has instructed me to advise you that authorization of the improvement is not in accord with his program at this time and that he again recommends that measures be taken to bring about prompt settlement of the water-rights controversy.

On February 11, 1949, with reference to the central Arizona project, Director Pace wrote the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], supplementing the above letter of February 4, 1949, concluding with the statement:

If the Congress, as a matter of national policy, makes a determination that there is a water supply available for the central Arizona project, the President will consider all factors involved in any legislation to authorize the project and will inform the Congress of his views respecting the specific provisions of this legislation.

This letter did not retract the condemnation of the project's economics stated in the budget letter of February 4, 1949; and the Congress has not, as a matter of national policy, made the determination that there is a water supply available for the central Arizona project; to the contrary, S. 75, as amended by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and reported, avoids any such determination, and, instead, authorizes the controversy to be submitted to the Supreme Court.

B. MESSAGES ON H. R. 1770

On June 13, 1949, Director Pace wrote the Secretary of the Interior with respect to H. R. 1770, a bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, saying:

Furthermore, H R. 1770, if enacted, would, in our opinion, have the effect of liberalizing existing reclamation laws in the sense of making it easier to authorize projects and consequently requiring increased total Federal outlays coupled with less possibility of recovery by the Government. The potential budgetary impact of such action is another aspect of the problem which needs careful study.

For these various reasons, I have recommended to the President that H. R. 1770 be held not in accord with his program at this time, pending a basic review of land and water resources development policies. The President has approved this recommendation.

I think we should note that the central Arizona project, costing from $738,000,000 to $1,200,000,000, would cost more and have a greater budgetary impact than all of the reclamation expenditures in the 17 Western States for the 11-year period, 1939–49, which total $993,000,000.

It is true that some advocates of the project in Arizona point out quite correctly that on the one hand we are dealing with the authorization of $1,200,000,000 for this one project, and on the other hand we are talking about money which has been actually appropriated; but the fact remains that all the appropriations over that 10-year period of time for all the 17 western reclamation States amounted to a total of approximately $993,000,000

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. It appearing that the audience has been reduced to its irreducible minimum, I wonder if my colleague will yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in view of the effective nature of this quorum call, as already revealed, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, to resume:

C. THE VERMEJO PROJECT, VETO MESSAGE

On August 23, 1949, the President vetoed H. R. 3788, to authorize the construction of the Vermejo project, New Mexico.

1. NONREIMBURSABLES

His message said, inter alia:

While I consider this to be a serious deficiency, I am more concerned about the fact that there are included in the figure of $1,170,920 proposed to be charged off against nonreimbursable benefits, classes of such benefits not now permitted under federally constructed irrigation projects. Neither sediment control nor recreation is currently authorized as a benefit against which nonreimbursable allocations of cost may be made. It seems to me highly questionable to approve the inclusion of such benefits with respect to this one project before the Congress has reviewed the desirability of making charges to such benefits generally possible under basic reclamation law.

Mr. President, this is one of the points which I have been trying to stress for the information of the Senate, namely, that the central Arizona project breaks down some of the basic concepts, limitations, and safeguards in the reclamation law. It opens up vast new horizons of nonreimbursable projects. So the President of the United States in vetoing the Vermejo project bill, House bill 3788, did so because, among other reasons, it opened up certain additional nonreimbursable items. I wish to call the attention of both the Presiding Officer and such other Members of the Senate as are present at this time to the fact that the measure now under consideration by the Senate, Senate bill 75, adds as nonreimbursable items some of the very same items the President of the United States criticized in his veto message of House bill 3788.

The veto message on House bill 3788 also objected to a nonreimbursable allocation to fish and wildlife, saying:

While such nonreimbursable allocations are permitted in water-resources development projects, they are usually restricted in scope to the prevention of loss of and damage to wildlife.

Mr. President, I think it is worthy of noting that section 3 of Senate bill 75 authorizes the Secretary to write off allocations to fish and wildlife conservation without limit.

2. AMORTIZATION PERIOD

The veto message on the Vermejo bill, House bill 3788, also objected to the extension of the amortization period from 40 to 67 years, saying:

I wish also to point out to the Congress that H. R. 3788 deals with another issue which I believe should be first considered in basic law. I refer to the authorized period of repayment. There has been a tendency during our some 45 years of experience under the reclamation laws to increase the period of repayment of construction costs. Despite this trend, I believe the matter of further extensions to periods greatly in excess of the 40 years (plus, in some cases, a 10-year development period) now generally authorized, is a matter of such vital concern to the Nation as a whole that it should be carefully

reviewed as a principle of general application. It is not a matter to be treated in piecemeal and isolated consideration on the basis of apparent needs of one or another small project to which no need for urgent action is attached.

Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senators now present the fact that the quotation I have just read from the President's veto message of the Vermejo bill, House bill 3788, merely underscores the remarks I made earlier, namely, that Senate bill 75 does by piecemeal change the concept of our Federal reclamation laws; and I further point out that on the basis of the veto by the President of the United States of the Vermejo bill, House bill 3788—and on that ground alone—the central Arizona project bill should be vetoed by the President if it ever reaches him. But, Mr. President, on that ground I think it would be a bad mistake of public policy for the Congress of the United States to throw away the yardstick. I make that statement for the reasons I have already outlined and for the reasons which are so clearly stated in the veto message of the President of the United States in regard to House bill 3788.

Mr. President, I think it should also be noted that section 3 of Senate bill 75 provides no repayment period other than "such reasonable period of years, not to exceed the useful life of the project, as may be determined by the Secretary." The shortest period proposed by Arizona witnesses is 70 years, for a project to cost $738,000,000. If, however, the tunnels, specifically authorized by section 1 of the bill, are built, the total cost will be over $500,000,000 more—or a total of $1,200,000,000—according to the Reclamation Bureau, and no repayment period for the aggregate of one and a quarter billion dollars has been suggested.

D. THE WEBER BASIN PROJECT LETTER OF DISAPPROVAL

On August 30, 1949, the President approved, with reluctance, Senate bill 2391, to authorize the Weber Basin project, Utah, but issued a letter summarizing defects which he said would have to be cured by further legislation or by contract. They were as follows:

REPAYMENT PERIOD

1. It authorizes the repayment of irrigation water supply cost over a period of 60 years instead of the period of 40 years which has prevailed heretofore under the reclamation law.

NONREIMBURSABLES

2 The project report of the Regional Director contemplates a nonreimbursable allocation of cost in the amount of $4,656,000 for recreation. The allocation of cost to recreational facilities is not now authorized under reclamation law. If the allocation authorized in connection with the project were uniformly applied as a precedent, it would ultimately involve the Government in the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Those statements are taken from the letter of the President of the United States. I think it is worthy of note on the part of the Senate that Senate bill 75, the pending measure, in section 3, authorizes the Secretary to make a nonreimbursable allocation to "recreation"—I refer to page 5, line 9—without limitation as to amount. Yet a similar item was criticized by the President of the United States.

The President's message on Senate bill 2391, the Weber basin bill, continued:

INTEREST COMPONENT

3. Under the proposed repayment plan for the project, the amounts repaid by municipal and industrial users would be applied first to the repayment of the cost allocated to municipal and industrial purposes, and then to the repayment of part of the cost allocated to irrigation—all of this on a basis which would provide total revenues over a period of 60 years sufficient only to cover the total reimbursable cost without interest Thus, in addition to receiving no interest on the reimbursable irrigation cost, the Government would also receive no interest on the reimbursable cost for municipal and industrial uses.

The Senate should note that Senate bill 75, in section 3, on page 5, lines 18 to 22, authorizes the same result. The Secretary is to determine the amount which can be allocated to irrigation and returned to the United States "by revenues derived from sources other than the delivery of water for irrigation purposes." The testimony showed that this meant the interest component of the power revenues. By this device no interest on any feature of the project would be repaid to the Treasury in compensation for the use of the Government's money. The total amount of interest foregone is $465,600,000.

REVIEW BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The President's veto message on Senate bill 2391, the Weber Basin bill, said, with reference to review by the Army:

4 On the basis of such study as he has had time to make, however, the Chief of Engineers raises serious questions as to the amount allocated for flood control.

The Senate should note that as to the central Arizona project, the report of the Chief of Engineers stated—and I call attention to the minority views on Senate bill 75, Senate Report No. 832, Eighty-first Congress, first session, at page 31:

The legal and economic premises upon which the project as a whole is based appear to be open to serious question, particularly with respect to water rights and to the analysis of the economics of the works.

REVIEW BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The President's veto message on Senate bill 2391, the Weber Basin bill, continued:

5. The report on the project was not made available to the Department of Agriculture Consequently, it has not been possible for that Department to express its views with regard to the agricultural and economic possibility of the proposed plan.

I believe the Senate should note the fact that the central Arizona project was reviewed by the Department of Agriculture, and that the Department reported—and I call attention to an extract from the minority views, Senate Report No. 832, Eighty-first Congress, first session, page 30—as follows:

Frankly, we were unable to determine from your report whether or not the benefits actually would exceed the costs. * * * In at least the respects mentioned above, the benefits and costs used in testing the economic soundness of the project are in error

RE PIECEMEAL LEGISLATION

In concluding his message on Senate bill 2391, the Weber Basin project bill, the President said:

I consider it essential that the program be not jeopardized by premature authorization of projects in advance of resolution of questionable features. To do so may lead to unsound action which will endanger the success of our whole reclamation program.

I call the attention of the Presiding Officer and other Members of the Senate to the fact that this is the very point which I raised heretofore, that this unsound, infeasible central Arizona project, in its present form, will tend to jeopardize future sound reclamation project in the West. It is the very point which has been underscored also by the President of the United States, in his letter.

E. COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON VETO

On October 14, 1949, the President vetoed H. R. 5134, a bill relating to the Colorado-Big Thompson project, and authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make nonreimbursable allocations of cost to recreation. His veto message said:

I am unable to approve this bill because of two major objections. First, this bill would establish, for this one project only, certain policies which present an important departure from present law, but which have not been studied sufficiently to know whether or not they form a desirable basis for a new national policy.

The basic laws do not authorize the allocation of any part of joint-project costs to recreation; in the few cases where recreation facilities have been built so far, they have been separately justified and financed. This bill, however, would require nonreimbursable allocations to recreation as part of the cost of joint features of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. It would clearly be unwise to adopt such a policy in connection with this one project, before it had been decided whether the adoption of such a general policy is in the national interest. Furthermore, if such a general policy is to be adopted, there should certainly be provision for careful standards to guide its application to a particular case—standards which are not provided for in this bill.

I again point out, Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, that the President in his veto message has underscored the objection which the opponents to the bill have pointed out, for the bill also sets up certain evasions of the standards now in the reclamation laws; and, if it is done in this case, as the President quite properly pointed out in his veto message, it will be done to break down all the standards in the future. I am only sorry that not more Members of the Senate can be here to understand that it is not merely a controversy between Nevada and California on the one hand and Arizona on the other. On the contrary, it affects the Nation's basic reclamation laws. It goes to the very basic question of a sound public policy. As the able Presiding Officer, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] knows, the Senator from California has not been narrow in his belief in the importance of sound projects throughout the country. I happen to have visited not so very long ago in his State and the Tennessee Valley,

which is in his general area. I think the Senator who is now presiding recognizes the fact that when measures of a sound nature for his section have been under consideration by this body, the junior Senator from California has supported them. So long as they have a sound basis and sound standards, I believe projects can be justified, whether they be in the great Tennessee Valley, in the West, in the New England States, or in the great Middle West. But I say to you, Mr. President, that if once the standards are broken down, if the door is opened wide, if the yardstick is thrown away, it will not only jeopardize in the minds of the American people, particularly in the minds of the American taxpayers, the unsound projects, but it will, in my opinion jeopardize sound public works everywhere. It is for that reason that I believe the issue is basically important, so important that we felt it necessary, in view of the sparse attendance in the Senate of the United States, that there should be an opportunity by speeches on the floor, by reiteration, by questioning, by running debate over a period of time, finally to bring home to the consciousness of the American people, including Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives, the fact that here is a project which jeopardizes all sound reclamation projects and all other sound projects in every section of the country.

F. SECOND BUDGET LETTER ON H R 1770

On January 27, 1950, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget wrote to the Secretary of the Interior requiring certain amendments in H. R. 1770, referred to above. This is a bill which would amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. The amendments proposed by the Bureau of the Budget would—

First. Delete language which contemplates diversion of the interest component of power revenues to subsidize irrigation. The language stricken is virtually identical with that found in S. 75, page 5, line 18.

Second. Delete language which would have expanded the list of nonreimbursable allocations to include "(iv) recreation; (v) general salinity control; (vi) sediment control; (vii) the improvement of public transportation; (viii) protection of the public health; (ix) promotion of national defense; and (x) the fulfillment of international obligations."

I think the Senate should know that Senate bill 75, page 5, line 7, would authorize write-offs in addition to navigation, flood control, and fish and wildlife, all of which are found in existing law—and I think the Senate should pay particular attention to this—to silt control, river regulation, recreation, general salinity control and any other purposes "which may hereafter be made nonreimbursable by law." S. 75 imposes no limitation on the Secretary's discretion to make these write-offs, but the Interior Department's testimony on S. 75 indicates that they expect to write off about $80,000,000 for these purposes. So that will be an amount which will not be repaid, even without interest. The budget letter of January 27, 1950, proposes that sediment control, insofar as it is related to reimbursable features such as power, irrigation, or municipal water supply should not be written off; to the contrary, it is expected that "the allocation will reflect such cost and that provision will be made for its return to the United States;" and that sediment control allocations be made nonreimbursable only insofar as sediment control relates to navigation and flood-control functions. The budget letter added that these subjects should be referred for study by the Water Resources Policy Commission.

I may say again that the opponents of the pending bill believe that, inasmuch as the President of the United States has established the Water Resources Policy Commission, the members of that Commission, with us, presumably are going to study the question as to whether the yardstick should be changed somewhat, and as to whether, instead of having a foot rule, we should have a yardstick, or just what standards should be fixed. Certainly it would seem to me that before we break them down entirely we should have the report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission.

With respect to the provision of S. 75, making nonreimbursable allocations to any other purpose which may hereafter be made nonreimbursable by law," the budget letter of January 27, 1950, on H. R. 1770, goes in the opposite direction by requiring an amendment which would prevent the Secretary from making reallocations, once a project has been approved by Congress, and would require such reallocations to be submitted to Congress and approved by it.

The budget letter concluded by stating there should be referred to the President's Water Commission such questions as (a) repayment period for irrigation, (b) subsidy to irrigation, particularly from utilization of the interest component, and (c) repayment period for other reimbursable features of the project. S. 75 is inconsistent with this reservation of policy matters for consideration by the President's Water Policy Commission.

Mr. President, I wish to insert, as part of my remarks—I shall not read it to the Senate at this time, because of the small attendance of Senators on the floor, but I think it should be made a part of my remarks—the minority views of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I ask that, starting on page 18 of the committee report, the minority views be printed as a part of my remarks, together with the appendix which immediately follows.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Is there objection?

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

MINORITY VIEWS

The undersigned minority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs submits the following views in opposition to the pending bill:

SUMMARY

I. What the bill would authorize:

1. A grandiose irrigation scheme to pump water 1,000 feet high and transport it over 300 miles to irrigate ordinary field crops, such as cotton, grains, and hay.

2. An admittedly infeasible 80-mile tunnel which would cost $550,000,000.

3. A power dam loaded with uneconomic commitments, one-third of the power generated to be donated for project pumping, the other two-thirds to pay the entire reimbursable construction cost of the project, irrigation as well as power.

II. The cost is excessive: initially, $738,000,000; ultimately over one billion and a quarter dollars—more than has been appropriated for reclamation in the last 11 years.

III. Federal subsidies are unprecedented:

1. Nonreimbursables written off, $73,000,000.

2 Interest, $465,600,000

3. Contributed in electric energy, $315,000,000.

Total, $850,000,000.

IV. Results would not justify the cost; the project would bail out large landowners who have speculated in a war-boom development in the face of a known shortage of underground water and also permit irrigation of a large acreage of new lands. The works would, at a cost of $1,750 per acre, irrigate land worth, with water, $300 per acre.

V Estimates of Colorado River water needed are exaggerated; the United States Geological Survey indicates the basic factors on which the actual need should be evaluated are unknown and should be investigated.

VI. The plan of repayment cannot work out:

1. The irrigators cannot pay 1 cent of irrigation-construction cost, even for their local distribution system or drainage system.

2. Power must pay all reimbursable construction cost.

3 Determination of the repayment period is delegated to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

4 (a) Bridge Canyon power would not pay out the project over the assumed 70-year period or ever. By the Watkins amendment, Bluff Dam is eliminated from the project. The Bureau estimates of Bridge power revenues are predicated on the existence of Bluff Dam. Without it, Bridge Canyon Reservoir would be completely filled with silt in 30 years. The amendment renders the Bureau's revenue estimates totally invalid and the project totally infeasible.

(b) Estimates of Bridge Canyon returns are based on ideal operation under conditions of river flow assumed to be known in advance.

(c) To attain Bureau estimates of power revenues would require invasion of legal rights of Hoover Dam power contractors.

(d) Estimates of irrigation revenues will not be realized.

VII. All departmental reports except that of Interior are highly critical of economic and engineering features of the project; the President has declared that it is not in accord with his program.

VIII. The project has no dependable water supply; the Secretary of the Interior states that the right of Arizona to water for the project is involved in long-standing controversy and that if contentions of California are correct, there will be no dependable water supply available for the project. The situation should be cleared up by adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 4, permitting the United States to be joined in an interstate suit in the Supreme Court. The approach taken in S. 75, by authorizing the entire project, then waiving the immunity of the United States to suit, and then suspending expenditures for the aqueduct to central Arizona pending the suit, is unprecedented and wrong. The United States Treasury should not be committed to build the aqueduct at all when the basic feature of water supply is an unknown quantity.

I. WHAT THE BILL WOULD AUTHORIZE

1. A grandiose irrigation scheme

The main objective of the bill is to furnish a supplemental irrigation water supply to an area in Arizona called the central Arizona project. To do this it is proposed to pump water from the Colorado River to a height of 987 feet, nearly twice the height of the Washington Monument. The water is then to be transported through a main canal 315 miles long, a much greater distance than from Washington to New York. The irrigation use then to be made of the water is, almost exclusively, for the growing of ordinary field crops, such as cotton, grains, and hay. The use of such extravagant means to reach such a moderate result is, on the face of it, utterly fantastic and economically unsound. No comparable irrigation system, public or private, has ever been constructed.

2. An admittedly infeasible tunnel

The bill would authorize a tunnel 60 miles long running under several mountain ranges, by which the water might be conveyed by gravity from the river to the proposed main canal. Sponsors of the project freely admit that the tunnel is now economically infeasible. No official cost estimate was submitted to the committee. The bill (p. 3, line 19) says that construction of the tunnel shall be deferred "until Congress by making appropriation therefor has determined that economic conditions justify its construction." No evidence indicates what such economic conditions might be.

Thus, for the first time in history, the Congress is besought to authorize a project, without even a cost estimate, when its own sponsors say it is infeasible. As a result, the unprecedented responsibility for determining when, if ever, the tunnel may be feasible would be improperly cast upon the Appropriations Committee.

3. A power dam loaded with uneconomic commitments

The bill would authorize Bridge Canyon Dam on the Colorado River. This dam, the size of Hoover Dam, would be built solely for power generation.

One-third of the power generated (1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours each year) would be committed for pumping water up the 1,000-foot lift for the irrigation scheme. That is more electric energy than was used in the entire State of Arizona (1,206,000,000 kilowatt-hours) in 1943. All the energy which can be generated at Bridge Canyon is badly needed in the present power market of the Pacific Southwest. To commit one-third of the Bridge Canyon power to the extreme pump lift required for the central Arizona project entails the consequence that 2,500,000 barrels of fuel oil per year must be consumed to serve other power needs in the Southwest for which the Bridge Canyon power could be used. As is later shown, there is no water supply available for the project, except by taking it from existing projects, and the welfare of the United States, as a whole, cannot therefore be bettered by such a process. Under these circumstances to commit one-third of the Bridge Canyon power to the extreme pump lift, with the modest production of crops to be achieved, would be an egregious waste of the Nation's natural resources.

The remaining two-thirds of the Bridge Canyon power would be sold. The rates for that power would have to pay the entire cost of the dam and power installations. In addition, it is proposed to make the rates sufficiently high to pay the entire capital cost of the irrigation system. Use of Federal funds to develop low-cost electric power for the benefit of the people of a region is justifiable. But the result here, as the Federal Power Commission has indicated (see appendix A), would not be low-cost power. The power consumers of the Pacific Southwest would be saddled with an unreasonable and unjustifiable burden.

Bridge Canyon Dam, as the Federal Power Commission points out, has no physical relation to the central Arizona project. The minority favors construction of this dam and does not object to its contributing for the benefit of irrigation in a reasonable measure. It objects to burdens on Bridge Canyon which are excessive.

II. COST IS EXCESSIVE

The project is by far the most costly single reclamation project, for the primary benefit of a single State, that has ever been conceived or presented to the Congress. According to Bureau of Reclamation estimates, the cost of the initial works would be $738,000,000.

This amount excludes the cost of the 80-mile tunnel and appurtenances, which is understood to be an additional $550,000,000. The total ultimate cost would be $1,288,000,000.

The minority believes that these cost estimates are insufficiently grounded and that actual costs would greatly exceed the estimates.

But on the Bureau's estimates, the initial cost would be twice the cost of the Panama Canal. It would equal or exceed that of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It would equal that of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. It would be nearly five times the cost of the Boulder Canyon project.

The aggregate amount appropriated for all reclamation projects in the 17 Western States in the last 11 years has been $393,307,017 The ultimate cost of the single central Arizona project would far exceed that amount.

III. FEDERAL SUBSIDIES ARE UNPRECEDENTED

The taxpayers of the United States would make an outright gift of the following subsidies, totaling $850,000,000:

1. Nonreimbursables written off, $73,000,000

Of this amount, $33,000,000 is accounted for by one item, "Recreation," chiefly ($31,000,000) at one reservoir, Bridge Canyon, which is relatively small (one-tenth the capacity of Lake Mead, behind Hoover Dam) and is located at the bottom of a deep and inaccessible canyon. The minority believes that an independent bill appropriating $31,000,000 to the National Park Service for establishing recreation facilities at such a spot would receive, and would deserve, scant consideration. Nor should such a considerable item be more easily favored because it is tucked away as an incident to this project.

Another item of $3,000,000 is set up for "Fish and wildlife." Like the "Recreation" item, it is not supported by any showing of the amounts which the Government would expend as the costs of the functions mentioned. The only explanations presented are imaginative estimates of national benefits on an annual basis, measured by no rational yardstick and apparently picked out of thin air. These national benefits are then capitalized at 2.5 percent to produce the large figures named.

The minority has no quarrel with the principle that actual expenditures made for the service of Federal functions should be nonreimbursable. It insists that sound and scrupulous proof should be made of the real costs involved and that "blue sky" estimates should not be used to bolster up an unsound project at the expense of the Nation's taxpayers.

A third allocation of $5,000,000 is for "Salinity control." This item is nothing more nor less than land drainage. Heretofore, the farmers on all reclamation projects have paid for their own drainage works. The benefits are private, not national. No reason is seen why, by the use of a new label, the farmers on this project should be singled out for a special favor at the expense of the Nation's taxpayers.

2. Interest, $465,600,000

The reimbursable indebtedness would be $665,000,000. At 2 percent, over the least repayment period proposed in the hearings, 70 years, not including a 15-year construction period, the average annual interest paid by the taxpayers of the United States on that part of the national debt would be $6,650,000 and the total, $465,600,000.

No interest on any feature of the project would be repaid to the Treasury as compensation for the use of the Government's money. It is said that interest would be charged on the commercial-power features of the project, but the statement is essentially untrue. It is actually proposed to divert this so-called interest, amounting to $350,000,000, and apply it to repayment of the capital costs allocated to irrigation.

The minority does not dissent from the wisdom of the reclamation law, under which no interest is charged on irrigation features of a reclamation project during the repayment period fixed by that law, 50 years. It sees, however, no excuse for relieving commercial power plants, transmission lines, and related facilities from paying into the Treasury interest on the money advanced by the taxpayers of the United States to build them. It calls attention, moreover, to the way in which the interest actually borne by the Government is magnified by this process, taken together with the extension of the repayment period beyond 50 years.

3. Contributed in electric energy, $315,000,000

One-third of the energy output of Bridge Canyon (1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year) is committed to the pumping of irrigation water. The irrigators pay no capital charge therefor. If sold as commercial power, that energy would produce an additional revenue of $4,500,000 a year, or in 70 years, an aggregate of $315,000,000.

The total Federal subsidy is at least $850,000,000.

IV. RESULTS WOULD NOT JUSTIFY THE COST

The ends sought to be attained by the bill furnish no recognizable justification for a project of such tremendous magnitude. The objective is said, primarily, to be to "rescue" 150,000 acres which might otherwise have to go out of production. This area is about equal to that put under irrigation for the first time, in central Arizona, during the war boom in agricultural prices. It is owned by fewer than 500 individuals, who have probably already recouped their investment from wartime profits. The development has occurred in the face of a well-known deficiency of the underground water supply and is characterized by Arizona witnesses as a "mining" operation.

In addition, it is said that the project will irrigate 73,500 acres of land represented as having an "irrigation history," but asserted to be idle for lack of water. Proponents of S. 75 admit that no such area can be defined or located. As a matter of fact, such an acreage is roughly equal to that normally idle at any one time, in any irrigation enterprise of comparable size. In irrigation projects, 10 to 12 percent of the acreage is expected, for various reasons, to be idle in any one year. It does not use irrigation water. A water supply is not required for such idle land. Surprisingly, according to the Bureau testimony, nearly half of the project water to be applied to irrigation would be required for this 73,500 acres.

The United States is, then, asked to commit itself to an expenditure of over $1,000,000,000, to pump water a thousand feet high, and transport it over 300 miles, to "rescue" 150,000 acres now in cultivation to ordinary

field crops—cotton, grains, and hay—and to permit 73,500 acres, evidently new desert lands, to be brought under cultivation to like crops.

The costs of the projects allocated to irrigation alone will be at least $1,750 per acre for the land in both categories. That is $280,000 for a 160-acre farm. General farming land in Arizona, with water, is worth not to exceed $300 per acre, or $48,000 for the same 160-acre farm.

The project's sponsors say that this project is required to prevent a total collapse of the economy of the State of Arizona. This claim is patently exaggerated. As to the 73,500 acres asserted to have had an irrigation history, it is evident from the testimony of Bureau witnesses that this land has not been irrigated for a generation. The economy of Arizona has for many years been adjusted to its not being irrigated. As to the 150,000 acres of land presently irrigated and sought to be rescued, it must be remembered that the irrigation of this land has been a speculative wartime venture, dependent on mining a known insufficient water supply. It is, unfortunately, always necessary to make adjustments when a mined resource is exhausted.

Further, as a Bureau witness testified, it could hardly be expected that appropriations would be made for the project at a greater rate than $50,000,000 a year. At that rate, 15 to 25 years would be required to complete the project. Long before such a period elapses, the economy of Arizona will have adjusted itself, whether on the prewar basis or on some new basis, arrived at by a change of crops or otherwise. The claim that the project would accomplish the asserted rescue is, thus, wholly specious.

V. ESTIMATES OF COLORADO RIVER WATER NEEDED ARE EXAGGERATED

The Bureau's estimate of water supply required to be imported for the project is believed to be based on insufficient and inconclusive data and to be greatly exaggerated. It is probable that the tremendous cost of the aqueduct work and the perpetual high annual pumping cost could be reduced to a marked degree by more realistic evaluation of the need for imported water

From a letter in the record from the Director of the United States Geological Survey, dated June 9, 1949, it appears that a great many factors relating to the safe yield of the underground basin and the possibility of increasing the availability of local water sources are as yet not adequately known or evaluated. Among these factors are:

1. Actual surface and ground water flow into the area

2. Actual surface and ground water flow out of the area.

3. Augmentation of the local supplies by spreading of floodwaters to recharge the underground basin.

4. Extent to which waste of underground water absorbed by nonbeneficial vegetation in swamp areas can be reduced. By elimination of such vegetation, it is known that several hundred thousand acre-feet of water per year can be saved for beneficial use

5. Rates of consumptive use of water by crops.

6. Extent to which quality of irrigation water can be improved by elimination of salt springs and other sources of contamination.

7. Development of unused local water sources.

It is indicated by the Director's letter that these important subjects, which control any conclusion as to the amount of water which should as an economic matter be sought to be imported from the Colorado River, have not been adequately investigated. He suggests an outline of a "comprehensive and intensive water investigation needed for the maximum utilization of the available water supplies in the area." The time required for such investigation, 3 years, and the cost, $600,000, appear moderate and justified.

It is apparent that the estimate of the need for imported supply used by the Bureau of Reclamation, 1,200,000 acre-feet a year, is not based on adequate investigation of actual need and is definitely exaggerated. Importation of such a quantity from the Colorado River would, in the long run, lead to one of two results: Either the water logging of large parts of the area, or, contrary to the professed object of proponents of S. 75, a great expansion of the irrigated area of central Arizona. There is good ground to believe that, upon thorough study, a far less costly solution for the rescue of central Arizona can be found than is proposed by S. 75.

VI. THE PLAN OF REPAYMENT CANNOT WORK OUT

1. The irrigators cannot pay their way

The central Arizona project is the first reclamation proposal ever presented to the Congress on which the irrigators cannot pay $1 on the construction cost of their irrigation works. Indeed, the costs of the project are, without dispute, so great that the irrigators cannot even pay as much as the costs normally assigned to operation and maintenance.

Ordinarily such costs include a component of capital cost for the power used for pumping. In the central Arizona project that component is omitted. It is about half as large as the total sum which the irrigators are to pay. In other words, they are able to pay only two-thirds of normal operation and maintenance costs.

Again, the irrigators are not able to pay the cost of their irrigation distribution system or their drainage system, which have in all previous reclamation projects been required to be repaid by the irrigators The estimated cost of the distribution system is $54,000,000 and of the drainage system $10,000,000.

2 Power pays all reimbursable construction costs

Consequently, the power revenues from two-thirds of the energy generated at Bridge Canyon must, except for nonreimbursables, pay the entire bill for construction of the dam and all of the power works, including generating plants, transmission lines, and substations, etc. They must also pay for all the irrigation works, including the distribution system, and the portion—$5,000,000—of the drainage system which is not forgiven as nonreimbursable As stated, they must even pay the capital costs attributable to the power capacity which is assigned to be used for irrigation pumping, although this is normally a component of the price of such power and paid by the irrigators as an expense of operation.

3. Determination of the repayment period is delegated to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior

The Congress has invariably, up to now, determined the period within which repayment must be made for the construction costs of reclamation projects. S. 75, in this respect, is a violent departure from this settled rule. Section 3 provides that the repayment period shall be "such reasonable period of years, not to exceed the useful life of the project, as may be determined by the Secretary."

Considering the fact that some of the Roman aqueducts and the Roman roads, over 2,000 years old, are still in use, this formula, for which the Bureau of Reclamation has been reaching out for several years, does not seem to be a prudent one. No one can now know the worth of hydro power in the far future. The reduction of annual payments to near zero cannot be sanctioned. The absorption of interest by the United States over centuries cannot be justified.

However, Bureau witnesses, after using a variety of bases in reports and testimony, concluded by suggesting a period of 70 years. Accordingly, the possibility of repayment of the costs of the particular project may be tested by that period.

4. The project costs will not be paid

(a) Bridge Canyon estimated power revenues would not be realized through 70 years: Bridge Canyon Reservoir would have relatively small capacity (one-tenth of Lake Mead). The river's flow is erratic and carries great volumes of silt.

Only a great dam with very large storage capacity, constructed upstream from Bridge Canyon, such as is possible at or near Glen Canyon, would impound the silt and regulate the flow of the river so as to enable Bridge Canyon to produce the constant production of firm energy which must be sold throughout 70 years. Witnesses for the Bureau of Reclamation admitted that the Glen Canyon Dam is indispensable as a protection to the Bridge Canyon power output, and said that the Bureau is now making studies of such an additional dam

The cost of a Glen Canyon Dam is understood to be much in excess of a quarter of a billion dollars. No provision for its financing or repayment is made in S. 75. The amendment to section 1, proposed by Senator Watkins and accepted by the committee, would definitely prevent its construction as an adjunct to Bridge Canyon.

It may be said that Glen Canyon Dam will someday be built. But it is not known whether Glen Canyon Dam will stand on its own feet financially. It may or may not produce sufficient revenues to amortize its cost without subsidization from Bridge Canyon power revenues, or from the Federal Treasury

The Watkins amendment demonstrates that Glen Canyon Dam cannot be leaned on by the project, as furnishing either water storage or silt control. It makes it evident that if and when Glen Canyon is authorized and built, it will be designed and operated to serve the purposes of the upper basin in which it lies. Upon this basis, it is quite unlikely that Glen Canyon would be built within the useful life of Bridge Canyon Reservoir, which, as shown hereinafter, is only 30 years.

Again, the project, as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation, includes construction of the Bluff Dam on the San Juan River in the upper basin. The Bluff Dam would be a stopgap which would give Bridge Canyon temporary and partial aid by river regulation and silt detention The Watkins amendment also excludes this dam from the project

The engineering evidence is clear that without the silt storage afforded by the Bluff Dam, the Bridge Canyon Reservoir would be filled with silt to the dam's spillway level in 30 years. Even with Bluff constructed, Bridge Canyon Reservoir would be filled with silt in from 40 to 50 years.

Long before the reservoir is completely silted up, the lack of storage capacity would seriously impair the firm power production. During the balance of the 70-year period it is improbable that a high-head power plant could be operated at all, because the silt flowing through the generating works would destroy them Regardless of this fact it would be a mere run-of-the-river plant, producing a minimum of firm or guaranteed power. During the few months of the flood season, large amounts of dump power would be produced, but during the many months of the low-flow period hardly enough power would be produced to meet the requirements of the project's irrigation pumping load.

Also, as shown by Bureau reports, without Bluff the capacity of the spillway at Bridge Canyon Dam must be greatly increased, at an additional cost of many millions of dollars. Neither this cost nor its repayment has been included in the Bureau's financial studies.

The Bureau's estimates of Bridge Canyon power production and resulting revenues are totally invalid without a Glen Canyon Dam.

Without either Glen or Bluff, it is self-evident that Bridge Canyon revenues would be so reduced that they would not pay the project out, either in 70 years or in any period at all.

(b) Estimates of revenues from Bridge Canyon are unduly optimistic: The estimates of revenues from the Bridge Canyon power plant are based upon an ideal operation of the power plant at Bridge Canyon Dam, which could only be obtained through a foreknowledge, several years in advance, of precipitation and run-off of the Colorado River. Such ideal operating conditions could not be realized under normal circumstances.

The flow of the Colorado River is erratic. It was varied within extremes as wide as from 5,000,000 to 25,000,000 acre-feet per annum. The tremendous snow storms of the past winter were anticipated in March of this year to produce unusual flood flows, but the actual result has been only an average run-off.

It is easy, working from records of known past series of years, to produce on paper a plan of optimum operation of power works and estimates of maximum revenues. It is not possible to have any assurance that, for any period in the future in which the river's flow unknown, such estimates will prove out. If they do not, the financial feasibility of the project is impaired.

(c) To attain Bureau estimates of power revenues would require the invasion of rights of Hoover Dam power contractors: To make "firm" power of practically all the energy produced at Bridge Canyon, the Bureau plans to "coordinate" Bridge Canyon production with that at Hoover Dam, in such a way as to violate the contracts of the Hoover Dam power contractors, to their substantial detriment. The Bureau would credit Bridge Canyon with power produced at Hoover, without charging any of the cost of the Hoover plant to the Bridge Canyon project. Without such handling of the two plants, only a small part of the energy produced at Bridge Canyon could be sold as firm power and produce the revenues which firm power commands. The revenues estimated by the Bureau cannot be realized without violation of existing contracts executed by the United States

(d) Estimates of irrigation revenues will not be realized: The estimates of revenues from the delivery of irrigation water assume that irrigators in central Arizona will, year in and year out, take and pay for the full supply of water. Without that assumption, the financial feasibility of the project is again impaired.

The climate of central Arizona is shown by nearly a century of records to be characterized by alternating cycles or series of years of high and low rainfall. During wet cycles, which have lasted from 11 to 18 years consecutively, the local water supplies of central Arizona have been sufficient to supply all irrigation needs and to build up underground water tables to the point that large areas were threatened with waterlogging and pumping of large numbers of wells had to be employed to drain them. During such extended periods, which will, of course, recur many times within the proposed repayment period, it is not to be expected that farmers will buy and pay for high-priced Colorado River water for which they have no use.

The estimates of irrigation revenues used by the sponsors of the project are, therefore, mere paper estimates and do not carry conviction.

VII. DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS ARE CRITICAL

The reports of the Government Departments, other than Interior (Bureau of the Budget, Agriculture, Federal Power Commission, and Army) indicate serious questions as to the engineering and economic features of the project and as to methods employed in computing benefits. Excerpts from such reports are appended hereto (appendix A).

Special attention is called to the concluding paragraph of the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget:

"The foregoing summary and the project report have been reviewed by the President. He has instructed me to advise you that authorization of the improvement is not in accord with his program at this time and that he again recommends that measures be taken to bring about prompt settlement of the water-rights controversy."

VIII THE PROJECT HAS NO DEPENDABLE WATER SUPPLY

The testimony shows that all of the water supply available under the Colorado River compact to the States of the lower basin (Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah) will be required for projects which are now in existence and operating. Accordingly, the central Arizona project can only have a water supply for the new use which is proposed, by taking it from some other project. From an economic standpoint, it cannot be seen that the welfare of the United States can be bettered by spending a billion dollars to deprive one area of water in order to supply it to another. No national benefit would ensue.

The lack of assured legal right to the water, however, is even more important.

The Secretary of the Interior, in reporting on the central Arizona project, says:

"Assurance of a water supply is an important element of the plan yet to be resolved. * * * If the contentions of the State of Arizona are correct, there is an ample water supply for this project. If the contentions of California are correct, there will be no dependable water supply available from the Colorado River for this diversion. * * * The Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior cannot authoritatively resolve this conflict. It can be resolved only by agreement among the States, by court action, or by an agency having proper jurisdiction."

Obviously the expenditure of the vast sums of money proposed should not be authorized in the absence of a legal right to a dependable water supply. The Senators from Nevada and California have submitted, in Senate Joint Resolution 4, an affirmative and clean-cut method whereby the long-standing controversy over rights to the lower basin water can be expeditiously resolved. The resolution waives Federal immunity to suit in the Supreme Court, which is necessary to enable the States to litigate the issues and solve the problem.

An attempt has been made by supporters of S. 75 to cure the situation by a different approach, viz, the enactment of that bill with the addition of sections 12 and 13. Those sections would provide that Federal immunity to suit be waived in any action brought by any State within 6 months after the effective date of the act "to determine the right to the use of water for diversion from the main stream of the Colorado River through aqueducts or tunnels to be constructed pursuant to this act for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona." They would further provide that no moneys shall be expended for the construction of works authorized by the act which are required solely for delivery of water from the river for use in Arizona "during a period of 6 months after the enactment of this act and during the pendency of any suit or suits in which the United States shall be joined as a party under and by virtue of the consent granted in section 12 of this act."

The committee should have taken pains to correct many glaring defects of form in sections 12 and 13, only one of which need be cited for illustration. Section 13 would suspend the construction of the aqueduct to central Arizona during the pendency of the litigation only. It would permit such construction to proceed in the event the Supreme Court holds that Arizona has no water right for the project whatsoever.

During the hearings supporters of S. 75 vigorously opposed Senate Joint Resolution 4 upon the ground that the proposed lawsuit was not justiciable within the decisions of the Supreme Court. Conceding the necessity of the litigation, they urged that it was necessary that some project in Arizona be authorized before California could have a justiciable case. It is presumably for that reason that they have urged the extraordinary step of approving the hybrid measure, S. 75, plus a waiver of immunity of the United States to suit.

The proposition that authorization of a project is needed to make the case justiciable rests solely on assertion. Not one decision of the Court so holds. On the contrary, its last relevant decision, *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming* (325 U. S. 589), supports strongly the view that the case is at present justiciable. What proponents of S. 75 hope is that the authorization of the project will throw the weight of Congress into the scales in the Supreme Court. Proponents have testified that such authorization would have value to them as evidence before the Court.

The approach sought in sections 12 and 13 is wrong. It purports to commit the Treasury of the United States to the expenditure of a billion dollars or more when the Congress has been clearly and directly informed by the responsible department that the claims of Arizona to a water supply are in grave controversy.

Until the Supreme Court speaks, the Congress will not have information as to whether Arizona has a right to a sufficient water supply upon which to predicate an authorization of the central Arizona project.

The Bureau's report shows that the project, as designed, requires a water supply of 1,200,000 acre-feet per annum. When the Court speaks, it may be that Arizona has no right to any water supply for the project, or its right may be for some quantity intermediate between 1,200,000 acre-feet and zero. If the decree shows a supply available which is materially less than 1,200,000 acre-feet, the project, if feasible at all, must be redesigned to fit the supply. To authorize a project now, when it is designed upon an assumption unsupported by any information upon which the Congress may rely, defies all precedent. It is not good legislation.

IX. CONCLUSION

As a matter of course, it is incumbent on proponents of a project to show that a legal right to a dependable water supply for the project exists. Here the right to a water supply is embroiled in grave and long-standing interstate controversy. The majority of the committee has chosen the extraordinary course of authorizing the project when that course could only be the sound one if Arizona's claims in a very complex and difficult lawsuit were known in advance to be 100 percent correct. That is not known.

Entirely independent of this, the project as proposed is hopelessly uneconomic and infeasible; it would be an unjustified burden on the Nation's taxpayers and on the consumers of Bridge Canyon power, and an unreasonable waste of the Nation's natural resources.

To pump water 1,000 feet high, or carry it through an 80-mile tunnel, and transport it over 300 miles to irrigate common field crops, some of which are already subsidized by the Federal Treasury; to obligate the Treasury for over $1,250,000,000 for such a mediocre end; to allow unprecedented Federal subsidies, including a vastly inflated item for recreation, and the application of the interest component of power rates to pay irrigation capital costs, rather than return it to the Treasury as compensation for the use of the money loaned to build power works;

to irrigate land, at a cost of $1,750 per acre, which will be worth $300 per acre with water; to do this when the actual need for the estimated quantity of imported water is shown by a disinterested and highly respected Government agency to be unknown; to base estimates of repayment on figures of power revenues, when physical conditions will preclude their being realized and on irrigation revenues that will obviously not be received; to do these things when the reports of all Government departments except Interior are sharply critical of basic economic features of the project and the President has declared that it is not in accord with his program; all this the minority conceives to be preposterous.

For these major reasons, the minority recommends that S. 75 be not adopted.

APPENDIX A

EXTRACTS FROM COMMENTS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES ON REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ON PROPOSED CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

PROJECT PLANNING REPORT NO. 3-8B.4.2 DATED DECEMBER 1947

The following comments with respect to various aspects and features of the proposed central Arizona project are quoted from reports of Federal agencies as follows: Department of Agriculture, May 5, 1948; Department of the Army, May 12, 1948; Federal Power Commission, May 21, 1948; Bureau of the Budget, February 4, 1949.

UNRELATED FEATURES INCLUDED IN PROJECT

Comments of the Federal Power Commission and of the Department of the Army with respect to certain project features are quoted as follows:

Federal Power Commission

"The Commission staff has reviewed the Bureau's report and points out that the Bridge Canyon project and its two auxiliaries, Bluff and Coconino Reservoirs, have no essential physical relationship with the central Arizona diversion project. These reservoirs are not needed to regulate flow for the central Arizona diversion, nor would the Bridge Canyon power plant necessarily be the only source of power available for pumping from Lake Havasu into the Granite Reef aqueduct The only relationship between the three reservoirs as a group and the diversion project appears to be the assumed financial relation in order to provide means for repayment of a large percentage of the reimbursable costs of the diversion project chargeable to irrigation."

Department of the Army

"However, since the central Arizona project is composed of individual units and interrelated groups of units which are not mutually interdependent for adequate functioning, it is believed that action on certain of these units and groups need not be delayed pending settlement of legal and economic questions for the project as a whole but that they may properly be considered on their own merits as separate units or groups of related units."

"The Corps of Engineers is now studying a group of related units included in the central Arizona project. These units consist of improvements in the Safford Valley, the Buttes Dam and power plant, the Charleston Dam, and the Tucson water supply aqueduct. This group is urgently needed and does not depend on importation of Colorado River water or on subsidization by Colorado River power. This group will be reported upon separately by this Department at a later date."

FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT

Comments of the Department of the Army, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission with respect to certain engineering and economic aspects of the project are quoted as follows:

Department of the Army

"The legal and economic premises upon which the project as a whole is based appear to be open to serious question, particularly with respect to water rights and to the analysis of the economics of the works."

Department of Agriculture

"The first and most important question that must be asked about any proposed public work is, Will the total benefits produced equal or exceed the total costs? Our first concern then, was to find out if the central Arizona project would satisfy this requirement. Frankly, we were unable to determine from your report whether or not the benefits actually would exceed the costs. In the estimation of benefits, gross, rather than net, crop values have been used in the calculation of irrigation benefits. You will recall that in commenting upon previous reports prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, we have pointed out that this procedure disregards the cost of producing the crops. In the present report, it is indicated that this cost of production is assumed to equal the indirect benefits accruing to the project. But, in our opinion, this is not a valid way of estimating indirect benefits. In this connection, we want to make it clear that we are not questioning the propriety of utilizing indirect benefits in justifying the project, but merely pointing out that an incorrect procedure has been used in estimating these benefits.

"The actual relation of benefits to costs is still further obscured by what appears to be a failure to use the market value of power in estimating for evaluation purposes, the cost of pumping the water supply. Market value must be used in economic evaluation because the power has alternative uses. (This does not mean, of course, that market value must be used in fixing rates to be charged for water—an operation separate and apart from economic evaluation) Here again it is to be understood that we are pointing out a procedural error; not questioning the estimates of construction cost

"In at least the respects mentioned above, the benefits and costs used in testing the economic soundness of the project are in error. We would recommend, therefore, that further and more careful consideration be given to the economic evaluation of the proposed irrigation project. It is not possible to predict the effect that the suggested procedural changes might have on the benefit-cost ratios set out in the report.

"Sound economics and common sense require, first, the consideration of possible alternatives; and, second, the choice of that alternative yielding the largest return on the investment. We presume that the Bureau of Reclamation has given consideration to various alternative solutions for the water problems of the central Arizona area. This leads us to suggest that these be briefly reviewed in the report so that the Congress and the public will be assured that optimum returns will result from the investment of the public funds required"

Federal Power Commission

"It is observed that the burden of irrigation costs on power would be considerable and that costs of commercial power would be approaching a level that cannot be classed as low-cost power in the region. This raises the question of whether subsidies for irrigation should not be looked for from sources other than power if the irrigation features of the project are adopted.

"The staff is not prepared at this time to comment on the justification for the proposed allocation of $60,715,000 of the cost of the Bridge Canyon, Bluff, and Coconino Reservoirs to silt control, recreation, and fish and wildlife conservation. It is pointed out, however, that this cost, which would be nonreimbursable and which includes about $36,000,000 allocated to recreation, amounts to more than 25 percent of the estimated cost of these reservoirs."

ADEQUACY OF PROJECT PLANS

Comments of the Federal Power Commission and the Department of Agriculture with respect to the adequacy of the proposed plans of the project to carry out proposed functions over the proposed life of repayment are quoted as follows:

Federal Power Commission

"The Commission staff believes that the Glen Canyon Reservoir project on the Colorado River upstream from the Bridge Canyon site should be initiated very soon after the Bridge Canyon Reservoir is constructed. This will be necessary to prolong the period of usefulness of the storage capacity at Bridge Canyon which would otherwise probably be entirely filled with silt in from 40 to 50 years, even with the Bluff and Coconino Reservoirs constructed with the capacities proposed in the report. Bluff and Coconino Reservoirs, being off the main stream, would be of no assistance in reregulating the depleted flows from the upper basin above the confluence of the San Juan River, to meet the 10-year average requirements under the Colorado River compact Without major upstream storage on the main Colorado River, such as at the Glen Canyon site, as the Bridge Canyon active storage capacity is gradually reduced by silt deposits, this project and the firm power available therefrom, would become more sensitive to upper basin depletions and withholdings of water in headwater storage, and would gradually assume the character of a run-of-river plant. The Glen Canyon Reservoir would obviate the necessity of the Bluff Reservoir, insofar as silt storage is concerned, or at least would defer the necessity of Bluff."

Department of Agriculture

"The contemplated reservoirs will be rendered useless by sediment within a comparatively few years if nothing is done to reduce erosion. It seems clear from the foregoing that the proposed central Arizona project must be supported by projects and activities not contemplated in the report; in particular, by upper basin reservoirs and a program of land treatment."

GENERAL JUSTIFICATION—COMMENTS OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

The concluding comments of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the proposed project are as follows:

Bureau of the Budget

"From an examination of the report, of the comments of the affected States, and of the remarks of other interested Federal agencies, it is apparent that there are a number of important questions and unresolved issues connected with the proposed central Arizona project. The provision of adequate water supply, if found to be available, is admittedly a high-cost venture which is justified in the report essentially on the basis of an urgent need to eliminate the threat of a serious disruption of the area's economy. Even so, the life of certain major parts of the project is appreciably less than the recommended 78-year-pay-out period. The work could be authorized only with a modification of existing law or as an exception thereto. Furthermore, there is no assurance that there will exist the extremely important element of a substantial quantity of Colorado River water available for diversion to central Arizona for irrigation and other purposes.

"The foregoing summary and the project report have been reviewed by the President. He has instructed me to advise you that authorization of the improvement is not in accord with his program at this time and that he again recommends that measures be taken to bring about prompt settlement of the water-rights controversy."

SHERIDAN DOWNEY.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, because I think it is important that the Senate of the United States have the full text of some of these documents, and so that no one can say they have been taken out of context, which I would not want to happen, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks, at this point in the RECORD, the letter from the Bureau of the Budget to the Secretary of the Interior, dated February 4, 1949, which appears on page 2 of House Document No. 136, Eighty-first Congress, first session, dealing with the central Arizona project.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1949.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In Director Webb's letter of September 16, 1948, concerning your report on the central Arizona project, he pointed out that the Bureau of the Budget had not completed its review and analysis but agreed with your suggestion that the report should be forwarded to the Congress. I am now able to advise you that the Bureau of the Budget has completed its study of the report and a determination has been made of the relationship of the proposed project to the program of the President.

The report proposes the construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam and power plant, a pumping plant at Lake Havasu, and an aqueduct from there to Granite Reef Dam in central Arizona, together with other appurtenant works for the purpose of providing supplemental water to irrigation areas in central Arizona and hydroelectric power in the Arizona-southern California area. The total estimated cost of the project as of January 1948 is $738,408,000, of which (based on existing law $420,000,000 would be allocated to irrigation, $291,000,000 to electric power, $18,000,000 to municipal water supply, $6,000,000 to flood control, and about $3,000,000 to fish and wildlife. It is proposed to install 750,000-kilowatt capacity of power generation at Bridge Canyon Dam, with about 2 percent additional generation at smaller dams on the project.

The report calls for an ultimate annual diversion of 1,200,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River at Lake Havasu (Parker Dam) with a pump lift of 985 feet to the Granite Reef aqueduct through which it would be conveyed for a distance of 241 miles to the Phoenix area of Arizona as a supplemental supply of irrigation water. The use of such supplemental water would be "(1) to replace the overdraft on the ground-water basins, (2) to permit the drainage of excess salts out of the area and maintain a salt balance, (3) to provide a supplemental supply to lands now in production but not adequately irrigated, (4) to increase the water supply for the city of Tucson, and (5) to maintain irrigation of 73,500 acres of land formerly irrigated but now idle for lack of water." It is proposed to charge the district $4.50 per acre-foot of water. The duty of water varies between projects and between surface and pumped water. However, diversion demand of surface water at district head gate is given as an average of something about 5 acre-feet per acre. The rate for power would be (under existing law) 6.22 mills.

It is the opinion of the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation that the "project has engineering feasibility in the sense that there are no physical obstacles * * * that could not be overcome." He states, however, that "financial feasibility of the project is more difficult to determine" and further, in his report to the Commissioner of Reclamation, he raises the question of adequacy of the water supply for this project.

It is pointed out in the report, that the project as proposed is economically infeasible under existing reclamation laws and that it is essentially a "rescue" project designed to eliminate the threat of a serious disruption of the area's economy. Modifications in these laws are therefore proposed in the report to extend the repayment period for the entire project, including power, to 78 years and to use one-fifth of the interest component on the commercial-power investment to aid in the repayment of irrigation features.

The State of Arizona says that under the Colorado River compact, other agreements, and California's self-limitation act, Arizona has allocated to its use 3,670,000 acre-feet of water per year. It states that it is now using from the mainstream of the Colorado and its tributaries in Arizona a grand total of 1,408,000 acre-feet of water per year, thus leaving 2,262,000 acre-feet for additional consumption which cannot be lawfully used elsewhere than in Arizona. It estimates the (consumptive) use for the central Arizona project at 1,077,000 acre-feet, which together with the other planned uses will still leave in the mainstream, according to the State's estimate, a balance of 619,000 acre-feet apportioned to Arizona for future use and for reservoir losses. Arizona bases its case for diversion of water from the Colorado River upon these figures and proposes to use such water as a supplemental supply for lands now inadequately irrigated. It states further that the irrigation of lands in central Arizona has been expanded beyond the water supply of central Arizona and that this is resulting in an exhaustion of their underground supply with insufficient surface stream flow to maintain production in the lands now irrigated. To avoid the danger to the entire economy of the State, it considers it essential that the central Arizona project be expedited

The Commissioner of Reclamation states that assurance of a water supply is an extremely important element of the plan yet to be resolved; that the showing in the report of there being a substantial quantity of Colorado River water for diversion to central Arizona for irrigation and other purposes is based upon the assumption that claims of the State of Arizona to this water are valid. He states that the State of California challenges the validity of Arizona's claim and that if the contentions of the State of California are correct, there will be no dependable water supply from the Colorado River for this diversion.

He further states that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior cannot authoritatively resolve this conflict between States and that it can be resolved only by agreement among the States, by court action, or by an agency having proper jurisdiction.

The comments of the several affected State governments and interested Federal agencies with respect to his report contain a number of objections and reservations with respect to the proposed project. Specifically, the Department of Agriculture questions whether the benefits actually exceed costs. It questions, as it has on numerous other occasions in commenting on proposed reclamation projects, the use of the gross rather than the net crop return method of computing benefits. The Department further says:

"The actual relation of benefits to costs is still further obscured by what appears to be a failure to use the market value of power in estimating, for evaluation purposes, the cost of pumping the water supply. Market value must be used in economic evaluation because the power has alternative uses."

Commenting further on benefits, the Secretary of Agriculture states:

"While it is necessary that benefits exceed costs if a project is to be considered economically justified, this alone is not sufficient. Sound economics and common sense require: First, the consideration of possible alternatives; and, second, the choice of that alternative yielding the largest return on the investment."

The comments of the Department of Agriculture go even further and state:

"At least in the respects mentioned above the benefits used in testing the economic soundness of the project are in error. We would recommend, therefore, that further and more careful consideration be given to the economic evaluation of the proposed project."

The Federal Power Commission points out that there is no essential physical relationship between the Bridge Canyon power project and the central Arizona diversion project, but that the two are linked together in the report because of the need for subsidies from electric-power income to help finance the irrigation improvement. It also indicates that the burden of the irrigation costs are considerable and that the proposed charges for electric power consequently approach a level where such power cannot be classed as low-cost in this region. The Federal Power Commission also suggests that further studies are required before the proper installed capacity at Bridge Canyon power plant can be finally determined and that it could probably be considerably more than the 750,000 kilowatts proposed.

The State of Nevada says:

"There is a grave question regarding the availability of water to Arizona to supply the project. * * * Studies have been made by California and Nevada engineers which show there will be little or no water for the central Arizona project. * * * Investigations and reports should be held up or be only preliminary in character where there is a question as to availability of water."

The State of Nevada further says that some engineers have expressed an opinion that the Bridge Canyon Dam and reservoir cannot be utilized properly and to its full extent as a power project because of the limited storage behind the dam which in a few years would fill with silt and power service would depend on natural fluctuating river flow. They raise questions as to whether it would not be desirable to construct Glen Canyon, which would provide much additional storage capacity, at the same time at Bridge Canyon.

The State of Nevada, in commenting on the economic justification of the project, computes the net irrigation construction costs on the acreage which will be salvaged by the project at $1,469 per acre and questions the justification of such costs in the face of an estimated farm-land value with irrigation of $300 per acre.

The State of California says that a controversy has existed between California and Arizona for many years as to their respective claims to Colorado River water and that conferences held on this subject throughout have not brought a solution. The State further says that until there is a final settlement of the water rights, the aggregate of Arizona and California claims to Colorado River water will exceed the amount of water available to the lower-basin States under the Colorado River Compact and relevant statutes and decisions. It states that as long as the present unsettled situation exists, each State in the lower basin must, of necessity, interest itself in the others' projects which would overlap its claims. Accordingly, the State of California submits the following conclusions: (a) The plan for construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed project is not financially feasible

under existing Federal reclamation law and the modifications thereof considered in the report; (b) consideration of an authorization for the central Arizona project should be withheld until a determination has been made of the respective rights of the lower-basin States to the waters of the Colorado River system; and (c) extensive and detailed studies and investigations should be made by the Bureau of Reclamation of local water supply and use in order to determine accurately the amount of supplemental water needed for existing irrigated lands in the Salt River and middle Gila River Valleys and to formulate plans for additional conservation of local water supplies.

With reference to the controversy that exists between the claims of the States of the lower basin, it is concluded that the situation has not changed since your interim report of July 14, 1947, on the status of your investigations of potential water-resource developments in the Colorado River Basin. In the report of the Commissioner of Reclamation, approved by you, it is stated "that further development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin, particularly large-scale development, is seriously handicapped, if not barred, by lack of a determination of the rights of the individual States to utilize the waters of the Colorado River system."

On July 23, 1947, Director Webb replied to your letter of July 19, 1947, as follows:

"Acting under authority of the President's directive of July 2, 1946, I am able to advise you that there would be no objection to submission of the proposed interim report to the Congress, but that the authorization of any of the projects inventoried in your report should not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President until a determination is made of the rights of the individual States to utilize the waters of the Colorado River system."

From an examination of the report, of the comments of the affected States, and of the remarks of other interested Federal agencies, it is apparent that there are a number of important questions and unresolved issues connected with the proposed central Arizona project. The provision of adequate water supply, if found to be available, is admittedly a high-cost venture which is justified in the report essentially on the basis of an urgent need to eliminate the threat of a serious disruption of the area's economy. Even so, the life of certain major parts of the project is appreciably less than the recommended 78-year-pay-out period. The work could be authorized only with a modification of existing law or as an exception thereto. Furthermore, there is no assurance that there will exist the extremely important element of a substantial quantity of Colorado River water available for diversion to central Arizona for irrigation and other purposes.

The foregoing summary and the project report have been reviewed by the President. He has instructed me to advise you that authorization of the improvement is not in accord with his program at this time and that he again recommends that measures be taken to bring about prompt settlement of the water-rights controversy.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Director.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that there also be printed as a part of my remarks, at this point in the RECORD, a letter from the Bureau of the Budget to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], dated February 11, 1949, which appears on page 6 of the same House document to which I have referred.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
February 11, 1949.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Members of the Congress have raised a question as to the interpretation to be placed upon the last clause of the last sentence of my letter of February 4, 1949, addressed to the Secretary of the Interior advising him of the relationship to the program of the President of the central Arizona project. The clause referred to reads as follows:

"And that he (the President) again recommends that measures be taken to bring about prompt settlement of the water-rights controversy."

During the last Congress in connection with consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 145 and House Joint Resolution 227, this office advised the Attorney General that it would be in accord with the program of the President to resolve the water-rights controversy by waiving immunity of the United States to suit and by granting permission to the States to bring such actions as they might desire, if the Congress felt it to be necessary to take such action. This advice was transmitted to the Congress by the Attorney General. Similar advice was also transmitted by the Secretary of the Interior, together with specific suggestions as to a form of a resolution which the Congress might consider.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding of the President's position, I shall be grateful if you will advise the members of your committee that the President has not at any time indicated that suit in the Supreme Court is the only method of resolving the water-rights controversy which is acceptable to him. On the contrary, the letters addressed to the Congress last year, as indicated above, stated specifically that enactment of the resolution authorizing suit would be acceptable to the President "if the Congress feels that it is necessary to take such action in order to compose differences among the States with reference to the waters of the Colorado River."

The project report and materials relating to the positions of the several States affected are now before your committee for consideration. If the Congress, as a matter of national policy, makes a determination that there is a water supply available for the central Arizona project, the President will consider all factors involved in any legislation to authorize the project and will inform the Congress of his views respecting the specific provisions of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Director.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of comment from the Secretary of the Army, dated May 12, 1948, which appears on page 102 of the same House document, be printed as part of my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., May 12, 1948.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to the letters from the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation dated February 5 and 6, 1948, to the Secretary of the Army and Chief of Engineers, respectively, with which there were enclosed for the information and comment of the Department of the Army copies of your proposed report on the central Arizona project.

Your proposed report recommends the construction of dams, power plants, transmission lines, pumping plants, aqueducts, irrigation and drainage systems, and other incidental works at a total estimated cost, based on July 1947 price levels, of $738,408,000, of which $658,096,000 would be reimbursed from charges made for power, irrigation, and municipal water supply. The project would include a dam and power plant on the Colorado River at the Bridge Canyon site to develop power for California and the lower Colorado River basin and to provide energy for pumping Colorado River water to irrigated areas in the central portion of Arizona.

The legal and economic premises upon which the project as a whole is based appear to be open to serious question, particularly with respect to water rights and to the analysis of the economics of the works. However, since the central Arizona project is composed of individual units and interrelated groups of units which are not mutually interdependent for adequate functioning, it is believed that action on certain of these units and groups need not be delayed pending settlement of legal and economic questions for the project as a whole but that they may properly be considered on their own merits as separate units or groups of related units.

The Corps of Engineers is now studying a group of related units included in the central Arizona project These units consist of improvements in the Safford Valley, the Buttes Dam and power plant, the Charleston Dam, and the Tucson water-supply aqueduct. This group is urgently needed and does not depend on importation of Colorado River water or on subsidization by Colorado River power. This group will be reported upon separately by this Department at a later date.

Other than as outlined in the foregoing comments, the extent to which plans of the Department of the Army would be affected by the plan recommended in your proposed report cannot be determined until presently authorized investigations by the Corps of Engineers in the Colorado River Basin are completed.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the letter of comment from the Secretary of Agriculture, dated May 5, 1948, which appears on page 103 of the document to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 5, 1948.

Mr. MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

DEAR MR. STRAUS: In compliance with your request of February 6, 1948, the Department of Agriculture has reviewed the proposed report of the Secretary of the Interior, dated December 1947, on the central Arizona project. Our review has been limited to a study of the report by technicians, economists, engineers, and agriculturists—under instructions to make an objective analysis and to submit suggestions that might be of real value to you in improving the proposed project In the following the principal results of the analysis are briefly set out.

Your report deserves the most careful and sympathetic consideration of all those concerned with the social and economic well-being of the Southwest and of the Nation. As the Federal agency most concerned with the health and prosperity of the Nation's agriculture, this Department, quite naturally, would like nothing better than to be able to say that your proposed remedy for the agricultural problems of central Arizona constituted an acceptable and final solution. However, the present report does not, in our opinion, provide satisfactory answers to all of the questions that must be raised in considering a project of this nature.

The first and most important question that must be asked about any proposed public work is: Will the total benefits produced equal or exceed the total costs? Our first concern then, was to find out if the central Arizona project would satisfy this requirement. Frankly, we were unable to determine from your report whether or not the benefits actually would exceed the costs. In the estimation of benefits, gross, rather than net, crop values have been used in the calculation of irrigation benefits. You will recall that in commenting upon previous reports prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, we have pointed out that this procedure disregards the cost of producing the crops. In the present report, it is indicated that this cost of production is assumed to equal the indirect benefits accruing to the project. But, in our opinion, this is not a valid way of estimating indirect benefits. In this connection we want to make it clear that we are not questioning the propriety of utilizing indirect benefits in justifying the project, but merely pointing out that an incorrect procedure has been used in estimating these benefits.

The actual relation of benefits to costs is still further obscured by what appears to be a failure to use the market value of power in estimating, for evaluation purposes, the cost of pumping the water supply. Market value must be used in economic evaluation because the power has alternative uses. (This does not mean, of course, that market value must be used in fixing rates to be charged for water—an operation separate and apart from economic evaluation.) Here again it is to be understood that we are pointing out a procedural error, not questioning the estimates of construction cost.

In at least the respect mentioned above, the benefits and costs used in testing the economic soundness of the project are in error. We would recommend, therefore, that further and more careful consideration be given to the economic evaluation of the proposed irrigation project. It is not possible to predict the effect that the suggested procedural changes might have on the benefit-cost ratios set out in the report.

While it is necessary that benefits exceed costs if a project is to be considered economically justified, this alone is not sufficient. Sound economics and common sense require: First, the consideration of possible alternatives; and, second, the choice of that alternative yielding the largest return on the investment. We presume that the Bureau of Reclamation has given consideration to various alternative solutions for the water problems of the central Arizona area. This leads us to suggest that these be briefly reviewed in the report so that the Congress and the public will be assured that optimum returns will result from the investment of the public funds required.

Turning now to a consideration of the scope of the proposal, we suggest that, despite the magnitude of the project, it cannot stand alone; that it must be considered as an integral part of an even broader scheme of development. This is because the proposed project is related to, and dependent upon, numerous other projects and programs needed in the Colorado River Basin. As an illustration, optimum returns cannot be obtained from the proposed Bridge Canyon Dam without the construction of storage reservoirs in the upper basin to regulate the flow through the Bridge Canyon powerhouses. This, of course, you recognized in your March 1946 report on the Colorado River, in which consideration was given to the need for a basin-wide engineering plan. As you will recall, our comments upon that report were favorable to the principle of basin-wide planning, although critical of the plan presented on the grounds that it was not sufficiently comprehensive. In particular, we pointed out that a truly comprehensive program would have to provide for measures to minimize erosion and slow down the rate at which reservoirs would fill with sediment. We must repeat this warning with respect to your present proposal. The contemplated reservoirs will be rendered useless by sediment within a comparatively few years if nothing is done to reduce erosion.

It seems clear from the foregoing that the proposed central Arizona project must be supported by projects and activities not contemplated in the report; in particular, by upper-basin reservoirs and a program of land treatment. We are persuaded, therefore, to urge a return to the basin-wide program concept underlying your March 1946 report; at the same time, again calling your attention to the need for a truly comprehensive plan in the Colorado Basin, prepared jointly by all agencies able to make worth-while contributions thereto. We cannot help but feel that, in the long run, piecemeal planning and authorization of the basin program will be inefficient and wasteful.

The present report seems to be deficient in still another important respect. So far as we can determine, once the new water supply became available there could be a repetition of the unfortunate overexpansion that gave rise to the present problems of the central Arizona area. We suggest that in revising the report, Federal participation be conditioned upon dependable assurances that the area to be irrigated will be limited, in perpetuity, to that acreage for which an adequate water supply will be available. The requirement that a State ground water control law be enacted is a step in the right direction.

The Department of Agriculture will be very glad to assist you in any way possible. As we have indicated previously, we would be particularly pleased to participate in the preparation of a comprehensive basin-wide plan for the development, utilization, and conservation of both the land and water resources of the Colorado Basin.

Sincerely,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comments of the Federal Power Commission, dated May 21, 1948, starting on page 105 of the same House document, be printed as a part of my remarks.

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

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, May 21, 1948.

Mr. MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUS: The comments herein with respect to the Secretary of the Interior's proposed report on the central Arizona project, approved by the Secretary on February 5, 1948, and the regional director's report dated December 19, 1947, are transmitted in response to your letter of February 6, 1948. This is in accordance with the established procedures of the Federal Interagency River Basin Committee.

The project, described in the regional director's report, involves the construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam and power plant on the Colorado River above Hoover Dam, to develop power for California and the lower Colorado River Basin and provide energy for pumping water from Lake Havasu behind Parker Dam for diversion to the irrigated area in central Arizona. The project also involves the construction of pumping plants, aqueducts, related dams, irrigation and drainage systems, power plants, transmission lines, and incidental works.

The recommendations of the report for construction of the project are contingent on the establishment of the validity of the claims of the State of Arizona to the right to divert Colorado River water to central Arizona for irrigation and other purposes. This right is challenged by the State of California. It is expected that the Congress will give full consideration to the divergent views of these two States before providing funds for construction of the project.

The report shows the estimated total cost of the project, based on prices as of July 1, 1947, to be $738,408,000. Of this amount, $658,096,000 is indicated as chargeable to irrigation, power, and municipal water supply, and $80,312,000 to flood control, fish and wildlife conservation, silt control, recreation, and salinity control. The regional director recommends that the former group be treated as reimbursable and the latter as nonreimbursable. The money required to repay the reimbursable cost of the project would be obtained by the sale of water to the irrigation district at $4.50 per acre-foot delivered to the farms, the sale of power in Arizona and southern California at a rate of 4.82 mills per kilowatt-hour delivered to the load centers, $0.15 per thousand gallons of water delivered to the city of Tucson, and taxes to be levied by a conservancy district which would include all of the area affected by the project and would have the power to levy taxes on all of the area benefited. The amount of revenue to be obtained from the conservancy district has not been estimated, as the district has not yet been formed.

The report of the regional director shows that the central Arizona project is infeasible under the terms of existing reclamation law. However, the project would be economically feasible with the modifications to these laws provided by the terms of pending legislation. Assuming an amortization period of 78 years and an interest rate of 2 percent, the annual benefits were estimated in the report at $41,971,000, the annual charges at $25,783,500, and the benefit-cost ratio at 1.63 to 1.0.

Under the plan shown in the report, it is intended to divert to the central Arizona area from Lake Havasu, formed by Parker Dam, approximately 1,200,000 acre-feet of water per year. Diversion would be made by pumping, with a total lift of 985 feet in four lifts to Granite Reef aqueduct. This aqueduct would terminate on the Salt River at the existing Granite Reef Dam. Water would be delivered through the aqueduct at a constant monthly rate, except for a 1 month shut-down each year for repairs. Initial diversions would be 850,000 acre-feet annually, which would increase uniformly to 1,200,000 acre-feet in 50 years.

The McDowell pumping plant and reservoir would be constructed near the terminus of the Granite Reef aqueduct to raise and store any water that could not be immediately used for irrigation. There would also be a power plant constructed at the McDowell Dam, using the pumped water and additional natural and regulated inflow; an aqueduct from the Salt River above the existing Stewart Mountain Dam and power plant to the Gila River; the enlarged Horseshoe Dam,

Reservoir, and power plant on the Verde River; the Hooker Dam and Reservoir on the upper Gila River; improvements to the irrigation system in Safford Valley; the Buttes Dam, Reservoir, and power plant on the Gila River; the Charleston Dam and Reservoir on the San Pedro River and an aqueduct from that reservoir to Tucson; an irrigation distribution system; a drainage system for salinity control; and an extensive power transmission system. Power for pumping and for commercial uses would be obtained from the Bridge Canyon power plant. The Bluff Dam and Reservoir on the San Juan River and the Coconino Dam and Reservoir on the Little Colorado River would be constructed primarily for storage of silt to protect Bridge Canyon Reservoir.

The Bureau proposes as a part of the central Arizona project the installation of four power plants—at the Bridge Canyon, McDowell, Horseshoe, and Buttes Dam, respectively. The project plan includes four additional dam and reservoir projects—Bluff, Coconino, Charleston, and Hooker—at which no provision is made for the generation of power. The power features of the Bureau's plan are summarized in the report as follows:

Power plants	Installed capacity (kilowatts)	Gross average power head (feet)	Annual firm energy at plant (millions of kilowatt-hours)		
			Initial conditions	Average during first 50 years of operation	Ultimate conditions
Bridge Canyon	750,000	612	4,075	4,395	4,114
Horseshoe	10,000	141	40	40	40
McDowell	4,100	54	23	21	19
Buttes	6,000	144	35	35	35
Total	770,100		4,773	4,491	4,208
Energy replacement at Stewart Mountain			25	28	31
Total			4,748	4,463	4,177
Energy requirements at Havasu and McDowell pumping plants			1,154	1,393	1,633
Firm commercial energy			3,594	3,070	2,544

The plan of development presented in the report is predicated on the assumption that the Congress will give the full consideration that it deserves to the conflict between the States of Arizona and California as to the right of Arizona to divert from the Colorado River the additional amounts of water contemplated in the report. The Commission has no jurisdiction in the determination of the respective rights of the two States to divert water from the Colorado River The comments herein, therefore, are not to be construed in any manner as being directed to or prejudicial to the respective claims of these two States. The comments herein are made objectively from the viewpoint of the Commission's statutory interest in the conservation and utilization of the water-power values inherent in river basins and in individual project sites.

The Commission staff has reviewed the Bureau's report and points out that the Bridge Canyon project and its two auxiliaries, Bluff and Coconino Reservoirs, have no essential physical relationship with the central Arizona diversion project. These reservoirs are not needed to regulate flow for the central Arizona diversion, nor would the Bridge Canyon power plant necessarily be the only source of power available for pumping from Lake Havasu into the Granite Reef aqueduct. The only relationship between the three reservoirs as a group and the diversion project appears to be the assumed financial relation in order to provide means for repayment of a large percentage of the reimbursable costs of the diversion project chargeable to irrigation.

The staff is not prepared at this time to comment on the justification for the proposed allocation of $60,715,000 of the cost of the Bridge Canyon, Bluff, and Coconino Reservoirs to silt control, recreation, and fish and wildlife conservation. It is pointed out, however, that this cost, which would be nonreimbursable and which includes about $36,000,000 allocated to recreation, amounts to more than 25 percent of the estimated cost of these reservoirs.

The report states that the return from the sale of commercial power at the proposed rate of 4.82 mills per kilowatt-hour will yield an estimated annual revenue from power of $12,918,000. The generation from the plants other than Bridge Canyon is relatively inconsequential in amount, and on this basis it appears that your Department anticipates the sale commercially of some 2,700,000,000 kilowattt-hours of Bridge Canyon power This amounts to approximately two-thirds of the net Bridge Canyon generation, one-third being utilized for pumping from Lake Havasu into the central Arizona irrigation conduit. The rate of 4.82 mills for the commercial sale of power has been estimated in the report upon the basis of a 78-year amortization period and an interest rate of 2 percent, and in general accordance with other features of recently proposed legislation which would modify the existing Reclamation Project Act. As compared with this rate, the report estimates that the rate would be 6 22 mills per kilowatt-hour on the same basis of sale of 2,700,000,000 kilowatt-hours if computed in accordance with the existing Reclamation Project Act, which provides for an amortization period of 50 years and an interest rate of 3 percent.

If it is assumed that Bridge Canyon, Bluff, and Coconino Reservoirs are constructed solely for power, including incidental benefits of silt control, etc, but without money allowance therefor, and also without allowance for purposes of the irrigation project, the staff estimates the cost of power at 4 1 mills per kilowatt-hour on the usual basis of 50 years amortization period and 2½ percent interest rate.

Thus it appears that power users would be directly contributing, as a subsidy to irrigation, the difference between 4.1 mills per kilowatt-hour and the 4.82 mills per kilowatt-hour proposed in your report

It is observed that the burden of irrigation costs on power would be considerable and that costs of commercial power would be approaching a level that cannot be classed as low-cost power in the region. This raises the question of whether subsidies for irrigation should not be looked for from sources other than power if the irrigation features of the project are adopted.

The staff is of the opinion that considerable further studies must be carried forward before the proper installed capacity at Bridge Canyon power plant can be finally determined. At present the staff believes that the installation of 750,000 kilowatts suggested in the report represents the minimum capacity that should be provided for at this project. The installation should be determined having in view the maximum reasonable upstream regulation and with regard for future depletions of water supply.

The Commission staff believes that the Glen Canyon Reservoir project on the Colorado River upstream from the Bridge Canyon site should be initiated very soon after the Bridge Canyon Reservoir is constructed. This will be necessary to prolong the period of usefulness of the storage capacity at Bridge Canyon, which would otherwise probably be entirely filled with silt in from 40 to 50 years, even with the Bluff and Coconino Reservoirs constructed with the capacities proposed in the report. Bluff and Coconino Reservoirs, being off the main stream, would be of no assistance in reregulating the depleted flows from the upper basin above the confluence of the San Juan River to meet the 10-year average requirements under the Colorado River compact. Without major upstream storage on the main Colorado River, such as at the Glen Canyon site, as the Bridge Canyon active storage capacity is gradually reduced by silt deposits, this project and the firm power available therefrom would become more sensitive to upper-basin depletions and withholdings of water in headwater storage and would gradually assume the character of a run-of-river plant. The Glen Canyon Reservoir would obviate the necessity of the Bluff Reservoir, insofar as silt storage is concerned, or at least would defer the necessity of Bluff.

If the Bluff and Coconino Reservoirs are to be constructed with storage capacities comparable to those shown in the report, provision should be made for the generation of power at each of those reservoirs, in view of the proposed heights of dams, the average flows, and the Bureau's estimated rates of sedimentation and consequent length of useful life of the respective reservoirs. It is noted that the report of your Department on the Colorado River dated March 1946 suggested an installation of 52,000 kilowatts for the Bluff project.

In regard to the McDowell power plant, if local conditions at the terminus of the Granite Reef aqueduct are favorable, it might be feasible to construct a pond of sufficient capacity to serve as a combined forebay for the McDowell pumping plant and afterbay for the McDowell power plant, thus permitting a large installation at the latter plant for peaking operation. The McDowell plant would be within short transmission distance of the Phoenix load area.

The staff believes that the generating capacity at the proposed enlarged Horseshoe Reservoir and power plant on the Verde River should be considered upon the basis of its use for peaking operations, with the fluctuating discharges being reregulated by the existing Bartlett Reservoir. This plant would also be within short transmission distance of the Phoenix area. It is noted that the development of power at the Bartlett Dam was suggested in your report of March 1946 on the Colorado River.

Power possibilities at the proposed Charleston Reservoir on San Pedro River do not appear attractive, as this reservoir would be depended upon increasingly for municipal water supply for the city of Tucson, requiring hold-over storage in an area subject to severe protracted droughts and excessive rates of evaporation. The Hooker Reservoir on the upper Gila River does not appear attractive for power, although detail studies might indicate that small amounts of seasonal byproduct energy could be economically produced. The Colorado River report of your Department showed an installation of 3,000 kilowatts at the Hooker Dam.

An application for a preliminary permit for a dam and power plant to be constructed at the Bridge Canyon site on the Colorado River (project No. 1503) was filed with the Commission on August 3, 1938, by the State of Arizona. Public hearing on the application has been postponed from time to time on request of the applicant. Further action on the application by the Federal Power Commission is being held in abeyance at the present time.

The Commission appreciates the opportunity of reviewing and commenting on the Bureau's report on the central Arizona project.

Sincerely yours,

NELSON LEE SMITH,
Chairman.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks on the central Arizona project, and in continuation of them, the three budget messages of the President from which I quoted, because I think it is important that the Members of the Senate have opportunity to read the entire messages, to be sure that the quotations which have been made were not taken out of context.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the President's budget message of August 23, 1949, on the Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico, be printed as a part of my remarks.

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

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning without my approval H. R. 3788, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to construct, operate, and maintain the Vermejo reclamation project for the purposes of irrigating approximately 7,200 acres of semiarid land in Colfax County, N. Mex; controlling floods; providing for the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife; and providing recreational facilities.

The total cost of this project is estimated to be $2,959,000 with tentative allocations as follows:

Reimbursable: Irrigation	$1,788,080
Nonreimbursable:	
Sediment control	222,000
Fish and wildlife	718,590
Recreation	134,880
Flood control	95,450

The project report shows the benefit-cost ratio to be 1.76 to 1.

It is estimated that the reimbursable costs would be repaid by the water users without interest in 67 years (plus a 7-year development period). This estimate is based upon an economic analysis which indicates that the water users will be able to meet annual water charges of $6.30 per acre. Of this amount $2.61 per acre will be required for operation and maintenance, thus leaving $3.69 per acre available for application against construction charges.

These estimates of the ability of the water users to repay the costs allocated to irrigation were not officially reviewed by the Department of Agriculture in the usual manner before the Congress took action on this bill. Time has not permitted such review to be made within the period allowed for Presidential action on enrolled bills. Therefore, I am unable to report to the Congress whether the conclusions reached by the Bureau of Reclamation with regard to the agricultural and economic feasibility of the proposed plan are concurred in by the Department of Agriculture.

While I consider this to be a serious deficiency, I am more concerned about the fact that there are included in the $1,170,920, proposed to be charged off against nonreimbursable benefits, classes of such benefits not now permitted under federally constructed irrigation projects. Neither sediment control nor recreation is currently authorized as a benefit against which nonreimbursable allocations of costs may be made. It seems to me highly questionable to approve the inclusion of such benefits with respect to this one project before the Congress has reviewed the desirability of making charges to such benefits generally possible under basic reclamation law.

Furthermore, it is proposed to allocate $718,590 for fish and wildlife. While such nonreimbursable allocations are permitted in water resources development projects, they are usually restricted in scope to the prevention of loss of and damage to wildlife. In this project, about one-half of the allocation is proposed as a benefit from the creation of a wildlife management and development area of 5,200 acres not required for operation of the irrigation project or for protection of existing wildlife resources of this specific area. There are instances where waterfowl eventually discover and use some of the backwater areas of federally owned reservoirs where no allocation of cost is assigned for wildlife benefits. If such use develops into substantial proportions, an appropriate area may later be established as a refuge for such waterfowl without in any manner affecting cost allocations. Such areas are then operated and maintained by the Fish and Wildlife Service. The creation of new wildlife areas is normally a part of the regular program of the Fish and Wildlife Service. In this instance because the area is made up of low-lying land in the district and since it is located along an important fly-way, the establishment of resting and nesting areas for waterfowl has been included in the project. It seems to me this establishes a dangerous precedent for charging off an appreciable amount of the actual project costs.

The costs allocated to flood control are relatively small and permitted under reclamation law. However, they have been differently computed by the Secretary of the Army. His letter of May 19, 1949, to the Secretary of the Interior points out that assuming a 50-year useful project life and a 3 percent interest rate, the annual flood-control benefits are considered to justify flood-control costs of only $72,800 as compared with the $95,450 figure computed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The relationship between this allocation and that for sediment control, which was inserted by the Congress, is not apparent.

I wish also to point out to the Congress that H. R. 3788 deals with another issue which I believe should be first considered in basic law. I refer to the authorized period of repayment. There has been a tendency during our some 45 years of experience under the reclamation laws to increase the period of repayment of construction costs. Despite this trend I believe the matter of further extensions to periods greatly in excess of the 40 years (plus, in some cases, a 10-year development period) now generally authorized, is a matter of such vital concern to the Nation as a whole that it should be carefully reviewed as a principle of general application. It is not a matter to be treated in piecemeal and isolated consideration on the basis of apparent needs of one or another small project to which no need for urgent action is attached.

The policy with respect to the repayment period for rehabilitation and betterment of federally constructed reclamation projects has not yet been established although two measures dealing with this problem are now pending (H. R. 1694 and S. 1239). There seems to be no reason why rehabilitation and betterment of a single nonfederally constructed reclamation project should receive treatment which may be different from that finally authorized for Federal projects.

On July 29, 1949, when I approved the bill authorizing the Federal Government to take over the Fort Sumner irrigation project, I indicated that my action was in recognition of an emergency created by the unsafe condition of the dam, which is threatened with destruction if a flood should occur. I further pointed out that approval of that bill did not constitute a precedent for the approval in the future of other bills authorizing Federal assistance for individual projects where no emergency exists. None of the facts before me supports the conclusion of emergency in connection with the Vermejo project.

The Vermejo project can no longer be self-sustaining because the financial resources of the landowners are insufficient to accomplish the needed rehabilitation. Similar conditions undoubtedly prevail in other irrigation districts. I believe that an equitable and just basis for granting Federal aid to any irrigation district which is in financial distress should be established by enactment of legislation similar to that under which the Federal Government formerly carried on a program for extending assistance to non-Federal irrigation districts.

The records indicate that there are 86 landowners and 45 farm operators within the Vermejo district. I sympathize fully with the situation in which they find themselves, and I recognize that in disapproving H. R. 3788 I am taking an action which they may at first find it difficult to understand. Nevertheless, I believe that they will accept my action as an indication of the need for basic legislation under which all projects requiring Federal assistance will be treated alike. Recommendations for such legislation are being developed for presentation to the next session of the Congress. If the Congress acts upon them promptly, little time will have been lost and there will be established principles for Federal aid which can be equitably administered over the years as needs arise.

HARRY S TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 23, 1949.*

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed the statement by the President of August 30, 1949, relative to the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah.

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

AUGUST 30, 1949.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have approved S. 2391, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah.

This bill will authorize the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to construct, operate, and maintain the Weber Basin project for the purpose of supplying irrigation water to 70,000 acres of new lands and supplemental water to 30,000 acres of land now inadequately irrigated; supplying municipal, industrial, and domestic water; controlling floods; generating and selling electricity; and for other beneficial purposes.

I have signed this bill with reluctance because it was enacted without following the normal procedures for obtaining full information and adequate review concerning irrigation projects before authorization. The bill appears to have been enacted on the basis of the information contained in a preliminary

report of the Regional Director of the Bureau of Reclamation. This report had not been reviewed by other interested agencies or by the Executive Office. So far as I know, there has been no final report on the project by the Secretary of the Interior or the Commissioner of Reclamation.

The enactment of this bill under these circumstances raises a number of serious questions. These questions are raised because there has not been sufficient opportunity to review the adequacy of the data contained in the report of the regional director, and because the bill represents in some respects basic departures from the established reclamation law.

I have given my approval to the bill only because I am convinced, after careful study and after discussions with several Members of Congress from Utah that the project is basically sound and that it will be possible to overcome the most serious difficulties arising from the lack of adequate consideration before the project was authorized.

The provisions of the bill which appear to be most questionable are as follows:

1. It authorizes the repayment of irrigation water supply costs over a period of 60 years instead of the period of 40 years which has prevailed heretofore under the reclamation law.

2 The project report of the Regional Director contemplates a nonreimbursable allocation of cost in the amount of $4,656,000 for recreation The allocation of cost to recreational facilities is not now authorized under reclamation law. If the allocation authorized in connection with the project were uniformly applied as a precedent, it would ultimately involve the Government in the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars.

3. Under the proposed repayment plan for the project, the amounts repaid by municipal and industrial users would be applied first to the repayment of the cost allocated to municipal and industrial purposes, and then to the repayment of part of the cost allocated to irrigation—all of this on a basis which would provide total revenues over a period of 60 years sufficient only to cover the total reimbursable cost without interest. Thus, in addition to receiving no interest on the reimbursable irrigation cost, the Government would also receive no interest on the reimbursable cost for municipal and industrial uses.

4 The report on the project was not referred to the Department of the Army for review and comment by the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. Consequently, the Corps of Engineers has had no adequate opportunity to consider the phases of the project in which it is interested. On the basis of such study as he has had time to make, however, the Chief of Engineers raises serious questions as to the amount allocated for flood control.

5 The report on the project was not made available to the Department of Agriculture. Consequently, it has not been possible for that Department to express its views with regard to the agricultural and economic feasibility of the proposed plan.

There is no urgency for immediate construction of the Weber Basin project. In fact, the plans of the Bureau of Reclamation call for construction to be spread over a period of 12 years. I believe, therefore, that the objections to the present authorization can, for the most part, be eliminated—some of them by future action of the Congress, and some by the exercise of the discretion which the bill fortunately permits.

The bill does not commit the Secretary of the Interior to the cost allocations made in the report of the regional director. It is flexible enough to permit an apportionment of the cost on an equitable and sound basis consistent with the facilities and system of operation finally adopted for the project. The construction of the proposed recreational facilities can be postponed until such time as the Congress has enacted basic standards for the allocation of costs to recreational purposes in connection with reclamation projects. The questions of proper allocation of flood-control benefits and construction costs can be resolved between the Secretaries of the Interior and the Army. Additional information concerning the ability of water users to repay the costs of irrigation features of the project can be developed in consultation with the Department of Agriculture The questions of a 60-year repayment period and interest on the reimbursable costs for municipal and industrial water users will be reconsidered when a complete study of this project is available.

For the foregoing reasons, I am directing the Secretary of the Interior to take the following steps: To complete his study of this project and submit a final report; to defer initiation of construction of any of the recreational facilities pending determination of a national policy on recreation at water resources development projects; to work out with the Department of the Army a sound flood-control plan and cost allocations; to consult with the Department of Agriculture on the ability of the water users to repay the costs of the irrigation features; to make such other adjustments in the plans, estimates, cost allocations, and repayment obligations as may be required on the basis of the above and the data which will become available when detailed surveys, engineering designs, and refined estimates are completed; and to defer final negotiations on any repayment contracts with the water users until definite repayment amounts and conditions are settled.

I do not intend to submit any requests for construction appropriations until the above preparation has been accomplished and it is known as surely as possible what is going to be done, how much it will cost, how much is going to be repaid and when. It would seem that this plan for proceeding with the Weber Basin project is only fair to the water users who will eventually have to return to the United States the investment allocated to irrigation and municipal water supplies.

I have always favored a sound water-resources development program and the authorization of additional projects as needs arise and as they are found to be justified. I consider it essential that the program be not jeopardized by premature authorization of projects in advance of resolution of questionable features. To do so may lead to unsound action which will endanger the success of our whole reclamation program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask that the message of the President dated October 14, 1949, on the Colorado-Big Thompson Federal reclamation project, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning without my approval H. R. 5134, to promote development in cooperation with the State of Colorado of the fish, wildlife, and recreational aspects of the Colorado Big Thompson Federal reclamation project.

This bill is intended to provide for the planning, construction, and operation of fish, wildlife, game, and recreational facilities in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson project. To this end, it includes several major provisions. It would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan joint programs under cooperative agreements with State, Federal, municipal, or local agencies, and to advance funds to such agencies in connection with the planning or execution of these programs. It would also authorize the Secretary to construct, operate, and maintain fish, wildlife, game, public park, and recreational facilities, including the purchase of land or other rights or property where necessary. The bill would direct the Secretary to make nonreimbursable allocations of such portion of the construction costs of the Colorado-Big Thompson project, heretofore or hereafter incurred, as in his judgment represents the cost of fish, wildlife, game, and recreational development. The bill provides that in the event the Secretary, the interested State agencies, and the local interests were unable to agree on any of the major features of any plan or program proposed by the Secretary under this bill, the matter would have to be referred to the Congress and the proposed work could not proceed, except on approval by an act of Congress. Finally, the bill would authorize the appropriation of not to exceed $100,000 to carry out its provisions.

I am unable to approve this bill because of two major objections. First, this bill would establish, for this one project only, certain policies which represent an important departure from present national law, but which have not been studied sufficiently to know whether or not they form a desirable basis for a new national policy.

I am particularly concerned about the recreation features of this bill. Almost all multiple-purpose projects for developing our water resources present opportunities to realize valuable recreational benefits, especially where large reservoir-lakes are created. Those recreational benefits should clearly be realized, for the benefit of the people who live nearby and those who may visit. But there are serious questions of national policy which must be answered before such recreational development can proceed on a sound basis.

For example, are the benefits of such recreational development, in connection with reclamation projects or flood-control projects, of sufficient national importance to justify the investment of Federal funds, or should some or all of the costs be borne by State and local interests? This bill contains no policy guidance on these questions. They are, however, clearly matters of national policy which should be considered with respect to water-resources projects generally, before embarking on large-scale individual projects.

Another example of a major policy question raised by this bill which needs further study is what part, if any, of the construction cost of multiple-purpose water-control projects should be allocated to recreation. Until now, the basic laws have authorized the allocation of the costs of multiple-purpose projects to flood-control, navigation, irrigation, power, and municipal water supply, as appropriate in particular cases In certain cases, where the development of facilities to protect fish and wildlife has been incidental to other work on a project or necessary to prevent damage to those resources, the law also authorizes the allocation of part of the cost of multiple-purpose projects to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife. The basic laws do not authorize the allocation of any part of joint project costs to recreation; in the few cases where recreation facilities have been built so far, they have been separately justified and financed. This bill, however, would require nonreimbursable allocations to recreation of part of the cost of joint features of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. It would clearly be unwise to adopt such a policy in connection with this one project, before it has been decided whether adoption of such a general policy is in the national interest. Furthermore, if such a general policy is to be adopted, there should certainly be provision for careful

standards to guide its application to particular cases—standards which are not provided for in this bill.

My second major objection to this bill is that it contains certain specific features which, it is clear without further study, are unwise. One of these is the provision that State agencies and local interests could prevent the Secretary of the Interior from proceeding with any major action under the bill if they disagreed with him in any respect. It seems to me that this carries to an illogical extreme the desirable principle that State and local interests should participate in Federal programs for developing water resources. Surely it is possible to provide for adequate cooperation among Federal, State, and local agencies without giving State and local agencies a complete veto over the administration of a Federal law by a Federal administrative officer.

Another specific provision of this bill which is objectionable is that it authorizes only $100,000 to be appropriated to carry out its provisions. The legislative history of the bill contains no explanation of this figure. It is such a small part of the probable total cost of the bill that it is relatively meaningless and certainly misleading. The Secretary of the Interior has estimated that the ultimate development costs for the purposes stated in the bill would be in the neighborhood of $2,000,000—and this figure does not appear to include any allocation of construction costs heretofore incurred in connection with irrigation and power features which, under this bill, would be reallocated and written off as nonreimbursable. It does not seem to me to be appropriate, particularly in connection with a Federal public works project, to authorize extensive work to be done by the Government unless the full cost of that work is simultaneously understood and approved.

For these reasons, I believe that further study is required in both the executive and legislative branches before we shall be in a position to establish sound, long-range policies for recreational development in connection with water-resources projects generally, and for the Colorado-Big Thompson project in particular. Consequently, I feel impelled to withhold my approval from this bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 14, 1949.*

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the roll call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL GOMPERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my intention to say a few words on Friday, January 27, 1950, the anniversary of the date of the birth of Samuel Gompers, founder of the American Federation of Labor. I had planned to pay tribute to this great American on that day. However, the Senate was not in session, and therefore I take this occasion to pay my respects to Mr. Gompers.

I ask that the remarks which I had intended to deliver from the floor of the Senate be incorporated as a statement, and that following that there be printed an article entitled "What Gompers Bequeathed," published in the Reporter, written by one of the outstanding scholars of the labor movement in America, Prof. Selig Perlman, of the University of Wisconsin.

There being no objection, Mr. HUMPHREY's statement and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAMUEL GOMPERS

The American success story is usually a story of accumulation of wealth. On this day I want to memorialize a success story of a different sort.

The hero of my success story was born a poor man. And died a poor man—that is, poor in worldly goods.

My man specialized in accumulating ideas and ideals. His all-consuming ideal was the vision of a great American labor movement. And, he lived long enough to see the fruition of that ideal.

I am talking about Samuel Gompers, of course, and January 27, 1950, is the one hundredth anniversary of his birth.

Not that Samuel Gompers invented unionism. In a very real sense the striving of men and women to improve their conditions of living through self-organization is as old as history itself. Nor was Samuel Gompers even the first to preach the cause of unionism in the United States. The union as a permanent organization of working people dates with the founding of our Republic. Even before the Constitution of the United States was adopted groups of craftsmen—shoemakers, carpenters, printers—banded together in societies to improve their conditions of work. And as a byproduct they organized mutual-aid burial societies to give the artisan a decent burial. Unionism is rooted deeply in our American tradition.

History reveals that in no democratic country has unionism had a harder row to hoe. When the forces of law and order, through the injunction and other devices, were not adequate to beat back the efforts of workers to form organizations of their own choosing, some employers resorted to an arsenal of savage tactics—strikebreakers recruited from the boweries and flophouses of the Nation, spies hired through industrial espionage agencies, the militia, the National Guard, the tear-gas bombs—all were used in a primitive and savage attempt to keep men and women from organizing into unions.

In spite of this hostile environment, unions grew—slowly, it is true—but they grew with a kind of inexorable recognition of the rightness of their cause.

And if any man has the right to be called the chief architect of a movement as great and as strong as the American labor movement, it is that immigrant lad born in 1850, Samuel Gompers.

For almost 75 years before Gompers came upon the American labor scene national federations had come and gone. The hostility of the environment and, in part, the bewildered idealism of some of the early labor leaders prevented their organizations from persevering. It was Samuel Gompers who, by studying history and also what was happening around him, developed pragmatically the ingredients of effective labor organization.

Gompers' contributions can be put under three headings: "Free unionism," "Democratic unionism," and "Permanent unionism."

Gompers had studied hard the experience of early American unionism and of unionism in Europe. He saw very soon that if unions were to persevere in the United States and weather the storms of conflicting political philosophies that unions would have to divorce themselves from exclusive reliance on Government or on particular political parties.

In short, Gompers saw the basic responsibility of unions as collective bargaining on their own strength. To build a hard core of union membership which would persist in good times as well as bad times, Gompers insisted that wages, hours, and working conditions were the central concern of the American labor movement, and that no lasting movement could be built on slogans alone.

Gompers' critics called this "pure and simple unionism" and "business unionism." Despite the good intentions of most of Gompers' critics, Gompers had read labor history more effectively than his critics. He knew that the manifestos, the banners, the slogans, the catch words were no substitute for the stock and trade of unionism—organizing workers into unions that would last; and that the first (not necessarily the only) concern was improving the conditions of work. And so while the dual unionisms of Gompers' days with their more ambitious programs dropped from sight, victims of the hard facts of life, Gompers' unionism "muddled through" and gradually caught hold.

To this day the United States is one of the few countries in the world with a labor movement whose fate is not inextricably intertwined with the fate of a government.

Democratic unionism owes much to Samuel Gompers. Gompers' experience in the Knights of Labor had taught him that no over-all labor organization was wise enough and strong enough to deal with the infinite variety of problems that confronted unions in our complex industrial civilization.

It was Gompers who developed the idea of what he called trade-union autonomy—an idea which owes much to our theory of the separation of powers between the States and the Federal Government. As Gompers saw the structure of the American labor movement, an over-all labor organization like the A. F. of L. was comparable to the Federal Government; the international unions were comparable to the States. (Glib commentators who talk about the A. F. of L. or the CIO standing for this or standing for that have not mastered the most important fact about the American labor movement—that authority resides in the international unions, not in the federations.)

In a very real sense then neither the A. F. of L. nor the CIO are unions at all, with the minor exceptions of the Federal labor unions in the case of the A. F. of L., and local industrial unions in the case of the CIO. Neither the A. F. of L. nor the CIO call strikes, negotiate agreements, or do any of the day to day work, which are the bench marks of unionism in the United States. The center of the American labor movement is the 100 or so international unions in the A. F. of L. and the forty-odd international unions in the CIO, the great railroad brotherhoods, and international machinists. With respect to the A. F. of L. or CIO the international unions are free agents in the fullest sense of the term.

The fact that this is so, is directly traceable to Gompers' concern over the excessive concentration of authority and power in a federation of unions. The American labor movement is, therefore, a decentralized movement.

Gompers had a keen insight in what it takes to keep an organization going in an antagonistic environment. He had seen too many organizations rise with prosperity and disappear with the first signs of depression. From the very beginning Gompers felt that dues ought to be adequate enough to permit the union to hold its head above water in slack periods.

Gompers' conception of the union went beyond that of the union as a dues-collection society. He saw it also as an expression of the desire for mutual aid and assistance among workers. Here again Gompers read his labor history soundly. One of the first things that the early unions did was to try to protect themselves from the indignity of a burial in a potters' field. From provision

for death benefits, Gompers envisioned the union as providing other kinds of insurance. In addition to providing a useful service to union members, Gompers shrewdly saw that the insurance benefits would also serve as a tie between the member and his union which he would not easily relinquish when the going got tough.

What was Gompers' essential genius? I think it was his penetrating understanding of the American culture and what a union had to have to survive and grow in that culture.

As an American, I take an enormous satisfaction in the Gompers' story because it serves to give additional strength to the American heritage of equal opportunity irrespective of national origin, creed, and color.

Sam Gompers had many strains in him. His family origins include German, Dutch influences. Rabbis and merchants are found in the Gompers' lineage. Samuel Gompers himself was born in England and received his first training in a Jewish free school where he learned to read the Talmud. Upon his arrival in New York he was thrown in with a circle of German socialists and unionists.

Yet these diverse strains produced through Gompers a form and shape of unionism peculiarly American and integrated in American life as nothing in the past history of labor had been.

The career of Samuel Gompers illuminates the way in which our cultural diversity has been a source of strength in building an effective democracy.

If the labor movement is one of the great pillars of our democracy, and I believe it is, Gompers, as the man who has given it shape, substance, and meaning, deserves to be ranked as one of the social architects of our times.

[From the Reporter of January 31, 1950]

WHAT GOMPERS BEQUEATHED

When the immigrant Samuel Gompers appeared on the American labor scene, the native union movement, almost 50 years old, had been periodically yielding to urges that were most creditable to its idealism, but disruptive of its organizational stability. Although in his youth Gompers took part in these searches for panaceas, he was capable, under instruction, of discovering underlying realities, and he finally distilled, from his own and others' experience, some historic rules of conduct for American labor:

First, labor must organize separately from the other producing classes.

Second, the capitalist system had come to stay, and there was no desirable escape from it, by way of either producers' cooperatives or state socialism.

Third, labor parties merely expose labor's weakness as a vote-getter and cause internal dissension. It is, however, important for labor to have a collective-bargaining arrangement with one of the existing parties during any particular election.

Fourth, it is safest to build unions around the job-interest common to all wage earners, whatever their politics, religion, or ethnic origin, since the American working class is notably divided into such vertical groups.

Fifth, the strongest unity comes when those whose jobs come out of the same job reservoir, due to a common trade skill, are joined in one organization.

Finally, labor must strive, by all means of economic coercion or persuasion, to bring employers around to recognizing unions as coadministrators with themselves of the available jobs. But Gompers insisted that labor should never run the risk of being called subversive by advocating any sort of workers' control, socialism, or nationalization of industry.

Gompers had no millennium to offer—only a process and a structure that were termed, although not by Gompers himself, "industrial government." It was an intergroup government by the employer and the recognized "legitimate" union (not a company union). The employer was guaranteed uninterrupted production; the employee a safeguarded wage and freedom from abuses of power by the foreman or shop boss; and the union was given security through the closed shop or union shop. It was recognized that, for the system to function effectively, management must go on receiving its mandates from ownership, individual or corporate, and not from either government or labor.

Management's profit-spurred drive for changes in technology and wage remuneration had, Gompers maintained, to be watched with a sentinel's alertness. This meant that the union had to exact guaranties for consenting to such changes. Finally, Gompers believed that, with the necessary safeguards studding this "government of the job," the fears voiced by the Socialists that capitalism was, by its very nature, identical with labor exploitation, and a menace to democracy and peace, were the fears of immature minds.

Gompers' dicta prevailed during his 37 years as president of the American Federation of Labor, and beyond. Only in 1931 did the A. F. of L. convention reverse the master's stand against compulsory unemployment insurance. "Voluntarism" seemed to have lost its appeal in the depressed economic state of the country.

The New Deal supplied the federation with much-needed external impulses, and thus opened the doors to the heretofore inaccessible mass-production industries. Unfortunately, the leaders of the A. F. of L. managed to offset these blessings with the curse of a labor civil war on the issue of industrial versus craft unionism. Gompers, who had stretched his principal of nonpartisan political action by getting his executive council to endorse La Follette for President in 1924, would surely have found a way to bring together craft unionists and progressives in a joint expansion campaign. For Gompers, who had supported the organizing campaigns in meat packing and steel in the war period—William Z Foster was his appointee as manager of this drive—was never a dogmatic craft unionist if he knew that he was not endangering the stability of the federation.

In 1934–35 the progressives, who later led the CIO, might easily have been satisfied within the framework of the A F. of L., even though Gompers had passionately denounced their predecessors, the Socialist industrialists, as people of the radical blueprint.

The New Deal also effected a revolution in American Government which had an enormous bearing on labor's strategy. Roosevelt's attack on the United States Supreme Court, followed as it was by the Court's counter-reformation, changed the Government into a much more integrated law-making instrument For the first time the low-wage standards in the South could be effectively changed by congressional action. Gompers' "pure and simple" unionism now truly looked like a museum piece in the face of the many prolabor laws that the Court validated. Gompers' objectives were now being pursued with the aid of a legislative instrument which had suddenly acquired a cutting edge. Nor was this such a startling innovation for American labor. The railway unions, of which Gompers highly approved (the strongest ones, the Brotherhoods, were outside the federation, but the shop crafts were in it), and whose industry, being in interstate commerce, was, on most issues, subject to one Government instead of 49, had already built up one of the most effective lobbies, and had also shown their political awareness as La Follette's warmest supporters for President.

Gompers preferred economic action not because he had swallowed Herbert Spencer's anti-state philosophy whole, but because of his experience with hostile government, and because he feared that employers would use protective labor laws as grounds for denying union demands. ("The minimum will become the maximum.")

In the present campaign for pensions, even those union leaders brought up in the anti-Gompers wing of the labor movement are unexpectedly finding themselves traveling his road. How, then, does Gompers-ism as a whole look 25 years after its founder's death? The behavior of the CIO, born out of a struggle against those who officially wore Gompers' robes, should offer decisive evidence. Had the CIO emblazoned socialism on its standard, and had it sponsored an independent labor or farm-labor party, it would have spelled out its belief in the out-of-dateness of Gompers-ism. Instead, it treats the free-enterprise system as one that is not to be questioned, and is now summarily expelling Red-tinged unions.

In politics the CIO is making bargains with the Truman Democrats, and showing its complete confidence in professional old-party politicians by mobilizing its own political action committee in the service of this partnership. The stock argument of the old left-wingers that labor could only trust its own party, and never any old party, carries little weight when the latter must depend on labor for its election finances and for ringing doorbells in a campaign.

In no other respect is Gompers more entitled to contemporary recognition than in the field of international relations. Gompers, the immigrant from London, considered himself a living link with European labor, and he showed equal concern for workers in Latin America. He deplored European labor's devotion to socialism without realizing that in a caste society such a challenge to capitalism was labor's most telling way of convincing itself and the ruling class that the days of the workingman's social inferiority were over. For this reason, Gompers' contacts with Europe's labor leaders were not always happy ones. In their eyes, he was an anachronism; in his, they were utopians. Nevertheless, Gompers' educational work within the federation has kept the native-born elements in it from forming an isolationist wing. Even Gompers' detractors will not dispute his role at Versailles, where President Wilson's high regard for him was instrumental in the creation of the International Labor Office The spirit of internationalism that he implanted in the federation continues after his death.

That no voices of hate have ever been heard in American labor circles is doubtless Gompers' most valuable legacy. The highly constructive role recently played by the American labor leadership in strengthening the spirit of the unionists in western Europe, in their struggle to avoid being reduced to mere Soviet tools, would also have been impossible without the Gompers' tradition.

The recent success of the AFL and CIO in shaping the outlook of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has been interpreted by some Europeans as dictation by rich America to impoverished Britain. Yet who can be certain that after another quarter of a century this American dictation will not be seen as the beginning of the recognition of Gompers as the leading intellectual, not only of American labor, but of free labor throughout the world?

SELIG PERLMAN.

FOSTPONEMENT OF STRIKE OF TELEPHONE WORKERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement in reference to the negotiations which are now being conducted between the Communications Workers of America and the Bell Telephone system.

We were all pleased to learn that the Nation-wide strike in the telephone industry, scheduled to begin this morning,

has been postponed, at the request of the Federal Government until February 24. The leadership of the Communications Workers of America is to be congratulated on its sense of public responsibility in consenting to postpone action in the interest of arriving at an amicable settlement of the labor-management controversy.

I want to take this occasion, too, Mr. President, to congratulate Mr. Cyrus Ching, Director of the Conciliation and Mediation Service, and his staff, for their energy and steadfastness in the interest of preserving industrial harmony in the telephone industry.

I welcome this newest move for industrial peace because of my intense interest in the problems affecting the telephone industry, and because the convenience and welfare of all the American people hinges so directly upon developments in that industry. As a former mayor of the city of Minneapolis, I know from personal experience the problems of the telephone industry and inconveniences which can be caused the public as a result of the periodic disputes between labor and management which have characterized that industry for the past few years.

I recall specifically, Mr. President, a statement by the distinguished former Chairman of the National War Labor Board, Dr. George W. Taylor, on February 2, 1946, when, in referring to the 1944 National Telephone Panel of the National War Labor Board, he said:

> The telephone industry presented one of those instances where wages could not be stabilized by application of the general wage stabilization program by regional war labor boards. Because of the nature of the telephone industry, wage data for comparison with telephone wage rates within the regional areas were inadequate. Furthermore, varied application of the wage policy by the regional boards would have greatly distorted the wage pattern of the telephone industry. It was impossible, indeed, that for the industry as a whole, area handling of interplant inequality cases would create more inequalities than it would correct. The National War Labor Board became convinced of the necessity of stabilizing telephone wages on an industry basis rather than by strict adherence to area wage considerations.

It is my feeling that collective bargaining in the telephone industry is one of the most serious labor-management problems which we face. Much of this is due to the unusually complicated holding company corporate structure of the telephone industry and the Bell system.

A unanimous report of the National War Labor Board telephone panel concluded:

> The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. constitutes the coordinating and policy-making body for the Associated Bell Companies. * * * The over-all wage structure of the Bell system reflects the centralized management policy of the A. T. & T. Co. The unifying influence of the A. T. & T. Co. appears in the close similarity of most nonrate aspects of the wage structure of the various Associated Bell Companies.

Yet the telephone industry seems to resist all attempts at Nation-wide bargaining. It is certainly not my intention at this time, nor do I have sufficient facts, to evaluate the merits of either the present dispute between labor and management, or previous disputes. Nor is it my intention to indicate the wisdom or lack of wisdom in the union's attempt to institute industry-wide collective bargaining. I do feel, however, that one of the functions of the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of our Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee should be to make an exhaustive study of industry-wide bargaining, particularly as it affects the telephone industry. I make this statement now, Mr. President, because it is my intention, as a member of that subcommittee, to urge such consideration and such study.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I was wondering when the junior Senator from California and his colleague might present their amendments for the consideration of the Senate. It has been indicated that several would be submitted, and I am sure that all Senators would like to see them in advance, and have an opportunity to study them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the request of the Senator is a reasonable one. I have been working with my colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and I was hopeful we could get some of the amendments in today. I believe we will have practically all of them in during the coming week. We have assured the senior Senator from Arizona that in no event will any of them come in after the 20th, so that they can be printed and lie upon the table. I think the request of the Senator is a reasonable one, and I shall do everything I can to expedite the printing of the amendments. There is no desire on our part to delay.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is very important that amendments which may be submitted be presented at an early date, so that we may have an opportunity to study them, and so that the Senate may have an opportunity to consider them. I think they should be printed and lie on the table several days in advance, because it has been indicated that they will be offered, and it has also been indicated that some of them are very important, so far as Arizona is concerned.

I believe the senior Senator from California said that if some amendments were agreed to the bill might not be objected to. I think it highly desirable that the amendments be offered and printed as quickly as possible, so they may be available to Senators. I should certainly appreciate the opportunity of studying them.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the majority leader desires to have the Executive Calendar considered very shortly. Therefore, I shall not take much of the time of the Senate. I merely wish to say that from the tenor of the remarks made by the senior and junior Senators from California and the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] I am afraid the impression has been created that what is now involved before the Senate is a controversy merely between the States of California, Nevada, and Arizona. For that reason, I wish to read to the Senate a resolution adopted on September 20, 1949, by the States of the upper basin. In other words, of the seven States in the upper and lower basins, there are four which join with Arizona in urging the passage of S. 75, the pending measure, whereas there are two which do not agree with us. The resolution is as follows:

Be it resolved by the Colorado River Basin States Committee, an organization composed of official representatives of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and open to the States of California and Nevada, in meeting assembled at Grand Junction, Colo., this 20th day of September 1949, That—

Whereas this committee approves the provisions of S. 75 as amended and reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the Senate of the United States on August 3, 1949, a bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; and

Whereas this committee is in full accord with the majority report of said Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on said S. 75, as amended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee commends the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate upon its thorough and careful consideration and report on S. 75, as amended; and be it further

Resolved, That this committee urges the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives to give favorable consideration to the provisions of said S. 75 as amended by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in its consideration of H. R. 934 and 935; and be it further

Resolved, That this committee respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take favorable action upon said S. 75 as amended by the said Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and reported to the Senate of the United States on August 3, 1949; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman of this committee is requested to send copies of this resolution to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate, to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the said Public Lands Committee, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and to each Member of the congressional delegations of the participating States.

Adopted unanimously, September 20, 1949.

CLIFFORD H. STONE,
Chairman.

The representatives of the five States present when the resolution was adopted were the regularly constituted and official interstate water commissioners appointed under authority of the laws of each State.

For the State of Colorado: Clifford H. Stone, Frank Delaney.

For the State of Wyoming: Joe Budd, H. Melvin Rollins.

For the State of Utah: Harold A. Linke, William R. Wallace.

For the State of New Mexico: Fred E. Wilson, John H. Bliss.

For the State of Arizona: Wayne Akin, Charles A. Carson.

There has come to my attention a resolution adopted by the Phoenix Central Labor Council endorsing the passage of Senate bill 75. It is a very clear-cut delineation of the Arizona position with respect to the pending legislation, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

Whereas the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation have reported to the Congress of the United States that the central Arizona project is in all respects feasible, and that the early completion of the works proposed is essential to maintain the economy of the State of Arizona, and the national welfare; and

Whereas the quantity of water of the Colorado River that is proposed to be diverted to the State of Arizona for the central Arizona project is well within the settled rights of the State of Arizona as established by the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the California Self Limitation act, and the Arizona water delivery contract; and

Whereas the State of Arizona will not use or attempt to use, or interfere with the use of, any waters from the Colorado River within the State of California which the State of California can legally use under its self-limitation statute; and

Whereas the State of Arizona will not attempt to utilize any waters from the Colorado River for the central Arizona project, which can be lawfully used anywhere else; and

Whereas certain powerful interests in southern California are opposing the State of Arizona and the central Arizona project on false and unjustifiable grounds; and

Whereas the State of Arizona, in waging this fight for her rights in the Colorado River system, finds herself pitted against tremendous odds in the same manner as labor has had to fight against tremendous odds in her struggle for the rights of the common man; and

Whereas the authorization and the construction of the storage dams, canals, transmission lines, and works necessary for the central Arizona project will provide members of organized labor with widespread employment in all phases of construction work, and in the building trades, transportation, and factories in many points of the United States; and

Whereas the opponents of the central Arizona project have been opposing Arizona by contending that it was a matter for the United States Supreme Court to decide; and

Whereas the State of Arizona has accepted amendments to S. 75 which were proposed to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Senate by the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of the State of Wyoming, chairman of the above-named committee, and the Honorable EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, the able Senator from the State of Colorado, who is the ranking Republican member of the same committee; and

Whereas the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment to S. 75 clears the way for the legal adjudication of California's claim and provides that no moneys can be appropriated for the construction of any works of the central Arizona project to be used solely for the delivery of water from the main stream of the Colorado River to central Arizona until the conclusion of any suit which California or any other State of the Colorado River Basin is authorized to file within 6 months after the authorization of the central Arizona project by the Congress; and

Whereas the construction of other works authorized by the central Arizona project authorization bill, such as the Bridge Canyon Dam, power plant and transmission lines to supply badly needed hydroelectric energy for use in Arizona, can proceed while such a suit is pending without jeopardizing any possible claim of California to the use of water of the river: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Phoenix Central Labor Council, That this organization and its officers and agents do everything within their power to support the said central Arizona project authorization bill, and do request the Congress of the United States to speedily pass S. 75 and its companion measure, H. R. 934; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be recorded in the minutes of this body and the secretary be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the members of the congressional delegation from Arizona in the Congress of the United States, and to the secretaries of the various central labor councils throughout the United States.

GEORGE S. SEBESTYEN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Phoenix Central Labor Council, A. F. of L.
PHOENIX, ARIZ., *November 22, 1949.*

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of executive business, I should like to ask the Senators who are most interested in the pending bill whether speeches will be made tomorrow by any Senators who may be interested on one side of the question or the other?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, speaking for the side of the State of Arizona, I doubt seriously that there will be any addresses made tomorrow on our part.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] advise me whether any speeches will be made tomorrow by Senators on his side of the question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as I know, there are no speeches contemplated for tomorrow on the project.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. With that understanding, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate resume consideration of Senate bill 2440, a bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, Calendar No. 926.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2440) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

SPONSORSHIP OF DISPLACED PERSONS SEEKING ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, an article entitled "DP's Sponsor Other DP's for Entry to United States," was published in a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune. I have no knowledge respecting the source of information on which the article is based, but I wish to say that the article must certainly be based on information similar to that obtained by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of the United States, from the record made in Europe by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and by the Committee on the Judiciary itself in hearings held here in Washington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

DP'S SPONSOR OTHER DP'S FOR ENTRY TO UNITED STATES

Displaced persons who have streamed into the United States from Europe during the last 16 months under the 1948 DP Act are being allowed by Federal authorities to act as sponsors for other refugees seeking admittance to this country, an official of the Illinois Displaced-Persons Commission disclosed yesterday.

Such sponsors—homeless and largely destitute themselves until they arrived from Europe—are finding it possible to sign vouchers for new refugees before the sponsors themselves even have applied for first citizenship papers, it was explained.

CITIZENSHIP NOT REQUIRED

"There is nothing in the DP Act which specifies that the sponsor of a displaced person in Europe must be either an American citizen or the holder of first citizenship papers," the Illinois commission official said.

"A resident displaced person can sponsor another refugee if he can guarantee the new refugee will be provided with a job and housing without displacing an American citizen and can also guarantee that the new refugee will not become a public charge," the official explained.

Eight or 10 cases, in which displaced persons settled in Illinois have filed sponsorship papers for refugees still in Europe, are pending before the Illinois commission, it was said. More are expected in the future.

ONLY TWO ON COUNTY STAFF

It is the commission's duty, in such cases of individual sponsorship of refugees, to determine whether the sponsor is financially able to stand back of the guaranties he gives for the new refugee. Apparently, however, the commission makes no attempt to investigate such sponsors thoroughly.

"We have a staff of only two persons in Cook County," it was explained. "Therefore we generally have to take the word of the sponsor that he is financially able to sponsor a new displaced person."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 485. An act for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel; and

S. 1704. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of F. DuWayne Blankley.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills,

in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 597. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States;

H. R. 1026. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

H R 1275 An act for the relief of Anna Helman;

H R. 1293 An act for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co;

H R. 1479. An act for the relief of Michael A. Driscoll;

H R 1481. An act for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni,

H R 1487. An act for the relief of Lt. (sg) Giacomo Falco;

H R 1862 An act for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi);

H R 2230. An act to reimburse Arthur S. Horner, Leah B Horner, and Maude Brewer, partners composing a firm, doing business as A. S Horner Construction Co.;

H. R 2351. An act for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood;

H. R. 3306 An act for the relief of Antonio Rojas Velez,

H R 3309. An act for the relief of the estate of Ovidio Vazquez;

H. R 3315. An act for the relief of Alejo Padilla;

H. R. 3319. An act for the relief of Juana Pagan;

H. R. 3351. An act for the relief of John J. Franklin, James H. Bradford, William M. Orr Co., and Alex Maier;

H. R. 3462. An act for the relief of Walter J. O'Toole;

H. R 3924. An act for the relief of Dr. T. F. Harrison;

H R 4502 An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain easement near Fort Belvoir, Va., in exchange for another easement elsewhere in the same property;

H. R. 4100. An act for the relief of Calvin E. Cranford,

H. R 4747. An act for the relief of Louise Ahting,

H R 4857. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katsuko Nakahara Huntley;

H R 5580. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther,

H R 5609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps;

H. R. 5610 An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn;

H R 5611. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles M Phelps;

H R. 5682. An act for the relief of William T. Orton;

H. R. 5704. An act for the relief of Janis Shimada;

H. R. 5860 An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of Frank Phelps under existing regulations;

H. R. 6003. An act for the relief of Beulah L. White, widow of John E. White;

H. R. 6093. An act for the relief of Masami Hiroya and Aiko Hiroya;

H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eivor Anne-Britt Jedlund;

H. R 6283. An act for the relief of Johny Nielsen;

H. R. 6323. An act for the relief of Raymond B. White; and

H. R. 6345. An act for the relief of Mrs. Raymond Schaffer, Jr.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R 597 An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States;

H. R. 1026. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

H. R. 1275. An act for the relief of Anna Helman;

H. R. 1293. An act for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.;

H. R. 1479. An act for the relief of Michael A. Driscoll;

H. R. 1481. An act for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni;

H. R. 1487. An act for the relief of Lieutenant (sg) Giacomo Falco;

H R. 1862. An act for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi);

H. R. 2230. An act to reimburse Arthur S. Horner, Leah B. Horner, and Maude Brewer, partners composing a firm, doing business as A. S. Horner Construction Co.;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood;

H R. 3306. An act for the relief of Antonio Rojas Velez;

H. R. 3309. An act for the relief of the estate of Ovidio Vazquez;

H. R. 3315. An act for the relief of Alejo Padilla;

H. R 3319. An act for the relief of Juana Pagan;

H. R. 3351. An act for the relief of John J. Franklin, James H. Bradford, William M. Orr Co., and Alex Maier;

H R. 3462. An act for the relief of Walter J. O'Toole;

H. R. 3924. An act for the relief of Dr. T. F. Harrison;

H. R 4100. An act for the relief of Calvin E. Cranford;

H R. 4747. An act for the relief of Louise Ahting;

H. R. 4857. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katsuko Nakahara Huntley;

H. R. 5580. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther;

H. R. 5682. An act for the relief of William T. Orton;

H. R. 5704. An act for the relief of Janis Shimada;

H R. 6003. An act for the relief of Beulah L. White, widow of John E. White;

H. R. 6093. An act for the relief of Masami Hiroya and Aiko Hiroya;

H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eivor Anne-Britt Jedlund;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Johny Nielsen;

H. R. 6323. An act for the relief of Raymond B. White; and

H. R. 6345. An act for the relief of Mrs. Raymond Schaffer, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4502. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain easement near Fort Belvoir, Va., in exchange for another easement elsewhere on the same property; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B M. (Bud) Phelps;

H. R. 5610. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn;

H R 5611. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles M. Phelps; and

H R. 5860. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of Frank Phelps under existing regulations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be stated.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David L. Bazelon, of Illinois, to be judge, District of Columbia circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of H. Nathan Swaim, of Indiana, to be judge, seventh circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John A. Carver, of Idaho, to be United States attorney for the district of Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence U. Landrum, of Minnesota, to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Vincent Keogh, of New York, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Everett M. Evans, of Idaho, to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward Lawrence Burke, of Vermont to be United States marshal for the district of Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of William Webster, of Massachusetts, to be Chairman of the Research and Development Board, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Hal P. Demuth and Merlyn E. Natto, to be ensigns in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 9, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 8 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

William Webster, of Massachusetts, to be Chairman of the Research and Development Board.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 8 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Hon. David L. Bazelon to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Hon. H. Nathan Swaim to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

John A. Carver to be United States attorney for the district of Idaho.

Matthew E. Welsh to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana.

Clarence U. Landrum to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota.

J. Vincent Keogh to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Everett M. Evans to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho.

Edward Lawrence Burke to be United States marshal for the district of Vermont.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Ralph E. Jasper, Winchester, Ill., offered the following prayer:

God of peace and glory, hear our prayer of thanksgiving, as we praise Thee for the richness and fullness of life. Bless us as we pray for ourselves, that we may live up to our responsibilities; bless us as we pray for our loved ones and our neighbors, both around the block and around the world. Bless that which is accomplished here this day, that meets with Thy approval, baptize it with Thy Spirit and cause it to prosper and bear fruit in peace and good living. Forgive us of all that displeases Thee, we ask in His name. Amen.

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

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

FEBRUARY 7, 1950.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I want to thank you for appointing me to the Board of Visitors of the Naval Academy. However, I do not believe that I can serve and will appreciate your acceptance of my resignation.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

J. GLENN BEALL.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 816, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER], to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Washington Post.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against all business being transacted except the call of the committees. This is Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman intend to object to all extensions of remarks?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will have to, Mr. Speaker, because this is Calendar Wednesday.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I propound a unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may do so.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an indefinite leave of absence be granted to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], on account of illness in his family.

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

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I object to a unanimous-consent request that a Member be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD, is it proper to move that he be permitted to extend his remarks?

The SPEAKER. That is not a privileged motion.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 89]

Allen, Calif.	Hall, Leonard W.	Pfeiffer, William L.
Baring	Halleck	Philbin
Barrett, Wyo.	Jackson, Calif.	Potter
Bland	Kee	Powell
Blatnik	Kirwan	Regan
Bolling	Lichtenwalter	Sabath
Bolton, Md.	McDonough	Sadowski
Bolton, Ohio	Marshall	St George
Brown, Ga.	Miles	Sanborn
Bulwinkle	Monroney	Shafer
Camp	Morrison	Shelley
Chelf	Morton	Short
Christopher	Nixon	Smathers
Cole, N. Y.	O'Hara, Minn.	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Pace	Smith, Va.
Dawson	Patman	Vursell
Dingell	Patterson	Wadsworth
Dolliver	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	White, Idaho
Gilmer		Williams
Gwinn		Wilson, Ind.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7207) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1614) which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

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

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

POSTAL RATE INCREASES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (when the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2945) to adjust postal rates.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2945, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennesee. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Members will stay on the floor during the debate on this bill, as it is a very important measure. Your committee has spent more

time on this bill than all other bills combined during the first session of this Congress.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I understand from the statement of the distinguished chairman that he has a very important bill here, one that will take up considerable time in discussion. I also understand the gentleman has other bills that he will take up, if time permits, that would run well into consuming the day. That is a correct statement, is it not?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. I understand the gentleman would like to go ahead with the orderly consideration of his bill without unnecessary quorum calls.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi. I hope this important bill may be acted on by the committee this afternoon.

As I said in the beginning, your committee has given more time, more thought, more study, and more attention to this bill than to all other bills combined last year. Hearings were held in March, April, May, and June on this bill. It is a bill to readjust our postal rates.

May I say at this point that I trust that no Member will ask me to yield until I finish my statement, in order that I may explain the provisions of the bill.

At the present time the Post Office Department has a deficit of over $550,000,000. Last October Congress passed another postal pay bill for employees which cost $150,000,000. Since 1945 this Congress has increased the salaries of postal employees $740,000,000. The rates for the transportation of mail since 1945 have increased $165,000,000.

The last fiscal year, 1949, the receipts of the Post Office Department were $1,571,851,202. The expenditures were $2,122,980,730. The total deficit for the fiscal year 1949, which closed last June 30, was $551,129,528. The deficit for this fiscal year, which closes next June 30, is estimated at more than $550,000,000 also.

You know it is very easy to increase the salaries of postal employees, but it is extremely difficult to ever pass any kind of bill readjusting the postal rates. I know that Members have received a torrential flood of propaganda mail against this bill. I doubt if you have received mail from the general public asking you to support this bill. I know that users of second and third class mail have been unusually diligent in propagandizing the Members of Congress. It has now come to this question: Are the Members going to help remedy the situation and help the Post Office Department in their financial distress by the passage of this bill, or are they not? What will this bill do? This bill will increase the postal rates by $131,000,000. That will leave a deficit of over $400,000,000.

The Postmaster General sent us a bill last year which called for an increase in rates of $253,000,000. Your committee after long deliberation felt that it could not approve the entire request of the Postmaster General for $253,000,000 and brought in this compromise bill increasing the rates to $131,000,000.

What rates are increased? As the Members know there are four classes of mail. First-class mail includes letter mail and postal cards and air mail. Second-class mail includes all newspapers and magazines and other publications which have a bona fide subscription list. The third and fourth class embraces all mail not included in the first and second classes. Third-class mail includes all circular mail and all parcels weighing up to 8 ounces. Then there is fourth-class mail composed of all mail weighing 8 ounces or more and includes parcel post, books, and catalogs.

In addition we have the special services which include special delivery, collect on delivery, insured mail, money orders, and postal notes.

This bill increases only one class of first-class mail and that is the post and postal card. At the present time, as you know, the postage on the post and postal cards is 1 cent. The uncontroverted proof shows it costs the Post Office Department 2 cents 6 mills to carry every one-penny postcard. If we increase the postcard rate to 2 cents, there will still be a tremendous loss in the carriage of postcards and the post. At the present time there is a deficit of $65,000,000 in delivering the post and postal cards. This bill, by increasing the post and postal cards to 2 cents, would bring in $36,000,000, leaving a deficit still of $29,000,000 in that class of mail. But I have heard Members say, "Do not think about destroying the one-penny postcard. It is the poor-man's card."

Well, what are the facts about the postal card? There are 3,000,000,000 postal cards sent through the mails each year. Do you know that between 90 percent and 95 percent of them are sent by commercial concerns and by business houses for commercial purposes? Very few of these cards are sent by the individual for individual messages.

Are you going to continue subsidies to these large business houses that use the 1-cent postal card for advertising purposes? Is it fair to call upon the taxpayers to pay these subsidies to the large business concerns and still give them the benefit of the 1-cent postal rate?

That is the only class of first-class mail that is increased except the drop-letter mail. That is a letter deposited in the local post office, without the services of a city carrier or a rural carrier.

The next class is second class. At the present time there is a deficit in second-class mail of $174,000,000. The receipts from second-class mail are a little over $43,000,000. The expenditures for carrying second-class mail are $218,000,000. This bill only increases the second-class mail about 33⅓ percent. It only increases the total revenues about $15,000,000. If this bill, with the increase in second-class mail, is adopted, there will still be a deficit in second-class mail of $160,000,000. Yet some of these second-class publishers have been waging a terrific campaign against the increase in second-class rates. We have been generous with the second-class publishers and they certainly ought to be satisfied. The last postal increase rate approved by Congress was during the Eightieth Congress. At that time your committee reported out an increase for second-class mail. The leadership of that Congress, unfortunately, told our committee that we could not increase the rate on second-class mail; that we could increase it on all mail except second-class, and directed us to take out the increase for second-class mail. We increased other classes of mail; and, yet, by Public Law 900 passed by the Eightieth Congress we did not increase second-class mail one single, solitary penny.

Do you know that the rates for carrying second-class mail today are substantially the same as they were in 1879 when second-class mail was established? For over 70 years the newspaper and magazine publishers have enjoyed the small rate for mailing their publications. If there is any class of mail for which an increase is abundantly justified, it is second class.

I come now to third-class mail. The only increase in third-class mail is for circular mail sent in bulk, in mailings of 200 or more identical pieces. You Members know how your offices are flooded with this third-class propaganda mail from day to day. We have a tremendous deficit in third-class mail. The present deficit is $129,000,000. Last year there were over 9,500,000,000 pieces of third-class mail.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I cannot yield until I get through.

Let me say to you that as the Post Office Department is suffering from this tremendous deficit on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, the more business it does the greater the losses. This year we had the highest revenue in the history of the post office, over one and one-half billions of dollars, yet we also have the largest deficit in the history of the Department. So you can see that as the volume of this cheap mail increases the deficit grows larger and larger and larger.

We only increase the rate on this bulk third-class mail from 1 cent to 1½ cents. Is not that cheap and reasonable so as to be able to send a circular letter in bulk through the mails for 1½ cents?

Now I come to fourth-class mail, which includes parcel post, catalogs, and books. Your committee has recommended a very small increase in catalogs, only 1 cent on an average, which will reduce the deficit considerably but not wipe out the entire deficit. We have increased parcel post and also in the bill for parcel post there is the provision that parcel post shall be limited in the first and second zones to not more than 40 pounds in weight and to not more than 72 inches in length and girth combined for size; and that parcel post sent to zones beyond the second-class zones, from the third to the eighth, shall weigh not more than 20 pounds and shall be not greater than 72 inches in combined length and girth. There has been some dissatisfaction, and I concede that there is grounds

for it, from people on the rural routes who complain that they do not want their parcel-post packages reduced either in size or weight, since they do not receive express service. So, therefore, I am prepared to offer an amendment which will take care of the situation and which will give the full parcel-post service so far as weight of 70 pounds and limit of 100 inches are concerned to the people on rural routes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will permit the present rate of 70 pounds and the same size of 100 inches to continue for all parcels addressed to or from any rural route in the country and also parcels addressed to or from any third- or any fourth-class office. My amendment will remove all objection from the farmers.

Mr. Chairman, do you know that at the present time, although the weight limit is 70 pounds, only about 1 percent of the parcel-post packages sent through the mails come over 50 pounds? So that very few packages of more than 50 pounds are being sent through the mails today. But by my amendment we will accept packages weighing 70 pounds and 100 inches in girth or size, addressed to farmers on rural routes or from people on rural routes and to third- and fourth-class post offices.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to what the President of the United States has said about increasing postal rates. In the President's budget message of January 10, 1949, he said:

The postal deficit for fiscal year 1950, on the basis of current postal rates, would be more than $400,000,000. A deficit of this size is unsound; it imposes upon the general taxpayer a financial burden which should properly be borne by the users of the service.

Large postal deficits are resulting from a record volume of postal business, most of which is carried at rates which do not cover handling costs. The low rates for parcel post have led to substantial diversion of express traffic from common carriers, with the result that the Post Office Department is now receiving a volume and type of parcel business which it cannot efficiently handle with existing facilities. Present rates for second- and third-class mail are so low that they make only a small contribution to the costs of handling such mail.

Then, on June 24, 1949, the President stated in a special message which he sent to the Congress:

The postal deficit for the fiscal year 1950, on the basis of current postal rates, would be more than $400,000,000. This deficit results primarily from the volume of postal business which is carried below cost. If the postal service is to be conducted on a businesslike basis, it is essential that the postal rates be brought in line with the increased costs of postal operations. I again strongly urge, as I have in previous messages during the past 2 years, that the Congress enact an adequate revision of the postal-rate structure.

Mr. Chairman, in his budget message of last month the President stated the following:

I have repeatedly urged the Congress to raise postal rates so as to bring them into line with postwar costs. The need for such corrective action becomes steadily more urgent. It is unsound and unnecessary for the postal operation to continue as a growing burden on the general taxpayer. Instead, the users of the postal service should as a group pay the full cost of services received.

Mr. Chairman, this parcel-post business has increased so tremendously that today the Post Office Department does not have sufficient or adequate facilities for handling this terrific volume of parcel-post packages. At the present time we are handling over a billion pieces of parcel post. During the last 3 years there has been an increase of over 200,000,000 pieces of parcel post.

Mr. Chairman, it was never intended that the Post Office Department be in competition with private business. But what is the situation today? We are driving out of business by unfair competition the private express companies. This is not fair to the express organizations and to their many thousands of loyal employees, many of whom have been laid off during the last few years due to the increased volume of parcel-post business and the great decrease in express shipments. We should, therefore, increase the parcel-post rates.

Mr. Chairman, you will hear some misinformed people say that if the Post Office Department would get credit for the penalty and frank mail it would wipe out the deficit. But do you know the true story about that? The deficit is $551,000,000? Do you know what the penalty mail would bring in in revenue if postage were paid on same? It would bring in approximately $76,000,000.

Do you know how much the franked mail of Members of Congress you talk about costs? Some people would try to make you believe that we could wipe out the entire postal deficit if we just made the Members of Congress pay for their own mail. The truth of the matter is that the total postage bill on franked mail would be just a little over $1,000,000. So the total subsidy for franked and penalty mail is about $77,000,000, and the other subsidy is for the air lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, our committee has persistently and repeatedly urged that subsidy pay to air lines be divorced from the air-mail pay; that the Post Office Department pay only the actual cost of the transportation of air mail. That legislation is now being considered by another committee of this House, and I hope it will be adopted. But the subsidy being paid to air lines under the guise of air-mail pay is only $50,000,000, according to the Postmaster General, so this whole free mail and subsidy by the Post Office Department amounts to only $120,000,000.

I have here a letter from Deputy Postmaster General Burke showing exactly the cost for last year, $128,000,000. So, Mr. Chairman, if you take out the penalty mail and franked mail and the subsidies paid to air mail, $128,000,000, you will still have a deficit of $423,000,000. This bill, conservative as it is, raises only $133,000,000.

I cannot see how any Member can oppose this bill. We have been extremely fair to all users of the mails. I know that the Members have been under tremendous pressure from special interests and from large users of mail to oppose this bill, but they do not give you the real facts. Mr. Chairman, I have here in my hand a circular letter sent out by a large mail-order house, in fact, the largest in the United States. I will not mention its name. This letter was sent by this mail-order house to people to propagandize against this bill. Do you know how many circulars this large mail-order house sent out in recent weeks? Over three million sent to farmers and people throughout the United States to high-pressure Members of Congress to vote against this bill.

I plead with you to give this bill fair consideration, and I believe that if you do you will support the bill.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Gladly.

Mr. CANFIELD. I admire the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee for the timely and courageous argument he is making in the well of the House today in behalf of Federal economy and the pay-as-you-go principle in Government. As a member of the House Subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office Appropriations I have had to review this deficit year after year. I was quite surprised; yes, I was chagrined to learn in the hearings this year that the Hoover Commission in appraising the functions and the problems of the Post Office Department steered away from the No. 1 problem of that Department, this ever-growing deficit.

Newspapers have been mentioned. There are some newspapers in the country who want to pay the freight, notably the Scripps-Howard newspapers. I like their editorial policy on this issue. What do they say? They say this: "We, as newspapers, are forever crusading against Federal subsidies, and yet we know we are subsidized ourselves. We are willing to pay the freight. Let the bill be brought out on the floor of the House and the Senate and be enacted into law." We are challenged here today as advocates of Federal economy to stand up and be counted. The gentleman from Tennessee has given us our first real opportunity this year to vote yea or nay. I vote "aye."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his valuable contribution.

Mr. Chairman, this is a hard fight. It is not easy for me to get on the floor and advocate a bill of this kind. I know it is not popular with some, but I know it is right and it is just, and I am not going to fall for this propaganda that is being distributed by some of the big users of the mail. Furthermore, I am just as much interested in economy as the Members on my left, and just as much interested in a balanced budget as they are.

Let me say to you Members on the left where there is so much opposition to this bill, I know you are sincere, I know you want to reduce expenses, you want to

get a balanced budget, but now I say here is your first chance, your first opportunity in this session to come on and help reduce the deficit of our Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). One hundred and seventeen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, representing the minority on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I was partly responsible along with some other members of the committee, in preparing a minority report. We sent this to Members of the House the last 2 days, and no doubt you have received it. Many of you have studied this minority report on H. R. 2945; it is Report No. 1452, part 2.

We are opposed to the bill fundamentally for the reason that we believe that the Post Office Department is a service organization, set up for service to the American people. It is the only public agency in the Government today that serves all of the people. It never was intended that it should make a profit.

The point is made that the Post Office Department should be run on a business and efficient basis. Of course, we all agree to that. It should be. But we do not agree that it should be run on any basis where it makes a profit or necessarily breaks even. To carry that point of view to a further length, you could say this: If the proponents of this bill have their way from now on, next year they will come in with another bill and in the future with other bills to try to increase rates so as to break even or make a profit on the Post Office Department revenues and disbursements. It would lead eventually to eliminating rural free delivery, because that costs more money than it returns. It does not break even today. It loses money for the Department, but it is a fine service to the farmers of America. We are against the curtailment of rural-route service.

We have all the third- and fourth-class offices in the country to serve, in the out-of-the-way places, and sometimes in the metropolitan areas as well. The Post Office Department serves the little towns with third- and fourth-class post offices. You would have to eliminate those, if you wanted to put the Department on a profit basis or even on a break-even basis. So the argument that the Department should break even or should pay a profit does not hold water, because the Post Office Department is a service to the people of this country.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. On that basis, would the gentleman advocate the lowering of postal rates in any of these categories as they now stand under the law?

Mr. HAGEN. We are here to fight any increase in rates.

Mr. REES. I understand that, but on that basis would the gentleman advocate the lowering of the rates?

Mr. HAGEN. We have not advocated the lowering of the rates, no, not unless they are discriminatory or excessive or cause a lowering of revenue, and that has happened. We have in the past increased rates, and it has proven out that the business, the volume, and the revenue of the Post Office Department did not come up to what was expected, so they went back to the lower rates.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I remember that last year when the bill to increase the salaries of postal employees was under consideration only two Members of the House voted against the increase. Just how long does the gentleman think we can continue to increase the salaries of those who carry on this service, without taking additional money from the taxpayers? Is that what the gentleman advocates, that we should sort of subsidize the service more than we are now?

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I should like to answer the gentleman in this way, that certainly this Government cannot arrange the salaries and working conditions on the basis of the revenue. If that is to be the rule, what are we to do with all the Federal employees in the Government, with a $5,000,000,000 deficit facing us?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I answer that? You might at least keep the postal employees on a comparative basis with the rest of the employees in their respective communities. They never quit.

Mr. CORBETT. I think we all recognize that of all the large classes of employees in the country, the postal and Federal employees have received the smallest increases in proportion to the increased cost of living. These other classes include the auto workers, the coal miners, the steel workers, and so on.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All things considered, that is just nonsense.

Mr. HAGEN. I decline to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, there are no hearings available for us here today. The Members of the House do not have the hearings available so they can study this very important measure. This measure affects every person in America. The post office serves everyone. We should know the arguments and testimony presented on this bill.

Incidentally, no hearings have been held on this new, revised bill, the committee amendment. The hearings that were held over many, many weeks were held on a much different type of bill. This new, revised bill was not presented to anyone for consideration, outside of the committee in executive session for just a short time. No American taxpayer or citizen or representative had the opportunity to testify on the bill that is presented to you today.

Mr. REES. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sure the gentleman wants to be reasonably fair about that. He knows that during the Eightieth Congress many weeks were spent in hearings on the general question of increased postal rates. I think the gentleman from Minnesota was present at least a considerable part of the time. He is also familiar with the fact that hearings were held again during 1949 on this subject.

Mr. HAGEN. I think the gentleman misunderstood my remarks. No hearings have been held on this new, revised bill we are considering here today.

Mr. REES. They were held on the general subject of increased postal rates.

Mr. HAGEN. The hearings were held on the original bill, H. R. 2945, which is quite different from the bill we have here today.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I am sure the gentleman does not desire to create a wrong impression about this. As chairman of the committee, I introduced a bill sent down to me by the Postmaster General, calling for an increase of $253,000,000. We held hearings over 3 months. As a result this bill was introduced. Is that not a fact?

Mr. HAGEN. That is right. I said that a hearing was held, but not on this revised bill, which was considered in executive session for a very short time. The hearings were held on the original bill, H. R. 2945, as originally introduced. The bill we are considering now is quite different and there were no hearings on this new bill. In fact, the executive session was very brief and less than 5 minutes was taken in the consideration of class IV rates in the final executive session on this bill.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. Would the gentleman tell us whether any business firm or mail-order house or user of the mails has had an opportunity to present one bit of testimony as to how this bill will affect their mailing costs?

Mr. HAGEN. No one had an opportunity to present any information to the committee or at least not in a committee hearing on this new revised bill.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. There are two volumes of hearings which were held on H. R. 2945. What the gentleman is telling you is that two subcommittees were later set up to, in effect, mark up the bill. That is all the committees did. They marked up the bill and the bill that came out was so emasculated downward that you would hardly recognize it.

Mr. HAGEN. That is exactly right.

Mr. MILLER of California. And there are two volumes of hearings.

Mr. HAGEN. The gentleman is right again. But this is a new revised and

different bill and it should be recommitted for final, further study and consideration before a complete bill is brought out.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. A smokescreen has been thrown out here today and the inference has been made that postal employees are in jeopardy insofar as salary raises go if we vote against this bill. I would like to have the gentleman state the situation on that score.

Mr. HAGEN. This bill has no connection with salaries whatever. Both sides of the House will agree to that.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Nevertheless, they are trying to infer that.

Mr. HAGEN. There is no basis for that whatever. The membership on both sides of the House will say that.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. It is true that the action which we take on this legislation will not affect salaries of the post-office employees, but it could very well affect not only the salaries but even the jobs of thousands of the employees of the Railway Express Agency.

Mr. HAGEN. That is right.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is most kind in yielding to various Members. I hope he takes more time because I believe we have used up his 10 minutes in asking him questions. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] refused to yield to me when he was addressing the Committee. He suggested that they were offering an amendment to the bill which would take care of rural routes. The question I wanted to ask him concerning his amendment was whether it would take care of fourth-class post offices and star routes as well as rural routes. I wonder if the gentleman now addressing the Committee could give us any information as to what the proposed amendment might do.

Mr. HAGEN. I am not fully aware of exactly what the amendment might do. But if there are quite a number of amendments coming up, it is a further indication and proof that the bill ought to be recommitted. If any Members have amendments to offer to this bill at this time, which is of such great importance to the people, they should be considered at length and all amendments should be proposed and considered and adopted or rejected in committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. My amendment expressly covers both rural and star routes.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. WITHROW. It might be well at this time to observe that on January 11, 1950, the other body recommitted their version of this bill to the committee for the reasons given by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed.

We are talking about deficits in the Post Office Department. Of all the witnesses who appeared before our committee outside of the official family and a few on fourth-class mail, not a single one appeared in support of the increases proposed in this bill—not one. They were not special interests and they were not vested interests. They represented the American people. I will just give you the names of a few of them.

Here is a country newspaperman from Iowa. Here is Louis A. Lopez, of the International Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, who strongly opposed the bill. Here is John B. Hagerty, of the International Allied Printing Trades Association and International Brotherhood of Bookbinders Union Organization. In fact, there are many, many union organizations which appeared with their representatives expressing the strongest opposition to this bill. Some Members of Congress appeared. The International Brotherhood of Paper Makers had a representative Paul L. Phillips. The Paper Mill Workers Union had a representative. The Boy Scouts of America appeared in opposition, as did the Christian Herald Association, and many others. Many religious and fraternal organizations had representatives there. Many veterans' organizations were on hand protesting. There was the Disabled American Veterans organization, the American Legion, the VFW, and others.

Many farm publishing organizations appeared in opposition to this bill. Many business people, many small-business men were there in opposition to the bill.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I would like to proceed now, if I may.

The Farm Bureau people appeared; the Farmers Union, the National Grange, the Elks, the Eagles; and dozens of other groups appeared in opposition to this bill. Not a single representative of the American public appeared for this bill except one or two who appeared for an increase in fourth-class rates, and members of the Post Office Department.

Now let me proceed with reference to first-class mail. This bill proposes to increase the post card from 1 cent to 2 cents. That is a 100-percent increase. You can not increase charges 100 percent in any part of your business. No one can stand a 100-percent increase on its first-class mail charges.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. Could the gentleman inform some of us who do not know, what the penny post card costs the Government to print?

Mr. HAGEN. It costs 2.6 cents to print, sell, and deliver, according to reports given out by the Post Office Department.

Mr. SUTTON. That is without delivery; is that right?

Mr. HAGEN. No. That is the cost, with delivery. The cost is proposed to be increased to 2 cents instead of 1 cent. That is 100-percent increase. That is too much. How about the millions of post cards used by veterans' organizations and farm organizations such as rural electrification groups, and all those organizations which use the 1-cent card for notices of all kinds.

We proposed in the committee to raise the postal card put out by Uncle Sam to 2 cents, and continue the 1-cent rate on the private post card. Oh, no. They did not want that. You see, the Government is competing with every printing shop in America. Uncle Sam is competing with every printer in America by the practice of selling these postal cards in the post office. If they were increased to 2 cents and we maintained the 1-cent charge for the private or personal mailing card, the business would go to private concerns and private businessmen would hire more printers and there would be more employment in this country.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman address himself to subsection (4), section 2, page 21, about these religious and other publications. There seems to be a special provision for them. I was wondering whether that was designed to meet the objections of various religious and fraternal organizations which appeared in opposition to this legislation.

Mr. HAGEN. That matter will be discussed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], who has an amendment along that line.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HAGEN. I would like to proceed, if I may.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I would like to clarify this.

Mr. HAGEN. Well, it can be clarified later. I would like to proceed now.

The Post Office Department claims not to lose money on printed envelopes. They charge a person so much for printing envelopes. The extra charge for printing is only 44 cents more than for the unprinted envelopes. You can buy a thousand stamped envelopes at the postoffice and pay only 44 cents more to have them printed up. They have to send down to Ohio for the order and it comes back by parcel post. The parcel post alone on that 1,000 envelopes is 91 cents, plus the job and the costs of handling it up and down the line. The Hoover Commission says that any small Government purchase order, for instance, when you buy a pair of pliers, would cost $10 to handle it. So it surely costs $10 to handle this order of a thousand printed envelopes. Still they are selling them for only 44 cents more than you can buy the unprinted envelopes for. So here is a place for economy. But, no. They turned us down in the committee on that sort of thing.

It has been said that the Scripps-Howard papers are supporting this postal increase. They are ready and willing and anxious apparently to secure an increase in second-class mail. Do you know why? They hardly use the mails. The Scripps-Howard paper, here in Washington, the News, does not go through the mails to any extent. Only about 1 percent of their circulation goes through the United States mails. The Washington Star has less than 2 percent of its circulation going through the mails. So some of these big metropolitan newspapers are willing to increase the second-class rates, just like a cigarette manufacturer may be happy to see the tax on cigars go up, because he does not sell cigars, and the increase would not affect his business; may even increase it.

But that is not all; it discriminates against little weekly newspapers throughout the country, religious papers, veterans' papers, labor papers, because 100 percent of their circulation goes through the mail. They will have to bear their full share of these increased charges on second-class mail. And that is not all; the Washington News, the New York News, the New York Mirror, the Washington Star, and these other big papers that do not go through the mails to any great extent will eventually monopolize the publishing game in this country because the little papers which have to pay these increased charges to survive will have to raise their subscription price by mail. The result is that many of their subscribers, not being able to afford the increased-subscription rate, will then buy the big metropolitan papers instead, finding them cheaper, because they do not go through the mails. The result will be that the big papers will monopolize the newspaper field, and the small weekly paper and small-town dailies driven out of business.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. REES. The gentleman would have this Committee believe—and I do not think he wishes to get that idea across—that there is great discrimination against religious publications by reason of this legislation. The gentleman well knows that those publications have always been protected, and rightly so; and he also knows that the increase in the rates here are comparatively small and that there are no increases for nonprofit publications in this class. For the record, let him state to the Committee just how much more this increase is going to cost newspapers or magazines?

Mr. HAGEN. The gentleman misses the point. I say it is discriminatory inasmuch as the rate applies to the small newspapers and publications, which cannot avoid using the mails. The increases are not effective on publications and people who can get away from using the mails.

Mr. REES. For the information of the Committee will the gentleman state the cost of the increase in this bill on religious publications; state the amount in money?

Mr. HAGEN. The increase is about 50 percent on profit publications.

Mr. REES. How much money?

Mr. HAGEN. On a bill of $100 it would be a total of $150, or if the old bill were $10, the new postage bill would be $15. An increase of 50 percent on small weekly newspapers is a tremendous increase and puts them at a tremendous disadvantage with these big papers that are not compelled to pay it. This rate does not greatly affect the big papers but does directly fully affect their small competitors.

Today the Post Office Department wants an increase in postage rates all along the line. It was not so in 1933, and the Democrats were in power then, too. It was the same sort of Post Office Department. Then they were opposing increases of all kinds. In a report sent to the Senate they opposed increases on second-class mail and other increases that were proposed. Let me show you a statement they made on December 8, 1933. I quote:

> There is no class of post-office business to which the law of diminishing returns applies with greater force than second-class mailings, and the Department considers it to be beyond question that further advances in the rate of postage applicable to this class of mail matter will diminish, rather than increase, its revenues.

In other words, the higher the rate on second-class the lower the revenue, the lower the volume of business. And what happens? A bigger deficit than you have now. It is just like the butcher; he loses money when he sells soup meat, but he is not going to throw the soup meat in the ashcan, he is going to handle it; he handles it however so that his deficit will be less than it otherwise would be or his profits greater than they would be if he threw the soup meat away.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. REESE. The gentleman's argument is that if a man loses $5 on each suit of clothes he sells he should just go on selling suits anyhow. That is the effect of the argument of my friend from Minnesota, the greater the use the greater the deficit.

Mr. HAGEN. But to get back to the second-class mail. The newspapers now perform most of the operations of the Post Office Department in the preparation and mailing of second-class matter; most of them perform at least seven of the steps necessary in the mailing of newspaper material. These steps are performed by the weekly newspapers and the small-town daily newspapers for the Post Office Department. Many a postmaster tells a newspaperman: "You are the best customer I have got; you do all the work; all I do is to receive your check every week."

Now going back to 1933, the Post Office Department quoted these figures which shows that their deficit gets larger with the increase of rates. On the rates in force in fiscal year 1932 the increases ranged from 33 percent to 67 percent over those in effect in the previous year. This resulted in a decrease in revenue of 15.3 percent. So if we increase the rates your revenue is going down.

You may talk about the magazines paying a proper rate and they should pay their way, but what happens if you increase the rates on larger magazines? They take their magazines out of the mails completely. Right now they are experimenting, and very succesfully, with a plan of having men with jeep cars delivering the publications 1 or 2 days a week throughout the larger populated areas of the country. The larger publications, the big publications, will take most of their second-class mail from the post office if higher rates of this kind go into effect. You may say you are going to make the big newspapers and magazines pay this increased postage but they will avoid it by new distribution methods.

This bill, on the contrary, will hamper, harm, and injure the small publishers of the country, the farm press, education press, the veteran press, the labor press, and also all of the little publications throughout the country which we need more than ever before. As a matter of fact, the weekly newspapers gradually are going out of existence now and with another impact of increased cost there will be another large percentage of weekly papers folding up. The weekly press of this country is the backbone of the Nation and we need more of them instead of less.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In confirmation of what the gentleman said, the weekly newspapers in my congressional district during the past 8 years have dropped from 104 down to 87 in number on account of increased costs.

Mr. HAGEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. A Hoover task force in examining the Post Office Department came forth with a report that if certain modernization of equipment and methods was installed the Department could save $180,000,000 a year. To the gentleman's knowledge, has anything been done by the Post Office Department to bring about any of those savings recommended by the Hoover report?

Mr. HAGEN. We have not received any information on that. We understand something may be forthcoming however. We understand there are some savings expected to come out of the effort now being made by the Post Office Department.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Does not the gentleman believe that the Post Office Department should make a sincere and determined effort to decrease costs before increasing the cost of the service to the users of the postal service?

Mr. HAGEN. Yes, any business does that. If a business finds it is losing money it starts cutting corners and tries

to be more efficient in order to save money.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that a number of people appeared before us, representing the labor unions, the farm organizations, business and fraternal organizations and others. They said in effect that "We know there is a deficit so far as the post office is concerned, but the Post Office Department is a service organization to all of the people and it tries to give a mail service at the least possible cost commensurate with the greatest service. We are willing to pay the deficit through taxation. We are paying the deficit that way now."

All of these enterprises, all of these business people, all of these individuals are paying for the deficit now through income-tax payments and other taxation. They would rather have it paid that way than by increasing the postal rates at this time.

In the case of third-class mail the bill proposes that the rate be raised from 1 cent to 1½ cents. That is a raise of 50 percent.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. They are not paying the deficit by paying it through an increase in the income tax. We are paying it by issuing more notes and increasing the public debt.

Mr. HAGEN. Yes. The people who testified before our committee said: "We know this deficit must be paid but we are willing to pay it the usual way, through taxation, and not by soaking the little fellow and increasing the rates where it cannot be taken into consideration without effecting a tremendous impact on business and labor and the welfare of the country."

Mr. Chairman, there will be many, many thousands of people thrown out of work if the increase goes into effect. Many, many specialty houses and other manufacturing houses who depend on the third-class mail will have to go out of business. Their traditional way of doing business through 1-cent post cards will be broken up and they will have to start a new pattern, a new tradition, a new development in their business.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In all fairness, has there not been an increase in the price index in the last 10 years and what increases have been made to compensate for the general price increase throughout our entire economy?

Mr. HAGEN. They are not objecting so much to some sort of increase, but these gentlemen who came in here and testified state that a 50-percent or a 100-percent increase—and the original bill provided up to a 600-percent increase—is too much of a jump, too much of an increase. They might be willing, some of them, to say, "We will take 10-, 20-, or even a 30-percent increase"; but when you hit 50 percent and 100 percent, that is quite an impact on their business, and everyone, labor and management alike, suffers.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. One last question. In this bill, have they made provision for a uniform increase in all categories of mail?

Mr. HAGEN. No. Each class is charged a different percentage, but I will not have time to go into that. But it is not the same at all.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman, then, feels that the increases are inequitable in the various classes?

Mr. HAGEN. To some extent they are. Of course, I think they are too high in many cases, and I think the increases will result in a less volume of business and a greater deficit to the Post Office Department. And what will be done if that happens?

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I might say to the gentleman from Washington, apparently from page 3 of the report it appears that on January 1, 1949, there were rate increases at that time totaling more than $125,000,000 annually. I do not know what those were, but I think that partially answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. HAGEN. On that very point, the proposed increase represents 50 percent in some cases, and all at one time. There are many publishers of farm and other newspapers and magazines, who have subscriptions ahead for 3, 4, and 5 years, subscriptions that are paid for on the basis of an old rate, so that if any increase is provided it should be staggered for 3 or 4 or 5 years ahead of time instead of all at one time.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we all know that there have been general increases in the cost of doing business in the past decade. What I am trying to find out is what is a reasonable adjustment to meet those increases that have resulted by reason of your over-all increase in your price index?

Mr. HAGEN. That is something the committee has to go into. That is why we want this bill recommitted so that we can study those factors that should apply in the consideration of a bill of this kind.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman mentioned these 50-percent increases. According to my figuring, the proposed total cost of the penny post card represents a 100-percent increase.

Mr. HAGEN. That is correct.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I would like to remind the gentleman that there are many Members that feel like the gentleman does, that this bill should be recommitted, and they would like to be yielded some time.

Mr. HAGEN. I will be glad to yield at this time.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has said that we had a new unconsidered bill before us. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] was interested in how long we would spend our time in discussing this unconsidered bill. The other body, I understand, has deferred action on this very same bill. When is a motion to adojurn today in order? When do we come to recommit this bill to save our time instead of going through this shadow boxing on an unconsidered measure this way?

Mr. HAGEN. Well, I think the bill should be recommitted, and at the proper time we expect to make a motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota, a member of the committee, what there is in the proposal now, together with the amendment that is to be offered, which protects people who live on the farm and away from railroad facilities in the ordering of heavy parcel-post packages? The railroads cannot give the service, the Railway Express Agency cannot give the service by truck or rail. The people are entitled to a nearby delivery service at a price. Now, a lot of the good farmers in my district are willing to pay an increased fee for mail-box delivery; they do not think they should have the service for nothing; they do not expect people to subsidize it. But, they are very critical on the proposition that they fear the Congress may take the privilege away from them of ordering packages sent to their mail boxes on the theory that the railroads or express agency may induce us to vote along that line. Would the gentleman comment on that proposition and make it clear as to what this bill does?

Mr. HAGEN. This bill increases the rates on parcel post. It does not limit the service any compared to what we have now, except what may happen because of the increased rates and limitations on mailing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman means as to size and weight of package.

Mr. HAGEN. As to size of package, there is a limitation both as to weight and dimensions. In other words, if this bill passes, the parcel will have to be much smaller than it is at this time. There is a further limitation on size and weight of parcels going through the mail, according to this new bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With the amendment that is to be proposed?

Mr. HAGEN. I understand someone will propose an amendment to reduce that limitation so that the limitations will not be as great as the bill proposes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to be sure on this because we are going to vote

on this. Does the chairman's amendment bring this bill in conformance with present law as to size and weight of parcel post?

Mr. HAGEN. The chairman will have to answer that himself.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. My amendment would provide that the present weight and the present size shall continue to apply to all parcels addressed to or from any rural route anywhere.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the question I am raising. So the gentleman's amendment will bring this bill in conformance with present law.

Mr. HAGEN. I am sorry, I cannot yield any further, Mr. Chairman.

In conclusion, all segments of American life are opposed to this bill, businessmen, farmers, union labor, and the general public. If you vote for a bill of this kind, you will be voting against the best interest and the welfare of the American people.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Can the gentleman tell me if the Hoover Commission recommends certain rate increases?

Mr. MILLER of California. The Hoover Commission as such does not recommend specific increases in postal rates. However, since the gentleman has asked the question, let me answer one of the arguments that has been made here in connection with the Hoover report, in answer to this argument that the bill should be recommitted. The Hoover Task Force Report, appendix 1, on page 29, states:

> Until it is in position to prove what reasonable costs of its services are, the Department's rate recommendations to Congress cannot carry proper weight. When it is in this position the Department should have a strong voice in the determination of its rates.

Now, get the next language:

> In the meantime, however, necessary revisions of rates should not be postponed.

If the gentleman will read the report of the committee he will find the same thought restated in another way. We spent a great deal of time, for this is a complex problem, and we are asking for a minimum increase at this time, only $15,000,000, in second class, a total of $131,000,000 against a deficit of $500,000,000. But the committee in its report recommends that immediately after the adoption of this bill it should start restudying this question in order to bring in new rate recommendations to bring them up to a proper standard.

Mr. FORD. The Hoover Commission did not make any specific recommendations for rate increases of one sort or another?

Mr. MILLER of California. No; the Hoover Commission made no such specific recommendations. The Hoover Commission did not make recommendations as to dollars and cents. It leaves that in the hands of Congress.

May I say to my friends on the right that this is the administration's bill. The administration is behind this bill. It wants this bill in order to help cut down the deficit that has grown up in the Post Office Department as the result of creeping subsidies that overwhelm it.

I wish to compliment the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee, on the vigorous defense he has made of this bill and the fine explanation he gave of it. Of course, I understand why those people who are publishers or who are connected with the publishing industry are concerned about the proposed rates on second- and third-class mail. They have their hands in the public pocket now. They have been bleeding Uncle Sam to the tune of nearly a half billion dollars a year and they do not want to let go of those subsidies. If you mean to have economy and you want economy, then here is one opportunity to practice what has been preached. So far as I am concerned, I adopt this philosophy: That where a man uses the postal services for business and for profit, he should pay the cost of that service. There is a twilight zone some place in this whole field where the Government should carry part of the load in the interest of dissemination of information. That is important and we recognize it. But where a profit motive enters into it I believe that the man making the profit should pay the cost.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. WIER. One thing about this legislation which interests me and is of great concern to me is the fact that in my district I have a large number of Lutheran, Catholic, and other religious publications which have no other purpose except the dissemination of news. Then, I have the farm organization papers—all three of them, the Farmers' Union, the Farm Bureau and the Grange. Then we have fraternal organizations. We have three veterans organizations and we have the religious papers. Are the rates going to be increased for religious papers and so forth under the bill H. R. 2945?

Mr. MILLER of California. Those papers are not being increased under this bill if they are religious, fraternal, labor, agricultural, or scientific papers and if the profit made does not accrue to any individual. If it goes to a charity, then it is not subject to a raise in rates.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. What about charitable institutions and nonprofit institutions?

Mr. MILLER of California. If they are charitable institutions or if profit does not enter into it, they are excluded.

After the conclusion of the hearings on H. R. 2945, which as the chairman has indicated, lasted for a period of 4 months, two subcommittees were appointed to recommend to the committee rates based upon the views as expressed by the members of the committee and the views received from the Postmaster General and those who testified at the public hearings. I was named as chairman of the subcommittee to consider second- and third-class mail.

Our subcommittee had numerous meetings before submitting its report to the full committee. As a result of these conferences, it became apparent that the entire second class rate structure required overhauling. The last complete revision of the second class was made in 1879. Because of the extremely low rates that have been provided for second-class mail through the years, many publishers have revised their publication distribution methods in order to take advantage of this low rate. Examples have been shown the committee of all types of publications that are now going as second class mail—many of these spend more money in obtaining the subscriptions than the cost of all other expenses of publication. This is largely because of the low rate that can be obtained if there is a subscription list as compared to a publication that does not have a subscription list.

Because we have consistently favored second-class mail rates as compared to other mail rates we have fostered an unfair competition between those who do have a subscription list and those who do not have one. For example, in the rate bill passed last Congress, you will recall that the leadership directed that the second-class mail rates be excluded from the postal rate revision bill before it would be permitted to come before the House. Even the rates in that bill were merely token increases raising second-class mail less than one-tenth of the deficit for that class. At the same time other users of the mail were being called upon to provide $145,000,000 annually in revenue.

As for second-class mail, we are not doing much better in this bill. We will agree that the rate increases provided here represent a very minimum increase. Many publications will receive no increases at all. Publications of religious, educational, philanthropic, fraternal, and so forth, organizations, for example, will not receive any increases unless they happen to be paying less than one-eighth cent per copy, which is approximately one-fiftieth of what they would pay for comparable service on first-class mail. I do not believe they can expect much more of a concession than that, although I notice that the minority views express a concern over this one-eighth-cent minimum.

Weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers having less than 5,000 circulation will not receive any increases at all other than the redefinition of free-in-county. Under this definition of free-in-county we are eliminating the free-in-county privilege where there is an actual delivery made to the patron by either a rural carrier or star-route carrier. The way the present free-in-county works out now there is no postage charged for the delivery to a patron on a rural route when that rural route emanates from a post office which does not have city letter carrier service. On the other hand, 1 cent a pound postage is charged for delivering such publications to a patron living on a rural route which happens to come out of a post office where there is city letter carrier service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixteen Members are present; a quorum.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. In the report and in the statement of the chairman of this committee, the statement is made that the last fiscal year ended with a deficit of approximately $550,000,000. It is stated that under the terms of this proposed legislation there will accrue additional revenue to the Treasury of about $131,715,000. Thus it is anticipated that the deficit may be reduced by that amount. That is what it is hoped. I understand that the gentleman's committee has reported to the Congress, and the bill is now pending before the Rules Committee, H. R. 87, which proposes to extend military service credits to the employees of the Postal Department. I have been advised that over a period of time that legislation will impose additional burdens upon the Post Office Department, aggregating some $400,000,000 at its peak. I ask the gentleman whether or not his full committee gave consideration to the possible impact of that legislation upon the efforts which are being made in this bill to reduce the Federal budget deficit in the Post Office Department.

Mr. MILLER of California. First, let me say to the gentleman and that as far as the pay and remuneration of the postal employees is concerned, it is impossible to tie them into the postal deficit because neither the Post Office Department nor anyone else has any control over them. The Congress of the United States is the one that fixes both rates of service and rates of pay. We cannot say to a man that he has got to work for a substandard wage because the Congress has not the courage to wipe out the postal deficit. It is our responsibility to fix salaries and postal rates. The estimate of the cost of H.R. 87 that he uses—$400,000,000—is questionable. Some of us figure from other sources that the cost of the bill would be about $22,000,000 a year over about a 10-year period.

Mr. KEEFE. I am interested to ask this question because the gentleman stated that this particular bill was an administration bill supported by the administration. Is H. R. 87 in that same category? And is it an administration bill as far as the gentleman knows?

Mr. MILLER of California. As far as I know I have never seen a favorable report from the administration on the bill H. R. 87. It is a bill which was reported by the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. It is opposed by the Post Office Department.

Mr. MILLER of California. It is opposed by the Post Office Department. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the original bill, the predecessor of this one, called for about $300,000,000 a year instead of the small amount of $135,000,000 that we are reporting to the House.

Mr. KEEFE. It is a mere partial effort to deal with what is a very pressing and important problem.

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes. A partial effort, because, as I have said before, many people have predicated their business activities on these low rates that they have enjoyed for a number of years, and it would not be just to pull the carpet out from under them overnight, leaving them greatly embarrassed and harassed in their business. But if the gentleman reads the report he will see that in the report we serve notice on them that after this bill is passed we are immediately going to consider new legislation and then over a period of years we hope to bring these rates up to their proper level without adversely affecting business; we give them a chance to adjust themselves.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman and ask his indulgence for just one further question: The chairman of the committee indicated that he intended to offer an amendment to take care of some of the criticism that had been directed toward this bill with respect to the receipt and delivery of parcel post on the farm.

Mr. MILLER of California. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. Is that a committee amendment?

Mr. MILLER of California. That will be offered by the gentleman from Tennessee and supported at least on my side of the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What will be the net effect as far as the budget is concerned of the bills reported from this committee in this Congress on the one hand raising postal salaries or increasing compensation, and on the other hand bills increasing revenue; what will be the net balance?

Mr. MILLER of California. If we pass this bill I presume there will still be a slight minus balance. On the other hand, as we go forward into the years to come correcting this thing gradually we will wipe that out.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman know what that balance is?

Mr. MILLER of California. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California three additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. While there are those who object to this change, pointing out that it will result in some high increases for certain publications if there is such an increase, it only means that we are practically carrying their entire distribution free. In every instance today where city letter carrier service is established for the first time, the same change takes place that we are providing in this bill as far as the postage bill of the newspaper is concerned. In a town or city where there is no city letter carrier service, the publisher finds that when that service is established he then has to pay 1 cent a pound for the delivery of his publication on rural routes where previously he did not pay anything.

You will find that the newspapers and magazines take the position that if there is a subsidy to second-class mail because of the low rates, it is a subsidy to the subscriber and not to the publisher. I do not know of one single publication that sells their newspapers cheaper to the man living on the rural route, which is presently delivered free-in-county than he does to the man living on the rural route where he has to pay a cent a pound. Incidentally, the average four-page newspaper weighs 2 ounces.

If there is a substantial increase to any particular publisher, as I have said, it only means that we are now carrying a large number of his copies free. Looking it over from the standpoint of individual copies, the increased cost per copy will be one-eighth cent. If it is the small newspaper that they apparently like to talk about. This means that on the weekly newspapers, the annual increase will be 7 cents. That means that the reader on the rural route will still receive delivery to his mail box of 52 issues for 7 cents, which is a pretty reasonable rate considering the service performed.

Most of the increases provided in the bill are in the zone rates. These zone rates apply only to the advertising portion and, in a sense, should be based largely on an ability to pay. The committee, in making the recommendations for second-class mail, wanted to be certain that there would not be such a burden on any publication that they would be forced out of business.

These rate increases represent on the average an increase of 33⅓ percent over the present rates paid. The other expenses of the publishers have certainly been increased to a much greater degree and did not affect their discontinuance of publications. As a matter of fact, we are in an all time high with respect to the volume of second-class mail. Publishers have increased the newstand and subscription prices of their publications a number of times. Again, this has not reduced their circulation. The Saturday Evening Post, for example, was traditionally a nickel but today it is 15 cents on the newsstand, or an increase of 300 percent. The same is true of Collier's and many other popular magazines. Certainly the rate of increase of 33⅓ percent is pretty small compared to the 300 percent of selling-price increase.

I believe it is fair to point out as well that the postal service not only helps the publishers from the standpoint of second-class rates but, as you have observed in your mail, that most publishers have gone to third-class mail and other losing services as a means of promoting the sale of additional subscriptions for second-class mail. In fact, one publisher stated that their postage bill for second-class mail was $377,000 a year, while their postage bill for third-class mail was $1,250,000 a year. So you can see that we are not only subsidizing the publishing industry by low second-class rates but they are also getting a pretty substantial

subsidy from the losses of the Department in handling other classes of mail.

Many are of the view that a higher postal rate may mean a loss of jobs. It may well be pointed out that this low third-class rate has cost the job of many a salesman because business now prefers to use this subsidized service rather than pay the salesmen's commission.

The rates recommended in H. R. 2945 for second-class mail follow the traditional pattern of existing rates. The minority views that have been filed have criticized these rates from the standpoint that there are more increases to some users of second-class mail percentage-wise than to others. The reason for this apparent discrimination is largely because of concessions in rates to special groups which were insisted upon by the very people who are now criticizing the rate structure recommended. For example, there are no increases provided for publications of religious, fraternal, education, philanthropic, and so forth, organizations. There are no increases provided for the small weekly and daily newspapers. There are no increases provided for publications within the county of publication. I think that with these concessions it is bound to cast the heavier burden on publications sent to subscribers outside the county of publication and on the advertising portion.

While it is true that publications that find it necessary to use the mail nearly 100 percent for distribution will receive a greater increase in their over-all costs, it should be pointed out that these very same publications are actually receiving a much greater contribution toward their costs than the others, since we are charging less than 25 percent of the cost of handling second-class mail. They will still be receiving a much greater proportional share of the $175,000,000 deficit in second-class mail.

There are those who say that the cost ascertainment is not properly set up for rate-making purposes. I believe this bill recognizes that almost to a fault. If cost ascertainment were recognized as a means for setting these second-class rates, we would be coming before the House today with rates that would raise $175,000,000 a year instead of $15,000,000 a year.

I might also say, that the rates we are recommending as a committee represent a tremendous difference from the rates recommended by the Postmaster General. Under the rates recommended by the Postmaster General, there would have been a rate increase in second-class rates of $75,000,000 the first year and $50,000,000 the second year, making a total of $125,000,000 a year. We are raising, in this bill, only $15,000,000, or just a little more than 10 percent of what the Postmaster General felt should be raised from the second-class mail.

We have not had an unrealistic approach to the problems of the publisher nor have we been unsympathetic to the American reading public. We recognize the tremendous contributions of the publishing industry. We want to keep it strong and we want it to continue as a major force in our economy. But, as so many publishers have often said in their editorials, we cannot expect a strong publishing industry nor a free press if they are going to have to rely almost entirely upon a Federal subsidy for their existence. For example, the subsidy paid to second-class mailers is more than losses experienced under agricultural price-support programs in 1949—$170,000,000. Yet, columns and columns of newsprint have been spent deploring the cost of that program.

In conclusion, I would like to state again that these rates are completely fair. I have talked to many individual publishers, particularly to publishers of small newspapers, and when the rates in this bill had been explained to them, they were satisfied. I have found, however, that the people who form the national policies for them with respect to lobbying against any increases whatsoever, prefer to keep them in the dark with respect to the big concessions made in the committee recommendations as compared to the recommendations of the Postmaster General. Many of them are still talking about the 400-percent and 600-percent increases which would have resulted from the Postmaster General's recommendations when realistically, of course, the increases in H. R. 2945 are slightly more than 30 percent.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some inquiry as to whether the administration favors this bill. The President has sent repeated messages in favor of increased rates. The Postmaster General has told me that he is for this bill. The administration not only thinks this is a good bill but is in favor also of raising further revenues from our postal business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the Post Office Department get on a sound basis so that its income will equal its expense. I feel that advertisers using the mails should certainly pay their full share of the cost, also magazines and other classifications.

The only exception, in my opinion, is the small-town newspapers and this particular class of postal users it seems to me are in an entirely different category than the others. The postal expense to a small country newspaper is one of their largest items. They have no large complicated system of distribution as the big city newspapers and magazines have. They do not use trucks to deliver to wholesale distributors who in turn use their trucks to deliver to the news stands. These small newspapers have to depend almost entirely on mail. Most of them have little working capital and a raise in their postal rates would put many of them out of business automatically.

On the other side of the ledger, they contribute, in my opinion, more to the welfare of the country in proportion to their use of the mails than any other segment of our whole business structure.

If this bill in its final form exempts country newspapers so that they do not get any raise in their postal rates I will then vote for it and will, of course, support any amendment to that effect. If, however, the bill as presented comes to a final vote with that provision affecting small newspapers still in it I will vote to recommit and if that fails vote against the bill.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 2945, is entitled "A bill to readjust postal rates" But we cannot act on it intelligently without knowing what its objectives are and whether and how well they will be accomplished. The gentleman from California admits the bill has been emasculated beyond recognition from the original bill.

It is claimed that the bill has two primary purposes. The first is to pass on to users of the mails a larger part of the cost of handling the mail. Presumably it is intended that this would be done in a fair and equitable manner. The second purpose is to increase the revenues of the Post Office Department for the declared objective of offsetting a part of its current deficit. But let us see whether this bill will actually fulfill either one of these intended purposes.

One of the principal features of this bill is the increase in the third-class rates. It increases the third-class bulk rate from a minimum of 1 cent per piece to a minimum of 1½ cents per piece. This is a 50-percent increase. The majority report says that it is a mild and reasonable increase. But it is not mild and it is not reasonable. From the standpoint of users of the mails such an increase is devastating and destructive of their business.

Third-class bulk mail is the small-business man's chief selling and advertising tool. It is the only medium open to him by which he can do business with customers in other cities and other States. It is one of the very keystones of the free-enterprise system by which anyone, even if he has but a few dollars capital, can found a business or expand a business already established. Thousands of businesses have been started in this country since the 1-cent third-class bulk rate was established, businesses which, in many cases, have used no other means of securing orders. Most of them started as a 1-man or 1-woman business selling some wanted article or service by third-class 1-cent mail. Many such businesses have grown to the point where they employ hundreds of workers, use the services of an untold number of printers, paper and envelope makers, manufacturers of all kinds of merchandise, suppliers of all kinds of materials and services.

Are you going to tell all these people that now they can do something else for a living? That they can lay off their employees, cancel their orders with their far-flung suppliers, close their doors, and quit? Are you going to tax them out of business by suddenly jumping the cost of their major sales source by a ruinous, prohibitive 50 percent. Are you going to say to the young men and young women of today and tomorrow who want to start like businesses of their own that the road is blocked, that such opportunities no longer exist for

them? Are you going to tell the thousands of manufacturers and suppliers who serve these little businesses that you do not care what happens to them or to their employees whose jobs this bill would destroy, because the Post Office Department wants to increase the third-class bulk rate minimum a full 50 percent from 1 cent to 1½ cents per piece, regardless of the impact on them and on the whole national economy?

Unless you have had occasion to make a special study of postage rates and their effect on users of the mails, you may not know what users of third-class bulk mail are required, by the very nature of their business, also to be large users of both first-class and fourth-class mail. This is true because the orders produced by their third-class circulars are received by first-class mail on business reply postcards or envelopes, the postage for which is paid by the seller. These same orders are then, in turn shipped to the purchasers by fourth-class mail—parcel post—and this postage is usually prepaid by the same third-class advertiser. Thus, when you increase postcard rates you are automatically increasing the postage costs of third-class mail users, and the same thing is true when you increase parcel-post rates. Third-class mail users are actually the source of a tremendous volume of both first-class and fourth-class mail.

I understand and I believe I am correct when I say the Eightieth Congress increased parcel-post rates by 28 percent, which became effective only last year—in 1949. A large share of that increase was and is being borne by third-class mail users. Now, this bill would pile on another 12-percent increase in parcel-post rates, in addition to doubling the postcard rate, and in addition to a huge 50-percent increase in the third-class bulk rate itself. Third-class mail users would be expected to pay all three of these increases—one on top of the other. In many cases this accumulated pile-up of postage increases could amount to more than the total earnings of third-class users, and in many other cases third-class mail users would have no other course left but to close up shop.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is enacted as written and the proposed third-class rates go into effect, every Member of this House can expect to hear from the people back home who will be hit hard by its effects. You will not hear just from big business or medium-sized business or small business, though you will find them all well represented. You will also hear from millions of plain people in all walks of life—in all sections of the country. They are people who, though they may not fully realize it now, will soon wake up to the fact that they have jobs that depend on 1-cent third-class mail. This bill, which some of you may think is aimed only at those who use the mails for business purposes, let me say, concerns all Americans. Its effect will reach into every home and every business in the Nation.

If for no other reason than the unfairness of it, this bill should be returned to the committee for further study. Does any single Member of this House really believe that this is an equitable bill? Can any Member back up the assertion that there is even a vestige of fairness in it? Let us look at the facts.

The brunt of the increases proposed by this bill would be borne by the third-class mail users.

This bill proposes to exact another $23,600,000 in postage revenue from users of third-class mail. This is over 23½ percent of the deficit which the Post Office Department says is chargeable to third-class mail.

Is that fair? Is that an equitable distribution of the postal deficit among all the users of the mails? You know as well as I do that it is not. This bill would saddle the greatest burden of postage increases directly on the backs of third-class mail users—the people who use the mails to produce business, to make jobs, to meet pay rolls, and pay taxes into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for this bill as now written, in my opinion, is a vote against the best interests of all the people.

Members of the committee which reported the bill may tell us that "This is the best bill we could work out in committee," but that does not mean that it is an equitable adjustment of postal rates. On the contrary, it is discriminatory, and the House ought to reject it entirely.

How about the second avowed purpose of the bill? Will it increase the revenues of the Post Office Department?

The hard facts are that it will not produce additional postal revenue that it is expected to produce. It is my opinion it will result in decreased revenue and an even larger postal deficit. That would be inevitable, if this bill were passed, because the proposed increases would make postal rates unjustifiably excessive. The 50-percent boost in the third-class, single-piece rate is especially unreasonable. These new rates are so excessive that mail users will be forced to cut down their use of the mails and mail volume will drop off sharply. This is not mere idle speculation. I understand it has happened before when postage rates were raised too high, in 1917 and again in 1925, and it will happen again in 1950 if this bill is passed.

It is up to you to answer that question by the way you vote on this bill. Every Member who has looked carefully into this question of postal rates knows that this bill will not result in a fair and equitable distribution of the postal deficit, but will both add to the deficit and place the heavy burden of exorbitant increases on those least able to bear it. It will not be a move toward Government economy, but in my opinion will cost the Government many millions in lost revenues from postage and taxes.

It is unthinkable that this bill should be passed in its present form. It should be recommitted for further study by the committee. Serious thought needs to be given to the economic repercussions which would surely follow excessive and unreasonable rate increases, and the present bill's glaring inequities and discrimination against third-class mail users must certainly be eliminated. I urge my colleagues to vote to recommit this bill or defeat it.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARST].

Mr. KARST. Mr. Chairman, I served as a member of a subcommittee which made the recommendations for increases in third-class mail rates.

The major increase in third-class mail is the increase in the minimum rate for bulk mailings from the present rate of 1 cent to 1½ cents. This same increase applies to catalogs of 24 pages or more. There are no increases in the regular third-class mail rate. You will recall that regular third-class mail was increased by Public Law 900, Eightieth Congress. There will be no increase under this bill for the sending of seeds, bulbs, scions, and so forth.

As I have stated, this increase is comparatively simple to understand from the standpoint of the rate change. I would like to just briefly summarize some of the objections to the bill and present the committee's views. Those who are objecting to the bill state that some third-class mailers will be receiving an increase of 50 percent while others, those using the pound rate on bulk mailings, will receive a reduction.

The chairman has already indicated that he will offer an amendment which will leave the pound rate at the present rate and not result in a reduction. I might say that we used as a pattern the Senate bill reported by the Senate subcommittee at the time we were considering this bill because we believed the House recommendations should be somewhat in harmony with those made by the Senate. As the Senate subcommittee recommended it, the 2 cents reduction in the pound rate was an oversight. Leaving the rate as it is in the bill will be consistent with not decreasing any rates in a general rate increase bill and will remove the objection that has been voiced that while some are receiving increases in third class, others are receiving decreases.

Third-class mailers say that the cost ascertainment system does not properly show the deferred service given to third-class mail or service performed by third-class mailers. While this may be true, as far as the cost ascertainment is concerned, we have not used cost ascertainment as a hard and fast guide for setting these rates. If we had, we would have adopted the Postmaster General's recommendations which would have eliminated any concessions to bulk mailers. When compared with the first-class letter rate of 3 cents, under the rate recommended of 1½ cents, we will be allowing a 50-percent reduction to third-class mailers to cover the service performed by them as well as deferred service. Third-class mailers state that we should recognize bulk mailings as a byproduct and charge less for handling them. Again, this rate, which is one-half of the first-class rate, represents a byproduct rate.

In my opinion, the committee's recommendations have given substantial recognition to business and other organizations using the third-class bulk mailing privilege. Some few have stated that there will be a reduction in mailings if these increases go into effect. Looking

back into experience, we can point out that this was not the case when all other segments of third class were raised last Congress. It should be remembered that the users of the 1-cent minimum rate, along with the users of second class, did not receive any increases in the $145,000,000 increases given mailers in Public Law 900, Eightieth Congress. These increases, of course, became effective on January 1, 1949.

May I emphasize the committee has not been without concern to the implication of postal rates on our business economy and it is because of that concern that we have recommended a bill so drastically modified from the recommendations of the Postmaster General.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. REES. I would like to yield to the gentleman, but as ranking member of the committee on my side of the House I have been allowed only 5 minutes to try to discuss a very long and important piece of legislation.

Mr. WIER. But there is one phase here that has not been touched upon to which I would like to get an answer.

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman briefly for a question.

Mr. WIER. That is in the cost of the operation of the mail service. We are talking about increasing the rates and we are talking about wages yet to come. But nothing has been said here of any attempt of the Post Office Department to save some money from the tremendous amounts that are spent in the way of subsidies to the Air Force and to rail companies and steamship companies. Has any review been made of the cost in the respects which I have mentioned?

Mr. REES. I must say to the gentleman that that is a separate matter from what we are considering here, but consideration has been given to those questions by our committee. We agree there have been subsidies and increased subsidies because of increased costs. That is what we are doing here today. We have an increased cost for carrying this mail. That is what you have. That is what you are talking about. Are you willing to go along and let these individuals and these groups who use the mail for business purposes pay a part of that increased cost, or do you want to go ahead and charge it to the taxpayers and to the Treasury. Of course, after all this is a service rendered to the people. I agree to that. But how far, how much service do you want to render free? That is the question as I see it.

I want to briefly call your attention to just a few things. The administration bill did ask for $395,000,000. That was too much. I opposed it. This bill is for $130,000,000 or less. I just cannot see how Members of the House who are advocating economy and who say we want to save here and insist on reducing appropriations would turn this legislation down. If you look it over as carefully as you ought to look it over, most of you who are going to vote against it are going to vote against it because some particular group or some person has told you not to support it. I agree with you that it is a great deal easier to vote against this bill than it is to vote for it. But let us stand up and do what we regard the right thing by the people of this country. If it is right, let us vote for it, and if it is wrong, then, of course, turn it down. That is our privilege.

It has been said on the floor of the House that business concerns would lose business because of this legislation. Not at all. If I thought anyone would be injured I would not support this bill. There were some increases in the last Congress, the Eightieth Congress; there were little increases, but there was not any business lost through the mail. But these people who use the mail have increased their own costs. They are paying more in salaries. They are paying more for materials. They charge more for advertising and they charge more for subscriptions. They ought to be willing to go along and pay a part of this increased cost. This bill does not require them to pay nearly all of it. This is only a small part of the increased cost of the postal service. As someone has suggested, the over-all increase on this thing is between 6 percent or 7 percent.

The original recommendation, as I said a moment ago, was something over $400,000,000. This provides for only a small part of that amount. Someone said that there would be so much disruption. There were some increases in 1945 and 1947 and 1948, but there was no disruption and there will be none under this proposed legislation. It has been said that there has not been a great flock of people who came before our committee to insist on rate increases. This House supported and I supported and worked for an increase for postal employees, which, of course, increases the cost of government.

I think it is the experience of most of our committees that they are not crowded with people demanding legislation that might save costs to the people of this country. I feel that if the membership of this House does not approve the legislation they are not in such good shape to demand economies and savings. I realize this item is only $130,000,000; but if we can save that much for the taxpayers without injury to anyone, it seems to me we ought to do it. I realize, too, the administration is asking for $400,000,000. I do not go along with that proposal. I think it is too much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. REES. There is a great deal being said about the minority report, and that there were not proper hearings held on this particular bill. For 3 months hearings were held on this bill that was submitted to our committee. Then the bill was submitted to a subcommittee to write up a bill. They brought in a much more moderate bill than the one that was before us in the first place. Furthermore, those of us who are concerned about patrons who are getting their parcels on rural mail routes will be interested to know that the distinguished chairman of our committee at the proper time will submit an amendment that will take care of this. I am in favor of the amendment.

I do not want to increase costs against anybody any more than you do, but I think what is fair is fair and what is right is right. I think you ought to read this bill. It has been before you a long time. You have had a chance to study it. I regret that we do not have a rule, but, nevertheless, it is here under rules of the House, and it is my judgment that you should support it.

Something was said about those who do support the measure. I do not have time to read this entire list of names, but I will submit it for the RECORD:

Marion B. Folsom, treasurer and director, Eastman Kodak Co.

Beardsley Ruml, vice chairman of the committee.

John D. Biggers, president, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co.

Philip L. Graham, president and publisher, the Washington Post

Ernest Kansler, chairman of the board, Universal CIT Credit Corp.

Fred Lazarus, Jr., president, Federated Department Stores, Inc.

J. Cameron Thomson, chairman of the Subcommittee on Monetary and Fiscal Policy and president of the Northwest Bancorporation.

James F Brownlees, member of the committee.

W. L. Clayton, chairman of the board, Anderson, Clayton & Co.

S. Sloan Colt, president, Bankers Trust Co.

Gardner Cowles, president and publisher, Des Moines Register and Tribune.

Chester C. Davis, president, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp.

John M. Hancock, partner, Lehman Bros.

George L. Harrison, chairman of the board, New York Life Insurance Co.

Robert Heller, president, Robert Heller & Associates, Inc.

Jay C. Hormel, chairman of the board, George A. Hormel & Co.

Amory Houghton, chairman of the board, Corning Glass Works.

Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.

Meyer Kestnbaum, president, Hart, Schaffner & Marx.

Robert A. Lovett, partner, Brown Bros., Harriman & Co.

Fowler McCormick, chairman of the board, International Harvester Co.

W. A. Patterson, president, United Air Lines.

Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co.

Harry Scherman, president, Book of the Month Club.

H. Christian Sonne, president, Amsinck, Sonne & Co.

W. Walter Williams, CED, chairman and president of Continental, Inc.

Theodore C. Yntema, vice president in charge of finance, Ford Motor Co.

Mr. Chairman, I have no personal feeling with regard to this bill. I want to do the thing that is just and right, and perform my duty as I see it. As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have attended all hearings and have spent a great deal of time and energy in dealing with this problem. I am giving you my personal opinion only when I tell you that I believe in the interests of the people of

this country this legislation should be supported.

I do not believe that those who use the mail for business purposes really want the Government to subsidize their business. This will give them an opportunity to pay a small share of that subsidy but not nearly all of it.

I should add one thing more. It has been suggested the Hoover plan should be studied first. I am certainly in favor of studying the Hoover plan, but that does not deal with mail rates. If it is approved, I think the maximum amount would be $140,000,000. You can see there would still be a considerable amount that would have to come from the Treasury. I agree with those who say the Post Office Department is a service agency, but I do think that those who use the service for profit should want to pay a part of the increased costs.

The rate increases in this bill will not even pay for the costs of the postal employees salary increase passed during the last session and which is presently in effect.

Nobody likes to raise postal rates or raise taxes. We have all talked a great deal about taking off certain obnoxious taxes placed on business during the war. In my judgment, we are dealing with a problem right now that will have an effect on whether we shall be successful in eliminating these taxes. I believe that people would prefer to pay the proper postage for the services they receive from the Post Office Department than to be paying wartime excise taxes.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT].

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, yesterday's editions of the Washington Star carried a story setting forth the details of a transaction under which the Department of Agriculture hired an airplane at $450 per hour to distribute grasshopper bait.

Now I do not doubt that grasshoppers are a menace in certain parts of the country and may even call for such heroic measures.

At the same time I consider them far less a threat to the general welfare of this Nation than the kind of thinking which permits us to condone the payment of $450 per hour in a local war against grasshoppers when we are considering a discriminatory increase in postal rates under H. R. 2945—a measure which would be against the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, as a newspaperman of many years' experience, I rise to tell you that this increase in the second-class mail rates will seriously affect newspapers, both large and small.

I consider the Post Office Department our most important branch of the Government. I do not believe that its members are overpaid. There is no one who can find fault with the service which it renders to the Nation, yet we are constantly hearing demands for pay-as-you-go operation by the Post Office Department, when an honest analysis of the budget would show that a large portion of the post-office costs should be charged against Government services—mail service and manifold other services to other departments, which also serve the people and are fully supported for that purpose.

What is proposed under H. R. 2945, among other cost increases, exactly doubles second-class mailing costs for magazines and many newspapers of general circulation. It would curtail and restrict the publication service and mail delivery of papers to persons in rural areas.

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

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I believe the gentleman is correct, that instead of a small increase, there is a 48- or 50-percent increase in certain second-class mailing privileges, and also a decrease in the extent of coverage generally coming into the rural areas.

Mr. DAVENPORT. The increase would be particularly burdensome on morning newspapers, which have a large rural circulation and it is going to drive some of the smaller newspapers out of business.

Rather, we should be here passing resolution commending its splendid performance and memorializing its accomplishments in all the branches of this Government. None has ever surpassed it in satisfactory stewardship. But I say here that if this bill is passed it is going to affect seriously newspapers both large and small; it is going to cut down their circulation.

I rise against this bill; I think we should defeat it.

Perhaps we have already forgotten that it was the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt who had enacted the present low-cost book rate so that reading matter and knowledge would be denied to no one in the United States.

Perhaps we forget that magazines and newspapers are a great source of public enlightenment; a democratic privilege which distinguishes us from censor-ridden Russia.

Perhaps the committee has overlooked these and some other considerations which make this bill a measure contrary to public interest. It would rob the people of much education, enjoyment, and convenience to pay a part of the legitimate cost—not so-called deficit—of a department which serves other Government departments and the public, and I move that it be recommitted for further study.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this legislation on the ground that it has not been properly considered by the Congress, and on the ground that the Congress has not sufficient information at hand to consider it as it should be considered and do justice to all concerned.

First of all I should like to say that the present bill does away with the free-in-county privileges that are granted to newspapers of the type I find in my district. The mortality rate amongst those weekly newspapers has been very, very high. Their profit margin is very small; as a matter of fact, during the past 10 years, in the Third Congressional District of Wisconsin, more than 35 percent of the rural papers have closed their doors or changed hands. However, whenever the employees of the Post Office Department ask for an increase of wages based upon the cost of living, immediately the terrible deficit is brought up as an argument against that increase. Today this rate increase is predicated almost entirely upon the fact that we have a terrible deficit in the Post Office Department. I say this in all respect to the Members of this Congress, but I do not believe there is a man in this Chamber who knows exactly what the postal deficit was for 1948. The reason is that the true facts are not reported to the Congress.

The Hoover Commission has shown that the annual post-office deficits are mainly due to inefficient, bureaucratic business methods. Dr. Robert L. Johnson, chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, has said:

> Adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations, vigorously executed, can cut the postal deficit by $250,000,000 a year.

The chairman of the committee mentioned penalty mail and franked mail. This makes up only part of the free services rendered by the Post Office Department to other departments of the Government and for which they receive no credit at all, and there is no report available to the Congress that will give the true picture as to the services that other departments of the Government receive from the Post Office Department.

I do want to make it perfectly clear that I am not arguing against the rendering of these services to the other departments of government by the Postal Department. I know that most of them are necessary. My criticism is of the method of bookkeeping and the charge of extraordinary annual postal deficits, when in reality the cost should be spread out and charged to the other departments of government which receive the services. The details of the rate increases have been discussed by several of my colleagues who are members of the committee. However, I want to add, as forcibly as I can, the warning that there will be terrible impacts if this measure is enacted as it is proposed today. I have at hand a telegram which I wish to be made a part of the RECORD; it is typical of the sincere anxiety being felt by men in legitimate business as to what this measure will do to them:

> We urge you to vote to recommit bill H. R. 2945 to committee for full intelligent appraisal of post-office finances as recommended by Hoover Commission. Most newspapers favor a fair increase but it is our belief that present proposal is discriminatory and excessive and does not allow sufficient time to adjust current mail subscription prices, which in our case have been kept at a low level in spite of increased costs of production.
>
> WILLIAM T. BURGESS,
> *Publisher, La Crosse Tribune,*
> *La Crosse, Wis.*

When I attended school, one of our professors whenever the Post Office Department was mentioned, expounded at great length on its accomplishments, the fine services of the Department, its many contributions to the development of our

country. Then he always made clear one thing and that was that the rate structure was merely a means of preventing abuses of those services. I am in entire agreement with him. I believe that the Postal Department has done more to develop this great Nation of ours than any other one agency of government. If we are to subscribe to the theory that the Postal Department should balance its own budget, then in fairness that same yardstick should be used on every other department of our Government. I want to emphasize the fact that there is not one department of our Government at the present time that has a balanced budget.

At the proper time I shall attempt to amend the measure now being considered so that those newspapers which are now enjoying the free-in-county privileges will continue to enjoy that privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, almost since the inception of the Post Office Department in this country there has been some controversy and some discussion as to whether or not our post office should be regarded as a business to split even or to make a profit; or should it be considered as a service. When the committee opened hearings on postal rates last January the question was raised as to whether or not this Department should render a service to the American people and to American business. It was pointed out repeatedly that we could not intelligently proceed with the business of rate making until we had settled that basic bit of philosophy. But to this day we do not know whether we are trying to run a business or trying to run a service and the Members of this Congress are being asked to vote on a hastily thrown together rate raise bill without having any basic understanding of what they are doing.

Now then, we have heard the discussion brought up that because of the postal deficit, therefore we must raise the rates in order to meet that deficit. Well, who knows what the deficit is? As the gentleman who preceded me pointed out you have a mess of subsidies in there; you have penalty mail, you have frank mail, you have all kinds of services performed by the people in the Post Office Department, and we do not know whether the deficit is in the neighborhood of two, three, or five million dollars. But, when they get up here and plead that this is an economy measure, this is the way to save money, goodness knows it is just an easy way to cover up increased inefficiency by levying another tax on American business and the American public. There has been no plea from this committee or from its leadership to cut down the expenses of the Post Office Department which the Hoover Commission recommended could be cut by $140,000,000. No; carry on with the inefficiencies; carry on with an overstaffed pay roll, and then to make up the deficit, whatever it is, add some more taxes.

We are hearing from all over this country that business is hurt; that business is suffering. Mark this well, all of the publication business, your printing business, your newspapers, your small business, your mail-order groups, and all the rest have gone along and set up their business programs for a period of years based on what they thought their postage charges would be. We had a parade of businessmen and groups coming before us and saying to the committee that if you pass this postal-increase bill they are going out of business These are the people we have to call on for $44,000,000,000 worth of income taxes, if we can squeeze it out of them this year. Now, do we want to destroy their budget arrangements on which they hope to make some profit in order to pay part of their tax? Therefore I say to this committee that if we pass this particular bill we have, in effect, levied a tax to cover up the inefficiencies and the subsidies which the Post Office Department indulges in, and therefore I believe this bill should be recommitted.

There is another reason that is more important why it should be recommitted, or of equal importance. While we did have hearings at length on the general subject of rate increases on this particular piece of legislation, we not only did not conduct hearings and give people an opportunity to tell us how badly it was going to hurt them, but when the subcommittees were appointed there was an agreement, after the subcommittee that I served on met, that we would meet with the other subcommittees and see if the raises that were agreed on were out of line with the raises that the other subcommittee agreed on. No such hearing was held. We went into executive session and reported this bill out and, believe me, I am sure that there are members on the committee not really familiar with the provisions of the legislation.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I just want to ask one question for clarification. On the point of periodicals, is it not true that there are two types of charitable periodicals, one for profit and one not for profit, and therefore it is true that those nonprofit periodicals are penalized under the bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Well, I think the gentleman's point is simply this, that where the publication itself is of a charitable nature, while it is profit making, the profits go into a charitable organization.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not true in quite a few instances that this is an increase in postal rates in various categories of 48, 50, and 60 percent, so it is not a small increase?

Mr. CORBETT. It is a very grievous increase which upsets their budgetary plans for the year. I want to say in closing that I believe this committee will be doing the people of America a great favor and will be aiding this committee in its work if it recommits this bill for further consideration and study.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H. R. 2945. It is not anything new for the Post Office Department to have a deficit. It would really be news if the Post Office Department was breaking even, or making money, so I do not believe there is any objection to a moderate deficit in the Post Office Department. It is not intended that this raise or any raise in postal rates cover the money that is expended by the Post Office Department for air-mail subsidies or for Government mail. Our distinguished chairman has pointed out to you already that the total cost in air-mail subsidies and for Government mail is approximately $122,000,000. This increase raises the gross revenue $131,000,000. We have a deficit of $550,000,000. Add to that deficit the raises we have given to the employees this year in the Postal Reclassification Act. Add to that the raises that will probably be voted under H R 87, if and when it comes up, and you will have the deficit in the Post Office Department reaching astronomical figures. It can easily go over a billion dollars a year if we do not do something about it.

You say the answer to that is, let us quit voting these raises, but are you going to do it? If memory serves me correctly, there were only two Members of the House who voted against the postal reclassification bill. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] were the only two who voted against it. So if history repeats itself, we are going to have more pay raises instead of cutting down on them.

Mr. CARROLL. It would be very helpful to those of us who have not yet made up our minds if the gentleman could give us some idea, going back 2 or 3 years, as to what have been the deficits of the Post Office Department. The gentleman says it was $500,000,000 in the last fiscal year.

Mr. HERLONG. That was in the fiscal year 1948. It was $550,000,000. It was about the same in 1949.

Mr. CARROLL. What was it in 1946 and 1947, does the gentleman have any idea?

Mr. HERLONG. I do not have the figures now.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Colorado I may say that in 1946 it was $148,000,000; 1947, $263,000,000; 1948, $308,000,000; and 1949, $551,000,000.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, in the past 5 years it has progressed from $100,000,000 to $500,000,000, and in view of the pay increases the gentleman says

it may approach nearly a billion-dollar deficit.

Mr. HERLONG. It is entirely possible; yes.

Mr. CARROLL. The bill now before this body, as I understood the remarks of the gentleman from California, by the raises you are attempting to effectuate here asks for only approximately $135,000,000?

Mr. HERLONG. That is right. We have not gone nearly as far as we should have gone.

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

Mr. HERLONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. May I say to the gentleman from Colorado that the figures he was given on the deficit are figures of the Department which do not include the amount of money given in subsidies, penalty, and franked mail, and other things, so that if the cost ascertainment were correct and the charges were allocated where they should be allocated, there would not have been any deficit recorded in a number of those years.

Mr. CARROLL. I am searching for information Is it not a fact that the deficits of the Post Office Department in the last 5 years have progressed from $100,000,000 to $500,000,000?

Mr. CORBETT. The actual recorded deficit which has been made up by appropriation has increased and a great part of that increase is an increase in subsidies and in the use of the postal department for other purposes than delivering the mail.

Mr. CARROLL. If the gentleman will yield further, I was very much impressed by the remarks the gentleman from Pennsylvania made on the question of whether or not we are trying to operate this as a business or as a service. Some of us have the opinion that somewhere in between, while we are making this great decision, there ought to be a balancing-off point. That is why I am a little bit surprised that even here we are only meeting it with $135,000,000.

Mr. HERLONG. I thank the gentleman. I cannot yield further at this time.

I just want to say that any way you look at this thing, it all adds up to a lot of red ink. Actually there is so much red ink over there in the Post Office Department, that I am afraid some people are liable to accuse the Postmaster General of being a Communist, because that is what they say every time they hear the word "red."

Seriously this is a situation that we can do something about. Is the Post Office Department a service institution, or is it a business institution? I think that each one of the Members who has spoken on this bill today is correct in saying that it is a service institution. But there is no reason for its being run on other than a business basis. There is no reason for us to run this deficit up to astronomical figures just because it is a service institution; because if that argument were carried to the extreme, there should be no need to charge anything for any of the postal services but just make them all free services to all the people. I say it was never intended for some of our classes of mail to ever pay their own way. The law requires that some of them, such as parcel post, pay their own way. Now, as to the cost of handling the different classes of mail, I would not be fair with the Members if I did not admit that there was some criticism of the cost-ascertainment system of the Post Office Department in our committee. But let me give you the background on that. The system we use was adopted on February 25, 1925; the Seventy-seventh and the Seventy-eighth Congress each appropriated $50,000 for a further study and revision of the cost-ascertainment system used by the Post Office Department. With that background of effort on the part of the Congress and on the part of the Post Office Department to develop a better cost-ascertainment system, I think in all fairness we must admit that the cost figures we have arrived at under the system which we have, are at least reasonably accurate.

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

Mr. HERLONG. I yield.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made the point that in the event the Hoover Commission recommendations were adopted by the Post Office Department some one hundred millions of dollars would be saved through operating efficiencies. Can the gentleman inform us whether, even in the event those operating efficiencies were undertaken by the Post Office Department and resulted in that saving, would not the sum total of that saving, plus the amount of increases on these rates still be less than the deficit?

Mr. HERLONG. The gentleman is entirely correct.

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

Mr. HERLONG. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made a very good observation. I would like to have information from him or from some member of the committee. The question is how much of the subsidies that are given to the airlines and other groups are now included in the $500,000,000 deficit.

Mr. HERLONG. Fifty million dollars a year.

Mr. CARROLL. Is that all of the subsidy?

Mr. HERLONG. That is the air-line subsidy.

Mr. CARROLL. How about the other subsidies?

Mr. HERLONG. Can the gentleman from California give us a figure on that?

Mr. MILLER of California. There are a whole series of subsidies. If you mean direct subsidies to the air lines, it is about $60,000,000 a year. This is the situation. We subsidize the railroads. If a car of fruit is shipped from California east, we pay the freight on the car one way. If a car of mail is shipped from Washington to California and there is no back mail, we pay the backhaul on that car. That is a subsidy.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The reason I ask the question, if the gentleman from California will help me out a little further, is this: How much of the subsidies have increased the deficit? The reason for that is this: If it comes as a result of the subsidies obviously we should not load it on some other group. That is why I asked the question.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Under the Kelly law passed by the Congress in 1930, the Postmaster General is required to make a report to the Comptroller General as to the amount of free mail, franked mail, and of subsidies. A report was made on December 9, 1949, and the total cost of the subsidies is $120,118,000. So, taking that off of the deficit, there is still $431,000,000 deficit.

Mr. HERLONG. We have heard a great deal of talk about balancing the budget, and we have heard many people say that we must not spend more money than we take in. I plead guilty to having made that statement and I mean it when I say it. I am one who wants to balance the budget Consistent with that position, I am going to vote for this bill and I urge that you do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

FIRST-CLASS MAIL

SECTION 1. The rate of postage on postal cards (including the cost of their manufacture) and on private mailing or post cards (conforming to the conditions prescribed by the act entitled "An act to amend the postal laws relating to the use of postal cards," approved May 19, 1898 (U S C., title 39, sec. 281)), shall be 2 cents each: *Provided*, That the rate on each portion of double postal cards issued and sold under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1879 (ch 180, 20 Stat. 362; U S. C., title 39, sec. 358), shall be 2 cents.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"FIRST-CLASS MAIL

"SECTION 1. (a) The rate of postage on postal cards (including the cost of their manufacture) and on private mailing or post cards (conforming to the conditions prescribed by the act entitled 'An act to amend the postal laws relating to the use of postal cards,' approved May 19 1898 (U. S C, title 39, sec 281), shall be 2 cents each: *Provided*, That the rate on each portion of double postal cards issued and sold under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1879 (ch 180, 20 Stat. 362; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 358), shall be 2 cents.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (a), the rate of postage on mail matter of the first class when mailed for local delivery, at post offices where free delivery by carrier is not established, and when the matter is not collected or delivered by rural or star route carriers, shall be 2 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof.

"SECOND-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 2. (a) In the case of publications entered as second-class matter (including sample copies to the extent of 10 percent of the weight of copies mailed to subscribers

during the calendar year) when mailed by the publisher thereof from the post office of publication and entry or other post office where such entry is authorized, or when mailed by news agents (registered as such under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General) to actual subscribers thereto or to other news agents for the purpose of sale, the rates of postage per pound or fraction thereof computed on the bulk weight of each mailing and based on the eight postal zones established for fourth-class matter (act of August 24, 1912, U. S. C., title 39, sec. 292), except as otherwise herein provided, shall be as follows:

"(1) The rate of postage on that portion of any such publication devoted to matter other than advertisements shall be 2 cents per pound, or fraction thereof.

"(2) On that portion of any such publication devoted to advertisements the rates per pound or fraction thereof for delivery within the eight postal zones established for fourth-class matter shall be as follows:

"For the first and second zones, 2½ cents.
"For the third zone, 3½ cents.
"For the fourth zone, 4½ cents.
"For the fifth zone, 5½ cents.
"For the sixth zone, 6½ cents.
"For the seventh zone, 8 cents.
"For the eighth zone, 10 cents.

Provided, That publications having over 75 percent advertising in more than one-half of their issues during any 12 months' period shall not be accepted for mailing as second-class matter and their entry shall be revoked.

"(3) The rate of postage on publications in which the space devoted to advertising does not exceed 5 percent of the total space shall be 2 cents per pound.

"(4) The rate of postage on publications maintained by and in the interests of religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, shall be 1½ cents per pound or fraction thereof when mailed for delivery outside the country where published and entered as second-class matter, and the publisher of any such publication, before being entitled to such rate, shall furnish to the Postmaster General, at such times and under such conditions as the Postmaster General may prescribe, satisfactory evidence that none of the net income of such organization or association inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual.

"(5) That in the case of weekly or semiweekly newspapers having a total circulation of not exceeding 5,000 copies and daily newspapers having a total circulation of not exceeding 10,000 copies, the rates of postage shall be the same as authorized by existing law, when mailed for delivery outside the county where published and entered as second-class matter

"The term 'newspaper' as used herein shall include publications issued weekly or more frequently and having the characteristics of publications commonly recognized and referred to as 'newspapers' and which are circulated in the main locally or within a county, State, or corresponding area, and the contents of which publications shall consist in the main of current news, editorials, articles, and items of current interest to the general public and shall not be devoted to a particular trade, industry, occupation, or profession.

"(6) The free-in-county mailing privilege and the rates of postage on copies of publications of the second class when addressed for delivery within the county in which they are published and entered as such shall be the same as authorized by existing law: *Provided, however*, That no copies shall be accepted free of postage when addressed for delivery by rural or star-route carriers: *Provided further*, That copies of a publication mailed at a post office where it is entered, for delivery by letter carriers at a different post office within the delivery limits of which the headquarters or general business office of the publisher is located, shall be chargeable with postage at the rate that would be applicable if the copies were mailed at the latter office, unless postage chargeable at the pound rates from the office of mailing is higher, in which case such higher rates shall apply.

"(7) In no case, except where the free-in-county mailing privilege is applicable, shall the postage on each individually addressed copy be less than one-eighth of 1 cent.

"(8) The rate of postage on copies of publications having second-class entry mailed by others than the publishers or authorized news agents, sample copies mailed by the publishers in excess of the 10-percent allowance entitled to be sent at the pound rates, and copies mailed by the publishers to persons who may not be included in the required legitimate list of subscribers, shall be 2 cents for the first two ounces and 1 cent for each additional two ounces or fraction thereof, except when the postage at the rates prescribed for fourth-class matter is lower, in which case the latter rates shall apply, computed on each individually addressed copy or package of unaddressed copies, and not on the bulk weight of the copies and packages.

"NOTICES TO PUBLISHERS

"SEC. 3. The charge for the notices required by the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes,' approved May 12, 1910, as amended by the act entitled 'An act to provide a postage charge on notices to publishers regarding undeliverable second-class matter,' approved July 21, 1932 (U. S. C., title 39, sec. 277), to be sent to the publishers of publications of the second class concerning copies of such publications which are undeliverable as addressed shall be 4 cents each.

"THIRD-CLASS MAIL

"SEC 4 The rate of postage on third-class matter shall be 2 cents for the first two ounces or fraction thereof, and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof up to and including eight ounces in weight: *Provided*, That upon payment of a fee of $10 for each calendar year or portion thereof and under such regulations as the Postmaster General may establish for the collection of the lawful revenue and for facilitating the handling of such matter in the mails, it shall be lawful to accept for transmission in the mails, separately addressed identical pieces of third-class matter in quantities of not less than 20 pounds, or of not less than 200 pieces, subject to pound rates of postage applicable to the entire bulk mailed at one time: *Provided further*, That the rate of postage on third-class matter mailed in bulk under the foregoing provision shall be 12 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1½ cents, except that in the case of seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants the rate shall be 10 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1 cent: *And provided further*, That pieces or packages of such size or form as to prevent ready facing and tying in bundles and requiring individual distributing throughout shall be subject to a minimum charge of 3 cents each.

"FOURTH CLASS (PARCEL-POST MAIL)

"SEC. 5. (a) On fourth-class matter (not exceeding 72 inches in girth and length combined and limit of weight over 8 ounces to 40 pounds in the first and second zones and 20 pounds in the third to eighth zones) the rate of postage except as herein provided for catalogs (limit of weight over 8 ounces up to and including 10 pounds), shall be by the pound as hereinafter provided, the postage in all cases to be prepaid by stamps affixed thereto or as otherwise prescribed by the Postmaster General.

"(b) The rate of postage on matter of the fourth-class shall be as follows:

"(1) On all matter mailed at the post office from which a rural route starts, for delivery on such route, or mailed at any point on such route for delivery at any other point thereon, or at the office from which the route starts, or on any rural route starting therefrom, and on all matter mailed at a city-carrier office, or at any point within its delivery limits, for delivery by carriers from that office, or at any office for local delivery, the postage shall be 15 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 40 pounds.

"(2) For delivery within the first and second zones, except as provided for in paragraph (1), and except when the distance by the shortest regular mail route from the office of origin to the office of delivery is 300 miles or more in which case the rate of postage shall be the same as for delivery within the third zone, 16 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 2 1/10 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 40 pounds.

"(3) For delivery within the third zone, 16 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 20 pounds.

"(4) For delivery within the fourth zone, 17 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 4½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 20 pounds.

"(5) For delivery within the fifth zone, 19 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 6 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 20 pounds.

"(6) For delivery within the sixth zone, 21 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 7½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 20 pounds.

"(7) For delivery within the seventh zone, 23 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 9½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 20 pounds.

"(8) For delivery within the eighth zone, 25 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 11½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 20 pounds.

"(c) Catalogs and similar printed advertising matter in bound form weighing more than 8 ounces but not exceeding 10 pounds shall be subject to postage rates based on the eight parcel-post zones as follows:

"(1) When mailed at the post office from which a rural route starts, for delivery on such route, or mailed at any point on such route for delivery at any other point thereon, or at the office from which the route starts, or on any rural route starting therefrom, and when mailed at a city-carrier office, or at any point within its delivery limits, for delivery by carriers from that office, or at any office for local delivery, the postage shall be 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound.

"(2) For delivery within the first and second zones, except as provided for in paragraph (1), and except when the distance by the shortest regular mail route from the office of origin to the office of delivery is 300 miles or more in which case the rates of postage shall be the same as for delivery within the third zone, 9 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(3) For delivery within the third zone, 10 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 2½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(4) For delivery within the fourth zone, 11 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(5) For delivery within the fifth zone, 13 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(6) For delivery within the sixth zone, 14 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(7) For delivery within the seventh zone, 15 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 6 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(8) For delivery within the eighth zone, 16 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 7 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"SPECIAL DELIVERY

"SEC. 6. Mail of any class shall be given the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable and immediate delivery at the office of address when, in addition to the regular postage, a special-delivery fee is prepaid thereon by means of special-delivery stamps or ordinary postage stamps, or in such other manner as the Postmaster General may prescribe, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than 2 pounds, if of the first class, 20 cents; if of any other class, 30 cents. Matter weighing more than 2 but not more than 10 pounds, if of the first class, 30 cents; if of any other class, 40 cents. Matter weighing more than 10 pounds, if of the first class, 40 cents; if of any other class, 50 cents.

"POSTAL NOTES

"SEC. 7. Subsection (a) of section 207 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for permanent postal rates and to provide pay increases for Government employees,' approved July 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 1264), is hereby amended by deleting the sentence reading 'The fee for issuance thereof shall be 8 cents each' and by inserting in lieu thereof a sentence to read as follows: 'The fee for issuance thereof (postal notes) shall be 10 cents each.'

"NOTICES CONCERNING UNDELIVERABLE THIRD- AND FOURTH-CLASS MATTER

"SEC. 8. The charge for the notice furnished to the sender of ordinary mail of the third and fourth classes, pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, when the matter is not deliverable as addressed, shall be 5 cents.

"REGISTERED MAIL

"SEC. 9. (a) Mail matter shall be registered on the application of the party posting the same. The registry fees, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this subsection, shall be as follows: For articles having no intrinsic value and for which no indemnity is payable, 27 cents; for registry indemnity not exceeding $5, 30 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $25, 40 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50, 45 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $75, 55 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $75 but not exceeding $100, 65 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200, 80 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $300, 95 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $300 but not exceeding $400, $1.10; for registry indemnity exceeding $400 but not exceeding $500, $1.25; for registry indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $600, $1.35; for registry indemnity exceeding $600 but not exceeding $700, $1.45; for registry indemnity exceeding $700 but not exceeding $800, $1.55; for registry indemnity exceeding $800 but not exceeding $900, $1.65; for registry indemnity exceeding $900 but not exceeding $1,000, $1.75: *Provided*, That for registered mail having a declared value in excess of $25 a registry fee of not less than 45 cents shall be paid.

"(b) For registered mail or insured mail treated as registered mail having a declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the registry or insurance fee paid there shall be charged additional fees (surcharges): *Provided*, That for registered mail or insured mail treated as registered mail handled at less than the maximum risk the Postmaster General may fix by rules the rates at less than 100 percent of the declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the registry or insurance fee paid. The additional fees (surcharges) shall be as follows:

"When (a) the declared value, or (b) the amount based on less than 100 percent of the declared value of registered mail or insured mail treated as registered mail handled at less than the maximum risk at the rates fixed by rules prescribed by the Postmaster General exceeds the maximum idemnity covered by the registry or insurance fee paid—

	Cents
"By not more than $50	2
"By more than $50 but not more than $100	8
"By more than $100 but not more than $200	4
"By more than $200 but not more than $400	6
"By more than $400 but not more than $600	7
"By more than $600 but less than $800	8
"By more than $800 but less than $1,000	10

"If (a) the declared value, or (b) the amount based on less than 100 percent of the declared value of registered mail or insured mail treated as registered mail handled at less than the maximum risk at the rates fixed by rules prescribed by the Postmaster General exceeds the maximum indemnity covered by the registry or insurance fee paid by $1,000 or more, the additional fees for each $1,000 or part of $1,000 on articles destined to points within the several zones applicable to fourth-class matter shall be as follows:

	Cents
"For local delivery or for delivery within the first zone	11
"For deliverey within the second zone	12
"For delivery within the third zone	14
"For delivery within the fourth zone	15
"For delivery within the fifth or sixth zones	16
"For delivery within the seventh or eighth zones	18

"FEES FOR INSURED MAIL

"SEC. 10. The fees for insurance, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this section, shall be as follows: 5 cents for indemnification not exceeding $5; 10 cents for indemnification exceeding $5 but not exceeding $10; 15 cents for indemnification exceeding $10 but not exceeding $25; 20 cents for indemnification exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 30 cents for indemnification exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 35 cents for indemnification exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200.

"FEES FOR COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

"SEC. 11. The fees for collect-on-delivery service for sealed domestic mail matter of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate and for domestic third- or fourth-class mail matter shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be as follows: 25 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $5; 35 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $10; 40 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $10 but not exceeding $25; 50 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 60 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 70 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $150; and 80 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $150 but not exceeding $200.

"REGISTERED COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

"SEC. 12. (a) The fees for collect-on-delivery service for registered sealed domestic mail of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be 65 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $10; 85 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $10 but not exceeding $50; $1.10 for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; and $1.25 for collections and indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200. The maximum amount of charges collectible on any registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery article shall be $200.

"(b) When indemnity in excess of $200 is desired, the fees for such registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery mail shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be $1.50 for indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $500; $1.90 for indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $1,000.

"CERTIFICATES OF MAILING

"SEC. 13. Upon request and payment of a fee of 3 cents for each article described, the sender shall be issued a certificate as evidence of the mailing of ordinary mail of any class, or copy of the receipt issued as evidence of the mailing of registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail: *Provided*, That the sender shall, upon request and payment of an additional fee of 1 cent for each article described, be issued copies of certificates for ordinary mail, or additional copies of receipts for registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail.

"SEC. 14. All existing laws or portions thereof, inconsistent or in conflict with this act, are hereby amended or repealed.

"SEC. 15. This act shall take effect on the first day of the third calendar month following the calendar month in which it is enacted, except the rates herein provided for second-class mail shall take effect on the first day of the second quarter beginning after the approval of this act."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the bill and that it be open to amendment at any point.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I object. I think the Members should read this bill and know what is in it.

(The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.)

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, of New York: On page 1, line 1, strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to get recognition on this bill for some time. I want to deal with some phases of it which I think are worth while and which we should all consider carefully. In the first place we have labored for 5 weeks in this session of the Congress, and there has been nothing but procrastinating tactics indulged in until today. We are

victims of filibuster by points of no quorum. Then we are presented with this bill and it is rammed down our throats without an opportunity to consider it.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman mean including today?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have not noticed very many delaying tactics on the floor today. We seem to be proceeding a little too fast. In fact, this measure is being rammed through.

Mr. CHURCH. This bill is being rushed through.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will agree with the gentleman from that standpoint.

This bill also includes the doubling of the penny postcard rate and although my statement was met with loud guffaws on the floor at a time previously when I talked about it, I still feel taking this action is a drastic mistake. The general public ought to be able to send a postcard for a penny instead of being charged two cents.

Furthermore, I think the gentleman from Minnesota and his minority group are deserving of the highest praise for their submission of their report which is valuable, indeed, to the consideration of this bill. I, for one, am going to join him and others along with him in voting against this bill because I think it ought to be defeated. I think the penny postcard increase is a stab in the back to the public, but that is only a part of it. The rate on the penny postcard should certainly never be raised to 2 cents by the Congress. The Congress should not permit it.

I think that the other proposals in this bill are wrong to a considerable degree.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. REES. I assume the gentleman has very carefully read the majority report as well as the minority report and that he is quite familiar with all of the details. Is that correct?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is correct

Mr. REES. With respect to second-class mail, what is the problem there which seems to disturb the gentleman from New York? Let us just have that for the record so that we will know how he feels about it, because I know the House is anxious to know his views with respect to each particular feature of this legislation.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Since the gentleman has asked me that question point-blank, I will say that I have been criticized by some newspapers for abusing the franking privileges. I took them to task in answer to that and found that I had sent out in 1949 about a ton and a half of free mail. I observe some of the Members are mirthful. That ton and a half of free mail is the average for a Congressman. We are all in this thing together, if you would like to know.

I went through the Post Office reports and I found that one of the same newspapers which jumped on me for abusing the franking privilege, shipped 225 tons of free mail in the same period of time. I think the average Member of Congress ought to be able to enjoy a ton and a half as against such a fantastic abuse of free mails.

Mr. REES. How does the gentleman feel about the third-class mail?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. So it seems to me that we have a lot of things to consider in this bill. It seems to me we ought to take our time to carefully consider the raising of these rates and when it comes to doubling the rate on the penny post card and putting it on the shoulders of the general public we ought to stop, look, and listen.

Mr. REES. But the gentleman's motion would strike the entire bill out and that would be the end of it; so far as he is concerned, is that the way he feels about it?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman recognizes that I have had quite a lot of competition here and I have been trying to be heard on this bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I understand the gentleman is not seeking seriously to have his amendment adopted to strike out everything after the enacting clause, but he merely wanted to get 5 minutes' time to speak, is that it?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is being facetious. I will inform the gentleman that I am going to vote against his bill. I can tell him that.

I can also tell him that in some instances his bill does not go far enough. Some of the daily newspapers have delighted in harpooning me for using my legal and proper right of franking messages and mail the length and breadth of my district. Much to my amazement, I find these newspapers are using free mail to a much greater extent than I could if I stayed in Congress 50 years.

I find that these newspapers in question overlook this brazen abuse they impose upon the taxpayers. How can they have the gall to find fault with a Member of Congress in the limited amount of franking he does, while they enjoy unfathomable license to free mail?

This bill, therefore, is not tough enough. There should be twenty times more penalty on these newspapers than is here imposed.

People who live in glass houses should not throw stones. These newspapers had better soft-pedal trying to put me in wrong with the folks back home for doing something they are far more guilty of doing. They are way out on a shaky limb.

As for me, you may be sure I am going to town with a real franking program. It is my legal right, and I expect to serve the people of my district just as long as they want me to with a lot of messages, letters, data and answers for their benefit and mine.

I repeat, people who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The question recurs on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be again reported.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the preferential motion.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Was that motion in order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not have to pass upon that question at this time. The parliamentary inquiry comes at an improper time.

Mr. MICHENER. I was just thinking of the precedents.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAGEN) there were—ayes 23, noes 86.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: On page 22, line 3, strike out the word "country" and insert in lieu thereof the word "county."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is just a correcting amendment, changing the word "country" to "county."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: On page 22, line 11, strike out the words "weekly or semiweekly" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "weekly, semiweekly, or triweekly."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee to the committee amendment: On page 25, line 12, strike out "12 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "14 cents."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAGEN) there were—ayes 76, noes 21.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. A quorum is not necessary to vote in the Committee of the Whole and a vote in the Committee of the Whole cannot be forced by a point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Mississippi that the rules require a quorum of a hundred in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RANKIN. But the gentleman objected to the vote on the ground there was no quorum present.

Mr. HAGEN. There was not a quorum present as disclosed by the announcement of the vote.

Mr. RANKIN. It is all right to make a point of no quorum; that is one thing; but to object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present is something else.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-six Members are present, a quorum.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee to the committee amendment:

Page 26, line 1, insert after the words "eighth zones" a semicolon and the following: "except that in the case of parcels (1) mailed at any post office or on any rural or star route for delivery at any third- or fourth-class post office or for delivery by any rural or star route carrier, or (2) mailed at any third- or fourth-class post office or on any rural or star route, the limit of size shall be 100 inches of girth and length combined and the limit of weight shall be over 8 ounces to 70 pounds"

Page 26, line 18, and page 27, line 2, strike out the words "up to and including 40 pounds"

Page 27, lines 5, 8 and 9, 12, 15 and 16, 19 and 20, and 23 and 24, strike out the words "up to and including 20 pounds"

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I mentioned briefly during general debate on this bill. This amendment would continue the present maximum weight of 70 pounds and the present size limit of combined length and girth of 100 inches on all parcels sent to or from a rural delivery route from any office, first, second, third, or fourth class. This, therefore, takes care of those residing on rural routes anywhere; and it also provides that the same weight and size limitations shall apply to parcels sent to or from the small post offices, the third- and fourth-class offices. I am sure the Members have received more mail on this one matter than anything else in the bill, and I believe there is no objection to the amendment.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Will this in any way change the rate on parcel post?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Yes. There is a small increase in parcel post. The objection is not to the increase; the objection is to the reduction in the weight and size limit on rural deliveries.

Mr. DONDERO. I may say that last year when the Commissioner of Public Buildings came before the Public Works Committee he said that the Post Office Department could operate with its present physical facilities if it was not for the parcel post.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am for this amendment and I shall support this bill unless there are some very bad changes made in it.

The railroads of this country are continually having to discontinue railroad service, which means that the train cars do not carry tonnage for the post office or for the people generally. So if the trains do not run by reason of a shortage of coal or otherwise, where passenger trains are eliminated as a result of the competition of busses and airplanes, touring cars, and so forth, certainly the express packages will not be delivered to the destination point by rail.

There is considerable involved in this whole situation as evidenced by letters we have received from employees of the Railway Express Agency. They take the position that the Congress has been supporting a situation where employees of the express agency have to subsidize, through the payment of taxes, tonnage moved through the mails for the accommodation of farmers and others at less than the handling cost. I can understand that kind of an argument very well. I replied to some of my friends who work for the express agency that based upon my limited knowledge of handling tonnage over the rails and over land, there is no way the express agency can give this service to people who live out in the country.

I have a direct case which happened only last week. Driving in from my farm out here I picked up an elderly lady who was walking along the highway with a little fellow about 3 years of age. I asked her where she was going. She said, "I am going to the express office." She got in the front seat of the car with me and I opened up the conversation. I found she was the mother of 13 children and that this was the youngest child. This lady lives out beyond Oxon Hill. Her son had sent her an express package instead of sending it by parcel post. She lives 9 miles from the express agency over here back of the Union Station. She has to make an 18-mile trip to get the package. She has no bus service on the road on which she lives; so it is bum a ride or walk to the end of the bus line. The Yellow Bus Co. does not want to serve the people out in that section of Maryland.

I use that as an illustration of what can happen all over the United States if we legislate in such a manner that large packages cannot be delivered at the rural delivery box in the farm areas.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of every person paying his direct cost in transportation. I do not care whether it is a newspaper publisher or the farmer or the shipper of packages that move through the mail or otherwise. Let them pay those direct costs as best they can be determined. I do not want one group of shippers or one group of people to subsidize at a low freight rate or carrying rate a shipment of goods by reason of the rate differential that applies. In other words, if you ship sugar, let us have sugar carry its full traffic cost. If you ship potatoes, let potatoes carry its share, steel carry its share, cotton carry its share, peanuts carry its share, and so on down the line. But do not ship peanuts below cost, then make the freight rate so high on some other item that the fellow who ships the other item will subsidize the movement of peanuts. Do not ship mail packages at so low a cost that somebody else has to subsidize that cost. That is the point I am making.

Here is the situation where, as I understand the chairman, he brings this bill into conformance with present law with respect to the size of the package and the weight of the package, and if that is what this amendment does, I am for it, because I want those people to be able to receive those packages at the rural-delivery box so that they do not have to get into a car and drive 15 miles or 30 miles or perhaps 80 miles round trip in order to get a piece of merchandise at the express agency. That would force an over-all cost that would be prohibitive.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to make an inquiry of the chairman of the great Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. Inasmuch as I have had a great many telegrams and letters from operators of chicken hatcheries in Connecticut complaining about this particular phase of H. R. 2945, I would like to ask the chairman if his amendment would provide for the continuation of the shipment of baby chicks in like containers through the mails as used heretofore.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. It would, I will say to the gentleman from Connecticut. Last week I explained the amendment to the head of the Hatchery Association, and he said he believed it would take care of their case.

Mr. SADLAK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to say a few words regarding the committee. I had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for 4 years, and have a very high regard for the members of that committee. I am sure they have done a conscientious job in bringing before us a bill to produce some additional revenue that is badly needed in the Post Office Department and without doing any harm to the users of the mails or making them pay too much for the service they get. I am strongly in favor of the pending amendment and endorse what the gentleman from Michigan said that these people who live in rural areas need the parcel post as is, with its larger packages, to meet a very real need of theirs.

But, there is no excuse, there is no justification for turning the Post Office Department into a freight and express agency in competition with the existing private agencies on the basis of subsidizing the shipment of large packages at public expense. It was my privilege, during my service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to spend a day at Dallas, one of the largest post offices in our section of the country. I went down to the terminal station in the

afternoon as the great trucks that serve the mail-order houses and others that make shipments of parcel post from Dallas lined up for blocks to unload their packages. At that time an average of 29 carloads of parcel post were leaving Dallas each day, with the people of this country paying a subsidy, as it were, for every package of it, since the postage charged was far less than the cost of transportation and handling.

From time to time we have heard lots of criticism of the Post Office Department because of the deficit it incurs. I know of no more conscientious or able official of this Government than Postmaster General Jesse Donaldson. I know how he has worked, and how much he wants to see that deficit brought down. But, how many of our Members have taken the time to reflect that the Postmaster General controls less than 5 percent of anything down there that may affect it. Congress fixes the postal income by fixing postal rates. Congress fixes the outgo to a large extent by setting the salaries of the Department employees. Not only that, but we subsidize railway mail service in the form of extra payment by the Department. We subsidize air mail by extra payment by the Department. We subsidize ocean-going mail in the same way. When I was a member of the committee we had up the question of subsidizing mail service to the Aleutian Islands in order to help a little steamship company to operate, a service that was absolutely essential to preserving our communications in the interest of national defense. The ship could not operate without the subsidy and operation of the ship was necessary to supply the small settlements throughout the area.

Again, the Post Office Department maintains and is the custodian of the Federal buildings. It furnishes free space to field personnel of other departments of the Government, even furnishes the equipment, in some instances the supplies they use, and heat, light, and other services, as well as to all of the agency representatives in those buildings. That, too, is a charge to the Post Office Department. So it goes.

Now, then, my colleagues, there is one other thought. It has to supply and does supply free mail service for the official mail of every official in this Government, including the Congress.

Some object that we ought to have the post office on a self-sustaining basis. My own idea about it is, and the Postmaster General estimates, that about $150,000,000 a year in the form of subsidies, free services, and so forth, is in the interest of the general public, like those I have mentioned, and of the mail service of the departments of the Government. There is no use taking money out of one pocket and putting it in the other. There are also subsidies in the form of cheap postage rates that we give to such things as newspapers, periodicals, and religious publications, in the interest of the dissemination of public knowledge, information, and culture. Those ought not to be paid for by the stamp-lickers, the mail users. That ought to be paid out of the Treasury and shared by all of the people. So if we could reduce the deficit of the Post Office Department through postage rates to the point where it would be down to $150,000,000 a year, it would be a good thing, and that is a good target to shoot at, since the mail users would then be paying the cost of the service received.

I do not approve all the individual rates proposed in this bill. Perhaps if each one of us had been writing them all we would have changed them somewhat. On the whole, however, I want to compliment the committee on bringing out this bill.

In any case, those who have seen fit to criticize Postmaster General Donaldson in the past because of the deficit in his Department should either vote to increase postal income or hereafter hold their peace on that subject. As I have said, I am not fully satisfied with it, but I feel the committee has done a conscientious job in an effort to render a real public service.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. The change in the bill proposed by the chairman does eliminate some of the objections to the bill. But get this interesting fact: Here, where an important part of the postal deficit comes from providing rural services, the group comes before us saying they want to cut the deficit somewhat, then they propose that you raise the weight limitations and the size limitations in the area where the loss through handling it is greater.

It seems to me that when we are talking about the pressure groups that we remember that we are penalizing the urban folks to provide more for the rural folks. We might just as well face it frankly.

I wish the gentleman's amendment had gone all the way and simply brought the limitations back to where they now are in regard to size and weight. Certainly, if the idea is to get more revenue, why have they put a restriction on the size and weight? By their action they have definitely eliminated business which does come to the post office.

Of course, here we have another example. None of us are entirely familiar with this amendment and how it fits into the exact language of the bill. I believe in this very hurried last-minute concession we simply see more evidence of why the committee ought to return to its room and do this job over again.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I was much impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I had in my office the other day a committee who spoke to me about this bill. I inquired just how this bill would affect urban and rural areas regarding parcel post service. Therefore I ask the chairman of the committee, or some other member of the committee to give me information with respect to that very point. Whether or not the city people, the urban areas, would be bearing an undue proportion of the load. We know we are giving relief to rural areas. Personally I think they ought to have this relief because they do not have the transportation facilities to properly serve them. Now, if the chairman will answer the question: How much of the parcel post, in the terms of 70 pounds, is being used by urban areas? Do we have any information on that?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The Post Office Department has no break-down on that, but it does have statistics to show that just a litle over 1 percent of all the parcels mailed weigh over 50 pounds.

Mr. CARROLL. I also was informed that many thousands of employees of the Railway Express Co. have been dropped from employment due to the fact that certain business groups are using the parcel post insteal of the railway express service for the handling of packages which clearly ought to be carried as freight or express. That is to say, there is an increasing tendency on the part of businessmen to use parcel post rather than the railway express service. What is the reason for this?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. I do not think it is intended that the Post Office Department should be in the express business.

But on account of the great disparity between the rates on parcel post and the express rates, the Post Office Department today is in the express business on a gigantic scale, and many of your large mail-order houses and merchants are using the Post Office Department for that purpose to send parcel post.

I think we should cut down on the size and weight of parcels going to the cities which have express service.

Mr. CARROLL. I was led to believe by this committee that the Postmaster General does want a restriction placed upon the size and weight of parcel post because he believes his Department was being used too much for freight business. Was there such evidence before your committee?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct. The Postmaster General said their facilities were being overtaxed by these parcels and that there should be a reduction in the weight and size of these parcels.

Mr. CARROLL. Then the real purpose of the gentleman's amendment is to give adequate relief to those in the rural areas who do not have railway express facilities?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct; and also in the small towns with fourth- and third-class post offices where they do not have express service.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it your contention that those who live in the urban areas use this 70-pound limit to the extent of only about 1 percent?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. What will your amendment do to those who live in the urban areas so far as the weight and size of the packages are concerned?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The bill provides for parcels sent to the first and second zones, that the limit shall be 40 pounds, and the size or girth 72 inches.

For parcels going to the other zones, that is zone 3 to zone 8, the limit shall be 20 pounds and the length or size or girth 72 inches.

Mr. CARROLL. Have you had any objection or resistance from small business groups in these urban areas to this provision by your amendment to the bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. None at all. The objection is all by the large mail-order houses.

Mr. CORBETT. Today is the very first that we have heard of it. I would like to call the attention of the committee, if I may, to the fact that at the time that the parcel post was established, it was decreed as part of the law that if the revenue fell below the cost of handling the Postmaster General should adjust the rates, and up until now he has failed to do so. One reason is, as he stated before the committee, that he was not going to take the responsibility for raising the rates in the rural regions which this bill does, regardless of what the bill does with reference to the size, and so forth, of the packages.

Mr. CARROLL. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania this question: Is it true that the Postmaster General in his testimony before the committee was desirous of getting rid of the freight business in the Post Office Department?

Mr. CORBETT. I cannot answer that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] that this amendment ought to apply to all the postal service.

I certainly agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] that it ought to apply to the people in the rural areas.

I am in favor of extending rural mail routes and rural power lines to every farmhouse they can reach with the draft in time of war.

You can go out and get that man's son or that woman's son with the draft. I have a letter from a widow lady this morning expressing her delight at getting electricity to her house. She said, "My son was in the war."

Yet it has taken years to get a power line to her house.

If you can send out and get those boys to fight every war that is kicked up, or that we get into, surely we can provide them the facilities of modern civilization.

The Post Office Department has one rule that ought to be amended, and so has the Rural Electrification Administration. They require three residents to the mile. Whenever you go to extend a rural route they want three houses to the mile, instead of averaging the entire route. That ought to be changed. If one man is entitled to his mail, they are all entitled to it.

Again, we have States, and I call particular attention to such States as the Dakotas and Montana, and some others, where the houses are few and far between, and because of that limitation many of them are denied the use of the rural mails and also the use of rural electrification. It ought to be extended to all of them.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. The deficit in this class of mail is not nearly so great as the amount of money we have wasted on the potato crop.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, it would not cost half as much as you are getting ready to give Korea.

It would not cost one one-hundredth or one one-thousandth as much as you have poured into the sink holes of foreign countries, that is not appreciated by those people, and instead of bringing about recovery has caused many of them to sit down and wait to be fed out of the pockets of the American taxpayers.

We had better look after the American people first. These people are all Americans. I would like to see this service, as well as rural electrification, extended to every farmhouse, no matter what State or what section of the country it is in. That is what I have been struggling for in my battle for rural electrification. That is what I am struggling for in my battle to extend the rural mail service—take it to every house that you can reach with the draft in times of war, or that the tax collector can find in times of peace.

Let us take it to them all. Then you will be rendering a real service to the American people, and not simply bleeding them to get money to give somebody else.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What you mean by pouring money into the sink holes of Europe is that we are supporting socialistic governments over there?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, I mean Europe, Asia, Africa, Israel, and Japan; the whole field. Israel, in my opinion, is a Soviet satellite country, and many of the other countries we have been financing have gone Socialist if not Communist.

They have contempt for our form of government. Yet we have been financing them at the expense of American taxpayers at a time when we owe more money than all of the rest of the nations of the earth put together.

I say it is time for us to get back home and look out for the American people, who fight the Nation's battles in times of war and sustain its institutions in times of peace.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this particular amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is there any possibility that the gentleman may amend his amendment to provide this same weight and size limitation throughout the service, rather than just for a small portion?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. No. That would kill the whole parcel-post amendment.

Mr. CORBETT. In what way?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service deserves the gratitude of the House for its patient labors on this complex bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] deserves special commendation for the clear and incisive majority report which accompanies the measure.

With the bill and report before me, I want to raise some pertinent questions in regard to them, particularly in regard to second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, and in regard to this talk of deficits. I am getting a little tired of this talk of deficits. These are not deficits in the ordinary sense. Actually they are subsidies for million-dollar corporations.

There should be no misunderstanding of my position. I think this bill should be approved as a careful step in the right direction. It will cut the anticipated $550,000,000 in subsidies by the Post Office by $131,000,000 during the next fiscal year. If the bill were to be defeated or returned to committee, there is a strong likelihood the total subsidy would remain untouched for some time.

I emphasize here, however, that I will support any effort, either here or in a House-Senate conference report, to go still further than the committee in paring subsidies.

My reasoning is direct and plain. I am a firm believer in the human welfare state. I am just as firmly opposed to the corporate welfare state. The present postal rate structure is part of a subrosa corporate welfare state for some of the people who spend most of their time fighting an open, democratic, human welfare state.

While the changes recommended by the committee make a beginning in slicing subsidies and financial aid to the rich, they do not go far enough. If in this session, we can do no more on postal rates than pass this bill, we will have done something. But this ought to be the first in a series of changes designed to put the Post Office back on a paying basis by taking powerful corporate entities off its charity lists.

Let us look at this situation as it is now, as it would be under the bill before us and as it should be as soon as possible.

Most first-class-letter mail provides adequate revenues to meet costs. The average citizen is paying his way.

But it costs 2.6 cents to handle the average penny post card. And, note this, 90 percent of the 3,000,000,000 post cards mailed annually are those used by utilities, business concerns, and advertisers. An increase of post card cost from 1 cent to 2 cents, as proposed in this bill, will

cut the post card deficit from $57,000,000 to $21,000,000. I do not advocate that the Government should lose even $21,000,000 a year on a service primarily for utilities and advertisers permanently, but, at least, we are moving in the right direction.

Second-class mail provides some spectacularly interesting figures. Here is a real hand-out—a hand-out to the bitterest critics of human welfare measures. The Post Office figures that it spent $200,000,000 more in 1949 in handling second-class mail than the second class mailers paid into the Department. The newspaper, magazine, and periodical industry got a $200,000,000 gift from the Government.

One of the largest chunks went to the Luce publishing empire. While Time, Life, and Fortune took pot shots at a welfare state aimed at human well-being and abundance, their publisher got an estimated $11,000,000 subsidy from the Government, from the taxes of you and me and everybody else.

The Luce magazines, together with the next top three magazine groups in order of circulation, profited by the princely total of $34,000,000 in subsidies.

Because of the postal rate structure and the inequities in it which the Nation's publishers have supported all these years, it cost the Post Office Department that much more to deliver the magazines than the publishers paid for the convenience of having them delivered.

Of the whole $200,000,000 deficit in the second-class mail group, this bill would wipe out only $15,000,000. That leaves $185,000,000 to go, and I think some of it ought to go—the more the better.

Third-class mail presents a similar problem. Made up of miscellaneous printing, books, small catalogs, merchandise, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, and plants, all weighing under 8 ounces, it accounted for a $101,000,000 deficit in 1949.

Here only $23,600,000 has been cut, leaving for the future an unhealthy deficit of more than $75,000,000.

Fourth-class mail splits into many subdivisions—parcel post, books, catalogs, and advertising matter weighing between 8 ounces and 10 pounds, and others. I will note only in each group that a deficit now exists; that a substantial deficit will remain if this bill is passed.

The total deficiencies, due almost entirely to subsidies of one kind or another, are $550,000,000, an important sum in this economy year.

Opponents of the measure before you and of further rate increases have argued that the Hoover Commission recommendations on the post office will wipe out the deficiencies without resorting to rate increases.

It should be noted that those who use this cry are those who receive the subsidies, the newspapers and magazines. As a matter of fact, this committee report refutes that claim out of hand. The Hoover Commission report on the post office makes some important contributions and the committee promises us they will develop legislation from them. But in case after case, the actual physical transportation costs alone are more than the postal rates. None of the other handling charges are even considered. The changes suggested by the Commission will be useful, but they do not end the need for cutting subsidies.

There is another major question here, the matter of the policy of this Congress toward small business as compared to big business.

Just as our present postal-rate structure gives huge subsidies to those who do not need them, so it often penalizes small firms which do not get equal subsidies and cannot compete with those who do.

That requires illustration and there are many examples.

Let us look at the daily and weekly newspaper situation in this country, for example.

In the last 20 years the various pressures on small newspapers have cut the number of daily newspapers from 2,700 to 1,700. The number of weeklies has slumped from 12,500 to 10,000 in the same period. The total circulation of all newspapers is up, the number of newspapers down. Why?

Because of the slow steady drive of the big newspapers. Take the Chicago Tribune, for instance, if you can stand it. With the help of the United States mails it sweeps out into a three-State area which it paternally refers to as Chicagoland. And it does it with a pay load of advertising that is matched only by the bulk of advertising in the Luce and Curtis magazines, Life, and the Saturday Evening Post. The Congress sets up postal rates to help disseminate worthwhile reading matter and the American people end up by paying for the mailing of ads telling them they have halitosis.

Because of bulk mailing rates, the large newspapers and magazines can blanket the territories of the smaller with a finished metropolitan product. The diversity of American publications, the right of every community to at least one spokesman, needs protection. Instead, the Congress gives the monopolizers subsidies, giving the advantage to them rather than to those who are in need—small newspapers and magazines.

I note with gratitude that the committee has not increased rates for nonprofit periodicals, weeklies of 5,000 or less paid circulation, and dailies of 10,000 or less. I would suggest that we assist these and newspapers of up to 50,000 circulation even more.

The catalog situation is another case in point. Because the big catalog houses—Montgomery Ward and Sears, Roebuck—have catalogs heavy enough to get into fourth-class mail, they pay relatively much less for mailing than do the small catalog houses which put theirs into third-class mail.

At the present time 5 pounds of small catalogs cost 50 cents to mail, while 5 pounds of large catalogs cost about 14 cents and 5 pounds of newspaper and magazine advertising costs about 7½ cents.

Montgomery Ward and Sears, Roebuck, therefore took advantage of their position to mail 91 percent of the fourth-class catalogs sent out in 1948. They did a sales volume of $3,500,000,000, yet the Government subsidized them millions of dollars in postal rates. Make sense? Not much.

Now, as I said before, the whole business of rate fixing is extremely complex. Suggestions that a quasi-judicial postal-rate-fixing body independent of the post office be established seem to have merit.

But in the meantime, some of the grosser inequities ought to be removed. Above all, we should stop paying subsidies to the industries which are semimonopolizing American business. When you consider the following list of advertising revenues for 1949, it would seem that the American taxpayer might be spared the necessity of paying its freight:

Life	$76,346,727
Saturday Evening Post	59,259,119
Time	23,771,782
Ladies' Home Journal	22,743,526
American Weekly	18,369,671
Collier's	17,064,959
Better Homes and Gardens	16,967,118
This Week	16,780,120
Look	15,064,170
Good Housekeeping	14,883,253
Woman's Home Companion	11,267,552
McCall's	10,737,228
Newsweek	9,783,560
Country Gentleman	8,946,640
Farm Journal	7,880,746
American Home	6,571,360

I think this country can afford a human-welfare state, but I do not think we can afford to go on financing a corporate-welfare state busy with monopolization of American industry, and I think now is the time to stop.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am pleased to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does not the gentleman feel that despite their protests against subsidies the newspapers of this country receive the greatest subsidies in the country as a result of existing postal rates?

Mr. BIEMILLER. The newspapers plus the magazines. The magazines are even bigger offenders, if you will. I repeat what I said a moment ago, that the magazines, despite the tremendous volume of advertising they carry, go through the mail at about 7½ cents for 5 pounds.

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

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I should like to read from an advertisement inserted by Life magazine in the San Francisco Chronicle of Friday, January 20, showing where Life had a total investment by advertisers from January to December of 1949 of $76,364,727. The Saturday Evening Post, $59,259,119, and Time, $23,771,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I can understand the opposition of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] to the Chicago Tribune. That paper has had a very prominent part in cleaning up some of the deplorable conditions existing in years gone by in his State of Wisconsin, notably more recently the Communists in certain labor organizations. So it is no more than natural that he should not like that paper, and its policies.

I do not, however, know what the gentleman's complaint is about the use Sears, Roebuck and Montgomery Ward make of the postal services in distributing their catalogs. What if they do use that service. He is yelling all the time about the big fellows. About big business which provides employment for so many of his constituents. Who profits from Montgomery Ward and Sears, Roebuck sales? Little boys, do they not? Little boys who want to buy 10 cents worth of this, that, or the other. Some farmer's boy might want to buy a jackknife. He has saved a little money. He sends to Sears or Ward and gets an article he otherwise could not buy. He can get it delivered to his home. Farmers by the million buy of either one of these corporations or perhaps of a chick hatchery or a nursery or a seed house. Is that what the gentleman is yelling about? Does he want to deprive the little fellow of his opportunity to purchase to the best advantage? He is always talking about the big fellow. If Sears, Roebuck and Montgomery Ward and other catalog houses do not serve the little fellow, who does? And I do not happen to have any stock in either. I do not know whether the gentleman has. But enough of that.

Mr Chairman, I am sorry the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] is not on the floor. I looked all around for him, but I cannot find him. I want this bill recommitted to the committee, although I am not too optimistic about the vote on this motion. I wanted to discuss with the majority leader the restoration of our two-party government.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] was saying the other day that he believed we ought to have a two-party government. So do I. But that is not what the majority is now permitting us to have. I want to say to the gentleman on this side of the aisle that is why I thought we should have been permitted to talk in our one-minute speeches about our attempt to reestablish a two-party government out there at Uline Arena the other day when more than 12,000 good citizens expressed their disapproval of the present administration. All the little fellows were there. The big boys were over at the Shoreham meeting the Veep and his bride. There were so many there some 2,000 had to sit on the floor.

The majority leader says, "Yes; let us have a two-party government." But we do not get it in committee. Let me give you this example: The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has 18 members on the majority side. The Republicans have 7 members. Last year they gave us some committee assignments, and at that time, under the suggestion of the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the minority was permitted to name its own minority members of those subcommittees. We did. But what happened this session? Well, the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], comes along and he just reshuffles one of those committees. The Republicans had its members on five subcommittees and one minority member was by the minority placed on three subcommittees. I am not finding fault with that. Here is what I am finding fault with: I am a member of the minority. What does the chairman of the committee do to me? I am ranking minority member of the committee; I was ranking member on a subcommittee; and the first thing I learn this morning, after getting a notice from the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], to attend a subcommittee meeting this morning, is that I am not on that committee any more. I spent some time getting ready for the subcommittee hearing, and I went up to the hearing room, but I find that I am not on that committee any more. The chairman removed me. It was not the minority who made that decision, nor do I believe the action was taken by the committee. I was the ranking man on that subcommittee on the minority side. [Applause.] I thank you gentlemen of the left for that applause on behalf of the left. More often I get the raspberry from some of you. You know, that is quite agreeable to me. It is encouraging to me that you have at last recognized the fact that there should be a two-party government and that the majority will follow the long-established procedure in the selection of committee and subcommittee members.

I am bringing this to the attention of the House, not with any hope for relief, because I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, will set the chairman of the committee right when he can get to him, but, you see, when the gentleman talks about a two-party government I wish to be certain that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is made aware of the situation. Apparently what they are doing to us—you are doing it to us in this committee, anyway—is that you are giving us a two-party government but you are running both parties—selecting not only your committee members but naming the committee members for the minority. That is not two-party government.

The majority is telling the minority what to do and what places we can hold and who is to hold those places. Now, that is not two-party procedure. That is the practice of a dictator.

Now I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment to the committee amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

Page 35, after line 12, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 14. (a) The Postmaster General is authorized to prescribe by regulation from time to time the fees which shall be charged by the postal service—

"(1) for the registry of mail matter;

"(2) for securing a signed receipt upon the delivery of registered mail matter and returning such receipt to sender;

"(3) for the insurance of mail matter, or other indemnification of senders thereof for articles damaged or lost;

"(4) for collect-on-delivery service;

"(5) for special-delivery service;

"(6) for special-handling service;

"(7) for the issuance of money orders and for the issuance of postal notes;

"(8) for notice to publishers of undeliverable second-class mail;

"(9) for notice of change of address; and

"(10) for certificate of mailing.

"(b) Regulations issued by the Postmaster General under subsection (a) shall, to the extent prescribed therein, supersede existing laws, regulations, and orders governing the fees for the services covered thereby."

Page 35, line 13, strike out "SEC. 14" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 15."

Page 35, line 16, strike out "SEC. 15" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 16."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there will be opposition to this amendment to the committee amendment, because the members of our committee who have been in opposition to this bill in filing their minority report said this:

While the position of the minority is that the Postmaster General should be able to set the rates on special services himself—

The minority endorse this amendment.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I think we can save time and expedite matters. I think it ought to be made clear to the Congress that in taking this particular procedure to turn over the rate-making power of the Congress on these special items to the Postmaster General, it is a new departure which a majority of the minority did approve, and I think with that one statement that some of us feel that this experiment will have to be watched carefully. I think it is only necessary that we do emphasize that now the power of the Congress over these particular rates will be transferred to the Postmaster General.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I might say that this amendment is in line with the recommendation of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, and I am sure the amendment is pleasing to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

In all fairness, the Postmaster General ought to set the rates for special services—like special delivery, money orders, postal notes, collect on delivery, and insured mail. Congress has no business to try to fix those rates. Let us continue to control the rates on first-, second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, but give the right to fix rates on special services which should be self-supporting to the Postmaster General, who is one of the finest officials I have ever known. I have known Jess Donaldson since 1933. We were together in the Post Office Department from 1933 to 1942. He has been in the service over 40 years. Today we have, in my opinion, the most capable, most versatile, and most accomplished Postmaster General we have ever had. He knows every angle of the postal service. We are fortunate to have a man like Jesse Donaldson as Postmaster General.

I also want to pay tribute to his chief assistant, Deputy Postmaster General Vincent Burke, who has served in many capacities in the Post Office Department. He was formerly postmaster of the District of Columbia. He has been in the postal service over 40 years.

You can rest assured that as long as Jesse Donaldson as Postmaster General and Vincent C. Burke as Deputy Postmaster General are at the head of the Department it is going to be run efficiently and economically.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. If the gentleman's philosophy is adopted, then we can hold somebody responsible for these things—something that we cannot do now.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I expect to support this amendment because I believe it is a step in the right direction. I wish the great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service would put into effect the other Hoover Commission recommendations.

It seems to me that, to boil down the problem before us, we have two or three questions we must pass upon in connection with this legislation. First of all, do we want to vote a general rate increase measure before we attempt to put into effect all of the recommendations and findings of the Hoover Commission to obtain real efficiency and economy in the operation of the Post Office Department.

It is rather difficult for me to understand how anyone can tell what postal rates should be increased until we know what it actually costs to operate the Post Office Department.

Then I think we also must pass upon the general question as to whether or not we want to make the Post Office Department entirely self-supporting, the only self-supporting agency in the Federal Government. Eighty percent of the cost of the Department of Agriculture, which is for the benefit of the farmers of this Nation, is paid out of the general revenue funds of the Nation; a similar situation exists as to the Labor Department, which aids labor, and the Department of Commerce, established to help business, and so forth, in their departments and agencies of the Government.

Finally we may have to try to decide what the postal rates should be, and whether we can place such rates at figures much higher without reaching the point of diminishing returns. I remember when we raised the rates on air mail so high that instead of taking in more money from air-mail services we took in less. So we may find that regardless of what we want to do we cannot charge enough in the postal rates to make the Post Office Department self-supporting.

However, I want to mention two or three other reasons why I think I will have to vote against this bill. I do not believe any individual in this House who is against discrimination can support this measure, because this is a discriminatory bill. It does not affect me and my newspapers; instead, it discriminates in favor of my newspapers against the larger publishers. For instance, if a paper has more than 10,000 circulation it has to pay a higher rate of postage than a paper that has 9,500 circulation. That just does not make sense.

It discriminates in favor of air lines, ships, and other transportation agencies by giving them large subsidies.

Then, it discriminates against private enterprise. It gives one postal rate to fraternal, religious, and other types of publications which are not for profit, and provides an entirely different rate on any exactly similar publication operated for profit. So it discriminates against private enterprise.

It discriminates also against deficits. That is something I think we should pay attention to. Seemingly you say we must not have a deficit in the Post Office Department, but it is perfectly all right, and a splendid economic policy to have a great deficit in the general operation of the Government of five or six billion dollars a year. So this is a discriminatory bill to my point of view. It discriminates against the farmer in many instances. It discriminates against the city man in other instances. As I read this bill, and if you will take just one second to read the measure you will find out, almost every section of the bill discriminates against someone. I think I know why. It discriminates for the same reason that some of these amendments have been offered on the floor, and you who favor this bill, are trying to say, "Well, we will discriminate in favor of this particular group of publishers, or in favor of this particular group of mail users in order to get their support, or in order to pacify their opposition, so that they will not have their Representative vote against the bill."

In other words, this is practical politics, gentlemen. This bill is being written and rewritten and changed on the floor so much that I am not sure many of us understand what is now in it in order to try to get enough votes to finally pass it. I think if we would follow in the House the same procedure that was followed in the other legislative body across the way and send this bill to the committee to work it over after the proper steps have been taken to put into effect all the efficiencies and economies recommended by the Hoover Commission for the Post Office Department, we might be able to support a measure such as this in the finality.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has worked assiduously to try to put into effect some of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and has done a fairly good job.

We have worked and put in recommendation No. 1, that the Postmaster General should remain a Cabinet officer appointed by the President. There has been put into effect No. 2, relative to the Director of Posts, only we call him the Deputy Postmaster General. We have gone through with other of these recommendations. We are presently working in this bill on recommendation No. 6. We have enacted a law at this session of Congress setting up the Division of Research and Development in the Post Office Department, something that is very badly needed, and carrying through with this particular bill we are following another recommendation of the committee. Let me again cite to you that this is a complex problem and that these recommendations of the Hoover Commission, which are good, should be put into effect.

But until the time that such recommendations can be put into effect, the task-force report on the Post Office of the Hoover Commission says:

> In the meantime, however, necessary revisions of rates should not be postponed.

This has never been said to be the final word on the revision of rates. It is the first step on the revision of rates and is in direct harmony and consonance with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Recommendation No. 9 of the Hoover Commission, as it applied to the Post Office, would separate subsidies from compensation for carrying air mail. If this bill was reported out of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, it would mean a $60,000,000 difference in the deficit of the Post Office, where it does not belong, and place it in another part of the Government and the Hoover Commission recommended that. I hope that committee will report the bill out.

Mr. MILLER of California. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to propound a couple of questions to the chairman of the committee or some member of the committee.

I was much impressed with the final remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] about the lack of consideration which this measure has received. This is a very technical subject. It is almost as difficult to understand as the cotton or peanut program, when a Member has not had the benefit of study of the subject on a committee. I would like to know whether there were, in fact, hearings on this measure now before us, or were the hearings on the original H. R. 2945, which is quite different from the measure that is before us now? Could the chairman enlighten us on that question?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Hearings were held on postal-rate legislation as proposed by the Postmaster General for 4 months last year. Hundreds of witnesses appeared before the committee. As a result of those extensive hearings the committee reported out this bill. I have here two volumes of hearings that were held the past year. The year before the committee held similar extensive hearings. In fact, I have been a member of that committee since 1943, and I have been working day and night on these matters.

Mr. KEATING. I am aware that there were hearings on a measure, and I appeared there to present views, some of which, I am happy to note, have been adopted by the committee, but my understanding is that hearing was held on H. R. 2945, and was not on the bill that is before us today.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. H. R. 2945 is the bill upon which hearings were held, which bill was sponsored by the Postmaster General. This amendment is a committee amendment to that bill.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate it is in form a committee amendment, but it is an entirely new piece of legislation amounting to 16 pages on an extremely technical subject. It seems to me we ought to have this matter considered more thoroughly by the committee that is familiar with these details, rather than to thrash it out here on the floor of the House. I say that as one who favors at least a part of the provisions in this bill. I am particularly impressed, as was the gentleman from Colorado, with the argument of the employees of the American Railway Express Co., that they are being discriminated against and injured through the subsidy afforded a competitor of the company which employs them. I think they have a justifiable complaint. It is most unfortunate that relief for them is tied up in the same bill with other provisions which are certainly of a questionable character. The legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks in my district has presented to me a very convincing argument on one phase of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a number of amendments have been offered to this bill, and others will be offered. I doubt if all of us fully understand what is in the measure. It must be fixed up with respect to parcel post for the benefit of farmers and we must not paralyze small-town papers. It occurs to me that the pending amendment will very much improve this bill. If I understand the amendment that is before the House at the present time, if adopted, the rates governing the four basic classifications of service, the four classifications of mail, will be fixed by the Congress. But the incidental and technical services will be turned over to the Postmaster General in the matter of fixing rates. Such things as registered mail, special-delivery mail, the service for postal notes, incidental and technical services of that kind, in line with the Hoover Commission recommendation, will be placed with the Postmaster General for the fixing of rates of service. In my opinion, that is a long step forward. I do not believe that this Congress, with 435 Members, can intelligently come to an agreement on fixing rates for these small services, these important and technical services rendered by the Post Office Department.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. REES. Do I understand the gentleman that he would rather have the Post Office Department fix these rates and not submit them to the Congress, or would he not rather have the Post Office Department make recommendations and let the Congress pass on it? How does the gentleman feel with respect to that question?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I would rather have the Congress write the rate, fix the rates for all of the four principal classifications of mail. But there are, incidentally, services in connection with the Post Office Department that I believe can very well be delegated to the Postmaster General. That is my feeling. I believe there are some services that the Postmaster General knows more about handling than do the Members of Congress.

Mr. DONDERO. For example the fees that should be charged in the Postal Savings Division.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is one.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman know what the deficit of the Postal Savings Division runs to now?

Mr. LECOMPTE. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired, all time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: On page 23, line 7, strike out beginning with the word "provided" through and including the colon in line 9.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is no objection to this amendment; it merely provides for a continuance of the present free-in-county rate for publications of that county.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, that was the amendment I had intended offering. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee does not entirely do the job. He strikes out in line 7, on page 23, the words:

Provided, however, That no copies shall be accepted free of postage when addressed for delivery by rural or star-route carriers.

Is not that the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Yes; that is my amendment.

Mr. WITHROW. Further than that, in line 9, on page 23, you will have to strike out the word "further."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is immaterial.

Mr. WITHROW. I talked with counsel about it and he insisted upon it.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. Is it the intent of the gentleman's amendment to restore the right of the small newspaper to the privileges he now has under existing law?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. GOLDEN. And the gentleman believes that his amendment will do that?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Unquestionably so.

Mr. GOLDEN. I believe the amendment is very important and I shall support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: In line 14, page 25, strike out the words and figures "1½ cents" and insert in lieu thereof "1 cent."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, not having used any of the time in general debate on this measure I desire to take this occasion to pay a word of tribute to the distinguished chairman of our committee both for the able and vigorous manner in which he presented this bill today on the floor and also for the fair and complete manner in which hearings were conducted on this bill before the committee.

My amendment is directed to the 1½-cent provision in line 14 on page 25 relating to third-class matter. The bill provides for an increase of ½-cent per piece over the existing rate, that is an increase of 50 percent in the bulk mailing rate per piece of third-class matter.

Third-class matter is that mail matter which includes circulars, miscellaneous printed matter, catalogs and books of 24 pages or more. The various classes of mail and kinds of mail of which third-class matter consists is set out on pages 8 and 9 of the committee report.

All of us are familiar with the fact that many small businesses use this class of

matter to advertise and to bring in business of a mail-order nature. This bill here which increases this rate 50 percent is going to handicap many small businesses very seriously; in fact, I believe it will put some of these small businesses entirely out of business. We ought to consider this particular amendment here and this particular increase very carefully before adding it on.

I intend to vote for the bill on final passage since the amendment was offered by the chairman of the commitee which changes the parcel post provision. But my amendment is a worthy one.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to point out one or two things about the amendment. You have heard the chairman state here, and the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and probably others, that there has been no increase in second-class mail matter since 1879. The gentleman from California in his speech a moment ago said also that this bill is the first step toward revision of rates and that there will be additional revisions from time to time.

This is not the first step in revision of rates on third-class matter. This is the second step. I call attention to the fact that in January 1949 there was an increase in third-class matter which resulted in an increase in revenue to the Post Office Department of $17,000,000. You will find that in the report.

I also call attention to the difference in dealing with forwarders of second-class mail in this bill and in dealing with forwarders of third-class mail. The sponsors have said there has been no increase in second-class rates since 1879. But there was an increase in third-class rates in January 1949, which brought in $17,000,000 additional. The rates that are proposed for second class this year do not bring in that much. They will bring in approximately $15,000,000, according to the figures set forth dealing with second-class matter. Why add a burden of $17,000,000 in 1 year on the small business people, then the next year add $23,000,000 more? I say that is not dealing with them on the same basis that the second-class mail users are dealt with.

This committee report gives a very good explanation of the bill. You will find on page 8 that third-class mail consists annually of 553,000,000 pounds only and that second-class mail, which you will find set forth on page 5, consists of 2,107,000,000 pounds annually. The increase sought for third-class mail is certainly out of proportion when compared with the proposed second-class increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up too much time of the committee because I hope we can soon get a vote on this very important bill.

I must disagree with my good friend and colleague from Georgia, a member of our committee, about his amendment. We did not increase the per piece rate on this bulk mail last year; we only increased the pound rate from 12 to 14 cents and we increased the individual mail rate. That is where the $17,000,000 came from.

Let us see what the position is today with respect to third-class mail. We have a deficit of over $129,000,000 on third-class mail. There are over nine and one-half million pieces of third-class mail sent out a year. Our offices are flooded with this propaganda about third-class mail only paying 1 cent. It is nothing but fair and right that the rate be raised to 1½ cents.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. I object, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment on the Speaker's desk which has a bearing on this amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee applies only to the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers on the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's demand comes rather late, other business having intervened after the announcement by the Chair that the motion had been agreed to.

Mr. CORBETT. I was on my feet, Mr. Chairman, seeking recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was not on his feet demanding tellers to the knowledge of the Chair.

Mr. CORBETT. But I was on my feet seeking recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will proceed.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I am only going to take 2 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, this morning's Washington Post carries a picture of a cargo of potatoes which have been shipped into New Orleans from Canada by boat. Now the question immediately pops into the mind of the average American citizen: "Why import potatoes when we have a tremendous surplus ourselves?" These are not Government potatoes. They were brought in by private traders. The present law pegs the American potato price higher than the Canadian price, so these potatoes have been shipped into this country to seek their highest market.

We would not be importing potatoes now, Mr. Chairman, if the Republican and Farm Bureau dominated coalition in the Congress had not rejected last year the administration sponsored Pace bill which would have allowed the Brannan plan to operate on potatoes. The Brannan plan would have allowed American potatoes to seek their natural market level, and, in view of our big potato surplus, to fall low enough in price to keep the Canadian potatoes out of this country.

The present law on potatoes which the Eightieth Congress wrote forces the Secretary of Agriculture to buy potatoes at the support price, and with no demand for the surplus he can only let them rot or otherwise dispose of them at a loss.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, if the price-support program is to be continued on potatoes, the Brannan plan should be enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired on the pending amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 35, noes 98.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY: On page 22, line 10, insert the following language:

"In the case of any publication devoted to agriculture, and in the case of any religious, educational, or scientific publication designed specifically for use in school classrooms, or in religious instruction classes (to which the rates prescribed by subsec. 4, pp. 21 and 22, are not applicable), the rates of postage shall remain the same as authorized by law existing immediately prior to enactment of this act. The publisher of any such publication before being entitled to such rate shall furnish proof of qualification to the Postmaster General at such times and under such conditions as the Postmaster General may prescribe."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I am in general support of the bill which was reported by the committee. The question raised in this amendment was brought up before the committee and the division on it was rather close. Therefore, I am taking this occasion to present it to the House for consideration.

By way of explanation, I think the House should know that religious and other publications of this kind, which are nonprofit, are exempted; there will be no change in the rates applicable to them. The effect of this amendment is to extend exemption to some magazines in the same category which are operated for profit, principally magazines devoted to agriculture and those magazines of religious, educational, and scientific nature which are published exclusively for use in classroom instruction.

Representatives of both of these types of publications did appear before the

committee. In the case of the representatives of the agricultural publications I think I can say they are the one group which was willing to make some suggestions as to how we might work out a satisfactory bill. Representatives of other publications—and this is in answer to the gentleman from New York—were heard on H. R. 2945 in its original form, but when we said to them, as we said to almost everyone, "What do you suggest if these rates are too high? What do you think would be a fair increase?" they had nothing to offer.

The farm people said, "Let us sit down. We think maybe a 5-percent increase over a period of maybe five or more years would be quite acceptable."

There are one or two things in the picture which I believe you should consider. In the first place, the farm publications are generally subscribed to for a period of about 5 years, so that a sudden increase of about 40 percent, as is suggested in this bill, would throw a very great burden on them in the first year.

In addition to this it is true that nearly all of the publications are sent out by mail and less than 1 percent is distributed by other means. Whereas in the case of the big city publications, the Saturday Evening Post, and such publications, the percentage that is distributed through the newsstands is very high. So there is no such remedy for the farm publications. Most educational publications, of course, operate on a very narrow margin. We had testimony before the committee which said that if this increase went into effect, many of them would be forced out of business. These publications are used in connection with schoolroom instruction or in connection with Sunday school classes.

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

Mr. McCARTHY I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I think the gentleman has presented to us a very desirable amendment. I am particularly interested in the dissemination of information through publications to be used in school classrooms or in religious instruction classes. I will be very happy to support the gentleman's amendment, and I hope it will pass.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to make one more point. The publications which are the subject of my amendment are produced for profit and will not receive the same preference as nonprofit publications. They will pay the present rates on second-class mail which includes a graduated increase for the advertising section of these particular publications which are produced for profit.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the gentleman's amendment on the ground that it represents a reasonable protection to these magazines and periodicals of low price which usually have long subscription periods. I think this amendment will give them the protection they need in the years immediately ahead.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the intention.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I compliment the gentleman upon his amendment and for the statement that he has made. I intend to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I shall support the gentleman's amendment. His amendment is a very proper one. I have received a great many letters dealing with this particular subject. I think the gentleman's amendment fully covers all of the objections I have received from many different sources.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

This is a very meritorious amendment. I think it should be passed. I am hopeful that perhaps the chairman of the committee will offer no objection to it. To give you an idea of the services that the farm publications render to this country, I just want to quote briefly from the hearings which of course you do not have before you but which appear in part I of the hearings on the bill.

There was a representative from Iowa who spoke before our committee as follows, in connection with the services of the agricultural press to the country at large. This is his testimony:

> I believe that I should mention also that our two publications, the Farm Bureau Spokesman and the Iowa Wool News, have played a part, along with other agricultural publications, in helping introduce new crop varieties, weed- and pest-control measures, labor-saving practices, and soil-conservation developments to Iowa farmers through general agricultural news stories sent us from the Iowa State College at Ames, Iowa. During 1948 our publications also carried free of charge 5,200 inches of space devoted to the United States Savings Bond drive, the American Red Cross, the Friendship Train, and many other patriotic and meritorious movements.

That is just one example of little publications in Iowa. It could be multiplied many thousands of times throughout the country. If any group of people is entitled to this new rate, they are the agricultural publications of the country.

With reference to the remarks made about the big newspapers by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER]. He talks about the big papers and then pretends to be for this bill because it will hurt the big papers and help the little papers. Actually it is just the opposite. If he is a friend of the little papers of this country, if he is a friend of the weekly press and the small dailies, then he will vote against this bill because this bill discriminates against the small dailies and weeklies. All of you know, he should know, and the fact is as has been stated here before that the Chicago Tribune, the Washington News and all of the big metropolitan papers of the country do not use the mails to any great extent. They are not big customers of Uncle Sam's post office as far as the sending of their publications through the mails is concerned.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I have a small newspaper which I operate. I am afraid of discrimination in favor of such newspapers. Does it not provide that a newspaper having a circulation of less than 5,000 will enjoy the same rates presently enjoyed and will not suffer any increase in rates?

Mr. HAGEN. There is further discrimination against newspapers with a circulation over 5,000.

Mr. HAND. It is discrimination in favor of them.

Mr. HAGEN. This bill has many discriminations. That is why you should recommit the bill, so that we can adjust those discriminations. For instance, 1 percent or so of the Washington Star circulation goes through the mails. Some New York papers have less than 1 percent going through the mails. The Chicago Tribune has less than 1 percent of its Sunday papers going through the mails. So they are not materially affected by this increase. It is the weekly and the small daily newspapers in the Chicago area and all over the Nation which are most affected. If the postage rates are raised, then the large newspapers can come in and take the subscriptions away from the small town papers who would have to raise their subscription rates.

I want to read to you the percentage of increase in rates for some of the smaller daily newspapers. The Chattanooga Times postal bill will be increased 49 percent.

The Memphis Daily will be increased 55 percent.

The Raleigh News and Observer, 58 percent.

The big city newspapers, which have less than 2 percent or so of their papers going through the mail, will suffer a relatively minor increase in their total newspaper distribution costs, actually less than 1 percent in many instances.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. Does the gentleman subscribe to my amendment which exempts daily newspapers up to 150,000 circulation?

Mr. HAGEN. Certainly. The Congress back in 1879 set up this law favoring low rates for the distribution of newspapers and publications. For what reason? To get the country informed and keep the people advised, so that we can build a democracy and a republic and make it strong. Let the people be informed, was the watchword. More than at any time in our history the people should be fully informed these days. That is why we want to maintain these low rates, so that the people can afford to subscribe to these publications. The people cannot afford to take these newspapers and magazines if the cost is

too high. Rates on second-class mail already have been made in the past. These increases should stop.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN] has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague on the committee, but we must draw the line some place. We are dealing with a deficit in the postal department. We are dealing with a plan to gradually wipe out this deficit. What we do here today in establishing certain standards which we hope will put into effect in the future, to bring about a more reasonable rate structure within the whole postal department.

We have exempted religious, agricultural, scientific, educational, and other magazines and papers that are nonprofit. We have even gone further than that. In the law presently, unless the profit can be traced to some individual, the papers also receive exemption. Where that profit is used for charitable purposes or eleemosynary purposes, it is exempt. This line must be drawn. Here is the place to draw it.

I have great sympathy with the objectives that the gentleman seeks to reach, but let me point out that such magazines as Country Gentleman, one of the biggest and best money-makers in the country, would be exempt under the provisions of the gentleman's amendment. There are other papers in the same category that would come under that same exemption if the amendment prevails.

The gentleman has also labored the point of certain educational publications. Those are very desirable publications, but they are conducted for profit. When they are conducted for profit they should pay their proper cost of maintaining distribution through the mails. I therefore find myself in opposition to the amendment, and I hope it will be rejected.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. If this amendment should prevail, we might find some poor little individual with no profit being called upon, in the form of taxes, to pay a subsidy to a business which was operating at a profit. This would be most unjust.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman is right.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows that the content of these magazines is exactly the same as the content of magazines that are exempt because they are nonprofit.

Mr. MILLER of California. They are nonprofit and that is one of the wide fields that we have not taken into consideration. That is made a charge against the Treasury on the theory that it is a dissemination of information and for the eleemosynary purpose for which certain magazines are published.

Mr. YATES. I think that historically, at least, there is justification for the gentleman's amendment in the fact that educational and religious institutions have been exempted from taxation. I know of no such exemption for agricultural publications. What about magazines such as Popular Science or Popular Mechanics? Could not the claim be advanced that they would be disseminated specifically for educational purposes and they receive an exemption under the amendment?

Mr. MILLER of California. It would encourage the publishers of such magazines to take advantage of this subsidy.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would make a special classification or exemption for profit agricultural publications or magazines and would also apply to religious, educational, and scientific publications. Should you make an exemption in favor of a profit agricultural magazine or should you make it in favor of a profit scientific magazine and for this kind of trade magazines? Do you know that very few of these farm publications that return a profit are owned by the farmers themselves, the Country Journal, the Farm Journal, and cattle publications? You will find that interests well endowed own these publications, that the farmers do not own them.

We do give a special preferential rate to the nonprofit agricultural publications, religious, labor, scientific, and educational publications; but we cannot give the same preferential rate to a profit-making publication, agricultural or any other; and I appeal to you to vote down this amendment.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Two amendments are pending at the desk at the present time. The gentleman's amendment, therefore, would be an amendment in the third degree and is not in order at this time.

Mr. CORBETT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute, to strike out the first line of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment is not in order; it is still an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAGEN. Is the gentleman going to follow the policy of moving to close debate on these amendments immediately after he has spoken?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Oh, no; we have had ample debate on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAGEN) there were—ayes 106, noes 42.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer and I have been on my feet a dozen times.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that the gentleman can offer his amendment after the pending amendment is disposed of. The gentleman from North Carolina was on his feet when the limitation of debate was adopted by the committee.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANFIELD. The Chair will recall that I was on my feet before the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not observe the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sorry to be so transparent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the committee closed debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. The action of the committee was to close debate on the McCarthy amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then gentlemen who have amendments to offer can still get time on their amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendments will be in order after the pending amendment is disposed of. May the Chair propound an inquiry of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]. Was the gentleman from New Jersey on his feet seeking recognition to speak under the 5-minute limitation of debate?

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet in an attempt to promote an amendment I have on the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have that opportunity. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not commissioned by the House Committee on Agriculture to speak in behalf of the pending amendment, but I venture the assertion that every member of that committee is in favor of it. I have no authority to speak for the great farm organizations of the country, or for the farm leaders of America. I actually have no commission to speak even for the farmers themselves but I earnestly believe that both farm leaders and farmers are in favor of the adoption of this amendment.

From the very time that rural free delivery was established in this country, the RFD and farm magazines have gone hand in hand with the development of American agriculture and of rural life in America. The RFD made possible the delivery of magazines and newspapers to farm families and such magazines and papers have been more effective than any other medium of information in bringing about the great efficiency and the abundant productivity of American agriculture.

The pending bill, with its greatly increased rate, is well calculated to impair the efficiency of this medium of information and is likewise well calculated to destroy and to put out of business many of the leading farm magazines and publications upon which the farm people of our Nation depend so heavily for pertinent information which is vital to the business in which they are engaged.

Reliable statistics show that approximately 97 percent of the entire circulation of farm publications is delivered by mail and that farmers rely more upon these publications for farming information than they do upon any other source—even more than they rely upon their county agents or the official publications of the United States Department of Agriculture. Reliable estimates indicate that the rates in this bill would increase the postage costs of farm magazines by as much as 50 percent. In the case of the Progressive Farmer, one of the greatest farm magazines now being published in this country, the rates proposed in this bill would more than consume the entire profits of the publishers of this very worth-while periodical and, in addition thereto, would be great enough to include all income taxes or pension arrangements and profit-sharing plans for the company's employees and would probably force the company into bankruptcy within the short period of 2 or 3 years.

Farm publications are traditionally sold on a long-term subscription basis. The average term of paid-up subscriptions to farm magazines is 27 months. The average paid-up term for all magazines, including the farm magazines, is only 18 months. This means that while the fiction magazines and all the others may be able to increase their revenues by raising their subscription rates and the price at which their magazines are sold at newsstands, this is virtually impossible with farm magazines because they are, on the average, committed by a firm contract to deliver their magazines to subscribers at the present subscription rates for another 2 years and 3 months.

Farm magazines are primarily a source of information to farmers and not of entertainment. They are the most effective means of education in new farming practices.

A survey made in Iowa by the Iowa State College showed that seven times as many farmers find out things they want to know from farm magazines and publications as they do from the official bulletins of the State and national agricultural agencies. This survey asked farmers where they found out what they wanted to know about farming. It found the major sources of information referred to as follows:

	Percent
Farm papers and magazines	71
Radio	49
Newspapers	36
Other farmers	31
The Farm Bureau, the AAA, and Soil Conservation Service combined	29
County agents	12
Department of Agriculture bulletins	10

A similar survey was conducted by the Department of Agriculture Extension Service in Vermont, and the results are very similar. When Vermont farmers were asked where they got their new agricultural information, they listed the following sources:

	Percent
Farm newspapers and magazines	48
County agents	17
Other extension service activities and the Farm Bureau	12
Government booklets and letters	5
Other Government programs, such as AAA, ACP, etc	4

The Department of Agriculture itself relies heavily upon farm publications as a means of getting new agricultural information to farmers. A glance at any farm magazine will demonstrate this beyond question. It will show article after article written by authorities on various farm subjects in the Department of Agriculture and in the State colleges and experiment stations.

Farm publications are unlike any other general type of publication—they are almost entirely educational in character. Farmers rely more upon their farm magazines than upon any other source—including all the Government activities—as the direct source of information on modern farming. These magazines depend 97 percent upon the United States mails for their delivery. The postage rates proposed in this bill will put many, if not all, of our present farm publications out of business. This would be a loss to the Nation far greater than any loss which may be sustained now by the Post Office Department in delivering these farm publications. The Nation and this Congress, interested as it is in sound economy, cannot afford to let this happen.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would the gentleman be in favor of including all magazines sent out by labor organizations?

Mr. COOLEY. They are already exempt under the bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In this amendment, would the gentleman be in favor of including them?

Mr. COOLEY. It is not necessary to put them in the amendment. The bill itself exempts publications by nonprofit corporations or organizations such as labor organizations.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. They are given preferential rates only as to nonprofit publications.

Mr. COOLEY. That is all.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Who owns the Country Gentleman?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows who owns that publication.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Who owns the Southern Agriculturist?

Mr. COOLEY. I will not yield further. The gentleman knows who owns them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is not the real question what kind of service these publications furnish to the farmers of the Nation?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is exactly right. We heard a lot of talk about the death sentences being imposed upon the utilities years ago, but this bill is really a death sentence to publications serving American agriculture. I know that the Department of Agriculture depends largely upon the circulation of the magazines that go into rural sections to get across to them the results of the research programs and of all other activities of the Department of Agriculture.

You need only to look in one of these publications which I have here before me. Here is the Progressive Farmer. One article is entitled "Planting Cotton," another "Corn in Texas," another "Green Grazing in January," still another "West Texas Lands Are Prosperous," and all the way through you will find one story after another pertaining to agriculture and written by agricultural experts, either working for the Federal or the State governments. Here is an article by an engineer connected with the A. and M. College in Texas concerning safety on the farm. Here is an article by Mr. John A. Arey, of the extension service of North Carolina State College, one of the greatest dairy specialists of America, entitled "Clean Milk Pays Profits," another regarding irrigation systems, another about "What I Saw of Italian Farming," another entitled "Insurance for Farm Families," and on and on and on. And the truth about it is that this publication, for instance, cost the farmer only $1 for 5 years.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. No; I decline to yield. The gentlemen closed debate. I have no desire to delay unduly the final action on this bill. I regret very much that the gentleman in charge of the bill has limited this discussion to five brief minutes when it affects the welfare of millions of people. I regret very much that time will not permit a full and frank discussion of the matter under consideration.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. What did the gentleman say the cost of that publication was?

Mr. COOLEY. One dollar for 5 years.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As a matter of fact, if you read the contents, it is almost exactly the same as a list of farm bulletins, is it not?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. And the Government gives you and me the right to use the mails to frank out those bulletins?

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And the Government prints them. It is cheaper to let these people print the bulletins and send them out than to have the Government print them and for us to send them out.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct. One thing I want to say on behalf of the publishers of these magazines, as pointed out by the author of this amendment, they have not asked for preferential treatment. They only ask that a graduated rate be imposed upon them so that they might be able to stay in business and work out their own problems over a period of from 3 to 5 years. But, the effect of the pending bill is to put these magazines into liquidation.

Some of these farm magazines and periodicals are devoted almost exclusively to the problems of the rural people of our Nation. I wish very much that it were possible for every Member of this House to examine closely these periodicals which I have here on the desk. If this were possible, I believe that the membership of the House could vote more intelligently upon the pending amendment. The Government actually saves money by using, free of charge, the pages of these many publications in disseminating information which is vital to the welfare of our Nation. Just about every agency within the Department of Agriculture uses freely the farm magazines and periodicals in furthering our great farm program, in every part and parcel of it. If the publishers of these magazines and periodicals could absorb the extra cost or could pass it on even to the farmers themselves, or if they could increase advertising and thereby increase their profits, the situation would be quite different. At the moment they are able to do neither, and consequently if the increased rates go into effect, we will be rendering a disservice not only to the publishers, not only to the farmers, but likewise to the Government and to all the people of the Nation.

In conclusion, I desire to read a telegram from Dr. Clarence Poe, president and editor of the Progressive Farmer:

RALEIGH, N. C., *February 8, 1950.*

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Member of Congress:

Tremendously appreciate your willingness to ask exemption of farm press from proposed confiscatory increase in second-class postage. United States Government spends many millions for research, and you know farm papers are more effective than official farm bulletins in promptly and continuously carrying and simplifying research findings to farmers. In times of peace such service justifies giving the exemption you ask. In case of another war the farm press could be as valuable as an army in maintaining maximum food and fiber production.

CLARENCE POE,
President and Editor, the Progressive Farmer.

Dr. Poe has been associated with the Progressive Farmer for 50 years. He is held in high esteem by the farm people of America and by all who have had the privilege of knowing him. He is regarded as one of the greatest farm leaders of his day and generation, and I know that you can safely rely upon the statements he has made concerning the confiscatory character of the proposal now under consideration.

I urge the adoption of the pending amendment and express the hope that it will be adopted by a substantial majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee) there were—ayes 114, noes 70.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the committee substitute and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SUTTON) there were—ayes 99, noes 76.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee and Mr. CORBETT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 133, noes 72.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. Is a motion that the Committee do now rise in order at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Such a motion would be in order.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 76, noes 125.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce that Members who have amendments at the desk will be recognized for 1 minute in support of their amendment and the committee will be recognized for 1 minute in opposition to each amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHURCH. Is it the opinion of the Chair that 1 minute is sufficient on these important amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot answer that question.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: On page 25, line 14, after "piece of", strike out "1½ cents" and insert "1¼ cents."

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia offered an amendment to retain the present third-class rate of 1 cent. The bill calls for an increase of 50 percent, from 1 cent to 1½ cents. This is an exorbitant increase for users of third-class mail to absorb. My amendment asks for an increase of one-quarter cent, a 25-percent increase, rather than a 50-percent increase at this time. The 50-percent increase would work a hardship on the users of third-class mail, throw hundreds out of employment who are dependent upon the use of third-class mail, and if the 25-percent increase were adopted it would give the users an opportunity to adjust themselves to meet the increased demands that are being made upon them by these increased costs of operation. The House has been very patient today, at the same time it must be remembered many people are concerned, and we are making a change in the postal-rate structure that will affect hundreds, yes thousands, of people. We should have time to carefully debate this proposed legislation but we are not being given that opportunity.

I hope my amendment will be adopted, which is a 25-percent increase rather than the committee's proposal of a 50-percent increase. If my amendment of 25 percent is not adopted and the excessive increase of 50 percent, as proposed in the committee bill, is accepted, it will compel users of third-class mail to curtail drastically their volume of third-class mail—their one and only means of carrying on their business.

And let me warn you, the result will be to destroy a large part of many businesses and the employment and the tax revenues that depend upon them. The committee has rushed through this bill today. It is my prophecy that postal revenue will decrease rather than increase because of the unavoidable reductions in mail volume that will occur because of these increased rates in third-class mail.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be voted down. Practically the same amendment was offered just a few minutes ago. By the vote on that amendment the committee decided to keep the committee rate of 1½ cents. There are over 9,000,000 pieces of this propaganda matter deposited in the mails.

The Post Office Department has no 1¼-cent stamp; the postal meters have no 1¼-cent designation.

I appeal to you to stand by the 1½-cent rate that is now in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANFIELD: On page 35, line 20, insert the following: "It is the sense of the House the postal deficit shall not be covered by taxes on incomes, imports,

corporations, fur coats, railroad tickets, theater tickets, pocketbooks, cosmetics, and baby oil."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is merely to point up the problem that confronts us, serious as it is. We have got to get the money somehow. We have either got to get it by making these subsidy groups pay the freight or we got to get it through taxing all of the American people, so many of whom are tired of shouldering somebody else's load.

There is discrimination here today and it is discrimination against the taxpayers of the United States as a whole. Here is a golden opportunity for economy advocates to stand up and be counted for a bill seeking to meet part of this deficit in a proper way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order that the amendment is not germane and is not in order.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAGEN: On page 19, lines 20 and 21, after the word "manufacture", insert "and on private mailing or post cards"

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will retain the rate on post cards as it is today, namely, 1 cent. In other words, post cards which are privately printed by print shops throughout the country and sold in stores and business houses now go for 1 cent postage. This amendment retains the rate at 1 cent. The amendment would not change the proposed raise in the bill of 2 cents on other cards. In other words, the Government postal card, by the bill, will have an increase of from 1 to 2 cents. My amendment will retain the private post card, sold at various stores, at 1 cent. This rate should be maintained at 1 cent because there are billions of cards in the country in the stores, in all the print shops, and in post card manufacturing concerns with the words "one cent postage" on the card. The time may come in the future for raising the rate, but it should not be raised now and the rate of 1 cent should be continued on post cards.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out in my opening statement, it cost the Post Office Department 2.6 cents to send every postal card through the mail. There is a deficit of over $66,000,000 on those cards.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the pending amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCARTHY: Page 29, after line 14, insert the following new subsections:

"(d) Books, permanently bound for preservation (including books bound with cardboard or paper), consisting wholly of reading matter, or, in the case of work books for schools, consisting of a combination of reading matter and blank spaces for students' notations (regardless of whether the pages having such blank spaces are intended to be removed from the books for separate use), and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books, and when in parcels acceptable for mailing as fourth-class matter, may be sent at the rate of postage established by section 2 (a) (1) for that portion of publications mailable as second-class matter which is devoted to matter other than advertisements, plus 50 percent.

"(e) The rate of postage for library books shall be the same as authorized by existing law"

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to establish something of an equity in the relationship between the rates on books and rates on periodicals and also on catalogs.

My amendment proposes that the book rate be 50 percent higher than the rate on reading material in periodicals like the Saturday Evening Post, which would be 3 cents a pound. At the present time you pay 8 cents a pound if the material is printed in a book and sent through the mail. If you sell it in serial form to the Saturday Evening Post you receive a rate of 1½ cents a pound. Under the increase here proposed you will pay 2 cents in the Saturday Evening Post and 8 cents if you send it through the mail. At the present time it costs about 10 cents for each catalog in the parcel post classification and it costs about 20 cents for a book. You can send the Sears, Roebuck catalog for 10 cents and the Bible for 20 cents. I do not think that is equitable.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to try to raise revenue.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under what precedent or ruling is the Chair recognizing a certain member of the committee for 1 minute in opposition to each amendment being offered? That was not included in the motion. Had it been included in the motion, it would have been subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is trying to be fair in the conduct of the committee, and the only gentleman that has arisen on the opposite side has been the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]. There was no point of order raised at the time that I announced that I would recognize the committee for 1 minute in rebuttal to each amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But the gentleman from South Dakota got up at the time the Chair proposed to recognize the gentleman from Tennessee a second time. Obviously, when the committee avails itself of the opportunity to make a motion to limit debate it, in a sense, is closing debate, and unless it does seek to limit time and is successful in so doing, in principle it forfeits that courtesy. The Members who have proposed amendments here have been waiting all afternoon to be heard, and if the committee adopted the procedure of seeking to close debate on 20 minutes' notice, with 10 amendments pending, it would seem as a matter of courtesy that the committee should restrain itself to one member of the committee who might have been on his feet, but to recognize one gentleman a succession of times seems entirely out of keeping with the spirit of closing debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman, in the list of names, also read the name of the committee. If the Chair was so inclined, the Chair could recognize two Members for 5 minutes each on amendments, on each side, and that would preclude the others from having any voice in the amendments that are pending, or in the debate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That, of course, is true, the Chair could do that. But, ordinarily, under the precedents always followed in the House, when time is closed on amendments, the time is divided among those who are seeking to offer amendments, and unless the motion specifically reserves time to the committee, it has been the precedent to divide the time among those who are seeking to offer amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that the committee is entitled to a rebuttal on any amendment that is offered, and has so announced, and there was no point of order made at the time. The Chair sustains its present position.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHURCH. The provision of the rules that a Member may require a reading of the engrossed copy of the bill, because of the unusual situation I have been placed in today, waiting here since noon, is still a part of the rules, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman from Illinois that that question should be addressed to the Speaker of the House when he takes the present position occupied by your humble servant. The gentleman from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to try to raise revenue, to increase certain postal rates. It is not a bill to decrease postal rates, and yet this amendment would reduce the rate on books from 8 cents for the first pound to 3 cents for each additional pound. We have been very fair to books in this bill. We have not increased the

rates on books, and I hope the committee will let the present rate of 8 cents for the first pound and 4 cents for each additional pound stand and ask that you vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MCCARTHY) there were—ayes 22, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to say that I am witnessing here a new high in gag-rule procedure. I am one of those on this side of the aisle who voted a year ago last January and who voted again this year to liberalize the rules. I did not suppose I would see this afternoon the vote on the part of the Democratic membership to gag the House. Ten amendments are offered here and the proponents of these amendments are being allowed exactly 1 minute each to present them. This is a new high in the gag-rule, and the most high-handed action I have ever seen in this Chamber. I will vote against this bill if for no other reason than this procedure.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my 60 seconds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of joining in the protest voiced by the gentleman from Iowa. There are many good features in this bill which certainly deserves more than the cursory consideration that is possible at this late hour. Many of us might be able, at the conclusion of a full debate and after supporting various amendments to improve the bill, to vote for the measure, whereas if debate is shut off now and no opportunity afforded to put the bill in shape, we may be forced to oppose it.

Through the attitude of the majority leadership in trying to ram this half-digested measure down our throats, considering 10 or 12 amendments in 20 minutes, we are placed in a dilemma to which we should not be subjected. No opportunity is given us to have a final vote on anything except a bill containing features, both good and bad, and never adequately subjected to committee study and consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman joined with the gentleman from Iowa in voting for the gag rule, let me say that you are now getting just what you voted for.

Mr. KEATING. I voted against the motion to limit debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to echo the sentiments of the people that want to see proper justice done to these small newspapers and the users of the postal service. I am sorry that adequate time is not given for the consideration of these amendments and for a full and free discussion here this afternoon, since this debate is being shut off. I have done everything I could to prevent that from being done. I may say that I am going to ask for the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill because of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHURCH: Strike out all of section 1, beginning at line 19 on page 19, and ending at line 9 on page 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Section 3916 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 39, sec. 356) is hereby repealed."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment discontinues entirely the issuance of Government postal cards and provides for the continuance of the 1-cent postage rate on the privately printed post cards. The adoption of this amendment would realize a saving of around $45,800,000 a year. At the same time, it would take the Government out of competition with private enterprise engaged in the manufacture of post cards.

According to the testimony of the Postmaster General before the committee, it costs the Post Office Department around 2.6 cents for each postal card it sells at 1 cent. In other words, the Department pays 1.6 cents more than it receives for each of these cards.

During 1948 approximately 2,830,000,000 of these Government cards were transmitted by the postal service. On each of these the Post Office Department lost at least 1.6 cents, representing the cost of manufacture and distribution. It can thus be seen that the elimination of this item entirely will realize a substantial saving, which I have estimated at $45,800,000 annually, not including the saving that would be realized in the transmission costs.

I should like to emphasize this point. In his testimony before the committee the Postmaster General specifically stated that he would prefer to have the Post Office Department discontinue to manufacture the penny postal card to raising the rates, as proposed by this bill.

His statement will be found on page 33 of the committee hearing. He said:

I would much prefer if there would be a final decision of the committee not to raise the rates on the two cards but to repeal the law that requires the Post Office Department to manufacture them.

The existing provision of law which requires that the Postmaster General manufacture and sell these penny postal cards was originally enacted in 1872, amended in 1876, and last amended in 1877. It is obvious from these dates, as well as from a reading of the provision itself, that the purpose of it was to encourage the use of the mails. The provision starts with this phrase "to facilitate letter correspondence, and to provide for the transmission in the mails," and so forth.

There is certainly no need today for stimulating the use of the mails. That need may have existed 75 or so years ago when this system of penny postal cards was inaugurated. And there is no reason why it should be continued at such an expense to the people as a whole.

Those who may desire to use the card as a means of communication can purchase them from private stores and, under my amendment, send them at a 1-cent rate, which is a rate below the actual transmission cost. I believe this procedure is much to be preferred to the proposal embodied in this bill to raise the postage rates to 2 cents on both the Government-issued cards and those privately manufactured.

The enactment of the bill as it now stands will place a great many businesses out of business. Billions of private cards bearing the inscription "place 1-cent stamp here" are in the inventories of wholesalers, retailers, and manufacturers throughout the United States. There would be untold confusion in every post office if attempts were made to collect the additional postage—on such short notice—for paid-for cards.

By adopting this amendment, we will not only be saving several million dollars a year, but we will at the same time be eliminating this wholly unnecessary competition on the part of the Government with those engaged in the manufacture of post cards.

We will also be encouraging the use of the private picture card. This has great educational advantages. It will encourage people to use cards which depict some historic scene of a city or section of the country. It will encourage travel and encourage our people to become acquainted with the many wonders existing in this country of ours.

I hope the committee will adopt my amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do not understand exactly what the gentleman's amendment does. I know that it is not a good amendment, and ask that it be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHURCH: Strike out all of section 1, beginning on line 19, page 19, and ending on line 9, page 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SECTION 1. The charge for postal cards issued and furnished to the public by the Postmaster General shall be at a rate fixed by the Postmaster General to approximate the cost of their manufacture and distribution in addition to the postage rate of 1 cent each."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply provides that the Postmaster General shall charge for the postal cards issued by his Department the cost of manufacture and distribution of the cards, as well as the postage rate of 1 cent.

It has been estimated that the penny postal card costs 2.6 cents each. For only 1 cent postage a person is furnished free of charge, the cardboard, the printing, the cutting, packing, boxing, distri-

bution, and sale of a card. This is not the type of service that the post office is intended to perform. And it represents a cost to the Government of at least $45,800,000.

By this amendment I provide that the 1-cent postage rate on both postal cards issued by the Government and those privately manufactured shall be continued. But I also provide by this amendment that in fixing the price of the postal cards sold by the Government the Postmaster General shall approximate the cost of manufacture and distribution of the card. We will thus discontinue this unnecessary subsidy, discontinue this competition with private enterprise, and at the same time eliminate the necessity of an increase in the postage rate on all cards as provided in the bill as it now stands. As the bill now stands we are asking all the people to bear the additional cost to subsidize a few.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am sorry I cannot yield.

Mr. TACKETT. I am trying to help the gentleman.

Mr. CHURCH. Well then, go ahead. I wish the gentleman could get me some more time.

Mr. TACKETT. Will the gentleman state whether or not this amendment provides that the Post Office Department shall actually charge what they expend for the making of post cards, rather than letting the taxpayers pay the expense so that they can take business away from the printing companies?

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is exactly right. At least the Postmaster General can charge the approximate cost.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is not a good amendment and I ask that it be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, in view of the remarks heretofore made, would a motion that the committee do now rise be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. Such a motion is in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I make the point of order that the motion is not in order because it has not been submitted in writing.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I send the motion to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, how many amendments still remain to be disposed of?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order. We cannot wait here for amendments to be written.

The CHAIRMAN. There are five amendments pending.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, how much more time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. There are 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I raise the point of order that 20 minutes ago we voted to close debate. The 20 minutes have gone.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman that the 20 minutes for debate have not been used. The Chair will watch the matter closely.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEATING moves that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 72, noes 144.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in support of this bill. However, I regret that we have not taken time to perfect the bill as it should have been.

There has been one amendment adopted which does offer discrimination against some of the other publications—some of the agricultural journals that were voted in under the religious and other classes of publications. While it is a bill to get increased revenue, although I do not think the bill is in proper form as it should be, I hope there will be an opportunity to have the bill perfected when it reaches the other body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr SUTTON: On page 22, line 14, after the word "exceeding", strike out "10,000" and insert "150,000."

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, the philosophy of this amendment is the same as that expounded by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to help the rural sections and urban papers. I am glad that the great majority whip, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], joins with me in support of this amendment. It is not to take care of papers like the Chicago Tribune, which has a million circulation, but it is to take care of the average daily newspaper throughout the United States.

This is a good amendment, and I wish I had time to explain it more fully to you.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does it not also take care of the papers that go through the mails into the rural sections, not sold on newstands and delivered?

Mr. SUTTON. It certainly does.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Obviously, the gentleman does not have time to explain the amendment in detail, but I think it is a very important amendment, and I hope it may be adopted.

Mr. SUTTON. I appreciate the remarks of my colleague from Tennessee, the distinguished majority whip.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I understand this amendment proposes that we leave the rates as they are for all second-class publications with less than 150,000 circulation.

Mr. SUTTON. One hundred and fifty thousand circulation.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is certainly unfair discrimination. The newspapers are paying the same rates they have been paying for the past 70 years. Not one single solitary increase has been made since 1879. They should pay more, and I hope this amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SUTTON) there were—ayes 38, noes 120.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAGEN: Page 24, line 9, after the word "packages", insert "increases provided in the section shall be effective as follows: 50 percent of the increases effective January 1, 1951; and 50 percent of the increases effective January 1, 1952."

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes that the increases in the rates for all the publications that go through as second-class mail be extended over a period of time. Publishers have accepted subscriptions for 2, 3, and 5 years at their present rates and prices. This amendment will merely extend the time of the proposed second-class mail increases over a 2-year period so that publishers will not all find themselves with increased postage rates on the old rate of subscription that was charged at the lower postage rates. Unless this amendment is adopted, it will greatly harm many small publications.

In closing let me say that I want to condemn the high-handed manner in which this bill has been rushed through here. At a time when 10 important amendments were still pending we were limited to 20 minutes' time. I have several amendments that I shall not even have an opportunity to have read at the Clerk's desk, let alone offer and discuss.

Here is a bill that affects every American, one-hundred-and-fifty-and-some-million American people, and yet we have been forced to rush it through at this late hour of the day.

There will not be a roll call on it tonight anyway, because an engrossed copy of the bill will be demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Add a new section at the end of the bill as follows:

"In no instance shall the provisions of this bill affect rates now in effect on shipments of garden or field seeds."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, it should not take even 1 minute to explain the value of the amendment and the need of it in this bill. Everyone knows how many American families are dependent on their gardens for much of their food. If we are going to make it difficult for those folks to get garden seed and we are certainly going to hurt a lot of poor families in America.

Another thing, garden seed and many field seeds are in short supply, and we need soil conservation no end. Let us not make it any more difficult or expensive to get garden seed and the needed field seeds, the latter especially which are so necessary for the conservation of our precious soil I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending amendments having been disposed of except the committee substitute as amended for the bill, the question now occurs on the committee substitute as amended for the bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAGEN moves that the Committee rise and report back to the House the bill with the enacting clause stricken.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this motion in an effort to have a few minutes more time. Here is a bill that vitally affects every American. It has a far-reaching effect on the economy of this country. The proponents are trying to rush it through in the matter of a few hours' time.

This bill, if enacted into law in its present form, will throw many hundreds of thousands of people out of work; it will close up hundreds of businesses throughout the country; it will curtail the activities of all the weekly and agricultural papers of the country and will have a tremendous effect on all business, and it may bring about a recession in the Nation.

We should have more time to consider the many amendments that could have been offered, many of them very meritorious. The fact that the bill has had so many amendments offered to it shows that it was not clearly drawn nor fully considered in the first place, and that it should be recommitted to the committee for further consideration. There is no one here now who knows how many amendments were adopted, and there were many more that could have been considered if we had not been shut off for time. I condemn the practice of shutting off time of debate as undemocratic, as un-American, and not becoming this body.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the remarks of my colleague and add that from the time this particular version of the bill was reached up to this moment there has been a complete disregard of the welfare of the country and its people and the welfare of the whole Postal Department in the hurry to rush this thing through regardless of any scientific consideration or anything else. I hope that if we cannot recommit the bill, the Senate continues its action along that line.

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

Mr HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to concur in the gentleman's remarks also and to say further that if no one else does it I am going to demand a reading of the engrossed copy of the bill. I said that earlier in the day and I repeat it.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Has the gentleman knowledge of the fact that newspaper costs, production and labor, have gone up without any raise in revenue? If some of the gentlemen here who are going to vote for this bill would only go back and talk with some of their publishers and get their ideas they might have a change of heart. I think the Members are confused and I think we should have more time to study this bill.

Mr. HAGEN. The gentleman is right. We should have more time to study this very complex bill, I will therefore ask that the Members vote in favor of the motion to recommit the bill to the committee. Many do not fully understand now what is in the bill. I think we should consider this proposal further in committee, then bring it back later to you.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I have 81 country newspapers in my district. This is the most discriminatory bill I have seen come before the Congress this year. It will put approximately one-third of those country newspapers completely out of business.

Mr. HAGEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I would just like to pass on this information. I talked with a publisher just the other day who said that the enactment of this measure would cause him to curtail by thousands of copies that circulation which goes out into the country areas. We therefore are being unfair to the people who live in the outlying sections who get these big daily newspapers.

Mr. HAGEN. If this bill passes this House, I am glad to say that I will not be responsible for its passage. I can go back and face my people and my weekly and small daily newspaper publishers and say to them that "I fought for you, but the Democratic Party was against you and we got licked, so we will have to fight it out further in the next election."

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKINNON. I would like to point out just a couple of facts about newspapers. I have been in the newspaper business ever since I was a kid in high school. I have had a fair degree of success in publishing newspapers, and I would like to point out to the gentleman who spoke a moment ago that as far as revenues from newspapers go, last year the newspaper fraternity had the biggest year in advertising history. They can well afford to pay a modest increase in cost as this bill provides. As far as weekly newspapers go, they are exempt in this bill. Furthermore, if this bill is passed, it will have a tendency to help the small newspapers by keeping the big metropolitan dailies out of the small newspaper dealers' field.

Mr. HAGEN. The increases in this bill will not be paid by the big newspapers but largely will be paid by the small weekly and daily newspapers and other small publications using the mails for the distribution to their subscribers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2945) to adjust postal rates, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Obviously that cannot be done at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill under consideration today.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I was granted for today be transferred to tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted as follows:

To Mr. LOVRE (at the request of Mr. CASE of South Dakota), for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. HAVENNER), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. SANBORN, until February 16, on account of official business.

To Mr. ALLEN of California, for February 8, in addition to leave herctofore granted, on account of extreme illness in family.

To Mr. WADSWORTH (at the request of of Mr. ARENDS), from January 24 and indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. WERDEL, from February 8 through February 16, on account of official business.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, this is Calendar Wednesday, and I ask that the business of Calendar Wednesday proceed. I submit that the regular order is the continuation of the call of committees by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The Chair at this time is going to lay before the House a matter of highest privilege.

UNITED STATES AGAINST CHRISTOFFEL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

FEBRUARY 8, 1950.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR. From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received a subpena duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court on the 9th day of February 1950 at 10 o'clock a. m. as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Harold Roland Christoffel* (No. 791–47, criminal docket), and to bring with me the minute book of the Committee on Education and Labor for the Eightieth Congress, including the minutes of the executive session of said committee.

Since this minute book is under the unqualified control of the House of Representatives, and the Clerk is not possessed of any right over it that would enable him to comply with such a request without first obtaining the consent of the House, the book in question is submitted herewith and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very respectfully,

RALPH R ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT—THE UNITED STATES *v.* HAROLD ROLAND CHRISTOFFEL (NO. 791–47, CRIMINAL DOCKET)

The President of the United States to Ralph Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Thursday, the 9th day of February 1950, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the minute book of the Committee on Education and Labor of the Eightieth Congress of the United States including minutes of the executive sessions of said committee, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness the honorable chief justice of said court, the 8th day of February, A D. 1950.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.
By EDWARD J. SKIENS,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 465) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *Harold Roland Christoffel* (No 791–47, criminal docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpena duces tecum was issued by the chief justice of said court and addressed to Ralph R Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 9th day of February 1950, at 10 o'clock antemeridian, and to bring with him the minute book of the Committee on Education and Labor of the Eightieth Congress of the United States including minutes of the executive sessions of said committee in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives. Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of the House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in possession of the House of Representatives can, by mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession: Be it further

Resolved, That this matter be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for determination as to whether documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives as set out in the subpena of the said court will be released pursuant to such subpena: Be it further

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpena duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him the papers or documents mentioned in said subpena: And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena duces tecum aforementioned.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I insist on the calling of the committees.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 64, noes 26.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 9, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1218. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to the subjects of such orders pursuant to section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1948 (Public Law 774); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1219. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U S C, 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1220. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of the General Services Administration covering the period July 1 through December 31, 1949, pursuant to section 210 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7207. A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia H R. 6670. A bill to incorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1615). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R 4316. A bill to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary

buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. S 563. An act for the relief of the P. S. Cook Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 914. An act for the relief of Gladys Inez Greenwood; without amendment (Rept. No. 1594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE. Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 1047. A bill for the relief of the Aero-Bocker Knitting Mills, Inc; without amendment (Rept No 1595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS· Committee on the Judiciary. H. R 1290. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force, with an amendment (Rept. No. 1596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary S 1449. An act for the relief of Robert B. Workman, without amendment (Rept. No. 1597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr JENNINGS Committee on the Judiciary H R 1464. A bill for the relief of W. B Terry; without amendment (Rept No 1598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING. Committee on the Judiciary H R 1699 A bill for the relief of the estate of William Kraus; with an amendment (Rept No 1599) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary S 1933 An act for the relief of C L Leffingwell and others, without amendment (Rept No. 1600) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. FRAZIER. Committee on the Judiciary H. R 2719 A bill for the relief of I. D. Cosson, with an amendment (Rept No 1601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON· Committee on the Judiciary H R. 2765. A bill for the relief of Reno E Stitely; with an amendment (Rept. No 1602) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary H. R. 2929. A bill for the relief of Mrs Dorothy Manious; with an amendment (Rept No. 1603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING Committee on the Judiciary. H. R 3725. A bill for the relief of Mrs Elizabeth Gardner; with an amendment (Rept No 1604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H R 4301. A bill for the relief of Y. S. Hu; without amendment (Rept. No 1605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4342. A bill for the relief of J. R Holden, R C. Biggadike, and John Hoffman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5546. A bill for the relief of Harry Tansey; without amendment (Rept No. 1607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6051. A bill for the relief of Alcide Raymond; without amendment (Rept. No. 1608). Referred to the Comr ittee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 6691. A bill for the relief of Paul D Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6692. A bill for the relief of Sgt Blaine W. Hughes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6694. A bill for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R 6695. A bill for the relief of Edgar F. Russell; Lillian V. Russell, his wife; and Bessie R. Ward; without amendment (Rept. No 1612) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr DENTON. Committee on the Judiciary. H. R 6696 A bill for the relief of Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams, without amendment (Rept. No 1613) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr CANNON

H R 7207. A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr ANGELL:

H R 7208 A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the "Agricultural Act of 1949"; to the Committee on Agriculture

By Mr BONNER·

H R 7209 A bill authorizing and directing the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake a continuing study of the shortage of white shad, herring, and other fish in the Albemarle and Pamlico Sounds and tributaries with respect to the biology, propagation, and abundance of such species to the end that such Service may recommend appropriate measures for arresting the decline of valuable food fish for increasing the abundance and promoting the wisest utilization thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLEMENTE·

H R 7210. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to give prisoners of war $2 per day for the period of confinement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R 7211 A bill to amend section 82 of the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii and temporary vacancies therein; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H R 7212. A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the "Agricultural Act of 1949"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr HELLER:

H. R 7213. A bill to exempt admissions to moving-picture theaters from the Federal tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R 7214. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in more adequately financing education in the elementary and secondary schools of States found to be needy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs NORTON:

H. R. 7215. A bill to provide for the renovation of the Columbia Hospital for Women in the District of Columbia, and for the construction of a modern nurses' home on the grounds of such hospital; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H R. 7216. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Bryson City, N. C., a post-office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7217. A bill to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Bryson City, N. C., for the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr RIBICOFF:

H R. 7218. A bill to amend section 301 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. Code, title 7, sec. 1301 (b)), and to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. Code, title 7, sec 1313); to the Committee on Agriculture

By Mr WHITTINGTON:

H R 7219 A bill to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and the improvements thereon in the District of Columbia, to the Committee on Public Works

By Mr ASPINALL·

H. R. 7220 A bill to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases, to the Committee on Public Lands

By Mr WERDEL:

H R 7221. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in more adequately financing education in the elementary and secondary schools of States found to be needy, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Education and Labor

By Mrs WOODHOUSE

H R 7222 A bill to amend section 301 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (U. S Code, title 7, sec 1301 (b)); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts·

H R 7223 A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, to be held at Lexington and Concord, Mass, April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950, to the Committee on Armed Services

By Mr MURPHY:

H J Res 416 Joint resolution to provide for research into the health hazards of air pollution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

By Mr WALTER:

H Res 464. Resolution providing for two additional clerks for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER· Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, requesting the enactment of legislation repealing the wartime excise taxes, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 7224 A bill for the relief of Thomas (Toma) Moldoveanu and Constance Mol-

doveanu (his wife); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7225. A bill for the relief of Mircea Niculescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 7226. A bill for the relief of Frank W. Hess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 7227. A bill for the relief of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 7228. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Kamada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7229. A bill for the relief of Seiko Kastuzawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H R. 7230. A bill for the relief of Ramute Alexandra Vailokaitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7231. A bill for the relief of Esther Stone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H R 7232. A bill for the relief of Stefanie Pfister and Hildegarde Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1815 By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to withhold recognition of the Communist government in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1816. Also, resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation repealing the wartime excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1817. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Beloit, Wis., urging passage of H. R. 5940, the so-called Emergency Professional Health Training Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1818. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 27 residents of the Seventh Michigan District, urging the removal or impeachment of Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, because of his recent statement in the Alger Hiss case, and his replacement by a man not only qualified and capable but loyal to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1819. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Agnes Brant and others, Boynton Beach, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1820. Also, petition of Nellie L. Hackley and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1821. Also, petition of Mrs Edna Ferguson and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1822. Also, petition of Margaret Anderson and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1823. Also, petition of Mrs. Jane Morris and others, Winter Park, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1824. Also, petition of Juan Carrasco, Fajardo, P. R., relative to the condition of Juan Carrasco and requesting that his case be given consideration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1825. Also, petition of Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., general counsel, National Independent Meat Packers Association, Washington, D. C., relative to a change in the buying policy of the armed forces, which is considered injurious to the cattle-raising industry of the Southwest, and requesting that this unfair change in buying policy be reconsidered; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1826. Also, petition of the chairman, Council for Reenforcing Rightist Camp of Korea, Seoul, Korea, expressing gratitude for the United States Government's efforts in liberating Korea and for aid to Korea since World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

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

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

Almighty God, grant to our anxious, groping hearts the assurance that behind the shadows and in them standeth One who slumbereth not nor sleeps. We are beset by perplexity. Our needs are many, but our greatest need is of Thee. We confess that our own selfishness has hindered the coronation of Thy purposes for all mankind. We have too often sought a solution for human wrongs which would leave ourselves unchanged. We have been unwilling to pay the cost of better things.

So fashion our desires and deeds in accordance with Thy will that, rising to the full measure of our duty and our opportunity, we may be laborers together with Thee to build the new world for whose coming good men have bravely died and where the nations of the whole earth may live together in trust and fellowship. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TYDINGS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 8, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 570 An act for the relief of Donald Francis Wierda;

S. 736. An act for the reimbursement of Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.;

S. 753. An act for the relief of Sisters Antoinette Cometti, Mary Gibin, Angela Pelosin, Emma Ghisleni, Elisabetta De Caterin, and Onorina Franzina;

S. 777. An act for the relief of Calvin D Lynch & Son; W. Thomas Lockerman; Sudlersville Supply Co.; George C. Moore and H. A. Moore; J. McKenney Willis & Son, Inc; Hobbs and Jarman; C. S. Thomas; and Royse R. Spring;

S. 1003. An act for the relief of Emory T. Wales;

S 1019. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of personal injuries sustained by Carl J. Freund and Pauline H. Freund, his wife, of Seattle, Wash;

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Saul Phillips;

S 1054. An act for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo;

S. 1088 An act for the relief of Milton Buechler;

S. 1096 An act for the relief of Abe Lincoln and Elena B Lincoln;

S. 1166 An act for the relief of Toriko Tateuchi;

S. 1353. An act for the relief of G. H. Lazarus, Jr, and Jesse F. Bewley;

S. 1446 An act for the relief of James Hung Loo;

S 1534. An act for the relief of Harry Comber;

S 1702 An act for the relief of Riyoko Sato;

S 1801. An act for the relief of Mrs Effie S Campbell;

S 1915. An act for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko;

S 1924 An act for the relief of the estate of William Walter See;

S 2031. An act for the relief of the Willow River Power Co;

S. 2100 An act for the relief of Penelope Corolyn Cox;

S 2114 An act for the relief of Mitsue Shigeno;

S 2119 An act for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co;

H R. 587. An act for the relief of the estate of Dick Walook, Alfred L. Woods, and Edward Kimoktoak; and

S. J Res. 105. Joint resolution to provide unrestricted entry privileges to Sister Elizabeth Kenny.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES IN NEW ENGLAND STATES AND NEW YORK

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, in his capacity as President of the Senate, has received a communication from the President which he will ask the Secretary to read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 9, 1950.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate
of the United States.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am informed that the Senate will shortly consider H. R. 5472, the rivers and harbors and flood control authorization bill. In addition to authorizing projects for construction, this bill will also authorize a number of investigations and studies to be made, looking to future projects for the development and conservation of our land and water resources. Such investigations and studies should be carefully planned, so that all relevant facts will be considered, and the resulting information and recommendations will be of lasting value for future action, both governmental and private.

I am writing this letter to recommend that the Senate adopt an amendment to H. R. 5472 which I understand is to be offered by a group of Senators from the New England States and New York, providing for a broad-scale study of how the land and water resources of those States may be best conserved and developed for the best interests of their people and the whole Nation.

We are often inclined to think that, because those States were originally settled 200 years and more ago, and because they led the Nation for many years in industrial and commercial development, they do not need the benefit of modern methods of resource development and conservation. Such a conception is very far from the truth. New York and the New England States have real and serious problems of soil and forest conservation and management, and of controlling and using water to prevent floods, to provide domestic and industrial water supplies, and to furnish low-cost hydroelectric power. These problems must be overcome if these States are to participate fully in the economic growth of our country.

We have gradually come to understand that, if best results are to be achieved, these problems should be considered together, and met by comprehensive planning and action which recognizes the close inter-relationship of land and water and their manifold uses. In many areas of our country coordinated plans have been worked out for multiple purpose, integrated development of natural resources. However, these seven States have not, so far, had the benefit of such comprehensive study and planning.

Some notable individual projects have been planned, such as the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. These projects should, of course, proceed without further delay. No additional study is needed before they are constructed. They are obviously necessary parts of any broad-scale program. But a wider scope, a broader vision, is needed if the full possibilities inherent in the resources of these States are to be realized.

In the field of hydroelectric power, for example, it is not enough to consider each project by itself. There are many undeveloped power sites in the New England States, including the Passamaquoddy project, which have been estimated to offer in the aggregate as much as 3,000,000 kilowatts of additional capacity. The redevelopment of the power capacity of Niagara Falls, concerning which negotiations with Canada are in progress, can provide more than 1,000,000 kilowatts of additional capacity. From Niagara on the west, through the St. Lawrence project, which will provide just under 1,000,000 kilowatts, and on into the New England States, there is a whole range of projects which should be considered in relation to each other. These projects could all be interconnected by transmission lines. Some of them offer a steady, continuous power supply; others could provide the intermittent supply needed to meet peak loads. Much of this power could be produced at as low cost as any in the Nation.

These potentialities need to be thoroughly studied, since they offer real possibilities for increasing the present power capacity of New York and the New England States by as much as 50 percent.

Development of this great supply of hydroelectric power, representing three or four times as much electricity as we will obtain from the St. Lawrence project alone, would clearly stimulate the broad economic development—industrial, commercial, agricultural—of those portions of the region which have for many years been lagging in all-around economic progress.

This power supply would also be a powerful force toward lower electric rates in New York and New England. This region now includes some of the highest electric rate areas in the country. Residential rates in the New York City and Boston metropolitan areas in recent years have been the highest of all cities over 50,000 population in the country—about one-third higher than the national average. Six of these 7 States are among the 10 States in the Union having the highest power rates for residential consumers. The homes, farms, and industries in these States should be enabled to share in the general downward trend of rates and upward trend of use, which have added so much to the prosperity of other regions.

These power possibilities are only one example of the questions of land and water use in the New England States and New York which should be thoroughly studied. Some of the worst cases of water pollution in the country are found on the rivers in these States. A great deal should be done to rebuild depleted soils, restore forests, and increase recreational opportunities. These and other resource questions should be studied together, and guidelines laid down which will be useful to Federal, State, and local governments and private groups in providing for the provident husbandry of the precious natural resources of these States.

I believe that a sound method for accomplishing this is provided by the proposed amendment to H. R. 5472. The amendment would establish a Study Commission of seven members, including citizens from the region and representatives of the principal Federal agencies concerned. The Commission would utilize all the studies which have been made already, and would arrange for such further investigations as may be desirable. An advisory committeee appointed by the governors of the seven States would participate in the work of the Commission, and the Commission's recommendations would be submitted to the governors for their comments before submission to the President and to the Congress. The Commission's final report would be submitted in 2 years, after which time it would be dissolved.

These provisions, which are similar to those already adopted by the Senate to establish a study commission for the Arkansas, Red and White River Basins, should result in a great combined program for wise, permanent, and economically sound development of the natural resources of these States. Such a program will be a stimulus to economic growth and prosperity not only for those States, but for the whole Nation.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Inasmuch as the bill to which reference is made is on the calendar, the Chair suggests that the letter of the President lie on the table, and, without objection, that will be done.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am naturally pleased by the President's recognition of the broad purpose which I proposed last year, and which is already embodied in the bill which was favorably reported at the last session, I believe, by unanimous vote of the committee. I hope this may mean that the majority leadership will at long last set this important subject down for early action.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I join in the statement just made by my colleague from Massachusetts. I joined with him in the resolution he submitted more than a year ago providing for a study of this subject.

I wish to say, furthermore, that more than a year ago I asked for and received a report from the Federal Power Commission which had made an informal survey of the whole problem in New England. That survey specifically dealt with the question of the economic value of the Passamaquoddy project, as well as any other undeveloped water power.

The President, in the message to the reading of which Senators have just listened, mentioned the St. Lawrence waterway. We are all in accord that the St. Lawrence power project should be proceeded with. The waterway project, however, is another matter, a bird of another feather. It seems to me there should be much further study of that project so as to determine its economic feasibility in connection with vessels of the present day which draw 32 to 36 feet when loaded, whereas the survey, I believe, provides for channels of only 28 feet, and there is no harbor in the Great Lakes more than 30 feet in depth.

I mention these things in connection with the President's letter. I hope surveys of New England power potentialities will be proceeded with. I certainly join my colleague in trusting that the proposal will be adopted. I most respectfully call attention, however, to the work which has already been done on this subject at the instigation of Members of Congress.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am very glad to join my distinguished colleagues from Massachusetts in their expression of appreciation over the fact that the President seems at last to have realized the necessity of an undertaking of the kind he describes in his message. Coming from the State of New York, as I do, I am also gratified to note that the President seems to recognize that the St. Lawrence power project is altogether feasible without the seaway project. Some of us in New York have maintained that position for a great many years. I trust indeed that the President's proposal will receive the consideration it merits.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I was very glad to hear read at the desk the message from the President of the United States urging the establishment of a New England-New York survey, as proposed in the amendment of which I am a cosponsor. I have prepared a statement on the subject, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN COMMENTING ON PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MESSAGE ON PROPOSED NEW ENGLAND-NEW YORK SURVEY

President Truman's message urging the establishment of a New England-New York survey as proposed in the amendment of which I am cosponsor sets forth in clear and simple language the reasons for this undertaking. The message projects the possibility of coordinating navigational, power, and flood-control measures throughout the Northeast.

The proposed survey will not, of course, retard or delay impending projects for the development of power or other facilities at the Niagara or St. Lawrence. These projects will be pushed forward with all vigor in Congress and elsewhere and would be fitted into the study which is proposed in the pending amendment. And the St. Lawrence Seaway project, of course, will not even come within the purview of this study, since the St. Lawrence, an international waterway, has already been more than adequately studied in all aspects. The idea is to fit in the great power and navigational and flood-control potentials of New England with the already blueprinted potentials of sites and waterways in New York. And some of the navigational and power potentials of New York still remain to be adequately studied.

President Truman's message suggests that this great northeastern region of the United States may still be a new frontier for a vast increase in the productivity of the people living in that area. It holds a promise that this entire area, with new projects for the integration of the relationship between land and water, can support an even greater number of people than now inhabit it. Regions and districts which have long been thought to have reached the ultimate in development and conservation may be able to produce new riches far beyond present limits. Comforts and conveniences may be brought to our rural inhabitants in greater amount and at lower costs than is now considered feasible.

Of course, all this is in the realm of prospect. It will take the tools of scientific study and examination to see whether these possibilities are real.

I think the President has performed a great service in calling this to the attention of the Congress. The potentialities are enough to fire the imaginations of us all. I know the people of New York will look forward eagerly to the results of this study if, as I expect, the Senate and the House approve this undertaking.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and offer other routine matters for the RECORD and the Appendix, without debate and without speeches.

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

THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of January 26, 1950, Walter Lippmann comments on our two-party system in a way which seems to me to be extremely sound and worthy of the careful attention of the Members of the Senate. We, all of us, live and work under a two-party system, and yet there are many who do not understand its true significance. Mr. Lippmann says that "the solidarity of the people in a free society is stronger than their division into parties, their separation into sects, the diversities of class and of locality; and that their capacity to find common ground is stronger than all the many interests which divide them." Those who so thoughtlessly use the word "me-tooism" would do well to ponder Mr. Lippmann's article. I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

MR. CHURCHILL AND ME-TOOISM

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Conservatives in Britain have been having an argument within their own ranks about "me-tooism" rather like that among our own Republicans Though comparisons can be very misleading, since Britain's economic condition is so very different from America's, the Conservatives had to decide, as do the Republicans, where they should draw the line on which to fight the election.

If I have understood Mr. Churchill's speech and the Conservative platform, they are drawing the line between the welfare state and the socialist state. They do not, as do many Republicans, identify the welfare state with the socialist state. On the contrary, they distinguish as sharply as they can between them. Thus they stand for government action to maintain full employment, and to support the purchasing power of the poor, and they promise to preserve, but with some modifications, the social services. What they oppose are not these, the essential elements of the welfare state, but the nationalization of industries, bulk government buying and certain other government controls and arrangements which have to do with the socialist rather than the capitalist method of producing wealth.

The issue, as the Conservatives hope to define it, is between the welfare state based on an economy of free, or at least freer, enterprise on the one hand, and on the other, the welfare state based on a planned, government-owned or managed, socialist economy. No doubt the Conservatives would trim the welfare state to what they believe to be the necessities of production, and to the deficit in the British economy. But they do not attack the welfare state in principle. They do not say it is incompatible with a free economy. They do not say that the welfare state is socialism.

We see at work here a force which is almost certainly the secret of British and American success in operating free institutions through governments by parties. It is the force which draws the two parties closer and closer together as they face the voters—until when election day arrives, it often seems as if on measures and principles the choice is between tweedledum and tweedledee.

That happens because in a sound democracy the central mass of the voters who decide the result are not doctrinaires and ideologues but moderate and pragmatically minded men and women. Without these middle people, who hold the balance of power, democracy is unworkable, as we can readily see in all the countries where the middle people do not exist. For a nation, divided irreconcilably on principle, each party believing it is pure white and the other pitch black, cannot govern itself. The sharp division of parties will first paralyze the government, and then when conditions become bad enough, men will feel they must achieve by violence what they cannot achieve by the normal processes of law.

The force exerted by the middle people results in what the extremists call me-tooism. But that is only a derogatory epithet for what is in truth the proudest and noblest achievement of democracy—namely that the solidarity of the people in a free society is stronger than their division into parties, their separation into sects, the diversities of class and of locality; and that their capacity to find common ground is stronger than all the many interests which divide them.

As long as this solidarity exists- as it does in Great Britain and the United States—it will never be good politics to draw the issues so sharply that they are irreconcilable That is annoying to the doctrinaires, irritating to the fanatics, and disappointing to the sentimentalists. But that is how free societies survive through storm and stress They never allow their differences to divide them, their debates to become battles, and they push their leaders on to that common ground where all can live together in the same community.

There is nothing unprincipled in a refusal to let a nation become divided on principles propounded by its extremists. Devotion to the principle of solidarity, of the national unity, and of neighborly respect and deference each man for his fellows, is a greater principle than any which any political party can think up in order to call attention to itself, than any movement be it of the right or the left can propound for the alleged salvation of mankind.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United State Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission's action under the provisions of section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUDIT REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the United States Maritime Commission, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1948, and June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Bureau of Employees' Compensatio , Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law and the reason for ordering suspension of deportation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Michele Pennino from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to the subjects of such orders (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the wartime excise taxes, to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE), p. 1620, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 8, 1950.)

The petition of O. O. Owens, of Tulsa, Okla., praying for an investigation of alleged collusion and fraud, including forgery, by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and its employees; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Lion Mountain Post, No. 276, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Whitefish, Mont., favoring the enactment of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Joseph S Smuda, legislative officer, Mount Vernon Post, No 2796, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Fellowship of Reconciliation Group of the Community Church of New York, of New York City, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing funds to manufacture the hydrogen bomb; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the South Dakota State Dental Society, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., and the Downingtown (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Gerald W. Conway and Maurice J. Blake, of Dubuque, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a four-lane superhighway between Rochester, Minn., and Dubuque, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition signed by sundry citizens of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of legislation to balance the budget and reduce the cost of Government, as recommended by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A petition signed by sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution memorializing Congress in plea for cooperation by the United States Army engineers for the removal of wrecks in Narragansett Bay and Providence Harbor

"Whereas there are many wrecks of small boats and ships littering the waters of Narragansett Bay and the Providence Harbor in Rhode Island, left there by the destructive hurricane and tidal wave of September 1938, which present a serious hazard to navigation and a menace to small boats on these navigable waters of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the State of Rhode Island through its general assembly, now requests the Congress of the United States to give consideration to this serious situation and to pass the necessary legislation or work for that cooperation with the official authorities of the United States Army engineers in order that these wrecks of small boats and ships may be removed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress be and they are hereby earnestly requested to use concerted effort to bring about this greatly needed assistance in clearing the navigable waters of this State from dangerous obstructions; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress and to the United States Army engineers in Washington, D C"

ADEQUATE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the prevailing threats to the continued security of our Nation emphasize as nothing else can the vital necessity for an adequate American merchant marine. In this connection, a resolution adopted by the twenty-third annual convention of the Propeller Club of the United States and the American Merchant Marine Conference in New York, October 19–21, 1949, reflects the official position of these two great organizations and deserves the thorough consideration of all Members of this body. I ask unanimous consent that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES AND AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE CONFERENCE, NEW YORK, OCTOBER 19–21, 1949

DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

The maintenance of an adequate American merchant marine, under private ownership and operation, requires that—

1. Private capital be invested in the construction in American shipyards of vessels of new and improved type and design.

2. Shipowners be assured full opportunity to amortize their capital investments in order to provide funds for vessel replacement purposes.

3. Rights existing under present statutes to establish tax-free or tax-deferred reserves for the payment of future operating losses be extended to all owners of American-flag ships.

4. The merchant marine have adequate protection against discriminatory practices that favor foreign ships or other types of domestic carriers.

The Propeller Club of the United States strongly recommends:

(a) The absorption by the Government of construction differential subsidized to enable United States citizens to purchase new vessels built in American shipyards at world market prices.

(b) Owners of vessels should be permitted by appropriate governmental agencies to amortize investments in vessel property by increasing annual depreciation charges against earnings in profitable years within the discretion of the owner, and in accordance with the accepted business practices and the policies of other maritime nations.

(c) Permission to all owners of American-flag vessels to establish tax-free or tax-deferred reserve funds for the payment of losses and for such other purposes as may be consistent with the national maritime policy.

(d) That immediate and vigorous action be taken by our Government to protect United States shipping from discriminatory practices by any foreign country (with particular reference to proceedings required by section 26 of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended) and, if necessary, further legislation be enacted which will insure equal treatment of United States shipping in international trades with ships of the particular or most-favored nation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res 228. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to employ additional personnel from March 1, 1950, to January 31, 1951, and increasing the limit of expenditures; with amendments (Rept. No. 1266)

By Mr HUNT, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H R 7876 A bill to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, to provide for additional appointments, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1267).

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

S 2724 A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No 1268).

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. NO. 1263)

Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted a report making certain recommendations concerning small business, which was ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "A COMPENDIUM OF MATERIALS ON MONETARY, CREDIT, AND FISCAL POLICIES" (S. DOC NO. 132)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to report several resolutions unanimously approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration and ask unanimous consent for their present consideration.

From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 216,

and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 216) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the committee print entitled "Monetary, Credit, and Fiscal Policies."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if all the reports he is about to make were unanimously approved by the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. They were. Some of the resolutions which were referred to our committee after having been previously referred to some other committee were also unanimously approved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator a further question. I know that one of the resolutions, Senate Resolution 228 involves a very considerable amount of money—some $80,000. When the report comes, would the Senator be willing to state the number of persons involved and would he be willing to go into a little detail in explanation of the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HAYDEN subsequently said: Mr. President, the resolution to which the Senator from Massachusetts referred previously was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, and it would authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to spend approximately $80,000. But the acting minority leader has suggested that he would like to know more about the matter, so I shall report the resolution for the calendar.

(Senate Resolution 228, reported by Mr. HAYDEN appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate Resolution 216?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceed to consider the resolution (S. Res. 216) submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on January 20, 1950, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported with amendments, on page 1, in line 2, after the word "entitled" and the quotation marks, to insert "A compendium of materials on", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the committee print, entitled "A Compendium of Materials on Monetary, Credit, and Fiscal Policies," prepared for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, be printed as a Senate document.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the committee print entitled 'A Compendium of Materials on Monetary, Credit, and Fiscal Policies'."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATING TO UTILIZATION OF FARM CROPS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 222, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. 222) submitted by Mr. GILLETTE on January 31, 1950, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 900 additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee relative to utilization of farm crops.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF IMMIGRATION HEARINGS BEFORE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask how much is involved in the concurrent resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No amount is stated in the body of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. It will cost $3,000.

Mr. LUCAS. What is it for?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is for the printing of additional copies of immigration hearings before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. The Bureau of the Budget estimates the cost of printing to be $1 a volume, and there are 3,000 volumes to be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69), submitted by Mr. MCCARRAN on January 13, 1950, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 additional copies of the hearings conducted before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1832, Eighty-first Congress, first session, to amend the Immigration Act of October 16, 1918, as amended. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "PROGRESS ON THE HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS"

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 70, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) submitted by Mr. MCCLELLAN on January 23, 1950, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 1158, Eighty-first Congress, first session, entitled "Progress on the Hoover Commission Recommendations," of which 3,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, 1,000 copies for the Senate document room, and 500 copies for the House document room.

DISPOSITION AND PRINTING OF EXECUTIVE JOURNALS OF SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 223, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Let me say that under the law we have been printing 500 copies of the Executive Journal of the Senate year after year, for a great many years. The result is that the shelves in the Library of Congress, where they are stored, are crowded. There is no demand for the printed journals. There has also been an injunction of secrecy on these records.

Mr. Biffle, the Secretary of the Senate, has examined into the matter, and is satisfied that, from now on, 50 copies will be sufficient. The authorization is for him to dispose of the extra copies previously printed in any manner he can. His plan is to have the Library of Congress ask other libraries in the United States if they wish to have them. If they do not, the extra copies will be destroyed as waste paper.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. As I understand, the resolution, if adopted, will result in the printing, in future, of 50 copies, instead of 500. So actually there will be a saving in expense. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. It so happens that about a dozen volumes are now at the Government Printing Office, awaiting printing. So, under the resolution, instead of printing 500 copies of each of the volumes, only 50 will be printed. So there will be an immediate saving, and also a saving from now on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 223), submitted by Mr. HAYDEN on February 1, 1950, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized to dispose of, by whatever method he may deem appropriate, the following documents (except file copies) in his possession; and the injunction of secrecy now in effect upon any of such documents is hereby removed:

Printed copies of the Executive Journals of the Senate together with indexes for certain years for the period from December 1, 1901, to December 31, 1948, as follows:

Volume 33, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session.

Volume 34, Fifty-seventh Congress, second session, including special session of the Senate convened on March 5, 1903.

Volume 35, Fifty-eighth Congress, first, second, and third sessions, including special session of the Senate convened on March 4, 1905.

Volume 36, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session.

Volume 37, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session.

Volume 38, Sixtieth Congress, first session.

Volume 39, Sixtieth Congress, second session, including the special session of the Senate convened on March 4, 1909.

Volume 40, Sixty-first Congress, first session.

Volume 41, Sixty-first Congress, second session.

Volume 42, Sixty-first Congress, third session.

Volume 43, Sixty-second Congress, first session.

Volume 44, Sixty-second Congress, second session.

Volume 45, Sixty-second Congress, third session

Volume 46, Sixty-third Congress, first session, including special session of the Senate convened on March 4, 1913.

Volume 48, Sixty-third Congress, third session.

Volume 50, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session.

Volume 52, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, including separate index.

Volume 53, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session.

Volume 55, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session.

Volume 56, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, including separate index.

Volume 57, Sixty-seventh Congress, special session of the Senate convened March 4, 1921.

Volume 59, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, including separate index.

Volume 60, Sixty-seventh Congress, third session.

Volume 64, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, including special session of the Senate convened March 4, 1925, including separate index.

Volume 66, Seventieth Congress, first session, including separate index.

Volume 68, Seventy-first Congress, first session, including special session of Congress convened March 4, 1925, including separate index.

Volume 70, Seventy-first Congress, special session of the Senate convened July 7, 1930.

Volume 71, Seventy-first Congress, third session.

Volume 74, Seventy-third Congress, first session, including special session of the Senate convened March 4, 1933.

Volume 75, Seventy-third Congress, second session, including separate index.

Volume 76, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session.

Volume 77, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session.

Volume 78, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session.

Volume 79, Seventy-fifth Congress, second session.

Volume 80, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session.

Volume 81, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session.

Volume 82, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, including separate index.

Volume 83, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

Volume 84, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session.

Volume 85, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

Volume 86, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

Volume 87, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

Volume 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, including separate index.

Volume 89, Eightieth Congress, first session, including separate indexes.

Volume 90, Eightieth Congress, second session, including separate indexes.

SEC. 2. The Executive Journals of the Senate (except the original and file copies), together with indexes, for the following years, shall, when printed, be disposed of by the Secretary as provided in the first paragraph of this resolution; and, when printed, the injunction of secrecy now in effect upon any of such documents is removed:

Volume 47, Sixty-third Congress, second session.

Volume 49, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, including separate index.

Volume 51, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session, including special session of the Senate convened on March 5, 1917.

Volume 54, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, including separate index.

Volume 58, Sixty-seventh Congress, first session, including separate index.

Volume 61, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session.

Volume 62, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, including separate index.

Volume 63, Sixty-eighth Congress, second session.

Volume 65, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session.

Volume 67, Seventieth Congress, second session.

Volume 69, Seventy-first Congress, second session, including separate index.

Volume 72, Seventy-second Congress, first session, including separate index.

Volume 73, Seventy-second Congress, second session.

Volume 91, Eighty-first Congress, first session, with part of index.

SEC. 3. Hereafter, not more than 50 copies of the Executive Journal for a session of the Congress, including the documents designated in the foregoing section, shall be printed.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 215, submitted on January 19, 1950, by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and subsequently referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I submit a report (No. 1264) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were, on page 1, line 2, after the word "authorized", to strike out "until otherwise provided by law" and insert "until February 15, 1951"; and in line 3, after the word "one", to strike out "analyst" and insert "additional professional staff member", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized until February 15, 1951, to employ one additional professional staff member and one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (3) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF BANKING AND CREDIT LEGISLATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 218, and I submit a report (No. 1265) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Let me say that of $60,000 allowed by the Senate a year ago to the Banking and Currency Committee for investigation of the problems relating to banking and credit legislation, small business, and economic stabilization, approximately $35,000 has not been expended. The resolution, if agreed to, will allow the Committee on Banking and Currency to use the unexpended balance for the same purposes for which the appropriation heretofore has been made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 218) submitted by Mr. MAYBANK on January 23, 1950, and reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and subsequently referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 101, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 6, 1949 (providing for an investigation of problems relating to banking and credit legislation, small business and economic stabilization), is hereby continued until February 15, 1951.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 9, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 570. An act for the relief of Donald Francis Wierda;

S. 736. An act for the reimbursement of Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co;

S. 753. An act for the relief of Sisters Antoinette Cometti, Mary Gibin, Angela Pelosin, Emma Ghisleni, Elisabetta De Caterin, and Onorina Franzina;

S. 777. An act for the relief of Calvin D. Lynch & Son; W. Thomas Lockerman; Sudlersville Supply Co.; George C. Moore and H. A. Moore; J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc.; Hobbs & Jarman; C. S. Thomas; and Royse R. Spring;

S. 1003. An act for the relief of Emory T. Wales;

S 1019. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of personal injuries sustained by Carl J. Freund and Pauline H. Freund, his wife, of Seattle, Wash.;

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Saul Phillips;

S. 1054. An act for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo;

S. 1088. An act for the relief of Milton Buechler;

S 1096 An act for the relief of Abe Lincoln and Elena B. Lincoln;

S. 1166. An act for the relief of Toriko Tateuchi;

S. 1353. An act for the relief of G. H. Lazarus, Jr., and Jesse F. Bewley;

S. 1446. An act for the relief of James Hung Loo;

S. 1534. An act for the relief of Harry Comber;

S. 1702. An act for the relief of Riyoko Sato;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Mrs. Effie S. Campbell;

S. 1915. An act for the relief of Niktor A. Kravchenko;

S. 1924. An act for the relief of the estate of William Walter See;

S. 2031. An act for the relief of the Willow River Power Co.;

S. 2100. An act for the relief of Penelope Corolyn Cox;

S. 2114. An act for the relief of Mitsue Shigeno;

S. 2119. An act for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co.; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to provide unrestricted entry privileges for Sister Elizabeth Kenny.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 3015. A bill for the relief of Walter Tyson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S 3016. A bill for the relief of Adele M. Steffensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. HILL:

S. 3017. A bill for the relief of Sgt James C. Hollon and Bessie L Hollon; and

S. 3018. A bill for the relief of W. F. Steiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 3019. A bill to change the name of Ice Harbor Dam, Lower Monumental Dam, Little Goose Dam, and Lower Granite Dam on the Snake River to the Whitman lock and Dam, Lewis lock and Dam, Clark lock and Dam, and the Spalding lock and Dam, respectively, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 3020. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistics concerning, and the establishment of standards, grades, and classifications for, naval stores; to provide an inspection service therefor; to prevent deception in transactions therein, to regulate traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. IVES submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6000) to extend and improve the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System, to amend the public assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE ON SOCIAL SECURITY AND OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by her before the Committee on Finance on the subject of social security and the old-age assistance program, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GREAT LAKES WATERWAY MUST BE COMPLETED—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of the vital necessity of completing the Great Lakes Waterway, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE BOLTON BEFORE THE WOMEN'S CLUB OF RICHMOND, VA.

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON of Ohio, before the Women's Club of Richmond, Va., on January 9, 1950, together with a news item appearing in the Richmond Times Dispatch of January 5, 1950, announcing the address, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement by John J. Goff, chairman, Committee of Associated Pension Funds of New Jersey, in opposition to the enactment of House bill 6000, in its present form, and a resolution adopted by the Legislature of New Jersey on March 23, 1942, dealing with the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

BLUEPRINT FOR A BETTER AMERICA—POLICY STATEMENT BY NEW YORK YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the conclusion from a policy statement entitled "Blueprint for a Better America," by the New York Young Republican Club, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATION WAS ECONOMICAL WHEN THE PEOPLE INSISTED—ARTICLE BY HERMAN A. LOWE

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Nation Was Economical When the People Insisted," written by Herman A. Lowe, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUPERSONIC RAM-JET ENGINES—ARTICLE BY ANSEL E. TOLBERT

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article with regard to supersonic ram-jet engines, written by Ansel E. Tolbert, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 2, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

GORDON GRAY, AN ENLIGHTENED PUBLIC SERVANT—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "North Carolina's Gain," from the Washington Post of February 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2912, TO PROTECT TRADE AND COMMERCE AGAINST UNREASONABLE RESTRAINTS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 16, 1950, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 2912, to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraints by labor organizations. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in this legislation may appear and make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SALTONSTALL was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from tomorrow through Tuesday of next week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. IVES was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on Monday and Tuesday of next week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HENDRICKSON was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Monday next.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHOEPPEL was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from tomorrow noon until noon of Thursday next.

At his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing through February 21.

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TOBEY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from today until Monday, February 20, 1950.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there seems to be an unusual number of unanimous-consent requests on the part of our friends on the other side of the aisle, to be absent from the sessions of the Senate for a while.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is not surprised, is he?

Mr. LUCAS. I am a little bit surprised. It must be that fences are down in some sections of the country. I presume they need mending, and I am not going to object to any of the requests.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am confident that the Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle will feel the same way toward Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle who have their fences down, and who will make requests to be absent to attend Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the cooperative spirit shown by the Senator from Massachusetts. I wish to say to him and to my other good friends on the other side of the aisle, that we believe our fences are in pretty good shape, and we are not in the least going to try to mend them in a week's time, as Senators on the Republican side seem to be attempting to do.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is not bragging, is he?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for a question.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is not bragging, is he?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know whether that is a question or not, but if we are

bragging, I do not believe I would collaborate with the Senator from Wisconsin.

F. DuWAYNE BLANKLEY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1604) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of F. DuWayne Blankley, which was, on page 1, line 6, after "Mexico", to insert "((1) on the question of liability of the Government and (2) on the question of the amount of the recovery)."

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator state for the benefit of the RECORD briefly what the amendment proposes?

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment is, on page 1, line 6, after the word "Mexico", to insert "((1) on the question of liability of the Government and (2) on the question of the amount of the recovery)." The effect of the amendment is that the court may make a decision respecting the two questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

JOYCE VIOLET ANGEL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 485) for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Miss Joyce Violet Angel, of Zephyrhills, Fla., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on November 5, 1949, the date of her lawful entry into the United States upon the payment by her of a visa fee of $10 and a head tax of $8.

SEC. 2 Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category from the first available immigration quota for Egypt.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Benton	George	Johnston, S. C.
Bricker	Gillette	Kefauver
Byrd	Green	Kem
Cain	Gurney	Kerr
Chapman	Hayden	Kilgore
Chavez	Hendrickson	Knowland
Connally	Hickenlooper	Leahy
Cordon	Hill	Lehman
Darby	Hoey	Lodge
Douglas	Holland	Lucas
Downey	Humphrey	McCarran
Ecton	Hunt	McClellan
Ellender	Ives	McFarland
Flanders	Jenner	McKellar
Frear	Johnson, Colo.	McMahon
Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.	Magnuson
Martin	Robertson	Thomas, Okla.
Maybank	Russell	Thomas, Utah
Millikin	Saltonstall	Tobey
Mundt	Schoeppel	Tydings
Murray	Smith, Maine	Watkins
Neely	Smith, N. J.	Wiley
O'Conor	Sparkman	Withers
O'Mahoney	Stennis	Young
Pepper	Taylor	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Armed Services Committee, I report sundry routine nominations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. They are reported unanimously by the Armed Services Committee. I ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that as a member of the committee, I know that the action of the committee on these nominations was unanimous The nominations are promotions, and they have laid on the table the required length of time. Is not that correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none and the nominations are considered and confirmed and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmations.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2440) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, when Senate bill 2440 came before the Senate for consideration a few days ago, numerous Senators asked questions about certain phases of the bill. Because the bill had been acted on in committee almost 8 months ago, the Senator from Maryland, in charge of the bill, had become a little rusty on some of the testimony. Obviously, a multitude of items have been handled over that period of time.

This bill is rather comprehensive, and contains scores of items of various kinds. I should like to tell the Senate that the subcommittee which considered the bill sat for about a month and went into each one of the projects very, very carefully. When the subcommittee concluded its hearings, the full committee considered the bill; and so it comes to the Senate.

Between the time of the colloquy between myself and other Senators and today, I have had an opportunity, in line with the questions then asked, to develop and bring to the Senate the information which I was at a loss to furnish accurately the other day because of the long time which had elapsed and because some of the questions were not immediately answerable at that time.

So today I wish to read a statement which in a general way will clear up some of the things about which questions were asked the other day; and then, of course, I shall be glad to submit to additional interrogation, if I have not fully cleared up the matters in dispute.

At the time when Senate bill 2440, the military construction authorization bill, was considered by the Senate late one afternoon last week, I made a brief statement in explanation of the bill. Since relatively few Senators were present and heard that explanation, I shall review very briefly the main provisions of the bill. In addition, I have reread the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the previous discussion on this bill, and I shall attempt to answer more fully the questions that were asked at that time. I hope Senators who are interested in this bill will remain, in order that it may be disposed of without undue delay.

This bill was reported unanimously by the Senate Armed Services Committee on August 15, 1949, after complete hearings before the full committee. In my opinion, this is one of the most important bills which the Department of Defense will ask the Congress to pass on during this session, because this bill authorizes the construction of additions to the physical plant which will enable the military to meet their responsibility at a time when world conditions are far from tranquil and serene.

This bill authorizes the construction of specific public works facilities required by the Department of Defense at military installations in the continental United States and at overseas locations, and the appropriation of funds to carry out these projects.

This bill, which includes projects for the three services, represents the first unified construction legislation developed and presented by the Department of Defense. Heretofore the Army, which then included the Army Air Corps and the Navy have submitted separate public-

works bills, each—that is, the Army and the Navy, including the Army Air Corps—developed without regard to the other. The various projects in the bill were carefully screened in the office of the Secretary of Defense before submission to the Congress. The paragraph I am now reading is important, to show the screening this matter had before it came to the committee. The Research and Development Board reviewed all research and development facilities project to insure that each is critically required, that there is no duplication, and that full use can be made of each facility projected. The Joint Chief of Staffs reviewed the projects to determine their strategic and operational necessity, and the Chairman of the Munitions Board, as the personal representative of the Secretary of Defense, integrated the highest priority projects into a facilities-construction program, which was submitted to the Congress.

As reported to the Senate, the bill provided a total monetary authorization of $635,000,000. It will be recalled that near the end of the first session of the present Congress in 1949, when it was apparent that S. 2440 would not be enacted prior to adjournment, at the urgent request of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, some of the authorizations provided in this bill for Alaska and Okinawa were submitted in a new bill, which was promptly enacted by the Congress and became Public Law 420. Thus, authorizations amounting to $115,000,000 for Alaska and Okinawa, included in this bill, have already been provided. In addition, the Secretary of Defense has recently reviewed S. 2440, and he recommends reductions and deletions in the amount of $20,000,000. The Armed Services Committee recently considered the Secretary's recommendations, and reported to the Senate an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which eliminates the authorizations already provided for Alaska and Okinawa, and, in addition, the reductions recommended by the Secretary of Defense. There are no new projects added to the bill. I emphasize that statement. The total monetary authorization as provided in the amended bill is slightly less than $500,000,000. It is not the intent of the Department of Defense to request the appropriation of this total amount for the next fiscal year. Funds will be requested for those most urgently needed, and the balance will be requested in future years, allowing the services to plan their permanent construction in an orderly manner.

Of the total $500,000,000 authorization, approximately $90,000,000 is recommended for research and development facilities, which, in addition to the buildings, includes the required power and the highly technical machines and devices required by our scientists to continue their progress. Their accomplishments will determine the weapons of any future conflict, and the amount requested in this bill may be small in consideration of the amount that might have to be spent for weapons should we have delay. We all know what the exigent production of new weapons costs in time of great emergency; therefore I feel that every dollar we are spending for research and development now, in order that we may get the latest weapons before any conflict—and I hope none will ever come—and provide an orderly program for their production, will to any business mind, prove to be an economical and saving way to proceed. Housing for military personnel is still the most critical need of all the services. Recently, the Washington Post carried pictures of housing conditions of Marines and their families in nearby Quantico, and I have a group of pictures on my desk depicting military personnel and their families existing in hovels that in many places would not pass for squatters' shacks. I hope Senators who are interested in the program will come by my desk, where Colonel Galusha has probably 50 or 60 photographs, and see some of the conditions under which the men of the armed services even close to Washington are now living, to say nothing of the conditions elsewhere, which in my judgment are much worse.

I recently asked the services for a report on housing being constructed under the Wherry bill enacted during the first session, which I joined in sponsoring.

The report indicates that to date the services have certified to the FHA a total of 11,792 units. Proposals have been received and are now under consideration, or are being received, for an additional 51,806 units. Additionally, there are 65 projects of varying sizes under consideration.

The housing for which authorization is provided in the bill is to fill part of requirements of the services which cannot be provided under the Wherry bill. This unsatisfied requirement is in the non-commissioned officer and junior officer group with large families. Housing in this bill will help to fill the gaps left where Wherry-Tydings housing is constructed, at isolated stations, at overseas stations, and at stations with only a small requirement. Approximately $113,858,400 is proposed for authorization for family housing; $20,056,600 for the construction of barracks for unmarried personnel.

Section 404 provides that family quarters constructed under the authority of the bill shall not exceed 1,080 square feet per unit. This is the smallest unit normally provided for military personnel, and is ordinarily assigned to non-commissioned officers or civilian employees. This provision is included in the bill in order to provide the maximum number of units for the money authorized. When military housing becomes less critical and less costly, it is anticipated that funds will be requested for a limited number of larger type quarters.

Section 405 provides that the cost per family unit shall not exceed $14,000 which cost will include a kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone, architectural and engineering services and all contingencies, and further that the cost per family unit shall not exceed $2,500 for site development and outside utilities, including architectural and engineering services and all contingencies. Outside of the United States the above limitations may be increased not to exceed 100 percent.

I am informed by the responsible officers of the three services that these figures were arrived at from a careful study of cost figures on housing constructed under similar authorization passed by the Eightieth Congress, but which did not contain a monetary limitation on the cost of the unit. I have brought into the Senate Chamber some architectural drawings and floor plans of the housing it is proposed to construct under this bill. These buildings are two-story, with a basement, and ordinarily each building will contain eight units. Each unit generally consists of a full basement, a living room, a dining alcove and kitchen on the first floor, with three bedrooms and bath on the second floor. Plans have been prepared in colonial, Spanish, and modern architecture to permit selection of a type most suitable to individual stations. Although the space provided in various locations will be the same, the wall construction will vary in order to blend with surrounding architecture and to take advantage of savings due to geographical locations and local materials.

As will be noted from the drawings, these multiple units are of simple design, and I am assured that costly materials and embellishments are being avoided. Heating plants are located in individual units or are central for each building, depending upon which method is most economical. Inexpensive laundry tubs are provided in the basement of individual units.

The estimated cost of the house consists of the basic contract price with utility lines extending to 5 feet from the exterior wall. It also includes a cooking range, refrigerator, and the proportionate share of the area telephone system to be installed, which normally amounts to $300. The cost also includes the individual hot-water heater, where applicable, and the proportionate cost of the heating plant where such plant is an integral part of the eight-family row house.

The components of the estimate of $2,500 unit cost for site development and outside utilities are extensions of gas, or steam, where applicable; water, sanitary sewerage, storm drains, and electric systems into housing areas, and distribution lines from mains to a distance of 5 feet from each structure; clearing of the site where necessary; grading and drainage; sodding, seeding, or sprigging where necessary; and roads and walks. Thus, there may be a wide variation in this cost, depending on the distance utility lines, roads, and so forth, have to be extended.

The cost of land acquisition is not included in this limitation. Generally military housing is placed on land already a part of the military reservation. In those rare cases where additional land is required, a separate item is included in the justification furnished to the committee, and detailed explanation is given. In the cost of the house and the cost of site preparation and utilities there is included the item of Government costs. The components of this latter item include design, preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, administration and inspection of the contract work,

and fiscal and cost accounting as required by laws and regulations.

During fiscal year 1949 the Army and the Air Force requested bids on 1,530 units which are similar in size and design with units which it is proposed to build under the authority of this bill. I have an analysis of the cost of the construction of these 1,530 units. These units were constructed in all parts of the country, contracts being awarded as a result of bids received from 4 to 23 bidders. The average number of bidders for each project was 10. The contract price for the construction of the house alone, including range, refrigerator, and telephone connections, varies from $16,580 to $9,684, and the costs for site development and outside utilities vary from $6,125 to $672 per unit. The total cost for the completed unit varies from $24,650 per unit to $12,114, and the average total cost of the entire country is $15,036

I ask unanimous consent that the complete table from which I have read extracts may be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Army and Air Force family housing construction program, continental United States, standard row houses, fiscal year 1949

Location	Date awarded or opened	Number of units	Number of bidders	House only	House only, including range, refrigerator, and telephone	Percent over or under (−) Government estimate	House, including range, refrigerator, telephone, contingencies, Government costs	Outside utilities per contingencies, and Government costs	Total project cost per unit
West Point, N. Y.	Nov. 9, 1948	56	5	$15,980	$16,580	−10	$18,525	$6,125	$24,650
Fort McPherson, Ga.	Mar. 1, 1949	16	10	12,373	12,973	−10	14,194	1,144	15,628
Camp Detrick, Md.	Mar. 21, 1949	52	9	12,050	12,681	−14	14,168	2,618	16,786
Fort Bragg, N. C.	Apr. 19, 1949	52	15	10,337	10,937	−14	12,219	1,596	13,815
Fort Knox, Ky.	Apr. 22, 1949	152	8	11,616	11,986	−20	14,062	1,336	15,398
Fort George G. Meade, Md.	May 10, 1949	48	11	11,048	11,719	−7	12,757	2,619	15,376
Army Chemical Center, Md.	May 16, 1949	24	8	11,304	11,719	−11	13,127	1,433	14,560
Vint Hill Farms, Va.	May 27, 1949	40	8	10,705	11,310	−11	12,670	2,190	14,860
Fort Benning, Ga.	May 31, 1949	80	4	9,084	9,684	−22	10,819	1,841	12,660
Fort Sheridan, Ill.	May 11, 1949	6	6	14,642	15,342	−3	17,140	2,216	19,356
Fort Hamilton, N. Y.	June 1, 1949	32	12	13,189	13,404	−2	14,975	1,676	16,651
Fort Sill, Okla.	May 31, 1949	52	13	11,719	12,019	−14	13,129	1,707	17,136
Camp Lee, Va.	June 10, 1949	8	8	11,009	11,609	−7	14,107	2,163	16,570
Fort Lewis, Wash.	June 29, 1949	144	10	10,888	11,588	−32	12,914	1,814	14,727
Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado	June 24, 1949	32	8	10,733	11,033	−9	13,215	672	13,887
Camp Hood, Tex.	June 30, 1949	180	9	10,044	10,710	−21	11,946	773	12,719
Two Rock Ranch, Calif.	June 24, 1949	4	8	13,111	13,839	−16	15,462	1,554	17,016
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.	June 29, 1949	16	4	12,956	13,656	−10	15,257	880	16,137
Fort Riley, Kans.	June 24, 1949	32	10	12,317	13,017	+13	14,543	3,486	18,031
Andrews Air Force Base, Md.	May 20, 1948	120	8	12,476	13,156	−2	14,698	2,252	16,950
Chanute Air Force Base, Ill.	June 3, 1949	48	4	15,125	15,700	−5	17,650	2,350	20,000
Selfridge Air Force Base, Ill.	June 27, 1949	40	9	13,094	13,769	−15	15,160	1,731	16,891
Lackland Air Force Base, Tex.	June 21, 1949	64	10	10,888	11,509	−27	12,859	1,573	14,432
Carswell, Air Force Base, Tex.	June 30, 1949	136	10	9,724	10,337	−19	11,549	1,000	12,549
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Tex.	...do	128	23	9,344	9,999	−16	11,171	943	12,114
Randolph Air Force Base, Tex.	...do	80	10	10,757	11,330	−16	12,658	1,763	14,421
Average of projects awarded		1,530	10	11,225	11,808		13,271	1,765	15,036

Mr. TYDINGS. The chart on the easel lists six typical locations at which during this previous year, each service has constructed family housing of the same type and size which is proposed to be built under this bill. The prices are shown for each location. They are not the highest, nor are they the lowest costs encountered in building these quarters in various sections of the country.

It is a very interesting chart, showing buildings for the Army, for the Navy, and for the Air Force, the number of units built for each one of the three services which are encompassed in the chart, how many bidders there were for each of the jobs encompassed in the chart, the average cost of the housing to be built at the respective and designated locations, the average cost of the utilities installed in each of the locations, and the average cost of the completed house for each of the locations selected by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. It is very interesting to note that at Fort Bragg, N. C., where 32 units were built, there were 15 bidders, the average cost of building the 32 houses was $12,219, and the average cost of bringing the utilities and connecting them with the newly built houses was $1,596 for each house. The units which are pictured are typical units, and the chart to which I am referring shows a row of two-story houses of quite modest character. The average cost of building these 32 houses was $13,815, complete.

Going all the way across the country, 16 units were built at the Presidio, San Francisco, Calif. There were only four bidders on these houses. The average cost for each house was $15,257. The average cost of installing the utilities was $880, and the total average cost of the completed houses at the Presidio, in San Francisco, as a result of open bidding for modest three-story row houses, was $16,137.

I have referred to the houses built for the Army at Fort Bragg, N. C., and at the Presidio, in San Francisco. Let us now look at the housing for the Navy and see how the program worked out.

There were 16 units built at Dahlgren, in Virginia, close to Washington. There were only two bidders on the contract. When the job was completed the average cost was $14,158. The average cost of bringing utilities, such as water, sewerage, electricity, and the like, to each of the houses, and connecting them, clearing the site, grading, and so forth, was $2,636, making a total cost of building those modest houses, having only two stories and only 1,080 feet of floor space, of $16,794.

Now let us go across the country again to where the Navy had another building project, at White Sands, N. Mex. At that place 55 houses were built, and there were 14 bidders, quite a substantial competition. The cost of building those houses at White Sands, N. Mex., where I imagine the climate would lend itself somewhat to economy, although transportation might defeat that to some extent, was $11,908 for the house alone, and $2,212 the cost of grading, site clearance, water, gas, sewerage, or whatever was necessary to make those properties habitable. The combined cost of the house and the utilities in White Sands, N. Mex., as described, was $14,120 for the completed construction.

Now let us see what the Air Force experience was. The Air Force needed rather a large operation at a place called Carswell, in the State of Texas. There the Air Force desired to build 136 units, and there were ten bidders on the job, quite a substantial number. The average cost of the houses built at Carswell, Tex., for the Air Force was $11,549. The average cost for the utilities hereinbefore referred to in my remarks was $1,000. So that the combined cost of building these 136 houses in Texas for the Air Force was $12,549 per unit. That figure is a little lower than in the case of some of the other illustrations referred to. I think some of the saving there probably resulted from the fact that there were 136 units, many times the number built in the other places, and of course moving the equipment, and other things of a like character, on the ground for a large operation, somewhat diminishes the cost per unit.

Now, to take another Air Force illustration, let us go from Texas straight north to Michigan. In Michigan, at Selfridge Field, the Air Force wanted 40 units built. There were nine bidders, quite a substantial number. The bids were advertised, and, as a result, the successful bidder got the contract for $15,160, in competition with eight other bidders. That was the average cost for building the 40 houses at Selfridge Field, Mich.

Then, when it became necessary, as is obvious, to connect the houses with the

utilities, for gas, sewerage, water, and so on, it was found that the cost was $1,731 per unit, making a total unit cost of $16,891 for the 40 houses for the Air Force at Selfridge Field, Mich., a rather large number, I might say, by comparison.

Of course, these average costs of the houses include stoves, refrigerators, telephone installation, engineering, architecture, and inspection. The average cost of utilities, to which I have referred with specific figures, includes water, sewer, gas, electric power, sidewalks, and streets. Streets are always, with curbs or without them, macadam, concrete, or whatever may be necessary, rather expensive, and if grading is an essential part of the building of the streets, as it is in many of the localities, the cost correspondingly rises.

Mr. President, some of what I am saying may be slightly repetitious, but I am making these statements so that I may more fully, rather than inadequately, describe what the experience has been.

The cost indexes developed by the Engineering News-Record—a weekly magazine covering the engineering and construction fields—show that, between the time the estimates for the construction were defended before the Bureau of the Budget and January 1950, the building costs have increased 1.35 percent. In other words, since these estimates were submitted to the Senate, building costs have risen about 1⅓ percent, but we have not allowed any increase because of this fact since we believe that the houses can be built within the limits heretofore designated.

In fact, the present building costs are shown by these indexes to be almost the same level as in October 1948 when an all-time high was reached. Bidding experience and other cost studies indicate that building costs vary widely in different sections of the country as a result of climatic conditions, locations of installations with reference to sources of material and labor, and variation in the cost of labor and material. For example, it is estimated that in northern Maine building costs exceed the national average by 30 percent; in the New York City area by 15 percent; and in the San Francisco area by 14 percent.

During our previous discussion on the bill the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] spoke of the high cost of construction at Chanute and Scott Air Force bases in Illinois. I have since been informed by the Department of the Air Force, on inquiry, that their highest cost experiences occurred at these locations. At Chanute Field awards were made for 48 units—the houses at a cost of $17,650 each and the utilities at a cost of $2,350 each, or a total of $20,000. These units are the same as those constructed at the locations named on the chart. At Scott Air Force Base the Air Force has attempted unsuccessfully twice to secure satisfactory bids. The first attempt last June resulted in a total bid of $19,031 for the house and $6,834 for utilities or a total cost of $25,865. The houses were readvertised for bids after eliminating the basements, in the hope, of course, of reducing the cost. This time the low bid was $18,128 for the house and $6,379 for utilities or a total of $24,507. The Air Force did not accept either bid as the cost was considered prohibitive. The Air Force still wants to construct these units at the two places mentioned, and I am sure they would be delighted to have the assistance of the able and genial Senator from Illinois in getting lower bids on these units.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To the best of my poor abilities I should be very glad to cooperate with the Air Force in getting lower bids, and if there are contractor rings in Illinois who are holding up the Government for excessive prices, I do not want them to exist and flourish.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator from Illinois, and the Air Force takes the same view, because twice they have submitted this proposal and twice the bids have been so high that they have been rejected, so we are all in agreement that something better than what has so far been offered is obtainable. I am sure that this matter will be pursued, and whenever there come forward some builders who can meet the the requirements of the Government within the money that is available, we will have action, but until they do come forward, obviously there is not going to be any action, and I am sure that action is what the Senator from Illinois and I both desire.

Going back to the two Air Force cases, the cost of the land was not considered in either case The authorization in this bill contains an item for the procurement of land. This land is for additional base expansion, of which only a portion will be occupied for housing.

There is no intent to procure 14 acres per house as the Senator from Illinois indicated, in our previous discussion, he had heard. The cost of $500 per acre for the additional land required was based upon the best available information at the time estimates were prepared. The Air Force will procure this land at the lowest possible cost if this authorization is granted, and here again I am sure the Air Force will be delighted to have the Senator from Illinois assist.

If the authorization is granted, the Air Force will procure this land at the lowest possible cost. Here, again, I am sure the Air Force will be delighted to have the advice and counsel and the help of the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois. In other words, if we allow $500 an acre to procure this land, the Air Force is not going to pay $500 an acre for the land if it can procure it for less. That is a certainty. They tell me they had that in mind all the time, but they did not want an appropriation which would defeat the acquisition of the land. They thought a lower figure might possibly do so.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield further to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that an authorization of $500 an acre would create a lively expectation on the part of present owners that they might hold out for $500, and that in due course of time that amount would be forthcoming? It would whet the appetite, so to speak.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is persuasive. I do not think that can be denied. But I am advised that the Air Force received proposals from substantial and, I might say, experienced real estate men, and it was upon their advice that this appropriation was asked, as being what might have to be paid, although there is no disposition on the part of the Air Force to pay it, for the simple reason that every dollar it can save in any place in the bill, will permit additional housing and many other things the Air Force would like to have.

The Armed Services Committee is in complete accord with the principle of economy. We have written cost and space limitations into the bill. I think it would only be fair, however, to warn against going too far in this respect, as it might altogether preclude the construction of adequate quarters, or make it possible to build quarters only in locations where building costs are low.

After discussing this matter for a long while in the light of experience, samples of which I have read, and in view of the reports I have placed in the RECORD of our experience on a Nation-wide basis, the Armed Services Committee feel that we have placed pretty much all the restrictions which we thought we could place in the bill without making them so tight as to defeat the purpose of the bill.

Mr. President, I regret that the other day I did not have all this information readily available. We did have it before the committee last June. Much of it had been taken from the committee files and sent back to the Department. We not only had the charts which I have mentioned here today, but we had small cardboard models from which the roofs could be removed and everything that went into the houses could be seen. There was considerable questioning of both General Pick, who is head of the Engineer Corps of the Army, and Admiral Jelley, head of the Engineer Corps of the Navy, together with certain architects who worked with us, about trying to secure an adequate type of housing at the least possible expense to fulfill this need. Obviously, I had no idea that we would go so far into the matter. I am glad we have gone into it again so we may all understand and be able to tell the people of America exactly what the program involves.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I recall to the Senator's recollection that a few days ago, when this matter came up for consideration, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and I both raised the question of the removal of the Watson Laboratories from Eatontown, Monmouth County, N. J., to Rome, N. Y.

We raised the question whether that matter could not be postponed pending a further investigation of the whole subject.

I have just been advised by Members of the House that the House Armed Services Committee met this morning with Secretary Symington, and that Secretary Symington agreed that there would be no further removal of personnel from the Watson Laboratories, and that further determination of the matter would be suspended until members of the House Armed Services Committee had had the opportunity to visit the laboratories, which they plan to do in the near future.

In view of that situation, the junior Senator from New Jersey and I wish to suggest that the paragraph dealing with the Watson Laboratories be stricken from the bill, and that the matter be subject to future determination, with the consent of the Department of the Air Force.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Permit me to answer the Senator from New Jersey, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

I will say I do not think that would be advisable, on the basis of the Senator's own remarks. In view of the fact that the bill is a Senate bill, and that it must go to the Armed Services Committee of the House, which has already taken the action to which the Senator has referred, if there is any reason why the item should be eliminated from the bill, after members of the House Armed Services Committee have visited the site of the laboratory and gone into the matter, it is quite obvious it will be done.

If we take the other course and remove the item from the bill, and it should be found advisable to have it in the bill, and the bill should go to the House without the item, then we would be in somewhat of a difficulty. So, the Senator, as I told him the other day, and his colleague and the Senators from New York will have adequate chance, this being a Senate bill, to bring the matter to the attention of the House Committee on Armed Services, where it can be restudied. But to take the item out now, with no restudy, would not, in my opinion, be serving the best interests of the Government, for I have received no word from the Department of Defense that it is advisable to remove the item at this time.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I fully agree with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland. I understand that under the circumstances described by him this item in the bill will not be stricken from the Senate bill unless it is so voted by the Members of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. I could not say that, because the bill comes to me after screening by the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chairman of the Munitions Board, the head of the Development and Research Division Board, and several other agencies at Washington which have screened it and rescreened it, and rescreened it, and have cut out overlappings. So I feel I would be assuming to presume on their judgment were I to consent to remove the item, in the light of some further facts. But in view of what the House has just done, to wit, decided that no action will be taken dealing with this matter until the House has more information, and makes up its mind, it will be perfectly safe to leave it in the bill, and let it go to the House, where, if a contrary opinion is held, it can be removed, in which event, of course, if it should meet with the approval of the Defense Establishment, I say very frankly to the Senator from New York I would feel like keeping it out, but in the absence of the approval of the Defense Establishment I do not very well feel I could agree to remove the item.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I want to make it very clear that the position which the Senator from Maryland has just now announced, is exactly the position I took when I appeared before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services 2 or 3 days ago. I there made it very clear that I appeared in support of the item under the very deep conviction that the item was placed in the bill on recommendation of the Air Force, and only after scrutiny of the committee which the distinguished Senator from Maryland heads. I have certainly based my support of the item purely on the ground of national defense. If I were convinced that the transfer of the laboratories was not in the national defense interest I would be the first to agree to the elimination of the item.

Mr. TYDINGS. That would be my position.

Mr. HENDRICKSON and Mr. IVES rose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield first to the junior Senator from New Jersey, after which I will yield to the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to say that I base my opposition to this item on the same grounds on which the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] bases his support of the item. I am interested, first, in the national defense. However, so far as I have studied this problem, I am firmly convinced that this transfer will not be in the interest of economy and that it will not be in the interest of our national defense. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Maryland is aware of the fact that at the subcommittee hearing the other day a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] said to the Air Force generals present that they were completely unequipped to show the necessity of any such change. That was as a result of hearing much testimony.

Mr. TYDINGS. If that is the case, I should like to ask my genial and able colleague from New Jersey, what is the fear, then, of letting the item go over to the House? If that be the case, the House will take it out of the bill. The Senator from Maryland has said that if the defense authorities say it should come out of the bill, he will interpose no objection. I understand that that position meets with the approval of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. HENDRICKSON. My fear is that if the same situation were reflected in all the other items of the bill which we find in respect to what I shall call the Watson Laboratories item, then I would look askance upon the whole bill. I do not like to do that, because I know it is an important bill. I should like to support the bill, but I do not wish to be in the position of supporting the bill when questions are raised in my mind about some of these large and extravagant appropriations. I am convinced beyond any question of doubt, as I said, that this is an extravagant move, and I can support that position with a brief, which I could place in the RECORD; but I do not wish to clutter the RECORD. I am sincerely of the opinion that this change would not be for the good of the national defense. That opinion is based on the testimony taken before the House subcommittee on Tuesday last. I feel that there is no question that we should leave the item out of the bill and then let the subject be taken up in conference after the House has investigated the matter through its subcommittee in the field.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. The senior Senator from New York thanks the distinguished Senator from Maryland. I have very little to say on this subject. I should like to point out that the Senators from New York stand together on this question. I fully concur in the statement made by my colleague [Mr. LEHMAN]. We definitely desire to let this question rest on its merits. The recommendation has been made that this transfer be effected. If subsequent events indicate that that recommendation is ill-founded, and it is ascertained to be desirable that other action be taken, I know that my colleague and I again will agree, as he indicated in his remarks, that that be done. However, I should like to point out, in connection with the remarks of my able colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] that if the situation is as he indicates, no damage can result from passing the bill in the Senate as it now stands.

However, as I recall the record, it does not show the situation to be exactly as stated. I seem to remember that in 1948 the Air Force was urging that this transfer be made for reasons of economy, efficiency, and defense purposes. But if the situation be as my distinguished colleague from New Jersey has indicated, no damage whatever can result from passing the bill in the Senate as it now stands.

The action taken by the House committee this morning has been brought out. Obviously, the House is waiting for action on the bill by the Senate before it reaches a final conclusion.

Mr. TYDINGS. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee and other members of the committee are frequently embarrassed in attempting to explain certain matters without at the same time divulging classified information. I hold

in my hand a highly classified and confidential document which reasons out the whole process. I do not feel at liberty to read it on the floor of the Senate, but I can assure my good friends from New Jersey that when this item was put in the bill it was not put in on any "pork" or geographical basis.

Mr. IVES. Nor at the request of New York.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me finish——

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to make it perfectly clear that I have no interest in this bill on a "pork barrel" basis.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand. I do not mean to convey that connotation. I have no objection to permitting the Senator to read this confidential report, provided he will not divulge it. I do not feel that I can read it on the floor. The report substantiates the reasons for this undertaking. They are very important.

I sympathize very greatly with the situation in New Jersey. I believe that when we begin to move a plant from one State to another, as the able Senator from New Jersey pointed out, there are many considerations which ought to weigh in favor of keeping it where it is. I should like him to have the opportunity of presenting all those reasons. However, this report, which was read to the Committee on Armed Services, was so compelling that we felt as of that time that there was nothing else for us to do, in the light of the recommendation contained in it, but to place the item in the bill and act on it. I pledge my word to the four Senators who are interested that I will personally see the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House—although that may not be necessary—and tell him of the colloquy among the five of us, and I shall ask him, when this item comes up for discussion, to hear the Senators from New Jersey and the Senators from New York, who have divergent opinions on this subject, so that no final action will be taken until this subject can be threshed out in the proper forum. If the House committee, after consultation with the military authorities, sees fit to take the item out of the bill, I serve notice on my distinguished colleagues from New York that I shall not feel compelled to seek to have it put back in the bill unless the military authorities ask me to do it. I do not believe that I can be any fairer than that under the circumstances. I shall be very happy to have Senators read this memorandum, but I ask them particularly not to communicate it to any one who might want to have it, because in my judgment that would not be in the best interests of national defense.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The senior Senator from New York had not quite concluded his remarks, but the Senator from Maryland has done a very fine job of it for him. However, the senior Senator from New York agrees to the proposal which has been submitted by the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to ask the Senator from Maryland to identify the particular item which is now under discussion.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is on page 18, line 4, of the bill. It reads as follows:

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.: Shelter and laboratories for automatic radio grid direction finder, alterations of buildings for Watson laboratories, development of instrument landing system, NAVA globe system building, $3,114,500.

I believe it is clear that this is not a fly-by-night experiment, but one which goes directly to the defense of the Nation.

I should like to say again to the Senators from New Jersey and the Senators from New York that if the military authorities do not back up the position which they have given me under seal, namely, that they are satisfied to have this item eliminated from the bill, and the House eliminates it, I will not ask that it be reinserted in the bill. I will guarantee to the four Senators who are primarily interested and who have very understandable reasons for the positions which they take, including reasons based on what is best for the national defense, that so far as I am concerned—although it is not necessary—I shall carry this whole matter to the House Armed Services Committee and see to it that a forum is provided so that the entire question may be threshed out.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to say that the distinguished Senator from Maryland is manifestly fair. I appreciate very much his cooperative attitude, and I am sure that I speak for my colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] when I say that we gladly join in that agreement.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank both Senators from New Jersey. I advise them not to give up the point of view which they now hold until they have had the opportunity to find out whether the item should go out or not. My fear is, however, that if we take it out now it might be very difficult to get it back in.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I concur in what my distinguished colleague has said. The distinguished Senator from Maryland has been very fair. I can assure him that we shall continue to present our case, as he has suggested we should do, until the members of the subcommittee of the House of Representatives have visited the site and until the Department of Defense and the Air Force are entirely satisfied with the committee's conclusion. We are thinking in terms of the best defense of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. The proposal I offered will not prejudice the case of the two Senators from New Jersey or the case of the two Senators from New York, or the merits of the program itself. The whole subject will be entirely reopened, and every right and privilege which the Senators now have will be accorded to them, I am sure, in a further survey of the subject.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I merely wish to say that I appreciate very much the position taken by the Senator from Maryland, and of course I concur fully in what my colleague from New York has said.

Let me ask the Senator whether he will feel free to show this letter confidentially to the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator from New York that the House committee will have that letter before them without my doing so, when the proposition comes up.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. But either Senator can ask for it.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I show this to the——

Mr. TYDINGS. I have no objection to having either Senator examine it. It is something which I should prefer not to have to show; but every once in awhile I am driven to the ramparts, and have to do it.

Mr. President, let me inquire if there are other questions to be asked. If not, I think I have cleared up the doubts which arose the other day. It was most helpful to have the questions asked, and I hope I have been able to satisfy Senators and to answer the questions which arose in their minds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the original objections which I had to the Tydings substitute for Senate bill 2440 were directed to the absence of limitations on average costs in the section dealing with the housing of military personnel.

As all of us know, the provision, in section 405 is that there shall be a top of $14,000 on construction costs per family unit, and a top of $2,500 per family unit for site development and utilities, or a total authorized maximum of $16,500 for each family unit.

The very able and distinguished Senator from Maryland in his discussion insisted that those were maximum costs, top costs, and that in all probability the actual costs would be appreciably less than that, in most localities of the country. And in perfectly good faith, he referred back in his mind, I am sure, to the testimony of the Chief of Army Engineers, General Pick, when he appeared before his committee, at which time General Pick gave figures on differing costs of contracts which had been let in the past. I take it that it is to those differences in past costs that the very able and distinguished Senator from Maryland has referred today in the tables he has put before us and in the matter he has placed in the RECORD.

ACTUAL PER-UNIT AUTHORIZATIONS PROVIDED IN THE BILL

But those are not the costs which would be authorized under this bill.

The bill itself is somewhat defective in failing to indicate what the housing and outside utility costs would be for each of these various projects, as distinguished from the other items which are to be authorized, because the authorizations are stated in round figures, aggregate sums for each installation. The number of housing units is not stated in the bill; and it is difficult, indeed impossible, from the bill itself and from the accompanying committee report to determine what the precise per-unit authorizations are.

But I have gone back to the three volumes of justifications submitted by the Chief of Engineers for the Army and by the appropriate engineering units for the Air Force and the Navy, which I may say were kindly placed at my disposal by the Committee on Armed Services. We have isolated what the authorizations would be for the construction of family quarters and for outside utilities in the case of each and every project for which requests were submitted in this legislation.

We have found that in the new bill, as proposed, certain projects have been dropped. As the Senator from Maryland has said, no new projects are added. Indeed, the figures on the housing projects retained have not been altered.

So the detailed break-down of these justifications enables us to find out what the authorized cost under this bill would be for each and every specific project which is proposed in the bill.

I have before me a table, which I shall be very glad to submit to the committee or to any Senator, and which I shall later request to have printed in the RECORD, which gives what these authorized per unit costs will be at each location. I should like to read a few, first for the Army:

The Army receiving station, at La Plata, Md.: six family units; authorized construction cost per unit, $14,000; utilities, $2,500. Total construction and utilities, $16,500 per unit.

Army Transmitting Station, in the Virginia-District of Columbia area: Six family units; construction cost per unit, $14,000; utilities, $2,500; total construction and utilities, $16,500 per unit.

Fort Benning, Ga.: 376 family units; construction cost per unit, $14,000; utilities, $2,500; total, $16,500 per unit.

Black Hills Ordnance Depot, S. Dak.: six units; construction cost per unit, $14,000; utilities, $2,500; total, $16,500 per unit.

Fort Bliss, Tex.: 28 units; construction cost per unit, $14,000; utilities, $2,500; total, $16,500 per unit.

Mr. President, instead of wasting the time of the Senate by reading the figures for each project, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabular summary of the costs of the family quarters to be authorized in the amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 2440.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Summary of family housing items in S. 2440, amendment (2/2/50A) in the nature of a substitute

[Taken from: (1) The justification for military construction authorizing legislation, 1950, from the Office of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, May 1949 (2) justifications supporting H. R. 4766, dated June 17, 1949, submitted June 23, 1949, by Rear Adm. J. J. Manning, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks; and (3) justification briefs in support of construction authorization, fiscal year 1950, revised July 15, 1949, Department of the Air Force]

I. INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

A. DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Location of project	Average costs per unit: Number of units	House construction	Utilities	Total, house construction and utilities	Aggregate housing costs
		Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Army station, La Plata, Md.	6	14,000	2,500	16,500	99,000
Army transmitting station, Virginia (District of Columbia area)	6	14,000	2,500	16,500	99,000
Fort Benning, Ga.	376	14,000	2,500	16,500	6,204,000
Black Hills Ordnance Depot, S. Dak.	6	14,000	2,500	16,500	99,000
Fort Bliss, Tex.	28	14,000	2,500	16,500	462,000
Fort Bragg, N. C.	404	14,000	2,500	16,500	6,666,000
Deseret Chemical Depot, Utah	14	14,000	2,500	16,500	231,000
Camp Detrick, Md.	22	14,000	2,500	16,500	363,000
Fort Dix, N. J.	56	14,000	2,500	16,500	924,000
Camp Hood, Tex.	508	14,000	2,500	16,500	8,382,000
Fort Knox, Ky.	56	14,000	2,500	16,500	924,000
Camp Lee, Va.	190	14,000	2,500	16,500	3,135,000
Fort Lewis, Wash.	274	14,000	2,500	16,500	4,521,000
Fort Monmouth, N. J.	186	14,000	2,500	16,500	3,069,000
Murphy General Hospital, Massachusetts	12	14,000	2,500	16,500	198,000
Oliver General Hospital, Georgia	24	14,000	2,500	16,500	396,000
Fort Riley, Kans.	6	14,000	2,500	16,500	99,000
Sierra Ordnance Depot, Calif.	10	14,000	2,500	16,500	165,000
Fort Sill, Okla.	38	14,000	2,500	16,500	627,000
Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebr.	6	14,000	2,500	16,500	99,000
Tooele Ordnance Depot, Utah	8	14,000	2,500	16,500	132,000
Two Rock Research Station, Calif.	14	14,000	2,500	16,500	231,000
Valley Forge General Hospital, Pennsylvania	24	14,000	2,500	16,500	396,000
Vint Hill Farms, Va.	46	14,000	2,500	16,500	759,000
White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex.	114	14,000	2,500	16,500	1,881,000
Total	2,434				40,161,000

B. DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY [1]

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.	107			16,500	1,765,500
Naval aviation ordnance test station, Chincoteague, Va.	10			16,500	165,000
Naval ordnance test station, Inyokern, Calif.	111			16,504	1,832,000
Marine barracks camp, Lejeune, N. C.	352			16,500	5,808,000
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent, Md.	47			16,500	775,500
Naval communication station, Skaggs Island, Sonora, Calif.	30			16,500	495,000
Navy communication station, Winter Harbor, Maine	6			16,500	99,000
Total	663				10,940,000

[1] Break-down between house construction and utilities costs not shown in Navy justifications.

I. INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Con.

C. DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE [1]

Location of project	Average costs per unit: Number of units	House construction	Utilities	Total, house construction and utilities	Aggregate housing costs
		Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Tex.	94			16,500	1,551,000
Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.	96			16,500	1,584,000
Campbell Air Force Base, Hopkinsville, Ky.	24			16,500	396,000
Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.	96			16,500	1,584,000
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz.	136			16,500	2,244,000
Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.	96			16,500	1,584,000
Fairfield-Suisun Air Force Base, California	96			16,500	1,584,000
Great Falls Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.	240			16,500	3,960,000
Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, Calif.	48			16,500	792,000
Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex.	240			16,500	3,960,000
Hood Air Force Base, Temple, Tex.	24			16,500	396,000
Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.	48			16,500	792,000
Limestone Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine	192			16,500	3,168,000
MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla.	96			16,500	1,584,000
March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif.	32			16,500	528,000
Moses Lake Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.	240			16,500	3,960,000
Muroc Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif.	96			16,500	1,584,000
Rapid City Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.	144			16,500	2,376,000
Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill.	48			16,500	792,000
Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex.	192			16,500	3,168,000
Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.	96			16,500	1,584,000
Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.	96			16,500	1,584,000
Total	2,470				40,755,000

[1] Break-down between house construction and utilities costs not shown in Air Force justifications.

II. OUTSIDE UNITED STATES

A. DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

	Units	Average costs per unit (house construction and utilities)	Aggregate housing costs
Fort Richardson, Alaska	259	*Dollars* [1] 35,459	*Dollars* 9,184,000

B. DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Naval Operating Base, Guam	92	33,000	3,036,000

[1] House construction only. Separate unit utilities costs not shown. Outside utilities serving family quarters, barracks, etc., in whole installation, $8,200,000.

II. OUTSIDE UNITED STATES—Continued

C. DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

	Units	Average costs per unit (house construction and utilities)	Aggregate housing costs
		Dollars	*Dollars*
Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska	220	46,200	10,164,000
Ladd Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska	120	46,750	5,610,000
Total	691		27,994,000

SUMMARY

(1) Inside United States, aggregate cost:	
Army	$40,161,000
Navy	10,940,000
Air Corps	40,755,000
Total	91,856,000
Average cost per unit	16,500
(2) Inside United States, units:	
Army	2,434
Navy	663
Air Corps	2,470
Total	5,567
(3) Outside United States units	691
Aggregate cost	$27,994,000
Average cost per unit	40,512

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I can say that in the case of every project, regardless of where located, or regardless of what the local costs may be, there is proposed to be authorized a total expenditure of $14,000 a unit for construction, and $2,500 a unit for outside utilities, or where the break-down is not shown, $16,500 for construction and utilities, whether the units be located in the mild climate of Virginia or in the sands of Texas or close to the rock-bound shores of Massachusetts or in the Black Hills or in the equable climate of Puget Sound, or wherever the units may be located. Wherever they are and whatever the local cost situation may be, the authorization proposed is precisely the same.

COST LIMITATION CAN BECOME AVERAGE

So what we have here, according to the plans of the engineers of the various services, is not merely a maximum figure; it is not merely a total of $16,500. It is a minimum figure, it is a uniform figure, it is an average figure.

Unless we introduce into this bill safeguards fixing a maximum on the average which can be spent, this proposed maximum authorization under the plans which have been submitted will in all likelihood become the uniform and the universal standard of costs since it is proposed that the same figure is authorized for all units, regardless of location.

(At this point a message from the House was received and Mr. DOUGLAS yielded to Mr. SALTONSTALL, who moved concurrence in House amendments to Senate bill 2681, all of which appears at the conclusion of the speech of Mr. DOUGLAS.)

MAXIMUM FIGURE DOES NOT INCLUDE COST OF LAND

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the figure $16,500 does not include an allowance for land. The buildings are to be placed on existing military reservations, and as the Senator from Maryland has stated correctly, no additional expense will be incurred by reason of acquiring further amounts of land, except in the one possible case of Scott Field, in my State, and possibly in the case of one air force base in California. Therefore, the actual costs are higher than we might think, because in the cost of an ordinary private building the purchaser must pay for the land which is bought. We therefore should add to the average, minimum, uniform cost of $16,500 a further allowance for the value of the land; and I suppose it would be most conservative to say this possibly would be an additional $500 or $1,000 per unit, thus bringing the real cost of the enterprise, put on a comparable basis with private building, to $17,000 or $17,500.

Furthermore, the master architectural plans have already been prepared by the engineering units, or at least some drawings are furnished by the engineering units of the various services, because they have been submitted to them. Assuming that architect's fees approximate 3 percent, it would mean a further $500 advantage which is given in the case of this military housing as compared with private housing; thus indicating that the real cost of such a venture is probably between $17,500 and $18,000, for a six-room house with 1,080 square feet. I say 1,080 square feet because section 404 of the bill provides that there shall not be more than 1,080 square feet, and I have not had sufficient time to analyze the plans and ascertain what the total number of square feet actually is in the buildings proposed.

COSTS ARE TOO HIGH COMPARED WITH PRIVATE CONSTRUCTION

Mr. President, let us now compare these costs with the costs of private construction. I hold in my hand the Second Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the calendar year 1948. I am referring to page 214 of the report. I shall later ask permission to have the table as a whole included in the RECORD. Let me take the cost of constructing houses with an average of 5.2 rooms and with an average floor space of 1,048 square feet. These are roughly, though not completely, comparable with the six-room house having 1,080 square feet proposed in the pending bill. I ask the Senate to listen very carefully when I give the average cost of these new homes constructed under FHA in 1948. The average cost was $9,351, and this includes land. It does not include all outside utilities, except in those cases where there is a private subdivision, and where the cost of the utilities furnished by the subdivider is charged into the price of the lots sold. But here is an average cost of $9,351, including land, compared with a cost of $14,000 excluding land, under the proposal now before the Senate. To my mind this indicates greatly swollen estimates, greatly swollen figures of cost; and there are tens of millions of dollars at stake in this matter. If the figures are $5,000 per unit above what the cost should be, for nearly 5,600 units provided inside continental United States, there is an excess cost of $28,000,000 in that item alone.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the table from the Second Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the year 1948, to which I have just referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TABLE 28.—*Average characteristics by calculated floor area based on FHA-insured mortgages secured by new and existing single-family homes, sec. 203, 1948*

Calculated floor area (square feet)[1]	New homes, average				Existing homes, average			
	Percentage distribution	Calculated floor area (square feet)	FHA valuation[2]	Number of rooms[3]	Percentage distribution	Calculated floor area (square feet)	FHA valuation[2]	Number of rooms[3]
Less than 600	0.9	524	$6,624	3.6	0.9	526	$5,704	3.9
600 to 699	4.6	668	6,481	4.0	4.7	663	6,138	4.1
700 to 799	20.6	756	7,321	4.2	16.3	751	6,865	4.3
800 to 899	22.0	844	7,966	4.5	18.5	845	7,289	4.6
900 to 999	16.2	945	8,553	4.9	13.3	945	7,834	4.9
1,000 to 1,099	11.2	1,048	9,351	5.2	10.9	1,045	8,347	5.2
1,100 to 1,199	8.7	1,142	10,089	5.5	8.0	1,146	8,826	5.5
1,200 to 1,299	6.4	1,242	10,653	5.7	6.8	1,244	9,032	5.7
1,300 to 1,399	3.4	1,345	11,239	5.9	5.1	1,341	9,494	6.0
1,400 to 1,499	2.2	1,443	12,020	5.9	3.7	1,444	9,862	6.2
1,500 to 1,699	2.3	1,576	12,854	6.1	5.0	1,587	10,531	6.5
1,700 to 1,999	1.0	1,804	14,768	6.3	3.8	1,825	11,335	6.8
2,000 or more	.5	2,705	14,315	6.3	3.0	2,457	13,201	7.6
Total	100.0	972	8,774	4.8	100.0	1,075	8,281	5.2

[1] Area of spaces in the main building above basement or foundations measured at the outside surfaces of exterior walls. Garage space and finished spaces in attic are excluded.
[2] FHA property valuation includes valuation of the house, all other physical improvements, and land.
[3] Excludes bathrooms, toilet compartments, closets, halls, and similar spaces.

COST ESTIMATE BY RETAIL LUMBER DEALERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have had other estimates which have been made informally in the short period of time I have had to prepare the material. We have had a report from the National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association, and we have here the tabulations taken from the questionnaires which have been returned to the Retail Lumber Dealers' Association showing costs of construction in 1948. We have interviewed Mr. Joseph T. King, who represents that organization. He estimates that the Nation-wide average price of houses built by members of the association is from $8 to $10 a square foot, which includes land cost, and that the higher figure, $10, usually prevails in

urban areas, while the lower figure is more common in suburbs and rural areas. The estimate is based upon questionnaires filled out by hundreds of builders who had constructed more than 14,000 houses within the period under consideration. I shall be very glad to submit those questionnaires for examination. From $8 to $10 a square foot would represent a cost of from $8,640 to $10,800 for the floor area called for in the present bill, and a rough average between those two figures would approximate the $9,350 indicated by the FHA figures.

I submit, therefore, that all the evidence we can get indicates that approximately comparable quarters can be constructed under private contract for somewhere around $9,350, or, on the construction costs alone, over $4,500 less than is provided in the authorization of the pending bill.

OUTSIDE UTILITIES

I think we should also go into this question of outside utilities. There is a maximum, a minimum, a uniform, and an average allowance of $2,500 in each one of the projects inside continental United States. But in the actual experience of the Army in providing housing during the fiscal year 1949, consisting of standard row houses, the average cost for outside utilities was fixed at $1,914. This figure comes from a table substantially similar to, although I think not identical with, that read into the RECORD by the chairman of the committee.

I am informed, Mr. President, that this table is for the Army, and does not include the Air Force and the Navy and their justification figures do not isolate the utilities item as the Army does. But it indicates that the average cost for the Army—and that, I should think, would be fairly typical—would be only a little more than $1,900, as compared with the maximum, minimum, uniform, and average cost of $2,500 provided for in the bill.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that is rather a misstatement on the part of the Senator from Illinois. There is no uniform cost of $2,500 for outside utilities. That is the maximum cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Maryland that I have previously made reference to a table showing the per unit cost of each one of the projects provided for in the bill. In each and every case the table indicates that the authorization for a given project is, as I have said, $14,000 for construction and $2,500 for utilities, or $16,500 for both where the break-down was not shown. That is true irrespective of where the construction is to take place and is the same for the Navy as for the Army and for the Air Force. In each case the cost of the utilities is $2,500. There is no geographical variation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree that that is the formula which is used here, because we cannot tell which one will use the maximum. Certainly there will be many that will not use it. I have only to refer to the table before us for the fiscal year 1949 to show that the cost at San Francisco was only $880 for the utilities. Therefore, in that instance, if an authorization of $2,500 were made, the remainder of it would go into the Treasury. They cannot spend more than they need to install the utilities. The same is true of housing at White Sands, N. Mex. The houses cost $11,908. That is a long way from $17,000 or $21,000 if all the maximum obstacles existed. The bill does not compel them to spend the money; it simply puts them in position to build houses of a particular character, of limited design and limited floor space, with certain equipment, and says that the size cannot be more than 1,080 square feet, and cannot cost more than $14,000. If it can be built for $8,000 or $10,000 or $12,000, that is what it will cost. It is all done by competitive bidding. Competitive bidding, I think, will pretty well take care of a great deal of the Senator's fear in this matter.

I do not dispute his point that the authorization is for the maximum, but I do dispute the statement that that amount of money will be spent. I do not know what formula the Senator has in mind; but if he has any reasonable formula that will stand the test of analysis, I should like to consider it. I do not say I will accept it, but I am as anxious as he is to save every dollar that can possibly be saved. I know the Senator will appreciate the fact that if we are building 10, 20, or 25 units as against 50 or 75 units at some location, there is a great deal of difference in the unit cost, all other things being equal.

I should like to inquire if the Senator has a proposal that would tackle the proposition to which he has been addressing himself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In due course of time I shall make a proposal.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to be studying it so that I might be able to agree to it. I cannot agree to it within a couple of minutes. I feel that now we have ample time. I am in a little different position from that in which I found myself a few days ago, because we now have time for discussion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The junior Senator from Illinois is in favor of retaining the maximum figure proposed in this bill. I do not object to saying that none of the houses provided for by the bill should cost more than $14,000. I do not object to saying that the outside utilities should not cost more than $2,500. It may well be that in certain extraordinary circumstances—the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] mentioned one in connection with his State—situations of an extraordinary nature may arise; but I think they would have to be quite extraordinary to justify a cost of $16,500 for houses of this character.

What the junior Senator from Illinois has been trying to say is, that we should throw around it a further safeguard to provide that the average cost for each house should not exceed a given figure very much below $14,000, and that the average cost of outside utilities should not exceed a given figure considerably below $2,500. If we put those provisions into the bill, we shall be able to provide for local variations in cost, and, in my judgment, we can save $30,000,000.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think we are going to be fully safeguarded, but I have no objection to putting reasonable precautions in the bill. I was just thinking in my own mind, without being profound about it, that we might say that wherever, as the result of competitive bidding, the cost of building any house and the cost of installing utilities in any house shall fall below the maximum set forth in the bill, and sums appropriated for the building of the house, not required above that which is actually expended, shall be recovered into the Treasury and may be used for another purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland, but, in my judgment, that would not be adequate, because what we may face is that what is alleged to be competitive bidding very frequently is not competitive bidding. I was shocked as I said last Friday, at the costs at Scott Field, in my State, where the lowest bid was about $24,000, and at Chanute Field, outside Champaign Ill. In my judgment those bids at Scott Field indicate a possible absence of competitive bidding, and the bids should have been rejected. I am very glad they were rejected.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I finish, please?

Mr. TYDINGS. But before the Senator leaves the reference to the Senator from Maryland, I should like to say that I do not want anyone to draw the conclusion that the Senator from Maryland thinks those bids should have been accepted. I agree that they were prohibitive bids and should have been rejected and were rejected. I think the Air Force is to be complimented on that action.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would further say, however, that if there is passed a bill which authorizes $14,000 for construction plus $2,500 for utilities, every contractor in the country will know what that authorization will be. He will know that if he does not exceed that figure, or if contractors as a group do not exceed it, the contracts will be awarded. But if we set up an average figure to which housing costs must conform, contractors will realize that merely staying under the maximum will not be sufficient. In fact, there is a provision in section 407 which sounds as though contracts could be awarded even in advance of a specific appropriation which might mean that contracts will be negotiated on the basis of the maximum figure, in virtually every case.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wonder if the Senator, as a result of his research, has in mind any figure which he thinks would be fair both to the Government and all other parties concerned, which would cover the average cost of a house in continental United States and the

average cost of utilities in continental United States. Has the Senator arrived at a figure? If so, if he will tell us what the figure is and who supports it, I should be very much interested in hearing it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have a figure which I should like to propose. I wish to say that I am not an expert in this matter. I suppose the statistical bases can be shot at in individual cases, but I should like to propose an amendment in due time, which I shall read, and then submit to the Senator from Maryland for examination. It would read:

Provided, that the average cost—

And I emphasize the word "average"—

Provided, that the average cost of all the family quarters to be constructed under the authority of this act shall not exceed (1) $9,000 per family unit for construction, including kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone, architectural and engineering services, and all contingencies and (2) $1,750 per family unit for site development and outside utilities, including architectural and engineering services therefor, and all contingencies.

Mr. President, that would give a total cost of $10,750, compared with the $16,500 provided by the pending measure, and would save $5,750 on each house, or an aggregate in excess of $30,000,000 on construction inside the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Without binding myself, at first blush I think the figure of $1,750 for utilities pretty well conforms with what appears to be the general average for the cost of utilities as a result of competitive bidding shown on the chart. But I am reluctant to take it without more supporting testimony, in view of the experiences indicated by the figures on the chart. For instance, there were 15 competitive bidders at Fort Bragg, N. C., and the average cost was $12,202, including stove, refrigerator, and so forth. Likewise, in New Mexico, where there were 14 competitive bidders, the price was nearly $12,000. Likewise, in Texas, where there were 10 competitive bidders, the price was $11,500; these illustrations being in different parts of the country, and taken at random. So, if I were to accept the figure the Senator from Illinois suggests, $9,000, while it is appealing, and while I should like to embrace it, while I should like to have money saved, I feel I would be accepting an amendment which would not be susceptible of translation into action, in light of the experience which has already been had.

If I am wrong about that, and if the Senator can support his contention by more widespread figures than the few he has mentioned, the situation would be different.

Let me also point out to the Senator that the square feet of floor space which he gave in saying that a house could be built for so much money was less floor space than we are providing for in the bill, in one case about 40 feet, as I recall.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would involve a difference in cost of not more than $400.

Mr. TYDINGS. All those things add up, and when we have four hundred more dollars, taking the matter on a square-foot basis, we may have more piping utility to install, we may need more radiation, we may need a larger furnace, we may need a longer water line. There may be many things to be taken into consideration. So it is not fair to use a 35-inch yardstick to measure a 36-inch yard.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me first reply to the Senator from Maryland. I had better take Senators on one at a time, or I shall have an accumulation of arrears.

The FHA estimate was $9,350.

Mr. TYDINGS. For a house of what size?

Mr. DOUGLAS. For a house with 1,048 square feet. But that included land costs, which probably would be close to $1,000, whereas the figures submitted by the Army engineers, and by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, do not include land costs. So, the actual construction costs in each case would be less.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. What size lots were these the FHA was using?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I cannot tell since the report did not go into the size of the lots. I merely say that the cost of land is included. The Senator said I was using a 35-inch ruler to measure a 36-inch space. He may discover that I was using a 37-inch ruler, and while there were about 40 less square feet, there was the cost of land, which was not included in the estimates of the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator used a 35-inch ruler in one part of his argument and a 37-inch ruler in another part.

Mr. DOUGLAS. An average of not far from 36 inches.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not interested in averages so much as I am in accuracy. I doubt if any, or at least, many of the FHA houses to which the Senator has referred, were built on lots which would cost $500. I think that is an exaggeration, and not substantiated by anything in the Senator's portfolio, but is taken right out of the blue to support his argument, and is not based on any fact to support it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say, in reply, that the land cost would be somewhere between $500 and $1,000. I have not tried to substantiate the cost of lots, because I thought it was common knowledge that they ran from $500 to $1,000 and often much higher.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is guessing. We cannot afford to base the law on guessing. That is what the Senator is complaining about, and he certainly does not want to fall into the very error which he is criticizing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Maryland is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel, swallowing the camel of $5,000 padded costs in the estimates of the engineers. I suggest to the Senator from Maryland that he observe a due sense of balance in these matters.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Maryland feels that his honor has been affected, I yield to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not feel that my honor has been affected, but I think the argument of the Senator from Illinois is much in the nature of the Senator trying to swallow a camel, while the substance of the argument is about the size of a gnat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Maryland is swallowing an elephant, which is even larger than a camel.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. I listened to the reading of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, and of course we are all in harmony with his objective to save as much money as possible in the construction of the contemplated houses.

The Senator from Illinois makes reference to the average cost. I am wondering if his amendment should not further state something to the effect that the plans and specifications, the designs, and the materials to be used in the average cost house of which he speaks, should not be the same as anticipated and contemplated in the houses the Army is going to build.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With the Senator's very seductive manner, unconsciously, I am sure, he may have spread a trap for my unwary feet to fall into, because sometimes one can so name materials and specifications that the costs are unduly loaded. Upon occasion I have suspected that that occurred in the city of Chicago, where for a time I served as an alderman. Upon occasion I suspect that it occurs in connection with the houses under consideration.

I think we may find that the materials are often more costly than is necessary, that the specifications may be excessive, and that simpler designing and simpler materials would result in appreciably lower costs. So I do not care to tie my hands behind me in that respect. I know the Senator from Wyoming had no such design, but I thought that unwittingly, with the best of intentions in the world, a yawning chasm was being opened up before me, and, if I put my foot forward, it would be disastrous to me.

Mr. HUNT. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I had in mind only making his amendment more tightly drawn, perhaps, than he had prepared it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It certainly would have been more tightly drawn, I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HUNT. I did not intend at all to lay any trap for the distinguished Senator from Illinois. The junior Senator from Wyoming knows a good deal better than to attempt to do that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming had no such intention.

Mr. HUNT. I still contend, Mr. President, that merely lowering the average

price will not be effective and will not accomplish what the junior Senator from Illinois has in mind, if he does not at the same time make some reference to the fact that the average cost of the proposed building shall be for exactly the same type of building as is contemplated in the higher cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would be prepared to consider that, but my first disposition——

Mr. TYDINGS. I am trying to find an area in which I can agree with the Senator from Illinois in his very worthy endeavor to try to save the taxpayers' money. I was wondering whether the houses which cost, I think, $9,350—was that the figure to which the Senator referred a while ago?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The average under FHA; yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was wondering whether they were built with basements, I was wondering whether they had heating plants, I was wondering what kind of heating plants they had, I was wondering whether they had laundry tubs and refrigerators; I was also wondering whether they had electric lights, whether they were built with brick, grade A, or 1, 2, or 3 class of lumber.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator like to know whether they have asbestos in the houses?

Mr. TYDINGS. Since the end of the war I have seen a good bit of housing which many unfortunate people, who have been desperate for homes, have had to buy. Those houses have looked pretty good until one begins to live in them. Those who bought them would have been better off had they paid a little more money and gotten houses which would have stood up; some of them looked as if they were built to last only until the dealer could dispose of them to some unsuspecting purchaser.

One thing I do not want to do is to build such a cheap house that we will spend three times as much as we save keeping it in repair. I am interested in knowing whether the houses provided for by the pending bill, being brick houses in the main, and also stucco houses, which are durable and less expensive to keep up, compare favorably in a general way with the houses the Senator has referred to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that FHA has greatly improved the building situation in the country by laying down certain specific standings which the builder must meet before he can obtain the FHA-insured loan, and that therefore we can be pretty certain these are not jerry-built houses, because jerry-built houses would not be insured.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope that is so, and I have no evidence to the contrary, but it does not answer my point as to whether the figures the Senator has given are based on frame dwellings or brick dwellings. As we all know, brick dwellings cost more than frame dwellings. The cost would also depend on the type of plaster used, and so on. The FHA has been interested in having pretty good houses built, as fast as they could be built, in order to relieve the housing shortage. I am interested in that, too. But I am interested in building the kind of house which will not eat itself up with repairs.

The Senator from Maryland has had quite a little experience in that line on military reservations. For example, the Aberdeen Proving Ground, which employs many thousands of persons normally, is just about 5 miles from where the chairman of the Armed Services Committee lives. It is only about a mile and a half away as the crow flies. When I came to Congress, a long while ago, those in control of the Aberdeen Proving Ground, which had been built during World War I, and the housing was of that date, came to me and asked if they could not get a more permanent type of construction. In the course of that consideration I went into the repair bills at the Aberdeen Proving Ground. As the years went on the repair bills were beginning to mount to such a figure that it seemed to me, in the interest of ultimate economy, more durable construction should be provided. I was able, gradually, to have that done. But let me say it was not all done at one time. It was done gradually over a period of 10 or 15 years.

The same thing is true respecting the veterans' hospital at Perry Point, Md., a couple of miles across the river, where all the houses erected were of wood. Men who had lost their minds, and who were locked up, lived in wooden buildings there. The American Legion, as well as I, who am a veteran, became interested in the matter, and gradually we had all those fire traps torn down and durable buildings erected.

I wish to say that anyone who looks at the drawing which stands on the easel in front of the Senate will see the size of one house with a doorway. He will see that there is nothing extravagant or grandiose about it. We have tried to provide sufficient money to build it properly while it is being built, and not on the modern American plan of putting up something for 5 or 6 or 8 years and then having to tear it down or having to ask for a large appropriation with which to repair it.

I am afraid that many of the houses—and I say this in no way of criticism—to which the Senator from Illinois has referred are not of the durable kind of construction which we have insisted on, along with economy, in the building of these permanent installations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Maryland, who has asked me to submit the evidence as to why I think the cost of $9,000 would be approximately accurate, that the FHA houses, which cost $9,350 for 1,040 square feet, while they contain 40 fewer square feet than provided in the plan submitted by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, nevertheless, have included in that figure land costs, which are not included in the item under consideration. Therefore, the figures seem to be roughly comparable.

Second, the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, on the basis of a study of 14,000 houses, reaches the figure of from eight to ten dollars a square foot, including land cost, which amounts to from $8,640 to $10,800 for a 1,080-square-foot house; so probably the average would be not far from $9,500, let us say.

Furthermore—and this is very important—Public Law 21, which, as the Senator from Maryland stated, he helped to sponsor, provided for construction off military reservations of military housing under FHA, and I ask the Senator to notice that it provided for an average construction cost of $9,000 per unit for row-type units, or $10,000 for detached dwellings.

The Senator from Maryland himself sponsored a bill providing $9,000 for housing off military reservations, and now he wants legislation providing for $14,000, plus $2,500 on military reservations. I submit there is such a disparity in cost unaccounted for by comparable differences in quality and extent of housing, that it is very difficult to justify the differential.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many bedrooms did the houses have under the Wherry-Tydings bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland how many? As I remember, the law provided for houses of all sizes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thought the Senator said they were smaller houses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I said that the difference between them was greater than could be accounted for by differences in accommodations. I grant that there are differences, but the question is whether those differences are sufficient to justify $5,000 difference in cost.

Mr. TYDINGS. Allow me to answer the Senator now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Perhaps the Senator can answer his own question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Many of the houses built under the Wherry-Tydings bill have no bedrooms; many of the houses built under that bill have one bedroom. They are not uniform houses. They are houses built to cover a wide variety of needs. So, the yardstick there, with all due respect to the Senator, again, is not the same one that should be used to measure this proposal. Many of these houses built under the Wherry-Tydings bill have no basements. Many of them are without bedrooms. Many of them have one room, and some of them have two and three rooms. So no comparison could be made.

But may I ask the Senator whether in his illustration of what the Lumbermen's Association said these houses could be built for, if they gave the inside floor space or the outside floor space, there being a considerable difference in floor space if we consider the thickness of the walls? There are two ways of calculating floor space. I do not know from the remarks of the Senator from Illinois whether he is considering inside floor space, which is what we are considering. If we were to use the total floor space, including the foundation of the building, the cost per square foot would be much less than the chart shows. The chart is based on inside floor space. I do not know whether his yardstick is accurate. I do not know whether it is based on inside or outside floor space.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall have to check up on that.

Mr. TYDINGS. It may be that the Senator is using the same yardstick I am using. In the event the calculation were based on the outside or the over-all foundational floor space, it would make a great deal of difference. I believe the Senator from Illinois will find that when square feet or cubic feet are used as a basis for calculating building costs, the outside length and width of the building are used, and not the interior floor space.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from Maryland what figure he would submit as an average cost figure? Does he intend to stand solely on the maximum of $14,000? If the Senator from Maryland will make an estimate, perhaps we can get our heads together on it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am interested in saving every dollar we can possibly save. All I want to do is to be convinced that any proposal which is offered will result in a saving without deteriorating the substantial qualities of the buildings which we authorize.

In trying to meet the point of view of the Senator from Illinois I would be willing to do a number of things which I believe would safeguard the interests and the point of view which he has so ably expressed. For example, I would be willing to insert a provision to the effect that no bid could be accepted unless it were approved by the Secretary of Defense if less than five or six bidders were to submit bids, so as to assure a wide range of competition. I do not wish to imply that such a provision would insure an airtight rule in every case. There may be some isolated place where it would not be possible to get five bidders, in which case there would have to be sufficient elasticity to get the work done. But I would be willing to provide in the bill that no bid shall be accepted unless investigation shows that there are at least so many good-faith bidders. That suggestion is oper to some question, of course, because some bidders might submit phony bids which would be higher than the bid of the real bidder, and which would be submitted solely for the purpose of shutting off competition. However, I assume that when five or six bids are submitted the supervising authority is in a position to ascertain whether or not the bids are good-faith bids or phony bids. That is one thing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I deal with that? I think it is better if we deal with these issues one at a time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There would be some protection if we had more bidders, but the Senator from Maryland is perfectly aware of the fact that this system can be abused by contractors' rings. For example, there might be five bidders, from A to E, and A could be low man at $16,500.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have just said that the bidders' market could be rigged.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And E could be high man at $20,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the bid could be solemnly awarded to A. On the next bid B could be low man and A could be high man. The awarding of bids could be rotated, and in each case the bid could be awarded to the low bidder at $16,500, and the cost would still be that figure. The building industry is subject to collusion, I am sorry to say, to a far greater extent than we have ever dreamed. It is not always possible to protect the taxpayers against this type of collusive bidding.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I myself pointed out that this would not be an airtight way of getting honest bids, but I assume the more bidders that are required on a project the more difficult it is to make combinations. I notice that in some of these cases there were only two bidders, and in others there were four bidders. In most cases there were 9, 10, 14, or 15 bidders. It is interesting to note that when there are more bidders the price is lower than when there are fewer bidders. Perhaps that is not a justifiable conclusion to be drawn. Nevertheless, it is shown on the chart. Therefore, it seems to me that that would be one approach. We might couple with that suggestion the provision that they must be bidders in good faith and that the supervising authority shall make some examination to insure that result.

Leaving that question for the moment, I should be glad to accept an amendment providing that the maximum amounts provided for in this bill are not amounts which, when appropriated, must necessarily be expended, and that when a project is built for less than the amount provided, any sums appropriated which are not used for the actual building shall not be spent for any other purpose but shall be covered back into the Treasury. My reason for making the suggestion is that the Senator from Illinois fears—and perhaps I share the fear—that if money appropriated by the Government is not spent for one purpose, and a part of it is saved by a Government agency, an easy way is usually found to spend it for another purpose. So an amendment of that kind would be a safeguard and, in my opinion, would make certain that any savings resulting from competitive bidding would be covered back into the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that all the Senator from Maryland has to offer?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. I conclude by saying to the Senator from Illinois that I am not willing to accept his figures, because I do not know that they embrace the same character of substantial building which we propose. I do not know whether they embrace the over-all floor space or the inside floor space. I do not know what yardstick he is using. He mentioned the cost of the lots as an average of a thousand dollars. I doubt very much if that is correct. However, I am willing to accept the figure of $1,750, which he has suggested as an average cost, as a ceiling on the utilities. That is the average which the experience shown on the chart seems to indicate may be accepted without weakening the durability of the building program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe that the proposals of the Senator from Maryland go very far toward meeting this difficulty. It would be generally known that an authorization of $14,000 per unit had been made. I believe there would be very few bids submitted much below that figure. Therefore no appreciable amount of money would be returned to the taxpayers. We would be paying $14,000 for each of the buildings.

I have made a computation in my head as to the cost if we were to house every nonfarm family in the United States on the expensive scale proposed by the Committee on Armed Services. The committee proposes a cost of $16,500, for building and utilities. To that, as I pointed out, must be added at least $1,000 or $1,500 for land and architectual fees. So in reality we are providing $17,500 or $18,000 for each housing unit. As I remember the figures, there are 36,000,000 nonfarm dwellings in the United States. At a cost of $17,000 per unit, we would have a total cost of approximately $570,000,000,000, which is more than the total wealth of the United States.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Illinois might have used the cost of building houses for generals, admirals, and colonels.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That would cost much more. If they were to be included, there would be no limit. If we were to provide a $17,500 house for an enlisted man, how much more would it cost to provide a house for a field officer or for a general officer? The cost would really run into astronomical figures.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out also to the able Senator from Illinois that the figures of the retail lumber dealers as to what these houses can be built for are rather startling. I buy a good deal of lumber and sell a good deal of it, and I operate a rather big enterprise at home. The prices I pay for lumber are different from the prices which have been quoted on the Senate floor. If anyone would like to get rid of some big money fast, let him go out and buy some lumber. Most of the lumber he will buy will be freshly cut and unseasoned. It will warp and bend out of shape as soon as it is installed. I am inclined to take with a great deal of salt the figures which have been quoted here, because there is as much difference between the various kinds of lumber which can be used for building as there is, let us say, between the average Russian and a Member of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my distinguished and genial friend, the Senator from Maryland, that I shall offer him a volume containing the raw data upon which these estimates are made. He may sprinkle this volume with salt, if he will. It weighs some three pounds. I do not know how much salt he will need to sprinkle on it in order to season it properly. [Laughter.]

These estimates are rough, it is true; but they are based upon 14,000 houses. The Senator has the estimates, and he can look them over.

Mr. TYDINGS. There again, I do not know. As I look them over, in the case of nearly every one of them I see that no basement is provided for. However,

every one of the houses to be authorized by the measure now pending will have a basement. So there is a difference, on the face of the record.

As I further examine the record the Senator has given me, I find that, in answer to the question as to whether the house has a basement, the answer is "No," "No," "No," "No," "No"—indicating in each case no basement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. These are rough estimates and you are looking at only one sheet of California figures. I do not say that $9,000 is the precise average which should be fixed. The proper average may be larger. But I do say that $14,000 is an excessive average, and I stand on that statement.

Let us get this debate in its true proportions. Instead of having the Senator from Maryland discuss types of plaster and types of lumber and basements, and so forth, let us go into the question of whether $14,000 plus $2,500 for outside utilities is an excessive average for the proposed housing. That is the whole issue.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The reason I started at the basement level is that we have to build proper debate on a firm foundation, and the basement is the foundation of the House.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say the Senator has constructed his case on castles in the air, not on a firm foundation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to read from the exhibit the Senator has submitted to me. I cannot make out the names of all the companies involved, but one of the lumber companies, in answer to the question, "Does your estimate include a basement?" replied, "No."

The Star Lumber Co., in answer to the question, "Does your estimate include a basement?" replied, "No."

The San Carlos Lumber Co., in reply to the question, "Does your estimate include a basement?" replied, "No."

San Carlos is in California, and the houses there, without a basement, will cost $9,750.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, basements are not as prevalent in California as in other sections of the country.

Would the Senator from Maryland state what he finds in the column which indicates whether the estimates include land or do not include land?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I shall be glad to do so. I find that the lowest amount for land is $500, at Moorehead, Calif., and at first blush it would appear that the highest amount for land is $1,200, at Hayward, Calif.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the statement of the Senator from Illinois, namely, that land costs would range from $500 to $1,000. The Senator from Maryland said that statement was made on the basis of unsubstantiated guesses. I considered the cost of lots to be common knowledge and these figures will back this up.

While it is true that all the houses referred to in the estimates may not have basements and may not have all the appurtenances which the genial Senator from Maryland would desire, nevertheless, the estimates do include land, and the houses and the land cost only about $9,500 each, per unit, whereas the Senator from Maryland is advocating a $14,000 house; and the difference between the two runs into millions of dollars, in the total amounts.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Again I am reading from the Senator's own witness, sitting on the witness stand, so to speak, although invisible, of course; in other words, I am reading from the exhibit the Senator has handed to me, and here is the recorded testimony:

How many bedrooms will there be in a house costing $9,750? The answer is "one."

How many bedrooms will there be in the houses which are to be authorized by the pending measure?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that nominally there are to be three; but I believe that one of them might more appropriately be termed an alcove.

Mr. TYDINGS. Nevertheless, it is a room.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the word "room" can cover a multitude of sins.

Mr. TYDINGS. But there are only one or two bedrooms in the case of the houses referred to in the exhibit the Senator from Illinois has handed to me. The first estimate shows two bedrooms; the second one, two; the next, two; the next, two; the next, three; and the next several ones show two, two, two, two, two, three, two, two, two, and two.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the avenging angel turn the page? If he will, I hope he will find further evidence.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do turn the page. I find there, listed as the number of bedrooms, two, two, two, two——

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will look at the other page—he is reading from a page showing houses costing under $5,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the Senator from Illinois to wait a minute, please. He has turned the page for me, and I wish to read it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am reading from his own evidence, not mine. Let us see what is said for the next State: The number of bedrooms shown is two, two, two, two, one, two, two, one, two, two.

But in the pending measure we ask authorization for three-bedroom houses.

The Senator from Illinois handed me this book; and I assume that when he turned the page, he turned it at the proper place. I do not know; this book is the Senator's witness, so to speak, not mine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have no desire to misrepresent. We are glad the evidence is in. We shall simply submit other pages, that is all.

I may say that I am informed that some of the houses which have been referred to by the Senator from Maryland are those costing under $5,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no; the Senator is mistaken there. The one about which I am reading now is a house costing $9,750, and it has only two bedrooms, and no cellar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland is correct; the Senator from Illinois is in error on that point.

Mr. TYDINGS. Good; now we are getting somewhere.

Mr. President, in the pending measure we propose authorizations for houses, each of which will have a cellar under it, and each of which will have three bedrooms and a bath.

What is the yardstick, by way of comparison? It is a house with no cellar, with two bedrooms, and so far as I know it will not have a bath. That house costs nearly $10,000, without those things. I have read from the record the Senator from Illinois has submitted to me, which may be regarded as the Senator's own witness, not mine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say that on the whole the houses for which the estimates are submitted are two-bedroom houses.

Mr. TYDINGS. But without basements.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct in many instances, but land costs are included.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But some of them have three bedrooms, and in all cases the costs are below $10,000.

What I am trying to say is that I do not insist that $9,000 is the precise figure in the case of the houses for which authorization is requested in the pending measure, but I do insist that $14,000 is an excessive figure for them. I wish the Senator from Maryland would devote his great legal talents and his great public ability, not to shooting holes in the $9,000 figure, but in joining me in the effort to save $30,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to read further from the same evidence, if the Senator will again yield to me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the pending measure, we request authorization for a two-story house with a basement. On the other hand, all the houses covered by the estimates submitted to me by the Senator from Illinois are one-story houses. All of them are. For instance, in referring to the estimates, I find the number of stories listed as follows: One, one, one, one, one-and-one-half, one, one, one, one, one, one, one, one, one.

So, although in the pending measure we request authorization for a two-and-one-half story house, we find that in the estimates submited by the Senator from Illinois, one-story houses are covered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have never known the advantage of a two-story house in itself, as compared to a one-story house. One-story houses require more land. Two-story houses are often built because it is economical. I do not know why the two-story house should

be made a fetish. I think the test is the number of square feet provided.

Am I correct in stating that one of the rooms the Senator from Maryland is trotting out as a magnificent bedroom contains less than 100 square feet?

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me tell the Senator. As to the size of the bedrooms, one is 14 feet, 5 inches by 10 feet, 5 inches; one is 10 feet, 9 inches by 10 feet, 5 inches; and one is 9 feet, 5 inches by 8 feet, 5 inches.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the one to which I wish to refer—in other words, 80 square feet. That is not a bedroom; it is an alcove. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think a bedroom with 80 square feet in it is sufficient for many purposes. When I was a boy, I slept in a small bedroom of about that size, and I grew to manhood without being stunted.

But how big are the bedrooms in the two-bedroom houses the Senator from Illinois is using as his illustration?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, all I wish to say is that the Senator from Maryland should not be too proud about the three bedrooms to which he refers in order to justify a cost of $14,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there are many enlisted men and many junior officers in the Army who will be very glad to get that extra bedroom, believe me

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now the Senator from Maryland has shifted the emphasis. I do not object to three bedrooms; it is fine to have that number of bedrooms in a house. What I object to is the cost of the three-bedroom houses covered by the requested authorization before us.

It is not a question of authorizing houses with inferior accommodations; it is a question of getting them built for less money.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the document the Senator from Illinois has placed in my hand is a rather interesting one. I enjoy reading it almost as much as I enjoy reading some of our great magazines. For example, here is one house with an area of only 1,000 square feet, a house without a basement, only one story in height, and probably with two bedrooms. It does not say clearly. It says two or three. I do not know whether the floor area is outside or inside, but it has 80 square feet less than the houses contemplated by the bill as set forth on the chart, and it costs $9,750 without a basement, without any equipment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But with land.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe I could take the information and evidence supplied by the Senator from Illinois much as I respect and admire his effort to throw safeguards around the appropriation. I do not believe we have the kind of substantial facts, judging by those I have read, upon which to base an argument, because we are talking about one horse that is black and another horse that is white, and I think our comparisons should be based on horses of like color.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Whatever may be the case with respect to this $9,000 estimate, certainly the overwhelming weight of the evidence indicates that the $14,000 figure is excessive. I might even consider raising the average from $9,000 to $10,000, with $1,750 for utilities. That would provide $11,750 for the house, plus land. Incidentally, if the entire population of the country were housed on that standard, the housing bill alone for the nonfarm population would be around $450,000,000,000, or approximately equivalent to the total national wealth.

I desire to make clear that I want good housing for military personnel, and I am glad we are providing housing for the three upper pay grades, because it will permit the sergeant majors, the first sergeants, the technical sergeants, and the staff sergeants to have their families about them, and it will result in a much better family life and much better morals throughout the whole Military Establishment. I am for that.

I recognize that there are peculiar conditions in Alaska which may justify higher cost limits there, though I have not said anything about that. But what I am saying is that we should economize on the cost per house, so that we may (a) construct more houses and (b) save money for the taxpayers.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to the Senator that I just now went to the chart. I took the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and I took North Carolina and San Francisco, Virginia and New Mexico, Texas and Michigan. Using this column, which I counted up very quickly in my head, it comes to a few more dollars than $75,000 for the six localities, or $12,500 on an average. That represents North and South, East and West; and it represents North and South in the central part of the country. There, the average is $12,500 by actual experience. In the first case there were 15 bidders. In four of the six examples set forth on the chart, there were nine or more bidders on each project. I could not go lower than $12,500 as an average, in view of those figures, in the light of the present information I have available.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I started at $9,000. Under great duress, I would go up to $10,000. The Senator from Maryland has come down to $12,500. There is a zone of "indeterminacy" between us. I think there will be further debate on this issue, and perhaps it can be resolved. But I believe the proper figure lies very much closer to $9,000 than it does to $12,500.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator from Illinois will allow me to correct him in one statement he makes, when he says the Senator from Maryland has come down, the Senator from Maryland has not come down; he is still in favor of the $14,000 top. What I have done is to try to set an average.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is all the Senator from Illinois has been trying to do.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; but do not say I have come down. I am still for the $14,000 top.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My proposal is for an average. The Army, Navy, and Air Force figures represent an average of $14,000.

I may say there is a further element which needs to be considered. The eloquent, ingenious, and congenial Senator from Maryland has thrown a bewildering smoke screen of basements, sizes of rooms, types of various kinds of lumber, so that it is very hard to get at the solid body of this argument.

Mr. TYDINGS. They are not smoke screens; they are blockbusters.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But there is another point which should be borne in mind, and it is somewhat different from that which the Senator from Maryland has advanced. It is that building costs, contrary to what the Senator—I am sure in perfectly good faith—says, have been slightly reduced during the past year. For instance, I read from the Index of Building Costs, compiled by E. H. Boechk and Associates, published in Construction and Construction Materials Reports by the Construction Division, Office of Domestic Commerce, in the Department of Commerce. They give an index figure of costs for October 1948 (based on 1939=100) of 216, and a figure of 204 for October 1949, a reduction of 12 points, approximately 5 percent. If we compare December 1949 with December 1948 the reduction is less by about 7 points, or 3 percent. In the verbal estimate made by the representative of the National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association, whose rough tabulations I produced and which the Senator from Maryland smote hip and thigh, they make an estimate of a reduction in cost from last year of approximately 10 percent.

Therefore, I submit the figures on costs for previous years, which I presented, should be scaled down in terms of present figures. So, when the Senator says I measure with a 35-inch ruler on the type of house, though conceding that I measure with a 37-inch ruler on land value, let me assure the Senator I probably measure with a 38-inch ruler in terms of construction cost, and that if we should go to current construction costs, the Senator would find that the average general ruler was not so far from 36 inches. I have no desire to prolong the argument.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want to try to accommodate in every way I can the very worthy aim of the Senator from Illinois in throwing safeguards around the bill. I should like to say before I make this statement that the figures on the blackboard show that his estimate of $1,750 for utilities, as an average, is well taken.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted at this tribute from the somewhat critical Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. That would in no way interfere with the ceiling. It would simply provide that in the doing of all these things the cost shall not exceed an average. In equal good faith, by actual experience, as shown on the table, the average of those units would be $12,500. I think that is correct. I understand I am out of line, for I am now advised it is closer to $13,000. But as I added it in my head very quickly, I made it

$12,500. I should be very glad to establish an average which the facts themselves, based on experience with precisely like and identical houses, show can be used.

The Senator from Illinois has left me in a position where I am not certain in my own mind. I say this without any desire to belittle the splendid argument and the philosophy he has maintained; but he has left some doubt in my mind as to whether the figures he used are applicable in judging a house of a different type and in, some cases, of a more expensive type. I am advised that the average of the figures on the chart is $13,200, including, of course, the equipment. I should be glad to keep the top limit of $14,000 for a house, and an average of $1,750 for utilities for a house, and provide that the average of all houses shall not be greater than the $13,000 figure which the chart indicates, or what the experience of other building projects not listed on the chart would indicate. But I do not believe I would be as sound as I should like to be, in accepting the Senator's figure, predicated, as he himself has so frankly stated, upon houses of a different kind of construction and containment from the houses we are here proposing to build. If I were to accept the figure which the Senator offers in the best of faith, I am afraid that until further testimony could be adduced I would find that I had inadvertently defeated Army, Navy, and Air Force housing.

The Senator from Illinois has done splendid work, this debate has developed a good many facts, and I think some little misunderstanding has been wiped away as we have discussed matters back and forth in good faith. We have all profited by the debate, it has been in the best interests of the country, and that is a good thing. I shall be willing to accept any reasonable average. I have been willing to accept it from the minute I came on the floor with the bill. As the Senator will realize, I do not want to accept an average which will defeat the purpose of the bill or result in the building of shacks of which we have too many in America to house the junior officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and also the noncommissioned officers in those services.

I should also like to point out to the Senator that the debate has had a great influence on the course of the proposed legislation. Whatever we do here will have wide consideration in the House because of the debate in the Senate, and, as the bill must be considered by the House of Representatives after it leaves the Senate, if there shall come a reasonable figure based on Army, Navy, and Air Force actual experience, which I think will stand the test of hard analysis, I shall be delighted to put that figure in as an average, but under no circumstances do I want to remove the ceiling except as I have heretofore indicated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator that I, too, do not want to remove the ceiling, but I am reluctant to accept past costs as an indication of what we should authorize in the future, because it is not at all certain that we shall have this type of house, and it is not at all certain that in the past the military forces have exercised due care in getting costs down to a minimum. We may find that the costs in the past have been excessive, and that, therefore, we should not take past costs as an indication of what future costs should be.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WITHERS. Is there any way at all whereby we can receive fair bids on these contracts? Can the Senator devise a plan by which fair bidding can be obtained?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am fearful that a mere provision in the law that all bids shall be fair will not assure our actually receiving fair bids.

Mr. WITHERS. I am not proposing that such a provision be put into the bill. We are not bound to accept any bid as it is made, are we?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. WITHERS. We have a right to reject bids, have we not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WITHERS. We have a right to make our own estimates on each house which is to be constructed, have we not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WITHERS. We have a right to reject any bid.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. WITHERS. If the bids were rejected, the bidders would know that they were out of line with our own estimates.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. WITHERS. We have a right to make our own estimates, to determine costs of materials, and to ascertain from our own figures whether the bidder's figures are out of line. What would be the danger in opening these projects to bids? How would the taxpayers suffer? The taxpayers' sons might suffer while waiting for the housing. If we find out that the contractors are crooks and none of them wants to submit a fair bid, we might bid on the projects ourselves. Might not that be done?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope so.

Mr. WITHERS. We would not be bound to accept a bid which was entirely out of line. We might want to accept a bid which was below the low estimate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WITHERS. Could that be done?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WITHERS. While we are looking out for the taxpayers, I am a little bit more interested in the taxpayers' sons, and I should not be surprised if other taxpayers are interested in the taxpayers' sons. They are all America's sons, and if we err I want my error to be on the side of the taxpayers' sons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thoroughly agree with the Senator.

Mr. WITHERS. I have had a good deal of experience in letting contracts, and I found that most of the persons with whom I dealt were honest. We have not had much difficulty in catching the crooks. We have had to reject very few bids because we thought they were padded and stuffed. I have a great deal of confidence in American bidders. If we are going to err, let us try to err on the side of the taxpayers' sons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his statement, which is very sincere and is intended in the public interest. Our aims are the same. What I have been contending for is that unless we have an average figure included in the bill——

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WITHERS. The Senator from Illinois knows that prices vary from time to time, and what we might put into the bill might be a meaningless thing. Is not that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I do not think it is correct.

Mr. WITHERS. I myself let a contract for a house, and 2 months later there was a 20-percent variance in the prices. That is a wide variance. There is likely to be depreciation in costs, and if we establish a floor, bidders will certainly feel inclined to go to that floor. I want the services to have the benefit of the best prices obtainable. There is no other way I know of to obtain a fair public bid except to have the project wide open to every bidder, with every card on the table, and with the knowledge that we have men capable of determining fair estimates. I do not believe the taxpayers will suffer as much as the Senator thinks they will. I am interested in seeing that the taxpayers' sons do not suffer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that it is my feeling that unless we put in an average figure appreciably below the maximum proposed, rather than merely retaining the maximum figure which is now in the bill, there is likely to be difficulty. The so-called maximum figure, as I developed it from a study of the justifications, is the uniform figure which the engineering authorities use for every locality in the United States—a uniform figure of $14,000 plus $2,500. If that merely stood by itself, the contractors would know that if they should go up to that point, their bids, in all probability, would not be rejected.

Unfortunately, while there is competition in the construction industry, we know there is often far less competition than many persons claim. We know there is sometimes collusive bidding and rotated bidding. What I have been trying to do was to place legislative protection in the bill so that we might get a greater degree of competitive bidding and force bids down. I assure the Senator that my purpose is not to defeat housing. The purpose is to save money. If we save money, we can get still more housing. Waste does not help anyone.

Mr. President, I think I have discussed this subject long enough. I want to reserve one or two matters for discussion at the end.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Maryland to page 5, lines 13 and 14, of his bill, containing an authorization for Murphy General Hospital, Massachusetts, for "family quarters and utilities, land acquisition, $241,000."

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator give that reference again?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Page 5, lines 13 and 14, of the bill.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOBEY. We have all heard about the men who marched up hill and marched down again. This is a little exemplification of it.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded calling the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bricker	Humphrey	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Murray
Cain	Ives	Neely
Chapman	Jenner	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex	Pepper
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Darby	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Kem	Saltonstall
Downey	Kerr	Schoeppel
Ecton	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Leahy	Sparkman
Frear	Lehman	Stennis
Fulbright	Lodge	Taylor
George	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Gillette	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Green	McClellan	Tobey
Gurney	McFarland	Tydings
Hayden	McKellar	Watkins
Hendrickson	McMahon	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Withers
Hill	Martin	Young
Hoey	Maybank	
Holland	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2681) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington, to be held at Lexington, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT CELEBRATION COMMEMORATING ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF LEXINGTON

During Mr. DOUGLAS' speech,

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should be very glad to yield for one question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My purpose in asking the Senator to yield is simply this. Yesterday the Senate passed unanimously a bill reported from the Committee on Armed Services to permit the Marine Band to play at the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington. The House has passed the bill with amendments so as to include "Concord." I shall appreciate it if the Senator will yield to permit consideration of the amendments of the House.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield for that purpose. I may say to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts that the people of the Bay State will be greatly edified by listening to the Marine Band.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the sentiments of the Senator from Illinois, who was born in the State of Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2681) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington, to be held at Lexington, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950, which were, on page 1, line 6, after "Lexington", insert "and Concord"; on page 1, line 8, after "Lexington", insert "and Concord", and amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, to be held at Lexington and Concord, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2945) to readjust postal rates, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2945) to readjust postal rates, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2440) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this bill is very important and imperative to our national defense. There are in the bill several provisions which will be of great benefit to the Navy, the Air Force, and to the State of Florida.

In particular, I call attention of the Senate to the following items:

	Amount
Mayport aircraft carrier basin, Jacksonville, Fla	$4,920,000
Acquisition and expansion of oil terminal facilities, Navy, Jacksonville, Fla	3,175,000
Dredging submarine basin, Key West, Fla	739,000
Establishment of advanced warfare school, Fort Lauderdale, Fla	275,000
Family quarters, utilities, and armament-testing facilities, Air Force Base, Eglin Field, Valparaiso	3,459,000
Family quarters, utilities, fuel storage facilities, and airfield pavements, MacDill Field, Tampa, Fla	4,412,000
Bulk storage for oil, Air Force, Panama City, Fla	537,339

Mr. President, in 1939 the Hepburn Board recommended the establishment of a major air base at Jacksonville, Fla., to provide facilities for several carrier groups and for the berthing of carriers. Later, Congress approved these recommendations.

There is only one harbor on the Atlantic coast which is capable of handling large aircraft carriers. However, there are certain conditions, such as air space limitations, which preclude any expansion in that area. In view of our military requirements, it is absolutely necessary that a harbor capable of supporting large aircraft carrier operations be developed on the southeastern coast. The Navy has selected the Mayport Basin in the Ribault Bay area for this project. The site is adjacent to major air and repair industrial facilities located at the Jacksonville Naval Air Station which now is in active operating status. This station provides for overhaul and repairs of carriers and for training of technicians and reserves for our naval air arm. Under the provisions of this bill, the project would include the dredging of the St. Johns River to 42 feet and widening to 500 feet and deepening to 42 feet the entrance channel to the bay, as well as the construction of necessary piers, roads, and similar facilities, and dredging the turning basin to permit it to handle large carriers.

Mr. President, it is most urgent that adequate Navy-owned fuel-storage facilities be provided on the Florida east coast area. The Navy lacks fuel storage facilities in the southeastern part of the United States, and there is a great need to guarantee a continuous supply of fuels, particularly aviation gasoline for existing naval aviation facilities. At the present time the Navy has contracts for providing aviation gasoline at three locations in Florida, but this requires the trucking of the gasoline to the various naval air stations in Florida and southern Georgia. In my judgment, this is a very precarious situation, because an interrupted delivery of gasoline would curtail flight operations and would greatly hinder our naval air operations in the interest of national defense. If the Congress authorizes this project, it will enable the Navy to acquire and expand residual oil terminal facilities, tankage, pipe lines, and to expand the existing oil-storage facility at Jacksonville which has been declared surplus by War Assets Administration.

The bill also proposes the dredging of the submarine basin at the naval station at Key West, Fla. This work would increase the existing depth in the basin to 30 feet, which would permit the operation and testing of submarines and other vessels without damage to their propellers.

The Navy plans also, if authorized to do so, to locate at Fort Lauderdale, Fla., the only school in the country which will give coordinated underseas-warfare instruction, including antisubmarine warfare in surface, air, and submarine aspects, to senior naval officers who will be responsible for the conduct of underseas war operations. This project will provide facilities for the training of about 50 officers in a class.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that Congress should approve this project in the interest of our national security.

Mr. President, family housing and utilities for the use of service families

at our air bases in Florida are not sufficient to meet their needs and requirements. In the Valparaiso area, near the Eglin Field Air Force Base, in west Florida, the family housing situation is extremely critical. Based upon the present plans of the Air Force for using this base, there is an indicated deficiency of 64 percent. It is estimated that if Congress authorizes $1,584,000 for Eglin Field it will permit the Air Force to construct 96 units of housing. In the Tampa area, around the MacDill Air Force Base, the situation is just as desperate. The indicated deficiency is 71 percent, and $1,584,000 proposed in the bill would permit the construction of 96 housing units. The additional family quarters which will be provided by the bill will only partially relieve conditions at both air bases.

The bill would also authorize $1,875,000 for the construction of armament engineering test facilities at Eglin Air Force Base to insure the adequate execution of the current program. In addition, if the bill is passed by Congress, it will permit the MacDill Air Force Base to acquire additional fuel-storage facilities and to widen taxiways and construct an additional parking apron at an estimated cost of $2,828,000. MacDill Field is now a base for a medium-bomber group and also has a squadron of air-sea-rescue aircraft. The purchase and rehabilitation of an oil plant at Panama City will enable the Air Force to drop the leasing of bulk storage of fuel in this area. At present these facilities are obtained by lease from commercial companies. The bill would permit the Air Force to acquire a former Navy residual oil terminal at Panama City as soon as funds for such acquisition become available. Of course, at the present time the terminal still belongs to the Navy.

Mr. President, we can no longer postpone consideration of this important bill. I very much hope the Senate will pass this bill, significant as it is to our entire national security, before the end of this day

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I inquire what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The pending question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is open to amendment from the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, on page 23, in line 14, after the word "contingencies", it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That the average cost of all the family quarters to be constructed under the authority of this Act shall not exceed (1) $11,000 per family unit for construction, including kitchen range, refrigerators, telephone, architectural and engineering services and all contingencies and (2) $1,750 per family unit for site development and outside utilities, including architectural and engineering services therefor and all contingencies.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. The amendment I offered is in the nature of a substitute. The Senator from Illinois has now offered an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. I take it that perfecting amendments to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the amendment in the nature of a substitute are in order. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Perfecting amendments to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment, which in itself is in the nature of a substitute for the entire bill, are in order.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I should like to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment, namely, to strike out the figure "$11,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$13,000."

I shall discuss that amendment after the Senator from Illinois speaks; I assume that perhaps he may wish to make a short statement in regard to his own amendment to the committee amendment. Or would the Senator prefer that I discuss at this time my amendment to his amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Suppose the amendment of the Senator from Maryland should be agreed to; would it then be in order to offer an amendment to the section as amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order to offer amendments to other portions of the section, but not to that portion. It would, however, be in order to offer a new substitute amendment in its entirety.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the situation then that if the last amendment of the Senator from Maryland is adopted fixing a $13,000 average, we shall then be stopped from proposing a lower figure as a subsequent amendment to the proposals of the Senator from Maryland, therefore, and, that the figure will be frozen at $13,000?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Illinois that if the Tydings amendment should be agreed to, the question would then be on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, as amended, by substituting the numerals "$13,000", for the numerals "$1,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is aware of that fact. But suppose it should be adopted; would there then be any possibility of offering an amendment which would reduce the average below the $13,000 figure? We are going through an elaborate game of cards, here; the Senator from Maryland has just trumped my trick, and I want to find out whether there is any possibility of overtrumping.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Illinois that his suspicion is well founded, and that if the $13,000 figure is substituted for the $11,000 figure, the $13,000 figure will stand, and the only way to replace it after that time would be to withdraw his entire amendment and offer another in place of it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I want to try to take no undue advantage of the legislative situation, and I shall try to state what is involved here in about two or three sentences. We have debated the subject all afternoon, and I do not want to prolong debate. The reason I have proposed $13,000 as an average of what the houses will cost, keeping the ceiling of $14,000, beyond which none of them can go, and an over-all average of not to exceed $13,000, is that the actual table of experience in building houses in many States all over the country shows the average cost to be $13,271. I have taken off $271 already from the average in an effort to force it to what I believe to be the greatest possible extent without harming the proposal.

The amendment of the Senator from Illinois provides that the average shall not exceed $11,000 all over the country. There is no experience that I know of, or at least I may say it seems so, in my judgment, which would justify such an average. The figures I have represent the average from California to Maine, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, of houses identical with those to be built under the pending bill. I do not believe I could go further in reducing it in the face of the table. The Senator from Illinois feels otherwise. He feels it could safely be reduced to $11,000 as an average, keeping the $14,000 top, as provided. My fear is that if his amendment is adopted it will result in the building of houses only in places where they can be built cheaply, and in none being built in places where it is not possible to hit the average which he so admirably desires to obtain. In the event my amendment is adopted, of course, his amendment would be out of order, as the matter now stands. In the event my amendment is voted down, his amendment would then be in order. I think I have stated the matter with reasonable accuracy and fairness. I am compelled to take this legislative process, and to offer my amendment, in order to bring the issue clearly before the Senate.

The matter will have to be reviewed by the Appropriations Committee, even after the authorization is made. That committee may find it possible to go lower in the light of the facts, but we ought to go lower on facts and not on supposition, which, in my opinion, would defeat the program. Furthermore, it is a Senate bill. It must go to the House Armed Services Committee for review and reexamination. We, therefore, have two more procedures through which it must pass; first, the Senate Appropriations Committee, if the bill passes both Houses, which committee will appropriate only such money as is deemed wise for the purpose; and secondly, the House Armed Services Committee. As has been suggested, the House Appropriations Committee would also have to act on it.

I may now point out that there is insufficient money in the President's budget to cover all these projects. The pressure, therefore, is already on the Military Establishment to get the utmost they can within the money the President has asked the Congress to appropriate. I ask for the question, Mr. President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief, because there has already been a long discussion of the subject. The amendment of the Senator from Maryland to my amendment, instead of fixing an $11,000 average, would, as he stated, fix a $13,000 average. The total savings which would be effected by the amendment of the Senator from Maryland would amount to only $9,000,000 inside continental United States, whereas the amendment I propose would save $21,000,000 inside continental United States. If the provisions now in the bill concerning Alaska and regions outside continental United States are to remain in it, the further saving under my amendment would be approximately $10,000,000, making a total saving of $31,000,000, as compared to the saving under the proposal of the Senator from Maryland of approximately $12,000,000. That is the financial stake involved. I do not want to prolong the discussion further. The RECORD can be read. I ask Senators to vote "no" on the amendment of the Senator from Maryland to my amendment, and to strive to fix $11,000 as the average. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before we reach a vote, I think I should be recreant in my obligation as a Senator to all the people of America if I did not take this occasion to praise the able and eminent Senator from Illinois for his great desire to effect economy, and for the part he has played in the discussion which has taken place, which I think will have a wholesome effect on all those who administer the act. The Senator from Illinois has rendered a fine public service in debating the whole matter, and I am sorry I cannot accept his point of view, only because I believe, while he and I want the same thing, that his amendment would defeat the program. But nevertheless, he has shown himself to be alive to the interest of the taxpayers, and I share that interest. While I can go with him on this question, because I do not believe it would be wholesome, the Senator has shown himself to be an outstanding Member of this body, and comprehensive of all the implications involved in any appropriation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to thank the most gracious Senator from Maryland for his kind words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to interfere with the statement the Senator from Illinois is making. He wanted to thank the Senator from Maryland. I did not realize that. I yield, then, to enable him to finish his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely wanted to thank the Senator from Maryland for his very kind words, which are undeserved, and to say that he is a most gracious Member of a most gracious club.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to propound a question to the distinguished Senator from Maryland; if I may.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Virginia do so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Naturally, I want to vote to save public funds. I should like to ask, first, if there was any division at all in the committee on this issue, and did the committee consider, before the bill was reported, the plan now proposed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall answer the questions in order. First of all, the bill came from the committee with a unanimous report, after—I am guessing, but I think I am substantially accurate—approximately 6 weeks of hearings. The suggestion of the Senator from Illinois was discussed. It was not discussed in exact terms, but the principle was attempted to be obtained, and we agreed upon a limitation of floor space, upon a uniform building, and upon a ceiling, so as to keep the cost down to an irreducible minimum.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Over what period of time will the program probably extend?

Mr. TYDINGS. According to advices received yesterday and today—and we had received other advices prior to that time—it will probably take 2 or 3 years to complete. It will depend somewhat upon how much money the Appropriations Committee makes available annually. The President's budget this year calls, I think, for approximately $400,000,000 to do a job amounting to approximately $500,000,000. That is my recollection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As the junior Senator from Virginia understands, there is a program which will cover two or more years, and the Senator specifies a top limit.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Am I to understand that as the military authorities come before the committee to get funds from time to time the members of the Appropriations Committee may inquire into the then existing construction costs and ascertain to what extent the military authorities are planning to go, and may use their own best judgment at that time as to how much to appropriate?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct in his understanding. I not only hope the Appropriations Committee will do that, but, as the Senator from Virginia is an eminent member of that committee, I request that he and his colleagues inquire into it, as I know they will, and reduce the expense by every dollar it can be reduced, without destroying the essentials of the program.

Mr. ROBERTSON. With that assurance from my distinguished friend, I am going along with the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. HUMPHREY asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, may we have the amendment explained for the benefit of those Senators who were not present during the discussion?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall be glad to do so with the permission of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Illinois has offered an amendment providing that the housing shall in no case cost more than $14,500 a house and that the average cost shall not be more than $11,000 a house. The Senator from Maryland offered a perfecting amendment which provides the same ceiling of $14,500 a house, but fixes an average of $13,000 a house, rather than $11,000; the reason being that I took the figure from the actual experience of the military department in some twenty or thirty States in building houses, exactly like those which have been discussed. As houses built in the North cost more than those which are built in the South, if we make the average too low, we shall have houses only in places in which they can be built at a minimum cost rather than where they are actually needed. Therefore, I have offered an amendment covering what actual experience shows to be the average and reducing it a little in order to get a little more economy into the program.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bricker	Humphrey	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Murray
Cain	Ives	Neely
Chapman	Jenner	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex	Pepper
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Darby	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Kem	Saltonstall
Downey	Kerr	Schoeppel
Ecton	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Leahy	Sparkman
Frear	Lehman	Stennis
Fulbright	Lodge	Taylor
George	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Gillette	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Green	McClellan	Tobey
Gurney	McFarland	Tydings
Hayden	McKellar	Watkins
Hendrickson	McMahon	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Withers
Hill	Martin	Young
Hoey	Maybank	
Holland	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], as amended by the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HOEY rose.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senator from North Carolina offers his amendment, I should like to offer a number of amendments relating to the inactivation of certain hospitals to which reference has been made. I shall appreciate it if we can dispose of those amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendments, as follows:

On page 5, delete all of lines 13 and 14.

On page 5, delete all of lines 17 and 18.

On page 6, line 17, delete "Farmily" and substitute in lieu thereof "Family."

On page 7, delete all of lines 3–5, inclusive.

On page 12, line 7, delete "Heuneme" and insert in lieu thereof "Hueneme."

On page 13, delete "Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Charleston, Rhode Island."

On page 13, delete all of lines 23 and 24.

On page 15, line 4, delete "one hundred thousand barrels" and insert in lieu thereof "one hundred ninety thousand barrels."

On page 17, line 2, delete "devise" and insert in lieu thereof "device."

On page 20, line 16, delete "refrigeration building"

On page 21, line 11, delete "$216,849" and insert in lieu thereof "$261,849."

On page 22, line 9, delete "$65,159,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$64,087,300."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland wish to have the amendments acted upon en bloc?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendments offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, after line 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

Camp Lejeune, N. C.: Construction of railroad spur from Camp Lejeune to Cherry Point, N. C., $3,000,000.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, that is an amendment which is already in the House bill, and is very strongly recommended. The amendment would authorize expenditure, but it would not cost anything, since a profit would be realized by the Government as a result of the amendment in the cost of transportation of freight between the two points the Government would save.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am reasonably familiar with the amendment. I believe the House has it under consideration now. It would appear from a cursory examination of it that there is a probability it would result in a saving. I do not want to commit myself, but will take the amendment to conference if the Senator will let me accept it in that vein, and will look into it again. If it is not an economically sound proposal, we will have to drop it in the conference, but I think it is worthy to be taken to conference for further consideration.

Mr. HOEY. That is entirely satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment lettered "A," which I now offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

Air Force base, Savannah, Ga.: Facilities, barracks, quarters and utilities, pavements and storage, $1,275,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if Members of the Senate will look at page 17 of the original bill they will find in lines 15 and 16 an item for the Chatham Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga., in the same amount of $1,275,000. In the substitute that item was considered by the committee and reported. It does not appear in the substitute proposed by the Senator from Maryland.

That is due to the fact that the Air Force is now in process of moving the heavy bombardment group which is stationed at Chatham Field to Hunter Field, which is some 7 miles away. There is no doubt of the need for the improvement of the facilities at Hunter Field. The need is perhaps not quite so great as it was in the case of Chatham Field, but there is a great need, particularly for the housing of the personnel at that base.

I called up the Department of Defense to find out why a request for this item had not been sent to the Congress, and was told it was due to the fact they had not yet moved. They are planning to move on the 1st day of June, I believe, to make the actual transfer from Chatham Field to Hunter Field. For that reason the Secretary of Defense has not cleared any request for an authorization for that field. I was assured that the Air Force was preparing an authorization which they would submit in a second public-works bill. In my opinion the Congress will not pass, or is not very likely to pass, any other military public-works bill at this session. Some 1,800 airmen are located at that base, and the housing and other facilities are completely inadequate. In my opinion, this item should go back into the bill. The mere fact that there has been a technical transfer should not deny the men who are stationed at the field improved quarters and a place to live, and proper facilities. I hope the amendment will be agreed to. It seems to me to be eminently fair under the circumstances in this case, when, merely due to the technicality that they have not moved from one field to the other, there is no proposal before the Senate to take care of the men of this heavy-bombardment group.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wish to remind my colleague that in the transfer from the one field to the other, there was a present lack of money to remove the heavy installations to Hunter Field. That has been arranged, and the Civil Aeronautics officials themselves are now engaged in the actual removal of those facilities to Hunter Field. So that at a very early date it will be possible to move to the new field, or rather, to the old field, Hunter Field. Everything will be ready then for these quarters and these other utilities that were provided for in the original bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. My colleague is eminently correct. Not only that, Mr. President, but the city of Savannah has contributed substantial sums for the purposes of improving these fields and for their construction—I have forgotten the exact amount, but it runs into several hundred thousand dollars—as well as having made contribution toward moving the facilities for the commercial field, which is now Hunter Field, over to Chatham Field.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is a great deal in what the Senator from Georgia has said. Of course, he is correct in saying that the field has been moved from Chatham to Hunter. I should like to go along with him on the amendment. I cannot do so personally because I asked the Defense Department whether they wanted this appropriation, and I was advised they did not need it at this time. I would not be surprised to find them asking for it later, but at the present time I tell my colleagues of the Senate that the Defense Department does not favor the appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland if he does not refer to the Secretary of Defense rather than the Secretary of the Air Force in making that statement?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say that our communication, I believe, does come from the Secretary of Defense. I was under the impression we had received it from both, but I think that is erroneous. I think it is only from the Secretary of Defense who did not question the merit of the proposition, but said that he did not feel he should recommend it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Marine Corps depot of supplies, eastern United States: Depot facilities at location to be determined, $25,000,000.

Increase the total authorization of section 402 by $25,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it came to my attention that the Marine Corps was in dire need of a depot on the east coast. At the present time the Marine Corps has no depot which is at all adequate to provide for its operational facilities on the east coast. The only large storage facility which it has at the present time is on the west coast, and it is grossly inadequate.

The Navy Department has approved the request for this item but it has not cleared the office of the Secretary of Defense. At my request the Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps came before the committee. His testimony was to the effect that there was three or four million dollars' worth of valuable equipment, consisting of ordnance, electronic equipment, general supplies, motor transport, and engineering equipment, for which there were no storage facilities. He further testified that the Marine Corps had examined every storage place which had been made available by the Army, that only four or five small spaces were available, which were not sufficient to provide for this material, and that the places were so widely scattered that it would be very expensive to undertake to use them rather than to have a general storage depot.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is the Senator in a position to indicate whether the material involved is obsolete or an up-to-date usable type of material which is needed?

Mr. RUSSELL. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that this was all the most modern type of equipment, which would be put into use immediately by the Marine Corps in the event of war. I shall read briefly from program 7, priority No. 101, which was submitted by the Marine Corps to the Secretary of Defense:

The Marine Corps does not have supply facilities in the eastern United States capable of supporting even limited operations in the Atlantic area. Supporting facilities to meet the logistic requirements of any future operations are largely concentrated on the west coast. This is a result of the main effort of the Marine Corps in the last war being in the Pacific; the east-coast depots were merely required to support training activities in the East. Consequently, the majority of the war-reserve stocks are now located in western United States, and must remain there until eastern facilities are established to allow redistribution. Concentration of stocks on the west coast for support of a main effort across the Atlantic is neither efficient nor logical and may well invite defeat of forces initially committed. War-reserve stocks, to be worth having at all, must be located in approximate geographical areas corresponding to foreseeable troop deployment. Further, the stocks should be so located as to permit immediate distribution and not subject to delays and disruptions of transportation systems attendant to the outbreak of hostilities.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the entire statement from which I have been reading.

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

Locations to be determined

Development of a Marine Corps depot of supplies in the eastern United States, including buildings, utilities, collateral equipment, and accessory construction	$25,000,000

The mission of the Marine Corps depot of supplies, eastern United States, is to function as the general storage and supply depot in receiving, storing, and issuing all material necessary to support Marine Corps forces and establishments east of the Mississippi River and Marine Corps forces overseas in the Atlantic Ocean and adjacent areas.

The Marine Corps does not have supply facilities in the eastern United States capable of supporting even limited operations in the Atlantic area. Supporting facilities to meet the logistic requirements of any future operations are largely concentrated on the west coast. This is a result of the main effort of the Marine Corps in the last war being in the Pacific; the east coast depots were merely required to support training activities in the East. Consequently, the majority of the war-reserve stocks are now located in western United States, and must remain there until eastern facilities are established to allow redistribution. Concentration of stocks on the west coast for support of a main effort across the Atlantic is neither efficient nor logical and may well invite defeat of forces initially committed. War-reserve stocks, to be worth having at all, must be located in approximate geographical areas corresponding to foreseeable troop deployment. Further, the stocks should be so located as to permit immediate distribution and not subject to delays and disruptions of transportation systems attendant to the outbreak of hostilities.

The status of existing supply facilities on the Atlantic seaboard is:

Depot of supplies, Philadelphia: Manufacturing facilities, publications stock and issue, limited general storage.

Depot of supplies, Norfolk: Engineer storage (limited) and distribution, mounting-out area for a peacetime division, forwarding depot for forces in the Atlantic but not capable of storing supplies to be shipped.

Supply depot, Camp Lejeune, N. C.: Support training activities and Marine Division at Camp Lejeune, stock mounting-out supplies and two monthly resupply shipments for a peacetime division.

The afore-mentioned supply activities are not capable of expansion to provide logistic support to an operation in the Atlantic area, other than the use of Norfolk as a shipping depot. Even if it were possible to expand these activities, it is not desirable, from a strategic viewpoint, to make large concentrations of vital installations directly on the Atlantic seaboard.

It is essential that redistribution of war-reserve stocks commence as soon as possible, and this cannot be initiated until a depot has been established to receive these stocks. Upon establishment of the proposed depot, it is planned to place material there in the most economical manner possible by: (1) Shipping stocks from the west coast, mainly by water shipment, as funds and shipping become available, and (2) when new procurement is required to replace issues made from west coast stocks, to schedule shipment of such new material to the proposed eastern United States depot.

Location: To be determined after further study and inspection of sites by a committee appointed by the Marine Corps Station Development Board. Considerations dictating the general location are:

1. Should be inland, approximately 300 to 400 miles from the Atlantic seaboard.
2. Should be on a well-established rail and highway net, offering access to manufacturing centers, shipping ports, and air-transport facilities.
3. Should provide space for 5,000,000 square feet of open storage.
4. Should be near a reasonably good labor pool, but not located near a war industry which would compete for that labor.
5. Should have access to good power sources.
6. Should be adjacent to housing, or space for operating personnel.

The specific siting of the proposed depot will be dictated by—

1. Adaptability of ground for construction of installations.
2. Cost of land.
3. Proximity to other probable targets for strategic bombing or sabotage.
4. Location of existing roads, railroads, and commercial power and communications systems.

Size: 2,500 acres.

Covered storage, peacetime increment: 2,000,000 square feet.

Barracks, housing, administration, utilities, and other necessary features: to be designed after selection of site.

Estimated cost of the project is as follows:

Site acquisition	$500,000
Architectural and engineering fees	2,000,000
Site preparation	200,000
Barracks, bachelor officers' quarters, mess hall, and administration	900,000
Utilities:	
Sewage system and treatment plant	1,000,000
Water-supply system	500,000
Electric-distribution system	50,000
Communication system	100,000
Dispensary	150,000
Housing, officer and enlisted	1,468,000
Covered storage, 2,000,000 sq. ft.	14,000,000
Roads, interior	600,000
Railroad, interior roads and sidings	500,000
Fence, gatehouses, security devices	250,000
Garage and industrial truck service building	225,000
Depot administration building	175,000
Recreation, post exchange, theater	175,000
Contingencies	2,207,000
Total estimated cost	25,000,000

Mr. RUSSELL. Through some inadvertence the testimony of General Hill at the hearing was not printed in the RECORD. I regret that was not done, because it seems to me that he makes out a very compelling case for this item.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], asked General Hill this question:

The CHAIRMAN. Is this material that is affected adversely by the weather?

General HILL. It is, sir.

Mr. RUSSELL. What steps, if any, have you taken to try to get storage facilities?

General HILL. For about 4 years, sir, we have been trying to get one in the program. It has been approved by the Navy Department, and last year it went to the National Military Defense Establishment, but was not considered operational, so was not put in the President's budget and at the present time it is not in the President's plan.

I do not wish to belabor this point, but the testimony at the hearing shows the great efforts which the Marine Corps has

made to get storage facilities which had belonged to the Army or to the Navy, and their inability to do so.

In response to a question asked by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], General Hill testified that more than $300,000,000 worth of this equipment was stored on the outside. He made a very telling case.

The chairman of the committee [Mr. TYDINGS] stated to him in the course of his testimony:

I think you have made out a pretty good case.

Of course, if we intend to disband the Marine Corps, this item ought not to be included in the bill. There are those who think that the Marine Corps has served its purpose and that hereafter amphibious operations should be handled by the Army. The Marine Corps is being drastically reduced all down the line. I am one of those who believe that in time of war the Marine Corps gives the Nation something which is incapable of monetary evaluation. The esprit de corps and the traditions of the Marine Corps mean a great deal to the fighting forces of the United States. I believe it would be a great tragedy, if not a fatal mistake, to let the Marine Corps be whittled away completely. If we intend to have a Marine Corps, it is entitled to storage facilities for its war reserves on an equal basis with those possessed by the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy.

In my opinion, the approval of this item certainly would be an expression on the part of Congress that we do not think the Marine Corps should be diminished to the point of extinction. I believe the Marine Corps is entitled to equal treatment with any other part of the armed services in any construction or preparedness program.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I regret very much that I must oppose this amendment, and I hope the Senate will not approve it, for the following reasons:

When this proposal was first made I communicated with the Department of Defense at the Pentagon and asked them whether or not there was a need for these warehouse facilities and whether or not there were any vacant facilities in which this equipment could be stored, without the necessity for an expenditure of $25,000,000 for the construction of warehouses for the Marine Corps. This is one of the largest items in the bill. It has never had the approval of the Navy Department, the Marine Corps, or the Department of Defense. The general who appeared before us was from the Marine Corps. There is no doubt about that. But the Commandant of the Marine Corps did not write the committee a letter approving it.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. As the Senator knows, of course, the Commandant of the Marine Corps could not write a letter which would be contrary to the position taken by the Secretary of Defense. He knows further that the Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps could not have come before the committee had it not been that I insisted on his being brought before the committee to testify with respect to this item, because that would be contrary to the policy of the Secretary of Defense. The general, who certainly should have known something about it, testified that this item had been approved by the Marine Corps and by the Navy Department, but had met with disapproval when it was submitted to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. TYDINGS. All these items were submitted to those who screened them. My point is that the Commandant of the Marine Corps did not write to us urging the approval of the item. The Secretary of the Navy did not write to us. When I suggested to the Secretary of Defense that $25,000,000 for storage facilities to store equipment which was on the Pacific coast and to transport it all the way across the country was a very large item, and that every facility ought to be utilized to put the equipment under cover without the expenditure of such a large sum of money, and suggested that some place ought to be available, he answered by saying that he had already established a committee to find out what existing buildings could be utilized in which to store the equipment rather than to construct new buildings, that the uncovered equipment would be moved under cover as quickly as possible, and that he was opposed to this proposal.

I first received a letter on this subject from the Secretary of Defense on September 13, 1949. It reads as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, September 13, 1949.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: The matter of a Marine Corps depot of supplies on the east coast of the United States, referred to in your letter of August 22, 1949, is being given urgent attention by the Munitions Board. Last February Mr. Donald F. Carpenter, the former chairman of the Munitions Board, considered items to be included in the Public Works Authorization bill which your committee has just considered At that time the Marine Corps presented detailed data on the need for such a project. However, the project was not selected for inclusion in the bill because current operational necessities were believed to be more urgent than those for mobilization. More particularly the item was suspended until a determination could be made whether existing facilities could provide the needed depot space.

It has developed, as you point out in your letter, that the immediate need is not for the construction of a depot but for covered storage space in the East which will permit the removal of valuable equipment and supplies from open storage where they are said to be deteriorating. Action was initiated last April by the Munitions Board to determine the availability of unoccupied storage space in active, inactive, and surplus installations. No inactive and surplus space was found which was acceptable to the Marine Corps. Within active military storage facilities in the East there are approximately 1,000,000 square feet of available covered storage space, which is about one-half of the peacetime needs of the Marine Corps. This space is widely scattered between and within installations, a little here and a little there. The Marine Corps found this space to be unsuitable because its use would be difficult due to its dispersion, and uneconomical and unsatisfactory from an operational viewpoint.

In order to expedite an acceptable solution the acting Chairman of the Munitions Board is organizing a group to find covered storage space which it considers suitable to meet the current urgent needs of the Marine Corps to protect its property from deterioration due to outside exposure. Because of the importance of this problem, the group will be composed of officers of flag and general rank from the three services.

I appreciate the valuable suggestions offered in your letter and I shall do everything possible to find satisfactory storage space for the Marine Corps without the need at this time for the additional construction envisaged in the request to which you refer

I shall inform you later of the results of my investigation.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

Then, Mr. President, on October 7, 1949, in response to a letter of mine or a call, I received the following letter from the Secretary of Defense:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, October 7, 1949.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Supplementing my letter of September 13, 1949, on the subject of a Marine Corps depot of supplies on the east coast of the United States, this matter was again discussed by the Munitions Board on September 15, 1949, and, in the light of the record, as set forth in the attached statement, it was decided that an over-all study of the storage operations of the military departments should be undertaken, rather than to confine this study to the specific subject of a Marine Corps depot of supplies on the east coast of the United States.

It was also decided that, because of the increased time which will be required for such a study, and because of the unavailability for an extended period of officers of flag and general rank, that the group to conduct this study should be composed of officers of the rank of colonel in the Army and Air Force or of captain in the Navy. The report of this group will subsequently be reviewed by officers of flag and general rank, as was the case in reviewing projects for inclusion in the public-works authorization bills.

In view of the facts set forth in the attached statement, I am sure you will concur in this procedure, and in my decision not to recommend an appropriation of $20,000,000 at this time to initiate construction of this depot. I shall be happy to inform you of the results of the study. Again expressing my appreciation of your valuable suggestions, which will be placed before the study group, and with kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

In other words, Mr. President, from the letter of October 7, we see that the projects now included in the pending measure have gone through the mill of review by the appropriate officers, whereas the pending proposition has not yet gone through that mill.

In addition, Mr. President, I have a history of this whole proposal.

The point is that here we have a request for a very large appropriation, namely, $25,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not an authorization, Mr. President?

Mr. TYDINGS Yes; it is an authorization of $25,000,000, for the building of warehouses in which to store or house equipment belonging to the Marine Corps. Much of the equipment is already on the west coast, in California,

near the Pacific Ocean. I do not know what it would cost to ship the equipment across the United States; I do not know how many freight trains would be required for that purpose or what would be the cost, in addition to the cost of building the warehouses.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if we are to provide for the construction of projects simply upon the testimony of some high-ranking officer, even though the projects may be meritorious, but are to do so without a proper screening by the officers or authorities who are charged with the duty of picking out the most urgent needs, to be cared for first, in my opinion we shall have a measure which will defeat its entire purpose, and the appropriations will be correspondingly reduced.

The time may come when we shall receive some recommendations on this subject, if there is nothing to do but build warehouses for the storage of the various pieces of equipment. But that time has not yet arrived. I cannot imagine that the Senate of the United States will appropriate $25,000,000 at this time for this purpose, when no approval of it has been given to the committee by the head of the Marine Corps, by the Secretary of the Navy, or by the Secretary of Defense.

I share the point of view of my able colleague on the Committee on Armed Services, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that we cannot go on forever leaving this equipment in the open. Of course, some of it can stand the weather fairly well, but some of it cannot. We must move into storage first the equipment which cannot stand the weather, and we must wait until an appropriate time, later on, to move under cover the equipment which can stand the weather.

I have on my desk pictures showing any number of tanks, tractors, and other equipment stored in the open. I now hold in my hand, for instance, a picture showing hundreds upon hundreds of pieces of equipment which are stored in the open. That equipment is very valuable. I can duplicate that picture with many other pictures taken all over the Pacific area. In some cases we find, on the basis of surveys already made, that it would cost more to bring the equipment back to continental United States than we could get for it after it was brought back to this country. Some of the equipment is useless because it is battle worn, and some of it is neglected. Moreover, we have found that in many cases the cost of putting guards on the islands where much of the equipment is located would be greater than the loss incurred by permitting the equipment to deteriorate and go to pieces. We are bedeviled, on the one hand, by wanting to save the equipment, and bedeviled, on the other hand, because the cost of saving it almost defeats that objective. If the matter had come before us after it had been screened, then I think that would be one thing.

I have tried to be generous on the airfield matter, which had not been screened, because there was a little different situation. There was an appropriation for one field, and that field has been abandoned because recently there has been a consolidation, and it seemed to me there ought to be some latitude there, so that further consideration may be given the matter. But that is in an entirely different category from this $25,000,000 authorization, and I sincerely hope it will not be approved by the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I concede that the two items are in entirely different categories. However, I cannot agree with the distinguished chairman of the committee that this item has not been approved by the Navy Department. When he refers to screening, he refers to items which have been sent to the Committee on Armed Services by the Secretary of Defense. This item has been approved by the Marine Corps. I have before me the testimony of Maj. Gen. W. P. T. Hill, the Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps. I did not call the Commandant, because I got the man who has knowledge about the need for this program. I am sure if we had brought the Commandant of the Marine Corps before the committee he would have said he thought this was essential to any successful operation by the Marine Corps from the east coast. From the statement before the committee by General Hill, I read the following:

> General HILL. For about 4 years, sir, we have been trying to get one in the program. It has been approved by the Navy Department, and last year it went to the National Military Establishment but was not considered operational, so it was not put in the President's budget and at the present time it is not in the President's plan.

The President's plan, of course, is what the Secretary of Defense sends to the Senate. We all know what happens to those who are in the Navy Department or in the Marine Corps when they voluntarily testify at variance to what has been decided by the Secretary of Defense. I should certainly not have the Commandant of the Marine Corps come forward to volunteer his testimony, because he would undoubtedly be relieved of his command. General Hill talks about finding the space. He was asked this question:

> Have you made any effort to get facilities for this storage, that had been used by the Army or the Navy?
>
> General HILL. Yes, sir. We went to the War Assets Administration before it was terminated. We have gone to the Munitions Board and they have suggested certain sites and locations which we have inspected * * *. They are all very small. Some of them were up in Elmira, N. Y.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Joliet, Ill.; near Cincinnati, Ohio; Miami, Fla.; and Savannah, Ga., but they all were either turned over to the National Guard or had been disposed of to some other organization before we got there, or were small.

The Marine Corps have been trying for years to have this provision made. They have screened it. So far as screening is concerned, it has been screened all the way up to the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense has not seen fit to approve the item. I thought when I heard the testimony that they had made, in the words of the distinguished chairman, a very good case for this item, and I still think they did, even though it has not been approved by the Secretary of Defense.

It seems to me to be a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy, when we have $300,000,000 to $400,000,000 worth of the most valuable military equipment, which might be needed by the Marine Corps tomorrow, as a spearhead, perhaps, to some effort to save civilization from impending danger, not to authorize the construction of warehouses in which it can be stored. It does not mean that the warehouses will ever be built, for that matter, because, as the Senator from Maryland so eloquently suggested a few moments ago, it is necessary to go through the different appropriations committees and to get budget estimates before the funds can ever be appropriated. But I see no reason why the Senate should not approve the item. It has been approved by the Marine Corps and has been approved by the Navy Department.

I think the Senate at least should vote to authorize the construction of warehouses where the equipment can be stored, so that, later on, if there is a change in the international situation, it could serve the Marine Corps as well as did the equipment used so effectively by the Marine Corps in the Pacific during the last war.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have the utmost respect for my friend from Georgia, and certainly want to do everything I can to help the Marine Corps. But in support of what the Senator from Maryland has said, I may say that I remember the discussion on the subject which occurred in the committee.

I think the great worry all the members of the committee had was that we might authorize perhaps more than was justified in these time for warehouses and buildings and things of that sort, and fail to make adequate provision for the new equipment that we must have to keep our armed services up-to-date, in order to make it possible for our boys to fight as safely as possible and as efficiently as possible. In this bill we undertook as our objective to give approval only to the projects which were recommended. If my memory serves me right, we took the items which were approved by the Secretary of Defense. I think if we at this time begin adding others, we shall find ourselves in a very difficult position.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia that there is much equipment that should be placed under cover in some way, but all I can say is that this was not one of the items the Department of Defense finally recommended to us, on the revised list, which was kept as small as practicable. I think even now the whole bill may be too big an authorization. I certainly do not believe that we should add to it now.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator from Massachusetts think the Committee on Armed Services should confine its considerations only to those matters which they are permitted to consider by the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No, I do not, but I think the difficulty is, there is such a wide range of matters that when we try to go outside the big items which we feel may be of value—and I agree with what the Senator from Georgia says—we get ourselves into a very difficult position. That is all I have to say.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we should ever happen to have a Secretary of Defense who wished to abolish the Marine Corps, he could do it very easily under the Senator's formula, because he would not submit any item to the Armed Services Committee that would enable the Marine Corps to exist.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to answer the Senator's suggestion, because it comes pretty close to home. I had a son in the Marine Corps. I want to do everything I can to keep the Marine Corps in existence as a fighting force and as a necessary adjunct to the Navy. I can assure the Senator from Georgia I would not do anything that I felt would jeopardize the future existence of the Marine Corps.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to the Senator that the status of the Marine Corps in numbers is fixed by law, and it must be, as I recall, at 20 percent of the strength of the Navy. So, as the Navy goes up, the Marine Corps goes up; as the Navy goes down, the Marine Corps goes down. There is no chance of hurting the Marine Corps in that respect, or wiping it out, as I have often heard stated. It will never be wiped out with my approval, while the present law is on the statute books.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAPMAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum-call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before the final vote on the bill, I wish to express my personal appreciation and the appreciation of all persons concerned in Alaska for the consideration which the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has given the problem of military housing in Alaska. The committee devoted a great deal of time to it. This housing is long overdue, and I hope the bill will have speedy passage in both the Senate and the House, so that work may be done in Alaska during the season. I again wish to thank the chairman and his committee for their courtesy and for the consideration which they have given the problem.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2440) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

OBLIGATION OF FUNDS FOR ASSISTANCE IN CERTAIN AREAS OF CHINA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in making an announcement recently in the Senate as to the order of business, I advised the Senate that following the passage of Senate bill 2440 the Senate would proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1082, House bill 5839, which is known as the Forest Service bill and which is being handled by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] reported that bill from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am not a member of that committee. I have offered some amendments to the bill which are agreeable to all concerned. I think the Senator from Minnesota is in charge of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. What I meant to say was that the Senator from Wyoming had objected to the bill in the past, and I now understand that he has some perfecting amendments which are satisfactory to all concerned. However, the Senator from Wyoming will not be in the Senate tomorrow, and, therefore, desires that some other measure be taken up. In discussing the question with the acting minority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I find it is satisfactory to them that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2845. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2845.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2845) to enable the President to obligate funds heretofore appropriated for assistance in certain areas in China until June 30, 1950.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, while this is not one of the five or six bills which it was agreed would be taken up in the next few days, I have tried to ascertain, on the side of the minority, whether there was any objection to considering the bill tomorrow. I can find no evidence of objection on the part of anyone to having the bill considered, and I know it has to be acted upon very shortly if it is to be of value. So I hope the request will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2845) to enable the President to obligate funds heretofore appropriated for assistance in certain areas in China until June 30, 1950.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is now 5 o'clock, there will be some debate on the bill just taken up, and in view of the fact that the bill was not contemplated by the leadership on this side, I think it is advisable that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

There are two other bills on the calendar, which have been reported unanimously by the Committee on Finance, one a few days ago. One of the bills, Senate bill 501, would repeal section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948, and House bill 5486 would amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of stamp machines, and for other purposes. Whether or not those bills will be taken up tomorrow depends perhaps on how long it will take for the consideration of the bill just made the unfinished business. However, I may say, after having conferred with a number of Senators, that after the Senate concludes its business tomorrow we will probably take a recess until Tuesday, February 14.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 10, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 9 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

NATIONAL MILITARY ACADEMY

Col Elvin R Heiberg, O16378, for appointment as professor of mechanics, United States Military Academy.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Melecio M Santos, O14683, to be a lieutenant colonel.

Kenneth D. Nichols, O17498, to be a colonel.

The nominations of Lorenzo R Berry et al. for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 30, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Lorenzo R. Berry, which appears on page 1086, and ending with the name of Kenneth Y. Wright, Jr., which is shown on page 1090.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Howard F. Currie, O29502, et al., for appointment in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 2, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Howard F. Currie, which appears on page 1370, and ending with the name of Michael I. Youchah, which is shown on page 1371.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

Ralph E McShane	Leon J Huffman
Thomas B. Brittain	Harold A. Houser
Richard P. Glass	John M Higgins
Clark L. Green	Edward A. Solomons

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the line of the Navy:

Bess A. Dunn	Joy B Hancock
Eleanor J. Durrett	Louise K. Wilde

The nominations of Aaron F. Adams et al., the nominations of Sigmund Abraham, Jr., et al., and the nominations of William J. Bennett, Jr., et al., which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 2, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Aaron F. ADAMS, which appears on page 1371, and ending with the name of James N. Martin, which is shown on page 1375.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1950

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who wert the God of our fathers, we rejoice that Thou art also the God of their succeeding generations.

Fill us with an eager desire to have our beloved country enjoy the blessings of democracy in an ever-increasing measure.

May we share these blessings with all the needy members of the human family and in a spirit that is indicative of a real personal interest in their welfare and happiness.

Grant that we may build a finer social order and may the nations of the earth never again seek to settle their difficult international problems by submitting them to the dreadful arbitrament of war.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2681. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington, to be held at Lexington, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States No. 50–15.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 485. An act for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel; and

S. 1604. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of F. DuWayne Blankley.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. KILBURN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the one-half minute speeches made at the Lincoln Day Republican box social on February 6.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

READJUSTING POSTAL RATES AND PARCEL POST REGULATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] offered an amendment to the bill H. R. 2945, now under consideration, by which amendment he attempts to exempt certain rural areas from the changes and restrictions imposed by the bill as to the size and weight of parcel-post packages in the postal service to and from rural towns and communities not served by any commercial carrier service to the people residing in such areas. That amendment exempted all rural routes and third- and fourth-class post offices from the provision in the bill reducing the size and weight of parcel-post packages mailed to and from rural routes and third- and fourth-class post offices. But most Members probably do not realize that there are numerous second-class post-office towns in their districts that are rural towns without express service or other commercial carrier transportation facilities; and the people residing therein depend entirely upon parcel-post service. If this bill is adopted in its present form the farmers residing near such towns who are not on rural routes, and the people in such second-class post-office towns will be deprived of essential parcel-post service as a result of the reduction of size and weight regulations as now provided in H. R. 2945. This will hit the farmers especially hard, those living around the second-class post-office towns, and they, too, will be deprived of the parcel-post service that they now receive. It will mean, for instance, that those engaged in the business of chicken hatcheries cannot ship baby chicks to or from second-class post-office towns. Furthermore, the reduction of size and weight of parcel-post package service creates, by compelling use of smaller and separate packages, a higher and additional increase of rate separately provided for in the bill.

Under these circumstances and because of other objectionable provisions in the bill I am compelled to vote to recommit it to the committee for further consideration.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include an article which appeared in the Exeter Newsletter, and in the other the remarks of the national chaplain of the American Legion.

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. CAVALCANTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution in favor of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and against the Communists adopted by the Knights of Columbus of his district.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from one of the leading newspapers of his district.

THE FORGOTTEN MAN IN THE EXCISE TAX PICTURE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak briefly today about the forgotten man in the excise-tax picture. Amid all of this current concern over reductions in the wartime excise taxes on furs and jewelry and several other items, he has been almost completely forgotten.

He is the man who buys a tire—the man who uses tires in the earning of his livelihood, whether he be a farmer, a worker or a professional man. There are millions of him—upward of forty millions.

Tires are in no sense a luxury. You will remember that they were virtually impossible to get during the war, even if you held one of those coveted B or C ration coupons. They carried a high priority as essentials to the war effort.

They are no less essential in peacetime. Yet even today, more than 4 years

after the end of the war, taxes on some tires remain at levels more than double that of the excises levied against costly perfumes and luxurious furs. And all classes of tires bear taxes unfairly and disproportionately higher than the excises borne by comparable products.

At present wartime rates, for example, the excise tax on industrial and lawnmower tires ranges from 26 to 35 percent of the sales value of the tire; on automotive tires and tubes the range is from 7 to 14 percent at various levels of sale; and on baby-carriage tiring and tires for children's toys this tax ranges up to as much as 55 percent of the sales value.

American motorists, farmers, and truckers paid out more than $1,100,000,000 in tire and tube excise taxes since 1932. Last year alone their tire and tube taxes amounted to more than $150,000,000.

Harder hit by these taxes probably than any other single group of tire users was the American farmer. Taxes paid on tires and tubes purchased for farm vehicles last year exceeded $33,000,000. A single farmer must lay out more than $60 in taxes to put new tires and tubes all the way around on his utility car, his farm truck, his tractor and farm trailer.

Tire and tube taxes were selective and discriminatory when they were imposed. They became more so when they were increased in 1940, burdensomely so when they were doubled in 1941 as a temporary wartime measure to raise much-needed revenue to support our military effort.

This tax means nothing to the manufacturers of tires, large or small. Their role is simply that of a tax collector. But it is a matter of real dollar-and-cents concern to more than 200,000 small-business men in America who, as tire dealers, have much-needed operating capital tied up in taxes which they have paid on their floor stocks. And it means even more to upward of 40,000,000 tire users who pay the bill in the final analysis.

H. R. 6898, which I introduced in this House on January 20, recognizes the inequity of this tax. It would carry rates on tires and tubes back to their prewar level. Moreover, it would aid these small-business men by affording to them a means of unfreezing at least half of this sterile capital by permitting them to recover taxes which they will already have paid on floor stocks upon the effective date of this legislation.

Gentlemen, I urge your serious consideration of the merit of this bill.

CONGRATULATIONS TO WATTS REGULATOR CO.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, from 1875 to 1950 is a 75-year span of progress on the books of the Watts Regulator Co., of Lawrence, Mass.

On this three-quarter century anniversary, management, workers, customers, and friends will attend open house at the plant to celebrate an accomplishment in which all have shared and to look forward to an even brighter tomorrow.

It is a modern plant with up-to-date facilities, catering to an increasing demand for its plumbing and heating specialties.

Behind this physical evidence of ingenuity and organization is the American story, ignored for many years during which our people were concerned with experimentation and adaptation, but which is coming into its own again as we realize that it is the main factor in our great development as a Nation.

Our industrial plant and equipment did not come ready made. It had to have a beginning, sparked by men who had an idea and the persistence to build that idea into the buildings and machinery and techniques for creating jobs and creating wealth.

When Burchard E. Horne, the present owner, took over the Watts Regulator Co. in 1918, he only had a small machine shop with little more than a dozen employees.

But he and they had the faith in each other that is called teamwork, which is an indispensable ingredient for success in any enterprise.

Today it is called the science of industrial relations. Giant corporations and powerful labor unions employ many people and expend considerable sums in trying to recapture the lost unity of teamwork, as bigness tends to push employer and employee farther and farther apart.

This problem does not exist at Watts Regulator.

The company has grown and expanded until it now has many employees and its specialized products serve a national market, but it is still a small industry. We hear much these days about the financial and competitive handicaps under which small industry operates. But to counterbalance this small industry is humanized. There is an immediate and personal communication between management and workers. Both produce. Both share in the fruits of mutual production. But, above all, the viewpoints of both are understood by one another, and from this appreciation comes the inspiration to go forward together, doing the job well.

This is the secret of success at Watts Regulator. It is an example of that sincere cooperation between management and labor upon which the fate of our free industrial society depends.

And so we extend our congratulations to the industrial family at the Watts Regulator Co., of Lawrence, not only for its steady production and its material progress but for that harmony in human relations that makes the American success story a fact in which we all take pride.

It is a lesson by the little people which the big people should copy.

The Watts Regulator Co. is showing the way to the future.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to destroy the VA medical and hospital services and reestablish it as part of a single over-all Government agency designed to serve the health needs of all citizens, veterans, and nonveterans alike, is a complete about-face, and a return to the chaos which existed before VA was organized.

To complete its destruction, the Hoover Committee further proposes to divorce the insurance operation from VA and set up a Government insurance corporation independent of other related benefits administered by VA in the interests of veteran policyholders.

The present integrated system of services to veterans was created to get away from the waste and inefficiency of the identical disintegrated system to which it is now proposed to return.

The unified services now provided veterans by the VA did not come into being overnight.

The building up of the present administrative unity of the Veterans' Administration, guided by the will of Congress, took 12 long years. It took from 1918, following the close of World War I, until 1930.

At the end of World War I, five separate agencies were trying vainly to serve veterans.

Let us see what happened to the individual veteran after World War I under this crazy-quilt pattern. A disabled veteran presented his claim for pension to the Pension Bureau. Without medical information the Bureau was tied hand and foot. It could not move. The veteran was sent hobbling across town on his crutches to get a medical examination. Weeks passed—often months—before report of the examination reached the Pension Bureau. Meanwhile the veteran waited pensionless.

Conditions got so bad they bordered on the scandalous. The President appointed a committee headed by Charles G. Dawes to investigate and recommend a remedy.

The report of this committee submitted to the Congress, in 1923, said:

> It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the present deplorable failure on the part of the Government to properly care for the disabled veterans is due in large part to an imperfect organization of governmental effort. * * * No emergency of war itself was greater than is the emergency which confronts the Nation in its duty to care for those disabled in its service and now neglected.

This brought together three of the five organizations serving veterans.

The improvement was so great that in 1930 President Herbert Hoover asked the Congress to bring all veterans services together in one integrated organization.

I agree with the opinions expressed by Mr. Hoover as President. I am for increased efficiency and the utmost economy in handling veterans affairs.

But I am opposed to wrecking the finest medical service that has been built up in the United States. I am opposed to

breaking up a smooth running, efficient organization to return to the chaos and confusion, that brought about the shameful treatment accorded our veterans of World War I—a system that was ended when the VA was created in 1930 under President Hoover.

Our veterans have a right to expect the benefits awarded them by a grateful Nation to be administered promptly, sympathetically and with justice. We have built an organization to accomplish this.

I am opposed to destroying it now.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 20 minutes following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article taken from the Buffalo Courier.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Ambassador Austin before the Legislature of Puerto Rico on last Monday.

ATTENDANCE OF UNITED STATES MARINE BAND AT LEXINGTON, MASS.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2681) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington, to be held at Lexington, Mass., April 16, through 19, inclusive, 1950.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say that this bill has passed the Senate. It permits the Marine Band of the United States to participate in the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the famous battles of Lexington and Concord which played such an important part in the development of our constitutional government

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would be glad to have the Marine Band attend that celebration. I would also like to have more bands around proclaiming American liberty and American freedom and constitutional government throughout this country.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and give concerts at a celebration to be held April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950, at Lexington, Mass., commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying expenses of such band in attending and giving concerts at such celebration there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to cover the cost of transportation and pullman accommodations for the leaders and members of the Marine Band, and allowance not to exceed $8 per day each for additional traveling and living expenses while on duty, such allowance to be in addition to the pay and allowance to which they would be entitled while serving their permanent station.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Page 1, line 6, after the word "Lexington", insert "and Concord", and on page 1, line 8, after the word "Lexington", insert "and Concord."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, to be held at Lexington, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS of California) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address of a former colleague, Hon. C. A Christopherson, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

Mr. STEFAN (at the request of Mr. HAGEN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include four newspaper articles.

POSTAL RATE INCREASES

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill (H. R. 2945) to adjust postal rates. The Clerk will read the engrossed copy of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the engrossed copy be considered as having been read.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HAGEN. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAGEN moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 150, nays 218, answered "present" 1, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—150

Albert	Gross	Meyer
Allen, Ill.	Gwinn	Michener
Andersen, H Carl	Hagen	Miller, Md.
Anderson, Calif	Hale	Miller, Nebr.
Andresen, August H.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Morgan
Angell	Harden	Moulder
Arends	Hays, Ohio	Murray, Wis
Aspinall	Hedrick	Nelson
Baring	Herter	Nicholson
Beall	Heselton	Norblad
Beckworth	Hinshaw	O'Hara, Minn
Bishop	Hoeven	O'Konski
Blackney	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Neill
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman, Mich	Philbin
Bramblett	Holmes	Phillips, Calif
Brehm	Horan	Phillips, Tenn
Brown, Ohio	Hull	Plumley
Burdick	Jackson, Calif.	Poulson
Burleson	Jackson, Wash	Powell
Cannon	James	Rankin
Carnahan	Javits	Reed, N. Y.
Case, N J.	Jenison	Rich
Case, S Dak	Jenkins	Richlman
Celler	Jennings	Rogers, Mass
Chiperfield	Jensen	Sasscer
Christopher	Johnson	Scott, Hardie
Church	Judd	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Clevenger	Keating	Scrivner
Cole, N Y.	Keefe	Scudder
Corbett	Kilday	Secrest
Cotton	King	Simpson, Ill.
Cunningham	Kruse	Simpson, Pa.
Curtis	Kunkel	Smith, Wis.
Dague	Lane	Stefan
Davenport	LeCompte	Talle
Davies, N. Y	LeFevre	Teague
Davis, Wis.	Lemke	Tollefson
D'Ewart	Lodge	Underwood
Dondero	Lovre	Velde
Eberharter	Lucas	Vursell
Ellsworth	McConnell	Walter
Elston	McCulloch	Weichel
Engel, Mich	McGregor	Whitten
Fellows	McGuire	Wigglesworth
Fenton	Mack, Wash.	Withrow
Flood	Marcantonio	Wolcott
Ford	Marshall	Wolverton
Fulton	Martin, Iowa	Wood
Gavin	Martin, Mass.	Woodruff
Gillette	Mason	
	Merrow	

NAYS—218

Abbitt	Bonner	Carroll
Abernethy	Bosone	Cavalcante
Addonizio	Boykin	Chatham
Allen, La.	Breen	Chelf
Andrews	Brooks	Chesney
Auchincloss	Bryson	Chudoff
Bailey	Buchanan	Clemente
Barden	Buckley, Ill.	Cole, Kans
Barrett, Pa.	Buckley, N. Y.	Colmer
Battle	Burke	Combs
Bennett, Fla	Burnside	Cooley
Bennett, Mich.	Burton	Cooper
Bentsen	Byrne, N. Y.	Cox
Biemiller	Byrnes, Wis.	Crawford
Boggs, La.	Canfield	Crook
Bolling	Carlyle	Crosser

Davis, Ga.	Jones, Mo.	Preston
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, N. C.	Price
Dawson	Karst	Priest
Deane	Karsten	Quinn
DeGraffenried	Kee	Rabaut
Delaney	Kelley, Pa.	Rains
Denton	Kelly, N. Y.	Ramsay
Dollinger	Keogh	Redden
Donohue	Kerr	Regan
Doughton	Kilburn	Rhodes
Douglas	Klein	Ribicoff
Doyle	Lanham	Richards
Durham	Larcade	Rivers
Elliott	Latham	Rodino
Engle, Calif.	Lesinski	Rogers, Fla.
Evins	Lind	Rooney
Feighan	Linehan	Roosevelt
Fernandez	Lyle	Sadlak
Fisher	Lynch	Shelley
Fogarty	McCarthy	Sheppard
Forand	McCormack	Sikes
Frazier	McGrath	Sims
Fugate	McKinnon	Smith, Kans.
Furcolo	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Gary	McSweeney	Spence
Gathings	Mack, Ill.	Staggers
Goodwin	Madden	Stanley
Gordon	Magee	Steed
Gore	Mahon	Stigler
Gorski	Mansfield	Sullivan
Gossett	Marsalis	Sutton
Granahan	Miles	Taber
Granger	Miller, Calif.	Tackett
Grant	Mills	Taurlello
Green	Mitchell	Taylor
Gregory	Morris	Thompson
Halleck	Morrison	Thornberry
Hardy	Multer	Towe
Harris	Murdock	Trimble
Harrison	Murphy	Vinson
Hart	Murray, Tenn.	Wagner
Harvey	Noland	Walsh
Havenner	Norrell	Welch
Hays, Ark.	O'Brien, Ill.	Wheeler
Hébert	O'Brien, Mich	Whitaker
Heffernan	O'Hara, Ill.	White, Calif.
Heller	O'Sullivan	Whittington
Herlong	Pace	Wickersham
Hobbs	Passman	Wier
Holifield	Patten	Willis
Hope	Perkins	Wilson, Tex
Howell	Peterson	Winstead
Huber	Pfeifer,	Woodhouse
Irving	Joseph L.	Worley
Jacobs	Pickett	Yates
Jonas	Poage	Young
Jones, Ala.	Polk	Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hand

NOT VOTING—62

Allen, Calif.	Hare	Rees
Barrett, Wyo.	Hill	Sabath
Bates	Kean	Sadowski
Bland	Kearney	St George
Blatnik	Kearns	Sanborn
Bolton, Md	Kennedy	Saylor
Bolton, Ohio	Kirwan	Shafer
Brown, Ga.	Lichtenwalter	Short
Bulwinkle	McDonough	Smathers
Camp	McMillan, S C	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Macy	Stockman
Dingell	Monroney	Thomas
Dolliver	Morton	Van Zandt
Eaton	Nixon	Vorys
Fallon	Norton	Wadsworth
Gamble	O'Toole	Werdel
Garmatz	Patman	White, Idaho
Gilmer	Patterson	Williams
Golden	Pfeiffer,	Wilson, Ind
Graham	William L.	Wilson, Okla
Hall,	Potter	
Leonard W	Reed, Ill.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Brown of Georgia against.

Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr Gilmer against.

Mr. William L. Pfeiffer for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Bates against.

Mr. Van Zandt for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Lichtenwalter for, with Mr. Rees against.

Mr. Allen of California for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Graham for, with Mr. Wilson of Oklahoma against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Kean against.

Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Fallon against.

Mr. Golden for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Sanborn for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. McDonough for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Hill for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Nixon for, with Mr. Bolton of Maryland against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Camp with Mr. Macy.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Werdel.

Mr. Smathers with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Monroney with Mr. Morton.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Dingell with Mr Stockman.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr Blatnik with Mr Barrett of Wyoming.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Doliver.

Mr. Thomas with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.

Messrs. BRYSON and RANKIN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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

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

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HAND Mr. Speaker, I was reluctant to vote "present" and I cannot recall ever having done so before on the final vote on any legislative matter. The fact is, however, that the bill on which we have just voted provided that the proposed increase in rates should not apply to weekly newspapers having a circulation of less than 5,000. I am directly and personally interested in such a newspaper and, therefore, have a direct and personal interest in the legislation on the floor with the preparation of which, of course, I had nothing to do. Under the circumstances I feel it would be quite improper for me to have voted at all on the measure and thus I felt honor bound to merely record my presence without voting.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY AND NEXT WEEK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order that I might obtain the program for the balance of the day and for next week, if the majority leader has that information available at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am in a position to respond to the inquiry. The next order of business will be the economic assistance to certain areas in the Far East bill under the 5-minute rule; thereafter the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman know whether there is any controversy connected with that bill or not?

Mr. McCORMACK. So far as any information I have received, there is none. I have seen no evidence of it. Thereafter there is a resolution from the Committee on Foreign Affairs; one of those 7-day resolutions.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the Lodge resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Of course, the usual procedure is to have it read and then lay it on the table. Just what will develop, I do not know. I have no knowledge whether or not there will be any difficulty there, but if those matters are disposed of, then I shall ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

Monday, of course, is the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birthday; that is that is the day it will be celebrated There will be no business on Monday.

I have nothing for Tuesday.

Next Wednesday, of course, will be Calendar Wednesday. So, there will be nothing for Monday or Tuesday. I am definitely making that statement now.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell us what committee has the call on next Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. The Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They are next in line?

Mr. McCORMACK. Ordinarily Monday would be District day, but I am informed that the Committee on the District of Columbia has no bills to call up that day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will they have any bill to be called up on Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I was going to continue. I assume that the committee will exercise its privilege on Wednesday, although I cannot say definitely. I would be surprised if it did not.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN AREAS IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2319) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and the foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 2319, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Tuesday, February 7, the Clerk had read section 1 of the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. To enable the President until June 30, 1950, to obligate funds heretofore appropriated for assistance in certain areas of China, section 12 of Public Law 47, Eighty-first Congress, is amended by striking out

"February 15, 1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1950."

SEC. 3. (a) The Administrator for Economic Cooperation is hereby authorized to furnish assistance to the Republic of Korea in conformity with—

(1) the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, wherever such provisions are applicable and not inconsistent with the intent and purposes of this section 3; and

(2) the agreement on aid between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea signed December 10, 1948, or any supplementary or succeeding agreement which shall not substantially alter the basic obligations of either party.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Administrator shall immediately terminate aid under this section in the event of the formation in the Republic of Korea of a coalition government which includes one or more members of the Communist Party or of the party now in control of the government of northern Korea.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Administrator is authorized to make available to the Republic of Korea merchant vessels of tonnage not in excess of 2,500 gross tons each, in a number not to exceed 10 at any one time, with a stipulation that such vessels shall be operated only in east Asian waters and must be returned forthwith upon demand of the Administrator and in any event not later than June 30, 1951. Any agency of the United States Government owning or operating any such vessel is authorized to make such vessel available to the Administrator for the purposes of this section upon his application, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law and without reimbursement by the Administrator, and title to any such vessel so supplied shall remain in the United States Government.

(d) In order to carry out the provisions of this section 3, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, in addition to sums already appropriated, not to exceed $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950.

(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $30,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this section, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the Administrator shall request, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder, from funds made available for the purposes of this section 3.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I call to the attention of the Members of the House my bill, H. R. 7134, which was introduced on February 3, and which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation to turn over gratuitously to the governors of each State for distribution on a basis of population all of the surplus Irish potatoes and eggs acquired under the price support program. I have requested the chairman of the House Agricultural Committee to permit me to appear before the committee to present this plan, and I am certain that I will be afforded an opportunity to do so.

Mr. Chairman, these potatoes and eggs were acquired with the taxes of the citizens of this country, and it is my opinion that, instead of destroying these products that our people should have the benefit of the same.

More than $200,000,000 has been paid for these surplus potatoes and eggs, and the amount necessary to distribute this food to our people would be negligible in comparison to the values inasmuch as the facilities of each State could be utilized for the distribution.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be unthinkable to again destroy this valuable food when the same could be distributed and utilized by our people, especially in many sections where the same is so desperately needed at this time.

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

Mr. LARCADE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If we are going to destroy these potatoes and eggs, why not send them to Korea and save this money?

Mr. LARCADE. I think our people should be given first call on them.

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

Mr. LARCADE. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture I would like to hear the gentleman, and hope that our chairman will set the date. You should be commended for your efforts to distribute surplus foods to the needy. We have flooded conditions in Arkansas and our people can use these foods. Something should be done rather than to destroy these potatoes and other surplus foods.

Mr. LARCADE. I think the gentleman is quite correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, in announcing the program for next week the distinguished majority leader said that perhaps the Committee on the District of Columbia would have some legislation on Calendar Wednesday. That committee has a very, very important and emergent piece of legislation which it would like to consider which is so important that the committee instructed our chairman to use all means possible to have it considered, even if it was on Calendar Wednesday. The great question which we are going to discuss at that time is whether or not we will grant a charter to the Girl Scouts of America.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to talk about the potato program or the agricultural program. Of course, it is very important as to what might happen on next Wednesday. I understand there has been some talk about bringing up the bill in which I am interested regarding some qualifications for physicians to practice in the District. I hope it is not brought up on Calendar Wednesday. I think it ought to be brought up on the regular District day and be discussed in the regular order.

Now a word about Korean aid. Mr. Chairman, in reviewing some of the aid we are giving to the nations, I find in the Far East that we have five or six agencies engaged in giving aid. We have a Korean aid bill. We have ECA working in Korea. We have GARIOA working in Japan and occupied countries, and we have some military assistance that has been used in various spots in the Far East. We have had money appropriated to China. Some of it, I understand is still unspent. We have numerous aid bills for the Philippines These Government agencies are not working together. They are working at cross purposes in many instances. It would seem to me that the Congress sooner or later should consider putting all of this under one umbrella so that we can get some efficiency in the aid that we are trying to extend to these countries. Here are five or six agencies not working together. I happen to know that in Japan, for instance, they have been short of fertilizer until just recently. Now, they are able to export fertilizer. They have fertilizer which can be exported to Korea, which Korea needs. Korea, by the way, is exporting rice, large amounts of rice, and Japan needs rice.

Why not have Korea send some of her rice to Japan and have Japan send some of her fertilizer to Korea? Under the half dozen aid programs, that is not possible. It seems to me the entire aid program, not only in the Far East but in the European countries, ought to be coordinated so that they would not be working at cross purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. For a correction, yes.

Mr. JAVITS. What the gentleman says is being done. In other words, the occupation authorities in Japan are working with the ECA in Korea and are doing just what the gentleman wants to have done.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Let me say that not one pound of fertilizer has gone from Japan to Korea and not one pound of rice has gone from Korea to Japan, and I can prove that, and the gentleman knows it. It just is not so. It ought to be so, but it is not. They tell us in the Philippines there has been quite a scandal in the handling of our surplus property. I do not know. I know we left about $2,000,000,000 worth there, and we will perhaps get less than $100,000,000 out of it. The Filipinos are here asking us to appropriate money to make up the difference, forty or fifty million dollars, which we said they would get, and which they did not get.

All of these programs ought to be coordinated, and I hope the gentleman from New York will make an effort to get that done.

The Korean people do not need food. They have food. They do not need many

of the things that we propose to do in this bill. Why build fertilizer plants when they can get fertilizer out of Japan? Why not use some of that Japanese aid to send fertilizer to Korea?

Then we propose to make it possible to irrigate some 235,000 acres of land in Korea. That is a very fine thing. Also to build electric power plants, put in permanent improvements which later on will probably be just right for the Communists to take over. Make no mistake about it. A radio announcer this morning said that the Russians were building some parts for ships close to Korea. For what purpose? To move in and take over Korea. Do we propose to make $60,000,000 available to Korea between now and the last of June and then in another bill that is coming in another $60,000,000 a year for 3 years? This is not all of the Korean aid. In my humble opinion, we in the United States ought to begin to pay some attention to our own defenses. We can spend ourselves into destruction. We are on that road now. We are trying to help the nations of the world, but who is going to help us when we go broke?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot find it in my conscience to support this legislation. Appropriation bills will be coming before this House shortly, bills that involve the future and the welfare of the people of America. I for one have got to make some choice. I admit the tug at my conscience and heart of the desire to help these people throughout the world, but you who are not charged with the primary responsibility of examining and scanning the budgets that have been submitted by the Executive this year will have to give some answers to the people back home as to why we can so glibly and easily turn over these vast sums of money to rehabilitate and take care of people in foreign countries and of necessity be compelled to deny to our own people the services that they so earnestly desire. Let me call your attention to just one thing. If there is anything in this country that touches the people more than another it is the matter of public health and the welfare of the people of this Nation so far as it involves health problems. The whole people of the country have been awakened to the necessity for the expansion and the continuation of the programs of research and control in the fields of cancer, heart disease, and mental illness. There is not a man, woman, or child in this country who is not willing to be taxed, not only to carry a nominal program, but also to expand and carry forward those programs. What has happened? If you examine the budget submitted by the President you will observe that in those great categories of public necessity they have been definitely stopped in their tracks due to proposed rescissions, if I may use that word, in connection with the various programs that are so near and dear to the hearts of the people of America. And why, why should we contain and stop the programs of research in the fields of cancer, heart disease, and mental illness?

It is said that we have not the money to go around, that the demands are so great in other fields we cannot afford to spend that money for our own people. So far as I am concerned, and I only speak for myself as a member of the subcommittee charged with that initial responsibility, I am serving notice I am going to try to bring to this Congress, budget or no budget, appropriations that will permit those magnificent activities to be carried on at a level that will not insure their curtailment or destruction in the interest of the people of the United States. The only way I can see to do that is to make some curtailment in certain of these other items of the budget.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced with a tremendous responsibility in making that determination. Every person who comes before the committee is asking for more money for America; yet if we are going to try to keep the appropriations within the budget estimates and make some reductions, we will have to curtail some place along the line. I would be willing to see some curtailment in this appropriation, to have it in the over-all picture of the budget, so that we could say: "Here, we can make a reduction. Perhaps we can do it when the appropriation comes before the Congress." But let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, in talking with the people of this country and of my district, they are going to ask Congress to do something for our own people in connection with some of these programs and give some consideration to the necessities of our people here before we scatter our substance to such an extent we cannot carry on our own domestic programs in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am only a freshman Member of this House and have been rather consistently an administration Democrat. I have voted for the appropriation for the European recovery program and for many other measures to send money and goods overseas as gifts. They have been going to Europe, Asia, in fact, all around the globe; but I do not mind saying that I am getting tired of it. The time is going to come and it is not going to be in the far-distant future when I am going to refuse to vote for any appropriation designed to send goods and money to Europe, Asia, Africa, or anywhere else in the world unless a different attitude is evinced regarding the things that are needed at home. The Book of Books says:

> He that provideth not for his own and especially they of his own household is an infidel and has already denied the faith.

I do not want to see this Congress reach the place where the people of the United States can point their finger at us and say, "You are infidels, you have not provided for your own."

Mr. Chairman, this measure only calls for an appropriation of $60,000,000 and $60,000,000 does not mean much any more. That $60,000,000 would terrace 240,000 acres of farm land in this country from which half the topsoil has already been eroded away and which is becoming more worthless every time it rains. This land is a part of the United States. A part of the country we call home and over which the Stars and Stripes wave. A part of the country and land that you gentlemen and ladies on both sides of this aisle profess to love. A part of the land that our boys gave their lives for. We had better give our own country something before we go around spending millions and billions of dollars to take care of somebody else's country.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you something else, $60,000,000 will buy and spread 20,000,000 tons of agricultural limestone on the land in this country. Sixty million dollars will provide a good sod of grasses and legumes on 5,000,000 acres of land that is now in desperate need of being returned to grass to save it from utter destruction. If I should ask for $60,000,000 to do any of the worth while things above mentioned in our home country I would be reminded of the $285,000,000 that has been allowed for soil conservation in 1950. Two hundred and eighty-five million dollars to do a job in our own country that our Extension Services and our agricultural colleges all say would take $1,500,000,000 per year to accomplish. We are doing for soil conservation in 5 years what should be done each and every year. I am serving notice on the Members of this House that the time is near at hand when I will not vote for gifts for other countries while my own country is bleeding to death at every river's mouth from Vancouver to the mouth of the St. Lawrence. I am tired, awfully tired, of voting to send money and goods to Europe, Asia, and Africa when we are doing so very little to save our own land.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on this bill. I voted against it before, and I intend to vote against it again.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if anybody knows, for there is nothing in the hearings, what the present status of this situation is. Would the gentleman tell us?

Mr. SUTTON. I am like my neighbor and colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER], who is getting tired and has already gotten tired of sending the money of the American taxpayers outside of America. Just the other day I noticed in the RECORD a statement about expenditures which was prepared by the United States Department of Commerce, entitled "Foreign Transactions of

the United States Government." I requested and received one of these statements from the Department of Commerce. I wish every Member of the House would get this publication. I believe that if you will look over this report by the Department of Commerce with an unbiased and unprejudiced mind, you would not send $1 out of the United States of America ever again.

I would like to give you a few of the figures contained therein. On page A-11 of this report I find that we have given to Russia $11,248,000,000. Now, there is not a man, woman or child in the United States of America that hates communism any more than I do. I know that should we go back to war that I am of the age and of the spirit to again volunteer my services. I fear that we boys will have to fight again some time. We must realize that certain foreign nations are traitors of democracy and traitors of the people. I hate communism, therefore, I do not propose to continue to coddle communistic governments with hard-earned American taxpayers' dollars.

Our great majority leader says that this is a means of fighting communism, speaking of aid to Korea. However, it occurs to me that if our $28,200,000,000 hypodermic, already administered, has not destroyed the plague that it is high time that we change our prescription. I also find that we have given Yugoslavia $332,000,000. That is another Red nation. I find that in the over-all picture since the cessation of the war, according to the Department of Commerce, that we have given in grants and credits American people's money to the tune of $28,200,000,000. Now, we all believe in economy. When are we going to practice it? We all believe in democratic principles and in our freedom. We all believe in practicing the principles of democracy and of strengthening our own defenses. When are we going to start practicing these? When are we going to start building up our own national defenses? Why are we going to continue to give American taxpayers' dollars to these countries who are not sympathetic with our principles of democracy?

Are we as Americans and Representatives in Congress for our 150,000,000 people in the United States, going to continue to give away the taxpayers' hard-earned money, not just to Korea but to the Communists, to those countries who do not believe in God, to those countries who do not believe in the principles of democracy? There must be a stopping place. We must cease the squandering of the substance of America's toil. Our people have been more than generous; it is time to stop, think, and take inventory.

I have as much sympathy for the Koreans as anyone. I have as much sympathy for them as any other foreign country. I would like to see them build up a democracy. But the American taxpayers are spending American dollars to help the Korean people build up their country for Russia to take over.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill is defeated.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make this brief observation. It will be very interesting to watch certain commentators and other propaganda agents in the future to see the action they take regarding those who are now taking this stand, as to whether they class them as isolationists, as they have enjoyed doing so much in the past toward those of us who have been advocating the same program for a good many years. Many of us have been called Republican reactionaries and isolationists by these individuals. Now let us see how they refer to our Democratic colleagues who have finally seen the light.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, on the all-important question of financing these programs, some of which are undoubtedly necessary, I find myself today affected with considerable sympathy for the month of February. I find that the month of February has a good deal in common with poor old John Taxpayer. Both of them will soon yield to the oncoming and inevitable demands of March, and both of them are short.

In an effort to make available to the needy certain commodities at home and abroad, on last Thursday some 28 Republican Members of this House introduced or supported bills to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to distribute available surplus food commodities to the school-lunch and welfare agencies. Yesterday our "promising" Secretary of Agriculture announced that he would comply in part with the directive. These distributions provided in our bill would involve aid to foreign countries, including Korea, but only after distribution to the public relief agencies here and to private relief agencies here. This action of the Secretary was in accordance with the intent of Congress contained in the Agricultural Act of 1949, that was signed at the White House last October 1. Up until yesterday Secretary Brannan has seen fit to find that only potatoes are in surplus for Americans despite the warehouses bulging with stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. However, when it came time to hand out acreage allotments the Secretary of Agriculture had no trouble in finding surpluses and over-supply to justify the cutting of agricultural production.

In yesterday's action, however, he has agreed that the school-lunch program and the welfare agencies may secure dried eggs and dried milk provided they are willing to pay the freight and handling charges. The cost of such commodities now in storage is, I believe, in the neighborhood of $115,000,000. This is what the law authorized him to do last October 1. Why the delay, Mr. Secretary? Why, in fact, is the Secretary of Agriculture so interested in sabotaging activities such as these and, on the other hand, equally sabotaging any effort to make the Anderson bill work? Would he give our new bill more help, if we call it "The poor man's Brannan plan"?

However, in the bills offered last Thursday, the effort was made to expedite the movement of all food surpluses owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation and to cut the constantly accumulating storage charges by having 6 months' storage cost advanced against the transportation and handling charges. So far the House Committee has ignored the bill, although five of the Republican members of the committee support the proposed legislation which is to be found in H. R. 7135 and other bills.

Why cannot Americans receive administrative and legislative consideration? Why cannot deserving Americans, and the American farmer, be accorded something other than lip service by their professed friend, the Secretary of Agriculture?

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. Has the gentleman any information as to the amount of edible food commodities that are being stored in this country and what the Federal Government is paying for that storage?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Yes; I have such information. I do not have it available here, but I will on a later date undertake to put that in the RECORD. I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for his support of this same proposed legislation.

I thank the gentleman. I believe we have made a constructive suggestion worthy of immediate consideration.

Mr. HESELTON. Are the storage charges many millions annually?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE of California. Do you not mean the total value of the commodities and not the storage charges? The gentleman asked for the storage charges.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I thought the gentleman said the total value.

Mr. HESELTON. I thought the gentleman referred to the total value of the commodities.

It is interesting to note that last week, Wednesday, the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Senate Agriculture Committee to discuss the disposition of 50,000,000 bushels of surplus edible potatoes. On Friday night field men of the Department were ordered to start dumping these potatoes and the Secretary predicted that the total to be destroyed in the next few weeks would be between twenty-five and forty million bushels at a cost of $1.25 per bushel. That would be between thirty-one and one-quarter million and fifty million dollars, which certainly would pay for the transportation of millions of bushels of these potatoes to localities where they could be eaten. This precipitous action was tragic in the face of the statement of former Secretary of Agriculture Anderson in the Senate Friday afternoon that the 1949 act gave the Secretary discretion to make these surplus commodities available to school-lunch programs, to welfare and charitable institutions, and to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We certainly should be interested in this latter possibility of disposition since I understand that we are being asked to provide

$803,000 more in the urgency deficiency bill later this afternoon for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and for the welfare of our American Indians. If there is an urgent need for this request and if it involves shortages of food, why should we not get the food to these deserving Americans rather than to pay storage and ultimately hire more people to destroy these commodities?

These bills would make that action mandatory and would broaden existing authority. They are not intended to solve the problem of a sound agricultural program. As is so often stated here, we face a condition, not a theory. Approval of these proposals would prevent the carrying out in full of the waste of good food under an arbitrary administrative edict.

As the gentleman has pointed out, the Department now moves belatedly and grudgingly into the field of providing dried eggs and dried milk as Congress intended them to be provided for those who need them. Actually, according to the inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of December 31, 1949, there were 254,490,784 pounds of this commodity and the cost is listed at $31,615,535.72; there were 76,433,954 pounds of dried eggs and the cost was $98,645,444.68. Of course, this is entirely exclusive of the accrued storage charges.

I received today from a responsible official in one of the communities in my district a request for information as to how potatoes might be furnished for needy residents, and I have asked the Secretary to advise me on this point. I am also requesting further information as to the actual facts involved in the storage programs, as to where these articles are being stored, and as to what the cost has been and is to the American taxpayer.

It occurs to me that all Members might like to know what the commodity inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation showed as to other items as of December 31, 1949, and I shall ask permission when we return to the House to include those figures. They are butter, cheese, prunes, raisins, edible dried beans, rice, turkeys, and canned Mexican meat.

What more will be selected and when will we have further action in these other fields? Certainly the record proves beyond any question to all except those who will not look at the facts that we have a challenge here which is urgent. Irrespective of the frenzied attempt of some to defend this outrageous misinterpretation of congressional intention and illogical maneuvering for political position, I do not believe that either the people in this country, who need food, or the taxpayers, who are being asked to finance these absurd gyrations, will be happy about any delay in taking a prompt, constructive action.

Bear in mind that, according to the latest figures, there are 2,715,751 persons receiving old-age pensions, 1,486,404 receiving dependents and children benefits, 92,000 blind receiving help, and 543,000 on State and local relief rolls. As was stated by these 28 Republican Members of the House when these bills were filed:

> Why not bring these two sets of statistics together, for they are more than statistics? They are people and food. Better to get the food to the deserving people than to pay storage, and ultimately hire more people to destroy the food.

I think the Members may be interested in seeing the list of those who joined in support of this recommendation. Besides the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.] and myself, they were: JOHN PHILLIPS, California; JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan; RICHARD M. NIXON, California; HARDIE SCOTT, Pennsylvania; WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER, New York; KENNETH B. KEATING, New York; J. GLENN BEALL, Maryland; DONALD JACKSON, California; ROBERT J. CORBETT, Pennsylvania; EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, New York; THOMAS H. WERDEL, California; W. STERLING COLE, New York; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, New York; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; ALBERT W. COLE, Kansas; ANTONI N. SADLAK, Connecticut; HENRY J. LATHAM, New York; WILLIAM S. HILL, Colorado; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa; AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota; PAUL B. DAGUE, Pennsylvania; GERALD R. FORD, JR., Michigan; HAROLD O. LOVRE, South Dakota; JAMES W. WADSWORTH, New York; DANIEL A. REED, New York; and HENRY O. TALLE, Iowa.

I am also including for the information of Members the text of the resolution referred to:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That in order to prevent the waste, and to assure proper utilization of food commodities acquired through price-support operations, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation are authorized and directed to make available such commodities as follows in the order of priority set forth: First, to school-lunch programs; and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Federal, State, and local public-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy Indians and other needy persons; second, to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States; third, to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons outside the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture shall first determine that any such commodities are in ample supply over and above such reserves as may be required and deemed in the public interest. The Secretary of Agriculture and Commodity Credit Corporation shall make any such commodities available at point of storage, at no cost save handling and transportation costs from point of storage. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation may advance as against handling and transportation costs in making delivery up to the equivalent of 6 months' storage costs on any such commodities turned over.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Yes. As to potatoes, the Secretary of Agriculture will pay freight to give them away for pigs to eat. Does this administration think more of pigs than of people? I think the gentleman will also be interested in a recent article which pointed out that in view of the destruction and storage and losses in the potato program a dealer down in New Orleans only this week bought 1,000,000 pounds of potatoes from Canada because he could buy them more cheaply there. This dealer said: "I don't know why I can buy choice potatoes from Canada and have them shipped down here cheaper than I can buy them from Maine or Idaho; but I know I can do it."

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Suppose we should have had a bad year next year? Do you want to get rid of all our surplus so that we will be in a very bad fix after that?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am sure that nobody is suggesting that we get rid of absolutely all of our surplus. We are suggesting that some of these gluts be removed from the warehouses.

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. The Secretary of Agriculture, through the Production and Marketing Administration, has told the public that every bit of the dried eggs being stored in Kansas will have to be dumped where they were purchased back of last year and beyond that and he has warned that the rest of them are becoming mildewed. Does the gentleman from West Virginia want to keep them?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Some of our delightful friends from the city over on the other side apparently do not know anything more about potatoes than that they are good baked. You know that they rot after a while and you cannot store them. You come out on the farm and I will show you some of these things.

Mr. BURNSIDE. What do you want to do, give them all away?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WHITE of Califorina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat amused by the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the problems facing agriculture. Apparently he is not aware that the Anderson bill which he so highly praises fails to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture is permitted to pay freight charges on these surplus commodities when they are for human consumption. On the other hand, the Anderson bill specifically provides that the Department of Agriculture can pay freight on these commodities if you feed them to livestock. There is a plain case of a law which discriminates against the hungry people of this Nation in favor of animals. I think it is a strong indictment of the Anderson bill.

Speaking a little further about the gentleman's remarks——

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. The gentleman is not discussing the pending bill, and has not had consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from California will proceed in order.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to a great many people that today this Nation is paralleling in many respects the course of action followed by the allies of western Europe during the period before Munich.

I make that statement in the light of events which are transpiring at this very moment in Asia. Conquests are being consummated which are strikingly similar in their execution to the conquests of Adolf Hitler. Through processes of political infiltration, through the lending of every possible type of aid and assistance, the satellite forces of the Soviet Union continue undeterred in their march across the face of Asia, under ever-increasing clouds of dust which show no likelihood of settling anywhere for a long time to come.

As France, England, and the United States waited during those torturous years of 1937 and 1938 for the blows of Adolf Hitler to fall, so it seems to me that the free nations of the West are today waiting in exactly the same mood of passive anticipation for the next uncontested blow to fall in the Orient. Neville Chamberlain, that distinguished British diplomat, was certainly, if I may be forgiven the phrase, a piker in many respects in his actions before, and for a period after he came back from Munich. The Prime Minister of England had no blueprint for approaching disaster such as we have today in the Communist manifesto. He had no recent historical precedent on which to base his humanitarian activities and his moves toward peace as he made his way to Munich. Certainly, the free democracies of the world in this hour should be able to see, in what has transpired in our day, the threat that faces us in Asia, and the almost certain and complete conquest within a matter of weeks or months.

As strongly as any other Member of this body, I have opposed communism wherever it has reared its head. I have supported bills coming to the floor from our committee for aid to Greece and Turkey, and for assistance to other nations throughout the world. I gladly supported ECA when the problem and the calculated risks were explained and weighed. I did these things when the President of the United States told us frankly what he had in mind. He told us what the difficulties were; the nature of the conquests, and what he intended to do about them. He told us then that he would use very resource at his command to resist the Red tide, and that we would, whenever and wherever our help was needed, defend those free peoples who were attempting to help themselves in stopping the aggression.

What the world needs today, Mr. Chairman, and needs much more than a small measure of economic and possibly futile assistance to Korea and Formosa, is a statement on the part of the United States of America that will carry conviction into the homes and into the hearts of the people who live under this constant pall of dread and fear. If $60,000,000 or $600,000,000 would insure in our time the peace that Neville Chamberlain thought he had achieved in his efforts to appease Adolf Hitler, it would be a good investment, indeed. But any program designed to insure freedom for the peoples of the Far East will require an instrumentality far more effective than the mere giving of a small portion of economic assistance to Korea and to Formosa.

I shall oppose this measure, with great reluctance, and only after long hours of sincere thought on the subject. I have a deep conviction that along this 10 percent course of action lies 100 percent disaster for the United States of America in our day. For one thing, so far as I am personally concerned, I want to know, before I vote one more penny of foreign assistance, what the administration intends to do with respect to recognition of that international conspiracy in China, which regime is the natural child of secret agreements concluded with a wartime ally who was all too willing to partition Poland, Finland, Czechoslovakia, and the rest of central Europe.

I shall oppose this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman knows that I completely subscribe to the effective position which he took in opposition to the bill for Korea alone. But in view of the failure of the State Department to implement the prior appropriations of this Congress with respect to aid for China, does the gentleman feel that this additional gesture with respect to Formosa is any convincing argument that I can use for supporting this bill when I opposed the previous bill?

Mr. JACKSON of California. No, I do not. I would say that the gentleman's position is entirely logical. Much of my opposition stems, unfortunately, from a lack of confidence, a lack of confidence which is daily growing, with respect to the activities of the State Department in both a domestic sense and in the foreign field. I take my stand on this measure out of regard for the United States of America and without regard for any partisan consideration. I feel that some changes should be made, and these changes must be made before the Department of State can ever regain the position of dignity and public confidence it once enjoyed and which are today essential to the proper discharge of important duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest regret that I just heard my colleague, the gentleman from California, whose advice and counsel we value very highly on the committee—and I think that goes for members on both sides—declare that after long deliberation he felt that he had to vote against this bill. I believe that his views on the subject are important and worth while, and I ask the indulgence of the House in replying to him for just a very few minutes, because we must understand where South Korea stands now.

South Korea is on the very brink of fatal economic peril. With respect to their inflation, a reference to the committee's report will indicate that the circulation of money has almost doubled in the space of a year, and the reason for that is the fact that American aid which was relied on and depended on by the Korean people, albeit without commitment—let me emphasize that—but which they depended on, was not forthcoming.

Secondly, and very important, and this goes back to what my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], spoke of when the bill was considered under general debate. Let us be very clear about North Korea, and let us not get confused by any assertion that we are backing some police state in South Korea, because you cannot understand South Korea without comparing it with North Korea. North Korea shut out the United Nations Commission which was sent there to insure a free election. In June of 1948 there was a manifesto by the Government of North Korea that there would be an election. Call it an election if you will, but the fact is that 99 percent of the people would probably have been made to vote on a one-party ticket to support that party—yet even at that no election has yet been held. The people of South Korea agreed to hold elections under the watchful eye of the United Nations Commission, and their government is the result of a free election. There is the difference.

It is not just a matter of military protection in the Pacific; I have urged, and I shall continue to urge and to fight for a Pacific pact, which I think is essential. But that is not the only point; the fundamental point about the Pacific is that the peoples of the Pacific, the rank and file of the people, the teeming millions of them, want some recognition of their right to a better life, although they are relatively unskilled in the theories of freedom and the theories of constitutional government. The people of South Korea turn to us and look to us to help them maintain a free government to help them to get for themselves a better life.

If we help them accomplish this they, and the peoples of all Asia will feel that we carry out our pledges to help peoples to gain for themselves freedom and a chance for a better standard of living. On the other hand, if we just baldly tell them that we must have completely superior, naked military power in that area we will defeat the ends and purposes of the free peoples of the world, for the peoples of Asia will not believe that we can be trusted, and it will have its repercussions throughout all of Asia.

All of Asia is watching what we do. I think, therefore, that the important, the overwhelming, the fundamental significance of this aid to South Korea is the

effect it will have on the common people of Asia proving to them that the United States really means what it says in offering them an opportunity for their own freedom and their own well-being, proving to them that it is not a question of a naked military power display as between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I am very grateful to the gentleman. I am entirely in agreement with the gentleman on one point—at least I believe this to be the gentleman's position—that we would certainly be strengthened in whatever course of action we followed in the Pacific area by a definite, straightforward statement of what we intend to do. Does the gentleman agree to that extent?

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question about the need for a positive and complete Pacific policy, and I have spoken to the fact that a Pacific pact militarily and a far eastern recovery program economically are essential. I point out that if you default in respect to South Korea you vitiate everything you say about the need for a far eastern policy if you do not support this measure. This measure represents performance, not talk.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Of course, we share opposite opinions on that point, but I would like to say in that connection that I have the utmost regard and respect for the position taken by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. When will it be in order to offer amendments to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Section 3 is now open to amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if this is the picture, and I may say this is what bothers me about this bill. We have no policy in the Far East or anywhere else. Korea is raising enough rice to support herself. She may require that a little cotton come in and a little fish or something like that. But the major part of this operation relates to the development of permanent resources like mining and power plants.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. TABER. We have the cart before the horse when we try to embark upon a permanent program without having a policy as to how we should proceed; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes; I think so.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is worse today than the one we had before us several weeks ago. We have certainly opened up the door for more money to the extent of at least $10,000,000. We are asked to contribute $60,000,000 to Korea only as a starter, only to get our foot in the door. The 3-year program will cost $320,000,000.

The gentleman from New York has just called attention to the fact that this money for Korea is going to be put into permanent establishments—railroads, fishing fleets, coal mines, reclamation projects, and so forth. We are asked to do that in face of this situation, and I read from page 15 of the report:

> As to negative aspects of the South Korean economy in its present phase, a New York Times dispatch of January 13, 1950, makes note of "the Korean financial situation, which United States experts describe as 'deteriorating' in the face of unchecked deficit spending."
>
> The dispatch continues:
>
> "During the first 8 months of the fiscal year 1949–50, deficit expenditures of the Government exceeded the entire budget for the year. The chief spenders were the Ministry of National Defense and the Home Ministry. The latter pays for a police force of army proportions. The office of the Prime Minister spent more than three times its entire budget on intelligence activities alone.
>
> "Most of the deficit money was obtained either from printing presses or overdrafts on the Bank of Korea. The abrupt rise of currency in circulation during the last few months, despite a slight reduction in 1949, is shown by the following figures. December 31, 1948, 43,000,000,000 won; March 31, 1949, 38,000,000,000 won; January 7, 1950, 74,000,000,000 won.
>
> "The present situation, in the opinion of United States financial experts here, has arisen because of uncontrolled spending not only by agencies concerned with hunting down Communists but by other departments, inadequate tax collections, and failure to absorb United States aid matériel."

Now, we are going to pour this $60,000,000 into that kind of a situation? It was very encouraging, I thought, just a few moments ago, when several Members of this House took the floor and eloquently pleaded for the poor American taxpayer. Now, there are those who smile about that situation, but the Members of this House will hear more about that when they go back to their constituencies in July or August of this year.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. It is not only too bad that they smile when we think of the taxpayers paying all of this debt, but if we want to keep our country solvent, should we not do these things differently than the State Department is trying to do in the way of conducting affairs in foreign countries with our money at this particular time?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Certainly. Of course, the only foreign policy we have in the Far East today is Titoism. Why, the boys in the State Department are on their knees praying that the Chinese Communists will repudiate Stalin. Under no circumstances can this bill be justified. The American taxpayers are entitled to a break.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when one protests foreign spending he is purposely made to appear by a majority of the Members of this House as not being properly advised. Perhaps I am not properly informed about some things, but I can assure you that I am sufficiently informed on this subject to know that not one economist, not one businessman, not one laborer, nor not one farmer can honestly justify our lavish foreign aid spending program.

This foreign aid spending program was imposed upon the Congress by a group of smart men who were anxious to promote their businesses immediately following World War II at a time when this Congress did not know what to do and was willing to take any kind of chance that might prevent another war. The Congress had every reason at that time to believe that perhaps the smart promoters of the Marshall plan were sincere. I venture to say that most of the Members of this Congress now conscientiously feel that they have made a mistake in supporting the foreign aid program, but do not have the courage to admit it and return to a sane and sound foreign policy. Possibly it is necessary for their voters to be misled for the protection of their officials. I say there is nothing more honorable than the admission of error and mistake.

Many Members of this Congress privately admit they now doubt the soundness of our foreign-aid policy, but brush it aside with assertions that they have now taken a stand and do not feel it advisable to turn back.

With the facts now available, there is not a school child in this country who could at this time be sufficiently blinded by the promoters' scheme as to advocate a continuation of this wild business promotion. Socialistic England is the prime beneficiary even of United States funds spent elsewhere in the foreign-aid program. Not long ago a school teacher was telling her pupils about the United Kingdom being spread out all over the world like a big octopus and that the sun never went down on possessions of Great Britain. One child spoke up, "Teacher, I knew that, and I can tell you why the sun never goes down on the United Kingdom." The teacher was astonished to know that her pupil was better informed than she and inquired of Johnny why the sun never went down on British possessions. Johnny said, "Teacher, the sun never goes down on British possessions because we can't trust them in the dark."

I am not an isolationist and fully realize that we cannot place a fence around this country and hope to give to our citizens their entitlements. I am cognizant of the fact that all of Europe, Asia, Africa; and, in fact, any part of the world is closer to us today than Los Angeles was to Washington when Monroe uttered his doctrine. When I ran for Congress, I told my voters that some foreign assistance was justifiable because we could not conscientiously allow friendly democracies that had assisted us in curtailing both World Wars to European soils to be without the necessities of life. Yes, Mr. Chairman, many of the European and Asiatic countries savagely

fought for the preservation of democracy and thereby kept the fight off our soils and afforded a great protection to our women and children.

However, my investigation of the foreign-spending program does not reveal such assistance at our hands to suffering humanity. We find some big-business men in this country collaborating with businessmen abroad to fleece the American taxpayers. Our foreign-aid money is being used to build factories where factories were never before; to build highways where highways were never before; to construct flood-control projects that do not replace war-torn facilities; and to purchase commodities at a great profit to many who pretend to be wiping tears for struggling humanity.

I will not have time to cite the wrongs that have been committed in the name of national defense and restoration of war-torn Europe. Some of you should scrutinize the ECA mule transaction on behalf of Greece. You will find that the ECA purchased approximately 7,500 farm mules through a contract with some Turk who in turn made a subcontract with a couple of gentlemen in this country who received $90 per mule delivered at the port, and the Turk received an additional $15 upon each head delivered to Europe. The ECA paid $147.75 for cargo freight per mule from the United States to Europe. Each mule cost the ECA $252.75, while the two citizens of this country paid from $35 to $50 per head. In another such transaction, the Army purchased approximately 10,000 mules at an average price of $139.68 per head delivered to Fort Reno, with a loss of 36 mules in transit. That transaction was carried on with just as much underhandedness as the ECA mule-purchasing program. I wish I had time to give you the benefit of many such ECA transactions. If only our voters knew the whole story, this foreign-aid spending program would end in short order.

For a time I was at a loss to know why those who have been hollering the loudest throughout the United States of America against the great expenditures by the Congress say so little against the foreign spending program. A little investigation will enlighten you considerably as to why many of the big businesses and the big newspapers protect the foreign-aid program while criticizing all other types of public expenditures. They holler for suffering humanity abroad and about their fear of communism, but let us see just how much money they are getting for their sympathies and pleadings.

The Marshall plan was conceived in inequity and born in sin at the hands of some Wall Street bankers and war profiteers and those connected with the interests in the I. G. Farben cartels of Germany. Right now a move is in existence to give more billions to the British, and I venture to say that this session of Congress will not have ended before an effort is made here through a backdoor method for this country to assume the debt of Britain in India, Egypt, and other foreign countries. Efforts will be made to cause these debts to be paid by the United States accepting sterling now frozen in London in payment for agriculture products accumulated by the Commodity Credit Corporation, for machinery and other items. The activities of the International Chamber of Commerce is ample authority for this grandiose scheme. The interests back of the idea of paying Britain's debts are the same ones which brought into existence the highly lauded Marshall plan for their own selfish profiteering motives.

I have learned from a very reliable and authentic source some interesting facts concerning the advocates of the foreign spending program. Mr. William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State, was the principal architect of the Marshall plan. His firm, known as Anderson, Clayton & Co., has supplied at least $100,000,000 worth of cotton to the ECA program. Mr. S. Sloan Colt, president of the Bankers Trust Co., of New York, is another leading proponent of the foreign spending program. His bank has enjoyed a large percentage of the ECA credit business—already doing $281,000,000 in business through the Marshall plan. It will be interesting to know that two directors of the Bankers Trust Co , Phillip Reed and Ward Melvill, were members of the committee for the Marshall plan. Mr. Reed is also president of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Sosthenes Behn and Mr. Gerald Swope, directors of the National City Bank of New York, were represented on the Marshall-plan committee, and their bank has enjoyed $310,000,000 in ECA business. The Irving Trust Co. has found it profitable for the hard Marshall-plan work performed by their directors, Henry P. Bristol and David L. Luke, for they have enjoyed $220,000,000 in ECA credit business.

As usual, J. P. Morgan & Co. lost no chance to profit out of funds supposed to be used to combat communism and feed suffering humanity. That company has done $238,000,000 of ECA business. Incidentally, the vice president of J. P. Morgan & Co., Mr. Raymond Atkins, is one of the study group suggesting additional British aid. The Bank of America has done all right with the ECA program—a lucrative $197,000,000 of it. There are many other sympathizing organizations that have certainly lost no money by sending their directors to Washington for honorary committee work which has for its purpose the selling of white elephants to our excited taxpayers. Now, remember, that these same businesses are leading the fight against any assistance to the underprivileged of this country.

These promoters have not failed to cross every "t" and dot every "i." For fear that the humanitarian idea might become stale, they have something to offer to every section of our country in order to whip up a few more votes. The southern Members are told today that we cannot afford to vote against this bill because Korea needs a little cotton. Well, I wish to say to that argument that, even though I come from a cotton section, my people do not wish to sell their wares through trickery and fraud. The ECA, handling their business as per the mule transactions, will pay a fancy price for each pound of cotton. My farmers will get the maximum price of 25 to 30 cents per pound, and by the time some big shots in this country have collaborated with those in Korea, the price of a cotton shirt will be comparable with that of a Cadillac automobile. You know why the cotton is not sent directly from the South to Korea rather than through the middlemen. If it were, there would be little cry from the present promoters for foreign spending.

There are a lot of big-business men in the United States who have foreign credit that they can visualize slipping from them; therefore, it is necessary for them to induce the good taxpayers of this country to continue spending money upon foreign soils to protect these business investments.

Mr. Chairman, in one breath we contend that communism is unbearable and cannot be tolerated—to which I agree 100 percent—and in the next breath we contend that it is necessary for us to spend billions of dollars fighting that system of government. The first—and, so far as I know, the only—Communist college ever to be established in the United States was in my district—Commonwealth College at Mena, Ark. While serving as prosecuting attorney down there, it was my pleasure to close that institution. Any of you may go to Mena, in Polk County, Ark., where that college operated for several years, seeking Communists and I can assure you that your efforts will be futile. Those Polk County people saw communism in action, and, therefore, are stronger than any people in this country against communism. You are spending billions of dollars trying to keep the people from knowing communism. I venture to say that if you will spend a little money letting them know communism it will not cost us 1 dime to abolish it.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman referred to the National City Bank of New York.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder if the gentleman remembers when it and one other banking institution induced an administration about 25 years ago to send troops to Nicaragua ostensibly to hold honest elections. Senator Morris said, "Why not send them to Philadelphia or Pittsburgh?" Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. TACKETT. I recall hearing of that occasion.

Mr. RANKIN. They went down there and they came to find out that some bonds had been floated in Nicaragua and these banks had bought them. They feared that the incoming administration was going to repudiate the bonds because of the manner in which they had been floated, so they induced the administration to send the Marines to Nicaragua.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes; and these banks are now interested in floating bonds to finance the foreign spending program in order that they may get their tentacles wrapped around a greater portion of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask when it will be in order to offer amendments to section 3?

The CHAIRMAN. When the gentleman is recognized. Section 3 has been read and is now open to amendments. Continue, Mr. TACKETT.

Mr. TACKETT. This whole foreign-aid structure, even though I am supposed to be ignorant because I oppose it, is serving but one purpose; and that is to take care of the big businesses in this country that have foreign investments. Most of the newspapers continually fight Government expenditures, but very few of them find any fault with the billions of dollars supposedly for foreign aid. No, they do not dare open their mouths upon this subject because big businesses will not tolerate it of their controlled newspapers.

Oh, yes; the people in your district feel just as the people in my district. They doubt the wisdom of the whole affair and sincerely believe it wasteful spending. All of us continually write back home telling every old, indigent, crippled, and underprivileged person that sooner or later we are going to do something for them. We promise that in due time they will have a bed of roses. Those people may be old, crippled, and underprivileged, but they exhibit more wisdom in all of their everyday activities than this Congress has exhibited on any one foreign-aid proposal. They know the score; and that their time shall never come. I am a rabid liberal when it comes to taking care of the people of this country, but I am a reactionary conservative concerning foreign spending that prefers selfish business interests to our own people. I must admit that some of the membership has exhibited enough courage to tell their underprivileged people that it is first necessary to take care of the foreigners. Others have found it politically expedient to rely on the Townsend plan which is definitely known as another big, money-grabbing scheme and is not supposed to ever reach the floor for a vote. I am for assisting the old, indigent, and underprivileged prior to assisting the big shots of this country to gobble up blood money; and I shall not dodge the issue with the Townsend plan. I am just as strong against the Townsend plan as I am against foreign aid, and I am not afraid to tell my people that I am opposed to this socialistic bunch of tomfoolery.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. It is a pleasure as a Republican on the Republican side to find a Democrat now publicly declaring that the Democrat Party is a party of big businesses.

Mr. TACKETT. I do not agree with your conclusions. The leadership of your party takes great pride in referring to the foreign-spending program as a bipartisan matter. The majority of your party is just as strong as the majority of my party for this spending of billions of dollars throughout the world. Very few of you Republicans vote along with the few of us in our efforts to curtail these needless expenditures. The majority of your party merely uses a few dilatory tactics, lay all the blame on the Democratic leadership, and then fall in line with the foreign-aiders on the final vote.

Your party cannot be trusted, Mr. FULTON. You are always going to do so much for us southerners, but you are never there when the going gets rough. The activities of your party make certain that the Republican Party cannot be trusted any farther than you can throw a bull by the tail. The newspapers are always talking about a Republican-southern Democrat coalition, which is just a bunch of foolishness with no scintilla of truth involved. A majority of you Members on the left of the aisle are just as wild as the most rabid liberal on the right side of the aisle. I have sat here day in and day out and watched a few of you pretend to be savers of tax money, but on the final roll call it is quite convincing that a lot of demagoguery has been exhibited because a proportionate number of Republicans to Democrats are usually lined up on the spending bandwagon.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman was saying something about the Republicans and big-money men in that party. Is it not true that big money does not pay any attention to party lines but just goes after what they want?

Mr. TACKETT. Big money does not give a hoot about the policies of Democrats, Republicans, Socialists, or Communists—it does not make any difference to them—all they want is to get the gravy out of the taxpayers; and, at the same time, criticize all others who happen to sop some of the gravy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, you are saying the truth.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Recently the British Government recognized the Communist Government of China. Does the gentleman know whether there is any truth or any basis for the rumor going around that the United States Government soon is to recognize the Communist government of China?

Mr. TACKETT. I will say that I do not know, but that I would not be surprised at what our State Department might do at any time. There is no telling what they will do.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In answer to the question, we have been holding hearings on appropriations for the foreign service and our State Department in my committee. The fact of the matter is that while the British Government has recognized the Communist Government of China, the Communist Government of China has not recognized the Government of Great Britain. So far as the United States is concerned, all of the information I can get after lengthy interrogation of the Secretary of State and other officials in the Department of State, there is no sign that the United States Government is going to recognize the Red government in China.

Mr. TACKETT. I hope the gentleman is correct.

I have received a couple of letters criticizing my last vote against the Korean aid bill. Those two people fear that should this bill not pass, the prestige of the United States Government might be injured. Well now, is not that just pitiful? The advocates of this proposal often refer on the floor of this House to the possibility of our prestige being lowered should we not send money to Korea. I value the lifeblood of our American boys and girls more than prestige. We can just keep meddling around in other people's business until we will find ourselves in another war. There is no doubt in my mind but that we are heading straight into world war III because our State Department enjoys sticking its nose into the affairs of every other country with the approval of this Congress. Our prestige is not all that is to be hurt; but, to the contrary, it will be some of our young American boys and girls slaughtered to appease some big business interests who would actually rather see us in war than at peace in order that they might enhance their purses while the youth fight the battles. It always has been and always will be a poor man's fight and a rich man's war. The selfish promoters of this foreign-aid spending program were not satisfied with their lavish monetary gains from the last war and, therefore, continue their vulturing tactics.

The proponents of this bill do not even contend that Korean aid is necessary for suffering humanity, or even for defense. They merely contend that we need to build some factories and carry on some public work in that area to prove our friendship to those people and save our prestige. Why do not they just admit that big businesses are wanting some substances in retaliation for their gripe against a few smaller fellows in this country who have for the first time here of late been receiving some attention from the Congress.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] said that the Communists of China had not recognized Great Britain. Well, if they ever

see Mr. Attlee, the Communists will recognize him.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes; if for no other reason he heads the twin-sister party of communism.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask the gentleman a question on the serious side?

Mr. TACKETT. Yes; I am serious about this whole thing.

Mr. FULTON. When you see communism expanding abroad, do you think we should completely ignore such expansion, or do you think there is some point at which we should try to stop communism expanding abroad?

Mr. TACKETT. Yes; I absolutely do; but I can tell you this: You are going at it the wrong way. What are the Communists doing? They are taking by infiltration. What are we doing? We are attempting to take with our wealth. What is the difference? Very little; but the ultimate result is the same. What we cannot get with our money, we at least realize that we should not take by infiltration. We should not be buying control. Yes; we should draw a line and advise Russia in no uncertain terms that she is not to cross that line unless she expects her bluff to be called. Russia is not going to intentionally find herself in conflict with the United States, and you know that. Appeasing, giving, and taking with Russia, and sticking our nose into the affairs of all others, and by the Atlantic Pact inviting any little country that belongs to the pact to find herself in conflict with Russia with assurance of our assistance is surely going to lead us into war. It will not cost us a dime to keep Russia out of other countries in which we do not want her to infiltrate by letting her know in no uncertain terms that she is not to enter therein with our good graces and without expecting conflict. Oh, yes, you will say that Russia will infiltrate through the underground as to allow her agents to become in control of some country so as to place us in the position of not being able to carry out our threat. Russia cannot get anything done underground that the people in those countries do not want if Russia knows that we do not intend to tolerate any acts contrary to the wishes of the people of those countries.

Communism abolishes Christianity, individual initiative, free enterprise, and open competition. It cannot prevail, but will die of its own course long before a monopoly of world trade at the hands of Russia could possibly be achieved. Millions of United States foreign-aid dollars have reached the hands of Russia to assist the cause of the Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if I had not been convinced before that this is a bad bill, the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] would have convinced me. The gentleman expressed my views in a clearer and more persuasive manner than I could have done. He repeated the arguments a few of us on the Republican side were making in 1942. We were then called isolationists, a characterization I have never resented. Sometimes we were enemies charged with being unmindful of our duty to the rest of the world, expressing our interest in our country before the Second World War. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] was one of those who tried to keep us out of war—who saw where we were heading. He did his utmost to keep us out of that war, but in we went.

Now, I have no fault to find, with either the conclusions the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] drew as to who wanted war, when he referred to those gentlemen who have money, for if I read history aright, that has always been the situation; those who might profit out of a war, not the people who had to do the fighting and make the sacrifices, were the ones who caused war.

The gentleman said he could not understand why so little had been said against this bill. Well, he is a new Member. I think he came in last year. Hence he does not understand that, but I can tell him. One reason is that every time anyone raised his voice against sticking our nose into everybody else's business, someone on the floor of the House or in the press would call him disloyal as well as ignorant. You were just inviting abuse as well as criticism if you did not go along with the administration's foreign policy.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, you are such a fine, large gentleman. What is it?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Who stuck their nose in our business at Pearl Harbor?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, and who asked them in? Have you read the papers?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. They did not wait to be asked.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, now, listen. I will not say you are ignorant, but you are not aware of the facts. Who stuck their nose in our business? Who asked the Japs to do it? Do not you know? If you do not, then read a little history. Read John Flynn's Looking Ahead, or any one of a half dozen other publications. There are none so blind as those who will not see. Those who have the facts as they have come to light in the last 4 years now know that the administration had us committed to war long before the Japs struck. So here we go again—looking for a third world war—another crop of veterans to say nothing of those who must die.

Now a word to all those who have been talking about spending money to set everything right all over the world—one gentleman said he knew what the world wanted. I do not know what the world wants. I think I know what my constituents and the common people of America want, and that is not another war—they want peace.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In just a minute. Always my constituents have been writing me ever since I have been here, and they tell me every time I am home, "For heaven's sake, Clare, let us keep out of these foreign entanglements—let us avoid war—it will destroy us."

What have we got out of our two World Wars? The ill will of almost every nation.

And what do the people who followed a policy which meant war admit now? The champions of this bipartisan foreign policy over in the other body are ready to admit, and they have admitted recently what others have long known to be true, that we just cannot take on all the world, supply them with food, clothing and shelter, and everything else they need, without destroying ourselves economically. That is just what Russia wants. She wants us to bleed ourselves white so that we have no ability left to defend ourselves. But now, what is being proposed?

Today, over in the other body, a committee holding hearings, the purpose of which is to make us surrender our form of Government, forsake the Constitution and the principles enunciated therein, haul down our flag and hoist some international rag and agree that our young men, and our girls, for we have young women in the armed services now, shall be bound to fight in every war that any one of those quarrelsome nations starts.

For the life of me, I cannot understand the thinking of any American who wants us to join hands in a firm partnership with the bankrupt, trouble-making, trouble-seeking, quarrelsome and, from a military standpoint, helpless nations all over the world, and agree not only to go to war in their behalf whenever they think a war might be advantageous to them—bind ourselves not only to pay in dollars and material but in the lives of our men—but to bear the cost of a third world war.

The Communists advocate the overthrow of our Government by force. Without in any way challenging the patriotism or the sincerity of those who are now advocating some form of a world government—and I care not what they call it—in which we should join, binding ourselves, I repeat, to fight whenever, wherever, one of our partners might decide, in my humble opinion, they will, if they succeed in their efforts, arrive at the same destination toward which the Communists are looking.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

Mr. NICHOLSON and Mr. RICH objected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] is recognized in opposition to the motion.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition whatever to argue this motion. We all understand the reason the motion was made, and that reason is not good. I hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 32, noes 67.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman's objection is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may not in the Committee of the Whole object to a vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, but he may make the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair assumes the gentleman intended to make a point of order that a quorum was not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I did not speak on this bill when it was under consideration the other day, and I do not intend to say very much right now except that while the gentleman from Arkansas has made a very cogent statement, one which is deserving of our keenest attention, we must all remember that we have not found it possible to change the foreign policy of our country to his liking, or to mine, or probably to the liking of a very great many present here. But in connection with this Korean and Formosa aid business, I trust we will not be swayed too much by the very able reasoning of the gentleman from Arkansas or these other Members. I hope we will examine the situation from a purely strategic standpoint. What we have before us is a strategic program whether or not the foreign policy of this administration has been adequate or properly conducted. I do not like the way it is being administered. I will say that very frankly, and I think that much of this money is being spent not only unwisely but perhaps to the profit of some people in this country who have no moral right to be engaged in such an undertaking. I want to say here that while the island of Formosa is not strategically important in the defense of our country from the standpoint of our occupation of that island, but it is exceedingly important that no other government that is unfavorable to us shall occupy it. That is the truth. No one will say that it is strategically important to us, but it is mighty important that nobody who is against us shall occupy it. That is to a lesser degree true also of South Korea. How this money may be squandered in South Korea I do not know. I may say to the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who think this bill is wrong that if they will make it their business to see that it is properly administered and the money not squandered by their own administration there may be some success. But, for goodness' sake, let us look at this in the strategic interest of our country, in the situation we find today, not last year, 5 years or 10 years ago. Those are important days which are gone by. They are in the history book. We cannot change them. We can only do our best to override the mistakes of the past and to do what is right today.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I call the gentleman's attention to the hearings. He will find in those hearings that neither Formosa nor Korea are considered as a vital part of our security line.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is what I said a moment ago, if the gentleman has heard me. I likewise said it is mighty important that Formosa is not occupied by a power that might be opposed to us. That is the important thing. It is indeed not strategically important for us to occupy it except, possibly if we found that necessary in order to preclude another country from occupying it.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman have any information that the State Department or the defense organization will move one finger to prevent the Communists from taking over South Korea?

Mr. HINSHAW. If I had such definite information, I would not give it on the floor of this House.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement of the strategic meaning of the position of the United States, because with Formosa under a foreign power which was antagonistic to the United States in the last war, Formosa was used as a landing or staging area against the Philippines and could be so used again.

Mr. HINSHAW. All one has to do is to learn just a little smattering of military science, tactics and strategy. Then examine the geography of the Pacific; take a look at the island of Formosa and the answer is absolutely clear. Anyone who fails to recognize the situation in which we find ourselves today from a military or strategic standpoint, may make a very grave mistake in his conclusions over legislation of this kind. Much as I do not like the way a great deal of our foreign program has been handled and much as I doubt that this money will be expended wisely I feel compelled to support this bill because in this bill we find some recognition of the importance of Formosa to our defense in the Pacific.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to see if we cannot limit the time for debate. We seem to be going around in a circle. We are starting back on the subject with which we began.

Mr. GAVIN. It may appear to the gentleman that we are going around in circles, but we are not. We just want an opportunity to be heard, to express our opinions, so that the folks back home may know where we stand.

Mr. KEE. The gentleman misunderstands what I said. I am not trying to keep any Member from expressing his views.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have an amendment on the desk that I hope can be considered before we close debate. It is very important, and I am sure my colleagues will be interested in it.

Mr. KEE. I should like to arrange, by unanimous consent or otherwise, for a limitation on debate, or we will not get through this evening.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 20 minutes.

Mr. RICH. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on section 3 and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 66, noes 43.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, is the committee amendment being considered as an original bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Section 3 has been read.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is there still another section to be read?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, section 4.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, Mr. Chairman, the important point is this: Could not some of the Members who have been allotted time under the limitation of time be able to secure time to speak during the consideration of section 4, if they do not care to claim their time now?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That would result in more time being allotted to the gentleman who may have substantial amendments, rather than pro forma amendments to offer?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

(By unanimous consent the time allotted to Messrs. JUDD, BREHM, and CHIPERFIELD was given to Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.)

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, when the Korea bill was being considered about 3 weeks ago, I stated my reasons why I was against such aid. Nothing has transpired since that time, including the changes that have been made in the bill, that would cause me to change my decision.

During the debate last Tuesday it was stated that there has been a reduction from $150,000,000 as originally proposed, to $60,000,000. As a matter of fact, $60,000,000 of the original amount has already been appropriated, and because of the time involved in securing the remainder of the appropriation the evidence discloses that only $60,000,000 more can be used before June 30. So, in reality, there is no reduction from the original plan.

In the present bill there is a sop offered for those who believe in supporting China, of somewhere around $10,000,000 for economic aid to Formosa. It seems to me this aid to Formosa is too little and too late to be of much significance even though one's sympathies are with the liberty-loving people of China.

Since the original debate on the Korean aid bill I have received several letters favoring aid to Korea because the writers were of the impression that the bill would provide food for the hungry Koreans. We are all familiar with the fact that the purpose of this bill is not to feed hungry people but to build railroads, power plants, and so forth. The only items the evidence discloses that is for human consumption is vegetable oil and salt. Since the hearings were held it has been shown there is no need for salt.

To my mind, this bill is the dying gasp to correct a misdirected administration policy in the Far East which has been an utter failure. From the time General Marshall, great soldier and statesman that he is, tried to carry out orders of the President to form a coalition government in China with the Communists, together with the State Department's handling of the Ward case and its decision to remove our diplomatic officials from China, I have gradually lost faith in the State Department's judgment. The last straw was the recent statement of Mr. Acheson concerning Mr. Hiss.

But, to illustrate Mr. Acheson's lack of vision, I have but to call attention to his statement of March 20, 1947, when he said:

> The Chinese Government is not in the position at the present time that the Greek Government is in. It is not approaching collapse. It is not threatened by defeat by the Communists. The war with the Communists is going on, much as it has for the past 20 years.

To me it seems absolutely futile that we should build up Korea, as it would only serve as an additional inducement for Russia to take over.

The trouble, as I see it, with our foreign policy is when some foreign country needs economic aid, it is immediately assumed it is our responsibility to come to its aid. I believe this should only be true when it is for the best interest of our country, including our own security, for us to do so.

In the case of Korea I do not feel this is the fact. When we are going into the red to the tune of $5,500,000,000 this year, and with a like indebtedness facing us next year, I believe we must take into consideration that since June of 1945, in a postwar era, we have already given aid to foreign entities amounting to $33,070,200,648, and Korea has already received $326,580,489.

It seems to me it is about time to give the American taxpayer a break and say to ourselves, "Where is the money coming from?"

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 5, lines 17 and 22; strike out "60,000,000" on line 17 and insert "20,000,000"; in line 22 after "aggregate", strike out "30,000,000" and insert "10,000,000".

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is very clear. It merely strikes out the amount of $60,000,000 which the bill carries up to the end of June 30, 1950, and inserts $20,000,000. It reduces the amount which is made available by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I have the report of the Economic Cooperation, they allocated over $10,000,000 to Korea last December. That money is still in the process of being spent. This bill proposes $60,000,000 to be spent between now and June 1950—there is a $30,000,000 loan by the RFC and their appropriation from Congress. It must go through the other body. It must get back here for conference and then the appropriation must be made. We probably will have about 2 months in which to spend the $60,000,000. Then, I would point out, too, Mr. Chairman, the fiscal policy of the Korean Government is one of printing press money. I told this body before when we visited there November last, when they were asked how they handled their money they said, "When we want more money we just print it." That was when the won was 900 to the dollar and it used to be 4 to the dollar. They said, "We just print it." Of course that is just printing press money. I am opposed to the entire bill but it is quite apparent that the Administration insists on passing it. I am interested that the taxpayers of the country be given some kind of a break, while we are playing Santa Claus all over the world and Uncle Scrooge at home. As I said, under this bill $60,000,000 is to be allocated in about 3 months' time. I maintain that is all out of proportion and more than can be spent wisely in this short time.

It is for capital improvements. There is no military aid. I trust the amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time assigned to me may be given to the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not have favorable consideration. We heard the debate today and we heard a full explanation of the bill some 2 or 3 weeks ago when this identical bill was before the House.

I dislike to take up the time of the House going over the history of the matter. The Senate bill, from which the commitee has struck everything after the enacting clause, had come here carrying an authorization for $150,000,000. That was for the fiscal year 1950. The original bill in the House in which the authorization had been cut from $150,000,000 to $60,000,000, failed of passage during the first session of the Congress. Because of that failure, the operations of our Government in its aid program in Korea were held up. We could not carry on the operations to the same extent they should have been carried on or would have been carried on had the bill passed. Contracts had to be cut down. No forward contracting could be done, and for a period of some months the aid program was carried on solely by reason of piecemeal appropriations that were from time to time initiated in the other body and made available to carry on the Korean program. The total of those appropriations, all in all, amounted to $60,000,000. Those were the appropriations frequently called unauthorized appropriations on this floor. As a matter of fact they were authorized by the appropriations. All work would have been halted had not those appropriations been made. Then we came in with a bill some weeks ago asking for the appropriation of $60,000,000. As stated, that bill had been cut down from an original authorization of $120,000,000. We asked for only $60,000,000. Why? Because we found that $60,000,000 would be needed and all that would be needed. It is absolutely needed to carry on this work until the 30th day of June of the present year. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be granted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, there has already been appropriated this year $60,000,000 for Korean aid operations. What the status of that fund is the Congress has not been informed. I have checked the speeches that were made here on Tuesday, I raised the question

with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] when he spoke, but nothing has been forthcoming. This is a travesty. With the State Department having no policy on the far eastern question or any real policy on anything, it is absolutely impossible in any intelligent way for the United States to embark upon major construction items in Korea. They do not need immediate relief, at least not to any enormous extent; they have food enough, they can get enough of the necessities of life. As a permanent proposition undoubtedly they will need some mechanical development, but there is money enough, should this motion be adopted, to provide amply for all relief needs.

Why do we not approach these things from an intelligent standpoint? Why do we not have the cart behind the horse instead of ahead of it? This whole picture is gotten up on the basis of putting the cart in front of the horse, and we are just going haywire in the whole situation. I plead for some intelligent approach to this problem in the Congress. Why can we not have the same consideration for our taxpayers that we have for foreigners? Frankly, if we have an obligation to do something for Korea, how much more do we have an obligation on the part of our State Department to determine where we are going, and upon the part of the President and the majority in the Congress to lay out that program? Instead, there is nothing of the kind; we are just throwing the money in blindly; we have no intelligent approach to this problem, no intelligent information as to what money they have or what they need. There were no hearings when this was presented that were printed and submitted to the House. I think we ought to adopt this amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been before the House on previous occasions, and it was defeated the last time by a vote of 193 to 192, I believe; so that evidenced the will of the House. The State Department becomes alarmed then goes into a huddle and comes up with a new bill, and back it comes to the House all polished up with a new title; but make no mistake about it, it is just the same Korean-aid bill.

In November I visited some four different European countries, Germany, Austria, Italy, and France. Recovery in all the countries is amazing; they are well on the mend; the people are well fed, well shod, well clothed, and with this aid given, they are doing very well, and let no one tell you otherwise. Instead of cutting down, sloughing off in the spending program and letting them slug it out a little harder, I am of the opinion in the very near future we are going to be asked to put in another three or four billion dollars to these countries. So, we are not only taking care of the European economy, but now we are going to spread out and take on the entire world; we are going to take on Korea, Formosa, and all the Asiatic countries.

I say it is about time that we start looking after our own back yard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be given to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, when I returned home recently I picked up an issue of the Pittsburgh Press, and here are some of the headlines: "Hearts, purses open, save starving village after mine closes—Teacher's plea for hungry children brings $15,000 in gifts from Nation."

On the next page: "American miracle rescues tiny mine village from starvation."

Going to the next page: "Families removed from fire-trap tenement—Fire would have been disastrous—An impassable fire escape, littered with debris and too weak to stand on was found when families were taken from this Webster Avenue building—Coal in the bedroom—Wilson Borland, executive director of the Pittsburgh Housing Association inspects what had been the bedroom of one of the slum tenants."

Mr. Chairman, what I would like to bring to the attention of the House is this: Why should we not be concerned about the people in our own back yard? Why do we have to take in the world? All of us can take a look right around in our own districts and we will find plenty of places to make investments in order to protect the welfare of the American people.

The time has come when we should give careful and thoughtful consideration to this colossal program of spending before we end up in bankruptcy. Everyone thinks Uncle Sam is a rich uncle, that his pockets are inexhaustible. It is spend, tax, tax, spend, spend, and tax.

I say the time is here when we should look after our own welfare and the interests of the American people. Cut out the spending, cut down taxes, balance the budget and give relief to the American taxpayer.

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

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. We ought to take care of the American people. We want to help these foreign countries, but we do not want our State Department to squander money the way it is doing at the present time, and doing a bad job at that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be given to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I was in Austria this past November where we are dumping millions and hundreds of millions of dollars. Austria is within the sphere of the Russians, the Communists, and the more money we pour into Austria the more money the Russians drain out. Korea is in the same orbit so far as China is concerned, and the more money we pour into Korea the more money they will siphon out.

The question for the Members of the House to decide is, How long can we stand this terrific drain on our financial resources without eventually finding ourselves on the doorstep of bankruptcy? Let me tell you right now, Mr. Chairman, and I reiterate what I said the other day, that no bankrupt nation ever won a war.

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

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. We have given to Austria $604,000,000.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, $604,000,000.

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

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Can it definitely be proven that any of our foreign aid has stopped communism anywhere in the world? And I mean in practice, not in theory.

Mr. GAVIN. Not to my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be given to the gentleman from California.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of entering the debate on the Korean aid bill, but, inasmuch as the name of the distinguished and patriotic Will Clayton has been injected into the deliberations by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] and his good name brought into question, I am constrained to rise in his defense if his fine character, patriotic and selfless service to the Nation needs any defense.

The name and fame of Will Clayton has been emblazoned in our Nation's history, and no mean reference or detraction uttered here or elsewhere will reduce in my estimation or in any way detract from his service or credit. He has earned his place in history.

What I cannot understand is why a Member from the cotton-growing State of Arkansas will take this opportunity to kick in the teeth one of the greatest champions of King Cotton because he—Will Clayton—wants to sell a hundred million dollars' worth of the South's first and greatest product. I wonder if cotton is to be sold or permitted to rot in southern fields.

As a northerner, I cannot figure out this riddle, and I doubt if the gentleman from Arkansas could ever explain. Mr. Clayton favors the Marshall plan, but he wants to sell cotton at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, it seems obvious to the Members of the House who have been watching this problem away back from the days of Yalta that we turned our backs on the opportunity of China and Korea at that time and it was only a matter of time until they would fall into the Russian or Communist orbit. They are almost there now, and it has been the fault largely, at least in great part, of our own State Department and high officials at or before the close of the war. Now we are asked to put $60,000,000 more into Korea. An amendment is before the House to reduce it to $30,000,000. I am in favor of reducing it to $30,000,000 because anyone who is thinking clearly knows that just as soon as Russia and Communist China want to move down they will take all of Korea, and they will take the $60,000,000, if we put it in, in developing their heavy industry; and if we only put in $30,000,000, which this amendment calls for, we will have aided their ultimate conquerors, Communist China, by only to the extent of $30,000,000. This will only be a temporary aid to the southern part of Korea if we vote ten, twenty, or thirty million dollars in this bill. So I think it would be the part of wisdom, inasmuch as there is sufficient food in Korea, that we simply give them this pat on the back for $30,000,000 at this time and await the turn of future events. Let us save this $30,000,000 now by reducing the sixty million to thirty million, as this amendment provides.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently opposed this program from its very inception. I think it is wrong in principle and definitely is not getting us anywhere. I believe that we should have a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force in these dangerous times, and I have voted for all of the appropriations in regard thereto. But, we are spreading ourselves out so thinly over the world that we are dissipating our strength. If communism is the international threat that some say it is, then we are not doing enough. If it is not the threat that some think it is, then we are doing too much. We are not doing it right, that is a cinch. There is nothing in this program as I see it, except a psychological set-up and a bad one at that. It is not feasible, it is not practicable, it is not reasonable. One reason why there is so little expressed opposition is that the big newspapers are mostly for it and we know, of course, why they are for it. I do not believe that the people of America are for this sort of program, or ever have been.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, what you do with this problem today depends on how you appraise the situation that is before us. If you believe that what is done in Korea and China does not concern us, naturally you will not put one dollar over there. It is my firm conviction, after a great deal of thought and study, that what we do in Korea today might be very important to the future security of America. What we have failed to do in China has already hurt us.

As I see it, the basic problem before America today is not primarily the matter of finances, although that is very important. It is, are we able by our leadership and by the help of our friends that we have left in the world today to stop another war?

We have had plenty of road blocks to bringing about of peace placed in our way during the last few years. All the arguments these gentlemen have made about the cost of war, about the ungodly profits of war that were made in this war and in the first one, creating thousands of millionaires, constitute one of the reasons why I think our conduct in Korea today will be watched throughout the world. Are we going to turn our backs on the only visible symbol of liberty in that part of the world? Are we going to turn our backs to that symbol of freedom and say to the Chinese, who are resisting the infiltration of communism, that we are walking away from them? Are we going to walk away from Asia and let it fall into the lap of the Communists?

Do not think our future and the future of our children is not involved in this problem today. It is involved right in this particular thing we are proposing in this legislation. Are we going to break faith with little Korea, who was promised this aid?

I do not know the details of how they are going to spend the money, but we must have faith in somebody that is running the foreign policy of the United States. They have explained the need for and purposes for which this money is to be spent. The committee that held the hearings is almost a unit in advocating this bill. I have faith in their judgment. As far as I can see from personal observation and trips to both these countries, this appropriation is a very vital step in trying to creep slowly toward a peaceful and stable world. That is what motivates me in voting for the proposed law and also in opposing this amendment. I think our future security is the great problem we have today. We can show by our conduct here whether we are going to go along and help this little country or turn our backs on Asia. I would like to concur in the statement of my colleague from California [Mr. HINSHAW] as to the strategic problem involved.

If we do not get world peace, it means that the brutal war which closed in 1945 will have been lost. It means that we will have broken faith with the millions who fought and the thousands that died and were wounded, all of whom fought to bring freedom and peace to the world. This little bill is only a minor part of the over-all problem. But it is a rather important part in the particular sector of the world where Korea is located.

Last evening I attended a very interesting banquet in honor of the Boy Scouts of the District of Columbia. We were told that about 2,000,000 boys are engaged in the Scout movement in the United States and getting the training which it offers to the youth of today. As I listened to a report on their activities on this, the fortieth anniversary of the beginning of the Boy Scouts of America, this thought continued to harrass my mind: The Boy Scout leaders will undoubtedly develop the character of these boys; they will train them and teach them to become sturdy and devoted American citizens; they will prepare them for the leadership of the future world in which they will be the men to carry on the best traditions of America; but unless we can, by American leadership, coupled with cooperation of other liberty-loving nations, bring about the stability that will insure world peace, what will the training of these boys be utilized for? They were trained to handle assignments in a peaceful world. So to avail ourselves of their ability, vision, and courage we must have peace.

I do not for one moment wish to minimize the financial and other problems before our country. They are serious and I fully recognize that our financial strength is an important factor in our security. But the only threat that is real to the freedom of the world is the infiltration and political and economic penetration conducted by the Communists of the world in practically every continent of the world. If we cannot stop that, either by our direct action or by supporting and strengthening those who are subjected to this kind of penetration then world peace has a slim chance. These are only a few of the serious things that have motivated me in my determination to give this aid to little Korea, a gem of free government and personal liberty surrounded by aggressors who would jump at the chance to take this small country over.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is not here at the moment, so that the time allotted to him has not been used, I ask unanimous consent that his time be given to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is not on the floor.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Thank you, but I do not know that I can use it, anyway. I am going to speak entirely extemporaneously.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the theory behind the Marshall plan and our efforts to try to bring about a strengthening of those countries which need to have that strength given to them and are standing up for democracy and will be able to resist communism. By such aid we may be able to prevent another war. However, when I hear $60,000,000 called a "symbol" and realize how much money $60,000,000 is and how relatively small the area of Korea is with its relatively small population, I think that is

a rather substantial symbol. I am in good faith speaking in favor of the amendment. I intend to vote for this bill if the amendment is adopted. I will not vote for the bill if the amendment is not adopted.

Our overexpenditures in both foreign and some domestic expenditures are bleeding the defense of this country white. We can look at the recent reductions in our armed services for an example of what is happening. For instance, the recent cuts in the Navy and the new complications in the Pacific have together underlined a drastic need for at least two additional carrier groups, providing that sufficient strength is also maintained in the Atlantic. Whether they will be forthcoming is doubtful in view of the fiscal situation. I personally desire to see these carrier groups activated and the Armed Services public works bill enacted. I feel reduction in the sum involved in this Korean aid bill would be one step which we can take to provide for more funds for our domestic defense. We are told we must give the whole amount of money requested in this bill. It is a part of a pattern of such requests, the total of which is vastly beyond the ability of our country to stand and remain fiscally sound. We can afford such a program if we will keep the requests within reasonable limits. But we are not doing that. This amendment should be adopted.

I would like to say one other thing which I think probably has more significance than anything that I have said so far in this little talk. It concerns the situation in Formosa. There is no need for a great deal of additional military strength in Formosa. They have the military strength. There is no need for a great deal of additional money in Formosa. They have the money. What is lacking? What is lacking is a plentiful supply of the will to fight and the will to resist and the will to get ahead. This is primarily a matter of morale and of political confidence. What are we doing about this? I do not like to be critical of any department of the Government. I am not inferring that I could do a better job if I were there; but to me it is as clear as crystal that what is needed right now is a plebiscite or a free election in Formosa. The results may be that they will either become an independent republic, or go communistic, or decide that they will stay under the flag of Nationalist China. If they decide to be a free and democratic government, either under a flag of Formosa or of Nationalist China, then I think we should give them every possible aid. They do not need money. They do not need troops. They do not need anything except faith in the fact that they are not going to be stooges in the future. That is what concerns most of Asia today.

I call upon the State Department to look into the possibility of having free elections there. Such elections would seem to be a prerequisite to any solution in Formosa. Maybe the United Nations should hold them. Maybe a commission of people from the southern Asiatic countries, such as India and others, should do it. The United States should take initiative if no one else does. That is what is really needed in Formosa. It is strange to me that our country cannot take the initiative in these very important things while other countries can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to clarify a few facts because there are lots of ways to kill a bill and this is one of them, this effort to reduce the amount authorized by the figure which the gentleman's amendment calls for.

For this reason, even assuming that bare subsistence for the people of Korea was desirable between now and the end of the fiscal year 1950, the report on page 18 states as follows:

> It is contemplated that approximately one-third of the sum sought for the balance of the fiscal year will be devoted strictly to recovery.

That leaves two-thirds for subsistence items, which means $40,000,000 of the $60,000,000. Secondly, we have heard a great deal about power plants and fertilizer plants, and so forth. These are now concentrated in North Korea and unavailable to the people of South Korea. South Korea is no pasture. Even in order to get more produce from the rice fields, in order to get the food to a country having 21,000,000 people, you have to have railroads, or have some facilities. They have to have cotton textiles for the people to make their clothes out of. They have to have creosote for farm buildings. They have to have cement and all of the things that go into even a civilized society. The figure which is fixed in this bill is not sacrosanct but it is a figure apportioned to needs, and not subsistence alone, which is not enough.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is this a bill to build some railroads in Korea?

Mr. JAVITS. No; the amount of railroad construction envisaged under this legislation is very slight and is only to develop the truncated railroad systems so as to make it more useful for the South Korean economy. For the gentleman's information, in the fiscal year 1950 there will be $2,432,000 in rail construction in the whole program of $120,000,000. Eight hundred and two thousand dollars for railroad construction purposes was used of the initial $16,000,000. Of the second sum of $60,000,000 as proposed in this bill $1,630,000 will be used for railroad construction. Seventy-six thousand dollars has been used up to the present for railroad electrification but none will be used for this out of the authorization we are here asked to vote on.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 43, noes 69.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 54, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 4. The authorization for appropriations in this act is limited to the period ending June 3, 1950, in order that any subsequent authorizations may be separately passed on, and is not to be construed as an express or implied commitment to provide further authorizations or appropriations.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have said before, I say again, that if there ever was a foreign-aid bill that should be passed this is it. It is all right to be against the State Department and its policies; it is all right to say you are against big business—I am not against big business, and I am not against small business—but let me tell you this is of outstanding importance by itself. Let me tell you why it ought not to be considered along with other foreign-aid bills.

When the war was over, the United States Government was a party to dividing Korea. That part of Korea north of the thirty-eighth parallel was occupied by Russia and the south half of Korea was occupied by the United States. We were assisted in making that division. Had that division not been made, Korea would not today be asking the American Government for anything. Then talk to me about placing Korea with the other nations receiving foreign aid. Mr. Chairman, it is not right. Korea was divided, without her consent; Russia, as I have said, was given the northern half and America was given the southern half. Old Glory, the American flag, is there in our section of Korea. Further, I call your attention to the fact that under the supervision of the United Nations an election was held in Korea; we agreed to that election; that election was held after the adoption of their new constitution, and the new officers are doing a great work. Their constitution is somewhat like ours. They then set up a government somewhat like ours. We endorsed that. We are helping them now. Because, however, a few Members do not like the State Department, because others do not like the party in power in China, because still others do not like European relief, all are being urged to vote against this bill.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that the Koreans are among the finest peoples that God Almighty ever breathed the breath of life into. They followed us through their liberation as I have heretofore indicated. They were willing that the division be made that we suggested. At least, they accepted the decree; they later adopted the kind of constitution we wanted them to have. Then they set up the kind of government we thought they ought to have. The seeds of democracy have been planted. They believe in us. Are we going to run out now because there may be somebody somewhere who does not want to give Korea relief? I am not for the Communists. I do not think we have any Communists or even any fellow travelers or anybody of that kind in the House.

They would not vote for this bill, though, if they were here because they do not want to pass it.

Mr. Chairman, let us consider aid for Korea without getting the matter mixed with other relief or foreign-aid bills. They asked us for $150,000,000 a year ago. This Congress said it would let them have $60,000,000 and asked them to reexamine their needs and see if they could not reduce their request. They have done that. They have reduced their request by $30,000,000. We have, impliedly, at least, agreed that if they would make these reductions that we would go along with them regarding the balance of the request.

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

Mr. NORRELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULTON. I just wanted to say that we on this side thank the gentleman for his sincere and excellent statement.

Mr. NORRELL. I appreciate the gentleman's words. I feel very deeply that the bill ought to be passed.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that I will put my record for economy against that of any Member of this Congress. I have stood for economy even under circumstances when it was rather embarrassing to me. We ought not to play politics with this bill; we ought not, Mr. Chairman, to play politics with the people of Korea.

I urge that the entire bill as presented to the House be passed today if we want to do anything to prevent the spread of communism further into southeastern Asia.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, let us reason together now a little bit about this situation. As I understand it, there are about twenty to twenty-three million people that this so-called aid will go to. We propose to send about $60,000,000 over there, which will be an average of about $3 apiece per person. I might be in error but I believe that is substantially correct. Those people do not dress like we do, they do not have the same educational system that we have, and I dare say that very few of them know anything about the mechanics or the theory of our Government. I doubt that very few of them know anything about the traditions of our Government. Why do we think that spending $3 apiece, on the average, is going to change their way of life and is going to bring them around to our way of life? How can we expect such a sum of money to really have any impact whatsoever upon those people?

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. As one illustration—because when we divided Korea all of the power plants and steam plants were located in Northern Korea. When Russia got it they cut the lights and all of the power in southern Korea. If they build a steam plant, the gentleman knows we cannot divide it on a per capita basis.

Mr. MORRIS. I get the gentleman's point and he makes a very good one. But the situation is simply this: Those incidents like you mention may happen at any time on any occasion and we cannot be responsible for them. Suppose they do build a light plant with some of the money proposed in this bill; it will only last for a while, it will only result in a temporary service. We cannot keep building for them forever. If we are going to start in on the thing on the theory of keeping them friendly toward us why we will just have to keep on from now on, forever.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot take over the world. We just cannot do that. We might go in there temporarily with this program and create a little good feeling for us, we might do that, but next Wednesday that feeling might be gone. Maybe they will want something else. It is just too big and it cannot be done, I may say to the gentleman from Arkansas. It might help a little while, but if we start in on it on the basis of bringing them over to our way of life, we are going to have to continue with it from now on to keep them that way. No, it is not practical, it is not reasonable.

Mr. Chairman, the thing for us to do, as I see it, is to work diligently, truly, and sincerely for peace, but keep ourselves strong in this dangerous world and be ready for any enemy that might come against us; to hold the banner of liberty and justice high, as an example for all the nations of the world, hoping that they will follow our example, that they will let us teach them by precept and by example. Let us deal fairly with them in trade, let us deal with them fairly in all matters, but let us realize the fact, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot buy friendship and if we could, we do not have enough money with which to do it. It just is not practical, it is not reasonable, from any standpoint that you may approach it. No, it is not a reasonable thing to do. Not only that, but as has been suggested before, we are weakening ourselves in the process. Instead of retaining that money to make ourselves strong, we are spreading it out very thinly and finally we may find ourselves, God forbid that day should ever come, as one of the have-not nations instead of one of the have nations of the world.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. I want to make the observation that the gentleman and I have voted against these so-called relief programs for some time now.

Mr. MORRIS. Let us not call them relief programs.

Mr. WHITE of California. Foreign aid programs. The bipartisan sponsors of this legislation have made the point that there is some cotton in this bill; in other words the cotton people can sell cotton over there and make a little money out of this bill. The gentleman knows I am in the cotton business. That is my main business or has been and my district has lots of cotton in it. But I am still going to vote against this thing. They cannot put enough pork in it to make me vote for it, even if all the money went for cotton.

Mr. MORRIS. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from California and he certainly shows a very wonderful spirit here in being willing to sacrifice personal gain and a matter that might be of personal or political help to him, in order to carry on with his duties here in the way that he sees them. I appreciate that splendid attitude. Let me say this, my friends: let us never base a proposition like this on a question of business. That is not right, that is not fair. I am afraid this program is a step toward war and if this program will tend to get us in a war, then all the business we get out of it will not be worth the price we will be paying. No business can ever compensate for leading us toward war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, coming from the part of the world that I come from I naturally would like to vote for this bill. But I am deeply concerned about two or three things which I feel I must call to the attention of the committee today. One is the fact that this money, whatever the amount may be, is borrowed money. We will have to borrow it in order to send it to those people, therefore we must give this matter most careful scrutiny. We are running in the red in this country at the rate of about $16,000,000 every calendar day, and it is a serious matter when we spend $60,000,000 more.

Then I am reminded of the fact that about 3 weeks ago this same bill or practically the same bill was on this floor. I believe the bill we had before us at that time, Mr. Chairman, called for $120,000,000, or some such figure. I thought it was rejected by the House by three votes, but I heard in the debate today that it failed by one vote. If that is true, I can take unto myself the credit for saving the Government of the United States $60,000,000 in the last 3 weeks because I voted against the bill 3 weeks ago. At that time, and I recall the debate distinctly, it was argued that we had to have that amount of money because the needs had been accurately calculated, and that was the least amount of money the Koreans could get along with. Today the amount is cut in half. It is again stated that the needs have been carefully calculated and that this is really and truly the correct amount. It seems possible if we wait another 3 weeks the figure might be reduced still more and thus further millions of borrowed money saved. I think we must strengthen our position in the Pacific but I do not see how I can vote for any such haphazard estimate as is represented by this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is much more at stake here than so-called aid to Korea.

Korea is only a small part of the Pacific, and therefore only a small part of our Pacific policy, if, indeed, we have a Pacific policy. As of today, our Pacific policy, if it deserves to be called a policy, ranges from total occupation, as in Japan, to total abandonment, as in Formosa.

Within that range, we have half-occupation, as in Korea.

To make a sensible approach to the Korean question, I say we must consider Korea in relation to whatever the policy is in the rest of the Pacific—and the rest of the world—because our set-up in Europe is no more consistent than in Asia, with the "policy" ranging from support of a dictator, Tito, to a cold war against a dictator, Stalin.

Those who negotiate abroad have repeatedly sidestepped this Congress. Now they want money. I say now is the time to ask them some questions and demand the answers before appropriating another dime.

What is our policy in Asia?

What is our policy in Europe?

What is our foreign policy?

What will happen to the money expended in Korea? Is it proposed to eventually abandon Korea, or is it proposed that we continue to half support it, and if so, how is it proposed that we protect the half that we occupy? Is it protectable? China is gone. We have practically given up Formosa. Will we provide funds for Korea only to read in the newspapers, any day, that we have likewise abandoned Korea?

Are plans already prepared to abandon Japan, the Philippines, and all the rest?

In the event of emergency, who can we count on in Asia?

What is the situation in Indochina? Can we expect a quick sell-out there when the chips are down?

To what extent is Britain prepared to back up the claim that Hong Kong will be defended? Would Hong Kong last any longer against the Reds than it did against Japan in World War II? Is there any reason to believe the Chinese Nationalists can or will defend Formosa any better than they did the rest of China? What correlation is there, if any, between the Department of State and the Department of Defense? It has been suggested that we call in Secretaries Johnson and Acheson to get the facts. I say we should add to the list General MacArthur and other military men being sidestepped in Asia. Do they approve of the decimation of our Navy and Air Force? Why are competent Reserve officers, with years of training at the taxpayers' expense, being discharged? Is it because of Johnson's whims or is it because of a lack of funds? If it is a lack of funds, perhaps we should transfer to the defense of the United States some of the billions of dollars being shoveled out all over the world.

Before we vote another dime let us find out what is going on.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to straighten out this financial situation as to whether any part of the $60,000,000 already appropriated is still available for this program, and without this bill?

Mr. FULTON. The money that has been appropriated, of course, is already in the supply pipe lines. The Economic Cooperation Administration says that the $60,000,000 now requested in the bill is necessary to keep the recovery program for Korea moving at the same tempo for the remainder of the fiscal year 1950.

Mr. JUDD. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that without the passage of this legislation, they will have on February 15 less than $200,000 left.

Mr. KEATING. For Korea?

Mr. JUDD. For Korea, less than $200,000.

Mr. KEATING. Is that evidence in this record?

Mr. JUDD. It was given to the committee, and I think it is in the new committee report. The program finishes on February 15 if this bill is not passed.

Mr. KEATING. I do not find it in the record.

Mr. FULTON. This appears in the committee report on page 15:

> According to information given to the committee by the Economic Cooperation Administration, the situation concerning absorption of aid material is satisfactory. They report that approximately 92 percent of landed goods has been distributed, judging by the ratio of billings to deposits in the counterpart fund.

So you can see it has almost all been used up.

Let me go further. It is necessary that we aid South Korea because it has been called the showcase of democracy on the mainland of Asia. It is also necessary that we have a government friendly to us on the island of Formosa. I am sorry my time has expired, as this is an important question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the nicest thing about this debate is that it is drawing to a close.

I think the issue is pretty clear. I think we all know what we are going to do. Certainly many of us have been in the well of this Chamber trying to explain why we are going to vote for or against this bill. We ought to be satisfied that the time is at hand when we can stand up and be counted.

I call to the attention of the Members that it is a fact that an American administration in the early days of the present century was responsible in large part for selling Korea down the river to Japan. An American administration now is trying to do something about Korea through the creation of a South Korean state. We have made a commitment. It does not have to be written down. We created this state. We have a pledge to keep, and I hope on this floor today we will show that we mean what we say by giving an overwhelming vote in favor of this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I would favor the program for Korea in this bill even if that were the only issue involved. I do not believe the picture is quite as discouraging as it may appear to many Americans when they first go over there. People in Asia are accustomed to living on a very low scale and conditions usually are not as hopeless as they look. As evidence of that, the Secretary of State told us last June that if this bill was not promptly passed Korea certainly would be gone in 2 or 3 months. Well, Mr. Chairman, the bill was not passed, more than 7 months have elapsed, with only piecemeal aid, and the internal situation in South Korea is stronger today than it was then.

So much more can be done for less by people in these countries if given hope and some moral support. That is the thing these people in Asia have needed since the war quite as much as they needed goods. They could not recover without some material support, that is true, but goods will not do the job if there is not also some evidence of confidence in them.

There is a larger issue than Korea and Formosa. All of free Asia is involved.

The 450,000,000 people of China on the mainland are already behind the iron curtain. They are going to stay there for as long as we can foresee. But there are 800,000,000 people in Asia who are not behind the iron curtain. They constitute one-third of all the people in the world. They want to stay free. If the United States were to refuse to give this assistance, which is minimal considering the stakes involved, to the people resisting communism in Korea and Formosa, then I ask you what can the other 800,000,000 people of east Asia expect to do except get ready to make a pilgrimage to Moscow. If that happens and Asia is gone, then the ten or twelve or fifteen billion dollars put into European recovery will go down the drain too, because they cannot recover in western Europe without the raw materials and markets of Asia. Passage of this bill will give hope and concrete aid to the people of the two areas that are directly affected. But, vastly more important, it will give hope to all of the human beings in Asia who still have a good chance to stay on the side of freedom. Are we doing so well in the cold war against Communist enslavement that we can just wave aside 800,000,000 friends and potential allies as of no consequence? They have the greatest undeveloped resources remaining in the world today. It seems to me that having put in some $400,000,000,000 to win the last war, it is not too much to spend the relatively few millions in this bill to help keep it won, instead of letting the victory slip through our fingers out of what I believe is a false sense of economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to express the same degree of pleasure felt

by the preceding gentleman that this debate is coming to a close. I shall not use the time remaining to me, except to thank all of my colleagues on the committee and my good friends here regardless of their political affiliations, for their fine support and cooperation. I want to thank all of those who have given their support, as well as those who have withheld it, and to express the hope that all of you may stand by our side and do what is necessary to maintain our position in the family of nations, to uphold the prestige of the United States, to keep our commitment to the people of Korea, and to keep faith with all the other nations in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute.

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2319) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea, and pursuant to House Resolution 458, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with instructions to report the same forthwith with the following amendment: On page 5, lines 17 and 22, strike out "$60,000,000" in line 17 and insert "$20,000,000"; in line 22, strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes, 33, noes 90.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

The roll call is automatic.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 137, nays 239, answered "present" 1, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—137

Abernethy	Halleck	Phillips, Tenn.
Allen, Ill.	Hand	Pickett
Allen, La.	Harden	Plumley
Andersen, H. Carl	Harrison	Powell
Anderson, Calif.	Harvey	Rankin
Andresen, August H.	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Andrews	Hill	Regan
Barden	Hoeven	Rich
Beall	Hoffman, Ill.	Rivers
Bennett, Fla.	Hoffman, Mich	Sadlak
Bennett, Mich.	Hope	Scott, Hardie
Bishop	Hull	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Blackney	Jackson, Calif.	Scrivner
Bramblett	James	Scudder
Brehm	Jenison	Secrest
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Shafer
Bryson	Jensen	Sikes
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Simpson, Ill.
Carlyle	Kean	Simpson, Pa.
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	Smith, Kans.
Chiperfield	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Church	Kunkel	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Larcade	Stanley
Cole, Kans.	LeCompte	Stefan
Colmer	LeFevre	Stockman
Crawford	Lovre	Sutton
Curtis	Lucas	Taber
Dague	McConnell	Tackett
Davies, N. Y.	McCulloch	Talle
Davis, Ga.	McMillen, Ill	Tauriello
Davis, Wis.	Mack, Wash.	Taylor
D'Ewart	Marcantonio	Thomas
Dondero	Martin, Iowa	Towe
Doughton	Mason	Velde
Ellsworth	Meyer	Vursell
Elston	Michener	Weichel
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Md.	Wheeler
Fenton	Miller, Nebr.	White, Calif.
Ford	Morris	Whitten
Gavin	Murray, Wis.	Willis
Gillette	Nelson	Wilson, Tex.
Goodwin	Nicholson	Winstead
Gross	Norblad	Withrow
Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Hara, Minn.	Wolcott
	O'Konski	Wood
	Paseman	Woodruff
	Phillips, Calif.	

NAYS—239

Abbitt	Chelf	Forand
Addonizio	Chesney	Frazier
Albert	Christopher	Fugate
Angell	Chudoff	Fulton
Aspinall	Clemente	Furcolo
Auchincloss	Cole, N. Y.	Gamble
Bailey	Combs	Garmatz
Baring	Cooley	Gary
Barrett, Pa.	Cooper	Gathings
Battle	Corbett	Gordon
Beckworth	Cotton	Gore
Bentsen	Cox	Gorski
Biemiller	Crook	Gossett
Blatnik	Crosser	Granahan
Boggs, Del.	Cunningham	Grant
Boggs, La.	Davenport	Green
Bolling	Davis, Tenn.	Hagen
Bolton, Md.	Dawson	Hale
Bonner	Deane	Hardy
Bosone	DeGraffenried	Hare
Breen	Delaney	Harris
Brooks	Denton	Hart
Buchanan	Dingell	Havenner
Buckley, Ill.	Dollinger	Hays, Ark.
Buckley, N. Y.	Donohue	Hays, Ohio
Burdick	Douglas	Hedrick
Burke	Doyle	Heffernan
Burleson	Durham	Heller
Burnside	Eaton	Herlong
Burton	Eberharter	Herter
Byrne, N. Y.	Elliott	Heselton
Canfield	Engle, Calif.	Hinshaw
Cannon	Evins	Hobbs
Carnahan	Fallon	Holifield
Carroll	Feighan	Holmes
Case, N. J.	Fernandez	Horan
Cavalcante	Fisher	Howell
Celler	Flood	Huber
Chatham	Fogarty	Irving
Jackson, Wash.	Mansfield	Rains
Jacobs	Marsalis	Ramsay
Javits	Marshall	Redden
Johnson	Martin, Mass.	Rhodes
Jones, Ala.	Merrow	Ribicoff
Jones, Mo.	Miles	Richards
Jones, N. C.	Miller, Calif.	Riehlman
Judd	Mills	Rodino
Karst	Mitchell	Rogers, Fla.
Karsten	Morgan	Rogers, Mass.
Kee	Morrison	Rooney
Kelley, Pa.	Morton	Roosevelt
Kelly, N. Y.	Moulder	Sasscer
Kennedy	Multer	Shelley
Keogh	Murdock	Sheppard
Kerr	Murphy	Sims
Kilburn	Murray, Tenn.	Spence
Kilday	Noland	Steed
King	Norrell	Stigler
Klein	Norton	Sullivan
Kruse	O'Brien, Ill.	Thompson
Lane	O'Brien, Mich.	Thornberry
Lanham	O'Hara, Ill.	Tollefson
Latham	O'Neill	Trimble
Lemke	O'Sullivan	Underwood
Lesinski	O'Toole	Vinson
Lind	Pace	Wagner
Linehan	Patten	Walsh
Lodge	Perkins	Walter
Lyle	Peterson	Welch
Lynch	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Whitaker
McCarthy	Philbin	Whittington
McCormack	Poage	Wickersham
McGrath	Polk	Wier
McGuire	Poulson	Wigglesworth
McKinnon	Preston	Wilson, Okla.
McSweeney	Price	Wolverton
Mack, Ill.	Priest	Worley
Madden	Quinn	Yates
Magee	Rabaut	Young
Mahon		Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Jennings

NOT VOTING—54

Allen, Calif.	Hall, Leonard W.	Sabath
Arends	Kearney	Sadowski
Barrett, Wyo	Kearns	St. George
Bates	Kirwan	Sanborn
Bland	Lichtenwalter	Saylor
Bolton, Ohio	McDonough	Short
Boykin	McGregor	Smathers
Brown, Ga.	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Bulwinkle	Macy	Staggers
Camp	Monroney	Teague
Coudert	Nixon	Van Zandt
Dolliver	Patman	Vorys
Fellows	Patterson	Wadsworth
Gilmer	Pfeiffer, William L.	Werdel
Golden	Potter	White, Idaho
Graham	Reed, Ill.	Williams
Granger	Rees	Wilson, Ind.
Gregory		Woodhouse
Gwinn		

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Mr. Sadowski for, with Mr. Brown of Georgia against.

Mr. White of Idaho for, with Mr. Bates against.

Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. McDonough against.

Mr. Jennings for, with Mr. Vorys against.

Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Nixon against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Sanborn against.

Mr. Graham for, with Mr. Allen of California against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio against.

Mr. Rees for, with Mrs. Woodhouse against.

Mr. Lichtenwalter for, with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer against.

Mr. Golden for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

Mr. Van Zandt for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Monroney with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Smathers with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. VORYS, who, if present, would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240, nays 134, answered "present" 0, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—240

Abbitt	Dingell	Jones, Ala.
Addonizio	Dollinger	Jones, N. C.
Albert	Donohue	Judd
Angell	Douglas	Karst
Aspinall	Doyle	Karsten
Auchincloss	Durham	Kee
Bailey	Eaton	Kelly, N. Y.
Baring	Eberharter	Kennedy
Barrett, Pa.	Elliott	Keogh
Battle	Engel, Mich.	Kerr
Beall	Engle, Calif.	Kilburn
Beckworth	Evins	Kilday
Biemiller	Fallon	King
Blatnik	Feighan	Klein
Boggs, Del.	Fernandez	Kruse
Boggs, La.	Flood	Lane
Bolling	Fogarty	Lanham
Bolton, Md.	Forand	Latham
Bonner	Ford	Lemke
Bosone	Frazier	Lesinski
Boykin	Fugate	Lind
Breen	Fulton	Linehan
Brooks	Furcolo	Lodge
Buchanan	Gamble	Lyle
Buckley, Ill.	Garmatz	Lynch
Buckley, N. Y.	Gary	McCarthy
Burdick	Gathings	McCormack
Burke	Gordon	McGrath
Burleson	Gore	McGuire
Burnside	Gorski	McKinnon
Burton	Gossett	McSweeney
Byrne, N. Y.	Granahan	Mack, Ill.
Canfield	Grant	Madden
Cannon	Green	Mahon
Carnahan	Gregory	Mansfield
Carroll	Hagen	Marsalis
Case, N. J.	Hale	Marshall
Case, S. Dak.	Hall,	Martin, Mass.
Cavalcante	Edwin Arthur	Merrow
Celler	Hardy	Michener
Chatham	Hare	Miles
Chelf	Harris	Miller, Calif.
Chesney	Hart	Miller, Md.
Christopher	Havenner	Mills
Chudoff	Hays, Ark.	Mitchell
Clemente	Hedrick	Morgan
Cole, N. Y.	Heffernan	Morrison
Combs	Heller	Morton
Cooley	Herlong	Moulder
Cooper	Herter	Multer
Corbett	Heselton	Murdock
Cotton	Hinshaw	Murphy
Cox	Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.
Crook	Holifield	Noland
Crosser	Holmes	Norrell
Davenport	Horan	Norton
Davis, Tenn.	Howell	O'Brien, Ill.
Dawson	Huber	O'Brien, Mich.
Deane	Irving	O'Hara, Ill.
DeGraffenried	Jackson, Wash.	O'Neill
Delaney	Javits	O'Sullivan
Denton	Johnson	O'Toole
Pace	Riehlman	Tollefson
Patten	Rodino	Trimble
Perkins	Rogers, Fla.	Underwood
Peterson	Rogers, Mass.	Vinson
Pfeifer,	Rooney	Wagner
Joseph L.	Roosevelt	Walsh
Philbin	Sasscer	Walter
Polk	Scudder	Whitaker
Preston	Shelley	Whittington
Price	Sheppard	Wickersham
Priest	Sikes	Wier
Quinn	Sims	Wigglesworth
Rabaut	Spence	Wilson, Okla.
Rains	Steed	Wolverton
Ramsay	Stigler	Worley
Redden	Sullivan	Yates
Rhodes	Teague	Young
Ribicoff	Thompson	Zablocki
Richards	Thornberry	

NAYS—134

Abernethy	Harden	Pickett
Allen, Ill.	Harrison	Plumley
Andersen,	Harvey	Poage
H. Carl	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Anderson, Calif.	Hébert	Rankin
Andresen,	Hoeven	Reed, N. Y.
August H.	Hoffman, Ill.	Regan
Andrews	Hoffman, Mich.	Rich
Barden	Hope	Rivers
Bennett, Fla.	Hull	Sadlak
Bennett, Mich.	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hardie
Bentsen	Jacobs	Scott,
Bishop	James	Hugh D., Jr.
Blackney	Jenison	Scrivner
Bramblett	Jenkins	Secrest
Brehm	Jensen	Shafer
Brown, Ohio	Jonas	Simpson, Ill.
Bryson	Jones, Mo.	Simpson, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kean	Smith, Kans.
Carlyle	Keating	Smith, Wis.
Chiperfield	Keefe	Stanley
Church	Kunkel	Stefan
Clevenger	Larcade	Stockman
Cole, Kans.	LeCompte	Sutton
Colmer	LeFevre	Taber
Crawford	Lovre	Tackett
Cunningham	Lucas	Talle
Curtis	McConnell	Tauriello
Dague	McCulloch	Taylor
Davies, N. Y.	McMillen, Ill.	Thomas
Davis, Ga.	Mack, Wash.	Towe
Davis, Wis.	Magee	Velde
D'Ewart	Marcantonio	Vursell
Dondero	Martin, Iowa	Welchel
Doughton	Mason	Welch
Ellsworth	Meyer	Wheeler
Elston	Miller, Nebr.	White, Calif.
Fellows	Morris	Whitten
Fenton	Murray, Wis.	Willis
Fisher	Nelson	Wilson, Tex.
Gavin	Nicholson	Winstead
Gillette	Norblad	Withrow
Goodwin	O'Hara, Minn.	Wolcott
Gross	O'Konski	Wood
Halleck	Passman	Woodruff
Hand	Phillips, Tenn.	

NOT VOTING—57

Allen, Calif.	Jennings	Rees
Allen, La.	Kearney	Sabath
Arends	Kearns	Sadowski
Barrett, Wyo.	Kelley, Pa.	St. George
Bates	Kirwan	Sanborn
Bland	Lichtenwalter	Saylor
Bolton, Ohio	McDonough	Short
Brown, Ga.	McGregor	Smathers
Bulwinkle	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Camp	Macy	Smith, Va.
Coudert	Monroney	Staggers
Dolliver	Nixon	Van Zandt
Gilmer	Patman	Vorys
Golden	Patterson	Wadsworth
Graham	Pfeiffer,	Werdel
Granger	William L.	White, Idaho
Gwinn	Phillips, Calif.	Williams
Hall,	Potter	Wilson, Ind.
Leonard W.	Poulson	Woodhouse
Hill	Reed, Ill.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McDonough for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Brown of Georgia for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Bates for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. McGregor against.

Mr. Vorys for, with Mr. Jennings against.

Mr. Nixon for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Sanborn for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Allen of California for, with Mr. Graham against.

Mrs. Bolton of Ohio for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

Mrs. Woodhouse for, with Mr. Rees against.

Mr. William L. Pfeiffer for, with Mr. Lichtenwalter against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Golden against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Van Zandt against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Potter against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Macy against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Hill.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Dolliver.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.

Mr. Smathers with Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Bland with Mr. Werdel.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide economic assistance to certain areas of the Far East."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 2681. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington to be held at Lexington, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two statements.

Mr. SABATH (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the City Council of Chicago.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. WAGNER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HILL and Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and an editorial.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD the reason why I failed to respond to the roll call had earlier today on the motion to recomit H. R. 2945. I had previously made an appointment with the President of the United States for 11:15 this morning. When it was announced yesterday evening that the House would meet today at 11 it was then too late for me to cancel my appointment with the President. After my interview I hastened back here to the floor but too late to vote on the motion to recommit. Had I have been present in person I would have voted "No" on the motion.

Both matters discussed with the President I consider to be of vital importance to my district. One relates to the certification of the permanency of Vance Air Force Base at Enid, Okla., and the other to Optima Dam and Reservoir project in Texas County, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NIXON (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in seven places and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news article.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a sermon.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two letters dealing with the subject of Indian housing.

Mr. SHELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject, Democracy in Northern Ireland.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington News.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7207) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] if we can agree on 30 minutes for general debate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think 30 minutes will be sufficient time, 15 minutes on each side.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 30 minutes, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7207, with Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is a composite bill, made up of items reported by the subcommittees on independent offices and Department of the Interior. The bill includes items only of extreme urgency, and are brought before the House in response to legislation recently enacted, or under circumstances which could not have been anticipated or foreseen.

There will be a later deficiency bill which will incorporate the usual deficiencies incurred by the various departments. But, beginning with the next Congress, when the omnibus bill shall have become operative, we trust it will be unnecessary to report any further deficiency bills, except for items occasioned by emergencies which cannot be foreseen at the time the omnibus bill is passed.

Unfortunately, there have been instances in the past, when departments protested against cuts in their budgets, for someone to offer comfort and consolation by assuring them that Congress would be in session if any deficiency developed and they could come back.

Of course the department representatives left the Capitol with shining faces and proceeded to spend what they deemed essential to their program, and then confidently presented themselves at the appointed time with a deficiency estimate, and as a result the executive branch of the Government determined the rates and conditions of expenditure rather than the legislative branch which under the Constitution should control the purse strings. Or agencies denied funds by the subcommittee having jurisdiction of their expenditures would bypass the subcommittee and apply to the deficiency subcommittee or other subcommittee which would grant additional funds in some subsequent bill.

Under the omnibus bill such strategy is eliminated and each agency or bureau is provided for in one place in the one bill and under the jurisdiction of the one subcommittee. And every agency and bureau will be required to live within its appropriation under pain of penalties prescribed by the Antideficiency Act and without hope or benefit of deficiency or supplemental appropriations.

The bill before us contains four items. Two of them for the purpose of expediting construction under the Atomic Energy Commission and TVA are made necessary by the fact that Congress has recently authorized expansion and increased expedition in the production of fissionable material. The third item is for the Veterans' Bureau and provides additional funds for readjustment benefits to veterans, that appropriation having been unexpectedly exhausted sooner than anticipated. The remaining item provides additional funds for the Indian Bureau to take care of emergencies.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the committee which has jurisdiction of appropriations for Atomic Energy, TVA, and the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I believe the chairman of the full committee has already amply explained these items. I do not want to delay the House. I therefore yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas yields back 4 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the Widow's Creek steam plant which TVA proposes to build in Jackson County, Ala., about 29 miles from the city of Chattanooga, will have an initial installation of two turbogenerators, each with a rated capacity of 112,500 kilowatts, but capable of producing 125,000 kilowatts. The new plant is urgently required in order that the plants of the Atomic Energy Commission at Oak Ridge may be assured of the power needed for their expanded operations. If the appropriation is speedily granted, TVA expects to have this new steam plant operating during the summer of 1952.

TVA is also requesting funds to add a fourth unit to the Johnsonville steam plant now under construction in the western part of the TVA power system. This proposed fourth unit at the Johnsonville plant, together with the first units to be installed at the Widow's Creek plant, are added to the TVA system at this time to permit it to take on the new requirements of the Oak Ridge plant.

At the same time funds are requested to restore a part of last session's reduction in TVA's appropriation request for this fiscal year in order that its entire construction program may keep on schedule. It would be a calamity if a single unit being placed in an existing dam were delayed, if the Holston Dam now under construction were slowed up so that it could not be closed to catch next winter's rains, or if the steam plant

already under construction at Johnsonville did not bring power in on schedule.

Power requirements are increasing in the TVA area with a vigor rarely seen in any region of our country. The number of power users in the Tennessee Valley has increased to more than a million. The average residential customer uses 2,796 kilowatt-hours a year in the Tennessee Valley, compared with 1,655 for the average user in the Nation. Not only is residential use of electricity doubling every 4 or 5 years within the TVA area; use of power in commerce and industry is following a similar trend though not quite as steep. And most rapid of all has been the growth of farm use of electricity. Last year power lines were being strung to as many additional farms every 2 or 3 months as the total number of farms in this region served in all the years before TVA.

In planning its future power requirements, TVA must take into consideration not alone these important factors—that is, the growth of power loads of residential, commercial, and industrial customers—but also must be certain to provide ample power to take care of national defense needs. These are very important in the Tennessee Valley. TVA already is supplying large amounts of power to Oak Ridge and additional large blocks are going to be needed. TVA, too, is going to be called upon to supply a great deal of power to the new Air Force center near Tullahoma.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations, the committee which has jurisdiction of appropriations for Indian affairs.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Texas, I do not care to consume the time of the House or the Committee unless it is necessary.

This budget request came to my subcommittee for $803,000 for relief for all of the Indians of the Nation with the exception of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes. They have their own individual and separate claim.

The increase here is needed because of two things: One, the case load has grown heavier; two, grasshopper devastation and the hard winter, these things having deprived them of their crops and their work. The committee thinks the appropriation should be granted, and we recomend its passage.

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

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to thank the committee for its fine action in approving the supplemental appropriation of $803,000 for the welfare of the Indians. As the gentleman and the other members of his committee know, the Governor of Montana had declared an emergency for the northern part of our State. Many of our Indians are suffering. We hope this supplemental appropriation will be approved promptly so that it may be used to take care of some of their needs.

Mr. NORRELL. I thank the gentleman. Let me remind the membership that the Indians are wards of the Nation and we cannot permit them to starve.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to ask the gentleman whether any of this money to be appropriated for relief is to be used for the acquisition of food?

Mr. NORRELL. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Would there be any reason why the Committee could not accept an amendment to the bill that the money should be used to acquire surplus foods that are already in the possession of the Government?

Mr. NORRELL. I would not think the Committee would want to do that. They will take the money and buy the food they need. Certainly they should be sensible in trying to carry out the overall program of the Nation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman that if we could use the food that the Government already owns it might be transferred to the Indians and we would save that much money.

Mr. NORRELL. I think that might be done, but I would not want to limit it in that respect because somebody else might want to limit it in some other respect. I do not have an Indian in my district. It is a lot better, in my opinion, to make the lump-sum appropriation, then let those in charge of the service be guided by sensible procedure. I have an idea it will be done somewhat along the lines the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. AUGUST H ANDRESEN. I would like to suggest for the record that the Indian Bureau adopt some policy so that it will not be necessary to waste the money as long as the money has already been paid for the food.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say that I would not defend the Indian Bureau in pursuing any other policy than somewhat like the gentleman has suggested.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think reference to the hearings will disclose that particular suggestion was discussed when this item was before the subcommittee. It was discussed by Mr. Nichols of the Indian Bureau and myself. Mr. Nichols said that $88,000 had been subtracted from the budget of last year in anticipation of getting surplus food. They have been able to make only a limited use of this source of food because of the necessity of paying the transportation expenses. It was indicated that a portion of this money could be used for the payment of transportation, and under those circumstances they could use some of these surplus commodities.

Mr. NORRELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the items contained in this bill are deficiencies that probably cannot be avoided at this time. We must provide the money. The committee has made some cuts where it was able to do so. Probably there is no controversy, so far as I know, with reference to the bill.

There are some things in connection with it that we should call attention to, and they are rather important insofar as the general economy of the country is concerned. This Congress has provided for veterans the opportunity for training. I want to read an item that appears on page 27 of the hearings where an investigation was made with reference to the results of this educational and training program. Mr. Sterling furnished this information, and he was representing the Veterans' Administration:

> As of the end of July 1949, 2,592,500 veterans had been enrolled in courses in schools below college level under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. It is estimated that 500,000 of these veterans or 19.3 percent had pursued their courses to completion.

That is a terribly disappointing picture and indicates that the right requirements are not being made of those who go in, nor are they required to do the things that they should do with all the enormous sum that is being expended upon them by the Government. The total figure for this year will run to $2,754,000,000.

An investigation of some of these schools indicated an attendance of only 31 percent, although they were putting in bills for 100-percent attendance, again indicating that the proper check on this operation was not being made. I feel that in the interest of the Government and in the interest of the veterans these things should be straightened out. I think the committee is entitled to a great deal of credit for its consideration of this matter and bringing these things out.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the ranking minority member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, which committee heard most of these items.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York has said, the committee was somewhat disturbed by the evidence that is developing as to abuse of readjustment benefits provided to the Veterans' Administration. The abuse, so far as we could determine, is not in the Veterans' Administration. The abuse exists on the part of some fly-by-night schools where GI's have been induced to enroll with the suggestion that they would be ahead the subsistence allowance and the school would get the tuition payments. There has been no adequate check-up and no adequate guaranty that the schooling has actually been provided. Absences in some of these Johnny-come-lately schools have come to very high figures. In the hearings on the regular bill for fiscal 1951 there will be more evidence than shown in the hearings there. It is possible the committee may suggest some procedure whereby the Government will receive a certificate or some other assurance that the schooling it is paying for is actually being received

The other two items that were considered by the Independent Offices Subcommittee deal with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority Both of these are well covered, I think, in the report of the committee. They are part of the urgent

program to achieve production goals asked for by the responsible heads of the Government.

Last fall before Congress adjourned, representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority appeared before the committee and said that in view of the new production goals that they would like to use some of the funds which had been previously appropriated for fiscal 1950 to start some of this work, although realizing that we could not at that time make a new appropriation. It was understood that they might go ahead with their plans so that this work could be prosecuted as rapidly as possible, and we would consider the money need shortly after the new session opened, which has been done. One of these calls for considerable expansion in hydroelectric capacity and some steam generation for the Tennessee Valley Authority. Before we assented to this expansion, it was suggested that the TVA people canvass the Army engineers and other agencies of the Government to see whether or not power might be available through plants now under construction or from sources where power was already available.

The testimony as shown in the hearing on this urgent deficiency bill will show that the TVA people did make some study along that line, and while it was indicated that some temporary power might be found, it was of a temporary character. Consequently the committee did approve the funds requested in the amount shown of $11,682,000 to permit the program to go forward as indicated. There was no controversy over the purpose. It was simply a question as to whether or not we might save some of the money by using power that would be otherwise available. We did not find it in a permanent form, so consequently the committee reported the item in the amount as shown.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HAGEN. In the case of the welfare fund for Indian relief, will any part of this money be available for the payment of freight charges on relief shipments that might be sent to them on the reservations?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It will be. In the consideration of a supplemental bill a few years ago the Appropriations Committee accepted an amendment which authorized, as far as the legal right is concerned, the use of welfare funds for the payment of transportation charges when surplus commodities are used. The hearings on this particular item, as shown in the testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Interior Department, contemplated that a part of this money would be used for that purpose. In fact, that was part of the showing of the need, that it was necessary to have some money to pay transportation expenses if the surplus commodities were to be used to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the item in the bill of $803,000 for the welfare of the Indians. I know of the need for this money for the remainder of the year.

In my own State, in eastern Montana, we have had a severe drought that has seriously affected the welfare of these Indians. In addition, the grasshoppers came in, as they do in those cases. This winter we have had a very, very severe winter. On one of the reservations in the month of January the temperature averaged 27.8 below zero for the whole month, and 50 below was registered several times during the month. The result is that these Indians are suffering from want of food and want of fuel. The need for this appropriation, I can assure you, is very great.

With the supplies the Indian Bureau has advanced up to date we have been able to take care of the immediate welfare of these Indians, but these funds will run out by the first of March. This additional money is needed if we are to take care of the situation that has developed due, first, to the drought and, second, to the very severe weather.

I would say to my friend from Minnesota that we have made use of these surplus commodities. They have shipped several carloads into this area for use in this emergency. There are difficulties in connection with shipping potatoes because of lack of storage at temperatures such as 50 below zero. It is difficult to handle some of these commodities. Others, such as dried eggs, can be handled.

We have had some difficulty because of the snow conditions, the difficulty of opening roads and getting food to these people, but I think we have solved some of those difficulties. With this additional money, I think we can take care of the situation that has developed and bring these Indians through this one winter season. I am hoping that as time goes on we can find a solution for this problem so it will not be recurrent, but it is with us this winter. We have had to grant them some additional aid, but I think we will have to have some more for the rest of the winter. However, this item should take care of it. I appreciate the committee's including this item of $800,000 in this legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have just come back from home. When we passed this foreign-aid bill here today, I was reminded that we also have problems close at home.

We live on the Red River. When I left there the Red River was cresting at flood level. The other rivers in the lower Mississippi River Valley are high. The Mississippi River, for instance, is reaching a very high level, so high, in fact, that I am informed there has been fear expressed that the strain on the levee system may be too great.

As a result of this act, Mr. Chairman, I was today informed that the Army engineers intend tomorrow afternoon to open up what is known as the Bonne Carre Spillway, immediately north of New Orleans. That is one of the safety valves for the lower Mississippi system. When it is opened up, it will permit the flood waters from the Mississippi to flow directly into Lake Pontchartrain, and thereby reach the Gulf of Mexico by a shorter route. I am glad to report that thus far the flood control system built by the engineers is holding up all along the line. But we who live in the lower valley realize that the flood waters are high and we appreciate the fact that Congress is making a genuine effort to push speedily the work of completely protecting the lower valley from future floods.

I might say that this spillway has been used only twice in the past since its construction. This will be the third time and tomorrow when the levees on the east bank of the Mississippi open the waters of the Mississippi will roar across the land into Lake Pontchartrain and into the Gulf.

Mr. Chairman, in the Red River Valley we see progress being made in the control of our flood waters which come down into Louisiana from Arkansas, Texas, and Oklahoma. We, of course, are happy to realize that substantial progress is being made in making the valley safe. But this progress is not fast enough. I am told that at that rate of progress, the Red River Valley will not be completely safe from project floods for some 20 years. This is a long time; and we who live behind the levees feel that in a real sense we are tempting providence when we stage our work on the hope that the angry waters of the upper reaches will be held up until that distant date when our flood projects shall have been completed in accordance with the measured progress of a methodical Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For an additional amount for "Tennessee Valley Authority," $11,682,500, to remain available until expended; and the limitation under this head in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, on the amount available for administrative and general expenses of the Corporation, is increased from "$3,699,000" to "$3,845,000."

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to take this time at this late hour, but there is something involved in this bill which presents a very serious situation so far as the whole American economy is concerned. I wish to take these few moments to review a little in connection with this surplus food situation. It may be all right for us—our salaries are going right along. Everything is going along fine. The stock market is going along and the women are still buying their mink coats and we are going to have a $3,000,000 Roman holiday here in Washington in a few months. Meanwhile the fact is that our agricultural economy in many places is deteriorating. For example, at the present hour in many places in the Midwest eggs are selling for the lowest percentage of parity that they have ever sold for to my knowledge. It is 39 percent of parity.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In just a moment.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the bill and he did not ask for unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California is too hasty because I am talking on this bill and the things that I am talking about are leading up to this question of food for the Indians which has to do with this particular bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The matter under consideration at the moment happens to be the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, that may be true, but I moved to strike out the last word. I am talking in connection with this bill. In this bill we have surplus foods for the Indians.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman should discuss that matter which is pending at the present time. The part of the bill to which he refers has not been reached yet.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get too technical. I move that the House adjourn. We do not have a quorum. I do not like to do that, but in the 11 years that I have been here, this is the first time that anything like this has ever happened and I get kind of tired sometimes of some of the things that are going on around here.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, could I withhold that point of order just briefly to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this morning I started to speak out of order on an issue in response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.] on the very same type of discussion, and I was taken off my feet by somebody on the left.

I am not going to be as bad as they were. I am going to withdraw my point of order.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am glad the gentleman has heard of the Golden Rule. Just because somebody does something to you is no reason why you should want to do it to somebody else.

As I said, we are in a serious situation. We have surplus agricultural products selling as low as 39 percent of parity. We have many kinks in the law that should be straightened out. Last week we read that the CCC could not get rid of this surplus food unless somebody else paid the freight. Since December our colleague the Honorable GLEN BEALL, of Maryland, and I have been trying to get a hearing before the Committee on Agriculture to get some of these things straightened out. I would like to know why it is that we can pay the freight on these agricultural products for animal feeding, as we have been doing for the last year or more, and yet cannot do it when they are for human use.

We are all going to be criticized, and justly so, if we sit here and let any of these foods go to waste. This is especially true with the situation being the way it is in the United States at the present time. Unemployment is increasing, farm income and purchasing power is decreasing. So far as I am concerned, I do not want to accept any of the responsibility of not doing this job the way the Congress intended for us to do it when they passed the law. If anyone wants to take the responsibility of ruining the American farmer and his economy, that is a responsibility he will have to assume. This Indian food is just one angle of it. There is no reason in the world why we should not get these departments acquainted with one another so that they can work for the common good, not only for the rural people but for the whole country, and for this entire support program.

They have got the potato business pretty well worn out and now they are going into the egg business. Yet the other day we passed a little cotton bill which, if it becomes law, will cost more money than the egg program has cost in 9 years. Still you have not heard any commentators or newspapers worrying about that $100,000,000 or $200,000,000. Poultry is 10 percent of the national farm income, and the cotton which we need in the United States is not over 5 percent of the farm income. So that if we are interested in saving not only the rural people, but if we are interested in human beings and in the economy of this country, we should coordinate these forces, and we will be furnishing this food, according to law, to the Indians and to these other groups, as provided by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MANSFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7207) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House, without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POLICY REGARDING FORMOSA

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 452) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the President be and is requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish this House within 15 days after the adoption of this resolution with full and complete answers to the following questions, namely:

1. With respect to the President's statement of January 5, 1950, on policy regarding Formosa—

a. Were the views of the Secretary of Defense solicited in the formulation of the policy enunciated therein?

b. Were the above views and the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and of Gen. Douglas MacArthur presented to the National Security Council in its deliberations preceding the said statement?

c. Is Hainan included in the policy enunciated in said statement?

d Have the following been considered by the Executive as alternatives to the policy enunciated in said statement:

(1) Insistence on the execution of the terms of the Cairo Declaration, which provided for the return of Formosa to the Republic of China;

(2) Consideration of Formosa as a possession of Japan to be administered by the victor powers until eventual disposition under a peace settlement with Japan; and

(3) A plebiscite in Formosa, under the auspices of the Far Eastern Commission or a special commission of the United Nations, to determine whether the inhabitants desire—

(a) to continue as a province of and the seat of government of the Republic of China;

(b) to be placed under a United Nations trusteeship; or

(c) to become an independent nation?

e. Does the Executive have information as to—

(1) Alternate sources of essential commodities such as rice and iron ore to replace Formosa and Hainan as sources of these commodities for Japan in the event of the capture of these islands by the Chinese Communists; and

(2) The factor of additional cost of the occupation of Japan to the United States in the event of the capture of Formosa and Hainan by the Chinese Communists?

f. Has any recent survey of defense resources of Formosa been made by any agency of this Government?

g. For what purposes and in what amounts has assistance been rendered to Formosa under the present Economic Cooperation Administration program, which, in the words of the statement, "the United States Government proposes to continue"? In this connection, what steps have been taken and what sums have been spent in—

(1) The $17,000,000 capital improvement program which was contemplated for Formosa at the time of the consideration of legislation to extend the China Aid Act in March 1949; and

(2) the land tenure reforms and similar welfare improvement measures carried out by the Provincial Government of Formosa with the advice and assistance of the Joint Commission for Rural Reconstruction?

2. With respect to the current situation in China and the Far East;

a. What are the numbers and types of vessels and craft transferred to China under the agreement of December 8, 1947? What balance remains to be transferred?

b. Have the Chinese Communist forces obtained, and are they obtaining, amphibious

assault equipment from the Soviet Union or elsewhere?

c. Has the United States Government made any statement with respect to the recognition of the Communist regime by the United Kingdom?

d. Has the United States Government formulated its attitude with respect to admission of the Communist regime in China to the United Nations?

e. What areas in Asia come within the scope of the Truman Doctrine?

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KEE. In just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, when this resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs we immediately put it into proper channels in order that the various inquiries made in the resolution might be answered. We have received through the Department of State a full and complete answer to all the questions in the resolution. These answers will all be published in the report which the committee has brought in with the resolution, with the exception of two supplemental answers which it is deemed to be incompatible with the public interest to publish. But the two supplemental answers will be kept on file with the committee and be available for the information of members of the committee.

Accompanying the resolution is an adverse report by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE], a member of our committee and the author of the resolution, 5 minutes in which he desires to make a statement.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for his courtesy. Unfortunately the State Department answers are not yet in printed form, as I understand it, therefore they are not available at this time for the Members of this body. I have, however, had a quick look at them.

The answers given by the Department of State to House Resolution 452, the privileged resolution of inquiry which I introduced on January 27, are not in all respects responsive to my questions. In other respects the answers are evasive and beyond that the answers indicate a firm adherence to the State Department's policy of lack of firmness toward the forces of Communist aggression in the Far East.

In the course of these answers the State Department takes the view that they are bound by the Cairo Declaration with respect to Formosa. In other words, that Formosa must be treated as a part of China. Without arguing the merits of that proposition, I might point out that the Cairo Declaration also constituted a commitment on our part that Manchuria should be a part of China. Yet, at Yalta, control of the major ports and railroads of Manchuria, which means control of Manchuria, was transferred to the Soviet Union without even the knowledge, not to mention the consent, of the Chinese Government.

As an argument against taking action the State Department says that, "We must not place ourselves in the unenviable position of the U. S. S. R." Perhaps one is entitled to wonder whether in the opinion of the U. S. S. R. or the people of Asia our position in China is exactly enviable.

According to the answer $9,000,000 has been obligated for fertilizer in Formosa. Yet the State Department in its answer objects to the use of a much smaller amount of United States funds to build up fertilizer plants in order that they can make their own fertilizer. It favors suspension of any capital-improvement program because of the precarious situation of Formosa with respect to the Communist menace. Yet, surely the position of Korea is also precarious and yet capital improvements in Korea are going on apace to the tune of millions of dollars. Furthermore, if the situation in Formosa is so precarious, then why is it said elsewhere in the answer that the anti-Communist forces on Formosa have sufficient resources to repel any likely attack? Certainly the southern Koreans do not have sufficient resources.

Elsewhere in the State Department's answer it is said that a total of 131 vessels have been transferred by the United States out of 138 on the proposed list. Yet, under Public Law 512 the President was authorized to transfer 271 vessels. What is the reason for not transferring the 140 vessels which represent the difference between 271 and 131?

It is heartening to know that the United States Government will back up the representatives of the Nationalist government of China in the United Nations. I am glad that at last this has been affirmatively stated.

But the State Department completely avoids an answer to my question: "What areas in Asia come within the scope of the Truman doctrine." And in its evasion of this answer it advances the extraordinary theory that the Truman doctrine involves, primarily, economic and financial aid. Then what of the hundreds of millions of dollars that we have spent on military aid to Greece and Turkey as a result of the Truman doctrine? And what of the military aid to the Philippines and to Korea?

It would have been more honest if the State Department had admitted that they have conducted a retreat from the Truman doctrine.

These are but a selected few of many criticisms which I could make.

And so, while I appreciate the information provided with respect to some of the questions, it is with regret that I must note that the State Department answers to other questions in my resolution of inquiry are not satisfactory.

I think it is important that these grave questions should be clarified so that the American people should know where they stand with respect to this entire disturbing dilemma.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman explain the reason for our not receiving the answers to the questions before the discussion today concerning Korea and Formosa? It seems rather odd that the answers now follow but did not precede the earlier discussion today with reference to Korea and Formosa.

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, a few words only in reply to the gentleman from Connecticut. The resolution, together with the reply of the Department of State, was submitted to the committee, read to the committee, was passed upon by the committee, deemed satisfactory, and the committee reported out the resolution adversely.

I therefore move that the resolution be laid on the table.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman withhold that so that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. KEE. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has a request been submitted to the House that the report of the State Department to the interrogations be put in the RECORD in connecion with these deliberations?

The SPEAKER. It has not. They are contained in the report of the committee, as the Chair understands.

Mr. KEE. We reported the answers to the House.

The SPEAKER. The motion now is to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I understood the gentleman from West Virginia to say something about a couple of answers that should not be published, but those that might be published, it seems to me, it might be appropriate and consistent with the precedents of the House if they were printed.

Mr. KEE. We have reported the answers to the House, and they will appear in the report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. KEE. Only for a question.

Mr. CHURCH. My question is the same one that I asked a while ago of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE]. I do not understand, and maybe the gentleman can explain to me why House Resolution 452 and the answers thereto were not brought up before the discussion regarding Formosa and Korea earlier today. It seems odd that this comes up after that matter was disposed of today.

Mr. KEE. I do not program measures for hearing in the House for consideration.

Mr. CHURCH. But the leadership must have been responsible for the order in which these matters came up for discussion today.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. For a question.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, there is no question more important to the west coast, that is why I ask this question, especially as the statement has been repeatedly made that with the withdrawal of the United States from the line of Okinawa-Formosa and so forth, that we have become the line of defense. So, I ask this question very respectfully: The chairman of the committee has said that these questions were replied to by the Department; that several of the questions had certain national

defense significance, and he could not bring the replies to the floor.

Mr. KEE. Two of them only.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. But he has said that the others had been replied to and were considered by the committee, which I do not consider to have been, therefore, considered by the entire Congress, which is necessary, and I am asking whether or not it is the intention of the chairman or of that committee to bring these replies in full to the Congress in order that we, who are vitally interested in our part of the country, may know what the answers are.

Mr. KEE. The replies are incorporated in our report. They will be published.

Mr. TABER. Why was it not printed before the resolution was brought in?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is a proper question. When are the replies going to be printed? Why were they not printed before the resolution was brought up and, as the gentleman from Illinois said, why were they not printed before the discussion of the Korea-Formosa aid?

Mr. KEE. Under the rule, we have to report these resolutions to the House, with the action of the committee on them, within 7 days. It took quite some time for us to get the answers back from the Department. We reported them at the earliest possible time. They would have been reported on yesterday had that day not been Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That does not reply to my question, or, rather, it is a reply, but it is not, perhaps, a satisfactory reply because the committee did not have to bring up this resolution until after they were printed.

The SPEAKER. A parliamentary question is involved there with which the gentleman is perhaps not familiar.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Would the Speaker care to enlighten me on the parliamentary question?

The SPEAKER. It is that if the committee does not report the resolution within 7 days, the gentleman from Connecticut may call it up.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is the Speaker saying that the report had to be acted upon in 7 days?

The SPEAKER. By the committee or by the House. If the committee does not report it within seven legislative days, the gentleman from Connecticut can call it up. The committee has considered it, so the gentleman from West Virginia has said. The committee has the answers. It considered them, and it took action. The gentleman has now reported this resolution unfavorably and is going to move to lay it on the table. That is the usual course. It is done many times every year.

Mr. KEE. It is also quite customary to report them and consider them at the earliest possible moment.

The SPEAKER. May the Chair say that the gentleman from West Virginia is not responsible at all for the bill carrying Korean and other aid coming up before this resolution. The Chair will take the responsibility for that himself.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. With all respect to the Speaker, may I say that I certainly had no question of that. I thought it was possible under the rules for the committee to hold it until it had printed the report. I think we understand now that the committee is keeping the House in the dark just as long as possible concerning the reply. Am I right?

Mr. KEE. That has never been done within my remembrance since I have been on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of the speech I made at the Washington Town Hall a week ago Monday on what our China policy should be.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Monroe Watchman, a West Virginia newspaper.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

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

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing and is estimated to cost $205.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

H-BOMB AND UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, Senator MCMAHON'S address on the H-bomb is splendid as a bid to the Soviet Union to settle its problems with the United States on the atomic and H-bombs, but it leaves us where we were in respect of a program of current action if the Soviets do not pick up our bid. The great contribution made by Senator MCMAHON is to raise to a level commensurate with the cruel problem of the H-bomb, the power and resources which we must muster to meet it, and to affirm our capability and willingness to devote $50,000,000,000 in 5 years to the fight for peace.

I do not believe that this is our only alternative. I believe that valuable as Senator MCMAHON'S proposal is as a means for perhaps inducing agreement on a plan for control and inspection of atomic energy we cannot wait on the success of this offer alone. This can indeed be a brilliant and important—though deferred—aspect of the policy, but we must also have a current operating policy which in it has the capability for success, too—a success defined as the maintenance of international peace and security without war and the raising of the standards of living of the peoples of the world, while we maintain, strengthen, and develop free institutions everywhere. For this purpose we have in the making a dynamic foreign policy provided that we once see it as a complete whole and pursue it with the vigor and resources which Senator MCMAHON suggests, but without the condition precedent so difficult of attainment which he prescribes.

Looked at in totality, the foreign policy which we are pursuing today is to endeavor to aid the recovery of the war-torn nations through the European recovery program, the Greek, China, and now the Korean assistance programs, at the same time that we seek to bring up to a higher degree of economic well being the underdeveloped countries through the point-4 program and at the same time that we give the whole world which we are helping to maintain free, military cover through our own military resources and the obligations that we have undertaken under the Charter of the United Nations, the Atlantic Pact, and the mutual defense assistance program. In this way we afford an opportunity to war-torn and underdeveloped countries to rehabilitate themselves with our aid under a military security which we give them until such time as their economic status will permit them to join in collective security for them and ourselves on an increasing basis. By pursuing this policy we husband our resources because we are not endeavoring to establish military security as well as economic improvement in the various countries which we are assisting except such as is consistent with their state of economic recovery and the requirements of their morale. Viewed in this way, we have a complete policy which is not a policy of containment but a human policy.

A four-point program of additions to current American foreign policy is needed to meet the challenge to world peace presented by the acceleration of the United States-Soviet arms race resulting from the H-bomb development. This four-point program is as follows:

First, a $1,000,000,000 per annum recovery program paralleling the European recovery program and providing for self help and mutual cooperation and an organization for Far East economic cooperation for the Far East, where we have been dealing with the problem of economic recovery and development piecemeal and sporadically; second, an invitation to Indonesia, India, the Philippines, Burma, Pakistan, South Korea, Viet Nam, Australia, and New Zealand to establish a Pacific pact with the United States giving to the Far East the same assurances of our support as we gave to western Europe in the event of aggression against them; third, a prompt and greatly expanded point 4 program of the scope, and with the assurances against colonialism adequate to the size of the underdeveloped areas and

the vast populations involved; and fourth, a means for financing development as a follow-up on the European recovery program and point 4 based on a World Economic Development Corporation operating like the RFC with an initial $10,000,000,000 capital.

In the production of the H-bomb with the vast additional expense involved for the National Military Establishment, our democracy again faces the question of preferring guns to butter. This for us, unlike a dictatorship, is always a difficult question. We have, heretofore, been able to deal with this problem of increased military expenditure by an overall expansion of our economy. The proposals which I am making look to the further expansion of our economy to meet the H-bomb challenge grounding it on increased domestic production, and on increasing the production and raising the standards of living of the free peoples overseas, making them stronger in their will to resist communism and more able to do it effectively both physically and morally. I urge also the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 64, the world federation resolution, as the political capstone of our peace efforts.

If the die is to be cast for war by the Soviet Union then we are in for it whether or not we have economically aided the other free areas of the world. What we must at all costs avoid, however, is giving up by default; in other words, withholding or impairing our economic assistance so that Communist infiltration trading on the despair, economic depression, and postwar destruction of countries will win without any Soviet aggression from without being necessary. This we dare not do, and it must, therefore, be our fundamental policy to repair and develop the economy of free peoples or those striving to attain freedom. Here we have the best chance of retaining for freedom the greater part of the world which is now outside the Soviet orbit and attracting away from the Soviet Union more and more of its satellites in the area behind the iron curtain, because of the inevitable and irresistible attraction of an economic prosperity in being which the Soviet Union can only promise and never deliver. This is our best opportunity for counteracting the expansionist drive of the Soviet Union while putting her in such fear as to her own isolation that she will be far more ready to make the kind of agreement which Senator MCMAHON has in mind than she is today. If in the interim the U. S. S. R. should decide to move militarily we would at least have peoples to rely on who are believers in freedom and therefore a powerful weapon against communism, and who as resistance fighters could enormously cut the Communist chances of success in the near term, with a real chance that for the longer term the free world can gain the power which will make even armed attack unthinkable to the U. S. S. R. To pursue a program of this character our whole conception of recovery and what it takes to carry it out must be revised.

This line of action is blueprinted in a new book just written by my brother, Benjamin A. Javits, and about to be issued by the publishers, the United Nations World, through Funk & Wagnalls, entitled "Peace by Investment." This book offers the creative, conscious, and cosmopolitan use of credit as an effective and practical way of achieving the ends now inadequately pursued by the United States foreign economic policy. It advocates that this program be pursued over a period of 50 years and consider the potentialities of investment in the same magnitude as those considered by Senator MCMAHON—$50,000,000,000—but this time not under a fixed condition precedent but as an investment in peace through well-being.

The magnitude of the problems to be solved are so great that the amounts of money to be dealt with must be commensurate with the scope of the problem. Western Europe will in 1952 still need material dollar help in some form. The estimate of programs for recovery in Asia aggregate about $1,000,000,000 a year. Point 4 programs to provide technical assistance to backward areas, particularly in Asia, the Near East, Africa, and Latin America, may well involve an expenditure of several hundred million dollars a year when they really are moving forward; and this is exclusive of the follow-up investment required. Considered in terms of outright expenditure these sums are vast, but considered in terms of our economic machine which is now producing an annual non-Government income of about $215,000,000,000, a reevaluation of all our concepts is necessary for our investments in world peace. They could properly be considered as investments anticipating at the very least an enormous increase in national productivity attributable to the revival of the world's economy, or as Senator MCMAHON contemplates a vast reduction in military expenditures. President Truman has noted that an increase of a few percent in the standard of living of the peoples of Asia who constitute about 50 percent of the population of the earth could keep the United States busy for 100 years and could step up our national income to $300,000,000,000 a year.

As world recovery requires not only money but know-how and as United States private business has vast resources of know-how a partnership of the United States Government and the United States private business for overseas economic development is indicated.

To provide the means for investment on the scale required by world recovery and development of the economically underdeveloped countries adequate to form the needed basis for world economic prosperity, a single international financing organization is required such as a great, new Economic Development Corporation financed by the United States Government in a magnitude proportioned to the business to be done. We must be thinking in terms of initial capital in the magnitude of $10,000,000,000.

An Economic Development Corporation would function very much like the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in extending loans on mortgages, or otherwise, to prospective investors and developers abroad, and in acquiring securities from such investors or developers, in effect creating a Government-business partnership. Such companies should also be participated in by governments or individuals in the areas where economic development work is to be undertaken.

Cooperation with participating countries would be likely to determine the success or failure of the whole program and there we should adopt the procedure so successfully worked out in connection with the European recovery program. We should bring about the establishment of regional organizations of participating countries like the Organization of European Economic Cooperation of the 19 countries participating in the ERP, which can advise with us on over-all plans for particular regions with similar economic, social, and political interests. From this would logically follow the negotiation of agreements or treaties giving fair protection for and preventing discrimination against investments by United States nationals and the new Economic Development Corporation in such areas. The work of the International Bank and the Monetary Fund to help members to get their internal financial and economic affairs in order would continue.

Investment or loans by the Economic Development Corporation would go far to quieting the fears of American businessmen that the United States Government would leave them adrift at some point after encouraging them to undertake broad-scale ventures for overseas economic development.

Added to the vast economic recovery programs for free peoples we must also have a political and ideological appeal. In this way we are brought to the eventuality of world federation reaching across all barriers, extending also to the people of the Soviet Union and its satellites and offering them a place with all the other peoples of the world with commonly assured guaranties of commonly accepted world law and world controls, which should quiet their fears of American domination of the United Nations. While we strive to carry out a program of investment and recovery we must in parallel strive to carry forward the movement for world federation as the ultimate answer to a question which may well not prove capable of final settlement on economic grounds alone but may require that political capstone which can be found in world federation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CAN WORLD PEACE BE ATTAINED IN THE SHADOW OF THE HYDROGEN SUPERBOMB?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I have shared for almost 4 years the problems and responsibilities charged to us by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

During the past 4 years production of atomic energy has been multiplied, and the destructive capacity of the atomic bomb has been magnified.

Unfortunately, there has been no comparable progress in the field of international diplomacy.

We who are charged with extensive knowledge in the field of potential atomic destruction are forced into a discouraging position of near despair, because there is no effective international agreement to control the production of atomic energy or the use of atomic weapons.

For the past few months we have been wrestling with the problems of the hydrogen superbomb. This terrible weapon is gestating in the womb of scientific research and development. Its birth date may not be far in the future. Once born, it will multiply geometrically the ghastly horror of the Hiroshima atomic explosion—that Hiroshima bomb destroyed a city of a hundred thousand people, laying waste an area of more than four square miles.

The hydrogen bomb may be capable of destroying the largest city on earth. It may destroy man and his works over an area of 100 or more square miles.

Our minds cannot do other than recoil in horror at such a possibility—that American, British, Canadian, and Soviet scientists should be embarking on such a terrible and horrifying project seems fantastic. Like a person gripped by a grim nightmare, we struggle in futility to break the chains that bind us.

But we are not in a nightmare to be dispelled by an awakening. We are awake. These menacing forms and lurking shadows are the reality of the hydrogen-atomic age.

Should American scientists develop this power to destroy?

Should American plants grind out hydrogen bombs as they have been producing the atomic bomb?

What is our moral responsibility to ourselves and to the other peoples of the world?

Is an alternative course possible?

These are some of the questions I have been wrestling with, not academically, or as one without responsibility, but officially, as Congressman representing the Nineteenth Congressional District of California, and as a Member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Official responsibility cannot be divorced from personal responsibility to oneself and to loved ones. It cannot be divorced from the ethical values and spiritual faith which are as much a part of one's conscience and good judgment as the arm is part of the physical body.

Official and personal responsibilities must be discharged. The questions must be answered. And time dictates that postponement or delay is impossible. In fact, delay would become an accessory to our enemies.

A decision has been made, reluctantly, after intensive study of a wide range of factors, and after months of soul-searching by the Government officials and the scientists involved in the hydrogen-atomic project.

On January 31, 1950, President Harry Truman directed the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with research and development of the hydrogen bomb.

The President's decision in favor of continued research and development of this new and terrible weapon was, in my opinion inevitable. Be assured that this decision was not lightly taken, neither did it rest on the judgment of one man.

The President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, and in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, had the responsibility of evaluating the many factors involved in the hydrogen-bomb problem. It was a matter of primary concern to our Joint Chiefs of Staff, representing our Army, Navy, and Air Force. It was a matter of great concern to our Department of State. And it has been a matter of equal concern to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the United States Congress.

The President was in possession of the thinking and the advice of the official bodies concerned with this problem, and of advice from many other sources, during the months which preceded his announced decision

The scientific theory for the thermonuclear hydrogen bomb is many years old, and was in existence before the production of the atomic bomb. The development of the atomic bomb furnished one of the important factors necessary to make the hydrogen bomb possible.

The production of the hydrogen bomb, while not a matter of absolute certainty, has now entered the realm of probability. According to many prominent scientists it presents no insurmountable barriers

The Russian atomic explosion which was announced September 23, 1949, concluded the United States monopoly of the atomic bomb, and also ended the fancied security and superiority which many Americans were hugging to their bosoms.

In the face of diplomatic failures to secure adequate international agreements for controlling the atomic menace, a certain complacency based on reliance on weapon superiority had remained to comfort us. It gave us an avenue of escapism down which we could travel in ostrich-like fashion, refusing, in our smugness, to realize that the problem of world peace, and therefore the answer to the problem of our national security was unsolved. Although the problem remained, the necessity for its solution seemed less pressing.

The Russian atomic explosion of 1949 shattered that dream of fancied security for a brief time. It would indeed be tragic if the announced intention to develop a hydrogen superbomb should again restore our dream of a security based on permanent maintenance of weapon superiority.

Assuming that we can and will develop a so-called superbomb within X period of time—we have no absolute assurance that the Soviet Union will not develop an equally destructive superbomb in X, one-half X, or twice the period of time that X represents. In either case the result might well be the same: Temporary superiority for the first successful developer, followed by a fear-ridden stalemate when each has developed similar or like weapons.

Assuming again that both nations develop superbombs capable of destroying all life within a 100-square-mile area or more, we are not thereby canceling the use of these terrible weapons by one nation or the other.

Factors of deliverability and vulnerability become very important. The ability to surprise and the ability to retaliate, the psychology of totalitarian aggression and the psychology of democratic hesitation to launch an aggressive "preventive" war—all these must become factors of national policy and security.

I do not profess to have absolute answers to the dilemma which we face. I know of no one wise enough to give to an anxious world the final answers. This I firmly believe: There is no permanent security for our people or the people of other nations in this mad race of atomic armament.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to yield to our beloved and respected majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The distinguished gentleman from California occupies one of the most important positions of any Member of Congress or any person in the United States, by reason of his membership on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The very fact that the gentleman from California [Mr HOLIFIELD] was appointed to that Committee by the Speaker shows the complete confidence that the Speaker of the House of Representatives has in him, and which I have in him, and which all of his colleagues have in him. The gentleman addressing us, together with his other colleagues, has information of great value and of great importance to our country and of transcending importance to the world The gentleman is making a very powerful contribution not only to the Members of Congress but to the people of our country and his remarks should be construed and be evaluated in the light of the knowledge that he has by reason of the position of responsibility that is his.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from California not only for his service in this body but particularly as a member of the important Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He has conducted himself not only with ability but with dignity and with strength. His modesty is evidenced by the remarks he has just made that he does not know all the answers. None of us know all the answers. His remarks are all the more impressive and forceful because of his modesty. But one thing is certain. I have confidence in the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and I know that if anyone can make his contribution toward the answer, with the knowledge and information he has, the gentleman from California will make his marked contribution. The gentleman has said he agrees with the President in the decision which was made only after consultation with the advice of many minds. That information of itself is a matter of great importance to all of us, and particularly should be to the American people. It is the American way.

The thought enters my mind that if such a decision was not made and some other country that might be a future enemy of ours in case of war did make the decision, what a terrible indictment it would be against all of us, not only those of this generation but of future generations if those in whom responsibility was vested failed to make the decision that would be in the national interest of our own country. I am glad the President made the decision he did. I am sorry the situation is such that it had to be made. I cannot see how any other decision might be made.

Again, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California for his part and for whatever value my opinion might be worth to the people of his district. They can well be proud of him. The gentleman had no knowledge I was going to make this observation. The people of the gentleman's district in California may well be proud of the standing and prestige of the gentleman in this body and the great contribution he is making not only toward meeting the problems that confront us throughout the world but in trying to meet the problems that confront our people from the domestic standpoint.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the majority leader for his comments and I shall try to continue to merit the confidence of the leadership and of the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we as a peace-loving people are caught in a trap. We desire peace for ourselves and for all people everywhere. We have no dreams of imperialist aggression against any people in the world. Yet, in the face of our traditional desire for peace and our renouncement of dreams of empire, we are forced by circumstances, apparently beyond our control, to undertake the greatest peacetime armament program in history.

What are those circumstances? Basically they rest on the refusal of the Soviet Union to enter into an effective international agreement for the control of atomic energy.

More than 3 years ago the representative of the President, Mr. Bernard Baruch, offered to share our atomic knowledge with other nations and to place all atomic facilities and production in the hands of an international control authority. No greater offer, no more statesmanlike approach to the menace of atomic destruction could have been made. Only one important stipulation was laid down: The international agreement must include continuous inspection of every nation's atomic facilities by an international inspectorate, to insure full compliance on the part of every nation.

The U. S. S. R. refused to submit to internal inspection at that time and at every subsequent occasion.

Without continuous inspection, no agreement to control production of atomic weapons would be worth the paper upon which it was inscribed.

The Soviet propaganda carefully avoids this basic requirement of continuous internal inspection. This is an essential for world security in the atomic age. The Soviets, by refusing to meet the issue, cannot escape the onus of defeating the efforts of the peoples of the world who are sincerely striving to establish a real and lasting peace. Because of this refusal of the U. S. S. R. to cooperate with us in taking the only effective step toward world peace, we must maintain our great burden of armament.

In so doing we must always keep in mind the fact that we are not buying permanent security. We are only buying time. How long a period of time, we cannot judge. We cannot control either the time or the place of totalitarian aggression. We are forced, therefore, to maintain a constant military force—a military force ready to defend our country with the latest and best of scientific weapons, a military force ready to visit immediate and terrible retaliation on any aggressor nation.

Meanwhile, during the period of time which we are buying at such great price, we should make every effort possible to establish world peace through strengthening the United Nations. And we should make economic and military aid available to every nation which will subscribe to the principles of the United Nations Charter. We must always have before us the goal of peace through friendship and strength. This investment may be our last chance.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was very pleased to read a statement made to the press yesterday by Secretary Acheson, which I think is of vital importance because, if I may say so, it is along the line that I have thought for a long while, and that is, that in the world today the forces of decency, those who believe in a future decent world, must have strength. Unfortunately, as I said on the floor the other day when I made my remarks on the far-eastern bill, it is not what I would like to do, but there is only one way, so far as the Communists are concerned for them to command respect, that is through fear of our power, and strength constitutes power. I was very glad to read what Secretary Acheson said yesterday, and I hope it will be implemented in effective form.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I agree with the majority leader. I, too, admire the words spoken by Secretary of State Dean Acheson. While he has been much maligned and criticized, I still believe that he expresses the will of the great majority of the people of the United States, which is a will to do that which is necessary to maintain the security of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, only such aid can be given as lies within our economic power. We must be judicious in the amounts of aid given. We must be sure that such aid is given to those nations which are devoted to the principles of freedom. We must be realistic to the point of building these nations to such economic and military strength as we deem will rally them to our side if and when the aggressor strikes.

I know that the people of my district and the Nation are vitally interested in these great questions. I know that they have been terribly shocked by the hydrogen-bomb announcement.

Many forms of escapism will be presented. The great body of American citizens are peace loving and devoted to religious principles. We instinctively recoil from the horror of war and the atheistic materialism advocated by the Communist philosophy.

Some of our people are sincere pacifists and many are confused by the false peace propaganda of the Soviets.

Some of our people refuse to consider or recognize that our former position of comparative national security is dangerously threatened by recent scientific discoveries such as the supersonic airplane and atomic weapons of mass destruction.

Some of our people are confused because they do not have full information on these subjects which are so far removed from the problems of daily life.

For these reasons I have made this report to the people of my district and the Nation. For those persons who are honestly and desperately seeking the solution to world peace and freedom I have endeavored to set down basic facts and developments regarding the hydrogen-bomb controversy, as well as to state my own findings and views concerning it.

In our imperfect world we are faced with the realistic situation of the refusal on the part of an important nation to cooperate in a genuine plan of international control of atomic weapons. We are faced with the certainty of further secret development of atomic or hydrogen mass-destruction weapons behind the iron curtain.

Under these undeniable facts can any citizen of the United States blindly object to our decision to maintain at least equality in this terrible field of mass-destruction weapons?

I do not claim that a perfect answer can be found, torn as we are between our desire for peace and the necessity of self-protection. Perfect answers do not exist in an imperfect world, and decisions of this magnitude are never completely satisfactory.

We, a peace-loving people, can only proceed according to the measure of our own judgment based on the wisdom and strength given us by God.

AMERICAN JEWELED WATCH INDUSTRY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, hearing the gentleman from California give his able address regarding atomic energy and the hydrogen bomb makes me think more than ever of the importance of keeping the wartime watch companies in operation. The Waltham Watch Co. is nationally and internationally known. It is known that the workers there make precision instruments that are vitally needed today. Why the Waltham Watch Co. did not avail itself of Government orders and the good offices of the National Defense I do not know and will never know. It is vital to keep these precision workers occupied. There have been too

many "might have beens" during the past few years in our national defense.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is aware of a letter that Hubert E. Howard, Chairman of the Munitions Board, addressed today to Harley Hise, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, showing the importance of the American jewel watch industry in time of emergency. This letter was delivered to our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE]. May I suggest to the gentlewoman that because of the importance of this letter it be made a part of her remarks?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It would be fine, but I am wondering if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] would not like to have it placed in the RECORD as a part of his own remarks. I think that would be better.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] be permitted to include in the RECORD at the termination of the remarks of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts a letter from Hubert E. Howard, Chairman of the Munitions Board, to Harley Hise, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The rather dreadful thing to me is that months ago there was known the importance of keeping these precision workers at work, yet the doors are closed today. Over 600 workers in my own district are out of work, walking the streets. Many of them may be forced to go away from Waltham to seek work elsewhere. The RFC has loaned over $100,000,000 to Lustron and $100,000,000 to Kaiser-Frazer. I ask you if it is not much more important to keep these precision workers at work on precision instruments than to lend money to the automobile industry. The precision workers are more vital in the national-defense picture than the automobiles or the Lustron Co. Why was the Waltham Watch Co. discriminated against?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] may proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I saw an advertisement in the Philadelphia paper, a huge one-page advertisement, of all kinds of watches from Switzerland to be sold for $11. I ask you, How can our labor compete with the labor in foreign countries? Why something is not done by the administration or by the State Department to stop the influx of Swiss watches to this country, which is ruining our watch industry, is something I cannot understand. Why favor foreign industries over and above our own.

There are only three watch companies remaining to us now, I believe, in the United States. That is un-American. They will go out of business if this influx of watches continues. You will lose these precision workers also. The State Department should act. Since the Waltham Watch Co. could not compete, certainly they should have been given Government orders. My belief is that they would have been given those orders, but they were not properly sought for. If they had been properly sought, or the administration had helped, they would have been granted.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I submit the following letter for printing in the RECORD:

MUNITIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1950.

Mr HARLEY HISE,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

DEAR MR. HISE: The Munitions Board has heretofore expressed to you the position and importance of the American jewel-watch industry as a resource for national defense.

You were informed that there are approximately 8,000 highly skilled workers in the industry and that the acquiring of the degree of skill requires from 2 to 10 years of intensive training The essentiality of the maintenance of this nucleus as a basis for expansion in times of mobilization is apparent.

The Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin Watch Cos. employed 100 percent of their capacity in Government work from December 1941 to August 1945, manufacturing such items as aircraft instruments, chronometers, fire-control watches, time fuzes, etc

It is considered that the maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin Watch Cos. is vital to the defense of the United States and should be preserved

The above information is provided again for your consideration of the application of the Waltham Watch Co. for financial assistance.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT E HOWARD,
Chairman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WILLIAMS (at the request of Mr. COLMER), for an indefinite period, on account of serious illness in the family.

To Mr. KIRWAN (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. GOLDEN (at the request of Mr. GROSS), for an indefinite period, on account of serious illness in the family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 587. An act for the relief of the estate of Dick Walook, Alfred L. Woods, and Edward Kimoktoak.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 570. An act for the relief of Donald Francis Wierda;

S. 736. An act for the reimbursement of Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.;

S. 753. An act for the relief of Sisters Antoinette Cometti, Mary Gibin, Angela Pelosin, Emma Ghisleni, Elisabetta De Caterin, and Onorina Franzina;

S. 777. An act for the relief of Calvin D. Lynch & Son; W. Thomas Lockerman; Sudlersville Supply Co; George C. Moore and H A. Moore; J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc, Hobbs & Jarman; C. S. Thomas; and Royse R. Spring;

S. 1003. An act for the relief of Emory T. Wales;

S 1019. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of personal injuries sustained by Carl J. Freund and Pauline H. Freund, his wife, of Seattle, Wash.;

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Saul Phillips;

S 1054 An act for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.;

S. 1088 An act for the relief of Milton Buechler;

S. 1096. An act for the relief of Abe Lincoln and Elena B. Lincoln;

S. 1166. An act for the relief of Toriko Tateuchi;

S. 1353. An act for the relief of G. H. Lazarus, Jr., and Jesse F. Bewley;

S. 1446. An act for the relief of James Hung Loo;

S. 1534 An act for the relief of Harry Comber;

S. 1702. An act for the relief of Riyoko Sato;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Mrs. Effie S. Campbell;

S 1915. An act for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko;

S 1924. An act for the relief of the estate of William Walter See,

S. 2031. An act for the relief of Willow River Power Co.;

S. 2100. An act for the relief of Penelope Corolyn Cox;

S. 2114. An act for the relief of Mitsue Shigeno;

S. 2119. An act for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co.; and

S J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to provide unrestricted entry privileges for Sister Elizabeth Kenny.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 13, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1221. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the Finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 391); to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1222. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1223. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting report No. 17 pursuant to section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2328 An act to increase the number of examiners in chief in the Patent Office, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No 1617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 452. Resolution requesting the State Department to furnish full and complete answers to certain questions relating to the foreign policy of the United States in the Far East; without amendment (Rept. No. 1618). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 7233. A bill to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to delay the communication of betting odds on, and results of, horse and dog races under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIES of New York:

H. R. 7234. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available again to egg producers at such prices as may be necessary to establish an equitable egg-feed ratio; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 7235. A bill to extend, under certain conditions, the period for initiating a medical or dental course under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R 7236. A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the "Agricultural Act of 1949"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAND (by request):

H. R. 7237. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell grain to egg producers at such prices as may be necessary to establish an equitable egg-feed ratio; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 7238. A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the "Agricultural Act of 1949"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 7239. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell grain to egg producers at such prices as may be necessary to establish an equitable egg-feed ratio; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALSH:

H. R. 7240. A bill to amend sections 12 and 14 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938 (sec. 2-1112-1114 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr HARRIS:

H R 7241. A bill to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R 7242. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell grain to egg producers at such prices as may be necessary to establish an equitable egg-feed ratio, to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr KENNEDY:

H. R. 7243. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill, to be held at Boston, Mass., June 16-17, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7244. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1945 (Public Law 106, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide true time and one-half for overtime and true double time for Sunday and holiday duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H R. 7245. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a two-price plan for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R 7246. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 so as to equalize credits for service in the armed forces for pay and longevity purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 7247. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell grain to egg producers at such prices as may be necessary to establish an equitable egg-feed ratio, to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 7248 A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to extend financial assistance to business enterprises for purposes advantageous to the national defense, to the Committee on Banking and Currency

By Mr. BURTON:

H R 7249. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to compensate members of the military and naval forces of the United States for losses sustained as a result of Japanese sequestration of bank accounts in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H J. Res. 417. Joint resolution designating the 3d day of February in each year as "Dorchester Day", to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. Res. 466. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to recommend a national fuel policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAND:

H. Res 467. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to investigate and study the desirability and feasibility of a national retirement system; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Rer. 468. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 467; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 7250. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Chemical Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 7251. A bill for the relief of Ethel Cristeta Berner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7252. A bill for the relief of Berniece Josephine Lazaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 7253 A bill for the relief of Charles Wilson Roland and Mirtie L. Roland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 7254. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bernard Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 7255 A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in Hopkins County, Ky., to the estate of James D. Meadors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H R 7256. A bill for the relief of Mieko Nishitsuru; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1827. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution passed at a meeting of Little Rhody Chapter, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, requesting that a grace period of 3 years be given individual officers assigned to combat units after reaching age in grade before transfer to the Inactive Reserve and that there shall be no age limitations for Reserve officers in noncombat assignments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1828. By Mr GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, asking Congress to withhold recognition of the Communist government in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1829. Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, asking Congress to enact legislation repealing the wartime excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1830. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the Board of Trade of Concord, Mass., against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

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

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

God of our fathers, above all the commotion and confusion of the busy present with its bewildering demands, we would now turn aside to seek the quietness of Thy presence. In the secret of Thy pavilion we take refuge from the strife of tongues. By tasks too difficult for us we are driven unto Thee for strength to endure and for wisdom to rightly interpret the signs of these trying times. In the unknown days of peril and of challenge which loom ahead, give us spirits that are calm and confident, a trust in spiritual verities that nothing

can shake and an assurance of the protecting shadow of Thy unfailing love. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 9, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2319) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7207) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the week beginning February 13.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER was excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate for the week beginning February 13.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD and the Appendix of the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

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

RESOLUTIONS OF TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE NEGRO FARMERS CONFERENCE AND EDITORIAL FROM BIRMINGHAM (ALA.) NEWS-AGE-HERALD

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a set of resolutions adopted by the Fifty-ninth Annual Tuskegee Institute Negro Farmers Conference, on January 18, 1950, together with an editorial from the Birmingham News-Age-Herald of January 29, 1950, entitled "Better Negro Farmers."

There being no objection, the resolutions and editorial were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE FIFTY-NINTH ANNUAL TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE NEGRO FARMERS CONFERENCE, JANUARY 18, 1950

The history of the Tuskegee Farmers Conference is a record of over a half century's progress toward better farming and better living. Each year, for the past 59 years, the conference has pointed up the most urgent needs of the farmer and his family.

From the beginning, farm ownership has claimed major emphasis. Better housing, more wholesome family living, and improved educational and health standards have also been emphasized. In fact, the Tuskegee Farmers Conference has worked earnestly to engender a wholesome respect for the American standard of living among those whom it seeks to serve.

During the past 50 years the Tuskegee conference has helped bring into reality many programs vitally affecting conditions in the South. The Agricultural Extension Service, more adequate private and public agencies for farm credit, and improved techniques in soil conservation are but a few of such programs.

We highly endorse this year's Farm and Home Week and its emphasis upon improved farm and home practices. We take the same view of the Tuskegee Institute Conference To Study Programs and Objectives of State and Federal Agricultural Agencies which met here January 16 and 17. It is believed that such a conference could well become an annual event.

We note with extreme sorrow the passing of Mr. Albon L. Holsey, Tuskegee Institute official and former United States Department of Agriculture employee. His death on January 16 brought to close 36 years of service to Tuskegee and the farmers conference.

In order that farmers and their families may increasingly share in a more abundant life, we point out the following problems and offer these recommendations:

ECONOMIC TRENDS AFFECTING RURAL PEOPLE

The traditional pattern of farming in the cotton South is rapidly changing. The tendency is toward fewer and larger farms, increased livestock production and wider use of farm machinery with the result that small farmers are being disadvantaged and share tenants and farm laborers are being displaced at a rapid rate.

We, therefore, recommend that Negro family-sized farms make full use of private and public financing agencies to enlarge and improve their farm holdings where needed and that they follow approved practices to expand production of livestock. These farmers are further urged to purchase and operate more farm machinery individually and cooperatively. We also urge the farmers with small acreages to use all available facilities in shifting to intensified farming or seek off-farm employment where possible. For those farm people who will be displaced by this changing pattern we urge appropriate agencies to study ways by which they can be trained and employed in agricultural agencies and industry. This will require further industrialization of the South.

We recommend that the Federal, State, and local government encourage the establishment of such industries as may be needed and we endorse proposed legislation now pending directed toward this goal. Because of the changes in agriculture, now under way, we urge county agents, agricultural teachers, ministers, and rural leaders to keep themselves abreast of trends and developments.

COTTON-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

On December 15, the farmers of the Cotton Belt voted for cotton-marketing quotas and acreage allotments. However, the 23 percent acreage cut has proved too drastic as a first step in reducing the cotton acreage. Indications are that the Allotment Act, Public Law 272, will be amended.

We recommend that safeguards against reducing the acreages of small farmers below a definite minimum be retained in any revision of the present law. We further urge that safeguards be written into the law which will protect tenants and croppers as far as possible against displacement, and provide training and placement aid for those who are displaced.

NEGRO REPRESENTATION AND EMPLOYMENT

Negroes cannot make their fullest contribution to society through token representation and special appointments. It is through equitable distribution of employment opportunities on all levels that a citizen can better fulfill his obligations to, and enjoy the privileges of the American way of life. That these high purposes may be more fully realized we recommend:

1. Negro representation on all policy-making bodies, fund-appropriating and approving committees in Agriculture, Education, Health, Welfare, and related agencies where public funds are involved.

2. We commend those agencies that have given qualified Negro personnel broader job opportunities. Special commendation in this regard is due the Agricultural Extension Service for increasing personnel in field positions; to Farmers Home Administration for maintaining personnel on a national level; to Vocational Agriculture and Home Economics in maintaining a high level of employment in field positions, and to Soil Conservation Service for continuing the services of technicians on several levels. We urge a further expansion of employment in these and other related agencies.

3. We recommend that greater numbers of qualified Negro personnel be hired in all public-service agencies and divisions of these agencies on county, State, regional, and national levels, including all areas of agriculture, public health, and welfare services.

4 We recommend that those areas of greatest need affecting the greatest number of people be given immediate attention, such as the appointment of Negro specialists on State extension staffs, county personnel in Farmers Home Administration, technicians, planners, and aides in Soil Conservation Service, State representatives in the Farm Credit and Rural Electrification Administrations, Conservation Service, and Public Health Workers in all categories.

5. We deplore efforts on the part of any Federal or State agency to create irregular job titles and job descriptions that result in salary, performance, and promotion differentials based on race. We note with alarm the increasing practice of reducing Negro county agents to the status of assistants.

6. We heartily endorse the present trend toward construction of county buildings that provide office space and other conveniences for all agricultural workers. We urge that equal facilities in such buildings be provided Negro workers. We endorse H. R. bill 402 authorizing this program.

7. We urgently recommend that Negro leadership, particularly in rural areas, will individually and collectively seek to create employment opportunities in public service for qualified Negro personnel. We feel this can best be done by making the needs of the Negro community known to proper authorities and by continually urging that Negroes be given wider opportunities for service.

8. We recommend that parents, teachers, ministers, in cooperation with educational and vocational guidance institutions teach Negro youth the importance of adequately preparing themselves for employment in

order to meet competition and overcome obstacles preventing their full participation in public life.

9. We further recommend that the Civil Service System be carefully and constantly studied by public schools and colleges with a view toward alerting aspirants for local, State, regional, and national jobs in order that no opportunities for employment may be lost or overlooked because of a lack of information.

BROAD SCALE FARM POLICY

We endorse legislative proposals which provide for spreading the benefits of support-price programs to consumers as well as to farm producers. We further endorse legislation encouraging balanced farming and diversification in the South, and also we favor long-range legislative policy aimed at party income for farm people rather than parity prices.

RESEARCH

Negro youth today are missing a vital part of their college training due to a lack of research opportunities. This conference, therefore, goes on record as recommending that public funds be set up to provide adequate experiment facilities and research projects at all Negro land-grant colleges.

THE SEVENTEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS

The economic and social significance of the Seventeenth Decennial Census, which will begin April 1, 1950, is of vital concern. Important changes in congressional representation in some States will result. The importance of giving accurate census figures cannot be overemphasized. This conference urges rural leadership in all areas of work to assist farm people in making a complete and accurate census report.

THE PRESS

In recent years, the Negro press has devoted more space to agricultural news We commend the press for recognizing its responsibility in this important area and urge all agricultural agencies and workers to make more news available to this valuable medium. An increasing tendency of the daily press to recognize and publicize achievements of Negro farmers is highly commended

EDUCATION

This conference endorses all programs of educational betterment which seek to equalize training and facilities for American youth regardless of race, color, or creed. It recommends further that specific attention be given to three major areas of training, namely: (1) Training of specialists to serve in agricultural and home economics services; (2) preservice and in-service training of public employees, and (3) technical training in more of the occupations which have to do with producing, processing, and distributing agricultural commodities.

This conference likewise calls for the proper enforcement of compulsory school laws. Too many violations are yet practiced by both parents and employers.

The conference further urges rural leadership to encourage and assist Negro farm people to look after their own business. They need to be taught: (1) To deposit their money in banks; (2) to avoid entering into false contracts; (3) how to properly draw up and record property deeds; and (4) how to make legitimate wills.

THE FARM HOME

The future of our Nation depends very largely upon the type of rural homes that we develop. Homes should be more than mere shelters. They should provide families with an environment suitable for the development of wholesome ideals, attitudes, habits, and ambitions. The good rural home should differ from the good urban nome only in its location. This conference, therefore, recommends that farm people make every effort to take advantage of all public and private agencies set up to improve rural housing. It calls attention to the Tuskegee low-cash-cost housing program and urges its adoption wherever possible. We commend the Congress and Administrator, Dillard B. Lasseter, upon the 1949 Housing Act which provides aid for the improvement of farm housing. This act is now being administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

We urge that agency to guard against inequitable distribution of rural housing loans.

THE RURAL CHURCH

Because of the many changes which are occurring in our rural communities, there is urgent need for the churches to take a larger part in solving economic and welfare problems.

We commend the churches for such steps as they have already taken in this direction. However, we recognize the need for more full-time resident ministers to work with the rural people The churches need to join hands with other agencies at work for good in the community and to encourage thrift, brotherhood, and clean, wholesome living.

HEALTH

This conference commends the great progress that has been made in the health conditions of the Negro people and urges continued cooperation in the year-round program of the national-health program to the extent that health education shall become community-wide through the participation of school teachers, school children, families, churches, and all civic groups. In addition, it recommends

1. That greater efforts be made by public and private agencies to further reduce maternal and infant mortality and deaths from preventable and curable diseases.

2 We are gratified to note the construction of rural hospitals through State and Federal funds in many States that provide facilities for Negroes We urge that such legislation be expanded to more fully meet the needs of all the people. We recommend that Negro doctors and nurses be included as regular staff members of such institutions.

3. That a more active program for training physicians, dentists, and professional nurses for rural service be established.

4. That more public jobs in health service be opened to Negroes.

5 That more emphasis be placed on food habits and diet and their role in promoting better and happier living

6. That sanitation in homes, in churches, in schools, and in all public places be related to the general health program of the community

VETERANS

Many of the problems that faced veterans of World War II at the close of hostilities are still in need of solution. This conference urges the continued support of all agencies designed to assist veterans in finding employment, obtaining adequate housing, opportunities on the farm, in-service training programs, and other essential services necessary to their welfare.

CITIZENSHIP

We recommend that teachers, ministers, parents, and all workers with rural people stress the value of good citizenship in a democracy and begin early to instruct the young in their obligations and privileges as good citizens. We also recommend that all citizens, young and old, qualify to vote and use their ballots to help elect men of character and training, who will consider the interests of all of the people in carrying out their official duties.

Committee on Resolutions: Charles E. Trout, Chairman; T. M. Campbell; Mrs. Jessie P. Guzman; the Reverend E. T. Dixon; Ernest E Neal; Joseph Bradford; Frank Jacobs; W. M. Maffett; Sherman Briscoe; Miss Patsy Graves.

[From the Birmingham News-Age-Herald of January 29, 1950]

BETTER NEGRO FARMERS

Thomas M. Campbell is an extension field agent of the United States Department of Agriculture. Although his territory is the whole lower South from Florida to Oklahoma, he works out of Tuskegee Institute. He was the first Negro farm-demonstration agent in the United States, he has been on the job for 44 years.

Only city folks have to be told who Tom Campbell is. His name is known all over the rural South to both white and Negro farmers, for he has done a tremendous service to the agriculturists of his race

At the beginning of this year he joined with another Negro field agent, John W. Mitchell (who has been on the job since 1917), in a look-ahead statement of what is in store for the Negro farmer in the South.

"Things are not likely to be very bad," says Tom Campbell, "and yet they may not be too good "

What he meant by that somewhat enigmatical statement this release, sent out from the United States Department of Agriculture in Washington, makes clear

"Cotton," says the statement, "is not now the only cash crop; indeed, for many families it is not the main cash crop There has been much diversified farming· tobacco, peanuts, truck crops, timber, beef and dairy cattle, and poultry. But Negro farmers this year will have to look forward to a declining income level because price supports are no longer mandatory for many farm products But," says Campbell, "because so many farmers made better incomes during the war and postwar years than they ever had before, a lot of them got out of debt and the price declines will not affect them disastrously."

Negro farmers are getting to be better farmers all the time. In many cases they are mechanizing their activities. Campbell estimates that 50,000 Negro farmers in the southern States now own tractors. The change from a cotton economy to another type is of value to the farmers, for with more livestock produced they are also producing more crops such as corn, wheat, and rye.

Mr. Campbell points out a great need for construction work in rural areas. Almost every Negro home in the South needs some sort of repairs; many of them ought to be abandoned. A vast number of homes do not as yet have toilet facilities, and some families have to walk a quarter of a mile to get water. These facts are distressing to contemplate It is to be presumed that the provisions of the public housing bill passed by Congress last summer may be of considerable help in improving Negro residential property on southern farms.

The most hopeful sign of all is that the new generation coming on is better educated in every way than its predecessors. Negro schools are better than they were one, two, three, or more decades ago. There is now probably no family in the South in which there is not at least one member able to read, write, and keep simple accounts. These Negro youths are being encouraged by their families, their schools, their pastors, their farm agents, and their white friends to learn methods of scientific agriculture by which they can raise the cash income of their families. There are, for example, about 350,000 colored 4-H Club members now in the South.

The Government is helping, too. When Campbell began work in 1906 he was the only Negro agent in the entire country. Now there are more than 800 of them. How encouraging it must be for Tom Campbell now to look about the South and to observe the fruits of his own labor and that of others he has trained or championed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 2822) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264), reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1269) thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 456) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1270) thereon.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7207) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of the bills (S. 2639) to raise the limit placed on the monthly disability compensation payable to veterans suffering from service-connected quadraplegia, and (S. 2924) to establish for individuals who served in the armed forces during World War II a presumption of service-connected disability in the case of tuberculosis existing within 3 years after discharge from such forces, and that they be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The first of these bills, S. 2639, deals with the amount of compensation to be paid veterans suffering from service-connected quadraplegia; the other, S. 2924, deals with the question of presuming a service-connected disability in the case of certain veterans suffering from tuberculosis.

The subject matter covered by these bills is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Finance, and I ask that both bills be referred to that committee for proper consideration.

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

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN AREAS OF CHINA AND AID TO KOREA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2319) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act be cited as the "Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950."

SEC. 2. To enable the President until June 30, 1950, to obligate funds heretofore appropriated for assistance in certain areas of China, section 12 of Public Law 47, Eighty-first Congress, is amended by striking out "February 15, 1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1950."

SEC. 3. (a) The Administrator for Economic Cooperation is hereby authorized to furnish assistance to the Republic of Korea in conformity with—

(1) the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1949, as amended, wherever such provisions are applicable and not inconsistent with the intent and purposes of this section 3, and

(2) the agreement on aid between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea signed December 10, 1948, or any supplementary or succeeding agreement which shall not substantially alter the basic obligations of either party.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Administrator shall immediately terminate aid under this section in the event of the formation in the Republic of Korea of a coalition government which includes one or more members of the Communist Party or of the party now in control of the government of northern Korea.

(c) Nothwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Administrator is authorized to make available to the Republic of Korea merchant vessels of tonnage not in excess of 2,500 gross tons each, in a number not to exceed ten at any one time, with a stipulation that such vessels shall be operated only in east Asian waters and must be returned forthwith upon demand of the Administrator and in any event not later than June 30, 1951. Any agency of the United States Government owning or operating any such vessel is authorized to make such vessel available to the Administrator for the purposes of this section upon his application, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law and without reimbursement by the Administrator, and title to any such vessel so supplied shall remain in the United States Government.

(d) In order to carry out the provisions of this section 3, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, in addition to sums already appropriated, not to exceed $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950.

(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $30,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this section, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the Administrator shall request, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder, from funds made available for the purposes of this section 3.

SEC. 4 The authorization for appropriations in this act is limited to the period ending June 30, 1950, in order that any subsequent authorizations may be separately passed on, and is not to be construed as an express or implied commitment to provide further authorizations or appropriations.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide economic assistance to certain areas of the Far East."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments. The matter has been worked out in a manner which is satisfactory to both the proponents of the Senate bill and the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the House amendment extends the period from February 15 to June 30, which is the end of the fiscal year, both for the China Aid Act and the Korea Aid Act. The original Senate bill, S. 2319, having been passed by the Senate, went to the House; the House made some amendments relative to the Korean situation, but the China aid provisions are practically identical with those in Senate bill 2845 reported from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and which is now the unfinished business. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct. The time is extended as proposed in the Senate bill

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 2845 to enable the President to obligate funds heretofore appropriated for assistance in certain areas in China until June 30, 1950, will be indefinitely postponed.

TAXES ON DISTILLED SPIRITS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the pending business, as I understand the parliamentary situation, is now Senate bill 75, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and its incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 75 be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5486, Calendar No 1220.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5486) to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, for the transfer and redistillation of spirits, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to temporarily laying aside Senate bill 75 and to the present consideration of House bill 5486?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5486) to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, for the transfer and redistillation of spirits, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is a bill which has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Finance. That committee is now holding hearings on House bill 6000, dealing with various phases of additional coverage under

social security, and the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. GEORGE] cannot now be present. House bill 5486 is similar to a bill that was passed last year by the Congress dealing with the use of stamp machines for the payment of taxes upon beer and wines and other types of liquors. This bill deals specifically with stamp machines for payment of taxes on distilled spirits. The report speaks for itself. In view of the fact that the Congress has previously considered legislation which is on all-fours with the bill which is now before the Senate, I presume there will be no serious objection to its passage.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that this is one of the bills which the Senator announced several days ago would be taken up at approximately this time, and that the bill was unanimously reported from the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from California is correct. The bill is one of those with respect to which there was an agreement with the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and other Senators on the other side of the aisle. Apparently there are no complications which would raise any serious objection to the consideration and passage of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill

The bill (H. R. 5486) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUGAR QUOTAS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 501, Calendar No. 1139.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 501) repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this bill was objected to by the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE and Mr. SALTONSTALL] when it was called on the calendar. It is my understanding that they have withdrawn their objections. It is in the category of the bills referred to by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] a moment ago. It was reported unanimously from the Committee on Finance. It deals with the repeal of section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948.

Section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the amount of sugar which may be allocated to a nation exporting sugar to the United States under the Sugar Act if the Secretary finds that that nation denies fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation, and industry. This particularly affects the sugar companies in South American and Central American countries with which we are constantly dealing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the majority leader if the section which will be repealed in the event this bill is passed is the section in the current Sugar Control Act which allows to the sugar control authorities the right to affect harmfully the quota of our neighboring nations, particularly Cuba, in the event that private obligations owed by nationals of Cuba to citizens of the United States are not satisfactorily discharged.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is correct in his interpretation of the repeal of section 202 (e).

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LUCAS I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the junior Senator from Florida correct in his understanding that the removal of this section will allow the sugar situation to stand solely upon its own bottom, in connection with the needs for sugar and the relative merits of the producing areas, both within the Nation and offshore, without injecting the question of performance by nationals of another country of their obligations to nationals of this country?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. That is my understanding of the bill, which was reported unanimously by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows.

Be it enacted, etc, That section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948 is hereby repealed.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

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

The clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hal P. Demuth to be an ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

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

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Merlyn E. Natto to be an ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, February 14, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Julius C Holmes, of Kansas, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 1 to Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister of the United States of America

Paul J. Reveley, of Connecticut, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Charles B Borell, of New York.
Myron H. Schraud, of Texas
Ben A. Thirkield, of Virginia, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a vice consul of the United States of America
Harold J. Noble, of California, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The following-named persons to be members of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department

J. H. Allen, of Florida.
Daniel W Bell, of the District of Columbia.
Morris L Ernst, of New York
Frank M Folsom, of New York
Alfred E Lyon, of New York
Robert L Thornton, of Texas
Charles A Ward, of Minnesota

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 19 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Hal P Demuth to be ensign, effective January 5, 1950

Merlyn E. Natto to be ensign, effective February 25, 1950.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for days in the calendar of our national history when we are privileged to call to mind the life and character of those who sought to serve their generation according to Thy holy will.

Today we are paying tribute to the memory of a great American patriot who stood like a giant among his contemporaries and whose record of heroic service has made an indelible impression upon succeeding generations.

Grant that his supreme passion for the preservation of the Union may also inspire us with longings to promote and

preserve the union of God-fearing men and nations in their search for amity and peace.

We are confident that Thou art not calling upon us to seek and accept peace at any price.

We believe, however, that our beloved country has been commissioned to strive for righteousness and justice, whatever the cost may be, to bring to fulfillment and fruition those glorious aspirations.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 9, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On February 1, 1950:

H. J. Res. 184 Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 7, 1950, as National Children's Dental Health Day.

On February 7, 1950:

H. R. 6212. An act to amend section 5 of the Federal Firearms Act.

On February 8, 1950:

H R 322 An act to transfer funds to the town of Craig, Alaska; and

H. R. 2585. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain metallic impurities in tin ores and concentrates when such impurities are not recovered.

On February 9, 1950:

H. R. 746 An act for the relief of the legal guardian of August Michela, a minor; and

H. R. 4387. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Treasury Department.

On February 10, 1950:

H R. 4106. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 5486. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, for the transfer and redistillation of spirits, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 501. An act repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948;

S. 2440. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes;

S. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of immigration hearings before a judiciary subcommittee; and

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 1158, Eighty-first Congress, first session, entitled "Progress on the Hoover Commission Recommendations."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2319. An act to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea.

UNITED STATES AGAINST CHRISTOFFEL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 469) in respect to the privileges of the House, which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *Harold Roland Christoffel* (No. 791–47, criminal docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, a subpena duces tecum was issued by the chief justice of said court and addressed to Ralph R Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 9th day of February 1950, at 10 o'clock antemeridian, and to bring with him the Minute Book of the Committee on Education and Labor of the Eightieth Congress of the United States including minutes of the executive sessions of said committee in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the Attorney General of the United States has requested the House of Representatives to permit the production of copies of certain records of the Committee on Education and Labor of the Eightieth Congress of the United States; and

Whereas on the 18th day of January 1950, with respect to a prior subpena in the same case, the House of Representatives adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *Harold Roland Christoffel* (No. 791–47, criminal docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, a subpena duces tecum was issued by the chief justice of said court to Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 19th day of January 1950, at 10 o'clock antemeridian, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it

"*Resolved*, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

"*Resolved*, That Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpena duces tecum before-mentioned but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

"*Resolved*, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum then the said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their file or custody under said Clerk; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena afore-mentioned."

Whereas nothing occurred of sufficient importance in the executive session of said Committee on Education and Labor on the afternoon of March 1, 1947, to justify the entry of a minute of said meeting and no minutes of said executive meeting were made, and

Whereas the national security or public safety of the United States will not be jeopardized by the publication of any part of the proceedings in question of said Committee on Education and Labor of the Eightieth Congress of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privilege of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate or process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That no officer or employee of the House of Representatives has the right, without the consent of the House of Representatives first obtained, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum, to produce any document, paper, or book belonging to the files of the House of Representatives before any court or officer thereof, nor to furnish any copy of any testimony given or paper filed on any investigation before the House of Representatives or any of its committees, except such as may be authorized by statute to be copied, and such as the House of Representatives itself may have made public, be it further

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the afore-mentioned subpena duces tecum but shall not take with him any original paper, book, or document on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, be authorized, in accordance with the request of the Attorney General of the United States, to produce certified copies of the minutes of the public meetings only of said Committee on Education and Labor of the Eightieth Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the afore-mentioned subpena duces tecum.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to know if we are assured that we will get these documents back. The FBI wrote the most condemning letter I ever read on Edward U. Condon, in which it denounced him as the weakest link in atomic security,

and proved it beyond a reasonable doubt; yet when the Committee on Un-American Activities attempted to get that original letter we were denied that right.

I am opposed to sending these records out of the possession of the Congress, and I want to know that the Congress will get them back.

Mr. CELLER. I may say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that only copies will be submitted.

Mr. RANKIN. That is better.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. I do not understand why the court is asking for all these papers when they do not exist. I happen to know. I was subpenaed and appeared at court this morning, but was not called. There are no such papers.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HOWARD DOBSON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of the House share a sense of sorrow and loss in death last Friday of a very able member of the House Press Gallery, Howard Dobson, who had been with the Associated Press, covering the proceedings of the House of Representatives since he came out of the armed services.

He was notified 2 months ago that he had but a short time to live after his disease had been diagnosed as cancer. The quiet courage that characterized Howard Dobson in the armed services and as a very able correspondent was further demonstrated during the last 2 months of his illness.

I have before me a brief comment, Mr. Speaker, that I think characterizes that courage as well as anything I could say. This is taken from a column written on Christmas Eve by one of his colleagues, James Marlow, an AP columnist. Here is what he said:

"I went to see him the other day," Marlow said. "He knew life was being chewed away inside him. He had lost weight until he looked like the ghost of a ghost.

"He looked at the bright window and through it at the bright trees outside. 'It's beautiful outside,' he said. It was his way of saying: 'That's the world out there. I love being alive in it, but I may not be out in it much again.'"

Mr. Speaker, the greatest tribute that can be paid to a newspaperman, I think, is to say that he was a good reporter. That can truly be said of Howard Dobson. He was in every sense a gentleman whose presence in the press gallery will be greatly and sorrowfully missed.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] in paying tribute to the very fine newspaperman who was not only a credit to the newspaper profession but a credit to the Nation as a whole. He was an individual whose passing will be keenly regretted by everyone who knew him and he will be sorely missed not only by the fraternity but all of us here. I regret the passing of this great newspaperman.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this very fine newspaperman covered Iowa and part of the Middle West. We found in him a friend, a capable reporter, and a man in whom we had a great deal of confidence.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with others in paying tribute to Howard Dobson. A fine newspaperman, a great citizen, has gone from us.

THE LATE TILMAN B. PARKS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, another former Member of this House has been called by our Maker and gone to his glory, reminding us that the sands of time run surely toward the life of every person.

The Honorable Tilman B. Parks, whom some of you know, died yesterday morning at 8 o'clock at Suburban Hospital in Bethesda.

For 16 years Mr. Parks represented the Seventh Congressional District of Arkansas, which district it is now my privilege to serve. He was elected to Congress in 1920 and served eight consecutive terms in the House of Representatives until his retirement in 1936.

He was born on a plantation near Lewisville, Ark., 77 years ago. He was the son of the late William Parks, who as a captain at the age of 16, was perhaps the youngest commissioned officer in the Confederate Army.

Mr. Parks obtained his education at the University of Texas and the University of Virginia. He was admitted to the Arkansas bar in 1900.

He had an outstanding record of accomplishment in public service. Prior to his election to Congress he served three terms in the Arkansas State Legislature and was prosecuting attorney for the eighth judicial district of Arkansas for 4 years, making a total of 26 years of outstanding service to his people who had entrusted him with their confidence, and to whom he was so devoted.

I am glad to say, Mr. Speaker, that I knew Mr. Parks personally. I have known him practically all of my life. He was a warm personal friend of my father, who also would have been 77 years of age had he lived.

I remember as a very small boy during the First World War, the stirring and patriotic speeches of Mr. Parks in the sale of Liberty Loan bonds. He was prosecuting attorney at that time and a very able one.

Many of you no doubt remember him as an outstanding and able Member of this Congress. He was a member of the Appropriations Committee. In his devotion to duty and service he was enthralled with the burning desire and spirit that made him an outstanding and able legislator.

He was loyal and patriotic at all times. He was a good Christian man, and a member of the Baptist Church. He was a good and devoted husband and father, loyal to his family. His wife passed on to her reward in 1926.

He is survived by a son, Tilman B., Jr., and two daughters, Mrs. Ann Parks Marshall, now living in Chicago, and Mrs. Josephine Pugh, of Kenosha, Wis., and three grandchildren.

He will be missed even though he had attained more than his three score years and 10. In paying this warm tribute to my departed friend, Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my deepest sympathy to his family in their bereavement.

May his soul rest in peace with God.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Tilman Parks brings back memories of bygone days. He and I came to Congress at the same time. There were 105 new Members who entered that Congress who had never served in Congress before, and I am the only one who remains today.

With him came Mr. Driver, of Arkansas. With me came Mr. Lowry, of Mississippi, and a large number of others; fine patriotic Members of this body who have now passed to the Great Beyond.

Tilman Parks was a man of courage. When I first came to Congress our distinguished former Speaker and Vice President, Jack Garner, in a conversation we had, slammed his fist down on the desk and said, "JOHN RANKIN, we do not need any more brains in Congress; we have all the brains we can use. What we need is courage."

That applies also to the present Congress.

Tilman Parks, whatever else you might say of him, had the courage of his convictions.

When I look back over the years and recall the names on both sides, the faces and the figures of those Members who have passed on, I feel like the distinguished Irish poet, Thomas Moore, who said; and I quote his words with one slight change:

Oft, in the stilly night,
Ere slumber's chain has bound me,
Fond memory brings the light
Of other days around me.

The smiles, the tears, of former years,
The words of love then spoken;
The eyes that shone now dimmed and gone,
The cheerful hearts now broken.

When I remember all
The friends so link'd together,
I've seen around me fall,
Like leaves in wintry weather.

I feel like one who treads alone
Some banquet-hall deserted,
Whose lights are fled, whose garlands dead,
And all but he departed!

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to hear of the death of our late colleague, who was one of my close friends. The people of his district and of his State can well feel proud of the great work and the constructive service that he rendered while a Member of this body. I join with the Arkansas delegation in their expressions of regret, and extend to his children and his grandchildren my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know Mr. Parks from boyhood, and I cherished his friendship greatly. His career was an unusual one. Endowed with a brilliant mind and an engaging platform personality, he became an outstanding leader in Arkansas while still a young man. His long service in the Congress was impressive, and established for him a reputation as an able public servant. I mourn his passing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by E. Stanley Jones.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials and a letter.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial from the New Orleans States and in the other an address by Mr. Lloyd J. Cobb, president of International House of New Orleans.

STATE DEPARTMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, not as a threat but as a warning, I should like to say that the filing of the resolution to investigate the State Department should not be taken lightly by Mr. Acheson and others in the Department, for to longer stubbornly refuse to recognize the public clamor for a house cleaning could prove to be a major mistake.

A public hearing on the resolution conducted by the Rules Committee would be equivalent to putting the Department on trial, which is a hazard that it cannot afford to take, and something which it should endeavor in every way to avoid.

It is my consideration for the President, Mr. Speaker, that makes me hesitate for the time being to advocate an all-out investigation. This is something which in my opinion the President should handle. I beg that he take a hand and do something about it, because it is not just a storm that is going to blow over.

TORNADO DAMAGE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I know that the House of Representatives will learn with deep sorrow of the disastrous tornadoes which swept through north Louisiana, east Texas, and parts of Arkansas late yesterday afternoon. The American Red Cross reports to me that 25 persons were killed in Louisiana, and 68 injured; whereas in east Texas 5 people were killed and 61 injured. Property damage was heavier in Texas; whereas loss of life was heavier in Louisiana. More particularly, I learn that at the Slack Airport Depot 4 soldiers were killed and 13 were injured. At Sligo, which is immediately east of Shreveport, five persons were killed and eight were injured. At Logansport, 45 miles south of Shreveport, 3 persons were killed and 19 were injured. In the Caster-Jamestown area of Bienville Parish, nine persons were killed and five were injured. I have not been able to get a report of the property damage as of this hour.

Immediately upon receipt of this information, I contacted Federal agencies and asked for full cooperation with the American Red Cross in handling the serious problems which follow a terrific tornado such as this one was. The Air Force has informed me that it has contacted Barksdale Air Base at Shreveport, and the commanding officer is authorized to extend such assistance as is available in such an emergency and is cooperating fully with the American Red Cross.

The American Red Cross reports that representatives from Atlanta, Ga., have entered the tornado area and that together with local Red Cross chapters are rendering all possible assistance to those in need and in distress. The tornadoes were accompanied by heavy rainfall, which, of course, has made the distress much more acute.

CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker—

Four score and seven years ago our forefathers brought forth on this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

The familiarity of those majestic words is such that their meaning sometimes escapes us.

Exactly four score and seven years have passed since that historic utterance of our democratic faith. We have honored the words, but what of the deeds they ask?

In 1863 Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation and put an end to slavery in America. Our Nation had lived 87 years with the curse of slavery before Lincoln acted. Another 87 years have slipped into history. Is it not now time to complete the work that Lincoln began?

That great and plain man signed the proclamation because he meant what he later said in the Gettysburg address—that all men are created equal. Do we mean less?

This Congress has before it a civil-rights program dedicated to that famous proposition. The first measure in that broad program is fair-employment practices legislation to ensure that equal men have an equal opportunity to make a living.

Next week we will act on that program, Democrats and Republicans alike. Four score and seven years later, we have an opportunity to reaffirm Lincoln's democratic faith. I suggest we forego the usual platitudes and honor a great President in the deed rather than the word.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him over Station WJR, Detroit, Mich., on February 10, 1950.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Petras Dauzvardis, Consul of Lithuania at Chicago.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address on Tadeusz Kosciusko.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of Tuesday, February 7, 1950, entitled "Whose Way on Rivers?"

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Buffalo Courier.

Mr. CHESNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a patriotic prayer written by one of his constituents, Rev. Francis C. Young, known as the poet priest, pastor of St. Juliana's Church in Chicago.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject, Abraham Lincoln's Philosophy of Government Should Guide Us.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address by the distinguished minority leader, and in the other a statement by a distinguished clergyman, Rev. William H. Hudnut.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. WOODRUFF) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances; in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address on Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. TALLE (at the request of Mr. LECOMPTE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made before the Committee on Appropriations with respect to the conservation of forests.

Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on valley authorities by the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders heretofore entered.

SURPLUS POTATOES FOR NEEDY AMERICANS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, last week 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes were ordered into the process of destruction. The cost of that destruction is estimated at between thirty-one and one-fourth and fifty million dollars. In the First District of Massachusetts a great many potatoes are grown. They are available for human consumption. Massachusetts officials of the United States Department of Agriculture report that there are plenty of them. On Friday the authorities of Greenfield, Mass., requested me to see if I could find any way by which they could obtain some of these potatoes for consumption by needy people in that town. I obtained assurances from the Department of Agriculture here in Washington that it would cooperate in that effort. A survey of needs is being undertaken by the local clergy and the Council of Social Services of Greenfield. Their report will be available at 5 o'clock tomorrow. The State department of public welfare has assured us today that it would cooperate. If the Federal Department of Agriculture keeps its promise to me, those potatoes will be eaten, not destroyed. You will have a clear precedent under which you can assist your communities to get these potatoes to people who need them. All our communities are burdened by gigantic costs for welfare and assistance. This can reduce that bill in some degree. It will save the Federal Treasury between thirty-one and one-fourth and fifty million dollars.

In connection with remarks I made on Thursday with reference to the problem of disposing of surplus edible food commodities I stated that it occurred to me that all Members might like to know what the commodity inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation showed as to items other than potatoes, dried eggs, and dried milk as of December 31, 1949, and I added that I would ask permission to include these figures. Through inadvertence I did not include them in the revision of my remarks. So that the record may be complete, I want to place the entire list in the RECORD both as to amounts and as to the cost as contained in the official report of the Commodity Credit Corporation. They are:

Dried milk, 254,490,784 pounds	$31,615,535.72
Dried eggs, 49,445,878 pounds	98,645,444.68
Butter, 98,675,801 pounds	61,003,323.06
Cheese, 23,935,157 pounds	8,030,266.80
Prunes, 49,985,455 pounds	5,006,203.64
Raisins, 22,972,360 pounds	2,210,133.26
Edible dried beans, 4,850,795 hundredweight	42,859,926.40
Rice, 431,820 hundredweight	2,936,252.60
Turkeys, 725,480 pounds	309,173.80
Canned Mexican meat, 49,445,878 pounds	12,468,074.26

This involves a matter of approximately 277,480 tons of surplus commodities at a total cost of approximately $265,000,000.

In addition, of course, there are these 50,000,000 bushels of surplus edible potatoes which the Secretary stated last week would be destroyed in the next few weeks at a cost of between thirty-one and one-fourth million and fifty million dollars.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Lincoln Day speech delivered at Lock Haven, Pa., by Reverend Peters.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House on Thursday next for 15 minutes following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore granted.

J EDGAR HOOVER

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the mail which I am receiving from my home district is any indication, the people throughout the country have a great deal of faith in J. Edgar Hoover. I believe that his work with the FBI has put the country in good stead.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not have to get mail in order to have faith in J. Edgar Hoover. I have complete faith in that distinguished gentleman.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not either. I assure the gentleman that the statement which I made indicated how the people of my district feel, although I was well aware of it.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I not only have faith in J. Edgar Hoover, but if they will pass my resolution making the FBI an independent agency and take the hands of these subversives off of him, who are trying to hold him down, he would unmask a cabal of treachery in this country that would arouse the American people.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I believe his good work will help the country. It is my opinion that Congress could get nowhere without the invaluable exposures and information which the FBI has made available to the various committees. Or, to put it this way, few investigations conducted by Congress

would have borne fruit without the great helping hand of Mr. Hoover and his agency.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission was granted to Mr. MANSFIELD to address the House for 25 minutes today, following the other special orders.

By unanimous consent, permission was granted to Mr HOFFMAN of Michigan, to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

LINCOLN AND THE NEED TO FORGET PARTISANSHIP

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on this day thoughtful men and women not only in the United States of America but in countries throughout the world pause for a moment amid the conflicts of this modern age and think for a time of the life of Abraham Lincoln and thus receive an inspiration for rational tolerant thinking. I believe that it can be said that not only here in America but among all decent people throughout the world the memory of Abraham Lincoln is sacred. He is looked upon as a man of great and abiding tolerance and simple Christian faith. Despite these homely but eternal virtues, he was a man of prompt and profound decision. He believed in justice; justice for all men, real simple Christian justice. He stood ready at all times to effect reasonable compromise that would not destroy the attainment of his goals which were the abolishment of slavery and the preservation of the union. He dedicated himself to a complete understanding of these problems and when, with the aid of divine inspiration, he arrived at a just conclusion, he had the courage to meet derision, ridicule, and hate with simple but firm logic based on honest considerations without regard for mere expediency or temporary political advantage.

There are those in America today who like to claim that this proposal or that suggestion is to be found in the words and utterances of Jackson or Jefferson or Lincoln. No one can prophesy with certainty what the attitudes of these great men of the past would be if they were on the scene today. I am certain, however, that if we had the power to commune with the spirits of these great men and others of our past of like stature, I am certain they would give expression to the hope that the time would soon come when in the consideration of the great questions of human relations that are before the country today we might be able to forget the partisanship and sectionalism that is being manifested here in Congress just as it was in Lincoln's time. With but one motive in mind Lincoln had to stand by his convictions and fight members of his own Cabinet, his own generals, leaders of his own party, and many people who constantly denounced him on the platform and in the public press. History records that he went through a living hell in order to achieve the principles in which he believed. He finally laid down his life in order that freedom, unity, and justice might prevail.

It seems to me that we can well afford at this time of reflection to really dedicate ourselves to the consideration of these great social and economic problems in a spirit of tolerance. We should reject the sniping, snarling, bitter partisanship dedicated largely to politics and expediency which we find so often when we consider these questions and we should adjust ourselves and our thinking so that the problems will be solved. In my humble judgment the present time is so critical that we must act promptly or there will be greater danger than the Nation experienced during the days in which Lincoln occupied the Presidency.

As he resolved to bind up the Nation's wounds after the War Between the States, so let us here resolve to bind up the Nation's political and economic wounds with promptness and decision so that as one great people we can move forward together in the great battle that lies ahead against the forces of hate, avarice, greed, and intolerance that threaten us from within and from without.

RESPECT FOR PAST PRESIDENTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, or a few days ago, the press carried a cartoon that in my opinion was slanderous of a former President of the United States. I have never been one who advocated necessarily the domestic policies of Herbert Hoover, neither have I been one, because I might disagree with him, to speak disrespectfully or malign our former President. This cartoon is credited to a great organization, the American Legion, an organization to which I have belonged for the last 20 years and more.

It seems to me that that great organization, the American Legion, if it is not responsible for that cartoon, should immediately repudiate it. If they are responsible, they should hang their heads in shame, because Herbert Hoover, first of all, has been a great American, and I am sure he does not now, or ever did, subscribe to the implications of that cartoon.

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

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, Herbert Hoover is one of the great men of the world at the present time.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG SPEECH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, after the First World War I had the honor to be sent by an exchange of students to England to finish my law course and I there studied at the Inns of Court in London. During that time I had the opportunity to be on a sightseeing tour at Oxford University. I was taken through that great hall where all of the degrees had been conferred on such men as Mark Twain and other great Americans and Britishers. Up behind the chancel in that great hall, which might be said to be the birthplace of the English language, I found a copy of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address painted on the wall and below it this statement: "The finest example of English extant."

I was later talking to my professor of English and I asked him, "Do you people who love the English language agree to that?"

He said that the heads of Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, Aberystwyth, and other great English universities meet every year and one of the common discussions is the Lincoln Gettysburg Address. He said also, "They have torn it apart in every way and the only word about which there can be any question is the one where Lincoln said, 'dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal'." They said that a proposition was amenable only to a mathematical solution. Yet they looked around but could find no other word to take its place.

So that great statement ranks, in my opinion, and I think in the minds of most people who love the English language, as the finest use of that vehicle of expression. I am always proud when I realize that the British and the Australians who criticized us Americans for not getting into the war earlier, and said that we were only a money-grabbing country,

standing with them and pointing to that Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. I said, "Here is a man born in the forests of America, reading as he could just the Bible and Bunyan's Pilgrims' Progress, yet he gave expression in those words in the Gettysburg Address which you admit is the finest example of English extant." Lincoln proved that we had other interests beside just earning money.

My grandfather McSweeney happened to serve with Bob Ingersoll in the Star-Route trials in Washington. After my grandfather's death Ingersoll came to our house often and I remember my father saying, "Mr. Ingersoll, I find in your great utterances, especially on the platform, that you never tell a story to illustrate a point." And I was impressed as a boy with the fact that Mr. Ingersoll said, "I am not capable of weaving a story into my speech. In fact," he said, "there are only two persons in the history of oratory to my humble mind who were able to do it. One was Jesus Christ who by his parables was able to illustrate the thing at hand in a beautiful, beautiful but simple way, and the other was Abe Lincoln, whose stories fitted so perfectly into the remarks he was making."

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that Abe Lincoln is the embodiment of everything which is fine and noble that America has produced, and I, as an American, today am especially proud of his contribution not only to America's concepts of what is right and wrong, but, having been in Europe in the Army in both World Wars, I realize he has contributed to the world's concepts of what is right and wrong. And today we should bow our heads and thank God he was given to America in a great and crucial time of America's history.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REORGANIZATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak out against proposed legislation, based on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, to dismantle the Veterans' Administration by scattering most of its major functions among half a dozen Federal agencies. In my opinion, such legislation is contrary to established principles of sound public administration, and against the best interests of our veterans.

The Hoover Commission has proposed the following major changes in veterans' affairs: First, take all veterans' medical and hospital services from the Veterans' Administration and give them to a new medical agency; second, locate the veterans' hospital construction program in the Department of Interior; third, set up a new Veterans' Insurance Corporation to handle Government and national life insurance programs; and, fourth, place the loan-guaranty program of the GI bill of rights in a division of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. Speaker, such proposals ignore past administrative experience in the handling of veterans' affairs. You will recall that after World War I the various Federal services for veterans were administered by a number of agencies, separate and apart from each other. The result was confusion, inefficiency, and inadequate service for the veteran.

Finally the situation became so bad that in 1921 Congress enacted legislation Public Law 47, Sixty-seventh Congress—to establish the Veterans' Bureau as an independent agency reporting directly to the President. It was this agency that later evolved into the present Veterans' Administration which functions today as the single agency responsible for administering all services designed for the protection of the welfare of the veteran.

Now the Hoover Commission proposes that we break up this agency—that we go back to the chaotic state of veterans' affairs which existed prior to 1921. This is a step backward, and one that I intend to oppose, as a veteran, as a legislator, and as a citizen.

What has apparently been overlooked by the Hoover Commission in this instance is that reorganization is not an end in itself—that the purpose of any reorganization is to secure more efficient and economical service for the people involved. And there can be no doubt that the Commission recommendations on this matter, should they be accepted by Congress, would mean poorer service for American veterans

As a member of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I yield to no one in my desire to obtain through administrative reorganization greater economy and efficiency in Government. I am well aware that there is a real need for certain reforms in the Veterans' Administration. But the way to secure better service for our veterans is to reform the internal administration of the Veterans' Administration, not to destroy this valuable agency completely.

SURPLUS COMMODITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was much interested in what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] had to say about the need for some of the surplus food in his particular area. On January 12, a full month ago yesterday, I asked Mr. Brannan, who was then before our subcommittee, what would prevent him or what would prevent the Department of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, to make available to welfare groups and old-age recipients throughout the Nation such surplus products as potatoes, butter, eggs, and fruit. The answer was that the Commodity Credit Corporation did not have the necessary authority to pay out funds for freight to those central points, such as county seats.

It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, in the appropriation bill which will shortly come from our Subcommittee on Appropriations on Agriculture to attempt to make that authority available to the Department, provided that the legislative Committee on Agriculture has not by that time cleared that bottleneck. I think it is senseless to even think about destroying any of this food. Certainly, this Congress should rightly be criticized if we go along the line of reasoning that any of this good, edible food should be destroyed. It is to my mind un-Christian as well as being unnecessary.

Our entire price support program may fall because of public reaction against mounting surpluses. How can we take care of this problem?

First of all, we must prevent the bringing into this country of huge quantities of the very same commodities with which we are having difficulties. More than 5,000,000 bags of potatoes came across our border from Canada during the past 11 months. This means 10,000 carloads of potatoes in direct competition with our own product. Several shiploads of Canadian potatoes have recently arrived at eastern United States ports. Some of these are being sold in Washington today. Canadian shippers can pay the duty and freight and still undercut Maine potatoes in this market by 15 cents a bag. One wholesaler here admits to the purchase of 250,000 pounds of these potatoes. What is the answer? Raise the duty or declare an embargo against further imports while we have a surplus here.

Our Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, owns nearly 100,000,000 pounds of good creamery butter. It purchased this butter to hold up the price to 90 percent of parity for this producer. Yet, another branch of our Government, the State Department, has entered into agreements for the lowering of our 14-cents-per-pound duty down to 7 cents on a considerable amount of Danish and New Zealand butter. It was reported to me yesterday that some stores in Washington are today offering Danish butter 5 cents per pound cheaper than good creamery butter.

A third branch of our Government, the armed services, have bought millions of pounds of oleo for our servicemen, regardless of the fact that 100,000,000 pounds of good butter was on hand. We should give to the Department of Agriculture some say in the procurement of foods for other departments of Government. Certainly foods should be purchased through one general supply office aware of the fact that this huge quantity of butter was available, instead of new purchases of an inferior article, oleo, being made for our servicemen.

Further as to imports:

Let us glance at some other figures. From July to November, we imported

18,500,000 bushels of barley, even though Government stocks were on November 30 over 58,000,000 bushels.

From July to November we imported over 12,000,000 bushels of oats, even though Government stocks on November 30 were over 40,000,000 bushels.

From July to November, we imported 45,480 bags of dried beans, even though Government stocks were 9,000,000 bags.

From July to November, while hog prices skidded badly throughout the Midwest, we imported over 1,500,000 pounds of pork and pork products.

But worst of all: From July to November, we imported the equivalent of 90,000,000 shell eggs in shell, frozen, and dried form, most of them from Red China where the industry is being expanded and shipments increased.

It is ridiculous to import a large quantity of eggs, putting our market into such a position that in December and January throughout our district farmers were receiving from 20 to 25 cents per dozen for eggs. Is it good business to import eggs in the face of the huge stock of dried eggs owned by the Government and for which a market is not available?

Why does not this administration prohibit the bringing into the United States of huge quantities of the same farm products for which we have difficulty in maintaining parity for the producer? Can you understand the line of reasoning that permits these imports of competitive farm products? I cannot.

Secondly, we must not destroy food. On January 12, I suggested to Secretary Brannan that any surplus foods which could be used, should be made available to the old people of this Nation who are on old-age assistance. Also, these products could be distributed through the county welfare organizations in every county to people who could show that their children were not obtaining sufficient nourishing food because of lack of family income. It will be necessary to provide funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation to use for paying the freight on its surplus commodities to central points of distribution. It is far better to furnish this money than to permit good food to deteriorate and rot.

I would strongly urge that if this surplus food is made available to welfare organizations for distribution, that it be given to these organizations only on the condition that they do not use this food as a club to beat down the already pitifully small grants to our old people who are forced to be old-age recipients.

I would also strongly urge that the names of the families to whom these foods are distributed be kept confidential. Even in the school-lunch program today some communities unthinkingly publish the names of the children whose parents are unable to pay for their lunches. There is no reason to cause humiliation to anybody, children especially, if our surplus foods are placed into consumption through welfare channels. Let our own people eat this food if they need it and by all means let us not destroy good food.

RABBIT WEEK

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a proclamation by the mayor of the city of Glendale, Calif.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of the city of Glendale, Calif., is in Washington in his personal capacity, but in his official capacity he has brought to me a proclamation which he has made in conjunction with matters which will be apparent when I read his proclamation:

Whereas I have been requested to proclaim Rabbit Week from February 12 to 18, at a time when citizens generally should recognize the excellent qualities of rabbits as a food for human consumption; and

Whereas rabbits are known to multiply very rapidly, but are greatly outdistanced in the rapid multiplication of the tax load upon our people; and

Whereas the rapid multiplication of the taxes of our country makes it advisable that our people should know of all available sources of food supply if we are to have any money left after tax payments to purchase any food; and

Whereas many people know very little of rabbits, except a belief they come from magicians' hats, and likewise many legislators and commissioners empowered to levy taxes seemingly know very little of dollars except a hazy belief they grow on trees, and

Whereas the rapid multiplication of the rabbit specie, when in the wild state, causes them to become pests, furnishing us an example of concern that if the rapid multiplication of the tax load is not curtailed, the people might go wild and likewise become pests; and

Whereas rabbits are herbagors—that is, animals that graze, illustrating further concern that if the tax load is not lessened, the people might become herbagers, thus taking from the rabbits a long-cherished right of grazing in the fields, resulting in unfair competition to the rabbits, with extended hearings, long-drawn-out litigation, and inevitable bureaucratic regulations over grazing rights between long-eared rabbits and long-suffering taxpayers, all of which is contrary to the peace, dignity, and comity between fast-running rabbits and fast-sinking taxpayers:

Now, therefore, I, George R Wickham, mayor of Glendale, Calif., a city of over 100,000 cultural, well-behaved, loyal, and patriotic citizens, do hereby call upon the Congress of the United States, State legislatures, county commissioners, boards of supervisors, city councils, and all taxing agencies so pyramidally engrafted upon our beloved Nation, to take note that rabbits are a delicious food, containing nutriment and vitamins of sustaining and healthful value; but at the same time to remember and heed that multiplication of taxes, like unrestrained multiplication of rabbits, is neither conducive to the public welfare nor necessary to the pursuit of happiness.

Witness my hand this 1st day of February 1950.

GEORGE R. WICKHAM,
Mayor of the City of Glendale, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Altoona Tribune of February 11 entitled "Was Lincoln a Reactionary?"

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, how much is this going to cost?

Mr. RICH. It is just one of those items that are being put in every day by every Member.

Mr. HUBER. I read the RECORD every day, and every day it costs $80 a page. Some day we have got to stop saving money somewhere.

Mr. RICH. Stop saving money? That is the trouble with you. You are not trying to stop saving money.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the impression made by the gentleman from Ohio. It does not cost $80 a page. All it costs is the ink and the paper. We already have the machinery running and the people employed to print the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. RICH. It may not cost $80 for that, but if the gentleman from Ohio will read it and if Members of the Congress will heed it, it will save you billions of dollars. Heed it.

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

There was objection.

THE POTATO SITUATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] on his very frank statement in pointing out that the Secretary of Agriculture at the present time does not have authority to pay the freight on surplus potatoes when they are for human consumption. I also wish to point out the difference in the frankness and fairness of the gentleman from Minnesota as compared to other Members on the minority side who during the past few days have apparently sought to cast some blame on the Secretary of Agriculture in the potato situation. There certainly can be no blame justifiably put on the Secretary in that matter, because the antiadministration coalition in Congress passed the present law over the protest of the administration. The administration's bill would have provided that those potatoes go to the American consumer at whatever price they would bring. The potatoes would have been eaten at this time at a cheaper price to the consumer rather than lying there and rotting, as they are now.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 466)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President

of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the budget message for 1951, I stated that there is some question whether some of the training being received by veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is conforming to the original sound objectives of the law. I also said that I had asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to study this situation thoroughly and to recommend to me any corrective measures, administrative or legislative, which should be taken to assure that our expenditures for this program yield a proper return both to the veterans and to the Nation as a whole.

The contribution which the Servicemen's Readjustment Act has made to the postwar development of the Nation's most important resource—its young men and women—is very great. It is now approximately 4 years after general demobilization. During these 4 years the overwhelming proportion of all veterans have completed their readjustment or moved far in that direction. For the great majority of those who have made use of the education and training provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, the law has been of real and lasting service. A great deal of fine education and training has been provided. The Nation will be better prepared to face the difficult problems of the future because of the improved education and skills provided to millions of its worthy and capable young men and women.

Because the law has contributed effectively to the successful transition of so many veterans, I am confident that veterans and nonveterans alike will wish to see that the record of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act shall not be blemished by the belated growth of certain kinds of trade and vocational training which do not contribute materially to the prompt and constructive readjustment of veterans. It was this conviction which led me to ask for a careful study of this aspect of the veterans' training program.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget have now reported to me. Their report makes it clear that the recent rapid increase in trade and vocational training has included training of less than acceptable quality. In a number of cases veterans have not received instruction which meets reasonable standards. In a good many instances veterans have been trained for occupations for which they are not suited or for occupations in which they will be unable to find jobs when they finish their training.

It seems evident that each time a course of trade and vocational training does not contribute in a substantial way to the occupational readjustment of a veteran; it constitutes a failure of that portion of the program. Such failure is costly to the veteran, to his family, and to the Nation. While nothing that we may do can entirely eliminate such failures, I feel that steps can and should be taken to give greater assurance that every trade and vocational course under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act will provide good quality training and will in each instance help a veteran to complete his occupational readjustment and find satisfactory employment.

The report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which I transmit herewith, contains recommendations to achieve this purpose. I commend the report to the Congress. In the interest of veterans as individuals and in the interest of the Nation, I urge that the Congress take suitable action, as it has done previously with respect to other types of training, to assure that all trade and vocational training conforms with the original sound intent of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 13, 1950.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a report from the Committee on Un-American Activities on Faker Einstein.

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

There was no objection.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have heard many fine addresses here with regard to Lincoln's Birthday. Coming from the Abraham Lincoln district in Illinois, I want to say a few words on this occasion.

Mr. Lincoln was, without question, one of the greatest Presidents of all time, and he has merited the praise that has been extended him. However, we have idolized him and praised him to such an extent that we have a tendency to forget that this great President was also a human being. His life's story relates and vividly impresses us with the fact that he made mistakes. He was a failure as a shopkeeper and was adjudged by many people in his own community as shiftless and a certain failure in life. He was defeated in political life just as many of us have been at some time or other. He was human like most of us living today. Perhaps it is this background that contributed so much to his greatness by instilling in his heart love for his fellow men.

Lincoln was a humble man, and it was this humility that made him a really great man. I think that he would prefer to be remembered today as the person he really was, a human being.

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply impressed with an article about Abraham Lincoln in one of the weekly newspapers in my district. This article was written by the editor of the Macoupin County Enquirer and I feel that it exemplifies my feelings as to what Abraham Lincoln would like to have said on this day.

It included an autobiography written by Lincoln himself. I would like to include that in the RECORD on this occasion.

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

There was no objection.

CHASING HEADLINES WITH W. L. SCHMITT

Sunday is Abraham Lincoln's birthday. Noting that fact, I got down some of my Lincoln books with the idea of writing a sketch appropriate to the occasion. The books are fascinating, and the evening was gone almost before I knew it.

The reading carried me in memory to visits that I have been privileged to make * * * to the Lincoln home and tomb in Springfield, and the feeling of awe that filled my heart as I moved silently through the rooms where he had lived, loved and labored * * * and how I felt I was in the presence of that great man as I stood in the inner room of his tomb and read the line. "And now he belongs to the ages."

One of the ambitions of my life, and one which I hope one day to realize is to visit his birthplace in Kentucky, and the wonderful stone structure that covers the tiny log cabin which was the Lincoln home in 1809; to visit the site of the Lincoln home in Spencer county, Indiana, where the State of Indiana has recently finished a memorial structure, not far from the modest tombstone that marks the grave of Nancy Hanks Lincoln; the magnificent Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D C, where each year millions are drawn by its splendor and by the everlasting greatness of that lonely man from the Illinois prairies.

Then I came to this conclusion: So much has been written about Lincoln, by competent students of his life, that it would indeed be a brave person who would attempt to set down anything new. On top of that I was intrigued more than ever by Lincoln's own autobiography, the only one he is known to have written. He penned it for use in his 1860 campaign for the Presidency. Its brevity and simple language, together with the manner in which he plays down his difficulties in gaining an education, bring it almost to the rating of a classic

Let's read it again:

"I was born February 12, 1809, in Hardin County, Ky. My parents were both born in Virginia, of undistinguished families—second families, perhaps I should say. My mother, who died in my tenth year, was of a family of the name of Hanks, some of whom now reside in Adams, and others in Macon County, Ill. My paternal grandfather, Abraham Lincoln, emigrated from Rockingham County, Va., to Kentucky about 1781 or 1782, where a year or two later he was killed by the Indians, not in battle, but by stealth, when he was laboring to open a farm in the forest. His ancestors, who were Quakers, went to Virginia from Berks County, Pa. An effort to identify them with the New England family of the same name ended in nothing more definite than a similarity of Christian names in both families, such as Enoch, Levi, Mordecai, Solomon, Abraham, and the like.

"My father, at the death of his father, was but 6 years of age, and he grew up literally without education. He removed from Kentucky to what is now Spencer County, Ind., in my eighth year. We reached our new home about the time the State came into the Union. It was a wild region, with many bears and other wild animals still in the woods. There I grew up. There were some schools, so-called, but no qualification was ever required of a teacher beyond 'readin', writin', and cipherin',' to the rule of three.

If a straggler supposed to understand Latin happened to sojourn in the neighborhood, he was looked upon as a wizard. There was absolutely nothing to excite ambition for education. Of course, when I came of age I did not know much. Still, somehow, I could read, write, and cipher to the rule of three, but that was all. I have not been to school since. The little advance I now have upon this store of education, I have picked up from time to time under the pressure of necessity.

"I was raised to farm work, which I continued till I was 22. At 21 I came to Illinois, Macon county. Then I got to New Salem, at that time in Sangamon, now in Menard county, where I remained a year as a sort of a clerk in a store. Then came the Black Hawk War, and I was elected a captain of volunteers, a success which gave me more pleasure than any I have had since. I went into the campaign, was elected, ran for the legislature the same year (1832), and was beaten—the only time I ever had been beaten by the people. The next and three succeeding biennial elections I was elected to the legislature. During this legislative period I had studied law, and removed to Springfield to practice it. In 1846 I was once elected to the lower House of Congress. Was not a candidate for re-election. From 1849 to 1854, both inclusive, practiced law more assiduously than ever before. Always a Whig in politics; and generally on the Whig electoral tickets, making active canvasses. I was losing interest in politics when the repeal of the Missouri Compromise aroused me again. What I have done since that is pretty well known.

"If any personal description of me is thought desirable, it may be said I am, in height, 6 feet 4 inches, nearly; lean in flesh, weighing on an average 180 pounds; dark complexion, with coarse black hair and grey eyes. No other marks or brands recollected."

The times of Washington seem so remote that it is hard to realize that the men who founded our Nation really existed But in the case of Lincoln, when we consider that he was familiar with the community in which we live and men and women we knew knew him, we can visualize the tall and silent, tragic Lincoln as very human, and very near and dear to us. He was a great and good man, born destined to blot out a great national shame—slavery, and to reunite a Nation torn by rebellion That was Lincoln, and as he might have said: "No other marks or brands recollected."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party was born in the State of Wisconsin. As a son of that commonwealth, it is fitting and proper for me to acknowledge that the first and greatest leader of that party was Abraham Lincoln. As time marches on his stature increases in depth and in glory. His contemporaries were unable to measure the meaning of his simple language or his humanitarianism. Time only has added increased lustre to this immortal figure.

Today, Mr. Speaker, as we observe his birthday we instinctively turn to him. We know him now as the man who was born of humble people under circumstances that were indeed set in the full atmosphere of the hardy pioneer. We see him as the railsplitter, as the young captain in wars against the Indians. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, the story is told that when the war against the Blackhawks was over, young Lincoln was mustered out of military service in my district at Whitewater, Wis. From that city he walked to his home in Illinois. We also see Lincoln as the lawyer who rode the circuit of the courts in his State. He was never the great legal expert, but his ability to find the facts and apply them with uncanny, but homely logic, was unmatched anywhere in his State. We see him again as the politician in this very House of Representatives and later as he matched his wit with Douglas in the celebrated Lincoln-Douglas debates over the issue of slavery. Still later we see him as he speaks to his friends and neighbors in Springfield when he starts his journey to Washington—never to return.

Mr. Speaker, Lincoln's elevation to the Presidency would have been impossible without his wit and oratory and his matchless ability to speak in simple understandable language. No more beautiful English has ever been written.

Lincoln gave apt expression to the hopes that rested in the hearts of men when he declared the principles upon which a free government must rest—as, by, and for the people. Many other heroes—civil, military, and religious are forgotten, but the great Lincoln has become a symbol of liberty all over the world. To him human rights transcended all others, yet, he recognized the right to own property. It was he who said that no one had the right to destroy his neighbor's property. Likewise, he condemned the unwise use of property for selfish purposes and particularly monopolistic practices.

Mr. Speaker, this should be a day of soul-searching for Republicans as our party members join to laud the memory of our Great Emancipator. What would Lincoln say of conditions today and what kind of a program would he advocate? In 30 years we have won two World Wars ostensibly to make liberty and freedom safe for people everywhere. After the first victory we lost the peace at the peace conference. Five years after the second victory we are impotent to write a peace with our own allies. And today the world is half slave and half free as was our own country in 1860.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the Black Hawk War when Abraham Lincoln was sworn in as a captain in the United States Army, the oath was administered to him by Col. Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi. If those great men could come back here today and see the communistic drives that are being made to undermine and destroy this Government, they would join hands in the fight to save America for Americans.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. What would Lincoln say about bungling statesmanship which sacrificed principles for expediency at Cairo, Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam? What would he do today as he considered the A- and H-bombs—as he considered the arms race now in progress between a free society and a slave society? He perhaps would not point an accusing finger at anyone, but he would face the facts as they are and then apply his simple logic to them.

We face imponderables today as Lincoln faced them before the Civil War. By his wisdom he saved the Union and now we are challenged to do our part to save the world—civilization—against total devastation that must follow world war III.

In considering the problems of today I believe that Lincoln would declare that if people are to be free, then the individual is supreme. He would further state that government must always be the servant of the people, never its master. I also believe that he would insist upon the right of a people to determine the form of government under which they would live—the right of self-determination. To preserve this principle Lincoln would go to war.

What would Lincoln say about the infiltration of subversive elements in high Government positions, and about "red herrings," and the conviction of a former high official in the State Department who lied about his part in a scheme to pass on valuable informaiton to an enemy? What would he think about the Secretary of State who defended this man after his conviction? Where would he place these people who would destroy their own Government from within? We know the answer because Lincoln went to war to preserve the Union.

Mr. Speaker, the Great Emancipator was on his knees when searching for guidance in those dark days of the Civil War. We should follow his example as we face destruction by the atom bombs. The very great need of this day is to renew the spirit that permeated the heart and mind of Abraham Lincoln. That is the challenge to every American regardless of party; to make sure that this country will not be destroyed from within. Again we are called upon to save the Union against those within who would substitute a world government for one that has given the highest standard of living for any people on the face of the earth. It must not be destroyed. Long may the land of Lincoln thwart the ambitions of dictators. Here there must be one people, free and indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. STEED]. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TWO-PARTY GOVERNMENT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the strangest and at the same time most interesting incidents that has happened recently is that where Thomas Stokes took occasion to criticize the Republican Party because it was not more effective. Over the years, as most of us know, Mr. Stokes has taken occasion to criticize, shall I say—that is a mild term when used with his writing—criticize all those who opposed the administration. Time and time again he has taken Republicans over the coals, blistering them without cause—attempting always to discredit them. Then a few months ago he came out with a column in which he stated

that it was just too bad that the Republican Party was not more effective in its opposition to the New Deal because he said it was necessary that we have in this country a two-party Government. After doing everything within his power to tear down the Republican Party he bemoans the fact it is not stronger in its opposition to the New Deal which he evidently now thinks is dangerous to the Nation's welfare. Not long ago the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] stated that he believed in two-party government, and I am sure he does. But let me show you just what is happening here in Congress to the two-party system. Last year, when the majority Democrats took over the committees, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] became chairman of the Standing House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is a member of that committee. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], our former majority leader when the Republicans were in power, was a member of that committee. The chairman, after consultation with, I assume, the majority members, anyway, after consultation with someone, named the majority members of five subcommittees of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments.

I happen to be the ranking minority member of that committee. We Republicans consulted—I was their ranking man—about naming the minority members of that committee. We did. We got along very well last year in committee; very well indeed.

Under the two-party system and established practice the majority party always insists upon a majority of each standing and special committees being members of the majority party. The majority party leaves to the minority party the naming of minority members of each standing and special committee.

In practice, the minority leadership, after consulting minority Members, sends to the Speaker the names of the minority members of the various committees. The Speaker appoints those so named to the designated committees.

When the committees are organized the majority selects the majority members of the staff and the minority members, acting through the ranking minority member, name the members of the minority staff.

A similar practice is followed when members of the various subcommittees are selected; that is to say, the ranking minority member usually, after consulting with his fellow minority members, names the minority members of all subcommittees.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], who is an ardent supporter of antidiscrimination legislation, has not, in my opinion, as chairman of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, followed a course of nondiscrimination.

When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] took over as chairman in 1949 the usual and customary procedure was followed. He, as chairman, named the majority members of five subcommittees. As ranking minority member I named the minority members of the same five subcommittees.

Recently some investigations have been under way where testimony was given reflecting adversely upon at least one administrative agency.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] wrote a minority report criticizing more severely than did the majority report written by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] the negligence of the Maritime Commission members and also suggesting strongly that the law be amended.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has had some experience as an investigator and is not endeared to New Deal bureaucrats.

At the opening of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], disregarding the two-party system and the established practice and custom, removed the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], in spite of his protest, from the Government Operations Subcommittee, but retained a new minority member on three of the five subcommittees.

In addition to the question of whether Wickard and the administration has in the Department of Agriculture something to cover up—as undoubtedly it has in the State Department—is a minor one. The real question is whether we shall have a two-party government or whether we shall, in theory, have two parties, but actually one party—the majority party—as in this instance, dominating the minority members, telling the minority who shall and who shall not be on subcommittees. That is one-party government.

It is easy to see why, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] is permitted to have his way, we will have not only "me-too-ism" in the minority members of the subcommittees and committees, but we will have "yes men"—men who, for one reason or another, will go along blindly and submissively with the House leadership.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] talks against discrimination, but here is a concrete example of how, when given authority, he exercises it.

There are others with similar views and practices.

Then last week, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]—and I regard him very highly as one of my personal friends—we get along all right—called me up and he said: "We want you to come up to a subcommittee meeting. We have something very important that is coming up in connection with the General Accounting Office. We also have some hearings that have to do with the REA and I would like to have you on that." I had attended the previous hearings.

I went up. But in the meantime I discovered I was not on the committee. So I left. Some folks would say, "I took my doll and went home." Why not? We were not going to be permitted to play there anyway. Lo and behold, here last Thursday, if that is the last day we were in session, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] came over and he said, "I want you to come up here to a subcommittee meeting on Monday." I said, "I cannot do that because I am not on the committee." "Oh," he says, "come on up." "No, I cannot do it," I said. "I remember what the Irishman said: 'On again, off again, Finnegan.' I cannot do that." He says, "We need you." I said, "Sure, somebody has got to turn the grindstone and you want old man HOFFMAN around. He is willing to do it and sometimes he likes it especially if it happens to hit anyone over here who is carrying water on both shoulders."

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am wondering why the gentleman had to be around when they wanted somebody to turn the grindstone?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts I guess it is because I am something of a sap. I do not know what else it can be.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot permit the gentleman to find himself guilty of that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman cannot permit me to convict myself?

Mr. McCORMACK. I find the gentleman not guilty of being a sap and if I were a judge I would not accept the gentleman's confession.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is not the judge and he is not the jury.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sitting here on the floor of the House. I am one of the judges.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. The gentleman is an innocent bystander.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman, as I said, is just an innocent bystander.

I may also say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that when I was practicing law I always delighted in suing a banker or some big corporation for the poor devil or the farmer boy when he got skinned out of his horses. He would go down to Jockey Street and get skinned out of his team. I would much rather sue the rich and powerful than the poor fellow who usually had no one to help him. The powerful always have some one to protect them. You know, I was always a meddler in legal affairs of the unfortunate, but as an isolationist not so much in European affairs.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] came along and he said "Come on down." "No," I said, "why are you so anxious?" He said, "The rest of the Republicans are all out of town." He said, "RIEHLMAN and LOVRE, have gone, and we will not have any Republicans there, and that will not look good." Well, I said, "I am not going to turn any grindstones this time." He said, "Will you not do this for me?" "No," I said, "I cannot do that, because the chairman of the full committee has taken all of my assumed authority, or whatever it was—I thought I had some and the Republicans had some away from me; so, I cannot do that."

Now, here I am, and I am not sure that I am even going to be on any subcommittee any more. What I would like to know, and that is why I asked the gentleman from Massachusetts to stay around here, as long as he believes in this two-party system, does he not think that if we have two parties that the minority party ought to be able to run its own affairs?

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will be delighted, and happy.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman misunderstands the situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Maybe so.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But I am out.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, let us see.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am still sore where your chairman kicked me.

Mr. McCORMACK. When the gentleman from Michigan says he is out, I do not want the gentleman from Michigan to be out at any time. I have too much respect for the gentleman to be out when he should be in. This subcommittee the gentleman from Michigan is talking about is the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] is chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr McCORMACK. Is it not a fact that last year the representation was increased on the Republican side by one Member and one on the Democratic side?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. On that particular subcommittee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman says does not concern any other subcommittee. There has been no Republican taken off any other subcommittee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, there has been one put on on another, on the Holifield subcommittee, without consulting the minority.

Mr. McCORMACK. When the gentleman from Michigan was put on there, there was a Democrat put on; I do not know just who it was.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. HOLIFIELD.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now he was taken off the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. So, naturally, the gentleman being his opposite going on at that time would come off also.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, no. Listen.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right. But there is an honest difference of opinion there. I suggested this to my friend. He came over and spoke to me on the floor and I said, "Certainly, I will be glad to look into it, and you ought to go and see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], who is very considerate," and the first thing I knew, I picked up the RECORD and I found that my friend had made a speech before he came to see me.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And I told the gentleman when I saw him that I had.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I did not hear it, and I accept the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is why I am making another one now that the gentleman is here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, I do not like to enter into any discussion with my friend, because I went to look at the RECORD and see what the gentleman said. My understanding also is that the gentleman, as ranking minority member, is ex officio a member of all subcommittees.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Ex officio?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all I am.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, the gentleman is the leader on that side.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am proud of the fact that I am ex officio a member of all subcommittees, so that being so, if the gentleman is the ranking minority Member of that side he is ex officio a member of all subcommittees.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Ex officio?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can participate in any subcommittee hearings. I can vote.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no. Only because our committee expressly authorizes it. And our committee list does not so state. I am not listed as a committee member ex officio.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I can; that is understood. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], being a member of the committee, by reason of being majority leader, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], by reason of being the ranking minority member, as I understand, are ex officio members of all subcommittees.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right as to the chairman of the committee. I do not know whether as majority leader the gentleman is a member ex officio of all subcommittees.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, if that is right, I have won my case.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no, the gentleman has not, and I will tell him why. Now, you just listen to me, will you?

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree that the matter should be looked into in order to have harmonious relationships. If the gentleman is disturbed——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Terribly disturbed.

Mr. McCORMACK. How is that?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Terribly disturbed on behalf of my party; not on my own behalf.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I used the "disturbed" advisedly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Harmonious relationship between the two parties in the House is a matter that should always be maintained. It should always be maintained in the committee. I suggest to my friend that he let the matter rest, and let us get into a huddle. I think we can adjust the situation very quickly without using the House as a sounding board, yet that does not concern me any. However, the way to have harmony exist is through discussion and negotiation first. Then, if you cannot find a harmonious solution, take the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did try to bargain collectively, but I did not get anywhere.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman came to me after he made his speech.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; but I tried to talk to the chairman before that. I told him I wanted to stay on that subcommittee, but he kicked me off. I do not like to be kicked off by one who is all out to eliminate discrimination.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman then came to me. If there was a clash of personalities, which I do not admit, he then came to me as a conciliator. Is that right?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right; and as one who stands for the two-party system, who wants to see it work.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but the gentleman came to me after he made his outburst.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As a conciliator.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why did not the gentleman come beforehand?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman was not around. I was off. I did not even know I was off until I went upstairs last week and saw my name had been stricken from the subcommittee list.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but there was a Democrat taken off who was put on at the same time the gentleman was put on, so the gentleman was not discriminated against. There is an honest misunderstanding at the most.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I ask for 5 minutes more if he is going to keep on.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thought we were having a little friendly colloquy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We are.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want it to continue or not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Go ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no desire to continue. I made out my case a long time ago.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will dispel the dust the gentleman has kicked up.

What the gentleman says about the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] having been on the top of that particular subcommittee and my having been on the other side on the top of that particular subcommittee is true. There is no question about that. But instead of putting the newly elected Democratic Member from California on there in place of Mr. HOLIFIELD, who is from California, and keeping the thing balanced as to

numbers, they do not put him on but they take the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] off and they take me off.

My point is this: The chairman of the full committee does that without consulting the minority. Perhaps the minority would like to have me on that particular committee and the low man on our side taken off. That was not done. I got the rumor straight from the Agriculture Department that one reason why I was kicked off is that Mr. Wickard, whose REA is up for investigation—and that is what was up last week—did not want me on there.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman is on there ex officio.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, ex officio. I am an "ex"; all right; do not worry about that.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all I am. The gentleman is on it just as much as I am. I am an ex officio member, and I have the right to participate and I have the right to vote. So ex officio means that instead of assigning me to every subcommittee, it is a blanket order, and I am on there. So is the gentleman from Michigan. As far as that committee is concerned, the gentleman has a higher honor than any ranking minority member on any other committee. I do not think the gentleman will find the ranking minority member of any other committee an ex officio member of a subcommittee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I have five additional minutes?

Mr. McCORMACK. So the gentleman has been more highly honored by the Committee on Expenditures than any other ranking minority member has been by any other committee of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now he says that I am doubly honored because I am still ex officio. Sure. But before, I was ex officio I was also one of the regular subcommittee. You took away half of me, anyway. You cannot get around the proposition, I may say to the majority leader, that you denied the minority the right to say who should be on the subcommittee. If you gave us only 2 men on the Hardy committee, it was up to the minority to name those two and you cannot get away from it.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. In all of this colloquy we have had, perhaps the gentleman from Michigan did not interpret my mind properly. Probably I did not express myself adequately enough.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We have used enough words.

Mr. McCORMACK. But assuming always that the gentleman is astute, so that he can penetrate a person's mind and see what is in there, he would have known that I think his argument about being left off the committee is unnecessary, because he is a member of the committee ex officio.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I got that "ex officio."

Mr. McCORMACK. On that question, yes, it should be discussed. I will agree that that is a matter that should be discussed. I am sure if the gentleman had discussed it before talking the matter would have been solved very, very easily. I am sure if we get together after this thing is over—if we get together with the chairman of the committee and the full committee the gentleman will be very happy, at which time I know he will be glad to come on the floor of the House and express his happiness.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I do not need to get together with my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, or the gentleman from Illinois, as long as the gentleman from Massachusetts says the matter is going to be discussed. I am going to be satisfied. I know how it is going to come out, at least I think I do, and will come to the floor and express my satisfaction if the action is satisfactory.

Mr. McCORMACK. That pleases me very, very much.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, then we are all happy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEED). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 25 minutes.

THE SMOKE-JUMPER STORY—AERIAL FIRE DEPOT AND STORAGE GARAGE NEAR MISSOULA, MONT.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, most of the virgin commercial timber left in the United States lies in the far away places of our western mountains. There on State, private, and Federal lands are the pines, the firs, and the cedars—timber stored on the stump, timber ready and waiting for its harvest, lumber and other forest products for national use, security, and prosperity. Intermingled with this older timber, young trees are growing to replace the parents trees—a new timber crop to supply the needs of future American families.

Much of this national resource, especially on the publicly owned national forests, is wilderness, long miles beyond the reach of present-day roads, traversed only by rough and winding trails for foot and horse, and ever these are few. Under good forest management and protection the young trees will live on and grow, the land will produce successive timber and other crops in a sustained yield.

But when, in dry western weather, lightning strikes, or men become careless, the aspects change. When wildfire takes over, both present and future are threatened. Instead of resource production, there is resource destruction. Everybody loses when timber burns. Forage for domestic livestock, food for wildlife, watershed cover, recreation values, and the very soil itself, burn with the timber. When wildfire attacks our remote western forests, time is of the essence. And the essence of wildfire control is speed.

In similar pursuits infantry and cavalry have largely given way to airborne troops, and in the West, footmen and horsemen have given way to airborne fire fighters who spearhead the attack on distant forest fires. These trained experienced fire fighters from the sky are called smoke-jumpers. In June 1949, four smoke-jumpers from Missoula, Mont., gave a demonstration in Washington. Fully equipped, they jumped from their cruising Ford trimotor to the Ellipse between the Monument and the White House grounds. They made good landings and cargo supplies were then dropped to them as a part of the show. The exhibition was greatly enjoyed by a large Capitol crowd. It was also televised.

It should be noted that in over 12,000 jumps no jump fatalities have occurred. Actual fire fighting on the ground is very hazardous and takes human toll in spite of all precautions.

Many newspaper and magazine pieces have been and are being written about the smoke-jumpers and they are the subject of several proposed motion pictures. The purpose, life, achievements, fortunes and welfare of this unique organization of young volunteers are of public interest, countrywide.

It is with the welfare of the smoke-jumpers and a confidence in their value to forest protection that we are concerned. Here are the basic facts and essential needs:

First. Shortly after World War I, the Army Air Corps and the United States Forest Service started cooperation on aerial fire detection in the West. This first step was the spotting and reporting of forest fires by flying patrol. The late Gen. H. H. Arnold figured prominently in this early phase.

Second. Cargo dropping of supplies and equipment to ground fire-fighting crews was first employed by the Forest Service on actual fires in 1929. Six years later this had become a practical means of supplying fire crews in the back country.

Third. Successful cargo-dropping led to the proposal that airplanes and parachutists might also be used for transporting fire-fighters. For years this idea was regarded as a hair-brained scheme. In 1934 and subsequent years, quick-opening, partly steerable, and reasonably safe passenger parachutes were developed. Knowledge increased.

Fourth. Smoke-jumping as a modern means of forest-fire control was western-born in 1939. Dummy tests were made in advance of some 60 live jumps. Hardy aerial pioneers landed safely in green timber, mountain meadows, open-ridge tops, and on steep, boulder-strewn slopes in the high country. There were no injuries of consequence.

Fifth. The first practical use of smoke-jumpers on actual fires came in 1940. Small squads functioned in Washington, Idaho, and Montana. Missoula-based jumpers hit and handled nine fires during a bad lightning season. An analysis of these indicated a net over-all savings

of approximately $30,000 or nearly three times the cost of the entire project.

The same year a smoke-jumper made the first rescue jump to a crashed plane and the first jump doctor was trained to care for injured fire-fighters and for medical aid in other far country emergencies. Also, four United States Army officers came to the parachute training camp at Missoula to study Forest Service jumping equipment and techniques. This was one of the first steps in the development of Army airborne troops.

Sixth. In 1941 the smoke-jumper project for the Inland Empire was transferred wholly to and centered at Missoula to serve Montana and parts of adjoining States. The Forest Service used and trained 26 men. A commercial flying service provided ships and pilots. The jumpers handled nine fires with an estimated saving of $35,000 in fire-fighting costs, plus an unestimated amount of timber and watershed values.

Seventh. In the last decade smoke jumping has proven of enormous value in forest-fire control. By quickly reaching remote fires, smoke-jumpers save natural resources. They also save costs, thousands of dollars, by getting to and controlling small fires before these young blazes swell into roaring infernos, expensive, dangerous, and difficult to handle.

It is estimated that in 1945 a net saving of over $254,000 in suppression costs was effected. It is conceivable that many of the fires handled when small could, with control delayed, have gone over the hill and grown to a suppression cost of that much for a single fire. The losses to growing timber and watershed would probably have been very large. When the timberlands of Montana and Idaho are attacked by as high as 1,000 fires in a 10 day dry, lightning period, many of the hot spots are from 1 to 2 days distant by ground travel. But they can be reached by air in from 1 to 3 hours. Then a few men can handle a blaze that could otherwise become a major fire requiring the efforts of several hundred men. As an extreme comparison, it is said that the Forest Service can put smoke-jumpers on a fire 600 miles away faster than ground forces can reach a smoke only 10 or 15 miles past a road's end.

Eighth. Smoke-jumping is no longer regarded as a harebrained idea, it is an established practical project. The system is used to protect national forest, national park, State, and private timberlands from just north of the Mexican border in Arizona to the Canadian line, and in Canada also. The first Dominion jumpers were Forest Service trained at Missoula, their instructors still attend Forest Service jump-training schools for refresher courses. During World War II our own Five Hundred and Fifty-fifth Battalion of Negro paratroopers were trained by Missoula instructors in timber jumping and fire fighting to combat the expected Japanese balloon fires.

Paradoctor and rescue-work training have also been carried on.

That is a résumé of smoke-jumper history and of the chief facts. Now, as given me by the United States Forest Service, here are the essential smoke-jumper needs:

First. The Forest Service smoke-jumper and aerial fire-control program has outgrown the available facilities at Missoula, Mont. Up to the present time, development of the physical plant from which the smoke-jumpers operate has not kept pace with other progress. In fact, no substantial investment has been made in quarters, kitchens, mess halls, sanitary facilities, warehouses, control rooms, flying fields, and so forth, at the Missoula base. Using all possible safety precautions, the facilities that were available have had to serve. The Forest Service is limited by law as to the amount and type of improvements that can be made in rented facilities with Government funds. Now the welfare of 150 jumpers is affected.

Second. Quarters: During the fire season the men are housed and messed in an old county warehouse at the fairground adjacent to Hale Field on the outskirts of Missoula. This building lacks sanitation and is woefully inadequate. Many of the men are forced to sleep outside next to riding-club horse corrals. The kitchen and mess hall accommodating 50 men are part of the same building. This causes further congestion and aggravates the inadequate and unsanitary set-up. This makeshift building does not begin to meet minimum standards. It is unsightly and unsatisfactory and gives the men little comfort or pride.

Third. Other buildings: Two old CCC buildings placed together on a temporary foundation serve as parachute loft—repacking, repairs, and so forth—dispatch and administrative office, smoke-jumper equipment storage and ready room—briefing and suiting up. This is inadequate and inefficient; even by taking all reasonable precautions, it is still a firetrap. Even so, the Forest Service is forced to keep not less than $85,000 worth of jumper equipment stored there. This is specially designed equipment, its replacement is difficult and slow.

Fourth. Flying field: Hale Field is Missoula County land. Its runways are gravel, unlighted, and rather short for some of the aircraft in use such as the C-47. It is close to dangerous mountain obstructions. The Army Air Force will not land at Hale Field, indicating that they believe it unsafe for use by the larger modern aircraft. This is unhandy since they work with the Forest Service under cooperative agreement. Also, at times, freight must be trucked from Hale Field to another airport to be picked up by C-47's. Abandonment of Hale Field seems certain at a very early date and considerable local pressure is directed toward that objective.

In the aerial fire-fighting game, predaylight take-offs are often desirable. This places smoke-jumpers over a fire, ready to jump, at daylight. Evening flights are also common, often requiring planes to land after dark. The obsolete Hale Field is just an added hazard which could be eliminated by moving to a new location. Also, the county is considering disposing of its present set-up since it has obtained better grounds and buildings for county-fair use at the old Fort Missoula base. This would leave the Forest Service no place from which to operate the smoke-jumper project.

Fifth. Proposals: An entirely new physical plant is needed. This would be located on land to be acquired by the Forest Service adjacent to the present municipal airport west of Missoula and also county-owned. The CAA has indicated that the increased traffic thus brought to the municipal port plus the number of small private planes now flying there might justify the installation of a modern control tower, a needed facility at this field.

The objective of bringing these lands under the authority of the act of March 1, 1911, is to place them under national forest administration and applicable laws, rules, and regulations. The proposal has been discussed with the municipal airport board and no obstacles or conflicts are foreseen. The project will contribute rather than detract from the business available to the local commercial flying concerns. It will assure continuance and expansion in western Montana of a valuable public service and an operation of real economic importance to the State and locality.

The financing of the proposed project under the regular appropriations for the Forest Service is out of the question. A special bill and appropriations are essential. As listed below, the complete development, including a garage, is estimated at $1,160,000, about equal to the cost of fighting 10 average big forest fires.

Dormitory building, 19,400 square feet	$203,700	
Parachute loft building, 14,630 square feet	120,698	
Fire equipment building, 60,000 square feet	360,000	
Hangar building, 8,100 square feet	52,650	
Custodian residence	15,000	
		$752,048
Facilities		106,000
Furniture and equipment		27,500
Garage, storage, 16,900 square feet	$118,300	
Land	20,000	
		138,300
Subtotal		1,023,848
Plans and contingent:		
Plans and supervision, 8 percent		81,908
Contingent, 5 3 percent		54,244
Grand total		1,160,000

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 7257, a copy of which follows:

H. R. 7257

A bill to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to acquire by donation, purchase, and/or condemnation such tract or tracts of land, at or near Missoula, Mont., as in his judgment may be suitable for the construction thereon of fire control smoke jumper headquarters, air cargo supply base, a storage garage and other facilities, and said land upon acceptance of

title to be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to lands acquired under the act of March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 515, 516).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, by contract or otherwise, to cause to be planned, designed, and constructed on said land, such buildings as in his judgment may be suitable as fire control smoke jumper headquarters, air cargo supply base, storage garage, and other facilities, and including the purchase and installation of necessary equipment, the making of sewer, water, gas, electrical and other connections, and the construction of such roadways, sidewalks, landscaping, and approaches as may be required.

SEC 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,160,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary, may, prior to July 1, 1951, enter into contracts for the acquisition of the land and for the construction of the buildings and other installations herein authorized, to an amount not in excess of $500,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House additional testimony showing the need for passage of my bill at the earliest opportunity.

First. The use of airplanes for detection and suppression of forest fires has long been an accepted and worth-while procedure.

Second. The hauling of supplies, material, and manpower to the back-country areas has proven successful, economical, and essential to efficient operations.

Third. The experimental use of smokejumpers for fire-suppression purposes, rescue missions, and emergency purposes has been completed after 10 years of intensive experimentation. The experiments have been successful and the Forest Service has now adopted this method of getting manpower and supplies to the very large areas of inaccessible parts of the national forests.

Fourth. During the period of experimentation the Forest Service at Missoula, Mont., has used temporary, makeshift, and widely scattered and unsatisfactory facilities. The Forest Service at Missoula is now confronted with the problem of developing and organizing the smokejumper program on a permanent and efficient basis. The makeshift arrangements now in effect are no longer safe, efficient, nor adequate to meet the current problem.

Fifth. The proposed plan involves shifting operations from several points within a radius of 30 miles of Missoula and concentrating the principal activities at the new county airport several miles west of Missoula.

Sixth. Facilities to be abandoned are either leased improvements or temporary structures that have served their purpose and have been fully depreciated. Installations, equipment, and other items of value will be transferred to the new location. The leases can be terminated without loss to the Government.

Seventh. The advantages are manyfold. The principal value will be to concentrate activities at an airport fully equipped for all-weather flying, surfaced runways, CAA facilities, weather-station developments, lighted runways, county maintenance, and easy accessibility. All types of planes can use this airport, and adequate land is available on which the facilities proposed can be constructed at reasonable costs.

Eighth. The proposed improvements are those considered necessary for conducting the proper training, housing, and equipping of some 150 smoke-jumpers each season. Also to be provided are storage facilities of food and equipment needed to service the national forests of this region and to permit full cooperation with other regions, the National Park Service, adjacent States, as well as local fire protective associations. The facilities proposed are sufficient only to meet the current requirements. Buildings will be so designed that expansion could be undertaken to meet future requirements as such need develops. To continue the smoke-jumper program with the present temporary makeshift facilities is unsound, inefficient, unsafe, and unsanitary. The future success of fast action on fires depends on smoke-jumpers and plane transportation. The future of the smoke-jumper program is dependent upon efficient operating facilities, stability of operations and housing, storage and training facilities that can be realized only with the development of permanent improvements properly located and coordinated.

Ninth. Immediate authorization and appropriations are needed to acquire the land and prepare site plans, designs, and specifications for structures and facilities. Appropriations for completion of the construction program could well include one-half the program in one fiscal year and the balance in the succeeding year.

Tenth. Regular annual appropriations to the Forest Service are inadequate to finance this special project.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BLAND (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

A bill and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S 501. An act repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948, to the Committee on Agriculture.

S Con Res. 69. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of immigration hearings before a Judiciary subcommittee; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No 1158, Eighty-first Congress, first session, entitled "Progress on the Hoover Commission Recommendations"; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5486. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, for the transfer and redistillation of spirits, and for other purposes.

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

S. 485. An act for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel;

S. 1604. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of F. DuWayne Blankley;

S. 2319. An act to provide economic assistance to certain areas of the Far East; and

S. 2681. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, to be held at Lexington and Concord, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 7, 1950:

H. R. 4106. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

On February 10, 1950:

H R 587. An act for the relief of the estate of Dick Walook, Alfred L. Woods, and Edward Kimoktoak.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 14, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1224. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Lt (jg) Charles W. Ireland, Supply Corps, United States Navy, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1225. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Christina Moumtzis Vlahakis, file No. A-6856265 CR 27420, requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1226. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Albino Cancelo Torrado, alias Albino Cancelo or Albino Torrado, file No. A-4375147 CR 26408, requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1227. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Raymond Fred Manning or Raymond Frederick Leaford Manning or Raymond or Ray Frederick Manning, file No. A-5688547 CR 23901, requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned

to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1228. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the act of July 14, 1943 (57 Stat. 563), which provided for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1229. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, pursuant to provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 467); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1230. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and subsidiaries for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1946 and 1947, pursuant to provisions of section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945 (59 Stat. 6), and the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U S C. 841), respectively (H. Doc. No. 468); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr DURHAM· Committee on Armed Services S 1990. An act to amend section 429, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the act of August 5, 1882, as amended, so as to substitute for the requirement that detailed annual reports be made to the Congress concerning the proceeds of all sales of condemned naval material a requirement that information as to such proceeds be filed with the Committees on Armed Services in the Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr SASSCER: Committee on Armed Services H. R. 6539. A bill to amend Public Law 626, Eightieth Congress, relating to the Army Institute of Pathology Building; without amendment (Rept. No. 1620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 204. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche; without amendment (Rept. No. 1621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 309. An act for the relief of Gabe Budwee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 714. A bill for the relief of Pieter Cornelis ten Wolde and family; without amendment (Rept. No. 1623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1170. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John Kaudy (formerly Stella Cappler); with an amendment (Rept. No 1624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2232. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Solveig Normanson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3330. A bill for the relief of Therese Hohman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4604. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills, namely, Alfred Zorgis, Teodor Egle, Karlis Fogelis, Vasily Kils, and Aleksanders Zelmenis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4781. A bill for the relief of Veronica Jolly; without amendment (Rept. No. 1628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5541. A bill to amend Private Law No. 463, Seventy-sixth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 6577. A bill for the relief of Haruko Teramoto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R 7257. A bill to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest-fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes, to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H R 7258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for certain exemptions from the tax on admissions and to provide for exemptions from penalties for past offenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H R 7259. A bill to repeal paragraph 813 of the Tariff Act of 1930, to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr CHIPERFIELD:

H R 7260. A bill to provide for the holding of court and the furnishing of quarters at Rock Island for the United States District Court for the Southern District, Northern Division, of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H R. 7261. A bill to provide better promotion opportunities for Federal employees in the executive department, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H R 7262. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians of the Turtle Mountain Reservation, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 7263. A bill to provide for the donation by the United States of the site of the original Fort Buford, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H R 7264. A bill to authorize the establishment of methods for the evaluation of the performance of work of Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7265. A bill to provide for the conduct of a periodic census of governments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NOLAND:

H. R. 7266. A bill providing for a commemorative stamp in honor of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Indiana Territory; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 7267. A bill to revise the basis for award of disability pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 7268. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS·

H. R. 7269. A bill to provide pensions for certain peacetime veterans, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H R. 7270. A bill to provide pensions for disabled unemployable veterans who served in a war, campaign, expedition, or insurrection beyond the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs

By Mr. PETERSON:

H R. 7271. A bill making certain provisions in connection with the certificate of merit granted to an enlisted man for distinguished service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7272. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of May 29, 1944 (Public Law 319, 78th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H R 7273 A bill to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr RANKIN (by request):

H R 7274 A bill to revise requirement for award of additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H R. 7275. A bill to adjust death pension rates of widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7276. A bill to increase disability pension rates of veterans of World Wars I and II, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:

H. R 7277. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part I, as amended, to establish a conclusive presumption of service connection for loss of teeth, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY:

H J Res. 418. Joint resolution authorizing the purchase of automatic typing equipment for use in the offices of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H Res. 470. Resolution to amend rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Res. 471. Resolution to amend rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H Res 472. Resolution providing for further amounts to cover the expenses incurred by House Resolution 114, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox and requesting that the Congress pass appropriate legislation authorizing the issuance of a postage stamp

showing the beautiful Montpelier with a portrait of Gen. Henry Knox; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 7278. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7279. A bill for the relief of Umeko Stevenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr BENNETT of Florida:

H R. 7280. A bill for the relief of Dr. Apostolos A. Kartsonis; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 7281. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Ireland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 7282. A bill for the relief of Cornelius VerSluis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 7283. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jack B. Meyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 7284. A bill for the relief of George Lahood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER (by request):

H. R. 7285. A bill for the relief of Orlando Santos Rodrigues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H R 7286 A bill for the relief of Paolo Danesi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H R. 7287. A bill to provide for the conveyance to William Sandmann of certain real property in Coal County, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1831. By Mr CROSSER: Communication stating that Ohio students win both divisions of national conservation poster contest, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1832. By Mr. RICH: Petition of employees of secondary recovery producers, McKean County, Pa , in opposition to any change in the depletion allowance rate to the oil industry, to the Committe on Ways and Means.

1833. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Grace McCracken O'Dwyer and others, Washington, D. C , requesting that Congress hold strictly to the liberty we are endowed with in the United States Constitution and asking that they vote against any legislation such as embodied in the world federation bills, House Concurrent Resolutions 64 through 94, now pending before the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1834. Also, petition of O. O. Owens, Tulsa, Okla., requesting a thorough investigation by the Congress of collusion and frauds, including forgery, by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, its officers, agents, attorneys, and other representatives perpetrated pursuant to a prolonged and continuous series of conspiracies to extort money from said O. O. Owens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1835. Also, petition of Elizabeth Nord, Rhode Island State Industrial Union Council, Providence, R. I., relative to the continuation of the partition dividing all the people of Ireland and requesting that the Congress do all in its power to bring this unjust condition to an end; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1836. Also, petition of Dr. John M. Chang, Ambassador, Korean Embassy, Washington, D. C., relative to a letter from the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea expressing gratitude for the approval by Congress of the economic-aid bill for Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1837. Also, petition of N. D. Watson and others, Dover, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1838. Also, petition of James A. Hoyt and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1839. Also, petition of Annie McElroy and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1840. Also, petition of J. F. Anstett and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1841. Also, petition of C. W. Wilson and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1842. Also, petition of W. A. Bloom and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1843. Also, petition of Mrs. W. C. Rice and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1844. Also, petition of O. A. Jordan and others, Dover, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

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

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

Our Father God, we come seeking wide horizons around our noisy days. Through our preoccupied and cluttered lives we would clear a highway for Thy holy purposes. More potent than the raucous voices without may there come the whisper of a still voice within, heard only by obedient hearts. May all life, private and public, be to us as a sacrament. Make Thou our bodies Thy temples and our hearts Thy altars where the sacred flame is ever burning. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 10, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On February 9, 1950:

S. 1282. An act to authorize grants under the Federal Airport Act for minor projects at major airports, and for other purposes.

On February 11, 1950:

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Mrs. Effie S. Campbell; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to provide unrestricted entry privileges for Sister Elizabeth Kenny.

On February 13, 1950:

S. 570. An act for the relief of Donald Francis Wierda; and

S. 1003. An act for the relief of Emory T. Wales.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 485. An act for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel;

S. 1604. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of F. DuWayne Blankley;

S. 2319. An act to provide economic assistance to certain areas of the Far East;

S. 2681. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, to be held at Lexington and Concord, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950; and

H. R. 5486. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, for the transfer and redistillation of spirits, and for other purposes.

SOUTHERN FIREPROOFING CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 627) for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. DONNELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Anderson	Douglas	Gillette
Byrd	Downey	Graham
Chapman	Eastland	Green
Chavez	Ecton	Gurney
Connally	Ellender	Hayden
Cordon	Ferguson	Hendrickson
Darby	Fulbright	Hickenlooper
Donnell	George	Hill

Holland	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Humphrey	McCarran	Sparkman
Hunt	McClellan	Stennis
Johnson, Colo.	McFarland	Taylor
Johnson, Tex.	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Johnston, S. C.	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Kefauver	Magnuson	Tydings
Kerr	Neely	Wherry
Kilgore	O'Conor	Williams
Knowland	O'Mahoney	Withers
Leahy	Robertson	
Lehman	Russell	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr LODGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BRIDGES was excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing through Tuesday, February 21.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without speeches and without debate.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. DONNELL, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Three letters from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Raymond Fred Manning or Raymond Frederick Leaford Manning or Raymond or Ray Frederick Manning, Albino Cancelo Torrado alias Albino Cancelo or Albino Torrado, and Christina Moumtzis Vlahakis, from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on June 15, 1949, and January 16, 1950, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report), to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Subsidiaries, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1946 and 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

A letter from the chairman of the War Claims Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (with an accompanying paper), to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Grace DeStaffany, legislative chairman, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Auxiliary No 7655, Conrad, Mont., praying for the enactment of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Post No. 47, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Uniontown, Pa., favoring the enactment of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Will Miller, and sundry other citizens of Hardinsburg, Ky., relating to certain inventions of Mr. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The memorial of Mrs. Urn A. Coleson, of the United States, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to readjust certain postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by Post 47, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Uniontown, Pa., favoring the enactment of House bill 4567, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

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

"We, your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the State of Maine in the ninety-fourth legislative (special) session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas in view of the fact that there is being planned in the State of Maine, to be held on July 25, 1950, a celebration of national scope on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Maj. Gen Henry Knox, friend of Washington; and

"Whereas Maj. Gen Henry Knox held the distinguished positions of head of the Department of Artillery in the American Revolution, 1776–83; Secretary of War in the National Government, 1785-94; New England's greatest single industrial promoter, 1795–1806; and proprietor of the Waldo Patent in Maine, and who built a beautiful home on the bank of the Georges River and lived in Thomaston: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, your memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge the Members of Congress to give early recognition to this great historic occasion with full approval and support of events of the year, and pray the Congress of the United States through our Senators and Representatives to pass appropriate legislation authorizing the issue of a postage stamp showing the beautiful Montpelier with a portrait of Gen. Henry Knox, in recognition of these historic events of national importance; and, also to pass appropriate legislation to have a coin struck to mark the occasion of his eminent military, political and industrial service to our country; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state, by registered mail, to the proper offices and committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the President of the United States, and to each of the Representatives and Senators representing the State of Maine in the United States Congress.

"In senate chamber, February 7, 1950, read and adopted.

"CHESTER T. WINSLOW,
"*Secretary*

"House of representatives, read and adopted, February 7, 1950, in concurrence.

"HARVEY R. PEASE,
"*Clerk.*"

A telegram from the secretary of the senate of the State of Texas, embodying a resolution of the senate of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Finance:

AUSTIN, TEX., *February 9, 1950.*

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Vice President of the United States:

The Texas State Senate today unanimously adopted the following resolution·

"Senate Resolution 24

"Whereas the Congress is considering a measure which would repeal or reduce the depletion allowance now made in connection with income taxes on producers of natural resources; and

"Whereas the economy of the State of Texas to a great degree is tied up with the production of natural resources; and

"Whereas these industries furnish a large portion of the revenue for the support of the State government, including its public-school

system and its welfare and other programs; and

"Whereas prospecting for new reserves is a hazardous and expensive operation; and

"Whereas the elimination or reduction of the present allowance for depletion would tend to create unemployment and would seriously cripple these industries, and particularly the smaller units and independents who have been the backbone of these industries; and further would seriously retard the search for and development of new sources of supply vitally necessary to this country particularly in case of war: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of Texas*, That the Congress of these United States be and is urged respectfully to defeat this attempt to eliminate or reduce the depletion allowance, and thereby to preserve the economy of the various States and assist in preparing this country to defend herself, if necessary; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be wired immediately to Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President of these United States, and that copies hereof be mailed to the Representatives and Senators in Congress from the State of Texas."

LOYCE M. BELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by J C. Darrell, secretary, Maryland Highway Users Conference, praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the Federal automotive excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance

A resolution adopted by the mayor and city council of Havre de Grace, Md., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the dredging of Oakington Channel, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution memorializing Congress with relation to the amendment of the retirement requirements as they apply to soldiers, sailors, marines, and national guardsmen, so that those otherwise eligible for retirement after 20 years of service may receive the benefits for which they would be entitled without having reached the minimum age, therefor

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island be and they are hereby earnestly requested to seek an amendment of the retirement requirements as they apply to soldiers, sailors, marines, and national guardsmen, so that those otherwise eligible for retirement after 20 years of service may receive the benefits for which they would be entitled without having reached the minimum age therefor; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

RESOLUTIONS OF OLMSTED COUNTY (MINN.) FARM BUREAU

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Olmsted County (Minn.) Farm Bureau at its annual meeting on December 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLMSTED COUNTY FARM BUREAU RESOLUTIONS, ANNUAL MEETING ON DECEMBER 10, 1949

* * * * *

2. Since conservation of soil and water are basic necessities for the survival of mankind and since the security of future generations is a responsibility of all of us through our Federal Government, we believe any Federal benefit payments made to agriculture should be based on proper soil and water conservation practices. We also believe the Soil Conservation Service should be maintained as an independent agency with sufficient Federal funds to carry on its program at a high state of efficiency.

We urge that increased effort be made to further publicize the need for conservation education to the end that all people will realize that conserving soil and water is their universal concern.

3. We urge true freedom and justice for all regardless of creed or color and urge that we spend as much thought and money for the advancement of world peace, as we do for armaments and preparation for war.

4. We urge stricter control of Marshall-plan shipments sent to western Europe. Also urge an immediate ban on shipment of war materials and supplies to Russia or her satellite states, for as long a time as the cold war may exist.

5. Because of the efforts made in the Communist Party to entangle us in foreign affairs and to support Communist nations, we urge that our Congressmen withhold their recognition of the newly set-up Communist form of government.

6. *Resolved*, That we urge our Farm Bureau organization to work for greater economy in our local, State, and National Governments.

7. We urge consideration be given to every economy in our National Government along the lines proposed by the Hoover Commission.

8 We urge further investigation of spread between what farmer receives for his poultry products and other farm products and the retail price the consumer pays.

9. Whereas farm prices have been going down for the past year; and

Whereas the flexible support plan has provided little or no floor price support; and

Whereas minimum farm commodity prices have dropped approximately 33 percent and manufactured articles have not dropped in accordance: Now, be it

Resolved, That the next Congress enact a new parity price-support system including all agriculture products so as to maintain a normal farm-purchasing power; be it further

Resolved, That the administrative authority be given the farmers insofar as feasibility and practicability will warrant.

* * * * *

21. Whereas the farmers receive approximately two-fifths of their income from dairy products in the State of Minnesota; and

Whereas the Federal Government is considering reducing the tax on oleomargarine as well as cutting the restrictions relative to coloring it, to appear and look like butter; and

Whereas unscrupulous people and business firms will no doubt sell oleomargarine in substitution for butter; and

Whereas we deem and feel this practice is unfair competition: Now, be it

Resolved, That the Olmsted County Farm Bureau go on record in opposition to reduced taxes and changing the natural color of oleomargarine; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all officials representing Minnesota in Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 3001. A bill to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1272); and

H. R. 3150. A bill to revise and repeal certain acts relating to rules of survey to permit departures from the system of rectangular survey when necessary on all public lands, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1271).

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

S. 2859. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to provide for the promotion and maintenance of civilian recreation programs; with amendments (Rept. No. 1273).

RELIEF OF PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST—REPORT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report an original joint resolution providing relief for Palestine refugees in the Near East, and I submit a report (No. 1275) thereon.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 153) for the authorization by the United States to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—MINORITY AND SEPARATE VIEWS (PT. 2 of REPT. NO. 1237)

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] I submit minority views on the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, together with separate views of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I ask that they be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The views will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1274)

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I submit a report prepared by the Subcommittee on Relations with International Organizations, dealing with the administrative, budgetary, and fiscal aspects of United States participation in international organizations during fiscal year 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of December 1949, and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement submitted by Mr. BYRD were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, NOVEMBER–DECEMBER 1949, AND PAY, OCTOBER–NOVEMBER 1949

NOTE WITH REFERENCE TO PERSONAL SERVICE EXPENDITURE FIGURES

It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal service shown in table I of this report are for the month of November, and that they are compared with personal service expenditure figures for the month of October, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of December and are compared with the month of November. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.

(Figures in the following report are compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside continental United States. Table III shows personnel employed outside continental United States. Table IV gives, by agency, the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for December 1949 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Pay roll (in thousands of dollars) in executive branch		
	In December numbered	In November numbered	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	1,981,156	1,985,959	−4,803	$550,464	$528,383	+$22,081
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,221,740	1,217,297	+4,443	334,910	314,512	+20,398
2. National Military Establishment	759,416	768,662	−9,246	215,554	213,871	+1,683
Within the National Military Establishment:						
Office of Secretary of Defense	1,721	1,721		624	611	+13
Department of the Army	316,550	320,995	−4,445	83,714	84,989	−1,275
Department of the Air Force	150,743	151,650	−907	42,097	41,816	+281
Department of the Navy	290,402	294,296	−3,894	89,119	86,455	+2,664

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States, outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further break-down in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because pay-roll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(See table II)

Federal personnel within the United States decreased 3,307 from the November total of 1,832,143 to the December total of 1,828,836.

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment there was an increase of 3,023 from the November total of 1,160,163 to the December total of 1,163,186.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for December was 665,650, a decrease of 6,330 under the November total of 671,980.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense decreased its personnel 3 from the November total of 1,716 to the December total of 1,713.

The Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States decreased 3,209 from the November figure of 277,437 to the December figure of 274,228.

The Department of the Air Force civilian personnel within the United States increased 143 from the November figure of 126,549 to the December figure of 126,692.

The Department of the Navy civilian personnel within the United States decreased 3,261 from the November figure of 266,278 to the December figure of 263,017.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(See table III)

Outside continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 1,496 from the November total of 153,816 to the December total of 152,320.

An increase of 1,420 was reported by the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment from the November total of 57,134 to the December total of 58,554.

Total civilian employment outside continental United States for the National Military Establishment decreased 2,916 from the November total of 96,682 to the December figure of 93,766.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense reported an increase of 3 in its staff overseas.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease in overseas civilian employment of 1,236 from the November figure of 43,558 to the December figure of 42,322.

The Department of the Air Force reported a decrease in overseas civilian employment of 1,050 from the November figure of 25,101 to the December figure of 24,051.

The Department of the Navy reported a decrease in overseas civilian employment of 633 from the November figure of 28,018 to the December figure of 27,385.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

(See table IV)

Total industrial employment during the month of December decreased 3,208 from the November figure of 471,557 to the December figure of 468,349.

Industrial employment in departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment increased 3,353 from the November figure of 20,133 to the December figure of 23,486.

The National Military Establishment decreased its total industrial employment 6,561 from the November figure of 451,424 to the December figure of 444,863.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 3,318 from the November figure of 169,914 to the December figure of 166,596. Inside continental United States Army industrial employment decreased 2,501 while outside continental United States there was a decrease of 817.

The Department of the Air Force reported a decrease of 951 industrial employees from the November figure of 89,251 to the December figure of 88,300. Inside continental United States Air Force industrial employment decreased 22 and outside continental United States there was a decrease of 929.

The Department of the Navy decreased its industrial employment 2,292 from the November total of 192,259 to the December total of 189,967. Inside continental United States Navy industrial employment decreased 1,863 while outside continental United States there was a decrease of 429.

The term "industrial employees," as used by the committee, refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

AVERAGE FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, FISCAL YEARS 1939, 1948, AND FIRST HALF OF 1950 WITH COMPARISONS

Table V shows average Federal employment in the executive branch, fiscal years 1939, 1948, and first half of 1950 with comparisons. Comparisons broken to show civilian employment in Post Office Department, National Military Establishment, Veterans' Administration, and other agencies. Year 1939 was selected as the peak year prior to the prewar emergency. Year 1948 was selected because Federal employment in the executive branch in this year reached its postwar low.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1949, and comparison with November 1949; and pay for November 1949 and comparison with October 1949*

Agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	October	November	Increase	Decrease	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment)								
Agriculture	$19,990	$20,826	$836		75,236	74,283		953
Commerce	14,179	15,028	849		47,575	46,206		1,369
Interior	15,438	17,229	1,791		51,155	54,500	3,345	
Justice	9,102	9,598	496		26,376	26,309		67
Labor	1,585	1,763	178		5,109	5,342	233	
Post Office	125,164	131,577	6,413		533,079	535,745	2,666	
State	6,216	6,824	608		22,120	23,735	1,615	
Treasury	25,709	27,399	1,690		85,441	85,762	321	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	95	114	19		246	248	2	
Bureau of the Budget	235	257	22		536	532		4
Executive Mansion and Grounds	15	17	2		74	65		9
National Security Council [1]	8	9	1		17	17		
National Security Resources Board	140	152	12		285	301	16	
Council of Economic Advisers	22	31	9		36	36		
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	2	2			5	5		
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	102	101		$1	259	255		4
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,281	1,653	372		4,134	4,189	55	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	2	4	2		7	11	4	
Office of the Housing Expediter	1,629	1,640	11		4,396	4,291		105
Philippine Alien Property Administration	15	11		4	81	81		
Philippine War Damage Commission	225	239	14		1,076	1,044		32
War Claims Commission	11	16	5		46	52	6	
Independent agencies								
American Battle Monuments Commission	28	27		1	228	372	144	
Atomic Energy Commission	1,660	1,777	117		4,819	4,842	23	
Civil Aeronautics Board	254	272	18		650	646		4
Civil Service Commission	1,104	1,217	113		3,693	3,662		31
Export-Import Bank of Washington	60	63	3		126	125		1
Federal Communications Commission	488	526	38		1,323	1,329	6	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	371	405	34		1,091	1,086		5
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	177	190	13		344	341		3
Federal Power Commission	296	319	23		760	753		7
Federal Security Agency [2]	9,076	9,727	651		34,583	34,495		88
Federal Trade Commission	268	296	28		640	640		
General Accounting Office	2,655	2,803	148		8,646	8,663	17	
General Services Administration	6,327	6,872	545		28,969	23,523		446
Government Printing Office	2,266	2,365	99		7,092	7,077		15
Housing and Home Finance Agency	3,650	3,962	312		11,887	12,119	232	
Indian Claims Commission	6	8	2		11	10		1
Interstate Commerce Commission	772	859	87		2,163	2,147		16
Maritime Commission [3]	1,676	1,654		22	5,589	5,504		85
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,219	2,420	201		7,414	7,471	57	
National Capital Housing Authority	77	85	8		316	316		
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	7	8	1		20	20		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	2	4	2		11	13	2	
National Gallery of Art	77	85	8		320	319		1
National Labor Relations Board	521	551	30		1,605	1,508		97
National Mediation Board	48	51	3		111	111		
Panama Canal	3,441	3,262		179	21,276	20,954		322
Railroad Retirement Board	708	751	43		2,459	2,424		35
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,712	1,819	107		4,441	4,455	14	
Securities and Exchange Commission	426	458	32		1,052	1,043		9
Selective Service System	452	495	43		3,502	3,466		36
Smithsonian Institution	159	173	14		[4] 549	545		4
Tariff Commission	95	101	6		221	224	3	
Tax Court of the United States	57	56		1	130	129		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	3,765	3,534		231	13,068	12,864		204
Veterans' Administration	48,447	53,225	4,778		195,899	195,535		364
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	314,512	334,910	20,837	439	1,217,207	1,221,740	8,761	4,318
Net increase excluding National Military Establishment			20,398				4,443	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	611	624	13		1,721	1,721		
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	73,458	72,152		1,306	277,437	274,228		3,209
Outside continental United States	11,531	11,562	31		43,558	42,322		1,236
Department of the Air Force								
Inside continental United States	36,947	37,293	346		126,549	126,692	143	
Outside continental United States	4,869	4,804		65	25,101	24,051		1,050
Department of the Navy								
Inside continental United States	79,917	82,046	2,129		266,278	263,017		3,261
Outside continental United States	6,538	7,073	535		28,018	27,385		633
Total, National Military Establishment	213,871	215,554	3,054	1,371	768,662	759,416	143	9,389
Net change, National Military Establishment			1,683				9,246	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	528,383	550,464	23,891	1,810	1,985,959	1,981,156	8,904	13,707
Net change, including National Military Establishment			22,081				4,803	

[1] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Includes personnel and pay for Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.
[3] Exclusive of 135 seamen and 2,463 seamen trainees on the rolls of the Maritime Commission and their pay.
[4] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1949 and comparison with November 1949*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):					Executive departments (except National Military Establishment)—Continued				
Agriculture	72,654	71,615		1,039	Labor	5,022	5,256	234	
Commerce	43,624	42,270		1,354	Post Office	531,217	533,889	2,672	
Interior	45,450	48,887	3,437		State	8,363	8,381	18	
Justice	25,893	25,834		59	Treasury	84,721	85,041	320	

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1949 and comparison with November 1949*—Continued

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	246	248	2	
Bureau of the Budget	536	532		4
Executive Mansion and Grounds	74	65		9
National Security Council [1]	17	17		
National Security Resources Board	285	301	16	
Council of Economic Advisers	36	36		
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	5	5		
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	85	85		
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,022	1,013		9
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	7	11	4	
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,371	4,267		104
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2		
Philippine War Damage Commission	6	6		
War Claims Commission	46	52	6	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	16	15		1
Atomic Energy Commission	4,816	4,840	24	
Civil Aeronautics Board	631	629		2
Civil Service Commission	3,688	3,657		31
Export-Import Bank of Washington	124	124		
Federal Communications Commission	1,292	1,298	6	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,091	1,086		5
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	344	341		3
Federal Power Commission	760	753		7
Federal Security Agency [2]	33,807	33,710		97
Federal Trade Commission	640	640		
General Accounting Office	8,646	8,663	17	
General Services Administration	23,952	23,505		447
Government Printing Office	7,092	7,077		15
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,843	12,072	229	
Indian Claims Commission	11	10		1
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,163	2,147		16
Maritime Commission [3]	5,572	5,489		83
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,413	7,469	56	
National Capital Housing Authority	316	316		
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	20	20		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	11	13	2	
National Gallery of Art	320	319		1
National Labor Relations Board	1,591	1,495		96
National Mediation Board	111	111		
Panama Canal	634	624		10
Railroad Retirement Board	2,459	2,424		35
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,428	4,442	14	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,052	1,043		9
Selective Service System	3,417	3,383		34
Smithsonian Institution	[4] 545	541		4
Tariff Commission	221	224	3	
Tax Court of the United States	130	129		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,068	12,864		204
Veterans' Administration	194,257	193,900		357
Total, exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,160,163	1,163,186	7,060	4,037
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			3,023	
National Military Establishment				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,716	1,713		3
Department of the Army	277,437	274,228		3,209
Department of the Air Force	126,549	126,692	143	
Department of the Navy	266,278	263,017		3,261
Total, National Military Establishment	671,980	665,650	143	6,473
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			6,330	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	1,832,143	1,828,836	7,203	10,510
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			3,307	

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Includes personnel for Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.
[3] Exclusive of 135 seamen and 2,463 seamen trainees on the rolls of the Maritime Commission.
[4] Revised on basis of later information

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1949 and comparison with November 1949*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment)				
Agriculture	2,582	2,668	86	
Commerce	3,951	3,936		15
Interior	5,705	5,613		92
Justice	483	475		8
Labor	87	86		1
Post Office	1,862	1,856		6
State	13,757	15,354	1,597	
Treasury	730	721	1	
Postwar agencies				
Displaced Persons Commission	174	170		4
Economic Cooperation Administration	3,112	3,176	64	
Office of the Housing Expediter	25	24		1
Philippine Alien Property Administration	79	79		
Philippine War Damage Commission	1,070	1,038		32
Independent agencies				
American Battle Monuments Commission	212	357	145	
Atomic Energy Commission	3	2		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	19	17		2
Civil Service Commission	5	5		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	1		1
Federal Communications Commission	31	31		
Federal Security Agency	776	785	9	
General Services Administration	17	18	1	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	44	47	3	
Maritime Commission	17	15		2
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	1	2	1	
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Labor Relations Board	14	13		1
Panama Canal	20,642	20,330		312
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	13	13		
Selective Service System	85	83		2
Smithsonian Institution	4	4		
Veterans' Administration	1,642	1,635		7
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	57,134	58,554	1,907	487
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			1,420	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	5	8	3	
Department of the Army	43,558	42,322		1,236
Department of the Air Force	25,101	24,051		1,050
Department of the Navy	28,018	27,385		633
Total, National Military Establishment	96,682	93,766	3	2,919
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			2,916	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	153,816	152,320	1,910	3,406
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			1,496	

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1949 and comparison with November 1949*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Commerce	1,222	1,194		28
Interior	5,439	4,939		500
State	333	569	236	
Treasury	4,275	8,077	3,802	
Independent agencies				
Atomic Energy Commission	136	138	2	
General Services Administration	139	142	3	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	14	12		2
Panama Canal	1,776	1,770		6
Smithsonian Institution	6	5		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	6,793	6,640		153
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	20,133	23,486	4,043	690
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			3,353	
National Military Establishment:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	144,757	142,256		2,501
Outside continental United States	25,157	24,340		817
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	70,252	70,230		22
Outside continental United States	18,999	18,070		929
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	172,321	170,458		1,863
Outside continental United States	19,938	19,509		429
Total, National Military Establishment	451,424	444,863		6,561
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			6,561	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	471,557	468,349	4,043	7,251
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			3,208	

TABLE V.—*Average Federal employment in executive branch, fiscal years 1939, 1948, and first half of 1950, with comparisons*[1]—*broken to show civilian employment in Post Office Department, National Military Establishment, Veterans' Administration, and other agencies*

Agency	Average employment, by fiscal years			Increases or decreases in average employment					
	1939	1948[3]	1950[3]	1939–48		1939–50		1948–50	
				Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Post Office Department	297,191	472,972	529,735	+175,781	+59	+232,544	+78	+56,763	+12
National Military Establishment	179,898	844,583	813,028	+664,685	+369	+633,130	+352	−31,555	−4
Veterans' Administration	36,278	201,190	195,815	+164,912	+455	+159,537	+440	−5,375	−3
Other agencies	369,425	506,403	498,754	+136,978	+37	+129,329	+35	−7,649	−1
Total	882,792	2,025,148	2,037,332	+1,142,356	+129	+1,154,540	+131	+12,184	+1

[1] 1939 was the year of peak Federal employment prior to the prewar emergency, 1948 was the year Federal employment reached a postwar low
[2] Prior to inauguration of committee reports, therefore, figures are from adjusted Civil Service Commission reports
[3] Figures are from former committee reports revised and corrected to date

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, IN CONNECTION WITH THE MONTHLY REPORT ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY, NOVEMBER-DECEMBER 1949

Federal employment in civilian agencies of the executive branch turned sharply upward during December with over-all increases averaging more than 143 a day, but civilian employment by the Military Establishment maintained its downward trend for the sixth consecutive month in the current fiscal year.

An increase of 4,443 in civilian agency personnel during December offset by nearly 50 percent, a decrease of 9,246 in civilian employment by the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The net decrease of 4,803 in the executive branch as a whole brought total employment down to 1,931,156, which, again in December, was a new low since 1942.

These figures were revealed today by the Joint Committee on Reduction on Nonessential Federal Expenditures in its compilation of December personnel reports by executive branch agencies.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

December reductions in civilian employment by the Military Establishment brought total separations during the 4 months since the Johnson retrenchment order to 99,370.

For the first 6 months of the current fiscal year total employment in the Military Establishment has been reduced by 125,312, from 884,728 last June to 759,416 in December.

CIVILIAN AGENCIES

Average employment in the civilian agencies (exclusive of the Military Establishment) as a whole came down during the first 5 months of the fiscal year but the relatively small reduction included seasonal declines in agencies such as Agriculture and Interior which are heaviest in the autumn months. With a 4,500 increase in December civilian agencies finished off the first half of the year in December with over-all employment totaling 1,221,740, only 7,965 less than when the year started July 1.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Such reductions as were made in other civilian agencies of the Government were largely nullified by the steady addition of permanent employees in the Post Office Department.

Exclusive of the Post Office Department employment, civilian agencies in the executive branch decreased 26,172 in the first 6 months of the current fiscal year. In the same period employment by the post office increased 18,207.

The records show that post-office employment has increased without interruption for ten consecutive months. In the 10-month period ending in December the number of post-office employees increased 28,315, from 507,430 last February to 535,743 in December.

A special table in the committee report shows that the Post Office Department average employment went up 12 percent in the period between 1948 and the first half of the current year, while the Military Establishment, Veterans' Administration, and other agencies in the executive branch, exclusive of the Post Office Department, reported decreases in the average employment.

In the decade since 1939 average employment by the Post Office Department has increased by more than a quarter of a million, from a 1939 average of 297,191 to an average over the past 6 months of 529,735, an increase of 78 percent.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 14, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 485 An act for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel;

S 1604. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of F. DuWayne Blankley;

S. 2319. An act to provide economic assistance to certain areas of the Far East; and

S. 2681. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, to be held at Lexington and Concord, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Brig. Gen. Don G. Shingler (colonel, Corps of Engineers) to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of law, vice Col. Clark Kittrell.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 3021. A bill for the relief of Rai Bahadursingh; and

S. 3022 A bill for the relief of Sadie I Porter and her two children, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 3023. A bill to revise requirement for award of additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents;

S 3024. A bill to increase disability pension rates of veterans of World Wars I and II; and

S 3025. A bill to adjust death pension rates of widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S 3026. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Jesus Juan Llanderal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3027 (by request). A bill to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and the improvements thereon in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S 3028 A bill for the relief of John H. Parker, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ECTON:

S 3029 A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mr. Wilbur J. Scott; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3030. A bill for the relief of Bozidar Steve Jelisavcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. McMAHON:

S 3031. A bill for the relief of Sisters Linda Salerno, Luigiana C. Cairo, Antoinette Impieri, Anna Impieri, Rosina Scarlato, Iolanda Caglianone, Maria Assunta Scaramuzzo, Francescaina Conterucci, and Filomena Lupinacci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3032. A bill for the relief of Jan W. Raykowski and his wife, Jozefa; and

S. 3033. A bill for the relief of Nissim Salim Tawil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 3034. A bill to provide for a 10-year statute of limitations for certain offenses against the United States respecting defense information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 153) for the authorization of a contribution by the United States to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, which was placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. FERGUSON), submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them,

jointly, to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON UMPQUA HARBOR AND RIVER, OREG. (S DOC. NO. 133)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated September 28, 1949, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on the Umpqua Harbor and River, Oreg., with particular reference to providing improvements at and in the vicinity of the confluence of the Scholfield River and the Umpqua River, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

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

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON LITTLE MISSOURI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MARMARTH, N. DAK. (S. DOC. NO. 134)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated October 4, 1949, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on the Little Missouri River and tributaries at Marmarth, N. Dak., to determine the advisability of combining the interests of flood control and of irrigation in a program at this time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted October 25, 1937, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be referred to the Committee on Public Works and be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

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

SERVICEMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 466)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the budget message for 1951, I stated that there is some question whether some of the training being received by veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is conforming to the original sound objectives of the law. I also said that I had asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to study this situation thoroughly and to recommend to me any corrective measures, administrative or legislative, which should be taken to assure that our expenditures for this program yield a proper return both to the veterans and to the Nation as a whole.

The contribution which the Servicemen's Readjustment Act has made to the postwar development of the Nation's most important resource—its young men and women—is very great. It is now approximately 4 years after general demobilization. During these 4 years the overwhelming proportion of all veterans have completed their readjustment or moved far in that direction. For the great majority of those who have made use of the education and training provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, the law has been of real and lasting service. A great deal of fine education and training has been provided. The Nation will be better prepared to face the difficult problems of the future because of the improved education and skills provided to millions of its worthy and capable young men and women.

Because the law has contributed effectively to the successful transition of so many veterans, I am confident that veterans and nonveterans alike will wish to see that the record of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act shall not be blemished by the belated growth of certain kinds of trade and vocational training which do not contribute materially to the prompt and constructive readjustment of veterans. It was this conviction which led me to ask for a careful study of this aspect of the veterans' training program.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget have now reported to me. Their report makes it clear that the recent rapid increase in trade and vocational training has included training of less than acceptable quality. In a number of cases, veterans have not received instruction which meets reasonable standards. In a good many instances veterans have been trained for occupations for which they are not suited or for occupations in which they will be unable to find jobs when they finish their training.

It seems evident that each time a course of trade and vocational training does not contribute in a substantial way to the occupational readjustment of a veteran, it constitutes a failure of that portion of the program. Such failure is costly to the veteran, to his family, and to the Nation. While nothing that we may do can entirely eliminate such failures, I feel that steps can and should be taken to give greater assurance that every trade and vocational course under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act will provide good-quality training and will in each instance help a veteran to complete his occupational readjustment and find satisfactory employment.

The report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which I transmit herewith, contains recommendations to achieve this purpose. I commend the report to the Congress. In the interest of veterans as individuals and in the interest of the Nation, I urge that the Congress take suitable action, as it has done previously with respect to other types of training, to assure that all trade and vocational training conforms with the original sound intent of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 13, 1950.*

DEATH OF HOWARD DOBSON OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS BUREAU, WASHINGTON, D C.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on Saturday I read in the newspapers that Howard Dobson, a former Iowa man and a reporter for the Associated Press Bureau in Washington, D. C., had died of cancer here after being hospitalized since last Christmas.

Mr. Dobson was born in Lake City, Iowa, and educated in our public schools, as well as in the public schools and University of Nebraska. Later he received his first newspaper experience on the Sioux City Journal, in my home State of Iowa. For a time he also worked for the Des Moines Register and Tribune. In 1943 he came to Washington, D. C., to write for the Associated Press Bureau, and covered the regional news for Iowa, Nebraska, and several other Midwestern States.

I became well acquainted with Howard Dobson in Des Moines and during my service in the United States Senate. I also had opportunity to observe the quality of his work as correspondent for the Associated Press. Others have already praised his gentleness and his great patience, but I can testify to his unceasing efforts to attain an objective viewpoint in his work, which was the reporting of events in the Nation's Capital for readers thousands of miles away. He was fair and accurate. By his faithful adherence to these ideals, he was a great credit to the journalistic profession, which he served so well. A young man, Howard Dobson was devoted to his profession, and possessed rare ability. The honors which he received from his fellow workers of the Capitol press corps attest to the respect which he merited also from others members of the press. He will be greatly missed in the press galleries of Congress.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his family and his loved ones in the passing of an extremely able man.

THE STATE OF THE UNION AND THE 1951 BUDGET—STATEMENTS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 7, in reply to the remarks of the senior Senator from the State of Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I discussed the subject of the President's budget for the fiscal year 1951, and made reference to the general economic outlook for the year 1950.

It was my contention, in my reply, that the Fair Deal program is thoroughly consistent with the legitimate aims of a free economy. Furthermore, I stated at that time that the legislative proposals of the New Deal and Fair Deal have in fact expanded the area of economic opportunity for the American people and make more secure their political liberties.

It had been my intention during the course of my remarks to request inclusion in the RECORD of a statement which

I had prepared some time ago pertaining to the general economic situation and its relationship to the Fair Deal program. Likewise, I had intended to include in the body of my remarks a statement which I have prepared analyzing the budget for 1951.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, the afore-mentioned statement on the economic outlook and the analysis of the budget for the fiscal year 1951.

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

THE STATE OF THE UNION

The report here in Washington is: "The state of the Union is good." So said our President in his annual state of the Union message to the Congress.

The President's conclusion as to the state of the Union was well documented by facts and figures. Even more convincing are the recent year-end round-up stories as to production, retail sales, employment, profits, and wages. The financial pages of every newspaper in the land carry the encouraging story that business in 1949 approximated the all-time high levels of 1948. The recession which hit us in the spring of 1949 was stopped cold in its tracks, and the upward swing in business started in early fall to reach new peaks in December. Corporations report an average of 7 percent increase in dividends over 1948. In the closing months of 1949 industrial output was rising, employment was increasing, and the buying power of the dollar was on the up-grade.

The business outlook for 1950, according to the vast majority of financial and economic reports, could be summarized by saying that incomes and spending are on the rise, good times are in the offing. Such magazines as Business Week and U. S. News have made exhaustive studies of business conditions for the coming year and the predictions are optimistic. Such quotes as the following from U. S. News portray the picture: "Business is to be good during the first half of 1950. Everyone agrees on that. * * * Business in the second half of the New Year is likely to be just as good as the first half, perhaps a little better. * * * Danger points appear to be few." The favorable factors appear to outweigh unfavorable factors: "People have money and are in a mood to spend it. Demand remains high. Credit is not strained." The economic outlook for 1950 is outlined by such comments as: "The money people will receive promises to top all previous years. It is estimated at $217,700,000,000, and that will be close to three times the 1940 individual income. Consumer spending in 1950 will be as great as in the boom of 1948. Retail trading will approach the 1948 level. Output of industry is expected to be higher than 1949 and equal to 1948. The construction industry is expected to have another boom year. Employment is anticipated to average a million more workers in 1950 than in 1949." In summary, the U. S. News in its report to the Nation says: "The price level is expected to show stability throughout the year. * * * Employment will be higher. Living costs are expected to be about the same. Corporate profits will increase slightly; dividend payments will likely be moderately higher in 1950."

Yes indeed, the state of the Union is good. The record and the evidence is overwhelming to support the President's conclusion. The one disturbing sign was an average of 3,500,000 unemployed in 1949, a rise over the years 1947 and 1948. Despite the unemployment, however, economic activity was high and profitable. The loss from unemployment, however, is estimated from ten to fifteen billions of dollars in national income. It was this factor which the President gave special consideration, and called upon the Nation to raise the standard of living and the average income of the family, thereby to increase the consumption of goods and services and offering full employment to the available work force.

The greatest loss of the depression came from unemployment. Even in such unprecedented good times as 1948 and 1949, our major weakness and our major economic loss was from unemployment. Therefore the President has outlined a bold and courageous program of Government activity to bolster the economy. A recent report from the President's Council of Economic Advisers, entitled "Business and Government," outlines the philosophy of the Fair Deal and its relationship to our national economy. The emphasis is upon cooperation and encouragement of capital investment to provide new jobs and new purchasing power. The President sees the Fair Deal program as an insurance policy against recession and economic catastrophe. He envisions the Fair Deal program as opening new areas of economic and social activity, thereby releasing the pent-up energies and power of our people and our economic system. The emphasis is upon health, education, the development of natural resources, the provision of cheap credit for investment and new enterprise. There is a deep concern in the administration circles over the fall of farm income. Therefore extra time and emphasis is being placed upon improving the existing farm legislation so as to place a floor under farm prices and a guaranty of a stable and expanding farm income

During the past 2 years there has been a vicious and persistent attack upon the economic and political principles of the Fair Deal. There has been the cry of statism, socialism, and national insolvency. These have been cries in the wilderness. The record speaks for itself. The high levels of economic activity and prosperity in 1947, 1948, and 1949, along with the optimistic forecast for 1950, should set aside the false warnings of the false prophets. The so-called period of disaster has not materialized. The liberty of the American people has not been destroyed. The solvency of the Nation is not jeopardized. In fact, the state of the Union is good.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON THE 1951 BUDGET—OUR ECONOMY AND TAXATION

One of the most controversial issues facing our country is the President's budget calling for an estimated expenditure of $42,439,000,000 The estimated revenues are placed at $37,306,000,000. Simple arithmetic tells us that the President's budget would, therefore, result in a deficit next year of approximately $5,100,000,000. Total spending for the coming year will, however, be cut by almost a billion dollars as compared to last year.

In general terms, the President's budget reveals that 71 percent of the budget will go for foreign aid, veterans assistance programs, national defense, and interest on the national debt. To be specific, let us take a look at what happens to the budget dollar:

	Cents
National defense	32
Veterans assistance	15
Foreign aid	11
Interest on the public debt	13
Social welfare, health, and security	6
All other Government functions	23

In summary, 71 cents out of every budget dollar will go to pay for the cost of previous wars and for our program of peace and security for today and the future. The sum of 29 cents out of each budget dollar will go to meet the requirements of our domestic economy.

The most controversial part of the budget appears to be the item pertaining to the 6 cents out of each budget dollar for social welfare, health, and security. The total request by the President is approximately $2,700,000,000. This sum of money is required for public assistance to the aged, blind, dependent children, maternal and child care, public health, school-lunch program, and all aspects of the social security law exclusive of unemployment compensation.

The balance of the budget dollar—23 cents—will go for the following programs: Price supports for American agriculture, rural electrification and telephones, soil conservation, all the activities of the Department of Agriculture, land and water resources development, atomic energy, reforestation, highway systems, aviation and airport development, navigation, business loans, research, unemployment compensation, and the many administrative activities and responsibilities of the Federal Government.

In round figures then here's the answer to where the money will go:

National defense	$13,500,000,000
Veterans	6,100,000,000
Interest on public debt	5,600,000,000
International	4,700,000,000
Social welfare, health, and security	2,700,000,000
Natural resources	2,200,000,000
Agriculture	2,200,000,000
Housing and education	1,800,000,000
Transportation and communication	1,700,000,000
General Government	1,300,000,000
Labor, finance, commerce, and industry	500,000,000

The President gave the key to a program of balancing the budget when he said the budget is "directed at achieving a budgetary balance in the only way which it can be achieved—by measures which support rather than impair the continued growth of our country." The President proposes to balance the budget by future revenues, from a growing economy rather than from short-range economies that would make the country weaker.

The President took note of the fact that despite the great prosperity of 1949, the cost of unemployment was between $10,000,000,000 and $13,000,000,000 in lost production and lost wages. He also had in mind that approximately two-fifths of the families in this Nation have a gross income under $2,500 a year and that four-fifths of the families had a gross income under $5,000 a year. It is the purpose of the Fair Deal program to bolster up that low income section of our economy. In this manner the low-income citizens will be able to improve their earning capacities, thereby raising their income and making a greater contribution to the economy. The emphasis of the President was not only upon all possible economy in government but, even more so, upon an expanding economy and a more productive and fully employed people.

For the first time the budget this year revealed that a large percentage of the proposed expenditures would be used to build up the assets of the Nation. Much of this would be repaid to the Government either directly or indirectly in the future. A special tabulation revealed that a total of $12,400,000,000 out of a total $42,400,000,000 would be used for loans, grants, construction, and productive public works. Approximately $4,000,000,000 of this investment would be repaid to the Government through repayment of loans, sale of commodities, or sale of power from hydroelectric projects. Much of the rest of the over-all $12,000,000,000 investment fund would go to such development purposes as State and local construction of hospitals, schools, research, education, health, and natural resources.

One of the problems in understanding the budget is the failure to separate capital improvements from expenditures. It should be noted that American business considers capital improvements as assets and not as liabilities. If our Government followed the budget practices of private business, it is safe to say that our budget could well be called a balanced budget. Surely, stockpiling of strategic materials such as rubber, tin, manganese, nickel and chromium represent an investment.

Nor can it be denied that that portion of the budget which deals with storage for farm products, particularly nonperishables, in reality represents an investment rather than an expenditure. Similarly, loans on housing and FHA mortgages, farm credit, and Export-Import Bank loans should not be classified as expenditures but rather what they truly are, namely, loans. A bank considers loans an asset, not a liability. The vast majority of these loans will be repaid with interest. In fact, several Federal loan agencies are showing net profits to the Government.

FACTS CONCERNING FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Total cost for wages and salaries of all civilian employees as provided in the budget equals $4,800,000,000. Total number of civilian employees provided by the budget is 1,960,000 of which 75 percent will be for the Department of Defense, Post Office Department and Veterans' Administration. The high peak of Government employment was 3,770,000 during the war.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES PER CAPITA

During the fiscal year 1939, Federal Government expenditures amounted to about $69 for each man, woman, and child in the country. In the fiscal year 1951, the per capita expenditure is estimated at more than four times that amount, $278.

About 80 percent of the increase has occurred in four areas—national defense, international affairs and finance, veterans' services and benefits, and interest on the public debt.

The percentage of increase for all other programs is less than the rise which has taken place in average Government salaries and in the prices the Government has to pay for the goods it buys.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES AS A PERCENTAGE OF NATIONAL INCOME

Since fiscal year 1939 the national income of the United States has more than trebled. Federal budget expenditures, however, have risen to about four and three-quarters times their 1939 level. Whereas budget expenditures were less than 13 percent of the national income in 1939, they are estimated at about 18 percent of the national income in 1951.

The proportion of the national income which in 1951 will be devoted to four purposes—national defense, international affairs and finance, veterans' services and benefits, and interest on the public debt—is itself equal to the 13 percent devoted to all Federal expenditures during 1939. On the other hand, 1951 expenditures for non-war-related programs are estimated to represent 5.3 percent of the national income compared with 9.1 percent spent for these programs in 1939.

MEANS OF ECONOMY

The most concrete proposal for Government economy is represented by the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. It is estimated that approximately three and one-half to four billion dollars can be saved if these recommendations are carried out. The first session of the Eighty-first Congress enacted approximately 20 percent of the recommendations at an estimated saving of $1,500,000,000. I have actively supported the Hoover Commission proposals and shall continue to give them my support. As a member of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I have participated in the preparation of Hoover Commission legislation which has resulted in the saving thus far made. Additional legislation is under way and will be presented to the Congress. Other economies are being effected by constant investigation of the executive departments by the Senate Committee on Expenditures. These savings are seldom publicized, but have resulted in substantial gains.

Economy is a desirable objective in any enterprise, whether it be private or public. Economy, however, cannot be separated from efficiency. Further savings can perhaps be obtained by a very careful analysis of our national defense needs, our public works, and rivers and harbors appropriations. It must be kept in mind, however, that any savings or drastic cuts in expenditures which result in the jeopardizing of our national security, our foreign policy, or our responsibility to preserve democracy and peace all over the world, would prove to be a false economy. It is true that the cold war costs money—but a hot one would cost immeasurably more.

TAXATION

I have long favored and continue to support repeal of the wartime excise taxes. Such excise taxes served their purpose during the war. At present they serve to retard business and place an unfair burden upon the consumer and the retailer. I shall vote for their repeal. The chairman of the Senate Finance Committee has assured the Congress that appropriate legislation for the repeal of the taxes will be presented to the Congress.

Government revenue, however, must be maintained. I am supporting the President's tax recommendations presented to the Congress on January 23. These recommendations include the following:

1. Plugging the loopholes under present tax laws. These include:

(a) Excessive exemptions now enjoyed by the oil and mining interests.

(b) Abuse of tax-exemption privileges granted to certain trusts, educational, and charitable organizations. I refer here only to the tax loopholes that have developed through the abuse of such privileges.

2. The revision and the improvement of the estate, gift-tax, and corporation-tax laws.

The President's recommendation on corporation income calls for a moderate increase in the tax rate on that part of the corporation's net income which is excessive of $50,000. The President further recommended that the tax rate on corporate income below $50,000 be reduced. This reduction on taxes paid by medium-sized corporations would provide additional capital for small-business expansion. The tax increase would apply to less than one-tenth of all corporations.

Recent profit statements and dividend reports indicate that a moderate corporation tax increase would not be an excessive burden A recent report of the Federal Trade Commission covering 528 corporations in 25 selected industries, discloses that since the war there was an average 20-percent profit on invested capital in those industries after taxes.

It is of the utmost importance that every possible effort be made to hold Government expenditures within Government revenues. This can be done through the following courses of action:

1. Improvement of efficiency of Government operation such as suggested in the proposals of the Hoover Commission report.

2. Reduction in appropriations in those areas of Government activity where such reduction would not impair national security or the domestic welfare.

3. Revision of tax laws to provide increased revenue. This should be based entirely upon the principle of ability to pay with consideration for the provision of capital for small-business expansion.

STATEMENT OF EARNINGS OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, some time ago I asked Mr. Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, to give me a statement as to the earnings of that Authority. I have received from him such a statement.

I may add, Mr. President, that I asked the clerk of the Appropriations Committee to give me a statement as to how much the Tennessee Valley Authority has cost up to date. The total amount is $815,921,481. So it is seen that in 1949 the Tennessee Valley Authority is paying more than 2½ percent on its investment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from Mr. Clapp, together with the statement furnished me by the clerk of the Appropriations Committee. They contain information which I think the Congress should have.

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

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., February 10, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: In the course of a recent conversation we discussed TVA's progress in repaying the Nation's investment in the TVA power system and the rate of return on that investment earned by the TVA from the sale of power. You suggested that I condense what I reported to you then into a brief, written statement. This letter is in response to that request.

The financial results of the TVA power program are shown in the figures describing two facts: first, the rate of return which the power program is earning on the Government's investment, and, second, the revenues received from the sale of power and the uses to which these revenues have been put, including cash payments into the United States Treasury.

Rate of return: During the last fiscal year, proceeds from the sale of power amounted to $58,030,000; operating expense to generate and transmit the power and manage the power business, including depreciation, amounted to $36,552,000; the difference is $21,479,000 and is the net earnings of the TVA power system for 1949. These net power earnings represented a rate of return of 5 percent on the total money invested in the TVA power system—money derived partly from the taxpayers and partly from the consumers of TVA electricity. This 5-percent return was the second highest annual return since the TVA began in 1933.

The highest rate of return in any 1 year was 5½ percent which was achieved in fiscal year 1947. The rate of return in fiscal year 1948 was 4¼ percent.

The average annual rate of return over the entire 16 years of TVA's existence is about 4 percent of the average investment in the power system. This includes the period from 1933 to 1940 when TVA was held back in selling its power by lawsuits brought by the private utilities. In some years a lower return must be expected, particularly in the event of very dry weather when we will be required to use less hydro power and more of the higher-cost steam power, but the return has now exceeded 4 percent for 7 consecutive years. This rate of return, as I stated, is after an allowance for depreciation, a charge paid by the consumers to make replacements and to keep the property investment intact and useful.

This record of an average rate of return of 4 percent is proof that the users of electricity are paying considerably more than all the

cost incurred by TVA in producing and transmitting the power to the retail distribution systems of the cities and rural electric cooperatives who sell the power at retail rates to the ultimate consumers.

Cash payments to the Treasury and use of revenues: The second fact about the financial success of the TVA has to do with the cash picture—the proceeds received from the sale of power, payments made to the Treasury, and the uses which have been made of the balance.

As you know, TVA began retiring its bonded indebtedness (to the Treasury and the RFC) in the fiscal year 1944. In addition, in December 1946 TVA made its first cash payment into the United States Treasury under section 26 of the TVA Act, when for the first time operating proceeds exceeded requirements financed from this source of funds.

During the current fiscal year, TVA will pay $6,700,000 into the Treasury, of which $5,500,000 will be paid from power earnings and $1,200,000 from miscellaneous receipts.

By June 30, 1950, the end of the current fiscal year, TVA's cumulative payments into the Treasury will total about $54,200,000. This $54,200,000 will consist of $16,000,000 for bond retirements, $29,100,000 paid from power earnings under section 26 of the TVA Act (making a total of $45,100,000 from power) and $9,100,000 of nonpower proceeds also paid into the Treasury under section 26.

From the beginning in 1933 through the end of the 1949 fiscal year, revenues from power totaled $367,000,000 Out of this $367,000,000, TVA paid out-of-pocket operating expenses (for the power program only) amounting to $155,000,000. This $155,000,000 includes over $18,000,000 representing in-lieu tax payments to States and counties as prescribed by Congress in section 13 of the TVA Act, and over $6,000,000 paid to the Treasury and the RFC as interest on the outstanding bonds (which interest was, of course, in addition to the payments on principal to the Treasury described above). The balance of the $155,000,000 went for wages and for coal and other materials and supplies required to operate the TVA power system over the 16-year period.

Taking the total revenues of $367,000,000 and subtracting operating expenses of $155,000,000 leaves cash earnings (i. e., net earnings before charges for depreciation) of $212,000,000. These cash earnings have been used as follows:

One hundred and fifty-nine million six hundred thousand dollars has been used to make replacements to the power system facilities and to add additional generators and transmission lines to the system as reflected each year in TVA budgets reviewed by the Congress. (In this way, TVA paid for these facilities immediately instead of asking for appropriations and paying back the appropriation over a 40-year period as allowed under the law.)

Thirty-nine million six hundred thousand dollars has been paid to the Treasury. (Adding the payment to be made this year, the figure will reach $45,100,000 as described above)

Seven million six hundred thousand dollars represents the value of power inventories (coal, conductor cable, transformers, poles, etc., on hand for use and construction) which were on hand on June 30, 1949.

Five million two hundred thousand dollars represents accounts receivable and cash in the TVA checking account in the Treasury. (This represents all the reserve that was on hand on June 30 to help meet increased operating expenses in case of dry weather and low stream flow.)

As I told you in our recent conversation, this is a record that should reassure the country about the safety and success of the power business in the Tennessee Valley.

Nor does this tell the whole story. You know about the tremendous increase in rural electrification in the Tennessee Valley, the strategic value of TVA power for the atomic energy program and the aluminum and munitions programs during the war, and even now, the millions of dollars worth of generators, turbines, etc., purchased by the TVA from factories in other parts of the country, the millions of dollars spent by electricity consumers in the Tennessee Valley for electric appliances—hot water heaters, ranges, refrigerators, etc.—made in cities outside the Tennessee Valley. These and many other results of the expanded use of electricity in the Tennessee Valley, made possible by appropriations to the TVA by the Congress, add to the working value of the TVA power investment as a good investment for the whole Nation.

On the narrow basis of rate of financial return and cash payments to the Treasury, the TVA power system shows a successful public service, business result. On the broader basis of increased prosperity and national security I believe the results are even more conclusive.

If there are additional facts you would like, I should be glad to supply them.

Sincerely,

GORDON R. CLAPP,
Chairman of the Board.

Summary of amounts appropriated for Tennessee Valley Authority

Law	Name of act	Congress	Amount
Public No 77	Fourth Deficiency	73d	$50,000,000
Public No 412	Emergency	do	25,000,000
Public No 260	Second Deficiency	74th	36,000,000
Public No 739	First Deficiency	do	39,900,000
Public No. 121	Second Deficiency	75th	40,166,270
Public No 534	Independent Offices	do	40,000,000
Public No 8	do	76th	39,003,000
Public No. 459	do	do	40,000,000
Public Res 95	Resolutions (S J 285, H J 583)	do	25,000,000
Public No 28	Independent Offices	77th	79,800,000
Public No. 179	Resolution (H J Res. 194)	do	40,000,000
Public No. 353	Third Supplemental	do	47,000,000
Public No. 422	Fourth Supplemental	do	30,000,000
Public No 630	Independent Offices	do	136,100,000
Public No. 90	do	78th	(1)
Public No. 358	do	do	(1)
Public No 49	do	79th	9,648,000
Public No 519	Government Corporations	do	39,906,000
Public No. 268	do	80th	18,700,000
Public No 800	do	80th 2d	27,389,064
Public No 71	First Deficiency	81st 1st	2,950,000
Public No 266	Independent Offices	do	49,359,150
Total amount appropriated			815,921,481

[1] Unexpended balance only

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY AT SAN FRANCISCO

[Mr WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a Lincoln Day meeting under the auspices of the California Republican State Organization and the San Francisco County Republican Committee, at the Hotel Fairmont, San Francisco, Calif., on February 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY AT LOS ANGELES

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a Lincoln Day meeting under the auspices of the California Republican State Organization and Los Angeles County Republican Committee, at the Hotel Biltmore, Los Angeles, Calif., on February 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

AIR ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Secretary of the Air Force, W. Stuart Symington, at a meeting of the Nashville Chamber of Commerce, at Nashville, Tenn., on February 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE BEFORE THE GRADUATING CLASS OF BAYLOR UNIVERSITY

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, before the graduating class of Baylor University, at Waco, Tex., on February 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR DRISCOLL

[Mr SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Gov. Alfred E Driscoll, of New Jersey, at the Lincoln Day dinner held in New York, N. Y., on February 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPPOSITION TO RATIFICATION OF THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION—STATEMENT BY LEANDER H. PEREZ

[Mr. STENNIS, on behalf of himself and Mr. EASTLAND, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Leander H. Perez, district attorney of Louisiana, against ratification of the Genocide Convention, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CVA AND CONSERVATION—LETTER BY WINTON WEYDEMEYER

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an open letter entitled "The CVA and Conservation," addressed to the editors of Nature magazine by Winton Weydemeyer, master of the Montana State Grange, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPRESENTATIVE O'SULLIVAN, OF NEBRASKA—EDITORIAL FROM KEARNEY (NEBR.) DAILY HUB

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "O'SULLIVAN's Oratory," published in the Kearney (Nebr.) Daily Hub of February 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CUMBERLAND RIVER—EDITORIAL FROM THE PARIS (TENN.) POST-INTELLIGENCER

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial

entitled "Looking Forward," by W. Percy Williams, publisher of the Paris (Tenn.) Post-Intelligencer, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FULBRIGHT EXCHANGE PROGRAM IN OPERATION—ARTICLE BY CHARLES E. ODEGAARD

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Fulbright Exchange Program in Operation," by Charles E. Odegaard, published in the December 1949 issue of the News Letter of the American Council of Learned Societies, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS IN CHINA—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Three Bad Weeks," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of February 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY—ARTICLE BY E. A. WATSON

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Washington and Lee University and Its Bicentennial Celebration," written by E. A. Watson, editor of the Ironworker, and reprinted in the twentieth anniversary edition of Dixie Business, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make an observation for 2 or 3 minutes. I wish to call a matter to the attention of the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. House bill 5472 is a rivers-and-harbors and flood-control bill. It was developed by the House of Representatives, after thorough and lengthy public hearings. It passed the House of Representatives on August 22, 1949.

The Senate Committee on Public Works held 17 days of hearings on the bill. Modifications of the provisions made by the House and the consideration of additional projects were developed before the committee. The committee reported the bill to the Senate on October 7, 1949; and shortly thereafter the Senate passed the bill, including all but a few of the provisions reported by the committee.

Before reporting the bill, the committee considered the multiple-purpose program for the Columbia River Basin, involving flood control, navigation, power, and irrigation projects. The Committee on Public Works considered all those projects; but inasmuch as irrigation matters fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Committee on Public Works reached a decision to act only with respect to the flood-control, navigation, and power projects.

At the informal request of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, it was agreed that that committee would consider the irrigation projects and subsequently would offer, on the floor of the Senate, an amendment covering their recommendations with respect to the irrigation projects.

The Committee on Public Works has been most tolerant and extremely patient in connection with this matter. Nevertheless, we think this bill should be considered. Since the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was not able to conclude its consideration of the irrigation projects during the last session, the bill was held over until the present session, the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. We have now been in session approximately 6 weeks. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has recently been holding further hearings on the irrigation projects, but has not yet arrived at any conclusion regarding them. Over 4 months have now elapsed since the Committee on Public Works reported the bill to the Senate, but the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has not yet completed its action on the irrigation projects.

We wish to give the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as much time as possible, and as much time as is sound, to consider those matters. But there is no reason whatever why a bill that is being considered and handled by the Public Works Committee of the Senate should be delayed any longer. I hope the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs can now give us some information as to when the Senate may be able to take up the bill, which is so important to every one of the 48 States of the Union. I wonder whether we can get information from the majority leader on when we may expect action.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been holding almost daily sessions for more than a week considering certain amendments recommended by the Bureau of the Budget with respect to reclamation features which Members of the Senate desire to have considered in connection with the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I interrupt the Senator a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They referred, did they not, to the Columbia River Basin?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendments to which I refer, and to which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is now giving its attention, relate to the Columbia River Basin project.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator from Wyoming know that at this moment the bill has been completed entirely by the Senate committee, excepting only the matters which the Senator's committee is now considering?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Wyoming is perfectly well aware of that. The Senator from New Mexico was very indulgent at the last session of the Congress, when his bill was placed upon the calendar. We had an exchange on the floor at that time in which, as I recall, it was agreed that opportunity would be extended to Senators who desired to include these reclamation features to offer the amendments. It has been necessary, however, because of the great interest among the people of the Northwest, to await reports from various organizations and from State and local governments in the Northwest. This morning the last of the reports were received. I am hoping that the hearings upon the bill may be concluded tomorrow, and that thereafter, very quickly and as expeditiously as the chairman can bring it about, the committee will reach its conclusion as to what amendments should be offered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to make one further observation. The Committee on Public Works of the Senate met this morning, and I may say in all sincerity they have been extremely annoyed that a bill which comes under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee should be delayed to such an extent. They do not mind a request for tolerance, they do not mind a desire for patience, they do not mind fair play, they do not mind fine gestures and consideration on the part of other committees, but we do feel that the bill should be passed. It is a Senate bill.

Mr. President, the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee goes to matters pertaining to rivers and navigation, flood control, public roads, and public buildings. The fact that we now have in the bill irrigation or reclamation matters is only incidental to the fact that the Committee on Public Works has jurisdiction over the bill. The fact that reclamation comes into the picture is only because the Reorganization Act provides that, where there are several multiple-purpose matters, the committee having the superior interest in the whole purpose shall have jurisdiction. We do not handle anything with reference to reclamation as such. The only reason for our handling reclamation is because certain of the navigation and flood-control projects which are being considered also involve reclamation within the area of the projects. My committee is becoming rather impatient. I hope that both the leadership and other committees will have some consideration for our committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I may say I also hope that all members of the Committee on Public Works will have consideration for Members of the Senate who may desire to propose amendments to the bill. We are endeavoring, to the very best of our ability, to examine and report upon amendments which have been suggested by the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of Reclamation, which are very important to the great northwestern area of the United States; and I am quite sure the Committee on Public Works will continue to show the spirit of cooperation which the Senator from New Mexico has already shown.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We want to show that spirit of cooperation, but I insist, I may say to the Senate, we are not going to let any other committee legislate for the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, with respect to the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] with reference to House bill 5472, which is known as the flood-control bill, I should like to say that that

bill has been on the calendar for a long time, and it is the hope of the majority leader that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will conclude the hearings as rapidly as may be possible in order that he may be in position to offer any amendments to the bill which may be deemed advisable in protecting the interests of the Northwest. I hope we may reach consideration of the bill within a very short time, because the members of the Committee on Public Works are crowding the Senator from Illinois, and I am sure the Senator from Wyoming will cooperate with me in the matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Wyoming is happy to cooperate, and the committee has been cooperating. The amendments which have been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and sustained by the Secretary of the Interior have been transmitted to the committee only toward the end of the month of January and at the beginning of this month. I do not want anyone, on reading the RECORD, to gain the idea that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has not been diligently working upon the measure, because it has been. The amendments were considered as soon as they were received, and there have been almost daily sessions of the committee with reference to them.

CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to make an announcement.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, yesterday, and again today, I assisted the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island in conducting the annual hearings of the Subcommittee on Wildlife of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Those hearings will be available within about 2 weeks, and will be mailed to every Member of the Senate. I hope all my distinguished colleagues will read the hearings, because they deal with a great natural resource. They refer to the fact that there are 28,000,000 sportsmen in this Nation who buy hunting and fishing licenses and who distribute annually about $4,000,000,000, to say nothing of the contribution made by this type of outdoor life to a happy and contented citizenry.

Mr. President, during the course of the hearings yesterday, I referred to a friend in Germany who shot a deer on the land of a farmer with whom he was hunting. The deer fell over the fence on adjoining land, and the German farmer refused to retrieve it, "Because," as he said, "in Germany we do not trespass upon the property of others." There were also witnesses who told us that last year about 25,000,000 ducks had been killed legally and illegally, of a total of possibly 50,000,000.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Rhode Island, returned to his home with these problems upon his mind. When he went to sleep, he had a dream, and, although he had never shot a gun in his life, he dreamed he was in a duck blind in Rhode Island when a cloud of ducks came over. He dreamed that he shot into the middle of the flock, killing a duck, which, to his dismay, fell in Massachusetts. Being a law-abiding citizen of Rhode Island, he could not trespass in Massachusetts, and he was unable, therefore, to recover the first and only duck he ever killed. [Laughter.]

FACILITATION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF THE WORK OF THE FOREST SERVICE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1082, House bill 5839.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is this one of the bills listed for consideration at the time the statement was made by the majority leader last week as to what was expected to come before the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the senior Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate is House bill 5839, to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes. The facts are that the Forest Service as a bureau has plenty of laws for its guidance. These laws, as a rule, were passed in the form of amendments many of them to appropriation bills. The Department recommends that the Congress codify the laws pertaining to the Forest Service, and it has submitted the bill now pending for the consideration of the Congress.

The bill was before the Eightieth Congress for consideration. The appropriate committee held extensive hearings on the recommendations of the Department, and reported the bill, which was later passed by the House. It came to this body, but for some reason it was not acted on by the Senate during the Eightieth Congress. In the Eighty-first Congress the House again considered the bill, passed it, and sent it to the Senate, and the Senate now has before it House bill 5839.

When the bill reached the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a subcommittee was appointed to consider it and to make recommendations. The chairman of the subcommittee was the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. Hearings were held, and a report was submitted, but the subcommittee did not see fit to offer any amendment to the bill. Therefore, the bill we have before us today for consideration is the bill in the same form in which it passed the House of Representatives.

I am advised that after the bill was reported and placed on the calendar the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] considered the measure and found that for the benefit of the Forest Service, in his opinion, some amendments to the bill were needed. I am also advised that those amendments are pending, that the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was consulted, and that the subcommittee is in agreement with the amendments to be submitted by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, when this bill was reached upon the call of the calendar during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, I was one of those who made objection to its passage at that time by unanimous consent, because a reading of the bill convinced me that some perfecting amendments and some additional amendments should be made. I had conversations with the able senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] at that time, and it was agreed that amendments should be worked out during the recess of the Congress.

During the recess, Mr. President, the matters were considered broadly by grazing users of the forests and by the Forest Service itself. I arranged for a conference between the chief of the Forest Service and his staff, and committees of the grazing users of the national forests, with the thought that they could work out, between them, amendments upon which there would be agreement. I participated in conferences with the head of the Forest Service. I advised the Senator from Minnesota of the progress of all these negotiations, and placed in his hands copies of the amendments to be proposed.

I am now in receipt of a letter from the senior Senator from Minnesota, dated February 14, in which he expresses my understanding, namely, that the amendments which I am about to propose meet his agreement, and also meet the agreement of the Forest Service. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1950.

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

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Since I am author of a companion bill in the Senate and also designated by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to report H. R. 5839, I regret that I am unable to be present at the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 14, when this measure will be under consideration.

I am writing to you at this time to say that I believe this measure to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service will make it possible for that service to carry

out its functions more effectively and efficiently. As indicated in the report of the committee, the changes and improvements in the law relating to the Forest Service which are proposed in this bill are the outgrowth of cumulative experience of the service and are based upon careful study.

I wish also to say, as I stated on the floor of the Senate on February 1, that I have no objection to the amendments which you have offered to this bill. I have been advised by the Forest Service that that agency desires to interpose no objection to these amendments.

I hope the Senate will act favorably upon H. R. 5839 with the amendments which you have proposed.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in his letter, the Senator from Minnesota says, among other things:

I have been advised by the Forest Service that that agency desires to interpose no objection to these amendments.

Mr. President, when this same bill was reached upon the call of the calendar at this session of the Eighty-first Congress, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] interposed an objection, and the bill went over. His objection has now been removed, and I have a letter from the office of the Senator from Utah expressing withdrawal of his objection. I ask that this letter may also appear in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., February 13, 1950.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to take this opportunity to clarify my position on the omnibus forest bill, H. R. 5839.

As you know, I objected to this bill when it was called on the calendar last February 1. You will recall that it was proposed for passage, as amended, the previous day. I had had no opportunity whatever to study the amendments and I could not, with a clear conscience, vote on something I knew nothing about. Further, I had promised my constituents in Utah that they would have an opportunity to analyze any amendments to this bill and give me their opinions of them before any action was taken. Therefore, when the amendments were introduced one day and the bill called on the next day, my constituents in Utah knew nothing of their terms and I was under obligation to give them the opportunity I had promised.

Since that time, I have had an opportunity to go over the amendments and have received notification from Utah that they have had an opportunity there to analyze them. I am happy to tell you that I will support the bill and the amendments when the legislation is again called on the calendar.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the first amendment I wish to offer is amendment lettered "E," which proposes to insert a new section at the end of the bill. This section provides for the establishment of local advisory boards in the various forests of the Nation.

On page 2 of the amendment as printed, in line 17, appears the word "may," in the following sentence:

In addition a wildlife representative may be appointed as a member of each such board by the State game commission, or the corresponding public body of the State in which the advisory board is located, to advise on wildlife problems.

Some questions have been directed to me as to whether the word should be "may" or "shall." The amendment was drawn with the word "may" in it, because, as a reading of the sentence indicates, the appointment of such persons will be dependent upon the action of the various State game commissions, and it was not desired to control action by the State commissions if the State commissions did not intend to act, but if the State commissions do act, it is my understanding that the persons so recommended shall be appointed. So I believe no change is required in that respect.

Mr. President, with this explanation, I hope that the first amendment may be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

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

SEC. . (a) (1) To provide national forest grazing permittees means for the expression of their recommendations concerning the management and administration of national forest grazing lands, a local advisory board shall be constituted and elected as hereinafter provided for each national forest or administrative subdivision thereof whenever a majority of the grazing permittees of such national forest or administrative subdivision so petitions the Secretary of Agriculture. Each elected local advisory board existing for such purpose at the time of the enactment of this act, and recognized as such by the Department of Agriculture, shall continue to be the local advisory board for the unit or area it represents, until replaced by a local advisory board or boards constituted and elected as hereinafter provided.

(2) Each such local advisory board shall be constituted and elected under rules and regulations, consistent herewith, now or hereafter approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, and shall be recognized by him as representing the grazing permittees of the national forest or administrative subdivision thereof for which such local advisory board has been constituted and elected.

(3) Each such local advisory board shall consist of not less than 3 nor more than 12 members, who shall be national forest grazing permittees in the area for which such board is constituted, elected, and recognized. In addition, a wildlife representative may be appointed as a member of each such board by the State game commission, or the corresponding public body of the State in which the advisory board is located, to advise on wildlife problems.

(4) Each such local advisory board shall meet at least once annually, at a time to be fixed by such board, and at such other time or times as its members may determine, or on the call of the chairman thereof or of the Secretary of Agriculture or his authorized representative.

(b) Upon the request of any party affected thereby, the Secretary of Agriculture, or his duly authorized representative, shall refer to the appropriate local advisory board for its advice and recommendations any matter pertaining to (1) the modification of the terms, or the denial of a renewal of, or a reduction in, a grazing permit, or (2) the establishment or modification of an individual or community allotment. In the event the Secretary of Agriculture, or his duly authorized representative, shall overrule, disregard, or modify any such recommendations, he, or such representative, shall furnish in writing to the local advisory board his reasons for such action.

(c) (1) At least 30 days prior to the issuance by the Secretary of Agriculture of any regulation under this act or otherwise, with respect to the administration of grazing on national forest lands, or of amendments or additions to, or modifications in, any such regulation, which in his judgment would substantially modify existing policy with respect to grazing in national forests, or which would materially affect preferences of permittees in the area involved, the local advisory board for each area that will be affected thereby shall be notified of the intention to take such action. If as a result of this notice the Secretary of Agriculture shall receive any recommendation respecting the issuance of the proposed regulation and shall overrule, disregard, or modify any such regulations, he or his representative shall furnish in writing to the local advisory board his reasons for such action.

(2) Any such local advisory board may at any time recommend to the Secretary of Agriculture, or his representative, the issuance of regulations or instructions relating to the use of national forest lands, seasons of use, grazing capacity of such lands, and any other matters affecting the administration of grazing in the area represented by such board.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my attention was diverted. Has the amendment been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Which amendment was that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is the amendment setting up local advisory boards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the amendment lettered "E."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether or not the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has been advised of all these amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, Mr. President; I think every one interested has been advised.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood that at one time, before the amendments were offered, the Senator from Colorado wanted to make some suggestions as to amending the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand the point of view of the Senator from Colorado is exactly the same as my own, and that he is satisfied with the amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator, and I shall not ask for a reconsideration of the vote by which the first amendment was just agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now offer amendment lettered "D," which proposes a new section to be inserted at the end of the bill, which would authorize the Secretary to issue 10-year grazing permits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

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

SEC. . The Secretary of Agriculture in regulating grazing on the national forests and other lands administered by him in connection therewith is authorized, upon such terms and conditions as he may deem proper, to issue permits for the grazing of livestock for periods not exceeding 10 years and renewals thereof: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as limiting or restricting any right, title, or interest of the United States in any land or resources.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now offer amendment lettered "C." This is a substitute for section 12 of the bill. The amendment is to come on page 9, beginning with line 11, to strike out through line 9, on page 10, and insert in lieu thereof certain language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, beginning with line 11, it is proposed to strike out through line 9 on page 10, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 12. Of the moneys received from grazing fees by the Treasury from each national forest during each fiscal year there shall be available at the end thereof when appropriated by Congress an amount equivalent to 2 cents per animal-month for sheep and goats and 10 cents per animal-month for other kinds of livestock under permit on such national forest during the calendar year in which the fiscal year begins, which appropriated amount shall be available until expended on such national forest, under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for (1) artificial revegetation, including the collection or purchase of necessary seed; (2) construction and maintenance of drift or division fences and stock-watering places, bridges, corrals, driveways, or other necessary range improvements; (3) control of range-destroying rodents; or (4) eradication of poisonous plants and noxious weeds, in order to protect or improve the future productivity of the range

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now offer the amendments lettered "F." This is a series of technical amendments which change words. For example, the words "Forest Service" are stricken out and the words "Secretary of Agriculture" are inserted in lieu thereof. On page 3, line 25, after the word "cost", it is proposed to strike out the words "or the depositor's share thereof," and to insert "of the work to be done for the benefit of the depositor."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 3, line 18, after the word "The", to strike the words "Forest Service" and insert, "Secretary of Agriculture."

On page 3, line 25, after the word "cost", to strike the words "or the depositor's share thereof" and insert "of the work to be done for the benefit of the depositor."

On page 5, line 5, after the word "cost", to insert the words "and the funds received as reimbursement."

On page 6, line 3, after the word "required", to insert the words "by the Secretary of Agriculture."

On page 8, line 12, after the word "is", to insert the words "determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be."

On page 8, line 17, after the word "the", to strike the words "Forest Service" and insert the words "Secretary of Agriculture."

On page 8, line 21, to strike the words "other than national forest lands" and insert the words "(other than national forest lands)."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, since these are merely technical amendments, to which there is no objection, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the amendments are agreed to, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming a question, since I was not on the floor of the Senate during all his able presentation of the amendments. It is my understanding that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are agreeable to all the amendments. They attended the hearings, and the Senator knows that they feel that the amendments should be agreed to; does he?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. I have made a part of the record letters which I have received from the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and in response to the Senator from Nebraska I have expressed my belief that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is satisfied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, at this time I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the working out of these amendments, and arriving at an agreement on the part of all parties, is very satisfactory, and a very happy solution of the questions involved, so far as the people in my State and in the West generally are concerned. I therefore ask that an editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune be made a part of the RECORD at this point. It commends all those who have taken part in perfecting the legislation.

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

AGREEMENT OF STOCKMEN AND FOREST OFFICIALS ON RANGE PROGRAM PRESAGES BETTER DAYS

There is good news today, too.

Heralding better relations between the United States Forest Service and organized stockmen, compromise legislation has been worked out to improve grazing conditions and administration of national forests. Agreements have been reached on some controversial points in the omnibus forest bill (H. R. 5839), sponsored by Congressman GRANGER, of Utah. The original measure was passed by the House of Representatives last August, but was tied up in the Senate after stockmen objected.

With some 4,000,000 acres of forest ranges in need of rehabilitation, a spirit of cooperation which would remove the roadblocks to such improvements would be a great boon to the region. It would remove a sore which could fester to damage seriously basic western industries.

Compromises worked out with the help of Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, have been accepted generally by forest officials and leaders of various cattle and sheep associations. (Active in the conference was J. M. Jones, of Salt Lake City, executive secretary of the National Wool Growers' Association, and other prominent leaders of stockmen's associations.) Better understanding and enlightenment—giving a green light to rebuilding barren watersheds—would greatly benefit the livestock industry and hundreds of communities depending upon the mountain areas for water.

A Board of Appeals is established to advise the Secretary of Agriculture on appeals from decisions of the Chief of the Forest Service involving public use of the forests. The Board is to comprise five persons in agencies within the Agriculture Department, excluding the Forest Service. The Board would consider each appeal on its merits and make recommendations to the Secretary.

After the stockmen-Forest Service conferences Senator O'MAHONEY introduced three amendments to the Granger bill, which are aimed to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service. They are:

1. A substitution for controversial section 12 of the bill (which was fought by the stockmen), providing that 2 cents per head of sheep and 10 cents per head of other livestock per animal month of the grazing fees should be used for range improvements, when appropriated by Congress. Funds would go for artificial revegetation, purchase of seed, construction and maintenance of fences, bridges, corrals, driveways, other range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous plants.

2. A provision for election by permittees of local advisory boards for each national forest, when requested by a majority of the permittees. A representative of wildlife interests might be named to the boards by the State game commission. The advisory boards would make recommendations concerning terms, renewals, and reductions of grazing permits or establishing or modifying allotments. If the Secretary of Agriculture did not follow the recommendations, he would be required to furnish the local advisory board of his reasons in writing. The boards would be notified at least 30 days in advance of any changes in regulations or policy and given a chance to make recommendations.

3. A section authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to issue grazing permits and renewals for permits not exceeding 10 years. This is hailed by stockmen as a recognition of grazing as one of the basic uses of forest land. It permits the Agriculture Department to open the question of permit renewals at 10-year intervals.

The omnibus bill, with the O'Mahoney amendments, would result in no radical departures in forest management, but would formalize, and in some cases remove, any question of legality in present procedures. It would recognize formally the advisory boards, though final authority would still rest with the Department of Agriculture.

As expressed by Senator O'MAHONEY, the conference between Chief Lyle F. Watts and Assistant Chief Granger of the Forest Service

and the committee of stockmen "have formed a pattern of cooperation * * * which augurs well for the future."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5839) was passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. THYE conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should add, now that the bill has been passed, that in addition to the amendments which have been agreed to, the Forest Service recommended, and the Secretary of Agriculture signed an order under the authority which he has under existing law, establishing a National Advisory Board of Appeals, to which permittees who may be dissatisfied may, upon written application, carry their appeals for consideration by the Board and for recommendation to the Secretary.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I issued on January 31, 1950, explaining the amendments which have just been adopted and the manner in which they were developed.

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

Following conferences with Forest Service officials and representatives of livestock interests using the national forests for grazing purposes, which started during the closing weeks of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress and continued during the recess and early weeks of the second session, a program designed to improve grazing conditions and administration of the national forests has been agreed upon.

First is the establishment by Executive order, printed in the Federal Register of January 25, 1950, of a National Forest Advisory Board of Appeals to advise the Secretary of Agriculture on appeals to him from the decisions of the Chief of the Forest Service involving any public use of the national forests. This Board shall be comprised of five members from any agencies within the Department of Agriculture except the Forest Service. It will be the duty of this Board to consider each appeal on its merits and furnish its advice and recommendations to the Secretary.

Conferences which I arranged last week between the Forest Service and a committee of stockmen representing cattle and sheep permittees, I am happy to say, have resulted in agreement on three additional important proposals, which I introduced today as amendments to H. R. 5839, the Granger bill, to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service.

The first amendment is a substitution for section 12 of the above bill and provides that, of the grazing fees collected in each national forest, 2 cents per animal month for sheep and 10 cents per animal month for other kinds of livestock, when appropriated by Congress, shall be available for range improvements in such forest, such as artificial revegetation, the collection and purchase of seed, construction or maintenance of drift or division fences, bridges, corrals, driveways, and other range improvement, and the control of rodents and the eradication of poisonous plants, to protect and improve the forest ranges.

The second amendment proposes a new section to the bill which establishes a local advisory board of not less than 3 nor more than 12 permittees for each national forest or administrative subdivision thereof when requested by a majority of the grazing permittees. This amendment uses the identical language proposed in a bill, S 33 of the Eightieth Congress, by Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, to establish local advisory boards to provide national forest grazing permittees a means for the expression of their recommendations. These boards are to be elected by the permittees and recognized by the Secretary of Agriculture as representing the grazing permittees of the national forest for which they are elected. A wildlife representative may also be appointed to such board by the State game commission to advise on wildlife problems. These boards are to meet at least once a year at a time fixed by the boards, and at other times determined by the members, or on call of the chairman, or of the Secretary of Agriculture. On the request of any affected party, the Secretary shall refer to these advisory boards for advice and recommendations concerning terms, renewals, and reductions in a grazing permit or the establishment or modification of an individual or community allotment. If the Secretary of Agriculture does not follow such recommendations, he would be required to furnish the local advisory board, in writing, with his reasons At least 30 days prior to the issuance of any regulation by the Secretary of Agriculture concerning administration of grazing on national forests which modify existing policy or affect the preference of a permittee in the area, the local board for such area will be notified of the intention to take such action and be called upon for recommendations, and these boards may also at any time make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the administration of grazing, seasons of use, grazing capacity, and similar matters in their area.

The third amendment which I introduced authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue grazing permits and renewals for periods not exceeding 10 years

I feel that the conferences between Chief Lyle F. Watts and Assistant Chief C M. Granger, on behalf of the Forest Service, and the committee of stockmen have been most successful. They have formed a pattern of cooperation between the Forest Service and the livestock industry which augurs well for the future.

J B. Wilson, secretary, Wyoming Wool Growers Association; F. E Mollin, secretary, American National Live Stock Association; Vernon Metcalf, Nevada; J. M. Jones, secretary, National Wool Growers Association; Floyd Beach, permittee, Uncompahgre Forest, Colo.; Clarence Currey, permittee, Roosevelt Forest, Colo.; Everett Shuey, secretary, Montana Wool Growers Association; Louis Horrell, chairman, Joint Livestock Committee; Frank Mockler, cattle permittee, Wyoming; Radford Hall, assistant secretary, American National Live Stock Association; and John Noh, chairman, forestry committee, National Wool Growers Association, were among the members of the livestock committee who have been working diligently upon this matter here in Washington for the past 2 weeks. I feel that they have done an excellent piece of work.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the statement made by the majority leader at the last session, which was held on Friday of last week, that the next business to be taken up, after the passage of House bill 5839, which has just been acted upon, would be House bill 4406, Calendar No. 810, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4406.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island feel that a quorum call is necessary?

Mr. GREEN. I do not think so. The objections which have been voiced heretofore have been overcome. I am sure no objection will be made to the consideration and passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4406) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, House bill 4406 came over from the House, and was referred, together with a similar bill, to the Committee on Foreign Relations. A subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was appointed to consider the bill, and hearings were held. Finally, after being considered at several meetings, it was unanimously voted to report the bill favorably, with certain minor amendments. It now comes before the Senate for action. The bill was reported by me on July 28, 1949, by direction of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, the immediate purpose of the bill is to provide for the distribution of a fund provided by the Yugoslav Government for claimants against that government, by reason of the taking in various ways of property of American citizens. A bloc sum of $17,000,000 was agreed upon, and that sum has been ready since the time the fund was established, for distribution among the American claimants.

The bill sets up a commission of three, a commission similar to one which was set up in 1942 for the handling of claims by American citizens against Mexico. The bill not only sets up a commission to deal with the particular settlements of American claimants against Yugoslavia, but it further provides that similar action may be taken in regard to claims arising out of World War II, and which may be made in the future by American citizens against other governments which are not enemy states.

Mr. President, the $17,000,000 in question, or so much of it as can be proved to be due to American claimants, is greatly needed. I have received some pathetic letters from Americans practically all of

whose property had been taken in one way or another, or, to use a more desirable term, lost in one way or another in the tragic days of the setting up of a new government in Yugoslavia.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this time, or would the Senator rather proceed with his statement now, and yield for questions later?

Mr. GREEN. I am glad to yield to the Senator now.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island why the claims provided for in the bill are limited to claims by American citizens against Yugoslavia?

Mr. GREEN. They are not. The commission is set up to deal with claims of Americans against other countries which are not enemy countries.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why does there appear in line 21 on page 2 of the bill the expression "the term 'Yugoslav Claims Agreement of 1948' "?

Mr. GREEN. Because a claims agreement has been reached with that one country. Similar agreements are being negotiated with other countries. It is necessary to have such a commission set up to take care of claims by American citizens against other nonenemy countries.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the claims considered by such a commission include claims made by German nationals to whom the United States may owe money which may have been impounded by the Alien Property Custodian? Let us assume that the beneficiary of such a German nationalist may be an American boy whose mother lives in Germany. Does the bill include in its terms the right for such an American boy, or his German mother, to set up a claim against the United States Government?

Mr. GREEN. No. The bill has simply to do with claims against friendly governments.

Mr. WHERRY. It does not apply to individuals?

Mr. GREEN. Well, yes; individual claims against the Yugoslav Government, or against any other friendly government.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the bill applies to claims against friendly governments, and that it would not extend to citizens of Germany, because Germany was an enemy government in World War II, as well as World War I. But let us consider the case of a lad of German descent, who fought in the forces of the United States, and who at the time of the war was a citizen of the United States, but whose mother may live in Germany. Is any opportunity afforded under the proposed legislation for recovery in such a case?

Mr. GREEN. The settlement is a bloc settlement. In other words, it provides for a lump sum, that amount to cover all American citizens who have filed claims against Yugoslavia, or may file claims against Yugoslavia.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that, I will say to the Senator. I shall give the reason for my question. Recently several Senators joined in introducing a bill which dealt, as does the bill sponsored by the Senator from Rhode Island, with claims by American citizens against friendly countries; but included in the proposed legislation was the proposal to take care of such a situation as I have just inquired about of the Senator from Rhode Island. I wonder why it would not be possible to offer an amendment at this time to include other American citizens who, it seems to me, are entitled to money which has been impounded by the Alien Property Custodian, but which belongs to persons who live in countries which are not friendly countries. That is the point I was raising, and I think it a very important point. I fully understand the point made by the Senator respecting claims against friendly countries. But why should we not consider as well other claims by American citizens for money which has been impounded by the Alien Property Custodian, who now is in control of that money?

Mr. GREEN. The Yugoslav claims agreement does not include claims against any other countries. It provides for a bloc settlement, and the United States undertakes to devote the money provided by that settlement to payments of claims on the part of Americans against Yugoslavia.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. GREEN. The payments must be made for such a purpose. Otherwise the money would be returned to Yugoslavia.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, the bill applies only to claims coming under the Yugoslav Claims Agreement. Is that correct?

Mr. GREEN. The bill provides for the Yugoslav Claims Agreement, but it also would set up a commission which could enter into agreements with other friendly countries respecting claims against them by American citizens.

Mr. WHERRY. The bill provides for the establishment of a commission, and that commission shall now take care of payments to Americans who have claims against Yugoslavia, but shall also undertake investigation of claims by American citizens against other friendly governments, and shall undertake to enter into agreements with them similar to the Yugoslav Claims Agreement of 1948 between Yugoslavia and the United States?

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, such an agreement would have to be negotiated between the United States and Germany in order to include claimants against Germany?

Mr. GREEN. It could not be negotiated with Germany, because Germany is an enemy country.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that the war is not over for all purposes, and for that reason Germany is still an enemy country. The Senator knows that there are claims of individuals in Germany which are just as legitimate as the claims covered by this bill, and which ought to be resolved in the same way.

Mr. GREEN. But that would require settlement outside the scope of this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that they are outside the scope of the purposes of the proposed act. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. I see the point of the bill. However, we are going all over the map, to Yugoslavia and other countries, to do the very thing which I am talking about, and which we cannot do under the provisions of the proposed act for citizens of this country who may live in an unfriendly country.

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

The amendments which were agreed upon by the Foreign Relations Committee as a result of its hearings are enumerated at the bottom of page 2 of the committee's report. The most important amendment is the proviso with respect to future agreements. It was at first felt that this provision might be applied in the present case, but it was not included in the agreement executed. We limited the improvement, if it may be called that, to future cases.

The amendment reads as follows:

Provided, however, That if any agreement hereafter concluded between the Government of the United States and a foreign government, of the character mentioned in section 4 (a) of this act, includes provisions for the settlement and discharge of claims of individuals who, at the time of nationalization or other taking, (1) were permanent residents of the United States and (2) had declared their intention to become citizens of the United States in conformity with the provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, such individuals shall, for the purposes of this act, be deemed "nationals of the United States" if they shall have acquired citizenship of the United States prior to the effective date of the relevant intergovernmental settlement agreement.

This provision applies not to the case of Yugoslavia, but to agreements which are to be negotiated in the future.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. How many agreements does the Senator anticipate may be signed between the United States and other countries in anticipation of such claims?

Mr. GREEN. I do not know how many other agreements are now pending.

Mr. WHERRY. Are we negotiating to do with other countries what we are trying to do with Yugoslavia?

Mr. GREEN Yes; similar agreements are in process of negotiation. Of course, the various executive agreements may differ somewhat.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand, I am just trying to get an idea of the extent of the program.

Mr. GREEN. There is at present an agreement, practically completed, between the United States and Panama. I do not know what other agreements are pending at the present time.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator anticipate that there will be others?

Mr. GREEN. I remember two other cases. An agreement with Czechoslovakia is one, and one with Poland is another.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have any idea what amount of money is involved in the other agreements?

Mr. GREEN. No, I have not. The $17,000,000 figure is merely an estimate, but it is founded on precedent.

Mr. WHERRY. Estimates usually fall short of actual appropriations. I was wondering what the total amount of the

liability might be. In this bill we are not only authorizing the agreement involved, but we are authorizing the Commission to settle claims under similar agreements which may be negotiated in the future. Is that correct?

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator cannot give me any idea of the amount which might be involved in future appropriations?

Mr. GREEN. I do not believe anyone can do that. That would depend on the individual claims and the extent of the claims, as well as the percentage of them which might be justiciable and the percentage which might be well founded.

Mr. WHERRY. We have already settled some of these claims with other countries, have we not?

Mr. GREEN. I think not.

Mr. WHERRY. Have not payments been made for damages sustained by several other countries in Europe, which we arrived at by agreement of some kind?

Mr. GREEN. This does not involve a payment by the United States.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. This does not involve a payment by the United States. It contemplates payment out of a lump sum, agreed upon with the Government of Yugoslavia, to American citizens whose property was expropriated, or confiscated, or nationalized, in Yugoslavia.

Mr. WHERRY. None of the money represented by the $17,000,000 fund is to be appropriated by the United States?

Mr. GEORGE. No; none of it is. The only obligation incurred by the United States is in connection with the authorization of the creation of a commission to negotiate similar settlements with other countries, such as Austria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, or any other country which may likewise have confiscated the property of American citizens.

Mr. WHERRY. The Commission is authorized to make a study of the claims and enter into an agreement as to the amounts to which Americans living in a certain country are entitled?

Mr. GEORGE. That is a process of long negotiation between representatives of the State Department and representatives of foreign governments. When they arrive at the amounts which our citizens are entitled to be paid, or the amounts which the other country is willing to pay to our citizens, a commission will be established for the purpose of administering the fund. In the case of Yugoslavia, any money which is not paid out to American claimants will, of course, go back to the Yugoslavian Government.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island yield so that I may ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Are the administration costs to be paid out of the $17,000,000 fund?

Mr. GEORGE. I think so.

Mr. GREEN. The costs of administration will be 3 percent of each claim.

Mr. GEORGE. Each claim will bear its pro rata share of the cost of administration.

Mr. GREEN. I might say that that represents a decided bargain, because in connection with previous agreements the administrative cost was 5 percent.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I am always in favor of bargains for the American taxpayers.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more statement?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The question was asked as to how many of these claims might arise in the future. My hope is that many more of them will be coming in. It must be realized that when revolutionary governments come into power we cannot always take care of the interests of our people. Here we have an example of a nation which is willing to assume its obligation to pay for property which that Government confiscated. It is to be hoped that we may have many more such agreements in the future.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator see any objection to the Commission's going into other claims, such as were mentioned in the discussion between the junior Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Rhode Island—for example, claims of citizens of the United States with respect to which money has been impounded by the Alien Property Custodian? Why could not the Commission go into all such claims?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The procedure in the case of the Alien Property Custodian is entirely different.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. This is a Commission to settle claims to be paid to people in a certain country.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; to be paid to American citizens in this country.

Mr. WHERRY. Or wherever the citizens are.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. The more we study this problem the easier it is to keep things on a peaceful keel. At the same time the Senator from Nebraska must know that because of the difference in conditions in various countries the negotiation processes must be individually considered with respect to each country.

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] has been excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate through Thursday, February 16. At the request of the senior Senator from Kansas, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding the bill now under consideration, together with an article entitled "Nomads' Fraud," written by Tris Coffin and published in the Washington Times-Herald of August 3, 1949.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

Mr. President, I obtained consent to be absent from the Senate from February 10, through Thursday, February 16, and I have been advised that there is a possibility that during my absence H. R. 4406 will be called for consideration in the Senate.

I have prepared a statement that sets forth some of the points that have been raised and presented to me for consideration. I feel that this information should be made available to the Senate before final vote in order that in the final consideration of this measure an opportunity might be afforded to clarify some phases of the legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be filed in the body of the RECORD and that an article entitled "Nomads' Fraud," by Tris Coffin, published in the Washington Times-Herald under date of August 3, 1949, be inserted in the body of the RECORD following my statement.

FEBRUARY 9, 1950.

STATEMENT

Subject: H. R 4406, an act to apply for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments.

1. HISTORY IN THE HOUSE

H. R. 4406, in the House of Representatives, was a controversial bill. A motion to recommit, for which a roll call was demanded, resulted in yeas 151, and nays 177. During the debate on the bill several serious questions were raised concerning its provisions. Adequate answers to these questions are not found in the Senate committee hearings or in the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which reported the bill.

2. TERMS OF THE ACT

The provisions of H. R. 4406 are well outlined in the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations beginning on page 4. Certain aspects of the bill should be brought particularly to mind. It calls for the establishment of the International Claims Commission set up entirely within the Department of State to distribute funds set aside for satisfaction of Yugoslav claims. The decisions of this Commission, which operates within the Department of State, "shall be final and conclusive on all questions of law and fact and not subject to review by the Secretary of State or any other department, agency or establishment of the United States or by any court, by mandamus or otherwise."

Another provision of the bill is that the Commission shall exist to settle Yugoslav claims and similar claims settlements which may be made in the future with Poland, Czechoslovakia, or other nations. Although the Commission can be terminated by the President when its immediate task at hand is completed, it also may be reinstated by the President at any time when the need arises, without further action by the Congress.

The bill provides that a corporation is a person under the proposed law providing "20 percent or more of any class of outstanding securities which were at such time (the time of the nationalization or other taking of property) owned by individuals of the United States." It is conceivable, as the Senate committee points out, that the remaining 80 percent of the corporation might be held by foreign nationals, resident or nonresident of the United States.

3. BACKGROUND OF THE SETTLEMENT WITH YUGOSLAVIA

Yugoslavia made a settlement with the United States on July 19, 1948, providing a lump-sum payment by the Yugoslav Government of $17,000,000 to be divided in satisfaction of claims of American nationals which allegedly amounted to some $40,000,000.

The claims on behalf of American nationals against Yugoslavia grow out of policies and actions of the postwar Communist Government of that country. These are, principally: an agrarian reform law of August 1945, a law of December 6, 1946, nationalizing

basic industries; a law of May 20, 1948, nationalizing small-business enterprises; a law of June 23, 1948, nationalizing virtually all remaining property in Yugoslavia.

At the time this settlement was made, the United States Government had $46,800,000 in gold held as frozen assets of the Yugoslav Government in the Federal Reserve Bank in New York. The gold had been brought by submarine to the United States early in the war to prevent its falling into the hands of the Nazis.

We permitted the entry of the gold into this country as a gesture of help to a friendly country about to be invaded. Subsequently Yugoslavia was taken over by the Communists who presented their claim to the gold.

While we held the $47,000,000 of gold assets in New York, the State Department settled American claims of approximately that amount for $17,000,000 and released the balance to Tito. The action must have been inspired by a desire of the Department of State to aid the Tito stand against Moscow. The Department of State recently has encouraged the World Bank to make a $20,000,000 loan to Yugoslavia of which the first installment has already been issued according to press reports of October 11, 1949. On August 17, it was announced that Tito's regime would be allowed to purchase a steel mill in the United States. This settlement, which released more than 50 percent of frozen gold assets to the Yugoslav Government instead of applying it to the settlement of American claims, may have been prompted in part by a desire to put gold in Tito's hands as soon as possible.

Subsequent to the American settlement, the British have had to settle with Yugoslavia at considerably less than 25 cents on the dollar for British property that was nationalized by the Communists. The French reportedly are now settling for $4,500,000 their property which they valued at some $60,000,000 to $100,000,000.

4. BENEFICIARIES UNDER THE BILL

The United States Government will benefit from the bill directly in very minor degree. The United States has claims against the Yugoslav Government for a jeep and two airplanes.

There is not much information in the hearings either in the House or in the Senate as to who other beneficiaries will be. A charge has been made by the Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Texas, of the House, that much of the $17,000,000 will go to several large corporations. Among these are American corporations such as Socony-Vacuum with a claim of $7,000,000 to $11,000,000, and the American-Yugoslav Electric Co., which has a claim for $3,500,000. One witness told the House committee that he had heard that there are six or seven million-dollar claims. One of the beneficiaries is a Swiss corporation, which claims because more than 20 percent of the corporation is owned by American citizens. Almost no information has been presented to the Congress about the exact ownership of this corporation and whether 80 percent is owned by foreign nationals.

Mr. BECKWORTH also charged that stock of some of the corporations that will claim a part of the $17,000,000 was bought up for speculation purposes after the property was nationalized by the Communists. In the House hearings, on page 71, Hon. A. A. RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, declared: "I have a situation which has been called to my attention where a group of Americans acquired approximately a $17,000,000 interest for $20,000 plus a contingent payment of $260,000.

There must be many bona fide claimants who will come before the State Department Commission if this bill passes, but the Congress has not been presented information on who these claimants are or what the nature of their claim is.

5. RELATION TO THE POINT 4 PROGRAM

It has been argued in the House that this bill sets up a general pattern for confiscation of property of American nationals by foreign governments. If this bill is passed, the Claims Commission established will distribute the Yugoslav settlement which the State Department has made and also any settlement that may be made with Poland and Czechoslovakia, both of which now are pending. Claims against Czechoslovakia total about $8,000,000 growing out of nationals and other taking of American property interests. Similar claims against Poland total $175,000,000.

The Senate will be asked this session to vote on a bill guaranteeing American investors in foreign countries against loss of property through confiscation by foreign governments. As a part of the point 4 program the Export-Import Bank would issue such guaranties to investments made abroad. The Department of State, holding $40,000,000 of assets of Yugoslavia, allowed the Communist government there to confiscate American property of approximately that value and then settled for $17,000,000. If this procedure is followed in future negotiations with foreign nations under the point 4 program, the losses through Export-Import Bank guaranties could prove tremendous. The failure of the Department to get a better settlement when it had the possibility of receiving a 100-percent settlement might well be noted when point 4 is considered.

6. THE CLAIMS COMMISSION

In the House there was serious objection raised to establishing a Claims Commission within the Department of State from whose decisions no appeal could be made. Such a procedure was not followed in settling the Mexican claims or in any other previous claims distribution. It was proposed in the House that this settlement be distributed to claimants through the Court of Claims, presumably by an amendment extending the jurisdiction of that court. It was also proposed that the War Claims Commission might handle the settlement.

In the original bill the Claims Commission was to have been named by the Secretary. The Senate has amended it to have the Commission named by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

7. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Settlement made by the Secretary of State with Yugoslavia is an accomplished fact about which the Senate can do nothing. Discussion of the terms of the settlement on the Senate floor will not in any way help bona fide American claimants whose property has been confiscated by a Communist dictator. Constructive criticism might prove helpful as a deterrent to similar action in the future by the Department of State.

It is imperative at this time that the legislation set-up for distributing the funds to claimants shall be as sound as possible. This bill has several aspects which should have full discussions:

(a) Should the claims be settled entirely within the Department of State, which made this original bad settlement, without any right of appeal to a court of justice?

(b) Would it not be advisable to have this settlement distributed in a regular court of law or by a claims commission from which appeal could be taken?

(c) Is it wise in legislation of this type to create a commission which the President in the future may call into being without consulting Congress, whenever he needs such a commission to distribute future settlements which the State Department may make?

(d) Would it be advisable to recommit this bill to committee for further hearings in order that the State Department may present full information as to the number of claimants, the nature of the claims, and the status of their citizenship?

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 3, 1949]

NOMADS' FRAUD

(By Tris Coffin)

A new racket in misery is lurking behind a $17,000,000 claim bill in the House.

On the surface, everything is on the up and up. The Yugoslav Government has agreed to pay $17,000,000 to American investors whose properties in that country were taken over by the Communist government of Marshal Tito. But hard-hitting young Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Texas, was curious.

He dug around and discovered that under the bill tossed to Congress most of the dough would go to lawyers, international speculators who bought up the claims, and a few big United States corporations.

For example, one allegedly American concern, scheduled to get a $5,000,000 slice of the Yugoslav compensation, is, in reality, owned by Swiss interests.

Another wad would go to wealthy Yugoslavs who raced away to a safe haven in the United States when Hitler was pounding on the gates. Most of them, BECKWORTH discovered, did not become naturalized Americans until very recently, so as to collect the compensation.

The international sharpies went to work as soon as the word leaked out that Yugoslavia was going to pay back the $17,000,000 in claims. They bought up claims for as little as a penny to the dollar. BECKWORTH acidly described these operators as citizens of no country.

BECKWORTH also discovered that under the terms of the claim bill, lawyers could collect as much as 50 percent.

And this is only the beginning. Claims are in against Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other communized nations in the east.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Foreign Relations were, on page 2, line 7, after the word "aliens", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided, however,* That if any agreement hereafter concluded between the Government of the United States and a foreign government, of the character mentioned in section 4 (a) of this act, includes provisions for the settlement and discharge of claims of individuals who, at the time of nationalization or other taking, (1) were permanent residents of the United States, and (2) had declared their intention to become citizens of the United States in conformity with the provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, such individuals shall, for the purposes of this act, be deemed 'nationals of the United States' if they shall have acquired citizenship of the United States prior to the effective date of the relevant intergovernmental settlement agreement"; on page 3, line 5, after the word "persons", to strike out "who have been admitted to the bar of the highest court of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia,"; in line 7, after the word "the", to strike out "Secretary of State" and insert "President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate"; in line 9, after the word "the", to strike out "Secretary of State" and insert "President"; in line 17, after the word "the", to strike out "Secretary of State" and insert "President"; on page 4, line 10, after the word "The", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "Secretary of State" and insert "Presi-

dent"; on page 11, line 12, after the word "Administrative", to strike out "Procedures" and insert "Procedure"; in line 13, after the numerals "1946", to insert "except as otherwise specifically provided by this act"; in line 22, after the word "act", to insert "for transmission to the foreign government concerned"; on page 12, line 8, after the word "section", to strike out "7" and insert "8"; in line 16, after the word "section", to strike out "7" and insert "8"; on page 13, line 11, after the word "paragraphs", to strike out "(4) and (5)" and insert "(3) and (4)"; on page 15, line 9, after the word "section", to strike out "6" and insert "7"; in line 13, after the word "section", to strike out "6" and insert "7"; and on page 16, line 6, after the word "section", to strike out "6" and insert "7."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, let me inquire for my own information whether the clerk has stated the amendment which I read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; all amendments have been stated and agreed to.

If there is no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 4406) was passed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CREATION OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the unfinished business, as everyone knows, is Senate bill 75, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes. Apparently no Senators desire to address the Senate upon that measure, and in accordance with the agreement I have made with the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily Senate bill 75, and to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 596, Senate Resolution 58, to amend the Senate rules by creating a standing Committee on Small Business. This is in line with the agreement which has heretofore been made by the majority leader with the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 58) to amend the Senate Rules by creating a standing Committee on Small Business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 58) to amend the Senate Rules by creating a standing Committee on Small Business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for making Senate Resolution 58 the unfinished business. I understand he will make an announcement relative to when it is to be taken up.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. Mr. President, when we recess, we shall recess to Thursday next, and I should like to make an announcement which I hope Senators will read in the RECORD, because it is important.

Following the disposition of Senate Resolution 58 we shall then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 563, Senate bill 1498, to amend the Natural Gas Act, approved June 21, 1938, as amended. This is something which was not included in the agreement I made originally with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I have assured him we will not vote on the bill under any circumstances before late Monday afternoon.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, I want to comply with the majority leader's request, and I appreciate very much the announcement which has been made that Senate bill 1498 will be the order of business after Senate Resolution 58. But the majority leader realizes also that a Senator may object to taking up the bill by unanimous consent, even though the Senator asks it, and that in such event it would be necessary for the Senator to move to take it up.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct about that.

ASSISTANCE TO STATE AGENCIES ADMINISTERING LABOR LAWS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want to ask the majority leader and also the minority leader a question about a bill that is on the calendar. I do not want to take up the bill at this time. I understand we have had an agreement that we shall take up only certain bills. But I am anxious to have this bill considered at some time in the future. I refer to Calendar 854, Senate bill 1439; to provide for assistance to State agencies administering labor laws in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower. I merely wish at this time to call the bill to the attention of the majority leader and also of the minority leader, so that, if possible, at some future date, we may set a time when the bill will be taken up.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the interest of the Senator from South Carolina in the measure, about which I know something. I concur in the Senator's view that it is meritorious, and the Senator has the assurance of the majority leader that it will be taken up in due course.

ADMITTANCE OF STATE DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVES TO CAPITOL PRESS GALLERIES—EDITORIALS FROM THE EVENING STAR AND THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have noted that effort has been made by the State Department to open the facilities of the Senate Press Gallery to its news-gathering representatives.

Although it is indicated by the newspapers today that this effort has been postponed, I wish at this time to take the position that the standing committee of correspondents should firmly reject any such move by the State Department or any such move by the State Department or any other agency of the Government or any private organization not directly engaged in the dissemination of news in the purest sense of the word.

Likewise, I hope the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Senate will reject any such application if an appeal should be taken to either of those bodies.

If the news representatives of the State Department are allowed the privileges of the Senate Press Gallery, then all the propaganda experts of every Government agency will be entitled to the same privilege. This would require extensive additions to the Senate Press Gallery, but my principal concern is with respect to the precedent which would be established.

The Senate Press Gallery is set apart for the convenience of the free press of America. It is a free press that we have, and a free press is one of the foundation stones upon which our democracy is founded. It should not be open to any agency of the Government, just as it should not be open to any private organization that has for its purpose the dissemination of propaganda.

I ask to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a very able editorial from the Washington Star of yesterday, and the column written by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times of today.

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

[From the Washington Star of February 13, 1950]

AND NOW—A "FIFTH ESTATE"?

It is to be hoped that the Standing Committee of Correspondents—newspapermen chosen by their brethren to administer the Capitol Press Galleries—will stand firm against the State Department's application for admittance to these galleries of its own news-gathering representatives.

For if the State Department can present a rational thesis for the admittance of its news gatherers, there is no logical ground on which to turn down the propaganda and

public-relations agents of other Government departments who may be expected to seek identical privileges. There are more of them now than there are accredited press representatives in the galleries.

Perhaps the State Department, in its relatively new undertaking of distributing propaganda on a world-wide basis, should have its own reporters at the Capitol. But let us keep them out of the press gallery, up to this time reserved for bona fide representatives of the independent newspaper press of the United States. Let the Government, if it is committed to the business of gathering and dispatching news for propaganda purposes, set up its own gallery, appropriately labeled "Government propaganda gallery."

The press galleries stand as a symbol of the Fourth Estate—separate from and independent of Government. Once the infiltration of Government agents begins, this symbol is endangered. It is worth preserving.

[From the New York Times of February 14, 1950]

A PRESS GALLERY IS ONE OR IT ISN'T

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 13.—The renewed attempt of the State Department to have members of its own publications staff accredited to the press galleries of the Capitol reveals a misconception which is typical of these abnormal times. The danger line, which even in wartime must be guarded if a free and independent press is to be maintained as conceived in the basic design of this Republic, has often become a blur to representatives of Government, and this is the latest instance.

The State Department, with the approval of Congress and apparently most of the public, uses tax dollars to engage in certain press and radio activities. Part of these are for the purpose of distributing factual information to the American Government in the field, and part are for propaganda purposes among foreign peoples. The entire project is accepted generally as a function of modern government, made valuable or even necessary by the threat of international communism.

To achieve this project the State Department is a subscriber to various publications, and to the news tickers on which events, especially those in Washington, are unrolled as they occur. These ticker reports are, however, available to the Department as an information service only; its reportorial and editorial staffs (it has them) are not allowed to put this material in the departmental press or on its radio by the terms of contracts with the Associated Press and the United Press. Hence this staff must itself confirm the accuracy of what it reads in the newspapers and on the tickers and get such other items as may be thought required.

For these reasons, the Department submits, its news-gathering processes lag behind those of the contemporary press and it is often late with its publications. These ticker reports, however, are available to the Department for use as wireless dispatches in its field publications only; they may not be used in the Voice of America according to the terms of the contract with press associations. Hence the editorial and reportorial staffs of this enterprise must, it is complained, collect and verify much news on its own.

THE ADMISSION STANDARDS

This seemed so plain to the committee of reporters who manage the galleries for the Senate and the House that the first request of the State Department for membership therein was rejected. But now the plea has been renewed; there are to be hearings before the committee next month; and, if the original decision stands, the State Department can appeal to the Senate and House, which have the power to overrule it.

The press galleries, of course, are the property of Congress as much as the public and diplomatic reservations, etc., and backers of the State Department's application find it extraordinary that this particular Government area should be barred from representatives of another branch of Government, going about the public's business, and preserved for the exclusive use of representatives of a private industry. That is as far as they can see the issue, which amounts to not seeing it at all.

To begin with, the managing committee of correspondents requires for admission that applicants shall establish these things: Their principal income is derived from news correspondence designed for publication in newspapers entitled to second-class mailing privileges; the applicant is not engaged in paid publicity or promotion work; is not concerned with any claim before Congress or before any other Government unit and will not be; and is not a lobbyist for anything or will become one.

These regulations were set up to assure that the special facilities for getting information about public matters at the Capitol which Congress has provided to that end shall be used by none but members of the press who are concentrating on that task alone and have no private or official interests to serve. That is the historical origin of the press gallery in parliamentary nations, and it is obvious that no Government employee, however similar or commendable his assignment, comes within it. To admit the reporters of the State Department would require a new set of rules under which the galleries should be equally available to employees of all units of the Government. And if the State Department reporters were admitted under any twisted construction of the rules, that would be the logical development, also.

THE FOURTH ESTATE

The press gallery was established in the House of Commons as the public's window on the proceedings of Parliament. The State Department's proposal is for a complete and drastic revision of this objective, which Macaulay, in his essay on Hallam's constitutional history, described as follows:

"If the Commons [whose privileges in 1642 all London rose in arms to defend] were to suffer the Lords to amend money bills we do not believe the people would care one straw about the matter. * * * We doubt whether a surrender of their [Commons] constitutional rights would excite half so much dissatisfaction as the exclusion of strangers from a single important discussion. The gallery in which the reporters sit has become a fourth estate of the realm. * * * Publication of the debates * * * is now regarded by many persons as a safeguard, tantamount * * * to all the rest together."

A press gallery infiltrated by government is not the same thing.

RESIGNATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS FROM ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Nation suffered a great loss in the resignation of Lewis L. Strauss as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In my judgment, Admiral Strauss has performed a preeminently notable service in charting the course of the Atomic Energy Commission, one of the most difficult assignments that has been given to any Government official. He is a man of great ability, high patriotism, and indefatigable energy. He served 5 years in the Navy, where he rose to the rank of rear admiral, and his contribution to the Nation's welfare both in the Navy and as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission places him on the very high level of those who have given great national service in a period of crisis, such as we have gone through in the past 10 years.

I am very proud of the fact that Lewis L. Strauss is a Virginian. I agree with the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch that he is one of the most distinguished of living Virginians.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from the Times-Dispatch, entitled "A Notable Virginian."

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

A NOTABLE VIRGINIAN

Lewis L. Strauss, one of the most distinguished of living Virginians, is entitled to resign his membership on the Atomic Energy Commission, after undergoing more than 3 years of strain and overwork as a member of that body. His service there followed 5 years in the Navy, where he rose to the rank of rear admiral.

President Truman's decision to proceed with the manufacture of the H bomb apparently was in part due to the urging of AEC member Strauss. This is only the latest example of the remarkable public service performed by this remarkable man, who is still only 54.

He attended the public schools in Richmond, and although he did not go to college, he was elected last year to the presidency of the world famous Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N J. He is one of the Nation's leading bankers, having risen to a partnership in the New York firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. at the age of 33. He left Richmond in May 1917, at the age of 21 years for Washington, and soon became secretary to Herbert Hoover. He remained Mr. Hoover's secretary during the period when the President-to-be was directing relief activities for multitudes of starving peoples overseas.

His services in the recent war were so conspicuous that he was awarded various decorations and citations by both the Army and the Navy. He was already the recipient of decorations from half a dozen foreign governments.

It was his physics textbook at old John Marshall High School, when he was a student there, which aroused the interest of Lewis Strauss in science. As a result, he was instrumental years later in the construction of a laboratory at California Institute of Technology for research in the field of atomic energy. His appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission by President Truman was the natural outgrowth of his long-time interest in the latest atomic developments.

Mr. Strauss has also been preeminent as a lay religious leader, having been president of Congregation Emanu-El, in New York. He is likewise a foremost patron of music and the arts, and is a director both of the Metropolitan Opera, in New York, and the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, in Richmond.

Although he is hale and vigorous, and apparently a long way from retirement, Mr. Strauss' admirers and friends in Virginia are glad to note that he has a country estate near Brandy Station, Culpepper County. If he doesn't retire eventually to his old home town of Richmond, Richmonders will count on him to settle no farther away than Culpepper.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

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

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, February 16, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 14 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

David McK. Key, of Tennessee, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Burma.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

James K. Knudson, of Utah, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1953, vice Carroll Miller, deceased.

Richard F. Mitchell, of Iowa, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term expiring December 31, 1956. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William E. Steckler, of Indiana, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Indiana, vice Hon. Robert C. Baltzell, retired.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Hon. Edward A. Towse, of Hawaii, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Albert M. Cristy, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Leonard R. Sutton, pastor, First Methodist Church, Rantoul, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father God, when the whole world is wrestling with giant fears and frustrations, and men's hearts are failing them because of the terrifying possibilities of national and racial destruction, give to our leaders and statesmen such farsighted vision and courage that the way of truth and freedom shall have a new birth.

Help us to continue to believe in the high destiny of this great Nation. Make vital again the hopes and aspirations of men who dreamed, lived, fought, and struggled for a better way of life. Help us to preserve this heritage. Help us to continue to believe that the ultimate destiny of mankind is not in the hands of men of fear, hate, arrogance, and might, but in the hands of men of good will and faith.

Give us patience not only with those who do not understand us, but give us patience with ourselves. Help us to hear what the centuries are saying against the hours of selfishness, hatred, and greed. Give us a courage to work and labor for enduring values—values that will not mock us in years to come.

Bless these men, our Representatives, who must make decisions, who are often criticized and maligned unfairly. Make them fearless of the right, but fearful o the betrayal of their sacred trust. Save us from cheap politics and give us a vision of our responsibility for the well-being of our entire Nation; save us from sectional animosities and strife.

Extend Thy rule over human hearts. Hasten the coming of Thy kingdom on earth and give us wisdom as we labor for it; let not despair rule or crush our spirits. Forgive us of stupidity, error, and sin, and help us to know that righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.

Where Thou hast made us bearers of the torch of liberty, help us to keep it such that it may impart light to those that despair in this day of confusion. Amen.

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

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

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

FEBRUARY 10, 1950.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of WILLIAM B. WIDNALL as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-first Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of New Jersey to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of J. Parnell Thomas is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Representative-elect WILLIAM B. WIDNALL presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 43]

Abbitt	Dolliver	Johnson
Addonizio	Dondero	Jonas
Allen, Calif.	Donohue	Jones, Ala.
Allen, Ill.	Douglas	Jones, N. C.
Barden	Eaton	Judd
Barrett, Pa.	Eberharter	Kean
Barrett, Wyo.	Elliott	Kearney
Bates	Elston	Kearns
Battle	Engel, Mich.	Kee
Bland	Fallon	Kelley, Pa.
Bolton, Ohio	Fenton	Kelly, N. Y.
Bonner	Ford	Kennedy
Bosone	Fulton	Keogh
Boykin	Furcolo	Kerr
Brehm	Gamble	King
Brown, Ga.	Garmatz	Kirwan
Brown, Ohio	Gary	Klein
Buckley, N. Y.	Gavin	Kunkel
Bulwinkle	Gilmer	Lane
Burke	Goodwin	Lanham
Burton	Gore	Latham
Byrne, N. Y.	Gorski	LeFevre
Byrnes, Wis.	Gossett	Lichtenwalter
Canfield	Graham	Linehan
Cannon	Green	Lodge
Cavalcante	Gwinn	Lovre
Celler	Hall,	Lyle
Chiperfield	Leonard W.	McCulloch
Christopher	Halleck	McDonough
Chudoff	Hand	McGrath
Clemente	Harden	McGregor
Combs	Harvey	Macy
Cooley	Hays, Ohio	Mahon
Corbett	Heffernan	Martin, Iowa
Coudert	Heller	Martin, Mass.
Crawford	Herter	Mason
Davenport	Hill	Merrow
Davies, N. Y.	Hobbs	Meyer
Davis, Tenn.	Hoeven	Miller, Md.
Dawson	Hoffman, Ill.	Miller, Nebr.
DeGraffenried	Jackson, Calif.	Morgan
Delaney	James	Murphy
Denton	Javits	Nicholson
Dingell	Jenison	Nixon
Dollinger	Jennings	O'Toole
Pace	Rodino	Stanley
Patten	Rogers, Mass.	Stockman
Pfeifer	Roosevelt	Taber
Joseph L.	Sadlak	Talle
Pfeiffer,	Sadowski	Taylor
William L.	St. George	Teague
Philbin	Sanborn	Thomas
Phillips, Calif.	Saylor	Wadsworth
Phillips, Tenn.	Scott, Hardie	Wagner
Plumley	Scott,	Walsh
Potter	Hugh D., Jr.	Weichel
Poulson	Shafer	Werdel
Powell	Sheppard	Wickersham
Quinn	Short	Wilson, Ind.
Rains	Sikes	Wilson, Tex.
Reed, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.	Withrow
Reed, N. Y.	Sims	Wood
Rhodes	Smathers	Woodhouse
Ribicoff	Smith, Ohio	Zablocki
Riehlman	Staggers	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 242 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

JAMES M. CURLEY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know the double tragedy that last Saturday visited the family of our former colleague, James M. Curley, of Massachusetts, is keenly regretted by all of my colleagues, for within a period of 14 hours death took his only daughter, Mary Curley Donnelly, and one of his three remaining sons, Leo F. Curley.

It is not only a sad, but a terrible blow to our friend and former colleague, but with that faith and fortitude that he has always displayed, and in his intense grief, he turns to God for consolation, saying he "does not question God's will to take a life away."

His daughter, Mary Curley Donnelly, unusually gifted, was very close to her father. She was an adviser to her father and for years past took an active part in his campaigns. She was loyal to her friends. She was kind to all and generous to the poor.

His son, Leo Curley, had already established a reputation for ability and for honorable and constructive public service. He had a great future ahead of him.

James M. Curley has had a long and honorable career in public life. Some years ago I properly termed him as "the mayor of the poor."

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague, the distinguished majority leader, in expressing our deep regret at this shocking tragedy to the former mayor of Boston. To have a father lose one child is heart rending, indeed, but that within 1 day this blow should fall twice upon a parent is shocking in excess. I extend my sympathies to the bereaved parent and his loved ones.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. I want to join our distinguished majority leader in expressing sympathies to the Curley family. I realize anything we may say here will be of slight consolation to this bereaved family, and I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathies.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate very much the gentleman's observation.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. In the absence of other Republican Members of the Massachusetts Delegation I feel that I can speak for them and for all Members on this side in joining with the majority leader in expressing our heartfelt sympathies to Mr. and Mrs. Curley and the surviving members of the family on these sudden and tragic deaths.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman very much.

In his deep sorrow in this double tragedy of the death of his daughter and son, I know I speak the thoughts and sentiments of all of my colleagues in expressing and extending to him and the other members of his family and to Mrs. Leo Curley, his son's widow, our heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Nashville Tennessean and one appearing in the Southern Farmer.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the transcript of a radio address given last night over station KFI.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an article appearing in the Buffalo Evening News regarding James A. Farley.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I was given permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Jefferson as a National Planner." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $205, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter appearing in the New York Daily Commerce.

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

THE COAL INDUSTRY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, while it is true that President Truman, in his tax message to the Congress in referring to the plugging of tax loopholes, made no reference to the 5-percent percentage depletion tax as affecting the coal-mining industry, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and of the Congress itself that under no circumstances can any movement be initiated with the reference to removing this vitally important economic aid of the 5-percent percentage depletion tax in the coal industry.

Faced with the ever increasing and diversified competition, both domestic and foreign, as well as the seasonal nature, to a considerable extent, of the industry market, taken in conjunction with all of the other factors that have developed in the mining industry, in both production and marketing, every conceivable and reasonable aid and assistance and every right and privilege which exists must be jealously safeguarded. It is not necessary, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the Government or of the people the importance to our national economy in both peace and war of the anthracite coal industry and of the coal-mining industry generally. Even now a great to-do is being made and national emergencies being declared. Certainly the Government has given ample evidence time and again that it considers any circumstance surrounding the coal-mining industry one which affects the national welfare and safety.

Certainly there is no lack of subsidy for many other industries contributing to the national economy. This Congress has provided for the subsidies in agricultural pursuits on everything from tung nuts and honey to potatoes. I do not, at this point, intend to debate the pros and cons of governmental subsidy. I merely point out that many phases of our economy benefit by our direct dollar subsidies. The great and important coal-mining industry benefits by no such advantage.

Time and again I have brought to the attention of the various governmental agencies concerned the advisability of some form of Government subsidy, whether it be in the purchase or stock piling of coal to guarantee the spread of employment or some other type and kind of aid. To this date my pleas have gone unheeded.

The Ways and Means Committee is now conducting hearings on the oil industry. Of course, at this point I have no idea what action will be taken by the Ways and Means Committee or by the Congress.

These hearings are now going on. But I do say that if the Congress fails to act upon the suggestion of the President and reduces the oil percentage depletion privilege from 15 to 5 percent, then by the same token, I feel that the coal-mining industry has the right to demand the same privileges be extended to it and that its percentage depletion taxation privileges be raised to the same 15-percent level.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it was estimated by the Public Printer to exceed two pages of the RECORD and cost $615.

Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Mr. Frank A. Waring, of the Philippine War Damage Commission.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the National Wildlife Federation.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Press Democrat of Santa Rosa, Calif.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters he received.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION LEGISLATION

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

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

There was no objection

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, giving proponents of FEPC full credit for being sincere, and leaving out the vote-getting implications, I can only paraphrase Madam Rolland and say, "O justice, what wrongs are committed in thy name."

For the information of those who have been misled into believing that FEPC will solve any problems of any kind, I should like to quote briefly from a speech made by Dr. J. A. Long, Jr., of Palatka, Fla., at the dedication of a new Negro hospital at Tallahassee last week. It will be discouraging to agitators of race hatred to learn that Dr. Long, a Negro physician, is highly respected by both whites and Negroes in Florida.

He said:

We are not wanted in white neighborhoods, not always because of race but often because of risk, not alway because of prejudice but often because we destroy property, not always because of color but often because of character.

Dr. Long goes on to say that the Negroes of the Southland are challenged because of these facts, and urges upon them that they meet the challenge individually.

Dr. Long knows the problem and knows the answer. He knows that the answer is not in any forced Employment Practices Commission legislation.

I commend him for a very excellent statement, and join with millions of Southern people, both white and colored, in continuing our efforts to help the Negro meet and overcome this challenge in the proper way.

THE EFFECT OF DESTROYING SURPLUS POTATOES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, last night I received a message from the First District of Massachusetts that there are available for immediate use 7,000,000 pounds of surplus potatoes. This morning I asked the Department of Agriculture, through the Bureau of Home Nutrition and Home Economics, to advise me what the average consumption of white potatoes is per week for an average family. In studying 68 cities in the spring of 1948 they found the average consumption to be 6.7 pounds per family per week or 348.4 pounds per year. Using round numbers, the amount of surplus potatoes available in the Connecticut valley area would feed 20,000 average families for a full year. Yet, that is only a small fraction of the 50,000,000 bushels, or 3,000,000,000 pounds, that have been ordered to be destroyed.

I do not know whether any of you saw the article that appeared in the last part of the Post this morning, but it is very interesting.

It was from The District Line, by Bill Gold. The headline was "Uncle Sam holds sack—Canadians help fill it with potatoes." The article is:

While the Agriculture Department wonders how to get rid of its tons of surplus potatoes, Canadian growers are smuggling in thousands of bushels which they're selling to Uncle Sam, at his artificially high prices.

The problem calls for clear thinking and fast action, or first thing you know we'll be subsidizing Canada's output, too.

The thing to do is to beat them at their own game. Let's smuggle American potatoes into Canada at a faster rate than they're smuggling their potatoes into the United States.

Organize a new airlift, and dump the spuds overboard in sparsely populated regions. Reverse the Canol pipe line, and pump through a river of mashed potatoes. Bribe border guards; put our old time rum runners to work on this patriotic project.

Let's show the world that anybody who underestimates American ingenuity for wasting money makes a big mistake.

This last paragraph was emphasized by being italicized, as well it should have been.

I now insert a news story from Washington from the Newspaper Enterprise Association, by Douglas Larsen, appearing in the Berkshire Evening Eagle, Pittsfield, Mass., last Friday. Its headline, "'Spudlegging' adds surplus woes." The article is as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The unique crime of "spudlegging" has been added to the Department of Agriculture's woes of this year's potato-surplus fiasco.

Untold thousands of bushels of potatoes are being smuggled across lonely stretches of the Maine border. By avoiding the duty and taking advantage of the high-support price in this country, illegal operators are making from 30 to 45 cents a bushel.

If this traffic isn't controlled, Agriculture officials admit it might mean that the net cost of the spud surplus will be higher than the $100,000,000 top estimate made by Secretary Charles F. Brannan.

PROFIT EITHER WAY

In some cases, it is said, United States farmers are buying Canadian potatoes, sneaking them over the border past customs officials, and selling them to the Government at the support price This operation nets about 45 cents a bushel.

In other cases, Canadian and United States operators are buying up Canadian potatoes and selling them on the open market in Maine. This brings less than 45 cents a bushel because the market price is below the support price. But he difference still makes the transaction profitable and apparently worth the risk.

Customs officials here admit that they have sent as many additional inspectors and agents to Maine as their dreadful shortage of personnel will permit, to try to halt this traffic. But they say that it is increasing and that they are considerably disturbed about the situation.

Under the law, Canadian potato growers are allowed to ship into the United States 4,000,000 bushels at half the normal duty, which is 75 cents per hundred pounds. This quota was quickly filled this year. But even at the full 75-cent duty Canadian potatoes have been underselling American potatoes by from 13 to 15 cents a bushel.

Last year total Canadian potato sales in America amounted to about 10,000,000 bushels. This year it is expected to be close to that figure, adding that much more to the estimated 70,000,000-bushel United States surplus

In effect, this arrangement with Canada means that Uncle Sam is supporting the price of Canadian potatoes. Canadian farmers are working just as hard to grow more potatoes to take advantage of it as are American farmers, according to USDA experts.

I noted in yesterday's RECORD, as many Members undoubtedly did, the agonizing complaint which has been repeated here from time to time since this scandal has attracted Nation-wide attention and condemnation, by ardent supporters of the so-called Brannan plan that this never would have happened if that plan had been in effect. It is quite beside the point and wholly unnecessary to take up the merits or demerits of the so-called Brannan plan except to the extent that its author is a key figure in the current unpleasant mess. So that those who are so deeply distressed over failure to enact the Brannan plan may have the objective opinions expressed by others, I call their attention to the three editorials I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD yesterday at page A1018 and emphasize the fact that the first editorial is from the Boston Post, the leading Democratic paper in New England.

More important, however, are the actual facts, and I would suggest again to our unhappy colleagues that they spend a little time studying the RECORD of February 2 and 3. Specifically, at page 1427 will be found certain important facts. Briefly, they are that before the Secretary appeared before the Committee on Agriculture in the other body some sort of a press release was issued stating that under the act of 1949 the Secretary could not pay any transportation on all or any of the potatoes to get rid of them other than to an alcohol plant or some other place like that. When he was before the committee the Secretary was asked if that statement was not an inaccurate one. He replied that he had his lawyer present and would refer the question to him.

Mr. Edward M. Shulman, associate solicitor in charge of production and adjustment, Commodity Credit Corporation, advised the committee that the Secretary did have this authority, or at least that there was no prohibition against doing the thing which he claimed he could not do in the release he had given to the press.

Furthermore, the RECORD indicates that there was an apology made by the Secretary addressed to the former Secretary of Agriculture, the junior Senator from New Mexico. It would be well also for our colleagues to study with care the former Secretary's remarks.

Let us look further at the RECORD. This Congress last June passed a Commodity Credit charter bill. By the terms of the bill the President was instructed to appoint an advisory board of five persons whenever the Secretary should arrive at a situation he felt made their advice desirable and necessary. That advisory board was not appointed until the 1st of February this year. The Secretary came before the Agriculture Committee of the other body on February 2. This had the effect of taking the purpose out from under the advisory board which Congress had authorized to be set up for the very purpose the Secretary indicated led him to come before a legislative committee. And it is incredible that the Department with its far-flung organization did not forsee this situation months ago.

I think any objective and reasonable person familiar with the functions and responsibilities of the legislative and executive branches of this Government would agree that Congress cannot concern itself with the duties of every administrative program and that it was entirely correct and sound for the committee in the other body to decline to advise the Secretary, particularly in terms of what had developed before the committee as to the Department's actual interpretation of the law and as to the belated creation of this advisory board.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, while Mr. J. Edgar Hoover probably does not need the support of us Members of Congress in the fight against communism and against those who would purge his patriotic efforts to establish a sound security in the United States of America, I want to add my commendation of his work over the past 26 years.

I want to assure him, too, that I, as a former FBI agent, will oppose the attempts by subversive forces to oust him as Director of the FBI. The diabolical attempts of those would-be traitors to purge Mr. Hoover can be traced directly to the Kremlin, have no doubt about that. It has been proven very definitely that those forces are desperately attempting to turn our constitutional form of government into a socialistic and Soviet dictatorship. I, for one, resent it. I do not object to the Russians and those who are loyal to Russia having any type of government they see fit, but I do feel very definitely that those people within our continental boundaries who are not here under diplomatic immunity, and who are loyal to foreign governments, should be thrown out of the United States and sent back to their respective homelands so that they might live under the type of government to which they are loyal.

Stalin has often described our American constitutional government as the weakest type of government yet devised and has set out with every available treachery at his disposal to prove it. So, regardless of our political affiliations, let us all band together as Americans to back up such men as J. Edgar Hoover, whom we all know as a good American, fighting for the cause of liberty and justice and for American constitutional government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF SECRET INTELLIGENCE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, top-level military planners from England are working with their military opposites in the Pentagon and elsewhere on the following projects:

(a) Mutual exchange of top-level secret intelligence;

(b) Standardization of weapons and ammunition to permit greater flexibility in our military assistance program for Europe;

(c) Mutual exchange of industrial secrets relating to weapons.

I believe the policy of exchanging secret information with a trusted ally is an unsound principle. My reasons are based on the fact the Navy proximity fuse was given to the British during the war; sold by the British Government to Sweden after the war and later sold by the Swedes to Russia.

Should war come with Russia, our pilots will now fly into our own lethal weapon.

This unsound principle of giving information on secret weapons to a trusted ally has proven disastrous on two different occasions: First, the proximity fuse, and second, the secret of atomic weapons, both of which are now in possession of the Russians.

It is high time, in my opinion, that we retain all of our information on secret weapons so as to protect the welfare of our country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

REQUEST TO ADJOURN OVER

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. MARCANTONIO objected.

RACIAL MINORITIES DRIVING WHITE AMERICANS FROM THE FEDERAL PAY ROLL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this attempt to smear J. Edgar Hoover out of office is just another step in the Communist program. They used a similar method to destroy the Civil Service Commission. That movement eliminated the requirement that an applicant furnish a picture, and other information, was Communist inspired. The result is that the Federal pay roll is now stacked with incompetents, many of whom took the examination by proxy. We hear men whine about racial minorities, in their attempts to force on us this crazy FEPC, which is the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this Government has ever been threatened.

Do not forget that these alleged racial minorities have from 50 to 100 times as many of their own groups on the Federal pay roll in Washington as they are numerically entitled to, while our white American servicemen who fought the Nation's battles in time of war, and must now support its institutions in time of peace, are driven from the Federal pay roll.

I never saw a Jap or a Chinaman on the Federal pay roll until the last few years, that I remember. Everywhere you go now you see these racial minorities in control, with the result that the service has degenerated to an unspeakable degree.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by William F. Green.

CONCORDIA CHOIR

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the House a rare musical treat tonight in Constitution Hall. The Concordia Choir of 60 voices, from Moorhead, Minn., in my district in Minnesota, will sing a concert at Constitution Hall tonight at 8:30 o'clock. This outstanding world-famous choir is under the direction of Paul J. Christiansen, son of the famous musical director, F. Melius Christiansen, of St. Olaf College, of Northfield, Minn. So I urge all of you to go to Constitution Hall tonight to hear this famous choir of 60 voices from northwestern Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HEFFERNAN (at the request of Mr. KEOGH), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S 2440 An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Would a motion to adjourn until Thursday be in order?

The SPEAKER. It would, as long as there is a quorum present and no point of order is raised against it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until Thursday at 12 o'clock noon.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 15, noes 48.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. RANKIN. But he did not have the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offered a preferential motion.

Mr. RANKIN. But I had demanded the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The motion to adjourn takes precedence of a demand for the yeas and nays.

Mr. RANKIN. I demanded the yeas and nays on my motion to adjourn until Thursday.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 15, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1231. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 25, 1949, submitting a report, together with an accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of a channel from the ocean through St. Helena Sound or through Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, S. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 469), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 7220. A bill to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1632. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1633. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1634. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana (by request):

H. R 7288. A bill to provide Government protection for widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 7289. A bill to provide that firing squads shall be furnished at Government expense for certain war veterans' funerals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATTERSON (by request):

H. R. 7290. A bill to provide protection for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EVINS (by request):

H. R. 7291. A bill to remove requirement that a parent be dependent for award of gratuitous national service life insurance and to extend the time within which eligible persons may apply for this benefit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 7292. A bill for the relief of Erio Louis Tomita and Fumiko Tomita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 7293. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charlotte Geisdorff Kibby; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 7294 A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Rebecca Collins Ross; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H R. 7295. A bill for the relief of Chi-Cheng Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois:

H. R 7296. A bill for the relief of Miss Ilona Agoston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr SABATH:

H. R. 7297. A bill for the relief of Ignas Malcius, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 7298. A bill for the relief of Lueg Mee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1845. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition signed by Kelly I. Drey, president, and Richard E Melby, secretary-treasurer, West Central Minnesota Life Underwriters Association, Fergus Falls, Minn., against any form of socialized medicine and any further expansion of Government life insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1846. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of New Jersey district, Kiwanis International, urging immediate implementation of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in their entirety by the Congress of the United States, to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1847. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Tioga Valley Grange, No. 918, Mansfield, Pa., against the enactment of legislation legalizing any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1848. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Clara E. Milleson and others, Peoria, Ill., favoring legislation to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O Thou who art the Lord God omnipotent, grant that we may meet the tasks and responsibilities of this new day with a resolute faith in the guiding and sustaining presence of Thy spirit.

We pray that Thou wilt create within our minds and hearts those nobler thoughts and finer feelings which are the progenitors of achievement in the building of a better world.

Show us how we may release the hidden splendor of humanity and bring to fulfillment those capacities for beauty and strength of character which Thou hast planted within the soul of man.

To Thy name we ascribe the glory. Amen.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his motion for a moment until the Journal is read and we can receive a message?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I withhold the motion.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the Journal for the simple reason that it is incorrect.

On yesterday just before the motion to adjourn I asked unanimous consent that the House adjourn until Thursday. It was objected to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], the FEPC leader in the House. That should go into the RECORD; that is part of the RECORD of the proceedings, and it is not in this report. I demand that it be placed there at the proper point and that it also go into the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk is reading the Journal, not the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that it is the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Journal reflects only the actions that are taken.

Mr. RANKIN. It fails in this instance.

The SPEAKER. I am sure that if the gentleman will look in the RECORD he will find the objection he refers to.

Mr. RANKIN. No; it is not there; I have already looked at the RECORD.

Mr. BIEMILLER. It is in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can correct the RECORD; that would be the correct method; but that is not the Journal. If the objection is not there I am sure there would be no objection to correcting the RECORD to make it appear.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might state to the gentleman that it appears in the RECORD on page 1804:

Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. MARCANTONIO objected.

Mr. RANKIN. I wanted to be sure to get that into the RECORD, and in the Journal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I call the Speaker's attention to the fact that on yesterday I asked for a vote on my motion that the House adjourn until Thursday. While

we were taking that vote the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] moved that the House adjourn. The vote on my motion was interrupted; the motion to adjourn made by the gentleman from Massachusetts was given precedence and was voted on and agreed to.

I protest that that ruling was in flagrant violation of section 5360 of Hinds' Precedents, which states:

While a motion to adjourn takes precedence over other motions, yet it may not be put while the House is voting on another motion or while a Member has the floor in debate.

We had offered a motion to adjourn until a day certain. We were voting on it at that time. However, in violation of the rules of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts was permitted to offer a motion that the House adjourn.

In order to keep the record straight I call that to the attention of the House, and I wish also to call attention to the fact that Jefferson's Manual has the following provision in section XXXIII relative to adjournment:

A motion to adjourn simply takes place of all others; for otherwise the House might be kept sitting against its will, and indefinitely. Yet this motion cannot be received after another question is actually put and while the House is engaged in voting.

I call that to the attention of the House in order to keep the record straight. My distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who was going along with me, also endeavored to secure a roll call on the motion to adjourn until Thursday. We were absolutely within the rules of the House and the motion to adjourn by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was not in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not agree with the gentleman. On the motion made by the gentleman, upon which there was a vote, there was a vote by division, and the motion was lost.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I asked for a roll-call vote on that motion.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman asked for the yeas and nays, but before that question was put the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] moved that the House adjourn, which was a preferential motion. The Chair put the question and the House did adjourn.

Mr. RANKIN. And the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and I were asking for the yeas and nays and the Chair refused to put the question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just tried to say to the gentleman that anyone can ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were not ordered. The gentleman from Massachusetts was within his rights and made a preferential motion to adjourn, and the House did adjourn.

Mr. RANKIN. We had asked for the yeas and nays and our request for a roll-call vote was not even submitted, but the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts was put instead, which was a violation of the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will continue the reading of the Journal.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the Journal.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4406. An act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R 5839. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. THYE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 627) entitled "An act for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. DONNELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 44]

Allen, Calif.	DeGaffenried	Lovre
Bailey	Dingell	McCulloch
Barrett, Pa.	Dolliver	McDonough
Barrett, Wyo.	Dondero	McGrath
Bates	Donohue	Macy
Battle	Elliott	Martin, Iowa
Bentsen	Fellows	Mason
Bland	Gilmer	Meyer
Boggs, La.	Gwinn	Murphy
Bolton, Ohio	Halleck	Nixon
Boykin	Hand	Patten
Brehm	Harden	Pfeiffer,
Brown, Ga.	Harvey	William L.
Brown, Ohio	Hays, Ohio	Philbin
Buckley, N. Y.	Heffernan	Phillips, Tenn.
Bulwinkle	Hinshaw	Potter
Burke	Hobbs	Riehlman
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoeven	Sadlak
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Ill.	Sadowski
Carroll	Jackson, Calif.	St. George
Chatham	James	Sanborn
Chiperfield	Jennings	Short
Christopher	Jones, Ala.	Simpson, Ill.
Combs	Judd	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Kerr	Smathers
Crawford	King	Smith, Ohio
Curtis	Kirwan	Talle
Davenport	LeFevre	Taylor
Davies, N. Y.	Lichtenwalter	Vursell
Davis, Tenn.	Linehan	Wadsworth
Dawson	Lodge	Walsh
Welchel	Wilson, Ind.	Wood
White, Idaho	Withrow	
Wier	Wolcott	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 333 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I object to dispensing with further proceedings under the roll call.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House dispense with further proceedings under the roll call?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 258, nays 82, not voting 92, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—258

Abbitt	Garmatz	Madden
Addonizio	Gillette	Magee
Albert	Golden	Mansfield
Andersen,	Goodwin	Marcantonio
H Carl	Gordon	Marsalis
Andresen,	Gore	Marshall
August H.	Gorski	Martin, Mass
Angell	Gossett	Merrow
Aspinall	Granahan	Michener
Auchincloss	Granger	Miles
Bailey	Green	Miller, Calif.
Baring	Gross	Miller, Md
Beall	Hagen	Miller, Nebr.
Bennett, Mich.	Hale	Mitchell
Bentsen	Hall,	Monroney
Biemiller	Edwin Arthur	Morgan
Bishop	Hardy	Morris
Blackney	Hart	Morton
Blatnik	Havenner	Moulder
Boggs, Del.	Hays, Ark.	Multer
Bolling	Hays, Ohio	Murdock
Bolton, Md	Hedrick	Murray, Wis.
Bosone	Heller	Nelson
Breen	Herter	Noland
Buchanan	Heselton	Norblad
Buckley, Ill.	Hill	Norton
Burdick	Hinshaw	O'Brien, Ill.
Burleson	Hoffman, Mich	O'Brien, Mich.
Burnside	Holifield	O'Hara, Ill.
Burton	Holmes	O'Hara, Minn.
Camp	Hope	O'Konski
Canfield	Horan	O'Neill
Cannon	Howell	O'Sullivan
Carnahan	Huber	O'Toole
Carroll	Hull	Patman
Case, N J	Irving	Patterson
Cavalcante	Jackson, Wash	Perkins
Celler	Jacobs	Peterson
Chelf	Javits	Pfeifer,
Chesney	Jenkins	Joseph L.
Chudoff	Jensen	Phillips, Calif.
Church	Jonas	Pickett
Clemente	Karst	Poage
Cole, Kans.	Karsten	Polk
Cole, N Y.	Kean	Powell
Cooley	Kearney	Price
Corbett	Kearns	Priest
Cotton	Keating	Quinn
Crook	Kee	Rabaut
Crosser	Keefe	Rains
Cunningham	Kelley, Pa.	Ramsay
Curtis	Kelly, N. Y.	Reed, Ill.
Davenport	Kennedy	Reed, N Y.
Davis, Wis.	Keogh	Rees
Delaney	Kilburn	Regan
Denton	Kilday	Rhodes
Dingell	Klein	Ribicoff
Dollinger	Kruse	Rodino
Douglas	Kunkel	Rogers, Mass.
Doyle	Lane	Rooney
Eaton	Latham	Roosevelt
Eberharter	LeCompte	Sabath
Ellsworth	Lemke	Sasscer
Elston	Lesinski	Saylor
Engle, Calif.	Lind	Scott, Hardie
Fallon	Lyle	Scott,
Feighan	Lynch	Hugh D., Jr.
Fenton	McCarthy	Scrivner
Fernandez	McConnell	Scudder
Flood	McCormack	Secrest
Fogarty	McGregor	Shafer
Forand	McGuire	Shelley
Ford	McKinnon	Sheppard
Fulton	McSweeney	Simpson, Pa.
Furcolo	Mack, Ill.	Smith, Wis.
Gamble	Mack, Wash.	Spence

Staggers	Underwood	Wigglesworth
Steed	Van Zandt	Wilson, Okla.
Stefan	Velde	Withrow
Stockman	Vorys	Wolcott
Sullivan	Wagner	Wolverton
Tauriello	Walter	Woodhouse
Teague	Welch	Woodruff
Thompson	Werdel	Worley
Thornberry	White, Calif.	Yates
Tollefson	White, Idaho	Young
Towe	Wickersham	Zablocki
Trimble	Widnall	

NAYS—82

Abernethy	Frazier	Pace
Allen, Ill.	Fugate	Passman
Allen, La.	Gary	Preston
Anderson, Calif.	Gathings	Rankin
Andrews	Gavin	Redden
Barden	Graham	Richards
Beckworth	Grant	Rivers
Bennett, Fla.	Gregory	Rogers, Fla.
Boggs, La.	Hare	Sikes
Bonner	Harris	Sims
Bramblett	Harrison	Smith, Kans.
Brooks	Hébert	Smith, Va.
Bryson	Herlong	Stanley
Carlyle	Jenison	Sutton
Case, S Dak.	Johnson	Taber
Clevenger	Jones, Mo.	Tackett
Colmer	Jones, N C.	Thomas
Combs	Lanham	Vinson
Cooper	Larcade	Wheeler
Cox	Lucas	Whitaker
Dague	McMillan, S. C.	Whitten
Davis, Ga.	McMillen, Ill.	Whittington
Deane	Mahon	Williams
D'Ewart	Mills	Willis
Doughton	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Durham	Murray, Tenn.	Winstead
Evins	Nicholson	
Fisher	Norrell	

NOT VOTING—92

Allen, Calif.	Gilmer	Murphy
Arends	Gwinn	Nixon
Barrett, Pa.	Hall,	Patten
Barrett, Wyo.	Leonard W	Pfeiffer,
Bates	Halleck	William L.
Battle	Hand	Philbin
Bland	Harden	Phillips, Tenn.
Bolton, Ohio	Harvey	Plumley
Boykin	Heffernan	Potter
Brehm	Hobbs	Poulson
Brown, Ga	Hoeven	Rich
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Ill.	Riehlman
Buckley, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Sadlak
Bulwinkle	James	Sadowski
Burke	Jennings	St George
Byrne, N Y.	Jones, Ala	Sanborn
Byrnes, Wis.	Judd	Short
Chatham	Kerr	Simpson, Ill.
Chiperfield	King	Smathers
Christopher	Kirwan	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	LeFevre	Stigler
Crawford	Lichtenwalter	Talle
Davies, N Y	Linehan	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Lodge	Vursell
Dawson	Lovre	Wadsworth
DeGraffenried	McCulloch	Walsh
Dolliver	McDonough	Welchel
Dondero	McGrath	Wier
Donohue	Macy	Wilson, Ind.
Elliott	Martin, Iowa	Wood
Engel, Mich	Mason	
Fellows	Meyer	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Brown of Georgia with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Stigler with Mr. Short.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Patten with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. James.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Smathers with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. King with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Battle with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. Bates with Mr. Welchel.
Mr. Linehan with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Meyer.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Wier with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. DeGraffenried with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Burke with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Christopher with Mr. Lovre.

Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana, and Mr. BENNETT of Florida changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. BAILEY, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BOLLING, Mrs. BOSONE, Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois, Mr. EATON, Mr. FALLON, Mr. FENTON, and Mr. REED of New York changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House voted to dispense with further proceedings under the call for today, what business would there be before the House if it now fails to adjourn?

The SPEAKER. Calendar Wednesday business.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 97, nays 236, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—97

Abbitt	Grant	Priest
Abernethy	Gregory	Rains
Albert	Hardy	Rankin
Allen, La	Hare	Redden
Andrews	Harris	Regan
Barden	Harrison	Richards
Beckworth	Hays, Ark	Rivers
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Rogers, Fla.
Bentsen	Herlong	Sims
Boggs, La.	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Kans.
Bolton, Md.	Jones, N C.	Smith, Va.
Bonner	Kilburn	Stanley
Brooks	Kilday	Sutton
Bryson	Lanham	Tackett
Burleson	Larcade	Teague
Burton	Lucas	Thomas
Camp	Lyle	Thompson
Carlyle	McMillan, S C.	Thornberry
Chelf	Mahon	Trimble
Colmer	Marshall	Underwood
Cooper	Miles	Vinson
Cox	Mills	Werdel
Davis, Ga.	Monroney	Wheeler
Durham	Morrison	Whitaker
Evins	Murray, Tenn.	Whitten
Fernandez	Nicholson	Whittington
Fisher	Norrell	Williams
Frazier	Pace	Willis
Fugate	Passman	Wilson, Tex.
Gary	Peterson	Winstead
Gathings	Pickett	Worley
Gore	Poage	
Gossett	Preston	

NAYS—236

Addonizio	Andresen,	Auchincloss
Allen, Ill.	August H.	Bailey
Andersen,	Angell	Baring
H. Carl	Arends	Beall
Anderson, Calif.	Aspinall	Bennett, Mich.
Biemiller	Heller	Norton
Bishop	Herter	O'Brien, Ill
Blackney	Heselton	O'Brien, Mich
Blatnik	Hill	O'Hara, Ill
Boggs, Del.	Hinshaw	O'Hara, Minn
Bolling	Hoffman, Mich.	O'Konski
Bramblett	Holifield	O'Neill
Breen	Holmes	O'Sullivan
Buchanan	Hope	O'Toole
Buckley, Ill.	Horan	Patman
Burdick	Howell	Patterson
Burnside	Huber	Perkins
Canfield	Hull	Pfeifer,
Cannon	Irving	Joseph L.
Carnahan	Jackson, Wash.	Phillips, Calif.
Case, N. J.	Jacobs	Polk
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Poulson
Cavalcante	Jenison	Powell
Celler	Jenkins	Price
Chesney	Jensen	Quinn
Chudoff	Johnson	Rabaut
Church	Jonas	Ramsay
Clemente	Karst	Reed, Ill.
Clevenger	Karsten	Reed, N Y.
Cole, N Y.	Kean	Rees
Corbett	Kearney	Rhodes
Cotton	Kearns	Ribicoff
Crook	Keating	Rodino
Crosser	Kee	Rogers, Mass.
Cunningham	Kelley, Pa.	Rooney
Curtis	Kelly, N. Y.	Roosevelt
Dague	Kennedy	Sasscer
Davenport	Keogh	Saylor
Davis, Wis.	Klein	Scott, Hardie
Deane	Kruse	Scott,
Delaney	Kunkel	Hugh D., Jr.
Denton	Lane	Scrivner
D'Ewart	Latham	Scudder
Dingell	LeCompte	Secrest
Dollinger	Lemke	Shafer
Doyle	Lesinski	Shelley
Eaton	Lind	Sheppard
Eberharter	Linehan	Simpson, Pa
Ellsworth	Lynch	Smith, Wis.
Elston	McCarthy	Spence
Engle, Calif.	McConnell	Staggers
Fallon	McCormack	Steed
Feighan	McGregor	Stefan
Fenton	McGuire	Stigler
Flood	McKinnon	Stockman
Fogarty	McMillen, Ill.	Sullivan
Forand	McSweeney	Taber
Ford	Mack, Ill	Tauriello
Fulton	Mack, Wash.	Tollefson
Furcolo	Madden	Towe
Gamble	Magee	Van Zandt
Garmatz	Mansfield	Velde
Gavin	Marcantonio	Vorys
Gillette	Marsalis	Wagner
Golden	Martin, Mass.	Walter
Goodwin	Merrow	Welch
Gordon	Michener	White, Calif
Gorski	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Graham	Miller, Md	Widnall
Granahan	Miller, Nebr.	Wigglesworth
Granger	Mitchell	Wilson, Okla
Green	Morgan	Withrow
Gross	Morris	Wolcott
Hagen	Morton	Wolverton
Hale	Moulder	Woodhouse
Hall,	Multer	Woodruff
Edwin Arthur	Murdock	Yates
Hart	Murray, Wis	Young
Havenner	Nelson	Zablocki
Hays, Ohio	Noland	
Hedrick	Norblad	

NOT VOTING—99

Allen, Calif.	Davis, Tenn.	Judd
Barrett, Pa.	Dawson	Keefe
Barrett, Wyo	DeGraffenried	Kerr
Bates	Dolliver	King
Battle	Dondero	Kirwan
Bland	Donohue	LeFevre
Bolton, Ohio	Doughton	Lichtenwalter
Bosone	Douglas	Lodge
Boykin	Elliott	Lovre
Brehm	Engel, Mich.	McCulloch
Brown, Ga.	Fellows	McDonough
Brown, Ohio	Gilmer	McGrath
Buckley, N. Y.	Gwinn	Macy
Bulwinkle	Hall,	Martin, Iowa
Burke	Leonard W.	Mason
Byrne, N Y.	Halleck	Meyer
Byrnes, Wis.	Hand	Murphy
Carroll	Harden	Nixon
Chatham	Harvey	Patten
Chiperfield	Heffernan	Pfeiffer,
Christopher	Hobbs	William L.
Cole, Kans.	Hoeven	Philbin
Combs	Hoffman, Ill.	Phillips, Tenn.
Cooley	Jackson, Calif.	Plumley
Coudert	James	Potter
Crawford	Jennings	Rich
Davies, N. Y.	Jones, Ala.	Riehlman

Sabath	Simpson, Ill.	Walsh
Sadlak	Smathers	Weichel
Sadowski	Smith, Ohio	White, Idaho
St. George	Talle	Wier
Sanborn	Taylor	Wilson, Ind.
Short	Vursell	Wood
Sikes	Wadsworth	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hobbs for, with Mr. LeFevre against.
Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Patten against.
Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Walsh against.
Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. Hand against.
Mr. Kerr for, with Mr. Murphy against.
Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Heffernan against.
Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.
Mr. Brown of Georgia for, with Mr. McGrath against.
Mr. Bates for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Battle for, with Mr. King against.
Mr. Bland for, with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio against.
Mr. Bulwinkle for, with Mr. Donohue against.
Mr. Smathers for, with Mr Philbin against.
Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Christopher with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Wier with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Sanborn.
Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Short.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Burke with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. DeGraffenried with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Combs with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Carroll with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. PRESTON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. MACK changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does a motion to fix time to adjourn take precedence over a motion to adjourn?

The SPEAKER. It does not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker: Is it in order to offer to a motion to adjourn, an amendment seeking to fix the time of adjournment?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

MOTION TO DISPENSE WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—yeas 18, nays 94.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 94, nays 240, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—94

Abbitt	Grant	Preston
Abernethy	Gregory	Priest
Albert	Hardy	Rains
Allen, La.	Hare	Rankin
Andrews	Harris	Redden
Barden	Harrison	Richards
Beckworth	Hays, Ark.	Rivers
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Rogers, Fla.
Bentsen	Herlong	Sikes
Boggs, La.	Jones, N. C.	Sims
Bolton, Md.	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Bonner	Kilday	Smith, Va.
Brooks	Lanham	Stanley
Bryson	Larcade	Sutton
Burleson	Lucas	Tackett
Burton	Lyle	Teague
Camp	McMillan, S. C.	Thompson
Carlyle	Mahon	Thornberry
Chelf	Marshall	Trimble
Colmer	Miles	Underwood
Cooper	Mills	Vinson
Cox	Monroney	Wheeler
Davis, Ga.	Morrison	Whitaker
Evins	Murray, Tenn.	Whitten
Fernandez	Nicholson	Whittington
Fisher	Norrell	Williams
Frazier	Pace	Willis
Fugate	Passman	Wilson, Tex.
Gary	Patman	Winstead
Gathings	Peterson	Worley
Gore	Pickett	
Gossett	Poage	

NAYS—240

Addonizio	Delaney	Howell
Allen, Ill.	Denton	Huber
Andersen, H. Carl	D'Ewart	Hull
	Dingell	Irving
Anderson, Calif	Dollinger	Jackson, Wash.
Andresen, August H.	Douglas	Jacobs
	Doyle	Javits
Angell	Eaton	Jenison
Arends	Eberharter	Jenkins
Aspinall	Ellsworth	Jensen
Auchincloss	Elston	Johnson
Bailey	Engel, Mich.	Jonas
Baring	Engle, Calif.	Karst
Beall	Fallon	Karsten
Bennett, Mich.	Feighan	Kean
Biemiller	Fellows	Kearney
Bishop	Fenton	Kearns
Blackney	Flood	Keating
Blatnik	Forand	Kee
Boggs, Del.	Ford	Kelley, Pa.
Bolling	Fulton	Kelly, N. Y.
Bosone	Furcolo	Kennedy
Bramblett	Gamble	Keogh
Breen	Garmatz	Klein
Buchanan	Gavin	Kruse
Buckley, Ill.	Gillette	Kunkel
Burdick	Golden	Lane
Burnside	Goodwin	Latham
Canfield	Gordon	LeCompte
Carnahan	Gorski	Lemke
Carroll	Graham	Lesinski
Case, N. J.	Granahan	Lind
Case, S. Dak.	Granger	Linehan
Cavalcante	Green	Lynch
Celler	Gross	McCarthy
Chesney	Hagen	McConnell
Chudoff	Hale	McCormack
Church	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGregor
Clemente		McGuire
Clevenger	Hart	McKinnon
Cole, Kans.	Havenner	McMillen, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Hays, Ohio	McSweeney
Cooley	Hedrick	Mack, Ill.
Corbett	Heller	Mack, Wash.
Cotton	Herter	Madden
Crook	Heselton	Magee
Crosser	Hill	Mansfield
Cunningham	Hinshaw	Marcantonio
Curtis	Hoffman, Mich.	Marsalis
Dague	Holifield	Martin, Mass.
Davenport	Holmes	Merrow
Davis, Wis.	Hope	Michener
Deane	Horan	Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.	Quinn	Stockman
Miller, Nebr.	Rabaut	Sullivan
Mitchell	Ramsay	Taber
Morgan	Reed, Ill.	Tauriello
Morris	Rees	Tollefson
Morton	Rhodes	Towe
Multer	Ribicoff	Van Zandt
Murray, Wis.	Rich	Velde
Nelson	Rodino	Vorys
Noland	Rogers, Mass.	Wagner
Norblad	Rooney	Walter
Norton	Roosevelt	Welch
O'Brien, Ill.	Sasscer	Werdel
O'Brien, Mich.	Saylor	White, Calif.
O'Hara, Ill.	Scott, Hardie	White, Idaho
O'Hara, Minn.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Wickersham
O'Konski		Widnall
O'Neill	Scrivner	Wigglesworth
O'Sullivan	Scudder	Wilson, Okla.
O'Toole	Secrest	Withrow
Patterson	Shafer	Wolcott
Perkins	Shelley	Wolverton
Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Sheppard	Woodhouse
	Smith, Wis.	Woodruff
Phillips, Calif.	Spence	Yates
Polk	Staggers	Young
Poulson	Steed	Zablocki
Powell	Stefan	
Price	Stigler	

NOT VOTING—98

Allen, Calif.	Gilmer	Murdock
Barrett, Pa.	Gwinn	Murphy
Barrett, Wyo.	Hall, Leonard W.	Nixon
Bates		Patten
Battle	Halleck	Pfeiffer, William L.
Bland	Hand	
Bolton, Ohio	Harden	Philbin
Boykin	Harvey	Phillips, Tenn.
Brehm	Heffernan	Plumley
Brown, Ga.	Hobbs	Potter
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley, N. Y.	Hoffman, Ill.	Regan
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Calif.	Riehlman
Burke	James	Sabath
Byrne, N. Y.	Jennings	Sadlak
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Sadowski
Cannon	Jones, Mo.	St. George
Chatham	Judd	Sanborn
Chiperfield	Keefe	Short
Christopher	Kerr	Simpson, Ill.
Combs	King	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Kirwan	Smathers
Crawford	LeFevre	Smith, Ohio
Davies, N. Y.	Lichtenwalter	Talle
Davis, Tenn.	Lodge	Taylor
Dawson	Lovre	Thomas
DeGraffenried	McCulloch	Vursell
Dolliver	McDonough	Wadsworth
Dondero	McGrath	Walsh
Donohue	Macy	Weichel
Doughton	Martin, Iowa	Wier
Durham	Mason	Wilson, Ind
Elliott	Meyer	Wood
Fogarty	Moulder	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hobbs for, with Mr. LeFevre against.
Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Patten against.
Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Walsh against.
Mr. Jones of Alabama for, Mr. Hand against.
Mr. Brown of Georgia for, with Mr. Murphy against.
Mr. Kerr for, with Mr. Heffernan against
Mr Wood for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.
Mr. Bates for, with Mr. McGrath against.
Mr. Battle for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Bulwinkle for, with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio against.
Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Kirwan against
Mr. Smathers for, with Mr. Burke against

Until further notice:

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Christopher with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Short.
Mr. Combs with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. King with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Wier with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. DeGraffenried with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr Byrne of New York with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Meyer.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Sanborn.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Sadlak.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Just preceding the last roll call the House refused to adjourn. I submit that this motion is dilatory. I understand that it is entirely within the Speaker's discretion to rule on these motions, but in view of the fact that we have just had a motion to adjourn this one obviously is dilatory.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will hear me on the point of order, other business has been transacted and another roll call has intervened.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule. Business has intervened. The Chair holds the motion to be in order.

The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOSSETT) there were—ayes 69, noes 91.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 109, nays 219, not voting 104, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—109

Abbitt	Gary	O'Hara, Minn.
Abernethy	Gathings	Pace
Albert	Gillette	Passman
Allen, La.	Gore	Patman
Andrews	Gossett	Peterson
Barden	Grant	Pickett
Battle	Gregory	Poage
Beckworth	Hardy	Preston
Bennett, Fla	Hare	Priest
Bentsen	Harris	Rains
Bolton, Md	Harrison	Rankin
Bonner	Hays, Ark.	Redden
Bramblett	Hébert	Regan
Brooks	Herlong	Rich
Bryson	Hill	Richards
Burton	Hoffman, Mich	Rivers
Camp	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Cannon	Jones, N. C.	Sikes
Carlyle	Kilburn	Sims
Chatham	Kilday	Smith, Kans.
Chelf	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Larcade	Stanley
Cooper	Lucas	Sutton
Cox	Lyle	Tackett
Curtis	McMillan, S C.	Teague
Dague	Mahon	Thomas
Davis, Ga	Marshall	Thompson
Evins	Mills	Thornberry
Fellows	Monroney	Towe
Fernandez	Morrison	Trimble
Fisher	Murray, Tenn.	Underwood
Frazier	Nicholson	Velde
Fugate	Norrell	Wheeler
Whitaker	Willis	Woodruff
Whitten	Wilson, Okla.	Worley
Whittington	Wilson, Tex.	
Williams	Winstead	

NAYS—219

Addonizio	Green	Morris
Allen, Ill.	Gross	Multer
Andersen, H. Carl	Hagen	Murray, Wis.
	Hale	Nelson
Angell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norblad
Arends		Norton
Aspinall	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, Ill.
Auchincloss		O'Brien, Mich.
Bailey	Hart	O'Hara, Ill.
Baring	Havenner	O'Konski
Beall	Hays, Ohio	O'Neill
Bennett, Mich.	Hedrick	O'Sullivan
Blemiller	Heller	O'Toole
Bishop	Herter	Patterson
Blackney	Heselton	Perkins
Blatnik	Hinshaw	Pfeifer, Joseph L
Boggs, Del.	Holifield	
Bolling	Holmes	Phillips, Calif.
Bosone	Hope	Polk
Breen	Horan	Powell
Buchanan	Howell	Price
Buckley, Ill.	Huber	Quinn
Burdick	Hull	Rabaut
Burnside	Jackson, Wash.	Ramsay
Canfield	Jacobs	Reed, Ill.
Carroll	Javits	Reed, N. Y.
Case, N. J.	Jenison	Rees
Case, S Dak.	Jensen	Rhodes
Cavalcante	Jonas	Ribicoff
Chesney	Karst	Riehlman
Chudoff	Karsten	Rodino
Church	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Clemente	Kearney	Rooney
Clevenger	Kearns	Roosevelt
Cole, Kans.	Keating	Sabath
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Sasscer
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Saylor
Corbett	Kelly, N. Y.	Scott, Hardie
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Crook	Keogh	
Crosser	King	Scrivner
Davenport	Klein	Scudder
Davis, Wis	Kruse	Secrest
Deane	Kunkel	Shafer
Delaney	Lane	Shelley
Denton	Latham	Sheppard
D'Ewart	LeCompte	Smith, Wis.
Dingell	Lemke	Spence
Dollinger	Lesinski	Steed
Douglas	Lind	Stefan
Doyle	Linehan	Stigler
Eaton	Lynch	Stockman
Eberharter	McCarthy	Sullivan
Ellsworth	McConnell	Taber
Elston	McCormack	Tauriello
Engel, Mich.	McGregor	Tollefson
Engle, Calif.	McGuire	Van Zandt
Fallon	McKinnon	Vorys
Feighan	McMillen, Ill.	Wagner
Fenton	McSweeney	Walter
Flood	Mack, Ill.	Welch
Forand	Mack, Wash.	Werdel
Ford	Madden	White, Calif.
Fulton	Magee	White, Idaho
Furcolo	Mansfield	Wickersham
Gamble	Marcantonio	Widnall
Garmatz	Marsalis	Wigglesworth
Gavin	Martin, Mass.	Withrow
Golden	Merrow	Wolcott
Goodwin	Michener	Wolverton
Gordon	Miller, Calif.	Woodhouse
Gorski	Miller, Md.	Yates
Graham	Miller, Nebr.	Young
Granahan	Mitchell	Zablocki
Granger	Morgan	

NOT VOTING—104

Allen, Calif.	Celler	Hand
Anderson, Calif	Chiperfield	Harden
Andresen, August H.	Christopher	Harvey
	Combs	Heffernan
Barrett, Pa.	Coudert	Hobbs
Barrett, Wyo.	Crawford	Hoeven
Bates	Cunningham	Hoffman, Ill.
Bland	Davies, N. Y.	Irving
Boggs, La.	Davis, Tenn.	Jackson, Calif.
Bolton, Ohio	Dawson	James
Boykin	DeGraffenried	Jenkins
Brehm	Dolliver	Jennings
Brown, Ga.	Dondero	Johnson
Brown, Ohio	Donohue	Jones, Mo.
Buckley, N. Y.	Doughton	Judd
Bulwinkle	Durham	Keefe
Burke	Elliott	Kerr
Burleson	Fogarty	Kirwan
Byrne, N. Y.	Gilmer	LeFevre
Byrnes, Wis.	Gwinn	Lichtenwalter
Carnahan	Halleck	Lodge
Lovre	Patten	Smathers
McCulloch	Pfeiffer, William L.	Smith, Ohio
McDonough		Staggers
McGrath	Philbin	Talle
Macy	Phillips, Tenn.	Taylor
Martin, Iowa	Plumley	Vinson
Mason	Potter	Vursell
Meyer	Poulson	Wadsworth
Miles	Sadlak	Walsh
Morton	Sadowski	Weichel
Moulder	St. George	Wier
Murdock	Sanborn	Wilson, Ind.
Murphy	Short	Wood
Nixon	Simpson, Ill.	
Noland	Simpson, Pa.	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hobbs for, with Mr. LeFevre against.
Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Patten against.
Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Walsh against.
Mr. Jones of Missouri for, with Mr. Hand against.
Mr. Brown of Georgia for, with Mr. Murphy against.
Mr. Kerr for, with Mr. Heffernan against.
Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.
Mr. Bates for, with Mr. McGrath against.
Mr. Bland for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana for, with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio against.
Mr. Smathers for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Donohue against.
Mr. Burleson for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Irving with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Miles with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Wier with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr Sanborn.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. DeGraffenried with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Christopher with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Noland with Mr. Macy.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. The next business in order, as I understand, is the call of committees under the Calendar Wednesday rule; is that right?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. I believe the Committee on the District of Columbia is the committee with which the call rests, and will be the first committee called today. In view of the fact that this committee has important legislation to present to the House for its consideration would a point of order that a quorum is not present be in order at this moment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would certainly count to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If the leadership on both sides of the House exercised their influence we would have a quorum present.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from New York is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not submitted a parliamentary inquiry.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 49]

Allen, Calif.	Donohue	Meyer
Anderson, Calif.	Durham	Morton
Andresen,	Elliott	Moulder
August H.	Engle, Calif.	Murdock
Baring	Fisher	Murphy
Barrett, Pa.	Fogarty	Nixon
Barrett, Wyo.	Gilmer	Patten
Bates	Gwinn	Pfeiffer,
Bland	Halleck	William L.
Boggs, La.	Hand	Philbin
Bolton, Ohio	Harden	Phillips, Tenn.
Bonner	Harvey	Plumley
Boykin	Heffernan	Potter
Breen	Hobbs	Ramsay
Brehm	Hoeven	Regan
Brooks	Hoffman, Ill.	Sadlak
Brown, Ga.	Jackson, Calif.	Sadowski
Brown, Ohio	James	St George
Buckley, N. Y.	Jennings	Sanborn
Bulwinkle	Johnson	Short
Burke	Jones, Mo.	Simpson, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Judd	Smathers
Byrnes, Wis.	Keefe	Smith, Ohio
Celler	Kerr	Talle
Chiperfield	Kirwan	Taylor
Christopher	Klein	Vursell
Colmer	LeFevre	Wadsworth
Combs	Lichtenwalter	Walsh
Coudert	Lodge	Weichel
Crawford	Lovre	Whitaker
Davies, N Y.	McCulloch	White, Idaho
Davis, Tenn.	McDonough	Wier
Dawson	McGrath	Wilson, Ind.
Dingell	Macy	Withrow
Dolliver	Martin, Iowa	Wood
Dondero	Mason	Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 326 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Is there objection to dispensing with further proceedings under the call?

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKETT) there were—ayes, 126, noes 17.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that we do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a preferential motion. I move that the House do now adjourn; and on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 126, nays 198, not voting 108, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—126

Abbitt	Gary	Passman
Abernethy	Gathings	Peterson
Albert	Gavin	Pickett
Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Poage
Allen, La.	Gore	Preston
Andresen,	Gossett	Priest
August H.	Graham	Rains
Andrews	Grant	Rankin
Arends	Gregory	Redden
Barden	Hardy	Reed, Ill.
Battle	Hare	Rich
Beckworth	Harris	Richards
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison	Rivers
Bennett, Mich.	Hays, Ark.	Rogers, Fla.
Bentsen	Hedrick	Shafer
Bolton, Md.	Herlong	Sikes
Bonner	Hill	Simpson, Pa.
Bramblett	Hoffman, Mich.	Sims
Bryson	Jenkins	Smith, Kans.
Burleson	Jensen	Smith, Va.
Burton	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Wis.
Camp	Jones, N. C.	Stanley
Cannon	Kilburn	Sutton
Carlyle	Kilday	Tackett
Chatham	Lanham	Teague
Chelf	Larcade	Thompson
Clevenger	Lucas	Thornberry
Colmer	McConnell	Trimble
Cooper	McMillan, S. C.	Underwood
Cox	McMillen, Ill.	Velde
Curtis	Mahon	Vinson
Dague	Marshall	Werdel
Davis, Ga.	Miles	Wheeler
DeGraffenried	Miller, Nebr.	Whitten
Durham	Mills	Whittington
Evins	Monroney	Williams
Fallon	Morrison	Willis
Fellows	Murray, Tenn.	Wilson, Okla.
Fenton	Nicholson	Wilson, Tex.
Fernandez	Norblad	Winstead
Fisher	Norrell	Woodruff
Frazier	O'Hara, Minn.	
Fugate	Pace	

NAYS—198

Addonzio	Forand	Kennedy
Andersen,	Ford	Keogh
H Carl	Fulton	King
Angell	Furcolo	Klein
Aspinall	Gamble	Kruse
Auchincloss	Garmatz	Kunkel
Beall	Golden	Lane
Biemiller	Goodwin	Latham
Bishop	Gordon	LeCompte
Blackney	Gorski	Lesinski
Boggs, Del.	Granahan	Lind
Bolling	Granger	Linehan
Bosone	Green	Lynch
Breen	Gross	McCarthy
Buchanan	Hagen	McCormack
Buckley, Ill.	Hale	McGregor
Burnside	Hall,	McGuire
Canfield	Edwin Arthur	McKinnon
Carnahan	Hall,	McSweeney
Carroll	Leonard W.	Mack, Ill.
Case, N. J.	Hart	Mack, Wash.
Case, S Dak.	Havenner	Madden
Cavalcante	Hays, Ohio	Magee
Chesney	Heller	Mansfield
Chudoff	Herter	Marcantonio
Church	Heselton	Marsalis
Clemente	Hinshaw	Martin, Mass.
Cole, Kans.	Holifield	Merrow
Cole, N. Y.	Holmes	Michener
Corbett	Hope	Miller, Calif.
Cotton	Horan	Miller, Md.
Crook	Howell	Mitchell
Crosser	Huber	Morgan
Cunningham	Hull	Morris
Davenport	Irving	Multer
Davis, Wis.	Jackson, Wash.	Murray, Wis.
Deane	Jacobs	Nelson
Delaney	Javits	Noland
Denton	Jenison	Norton
D'Ewart	Johnson	O'Brien, Ill.
Dollinger	Jonas	O'Brien, Mich.
Douglas	Karst	O'Hara, Ill.
Doyle	Karsten	O'Konski
Eaton	Kean	O'Neill
Eberharter	Kearney	O'Sullivan
Ellsworth	Kearns	O'Toole
Elston	Keating	Patterson
Engel, Mich.	Kee	Perkins
Feighan	Kelley, Pa.	Pfeifer,
Flood	Kelly, N. Y.	Joseph L.
Phillips, Calif.	Saylor	Tollefson
Polk	Scott, Hardie	Van Zandt
Poulson	Scott,	Vorys
Powell	Hugh D., Jr.	Wagner
Price	Scrivner	Walter
Quinn	Scudder	Welch
Rabaut	Secrest	White, Calif.
Reed, N. Y.	Shelley	White, Idaho
Rees	Sheppard	Wickersham
Rhodes	Spence	Widnall
Ribicoff	Staggers	Wigglesworth
Riehlman	Steed	Wolcott
Rodino	Stefan	Wolverton
Rogers, Mass.	Stigler	Woodhouse
Rooney	Stockman	Yates
Roosevelt	Sullivan	Young
Sabath	Taber	Zablocki
Sasscer	Tauriello	

NOT VOTING—108

Allen, Calif.	Elliott	Murdock
Anderson, Calif.	Engle, Calif.	Murphy
Bailey	Fogarty	Nixon
Baring	Gilmer	Patman
Barrett, Pa.	Gwinn	Patten
Barrett, Wyo.	Halleck	Pfeiffer,
Bates	Hand	William L.
Bland	Harden	Philbin
Blatnik	Harvey	Phillips, Tenn.
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Plumley
Bolton, Ohio	Heffernan	Potter
Boykin	Hobbs	Ramsay
Brehm	Hoeven	Regan
Brooks	Hoffman, Ill.	Sadlak
Brown, Ga.	Jackson, Calif.	Sadowski
Brown, Ohio	James	St. George
Buckley, N. Y.	Jennings	Sanborn
Bulwinkle	Jones, Mo.	Short
Burdick	Judd	Simpson, Ill.
Burke	Keefe	Smathers
Byrne, N. Y.	Kerr	Smith, Ohio
Byrnes, Wis.	Kirwan	Talle
Celler	LeFevre	Taylor
Chiperfield	Lemke	Thomas
Christopher	Lichtenwalter	Towe
Combs	Lodge	Vursell
Cooley	Lovre	Wadsworth
Coudert	Lyle	Walsh
Crawford	McCulloch	Weichel
Davies, N. Y.	McDonough	Whitaker
Davis, Tenn.	McGrath	Wier
Dawson	Macy	Wilson, Ind
Dingell	Martin, Iowa	Withrow
Dolliver	Mason	Wood
Dondero	Meyer	Worley
Donohue	Morton	
Doughton	Moulder	

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hobbs for, with Mr. Patten against.

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. LeFevre against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Walsh against.

Mr. Jones of Missouri for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Kerr for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Brown of Georgia for, with Mr. Hand against.

Mr. Bates for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Bland for, with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio against.

Mr. Bulwinkle for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana for, with Mr. Donohue against.

Mr. Smathers for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Fogarty with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Dondero.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Wier with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Christopher with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Lichtenwalter.

Mr. Patman with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Coudert.

Mr. NELSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, at the time the gentleman from Michigan moved to adjourn, the Speaker had just stated what the question was—which was the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to dispense with further proceedings under a preceding call of the House. I objected to the vote, as was revealed by a division on the question, on the ground that a quorum was not present. Is not now the order of business an automatic roll call on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

The SPEAKER. No; it is not. The vote now comes de novo.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKETT) there were—ayes 138, noes 6.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Under the rules of the House, are the cloakrooms a part of the Hall of the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot count any Members that he cannot see.

The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 243, nays 86, answered "present" 1, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—243

Addonizio	Chudoff	Fulton
Andersen, H Carl	Church	Furcolo
Anderson, Calif.	Clemente	Gamble
Angell	Cole, Kans.	Garmatz
Aspinall	Cole, N. Y.	Gavin
Auchincloss	Corbett	Gillette
Battle	Cotton	Golden
Beall	Crook	Goodwin
Bennett, Mich	Crosser	Gordon
Bentsen	Cunningham	Gorski
Blemiller	Curtis	Graham
Bishop	Dague	Granahan
Blackney	Davenport	Granger
Blatnik	Davis, Wis.	Green
Boggs, Del.	Delaney	Gross
Bolling	Denton	Hagen
Bolton, Md.	D'Ewart	Hale
Bonner	Dollinger	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bosone	Douglas	Harris
Bramblett	Doyle	Hart
Breen	Eaton	Havenner
Buchanan	Eberharter	Hays, Ark.
Buckley, Ill.	Ellsworth	Hays, Ohio
Burnside	Elston	Hedrick
Canfield	Engel, Mich.	Heller
Carnahan	Fallon	Herter
Carroll	Feighan	Heselton
Case, N. J.	Fenton	Hill
Case, S. Dak.	Fernandez	Hinshaw
Cavalcante	Flood	Hoffman, Mich.
Chelf	Fogarty	Holifield
Chesney	Forand	Holmes
Hope	Ford	Holtzman
Horan	Mahon	Rogers, Mass.
Howell	Mansfield	Rooney
Huber	Marcantonio	Roosevelt
Hull	Marsalis	Sabath
Irving	Marshall	Sasscer
Jackson, Wash.	Martin, Mass.	Saylor
Jacobs	Morrow	Scott, Hardie
Javits	Michener	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Jensen	Miles	Scrivner
Johnson	Miller, Calif.	Scudder
Jonas	Miller, Md.	Secrest
Karst	Miller, Nebr.	Shafer
Karsten	Mitchell	Shelley
Kean	Monroney	Sheppard
Kearney	Morgan	Simpson, Pa.
Kearns	Morris	Smith, Wis.
Keating	Multer	Spence
Kee	Murray, Wis.	Staggers
Keefe	Nelson	Steed
Kelley, Pa.	Nicholson	Stigler
Kelly, N. Y.	Noland	Stockman
Kennedy	Norblad	Sullivan
Keogh	Norton	Taber
Kilburn	O'Brien, Ill.	Taurielio
King	O'Brien, Mich.	Tollefson
Klein	O'Hara, Ill.	Trimble
Kruse	O'Hara, Minn.	Van Zandt
Kunkel	O'Konski	Velde
Lane	O'Neill	Vorys
Latham	O'Sullivan	Wagner
LeCompte	O'Toole	Walter
Lemke	Patman	Welch
Lesinski	Patterson	Werdel
Lind	Perkins	White, Calif.
Linehan	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	White, Idaho
Lyle	Phillips, Calif.	Wickersham
Lynch	Polk	Widnall
McCarthy	Poulson	Wigglesworth
McConnell	Powell	Wilson, Okla.
McCormack	Price	Withrow
McGregor	Quinn	Wolcott
McGuire	Rabaut	Wolverton
McKinnon	Reed, Ill.	Woodhouse
McMillen, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
McSweeney	Rees	Yates
Mack, Ill.	Rhodes	Young
Mack, Wash.	Ribicoff	Zablocki
Madden	Riehlman	
Magee	Rodino	

NAYS—86

Abbitt	Fellows	Preston
Abernethy	Fisher	Rains
Albert	Frazier	Rankin
Allen, Ill.	Fugate	Redden
Allen, La.	Gary	Regan
Andrews	Gathings	Richards
Arends	Gossett	Rivers
Barden	Grant	Rogers, Fla.
Beckworth	Gregory	Sikes
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Sims
Boggs, La.	Hare	Smith, Kans.
Brooks	Harrison	Smith, Va.
Bryson	Herlong	Stanley
Burleson	Jenison	Stefan
Burton	Jones, Ala.	Sutton
Camp	Jones, N. C.	Tackett
Cannon	Kilday	Teague
Carlyle	Lanham	Thompson
Chatham	Larcade	Thornberry
Clevenger	Lucas	Underwood
Colmer	McMillan, S. C.	Vinson
Cooper	Mills	Wheeler
Cox	Murray, Tenn.	Whitten
Davis, Ga.	Norrell	Whittington
Deane	Pace	Williams
DeGraffenried	Passman	Willis
Doughton	Peterson	Wilson, Tex.
Durham	Pickett	Winstead
Evins	Poage	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Andresen, August H.

NOT VOTING—102

Allen, Calif.	Celler	Gwinn
Bailey	Chiperfield	Hall, Leonard W.
Baring	Christopher	Halleck
Barrett, Pa.	Combs	Hand
Barrett, Wyo.	Cooley	Harden
Bates	Coudert	Harvey
Bland	Crawford	Hébert
Bolton, Ohio	Davies, N. Y.	Heffernan
Boykin	Davis, Tenn.	Hobbs
Brehm	Dawson	Hoeven
Brown, Ga.	Dingell	Hoffman, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Dolliver	Jackson, Calif.
Buckley, N. Y.	Dondero	James
Bulwinkle	Donohue	Jenkins
Burdick	Elliott	Jennings
Burke	Engle, Calif.	Jones, Mo.
Byrne, N. Y.	Gilmer	Judd
Byrnes, Wis.	Gore	Kerr
Kirwan	Murphy	Simpson, Ill.
LeFevre	Nixon	Smathers
Lichtenwalter	Patten	Smith, Ohio
Lodge	Pfeiffer, William L.	Talle
Lovre	Philbin	Taylor
McCulloch	Phillips, Tenn.	Thomas
McDonough	Plumley	Towe
McGrath	Potter	Vursell
Macy	Priest	Wadsworth
Martin, Iowa	Ramsay	Walsh
Mason	Rich	Weichel
Meyer	Sadlak	Whitaker
Morrison	Sadowski	Wier
Morton	St. George	Wilson, Ind.
Moulder	Sanborn	Wood
Murdock	Short	Worley

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Hobbs against.

Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Mr. Walsh for, with Mr Boykin against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Wood against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Kerr against.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Brown of Georgia against.

Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Bates against.

Mr. Murphy for, with Mr. Bland against.

Mrs. Bolton of Ohio for, with Mr. Bulwinkle against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr Hébert against.

Mr Celler for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. McGrath for, with Mr. Smathers against.

Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mr. Jones of Missouri against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Christopher with Mr. Weichel.

Mr. Burke with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr Moulder with Mr. Brehm.

Mr Weir with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Short.

Mr Whitaker with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.

Mr. Sadowski with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Lichtenwalter.

Mr. CHUDOFF changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. VORYS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GOLDEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk called the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not yield to the gentleman for a parliamentary inquiry at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk has called the Committee on the District of Columbia. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. That motion is always in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] has been recognized.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] has been recognized.

INCORPORATING GIRL SCOUTS

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6670) to incorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Harry S. Truman, of Independence, Mo.; Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, of Washington, D C., Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, of Northampton, Mass.; Mrs Franklin D. Roosevelt, of Hyde Park, N. Y.; Mrs. Arthur O. Choate, of New York, N. Y; Mrs. Frederick H. Brooke, of Washington, D C.; Mrs. Vance C. McCormick, of Harrisburg, Pa.; Mrs. Harvey S. Mudd, of Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. Alan H. Means, of Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. C. Vaughan Ferguson, of Schenectady, N. Y.; Dr. Mary H. S. Hayes, of New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Walter N. Rothschild, of New York, N. Y.; Mrs Charles Kendrick, of San Francisco, Calif.; Mrs. Frederick H Bucholz, of Omaha, Nebr.; Mrs. Nathan Mobley, of Greenwich, Conn.; Mrs. Amory Houghton, of Corning, N. Y.; Mrs. Gordon Hunger, of Scarsdale, N. Y.; Mrs. Charles H. Ridder, of New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Paul Rittenhouse, of New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Alfred R. Bachrach, of New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Stanlee T. Bates, of Cleveland Heights, Ohio; Mrs. D. D. Bovaird, of Tulsa, Okla.; Mrs. W. Wright Byran, of Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. R. A. Burnett, of Amarillo, Tex.; Mrs. Cyril T. Carney, of Des Moines, Iowa; Mrs. Leonard G. Carpenter, of Crystal Bay, Minn.; Mrs. Everett Case, of Hamilton, N. Y.; Dr. Rosalind Cassidy, of Santa Monica, Calif.; Mrs. H. S. Fenimore Cooper, of Cooperstown, N. Y.; Mrs. J. Roger DeWitt, of Independence, Mo.; Mrs. R. T. Dozier, of Montgomery, Ala.; Mrs. Charles W. Farnsworth, of Concord, Mass.; Mrs. Merritt Farrell, of Newtown, Ohio; Mrs. W. V. M. Fawcett, of Newton, Mass.; Mrs. J. T. Finlen, of Butte, Mont; Mrs. John A. Frick, of Allentown, Pa; Mrs. A. B. Graham, of Portland, Oreg.; Mrs. Edward F. Johnson, of Scarsdale, N. Y.; Mrs. Charles H. Larkin, Second, of Eden, N. Y.; Mrs. Roy F. Layton, of Chevy Chase, Md.; Mrs. James P. McGranery, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. Julius Mark, of New York, N. Y.; Miss Clementine Miller, of Columbus, Ind.; Mrs. Dudley H. Mills, of Glen Head, Long Island, N. Y.; Mrs. Hilleary L. Murray, of Minneapolis, Minn; Mrs. C. E. Robbins, of Pierre, S. Dak.; Mrs. Harry M. Robbins, of Seattle, Wash.; Mrs. Snelling Robinson, of Lake Forest, Ill.; Mrs. Harry M. Sartoris, of Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Theodore Squier, of Milwaukee, Wis.; Miss Dorothea Sullivan, of Washington, D. C.; Mrs. John Arthur Thum, of Glendora, Calif.; Mrs. George L. Todd, of Rochester, N. Y.; Mrs. Abe D. Waldauer, of Memphis, Tenn.; Mrs. Frank L. Weil, of New York, N. Y.; Mrs. John M. Whalen, of Kingston, R. I.; Mrs. William T. Wilson, Jr., of Winston-Salem, N. C.; Mrs. Albert E. Winger, of New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Arthur Woods, of Washington, D. C., officers, directors, or members; and their associates and successors, constituting Girl Scouts of the United States of America, a membership corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia (hereinafter referred to as the "old corporation"), are hereby incorporated a body corporate and politic of the District of Columbia, where its domicile shall be.

SEC. 2. The name of such corporation shall be Girl Scouts of the United States of America (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation," and by that name it shall have perpetual succession, with power to sue and be sued in courts of law and equity within the jurisdiction of the United States; to take, receive, and hold, in trust or otherwise, and to sell and convey real and personal property necessary for its corporate purposes, and other real and personal property, the income from which shall be applied to its corporate purposes; to adopt a seal, and to alter or destroy such seal; to have offices and to conduct its business and affairs within and without the District of Columbia and in the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States; to adopt a constitution, bylaws, rules, and regulations (including regulations for the election of associates and successors) not inconsistent with the laws of the United States, or any State thereof, and from time to time to alter such constitution, bylaws, rules, and regulations, and generally to perform such acts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act and promote the purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be to promote the qualities of truth, loyalty, helpfulness, friendliness, courtesy, purity, kindness, obedience, cheerfulness, thriftiness, and kindred virtues among girls as a preparation for their responsibilities in the home and for service to the community, to direct and coordinate the Girl Scout movement in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and to fix and maintain standards for the movement which will inspire the rising generation with the highest ideals of character, patriotism, conduct, and attainment, which purposes shall be nonsectarian, nonpolitical, and not for pecuniary profit.

SEC. 4 There shall be a National Council of Girl Scouts, which shall have power to make and amend a constitution and bylaws, and to elect a board of directors, and officers and agents. The number, qualifications, and terms of office of members of the national council shall be prescribed by the constitution, except that they shall be citizens of the United States, or residents of its Territories or possessions. The constitution may prescribe the number of members of the national council necessary to constitute a quorum, which number may be less than a majority of the whole number. The affairs of the corporation between meetings of the national council shall be managed by a board of directors, except that the bylaws may provide for an executive committee to exercise the powers of the board of directors in the interim between its meetings, and for other committees to operate under the general supervision of the board of directors. The number, qualifications, and terms of office of members of the board of directors shall be prescribed by the constitution. The constitution may prescribe the number of members of the board of directors necessary to constitute a quorum which number shall not be less than twenty, or two-fifths of the whole number. The board of directors, to the extent provided in the constitution and bylaws, shall have the powers of the national council, in the interim between its meetings. The national council, or between meetings thereof, the board of directors, may authorize and cause to be executed leases, mortgages, and liens upon, and sales and conveyances of, any of the property of the corporation; and the proceeds arising therefrom shall be applied or invested for the use and benefit of the corporation.

SEC. 5. A meeting of the national council shall be held at least once each 2 years at a time and place to be fixed as provided in the constitution, for elections, and to receive the reports of the officers and board of directors. Special meetings may be called as prescribed in the constitution. The national council and the board of directors shall have power to hold meetings and keep the seal, books, documents, and papers of the corporation within or without the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to have and to use, in carrying out its purposes, all emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases now or heretofore used by the old corporation in carrying out its program, it being distinctly and definitely understood, however, that nothing in this act shall interfere or conflict with established or vested rights.

SEC. 7. On or before the 1st day of April of each year the corporation shall make and transmit to Congress a report of its proceedings for the year ending December 31 preceding, including a full, complete, and itemized report of receipts and expenditures of whatever kind.

SEC. 8. On the effective date of this act, the separate existence of the old corporation shall cease and the old corporation shall be merged into the corporation. The corporation shall possess all the public and private rights, privileges, powers, and franchises and shall be subject to all the restrictions, disabilities, and duties of the old corporation so merged into it, and all of the rights, privileges, powers, and franchises of the old corporation, and all property—real, personal, and mixed—and all debts due it on whatever account shall be vested in the corporation; and all property, rights, privileges, powers, and franchises and all other interests of the old corporation shall be the property of the corporation and the title to any real estate vested in the old corporation by deed or otherwise, under the laws of the District of Columbia or any State, shall not revert or be in any way impaired by reason of this act: *Provided, however*, That all rights of creditors and all liens upon any property of the old corporation shall be preserved unimpaired and all its debts, liabilities, and duties shall attach to the corporation and may be enforced against it to the same extent as if such debts, liabilities, and duties had been incurred or contracted by it.

SEC. 9. Congress shall have the right to repeal, alter, or amend this act at any time.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with my remarks I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the other members of the committee for having reported this very excellent bill for your consideration.

H. R. 6670 is, as you know, a bill to incorporate the Girl Scouts of America. There is not very much to be said about this bill, except that the purpose of the bill is to give the same prestige to the girls of America as has been given to the boys. You all know that the Girl Scouts and the Boy Scouts of America are the future citizens upon whom we shall have to depend. They are doing a magnificent work. They are building character. They are an honor to our country.

The purpose of the scout law, as you know, and as you will see from the report that has been submitted by the committee, is to incorporate, by congressional act, the Girl Scouts of America. It is presently a membership corporation, organized under the laws of the District of Columbia. This Federal incorporation is not going to cost the Government any additional money. It is

something to which the Girl Scouts have been looking forward for a long time.

You will notice from the bill that Mrs. Truman, Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and most of the great leaders among the women in this country are the incorporators.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is our good friend the gentlewoman from New Jersey included in that list?

Mrs. NORTON. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. She should be. While everyone whom the gentlewoman has mentioned is a great lady, there is none greater than the gentlewoman from New Jersey herself.

Mrs. NORTON. I thank the majority leader and my very dear friend very much. I have so many things to thank the gentleman for, and, if he will assist me in getting a unanimous vote on this bill, my debt to him will be greatly increased.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I wish to assure the gentlewoman that I do not think there will be any opposition on this side of the House.

Mrs. NORTON. I sincerely thank the gentleman. This bill is really nonpolitical. It is one of the few bills that will come before the House that is completely nonpolitical.

The Girl Scouts aid in hospitals, nurseries, libraries, and museums, and during the World War they did magnificent work, all of it as volunteers. The organization is open to all girls from 7 to 17 years of age. It is one organization where questions of race or creed do not enter. So, Mr. Speaker, as so much time has been taken today in trying to bring this bill to the floor, I shall not take any further time, but I sincerely hope we will get a unanimous vote and prove to these young girls how sincerely interested the House of Representatives is in their endeavors.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Girl Scouts have done a magnificent job in bringing the different countries together. The Girl Scouts from other countries have attended conventions in Washington. It has been a great thing in building up good will among the countries.

Mrs. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution, and I entirely agree with her.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sure that every Member of the House who has had any experience with the Girl Scout organization either in his own family or otherwise joins me in seconding what the distinguished gentlewoman has said in tribute to the worth of this organization. I wonder if the gentlewoman intends to ask that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD? I hope she will.

Mrs. NORTON. It is a pleasure to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of granting incorporation to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America. The Girl Scouts are grouped in an organization which is a character-building one, which has always been for community service and productive of good citizenship and substantial homemaking.

The Girl Scouts place an exacting emphasis upon loyalty and service to God and country and the inculcation of these standards makes girl scouting one of the bulwarks of the American way of life.

Girl scouting provides the women of tomorrow with practical experience in making democracy work, but the bulwark of this great country is still loyalty and service to God and country. To assist in attempting to forever guarantee the ideals of girl scouting and of all loyal Americans I have today requested discharge of H. R. 4937, a bill to remove the limitation on the commencement of prosecutions for offenses arising from espionage, and so forth.

It is imperative that the statute of limitations be lifted on crimes involving treason, espionage, treachery, sabotage, and so forth, in order that the defenses of the United States may be properly protected against perpetrators of these heinous crimes.

As the law now stands, at the end of 3 years from the time that anyone has committed an act of treachery against the United States these persons can openly announce the commission of the crime and the date thereof, and nothing can be done about it—the reason being that the statute of limitations shall have run—in accordance with the law presently in effect.

The statute of limitations gives them a blanket of immunity. There is no statute of limitations for murder, but there is a statute of limitations for treason, and while murder might involve one, two, or three persons, treachery involved with the A-bomb or H-bomb concerns all of us. There should be no limitation on treasonable acts. This in itself will be some sort of deterrent to the commission of such acts.

It is the full-time obligation of all citizenry to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and the passage of this bill can give the agencies of the Government the power to punish all the perpetrators of treasonable crimes.

GIRL SCOUTS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA DESERVE UNANIMOUS VOTE BY THIS HOUSE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, clearly the distinguished Congresswoman from Massachusetts was correct when, a few minutes ago, she argued that the Girl Scouts of America should be put in the same legal status as are the Boy Scouts of America by the United States Congress. H. R. 6670, for which she so appropriately spoke, will do just that.

Having been the first president of the Boy Scout Council in my home city of Long Beach, Calif., and having had clear opportunity to also observe the organization of the Girl Scouts of America in my home city and also in the various Girl Scout troops of the other communities in the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I have the honor of representing, I unhesitatingly vigorously urge that we vote for this bill 100 percent, to wit: Unanimously.

The Girl Scout promise and the Girl Scout laws are as follows:

THE GIRL SCOUT PROMISE

On my honor, I will try: To do my duty to God and my country; to help other people at all times, to obey the Girl Scout laws.

THE GIRL SCOUT LAWS

I. A Girl Scout's honor is to be trusted.
II. A Girl Scout is loyal.
III. A Girl Scout's duty is to be useful and to help others.
IV. A Girl Scout is a friend to all and a sister to every other Girl Scout.
V. A Girl Scout is courteous.
VI. A Girl Scout is a friend to animals.
VII. A Girl Scout obeys orders.
VIII. A Girl Scout is cheerful.
IX. A Girl Scout is thrifty.
X. A Girl Scout is clean in thought, word, and deed.

The whole organization is nonpolitical, nonsectarian, and is open to all girls from 7 through 17 years of age who subscribe to the worthy promise and to the laws. It exists in all types of communities. And I am informed at the present time it is the largest organization of its kind in the wide world.

These splendid Girl Scout troops in the Eighteenth California District teach the girls in the skills of homemaking, arts, crafts, safety, outdoor living, and health; each troop is self-governing and Scouting furnishes the girls of today, who are manifestly the women of tomorrow, with practical experience in making democratic processes operate in the American way.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the completion of consideration of any bill that may be called up from the Committee on the District of Columbia today, that the further call of committees under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request; I do not wish to take my friend's time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER Mr Speaker, I believe that my colleagues will agree that I rarely seek the attention of this House or attempt to stress my views except where I have deep convictions and some justification for the hope that I may reason with my colleagues here. But, notwithstanding my sincere convictions, I hope that I may utter no thought nor advance any argument that will offend my colleagues, for whom I have always entertained only the kindest feeling and whose respect and confidence I have always sought. But, Mr Speaker, there are occasions when a Member of this body charged not only with the solemn responsibility of representing the people of his district, but, also, charged with the even more important duty of representing the best interests of all of the peoples of this glorious young Republic, must speak his piece.

We all are aware now as the result of what has just transpired here that the stage is set to bring up the so-called fair-employment-practices bill and to ram it through this body with a minimum of debate on next Wednesday For the reason that there will be little time for debate on next Wednesday, I am making this humble contribution to the cause with the hope that some of my colleagues may be provoked into some serious thought concerning this problem.

Mr Speaker, we are all cognizant of the fact that this is going to be done, notwithstanding the fact that next Wednesday is February 22, George Washington's Birthday This will be done notwithstanding that it has been an unbroken custom for a hundred years or more that that day be set aside for the purpose of reading the Farewell Address of the Father of his Country. Of course, it is not necessary to call your attention to the fact that only on the day before yesterday no business was transacted in this House, under some kind of agreement, out of deference to the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, another great President of the United States. Why, I ask you, this departure from this sacred custom? The answer is obvious. It is for the same reason that for the first time in many years Calendar Wednesday has been resorted to for the handling of the people's business. It is because we must hasten to pass this iniquitous, foreign, and obnoxious piece of legislation called the fair-employment-practices bill. This is an election year, and the god of politics must be served.

And who, I ask you, my friends, is responsible for this situation? Who is it that cracks the whip and makes the leadership of both major parties jump through the hoop? It is the organized minorities, and who is their spokesman? The able gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], who, back in 1942, introduced the first FEPC bill in this Congress.

There are other Members from New York, as well as others from a few other States who are vying with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] for honors and for currying favor with certain organized minorities; but if honor there be in such a proposal, the lion's share must go to the gentleman from New York, who first conceived this program, and who has been and is today the floor manager for its enactment. Strange proceedings these, but exemplary of the power of organized minorities under our democratic system.

What is the FEPC? Stripped of its political glamor, what would it do? We are told that it would prevent discrimination in private employment because of race, color, creed, or national origin. It is, therefore, given an appealing name—"fair employment" It sounds good. Everyone wants to be fair; therefore, this is a good bill. Most Americans are fair-minded people; therefore, the idea of fair employment is appealing to most people; but the proponents of the bill, while emphasizing its title, do not point out that it is the most flagrant proposal for regimentation of business, both big and little, ever proposed to a congressional committee

They do not point out that under this bill any employer, whether he be in New York, California, or Mississippi, can, at the whim of some irresponsible Federal agent, be hailed before a commissioner or a commission here in Washington at his own expense on some flimsy charge of discrimination in the employment of a janitor, a factory worker, or some other employee, or, for that matter, if the employer complained of were in New York he could, under this bill, at the wishes of the Federal agent, be hauled out to California or, for that matter, to the Virgin Islands and there be required to defend himself at his own expense as best he could, away from his home and in a foreign atmosphere.

Neither do the proponents of this legislation emphasize that this would set up another bureaucracy with literally hundreds of thousands of Federal employees with the resultant enormous increase of the necessary taxes with which to further hamstring the little, as well as the big-business men of this country.

Neither are you nor your constitutents told that this additional heavy burden of regimentation, with additional Federal agents snooping about, is going to be equally as obnoxious to the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker in Ohio, as it is in Alabama. In fact, I am not so sure that it is not going to prove more irritating and obnoxious to the industrial East and West than it is to the agricultural South.

I am wondering how my friends from these sections are going to feel when they have to explain to their people back home their vote for this iniquitous proposal when those constituents come face to face with the annoyance, irritation, and impracticability of the administration of this unwise bill.

Permit me to say, in all kindness and brotherly love to my friends on the Republican side of this House, that I realize your problem, and I sympathize with you in your problem. As a rule, you are a sturdy lot. You believe in the American free-enterprise system. You are opposed to regimentation of our people. You, at one time, were regarded as the party of the businessman. The ideology of this proposal does not appeal to you. It is foreign to your whole concept. On the other hand, you still have some hope of getting the Negro and the so-called liberal vote, or enough of it to retain your seats here in Congress. You dislike the idea of taking a bold, courageous stand in behalf of the free-enterprise system with as little governmental regimentation of business as possible. It is a serious problem for you; but need I, in all charity, remind you that you have lost that vote, anyway? You cannot possibly hope to outbid those in charge of the Democratic Party for that vote. You either have to take a courageous stand in behalf of the principles of the free-enterprise system and take your chance with the great unorganized masses, who, in reality, are in the majority, and make a clear line of demarkation between you and the party now in power, on the one hand, or, else, on the other hand, be gradually liquidated on a me-too basis. Need I remind you of Aesop's fable of the dog who dropped his bone in the stream to grab the mirrored reflection of that bone?

And now, with your permission, and again, with charity to all, I submit the question to my Democratic colleagues of the North, East, and West, whether you are sure of your political wisdom. I realize that in order to capture the Negro and so-called liberal vote you may think it expedient to aim this bill at the South. I am not oblivious of the fact that there are those now in charge of the Democratic Party who are inclined to boast of their ability to win elections without the contribution of the so-called solid South, but I should like to call your attention to the possibility that there may again come a day when the vote of that great section of our common country may be not only welcome but necessary in order to win elections for the Democratic Party. That there were deflections from the solid South, and those deflections came as a result of this very program in the last presidential election, is, of course, fresh in your minds. That there may be greater deflections in the future, if you persist in using the South as a "whipping boy," is, of course, a real possibility. How long my people will continue to take this type of punishment, of course, poses a real question which those in charge of the party today might well ponder.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my Democratic brethren to the fact that some 8 years ago, when a similar piece of legislation was under consideration, I pointed out then that the South would not always stand for such treatment at the hands of its Democratic brethren. Among other things I said then:

Mr. Chairman, I never thought that I would live to see the day when the Democratic Party, the party to which my forebears, have belonged for generations—the party which has been nourished, protected, and fathered by the South—would take the lead under its administration to force this type of action down the throat of its best friend. Since the Civil War the Democratic Party has been the beneficiary of everything the South had to offer. When the Democratic Party offered a candidate for President it knew that it had the support of the solid South. In that section it has been little short of treason for these many years to do other than vote the Democratic ticket.

In all these years the South has asked for little, and gotten less, from that party. In fact, the only thing that it has ever gotten out of the Democratic Party when it was in power was the privilege of having representatives in the two branches of the Congress, which the Constitution guaranteed it Prior to the Civil War that great section of this country furnished many, if not most, of the great, outstanding political figures of the country It furnished its Washington, its Jefferson, its Patrick Henry, its Lee, its Davis, and its George Today the caliber of its men has not decayed It still provides the Nation with much of its leadership But because of its political isolation it is denied the privilege of one of its sons becoming the nominee of its party for the exalted office of the Presidency This is not because it does not have the men of Presidential caliber, but because that party realizes that it already has the votes of that section of the solid South, and always the nominee comes from some doubtful section.

When the party is in power the sweetest plums of political patronage and preference likewise go to other sections where political allegiance is not so constant The only thing the South has ever asked, and the only reason it has been so constantly and consistently loyal to the Democratic Party, has been because it thought that that party offered it the privilege of handling its own domestic and internal affairs

It might be well in this connection, in passing, to point out to those beneficiaries of the Democratic Party in other sections of the country, those of you who are today becoming a party—an unwilling party, I grant you, but nevertheless a party—to forcing this legislation down our throats, that if you are going to deny our people the right to control these political and social matters which are so peculiarly their own, there is little, if anything, left to the South as grounds for a unified support of that party. Might they not well reason that if this last vestige of benefit which they receive from that solid support of the Democratic Party is to be removed by a Democratic administration, they might profitably seek another course and join the other States of the Union in frequent changes of their political affiliations?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the ranking minority member of the committee. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] will yield his 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], which I now yield him.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may use that 5 minutes to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman knew it could not be brought up last fall because we did not have sufficient Mondays to do so. We had to pass 21 legislative days before we could call up a bill.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman from Mississippi does not know anything of the kind. Now let me proceed.

Mr. Speaker, this country has become the greatest, the most powerful, and the richest country in the world under the American free-enterprise system. To it all other nations look not only for leadership, but for financial assistance. The fact that this country has more than 90 percent of the steel, the radios, automobiles, telephones, washing machines, and so forth, in the world is no accident It is the result of the free-enterprise system which so many in this country, for political preferment, on the one hand, or because of their infatuation for some foreign ideology, on the other hand, would destroy. Regimentation of the type proposed in this legislation is not consistent with that system. It is unsound. It is ill-conceived It will not work, and should be defeated.

Mr Speaker, I have spoken from my heart. I am muchly concerned about the future of this great country. It is impossible to legislate in this field

With the hope that I have not and will not offend the sensibilities of any of you, my colleagues, whose respect I covet and whose friendship I enjoy, permit me to say, in conclusion, that, while we all may covet the honor of being a Member of this great legislative body, I am sure that we all recognize that whether we continue as Members of this body is not important. The matter of importance for us and our children is whether or not this great country founded upon the free-enterprise system without the regimentation of the Federal Government is the important thing Yes, the important principle involved is whether the freedom of the individual, the freedom of the American free-enterprise system, shall survive. Let there be, therefore, no Member who will, under the political lash of minority groups, be a party to stultifying his conscience and to destroying the greatest embodiment of human government ever conceived in the minds of men—the American Republic

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

OREGON—THE EPIC OF THE BEAVER STATE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we Oregonians here in the Nation's Capital celebrated the ninety-first birthday of the State of Oregon. Similar celebrations took place in Oregon and elsewhere.

On September 11, 1948, the Library of Congress presented an exhibition of rare books, manuscripts, old maps and prints, newspapers, music, and photographs from its collections, together with documents from the National Archives, and photographs from institutions in Oregon, to honor the one hundredth anniversary of the act of Congress establishing the Territory of Oregon. As one of the Representatives of the State of Oregon I was honored to be asked to make the historical address on that occasion. The following historical data in those remarks are of sufficient public interest, I believe, to have a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, since the State of Oregon has played an important role in the development of the national life of our Republic

For many ages nature worked to prepare the area of Oregon—380 miles east and west, 280 across north and south, and 96,000 square miles. It was stored with riches to challenge the energy of the pioneer The long and mighty upheavals of geology made it really two very different countries, separated by the towering backbone of the Cascade Mountains from the lower Columbia River to California At the northern end the graceful snowcapped cone of Mount Hood cuts the sky like a solitary sentinel, visible over most of Oregon on a crystal day Only 30 miles from Portland, it has become a popular winter sports area, centering in the hospitality of Timberline Lodge to hosts of visitors and skiers. This is only one of many winter sports areas along the Cascade Range

East of the ridge lies a foreign country—vast and rugged, with slighter rainfall. That is the cattle, sheep, and wheat region, with Pendleton of the world-famous round-up, and Burns and Lakeview as typical sheep towns There grows the great Ponderosa pine, providing a lumber industry for Bend and Klamath Falls Rolling stretches of wheat ripple in Umatilla, Morrow, Sherman, Gilliam, and Wasco Counties. There may be found some of Oregon's most striking scenery, which thrilled early explorers There are hundreds of mountain lakes and streams, and Crater Lake, the blue jewel in the former crater of a volcano, Mount Mazama In the northeast corner lie the Wallowa Mountains, which rival the beauty and splendor of Switzerland's Alps It is great game country, where deer, mountain birds, and waterfowl abound to tempt the sportsman.

Western Oregon, with 40 annual inches of rainfall, has been called the green paradise For 150 miles below Portland stretches the rich Willamette Valley, 50 miles wide, where live a million people, two-thirds of Oregon's inhabitants The abundant water, the fertile river bottoms, and the sheltering walls of the Cascades and the Coast Range, make it an ideal home and farm country. Along the 300 miles of beautifully scenic coast, whitened by surf, are fine beaches, lumber towns, and picturesque fishing communities.

Modern Oregonians have responded to this large environment, with its mild and temperate climate, and live much in the outdoors. It makes them want to own their homes, to be hospitable and friendly, and to be generous and progressive in their thoughts.

It has appeared also in their native literature. For Oregon has been making an impression upon American authors, since the supposed first printing of the name in 1778, in Jonathan Carver's Travels. The earliest local writings were personal records of explorers, seamen, traders, trappers, and homesteaders. The poet, William Cullen Bryant, might have been reading one of them about 1817, when in Thanatopsis he wrote:

Or lose thyself in the continuous woods
Where rolls the Oregon, and hears no sound
Save its own dashings.

This is said to be the first reference to Oregon in American poetry.

The newspaper often was the only reading for many of the pioneers. The first native one, the Oregon Spectator, appeared in 1846, but folded up when the printer joined the host rushing to the gold fields of California. By the 1860's, Portland was becoming the literary and publishing center of the Northwest. Joaquin Miller, world-famous poet of the Pacific coast, published his earliest volumes there.

Toward the close of the nineteenth century, memory turned to the pioneer days, and Oregonians wrote many historical works, and recollections of the Oregon Trail and the primitive settlements. Modern poets and novelists have gone native, taking their themes from local scenes and experiences—in the rich vegetation and flowers, the mountains, the feeling of the chinook wind, life on Willamette Valley farms, the old wagon trains, the fur barons and missionaries, the sage-brush and desert country, and places haunted by ancient Indian legends.

They are vividly aware of how long Oregon belonged to the Indian. When the early American seamen, fur trappers, explorers, miners, and settlers entered, they found Oregon inhabited by numerous and powerful tribes. Among them were the hard-riding Cayuses, and the Nez-Percés—Pierced Noses—of the eastern high country—Umpqua fishermen of the lower coast—reed-gathering Klamaths among the southern lakes—wood-carving Chinooks on the lower Columbia River, who gave a name to the trade language of the coast, the Chinook jargon. In the south dwelt the Modocs, whose last-ditch resistance to the white man caused one of the fiercest Indian wars in American history—the tragedy of the lava beds.

As homesteaders flocked to Oregon over the 2,000-mile trail from Missouri, the Indians by many treaties disposed of their lands and acquired reservations. Some listened willingly to brave Catholic and Protestant missionaries. For them, Oregon's first printer produced grammars and religious books, which have become rarities, like the Nez-Percés First Book, issued in 1839 at the Mission Press, Clearwater, now in Idaho but then in the Oregon country.

Others desperately resisted the advance of settlement, and within 30 years Oregon suffered the terrors of at least six Indian wars. In 1847 a band of Cayuses attacked the Presbyterian mission near Walla Walla, burnt all the buildings, and killed 14 people, including Dr. Marcus Whitman and his wife. The Rogue War, 1851–56, ended in the surrender of Chief John, who was imprisoned later in the grim fastness of Alcatraz in San Francisco Bay. The Spokane War raged in 1858. In 1872–73 the Modocs refused to move to the Klamath Reservation, and held out against soldiers in the lava beds near Tule Lake on the Oregon-California border until Captain Jack, their leader, was captured and hung. Five years later the Nez-Percés, led by the younger Chief Joseph, resisted removal from their beloved Wallowa Valley. Joseph gave up after a masterly retreat across Idaho and Montana, and is buried at the foot of Wallowa Lake. After the brief Paiute and Bannock outbreak in eastern Oregon, in 1878, the State had no more Indian wars.

The name of Oregon has been an intriguing one for men of many nations. The adventurous Jonathan Carver first mentioned it as now spelled in his Travels, published in 1778, with a map showing the great river of the West. He heard of it from Indian tribes beyond the Great Lakes, on his journey to Wisconsin and Minnesota, in 1767–68. Other Indians spoke of the land of the beautiful river. Moncacht Apé, an inquisitive Natchez, told the French explorer Le Page du Pratz about his trip overland, up the Missouri River to the Great Water. About 1765 the famous Maj. Robert Rogers, leader of the Rangers, proposed to King George III an exploring expedition to the Pacific Ocean by way of the river called by the Indians Ouragon.

To seamen, Oregon was part of the northern mystery. Its fogs, perilous capes and bars, and strong currents might hide the fabled "Strait of Anian," perhaps a northeast passage to Hudson Bay. The unknown beyond Cape Blanco lured a few bold sailors as early as the sixteenth century to explore Oregon's 300 miles of rocky, surf-beaten coast. Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo, a Portuguese, in Spanish service, in 1543 explored it with his chief pilot, Bartolomé Ferrelo. It is believed that they reached 44°—but a storm probably hid the land. On his voyage around the world in the *Golden Hind*, 1579, Sir Francis Drake saw the forested wilderness and called it New Albion—the name it bore on maps for many years. He abandoned there his search for a northeastern passage to England.

Belief in the passage died hard, and the Spaniard Sebastian Vizcaino searched for it in 1602. One of his ships, under Martin d'Aguilar, went north of 42°—the present southern boundary of Oregon. He reported the entrance of a river or strait not far from Cape Blanco, which he named. The stream could have been the Umpqua.

After that venture, approaches by sea ceased for a long period, until Spain's jealousy was aroused by the advances of Russia and England into the Northwest. Then, in quick succession, came Juan Perez, Bruno Haceta, and Bodega y Quadra. The first sailed along all or most of the present Oregon coast in 1774. Haceta did the same in 1774 and 1775, and on his second voyage noticed evidences of a great northern river. He sighted the Tillamook coast, and in his diary described its ruggedness. He and Quadra both sighted but did not enter the mouth of the Columbia.

Between 1775 and 1800 the northern mystery began to yield to the persistent navigators. Scientific curiosity inspired the English Captain Cook's last ill-fated voyage in 1779. Seeking a sea passage to the Atlantic, he sailed along the Oregon coast to Vancouver Island, traded with the Indians for furs, and studied their life and customs. With him were two Americans, Gore and Ledyard, the first to visit the Pacific Northwest. After Cook came other English captains.

Barkley in 1787 named the Strait of Juan de Fuca for its supposed discoverer of 1592, who had thought it was the Strait of Anian. Next year came John Meares to search for the great river reported by Haceta. Entering the mouth of the Columbia, he thought it was a large bay, named it "Deception," and the northern promontory "Cape Disappointment."

The real opening of the Oregon coast was due to the commercial genius of the solid men of Boston, who sensed the possibility of fortunes in the fur trade. In 1788 Capt. Robert Gray, of Boston, with Capt. John Kendrick, made a trading voyage to the Pacific. Their ships, the *Columbia* and the *Lady Washington*, were the first American vessels to visit the northwest coast. On his second voyage, May 11, 1792, Gray entered the mighty, long-sought beautiful River of the West, sailed up for several miles, traded with the Indians, and noted the country. He named the great river for his ship, the first to drop anchor in its inland waters.

English and American rivalry was beginning. The British captain, George Vancouver, mapped the northwest coast in 1792–94. In 1795 appeared the first British map bearing the name Columbia River. In 1792 Lt. William R. Broughton, an English naval officer under the command of Vancouver, explored the river for nearly a hundred miles inland, reached the Cascades, sighted and named Mount Hood, and claimed the region for Great Britain, declaring that "the subjects of no other civilized nation or state had ever entered this river before," even though he knew of Gray's visit in the same year.

The last of the great navigators was a famous Arctic and South Seas explorer, Capt. Charles Wilkes. In 1841 he brought an American naval squadron to the Columbia, which he thoroughly surveyed. His published report is one of the great sources of information about early Oregon, and is richly illustrated with sketches of the country and the primitive Indian life.

While agents bargained with the Indians for furs, in Chinook jargon, scientists charted bays and rivers, and artists sketched tall ships at anchor, and mammoth evergreens in the vast, silent forests. Captains carefully kept their log books, and some of the accompanying adventurers wrote journals. In their faded ink we read one of the most exciting and heroic episodes in American history—how seamen penetrated the mist of legend and conjecture which long hid the beauty and riches of Oregon.

While navigators disclosed the coast, the interior was thoroughly explored by another kind of adventurer—the fur-trappers and traders. Behind them schemed the business genius of the great fur companies—the Hudson's Bay, the Northwest, and the Pacific Fur Co. of John Jacob Astor. The enterprise of that bold New York merchant is recalled by the name of Astoria. There the first fur-trading post in the Columbia region

was established by members of his company in 1811. Their post was located near a log fort which sheltered the Lewis and Clark overland expedition in the winter of 1805–06.

One group of Astor's company sailed from New York in the ship *Tonquin* around Cape Horn, and arrived at the mouth of the Columbia in March 1811. Another group came overland and arrived about a year later. The sea voyagers built the post at Astoria. The story of that adventure has been immortalized by Washington Irving's Astoria; by Ross Cox's Adventures on the Columbia, a description of life among the trappers and traders; and by Gabriel Franchère's Narrative of a Voyage to the Northwest Coast of America. Franchère was a clerk of the Astor company.

From that time it was open war between British and American fur interests, and the Oregon question became a perennial annoyance to statesmen of the two nations for over 30 years.

When the War of 1812 broke out, British interests saw their opportunity, and in 1813 the Northwest Co. purchased Astoria and renamed it Fort George. The United States did nothing. Although Astoria was restored to American hands in 1818, by treaty, the fur trade was securely in the grasp of the Northwest Co., which in 1821 merged with its British rival, the Hudson's Bay Co.

Then began the despotic rule of the white-headed eagle, Dr. John McLoughlin. For some 20 years he was the most powerful man in Oregon. In 1824 he became chief factor of the Hudson's Bay Co., and within a year built Fort Vancouver on the north bank of the Columbia, a few miles east of the mouth of the Willamette. With an iron hand he controlled the wild white trappers and Indians. He symbolized the despotic power of the fur barons, and for a long time succeeded in crushing all competition. He used to entertain competitors at dinner in his home, which was virtually the capital of the Northwest.

The doctor was boss from California to Alaska, and from the Rockies to the sea. Although he feared the effect upon his fur trade, he aided American newcomers. The company forced his resignation in 1845 and ended his domination. An instance of his power is the notice he posted at Oregon City in 1843, requiring bond for a deed to lands there. Somebody tore it down and wrote on the back "Dr. McLoughlin's ukase." He spent his declining years in a stately house which is still standing at Oregon City.

He noted with alarm the increasing penetration of American fur men whose names are eminent in the epic of the Northwest frontier—"Jed" Smith, John Work, Peter Skene Ogden. "Jed" Smith reached Oregon from California in 1828. Indians attacked his party near the mouth of the Umpqua, killing all but Smith and three of his companions, and taking his furs. With a typical gesture, McLoughlin sent an expedition to buy the pelts, with the distinct understanding that "Jed" should keep out of Oregon. Ogden was active in the Snake River country and Oregon about 1824.

Some of the fur men, in journals and diaries, left fascinating records of their experiences in that brief, intense period of Oregon history. When the trade declined, many settled down and mingled with the incoming tide of Americans. They had become half accustomed to the new life, by acquaintance with the permanent, fortified stations of the fur companies. The posts resembled villages, with palisaded enclosures, numerous buildings, cultivated fields, pastures for sheep and cattle, and horse corrals. The post was a transition from the wilderness to the new Oregon, to be built by missionaries, teachers, storekeepers, miners, and homesteaders, who came in rocking wagons on the overland trail, or on crowded steamers from Panama and San Francisco. And the post of the fur trader gave to Oregon its popular name—Beaver State.

A new Oregon was foretold by the ever-increasing interest of Americans in an overland route to the Pacific. For a long time, during the American Revolution, nobody followed the suggestions of Rogers and Carver. But the project of an expedition was discussed by the restless and inquisitive Thomas Jefferson, and his secretary, Meriwether Lewis. When Jefferson, as President, accomplished the purchase of Louisiana in 1803, their dream became a reality. Lewis and William Clark, starting from St. Louis in 1804, headed the famous expedition authorized by the President and Congress, "to explore the Missouri River, and such principal streams of it, as, by its course and communication with the waters of the Pacific Ocean, may offer the most direct and practicable water communication across this continent, for the purposes of commerce."

The party started up the Missouri on May 14, 1804, and reached the headwaters of the Columbia in October of the following year. They journeyed downstream, reached Cape Disappointment in November, and passed the winter in their rude log fort, named Clatsop for a nearby Indian tribe. In the spring they returned, reaching St. Louis on September 23, 1806. This was the first journey by white men across the Oregon country. Accounts of it stirred widespread interest, particularly in the fur trade, and directly inspired Astor's venture of 1811.

Later overland adventurers made Oregon well known to wide-awake Americans. In 1812 Donald McKenzie explored the beautiful, fertile Willamette Valley destined to be the center of American occupation. The way over the plains and mountains became known as the Oregon Trail. To most Americans the symbol of the trail is a picture of a covered wagon carrying a mother and her baby into the wilderness, with the father riding alongside. But that was the later aspect of the road to Oregon, which challenged adventurous spirits long before the great rush of miners and settlers in the 1840's.

Reports of Captain Bonneville's expedition of 1831–35, and of John C. Frémont's in 1843, the writings of Washington Irving and Francis Parkman made the Oregon Trail a literary tradition. About the trail grew up a vast literature of guide books, journals written by members of exploring parties, and reminiscences of those who braved its dangers and hardships. Some, like Ezra Meeker, lived to make the journey again by auto or airplane.

The British were not idle, and sent rival expeditions. Probably the most famous was the Warre-Vavasour party of the 1840's, led by Capt. Henry James Warre. His party went through British Columbia, followed the Columbia to its mouth, and explored the attractive Willamette Valley. On the way the captain drew sketches which are among the most beautiful early illustrations of Oregon scenery. They were published at London in 1848, as lithographs, in his Sketches in North America and the Oregon Territory. They show what a vivid impression was made upon early comers, by Oregon's mighty Columbia, the lovely Willamette Valley, majestic Mount Hood, old posts built by fur traders, and strange customs of northwestern Indians.

Before title to Oregon had been settled, Americans were dreaming of a transcontinental railroad, and one from California to Willamette Valley. Agitation reached a peak in the 1850's, when the Federal Government sent explorers to locate possible routes. One expedition penetrated Oregon from the south, following generally a well-known route of French-Canadian fur traders between the Willamette Valley and Spanish settlements in California. Entering the rugged Klamath Country of southern Oregon, they followed the mighty Cascade Range and traversed the Willamette Valley until they came in sight of the snowy tent of Mount Hood. Another group penetrated Oregon from eastern Washington and went down the Spokane and Columbia Rivers. Artists on the expeditions made sketches which were published as tinted lithographs in official reports.

These century-old illustrations show the wild Oregon as the explorers and trappers saw it—fur-traders' forts, Indian camps, fisheries, and burial places; all in a setting of rocky gorges, snow-clad peaks, fertile valleys, and evergreen forests, which now attract multitudes of tourists and homemakers to one of America's scenic wonderlands. This was primitive Oregon, before the coming of railroads, sawmills, cement highways, hydroelectric power plants, and factories.

Settlers had already begun to enter this beautiful land. Those who wanted Oregon to be American, perceived that permanent settlement would make possession 9 out of 10 points in the law. One of the earliest advocates of colonization was a Boston schoolmaster, Hall Jackson Kelley, who wrote to encourage emigration. He is often regarded as the father of Oregon. His efforts were seconded by men like Nathaniel J. Wyeth, who in 1832 went from Boston to the Columbia to establish a salmon fishery and packing plant. He returned to the East in 1833, but came again in the next year and established Fort William on Sauvie Island.

Missionaries were among the earliest to respond to publicity. Since the founding of New France on the St. Lawrence, French missionaries (called black robes by their converts) had been carrying Christianity to Indians. Close on the

heels of trappers, they reached Oregon. Their work there is well described by the lives of a heroic Belgian priest, Father Pierre Jean de Smet, apostle to the Northwest, and of Father Francis Norbert Blanchet, who in 1844 became the first Archbishop of Oregon. He erected the first log church within Oregon's present limits—St. Paul's, Marion County—in 1836, and became its first pastor in 1838.

The self-sacrifice, devotion, and hardships of Catholic fathers were rivaled by their Methodist and Presbyterian brethren. They and their wives abandoned comfortable Eastern parishes, in response to appeals from missionary journals and societies. They wrote letters and books on experiences in Oregon, which assisted publicists, explorers, and statesmen to fasten the American grip upon the region.

Jason and Daniel Lee, Methodist ministers, came with Nathaniel J. Wyeth's second company in 1834. They were the first Protestant missionaries to the Northwest to Christianize and educate Indians. In 1835 they established a Methodist mission and school at French Prairie in the Willamette Valley. In 1844 the school was absorbed by the Oregon Institute (now Willamette University), organized in 1842. The Lees praised Oregon in letters to eastern friends, and so helped to encourage settlement, especially through Daniel Lee's book, Ten Years in Oregon, published in 1844.

Soon after the Methodists came the Presbyterians. In 1836 Dr. Marcus Whitman and the Reverend Henry Harmon Spalding arrived in Oregon and established missions in the Walla Walla and Clearwater Valleys. In the winter of 1842, Whitman made a perilous journey across the continent to present the needs of this mission, and to enlist homeseekers and secure Government aid in settling Oregon. His trip inspired a larger trek across the plains. One of his companions on the first trip to the Northwest was the Reverend Samuel Packer, who in the 1830's wrote an astonishingly successful book, Journal of an Exploring Tour Beyond the Rocky Mountains.

Missionaries are important in the history of Oregon, because they formulated rules of government for themselves and the Indians, and the American settlers accepted them as leaders. They and their brave wives were among the first people to appreciate Oregon as a future land of homes. They built schools which still flourish in the Willamette Valley. To them the Territory of Oregon owed its first books, printed on a little hand press, brought by ship from Honolulu and carried deep into the wilderness. The trail which they followed, across the plains and the Rockies, was soon whitened by the wagons of thousands of people, who came to Oregon to stay and build a new State.

They were coming by 1839, when the Peoria party, the first overland group, left Illinois. The first considerable wagon train over the Oregon Trail made the long and trying journey in 1843. That was the beginning of a migration which brought thousands to the Columbia and Willamette Valleys before 1860.

In the 1840's a flood of books on Oregon appeared in the United States and Europe. They advertised Oregon's attractions, offered much-needed advice to emigrants, and details of the overland trail, or of the long sea voyages by way of Panama or Hawaii. Some of the later ones appealed to continental Europeans, especially Germans, Swedes, and Finns, who formed large communities in Oregon.

American settlement had scarcely begun, when the people began to agitate for a local government, and for incorporation into the United States. On the first of his two trips to the Atlantic coast, in 1838, Jason Lee presented to Congress a memorial asking for protection of American citizens. The paper, signed by 36 settlers, requested admission into the Union. In 1838 the Reverend David Leslie, a missionary, presented a similar memorial signed by him and about 70 others, asking for "the civil institutions of the American Republic" and "the high privilege of American citizenship." Two years later Lee made an earnest speech in favor of an American provisional government, at a meeting of the settlers.

The gathering was occasioned by the death of Ewing Young, a cattle baron of the 1830's. He owned a great part of the Chehalem Valley, and a large herd of Spanish cattle, which he drove north from California. As he left no will or legal heirs, at his funeral the people planned to call a mass meeting of Oregonians south of the Columbia, to appoint administrators of his estate and to form a provisional local government. That meeting was held on February 17 and 18, 1841, at the Methodist mission in the Willamette Valley. The people elected a supreme court judge with probate powers, minor court officers, and a committee to draft a constitution and a code of laws.

Organization was perfected by two conventions held at the village of Champoeg in 1843, to organize a provisional government. The Americans feared the threat of a general Indian attack upon all American settlements in the Willamette Valley. At the second meeting, July 5, they adopted articles of compact and a detailed organic law, based largely upon the laws of Iowa. At a special election, July 25, 1845, the government was confirmed and came into effect, the amended organic law was approved, and George Abernethy was elected Governor. The meeting on July 5 made Oregon City the capital and established the first four districts or counties—Champoeg (Marion), Clackamas, Tualaty (Washington), and Yamhill.

In the meantime, petitions for occupation of Oregon, and for the organization of a territory, poured in upon Congress. Governor Abernethy, in a long, confidential letter, urged President Polk to take action. The champions of Oregon in Congress, particularly Senators Benton and Linn and David R. Atchison, of Missouri, seconded his efforts in speeches and writings. Congress did not act because of the unsettled state of the perennial Oregon question, which threatened to involve the Nation in a third war with Great Britain—which few on either side really wanted.

The difficulty arose from the vagueness of the boundary between Canada and the United States, west of the Great Lakes. A treaty with Great Britain in 1818 defined it at 49° to the Rockies, and agreed to a 10-year joint occupancy of the Oregon county between that line and the Columbia River. This treaty was ratified on January 19, 1819, and was renewed in 1827. In the meantime Spain, by the Treaty of Florida in 1819, renounced her pretensions north of 42°, the present southern boundary of Oregon. Five years later Russia gave up all interests south of 54°40', the present southern limit of Alaska.

As the American frontier pushed westward the situation became acute. Extreme American expansionists shouted "Fifty-four forty or fight" in James K. Polk's campaign for the Presidency in 1844. Polk at first favored the idea, which became a hot political issue, fiercely and endlessly debated in Congress and the press, while petitions poured in from the States, demanding American occupation of Oregon. As was predicted by the astute Georgia statesman, Alexander H. Stephens, cooler counsels prevailed, and the Treaty of 1846 between the United States and Great Britain compromised on the present northern boundary at 49°. The United States gained a magnificent domain, rich in natural resources which even yet are not fully realized. It included the present States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and a considerable part of Montana.

The great question having been answered, a bill to organize the Territory of Oregon was introduced into Congress. President Polk wanted to see a Territorial government out there before the end of his term. He got his wish, for after a 24-hour debate Congress passed the bill on August 14, 1848, and the President signed it the same day. The area included all the original Oregon country, from 42° to 49° and from the Rockies to the Pacific. Within a few years Oregon was reduced to its present area by the creation of the Territories of Washington and Idaho.

The next step was the selection of a governor. President Polk selected Gen. Joseph Lane, of Indiana, appointing him immediately after the signing of the bill. Twelve years later Lane became Vice Presidential nominee on the Democratic ticket with John C. Breckinridge, but he lost Oregon to Abraham Lincoln.

To carry the news to Lane, the President selected Joseph L. (Joe) Meek, appointing him United States marshal for Oregon. Joe, a noted mountain man, had attained considerable prominence in Oregon. He and some of his followers, adventurous spirits, went overland to the Willamette Valley and claimed free land. At the famous Champoeg meeting in May 1843, he and his American followers opposed Father Blanchet and his French Canadians on the question of establishing a provisional American government. According to tradition, when the meeting was evenly divided, Joe roared for separation, and two Frenchmen sided with the Americans. To some extent, he was responsible for the first American government west of

the Rockies. He became high sheriff, and later went to Washington to report the massacre of Marcus Whitman, as "Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from the Republic of Oregon to the Court of the United States." He never lacked humor.

Meek hastened to Indiana to inform Lane of his appointment, and the two hurried overland to Oregon. They reached Oregon City by boat, and proclaimed the Territorial government on March 3, 1849, the day before President Polk left office. The first Territorial legislature met at Oregon City on July 16, 1849.

Oregon remained a Territory only 11 years, due to the great rush of population in the 1840's and early 1850's. As Meek and the other men of Champoeg were electing officers, the first great wagon train for Oregon was gathering on the banks of the Missouri, at Independence. "Oregon or bust," became the cry of thousands in the East and Middle West. By 1859 the population had soared to over 53,000.

The cry for statehood became insistent, and in August and September 1857 a convention met at Salem to draft a constitution. On November 9 it was ratified by popular vote, which went heavily against slavery, but also barred free Negroes from Oregon. A bill to admit Oregon as a State was introduced in Congress, and was signed by President James Buchanan on February 14, 1859—the eleventh anniversary of the passage of the act establishing a Territorial government. Oregon thus became the thirty-third State. The news reached Portland on March 15, Oregon City on the following day, and the State government was formally organized on May 16, 1859. The first State Governor, John Whitaker, was inaugurated on March 3, and the legislative assembly already had met in 1858.

Within a short time, October 1860, Oregon sent to the United States Senate the brilliant orator, Edward Dickinson Baker, an old friend of Abraham Lincoln. He campaigned successfully for Lincoln in Oregon in the Presidential election of 1860, and helped to squelch the secession movement on the Pacific coast. After a short service in the Senate, he joined the Union Army, made a final appearance before the Senate in a colonel's uniform, and was killed while leading a charge at the battle of Ball's Bluff, October 21, 1861. Baker City and County were named for him.

Oregon was conceived in democracy, the first government was the result of a spontaneous popular movement. That tradition of democratic procedure survived the frequent turbulence of persons and factions. Oregon naturally took a leading position in the crusade for greater popular control of government, which was a feature of the progressive movement of 40 years ago. William S. U'Ren, of Portland, a leader of that agitation on the west coast, headed a campaign which resulted in Oregon's setting an example to the Nation.

The State adopted the initiative and referendum for laws in 1902, the direct primary for choosing candidates in 1904, the recall of officials in 1908. These laws together became known throughout the Nation as the "Oregon system." Although naturally conservative, Oregonians early adopted some of America's most advanced legislation, including a gasoline tax to pay for the 52,000 miles of fine highways. Oregon has avoided the unpopular sales tax, and was among the first States to adopt an income tax.

Oregon was the pioneer of public education on the west coast. One of the first acts of the provisional government, in 1845, was to provide for free public schools. The Territorial legislature passed a school law in 1849, due in part to the influence of missionaries, who had been founding schools since the 1830's. One of them, the Reverend George H. Atkinson, has even been called the father of public education in Oregon. Before they became a State, Oregonians in 1858 organized their educational association.

Now the State's youth has a wide choice among public higher schools: The State university of Eugene, a State college at Corvallis, and three strategically located State teachers' colleges. There are private universities and colleges of high standing, such as Willamette, Pacific, Portland, Linfield, Reed, and Lewis and Clark. Oregon has one of the highest literacy rates in the Nation, and the intelligence it suggests is one of the State's perennial attractions to outsiders looking for a home.

For Oregon has never ceased to attract people. They are still coming: the population leaped from 1,089,000 in 1940 to 1,525,000 in 1948, an increase of 40 percent in less than a decade. The immigrant tide is estimated at 600 families a month. It is said that since 1940 more people have entered Oregon than in the whole century after Lewis and Clark reached the Columbia. Even with this enormous migration, there is almost no unemployment, because the State has so much to offer the newcomers.

To those who think of Oregon as the State of the fir tree and the salmon, it comes as a surprise that it is one of the leading agricultural Commonwealths. The farm income in 1947 amounted to some $385,000,000. Salem is in the heart of the rich Willamette farming region, where are raised berries, fruit, nuts, root crops, livestock, and turkeys. The fruit industry centers in Medford, home of the Comice pear, and a tourist center. On the well-watered delta lands of Tillamook and Coos Counties grow lush natural grasses, which support some of America's finest herds of dairy cattle. The Tillamook premium cheddar cheese, manufactured in model factories, is shipped all over the world.

Farming in the drier southern and eastern counties depends largely upon irrigation. The irrigated lands of Klamath, Malheur, and Deschutes produce netted gem potatoes, melons, and fruit—sometimes 600 sacks of potatoes per acre. Hood River County apples are world famous, as are Wasco County cherries. Oregon has over 1,100,000 acres under irrigation. Around Pendleton, in Umatilla County's Blue Mountain country, stretch the wheatlands. The countryside out there is a checkerboard of green and yellow, as the fields produce canning peas and wheat in alternate years. Peas revive soil depleted by wheat, and the crop brings in almost as much money.

Mining has been a leading industry from pioneer days, as Oregon has vast mineral deposits, even now but slightly developed on a commercial scale. In 1947 mines produced between nine and ten million dollars' worth of gold, silver, copper, lead, and nonmetallic minerals.

The Beaver State is the Nation's first producer of lumber. Eugene, in the Willamette Valley, alone has 350 sawmills producing annually a billion feet of lumber. Since 1938 the State has held first place in lumber, and last year—1947—forest-products industries brought in nearly half a billion dollars of wealth. The 30,000,000 acres of forest land still have 364,000,000,000 feet of old-growth timber, consisting of Douglas fir, western hemlock, ponderosa pine, Sitka spruce, and western red and Port Orford cedars.

There are millions of acres in growing younger forests. The forests supply not only lumber but also plywood and pulpwood and give employment to 76,000 people. From the tragic experience of others, the State has learned to conserve this natural resource. Forest-management programs, including many introduced by private owners of timber, are working the forests under the principle of sustained yield. Several large places, like Eugene, Coos Bay, and Gardiner, are largely dependent upon the lumber industry, the State's largest single source of income.

The fishing industry has been carried on by the Indians for ages and now is world famous. Oregon had one of the first fish-packing plants in the Nation, established by Nathaniel J. Wyeth in 1832. The Columbia River salmon and the tuna are the delight of sea-food lovers. Astoria and North Bend are devoted to the industry.

One of the many factors drawing people to Oregon is its bright industrial future, based upon hydroelectric power development. The world-renowned Bonneville Dam—named for an explorer of Oregon—spans the Columbia about 30 miles above Portland and supplies cheap power to the lower Columbia and Willamette Valleys. At the present time seven huge dams are being built on the watershed of the Willamette, to supply power for industries, control floods, provide irrigation, and prevent erosion. Another huge power dam near Pendleton will bear the name of Oregon's great United States Senator, Charles L. McNary. A large portion of the Nation's unutilized water-power resources are in the streams of the Beaver State.

The growing capital of this economic empire is Portland with its 450,000 souls—nearly one-third of the State's population. It is the outlet for a huge inland empire of forests, mines, ranches, and farms, comprising eastern Oregon, eastern Washington, and Idaho. It is not only one of the leading Pacific coast ports, but also a railroad and manufacturing center, processing the products of the forest, farm, mine, and range, for consumers all over the world.

All about Portland lies scenic Oregon, whose beauties attract the State's "third largest crop"—the tourists. In 1947 they

came to spend $115,000,000 along roads like the Redwood Highway, and at Medford, Grants Pass, The Dalles, Mount Hood, and scores of other beauty spots. They take away with them not only the wonder and awe of a glorious scenic panorama, but also the impression of a State of good managers and homesteaders—hospitable, friendly, industrious. For they have seen Oregon, still the land of the pioneer.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech I made at Baltimore last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the national legislative committee, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, today charged that the intention of the Congress with respect to national security and the unified structure of the armed services is being thwarted by executive action on the part of the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The committee cites the case of the Marine Corps to which the Congress in 1947 had assigned the primary role of amphibious operations. Notwithstanding this announced intention of the Congress, the Joint Chiefs of Staff by majority vote ordered Joint Army-Navy-Air Force amphibious operations in the Caribbean during 1950 but excluded units of the Fleet Marine Force from active participation therein. In a parallel action the Secretary of Defense ordered the budget for the Marine Corps for the fiscal year 1951 to reflect a sharp reduction in number of battalions in the two remaining marine divisions and almost a 50-percent reduction in the number of marine aviation squadrons. The committee raises the question as to how much of this piecemeal destruction of the Marine Corps is attributed to certain elements in the armed forces who bitterly opposed the assigned role of the Marine Corps in the National Security Act of 1947.

The committee also cites the case of the Air Force which had been authorized 70 groups by the Congress. Notwithstanding this law, the President and the Secretary of Defense set about reallocating the appropriations for National Defense to suit their own ideas. As a result the Air Force today is having difficulty clinging to 48 groups and has been forced to curtail its tactical air arm so vital to the support needs of the Army Ground Forces.

The cancellation of the prototype of the modern naval carrier by a 2 to 1 vote of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was also cited as a further example of thwarting the intention of the Congress which had appropriated funds for the construction of this vessel.

The committee views these actions of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff as indicating ominous evolutionary progress toward the creation of a Prussian-type general staff which would sound the death knell of our traditional civilian control of our armed services. The committee warns the Congress that it must proceed in forthright manner to restore the prestige of the Congress in matters relating to national defense.

The attention of the Congress is invited to the mandates of the fiftieth national convention of the VFW preserving the amphibious functions of the Marine Corps, creating a 70-group air force, encouraging the development of naval aviation, and establishment of a system of universal military training as representing the voice of more than a million overseas veterans as to what constitutes a well-balanced national defense program.

The committee urges the Congress to look beyond the statements of the Secretary of Defense, who contends that economy is being accomplished without sacrifice to our national defense, lest our whole defense structure proves little more than a house of cards when the hour of need arrives.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, of course I am wholeheartedly in favor of the bill we have under consideration, but it strikes me as being a bit ironical that here on the day that we are incorporating the Girl Scouts of America in an effort to preserve the morality and the character of American youth, the Washington newspapers carry in blazing advertisements and cards on the streetcars announcing the grand opening of the movie film Stromboli glorifying a couple that have incensed the decency and morality of the world. Even the ad itself insults refined sensibility in proclaiming "Raging passions."

I want to take this opportunity to commend the ministers of the churches and the Christian people of this country who are seeking to ban from the theaters of the land this outrageous film. I want to commend the distinguished Italian judge, the Vatican judge, who branded this film's major characters for what they are and their activity for what it is. I want to commend particularly the Catholic Church. It was their legion of decency some years ago that started a campaign to clean up such indecencies in the movies. Morality, after all, is the big problem of any people, and a nation that glorifies prostitution, adultery, and the social sins that are so frequently portrayed in our movies, and particularly demonstrated in this film, should take note of the direction in which it is going. Righteousness exalteth a nation but sin is a reproach to any people.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I commend the gentleman most heartily for his statement and agree with him 100 percent.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think certainly all of the gentlemen would agree.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does it occur to you perhaps that all this publicity is merely to boost the sale of tickets for the show?

Mr. GOSSETT. Oh, I am sure that is true, but we are commercializing vice and it is a reflection upon the character and integrity of the American people. The premiere is being held today in the Capital City of our Nation, here in the city of Washington, and we see this thing being ballyhooed on the very day that we are seeking to promote morality in the youth of the land.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree in the views that the gentleman has expressed, but I recall very distinctly in the community in which I lived in my earlier years, if you had an egg-sucking dog, he hid the shells and did not boast about his iniquities.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I compliment the gentleman on the statement of his ideas. I agree with him heartily. But these people who are connected with this are not Americans but foreigners, so why not leave the thing alone and not try to be nationalistic about it?

Mr. GOSSETT. I might say that the leading theater proprietor in the great State of Texas, Mr. Carl Hobitzelle, has banned the showing of this picture in a great many of the theaters of Texas. He is to be commended, and I have written him congratulating him on his action.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

FEDERAL FAMILY SUPPORT ACT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, today I am depositing on the Clerk's desk a bill known as the Federal Family Support Act. I do this to join some of my colleagues demanding that Congress take action against these galloping pappies, these abandoning fathers, who leave their homes to toss their wives and children into destitution. This abandoning of the home is an attack upon the very unit of society, and the Nation is no stronger than its homes.

More than 1,000,000 American wives and children were deserted last year by fathers walking out and crossing State lines. Every 5 minutes, at least, one scoundrel crosses a State border to avoid supporting his wife and children, leaving the family destitute and costing the taxpayers $50,000,000 annually. No one can tell how much misery is caused by these runaway fathers, increasing malnutrition, illness, and juvenile crime. This is a criminal act but the present laws allow these abandoning fathers to get away with their crimes. It is time to put a stop to this injustice to mothers and children. In my opinion, this disregard for the security of the family, the home, and the country should be a problem for the Federal Government. Until legislation is enacted to provide for the reciprocal enforcement of support orders, these runaway husbands and fathers will continue

to make a mockery of justice. These galloping pappies must be taken in tow.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution and a speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that tomorrow the FEPC bill will come before the Rules Committee. I believe there will be four Democrats and two Republicans in favor of the rule. As a Member of Congress and as a longtime advocate of this measure, I humbly call upon the remaining Republican members on the Rules Committee to abide by the long-standing tradition of their party and the platform of their party, and to join with the four Democrats who favor this rule to bring this measure to the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Not now.

I notice that the distinguished majority leader is present, sitting on my right. I would like to take this opportunity to ask the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, if the Rules Committee were to vote this measure out, whether and when he would program the measure.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a very fair question, and I am glad the gentleman asked me. If the Rules Committee reports out a rule tomorrow, and I hope they do, it is my intention to program it the early part of next week.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have yielded back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two communications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Norton bill for the congressional incorporation of the Girl Scouts will pass the Congress. As a member of the national advisory council, I am particularly glad the House will support this measure today. I hope there will not be a vote against it.

There are Girl Scouts all over our great United States. They are in every city, every town, and every hamlet. They are a great power for good and unselfish living. This organization is one which commands our praise and of which America is very proud.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by Gov. Roy J. Turner, of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the commander of the American Legion of the State of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a tribute to Susan B. Anthony, a woman of consecrated purpose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, the city of Philadelphia has had a fair-employment practices commission since March 12, 1948. The ordinance has worked so well that I think it may be interesting to include at this point the report of the commission to the mayor of Philadelphia under date of June 1, 1949. It is especially to be noted that notwithstanding enforcement provisions in the ordinance that every complaint has been disposed of to date by the commission itself without resort to any of the enforcement procedures. The report follows:

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 1, 1949.

The Honorable BERNARD SAMUEL,
Mayor, the Members of City Council,
City Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: It is now a year since the fair employment practice commission was organized and began functioning. We are submitting, therefore, a report on our activities and experience.

It should be recalled that the commission operated without a budget until November 1, 1948. The situation meant that appointment of a full staff and complete organization necessarily carried over into the beginning of 1949. We believe that considerable progress has been made, nevertheless, in correcting unfair employment practices, and that there has been an effective impact on the community through our educational program.

Change in the economic climate that may lead to reduction in employment opportunities will greatly add to the work load and responsibility of the commission and its staff. We feel it is our duty, however, to be ready to meet all problems that may arise in our field and to work for solutions and adjustments in keeping with the goals set up in the ordinance.

Respectfully submitted.

THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION,
GERALD F. FLOOD, *Chairman.*
LOUIS B. F. RAYCROFT, *Secretary.*
NORMAN BLUMBERG.
F. CURTIS DAVIS.
TANNER G. DUCKREY.

TWO PHILADELPHIA STORIES

Mrs. Smith worked in a shop where both white and colored power-machine operators were employed. All were sewing garments. Mrs. Smith noticed that more and more of the larger, heavier garments were being assigned to her. They were hard to handle and slowed up her production. Since she was on a piecework basis, her pay dwindled. The other Negro operators had the same experience. The white operators were getting

the smaller, lighter garments. Their production was higher and their take-home pay was larger. It looked like discrimination.

Mrs. Smith went to the Philadelphia Fair Employment Practice Commission in city hall. A field representative of the commission interviewed her; then consulted the union of which she was a member; and then saw the employer. The employer said he knew nothing about the alleged practice. But on checking the work records, time cards, and pay rolls, he found that the facts bore our Mrs. Smith's story. There was a conference of the employer, a commission representative, and an official of the union.

The commission's representative emphasized that the principle of the law was equal treatment for all employees; white or colored, Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish, native-born or foreign-born. The field representative found that the employer was in complete agreement with these provisions of the ordinance and that the firm's employment policy was one of hiring according to qualifications without regard to race, color, or national origin.

It became clear that the foreman in charge of assigning the work to the operators was responsible for the discrimination. The employer ordered the unfair practice stopped and instructed the foreman to distribute the work equitably among all workers regardless of their race, religion, or national origin. Two weeks later Mrs. Smith reported that her work assignments were satisfactory and her weekly pay had increased.

The XYZ Corp. manufactures low-price consumers' goods. They are in wide demand in Philadelphia and are distributed directly through neighborhood stores.

The fair employment practice commission received a charge of unlawful discrimination in employment by the corporation. A large civic organization was interested and reported that rumors of such discrimination by the corporation had been widespread among its membership for some time.

The staff of the commission investigated the charge. Conferences were held with officials of the firm. The investigation and conferences disclosed people of various religious beliefs, racial strains, and national origins working harmoniously under the firm's policy of hiring and promoting on merit alone. It was clear that there was no sound basis for the charge. The officials were aware of the rumors circulating in the community and of the harm to the firm's business, but were at a loss for a way to refute them.

The commission dismissed the charge as groundless. A report was made to the executives of the civic organization with a recommendation that their membership be informed of the commission's findings.

These are just 2 of the 204 cases the Philadelphia Fair Employment Practice Commission has handled during its first year of operation.

PHILADELPHIA PASSES THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ORDINANCE

The city takes action

For many years Philadelphia had been experiencing the same kind of stirring on behalf of civil rights that was going on in other parts of the country. A ground swell of community feeling behind a fair-employment-practice law had been building up throughout the city for several years. It climaxed on January 15, 1948, when Councilmen Schwartz, Garman, Sullivan, and Armstrong introduced an ordinance to outlaw discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, and to establish the fair-employment-practice commission.

On February 19, 1948, a public hearing on the proposed ordinance was held. Businessmen, spokesmen for labor, schools and colleges, racial and religious groups testified to the need for and the varied popular support of a fair-employment-practice measure for Philadelphia. On March 11, 1948, the city council unanimously passed the ordinance. On March 12, 1948, upon the mayor's approval, it became law.

What the ordinance provides

Under the terms of the ordinance, employers, employment agencies, and labor unions are forbidden, prior to employment, registration, or admission to membership, to make any inquiry concerning or record of the race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry of applicants. They are also forbidden to establish employment or membership qualifications or quotas, or otherwise to discriminate against any person with respect to referral, hire, tenure, promotion, or conditions of employment because of the same criteria. Newspapers may not print advertisements specifying qualifications within these categories. No one may interfere with fair employment practices. (Federal and State agencies are not covered. Nor does the ordinance apply to fraternal, sectarian, charitable, or religious organizations, or to persons employed in personal and confidential positions or in domestic service.)

Employment on merit is the heart of the ordinance. The law is based on the concept that opportunity to compete freely for jobs without discrimination is a civil right; that no one may be denied the right to work because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ORDINANCE IN ACTION

The men behind the action

The commission is the executive arm of the ordinance. It is empowered to receive, investigate, and adjust charges involving discrimination in employment. It may hold hearings and issue orders in support of its findings.

Five commissioners are provided by the ordinance, three appointed by the mayor and two appointed by the president of city council. They serve without compensation.

The chairman of the commission is Gerald F. Flood, judge of common pleas court No. 6. The secretary is Louis B. F. Raycroft, for many years in business, now coordinator for the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, United States Department of Labor. The other members are Norman Blumberg, vice president of the Central Labor Union of Philadelphia (AFL); F. Curtis Davis, attorney, county adjutant of American Veterans of World War II; and Tanner G. Duckrey, assistant to the board of superintendents of the Philadelphia public schools.

The commission was appointed and held its first meeting on May 24, 1948. It has met regularly since that time to discuss and pass on cases and to formulate policy. Until November 1 the work of the commission office was carried on by Secretary Raycroft, with the aid only of a clerk loaned by the mayor. On October 22 city council made an appropriation of $8,500 for the commission's use during the last 2 months of 1948. Later an appropriation of $49,700 was made for 1949. These appropriations made possible the appointment of a staff and the development of an educational program.

The commission at work

Every case is handled on an individual basis. A charge is made on an official form. It is promptly investigated by a staff field representative. The first step is to determine the validity of the charge. For instance, an applicant for a job feels that he has been unfairly discriminated against. It must be determined, insofar as possible, whether the incident and surrounding facts are true as reported. This may involve checking work history and qualifications of the applicant. If no probable validity for the grievance appears, there is no occasion for contact with the respondent, and the charge may be dismissed.

One side having been heard, the next step is to get the story of the employer or the union. A conference is arranged, the charge is explained, and the problem is fully discussed. Are there omissions in the complainant's story? What is the employer's or union's version? If discrimination has occurred in some department of the firm, possibly the employer was not aware of it. Does he know of the existence of the fair-employment practice ordinance? Whatever the combination of factors, every effort is made to get at the truth of the matter. If no discrimination is indicated, and the charge is found to be groundless, the case will be dismissed. When discrimination is indicated, an adjustment is attempted. The case will be closed when a satisfactory adjustment has been reached. If there is no satisfactory settlement, the commission can call a public hearing and make an appropriate order which is enforceable by a court.

The employer sets his own hiring standards, which the fair-employment practice ordinance respects so long as these standards are not based on race, religion, or ancestry. If unlawful criteria are used, however, and there is evidence of discrimination in hiring, upgrading, or discharge from a job, a change in practice is required before a case is terminated satisfactorily. Our experience has shown that employment patterns can be changed without friction or personnel unrest.

The conference method

Talks are carried on informally and in confidence. Patient efforts are made to settle all differences harmoniously, in conference, by conciliation and persuasion. Thus far, the Philadelphia commission has had the same experience as other communities which have fair-employment practice laws; the commission has not found it necessary to call a hearing, nor to certify a case for court action.

Each case presents different problems of approach and treatment. Cases are handled carefully but with dispatch. The information and statements given by all parties are held in complete confidence in accordance with the Commission's policy of not identifying its cases.

The impact on the community

The psychological reach of the Philadelphia Fair Employment Practice Commission is increasing. Copies of the ordinance and educational literature, the activities of the commission and its personnel are reaching more and more people. Conferences with industrial, labor, and other community leaders to discuss the facts and implications of the ordinance are under way. Furthermore, charges of discrimination afford the commission an opportunity to talk to employers, unions, and employment agencies about the ordinance and the principle of employment on merit.

It should be underscored that the commission does not prejudge any employer, union, or firm. The aim is to enlist the cooperation of employers, labor unions, and employment agencies. The approach of the commission is constructive, not punitive.

EDUCATION UNDER THE ORDINANCE

The use of law to check discrimination

The commission accepts the proposition that prejudice cannot be legislated out of existence. The commission equally accepts the often demonstrated fact that manifestations of that prejudice—overt acts of discrimination—can be checked by a law with means of enforcement.

When a charge is brought, the law becomes the occasion for explaining the goal of the ordinance—employment practices based on fairness and merit. The staff representatives of the commission have an opportunity to talk with the employer, the manager, or the labor union official. The give and take of the conference table enables the parties concerned to get a lot of things "off their chests." Feelings and misconceptions are brought out into the open.

As a result, the case is generally adjusted to the satisfaction of the people directly involved. But the gain is even greater. The

likelihood that other incidents of discrimination will arise in the same place is reduced, and employment opportunities are opened for others among the groups previously discriminated against.

There are plants, firms, and organizations where discrimination because of race, religion, or national origin is not the deliberate expression of prejudice. Here, over the years, patterns of employment have grown up which exclude members of particular racial or religious groups. The desire to maintain existing and familiar traditions and the usual resistance to change help to perpetuate the patterns. The law is the instrument which can check that practice of arbitrary exclusion. Properly applied it makes equal opportunity a reality for all qualified people.

The use of education to reduce prejudice and fears

For the employer and the worker discrimination is frequently rooted in prejudice or in fear. It may be fear of loss of business, or fear of labor trouble, or fear of change. Both prejudice and these untested fears tend to evaporate when people work together and get to know each other better. Knowledge that fair-employment practices work successfully also tends to abate such fears. The commission makes this possible through its educational program. It seeks to produce a willingness to try working side by side. It supplies the facts for knowing and understanding people of varying racial or religious groups or national origins.

The most far-reaching provision of the fair employment practice ordinance is that which requires the commission to work out and implement a comprehensive educational program.

Operation of the commission's educational program

The commission's educational activity began in June 1948 with the investigation of the first charge, because the contacts and conferences with the parties involved in charges are of educational value. The actual planning and formulation of a community-wide educational program began in November 1948 when the commission was able to secure an executive staff. A varied program has been developed having two main purposes. First, to inform the public about the fair employment practice law and how the commission operates under it. Second, to reach the thinking and attitudes within the community so as to eliminate and prevent prejudice and discrimination.

Employers, labor organizations, civic groups, schools, and religious organizations are slowly becoming part of the Philadelphia fair employment educational mainstream. Requests are constantly coming in for the commissioners and staff to appear for explanation and clarification of the ordinance at public gatherings. Since November they have filled more than 75 such requests, appearing before industrial business and labor groups, civic and fraternal organizations, in churches, synagogues, and schools. They have appeared before legislative bodies and in connection with national and patriotic celebrations. Outstanding citizens have been called upon to help spread the word about the FEPC. The community is responding

The commission has written to many industrial and business firms, employment agencies, labor groups, and religious, civic, and educational institutions advising them of its operation and program. About 10,000 abstracts outlining the substance of the ordinance have been distributed. Five thousand posters in color are being placed in stores, plants, union offices, and institutions. These posters indicate that in Philadelphia the right to employment on merit is protected by law.

A 6-page illustrated folder has been circulated describing the spirit and meaning of the ordinance. In response to requests from employers, unions, schools, churches, and various organizations more than 100,000 copies of the folder have been distributed throughout the city.

By proclamation of the mayor, the week of March 13–19 was observed as Fair Employment Week. This marked the first anniversary of the passage of the Philadelphia Fair Employment Practice ordinance. Local radio stations cooperated by sponsoring more than 20 special programs. The commission held open house at its City Hall offices on March 15, to give Philadelphians a chance to meet and talk with commissioners and staff members. All the daily and weekly newspapers were unusually helpful in keeping the news of the fair employment practices commission before the public. They carried news, feature stories, and editorials on the work of the commission.

Further educational channels are being opened. Educational authorities have met with commission representatives to plan implementation of the commission's educational program through their institutions. Meetings are also being held with industrial, labor, and other organizations to explore avenues for making the educational program effective.

EFFECTS OF 1 YEAR OF OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION

Results of adjustment process

The commission is required to seek to adjust all complaints of unfair employment practices forbidden by the ordinance. During the past year it has received 204 charges of discrimination against employers, labor organizations, employment agencies, and advertisers. Using the adjustment process, the commission has already closed 155 charges to the satisfaction of all the parties concerned.

Besides eliminating the grievances, the adjustment of these cases also had another immediate result. Job opportunities opened in firms and stores for people who were previously not accepted because of their race, religion, or national origin. For instance, in certain of the smaller central city shops only white salespeople had been traditionally employed. Then a charge was brought against one of the stores. In adjusting it, the commission also reached a group of the retail shops in the area. Negro salespeople were employed and openings were created among the entire group of stores.

A similar result occurred in connection with membership in some unions where colored applicants found admission difficult. The adjustment process brought contact with the union officials who took steps to correct the condition.

Another source of complaints that called for adjustment was the presence of discriminatory questions on employment application forms. Both firms and employment agencies were involved. The commission's requests for correction or elimination of the unlawful items were readily complied with. Moreover, the result was frequently greater than mere correction of a printed form. From correction of the application blank the discussion led to the content and manner of the preemployment interview. The commission was asked for suggestions and materials to make the interview conform with the ordinance. Thus the adjustment process led directly to educational activity. The outcome was in the direction of the ultimate goal—elimination of discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry.

The measurable influence of the adjustment process is far greater than simply the number of charges received and handled. Not only the complainants and respondents named in the charges are affected. In the case of some firms or unions the number of employees or members runs into the thousands. The contacts made by the commission and its staff with the complainant and respondent affect all the employees of the firm or all the members of the union in the case. A true measure of the commission's activities must take all of these elements into account.

Employment policies and patterns

In the year that has passed since the first meeting of the commission a real impact on the community has been made. The ordinance was itself the first factor. The sanction of legal enactment strengthened the hands of those whose fair-employment practices antedated the ordinance.

The work of the commission has been greatly helped by the cooperation of many groups. The Philadelphia press as well as its advertisers were prompt in carrying out both the letter and spirit of the ordinance. Their cooperation has resulted in the virtual disappearance of "Help wanted" advertisements mentioning race, religion, or national origin. Similarly, through the cooperation of the Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania, discriminatory advertising by employment agencies has been eliminated from the 1949 issue of the Philadelphia classified telephone directory.

Generally the inclusion of items about race, religion, or nationality on application forms has been reduced

Many department stores and specialty shops now have Negro personnel in sales positions, as cashiers, and in the general clerical field. Employment of colored workers in chain stores, public utilities, and in at least one large insurance company is expanding. The integration of Negroes in AFL and CIO unions has been stimulated.

The employment of Negro youth has increased since the advent of the Philadelphia fair employment practice ordinance. This is shown by figures compiled by the employment certificating service of the division of public personnel and counseling of the board of public education. The percentage of Negro youth to receive employment certificates has increased markedly during the first quarter of 1949 over the same period of 1948. Moreover their employment opportunities have improved not only in number but also in quality.

During this first year the corrective and educational activities of the commission have begun to show a salutary effect. Employment policies and patterns do reflect a lessening of discrimination because of race, religion, or national origin against people frequently referred to as minority groups.

However, not only minority groups but all Philadelphians will benefit by the operation of the law. For the commission's experience indicates the growth of a basic idea in the minds of Philadelphians—the idea that every individual is to be considered on the basis of his qualifications alone. Thus the law serves all citizens: white or colored, Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish, native-born or foreign-born.

Fair employment is good business

At the end of a year's activities a number of things have become clear. The principles of equal job opportunity and employment on merit are based on tested knowledge that discrimination is uneconomic. The effect of discrimination on the worker is reduction of his income, inability to utilize all of his training, knowledge, and skill, as well as personal frustration and loss of self-esteem.

Where a fair employment practice law operates the untapped skills of thousands of workers are utilized more and more. That law assures to employers an enlarged labor market without interfering with their right to hire the best qualified persons available. For employers and for the community the practice of fair employment is good business.

TOWARD INTEGRATION IN PHILADELPHIA

The Philadelphia Fair Employment Practice Commission does not operate in a vacuum. Philadelphia is fortunate in having had many individuals and organizations with a deep concern for better human relations. Today it is a commonplace for students of government to recommend strong citizens' movements to accompany governmental programs. In no field is there greater need for this type of effort than in the area of fair employment.

Every institution in Philadelphia has an important part in achieving the goal of the FEPC's educational program—the elimination and prevention of prejudice and discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry. Not only industry and labor organizations, but employment agencies, the press and radio, have vital roles. The same is true of our schools and colleges, our health and welfare agencies, and in particular their vocational counseling services.

The ultimate success of our common effort will be hastened to the degree that all of us are committed to the principle and the practice of employment on merit.

APPENDIX

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

TABLE I.—*Number of charges, June 1, 1948, to May 31, 1949*

Number closed	155
Number under investigation	49
Total number received	204

TABLE II.—*Analysis of charges received*

	Number	Percent of total
A. Source:		
Individuals	153	74
Civic organizations	26	13
Initiated by commission	17	8
Labor organizations	8	4
Total	204	100
B. Basis of alleged discrimination:		
Race or color	116	57
Religion	60	29
National origin or ancestry	28	14
Total	204	100
C. Type of discriminatory act charged:		
Employment refused	70	34
Application form unlawful	48	24
Upgrading refused	23	11
Discriminatory advertisement	16	8
Union membership refused	15	8
Dismissal	12	6
Referral by union hiring hall refused	8	4
Referral by employment agency refused	5	2
Discriminatory work assignment	5	2
Seniority against lay-off denied	2	1
Total	204	100

	Number of charges	Number of respondents
D. Type of respondents:		
Business and trade	64	62
Employment agencies:		
Commercial	20	15
Public	4	1
Labor organizations	27	11
Governmental employers	17	9
Utilities and transportation	16	5
Construction	14	2
Manufacturing	12	7
Hotels and restaurants	5	5
Finance and insurance	4	5
Professions	2	2
Other	13	13
Total	204	137

TABLE III.—*Analysis of charges closed*

	Number	Percent of total
Basis of closing:		
Satisfactory adjustment	97	63
No evidence of discrimination	27	17
No jurisdiction	14	9
Insufficient evidence of discrimination	12	8
Withdrawn by complainant	5	3
Total	155	100

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD].

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two articles by Robert Montgomery on excise taxes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire of the majority leader what the program is for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no program for the rest of the week. I am glad that the gentleman raised the question so that I can advise the Members what they may expect and govern themselves accordingly.

I may say that after the Committee on the District of Columbia has disposed of its business today, if the House will permit—and it can be done only by unanimous consent—I hope that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may be recognized. He has an hour's special order which he wishes to use in connection with a commemoration of the Spanish-American War. He is one of four Members of the House who, I understand, served in the Spanish-American War. In making the consent request I want the House to know that it has no other objective in mind; in other words, there will be no further call of committees on the calendar after the Committee on the District of Columbia has disposed of its legislative business for the day. Rather than a motion to adjourn being made, I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] will be permitted to proceed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. May I ask the distinguished majority leader if it is intended that Washington's Farewell Address be read on the 22d of February?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall make that request at the proper time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Is it the intention of the leadership to take any steps to see that that is done, other than merely to submit a request?

Mr. McCORMACK. In turn, may I ask the gentleman from Virginia a question which I think is very pertinent? Assuming that FEPC does not come up—and we are now merely talking over the matter of procedure—assuming it does not come up before next Wednesday, is it the intention of the gentleman from Virginia and other Members to use the reading of Washington's Farewell Address for dilatory purposes by making points of no quorum during the reading of the address? Or will the reading be permitted to proceed without interruption?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman has asked a very pertinent question, a very honest question, a very fair question, which I will answer with equal candor. If I may be permitted to say so, the reading of Washington's Farewell Address has been a time-ordered precedent of this House, and I think it would be a terrible thing to go out to the country that it would not be done this year; I think it would bring a very bad reaction entirely apart from any little squabble we may have here about a matter over which we may differ.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman; my thoughts are the same as his in that regard.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Accordingly I would be perfectly willing to enter into an agreement that, as far as I am concerned, there will be no effort to use the reading of the address for any ulterior motive.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it would be unfortunate if it were used for any other purpose, and I think that can be very easily worked out. It would be most regrettable to have the reading of Washington's Farewell Address made the basis for dilatory tactics while the message itself was being read. What might happen afterward is a different proposition, but once the reading of the message starts I think we should have an understanding that there would be no point of order raised during its reading. I hope that can be arranged for.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

INCORPORATING GIRL SCOUTS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, we have now heard from the gentleman from Mississippi as well as the gentleman from New York on the question of the FEPC. I invite the gentlemen, who are constitutionalists here, and who are struggling hard—and many of the distinguished gentlemen from the South agree that it is one of the first tenets of their faith—to sustain character and the Constitution——

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is proceeding out of order; that he must ask for the right to do it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman made such a request, and it was granted.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I did not hear it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the first sentence on the second page of this report about incorporating the Girl Scouts which reads as follows:

> The emphasis upon democratic methods and procedures and the ideals of loyalty and service to God and country, which it inculcates, makes Girl Scouting one of the bulwarks of the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the tension which has arisen in this Chamber is not attributable to the debate on the merits of FEPC. That will come in due time. It is attributable only to an effort, obviously a well-planned effort, to keep the FEPC from being considered by the greatest deliberative body in the world—that has caused the tension and the resentment.

An adherence to the constitutional processes upon which all Americans rely—especially minorities, and I emphasize that, for we must remember that there are not only minorities of color but there are minorities of opinion as well—dictates that this question be brought up and disposed of according to democratic procedures called for by the Constitution. Opposition to the FEPC substantively is the right of any Member, no matter how much any of the rest of us may disagree, but I think those of us who are for FEPC have a right to feel that according to the procedures of the Congress, the operation of which is now long overdue on the FEPC measure, it ought to be brought up now for debate and a vote.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] said that he would like to see the Rules Committee vote out a rule on it. I would too. Yet I call the attention of my colleague to the fact that there are four ways at least in which a measure can come to the floor for consideration. First, by rule, and we can appeal to the individual consciences of members on the Rules Committee. But we can also appeal to the individual conscience of every Member of the House because there are two discharge petitions on the Speaker's desk. It is entirely in order to sign both of them, and signature by 218 Members would bring the measure on the floor of the House for consideration. Then we all know we have the 21-day rule under which the Speaker can recognize the chairman of the appropriate committee; this is in practice a matter within the Speaker's discretion. Also we have Calendar Wednesday which if not impeded in a way to prevent the measure from coming up will bring the FEPC bill on the floor. So, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to those who believe, and I think sincerely, that they are devoted to the constitutional system and who invoke it often, to at this time lay some of their feelings aside and let the Constitution operate by permitting the FEPC bill to be brought up. We will argue the merits if and when it is up for consideration. Members may then vote for or against. But the Congress will have had a constitutional opportunity to consider and vote on FEPC. That is all anyone has a right to argue about at this time.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Does not the gentleman feel that under the circumstances if a rule were granted, to emphasize the very points that the gentleman from Mississippi feels so strongly about, then we could work our will upon this important legislation? If we do not do so, it comes up on Calendar Wednesday and, necessarily as a result of dilatory tactics, only for a few hours' debate. The proper way to do it, it seems to me, is to bring out a rule. The gentleman from Mississippi makes his own point. If we bring out this important piece of legislation by rule, we can take hours or days or weeks, if it is necessary.

Mr. JAVITS. I deprecate the political undertones which arise, which necessarily arise, from a plea for a rule. I think we have a right to say to those on the Democratic side: "You should use your persuasions, even on the southern Democrats, to get a rule," just as those on the Republican side must do all possible to persuade the Republicans on the Rules Committee. But I do not believe that there should be the implication that it is the fault of the Republicans or the fault of liberal Democrats a rule is not reported out. Therefore, I appeal here not to the conscience alone of two Republicans or four southern Democrats; I appeal to the conscience of every Member of the House to sign the discharge petitions, then we are sure of getting FEPC out for a vote without further appeals.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in two to include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I notice the pending bill does not contain any provision against discrimination because of race, creed, color, or state of origin. I do not know why that was left out, nor why an amendment was not offered by the advocates of FEPC.

There is more than one question in this proposed FEPC legislation. There is the fundamental question as to whether we are to have legislation prohibiting discrimination because of the reasons as stated in the bill, and then there is the question of how we are to prevent discrimination if it occurs.

My position on FEPC was made clear 10 years ago, and I see no reason to change it. I am against that type of legislation, and expect to hold to that opinion. But, if those who favor this kind of legislation really want it, why is it they do not follow the procedure which has given justice, equality to other groups or individuals who are wronged?

We all know that our courts, our judges, our juries over the years have given us a way of getting justice, getting a remedy for a wrong, that is fair and beyond anything that has ever been developed in any other country, and I do not except even England.

Why is it that instead of writing a law providing that if a man be discriminated against when he sought employment because of race, creed, color, state of origin—why is it that instead of writing that kind of a law and giving the individual so discriminated against a remedy in the local courts, a court where he can appear before a local judge, before a jury of his peers, have his case judged on the merits—I say, why is it that no one will listen to that kind of procedure?

Several years ago a bill of that kind was introduced by me. It got no attention. It is still pending—ready for adoption. It can be before the House any time the House wants it. Why is it we do not use the old tried adequate way of remedying a wrong? Is it because we are determined to have some new expensive arbitrary Government agency? An agency biased and prejudiced—and I make that statement advisedly, as the Labor Board in the old days. As in the beginning of the administration of the Wagner law? Is it because we want some particular individuals, some individuals with a particular belief and policy, to administer the law?

Well do I remember when the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], as chairman of a special committee of the House, conducted hearings which had to do with the manner in which the then President's Commission on FEPC was administering the program. And, what did we find? We found that 59 percent of the jobs and 55.8 percent of the total funds of that agency were given to colored individuals, while that group was but then 9 percent of the population.

Now, is that what the advocates of this proposed legislation want? Is that their goal? Is that what the advocates

of this legislation want—special privileges, special administration through a Government agency which will give not only equality to them, but special privilege, special benefits, and which will put other groups—as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] once said, and I do not always agree with all he says—a group that needs protection in this country, the white tax-paying Gentiles—at a disadvantage—discriminated against.

I do not adopt his suggestion, but I do call your attention to the fact that that is what he said. And, if we get the wrong kind of a commission or agency who is going to be denied equality? Employers will be at the mercy of a Government agency which will exploit them—a voting minority—in favor of a voting majority.

Who was denied equality under the Wagner Act? The employer was denied the right of free speech. You remember the act. No use to rehearse all the special advantages given organized labor—given labor until today it is in a position to, and does by Nation-wide strikes, threaten the public health and welfare. Is that what they want?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York, whose sincerity I admire.

Mr. POWELL. If the enforcement power of the FEPC was placed in the hands of a court, as the gentleman suggested, would he then be for FEPC?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I introduced such a bill.

Mr. POWELL. I am happy to know the record shows the gentleman is for FEPC.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; that is not the situation—that the bill would give us everything good that may be in the proposed FEPC idea without its evils. That bill was introduced to give a better, more palatable remedy as so often I have had to take a dose of bitter medicine which I did not like, and always I tried to sugar-coat it a little bit. I believe that kind of a bill would give all you desire and in some measure protect the rest of the people.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on cigarettes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I take these remaining seconds to answer the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I had no intention of injecting anything political into my discussion. I was merely trying to emphasize that it seemed to me, in view of the admission of the gentleman from Mississippi, who indicated that the time had come when we were going to meet the FEPC issue, that, not referring solely to the Republican members of the Rules Committee but also to some of our southern Democrats, from their standpoint they would receive fairer consideration of an important piece of legislation under the rule than under the Calendar Wednesday procedure. That is the point I tried to make.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I desire to address my remarks to the speech made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

In singling out the fact that I introduced the first FEPC bill in the history of the United States back in 1940, he would have the determination of the issue on just that. I think it is quite obvious that I am not important, and no individual here is important as compared to the importance of the issue. It is true I have fought consistently for the enactment of FEPC for 10 years; but no individual has any right to assume for himself any credit or any glory out of this fight.

May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the issue involved in FEPC is much older than even this Congress. It antedates the very establishment of our own Nation. It is an old struggle. It began with the establishment of slavery in America. FEPC is merely another form of that same old struggle. It was evidenced in the adoption of our Declaration of Independence. There the great principle was enunciated at an historic hour, an hour of crisis for our country, that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As the years went by and as it became evident to the slaveocracy of this country that slavery would be once again profitable as the result of inventions, as a result of cotton, as a result of sugar, they started to whittle away at that principle, and it was whittled away so much that in the Dred Scott decision it was stated that no Negro had any rights that any white man must respect. Today this doctrine is the real basis of white supremacy, utilized again for the exploitation of the Negro people. This is the real motivation of the opposition to FEPC.

It just so happens that this week is Negro History Week. It is also the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. These two occasions should recall to our minds that Americans shed their blood to wipe out that ignominous decision of the Supreme Court. After victory had been achieved, again there was betrayal, betrayal then just as there is betrayal now, betrayal on the part of those who pretended to be the friends of freedom, but who sold out the fruits of the people's great victory in exchange for the winning of a dubious Presidential election.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the President of the United States, enunciated the proposition of an emancipation proclamation in industry. There can be no freedom unless it is implemented with the economic ability to maintain freedom. Freedom meant nothing to the emancipated slave unless he was given land, and the failure to give him land is the fundamental reason why this great question is still one being fought out down in the South and in the Nation. Freedom to the Negro or anyone else means nothing as long as he is barred from employment because of the color of his skin, the church in which he worships, or the land in which he was born.

FEPC is emancipation proclamation in the industrial life of the Nation. That is the basic issue involved in the FEPC. So that it is bigger than I, and bigger than anybody. I do hope from now on in discussing this issue we will address ourselves to the great fundamental principles involved in that issue.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO DISPENSE WITH FURTHER CALL OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of committees today under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McSWEENEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution which appeared in the Ohio bar report relative to a distinguished attorney in the State of Ohio.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 14, 1950, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5486. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, for the transfer and redistillation of spirits, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BROWN of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 16, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1232. A letter from the Chairman, War Claims Commission, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1233. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the calendar year ended December 31, 1949, pursuant to Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1234. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of tort claims paid by the Administration during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1235. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 19, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of East Pass from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945, to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2441. An act to amend section 81 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for additional officers of the National Guard of the United States on active duty in the National Guard Bureau; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3843. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Inc., of the State of Wisconsin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RHODES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6475. A bill to amend the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 to provide for the consideration of claims for the payment of certain postal notes filed later than 1 year from the last day of the month of issue; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7058. A bill to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1656). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6171. A bill to authorize commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to administer certain oaths, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1657). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. S 2205. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for the removal of sludge; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1660.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3247. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of 1934 of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1661). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4229. A bill to amend section 17 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1662). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4788. A bill to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7147. A bill to change the effective date of the act of June 19, 1948, relating to the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 229. An act for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 321. An act for the relief of Lloyd D. Lyles; without amendment (Rept No. 1636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 481. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Clarence Herbert Hartman, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1916. An act for the relief of Edna A. Bauser; without amendment (Rept. No. 1638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 44. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 45. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 633. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Victor V. Greg; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1133. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Merle Leatherbury Pyle and Patricia M. Pyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 1642). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1606. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1643). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1697. A bill for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3080. A bill for the relief of Earl L. Doss; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3506. A bill for the relief of Louis P. Murphy, United States immigrant inspector, El Paso, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1646). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4380. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay; without amendment (Rept. No. 1647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4608. A bill for the relief of William J. Drinkwine; with an amendment (Rept No 1648) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4720. A bill for the relief of Stella Avner; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5274. A bill for the relief of Francis A. Gunn, with an amendment (Rept. No. 1650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5523. A bill for the relief of Fred I. Massengill; without amendment (Rept. No. 1651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5753. A bill for the relief of Jean Clark; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. S. 2520. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted devised land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6521. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, S. Dak., allotted to Lucy Arapahoe Iron Bear, without amendment (Rept. No. 1659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 7299. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept voluntarily conveyances of lands owned by Waccamaw Indians in North Carolina and to issue trust patents for such lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 7300. A bill to provide a 5-day workweek for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7301. A bill to amend section 10 (d) of the Administrative Procedure Act so as to broaden judicial relief under that section pending review of administrative action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 7302. A bill to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Public Lands

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 7303 A bill to amend section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 7304. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell grain to egg producers at such prices as may be necessary to establish an equitable egg-feed ratio; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 7305. A bill to provide for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7306. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and authorize a stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHEELER (by request):

H. R 7307. A bill to establish equitable income limitations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H R. 7308. A bill to provide for the use by the Veterans' Administration of surplus hospital beds at the Corpus Christi Naval Hospital, Corpus Christi, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 7309. A bill to provide for the use by the Veterans' Administration of surplus hospital beds at the Corpus Christi Naval Hospital, Corpus Christi, Tex; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H R. 7310. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to its application to radio network organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 7311. A bill to restore insurability of service-connected disabled World War II veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R 7312. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. Res. 473. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the problems of the aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. Res 474. Resolution authorizing the creation of a select committee to investigate the education and training program under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 475. Resolution providing for the reading of Washington's Farewell Address on February 22, 1950; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, requesting the adoption of necessary measures to put American surplus agricultural products into world trade; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 7313. A bill for the relief of Lucy Teresa Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H R. 7314 A bill for the relief of Yukie Nishimura Okubo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R 7315. A bill for the relief of Daijiro Yoshida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H R. 7316. A bill to authorize the appointment of John F. Rand as a permanent lieutenant colonel in the Regular Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R 7317. A bill for the relief of Mr and Mrs. Henry M Schafhausen, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 7318. A bill for the relief of the Clemmer Construction Co., Inc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7319 A bill for the relief of the U S. Truck Sales Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 7320. A bill for the relief of Herbert Samuel Polson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H R. 7321. A bill for the relief of Eleni Katsalakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H R. 7322. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Benjamin Babine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7323. A bill for the relief of Nison Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1849. By Mr. HAGEN: Resolutions adopted by the Board of Commissioners, County of Beltrami, State of Minnesota, protesting the redefinition of "employee" under the provisions of sections 10 (a) and 206 (a) of H. R. 6000, an act to extend and improve the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, to amend the public assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1850. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of several residents of Cherry Valley and South Valley, N. Y., advocating passage of H. R. 2428, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising and stop its broadcasting over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1851. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of the department of Christian social relations of the Keota (Iowa) Methodist Church, urging favorable consideration of S. 1847 and H. R. 2428, bills to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1852. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging additional RFC funds for the Waltham Watch Co.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1853. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to securing additional financial aid for the Waltham Watch Co., from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1854. By Mr. SHAFER: Resolution of Kalamazoo Council, No. 1616, Knights of Columbus, Kalamazoo, Mich., relative to certain provisions of legislation for Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1855. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Frank Kresen Post, No. 24, Lake Geneva, Wis., approving of the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy in the Lake Geneva, Wis., area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1856. Also, resolution of the Coterie Club, of Beloit, Wis., against any form of compulsory health insurance or system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1857. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ernest L. Heim and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means

1858. Also, petition of Kenneth Harris and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, high and holy, above all our thought, the path of prayer but leads us to an appalling sense of our own need and to a poignant realization of how far we have fallen short of the glory of Thy plan for us and for mankind. Yet apart from Thee, our outlook for the future is clouded with apprehensions that haunt us and murder sleep, our minds are plagued with questions that we cannot answer as to how humanity, with the dread secrets of nature in its fumbling hands, can live on this planet in peace and security. Our hopes of a united world for which costly blood has been poured on the anguished ground seem ever to move into thin air from our eager grasp, like mirages of the desert. Make us such men that Thou mayest speak to us and that to this bewildered generation we may be the broadcasters of Thy voice and will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 14, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced

that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 14, 1950:

S. 736. An act for the reimbursement of Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.;

S. 753. An act for the relief of Sisters Antoinette Cometti, Mary Gibin, Angela Pelosin, Emma Ghisleni, Elisabetta De Caterin, and Onorina Franzina;

S. 1534. An act for the relief of Harry Comber;

S. 1702. An act for the relief of Riyoko Sato;

S. 1915. An act for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko;

S. 1924. An act for the relief of the estate of William Walter See;

S. 2100. An act for the relief of Penelope Corolyn Cox;

S. 2114. An act for the relief of Mitsue Shigeno;

S. 2119. An act for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co.; and

S. 2319. An act to provide economic assistance to certain areas of the Far East.

On February 15, 1950:

S 777. An act for the relief of Calvin D. Lynch & Son; W. Thomas Lockerman; Sudlersville Supply Co.; George C. Moore and H. A. Moore; J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc.; Hobbs & Jarman; C. S. Thomas; and Royse R. Spring;

S. 1019. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of personal injuries sustained by Carl J. Freund and Pauline H. Freund, his wife, of Seattle, Wash;

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Saul Phillips;

S. 1054. An act for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.;

S. 1088. An act for the relief of Milton Buechler;

S. 1166. An act for the relief of Toriko Tateuchi; and

S. 1446. An act for the relief of James Hung Loo.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6670) to incorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KNOWLAND was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet today and tomorrow during the sessions of the Senate.

On request of Mr. DONNELL, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GEORGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Martin
Anderson	Hayden	Maybank
Benton	Hendrickson	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Byrd	Hoey	Murray
Chapman	Holland	Myers
Chavez	Hunt	O'Conor
Connally	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Jenner	Robertson
Darby	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Donnell	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Kefauver	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kerr	Stennis
Eastland	Kilgore	Taft
Ecton	Lehman	Taylor
Ellender	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarran	Tydings
Fulbright	McClellan	Wherry
George	McFarland	Wiley
Gillette	McKellar	Williams
Graham	McMahon	Withers
Green	Magnuson	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD and for printing in the Appendix, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REVISED SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 135)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised supplemental estimate of appropriation, Department of the Interior, in the amount of $100,000, fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (S. Doc. No. 136)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the amount of $168,000, Department of Labor, fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly and Municipal Councils of St. Croix and St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Administration under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by the Corporation, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF ADVANCE PLANNING PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator of General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the Advance Planning Program of Non-Federal Public Works (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Polish American Club, Inc., at Tampa, Fla., relating to surplus agricultural commodities and the so-called Brannan plan; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Telegrams and letters in the nature of petitions from auxiliary to Post No. 209, Missoula, Mo.; New Kensington (Pa.) Post, No. 92; Amiens Post, No. 1740, of South Wilmington, and Baker-Ladd Post, No. 1567, of Herrin, both in the State of Illinois; Post No. 5159, of Hot Springs; Post No. 1551, Harlowton;

Cataract Post, 3648, of Basin; the ladies auxiliary to Lieutenant Harold Joyce Post, No. 1116, of Helena; and Fort Peck Post, No. 3107, of Glasgow, all in the State of Montana, all Veterans of Foreign Wars, praying for the enactment of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the executive board of the Rhode Island State Industrial Union Council, CIO, of Providence, R. I., protesting against the continuation of the partitioning of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Juan G. Manlago, Manila, Philippine Islands, for and on behalf of 50,000 tenants or farm hands of Luzon, Philippine Islands, remonstrating against the decision of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission relating to holders of sugar-marketing allotments by tenants or farm hands of Luzon, Philippine Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A cablegram in the nature of a petition from the Hawaii Farm Bureau, of Honolulu, T. H., praying for the confirmation of the nomination of Ingram M. Stainback as Governor of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the New Orleans (La) Board of Trade, Ltd., relating to toll rates for commercial vessels using the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Resolutions adopted by the Lane County District Dental Society, of Eugene, Oreg.; the Utah State Dental Association; the South Side Virginia Dental Society, and the Kanawha Valley Dental Society, of Charleston, W. Va., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by T. Cassara, vice president and chairman of educational committee, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 110, the so-called Labor Extension Service bill; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by Bendix (Ind.) Local, No. 9, UAW-CIO, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 110, the so-called Labor Extension Service bill; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A telegram from the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of Texas, embodying a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of Texas; to the Committee on Finance:

AUSTIN, TEX., *February 15, 1950.*

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Vice President, United States,
Washington, D. C.:

"Whereas the Congress is considering a measure which would repeal or reduce the depletion allowance of 27½ cents made in connection with income taxes on producers of natural resources; and

"Whereas the economy of the State of Texas to a great degree is tied up with the production of natural resources; and

"Whereas these industries furnish a large portion of the revenue for the support of the State government, including its public-school system and its welfare and other programs; and

"Whereas prospecting for new reserves is a hazardous and expensive operation; and

"Whereas the elimination or reduction of the present allowance for depletion would tend to create unemployment and would seriously cripple these industries, and particularly the smaller units and independents who have been the backbone of these industries, and further would seriously retard the search for and development of new sources of supply vitally necessary to this country, particularly in case of war: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas,* That the Congress of these United States be and is urged, respectfully, to defeat this attempt to eliminate or reduce the depletion allowance and thereby to preserve the economy of the various States and assist in preparing this country to defend herself if necessary."

Read and adopted February 15, 1950.

CLARENCE JONES,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

FINANCIAL AID FOR WALTHAM WATCH CO.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the City Council of Waltham, Mass., favoring additional financial aid for the Waltham Watch Co., from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions relative to securing additional financial aid for the Waltham Watch Co., from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

Whereas the Waltham Watch Co., for many years outstanding in American industry as a watch and precision instruments firm, employing thousands of skilled American workmen, is now confronted with the necessity for additional working capital to enable it to operate at a profit, and to keep its doors open; and

Whereas the refusal of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to grant the request of said company for additional capital has resulted in the termination of employment of 1,231 workers with but 3 hours' notice, thus inflicting great hardship on these skilled men and women, most of whom have spent the greater part of their lives in the watch industry, and their families, and seriously impairing the economy of the city of Waltham: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts does hereby petition and urge the President of the United States to take such action as he may deem necessary and advisable to effect an immediate agreement between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Waltham Watch Co., whereby said company may be reorganized and additional investing capital advanced thereto for its continued operation, thereby saving this industry, so vitally important to our national economy, and securing the employment of thousands of skilled American workmen; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States and to each Member of Congress from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted, February 7, 1950.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, February 8, 1950.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

A true copy.
Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the 100-year-old Waltham Watch Co. is one of the major industries of this city, and at least one-fifth of the city's population is affected, either directly or indirectly, by its closing; and

Whereas it has come to the attention of the City Council of the City of Waltham that the Waltham Watch Co. has on the Nation's market at present watches that compare favorably with any watches in the world, and the prospects for this company's continuance as a going concern were better at this time than they have been for some time in the past; and

Whereas the Waltham Watch Co. is one of the three companies in the United States capable of providing this country with timing devices and other war implements in time of national emergency, and is, therefore an industry vital to the Nation's defense; and

Whereas it appears that the closing of the company at this time was wholly unnecessary, and that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation gave the employees of this company less than 3 hours' notice before locking the doors of the plant, and these employees are entitled to, as Americans, more notice than that; and

Whereas it is vital to the interests in this city, the commonwealth, and to the Nation that this American industry be preserved: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Waltham does hereby resolve that it will take all steps possible as a governmental body to help preserve the Waltham Watch Co. as a going concern in the city of Waltham; and be it further

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Waltham censures the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for its hasty action in closing the Waltham Watch Co at a time when the prospects of its success were bright; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States be memorialized to take all steps necessary to aid this American industry so essential to national defense.

G Chauncey Cousens, Mayor; Councilor Linwood I Locke; Councilor Louis B. Connors; Councilor George M. MacDonald; Councilor David A. Hansen; Councilor Thomas M. Flaherty; Councilor Martin J. Cavanaugh; Councilor Martin J. Hansberry; Councilor Joseph D. McCarthy; Councilor Robert A. Grimes; Councilor Thomas J. Flannery.

Read and adopted February 6, 1950.
Attest:

WILLIAM J. LANAGAN,
City Clerk.

PLACING OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES IN WORLD TRADE—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi urging the Congress to take immediate steps that may be necessary to put our surplus agricultural products into world trade, to the end that needy nations may buy and sell in our markets through the use of dollar exchange and further respectfully suggesting that measures introduced by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] offer a solution to such problem.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 31

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt the necessary measures to put American surplus agricultural products into world trade

Whereas it is a matter of sound common sense that all the wealth of the world con-

sists of the raw materials of agriculture, plus the latent resources of the earth, such as oil and gas, minerals, etc.; and

Whereas agriculture is the only process through which the human race is fed and clothed and is the foundation of all earthly existence; and

Whereas the failure to distribute our surplus agricultural products in world trade, and for the benefit of the people of the world, is nothing short of a crime against civilization; and

Whereas our national income averages about seven times our agricultural income, and is about five times our combined total raw material income, through processing, transportation and distribution; and

Whereas a reduction in the production of agricultural wealth would reduce our national income and our standard of living about seven times in proportion to such reduction, a fact well proved by our experiences of the great depression during the early thirties: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is urged and requested to take immediately whatever steps may be necessary to put our surplus agricultural products into world trade, to the end that needy nations may buy and sell in our markets, without import-tax penalties, through the use of dollar exchange, with which to purchase our surplus agricultural products. It is estimated, and we accept it as a fact, that less than 1 percent of our national income from foreign trade, without import-tax penalties, would be sufficient to remove our agricultural surpluses and thereby maintain our national economy on a sound and stable basis.

The national wealth and economy being at stake, the Congress is earnestly urged to take such prompt and economically sound remedial action as will provide the dollar exchanges necessary to produce the results so universally needed and desired, and to that end it is respectfully suggested that the two measures dealing with this subject and introduced in the United States Senate by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND from Mississippi, offer a solution to the problem herein stated.

That copies hereof be sent to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress, with the request that they be referred to the proper committee of each House respectively, to the two Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from Mississippi, and to the press.

Adopted by the house of representatives February 7, 1950.

WALTER SILERS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate February 8, 1950.

SAM LUMPKIN,
President of the Senate.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESS—RESOLUTION OF MERRILL (WIS.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I have received from the National Affairs Committee of the Merrill (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce on the important issue of tax relief for small business. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERRILL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Merrill, Wis., February 13, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: At a recent meeting of the national affairs committee the following resolution was adopted and passed on to the board of directors for action; they also adopted said resolution. Here is the resolution:

"*Resolved*, That all wartime excise-profit taxes should be repealed and that the method of taxing small corporations up to $25,000 income be increased to $50,000 on a similar basis or approximately as follows:

"First $5,000, 20 percent normal and surtax.
"Next $15,000, 25 percent.
"Next $15,000, 30 percent.
"Next $15,000, 35 percent."

We would recommend all corporations be allowed to compute their tax on the above basis up to $50,000, and that above that the rate be adjusted to meet the absolute minimum requirement.

Depending on you,

JOE P. MULVIHILL,
Executive Secretary.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the so-called potato amendment has been added to the cotton reallocation joint resolution. On behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I report favorably to the Senate for the calendar House Joint Resolution 398, relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, containing the potato amendment, and I submit a report (No. 1276) thereon. Inasmuch as the provisions of the joint resolution are of vast benefit to the cotton planters, and probably likewise to the potato planters, I ask that the joint resolution, as proposed to be amended by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the joint resolution, as proposed to be amended, will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The joint resolution, as amended, is as follows:

Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended

Resolved, etc., That section 344 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(4) Any part of the acreage allotted to individual farms in any county under the provisions of this section which will not be planted to cotton in the year for which allotted and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotments to such farms and may be reapportioned within the State in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, preference being given to other farms in the same county receiving allotments which the Secretary determines are inadequate and not representative in view of their past production of cotton. Any transfer of allotment under this paragraph in any year shall not operate to reduce the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm from which acreage is transferred; except in accordance with paragraph (1) (B) and the proviso in paragraph (2) of this subsection: *Provided*, That any part of any farm acreage allotment may be permanently released in writing to the county committee by the owner and operator of the farm and may be reapportioned in the manner set forth above.

"(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and without reducing any farm-acreage allotment determined pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, each farm-acreage allotment for 1950 shall be increased by such amount as may be necessary to provide an allotment equal to 60 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton (or regarded as having been planted to cotton under the provisions of Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) on the farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948; but no such allotment shall be increased by reason of this provision to an acreage in excess of 40 percent of the acreage on the farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation, determined in the same manner and with the same exclusions as provided for by paragraph (2). Determination of the average acreage planted or regarded as planted on any farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948 shall be made by the county committee after consideration of such evidence as may be submitted by the owner or operator, and shall be subject to review by the State committee. An increase in any 1950 farm-acreage allotment shall be made pursuant to this paragraph only upon application in writing by the owner or operator of the farm within such time as may be prescribed by the Secretary, and the amount of any such increase shall not exceed the amount requested in such application. The acreage allotment computed in accordance with paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection (f) for each year subsequent to 1950 for each farm receiving an increase in its 1950 acreage allotment pursuant to this paragraph shall be increased by such amount as may be necessary to provide an allotment equal to its allotment for the preceding year increased or decreased, respectively, in the same proportion that the county acreage allotment is greater or less than the county acreage allotment for the preceding year; but no allotment shall be increased by reason of this provision to an acreage in excess of the largest acreage planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) to cotton on such farm during any of the preceding 3 years. To the maximum extent possible, the Secretary, and State, and county committees shall carry out the provisions of this paragraph in 1951 and subsequent years by use of the acreage reserved under sections 344 (e) and 344 (f) (3) and by reallocated acreage under paragraph (4) of this subsection. The additional acreage required to be allotted to farms under this paragraph shall be in addition to the county, State, and National acreage allotments and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota."

SEC. 2. No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution relating to farm-acreage allotments for cotton under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and to price support for potatoes."

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and

recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr LODGE·

S 3035. A bill for the relief of George A. Efron and his wife, Anna; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. MARTIN·

S. 3036. A bill to permit enlisted personnel to retain their duffel bags upon discharge from active service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S 3037 A bill for the relief of Nicholas Yialouris (also known as Nicholas Gialouris or Nicolaos Gialouris or Nick Yialouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr MURRAY

S 3038 A bill to establish and maintain in the Bureau of Land Management a record of title to all lands held by the Federal Government, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr HOLLAND·

S 3039 A bill for the relief of Eugene F. Edwards, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY

S 3040 A bill to relinquish the mineral rights of the United States under certain lands in the county of Santa Barbara, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services,

S. 3041 A bill for the relief of Shigematsu Takeyasu;

S 3042 A bill for the relief of Alexander Lashkareff and his wife, Victoria,

S 3043 A bill for the relief of Isolde Karnold, and

S. 3044. A bill for the relief of Berniece Josephine Lazaga, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr TAYLOR·

S 3045. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make provision for public roads in connection with the construction of Federal reclamation projects involving new public lands, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

S. 3046 A bill for the relief of Fidel Arciniega Basterrechea, to the Committee on the Judiciary

(Mr. TAYLOR also introduced Senate bill 3047, to provide for the hours of service by amending the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service, approved July 6, 1946, and for other purposes, as amended," which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. TAYLOR also introduced Senate bill 3048, to provide time and a half for compensatory time by amending the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service, approved July 6, 1946, and for other purposes, as amended," which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LUCAS introduced Senate bill 3049, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S 3050. A bill to amend Public Law 359, chapter 287, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S 3051. A bill authorizing the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to convey certain land to the housing authority of the town of Phillipsburg, N J; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY (for Mr. PEPPER)·

S 3052 A bill to prohibit an individual from traveling in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to abandon his dependent child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 3053 A bill to raise the total annual earning restrictions on unmarried veterans in connection with payment of pensions and payments of compensation; and

S. 3054. A bill to provide national service life insurance for certain persons who evidenced an intention to secure such insurance, but through no fault of their own failed to do so, to the Committee on Finance

PAY AND WORKING CONDITIONS OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills relating to pay and working conditions of postal employees, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD, together with a brief explanatory statement by me

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bills and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S 3047) to provide for the hours of service by amending the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service, approved July 6, 1946, and for other purposes, as amended," introduced by Mr. TAYLOR, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 is amended to read as follows "The 8 hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than nine consecutive hours, and the schedules of duty of the employees shall be regulated accordingly."

The bill (S. 3048) to provide time and a half for compensatory time by amending the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service, approved July 6, 1946, and for other purposes, as amended," introduced by Mr. TAYLOR, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 134, approved on July 6, 1946, as amended, shall be amended to provide that all work performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays shall be repaid by compensatory time and that such compensatory time shall be at the rate of 90 minutes for every 60 minutes employed, and that every period of work in excess of even hours equaling 31 minutes, but less than 60 minutes, shall be counted as 60 minutes.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. TAYLOR is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR TAYLOR

Mr. President, I have introduced two bills concerned primarily with the working conditions of postal employees. The object of both bills is to improve the working conditions of all postal employees.

My first bill has for its purpose providing by law that all schedules must be on an 8-within-9-hour basis. Practically all post offices are now on such a schedule. The Postmaster General in his instructions has advised postmasters to put such a schedule into operation. Unfortunately, however, there are a few postmasters who stubbornly refuse to modernize the hours of work. This creates an extreme hardship, particularly in the larger cities. In some post offices, employees are compelled to take a 2-hour lunch period. With the population of the country moving more and more to urban centers, and with the metropolitan limits of every one of our greater cities stretching miles out into the country, it takes some employees an hour each way to go to and from their work. If, in addition to their 8 hours per day, they are required to take 2 hours for lunch, you can readily see that their work day is spread over an abnormally long period To my mind, this creates an extreme hardship upon these employees and I hope that the Members of the Senate will cooperate with me and see this this bill is speedily enacted into law

The second bill that I have introduced today has to do with something that is peculiar to Government operation This is what is commonly known as compensatory time. If an employee works on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday in private industry, he is compensated by receiving overtime, usually at a double rate We do not have compensatory time in private industry

Theoretically, the Post Office Department is operated on a 40-hour week It is necessary, however, to furnish service over 6 days If an employee works on a Saturday during the month of December, when normal substitute replacement is not available, he receives overtime pay at the rate of time and one-half. However, if he is compelled to work on a similar basis during the rest of the year, he receives what is known as compensatory time, which is merely time off on an hour-for-hour basis If the time of this employee is worth time and one-half when it comes to overtime, it appears to me that, if he is to be paid in time off, the time that he takes away from his family during a normally free period is certainly entitled to like consideration.

My bill provides that when an employee is given compensatory time, it shall be on the basis of 90 minutes for every 60 minutes worked. I think that this legislation is just, fair and equitable, and long past due.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. HOLLAND each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the resolution (S. Res. 58) amending the Senate rules by creating a standing Committee on Small Business, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOWNEY (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND) submitted 15 amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado

River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MARTIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6670) to incorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS AT THE LAW ENFORCEMENT CONFERENCE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States at the Law Enforcement Officers' Conference in Washington on February 14, which appears in the Appendix]

WASHINGTON REPORT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Washington Report," delivered by him over radio station WMTR, at Morristown, New Jersey, on February 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on February 12, 1950, in Knoxville, Tenn., at a dinner celebrating the one hundred and forty-first anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, which appears in the Appendix]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a Lincoln Day dinner sponsored by the Summit County (Ohio) Republican Central and Executive Committees, at Akron, Ohio, on February 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement in reference to Senate bill 2912, to amend the antitrust laws, made by him before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on February 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MINIMUM-WAGE BILL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him with reference to the minimum-wage bill, which appears in the Appendix]

CRITICISM OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

[Mr IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram addressed to the President of the United States by the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Inc., and reply thereto from Peyton Ford, Assistant to the Attorney General, which appear in the Appendix.]

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2, ABOLISHING THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary prepared by him of the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 2, which appears in the Appendix.]

CLOSING OF WALTHAM WATCH CO.—EDITORIAL FROM THE WALTHAM NEWS-TRIBUNE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Say It Isn't So," published in the Waltham News-Tribune for February 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

ASIA'S CHALLENGE TO US—ARTICLE BY RAYMOND B. FOSDICK

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Asia's Challenge to Us—Ideas, Not Guns," by Raymond B. Fosdick, published in the New York Times magazine for Sunday, February 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY MR. TALMAGE WILCHER

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Mr Talmage Wilcher, State Republican committeeman from Arlington, Va., on February 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE LEONARD W. HALL RELATING TO EDWARD LAMB

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Representative LEONARD W. HALL, of New York, regarding Mr. Edward Lamb and President Truman's trip to Ohio, which appears in the Appendix]

AMERICAN INDUSTRY—ADDRESS OF VICE ADM. HAROLD G. BOWEN, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED

[Mr SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "American Industry," delivered by Vice Adm. Harold G. Bowen, United States Navy (retired), on January 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

REESTABLISHMENT OF MAINTENANCE OF FREE AND COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

[Mr DARBY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the American National Livestock Association at its fifty-third annual convention at Miami, Fla., on January 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY JAMES W. SILVER

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Fulbright Program Is One Good Thing That Grew Out of War, State Man Avows," written by James W Silver, chairman of the history department, University of Mississippi, and published in the Clarion-Ledger, of Jackson, Miss., for December 20, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR McMAHON AND HIS PROPOSAL TO NEUTRALIZE THE BOMB

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "McMAHON, Senator and Atomic Specialist," written by William S. White, and published in the New York Times magazine of February 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALTERNATIVE TO ATOMIC CHAOS—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Alternative to Atomic Chaos," from the Christian Century of February 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

IS THE A. & P. SUIT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST?

[Mr KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a discussion entitled "Is the A. & P. Suit in the Public Interest?" recently presented on the American Forum of the Air, and participated in by Senator O'MAHONEY, which appears in the Appendix]

A NOVEL PLAN TO RAISE REVENUE—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Novel Plan To Raise Revenue," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of February 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

EDUCATIONAL ADVANCEMENT IN MISSISSIPPI

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a news item published in the Memphis Press-Scimitar of February 11, 1950, relative to the progress being made by Mississippi in solving educational problems and indicating the good relationship prevailing between the races in that State, which appears in the Appendix]

WHAT IS PROSPERITY?—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON (PA) OBSERVER

[Mr MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Is Prosperity?" published in the Washington (Pa) Observer, which appears in the Appendix.]

NO SECURITY WITHOUT NATIONAL SECURITY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON (PA.) OBSERVER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Security Without National Security," published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer, which appears in the Appendix]

A LESSON FOR TRUMAN TO LEARN—EDITORIAL FROM THE WILLIAMSPORT SUN

[Mr MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Lesson for Truman To Learn," published in the Williamsport Sun for February 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF OPENING OF SENATE RADIO AND TELEVISION GALLERY

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, yesterday marked the tenth anniversary of the formal opening of the Senate Radio and Television Gallery. In that connection, I submit some historical data which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Yesterday, February 15, marked the tenth anniversary of the formal opening of the Senate Radio and Television Gallery.

On February 15, 1940, D Harold McGrath, who had been secretary to Senator Lewis B. Schwellenbach, of Washington State, became

the first superintendent of the gallery. William W. Vaughn, now aide to the Vice President, assumed his duties as assistant to Mr. McGrath.

The Senate Radio Gallery was authorized on April 25, 1939, in Senate Resolution, 117 which was sponsored by the late Senator Warren W. Barbour, Republican, of New Jersey, and myself.

A small space, 150 square feet, just off of the ladies' gallery, was set aside for use of 32 radio news workers then accredited to the gallery. In the vernacular of newsmen, this became the Radio Gallery. Informal use of this space was made by Macon Reed, Jr., representing Transradio Press, and Francis W. Tully, Jr., of the Yankee Network, for several months. Also, during the special session in the fall of 1939, some radio newsmen worked out of this space, but it was not until February 15, 1940, that the gallery became activated under the direction of the executive committee of the Radio Correspondents' Association. This committee consisted of Fulton Lewis, Jr., of Mutual Broadcasting System; William R. McAndrew, of National Broadcasting Co.; Fred W. Morrison, of Transradio Press; and Albert L. Warner, of Columbia Broadcasting System.

The present executive committee supervising the operation of the gallery is as follows: Elmer Davis, American Broadcasting Co., chairman; William R. McAndrew, National Broadcasting Co., vice chairman; Francis W. Tully, Jr., Washington Reporters, Inc., secretary; Willard F. Shadel, Columbia Broadcasting System, treasurer; Howard L. Kany, Associated Press Radio, member at large; George E. Reedy, the Arrowhead Network, member at large; Rex R. Goad, Transradio Press Service, member at large; Albert L. Warner, American Broadcasting Co., member ex officio.

The gallery activities are still supervised by D Harold McGrath. He now has three assistants: Robert C. Hough, of Purcellville, Va., who started as a page in the Senate, Con J. D'Andrea, of Wilmington, Del, who for 10 years, was widely known among the Members of the Senate as he presided at the family gallery door. The third assistant is Robert Mercer, of Nashua, N. H.

In 1941 the working space of the radio newsmen was expanded by the addition of an area 9 feet by 14 feet. With the war years membership grew rapidly. In March 1945 a large committee room, which had been occupied by Leslie Biffle as secretary of the majority, was vacated when Mr. Biffle became Secretary of the Senate. Senator BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the Rules Committee, then proposed to his committee that this space become allocated to the radio news workers. This was done. Five special soundproof booths were constructed—one assigned to each major network and one made available for the use of independent broadcasters. Before the work of constructing these booths began, however, the space was put to use. On April 15, 1945, Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, then majority leader, spoke amidst the construction scaffolds on the death of President Roosevelt. A few days prior to this Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY had made a recording in these quarters.

On November 8, 1945, the gallery was formally dedicated by President Harry Truman, keeping a promise he had made to Mr. McGrath when he was Vice President. As far as it is known, this is the only room in the Capitol that has ever been dedicated by a President. All Members of the Senate were invited guests of the occasion and more than 70 attended. Nearly every accredited member of the gallery also attended.

There are now 166 accredited members in the gallery, compared to 32, 10 years ago. An average of seven broadcasts a week originate in the Senate Radio Gallery. In addition, straight reporting by representatives of all affiliated organizations makes the place a busy one. Recently television became a part of the gallery activities and television shows are frequent.

Of the original 32 members who were with the gallery in 1940 the following are still accredited: H. R. Baukhage, American Broadcasting Co.; Walter Compton, Dumont Television; Rex Goad, Transradio Press Service; Fulton Lewis, Jr., Mutual Broadcasting Co.; W. R. McAndrew, National Broadcasting Co.; Stephen J. McCormick, Mutual Broadcasting Co; Robert E. Lee Moore, Transradio Press Service; Fred W. Morrison, National Broadcasting Co.; Macon Reed, Jr., Transradio Press Service; Francis W. Tully, Yankee Network; and Albert L. Warner, American Broadcasting Co.

The executive committee of the Radio Correspondents' Association which supervised the operation of the gallery under the Senate rules are also officers of the Radio Correspondents' Association, which is the organization for the radio and television fraternities in the Nation's Capital. The organization, through its membership, represents virtually every radio station in the United States.

Since 1940 the executive committee of Radio Correspondents' Association has had a job of accrediting radio news correspondents attending the national political conventions of the Republican and Democratic Parties.

Those who have served as presidents of the association are: Fulton Lewis, Jr., 1939–40; Albert L. Warner, 1940–41; H. R. Baukhage, 1941–42; Fred W. Morrison, 1942–43; Eric Sevareid, 1943–44; Earl Godwin, 1944–45; Richard Harkness, 1945–46; Rex Goad, 1946–47; Bill Henry, 1947–48; Albert L. Warner, 1948–49, and Elmer Davis, the present president, 1949–50.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to join the distinguished Senator from Iowa in expressing the appreciation of the Senate of the splendid services which have been performed during the past 10 years by the radio correspondents' gallery. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a further statement relative to this matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I would like to join the distinguished Senator from Iowa in expressing the appreciation of the Senate for the splendid services performed during the past 10 years by the members of the radio correspondents' gallery.

As we all know, many millions of Americans rely upon radio reporters and commentators to give them the latest news about the operations of their Government. With the members of the press and the television reporters, the radio men have made it possible for the American public to be the best-informed public in the entire world.

I wish to extend my congratulations to every member of the radio gallery and to give special commendation to D. Harold McGrath, who has served so capably as superintendent of the gallery since it was established 10 years ago. Before he became superintendent of the gallery, Mr. McGrath was secretary to the late Lewis B. Schwellenbach of Washington State, who was a Member of the Senate for a number of years. I know that Mr. McGrath and the other members of the gallery will give distinguished service in the years to come, as they have done in the last decade.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to join the distinguished majority leader in extending congratulations to the radio correspondents and commentators for the services they have rendered here in 10 long years. I know that I am speaking the sentiments of all the Senate when I say that we congratulate the members of the radio and television correspondents' gallery on the services they have rendered.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a self-explanatory statement on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The junior Senator from Nebraska joins in observing the tenth anniversary of the Senate Radio Gallery.

It has been a pleasure to be associated with the men and women of the Radio Gallery in the dissemination of news.

They have a great responsibility to the people, and they are discharging it well. The men and women of the Radio Gallery have a responsibility for fairness and accuracy over the air waves.

These belong to all the people and the men and women of the Radio Gallery are using the radio channels by permission of the people through the Federal Communications Commission.

And this Commission has a responsibility to prevent abuse of this privilege by radio commentators who thrive upon scandal—real or manufactured.

On this joyous occasion, in which the men and women of the Radio Gallery celebrate the tenth anniversary of their admission, is no time to point to violations of the ethics of the radio profession.

Rather do we salute the vast majority of reporters and commentators who conscientiously and sincerely perform their duties.

And my congratulations go to Harold McGrath who has been superintendent of the Radio Gallery for this decade.

BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT—REPORT OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at the end of December, the Council of Economic Advisers submitted to President Truman its fourth annual report to the President, entitled "Business and Government." This report has been generally welcomed as a most instructive and stimulating document.

The editors of the well-known Catholic magazine, America, have considered Business and Government so significant that they made arrangements for a special symposium, bringing together the views of economists in all sections of the country. This symposium appeared in the issue of February 11, 1950.

One of the participants in this symposium, Prof. John H. Sheehan, who is head of the department of economics at the University of Notre Dame, makes the following interesting statement:

The report of the Council of Economic Advisers and the very fact that we have such a body of professional advisers are encouraging signs.

Another statement of particular interest is found in the section of the symposium written by Rev. Joseph D. Munier of St. Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park, Calif.:

The usual snipers at all reports from Washington administrative agencies—

Writes Reverend Munier—

have been forced to admit the soundness and saneness of the comments of the Council of Economic Advisers on the relations between business and Government. Even its recommendations for the future are hard to

smear, namely, that our business system must assume more responsibility for the long-run common good and must embrace more fully the goal of continuous production and employment, especially through concerted effort to combat serious economic downturns.

Finally, let me quote briefly from the statement of Charles J. Walsh, who is a member of the department of economics at Fordham University:

I believe this report will eventually be regarded as an important milestone on the road to an improved relationship between private business and a democratic Government, on the basis of which the enterprise system may flourish, social improvement be promoted and essential freedoms preserved. * * * The Council deserves thanks for giving purposive direction to all Americans striving for a free, dynamic, progressive society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the symposium from America from which I have just quoted.

There being no objection, the symposium was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS: A SYMPOSIUM

GROWTH AND STABILITY

So compact a work as the 38-page fourth annual report to the President by the Council of Economic Advisers cannot, with adequate justice, be commented upon briefly. Its general title, "Government and Business," indicates its breadth and vital importance. Dealing primarily with general principles of Government-business relationships, in a country dedicated to individual freedom and the common good, the report is also filled with concrete ideas. It merits careful study.

From the section Trends in Government's Attitude Toward Business, two propositions may be singled out for comment: (1) "Efforts to promote expansion of * * * total production and income are more significant than measures to 'redistribute' the current product;" (2) "Flow of income to different parts of the economy should be viewed as an economic no less than a social problem * * * [to make practicable] a stable and expanding economy."

Proposition 1 recognizes that, from the whole pie of our total production, some of the cooks have received inadequate pieces. But taking heart from our "notable expansion in production" in the war and postwar years, the Council believes we "can create within less than a generation a truly good standard of living for all."

In aiming at this desirable and necessary social goal, the Council logically advances the second proposition: namely, intelligent attention must be given to economic actualities and possibilities. For instance, we must encourage and provide "sufficient funds and incentives for growth of productive facilities [concomitantly with] a sufficient flow of income to ultimate consumers to clear the markets of goods." This is the formula needed to avoid periodic overproduction and dangerous depressions. Though difficult to carry out, this proposition expresses good logic, ethics, and economics.

An economic system for freemen must have as its proper end a decent livelihood for all. This has been Catholic teaching for centuries, emphasized by Thomas Aquinas, Leo XIII, Pius XI, and Pius XII. Unfortunately, from the late eighteenth century to the 1920's, too many people followed the false philosophy of economic individualism. Then the depression despair of the 1930's swung some toward the notion that free enterprise was dead or unworkable. World War II, however, proved the vigor and productive possibilities of free peoples cooperating as free persons and responsible social beings.

This wartime lesson in the necessity of cooperation by increasingly interdependent members of society has, fortunately, not been lost. The Report of the Council of Economic Advisers and the very fact that we have such a body of professional advisers are encouraging signs.

At the close of his article on the Report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers (Am. 2/4) Father Masse announced that this week we would publish the opinions and analyses of a panel of economic experts on the subject. America herewith presents a symposium of opinions submitted to us on specific parts of the report.

Completely rejected in the report is the despairing philosophy of the 1930's of "economic maturity" and stagnation. Instead, it voices a positive philosophy of growth and stability. We are getting back on the right road in our thinking about the relationships of government and business. (Prof. John H. Sheehan, head of department of economics, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.)

SECULAR STAGNATION

The latest report of the Council of Economic Advisers marks a momentous turn from the attitudes which prevailed from 1932 to 1949. I is the first major indication that Truman's Fair Deal has a distinct philosophy in its own right.

Nowhere is this change more evident than in the Fair Deal's repudiation of the doctrine of what is called in economics "secular stagnation." During the 1930's it was widely held that American business had reached the height of its expansive power. The 1932 depression was often called a crisis of overproduction. Support for this thesis was gathered from the pitifully low rate of business investment during the 1930's.

There were two corollaries to the stagnation thesis. The first was the need for equalizing incomes through taxation and wage increases. Since investment was to be at a low level, a high rate of saving (resulting from high income) would be dangerous. Purchasing power, not savings, was wanted. Secondly, if redistribution of incomes did not provide full employment, the indicated area of economic expansion was in the field of public works. Government investment was to take care of workers who became surplus through technological advance or population gains.

The newly espoused Fair Deal philosophy holds by contrast that our American productive capacity still has enormous room to expand before it outgrows our needs and wants. We need higher incomes, in terms of real goods and services, and not merely a redistribution of existing production totals. By raising real incomes we can buy more and better food, housing, and other necessities, as well as comforts and luxuries.

The corollaries to this thesis are clear, and the report indicates that the President's advisers may be willing to accept them. In fact, the anguished cries in the Nation show that doctrinaire antibusiness liberals have so interpreted the report.

In the first place, this new program logically calls for certain adjustments in tax policy. It is widely agreed that present tax policies either discourage investment or channel it into socially unhealthy patterns. There is little equity capital available for small business today. Existing economic expansion is achieved either by way of loans or by withheld profits of the large and successful corporations.

Secondly, the Government could aid business by clarifying its regulative programs. Without sacrificing antitrust and similar controls, these programs could be made definite and thus remove business uncertainty.

Thirdly, positive means could be found to stimulate equity investment. One device is the formation of investment funds, privately organized but partially guaranteed by the Government.

Finally, labor could contribute by a more realistic wage policy. Wage increases could be tied to productivity and not permitted to wipe out reasonable profits.

The new approach by the Council of Economic Advisers appears to harmonize well with Catholic social teaching. The present Holy Father has stressed the need for greater production and for the stimulation of small and medium-sized business. The emphasis upon cooperation rather than class struggle is likewise in harmony with the Catholic tradition. In this light, the new stress in the Fair Deal is welcome. (Rev. John F. Cronin, S. S., assistant director, social action department, N. C. W. C., and author of Economics and Society, Economic Analysis and Problems, Catholic Social Action.)

WATCHDOG AND HELPER

The Council assures us that in a stable and expanding economy there is room for big business and small business. This is begging the question. Is not the concentration of economic power itself a cause of instability and contraction in the economy? How would Government expenditures increase employment unless more goods and services were produced? The monopolist has the power to absorb the increased purchasing power in higher prices and, by restricting output, to check the hoped-for increase in employment.

In choice federalese, the Council lays its finger on the chief flaw in our antitrust policy: "Under our system of law and administration, many adjustments to new situations are made interstitially without organic reconstruction of the legal framework." What would be the agony of Lippy Durocher if in a tight game with the Dodgers the umpires were free to invent a new rule interstitially, that is, between the innings. No legal framework means no book of rules. Indeed the Council is right in saying: "We are still a long way from having completed the necessary rethinking of problems involving business size and practices."

At the other extreme, the solution is not to emasculate antitrust legislation. In our opinion the Federal Trade Commission should be obliged by Congress to lay down rules of the game showing what constitutes monopoly or collusion as of a given time. Revisions should be integrated periodically with industrial developments. Then we should not only have flexibility, but no business could be punished for "violations" which are not covered by existing definitions and rules.

The Council, however, is certainly right in shifting the emphasis from supervising to assisting business in its complex operations. In 1949, with a gross national production of $258,700,000,000, the Federal Government spent more than $43,100,000,000, while Federal, State and local governments together spent around $60,600,000,000. The Federal debt is now more than $256,800,000,000. The Council is modest, if anything, when it says: "The fiscal, credit, monetary, and other facilitative operations by which the Government may promote an environment conducive to business expansion are at least as important as the more traditional watchdog functions." How can Government spending and taxing of this magnitude fail to affect the climate within which families and businesses make their decisions?

Recalling the hard fact that economics and politics do not mix, I must make a reservation. While approving the new trend I can only pray that the expenditure and revenue programs of the Government will in very truth be consistent with the progress and stability of the private economy.

There is a strong case for counter-cyclical fiscal action—surpluses in good times, deficits in bad. The Council states in part II of its report that we are now enjoying a recovery movement; and that we are justified

in having an optimistic outlook for the coming month. Why, then, should it be necessary to increase transfer payments (social-security and farm-benefits payments to veterans, and other disbursements by Federal and local governments) to an annual rate of $17,000,000,000 in the first half of 1950? Could we not spread out over a longer period of time at least the $2,800,000,000 in GI insurance dividends? Or does the fact that this is an election year influence the Government's facilitative operations? (Rev. Cyril McKinnon, S J, director, Marquette University Labor College)

HIGH-LEVEL PRODUCTION

The usual snipers at all reports from Washington administrative agencies have been forced to admit the soundness and saneness of the comments of the Council of Economic Advisers on the relations between business and Government. Even its recommendations for the future are hard to smear, namely, that our business system must assume more responsibility for the long-run common good and must embrace more fully the goal of continuous production and employment, especially through concerted effort to combat serious economic downturns. This concerted effort, it is suggested, could be facilitated by more serious study of measures contributing to the stability and growth of our economy. But the council feels that individual study and action may not be enough to head off depressions unless accompanied by some institutional approach which will ensure concerted and massive private action.

The alert and informed Catholic cannot fail to find in these recommendations echoes of papal suggestions for economic reconstruction. Our Catholic principles lead us to oppose handing over to the state all responsibility for the welfare of the citizenry. We insist that business has the primary duty of creating jobs and providing for the security of its employees. In their 1940 statement on the church and social order, the American hierarchy said that the goal of continuous production and employment depends on a reasonable relationship between wages and salaries, as well as on a harmonious proportion between income and prices. "Because economic society has not followed the moral laws of justice and charity, the principles of interdependence have been violated and we have precipitated unemployment with all its consequent hardships and misery." By all means let us have education on those decisions which affect the relationships between wages and prices. But it will demand more than the studied awareness of the problem to bring about the concerted action necessary to ensure the stability and growth of our economic system. Some institution will have to watch the chiselers, will have to bring into line those who have never made a decision except for their own profit. But what institution can do this? Government alone? Management alone? Labor alone? Most certainly not. To win the war it was recognized that all groups had to work together and sacrifice together to gain a common objective. Why should there be any difference in time of peace?

The Catholic proposal, first stated in Pope Pius XI's encyclical On Reconstructing the Social Order (1931), suggests the establishment of a collaborative framework to replace the outmoded system of irresponsible self-interest. "Industry council" is the best term to describe what the Pope had in mind. All interested parties would be represented in the government of the councils and all authority would be delegated from the bottom. Such an instrument of economic democracy gives real hope that the social aspects of vital private decisions would receive due consideration, and also promises to insure consistent private action for the general economic good. (Rev. Joseph D. Munier, member, faculty of St. Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park, Calif., and author of Some American Approximations to Pius XI's "Industries and Professions.")

ECONOMIC CONTROLS

The fourth report of the Council of Economic Advisers marks a significant turning point in official thinking about the relationships between business and government. Although its conclusions have not as yet received the attention they deserve, I believe this report will eventually be regarded as an important milestone on the road to an improved relationship between private business and a democratic Government, on the basis of which the enterprise system may flourish, social improvement be promoted, and essential freedoms preserved.

What the report amounts to is an effort to frame an economic charter for Americans: "There is room for a broad effort to formulate or restate a philosophy of the relationship between business and government; * * * in our economic life no less than in our political, there is a need for some common philosophy to hold us together." The formulation of this common philosophy provides a framework within which business, labor, the farmer, and the administrator can be united in pursuit of a set of common objectives. It also provides a set of criteria by which specific legislative proposals may be judged and administrative policies selected.

A democratic society cannot endure unless there is agreement on basic objectives. There can be disagreement on specific policies to achieve these objectives, and this disagreement can form the basis for competing political organizations. But if our basic objectives must be constantly subjected to test in the political arena, stable political and economic progress becomes impossible.

The key ideas in the Council's formulation of its economic charter are, in my opinion, to be found: (1) In the Council's final emancipation from the economic ideas and influences of the 1930's ("We have now moved far enough away from the depression of the early thirties to start looking ahead, and to appraise the heartening evidence that free enterprise and free government have blended their varying strains into a rewarding effort"); and (2) in its rejection of specific Government controls as the answer to the basic economic questions confronting the American economic system. The Council stresses the creation of a climate favorable to business and urges that the main concentration of economic policy should be upon encouraging stability and growth within our free enterprise system itself.

The sloughing off of the economic psychology of the thirties (stagnationism, etc.) is a tremendous accomplishment. Consciously or unconsciously, it has colored Government economic thinking—including that of the Council itself—and found expression in law, regulations, and attitudes which, in many instances, penalized business and subjected enterprise to hampering restrictions. These included the laws which discouraged savings and investment, stressed income redistribution rather than its increased creation, weakened incentives, and narrowed the area of private decision.

The rejection of direct Government controls as the answer to economic problems reflects experience both in this country and abroad. We have learned that controls create as many problems as they solve, or even more—if you control prices, prices no longer perform their rationing and allocating functions; if you hold down the cost of living without restricting incomes—including wages—suppressed inflation results; where suppressed inflation exists, incentive is destroyed, production is discouraged, resources misdirected, and both morals and morale are sapped by black markets.

To be effective, controls must be total, and total central control is administratively impossible in a free society. The authoritative London Economist in summing up British experience has said: "The value to the community of having its economic decisions dispersed among a million heads, instead of concentrated on a hundred, has been vastly underrated."

The Council deserves thanks for giving purposive direction to all Americans striving for a free, dynamic, progressive society. (Charles J. Walsh, member, department of economics of Fordham University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and former Chief of the Office of Export-Import, OPA.)

THIRTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this is the thirty-second anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. This anniversary is not being publicly observed in Lithuania itself because that nation, like so many other little nations of Europe, is now under the tyrannical domination of Soviet Russia. I have prepared a brief recital of the history of the Lithuanian struggle for freedom, and a description of the current situation in which those courageous little people on the Baltic find themselves today. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert in the RECORD these remarks and the statement to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY

Mr President, may I be permitted to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that today is the thirty-second anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. The month of February is marked by the birthday anniversaries of some of the greatest champions of human dignity and freedom—George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Gen Thaddeus Kosciusko. The history and character of the Lithuanian people may be fittingly associated with the characters of these three great men.

The Lithuanian Declaration of Independence signed and proclaimed in a small room, at a secret session of the Council of Lithuania in the city of Vilna, during the German occupation in the First World War, marked the resurrection of an old nation-state after a period of 115 years of Russian occupation and 3 years of German occupation. For Lithuania had been an independent kingdom and, then, a grand duchy since the beginning of the thirteenth century. While valiantly defending themselves against the invading hosts of Teutonic knights and then against the Mongols, the Lithuanians had formed a national state and expanded their rule over vast areas of the Ukraine and White Ruthenia. Centuries before our own Declaration of Independence, the Lithuanians practiced complete religious and linguistic toleration in dealing with the Catholic, Orthodox, Mohammedan, Jewish, and pagan subjects of their vast empire.

Old Lithuania, confederated with Poland in a dual commonwealth, was dismembered among the Russian, Prussian, and Austrian autocracies in 1795. There was a mass insurrection against this development. The insurrection was headed by Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, who is shared in historic traditions by the United States, Poland, and Lithuania. That insurrection was suppressed by united Russian, Prussian, and Austrian forces. There was a brief revival of freedom for 6 months in 1812 when Napoleon permitted the restoration of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. For more than a century, Lithuanians suffered oppression. That period was punctu-

ated by sporadic revolts. All Lithuanian printing was suppressed between 1864 and 1904. Military conscription was imposed. Russian Cossack regiments roamed the countryside applying the whip and the gallows—in peacetime—and shutting down Catholic churches. Churches could not be repaired. No crosses could be erected without the permission of the Russian military police. The clergy were shadowed and restricted to the boundaries of their particular parishes.

These repressions forced more than 1,000,000 Lithuanians of military age into voluntary exile in western Europe and America. Other thousands were exiled annually to Siberia.

Books were printed in the United States and Germany and were smuggled into Lithuania. The Lithuanians avoided Russian schools and raised their literacy standards by means of clandestine schools, through a system of traveling tutors, whose instruction was supplemented, during long winter evenings, by parents who supervised their children's education in their homes. Eternal vigilance had to be maintained against night raids by the Russian police and troops seeking Lithuanian prayer books and primary readers for seizure and destruction.

These oppressive tactics failed completely. It was during this black-out that the Lithuanians experienced their national renaissance. It was a historic irony that, in literacy standards, Lithuania ranked fourth—after Finland, Estonia, and Latvia—in the Russian Empire, despite all the repressions.

Thirty-two years ago the Lithuanians found a great ally in their struggle for liberty in President Woodrow Wilson. Their terse Declaration of Independence was explicitly based on the recognized right of nations to self-determination They won their independence, after a prolonged struggle against Russian bolsheviki, Russian Czarist troops, and German forces

By the Moscow Peace Treaty of July 12, 1920, Russia renounced forever all claims to Lithuania. The Constituent Assembly of Lithuania promulgated a democratic constitution and a republican form of representative government. Lithuania was admitted into the League of Nations in 1921, and won American recognition in July 1922 Lithuania actively participated in the peace machinery of the League of Nations. She was a signatory of the Kellogg-Briand Pact. She had nonaggression and friendship treaties with both Russia and Germany, and she maintained close relations with Latvia and Estonia and Finland.

A good-neighbor policy failed, however, to save Lithuania. The Ribbentrop-Molotov pacts of 1939 sealed the fate of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Soviet armed forces overran Lithuania in June 1940, just as Hitler advanced on Paris in the west. The Baltic States were forcibly annexed by Russia, and the Soviet regime embarked on a systematic campaign of genocide to depopulate the culturally superior Baltic countries. That record of genocide was recently placed before the Subcommittee on Genocide of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a spokesman of the Lithuanian American Council.

The Government of the United States never recognized the fruits of Nazi-Soviet collaboration in lawlessness and aggression The United States Government faithfully adheres to its original policy statement of July 23, 1940, and continues to recognize the sovereignty of Lithuania and the other Baltic nations. The diplomatic and consular missions of free Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia continue to protect the sovereign interests of those countries in the United States. America may well be proud of this policy. We know that it has won us the deep gratitude and loyalty of 7,000,000 Balts.

I am glad to note that the observance of the thirty-second anniversary of independence of Lithuania coincides with the promise by the State Department of Lithuania-language broadcasts by the Voice of America. The State Department has requested appropriations for this purpose, and the proper subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee has approved this request for funds. I know that this development is gratifying to the 1,000,000 Americans of Lithuanian descent. It will be welcome news to Lithuanians listening clandestinely to the overseas radio in their enslaved homeland. The Voice of America will not be heard directly by the hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians in Siberian exile—but the Voice will reach them through others.

Our hearts go out to the oppressed freemen of Lithuania. It is our hope, as it is theirs, that the iron curtain will collapse ultimately and the Lithuanians will regain their well-deserved liberty.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, today is being observed in a great many communities of our great country as the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania I have prepared a statement of the historical significance of that anniversary, and I ask that it be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, today is being observed in a great many communities of our great country as the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania.

Rather than celebrate the anniversary of this significant hallmark in the history of the Lithuanian people with joy, as in the past, the observance this year is marked with sadness and reproach over the tragic fate of a small but viable people whose freedom and prosperity were brutally violated by its totalitarian neighbors.

There is no feeling of joy among the multitudes which will converge tonight, and the following week end, in the halls and auditoria selected by our fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent for the solemn observance of an event that had culminated the long struggle for human freedom and political independence of this ancient and progressive Baltic people.

How could there be any joy when these good Americans are painfully aware that their kith and kin in Lithuania are being oppressed, persecuted, exploited, massacred, and exiled to the Arctic and Siberian death camps? A great many Lithuanian American families are mourning for their dear ones, victims of the Nazi and Soviet conspiracy against peace and humanity. Even American citizenship failed to protect from exile a dozen or more native-born Americans married to Lithuanians.

The declaration of independence by the Council of Lithuania promulgated at a secret session held in Vilnius, or Vilna, during the German occupation of the country, on February 16, 1918, spoke simply of the recognized right of nations to self-determination and notified the Governments of Germany, Russia, and other countries of the reconstitution of the independent state of Lithuania, ordered on the democratic foundations, * * * and the severance of all ties which had formerly bound this state to any other nations.

Only a nation with an inborn sense of its own human dignity, to quote Immanuel Kant, the great philosopher who had sprung from the Prussian branch of the Lithuanian people, could express the achievement of its long-sought objective in such simple matter-of-fact words.

Indeed the road to freedom had been tortuous and long.

Fiercely contesting the Teutonic order's invasion from the west and north and the Slavic and Mongol invasions from the east and south, the Lithuanians had formed an independent kingdom in the first decades of the thirteenth century. It was exactly 700 years ago, in 1250, that Mindaugas, the wise ruler of Lettovia, had accepted baptism and a royal crown from the Pope. Unfortunately, the perfidy of the would-be apostles caused a reversion of the Lithuanian people to paganism. During the next 160 years the Lithuanians waged an unceasing defensive war against the hosts of crusaders from all of Europe.

Generation after generation of the Lithuanians were born under the sign of ceaseless warfare, and they were obliged to repulse continuous raids of the crusaders who attempted to baptize Lithuania with fire and sword and yoke of slavery. Prussian and Livonian kinsfolk were lost to the Teutonic Knights.

But while defending themselves from the west and north, the Lithuanians extended their benevolent rule over the vast steppes, marshlands, and forests of the Ukraine and Whiteruthenia to form an empire stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea.

The Lithuanian expansion, unlike the modern Soviet expansion, meant a liberation from the heavy Tartar yoke. Under the heathen Lithuanian rulers the Catholic and orthodox, as well as the Mohammedan and Jewish subjects, enjoyed tolerance and equality and a full cultural autonomy.

When the opportunity came, Lithuania became a Catholic country in 1387 when her ruler, Jogaila, was elected to the throne of Poland. Five hundred and forty years ago, in July 1410, the Teutonic Order was finally crushed on the fields of Tannenberg by the allied Lithuanian and Polish armies under the field command of Grand Duke Vytautas of Lithuania. In their eagerness to prove their newly accepted Christianity, the Lithuanians attempted their only crusade against the Tartars in 1399, and suffered a great defeat on the banks of the Vorskla in the Ukraine Nevertheless, they turned this defeat into victory, inasmuch as the Mongol might itself was mortally wounded in that battle and the Mongols were no longer capable of carrying their invasion westward across the Lithuanian dominions. The victors soon enough accepted Lithuanian overlordship, and Tartar settlers became one of the most loyal segments of the Lithuanian state society.

But Muscovy had risen on the ruins of the Tartar empire. Since 1447, Lithuania was forced to defend her empire from the Muscovite subjugation. The constant Muscovite aggression sapped the country's strength and led to the Polish-Lithuanian Union, the formation of a dual Commonwealth of Poland and Lithuania in 1569. The loose democratic structure of the commonwealth was unable to survive under the concentrated blows by the Muscovite totalitarian autocracy. The Commonwealth of Poland and Lithuania, called the eastern bastion of liberalism at the time, was dismembered among the militaristic powers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria in 1772, 1793, and 1795. The great mass insurrection of 1794, under Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who is acclaimed by the Lithuanians as their native son, by the Poles as their great leader, and by the American people as a veteran of the American Revolutionary War—failed A nation born of the struggle for basic human liberty went down fighting in the defense of its human liberty and political freedom.

Acting in close coordination with the Poles, every generation of the Lithuanians between 1794 and 1950 had striven to regain the nation's freedom. There was a brief flash of hope when, in 1812, the Lithuanians had secured—for 6 months—their independence under Napoleon. Following the

heavy Russian reprisals, the suppression of the very geographic name of Lithuania, the closing of the country's university, the tightening of serfdom, and the bonding of former freemen, the Lithuanians revolted again in 1831. This insurrection produced the epic of heroism and the fame of Countess Emily Plater, the "Lithuanian girl captain." In 1834, several hundred Polish and Lithuanian veterans of that insurrection were deported to the United States on board of Austrian men-of-war. The attempt at insurrection in 1848 was crushed in the bud but the great mass uprising of 1863 and 1864 held the world's attention for two whole years It was the blood and heroic sacrifices of the Lithuanian and Polish patriots that helped remove the threat of an European intervention in the United States during our own Civil War.

A total blackout descended on Lithuania in 1864 For 40 years, from 1864 to 1904, the Russians forbade all printing in the Lithuanian language and attempted to make Russians out of Lithuanians. More than a million hardy Lithuanians fled abroad during that period, usually just before they were due to be called to perform military duty. Books were printed in the United States and Europe, and were smuggled into Lithuania by thousands of book carriers—a unique profession of champions of freedom of thought not known anywhere else. The Lithuanians avoided state schools and taught their children at home Repairs to churches were banned by the Russian authorities, but the Lithuanians bravely faced Russian Cossacks' lances and whips when the latter attempted to shut down their temples. Tens of thousands were exiled to Siberia Other thousands languished in prisons for their possession of prayerbooks, prime readers, gospels, and other books in the Lithuanian language. And when the Russians lifted the language ban in favor of a censored press—by military censors in peacetime—they noted with surprice that, while Russia proper was sinking into illiteracy and backwardness, the Lithuanians were ranking fourth in literacy standards within the Russian Empire, ranking next after the Finns, Estonians, and Latvians.

No one wept when the Russians were evicted from Lithuania in 1915 by the German troops. A regime harsher than that in Belgium was instituted by the Germans, and the country suffered great material and physical and moral losses. But hope was in the air. There was expectancy following the American entry into the war. The Lithuanians knew that their 1,000,000 kinsmen in America would not let them down while they were to fight for freedom. Rejecting the German pressure for union with Prussia, the Lithuanians proclaimed their full independence on February 16, 1918. The first cabinet was formed on Armistice Day, and the country feverishly sought to organize self-government. The invading Russian bolshevik forces were expelled by the fall of 1919, the German-Russian White forces were beaten in November 1919, and first free elections to a constituent assembly were held in April 1920. Peace was signed with Russia on July 12, 1920, at Moscow and Russia renounced "forever" any and all claims to Lithuania. Soon thereafter Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations and earned American de jure recognition in July 1922.

Cultural, educational and economic standards were rapidly rising Lithuania remained on the gold standard even during the great depression. Private initiative in industry and business was encouraged by the government of farmers' sons, and Lithuania was a happy and prosperous country, minding its own business and readily co-operating in the peace machinery of the League. She was bound to Latvia and Estonia by ties of close political and educational collaboration. Friendly relations were established with Poland in 1938. Lithuania was a signatory of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the Litvinov Definition of Aggression Pact, and she had nonaggression and friendship pacts with Germany and, since 1926, with the Soviet Union. The country was confident of its future in this enlightened century. She was a law-abiding member of the international community, and she thought that her neighbors were minded likewise.

But there was the Hitler-Stalin deal of 1939, the partnership in aggression between two totalitarian would-be conquerors. The excellent relations and friendship with the Soviet Union proved to be no asset. Lithuania was invaded in June 1940 and annexed to the Soviet Union within a few weeks. The erstwhile friends presently revenged themselves upon the innocent Baltic populations by enslaving them, by imprisoning and exiling educated classes, by confiscating the lands and personal and real property of the victimized nation, by massacring and torturing prisoners, by despoiling the churches. The outraged people rose in arms in June 1941—and the German advance came within the next few days. A provisional government was proclaimed by the insurgents. But the Germans suppressed this government and wanted to convert Lithuania into an exploited nonself-governing colony, a part of the Ostland The Lithuanians resisted. Just when the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation consolidated all resistance into a closely coordinated network, the Russians returned. The Nazi occupation cost Lithuania 300,000 lives. The two Russian occupations cost the country some 700,000 lives. But the Lithuanians continue to resist, and the Russians occasionally roar in anguish at this stubborn resistance. For instance, Soviet official propaganda acknowledges that forcible collectivization fares badly in Lithuania, and that the greatest abstention from voting in the Soviet Union and in the annexed areas is registered in Lithuania.

Recalling this country's record of misplaced confidence and errors of policy at Yalta and elsewhere, one cannot help being proud of the fact that the United States Government maintained a consistent and unyielding policy on the issue of Lithuania and the Baltic States. In spite of the Russian insistence and the many temptations of exigency the United States refused to recognize the fruits of the Soviet collaboration with Nazi Germany and faithfully adheres to the original policy statement of July 23, 1940. The legations and consulates of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are functioning freely in this country and enjoy complete freedom of action in representing the interests of their enslaved countries. It inspires the hope of liberation not only among the Baltic peoples but among their fellow sufferers in the other areas of Europe.

It is encouraging that the Soviet Department has moved to provide for Lithuanian language broadcasts over the expanding Voice of America. Our help is indeed warranted in orienting the people of Lithuania regarding the true interpretation of world developments.

Mr. President, I am aware that in a number of States the governors have proclaimed Republic of Lithuania Day. Let us pay our respects to the gallant and dignified Lithuanian freemen suffering the indignity of enslavement under the Soviets. May their liberation come soon. We need this little country and its great people, and they need our encouragement.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me on Lithuanian Independence Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Today marks the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania. This anniversary is being observed today in a great many communities of our great Nation, particularly wherever a group of American citizens of Lithuanian origin or descent is found. As in the past few years, Governors of a number of States have proclaimed this day to be Republic of Lithuania Day. It is fitting, therefore, that we pause to pay our sincere respects to our many citizens of Lithuanian background and to encourage their untiring efforts in behalf of liberty—for their ancestral land and for other countries presently enslaved by Soviet totalitarianism.

We had a recent occasion to be reminded of the unceasing struggle of practical idealism against the onslaught of barbarianism. I have in mind the third Lithuanian American Congress held recently in the city of New York and its resolutions soberly evaluating the present international situation and calling for specific remedies in various fields of our foreign policy. The Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which is presently pending before the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification by the President, was singled out for our particular attention by our fellow citizens of Lithuanian origin who insist on a speedy ratification of the Genocide Convention. They are well aware that this convention will give no immediate benefit to their kith and kin in Lithuania and in Siberian death camps. Nevertheless, they want the convention to become a part of international law and to serve as a deterrent to the conspirators of the Kremlin at whom the Lithuanians point an accusing finger. I, for one, am glad that the hearings recently conducted before the Subcommittee on Genocide had provided an opportunity for Lithuanian Americans to air their grievances and to demand a "day in court" before public opinion.

The memorable declaration of independence proclaimed by the Lithuanian Council at Vilnius (Vilna) on February 16, 1918, signified the resurrection of an old nation-state rather a fulfillment of ambition by non-self-governing nationality. This declaration was based "on the recognized right of nations to self-determination" but, at the same time, it declared "the reconstitution of the independent state of Lithuania, ordered on the democratic foundations, and the severance of all ties which had formerly bound this state to any other nations" This simple and terse statement, characteristic of the Lithuanian race, carried a great convincing weight because of the long and honorable record of this small people fighting for freedom with unparalleled determination and dignity.

Lithuania became a member of the League of Nations in 1921, after negotiating a peace with Russia by the Moscow Treaty of July 12, 1920, by which Russia forever renounced any and all claims to Lithuania. The United States granted its de jure recognition in July 1922, and excellent relations were maintained between our two countries since then.

The two decades of independence marked extraordinary progress in every phase of life. Education was made compulsory, in either state-maintained or private schools, including the schools for the national minorities where all subjects were taught in Hebrew, Yiddish, Polish, German, Latvian or Russian. Nine university-level institutions

were in operation by 1940. The country encouraged private initiative in industry and trade, and subsidized the young industries, such as sugar beet, flax and meat processing industries. Monetary stability was successfully maintained, and gold standard was retained even during the great depression. Grain production was rapidly giving way to dairying and cattle breeding, balancing internal prosperity and providing profitable export and import trade with the United States and Great Britain. The port of Klaipeda, or Memel, has rapidly grown from a former German naval and fishing haven into a busy international trade mart. International obligations were scrupulously observed, and the young republic enjoyed confidence abroad. Lithuania was active in all international undertakings for the preservation of peace. Her international disputes were settled by arbitration and by the World Court She was active in the League of Nations. She was a signatory of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, of the Litvinov Definition of Aggression Pact, and she had nonaggression and friendship pacts with Germany and the Soviet Union. Friendly relations were maintained with Latvia and Estonia, and since 1938 with Poland. It is remarkable that Lithuania was the first country to defy the Nazis despite the proximity of Germany; in 1935 she prosecuted the Nazi plotters against her territorial integrity, and she readily accepted the Jewish and anti-Nazi German refugees from Hitler's terrorism

Then came the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pacts of 1939, followed by the nonaggression and mutual assistance pact with the Soviet Union whereby Russia imposed limited military garrisons upon Lithuania.

In spite of the strict neutrality maintained by Lithuania during the first year of the war, Russia invaded Lithuania in June 1940, as Hitler's legions marched into Paris and the British were at Dunkirk. Within a short space of a few weeks, Lithuania was forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union and the Russian NKVD took over Some 2,000 persons were immediately arrested and deported to Russia, and the Russian NKVD engaged in compiling long lists of the people's enemies slated for liquidation. The week of June 14–21, 1941, the Russians executed the first major operation of genocide by uprooting some 35,000 men, women and children. Heads of families were separated from their wives and children and were either massacred or shipped to Arctic Russia, while the women and babes in arms were resettled in Siberia in slave labor camps This operation provoked greatest indignation and a mass insurrection; more than 100,000 Lithuanians rose in arms during that week, and when the German troops marched into Lithuania on June 22, 1941, they entered the cities for the most part already seized by the Lithuanian insurrectionists. A provisional government was proclaimed and took over the administration. However, the Germans elected to suppress the insurrection and to make Lithuania a part of their Ostland colony. The provisional government was forcibly disbanded 7 weeks later, the armed forces—which had suffered some 15,000 casualties in fighting the Russians and, in some instances, the Germans—were disarmed and interned.

The country was stunned for a while. The Jewish massacres conducted by the Germans and manhunts for forced labor reawakened the people and resistance was born. It is remarkable that, of all the countries under German occupation, Lithuania and Poland were the only two nations that failed to produce SS legions for Hitler, in spite of the bitter anti-Bolshevik sentiment prevalent in both formerly allied peoples. All of the German schemes of mobilization failed, in contrast with the popular response when a home guard was permitted to be formed in 1944. Noting the enthusiastic response to a call to arms by native authorities, the Germans at once attempted to incorporate the raw recruits into German armed forces. The Lithuanians refused to take an oath of allegiance to Hitler and refused to go beyond their own frontiers. Then the Germans struck from ambush and disarmed the units. Some men escaped to the forests, others were sent to slave labor camps and auxiliary air corps construction battalions in Germany. By that time, however, the Lithuanian resistance was firmly consolidated and unified under the coalition of the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation. Passive resistance was transformed into an active resistance, and both the German and incoming Russian forces were fought by guerrilla units. Hundreds of thousands of people attempted to flee before the onrushing Soviet forces—but the Germans would not permit them to cross the frontiers. In consequence of this German policy, only about 80,000 Lithuanians reached the safety of western Germany, Austria, Italy, Switzerland, France and Sweden.

The meager news emanating both from angry Soviet comments and from the underground resistance sources which manage to send armed missions across the iron curtain show that Lithuania continues to resist the Soviet enslavement The latest issue of the Soviet Embassy Bulletin in Washington shows that only 200,000 farms were collectivized. When this disclosure is evaluated in the light of economic prewar statistics it shows that the tremendous Soviet pressure and series of deportations failed to drive the Lithuanian farmers into kolkhoz detention camps, only one-third of the country's farms were collectivized Every year since the second Russian occupation even the fictional prefabricated Soviet election statistics disclose the greatest ratio of resistance in Lithuania The percentages of voters are placed at 91 to 94 percent, instead of the customary 99-plus or 150 percent of participation. Even in citing the background of elected officials, the Russians attribute only 11 percent of party membership among the officials of Lithuania It is not at all surprising. In a country of 3,000,000 people the Communist Party had a membership of barely 1,500. Among these, less than 600 Communists were of Lithuanian race

We must be painfully aware that of the 14 prewar Catholic bishops, not 1 is left at the post. Only about one-fourth of the country's churches remain open to worshippers, and less than 25 percent of the clergy are outside prison walls Total manpower losses since 1940 amount to roughly 1,000,000 people—one-third of the entire population. Columns of prisoners are being driven to Siberia every month, and series of mass deportations follow every drive for collectivization But the spirit of freedom survives among the outraged population, and resistance continues.

I am proud to note that the United States did not abandon the Lithuanian people. The legation and consulates of Lithuania are open in this country, and our country never recognized the annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, never recognized the fruits of Nazi-Soviet conspiracy in aggression, in spite of the many temptations of exigency. Among the thousands of victims of aggression and war admitted to this country under the displaced-persons program, about 18,000 Lithuanians were already admitted to the United States to seek a new life in freedom And I am also proud to note that the Lithuanian people did not abandon the United States; they continue to fight for freedom, with the Atlantic Charter on their lips and in their hearts. Their hopes of ultimate liberation are reposed in the success of American leadership in bringing the maddened world back to its senses, in disintegrating the totalitarian conspiracy at world domination, and in rolling the iron curtain back into forgotten nightmare.

They should be encouraged by the fact that the State Department had requested appropriations for the next budgetary year to expand the Voice of America facilities by including broadcasts in the Lithuanian language I am confident that the requested appropriations will be granted by Congress.

I pay this well-deserved tribute to the valiant Lithuanian people, and I express the fervent hope that their suffering and tribulations will end in their ultimate reclamation of liberty and independence as one of the family of sovereign nations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me in regard to the thirty-second anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the world can well afford to stop and recall today that the people of Lithuania won their independence from Russia on February 16, 1918, 32 years ago.

It is one of the tragedies of our times that the liberty achieved by the Lithuanians was brutally taken from them again on June 15, 1940, when the Soviet Union took over Lithuania by force of arms The Soviet commissars seized the small Baltic republics without regard to their solemn pledges to respect the sovereignty of Lithuania and the neighboring Baltic States of Estonia and Latvia

For the past 9 years the sons and daughters of Lithuania have dedicated this anniversary to expressions of their determination to regain the freedom Lithuania lost in the Second World War.

Every Member of the Senate knows that the United States of America will never waver in its determination to see that all people have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live. That feeling among Americans is as strong today as it was on July 23, 1940, when our Government protested against Soviet plans to draw the Lithuanian people into the Soviet Union by the mockery of a Communist election.

The principle of freedom for all peoples was emphasized time and again by the United States and by Russia in the proclamations issued during the war and after the postwar conferences.

The Soviet Union has violated its pledges. The United States has lived up to its promises We have never for one second recognized the right of the Soviet Union to absorb the Republics of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. Where it has been physically possible, we have given direct aid to free people struggling to maintain their liberty.

The proof of our determination to halt communism and to liberate captive peoples shows very clearly in the great program for world recovery which we have launched.

We have tirelessly worked for peace at the council table of the United Nations, and we shall increase our efforts to attain world progress through that great international organization. We have answered the threat of Communist penetration in Europe with the Marshall plan, which has renewed the economic life of western European nations. We have united with the democratic countries in the Atlantic Pact to make it absolutely clear to any aggressor that an attack against one of the Atlantic nations will be regarded as an attack against them all. We are backing up this pact with the most powerful weapons the world has ever known.

We have stopped the march of world communism in Berlin, in Greece, in Turkey, and

in Korea. We have opened our doors to homeless people from the Baltic States and other countries which have suffered under the heavy hand of dictatorship. We are going to liberalize our displaced persons law in the near future.

However, we must have no illusions. This fight to win freedom for all the captive peoples of the world may take a long time. We must strive constantly and patiently to convince the people of Russia and all other Communist-dominated nations that the fear-inspired aggressiveness of their leaders can only end in their destruction. Through an amplified voice of America and other methods, we shall expose to the Russian people the reckless follies of their leaders.

Our steady pressure for peace must be accompanied by political, economic, and military alertness to convince Communist leaders that attempts at ruthless expansion are not worth the risk to them.

Then slowly but surely Communist leaders will be compelled to recognize the futility of their global dreams. Then one day the people of Lithuania and all other nations now in bondage will be able to live out their lives in peace on their own free soil.

THE COAL CRISIS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the coal crisis which now grips our Nation, a crisis which not only affects America's health but which affects industry and agriculture as well. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA DEMANDS END TO COAL CRISIS—THE PUBLIC WELFARE HAS BEEN CRUCIFIED TIME AND AGAIN—LABOR LAW MUST BE STRENGTHENED

"When is the White House going to take decisive action to end these repeated coal crises?"

This is the question which has come to me in hundreds of telegrams and letters from all over Wisconsin. Like my colleagues, I have heard from citizens and public officials alike rightly demanding an end to John L. Lewis' repeated outrages against the public welfare.

So I, too, ask this question of the President of the United States, of the Democratic administration, and the Democratic Party:

"When will you take decisive action to show John L. Lewis that it is the Federal Government which decides national policy rather than John L. Lewis or any other single tyrant in a labor union?"

The welfare of 150,000,000 Americans has been crucified time and again by these repeated coal stoppages. There is complete demoralization in the coal industry because John L. Lewis' arbitrary strikes have become as "certain as death and taxes," as old Ben Franklin used to say. The Democratic Party stands guilty of the worst blundering in the history of the United States labor relations. If the present strike continues, the American economy may be dealt a blow from which it will take years to recover, if at all.

MY REPEATED APPEALS TO WHITE HOUSE

I, for one, have taken up appeals for action on literally dozens of occasions with the White House, with the National Labor Relations Board, with the Solid Fuels Administration, and with every other Federal source involved in this question.

However, my repeated appeals to the President, like the appeals which have been made by other Senators and Representatives, have been ignored. My insistence on a stronger labor law has not been heeded. Time after time, dating all the way back to 1939, I have demanded on the Senate floor that we once and for all strengthen the national labor relations statute. I have introduced legislation for that objective. But the Democratic majority in Congress, instead of allowing the labor statute to be strengthened, has absurdly insisted on repealing it.

OUR THREE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. President, our Government is based on three separate and coequal branches—legislative, executive, and judicial. We in Congress can only pass laws. The President must enforce them. We in the Senate and House have no constitutional powers to enforce laws. That is the job of the President, and it is a job in which he has miserably failed.

PRESIDENT HAS MADE MOCKERY OF TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Had the President acted earlier in invoking the provisions of the law which Congress gave him, our Nation could have been spared the present crisis. Instead, he chose to delay and delay and delay.

At long last he appointed a three-man fact-finding board and gave it 7 days to report—a mere 7 days, although the Steel Board had been given 57 days for a comprehensive fact-finding job. What a mockery of real fact-finding to have stalled so long and then rushed in so late with appointment of the board. Obviously time is running out. Speed is now essential. But time is running out because the President himself delayed action for so long. Now the mine union criticizes the board because obviously insufficient time was available for its hurried work.

SUMMARY OF PRESENT CRISIS

Now, let us summarize the situation, as follows:

1. The President has, at long last, grudgingly invoked the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. I personally had pleaded with him, as did my colleagues, to take action many, many weeks ago, but he has only just come around to taking action at this late date. Even now, the 400,000 miners refuse to go back to work, and the Federal injunction is not applied to them as individuals. So what does the Chief Executive now do? He tries to wash his hands of the situation.

2. The President has, in effect, confessed that the Taft-Hartley law, far from being a slave-labor law (as has been ridiculously charged) is essential to protect the national welfare against a key stoppage such as this. Thus, too, the Democrats are swallowing and gagging on their own false words. For years, they have misrepresented the Taft-Hartley law. Now, they admit it is essential that the Government possess a law such as this to defend its very life.

VOTERS WILL NOT FORGET DEMOCRATIC DOUBLE-DEALING

3. The Democratic majority stands accused of permitting one man again and again and again to paralyze the Nation at will. The people of Wisconsin, like people all over the country, will not forget this fact. They will remember when they go to the polls next November that the Democratic administration has coddled and pampered the labor tyrants and has encouraged them to crucify the public welfare, in addition to impoverishing the families of laboring men themselves.

THIS STRIKE SITUATION CAN PROVE THE WORST BOOMERANG AGAINST THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN ITS HISTORY

4. The people will remember that the Republican minority in Congress has been fighting to preserve the Taft-Hartley law and to strengthen it. Obviously, the Taft-Hartley law needs more teeth against those who defy it or who continue crippling strikes once a Taft-Hartley injunction has run out.

5. The people of Wisconsin and of all America will remember that we sympathize, of course, with the difficulties experienced by American miners. We appreciate the problems that they are up against. We know that coal mining is a difficult, dangerous occupation. But we know, too, that it is the miners and their stricken families who have suffered most from these repeated and oftentimes unnecessary strikes.

COAL DEALERS HAVE BEEN BADLY HURT

6. We know, too, that coal dealers throughout the Nation have suffered tremendously because of these repeated stoppages. Coal dealers face competition from other sellers of different types of fuel. Coal dealers, by and large, small-business men, making a comparatively small income, cannot possibly stand to have their economic throats cut once a year by John L. Lewis' stoppages.

QUOTATIONS FROM WISCONSIN MESSAGES TO SENATOR WILEY

I could quote now from literally dozens of messages received from coal companies, from lumber firms which sell coal, from municipal officials, from State officials, appealing to the administration to take action. I have in my hand a message which was sent by the Wisconsin coal bureau, of which Mr. Roch P. Botsch is president and Mr. W. F. Ehmann is manager. This bureau sent a telegram to the President way back on January 24.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this message be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that it be followed by excerpts from several other letters and telegrams which have come to me from Wisconsin. These excerpts could be supplemented by literally hundreds of others from all over my State. These messages have endorsed my fight for a stronger labor statute.

DEMOCRATS DID NOTHING WHILE CITIZENS SHIVERED

No, Mr President, the people of the United States will not forget that the Democratic administration, the Democratic Party, and the Democratic President stood by with folded hands while the Nation has shivered and frozen in the biting cold of winter and while unemployment has spread. The people will not forget when they go to the polls that the administration, which pretends to be the farmer's friend, has allowed dairy plants to be closed down because of the shortage of coal. They will not forget that hundreds and literally thousands of industrial plants in Wisconsin and elsewhere are closing, in addition to railroad schedules being interrupted. The people of America will not forget this crucifixion of their rights.

No one gloats over the fact that the Democratic Party will be smashed by the anger of the American people because of this coal crisis for which the Democrats are responsible. This crisis is too big for partisan politics. But let the President be aware of the potential fate of his party and, what is more important, the terrible results to the American people if the present strike continues.

EXCERPTS FROM WISCONSIN MESSAGES

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 24, 1950.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Coal dock inventory running dangerously low on West Bank Lake Michigan docks. Survey shows less than half the amount of coal on hand as compared with same date last year. In order to take care of needs of the area more than a million tons must be shipped all rail directly from mines during the balance of the burning season to offset this shortage. To accomplish this, mines will have to go on a 5-day production basis at once. Some grades of coal are in such critical supply that industries requiring this type of coal will be compelled to shut down. Cheese factories, milk and food processing plants will be the first to be affected. Shortages of domestic sizes are extremely acute. Hardships and suffering have only been prevented because of mild weather. Seasonal

weather would bring disastrous results. We implore you to use your authority to get full production at the mines at once.

WISCONSIN COAL BUREAU, INC.,
ROCH P. BOTSCH, *President.*

From Appleton, Wis.:

"We supply Appleton's hospital, mental hospital and old people's home, etc., besides many homes and other industries. We are almost out of coal. Temperatures below zero all this week. Need coal immediately."

From Watertown, Wis.:

"A survey just completed in Watertown, Wis., discloses coal supplies on hand to care for not more than 2 weeks' need. Our situation is approaching a critical position. Respectfully urge you to use all authority at your command to prevent suffering in this city which may arise from inadequate fuel supplies."

From Madison, Wis.:

"The coal shortage at our dairy processing plants in Wisconsin is very serious and alarming. We have 9 days' supply on hand after which if no coal is received the daily milk production from our Wisconsin farmers will probably go by the sewer route. Yesterday I wired the President. If there is anything you can do within your power, do it. The Wisconsin farmers and dairy processing plants never needed your help as much as is needed now. Please act."

From Wisconsin Dells, Wis.:

"It is very unfortunate that we have a President who can think of nothing but politics and who has no consideration for the general welfare of the people. I believe it is high time that we find out whether one man can shut down the commerce of the United States whenever it suits his own whim."

MARKETING QUOTAS ON POTATOES—AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I introduce and send to the desk a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. This bill deals with marketing quotas on potatoes. In view of the importance of this bill, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD, and also appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3049) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LUCAS, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after part VI of subtitle B thereof the following new part:

"PART VII—MARKETING QUOTAS—POTATOES

"LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS

"SEC. 360. (a) Potatoes are a basic source of food for the Nation and are produced throughout the United States on nearly 2,000,000 farms. The production and marketing of the commodity provide employment for a large number of people and are of national interest. Potatoes are marketed on a Nation-wide market and, owing to causes beyond their control, farmers producing the commodity and persons engaged in the marketing thereof are unable to regulate effectively the orderly marketing of the commodity.

"The marketing of abnormally excessive and abnormally deficient supplies of potatoes acutely and directly affects, burdens, and obstructs interstate and foreign commerce. Abnormally excessive supplies overtax the facilities of interstate and foreign transportation, congest terminal markets, depress the price of potatoes in interstate and foreign commerce, and otherwise disrupt the orderly marketing of such commodity in such commerce. Such surpluses also result in disastrously low prices of potatoes to producers, destroy the purchasing power of such producers for industrial products, and reduce the value of the agricultural assets supporting the national credit structure. Abnormally deficient supplies result in an inadequate flow of potatoes and potato products in interstate and foreign commerce with accompanying injurious effects to the instrumentalities of such commerce and with excessive increases in the price of potatoes and potato products in interstate and foreign commerce. Such shortages also result in unreasonably high prices for potatoes and potato products to consumers and the loss of market outlets for potato producers.

"It is in the interest of the general welfare that interstate and foreign commerce in potatoes and potato products be protected from such burdensome surpluses and distressing shortages, and that potatoes be made available in adequate volume to meet domestic consumption and export requirements without impairing or wasting the soil resources of the country.

"The entire production of potatoes is available for marketing in interstate and foreign commerce. All marketing of potatoes is either in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or directly burdens, obstructs, or affects such commerce. The marketing of that portion of such commodity which enters directly into the current of interstate and foreign commerce cannot be effectively regulated without extending the regulation, in the manner provided in this part, also to that portion which is consumed within the State of production.

"NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA

"(b) Whenever the Secretary determines that the total supply of potatoes for the next marketing year will, in the absence of a marketing-quota program, likely exceed the estimated requirements for domestic consumption and export for such marketing year by such amount as will make a marketing-quota program necessary to effectuate the declared policy of this act, the Secretary shall proclaim a national marketing quota for the crop of potatoes available for marketing in such marketing year. The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of such national marketing quota in terms of the total quantity of potatoes required, together with the estimated imports, to make available a supply equal to the estimated requirements for domestic consumption and export for the marketing year for such crop. Such proclamation shall be made not later than September 1 immediately preceding the crop year for the crop for which the quota is proclaimed.

"REFERENDUM

"(c) Within 60 days following the issuance of the proclamation provided for in subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum, by secret ballot, of farmers who would be subject to farm-marketing quotas to determine whether such farmers are in favor of or opposed to the quota so proclaimed. If more than one-third of the farmers voting in the referendum oppose the national marketing quota, such quota shall become ineffective upon proclamation of the results of the referendum. In lieu of the question whether such farmers favor the national marketing quota so proclaimed, the Secretary may submit in the referendum the questions whether they (1) favor such quota for the one crop and also favor quotas for the three crops beginning with the crop for which such quota is proclaimed, (2) oppose quotas for such three crops but favor quotas for the crop for which such quota is proclaimed, or (3) oppose quotas for both the one crop and such three crops. If two-thirds or more of the farmers voting favor quotas for the three crops, no referendum shall be held for the second and third crops and a national marketing quota shall be in effect for each of such three crops for which a national marketing quota is proclaimed under subsection (b) of this section. If more than one-third of the farmers voting in the referendum oppose quotas, such result shall not affect or limit the proclamation and submission to a referendum in any calendar year, as otherwise provided in this subsection, of a national marketing quota for any subsequent crop. The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder within 30 days after the date of such referendum.

"APPORTIONMENT OF NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA

"(d) (1) The national marketing quota for potatoes, less the quantity set aside for apportionment under paragraph (5) of this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of the production of potatoes in each State during the five calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which such quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are deemed necessary for abnormal conditions affecting production and for trends in marketings or production: *Provided*, That the Secretary may, if separate data are available, establish production areas in any State and the term 'State' as used in this section shall be deemed to include any such production area.

"(2) The State marketing quota, less the quantity set aside for apportionment under paragraph (4) of this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among counties in the State on the basis of the production of potatoes in the county during the five calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are deemed necessary for abnormal conditions affecting production and for trends in marketings or production.

"(3) The Secretary shall provide for the apportionment of the county marketing quota among farms on the basis of one or more, as the Secretary determines may best effectuate the purposes of this act, of the following factors: Past marketing, production, or acreage of potatoes, taking into consideration the marketing quotas, acreage allotments, or production goals previously established for the farm; land, labor, and equipment available for the production, storage, and marketing of potatoes; abnormal conditions affecting production; and crop-rotation practices.

"(4) The Secretary shall provide for the apportionment of not in excess of 5 percent of the State marketing quota among farms on which potatoes are to be produced during the crop year for which the quotas are established but on which potatoes were not produced during any one of the immediately preceding 3 years on the basis of land, labor, and equipment available for the production, storage, and marketing of potatoes; crop-rotation practices; and the past potato-producing experience of the producers on the farm.

"(5) The Secretary shall provide for the apportionment of not in excess of one-half of 1 percent of the national marketing quota among farms eligible for a quota under paragraph (4) of this subsection which are situated in States in which the amount reserved under paragraph (4) is inadequate to provide fair and reasonable quotas for such farms on the basis of the factors set forth in paragraph (4) of this subsection.

"ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Secretary, on the basis of the estimated yield per acre of potatoes for

the State for the crop for which the national marketing quota is established, may convert the State marketing quotas, including that portion reserved under subsection (d) (4) of this section, into State acreage allotments and apportion the same among counties and farms in the States on the basis of the applicable factors set forth in subsections (d) (2), (d) (3), and (d) (4) of this section. The Secretary may also, on the basis of the estimated yield per acre of potatoes for the State or county, convert into an acreage allotment the amount reserved from the national marketing quota pursuant to the provisions of subsection (d) (5) of this section, and allot the same among farms as provided in that subsection.

"PERSONAL HISTORY

"(f) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, in any State, county, or other administrative area in which the Secretary determines that a substantial portion of the production of potatoes is carried on by persons who normally produce the commodity on different farms from one year to the next, the Secretary, in providing for the establishment of marketing quotas or acreage allotments for farms in such State, county, or area, shall consider the past acreage or marketings of potatoes by such persons, in addition to the other factors required to be considered.

"AMOUNT OF FARM MARKETING QUOTA

"(g) (1) If farm marketing quotas are established for potatoes without acreage allotments, the farm marketing quota for any crop shall be the smaller of the number of commodity units established as the farm marketing quota or the actual production of potatoes on the farm.

"(2) If farm acreage allotments are established for potatoes, the farm marketing quota for any crop shall be the actual production of potatoes on the farm less the normal production of the acreage planted to potatoes on the farm in excess of the farm acreage allotment. The normal production from such excess acreage shall be known as the 'farm marketing excess': *Provided*, That the farm marketing excess shall not be larger than the amount by which the actual production of potatoes on the farm exceeds the normal production of the farm acreage allotment, if the producer establishes such actual production to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

"(3) No farm marketing quota shall be applicable to any crop of potatoes on any noncommercial potato farm.

"PENALTIES

"(h) (1) Whenever farm marketing quotas are in effect with respect to any crop of potatoes, the farm marketing excess, or the marketing of potatoes in excess of the farm marketing quota, shall be subject to a penalty at a rate per unit equal to 50 percent of the parity price per unit for potatoes as of October 15 immediately preceding the crop year in which such potatoes are produced.

"(2) If a farm marketing excess is established for potatoes, such excess shall be regarded as available for marketing and the amount of penalty and the amount of potatoes to be disposed of pursuant to this subsection to postpone or avoid payment of the penalty shall be computed upon the normal production of the acreage on the farm planted to potatoes in excess of the farm acreage allotment. If a downward adjustment in the amount of the farm marketing excess is made pursuant to the proviso in subsection (g) (2) of this section, the difference between the amount of the penalty or the quantity to be disposed of as directed by the Secretary computed upon the farm marketing excess before such adjustment and as computed upon the adjusted farm marketing excess shall be returned to or allowed the producer.

"(3) The producer shall be liable for the payment of the penalty provided herein and the person in the United States to whom the potatoes are marketed by the producer shall be liable for the collection of the penalty, the amount of which may be deducted from the price paid to the producer. The person liable for the collection of the penalty shall, upon failure to collect such penalty, be jointly and severally liable with the producer for the payment of the penalty. The person liable for payment or collection of the penalty shall be liable also for interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the penalty becomes due until the date of payment of such penalty.

"(4) The penalty on the farm marketing excess of potatoes may be postponed or avoided by disposing of such excess in such manner not inconsistent with the purposes of this act as the Secretary shall prescribe, including, in the discretion of the Secretary, delivery to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other agency within the Department. The Secretary shall issue regulations governing such disposition, and, unless otherwise specified by the Secretary therein, any quantity of potatoes disposed of shall be of those types and grades which are representative of the entire crop produced on the farm. Upon failure to dispose of the farm marketing excess within such time as may be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, the penalty on such excess shall be due and payable. Any potatoes delivered to any agency of the Department pursuant to this paragraph shall become the property of the agency to which delivered and shall be disposed of at the direction of the Secretary in a manner not inconsistent with the purposes of this act.

"(5) Until the penalty on the farm marketing excess is paid, all potatoes produced on the farm and marketed by the producer shall be subject to the penalty provided by this subsection and a lien on the entire crop of potatoes produced on the farm shall be in effect in favor of the United States for the amount of the penalty.

"ADJUSTMENT AND TERMINATION

"(i) Nothwithstanding any other provision of this section—

"(1) the Secretary is authorized in the proclamation of a national marketing quota for potatoes to announce that, if the quota is approved, farm allotments established for potatoes shall be tentative allotments. If the Secretary determines with respect to any crop of potatoes for which a marketing quota is approved in the producer referendum that the supply, either actual or prospective, of potatoes available for marketing from such crop in any producing area or areas during any period of time is depressing or is likely to depress the farm price for potatoes to such an extent as will substantially impair the effectuation of the purposes of this act with respect to potatoes, the Secretary is authorized to reduce the acreage allotments established for all farms in the area or areas concerned by such uniform percentage not in excess of 20 percent as he determines is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act with respect to potatoes.

"(2) if at any time the Secretary has reason to believe that farm-marketing quotas in effect for potatoes will cause the amount of potatoes which is free of marketing restrictions to be less than the normal supply for the marketing year then current, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made with respect thereto. If on the basis of such investigation the Secretary finds the existence of such fact, he shall proclaim the same forthwith and shall specify such increase in, or termination of, existing quotas as he finds necessary to make the amount of potatoes which is free of marketing restrictions equal the normal supply.

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act or any other law or action taken pursuant thereto—

"(1) farm-marketing quotas shall, unless disapproved in the referendum held as hereinafter provided, be in effect for 1950 crop potatoes planted after the enactment of this part VII; and the farm-acreage allotments established for the purpose of eligibility for price-support operations for 1950 crop potatoes shall be the farm-acreage allotments for the purpose of such farm-marketing quotas;

"(2) any farmer who is dissatisfied with his farm-acreage allotment shall be entitled to have such allotment reviewed pursuant to the provisions of this act upon application made within 15 days after the enactment of this part VII.

"(3) within 45 days after the enactment of this part VII, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum among farmers who would be subject to farm marketing quotas for 1950 crop potatoes to determine whether such farmers are in favor of or opposed to such quotas. If more than one-third of the farmers voting in such referendum oppose such quotas, such quotas shall become ineffective upon proclamation of the results of such referendum, and no price-support operations shall be carried out for potatoes which would have been subject hereunder to such quotas. This disapproval of such marketing quotas shall not affect the right of eligible producers to price support for 1950 crop potatoes planted prior to the enactment of this part VII."

SEC. 7. Subsection (b) of section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (7) is amended by adding thereto the following: " 'Marketing year' for potatoes means any period determined by the Secretary during which substantially all of the crop of potatoes is normally marketed by the producers thereof."

(b) Paragraph (10) is amended by adding a new subparagraph (D) as follows:

"(D) 'Normal supply' of potatoes for any marketing year shall be (i) the estimated domestic consumption for the marketing year for which such normal supply is being determined, plus (ii) the estimated exports of the commodity for such marketing year, adjusted for surplus or deficiencies caused by abnormal conditions, changes in marketing conditions, or the operation of any agricultural program In determining normal supply, the Secretary shall make such adjustments for current trends in consumption and for unusual conditions as he deems necessary."

(c) Paragraph (13) is amended by adding a new subparagraph (F) as follows:

"(F) 'Normal yield' for any farm in the case of potatoes shall be the average yield per acre for the farm during the three crop years immediately preceding the year in which such normal yield is determined, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions, for trends in yields, and for changes in cultural practices. If for any such year the data are not available or there is no actual yield, then the normal yield for the farm shall be appraised in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, taking into consideration abnormal weather conditions, the normal yield for the county (determined in the same manner as provided for the farm), and the yield in years for which data are available."

(d) Paragraph (16) is amended by adding a new subparagraph (D) as follows:

"(D) 'Total supply' of potatoes for any marketing year shall be the estimated production of potatoes in the United States during the crop year in which such marketing year begins, plus the estimated imports of potatoes into the United States during such marketing year."

(e) New paragraphs are added as follows:

"(17) 'Potatoes' means all varieties of Irish potatoes or any regional or market classification, type, or grade thereon.

"(18) 'Crop year' in the case of potatoes means the period from December 1 of one calendar year to November 30 of the following calendar year.

"(19) 'Commercial farm' in the case of potatoes means any farm planting three or more acres of potatoes, or such smaller acreage of potatoes as the Secretary determines to constitute the production of potatoes primarily for commercial purposes."

SEC. 8. Sections 2, 301 (b) (1) (B), 301 (b) (6) (A), 301 (b) (9), 361, 371 (b), 373 (b), 374 (a), 375 (a), and the first sentence of section 373 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall be deemed to include potatoes in addition to the agricultural commodities specified therein.

SEC 9. Section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding a new subsection (d) reading as follows:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, (1) if producers have disapproved marketing quotas proclaimed for any crop of potatoes, no price-support operations shall be undertaken for such crop; and if marketing quotas are approved for any crop of potatoes, price-support operations shall be limited to potatoes which may be marketed without penalty; (2) the Secretary may also require that appropriate marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, be in effect for potatoes in applicable regional, production, or marketing areas prescribed by the Secretary as a condition to undertaking price-support operations for any crop of potatoes or for the potatoes produced in any such regional, production, or marketing area, and (3) the Secretary may limit price-support operations to potatoes which, under the terms of such marketing orders, or under marketing practices prescribed pursuant to section 401 (c) of this act, may be marketed or transported in the normal channels of domestic commerce "

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to detain the Senate for a few moments to discuss what I believe all Senators, and the people of the country as well, recognize as a very important problem.

At the present time, we have an agricultural program which has been in existence for a great number of years. On the whole, that program has worked successfully, especially with respect to what are known in the act as the basic commodities. When we speak of the basic agricultural commodities, we are speaking primarily of crops which are controlled through marketing quotas and acreage allotments.

One of the nonbasic crops which has had no marketing quotas is the crop of potatoes. Everyone knows that as a result of the failure of Congress to enact rigid controls with respect to marketing agreements and marketing quotas for potatoes, the Treasury of the United States has been compelled to expend many million dollars of the taxpayers' money.

The situation is so acute, and the psychological effect of the present potato program upon the entire farm program is so great, that I believe it advisable for Congress to act vigorously and firmly.

This morning the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is chairman, by a vote of 6 to 2, added the following amendment to the so-called cotton allotment acreage bill:

No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this act, unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

Mr. President, a number of Senators, commenting upon this amendment, have said that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have approved an extremely drastic proposal this morning. The Senator from Illinois agrees it is a drastic proposal, but the time has come when the Congress of the United States must take drastic action in order to clear up the potato problem.

The amendment, if adopted by the Congress, will tell the potato growers that they cannot expect further support prices until effective and rigid controls are enacted by the Congress. So, in order that they may know exactly what we have in mind, I have just introduced a bill, which will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with a view of the committee holding immediate hearings, in order that not only the potato farmers but also the consumers, the Department of Agriculture, and all others interested in the problem may have an opportunity to present testimony.

Mr. President, I am proposing a measure that will at long last give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority he needs to administer a proper price support program for potatoes. The bill I have introduced, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, would deal with potato production much in the same way as we now handle the basic commodities. The Secretary would have authority to set marketing quotas and to exact rigid penalties from those producers who exceed their quotas.

These changes in the law would apply to that part of the 1950 crop of potatoes which is planted after the enactment of my bill. I recognize that, since a fraction of the 1950 potato crop has already been planted, the restrictive provisions of these amendments will not apply equally to all potato producers. At this date, however, only about 10 percent of the 1950 crop has been planted and, if these changes are enacted promptly, they will cover all but a very small part of the 1950 crop.

Also, Mr. President, if the amendment which was approved by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this morning is adopted immediately by the Congress, it will take care of the 1950 crop, with the exception of about 10 percent, which is already in the ground. I may say parenthetically that the 10 percent of the crop of potatoes which is already in the ground represents potatoes which seldom rely upon price support. As a general rule, they are a special brand of potatoes which really bring more in the open market than the supported price.

The time has come when Congress must unequivocally face the problem of potato surpluses and promptly enact a sound and practical price-support program. Simply because a small portion of the 1950 crop has been planted should not dissuade us from taking action now toward correcting this problem which is growing more critical each successive year. The cost of supporting the 1948 and 1949 crops of potatoes will run around $325,000,000. We cannot afford another costly year. Bringing the 1950 crop under proper restrictions, as a conservative estimate, will save the taxpayers at least $50,000,000.

These changes in the Agricultural Act which I am recommending will not only bring the 1950 crop under effective supervision but will also enable the Secretary of Agriculture to set up a permanent workable program for future crops.

The hopeless inadequacies of our present laws have been clearly brought home to us over and over again. It cost the taxpayers $224,000,000 to support the 1948 crop of potatoes. The 1949 crop will cost the Government close to $100,000,000. In the 7 years potato price supports have been in operation the program has cost the taxpayers close to one-half billion dollars. Mr. President, when the figures are analyzed, it will be seen that the taxpayers have been compelled to pay $500,000,000 in the period of the last 7 years for the supporting of potato prices alone. It is time for the Congress to take the kind of drastic action necessary to prevent a continuation of these unholy and unjustifiable subsidies under the potato program.

The laws under which the Secretary today must administer the potato-support program are substantially the same as those which were in force during the war. The only difference is the level of support. Any impartial judgment must lead to the conclusion that the laws which were adequate during the war are wholly ineffectual and ill-adapted to the postwar potato industry. This fact is conclusively established by the record.

The total cost of the price-support program for potatoes during 3 years of war was less than $40,000,000. The total cost for the four postwar years will exceed $450,000,000.

Our present laws, while adequate during the war, are wholly unsuited today. The reason is clear.

Our objective during the war was to stimulate production. Price supports alone accomplished this: they rewarded those producers who would plant more potatoes. The Secretary today, however, cannot prevent the accumulation of surpluses by price supports alone, and that is virtually all we have as long as there are no penalties against exceeding acreage allotments.

The use of acreage allotments, with no means of enforcing them, rewards the noncooperating producer who exceeds his allotment and who then pours his potatoes upon the market at the Government-supported price. The price of potatoes must be supported in the market place. This is done by the Government purchasing potatoes grown by those producers who cooperate in confining their acreage to their allotment.

Since potatoes are perishable, they cannot be effectively stored as collateral for Government loans, as is done with the basic commodities. The alternative is for the Government to purchase the potatoes.

I should like to discuss for a moment the view which seems to be entertained by many people who are writing me about this subject. They appear to think that all the surplus potatoes, which belong to

the Government are stored in warehouses somewhere, and that all that needs to be done is to move in some boxcars, load the potatoes, and send them to charitable or eleemosynary organizations qualified to receive them under the amendment offered last year by the Senator from Oklahoma. But the truth of the matter is that practically all the surplus potatoes are in the cellars and basements of the farmers themselves. It is this fact that makes it difficult to distribute the surplus.

The number of bushels of potatoes the Government must purchase from the cooperating producers, and the price it must pay for them are pushed skyward by the noncooperating producers dumping millions of bushels on the market.

It is this overplanting and excessive marketing that must be corrected. It can be done only if the Secretary is empowered to set marketing quotas and to exact penalties from those who exceed them. Potatoes will then be brought under a workable program such as we now have for the basic commodities like tobacco and cotton.

Mr. President, unless the potato growers are willing to be placed under some kind of program, similar to the tobacco, corn, wheat, and cotton programs, they are not entitled to any support whatever.

The amendments which I have offered should attain this result: They would permit the Secretary to set up a national marketing quota in terms of bushels of potatoes. The question of accepting or rejecting this quota would be submitted to the producers by referendum. This national quota would be distributed among the States on the basis of the State's production over the last 5 years. The State's quota would then be broken down among counties and then among farms. In the case of the 1950 crop the referendum would be conducted within 45 days from the date of enactment.

The Secretary would have a choice, under my bill, of using quotas in terms of bushels alone, which I contend is the one sure way of stopping the overproduction of potatoes; that is, to allot them on the basis of bags or bushels, and not through the acreage system. Or, if he wishes, the Secretary may calculate the quota in terms of acres, and use acreage allotments. He can do either. In either case a producer who exceeds his quota or his acreage allotment could market the excess only upon paying a penalty for each bushel marketed. Such penalties should substantially take the profit out of the excess production of potatoes.

The Secretary of Agriculture in an official report stated that fewer producers yearly are cooperating in restricting their acreage to their allotments. With the profit taken out of this excess production there should be greater compliance and cooperation with the Department of Agriculture.

I want to emphasize particularly one provision contained in these amendments. It would empower the Secretary to establish better marketing practices in any production area without the necessity of first obtaining agreements with the producers, as is now the case.

Under these marketing practices, price supports would be limited to the commercially acceptable qualities and varieties. This would relieve the Government of the obligation to purchase at support prices inferior grades of potatoes. This alone would save many millions of dollars.

In other words, only those potatoes which come up to the standard, so far as size and grade are concerned, will be entitled to the support price. Potatoes left in the cellars on the farms will receive no support price, and the individual who attempts to place those potatoes on the market will suffer the penalties provided in the bill.

Furthermore, the Secretary has found it difficult to keep the potato program in bounds because of the steadily increasing yields per acre. Even with general compliance with acreage allotments there can be large surpluses as a result of stepped-up yields on the same number of acres. The yield per acre has increased more than 50 percent since the war. This has come about by closer planting, improved fertilizing, increased use of irrigation, and the planting on better lands. This steadily increasing yield makes acreage allotments by themselves inadequate as more potatoes are being grown on fewer acres. The potato producers who are using improved fertilizer, greater irrigation, and who are planting their rows closer together, potato on potato, practically, are the individuals who are destroying the confidence of the American people in the potato program.

I hold no brief whatsoever for the individual farmer who is constantly attempting to evade a fair and just law. The Congress of the United States enacted a law, providing price supports to keep the commodity at a decent level, and we find that some farmers are cultivating less acreage, but, at the same time, are increasing fertilization and planting potatoes closer together, and, in reality, raising more potatoes on a half acre of land than they formerly raised on an acre. Those are things which have been going on, which this bill intends to prevent and, at the same time, give the honest potato grower the benefit of the support program to which he is entitled.

The bill introduced by me deals with this problem by giving the Secretary the discretion of using quotas in terms of bushels rather than in terms of acres. If the Secretary, however, chooses to use acreage allotments he can cope with the problem of increasing yields by the authority given him by this bill to readjust acreage allotments by 20 percent when it becomes apparent that potato production under the original allotments will result in large surpluses.

So, either through the bushel check or through the 20-percent check, in my judgment, the bill will take care of the situation.

The American public is in favor of a sound farm program and favors one that includes proper supports for potatoes. The public recognizes also that stable farm prices are essential for the continued prosperity of our whole economy. However, the public will not stand very long for the continuation of a program which has ceased to have any relationship to a sound farm policy but which, in fact, is doing injury to our economy. I wish to emphasize as strongly as I can that if we permit such policies to continue the public may lose faith with a good part of our whole farm program.

The bill which I have proposed should be given serious and prompt consideration and acted upon without delay by the Senate. We cannot afford to permit our whole farm program to be discredited by following a policy which is completely ill-adapted to the problems of today.

Mr. President, I mean exactly what I say in that last statement. The farm program in my section of the country has worked well. The farmer in that locality is better off today than he has ever been in his history. Certainly the Congress of the United States will be realistic about this problem and will take steps to solve the potato question which threatens the whole farm program, including price supports for the basic commodities which have marketing quotas.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I congratulate the majority leader on the introduction of his bill and on the action taken this morning in announcing that price supports will be eliminated unless marketing quotas are provided. A hasty reading of the bill leads me to believe that it is similar to a bill which was introduced by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. I express the hope that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will call hearings upon his bill and the bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois and that we may move promptly to make marketing quotas possible for American farmers.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for his contribution. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] last year introduced a bill somewhat similar to the bill which I have introduced. There are some differences between them. The two bills can be considered together, and from the two, Mr. President, I am certain, in view of the able Members who constitute the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, all of whom are vitally interested in a sound farm program, we can develop a program which will take care of the potato situation. My purpose in introducing the bill was to do the very thing the Senator from New Mexico has suggested. I hope it will result in bringing about concrete action for the benefit of the potato growers themselves. I believe it will be possible to save approximately $50,000,000 this year on the potato program. That is extremely important, and that is the reason why I suggest we take drastic action, and in reality repeal the support program for potatoes; if Congress will go along with that kind of program, even though it be drastic, we can feel certain that we can enact the kind of legislation which will take care of the potato farmers and, at the same time, save the Treasury of the United States much money.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Illinois still has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader a question, if I may.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to take the floor away from any Senator, but I am very much interested in the bill which has been introduced relative to controls and marketing quotas. I am also interested in another phase of the question which the distinguished majority leader did not mention in his remarks. I am asking for information. Recently I read in a newspaper the statement that in the city of New Orleans a million pounds of potatoes which were imported from Canada were being sold in that market, and of course they received the benefit of the support price.

At the same time the Government is selling potatoes for 1 cent a hundred pounds in order to get rid of the surplus. I should like to ask this question: Has there been any extension of the agreement which was once made between our State Department and Canada and other nations which import potatoes relative to the quotas which the distinguished majority leader has mentioned? It is my understanding that there have been imported into the domestic market from other countries millions of pounds of potatoes which have had the benefit of the support price, and, if I am correctly informed, the Canadian farmers last year increased their acreage 10 percent while our farmers decreased their acreage 10 percent. Does the Senator have anything in mind along that line relative to restrictive legislation?

Mr. LUCAS. That question was not discussed in the committee. It is of importance, of course. It is my understanding that the potatoes which have gone into the market at New Orleans were shipped by water from Canada. Potatoes can be shipped from a port in Canada to New Orleans more cheaply than they can be shipped from Maine to Philadelphia.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. At the same time they were sold in direct competition with the American producer who was operating under the support price.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, no doubt, but it has nothing to do with the problem which is before us. The problem that we are concerned with here would exist whether there were potato imports or not.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I discussed this matter briefly with the distinguished minority leader a minute ago when he asked me the same question. I could not give him a very satisfactory answer. That particular matter came up at a hearing and was brought to the attention of the committee by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. There was an agreement between Canada and the United States limiting the quantity of potatoes which could be delivered to this country.

I regret to say that I do not recall when the agreement terminated, but it was some time during the year 1949. The Senator from Maine asked who had allowed it to lapse, and, so far as I know, the question was not answered, and I do not know who allowed it to lapse. I do think it is an important question and ultimately should be answered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico a question. Does he know whether the Secretary of Agriculture, or possibly the Secretary of State, has the authority or used the authority to terminate the agreements about which he is talking?

Mr. ANDERSON. I regret to say that I do not know. What I do know is that the Canadian Government has certain rights to export to the United States at a certain lower rate of duty potatoes which would ordinarily carry a higher rate of duty. Theoretically they could export a good many potatoes to this country, but the Department of State, working with the Department of Agriculture, negotiated an agreement with Canada whereby Canada would not export, in either 1948 and 1949, more than a certain number of potatoes. I understand that agreement has been terminated. I do not know whether it was terminated by its own limitations, or whether it was terminated at the request of the Canadian Government, or was terminated at the request of our Government. I merely say to the distinguished minority leader that that was a question the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] raised, and which was not answered. I think it is an important question to be answered, but I do not have the information, and I do not think any member of the Committee on Agriculture was furnished the information.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for the answer he has given me. I hope the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may propound that question, in discussing and considering proposed legislation.

I should like to ask another question of the Senator from New Mexico. Realizing that the distinguished Senator has been Secretary of Agriculture, and has had wide experience, does he feel that the importation of potatoes from other countries has had an impact upon the domestic market, or does he feel that such importation is a minor question at this time?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it has a very great impact on the American market. I am not an economist, as the Senator knows, but distinguished economists who have been consulted by the Department of Agriculture have worked out estimates as to what happens when there is a surplus. If there is a surplus of 5 percent, it does not result in the price dropping 5 percent, ordinarily it may drop 10 percent, or if there is a surplus of 10 or 20 percent, it might result in a drop of 50 percent. Every time there are a few more bushels, it disturbs a market which is already in trouble. When there was demand for the product in this country slight importations were insignificant, but when, as this year, there is a surplus of potatoes, any aggravation of it is many times more effective than in ordinary periods

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether or not acreage limitations have been imposed on the farmers in the importing countries, whether their acreage has been increased or decreased, or if they are controlled in any way whatsoever in producing potatoes?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not definitely informed as to the potato situation in Canada, but my understanding is that the farmers there have had increased acreage, and have no restrictions upon it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am interested in the bill which has been introduced by the distinguished majority leader, because many potatoes are grown in Nebraska, and there is a problem there.

I should like to propound another question to the distinguished former Secretary of Agriculture. Does he feel that under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture does have the authority to put into effect marketing agreements which would accomplish the purpose which the majority leader is seeking through the bill he has introduced?

Mr. ANDERSON. In reply to the distinguished minority leader I should like to say that under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to put into effect marketing agreements. However, in my opinion marketing agreements would not accomplish so much as would be accomplished by the legislation proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Agricultural Committee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], or by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. In my opinion it is necessary to put into effect marketing quotas, in order to maintain a completely effective program. I believe that the provision for marketing agreements provided in the Agricultural Act of 1948, and repeated in the Agricultural Act of 1949, would be somewhat effective, but I do not believe they would be completely effective. The principal reason why the program would not be completely effective is that marketing agreements work very well in industries in which the people who produce the goods want the agreements to work. An example of that is the citrus industry; the citrus growers want the program to work, and loyally cooperate to make it work. In the potato-growing industry most of the trouble is caused by the growers who are not interested in making the program work. Therefore, I believe that the legislation proposed by either of the distinguished Senators is necessary, and is the only way in which complete control can be had in the industry.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his statement, and I should like to ask the Senator this concluding question: If the Secretary of Agriculture had put into effect the marketing agreements to which the distinguished Senator has referred, would it

have solved the problem which now confronts us?

Mr. ANDERSON. In fairness to the Secretary of Agriculture it should be pointed out that he did state that in 1950 marketing agreements would be required. He is now trying to bring about control through marketing agreements, and I am sure that in 1950 he will do all he can, in the absence of any legislation, to make those marketing agreements effective. It is my opinion that the agreements will not be completely effective, and therefore that legislation is necessary.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the Secretary of Agriculture has gone as far as he can go, or could go with the legislative authority which he now has at hand, in order to accomplish the purpose?

Mr. ANDERSON. As far as he can go with the legislative authority he has at hand now.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Schuyler Otis Bland, late a Representative from the State of Virginia, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

A PLEA FOR WORLD DISARMAMENT

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate the kind suggestion of the minority leader that he would like to have a quorum call so that more Senators might be on the floor. However, they will have the opportunity of reading my remarks. I am making them more for the country at large, to be perfectly frank about it, than I am for the Senate, although I am not leaving out the Senate, by any means.

On January 28, 1946, 4 years ago, I introduced in the Senate a resolution requesting the President to invite all nations to a world disarmament conference aimed at abolishing all means of waging war, except a limited number of small arms, and providing for international inspection of all countries before disarmament, during disarmament, and after the disarmament takes place.

On March 18, 1947, I reintroduced this identical resolution. That was nearly 3 years ago.

On February 6, 1950, for the third time I have brought this same resolution before the Congress and the country.

At the time the resolution was first introduced, in 1946, it was but a few months after the close of World War II. At that time, the United States alone possessed the atomic bomb. Interest in the proposal, while encouraging, did not focus sufficient to compel action upon it.

In 1947, we still had sole possession of the atomic bomb. However, reports were widespread that other countries were considering ways and means of making it, so they might possess this weapon, too. Interest again was encouraging on the proposed resolution, and while increased over the year before, it was still not sufficiently focused to bring about adoption of the proposal.

This year, when I presented the same resolution, two new factors enter into the picture: (1) Russia now has the atomic bomb and the means of making more of them; (2) both countries are embarked upon the manufacture of the hydrogen bomb, which if successful would allegedly kill as many as 10,000,000 people with a single blast.

Thus, bombed out of our security and complacency, this proposal has now attracted not only widespread attention but growing and intensified support. It is too bad the original proposal was not acted upon when first offered. That was the most favorable time. Then friendly relations between ourselves and potential enemies were less strained. Then we alone had the bomb. Then we occupied, from almost every angle, unlimited advantages of incalculable worth at the bargaining table. That favorable moment was lost. It has as yet not gone beyond recall.

At some future date, the United States and Russia will each have the hydrogen bomb and the means of manufacturing more of them. This brings us face to face not with theory but with reality. Consequently, a tremendously accentuated interest is now evident in the proposal first offered 4 years ago.

Soon, very soon, people all over the world will know that before dawn a single bomb may wipe out the entire population of New York, or Philadelphia, or Chicago—or Paris, or Rome, or Brussels—or Moscow, or Petrograd, or Stalingrad.

But, Mr. President, the development of the first hydrogen bomb is not the end. It will not be the most decisive weapon mankind will ever construct. No sooner will the hydrogen bomb be a reality than a new bomb—the X-bomb—will be on its way. The new bomb will be to the H-bomb what the H-bomb is to the atom bomb. It will be many times more devastating than the hydrogen bomb which is now in the process of construction.

Nor will that be the end. No sooner will the new, more powerful bomb be perfected—which we may call the X-bomb—than a new means of mass destruction will occupy the minds of scientists and military men all over the world. Every nation able to do so will want to have a more devastating weapon than has any other nation. All history supports this. History demonstrates that the nations of the world, between wars and during wars, attempt to surpass all their rivals in the construction of more potent weapons.

Those who have had contact with the men who devised the atomic bomb know that with the creation of it the hydrogen bomb was inevitable. Similarly, men who have worked along with these scientists know that the H-bomb—the hydrogen bomb—is not the last of the great weapons.

Simultaneously with the building of the H-bomb—and later on, with the building of the more powerful X-bomb—and still later, with the construction of yet more powerful weapons, science and invention will search to find ways and means of more quickly and accurately delivering these great weapons on their intended targets.

Soon bigger planes carrying in themselves increased air defenses with greatly increased speed, capable of flying at higher altitudes will be in the skies. These new planes will carry scientific instruments which make the delivery of the bomb largely independent of human failings. Planes will be built that are more certain of hitting the desired spot in the enemy country than those which presently exist.

This is so elementary that I only outline this sequence to stimulate the imagination of those who, in the face of the gathering storm, have continued to look forward to a normal future and to lay normal plans.

With the building of the great bombs—the A, the H, and the X—other scientists and inventors will be delving into other mass-killing possibilities. There will be advances in bacteriological warfare and the means of transmitting a wide variety of communicable and contagious diseases to men, women, and children, domestic animals and plant life. These would be called into play in any war where the great bombs are used, because total destruction will be the objective of each belligerent in another great world war.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should prefer not to yield until I complete my statement. I appreciate the Senator's interest, but I should like to develop the subject in sequence, and then I shall be delighted to yield to any question the able Senator from Missouri may wish to ask.

There is more to tell but this should be sufficient to outline the case.

Thus, with the unfolding years, we may look ahead to the awesome possibility of the ultimate destruction of the civilization which mankind has been thousands of years creating. We may be nearing the end of the highway called the road of life, and drawing close to that sharp turn downward when it becomes the highway of death, not for just some millions of us, but for all of us. Last Sunday Prof. Albert Einstein, commenting on the H and future bombs, said that with their invention "annihilation of any life on earth is within the range of technical possibilities."

This is ultraexpert testimony. It cannot be brushed aside. It will not be rebutted by any of the other great scientists of our day. It supports, it dramatizes, and to all intents proves that another world war will mean the killing of not millions, but billions of men, women, and children on this planet.

That is the grim prospect. This is the stark reality of future warfare. The stores of giant explosives are being intensified and increased everywhere. An accidental spark or a deliberate act may touch off these unimaginably powerful weapons rapidly accumulating in the arsenal of world destruction.

At the moment, Mr. President, we live in the age of force. Recently we have seen its application in a great world war. Mighty Japan was brought to her knees. The towering military structure of Hit-

ler's army of yesteryear was annihilated. Much of Europe, particularly Germany, was made a desolate battleground and shambles. The death toll in that struggle was mountainous. It probably ran in excess of 15,000,000 persons.

That war was not confined to the battlefield. It was fought everywhere. No targets that impeded advance were spared. Each belligerent struck at its foes and the foes struck back wherever the slightest advantage could be obtained.

Men did not fight other men in uniform alone; they fought and overcame everything that stood in their way. They wrecked churches and cathedrals, factories and homes, palaces, and monuments—all, including noncombatants, were mowed down by the relentless scythe of modern war.

The wave of destruction reached its crest with the annihilation of the populations of two large Japanese cities. All the Allies approved this action, which, in each case, in a single second, wiped out the lives of 135,000 men, women, and children in Japan. The will to conquer completely and quickly was strong and recognized no barriers.

In that struggle the Americas were spared. In the future they can only be spared, if at all, if this Nation recognizes the clear peril—if we have the composite will, ability, and means, and make the sacrifices necessary to keep a new war from reaching us. Even though we keep it away from us, that may not save us. Dr. Einstein tells us that.

These grim facts of modern existence have filled our beings with emotions. They have crowded our minds with new ideas. There are literally scores of proposals offered. One group says our safety depends on the formation of an Atlantic Union. That, they say, will save us. But the radioactive air waves will not respect man-made treaties, Mr. President, if war eventually comes.

Another group wants world government, with an adequate police force. That, they say, will save us. Just how we are to avoid having two world governments is not made clear. It is obvious that the Russians and those allied with them will not enter a world government in which those allied with us predominate. Thus, there is likely to be two world governments, if this idea is put to the test.

If we have an Atlantic Union, we may then look for the creation of an eastern European-Asiatic Union.

Thus, if either of these two edifices are erected, the lines will be the same; the two great forces will sit opposite each other as they do now. If war comes, the same bombs and armaments will destroy civilization.

It is not my purpose to analyze in detail nor to embrace or oppose particularly these propositions today. In sum, all of them leave the world divided into two armed camps.

Thus in any case the world finds itself running feverishly, but running on a treadmill. There will be lots of motion but no progress. The dangers that caused these actions still remain to confront humanity. They are but realinements of the existing potential belligerents. The basic issues remain unchanged. Their motivation, to be charitable, is defense, not settlement or security. None of them, in my opinion, goes to the root of the matter.

Confronted with these varying proposals, the emotions and the thoughts of millions, the Secretary of State of our Nation has been looking at the modern world lately. On February 8, 1950, Mr. Acheson made some extemporaneous remarks upon the essentials of peace. He outlined the difficulties of achieving peace. In sum, his statements pointed to one single conclusion: that we and the other democratic nations of the world, on the one hand, and Russia and those associated with her, on the other, must sit and sweat it out.

All that the Secretary of State could hold before us was this: We must create strength everywhere in the world, that is, wherever we can. He said that if we do this, there is hope that the Russian people may reexamine their policy and change their point of view. Thus, he said, while we remain strong and steady and while we wait for the Russian people to reexamine themselves and their policies, the time may come when we can get an atmosphere of good will and establish a peace that will reconcile our various difficulties.

The Secretary of State may prove to be a prophet. He certainly is on firm ground when he says that for the time being we must remain strong, build up strength, and wait for an opportunity to achieve better things. I quote the Secretary of State, as follows:

> So I would like to conclude these remarks by stressing again that it is a good thing to examine our course, it is a good thing to look at every possibility which comes up. We must continue to do that; we must remember always that the road to peace is long and difficult in the world as it is today, but we must never waver in pursuing that goal. We must never for a moment doubt the possibility of achieving it.

That is where the Secretary holds the door a little ajar. I would be happier if he were to open it. From the Secretary's remarks it would seem that what the two great alinements of nations in the world are doing for the moment is playing checkers with each other. As we attempt to build up strength, certainly the Russians will attempt to build up strength. We are attempting to checkmate the Russian moves toward our king row. The Russians are attempting to checkmate our moves toward their king row. What the Secretary says is that it is his hope that eventually both sides will stop playing checkers.

The board on which Russia and ourselves are playing checkers is the volatile map of the world, peopled by 2,000,000,000 human beings. The checkers themselves are the great mass-killing weapons and the great armed might which each side is building up. Obviously, as the moves with such checkers take place, the danger of conflict with modern weapons increases. In this game of checkers, both sides are trying to occupy the same squares on the checkerboard. If at some point they quarrel over who rightfully should have this or that square, conflict ensues. That conflict will not be just starting another war. The truth is that in all probability in that war the slaughter will be many times as great as was the slaughter in all the other wars of human history combined. The ultimate prospect in such a war is that the wreckage—spiritual, economic, and financial—will be so strewn around the earth that, at best, the efforts throughout the ages to improve the lot of man will be set at naught. At worst, there will be nobody left to commence the rebuilding of civilization. Again Dr. Einstein is an outstanding supporting witness to this possibility.

To be more specific, if the Secretary believes "it is a good thing to look at every possibility that comes up," then I believe it is a good thing for him to try another roadway than the one he evidently has selected to travel. That roadway is to recognize the grim facts of life, the grim facts of future war, and having done that, to invite all the nations of the world to a world disarmament conference devoted exclusively to the purpose of world disarmament, with world-wide inspection before, during, and after such disarmament as is agreed upon.

It would appear to me that world disarmament—and this is what my senatorial friends who are here may be particularly interested in—would have many advantages to the Russians as well as to ourselves. I would assume that the Russian people, by and large, instead of working long hours and giving up a substantial part of their earnings to the waste of war and preparation for war, would rather spend this money for better homes, better clothing, better food, better living standards, and better opportunities. We certainly will want those things for ourselves, too.

I would likewise assume that the Russians might like world disarmament because Russia wants security for herself. It is plain that she opposes the building of a "cordon sanitaire" around her borders, just as the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic security alliance is our way of stopping Russia from building a "cordon sanitaire" around us.

I would assume that prior to any disarmament conference Russia would try to build up strong points all over the earth for her protection, just as our Secretary of State and our own country say we must continue to build up strong points all over the earth for our protection. The truth is that Russia's primary objective is security for Russia. Our primary objective is security for the United States. Each group constantly calls the other group wrong. Each side strives to show all mankind that the other fellow is a wicked villain, while he is the knight in shining armor. Evidently there must be in the world many people who think we in the United States are wrong. We know there are many who think Russia is wrong.

Thus the issue is clouded with propaganda, allegations, and recriminations on both sides. As I see this matter, what the world wants is a clarification of the issue. It wants to find out who has really good intentions and who has not. The

world wants a verdict not built on charges and countercharges but built on acts and on facts that are beyond reasonable dispute. The world wants a verdict, which must spring ultimately from the conscience of all mankind, as to which of the two great leaders, Russia or ourselves, is responsible for the arms race, for the constant threat of a total, incinerating war which will wreck all the pillars and bring down upon us all the whole edifice of civilization.

I believe we are willing, eager, and able to lay the case of the United States and our associates before the world's jury. We want peace. We are willing to work for peace. We propose that each side show his good faith to really obtain peace before the bar of world public opinion.

So if in good faith the President of the United States invites the heads of all nations of the world to a world disarmament conference devoted to that single subject, we would begin presenting our case to the world jury. We would tell all mankind that our country desires a real disarmament over the next several years, down to a limited number of light weapons for each country, sufficient only to keep internal peace and order.

That language is clear and understandable. It would be understood from Cape Horn to Point Barrow, from the Cape of Good Hope to the North Cape, and all the way around the Equator.

Thus, every man, woman, and child in the world will know sooner or later that this Nation is intent on achieving real peace, on bringing about real world disarmament, of course with proper safeguards, that the United States stands for a settlement of international disputes without recourse to the battlefield.

If Russia accepts this invitation in good faith progress will have been made and real achievement could follow.

If Russia refuses to accept our invitation, then everyone will know where the responsibility for the arms race really lies. The blame for the specter of the looming indescribable war can then be justly placed.

If the negotiations of the world disarmament conference are carried on openly, all will know who is acting in good faith and who is acting in bad faith, as the debate and negotiations unfold.

Whether the conference will succeed or fail, none can predict. The gloomy will say it is foredoomed to failure. The optimist will hold out hope of accomplishment. But whether or not it succeeds or fails, it will serve one wholesome purpose. That is, it will clear the atmosphere of the charges and countercharges, the pressure and the counterpressure, the moves and the countermoves, which are inherent in an unwillingness to face the real issue.

If the Russians refuse to accept the President's invitation, we shall find that out. If, having accepted it, they do not come with honest intent to achieve its purposes, we shall find that out.

In either of these contingencies, the world will know; and if Russia refuses to negotiate, then this Nation will gird itself to an extent commensurate with the real threat of attack upon us and the nations allied with us. We will have at last ended or at least mitigated the indecision in millions of minds as to who is wrong and what really is holding back the operation of the peace-making machinery of the world. Blame is likely to attach where blame is justified. Face-to-face dealing will have replaced the long-range, indirect maneuverings which have marked the last 3 years.

As I write this address, I have just been told that Mr. Winston Churchill, former premier of Great Britain, is reported to have said that if elected, he is considering pursuing a course of direct dealing with Russia to clear up this great international misunderstanding.

Now that Mr. Churchill wants a showdown on the great imponderable purposes, some of the cynics in our own country who hesitate to make a trial, saying it is no use, may soften their opposition at least a mite.

I commend Mr. Churchill's vision, his common sense and his courage. Evidently he is not satisfied just to sit and sweat it out.

Some may say that what is proposed is a superhuman effort. World disarmament is a superhuman effort but all the efforts in that direction are small in comparison with the efforts that all men, including ourselves, are making and must make to embrace our only other alternative—all-out defense for war.

I have previously pointed out what I believe are weak and impractical attempts to achieve security through atomic or hydrogen bomb control alone. I do not wish to cover this ground again today. In sum, I have said that even if we have such an agreement—to control the hydrogen and atomic bombs—even if it is working, even if no bombs exist and none are being manufactured, all the other weapons used in Europe in the last war still remain. I have likewise pointed out that if war starts with these other weapons, the minute it starts the agreements to control the manufacture and use of atomic and hydrogen bombs end. That is because the life of these agreements depends upon inspection. The moment war comes, inspection stops, and each of the belligerents, able to do so, begins manufacturing atom and hydrogen bombs immediately. It will be a real race to get these things first. In another war, they would certainly be used. Therefore, these attempts to control the atomic and hydrogen bomb alone are simply truces for their control between wars when they would not be used anyway. I repeat, they do not prevent their use during war and cannot, no matter how they are worded or what the agreements contain.

There must be complete world disarmament, with proper inspection, if the hydrogen and the atomic bomb are not to be manufactured and not to be used. To prevent their use, war itself must be destroyed. Unless war is destroyed, the use of the atomic and the hydrogen bomb, or any of the other great weapons now in the offing cannot be prevented. Attemps to control the atom and hydrogen bombs are good preliminary steps only. They might open up an avenue for future action, but they in themselves alone are not guaranties that the hydrogen and atomic bombs will not be used in another war.

We should remember that the war in Europe, from 1939 to 1945, was fought without the use of a single atomic bomb, without the use of a single hydrogen bomb; and, even if there were no other and greater weapons than those used in World War II, the prospect of another world war without hydrogen bombs and atomic bombs should give us pause. But if we have another world war, the use of the atomic and the hydrogen bombs, agreements or no agreements, is inevitable.

In such a conference as I have proposed disarmament would not precede complete agreement. It would follow such agreement. Disarmament would not take place except under proper inspection. Inspection would continue after disarmament, to see that it was maintained.

Thoughtful men may say "Such a conference will fail." No one can predict its outcome with certainty. Maybe it will. But this should not deter us from the undertaking. We should try to surmount the difficulties, not cringe in surrender before them. The effort toward world disarmament is fraught with no realistic danger. If an invitation is extended, all eyes will turn to Russia. When Russia speaks, we will know what the score is.

But assuming that the conference is had and it does fail, then there will be such a terrific patriotic response everywhere that men of good will will know that the only alternative we have left is a defense as strong as we can build it. Mr. President, I am now beginning to come to some new matter in connection with the discussion of this subject.

No, Mr. President, if failure comes to this enterprise, world disarmament, we will be better rather than worse off for having undertaken it.

In the last war, what we and our allies fought for was partial disarmament. We fought to disarm our enemies—compulsory partial disarmament. If war comes again, we shall fight for the same thing—to disarm whoever our enemies may be so they cannot attack us. This will be done by force. That is the whole purpose of warfare, to conquer and disarm by force our adversaries.

Now let me go back to the statement of the Secretary of State that we must build up strength everywhere we can and keep our nerves steady, and so forth. We had better look over our own defenses at home first, if that is to be our policy. Unless we are strong, then neither we nor the democratic nations that are dependent upon us can survive. Are we strong enough? The only way we can measure our strength is by contrasting it with the strength of a potential enemy. What is the strength of our potential enemy? Russia must be the core of this potential enemy strength. How strong is Russia? Russia has 200 divisions, of which it is safe to say more than 100 are well-equipped, trained, battle-tested, and ready for immediate emergency. The other 100 divisions are not in the excellent shape of the first, approximately 100, but can be quickly readied in emergency.

Mr. President, first, we have not one-tenth of this force in being. On land, Russia at the moment is the strongest military force in the entire world, beyond all peradventure of doubt. Furthermore, it is in Europe and Asia. In Europe, we have commitments so we would have to transport our forces to fulfill our engagements.

Second. In the air, Russia is probably about equal to the United States. In some categories, like fighter planes, she probably has more than we have. In other categories, such as strategic planes, we probably have more than she has. I am reluctant to state any figures, but I think these generalizations are completely accurate. There is not much margin of difference in the overall Russian and American air forces.

Third. On sea, taking up the third arm of defense, we are vastly superior and in a position to sweep the sea clean of surface ships. Our Navy is gigantic in its fire power, in its range, and in its modern mechanization. However, a new element has entered into the picture— the improved submarine. These, equipped with proper weapons, are many, many times more difficult to destroy and their ability is greatly increased to destroy surface ships, such as the ships of an enemy convoy. It is going to be difficult, and I would emphasize, very difficult, with present-day equipment to keep the sea lanes open as they must be kept open, first, for raw materials from distant lands for our factories.

It is going to be difficult to keep the sea lanes open, secondly, to transport the millions of men who may have to be transported to foreign battlefields before the war draws to a close. We must remember that our forces are now in Europe and in Asia, and we cannot abandon them.

In atomic bombs we are far superior. We have been at the business of making them longer. Our stock piles are obviously much greater than those of the Russian.. However, this is an advantage that may be temporary. There can be no assurance that it is permanent. We are told that both nations are working on the H-bomb. We believe we will have it first and in greater numbers, but this can be at best but an optimistic conjecture. There is no certainty at the present moment concerning who will have the advantage in the acquisition of this great decisive weapon.

Let us go on to see what effect each of the two great countries is making to augment its military strength.

What I am about to say is disturbingly arresting. In 1949, only last year, Russia had the largest budget in the whole history of the U. S. S. R. Many of their expenditures were for additional mechanization. Much of the money was devoted to the expansion of heavy industry. The weakest links in the Soviet economy were strengthened through the medium of additional appropriations. All of these measures are the twin brothers of military preparedness. It is estimated—and I hope this sentence will be remembered—that in 1949 Russia was expending for war preparations 85 percent as much as she spent for war preparations in 1941, the year that Hitler invaded that country. It is estimated that Russia is spending this year for war preparations two-thirds as much money as she spent in 1945, the last year of World War II. There are many items for new construction for industrial support of the Russian armed forces, for scientific research, for security operations, and for strategic stock piling.

Mark these figures well, Mr. President. The Russian budget for all purposes, peace and war, I estimate will absorb 75 percent of the total national income. In the United States, with our budget of $42,000,000,000 for all purposes, peace and war, we will absorb 18 percent of our national income. But here is the figure which brings us up sharply. The Russian budget will absorb about 30 percent of the national income for military preparedness alone. In the United States our military expenditures of $14,000,000,000 will represent only about 6 percent of our national income.

Nearly one-third of every dollar every Russian man, woman, and child earn is already devoted to military preparedness. In the United States, our small expenditure of $14,000,000,000 represents only approximately 6 percent of the total income of the men, women, and children of the United States.

These facts and figures clearly show that Russia is making a supreme all-out effort for total and complete military supremacy. These facts and figures show that Russia is making, in financial outlays, two-thirds of the military effort she made when fighting Hitler in 1945. There is no evidence that this great effort is to halt. The indications are that it will continue, and, if possible, be intensified.

Up to the moment, I agree in the main with Secretary of Defense Johnson, that our defense arrangements, considering our great stock pile of atomic bombs, have been sufficient for our own protection and for the protection of those allied with us These defenses, as a whole, and our stock pile of bombs in particular, would make it inadvisable for any nation to start a war involving us. This situation has been a mighty contributing factor to such peace as we enjoy at this critical time.

However, we should not lose sight of the fact that, with the atomic age, America in many respects has a vulnerability matched by few other nations. We have many great cities, teeming with millions of persons. Russia has fewer cities and they are wider apart. Our great cities, from the standpoint of geography, are exposed. Many of the Russian cities are not so clearly vulnerable. Russia, having industrialized later than ourselves, has been able to scatter her industrial life more than we have. Russia as a nation occupies more of the world's surface than does the United States.

Before the day of the airplane and the atom bomb, our great oceans shielded us and gave us time in which to prepare. The utility of these oceans as barriers to attack by an enemy has diminished greatly and will continue to diminish with the coming of the intercontinental bomber and the new giant bombs.

So I think, if we are not able to have an adjustment of our difficulties with the Russians, from here on out we will have to take a completely new look at our defenses. If we are not able to stop the arms race, through the medium of world disarmament or something approaching it, we shall have to be stronger in the future than it was ever necessary for us to be in the past in peacetime. This conclusion seems to me to be inescapable. Any weakness might invite attack. Only by being at least equal or, if possible, superior to any potential foe, can we best hope to avoid attack. In a word, if an understanding with the Russians with appropriate disarmament is impossible, we are going to have to have more, much more, national defense in a score of categories than has been required up to the present. We dare not fall behind in the arms race, without running the risk of disaster and losing our allies on the European Continent.

There has always been a widespread tendency to underestimate the Russians. People have forgotten that after Hitler had conquered Poland, subdued France with her widely publicized army and Maginot Line, overrun Belgium and Holland, and driven the flower of the British Army across the Channel at Dunkerque, he then attacked Russia in 1941. It was almost a universally held opinion then that Russia would not last 6 weeks. I heard nothing but that on the floor of the Congress and on the streets of the towns and cities of America.

The Russians retreated gradually to Petrograd, Moscow, and Stalingrad. During this interval, Russia amassed an army of tanks, an unbelievable pool of artillery and other weapons, and increased her plane production. At Moscow, the Russians threw their new implements and all their might into the fray. The finest panzer divisions of Hitler were met outside of Moscow and decimated. The Nazi retreat began. The Russian factories continued to turn out weapons at an unbelievable rate. They produced the best tank in the whole world, and it is so today. In a series of great battles, they drove the Germans all the way back to Berlin. Instead of 6 weeks, with defeat, as predicted, there was 4 years of determined fighting, with victory. That was the gross underestimation of Russian military power 9 years ago.

In 1945, we had produced our first atomic bomb for war purposes. It was used in August of that year and advertised to the whole world. Again there was a gross underestimation of Russia's ability to make this bomb. It is true that her ability to manufacture this weapon was aided greatly by the disclosures of Dr. Fuchs. However, instead of producing the atom bomb from 1952 on, the Russians produced the bomb in 1949. Again, the optimists who said, "All is well," had made another grave miscalculation.

Maybe it will take three lessons of underestimation to teach us that overestimation is a safer course than underestimation, when the whole of civilization is at stake. I still see in many quarters a desire to look down on Russian military might and industrial ability, in

the face of facts that have twice astounded the world.

Even today, in the United States Senate, the slowness with which military measures are considered and passed is absolutely appalling. The bill to provide modern wind tunnels, indispensable to the building of supersonic planes, was delayed for months by parliamentary objections. The same was true of the authorization for the NACA scientists. These scientists are the men who must devise the new equipment and instrumentation required for the new giant planes. The same was true of military housing, although our troops, upon which we must all depend for safety, were living under appalling conditions both here in the continental United States and overseas.

Through the Russian system of government, they take action upon things quickly. If our democratic processes are to survive, military legislation must henceforth be considered with more speed. Time is important. Time saved can mean the prevention of the outbreak of another war. It can mean life or death to many persons now living on this planet.

We must likewise begin to overhaul our civilian defense. There is likely to be not enough time to do this if the threat of war, or war itself, comes quickly. In the volatile state of world affairs, this may and could happen. If during the war a great bomb should hit one or more of our large cities, the death toll may run into the millions. In addition to the dead, hundreds of thousands may be injured. If no provision is made to deal with this while we yet have time to do it, many of those injured will die who could have been saved by preparation.

Until the possibility of war is diminished we should begin to organize and teach our policemen, firemen, teachers, doctors, nurses, and others the best means and methods of meeting this possible emergency. Plans for keeping order when attack is imminent will have to be laid. Plans for evacuation where possible will have to be worked out.

Indeed, considering the possibilities of a sneak attack, Pearl Harbor fashion, we may well consider some forms of inspecting ships bound for our harbors while they are still at sea. The possibilities are too pregnant with disaster to permit ships to come willy-nilly into our harbors without this inspection on the outside. It would be simple under present practices to bring an atom or hydrogen bomb to this country in the hold of a ship and wipe out the population of one or more of our large cities. We cannot let this side of national defense pass by unattended.

I could outline many more additional measures of defense which it would seem wise to undertake from now on out. Those mentioned, however, serve to illustrate my point. What I have said here is not in criticism of our defenses up to the moment. It is said as a warning—a grave, deep, sincere, and, I hope, long-sounding warning—to all our people that our safety henceforth will require more, rather than less defense—more effort, rather than less effort; more planning, rather than less planning; more sacrifices, rather than fewer sacrifices. There is no other road we can walk with safety. There is an increasing need for more and more research and development in defenses to be used against the new improved submarine, against tanks, against planes, against guided missiles, and a score of other things now in the purview of modern national defense.

Yes, Mr. President, in the present state of world affairs the arms race now under way will bring burdens we have not heretofore had to bear. All military men agree that the best deterrent to war is to be so strong that the enemy will fear to attack. Certainly our best hope of continuing to live is to be strong enough to destroy our potential enemies quickly when war comes. If war goes on too long, with atomic and hydrogen bombs, even the victor may be vanquished. All of these thoughts have brought me to the conclusion that it would be the part of wisdom, at this critical point, to find out which of the two alternatives we must grasp. Can there be world disarmament with inspection before, during, and afterward? Is the accomplishment of this goal impossible? If it is tried and found to be impossible, then our people, and people all over the world, will know who is responsible for the failure of the greatest humanitarian enterprise ever undertaken by man. The world will likely place the blame upon those who have denied mankind his right to live in peace.

If world disarmament is tried and succeeds, it will have been the greatest effort any government or governments, person or persons have ever made to preserve and advance civilization. If it fails, we will be no worse off. Then we shall embrace, with new vigor and understanding, the only remaining alternative—solid, unmistakable, adequate defense for us and those associated with us. If disarmament is not possible, this Nation and those associated with us will rise to the challenge. Instead of disarmament, then we shall renew our efforts for an armed truce.

Yes, Mr. President, that is the score. We will either have peace through world disarmament or will keep on as we are now going and intensify our efforts. All the world is poised on the horns of this dilemma.

Like Mr. Churchill, I would like to know the answer. I would like to get a clarification of the issues in dispute. What we want, in plain American, is a clean show-down. Must we walk the roadway to possible war with all of its sacrifices? Must we give new thought and effort and sacrifice to preparedness against attack? Or is it possible, on the other hand, to remove the fear of war by stopping the arms race? Is it possible to find a formula where the east and the west can do business without the burden, the fear, and the unlimited disaster of another world war?

The stakes are high but they are worth playing for in the light of Dr. Einstein's utterance:

Annihilation of any life on earth is within the range of technical possibilities.

I repeat that statement for the sake of emphasis. Dr. Einstein last Sunday said:

Annihilation of any life on earth is within the range of technical possibilities.

These are grave, ominous, and challenging words.

So I renew my plea to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State, to call a world disarmament conference of all nations. Let us see if we cannot remove, by courageous, determined, and honest effort, from the minds of the Russians and those associated with them, and from the minds of our own people and those associated with us, the fearful and darkening threat of the possibility of the last great war of them all, which carries with it the possible extinction of all humankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks an article entitled "Churchill and Another Talk," written by Mr. Walter Lippmann, and published in this morning's Washington Post.

Although the article is not "on all fours" with some of the thoughts I have expressed in my remarks, I find a point of agreement with Mr. Lippmann's statement that we must do something other than sit still and wait for disaster.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippman)

CHURCHILL AND ANOTHER TALK

Mr. Truman must have thought of his own campaign when he read that Mr. Churchill, winding up his campaign, had said "I cannot help coming back to this idea of another talk with Soviet Russia on the highest level." Except that Mr. Churchill, rather than Chief Justice Vinson, would do the talking, the idea that Mr. Churchill came back to has also been Mr. Truman's idea.

It has long been Mr. Churchill's idea Two years ago—when there was no election campaign in sight—he told the House of Commons that "with all consideration of the facts I believe it right to say today that the best chance of avoiding war is, in accord with the other democracies, to bring matters to a head with the Soviet Government and by formal diplomatic processes, with all their privacy and gravity, to arrive at a lasting settlement. There is certainly enough for the interests of all if such a settlement could be reached. Even this method, I must say, however, would not guarantee that war would not come but I believe it would give the best chance of preventing it, and that if it came, we should have the best chance of coming out of it alive."

Mr. Churchill is not famous as an appeaser, a pacifist, a wishful thinker, a fellow-traveler, or as an idealist who does not understand the realities of power and of the existing situations of fact and of the nature of the Soviet state. If then, even he feels that there should be "a supreme effort to bridge the gulf between the two worlds so that each can live their life, if not in friendship, at least without the hatred of the cold war," no lesser man is qualified to dismiss the idea.

The question is what the talks at the highest level would be about if they were to offer any chance of producing a settlement of the kind Mr. Churchill is suggesting. Perhaps it is possible to make an informed guess about the general character of those talks. Indeed, that is indicated in Mr. Churchill's

own remarks. The two worlds, he said, should be able to live their lives—which can mean only, I take it, that the cold war is not to end in unconditional surrender but in a negotiated settlement which establishes the limits of our respective spheres of influence. That is the kind of settlement which Churchill and Stalin were beginning to explore back in 1944, and they had made some progress with it in the Balkans.

Settlements of this type do violence to the principles which we have espoused since Wilson's time. We have believed in one world or none, and we have thought that the idea of an agreed division into spheres of influence which reflects the balance of power belonged, as Secretary Hull once declared, to "the unhappy past."

But now, as we contemplate the unhappy present we shall have to ask ourselves whether we do not prefer two or three or four worlds to none at all. We shall have to ask ourselves whether the classic method of settling conflicts may not be the only method. I believe it is, and that the new approach which the people of the world are demanding will bring us to the rediscovery of the older approach which we abandoned before mankind was ready to live as one in one world. For in the history of great powers the agreed division of influence has been the only alternative to a war for universal dominion.

It is most unlikely, however, that a settlement of this type could be reached by dividing the whole world into two and only two great spheres of influence. If that were attempted, there could be no agreement. For it would mean an attempt to agree on whether each country was to enter the Soviet orbit or the Atlantic Community.

The attempt to do just that is what broke down the four power negotiations and precipitated the cold war. For the cold war is a struggle to bring Germany, Japan, and many other nations into one coalition or the other. It is waged on the fundamental premise that the two alliances must be everywhere in close contact, that everyone must be in one alliance or in the other.

But that is not necessary, and in fact it is not what is probably going to happen. An agreed division of the classic type could be reached, and could be made to last, only if Russia on the one hand, the English-speaking powers on the other, recognize the right and the utility of many nations for their own security and survival not to enter into either military coalition—but to constitute themselves as buffers and mediators, and indeed as guardians of the balance of power.

This is the missing component in all our previous discussion of how to deal with the cold war—to take as our premise that, as the Times (London) put it last week "the world need not necessarily be divided into two rigid and hostile camps," that "it may be convenient to both sides that certain areas should be allowed to preserve—or made to keep—a kind of neutrality."

American public opinion is not, I venture to think, sufficiently aware how strong are the forces, just under the surface of official life, which are in motion all over the Old World in Europe and in Asia toward disentanglement from the two dangerously entangling alliances. I think it not improbable that these forces will gather momentum the longer we and the Soviet Union remain frozen in positions which offer no prospect of escape from the utter devastation of atomic warfare. The human instinct of survival, the national instinct to be independent, will not long tolerate the idea that the fate of mankind is to be determined exclusively in Moscow and in Washington.

The day may come, perhaps not so distantly, when a European statesman, another Canning, will arise to proclaim the doctrine that Russia and America are both of them new great powers, and that the Old World must now be called in to redress the balance of the New.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to associate myself wholeheartedly and completely with the superb statement which has just been made by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Certainly it has been sobering, it has been challenging, and it has been stimulating. It is an understatement. I hope that what he has said will provoke us into seriously facing the situation which he has outlined and which he has not exaggerated.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his more-than-generous remarks. He and I have served together on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I know that he regrets, as I regret, that it is not possible, for security reasons, for us to make full disclosure of many of the matters that come to us. I know that the implications of the atomic and hydrogen bombs and other possible weapons are of concern to him, as they have been of concern to all of us who have served on the committee. I thank the Senator for his support.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like first to commend the distinguished Senator from Maryland for his very able presentation of the subject he has discussed, and to tell him that I am profoundly interested in his suggestion, which I shall certainly study with the greatest of care.

I should like to ask the Senator whether he contemplates the possible joining of his proposal for a disarmament conference with the spirit of the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] a few days ago that we would express our willingness to cooperate in steps for the further development of the backward areas of the world in order to eliminate any possible cause of war.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from New Jersey was on the floor of the Senate at the time, but I attempted to say that if we got an agreement to outlaw the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb, and all the other weapons which were used in Europe during the war, even if no bombs were in existence, or were being manufactured, the same tension would exist in the world which is now present with the atomic bomb in existence. The tension might be mitigated a bit, but it would still remain.

I pointed out that the war in Europe was fought without any atomic or hydrogen bombs, and that the devastation was terrific. I pointed out that if we could get an agreement not to possess or manufacture hydrogen or other bombs, it would be predicated upon inspection, that if war came, as it has come in the past without these weapons, inspection would be impossible from that moment on; that therefore the treaties for control would be abrogated, and that each of the belligerents that could do so, would start making the bombs, and would surely use them, just as we used them in the last war. So, if we confined it to that segment it would be an encouraging step that might lead to further progress, but would not be an answer in itself.

The able Senator from Connecticut proposed that, and also proposed a peace offensive. I would not take issue with anything he has said. I think his impulses of mind and thought are very much like my own. But I feel that certain things would happen.

I have just said that Russia is devoting 30 percent of the entire income of all her people to military preparedness. If we had disarmament she would not need any of the $50,000,000,000 fund suggested by the Senator from Connecticut. All the energy and ingenuity of the Russian people could be turned to developing better homes, developing Russia's resources, exploiting her land, producing more food, producing more clothing, building more schools and providing more recreation. So that if disarmament could be secured, the peace offensive, with all the energies turned loose because of disarmament, would follow as a matter of course. I am not opposed to what the Senator from Connecticut offered, but I think if disarmament can be secured the peace offensive will come as a matter of course. If we do not succeed in obtaining disarmament, all the money in Christendom will not, in my opinion, buy peace.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Maryland. I am glad he brought out that point. But it seems to me that the proposal made by the Senator from Connecticut is a wonderful one. Let us move to go ahead with a peace offensive. It seems to me we have got to move into that area.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. I will not oppose, or vote against the proposal of anyone who has devoted thought to this subject, as most of us have. The Senator from Connecticut has a proposal which differs from mine. I like mine better because, after thinking over the subject for a great many years, I could find no other ultimate terminal. I can find many intermediate terminals, but it all comes back to the fact that unless we can bring about disarmament, fear will continue; each nation will move a little further each year toward arming itself, and eventually we will get back to the same point again. I am willing to consider any proposal which may be offered. I do not like the attitude of sitting and waiting. That is not in the American tradition. It is not in line with our way of life or our way of thinking. I like effort. The fact that we may fail 10 or 15 times should not deter us from making a new effort, particularly when so much is at stake.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from New Jersey would like to identify himself with the last statement made by the Senator from Maryland, possibly

with all his statements, but particularly with the last one. I do not like to sit and wait. I think we want to explore. As a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee holding hearings on various proposals, such as the one for a world federation, the proposal for an Atlantic union, and so on, I welcome all such suggestions, because we should explore them, and we should be thinking in terms of "Where do we go from here?" in a positive way. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his contribution.

While I was engaged in my statement I neglected to say that my suggestion does not spring from fear, so far as I am able to interpret my own emotion. It springs from what I think is the common-sense idea of what is good both for Russia and for ourselves. I do not want anyone to think I have made this speech because I feel we are weak. I believe we are the strongest nation in the world today. I believe that because we have strength we can afford to take the action I propose, when we know that some other nations which may not be so strong cannot afford to take such action. The strong always are and of right should be the leaders of progress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator in that statement.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland now yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri, but I want to apologize first. He was the first Senator who asked me to yield to him. I should have yielded to him first.

Mr. DONNELL. I assure the Senator from Maryland that is all right.

Mr. TYDINGS. I proceeded to yield to Senators in the order in which they rose, from those nearest to me to those farther away.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, before asking questions, I should like to take this opportunity to express the appreciation of this one Senator for the most able, scholarly, instructive address delivered by the Senator from Maryland, as well as for the solemn and thoughtful warnings and analyses, suggestions, and exhortations, which are contained within his address. I remember having heard at least a portion of an address along similar lines, delivered by the Senator several years ago, although as the days have gone on and changes in circumstances have occurred, he has projected himself to meet the new conditions. While I am not at this moment making any commitment as to my own position respecting his suggestions, I wish to say that I think the Senator's presentation is a highly challenging one, and deserving of the careful and solemn thought of every Member of the United States Senate. I thank him for it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Missouri, and I may say that praise coming from him in the general form it is, is high praise, indeed.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. Will the Senator now yield for a few questions?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am delighted to do so.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say that the particular question I had in mind when I sought to obtain the Senator's consent to yield some little time ago has been very fully answered by him. I may tell him, in order to satisfy his possible curiosity, that it related to whether he had observed, or intended to discuss the observations by Dr. Einstein. The Senator has discussed so fully and completely the observations by Dr. Einstein and his reference to the possibility scientifically of every human life being destroyed by the great bombs of the future, that I believe my question has certainly been adequately answered. But there have occurred to me, as the Senator has spoken, a few other questions to which I should like to obtain his answers.

Mr. TYDINGS. If I can answer I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. DONNELL. In the first place I should like to ask the following question: The Senator has commented upon the great expenditure which Russia is today making upon military preparedness, upon preparations of a warlike nature, or at least with respect to warlike equipment, and the like. I should like the Senator to tell us whether in his judgment the North Atlantic Treaty has acted in any way as a deterrent against such action taken by Russia. I should appreciate the Senator's observations.

Mr. TYDINGS. Whether it has encouraged such action or deterred it?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, it would be quite difficult for the Senator from Maryland to give the Senator from Missouri an accurate answer to that question. It would have to be a guess. My opinion is that even without the North Atlantic security alliance and the armed implementation plan Russia would have done pretty much what she is doing any way. I do not think I would be completely honest if I did not say the fact that we did that made it easier for Russia to do what she is doing.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Please let me finish.

Mr. DONNELL. I was not quite clear, however, as to what the Senator observed just a moment ago.

Mr. TYDINGS. The fact that we did, however, project and put into being the North Atlantic Security Alliance certainly made it easier and a matter of more importance for Russia to do what she is doing now than probably otherwise would have been the case. In the opinion of the Senator from Maryland, the Russians, up to the time the North Atlantic Security Pact became a reality, were concentrating their propaganda and a great deal of their force on the line of tension in Europe. It seems to me that with the coming of the North Atlantic Security Alliance I detected to some extent a recession of the Russian force at that point, and reliance on such measures as blocking traffic, aggressions, one might say, which necessitated the airlift. But the main Russian effort was the putting forth propaganda and pressure in the Far East.

Now that China has fallen and that great area pretty well allied with Russia, I am beginning to wonder if there will not be, after some other things happen in that area, a return to Europe of the force which was temporarily released there, resulting in the pressure in Europe being heightened and perhaps holding in store for us great difficulties.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator agree, in view of his observation made a moment ago, that perhaps the North Atlantic Treaty has made it easier for Russia to do what she has been doing? Would the Senator agree with me that the North Atlantic Treaty affords a very plausible excuse on the part of Russia to increase her arms, on the ground that the participants in the North Atlantic Treaty are building up an armed force which might prove to be an offensive force against Russia?

Mr. TYDINGS. I would have to say to the Senator what I tried to say in less detail earlier, that what each of us is doing is predicated on what the other is doing. It is pretty much like batting a ball back and forth to see how long it can be kept up in the air. So long as it does not drop, well and good. But when it is dropped, trouble may come. They do something and we counteract it. We do something and they counteract it.

As I see it, we are playing checkers on the world checkerboard. There is the H-bomb, the atom bomb, and all those things in the way of power politics. Perhaps there is no alternative. Perhaps we have to do that. But I should like to submit the case to the jury of world opinion and find out who is right or wrong—I think I know—but let us submit the case and see who will block a settlement, so that the nations and peoples of the world who may be in doubt will know, as near as humans can come to know, who is responsible for this point and counterpoint which is continually going on.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I believe the Senator's illustration of point and counterpoint and the playing of checkers on the world's checkerboard is most excellent and thoroughly in point.

I do not know whether the Senator will agree with me, but I respectfully call his attention to the fact that upon the floor of the Senate at least some Senators who opposed our entry into the North Atlantic Treaty took the view, which has been so graphically set forth by Viscount Grey in his history of World War I, and other historical events in England, that the building up of a great, powerful military force by the North Atlantic Treaty would necessarily involve a heavy risk, and that Russia might, in playing this game of checkers, feel that it was obligatory upon her, or at least that she would have an excuse to consider it obligatory upon her, to build up her own power, as I take it she has done, as the Senator has so graphically indicated this afternoon.

Mr. TYDINGS. I respect the Senator's point of view. I do not want to throw idle compliments around, but I

have always looked on the Senator from Missouri as a man of profound integrity of thought, and even though he may not agree with my point of view, I have great respect for any point of view he holds. As I see it, it was necessary for us to make that move in Europe because the Russians were trying very hard to win Italy and France, and to put pressure on some of the small Scandinavian countries at the time the North Atlantic Treaty was projected.

If we had not done what we did in Europe, it is possible that we might have lost some of our allies there. They might have been brought in behind the iron curtain. I do not say they would have. I say it is possible. So, therefore, there is always the imponderable to which none of us can give the complete answer. I can see how one man would take the view that it would have been better not to take the action we took. I can see how another person equally well versed in the facts would take the view that such action should have been taken. I thought that was our counterpoint. Evidently, many persons thought it was our point, which brought on the Russian counterpoint. So it is simply a question of where one starts and where one stops.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator from Maryland consider that if a disarmament conference were called, as he has so eloquently and powerfully argued should be done, it would necessitate, in order that the disarmament agreement be carried out, an amendment striking out article III of the North Atlantic Treaty, reading as follows:

> In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the parties separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

In the Senator's opinion, would it be necessary, in order to carry into effect a disarmament program upon which such a conference as he advocates might agree, that article III of the North Atlantic Treaty, which I have just read, be either amended or repealed?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think that would be necessary, because if all the nations agreed to a disarmament plan, it probably would contain a clause to the effect that all prior agreements or commitments contrary to the covenant therein set forth would be repealed and set aside, insofar as they might be in conflict with that covenant.

I would imagine that in various parts of the world there would be many documents and papers bearing on that subject; and it would not be practical to make changes in all of them. So I would imagine that the point to which the Senator from Missouri refers would be taken care of without difficulty.

My fear is whether it would be possible to agree upon a disarmament plan. If the disarmament plan or pact were agreed to, it seems to me its provisions would either nullify, amend, or change in whatever other way were necessary, any earlier pacts to which all the other nations had set their hands and seals.

Mr. DONNELL. Including article III of the North Atlantic Treaty?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think it would have to be named specifically, although I do not say, without further thought, that it would automatically be terminated. But I would say that, in a broad way, anything with which the disarmament plan interfered would be nullified from then on, whereas agreements with which the disarmament plan did not interfere would not be affected by it, of course.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator; I think he has answered my point.

I should like to inquire of the Senator relative to the assurance recently given by Mr. Louis Johnson. I think the Senator from Maryland took the view that he agreed with some, or possibly all, of Mr. Johnson's observations in regard to our national security.

Mr. TYDINGS. I took the view that, by and large, I thought our defenses up to the present time had been adequate. I then took the view that from now on we must reexamine them and, in all probability, strengthen them.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Maryland believed, did he not, the country would not be safe if it accepted the reassurance given a few days ago by Mr. Johnson, namely, that if we were struck at 4 o'clock, we would be ready at 5 o'clock?

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe Mr. Johnson's statement is accurate.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Maryland would not think, would he, we should rest on our oars in that respect, and that the national security should give us no concern?

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe what Secretary Johnson said is accurate; I make that statement on the basis of my own knowledge of the situation regarding our national defense. If we were struck at 4 o'clock in the morning, I believe retaliation would be on the way by 5 o'clock. I think that statement is accurate.

I believe that our defenses up to now have been adequate. So I believe in the correctness of what Mr. Johnson has said.

In view of all the circumstances, and in the light of the statement I made today, and in the light of what is happening elsewhere, I believe that from now on we must make a reexamination of our defense picture, and must make up our minds that we shall leave no reasonable thing undone in an endeavor to prevent the outbreak of a war which well could annihilate us. Therefore, I believe we must do all we can to be so strong as to make it impossible for any other nation to overwhelm us.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Maryland referred to the possible contingency that perhaps Russia would not agree or would not accept an invitation to such a conference.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I said that.

Mr. DONNELL. I can well appreciate the logic of examining in advance what would be the eventuality if that should occur.

Let me ask the Senator whether in his opinion it would be necessary, in order that such an international agreement of disarmament would be effective and beneficial, that every nation of any size or material strength should become a participant and should join in such an agreement.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is a very proper and logical question, and I turned it over in my own mind a good many times.

The first thing we think of is that if we got the big nations together and if they agreed, we would not have to bother about the other nations; but it occurred to me that no one knew the extent to which the disarmament would go, and that it is quite possible that we could reach the point where some of the smaller nations would have weapons which the larger nations would outlaw.

So, as a general proposition, it would be a fine thing to get the entire world back of this plan, rather than to have the big nations play politics with one another. Therefore, it would seem that the wiser course would be to have what we might call all the reasonably strong powers—not only the great ones, but the smaller ones who have reasonable strength—enter into the agreement, so the relativity would be continued all the way through, so far as arms are concerned.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland indicate whether he has given thought to the possibility, as he put it a moment ago, in the earlier part of his remarks, that some small nation, through scientific ingenuity and skill, actually might develop a greater ultimate strength, by reason of the ownership of a few hydrogen bombs, than some of the other nations, which have greater material strength, might have acquired, and that therefore it would be essential to have every nation, if possible, enter into such an agreement?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct and it is a good thought.

Upon thinking the matter through, I believe we would want all the nations to enter into the agreement, in view of almost any consideration which might enter into the picture.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us whether he thinks that if such a conference were called, in considering all the problems involved, during the course of the conference it would develop that each nation would be required to give to the others an inventory of what it possessed, including bombs—the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb, or whatever other bombs there might be; and if the Senator thinks it would be necessary to do that, let me also inquire whether he thinks there would be any danger that if our country were to lay on the table a statement that it had so many atomic bombs and so many hydrogen bombs and so many plants for making each of them, some other nation, after learning that, would refuse to enter into the agreement or would violate the terms of the agreement, thus placing us at a great disadvantage.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have given a great deal of thought to that matter. Of course, no one can devise a law or a rule

of procedure which will anticipate everything which might happen and which would, at least to some extent, retard its objectives. But it seems to me the procedure to be followed would be something like this: First of all, there would have to be a considerable preparation for any disarmament conference. The President could decide on the objective and could postpone it long enough to agree upon some mechanics. Certainly he would not call it within 2 weeks. If so, it would fail because there would not have been sufficient preliminary examination.

I have omitted from my remarks today a discussion of those points, but I have thought about them a great deal.

One of the ways to avoid the very situation the Senator from Missouri has outlined would be that if the nations came with clean hands and submitted their schedules, showing, let us say, that what A nation has and what B nation has and what C nation has, we would then have the right—and there is no reason why every other nation should not have the same right, if it desired world disarmament—before proceeding further to inspect the statements and to see whether the nations had stated what they actually had. If they had not stated in the main their military potentialities, we would then know that nation A, for instance, was not playing fair.

There are many ways of avoiding such danger, and all those ways should be explored, not only for our own protection, but for the protection of the other nations, for each nation would want to have such protection. Certainly there are many ways of safeguarding each nation in respect to every step it makes along that pathway, so that one nation would not do any more than its opponent would do.

For example, I would assume that if we had a disarmament conference and if a schedule of disarmament were worked out, to last over a period of 3 years, let us say, then at certain periods of time during those 3 years, certain things would take place under the eyes of international inspectors. The Russians would want to be in our country to see what we did, and we would want to be in Russia, to see what the Russians did. At any point, wherever these intermediate steps were carried out, for example, there would be the destruction of baseball bats today, iron slugs tomorrow, shillelaghs the following day, and so forth.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator is coming to the Irish contingent, now.

Mr. TYDINGS. As any one of these steps was being taken over a period of time, if any nation failed to play the game, the whole thing would stop right there; so that no nation would be caught in a relatively worse position, if it were done with reasonable fairness, than would any other nation. I am not going into the mechanics of the plan now, which is really not my field. I think primarily in that aspect the proposal would have to be worked out by our military men. I have not the right to quote the military men. I am not quoting them. I have discussed this with not many of them, and not recently with any of them. I think most military men would think it desirable but unattainable. Perhaps it is; but I think most military men would welcome it, if it could be accomplished.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I assure the Senator I greatly appreciate his answers. I do not want to inquire into the ultimate of detail, but I think, in a matter of this great consequence, it is of importance to have before us its possible eventualities. The Senator perhaps will regard the next question as indicative of a lack of confidence in another nation. I do not put it in that way, and, yet, I appreciate we have had some experiences which may lead us to have some fair degree of lack of confidence in some other nation.

After putting our inventory on the table, as the Senator has indicated, and other nations had done the same, so that there had been mutual disclosures, suppose, then, some nation in which we did not have much confidence, or in which we did have confidence, as we would have or we would not have made the disclosure, should say, "Well, gentlemen, we have gone far enough. We do not need to go any further. We do not agree with this plan." Within themselves they would say, "We have learned what we want to know about the United States; so far as the conference is concerned, it is over." What would the Senator think of the possibility of such a situation arising?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am going to say to the Senator in answer now to all three of his questions what I should have said in answer to the first. I think the Russians know exactly what we have in almost every category. Under our system of government, the budget reports, the reports of the different departments and different officers, the laws passed by Congress, the speeches we make, the newspaper interviews, the articles we write, come pretty close, I think, to disclosing all the information needed.

Mr. DONNELL. It is a good deal like the closed sessions of committees, the proceedings of which are disclosed in full in the press the following day.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. And I think, too, while we do not have avenues of information comparable to those of the Russians, we have a pretty good idea of what is going on. We may not guess accurately the time they will have a certain thing, but I think we have a pretty good idea of what they are doing and of just how strong they are. After all, it is impossible thus far to stop communications, human beings being constituted as they are. I think I can say to the Senator that the thing he has mentioned would be of relatively small consequence, because——

Mr. DONNELL. Because the Senator thinks Russia already knows the facts?

Mr. TYDINGS. Russia already knows about us pretty well, and we already know about Russia pretty well. We already know about Britain pretty well, and Britain knows about us. Military secrecy is a wonderful thing, when it concerns invention, science, processes, and instrumentalities which the other fellow has not seen; but so far as keeping vital information away from the chanceries of the world, my own contact with that side of political life has taught me that when they want it, they get a pretty accurate picture of what the situation is.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator will permit me to comment on that, now, I may say he is of course in the main correct. I recall an occasion when a number of our people, including at least the Senator who is now speaking, were taken by surprise. I refer to the disclosure which came with respect to the explosion of the atom bomb in Russia. I personally had had no such information as that confided to me, that Russia had a bomb to explode. It may be, though, that committees and other officials who were in close touch with matters of that kind were better informed than I.

Mr. TYDINGS. I may say now, in order to take some of the taint of error off our military men, that they have never fixed definitely any particular time when they said they thought Russia would have the bomb. They have said—and I have been in some of those briefings—"They may have it within a month, for all we know, or next year; but we believe under all routine circumstances it will be at such and such a point." They have never predicted with any assurance or certainty a particular year.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will be patient enough, I should like to ask two or three questions.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The matter to which I am about to refer might prove very annoying. I do not know whether it would be at all fatal to the possibility of getting together such a conference. My understanding is that in the United Nations at this time the Russians are declining to participate because of the fact that the Chinese Nationalist Government is recognized by the United Nations. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is my understanding That is why I do not think the United Nations should do this job which it is trying to do. More power to it. But, because it is interwoven with so many extraneous problems, they cannot get around to the main point.

Mr. DONNELL. That leads me to this question: If it be correct that Russia is declining to participate in the United Nations because of the fact that it is the Nationalist Government of China which is presently recognized by the United Nations, would not the United States Government, in calling a disarmament conference, be confronted with a very serious question as to which government it would recognize in China? If upon the one hand it should recognize the Communist government, it might go entirely counter to our own national desires. In the second place, if it should recognize the Nationalist Government and invite representatives of that government to a disarmament conference, Russia might say, "The conference is over before it commences; we decline to come."

Mr. TYDINGS. If Russia and the United States were to decide on dis-

armament, with France and Britain and perhaps some other countries going along with the plan, I do not believe we would have any trouble about which of the Chinese delegations signed the document. In the last analysis, the two great, mighty powers that can make and have these world-destroying weapons are Russia and the United States, and it strikes me that if those two agree, all the other difficulties are minor and can easily be solved. What I am fearful of, the two of them being two pretty robust giants, used to throwing their weight around and feeling their might—and I put us both in that category in order not to draw an invidious comparison—is that the trouble is going to be to get them to agree. If they agree, then all other states not so powerful are pretty likely to agree, too, because it is so sensible for them all. They would want to agree, in the first place, because it would bring the great powers to an equality of reason with the others, rather than the inequality of force.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit a final question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The question is really in two parts. One is, what was the outcome of the Harding Disarmament Conference? I do not mean the immediate document that was signed, but what was the success of it? In the second place, have there been any disarmament conferences other than the Harding conference; and if so, what has been the ultimate outcome of such conferences?

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the trouble with the Naval Disarmament Conference of 1922 was that it was limited to one branch of the service only, the Navy, and only to certain weapons of that branch. One of the great difficulties that stand in the way of atomic and hydrogen bomb control is this: If, merely by a stroke of the pen, it were possible to outlaw the manufacture of the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb only, then the money and effort now going into those things would be turned into the production of artillery, airplanes, conventional bombs, and so on. So all that would be accomplished would be that a great many people would be killed with smaller weapons rather than more people with greater weapons.

The trouble with the hydrogen and atomic bomb arrangement, in which field we are superior, is that it parallels the Naval Disarmament Conference of 1922, in which we also were superior. We gave up our great ships. We sank them all. That is what we are now proposing to do through atomic and hydrogen bomb control.

I have said over and over again I do not think it will work. If it has any advantage at all, it is that it opens the avenue a little toward disarmament with a hope that we can walk further down it. But my thought is that, unless total disarmament is obtained—and by "total" I mean pretty well down to the bottom—we do not get any disarmament at all. We would be giving up everything we had and getting nothing in return.

There is a great deal of similarity between the efforts to outlaw the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb at present and the Naval Disarmament Conference of 1922. We are superior in respect to the two things now in question. We were superior in the things that were in question in 1922. Consequently, if we were to have disarmament of the things only in which we were best equipped, it were better not to have any disarmament at all.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us whether there have been conferences other than the Harding conference?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. I shall state one of the reasons for my being not altogether so skeptical as a great many people are about Russia wanting disarmament. I think it will come into the Senator's mind as I relate it. As I recall, in 1925 or 1926 there was a disarmament conference under the League of Nations, in Geneva, Switzerland. All the nations of the world were represented—the British, the French, the Japanese, and the United States. At that time most of the countries attending the conference, at least the major ones, were stronger than Russia, although Russia had coming a pretty strong young green army. A man who arose in that conference electrified the world. It was 20 years ago or more, but I have remembered him. He was a man named Maxim Litvinov, the Russian representative at the Geneva Conference. He made a simple speech. I do not give it verbatim, but in substance he said:

> Gentlemen, this conference has been called for world disarmament. I propose that we disarm.

No one wanted to disarm. The Russian representative, on that occasion, proposed the very thing I am now asking for, and a foolhardy Western World, more intent upon empire than upon humanity, said, "We will disarm, but we will disarm only around the fringes. We shall not go into the core of the matter."

Litvinov went home; and that was the beginning of the Red army which defeated Adolf Hitler.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for answering my questions.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, first I should like to say that the senior Senator from Maryland is entitled to the gratitude and the commendation of his colleagues in the Senate and of the people generally, because, certainly, his thought-provoking address, delivered in his usual forthright and courageous manner, must challenge the attention of us all. We are most grateful to him for the enlightening information he has given.

May I ask the Senator whether he considers that there is anything inconsistent with the proposal he advances in the recent statement of the President of the United States in regard to the manufacture of the hydrogen bomb.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not a thing. We must continue to manufacture it. We must keep on building our strength. We must not let down until we know that disarmament is not only agreed to, but we must keep our defenses up to that point, and then reduce them, if disarmament is agreed to, only as we are certain beyond peradventure of a doubt, by adequate inspection, that the other fellow is walking down the disarmament steps to the same degree as we are walking down them.

Mr. O'CONOR. In last September and October the senior Senator from Maryland made a very thorough-going study of the defenses in western Europe and elsewhere. In the light of subsequent events, are the opinions which he expressed upon his return confirmed, and does he entertain at this time the same opinions he entertained at that time?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I do.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank my colleague for his kindly remarks.

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also extend my congratulations on the very forceful address of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Knowing some of the nations as we now know them, what is the Senator's opinion as to whether the nations which would agree to disarmament might be in favor of inspection? What chance is there at the present time for us to get that kind of an agreement?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think inspection is as much of a problem as I at one time thought it was, if the counter advantages are sufficiently great. What in the world has Russia to fear? Let us assume we can get disarmament. In my opinion, Russia will have accomplished a great deal without shooting a gun. She has acquired China. She can still carry on the war of ideas. Let us look at it from the Russian standpoint, from the standpoint of the comintern. Suppose Russia could take this terrific effort which I have described and translate it into railroads, industry, water power, into the lifting up of the standard of living of her people. She would be much more powerful than she could be in any other way. We want her to be powerful in that regard, so that her people will be benefited. There has been a disposition on the part of many persons to put a few wings on our shoulders and to assume that the Russian people sometimes may not want some of the same things we want. We may not agree with her method of getting them, but I should think Russia would be favorable to obliterating the fear of atomic and hydrogen bombs and to eliminating the expense of her great military establishment so she could devote herself to other matters. I do not think she has been so successful in war propaganda and ideas that she might not think it to be to her complete advantage to do it. I do not like to say that as an undertaking it is absolutely impossible. I think it will take some "guts," some determination, some vision, but I am sold on it, and no one has the right to say it is an impossible and an impracticable proposal. There is no proof in history to show it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his observation. Being chairman of the Armed Services Committee, of course, he has a great deal of information which

is very constructive and helpful to the Members of the Senate. I agree that the arguments which have been advanced by the distinguished Senator could be used to indicate that Russia would be in favor of such a proposal. I wanted to get at the mechanics of it immediately, in my question, and I wondered, without feeling that it is an impossibility, if we would be able to get the inspection which certainly we would have to have.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is sound on that point, and I thank him for his kindly remarks. Without inspection, Russia would not go into it. I know I would not. I would vote and fight against it as long as I could stand here. More than that, I would not want my country to take one step toward disarmament with the other great countries without taking the step of inspection simultaneously in the light of broad day. I should like to see the effort made, even though it should fail, to show the people of the world that the United States was not for peace merely in words, but was willing to put the matter to the test before a jury of all mankind. Then we would know who the culprit was who upset it, and we would receive the kind of response in this country which we must have.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have any information at all which might indicate that this may be accomplished, so far as Russia is concerned?

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not the slightest bit, except that I believe there is hope, based on what we have done in Europe and what Russia has done in Europe, going back 15 or 20 years. The Senator knows that some of the powers—we were not one of them—were in favor of the building of a cordon sanitaire, or a group of states around Russia. At that time Russia said, "We shall not let you do that. We are going to seize these states so they will be ours." It was a matter of point and counterpoint. We go to western Europe and build our cordon sanitaire, a little bit farther away than it was built before. I do not believe it is impossible to sit down with Russia and agree. I do not believe we could do it in a minute or in a day or a week, or even a month. It is big enough to work on for a year or perhaps longer. I think the mechanics can be found, and I should like to see it tried. If it fails, we shall not have lost a single thing in the effort. That is what encourages me. If we were going to be worse off because it had been tried and had failed, I might hesitate. But if we are not going to be any worse off, but shall probably be better off, then I think it should be undertaken.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WILLIAMS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is it in order at this point to ask unanimous consent that the order for the roll call be rescinded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the roll call be rescinded, that further proceedings under the call be suspended, and that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who has already been recognized, may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

THE IRREGULARITIES IN COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION ACCOUNTS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wanted the RECORD to show that the absence of a quorum had been suggested, and that a call of the roll was had, because yesterday I appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and at that time informed the Members of the Senate Agricultural Committee that I was going to take exception to certain statements which had been made before that committee on Tuesday of this week, and that if any Members of either the committee or the Senate wanted to take exception to any statement I have previously made, or would make today, I would be willing to yield to them at any time during the discussion this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator wants the RECORD to show that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on February 14, Tuesday of this week, Mr. Frank H. Weitzel, Mr. Irwin S. Decker, and Mr. James R. Blakemore, representing the General Accounting Office, appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry along with Mr. Frank K. Woolley and Mr. Karney A. Brasfield, representing the Commodity Credit Corporation; and together they did one of the neatest attempts of whitewashing the discrepancies and faulty accounting policies of a government corporation that I have witnessed during my membership in the United States Senate.

Their general theme was that instead of the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation being in a deplorable condition as I had previously reported, they were keeping excellent records.

Together they denied that there was any foundation to the claim that over $366,000,000 recorded as due from sales made in the general commodities purchase program could not be supported nor verified and gave the impression to the press that this figure was merely the result of a misunderstanding.

The result of this whitewashing episode was that there was flashed over the country the news that the Commodity Credit Corporation was completely exonerated of all charges of mismanagement and that all funds had been accounted for. The same press release carried the notice that the three General Accounting Office witnesses testified that Senator WILLIAMS—that is myself—has misunderstood their interim report, thereby accounting for all the unpleasant publicity which the corporation had received during the past 12 months.

Yesterday I appeared before the Senate Agricultural Committee and advised the members of that committee that I would speak on the floor of the United States Senate today, at which time I would emphatically deny that I had misunderstood or misinterpreted the report of the General Accounting Office as submitted to the Congress on March 30, 1949.

On the contrary, I advised them that I would review the complete record of this case and repeat the charge contained in the report of the Comptroller General to the effect that "the amount of $366,643,129 recorded as due from sales made in the general commodities purchase program could not be supported nor verified."

I suggested that if any member of that committee wished to take exception to any statement I have made heretofore or should make here today, that he be present and I would be perfectly willing to yield at any time during this debate and that I would discuss this report to any length necessary.

It is rather significant, Mr. President, that there are only two members of the majority party on the floor at this time.

I have never charged that there was any shortage in the funds of this Corporation, nor do I make that charge here today. On the other hand, I will not make the statement that there is not fraud or a shortage. I do not know. I merely know that the Comptroller General on March 30 of last year reported to the Congress that over $366,000,000 recorded as due from sales could not be supported nor verified. And it is my position that this must be accounted for.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the Senator willing to yield during the course of his remarks?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad to yield at any time.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator a question respecting the report of the Comptroller General. I have in my hand the report of the Comptroller General of the United States, House Document No. 148, Eighty-first Congress, first session. I believe that is the report the distinguished Senator had reference to, which contains the information relative to the $366,643,129. The point I want to make is this. The report states that the amount of $366,643,129 reported as due from sales made in the general commodities purchase program could not be supported nor verified.

The distinguished Senator has just stated that in the colloquy which was engaged in before the committee, or during the testimony given yesterday, whichever it was, that these representatives of the Commodity Credit Corporation said the Senator from Delaware had apparently misunderstood the shortage of $366,000,000, what it was for, and the bookkeeping involved. The amount of $366,643,129 referred to in the report is what the Senator is talking about, is it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator misunderstand, or are the facts set out here verified, and that there is that shortage?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There has been no misunderstanding. As to whether there is a shortage or not, I do not know. Neither does the General Accounting Office know. I merely know that according to the Comptroller General's own statement, which he sent to the Congress last year, House Document 148, a copy from which the Senator just read on page 33, the statement was made by the Comptroller General that the amount of $366,000,000-plus had not been supported or verified. So all I have said on previous occasions on this floor was to repeat the statement of the Comptroller General. If there is any misunderstanding, it was the Comptroller General who did not know what he was saying, not the senior Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. And the words the Senator has read are words contained in House Document No. 148, and they are the words of the Comptroller General in his audit report?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They were his exact words.

Mr. WHERRY. So the Senator from Delaware is not misunderstood. If there is anything in which there is a misunderstanding it is between the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Comptroller General. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. The Secretary of Agriculture stated that last year, after the report was submitted to the Congress, he would be able to account for every dollar. I hope he can, but he has not done so. If he can do so it is time that he do so now. We have waited 5 years for this report, and the amount is still not accounted for, so far as the Congress is concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Have the Department of Agriculture or the Commodity Credit Corporation submitted any facts or any evidence that would change the statement made by the Comptroller General in his report relative to the shortage of $366,000,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS. None that I have been able to obtain except that in general terms they say, "Oh, it is all right. Stop looking. We know it is all O. K."

As I said before, I am not making any charge of either fraud or shortage, for the simple reason I do not know what happened in this corporation. I merely know that the Comptroller General, as the Senator from Nebraska has pointed out, made the statement in his audit report that more than $366,000,000 in this account could not be supported or verified. As evidence that the Comptroller General could not clear the Commodity Credit Corporation, I should like to read the statement made in a letter by the Comptroller General in reply to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] as follows:

> In reply to a specific question by Senator ANDERSON as to whether the audit of the Commodity Credit Corporation disclosed any fraud, the Comptroller General replied that the audit of the Commodity Credit Corporation had not disclosed that fraud existed; neither had it disclosed that fraud did not exist—that is, the records for the period covered in the audit report in many cases were simply insufficient to tell us or anyone whether fraud existed or not.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. On page 20 of the audit report of the examination of the Commodity Credit Corporation I notice two or three paragraphs, which I shall read. One appears under the heading "Accounting Weaknesses and Improvements," as follows:

> Our examination of the affairs of the Commodity Credit Corporation was seriously impeded by major deficiencies in accounting policies and procedures and methods of financial reporting.

Then another paragraph, the third paragraph under the same heading:

> The primary causes of the failure of the accounting function were found in the manner in which the functions of the Corporation were intermingled with others of the Department of Agriculture, the apparent lack of appreciation by the management of the necessity for accurate financial reporting, and difficulties inherent in the operating characteristics of programs.

Then the paragraph "b":

> The Corporation did not maintain adequate control over amounts recorded as being receivable or payable. It was not possible in many instances to determine who owed amounts purporting to be receivable or to whom amounts recorded as owing were due.

Does the Senator know anything about those allegations made by the Comptroller General, especially the last one?

Mr. WILLIAMS. All I know is what the Comptroller General himself has said; that he was unable to verify these accounts. But I think out of all the Senator from Nebraska has read, the most damaging suggestion the Comptroller General made against this Corporation was that part in which he said their greatest difficulty was "the apparent lack of appreciation by the management of the necessity for accurate financial reporting."

Evidently the Corporation feels that it is above the law and that it does not have to report to the taxpayers and the American people and does not have to submit its books to the Congress, as is required by law. As evidence that the Corporation does feel that way, we are confronted with the fact that the books of the Corporation for the last 5 years have not yet been submitted to the Congress, and we cannot get the Corporation to make an accounting for those years. The books for 1946, which, under the law, were due on January 15, 1947, have not yet been submitted to the Congress.

The books for 1947, 1948, and 1949, all of which are overdue, have never been submitted to the Congress.

The Corporation says its affairs are in proper order. I do not say they are not in proper order or that they are not all right; but I say the Congress is entitled to have those books, and I ask why the books have not yet been submitted to the Congress. Certainly no one will contend that these reports should not be submitted before consideration is given to their request for another $2,000,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY The figures which have been referred to today come from the testimony of a representative of the Comptroller General or his Office, do they?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct; they are from that source.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware this question: Has either the Department of Agriculture or the Commodity Credit Corporation submitted any evidence which in any way refutes the statement to which the Senator has referred, which has been made by the Office of the Comptroller General?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If any such evidence has been introduced, I have neither found it nor seen it.

Inasmuch as the General Accounting Office and the Corporation officials seemed to believe according to the news release on Tuesday that everything connected with the Corporation is in order, I advised the Committee yesterday that perhaps I had overlooked something, and that is why I asked the members of the committee to be present on the floor today so they could correct any misstatements I might have made or correct any improper impression I might have given Yet it is significant, I say to the Senator, that not one majority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is on the floor of the Senate at this time, although the committee was advised that I would discuss this subject today.

Mr. President, the amount of $366,643,129 is still officially unaccounted for. I know that a representative of the General Accounting Office testified on Tuesday that the audit reports for 1946 and 1947 will, if the Congress ever gets them, account for a substantial part of the $366,000,000, and perhaps for all but $90,000,000. But even if that is so, why do they boast that they have found all but $90,000,000? What is wrong with accounting for the $90,000,000? That is still a great deal of money, and it cannot be passed over lightly.

The audit report for 1946 is 4 years overdue, under the requirement of law; and the 1947 report is 3 years overdue. Why have not these reports been submitted to Congress? No explanation is forthcoming as to why the Congress does not have those books.

The 1945 report was submitted to the Congress only last year, following a leak of information to the effect that the report would disclose some rather damaging information regarding the accounting practices of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Following the receipt of that information, I joined with other Senators in offering a resolution requesting the production of the books of the Corporation. At that time the charge was made by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] that my sole purpose in making that request was to get my

name in the newspapers; and the statement was made by him even before the records were available that there was nothing wrong with the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Apparently the Administration was determined from the beginning that it would whitewash the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Now, apparently in order to get their audit reports for the years 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, we are going to have to send in clerks to get some additional information in order to justify the adoption of another resolution requiring the production of the Corporation's books.

They may think this delay will check our interest, but I do not intend to drop this case until all those books have been submited to Congress in accordance with the law.

Furthermore, I will not withdraw my objection for any additional support to this Corporation until an accounting has actually been made for the money it has received.

Mr. President, there is now pending before the committee a bill proposing an additional $2,000,000,000 of borrowing authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation. I am unalterably opposed to making such an authorization until an accounting is made for every dollar the Corporation has had prior to the present time. If the Corporation cannot account for all the money it has received thus far, whether it cannot account for $366,000,000 or for $1,000,000, I am opposed to writing off any of the money for which it cannot account.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What answer has the Corporation given the Senator when he has requested an accounting of the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation? It seems to me that is information which any Senator should receive.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Nebraska perhaps knows as much about that reason as I do. So far, for over a year I have been requesting the presentation to the Congress of the books of the Corporation. As to why they are being held up and who is holding them up, the guess of the Senator from Nebraska is as good as mine. But so far, the fact remains that the books have not been produced or presented to the Congress.

I understand that the audits are completed for each of the years 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949. Yet they are being withheld from Congress for some reason.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the observations which have been made by the Senator from Delaware, to the effect that the Corporation is now ready to show that it can account for all but $90,000,000, that would indicate that the audit has been made; would it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would indicate that at least they know more than they are telling us.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Department refused to present those figures to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They have refused to send those figures either to me or to the Congress. They testified on Tuesday that perhaps they have accounted for all but $90,000,000, which amount Mr. Blaxemore, at one point in the hearings, said perhaps they would have to write off. This is the first time the $90,000,000 has been mentioned publicly anywhere. If they know how much will have to be written off, they should submit the information to Congress.

Immediately following the statement made before the committee on Tuesday, I called the General Accounting Office and asked them to supply me that information before I came on the floor today. That information was not received.

I asked for an itemized break-down of the portion for which they could account, because certainly if they found a part of the $366,000,000, they knew where they found it. I want to know just how each item is accounted for.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator make that inquiry of the witness who presented the figures to the committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not ask the witness, for the simple reason that I was not invited to be present in the committee at the time when they were discussing the financial affairs of this Corporation.

Last week I went before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and requested that they ask the General Accounting Office and the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation to submit the books; and I indicated to the committee that in the event those officials should not submit the books, I would be glad to meet with the committee at the time when those witnesses appeared. But, for some reason, the committee did not see fit to extend such an invitation to me. So I am discussing the question on the floor at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. So the request has not been complied with, so far as the Senator from Delaware is concerned or so far as he knows; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It has not been complied with, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether the witnesses submitted the books to the committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. To my knowledge no books have been submitted to the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. So not only was the request of the Senator from Delaware refused, but the witness who appeared before the committee to testify did not have the books there to corroborate the testimony he gave the committee yesterday, when he said there was no difficulty; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct, the complete audit reports for 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949 have not been submitted to the Congress. Those books are not necessarily supposed to be submitted to the committee. The law provides that they shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and shall be printed and made official documents, and then they are supposed to be available to every Member of Congress and to anyone else who may be interested. That requirement of the law has not been complied with.

Mr. WHERRY. But certainly a witness who testifies relative to the debit balances or any shortages should be able to account to the Congress regarding the accounting practices used in that connection. There is a difference between doing that and supplying the books themselves. But if a witness who appears before a committee claims there is no shortage to the extent of the full amount of $366,000,000, it seems to me a complete break-down should be submitted with the testimony he offers.

Did the witness offer such testimony or evidence?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There was no such supporting evidence. Perhaps I should read the testimony given by Mr. Blakemore before the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator now referring to the testimony given yesterday?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was presented on February 14 before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WHERRY. Who was the witness?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. James R. Blakemore, who is connected with the General Accounting Office.

Mr. WHERRY What is his official position there?

Mr. WILLIAMS He is Assistant Director of the Corporation Audits Division, General Accounting Office.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I read now from the statement made on Tuesday before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by Mr. Blakemore in reference to this three hundred and sixty-six million:

> Mr BLAKEMORE. Yes. As a matter of fact, subsequent development of that program, which meant taking $366,000,000 in receivables as of June 30, 1945, adding to it the billings for sales during the fiscal year 1946, subtract from it collections received in due course, and doing the same for the fiscal year 1947, resulted at June 30, 1947, in a book balance of some $90,000,000, so that the $366,000,000, you might say, in due course of operation—in other words, additional billings, offset by collections on the original $366,000,000, plus the subsequent sales—reduced it to some $90,000,000
>
> Of that amount, some $90,000,000 was written off, so the loss, if any, is within the $90,000,000, but it is certainly not $366,000,000.

If the Senator from Nebraska can reach any sound decision from that testimony, he is better than I am.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was there any evidence to show why the $90,000,000, or whatever loss was sustained, was written off?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There was no evidence to show that it was written off, or, if so, why it was written off. There is nothing but the back-handed statement I have just read from the testimony.

There is no evidence that the $366,000,000 was found. There is no testimony to show that everything is in order.

Nothing was said except, in effect, "Take my word that everything is lovely."

I have never said that they could not account for some of this $366,000,000 if they will get down to work. In fact, there is no reason why all of it should not be accounted for unless the records have deliberately been destroyed, in which case we have a right to know that.

I feel sure that this accounting would have been made long ago if the officials of the Department of Agriculture had spent one-half the energy working on their jobs as they do in working for the political campaigns.

In order that we may determine just who is confused or just who misunderstood the Comptroller General's statemen, I shall review the entire case.

On March 25, 1949, I made a statement on the floor of the Senate, which appears on page 3190 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to the effect that I had received information that the records of the Commodity Credit Corporation were in a deplorable condition and that "over $350,000,000 of receivables in the general commodities purchase program could not be supported or verified because of faulty accounting policies and poorly devised procedures."

At the same time, I pointed out certain other irregularities in the records of this Corporation which had been reported to me, and I asked the other Members of the Senate to join with me in demanding that the books of the Corporation be produced, so as either to verify or to disprove the accuracy of my information.

Subsequently, on March 30, 1949, the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General, submitted to the Congress an audit report on the examination of Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945. This report was made official House Document No. 148, and it is now available for any Member of Congress or for anyone else who may be interested.

As evidence that my information was correct, on page 33 of the report—House Document 148—is found this statement:

> The amount of $366,643,129 recorded as due from sales made in the general commodities purchase program could not be supported nor verified.

In the same report many other irregularities were listed, and severe criticism was made by the Comptroller General of the accounting practices of this Corporation.

Following its receipt by the Congress a resolution was passed by the Senate requesting that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments investigate this situation and see how much of the $366,000,000 could be verified.

During the succeeding months no accounting has been made to the Congress either by the Comptroller General or the Department of Agriculture regarding this discrepancy until Tuesday of this week. On Tuesday, Mr. Frank H. Weitzel, Mr. Irwin S. Decker, and Mr. James R. Blakemore, representing the General Accounting Office, appeared before the Senate Agricultural Committee and, according to the press, denied that in their report submitted on March 30, 1949, they had ever intended to leave the impression that there was anything wrong with the accounts of this Corporation and told the committee that I had "misunderstood" their annual report for the fiscal year 1945.

It is noteworthy that the auditors of the General Accounting Office were somewhat confused in their testimony Tuesday in that they contradicted themselves several times. For instance, they first insisted that the 1945 audit report which stated that they could not verify the spending of $366,000,000 was correct at the time it was submitted to the Congress on March 30, 1949. Later in their testimony they are quoted in the press as having said at one point that "all the funds have now been accounted for," and then they went on to say later that these unverified accounts had been reduced from $366,000 000 to $97,000 000 and then later to $60,000,000 and that finally this amount of $60,000,000 was accounted for by being charged off.

The general impression at Tuesday's meeting was, according to the press, that the Commodity Credit Corporation was completely exonerated of any charges of mismanagement and that as far as the taxpayers were concerned, all the money was accounted for. Also, the inference was clearly given that all this confusion regarding the accounting practices of the CCC was created by a misunderstanding on my part of the meaning of the language contained in their report.

First I want to say that there was and could be no misunderstanding on anybody's part of the language contained in the audit report for this Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, as submitted to the Congress by the GAO on March 30, 1949, in which it is clearly stated, "The amount of $366,643,129 recorded as due from sales made in the general commodities purchase program could not be supported nor verified."

If the General Accounting Office has since discovered what disposition has been made of this $366,000,000 they have not as yet reported their findings to the Congress. If the GAO has been able to verify all or any part of this $366,000,000 item then it is their duty to submit such explanation to the Congress with an itemized break-down as to what happened. Such a report was not submitted Tuesday and I am advised that such a report is not available.

The chronological history of this case, which can be found in the RECORD, is as follows:

On March 25, 1949, I made a statement before the United States Senate, which appears on page 3190 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to the effect that I had received information that the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation were in such a deplorable state of affairs that they were unable to render an accounting for over $350,000,000. On the same day I called attention of the Senate to many other discrepancies in their accounts which had been reported to me, and at that time I introduced a resolution requesting that the books of this Corporation for the fiscal year ended 1945 be delivered to the Congress.

On March 28, 1949, I told the Senate that following a conference with the General Accounting Office I had been advised that the information which I had disclosed to the Senate on March 25, 1949, as appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 3190, was in accord with their audit findings and that in compliance with our request of March 25 the Comptroller General promised that the audit report itself would be delivered to the Senate within a few days. My remarks on that date appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 3282.

On March 30, 1949, the Comptroller General did submit to the Congress the official audit report on the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945. This report was made official House Document No. 148 and is now available to anyone interested.

Upon receipt of that document, on that same day, I read to the Senate certain excerpts therefrom which supported in their entirety the disclosures which I had previously made regarding the affairs of this Corporation. My remarks of that date can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 3487.

After this report had been read by Members of the Senate I joined with eight other Senators in introducing a resolution requesting that an investigation of the affairs of this Corporation be conducted in an effort that we might render a more complete accounting for the money which this Corporation had spent. This resolution was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and I indicated to the members of that committee my willingness to appear at any time and assist in any manner possible in their investigation. This committee unanimously adopted the resolution that they would investigate this situation. However, to my knowledge, no action was ever taken.

On Tuesday of this week, February 14, 1950, three members of the General Accounting Office, accompanied by two members of the Commodity Credit Corporation, appeared before the Senate Agricultural Committee and gave the impression to that committee that there was nothing wrong with the accounting policies of this Corporation and according to the General Accounting Office on that date all of this discussion about the $366,000,000 was a result of the misunderstanding on my part as to what they meant by the statements contained in their original report submitted to Congress.

I emphatically deny that there had been any misunderstanding whatsoever or any misinterpretation of their statements and as evidence of that I shall proceed to read excerpts from the report of the General Accounting Office as submitted to the Congress by the Comptroller General on March 30, 1949, which covered the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the period ended June 30, 1945.

I suggest that anyone who thinks there might have been any misunderstanding regarding this report that they read my previous remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the dates and pages

heretofore mentioned and compare those remarks with the excerpts which I am now going to read from the official report of the Comptroller General.

Beginning on page 4 of the report, under the title "Corporate Management," we find this summary:

Weaknesses in management, operations, or accounting were attributed in large part by the Corporation to the stresses and exigencies occasioned by the war. We believe that, while this is true to a certain extent, the effect would have been lessened if a more sound managerial control had existed at the time.

From page 20, under the subtitle "Accounting Weaknesses and Improvements," I read:

Our examination of the affairs of Commodity Credit Corporation was seriously impeded by major deficiencies in accounting policies and procedures and methods of financial reporting.

* * * * *

The primary causes of the failure of the accounting function were found in the manner in which the functions of the Corporation were intermingled with others of the Department of Agriculture, the apparent lack of appreciation by the management of the necessity for accurate financial reporting.

* * * * *

b The Corporation did not maintain adequate control over amounts recorded as being receivable or payable. It was not possible in many instances to determine who owed amounts purporting to be receivable or to whom amounts recorded as owing were due. It also was not possible to determine that all amounts owed to or by the Corporation were reflected in the accounts.

From page 21, I read:

f The Corporation did not exercise satisfactory control over its investment in fixed assets, particularly grain bins and related equipment Records were not maintained in such a way as to enable the Corporation (or us) to know the location or condition of such assets, whether, in fact, they were still owned by the Corporation, or whether all income resulting from rental or sale had been received.

It is rather significant to note the last statement, in which the Comptroller General said the Commodity Credit Corporation did not know how many grain bins it owned; it did not know whether it owned any, or, if it did, where they were located. Yet, at the same time, the Secretary of Agriculture and the President, during the recent political campaign, were making a much ado about the shortage of grain storage facilities throughout the country. Actually they were selling grain bins as "surplus" during the 1948 campaign.

From page 22 of the report, I quote the following:

Unrecorded liabilities are known to have existed, but no representations can be made concerning either their aggregate amount, which we believe was substantial, or their effect upon the financial statements.

Mr. President, I emphasize the statement. It is not my statement. It is the statement of the Comptroller General regarding the affairs of the Corporation.

On page 33, under "Accounts and notes receivable," I find this statement:

The amount of $366,643,129 recorded as due from sales * * * made in the General Commodities Purchase Program could not be supported nor verified.

Again, that is a statement of the Comptroller General regarding the affairs of this Corporation, which statement was sent to the Congress on March 30, 1949. Now apparently they are attempting to say that is not what they meant.

Continuing, I read now from page 35:

In connection with cotton loans held by CCC, the Corporation had made no effort to prove the accuracy of the total amount of loans by adding the individual loan-account balances, and we were unable to reconcile the total amounts of loans reported by Federal Reserve banks, as custodians, with the records of the Corporation. In addition, a duplication of $2,329,483 between loans held by the Corporation and those held by private lending agencies was observed in connection with cotton loans. As a result of the above circumstances, the amount of cotton loans indicated in the above summary as outstanding at June 30, 1945, is presented from Corporation records without satisfactory verification.

It goes on to state:

The recorded balance of loans outstanding on wheat is known to be overstated by approximately $4,000,000, with a corresponding overstatement in accounts payable.

I fail to see how anyone could misinterpret the language of the Comptroller General. Charges of mismanagement are found throughout this report.

From page 38 of the same report, I read:

The natural-cooler storage facility is a natural cave located on the site of a limestone quarry near Atchison, Kans Its recorded cost to June 30, 1945, was $1,772,009

I shall not go into any discussion of the natural cooler at this time except to point out that this natural cooler or cave in Kansas about which so much has been said and on which the Government has spent millions of dollars, is constructed on leased land and the lease is about to expire.

I now read from page 39 of House Document No. 148, Eighty-first Congress, first session:

The amount of $203,186,263 indicated as owed on purchases made in the general commodities purchase program could not be verified. No detail listing of individual creditors' balances could be obtained. We are aware of an overstatement of approximately $18,500,000 resulting from the failure to record cash disbursements of that amount on regional office records. Numerous errors, omissions, and inadequacies in the application of accounting policies and procedures in the conduct of this program necessarily had an effect on the recorded balance of accounts payable.

Again, I want to emphasize that this is the statement of the Comptroller General and not my statement.

I continue reading from page 39:

No adequate record was kept of outstanding dairy or beef production payment program drafts, and no determination could be made as to the accuracy of the amount of $130,000,000 shown above as estimated program obligations at June 30, 1945.

Mr. President, if they accounted for any of this money, why do they not give Congress a detailed paper? It has been a long time since the books were closed, and we still have no explanation. Now we are told that we should forget the whole matter.

I move over to page 45 of this document:

Criticism has been leveled at the Corporation relative to methods (3) and (4), it being contended that favoritism was shown certain dealers and that others rarely were given an opportunity to participate. Even when sealed bids were publicly requested or obtained as a result of bid invitations to specific dealers, it was claimed that the specifications eliminated all but favored operators. In most cases the invitations would indicate that specific quantities of certain quality were desired at stated geographic locations. This was an advantage to any grain owner who had such described commodity near the stipulated location but did not necessarily indicate favoritism; we do not have any reason to conclude that locations were selected with that in mind. However, the selection of the successful bidder generally could be predetermined by the knowledge of location of quantities of grain.

Reading further from the same page:

We were informed that all sizable wheat purchases from July 1 to September 30, 1945, for example, were made without competitive bidding on the grounds that the use of the bid procedure clearly was impractical.

On page 46, the following statement appears on the same subject:

In the spring of 1947, an investigation was conducted by the Division of Investigations of the Department of Agriculture concerning alleged favoritism shown by the Corporation to a grain dealer in Kansas City. In the course of this investigation, rather widespread criticisms of the Corporation's grain trading practices and release of related information was encountered, particularly among members of the grain trade. As a result, the scope of the investigation was expanded considerably In the reports on the investigation, it was indicated that considerable basis appeared to exist for the criticisms and allegations made. In a report dated June 10, 1947, an investigator stated that, while the facts and circumstances developed were not conclusive, it appeared that further inquiry should be made and that effort should be directed at establishing control adequate to insure that advance information concerning the Corporation's buying plans would not be made available to unauthorized persons Based upon our review of the related reports, we agree that this entire field warrants further administrative inquiry.

Mr. President, I want to repeat that last line of the statement of the Comptroller General regarding the buying practices of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Based upon our review of the related reports, we agree that this entire field warrants further administrative inquiry.

Again, Mr. President, nothing has been done. It is very interesting to note that we are now told no further action is necessary and that everything is lovely.

I read further from page 46 of the document:

Ordinarily in the audit of commercial enterprises the audit procedures can be augmented and the scope of audit expanded to the extent that deficiencies encountered can be overcome sufficiently to permit of a satisfactory audit. In the case of CCC, however, we found the deviation from sound accounting practices so pronounced, the errors and arrearages in record keeping so substantial, and the internal auditing activities and internal controls so deficient that such expansions were not a practical possibility and would have been, even if possible, unjustifiable economically.

That sounds like a charge of loose bookkeeping to me.

Turning to page 47, he concluded the statement which he submitted to Congress last year with this statement:

The accounting deficiencies encountered were so substantial and the inaccuracies cited in this report so material that we cannot express an opinion that the financial statements prepared by the Corporation present fairly the financial position of Commodity Credit Corporation.

Those are the statements and that is the conclusion reached by the Comptroller General last March. I am now wondering why, suddenly, the General Accounting Office finds that everything is lovely, without submitting any further reports to the Congress.

Based upon this review of the evidence, there is no justification whatsoever for the press release yesterday to the effect that there had been a misunderstanding of the operations of this Corporation. If all or any part of the $366,000,000 item has been verified, it would be a very simple matter for the General Accounting Office to furnish to the Congress an itemized break-down of how this money had been found or how much remained unaccounted for.

Some effort has been made by administrative officials to show that a part of this amount represents transfers to other Government agencies. If this is true, then why have they not furnished us with a list of the other Government agencies which received the credit? These other Government agencies to which reference has been made were operating under direct appropriations from Congress, and if the Commodity Credit Corporation has transferred to these agencies substantial credits without requiring payment, it means that these other Government agencies might have spent more than Congress had authorized, in which event they, too, will need auditing. Certainly as a result of these unrecorded transfers their accounts would be over by the same amount the CCC was short.

On numerous occasions I have requested that the General Accounting Office furnish to the Congress an itemized break-down of any percentage of this amount which they have been able to account for subsequent to the delivery of the annual audit report last March, yet such information has not been made available. If they are unable to account for the full amount of the $366,000,000, to which they themselves first called our attention, then it is their duty to notify the Congress of the amount which must be written off as unreconcilable in order to balance the books of this Corporation.

As one Member of the Senate, I refuse to accept as final any such ambiguous statements as were made before the committee last Tuesday to the effect that they are satisfied that everything is now in order. It is significant that they do not explain what they have discovered to cause them to reverse their former position.

I suggest that the Members of the Senate read House Document 148 and they will find that it contains serious charges against this Government corporation of both mismanagement and inefficiency, and at the same time calls our attention to their lack of adequate financial records. After the General Accounting Office made these rather serious charges in their own official document, I refuse now to permit them to pass off these charges lightly by saying that this entire controversy was a result of a misunderstanding of their report. That report is still damaging and the charges are clear enough not to be misunderstood. Nor can this glaring example of inefficiency in one of our Government corporations be whitewashed with any such contradictory and nonfactual testimony as was presented to the committee on Tuesday.

I renew my previous statement that I shall continue to oppose giving any consideration to the request of the Commodity Credit Corporation for an additional $2,000,000,000 until such time as an accounting has been made, and until the books for the years audited, 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, have been delivered to the Congress as required by law.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the Senator know whose duty it is to write off any loss which might be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would say that it is the duty of the Commodity Credit Corporation to write off the loss. I believe that a statement should be carried on their books explaining the item and justifying its being written off as a loss. As is the case with any private corporation, it is conceivable that the Commodity Credit Corporation may have a loss. However, the loss should be accurately recorded. A private corporation cannot go to the Treasury Department and say, "We have spent $366,000,000. We know it is all right, but we cannot account for it. Just forget the whole thing." The Treasury Department would laugh at such a statement.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Has there been placed on record anywhere an explanation of any losses which have been incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe the losses are explained to a certain extent in the Corporation's financial report. They issue a monthly financial statement, and in it they explain their losses. However, as I have often said, they do not explain their losses clearly enough for the average taxpayer to understand them.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. What is the total amount of the losses as to which they have made an explanation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Losses?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I cannot say exactly. However, it was only last year that I called the attention of the Senate to the misleading information which was issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, in a bulletin which was circulated around the country, to the effect that while he admitted that support prices did cost some money, the net result of the Commodity Credit Corporation's operations as of that date showed a lifetime profit. He was boasting of a surplus. I could not understand how this Corporation could make money operating as it did. It was not set up by Congress with the intention that it should make money. It is a support program and in setting it up, Congress recognized the fact that it would lose money. Accordingly, I sent a letter to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in which I asked him how this Corporation could report a surplus and the Secretary of Agriculture could claim a profit. I received a reply from the Bureau of the Budget, signed by Mr. Frederick J. Lawton, in which he said that the only way the Secretary of Agriculture could boast that this Corporation showed a surplus as of that date was by including as income nearly $4,000,000,000 which had been appropriated to it by Congress.

(On request of Mr. WILLIAMS, and by unanimous consent, the following debate relative to the accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation, together with the three letters included therein, was ordered to be transposed from the RECORD of February 17 and to be printed at this point in the permanent RECORD of February 16:)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there has recently been considerable controversy in regard to auditing the affairs of the Commodity Credit Corporation. At this time I desire to ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Assistant to the Comptroller General, addressed to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under date of February 16, in which an attempt is made to clear up some of the questions relating to the audit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the request, let me observe that the letter to which the Senator from New Mexico refers is one to which I referred in my remarks yesterday. At that time I understood the letter had been inserted in the RECORD by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I stated that if it had not been inserted previously, I myself would insert it.

I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from New Mexico. Inasmuch as the letter was not inserted in yesterday's RECORD, I wonder whether he would have objection to having the letter, along with two other letters which I was planning to insert, all inserted in the permanent RECORD in connection with my remarks of yesterday, after their insertion in today's RECORD.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I have no objection to having that done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The letters to which I refer are as follows: First, my letter addressed to Mr. Stephen B. Ives, under date of March 29, 1949, in which I called his attention to the statement I made on the floor of the Senate on March 25, 1949, relative to the discrepancies in the

accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and asked Mr. Ives for verification of that statement. I ask that that letter be inserted first in the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, immediately following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, immediately following that letter, I ask that the reply, dated the same date, and signed by Mr. Stephen B. Ives, be inserted in the permanent RECORD as a part of my remarks of yesterday. In that letter Mr. Ives made the statement:

In reply to your letter of even date, the statements made by you, appearing on page 3190 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25, are in accordance with our audit findings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the permanent RECORD for yesterday, at the point I have just indicated. I call attention to the fact that both these letters preceded the report itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The letter also pointed out that the report itself would come to the Congress within a few days.

Immediately following the printing of that letter in the permanent RECORD for yesterday, as I understand, the letter to which the Senator from New Mexico has referred, dated February 16, 1950, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, will be printed. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; that is correct.

The letters ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

MARCH 29, 1949.

Mr. STEPHEN B. IVES,
Director, Corporation Audits Division, General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR IVES: Last Friday, March 25, 1949, I called to the attention of the Senate that I had received reports from sources which I considered very reliable, that over $350,000,000 of receivables in the general commodities purchase program of the Commodity Credit Corporation could not be supported or verified because of faulty accounting policies and poorly devised procedures.

I stated further that in the case of certain other programs it was also impossible to support the recorded balances of receivables, particularly in the case of claims in the case of cotton loans held by the Corporation. Also, that it had made no effort to prove the accuracy of the total amount of loans and it was therefore my understanding that the total amount of loans reported by the Federal Reserve banks, as custodians, could not be reconciled with the records of the Corporation. I stated that at least one duplication of over $2,000,000 had been reported to me.

I stated that it was my understanding that the wheat loans are overstated by about $4,000,000 with the corresponding overstatement in accounts payable.

I went on to say that the book value of the inventories held by the Corporation as of June 30, 1945, was in excess of $1,000,000,000, but that it had been reported to me that it was not possible to verify this amount physically.

Furthermore, I stated that an incident had been called to my attention where barley had been shipped to Russia in the amount of $1,000,000, under the trading program, and the item had been omitted entirely from the sales.

Will you please advise me whether or not the information cited above is correct?

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, March 29, 1949.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your letter of even date, the statements made by you, appearing on page 3190 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25, are in accordance with our audit findings.

However, it should be clearly understood that the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation were not out of balance in the amount of $350,000,000 at June 30, 1945. This figure represents the approximate book amount of the receivables on the general commodities purchase program at that date and the documentation thereof was such that we were unable to verify the fact that the total was accurate although many of the individual items were of course in order. Subsequent events have proved that a certain number were erroneously recorded and they have since been written off.

In this connection it is worthy of note that the payables in the same program were likewise overstated and a considerable amount thereof have subsequently been restored to income as not being actually due.

Nowhere in our report on the audit of Commodity Credit Corporation is there any implication of fraud or embezzlement and we are of the opinion that no such instances existed. Of course, it is possible that in an organization of this size there may have been minor defalcations of a nature which it would not be worth while to extend the audit procedures to uncover.

It is my understanding that this letter is being written at your request in order to clarify the record and that it will not be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,

STEPHEN B. IVES,
Director.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 16, 1950.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the hearings before your committee on February 14, 1950, on S. 2826, question was raised as to what steps were taken by the General Accounting Office to clarify any impression to the effect that there was a shortage in the accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation amounting to some $366,000,000.

At the outset I should like to quote what was actually stated in the report:

"The amount of $366,643,129 recorded as due from sales made in the general commodities purchase program could not be supported nor verified. The recorded balances of individual accounts are subject to qualification as a result of faulty application of accounting policies and poorly devised procedures. Amounts recorded as owing from sales made in this program were recorded on the basis of quoted prices on the date of recordation, while billings to customers were based upon the quoted price as of the date of delivery. Adjustments frequently were not made. In a number of cases, entries for quantities sold (with associated values) were based upon representations made by the purchaser and could not be supported by documentary evidence. In the case of certain other programs, it was also impossible to support or verify recorded balances of receivables, particularly in the case of claims and miscellaneous receivables."

A statement was made on the floor of the Senate by Senator WILLIAMS on Friday, March 25, 1949 (see p. 3190 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) that "It has been reported to me, from sources which I consider very reliable, that over $350,000,000 of receivables in the general commodities purchase program could not be supported or verified because of faulty accounting policies and poorly devised procedures." Upon telephone inquiry on Monday, March 28, 1949, from Senator WILLIAMS to Mr. S. B. Ives, Director, Corporation Audits Division, General Accounting Office, upon this point, Mr. Ives addressed a letter that same day to Senator WILLIAMS, stating as follows:

"Referring to our telephone conversation, it should be clearly understood that the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation were not out of balance in the amount of $350,000,000 at June 30, 1945. This figure represents the approximate book amount of the receivables on the general commodities purchase program at that date and the documentation thereof was such that we were unable to verify the fact that the total was accurate although many of the individual items were of course in order. Subsequent events have proved that a certain number were erroneously recorded and they have since been written off.

* * * * *

"Nowhere in our report on the audit of Commodity Credit Corporation is there any implication of fraud or embezzlement and we are of the opinion that no such instances existed. Of course it is possible that in an organization of this size there may have been exceedingly minor defalcations of a nature which it would not be worth while to extend the audit procedures to uncover."

Senator WILLIAMS, apparently after receipt of Mr. Ives' letter, stated on the floor of the Senate on March 28, 1949 (p. 3282 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), that—

"While the General Accounting Office confirmed the fact to me that over $350,000,000 receivables could not be reconciled with the proper vouchers, they said this did not necessarily mean that this represented a shortage. In fact, they said it was impossible to state with any degree of accuracy that there was or that there was not any shortage, since adequate records were not available. It is true that while the books did balance, they were balanced only as a result of allowing credit for certain of the items which cannot be substantiated in full. They did not indicate that they found any evidence of fraud, but they were very critical of the manner in which the books and records of the corporation had been kept during this period."

On March 28, 1949, a letter was addressed to Mr. Ives by Senator WILLIAMS wherein he specifically requested to be advised as to whether or not the information stated by him in the Senate on March 25, 1949, was correct. In reply, Mr. Ives by letter of March 29, 1949, said that the statements made by Senator WILLIAMS were in accordance with the audit findings. It was also said in the letter that it should be clearly understood that the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation were not out of balance in the amount of $350,000,000 at June 30, 1945, pointing out that this figure represented the approximate book amount of the receivable on the general commodities purchase program at that time and the documentation thereof was such that they were unable to verify the fact that the total was accurate, although many of the individual items were, of course, in order. It was further said that subsequent events have proved that a certain number were erroneously recorded and that they have since been written off.

Later discussions of the matter were had on March 29, 1949 (see p. 3379 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) and on May 25, 1949 (see p. 6808 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

On March 29, Senator WILLIAMS stated in debate:

"It is still not straightened out according to the General Accounting Office as of yesterday. They still do not have the full vouchers to follow through the transaction as required by the law.

"I repeat, as I said before, that I am not making any accusation that there is anything wrong, because I am not in a position to do so. I am merely saying that the records have not been reconciled in the amount of over $350,000,000 according to the General Accounting Office's own statement."

On May 26, 1949, Senator ANDERSON addressed a letter to the Comptroller General concerning the statements made by Senator WILLIAMS on May 25, 1949, and requested our comments. In reply, the Comptroller General stated that each statement of Senator WILLIAMS as was summarized by Senator ANDERSON in his letter of May 25 was correct, but stated, in so saying, that this did not mean he agreed with all the further assumptions and interpretations made by Senator WILLIAMS in the course of his several debates on the subject. In reply to a specific question by Senator ANDERSON as to whether the audit of the Commodity Credit Corporation disclosed any fraud, the Comptroller General replied that the audit of the Commodity Credit Corporation had not disclosed that fraud existed; either had it disclosed that fraud did not exist—that is, the records for the period covered in the audit report in many cases were simply insufficient to tell us or anyone whether fraud existed or not.

The Comptroller General also stated in his letter to Senator ANDERSON that he subscribed to the following statement made by our auditor in charge at the Commodity Credit Corporation charter hearings in the spring of 1948: "The question of dishonesty is not raised in any point of our report. It is a matter of inefficiency in the accounting setup and the accumulated errors. It is a matter of accumulation of work getting behind and errors that have been built up over the years rather than any dishonesty." The Comptroller General added to that statement that the accumulated errors and incompleteness leave it unproven whether fraud could or could not have occurred; however, "this is in no way to be taken that our auditors reported or disclosed any fraud."

Reference to this letter, as well as to the Comptroller General's letter of May 2, 1949, to Secretary Brannan, inserted in the record of the hearing February 14, 1950, was made by Senator ANDERSON in debate on May 26, 1949. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 6834, 6835.)

I am enclosing copies of letters of March 28 and March 29, 1949, from Mr. Ives to Senator WILLIAMS, as well as a copy of letter of May 26, 1949, from the Comptroller General to Senator ANDERSON. In connection with Mr. Ives' letters of March 28 and March 29, you will note that the last paragraph of each letter states that it is understood that the letter will not be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The sole reason for this was that, while our audit report to the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year 1945 was complete and had been reviewed and approved, the report as of March 28 and March 29 was in final typing. The information in the letters was intended for Senator WILLIAMS' use in clarifying the record, but it was thought better that any quotations of the position of the General Accounting Office be based on the complete official report of the office, which was submitted to the Congress on March 30, 1949, rather than solely on statements in Mr. Ives' letter.

While the request of your committee was limited to furnishing copies of the letters which are enclosed, in view of the statements that have appeared in the press as a result of the hearings it would be appreciated if you will have this letter, as well as the enclosures, made a part of the record of your committee.

I am sending copies of this letter to Senator ELLENDER, Senator ANDERSON, and Senator WILLIAMS.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Assistant to the Comptroller General.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I may say that I think all of us would like to discuss this matter at greater length. Probably the time when the bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation comes before the Senate will be the appropriate time to discuss the matter.

Therefore, I suggest to the Senator from Delaware that he defer the discussion until that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Discussion is not now in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico if it is not a fact that the correspondence to which we have just referred is the only correspondence which has been received by the Congress relative to these matters, and that all the letters referred to preceded the report itself, and therefore have no bearing whatsoever, one way or another, on the report submitted to Congress on March 30, 1949. In other words, they do not explain the items either way. Is not that a fact?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if any Senators wish to take exception to my remarks of yesterday, let them do so now.

Let me also state that the reason the letters just referred to have not previously been inserted in the RECORD is because of the request of the General Accounting Office that they be withheld from insertion, since they felt that the subject matter in the letter would be covered more fully by the complete report which would be delivered to the Senate the same week. They have no bearing on the report of March 30, 1949, or the statement of the GAO that the sum of over $366,000,000 had not been accounted for. That amount still has not been accounted for, and I challenge any Member of the Senate to produce evidence otherwise.

After the above transposition,

TELEVISION FREEZE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to discuss some of the current problems in television which have been receiving considerable attention recently in the press. But first, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks an article which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, February 12, 1950, by Jack Gould, radio editor of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATOR REPLIES—EDWIN C. JOHNSON EXPLAINS HIS POSITION ON TV "FREEZE" AND FCC—A REBUTTAL

(By Jack Gould)

Two weeks ago this department wrote about the Federal Communications Commission's "freeze" on the authorization of new television stations. In reply, a letter has been received from Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat of Colorado, and chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, which has supervisory authority over the Commission's activities. Pertinent parts of the letter follow:

"I read with a great deal of interest your column, Time For Action, in the Times of January 29. Consistently I have admired your forthright, sensible comments. I was, therefore, surprised to have you chide the Federal Communications Commission for being 'susceptible' to my 'beck and call' and that I 'persist in issuing communiques on what the Commission should or should not do in highly technical matters.' I try to meet my responsibilities, which are specified by law, to follow as closely as possible all developments and viewpoints expressed on broadcasting matters.

"Let us examine the principal points made in your column, a major portion of which I agree with heartily. First, you say 'television is in real trouble.' You point out that the freeze is the source of the trouble and then you enumerate four 'chain of events' flowing from the freeze. I agree those are realistic deductions of the kind of trouble you are talking about and they are premised on sound facts. Then you ask the question, 'Why the freeze?' and proceed to answer it."

HALF BAKED

"No informed person will disagree with some of your answers. Of course, there was interference in the low band; of course, no final decision with respect to allocations in the high band could be made until the interference question was solved. Actually, in my opinion, you were charitable in your reference to the interference problem. The Commission found itself in hot water because of its own injudicious half-baked allocation and the only way out was to clamp on the freeze; I had as much to do with inaugurating that freeze as you had, and I have about as much to do with keeping it on as you.

"You assert that the FCC has now no excuse for postponing the lifting of the freeze; that it has been agreed that a six megacycle width will be used for both color and black-and-white and that therefore the thing to do is to either open the high band, or find additional channels contiguous to the present low band. Perhaps you are right; perhaps the way is now open for the opening of the ultra highs, or at least, for a switch in the order of the current hearings so that testimony can be heard and agreement reached on the standards for the use of the high band. But here again, you are suggesting a technical engineering step which I do not feel competent to pass upon or give advice and upon which I have never advised.

"I suppose, and here I am only guessing, that the reason the FCC is reluctant to move first into the question of opening up the high band is that it wants to know as thoroughly as is now possible to know just how color will work on both bands, and whether and how the standards must be changed before opening both bands to insure a permanent workable system of Nation-wide television."

SHORT-SIGHTED

"However, I have never said, and do not assert now, that the color question must be settled first; I emphasize again there are technical engineering questions involved here that probably neither you nor I know very much about. I have asserted, and will continue to assert, that to open up the freeze merely for the purpose of making more stations available only on the low band is a short-sighted negative policy which will play into the hands of certain interests and will do irreparable harm even to those licensees who have applications now pending for low-band TV stations.

"If the FCC believes it has the engineering knowledge to permit it to open up simultaneously both the low and high bands for TV station assignments, by all means it ought to go ahead with that phase. I agree-

with you that color will not come overnight; that there will be a transition phase; that there will be a continued service for the vast number of black-and-white set owners. In my opinion the commission is asserting its authority properly in the public interest by holding the current hearings and I concur heartily with you that it call in the representatives of the industry and figuratively knock their heads together on matters which are in the public interest.

"I cannot resist pointing out that in recent weeks a new propaganda campaign has gotten under way to have the FCC do one thing—and only one—lift the freeze at once, and to heck with a Nation-wide competitive television allocation system However, very fairly you point out the need for considering the allocations problem on a broad basis of all available channels.

"I hope I am not being petty when I point out that your arguments do not logically lead to the gratuitous paragraph which flails me for something not related to the subject matter of your article. I do not deny that I watch the FCC's actions closely; the law directs me to do that. I do not deny that I have written the FCC on several occasions with respect to broad policy matters affecting the public interest over which I have statutory responsibility. But, in fairness, I would not want my lack of comment now to suggest that I am even remotely responsible for the freeze or the engineering facts which have brought it on and which are keeping it on. I am not omnipotent; I cannot alter scientific facts

"ED C. JOHNSON,
"Chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
"WASHINGTON, D. C."

The article to which Senator JOHNSON refers made it clear that institution of the "freeze" was due to interference factors. Continuance of the "freeze" however, has been due not only to interference factors but also to the inordinately complex task of determining the technical merits of the CBS and RCA color systems, a task in which Senator JOHNSON has played a much more active and specific role than his letter suggests.

In August 1949, for example, Senator JOHNSON wrote the Commission that a CBS demonstration proved color video was "here now" and that there was no reason for further delay in getting it started. In October 1949 he was quoted as saying "RCA's system has a potential of acceptance comparable to none." In November 1949 he wrote the Commission that compatibility of a color system with today's black-and-white method, which is the heart of the RCA plan, "certainly should not be the primary basis for decision."

The whole point of the original reference to Senator JOHNSON was that such evaluation of the technical and engineering merits of competitive color systems is a logical function of the FCC, which was specifically established by Congress to deal with scientific matters on which it was not practical for Senators and Representatives to legislate. Impromptu opinions on the merits of transmitting systems is not the same as exercising broad supervision over the FCC's affairs, which admittedly is the statutory responsibility of Senator JOHNSON'S; committee.

FCC ROLE

In the last analysis it is the FCC which must make up its own mind. But the Commission can hardly do its job in a healthy climate if it is subjected to constant advice from a group which for all practical purposes has the power of life or death over its existence. Senator JOHNSON'S committee passes on all appointments—and reappointments—to the Commission, can conduct inquiries into its affairs, and can be a decisive influence in the amount of its appropriations.

If Senator JOHNSON believes that there are certain aspects of broadcasting which should be decided by Congress and not by the FCC, the remedy lies in a revised radio law, rather than in the indirect expression of congressional wishes through statements.

Senator JOHNSON, in one letter to the FCC, noted that it was typical of "totalitarian" reasoning to argue that color TV must be absolutely "perfect" before it can be introduced By the same token, it is unrealistic that millions of persons be denied excellent black-and-white television for an indefinite period merely because some day there will be color.

By reason of his commendably sincere interest in broadcasting and the importance of his office, the Senator can make a notable contribution to television by providing statesmanlike leadership in resolving the present impasse which is delaying all kinds of video, both black and white and color. His letter, particularly in its open-mindedness on the possibility of a revised approach to the problems of the "freeze," is a heartening step in that direction

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This article includes extracts from a letter which I wrote to Mr. Gould last week with respect to a previous article by him in the New York Times of January 9, in which he urged the lifting of the existing freeze on the allocation of additional television stations. But Mr. Gould conveniently omitted certain pertinent language contained in my letter to him.

For instance, I said:

Let us examine the principal points made in your column, a major portion of which I agree with heartily. First, you say "television is in real trouble." The greatest trouble seems to be to keep the supply of sets up to the demand—2,500,000 sets were sold last year. Recent stock market quotations of television manufacturing companies do not reflect very serious trouble. But, for the sake of argument, let's agree that television is in trouble.

That language is not found in the Gould article. By omitting it, Mr. Gould avoids an important point which he does not want to face.

Again he runs away from realities when in discussing the causes of the freeze he omits this sentence from my letter:

The truth is that the series of allocations in the VHF band were incorrect, ludicrously incorrect, and no one in the Commission will deny it.

Next he omits two extremely pertinent paragraphs which presumably do not pour any water on his propaganda wheel:

You continue that once the question of the high band was raised, the color controversy was dumped into the FCC's lap. You explain, fairly and honestly I may add, that in this color dispute the FCC would like to see the public saved the expense of investing in black-and-white if color can be made a reality in a reasonably short time. That has been my position throughout; about a year ago now when certain engineering studies came into my hands, I became convinced that if the FCC continued to shelve the color question, there was an excellent chance that three things would happen: (a) color would come only when certain powerful patent-holding corporations were good and ready for it to come; (b) the chain of circumstances would put the FCC into a position where eventually it could okay only one system of color (because of prior engineering standards which would have been adopted for use of both low and high bands); and (c) television would fall largely, if not wholly, into monopoly control. I have been pleading for color to be given the opportunity to develop in the good old American free-enterprise way.

The FCC, or at least certain members of it, quickly realized the position they were in and, with but a single dissent, last May decided to hold hearings on the two closely related vexatious questions. It was the FCC which decided the order of the hearings, i. e., that the color question be first explored Again, I had no more to do with that agenda than you; I was concerned only that color not be shunted aside into the indefinite future and that the Commission fulfill its legal duty under the law of pushing every advance and development in the broadcasting art. That there may have been sound engineering reasons for the FCC to first explore color before determining the allocations in the low and high bands is undoubtedly true, but that is a technical engineering question on which I have not commented or given advice.

Gould maintains that the FCC has now no excuse for postponing lifting of the freeze, but when I gave him this reason he did not publish it:

It is implicit, of course, from your own argument on this point that you agree that more channels must be available before a final and complete television allocation is made You obviously agree that to merely open the freeze for the purpose of assignment of additional stations in the low band will defeat the building of a Nation-wide competitive system of television, regardless of whether that system eventually is a black-and-white or color system.

It is especially revealing when Mr. Gould omitted this sentence from my letter:

Sure, the FCC "needs * * * some real gumption and backbone to assert its proper authority" and that gumption should be used, as it is now used, to not let certain publications in the interest of their advertisers call the tune.

He did not like that, and I know why. He wants the Commission to have gumption only to do what he proposes. What a nice cozy little arrangement that would be.

Mr. Gould, I presume, does not like anyone to infer that his column is being prostituted by private interests. That is the only way I can explain his deletion of this language from my letter to him:

A leading engineer for the principal patent holder in radio in the course of a letter informed me casually that recent tests indicated that the interference problem for both low and high bands were the same and therefore no useful purpose is served by maintaining the freeze on the low band; the legal counsel for a group of radio manufacturers spent several hours telling us much the same thing; a number of stories have appeared in the trade press recently along the same line; another group of leading lights in the radio industry have requested a conference with me shortly, on the same point; and now your column makes a similar suggestion.

So much for Mr. Gould and his fidelity in serving a pressure group which is determined to dominate the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. President, I desire to comment briefly about the existing situation in television. It is time that there be some plain talk about this matter. The original television allocation made by the Federal Communications Commission in 1947 provided for 405 stations to be located

in 140 communities in the United States. That allocation was made in the "lower band" of frequencies, the area in which the principal experimental work had been carried on. By May of 1948 the Commission had received so many protests from communities which would have been denied television station facilities under the original allocation that it proposed a new revised allocation under which more than 900 stations would be allocated to 461 communities. This was a little closer to providing for a Nation-wide competitive service. Meanwhile, in the larger cities on the eastern seaboard, permits had been obtained and construction work started on television stations. It was not long after the first few television stations went on the air that both the industry and the Commission realized that something was terribly wrong; there was so much interference that reception was wholly unacceptable. It did not take a genius to realize that under such circumstances there just would not be a sound television industry capable of expansion.

The original allociation put too many stations on the same channel too close together. That allocation was premised on use of the same channel by cities separated by something over 100 miles; they placed Cleveland and Detroit on the same channel. In making that allocation the Commission was guided by the engineering brains of the radio manufacturers, principally based on the experimental work of one of them. That experimental work was done in the lower bands, where only a limited number of channels were available. However, the Commission long before had set aside as the permanent home of television a portion of the spectrum known as the ultra-high band, where there is ample room for a Nation-wide television service without interference. But those who wanted to push television insisted that the high band should wait; they urged that they be given the green light to go ahead with the lower band. The Commission fell for this engineering argument, and it made the allocation which proved so tragically wrong.

By September 1948 the Commission knew it was in serious trouble, so it clamped on the freeze; in other words it announced it would make no more allocations and permit no further station construction while it ferreted out a solution to the interference problem. By clamping on a freeze, the Commission acknowledged that its original allocation and its proposed revised allocation were wrong, based on unsound and unproved engineering data. The freeze had been in effect since September 30, 1948, and no new stations have been authorized since that time. When it went into effect, some 40 television stations were on the air, and about 60 more had been authorized. Today there are 99 stations operating in 55 communities, and more than 4,000,000 sets are in use.

When the Commission ordered the freeze, it announced that it would hold hearings on the entire subject. Those in the industry who had sold it a bad bill of goods were frantically scurrying around trying new devices and plans and theories to overcome the interference. They were anxious to keep television in the lower band, where the original allocation had been made, and opposed the use of the higher band, where ample room was available.

From September 1948 to the early spring of 1949 the Commission studied, the industry studied, and nobody came up with anything that would satisfy the Commission, which by this time had become exceedingly cautious about moving forward again until it was sure of its ground. Meanwhile, the Commission also had become acutely conscious of the development of color television and its enthusiastic acceptance by the people. It had held hearings 2 years before on the use of color, and had turned down a demonstrated system on the ground that it was not ready for commercial use. But it realized that someday color television would have to be accommodated, and to make a decision on the interference problem without taking into account the use of color would be unwise technically and unsound economically. Should that be done, the Commission would find itself in another dilemma shortly, with another freeze unavoidable. So in May of last year it decided to hold extensive hearings on the interference problem, the use of both the lower and higher bands, and the standardization of color television. Those hearings began last September and have continued intermittently since. They resume again late this month, and no one can say just when they will be concluded.

The Commission's agenda for the present hearings specified that it would examine into the development of color television systems first, and thereafter study the use of the lower and higher bands. While I am not responsible for the order of the hearings, common sense dictates that the Commission wanted to have all the facts available about color television first, so that when it came to a decision about use of lower and higher bands it would know just how color should be accommodated. In short, it wanted to avoid its mistake of 2 years before when it had accepted a half-baked engineering thesis that stations could be on the same channel a hundred miles apart. To avoid areas of television distortion it now plans for a separation of more than 200 miles.

Lately certain elements in the television industry are getting ants in their pants. "The freeze," they cry, "let's get rid of the freeze. Let television go ahead. Forget a Nation-wide competitive system; forget color; forget using the higher bands. These things can come later; right now let's get television stations operating in another 30 or 40 cities. The Commission," they shout, "is stifling progress. The Commission is slow, hesitant, and lackadaisical; it ought to be investigated."

I have never hesitated to criticize the Commission when I thought they were wrong; by the same token, I am not going to remain silent and let them become the butt of unwarranted and unprovoked assault by people who are trying to grind their own ax, and without regard to the public interest and the general welfare.

No one can deny now that the Commission was terribly wrong technically when it made its original television allocation, although there were voices in the wilderness 4 years ago who warned of the error. But having made a mistake, there is no reason for the Commission to compound the error now by again listening to the same siren voices who were so wrong before and who led them astray.

Nevertheless, to high-pressure the Commission and others to their way of thinking, the radio manufacturers now have hired a high-powered public-relations firm to grease the skids. The propaganda started rolling. Two months ago I received a letter from Dr. C. B. Jolliffe, RCA's chief engineer and head of their laboratories, in which, in the course of other remarks, he casually informed me that Dr. Engstrom, their television expert, had recently completed studies which proved that interference problems for color and black-and-white television were the same, and that since interference was no longer a problem in the lower bands, there was no point in maintaining the freeze.

Counsel for certain radio manufacturers recently spent 2 hours talking to me about television problems, and conveying the idea that the freeze was unnecessary and improper, and that the color television question could be solved in its own good time. The trade press faithfully rallied to the attack with a series of stories, including two highly technical articles which were published in engineering journals. The trained seals took up the chorus with wisecracks. This was designed to furnish headlines for newspapers which devote attention to radio and television matters. Then alert radio writers got the cue and quoted copiously from such authorities as Dr. Allan DuMont and Mr. David Smith, of Philco.

Last week Dr. DuMont discussed the freeze situation with New Jersey legislators, who, the trade press reports, were impressed by his statements and promised to explore the situation.

Dr. DuMont, so far as I know, is one of the more reputable authorities in the field of radio and television. He has wide technical knowledge and is a successful manufacturer. He operates a television network which competes with three other and somewhat better entrenched network companies who have been in radio for many years. Understandably and very properly, Dr. DuMont is anxious to expand his television network. So long as the number of cities having television is limited, his network cannot expand. He has been cool, therefore, to color television development, and he has been impatient with delays, however unavoidable, since his primary aim is to expand his existing black-and-white network as rapidly as possible.

So Dr. DuMont hurls machine-gun-like innuendoes and distortions such as these: Hundreds of thousands of jobs are being denied workers by the existing freeze; the limits of the industry's expansion are drying up; the industry is becoming stagnant; soon unemployment will be rife in the industry. Mr. Smith of Philco blows the same kind of bubbles, and because these men are respected in the industry, their words are widely quoted.

Such statements are mischievous rantings and not based on facts. This talk about unemployment in the industry is not new to me, nor are efforts to enlist labor in the campaign to lift the freeze. Some weeks ago I received a letter from Mr. Joseph D. Keenan, director of Labor's League for Political Education, who informed me he had received reports from the electrical workers union that they feared the freeze would result in unemployment for their membership. I answered Mr. Keenan, and I should like now to quote from that reply:

I recall your conversation with me regarding the reports you have been receiving from local unions of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, arguing that the controversy about color and black-and-white television, and the present freeze on VHF licensing is causing unemployment.

Frankly, I just cannot understand the present basis of such reports In the first place, the controversy between black-and-white and color television has nothing to do with the freeze on licensing of additional television stations, the freeze was clamped on because of interference between stations, and the Federal Communications Commission is studying, as part of its current over-all television hearing, the use of ultra high frequencies and separation of stations on the very high frequencies. I had hoped that the hearing would be completed before now, but the subject is involved and complicated and it is vitally important, both to prevent monopoly and in the general public interest, that the decision be a sound one for the long pull so that we will have in this country a genuine Nation-wide, competitive television service And, of course, the matter is entirely an administrative one and not a legislative one and the Federal Communications Commission would be in a far better position to comment on the time element than would I.

However, I must call to your attention that television receiver set sales for the year just past will reach the amazing total of 2,500,000, that the month of November broke all previous records for television set sales; that in some areas television sets are actually being black-marketed, i. e., they are in such short supply that premiums are paid to get sets; that no manufacturer in the business can keep up with demands from retailers Under those circumstances, I fail to understand how there can be any talk of unemployment among electrical workers, insofar as production of television sets is concerned A similar picture obtains for the sale of radio sets. Certainly, the electrical workers cannot be referring to the amount of employment that would be afforded by the construction of additional television broadcasting stations, once the freeze is lifted. There is very little electrical work in that, except for the building of transmitters, and even that work is insignificant as compared with the employment afforded by volume production of receiver sets.

I am inclined to believe that the reports you are receiving are hangovers from a propaganda campaign initiated many months ago by the Radio Manufacturers Association, which had felt that the advent of color would adversely affect the sale of black and white receiver sets, and therefore they set in motion every wheel they could to becloud the issue Their interest was—and is—selfish; they desire to exploit the black and white receiver market and hold off color until a rich melon has been garnered, then make the switch and force the public to discard the old sets and buy new ones. Eventually, 30,000,000 American families would have invested $6,000,000,000 in black and white sets which would bring tremendous pressure against opening up color television, thus serving the interests of the dominating patent holding corporation in black and white television. The fears of the radio manufacturers lobby that the color question would hurt receiver set sales have proved groundless but they have just forgotten to turn off the propaganda mill; now the facts make them look silly.

The truth of this situation is there is no unemployment in the television industry; it is riding at an all-time peak. As I wrote Mr. Gould, but which he did not quote, the only trouble the television industry has today is keeping up with the demand for sets. Even the manufacturers predict a 4,000,000 set sale this year in the existing 55 market areas now operating. Certainly, recent stock market quotations of television manufacturing companies do not indicate that the companies are suffering. Television stocks have been the market leaders for weeks; one company's stock went up nearly 10 points in 1 week. Certainly, that does not reflect any trouble, or any recession in their business either, even though in the last 6 months set prices have been reduced a third.

Of course, what some of these manufacturers want is a freeze of their own, but their freeze would be entirely different. They want television to go down a blind alley based on the present wholly insufficient 12 channels which will not permit the building of a Nation-wide competitive television service. They becloud the issue by talking only about wanting to furnish the dear people with television programs but no one hears who is to furnish the service; to what extent monopoly control will flourish; and most important of all, which cities will get service and which will not

Senators from the Southeast and the Southwest, and the great Mississippi Valley area, and the Rocky Mountain area, have a right to be concerned about the future of television. If the siren voices who rant and rave today about lifting the freeze have their way, thousands of communities will either never have television or at best will receive it through little slave stations operating as satellites of some big monopoly-controlled station in a far-distant metropolis. If that is the kind of television we visualize for this country, all we need do is support the "lift the freeze now" crowd in their selfish aspirations.

If these shortsighted propagandists have their way the indications are clear as to what will not be done. They show little interest in the high band where 60 or more channels are available. In their book, television is merely a class service which can be made to pay big dividends. Why worry about the smaller towns when the larger cities have a greater-profit potential. They figure they can service all the large profitable cities with possibly another half dozen channels and the place to get those channels is right in the lower band where the present television channels are located. I should like to do that also but these channels are now assigned to various important Government services, including aircraft communications. Furthermore, FM radio is located there; also various safety services use frequencies in that area. But these manufacturers believe that a drive can be put on to shove these services out of their present position and assign the additional channels to television and everything will be fine—for them. I differ with them in that I want a permanent plan for the long pull based on a sound engineering decision and I want it now.

Only last week I read with a great deal of interest a letter from an eminent radio consulting engineer written to Mr. Max Balcom, president of the Radio Manufacturers Association, dealing with the propaganda wave to lift the freeze.

Says this engineer:

We fail to see what information and technical progress have been disclosed which have eliminated the need for the current freeze. RMA has done absolutely nothing except shout compatibility and lift the freeze in order to promote the sale of current black-and-white sets on a Nation-wide basis. RMA has not lifted a finger to cure oscillator radiation and image interference, both of which can seriously affect the sale of television sets as more sets are sold. Instead, RMA has established a standard of minimum radiation which is patently absurd, as FCC well knows.

There is no evidence that any RMC committee has studied television as a system or that RMA has any idea of the requirements of a truly Nation-wide system. In fact, the booklet says the new NTSC committee is now ready to help if FCC will tell it what to do.

If the RMA television committee members believe that the freeze should be lifted, what is the purpose of item 1 in the RMA recommendations? Why not come out and recommend the adoption of the RCA system with its speed flickering 15 picture per second rate and complex receivers, or the CTI system which will chain future receiver manufacture to projection techniques and expensive optical system

If compatibility is the one and only thing of importance, obviously we do not need the establishment of sound standards, as stated in item 1. We already have these sound standards in the form of the present monochrome standards now in use

If the RMA television committee will abandon its present policy of blind obeisance to compatibility which prevents the free expression of engineering thought and work on this complex problem, we feel confident that the many qualified engineering employees of RMA member companies can do a fine job by developing all of the pertinent facts The committee can then form a policy based on those facts to replace the present policy which was formulated before many of the facts disclosed during the past 6 months were available for widespread study by the engineers of the industry.

Mr. President, the campaign to lift the freeze is an artificial fog, spread by expert, high-powered propaganda artists, aided and abetted by a public-relations agency. Relying on a lack of background and knowledge among those it seeks to convince, it will continue to pressure Congressmen and Senators. Relying on threats and intimidation, it will continue to pressure the Commission. One plan is to have a congressional investigation of television, as if a congressional committee could deal with technical problems of dot sequential systems, proper band widths, and a score of other involved technical factors. If there is to be an investigation of television by Congress, let us have one which goes into monopoly controls and patent-holding devices and restrictions.

Nearly a year ago technical data came into our committee's hands which will provide an excellent basis for investigating television-patent monopolies. Our committee may decide that the time has come thoroughly to explore what is going on, but when it does so, it will be an investigation to determine who is calling the shots, and why. Meanwhile, I know the Commission will proceed with their hearings without becoming ruffled or stampeded by high-pressure tactics.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BLAND, OF VIRGINIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 476

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
February 16, 1950.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, a Representative from the State of Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Virginia will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 229) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, late a Representative from the State of Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in the passing of Representative BLAND, of Virginia, I feel a great personal loss. He and I have been close and intimate friends for many years. Our work brought us frequently together, and I have been impressed time and time again with the meticulous attention he paid to every detail of his public service. He leaves a record of constructive achievements that will be a monument to his memory. He had the respect and confidence of all his colleagues. His loss is a severe one to Virginia and to the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the second resolving clause, the Chair appoints the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] as Members of the Senate to attend the funeral of Representative BLAND.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as a further remark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate recess.

The motion was unanimously agreed to, and (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 17, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 16 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Ellis Campbell, Jr., of Dallas, Tex., to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas, in place of John B. Dunlap, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

TO BE MAJOR, CHAPLAINS

Siwinski, Clement Anthony, 18762A.

TO BE CAPTAINS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Ainsworth, Jess Willard, 13238A.
Allen, John Richard, 13213A.
Alukonis, Stanley, 13132A
Amundson, Floyd Allen, 13127A.
Anderson, Curtis Alloyes, 13136A.
Anderson, Richard Kenneth, 13201A.
Andrews, William Carlysle, 13291A.
Atterbury, Logan Cavanaugh, 13197A.
Behrens, William Chesly, 13202A.
Bennett, Eddie Lowell, 13155A.
Blake, Clifford Hubert, 13261A.
Blanchard, Jerome Louis, 13164A.
Bohling, Charles Frederick, 13289A.
Bouchard, Charles Chester, 13298A.
×Bradley, George Junior, Jr., 13187A.
Brown, Joseph, Jr., 13264A
Brown, Walter James, 13179A.
Caldwell, Joel Blackwell, Jr., 13263A.
Chinnock, Earl Howard, 13158A.
Christopher, Albert McAdams, 13278A.
Coleman, Thomas Philip, 13283A.
Collver, Robert Cecil, 13221A
Corcoran, Joseph Bernard, 13126A.
Corritore, Pascal Joseph, 13207A.
Covell, Frank Dustin, 13119A.
Cowan, Burl, 13191A.
Cox, Claude Wright, 13212A.
Crandall, Fred, 13129A.
Crockett, Woodrow Wilson, 13254A.
Davis, Montie Alius, Jr., 13108A.
Dawson, Theodore Estel, 13113A.
Dayton, Steward Ray, 13300A.
Dietrich, Clair McAlister, 13222A.
Driscoll, Kenneth Lloyd, Jr., 13273A.
Ebelke, William Henry, 13235A.
Edwards, Gerald Brinton, 13224A.
Ewing, Fredrick Eugene, 13232A.
Fallon, Gerald Walter, 13206A.
Fallon, Jack Stanley, 13272A.
Fazlollah, Maurice John, 13247A.
Fisher, Charles Ira, 13169A.
Fisher, Orville Lee, Jr., 13193A.
Foss, Robert John, 13243A.
Foster, Clifton Conroy, 13139A.
Foster, John Phillip, 13237A.
×French, Russell Aaron, 13174A.
Friedrich, Roy Edward, 13154A.
Fruit, Firman Harley, 13269A.
Galbraith, Charles Leland, 13181A.
Gassler, John, 13274A.
Gauvin, Francis Roland, 13208A.
George, Richard Pierce, 13226A.
Gillaspie, Mark Wolford, 13305A.
Good, Marvin Harold, 13162A.
Gregory, Fountain LeVerne, Jr., 13122A.
Grotenstein, Morton, 13185A.
Hale, Benjamin Lyle, 13188A.
Hall, Felton William, 13259A.
Hansen, Harold Christian, 13149A.
Harper, Cecil Leo, 13211A.
Harris, Charles William, 13245A.
Hartley, Frank William, Jr., 13189A.
Henke, Arnold William, 13217A.
×Hipsher, Charles Warren, 13209A.
Holder, Glendi Craig, 13138A
Hooper, William Duncan, 13151A.
Houser, Patrick Byron, 13239A.
Hunter, John Benedict, 13220A.
Irwin, James Richard, 13182A.
Jenson, Harris Lyle, 13121A
Johnson, George William S., 13165A.
Johnson, Howard Carrol, 13219A.
Johnson, Kenneth Alfred, 13294A.
Jones, Ellis Madison, Jr., 13120A.
Jones, Robert Louis, 13251A
Jordan, Arthur Cleveland, 13190A.
Keema, John Milford, 13293A.
Kennedy, Jerome Michael, 13260A.
Kleine, James Dallas, Jr., 13301A.
Kocel, Edward Peter, 13216A
Lambert, Henry Read, 13199A.
Lane, Ralph Hodgdon, Jr., 13279A.
Langworthy, Everett Walter, 13253A.
Lanphere, Jean Wilberger, 13115A.
×Larson, Loren Melvin, 13295A.
Laws, Warren Porter, 13257A.
Leavick, Franklin Morris, 13296A.
Liptak, James Steber, 13143A.
×Lockwood, Harold Keller, 13173A.
Long, Lewis Frank, 13234A
Looney, John Preston, 13186A.
Lupa, Henry Joseph, 13299A.
Lyman, Edward McLean, 13256A.
McCabe, Charles James, 13205A.
McClement, Robert Lloyd, 13236A.
McCullough, John Edward, Jr., 13177A.
McGuff, Paul Hoover, 13240A
McKenzie, Byron Ernest, 13164A.
Mayhew, John Frank, 13147A.
Menza, Dominic Frank, 13204A.
Metcalf, George Nathan, 13200A.
×Middleton, Cecil Jack, 13152A.
Mikkelsen, Albert Hansen, 13250A.
Moon, Jack F., 13176A.
Moore, Robert Sterling, 13171A.
Morgan, Noland Juul, 13303A
Morgan, Joseph Pierpont, 13218A.
Moses, Larrie Ellis, 13280A.
Mulanax, Robert Verdell, 13286A.
Mullin, Robert Edward, 13130A.
×Murray, Richard Earl, 13161A
Musgrave, Howard James, 13178A.
Nebughr, Raymond Laverne, 13241A.
Neil, John Gillespie, 13183A.
Ness, Patrick James, 13227A.
Norton, William Ray, 13140A.
Ostrem, Roy Ebert, 13233A.
Paulsel, Donald Quentin, 13288A.
Pascoe, Harry, 13266A.
Pidgeon, Charles Henry, 13125A.
Porter, Ernest James, 13141A.
Ports, Robert Alton, 13277A.
Quinones, Alphonse Diaz, 13110A.
Randels, James Bennett, 13258A.
Reilly, Alvin Edmond, 13116A.
Renken, Fred Phillip, 13123A.
Roberts, Ray Oliver, 13248A
Romo, Peter Edward, 13157A.
Ross, Richard Harold, 13163A
Sams, Richard Henry, Jr., 13267A.
Savage, Robert Berl, 13156A.
Schooley, Jim Corbett, 13302A.
Serafin, John Lawrence, 13153A.
Seymour, Charles Patrick, 13150A.
Sheak, Richard Robert, 13180A.
Shook, Fredric Warden, 13175A.
Siebern, Vincent Peter, 13133A.
Sitler, Fred Harry, 13124A.
Smith, Clyde Henry, 13287A.
Smith, Ralph Lindley, 13285A.
Smitherman, Julian Edward, 13276A.

×Sorbo, Albert Richard, 13166A.
Spencer, Robert Vernon, 13230A.
Sprague, Robert LeRoy, 13142A.
×Staley, Charles Walter, 13225A.
Stanley, Marvin Miles, 13109A.
Stein, Joe Eugene, 13192A.
Stevens, Charles Albert, Jr., 13117A.
Stewart, Dale Fenton, 13255A.
Swap, Arthur Merrill, 13214A.
Taylor, Roland Howard, 13282A
Terrell, James Henry, Jr., 13134A
Terrien, John Curry, 13131A.
Tift, Ralph E., 13292A.
Todd, Raymond Victor, 13112A.
Turner, William Hugh, 13271A.
Turnquist, Roy Henry, 13195A.
Tyson, Houston Carroll, 13210A.
Vacanti, Charles Louis, 13116A.
Van Rope, Roy Wilson, 13246A.
Warehime, Forrest Everett, Jr, 13194A.
Whalen, Daniel Joseph, Jr., 13265A.
White, William, 13228A.
Widney, Ellis Verne, 13137A
Wilson, Morris Francis, 13144A.
Wimberly, Wesley Forres, 13270A.
Wood, William Dean, 13215A.
Wright, Charles Franklin, 13284A.
Yarbrough, Leonard Harold, 13172A
×Yeoman, Bill Lee, 13146A.
Zalk, Arthur Aaron, 13275A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947. The officers nominated for promotion to captain have been found professionally qualified for promotion as required by law. The officer whose name is preceded by the symbol (×) is subject to physical examination required by law All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

TO BE CAPTAINS, AIR FORCE NURSE

Baldwin, Geraldine R., AN1421.
Geovanelle, Eleanor A., AN702.
Smith, Carol V., AN1734
Spillman, Frances J., AN1111.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST

×Nichols, Elizabeth M., AJ28

NOTE—The officers nominated for promotion to major, captain, and first lieutenant will complete the required 14, 7, and 3 years' service, respectively, for promotion purposes during the month of March. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Fred W. Ortmeyer, district superintendent of the Methodist Church, Algona, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for Thy goodness and Thy love. Accept our gratitude for each physical and spiritual blessing; for our homes, our schools, and our churches; for every privilege and opportunity which is ours as American citizens.

We earnestly pray that mankind may accept Thy spirit of altruism and love, so that the barrier of selfishness may be broken down and the brotherhood of man may become a reality. Grant a willingness on our part to render a positive service to our fellow men, especially to those less fortunate than we.

Thou from whom all thoughts of truth and peace proceed, kindle in the hearts of all men a true love for peace. May those who take counsel for the nations of the earth accept Thy wisdom and Thy guidance.

We invoke Thy special blessing in this hour upon all who hold responsible positions in State and Nation; upon the Chief Executive of our country and his associates; upon those who interpret the laws of our land. We remember every Member of Congress in our petition—guide them in their deliberations, grant Thy presence in today's session of the House of Representatives.

In this moment, O God, we thank Thee for the memory of the life of Judge BLAND. Wilt Thou bring consolation to the loved ones.

We give expression to our gratitude and seek these favors in the name of our Lord and our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDERS TRANSFERRED

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders heretofore granted for today to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] be transferred to next Monday, following the legislative business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extracts from soil-conservation articles.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "A Real Answer to Methodism's Pink Fringe."

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I wish to include an excerpt from the New York Times about Faker Einstein's joining the Communists in their attacks on America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include an editorial; in one to extend his own remarks with reference to the birthday of Thaddeus Kosciusko; and in one to include his own remarks in reference to the independence day of Lithuania, and to include resolutions of the Lithuanian Congress, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and is estimated to cost $328.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr YOUNG asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of Lithuanian independence day.

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter which I wrote some months ago to the President about Mexican migrant labor in this country and to include two reports, one from the governors' conference in California and one from the A. F. of L. study which was made recently in the Imperial Valley, notwithstanding the fact that the included matter exceeds the limit es-

tablished by the Joint Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, February 22, 1950, immediately after the reading of the Journal, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman tell us what the program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Next Monday is Consent Calendar day. There will be no other legislative business on that day.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day. If there is any legislative business on Tuesday outside of the calling of bills on the Private Calendar which is assigned for that day I will announce it on Monday. I have talked with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] about sending the basing-point bill to conference. The agreement they have with me, as I remember it, of which I informed the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], is that they would not make the motion before February 16 and that they would notify me as to when they were going to make the motion so that I could give the House advance notice. Can the gentleman from New York advise me when he is going to offer the motion?

Mr. CELLER. I think it would be appropriate to make the motion on Tuesday next.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is definite?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to hold the gentleman but may I ask the gentleman, Is it the intention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to offer that motion on Tuesday next?

Mr. CELLER. I have discussed the matter with Members of the House and they have agreed on Tuesday next.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to know so that the membership of the House will be as much advised as I am.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We can proceed on the assumption that it will be made on Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Now, there is an Indian bill which the President vetoed, a bill that was passed last year. A rule has been reported on it and I understand the objections of the President have been met. I may assign that for Tuesday or some day next week.

Any further announcement relative to Tuesday I will make on Monday.

Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday day. After the reading of the Journal there will be the reading of Washington's Farewell Address which I hope no Member will interrupt because that would be unfortunate and the country would resent it very much should a Member interrupt the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

Thursday and Friday are undetermined at the present time. Of course, if there are any conference reports they will be brought up at any time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask if the gentleman can give us the number of that Indian bill to which he referred so that we can look it up?

Mr. MORRIS. The bill is S. 2734, to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday and Thursday of next week, following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday next for 10 minutes, following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a bill which she has introduced that would create a Department of Veteran Affairs with a Cabinet member, the principle of which has been endorsed by the VFW; also to extend her remarks and include comments and an editorial regarding the Waltham Watch Co. and Swiss importations; also to extend her remarks and include an article of appreciation of Abraham Lincoln by Mr. James Morgan, of the Boston Globe.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next for 20 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACOBS (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) was given permission to address the House on Monday and Tuesday next for 30 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article in reference to his colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. BARING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

THE LATE SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, it is my very sad and unpleasant duty to announce the death this morning of the senior Member of the Virginia delegation, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND. Mr. BLAND has been a Member of the Congress for some 34 years. He was serving his seventeenth term in the House. He was the fifth oldest Member in point of service. He was chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and had long and well served his constituency and his country in that capacity. I think he was one of the hardest-worked Members of the House. I think it can truly be said that when the war came on and the functions of the merchant marine became so important, the work of that committee became so heavy that the tasks he was compelled to perform in those years, and did willingly and gladly and with all his heart, made him truly a casualty of the war, because since that time OTIS BLAND was never a well man; in fact, he had not been able to attend very often in the present session of the Congress.

I know that the loss to the country is great, because I do not think that any other man knew as much about the merchant marine of this country as did SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my friends here in the Congress will join with me in mourning his departure and will with me extend their very great sympathy to his bereaved widow, who is well known to so many Members of this House, because she is active in all of the social affairs of the membership, and I know that she is held highly in the affections of the Members of the House and their families. In the loss of SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND I feel that we have lost a very dear Member of our official family, and I know that it is a great loss to our country at this time when he is so much needed.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on an occasion of this kind one gropes for words to express his thoughts properly. In the passing of SCHUYLER BLAND the House has lost one of its outstanding Members and the country one of its outstanding legislators. I have lost a valued personal friend.

I can remember when I first came to Congress one of the first Members I met

was our late beloved friend. As a young and a new Member, I was immediately attracted to him, not only for his great capacity as a legislator but for his charming personality, his sweetness, and his kindness. Our association throughout the years in this body has been very, very close.

The House is deeply touched by the death of our late friend. We realize that while no man is indispensable, in the case of SCHUYLER BLAND it will be very difficult for any district in the country, never mind his own district, to replace him by one who possesses not only his qualifications but his broad, understanding mind.

Virginia is one of the mother Commonwealths of our country. It has given great men to the service of our country both in the preconstitutional days and during our constitutional history. The very father of our country, whose birthday we shall commemorate and honor next Wednesday, was a son of the great Commonwealth of Virginia. Down through the decades, from the earliest colonial settlement to the present time, Virginia has made its marked contributions in all walks of human activity, particularly in those that relate to the progress of our country, and more particularly to the public service of our country. There is a long list of outstanding men born in Virginia who have left their imprint upon the passage of time during their lives. Of them, SCHUYLER BLAND ranks with the greatest.

Speaking for the Massachusetts delegation, as I know I can in particular, and as majority leader speaking for the entire House, we join the Virginia delegation in expressing our deep sympathy on the death of our beloved friend. We extend to his widow and to the people of his district our profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I know of few men whose passing would touch me more deeply than the passing of OTIS BLAND. We were warm personal friends. I have had the privilege of visiting in his home and seeing his home life, the fine, courteous, splendid gentleman that he was, a man of outstanding ability, a man of great and fundamental character, truly one of the greatest souls with whom it has ever been my privilege to come in contact.

His district, his State and his country, that he loved so well and that he served so long, will miss him always. But I could not leave this place without saying something about his sweet helpmate, Mary. She was able; she was kind. When people she knew were in trouble, and you heard of it and went to see those people, you found Mary Bland already there. And she stayed and arranged things after all were gone. To that sweet and gracious lady I tender my deepest and sincere sympathy in her great loss. I want her to know that with her I shall miss him always.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I learned of the death of our good friend and beloved colleague, OTIS BLAND. His death is a great loss to all of us. When I first came to the Congress 26 years ago OTIS BLAND was one of the outstanding leaders of Congress and so he continued through all of his many years of service. He was courteous, thoughtful, and considerate. He gave his friendship freely and was always anxious to give a helping hand to the newer Members. Through occupying adjacent suites he and I formed an early friendship that ripened as the years rolled by. I came to admire him as a great Virginian, a great statesman and a stalwart American.

Perhaps no individual had a better grasp of the serious problem of the merchant marine than Mr. BLAND. He was an authority upon shipping and fisheries. It is unfortunate at this particular time when we face the task of maintaining for national defense a strong merchant marine that we should be deprived of his knowledge and his guiding hand.

I join with the Virginia delegation and all of our colleagues, both Republican and Democratic Members alike in paying tribute to an outstanding public servant and a sturdy American. We have all lost a great friend, and the country a strong right arm. To Mrs. Bland, whom I have had the privilege of knowing for many years, and for whom I have the greatest respect and affection, as well as to the members of her family, goes my heartfelt and deepest sympathy.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, throughout his long service SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND held an unwavering devotion to his country and the principles of this Republic. His great concern was a conscientious attention to matters entrusted to him by the Congress and by his constituents. Mr. BLAND rarely took the floor in this Chamber unless a matter affecting the committee he served so faithfully and with such ability was under discussion. But in these times his colleagues could rest assured that he would furnish them a carefully prepared and lucid exposition of the legislation offered for debate.

In his years as chairman of the important Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries he developed a peerless reputation as a champion of a healthy merchant sea service. The protection and proper utilization of our coastal and inland waters were problems to which he gave the diligent attention of a true conservationist.

Mr. BLAND learned the importance of industriousness in his youth, when he was obliged to practice rigid self-denial in his quest for legal knowledge.

He served as a friend and as an inspiration to scores of his juniors in this House, and particularly to those of us in the Virginia delegation. As an outstanding and beloved example of the useful legislator, he will be mourned sincerely by the entire membership of this House and by the pepole of Virginia whom he served so faithfully and so well. We from Virginia have a particular feeling today of love and sympathy for his beloved widow. The affection which existed between Mr. BLAND and his wife and their deep attachment and love for each other was an inspiration to us all.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCSWEENEY].

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and other Members of the Virginia delegation in paying tribute to a noble soul. One of the sadnesses upon my return to Congress was to find that some of the vigor and strength had gone from that once very vigorous and very arduous worker, Mr. BLAND.

I remember, before the days when we had amplification in this Hall, his splendid voice, loud and yet resonant, always could be heard with a kindly tone, carrying to us of the Congress his complete and reliable information relative to the things he knew were right and for the well-being of our country As I said, my sadness was increased when I came back to Congress and saw that Mr. BLAND'S step was somewhat halted, his back was somewhat bent, but I never saw a lessening of that kindly gleam that came from his genial eye.

I remember coming here in my younger days with my wife, newly married, and one of those persons who was very friendly, and tried to make it possible for us to enjoy this new situation more completely, was that gracious lady, Mrs. Bland. Through all these years that splendid friendship has continued.

I join with you and your colleagues, Mr. SMITH, in your beautiful expressions of sympathy and in your realization that we have lost not only a splendid public servant but a very fine friend.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, when Judge BLAND first came to the Congress of the United States the merchant marine of this country carried approximately 8 percent of the foreign commerce of this country. When Judge BLAND first entered the halls of this great body our merchant marine was at the lowest ebb in all of its great and glorious history. Today all over the world the American flag flies. The greatest tribute to Judge BLAND is the fact that those flags do fly everywhere in the world. I have the high privilege of representing the second port in the United States of America. There, in a very concrete, practical, and realistic way, we daily see the fruit of his great labors. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is the outstanding legislation passed by this Congress to restore and reaffirm the position of our country on the high seas. That act was the product of the genius of Judge BLAND, of Virginia. It meant that when we entered the second great World War we had the machinery, the equipment, and the shipyards to produce the greatest fleet that our Nation or any nation has ever known.

So not only do I join with my friends from Virginia in paying tribute to a dear colleague, a loving, humble, and understanding character, but to a man whose contribution to the United States of America and to the security of our great country is second to none. To his devoted wife I, too, extend my heartfelt sympathy. She has the consolation of knowing that Judge BLAND served his State and his country well and faithfully.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the Virginia delegation in paying tribute to this great American, Judge BLAND. I came here first about 20 years ago. I recall many, many times the vigor with which Judge BLAND presented problems that came before the committee of which he was chairman, the great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. How well and how ably he handled those problems, with that great vigor he possessed, and with a desire to impress upon the Members of the Congress that the things he said were absolutely true and correct. I think he did a wonderful job. He had a wonderful command of the English language. He was a gentleman in every sense of the word. Never have I gone to him and asked him to consider certain problems that he did not give me an honest, sincere hearing. He has now passed to the Great Beyond, but I consider him as a man who tried to serve his country and his State well. He did.

I too wish to pay tribute to his dear wife, who has always been one of the most gracious ladies I have ever known, and extend my sympathy to her in the sorrow she now suffers through the passing of her dearest companion and husband.

This Nation has lost one of the best legislators with whom it has been my privilege to associate; the State of Virginia likewise, and his congressional district

May God be gracious unto his widow and members of his family to whom we extend our sympathy.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND has sailed to his home port with his ship full rigged and on the bridge to the last. This is as he would have planned it.

During the 14 years I have been in this House, I learned to value the counsel and friendship of the departed. I served with him in the Committee on the Library and also in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Judge BLAND was a man of strong will and strong determination, but he employed these virtues with a wide, broad vision. This was a fortunate thing, as the gentleman from Louisiana said, for our country. He recognized in the days before the last war that a conflict was coming, and he realized, as many others did not, that the merchant marine was not an auxiliary force but was just as important—more important in many respects—than the Army and the Navy. He fought in a determined manner to strengthen the merchant marine, and he brought it up to such a high state of efficiency as to shorten the war by many years. His counsel will be missed by all in the committee; his counsel will be missed by those of his State delegation.

Today to his dear, faithful wife and to the Members of the Virginia delegation I extend the full degree of my condolence.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in 1939 I discovered very soon that Judge BLAND was one of the strong men of this Congress and an outstanding leader; I also discovered that he was devoted to duty. Judge BLAND was a man who extended to me a great deal of personal aid. I became acquainted with him early in my service here. We had a number of problems together in one of the departments.

SCHUYLER BLAND was a man who expressed confidence in young men, gave them encouragement when they came into Congress and gave them confidence in themselves. I doubt if I could name a man in my experience who has rendered greater service than Judge BLAND. We will not soon see his like again.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who served with Judge BLAND as members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries feel the loss almost as keenly as it is felt by the Virginia delegation. The Judge was far more than merely a committee chairman; he was more of an elder brother; and, to some of the younger members, perhaps, almost a father. He expected the best from those of us who worked under him. He gave us the fullest amount of responsibility, but always he was there with a helping hand under the elbow whenever we needed it.

The memory of the work that he did for the Nation and especially for the merchant marine of our country will continue to inspire all of us who have known him.

There is one other little thought that has been running through my mind all this morning since this most distressing news reached me. There is a term applied to a good many men but deserved by so very few—a gentleman of the old school. We may never have known another, but in knowing Judge BLAND we knew one.

I join with the Virginia delegation in extending to his family every sympathy.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND has brought sorrow to all of the Members of the House. While his health for more than a year had not been as good as usual, during the present session his many friends were delighted to note that there had been an improvement in his physical condition in the past few months. He had announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection after the expiration of his present term. The improvement in his health had encouraged his many friends to believe that the relaxation from public duties would result in his living to be much older.

He was a Member of the House for nearly 32 years. He was not only chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries but he was the outstanding authority on merchant marine in the United States. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Flood Control, of which I was chairman, had adjoining offices and committee rooms. We saw one another daily. For a short time I served on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries with Judge BLAND. There is no better opportunity to judge the work of a Member of Congress than in the committee room.

Judge BLAND was well born. He was a descendant of the Blands of Virginia, who were most prominent during the Revolution and the adoption of the Constitution. He was patriotic. He was an American of the Virginia mold. He was intensely loyal to his State and to his country.

Our departed friend was well prepared for service in the House. He was conspicuous in his community service. He had had experience on the bench. He had grown up with an excellent background and in the public service. From the very beginning of his service he took high rank among the Members of the House.

Judge BLAND was one of the most industrious men I ever knew. He was indefatigable in office and committee work. He was the master of every bill reported by his committee. The House came to rely upon him They knew that the hearings had been comprehensive; that all facts had been developed. The Members relied upon his conclusions and his recommendations.

No Member of either branch of Congress contributed more to the merchant marine in peace or to the expansion of the merchant marine in World War II than Judge BLAND. While interested in the merchant marine as it affected his district, he was interested in the merchant marine as it affected the Nation, and as it provided for the prosecution of World War II and for national defense. He is entitled to more credit for the merchant marine, for the Coast Guard, and for fisheries as authorized by the Congress, than any other Member of either body.

Judge BLAND was a loyal and devoted friend. He was dependable. He was reliable. His word was his bond. He was a living demonstration of the fact that the best way to have friends is to be a friend.

He was a devoted husband. His charming wife was the idol of his heart. She and my wife were close friends for years. They were associated in the activities of the Congressional Club composed of the wives of Senators and Representatives. My wife and I are personally and deeply grieved in the passing of Judge BLAND. We extend to his devoted wife our deepest sympathy.

Judge BLAND was among the leading Members of the House of Representatives for many years. No man was more influential or controlling in the passage of legislation which he championed and which he reported to the House. He will be greatly missed.

The passing of SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND is a distinct loss to Virginia and to the United States. The country can ill afford to lose such men as he. He lived the good life of his time. He served his country long, well, and faithfully. He has been gathered to his fathers. Honor to his memory. Peace to his ashes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, my acquaintanceship and association with the man we are paying tribute to this morning is of much shorter duration than that of the distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me.

I became acquainted with Judge BLAND during my short tenure as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. During the period I served with him and under him as chairman of that committee, I learned not only to esteem but to admire and to respect him.

He was a man of scholarly attainment. Anyone who had the pleasure of serving with him on the committee was soon made conscious of the fact that he was a man who had a broad conception of the duties and functions that his committee had to assume and, above all things, he was a presiding officer who was fair and impartial and through the erudite manner in which he conducted the affairs of the committee he won the admiration of every new Member who was privileged to serve under him.

I join the distinguished delegation from Virginia this morning in paying tribute to the memory of a great American, a great statesman, and a great scholar, and an humble citizen who has contributed so much to the cause and welfare of your country and mine.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, first I desire to join in the statements that have been made about Virginia which has contributed more great men to the Nation than probably any other State. I have always regarded Virginia as one of the best governed States in the Union; and that applies today.

Virginia produced the greatest leader of all times, George Washington, whose birthday we will celebrate next Wednesday.

She produced Thomas Jefferson, the wisest political philosopher the world has ever known.

She produced Patrick Henry, the greatest orator of all times. You may search the literature of all ages, and you will find no speech of its length that will compare with Patrick Henry's address to the Virginia Convention.

She produced Walter Reed, who has done more to alleviate the sufferings of mankind than Lister, Jenner, and Pasteur all combined. Some day I hope I may find time to pay my tribute to this great American.

She produced Robert E. Lee, the greatest commander of the English-speaking race, and many other great leaders I could mention.

But, all of them had one great attribute that was possessed to the highest degree by OTIS BLAND, and that was common honesty.

Alexander Pope said:

A wit's a feather, and a chief a rod;
An honest man's the noblest work of God.

When I first came to Congress I arrived several days before my term of office began. There was a contest going in the House over a seat in Pennsylvania. I saw OTIS BLAND put on trial in that contest. He took what to a majority on our side, especially our leadership, was the unpopular position, but he was inspired by that common honesty he always manifested in all his dealings in the House of Representatives, and I am sure in all his dealings in private life. He impressed me more that night than any other man that I saw in the Congress at that time, and during all the years we have served together that great attribute of OTIS BLAND, that sterling, common honesty, and courage to back it up, has stood out and marked him to me as among the great leaders of our generation.

I join with the Virginia delegation in mourning the untimely passing of this great Representative of that great State.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I have always had, from earliest days, the greatest respect for the Congress of the United States and for this House. The inception of that feeling is due, I think, to the fact that the first Congressman I ever saw or ever met or ever heard was our beloved colleague, Judge BLAND. When I was a young student, just beginning college, I heard Judge BLAND make one of his first speeches as a Member of the Congress at the unveiling of a statue to Gen. Hugh Mercer, the hero of the Battle of Princeton, after whom Mercersburg, Pa., was named, and who was a resident, as were many other distinguished people from George Washington and John Paul Jones on, of my then home town, Fredericksburg, Va.

I was born in Judge BLAND's district. I perhaps, have the unique distinction of being, so far as I know, the only Member of Congress, party lines aside, who had at one time been offered an appointment to the United States Naval Academy by a colleague with whom he later served in this House. That appointment was offered to me in the year 1918 by Judge BLAND. So I have known him and known his family and learned from him and followed with interest and affection all the things he did.

It was a great privilege to be able to serve with him and know him more intimately on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He was fair and he was courteous, but more than that he was kindly and he was helpful. At all times one felt the hand of a man who knew what was necessary to do and what was good for his country to have accomplished. He guided through this House many important and at times vitally essential items of legislation.

I know we will all miss him, that we will grieve for him and for his family in his passing. He has gone to a world where rewards of which we know naught await those who have truly served and been loved by their fellow men.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join in the very deep and sincere tribute of respect that is being paid to my good friend, whom I always called Judge BLAND.

I recall that in the early months of my first session of Congress I went to Judge BLAND and asked him to do me a favor, which he could easily have turned aside; he graciously granted it. It was a kindly, helpful, human thing for one of the ablest leaders in the House of Representatives to do to a new Member of Congress.

Always down through the years when I had an opportunity I would go out of my way to speak to Judge BLAND because of the fine, kindly smile he had and the kindly twinkle in his eyes.

When I first came here, Judge BLAND was one of the most effective, powerful speakers on the floor. He has left behind him a tremendous record of accomplishment. More than that, he has left with his colleagues an abiding affection for him as an individual as well as a Member of Congress.

Knowing Judge BLAND, I would say that he was born a gentleman. God gave him a kind and a great heart. Life gave him the opportunity to be generous with two great qualities. In my memory, he is a very fine and a great individual, who has left a very lasting impression upon me and on the Nation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, when I came to my office this morning and saw the flag at half mast, I did not know what it meant. It was a sad blow to me to learn that the occasion for this symbol of mourning was the death of my friend, SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND.

I had the honor in 1945 and 1946, to serve on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, under the chairmanship of Judge BLAND. Certainly nobody who ever served under him would forget him, would lack in admiration for his fine qualities as a legislator, or would lack in affection for him as a man. He was a most lovable personality. If he had a fault on the committee, it was that he was too patient with people who imposed on his good nature. But he had a wonderful heart and wonderful character.

The efficiency of the American merchant marine was his religion. It was the object of his devotion all his life. If the seas do not teem with American shipping, it certainly is not the fault of Judge BLAND.

As it happens I had occasion to go rather frequently to the district which he represented. I know something about the positive veneration in which he was held there. He was a prophet who had honor in his own country, and he had honor wherever anybody knew him. I mourn his loss and extend my heartfelt sympathy to his widow and devoted kinsmen.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my humble tribute to a great American. It was my privilege to know Mr. BLAND rather intimately in the last few years. I never met a man with a more gentle soul who had a keener and quieter sense of humor, or who had a more rigid sense of what was right, and practiced it, than did the gentleman from Virginia. I feel a deep sense of loss. My heart is full at his passing, and I extend my sympathy to his widow and family and his colleague from Virginia. A great power for good has left us and we are the richer for having known him.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the dean of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot forego the privilege of adding my few words on the passing of a great statesman from a great State. I had the pleasure of serving with him for many, many years. It is not given to many to have the privilege of serving in the House over a long span of life together with one's colleagues as it was his fortune to do. I always looked up to him with reverence because I saw in him the desire to be of service, not only to his district and his State, but to the Nation. He held a very important position in the House for many years. I do not know of any man in the years that have gone by who held that important position and who rendered greater service to the Nation than he did. He was a gentleman and a scholar. He was devoted to the cause of his country. I do not have the words to express my deep and heartfelt sympathy to his loved ones.

As for the House of Representatives we have lost a sincere and capable man by the passing of our friend, Judge BLAND. Younger men, following in his footsteps with the same zeal and sincerity for honest and courageous service, always recognizing and having the interest of the people at heart, can also expect many years of service in this great deliberative body. Real service to the country is appreciated and recognized as we are recognizing it today.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed grieved at his passing. I wish to express to his loved ones, to his district, his State and to the Nation my sincere regret at losing such an outstanding servant, great statesman, and loyal and patriotic citizen.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am deeply grieved at the untimely passing of our devoted friend and colleague. I join my other colleagues here in paying this high and well-deserved tribute to one of the greatest and ablest legislators it has been my privilege to know.

For 10 years I have personally known Judge BLAND. He has been an inspiration to me in the House of Representatives.

I happened to serve with him on a committee when I first came here, and learned to know him intimately. It was my privilege to visit in his district during the war. I had occasion to spend 2 or 3 days there. Several hours of 1 day were spent with him, during which time he showed me around his district at Norfolk and Newport News.

It was my pleasure to be with him that evening in the hotel. I never had a more delightful visit. I never experienced a finer or better reception from anyone. So I, too, saw the esteem in which his own people held him. I have seen the wonderful and outstanding service that he has rendered here. I take this opportunity of paying my respects and my tribute to Judge BLAND. I, too, want to extend my deepest sympathy to the family in their bereavement.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, we mourn today the loss of one of our most beloved members. In years of service in this House, SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND stood fifth among his colleagues. He was nominated for this high office by one of the most turbulent Democratic conventions ever held in Virginia. Although he was not a candidate, when a deadlock developed in the convention, his name was proposed on the eightieth ballot and he was nominated on the eighty-second ballot. He was elected in the special election which followed and took his oath of office on July 2, 1918. For more than 30 years he served without opposition within his own party and seldom was he challenged by a candidate outside the party.

Mr. BLAND'S record in the Congress is outstanding. As chairman for many years of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he labored diligently for the development of these important activities. At one time his committee also included all activities concerning radio and he assisted in drafting the first general radio law. In 1931 he served as Secretary of the United States Yorktown Sesquicentennial Commission and contributed substantially to the success of the celebration. He secured the passage of legislation providing for the creation of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial. He also collaborated in securing the passage of legislation establishing the Colonial National Historical Park, the Washington Birthplace Memorial, and the restoration of Stratford Hall.

Mr. BLAND served his State and Nation with consummate skill, marked ability, and untiring energy. He was independent, outspoken, and fearless. In every way he measured up to those high qualities which characterize a real statesman and a true Virginia gentleman. We can ill afford to lose a man of his caliber at this critical time in our history, but since the Divine Ruler of the universe has called him to his last reward, we can only be thankful for the useful life that he lived, extend our heartfelt sympathy to his faithful and beloved widow who has stood always at his side during his eventful life, and trust that his mantle will fall upon one of like stature.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, everybody who has known Mr. BLAND has recognized in him a great statesman, a great public servant; but we who have enjoyed a more intimate acquaintance with him have felt the warmth of his personal friendship and have loved him. We who have been privileged to associate with Mr. BLAND have had our lives enriched by that association.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, on an occasion like this it is exceedingly difficult for one to give full expression to his thoughts, and certainly that is true in my case, as I offer my most sincere sympathy to Mrs. Bland and join with my friends from Virginia, in extending our condolence to the loved ones of Judge BLAND.

It was not my good fortune to know Judge BLAND the length of time that many Members have known him, but during these 4 years I have grown to love the gentleman in such a way as to look upon him as a father and a wise counselor; likewise, it has been my good fortune to visit in his district where several kinsmen of mine reside, and I know in what deep regard and great respect the people of his own district hold him.

I am thinking of the love that Judge BLAND had for his church, and the moral influence that permeated his life. I believe that his great accomplishments are due in no small degree to the fact that he put first things first in his life. We have lost a most sincere and devoted Member of this great legislative body.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina and yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I probably hold an unusual distinction, that of being the youngest Member of Congress to have known Judge BLAND for the longest period of time. I had the privilege of meeting Judge BLAND and living in the same hotel with him during the second session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, some 20 years ago or longer. Perhaps the most lasting impressions made on the mind of any individual are those made during childhood. The impressions Judge BLAND made on me when I used to sit on his knee and listen to his stories were that he was a gentleman of a kindly nature and a great scholar. At that time little did I realize that I should ever have the privilege or opportunity of serving on a committee of the Congress of which he was the chairman. When I came to Congress in January of last year

I was delighted and elated that I should be assigned to his committee. As the gentleman from Texas has said, he was not only a brother to some but he was a father to many of us. Judge BLAND to my mind was a gentleman and a scholar, and above all he was a statesman. In observing his character and nature I have been frequently reminded of a little verse. Its author is unknown, but to me this verse exemplifies the nature of Judge BLAND:

There are so many lands and there are so many creeds;
There are so many paths that wind and wind,
But the only thing this sad world needs
Is the art of being kind.

Judge BLAND was the most kind individual I have ever known. I join with his host of friends in expressing deep sympathy to his family. His passing is a great loss to our country.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned this morning that our good friend, Judge BLAND, had passed away. He was a father to the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He was a father to the merchant marine industry. He was a friend of every person who knew him.

Judge BLAND was the type of man who could handle the most difficult situations with the greatest of ease. We have lost a great statesman, a hard earnest worker, and truly a fine American.

I extend my sympathies to his family.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I join with the Virginia delegation in expressing my sympathies to Mrs. Bland.

Many of the Members now in the House recall the dark days of 1939, 1940, and 1941. We remember back there when the great Commander in Chief sent word here to this body to get ships and get them at any cost. At that time the type of cruel warfare which we were witnessing was sweeping from the seas the greatest merchant marine fleet in the world. Mr. BLAND, as chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, assumed that responsibility, he assumed it as a patriot, and there is no doubt in my mind that in shouldering those heavy burdens his health was impaired, patriot that he was. He has left something that is worth while to all Americans. I extend to Mrs. Bland my very deepest sympathy.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I never more fully realized the limitations of language or the inadequacy of words than on an occasion like this when I attempt to express my feelings about a person such as Judge BLAND. Oftentimes I think it is the little things in a man's personality that reveal most of his character.

I recall that all during last year, when, as the Democratic whip in the House, I would put in a whip call for Members to come to the floor, each time Judge BLAND came he would always report to me personally. And he always came. He seemed to feel that since the call had come he should come to me personally as soon as he reached the floor. He would always come and say: "Your call came. I want you to know that I am here and you need not worry about me for the rest of the day. I will be here as long as I am needed."

That is one of the small things that reveals the great fidelity to the position he held, a fidelity that characterized Judge BLAND throughout all of his long and distinguished career here.

I join with all of our colleagues in paying a sincere, if brief, tribute to his memory, and in expressing my heartfelt sympathy for his loved ones.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, it was with extreme sadness that I heard the news this morning of the death of our beloved associate, colleague, and friend, Judge BLAND. It was not my privilege to have known him personally as long as many Members of the House have; but I had known him for some time. To know him was to love him. I appreciate the opportunity of having served here with him and fully realize the great benefit of his influence and guiding hand.

He was a kind and loving husband, a great statesman, a good family man, an outstanding legislator, and a real public servant. He walked humbly before his fellow man, always ready, willing, and desirous of hearing anyone who he thought could be helped. His constituency loved him. They held him in the highest esteem. He is survived by a most charming wife who felt that she, too, had the duty of looking after her people, and that she has done faithfully. We extend to her our greatest and heartfelt sympathies on this occasion. Virginia has lost a real statesman, and the Nation, too, will feel this great loss.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FUGATE].

Mr. FUGATE. Mr. Speaker, Virginia has lost her elder statesman. Some men are measured by their usefulness in their community, some in the State in which they serve, and some in the Nation, and some in the world. Judge OTIS BLAND had the distinction of being one who was able to serve the world.

We are told that there can be no greatness without great dimensions. Judge BLAND possessed measurements in the greatest dimensions. He had, in the long service here in the House, a tenure of years which gave him an opportunity to serve his country. He had breadth of understanding and depth of knowledge, and a kindliness such as I have never known.

When I came here as a freshman Member last year and was given assignment on his committee, at first I was not sure that I would be satisfied with that assignment. But, as the days came and went and I learned to know my chairman, I came to love him, not as a colleague, but as a father. Day after day, as he came on this floor, he would sit by me and hold some kindly council, something to say to me that I appreciated. I loved him; I respected him. I believe he was not only great in his community and in the State of Virginia, but in these United States, and he contributed largely, by reason of his knowledge of merchant shipping, to the winning of the war. As many of you know, he was considered the father of the merchant marine. He lived and thought and gave his devotion to making that arm of our defense strong. I know that each one of us feel deeply his passing. The 28 years of service here was a tenure that gave all of us an opportunity of knowing that Judge BLAND was no ordinary man. Many have said here today that they loved him, and I, too, loved him.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning Virginia, as well as our Nation, has lost one of its most valuable citizens. Representative SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND. We were all greatly shocked to learn of the death of our beloved friend. He was one of the most able and conscientious men in the House and the high esteem in which he was held by the people of Virginia is best evidenced by his election to this body for seventeen consecutive terms.

Mr. BLAND attained his position of leadership through his sterling character, his ability, integrity, and outstanding courage and those of us who have had the privilege of serving with him learned to love him for his kindness of heart and his willingness at all times to help those in need. His first thought was for his country, and his life was devoted to its service.

His knowledge and his wise judgment have been a large factor in the development of our merchant marine.

The Nation and Virginia have lost in SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND one of their finest statesmen. We shall sadly miss him and mourn the loss of one of Virginia's greatest and most useful public servants.

To his wife we extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have suffered a great personal loss in the passing of Judge BLAND. It has been almost 10 years now since I first came to Congress. My first assignment was to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The advice and kindly counsel he gave to me was that which a father would give to his son. In many ways I feel today as if I had lost my own father.

I know of no man who has served in the Congress who was more able than Judge BLAND. He was not only a great legislator, he was a great scholar. In spite of the passing of the years he was very alert to the problems confronting his great committee and the problems confronting the Nation as a whole.

He was kindly, and he was a gentleman in every sense of that term. He was one man who had a very keen sense of justice and fairness. I cannot recall an instance under his chairmanship in which he did not make every effort to see that the witness appearing before his committee had his day in court, so to speak.

The country has lost a great statesman. The country has lost the kind of man we need in Congress, whether they come from the Republican Party or the Democratic Party.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it is with heartfelt sorrow that I have learned of the passing of Virginia's able Representative, Congressman BLAND. He was a grand American gentleman, an able legislator. He made a record in the service of his country in the Halls of Congress that is an inspiration to all of us. We shall long miss his presence and his wise and kindly counsel. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I pay only a brief tribute to the gentleman from Virginia, Judge BLAND. I knew him and his gracious wife before coming to Congress. They were a very devoted and very splendid couple.

Judge BLAND was my idea of a perfect Virginia gentleman, and what can you say of one more than that? He was courteous and friendly; a gentleman even when he was aroused to righteous anger when he thought a wrong had been done to his merchant marine, when he thought a wrong had been done to his State, when he thought a wrong had been done to his country.

No matter how busy he was with affairs of state, he was never too busy to stop to talk to his friends and give them counsel. Although a Republican, I felt he gave me the same attention and the same interest he gave to one of his own party. I liked to appear before his committee. He, like all men of great stature, was very glad of any small bit of information regarding his duty as a Member of Congress. As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] has said, he was always here. Judge BLAND was always here. But now he has joined other great statesmen of Virginia who have gone to their reward.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, my heart was saddened this morning when I was preparing to come to the Capitol and heard over the radio the announcement of Judge BLAND's death. Since becoming a Member of Congress it has been my honor and my pleasure to serve under the chairmanship of the late Member from Virginia. I have never been given to eulogizing my friends after they die. It has always been my practice in life, and I have tried to lead my life so that I would express to my friends during their lifetime my admiration for them and my feeling for them.

My love for Judge BLAND can best be recorded in a House document which is now available. The occasion was the unveiling of a painting of Judge BLAND in the Merchant Marine Committee room. I am very proud now that I took the leading part in making possible the hanging of that portrait on the committee-room wall. I had charge of the exercises and presided over them. In that document I expressed then my admiration for Judge BLAND, though it was some years past. He was a strong leader. He was a fair chairman. He knew his subject. His heart, his mind, and his soul and energy were devoted to the upbuilding of the merchant marine of America for purposes of commerce as well as for the purposes of national defense. He was very jealous of this very great organization. He was very jealous of charges that may have been brought against it.

So interested was he that it hurt him when anyone criticized the Maritime Commission of the Merchant Marine of America. He felt it was a reflection on the great service that they had endeavored to render and the great service which they did render and he took it to his heart personally and felt it deeply. I was very fond of him. I admired him, and anyone who knew him as I knew him must have admired him. He was a fine Christian gentleman, strong in determination and strong in character, yet down deep in his heart he was as gentle as any man you will ever find.

He was a great husband. He loved his home. He loved his friends. From my personal association with Mr. BLAND I believe it was difficult for him to express to his friends his true feeling of the love and loyalty of their friendship. Yet I know it existed personally and deeply in his heart. I know his thought and his devotion and appreciation of friendship ever abided with him and went with him wherever he might be. To his family and his friends I express my deep sympathy and desire that they should know I feel I have lost a true and loyal friend under whose leadership I gained a great confidence in myself—an American who gave and gave freely to the causes of freedom and the causes that best served our country.

I shall always remember him and shall always treasure in my heart the pleasure of having known him and to be able to call such a splendid man my friend.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, it is the divinity that stirs within us that gives to us the expressed appreciation of a great Virginian, which means a great American, who had a moral cleansing influence upon every living thing he touched.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. STANLEY] is necessarily absent today. I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the death of our beloved colleague, the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, has brought sorrow and sadness to his many friends and admirers and removed from the House of Representatives one of its most able Members.

Mr. BLAND represented the First Congressional District of the Commonwealth of Virginia continuously from July 2, 1918, until February 16, 1950. He was loved and honored by the people of the Tidewater, Northern Neck, Lower Peninsula and Eastern Shore sections of Virginia, which made up his district, comprising the Counties of Spotsylvania, Caroline, Essex, Middlesex, King and Queen, Mathews, Gloucester, Westmoreland, Northumberland, Richmond, Lancaster, York, Warwick, Elizabeth City, Northampton, and Accomac and the cities of Fredericksburg, Hampton, and Newport News.

He was widely respected and greatly admired throughout the State of Virginia for his sterling qualities, meticulous adherence to duty, and outstanding record of public service. We recognized in him an authority on the maritime service, so important to our State and Nation. His legislative accomplishments in matters pertaining to commerce on the high seas will be a lasting monument to his ability and untiring efforts.

I am aware of the great privilege which has been mine to have known Mr. BLAND intimately and to have enjoyed his warm, sincere friendship. I acknowledge with gratitude and appreciation the many acts of kindness and consideration he so generously extended me.

No Representative in the Congress ever applied himself more diligently and conscientiously to the discharge of his duties. His service to his district, State, and Nation has upheld the finest traditions of the House of Representatives and of the constituency which so wisely elected him from time to time as its Representative in the Congress of the United States.

To his beloved wife I extend my profound sympathy. Her sorrow is great but the memory of his noble Christian character, faithful devotion to duty, and long record of able public service is one upon which she can reflect with great pride and satisfaction.

We shall miss Mr. BLAND very much, and, although conscious of a great loss, we are proud of his outstanding contribution to the welfare and progress of our beloved country, and we rejoice in the steadfast belief that his reward is that of a faithful public servant and fine Christian gentleman who stood for the right and kept the faith.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, they tell me that my friend of the long years,

one SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, of Virginia, of the land of my grandchildren, is dead, whatever that means.

It means little to me, for, so long as I live, he will live in my memory and the recollection of the days of our activity together, which tolerated no death.

He came to Congress from that great State, the mother of Presidents, from Virginia, which he served so faithfully. He was named by his parents after one whose virtues he exemplified superbly and with respect to whose ability he played no second place as of his day and age.

God grant him the rest given to tired and tried souls as he heard his Master say, "Well done thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things; I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of the Lord."

May the grace of God supply all those inadequacies for and of those of us who reverently pray.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for all of us. While I think most of us had observed that our dear friend and colleague, Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, was failing in health, nevertheless I for one was not prepared for his passing so soon. We are never ready to have those for whom we have great affection depart this life. It has been my privilege to serve with Representative BLAND for almost 32 years. I have found him to be at all times a man of courage and fidelity in the performance of his duties.

I understand that his people regarded him so highly and with such a degree of affection that during his entire service in the House, from July 2, 1918, until the present time, he never has had a primary contest nor an election contest. His entire 17 terms in the House of Representatives was of extraordinary statesmanlike service to his constituents. There is little consolation that one can have unless we can find it in these words:

> Life is not merely a floating shadow, a momentary spark, a dream that vanishes. Nothing can be grander than a life filled with great and noble thoughts—with brave and honest deeds. Such a life sheds light, and the seeds of truth sown by great and loyal men bear fruit through all the years to be.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy, in which Mrs. Reed joins me, to Mrs. Bland and to all the surviving members of the family of our departed colleague.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked this morning when I learned of the death of our beloved colleague, the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, of the First Congressional District of Virginia, who was affectionately known as judge to me and most of his colleagues in the House. I feel a keen personal loss in his passing, as he has been a real friend since I first came to the House and one whom I admired for his sterling character and lovable nature.

Judge BLAND was first elected to the Sixty-fifth Congress and reelected to each succeeding Congress. As chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House he wielded a great influence in obtaining the passage of vital and important legislation and contributed immensely to the building of our American merchant marine.

The judge's kindly manner and sincerity of purpose won the love and respect of all of his colleagues in the House. The Congress and the people of Virginia have lost a skilled statesman whose good deeds and extraordinary record will long endure. His dear wife has my heartfelt sympathy upon her great loss. May he rest in peace.

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I arise today to express my sympathy to the family of the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND. Judge BLAND was certainly one of the outstanding Members of Congress and his loss will be keenly felt. One of the great pleasures I have experienced since being elected to the Eighty-first Congress has been the privilege of being associated with Judge BLAND during his chairmanship of one of the committees in the House of Representatives. His loyalty to his country and his sound, solid thinking will certainly be missed by his colleagues who have known, respected, and loved him.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad occasion when one who has been privileged to serve with our late distinguished colleague, SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, must note his passing. He was above all a gentleman—a most capable representative of his people and a public servant of rare type. I was privileged for a number of years to serve under his inspiring chairmanship of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and I, therefore, had many opportunities to observe his gentility, courtesy, and kindliness especially to the younger Members. His memory will remain vivid with me for many years. The Congress and the country are better for his having lived. To his family I extend my deep and sincere expression of sympathy.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, when the news of the passing of our beloved colleague, SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, reached the House of Representatives on Thursday morning it was received with genuine sorrow. No person could know Mr. BLAND and not feel a sense of great loss that he would no longer answer to the roll call. For myself, I feel a deep personal loss for I counted him a dear friend of 25 long years. Many years ago, when as a new and "green" Member of the House, feeling puzzled about a certain bill, and not having any deep conviction as to how I should vote, I asked his advice. Although I was not aware of his having any personal interest in the bill until later, when I learned he was opposed to it, his advice was purely objective. I well remember his words, "If you believe in your heart that you should vote for the bill, do so; we all make mistakes but if they are honest mistakes there should be no cause for regret." That, I think, summed up his philosophy. And he lived up to it in his long service to his district and to his country. His voice was strong. It carried conviction, and you knew when you listened that whether or not you agreed with him, that here was a man you could trust, one who placed service to his country far above expediency.

During the late war when our hearts rebelled at some of the laws it was necessary to adopt in order to keep faith with America and for our own safety, Congressman BLAND never flinched. He was there always to be counted as one of the strong supporters of all that was best in legislative procedure.

I shall miss him. We all shall miss him but none so much as his beloved Mary, to whom our hearts go out in great sympathy, affection, and understanding. May his great soul rest in peace, and may the Bright Recorder place him among those who loved their fellow men.

Mr. FUGATE. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of February 18 in Newport News, SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, who for almost 34 years was a Member of this body, was buried in a most beautiful service. His neighbors and friends came by the hundreds to pay their respect. Few men have had the love, reverence, and esteem by their constituency as did Judge BLAND. The huge floral gift was evidence of the people's adoration.

His passing brought deep bereavement to all Virginians. We express our love and affection for his wife, who is so uniformly kind and considerate, and who was so helpful to her husband.

The pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Rev. Paul K. Buckles, D. D., conducted the service. His eulogy was one of the best I ever heard. For the edification of this body and the people I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Good actions ennoble us, and we are the sons of our deeds." One of long ago wrote these lines. How fittingly they apply to this great Christian statesman, humble child of God, and Christian gentleman.

His shining shield carried the truth where all might see. "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

He was a man among men, not a dreamer among the shadows. His life was a life of action and reality. He worked in his own sphere, nor wished it other than that, and he found his greatest happiness and his highest good in the service he rendered to his fellow man, and in serving him he served his God.

The strength of a nation lies not in its armaments, aerial navies in the sky, or grim ships of battle in every ocean, but in the men it breeds. And the strength of a man is always measured by the strength of his faith in God.

Long ago One walked in Galilee, climbed the hill to Calvary, and stretched himself on a lonely cross, and He said, "He that would be greatest among you, let him serve. The greatest of all is the servant of all."

In self-forgetful service he wore his life away, a casualty on the field of action for the sake of his brother man. His influence was always on the right side of any great moral issue. The humblest man had a place in his heart and in his life. There was nothing selfish about him. He was selfless in all of his actions.

In the strength of God he followed the light of truth and with a courage that brooked no interference with his own strong convictions. He now takes his place among the great immortals who have made their country great.

A nation can ill afford to lose one of such sterling faith, such mighty character, who stood with the strength of the rock-ribbed hills of his native land in defense of the right, the champion of truth.

God give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands.
Men whom the lust of office does not kill,
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy,
Men who possess opinions and a will,
Men who love honor, men who cannot lie.

At the end of life so lived in simple faith he could say, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing."

And like the servant of old who lived in such close and intimate relationship with God that when traveling days were done, "He was not, for God took him."

One who never turned his back but marched forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, Wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better, Sleep to wake.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay my respects to the memory of the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, and to join with my colleagues in the House in appreciation of the great character which he brought to us.

In the nature of things his long membership on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries put him in touch with those industries, and particularly with men engaged in the shipping industry in all of its phases and in all places from which ships of our Nation sail. Over our whole Nation, on the Pacific coast as much as elsewhere, this gentleman from Virginia was appreciated and revered for his untiring efforts on behalf of our Nation and its merchant marine.

I shall always remember with deep appreciation his kindly way, his unfailing adherence to the principles in which he believed, his promptness, and the pleasure it gave one to be in his presence.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time when one ceases to breathe the air he loves; such a phenomenon befell SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, the dean of the Virginia delegation in the House of Representatives. The departure of Congressman BLAND from a troubled world did not go unnoticed. Just as his family before him believed in a special philosophy, so did one of my most respected colleagues cling to the principles he held dear.

Mr. BLAND was the son of Schuyler Bland, a Confederate soldier, and Olivia James Anderson Bland. His ancestors include Theoderick and Richard Bland who were Members of the Continental Congress. The illustrious forebears of SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND would never have been ashamed of him. His record is unmistakably clear and defined.

In reviewing the sketches from his life, one realizes his continual progress. Mr. BLAND practiced law until July 1918, when he was elected to the Sixty-fifth Congress to succeed William R. Jones, who died in office. Mr. BLAND was reelected to the Sixty-sixth Congress and successively to the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. BLAND was chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House and was a recognized authority on the maritime service.

I had the pleasure of serving on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with Mr. BLAND. He was always prompt in calling committee meetings; he was friendly; he was helpful to all the members; he distinguished himself as a true servant of his country.

Mr. BLAND was responsible for the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and was a leader in framing the Ship Sales Act of 1946. Untiring in his efforts, always diligent, patient, and good natured, Mr. BLAND was an able administrator.

SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND died on February 16, 1950, at the age of 77, but in that passing went the sympathy of many, many people.

And though he has gone down the roadway of permanent sleep, that state of peace he now experiences is surely a token reward for the good things he did while he was with the world in all its tumult.

The far-reaching vision of SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND is reflected throughout this Nation, and his actions affected the entire world, resulting in the betterment of mankind.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution (H. Res. 476) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, a Representative from the State of Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral: Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. HART, Mr. WEICHEL, Mr. GARY, Mr. STANLEY, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. HARDY, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. FUGATE.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 20, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 7324. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting blind or aged dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 7325. A bill to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Valley Forge General Hospital, Phoenixville, Pa., by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7326. A bill to establish Federal education agencies and to eliminate segregation and discrimination in opportunity for higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7327. A bill to authorize delivery of surplus agricultural commodities for distribution to relieve hardship caused by unemployment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H R 7328. A bill to provide for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees separated from the service of the Federal Government or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H R. 7329. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 7330. A bill to authorize a survey, research, and construction necessary to develop the use of peat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R 7331. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code and the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to extend and improve the unemployment insurance system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H R. 7332. A bill to authorize an appropriation for cooperation with joint district No. 5, towns of Almon, Barthelme, Morris, and Seneca, and the village of Bowler, Shawano County, Wis., for the construction, extension, improvement, and equipment of public-school buildings at Bowler, Wis., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 7333. A bill to repeal certain excise taxes imposed during the war, to reduce to prewar levels certain other excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr SCUDDER (by request):

H R. 7334. A bill to extend the basis for appellate reviews in Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 477. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish to the

House of Representatives facts as to the number of watches, clocks, and parts of watches and clocks now being imported into the United States and the number imported during each of the past 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 478 Resolution requesting the Secretary of Commerce to furnish to the House of Representatives facts as to the number of watches, clocks, and parts of watches and clocks now being manufactured in the United States, the number manufactured during each of the past 5 years, and the names and addresses of the manufacturers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7335. A bill for the relief of Mrs Jessie K. Eyon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H R. 7336. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fumie Ishibashi Akimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R 7337. A bill for the relief of Bella and Archie Kennison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R. 7338 A bill for the relief of Asano Teramoto, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con Res. 181 Concurrent resolution favoring the grant of status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1859. By Mr. FELLOWS: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, relative to the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox and requesting that the Congress pass legislation authorizing the issuance of a postage stamp showing the beautiful Montpelier with a portrait of Gen Henry Knox; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1860 By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition to cease the exorbitant 20 percent Federal tax on theater tickets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1861. Also, petition to cease the exorbitant 20 percent Federal tax on theater tickets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1862. By Mr. HUBER. Petition relative to a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1863. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C W. Wilson and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1864. Also, petition of H. H. Belcher and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1865. Also, petition of Mrs. Josephine Hudson and others, Sarasota, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1866. Also, petition of Anna Lauridsen and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose keeping are the destinies of men and of nations, in all our ways would we acknowledge Thee. It is Thou who hath made and preserved us a nation.

Endue with Thy wisdom, we beseech Thee, our fallible minds. In these desperate and dangerous days, confronted with solemn problems that almost confound us, quicken in our hearts and minds every noble impulse and sanctify for Thy glory and for human good our best endeavors.

God the all merciful, earth hath forsaken meekness and mercy and slighted Thy word; yet falsehood and wrong shall not tarry beside Thee. Give to us peace in our time, O Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 16, 1950, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GRAHAM was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today, because of public business.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate following today and during the coming week.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GEORGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Martin
Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Benton	Hoey	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Chapman	Hunt	Murray
Chavez	Ives	Myers
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Darby	Johnston, S C	Robertson
Donnell	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Kerr	Saltonstall
Downey	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, N J.
Eastland	Lehman	Sparkman
Ecton	Lodge	Stennis
Ellender	Lucas	Taft
Ferguson	McCarran	Taylor
Frear	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
George	McFarland	Tydings
Gillette	McKellar	Wherry
Green	McMahon	Wiley
Gurney	Magnuson	Williams
Hayden	Malone	Withers

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent by leave of the Senate on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

EDWARD WOOLF—NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 499

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 7, 1950, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 499, for the relief of Edward Woolf. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee by Saturday, March 4, so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee considering resolutions with respect to foreign matters was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MCCARRAN, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the sessions of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD and for printing in the Appendix, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Mrs. John Cumberworth, of Charlotte, Mich., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 1847, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to name the new veterans hospital at Buffalo the Buffalo Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Austin Joseph Holliday, of Hampton, Va., praying for a redress of grievances (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The memorial of Alene Lloyd, of Meade, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1103 and House bill 2945, to readjust postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

THE BUDGET—RESOLUTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF TAKOMA PARK, MD AND D. C.

Mr O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Takoma Park, Md. and D. C., urging the Congress to take steps to balance the Federal budget and stabilize our currency.

Because I feel it deserves the thorough consideration of Members of this body, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RESOLUTION BY THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF TAKOMA PARK, MD AND D. C., AT ITS MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1950

"Whereas the Federal debt now exceeds $250,000,000,000, and

"Whereas the Federal budget of 1949-50 and budget of $42,400,000,000 for 1950-51 will according to conservative estimates in the aggregate increase the Federal debt by an additional $10,000,000,000; and

"Whereas the annual expenditures of the Federal Government are now 40 times as great and the interest on the national debt is now 5 times as great as the annual cost of the United States Government prior to World War I; and

"Whereas the increasing national debt and deficit financing not only threaten the American economic and political system but our security as a free people and an independent nation;

"Therefore, we the members of the Chamber of Commerce of Takoma Park, Md. and D. C., believing that conditions admit of no delay, call upon the Congress of the United States at this session to pass legislation—

"I. To stabilize our currency and prevent further devaluation of the dollar;

"II. To reduce the cost of Government as recommended in the Hoover Commission report;

"III. To balance the Federal budget, stop deficit financing, and reduce the crushing burden of taxes upon the American people.

"Copies of this petition are to be sent to honorable Senators and Representatives of the State of Maryland with the urgent request that they take all possible action in promoting and securing legislation at this session of Congress which will promptly and effectively attain the objectives of this petition."

FEBRUARY 14, 1950.

Senator HERBERT R O'CONOR.

DEAR MR. O'CONOR: The original petition was signed by over 40 members individually and was passed by unanimous vote of the Chamber of Commerce of Takoma Park, Md. and D. C., at its meeting February 8, 1950.

Sincerely yours,

L. V. LAMPSON,
Chairman, Finance Committee, Chamber of Commerce of Takoma Park, Md. and D. C., Takoma Park, Md.

INVESTIGATION OF LOYALTY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF STATE DEPARTMENT—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have in my hand Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, which has been adopted by both houses of the South Dakota State Legislature, which convened last week in special session, and which is still in session. It has been forwarded to me by the secretary of the Senate and the clerk of the House of the South Dakota Legislature, for filing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the purpose of calling it to the attention of the Congress.

It is a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and His Excellency the President of the United States to make an immediate, thorough and exhaustive study and investigation of the loyalty of the members, officers, and employees of the State Department, and to take such further appropriate action to rid the Department of State of procommunistic employees in order that the safety of the Nation will not be further endangered by men in high places who condone acts of treason which endanger the safety of the United States of America and the people.

The memorial then goes on to call attention to the conviction of Alger Hiss in the Federal court of the United States and to the activities of Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed in testifying as character witnesses for Alger Hiss. It also cites statements of the Secretary of State regarding Alger Hiss. I ask unanimous consent at this time to have the entire memorial properly referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency the President of the United States, to make an immediate, thorough, and exhaustive study and investigation of the loyalty of the members, officers, and employees of the State Department, and to take such further appropriate action to rid the Department of State of procommunistic employees in order that the safety of our Nation will not be further endangered by men in high places who condone acts of treason which endanger the safety of the United States of America and the people

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House concurring therein)—

Whereas through the activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Alger Hiss was twice tried in the Federal courts of the United States of America and convicted of the crime of perjury; and

Whereas members of the United States Supreme Court, Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed, voluntarily testified in the first trial as character witnesses, thereby breaking all of the precedents heretofore existing in relation to our Federal courts, and creating in the minds of the American people a disregard for members of our Federal judiciary; and

Whereas upon the conviction by a Federal jury in a Federal court of the said Alger Hiss, Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America, issued a prepared and considered statement in which he said, "I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss," which statement was designed to belittle the actions of an American jury in an American court and to raise in the minds of the American people a doubt as to the guilt of one of Dean Acheson's friends and former State Department employee in spite of, and in total disregard of results of a free and fair trial and a verdict rendered by a jury as provided by the Constitution and the laws of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency the President of the United States to make an immediate check of the loyalties and beliefs of the men employed in the State Department of the United States from Dean Acheson on down to determine whether or not the ideas and ideals of such individuals are such that the American people can have continued faith that such Department through its representatives will safely keep and guard the secrets of the United States of America from foreign enemies and that such Department and its employees in preparing and carrying out a foreign policy in relation to Russia and other foreign countries will adopt and carry out policies which are not contrary to the ideas and ideals of the American people as expressed by the Constitution of the United States and the laws adopted thereunder; be it further

Resolved, That His Excellency the President of the United States make immediately available to the House Un-American Activities Committee all secret files and lists and reports of investigations covering the loyalties and activities of any and all employees of the Government of the United States which in any way show or indicate disloyalty to the United States of America as expressed by Communist membership or otherwise; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States, to United States Senator CHAN GURNEY, to United States Senator KARL MUNDT, to Congressman FRANCIS H. CASE, to Congressman HAROLD LOVRE, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress.

R TERRY,
Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

A E. MUNCK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

W J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several

nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Paul L. Styles, of Alabama, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term expiring December 16, 1954; and

Daniel J. Daley, and sundry other candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 3055. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3056. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cantalini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 3057. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Florence Yarlott Doyle; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator HENDRICKSON at the annual Lincoln Day dinner of the Queens Village Republican Club, at Queens, N. Y., on February 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESSES BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two Lincoln Day addresses delivered by him, one at the Lincoln Day dinner sponsored by the Ward County Republican Executive Committee at Parkersburg, W. Va., Friday evening, February 10, 1950; the other, at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Republican Club of Oakland County, Mich., at Pontiac, Mich., Monday evening, February 13, 1950; which appear in the Appendix.]

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington," delivered by him on February 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE—DISCUSSION BY SENATOR PEPPER AND HAROLD STASSEN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a discussion entitled "Do We Want National Health Insurance in the United States?" participated in by Harold Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, and Senator PEPPER, on January 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LAW-ENFORCEMENT PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Attorney General McGrath at the Attorney General's Crime Conference held in Washington on February 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEED TO COMBAT INTERSTATE CRIME AND RACKETS—STATEMENT BY MAYOR DELESSEPS S. MORRISON

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Mayor deLesseps Morrison, of New Orleans, at the Attorney General's Crime Conference held in Washington on February 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT COOPERATION—ADDRESS BY MILLARD CASS

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of labor-management cooperation, delivered by Millard Cass, assistant to the Under Secretary of Labor, at Elkton, Md., on November 1, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PATRIOTISM OF A CATHOLIC—ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Patriotism of a Catholic, delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on February 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

WHY I HAD TO STEP ASIDE—ARTICLE BY DR. EDWIN G. NOURSE

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why I Had To Step Aside," by Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, published in Collier's magazine for February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

THE COAL SHORTAGE IN NEW YORK—MESSAGE BY GOVERNOR DEWEY

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a message to the New York State Legislature by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey relative to a bill providing emergency measures for the controlling of coal supplies, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPLY BY FACT-FINDING MISSION ON JERUSALEM TO ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Fact-Finding Mission on Jerusalem in reply to an article by Dorothy Thompson regarding the visit of the mission to Israel and its report on the situation there, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIGHTS STOP TRUMAN; HE'S LAW-ABIDING MAN—TRUMAN FLITS PAST 20 RED LIGHTS

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lights Stop Truman; He's Law-Abiding Man," published in the Washington Post for February 16, 1950, and an article entitled "Envious Go Green as Truman Flits Past 20 Red Lights," published in the Washington Post for February 17, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were, on page 1, after line 8, insert:

A-6080769, Assali, Nicolau Salim, or Nick Assali.

On page 4, strike out line 14.

On page 6, after line 9, insert:

A-1865724, Matsukata, Miyeko (also Miye Matsukata).

On page 6, after line 20, insert:

A-6391186, McIlhattan, Adriana, or Adriana Catri.

On page 8, after line 16, insert:

A-6388576, Tarabishy, Said Hassan or Tarabichi.

On page 8, after line 24, insert:

A-6018587, Wojciechowska, Maria Teresa.

A-5468253, Wolfel, John, or Mike Deal or Joan or Johann Wolfel.

A-6610614, Wong, Lee Wai Lan (nee Wai Lan Lee or Wong Lee Shee).

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution.

By way of explanation, if one is necessary, let me say that this is one of the deferral measures by which certain aliens have been deferred from deportation. The House amended the concurrent resolution by adding seven names and by striking out one name.

We have screened the names which have been added by the House of Representatives by the amendments; and the one name which was deleted by the House of Representatives was withdrawn by the Attorney General.

So, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

REMOVAL OF POTATO SUPPORT PRICES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] by Mr. Whitney Tharin, secretary of the National Potato Council, relative to the proposed removal of price supports on potatoes. I understand it is agreeable to the Senator from Illinois that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL POTATO COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1950.

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
Majority Leader, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: Potato farmers respectfully urge you to withhold action on your proposal to precipitately remove price supports from potatoes, unless marketing quotas are in effect, until after they have had an opportunity to be heard by the proper congressional committees.

It has long been the established practice of Congress, in any legislation as drastic as this, to give the persons involved a chance to present testimony and express their opinion. Attaching your potato proposal as a rider to the pending measure revising cot-

ton-acreage allotments automatically precludes the possibility of a hearing of any kind.

In addition, adoption of your rider would have the effect of changing the rules in the middle of the game as the Department of Agriculture already has announced the price-support program authorized by Congress for 1950. Farmers regard this announcement, a copy of which is attached, not only as a commitment by the Congress and a commitment by the Department of Agriculture, but also as a commitment by the United States Government.

As of today, farmers in southern Florida already are harvesting potatoes planted under that commitment. In northern Florida the crop is up and well along. In the major early production areas of California the crop is all planted. The potato crop is also completely planted in Louisiana, South Carolina, and Texas. North Carolina is one-third through planting and will be 90 percent through planting within 10 days. Virginia has just started planting.

The effect of your rider, as we understand the language, would be to permit these important areas to qualify for price supports, but would deny support to those areas that planted after the enactment of this provision.

Potatoes are not a one-State or regional crop. To the contrary, they are one of the few crops grown commercially in every State in the Union, as you will note from the enclosed statistical sheet giving the State acreage and production figures from 1945 through 1949.

Would it be fair for the Congress to provide support for part of the potato growers and deny it to the others? Would it be fair, in a national program, to provide support to the warm climate growers and deny it to New York, Idaho, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Colorado, and all of the other areas with colder seasons?

Farmers, like any other businessmen, have to plan their operations as far ahead as possible. In addition to dealing with the ordinary problems of business, farmers also have to arrange their plantings on a seasonal and rotation basis.

Most potato farmers began making their plans for 1950 upon passage October 31, 1949, of the Agricultural Act of 1949. That act, passed October 31, 1949, was their basic guidepost for the plans they made for 1950. In addition, the Secretary of Agriculture has implemented that act with his official announcement of the 1950 potato price support program.

Does the Congress of the United States now intend to say to potato farmers that it is going to back down on the commitment the Congress authorized and the Secretary of Agriculture has officially implemented?

Does the Congress now intend to use potatoes to set a precedent for taking supports from under all other crops, at any time, without even the formality of a hearing?

Once such a precedent is established, there would be ample grounds for the precipitate removal of any of the other crops from price support.

What would follow potatoes? Would some of the basics be next?

Potato farmers are berated for producing large yields per acre. The increased per acre yields have come in recent years not only in potatoes but in virtually every other crop grown in the United States. The development of mechanized farming, improved insecticides, and of better fertilization, plus the general use of better land, has brought increased per acre yields in every section of the country.

For example, one of the most spectacular per acre yield increases in recent years has been achieved through the use of hybrid corn. Largely due to the hybrid varieties, our corn production in five recent years has exceeded 3,000,000,000 bushels, an almost unheard of figure prior to the use of the hybrids.

As a result, the per acre yield of corn has increased from a national average of 31.4 bushels in 1938–47, to an average of 40 bushels for 1948–49.

Incidentally, in spite of the greatly increased yields, the corn acreage over those two contrasting periods has shown only a slight decrease while potato acreage has been cut 43 percent.

The increase in some of the individual States has also been impressive, Illinois, for example, having increased its average yield per acre from 48.3 bushels in 1938–47 to approximately 60 bushels per acre in 1948–49. Illinois, incidentally, has increased its corn acreage by more than 1,000,000 acres, the figures being 8,250,000 acres for the period 1938–48, as compared with 9,252,000 acres for the period 1948–49.

While we are considering corn, do you think it would be fair to have a corn price-support program for farmers in Iowa that did not apply to farmers in Illinois?

As we have advised you previously, potato farmers share your concern over the cost of the price-support program and have been making major adjustments, such as reducing acreage 43 percent since 1943, and supporting a 60-percent support price instead of 90.

These adjustments, as sharp as they are, have not been as effective as growers had anticipated and they are ready and willing to consider any additional steps that may be needed to reduce both surplus production and the cost of the potato price-support program.

However, they do feel that any additional steps that may be necessary should be taken in an orderly fashion, with all of the many factors involved carefully brought to the attention of the Congress.

There is now pending in the Congress a bill which would, in effect, do all of the things you are seeking to accomplish with your rider and your own potato bill. This bill is S. 2634, introduced by Senator ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

This bill was introduced on October 4, 1949, but to date no hearings have been called on it. The Thomas bill, or any other similar bill, would provide the vehicle for hearings which would permit potato farmers to offer testimony, recommend changes, and express their opinion as to the type of legislation they believe best suited for their commodity.

It has been the historic policy of the Department of Agriculture not to change a program in the middle of a crop season. The Department policy in this respect has been repeatedly stated by numerous high officials.

The most recent official reiteration of record of the Department's policy was the testimony of Mr Ralph S. Trigg, Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration, and President of the Commodity Credit Corporation

Mr Trigg, while testifying on September 19, 1949, before a Senate subcommittee hearing on S 2482, to repeal price support on potatoes and eggs, stated the policy of the Department, in reply to a question, in the following language. "If there are any adjustments to be made, we think they should be made at the end of a marketing season of a commodity, whether it is a calendar year basis or another basis, but not in the middle of a program to the extent of removing supports entirely."

We have been assured today, by other top-ranking officials of the Department of Agriculture, that that policy has not been changed.

In view of the fact that the Thomas bill, S. 2634, is pending, and the further fact that your precipitate rider is directly contrary to the long-established policy of the Department of Agriculture in regard to changing programs in the middle of a crop season, we trust that you will withdraw your rider at this time and permit this legislation to proceed in the orderly fashion which has long been the established democratic procedure of Congress.

Respectfully yours,

NATIONAL POTATO COUNCIL,
By WHITNEY THARIN,
Executive Secretary.

ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, may I take the occasion to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that yesterday, February 16, was Republic of Lithuania Day, a day to be regarded with approval by all who, like the people of Lithuania, regard the rights of the individual as sacred?

The sad fact that the people of that brave country are now under the despotic rule of Communist Russia detracts in no measure from the high resolve that has always prompted their national and individual feelings toward the safeguarding of individual rights.

On many occasions in the past it has been my privilege to participate in the joyful celebrations of this day which memorialized the reestablishment of Lithuania as a free and independent nation. Today there is no reason for jubilation. However, knowing the spirit of determination that still animates the people of that splendid country, I can at least join with them and with our American citizens of Lithuanian birth or descent in the fervent hope that, before too long a time has elapsed, the oppression that now enslaves them may be lifted and their country restored to the condititon of freedom and progress which its people enjoyed in the happly interval between the two great World Wars.

THE GREAT LAKES WATERWAY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway, which I ask to have incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE GREAT LAKES WATERWAY

During this Eighty-first Congress, as in past Congresses, we have been treated to the sorry spectacle of all sections of the Nation pleading for funds for what seem to be purely local improvement projects, many of those funds being not repayable at all to Uncle Sam. Next Tuesday, the Senate will vote on the central Arizona project which for a comparative small number of individuals in that area would appropriate $738,000,000—a mere bagatelle to the spenders, but an enormous amount to the taxpayers of this Nation.

In contrast to this project, which affects a handful of local landowners, there is still pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and before the House Public Works Committee a resolution for completion of the Great Lakes Waterway which involves a sum of $802,000,000 of which only $573,000,000 in cost is allocated to the United States. These $573,000,000 are, in addition, entirely repayable through electricity charges and ship tolls. Through the expenditure of this amount, not only would the Nation be assured of the continued economic health of the 50,000,000 people of the valley of the Great Lakes, but there would be assurance

of the economic health of our Canadian good neighbor and we would be providing for continental defense, particularly in connection with utilizing Labrador iron ore deposits.

I URGE MIDWEST TO OPPOSE ARIZONA PROJECT

I personally will oppose the central Arizona project, and I am hoping that every single colleague of mine in the Middle West will do likewise. It is not in the spirit of vindictiveness, and it is not with the idea that all the Arizona proponents should support the seaway. (Actually, my good friend, CARL HAYDEN, voted with us in 1948.) Rather, I will vote against S. 75, on the firm conviction that first things must come first. The seaway should have number 1 national priority, while comparatively unnecessary projects such as the central Arizona bill should be assigned to the bottom of the list, if at all, because of its very doubtful merit.

I urge my colleagues in the Midwest, moreover, to scrutinize all other proposed projects in other areas of the country, not in the spirit of vindictiveness or in a spirit of asking favors for the Midwest, but on the firm basis that we must impress upon the Nation that we insist that other projects shall have the same high standards of national usefulness as the Great Lakes waterway has.

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY SQUANDERING

Some of the most notorious of appropriation squandering is in connection with funds for alleged improvement of the Mississippi Valley area in which the Nation has poured and is being asked to pour literally billions of dollars, with very limited results in terms of national benefit.

VALLEY JOURNAL ADMITS SEAWAY INEVITABILITY

We recall that the Mississippi Valley group has always been in the forefront of the blind opposition to the seaway on the far-fetched ground that the seaway would harm the traffic going to the Gulf coast ports. This we have proved to be an absurd fear and yet it continues. Mississippi Valley sponsors have consistently derided the seaway and have implied that all the Presidents of the United States and all of the outstanding Government experts who have approved it were unqualified to give such endorsements.

I should like, however, to call the attention of the Senate, to this fact, that in the January 1950 issue of a Waterway Journal published in New Orleans, called the Work Boat, there was contained a significant editorial pointing to the fact that the seaway will indeed be ultimately completed. This editorial was addressed to the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association at St. Louis on February 6 and 7. I should like to quote from excerpts of that editorial. I believe that this bare-faced admission on the part of the Mississippi Valley group will enhearten all proponents of the Waterway, because it shows that our enemies recognize in their hearts the fallacy of their cause and they recognize the justice of our plea.

I urge those Senators who represent States in the Mississippi Valley area to cease their opposition to the waterway, and I urge the people of the Mississippi Valley to recognize that their higher national interest comes before their purely sectional fears.

Here are the quotations from the Work Boat with its grudging admissions and biased slant:

"Along with the making of more valley authorities, more Washington pressure may be expected for developing the St. Lawrence seaway, a project which—and this is a prophecy, make the best of it—sooner or later will come into being. Not that the Work Boat is any particular adherent of the project, but this publication sees the St. Lawrence deal as one that ultimately will be carried through; it will be just too hard to kill in the long run. And it is the counsel of the Work Boat to the Mississippi Valley Association to do a little long-distance planning in this regard; to continue the battle of presenting valley interests to press, public, and Washington in the meanwhile and postpone the evil hour as long as practicable, and also to plan quietly and thoroughly as to what may be done after the seaway down the St. Lawrence is finally approved and in operation. The thought may not be pleasant, but some timely planning at the present may more than make up for that ultimate defeat.

"Concentration on valley development, the prompt conclusion of the seaway or tidewater channel to New Orleans and the hastening of the Cal-Sag Channel at Chicago which may bind the Great Lakes more firmly to the Mississippi and the Gulf outlet, will be of great value to the Mississippi Valley in defending itself against any future diversion of traffic and business via that St. Lawrence outlet."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to make an announcement before he begins his remarks?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement which is rather important, so far as procedure in the Senate is concerned.

As everyone knows, the unfinished business is Senate bill 75, which the distinguished Senator from Arizona is about to discuss. The discussion of that bill had been temporarily laid aside in favor of the consideration of the resolution dealing with small business. It was my hope that we could conclude consideration of the small business resolution as of this date. Apparently, we may not be able to do that.

Yesterday the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported and there is now on the calendar House Joint Resolution 398, dealing with the cotton- and peanut-acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and so forth. Those who are interested in the cotton situation are urging me to try to have the joint resolution passed by the Senate at as early a date as possible. I should like to serve notice on the Senate now that on Monday next we shall try to lay aside whatever business may then be pending before the Senate and take up the House joint resolution, because of the emergency which exists with respect to the planting of cotton.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Where does that leave Calendar No. 563, Senate bill 1498, known as the Kerr bill, to amend the Natural Gas Act?

Mr. LUCAS. I announced the other day that we would take up that bill, but we will have to change our procedure a little, because of the emergency which has developed in respect to the cotton bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I may say I am not interested in when it shall come up, but what I should like to know, if the majority leader can advise me, is whether it might follow the so-called amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. LUCAS. I rather think it will.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is the understanding of the majority leader, then, that the bill with reference to cotton acreage, which includes a potato amendment, will come up, and an attempt will be made to conclude it, on Monday afternoon?

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I expect to do, I may say to the Senator from New Mexico. That is what I hope to do.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope it is the program.

Mr. LUCAS. It will be the program, if I can get the Senate to go along with me, which I am sure I can. Senators representing the Southern States in which cotton is grown, are extremely interested in obtaining immediate action upon the proposed legislation. It is of an emergency nature. Of course, the amendment which was attached to the bill by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, dealing with potatoes, is also an emergency amendment. So it seems to me we should consider the joint resolution on Monday, and I shall make that effort.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the majority leader whether he intends to have regular business in the Senate on Wednesday next, after the Senator from Maryland shall have read Washington's Farewell Address?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts we shall proceed immediately following the address to discuss and debate any issues that may then be pending before the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the majority leader.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in the propaganda that has been used by the southern Californians to influence Senators to oppose the enactment of the bill, S. 75, which would authorize the construction of the central Arizona project, no effort has been spared to repeatedly convey the impression that a very large sum of money is to be taken out of the Federal Treasury at a time when there is an insistent demand for economy in the operation of the Government. The size of the sum has been violently exaggerated and the thought is conveyed that the whole amount is to be expended at a time when the budget is unbalanced and the national debt is not being reduced.

Beyond doubt, $708,780,000 is a sizable sum of money to be made available by Congress for any purpose if it was to be used in 1 year when there is a prospect that the Treasury deficit may

amount to $5,000,000,000. But despite the propaganda to the contrary, such is not the fact because the bill as reported to the Senate delays any appropriation for irrigation works, estimated to cost $267,000,000, until after the Supreme Court of the United States has an opportunity to pass upon the question of how much water is available in the Colorado River to irrigate lands in Arizona. There will be eight parties to that lawsuit, the United States and the seven States of the Colorado River Basin. Nobody knows how long it will take the eight of them to prepare for and argue the case and how long thereafter it will take the Supreme Court to decide it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator from Arizona not feel that the very circumstance he has mentioned would justify even a very economy-minded Senator in voting in favor of the bill? Because it happens to be in my area, I have had the question put to me by Senators who are not familiar with the project, as to whether they should vote for it. I have tried to explain to them that the only way in the world the States of Nevada, Utah, and New Mexico will have a chance to participate in an equitable division of the waters of the Colorado is to get the matter before the Supreme Court. The interests of California and Arizona are so paramount to ours, it is almost impossible for us to get into court. We want to get into court. Does not the Senator from Arizona believe that a Senator interested in economy could still vote for the measure, even though he might think the expenditure a large one? I hope he will not think it large; but, even though he should, does the Senator from Arizona not think such a Senator might still vote for it as a matter of justice to those States who otherwise would never be able to obtain an equitable distribution of the waters of the Colorado River?

Mr. HAYDEN. This is the first time when a committee of Congress has specifically recommended that the United States permit itself to be made a party to a suit affecting Federal and interstate water rights, and that such a suit should be brought in the Supreme Court. As will be explained by the able lawyers on the committee, the terms of this bill represent the only way in which a Supreme Court action can be obtained.

The Senator from New Mexico is eminently correct, that the water question should be determined, and that the only place to obtain an equitable apportionment of the waters of the lower basin of the Colorado River now is in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not true that the States in the upper basin have reached an agreement among themselves?

Mr. HAYDEN. They did so, after long negotiation. In the lower basin we tried it with California over and over again, without success. An action in the Supreme Court appears to be the only resort left to us.

Mr. ANDERSON. Since the States of the upper basin have reached a voluntary agreement, have there not been numerous efforts to reach a voluntary agreement among the States of the lower basin?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct. Such efforts have extended over a period of many years, but with no success.

Mr. ANDERSON. Has there been any real progress made toward peace?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all. That is because of the directly divergent interests of the States of Arizona and California.

Mr. ANDERSON. As a matter of fact, as the consumption of water in California has increased, and the need of water in Arizona has increased, the friction has become greater between the two States, has it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. The controversy has become more accentuated.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the opinion of the Senator from Arizona, there is, therefore, no basis of hope that the five lower basin States can ever reach harmonious agreement. Is that not correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not within our lifetime.

Mr. ANDERSON. From the way things have been going, not in many lifetimes to come could they do that. Therefore, does not the Senator believe that, if we do not get the matter into the Supreme Court, a great deal of valuable time will be wasted, and people will suffer by reason of their failure to obtain relief?

Mr. HAYDEN. They are suffering now, and they will continue to suffer, as the water supply is further depleted. There can be no question about that.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the senior Senator from Arizona yield to the junior Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not want the RECORD to appear as though our distinguished colleague, the Senator from New Mexico, is of the opinion that a controversy exists between the States of Arizona and New Mexico. I think our States are in agreement. The enactment of S. 75 is the only way we can ever hope to obtain our equitable share of the water, and the only way New Mexico will ever get her equitable share.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very happy the junior Senator from Arizona made that observation. There was nothing in what I said which should have indicated that there was the slightest difficulty between New Mexico and Arizona, or between Arizona, perhaps, and Utah, or between Arizona and Nevada. The difficulty is in the tremendous requirements of the States of California and Arizona, and, because of that difficulty, there seems little likelihood we can ever reach an agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to permit me to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any difficulty between the States of New Mexico and California?

Mr. ANDERSON. There could be.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I mean. Is there any difficulty now?

Mr. ANDERSON. There could be, in this way—if the Senator from Arizona will permit me to reply——

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. If it should be desired to have California continue to use the tremendous amounts of water which she is capable of developing and using, because of her great population and her great need for it, and if Arizona should be granted all the water she needs, the States of Utah, Nevada, and New Mexico, minority States, in the lower basin, would be completely frozen out.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. ANDERSON. The distinguished minority leader, coming as he does from a State that has irrigation within it, recognizes the doctrine of prior application of water to beneficial use, and we are afraid, if waters of the Colorado River are put to beneficial use within the States of California and Arizona, before the matter can be settled in the courts, Nevada, Utah, and New Mexico may be greatly affected, though our lands may be very small, with a resulting injustice to the States of Nevada, Utah, and New Mexico.

I think the legislation should be passed, in order that we, with our relatively small amount of influence, might get into the Supreme Court of the United States and have a chance before that tribunal to stand up against a great State such as California, if that might be what we would have to do.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the Senator's argument. Naturally, coming from the distinguished Senator, the argument should be given consideration. I wondered whether there was any particular dispute at this time between New Mexico and California. If there is none other than what has been outlined, I think I understand it perfectly.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I shall place in the RECORD a table showing all of the irrigation features of the central Arizona project which are to be deferred, pursuant to the action taken by the committee in recommending the adoption of an amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. None of the features listed will be constructed if the Supreme Court decides against Arizona.

The table is as follows:

Havasu pumping plants	$25,973,000
Granite Reef aqueduct	131,716,000
McDowell Dam and Reservoir	3,346,000
McDowell power plant	16,326,000
Salt Gila aqueduct	34,585,000
Irrigation distribution system	54,086,000
Total	267,044,000

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona, since the four upper Colorado basin States have agreed upon a division of the waters among those four States, above Lee's Ferry, upon a percentage basis, could the anticipated suit in any way involve the compact now in existence, entered into by the four upper basin States?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is my understanding the agreement was very wisely made upon the basis of the percentage of water which may be available in the Colorado River and its tributaries at various times. All agree—at least we in Arizona agree—that the upper basin States are entitled to 7,500,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River and its tributaries. No one in Arizona disputes that. I doubt if the Supreme Court could find anything to the contrary. There are questions relative to depletion, evaporation, and consumptive use, that probably will have to be passed on by the Supreme Court, matters which in themselves will be of interest to the upper basin States. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico will become parties to the suit.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator this further question: Does he believe that the anticipated suit before the Supreme Court could in any way upset the compact between the upper- and the lower-basin States?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not see how it possibly could.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Has it not been conceded by the legal representatives of all the upper-basin States that this suit could not possibly prejudice our rights? I am quite confident that the upper-basin States are fully satisfied that the suit would not in any way prejudice their rights.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have mentioned the sum of $708,000,000 in round figures. Deducting $267,044,000 leaves approximately $441,000,000. That is, again a sizable sum to be principally devoted to the development of hydroelectric power on the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon. That dam is to be located a few miles above the backwater of Lake Mead, the reservoir which was created by the Hoover Dam. The Hoover Dam, which was authorized in 1928, cost $174,000,000. It was completed in 1936, and practically all of the power from it then went into southern California which was at that time a great market for power as it is today. The Hoover Dam was constructed during the depression, when costs were very low. If that structure, with its turbines and generators were to be built today, at present prices, it would cost a half-billion dollars.

The dam was built under a contract to repay its entire cost in 50 years, at 3 percent interest. As a banker's investment it has proved to be perfectly sound, because all payments have been made when due. The power produced there energized industry in southern California. It created new wealth in that area, the taxation of which by the Federal Government has paid the cost of the dam over and over again. The internal revenue collections in southern California, in 1936, were less than $200,000,000. In 1949, $1,410,000,000 was paid into the Federal Treasury by the collector of internal revenue in Los Angeles who gathers the money, due from taxpayers to the Government, in the eight southern counties of the State of California. I do not hesitate to say that if the Hoover Dam had not been built, the amount of revenues in southern California, in 1949, would have been reduced by the original cost of the dam. In other words, it has paid for itself year after year since it was placed in operation, and it will continue to do so for all time to come. So, while we may consider it as a banker's investment, the best way to look at it is that it was a capital investment which created wealth that becomes taxable, and that taxation will pay the cost of all such great projects.

From the time it was authorized 8 years were required to build the Hoover Dam. It will probably take the same length of time to finish the construction of the great Bridge Canyon Dam, but when it is finished—and the demand exists, beyond any question—every kilowatt of power produced there will be promptly purchased. Bridge Canyon power is just as badly needed in California, Arizona, and Nevada as is the power from the Hoover Dam project. It will be another sound capital investment.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a table showing the features of the central Arizona project which the bill, S. 75, authorizes to be constructed.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Features of the central Arizona project primary value for silt and flood control and for the production and transmission of hydroelectric power:

Coconino Dam and Reservoir	$7,487,000
Bridge Canyon Dam and Reservoir	191,939,000
Bridge Canyon power plant	73,419,000
Horseshoe Dam (enlargement) and reservoir	7,078,000
Horseshoe power plant	2,628,000
Buttes Dam and Reservoir	29,037,000
Buttes power plant	1,159,000
Charleston Dam and Reservoir	9,270,000
Tucson aqueduct	6,401,000
Safford Valley improvements	4,090,000
Hooker Dam and Reservoir	15,484,000
Drainage system for salinity control	9,973,000
Power transmission system	63,771,000
Total retained features	441,736,000

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if all of the Arizona hopes are realized by a favorable Supreme Court decision the ultimate expenditures for the central Arizona project will be $708,780,000. I should now like to address the Senate with respect to similar sums of money appropriated for expenditure in the State of California which I consider to be good capital investments. I refer to appropriations for flood control. I have here a tabulation made by the Corps of Engineers which shows that there are now authorized for construction in the State of California flood-control projects to cost $735,747,000. The amount so far appropriated by Congress for these projects is $195,084,000. The largest of the projects is the Los Angeles County drainage area involving approximately $301,000,000 of which $95,000,000 has been appropriated.

There is also the Pine Flat Reservoir, costing $51,000,000, the Table Mountain Reservoir, to cost $55,000,000, and the Whittier Narrows Reservoir, to cost $36,000,000. The money thus made available has no strings attached to it. It is not reimbursable. It is, in one sense, a direct gift from the Treasury of the United States. It is true that each one of these projects has been carefully examined and recommended by the Corps of Army Engineers, and it is true that the local communities make some contributions, but when it comes to returning money to the Treasury of the United States, the only way in which it is repaid is through protecting the taxable wealth or by creating new wealth which becomes subject to taxation. That is exactly what is being done by the flood-control projects in California. That is why I voted to authorize practically all of them, and that is why I have supported appropriations to carry on their construction.

California has a climate which is dry in the summer but torrential rains often occur in the winter. Flood damage to any person's property is a deductible loss under the income-tax laws. If the taxpayer suffers a loss, the Federal Treasury suffers a loss along with him. That is why it is a sound and good business investment for Congress to make these flood-control appropriations. But the total amount of them, approximately $735,000,000, is a sum of money equivalent to the total sum of $708,000,000 to be appropriated for the central Arizona project.

The table ordered to be included in the RECORD is as follows:

Authorized flood-control projects in the State of California

Name of project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date
Bear Creek	$503,000	$20,000
Black Butte Reservoir	11,079,000	95,000
Cherry Valley Reservoir	8,000,000	1,130,900
Farmington Reservoir	3,720,000	2,025,000
Folsom Reservoir	50,792,000	4,682,000
Hogan Reservoir	11,204,000	155,000
Isabella Reservoir	14,300,000	6,208,000
Los Angeles County drainage area (exclusive of Whittier Narrows Reservoir)	301,605,600	95,731,200
Merced County stream group	2,700,000	1,730,000
New Melones Reservoir	38,127,000	100,000
Pajaro River	25,500	
Pine Flat Reservoir	51,121,000	13,700,000
Sacramento River and minor and major tributaries	21,520,000	1,035,000
Salinas River	3,515,000	80,000
Santa Ana River Basin (including San Antonio Dam)	47,241,900	19,919,300
San Joaquin River and tributaries	4,005,000	90,000
Santa Clara River	4,956,000	
Stewart Canyon debris basin and channel	880,000	38,500
Success Reservoir	11,144,000	385,000
Table Mountain Reservoir	55,229,000	645,000
Terminus Reservoir	13,395,000	335,000
Ventura River	1,350,000	1,350,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir	36,320,000	5,194,100
Eel River	280,000	
Napa River	65,000	
Sacramento River, flood-control project	42,600,000	39,796,000
Total	735,747,000	195,084,000

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to point out some other sizable appropriations which are being made in California. With reference to reclamation appropriations, there are authorized for expenditure in that State at the present time projects to cost $765,295,000. Of that sum there has heretofore been appropriated, up to June 30 of last year, $423,398,000. Most of that money is reimbursable, as it would be in the case of the central Arizona project, and it is a good Federal investment.

The following table, to be printed in the RECORD, lists the projects to which I have referred:

Federal reclamation developments in California

Projects authorized for construction	Estimated total cost	Funds appropriated through June 30, 1950
All-American Canal project	$76,993,213	[1] $58,170,162
Central Valley project (exclusive of distribution)	500,386,000	333,593,862
Central Valley project irrigation distribution systems	72,500,000	
Klamath project (California portion)	[2] 6,048,867	[2] 5,560,000
Orland project	2,448,670	2,500,000
Parker Dam and power plant project	16,549,947	[3] 15,786,682
Santa Barbara project (Cachuma)	34,189,000	[3] 6,185,000
Solano County project	45,577,000	
Yuma project (California portion)	1,602,748	1,602,748
Total	765,295,445	423,398,454

[1] Exclusive of contract authorization as follows All-American Canal, $975,700, Santa Barbara, $1,600,000
[2] One-third of total project based on approximate division of irrigable acreage between California and Oregon
[3] Exclusive of $7,256,553 of trust funds contributed by Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and transmission line system in Arizona

I have voted for legislation to authorize many of these projects; I have voted to appropriate money to carry them on, and I shall continue to support them, because I believe they are intrinsically sound.

When there is an area such as that in the Central Valley of California, which can produce crops valued at a billion dollars a year, and when there are areas in southern California in which agricultural production is tremendous, all brought about by the use of irrigation water, we can be satisfied that the Federal Government will get its money back a long time ahead of the ordinary repayment period by reason of the payment of income taxes by those persons who make a profit out of the use of the water to grow crops, and the corresponding development which goes on in the cities and towns.

The Central Valley, Calif., project is a development in an area which is approximately 500 miles long and 100 miles wide, comprising the valleys of the Sacramento River in the north and the San Joaquin River in the south. There is more rainfall in northern California than there is in the southern part of the Central Valley. That region was settled in the early days, first, by Spaniards and Mexicans who obtained land grants in a cattle-grazing area. Later, irrigation development took place by taking water out of the streams. It was later discovered that there was an underground supply of water, and electric pumps have been used in recent years to bring large quantities of water to the surface. A magnificent civilization was developed in that area. Crops of all kinds could be grown. But, as the well drilling continued, the water table went down. The water table has dropped so low that hundreds of thousands of acres of hitherto valuable tax-paying land must be abandoned.

So there was conceived what was then thought to be a most fantastic project—to go to another watershed and bring water into the San Joaquin Valley. That is what the Central Valley project consists of—a great dam on the Sacramento River to impound the flood waters of that stream and to equate its flow so that it will be available when wanted. The power from the Shasta Dam will pump water up into the lower half of the San Joaquin Valley. By irrigating the lower area in the San Joaquin Valley with Sacramento River water, the water normally flowing in the San Joaquin could be applied higher up. That is the plan which has been worked out. It is entirely feasible and justifiable, if for no other reason, because it saved a civilization.

I am very familiar with the San Joaquin Valley. My mother lived there before she married my father. I have visited the valley many, many times. The agricultural production in the Valley is very much like what it is in central Arizona The climate is quite similar. The towns, such as Fresno, Calif., and Phoenix, Ariz., are comparable in the way they have developed.

The Central Valley project was originally initiated in 1935, not by an act of Congress, but by an allotment of $12,000,000 from the Public Works fund. There were work relief appropriations in those days, and President Roosevelt allotted that sum of money with which to begin the project.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In order better to identify the Central Valley project in California, would it not be correct to say that it is an empire in itself, about 100 miles wide and 600 miles long?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. It is a vast agricultural area.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is a greater production of farm food products in that area, on a percentage basis, than anywhere else in the country, is there not?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not doubt at all that the most modern developments in agriculture are being practiced in the Central Valley in California. There is mechanized farming, and the greatest skill has been used to bring about the highest possible development and the greatest production possible. All that is needed is water.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I say to the Senator from Arizona, knowing the Central Valley and the project which he is now discussing, that as much can be done in Arizona as has been done in California, provided water can be obtained.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no doubt about that. That is the comparison which I am making.

I hold in my hand a report made in August 1949 and recently issued by the Government Printing Office, entitled "The Central Valley Basin." I should like to direct attention to page 79 of that report, which indicates the expected development in that area. It is a summary of benefits and costs. I read from the report:

The following table summarizes the benefits and costs discussed in the foregoing paragraphs:

Annual benefits

New irrigation supply	$197,880,000
Supplemental irrigation supply	30,220,000
Salinity control	1,600,000
Municipal and miscellaneous water supply	8,040,000
Flood control	7,949,000
Navigation	1,314,000
Power	28,000,000
Total	275,003,000

Capital and annual costs

Item	Capital cost	Annual operation, maintenance, and replacement cost
Storage reservoirs	$840,600,000	$2,310,000
Canals and distribution systems	520,500,000	10,640,000
Power facilities	380,700,000	15,640,000
Channel improvements and reservoirs predominantly for flood control	27,000,000	260,000
Fish facilities	15,000,000	500,000
Total	1,810,800,000	29,350,000
Interest and amortization of capital cost in 50 years at 3 percent		70,380,000
Total annual cost		99,730,000

Ratio of benefits to cost, 2.7 to 1.

So the annual benefits to come from the expanded development of the Central Valley project will amount to $275,003,000

That development is to be brought about by a capital cost of $1,810,000,000. The only exception to be noted is that the figure of $1,810,000,000 was arrived at in 1942

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator state what the difference in the price would be?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was just coming to that. The figures which I have here from the United States Reclamation Service show that the difference between the 1940 prices and the prices when the figures were made for the central Arizona project is 2.15 to 1. Applying that rule to the costs for future development in the Central Valley project of California, or multiplying this figure of $1,810,800,000 by 2.15, we arrive at a total cost of $3,890,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Those are 1947 prices?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, 1947 prices.

Mr. McFARLAND. Based on the same figure that the estimate for the central Arizona project?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am trying to compare the estimates. Bringing the 1940 figure

for future construction of the Central Valley project down to 1947 prices, which were used to calculate the central Arizona project, the cost of the California project would be $3,890,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is the cost of the California project.

Mr. HAYDEN. That cost does not alarm me, because along with this increase in costs you have also an increase in the value of the products of the area. What it amounts to, if we look at it carefully, is that the high construction costs are the result of the lowered value of the construction dollar. The power rates have remained about the same, but all the other products of the land have increased in value. Very few, if any, of the reclamation projects which were built in the past with high value dollars could now be shown to have a repayment period of anything like the 40 or 50 year periods which were calculated at that time. So far as the proposed expansion of the Central Valley project in California is concerned it would simply mean that the repayment period would have to be extended over a longer period of years, because the farmer can pay only in proportion to what he takes off his land each year. Judging from what has happened in the past I say that this proposal of California is sound, and I am ready to support it whenever budget estimates are submitted for undertaking any part of it, because I am fully confident that the additional wealth created in California will return the money to the Treasury of the United States.

Mention was made in the beginning of the debate of the suit which the committee has authorized to be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States. I never was a law student, but in my early thirties I served for 5 years as the sheriff of my county which gave me an opportunity to listen to legal arguments in the courtroom. It was firmly impressed upon my mind at that time that in a civil action one could not stay long in court unless he could show that something was actually being done or quite certain to be done which was to his distinct disadvantage.

Mr. President, more than 20 years ago the people of my State became convinced that there were powerful interests in California which desired to secure an unfair and undue share of the water of the Colorado River to the permanent detriment of Arizona. On three different occasions, in 1930 (283 U. S 423), 1933 (292 U. S. 341), and 1935 (298 U. S. 558), the State of Arizona filed suits in the United States Supreme Court against the State of California in the hope that the Court might be willing to determine what would be an equitable apportionment of the 8,500,000 acre-feet of water assigned by the Colorado River Compact to the States of the lower basin of which Arizona and California are a part.

Able lawyers were employed by Arizona, among them Dean Acheson, the present Secretary of State. In all three instances the Supreme Court declined to entertain a suit and in its first decision stated that—

> The contentions are based not upon any actual or threatened impairment of Arizona's rights but upon assumed potential invasions (283 U. S. 425).

After three times resisting an Arizona effort to have the Supreme Court divide the waters of the Colorado River in the lower basin, the Californians quite recently have done an about face and now say that they want that Court to do that very thing. We in Arizona have good reason to suspect that this is but another scheme to postpone action. They say that they want such a lawsuit but do not say when.

The committee amendment to S. 75 which provides for a Supreme Court determination of water rights was drafted by two able lawyers, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and I hope that the numerous other lawyers in this body will listen to their explanation of what it is intended to accomplish. To me, as a layman, it appears certain to bring California up to the snubbing post where that State must promptly participate in an action before the Supreme Court and that is why the Californians do not like it. What they want is delay, delay, and more delay. Delay for many years to come in the hope that in the meantime more people will come to southern California and thereby build up a greater need for water.

The effect of the committee amendment is to withhold any authorization for the construction of irrigation works in my State until the Supreme Court decides whether there is a supply of water in the Colorado River for the central Arizona project. The result is that at this time the total authorization in the bill is reduced by $267,000,000 but it is made clear that if the Supreme Court does, in due course of time, decide that Arizona has a right to the water which she claims, then construction of the irrigation features provided for in the bill may proceed.

The O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment, as recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is designed to make certain that there will be what the lawyers call a justiciable issue. After three times successfully urging the Supreme Court to find that there was no such issue, the Californians now say that one exists despite the fact that there has been absolutely no change in the situation and will be none for years to come unless Congress authorizes the construction of the central Arizona project. I therefore urge the adoption of the committee amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Along that line, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the RECORD should show that the resolution introduced by the California Senators would never bring about an adjudication of the rights of the States because a justiciable issue does not exist at the present time.

Their resolution was introduced on the last day of the hearings on S. 1175, the predecessor of Senate bill S. 75, for the purpose of defeating the central Arizona project.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have urged the adoption of the committee amendment, because, having great faith in the able lawyers who devised it, I believe it will get the case before the Supreme Court, and that we can determine whether or not Arizona has a right to the water in the Colorado River which we say belongs to our State. If that determination is against us, then the money authorized in this bill for the construction of irrigation works will never be expended. If the decision is in favor of Arizona, then we will come back to see what the Congress will do about making the necessary appropriations.

Mr. President, I want to clear up one other matter in respect to the central Arizona project because it has been repeatedly alleged by the southern Californians that this water which Arizona proposes to take out of the Colorado River would benefit a comparatively small acreage of land and only a few farmers. What we have in central Arizona is 725,000 acres of excellent land all of which has been under irrigation—most all of it is now irrigated—but has a short water supply. As happened in California, we have exhausted the water in the streams by overexpansion of irrigation, and we have exhausted the underground water. Our case is identically parallel to that of the Central Valley project in California. Congress saved a civilization there. We ask the Congress to save a civilization in Arizona. Every precedent which has been established in connection with the central California project applies with equal force to the central Arizona project.

Now what do we propose to do through the central Arizona project? In round figures it is to bring 1,000,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River into central Arizona, and that water is to be disposed of at $4.75 an acre-foot. That is a rather high rate for irrigation water because it really effectively bars the cultivation of new land; but as a supplemental supply, just as it was in the case of California, and just as it was in the case of the eastern slope in Colorado, where water is brought through the Big Thompson tunnel for irrigation of lands out on the plains, the additional acre-foot, the final acre-foot, is the one on which profit or loss is made, and that is where a farmer can afford to pay a substantial price.

The productivity of the irrigated land in central Arizona is so great—among the highest in the United States—that for that additional acre-foot of water the farmers can bear the charge without any difficulty at all. The arrangement is not that a contract will be made with some individual landowner that he will take a certain quantity of water. The contracts are to be made for payment to the United States for that water each year by organized water users' associations or irrigation districts which, like regularly constituted municipal corporations, have the power to tax. They have another power which is even better than that. If a water assessment is not paid, the water user's gate can be locked. That is the most effective way of obtaining payment anywhere in a desert region.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will not the Senator clarify his last statement to me? Is it not a fact that the farmers of the central Arizona project cannot pay one single dollar upon either the principal or the interest on the farm benefits charged to them? Is that not a fact?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not a fact the way I understand it. Let me repeat, my understanding is that approximately 1,000,000 acre-feet of water are to be conveyed from the Colorado River into central Arizona; that contracts are to be made with the water-use organizations there to pay for that water at $4.75 an acre-foot, or $4,750,000 a year. They are to make contracts to pay for that water whether they use it or not. If it happens to be a wet year they may not use the water. But we are in exactly the same situation, if I may say to the Senator from California, as that which occurred recently in the State of California. Congress authorized the construction of the Santa Barbara water project. Its construction was dependent upon contract for the repayment of the cost of the project, and Congress in the last Interior Department appropriation bill made it contingent that a sufficient number of the organized water users in and around Santa Barbara should obligate themselves to make annual payments for the cost of the project as determined by the Reclamation Service, and until those obligations were voted there was no appropriation made.

Take the Solano project in California, a magnificent development to my mind; no money has been appropriated for it because there has been no determination yet as to who will pay its reimbursable costs.

We hear talk about a limited acreage and a small number of farmers. I wish to make the situation perfectly clear by saying that 725,000 acres of land will be benefited by the central Arizona project; that the 30,000 farmers who live on that land will be benefited; and that all that land will be included in contracts entered into by duly organized water users to pay $4,750,000 into the Treasury of the United States each year.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the Senator the record clearly reveals that the farmers of central Arizona cannot pay one dollar upon the investment or one dollar upon the interest. The $4.75 they would pay is not sufficient to pay one-half of the annual operation and maintenance. The only way the maintenance can be taken care of is by the virtual donation of one-third of the total power generated at Bridge Canyon, which the farmers will obtain practically at cost, and that the amount they would pay, $4.75, is not even sufficient to pay for operation and maintenance, and it is not contemplated it will pay one dollar, either upon the interest or upon the principal. All the interest on both the irrigation allocation of $400,000,000 and upon the power investment will be paid by the taxpayers of the United States over the 70 years, that will amount to more than $1,000,000,000, and all the principal upon both the power and the irrigation investment will be paid out of the income from the power.

Mr. HAYDEN. The senior Senator from California has made that assertion over and over again. In my judgment it is not borne out. There is no use now in arguing about it. The report of the United States Reclamation Service on the central Arizona project does not bear out the statement the Senator has made. The Senator can repeat it and repeat it indefinitely, but when the time comes for Congress to appropriate money for the construction of the irrigation works of the central Arizona project Congress will determine whether the Senator is right or whether I am right. I do know that so far as the Central Valley project is concerned the cost to be paid by the irrigation is not as great as the cost expected to be repaid into the Treasury from power. Whether the percentages in California and Arizona are the same is something else. The principle is the same, that a power subsidy is required to carry on the Central Valley project in California. The power generated at the Shasta Dam must bear a rate which, if there was no irrigation development, could be lower. Included in that rate is a subsidy to irrigation. There is no question about that. Included in the Bridge Canyon power rate is a subsidy for irrigation. And included in every hydroelectric development in the West that is combined with irrigation there will be and has to be a subsidy. There is a subsidy in the Missouri Basin project. I can place in the RECORD these various subsidies—I shall be very glad to do so—and show where they are. It matters not where they are located, there will be no future irrigation of land, no future reclamation development anywhere in the arid regions of the West that is not subsidized by power.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in yielding. Let me say that on next Monday afternoon I shall be present upon the floor with the reports of the Bureau of Reclamation and the direct statements made by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] to the effect that the farmers of central Arizona cannot pay one dollar toward either principal or interest, either of the power or the irrigation development, and that the $4.75 contemplated to be charged is not sufficient to cover by one-half the annual cost of operation and maintenance.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall, as always, listen with delight to the senior Senator from California.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I have never made the statement the senior Senator from California has just attributed to me. I have at all times said that the $4.75 per acre-foot which the Arizona farmers will pay for operation and maintenance and part of the construction charges. That statement is made in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation.

If my colleague wishes to have a comparison of the subsidies placed in the RECORD, here it is: For the Central Valley of California there is a subsidy of sixty-eight one-hundredths of a mill. For the central Arizona project it will be seventy-two one-hundredths of a mill—or very little difference.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the Columbia Basin it is smaller, namely, thirty-six one-hundredths of a mill. In the Missouri Basin it is 2.7 mills of subsidy for irrigation.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AIKEN in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in the Central Valley of California project, the amount paid by the farmers will pay more than one-half of the principal indebtedness upon the amount allocated to farm benefits.

I repeat that in the central Arizona project, according to the statements made by the farmers, by the junior Senator from Arizona, and by the Bureau of Reclamation, it is admitted that the $4.50 will cover nothing more than operation and maintenance.

In addition to that, in the Central Valley of California we pay 2½ mills pe kilowatt-hour for project pumping.

In the central Arizona project, the cost of the power, if sold commercially, would amount to $6,000,000 or $7,000,000. The people of Arizona will have to pay at the rate of a small fraction of 1 mill per kilowatt-hour, in order to pay for operation and maintenance.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the senior Senator from California will just vote for the committee amendment, the matter of water rights will be determined by the Supreme Court of the United States. If California can win in that lawsuit, no water will come to Arizona, and all the argument we have had today and all the argument which probably will be made hereafter with respect to irrigation rights will be utterly wasted. So I suggest to the Senator from California that his approval of the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment would be an excellent way to bring the issue to a head.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Does not the Senator think there would be less waste of time and motion if we would first let the Supreme Court decide these rights, and then attempt to pass upon this authorization?

Mr. HAYDEN. I entirely disagree with the Senator from California, because I do not believe that the Supreme Court will consider the case unless there is a real issue involved. However, that is a matter the Senator can debate with the lawyers.

There is a further matter which I should like to mention. In the southern California propaganda against the central Arizona project, the statement is repeatedly made that Colorado River water is required to supply the needs of 5,000,000 people. What 5,000,000 people, Mr. President? Not the over 5,000,000 who now live in southern California

because less than one-tenth of the water which they are now using comes from the Colorado River. I have before me a table of figures from the United States Geological Survey showing the actual diversions from the Colorado River through the metropolitan district aqueduct beginning with 30,700 acre-feet in 1941, increasing to 58,350 acre-feet in 1945, and to a maximum of 194,245 in 1948. The table is as follows:

Diverted from the Colorado River at Parker Dam into metropolitan water district aqueduct which has a total annual capacity of 2,212,000 acre-feet

Year.	*Acre-feet*
1941	30,700
1942	31,140
1943	34,630
1944	51,633
1945	58,350
1946	80,395
1947	85,356
1948	194,245
1949	178,597

Every year since that aqueduct was completed over 5,000,000 acre-feet has gone to waste out of that river into the Gulf of California. The water was there but it was not taken because it was not needed. It is perfectly evident from these facts that all this talk about the 5,000,000 people who need water has no legitimate relation to those who now live in southern California but is just camouflage which is being practiced so that another 5,000,000 can be told that if they will come to southern California, there will be ample water for them. All this talk of the needs of 5,000,000 people is based upon delay, delay until more people do get to southern California; and if the authorization for the central Arizona project can be postponed long enough, the Californians, with their usual optimism, expect another 5,000,000 people within the next 10 years.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield

Mr. CHAVEZ. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Arizona to mean that although at the moment the representatives of southern California would say, "We have to get some water from the Colorado River because of the fact that we have 5,000,000 people in southern California," yet the record, as I understood the Senator from Arizona to say, indicates that very little of the water the representatives of southern California now are claiming would be water to be used by the 5,000,000 people; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. If they had needed it, they certainly would have pumped it out of the Colorado River, because it has been there every day since the metropolitan aqueduct was constructed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But they did not use it.

Mr. HAYDEN. They did not use it—and why? Because they already had all the water that they needed from other sources than the Colorado River.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

As I understand the argument of the Senator from Arizona, it is that the water comes over the mountains from Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. The representatives of California would say, "You cannot use any of that water if you need it in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, or New Mexico, because California might need it for 5,000,000 people who might move to California in the future."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, of course, there is behind the 5,000,000 population argument this consideration: It is generally recognized that demands for water that is needed for human consumption have a priority over demands for water needed for irrigation and other uses. If there were in southern California sufficient human beings who were parched dry, for lack of water, undoubtedly they would make the effort the Senator from New Mexico suggests, so far as the upper basin or elsewhere is concerned. Let us recall the case of the Owens Valley in California. There was in that valley an irrigated area. The city of Los Angeles, then having a population of about 200,000 people, decided it needed the water in the Owens Valley for its use, so Los Angeles proceeded to condemn the agricultural land and take the water. The water was taken away from the irrigated land in Owens Valley because there was a higher use for it, namely, for domestic consumption in the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But the same argument would apply to the four upper basin States, as well; if they were to have increased populations which would need water, they would have a prior right to the water.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall not be at all surprised if, when the case gets to the Supreme Court, we will find the State of California urging that a mistake was made in the Colorado River compact, in the apportionment of the water among the States because that compact does not give due regard to the superior importance of the domestic use, as against ordinary irrigation use.

At any rate, the 5,000,000 people about whom the southern Californians have talked throughout all their propaganda actually do not now exist in southern California. Conclusive proof of that fact is that California has not felt compelled to come to the Colorado River to get water for the people who now live there.

There is another question which I should like to ask. Why is it that the Californians seek delay? The answer is perfectly obvious, Mr. President: No substantial irrigation or power development can hereafter take place anywhere on the Colorado River or its tributaries without aid from the Federal Treasury. That aid cannot be obtained except by votes in Congress and the approval of the President. As a result of the 1930 census, California with a population of 5,677,000 had 20 Congressmen and 22 electoral votes. The 1940 census found 6,907,000 people in that State and its Representatives were increased to the present number of 23. The latest Census Bureau estimates indicate that California will have a population of close to 11,000,000 in 1950 which means that in 1952 there will be at least 30 California Congressmen and the State will certainly have as many as 32 electoral votes.

As it now stands, California has a great advantage, but if any additional use of Colorado River water can be postponed until 1952 the probability of blocking further development anywhere else except in California will be materially enhanced. If the central Arizona project can then be stalled off for another 10 years and the fully expected additional 5,000,000 people come to California, the political power of that State will be further enhanced. In the meantime, with the exhaustion of the underground waters, thousands of people will be compelled to leave Arizona and cannot be counted when the census taker makes his rounds.

And also, as in the past, California will not be helpful to any additional diversion of water from the Colorado River and its tributaries in the Upper Basin States of New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming. The Californians want the water to come down the river so that they can get it. Those who speak for New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming, after many contacts and fruitless conferences with the Californians know just what motivates them. That is why the accredited representatives of those four States, as their interstate water commissioners, unanimously approved the resolution which I read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 8, urging favorable action upon S. 75, the pending bill to authorize the construction of the central Arizona project.

The Senators from California have announced that they will propose a very cleverly designed amendment to delay building the Bridge Canyon Dam and hydroelectric power plant by postponing any construction until other dams are built upstream on the Colorado River which will catch the silt carried by its waters. What are the facts? The Bridge Canyon Dam will back up the water in the narrow lower canyon of the Colorado, creating a lake 90 miles long. The Reclamation Service engineers, after carefully checking the annual deposit of silt in Lake Mead, above the Hoover Dam, now estimate that it will take 30 years for enough silt to accumulate above Bridge Canyon to seriously interfere with the generation of electric power at that site.

The southern Californians base their claim to a greater share of water from the Colorado River upon the needs of an ever-increasing population. The number of people in that half of the State has jumped from 2,932,795 in 1930 to 3,672,383 in 1940, and to a Census Bureau estimate of 5,600,000 in 1949. With true California optimism they confidently expect another 5,000,000 in the next 10 years. They therefore demand that Congress deny Arizona's claim to its share of Colorado River water or at least indefinitely delay any recognition of that claim until they will be in a better position to get it.

Today there is an acute shortage of power in southern California, just as there is in Arizona. The 5,000,000 people who now live there would find no difficulty in making use of all power to be generated at Bridge Canyon. Certainly the next 5,000,000 immigrants who they are sure will come there will need power.

If the southern Californians could be assured of control over all of the Bridge Canyon power, they would be enthusiastically supporting appropriations by Congress for the immediate construction of that dam, silt or no silt. In proof of what I am saying, I read from the 1948 annual report of the Metropolitan water district:

The department has maintained the position that no further Colorado River projects involving withdrawal of water from the lower basin should be authorized until the decision of the Nation's highest Court has finally determined the rights of the States.

In the meantime, department engineers are continuing cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation in exploring dam sites, and in urging authorization by the Congress of development of hydroelectric power. A suitable site already has been determined at Bridge Canyon, and drilling is being carried on at Glen Canyon to locate a satisfactory location.

Power dams at Bridge Canyon and Glen Canyon, neither of which involve withdrawal of water from the river, and which were included in the original plans for the development of the Colorado, are needed to supply the constantly expanding markets created by the population and industrial growth of all three lower-basin States. The combined projects, which can duplicate the contribution of Hoover Dam to the economy of the Southwest, without cost to the Government, will provide 1,535,000 kilowatts of generating capacity, and utilize water power equivalent to consumption of 15,000,000 barrels of fuel oil annually—energy that will flow on, forever wasted, until harnessed for the production of electricity.

The people who live in southern California need power much more than they do water, and complete proof of that is that up to now not one-half of the 4,400,000 acre-feet of water which Arizona concedes to California has been put to beneficial consumptive use.

No; it is only because a part of the power produced at Bridge Canyon is to be used to lift water from the Colorado River into Central Arizona that this delaying amendment is suggested—an amendment which clearly deserves defeat.

The southern Californians can cheerfully envision another 5,000,000 people coming to settle among them, but it is impossible for them to conceive that there will be a spirit of enterprise in the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona, where reservoirs will be established for power and irrigation which will control the floods of the Colorado River and its tributaries above Pridge Canyon and thereby completely solve the silt problem.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Speaking for California, let me say we are very anxious that the Bridge Canyon power plant be built, but we believe it can be a great economic factor for the Southwest and for the United States. We are unwilling to see one-third of that gigantic power dedicated to the job of pumping this water with very meager benefit. We are unwilling to see the interest upon the great sums asked by the Government to build it, diverted to this farming enterprise. We are unwilling to see the power users of the Southwest burdened with additional sums to pay for this gigantic farm proposition.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let us say it in another way. If there were no proposed irrigation developments which required pumping, if only gravity water were taken from the Colorado River, then none of the Bridge Canyon power would be used for that purpose. In that case there would then be no irrigation subsidy in connection with the Bridge Canyon Dam, and if power from it could be obtained by southern California, it would be that much cheaper. If they could get power in southern California without the irrigation-subsidy burden, they would be glad to get it that much cheaper. I say the principle of an irrigation subsidy from power is exactly the same at Bridge Canyon as it in in the Central Valley project in California, or in the Missouri Basin, or in the Columbia Basin, or anywhere else. It is impossible to nave any further irrigation development throughout the entire arid West without a power subsidy, and, so far as Arizona is concerned, the Bridge Canyon power site is wholly within our State. I can assure the Senator from California that so long as the State of Arizona is represented in the Congress, either in the Senate or in the House, if it is at all possible to use some part of the power generated in Bridge Canyon or elsewhere in the Grand Canyon region to help irrigate more land in Arizona, we are going to try to do that very thing, notwithstanding any protests which may come from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am totally unable to understand the statements made by the beloved senior Senator from Arizona. On the Colorado River, upon the power investment in the Boulder Dam project, the Government receives 3 percent, which goes back to the taxpayers and to the Treasury. That will not be true here. In Arizona, the interest will never go back to the Treasury of the United States. The Treasury will be out about $1,250,000,000. It will go to assist in the development of the irrigation project. In addition to that—if I may add this, and then I will conclude—the metropolitan water district and our farmers pay the full commercial value, about 5 mills, for the power they receive and employ from Boulder Dam. Under this project, as conceived, the Arizona farmers will get a tremendous part of the power at about seven-tenths of 1 mill per kilowatt hour, which is about one-fifth of the amount at which it can be produced even in the Northwest, where we have the cheapest power. We have no such subsidies, in any part of the Colorado River, such as Arizona is here asking.

Mr. HAYDEN. However that may be, the fact remains that, so far as the Hoover Dam project is concerned, if no interest had been charged, if there had been no reimbursement whatever to the Federal Government the total cost of the project would long ago have been paid. How? It would have been paid for by the increased prosperity in southern California which resulted in more money being paid to the Federal Treasury by way of taxation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. In just a moment. Bringing hydroelectric energy anywhere creates new wealth; and when that is done, the new wealth becomes taxable. I am just as confident, as I said before, that every year enough money is collected from the taxpayers of southern California because of the power from Hoover Dam, completely to pay the entire cost of it. We in Arizona are desirous of maintaining the wealth of our State and of increasing it, so we may become heavier Federal taxpayers just as was done in California. I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my colleague upon the clarity of his statements of the issues involved in the pending bill. The California witnesses admitted that, at least to the extent that flood control was charged off in connection with the Boulder Canyon project, California power users were being subsidized by the Federal Government and were getting cheaper power.

So far as the utilization of Colorado River water is concerned, it has been made very clear by the evidence and by the statement of the Secretary of the Interior that the lands of the east and west mesas in the Imperial Valley which have been referred to as an area to be irrigated, are in fact not irrigable. The Secretary of the Interior has refused to grant the turn-out gates for the irrigation of the east mesa land, which the University of California has determined to be land that is not fit to be irrigated. So my colleague has today developed the real issue here, and that is whether certain interests in southern California are going to have cheaper power, or whether the economy of the State of Arizona is to be saved. I wish to congratulate my colleague upon his developing that and bringing it out on the floor of the Senate

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator seems to be making the argument that if the Government invests in this project $1,000,000,000 more or less, it will result in such activity in Arizona and such swelling of income taxes that the entire Nation will benefit. It is the same argument the eloquent and brilliant Senator from Arizona has made repeatedly. Let me say Arizona has about 750,000 people. There are 150,000,000 in the United States. Arizona has one-half of 1 percent of the population of the Nation. If we are to subsidize other regions of the United States, in order that they may develop more business and produce greater income, it would require $2,000,000,000 As a matter of fact, the $1,000,000,000 of which the Senators from Arizona speak so casually represents approximately twice as much as the present assessed value of all the property in the State of Arizona. I fail to see how the State of Pennsylvania, whose taxpayers will pay approximately $75,000,000 or $100,000,000

of the benefit, will gain anything commensurate, because Arizona may pay higher income taxes into the Treasury.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator will not make that argument, the next time we have a bill under consideration in the Congress, authorizing the building of power plants, flood-control projects, or irrigation projects in California. The Senator from California will then adopt my logic and say whatever of that nature is done in his State will be a national asset, will create wealth to be taxed by the Federal Government, and the taxpayers of Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the United States will bear no extra burden. It depends entirely upon where the project is to be located, as to how the senior Senator from California applies his logic.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I want to say to the Senator, that is just not correct, if he will pardon me. I am opposing the wasteful and extravagant projects proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation within the Central Valley, as well as elsewhere. Whenever the Bureau proposes for us a project that will cost $1,000, $2,000, $3,000, or $4,000 an acre, in order to produce irrigated lands worth a fraction of that, I shall be aggressively opposed to them in California or in the State of Arizona. If this fantastic extravagant project were presented in the State of California, I should be just as aggressively opposed to it there as I am in central Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am reminded of an old saying, "Never bet against the future of the United States of America." Certainly, I would never bet against the future of the State of California. A State which can increase its population by more than 4,000,000 persons in 10 years, which can pay more than $3,000,000,000 into the Federal Treasury in 1 year, is a good place for the Federal Government to make capital investments. I shall continue to support such investments, regardless of whether the senior Senator from California is in favor of them or not. I have always been in favor of developments of that kind, regardless of where they may be located. All I ask of California is that while she grows and prospers she will be generous and humane enough to let Arizona, one of her nearest neighbors, also have a fair opportunity to grow and to prosper.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am directly thinking of the financial advantage of the State of Arizona. This project proposes to deduct one-third of the immense block of power which is going to be produced at Bridge Canyon for pumping the amount of water which has been mentioned, 1,000 feet, and conducting it 300 miles across the desert. In our opinion, formed by experts of the Federal Power Commission and the Department of Agriculture, that immense block of hydroelectric power would be worth five times as much to the State of Arizona in the production of wealth and employment as in utilizing it to irrigate common, ordinary field-crop land for principally cotton and grain.

In this matter we think the State of Arizona is making an almost fatal error, if the Congress of the United States and the President should ever say, "Certainly, you can take this tremendous block of power to irrigate a comparatively meager amount of land." We want to see Arizona prosper. We feel she is a sister State, but, unfortunately, she is now using an error of judgment, and we want to prevent her, so far as we can, from being improvident and wasteful of tremendous sums of money in the Federal Treasury, and of tremendous blocks of hydroelectric power.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I want to say that I wish again to congratulate my colleague for bringing the issue right out into the open.

It has been apparent, from the colloquy on the floor this afternoon, that the real issue in regard to the central Arizona project is whether the economy of the State of Arizona is going to be saved or whether the southern California power interests are going to get cheaper power. That is all there is to it. The record clearly shows that California has all the water she needs if the resources available to her are not wasted.

RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF JAMES BUCHANAN

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues a bill I have introduced to honor the memory of a distinguished American whose service to Pennsylvania and to the Nation is worthy of recognition and praise.

I refer to the fifteenth President of the United States, James Buchanan, the only Pennsylvanian elected to the office of Chief Executive of our Nation.

During his lifetime and since, President Buchanan has been the subject of much critical comment. But none of his contemporaries and likewise none of the historians who have recorded his life and works have questioned his sincerity or his integrity.

It has been said that Buchanan's character, the breadth of his legal knowledge, and his experience as a Member of Congress, Cabinet member, and diplomat would have made him an excellent President in ordinary times.

Had Buchanan been President in any period other than the Civil War era, he undoubtedly would have served most effectively.

It required a Lincoln to handle the slavery and secession issues. Such a man comes along only once in a century.

I should like to recall to the Senate some of Buchanan's achievements.

He was born near Foltz, Franklin County, Pa., on April 23, 1791. The bill I have introduced to authorize a commemorative postage stamp would honor the one hundred and sixtieth anniversay of his birth next year.

Both of his parents were of Scottish-Irish Presbyterian descent.

He graduated from Dickinson College in Carlisle, Pa., in 1809, thereafter studying law in Lancaster. Following his admission to the bar in 1812, he served a term in the State legislature.

During the period 1821 to 1831 he served in the United States House of Representatives and rose to the chairmanship of the House Judiciary Committee. During his five terms he handled legislation of great importance.

In the years 1832 and 1833, he served as our Minister to Russia where he negotiated an important commercial treaty.

Elected to the United States Senate in 1834 and again in 1840, he served with distinction. An able orator, he participated in many of the important Senate debates of that 12-year period.

Buchanan became Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Polk from 1845 to 1849. This period was marked by the annexation of Texas, the Mexican War, and negotiations with Great Britain on the Oregon question.

In 1853 Buchanan was appointed by President Pierce to serve as Minister to Great Britain.

Returning from this important post in 1856, Buchanan became the Democratic candidate for the Presidency. He defeated J. C. Fremont by an electoral vote of 174 to 114.

On the expiration of his term of office March 4, 1861, Buchanan retired to his home at Wheatland near Lancaster, Pa., where he actively supported the Union until his death at the age of 77 on June 1, 1868.

Few Presidents have held so many important posts and none was of higher integrity or had a greater devotion for his country.

George Ticknor Curtis, the principal Buchanan biographer, in the preface to his two-volume work on the fifteenth President, comments as follows:

> Mr. Buchanan's administration of the Government during the 4 years which preceded the commencement of our Civil War is a topic upon which friends and foes have widely differed.
>
> But no unprejudiced person who now examines the facts can doubt that, in many minds, injustice has been done to him. Perhaps this was inevitable, considering that a sectional civil war, of vast magnitude and attended with great bitterness, followed immediately after his retirement from office, when a political party which had been in opposition to his administration came for the first time into the full control of the Federal Government.
>
> I have found it an interesting task to trace the history of a man whose public and private character were always pure, whose patriotism was coextensive with his whole country, whose aims were high, and who was habitually conscientious in the discharge of every obligation.
>
> My estimate of his abilities and power as a statesman has risen with every investigation that I have made; and it is, in my judgment, not too much to say of him as a President of the United States, that he is entitled to stand very high on the catalog—not a large one—of those who have had the moral courage to encounter misrepresentation and obloquy, rather than swerve from the line of duty which their convictions marked out for them.

I am hopeful that this proposed recognition of James Buchanan will be given favorable consideration.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF THE ACTIVITIES OF MICHAEL J. LEE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that the man who heads the Far Eastern Branch of the

Department of Commerce is a Manchurian-born Russian named Michael J. Lee who was taken into the Department by Henry Wallace when he was Secretary of Commerce.

I am informed that Lee was turned down for United States citizenship three times—in 1935, 1937, and 1939—and that the grounds were, "Not good character, not attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, incompetent witnesses."

My information is that in those years Lee's real name was Ephraim Zinovi Liberman, and that he finally won citizenship, on his fourth try, after changing his name to Michael Lee and marrying an American-born woman.

Lee is said to be the man whom the Chinese blame more than any other individual for deliberately delaying vital shipments of aviation gasoline and other supplies to Nationalist China until the Red hordes took over. It is interesting to note that he recently headed a special governmental mission to Japan and served as adviser on China and the Far East to the United States delegation at the United Nations.

Several departments of government have had Lee's loyalty and citizenship under investigation, besides which charges of maladministration were recently brought against Lee by other colleagues in the Commerce Department. Yet Lee is protected and kept on in one of the most strategic jobs in the whole Commerce Department, where he is in a position to block shipments to Nationalist China and facilitate shipments to Red-dominated areas of the Far East.

ALGER HISS

Mr. President, this matter comes on the heels of the conviction of Alger Hiss, who was, in reality, a traitor to this country, although the charges had to be changed because of the original traitor charge having become outlawed.

Mr. Hiss was an adviser to a President who, everyone knew, was failing rapidly at the time, and who probably paid not too much attention to the proceedings at Yalta. In those proceedings we gave Manchuria, the bread basket of China, to Russia, wihout any consent whatever from the Chinese Government, and forced China later to agree. The bread basket of China was turned over to Russia, which gave Russia a foothold in China and in all of Asia.

At the same time they turned over to the Russian Government the city of Berlin, without permitting us any means of access at all, which since has resulted in what we call the airlift, hauling coal into Berlin by airplane, at a cost of nearly $500 a ton, wrecking the equipment and killing our boys, an activity sold to this country as a great achievement, which would not have been necessary if we had had any adequate representation at Yalta.

SHIPMENTS DELAYED

Mr. President, at the very time these shipments to Nationalist China have been delayed and blocked, shipments authorized by the Congress of the United States, duly authorized and made available, but delayed through such maneuvers as I have indicated, we have been making up the trade balance deficits of the 16 nations of Europe, through the ECA and the Marshall plan. They are in our budget, just as is the Department of the Interior, and we are giving them the necessary industrial machinery and money to buy raw materials, in fact, some of the raw materials themselves, yet following World War II, those 16 nations made 95 trade treaties with Russia and with the iron curtain countries, furnishing them the processed and manufactured materials necessary to consolidate their gains in eastern Europe and Communist China.

The Members of the Senate can find a complete list of these treaties by referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24 last, together with the details and list of materials of several of them.

SIXTEEN ECA NATIONS ARMING RUSSIA FOR WORLD WAR III

Mr. President, the 16 ECA countries are helping the Russian Communists to consolidate their gains in eastern Europe and in China. Of course, it is history now that two of those nations have recognized Red China. Shipments going through Hong Kong now have more than doubled over those of last year, I am informed. They are being shipped everything they need to consolidate their gains in China, and also to consolidate their gains in eastern Europe and to fight world war III.

On January 24 I introduced a joint resolution which would stop shipments and assistance to all nations which are helping Russia and eastern European countries and Communist China. I called upon the State Department to make the decision. In the event the State Department says that the cold war is still on, and that the spread of communism is still a threat to our own peace and safety, let us stop helping our enemies. But in addition to helping our enemies through shipping materials to Europe, apparently we have men in the Commerce Department who are blocking legitimate help to Nationalist China, not at this time only, but they apparently did it before the Communists actually took over.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada considers that this is one more link in the chain of all the maneuvers which tie up our national economy with Europe.

CONGRESS ABROGATED AUTHORITY TO REGULATE THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

I wish to mention at this time the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, under which the Congress of the United States abdicated its constitutional authority over the national economy in favor of the State Department. I consider that action an economic "Yalta," and it will so be considered generally in a very short time. The Congress of the United States is charged, by the Constitution, with the regulation of the national economy, but through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act abrogated that authority and transferred it to the State Department.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act has been extended, and is now in full force and effect. That act gives over to an industrially inexperienced State Department full authority over the domestic economy of this country, and puts into their hands the fate of every workingman's job and every investment in this Nation. They can say, after perfunctory hearings, what industries in the United States shall survive and what will be sacrificed. That is just a part of the whole picture.

NEW YORK DAILY NEWS—RUTH MONTGOMERY

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article by Ruth Montgomery, published in the New York Daily News on December 6, 1949, which outlines some of the details in this regard.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL CIRCUS

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON, D C., December 5.—Who is the man who controls the shipments of millions of dollars worth of food and vital war supplies to Nationalist China—at a time when we are losing the cold war in the Far East to Communist Russia?

He is Russian-born Michael J Lee, who three times was turned down for United States citizenship on these grounds:

"Not good character, not attached to principles of the Constitution of the United States, incompetent witnesses."

Incredible? That quotation is from the official Federal court records in Chicago, where Lee lost three successive petitions for citizenship on August 12, 1935, October 29, 1937, and August 4, 1939.

At that time his name was Ephraim Zinovi Liberman.

This man—who is now Chief of the Far Eastern Branch of the Department of Commerce—finally won United States citizenship on June 6, 1941, after marrying an American-born woman from Shanghai and changing his name to Michael Lee.

Lee last month headed a special governmental mission to Japan, which dealt with foreign trade and economic matters. Recently he served as adviser to the United States delegation at the United Nations on reconstruction and rehabilitation for devastated areas in China and the Far East.

CHINESE BLAME LEE FOR SHIPPING DELAY

It is Lee, more than any other Government official, whom GOP Congressmen and the Chinese blame for delays in vital shipments of aviation gasoline and other supplies to war-swept China until too late for the Nationalist Government to use them effectively against the Reds.

Representative WALTER JUDD, Republican, Minnesota, who repeatedly has urged the Department of Commerce to investigate Lee, charged "unconscionable delay" in aiding China "The China aid bill was passed by Congress April 3, 1947," JUDD, former medical missionary to China, declared. "It took until July to get the paper work set up, although when the British needed help after Dunkerque, President Roosevelt had ships loaded and moving in 8 days. No real material reached China until December—8 months after Congress authorized the aid."

JUDD called it "suspicious and unjustifiable to have a foreigner of Russian lineage and pro-Russian leanings heading exports to that strategic area."

"We are supposed to be in mortal combat with Russia in that area," he continued, "yet a Russian controls our shipping there. On the basis of Lee's slowness in executing the China-aid program—if for no other—it would be bad judgment to keep him in that post.

Who is his friend at court? An ordinary American works up to 20 years to head a division of government. This foreigner walked in at the top. We are taking unnecessary chances."

LEE'S CAREER IN UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Lee, who earns in excess of $10,000 a year, was brought into the Commerce Department by the then Secretary Henry Wallace in January 1946. Previously his application for commissions had been turned down by both the Army and the Navy. In 1942 he joined the Board of Economic Warfare, which was later recognized and called the Foreign Economic Administration. Lee was its deputy director of far eastern and other territories in charge of economic programs

When FEA folded up after the war, Lee was unemployed for a time until Wallace rescued him and took him to Commerce.

Despite numerous protests from Senators and Representatives, Lee has been kept on in this strategic spot. It is known that a loyalty hearing on Lee was held early this year. Another department of Government has been investigating his activities for a year and a half. But time—for China—has almost run out.

Here is the background of the man who heads the Department which controls all allocations and export licenses for China and the Far East:

Lee was born of Russian parents in Harbin, Manchuria, in 1907 The birth date given on his citizenship application was June 24, 1907. His official biography records it as July 27. While very young he became the protege of a Manchurian Chinese official named Mo Teh-hui, who was Harbin's chief of police.

VISITED RUSSIA AS SECRETARY TO DELEGATE

In 1929 Mo became president of the Chinese Eastern Railway and in 1930 was sent with the rank of ambassador to Moscow as Chinese delegate to the Sino-Russian conference. Lee, then named Liberman, went along as Mo's secretary and interpreter. Friends who knew him during this period insist that they noticed a marked change in Lee's politics after his stay in Russia, the fatherland of his parents.

Lee came to the United States in 1932, landing in Seattle, Wash., June 14. He obtained a law degree from the John Marshall Law School in 1935 and then began his four attempts to gain United States citizenship.

Invited to address the National Foreign Trade Council in New York last year, Lee furnished that business organization with a biography which gave his birthplace as the United States But when this reporter was supplied with an official biography from his office last week, it read: "Born and reared in the Far East * * * Upon his return to the United States was graduated from the John Marshall Law School." Actually, this was Lee's first arrival in this country.

SENATE RESOLUTION 230

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to submit and to have referred to the appropriate committee, a resolution for an investigation by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the particular act I have recounted on the part of the person I have just described.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 230) was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, in pursuance of section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation and administration of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not that Bureau is being operated in accordance with the law, the public interest, and the intent of the Congress.

Such study and investigation shall include, but shall not be limited to, an examination into the qualifications, honesty, competency, efficiency, and loyalty of people employed by the Department of Commerce, and particularly the qualifications, honesty, competency, efficiency and loyalty of Michael J. Lee, formerly known as Ephraim Zinovi Liberman, Chief of the Far Eastern Division of the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce.

SEC 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, (1) to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable, (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government

SEC 4 Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the allegations are true, or any part of them, this man should be removed from the Commerce Department forthwith.

If they are untrue, he should be cleared.

The Department of Commerce has, from its inception, been known as a thoroughly dependable branch of the Government. Let us keep it that way.

CREATION OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 58) to amend the Senate rules by creating a standing Committee on Small Business.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be very glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Lodge
Anderson	Gillette	Lucas
Benton	Green	McCarran
Bricker	Gurney	McCarthy
Chapman	Hayden	McClellan
Chavez	Hendrickson	McFarland
Connally	Hill	McKellar
Cordon	Hoey	McMahon
Darby	Holland	Magnuson
Donnell	Hunt	Malone
Douglas	Ives	Martin
Downey	Johnson, Colo.	Maybank
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Ecton	Kefauver	Murray
Ellender	Kerr	Myers
Ferguson	Kilgore	O'Conor
Frear	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Lehman	Robertson
Russell	Stennis	Tydings
Saltonstall	Taft	Wherry
Schoeppel	Taylor	Wiley
Smith, N. J.	Thomas, Okla.	Williams
Sparkman	Thomas, Utah	Withers

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Nebraska begins to speak on the pending measure, I should like to advise the Senate that those who are interested in the resolution pertaining to the creation of a standing committee on small business have been discussing the possibility of obtaining a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the resolution on Monday.

Therefore, I now propose the following agreement: I ask unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Monday, February 20, 1950, at the hour of 3 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment which may be pending or which may be proposed to Senate Resolution 58, amending the Senate rules by creating a standing committee on small business, and upon the final adoption of the resolution, provided, that no amendment which is not germane to the subject matter shall be received; provided further, that the time between 11 o'clock a. m. and 3 o'clock p. m. on said day shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the resolution, and controlled respectively by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and let me say that I have the floor, I understand—I should like to suggest to the majority leader that I had agreed to have the Senate vote on the resolution at 3 o'clock on Monday, following the convening of the Senate at 12 o'clock noon on that day. I submit to the distinguished majority leader that it is very difficult to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock, for committee hearings are going on, and Senators who are in attendance at committee meetings or who are otherwise engaged plan to be in the Senate Chamber at noon.

I am not averse to having 4 hours devoted to debate on the resolution on Monday, if that is the wish of the Senate; in fact, I would welcome it.

But I submit to the distinguished majority leader that if a 4-hour debate is what is desired, I believe it would work for the benefit of all concerned if the vote were taken at 4 o'clock on Monday, following the convening of the Senate at 12 noon. I know the majority leader realizes the difficulty of obtaining the attendance of a quorum of the Senate at 11 o'clock in the morning, for the committees are working in the mornings. As a result, very little time is saved by having the Senate convene at 11 a. m.

I submit that it is agreeable to me to have the voting begin at 3 o'clock on

Monday, if 3 hours are to be devoted to debate prior to the voting; but if 4 hours are to be devoted to the debate, I believe the hour of 4 o'clock would be preferable, for all concerned, as the hour to commence the voting.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the coauthor of the resolution we are now debating. He suggested that he thought 11 o'clock would be better. However, I told him that if the Senate convened at 12 o'clock on that day and the voting began at 3 o'clock, I would be willing to provide for him 30 minutes' time from the time allotted to me under the proposed agreement. I assumed the Senator from Nebraska would provide 30 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, at this time, I make no objection to that, but we are really considering entering into a unanimous-consent agreement with only 2 hours on a side, if 4 hours are allowed for debate, and an hour and a half on a side, if 3 hours are allowed. I do not wish to press the matter. I should be glad to have a vote at 3 o'clock, and, if the distinguished majority leader insists, I should be glad to have the Senate reconvene at 11 a. m. I want to cooperate. However, I submit to the majority leader that it does not save time to convene at 11 instead of 12. If the majority leader could see his way clear to allow debate from 12 o'clock to 4 o'clock, it would expedite matters, and, so far as Monday night session is concerned, after the vote has been taken on the amendments, I believe the Senate would be glad to remain in session until considerable progress had been made with the so-called cotton amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act. If the majority leader feels that my suggestion is not in line, I shall not object to having the Senate meet at 11 o'clock. I submit, however, I think 12 o'clock would be the better hour. From 12 till 4 would give ample time for all Senators to be present without the necessity of a long quorum call.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is immaterial to me. The only point I stress is that Senators who are vitally interested in House Joint Resolution 398, affecting cotton, have been pressing the majority leader for action. The joint resolution was delayed for 2 or 3 days in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the majority leader is a member. Time is of the essence, so far as the passage of the joint resolution is concerned. I have no objection to changing the time, and allowing the debate to run from 12 o'clock until 4 o'clock, if the Senator from Nebraska prefers. I think probably there is much merit in his contention that we really do not get very much done when the Senate meets at 11 o'clock.

However, I should now like to make a further statement. When we begin the consideration of House Joint Resolution 398, on Monday, we may have to hold a night session. Because of the previous unanimous-consent agreement entered into to make disposition of Senate bill 75, which involves the controversy between Arizona and California over water rights, we shall probably not be able to transact other business. So, there may be a night session, in order to dispose of the joint resolution relating to cotton. I think it is a little unusual perhaps to have a night session so early in the year, but there is an emergency in connection with cotton.

Mr. President, I modify my unanimous-consent request so as to make it read "between 12 o'clock and 4 o'clock," instead of "between 11 o'clock and 3 o'clock."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request, as modified? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader for his consideration in fixing the voting hour at 4 o'clock, and the hour of convening at 12.

I send to the desk a revised amendment to Senate Resolution 58, which is the pending business. I offer it at this time as a substitute to Senate Resolution 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the word "Resolved", and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business and to consist of 13 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this section and at the commencement of each Congress.

It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small-business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislation jurisdiction.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the revised amendment be printed, so that Senators may have it on their desks Monday morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the desk, and be printed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is very difficult to work out certain of the requests which have been made. If it is agreeable to the distinguished majority leader, and if he feels that the time has come for a recess, I shall be glad to surrender the floor and to proceed with the argument on the creation of a standing committee on small business on Monday at noon.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska in the form of a substitute for Senate Resolution 58.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska subject to perfecting amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is subject to perfecting amendments.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a perfecting amendment to the amendment just submitted by the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On the first page, beginning with the word "rule" in line 1, it is proposed to strike out down through the word "standing" in line 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(a) a special."

On the first page, line 7, strike out "section" and insert in lieu thereof "resolution."

On the first page, line 9, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 2, strike out lines 6 to 11, inclusive.

On page 2, after line 11, insert the following:

(c) For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eighty-first Congress and Eighty-second Congress, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants to request such information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $——— in any calendar year, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may state to the Senator from Montana that, in the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is not drawn as an amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska, but it is really drawn as an amendment to the original resolution. The Chair would suggest that the Senator from Montana consult the substitute which has been offered by the Senator from Nebraska, and make his amendment fit in with it, or that it be offered as a substitute for the substitute.

Mr. MURRAY. I offer it as a substitute for the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has a perfect right to offer a substitute to Senate Resolution 58, but am I not correct that any amendment he offers must be in the nature of a perfecting amendment to the amendment I have offered to Senate Resolution 58?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, after consultation with the Parliamentarian, announces that the Senator from Montana may offer a substitute for the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Since the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska is treated as the original text, and the Senator from Montana modifies——

Mr. MURRAY. I modify that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana does that by offering a substitute.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is, as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MURRAY. Exactly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana in the nature of a substitute is now the pending question before the Senate, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is correct; it is the pending question.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the substitute which I have sent to the desk, and which has now been read, changes the language of the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska to make the committee a special committee instead of a standing committee. In this way, it obviates the need of amending the standing rules of the Senate. The committee would have the same effect as a standing committee, which the Senator recommends, without making it necessary to change the rules. The special committee is authorized under the existing rules. Therefore, I submit that the substitute I have offered is the better procedure by which to handle the matter. A special committee has been in existence in the Senate for a great many years. It was set up originally in 1940, which was, of course, at the end of the depression, and the committee carried on extensive studies and research at that time, submitting a great many proposed amendments to laws. It was of great assistance to small business, especially during the period of rearmament, when it was found that small-business concerns were unable to continue in business because of the lack of materials with which to carry on civilian production. They could not get into war production, because they were not equipped for the purpose. As a result of our studies, we set up a Small War Plants Corporation, which aided small manufacturers in extending their plants and making it possible for them to obtain necessary funds with which to engage in war production. As a result, production was greatly accelerated and the war effort effectively aided by making it possible for this country to produce the armaments necessary to the successful conduct of the war.

I do not want to take up too much time at this moment, because we shall be discussing this subject again later, but I should like to point out that as a result of that committee, we created in the minds of the various agencies of the Government a knowledge of the need for measures to protect small-business enterprises. At that time thousands of small-business concerns were going into bankruptcy, and we caused the procurement agencies to establish small-business units and to make every effort to mobilize small business in the war-production program. Subsequently, we suggested many other amendments to the laws of the country which made it possible, for instance, for small-mine owners to engage in the production of scarce metals and minerals which were so necessary to a successful prosecution of the war. We amended existing laws so as to enable small-mine owners in the West to produce manganese and many other scarce metals which were so essential to the program. We also aided other concerns, which were affected by the stoppage of the production of automobiles incident to the prosecution of the war. As a result of the stoppage of automobile production 64,000 automobile dealers all over the United States were facing bankruptcy and ruin because they were unable to sell automobiles. As a result of the amendments we proposed at that time, those dealers were protected and enabled to remain in business during the progress of the war.

I could cite many instances of results accomplished by that special committee which, I think, would convince Senators that it is very important that a committee of a similar character be reestablished at this period because of the dangerous conditions which confront the Nation as a result of the growth of monopoly and the concentration of ownership.

Only a short time ago the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Standard Oil Co. against United States, which was decided on June 13, 1949, handed down an opinion which was written by Mr. Justice Douglas, and which has this to say:

> The increased concentration of industrial power in the hands of a few has changed habits of thought. A new age has been introduced. It is more and more an age of monopoly competition. Monopoly competition is a regime of friendly alliances, of quick and easy accommodation of prices even without the benefit of trade associations, of what Brandeis said was euphemistically called cooperation. While this is not true in all fields, it has become alarmingly apparent in many.
>
> The lessons Brandeis taught on the curse of bigness have largely been forgotten in high places. Size is allowed to become a menace to existing and putative competitors. Price control is allowed to escape the influences of the competitive market and to gravitate into the hands of the few. But beyond all that there is the effect on the community when independents are swallowed up by the trusts and entrepreneurs become employees of absentee owners. Then there is a serious loss in citizenship. Local leadership is diluted.

The decision goes on to recite the troubles and dangers which confront business enterprise in this country.

I submit that it would be wise for the Senate to reestablish the committee to which I have referred.

Mr. President, for the moment I withdraw the substitute which I have offered, and shall submit it at a later time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has not had time to read the revised amendment which I offered, and his remarks have been directed to the original resolution. The revised amendment which the junior Senator from Nebraska offers to Senate Resolution 58 does not amend the Standing Rules of the Senate. It establishes, however, a continuing special committee, which, once approved, does not have to come back at each session of the Congress for its continuance. Outside of that, I do not think there is any important difference as between myself and the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Do I correctly understand that the Senate will vote on the resolution on Monday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 4 o'clock.

Mr. MAYBANK. I heard the statement of the Senator from Montana to the effect that he was going to withdraw his amendment, or substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was a substitute for a substitute previously offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to withdraw it for the purpose of perfecting it during the intervening time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to withdraw his substitute. The pending question is the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Montana to say that he was going to perfect his amendment. That would have to be done today, would it not, so that it may lie on the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to amendment up to the time the vote is taken.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, the amendment need not be perfected until, say, 3:50 o'clock on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What the Chair meant to state was that the resolution would be open to amendment up to that time, but any perfecting amendment could be offered up to that time. No Senator is precluded from offering an amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from South Carolina, however, that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the

Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] have control of the time on Monday from 12 o'clock until 4 o'clock.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. If I should offer an amendment, I would have the right to perfect it, would I not, provided the Senators in charge of the time would give me the right to do so?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator would have a right to offer his amendment, regardless of the control of the time, but so far as debate is concerned that would be within the control of the two Senators to whom the Chair has referred.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader this question: If I should decide to offer an amendment, would it be possible to give me at least 5 minutes' time?

Mr. LUCAS. I will give the Senator 10 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator desires any more time, I will give him 5 minutes also.

Mr. LUCAS. I am always very generous with the other fellow's time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there seems to be a general consensus on the part of the Senators who have spoken on this subject that small business needs a special handmaiden in the form of a committee of the Senate of the United States, but the question seems to be, what kind of committee can best perform the needed service?

The Senate is aware of the fact that last year I was joined by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] in offering Senate Resolution 58, which was made the order of business and which now, as I understand, it is proposed to amend by the substitute which has been offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska. I think it appropriate at this time to call attention to several matters in that regard which have changed the situation quite materially from what it was at the time Senate Resolution 58 was offered by the Senator from Nebraska and myself.

In the first place, the Senate has acted on the question of what committee has the dominant interest in the field of legislative service to small business. The Senate will recall that when the reference of Senate Resolution 29 came up in February of last year, the President of the Senate referred the bill to the Banking and Currency Committee, that his reference was appealed from, and that the Senate was asked to express its view on that appeal, as to where properly the resolution should have gone, it being contended on the part of some Senators that it should have gone to the Committee on Rules and Administration, on the part of others that it should have gone elsewhere.

However, the President of the Senate ruled that the proper reference for that resolution was to the Banking and Currency Committee. The reason for his ruling was that under the appropriate section of the reorganization law he was directed in such cases to look to see what standing committee controlled the predominant part of the legislation arising in the field covered by the bill. The Senate by an overwhelming vote approved the reference made by the President of the Senate, thus indicating by an overwhelming vote, that it was the sense of the Senate that the Banking and Currency Committee does have, under the reorganization law, the dominant interest in this particular field of small business, and any legislation offered affecting the field of small business.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to also recall that later in the session of 1949 there was offered a resolution, Senate Resolution 101, by which it was proposed to set up a fund of $60,000 out of the contingent fund of the Senate for the Banking and Currency Committee, through itself or by a subcommittee, to make a study of various fields, one of which was the field of small business. The Senate will remember that at that time it was agreed that the small-business field was the largest field which was to be submitted to the Banking and Currency Committee for its investigation under the terms of Senate Resolution 101, and that the budget submitted in connection with Senate Resolution 101 showed that it was intended to spend $30,000 out of the $60,000 in an investigation affecting small business.

The Senate is aware of the fact, of course, that a very important subcommittee was set up by the Banking and Currency Committee, consisting of 10 members of a total membership of 13 of the Banking and Currency Committee, and that in deference to the size of the business which would be handled and its importance, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], became the chairman of that particular subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Thereafter extensive studies were begun by that committee, and the Senate will recall that in this year, 1950, when it was apparent that the funds heretofore assigned to the small-business field were not sufficient, and when the time given to this study under Senate Resolution 101 was about to expire, another resolution was introduced to extend the time, Senate Resolution 218, which was adopted by the Senate at this session.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that by adopting Senate Resolution 218 the time of service, as well as the field of service for this particular subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate was extended until February 1951. What is of further importance is that at that time, by the passage of Senate Resolution 218, to which was again attached a proposed budget, the Senate devoted more of the $60,000 which had been made available to this particular effort, more of it to the field of small business than had heretofore been made available for small-business investigations. I think the Senate will find that a total of $45,799.50 under this second budget, which was filed in connection with Senate Resolution 218, out of the total of $60,000, was made available solely for this study of small business and its various problems.

Mr. President, that means that regardless of what is done on the resolution which has been offered by my friend the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], in the nature of a substitute for the pending resolution, regardless of what is done on the resolution which has been discussed on the floor by my friend the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], in the event he offers his resolution, as he said he intends to do, as a substitute for the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska, the Senate has already voted to set up a study committee for small business and is committed to that course and has appropriated out of its contingent fund for that purpose to run the activity until February, 1951. So, I submit, Mr. President, that thoughtfully and kindly though they may be suggested—and suggested, I know, out of a real interest in the problems of small business—neither of the measures, neither the one submitted by the Senator from Nebraska nor the one proposed to be submitted by the Senator from Montana, will at all clear up this situation, but, instead, either of them would leave it more muddled than it is now, by having two separate committees given the same authority, with the necessity of double staffs and the necessity of making additional funds available for the functioning of whatever new committee would be set up.

That is a rather intolerable situation to leave here, and I think it would mean that we would leave small business and the many people engaged in small business, whom all of us wish to serve better, in a worse situation than now, so far as knowing where they should go or which committee will handle their problems is concerned.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to remind the distinguished Senator from Florida that in my judgment it is not so much a question of investigation as it is of legislation. A few moments ago the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] spoke of legislation which had been passed during the war years. Most of that legislation came from the Committee on Banking and Currency, because that committee had jurisdiction over the various control agencies and the various war plants.

I feel, as the Senator from Florida feels, that the Congress should do something positive to help the small businessmen by enacting legislation for his welfare, and not merely having it appear in the newspapers that we are going to investigate something.

The Committee on Banking and Currency has before it many bills which have for their object assistance to small business. We are working, for instance, on a Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and bills to extend amortization periods.

We hope the committee will report bills whereby Congress can legislate and something tangible can be accomplished

in the way of amortization of the obligations of small business, for instance, rather than merely to investigate. We have conducted investigations and we have now reached the stage of reporting constructive legislation to assist independent small business enterprises.

Unless after investigation we can legislate, we only muddle the minds of the small-business men, as the Senator has suggested. What I want the Congress to do is to pass a sensible, effective law. It is all right to investigate, but when the investigation is over, we should legislate, according to the results of the investigation or hearings, in the interest of the small-business men. In my opinion, that has not always been done. Our subcommittee and committee have now reached the stage of legislating.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I respond to the Senator by thanking him for his observations, and by saying that I, too, have felt that there was a hopeless gap in the program for small business through the functionings of the special committee which had no legislative authority whatsoever, and which existed through the war period and until the early part of last year. It was because of that that I drafted and then submitted, in conjunction with the Senator from Nebraska, Senate Resolution 58, which proposes to set up a standing committee with full legislative powers to deal with problems of small business.

However, I may say to the Senator from South Carolina that while I still think that eventually that is what we will have to come to, and while I still feel that small business is entitled to have a standing committee of its own with full legislative powers, I try to be practical about these matters, and in our discussion of this subject in the Democratic caucus some days ago I discovered that most if not all of the chairmen of the standing committees felt that the adoption at this time, of Senate Resolution 58 as now proposed, would mean a decided reduction of the jurisdiction of some of their committees, and they were not sufficiently advised as yet as to how seriously their committees might be affected, to give their consent.

It became quite apparent that we had very heavy opposition to the adoption of Senate Resolution 58, and that it had no chance of passage. So, Mr. President, in the hope of getting the next best thing, I then looked at the situation to see what could be done with reference to expanding the functions of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which undoubtedly does have greatest legislative jurisdiction in this field, so as to meet the problem as nearly as possible.

I may say that I have lying on the table, and I shall hope to offer as a substitute in the appropriate parliamentary way that may be available at the time, another method of handling this problem, which I wish to discuss briefly at this time in the belief that it dovetails better with what has been done already by the Eighty-first Congress through the passage of the two measures which I have mentioned, and through the making available of the funds which have already been made available, and through the institution of the many studies which are already under way through the functioning of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. So, Mr. President, I hope Senators will take the trouble to read the proposed substitute, and I wish to explain its nature briefly, if I may, at this time.

Recognizing the facts as I see them here, and that the Senate has committed itself to the course of action which I have already outlined, until February of next year, my substitute proposal would be to add to the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency nothing whatsoever, because I realize that will bring about a fight as to how the jurisdiction of present committees is affected, but instead, to make sure that that subcommittee has complete or plenary investigative authority, and to make that investigative authority so complete that there may be no doubt that it has the right to handle complaints from all types of small business, to render assistance, but not in the field of legislation, to all types of small business, retaining its own legislative authority which already has been ruled by the Senate to be a dominant portion of the legislation affecting small business.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. May I finish my statement? It will take me but a moment to complete my outline of the proposed amendment.

Mr. President, in order to have the functionings of this committee tied in better with other standing committees of the Senate which do have some jurisdiction over affairs of small business, it is my suggestion in the proposed amendment that five additional members shall be assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency and to its subcommittee, with full right of vote, but with their participation limited entirely to the consideration of small-business questions.

I may say that we have a precedent for exactly that kind of handling of our Senate legislative business in the fact that the reorganization law and the present rule of the Senate, permit and require that certain additional ex officio members of the Appropriations Committee shall be assigned to it from the Committees on Public Works and Armed Services and from other committees, to vote and to have complete participation as ex officio members of the Appropriations Committee in the handling of appropriations covering the matters that come from those planning committees, such as the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Armed Services; and there are one or two others in the same classification.

I will close my explanation of the proposal with the additional statement that in order to have this tie-in as effective as possible, my proposed amendment suggests that one of these additional five members shall come from the Committee on Finance, because everyone knows that many problems affecting small business have to do with taxation. Another of the five shall come from the Committee on the Judiciary, which has jurisdiction affecting small business, over the field of antitrust legislation and monopoly. A third of the additional five members would come, under my suggestion, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has broad and sweeping authority over commerce in general. My proposed amendment leaves the other two of the additional five members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who would sit ex officio and take part only in the consideration of small-business matters, to be chosen by the President of the Senate, of course, with the assistance of the policy committees and the leaders of the majority and the minority parties.

It is the suggestion of the amendment that three of the additional five members shall come from the majority party, and that two shall come from the minority party. The sole purpose in offering the substitute is to make of the present functioning subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency a more powerful and more effective and a more satisfactory agency in serving the cause of small business.

I may say that with all the good work which has been done so conscientiously by the present subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is handling the affairs of small business, it still seems to be definitely true that small business is not satisfied with that particular type of handling matters affecting it, and it seems to me that the making of this committee a vastly more important one in the manner suggested by the amendment will surely satisfy the legitimate demands and expectations of small business, that they have an important committee which shall have large legislative powers, and that it would continue to have legislative powers in the fields already covered by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and would have direct tie-ins through interlocking membership with other committees which handle the majority of legislative business affecting the small-business men of the Nation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I first want to thank the Senator from Florida for his statement. I understand what his thoughts on the subject are, and I can readily understand the view of many small-business firms that under the Reorganization Act there is not sufficient organization fully to protect the small-business men.

As Senators know, many difficult questions have been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and that committee has done its best to handle them. As chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency I have always taken the position that I did not want to interfere with the functioning of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to such matters as the antitrust laws, or with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with respect to matters involving trade, and so forth. For instance, the committee held long hearings on the 3-day coal week, but did not attempt to recommend legislation. We would send such matters to the Committee on the Judiciary. Two bills have

been introduced by members of the Committee on Banking and Currency dealing with taxation of small-business firms. Of course, those bills were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, as I see it, the cause of the great difficulty and trouble the small-business man faces has been the lack of a coordinating committee to initiate legislation in his interest. Committees can hold all the hearings they want to, but unless some legislation in the interest of the small-business man can be initiated as a result of such hearings, they will not be of as much value as they should be.

The majority leader has introduced a bill providing longer periods of amortization in connection with RFC loans. Unless legislation comes as a result of hearings on such a bill, the hearings are of little avail.

I hope the present Congress will enact reorganization legislation under which real help will be afforded the small-business men. They should be able to obtain such hearings as they desire, have such investigations made as they feel are necessary, and then have legislation prepared and pushed after such hearings are held and such investigations completed. The small-business man will not be greatly benefited by a committee simply preparing a report and leaving it on Senators' desks. I hope the suggestion made by the Senator from Florida that members of other committees may sit ex officio with the Committee on Banking and Currency may be adopted. Such ex officio members can be of great help to us in preparing legislation and in pushing legislation which will be of benefit to the small-business men.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

I will say, Mr. President, one additional feature of my proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I may not have mentioned, is this, that it very carefully preserves unimpaired all present legislative and other jurisdiction of all the standing committees in order to attempt to avoid any controversy here on the floor on that point. It carefully preserves their investigatorial powers, as they are given such powers under the terms of the Reorganization Act.

And, Mr. President, without decrying at all anyone else's suggestions, I believe my suggestion from the practical standpoint of finding something on which the Senate can get together will very greatly increase the prestige and the functional capacity of the committee already serving in this field—I believe that that result will be accomplished by the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I believe the Senator is laboring under a misapprehension when he assumes that the special committee, because of its lack of legislative authority, was incompetent to handle the problems of small business. That is entirely erroneous.

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope that nothing I said caused the Senator to draw that inference. I merely said I thought a committee which could investigate and initiate legislation simultaneously would be far better than one which could only investigate, and then would be obliged to send the subject matter to another committee.

Mr. MURRAY. The former Small Business Committee had no difficulty whatever in handling legislative matters and handling them more promptly than if they had been originated in the committee where such matters were usually handled, because as the result of our studies, as the result of our hearings, and from the vast experience we had, it was possible for us very quickly to convince the appropriate committee that the legislation we were asking for was very important. For instance, when automobile production was stopped, the automobile dealers of the country were in convention in Chicago. They were facing bankruptcy throughout the United States. They sent a delegation to Washington to see us, and after a consultation with them lasting for a very few days, we formulated a bill, and it was passed by Congress without any delay. It was passed by practically a unanimous vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Montana, to permit him to ask a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am still awaiting the question.

Mr. MURRAY. I merely wished to ask the Senator if he feels that a special committee would be defective or lacking in any respect because it did not have legislative authority. My understanding of the situation is that when the special committee on small business was in existence, it was very effective and came to be recognized by the small business of the Nation as the best forum for them to have in the Congress of the United States. Such a special committee is now working very well in the House of Representatives; the House has such a special committee, and it is still functioning.

It seems to me that when it has been demonstrated that the problem can be handled successfully before a special committee, there is no reason, so far as I can observe, to change the rules of the Senate regarding the appointment of committees and to make a monstrosity out of one committee by setting it up with unusual powers and authority, different from those of all other standing committees.

If we are to have a committee to handle the problems of small business, such a committee should handle those problems in the way in which they have been handled in the past and in the way in which the businessmen of the country expected them to be handled. They were satisfied with the way they were handled.

Let me say that we could present thousands of telegrams today, if we wished to do so, from businessmen with whom we have been in correspondence or communication. A few days ago a delegation from the automobile dealers came to me and recommended that everything possible be done to reconstitute the special committee which functioned in a manner so satisfactory to them in the past.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his remarks and his question, and I wish to answer his question.

My answer would be that a lack of legislative authority and jurisdiction very gravely handicaps a special committee; and my answer is based upon 2 years of service with the special legislative committee, at a time following the cessation of the war.

During the war period, Mr. President, when OPA was functioning and when there were all kinds of export controls, import controls, scarcities, licenses, quotas, and similar arrangements, there were undoubtedly a tremendous number of complaints from small business concerns which needed someone to handle effectively their complaints and to look after such matters, but this did not necessitate any legislative authority or legislative jurisdiction. I was not a Member of the Senate at that time, but I have no question at all in my mind that the able committee headed by the distinguished and able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] during the war period rendered a very high-grade service to the people of the Nation.

During that same period of time, Mr. President, I was serving as Governor of one of the States. We had in our State government at that time a special and very effective set-up to cooperate with small business in connection with the procuring of contracts and subcontracts on defense work. But at this time we have no such organization as that, and we have revamped our State organizations in order to take care of peacetime needs and peacetime requirements.

I am very strongly of the opinion that a lack of legislative jurisdiction and legislative power is a fatal handicap to the doing of any worth-while job in time of peace by a special committee devoted to the cause of small business.

Mr. President, if the Senate will bear with me for a moment, I wish to remind Senators of something which happened on the floor of the Senate last year during the consideration of the bill to extend controls on the exportation from this Nation of certain rare metals and other commodities. The bill was being handled by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and by the distinguished Senator who is now presiding over the Senate, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. At that time the argument was on the question of how long the measure then existing, which was one providing for voluntary controls in that field, should be extended—whether for 6 months or for 12 months.

It so happened that the Special Committee on Small Business had conducted exhaustive study and investigation of the problems of small business concerns handling steel, and we had published an exhaustive report, which was available both to the public and to the Members of Congress. But in the course of the debate on that measure, it developed—I cite this as an illustration of the complete ineffectiveness of hard work done

by a special committee of this kind, a special committee which is without legislative power—that no member of the Banking and Currency Committee had heard about that study or about the printing of that report. I find no fault whatever with the members of the Banking and Currency Committee on that account; they had been burdened with their own duties in connection with covering by their legislative committee the same ground which already had been covered so completely by the special committee in its investigation. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who now is presiding over the Senate, will recall that the report of the special committee covered matters which bore so closely upon the subject then pending that they were almost determinative of the issue which at that time had arisen, namely, whether a 6-month extension or a 12-month extension was advisable.

From that experience—quite specific and quite persuasive, because I had worked many hours in the course of the making of that investigation and the making of that report—it was borne home very heavily to the junior Senator from Florida that a Senator serving upon such a special committee which does not have any legislative power is to a large extent wasting his time, in time of peace, and is doing something which will not result in rendering any real service either to the groups affected or to the Senate of the United States in connection with the handling by a standing committee of legislation which pertains to the same subject matter which has been studied by such a special committee. I could mention other illustrations of that sort.

The fact remains that a committee which does not have legislative power is emasculated in its effectiveness, and its members feel that they are wasting their time. The fact also is that a legislative committee which takes up a matter coming from such a special committee has to plow the same ground over again and do the same work all over.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that in time of peace a standing committee with as much legislative power as can be provided is required in this field. I would have preferred a standing committee with plenary powers. That is why I joined in the submission of Senate Resolution 58. But as I view the matter now, unfortunately we cannot hope to have that measure acted upon favorably at this session. However, I believe we can obtain authority for the appointment of a stronger and more effective committee on small business; and by tying in its members, ex officio, with the members of other committees, we can do a good job for small business in this Nation.

I call particular attention to the fact that the amendments in the nature of substitutes proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] do not clear up the difficulty, but, in fact, complicate it further, in view of the action taken at this session of the Senate which commits us and ties our hands, and calls for the appropriation of funds for the doing of this job by a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee until February of next year.

In closing, let me say that if the suggested arrangement does not work out well, we can do the matter later in a more fulsome way. But the Senate has acted on this matter, and now we must do the best job we can do in connection with the action already taken and the functioning already going on.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to my friend the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Florida referred to the steel hearings held by the Banking and Currency Committee——

Mr. HOLLAND. No; I referred to the hearings held by the special Senate committee. I do not know whether the Senator was assigned to that special committee.

Mr MURRAY. I recall the hearings.

Mr. HOLLAND. But even if he was not assigned to that special committee, he certainly knew that those hearings were held.

Mr. MURRAY. I remember the hearings very well. But it is my understanding that that special committee did not propose any legislation. The committee had been reconstituted It was under the control of the Republican majority at that time. It failed to recommend any legislation, and its members did not appear before any standing committee or any regular committee to propose the enactment of a bill to remedy the condition.

Whenever the special committee had a problem of that kind, it prepared a bill and went before the appropriate committee, and had no trouble whatever in having the bill acted upon by the committee and reported to the Senate. We did not fail in a single instance to have such measures, originally coming from the Small Business Committee, reported to the Senate; and in almost every instance the standing committee in its action was unanimous.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit the record to be made clear?

Mr. HOLLAND. First, Mr. President, let me say that I should like to correct the Senator from Montana in one misunderstanding he has. The study which was made was one to determine how a bill passed by the Eightieth Congress, providing for the approval of voluntary controls, was affecting small business. It came out very clearly in the hearings of the Special Committee on Small Business, on which I was serving actively as a member, that small business was being very adversely affected, that numerous small fabricators of steel and others were being shut down and had to close their doors because the big steel companies were giving undue preference and undue recognition to the needs of fabricators and erectors who were their subsidiaries.

So when the bill was pending here, it appeared that certain testimony had been given by representatives of the Department of Commerce, who were not correctly informed regarding the matter, to the effect that the measure then pending, to continue the act then being administered, which was based on voluntary agreements, was acceptable to small business, that small business was agreeable to it and wanted it continued for 12 months, instead of for a bare 6 months, although, of course, a continuance for only 6 months would have made it possible for the Senate to have brought out some other measure on the subject at that session. The committee's report, its findings, and the committee's recommendation very strongly showed that small business was being most adversely affected. I think those who were here and participating in the debate will recall that that was the determining point upon which the action of the Senate was finally based in providing the 6 months extension rather than the 12 months extension.

I call the attention of my friend from Montana to the fact that we were not looking for legislation; we were looking for the correct facts as to how the administration of the law then existing was affecting small business, and we got those facts in such a way that the Senate, at the appropriate time, was able to work it out; but the Senate would not have done so if it had not been for one member of the special committee, who happened to be on the floor at the time the vote was about to be taken and who brought in the findings shown by the report, which otherwise would have been overlooked.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely want to keep the record straight. As I recall, it was last year, in January or February, when controls expired. I think the Eightieth Congress had passed the law, which, as the Senator now shows me, was to expire January 31. At that time a Small Business Subcommittee had not been set up, with appropriations. We did not get any appropriations until February 15. When the steel situation was called to my attention through the testimony of certain small steel producers who came down from New York, I sent for the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer. He was, so to speak, rather upset about it. He was made to understand that it had been done in this way. A check was made into the distribution of steel at that time. We sent for officials of the Commerce Department, who came before the committee to assure us they were going to give more attention to small-business firms.

I do not want the Senator from Montana to be mistaken. Neither do I want the Senator from Florida to be mistaken. That was before we had an appropriation for the Small Business Committee last year, and that was through no fault of his. I have never made any charges about it, but this is what happened: We went into the steel situation fully. I remember the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who perhaps knows a good deal about steel through his experiences in the Ohio area, brought up the matter. Congress abolished controls entirely. They were controls which the Secretary of Commerce, through his own

agents, exercised. His own agents did not know of certain of the controls, not only affecting the steel industry, but also cottonseed and soybean oil, as the Senator will remember.

We then acted on a voluntary suggestion. We contacted the small-business people, and everyone who came to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, we sent to the Commerce Department. I was told they were treated fairly, squarely, and honorably, as the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, would do. But he was unaware of the true situation. I want the RECORD to show also that I was totally unaware of it. This happened on January 31, as the Senator has now called it to my attention. It was in the early part of the session, when we were trying to rush through legislation that was to expire at the end of February, if I remember correctly.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, if I may be permitted——

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The Small Business Committee recommended very strongly against the removal of the controls, and we had conferences on several occasions in which we pointed out what would happen as a result of their removal. But it was insisted that the controls should be removed, and as a result, immediately there developed the conditions which were brought out in that hearing. The Small Business Committee made a report at the time, with which I did not agree. I filed minority views, in which I pointed out there was need of legislation, and that legislation should have been enacted to protect the small-business men who were being deprived of access to materials necessary to enable them to continue production.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, the Senator is referring to the Eightieth Congress, when I was not chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. No recommendation was made to the committee.

Mr. MURRAY. No; the Senator had no connection with it at that time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely want the RECORD to show we were not a party to what happened.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the only point I was trying to establish from the fact to which I have just referred—it is as clear as a bell—was that it shows conclusively two things; first, that the regular committee, with legislative authority, had to restudy, and did restudy, exactly the same questions which had been studied at great length and at considerable expense, and had been made the basis of a report of findings by the special committee; and second, it shows to what little extent the business of the special committee was considered to be vital not only to that particular standing committee but to many others. Mr. President, we cannot know, each of us, the business that is going on in every other committee of the Senate, and no fault is to be attached to anyone. But if we have the same job being done twice, certain facts are going to be brought out in one place which never are made known at all in the other place. Since there is only one place where they can be acted on effectively—and that is in the committee which has legislative authority—therefore I am unalterably opposed to a special committee without legislative authority, which, as I have said a while ago, is completely emasculated of any ability really to get the job done. Of course, members of that committee want to get it done, but they have no legislative authority, and they are not able to get it done.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, my experience of about 6 years as chairman of the special committee is directly contrary to the conclusions of the Senator from Florida. We found no difficulty whatever in having passed legislation which we thought desirable. Whenever we appeared before a committee with a bill, we had no difficulty convincing the committee of what should be done. Not only that, but we were able, because of the hearings we held, to get from the various departments of the Government results which were of great value to the small-business concerns of the country.

I am surprised to hear the statement made, after the experience of the Small Business Committee for 6 years, and the approval it won from businessmen throughout the United States, that the committee was not effective. I think it was one of the best special committees ever to operate in the Senate of the United States, because it procured results of great value.

For instance, one subject we had to investigate was aluminum. Another was rubber. As a result of our report on rubber, the commission appointed by the President of the United States, with Mr. Baruch at the head of it, called us into session with them and had us submit to them the result of our findings. They based their report to the President on the findings of our committee. We had a letter from Mr. Baruch commending us and pointing out that it would be a fine thing if such cooperation could be had through all committees of the Congress. I cannot understand how it can be said today that the special committee of the Senate has been ineffective and has not accomplished anything for the small-business men of the country. I have in the files of the Small Business Committee stacks of letters expressing approval of the work of the committee.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska knows that what I am saying is true. He knows that I cooperated with him and that he cooperated fully with me in our efforts to meet the problems of small business. The Senator knows that our files are filled with letters of commendation from businessmen and from large and small concerns all over the country. We not only helped the small-business men, but we removed certain of the troubles of the larger concerns. Take, for instance, our investigation of the requirement of reports from businessmen. Some of the business concerns had to employ extra help in order to enable them to make the voluminous reports which were being demanded by various agencies of the Government. We found that most of the information already existed in some department in Washington, and that the repeated demands for reports from small-business concerns were unnecessary. One large firm told us they had to spend more than $100,000 a year to prepare reports, half of which were unnecessary. I think it is a very peculiar thing that at this time and place the special committee is described in the Senate as an ineffective and inefficient committee, whereas it has the approval of businessmen in every section of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I may again say what I said a while ago, which apparently was not heard by my friend from Montana. I would not in any manner seek to question the fact that the committee under his leadership from 1941 to 1946 rendered good service in many regards. I think I mentioned the fact that OPA was operating at the time, and most of that time. I believe its discontinuance was one of the last acts of the session of the Congress in 1946, before adjournment, and that other control measures were effective. Various kinds of permits and licenses were required to do business, both in exporting and importing. There were shortages in many critical goods, which do not now exist at all. I tried to say as clearly as I could that I thought the special committee had a function at that time, and performed it, and performed it well. I based my statement upon participation in the service of the committee, jointly as a member with the Senator from Montana, in the two postwar years of 1947 and 1948. Without at all questioning the fact that the able chairman of the committee did his very best to render good service, and did render some good service, and that other members did, and I participated, I think, as actively in the affairs of the committee as did any other minority member, including my friend, the senior Senator from Montana—I merely want to say I found that in frequent cases we were stymied because we did not have legislative authority. I cited one of those cases a moment ago.

So far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, basing his statement on 2 years of postwar experience, at a time comparable to the time any committee now created would serve, I gained a very deep conviction that a special committee, under peacetime conditions, is largely wasting its time, and that the proper thing to do is to follow the path laid down by the Reorganization Act under which legislative jurisdiction is distributed among standing committees, and to have special investigations carried on, so far as possible, by standing committees. Under the present conditions, the best we can do is to turn to that standing committee which the Senate has already voted, by an overwhelming vote, as the dominant place, insofar as legislation is concerned, affecting small business.

Mr. President, before I conclude, I ask that at this point in my remarks there be printed the proposed substitute amendment which is now lying on the table and which, at the appropriate time on Monday, I shall hope to offer.

There being no objection, the substitute amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HOLLAND was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the word *"Resolved,"* and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That five Senators (three from the majority party and two from the minority party), to be appointed by the President of the Senate, shall be ex officio members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to serve on said committee or subcommittee (a) when any study or investigation of the problems of small business enterprises is being conducted pursuant to the authority granted to said committee by clause (2) of section 1 of Senate Resolution 101, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 6, 1949, and (b) when proposed legislation, the predominant subject matter of which relates to small business enterprises, is under consideration. One such Senator shall be a member of the Committee on Finance, one shall be a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, one shall be a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and each of the others shall be a member of such other standing committee of the Senate as may be designated by the President of the Senate

"SEC 2. (a) The first section of Senate Resolution 101, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 6, 1949, is amended by striking out 'during the Eighty-first Congress, until February 15, 1950,', and by inserting after 'small business, including' the following: '(but without limitation).'

"(b) Section 2 of such resolution is amended by striking out 'the Eighty-first Congress, until February 15, 1950,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Congress'

"(c) Senate Resolution 218, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 9, 1950, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 3 Section 4 of Senate Resolution 101, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 6, 1949, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC 4. The authority granted by this resolution with respect to the problems of small business enterprises shall not enlarge the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency as set forth in paragraph (d) of section (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, nor shall it diminish the power of any other standing committee of the Senate to investigate any matter within its jurisdiction.'"

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the Senator's proposed amendment, five Senators are to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and they are to be ex officio members of the Committee on Banking and Currency when small-business questions are involved. What power would they have, so far as voting is concerned?

Mr. HOLLAND. Full power, both on the subcommittee and when the full committee meets to consider those questions alone. I say to the Senator that the Legislative Drafting Service took the words which will be found in lines 1 and 2 at the top of page 2, out of the provisions of the Reorganization Act which are applicable to the Appropriations Committee and to its ex officio members from the Committee on Public Works and other committees who are given full participation and full voting privileges both in the subcommittee and in the full committee, but are limited to the consideration of those matters which lie within their fields.

Mr. LUCAS. Who would determine whether a subject before the Banking and Currency Committee involved small business?

Mr. HOLLAND. The chairman of the committee would determine it. Generally there would be no discussion and no possibility of any difficulty about it, but, as under the Reorganization Act the President of the Senate is required to refer matters to appropriate committees, on the very question of what committee is the proper field to which to refer a matter, so would the chairman of the committee act in this case.

I may say, in enlargement of my remark of a moment ago that a part of the wording is taken from the Reorganization Act which describes the duties of the President of the Senate when a bill lies within two or more fields. Those words are copied into my amendment in the nature of a substitute, to determine which field has the predominant subject matter, and then appropriately to refer it. Just such a determination would prevail in the Committee on Banking and Currency

Mr. LUCAS. Mr President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield

Mr. LUCAS Under the Senator's amendment, in the Banking and Currency Committee all matters determined by the chairman of that committee to be in the interest of small business would be considered and disposed of by 18 members instead of 13 members. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; if it were a matter of legislation in the field of jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee, that would be correct. If the subject did not have to do with legislation, but should affect questions of complaint, or investigation, the Senator is correct, except that his number is wrong. The present subcommittee consists of 10 members. Ten plus five would make fifteen. The full committee, in the consideration of a matter in the field of investigation or small-business legislation within its jurisdiction would consist of 13 plus 5, or 18 members.

Mr LUCAS. What I am trying to ascertain is whether it is an enlargement of the Banking and Currency Committee, so far as membership is concerned, and just what good it would do to have five additional members on the subcommittee from the various committees suggested.

Mr. HOLLAND. The same good that is accomplished in the Appropriations Committee, where there are three Senators from the Public Works Committee, the Armed Services Committee, and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and possibly others are assigned as ex officio members to consider appropriations affecting those particular fields. By sitting they swell the membership of the subcommittee by their number and they also swell the membership of the full committee by their number. The value of having them is to bring to bear the experience of men who are serving, let us say, on the Judiciary Committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or the Committee on Finance, and to have liaison back to the chairmen of those committees, if, indeed, the chairmen do not themselves wish to serve. The additional members, I may say to my good friend, the majority leader, were left, without reference to what committee they would come from, at the suggestion of the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who remarked that we have on this side of the aisle one exceedingly successful and experienced man in small business, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], who, by reason of his juniority, did not have membership on any of the major committees, but who has been very active in various small-business ventures, not merely business enterprises of his own, but in conjunction with other men engaged in small business. The Senator from Arizona remarked that we have experienced men on both sides of the aisle. I believe the distinguished majority leader made the same point, that there are Members on the other side of the aisle who, by reason of their juniority, could not be assigned to major committees, but who could be made available to the committee in order to assist in solving the problems of small business in the event the measure should be adopted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield for an observation? I shall not ask him any further questions.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall gladly yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I always dislike to disagree with my friend from Florida upon matters which he presents, because he is usually very forceful and gives all questions very thorough consideration. However, I think, when an amendment of this kind is offered, giving to the Committee on Banking and Currency additional members to the extent of five, based upon the argument made by the junior Senator from Florida as to why it should be done, I could use that same argument in the case of practically every existing standing committee, because we frequently have before us the question of jurisdiction in connection with a bill, as to whether it should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to the Committee on Banking and Currency, or to some other committee. So if this should be established as a precedent we shall, before very long, find some other Senator offering an amendment to increase the membership of some other committee.

I personally believe the committees at the present time have sufficient members. We can hardly get around to perform efficiently the work which we are expected to do, and if we load the Banking and Currency Committee with five additional members from other important committees, it seems to me we shall be establishing a precedent whereby we have some other committee asking, sooner or later, for the same thing. Some Senator may get the idea that he wants to be on the Judiciary Committee. This is one way to start a move in that direction. He can get some of his friends together who will say, "I think this committee is trespassing upon the jurisdiction of other committees, and I am a member of a committee on which I believe it is trespassing, and I should like

to have you join with me in offering a resolution to make the Judiciary Committee larger. Let us put on it a Senator from the Banking and Currency Committee, a Senator from the Committee on Finance, and so forth." Certainly if the amendment is proper and a member of the Finance Committe is entitled to sit on the Banking and Currency Committee when it considers small-business matters, some member of the Banking and Currency Committee is entitled to sit in the sessions of the Finance Committee to see what goes on with respect to small business, of which possibly the Banking and Currency Committee will have no knowledge.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his observations, but I do not think he has thought the subject through very fully. He says that five Members of the Senate would be confronted with additional duties which they do not now have. I respectfully invite his attention to the fact that under either of the alternative proposals a full committee of Members of the Senate would have given over to their jurisdiction entirely new matters, so that instead of there being 5, there would be 12, as under one of the suggestions, and 13 as under the other suggestion, with completely new duties, and there would be a completely new committee with a completely new staff, with all the expense and expenditures in connection therewith.

What we are trying to do is to build on the base on which the Senate has already built rather fully at this session, and in a way to better take care of the problems of small business, without affecting one jot or tittle the vested jurisdiction of the various standing committees in their respective fields.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be very brief, since I understand the Senate will recess shortly, and this matter will be debated fully Monday. But inasmuch as there have been so many observations about the various proposals, and in view of the interpretations which have been placed upon them, I should like to make an observation or two which I feel should be made at this time.

To begin with, I have a very great respect and affection for the junior Senator from Florida. That comes from my service with him on the very committee we are now discussing, and I appreciate deeply his views. I believe that if Senate Resolution 58 could be adopted by the Senate, it would be a great step forward in helping the citizens of this country, not only in matters of investigation, but also legislative matters.

Mr. President, I feel that the small-business man is the backbone of our American economy, that he should be protected, that he should be able to come to Washington, and without having to go to all the various Government agencies, have in the Senate a committee which could speak for him, and handle his problems, whether they are legislative or of a different kind.

The junior Senator from Florida says it is impossible to adopt Senate Resolution 58, which would provide a permanent standing committee with legislative authority. So far as I am concerned, I think such a committee would be just as important as any legislative committee we have today. When the distinguished Senator suggested that there should be debate on Senate Resolution 55, which the junior Senator from Nebraska was asking to have referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration rather than to the Committee on Banking and Currency, since I thought, under the rules of the Senate, it ought to go to the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator came forth with an idea, and it was then he offered me an opportunity to join with him in this resolution, and I did so. I think it is one of the most constructive steps the junior Senator from Florida has taken since he has been a Member of the Senate, one of the best contributions he has made. So far as I am concerned, I should like to have a vote on that measure, vote it up or vote it down, and see whether or not we can establish that kind of a committee in the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to ask the Senator whether or not, under the parliamentary situation at the present time, we could have a vote upon that measure, and vote it up or down.

Mr. WHERRY. If the majority leader will permit me, my idea is that Senate Resolution 58 is only the vehicle to which other amendments have been offered in order to reach one of three determinations: First, to set up a special committee only for the period of this Congress; second, adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska, which would accomplish the same purpose, except that the committee would be a continuing committee, and not have to be brought before the Senate each 2 years and be extended, a committee without legislative authority, as has been suggested by the Senator from Montana; or, third, provide for the creation of a permanent standing committee, which the junior Senator from Florida himself says will be the ultimate outcome of all these proposals at some future date.

Mr. President, we have those three or four issues before us. I should be glad indeed, if there were any way to get a vote on Senate Resolution 58, to withdraw the substitute, if I could—and I think I would be granted that privilege—and get a vote on the resolution. But after talking with the distinguished junior Senator from Florida and other Senators I agree that there is great resistance by the chairmen of the legislative committees, and that they do not want to give up any jurisdictional rights their committees possess. In a way, I agree with them. They are very jealous of their jurisdiction, and I suppose they should retain the jurisdiction they now have. But I submit, by the same token and by the same argument, that the importance of the Small Business Committee is demonstrated. The Small Business Committee cuts across the lines of all other committees. For that reason I believe we should set up a special committee which would handle all these matters, either with or without legislative authority. I say that with the greatest of affection for the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and especially for the chairman. I believe they are perfectly within their rights in insisting that a special committee be set up to handle problems of small business, so far as they are concerned. They have that right. The same applies to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as it does to the Committee on the Judiciary.

If there is anything on which I would take issue with the Senator from Florida, it is on the point suggested by the majority leader, namely, why stop at five? Why stop with one from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or one from the Committee on Finance? Think of the Committee on Rules and Administration, on which I serve, or the Committee on Appropriations. These committees are interested in the problems of small business, just as much as are the committees which have been suggested by the able junior Senator from Florida

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Let me finish this one point, then I shall yield.

For the reasons I have given, Mr. President, I do not see how any Senator can offer an amendment and say, "We will have members from just five committees." It seems to me that if the committees which have been mentioned do not give up some of their jurisdiction, under a permanent set-up, it is not possible for a Senator to come forward with an amendment and say, "This committee will be represented," or "That committee will be represented," and deny representation to all the others.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Does not the Senator believe that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs should be represented? That committee has jurisdiction over mines and mining. Nothing is more important than the protection of the small-mine operators of the Nation, who supply the metals and minerals which enable our industries to operate. It seems to me it would be very important to have that committee representation on the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his observations. I would just as soon let the junior Senator from Florida decide who should be the ex officio members of the committee. I would just as soon leave it with him as anyone else in the Senate. However, in the final analysis, practically every committee ought to be represented. That is the reason why we ought to have a special committee, with or without legislative authority.

The majority leader approached the problem from the angle of who would wish to get on the special standing committee. I should like to approach it from the angle of giving the Banking and Currency Committee more power. I agree with the Senator from Florida, the Banking and Currency Committee is not today handling the problems of small

business. They cannot do so under their jurisdiction; it is impossible for them to do so. It is therefore necessary to increase their power. It would be necessary to increase the committee's jurisdiction. When that is done, the same difficulty arises as when a special committee is created. Ex officio members are placed on a committee to consider matters which come before the committee.

However, the distinguished majority leader makes the distinction that the ex officio members are serving only for investigative purposes, that they cannot serve on the committee for legislative purposes, because by so doing they would override the jurisdiction of the committee.

I agree with that. They cannot be on the Committee on Banking and Currency to increase the legislative authority of that committee. If that were done, then the jurisdiction of all the other committees interested with the Banking and Currency Committee would be violated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the Senator is mistaken in perhaps one detail of what he has just said. The ex officio members would have the authority to vote both on nonlegislative and on legislative matters, but they would be confined as to their votes on legislative matters wholly to questions which were predominantly small-business matters. They would have the right to vote as do members assigned from the Public Works Committee and other committees when serving as ex officio members on the Appropriations Committee, who now are entitled to vote in passing upon matters coming within their field of jurisdiction.

Mr. WHERRY. Either the Senator did not understand my remarks or I misspoke myself. The answer to his argument is that if we give authority to each of the 5 members—and I say there should be 14 or 15—then there is no difference between their jurisdictional power and the power of a permanent Small Business Committee of the Senate set up with legislative authority. There is no difference whatever.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is there not this difference between that kind of a committee and a special small-business committee; that both committees would have exactly the same sort of investigational powers, but that the Banking and Currency Committee would, in addition, have legislative power in its field which the Senate has already ruled is the field of predominant interest, so far as small-business legislation is concerned?

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps that distinction can be made. The point can be reached in the interpretation of authority where it is possible to split birdseed. I do not say the Senator wants to do that, but it can be done. The junior Senator from Florida asked me if I would join with him, and I should like to be open-minded on the subject.

Certainly we need to do something to help small business. If what is proposed is the only solution, I do not wish to be prejudiced against the only solution that can be offered at this time. However, the way I feel about it now is that we would simply be extending the authority and jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee, both in the investigative field and in the legislative field. The purpose could be better accomplished if we were to give the same authority to a special standing committee, which could do a much better job. If we let the committee have a subcommittee, and let them have power, then we should let the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have the same power. They would have a perfect right to set up a subcommittee, and I would vote for that. I would vote for a separate committee to help the small-business men of the country, who need help, especially in matters of taxation. Certainly that is not within the prerogative of the Banking and Currency Committee. It belongs to the Finance Committee.

What we need is a committee which has power to deal with the subject matter. We have not had such a committee since the Eighty-first Congress convened. Small-business men are asking for a committee with power. I have received more mail on this subject during the past year than I have received in prior years. While I do not wish to seem to stress my service on the Small Business Committee, I wish to say that I did give considerable time to the work of that committee. In fact, I believe I can truthfully say that I spent more than half my time on the work of the Small Business Committee. I believe I spent more time on the work of that committee than on the work of all the other committees on which I served combined. And, believe me, I did a great deal of work in other committees. That will show that I believed the Small Business Committee to be an important one.

With respect to the matter of appointing members of other committees as ex officio members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to suggest to the distinguished majority leader that it is a point he ought to consider, if the amendment suggested by the Senator from Florida is adopted. I do not know who would have the right to select the members of the respective committees the Senator from Florida suggested should serve on the Banking and Currency Committee, but they would come from standing committees, and they would be chosen by reason of seniority. The five Senators in question would be chosen from among the senior members of the committees involved, which would not make available such places to the younger Members of the Senate, many of whom would be outstanding members of a special committee if they were given the opportunity to serve on it. I can think of 3 or 4 younger Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle who, if given the opportunity to serve on such a committee, would render excellent service. However, they would not be afforded opportunity to be chosen or appointed as ex officio members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. If a special committee were appointed, Members of the Senate from both sides of the aisle could be selected who would have the time to give to service on the special committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I had not intended to detain the Senate so long. I yield to the Senator from Montana, however.

Mr. MURRAY. I merely wish to say that it has been repeatedly asserted that the major jurisdiction over problems of small business lies in the Committee on Banking and Currency. I think that is not a true statement. The main jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency relates to financial aid to commerce and industry. There are other committees which have jurisdiction over matters which relate to small business. One of the most important subjects is business research and education. The country is suffering from the great growth of monopoly and concentration of ownership. Small business is finding it very difficult to compete. Small business requires much assistance in the way of research and education to make it possible for it to survive in competition with large business concerns that are becoming so integrated that soon there will be nothing left in the country for small independent businesses.

Then there is the subject of monopoly and unfair-trade practices. I think that is a subject which is more important than any subject over which the Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction. If any committee is to take over this problem as a special agency for handling small-business problems it ought to be the Committee on the Judiciary. But it seems to me that the able minority leader [Mr. WHERRY] has hit the nail on the head when he says that the only place where proper consideration and action can be had for small business is in a special committee or a standing committee. I am in favor of a special committee because I think it is the only practical committee that can handle the subject at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield. But first I wish to thank the Senator from Montana for his observation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think it is necessary to say that the statement made by the junior Senator from Florida to the effect that the Banking and Currency Committee is the committee which has the major portion of legislation applicable to small business is not simply his statement, but is based on the ruling of the President of the Senate, as upheld by an overwhelming majority of the Senate. I quote now, if I may, from the ruling of the President of the Senate, Vice President BARKLEY, that portion of it which deals with this subject:

In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, without debate, in favor of that committee which has the jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in

such proposed legislation; but such a decision shall be subject to an appeal.

Therefore, so far as the rule giving specific jurisdiction to committees is concerned, which was one of the objects of the Reorganization Act, undoubtedly the preponderance of jurisdiction—even though that might not include all the jurisdiction which could be conceived of in that connection—would be in the Banking and Currency Committee.

And from that ruling appeal was taken, and the Vice President's ruling was overwhelmingly sustained by the Senate.

Before closing may I say——

Mr. WHERRY. Let me speak to that point for a moment. I yielded to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I add one point?

Mr. WHERRY. Is it respecting the same point the Senator has just discussed?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Montana did not read completely from the Reorganization Act those matters which relate to the Banking and Currency Committee's jurisdiction over small business. Item 2 reads "Financial aid to commerce and industry," and so forth. That is one of the two items as quoted by the Senator. But item No 9 is "Control of prices of commodities, rents, or services."

That again has been the subject matter of much legislation of great effect upon small business and was one of the facets upon which the Vice President hung his case and his decision.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, speaking to the point just made by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida, if I recall correctly, the appeal in question was made on the basis of the decision of the Chair to send Senate Resolution 29 and Senate Resolution 55 to the Committee on Banking and Currency, instead of to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I objected to the ruling of the Vice President then, and I should object to a similar ruling now. A good case for objection was made at that time, because after the decision of the Vice President was appealed, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] succeeded in having adopted an amendment relating to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The amendment provided that in no case could the Committee on Banking and Currency assume jurisdiction over matters respecting which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had jurisdiction. The Senate agreed to that amendment by an overwhelming vote. I may be confused whether the action I last referred to was taken at the same time the other action was taken, but it related to the same legislation. The Senate voted to uphold the Vice President in his decision to send the resolutions to the Committee on Banking and Currency instead of to the Committee on Rules and Administration, but the Senate agreed to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Colorado which provided that in no event did the Senate, by the action it then took, provide that the Committee on Banking and Currency could assume jurisdiction of any kind, or power over matters which came under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. President, as a small-business man I can stand on the floor of the Senate and argue all day that the most important thing the small-business man needs today is relief from taxation. The Committee on Banking and Currency does not have jurisdiction over that subject. That is why I oppose the proposed expansion of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

If a small-business man cannot get the relief he needs through his banker he comes to Congress for help. The reason the small-business man comes here is that he wants relief from some other source than his banker. So that presents a psychological reason why the small-business man should be allowed to come with his problems to a special committee, instead of to a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, I had not intended to go into the merits of the question until Monday, but inasmuch as other Senators made observations today. I felt I should also say something on the subject. At this time we do not have a committee which is doing the job needed to be done for the small-business man. That is now admitted. Even the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] says the power of his committee has not been expanded. He says his committee has gone as far as it can go. His committee cannot step over the line. Does the Senate wish to give his committee such power? If the Senate is willing to give expanded power and authority to the Committee on Banking and Currency, why not give that authority and that power to a small-business committee, an independent committee?

I do not wish to tell the majority party what to do in this connection. The majority party seems to think it is doing all right, and has thought so for the past 18 years. But let me say that the best and most popular thing that could be done in the effort to help small business today would be to give small business a permanent standing committee with legislative authority. To my mind that is necessary. Senators may argue all day long on this question, but when they finish they will come back to one of two methods. Either that providing for a special committee without legislative authority, or that providing for a special committee with legislative authority.

Mr. President, I do not wish to speak in a political vein, because I say to my fellow Senators that my heart is with the small-business men. I think I know something of their problems. Believe me, I have had plenty of similar problems in my lifetime. I believe those in this great segment of our economy are entitled to a committee to which they can come with their problems. A committee should be established to which they can come with matters of allocation, to which they can come with requests for relief. Such matters came before the Small Business Committee, and help was afforded small-business men without such matters coming to the attention of the Senate. It was not necessary that the Senate be informed of what was done in many cases. Help was afforded the small-business men in connection with such matters as newspaper print. Help was given them along many other lines. Time and time again the personnel of the committee ironed out difficulties, respecting which complaints were made by small-business men, but which did not require legislation.

Legislative authority exists now, but the thing the small-business man wants most of all is the opportunity to present his problems to a committee which can conduct investigations and study the things he needs and his problems. He can bring such matters to a special committee which either has or does not have legislative authority.

I sincerely hope the junior Senator from Florida will not cease to press for action on Senate Resolution 58. I hope we can take final stand here once and for all, and create a committee which will be permanent, so we will not have to ask for extension of the committee either upon adjournment of the session of Congress, or when Congress convenes. If a committee is not a permanent one, but whose life must be extended from year to year, the result is that it loses much of its personnel. It is impossible to keep such a committee strong, because its personnel does not know from one year to the next whether it is going to be continued.

Mr. President, it seems to me the only sensible thing to do is to vote to establish a special committee, either without legislative authority or a special committee with legislative authority. In the meantime, if that cannot be done, then I suggest that certain standing committees appoint subcommittees to handle matters involving small business. I will say to the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and the distinguished junior Senator from Florida, that I shall vote to continue appropriations in the interest of small business, if the latter is the only way the matter can be handled during the present session of the Eighty-first Congress. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries that demonstrations are not permitted, and requests the cooperation of all our guests in the galleries.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret very much to find the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the distinguished Senator from Florida, who are team mates on Senate Resolution 58, now deserting that resolution. The Senator from Nebraska says he hopes the Senator from Florida will stand up and fight for Senate Resolution 58, but the parliamentary situation now is such that the Senator from Nebraska is offering an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate Resolution 58, and the Senator from Florida has offered a different amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate Resolution 58.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. In a moment, please.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Florida has gone south on his original proposal, and the Senator from Nebraska has gone west on his original proposal, and that the honorable thing and the quick thing to do is to get behind the proposal of the Senator from Montana and settle this matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Now I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think my good friend the Senator from Illinois might have been fair enough to have said for the record that the Senator from Florida had not opened his mouth or referred to any substitute until after the minority leader had offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute and until after the Senator from Montana had offered a substitute for that substitute, which then was withdrawn while the Senator from Florida was seeking the floor. I think that it might be appropriate to clarify the record at this time by making that statement, if my friend would be good enough to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, apparently the Senator from Florida has clarified the record from his own viewpoint.

I am not objecting to what has been done. I merely picked up an amendment which had been offered by the Senator from Florida. Apparently he had the amendment drawn long before this afternoon. It now is at the desk; and he was lying in wait, getting ready to offer it as a substitute; and finally he did talk about it. So I think I am justified in making a little argument in behalf of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by the Senator from Montana for the Wherry amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator very much for yielding.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield; but, of course, I can yield to only one Senator at a time.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct, and I appreciate very much the Senator's courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. President, the position of the Senator from Nebraska in this matter is clear. I am in favor of the appointment of a Small Business Committee. I will agree to the appointment of a Special Committee on Small Business. I have said on the floor of the Senate time and time again that I will vote for the appointment of a special committee for that purpose or for the appointment of a legislative committee, with authority, for that purpose.

The reason why I have offered the amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order to give the Senate a chance to vote on those questions. I have not gone west, nor have I been in the south. I have been all over the United States, talking to small-business men, and I wish to inform the majority leader that they want a committee of their own, either with legislative authority or without it. I will support either one which the Senate wishes to approve.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Nebraska is interested in small business, and I realize that he has been during all the years since he has been a Member of the Senate. I am merely pointing out what the legislative situation is, as I understand it.

I wish to reiterate that, in view of the fact that these two very distinguished Senators, who long ago rushed in with Senate Resolution 58 and said, "This is the answer to your prayers, so far as small business is concerned," now are moving away, one going in one direction and the other going in another direction, and in view of the fact that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is going to offer a perfecting amendment, as I understand, it seems to me that if the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Nebraska would agree to go along with the Senator from Montana, we would be able to end this argument.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me inquire whether the Senator from Illinois would go along, too.

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly would go along with the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that, because that is the first time in the years I have been here that the Senator from Illinois has been in favor of a committee on small business. If we are going to get the record clear, let us make it complete.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska is in error in that respect. When I was serving on the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, we on that committee furnished all the money the Senator from Nebraska wanted in order to take care of the Special Committee on Small Business.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct, but that was done after the committee was authorized.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course; but the Senator from Illinois certainly had an opportunity to block the Small Business Committee, in connection with the appropriations it needed, and could have done so had he wished to.

Mr. President, after the Reorganization Act was passed, all the Senator from Illinois was trying to do was comply with the letter and spirit of that act, so far as the organization of committees was concerned. However, the Reorganization Act has been violated so much that I shall have no qualms of conscience whatever in voting for the appointment of a special committee on small business to perform the task which was performed so well in prior Congresses by the special committee headed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and during the Eightieth Congress by the special committee headed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

So I shall vote for the amendment in the nature of a substitute, to be offered by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, in view of the departure, all of a sudden, of the two Senators from the original issue, I think that in the interest of harmony and in the interest of the small business of the country, both Senators should throw their arms around the Senator from Montana, so to speak, and should permit us to proceed with the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Montana for the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MURRAY submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the amendment of Mr. WHERRY to the resolution (S. Res. 58) to amend the Senate rules by creating a standing Committee on Small Business, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"That (a) a special committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business and to consist of 13 Senators shall be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution.

"(b) It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small-business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys.

"(c) For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $——— in any calendar year, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 20, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 17 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Stanford C. Stiles, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired September 28, 1949.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. John W. Roper, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as deputy chief of naval operations (personnel).

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, from all the traditions which separate us and write our names in different camps of thought and conviction we pause for the upward look which makes us one in solemn, yet glad, communion with Thee.

Teach us so to live and so to toil and so to play our part in this age on ages telling that we may face with clear conscience the gaze of our contemporaries and the judgment of posterity. May our attitudes and hopes widen every area of good will within the reach of our influence. In a divided, fear-haunted, violent world, may we be among those whom the generations to come shall call blessed, because the record shall write our names among today's peacemakers. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 17, 1950, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today, through Wednesday.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Malone
Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hill	Maybank
Brewster	Hoey	Millikin
Bricker	Holland	Morse
Butler	Hunt	Mundt
Cain	Ives	Murray
Capehart	Jenner	Myers
Chapman	Johnson, Colo	Neely
Chavez	Johnson, Tex	O'Conor
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kefauver	Robertson
Darby	Kem	Russell
Donnell	Kerr	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Downey	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Sparkman
Ecton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Lodge	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Taylor
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarran	Thye
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tobey
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Withers

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF MEMBERS OF THE JAPANESE DIET

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in the Vice President's office at the present time are 14 members of the Japanese Diet. They are now visiting this country to study the organization and procedures of the United States Congress and of various State legislatures. I respectfully request the Vice President to direct the Sergeant at Arms to escort these distinguished visitors into the Senate Chamber in order that they may witness the Senate procedure. Following the preliminary proceeding we will take a recess of some 20 minutes in order that we may all become better acquainted with these men from Japan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Sergeant at Arms will escort the distinguished visitors into the Senate Chamber.

The visiting members of the Japanese Diet, escorted by the Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber.

The SERGEANT AT ARMS (Joseph C. Duke). Mr. President, I have the honor to present members of the Diet of Japan. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state what the Senate, of course, already knows, that members of parliamentary bodies of other nations are entitled to the courtesy of the floor during any visit they make here.

The members of the delegation from the Japanese Diet were escorted to the seats assigned them in the rear of the Chamber.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate, and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENTS OF INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Attorney General of the United States, withdrawing the names of Heather Mary Bocko or Heather Mary Gill, and Fanny Sara Moritz or Fannie Sarah Moritz, from reports relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on May 1, 1949, and January 16, 1950, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO BY NAVY DEPARTMENT RELATING TO NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements entered into by the Navy Department relating to naval petroleum reserves (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT OF INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED TIN SMELTER, TEXAS CITY, TEX.

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and the program for the purchase and sale of tin metal, during the 6 months ended December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committeee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, of all the names, salaries, and duties of employees and officers in the employ of the Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SERVICEMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assure that expenditures under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, for education and training yield a proper return both to the veteran and to the Nation as a whole (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by Cheever Evans, Merill N. Penn, and Robert T. Peterson, Legislative Committee, Lloyd E. Frost Post, No. 4084, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Ridgecrest, Calif., praying

for the enactment of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

The petitions of Bruce Merlington, of Cedar Springs, Mich., and Martha Chesbro, parliamentarian of Post No. 4198, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Raynesford, Mont., praying for the enactment of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the California Motor Transport Associations, Inc., of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the tax on the transportation of property, and the Federal automotive excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Hosea V. Smith, clerk, of the Free Will Baptist Church, of Mount Vernon, Ill., relating to legalized gambling; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Military Order of World Wars, of Washington, D. C., protesting against the enactment of legislation to provide a world government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The memorial of John C Sarracino, Governor, Pueblo of Laguna, N. Mex., remonstrating against the enactment of certain provisions of Senate bill 75, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Resolution adopted by the women's board of Doctors Hospital, and the women's board of the Polyclinic Hospital, both of Cleveland, Ohio, and the Outagamie County Dental Society, of Appleton, Wis., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the crew of the steamship *American Shipper*, of Baltimore, Md., relating to amendment of the Taft-Hartley labor law, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The memorial of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Lanvaner, of Forest Grove, Oreg., remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1103 and House bill 2945, to adjust postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Delaware County, N Y., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing a flood-control dam on Charlotte River, Davenport, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, His Excellency the President of the United States, to make an immediate, thorough, and exhaustive study and investigation of the loyalty of the members, officers, and employees of the State Department, and to take such further appropriate action to rid the Department of State of procommunistic employees in order that the safety of our Nation will not be further endangered by men in high places who condone acts of treason which endanger the safety of the United States of America and the people.

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house concurring therein):

"Whereas through the activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation Alger Hiss was twice tried in the Federal courts of the United States of America, and convicted of the crime of perjury; and

"Whereas members of the United States Supreme Court, Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed, voluntarily testified in the first trial as character witnesses, thereby breaking all of the precedents heretofore existing in relation to our Federal courts, and creating in the minds of the American people a disregard for members of our Federal judiciary; and

"Whereas upon the conviction by a Federal jury in a Federal court of the said Alger Hiss, Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America, issued a prepared and considered statement in which he said, 'I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss,' which statement was designed to belittle the actions of an American jury in an American court and to raise in the minds of the American people a doubt as to the guilt of one of Dean Acheson's friends and former State Department employee in spite of, and in total disregard of, results of a free and fair trial and a verdict rendered by a jury as provided by the Constitution and the laws of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency the President of the United States to make an immediate check of the loyalties and beliefs of the men employed in the State Department of the United States, from Dean Acheson on down, to determine whether or not the ideas and ideals of such individuals are such that the American people can have continued faith that such Department, through its representatives, will safely keep and guard the secrets of the United States of America from foreign enemies and that such Department and its employees in preparing and carrying out a foreign policy in relation to Russia and other foreign countries will adopt and carry out policies which are not contrary to the ideas and ideals of the American people as expressed by the Constitution of the United States and the laws adopted thereunder; be it further

"Resolved, That His Excellency the President of the United States make immediately available to the House Un-American Activities Committee all secret files and lists and reports of investigations covering the loyalties and activities of any and all employees of the Government of the United States which in any way show or indicate disloyalty to the United States of America as expressed by Communist membership or otherwise; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States, to United States Senator CHAN GURNEY, to United States Senator KARL MUNDT, to Congressman FRANCIS H. CASE, to Congressman HAROLD LOVRE, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress.

"REX TERRY,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"A. E. MUNCK,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

By Mr. CONNALLY:

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 24

"Whereas the Congress is considering a measure which would repeal or reduce the depletion allowance now made in connection with income taxes on producers of natural resources; and

"Whereas the economy of the State of Texas to a great degree is tied up with the production of natural resources; and

"Whereas these industries furnish a large portion of the revenue for the support of the State government, including its public-school system and its welfare and other programs, and

"Whereas prospecting for new reserves is a hazardous and expensive operation; and

"Whereas the elimination or reduction of the present allowance for depletion would tend to create unemployment and would seriously cripple these industries, and particularly the smaller units and independents who have been the backbone of these industries; and further would seriously retard the search for and development of new sources of supply vitally necessary to this country, particularly in case of war: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Texas, That the Congress of these United States be and is respectfully urged to defeat this attempt to eliminate or reduce the depletion allowance, and thereby to preserve the economy of the various States and assist in preparing this country to defend herself, if necessary; and, be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be wired immediately to Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President of these United States; and that copies hereof be mailed to the Representatives and Senators in Congress from the State of Texas.

"GRADY HAZLEWOOD,
"President Pro Tempore of the Senate."

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services.

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation reimbursing those individuals who were drafted into the service in 1940, the difference between the base pay of a private of $21 per month and $50 per month which became the base pay of a private soldier 2 years later

"Whereas in 1940, due to a national emergency, the Congress of the United States enacted legislation which drafted into the service of our country thousands of young men who, while anxious to make any sacrifice for the defense of their land, were nevertheless most desirous of continuing their chosen professions and businesses in civilian life; and

"Whereas these young men were drafted into the armed forces and served willingly and with honor and credit; and

"Whereas these Americans in many cases gave up lucrative and highly paying positions and served for $21 per month for a period of about 2 years, when the base pay of a private soldier was raised to $50 per month, and by so doing, Congress recognized the inequity of the scale of pay for the different grades of rank; and

"Whereas Congress has never recognized the very pertinent fact that these men who were drafted and served for $21 per month for about 2 years form a large bloc of Americans to whom some form of additional remuneration is justly due; and

"Whereas many of these men returned to civilian pursuits after the cessation of hostilities only to find that their savings were gone and the matter of starting again was a long, expensive, and difficult task: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation immediately, giving those men who were drafted into the service on account of the national emergency in 1940, the difference between the $21 of a private and $50

which became the pay of the private soldier later, which payment will only partially reimburse these men for the financial sacrifices that they were called upon to make on account of the national emergency; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the house of representatives be directed to furnish a copy of this resolution to the two United States Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from South Carolina, and to each of the State commanders of each veterans' organization in the United States, and to each national commander of such organizations."

TAXES ON ADMISSIONS TO CERTAIN ATHLETIC CONTESTS — RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the removal of the existing taxes on admissions to high-school athletic contests or athletic contests conducted by charitable and nonprofit organizations.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows.

Resolutions memorializing Congress to remove existing taxes on admissions to high-school athletic contests or athletic contests conducted by charitable and nonprofit organizations

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to enact legislation repealing any existing requirement of law that any admission or other tax be imposed or collected upon tickets for admission to high-school athletic contests or athletic contests conducted by charitable and nonprofit organizations, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, February 6, 1950

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 9, 1950.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

LONG-RANGE SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF QUINCY, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of Quincy, Mass., favoring the adoption of a long-range shipbuilding program.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas employment in shipbuilding is decreasing nationally on a scale to cause serious concern, not only to shipworkers but to all thoughtful citizens; and

Whereas shipbuilding has played an important part in the growth and development of the city of Quincy, Mass.: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Quincy City Council in regular meeting, That the preservation of shipbuilding skills, the protection of foreign commerce, and the protection of the Nation's defense, demands adoption by the 1950 Congress of the United States of a long-range shipbuilding program, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to United States Senators from Massachusetts, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and HENRY CABOT LODGE, and all Members of Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

EXCISE TAXES ON TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION SERVICES—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA STATE RAILWAY COMMISSION

Mr WHERRY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Nebraska State Railway Commission on February 7, 1950, concerning the present Federal excise taxes on transportation and communication services.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 156

Whereas the Federal excise taxes on transportation and communication services were initially levied to help defray war costs and to discourage unnecessary travel and communication, and

Whereas almost 5 years have elapsed since the end of the war, and the urgent need for the levying of such taxes no longer exists; and

Whereas said taxes are discriminatory against the long distance users of transportation and communication services, and against Nebraska citizens because they are far removed from centers of population; and

Whereas the taxes are calculated on a percentage rather than on a flat basis and increases of rates necessitated since the end of the war have greatly increased the amount of tax; and

Whereas the tax as applied to rural and exchange services is grossly unfair and inequitable and has become more burdensome by reason of increases in exchange service rates made necessary by large increases in costs of rendering service with consequent pyramiding of taxes thereon; and

Whereas because of increases in rates for transportation and communication services, a decrease in traffic and a decline in economic status of the users of service, particularly the rural subscriber of telephone service, a situation has been created where the use of exchange services has reached a point of diminishing returns: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska State Railway Commission is of the opinion that the present excise taxes on transportation and communication services are inimical to the maintenance and use of transportation and communication facilities and should be completely repealed; and further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Kenneth S. Wherry and Hugh A. Butler, United States Senators, and to Carl T. Curtis, Eugene D. O'Sullivan, Karl Stefan, and A. L. Miller, Representatives of Congress, and to Walter R. McDonald, General Solicitor of the NARUC.

Adopted at Lincoln, Nebr., this 7th day of February 1950, at regular session.

THE NEBRASKA STATE RAILWAY COMMISSION,
HAROLD A. PALMER, *Chairman.*
WALTER E ROBERTS, *Commissioner.*
RICHARD H. LARSON, *Commissioner.*

Attest:

JOSEPH J BROWN,
Secretary.

CLEAR CHANNELS IN RADIO—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, relating to clear channels in radio for the dissemination of farm news.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farm people generally are having to depend primarily upon clear-channel radiobroadcasting stations for their radio information and dissemination of their programs to others. This will continue unless unforeseen new developments improve transmission and reception. We therefore firmly oppose any reduction in the number of clear-channel stations. We urge that the frequencies of clear-channel stations be held inviolate by international agreement and that the power of these stations be increased to allow for complete coverage to all areas in territories of the respective stations. We ask that radio service to farmers by substations be maintained and improved with reference to the special needs of people on farms.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED UNDER FOREIGN TRADE ZONES ACT—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN WAREHOUSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a resolution which was adopted by the fifty-ninth annual convention of the American Warehousemen's Association in Chicago early this month. The resolution was sent to me by Harold M. Willardson, president of the Milwaukee Warehousemen's Association, who, like his associates in this industry throughout the country, is deeply interested in the passage of certain legislation to remove restrictions which have been imposed by the activities in the Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934.

Naturally I share the deep interest of these warehousemen in facilitating world trade, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934 (title 19, section 81 A.-U. USCA) was enacted for the purpose of creating free ports wherein many operations essential to foreign commerce may be carried on without the burdensome intricacies of customs, laws and regulations applicable to ordinary ports of entry; and

Whereas the purpose of said act, namely to promote, stimulate, and facilitate international commerce, has not been entirely achieved by reason of undue restrictions against certain activities within foreign trade zones notably the activity of manufacturing and exhibiting; and

Whereas H. R. 2163, a bill, has been introduced into the present session of the Eighty-first Congress by Representatives BOGGS and CELLER for the purpose of removing these restrictions imposed by the activities in Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934; and

Whereas the achievement for the purposes of the said Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934 have been further hampered by confining foreign trade zones privileges to an extremely narrow and limited orb, namely the few foreign trade zones created by the Foreign Trade Zones Board pursuant to the Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934; and

Whereas we held that the extension of foreign trade zones privileges (as reflected in the Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934 and as proposed to be amended by the aforesaid Boggs-Celler bill) to qualified warehousemen will stimulate, promote and foster foreign commerce; facilitate the handling of commodities and materials shipped, stored, and handled in foreign commerce; stabilize world trade and cure the deficiencies of imports as compared with exports and materially contribute to the peace and economic well-being of the world; and

Whereas all of these aims and purposes are provided for in H. R 4723, a bill introduced by Representative BOGGS into the first session of the Eighty-first Congress and referred to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the said H R. 4723 does no violence to the customs of the United States or to the principles of the Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934 but is, on the contrary, thoroughly consistent with all of the tariff laws and regulations promulgated thereunder, and with the principles of the Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Warehousemen's Association merchandise division, in convention assembled thereby lauds the aims, objects, and purposes of H. R. 4723 and enthusiastically endorses and urges its passage by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Representative BOGGS, to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, President of the United States, and to such additional Representatives and Senators and to such other officials and agencies of the Government as may be designated by the AWA merchandise division committee on foreign trade zones.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2853. A bill to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift; with amendments (Rept. No 1277).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George W. Whitehurst, of Florida, to be United States district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida; and

Frank A. Hooper, of Georgia, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Georgia.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 3058. A bill for the relief of Nessie S. Widler; and

S. 3059. A bill for the relief of John J. Sebenick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3060. A bill for the relief of Petr Zenkl and his wife, Paula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3061. A bill for the relief of Dr. E. Gunnar Johansson; and

S. 3062. A bill for the relief of Alfred Theodor Ex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3063. A bill to allow additional credits for income-tax purposes in the case of persons reaching the ages of 75 and 85 years; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3064. A bill to increase annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 by 25 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3065. A bill to authorize loans to assist farmers in clearing cut-over timber lands; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3066. A bill for the relief of Dionisio Aguirre Irastorza; and

S. 3067. A bill for the relief of Andres Aguirre Irastorza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 3068. A bill for the relief of the adopted child of Lt. and Mrs. Neill C. Burnett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 3069, to establish a Bureau of Passports and Visas to be headed by a director, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 3070. A bill authorizing the naturalization of George Mikroulis; and

S. 3071. A bill for the relief of Maria P. Sigioltzakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 3072. A bill to provide benefits for members of the reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 3073. A bill for the relief of Sono Mary Theresa Nishimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request) introduced Senate bill 3074, to provide for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees separated from the service of the Federal Government or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3075. A bill for the relief of Evald Ferdinand Kask; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3076. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act; and

S. 3077. A bill for the relief of Shizu Fujii and her son Suenori Fujii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3078. A bill to define service of certain members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service;

S. 3079 (by request). A bill to define misconduct for compensation and pension purposes under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; and

S. 3080 (by request). A bill to provide allowance of death pension when death in service is denied service-connection; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 3081. A bill to provide for boundary adjustments of the Badlands National Monument, in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for Mr. PEPPER):

S. 3082. A bill for the relief of Erika Kuebart and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3083. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa J. Cason; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3084. A bill authorizing the erection of a monument to the memory of Henry Milton Brainard at Cape Arago Light Station in Coos County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3085. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of Nebraska over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations; and

S. 3086. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees under jurisdiction of the Winnebago Indian agency in Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 3087. A bill to authorize an appropriation for cooperation with the Gallup Board of Education, New Mexico, for the construction, extension, improvement, and equipment of school buildings to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. MAGNUSON introduced Senate bill 3088, to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration from the United States Tariff Commission to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

BUREAU OF PASSPORTS AND VISAS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Bureau of Passports and Visas to be headed by a director, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, and an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3069) to establish a Bureau of Passports and Visas to be headed by a director, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 153; 8 U. S. C. 201), be amended by adding a new section to be known as section 2A as follows:

"2A. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Passports and Visas to be headed by a Director with rank and compensation not less than that of an Assistant Secretary of State. The Director shall be a native-born citizen of the United States with not less than 10 years'

experience in the Foreign Service of the United States, and shall have attained at least class one in the Foreign Service. He shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(b) The functions of the Visa Division and of the Passport Division of the Department of State are hereby transferred to the Bureau of Passports and Visas and the functions of the Chiefs and other officers and employees of the Visa Division and of the Passport Division are hereby transferred to the Director for redelegation and redistribution by him in his discretion.

"(c) The Director shall have authority to maintain direct and continuous liaison with the Directors of Federal Bureau of Investigation, Central Intelligence Agency, and other internal-security officers of the Government for the purpose of obtaining and exchanging information in enforcing the provisions of this act in the interest of the internal security of the United States The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and the Director shall maintain direct and continuous liaison with each other with a view to a coordinated, uniform, and efficient administration of this act.

"(d) Within the Bureau of Passports and Visas there shall be a Visa Division and a Passport Division each to be headed by a Chief having at least 10 years' experience in administering the immigration and nationality laws. There shall also be a law officer designated to serve as general counsel of the Bureau of Passports and Visas who shall have authority to maintain liaison with the appropriate officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service with a view to uniform interpretation of the provisions of this act

"(e) Estimates of expenditures to be made by the Bureau of Passports and Visas of the Department of State shall be separately stated in the budgets submitted by the President for such Department; and appropriations for such Bureau shall be separately stated in all acts making appropriations for such Department and shall not be available for expenditure for any other function

"(f) The Director shall perform his duties under the general direction of the Secretary of State"

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR M'CARRAN

Mr President, I have today introduced a bill providing for the creation in the Department of State of a Bureau of Passports and Visas, to be headed by a Director, who will rank not lower and have compensation not less than that of an Assistant Secretary of State The introduction of this bill is prompted by the results of the testimony given before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Judiciary Committee by officers of the Department of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and other officers of the Government. It will be recalled that the Senate authorized the Judiciary Committee to make a study of the various provisions and operations of our immigration and naturalization laws.

We have heard testimony from the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, the Chief and other officers of the Visa Division, and we have studied the operations of the Passport Division, of the Department of State We have heard testimony from the Attorney General and officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and we have heard testimony from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. In the light of this testimony I have come to the unavoidable conclusion that there is something wrong in the present organization of the Department of State and I believe that Congress should step in and straighten out some of the organizational deficiencies which need attention at the earliest possible moment. It has been too easy for subversive aliens to obtain visas with which to apply for admission into the United States at ports of entry in this country, where they and their backgrounds are unknown to the immigration officials. We have also noted that certain American citizens with subversive or questionable records have been able to obtain American passports, with which they have proceeded abroad for purposes which obviously are not in the interests of the security and safety of the United States.

My inquiries and studies concerning the provisions and operations of our immigration laws have convinced me that there is urgent need for some amendatory legislation in advance of the completion of our study of the entire problem and the submission of a full report of our labors for the last 2 years. I have already introduced a bill (S 1632) on the substantive provisions of the law relating to the exclusion of subversives However, no provision of law that the Congress could write will solve the problem if the organizational set-up for its administration and enforcement is faulty

The results of my inquiries and study have been sufficient to convince me that the officers and employees of the Passport and Visa Divisions of the Department of State are handicapped by a defective organization setup. For many years both the Passport Division and the Visa Division of the Department of State functioned directly under an Assistant Secretary of State and maintained direct and continuous contact with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security and intelligence agencies of the Government, from which they obtained promptly and directly classified information relating to applicants for passports and visas. This information was analyzed by the experienced staffs and technicians of the Passport Division or of the Visa Division, depending upon whether the application was being made for a passport or for a visa, and the information was therefore brought directly to bear upon the decision reached on applications.

Mr. President, since the Judiciary Committee initiated its inquiries into the operational functioning of the Passport and Visa Divisions of the Department of State their long-established and direct contacts with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security and intelligence agencies of the Government have been abruptly terminated by directive of the higher officials in the Department of State My information does not indicate that the abrupt termination of contacts between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other agencies of the Government and the Passport and Visa Divisions was effected at the request, or the wish, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or of any of the other agencies, such as the Central Intelligence Agency, the military or the naval intelligence services

Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that this policy in the Department of State vitally affects our national and internal security. Can you imagine anyone in this day and time who is so oblivious to all considerations of our national security as to weaken the hands of those officers and employees of our Government who are trying to enforce the provisions of our law which exclude subversive aliens from this country? If the Kremlin had ordered this termination of contacts between the Passport and Visa Divisions and the security and intelligence agencies it could be no less fatal to our security.

Mr. President, let me recite some of the incidents which apparently led to this abrupt termination of direct contacts between the Passport and Visa Divisions of the Department of State and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security and intelligence agencies of the Government. You will recall that officers of the Visa Division testified before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1948. One of these officers was reprimanded by his superiors in the Department of State for telling the subcommittee the facts, which have been amply confirmed in the testimony of that officer's own superiors and other officers of the Government. We have established beyond a doubt that he was correct in saying that many subversive aliens were infiltrating into the United States. The Department of State, however, pretending not to know the facts, appointed a special committee of three private citizens to examine into this question. They submitted a wholly unrealistic report in which they denied the facts which have since been amply proven to be true, although the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization was denied access to any of the files of the Government in this instance.

However, the committee of three private citizens must have been disturbed in their own minds regarding the accuracy of the contents of their report. They must have figured that some day the true facts would certainly become known. They therefore included in their report to the Secretary of State the following statement:

"Your committee believes that existing administrative procedures, and the legislation on which they are based, are sufficient. The committee is not satisfied that practices under the outline of procedures are satisfactorily coordinated. This subject will be discussed in a subsequent memorandum to you, embodying certain suggestions which have occurred to your committee in the course of its inquiries."

Mr. President, I have seen no person who is willing to say what the suggestions were that occurred to the three-man committee which reported to the Secretary of State. The officers of the Visa Division say that they have never seen any record of the suggestions and have no idea what the suggestions were. However, I think we have the answer now. It appears that the abrupt termination of the direct contacts between the Passport and Visa Divisions and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security and intelligence agencies of the Government occurred soon after the three-man committee submitted its report.

Now I do not wish to give the Members of the Senate the impression that the Passport and Visa Divisions do not receive any information whatever from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security and intelligence agencies of the Government. They do receive some information from these sources, but it now comes through an intermediate office, called the Division of Security in the Department of State. When asked whether they are furnished by the Division of Security with all information received by that Division from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other agencies bearing upon applicants for passports or visas the officers of the Passport and Visa Divisions could not answer. How would they know? If asked whether the information had been edited or excerpted before reaching the Passport and Visa Divisions, the answer of the officers of the Passport and Visa Divisions would be the same. How would they know?

Mr. President, I have outlined a situation which could be considerably elaborated upon, but I believe that it is more important at this time to think in terms of a remedy for the faulty organizational structure which precludes the long-established direct contact between the Passport and Visa Divisions and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security and intelligence agencies of the Government.

Under the bill I have introduced there will be created in the Department of State a Bureau of Passports and Visas. The Passport and Visa Divisions of the Department will be reorganized under the Director of that Bureau. The Director will be required by statute to maintain direct and continuous contact with

the Directors of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, and with other security and intelligence agencies of the Government, as well as with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, to the end that every applicant for a passport or a visa may be adequately and expeditiously screened, insofar as it may be practicable to do so, before final action is taken on his application.

Mr. President, I have given some thought to the qualifications which should be required of the Director of the Bureau of Passports and Visas, and of the Chiefs of the Passport and Visa Divisions in that Bureau. Of course, the loyalty and ability of these officers should be beyond question. In view of what has happened I cannot be satisfied that the security of this country will be adequately protected from the infiltration of subversive and questionable persons unless we lay down in the law the requirements for appointment of the officers in charge of the Bureau and the divisions in it.

The Department of State took over the remaining functions and personnel of certain wartime agencies several years ago. The Federal Economic Administration, formerly Henry Wallace's Bureau of Economic Warfare, the Office of War Information formerly under Elmer Davis, the Lend-Lease Administration under Harry Hopkins, and the remnants of the Office of Strategic Services, were all taken over by the Department of State in a process of liquidation. Those who constitute the remnants of these liquidated agencies have been established in key posts in the Department of State. As they were trained to regard the Soviet Union as an ally instead of a cobelligerent it is quite naturally going to take some time for them to adjust themselves fully to the actual fact that Soviet communism is actually the enemy of the United States and of all free countries of the world.

Mr. President, to protect the internal security of the United States, I have introduced my bill to reorganize that part of the Department of State which is required to administer and enforce our immigration and nationality laws. I think a Bureau of Passports and Visas, organized to include the present Passport and Visa Divisions of the Department of State may accomplish the purpose.

SEVERANCE PAY TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL AND DISTRICT GOVERNMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees of the Federal Government and the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the bill and explanatory statement presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3074) to provide for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees separated from the service of the Federal Government or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) each officer or employee (including employees paid on an hourly or piece rate basis and employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates) in the service of (1) the executive branch of the Government, including the field service of the Post Office Department, (2) a corporation wholly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, or (3) the municipal government of the District of Columbia, who is involuntarily separated from such service, on or after the effective date of this act, not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency, shall be paid, immediately upon separation from such service, a sum as provided for in section (1) of subsection (b) (hereinafter referred to as "severance pay") by the department or independent establishment of the Government, or by the department or agency of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, with which he was employed immediately prior to separation.

(b) Such severance pay shall be in an amount equal to 1 day's basic compensation at the rate such officer or employee was entitled to receive immediately prior to separation, multiplied by the number of whole calendar months of that period of continuous service performed by him immediately prior to separation, but such amount shall not exceed 90 days' basic compensation at such rate.

SEC. 2. This act shall not apply to—

(1) any such officer or employee who is subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, or any other retirement law or system, and, at the time of separation from such service, has fulfilled the requirements of optional or automatic retirement under such act of May 29, 1930, or such other retirement law or system; and

(2) any such officer or employee who is entitled to receive compensation under the Federal Employee's Compensation Act, as amended, except an officer or employee entitled to receive any benefits under such act on account of the death of any other person.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month following the calendar month in which it is enacted.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

This bill provides for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees of the Federal Government and municipal government of the District of Columbia.

Officers and employees who are involuntarily separated from the service, not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency, shall be paid severance pay in an amount equal to one day's basic compensation for each whole calendar month of continuous service performed immediately prior to the employee's separation, not to exceed 90 days basic compensation, at the rate such officers or employees were entitled to receive immediately prior to separation.

Officers and employees who have fulfilled the requirements or who are entitled to receive compensation under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act will not be eligible to receive severance pay under the provisions of this bill.

Federal employees at the present time are not covered by unemployment compensation or severance pay and this legislation when enacted into law will not cost very much but will protect those employees who are let out of the service by reduction in force.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement by me explaining the meaning and purpose of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3088) to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration from the United States Tariff Commission to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 624), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall cause, on his own motion or on the motion of interested producers or processors, an immediate investigation to be made by the appropriate office or agency of the United States Department of Agriculture responsible for the administration of the affected program, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall specify.

"(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the Secretary of Agriculture finds the existence of such facts, he shall certify to the President such facts and the President may by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere

with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: *Provided,* That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 percent of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during a representative period as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture: *And provided further,* That in designating any article or articles, the Secretary of Agriculture may describe them by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other bases as he shall determine.

"(c) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States.

"(d) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever the Secretary of Agriculture finds and certifies to the President that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever the Secretary of Agriculture finds and certifies to the President that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section

"(e) Any decision, finding, or certification of facts and required fees or quantitative limitations of the Secretary of Agriculture under this section shall be final.

"(f) No international agreement hereafter shall be entered into by the United States, or renewed, extended, or allowed to extend beyond its permissible termination date in contravention of this section."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON EXPLAINING THE MEANING AND PURPOSE OF THE BILL AMENDING SECTION 22 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill amending section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. The bill conforms generally to two amendments I introduced last October when the so-called Anderson farm bill was before us. Most Senators will recall the debate on those amendments—debate culminating in Senate approval of one, by a vote of 44 to 28.

Section 22 of the AAA Act was designed by its authors to provide a means of protecting domestic agricultural producers—under certain circumstances—from ruinous imports Its machinery may be invoked through a proclamation by the President when imports threaten the efficacy of a marketing agreement, price support, school lunch, export subsidy, or similar farm program.

Section 22 has never been the effective safety valve its authors intended it to be. To the best of my knowledge, only two sets of domestic farm producers have ever been successful in obtaining the protection section 22 is designed to extend. The two sets of producers are growers of cotton and wheat. I have been unable to find a single case in which producers of a perishable agricultural commodity have been successful in obtaining action under section 22. Recent experience with imports dictates that the Congress either make section 22 an effective tool or write it off the books. There is no point in having a safety valve that doesn't work.

Since I argued this case here on the floor of the Senate in October, a number of incidents have occurred which demonstrate the soundness of the course of action I then implored the Congress to take. Let me cite two of them.

Last week newspapers throughout the country carried the story of Canadian potato imports. A shipload of Canadian potatoes reached New Orleans at a landed cost 10 to 15 cents per 100 pounds less than the support price on Maine potatoes in Maine. This is a repetition of what happened during the 1948 marketing season. During that period over 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes were imported from Canada at a time when this Nation was spending $200,000,000 to support the price to domestic growers.

I draw the second example from the experience of the apple industry. During fiscal 1949, apple imports amounted to about $5,750,000. During the identical period we exported apples valued at about $5,500,000. From the same crop we purchased for school lunches domestically grown apples valued at $4,500,000. It is obvious that school-lunch purchases from section 32 funds almost equaled the dollar value of apples imported.

I don't necessarily conclude that section 22 should have been invoked to stop these imports although many members of the industry urged such action. I do contend, however, that the machinery to deal with the situation should be sufficiently streamlined to permit such action should the facts so dictate

This bill proposes a streamlining of section 22. Here's what the amendment does: First, it transfers the fact-finding function from the Tariff Commission to the Secretary of Agriculture, thus, the Secretary will conduct the investigation of the effect of imports upon agricultural programs such as marketing agreements, school-lunch purchases, price supports, export subsidies, and similar programs. Second, he will recommend action to the President based on the facts developed through his investigation. Third, if the President concurs in the Secretary's recommendations, he may by proclamation impose either an import fee up to 50 percent ad valorem, or place a limitation on the quantity that can be imported of the commodity involved.

Under this bill, the Tariff Commission would be relieved of the responsibilities now assigned to it under section 22. The line of action would run from the Secretary of Agriculture to the President, instead of as is now the case, the Secretary of Agriculture to the President—the President to the Tariff Commission—the Tariff Commission back to the President.

In my judgment this is justified. The Secretary of Agriculture is charged by Congress with heavy responsibilities in connection with domestic production—when price support or similar programs are in effect. He should have parallel authority over imports, because domestic production plus imports constitutes the over-all supply with which the Secretary has to deal.

The President may or may not concur in the Secretary's recommendations, but at least under section 22, as I propose to amend it, the Secretary's recommendations would stem from his parallel responsibility on the one hand over domestic production, and on the other over imports of commodities which threaten to render ineffective a marketing agreement, price support, or similar farm program.

In addition, the bill amends subsection (f) of section 22. That subsection was added by the Eightieth Congress. It reads:

"No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party."

I propose that the emphasis be reversed. The section should be amended to read:

"No international agreement hereafter shall be entered into by the United States or renewed, extended, or allowed to extend beyond its permissible termination date in contravention of this section."

The issue here is simple, namely, shall the protection to agricultural producers and programs provided in section 22 be abrogated by an international treaty or trade agreement? Or to put it another way, shall the United States Government on the one hand say to the farmers of this country, "We have provided a safety valve against excessive and injurious imports through the medium of section 22," but on the other say to our foreign friends, "The trade agreement we are negotiating with you nullifies the effect of section 22."

In conclusion, section 22 should be streamlined if it is to be the effective tool its authors intended it to be. Subsection (f) should be reworded or repealed if we are to be honest with the farmers and taxpayers of this country and with our foreign friends.

May I add a postscript—by way of general comment—on my attitude toward trade agreements as they relate to the bill I have just introduced. I have consistently supported trade-agreement legislation. I see no inconsistency between that action and what I am here proposing.

The United States of America has been catapulted into world leadership. Reciprocal trade agreements are one of the media through which we seek to exercise that leadership. We do this because we believe freer trade will promote a higher standard of living in the world and will make a substantial contribution to world peace.

Reciprocal trade agreements cannot be negotiated under utopian circumstances. We can be idealists and still recognize the hard facts as they exist. If we were starting our trade-agreement policy with a completely clean slate we could remove all barriers, thereby adding immeasurably to the effectiveness of our world leadership and at the same time avoid wreaking irreparable damage upon specific industries and, therefore, upon selected groups of our own citizens.

Unfortunately trade practices and national policies over the last 200 years have encouraged patriotic, industrious American citizens to invest their energies and finances in enterprises to which the death knell would be sounded if a system of complete free trade were instituted world-wide, as of tomorrow morning. The practicalities of the situation demand, therefore, that the Congress and the executive branch, particularly the State Department, approach reciprocal trade in the light of things as they are.

I am not too much disturbed by the repeated accusations on the part of industry that the concessions we grant—as the leading Nation of the world—exceed in value the concessions we receive. Such is the price we pay for world leadership. I am extremely disturbed, however, over the apparent failure on the part of our negotiators to balance the international good we expect will emanate from a concession granted by us; against the immediate or prospective damage such concessions will wreak upon a domestic industry—the immediate and prospective damage such concessions will wreak upon a minor segment of our population.

I do not want to see the United States play the role of Uncle Shylock. Neither do

I want to see our reciprocal trade program jeopardized by those ardent free-traders who fail to recognize that steps toward our ultimate objective must be taken in a world where existing industrial and economic patterns demand consideration.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF BULLETIN ENTITLED "OCCUPATIONAL OUTLOOK HANDBOOK"

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a bulletin entitled "Occupational Outlook Handbook," and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me of the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Utah will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 74) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Bulletin No. 940 of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, entitled "Occupational Outlook Handbook," containing information on employment opportunities in occupations of interest to veterans and students, be printed as a Senate document, and that 3,300 additional copies be printed, of which 2,300 shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,000 shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and that the Bureau of Labor Statistics be requested to keep the information in this publication up to date.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. THOMAS of Utah is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

The Occupational Outlook Handbook gives information on employment opportunities in the major occupations and industries. It is used in vocational counseling of veterans and young people in schools who are trying to choose a field of work. The Nation spends billions of dollars on education annually; the information in the handbook helps young people to plan their courses of education to train them for jobs in which they will be able to find employment.

The handbook has been widely acclaimed by educational authorities in State school systems and colleges throughout the Nation. In its preparation, the Department of Labor had the cordial cooperation of thousands of business firms, trade associations, professional societies, and trade-unions in the various industries and professional fields.

Many Members of Congress have received requests for copies from schools and colleges in their States, but these requests can no longer be handled by the Department of Labor because the small supply originally printed for Department use is completely exhausted. The handbook is available from the Superintendent of Documents for $1.75, and many schools and private individuals have purchased it from this source. However, a great many State school systems have been unable to afford even this modest cost to equip each school in the State with a copy.

The purpose of this resolution is to print a supply of the Occupational Outlook Handbook for the use of Members of Congress in meeting requests coming to them from schools, colleges, and other organizations in their States which provide vocational guidance services to young people and to veterans.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOWNEY (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 75, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit certain amendments intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 75, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, as this is the last day on which amendments can be offered. If I were to make the statements necessary to explain the amendments, it would take a good part of the afternoon, and I do not desire to do that. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may offer the amendments, and have them printed in the body of the RECORD, together with explanatory statements respecting each amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the amendments and the statements referred to will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The amendments and statements are as follows:

Mr. McCARRAN Mr. President, at the outset of any discussion of the pending measure it should be clearly understood—and this fact should be borne in mind at all times—that whereas the title of the bill S. 75 speaks of "authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals," actually the main objective of the bill is to authorize the diversion of Colorado River water for an irrigation and reclamation project in central Arizona. It has been repeatedly pointed out, and correctly, that the Bridge Canyon Dam has no essential physical relationship with the central Arizona project. It is a means to that end, but not the only means; its usefulness in connection with the central Arizona project would be for the production of power to be used for pumping water nearly 1,000 feet high; and it has not been demonstrated that the proposed Bridge Canyon Dam would be the only possible source of such power. Indeed, it has not even been demonstrated, and it may be questioned whether it can be demonstrated that the proposed Bridge Canyon Dam would even be the cheapest source of such power.

This bill does contain authorization for construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam. It also contains various other authorizations and grants of authority, extremely broad in their nature. Indeed, in some respects the language of the bill is so vague that it is difficult to say just what it does authorize.

For example, the language contained in subparagraph (4) of section 1 (beginning on p. 2 of the bill, in line 22) and in subparagraph (4) of the same section (beginning on p. 3 of the bill, in line 3) is susceptible of being construed as a tremendous grant of power to the Secretary of the Interior. Construction of this legislative language, if enacted, will rest, in the first instance, with the Secretary of the Interior, and past experience leads us to believe that the language in question, under such circumstances, will not be narrowly construed.

The language of subparagraph (4) of section 1, referred to above, appears to embrace authority for the construction of steam plants for the generation of electrical energy without any limitation upon the number or capacity of such plants so long as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem such plants to be "incidental structures suitable for the fullest economical development of electrical energy generated from water at the works constructed hereunder." Senators will note the Secretary is not even required to find that steam plants are needed; he need only find that they are suitable. If it is not desired that the Secretary of the Interior be given authority to construct steam plants, this section of the bill should be amended, and I shall propose such an amendment when the proper time comes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2, in line 22, after the word "plants", insert the words: "(other than steam plants for the production of electrical energy)."

Mr. McCARRAN. Subparagraph (5) of section 1 is either very poorly worded, or very skillfully worded, depending upon whether it is intended to have any hidden effect. The language on page 3, beginning in line 4: "including interconnecting lines to effectuate coordination with other Federal projects" could be construed to refer to power transmission lines. I believe it would be so construed by the Secretary of the Interior. I believe it is intended that it shall be so construed. Under this language, so construed, the Secretary of the Interior would have blanket authority to construct a network of power transmission lines which would tie together the generators to be installed at the Bridge Canyon project, and those at Boulder Dam and at Davis Dam. He could even go further, and extend the interconnecting network to tie in the power production at the Shasta Dam in northern California. Construction of such a transmission line network has long been an objective of the Interior Department; and this bill, if enacted without amendment, could be deemed to give the authority for such construction, which has hitherto been denied by the Congress.

If there be those who say it would be a good thing to tie Boulder Dam power and Davis Dam power and Bridge Canyon Dam power together in a single system, so that power from Boulder Dam and Davis Dam might be supplemented with power from Bridge Canyon Dam, let me point out that there is nothing in the bill now pending before the Senate which would guarantee the accomplishment of that purpose. The objective of supplementing Boulder Dam power and Davis Dam power with power from Bridge Canyon Dam necessarily involves a flow of power from

Bridge Canyon Dam toward Boulder Dam and Davis Dam, and an allocation of Bridge Canyon power to be pooled with the power from Boulder Dam and Davis Dam. But power transmission lines work equally well in either direction; and it would be perfectly possible under the language of this bill, once such lines had been established connecting the three dams named, to turn the flow in the other direction, and take power from the Boulder Dam and Davis Dam projects, and allocate it for use or sale in connection with the Bridge Canyon project.

This would involve violation of contracts already in existence providing for the disposition of power from Boulder Dam; and in the opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada, that is exactly what would happen.

On the basis of the estimates of power revenues, prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, it seems perfectly clear that the Bureau intends to "firm up" Bridge Canyon power by supplementing it with power produced at Boulder Dam. Furthermore, it seems perfectly clear that the Bureau intends to accomplish this by simply transferring and crediting Boulder Dam power to the Bridge Canyon project, and to do this without charging any of the cost of the Boulder Dam to the Bridge Canyon project. Such a plan necessarily entails a totally unwarranted invasion of the rights of those who have contracted for power from Boulder Dam. The rights of the State of Nevada to power from Boulder Dam are thus threatened, and that is a matter which greatly concerns the senior Senator from Nevada.

Such an extremely broad grant of authority for the construction of power transmission lines, which subparagraph (5) of section 1 of this bill might be construed to grant, is unjustifiable and indefensible. If that is the way the bill is intended to be construed, then the bill should be defeated. If that is not the way the bill is intended to be construed, then the bill should be amended; and in order to give the Senate an opportunity to express its will on this point, I shall offer an appropriate amendment at the proper time.

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 3, in line 4, after the word "lines", insert the following: "(but in the case of power transmission lines, only when such lines have been specifically authorized by law and appropriations have been made therefor)."

Mr McCARRAN. The last proviso in section 8 of this bill (on p. 6, beginning in line 7) would give the Secretary of the Interior the absolute discretion to fix the repayment period for costs of the project. The only limitation placed upon this discretion would be that the repayment period to be fixed by the Secretary should not exceed the useful life of the project. The question of how the Secretary determines the useful life of the project would be left to the Secretary. He would not be limited to the period within which it is probable the reservoir to be created by this dam would be entirely filled with silt. That might be anywhere from 30 to 50 years, depending on whether Bluff Dam is constructed; and remember, the construction of Bluff Dam is prohibited under the Watkins amendment, which was adopted by the committee, and which consists of the matter in italics beginning on page 3 in line 20. In its estimates, the Bureau of Reclamation has talked about a 70-year repayment period; but there is nothing in the bill which would limit the repayment to 70 years. As a matter of fact, it seems perfectly clear that the project cost could not be repaid in 70 years, and that undoubtedly some longer period will be necessary. The Secretary of the Interior could make that period 100 years, or 150 years, or 500 years. I do not mean to be facetious, but there is nothing in this proposed law which would prevent the Secretary of the Interior from determining that the dam had a useful life of 1,000 years, or 2,000 years, and making the repayment period 10 centuries or more. I do not say that he would do it, but he could do it under the language of this bill. Furthermore, this bill applies the reclamation laws with regard to repayment, which means that during the entire period of repayment, whether it is 70 years, or 100 years, or 500 years, or whatever it is, no interest is to be charged on the construction cost. There may be good justification for such a provision in the case of a project which is to be repayable within 50 years, as the present reclamation law provides, but there is very little, if any, justification for it in the case of a repayment period which may be 2, or 3, or 10 times the period now provided for in the reclamation law Here, again, the bill needs amendment, and I shall offer an amendment at the proper time.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 6, in line 10, strike out the period at the end of the line and insert "with due regard for the probable reduction in capacity of the Bridge Canyon Reservoir by reason of silting, but not to exceed 70 years regardless of such determination."

Mr McCARRAN. Mr. President, it has already been pointed out that the Bridge Canyon Dam is in no way peculiarly a part of the central Arizona project, and it is certainly true that the central Arizona project is in no way necessary to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Bridge Canyon Dam. The Bridge Canyon Dam and central Arizona project are tied together in this bill because the construction of the dam will provide one means of generating the huge amounts of power necessary for the successful accomplishment of the central Arizona project. Personally the senior Senator from Nevada would much prefer, and believes that other Senators would much prefer, to see the Bridge Canyon Dam constructed as a separate entity. However, this bill as it now stands does provide for tying the Bridge Canyon Dam and the central Arizona project together, and it earmarks approximately one-third of the power to be generated at the Bridge Canyon Dam to be diverted for the uses and purposes of the central Arizona project. If that is to be done, Mr. President, it seems only right and fair that the rights of other States to the remaining power should be adequately protected. Accordingly, Mr. President, I propose to offer an amendment at the appropriate time providing that all of this remaining power shall be divided equally among the States of California, Nevada, and Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 4

On page 6, line 14, beginning with the word "sold," strike out all to and including the word "act," in line 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "for distribution in equal parts in the States of California, Nevada, and Utah."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it has already been pointed out in this Chamber repeatedly during debate that this bill contains provisions for unprecedented Federal subsidies amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. The amount which is used in the minority report, and which is referred to as an outright gift, is $850,000,000. If we are to authorize subsidies on any such scale—or, for that matter, if we are to authorize subsidies at all—we should write into the bill the strongest provisions we can to guarantee against land speculation or the unjust enrichment of those, if any there be, who may already have speculated in land in contemplation of the possible enactment of this measure. Fortunately we have a precedent in this regard, for provisions of this nature were written into the law when Congress authorized the reclamation of a large area in the Columbia Valley in connection with the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam. I propose to offer an amendment to this bill, following the lines of that precedent, which will remove incentive for speculation in the lands proposed to be irrigated under the project which this bill would authorize, and which will, to some extent at least, guard against unjust enrichment of any owners of such lands.

AMENDMENT NO. 5

On page 7, line 9, strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof a colon, and add the following provisos: "*Provided*, That every such contract shall require that all irrigable land held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of 40 irrigable acres and all county and State lands which may be irrigated under the said project shall be designated as excess land and as such shall not be entitled to receive water from said project. The contract shall provide further that no owner of such excess lands in the said project shall receive water therefrom for any part of the land owned by him if and so long as he shall refuse to sell any excess lands owned or held by him under terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and at prices fixed in the appraisals made and approved as herein provided. The Secretary of the Interior may require each landowner, as a condition precedent to receiving water from the said irrigation works, to execute a valid recordable contract wherein he shall agree to dispose of excess holdings then or thereafter owned by him in the manner provided in the contract between his district and the United States, and wherein the said landowner also shall confer upon the Secretary of the Interior an irrevocable power of attorney to make any such sale on his behalf. For the purpose of determining excess lands under the provisions of this section husband and wife shall be considered separate persons and each may hold not to exceed 40 irrigable acres as nonexcess lands or husband and wife together may hold 80 irrigable acres of community property as such nonexcess lands: *Provided further*, That in addition to the foregoing provisions, every such contract with any district shall also provide, with respect to all irrigable lands whether initially excess or nonexcess, that whenever any land is sold at a price in excess of the sum of the appraised value of the arid land, as determined by the Secretary, the appraised value of improvements made thereon after the date of the original appraisal, and the amount of irrigation construction costs actually paid for that land, then, before the new owner shall be entitled to receive water from the project, a proportionate part of the said excess or incremented value shall be paid to the United States as follows: If such payment is made to the United States more than 50 months after such sale at an excessive price has been made, then as a prerequisite to the right to receive water all of the incremented value shall be paid to the United States to apply on construction installments to come due on such land in inverse order of their accrual; if payment is made in less than 50 months but more that 49 months after the date of such sale, then 99 percent of such incremented value or excess of sale price shall be thus paid and applied; if payment is made in less than 49 but more than 48 months after the date of such sale, then 98 percent of such incremented value or excess of sale price shall be thus paid and applied, and so on for earlier payment allowing an additional reduction of 1 percent for each month, so that in the event that such payment is made to the United States within 1 month after the date of such sale, then the percentage of the incremented value required to be paid to the United States for application to construction costs as a prerequisite to the right to receive water shall be 50 percent thereof."

Mr. McCARRAN. The committee amendment to the bill contained in section 12, beginning on page 9, line 16, purports to accomplish the purposes of Senate Joint Resolution 4, by authorizing an original action in the Supreme Court to adjudicate claims of right to the use of waters of the Colorado River; and the succeeding section, which is section 13, also a committee amendment, purports to provide a measure of protection by deferring the construction of works required solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona until after water rights have been adjudicated under the provisions of section 12. There is grave doubt, however, whether the committee amendments actually do what they purport to do in this regard.

Section 12 contains no provision protecting the adjudication of Colorado River water rights by the Supreme Court, for which that section purports to provide, from being affected by other provisions of this proposed legislation. Since this whole measure will become law at the same instant, the act will necessarily be effective before any action can be brought under the provisions of section 12; therefore, section 12 should contain some safeguard against the possibility that this new law itself might be construed as limiting or coercing the action of the Supreme Court in adjudicating Colorado River water rights.

In connection with this danger, which I have pointed out, that the very enactment of this legislation might itself have a bearing on the adjudications of the Supreme Court with regard to Colorado River water rights, it is also necessary that sections 8 and 9 of the bill be amended, so as to make it perfectly clear that the Colorado River contract, the water-delivery contract between the United States and the State of Arizona dated February 9, 1944, the Mexican water treaty signed February 3, 1944, the protocol thereto dated November 14, 1944, and the understanding recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, are to be controlling as construed by the Supreme Court through the adjudication contemplated in section 12

Accordingly, I propose to offer amendments to sections 8 and 9 at the appropriate time.

AMENDMENT NO. 6

On page 8, ine 16, strike out the period, and add the following: "other than as they may be construed, modified, or affected by an adjudication of the Supreme Court under section 12 of this act"

AMENDMENT NO. 7

On page 8, line 25, strike out the period, and add the following: "other than as they may be construed, modified, or affected by an adjudication of the Supreme Court under section 12 of this act."

Mr. McCARRAN. During the debate on this bill, and, indeed, for a long time before this bill was introduced, there has been substantial controversy over the rights of the State of Nevada, and the rights of other States, to the use of water from the Colorado River. It has been the consistent contention of the State of Nevada, and of the senior Senator from Nevada, that under existing law, the State of Nevada is entitled absolutely to 300,000 acre-feet of water annually from Mead Lake, primarily for the production of power at Boulder Dam. Other States have made other claims, but I shall confine myself at this point to the claim of the State of Nevada. It has been stated, most irresponsibly, that Nevada has no such right to water from Mead Lake. The senior Senator from Nevada is not content that this bill should be enacted without protecting Nevada's right to water from Mead Lake.

I propose to offer an amendment to this bill, at the proper time, which will confirm Nevada's right to Mead Lake water. Because the 300,000 acre-feet per year to which Nevada is now legally entitled, under existing law, is by no means the full amount of water to which the State of Nevada has an equitable claim, the amendment which I shall propose will specify 1,000,000 acre-feet of water per year. I anticipate that other Senators, from other States, may wish to have this amendment modified so as to give protection to the claims of their respective States; and I shall be glad to entertain suggestions to that end, and to discuss the matter, either here on the floor, or privately, with Senators who are interested.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

On page 9, beginning with line 11, strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof a colon, and add the following proviso: *"Provided,* That any appropriation, control, or use shall be subject to the right of the State of Nevada to withdraw from Lake Mead 1,000,000 acre-feet of water per annum."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I referred a moment ago to the fact that section 12 of the bill before us is deficient because it contains no provision which will protect the Supreme Court, in its adjudication of actions brought under authority of this section, from the possible argument that Congress, by enacting other provisions of this very bill, has determined at least some of the issues involved. As I said before, section 12 should contain some safeguard against the possibility that this new law itself might be construed as limiting or coercing the action of the Supreme Court in adjudicating Colorado River water rights. Accordingly, I propose to offer an amendment on this point. This amendment, which complements the amendments, I propose to offer to sections 8 and 9.

AMENDMENT NO. 9

On page 9, beginning with line 16, strike out all to and including line 13, page 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 12. If any State or States within 6 months after the effective date of this Act shall begin a suit or suits in the Supreme Court of the United States to determine the right to the use of water for diversion from the main stream of the Colorado River through aqueducts or tunnels to be constructed pursuant to this act for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona, and to adjudicate claims of right asserted by such State or States or by any other State or States, based on any applicable compact, statute, priority, or treaty, consent is hereby given to the joinder of the United States of America as a party in such action or actions. Any State of the Colorado River Basin may intervene or be impleaded in such suit or suits. Any such claims of right affected by the project herein authorized and asserted by any defendant State, impleaded State, or intervening State under any compact, statute, priority, or treaty, or by the United States may be adjudicated in such action. In any such suit or suits process directed against the United States shall be served upon the Attorney General of the United States."

Mr. McCARRAN. Section 13 of the bill refers, on page 10, beginning in line 19, to "works authorized by this act which are required solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona." There may be some question whether this language includes the aqueduct from Lake Havasu to and connecting with the main canal and the pumping plants to raise water from Lake Havasu, which are authorized in section 1 of the bill. Certainly there should not be any such question, for it is obvious that these works are intended to be included in the language quoted. As a matter of fact, they are the primary works which are intended to be so included. But I say there "may be" some question whether they are included because the language of section 1, on page 4, does not in terms provide that these works are to be "solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona." What section 1 says, on page 4, is that these works are to be authorized "in order to provide a means of diversion of water from the Colorado River to the main canal pending the construction of said tunnel and said portion of the canal and"—now mark this language—"and for use thereafter as supplemental and stand-by works." I cannot conceive what use the Secretary of the Interior might decide to make of the aqueduct and the pumping plants except "for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona"; but if such other use can be found, however inappropriate and uneconomical it might be, the Secretary of the Interior would be in a position to contend that the works in question are not comprehended within the language of section 13. In fact, it might even be argued that, since section 1 contemplates that the canal and the pumping plants shall be used at some future time as "stand-by works," this means that they are not to be used solely and forever "for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona," and therefore that the works in question are not comprehended in the language of section 13.

Since it is clearly the intent that the construction of the canal and the pumping plants shall be deferred, pursuant to the provisions of section 13, until the adjudication of any suit or suits which may be brought under the provisions of section 12, and since it can do no possible harm to guard against a possible undesirable construction of the law, I propose at the proper time to offer an amendment which will leave no possible room for any construction different from the construction intended by the Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

On page 10, line 19, after the word "act", insert the following. "(including, but not by way of limitation, the aqueduct from Lake Havasu to and connecting with the main canal in the vicinity of Cunningham Wash, and the pumping plants to raise water from Lake Havasu authorized in section 1 hereof)."

Mr. McCARRAN. Section 13 of this bill is also poorly drafted in another respect. It purports to defer construction of certain works during the pendency of any action brought under section 12; but it would permit the period of deferral to end as soon as the court has handed down its opinion in the last of any suits so filed. This is a reasonable result only if the Court's decision gives Arizona enough water to make the central Arizona project feasible. Obviously, if the Court decides that Arizona does not have the right to enough water to make the project feasible, then the construction of works solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona should either be deferred indefinitely, until the plan can be revised in line with the Court's decision, or should not be authorized at all.

The report of the Bureau of Reclamation shows that the central Arizona project, as now designed, will require a water supply of approximately 1,200,000 acre-feet per year. Adoption of the amendment which I now send forward would mean that if the final adjudication of the Supreme Court shows an

available water supply materially less than 1,200,000 acre-feet per year, the project would be halted until it could be redesigned, and reauthorized by the Congress, to fit the available water supply, whatever that may be.

AMENDMENT NO. 11

On page 11, line 1, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "or in the event that final adjudication by the Supreme Court of any and all suits in which the United States shall be joined as a party under and by virtue of the consent granted in section 12 of this act fails to confirm the right of Arizona to an adequate and dependable supply of water from the main stream of the Colorado River for the irrigation and reclamation uses within Arizona contemplated by this act."

Mr McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amendments which I propose to offer, and which I have discussed here, are not suggested, and will not be offered, for any captious, or dilatory, or obstructive purpose. The sole purpose of these amendments is to improve the bill, to guard against possible improper construction at some future time, and to erect safeguards which fairness and equity dictate. There is a reason for each of these amendments, and I have stated those reasons. I am not sure, Mr. President, whether I can bring myself to vote for this bill in any event; but so long as there is any chance that this measure may be enacted by the Congress, I feel it my duty to seek to perfect the bill in every possible way, because the interests of the State of Nevada, which I have the honor to represent in this honorable body, are vitally concerned. I earnestly hope that any Senators who were not able to be present today to hear my explanation of these amendments will study the record, and familiarize themselves with the amendments between now and the date fixed for voting upon this bill.

BROTHERHOOD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY AT INTERDENOMINATIONAL BROTHERHOOD MEETING

[Mr SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Brotherhood," delivered by him before an interdenominational Brotherhood Meeting at the Synagogue of the Congregation B'nai Israel, of Elizabeth, N. J., on February 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY, WORLD DISARMAMENT, AND REVISION OF UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

[Mr WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a statement issued by him on February 19, 1950, together with a letter addressed by him to the Secretary of State, urging the State Department to request a poll of the United Nations regarding a new international conference on control of atomic energy, world disarmament, and revision of United Nations Charter, which appear in the Appendix]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE LODGE

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Lincoln Day address delivered by Representative JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of Connecticut, before the New Haven Republican Organizations' annual Lincoln Day dinner, February 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BROTHERHOOD IN AMERICA—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Brotherhood in America," published in the New York Times of February 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISSOURI BASIN—ADDRESS BY W. G. SLOAN

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by W. G. Sloan, chairman, Missouri Basin field committee, before the thirty-first annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., February 7, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC AND MILITARY PROBLEMS IN THE PACIFIC—ADDRESS BY GEN. WILLIAM J. DONOVAN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Gen. William J. Donovan on the occasion of the presentation to him by Columbia University of the Alexander Hamilton award, at the Ritz Carlton Hotel, New York City, on February 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEADERSHIP IN ASIA—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Leadership in Asia," published in the New York Herald Tribune for February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF COAL SUPPLIES IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, chapter 15 of the laws of 1950, State of New York, the text of "An act providing emergency measures for the control of coal supplies," approved by Governor Dewey on February 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIOGRAPHY OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a short biography of Susan B. Anthony, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT SPUD MUDDLE—LETTER FROM GEORGE B. BUCK

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to the Belfast (Maine) Republican Journal by George B. Buck, relative to the potato situation, which appears in the Appendix.]

POTATOES, POLITICIANS, AND ATOM BOMBS: AROOSTOOK COUNTY HAS DONE ITS JOB WELL—EDITORIAL FROM THE BANGOR (MAINE) COMMERCIAL

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Potatoes, Politicians, and Atom Bombs: Aroostook County Has Done Its Job Well," published in the Bangor (Maine) Commercial of February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

BROTHERHOOD WEEK—ADDRESS BY JOSEPH J. MORROW

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Prejudice: A Moral Problem," delivered by Joseph J. Morrow, personnel manager, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., of Stamford, Conn., before the Catholic Interracial Council of New York, on November 20, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

HISTORY OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE CARABAO

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the history of the Military Order of the Carabao, written by Commander Arthur Stanley Riggs, USNR, for the 1939 Wallow, and printed in the Army and Navy Journal of February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW GRAND PARAMOUNT CARABAO—ARTICLE FROM THE ARMY AND NAVY JOURNAL

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The New Grand Paramount Carabao," written by Carabao Robert Sherrod and published in the Army and Navy Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXPENSIVE "WILDCATS" — EDITORIAL FROM THE OIL CITY (PA.) DERRICK

[Mr MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Expensive 'Wildcats'," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

"HOUSING" IS A MISNOMER—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "'Housing' Is a Misnomer," published in the New York Times of February 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE CHINESE TRAGEDY—COMMENTARY BY W. EARL HALL

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio commentary entitled "America's Role in the Chinese Tragedy," by W. Earl Hall, managing editor of the Mason City Globe-Gazette, published in the Mason City Globe-Gazette for February 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PORTRAIT OF A STATESMAN—ARTICLE BY "REV. A. S. TURNIPSEED"

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Portrait of a Statesman," written under the pen name of "Rev. A. S. Turnipseed," published in the Montgomery (Ala.) Examiner for February 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROHIBITION OF INTERSTATE LIQUOR ADVERTISEMENTS

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Hon. Harlan M Calhoun, of Moorefield, W. Va., in regard to Senate bill 1847 prohibiting interstate liquor advertisements, which appears in the Appendix]

YOUTH RALLY ATTRACTS 2,000 WHITE AND NEGRO STUDENTS—ARTICLE FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Youth Rally Attracts 2,000 White and Negro Students," published in the Baltimore Morning Sun, Saturday, February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUDICIAL LEGISLATION: A THREAT TO CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BRICKER

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Judicial Legislation: A Threat to Constitutional Government," delivered by Senator BRICKER on February 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

IT'S FUN TO SPEAK YOUR PIECE, TOO

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a folder entitled "It's Fun To Speak Your Piece, Too," which appears in the Appendix.]

BIWEEKLY BROADCASTS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain biweekly broadcasts made by him during the month of February 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

SHOULD UTAH-IDAHO POTATO GROWER BE FARM SUPPORT "WHIPPING BOY"?—EDITORIAL FROM THE DESERET (UTAH) NEWS

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Deseret (Utah) News of February 15, 1950, entitled "Should Utah-Idaho Potato Grower Be Farm Support 'Whipping Boy'"? which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture dealing with the authority of the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and other officials of the executive branch to control imports and exports of agricultural commodities, which appears in the Appendix]

HOUSING LOANS—TELEGRAM FROM D. T. KIMBROUGH

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from Mr. D. T. Kimbrough, Jr., president of the Home Builders Association of Memphis, Tenn., concerning Senate bill 2246, which has to do with housing. I ask that the telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *February 17, 1950.*

Hon. K. D. McKELLAR,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Our home-building industry in Memphis produced over 6,000 homes here in 1949 under our free-enterprise system. This $36,000,000 per year industry has housed better than 70,000 Memphians and Shelby Countians in the four postwar years. As president of our association representing 150 home builders and associates, I respectfully urge you to direct your attention to Senate bill S. 2246 to come up for consideration on the floor of the Senate. We specifically ask your opposition to the following provisions which we feel are detrimental to the home-building industry: One, we are unalterably opposed to title 3 of S 2246 establishing cooperative housing with 3 percent loans for a 50- to 60-year period. Two, we are opposed to the provision providing three hundred million in direct Treasury loans through the VA. Three, we strongly oppose the elimination of 505 (A) VA-FHA combination loans and vigorously oppose the provision transferring more than 32,000 permanent Lanham Act housing units to local public housing authorities We urge you. support of provisions for the permissible mortgage limit of $7,600. Under section 203 (B) (2) (D) as now called for by the House bill and urge increasing the Federal National Mortgage Association appropriation by at least $1,000,000,000. We humbly ask your support of our position related to the amendments hereinabove.

D. T. KIMBROUGH,
President Home Builders Association of Memphis.

ALICE'S UNCLE IN BUREAU LAND—STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOWNEY

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, without reading, a statement of my own, entitled "Alice's Uncle in Bureau Land."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALICE'S UNCLE IN BUREAU LAND

(Mr. Ant, president of the Association of National Taxpayers, discusses the central Arizona project with Michael Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation)

(By SHERIDAN DOWNEY)

"Good morning, Mr. Straus. I can see that you are deep in a whirlpool of nonreimbursables," said the visitor.

Mr. Straus growled without looking up from his figuring. "Somebody around here has to find ways to make infeasibles look more like feasibles."

"I might agree, if I were you," said the visitor diplomatically. "As I understand it, you are planning to have the people spend $33,000,000 to recreate on the central Arizona project so you can charge the Treasury that much."

"Well?" glared Mr. Straus. "What's wrong with that?"

The visitor swallowed hard. "Let me introduce myself. I am the president of the Association of National Taxpayers * * * the ANTS, as we are known. Ha, ha, the hardworkers of the Nation. Just call me Mr. Ant."

Mr. Straus sat up straight, a gleam of hope in his eyes. "ANTS," he cried. "Ant control. How much do you suppose we could write off a reclamation project for ant control?"

'Probably you could write off a lot," said Mr. Ant. "If I may say so, you are very efficient at such work."

Mr. Straus smiled. "We have a good writing-off staff."

'Indeed," said Mr. Ant. "Especially with such things as fish and mountain lions and coyotes. I'm not forgetting recreation. My, but you are good at writing off project costs for recreation. And then there is interest. I expect there is no one in the country better at getting money out of the treasury without interest than you."

Mr. Straus waved a hand as if to dismiss the thought. "Oh, we seldom pay any interest for Federal money. We leave that to you people—the ANTS, isn't it?"

Mr. Ant put his umbrella and old battered hat on the floor beside his chair and sighed. "These are matters I'd like to discuss with you at length some time. Unfortunately I'm in a hurry this morning. I have to see some Senators about the central Arizona project, and——"

"Don't waste breath." Mr. Straus almost yelled "That project is all written off. The Treasury will get nothing——"

Mr. Ant swallowed so hard that Mr. Straus stopped speaking. There was an awkward silence, during which Mr. Straus grabbed his pencil and wrote off a million dollars from a Colorado project.

Mr. Ant regained his voice. "As I'm in a mood to pay a compliment," he said, "I may as well tell you that for sheer genius the write-offs of the central Arizona project are without equal."

"We'll do better," murmured Mr. Straus.

"It was a masterful performance," Mr. Ant went on. "As a taxpayer I would give anything. * * * I have left * * * to learn how you arrived at this peak of perfection. No one but a pure fiscal artist could have thought up such clever ways to keep the Treasury from being reimbursed. It's financial confusion of the highest order."

"You are too kind," Mr. Straus still murmured.

"Not at all," said Mr. Ant with some vehemence. "I believe you have written off at least $73,000,000 for fish propagation and recreation and such things. That's a world's record."

Mr. Straus only smiled, as if he was well aware of the fact.

"But the interest which the Treasury loses," Mr. Ant said with rising admiration. "It's inconceivable. If my figures are correct, the Treasury will lose more than a billion dollars in interest alone."

Mr. Straus frowned as if he were displeased. "Well, we had hoped to get more than that out of the Treasury, but there was a slight slip somewhere, I guess. The project only costs one and a half billions to build."

"And that's not paid back, either," said Mr. Ant with short breath.

"We're not in the paying-back business," Mr. Straus said firmly. "My point is, that we ought to be able to lose the Treasury more interest on such an amount than a mere billion."

"Your ambition overwhelms me," said Mr. Ant. He controlled his emotion. "You say that recreation benefits of the project are worth thirty-two million to the people How do you decide that?"

"Recreation is a great thing," said Mr. Straus.

"If you can get it," said Mr. Ant.

"We get it," said Mr. Straus. "Now, just think. We propose to build a great dam at Bridge Canyon for the central Arizona project. Bridge Canyon is one of the most awe-inspiring places on earth, and the most bleak. Nothing but burning desert all around it. A prairie dog wouldn't bury his mother-in-law there."

"Fine place for recreation," commented Mr. Ant. "Correct me if I'm wrong, but I thought the President vetoed reclamation projects with recreation benefits."

"Oh, well, he did," admitted Mr. Straus. "But he doesn't understand these things yet."

"Maybe I'm the same as the President, in that respect," said Mr. Ant. "Do you suppose you could explain it to me?"

"Do you have to have everything explained?" growled Mr. Straus.

"I'm only asking," answered Mr. Ant meekly.

"Well," said Mr. Straus as if he were talking to an inferior, "it's like this. Please pay attention. We believe that benefits to the Nation from recreation in this ghastly desert place are as follows: $687,600 for travel value, and * * *"

"Horse and buggy?" asked Mr. Ant. "There are no roads there."

"Somebody will have to build roads," snapped Mr Straus. "Travel value is based on our belief that 500,000 people will go to Bridge Canyon each year."

"What for?" asked Mr. Ant.

"To travel," said Mr. Straus. "And the travel value is what they spend to get there."

"Suppose they go some place else," suggested Mr. Ant.

"For heaven sake, stop interrupting," said Mr. Straus.

"I'm sorry," said Mr. Ant. "But what is the theory of travel benefit?"

"The greater the distance, the greater the benefit," said Mr. Straus. "Now, if this theory is applied to projects in general, it comes clear. If it's twice as far to one project as to another, the first project would have twice as much written off for travel benefit as the second. Is that plain?"

"Very," said Mr. Ant, and wiped his glasses.

Mr. Straus seemed satisfied. "Now we come to per diem value. That amounts to $660,000 a year for Bridge Canyon."

"Per diem for whom?" said Mr. Ant fearfully.

"Listen to him," scoffed Mr. Straus. "We figure that 20 percent of the visitors will stay one night, and 5 percent will stay longer."

"Where will they stay? Will there be hotels?" asked Mr. Ant.

"Somebody has to build a hotel," said Mr. Straus, and went right on. "That makes a total of 150,000 visitors, and each * * *."

"I thought there would be 500,000 visitors * * *." Mr. Ant began.

"For goodness' sake, let me finish," said Mr. Straus crossly. "Each will spend $4.40, or a total of $660,000 a year. There you have the per diem value."

Mr. Ant looked a little dizzy.

"Now we come to recreational value," Mr. Straus continued. "We figure this is about 20 cents each."

"Twenty cents," repeated Mr. Ant. "These aren't very high-class visitors, eh?"

Mr. Straus glared at him. "Leave class out of this. Recreational value at 20 cents each amounts to $100,000 a year. So * * * now we come to general value, and that's worth $269,000 a year. We arrive at this amount by figuring that general value is made up of 20 percent of travel value plus 20 percent of per diem value. Altogether that makes about $1,700,000 a year. Then you simply figure that over a 70-year period, which is the amortization period of Bridge Canyon Dam. That comes out $33,000,000."

"Who does it come out of?" asked Mr. Ant. His mouth was dry, but he managed to speak. "That's what the Treasury pays out for recreation at Bridge Canyon, the desert waste where there are no accommodations, no roads, no hamburger stands * * * only a few coyotes and prairie dogs."

"Don't be petty," said Mr. Straus critically. "What's the Treasury for?"

"I'm beginning to wonder," Mr. Ant said frankly.

Mr. Straus' face brightened. "But I haven't told you about the fish yet. Boy, fish are wonderful things for write-offs."

"What kind of fish?" Mr. Ant asked, somewhat recovering his sense of reasoning.

Mr. Straus waved his arms "Fish, fish, gentle fish. Who cares? In a write-off a fish is a fish We wrote off about three million for fish for Bridge Canyon Dam."

"They may not like it," suggested Mr. Ant.

"Never mind that," said Mr. Straus. "We like it. There will be a lake behind the dam, you know. The people who come there to recreate will catch fish."

"Three million dollars worth?" asked Mr. Ant. "That would be good fishing. But maybe they won't like to fish?"

"They have to like it," said Mr. Straus with finality.

"Maybe the people would rather go someplace else," said Mr. Ant.

"They won't be allowed to," said Mr. Straus, pounding his desk. "Look here, don't you start to sabotage this scheme. This is a benefit to the Nation."

Mr. Ant appeared to have found new courage. "I was just thinking that if the people didn't go to Bridge Canyon Dam to spend their money they might spend it someplace else, or they might buy shoes, or maybe cigars, and that would be a national benefit, too."

"Rubbish," scoffed Mr. Straus.

"Well," said Mr. Ant. "Something is bothering me. You say the fish are worth three million in the lake. How do you figure how many fish will be in the lake if they are not all caught?"

"More rubbish," said Mr. Straus. "We figured how many fish will be in the top foot of water. That's conservative figuring. We know that these fish will be worth about 50 cents a pound. There you have your total."

"You mean if a visitor catches a fish he can sell it to the Government and get his money back?" asked Mr. Ant.

Mr. Straus jumped up. "I've had enough of this nonsense," he roared. "Here we are trying to benefit the Nation, and you'd think we were trying to swipe $2,000,000,000 from the Treasury, to hear you talk. You taxpayers make me sick."

Mr. Ant looked sick. "I must be going," he said weakly. "I just reminded myself that the central Arizona project takes a couple of billion dollars from the Treasury and doesn't pay it back."

"Ha, ha," laughed Mr. Straus. "Maybe you'd like to talk about the billion dollars in interest the Treasury doesn't get back. That's really something." He grabbed up a pencil. "Look, let me explain about the interest——"

But Mr. Ant, his face white with horror, had grabbed up his hat and umbrella and was staggering out the door.

DEATH OF J. C. NICHOLS, OF KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, this country lost a great public-spirited citizen when J. C. Nichols, of Kansas City, Mo., died on February 16.

Mr. Nichols was one of the leading community developers in the United States. He was a unique combination of a man of vision and a man of action. The Country Club district in Kansas City, which he planned and developed, is world famous. There are few cities of large size in this country that in one way or another have not felt his genius. The physical aspect of many of them has been changed through the influence of his ideas.

Mr. Nichols contributed to the planning of the city of Washington as it is today. Its beauty, efficiency, and orderly arrangement is in no small measure due to his skill and foresight. He served as a member of the National Park and Planning Commission for 22 years. He was appointed to the Commission in 1926 by President Coolidge. His tenure of service continued through the administrations of Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman. During this time Mr. Nichols made approximately 150 trips from his home in Kansas City to Washington. Like the other members of the Commission, this was without pecuniary compensation.

I believe it is fitting that the unselfish service to his country of this able and patriotic citizen be made a matter of public record in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, Kansas lost one of its outstanding native sons in the death of J. C. Nichols February 16, 1950.

Born in Olathe, Kans., in 1880 and educated in Kansas schools, he became one of the leading citizens of Greater Kansas City. He had as much to do with the progressive development and growth of Kansas City as any other man.

The Country Club district of Kansas City is one of the outstanding examples of city planning in the United States. For many years Mr. Nichols was engaged in the creation in Greater Kansas City of perhaps the most beautiful and modern residential district in America. The Country Club Plaza district is one of the monuments to the accomplishments of this great man.

Mr. Nichols received national recognition by his appointment to the National Cap'tal Park and Planning Commission, a position he held for 22 years. He was often called the father of city planning in the West.

His death brought to a close a full, active, and useful life. It is fitting that we pay tribute to this great citizen of Kansas, Missouri, and the Nation. He was truly a national figure.

SOCIAL SECURITY VERSUS RAILROAD RETIREMENT MONTHLY BENEFITS—A COMPARISON

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a few days ago I inserted in the RECORD two tabulations comparing certain aspects of the social-security and railroad-retirement plans. I would now like to have inserted another tabulation entitled "Exhibit C," presenting some further comparison between the benefits to be provided under these two retirement systems.

It is important to remember that railroad employees pay out 6 percent of their wages to secure the benefits provided under the Railroad Retirement Act, whereas employees covered by social security at present pay only 1½ percent and even under the proposed rising scale of tax rates will never pay more than 3¼ percent. In other words, railroad employees today pay four times as much and in the future will always pay twice as much. They receive benefits which are generally less than those under the provisions of the proposed revision of the social-security system.

From these figures it is obvious to me that either railroad employees pay too much or social-security employees pay too little, or else the benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act are too small or the benefits under the Social Security Act are too large. I do not know which, but I certainly believe we have a responsibility to bring tax rates and benefits under the two systems more nearly in line.

EXHIBIT C.—*Social-security versus railroad-retirement monthly benefits—a comparison*

	Social security, 1950	H. R. 6000, social security proposed	Railroad retirement, 1950
Maximum retirement benefits possible			
For old age	$45 60	$64 40	$144 00
Wives	22.80	32.20	0
Husband and wife	68 40	96 60	0
Dependent child	22.80	32 20	0
Total	(91. 20)	128 80	144 00
Maximum	85.00	150 00	144 00
Average retirement benefits:			
For old age	26.00	46.30	84. 28
Wives	13.00	23.15	0
Husband and wife	39.00	69 45	0
Dependent child	13 00	23 15	0
Total	52.00	(92 60)	84. 28
Maximum	------	78. 00	------
Maximum survivor benefits possible:			
Aged widows	34. 20	48. 30	40. 61
Widows with children	34 20	48 30	40 61
Children	22 80	48 30	27 08
Total	57 00	96. 60	67. 69
Maximum	85. 00	150. 00	108 30
Parents	22. 80	48. 30	27 08
Average survivor benefits:			
Aged widows	20 62	37 40	29. 27
Widows with children	20. 83	37. 40	26. 85
Children	13. 03	28. 70	16. 60
Parents	13. 64	28. 70	15. 98

EXHIBIT C.—*Social-security versus railroad-retirement monthly benefits—a comparison*—Continued

	Social security, 1950	H R. 6000, social security proposed	Railroad retirement, 1950
Credit for military service performed during World War II	None	$160 00	$160 00
Disability insurance benefits	None	(1)	(1)
Amount a beneficiary may earn in covered employment without loss of benefits	$14 99	50 00	25 00
Maximum monthly retirement annuity awarded at age 65 after 5 years of coverage	42 00	72 00	24 00

1 Permanent and total disability.

Source Rail Pension News, published by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Pl., Chicago 43, Ill

The above exhibit C has been submitted to the Senate Finance Committee now holding hearings on H R 6000 for their study and consideration that rail workers should receive the same ratio of increases in benefits now proposed or those covered by social security and has been submitted by Mr Thomas G Stack, president of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc (a voluntary organization of union and nonunion rail workers) February 1950

BORING FROM WITHIN—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA (NEBR.) WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Boring From Within," published in the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald of February 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BORING FROM WITHIN

Recent events suggest that the Missouri Valley Authority advocates have switched to the tactics of boring from within.

The old issue of sufficiency of water, and who gets it, has been raised again. It has been presented by the Governors of Montana and Missouri. This could be more than coincidence Montana and Missouri are the chief spawning ground of MVA propaganda.

Governors Bonner, of Montana, or Smith, of Missouri, are serving their first terms, and are not as familiar with the background of Missouri Basin development as older members of the committee. We believe they are acting sincerely, but surmise they have been getting bad advice from people who don't want to see the valley development proceed the way Congress has determined it should.

These people, badly beaten in every attempt even to get a hearing for their authority plan in Congress, are trying to fan the old feud between the upper and lower regions of the Missouri Valley.

That original quarrel was between irrigation and navigation interests Congress satisfied the irrigation interests when it amended the Flood Control Act of 1944 to give irrigation priority over navigation in the use of water arising in States "wholly or in part" west of the ninety-eighth meridian. This, in effect, assures all irrigable portions of the Missouri Basin that they will not be deprived by navigation of any water they need for irrigation or other beneficial consumptive uses. That should satisfy the present Montana Governor as it satisfied his predecessor and the Montana water board.

Navigation doesn't figure in the attempt to revive the feud. Instead, the complaint is heard from Missouri that the upper States may take so much water that there won't be enough to satisfy downstream needs for drinking purposes and sanitation.

This ignores a public health survey which advised that about 1⅓ million acre-feet of water in the Missouri River below Sioux City would be adequate for drinking supply and sanitary purposes during the winter season when water normally would be stored for the following irrigation and navigation seasons. That is only about one-sixteenth of the average annual flow of the river at Sioux City. And it probably is less than the amount that would be released in power production anyway.

It ignores also a fundamental precept of water law and policy—that rights to water necessary for health and sanitation have first call.

The Montana and Missouri arguments, lumped together, make a weak wedge for any one to try to drive into the co-operative efforts of the Missouri Basin States to retain direction of the basin development with a minimum of Federal master-minding.

But they also show to what lengths the disciples of Washington totalitarianism are driven in their campaign to wreck Missouri Basin unity for the Pick-Sloan plan.

INVESTIGATION OF NATION-WIDE GAMBLING—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have issued a statement on the importance of an investigation of interstate gambling and racketeering activities. I believe such an investigation would have a tremendous salutary effect, and could lay the groundwork for revisions in our obsolete anticrime laws.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement I released be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that it be followed by a brief, clear-cut editorial endorsing this general idea, published in the January 1 issue of the Milwaukee Journal.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY SUGGESTING JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE INTERSTATE GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES

I believe that there is an excellent chance that the Senate Judiciary Committee will act on some version of legislation for a thorough investigation of interstate gambling and racketeering activities It is quite obvious to Members of Congress and the Department of Justice that present legal weapons available against the multi-billion-dollar crime syndicates are hopelessly obsolete. This holds true, particularly for our puny "popgun" methods of coping with gambling syndicates which rely on interstate wire and telephone facilities for their widespread operations.

It is quite obvious too that the Federal Treasury is losing literally billions of dollars in potential taxes because of the secrecy of income gained through the underworld's "take" in gambling, slot-machine and related activities. At the same time, it is obvious that no investigation will achieve real results unless it rips into the rotten heart of the tie-up between gambling syndicates and crooked politicians in State capitals and city halls. Merely arresting a few "tin horn" gamblers has been done too many times, while the real "big shots," well protected by tie-ins with crooked officeholders, have invariably escaped the net.

I believe that Senator KEFAUVER is to be congratulated for sponsoring the racketeering investigation idea. Necessarily, however, it would have to be taken up in its turn on the already crowded docket of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I suggest specifically that my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee look very earnestly into the question of authorizing a joint Senate-House committee to investigate interstate gambling and racketeering, rather than a Senate Judiciary subcommittee alone. The reason for that is this: There is a tremendous amount of waste motion involved, if we in the Senate hold hearings, suggest legislation and then if the House holds almost identical hearings to evaluate our proposals. It is important that we concentrate all our facilities against the big shots and that we mobilize the full weight of the FBI and other investigators in this process. It is essential, too, and I am sure my colleagues will agree, that this investigation not degenerate into a headline-hunting expedition which would barely scratch the surface of countless underworld activities.

Any investigation must proceed with the full cooperation of State and municipal officials in law enforcement work. Moreover, it will come to naught unless we strive toward a public awakening of the evils of gambling and a public crusade for effective enforcement of existing State and local laws. The Federal Government cannot do the job alone.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 1, 1950]

CONTROLLING INTERSTATE GAMBLING

It may be hoped that the Senate will adopt the proposal of Senator KEFAUVER (Democrat, Tennessee) that organized gambling in the country be investigated. There is evidence that national gambling syndicates are spreading their activities in the larger cities of the country. It is known, too, that they operate in such fashion that they often become entrenched before responsible local people know of their presence. Once organized in a city, it is extremely difficult to get rid of them.

In such a situation, a national study looking to a national remedy is indicated In this connection it is well to remember that kidnaping and the white-slave traffic continued as serious problems until Congress, alarmed at the growing menace, passed Federal control measures.

Where there is an interstate angle there can be a Federal remedy. There is reason to suppose that, if Congress took an interest in the matter, gambling syndicates could be as well controlled as drug traffickers now are. Somehow Federal courts seem to be able to carry out the intent of control laws better than some of our State courts.

EVERYBODY WANTS SOMETHING POSITIVE—EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, recent proposals by my distinguished colleague [Mr. TYDINGS] and the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], looking toward improvement in the current arms competition, have found a receptive ear among our people generally.

The attached editorial from the Baltimore Morning Sun of Saturday, February 18, is an example of the conviction so widely felt and expressed as the need of something—anything—positive that might possibly be done in the interests of heading off conditions likely to produce another world-wide conflagration.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Baltimore Morning Sun of Saturday, February 18, be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERYBODY WANTS SOMETHING POSITIVE

Not content with Secretary Acheson's careful statement of the reasons why he considers peace negotiations with Soviet Russia impossible just now, Senator TYDINGS has repeated his plea for a world-wide disarmament conference. Like Mr. Churchill, he feels that an approach to Russia would not do any harm. Like Senator MCMAHON, he considers that a bold gesture of some sort is necessary to stop the course of events. Such a disarmament conference would at the worst, he believes, tell the world who was responsible for failure.

Whatever one may think of the specific suggestions of Senator Tydings, Senator McMahon, and Mr. Churchill, these three men unquestionably have a point. If we look back over the tangled story of the postwar years, we find that our most notable diplomatic successes have been the result of certain simple and dramatic decisions. Each of them is asking, in effect, for another simple and dramatic decision.

The so-called Truman doctrine was the first of these. We decided that a Communist conquest of Greece and the continued pressure of Soviet Russia on Turkey could not be tolerated. We took certain steps. As a result, Greece was not conquered, and the pressure on Turkey was relaxed.

Another was the establishment of the air lift. The Russian tactic of isolating Berlin was met by the decision that if the western sectors of Berlin could not be supplied by ground transportation they would be supplied by air transportation. The simplicity of this decision obscured its brilliance and daring. It was responsible for a diplomatic victory of incalculable importance.

The third was the Marshall plan. It is easy to forget now how rapidly the state of affairs in western Europe was disintegrating in 1946 and 1947. The simplicity of General Marshall's idea, again, concealed in some degree its brilliance and its daring. The Marshall plan has not done everything that was hoped of it. But it stopped the disintegration of western Europe

Today people are tremendously concerned about Asia and the atomic armaments race. What about them?

The best that Secretary Acheson feels able to offer is a program, at once tedious and nerve-wracking, of methodically opposing every Soviet Russian move with a countermove, of reinforcing weak spots, plugging holes, concentrating on specific situations as they develop. As he says:

"This road is a very long one and a very difficult one. It takes purpose, continuity of purpose, perseverance, sacrifice, and it takes, more than almost anything else, very steady nerves."

But, under a popular government, a policy which depends above everything else on "steady nerves" is the most difficult of all to "sell" as well as to administer. Under popular government, people need something more than admonitions to be patient and to prepare for sacrifices. They need evidence that the patience leads somewhere, and that the sacrifices will yield tangible successes.

"Where are we heading?" they ask. "Just what is our policy, anyway?"

It is the vagueness and flexibility and obscurity of our present policy, the lack of a definite goal that everybody can understand, that leads such men as Senator TYDINGS and Senator MCMAHON and Mr. Churchill to speak out for something definite—an atomic-energy meeting, a world disarmament conference, a world-wide Marshall plan—anything that will somehow bring the boil to a head and yield relief. In their specific suggestions, these three men may be wrong. But they are right in sensing that something positive is needed to balance the negative virtues of perseverance, sacrifice, and steady nerves.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF MEMBERS OF THE JAPANESE DIET

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on the twentieth day of January last, Gen. Douglas MacArthur sent to the majority leader of the Senate the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 20, 1950.*
Hon. SCOTT LUCAS,
Majority Leader,
United States Senate,
(Report delivery Washington D. C.)

A delegation from the Japanese National Diet will shortly visit Washington in the course of a tour of the United States to observe on the American scene our concepts of democracy in action. This group CMA representing a legislative body patterned in form very much after our own CMA seeks orientation of Japanese thinking from a practical view of American legislative procedures as evolved through their historical development. I shall be most grateful for any assistance which you and other Members of the Senate may give to this delegation which will serve to guide and encourage the progress of representative Government in Japan and further our national aims underlying the occupation.

Cordial regard.

MACARTHUR,
SCAP, Tokyo, Japan.

On the 26th day of January last, in reply to the telegram, and also in line with a visit made by officers of the Army to my office, I sent the following telegram:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D C., January 26, 1950.
General of the Army DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
Supreme Commander, Allied Powers,
APO 500, Care of Postmaster,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR GENERAL MACARTHUR: Tracy S. Voorhees, Under Secretary of the Army, called at my office recently and advised me that a delegation from the Japanese National Diet will shortly visit this country, appearing at the State capitals and the Capital of the United States.

I advised Mr. Voorhees I should be most happy to show these gentlemen every Senatorial courtesy, which will help them develop the kind of interest in representative government we so desire.

With every good wish, I am,
Yours very sincerely,
SCOTT W. LUCAS.

Mr. President, when these gentlemen left Japan, General MacArthur made a very notable address. I shall not take time to read it to the Senate, but I hope every Member of the Senate will read the memorable address General MacArthur made to the delegation of the Japanese Diet immediately before their departure from Japan to the United States of America. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by General MacArthur may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As leader and active participants in the most peaceful political transformation ever effected by any country, east or west, you represent the new Japan, which places its faith in the sovereign will of the people rather than in dictatorship of the few. Most of you began your Diet careers following the surrender. All of you resisted the single-party system imposed upon your country by the discredited leadership of the past. I wish to congratulate you and your colleagues upon the signal success you have achieved in making genuine representative government a reality. At the outset, I had confidence in the ability of the people to understand, cherish, and defend the liberties and dignity they won only at the staggering cost of war and defeat. Now after six sessions of the National Diet under the new constitution, my confidence in the true self-governing spirit of the people is stronger than ever. As their agents, you have given every indication of being able to fulfill the three basic functions of a representative assembly, making laws, supervising the administration of laws, and looking after the diverse individual and group interests of the people. In your new Diet law, you incorporated many of the salient features of the United States Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. I distinctly recall that shortly after the Diet law was enacted about 3 years ago, the speaker at that time, Mr. Yamazaki, chairman of this delegation, proposed the study mission that you are now undertaking. I recommended then that more could be gained from a study of this nature after the Diet had had practice with its new procedures. You are now in a position to observe and evaluate the United States Congress and State legislatures against the background of much experience. You can concentrate on the letter and spirit of those American legislative practices which are essential to your needs and thereby accomplish much more than you might have at an earlier date. From the cordial and sympathetic discussions you have had with numerous delegations of United States Congressmen in your own Diet building, you may take for granted the hospitable treatment and generous assistance you will receive in the United States. Representative democracy is much more than popular elections and the assembling of successful candidates in legislative halls. The essential thing is that the people themselves rule, that legislators are the people's servants, reelecting and carrying out the people's will, that the combined wisdom of all is sounder than the arbitrary dictates of the few. This is the most difficult form of government. It imposes a burden of responsibility upon all citizens and encourages them to observe the conduct of their legislative agents. For over 300 years, Americans have conducted their affairs through popularly elected local assemblies, and for more than 150 years the United States has conducted its far-flung and ever-expanding affairs through a National Congress of State and district representatives. I urge you to observe closely the attitude of typical Americans toward their representatives and especially the attitude of elected representatives toward the desires and opinions of their constituents; and upon your return I urge you to inform your constituents and your colleagues concerning your observations of the fundamental spirit which underlies representative democracy in America at all levels.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as majority leader of the Senate, I am certain I speak in behalf of all Members of this deliberative body when I say that we are very happy that these gentlemen have come from far-away Japan to study our form of government, not only in the Nation's Capital, but in various State capitals of the United States.

We are deeply indebted to General MacArthur for having arranged the trip. In the General's message it will be found he says that this delegation from the Japanese Diet, now in America, individually resisted the single-party system imposed upon them by the party in power at the time of the attack upon

Pearl Harbor. This statement is of extreme impo tance to Members of this body, who have been elected by the people. Mr. President, we are the people's servants. It is our duty to carry out their will. It is under this system of free government, that our great country has advanced to the true leader in world affairs. I hope that our distinguished visitors will understand we greet them in the spirit of sympathetic cooperation, that their stay in the country will be a happy and profitable one in the interest of a representative democracy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL Mr. President, as one who sits for the moment in the seat of the minority leader, I join with the majority leader in welcoming these gentlemen from Japan. I may also say that, as a Senator from Massachusetts, and as one who reads the Boston newspapers very regularly, I am glad to welcome them. I do not agree with the action of the Boston City Council, which has been given such broad publicity. I hope that our visitors, thrcugh the other functions they were able to attend in Massachusetts and through their visits to other places in the State, were able to dispel from their minds any feeling that the reception given them in the city of Boston by the city council was indicative of the general attitude of the Massachusetts' citizenry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should merely like to join with the able majority leader and the acting minority leader in expressing a word of welcome to the delegation that is here. During November and December it happened to be my privilege to be in Japan and to visit both houses of their Parliament. As a Senator of the United States representing the State of California I received a most cordial welcome in both houses of the Japanese Parliament, and had the opportunity of meeting the very fine and able group who are carrying on the democratic processes in Japan. I join with the majority leader in expressing a real welcome to these distinguished representatives of the Parliament of Japan on the occasion of their visit to our legislative body.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am glad to join with the majority leader and with my colleagues from Massachusetts and California in this word of welcome. I was in Japan during the month of September of the past year. With General MacArthur, I had the privilege of meeting the leadership in the Japanese Diet, both in the council, which corresponds to our Senate, and in the house itself, which corresponds to our House of Representatives. I had the privilege of talking with the president of the council and with the speaker of the house, and I was very much impressed with the cordial feeling existing between their group and those of us who represented the Congress of the United States. I am happy as a Senator from New Jersey to reciprocate the expression of welcome I received in Japan by joining in extending to our distinguished friends from Japan this word of welcome.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I, too, join with the majority leader and other Senators who are welcoming members of the Japanese Parliament on their visit to the Senate of the United States. I also desire to pay tribute to one particular Senator. I think the attitude of all the Senators is noble, but I want to pay tribute particularly to the laudable purpose and the fine citizenship displayed in the noteworthy gesture made here today by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. It has touched me deeply.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as one of the Senators from the State of New York, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by my colleagues who have spoken before me. I deeply hope that the time may not be distant when Japan will be equipped to take a place in the great family of free democratic nations. I am very glad, on behalf of the State of New York, to welcome our visitors from Japan.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, first, I desire to commend General MacArthur for having sent this delegation to America to study our form of government. Next, I am very proud, when I read his statement, to note that he instructed them to be sure to visit South Carolina and also New York on their tour. I know that when these gentlemen from Japan went to South Carolina recently they received proper recognition and a demonstration of good old southern hospitality, which can only be extended by South Carolinians. I want to join our majority leader in what he has said today in welcoming these gentlemen.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I should like to lift my voice in consonance with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I want to express in my own way my feeling of repugnance and shame that the city officials of my native city of Boston, Mass., should have shown the un-Christian attitude, and I say the Un-American attitude, which they displayed in the city hall in recent weeks when this group came before them. So I join with other Senators in saying I am glad to have these gentlemen from Japan here today in the Senate of the United States, and to greet them in fine fellowship, as human beings, under God, facing a great future for Japan and this Nation of ours in one world.

I want to say also to my friends from Japan who are here, this is America, the United States of America, which we love, a free country of free men, and it is the only country in the world where such a greeting could be extended toward men who have been enemies of ours in the recent past, but who today come here as friends, with hands extended to them in greeting and in fellowship, with no guile or hypocricy, but in all sincerity. Today, in the United States Senate, here at Washington, we greet Japan.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as a Senator from the State of North Dakota, where many Japanese were interned at Fort Lincoln during the war, I wish the Senate to know that a great many citizens of our State became acquainted with people of Japanese origin from the west coast, and that as a result of that acquaintanceship, I am personally happy to welcome this delegation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to all the Senators who have joined me in a very cordial and heartfelt welcome to our distinguished visitors from Japan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it is agreeable to the Senate, the Chair will have inserted in the RECORD a list of the distinguished Members of the Japanese Diet who have just visited us.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list follow the remarks which have been made by the various Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list of Members of the delegation from the Diet of Japan is as follows:

JAPANESE DIET DELEGATION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (466 MEMBERS)

Democratic Liberal (266). Takeshi Yamazaki (Chairman of Delegation), 63, Ibaragi Pref., 8th term, former Speaker; Nobuyuki Iwamoto, 54, Kanagawa Pref., 3d term, Vice-Speaker, Chusuke Imamura, 50, Nagano Pref., 2d term, member Steering Committee.

Democrat (70). Saburo Shiikuma, 54, Hokkaido, 3d term, former Parliamentary Vice-Minister Communications, member Steering Committee.

Social Democrat (47). Inejiro Asanuma, 51, Tokyo, 5th term, member (former Chairman) Steering Committee.

People's Cooperative (14). Takizo Matsumoto, 48, Hiroshima Pref., 3d term, Harvard U. graduate, former Parliamentary Vice-Minister Foreign Affairs, member Foreign Affairs Committee.

Secretariat: Makoto Oike, 54, Nagano Pref., Secretary-General; Seiichi Shima, 35, Toyama Pref., Chief Liaison Officer.

HOUSE OF COUNCILLORS (250 MEMBERS)

Green Breeze Society (74). Hiroshi Takada, 51, Tokyo, Chairman Steering Committee.

Democratic Liberal (52). Hidejiro Onogi, 54, Kyoto, former member House of Peers, member Judicial Affairs Committee.

Social Democrat (41). Kanae Hatano, 53, Fukuoka Pref., former Minister Agriculture and Forestry, member Finance and Budget Committees.

Democrat (42). Tatsuro Sakurauchi, 64, Tokyo, former member House of Representatives 2 terms, Chairman Finance Committee.

Secretariat: Hideaki Kondon, 47, Shimane Pref., Secretary-General.

National Diet Library: Tokujiro Kanamori, 63, Tokyo, former State Minister, Chief Librarian.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I now move that the Senate stand in recess for 15 minutes, in order that we may become better acquainted with these gentlemen, who are with us as representatives of the Japanese Parliament.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess for 15 minutes.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Vice President.

CREATION OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 58) to amend

the Senate rules by creating a standing Committee on Small Business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time between now and 4 o'clock, when the vote is to be taken, is to be equally divided between the proponents of the resolution and those opposed, to be controlled by the junior Senator from Nebraska and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. Does the Senator from Nebraska wish to be recognized at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to be as soon as the distinguished majority leader yields.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield now.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the distinguished majority leader yields, I may state that I understand that the total time remaining will be practically 3 hours.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, an hour and a half to each side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. An hour and a half to each side, deducting the 4 minutes which have already elapsed.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I informed the Senator from Nebraska and the press that I was going to discuss a subject and give facts which I think will be of great interest to the Senate and the press. However, in view of the limitation of time between now and 4 o'clock, I shall not be able to do it until that hour. I hope to get the floor as soon as possible after 4 o'clock. I believe the facts which I shall disclose at that time will interest the Senate very greatly, and I hope as many Senators as possible will be on the floor then. My remarks will deal with the extent to which Communists have infiltrated into the State Department and are shaping State Department policy. I intend to cover that subject in detail as soon as I get the floor at 4 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration authorized the junior Senator from Nebraska to report favorably Senate Resolution 58, which is the unfinished business, and is now before the Senate for consideration. In the report, which was made on June 29, 1949, will be found comments and observations on small business in the United States, which indicate the interest not only of the junior Senator from Nebraska, but of many other Senators. Any Member of the Senate who is interested, and who will analyze the report, will find that it is estimated that there are 3,650,000 small-business concerns in the United States, owned and operated, on the average, by 2½ persons each. This constitutes a total of 9,125,000 persons, or 92 percent of our entire manufacturing economy. These concerns employ about 65 percent of all commercial and industrial wage earners, and produce about 45 percent of our entire output.

Those are the figures that were used in the report to the Senate made by me on June 29, 1949, to which I have referred, when the resolution to create a standing Committee on Small Business, with legislative authority, was reported favorably by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

On July 6, 1949, the report was placed in the RECORD, but I doubt that the Members of the Senate recall what that report set forth as the work objective of a permanent Small Business Committee. The report states:

> Your committee envisions that the work of the Committee on Small Business will include, but not be limited to, the study and investigation of—
>
> 1. Supply and distribution of basic materials with particular reference as to whether or not independent small business is obtaining its fair share of such materials under existing or future distribution methods and patterns:
>
> 2. Policies of Federal Government departments, agencies, and corporations with respect to inclusion of independent small business in their present programs and future planning with particular reference to the procurement activities of such departments, agencies, and corporations;
>
> 3. Prices charged for materials needed and utilized by independent small business to determine whether they are fair and equitable in relation to prices charged their larger competitors;
>
> 4. Pressures of vertically and horizontally integrated combinations to eliminate independent small business in the American industrial productive and distributive system;
>
> 5. Inability of both new and old independent small business to adequately finance itself from its own earnings due to tax structure and effect of such tax structure on the merger movement;
>
> 6. Participation of independent American small business in foreign-aid programs and adequacy of representation of independent American small business by diplomatic and consular officials abroad;
>
> 7. Development of programs to adequately insure independent small business a fair share of raw and finished materials and services on and from public-owned resources, forest services, irrigation and reclamation projects;
>
> 8. Development of a sound program to safeguard the place of independent small business in the American economy.

Mr. President, that is a program which is essential to the welfare and survival of independent business in this country.

The number and importance of the problems peculiar to small business warrant the establishment of a permanent committee in the Senate which will give full time and attention to the solution of these problems, as I stated last Friday, and which will have authority to recommend remedial legislation to the Senate.

Mr. President, I maintain that there is no one committee in the United States Senate which can give the time even to consider legislation from the standpoint of its effect upon smaller business, much less make the necessary investigations into our economy, or of regulatory agencies, when quick action may be needed to prevent the ringing of the death knell of an entire segment of our economy.

Mr. President, the special Senate Small Business Committee was permitted to expire by default on January 31, 1949. I hope the businessmen of the country will ponder and appreciate that statement. The committee was terminated, and has not been revived during this session of the Eighty-first Congress, although effort upon effort has been made, during this session of the Eighty-first Congress, to have considered on the floor of the Senate a resolution which would reestablish that committee for the benefit of small-business men.

Prior to the expiration of the committee, and before it was actually off the books, a legislative proposal was presented by the junior Senator of Nebraska, and by the senior Senator from Montana, to continue the special Senate Small Business Committee. Senate Resolution 29 was submitted on January 13, 1949, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. And it was because Senate Resolution 29 was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, instead of the Committee on Rules and Administration, that I submitted Senate Resolution 55.

The reasons for submitting Senate Resolution 55 were:

First, to insure continuity for the Senate Small Business Committee is essential.

Second, because there has sprung up in the Banking and Currency Committee a movement to take over all of the prerogatives of small business in the Senate, investigative and legislative.

Senate Resolution 33, submitted by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] on January 17, 1949, was called a resolution to provide for "Succession to the Special Committee on Small Business Committee." It was unanimously reported to the Senate from Banking and Currency on January 27, 1949.

It proposed that the Small Business Subcommittee on Banking and Currency take over all the functions and duties of the former special committee.

That assumption was based upon a conviction that special committees are prohibited by the Legislative Reorganization Act, and the committee's report also emphasized the need for prompt legislative action on small-business problems, which authority a special committee did not have.

Senate Resolution 33 was never acted upon, and was replaced on the calendar later by Senate Resolution 101, entirely different in purpose.

Senate Resolution 55 was referred to Banking and Currency, and, both Senate Resolution 29 and Senate Resolution 55 were reported upon unfavorably by Banking and Currency within a short time.

There has been a persistent impression among some Members of the Senate that the Legislative Reorganization Act prohibits the establishment of special and select committees.

When the legislative reorganization bill was passed by the Senate—and I was a Member of the Senate when it was passed and heard the debate on the issue—it contained a provision prohibiting the creation of special or select committees.

Many of us, including the junior Senator from Nebraska, because time was

running out, went along with such a provision in order to get the entire act passed. This was particularly true since section 101 (b) was retained, which gives full right to the Senate to change its own rules; one of those rules relating to the committee-forming power.

In other words, even though the Reorganization Act was passed, it does not mean that never can we amend it for the purpose of setting up a committee. The Senate governs its own procedure, and can at any time amend its rules, if it so desires, especially so with respect to the establishment of new committees.

When the legislative reorganization bill went to the House, the provision prohibiting the continuation or creation of special or select committees was stricken from the measure, and the House insisted on its amendments in conference.

The reason the House insisted on its amendments was that it had already set up some special committees. The House had already provided for a Special Small Business Committee, which it did not want to legislate out of existence. So the House struck out the restriction placed in the bill by the Senate.

One of the authors of the Legislative Reorganization Act, Senator La Follette of Wisconsin, moved to accept the House version of the bill which contained a provision that special committees could be established. When the conference report came to the Senate, it was approved, and the House version of the bill was enacted into law.

Because of the limit placed on debate today it is impossible for me to give all the colloquy and debate that occurred at that time respecting the measure, but let me say that it all was summed up by me in 1949, as appears on page 840 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, my statement, beginning in the first column of that page with the words, "There appears to be some misunderstanding and confusion regarding the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," down to and including the paragraph in the third column on page 840, beginning with the words, "The reason for the passage of the Reorganization Act." I ask to place this matter in the RECORD because I wish to present the summary of the history of the act; the fact that the Senate passed the Reorganization Act without the provision prohibiting the creation of a special committee or committees, and the fact that the House would not go along with such a provision. As the measure was approved, it provides that special committees may be organized.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There appears to be some misunderstanding or confusion regarding the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Some persons have said, and have told me, and some Members of the Senate have said, that special committees are prohibited by that act. Mr. President, that simply is not so; such a prohibition is not to be found among the provisions of that act. When the legislative reorganization bill passed the Senate, it contained a provision prohibiting the creation of special or select committees. I say it contained that provision when it passed the Senate; but many of us, including the junior Senator from Nebraska, went along with such a provision in order to get the entire act passed because of the fact that time was running out. It will be remembered that when consideration was given to the bill on the floor of the Senate, time was running out, and we took the bill as the Senate passed it, with that provision included. But section 101, subsection (b) gives full right to the Senate to change its own rules, one of which recognizes the committee-forming power of the Senate. However, when the bill went to the House, the provision prohibiting the continuation or creation of special or select committees was stricken from the measure. In conference, the House insisted on its amendment. The House amendment provides for the creation of such committees.

One of the authors of the bill, former Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, seated where the Senator from Kansas is now seated, voted to accept the House version of the bill, and in this form it was enacted into law. Therefore, from a legal standpoint, there is no prohibition against the creation of a special committee either by Senate resolution or by joint resolution, or by an act of the Congress itself.

That is the history of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 I supported that act. I voted for its passage, and I did it with that full understanding At that time I was a member of this special committee, and even though when the Senate passed the bill I voted for the provision against the creation of special committees, yet when the conference report came back it pleased me very much, and the bill passed the Senate by adopting the conference report, which did not prohibit the creation of special committees Indeed, this is amply evidenced by the creation or the continuance of many joint committees by this body, such as the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, the Joint Committee on Housing, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, which were created in 1948 The fact that these committees have been created by an act of Congress or by a joint resolution rather than by Senate resolution in no way changes their status.

Distinguished Members of the Senate have told me they recognize it is not a violation. One of our best constitutional lawyers tells me it is not a violation of the provisions of the Reorganization Act. Some of those who oppose special committees say, "No, their creation does not violate the law, but does violate the spirit of the act." Certainly Senators who feel that way will agree with me that the joint resolutions and acts of Congress creating the various special joint committees I have enumerated have been passed by their votes, and they have not moved to abolish those committees since they were created. So if those who oppose this resolution on the theory that it violates the spirit of the Reorganization Act continue to appropriate money and to set up special joint committees as they have done, then they are doing exactly what is sought by the resolution I have offered and asked to have referred to the Rules and Administration Committee. There is no difference. The legal status is the same. There is no violation of the spirit of the act; if one is right, so is the other. If we continue to create such committees, if we continue them in existence, if we continue to appropriate for them, we are doing nothing more, there, than I am asking the Senate to do, in this instance. It involves neither a violation of the act itself nor a violation of the spirit of the act.

There is no reason to dwell upon this, for it is my strong conviction that neither the creation of those joint committees nor the creation of the special committee sought by the resolution violates the spirit of the Reorganization Act.

The reason for the passage of the Reorganization Act, as I understand, was to simplify the operation of Congress, and with that I am in total agreement. The original provision contained in the Senate version of the act prohibiting the creation of special committees was designed to prevent creation of special committees when a standing committee had jurisdiction of the subject matter. That was the principal argument used. It was said, "Here is a standing committee which has jurisdiction. Therefore, a special committee that assumes the same jurisdiction, duplicates the work." I can remember the arguments so ably presented by the then Senator from Wisconsin. He certainly made a convincing argument on that basis, and that was one of the reasons given, if I recall correctly.

Mr. WHERRY. Therefore, Mr. President, from a legal standpoint, there is no prohibition against the creation of special committees, either by Senate resolution, by joint resolution, or by act of Congress. Of course, I know that some may say that the establishment of a new committee would violate the spirit of the Reorganization Act. Let me, as one who believes in the Legislative Reorganization Act, and who voted for it, and who today is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and of other committees say that my experience is that Senators have more conflicting dates for attendance on committee meetings now than they had before the passage of the Reorganization Act. I doubt very much whether the Reorganization Act has cut down the number of committees Senators are called upon to attend. They are now called subcommittees rather than special committees. I do not disapprove of the result of the Reorganization Act, but I may say to those who feel that the creation of a new committee would violate the spirit of the act, that it is my belief that we have created nearly as many committees, which we now call subcommittees, as we would have had if the Reorganization Act had not been passed.

Because of the very fact that the House insisted upon this provision, there is today a Special Small Business Committee in the House of Representatives. That committee is functioning very well. This is the first time since I have been a Member of the Senate that we have not had a corresponding committee in the United States Senate.

The point of whether a special or select committee violated the intent and purpose of the Legislative Reorganization Act has been a bone of contention every time a resolution to continue, or to grant funds to the Senate Small Business Committee, has come before the Senate, although the House of Representatives has gone ahead without interruption with its special and select committees.

Senate Resolution 58 which confronts the Senate today is: First, an effort to meet two of the most strongly expressed objections to a Special Small Business Committee, the resolution proposed to establish a new standing committee for small business; and second, it proposes to

give that committee full legislative and investigative authority.

The junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] introduced Senate Resolution 58 on February 7, the same day the junior Senator from Nebraska, made the appeal from the Chair's decision to commit Senate Resolution 55 to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I joined with him at that time.

Senate Resolution 58 offers a better way of meeting the objections to a Special Small Business Committee, and it would strengthen such a committee's position and authority immeasurably.

The junior Senator from Nebraska is not unmindful of the fact that a number of Senators object to a standing Small Business Committee, because it would cut across the jurisdictional lines of other standing commitees. That same argument may be used to defend the need for a separate Small Business Committee on the grounds that what is everyone's business, is no one's business.

The problems of small business have shifted through war and postwar years. They are still shifting between a hot war and a cold war, but they still go on, and it is more important now to have a committee in the Senate that can speak strongly in behalf of small business, than it was during and before war years.

Mr. President, I received more mail today than ever before from small-business men, asking for relief from directives and orders, asking for help in finding their way around among the bureaus in Washington, so they may bid for contracts which may arise by reason of appropriations made for Government procurement, the ECA, and other matters to which I shall refer as I speak during the present debate. They are knocking at the door asking for help, asking for guidance and direction, and they are certainly asking for a different form of financial help than they now can obtain.

When I came to the Senate in 1943 I was assigned to membership on the Small Business Committee, and was actively engaged in working on that committee until it was terminated by the majority party at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress. They have refused to revive it until the election, which will occur next November, has come closer to hand.

Whether a special committee is continued on a permanent basis, or a standing legislative committee is newly established, the responsibility is still ours to encourage by every means possible the basis of our industrial life, which is free, competitive enterprise. That is our job, and small business needs that protection now more than ever before.

Senate Resolution 58 has been on the Senate Calendar since June 29, 1949. It was first called on the calendar on July 6. Every time it has come up on the calendar, I have requested its consideration; but every time I have done so, some Senator has objected to its consideration. At the time it was reached on the calendar on July 6, the majority leader stated that he objected on the grounds that certain Members who wanted to be heard on the resolution were not then in the Chamber. He offered the information, too, that the Democratic Policy Committee at that time was unanimously in opposition to the appointment of a standing committee. He did not express himself as to how the Democratic Policy Committee felt about the appointment of a special committee.

On July 26, Senate resolution 58 was again reached on the calendar. At that time several Senators, unidentified, objected.

So it went through all the calendar calls in the past session, and throughout the present session until now.

I wish to congratulate the majority leader, regardless of the purpose, on bringing the resolution before the Senate at this time. I think it is a fine thing that it has been brought up now. I hope something constructive will come from this proposed legislation.

But in the past, objection has repeatedly been made to consideration of the resolution, in spite of repeated appeals by the junior Senator from Nebraska to the majority leader for consideration of the measure before the end of the session.

Again on the first calendar call of this session, on February 1, the majority leader objected to the consideration of Senate Resolution 58. He did not state what his own personal opinions were regarding the resolution, but he alluded to the conflict of opinion regarding a Small Business Committee in a recent Democratic caucus. I think it is true, there are in the Senate, not only on the other side of the aisle, but on this side of the aisle, Senators who believe that the creation of a Small Business Committee would be in violation of the spirit of the Reorganization Act. There has been a conflict and there will be a conflict on that subject. But regardless of how many Senators vote for or against the creation of such a committee, I shall vote, in behalf of small business, for the creation of a Small Business Committee, either with or without legislative authority, in order that there may be a Senate committee to which small-business men can come, and through which they can speak.

Mr. President, the majority leader and other members of the Senate are entitled to vote on the question of whether the Senate should set up a Senate Small Business Committee, either with or without legislative authorities.

If it is the will of the Senate not to have a Small Business Committee, under any conditions, then that settles the issue, at least for this Congress.

But, Mr. President, why at this late date—well into the second session of the Eighty-first Congress—is an attempt being made to force the issues back and forth, all over again?

Why was not an amendment to Senate Resolution 58, or a measure to meet the objections of the majority offered long before this time?

This brings us to what has happened to the Subcommittee on Small Business in Banking and Currency in the past year.

As I mentioned earlier, the attempt of the Banking and Currency Committee to succeed the former Special Small Business Committee was abandoned.

In place of Senate Resolution 33, the Banking and Currency Committee reported Senate Resolution 101, by which the committee took an entirely different position, and asked for funds to pursue three categories of investigations, among which were investigations of small-business problems. Sixty thousand dollars was asked, $30,000 of which was estimated to be spent on small-business investigations and studies.

Here, I should like to call attention to the fact that the Banking and Currency Committee asked for funds, to study and investigate the problems of small business, which is precisely the reason the Banking and Currency Committee gave when it turned down the resolution, introduced by the junior Senator from Nebraska—to create a permanent Small Business Committee, without legislative authority.

Senate Report 128, on Senate Resolutions 29 and 55—the report comes from the Banking and Currency Committee—states, on page 2:

> Your committee—Banking and Currency—believes the time has come to progress from action consisting mainly of analyses, studies, report, and recommendations on small business to practical legislative action designed to save small-business enterprises from gradual extinction in America.

Let us see how the Subcommittee on Small Business has progressed on its "studies and investigations" or its legislative program to save small-business enterprises from extinction. I speak now of the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee.

First, let me remind Senators that the Senate has expressed itself very decisively as to what prerogatives the Banking and Currency Committee may have regarding small-business investigations or legislation.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] offered an amendment to Senate Resolution 101 on May 6, 1949, which was adopted, and specifically limits any small-business activities by Banking and Currency to those subjects directly under its jurisdiction.

I have indicated the view taken of this matter by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and no doubt a similar view will be taken by all other Senate committees. In other words, if we expand the power of the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, we run headlong into the very reason why Senate Resolution 58 does not have the support of the Banking and Currency Committee, namely, that it deprives the committee of some of its jurisdiction.

Mr. President, what are the subjects directly under the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee? I shall enumerate them:

First. Banking and currency generally. All of us agree as to that.

Second. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under the Reorganization Act. We agree as to that, of course.

Third. Deposit insurance. Of course, we agree as to that.

Fourth. Public and private housing. We agree.

Fifth. Federal Reserve System. We agree.

Sixth. Gold and silver, including coinage thereof. Of course, we agree as to that.

Seventh. Issuance of notes and redemption thereof. We agree as to that.

Eighth. Valuation and revaluation of the dollar. Of course, we agree as to that.

Ninth. Control of prices of commodities, rents, or services.

Of these nine, matters relating to financial aid and control legislation are the only subjects which I believe to be of direct importance to small business, except, of course, it could be said that all legislation affects small business to some degree.

Tax relief, I think, would be the place to begin on aid to small business; and taxation problems, as well as a number of other finance problems, would be referred to the Senate Finance Committee, not to a subcommittee of Banking and Currency. If a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee were to investigate such problems without authority and were to propose legislation on them without authority, the subcommittee would certainly be cutting across jurisdictional lines, insofar as matters of finance and taxation are concerned.

According to the latest Banking and Currency Committee calendar, which I have before me, one hearing was held by the Subcommittee on Small Business on February 15, 1949. The hearing was held on an amendment to the ECA legislation introduced by the junior Senator from Nebraska in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, in accordance with recommendations made by the former Special Small Business Committee. That amendment has been adopted, and I understand that a good job is being done under its provisions.

Mr. President, I wish to insert at this point in my remarks a report from the House committee showing that that measure is resulting in the doing of a good job. That provision was written into the ECA Act; it was offered as an amendment by the junior Senator from Nebraska, and was adopted by the Senate.

The report reads as follows:

EXCERPT FROM THE PROGRESS REPORT, FIRST SESSION OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, HOUSE REPORT 1576, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

ECA OPERATIONS UNDER THE SMALL-BUSINESS AMENDMENT

In May 1949, ECA announced the appointment of personnel to formulate procedures to implement the small-business amendment and to handle both the domestic and European phases of the program. During the next months, the committee was in frequent contact with ECA representatives to check on progress.

On September 21, 1949, ECA announced plans for a five-point program to carry out the provisions of the amendment. The program when placed in full operation is designed to provide small-business firms with—

1. A counseling service in exporting under the Marshall plan.

2. Information regarding potential purchases to be made in the United States.

3. A directory of European importers and the products they have purchased under the recovery programs.

4. Information regarding commodities offering the greatest opportunities for sales in western Europe.

5 A directory of potential American exporters listed by commodities for distribution to European importers.

On October 19, 1949, ECA announced the establishment of an inquiry and export counseling group to aid small-business men on their export problems. In addition, it was stated that arrangements had been made with the Department of Commerce whereby its 42 field offices would render assistance to small business in (1) explaining of ECA pricing policies as guides to sellers in negotiations; (2) providing information on documentation; (3) granting advice on regulations governing the handling of overseas shipments; (4) explaining ECA's requirements regarding labeling; and (5) information on how the ECA Commodity Supplier Data may be used to find potential European purchasers.

The committee was informed on October 27 that a field counseling program had been developed by ECA whereby those small-business men interested in participating in the program could obtain practical personalized consultation from other businessmen in their own communities. This project draws on the fund of local business knowledge and relates it to ECA matters by the formation of local volunteer ECA counseling panels. To date this program has been tested in widely separated cities with good results, both in terms of the immediate assistance to local businessmen and in terms of tailoring the program more closely to their needs Plans are now under way to establish counselor meetings in several hundred cities throughout the country with the help of local chambers of commerce and other similar organizations ECA states that it intends to maintain constant contact with the field counselors through bulletins on recent developments and to furnish supplementary counseling materials as developed.

As the second step to implement the small-business amendment, ECA announced on November 6, 1949, that it had completed plans to publish a directory of the names and products of American small-business firms desiring to enter or continue in the export trade and would distribute the directory to overseas purchasers The directory will be printed in the languages of the countries participating in the recovery program and will be paid for out of local currency counterpart funds ECA is exploring with the Department of Commerce the feasibility of its distributing the directory to countries other than those participating in the recovery programs. This project gives promise of providing great benefit to small business and offers possibilities for further benefits at the conclusion of recovery programs.

ECA has displayed a commendable spirit of cooperation in implementing the small-business amendment and in other matters brought to its attention by the committee. The five-point program recently announced and described above seems to the committee to comprise a realistic approach to the problem of small-business participation. However, the key to insuring equitable participation lies in constant effort to provide small businessmen with timely information on the types and quantities of proposed purchases far enough in advance to permit him to bid or negotiate at the time purchase orders are contemplated.

Another hearing on petroleum prices is listed as having been held by the Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on Small Business on June 29 and 30, 1949. No testimony is available, and the advice from the clerk of the committee is that the hearings were exploratory; and nothing further has been scheduled at this time.

The subject of petroleum prices would be an interesting one for the subcommittee to get into.

Believe me, Mr. President, we who served on the Special Committee on Small Business know something about prices and allocations, not only as applied to petroleum itself, but also as applied to steel, which was allocated during the Eightieth Congress.

Only one measure—Senate Joint Resolution 93—specifically referring to small business, is listed on the committee calendar having been referred to the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Three other measures of a routine nature are also listed as follows: First, Senate bill 547 to extend voluntary allocations, which are out of existence now; second, Senate bill 548 to extend export controls, which was a routine extension at that time; and third, Senate bill 1570, to preserve export markets for surplus agricultural commodities. In this latter instance, it is notable that when we wrote into the ECA Act the amendment providing that $175,000,000 was to be used for that very purpose, we found that Mr. Hoffman and the Secretary of State interpreted that provision as not being practical, and we found that instead of using the $175,000,000 to purchase surplus wheat in this country—as ECA should have done, because the Secretary of Agriculture declared it was surplus—that money was used to buy wheat or other commodities in other countries, not the surplus wheat in the United States.

None of the matters I have just referred to specifically concern small business.

Mr. President, I do not want to give the impression that I am opposed to permitting the Committee on Banking and Currency to have a Subcommittee on Small Business. Each standing committee is entitled to do what it wishes in that respect, and the idea is not a new one with the Banking and Currency Committee. In fact, I have supported the appropriations for that committee. In the interest of small business, I would prefer to have a Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee, rather than to have no committee on that subject at all. But I say we cannot expand both the authority and investigating power and legislative power of the Banking and Currency Committee without crossing the jurisdictional lines of other committees. If that is done, then we run directly into the question of whether we would prefer to do so or whether we would prefer to have a special committee, without legislative authority, doing the investigating and ironing out the difficulties which confront small-business men, and doing the things that the small-business men of the country really want to have done.

There has been a subcommittee on small business in Banking and Currency since 1947. I do not know all that the subcommittee did during the Eightieth Congress; but it did not in any way in-

terfere with or duplicate the work of the former Senate Small Business Committee, so far as I remember.

However, I think the more effective way to handle small-business matters is to have everything on the subject of small business handled by one committee. After all, what is everybody's business is nobody's business. If we wish to give help to small business, I think we should do so by means of a continuing special committee, without legislative authority, or else by means of a standing committee with authority. I shall vote for either one.

Within the past few days, the Banking and Currency Committee has come before the Senate to ask for the extension of its investigation under Senate Resolution 101, and the use of unexpended funds.

The junior Senator from Nebraska voted for Senate Resolution 101 last year, because he thought then that was all we could expect to obtain for small business at that time, and did not want to leave small business completely without a voice in the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I have offered to Senate Resolution 58—an amendment which clearly defines the issues before us, namely, whether we shall have a permanent small business committee, without legislative authority, along the lines proposed in Senate Resolution 55—and it was reported adversely from the Banking and Currency Committee, as originally proposed by the junior Senator from Nebraska, or whether we shall vote for a standing committee with legislative powers, as proposed by Senate Resolution 58.

Senators may think my position is conflicting, but it is not conflicting, Mr. President. I think the Senate should have an opportunity to vote, first, on the question of the appointment of a special committee, as we have had in the past, without legislative authority. Of course, I think the committee should be a permanent one. I do not believe that at each and every session of the Senate we should be confronted with the question of whether we shall have a special committee on small business at that particular session. It is impossible to obtain the right kind of personnel or the right kind of assistance which is needed for such a committee, if the committee personnel know their jobs are not permanent.

I think, once and for all, the Senate should decide whether it wishes to have a special committee on small business, either with or without legislative authority. If Senators wish to vote for the latter, they can vote for the amendment I have offered to Senate Resolution 58. If that is defeated, Senators can vote for Senate Resolution 58 itself, to establish a standing legislative committee, with rank equal to that of every other Senate committee.

Mr. President, the amendment I have offered does not propose to violate in any way the rules of the Senate in regard to committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes more.

The Senator from Montana submitted an amendment at the close of the session on Friday, but subsequently withdrew it. I do not know his present intentions. I do not believe there is any difference now between the Senator from Montana and the junior Senator from Nebraska, except that the amendment of the Senator from Montana carries a provision for the creation of a committee to continue only during the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses. I submit that if it is possible to extend the life of a special committee through two Congresses it certainly is possible to bind a succeeding session with respect to a permanent committee, as well as to bind the Eighty-second Congress. I think the reason for wanting to carry it through the Eighty-second Congress possibly is that there is but little time left, it seems to me, in which to create a special committee for the remainder of the Eighty-first Congress. But if it is proper to create a committee for the Eighty-first Congress and the Eighty-second Congress, it certainly is proper to create a permanent standing committee, without legislative authority. I hope the distinguished Senator from Montana will join me in the amendment, so that we may have at least two votes. If he desires, he may call it his amendment; it is immaterial to me. I have no pride of authorship. But I think all will agree we should once and for all either make a permanent standing committee, without legislative authority, or a permanent standing committee with authority. Otherwise, we shall have the same difficulty at the beginning of each Congress, and it will be necessary to beg for a continuance of the committee, as a special committee, for the duration of one session of the Congress. If that procedure were followed it would impede the work. It would not permit the continuing employment of personnel to give us the assistance such a committee should have. All along the line, it seems to me, it would not be nearly so effective as a permanent committee upon which we could depend, even though it would be without legislative authority.

As I say, I think the Senate should vote these questions either up or down. If the Senate cannot make up its mind on one of those alternatives, let us give up the idea of trying to do the most effective thing for small business in this Congress, and merely allow matters to proceed as they now are, and await action at some future session of the Congress for the settlement of the issue.

To authorize a temporary small-business committee this late in the Eighty-first Congress, would be a make-shift arrangement, which could not be organized to take effective action before it expired.

To attempt to enlarge or give new authorities to a Subcommittee on Small Business in Banking and Currency would be equal to creating a standing committee within a standing committee—a monstrosity as far as operation would be concerned.

Mr. President, the support which the Senate decides to give to the establishment of a permanent Small Business Committee is not a small problem which may be relegated to the back of our minds, or handled, incidentally, in the major standing committees.

Today, American independent business is threatened not only by the exploitive abuses of concentrated economic power in the hands of "big finance" and "big business," but also by the new developments of economic power in the hands of "big labor" and "big government" which are now on the domestic scene.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like to correct a statement made by the Senator from Montana. I am sure, had he read the past RECORD, he would not have made the statement which appears in the RECORD for February 17, at page 1898. In that statement he said no legislation had been introduced by the members of the former Senate Small Business Committee, during the Eightieth Congress, nor had any of its members appeared before standing committees in behalf of legislation. I am sure an examination of the fact will reveal otherwise.

I said last Friday, and I now repeat, that while I am glad to admit that the Senate Small Business Committee during the Eightieth Congress was more distinguished for direct action against monopolistic-trade practices in industry, which were throttling small business, it also made specific legislative proposals, which were enacted into law.

The committee helped in the matter of newsprint distribution. It helped, and helped tremendously, in the field of petroleum distribution. No one can deny that. We persuaded major oil companies to continue distribution to smaller, independent dealers on the basis of the same quotas as those in effect in prior years. The same thing was true in steel. How anyone can even suggest that in the consideration of complaints and examination of needs, such as the petroleum shortage which developed in the city of Baltimore, the Small Business Committee was not effective, I do not know. I wish the distinguished Senator from Maryland were present to give the testimony he gave when we considered and solved the problem of fuel-oil shortage in Baltimore in the winter of 1947.

Mr. President, I yield myself another 5 minutes, in which to conclude.

Time and again the Small Business Committee secured help that was entirely outside the field of legislative authority. It is my plea that we support a proposal which will result in a continued service of that kind. If all we are going to do is to set up an academic board to consider matters affecting small business, a board which will go into the field and conduct hearings in the four corners of the United States, with the idea of introducing legislation which will impose upon the backs of small business further controls and impositions, then I am decidedly against it. I shall be the first Senator on the floor of the Senate to criticize it, if the committee is reorganized and operates solely for that purpose.

I think the principal purpose is to have a place to which small-business men may come, register their complaints, and have them considered. There should be a place to which they may come, where they may receive a friendly hearing, whether it be before a special committee or a subcommittee of some standing committee. But getting back to the subject of legislation, I may say the Small Business Committee did introduce proposed legislation in the Eightieth Congress. Time does not permit me to go into detail, but I want to give the law.

First. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee on June 17, 1947, to insist upon the continuation of export controls upon steel, which was in short supply. The export-control legislation was at that time about to lapse, by default. Saudi Arabia was at that time getting steel which should have gone to our own reserve oil companies. We should have been digging the wells instead of Saudi Arabia. A supply of 340,000 tons was temporarily held up. It has only been since the second session of the Eighty-first Congress that new supplies have been sent. I understand steel is now in ample supply. The statement by the Senator from Pennsylvania was made in support of House bill 3049. I ask that that portion of the report, containing the testimony of the Senator from Pennsylvania, be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. It is found in the reports of the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, Senate Report No. 825, Eightieth Congress, second session, pages 38 to 41.

There being no objection, the portion of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN OF THE STEEL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE CONSIDERING THE RENEWAL OF THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT, REGARDING THE EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROLS ON STEEL (JUNE 17, 1947)

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which you are chairman, has completed hearings upon H. R. 3049, a measure to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities.

In this connection I would like to call your attention to the hearings which have been in progress by the Steel Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee since May 15, 1947. These hearings have been concerned with an investigation of shortages in steel which are affecting the welfare and survival of smaller manufacturers and users of steel. In fact, as 95 percent of our domestic manufacture uses steel, the supply and distribution of steel is a basic consideration in our entire national economy.

In these investigations we have made some study of the situation with respect to shipments of steel in export, and while our inquiry into this situation is not completed and further sessions with the Department of Commerce and with the State Department are on our schedule of hearings, I would like at this time to express some of the facts in relation to the renewal and administration of the Export Control Act (as it pertains to steel) for your consideration.

Steel, and practically all steel products, are in short supply; not in relation to the volume of tonnage being produced, but in relation to a heavy and rising demand. Steel mills are operating at approximately 95 percent of capacity, and are producing finished steel at the rate of 65,000,000 short tons for the year 1947. This is considerably higher than the 49,000,000 tons produced in 1946 and the 46,000,000 tons produced in 1940 (approximate figures).

However, reviving domestic manufacture, rising per capita use of steel, work stoppages affecting the production of steel, and mounting pressures for export of steel have combined to produce a short market in steel.

In spite of this increased demand, and rising per capita use of steel, the steel-producing industry does not intend to increase its capacity, and states further that existing facilities are sufficient for long-term demand. Thus, with a lid on production, and a currently rising demand from every area, the pressures have developed a number of inequities of distribution, under which numbers of smaller concerns are suffering and actually being forced to go out of business.

There apparently is also an increased effort on the part of steel producers to develop export markets, with emphasis on South America. Thus we find that pressures are very much in evidence to cause removal of steel from export control. In fact, so anticipatory that in last Saturday's Washington Post, I noticed an article that stated millions of tons of steel will be going to Saudi Arabia within the next month or two. No such tonnage could be supported giving due consideration to our domestic need, nor could such tonnage be possible under proper export control

The attention of the Steel Subcommittee was originally called to the steel export situation by a number of complaints from small manufacturers and users who claimed that large shipments of sheet steel abroad were causing their difficulty, and other complaints from independent oil producers, from ranchmen and farmers who protested that large shipments of steel pipe abroad were making it impossible to secure any pipe for oil and gas lines to supplement our domestic supply—and for wells and watering systems for farms and livestock.

The natural-gas and oil shortage has reached serious proportions, as recently stated in news releases, and the Interior Department confirms the possibility of fuel-oil and natural-gas shortages for this fall. While oil barge and other transportation problems were mentioned as a cause, investigation by the Senate Small Business Committee indicates the pipe shortage is also a contributory factor

In securing figures from the Bureau of the Census on steel exports for the year 1946 and the first 3 months of 1947, we find total exports on the rise in 1947 over 1946, at the rate of what will appear to be a million and a half more tons this year. This represents also about a million more tons of export than shipped in the prewar year of 1938 when there was no shortage of steel and exports were unrestricted. Exports of such critical items as sheet steel and steel pipe and tubing have doubled and trebled in 1946 and 1947 over shipments of those items in normal prewar years.

The Steel Subcommittee was especially interested in shipments of sheet steel and steel pipe—and the countries to which these shipments were being made. Census figures indicate that our prime country of export on most steel products, especially on the vital sheet steel, is Canada. Next in volume are such countries as Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Switzerland, and other nations certainly not involved in war rehabilitation projects. Lesser shipments have gone to France and Italy, as we might expect, but not in the degree nor of the critical items as shipped to South America.

In the case of steel pipe—Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela, and Russia are chief recipients. In the case of Venezuela, investigation has shown that American oil firms are developing new oil resources in Venezuela which accounts for the large pipe shipments to that country. In the case of Russia, however, it is difficult to figure out any reason for the shipment of 65,000 tons of steel pipe and tubing to that country in 1946, with continued shipments of pipe still going forward—not to mention other steel products, as well. It is not probable that the United States will secure any oil as a result of pipe shipments to Russia, nor for that matter any other trade or economic considerations.

A clipping from yesterday morning's Washington Post gives further information on the oil-shortage situation in this country, and includes a brief, but pointed, statement that Russia is sending its fleet over to get United States gas and oil.

To resume the steel export story: In examining export control administration in the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce and by the Export Policy Control Committee, it was discovered that a simplified method of issuing export licenses has resulted in a number of conditions. (1) No control is maintained on the destination of exports permitted under the export license; (2) relatively little policing of the qualifications or statements submitted by the export licensee is done; (3) no knowledge is available of the end-use of the steel products being shipped in export; (4) export quotas seem to be quite elastic and variable, as determined by Government-sponsored projects.

By this last point it is meant that the Export Policy Control Committee, an interagency group under the general direction of the Commerce Department, ostensibly sets steel export quotas in relation to the strain upon the domestic economy—then it may permit a 20-percent increase to be shipped "exquota"—and then along may come a Government-sponsored project for which may be issued an export license in any amount over and above the original quota (which was supposed to have been set at a level not to disrupt the domestic economy).

The subcommittee is endeavoring to obtain a list of Government-sponsored projects from the Department of Commerce, and the amount of steel exports involved in each. Such Government-sponsored projects, we understand, may be based upon both diplomatic and international trade considerations (and, of course, national defense), and are generally agreed to with the approval of the State Department. Our information is not complete on this subject, but it is of great importance in the steel export picture as it is evidently a matter beyond the control of the nominal export control officials.

Going further into the export picture, it was discovered that in the instance of Canada (our largest receiver of steel products in export), there are no export controls and shipments may be made to Canada in any amount at any time. This situation seemingly dates back to the Hyde Park agreement between Prime Minister MacKenzie King and the late President Roosevelt made during the war, by which controls were eliminated on exports to Canada for a number of wartime considerations.

The question which is naturally raised is whether or not the Hyde Park agreement has been reviewed in the light of present-day economics with respect to steel exports (and undoubtedly other products), to determine why export controls should not be put into effect between Canada and the United States. It is interesting to note that Canada has never removed her export controls upon her shipments to the United States.

The increase of steel shipments to Canada is marked—409,279 tons of steel products were shipped to Canada in 1938, 876,-

135 tons were shipped in 1946, and steel products are being shipped to Canada at the rate of over a million tons per year at the end of the first quarter of 1947. Of this total, sheet-steel shipments are unusually large, which means that steel products such as stoves, refrigerators, and hundreds of other finished products using steel are being manufactured in Canada, rather than the steel going to our own steel-manufacturing industry for production of finished products needed here, and necessary to provide employment in the United States. Also, as no check is maintained on end-use of steel export shipments, it is possible that some steel shipped to Canada may find its way out of Canada to other countries in export.

While normal exports are to be desired to maintain foreign markets and to promote worthwhile and reciprocal projects, it is my opinion that the export situation is out of control and that a stronger hand with regard to exports of steel is of vital importance at this time.

To remove controls on steel would undoubtedly open the floodgates for the highly lucrative export market. Prices being secured for steel in export are twice and three times the mill price in the United States. At the same time an inadequate control, aggravated by the failure of the Department of Commerce to allocate existing manpower and funds, is also causing another set of problems in the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce. I believe that existing controls should be strengthened.

As chairman of the steel subcommittee, I would like to submit for the consideration of your subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee of the Senate, the following conclusions with respect to continuation of export controls and the strengthening of existing controls:

1. Export controls on steel should be continued for at least another 12 months, and should be reviewed at that time to determine the pressure of domestic demand.

2. The Export Control Act should be amended to provide for certain administrative requirements:

(a) That designation of destination be required on the issuance of all export licenses, and, as far as possible end-use of the steel must be indicated.

(b) That the procedures for issuing export licenses require detailed qualifications and identification of licensee, and that severe penalty be provided against forgeries, sales of licenses, and misrepresentation.

(c) That export licenses must be used within the quarter for which they are granted and for the purpose for which granted to the original licensee.

(d) That a review of the Hyde Park agreement with Canada be made at once by the responsible Government agencies, with a view to establishing export controls on steel exports to Canada.

(e) That there be set forth in the extension of the Export Control Act language directing the establishment of industry export advisory committees consisting of all segments of the industries coming under the export control; and that the Export Policy Control Committee be required to seek and give consideration to the recommendation of such committees, particularly with regard to the effect which export quotas and Government special projects might have on the domestic economy.

(f) That the Export Policy Control Committee be thoroughly investigated as to qualification of personnel and methods of operation, especially with respect to its policies for determining export quotas.

(g) And that when such quotas are determined due consideration will be given to see that small and newly established businesses in the export and import trade will be given a fair and equitable share of such quotas.

Mr. WHERRY. Another legislative action recommended by the Small Business Committee was a provision for procurement from small business, under the Selective Service Act of 1948. There is a provision, in section 18 (a), providing for the utilization of industry, which reads as follows:

UTILIZATION OF INDUSTRY

SEC. 18. (a) Whenever the President after consultation with and receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board determines that it is in the interest of the national security for the Government to obtain prompt delivery of any articles or materials the procurement of which has been authorized by the Congress exclusively for the use of the armed forces of the United States, or for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, he is authorized, through the head of any Government agency, to place with any person operating a plant, mine, or other facility capable of producing such articles or materials an order for such quantity of such articles or materials as the President deems appropriate. Any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be advised that such order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section. Under any such program of national procurement, the President shall recognize the valid claim of American small business to participate in such contracts, in such manufacture, and in such distribution of materials, and small business shall be granted a fair share of the orders placed, exclusively for the use of the armed forces or for other Federal agencies now or hereafter designated in this section. For the purposes of this section, a business enterprise shall be determined to be "small business" if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of its employees does not exceed 500, and (3) it is independently owned and operated.

That was provided for in Public Law 750. It was recommended by the junior Senator from Nebraska, as chairman of the Small Business Committee, and it was a good piece of legislation.

The third piece of legislation to which I desire to advert is the ECA amendment, providing for small-business representation in that agency. Senators will recall that last year, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the junior Senator from Nebraska recommended, as former chairman of the defunct committee, that the Senate enact procurement legislation providing that under purchasing programs inspired by ECA funds, small business be given the information and the opportunity to participate. Such legislation was passed by the Senate, in Public Law 47, Eighty-first Congress, section 7 (d).

Mr. President, finally, the junior Senator from Wyoming will recall that a bill was proposed last session by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], S. 1647, to relieve smaller, independent oil-refining companies from the payment of premiums on their contracts for Government-royalty oil. That was a recommendation by the former Small Business Committee. The Senator from Wyoming paid the committee a compliment when he brought up the legislation on the floor and stated it was recommended by the chairman of the Small Business Committee. It is now Public Law 280, Eighty-first Congress, and another example of legislation recommended by the former committee.

Mr. President, I could go on to give further illustrations of what the Senate Small Business Committee of the Eighty-eth Congress did. I again want to say the prime importance of the committee is not so much in connection with a legislative function. We have committees to do the legislating. It is true that in our investigation, any subject that needs legislation ought to be brought to the attention of the committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter. But I submit, in all fairness, it is impossible to have this job done as it ought to be done by any one of the jurisdictional committees such as the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is no reflection upon the Senator from South Carolina. I think he is doing as good a job as any chairman could do under the circumstances. But one of two things will have to be done. Either the Senate will have to give this subcommittee the jurisdiction that a special committee needs for investigative purposes, give it legislative authority, and authority to cover all the jurisdictional fields, or else, if the problem is to be handled a. I think it should be handled, then the Senate should once and for all set up a permanent special committee similar to the one in the House, and let it cooperate with the one in the House. Either give that committee legislative authority, or else merely give it investigative authority, and let it continue to do the job for the small-business men of the country, on a permanent basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The time reserved by the Senator for himself has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am authorized by the majority leader to take 15 minutes at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I merely want to say I have listened with great interest to the very eloquent remarks just concluded by the minority leader. I also wish to say I am in entire accord with him on most of his statements today and I should like to congratulate him upon the eloquence he has displayed in presenting the arguments in support of a program for the solution of small-business problems.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I want to thank the Senator for that statement.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to say also that the Senator from Nebraska served on the original Small Business Committee set up in the Senate in 1940 under my chairmanship. When he came to the Senate, he became a member of the committee, and it did not take very long for him to become familiar with the work of the committee and to become one of its most active members. He cooperated completely with me as chairman of the committee throughout the time the committee was in existence. In fact, I do not know of any member of the committee who was more energetic or more helpful in the programs we carried through. I recall with a great deal of interest how, when the Senator from Nebraska first began his activities on that committee and before he became

familiar with the entire program, he listened very carefully to some of the speeches I made in the early hearings we held. Very soon I began to observe my good friend from Nebraska making the same speeches I had been making for a year or two before he arrived. So I felt highly complimented by the spirit of emulation he was displaying. He had a thorough grasp of the problem involved and was extremely helpful to the committee.

On one particular occasion I had received great and enthusiastic applause for the arguments I was presenting on behalf of the program of the Small Business Committee. As chairman of the committee, I had the privilege of making the first speech. Therefore, I was in a very advantageous position over that of the Senator from Nebraska. I recall on one occasion he informed me he had another engagement and that he would like to have an opportunity to speak first. Very much to my surprise, I found he was making the same speech and presenting the same points that I had been making at several of the hearings we had held, but must confess his speech was much more eloquent than any I had made. He has today exhibited the same eloquence in behalf of his position on the question which is now before the Senate. I think if the Senate would leave this subject to the Senator from Nebraska and myself we could sit down as a committee of two and work out a program which, if the Senate would accept it, would be highly satisfactory to the small-business men of the country.

We are both convinced that there is real merit to our opposition to either a standing committee with legislative authority or a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee with the expanded jurisdiction which that committee seeks. I think the only proper course for the Senate is to adopt a resolution which will establish a small-business committee in exactly the same form in which the small-business committee was originally established. That committee during the period in which it operated performed very valuable service for the small-business men of the Nation. The Senator from Nebraska will concede that. In fact, he has made similar statements on many occasions.

After the Republicans became the majority party in the Senate and the committee was reestablished under the leadership of the Senator from Nebraska, I cooperated with him to the fullest degree in all his activities in connection with it, and I do not want it understood that I have ever undertaken to criticize the Senator or to intimate that he failed in any respect to perform effective service for the small-business men of the country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sorry I did not hear all the Senator said, but as one who is in sympathy with the small-business men in their problems, I should like to ask the Senator whether a small-business committee with authority to recommend legislation, would not be, in the opinion of the Senator, and based on his experience, more harmful to small business than it would be helpful?

Mr. MURRAY. I think it would be. In the first place, we could not define the jurisdiction of a standing committee with legislative authority without encroaching upon all the other committees which are already established. It would create vast confusion and difficulties for the legislative work of the Senate. I think the only thing to do is to proceed as in the past with a committee without legislative authority, because it has been demonstrated in the Senate by the small-business committee which operated for a number of years that it is not necessary to have legislative power. Action can be taken quickly and effectively without that authority.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In Massachusetts where there are many small businesses, certain interests may not want small industries to develop. Small industries of that character could come before a committee such as that which the Senator recommends and could receive its best judgment, and, if necessary, the committee could make recommendations to other committees regarding legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. That is exactly true and it is the way in which the Small Business Committee has always operated heretofore. Many small-business concerns representing various industries came before us. I remember that representatives of the baking industry and various other industries of the Nation came before us, for the reason that very often small-business concerns, as a result of the war, found they were unable to continue in business and were facing bankruptcy unless they could get some relief through the Small Business Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one more question?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senate in its wisdom does not recommend the establishment of such a committee, is it the opinion of the Senator from Montana that the matter should be left as it is until another session of the Congress?

Mr. MURRAY. No. I think that would be a great mistake, because small-business concerns are facing a very serious situation at the present moment. We are now in a buyer's market, and small-business concerns in many lines of industry have developed problems and are in a desperate situation. It seems to me that it would be a serious mistake if the Congress of the United States failed to recognize the conditions which exist in the country at this time and should fail to establish a committee before which businessmen could appear and present their difficulties. A few days ago a couple of representatives of the Automobile Dealers' Association called on me at my office and told me they were facing very serious conditions in the coming year and were very anxious to ascertain what we were going to do with reference to setting up a small-business committee, because they desired to present their problems to that committee when it was established.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. As I understand, the health and welfare of small business throughout the country are now considered and protected, so far as the Senate is concerned, by a Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. I know that many Members of this body would appreciate it if the Senator would point out precisely the weaknesses in the subcommittee approach to the problems of small business.

Mr. MURRAY. I have no desire to make any criticism of the Banking and Currency Subcommittee. I have no desire to criticize the position of any Senator of the United States with reference to position he takes in favor of one or the other of these courses. I am supporting the idea of a special committee because I know from past experience that it has been a successful method of meeting the problems of small business. So far as the Banking and Currency Committee is concerned, I must confess that I am not entirely familiar with what it has accomplished. I know of one or two matters on which it has worked. For instance, it undertook to hold hearings on labor monopoly and conducted some investigations along that line and had witnesses appear before it. Finally, it was discovered that it did not have jurisdiction over the problem, and it was turned over to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I communicated with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and said, "This is in your jurisdiction. Shall we go ahead and hold hearings?" The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] received permission before hearings were held.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for that information.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Is the senior Senator from Montana prepared to say that the small-business subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency is not properly qualified to protect the best interests of American small business or that the subcommittee is presently doing an inadequate job?

Mr. MURRAY. No. I think the members of the full committee on Banking and Currancy and of its subcommittee are men of unusual ability. I have no criticism to make of any member of the committee. I think they are fully qualified to undertake any problem or study of any problem that may come before the Senate. I feel, however, that it is wrong to continue to turn this problem over to a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, because our experience has been that to hand it over to a committee which has limited jurisdiction would not be as wise as it would

be to refer it to a committee established especially for the purpose of handling small-business problems. That is the only criticism I have to make of the procedure of the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], during the course of his remarks, went into that subject in considerable detail, and I am in entire accord with him on this matter.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to point out that small business generally, insofar as its contacts with the Banking and Currency Committee are concerned, appears to be duly appreciative of the fine work which that committee has done in connection with the problems of small business, and those from whom I have heard think it is an adequate place for the problem to be considered.

Mr. MURRAY. Every Senator is entitled to his own judgment and opinion on these questions, and I do not have any quarrel with the position Senators take, but I want to point out that at the present time small business is in a more desperate situation than it has been in at any other time in its history. When we established the original committee in 1940 it was because of the conditions small business had gone through during the period of the depression. Thousands of small-business concerns folded up during that period. It finally became such an important issue in the Nation that the National Democratic Party, at its 1940 Convention, adopted a platform plank approving the establishment of a special committee on small business in the Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Following what the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has said, do I understand correctly that the Senator from Montana objects to the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency because it has too narrow a scope?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; that is true.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency finds that a matter is not within its jurisdiction, can it not set forth all the facts and give those facts to one of the other committees of the Senate?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, but it would be irregular, it seems to me, for the subcommittee to be undertaking constantly the study of subjects which are not within its own jurisdiction. It would unnecessarily take up the time of the committee, which is one of the most important committees in the Senate. It has very important duties to perform. If they undertake to go over the whole field of small business in the United States, determine what is wrong with small business, and what it is necessary to do in order to preserve it in our system of enterprise, the members of the committee will find that they have too much work to do, and they will neglect some of the other important functions which they have to perform.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to point out that the Chair has informed us that the Banking and Currency Committee has the major interest in the affairs of small business, and it is for that reason that it is currently handling the problems of small business through a subcommittee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, that statement has been made many times, but I should like to say that it is not entirely correct. The committee does not have jurisdiction over the major problems of small business, by any means. There are four or five other important committees of the Senate which have functions to perform with reference to small business just as important as those performed by the Banking and Currency Committee. That is true even of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Very few people would think, at first blush, that that committee should consider matters in connection with small-business problems. Yet it has important functions to perform in that field.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I will yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. I should like to commend the Senator from Montana for the splendid work which he and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] have done in behalf of the small-business men not only of my State, but of the entire Nation. Long before I came to the Senate I was familiar with the splendid work of the Small Business Committee, and I was familiar also with how the small-business men throughout the State of Minnesota appreciated what was being done for them by the Small Business Committee. I certainly hope that this committee may continue to function in the same manner in which it functioned during the time it was designated an independent Small Business Committee. So again I say that I commend not only the able Senator from Montana but the junior Senator from Nebraska for having fought for the continuance of the life of the Small Business Committee in order that it may continue to do the splendid work which it has been doing. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his very generous remarks. I think what he has said is absolutely true. I recall many small-business concerns in the State of Minnesota that made splendid contributions to war production during the war. I cannot recall the names now, but I remember one organization in the State of Minnesota which succeeded in taking a subcontract for the manufacture of some materials which were being used in the war, and it cut the price almost in half because of its efficiency.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If time would permit we could certainly go into the splendid record made by the small-business men of Minnesota and of many of the other Northwestern States. They made an excellent contribution in assisting with their subcontracts some of the larger firms in the East and in other industrial sections of the country. They could have accomplished that and fulfilled those contracts only through the assistance of a committee such as the Small Business Committee.

Mr. MURRAY. That is absolutely correct. There can be no question about it. The committee was responsible in a very large measure for the tremendous volume of production during the war, because we mobilized thousands and thousands of small concerns throughout the United States which would have gone bankrupt if it had not been for the activities of this committee. We held hearings in Washington and in other parts of the country and brought the businessmen before us. We caused the procurement agencies of the Government to set up small-business units in their various departments in order to try to bring these small concerns into successful operation in fighting the war. We had over 2,500 business concerns scattered all over the western part of the United States working, in connection with the Navy, out of Mare Island. The Navy presented its E award to a number of these concerns for the excellence of their work in that regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on Friday last the majority leader said he would yield me 10 minutes, and if the time of the Senator from Montana has expired, I should like to have some time. I wish to discuss for a short time the question now pending before the Senate.

I would not question the sincerity of any Senator who makes an honest effort in behalf of small-business men. I would protest their motives, however, should they prove to be nothing more than a cloak of do-goodism enshrouding base political ambitions. My feelings would be the same regardless of the Senator's party affiliation.

Hear me well, Mr. President and Senators. I know my remarks will not change any votes in this Chamber today, but in anticipation of what is going to take place here at 4 o'clock, there will be a record of my caution which will be of little consolation in the coming congressional elections, and especially in 1952. The vote here this afternoon will not be a record of either political party. It will be a record of politics. The pending proposal is not an attempt to help small business.

I appreciate as much as does any other Senator that the small-business men of the Nation do need help and that it is necessary for them that legislative action be taken by the House and the Senate, but I cannot see how a special committee of the Senate, or an investigating committee, can in any way relieve them from the plight in which they now find themselves.

I am anxious to observe the future voting record of Senators on small-business legislation. I intend to report some legislation from the Banking and Currency Committee which will give the do-gooders a chance to stand up and be counted. It will be before November, too.

The small-business men of this Nation have been so taunted with lip service that they have become calloused to campaign promises. Even Government departments and agencies have failed in their pledges.

I wish to make it clear that many of the bills, amendments, and other measures, intended to relieve small business, have been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, but that committee has never gotten the proper cooperation from the agencies of the Government. In many instances, they have not even approved of legislative proposals which have been sent to the Senate, and in some instances they even threatened adverse legislation. So, regardless of some of the things we may or may not do in the House or Senate, I say, as Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that, certainly since I have been chairman, we have not received full cooperation from the Government agencies in an effort to help small business, not only through legislation, but in many instances by action taken by the departments. It has been necessary for us to change some of the laws. It was necessary last year, when we were considering the continuance of controls on steel, and continuance of export controls—which we later abolished—on cottonseed, oils, and other commodities affecting many of the small-business interests throughout the country. We did not get proper cooperation from the departmental agencies until after we brought the matters to the floor of the Senate.

On the basis of studies and investigations made by the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have been convinced of the necessity of certain legislative action. In deference to adverse reports by some of the departments, committee action was delayed on several bills during the past session. I think the Congress should now have an opportunity either to support this lip service, or brand it for what it is, and offer some practical help.

Now let us have a look at the record of gross inconsistencies. The majority leadership is flip-flopping to the support of a group of well-organized and highly vocal lobbyists who are clamoring for the creation of a special small-business committee. I say that, Mr. President, because I have received telegrams from these lobbyists. I have sent their names to the Secretary's office, where they are supposed to be recorded.

We criticized the Republicans vigorously in the Eightieth Congress for doing this very thing.

In January 1947 when the question of renewing the life of the Small Business Special Committee was before the Senate, administration leaders in this body, with unsurpassed logic, mercilessly flayed the Republican leadership which was attempting to create a special committee. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was then sacred in our administration leaders' eyes.

The then senior Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Hatch, who is now a Federal judge, told this body that he would welcome the opportunity of standing before a court to prove that the intent of the Legislative Reorganization Act was to do away with special committees. He pointed out the reason, intelligence and knowledge of the conditions that existed before the Reorganization Act was passed all led to that conclusion. As he stated, "one may argue until he is black in the face that it was not intended to do away with special committees," but the facts are to the contrary.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress in its report dealing with the whole subject of congressional reorganization declared:

> We recommend that the practice of creating special committees of investigation be abandoned. (No. 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess, dated March 4, 1946)

The La Follette-Monroney bill as passed by the Senate contained this provision in section 126:

> No bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or regulation, to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a joint committee, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives

The House deleted that provision from the bill. Representative MONRONEY, who was in charge of the bill in the House, explained that this provision was more suitable for the Senate which was plagued with a great many special committees.

He pointed out further:

> It is a rash that has broken out there which practically destroys the continuity and the power of the standing committees.

The then senior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. BARKLEY, arguing in 1947 against the establishment of a special committee, explained as follows the reason why the Senate concurred in 1946 in the House version:

> It (the bill) came back to the Senate when we were on the verge of adjournment, and we almost had to accept the House amendment or get no legislation at all along that line.

Several Members of this body made, in 1947, the most eloquent and convincing arguments that could be presented against the establishment of a special committee on small business. They were convincing because they were true. Thus, the present majority leader then stated:

> I undertake to say that this resolution does violate the spirit of the La Follette-Monroney Act.
>
> I do not refer to what was said on the last day of the session, when practically every Member of the Senate had his bags packed, ready to go home. There was not time for debate or even a conference. Senator La Follette accepted the House version in order to get something But I refer to what was said when this matter was debated at length.
>
> There we find the statements and conclusions which will prove to every reasonable and prudent mind that the spirit of the Senate of the United States on special committees, as expressed at that time, certainly is being violated by these particular resolutions (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Volume 93, part 1, pp. 285, 286)

Mr. President, those were the resolutions we adopted in 1947. On pages 285 and 286 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, will be found the remarks of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], which I have read.

What, then, has happened to our side of the aisle? It is not a question of the job that has been done by the Banking and Currency Committee through its Subcommittee on Small Business. In fact, all references to the subcommittee's work on this floor have been complimentary.

The small-business men who have availed themselves of our services have been most complimentary over the excellence and the thoroughness of our efforts in their behalf. In fact, Fred A. Virkus, chairman, Conference of American Small Business Organizations, recently testified as follows:

> I know this subcommittee and the Banking and Currency Committee are doing a better job for small business than has ever been done before, and personally I should like to see this jurisdiction over small business remain in this committee. (Hearings on Economic Power of Labor Organizations, p. 606.)

What, then, has happened to Members on this side of the aisle? I will tell the Senate what has happened. Members on this side of the aisle are doing precisely what they mercilessly criticized the Members on the other side of the aisle for doing in 1947. We are forgetting logic. We are casting aside the fruit of years of research into the functioning of our legislative process. We are casting into the scrap heap the reforms that flowed from those investigations.

And what will we get from this mess of pottage? We will get the same crop we reaped before the passage of the Reorganization Act. We will get inefficiency, waste, and duplication and confusion. The special committee will issue reams of reports that will be read by but few Senators, as we are all so busy. It will introduce a large number of bills that will be referred mostly to our committee, and in part to others. Our committee will not take the word of others for the existence of the conditions stated, as it is our duty to investigate the facts before legislating. Hence, lengthy duplicate hearings will again be held.

The Rules Committee and the Senate will be called upon to provide even more money so that the staffs of the standing committees may be enlarged in order to keep up with this new mass of recommendations from a committee with no legislative authority of its own.

Mr. President, I would leave the Senators with one further thought. Perhaps it would be well to simply repeal the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Seriously, my colleagues, do not lose sight of the fact that it is our party's duty to adhere to the Reorganization Act. If we do not do so now, let us not weep when there again breaks out a rash of special committees for 'ool, for mines, for liquor, for gold, and for $3 bills, and for many others.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the absence of the majority leader I will take 10 more minutes.

Before he left, the majority leader told me I could take that much time, if it was necessary for me to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, one of the most important things for Members of this body to consider is the great change that has come over the country as the result of the growth of big business and monopoly, and how it affects small-business concerns. Studies have been made of this situation in our country, and many articles have appeared in magazines and important newspapers dealing with the subject. I recall that back in the depression period it was shown that while all of small business was in a highly competitive situation and was not able to survive in that period, the big-business concerns were able to continue and to make progress, even though the country was in one of the most serious depressions we ever witnessed. All during the depression years the major corporations of the United States made satisfactory profits. In 1937 the major companies of the country made more profits than they did in 1929, which was the highest period of American prosperity. That was due to the fact that they were able to curtail production and raise prices and continue to operate successfully, while all the small-business concerns were in a state of intense competition and were not able to meet the conditions which had come upon them.

Mr. President, I shall refer to an article taken from Fortune magazine of March 1938, in which the situation I have described was discussed. The article shows how American business had changed over the years, and how we were rapidly becoming a collectivist economy in this country. The article says:

Thus collectivism in industry begets collectivism in government. And if this is not collectivism as practiced in the so-called collectivist states, it is only a couple of theoretic steps removed from it. Carried to its extreme, it means the downfall of the economy upon which American business has been reared; the perversion of the democratic order; the destruction of the right to risk and profit, and—all too easily—the loss of those civil liberties that are at present based upon the principle of the limitation of governmental power.

That article shows what a serious situation is confronting this country, and how important it is for the Senate to set up a special committee which will make small-business problems its chief concern, and work out ways and means of aiding small business to survive in this desperate period. I submit that the matter is very important.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement from a book entitled "People and Power," published by William Morrow & Co. of New York, in 1947. The book is written by Harvey Ferguson.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The effort here is to understand the psychology of conservative citizens and it cannot be understood without considering the fact that all of them have lived their whole lives in the world of laissez faire, and that the alternation of boom and slump was typically, for a hundred years, to those who own the means of production, both a means to wealth and a means to power. More individual fortunes have been made by speculation than by production, and speculation depends upon the wide swing in values which only the business cycle can produce. Every great bull market requires first a great bear market where those who have can buy cheap. Every real-estate boom is preceded by a period in which a great deal of real estate passes from the little fellow to the big one. No doubt, every lender hates to foreclose a mortgage, but during the great depression thousands of small property owners were closed out and their holdings were later resold at enormous profits The business cycle has played an essential part in a process of expropriation which has been concentrating American wealth in fewer and fewer hands for generations. The process is even more deadly to the little entrepreneur than it is to the wage earner, who has nothing to lose but the fat on his ribs. So the defense of free private enterprise, as carried on in the halls and lobbies of Congress by organizations representing vested interest, has, as a matter of fact, been a means of destroying the prime essential of freedom of economic enterprise as a mass condition, for that essential is access to some means of production (Ferguson, Harvey, People and Power, pp. 48–49, William Morrow & Co., New York, 1947).

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I also wish to call attention to the Supreme Court decision in the case of Standard Oil Co. against United States, which was decided on June 13, 1949, in an opinion written by Mr. Justice Douglas. The opinion refers to the concentration of industrial power in the hands of a few. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the opinion may be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The increased concentration of industrial power in the hands of a few has changed habits of thought. A new age has been introduced. It is more and more an age of monopoly competition Monopoly competition is a regime of friendly alliances, of quick and easy accommodation of prices even without the benefit of trade associations, of what Brandeis said was euphemistically called cooperation While this is not true in all fields, it has become alarmingly apparent in many.

The lessons Brandeis taught on the curse of bigness have largely been forgotten in high places. Size is allowed to become a menace to existing and putative competitors Price control is allowed to escape the influences of the competitive market and to gravitate into the hands of the few But beyond all that there is the effect on the community when independents are swallowed up by the trusts and entrepreneurs become employees of absentee owners. Then there is a serious loss in citizenship. Local leadership is diluted.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. May I inquire of the Senator from Montana if from the material he has he can insert something which criticizes the inadequacy of the present Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, in order that independently minded Senators may judge whether or not what we are doing is inadequate for the task of the future, in order that we can give better consideration to the proposal offered by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MURRAY. Quite naturally, no criticisms have been made by major magazines, because they have never made any study of the subject. I doubt if any of them really know about the activities of the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. Very many businessmen of the country do not know that such a subcommittee exists. Therefore, no public criticism has been made of it. I could not make any criticism of it. I think the subcommittee wants to do the best job it possibly can, but I do not think it is an effective way to meet the problems affecting small business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 52 minutes and the Senator from Nebraska has 46 minutes, the Chair is advised.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield several minutes to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield a portion of my 20 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate now that the small-business men who have availed themselves of our services have been most complimentary over the excellence and thoroughness of our efforts in their behalf. In fact, Mr. Fred A. Virkus, who is chairman of the American Small Business Organizations, recently testified as follows:

I know this subcommittee and the Banking and Currency Committee are doing a better job for small business than has ever been done before, and personally I should like to see this jurisdiction over small business remain in this committee.

Mr. President, I read that quotation merely because I wanted those who have worked so faithfully on the staff of the committee and the Senators who are members of that committee, and who have given of their time to its work, to have that acknowledgment of the value of their services placed in the RECORD, together with the speech I have made.

I am glad to have heard so many complimentary remarks, even by some Senators who may not be on the floor today, made regarding the work the committee and its staff have done.

I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as the junior Senator from Florida understands the situation, he has for his time the remainder of the 20 minutes yielded to him by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and 40 minutes yielded to him by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. President, I do not care to go over the same ground that I covered Friday afternoon in my argument on this subject. However, there are two points which I think need to be accentuated at this stage of the argument, the first of which is to remind Senators—and I wish more Senators were present in the Senate Chamber at this time—that this matter was very fully and ably argued to a conclusion, at least for the time being, in 1947, in the Eightieth Congress, and that the splendid arguments against the setting up of any special committee on

small business, as then suggested by Senate Resolution 20, are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that time, and it seems to me they still very clearly express a conviction on the part of the Democratic majority of this Congress, then the minority of the Eightieth Congress, against the creation of any special committee on small business or any other special committee, as being in contravention of the spirit of the Reorganization Act, and also as not being in accord with the best interests of sound, economical, efficient, and democratic government, here in the Halls of Congress.

I have been impressed today while rereading the arguments presented in the 1947 debate, and I wish time permitted me to read a larger portion of them into the RECORD at this point.

I wish to comment that able Senators, who are still Members of the Senate, took very strong positions against the adoption of the then pending measure, Senate Resolution 20, which was intended to reestablish a special committee on small business. The argument of the able senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was very compelling on this point. The argument of the able senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] was one of the best I have ever heard him make The two arguments made by the able senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are full of good meat, and they lead one to the very definite conclusion that it was against the interests of sound and well-organized legislative government to trespass against the spirit of the Reorganization Act by the adoption of a measure to set up a special committee on small business.

The able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] argued the matter with great ability and distinction.

The able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], although he now takes a different position, at that time—as shown by his participation in the argument on several occasions—was strongly of the feeling that the special committee should not be reconstituted or set up again.

The then serving minority leader, Mr. BARKLEY, now the President of the Senate, likewise argued this question exhaustively at that time, and I shall quote briefly from his argument before I conclude my remarks.

The arguments against the setting up the Special Committee on Small Business were not solely heard, however, from Senators on this side of the aisle. On the contrary, two of the ablest arguments were made by Senators who sit upon the other side of the aisle. I refer to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], both of whom made very able arguments against the setting up of a Special Committee on Small Business, against the breaking of the spirit and purpose of the Reorganization Act, and against the kind of confusion which they so ably pointed out would result by having the Senate again embark upon a course of action by which it would set up special committees running across the lines of jurisdiction of the general or standing committees.

Mr. President, I believe every Member of the Senate knows that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is one of the ablest scholars in this body. In his argument at that time, on January 15, 1947, I am impressed with the fact that he approached this question as a scholar, as a student, as one who had participated, as a member of the committee, in the work of the special joint committee from which came, as a result of its labors, the Congressional Reorganization Act. I shall not quote him at great length, but I certainly wish to quote some of the argument he made at that time.

First, in giving the basis upon which he would discuss this subject, he said:

MR THOMAS of Utah. I should like to discuss these questions on the high ground of the basic principles of good legislative organization and administration, without reference to personal ambitions or partisan advantage.

Again, he spoke as follows:

Speaking both as a close student of representative government and as an experienced practitioner of the political art, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and especially newcomers to the Senate, to consider the issue before us with open minds and with a view to the long-run welfare and repute of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I should like to approach the debate today on that same high plane.

Again, the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] spoke as follows:

We know that the Congress is not the body to execute, it is not the body to administer; but it is the body to direct. By resort to the expedient of special committees, Congress to a great extent actually loses control because of the independent way in which investigating committees set about and carry on their work without review by a standing committee of the Senate

Later in his argument the able Senator from Utah adopted the basic arguments as advanced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and quoted them as expressing in large part his position on this very interesting subject. I shall read the points he stated, from 1 to 9, which the senior Senator from Utah stated in the course of his argument as an analysis of his attitude on the question and also of the attitude, in opposition, of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the measure which would have set up a special committee for small business.

The Senator from Utah then said:

First. The jurisdiction of the standing committees has been so comprehensively described in the reformed rules as to cover every conceivable subject of legislation. Thus, to create a special committee is to trespass upon the assigned jurisdiction of some standing committee.

How very true that is, Mr. President. The Senator from Utah further said:

Second. The standing committees of the Senate have been authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act to exercise continuous oversight of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies within their respective jurisdictions. They are being equipped with professional staffs and expert investigators to assist them in performing their oversight function and have been armed with the subpena power for this purpose. Hereafter the investigatory function of Congress should be performed by its standing committees which have been empowered and equipped for the purpose instead of relying upon special investigating committees which are sporadic in nature and cannot introduce legislation to give effect to their recommendations.

Third. The reformed Senate rules limit Senators to service on two standing committees each so that they can meet their legislative responsibilities more effectively. If, in addition, Senators are appointed to serve on special committees, the burdens of committee work will be correspondingly multiplied and the old evils of poor attendance and scattered attention will return.

Fourth. Creation of one or two special committees now will pave the way for the establishment of a rash of special committees with inevitable duplication of the work of the standing committees and unnecessary large-scale expenditures. It might also lead to a revival of the use of staff personnel borrowed from downtown departments with all the disadvantages of that practice.

Fifth. Creation of special committees to deal with subjects already assigned to standing committees will also be a burden to, and impair the efficiency of, the executive agencies of the Government by requiring their officials to repeat their testimony on the same subjects before several committees of the Senate.

Sixth. Sporadic inquiries by select committees lack continuity and fail to provide the members of standing committees with direct knowledge of the information gathered In cases where legislative action is indicated, standing committees find it necessary to do much of the work over again.

Seventh. Special investigations should be conducted by subcommittees of the reorganized standing committees having jurisdiction of the subject matter involved. Thus, for example, inquiries into the condition of small business might well be assigned to a standing subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Eighth On June 10, 1946, the Senate approved of the ban on special committees by a vote of 49 to 16 in passing the La Follette bill

Ninth. Modernization of the congressional committee structure, achieved by the Legislative Reorganization Act, was the keystone in the arch of congressional reform. To set up a series of special committees now would be a regressive step that might lead to the ultimate destruction of this fundamental reform.

Following those nine statements of the compelling reasons the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had advanced against setting up special committees—reasons which were adopted by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah continued his remarks by making the following statement:

There is one further argument I should like to add to the cogent statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon While some special committees in the past have been "black sheep," some truly progressive committees in recent years have made a major contribution to public understanding of our economic and social problems. I applaud their achievements. But I say that all the advantages which are claimed for the special committee technique can now be enjoyed by our reorganized and newly staffed standing committees and their subcommittees. Armed with the power of subpena and staffed with expert investigators and empowered to keep constant watch over the activities of the executive agencies within their jurisdiction, there is no reason why our great standing committees of the Senate

should not serve the Congress and the country as well as certain outstanding special committees have done in the past.

That ends my quotation from the remarks made at that time by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], Mr. President.

While I am on this point, though, I should like to put in the RECORD one of the various quotations which might be given from the able arguments of the Senator from Illinois who, as I said a while ago, participated, not once, but several times in the debate, though he now takes the contrary position.

For instance, I quote from page 345 of volume 93, part 1, of the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following statement then made by the senior Senator from Illinois:

I am further told that General Gregory appeared one day before a special committee of the Senate and was kept practically all day before that committee giving testimony; that the following day he appeared before another committee of the Senate, giving the same testimony; and the third day he was summoned to the House of Representatives to give the same testimony over there on surplus property. That is an example of what the Senator is talking about—taking the time of important men in the executive branch of the Government of the United States and constantly bringing them before committees to go over the same subject-matter time and time again. If the Reorganization Act functions as the Senate said it should function in the debates we had when we passed the bill, when the time comes for these men from the executive branch of the Government to come to the Hill to testify, they can go before either one full committee or a subcommittee of a full committee. Then we shall eliminate the duplication of effort, waste of time, and waste of manpower which was unavoidable under the system which existed when we had special investigating committees.

I want to reread into the RECORD, as the advice of the Senate at that time, this verdict of the able Senator from Illinois, who then urged:

Then we shall eliminate the duplication of effort, waste of time, and waste of manpower which was unavoidable under the system which existed when we had special investigating committees.

I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Illinois is now of the opinion that some other conclusion was a sound one. However, this is the latest expression of his considered thinking that I have seen, and it is to the effect that duplication of effort, waste of time, waste of manpower, is inevitable under the system which existed when we had special investigating committees.

Mr. President, the able minority leader at that time, now the Vice President, in concluding the argument of this point before the Senate on the occasion which I mentioned used the following words:

Mr. President, in the interest of efficiency, economy, and orderly legislation, it seems to me to be common sense to refer to the committee having jurisdiction of substantive legislation the investigation necessary to bring out the facts which will show what legislation is needed; for, in the absence of legislation, neither the Small Business Committee nor any other committee can for very long do any legislative business or any other kind of business, because we must give our attention to the law, and not to an effort to substitute a committee of Congress for an executive department, whether it be the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, or any other agency which deals with the financial set-up of business whether it be large or small.

I go back to say it seems to me—and I paraphrase the Vice President, then the senior Senator from Kentucky—it seems to me still to be common sense to refer to the committee having jurisdiction of substantive legislation, the investigation necessary to bring out the facts which will show what legislation is needed.

Mr. President, not only was this the position taken by the distinguished leaders on this side of the aisle, but I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when the votes were taken on this measure, it appeared that all but three Members among the Democrats in the Senate at that time voted to stand by their then leader, the then distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky; and also by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, the whip at that time; and that with three exceptions, on both yea-and-nay votes taken on that legislation, first upon the so-called Tobey amendment, and, second, on the adoption of the resolution, there were only three Democrats then sitting in the Senate who did not go with the leadership and with the other leading Democrats, who had voiced their extreme disapproval of the custom and practice of setting up special committees, and of the efficiency of such a system. I may say those three include the senior Senator from Montana, who is consistent in his continued opposition on the floor of the Senate. He is the only one who has been consistent, I may say, and I think, in passing, we should all compliment him upon his consistency. The other two brethren among the Democrats who joined him in 1947 are no longer on the floor of the Senate. They were the then Senator from Texas, Mr. O'Daniel, and the then Senator from Tennessee, Mr. Stewart. So that the only Senator now serving as a Democrat who then took that position is the distinguished Senator from Montana, who quite consistently maintains his position; which, however, flew in the face of the party's position taken by his leadership, and followed by nearly all members of the Democratic minority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yield the Senator another 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes more.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I may say I have 40 minutes of the time of the Senator from Nebraska. I do not think the Senator heard me when I made that statement when I started. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator yielded 17 minutes, which expired. There is no record at the desk of the 40 minutes referred to.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Nebraska was called from the Chamber, but he told me before he left to announce that he had yielded me 40 minutes of his time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator has been talking about inconsistency. Does the Senator from Florida believe he has been consistent in connection with this matter?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida thinks he has been entirely consistent, and, since the question has come up, I wonder——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder whether it might be interesting to read a question which was addressed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] during the course of the debate. If ever inconsistency existed, it is the present announced position of the Senator from Illinois, as contrasted to his position taken in this question. I read the question, further——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will gladly yield after I get through reading the question propounded in the debate in 1947 by the senior Senator from Illinois to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in these words:

So that brings me back to the same question—

The Senator from Illinois was talking to the Senator from Michigan—

namely, if the Senator was so determined last year to eliminate special committees, and he voted to do so, and he played a part in doing so by his vote here in the Senate, it is difficult for the Senator from Illinois to understand the change of heart and mind overnight of the able Senator from Michigan.

That is the exact quotation taken from the debate at that time, which might be paraphrased now, to phrase this question addressed to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]: If the Senator was so determined last year to eliminate special committees, which he was, and he voted to do so—and he did—and he played a part in doing so by his vote here in the Senate—which of course is a matter of record—it is difficult for the Senator from Florida to understand the change of heart and mind overnight of the able Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Florida introduced in the Senate a joint resolution cosponsored by the Senator from Nebraska, asking the Senate to create a standing Committee for Small Business. Has not the Senator retreated from that position?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to answer the question. In the first place, the Senator from Nebraska had nothing to do

with the drafting of the joint resolution. It was drawn by the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. HOLLAND. In the next place, the Senator from Florida introduced it, thinking that a standing committee clothed with full authority could best handle the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator has retreated from that position, has he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has retreated, in this respect only——

Mr. LUCAS. Well——

Mr. HOLLAND. And if the distinguished Senator will allow me now to state my position, I think he will have the information he so ardently desires.

Mr. LUCAS. I have been talking about——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not yield until I have answered the question. The fact of the matter is this: The question came up in the caucus of our party, at which time our leader knows full well the majority refused to give to him a verdict on this that he could change his position or change the position of the party, because no such action was taken. But it became clearly apparent to the junior Senator from Florida, as it was to everyone who was there, that the chairmen of the several committees of the Senate were unwilling to accede to the giving of jurisdiction in this matter to a standing committee, because they could not feel at this time that they would know exactly how far it would go, about cutting across lines of their jurisdiction. It became so evident, that the majority of the leaders here on this side, excluding the Senator from Illinois, who, as I recall, made no expression at that time upon the subject, that the majority of the leaders, the chairmen of the committees, were not willing to give their approval, and it became very evident that the resolution as first introduced by me could not pass. Therefore, taking the next best course, he is turning to the Committee on Banking and Currency which has been found by the verdict of the Senate, through a vote of 57 to 20, to be the committee which has dominant jurisdiction in the field of small business; I am trying now to give to the committee not only the legislative authority which it has already, but sufficient investigatorial authority, without disturbing at all their legislative authority, so that they can more effectively cover this particular business; and I may say that in order to have a better tie-in with other committees which have a stake in small business, my proposed amendment suggests that, for instance, a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be assigned as an extra, an added and ex officio member to the Committee on Banking and Currency, on matters affecting small business; likewise, that a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has to do with antitrust legislation, which affects small business so vitally; likewise, a member from the Committee on Finance, which affects all tax matters that bear upon small business; leaving it to five additional committeemen, coming from committees where the best experienced members can be found, in the hope that small business will be better satisfied with that arrangement than it has proved it has been satisfied with the present situation in which a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency has handled the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The only reason the Senator from Illinois rose was to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida with reference to consistency and inconsistency. The Senator made a long speech after I asked him the question. The only thing I am asking is this: Is it not a fact that the Senator has retreated from his previous position, and is that not an inconsistent position?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not in the slightest.

Mr. LUCAS. Why did not the Senator approve the original resolution?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask to be protected against the assaults which are being leveled against me.

Mr. LUCAS. I apologize to the Senator if he thinks I am leveling any assaults against him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I accept the Senator's apology and shall be happy to state my position again, as I stated it on Friday. I should be glad to continue to fight for a standing Small Business Committee with legislative powers to deal with the affairs of small-business men, were that possible. Seeing I cannot get that, I am willing to stand for the next best thing, which is to lodge the jurisdiction in a standing committee, a committee which has the great preponderance of interest in the affairs of small business. The Senator cannot claim that I have abandoned my position, because, to the contrary, I stated on Friday that if I thought there were a chance for the resolution to be adopted, I would support it. I am not guilty of the type of inconsistency displayed by my friend from Illinois, who, after twitting the Senator from Michigan with being inconsistent in having adopted an entirely different position from the one he had taken the year before, now finds that the question be leveled at the Senator from Michigan is when addressed to him now impossible of being answered, because it clearly shows the complete inconsistency of the present position of the Senator from Illinois as measured against his position in 1947, 1948, and 1949.

So, Mr. President, if I may proceed with my statement——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at the moment. I am operating on limited time. When I finish my statement, if I have any time remaining, I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield now. I shall be happy to yield when I have concluded my statement.

The first point, Mr. President, is that the majority leader has deserted his party, the shepherd has deserted his flock, and now, in spite of the fact that jurisdiction has been conferred upon another committee, an excellent committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, to do the job, and it has been trying to do it, the Senator wants to establish a duplicate authority, a special committee on small business, to interfere with and encumber the work and the labors now being performed by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

That brings me, Mr. President, to the second part of my remarks, and I ask that Senators follow them very closely.

In February 1949, the Senate ruled that the Committee on Banking and Currency had the predominant jurisdiction over legislation affecting small business. A little bit later, on May 6, 1949, the Senate adopted Senate resolution 101 which following out the decision already made by the Senate as to where the major jurisdiction lay, turned over to the Banking and Currency Committee not any additional legislative jurisdiction, because that was carefully safeguarded under an amendment offered by my friend, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], whom I see here, but full investigative duties and functions. That resolution, which was agreed to on May 9, 1949, was the verdict of the Democratic Senate to the effect that that committee was the proper place in which such an investigation should take place.

Mr. President, I want to read into the RECORD at this time, in order that it may be crystal clear that what we did was done by deliberation and was done in such a way as to really vest investigative authority in the Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Resolution 101:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the Eighty-first Congress, until February 15, 1950, to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper, relating to small business, including (A) problems threatening the continued existence of small business enterprises, (B) financial aid to small business enterprises, (C) financial aid to veterans operating small business enterprises, and (D) adequacy of Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan authority and extensions thereof.

Further, Mr. President, the budget attached to the report on the resolution showed $30,000 out of a total of $60,000 appropriated out of the contingent fund of the Senate was earmarked to serve in this investigation in the field of small business. Not only was that action taken on May 6, 1949, but in this particular year, on February 9, Senate Resolution 218 came on to be acted upon, and it proposed that the authority of the Banking and Currency Committee and its subcommittee, as provided for in Senate Resolution 101, be continued until February 15, 1951.

Mr. President, not only was that done through the passage of the resolution, but if Senators will take the time to refer to the report attached thereto, they will find that a substantial additional sum of money was assigned to small-business investigations, raising the figure from $30,000 to approximately $45,000, to be expended in the investigations for the protection of small business. The report shows that antitrust litigation has al-

ready been brought in pursuance of some of the committee's recommendations. It shows that the committee has effectively served small business in many particulars, and the testimony filed by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, shows the approving reaction of various small-business men and small-business groups to the type of service which the committee has rendered.

But the point I am making, Mr. President, is that the Senate has acted. It acted last year and again this year, and has committed itself until February 15, 1951, to a course of investigation of the affairs of small business which is now being conducted by a highly trained and extensive staff, with all the facilities needed, and it is going on regardless of whether the Senate shall look with approval upon the suggestions made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] or the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. Regardless of whether their suggestions shall prevail, that activity will continue until February 15, 1951.

What a request to make to the Senate of the United States, when we are all economy-minded. What a request to make to the Senate of the United States to slap at a good committee which is rendering good service in the performance of a direction given to it by the whole body of the Senate, and to try to establish a special committee—whether standing or for the length of the session makes no difference—with authority to investigate the same field, with the necessity of establishing a new staff and providing for new expenditures, and of duplicating the whole field of service. I cannot believe that my friends, the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Nebraska, who have made contrasting suggestions and who, I understand, will offer substitutes, have really thought through the position in which they would put the Senate of the United States if their suggestions should prevail, and if, instead of having a single duly constituted authority to represent the Senate in the investigation of small-business matters, we establish an additional one. We would have a second horn of the dilemma, with conflicting and competing staffs and expenditures. They have suggested something which is nothing more nor less than duplication and which seeks to do nothing more nor less than to give affront to a committee which I think has rendered good service.

For the information of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] I say that that committee should have full authority, but it does not have it because we cannot give new legislative authority to standing committees because of the attitude in the Senate at this time. So, the best we can do is to give it investigative authority——

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. In just a moment, please.

I am not a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. I was a member of the Small Business Committee for 2 years. I found it was helpless to function properly because it had no legislative authority. It was completely emasculated as to any authority which any committee needs to carry through its recommendations and convictions. Therefore, what I shall say with reference to the Banking and Currency Committee is not a personal matter in any way, but I heard suggestions made on the floor of the Senate on Friday to the effect that small-business men felt they were going before a group of glassy-eyed bankers when they came before the members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. President, the members of that committee are Members of the Senate, just as are the rest of us who are assigned to other committees. It so happens, whether our friends who made the suggestion realize it or not, that the membership of the Banking and Currency Committee very peculiarly falls within the group of Senators which has shown the greatest sympathy for the problems of small business. For instance, there are three members of the Banking and Currency Committee who were members of the Special Small Business Committee, namely, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. In addition to those, there are two members of that committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who by their unyielding attitude in the protection of small business with reference to the basing-point bill, Senate bill 1008, have won the particular esteem and affection of the small business groups of this Nation. Yet it is suggested that in the Banking and Currency Committee there is an unsympathetic background for the rendition of real service to small business.

I could continue with my reference to the members of the special committee. For instance, there is the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], whose kindly, sympathetic attitude toward small business has marked everything he has done since he came to the Senate. There is the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is even now conducting an investigation in an effort to make the RFC more sympathetic in its consideration of loans requested by small business.

Mr. President, we can look at the whole membership of that committee. I apologize because time does not permit my mentioning the other members. Every member of that committee should be an acceptable person to small business for the handling of its complaints and consideration of its legitimate needs. So it seems to me, Mr. President, we should not be doing something which would seem rather ridiculous in the present state of our economy and in the present state of our overwork. To assign a new group of 12 or 13 Senators to handle what would not only be a new field of activity for them, but a duplicate field of Senate activity, deprived of any legislative power at all, needing a new staff, with new expenditures, with all the organizational work which would be entailed, would be a complete disservice to small business, and a complete disservice to the Members of the Senate who would be called to that new responsibility.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Florida to point out that under the Reorganization Act the Banking and Currency Committee has jurisdiction in that field?

Mr. HOLLAND. It has a large part of the jurisdiction. The Senate decided, by upholding the ruling of the Chair, that the committee has the dominant jurisdiction in the field of small business.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And that the Reorganization Act outlaws special committees of the type here under discussion?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Banking and Currency Committee has set up a subcommittee, with a technical staff, which is successfully functioning, and doing its work in an economical way.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my belief.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And under the so-called Murray plan there would be set up a new and competing committee, with authority to hold hearings in Washington and elsewhere in the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, and with authority to subpena witnesses and books, wherever they held hearings, in complete duplication and competition with the efforts of the Banking and Currency Committee, at least until February 15 of next year.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Neither of the distinguished sponsors of the proposed legislation has told us what their committee would cost in the event their proposed resolution were adopted. I assume it would be not less than $150,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would not assume that, but I have noticed the reticence of the distinguished sponsors in that particular regard.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from Florida is proposing now to give a little further coverage, in line with the precedent already established, under which we bring, from the Committee on Armed Services, or from the Committee on Public Works, or from some other committee, ex officio members into the Appropriations Committee when it has before it a bill dealing with a subject in the jurisdiction of one of those committees.

Mr. HOLLAND. I pointed out in my argument on Friday that we would be following exactly the same course which we are following with such distinct success in the functioning of the Committee on Appropriations. We realize that the members of the Committee on Public Works have a background and knowledge concerning public works which have been authorized, and three members become ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations when the committee is considering appropriations for public works. Similarly in the field of agriculture, in the field of armed services, and in other fields.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am not a member of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and

Currency, but I believe that the subcommittee is composed of as fine members as there are in the Senate. I have no objection at all to the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Florida to add, when some particular subject is under consideration, an additional five ex officio members, and I shall support the Senator in that amendment. I certainly hope that the other amendments will not be adopted, because I do not see how anyone who has sat on this floor and has spoken for economy and efficiency in business, as I have, can vote to set up two committees to do the same thing, with overlapping expenses, and with no assurance that the second committee will be as good as the one we have

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I merely wish to thank the Senator for his remarks with reference to my consistency. If the Senate had been equally consistent in handling this matter, we would not now have this problem before us. We would have kept the Committee on Small Business in operation. It was doing a splendid job. Its termination was a great disappointment to every businessman in the United States. If there is any merit to consistency, I think we should have been consistent and kept that committee in existence. It is proposed now to have members representing five different standing committees participate with the Banking and Currency Committee in matters involving small-business problems. May I ask the distinguished Senator whether that would include the Committeee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. HOLLAND. It may. As I stated on Friday—and I believe the Senator remembers my statement—I suggested that three of the additional members should come, one each from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, from the Committee on Finance, and from the Committee on the Judiciary, which latter committee is charged with the consideration of antitrust matters. As to the two additional members, I did not suggest from what committees they should come, because I think there are exceedingly able junior Senators who do not have heavy committee assignments, who may well be assigned to that committee. I should like to mention the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] as fulfilling that description. I had previously talked to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and he said that that part of my suggestion was an excellent one, because he felt there were some Senators on his side of the aisle whose success in business was outstanding, and who could make real contributions in this field. I should state, however, that the Senator did not agree with other portions of my suggestion.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator with respect to new Members of the Senate, who would be very competent and able. In fact, I can think of no Member of the Senate who is better informed on small business problems than the new junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and if any committee is set up, I should like to see him serve on the committee. But I insist that the program the Senator from Florida offers is not a satisfactory program. I do not think it would operate in a satisfactory manner, but that it would lead to confusion. It would require an amendment to the rules of the Senate, and it would change the situation completely. Other committees would have a perfect right to come before this body and insist on a similar program for their committees with reference to some other segment of our economic problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with all due deference to the Senator, I yielded for a question, and I should appreciate a question from him, if he has one.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Florida take the position now that the present Reorganization Act does not prohibit the creation of a special committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not technically, no. The Senate voted to prohibit the creation of special committees. In the last minute work upon the bill in conference the Senate conferees had to yield to the House, but the vote on the floor of the Senate, by an overwhelming majority, showed what the attitude of the Senate was. I pointed out, before the Senator returned to the floor, that so far as the Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle were concerned in 1947, with the exception of three, only one of whom is now a Member of the Senate, the argument made by our distinguished leader, the Senator from Illinois, and by his predecessor, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, now the Vice President, was so completely conclusive that as one man we marched down the bill behind them, save for the one exception whom I have already named.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. But it is a fact that the Senate by an overwhelming majority approved the conference report, which certainly took out the provision which the Senate had placed in the bill in its original consideration under which special committees could have been created by the Senate. I desire to get the RECORD clear. I should like to ask the Senator another question.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct, except that he fails to recognize the impelling difficulty of the situation. I read now from the argument of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] on that point. He said in 1947:

> It is an erroneous interpretation of what happened on that occasion to say that in the Legislative Reorganization Act Congress expressly refused to abolish special committees. We yielded to a parliamentary situation. We have not changed our minds.

He had shown in great detail that the mind of the Senate had been expressed on the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. I submit to the distinguished Senator, who is always so just and fair, that the Senator from Utah yielded to his interpretation, but if the record is to be cleared up, it will be found that the Senate overwhelmingly, I think unanimously, if I remember correctly, adopted the conference report after it had considered its position, when the matter was debated on the floor of the Senate. The conference report provided that the position of the House be accepted, which meant that the Senate or the House could create special committees if not in violation of the Reorganization Act. Is not that true?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct in this much of his statement, that the Members of the Senate, with their bags packed, ready to catch their trains—as is shown in the argument in the RECORD—voted for the reorganization bill as it came out of conference merely because they desired a reorganization bill, and they wanted the other good things in the bill, although, as stated time and time again by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and other Senators who opposed the provision they by no means gave up, as an objective, the effort to prevent the creation of other special committees; and that they by all means felt that the Senate had, in a direct vote on the question, expressed its views, which were that special committees were a harmful growth upon the body legislative and should be eliminated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I asked a question which the Senator has answered. Will the Senator now yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. The conference report was adopted after the original bill was passed by the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And the adoption of the conference report is what governs. Whether Senators had their hats in hand and their grips by their sides and were ready to leave is beside the question. If they did not want to adopt the conference report, knowing that the adoption of the report would perhaps mean the creation of special committees, they could have placed their hats on the racks and their suitcases in the cloak rooms and come back and further debated the question. We cannot go back on the final action, which was adoption of the conference report. We cannot go back of that, to the original vote of the Senate on the bill, and say that controls, because the Senate adopted the conference report, and did so on this floor with the full knowledge that by doing so, by acquiescing in the position of the House, either the Senate or the House could create a special committee in the future, if it chose to do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator from Nebraska is technically correct. Of course, the Senate was then practical, just as the Senator from

Florida seeks to be practical in not insisting upon the amendment originally offered, in which the Senator from Nebraska was kind enough to join him. I notice the Senator from Nebraska also has moved away from that proposal because he does not feel he can get what was first proposed. So we are trying to secure the best we can. That does not mean we are not in favor of the original proposal, and I believe the Senator from Nebraska will be the first to agree with me.

Mr. WHERRY. I will ask the Senator this question: Is it not a fact that it has been my position all along that I felt that a special committee, either without or with legislative authority, should be set up in the United States Senate, and that we should determine that matter once and for all? If the Senate fails to do that, then has it not also been my contention that if the Senate fails to do that that I have approved each and every measure that has come before the Senate to establish small-business committees, or subcommittees on small business in the regular committees? Has that not been my position?

Mr. HOLLAND. I rather think it has been. At any rate the Senator has said what I wanted him to say, namely, that he would still stand for Senate Resolution 58, just as the sponsors and proponents of the Reorganization Act are still for the elimination of the special committees, for the very reasons stated in their reports, for the reasons that were so impressive that an overwhelming majority of the Senate voted for that particular provision of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to take the time of the able Senator in discussing his own amendment to Senate Resolution 58, but if the Senator will further yield, I shall ask one more question: Does the Senator feel—knowing how just and fair the Senator from Florida is, and the junior Senator from Nebraska stated on Friday that if there was anyone in the Senate who was to select the committees from which the ex officio members would be chosen, the Senator from Nebraska knows of no other Senator he would rather have choose them than the junior Senator from Florida. But does the Senator from Florida feel that he can select, as among the committees themselves, which one is more important than the other, among Finance, Judiciary, Rules and Administration, and so forth? Matters come before the Committee on Rules and Administration which affect small business. The same is true respecting other committees. Which committee would the Senator choose above other committees? And after the Senator has chosen such a committee, what member of that committee is the Senator going to choose? The minority side is limited to membership from only two major committees. Younger members of the committee would be blocked, because senior Members would be chosen. While there are many younger Members who could render efficient service, they would not be chosen as members from two of the major committees. However, younger members of committees could serve on a special committee, regardless of their membership on other committees.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that it is my understanding, from the Legislative Reference Service, that the ex officio members will not find themselves deprived of any other major committee assignments, but that to the contrary, if provision be made for ex officio membership on a standing committee the reorganization measure itself provides for no such decision as the Senator mentions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not understand the authority from which the Senator quoted. My understanding is that there would be no restriction with respect to appointment of membership to a special committee, but that with respect to appointing Members to a subcommittee of a standing committee the question will at least arise as to whether a Member can serve on two major committees and also serve on the subcommittee of another committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is my understanding that the ex officio members created not by the statute but by a rule of the Senate would not be subjected in any way to that embarrassment or to that rule.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I know that every time the question of an appointment comes up a senior member of a committee really receives the appointment, rather than a new member.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that would be a matter wholly for discussion on his side of the aisle as to his two additional Members and on this side of the aisle at to the three additional Members from this side. I am quite willing to leave in the judgment of the Vice President, the presiding officer of this body, and in the judgment of the steering committees of the two sides, to pick the Senator who will be really helpful to small business from the sources provided in the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I would completely agree with that statement except that it is unfortunate to have a restriction which would prevent new Members of the Senate who are on major committees, who might otherwise serve if a special committee were reconstituted, and where their services would be so valuable.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would thoroughly agree with the Senator if the amendment I propose would accomplish that, but it would not. It would give complete latitude as to the naming of the three members from three standing committees, and even junior members could be chosen; and it would have no limitation at all as to where the two other members could be found. The Senator from Florida further said that he felt that by all means the junior Senator from Connecticut should be added from this side because of his outstanding and successful experience in the field of small business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that if the Committee on Banking and Currency is expanded—and, by the way, I want to say now that I would just as soon that committee should handle small-business problems as any other committee in the United States Senate, for I have complete respect for that committee—but if it is to be expanded under the authority proposed by the Senator from Florida, first, to have expanded investigative authority, and then have ex officio members voting on the legislative authority—I ask the Senator this question: Would it not override the jurisdiction of other standing committees? Would it not override the amendment the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] succeeded in placing in Senate Resolution 110 whereby it was proposed by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that the subcommittee of that committee was not to invade the jurisdiction of this committee? I ask the Senator, how will the chairman of that subcommittee know when it would, by its action, exceed its authority, and when it would not exceed its authority and jurisdiction?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would remind the Senator from Nebraska that Senate Resolution 101 would not be changed in that regard at all. The original amendment placed in that resolution on motion by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] would remain in it. There is not the slightest question in my proposal of breaking into the legislative jurisdiction of any committee. I would say also to my friend from Nebraska that Senate Resolution 101 already gives to the Committee on Banking and Currency very full jurisdiction so far as investigation only is concerned. I read again—I read this into the RECORD in the absence of the Senator from Nebraska a few minutes ago—that part of the measure which deals with jurisdiction conferred upon the Committee on Banking and Currency solely with reference to small business:

> To make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper relating to * * * (2) small business, including (A) problems threatening the continued existence of small-business enterprises, (B) financial aid to small-business enterprises, (C) financial aid to veterans operating small-business enterprises, and (D) adequacy of Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan authority and extensions thereof.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, is the Senator not asking the same expanded authority, so far as investigations are concerned and other provisions which the Senator is denying to a special committee? It seems to me the very arguments the distinguished Senator is making in behalf of expanded authority for

the Committee on Banking and Currency is the reason why the Senator is opposed to a special committee. The Senator would give to the subcommittee, so far as investigation is concerned, the same authority, unlimited practically, that the distinguished Senator from Montana and the junior Senator from Nebraska are asking for under a special committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that we are not giving it to them. We gave it to them last year. We extended it to them by action this year. We will simply recognize the status quo and vest in the same good committee which now has that jurisdiction, and which was given the money to carry forward the investigation until February 15 next year, a representation coming from other committees and from other Members of the Senate, so as to make them more satisfactory to the feeling that small business would like to have, that that committee is representative of all trends of thought in the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one final question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why not give a special committee the same authority it is proposed to give the subcommittee, and let that special committee which crosses all lines of legislative committees, have that jurisdiction over investigation, and not give them legislative authority, and then there will be an ideal committee to go clear across the lines, not limiting it to a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, the Committee on Banking and Currency has already dominant jurisdiction, and it has so been held by the ruling of the President of the Senate, and by the vote of the Senate in this field of small business, so that there would be a relatively large number of those studies made as an investigatorial body which it might translate into legislation.

My second point is that I feel that the attitude of small business in wanting a more generally named committee coming from all the portions of the Senate should be recognized.

My third point is this, and I ask the able and economically minded Senator from Nebraska particularly to let me know his answer to this point. His proposal and that of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] both simply offer from now until February 15, 1951, to set up a duplicating committee so far as investigatorial powers are concerned because the power has been given, and it is extended until that date by vote of the Senate, to the Banking and Currency Committee to make investigations in a very full and complete manner.

I am wondering how the Senator from Nebraska, with his well-known feeling that we should economize both as regards the time of the Senate and the spending of the money of the taxpayers of the United States, justifies his present feeling that a new special committee, requiring a new staff and new expenditures, and requiring a certain amount of the time of Senators, whose time is not now so employed, be set up, not to take the place of the Banking and Currency Committee or its subcommittee, but between now and February 15, 1951, to be completely a duplicate body to that already set up.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the Senator from Florida asking me the question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; and I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska, to permit him to reply.

Mr. WHERRY. In reply to the Senator's question, let me say that, to begin with, I feel that the Committee on Small Business should be a permanent committee without legislative authority. We might just as well settle that issue now, once and for all, and not have this question recur at each session of Congress. In view of that fact, it would not make any difference whether we established a special committee on this subject, because the special committee would go into the questions within its jurisdiction. That is point No. 1.

If there were any overlapping of jurisdiction at all for a period of 3 or 4 or 5 months, it would not be nearly so costly as it would be if it began at the beginning of the session commencing with the next Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am disappointed in the statement of the Senator from Nebraska as to his No. 1 reason, because I had understood him to take the position that the junior Senator from Florida takes, namely, that we would wish to have a standing committee with legislative power appointed, rather than a standing committee without legislative power.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall vote for either one or the other. I should like to have a permanent standing committee with legislative authority; but if I cannot have that, I shall do then just what the Senator from Florida will do, namely, I will get the best I can.

So if I cannot obtain the establishment of a standing committee on the subject, with legislative authority, I am perfectly willing to have a permanent committee without legislative authority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the statement has been repeatedly made on the floor of the Senate, during the debate, that the Banking and Currency Committee has the major jurisdiction over problems affecting small business. That simply is not so.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. An hour or so ago, when I had a short colloquy with the Senator from Montana, I understood him to say that the decision of the Senate that the Banking and Currency Committee had major jurisdiction over the problems of American small business was not correct in the opinion of the Senator from Montana. Let me ask whether the Senator from Montana intends to enlarge upon that premise?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; I intend to enlarge upon it, and I shall show why that committee does not have major jurisdiction in that field.

Mr. President, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, part 1, Standing Rules of the Senate, the Banking and Currency Committee has no legislative power over matters relating to the following subjects, all of which affect small business:

First. Agriculture generally.

Second. Inspection of livestock and meat products.

Third. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.

Fourth. Dairy industry.

Fifth. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.

All these are under the Committee on Agriculture, and affect the meat-packing industry, including small meat packers all over the country, in whom we are greatly interested. They have appeared on many occasions before the special committee.

They also affect the supply of sugar to soft-drink bottling industry under the Sugar Act of 1948, the fertilizer industry, agricultural and industrial chemical industry, the dairy industry, the insecticide industry, the wholesale and retail agricultural produce business.

Sixth. The Department of Defense—Army, Navy, Air Force.

Seventh. Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense. Both the above are under the Committee on Armed Services, and affect military procurement of all kinds, including mineral products.

Eighth. The postal service generally.

Ninth. Census and the collection of statistics generally. Both of these under the Committee on Civil Service, and affecting postage rates and their effect on small-newspaper publishers, also direct-by-mail advertising concerns, and the competition of mail-order houses with small merchants; collection of statistics useful to small-business concerns.

Tenth. Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency. These are under the Committee on Expenditures and affect procurement policies and practices of civilian agencies and departments of the Government.

Eleventh. Revenue measures generally.

Twelfth. Reciprocal trade agreements.

Thirteenth. Tariffs and import quotas, and matters related thereto.

Fourteenth. National social security. All these are under the Committee on Finance, and affect directly or indirectly every small-business concern in the United States.

Fifteenth. Measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad. These are under the Committee on Foreign Relations, and affect directly every American small-business concern engaged in foreign commerce.

Sixteenth. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

Seventeenth. Regulation of interstate railroads, busses, trucks, and pipe lines.

Eighteenth. Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television.

Nineteenth. Civil aeronautics.

Twentieth. Merchant marine generally.

Twenty-first. Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water.

Twenty-second. Bureau of Standards.

All these are under the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and affect—

Freight rates and shipping regulations.

Small bus, truck, and pipe-line operators.

Independent operators of radio and television stations.

Thousands of small-business men engaged in the aviation industry.

Small ship owners.

Scientific and technological aid to small business.

Twenty-third. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies—the greatest problem confronting small business.

Twenty-fourth. Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.

These are under the Committee on the Judiciary, and affect directly or indirectly every small-business concern in the United States.

Twenty-fifth. Measures relating to education, labor, or public welfare generally.

Twenty-sixth. Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.

Twenty-seventh. Wages and hours of labor.

Twenty-eighth. Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.

Twenty-ninth. Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.

Thirtieth. Child labor.

Thirty-first. Labor statistics.

Thirty-second. Labor standards.

All these are under the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and affect directly or indirectly every small business in the United States.

Thirty-third. Mineral resources of the public lands.

Thirty-fourth. Mining interests generally.

Thirty-fifth. Mineral-land laws and claims and entries thereunder. All these are under the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and affect directly every small-mine operator in the country, every small-petroleum producer.

Thirty-sixth. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

Thirty-seventh. Public works for the benefit of navigation, and bridges and dams.

Thirty-eighth. Water power.

Thirty-ninth. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

Fortieth. Measures relating to the construction or maintenance of roads and post roads. All these are under the Committee on Public Works, and affect, among other things, development of our natural resources and consequent economic expansion in all fields of independent enterprise.

Mr. President, I submit that, even under the most liberal interpretation of the Reorganization Act, the Committee on Banking and Currency is powerless to legislate on any of the above 40 subjects affecting small business.

If a standing committee were established, as has been debated here this afternoon, selection of members to serve on this committee would be governed by the seniority system, as has already been explained by the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], in the course of his remarks. Senators with the highest seniority would have the right to be appointed to this committee, and many junior Senators who are intensely interested in the problems of small business would not have an opportunity to serve on it.

Mr. President, I submit that the major jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee has to do with permanent plans for loans and risk capital. That is the principal jurisdiction possessed by the Banking and Currency Committee.

The next important problem of small business is a long-range research and educational program. That comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The next one, of course, is monopoly and fair-trade practices, which come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. So, Mr. President, it appears to me that it is very clear that the Banking and Currency Committee does not have jurisdiction over 80 or 90 percent of the problems of small business in this country. In fact, it has a very limited jurisdiction over the problems of small business.

I agree with the minority leader when he says that the only effective and efficient procedure is to provide for the appointment of a special committee. Of course I should like to see a permanent committee appointed, if it were possible to do so; but that is not possible; I do not think the Senate would vote to do so at the present time.

Therefore, I am supporting a program for a special committee which will continue during the remainder of the Eighty-first Congress and during the Eighty-second Congress. Then, at the expiration of that period, we can finally determine whether we should have a permanent standing committee on the subject.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me inquire how much time remains.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has 6 minutes remaining.

The Senator from Illinois has the remainder of the time, roughly 19 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall take 15 minutes of my time to discuss this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. First, Mr. President, I should like to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Washington. Earlier he requested that I do so. I now yield 3 minutes to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Illinois. It seems apparent to the junior Senator from Washington that too little consideration has been given this afternoon to the important work which has been accomplished and undertaken since its inception by the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. As but one typical bit of evidence regarding the excellence and character of the work of the subcommittee, I should like to offer for consideration by all Senators and small-business interests and concerns generally, certain remarks contained in a letter dated January 13, 1950, addresesd to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], by Henry Scharf, publisher for Trilane Associations, Inc., an organization devoted to accurate, factual reporting of Government procurement.

In part, the letter has this to say:

> The recent Munitions Board resolution approved by Secretary Johnson January 6, 1950 is now a matter of public record.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Your Small Business Subcommittee has indeed in this instance rendered the greatest service to American business since the inception of the procurement program. I am sure that your files will disclose hundreds of letters from manufacturers seeking Government business and encountering smokescreens of secrecy around public information. The wording of the resolution will now dispel all the restrictive conditions that had unnecessarily prevailed heretofore.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The patient and conscientious work of your Small Business Subcommittee indeed deserves recognition since without their efforts the original resolution of the Board, dated October 20, would have without a question been implemented. It would have virtually destroyed the meaning of broad procurement information.
>
> I personally know of the many obstacles that your committee encountered and Mr. Stewart's diplomacy and diligence was indeed a very decisive factor in bringing about—in the words of Admiral Ring—"a major victory."

Mr. President, for the reason that I think all Senators will be interested in the full text of the letter, I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1950.

Senator BURNET R MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: The recent Munitions Board resolution approved by Secretary JOHNSON January 6, 1950, is now a matter of public record.

All the work that went into bringing this resolution about is little known indeed, nor for that matter is the full significance of the resolution itself.

Your Small Business Subcommittee has indeed in this instance rendered the greatest service to American business since the inception of the procurement program. I am sure that your files will disclose hundreds of letters from manufacturers seeking Government business and encountering smokescreens of secrecy around public information. The wording of the resolution will now dispel all the restrictive conditions that had unnecessarily prevailed heretofore.

For ourselves it of course has accomplished fully its objective. By being able to obtain

all the information on Government procurement we can now keep manufacturers and dealers in every part of the country fully informed as to the Government's needs. It will remove many hardships that have heretofore existed.

It is sincerely hoped that the final implementation of this resolution will uphold the broad outlines of the resolution itself.

The patient and conscientious work of your Small Business Subcommittee indeed deserves recognition since without their efforts the original resolution of the Board, dated October 20, would have without a question been implemented. It would have virtually destroyed the meaning of broad procurement information.

I personally know of the many obstacles that your committee encountered and Mr. Stewart's diplomacy and diligence was indeed a very decisive factor in bringing about—in the words of Admiral Ring—"a major victory."

The prompt action by Mr. Lee Parsons indeed dispels any false impressions the public may have of lengthy time intervals prior to any positive action.

From long past experience we have no doubts but that this action will result in more bidders for the Government and I am confident that the lower prices thus obtained will probably save the Government many, many times the cost of your subcommittee.

For ourselves and for all the many subscribers who depend upon accurate and timely procurement information throughout the country, we would like to express to you our sincerest appreciation for a job well done.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY SCHARF,
Publisher for Trilane Associates, Inc.

Mr. CAIN. I again wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Illinois for permitting me to employ several minutes of his time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I did not expect to speak upon the pending question, but in view of the statement made by my very distinguished colleague from Florida in regards to my position on small business at a previous time in the United States Senate, I feel I am justified in saying a word or two. The problem before us is not a question of whether the Senator from Illinois has been consistent or has been inconsistent about a small business committee. The Senator from Florida, as a general rule, is very persuasive in his incontestable logic which he presents to the Senate upon any matter in which he is interested. But in his argument on the pending question, the Senator apparently took a great deal of time and some glee in quoting what the Senator from Illinois said 2 years ago, which is perfectly all right with me, but it has nothing to do with whether we are to have a small business committee either as a temporary or a permanent organization, or whether we are to have a permanent small business committee without legislative functions.

So it seems to me the argument advanced by my distinguished friend is far from the mark. Yet he uses what he calls my inconsistency as an argument, while he proclaims to all the world that he is very consistent in his position, although, had it not been for the Senator from Illinois, along with my good friend from Nebraska, we probably should not be debating the bill today. It was the Senator from Florida, according to what the Senator from Nebraska has said, who made the first mention of the standing permanent committee for small business. These two very able Senators in fact joined in a resolution to set up a permanent small business committee. When the time came to debate this very important issue, with all due deference to both of my good friends, they both vacated and abandoned the strong position they had taken on a permanent standing committee of the Senate; not because of any logic back of this change of heart, but merely for political expediency—in order to try to win a victory. That is practically what the Senator from Florida said when he stated that he got into a conference and found the chairman of the committee against the standing permanent small business committee, because it cut across so many jurisdictional lines of other standing committees. He, of course, is right about that. But these distinguished Senators did not give much thought to that in the beginning, when they came forward with the resolution seeking to set up a permanent standing committee for small business.

I presume, Mr. President, that when the time came to debate the issue, they would stand firmly behind this proposal. But, no, the Senator from Florida did not do so. He has another proposition by way of an amendment which is going to give more power to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and provide greater membership to the committee. He does not like that idea at all, but because he cannot win on his original proposition, he now is adopting the expedient method of trying to convince the Senate that it should go along with a resolution of this kind.

Mr. President, it is not the kind of resolution that ought to be passed. The Senator from Florida is wholly inconsistent in now attempting to do something entirely different from what he sought to do when he attached his name to the resolution. Yet he tells me, in all good faith, that he is absolutely consistent. It is a little difficult for me to understand how a Senator can stand on the floor, after he has abandoned his previous position entirely, and say, "I do not want a standing committee on small business for the United States Senate. I want it to go back to the Committee on Banking and Currency, but I want to add several members to the committee."

In the colloquy I had with the Senator the other day, I asked him, "Who on the Committee on Banking and Currency is to determine what is small business?" His reply was, "The chairman of the committee will make the determination of what is small business."

Mr. President, nothing at all will be accomplished by the proposal of the Senator from Florida. No one has more respect for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency than has the Senator from Illinois; but the chairman is to have power to say to his committee what is small business. When he makes the determination, he is then going to notify the members of other standing committees who are to be appointed by the Vice President, "We have a matter of small business before our committee this morning, and we invite you to sit in as ex officio members to help us make a decision." Mr. President, busy as we are, how many Senators from various other committees appointed to sit in with a committee of that kind to talk about small-business matters will attend? Mr. President, they will not go.

If we are to have a small-business committee of any kind, it ought to be left exactly as it is, with the Committee on Banking and Currency, without any additional members whatever. No additional members are needed, if it is left where it is. If that is not to be done, the work should be turned back to a special committee, without legislative functions, as it was handled in years gone by.

Mr. President, in the beginning of the discussion of small business in the Senate, when the war was going on, the Senator from Illinois, chairman of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported resolutions appropriating $380,000, which was spent by the Special Small-Business Committee during those 5 or 6 years for the benefit of small business.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have much time, but I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted to remind the Senator that I happened to be a member of his Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate during those years, and what he has said about the expenditure of $380,000 is absolutely correct. But, in addition to that, until the Reorganization Act was passed, the Committee on Small Business and the other special committees had hundreds of thousands of dollars. Numerous Government employees from different departments also worked on the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. After the passage of the legislative Reorganization Act of 1946——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my friend, I have only a few minutes. After the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed, the Senator from Illinois tried to live up to the letter and spirit of the act, by voting against special committees. The Reorganization Act is plain on that score; it outlaws special committees. But the Reorganization Act has been violated many times since then.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not disagree with what the Senator has said up to this point. But the legislative Reorganization Act does not outlaw special committees.

Mr. LUCAS. I was under the impression it did. I still think it did. I took that position at the time. But, anyway——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question, since I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder whether the Senator has any explanation for the Senate as to why, by supporting the resolution of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], he wants to establish a duplicate agency to that now functioning in the Banking and Currency Committee through the action of the Senate and which is financed until February 15, 1951.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Florida is the one who started this entire controversy. It was not the Senator from Illinois who started it. The Senator from Florida was not satisfied, apparently, either with the Small Business Committee which had functioned with the Senator from Montana at the head of it, or with the subcommittee functioning through the Banking and Currency Committee. The Senator from Florida is the one who is responsible for bringing in a resolution seeking to make it a standing, permanent committee. So the Senator should not ask me that kind of a question. The Senator from Florida is responsible for our being here at this particular time. He was not satisfied with either arrangement. He wanted a permanent standing committee so that small business would have a better opportunity to be served. He thought that was the better method. Other Senators did not think so. I did not think so, and the Senator from Florida does not think so at the present time, because he has completely abandoned his original position and now seeks to keep the Committee on Banking and Currency as the committee functioning for small business by adding five or six Senators from other committees, which does not mean a single thing. It is the most useless and futile resolution I have heard debated for a long time.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has sought to aid small business through a special committee for a period of 2 years. That is the way it was operated all through the years when the small-business committee was functioning. We had more standing committees when the small-business committee was a special committee than we have at the present time.

I say, Mr. President, there is a need for a committee of some kind that will work effectively in attempting to solve the problems of small business throughout the Nation. I do not say that the Banking and Currency Committee, through its subcommittee, has not done a fair job, but there is a constant effort on the part of persons on the outside, who are interested in small business, as well as on the part of a number of Senators, to take responsibility away from the Committee on Banking and Currency because they feel that that committee has all it can do with the tremendous number of problems which come before it at the present time, and that we should establish again a special committee such as that which we had during the war and during the Eightieth Congress.

That is all I have to say, Mr. President. I merely want the Senate and the Nation to understand that the Senator from Illinois is not opposed to small business——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I have no time to yield. The Senator from Florida had approximately 2 hours, and I have only 2 or 3 minutes. I regret that I cannot yield.

What I want to say in my closing remarks, Mr. President, is that the Senator from Illinois has been charged by some persons with being opposed to small business. I quoted the figures in the beginning with respect to t e amounts appropriated for the Small Business Committee only to show that the Senator from Illinois was in nowise opposed to small business. The truth of the matter is that I have never been affiliated with big business of any kind. I have been affiliated with small business in my home town of Havana, Ill., which is a town of approximately 4,500 persons, and I have always been interested in trying to do something for the independent businessman on the corner, whether he was the druggist, the groceryman, the hardware man, or the proprietor of some other small-business enterprise. I have seen a number of small businesses go by the wayside from time to time.

I was satisfied with the Small Business Committee which was operating during the war and which, after the war, rendered excellent service on behalf of small business. As the Senator from Montana said recently, it was only when the Small Business Committee decided that legislation was needed that it ever appeared, after an investigation, before a standing committee. It was possible that some standing committee might not have the necessary information. But any time that the Small Business Committee had information on which it thought legislation was necessary, it appeared before the proper committee and presented it, and a tremendous amount of legislation was enacted during the war and since the war as a result of the efforts of the Small Business Committee. There cannot be any question about that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that this controversy has been raging through the Senate and throughout the Nation as to what should be done, the Senator from Illinois desires to see the question settled once and for all.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska yields 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at the outset I want it understood that I am in favor of the strictest economy in Government in every sense of the word. I do not believe in the extension of any committee if the work can be performed in some other way, but in the case of small business I feel it is in an entirely different category from that of the ordinary line of business which comes before the Congress.

I realize that businessmen probably should not come to their Senators and Representatives for help, but Government has become so complicated that it is impossible for the ordinary businessman to have the means to transact business with his Government. There are in the Nation three and a half million business concerns, owned by an average of one and a half persons, which employ more than two-thirds of all the persons employed. Small business is a very substantial part of the American economy. At the present time the businessmen who own small businesses are very anxious to do business with the Government of the United States and with each other without being in direct opposition to the law. They cannot, as I stated, afford to have the attorneys and the accountants necessary to keep them within the bounds of law and regulations.

During my time in Congress when a small business committee was functioning it did a marvelous service. For example, in the matter of newsprint, it looked for a while as though it would be necessary for small weekly papers, such as church papers, veterans' organization papers, and labor organization papers, to go out of business because they did not have sufficient newprint. The distintinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] got together the large publishers of the United States, and they arranged for the allocation of sufficient newsprint to take care of those persons.

There was a time when it looked as if it would be impossible to secure tubular goods with which to drill wells in several States in the Central West so that it would be unnecessary to sell cattle because of lack of water, which would have caused a meat shortage. We were able to get together some manufacturers in Pittsburgh, and they produced the necessary pipe.

There was also a shortage of steel with which to construct veterans' hospitals. It was most difficult to get the amount needed, but it was found possible to secure an allocation by getting together the 11 largest steel producers in the country.

I might also mention the matter of exports. It was necessary to get permits for exports. That was a difficult thing to do. The Small Business Committee was able to help many small-business men obtain permits for exports.

There is another point which should be mentioned. The gray markets in steel, in newsprint, and in many other products cost many fine American businessmen an enormous amount of money.

This to some extent was corrected by publicity given by the Small Business Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Nebraska has 1 minute.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the parliamentary situation, so far as amendments are concerned, is that there is on the desk the revised amendment of the Senator from Nebraska which provides for setting up a permanent special committee without legislative authority. That is a recommendation which I think should be adopted. If we mean what we say, let us establish a special legislative committee. I have offered an amendment to Senate Resolution 58. Senators can vote for one or the other. I

understand that the Senator from Montana will offer another amendment perfecting my amendment, which would provide for establishing a committee at this session of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

The Senator from Nebraska has 1 minute left.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, so far as the amendments are concerned, the parliamentary situation, as I understand, is that there is on the desk a revised amendment submitted by the Senator from Nebraska which sets up a permanent special committee without legislative authority. That is the special committee which I think should be provided for. I believe that is what is needed. There is no use having this fight every session of Congress. If we mean what we say, let us establish a permanent special committee without legislative authority. I have offered an amendment to that effect to Senate Resolution 58, which is the resolution in which I joined with the distinguished Senator a year and a half ago, which provided for a permanent committee without legislative authority. That is the issue. Senators can vote for one or the other of the amendments.

I understood the Senator from Montana was to offer another amendment to my perfecting amendment which would provide for the establishment of a committee to function during this session of Congress and the next session. I do not see any difference between that and the one I have offered because both the committees would be permanent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TOBEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Illinois withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LUCAS. I withhold it.

Mr. TOBEY. Do I correctly understand that in voting on the question about to come before the Senate all Senators who wish to set aside or nullify the spirit of the Senate as set forth in January 1937, in the Reorganization Act, will vote "yea"? Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of no quorum has been suggested, and the Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. LUCAS. I withhold it for a moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand, those in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] will vote "yea," and those opposed will vote "nay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The parliamentary situation now is that the only pending question, in addition to the original resolution, is on the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska. Of course, that is the question that is to be voted on, and those who favor it will vote "yea," and those against it will vote "nay."

Mr. MAYBANK. The substitute is in the form of an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska offered by the Senator from Florida, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not. The Senator from Nebraska offered a substitute by way of an amendment. The Senator from Montana yesterday proposed a substitute for that substitute, and then withdrew it. So now the only question pending is on the substitute of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for the amendment in the nature of the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. I have withheld it for the last 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator still withhold it?

Mr. LUCAS. I still withhold it.

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment, or substitute, or whatever it is.

Mr. WHERRY. How long can the withholding of a quorum call be maintained, inasmuch as there was an agreement to vote at 4 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It can be withheld for any length of time, but if it is, some other Senator may make the suggestion, so that it could not go on indefinitely.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I suggest that it is like sand in the gear box.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted it is proposed to insert the following:

That (a) a special committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business and to consist of 13 Senators shall be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution and to continue during the Eighty-first and the Eighty-second Congresses.

(b) It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small-business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys.

(c) Senate Resolution 218, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 9, 1950, is hereby repealed, enective March 30, 1950.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a substitute for the substitute just stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by Mr. MURRAY, it is proposed to strike out all after the word *"Resolved"* and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That five Senators (three from the majority party and two from the minority party), to be appointed by the President of the Senate, shall be ex officio members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to serve on said committee or subcommittee (a) when any study or investigation of the problems of small-business enterprises is being conducted pursuant to the authority granted to said committee by clause (2) of section 1 of Senate Resolution 101, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 6, 1949, and (b) when proposed legislation, the predominant subject matter of which relates to small-business enterprises, is under consideration. One such Senator shall be a member of the Committee on Finance, one shall be a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, one shall be a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and each of the others shall be a member of such other standing committee of the Senate as may be designated by the President of the Senate.

SEC. 2 (a) The first section of Senate Resolution 101, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 6, 1949, is amended by striking out "during the Eighty-first Congress, until February 15, 1950,"; and by inserting after "small business, including" the following: "(but without limitation)."

(b) Section 2 of such resolution is amended by striking out "the Eighty-first Congress, until February 15, 1950," and inserting in lieu thereof "the Congress."

(c) Senate Resolution 218, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 9, 1950, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 4 of Senate Resolution 101, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 6, 1949, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The authority granted by this resolution with respect to the problems of small-business enterprises shall not enlarge the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency as set forth in paragraph (d) of section (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, nor shall it diminish the power of any other standing committee of the Senate to investigate any matter within its jurisdiction."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will explain the parliamentary situation. Under the precedents of the Senate the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska is regarded as the text of the resolution for purposes of amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Montana by way of a substitute is therefore in the first degree, that of the Senator from Florida is in the second degree, and no further amendment can be offered. The amendment or substitute offered by the Senator from Florida is not subject to amendment. Either the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska in the nature of a substitute or the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana in the nature of a substitute may be amended by way of amending the text, but the amendment of the Senator from Florida is not subject to further amendment, and that will have to be voted on first.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the

Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are detained on official business at Government departments.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] would vote "nay."

Mr SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr MILLIKIN] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—33

Aiken	Hendrickson	McCarran
Benton	Hill	McClellan
Cain	Hoey	Maybank
Chapman	Holland	Robertson
Connally	Ives	Russell
Ellender	Johnson, Colo	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Johnson, Tex	Smith, N J.
Frear	Johnston, S C.	Sparkman
Fulbright	Kerr	Stennis
George	Lehman	Taft
Hayden	Long	Tobey

NAYS—49

Anderson	Hunt	Mundt
Brewster	Jenner	Murray
Bricker	Kefauver	Myers
Butler	Kem	Neely
Capehart	Kilgore	O'Conor
Chavez	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Langer	Saltonstall
Darby	Leahy	Schoeppel
Donnell	Lodge	Taylor
Douglas	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McCarthy	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Watkins
Ecton	McKellar	Wherry
Ferguson	McMahon	Wiley
Gillette	Magnuson	Williams
Green	Martin	
Gurney	Morse	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Humphrey	Tydings
Byrd	Malone	Vandenberg
Eastland	Millikin	Withers
Graham	Pepper	Young
Hickenlooper	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. HOLLAND'S amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the substitute offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. LUCAS and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota, [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are detained on official business at Government departments.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator for Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—31

Anderson	Hunt	McKellar
Benton	Johnson, Tex.	McMahon
Capehart	Kefauver	Magnuson
Chavez	Kerr	Murray
Connally	Kilgore	Myers
Douglas	Langer	Neely
George	Leahy	O'Conor
Gillette	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Green	Long	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Lucas	
Hill	McFarland	

NAYS—51

Aiken	Gurney	Mundt
Brewster	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bricker	Hoey	Russell
Butler	Holland	Saltonstall
Cain	Ives	Schoeppel
Chapman	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Johnson, Colo	Smith, N. J.
Darby	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Donnell	Kem	Stennis
Downey	Knowland	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Taylor
Ecton	McCarran	Thye
Ellender	McCarthy	Tobey
Ferguson	McClellan	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Frear	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Williams

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Humphrey	Tydings
Byrd	Malone	Vandenberg
Eastland	Millikin	Withers
Graham	Pepper	Young
Hickenlooper	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. MURRAY'S substitute for Mr. WHERRY'S substitute was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me inquire whether the Senator from Nebraska is proposing the creation of a permanent standing committee, a select committee, or a permanent select committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is not now in order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MORSE and other Senators requested the yeas and nays, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Illinois would like to have stated at this time the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is about to be voted upon, the Chair will ask that that be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the word *"Resolved,"* and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business and to consist of 13 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution and at the commencement of each Congress.

It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small-business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are detained on official business at Government departments.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—56

Aiken	Hunt	Mundt
Anderson	Ives	Murray
Benton	Jenner	Myers
Brewster	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Butler	Kefauver	O'Conor
Capehart	Kem	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Darby	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Leahy	Taft
Downey	Lehman	Taylor
Dworshak	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Lucas	Thye
Ferguson	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McMahon	Wherry
Green	Magnuson	Wiley
Gurney	Martin	Williams
Hayden	Morse	

NAYS—26

Bricker	Hendrickson	McFarland
Cain	Hill	McKellar
Chapman	Hoey	Maybank
Connally	Holland	Robertson
Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Flanders	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Frear	Long	Stennis
Fulbright	McCarran	Tobey
George	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Humphrey	Tydings
Byrd	Malone	Vandenberg
Eastland	Millikin	Withers
Graham	Pepper	Young
Hickenlooper	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. WHERRY's amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 58 as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the title will be amended to conform to the text, as follows:

Resolution creating a Select Committee on Small Business.

This resolution places upon the Chair the obligation of appointing the Select Committee. The Chair will announce his appointments later.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1990) to amend section 429, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the act of August 5, 1882, as amended, so as to substitute for the requirement that detailed annual reports be made to the Congress concerning the proceeds of all sales of condemned naval material a requirement that information as to such proceeds be filed with the Committees on Armed Services in the Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of immigration hearings before a judiciary subcommittee, and

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 1158, Eighty-first Congress, first session, entitled "Progress on the Hoover Commission Recommendations."

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 398.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois for unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business and proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution just read by its title?

Mr. WHERRY. I am forced to object to giving unanimous consent to the taking up of the measure at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 398.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio will state the inquiry.

Mr. TAFT. What would be the effect of agreeing to the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion, if agreed to, would set aside the unfinished business for today. But, inasmuch as an hour has been fixed for voting tomorrow, it would automatically come back before the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. TAFT. Would it come back at 12 o'clock, or would it not come back until the hour for voting?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would come back at 11 o'clock, at which hour the Senate is to meet tomorrow. The division of time would be maintained as heretofore ordered. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Magnuson
Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hill	Maybank
Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Butler	Hunt	Murray
Cain	Ives	Myers
Capehart	Jenner	Neely
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kefauver	Russell
Darby	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Downey	Knowland	Smith, N J.
Dworshak	Langer	Sparkman
Eastland	Leahy	Stennis
Ecton	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Lodge	Taylor
Ferguson	Long	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Lucas	Thye
Frear	McCarran	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Wherry
Gillette	McFarland	Wiley
Green	McKellar	Williams
Gurney	McMahon	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 398, which was stated by title a while ago.

Mr. McCARTHY and Mr. LUCAS rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois wish recognition?

Mr. LUCAS. Was the motion agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, it has not yet been voted on.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is open to debate.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

THE HYDROGEN BOMB

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the problem which is symbolized by the hydrogen bomb touches every facet of human existence—ideological, philosophical, cultural, moral and spiritual.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order. The Senator will proceed.

Mr. LODGE. My statement will not take long. It is on a matter at least as important as the one we have been discussing.

Looking at it more narrowly from the standpoint of practical action by government, it impresses us first in its military aspect. We can understand how those who see nothing but its military impact become terrified, although even in this, the bleakest and most depressing phase of the whole business, there are elements of hope. For example, there appears to be no doubt of the following: that the United States can outproduce any other nation in the manufacture of these new weapons; that these new bombs will greatly increase the power of the defensive, which is surely an asset to a nation which has no aggressive intent; and that no aggressor can win a final decision by one—or a dozen—explosions of these new bombs in the opening days of a new war. Therefore, even in this military phase, which is the starkest and grimmest of all, we should be able to keep our nerve and our sense of proportion.

Mr. President, I hate to interfere with the conversations that are taking place on the floor, but I insist this is an important subject, and that it is one which it is proper to discuss on the floor of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no such compunctions. [Laughter.]

Mr. LODGE. I am delighted. The Chair is always refreshing and capable.

But, happily, government is not confined to a strictly military contemplation of the problem symbolized by the hydrogen bomb. The United States Government, thanks to the unparalleled productivity of the American people, can make an economic approach to the world crisis and wherever in the world there has been enough local energy to take advantage of our help, our economic assistance has in the last few years yielded tremendous results. Within the prudent limits of our own resources we should react to the problem of the hydrogen bomb by extending economic aid.

Then there is the political approach, which has a huge potential. Although results achieved here insofar as the unification of Europe is concerned have been disappointing, conclusion of the North Atlantic Pact shows what can be done. Let us hope that the North Atlantic community will become increasingly real and that under the spur of these great new dangers there will develop a common political outlook among the free nations which should accomplish great new things.

Mr. President, I think we all can have the deepest and most sympathetic understanding of those who, on the Senate floor and off the Senate floor demand an immediate show-down with the Soviet Union in the form of an appeal for disarmament. We must applaud their purpose, although it appears certain that their method and such other methods as have lately been proposed seem at this moment calculated to defeat that purpose.

We cannot, for example, enter into a Big Two meeting with the Soviet Union and set up two worlds without gravely shaking the confidence of all our friends in the Western World whom we have done so much to help and who have made such encouraging progress. We cannot enter into bilateral conversations without looking as though we were turning our back on the whole system of collective security which is symbolized by the United Nations.

We should not be fair to ourselves or to our friends if we were to agree with the Soviets to a two-thirds or a one-half or a 100-percent reduction in armament expenditures. We, in the United States Army, for example, spend far more money for clothing, pay, food, housing, and medical care, for example, in our military forces because we are a country which treats people like human beings. If we and the Soviets agreed to eliminate all money expenditures, the Soviet could and would use men as slaves without pay. Nor would it be fair to ourselves or to our friends to agree to a limitation of those weapons of a technical and complicated nature where we have a natural advantage and where, therefore, any apparently international limitation is actually a gain for the Soviets.

We know very well that, even if the Soviets should surprisingly agree to some form of international inspection, they would insist on such a strained construction of their agreement that the inspections which we would be allowed to undertake, if any, would not really be inspections in any honest or complete sense of the term. We are practically sure, moreover, that any appeal of ours would at this juncture be rejected because the Soviets would regard it as a sign of weakness on our part.

I know that there are those who would then say: "Let them reject it. Let us here in America show that we at least are willing to disarm. We will thereby stand in a favorable light before world opinion and thus impress the public opinion of the free nations with our virtue and with our love of peace."

I cannot believe that this is wise counsel. To make an offer which we are sure will be rejected is, in the first place, to mislead our own people as to the chances for acceptance and to subject them to a correspondingly severe disappointment. It thus tends to hasten the day of a "showdown"—a day which I hope and believe will never come. To make an offer which we know will be rejected might well be seized upon by the Soviets as proof of the fact that we are looking for a pretext for war. They might well say, "Here are the Americans making us a proposition which they know we will reject. What earthly reason could they have for making such an offer other than that of trying to provide an excuse for hostilities?"

Seen in the light of these realities, the offer which so many of our well-intentioned citizens suggest will actually bring nearer the danger of war.

Does this mean that we are condemned to do nothing? Far from it. We must continue to build our strength in every way that we can. We must build it slowly whenever the slow way is the only way. We must build it fast in whatever ways it can be done quickly. We must do it quietly where that is the only way it can be done. And if there is a chance to build strength dramatically I hope we will also take advantage of that.

The truth is that our sincere fellow citizens who ask for an American appeal for disarmament are right in wanting disarmament, but wrong in the way they propose to get it. In the quest for peace disarmament is the second step—not the first. The first step is for us to get strong enough so that the Soviets will ask us for a disarmament conference. Then—and only then—will there be a real prospect of accomplishing results.

If you get discouraged by the apparent slowness of this procedure, remember that in 1945 we in effect fell off the top of a high cliff when at Yalta, Potsdam and through our own sudden demobilization we lost the advantage we built up during the war. We are now climbing back to the top of the cliff, but this is a slower business than falling down, and we must be patient.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My colleague has stated that he does not believe we should make any advance to Russia at this time, but he did not say anything about proceeding through the United Nations. Would he be willing to state, very briefly, his position on that question?

Mr. LODGE. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My question is, What is the Senator's attitude as to proceeding through the United Nations rather than through a bilateral conference.

Mr. LODGE. I think collective action is desirable, but I do not believe the United States should make the request or make the appeal, because, in my opinion, it would look like weakness on our part, and it would amount to nothing. If the proper conditions were created, the Soviets would have no difficulty in finding ways of letting us know that they wanted disarmament.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator believe many things must be done prior to a disarmament conference, such as the raising of the curtain so that there could be inspection, freedom of communication, and freedom of the press, in order that the facts could be determined prior to a disarmament conference? In other words, should we not begin with first things first, with reference to disarmament?

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator from Michigan has put his finger on a very essential point. Disarmament is not the first step. It is a step which can come only after some other things have been done.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to

have placed in the body of the RECORD some tables relative to Senate bill 75, the central Arizona project. Many Senators have not been present during the course of the debate and are under the false impression that it is merely a controversy between California and Arizona. Of course that is not the case. Nevada, as well as California and Arizona, is interested in the matter.

It has been pointed out in the absence of some Senators that it is a project which calls for an authorization of a billion and a quarter dollars and that, in addition, it will remove the yardstick measurements which now exist under the reclamation laws.

Because so many of the Senators do not realize the immense amount of money involved in this project in the central Arizona area, I have had compiled for comparative purposes the total rivers, harbors, and flood-control authorizations in various groups of States in contrast to the billion-and-a-quarter dollar authorization provided for in Senate bill 75.

We find that for the New England States, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, for rivers, harbors, and flood control, the total authorizations amount to $348,400,000, or approximately one-fourth of the authorization in the project which will be voted on by the Senate tomorrow.

I have another break-down for the North Central States, showing that for the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin the total authorizations for rivers, harbors, and flood control, general, amount to $1,265,000,000, which is the approximate amount of the single authorization on which the Senate will be called upon to vote tomorrow.

I have another break-down for the Middle Atlantic States of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, showing the total authorizations for rivers, harbors, and flood control, general, amount to $988,768,000, or considerably less than the authorization in this one bill which will be before the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those break-downs appear as part of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the break-downs were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Authorizations and appropriations by States, rivers and harbors, and flood control, general

State	Total cost of authorized projects, including projects in approved comprehensive plans			Appropriations for construction		
	Rivers and harbors	Flood control, general	Total	Rivers and harbors	Flood control, general	Total
New England States:						
Connecticut	$16,380,700	$36,662,500	$53,043,200	$11,000,900	$11,063,000	$22,153,900
Maine	10,250,200		10,250,200	8,778,700		8,778,700
Massachusetts	67,791,500	64,032,400	131,823,900	60,347,400	19,745,000	80,092,400
New Hampshire	627,600	55,983,000	56,610,600	627,600	14,638,000	15,265,600
Rhode Island	9,772,300	5,831,000	15,603,300	9,697,900		9,697,900
Vermont	1,100,300	79,969,000	81,069,300	885,300	4,389,000	5,274,300
Total	105,922,600	242,477,900	348,400,500	91,427,800	49,835,000	141,262,800
North Central States:						
Illinois	266,269,800	195,911,600	462,181,400	147,041,800	57,247,000	204,288,800
Indiana	29,278,400	136,408,300	165,686,700	28,390,100	29,842,000	58,232,100
Michigan	176,995,400	2,290,600	179,286,000	113,305,700	1,655,000	114,960,700
Ohio	101,287,200	291,599,300	392,886,500	54,506,700	79,127,000	133,633,700
Wisconsin	48,147,500	17,779,000	65,926,500	43,705,400		43,705,400
Total	621,978,300	643,988,800	1,265,967,100	386,949,700	167,871,000	554,820,700
Middle Atlantic States:						
Delaware	38,234,000		38,234,000	33,409,700		33,409,700
Maryland	14,208,000	15,560,000	29,768,000	9,358,400	2,287,000	11,645,400
New Jersey	57,224,100	284,000	57,508,100	39,297,100	284,000	39,581,100
New York	192,231,900	136,241,000	328,472,900	142,833,900	65,887,000	208,720,900
Pennsylvania	113,381,600	421,404,300	534,785,900	77,021,000	111,135,000	188,156,000
Total	415,279,600	573,489,300	988,768,900	301,920,100	179,593,000	481,513,100

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 398 is on the Senate Calendar as a result of action by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In reporting the House measure the Senate committee has struck out all the House provisions after the enacting clause, and has instead inserted very largely the provisions of Senate bill 2919, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] on behalf of himself and several other Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, this joint resolution is an attempt to correct some inequities which it is claimed have arisen as a result of the application of Public Law 272. While the planting of cotton is going on, I believe it is impossible to examine carefully into all claims of inequities and to decide whether or not all of them are just, or whether any of them are just, or whether there should be any change in the law whatever. If at all possible, I believe the Senate should move to confer authority on the Secretary of Agriculture to make some adjustments in the Cotton Act. The whole danger is that the adjustments may be so large as to throw clear out of balance the possibility of the demand equaling the supply available. I believe that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in accepting the provisions of the Senate bill, has fairly well guarded against that possibility. The judgment of the House may prove to have been superior, but there is one section in the House bill which would add about 1,400,000 acres of cotton, according to the best estimates which the House committee was able to obtain.

At the time the provisions of the Senate bill were submitted to the Department of Agriculture, a request was presented to the Department for an estimate as to the acreage which would be added by the Senate bill. The committee was assured that the maximum acreage would probably be somewhere in the neighborhood of 790,000 acres. My own view is that we may find in actual operation there may be added only something in the neighborhood of 600,000 acres. In my opinion, the top figure will be 700,000 acres. I believe it is reasonable to assume that the many changes in ownership of cotton acreage, with 21,000,000 acres being allotted, may account for underplanting on many of the acres. Some people believe it will run as high as 2,000,000 acres. I do not believe it will run that high. I believe that with quotas becoming effective for the first time, the underplanting will be substantially less than 2,000,000 acres. I believe, however, that there is a strong probability and great likelihood that the 600,000 or 700,000 acres of cotton which would be added by the provisions of the Senate bill will not be more than the acreage which will be underplanted from the 21,000,000 acreage limitation. Therefore I believe that the over-all planting of cotton in 1950, if the provisions of the House joint resolution, as amended by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, were to be enacted, would stay within the 21,000,000-acre figure originally provided by the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I have no desire to detain the Senate long with an explanation of the joint resolution. I should like to point out that there were opportunities for inequities. The hope behind the joint resolution was that in every State the amount of acreage which could be reserved by the State committee, and in turn, by the county committees, would be reserved and would be used for the handling of these inequities. I may say that where that has been done the complaints have been reduced to a minimum. In testimony before the Senate committee, one of the ablest persons dealing with this subject at the present time estimated that 90 percent of the cotton farmers were satisfied with the allotment.

The great majority of cotton farmers are small planters, and the small planters were adequately protected by the legislation passed in the form of Public Law 272. There were some complaints to the effect that some of the larger operators were cut too much. It was felt, for example, that if the reserve had been set aside in every instance and made available for the relief of some of the hardship cases, even their complaints would have been minimized. There was testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, given by a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Oklahoma, to the effect that if those provisions had been adequately used in every case nearly all the

complaints would have been eliminated, and that there would have been general approval of the program.

The fact remains that, regardless of whether these things should have been done, in many instances they were not done. This was new legislation, handled by county committees, nearly all the members of which are volunteers, and the things they did were not perhaps the things they would do with more experience.

We test new legislation year by year. Cotton acreage is allotted by experience. We have been without cotton quotas for 8 years. Naturally, in many instances there are not now on the committees men who are familiar with the handling of this problem. So far as cotton provisions are concerned, I think the measure as reported to the Senate is reasonable. I think it will add a small amount of acreage, but I believe that the underplanting of acreage will be greater than the amount that would be added by the provisions of the joint resolution as reported by the Senate Committee.

Mr. President, there is an additional item in the bill to which I should like to refer briefly. It is a controversial subject. It deals with what the bill attempts to do with reference to potatoes. I recognize that there will be, as there has been and probably always will be, a very substantial difference of opinion as to how the potato situation can best be handled.

I have tried not to be harsh with the potato growers of the country. I realize that one of the important factors which contributed to the present great surplus of potatoes is that the growers were favored by extremely good growing weather in the last few months of the year. I invite attention to the fact that as late as August 1949, the predictions were for a crop somewhere in the magnitude of 365,000,000 bushels. Had we actually obtained a crop of 365,000,000 bushels, we would have been able to handle it without the slightest difficulty. The estimate which I have used comes from the Crop Reporting Board of the Department of Agriculture It was based upon the best available information. It was based upon the size of the plantings and what might be regarded as a normal out-turn of the crop. Subsequently, and probably not until the month of December, it became known that the crop had gone far beyond the estimated out-turn, and that instead of 363,000,000 or 365,000,000 bushels f potatoes, we would have a crop somewhere in the neighborhood of 402,000,000 bushels, which happens to be the size of the 1949 crop.

Mr. President, I desire to refer now to the publication of the Department of Agriculture known as Changes in American Farming. This is Miscellaneous Publication No. 707. At page 44 there is a chart which I am sure Senators will find profit in studying. The chart shows that the average production of potatoes in the United States in 1920 was under 100 bushels per acre, and while the chart does not show it completely, it shows that somewhere about 1948 the production had reached almost 200 bushels per acre, more than double. But in 1949 the production was 220 bushels per acre. Therefore any Senator who looks at this chart will have to add to it the figures for the remarkable out-turn in 1949, and those figures will carry up to new heights.

About one-third of all the potatoes grown in the United States are produced in three States, Maine, California, and Idaho. It is interesting to look at the figures of production of potatoes in those States. In the State of California in 1920 there was an average production that was somewhere in the neighborhood of 135 bushels per acre. I cannot tell exactly from this chart, because the chart is only in units of 20, but the line starts below the 140 bushel figure, so I assume it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 135 bushels. That was the per-acre production in the State of California in 1920. In 1948 the average per-acre production was 385 bushels, and in 1949 it was in that level again.

The State of Idaho has been very much more constant. The production in the State of Idaho started at about 180 bushels, or somewhat less than that, perhaps 175 bushels to the acre, and by 1948 it was 245 or 250 or perhaps 255 bushels.

The State of Maine, however, starting at 220 bushels per acre, dropped to a figure of about 215 bushels in the year 1922. The production stayed fairly level with some fluctuation because of improved agriculture, but in the year 1949 it had increased from 215 bushels to the acre to 450 bushels to the acre.

Mr. President, when a thing like that happens, there is difficulty with a price-support program. Therefore, it has been the judgment of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that perhaps the best way to bring this matter to a head, and find a possibility of enacting legislation which would restrict the production completely, would be to wipe out price supports at this time entirely. Therefore, the distinguished Senator from Illinois proposed an amendment to the cotton-acreage bill which provided that no price support should be available to the producers of Irish potatoes when marketing quotas were not in effect. That is, of course, drastic and unusual treatment. It is different and discriminatory. I think that should be acknowledged in the beginning, because, if it is not acknowledged, someone will rise and say it is discriminatory treatment, since there is provision in the Agricultural Act of 1949 under which basic commodities receive price supports in the neighborhood of 90 percent, and they will continue to receive something in that neighborhood in the years to come. There is the provision also that certain nonbasic commodities shall receive supports ranging from 75 percent to 90 percent, and they are spelled out. Certain others shall receive price supports from 60 percent to 90 percent. Then there is the general provision which allows the Secretary to support all other commodities as he may deem it necessary and proper, at levels from 0 to 90 percent.

But now only in the case of potatoes there would be a provision that he could not do it at all. I say that only because I want Senators to recognize that this is a drastic treatment for a very difficult and perplexing situation. True it is that it might be possible to control the situation by some other device. But the opinion of the committee is that there should be time to consider appropriate legislation.

The Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, was ready with a bill to submit to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but there was obviously not time to stop and consider his bill. If hearings were to be afforded, it would require 10 days or 2 weeks to study the testimony and have consideration given by the committee to the provisions of the bill. In addition to that, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] last October introduced a bill respecting which many persons had been hopeful that there would be hearings long ago.

Now, it is possible for those two bills to come to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for full consideration. I trust that when they reach the committee there will be the element of time that will permit a careful study of the whole problem.

What shall we do in the meantime? If we allow the matter merely to lie dormant additional States will move into the area of those who have already planted their potatoes, and, with still further delay, the line will be moved very much more rapidly into the northern areas; into the intermediate areas, and finally into the areas of late potatoes. If that sort of delaying procedure should occur there would be no action at all which would be effective at the present session of Congress.

This matter is of importance to all segments of agriculture, because if there are years and years of bad experience with a crop such as potatoes, the support extended to all other agricultural commodities may be jeopardized, and particularly to those basics which have been supported by a decision of the American Congress and the administration for a great many years. I think the chances of damage to the potato growers are very much less than the possibilities of damage to all the rest of the agricultural economy, which is of over-all importance. I therefore feel that we would be doing a favor to all American agriculture in adopting this very simple amendment which strikes all potato support. I think the result of such action will be a strong and vigorous demand for immediate and prompt consideration of legislation which will make possible quotas upon potatoes. It is not yet impossible for legislation of that kind to become effective on this year's crop.

Therefore, it seems to me that the part of wisdom for the Senate would be to accept this rider which is, as I have frankly admitted, discriminatory, and permit the matter then to go to conference. I hope the House will agree to the amendment, and that the adoption of the rider will bring to the attention of the Congress the immediate need for doing something with potato-acreage quota legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that the price support on potatoes which are now planted in the southern section of the country actually has very little effect upon the price itself because they are new potatoes, the first ones to come on the market? Is it not a fact that those potatoes as a general rule sell above the price support?

Mr. ANDERSON. The price support on potatoes in 1950 will be $1.01 a bushel. The report of last year's crop showed that the early potatoes sold at $2.85 a bushel. Those figures have been placed in the RECORD. Potatoes from Louisiana, as I am sure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will testify, generally bring well above the support level.

Mr. LUCAS. If that holds true, then the support price, so far as those potatoes are concerned, would have nothing to do with their actual market price, and the Government would be losing nothing upon those potatoes so far as the support price is concerned?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is approximately true, but not completely true. The Government will lose something, because it is already buying a few potatoes, and will continue to do so, but the amount of potatoes it buys is not tremendous.

As I tried to point out the other day, it is the abundance of these crops which is the best regulator of their prices. The fact that we support a few when there is a tremendous outpouring of potatoes really means that what we are doing is guaranteeing to the American public a very satisfactory market in which they will buy their potatoes. For example, in 1946, as I remember, something like 100,000,000 more bushels of potatoes were produced than in 1947. The average price to the farmers was something like $1.24 in 1946, and $1 43 the next year, when the potato crop was smaller. So that while the Government spent quite a bit of money for supports that year, the consuming public, the country as a whole, profited, because the price of potatoes dropped when there was a larger crop.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It is estimated, as I understand, that in the crop year 1950 we will lose nearly $100,000,000 on potatoes alone.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to suggest to the Senator that he probably refers to the crop year of 1949.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. I am referring to the crop year 1949. It is estimated that we will lose nearly $100,000,000 on that crop. Now, what we are trying to do by this amendment is to prevent the same situation from occurring with respect to the 1950 crop. If I understand the situation correctly, we will lose around $100,000,000 on potatoes this year. However, it is my understanding that if this amendment is adopted we can save at least $50,000,000 on the 1950 crop, provided we follow it up, as I hope we shall do, with the bill which I introduced the other day, which applies rigid restrictions through marketing quotas, agreements, and other necessary controls to the potato growers on the same basis that similar controls now apply to the cotton farmer and the tobacco farmer. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator from Illinois is correct in saying that if the rider is adopted, and we then pass effective quota legislation, the saving might be as much as $50,000,000. I think it is fair to say that there are many potato growers throughout the country who would question very greatly some of the provisions in the Senator's bill, and I am sure the Senator wants them to have the fullest opportunity to be present at hearings. We are not foreclosing what the decision on that question will be. But if as the result of the hearings and the suggestions made by potato growers it is possible to pass effective quota legislation, then I think that the rider, plus the legislation referred to, will save $50,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. That is exactly the reason for the offering of the amendment. It seems to me we have to do something drastic, something that is out of the ordinary, in order to bring the potato situation forcibly home to the American people. The Senator from Illinois does not want in any way to harm the potato growers of the Nation. The fact that we have given to the potato growers one-half billion dollars out of the Treasury in the past 7 years is a pretty good indication that we have not attempted to harm the potato growth. But the time has come when we must cease pouring this unusual amount of money out of the Treasury into a particular crop over which we have no effective control. All I want to do is to follow up this amendment with the bill I introduced the other day, along with the one introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, so that hearings can be held and there can be established effective controls over potato production. This can be done, according to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question. It is understood that the potato support program will cost the taxpayers from $80,000,000 to possibly $100,000,000 this year. But does not the Senator from New Mexico understand that if the Secretary had chosen to use the provisions of the law in requiring compliance with marketing practices through the marketing agreements, and which we are given to understand he does intend to use this year, the cost of the potato support program would have been reduced somewhere between two-thirds and three-quarters of the amount which it is now costing?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is fair to say that I do not know what the Secretary of Agriculture did in the way of using the provisions which were in the Marketing Act of 1948.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator understands, does he not, that the Secretary did not use that provision of the law which would have given him the right to require compliance with the marketing practices as a qualification for price support?

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand that he did not, but I have no way of knowing, and it was my hope that when we got into the consideration of the long-range provisions of the bill we would have before us the desirability of having marketing agreements, and that at that time it would be possible to question the Department of Agriculture to find out exactly what had been done. I understand the marketing orders were not issued. I tried to explain that as late as August, and probably later, it was anticipated that the crop would not be in excess of about 360,000,000 to 365,000,000 bushels, and if the crop had stood to that magnitude it would not have been necessary to have marketing orders or agreements. When the fact became apparent that the Maine crop was going to be very much larger and that other crops in other States was going to be very much larger, I do not happen to know.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not true that as late as November the total size of the potato crop was underestimated by about 40,000,000 bushels?

Mr. ANDERSON. My understanding is that very late it was underestimated by a great many million bushels.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator understand that the provision whereby the Secretary could require compliance with marketing practices was inserted in the law at the request of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON. It was my understanding that it was inserted in the law at the request of the Department of Agriculture; yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows more about the so-called Anderson bill than any other individual, because he was instrumental in securing its enactment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to suggest to the distinguished majority leader that the question propounded by the Senator from Vermont has to do with the Agricultural Act of 1948, in which marketing agreements were first inserted at the request of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. ANDERSON. They were carried forward in the Agricultural Act of 1949, however.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that. But, referring to the bill at present on the statute books as an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, known as the Anderson bill, I ask the Senator, Is that bill, plus whatever other laws are on the statute books at the present time, sufficient to control potatoes, if we are going to support them under the so-called price-support program?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I would wish to know what the Department of Agriculture planned to do under that program. I may say to the Senator that if the program did not have the type of

marketing orders added to it as was the case in 1948, it would not be sufficient to control potatoes. I believe marketing agreements can be effective if they are backed up by marketing orders.

Mr. LUCAS. One further question. I understand that the Senator from New Mexico was Secretary of Agriculture when the potato program was established, and that he recommended to the Congress from time to time that it do something about that matter, and that the 1938 act was in effect when the Senator from New Mexico was Secretary of Agriculture. My point is this: In view of the question of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], does the Senator believe the Secretary of Agriculture has power, or ever had power, to control potato production?

Mr. ANDERSON. He had his first possibility of power in connection with the 1949 crop, under the Agricultural Act of 1948.

I am not convinced that marketing agreements alone are sufficient to control potatoes. The reason why I say that is my belief that a marketing agreement, in order to be effective, must be supported by a desire on the part of both parties to support the agreement, and I do not think there is a desire at the present time to enforce marketing agreements on the crop.

That is a wholly different situation from what we find in connection with the citrus-fruit crop, where the citrus-fruit growers want the marketing agreement to work. When the growers want the marketing agreement to work, it works effectively, as I am certain the distinguished Senator from Florida will testify.

Mr. LUCAS. The whole question, then, comes down to the difference between marketing agreements and marketing quotas. Certainly it seems to me, in view of the money which has been lost on the support program on the potato crop in the last 5 or 6 years that if marketing agreements were effective to control production, they would have been put into use long before now.

It is the opinion of the Senator from Illinois that the only way we shall control potato production is by means of the rigid controls set up in the bill introduced last year by the Senator from Oklahoma, and more or less duplicated in a bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator understand that the Secretary of Agriculture is requiring marketing agreements to be in effect for the 1950 crop, as a qualification for price supports under the same provision of law, which was in the law last year

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I understand that is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. And does not the Senator also understand that if the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to use that provision of law this year, he certainly must have had the same authority to use the same provision of law last year? I do not say that the failure to use it was not due to a gross underestimate of the potato crop, due to the remarkably good growing season; but does not the Senator from New Mexico also understand that it cost the taxpayers, this year, in the neighborhood of $100,000,000 to support the potato crop, which is supposed to be under airtight Government control? I know it is difficult to get the exact amount, but it is in the neighborhood of $100,000,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that I do not think it is in the neighborhood of $100,000,000. I think it is in the neighborhood of $35,000,000.

I do not believe it is possible to put peanuts under airtight controls as yet. Perhaps I should say that in the operation of the law, the limitation has been put at 2,100,000 acres. That amount of land will produce more peanuts than the country will use this year, and there will be a loss on this year's crop.

But in 1951 it will be possible to put peanuts under complete acreage controls, and I hope the peanut growers will remember that that probably will mean less than one and one-half million acres, and possibly less than 1,000,000 acres

Mr. AIKEN In estimating the cost of the peanut-support program this year at $35,000,000—and I think the late estimate of the Department is thirty-eight million some hundred thousand dollars—the Senator from New Mexico is omitting the peanuts which were taken off the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation by the Army and the ECA; is he not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not entirely. There are two amounts of peanuts that are handled there.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not mean to get into this subject; but in part peanuts are handled under a foreign export program, under which the ECA and the Army were charged 8⅛ cents, as against the total, over-all cost of 16¼ cents. Certain other quantities were sold to the ECA and to the Army at cost, which means 16¼ cents I think on those the Army takes a loss, because the oil costs it more than the 8¼ cents for which it can buy the oil in the market.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is getting away from the question in talking about peanuts now, because we are concerned here with potatoes. The Senator knows that last year I did as much as any other Senator in trying to control the potato situation.

Mr. AIKEN. I only wish the Senator had been successful.

Mr. LUCAS. I attempted to be.

Nevertheless, we are now talking about potatoes. The Senator from Vermont appears to be telling the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture has the power, under the marketing agreements, to control potatoes. But the evidence will show, when we finally get to the point of taking evidence—at least, I have been so advised—that the measure we are now debating, followed up with quotas will save the taxpayers $50,000,000 on the 1950 crop.

The Senator from Vermont would create the impression that the Departmental officials have not done the correct thing. Regardless of whether they have or whether they have not, those officials now tell us that if this proposed legislation is enacted, we can save $50,000,000 on potatoes alone this year and in view of what the potato growers have received during the past 5 or 6 years, this legislation would not harm any producer very much.

I am interested in the potato question, not because I am attempting to be unduly harsh with the United States potato farmers—certainly I am not—but because I am interested in the great farm program which we in the Congress have enunciated over a period of years, and which has been the most successful program of its type in all the history of America.

Certainly we must have a prosperous agricultural economy in order to have a prosperous America. If we continue to subsidize crops, over which we have no control whatever—whether it be peanuts or potatoes or any other crop—we shall finally break down the program. I am interested in the continuing stability of our whole farm program, more than anything else.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished majority leader that if I were in the position of Secretary of Agriculture and had to have an effective program for the control of the potato situation, so that it would not cost the Government more than it should cost—and some little cost is justified—I would want marketing quotas. I think that is the best and the most effective way, certainly, to handle this situation.

I am not able to say whether marketing agreements would be effective in the case of potatoes. Before a judgment is passed upon that question, I would want to see what was done in 1949, under the terms of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and what has thus far been done in 1950, under the terms of the Agricultural Act of 1949. I would want to see what marketing orders were issued, what attempts were made to establish grades. Then I might be able to say whether I thought it was an effective way to handle the potato program.

I may say that when the original legislation was enacted, it was the opinion of the Department of Agriculture that marketing agreements would be, to a great degree, effective. At that time it looked as if the potato growers wanted to cooperate and would cooperate. I still think a great majority of the potato growers will cooperate in a marketing-agreement program If it is possible to handle this situation by means of marketing agreements, certainly that is a very desirable and satisfactory way to handle it.

Unfortunately, we have not yet had sufficient experience, in my opinion, to be able to know whether it will be effective; and what experience I have had

leads me to believe that I would like to have marketing quotas on a crop, rather than marketing agreements.

Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BREWSTER, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield first to the Senator from Mississippi, who has been seeking recognition for some time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether I correctly understood him to say, a while ago, that the proposed cotton bill will add 600,000 acres to the present allotments for cotton.

Mr. ANDERSON. I said the official estimate of the Department of Agriculture was 790,000 acres; and I have no way of disputing that figure, except that other estimates, made inside the Department, run as low as 600,000 acres, and some run as high as 800,000 acres. I believe the correct figure to be between the two.

Mr. STENNIS. But regardless of that, the Senator from New Mexico believes the total acreage will not exceed that presently allowed by law, namely, 21,000,000 acres; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think so. I think there will be underplanting, not nearly so much as some persons believe, but sufficient so that the acreage will still come within the 21,000,000 acres, or perhaps slightly above it.

Mr. STENNIS. I understood the Senator to say that the present law has operated exceedingly well for the small grower and operator.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. And that the present measure will take care of some of the inequities affecting the larger operators.

Mr. ANDERSON. Not necessarily that.

Mr. STENNIS. But is it not true that the bill affects smaller operators also, because many of them are tenants and have to come under the allotments allowed the larger land owners.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct; and I hope I did not leave the impression that only the large operators' allotments will be affected by this measure. There is a situation in the State of Texas, for example, which will be handled by it, that has nothing to do with either large or small operations, where all the crops will be taken care of. It is an attempt to make possible the application by the Department of certain additional facts or circumstances which they were not able to apply at an earlier date.

Mr. STENNIS. But, even in the case of large operators who are going to be taken care of, this measure affects many people, because they are tenants who receive their acreage really under the larger operator's allotment. Is that not true?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I may say every large operator, unless it be those in the large irrigated sections, operates with a system of tenants, who derive their allocation from the larger operator, and it happens that most of the relief will come in the States where that is the practice. Under the proposal there will be no relief, or only minor relief, to the State of California, for example, where there is a large irrigated area. The advantage will come, as the Senator from Mississippi has indicated, to the States where the large operator uses the tenant in his operation.

Mr. STENNIS. The family-unit farmer is the one who will benefit.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In view of the apparent fact that the Secretary did not deem it wise to use the power he possessed last year, and in view of the fact that the potato growers of the country were the ones who took the 60-percent parity, and the only ones so far as the major crops are concerned, would it not be more considerate and more equitable that the potato industry should have the opportunity to have its case considered before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and to recommend whatever additional legislation may seem to be indicated, to deal with the problem, before they are entirely deprived of the support program? That would be the effect of the rider in this case.

Mr. ANDERSON. In answer to the distinguished Senator, I said quite frankly, as I began, that this was discriminatory legislation, and I so recognize it, but I see no way of getting effective and early action without discriminatory legislation. I think it is a chopping-off, which I concede to be unfair, but it will probably precipitate immediate consideration of an acreage bill which will establish workable quotas.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is not that unfair, If I may use the word? No hearings have been held. The potato industry has been ready to go ahead with hearings on this matter, and would welcome an opportunity, if the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and his colleagues, could set this question for an immediate hearing. It would give some assurance of consideration which has already been too long delayed.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Maine places me in a bad position. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee which called upon the Department of Agriculture for a legislative proposal. The legislative proposal came, was received by the chairman of the committee, and was introduced by him as a bill. I think it would have been well if we had had hearings on it last October or, preferably last September, and had completed the hearings, so they might have been incorporated in legislation early in January. But a great many things intervened to make that impossible. I could also state to the distinguished Senator that I had not intended to say anything about that in speaking on the joint resolution, but in the absence of the chairman, members of the committee asked me to explain the cotton provisions of it, and naturally I felt obligated also to explain why we went into the potato situation as we did. I have tried to be fair and to say I do not think this is fair treatment, but I say it is a type of drastic treatment that sometimes makes it possible to obtain fair treatment. If I may take just another minute, let me say further to the distinguished Senator from Maine that when the matter comes before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I hope my conduct then will convince him that I should still like to be fair to the potato growers of the country. I think this is a necessary step perhaps to bring the question before the Congress in an effective way. Somehow, nothing would have been done with it, otherwise. The Senator has said the potato growers have been ready to proceed for 5 months. I think he is entirely correct in that statement, and therefore I think perhaps we have done them an injustice, and this may be another injustice. Two wrongs may not make one right, at all, but it may be that out of these two wrongs we may finally get some legislation that may be fair.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply wanted to ask one more question. Section 2 of the joint resolution as amended reads:

> No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

Assuming that the joint resolution becomes effective on March 1, and the potato quota bill is enacted into law, effective April 15, what will be the status of potatoes planted between March 1 and April 15? Also what will be the status regarding quotas of potatoes already planted, and which will be above ground by March 1?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I could answer those questions for the Senator from Vermont. I imagine when the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is considering the matter they will attempt to draft some sort of schedule which will make it possible to dispose of that question. I was going to say it would seem to me it would be desirable to have the provision reach as far back as possible. I am not greatly worried about what happens to potatoes planted in January, February, and March. I think that generally speaking they can be handled without much loss to the Federal Government, and whatever loss there might be would be more than offset by the lower prices paid by the consumers as they buy those potatoes in the stores. If, Mr. President, we had a great scarcity in January, February, and March of the early potatoes, then the price might be very high in the stores, and I would rather have a little bit larger supply, and support them a little bit, than to have a scarcity of those early potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask one more question. Suppose a North Carolina farmer plants, we may say, 50 acres before the acreage law goes into effect, and then finds he is entitled to market only the product from 35 of the acres he has planted. Would we then expect the other 15 acres to be destroyed? What would happen to them?

Mr. ANDERSON. I still say that is a matter the committee would have to consider. I do not think it presents too great a problem, because I think quotas can be allowed to a great many in the early,

intermediate steps, and still not bring about too great distress.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The able senior Senator from Vermont raised the question I had in mind, as to what would be done with the producer who either had his potatoes planted or was in process of harvesting them. But I could not quite follow the able Senator from New Mexico when he said that an excess yield, or an excess amount of early potatoes might be advantageous rather than a handicap. I think they have been a handicap to the Department of Agriculture, only in the most recent weeks, because, while I may not have the positive facts, I read in the public press that they have been buying some early potatoes at the present time in order to support the program, or to support the potato price, while in the northern section of the United States, the late potatoes are in surplus and we are attempting to dispose of them. So I cannot see how, if the Government is purchasing early potatoes in the deep South to support the program, those potatoes are not a problem to the Nation and to the Department of Agriculture at the present time.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that, earlier, I had admitted that, as I understood, some potatoes had been purchased in the South at this time. I say only that the surplus potatoes are the best price-regulating mechanism we have, and that applies to all farm programs.

I hope that in imposing quite drastic legislation affecting potatoes, we do not so fix the quotas that we will have a scarcity of potatoes. I should rather have a little abundance of potatoes, and remove them from the markets, than to have a scarcity of potatoes. Therefore, that is why I said I did not think the amount which had thus far been developed to be at all dangerous or to be costing the Government too much money.

Mr. THYE. If the able Senator from New Mexico will yield further, I fully agree with his statement as to a surplus, and that possibly it is to the benefit rather than a handicap to consumers of the Nation. If they do not plant sufficient acres to get a yield that affords a sufficient supply to meet the demand, the scarcity of the product may cause consumers to pay an enormous price. If and when we get to a point where we attempt to regulate every unit of production to merely our domestic consumption, we may find a short season when production is not so favorable as the production of potatoes was in the past going season of 1949. If that happens, Mr. President, then, consumers are going to pay a great deal more than the cost they paid under support prices at 60 percent of parity, as we had it in the calendar year 1949 and this winter of 1950.

I believe that in dealing with this overall question, we have got to make it clear on the Senate floor what we are going to do with the potatoes which are today planted and are growing, and to make it clear whether the support will be available to those who are planting this spring, in the late potato-producing areas, because it is absolutely wrong for the Congress to permit one section of the United States, in producing a crop, to receive a different support from that which is accorded to farmers in another section producing the same type of crop. So I definitely hope that when the question is finally disposed of we will have written into the law provisions which will be applied to the growers across the Nation, not merely to the growers in certain sectors of the country.

Mr. BREWSTER rose.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have badly infringed upon the time of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask one more question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like first to make one brief observation to the Senator from Minnesota. The joint resolution clearly says that potatoes which are planted up to the time of the effective date of the rider shall receive price support. This would not be the first time that there has been a difference in the way a price support has been given to potatoes, because at one time the price support was only made available to what were called storable potatoes, and the early and intermediate potatoes did not receive price support. I therefore suggest we have not always handled the problem exactly alike, although I admit to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that it probably is discriminating and may be unfair. I have tried to be frank about that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, one more question, please. Is it not true, I would ask the Senator from New Mexico, that a very substantial portion, possibly from 30 to 50 percent, of the contemplated surplus this year, may be the result of the influx of Canadian potatoes into our country?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not be able to say how much it may be, because I am not familiar with the figures. I have already conceded that the influx of Canadian potatoes, when we had a 50,000,000-bushel surplus, was a very distressing item.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not true that the President has the entire power to stop that influx whenever he shall deem it expedient in the public interest?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know. I do not think so, because I understand there is a provision in the tariff law which allows a certain amount to come in at a reduced rate, and which provides higher rates beyond that for additional quantities. The Senator from Maine is far more able to answer his own question than I am, and I shall therefore leave it with him.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to send to the desk and ask to have printed and lie on the table an amendment which I propose to offer to House Joint Resolution 398, when it comes before the Senate for action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Vermont in offering that amendment. If my colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] were present, he would also like to be associated in offering the amendment. He is at present at home because of the illness of his mother.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that I welcome his association with me in that amendment, and I should welcome any other Senators from agricultural States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the name of the senior Senator from North Dakota will be added as a sponsor of the amendment.

MILITARY SERVICE OF BRIG. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement prepared by myself dealing with the military service of Brig. Gen. Julius Klein and an additional statement of his military service.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BREWSTER

Mr. President, I am happy to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen soldier with whose past record I am fully acquainted Julius Klein has devoted a rich and active life to the service of his country and to his fellow men.

Julius Klein entered active military service with the Thirty-third Division in March 1941, before this country was at war. He did special research work on north African and German problems and prepared a comprehensive paper on combat public relations, which dealt with the problems of psychological warfare, military government, and propaganda. However, he was eager to assume active duties and requested that he be assigned to a service which would enable him to participate in active combat.

Holding the rank of lieutenant colonel, he was later placed in command of the Second Battalion, Twenty-third QM Truck Regiment, with which unit he was assigned to New Caledonia. He saw action in the South Pacific and later in the Philippines. He and his battalion received numerous commendations and was rated "superior" by the Inspector General. He was cited for bravery in the South Pacific by Lieutenant General Harmon, and was later awarded the Soldier's Medal for heroism by the President.

General Klein was later placed in command of the Five Hundred and Twenty-third QM Group, and assumed the responsibility of expediting the movement of cargo and troops from the port of Noumea. So well did he carry out his duties, under the stress of war and in the face of a multitude of wartime problems, that the convoy operations in that area were enormously improved

General Klein later commanded his group during the invasion of the Philippines and took full charge of all service troops on the island of Cebu. His group executed the movement of the Twenty-fifth Division to the Philippine theater, which was subsequently commended by the division commander and others as having been the best planned and executed movement of its size yet witnessed.

General Klein has made equally important contributions to the Illinois National Guard. Before a group of American Legionnaires at Bloomington, Ill., General Klein delivered what may well be called a speech of historic importance to the National Guard

system. In this speech, he opposed the federalization of the National Guard, a subject in which many of us in the Senate are deeply concerned. Very sagaciously, he invited attention to the danger of federalization. He said, and I quote: "The National Guard system, comprising, as it does, citizen soldiers, has always been a bulwark against the concentration of military power in our Federal Government I urge all citizens in groups and as individuals to take appropriate action to assure the rejection by Congress of proposals which would destroy our existing National Guard system" Unquote.

At the end of World War II, General Klein was called to Washington to assume the post of special assistant to the then Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson.

Mr. President, I would like to close with a quotation from the great American Douglas MacArthur's message to General Klein. "My appreciation for the conspicuous service you rendered while a member of my command is a matter of official record, as is your service prior to that time Your promotion to the grade of brigadier general is not only a highly deserved honor, but in furtherance of the public interest as well" This personal tribute from one of the world's greatest soldiers is solid indication of General Klein's standing in the brotherhood of patriotic military men who have contributed to America's glory.

I am sure that many of my colleagues on the floor of the Senate join me in spirit in paying tribute to this worthy gentleman, Julius Klein.

MILITARY RECORD, BRIG GEN JULIUS KLEIN—EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS AND OFFICIAL REPORTS

"He has always demonstrated his suitability for the rank of brigadier general"—Lt Gen Robert C. Richardson, Jr , May 6, 1946.

"He was assigned as port commander (Noumea) and reorganized the same in a superior manner. * * * He has definitely demonstrated his suitability for the rank of brigadier general"—Maj Gen. Rush B. Lincoln, May 7, 1946

"Your unselfish and outstanding devotion to duty merit this long overdue recognition of the conspicuous service you have given this Nation"—Maj Gen Edward F. Witsell, February 16, 1948.

"It has come to my attention that Col. Julius Klein has been selected as Commanding General of an AAA Brigade in the Illinois National Guard. I was most pleased to receive this news as I feel that it is a recognition of Colonel Klein's ability and a mark of approval of his performance in World War II. He will no doubt do an equally fine job in the citizen soldier army * * * It is gratifying to see his ability recognized. Colonel Klein is a man of great ability and one who has imagination coupled with an amazing capacity for work. His selection therefore seems to me to be very wise"—Lt Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., February 20, 1948.

"Colonel Klein has proved himself to be a fine and outstanding soldier and fully worthy of the faith you have placed in him by your recent recommendation that he be promoted to general officer rank. The National Guard will certainly benefit greatly by your action"—Maj. Gen. Ewart G Plank, February 24, 1948

"I have followed with interest his assignments, and the manner in which he has performed them all bear witness to his outstanding ability and his worthiness for the awards presented. * * * I regret that I am not in a position, due to my retirement, to place an official endorsement on General Klein's promotion papers. However, I would like to add my recommendation for Federal recognition of his promotion and to inform you of my complete confidence in his ability to serve in the rank of brigadier general."—Maj Gen. Rush B. Lincoln, March 5, 1948.

"He has the proper training and seasoned judgment for such a responsibility and I would not hesitate to have Colonel Klein in his new position under my command if the occasion should arise I heartily endorse your recommendation and the promotion of Col. Julius Klein to brigadier general."—Lt. Gen. Robert Eichelberger, March 18, 1948.

"I am delighted to hear of your recent promotion to the grade of brigadier general in the Illinois National Guard It is a well-deserved and long overdue honor, and you have my congratulations"—Gen Douglas MacArthur, April 9, 1948

"My appreciation for the conspicuous service you rendered while a member of my command in 1945-46 is a matter of official record. * * * I consider that your promotion to the grade of brigadier general is not only a highly deserved honor but in furtherance of the public interest as well and had the war not terminated when it did, I have no doubt but that you would have received this promotion in the due course of your active duty in the Army of the United States."—Gen. Douglas MacArthur, April 17, 1948.

"Brigadier General Klein served in my office when I was Secretary of War. * * * I cannot say too much for the caliber of his work He is an officer of marked ability and notable vigor. I am sure that he is thoroughly qualified for Federal recognition in his present rank and post"—Judge Robert P. Patterson, April 15, 1948

"As I relinquish my office as Governor of Illinois, I should like to express my appreciation for the splendid efforts you have expended in the service of our State and Nation * * * The tremendous efforts, the immeasurable value of this work, cannot be overrated. You have my heartfelt thanks for this job which has meant so much to the Nation we both serve. I was therefore pleased to receive and act favorably upon General Haffner's recommendation for your promotion to brigadier general"—Governor Dwight H Green, January 8, 1949

"I desire to take this opportunity to express to you my personal gratification of your interest in our national security as exemplified by your participation as a student in Senior Officers' Indoctrination Course, held at the Antiaircraft and Guided Missiles Branch of the Artillery School, Fort Bliss, Tex. * * * The interest and enthusiasm which you have displayed throughout the course has been an inspiration to both the faculty and the other student members of the class."—Maj Gen. John L Homer, February 17, 1949.

"I was particularly impressed by his knowledge of military tactics and strategy and his keen appreciation of the use of antiaircraft artillery and guided missiles It is my opinion that his professional qualifications are sufficient to qualify him for the rank of brigadier general, National Guard, to command an antiaircraft brigade. I would be highly pleased to have him as a general officer in command of units in any command I might have"—Maj. Gen. John L Homer, July 11, 1949

"Brigadier General Klein is, in my opinion, a real leader, and manifests this military leadership successfully and effectively in the distinctly high quality of his troop commands. I am satisfied that his knowledge, training, sound judgment, courage, and fine personal qualities fully qualify him for his appointment as brigadier general"—Maj. Gen Ewart G Plank, July 16, 1949.

"I consider it not only a privilege, but my duty, as the former chief executive and wartime Governor of Illinois, to appear before this Board in behalf of Julius Klein, a worthy citizen-soldier who has rendered distinguished services to the State and Nation, and who, particularly during my 8 years as Governor of Illinois, was of immeasurable value to me in matters pertaining to the military establishment of our State. * * * General Klein is eminently well qualified to hold positions in the military, because he has energy, ambition, drive, keen intelligence, loyalty, superior judgment, and forthrightness."—Dwight H Green, July 25, 1949

"I am familiar with the services rendered by Brigadier General Klein in World War II and with his subsequent performance of duty. For some time he served as special assistant to me in the office of the Secretary of War * * * He discharged his duties with fidelity, skill, and ability, being indefatigable in his work He has unusual qualities of leadership It is my opinion that he is thoroughly qualified for Federal recognition"—Judge Robert P Patterson, September 8, 1949.

"The results obtained during the field training of the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade are ample proof of the capabilities of the brigade commander and staff. * * * The brigade commander is to be commended for his initiative, energy, and enthusiasm which has been so largely responsible for the success of the camp. Through the brigade commander's varied experiences he has acquired an intimate knowledge of human nature, and as a result has been able to instill in his entire command a very high morale and a desire to reflect credit upon the citizen-soldier of our country"—Field Training Inspection Report, Fifth Army Inspection Team, August 7, 1948

"This unit has progressed rapidly and shows evidence of excellent leadership"—Annual Armory Inspection Report, Inspector General Fifth Army, January 3, 1949

"This is the second field training phase in which this unit has taken part * * * The excellent results shown by the units under their command are due to a considerable degree to the organizational ability and systematic supervision of the brigade commander and his staff An examination of the brigade commander's record and his conduct in the field indicate that he is well qualified both as an executive and a troop commander"—Field Training Inspection Report, Fifth Army Inspection Team, August 24, 1949

"Based on technical proficiency, condition of equipment, camp and range discipline, courtesy and morale, the training standard existing in the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade, Illinois National Guard, as compared with other National Guard units, is superior"—Report of Staff Visit by Representative of Chief Army Field Forces, September 7, 1949

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to discuss a subject tonight which concerns me more than does any other subject I have ever discussed before this body, and perhaps more than any other subject I shall ever have the good fortune to discuss in the future. It not only concerns me, but it disturbs and frightens me

About 10 days ago, at Wheeling, W Va., in making a Lincoln Day speech, I made the statement that there are presently in the State Department a very sizable group of active Communists. I made the further statement, Mr. President, that of one small group which had been screened by the President's own security agency, the State Department refused to discharge approximately 200 of those individuals.

The Secretary of State promptly denied my statement and said there was not a single Communist in the State De-

partment. I thereafter sent a telegram to the President, which I should like to read at this time:

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

In the Lincoln Day speech at Wheeling Thursday night I stated that the State Department harbors a nest of Communists and Communist sympathizers who are helping to shape our foreign policy. I further stated that I have in my possession the names of 57 Communists who are in the State Department at present. A State Department spokesman promptly denied this, claiming that there is not a single Communist in the Department. You can convince yourself of the falsity of the State Department claim very easily. You will recall that you personally appointed a board to screen State Department employees for the purpose of weeding out fellow travelers—men whom the board considered dangerous to the security of this Nation. Your board did a painstaking job, and named hundreds which had been listed as dangerous to the security of the Nation, because of communistic connections.

While the records are not available to me, I know absolutely of one group of approximately 300 certified to the Secretary for discharge because of communism. He actually only discharged approximately 80. I understand that this was done after lengthy consultation with the now-convicted traitor, Alger Hiss. I would suggest, therefore, Mr. President, that you simply pick up your phone and ask Mr. Acheson how many of those whom your board had labeled as dangerous Communists he failed to discharge. The day the House Un-American Activities Committee exposed Alger Hiss as an important link in an international Communist spy ring you signed an order forbidding the State Department's giving any information in regard to the disloyalty or the communistic connections of anyone in that Department to the Congress.

Despite this State Department black-out, we have been able to compile a list of 57 Communists in the State Department. This list is available to you but you can get a much longer list by ordering Secretary Acheson to give you a list of those whom your own board listed as being disloyal and who are still working in the State Department I believe the following is the minimum which can be expected of you in this case

1. That you demand that Acheson give you and the proper congressional committee the names and a complete report on all of those who were placed in the Department by Alger Hiss, and all of those still working in the State Department who were listed by your board as bad security risks because of their communistic connections.

2. That you promptly revoke the order in which you provided under no circumstances could a congressional committee obtain any information or help in exposing Communists.

Failure on your part will label the Democratic Party of being the bedfellow of international communism. Certainly this label is not deserved by the hundreds of thousands of loyal American Democrats throughout the Nation, and by the sizable number of able loyal Democrats in both the Senate and the House.

Mr. President, the only answer I have received to this telegram was the statement by the President at his press conference to the effect that there was not a word of truth in the telegram.

Subsequently, the Democratic leader of the Senate—at least, the alleged leader—made a speech in Chicago in which he repeated substantially what the President said, except that he went one step further and stated:

If I had said the nasty things that McCARTHY has about the State Department, I would be ashamed all my life.

He also said there was not a word of truth in my charge. I think it is unfortunate, not because I am concerned with what the senior Senator from Illinois happens to think, but because he occupies such an important position. I believe, if we are going to root out the fifth column in the State Department, we should have the wholehearted cooperation of both Democrats and Republicans——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Wait until I finish. If the Senator will stay with me for the next few hours he will learn a great many facts. I have never refused to yield to any Senator, and I do not intend to refuse. The Senator from Illinois will have full time in which to answer any question he wishes to ask, but let me first finish my sentence.

I started to say that I think it is especially bad because it indicates a preconceived decision not to work with us in attempting to ferret out Communists. I do not feel that the Democratic Party has control of the executive branch of the Government any more. If it had, with the very able Members on the other side of the aisle, we would not find the picture which I intend to disclose. I think a group of twisted-thinking intellectuals have taken over both the Democratic and Republican Parties to try to wrest control from them.

I shall be glad now to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that there is no one in the Senate or in the country who is any more opposed to Communist domination of any nation or Communist infiltration into any country than is the Senator from Illinois. What I am asking the Senator to do—and I hope he will do it, and the country wants him to do it—is to follow through with the speech which he made in Wheeling, W. Va., in which he stated more than 200 persons working in the State Department were known to the Secretary of State to be members of the Communist Party. If the Senator made that statement—and that is what has been reported—I want him to name those Communists. If there are card-carrying Communists in the State Department, the Senator from Illinois will go along with the Senator from Wisconsin in any way possible to remove those Communists from the rolls.

The Senator does not have to do as he did in Salt Lake City and say, "I am not charging these four people with being Communists." The Senator is privileged to name them all in the Senate, and if those people are not Communists he will be protected. That is all I want the Senator to do. If the Senator names those 205 card-carrying Communists, and he proves to be right, the Senator from Illinois will apologize for anything he has said about the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his views, but I should like to assure him that I will not say anything on the Senate floor which I will not say off the floor. On the day when I take advantage of the security we have on the Senate floor, on that day I will resign from the Senate. Anything I say on the floor of the Senate at any time will be repeated off the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not until I have finished answering the question of the Senator from Illinois. The Senator called my attention to something, and I am glad he did; otherwise I might have overlooked it. Incidentally, the speech in Reno, Nev., and that in Wheeling, W. Va., were recorded, so there is no question about what I said. I do not believe I mentioned the figure 205. I believe I said "over 200" The President said, "It is just a lie. There is nothing to it."

I have before me a letter which was reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 1, 1946, at page A4892. It is a letter from James F. Byrnes, former Secretary of State. It deals with the screening of the first group, of about 3,000. There were a great number of subsequent screenings. This was the beginning.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Please let me finish. The Senator will have all the time in the world to ask questions, and I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose, and he can even make short speeches and take all the time he wants.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois——

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The letter deals with the first group of 3,000 which was screened. The President—and I think wisely so—set up a board to screen the employees who were coming to the State Department from the various war agencies of the War Department. There were thousands of unusual characters in some of those war agencies. Former Secretary Byrnes in his letter, which is reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, says this:

Pursuant to Executive order, approximately 4,000 employees have been transferred to the Department of State from various war agencies such as the OSS, FEA, OWI, OIAA, and so forth. Of these 4,000 employees, the case histories of approximately 3,000 have been subjected to a preliminary examination, as a result of which a recommendation against permanent employment has been made in 285 cases by the screening committee to which you refer in your letter.

In other words, former Secretary Byrnes said that 285 of those men are unsafe risks. He goes on to say that of this number only 79 have been removed. Of the 57 I mentioned some are from this

group of 205, and some are from subsequent groups which have been screened but not discharged.

I might say in that connection that the investigative agency of the State Department has done an excellent job. The files show that they went into great detail in labeling Communists as such. The only trouble is that after the investigative agency had properly labeled these men as Communists the State Department refused to discharge them. I shall give detailed cases.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. As to the 57 whose names the Senator is demanding, if he will be patient and sit down——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the statements made, the Senator should yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall yield at this time only for a question. I shall not yield for any lengthy speeches by the Senator from Illinois. If he wishes to ask a question, I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, did the Senator say at Wheeling, W. Va., last Thursday night that 205 persons working for the State Department were known by the Secretary of State to be members of the Communist Party, or words to that effect? Did he call the attention of the country to the fact that 205 men in the State Department were card-carrying Communists? Did the Senator say that? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to insert in the RECORD a copy of the speech which I made at Wheeling, W. Va.

Mr. LUCAS. Cannot the Senator answer "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will ask the Senator please not to interrupt me. I will yield to him later. I will give him all the chance in the world.

Mr. LUCAS. I asked the Senator a very simple question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask at this time unanimous consent to be allowed to insert in the RECORD a copy of the speech which I made at Wheeling, W. Va., and at Reno, Nev. It was the same speech.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McCARTHY. In that case I shall read the speech into the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. We want to hear it.

Mr. McCARTHY. The speech reads:

Ladies and gentlemen, tonight as we celebrate the one hundred and forty-first birthday of one of the greatest men in American history, I would like to be able to talk about what a glorious day today is in the history of the world. As we celebrate the birth of this man who with his whole heart and soul hated war, I would like to be able to speak of peace in our time, of war being outlawed, and of world-wide disarmament. These would be truly appropriate things to be able to mention as we celebrate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln.

I hope the Senator from Illinois will stay for this.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be right here. I am coming over to the Republican side of the aisle so that I will not miss anything.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sure the Senator will not miss anything.

The speech proceeded:

Five years after a world war has been won, men's hearts should anticipate a long peace, and men's minds should be free from the heavy weight that comes with war. But this is not such a period—for this is not a period of peace. This is a time of the "cold war." This is a time when all the world is split into two vast, increasingly hostile armed camps—a time of a great armaments race.

Today we can almost physically hear the mutterings and rumblings of an invigorated god of war. You can see it, feel it, and hear it all the way from the hills of Indochina, from the shores of Formosa, right over into the very heart of Europe itself.

The one encouraging thing is that the "mad moment" has not yet arrived for the firing of the gun or the exploding of the bomb which will set civilization about the final task of destroying itself. There is still a hope for peace if we finally decide that no longer can we safely blind our eyes and close our ears to those facts which are shaping up more and more clearly. And that is that we are now engaged in a show-down fight—not the usual war between nations for land areas or other material gains, but a war between two diametrically opposed ideologies.

The great difference between our western Christian world and the atheistic Communist world is not political, ladies and gentlemen, it is moral. There are other differences, of course, but those could be reconciled. For instance, the Marxian idea of confiscating the land and factories and running the entire economy as a single enterprise is momentous. Likewise, Lenin's invention of the one-party police state as a way to make Marx's idea work is hardly less momentous.

Stalin's resolute putting across of these two ideas, of course, did much to divide the world. With only those differences, however, the East and the West could most certainly still live in peace.

The real, basic difference, however, lies in the religion of immoralism—invented by Marx, preached feverishly by Lenin, and carried to unimaginable extremes by Stalin. This religion of immoralism, if the Red half of the world wins—and well it may—this religion of immoralism will more deeply wound and damage mankind than any conceivable economic or political system.

Karl Marx dismissed God as a hoax, and Lenin and Stalin have added in clear-cut, unmistakable language their resolve that no nation, no people who believe in a God, can exist side by side with their communistic state.

Karl Marx, for example, expelled people from his Communist Party for mentioning such things as justice, humanity, or morality. He called this soulful ravings and sloppy sentimentality.

While Lincoln was a relatively young man in his late thirties, Karl Marx boasted that the Communist specter was haunting Europe. Since that time, hundreds of millions of people and vast areas of the world have fallen under Communist domination. Today, less than 100 years after Lincoln's death, Stalin brags that this Communist specter is not only haunting the world, but is about to completely subjugate it.

Today we are engaged in a final, all-out battle between communistic atheism and Christianity The modern champions of communism have selected this as the time. And, ladies and gentlemen, the chips are down—they are truly down.

I might say for the benefit of the Senator from Illinois that what I am reading was taken from a recording of the speech. I did not use a written speech that night. I continue the reading:

Lest there be any doubt that the time has been chosen, let us go directly to the leader of communism today—Joseph Stalin. Here is what he said—not back in 1928, not before the war, not during the war—but 2 years after the last war was ended: "To think that the Communist revolution can be carried out peacefully, within the framework of a Christian democracy, means one has either gone out of one's mind and lost all normal understanding, or has grossly and openly repudiated the Communist revolution."

And this is what was said by Lenin in 1919, which was also quoted with approval by Stalin in 1947:

"We are living," said Lenin, "not merely in a state, but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with Christian states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the Bourgeois states will be inevitable."

Ladies and gentlemen, can there be anyone here tonight who is so blind as to say that the war is not on? Can there be anyone who fails to realize that the Communist world has said, "The time is now"—that this is the time for the show-down between the democratic Christian world and the Communist atheistic world?

Unless we face this fact, we shall pay the price that must be paid by those who wait too long.

Six years ago, at the time of the first conference to map out the peace—Dumbarton Oaks—there was within the Soviet orbit 180,000,000 people. Lined up on the antitotalitarian side there were in the world at that time roughly 1,625,000,000 people. Today, only 6 years later, there are 800,000,000 people under the absolute domination of Soviet Russia—an increase of over 400 percent. On our side, the figure has shrunk to around 500,000,000. In other words, in less than 6 years the odds have changed from 9 to 1 in our favor to 8 to 5 against us. This indicates the swiftness of the tempo of Communist victories and American defeats in the cold war. As one of our outstanding historical figures once said, "When a great democracy is destroyed, it will not be because of enemies from without, but rather because of enemies from within."

The truth of this statement is becoming terrifyingly clear as we see this country each day losing on every front.

At war's end we were physically the strongest nation on earth and, at least potentially, the most powerful intellectually and morally. Ours could have been the honor of being a beacon in the desert of destruction, a shining living proof that civilization was not yet ready to destroy itself. Unfortunately, we have failed miserably and tragically to arise to the opportunity.

The reason why we find ourselves in a position of impotency is not because our only powerful potential enemy has sent men to invade our shores, but rather because of the traitorous actions of those who have been treated so well by this Nation. It has not been the less fortunate or members of minority groups who have been selling this Nation out, but rather those who have had all the benefits that the wealthiest nation on earth has had to offer—the finest homes, the finest college education, and the finest jobs in Government we can give.

This is glaringly true in the State Department. There the bright young men who are born with silver spoons in their mouths are the ones who have been worst.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am interested in what he is saying, both as

a Senator and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. When the Senator casts doubt on the personnel of the State Department that, of course, is something which interests me very especially. I not only feel that there should be no Communists in the State Department, but that there should be nobody in the State Department who is not affirmatively, enthusiastically loyal to the United States and what it stands for. Therefore I say to the Senator from Wisconsin now, that so far as the junior Senator from Massachusetts is concerned, he will at the earliest appropriate opportunity make a motion to have a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee take up every single one of the accusations which the Senator from Wisconsin makes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was hoping the Senator would.

Mr. LODGE. I make that statement at this point, when the Senator from Wisconsin is beginning to speak about the State Department, because I think that I for one have a special responsibility in that field.

Mr. McCARTHY. In case the Senator from Massachusetts is not able to remain and listen to all of my remarks.

Mr. LODGE. I cannot remain and listen to the whole of the Senator's speech, because I have another engagement, but I shall read it all in the morning with the utmost care.

Mr. McCARTHY. In case the Senator must leave—and I say it will take me a long time to conclude, if I continue to have the interruptions I have previously had—I should like to call attention to three of the cases which I intend to cite: Case No. 1, case No. 2, and case No. 81. Those, I think, represent the big three. While there are vast numbers of other Communists with whom we must be concerned, if we can get rid of those big three we will have done something to break the back of the espionage ring within the State Department.

I might say also, in case the Senator will not be present to hear me, that in giving the records I have been very careful about doing two things: No. 1, not to cite anything which has not been confirmed by the intelligence agencies which have been investigating these men; and No. 2—and this I think is very important—I have tried, and I hope successfully, to red-pencil anything that might be embarrassing to any investigating agency. I know it is easy to call for files, and when I call for a disloyalty file I do not mean that I am calling for the source of information. I do not think any intelligence agency can work and do a good job if the Senate or the House, or any other body is entitled to make public the source of the information. The files which I have here show the source of the information. I contacted one of the Federal intelligence agencies, one of the investigative units. I asked them if they would care to go over what I have to say before I say it, and red-pencil anything which they thought might in any way divulge the source of information, that would in any way inform the Communist spy ring of the information they have. The answer was, "Well, you have gotten all of it from the State Department files, and the Communists within the Department can see those files, and I will show you which Commies have the top-secret clearance, so if they have seen it, it does not do much damage for the Senate to see them."

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am not undertaking to say whether he is right or wrong. I have no way of knowing that. What I say is that the matter he is discussing is of such vital importance that I think it ought to be investigated by a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I say with my whole heart, I hope I am wrong. There is nothing as disturbing as is this picture. But if I am wrong, I shall be very happy indeed to know that I am.

Mr. LODGE. I say to the Senator that I shall do all I can to leave no stone unturned to get to the bottom of the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot yield any further.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps I can save some time. The Senator from Wisconsin in his discussion with the Senator from Massachusetts said that he had a long speech and had to read it. If the Senator will answer my question, perhaps we can save some time.

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot yield at this time for the Senator's question. I cannot yield for that purpose until I complete the speech.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska if I do not lose the floor thereby.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield to me without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the proceedings. I am perfectly willing to cooperate with the majority leader in every way. But when I look around the Senate Chamber I see only two or three Senators on the other side of the aisle, and half a dozen on this side of the aisle. The matter seems to me to be of such importance——

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska and I are present.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; but I believe more Senators should be present. I believe more Senators should be on the floor to hear this statement. I do not want to interfere with the majority leader's program, but I ask him if we cannot take a recess at this time, or, if necessary, have a quorum call to bring Senators back to the Senate Chamber so they can hear the speech being made by the Senator from Wisconsin. It seems to me the only sensible thing to do at this time is to take a recess or have a quorum call.

Mr. LUCAS. As I look around the Senate Chamber I see about as many Senators present as I usually see present when a speech is being made. Last Friday we discussed the creation of a Small-Business Committee all afternoon, and at times only 3 Senators were present. The resolution then before the Senate was a very important one. I believe there are perhaps 25 or 30 Senators now present. That is as many as would remain after we have a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well, if the Senator from Illinois feels that way.

Mr. LUCAS. I am perfectly satisfied to sit here and listen.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps the majority leader is, but I say that a very important speech is being made. Terrific challenges are being hurled. I am perfectly willing to stay until 9 o'clock, but I submit to the majority leader that I feel more Senators ought to be on the floor if the Senator from Wisconsin is going to proceed with his speech.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McCARTHY. If that is done I do not think we will obtain a quorum, and I will be obliged to discontinue. I should like to read some more of my speech.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that we proceed until 7 o'clock without having a quorum call, and at that time the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow, and that then I may have the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that what has now been suggested is what is often suggested under similar circumstances. Let me remind the Senate that on the request of certain Democratic and Republican Members I made the announcement that there would be no vote tonight on the important measure which is now pending, the cotton-potato measure. Consequently many Senators have gone home. Now the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the minority leader, and others, do not want the Senator from Wisconsin to continue. They want a quorum call. The Senator from Wisconsin now asks that he be allowed to quit at 7 o'clock. If the speech is one which is going to electrify the Nation, I should think the Senator from Wisconsin would desire to get it off his chest as fast as he possibly can, and not wait until tomorrow, because tomorrow the Senator will have no larger audience than he has at the present time. I should like to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that if the statement he is about to make is as important as he says it is, and if he can prove what he says he is going to prove, he will find the Senator from Illinois making the same demand that the Senator from Massachusetts made, which is a thorough and complete investigation with respect to all the Communists he is going to name. I want to remain here until he names them. That is what I am interested in. The newspaper reporters and the people of the country generally are demanding to know who these 207 or 201 Communists are.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I will not yield any further.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order to straighten out the record respecting the program for tomorrow?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that we already have a special order that the Senate will meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning under a unanimous-consent agreement, with the time for a vote having been set. Therefore it would not be possible for the Senator to continue his speech as of 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well. I will withhold yielding for a call of a quorum for the time being, if the Senator does not mind.

Mr. President, I continue to read from my speech:

Now I know it is very easy for anyone to condemn a particular bureau or department in general terms. Therefore, I would like to cite one rather unusual case—the case of a man who has done much to shape our foreign policy.

When Chiang Kai-shek was fighting our war, the State Department had in China a young man named John S Service. His task, obviously, was not to work for the communization of China. Strangely, however, he sent official reports back to the State Department urging that we torpedo our ally Chiang Kai-shek and stating, in effect, that communism was the best hope of China.

Later, this man—John Service—was picked up by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for turning over to the Communists secret State Department information. Strangely, however, he was never prosecuted. However, Joseph Grew, the Under Secretary of State, who insisted on his prosecution, was forced to resign. Two days after Grew's successor, Dean Acheson, took over as Under Secretary of State, this man—John Service—who had been picked up by the FBI and who had previously urged that communism was the best hope of China, was not only reinstated in the State Department but promoted. And finally, under Acheson, placed in charge of all placements and promotions.

Today, ladies and gentlemen, this man Service is on his way to represent the State Department and Acheson in Calcutta—by far and away the most important listening post in the Far East.

Now, let's see what happens when individuals with Communist connections are forced out of the State Department. Gustave Duran, who was labeled as (I quote) "a notorious international Communist," was made assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin American affairs. He was taken into the State Department from his job as a lieutenant colonel in the Communist International Brigade. Finally, after intense congressional pressure and criticism, he resigned in 1946 from the State Department—and, ladies and gentlemen, where do you think he is now? He took over a high-salaried job as Chief of Cultural Activities Section in the office of the Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the fact—especially in view of the comment he recently made—that I did not list John Service as one of the 57. Perhaps I could have, but I have listed only persons whose files were available to me. For some unknown reason, John Service's file has disappeared in the State Department. I have tried to find where it is, and I have been told that it is in the office—quoting the individual over there—"of the top brass." So I have not listed Service, and that is the sole reason why I have not. I have listed only individuals whose records have been confirmed by the President's own investigative agency.

The Senator from Illinois will also note that I have not named any of the 57. I have named or will name four individuals, and I have given or will give their records. One is John Service. I have shown what influence he has had in the Far East. I have not reached the second one yet; but I am now discussing what happens when those with communistic connections are forced out of the State Department, and in a short time I shall reach the fourth one.

I read further from my speech:

Then there was a Mrs. Mary Jane Kenny, from the Board of Economic Warfare in the State Department, who was named in an FBI report and in a House committee report as a courier for the Communist Party while working for the Government. And where do you think Mrs. Kenny is—she is now an editor in the United Nations Document Bureau.

Another interesting case was that of Julian H. Wadleigh, economist in the Trade Agreements Section of the State Department for 11 years and was sent to Turkey and Italy and other countries as United States representative. After the statute of limitations had run so he could not be prosecuted for treason, he openly and brazenly not only admitted but proclaimed that he had been a member of the Communist Party * * * that while working for the State Department he stole a vast number of secret documents * * * and furnished these documents to the Russian spy ring of which he was a part.

You will recall last spring there was held in New York what was known as the World Peace Conference—a conference which was labeled by the State Department and Mr. Truman as the sounding board for Communist propaganda and a front for Russia. Dr. Harlow Shapley was the chairman of that conference. Interestingly enough, according to the new release put out by the Department in July, the Secretary of State appointed Shapley on a commission which acts as liaison between UNESCO and the State Department.

That is the man who headed the conference which the Secretary of State said was a tool of Communist Russia, a sounding board of Communist propaganda. Again, that man was not named as one of the 57, but he might well have been.

I read further:

This, ladies and gentlemen, gives you somewhat of a picture of the type of individuals who have been helping to shape our foreign policy. In my opinion the State Department, which is one of the most important government departments, is thoroughly infested with Communists.

I have in my hand 57 cases of individuals who would appear to be either card carrying members or certainly loyal to the Communist Party, but who nevertheless are still helping to shape our foreign policy.

One thing to remember in discussing the Communists in our Government is that we are not dealing with spies who get 30 pieces of silver to steal the blueprints of a new weapon. We are dealing with a far more sinister type of activity because it permits the enemy to guide and shape our policy.

In that connection, I would like to read to you very briefly from the testimony of Larry E. Kerley, a man who was with the counter espionage section of the FBI for 8 years. And keep in mind as I read this to you that at the time he is speaking, there was in the State Department Alger Hiss, the convicted Alger Hiss; John Service, the man whom the FBI picked up for espionage—

And for turning over secret documents—

Julian Wadleigh, who brazenly admitted he was a spy and wrote newspaper articles in regard thereto, plus hundreds of other bad security risks.

The FBI, I may add, has done an outstanding job, as all persons in Washington, Democrats and Republicans alike, agree. If J. Edgar Hoover had a free hand, we would not be plagued by Hisses and Wadleighs in high positions of power in the State Department. The FBI has only power to investigate.

Here is what the FBI man said.

Mr. President, let me point out solely for the record something which I know Senators are well aware of, but something which causes confusion in the minds of many persons throughout the United States, namely, that the FBI has no power other than to investigate. People often write to Senators, and say in their letters, "With a man like J. Edgar Hoover at the head of the FBI, how is it that this situation exists?" For their benefit I think it should be stated that the FBI has no power whatever except to dig up facts and report them to the Department of Justice or other executive agencies.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On that point, let me inquire whether it is also true that the Secretary of State has the sole power to discharge, without trial, anyone in the State Department whom he thinks might be disloyal.

Mr. McCARTHY. I so understand—under the McCarran amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, under the McCarran Act.

Mr. McCARTHY. I so understand; and I understand that it applies both to employees of the State Department and to civil-service employees.

Mr. FERGUSON. So it is not necessary for a trial to be held in such cases, but the Secretary of State has full power to discharge, and that power was given to him in 1946; was it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; and I intend to call attention to it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not until I finish reading this statement. I shall be glad, when I finish reading it, to yield to the Senator.

I read further from the statement, reading what was said by the FBI man:

In accordance with instructions of the State Department to the FBI, the FBI was not even permitted to open an espionage case against any Russia suspect without State Department approval.

Incidentally, Mr. President, this was testimony given at a hearing of a Senate subcommittee, headed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR].

I read further:

Mr. ARENS. Did the State Department ever withhold from the Justice Department the right to intern suspects?

Mr. KERLEY. They withheld the right to get out process for them which, in effect, kept them from being arrested, as in the case of Schevchenko and others.

Mr. ARENS. In how many instances did the State Department decline to permit process to be served on Soviet agents?

Mr. KERLEY. Do you mean how many Soviet agents were affected?

Mr. ARENS. Yes.

Mr. KERLEY. That would be difficult to say because there were so many people connected in one espionage ring, whether or not they were directly conspiring with the ring.

Mr. ARENS. Was that order applicable to all persons?

Mr. KERLEY. Yes; all persons in the Soviet-espionage organization.

Mr. ARENS. What did you say the order was as you understood it or as it came to you?

Mr. KERLEY. That no arrests of any suspects in the Russian-espionage activities in the United States were to be made without the prior approval of the State Department.

That means the prior approval of the Alger Hisses and the Wadleighs in the State Department.

I read further:

Now the reason for the State Department's opposition to arresting any of this spy ring is made rather clear in the next question and answer.

"Senator O'CONOR. Did you understand that that was to include also American participants?

"Mr. KERLEY. Yes; because if they were arrested that would disclose the whole apparatus, you see."

Meaning the whole apparatus both inside and outside the State Department.

I read further:

In other words they could not afford to let the whole ring which extended into the State Department be exposed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not at this time. The Senator has insisted that I read this statement, and I shall read all of it before I yield.

I now read further:

This brings us down to the case of one Alger Hiss who is important not as an individual any more, but rather because he is so representative of a group in the State Department. It is unnecessary to go over the sordid events showing how he sold out the Nation which had given him so much. Those are rather fresh in all of our minds.

However, it should be remembered that the facts in regard to his connection with this international Communist spy ring were made known to the then Under Secretary of State Berle 3 days after Hitler and Stalin signed the Russo-German alliance pact. At that time one Whittaker Chambers—who was also part of the spy ring—apparently decided that with Russia on Hitler's side, he could no longer betray our Nation to Russia. He gave Under Secretary of State Berle—and this is all a matter of record—practically all, if not more, of the facts upon which Hiss' conviction was based.

Under Secretary Berle promptly contacted Dean Acheson and received word in return that Acheson (and I quote) "could vouch for Hiss absolutely"—at which time the matter was dropped. And this, you understand, was at a time when Russia was an ally of Germany. This condition existed while Russia and Germany were invading and dismembering Poland, and while the Communist groups here were screaming "warmonger" at the United States for their support of the allied nations.

Again in 1943, the FBI had occasion to investigate the facts surrounding Hiss' contacts with the Russian spy ring. But even after that FBI report was submitted, nothing was done.

Then late in 1948—on August 5—when the Un-American Activities Committee called Alger Hiss to give an accounting, President Truman at once issued a Presidential directive ordering all Government agencies to refuse to turn over any information whatsoever in regard to the Communist activities of any Government employee to a congressional committee.

Incidentally, even after Hiss was convicted—

The statement should have been "even after Hiss was indicted"—

it is interesting to note that the President still labeled the exposé of Hiss as a "red herring."

If time permitted, it might be well to go into detail about the fact that Hiss was Roosevelt's chief adviser at Yalta when Roosevelt was admittedly in ill health and tired physically and mentally * * * and when, according to the Secretary of State, Hiss and Gromyko drafted the report on the conference.

That is not entirely correct; actually the report on the conference was drafted by Hiss, Gromyko, and an Englishman whose name I cannot now recall.

Mr. MUNDT. It was Gladwyn Jebb.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what I understood the Senator to say previously.

I read further:

According to the then Secretary of State Stettinius, here are some of the things that Hiss helped to decide at Yalta. (1) The establishment of a European High Commission; (2) the treatment of Germany—this you will recall was the conference at which it was decided that we would occupy Berlin with Russia occupying an area completely circling the city, which, as you know, resulted in the Berlin airlift which cost 31 American lives; (3) the Polish question; (4) the relationship between UNRRA and the Soviet, (5) the rights of Americans on control commissions of Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary; (6) Iran; (7) China—here's where we gave away Manchuria; (8) Turkish Straits question; (9) international trusteeships; (10) Korea.

Of the results of this conference, Arthur Bliss Lane of the State Department had this to say: "As I glanced over the document, I could not believe my eyes. To me, almost every line spoke of a surrender to Stalin."

As you hear this story of high treason, I know that you are saying to yourself, "Well, why doesn't the Congress do something about it?" Actually, ladies and gentlemen, one of the important reasons for the graft, the corruption, the dishonesty, the disloyalty, the treason in high Government positions—one of the most important reasons why this continues is a lack of moral uprising on the part of the 140,000,000 American people. In the light of history, however, this is not hard to explain.

It is the result of an emotional hang-over and a temporary moral lapse which follows every war. It is the apathy to evil which people who have been subjected to the tremendous evils of war feel. As the people of the world see mass murder, the destruction of defenseless and innocent people, and all of the crime and lack of morals which go with war, they become numb and apathetic. It has always been thus after war.

However, the morals of our people have not been destroyed. They still exist. This cloak of numbness and apathy has only needed a spark to rekindle them. Happily, this spark has finally been supplied.

As you know, very recently the Secretary of State proclaimed his loyalty to a man guilty of what has always been considered as the most abominable of all crimes—of being a traitor to the people who gave him a position of great trust. The Secretary of State in attempting to justify his continued devotion to the man who sold out the Christian world to the atheistic world, referred to Christ's Sermon on the Mount as a justification and reason therefor, and the reaction of the American people to this would have made the heart of Abraham Lincoln happy.

When this pompous diplomat in striped pants, with a phony British accent, proclaimed to the American people that Christ on the Mount endorsed communism, high treason, and betrayal of a sacred trust, the blasphemy was so great that it awakened the dormant indignation of the American people.

He has lighted the spark which is resulting in a moral uprising and will end only when the whole sorry mess of twisted, warped thinkers are swept from the national scene so that we may have a new birth of national honesty and decency in Government.

Mr. President, that answers the question of the Senator from Illinois as to the number of Communists I stated were in the State Department. I have stated I have the names of 57. Let me make it clear that I do not claim to know all the Communists in the State Department. I do not have any counter-espionage group that can go there and ferret out all the information. I have also pointed out that the State Department refused to discharge—and so stated in a press conference—205 individuals who, its own security agency said, were unsafe risks. If the Senator has any further questions, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I now repeat the same question I asked the able Senator in the beginning: Did the Senator from Wisconsin, in a speech at Wheeling, W. Va., Thursday, February 9, declare that he had a list of 205 persons working for the State Department, who were known by the Secretary of State to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say, if the Senator is going to make a farce of this, I will not yield to him.

Mr. LUCAS. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. I told him three times. I read the speech to him. I told him I said there were 57 Communists in the State Department. I told him there were in the State Department 205, who, according to the President's own Security Board, are unsafe risks. They said, "Mr. Secretary, fire these men. Discharge them." He refused to do it. I quoted Secretary Byrnes' letter, telling him to do that. I shall not answer any more silly questions of the Senator. This is too important, too serious a matter for that. I am trying to get down to the point of showing the Senate cases, facts, and dates, so that the President will admit that he was wrong, and I hope the Senator from Illinois will admit that he went off half cocked in Illinois the other day when he said, as the President said, this is all lies, and tried to prejudge the case.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. This is pretty serious to the Senator from Illinois, and it is serious to the Senate, and it is serious to the country. The only thing I am asking the able Senator is whether the newspapers misquoted him. The newspapers quoted him, and there is an editorial in the Washington Post, which is libelous if not true, in which the Senator is quoted in his speech at Wheeling, W. Va., as saying that he had a list of 205 persons working for the State Department who were carrying Communist cards. What I want to know is merely one simple thing. I did not find anything in the speech to bear out what the newspaper reported to be true. The Senator keeps talking about 57; the newspaper says the Senator said there were 205. That represents quite a difference, and it is of importance, whether the Senator from Wisconsin made the statement or did not make it. He can answer yes or no to that. He may say that in his speech he did not make that statement; he may have made it in a conference of some kind. But it was carried all over the country, through the Washington newspapers, the New York newspapers, and the Chicago newspapers, that the Senator said he could name the 205 who were carrying Communist cards. It may be a silly question in the eyes of the Senator from Wisconsin, and that, as he said, I am trying to make a farce out of this thing, but it is a serious charge; the Senate and the country are entitled to know the facts.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I answer the Senator's question?

Mr. LUCAS. It is serious to me.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me answer the Senator's question, for the third time. I will tell the Senator, and I am now repeating it, if the Senator will sit down and give me the time to do it, that there are at least 57 Communists in the State Department. I think, without any trouble at all, with sufficient investigation, we can find the 205 for the Senator. As to what the Washington Post says, I do not know, and I frankly do not care. I think that is clear. I will not answer the Senator a fourth time. I said that I made speeches. I have said there were 57 Communists in the State Department. I wired the President to that effect.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not yielding to the Senator now. I have wired the President to that effect, and I told him those names were available to him. I am now going to give the Senate of the United States the facts, and I refuse to go further into the question raised by the Senator from Illinois. Let me tell him now, so there may be no question in his mind, I said 57 Communists were in the State Department. I said there were 205 in the State Department whom the Secretary of State refused to discharge, although his loyalty board said, "Discharge those men." Now, is that clear to the Senator?

Mr. LUCAS. If that is what the Senator is saying, I can understand; but what I am trying to find out is whether newspapers have deliberately distorted what the able Senator said in his speech.

Mr. McCARTHY. I refuse to yield further to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to find out.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. For a question, certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I correctly understand the Senator to claim he has submitted the names of the 57 cases to which he refers and the 205 names which are referred to, not only in the Washington Post but in a number of other newspapers, to the State Department? Does he claim he has submitted the names of 57 and 205, or any substantial number?

Mr. McCARTHY. The answer to the Senator is, "No." The answer is "No."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does not the Senator believe that, interested as he is in combatting communism, and we are all interested in combatting communism, that it is his duty both as a Senator of the United States and as an American to submit those names to the State Department or to the Senate, in executive session?

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator will but sit down and let me make my report to the Senate, he will have all the information he wants. The Senator from Wisconsin does not need any advice on his duty as a Senator, in this respect.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, not now; not until I give some of the information the Senator is asking for. I will not yield for another 15 or 20 minutes, until I can get down to the information which I am trying to give the Senate. I will not yield any further.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin will proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to yield later to the Senator.

Mr. President, I am going to have difficulty talking, while the Senators are chatting

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Chamber.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to yield for 5 or 10 minutes to let the Senators carry on their conversation.

Mr. President, I have before me information from the State Department files, information which the President says the Senate did not have. Having this information, it is a serious question as to what should be done with it. I originally thought possibly we could hope for some cooperation from the State Department and the President. However, in going over the material and finding that all of it, of course, has been available to the State Department, for it is all from their files, it seemed that nothing would be gained by calling it to their attention again. The President, I felt, had demonstrated his lack of interest quite thoroughly during all the Hiss investigation. Then, when I sent him a telegram and said, "Mr. President, I have the 57 names; they are yours if you want them"; and when he answered by calling me a liar, I felt I could get no cooperation from the President.

Then, when the majority leader, without even discussing the matter with me, though he knew I had stated that I had the information, he made a speech in Illinois and prejudged the case, without hearing the evidence, and said, "The Senator from Wisconsin is a liar," I felt I could get no cooperation from the majority leader. It was then suggested that I ask the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to go into the matter and that I submit the names to that committee. I talked to some of the members of the committee. They thought perhaps the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Foreign Relations, or both committees jointly might have jurisdiction, and they thought it should be discussed with them.

I discussed it with a number of the individuals who have been interested in the subject, digging up this information. They felt that under the present circumstances the committee could do very little, because, if we gave the committee the names and the information, and the President said, "You cannot get any information from the State Department files," they would be hamstrung. It was suggested that I draft a resolution providing that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or some other committee, should have the right to subpena the secret State Department files. That sounds all right on the face of it, Mr. President, but it is dangerous to go that far.

As is well known, during the Coplon trial the judge ordered the FBI to submit all its secret files, including the sources of information. That information was made public, and a number of men in the FBI have stated that it set the FBI back 10 years. It endangered the security of some of their best men.

I finally arrived at the conclusion that the only way to clean out the State Department, or any other Department which is infested with Communists, is not by the passage of any additional law. The only way it can be done is to secure the cooperation of the President. If we could get that, and he says that the information will be made available so that trusted staff members could go over the files, and we can be sure that the sources of information shall not be disclosed, we can clean house. I frankly think that is the only way. In line with that, I decided to submit to the Senate the detailed cases. Originally I was disturbed that I might give out information which would embarrass the investigative agencies by indirectly disclosing some of their sources of information, but I was told, "With so many commies over here having top positions, you need not fear giving the information to the Senate."

I have gone over it. Let me say, before starting, that I shall submit quite a large number of names. I think they are of importance. They all worked for the State Department at one time or another. Some are not there at the present time. Many of them have gone into work which is connected closely with the Department, for example, foreign trade,

and some branches of the Maritime Commission.

I shall not attempt to present a detailed case on each one, a case which would convince a jury. All I am doing is to develop sufficient evidence so that anyone who reads the RECORD will have a good idea of the number of Communists in the State Department.

While I consider them all important, there are three big Communists involved, and I cannot possibly conceive of any Secretary of State allowing those three big Communists, who are tremendously important and of great value to Russia, to remain in the State Department. I do not believe President Truman knows about them. I cannot help but feel that he is merely the prisoner of a bunch of twisted intellectuals who tell him what they want him to know. To those who say, "Why do you not tell the State Department; why do you not give the names to the State Department?" I say that everything I have here is from the State Department's own files. I felt, when the State Department asked for the names, without being willing to cooperate or to work with us, it was saying, "Tip us off; let us know on whom you have the goods."

Case No. 1. The names are available. The Senators may have them if they care for them. I think, however, it would be improper to make the names public until the appropriate Senate committee can meet in executive session and get them. I have approximately 81 cases. I do not claim to have any tremendous investigative agency to get the facts, but if I were to give all the names involved, it might leave a wrong impression. If we should label one man a Communist when he is not a Communist, I think it would be too bad. However, the names are here. I shall be glad to abide by the decision of the Senate after it hears the cases, but I think the sensible thing to do would be to have an executive session and have a proper committee go over the whole situation.

I was very happy to hear the Senator from Massachusetts say that he would move that the Foreign Relations Committee appoint a subcommittee to go into the cases.

The man involved in case No. 1 is employed in the office of an Assistant Secretary of State. The intelligence unit shadowed him and found him contacting members of an espionage group. A memorandum of December 13, 1946, indicates that he succeeded in having a well-known general intervene with an Assistant Secretary in behalf of one man who is an active Communist with a long record of Communist Party connections. There is another individual who is very closely tied up with a Soviet espionage agency. There is nothing in the file to indicate that the general referred to knew those two individuals were Communists.

That is a part of the usual modus operandi. If there is one Communist in the Department, he will get some other individual to recommend another Communist so that the breed can be increased.

This individual was successful in obtaining important positions for other Communists. They were finally ordered removed from the Department not later than November 15 of the following year. Subsequent to that time, however, both of them still had access to secret material.

A memorandum of November 2, 1946, pointed out that this individual and the previously mentioned Communists whom he succeeded in having placed were connected with an alleged Russian espionage agency. Nevertheless, this individual still occupies an important position in the State Department. I should like to point out at this time, however, that the security group, which was then operating in the State Department, was apparently doing a good job. It presented the entire picture to the Secretary of State. This individual who, the investigative agency of the State Department says, is a Communist, got a general innocently to bring two other Communists into the State Department, and he is today in the State Department and has access to the secret material. As I say, his name is certainly available to any Senate committee that wants it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator tell us the name of the man for the record? We are entitled to know who he is. I say this in all seriousness. The Senate and the public are entitled to know who that man is, as a result of the charge made by my friend. If he is a Communist, the Senator from Wisconsin knows that the Senator from Illinois will go right along with the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator can come to my office as soon as I finish and receive the names. I intend to go through all the cases. If it is the judgment of the Senate that it wants the names exposed on the Senate floor, which would be a very unusual procedure, I shall be glad to expose them. The question is too important for either the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Wisconsin to make the decision. If any Senate committee is actually interested in disclosing the names——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Committee on the Judiciary has been investigating communism more than half the year. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is entirely correct. We have never made a name public unless we had the consent of J. Edgar Hoover. I, for one, want to be recorded as absolutely agreeing with the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

The Senator from Illinois knows there is nothing secret about the names that he cannot have. I do not like this political byplay. If we continue as we have been going, the next war will be lost before we start. I heard a commentator last night say that Russia has 1,200 divisions, and he stated that there were 54,000 troops in Albania, indicating that Russia is about to start the fighting part of the next war.

It is tremendously important that we clean out the espionage ring in our State Department.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. No. I cannot yield at this time.

This is a case to which I particularly invite the Senate's attention. The files show two very interesting facts. A major portion of the file was removed. Papers refer to information in the file which is nonexistent. Upon contact with the keeper of the records, he stated that, to the best of his knowledge, the major portion of the file had been removed. He did not mention any name, but he said, "He was put in some high-brass job about 2 years ago."

I am inclined to think that this individual's name may be known from the information which I shall give here.

The file shows two things. It shows, first, that this individual had some of his clothing picked up, with unusual material in it, and, second—and this is important—it shows that the State Department and the President had prepared material which was to be sent to a foreign government. The file shows that before the material left the State Department it was in the hands of the Kremlin in Moscow. Do Senators follow me? The State Department's own investigative file shows that some secret material, which was being transmitted to another nation, before it even left this country for the other country, showed up in Moscow. So far, that is not too significant. However, the file shows that this particular individual, who has held one of the most important positions at one of the listening posts in Europe, was shadowed, that he was found to have contacted a Soviet agent, and that the Soviet agent was then followed to the Soviet Embassy, where the agent turned the material over to the Soviet Embassy. Do Senators follow me? This is what the secret State Department file shows: First, the papers get to Moscow in some mysterious manner, and, second, this individual, who is now one of our foreign ministers, contacts a Russian espionage agent, and that agent is followed to the Russian Embassy, where the material is handed over. This is no secret to the State Department.

Incidentally, I might say that I promised the press I would have copies of this material for their use. However, in view of the fact that I have nothing completely ready at this time, and must refer to the documents before me, which I cannot turn over to the press, I do not have anything to give them. I am sorry. I shall try, however, to give them now the material I have, and shall try to make the dates and places as clear as I can.

Case No. 3. This individual was born in Flushing, N. Y., in 1903. He was employed with OSS in 1942. In 1945 he was transferred to the State Department and assigned to Research and Intelligence. The State Department's file shows that he is a member of a number of Communist-front organizations, and that his pals are known Communists. The file further shows that this fact is admitted by him. The original report in

which this information is contained is dated July 3, 1942. The security report of April 18, 1946, indicates that numerous witnesses, including college professors and police officers in California, testified he was a radical and a fellow traveler. He was very friendly and sympathetic toward Harry Bridges, and strongly opposed any move to deport Bridges. The report also shows that he was also a close friend of Ralph Friedman, secretary of the Communist Party in California. Another security report, dated November 13, 1946, quotes his associates as saying that he favored the Chinese Communists in China and favored Russia in most respects.

The State Department officials themselves, according to this report, describe him as being overly sympathetic to Russia and the Communist experiment. This is all a part of the report. Another Government official said the individual frequently blamed the capitalists for all the trouble in Russia, and constantly praised Russia as the ideal. So far as I know, everything in this individual's file indicates that he is actively working with and for the Communists.

Case No. 4. The individual came to the United States from Hungary in 1944. He was employed as a translator and script writer for OWI, and later by the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. The report of January 3, 1947, indicates that he is an active member of a Communist front organization, and that he lost his former job because of his constant arguments in favor of communism. A former employer, according to the file, stated that this individual boasted of being a member of the Communist Party. A third informant also stated that this individual boasted of his Communist connections and argued that communism was superior to democracy. The fourth informant said that he constantly argued politics, and that communism was the ideal system for this country. Two of the references on his application for citizenship were members of at least one Communist-front organization and contributors to Communist periodicals. Another reference refused to recommend him, questioning his loyalty, and saying that he was a Communist. Another reference, of April 24, 1947, showed that this employee's supervisor in the State Department felt he was a fellow-traveler. This individual has been contributing to the Hungarian Communist magazine, N. O. K.

Various memoranda and reports by the State Department Security Agency in the files indicate that no one was found to question this employee's communistic connection and beliefs.

Case No. 5. This case serves as a very good example of the failure on the part of the State Department to take any action even after conclusive evidence of a person's Communist activity was shown by the State Department's own security agency. He was born in North Carolina in 1900. He was employed by the Foreign Economic Administration from August 1942, to August 1945, and was then transferred to the State Department and placed on Research and Intelligence.

I should like to call attention, Mr. President, to the number of these individuals who succeeded in getting into Research and Intelligence. Research and Intelligence, the Voice of America, and Far Eastern Affairs seem to be the three prime targets.

The report dated May 4, 1946, in this man's file shows that eight persons, including six college professors at Harvard University and the University of California, agreed that this individual has strong communistic leanings, and that in their opinion he was either a card-carrying member of the Communist Party or a fellow-traveler. That is the opinion of six professors at Harvard University and the University of California. Some of the opinions expressed by his associates might well be read.

A professor at the University of California stated that he was acquainted with this individual since September 1937; that he did not trust him; he considered him in the class of Harry Bridges; that under no circumstances would he hire him, and also that there was something about him that aroused his intuition, and caused him to be afraid of his outside connections, and under no circumstances would he recommend him to the Government.

A fellow student stated that he had known him since 1939 and that he knew him definitely as a Communist; that he felt that this individual was getting money from the Communist Party, and the other students did also, because they would say that this individual was not preaching communism for his health, but that it was a business with him; that he would not recommend this individual to the Government because he feels that he is a Communist.

This individual was discharged from a Navy school during the war for bad grades and for Communist activities. A memorandum, dated May 15, 1946, from CSA to the Office of Controls, states that an "investigation discloses evidence of a material nature tending to affect adversely the loyalty to the United States and its institutions." This report reveals that this individual is unmistakeably identified with communistic activities. While the records of the Bureau of Naval Personnel show that he was given a special order discharge in March 27, 1942, under honorable conditions, evidence in his file, all of which is, of course, available to the Secretary of State, reveals that he was discharged because it was found that he was an ardent student of and advocate of communism.

A report, dated March 25, 1947, indicates that this individual had been receiving mail from the Soviet Embassy, as well as communistic publications. An official of a Washington, D. C. university stated that he had hired this individual to conduct a class in Chinese, but later learned that he was closely connected with communistic groups on the west coast. Four members of the faculty at the University of California confirmed this individual's communistic leanings. All of the above information was brought to the attention of the top officials in the State Department in a memorandum summarizing the case in 1947, with the recommendation that he be immediately discharged. The State Department refused to discharge him because it was not proven that he had committed any overt act. Subsequent to this time, this individual argued often and heatedly in favor of a Communist regime in China. He admitted having been a subscriber to the Daily Worker.

Let me repeat for the benefit of the Senate, the State Department refused to discharge this individual because he had not been shown to have committed any overt act, despite the fact that the State Department's own security agency had in a report stated that he was unmistakably identified with communistic activities; despite the fact that he had been dicharged from a Navy school because he was an ardent student and advocate of communistic doctrine; despite the fact that he had been receiving mail from the Soviet Embassy, as well as being a subscriber to the Daily Worker; despite the fact that six professors at Harvard and the University of California agreed that he was a "party member or fellow traveler"; despite the fact that a fellow student who knew him well stated that he would not recommend him for a job in the Government because of his communistic activities. This man, the State Department says, must be kept on because he has committed no "overt" act.

The State Department's own Security Board then submitted four subsequent reports, the first one dated September 12, 1947, in an attempt to convince the Department that this man was dangerous and should be discharged. Subsequently this man's position was abolished. However, he was not discharged. Listen to this. His position was abolished, but what happened then? He was transferred to the Division of Research, replacing an employee who, so far as I can learn, had an excellent record, and whose loyalty was in no way questioned. This in spite of the fact that a State Department official who knew him and worked with him in China as well as in this country, said he was—and this is what a State Department official said about this man, whom the Department refused to discharge, whom they shifted over to another job where he bumped another worker—the State Department official said he was mediocre, dull, and incompetent. So his only qualification was his communistic connections. This same State Department official said, "This is the only man in the Government of whom I would speak unfavorably."

Keep in mind that under the McCarran bill, a very wise piece of legislation, the Secretary of State has the absolute unquestioned right to discharge a man of this kind. So the Secretary could have discharged him as first recommended. Four times bluntly they have said, "Get rid of this man." His superior officer says he is dull and incompetent, but for some reason or other he is still kept on.

Another State Department official said that he considered this individual extremely weak as to ability. I believe it is unnecessary to comment on the attitude of the State Department in this case. Certainly it is an attitude which frightens me and bodes ill for the future of the United States.

Another one is case No. 6. This individual is with the Division of Central Services. A security report dated December 31, 1946, describes her as being "pink" and as advocating that we substitute conditions in Russia for those in the United States. She takes a very active part in the conferences of the UPWA, which has been picked up by the CIO, actively opposed the President's loyalty order, but has been given top secret clearance. This individual has a right to see all the top secret documents.

Case No. 7. This individual was an associate business economist to August 1944; with FEA from August 1944 to August 1945, and then transferred to the State Department as an economist. This individual is a member of the Young Communist League. He was affiliated with four other organizations which are named by the Attorney General as having been Communist fronts. This individual admits membership in the Young Communists, and in the other Communist-front organizations, but claims to have changed his view since that time, and therefore was given top secret clearance by the State Department. I may say incidentally I am using the pronoun "he" in all these cases, although some of the individuals are not of the male sex.

Case No. 8. This individual was born in New York City in 1918. He was employed as an economist and analyst with the OSS in the State Department from June 1945. Previous to that time he worked for the War Production Board. He was assigned again to Research and Intelligence in the State Department. This man, according to the State Department files, was an active member of a number of Communist-front organizations, was a very close friend of several men who are under suspicion by the FBI of being connected with Russian espionage cases and has two brothers who have been openly working for the Communist Party.

I may say that I know that some of these individuals whose cases I am giving the Senate are no longer in the State Department. A sizable number of them are not. Some of them have transferred to other Government work, work allied with the State Department. Others have been transferred to the United Nations. But I think the cases are important whenever we find that an individual, despite his Communist connections, has been given top-secret clearance. That gives an idea what is going on.

Here is one which I think the Senate will enjoy:

Case No. 9. This individual, after investigation, was not given security clearance by the State Department. After failing to obtain clearance by the State Department he secured a job in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. And where do Senators think that man is today? He is now a speech writer in the White House. That is case No. 9. I will secure a little more information on that case if I may.

So that there may be no question about this, we will refer directly to the investigative file. I think I am doing Mr. Truman a favor by telling him this. I do not think he knows it. I do not think he would have this individual there writing speeches for him if he knew it.

Both the individual referred to and his wife—this is in the file of the investigative agency—are members of Communist-front organizations. He has a relative who has a financial interest in the Daily Worker. But in any event the State Department used good judgment not to clear this individual.

Case No. 10. This individual is in the Biographical Information Division of the State Department. Her husband signed a Communist Party election petition, stating he was a member thereof. She is active in the UPWA. The mere fact that her husband was a Communist may not make her a Communist, but she also has been given top secret clearance.

Case No. 11. This individual was an analyst in OSS from July 1943 to August 1945, and was employed in the Division of Map Intelligence in the State Department after August 1945. He is a close pal of a known Communist and has stated it would be a good idea if the Communists would take over in this country. He is a regular reader of the Daily Worker. This individual is not in the State Department at this time, but has a job in the CIA as of today. Here is what we find. Such individuals use the State Department as a stepping stone to some other agency. This man, who pals around with Communists, who is satisfied, according to the files of the State Department, that Communists should take over this country, is now in the Central Intelligence Agency.

Case No. 12. This individual started as a corresponding secretary at the White House. From there he moved over to the Soviet Embassy and obtained a job as assistant editor. From there he transferred to the State Department and, so far as I can discover, transferred from there to a section of the Commerce Department, with which the State Department works, where he remained until several months ago. Where he is as of today I frankly do not know. I think this is a rather interesting shift, however, from White House to the Soviet Embassy, to the State Department, to the Commerce Department.

Case No. 13. This individual is a foreign reserve officer under the information and cultural program. He was appointed to this position in September 1947, and assigned to Milan, Italy, where he took part in the educational program. This individual spent time in Soviet Russia in 1927 as a member of the trade-unions delegation to Soviet Russia, which delegation was repudiated by William Green, president of the A. F. of L. He was the sponsor, organizer, and member, respectively, of various Communist-front organizations. He has been cited by the Daily Worker a number of times for his work. The records of the industrial detail of the Chicago police department list him as a Communist as early as 1930. This man's file shows that members of the churches in Italy and high officials of the National Catholic Welfare Council objected to his being assigned to educational duties in Italy, basing this objection upon his communistic activities. Lt. Col. Gayre, of the British Army, who was this individual's supervisor in Italy, indicated that he was a "wild leftist theorist," who would veer entirely to the left if given the opportunity. This individual is described as a pedantic, tedious, conceited, impractical, pompous man, and this applies to so many of them, a man who would enjoy the pleasures of the right, but popularity with the left.

Case No. 14. This is a case of pressure from a high State Department official to obtain security clearance for an individual with a bad background from the standpoint of security. He was appointed in December 1945 as a translator in the State Department.

This is an interesting case showing the extent to which some of their superior officers will go when they find that some of these very unusual individuals are going to lose their jobs. He was appointed in December 1945 as a translator in the State Department. A report from another Government investigating agency under date of January 9, 1946, advised that the subject should be dismissed as a bad security risk because he was flagrantly homosexual. He had extremely close connections with other individuals with the same tendencies, and who were active members of Communist-front organizations, including the Young Communist League.

I think this is interesting, Mr. President. I asked one of our top intelligence men in Washington, one day, "Why do you find men who are so fanatically Communist? Is there something about the Communist philosophy that attracts them?"

He said, "Senator McCARTHY, if you had been in this work as long as we have been, you would realize that there is something wrong with each one of these individuals. You will find that practically every active Communist is twisted mentally or physically in some way."

The State Department's own security agency recommended the discharge of this employee on January 22, 1946. On February 19, 1946, this individual's services were terminated with the State Department. Subsequently on April 1, 1946, the action discharging this individual was rescinded and he was reinstated in his job in the State Department. In this case a CSA report of September 2, 1947, is replete with information covering the attempt of a high State Department official to induce several individuals who had signed affidavits reflecting adversely upon the employee to repudiate their affidavits. The file shows that that high State Department employee even went out and personally contacted the individuals who signed the affidavits, and asked them, "Won't you repudiate them?"

This individual, according to the security files of the State Department, was a very close associate of active Soviet agents. As to whether he is in the State Department at this time or not, I frankly do not know, but in view of the fact that he was reinstated, I assume that he is.

A while ago the Senator from Nebraska asked whether I would yield while he suggested the absence of a quorum. I shall be glad to do so now. However, if

the Senator thinks it is not possible to obtain a quorum at this time——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me at this time, let me say to the majority leader that I do not wish to disrupt the program. I wish to cooperate with the majority leader in carrying on the session.

I said then, and I say now, that these charges are very serious. If there is a desire to have a quorum call now, I shall be glad to have one.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say that I have just received a note that the majority leader—I am not criticizing him for doing so—has informed all Senators on his side of the aisle that there will not be a vote tonight, and that there is no reason for Senators to remain here, and that there will be no quorum call. I assume he did not do that because he did not want Senators on his side of the aisle to hear the charges. I assume he merely wanted to give them an opportunity to go to dinner. However, I have no desire to present what I regard as important information before a half-empty Senate.

On the other hand, if the majority leader thinks there is not a possibility of obtaining a quorum, because of the advice given to Senators on his side of the aisle, I shall be glad to yield for a motion to take a recess until tomorrow.

In other words, I do not agree to having the majority dismissed by the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I told Senators that there would not be a vote tonight upon the cotton bill which is the pending question. Had I known that there would have been any question about a quorum call, I certainly would have had Senators remain here, to be present to answer to a quorum call, if not to listen to the Senator's address.

We have now continued until 7:30 in the evening.

In view of the statement about having a night session and in view of the work that is before us, I had hoped that the Senator from Wisconsin would conclude his remarks tonight.

If he does not conclude his remarks tonight, but expects to resume them tomorrow, he certainly will not have any time then, because of the unanimous consent agreement which has been entered in regard to a vote at 3 o'clock on Senate bill 75.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me inquire of the majority leader whether the information I have received is correct. Did the Senator advise Senators on his side of the aisle that there was no reason for them to remain, that he would assure them there would be no quorum call and no vote?

Mr. LUCAS. I did not assure them that there would be no quorum call.

All that Senators on this side of the aisle asked me was whether there would be a vote tonight. I said, "No," that the Senator from Wisconsin was going to take the floor, and probably would occupy the floor for 4 or 5 hours, as I had been informed; and I said, "I will stay here, and I hope everyone else who wants to hear the Senator will stay here as he discusses this very important question." But so far as a vote was concerned, I advised all Senators who asked me, and I advised the minority leader so that he could advise Senators on his side of the aisle, that there would be no vote on the pending question tonight.

But I certainly hope the Senator from Wisconsin will proceed, because he is making a very important address, and the country is interested in it, and what few Senators are here now are interested in it; and I doubt whether there will be more Senators here day after tomorrow than are present now.

At this time I see another Senator returning to the Chamber after having had his dinner. I know he is very much interested in the question the Senator from Wisconsin is discussing. The Senator from Oregon has just reentered the Chamber, and I know he is trying to swell the attendance of Senators here a little.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is also reentering the Chamber now, I observe.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield once again, 10 or 12 Senators are in the Chamber at this time, several on the other side, and some on this side, who are staying here to be helpful to the Senator from Wisconsin. But I appeal to the Senator in regard to what I regard as the only logical thing to do. I do not wish to be in the position of forcing the majority leader to call a quorum.

I do know that the majority leader has told Members on both sides of the aisle, in my presence, that there would not be a vote tonight on the pending question. He did so with good intentions, namely, to state that there would not be a vote tonight on the potato issue.

But he knows, as I do, that when such statements are made, attendance in the Senate Chamber decreases, and it is very difficult to proceed with a night session under such circumstances.

I do not feel in a position to instruct the majority leader, in view of the other announcement.

However, we are to have a vote tomorrow at 4 o'clock; and after that, of course, we can take up anything that it is desired to take up.

This is an important matter, and there might be a demand to learn all the facts.

I think the Senator from Wisconsin is presenting a serious challenge, and I think it desirable to have all Senators present, if possible, to hear his remarks.

I do not insist upon having a quorum call. I doubt very much whether we could obtain a quorum, and I do not want to take advantage of the parliamentary situation. But I say, in all fairness, that as soon as the Senator reaches a point where he can conveniently suspend his remarks until tomorrow——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I shall not be as careful of the majority leader's feelings as the minority leader is. I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, unless the Senator wishes to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

I think it is very unusual, in view of the Senator's declaration of his interest in this subject, for the majority leader to dismiss Senators on his side of the aisle or encourage them to leave the Chamber.

I think the subject now under discussion is one in which the Democrats should be especially interested. As the Senator from Illinois knows, unless something is done to clean up the State Department, the Democratic Party is going to be identified with that group. I think that is wrong. I think there are too many fine Democrats in this country and too many fine Democrats in the Senate, on the Democratic side of the aisle, to permit the Democratic Party to be identified with the group I have been discussing. I think Democratic Senators should be as much interested as we on this side of the aisle are in cleaning up that situation.

But I do not like the information I have received, namely, that the Senator from Illinois has advised all Senators on his side of the aisle to leave. If the information I have received is not correct, I should like to know it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It is customary here, as the Senator from Wisconsin knows, that when Members of the Senate inquire whether there is to be a vote on the pending question at a certain time, if it is known that there is not to be a vote at that time, the reply is "No." Of course, immediately such Senators leave, as the Senator knows; and no doubt the Senator from Wisconsin himself has done that many times since he has been a Member of the Senate. Whenever the minority leader tells Senators on his side of the aisle that there is not going to be a vote on the pending question, they do not usually remain to hear the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin or the speech of the Senator from Illinois on any subject, regardless of how important it may be.

The Senator from Wisconsin should not think he has any monopoly on fighting communism in this country, and he cannot by implication or by innuendo attack the Senator from Illinois with respect to cleaning out the State Department. I have told the Senator before, and I repeat it now, that whenever the Senator names names and presents conclusive information before the proper committees, or if he will do it now before the Senate, if he desires, and if what he says is substantiated, I will go arm in arm with my good friend the Senator from Wisconsin in assisting in cleaning out any Communist nests in the State Department or in any other branch of the Government.

The Senator from Wisconsin knows me well enough to know that I was fighting communism long before the Senator from Wisconsin was, because I am several years older than he is. But the matter is so important that it seems to me we should have this entire story now. Let us get all the information and all the facts in the RECORD at this particular time; and the Senator can, by unanimous consent, offer and introduce into the RECORD anything he wishes to. Let him put all of it in, and then ask for a meeting, either before a special committee of some kind or before the Foreign Rela-

tions Committee or the Judiciary Committee, and go thoroughly into the things the Senator is talking about.

I am all for that, I say to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator agree with me that in view of the facts that I have presented, it is absolutely necessary that we have a complete and thorough investigation of this matter by a Senate committee?

Mr. LUCAS. I am in favor of a complete and thorough investigation of what the Senator has said; and I hope the Foreign Relations Committee or some other committee will bring the Senator immediately before it and will interrogate him under oath with respect to what he has presented here. The Senator should name names before that committee, because he has said——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator yielded to me.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. I will get a quorum, if that is the case.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator feels that he will embarrass Senators on his side of the aisle by calling a quorum, I will yield while he moves that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

Let me say this, Mr. President, in view of the attitude of the Senator from Illinois, who last week, before he knew any of the evidence, went to Chicago, where he said, "Senator McCARTHY is lying; there is not a single Communist in the State Department."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I——

Mr. McCARTHY. Wait a minute, let me finish. He said there was not a word of truth in what I said. He said if he had said what I said about there being 57 Communists in the State Department, he would be ashamed the rest of his life. He now seems to think this should be made a trial of the man who is digging out the Communists, instead of the Communists. If we are to indulge in such tactics I want the entire Senate present to hear it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will move to recess until tomorrow, if the Senate wishes that to be done.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. So far as the junior Senator from Idaho is concerned, he has been glad to remain on the floor to listen to these important revelations of the Senator from Wisconsin, because the Senator from Wisconsin, in his remarks, has shed some light upon the possible reasons for the State Department's foreign policy in China during the past few years, which possibly justified the infiltration of communism within China, to such an extent that it may now be too late to present this very vital information to one of the committees of the Senate. It is too late now to counteract and nullify that insidious State Department influence, through scores and scores of Communists and fellow travelers who have been responsible, even under Secretaries of State like General Marshall. We realize that only recently J. Edgar Hoover made the public statement that in this country today there are 540,000 Communists and fellow travelers. So I think, the American people are entitled to have a complete exposure of the forces within the State Department. If there is no truth or justification in what the junior Senator from Wisconsin has been telling this body this evening, then the American people should know the truth. But at a time when every American recognizes that we are at the mercy of sabotaging by those who have been placed on high levels in the State Department and other branches of the executive department, it behooves us not only to spend $13,000,000,000 or $14,000,000,000 annually on the national defense, but it is the duty, the obligation—I believe the American people join with me in making the statement that it is the obligation—of the President of the United States, who is alone responsible for the selection of these officials, through the Secretary of State, to make a housecleaning, so that we may proceed to build up the security and defenses of the country, to the end that we may be prepared, in case we should be the victims of Communist aggression in the months ahead.

I wish to compliment the junior Senator from Wisconsin on the revelations he is making at this time. Notwithstanding the fact that there are entirely too few Members of this body present, it is encouraging to note that so many members of the press and radio galleries are present. I believe they recognize that the American people want the facts, though, even now, it may be too late to clean our house of the rats and saboteurs who are a constant menace to the safety of the Republic.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have decided it may be well to complete the presentation of the case tonight, but I am not going to speak to an empty chamber. I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum, and then proceed to develop all the facts. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McClellan
Anderson	Hendrickson	McFarland
Butler	Ives	Murray
Cordon	Johnson, Colo	Robertson
Darby	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Lehman	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lucas	Wherry
Ecton	McCarthy	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators: and Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, much as I dislike to do this, I presume that I shall be compelled to make a motion to adjourn. I have not made it yet——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that debate is not in order.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall not debate; I shall only make a statement.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, unless I can make a statement also, I shall call for the regular order. If the Senator from Illinois is going to make a statement, I want an opportunity to answer him.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. LANGER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. LONG, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. KILGORE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

Mr. CAIN and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I find from reading the newspapers that the wet season is driving the pintails north.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, what is the result?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, what is the result of the vote?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, how am I recorded as voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. CORDON. I vote "nay."

Mr. IVES. What is the result, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk is still tallying.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. MCMAHON], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. JOHNSON] the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Rhode

Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent on public business.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—16

Fulbright	Kilgore	Murray
Hayden	Lehman	Robertson
Hoey	Long	Russell
Holland	Lucas	Sparkman
Johnson, Colo.	McClellan	
Kerr	McFarland	

NAYS—18

Aiken	Dworshak	Morse
Cain	Ecton	Schoeppel
Capehart	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Ives	Taft
Darby	Langer	Wherry
Donnell	McCarthy	Williams

NOT VOTING—62

Anderson	Gurney	Mundt
Benton	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Hill	Neely
Bricker	Humphrey	O'Conor
Bridges	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Butler	Jenner	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Kefauver	Stennis
Connally	Kem	Taylor
Douglas	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Leahy	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Lodge	Thye
Ellender	McCarran	Tobey
Ferguson	McKellar	Tydings
Flanders	McMahon	Vandenberg
Frear	Magnuson	Watkins
George	Malone	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Withers
Graham	Maybank	Young
Green	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to adjourn is rejected.

Mr. TAFT. A point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. If there is not a quorum present the vote is obviously invalid.

Mr. LUCAS. Not on this motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair state that no quorum is needed on a motion to adjourn.

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to compel the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a further delay, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. ELLENDER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Later, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. WITHERS also entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Was there unanimous consent given to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] to occupy the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was no unanimous consent granted.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, Mr. President, I demand recognition.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Do I not have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that so long as a point of order is not made against the Senator from Wisconsin, he would be entitled to the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I make the point of order, Mr. President, and I ask for recognition.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Is it not too late to make the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained, and the Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will withdraw the point of order if the Senator from Wisconsin wants the floor.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I should be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall speak on my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order has been withdrawn. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, for the benefit of those Members of the Senate who were not present earlier in the evening, I have given detailed records of certain individuals in the State Department who have very definite communistic connections. I explained to the Senate earlier in the evening that I would not take the time to make out a court case against each person referred to. I am pointing out facts so that there may be a convening of one of the appropriate committees to make a thorough investigation.

As I explained earlier, there is a serious question whether I should disclose names to the Senate. I frankly feel, in view of the number of cases—there are 81 cases—that it would be a mistake to publicly disclose the names on the floor. I shall be willing, happy, and eager to go before any committee and give the names and all the information available. I shall refuse to give the source of the information, however. I know the State Department is very eager to know how I have secured all this information. I know that the jobs of the men who helped me secure this material would be worth nothing if the names were given. If it were not for some good, loyal Americans in the State Department—and there are many of them—I should not have been able to present this picture to the Senate tonight. The vast majority of the employees of the State Department are loyal, and I think the President should see to it that their good names are not tarnished.

I told the Senate earlier this evening that I have what I call the Big Three, No. 1, No. 2, and No. 81. I feel that if those individuals are removed from the State Department we shall have gone a considerable distance in breaking the back of the espionage ring in the State Department.

I also told the Senate earlier that I have no way of knowing definitely which of these persons are still in the employ of the State Department. I know they have all been there at some time. A sizable number is still there.

Case No. 16. This individual's file is perhaps the largest, physically, of the files in the CSA. Among other things, the file reflects that this individual furnished material to known Soviet espionage agents and that he had constant contacts with a long list of Communists and suspected Soviet agents. On July 24, 1946, a recommendation of dismissal was made. Nothing was done. In September 1946 there was a request for further information, even though at that time the records showed that he was furnishing secret material to known Communist agents.

On July 24, the State Department's own security unit furnished detailed evidence showing that this man was furnishing secret material to known espionage agents. He had top-secret clearance.

In September further information was requested. As of October 15, 1947, nearly a year and a quarter later, there was nothing in the file to indicate whether the individual was with the Department or what the final action was in his case. I later learned that 6 months after the original recommendation of dismissal was made, he finally resigned. He was not discharged. He resigned on December 13, 1947. For what Federal agency he is working at this time, I frankly do not know. I have attempted to get that information from the Civil Service Commission. It has been very helpful, but there are so many individuals of the same name that the Commission has had difficulty in furnishing the information.

Case No. 17. This individual signed an affidavit saying that he was a member of the Communist Party. He did this on several occasions. This was not a non-Communist affidavit; it was a Communist affidavit. This file is rather significant, in that the reviewing officer in this case indicated that if this employee had testified to a change of heart, he would have received top-secret clearance. In other words, if this man had said, "I have now reformed," the security officer felt he was bound to give him top-secret clearance. This, of course, seems unusual to us, but a Communist, who has, of course, no respect for the oath, which consists of swearing before the Creator that he will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, is educated to the idea that there is no Supreme Being, so, obviously, an oath means nothing to him. I think the reviewing authority in the State Department should bear that fact in mind.

Case No. 18. This individual was thoroughly investigated before being hired on December 26, 1946. While the file indicates that this woman was a Communist, I am not too sure that she was not a psychopathic case. She was hired when the file showed a great deal of Communist activity on her part.

Case No. 19. This file is rather a lengthy one. It shows many Communist Party connections. The individual is working for the Government today. I have been able to secure that much information. Whether he is in the State Department I frankly do not know.

Case No. 20. This individual's file shows close connections with a number of Communist-front organizations. The individual, his sister, and his father spent some time in mental institutions. The report, which is dated July 7, 1947, shows that his mental health is unstable. This man is still in the Department as of today.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator have any information as to the type of responsibility the last-named individual has in the State Department? In other words, does he do janitorial work, or supervisory work, or just what kind of work does he do?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know. The information was not in the file. I was curious about that particular question myself. I was told that he had top-secret clearance. That would indicate that he was handling rather important documents. Frankly, what he was doing, I do not know. Let me check on the actual case, if I may, so that we may have any information on it that may be available. He is in the Office of Information and Educational Exchange. What he is doing there, I do not know.

Cases Nos. 21 to 26 are rather typical of many of the employees in the New York office of OIE. That is the Voice of America broadcast. The picture in the seven cases is substantially the same. First, the character reference is from another known Communist. In other words, the file shows, in effect, that it is a case of "You recommend me; I'll recommend you." So it is a case of Commies, or persons with Communist connections, recommending each other. There is nothing in the file which indicates the employees' activities beyond a period several years prior to the employment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator mean that he does not know what the activities are of these persons in the Department of State, or that he does not know their prior activities?

Mr. McCARTHY. I know that their activities in the Department were with the Voice of America in the New York branch.

Mr. DONNELL. I mean, in what type of work are they engaged?

Mr. McCARTHY. As to this particular case, I do not know. I shall come to one, case No. 81, but let me read that now for the benefit of the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. I was wondering whether the Senator would permit me to ask another question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator be kind enough, if he thinks it advisable, to give us from time to time, as he goes through the cases, information as to the type of work or the type of responsibility with which the individual is charged?

Mr. McCARTHY. I can say to the Senator that it would be extremely difficult to do that, because all the records are completely secret except what I could get from loyal State Department employees. I can tell in a great number of cases what particular branch the individuals are working in, whether in Research and Intelligence, or in other activities. Incidentally, Research and Intelligence is a favorite office for fellow travelers to get into. A short time ago I cited the case of one individual who succeeded in going from Research and Intelligence to CIA. He is with CIA today.

One of the principal cases is case No. 81. It deals with one of the top officials in OIE, the Voice of America, and I shall reach that shortly. Referring again to the previous case, the individual is still either working in this branch of the State Department, or has succeeded in transferring to some other agency having to do with information. All these individuals try to get into some branch having to do with information or research.

Case No. 28. This individual has been with the State Department as a Foreign Service career officer since 1936. He is still holding a high salaried job with the Government, and to the best of my knowledge he is now stationed at Frankfurt, Germany. A report of June 23, 1947, indicates that he is a member of the Communist Party, that he attended the Youth International in Russia in 1935. While working in the State Department, the file indicates, he showed an intense interest in getting information on anything pertaining to Russia, including any figures and records, whether or not the information had any connection with his particular job. He had been discharged previously from the AFL Federation of Government Employees, on the charge of communistic activity. Both he and his wife have been members of a number of Communist-front organizations, and he has been very closely associated with known Communist-front workers. The file discloses the interesting information that he is a member of the central group, whose task it is to spearhead an attack on J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. These fellows do not like J. Edgar Hoover at all. The man is a member of the central group which is the spearhead of such an attack. This is all in his file. He is still working for the Government.

Case No. 29. This individual, according to the State Department's own Security Division, is a known Communist member. A file dated April 13, 1947, shows that he is a member of an underground Communist group in Washington, D. C. Both he and his wife have been in close touch with a functionary of the Soviet espionage ring in Washington, D. C. I want to be sure about this. He is still working in Government work. Whether he is in the State Department or not I have not been able to find out, but I know he was in the State Department not too long ago, and he is still in the Government service. Let me repeat that for the benefit of the Senate. The intelligence agency's file shows that this man is a known Communist Party member, and another file, dated April 13, 1947, shows that he is a member of an underground Communist group in Washington, D. C. Both he and his wife have been in close touch with a functionary of the Soviet espionage ring in Washington. His brother, who either was or is in the State Department, was a member of the Jackson Heights, Long Island, N. Y., branch of the Communist Party. There was considerable additional material in the file of this individual which I cannot give to the Senate this time, because it is all tied up with the source of the information. The file indicates that this man is not only very active as a Communist, but is a very dangerous Communist.

Case No. 30. This man was a production supervisor of motion pictures for the OIE; that is, the Voice of America. He also had previously signed an affidavit to the effect that he was a member of the Communist Party. That is pretty

much the picture of all that OIE crowd in New York.

I might say that there has been some cleaning out. As we get down to case 81, Senators will see that one of the top people was temporarily transferred, and while away something else happened, and there are some good loyal people in the office in New York. Otherwise, I would not be able to get the information I am giving the Senate.

Case No. 31. This individual has been in Government service since July 1942. He was stationed in the Office of Information and Education of the State Department. The information was not in the file, but the hearings before the Un-American Activities Committee showed that he had signed a petition in New York in 1940 to the effect that he was a member of the Communist Party.

Case No. 32. This individual has been with the Government since July 1942. He was stationed in the Office of Education and Information in the State Department. It will be noted as I go through that the highest percentage of these individuals were stationed in some information branch of the Government. According to the Un-American Activities Committee, he had signed a petition in 1940 to the effect that he was a member of the Communist Party. The State Department took no action whatsoever upon this case, and so far as I know, the investigative unit there conducted no further investigation as to him, unless it was fairly recently.

Case No. 33. This man has been in the Government service since July 1942. The picture is pretty much the same as in the last case, except that he is in a high-salaried position at the present time in the Office of Information and Education. This man, I know definitely, is in the Office of Information and Education of the State Department. He signed an affidavit in 1940 that he was a member of the Communist Party. He has been in the Government service since 1942. Apparently no check was made on him as to his other Communist activities, and I have no further information about him.

Case No 34. This individual was born in Russia in 1896, and became a naturalized United States citizen in 1938. From July 1934 to April 1940 he worked for Amtorg Trading Corporation. The Senate will recall that that is the corporation that was visited by the FBI shortly after the last session ended, and they picked up five or six of the Amtorg officials in connection with espionage activities. This man worked for that corporation until 1940. He worked with the Maritime Union from June to August 1941, was with the OWI from February 1945 to February 1946, then was transferred to the State Department. His file shows that he has very close connection with the Communist espionage agents. As to this man, I frankly do not know whether he is still in the State Department or not. He went with the State Department some time after February 1946.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator referred, a moment ago, I think just before the last case, to one individual as being a high-salaried employee. Does the Senator have information as to what the man's salary is?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not. I think he was a CAF, class 9 or 10. He was up in the $7,000 or $8,000 bracket. I did not pay too much attention to that. He was in a fairly high-salaried position. I could get the information for the Senator, I think. In looking over the papers I have I do not find information as to the salary he receives.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I notice in several of the cases the Senator has mentioned it was not clear whether or not the officials mentioned were still employed by the State Department. The State Department issued a news release last week in which Mr. Peurifoy stated that 202 Communists and security risks have been dismissed from the State Department since 1946.

I wondered if the Senator has asked the State Department to let him see that list of those who may have been dismissed because of disloyalty reasons, which would greatly simplify the Senator's task in determining whether they are still there? Inasmuch as so much has been said about making information available, it would seem to me to be proper to make a direct request of the Department for a list of those whom the Department has dismissed for disloyalty reasons, to which the Department could not very well make any other than an affirmative reply.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from South Dakota know whether Mr. Peurifoy said that they were dismissed for disloyalty reasons, or dismissed and allowed to resign?

Mr. MUNDT. I think Mr Peurifoy's statement said that their relationships with the State Department were severed because of security reasons. I think frequently they are permitted to resign after they have been singled out and their attention has been called to the fact that the State Department has caught up with their disloyalty records, but whether they have been permitted to resign or whether they have been severed, since he has given us the definite figure of 202, there would be an ideal check list for the Senator from Wisconsin to use in finding out whether these persons are still with the Department of State.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator, but I think it makes a difference whether they have resigned or are discharged and obtained employment in other departments of the Government.

Mr. MUNDT. One of the great difficulties we confront in trying to get Communists out of Government is that apparently once they have been removed from one department there is no alert given to the other departments so they simply drift from one department to another. So if there were some such list made available to all the employment chiefs, then, assuming that the employment chiefs do not want to hire Communists, they could use that list as a screen.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee dealing with foreign affairs, I may say it was indicated that these persons in the majority of cases were permitted to resign rather than to be discharged.

Mr. MUNDT. They were permitted to resign after, I believe, they had been told that the State Department had made an examination of their loyalty status and found it questionable.

Mr. McCARTHY. And permitted to resign so they would find it easier to secure another job.

Mr. MUNDT. Perfectly true.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say in that connection, Mr. President, that the whole picture seems to be—and you recall I cited some cases along that line—that where they can get one top man in an important position, that then very shortly we see them dragging in their fellow Communists. When that is done we may be sure they will not be discharged for Communist activities. They are allowed to resign so they can be taken over by another department. The disturbing thing is that they are resigning from the State Department and then going into the other branches which, while not technically under the State Department, are to all intents and purposes under the State Department. When they are allowed to resign it does not give them a bad record and they can move into another position.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator is putting his finger on a very important deficiency in the President's so-called security program, because if a Communist is found to be guilty in the eyes of the State Department or any other department of Government and then permitted to resign so as to secure employment in some other department of Government or in some other bureau, or a place in private employment, the general public has had a fraud launched against it, and it is the policy of giving the benefit of the doubt to the Communists instead of the benefit of the doubt to the Government. Certainly when we come to the place where we have discovered a Communist I see no reason why all the departments of Government should not be alerted, and for that reason, when the evidence is complete, the general public might well be alerted so the individual cannot sneak his way into some college faculty, some farmers' organization, some labor organization, or some women's club. Once the security check has pointed out that here is a man attempting to sabotage freedom in this country and trying to sell us out to a foreign tyranny, Government departments are notoriously weak, in my opinion, if they fail then to alert the general public to that fact.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that is an excellent idea. I may say that merely alerting the new potential boss sometimes does not do too much good. The Senator was not present when I recited a very unusual case, the case of a man who is now one of our foreign ministers. The case was that of a man who is one of our ministers. His file suddenly disappeared, that is, the vast majority of it. An attempt was made to find out where the file went. The keeper of the file, if one can call him that, said it went to one of the top brass, and it is in his safe, and has been there for 2 years. However, he did not obtain all the material. Some of the remaining material shows that certain secret material was prepared for transmission to a foreign government. The material was prepared for a foreign government. It showed up in Moscow before it even left Washington. Does the Senator follow me? Of course, the Security Agency was very much concerned with that. They apparently had suspicions ahead of time. Their report—and their report of this matter is all in the file, the Senator understands, was to the effect that this man who is now one of our ministers, was shadowed by the Security Agency; their men physically saw him make contact with a known espionage agent. The agent was shadowed to the Soviet Embassy, and that is where the material disappeared, and then showed up in Moscow. When this man's superior officer cleans out his files, I am very curious what that man's file contains.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I left the Senate Chamber at 7:30 p. m. What number of case is the Senator now on?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am now on case No. 34.

Mr McMAHON. In the cases the Senator has recited, has the Senator simply read the derogatory information that was in the files or has the Senator attempted to give the full contents of the file in each case?

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say that I am only giving the Senate cases in which it appears clear that there is a definite Communist connection. If there is evidence in the file to show that a man was not a Communist, frankly, those files have not come to my attention.

I am not sure that I get the Senator's thought fully. This man may have been good to his wife and children and all that sort of thing. What I am interested in is: Does the file confirm what we felt we knew about him? In other words, does the investigative agency's file show that this man was in contact with Communists? Did he belong to Communist-front organizations? Did he belong to a Communist organization? Was he a foreign agent?

I assure the Senator that this is not a game. I am trying to give the Senate as clear a picture as I can. I do not give the Senate anything that would indicate the source of the information.

As I said earlier this evening, I think it is impossible and very unwise for us to pass any legislation providing that we could subpena, for example, the files of the FBI. I think if we did that we would set the FBI back 10, 20, or 30 years. The only way we can safely use these files is with complete cooperation and understanding. So, for example, when the FBI has cleared the staff of the Senator's committee, they can work with the Senator's committee and give the committee the benefit of its investigation.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I am glad to.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator understands that what I am trying to find out is whether the Senator has in his possession the complete file that is in the State Department, either the original file—I take it the Senator does not have that—or a copy of it. Has the Senator both the derogatory information and any good information that is in that file?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator asks whether I have complete State Department files. The answer is "No."

Mr. McMAHON. Has the Senator the complete files in any one of the 34 cases?

Mr. McCARTHY. Eighty-one cases.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator said he had presented 34 cases so far.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. I take it the Senator is going through all 81. I merely say that when the Senator reaches case No. 81 I hope to be home in bed. That is beside the point. I want to find out from the Senator if in the cases he has read or in the cases that are to be presented, the Senator is able to give the Senate both the derogatory information that is in the file and any contradictory information that indicates that the derogatory information may be in question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me answer the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. That is a yes-or-no question. Would the Senator give this information if he had it in his possession?

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator want the answer?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. The answer is that I obviously do not have photostats of all the files.

Mr. McMAHON. Has the Senator got——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish. I do not have a counterespionage group of my own. All I can do is pick up the information, check, and make sure it is confirmed by something in the State Department file. The Senator understands I do not have complete State Department files in these matters. I very greatly wish I did. That is one of the things I hope one of our committees will succeed in getting.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. In a moment, if I may. If we are going to have a staff to work on these files the FBI should clear the members of that staff first to make sure that we do not have Communists among its members. When that is done, I hope the State Department will cooperate fully, and will say, "Here are the files. Take a look at them."

I do not have that now.

Mr. McMAHON. At last, that is the answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator does not have in his possession any information which will indicate that that derogatory statement is true. Does not the Senator realize that if I were to send investigators into his State, perhaps I could obtain 105 or perhaps 1,005 witnesses who would make statements about the Senator that would be totally untrue and incorrect, and the same investigators might go to 2,000 other persons who would say, "Those 105 people are not telling the truth at all. They are very angry with the Senator because he voted for this bill or that bill that they did not like."

Did the Senator ever think of that?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut had been in the Senate Chamber earlier this evening, he would have heard that question answered.

The Senator from Illinois demanded, loudly, that I furnish all the names. I told him at that time that so far as I was concerned, I thought that would be improper; that I did not have all the information about these individuals. I have enough to convince me that either they are members of the Communist Party or they are giving great aid to the Communists. I may be wrong. That is why I said that unless the Senate demanded that I do so, I would not submit this publicly, but I would submit it to any committee—the Senator's committee or any other Senate committee—and would let the committee go over these in executive session. It is possible that some of these persons will get a clean bill of health. I know that some of them will not.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator has made my point for me, however, namely, that in the files that he has, there is only derogatory information.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. McMAHON. And that he is not able——

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. McMAHON. That he is not able to give to the Senate the information which contradicts the derogatory information.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not true.

Mr. McMAHON. Because if the Senator has it and if he is not giving it to the Senate at this time, it would appear to me that he is trying to present a one-sided picture.

I say to the Senator that there is no desire on my part to prejudge a single one of these cases. I do not need to tell the Senator that I am as much opposed to communism in the State Department or in any other Department as he is.

But I tell the Senator that in the course of my career I have examined many Government files and many investigation records, and I have seen in the files statements that, "This man McCarthy" or "This man——

Mr. McCARTHY. Make it "Jones."

Mr. McMAHON. Or "This man Smith is a terrible person. He is not to be trusted. He defrauds his creditors. He even beats his wife. He has been seen going around the corner with suspicious-looking persons."

And then if we go to other persons in the community, they say, "I am not at all surprised that you have been told that, because Smith had a fight with a man named Jones, who lives down the street. I will bet that you got an interview with him, and that in it he said that this fellow Smith is a terrible man."

I call attention to the possibility that if we had the whole file before us, as undoubtedly the State Department has, the information the Senator from Wisconsin is giving the Senate might be contradicted to the point where creditable witnesses or creditable evaluators of the files would say, "In that event, we cannot believe that information."

I do not say to the Senator that that is so; I merely point out the possibility of its being so.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think I have a fairly good digest of the files. However, in such a case as this, I think we must give the American people the benefit of the doubt. Instead of there being 57 Communists in the State Department, let us say that there are only one or two. If there were one or two Communists who were serving as top officials in our State Department, that alone would be fully sufficient to keep the opposition informed about the operations of the Department.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator to permit me to finish my statement, please.

I have said to the Senator that I am not indicting the 81. I have said there is sufficient in the files to show that there is something radically wrong. If the Senator will remain here and will listen to some more of the cases, I am sure he will be convinced. After all, he came to the floor after I had been speaking for some time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator advise the Members of the Senate now present whether he is presenting to the Senate a series of personal opinions about the persons or whether he is presenting matters of record?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not presenting anything except what is confirmed by the files of the individual concerned. In other words, in one case the intelligence department said, "Get rid of this man. Six professors, some at the University of California and some at Harvard, say this fellow is a fellow-traveler, a Communist, a close friend of Friedman, secretary of the Communists in California, and a close friend of Harry Bridges."

But the "top brass" in the State Department say, "No, because he has not committed any overt act."

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I certainly would not judge the case upon the basis of what the Senator has just said. I certainly think—and I think it is the American system——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator think it is the American system that when a man is accused, he shall be given a hearing, that all witnesses for him and against him shall be heard and adjudged; and then, upon that judgment and upon that evidence, does not the Senator think the judgment should be rendered?

Mr. McCARTHY. I say to the Senator——

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator, if I may continue my question——

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator that what we have to be careful of is that we do not imitate the very thing we are against. Star chambers are not for the United States of America, nor are trials ex parte, on the basis of part of the files of the persons concerned, on the floor of the United States Senate, the way to handle this matter.

That is my question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator from Maine to permit me to answer the Senator from Connecticut first.

If the Senator from Connecticut had been here a little earlier, he would have heard the majority leader demanding that we do exactly that. He demanded that I present the names and indict these people before the country, without giving them a chance to be heard.

I said, "No, I will not do that unless the Senate demands it." I said, "I have the information. I want to present it to any Senate committee, and have the committee decide about it."

This information is nothing new. It has been there a long time. If the Senator or anyone else who is interested had expended sufficient effort, he could have brought this to the attention of the Senate.

I do not fancy at all this condemnation of an attempt to bring this matter before the Senate. I intend to give all the facts. From the information which I have before me, I agree with the intelligence agencies which have said, "These men should not be in the State Department." I agree with the intelligence agencies who said, "Do not give these men top-secret clearance."

I may be wrong. That is why I am not naming them. But I think that soon—tomorrow—the proper Senate committee that is actually interested, not in investigating people who may be Communists, but in investigating as to whether or not the State Department is overrun with Communists, should examine into these matters.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is not the essence of star-chamber proceedings that the public are not permitted to know the facts? Is not the essence of the kind of government which we here are fighting the kind of executive government which refuses to permit the legislative authority to know the truth?

After the revelations in the Hiss and the Fuchs and some other cases would it not seem that the Congress should be permitted to exercise its historical authority, never denied until recent years; and does it not seem strange that the Executive would refuse to permit those in the Senate and in the House of Representatives the right to know what is going on in Washington?

I do not see how any defenders of democracy, in view of the Hiss and the Fuchs cases, can still maintain the right of the executive department of government to refuse—as has been occurring repeatedly in recent years—information from the files to be authorized to be seen by the committees of Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may point out to the Senator that the Constitution gives the Congress the right to get the information which we have been demanding for some time. Under the Constitution, of course, the Congress has a right to that information. How we can force the President to give the information to Congress I do not know.

On August 4, 1948, the day Hiss was exposed by the House committee, and the day of the President's famous "red herring" statement, the President signed an order saying, "No more departmental information shall be given to congressional committees."

At that time there might have been a reason for it; at that time the Congress was controlled by the Republican Party, and I can see why the President, with an election coming along, might have felt that the information might have been used for some political gain.

However, the President's party has had control of both the Senate and the House of Representatives for over a year now, and it seems that the President should be able to trust his own party. His party is in control. He should be able to say, "This is information to which the Congress is entitled, under the Constitution. My own party is in power. I will let them have it."

Frankly, Mr. President, I think the President is making a terrible mistake. If I may suggest something to the Senator, let me say that I think he and I certainly should be on the same side in this matter. The Democratic Party certainly is going to suffer because of this, but it should not. I think the Democratic Party has lost control of the executive branch. An unusual group of people—a group of twisted-thinking intellectuals—has taken over in the State Department, in recent years. They think they are right, that is what makes them dangerous.

If the Democratic Party, as we see it represented here in the Senate, had control, I do not think this sorry situation would exist.

So the Senator should work with us in trying to clean house.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator's observation is entirely beside the point, as was the observation just made by the Senator from Maine. I do not stand here to defend anyone. I simply wish to point out to the Senator that there was

a complete file on these persons, and the Senator obviously was giving only the derogatory information.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not correct.

Mr. McMAHON. I pointed out to the Senator that fairness demanded that the full files be made available, and certainly that should be done before judgment of the case is had. That is my position, and nothing else.

Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CAPEHART, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall yield in a moment.

First, Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Connecticut just indulged in an erroneous assumption when he said I was indicating only the derogatory information. This is a résumé of the file.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this time?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I hope the Senator will not follow the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut and discontinue his effort to purge Communists from the Government.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut made no such statement.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator should wait until I finish.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor. A Senator who has the floor can yield only for a question. Senators who wish to ask questions must first be yielded to for that purpose.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may I first make it clear that I will yield to every Senator present, as often as he wants me to yield, but for the present I am yielding to the Senator from South Dakota, and I will yield to no one else until he has finished his question. I shall be glad then to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MUNDT. I want the Senator from Connecticut to listen to this statement. I think I am quoting him exactly. I think he suggested that the Senator from Wisconsin should not continue with this effort of his, until the full files are made available to him. Is not that correct? Was not that the Senator's statement?

Mr. McMAHON. That is exactly correct.

Mr. MUNDT. I thought it was correct.

Mr. McMAHON. It is.

Mr. MUNDT. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will not yield to that kind of argument, because, had the argument of the Senator from Connecticut been followed, Alger Hiss would never have been convicted, for Alger Hiss was convicted after the President gave his freeze order denying us the right to see the full file. That would be a complete way to cover up every Communist in the Government.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me answer first, and then I will yield. I say to Senators, let them take their time. I will yield to everyone here, and all night if necessary. I want to say I definitely will not follow the suggestion offered by the Senator from Connecticut that I do nothing until I have the complete file of the case. The President said, "You shall not see the file." In fact, I never know when I have the complete file. I have information from the State Department files, information to which we are entitled. I am giving it to the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut has said something about my convicting someone. Although even the leader of the Senator's party has said, "You must give us the names," I have refused to do so. I have said, "I will give it to any committee. I will go before any committee. I will be sworn. I will do anything." I want to get some action, and I may say to the Senator, I think he is the type of man who should be working along with me on this matter. I have a great deal of respect for the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I am not trying to work against the Senator. What did I point out to the Senator and to the Senate? I pointed out that the Senator apparently has been giving the derogatory information contained in files of which he has secured possession. I further pointed out that in those files, if there was information which disproved the derogatory information, it was the duty of the Senator to present it to the Senate. Certainly no investigation of these persons could be consistent with American methods unless there were an evaluation both of the derogatory information and the information which went to disprove it. If we adopt any other theory than that, I claim we abandon one of the fundamental guaranties which underly our form of government. And if we are going to take the attitude that simply because someone says so-and-so is a Communist, or was seen talking to a Communist, it therefore, ipso facto, settles the matter, then I say we have adopted a theory which I do not understand to be in consonance with our form of government.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. I want to further point out to the Senator that, in fairness——

Mr. McCARTHY. Is this a question?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator has listened to speeches from some of his other colleagues. I am sure he will indulge me in this observation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Go ahead.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. If he wants to be fair, and has full and complete files on a man, he ought to read not only the derogatory information but anything else that is said. After it is read I might agree, especially if I could hear the witnesses, with the Senator's contention that a certain individual ought to be kicked out of the Government and perhaps be put in jail. What I do not see is how anyone can form an intelligent judgment simply by reading what a half dozen people say, because perhaps they are rogues, scoundrels, and thieves. Perhaps they have some ulterior motive in making the statements they do. I do not know. I do not judge this case and say the Senator is not right, that the Senator does not have derogatory information, which, if true, would warrant the full penalty of the law. He may be entirely right about it. What I am pointing out is that there may be other facts which we ought to hear in connection with those cases. That is my point.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator flatters me when he says it is my duty to present the entire file to the Senate and to give the Senate all the information. The President has said we shall not get that file, and, as of the present moment, we are not on a "Dear Joe, Dear Harry" basis. I cannot go to the White House and say, "Harry, give me this file, because Senator McMAHON insists that you give me the information." All I can do is to give Senators what I can dig up. I have given Senators the fullest, most complete, fairest résumé of the files that I possibly could.

For the Senator to speculate that I have other information which I will not give him, is, I think, completely unfair. I have already asked for the complete files. I sent the President a telegram. I said, "Mr. President, here are 57 names. You may have them. But, in fairness to the Senate and the country, let us get the information on these people."

Mr. BREWSTER rose.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me yield to the Senator from Maine, first.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the issue not as to who is to do the evaluating of which the Senator from Connecticut speaks? Is it to be done by the executive agencies that demonstrate in every way a determination to refuse what has always been considered the constitutional right of the legislative body to find out, or is the evaluation to be made in the historic method, by a duly authorized committee of the Senate? I do not understand that the Senator from Connecticut is denying the right of a senatorial group, nor do I understand him to be admitting it. I am very much interested to know whether he agrees with the executive viewpoint, asserted for the first time, so far as I know, in any substantial way in very recent years, that the executive would not give to committees of the Congress the right to look at files.

The first case I knew of was when, during the war, President Roosevelt refused Senator Truman, then chairman of the Truman committee, the right to examine the so-called Stettinius report. The first action which I took as chairman of the committee afterward was to ask President Truman for it, and he turned that report over, which conclusively demonstrated that we had been very much misled during the course of the war as to the mobilization, and the records thereof, demonstrating that Senator Truman was right in demanding the records, and the President was wrong. The new doctrine by which the President has now directed his subordinates to refuse records is novel, unfortunate, and menacing, and is at the very

essence of this entire issue. As I understand, the Senator from Wisconsin is presenting what he feels to be credible evidence that the Executive is not exercising due care. We have no other way, as I understand, to find out, unless some committee will demand the records, and unless the President will release them. How the Senator from Connecticut, himself, as chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, could determine regarding many matters, unless he had the files from the executive department, it is impossible for the Senator from Maine to understand.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me answer the question first, if I may. I thank the Senator from Maine very much for his statement. He is 100 percent correct. Unless we can obtain cooperation from the Executive, there is no way in the world of cleaning house. I am not giving my evaluation of the evidence, I want it understood. If Senators will listen, they will note that what I am doing is to recite the facts, which the State Department's own security agency dug up, and which information acted as the basis for their recommendation that the individuals in question, because of being security risks, be discharged and not retained in the service.

I know the Senator from Connecticut has not been present all the time. He has been away this evening. Some of the most incredible cases I have read and some that I shall read of giving a man top secrecy clearance, when the Department's own agency says "He is a bad risk; he is a Communist," have been uncovered. I may say to the Senator, if the investigative agency is overly eager, if they are doing a bad job, if they are persecuting individuals, if they are naming as Communists individuals who are not such, then it is up to the State Department and the President to get a new agency.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment, that I may make a final observation?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I shall be glad to yield; and after that I will yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McMAHON. It will only take me a minute. I understand the junior Senator from Massachusetts earlier said that at the next meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee he would move for an examination of these cases. I may say to the Senator, I shall be glad to second and to support the motion, because I should like to see developed not only the facts the Senator has been able to get, but also other facts that we as a committee may be able to develop. I should like to see that done. It would be quite all right with me, but I again emphasize, as I now take my seat—and I shall not participate in the debate again, so far as I know, and I shall not disturb the Senator further—that perhaps it would have been better had the Senator presented his complaint to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, in which committee I am sure he has full confidence, in order that the derogatory information might be weighed against any information which would tend to contradict it, so that we could have the benefit of that searching information before the Senator decided to come to the Senate floor with it. It is simply a personal observation. The Senator is within his rights. He has decided to do it differently. It is the Senator's responsibility. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator need not worry about disturbing me, because there is nothing I am more willing to do than to yield to a Senator. If I may have the Senator's attention, I will answer his question. I assume it was a question. The Senator suggested a course of action which he thinks I should have followed. As I explained earlier this evening, I thought of that. I thought there was some possibility of accomplishing the desired results in that fashion. However, keeping in mind that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and all the Senators have had substantially the same knowledge and opportunity that I have had, I questioned whether anything would be gained unless the President changed his mind and said, "I will give you the information." Then, when the leader of the Democratic Party, before seeing any of the evidence, made a speech in Chicago and said, "What the Senator from Wisconsin says is all untrue," I thought the only thing to do was what I have done, namely, to let the people of the country know what is going on, and then hope that the pressure of public opinion would be great enough to force the President to clean house. Frankly, I think he will not clean house until he determines it is politically inexpedient for him to do otherwise. I think the President is one of the cleverest politicians this Nation has ever had. I think when he discovers that the people of the country do not want a continuation of what is going on, there will be a housecleaning.

I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Senator familiar with the rule as laid down by the President that not only will he not permit any Member of the Congress or a congressional committee to have access to loyalty files, but that he will not permit the person in charge of them to testify before a committee as to any facts relating to a person's loyalty?

That was true in the Remington case, in which he told an admiral of the Navy, who had charge of one of the files containing disloyalty information, that the admiral was not permitted to testify in relation to it. Is the Senator familiar with that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am.

Mr. FERGUSON. Therefore, it seems impossible for the committee which might be named to be successful unless the President of the United States should change his order. Does not the Senator feel that the proper committee to investigate the matter is the Appropriations Committee, which has to appropriate the money to pay those persons? The State Department's appropriation is now before that committee. I understand that Mr. Acheson will appear before the committee. That will be the place for the Senate actually to obtain information on those particular persons, not only as to whether they are now in Government employ, but information as to the entire record of the State Department, the FBI, and other departments as to their loyalty.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will say that any committee that looks into the matter will have all the cooperation I can give it. I shall be more than happy to go before the Appropriations Committee and give it all the information I have. I think the Appropriations Committee should certainly look into the question especially so in the case of the Voice of America.

I think the Voice of America program is a very important program if properly conducted. I think it is almost impossible to spend too much money on it if the money is wisely spent, but I think the picture which we find in connection with the New York office of the Voice of America should be examined by the Appropriations Committee and that that committee should use a bright light and find out exactly what is going on. I shall cover that matter in some detail when I get down to the final case.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that if it had not been for a congressional committee Alger Hiss would not have been convicted?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think there is no doubt about that. The Senator will recall that at the time the House Un-American Activities Committee turned up the information on Hiss the President said, in a public statement, "We had all this information already." I do not know whether he had it, but if at that time the Un-American Activities Committee had decided to quit, Hiss might have been in Calcutta, instead of Service which might not have been too bad.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not reasonable to assume that in the file of Mr. Hiss there are possibly some good points as well as derogatory evidence?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think even the most fanatical Communist may treat his wife and children well; he may provide for them well. I do not think that is the question. The question is whether these persons are a threat to the United States. No matter how much good information there may be in the file regarding them, so long as they are loyal to Russia and to the Communist Party, and disloyal to this Government, I think they have no right to hold Government positions. I think it is a privilege to have a Government job, not a right.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that every man who has been convicted possibly had some good points about him, and there were some persons who would testify that he was a kindly and an honest man?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is certainly true.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not quite understand the argument which was used a little earlier, that there might be some good points in the files. What difference does it make how many good points there are if the persons involved are Communist sympathizers and fellow

travelers? Our jails are filled with persons who were perfectly honest up to the time they performed the acts or deeds which got them convicted. Is not that true?

Mr. McCARTHY. I take the position that it is not my task to take 81 cases and try and get all the evidence and then determine whether the intelligence unit which evaluates it was doing a good or a bad job. All I am doing is presenting enough of the picture so that I hope both the Democratic side and the Republican side will forget politics and help clean house. I think this is something in which we cannot think of politics as usual. If I were to give my Democratic friends some advice, it would be that I think we should get together and do some house cleaning. I notice the Senator from Mississippi frowning. I do not think he was present when I made it clear that if the Democratic Party as represented in the Senate had control of the executive branch I thought we would not have the sorry picture we have today.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact, to boil this all down, that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is simply asking that an appropriate committee of the Senate make a thorough investigation not only of the files but of any other source of information possible, and let that committee determine whether there are any disloyal persons or Communists, or what have you, such as the Senator has listed in these 81 cases? Is not that the whole crux of the matter?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Whether there are good things or bad things to be said about them, all the Senator is doing is asking that an investigation be made by an appropriate committee of the Senate. Whether that is correct procedure or not, the Senator is within his rights in asking it.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. I do not think a Senate committee can do a complete job unless the President will make the facts available.

Mr. WHERRY. Whether an investigation will accomplish the very thing which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] labored about will depend on whether all the information in the files is forthcoming to the investigating committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. I do not claim that all the cases I am reporting to the Senate refer to persons working in the State Department, but in view of the fact that most of them were in the State Department and had top-secret clearance, I think the Senate could call them before a committee and find out in what Government work they are now engaged, or, if they are not engaged in Government work, what they have been doing in private employment, and whether they are members of espionage rings. I am not concerned with the numbers over which the Senator from Illinois labored all night long, whether there are 205 or 57. It is a question of whether there are Communists in the State Department. As to three of them the record is so bad that I can find nothing good regarding them. I cannot conceive of the Secretary of State keeping them on. Under the McCarran law the Secretary of State has the absolute right to clean out any debris he cares to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the distinguished Senator contacted the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations relative to the files which he now has? Inasmuch as the distinguished Senator mentioned that fact, I certainly should like to pay a compliment to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and other members of the committee, who have done a pretty good job in insisting upon the departments making reports as to the progress which is being made relative to the subversiveness of persons who are in the departments, and they could do a better job. I should like to state that if all other committees fail, I believe the Committee on Appropriations would be a very good place to start, because if appropriations are withheld from a department or an agency, it can be brought around very quickly.

Mr McCARTHY. I have unlimited respect for the ability of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and I should like him to know now that at any time at all, tomorrow or the next day, or whenever he wants me to do so, I shall be glad to come to his committee and give him all the information I have. I believe the committee should decide after further and complete investigation, and after they have asked the President for the files, which of the names they wish to make public.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood the Senator to say that he had made an offer to the President of the United States. Will the Senator state what that offer was and how it was made?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to do so. From Nevada I sent a telegram to the President. I was out there making a Lincoln Day speech. I sent a telegram to the President telling him that I had names in my possession and that they were available to him. I have a copy of the telegram here.

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WITHERS. What kind of speech was the Senator making?

Mr. McCARTHY. A Lincoln Day speech.

Mr. WITHERS. I thought the Senator said it was a Republican speech.

Mr. McCARTHY. We call it a Lincoln Day speech.

Mr. WILEY. The appellations are synonymous.

Mr. McCARTHY. I sent a telegram to the President saying, in effect, "Mr. President, I have the names of 57 individuals in the State Department who are Communists, and those names are available to you." I suggested, however, that he dissolve the order for secrecy. Otherwise, just getting the names would be of no benefit. I heard nothing from the President, except that I read his statement at a press conference to the effect that the Senator from Wisconsin was not telling the truth.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. When did the Senator send this telegram to the President?

Mr. McCARTHY. It was approximately a week ago.

Mr. DONNELL. And the Senator has received no direct response whatever from the President or from the President's office?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have received no response from the President, and no acknowledgment. All I know is that according to the newspaper account the President is reported to have said that the Senator from Wisconsin was not telling the truth.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the Senator inform the President in the telegram that the 57 persons are or have been in the State Department?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did.

Mr. DONNELL. Notwithstanding the notice given to the President by a Member of the Senate a week ago by telegram, there has been no response received by the Senator from the President?

Mr. McCARTHY. None whatever.

Mr. DONNELL. If these persons are Communists—and we are not deciding that question at the moment—they have been allowed, so far as the Senator knows, to continue in whatever official positions they occupied during the intervening approximate week. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. I might say that I read the telegram into the RECORD. I shall be glad to hand a copy of it to the Senator. Since that time the majority leader also joined with the President in reflecting upon the truthfulness of the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Has the Senator already placed in the RECORD a copy of the telegram which he has just handed me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have.

Mr. DONNELL. I missed that part of the Senator's address.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, the telegram is in the RECORD.

I believe I was on case No. 34. This individual was originally cleared for employment in the State Department on June 2, 1946. Since that time, according to the State Department's file, he has admitted his communistic sympathies. I understand that he has resigned in order to take other Government employment. He was not discharged.

Case No. 36. This individual is 43 years of age. He is with the Office of Information and Education. According to the file, he is a known Communist. I might say that when I refer to someone as being a known Communist, I am not evaluating the information myself. I am merely giving what is in the file. This individual also found his way into

the Voice of America broadcast. Apparently the easiest way to get in is to be a known Communist.

Case No. 37. This individual has been in the United States since 1930 and was employed by the Office of Information and Education on April 22, 1947. He worked for the Russian Embassy in Turkey for 3 years. From 1944 to 1947 he was with a Russian welfare society. This individual is a very close associate of a known Communist now also with the Voice of America broadcast. The note says that this individual is still with the Voice of America broadcast.

Case No. 38. This individual is employed in a very responsible position in the Broadcasting Division of the Voice of America. As early as December 10, 1946, investigation by the State Department's security agency showed that this man was a fanatical Communist, that he was anticapitalistic, and definitely followed the Communist Party line. In this case there were reports from two different Government investigative agencies. Another Government investigative agency advised that a reliable informant reported that a well-known Communist in Newark, N. J., gave him the unqualified information that this individual was a paid-up fellow party member. While acting as a newspaper reporter prior to his present employment with the Voice of America broadcast he was reported by his superiors to have colored his news reports with Communist theory, and did not give complete and unbiased coverage to such reports. That is important because it is this individual who is now handing out news reports on the Voice of America program. A very close friend of this individual and his brother stated that both are definitely communist.

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WITHERS. What is the gentleman's name? Did the Senator call his name?

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. WITHERS. The Senator did not call any name?

Mr McCARTHY. Oh, no.

Mr. WITHERS. The Senator does not know who it is?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have called no names. The Senator from Connecticut, I think, gave the best reason why, namely, that we should not attempt to try to convict a man, that that should be done by a committee. I am submitting the evidence without giving the names. I have avoided that in every way possible.

Mr. WITHERS. Does the Senator think all the employees in the State Department are Communists?

Mr. McCARTHY. No. I think the vast majority of those employees are being done an almost irreparable wrong by having them painted with the brush of communism. I have been a lawyer, and out of 100 lawyers there may be 99 honest lawyers and 1 shyster; 1 crook, and the 99 get a bad name. That has happened in the State Department. If there were not some good, honest, loyal men in the State Department, men who were willing to risk their positions, I would not be able to give this report here tonight. I think the vast majority of those employees are loyal, protecting the security of the country for the time being, and in honesty to those employees the shady characters should be removed.

Mr. WITHERS. Will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. WITHERS. How does the Senator feel about attacking these men without calling names? How does the Senator feel the other employees who are straightforward feel about it, when he reflects on all of them and does not call names?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the condition today is so fraught with danger, I think we are in a period so definitely close to war, that even if we do damage some of the honest employees, I must take the only method I know of whereby I think we can secure a house cleaning. This information is nothing new. This has been known to the Secretary of State, or should have been—it is in the files—for a long time. I have decided that this is the best way of forcing the President to give the Congress the information so that it can clean house, as he apparently is not going to. Whether it is wrong, the Senator can decide for himself. I personally feel that this is the most effective way I can do this all-important job, and I intend to continue attempting to do it in this fashion, until the Senator or someone else shows me that there is some more effective, fairer way.

In that connection, I might say that I am very happy that there are so many Senators on the other side of the aisle who so thoroughly disagree with the majority leader. The majority leader has been condemning me rather vigorously for not giving the names of the people. I have been making every effort possible to keep the information in such form that no one can detect the names, until a full hearing of each case has been held.

Mr. WITHERS. I should like to ask the Senator what reason he has for not calling names. Does not the Senator think it would be a fine thing to let the public know who the guilty are? Is not the Senator privileged?

Mr. McCARTHY. Earlier this evening the Senator from Illinois said, "You are privileged if you make a mistake. If out of the 81 there are some innocent, if you malign them," the Senator from Illinois said, "you are protected." I made the statement then that when the day comes that I ever say anything on the floor of the Senate which I will not be willing to state off the floor of the Senate, on that day I will resign from the Senate.

Mr. WITHERS and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARTHY. I still yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WITHERS. If the Senator does not call names, has he not reflected on the whole Department of State, every one of the employees?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is entirely possible, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WITHERS. The Senator has the right in the Senate to call those names.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. WITHERS. But the Senator refused to do so. The Senator asked if I could state a better way. I will say a better way is to give the Senate, the public, the press, and everyone the name of every person the Senator says labors under any suspicion.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I do not think I will follow it, however, but I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. WITHERS. I would be better satisfied if I could go along with the Senator in that way. I would hate to follow the Senator only in part.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was not trying to be humorous. I respect the Senator's judgment. I have given the matter a great deal of thought, however, and the way I am presenting the matter is the way I think it should be done, and I intend to present it in that fashion.

Mr. WITHERS. The Senator simply tells us there are persons who are Communists but does not tell us who they are. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the Senator was not on the floor of the Senate all evening. I have stated repeatedly that I would go before any Senate committee and divulge names. I have said further that if it were the feeling of the majority of the Senate that they did not want it done in that fashion, that they feel we can do it in a better way, that we can do a better job by making the names public on the floor of the Senate I will be glad to abide by that decision. However I think that would be a mistake. I have dug out information which I think is of the utmost importance and I think we should get down to the job of trying to clean out these unusual people.

Mr. WITHERS. Does the Senator indict or accuse or what is he doing in this speech?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. WITHERS. Is the Senator indicting those whom he claims are guilty of the charges he makes?

Mr. McCARTHY. Am I indicting those who are guilty?

Mr. WITHERS. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not indicting those who are guilty. I am giving the Senate information about persons whom I consider to be Communists in the State Department.

Mr. WITHERS. In other words the Senator is suspicious that something is wrong without calling the names?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is a smart man. I know the Senator is. I have had many conversations with the Senator and I respect his intelligence. The Senator knows exactly what I am doing. The Senator knows I am giving the Senate what the State Department's investigative agency has said about these investigations. When the State Department's investigative agency has said that this man is a Communist, and that agency says he should not be working in the State Department, I am telling the Senate that. When the officials of the State Department say they will not

discharge the individual, anyway, I am giving that to the Senate. I am giving all the information I can to the Senate. The Senator from Kentucky knows exactly what I am doing.

Mr. WITHERS. Does the Senator know that I, like all others, am curious to know the names? When the Senator gives the cases, the press and country at large would like to know who they are.

Mr. McCARTHY. First let me say that this matter is too important for me to use it as a utensil whereby I can satisfy someone's curiosity, no matter how much I would like to see his curiosity satisfied. I do not intend to satisfy anyone's curiosity. I intend to do everything I can to try to clean up what I consider to be a bad mess.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, does the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not possible that the Senator from Kentucky might learn the names of these people sooner than he might like to?

Mr. WITHERS. I would like to know them if the Senator would tell me. I will make this observation. The Senator from Kentucky certainly could not learn the names too soon. If the individuals in question are guilty, I should like to say to the Senator from Indiana that no American could learn their names too soon.

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may suggest to the Senator, he is a member of the majority party, and I trust he is on much better terms with the President than I am. All the information I have given the Senate is in State Department files. There are several ways the Senator can obtain the names. No. 1. He can go to the President and say, "Mr. President, how about this case number so-and-so? Let me obtain the further facts on it."

Another way is to sit in when the proper committee asks for the names.

A third way, I will say to the Senator, is simply to come over to my office tomorrow morning and he can see the names, and I will satisfy his curiosity.

Mr. WITHERS. I shall be glad to. Does the Senator object to my divulging the names, if I see them? Have I that privilege?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it is up to the proper committee——

Mr. WITHERS. I think we should tell the people who they are.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it is up to the proper committee to decide whether it wants to divulge the names. Let me make myself clear to the Senator. If the majority of the Senate want me to divulge them in that fashion, yes. But I am not going to follow the Senator's advice and say, "Here you are, Senator, divulge them." Period.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator divulged four names in his speech in Reno, Nev. Why does the Senator refuse to divulge others before the Senate?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator knows that he is not stating the facts correctly. I read the speech I made.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish. I read the speech I made.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh——

Mr. McCARTHY. Do not read to me from the Washington Post.

Mr. LUCAS. I have the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, and a few other newspapers.

Mr. McCARTHY. I read to the Senate the speech I made at Reno, Nev. That speech was recorded. If the Senator wants a copy of that record I shall be glad to write to the Republican committee there and ask them to send the Senator a copy of the record. I think it will cost about $3 or three and a half. The Senator can play that record if he wants to. Otherwise, he can read what I read today into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I said there was a man, John Service, and I did not say he was one of the 57. An AP reporter called me and asked, "Were you naming the 57?" I said, "No. I did not say these people were Communists. They are not part of the 57." I said, "Here is John Service." I gave his record. Now I may think he is a Communist, but I do not have his file. His file for some mysterious reason has disappeared and is locked up in the safe of the top brass of the State Department. I discussed Service, who was picked up by the FBI when turning over State Department documents. I pointed out that while he was in China he recommended that communism was the hope of China. I commented, as I recall—and it is all in the RECORD here—on the fact that he was now on his way to Calcutta, India, to establish an Indian policy. I made it very clear that he was not one of the 57.

Then I took two other names and I said, "Here is what happens when you clear them out of the State Department." I gave the name of Mrs. Kenney, who had been listed by the FBI as a courier of the Communist Party while working for the Government. I pointed out that when she was forced out, because of public pressure and the FBI statement, that then she ends up where she is today, in one of the educational organizations or in some part of the UN Organization. I pointed out that the other one—and the Senator was present, and I should not have to repeat this again—who had been in the State Department as secretary to an Assistant Secretary of State. He was labeled as an outstanding Communist. When he was forced out of the State Department he went to work for the UN. I think both those individuals are Communists. Certainly if they are not, they look like them, they talk like them, and they walk like them. As one of my farmer friends once said, if a fowl looks like a duck and quacks like a duck and eats like a duck we can assume it is a duck. Those two individuals certainly answer that requirement.

Then I referred to a fourth one. I made it very clear that he had never been with the State Department. He is a man called Shapley. He headed up the peace conference in New York.

I pointed out to the Senate that Shapley had headed up this outfit that the State Department called a tool of Russia and a sounding board for Communist propaganda. That was in April. The State Department issued a press release in July, to the effect that they appointed this man on the advisory commission—I do not know the name of it—which advises the State Department on UNESCO. So I wish the Senator from Illinois would not plead ignorance of that. He knows it. I went over all this for the Senate earlier today.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The only reason I ask about these four is that it is my understanding the Senator did name them in his speech at Reno, Nev., and that the Senator said definitely—and I am now quoting only from the newspapers, and that is all I have been able to find out other than what the Senator has said tonight—in reply to a question by a reporter if he called these people traitors, he said, "I did not. I did not call them Communists either."

Is that what the Senator said?

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator wants to argue about the four, I will say, so that his mind will be at ease, that if he wants me to make it 59 instead of 57 I shall be glad to include two individuals who were named, one by the FBI and the other by the Un-American Activities Committee as being a courier for the Communist Party.

I do not get the Senator's argument. Does he say these people are Simon pure and that I maligned them? I talked about them publicly. If anything I said was not true, they can sue me for libel and slander. If it will make the Senator happy, I will be glad to say that all of them except Service are part of the 57. The only reason I do not include Service is that his file has disappeared, and I am trying to confine myself solely to information which is confined by the State Department's own investigative agency.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have any quarrel with what the Senator says. The only thing I am trying to do is to reconcile the Senator's speech here with the speech reported in the newspapers, and I have not received a satisfactory answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. What would the Senator like to know?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to know how he reconciles what he has said in the speeches he has made at Republican rallies with what he is saying here tonight. In other words, he named four persons when he was in the West. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky that the sooner the Senator can name these persons, the better off we will all be. So far as I am concerned, it will not be in executive session. If I have anything to say about it, it will be in the

open, where every individual in America, every newspaperman can attend, so that they will know definitely, as soon as possible, just who is being charged and who is not being charged with being Communists. That is only fair, as the Senator from Kentucky has so ably pointed out, because every individual in the State Department tonight is under a cloud, he is under a shadow as the result of what the Senator from Wisconsin is doing. I want to get the honest-to-goodness Americans from under that shadow, and whatever Communists are there, the majority party on this side of the aisle will be found to be just as strong in demanding that we clean house, if the Senator has the proof, as is anyone else. The Senator does not need to worry about that.

But the Senator has been moving around here——

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator to wait a minute, please; I do not yield any further at this time.

The Senator from Illinois says it is my job to prove these things. Since when has it been the job of a Senator who is a member of the minority, Mr. President, to clean house for an executive department? That is the task of the majority, and I hope they take that task on their shoulders.

Nothing the Senator from Illinois has done here tonight indicates that he even remotely realizes the seriousness of this problem.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that when he makes that statement, he simply does not know what he is talking about. I appreciate the seriousness of the situation the Senator is discussing. No one understands it better than the Senator from Illinois and the country as a whole do, as a result of the speeches the Senator from Wisconsin has made upon this question. If the Senator thinks there is anything frivolous about this, or that we are not trying to cooperate with him in this matter, he simply does not understand the situation.

We are going to help get the facts, and the Senator from Wisconsin is going to help us get the facts. He says he has the evidence there. All that needs to be done is for the Senator to come forward, along with the persons in the Intelligence Department from whom he has been able to get the information in the State Department. We will have them here. The Senator will have to tell us that, of course, and we will ferret this out, from top to bottom.

Mr. McCARTHY. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Illinois now demands that the President allow the State Department to bring to a Senate committee all the information in the files on these individuals? Or does the Senator feel that that should be kept secret, and that it is my job to probe behind the iron curtain and get the information?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Wisconsin has already been behind the iron curtain.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Illinois says it is my task to get the information. Does not he realize that is the task of the majority party and the majority leader? Does not he agree with me that the President should say to the Congress, in all honesty and fairness, "Here is a serious situation. I will open the files and let the proper committee examine them and learn what the facts are"?

Mr. LUCAS. That is the old argument which has been advanced ever since the days of John Marshall in respect to controversies between the executive and legislative branches of Government relating to the opening of the files. We have had that question over and over again.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, does the Senator decline to yield to any Senator?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I simply do not wish to prolong what is completely pointless on the part of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The whole evening has been rather pointless.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understood the Senator to say, in referring to two men, that they walked like Communists, looked like Communists, and talked like Communists. I think if we could spot Communists by their looks——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York is asking a question, I yield; otherwise I do not yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I will come to the question in a moment.

I think that if we could spot Communists by the manner in which they walk, our task in fighting communism would be far simpler than it is.

I would very much appreciate it if the Senator would tell us—and he would make a real contribution if he would—how he could spot any man as being a Communist, by his looks or by his walk. If he can do that, he certainly must have powers of perception which go far beyond anything known in human history.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I think it is a great mistake to take something that is so very important and try to make a farce of it. The Senator from New York is intelligent enough to know that if I say a man looks like a duck, eats like a duck, and walks like a duck I mean that in a figurative sense. The Senator likewise knows that if I say a man looks like a Communist, walks like a Communist, and talks like a Communist I mean that if a man associates with Communists and talks as Communists do and is very friendly with Communists, praises communism, attacks and belittles American democracy, joins Communist-front organizations, contributes money to them, and praises the Russian Communist system above our own, he probably is a Communist.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, let me observe——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think I should let the Senator from New York observe what he has in mind.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to point out that the Senator's answer certainly is not responsive to my question. He tried to identify these men as Communists—and they may be Communists—because, as he described them, they walk like Communists, they look like Communists, and they talk like Communists. That is an issue that is not new in politics. The accusation is made by the Senator——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me make clear that I have not seen them physically walk; I have not looked upon their faces; but when I speak of their looking like Communists and acting like Communists and walking like Communists, I am speaking of the record of those men and how they look in that record. The Senator from New York knows that.

I do not know whether those men are tall or short or fat or lean.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not think the Senator could describe a Communist by the way Communists look.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Referring to the request for secrecy in regard to these names, I ask the Senator whether he has tried to keep these names secret from the President of the United States?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I have not. I have offered the names to the President.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator whether in the telegram he sent from Nevada about a week ago to the President, there appears this language:

> In the Lincoln Day speech at Wheeling, Thursday night, I stated that the State Department harbors a nest of Communists and Communist sympathizers who are helping to shape our foreign policy. I further stated that I have in my possession the names of 57 Communists who are in the State Department at present. A State Department spokesman promptly denied this, claiming that there is not a single Communist in the Department.

Then, omitting some intermediate portions of the telegram, does not the telegram to the President resume as follows:

> Despite this State Department black-out, we have been able to compile a list of 57 Communists in the State Department. This list is available to you.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the Senator so telegraph the President?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the Senator then continue in his telegram to the President, as follows:

> But you can get a much longer list by ordering Secretary Acheson to give you a list of those whom your own board listed as being disloyal, and who are still working in the State Department.

Is that a part of the telegram the Senator sent?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator referred to having spoken at Wheeling on Thursday night. That was Thursday night, February 9; was it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Where did the Senator speak the next night?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not speak anywhere the next night. The telegram

was sent on Saturday, the 11th, in the afternoon.

Mr. DONNELL. So 9 days have elapsed since the sending of that telegram to the President of the United States, signed by the Senator from Wisconsin, I assume. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. And the Senator has not yet received any response?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the Senator ever at any time indicate to the President of the United States that he would not reveal the names of the 57, upon the President's request?

Mr. McCARTHY. In order to keep the RECORD absolutely clear, let me say that the telegram places no conditions upon my offer to reveal the names. However, in talking to some members of the press several days later, I told them I did not think I would feel free to give the President the names if he were going to maintain the iron curtain of secrecy, and merely say, "57 more red herrings," and claim that the men were simon pure, with no investigation made.

At that time I did indicate that a condition in connection with giving him the names would be that he draw back the iron curtain of secrecy. That condition was not stated in the telegram, but in fairness to the President I say that I assume that the condition was brought to his attention.

Mr. DONNELL. And if it does draw back the iron curtain of secrecy, of which the Senator from Wisconsin spoke, the Senator from Wisconsin is perfectly willing to give the President the names of every one of the 57 persons; is he?

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no question about that. Furthermore, I urge that the proper Senate committee convene, and I shall be glad to give the committee the names.

Mr. DONNELL. And the Senator from Wisconsin will give that committee every name; and the Senator offered a few moments ago, did he not, to give to the Senator from Kentucky, himself, personally, the names, tomorrow morning, if he wants them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I withdrew that, however, because the Senator said he wishes to make the information public.

I have been a lawyer for a long time, as the Senator from Missouri has; and I am convinced of the communistic connections of these persons—although it is true that some of them might not have paid dues to the Communist Party. But the reports are so convincing that I am confident those persons are working closely with the Communist Party.

Nevertheless, I do not think that, as a general proposition, one Member of the Senate should rise on the floor of the Senate and should make public the names of 81 persons in that way. If the matter were so urgent that that would be the only way to proceed, the names could be gotten, that would be another matter. But all of us will be back tomorrow, a committee can be convened tomorrow, and I am perfectly willing to give the names to a committee.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Wisconsin is perfectly willing to give the names to a Senate committee. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the majority of the Senate thinks it is proper to make them public on the floor of the Senate, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. A moment ago the distinguished minority leader [Mr. WHERRY], demanded the regular order. I second that demand. The Senator from Wisconsin is discussing an unsurpassably important question. He should be permitted to conclude his address without further interruption, and we should be permitted to hear all that he has to say without being required to sit up all night like wild cats and having to sleep all day tomorrow like hoot owls. Therefore I purpose to object to any further yielding by the Senator to anyone, for any purpose except that of asking a question, and I shall demand the strict enforcement of the rule.

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield only for a question.

Mr. WITHERS. I wish to ask one or two questions.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield for as many questions as the Senator wishes to ask.

Mr. WITHERS. The Senator from Wisconsin stated a short time ago that he would not disclose the names of the persons to the President unless the President would use the names and would pull back the iron curtain; the Senator from Wisconsin said he would give the names to the President if he would start to work on them.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, Senator, this is not a game.

Mr. WITHERS. Wait a minute. I asked the Senator a question. Let him answer it.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I answer the Senator?

Mr. WITHERS. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. It may not be the answer the Senator wants, but it will be an answer. I may say to the Senator, this is not a game. I have told the President he could have the names, and subsequently I indicated I felt it would be useless to give him the names and let him issue a whitewash statement, saying "57 red herrings." I felt that the minimum the American people could ask for was that he revoke the rule which, so far as I know, had never been in existence before he enforced it. He should not be worried about a Congress which has a majority of his own party, and when he does that, he can have the names. But I do not want the names buried behind a curtain of secrecy. I have enough confidence in the Senate however to feel that any committee of the Senate, when it gets the information and takes the trouble to go over it, together with the names, will insist that the President give them the information to which they are entitled. I believe perhaps the American people, both Democrats and Republicans—and I do not think, Mr. President, there will be found any party line of division—the 150,000,000 American people will say to the President, "Mr. President, you cannot hide these Communists behind an iron curtain. Give the Congress the information which is in the files; let them know; let them decide whether or not a house cleaning is in order." I am sure that if the Senator sits in on the hearings—and I hope they are extended—I am sure before he gets through he will agree with me 100 percent.

Mr. WITHERS. I want to ask the Senator this question: If I understand the Senator, he would not give the names to the President, unless the President would use them. Now, I asked the Senator for the names. The Senator said he would give me the names. I told the Senator I wanted to use them, and he would not give them to me, because I was going to use them. In other words, the Senator refused to give them to the President, because he would not use them, and he refused to give them to me, because I intended to use them. Does the Senator find himself in an inconsistent attitude in that respect?

Mr. McCARTHY. I wonder whether we have understood each other. I told the Senator if he came to my office tomorrow morning he could have all the names. As I understand the Senator—and I may have been mistaken—he said he would make them public.

Mr. WITHERS. Yes, that is using them.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is using them.

Mr. WITHERS. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then the Senator from Kentucky is correct; the Senator from Wisconsin will not give him the names in the morning.

To continue. We were on Case No. 38. This individual is employed in a very responsible position in the Broadcasting Division of OIE, the Voice of America. As early as December 10, 1946, an investigation by the State Department's own security agency was to the effect that this man was a fanatical Communist; that he is anticapitalistic and definitely follows the party Communist line. Another investigative agency advised that a reliable informer reported that a well-known Communist in Newark, N. J., gave him the unqualified information that this individual was a paid-up party member. I believe I have commented on the fact that here we have two Federal security agencies, each reporting the same thing. I believe I have read this, in regard to his activities as a newspaper reporter.

At the time he organized a strike and picket line, he had repeated conferences with a well-known New York Communist whose name is, of course, in the State Department's report. The State Department's own security agency recommended that this individual not be retained. However, as of today he is in the extremely important position in the broadcasting division of the World-Wide News Unit of OIE, in New York City, thereby to at least some extent controlling information which we are giving to the balance of the world. Do Senators follow this? This is a man who in

1946 was reported, not by one agency but by two, and the security agency recommended that he be dismissed. That was 3 or 4 years ago. The man is still in that very important position. This seems to be one of the most dangerous cases we have. In view of the Secretary's statement that he would discharge before sundown any Communists now in the State Department whose name was brought to his attention, I suggest that he immediately take action on this individual. He can start on him. The Secretary has about 12 hours more or less, in fact, about 18 hours, before sundown. He can show his good faith by discharging this man. He should have no trouble whatever finding him. He will find that two Federal investigative agencies said, "This man is a Communist, do not keep him; get rid of him." He will find that the man is still working. The Secretary, in case he has not acquainted himself with the McCarran bill, will note that he has the absolute right to terminate this man's services tomorrow. I should like to hope that we would get word from the Secretary to the effect that he had done so.

Case No. 39. This individual was appointed on January 2, 1947, as an economic analyist in Research and Intelligence. Again we find the old pattern back in Intelligence. He had been employed by the Soviet Purchasing Commission for a period from 1932 to 1945. In other words, he worked for the Soviet Purchasing Commission for 13 years. It was established by the State Department's own investigator that this individual could not have qualified for a position with the Soviet Purchasing Commission unless he were a member of the Communist Party. Despite this fact, this individual was given a job in Intelligence; which, as may have been noted, seems to be a favored spot for the Communists.

As to this individual, I frankly do not know whether he is now in the State Department or not.

Case No. 40 is that of another individual in Research, in the State Department since 1947. I do not have too much information on this, except the general statement by the agency that there is nothing in the files to disprove his communistic connections. He is still with the Government.

Case No. 41 is that of an individual born in 1910 in Cleveland, Ohio, appointed to a high position with the State Department, drawing the sum of $8,478.75 as an Assistant Chief in the Division of Occupied Areas. He is still in a high-paid position in the State Department. Investigation by the State Department's own security agency disclosed that most of his close associates and friends have records as fellow-travelers and Communists. He admitted having contributed money to a Communist-front organization.

There is a memorandum in the file to the effect that Joe Panuch had made considerable efforts to get this man out of the State Department. He was unsuccessful, however, and, incidentally, the information I get—and this is not so much from the files—is that this man Panuch tried to do a job of housecleaning and was given somewhat of a free hand under Jimmy Byrnes in starting to accomplish the job. However, when Byrnes left and Marshall took over—Senators will recall Acheson was then Under Secretary—the first official act of General Marshall was to discharge the man, Panuch. Obviously, General Marshall did not know anything about the situation. Some one of the underlings said, "Get rid of this man." It would seem to be only the logical thing that he would not, as his first official act, discharge a man, unless the Under Secretary said, "Get rid of him;" which is rather unusual. Here is one man who had tried to do the job of housecleaning, and the ax falls.

Case No. 42. This individual came to the United States in 1940, and was naturalized in Alabama in 1943. He returned to Germany as a civilian employee of the War Department in November 1946. He was appointed by the State Department to one of our intelligence departments. Both his brother and sister are listed as possible agents of the Comintern, and are active in Communist circles. There was evidence recommending dismissal. The report is that the evidence is sufficient to recommend dismissal. There is no information that indicates anything other than close Communist connections. Despite this fact, this man was never fired, but finally resigned in June 1947.

Case No. 43 is that of an individual who is a research analyst in the Division of Research for the Far East. He was recommended for the position by an individual who was listed by the FBI as a principal in a Soviet espionage case. The record indicates he is running very closely with a pack of Communists. This again is the old pattern—one Communist gets into a department, and he recommends another. In this case the FBI said the man who was trying to get him in is a principal in a Soviet espionage case.

Case No. 44. This is a rather interesting case of an individual who was sent to Paris to represent the State Department. A note dated September 15, 1947, listed him as cleared for Unesco placement. He was described in reports by various witnesses as interested in communism and by his roommate at the International House as a Communist. He pals around with a friend of two individuals known to be either Communists or fellow travelers. There is something in his file which I think is rather interesting. A note addressed to "David" and signed "M" inquires as to whether there is danger of this individual having another mental breakdown, which he had at one time in the past. While I do not have the exact wording of the note it, in effect, says get rid of this man, otherwise he may break and cause embarrassment if Congress gets ahold of him. The note is contained in the man's private file. It is a pencil note. Reading such stuff as this, one is not surprised at the President's action in signing the order, lowering the curtain.

Case No. 45 is the case of an individual who was a ranking official in the Office of Financial Development Policy. He was appointed in August 1946. Investigation indicates that he was very closely tied up with at least three individuals who have been named as Communists. He also recommended for appointment an individual very closely tied up with a Communist, who has been named as an espionage agent. So far as I can discover, this man was never discharged, but apparently resigned later, whether to take other government employment or private employment, I do not know.

Case No. 46 is the case of a man who holds a high position in the State Department. He had been affiliated with the magazine Amerasia from May 1937 to November 1941. This magazine consistently followed the Communist Party line. It was under the direction of Philip Jaffe and William Vanderbilt Field. Field has been a leading Communist and was one of the heads of the American Peace Mobilization, which the President and the Secretary of State publicly labeled as a tool of communism. Jaffe, as Senators will recall, was convicted and fined in connection with the John Service incident. It will be recalled that the FBI picked up Service for having delivered secret State Department documents to Amerasia. The State Department files show that this individual has been working very closely with these two men. On March 22, 1946, the State Department's own security agency recommended as follows:

> It is recommended that action be instituted to terminate subject's service with the State Department. It is suggested to achieve this purpose that an appropriate officer of the Department should inform him that his continued presence in the Department is embarrassing to the Department and that he be given an opportunity to resign. If he should not resign voluntarily, action should be instituted under Civil Service Rule No. 12, to terminate his services with the Department.

The Department, however, took no action upon this recommendation.

After that recommendation, the files show that this individual requested a fellow traveler to seek a position with the Board of Economic Warfare. The file further shows that this individual has been visited on several occasions by an alien fellow traveler. He has also recommended two former employees of the Amerasia Editorial Board to positions with the State Department. In other words, Mr. President, the usual tactics of getting into an important position and then bringing in fellow Communists.

A report dated August 18, 1947, recorded an interview with a former member of the Editorial Board of Amerasia who labeled this individual as "far to the left—awfully close to a fellow traveler." This individual was a subscriber to the Daily Worker. The file names a Communist Party member who has twice worked for this individual. The Biographical Register of the State Department shows him to be still in a position of importance there.

Case No. 47. This individual was employed in March 1944, as Division Assistant in the Division of Internal Security. The House Un-American Activities Committee advised on August 18, 1947, that an admitted former Communist Party member was formerly associated with this individual in Communist activities

in Washington, D. C. This individual's husband admitted having been a member of the Communist Party. The husband now has a highly confidential position with the Navy Department. The file indicates that this individual has been associated with a group of known Communists.

Keep in mind, Mr. President, that she was given a job in the Division of Internal Security.

A report dated July 16, 1947, states that in 1941 a Senate investigating committee had found that both this individual and her husband were members of the Communist Party. A report dated September 15, 1947, by a Government investigative agency, advised that a reliable informant reported this individual as a Communist, and that she has been recently contacting a member of the Soviet espionage ring. This individual is still in a highly paid job in the State Department.

Cases Nos. 48 and 49. One of these individuals is in the State Department in the Division of Occupied Areas. The wife is with the State Department in the Division of Research and Intelligence. The file shows that both the husband and wife are known to be close associates of individuals linked with Soviet espionage activities. Nevertheless, the wife was approved for top-secret material on the 11th of February 1947. The order approving her is rather unusual, in that it states, in effect, that the reason for her being approved for top secret material was that there was insufficient information to warrant her discharge on grounds of disloyalty.

Case No. 50. This individual is an executive secretary in the State Department. He has been reported by another Government investigative agency as having been in contact with a Soviet espionage agent. He is also a close friend of two employees of the State Department who are under investigation because of Communist associates.

Case No. 51. This individual agreed that he was responsible for the State Department's having employed an individual in one of the cases which I covered earlier today. It will be recalled that No. 14 was the case of an individual having furnished material to a known secret espionage ring and who had consistent contacts with long lists of Communists and suspected Soviet agents. He is still holding an important position in the State Department.

Case No. 52. This individual works for No. 16—I think that is the correct number—who, the State Department files indicate, was one of the most dangerous espionage agents in the Department. This individual was also temporarily employed as a correspondent of another individual listed as a Soviet agent by a Federal investigative agency. He and his wife are also close associates of two other alleged espionage agents who are named in the State Department files. He is presently holding a high-salaried and important position in the State Department and has been given top-secret clearance.

Here is a rather important case. In fact, they are all important. This is case No. 53, involving an individual who has been named by a confessed Communist spy as part of his spy ring. Prior to that time, on August 19, 1946, another governmental agency received information to the effect that he was a recognized leader of the Communist underground. This individual is, in my opinion, Mr. President, one of the most dangerous Communists in the State Department.

Case No. 54. This individual has been connected with a number of Communist-front organizations and was active in attempting to secure the issuance of a nonimmigration visa to a French Communist leader. This individual is presently employed in the State Department.

Cases No. 55. This individual was a close friend and associate of an individual described earlier in the day. It will be recalled that he was a very close associate of Soviet agents. A previous employer of this individual described her as having been "wrapped up" in communism and that she later married a man who was also a Communist. The files of the Department show that "she and her husband are contacts of a subject in the —— espionage case." The case referred to is a recent and very important Communist case.

Case No. 56. This individual was born in Russia and naturalized in San Francisco in 1929. Two former supervisors on non-Government jobs had recommended him unfavorably. The only favorable reference he had was from three Russian individuals, all in Government employment. He roomed with one of the Russians who had recommended him. The Navy Department informed the State Department that this individual had secret State Department documents in the room shared by him and the other Russian An investigation was instituted, the outcome of which I do not know. However, this individual was still in the State Department as late as December 1949

Case No 57. This individual was employed by the State Department in 1946 as a P-7 consultant. On June 7, 1946, a Government investigative agency advised that this individual was the contact man for a Russian espionage ring.

This report also included information to the effect that he had played bridge and exchanged language lessons with persons in the Soviet Embassy. On June 7, 1946, the same investigative agency reported that a known Soviet espionage agent was arrested with his wife in Finland in the 1930's and that while in custody this espionage agent's wife has requested the American Consul to forward on her behalf a request for funds from this individual. This individual had been in charge of the training of Soviet marines at one time at a Russian port. Nevertheless, this individual, on September 11, 1947, was given top secret clearance. The clearance officer in this case said:

> In the absence of additional highly derogatory information I feel that top secret clearance should be given.

I have been unable to find out whether this individual is working with the State Department at the present time, and, if not, whether he is in private or Government employment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he has submitted the names represented by the reports he has read and the other approximately 250 names to which references have been made? Has he submitted those names to the Secretary of State?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not follow the Senator's question. Have I submitted 250 names?

Mr. LEHMAN. I asked whether the Senator had submitted to Secretary Acheson the names represented by the reports which he has read, as well as the other approximately 250 names to which references have been made. The reason I mentioned 250 names is because I am adding the 57 names to the 205 names which have been mentioned on several occasions. I ask whether those names or any substantial number of them have been submitted to the Secretary of State?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have given Secretary Acheson nothing—period.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not understand the Senator's answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said I have given Secretary Acheson nothing—period. So that there may be no confusion, and I think I have explained it twice to the Senator—the Senator is not dull and knows what I am talking about—the 205 persons who were mentioned in Secretary Byrnes' letter were those whom the State Department refused to fire after the Security Agency had recommended that they be fired. I told the Senator that I did not have those names. All I have is the total number. The Secretary of State has those names, however. All he needs to do is to go to his files.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator for conceding that I am not dull, but I still do not understand why these names have not been submitted to the Secretary of State. I can understand the Senator's unwillingness to submit to this body or to any other public body the names of men accused on somewhat unsubstantiated charges, but I do not understand his unwillingness to submit the names to the responsible official, the head of the State Department, whom he is accusing of laxness. I wonder whether the Senator will make some further explanation in order that the matter may be clear to me.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am afraid that if it is not clear to the Senator now I shall never be able to make it clear to him, no matter how much further explanation I make. I told the Senator that the Secretary of State has the names as to which I am reading the numbers. They are in the files of the Secretary of State. I am giving the Senator information which is confirmed by information in the files in the Office of the Secretary of State. It should be clear to the Senator that all the information which I am giving on the floor of the Senate has been available to the Secretary of State for a long time. If the Secretary of State does not know

that the investigative agency has recommended that certain individuals be discharged, he can easily check and find out. The files are all in his possession.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield for a question

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know, or can he tell Senators, whether or not the loyalty board has checked any of these persons whom he is describing here by numbers?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have just told the Senator I do not know.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. I do not believe that the name "loyalty board" has come into the debate as yet. But I am not sure. I was not clear as to what agency the Senator was referring to.

Mr. McCARTHY. The name I used was "investigative agency." When employees from temporary war agencies were transferred to the State Department, a board was set up to screen them. Whether that was called the loyalty board, I do not know. It was an investigative agency. I do not know that at any one time there were two investigative agencies. There may have been.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If I understand the Senator correctly, the persons who are represented by the numbers which he has now given to the Senate, without giving any names, have been recommended to be discharged by the loyalty board selected by the President of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know whether that is correct. I have tried to make this clear. I do not have the names of all the individuals the loyalty board recommended be discharged. I found in the reports, however, a sizable number whom the investigative agency has recommended should be discharged. Let me make that clear. There was one group of 205, back in 1946. Since that time the investigative agency recommended that other groups be discharged. The treatment which was given to those recommendations was substantially the same as was given to the recommendations in 1946. In 1946, Secretary Byrnes said, out of 285, 79 were discharged. That is the first group. With subsequent groups the same action was taken. I have never had the names of all the groups. I do not even know how many there are. I know 206 is the definite number in the first group, because the Secretary of State has said there were 206.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator familiar with the personnel of the loyalty board?

Mr. McCARTHY. Frankly, I am not.

Mr. LUCAS. If it should turn out that some of the individuals whom the Senator has named by number have been cleared by the loyalty board, would that affect the Senator's opinion with respect to those persons?

Mr. McCARTHY. I would have to know something of the personnel of the loyalty board. When Communists are able to get their men into the Central Intelligence Agency and into the highest spots in the State Department, I assume that a prize target would be the loyalty board. So I cannot tell the Senator what I would think of this board's recommendations. If I had an FBI report on the loyalty board, and if it were a good, competent board, certainly that would mean something to me. However, when I find that some individuals who have been reported by the investigative agency to be Communists were given top-secret clearance, and if the loyalty board is in charge of giving top-secret clearance, it would indicate that the loyalty board is not too competent.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know what part the loyalty board has played in this investigation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Nor do I.

Mr. LUCAS. But I am sure they will be in it, because undoubtedly they have checked and double checked these individuals who are now identified by numbers. The Senator will find that the President's loyalty board is headed by a very capable and competent lawyer by the name of Seth Richardson, who is a very representative Republican and a tremendously loyal American. I see two Senators on the Republican side rising.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. All I say is that I hope the Senator will look at the names of the members of the Loyalty Board.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I intend to object to any Senator making a speech in the time of the Senator from Wisconsin. I made that statement before. He will either hold the floor or lose it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I might say that I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Michigan for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will yield in a moment. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. The hour is getting late, and I am very willing to yield for a question, but if I am to finish these remarks tonight, I do not care to yield for any more speeches.

I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely desired to ask the Senator whether he knew that Seth Richardson was the head of the loyalty appeals board, and not the board which might be operating in the State Department.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that Mr. Richardson has no jurisdiction whatsoever over any State Department employee, unless a State Department employee feels he has been badly treated, and appeals to Mr. Richardson's board. But Mr. Richardson does not pass upon any of the cases originally. If the State Department fails to fire a man who should be discharged, then nothing comes to Mr. Richardson.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the Senator is speaking about a security committee, composed of State Department employees, rather than a loyalty board, and that he is speaking about a committee that was in existence prior to the loyalty board?

Mr. McCARTHY. I might say that I do not know what the technical name of the investigative agency is. I know that within the State Department investigations are conducted. Some of those investigations may be conducted by the FBI; I do not know. I find, however, that in some cases information is received from several investigative agencies. What the technical names are, I frankly do not know.

Case No. 58. This individual was a research analyst with OSS from July 1944 to September 1945, when he was transferred to the State Department, where he is presently in the Research Division. He has been a member of at least one Communist-front organization. For many years he has been a close friend of an important subject in a Russian espionage case, both residing in the same apartment building. A Government investigative agency reported on July 11, 1947, that he was a member of the Communist Party. Now I ask the Senate to listen to this. He is holding an important position in the State Department today even though he was reported on July 11, 1947, to be a member of the Communist Party.

Case No. 60. This individual was employed by OSS, in the Division of Research, from June 1942 to September 1945, at which time he was transferred to the State Department. He is now a branch chief in Research and Intelligence. One of his former suprevisors stated that he was a Communist.

For some time he has resided with another State Department employee, previously mentioned herein, whose investigation was requested because of communistic activities. Nevertheless, this individual has been cleared and is still working in an important position where he handles top-secret material in the State Department.

Case No. 61. This individual is employed in Research and Intelligence in the State Department. He has been very active in UPWA, and one of his references has been closely affiliated with Communist-front organizations. A Government investigative agency has indicated the very strong possibility of a close tie-up between this individual and another Communist. The file indicates that additional investigations in this case are necessary. He is still in the State Department.

Case No. 62. This file is not important insofar as communistic activities are concerned, but rather is important because it sheds light on some rather unusual mental aberrations of certain individuals in the Department. In this connection, it perhaps should be mentioned that the types of individuals described in this file are regarded as bad security risks by most investigative agencies for the reason that they are rather easy blackmail victims. This file I recommend to the attention of any committee that cares to investigate it. It goes into some detail in regard to the peculiar—how can we put it—the pecu-

liar mental twists. I was trying to handle this matter delicately. I think this will be of interest to the committee in that it gives a rather interesting picture of some rather unusual mental twists of these gentlemen who are tied up with some of the Communist organizations.

Also it is confirmation of what I believe I mentioned earlier this evening when I was talking about one of the top investigators in Washington. I said to him, "Why do you find so many people fanatic about communism? Is there something that is so inviting about it? Is there something mentally wrong?" He said, "You will find if you search deep enough that there is something mentally or physically wrong with every one of them." There is certainly something wrong with this group. I might say that the new security officer has recommended that they get rid of all that type of individuals regardless of whether they are shown to have any communistic connection or not.

Case No. 63. This individual is employed by the State Department in Research and Intelligence. He was with Army Intelligence from 1944 to June 1946. In April 7, 1947, he was given a security clearance from the State Department. The files of the State Department investigative agency show that he is a very close associate of a former War Department employee who was dropped because it was believed he passed information and material to Soviet agents. One of his associates at the War Department, with whom he has since been in contact, is an individual who has been very active with communistically inclined groups. He has been a very close associate of another known Communist sympathizer. He has been given top secret clearance despite association with other known Communist sympathizers.

Case No. 64. This individual is presently employed in Research and Intelligence in the State Department. Again we find them in Research and Intelligence. The investigative agency files show that informants stated that he and his wife maintained a communistic and un-American attitude. The file indicates that the wife admitted being a member of the Communist Party. The file further shows that he is a close friend of a number of Russian agents connected with a major espionage case.

The investigation of this case was held up because the investigation at that time might have upset the investigation of what was considered a major espionage case, which was in the process of investigation. This individual apparently still enjoys clearance to top-secret documents.

Case No. 65. This individual is also still in the State Department in the Office of Information and Education and holds an important position. It would appear from his activities that he is very definitely communistically inclined. However, it is entirely possible that this individual is merely a left-winger who has been dominated by No. 81, who will be covered later, and a group of Communists and fellow travelers who have surrounded No. 81, to the extent that he has received credit for many of the Communist activities of No. 81. By No. 81 I refer to the case which I shall cover shortly. For that reason, while the work flowing from his office would indicate that he is sympathetically inclined at least toward Communists, I would hesitate in labeling him as such. In any event, however, I feel that he certainly is a bad risk in that position.

Case No. 66. This individual is also employed by the State Department as a music director in the Voice of America. He was listed on the draft classification as 4–F because of being a psychoneurotic. He and his mother, with whom he lived, provided a coffee kitchen for communistically inspired protest groups. He also worked for a time for a Communist-dominated organization. He studied for a time in the New School for Social Research under Hans Eisler, who, Senators recall, appeared before the House Un-American Committee. This individual is mentioned principally because he seemed to be representative of the group which accumulated around No. 81, whom I consider one of the big shots.

Case No. 67. This individual was employed by OWI in March 1942, and transferred to the State Department when that agency was taken over by the Department. After a meeting of Communists and Communist sympathizers, he was arrested for disorderly conduct. Two members of the Soviet underground attempted to get him out of difficulty and hush up matters so he would not lose his position in the State Department, which indicates that he is of importance to the Soviet underground. This information was set forth in detail in a memorandum, dated June 17, 1946, by an investigative agency, and brought to the attention of the State Department. However, this individual was still with the State Department in June 1947, and still had top-secret clearance. On July 16, 1947, a hearing was finally held. I am not aware of the outcome of this hearing. However, my best knowledge is that he is no longer with the State Department, but whether he resigned, was discharged, or whether he received a job with some other Government agency I do not know. I feel this case is important, Mr. President, for a number of reasons; one of them being that after it was definitely proven that the Communist underground had a deep interest in this man, and wanted to help him out, he still was given access to top-secret material for more than a year.

Case No. 68. This individual was with the OIE. He signed Communist Party petitions in which he alleged that he was a member thereof, as did his parents also. On November 4, 1941, the Civil Service Commission recommended his removal from the Government. This was never acted upon. He is still in the State Department and has been given top clearance.

Case No. 69. This individual was also employed by the OIE. However, little information was available on him except that he is a Russian, and that his sister is a known Communist and that he associates closely with Communists.

Case No. 70. This individual again is the typical Voice of America employee. The investigative agencies have indicated that he is affiliated with Communist-front organizations and has communistic sympathies. He is still with the State Department.

Case No. 71. This individual was employed by OIE in February 1943. He entered the United States in 1942 illegally. He is a Bulgarian. He lived 6 months with the editor of a Communist-controlled Bulgarian newspaper. He is a close associate of known Communists.

The Government investigative agency reported that the subject was reluctant to bear arms during the war, and that he faked inability to understand or speak English so as to avoid the draft. He was issued a certificate of naturalization on October 8, 1945, on a false petition which stated that he entered the United States on May 6, 1941. He is still working for the State Department, despite a rule that aliens shall not work therein, and while I have not been able to go into the matter completely, I have been informed that he also has top-secret clearance.

Case No. 72. This case, Mr. President, is interesting in that it is the direct opposite from the cases I have been reading. I cite it to show that unless one has a communistic background one cannot qualify for a position with the Voice of America, at least in the New York office. This man applied for a job with the Voice of America. He was investigated in the fall of 1946 for a position on the Russian desk of OIE. Investigation showed he was a refugee from the Red revolution. He was naturalized in 1927. He has a reputation as an expert in Russian affairs, having studied them for a period of many years. He was employed with OSS from February 1942 to December 1942, and then was requested to resign. He was forced to resign because of Communist pressure. A known Communist and a NKVD agent in the United States openly stated, according to the Intelligence files, that he was too anti-Communist to be employed by OSS. This man's immediate superior with OSS told him he was forced to fire him because of circumstances beyond his control. A high State Department official confirmed the reason for this man's dismissal from OSS.

This individual was very highly recommended by several witnesses as a high type of man, a democratic American, who supported democracy for Russia and opposed communism. However, he was turned down and was never employed by OIE. This was at a time when they were taking on all the other debris I have just described. Fortunately, however, his services are being presently made use of by McCloy in Germany, where he is acting fiscal adviser and, I understand, doing a good job. I believe I overlooked stating that he was born in Kiev, Russia, in 1877. I do not confuse this man, as I said, as being a Communist. The reason I cite the case is to show that the one good, sure way not to get into the Voice of America is that one is a loyal American and not an anti-Communist.

Case No. 73. This individual is in the Foreign Service. He was born in 1913, practiced law from September 1936 to September 1942. He was with the Board of Economic Warfare from November 1942 to September 1943. He has been with the State Department as a senior economic analyst from September 1943 until the present time. He was an applicant for a position as Foreign Service career officer. An investigative report dated June 1947 disclosed that he has always associated with known leftists and was highly recommended by four well-known fellow travelers. While in California his closest associates for several years were two active Communists. A former law associate for this individual refused to recommend him for Federal employment, stating he was extremely far to the left. A memorandum in his file dated December 12, 1946, requested investigation of black-market activities on his part in Spain. No report on this point, however, has been made available. A superior court judge in California, who has known the subject well, stated that under no circumstances would he recommend him for a Government position, because of his extreme leftism, and that he would not have him in any responsible Government position. Another California judge said this individual associated closely with fellow travelers, and he would definitely not recommend him. This individual, to the best of my knowledge, is still in Foreign Service, stationed in Madrid, Spain.

Case No. 74. This individual was employed on an American mission to the Far East during 1947. Intelligence units indicated that he was furnishing information to a Russian agent, and two sources of information reported that he was representing himself as an American intelligence agent. At that time he had been given clearance to confidential information. He was relieved of his particular assignment and transferred to different work within the Department.

Case No. 75. This individual was employed in December 1946 in the Foreign Service in the State Department. According to the files in the Department, he is a known contact of two suspects in the investigation of Soviet espionage activities in the United States. The investigative report dated March 1947 showed he sent material to one of the Soviet espionage suspects who had previously given him the names of two well known Communists whom he could contact abroad.

Case No. 76. This does not involve communistic activities, but does shed some light upon the possible reasons for some individuals' being employed by the State Department. This involves the case of a young man who was very patently incompetent and who had made gross misstatements in his application. He was turned down for employment. One of the superiors in the Department then wrote a note to the officer who had the task of deciding whether or not to employ this young man. That was after pressure had been applied from above to get him a job. The following is the comment made by the employing officer: "If ——— is so little concerned with the quality of Department personnel, there is little we can do. I believe he is more interested in the politics of the situation."

That is signed and dated.

Case No. 77. This young man applied for a position in the State Department. The file indicates he is a very close friend of reported Communists, and that he is closely associated with members of Communist-front organizations. The file indicates that his wife belongs to an organization listed as subversive by the House Un-American Activities Committee, and that a relative of his has a financial interest in the Daily Worker.

Mr. President, I believe I have covered this case before, and what I have just said seems to be a repetition. This is the case of a young man who ended up as a speech writer in a well-known house in Washington.

Case No. 78. This individual has made application for a P–8 position in the State Department. He has been employed by the Treasury Department from April 1940 up to the present time, except for military release from July 1942 to December 1942. State Department files show that he was highly recommended by two individuals engaged in Soviet espionage activities. Another Government investigative agency indicated that he was one of the contacts of the subject of a Soviet espionage case. One of his references refused to recommend him because of his association with pro-Communists. This individual is still holding a high-salaried position with the Treasury Department, in work, as I understand, directly with the State Department.

Case No. 79. This individual is on the special project staff at the State Department. The intelligence report in his file indicates that numerous informants reported he was pro-Communist, radical, and of dubious background. However, I understand he has been given top secret clearance.

Case No. 80. This individual is a chief in the Division of International Labor. The Department's investigative agency indicates receipt of information in October 1946, to the effect that this individual was a member of at least one Communist-front organization and is a fellow traveler. He, however, still retains his position in the State Department.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Wisconsin have a case No. 37 among the cases he is presenting?

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot tell at the moment, because the reporters for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have been using some of my papers. But I assume I had a case No. 37.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wondered why the Senator took them out of order. Is there any reason why he did not take them in order, beginning with No. 1, and going down through them?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did take them in order.

I get the impression that the Senator may have a file of his own, and apparently I do not have the same cases he has. I am very glad to know the Senator has, if that is the answer. However, I have taken them in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said: Mr. President, some of the papers have just been returned to my desk; and if I may do so, I shall give the Senator from Michigan the information that I do have a case No. 37.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator does?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. May I see it?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Next, Mr. President, I come to case No. 81. I think this individual has been doing this Nation untold damage because of the high position she holds in the Voice of America. This individual was in the Voice of America project, in the New York office, until some time ago. She was transferred to Europe, technically under control of the Commanding General, in the same type of work as the Voice of America, and subsequently the entire project was transferred back to the State Department, and she is today in the State Department.

I should like to read this material. Incidentally, this is the last case we have.

The file in this case contains a wealth of information indicating that this individual is an extremely dangerous and active Communist, completely disloyal to the United States, and loyal to Soviet Russia. Much of the information here, however, was given in strictest confidence but I shall try to give somewhat of a picture of this person.

It is perhaps sufficient to point out that the witnesses without exception have stated in essence that this individual has collected in her office a mixture of fellow travelers and pseudo liberals and outright Communists. These witnesses indicate that the group is close knit and attempts a vicious character assassination of anyone who attempts to disagree with them, and apparently rather successfully so.

All this information comes from the files of the investigative agency, and, as I have just said, shows that the witnesses indicate that the group is close knit and attempts a vicious character assassination job of anyone who attempts to disagree with them.

The witnesses without exception seem to feel that this individual has exerted a great deal of control over the information used on the Voice of America, and is doing the United States immeasurable damage.

I understand that this individual is now in Europe, and, although technically under the control of the Army, is in effect, to all intents and purposes, under the control of the State Department, and is still doing the same work as that involved in the Voice of America, formerly worked on in New York.

Mr. President, since this paper was dictated night before last I find that she is back in the State Department.

Immediate steps should be taken, in my opinion, to obtain not only the discharge but the prosecution of this individual.

Mr. President, I may also say that I feel very strongly that cases Nos. 1, 2, and

81 should not only be discharged but should be immediately prosecuted. However, unless the President will cooperate with us in that, the possibility of a successful prosecution is rather remote, because of the complete iron curtain of secrecy.

I wish to thank very much the Senators who very patiently have remained here and have listened to what may have been somewhat tedious during the last 8 hours.

I assure them that I tried to keep my remarks as brief as possible, while at the same time giving Senators all the pertinent information from the files.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a moment, and then I shall move that the Senate take a recess.

I do not know whether the newspaper clippings which have come over my desk are correct or incorrect. However, I know that the reporters for the wire services and other reporters for various newspapers who heard the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin in his latest tour across the country have reported many things he said which alarmed me, to say the least.

When the Senator from Wisconsin was at Wheeling, W. Va., the newspapers reported that the Senator declared he had a list of 205 persons working for the State Department, who were known to the Secretary of State to be members of the Communist Party. When I read that statement I was shocked, and alarmed, as I had a right to be. It seemed to me that if the Senator from Wisconsin had a list of 205 persons whom he knew to be working in the State Department, and he waited to go on a Republican tour in West Virginia in order to tell the people of the country the fact, it seemed to me to be slightly out of order. If he had the information, he should have reported it directly to the Secretary of State or to a committee of the Senate of the United States.

Not satisfied with that, in Reno, Nev., when he was making another political speech, the Senator from Wisconsin said he had compiled a list of 57 Communists in the State Department. Later, in another speech, he named four individuals, three of whom, I understand, have not been with the Department for some time, one of whom was never with the State Department. In that statement the Senator from Wisconsin said he hastened to say he did not charge any one of the four with being a Communist.

Mr. President, the only thing the Senator from Illinois has been attempting to get, and it is information, which the Senate and the country are entitled to have—is a statement of the names of these individuals in the State Department, and to get the names as fast as possible, in order to clear up any cloud that may be hovering over every member of the State Department at this very moment.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has done an injustice to members of the State Department who are loyal and patriotic, and who are attempting to carry on in the great world crisis in which we find ourselves. Instead of doing so on a political tour, it would have been much better and much more in keeping with the best interest of the Nation, had the Senator submitted the names directly to a committee of the Senate or to the State Department, instead of making political propaganda out of it from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois can speak for the majority party in saying there is not a single Member on this side of the aisle who is not as much interested as is the Senator from Wisconsin in determining where Communists rest, if there are any within the Government departments, and we will do the very thing the Senator is requesting. I guarantee him that a committee will be formed at once, and the Senator from Wisconsin will have an opportunity to come before the committee to tell who these persons are. Before the committee, he will not be able to hide behind numbers. He will have to tell the facts and disclose the names of the persons within the State Department who are Communists. It ought to be done, Mr. President. If such charges can be made against a group in the State Department, without naming them, they can be made against almost any group in any department. Therefore, in view of what the Senator has said upon his political tour over the country, and in view of what he has said on the floor of the Senate tonight, it becomes absolutely necessary to clear this matter up as soon as possible.

So far as I am concerned, if, as the Senator said in his Wheeling, W. Va., speech, if the press quoted him correctly, there is a single person in the Department carrying a Communist card, the Senator from Illinois wants to know about it, and every other Senator wants to know about it. We shall find out. We shall not find out by innuendo and by half truths and distorted facts. The facts, if there are facts, will be produced. We shall not go around talking about No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and so on to No. 83.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say at this time. I repeat what I said in the beginning, that all the Senator from Illinois was trying to find out was as to who the persons in question are. I think the Senate and the country are entitled to know as speedily as possible just who in the State Department is being charged with being a Communist. If the facts produced show that the persons on the list are Communists, the Senator knows that the President of the United States, as well as the Senator from Illinois and every other Member on this side of the aisle will not rest until such Communists are discharged from office. Moreover, if there have been any traitorous acts either of espionage or anything else connected with it, having in mind the numbers the Senator has given us, they, too, will probably be ferreted out.

But, Mr. President, to assert that 205 persons are card carriers of the Communist Party, or that even 87 are card carriers, is to reflect seriously upon the FBI. The FBI knows practically every Communist card carrier in this country. I say the President of the United States and the FBI would not knowingly permit such a card carrier to remain in any Government department. If they would, I should want to find out about it myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I now move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 21, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, we beseech Thee that in this Brotherhood Week our moments of prayer may be radiant with clear visions of high and helpful things that we are privileged to do together for the welfare of humanity.

We believe in no man's infallibility of wisdom and judgment, and may we therefore accept the Master's overtures of counsel in the noble adventure of building a social order which is truly Christian.

Grant that, as brothers of the Son of Man, our minds and hearts may be impervious to those attitudes and feelings which are alien to the spirit of our blessed Lord.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 16, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 229):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, late a Representative from the State of Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the above resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] may have an indefinite leave of absence on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks by inserting an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to on February 16, the Chair designates the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCSWEENEY] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately after the reading of the Journal on Wednesday, February 22, 1950.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HERLONG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

FREEDOM DAY

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, in connection with their campaign in behalf of good government at less cost, the Florida Retailers Association has suggested a new and jubilant national holiday to celebrate tax freedom. The date of the holiday this year would be April 28.

The idea is that from January 1 up to April 28 this year, the average person works for the Government. He will be liberated on April 28 and may then work for himself and his family for the remainder of the year.

I commend this organization for their campaign to call to the attention of the workingman the fact that 32 cents out of every dollar goes for taxes, and 21 cents of that amount are for undercover or hidden taxes. These taxes penalize the workingman out of all proportion because you and I know he must spend, and consequently pay tax on, virtually every dollar he earns in order to live.

Yes; the cost of government is too high. Our best consolation at this time is: Thank God we are not getting all the government we are paying for. On the other hand, if we paid only for the government we got, we could celebrate Tax Liberation Day much earlier in the year.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he delivered last Friday.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Jefferson-Jackson Day speech by the President of the United States.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a petition by Charles C. Price, head of the chemistry department, Notre Dame University, pertinent to world federation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to address the House today for 20 minutes following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 40 minutes following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a resolution which I am today introducing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOLIFIELD addressed the House His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FIFTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE "MAINE"

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was unfortunate that the fifty-second anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* fell on Calendar Wednesday.

There were many veterans of the Spanish-American War, with representatives of patriotic orders, in the galleries in the expectation that the special order previously entered would be reached.

I wish to thank for myself, as well as for all my comrades everywhere, the leaders on both sides of the controversy which is the cause of the futility and confusion of recent Calendar Wednesdays. The leaders on both sides of the controversy, or at least those who seemed to me to carry the prestige of leadership and with whom I talked, were all most cooperative in agreeing that when the legislative business of the day had been disposed of and by a common understanding the time had come to adjourn, the actual motion to adjourn would be withheld until after the proper and fitting observance of an anniversary sacred to veterans of a war of 52 years ago and of tremendous historical significance. It is only fair that I should make this statement in order that no one anywhere, especially no comrade of mine in any camp of the United Spanish War Veterans, should have reason to believe that even in the heat of a bitter controversy on this floor either side to that controversy intentionally would slap at the memory of the *Maine's* heroic dead. Such was not the case, and this fact I wish to be widely known.

My own position on FEPC is well and publicly known. It does not stem from political expediency. My years remaining are not so many that consideration of politics as affecting my personal interest could possibly be an inducement to change the pattern of a lifetime of thought and of action. I do not believe in discrimination, any sort of discrimination, and by my sons and my grandchildren I wish to be remembered, and to that extent to be an influence in their lives, as one who, having had an opportunity to serve in the Congress of the United States, voted against discrimination whenever it showed its ugly head; and voted for all measures calculated to end discrimination and to advance brotherhood.

I do not know of any better way that in my humble sphere I can serve my country and my God. But because in this I am as sincere as sincerity itself I have no right nor thought of questioning the equal sincerity of those who do not agree with me on matters of procedure and of policy. My personal respect for the characters and abilities of my colleagues is not measured by the degree with which our conclusions and our convictions on public questions are or are not in harmony.

I did not think it fair to the memory of the 260 heroes who died in the *Maine* that any of the bitterness of controversy marking our recent Calendar Wednesdays should attach itself to the ceremonies honoring their memory. It speaks most heartenlingly for the character of this body, where functioning democracy has its highest expression, that among all of the leaders or those I judged to be the leaders on both sides of this controversy with whom I talked I found none who was not in hearty agreement. I regret that it was impossible for me to contact every individual Member.

For my comrades, to whom February 15 is a sacred anniversary, I desire from the bottom of my heart to thank the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK]. His remarks as reported at the bottom of column 2, page 1824 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1950, I bring to the attention of all patriotic groups. There is no better work in good citizenship done in America, a work contributing to the building of a strong American character in each succeeding generation, than the work to which these patriotic groups are dedicated in the annual observances of the great anniversaries

of historic events in the progress of our people and the growth of our Republic.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts, our majority leader, had said unanimous consent was necessary for the House to proceed with the *Maine* memorial services as suggested. I am very happy to say that our distinguished colleague who did object has since told me that his action came from a misunderstanding.

I might add that on that very night we met with other Members of Congress who had served overseas or in foreign waters in time of war at the dinner tendered us by the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, a mighty organization of overseas veterans now in its fifty-first year and founded by the men who were the volunteers of 1898 and to whom February 15 will remain a sacred day as long as the breath of life remains with them. As comrades as well as colleagues we joined together in our observance of the *Maine* memorial day and in mutually regretting that a trivial misunderstanding had prevented the intended observance on the floor of the House.

But after the House had adjourned, and before joining up at the commander in chief's dinner, I had driven out past Falls Church down the Lee Highway to the place where now there is a national cemetery on one side of the road and on the other side a tavern and a few other buildings. This was the site of Camp Alger 52 years ago, forgotten by this generation, although the service it rendered 33 years after the end of hostilities in 1865 in healing the still sore wounds of sectional warfare, deserves a better fate than oblivion. It was the camp of the Spanish-American War near the National Capital, and on the soil of Virginia, where regiments from the North and the regiments from the South, again wearing the same uniform, pitched tents together and trained as reunited brothers to fight the battles of the Republic.

Only one person did I find who ever had heard of Camp Alger, so forgotten by the present generation is the war of 1898 that healed the wounds of the war of 1861–65 and started the United States of America on the road to world leadership. I pass his name to the surviving soldiers and sailors of the Spanish-American War with the hope that to him they will send messages of their appreciation. Melvin Steadman is 17 years old and in Falls Church he is known as the historian because every inch of rich historical interest in that locality he has charted with a fidelity to accuracy that could come only from love of country and from willingness to subject himself to the hard, grinding labor of research. He had not fallen into a modern trend of forgetting the Spanish-American War, or of minimizing its far-reaching repercussions. He not alone knew the general site of Camp Alger, but he was able to direct me to the spots where every regiment was camped.

I selected the place by the roadside as best I could where I had stood 52 years ago with my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] of the same regiment, with other boy soldiers from Michigan and from Massachusetts, infantrymen of the Ninth Massachusetts largely from the district now represented by our distinguished majority leader, waving our hats and screaming a welcome to the regiment just in from Tennessee at the head of which marched Col. Cordell Hull, later to become our great Secretary of State.

That night, 52 years ago at Camp Alger, on the soil of Virginia, the tents of the boys from Tennessee were spread beside the tents of the boys from Michigan and Massachusetts. Again the country was at war and it was a united country. God grant that it ever shall remain such and that under the influence of its leadership the world in which we live shall itself be a world united in peace and brotherhood.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the bill H. R. 7192, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McSWEENEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 479, Rept. No. 1665), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3105) to extend the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 480, Rept. No. 1666), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, and all points of orders against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper editorials.

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Keep Flood Control Under the United States Engineers."

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Practice What We Preach."

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, the friends of the Taft-Hartley Act now admit that neither an injunction under that act nor an order from Mr. Lewis can return the miners to the pits against their will. Further, these friends of the act admit that "if this be the shape of events to come, Mr. Lewis will have put himself and his union beyond the reach of the Taft-Hartley Act, for that law does not apply to individual miners." These admissions by the friends of the act bring into the open the misconceived propositions contained in it.

It advances the proposition that a labor union is the property of the union leader and that it exists separately and distinctly from the individual employee. It advances the proposition that a labor union is not necessary for the individual employee to bargain collectively with his employer. It advances the proposition that the individual employee can bargain collectively through a leaderless and emasculated labor union. All these propositions are misconceived and show the fangs of infamous revenge. They pose the doctrine of divide and conquer like a knife at the heart of collective bargaining.

These propositions are like manna to the predatory lust of the National Association of Manufacturers.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill providing for the establishment of an Air Force Academy, which will be a counterpart for West Point and Annapolis. The new Air Academy is to be located at Camp McCoy, near Sparta, Wis.

Last week the Services Academy Board, composed of presidents of universities, met to decide what should be done about establishing an Air Force Academy on a similar basis as that of Annapolis and West Point. The chairman of the Services Academy Board is Dr. Robert L. Stearns, president of the University of Colorado. General Eisenhower, president of Columbia University, is the vice chairman. This Service Academy Board, after praising our Military Academy at West Point and also our Naval Academy at Annapolis, called for an Air Force counterpart.

I am proposing the establishment of the new Air Force Academy at Camp McCoy, Wis., because the Government now is in possession of more than 40,000 acres of land which is ideal for air bases. There are many present Government facilities at Camp McCoy which could be utilized in the building of an Air Academy. The selection of Camp McCoy, which is now an inactive Army post, would mean a great saving to the Government. It would expedite the construction of an Air Academy in that it would not be necessary to acquire land. In addition, the school would be located in a locality which is subjected to the changing temperatures of the temperate zone. This would be particularly desirable in view of the fact that all of our military leaders are taking seriously the prospect that if there is a war fighting will take place where it is bitterly cold. They are anticipating what can be done to train our men in event there are major clashes in the Arctic regions.

Camp McCoy is all the more desirable because not more than 14 miles from it is located a large and modern Government hospital.

In addition, Camp McCoy has excellent transportation facilities being served by both the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific and Chicago & North Western Railroads.

The establishment of the Air Academy at Camp McCoy, Wis., would mean a great deal to western Wisconsin at a time when there is every indication the unemployment situation will become more and more acute. Then, too, it would bring to life a ghost Army installation in which the Government has already invested millions of dollars.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Don't Jump Yet, James."

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him on Iowa people and their State.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a statement showing how the reduction of the tariff on rubber footwear imperils the American workingman.

ALTERNATE CAPITAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the proposition that was made a few moments ago to establish an alternate capital of the United States somewhere in an area where it would be most protected.

That place, it seems to me, would be near Paducah, Ky., for several reasons.

In the first place, it would be near the center of population, remote from the coast, and beyond the mountain ranges.

In the next place it would be on the Ohio River, on the Tennessee, and our inland waterway we are now constructing, and near the Mississippi, with both rail and water transportation available.

It would also be near Mammoth Cave where, in case of an atomic attack, you would have the greatest storm cellar the world ever saw, and one that is big enough to hold the entire Congress and every department and every bureau of this Government.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would suggest Des Moines, Iowa, where it would be completely hidden by the tall corn.

Mr. RANKIN. The trouble about Iowa is that it is too far west, it is not on any stream, so we would be denied the use of water transportation, and it is remote from Mammoth Cave.

I say that near Paducah, Ky., is the best place, when viewed from every standpoint.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BURDICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JONAS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include newspaper articles.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication from the management and labor committee of the Denver Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the American Livestock Association.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and in each to include editorials.

IMPORTS FROM RUSSIA VIA GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like particularly to have the attention of the Members from Boston and the east-shore areas. I think this is an important item for their fishermen.

The British Socialist Government purchased 80,000 cases of crab meat from Russia, presumably canned by Japanese prison slave labor in Russia. They took those 80,000 cases back to England and shipped over 44,000 cases to Boston and New York to be sold in this country at $54 a case. That is expensive crab meat. I thought the people of this country ought to know that we are still permitting important commodities to come in from Russia and now they are coming in the back door, through England, and being sold here. I presume that 34,000 cases now in England will be used just prior to the election to kind of sweeten up some of the people who are not used to eating crab meat in England.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an important matter and that fishermen of the

country ought to know and, particularly, the people who eat this expensive Russian crab meat at $1 a can. I feel the American people should know that we are still doing business with Russia, even through the back door provided by England, and what has happened with imports of crab meat is only a sample.

BRITISH GOVERNMENT SELLING SOVIET-PACKED FOOD IN UNITED STATES

British Food Ministry is selling Russian-packed crab meat from consigned stocks in New York and Boston, insisting on certified checks before releasing Chatka brand to domestic distributors.

Socialist government has already moved to the United States and is selling for its own account about 44,000 cases out of a much larger block acquired from the Communists probably in a barter deal.

Quality crab meat is selling slowly. One reason is that price of $54 for a case of 96 cans is so much higher than competing canned fish. Another is resentment against a product packed in Kamchatka by Russians probably assisted by retained Japanese prisoners of war working as the equivalent of convict labor, so experienced in the canning of crab meat that they furnished us nearly all that type of crab before the war.

British Government recently reduced their price in this selling because of competition from another block of Russian crab meat, secured in a barter deal by a southern California organization and offered to distributors in smaller cases.

Complaints to Washington from domestic crab meat packers, who are not much affected by competing with a quite different product, have become entangled in the usual interdepartmental differences.

Fish and Wildlife Section of Department of Interior resents the British Labor administration dumping Russian products in the United States.

State Department wishes no interferences with British effort to get dollars, especially on the eve of election where the Labor government dumping Communist-produced food in the United States could be made a campaign issue.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF FOOD DISTRIBUTION, INC.
New York, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

THE POTATO SITUATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include a short editorial from the Williamsport (Pa.) Gazette and Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania Cooperative Potato Growers Association want no more part of the Federal price support program for potatoes they are growing this year.

Read this editorial.

When the farmers of my State say that they do not want any support prices on the potato program they realize just what this administration is doing. Running the Government into bankruptcy. Let me show you one item here. Out in Minnesota they paid a farmer for 160,000 pounds of potatoes $1.46 a hundred, or $2,336 to a farmer. Then the farmer bought the potatoes back for $16.

Now, I see in this morning's paper, after paying a penny per hundred pounds he is selling the bags back to the Government for 16 cents a bag. So he is making 1,600 percent on his second purchase of potatoes. He owned the potatoes. He sold them to the Government. Then he bought them back from the Government and the Government is going to pay him 1,200 percent on the price that he paid for the bag. You see Uncle Sam holds the bag. That is some business by this administration. It is the way it runs business. When is it ever going to stop?

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Williamsport (Pa.) Gazette and Bulletin of February 16, 1950]

NO SUPPORT, THANK YOU!

The Pennsylvania Cooperative Potato Growers Association wants no part of the Federal price-support program for the potatoes they grow this year.

That was the unanimous decision of the members of the association at a meeting at Harrisburg this week. The action is a significant sequel to the Federal dumping of the Nation's 1949 surplus potato crop.

Last year, only 4 percent of this State's potato growers signed up for the 1949 potato price-support program, says the association. The State produced 19,000,000 bushels of potatoes. In Maine, 62 percent of the growers were eligible for price support and they grew 72,000,000 bushels of potatoes.

The co-op points out that Pennsylvania potato growers have constantly tried to adjust their production to consumer needs but on a strictly voluntary basis. And that kind of voluntary control doesn't cost the taxpayers any money for price support.

Thus Pennsylvania's potato production contributed less to the surplus with only a small percentage of the growers under Federal control than Maine's crop did with more than half of the potato industry being paid to stay within acreage limitations.

In all fairness to Maine, it must be said that the weather upset potato acreage planning. Never before had this country produced a surplus 2 years in a row with perfect weather recorded during those 2 years. That's something production and marketing experts didn't figure out. Try as we may, we can't understand how they can expect to either.

It is just another example of how things get all fouled up when you ram price support props into the natural supply and demand machinery.

It takes more than a little courage to turn down Federal handouts these days but Pennsylvania potato growers apparently prefer freedom in farming to subservience to the Federal Government.

That from the "potato roots" of Pennsylvania, if you please.

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT WITH REFERENCE TO VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days I have received many, many communications opposing the Hoover Commission report as it affects the Veterans' Administration program.

This proposed reorganization would dismember the Veterans' Administration to the detriment of the veteran. I feel strongly that the present rights of veterans must be maintained, and the plan as proposed by the Hoover Commission is definitely against the veterans' welfare.

This proposal would destroy the structure of veterans' benefits which have been built up over the past 31 years. We must remember that Mr. Hoover, himself established the Veterans' Administration in 1930 for the purposes of efficiency, economy, and uniformity of policy and administration. To make changes now would throw the administration of veterans' laws into a state of chaos.

Every time an effort is made to save tax money it is, you can be sure, at the expense of the war veterans and widows and orphans. History is just repeating itself again in this proposal. The recommendations contained in the Hoover report would lead to neither economy, nor efficiency, and no one can question the fact that the veterans' cause is just. It destroys the traditional recognition of the rights of veterans to Federal employment preference, which has been in existence since Civil War days, and which is our way of showing to these that fought for our country the gratitude of a nation to its war veterans.

This report would only add agencies to our already much too large and complex Government. It would also add additional expense for high-bracket executives to head these added agencies, and we have no assurance that this operation would be administered any more efficiently or economically.

We must remember the care of the returned war veteran and his dependents is a part of our national obligations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include an editorial from the Arkansas Democrat and another from the Texas County Gazette.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extracts.

ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday was the thirty-second anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. Due to the passing of our late colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Bland, I was unable to obtain the floor at that time to extend sincere greetings and best wishes to my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent and birth.

The Lithuanian people are continuing their valiant fight for liberty and independence and I feel that it is fitting to direct the attention of the American

people to the fact that Lithuania is today carrying on a battle for the identical freedom which we succeeded in obtaining in 1776. In this valiant struggle to preserve the ideals of liberty and equality they have earned the admiration and esteem of all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world.

Their cause should be one for the whole democratic world which observes with great sorrow the tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania. They have been cruelly dominated by the Soviet rule of terrorism and oppression but this has not daunted their patriotic fervor and intense love of liberty and justice. Because of the indomitable spirit of the people and their devotion to ideals under the most trying conditions, Lithuania will not remain enslaved. Such a courageous struggle must and will lead to final triumph. In their cause the Lithuanian people have the support of freedom-loving people everywhere who fervently hope and pray that the day is not far distant when once again they shall proclaim the establishment of an independent Lithuania which will take its place beside the democratic nations of the world.

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 481) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R 874) to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. BIEMILLER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and accompany the same with appropriate printed material.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently made by John E. Peurifoy, Under Secretary of State.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in relation to the program for tomorrow, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] spoke to me in relation to a motion that was to be made to take from the Speaker's desk and send to conference the basing-point bill. That motion will not be made tomorrow.

Mr. WALTER. I understand it is to go over for a week.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us just when it will be called, as there are several Members very much interested.

Mr. WALTER. It is hoped that it will be brought up 1 week from tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am going to suggest, so that we can have control, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] confer with me, because I would like to put that in the program when I announce it the latter part of the week, as to when it will be taken up, so the Members can have advance notice, rather than 24 hours' notice, or a shorter notice, or rather than the statement now that it will probably be made next Tuesday. In other words, as a result of this colloquy, so that the House will be advised as to my state of mind, there is no definite date made for next week. I am not construing it that a definite date is made. Those interested will confer with me sometime this week as to a date, so that I, in turn, can advise the House when I announce the program for next week. That is the only fair course to pursue in the interest of all Members of the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will see that that takes place, and unless they confer with me, I would not expect that a motion would be made, even if it is one of priority, without the majority leader having been conferred with, in order to give the House at least 2 days' advance notice.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I discussed with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the matter of calling up this privileged resolution on Tuesday of next week, as he will oppose the motion. It is entirely agreeable to him. I believe that under the circumstances, therefore, it will be right to announce at this time that it will be called up on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Let the Chair make a statement.

A great many people are interested in this matter and the Chair has told a great many people who were deeply interested in it that it would come up tomorrow. Nobody has said anything to me about not bringing it up tomorrow.

When Members change their minds about calling up motions of this kind the Chair would like to know it in advance; and that is no criticism of the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understood that is so, because no criticism could be directed toward the majority leader, expressed or implied. The majority leader was undertaking to advise the House as to a changed situation so that the Members might govern themselves accordingly. The majority leader is trying to fix some kind of definiteness with reference to the program for next week. As far as I am concerned my statement stands, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], confer together; and I expect they will confer with me also as to the date on which they would like to bring it up next week. Under those circumstances and with that understanding the matter will be left in an uncertain state as to date. It will probably be called up next Tuesday, but I cannot state that definitely at this moment. I expect that both the Speaker and I will be consulted in the matter.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that the program should be announced not later than Thursday, because many Members leave the city on Friday and they probably would not get notice. If the majority leader could make the announcement on Thursday as to the date on which this bill would be called up it will accommodate the membership very much.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a very fair and proper thing. I always try to announce the program for the coming week on the Thursday of the week preceding, and do whenever possible.

The other day in announcing the program I said there might be a change, and I wish to state now that a rule has been reported out by the Committee on Rules on the bill S. 2734, to rehabilitate the Navajo and Hopi Indians. That bill will be in order tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "Some Lessons from Past Congressional Investigations of Lobby-

ing" by Edgar Lane, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and will cost $328.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

HARMFUL COMPETITION FROM ABROAD

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we just heard the statement made in regard to crab meat being sent to the people of England and America from Russia in direct and harmful competition with our own fisheries on the coasts of our country, hurting both our fishing industries and our consumers. Russia must smile at our discomfiture. Russia must laugh when objection is made to the importation of such large numbers of Swiss watches, movements, and parts and nothing is done to curtail them. Russia knows precision instruments are of military importance to our national defense and the watch workers are precision instrument makers. Watches are imported from Switzerland in such large numbers that the watches are selling at the Filene Co. at Boston for $13 each and at Philadelphia for $11. The tremendous importation of Swiss watches, movements, and parts is permitted to continue. The Secretary of State has authority to stop the imports and to keep United States workers employed, and to save our United States watch industries, but he does nothing about it. The Waltham Watch Co. has gone out of business because it did not receive the necessary loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and because it did not secure Government orders. These things have been permitted to occur, notwithstanding the fact that the Waltham Watch Co. turned its entire plant over to the United States Government during the war for wartime production and the United States Munitions Board has stated that the United States watch companies are a vital part of our national defense. To be fair to our United States Department of Defense let me say I believe they have been willing to place orders with the Waltham Watch Co., but the orders were not asked for by the administration. We must preserve our watch industries, as they will be needed in the next war. Mr. Speaker, these precision workers are needed in manufacturing the atomic bombs and other bombs. It is most vital to our country to keep the Elgin Watch Co. and the Hamilton Watch Co., as well as the Waltham Watch Co. The tremendous Swiss competition is also very dangerous to them. They are most vital to our national defense, and this ruinous competition will put them, too, out of business.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2988) to provide for a Resident Commissioner from the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. WILLIAMS, DEANE, and BYRNES of Wisconsin objected.

AMENDMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4295) to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I understand this measure is now pending before the Rules Committee. I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MUSEUM AT KLUKWAN, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2012) to authorize the erection and operation of a museum at Klukwan, Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PRACTITIONERS BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4446) to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. TRIMBLE, GROSS, and CUNNINGHAM objected.

NATIONAL CEMETERY AT FORT LOGAN, COLO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4548) to provide for the utilization as a national cemetery of surplus Army Department-owned military real property at Fort Logan, Colo.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC AIRPORTS SERVING NATIONAL PARKS, NATIONAL MONUMENTS, AND NATIONAL RECREATION AREAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1283) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports in, or in close proximity to national parks, monuments, and recreation areas, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has been passed over without prejudice at the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]. The gentleman from Kansas is ill today and unable to be present; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL LABOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5557) to provide for coordination of arrangements for the employment of agricultural workers, admitted for temporary agricultural employment from foreign countries in the Western Hemisphere, to assure that the migration of such workers will be limited to the minimum numbers required to meet domestic labor shortages, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. SUTTON, GRANGER, and BIEMILLER objected.

FOREST RECREATIONAL RESOURCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2419) relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. BYRNES of Wisconsin and WHITE of Idaho objected.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5965) to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN PARTS OF ALASKA BY WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4424) to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ALASKA AIRPORTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2436) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska,"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EDUCATION OR TRAINING OF VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944).

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, a rule has been granted on this bill; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING A CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4499) to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Lands which reported out this bill is now considering a substitute bill for the legislation proposed by this bill; consequently, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING CERTAIN VETERANS' BENEFITS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6561) to extend certain veterans' benefits to or on behalf of dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMEND WORLD WAR VETERANS' ACT, 1924

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6562) to amend the Veterans' Regulations to provide additional compensation for the loss or loss of the use of a creative organ.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(k) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of compensation provided in part I, paragraph II, subparagraphs (a) to (j), shall be increased by $42 per month; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirements for any of the rates specified in subparagraphs (l) to (n), inclusive, of part I, paragraph II, the rate of compensation shall be increased by $42 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed $360 per month."

SEC. 2. The last paragraph of section 202 (3) of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (38 U. S. C. 473), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"There shall be paid to any person who suffered the loss of the use of a creative organ or one or more feet or hands as the result of an injury received in the active service in line of duty between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, compensation of $42 per month, independent of any other compensation which may be payable under this act: *Provided, however*, That if such injury was incurred while the veteran was serving with the United States military forces in Russia, the dates herein stated shall extend from April 6, 1917, to April 1, 1920."

SEC. 3. This act shall be effective from the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "compensation", insert "therefor shall be $42 per month independent of any other compensation."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "shall be increased by $42 per month."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations and the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide additional compensation for the loss or loss of the use of a creative organ."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4684) to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WALTER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I object, Mr. Speaker.

REPEAL CERTAIN AUTHORITY AT FORT MONROE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4316) to repeal the authority to assess owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have a member of the committee explain this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the late distinguished Member from Virginia, Mr. Bland, with a unanimous report by the Committee on Armed Services. It has to do with the repealing of the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation. It was submitted to the House by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] who is absent today on account of illness. If the gentleman wants the full details of the bill, he can find them in a very able report which was prepared by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in reserving the right to object was to have some member of the committee emphasize in the RECORD the fact that this bill is another illustration of the outstanding character of service rendered for so many years by our late colleague from Virginia, Mr. Bland. I am acquainted with the purposes of the bill, which are good, but I felt that this colloquy should appear in the RECORD in order to again convey to the people of the district that our late colleague so ably represented for so many years the fact that even in his serious illness, in his last days, when he was undergoing the effects of his serious illness, that he was carrying on his public service ably and courageously. The passage of this bill would be, in a sense, probably the final monument of the great work done by our late colleague.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not the Committee on Armed Services approved this bill unanimously?

Mr. VINSON. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that bills sent from the Committee on Armed Services to the Consent Calendar are unanimously approved by that committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective July 1, 1948—

(a) That paragraph headed "Sewerage system at Fort Monroe, Va.," of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat. 213), as amended, is amended by striking out the following: "; and the Secretary of War is hereby further authorized to assess upon vessels using the wharf at Fort Monroe, Va., one-half of the actual cost of repairs rendered necessary by the ordinary wear and tear of said wharf, and any damage done to said wharf by any vessel shall be paid for by the owner or owners of said vessel; and he is also authorized and directed from time to time to cause to be assessed upon and collected from the owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and from individuals or corporations engaged in business thereat, other than water-navigation companies, one-half of such sum or sums of money as he may deem just, reasonable, and necessary for expenditure upon the repair and operation of, such roads, pavements, streets, lights, sewerage, and general police, as in the opinion of the Secretary of War should be constructed and maintained in order to protect the interest of the United States and the interests, health, and general welfare of the said nonmilitary interests now

established or that may hereafter be established at Fort Monroe: *Provided further*, That all funds collected as above provided, or that may be received from other incidental sources from and after this date, be, and are hereby, made special contingent funds, to be collected and expended for the above purposes in accordance with rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, who will render annually to Congress a detailed account of all receipts and expenditures."

(b) The Secretary of War is hereby empowered to authorize and regulate the activities of the nonmilitary interests on the Fort Monroe Military Reservation in accordance with the law, and rules and regulations prescribed by him, relating to similar nonmilitary interests on other military reservations.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "1948" and insert "1950."

Page 3, line 3, strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATENT OFFICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2328) to increase the number of examiners in chief in the Patent Office, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 476 of the Revised Statutes (United States Code, title 35, sec. 2) be amended to read as follows:

"There shall be in the Patent Office a Commissioner of Patents, two assistant commissioners, and 12 examiners in chief, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The assistant commissioners shall perform such duties pertaining to the office of commissioner as may be assigned to them, respectively, from time to time by the Commissioner of Patents, and the examiners in chief shall serve as members of the board of appeals and may also perform such duties of a comparable nature pertaining to the office of commissioner as may be assigned to them, respectively, from time to time by the Commissioner of Patents. All other officers, clerks, and employees authorized by law for the office shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce upon the nomination of the Commissioner of Patents in accordance with existing law."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 482 of the Revised Statutes (35 U. S. C. 7) is amended by adding the following paragraph:

" 'The Commissioner, when in his discretion considered necessary to maintain the work of the board of appeals current, may designate any examiner of the primary examiner grade or higher having the requisite ability, to serve as examiner in chief for periods not exceeding 6 months each, and any examiner so designated shall be qualified to act as a member of the Board of Appeals. Not more than one primary examiner shall be among the members of the Board of Appeals hearing an appeal.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend section 482 of the Revised Statutes relating to the Board of Appeals in the United States Patent Office."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALES OF CONDEMNED NAVAL MATERIAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1990) to amend section 429, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the act of August 5, 1882, as amended, so as to substitute for the requirement that detailed annual reports be made to the Congress concerning the proceeds of all sales of condemned naval material a requirement that information as to such proceeds be filed with the Committees on Armed Services in the Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 429, Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U. S. C. 466), is hereby further amended by deleting therefrom the words "or materials" and "and materials" where they appear therein.

SEC. 2. The sixth sentence of section 2 of the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 296), as amended (34 U. S. C. 544), is amended to read as follows: "It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Navy annually to file with the Committees on Armed Services in the Congress information as to the proceeds of all sales of materials, stores, and supplies, made under the provisions of this act, and the expenses attending such sales."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMY INSTITUTE OF PATHOLOGY BUILDING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6539) to amend Public Law 626, Eightieth Congress, relating to the Army Institute of Pathology Building.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of June 12, 1948 (Pub. Law 626, 80th Cong.), is hereby amended by deleting that part which reads as follows:

"Forest Glen, Md.: Complete plans and specifications for construction of an Army Institute of Pathology Building, including all necessary auxiliary facilities; $600,000,"

and substituting the following:

"Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Complete plans and specifications for construction of an Armed Forces Institute of Pathology Building, including all necessary auxiliary facilities, $350,000."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that I take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] for his courtesy in considering my bill H. R. 6539, which would change section 1 of Public Law 626 of the Eightieth Congress. This bill relates to the Army Institute of Pathology building and provides for the authorization of a sum of $350,000 instead of the original sum of $600,000 to complete the plans and specifications for the construction of an Armed Forces Institute of Pathology building, including all necessary auxiliary facilities.

In modern medicine the Department of Pathology, the laboratory of any hospital or group of hospitals, is the heart of the facility. Accurate diagnosis and consequent treatment is largely dependent upon perfection of laboratory work.

The benefits to be derived from the change of location of the contemplated building have been recognized by both the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army. The fiscal advantage of the savings made possible as well as the value of the broader improvements involved has been given Bureau of the Budget approval. All three recommend passage of the bill.

FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7220) to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have somebody explain the bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. In the first session of the present Congress we passed a bill providing for the procedure to take care of emergency programs on reclamation projects. In so doing, we established a procedure which calls for a delay of 60 days in the committees of the House and the Senate. That defeats the very purpose of the bill in some instances. There are two reclamation projects in the West, one in my district and one in the district of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], which are in need presently of this repair work in order to deliver water for the coming irrigation season. There is a tunnel that is down in the Grande Valley water users' project. Unless this bill is passed and immediate consideration can be given to those repairs, there will be some 38,000 acres of land in Mesa County, Colo., that will be left without any irrigation water in the present season.

Mr. RICH. Has this legislation been approved by the Interior Department?

Mr. ASPINALL. It has been approved by the Interior Department and the committee has acted favorably on it.

Mr. RICH. What is the cost?

Mr. ASPINALL. No cost whatsoever as far as this legislation is concerned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of the act entitled "An act to provide for the return of rehabilitation and betterment costs of Federal reclamation projects," approved October 7, 1949, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a semicolon and the following:

"except that, any such determination may become effective prior to the expiration of such 60 days in any case in which each such committee approves an earlier date and notifies the Secretary, in writing, of such approval.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert the following: ": *Provided*, That when Congress is not in session the Secretary's determination, if accompanied by a finding by the Secretary that substantial hardship to the water users concerned or substantial further injury to the project works will result, shall become effective when the chairman and ranking minority member of each such committee shall file with the Secretary their written approval of said findings."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, that completes the call of the eligible bills on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SAFETY IN THE COAL MINES AND THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is to call to your attention the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] made on the floor of the House on February 2 last. At that time, and I am reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 1376, he said:

Mr. Speaker, nearly one-half million of our fellow men in this Nation go down to the collieries to work For the first 11 months of 1949 the friends of the Taft-Hartley law have upon their heads the blood of 534 of these our fellow men who went down to the collieries, never to return alive In view of this, how Hitlerlike and macabre is the voice of the colossus from Winchester—

I assume that means Winchester, Va., and I assume it refers to a Member of the other body because of remarks made by that gentleman with reference to the coal strike and which are here referred to—

who calls on the President to invoke that infamous law against these fellow men and to "handle arrogant labor leaders like Governor Tuck did here in Virginia."

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] continued:

Verily, Mr. Speaker, the hand that handled the labor leaders in Virginia was (sic) indeed the hand of Tuck, but the voice that commanded the hand of Tuck was truly the voice of the colossus—Hitlerlike and macabre. It is the prototype of this colossus that is undermining democratic government by refusing to yield obedience to the limitations on States' rights contained in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of this democratic Government. Men of honest minds rejoice in the sane decision of the President not to use the infamous Taft-Hartley law.

My point now is, and it was when I raised the question the other day, as to the propriety of those remarks being made from the well of the House. Those remarks in my opinion charge all those who supported the Taft-Hartley Act, and that means more than two-thirds of the membership of each body, with being responsible for the death of those 534 miners who lost their lives through accidents in the mines. We are all aware of the fact that all too often the Members of Congress and the Congress itself, as a whole are charged with reprehensible conduct.

My point is that it is not proper for a Member of the House to make that kind o a charge when there is no foundation in fact for the charge. I was overruled by the Speaker and, of course, I abide by that ruling, although I do not agree with the Speaker's decision.

Under the precedents then cited it seems a question of personal privilege and privilege of the House was raised. It is also contended that the question was raised at a proper time and in proper manner.

Most respectfully, but having in mind the doctrine of free speech, permit me to express the opinion that, while there are precedents justifying the ruling of the Speaker, some of them made by the present Speaker, there are precedents to the contrary.

It has been held that a Member may present a question of privilege involving words spoken in debate, notwithstanding another method of procedure is available. Permit me to quote from Six Cannon's section 561, as follows:

Although the previous question had been ordered on a pending resolution, it was held that a question of privilege might be debated.

A Member may present a question of privilege involving words spoken in debate notwithstanding the rule affording another method of procedure under such circumstances.

On December 12, 1912, the House was considering the contested election case of *McLean* v. *Bowman*. The previous question had been ordered on the resolution offered by Mr. S. F. Prouty, of Iowa, as a substitute for the resolution (H Res. 687) recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 1, when Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer, of Pennsylvania, claimed the floor for a question of privilege based on personal references made in debate by Mr. John R. Farr, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. James R. Mann, of Illinois, submitted that the proper procedure under the circumstances was to demand that the words objected to be taken down under the rule, and a question of privilege was not involved.

The Speaker [Champ Clark of Missouri] said:

"It seems to the Chair it would be an outrageous decision to hold that a man can stand here as a Member and say anything he happens to think of about another Member and the one who is assaulted shall not have personal privilege of replying. That is a general rule If the gentleman, Mr. Palmer, will state what the other gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Farr, said, then the Chair will rule whether it is a question of personal privilege."

Thereupon Mr. Mann made the further point of order that the previous question having been ordered Mr. Palmer could not be recognized to present a question of privilege until the vote was taken on the pending resolution.

The Speaker said:

"The only question in deciding this point of order, is whether, the previous question having been ordered on this contest, it brings the transaction to such a conclusion that the gentleman will have to wait until the House gets through voting. That is the point of order last made by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mann.

"The Chair is of the opinion that if there is a question of personal privilege involved the gentleman ought to be heard on it, notwithstanding the fact that the previous question has been ordered on the pending resolutions."

I did not leave in the RECORD my original remarks on this subject because I thought that they were a violation of the privileges of the House. I am referring to it now, and quoting these remarks, which I have quoted in full, because I still think, and everyone has a right to his individual opinion, that those remarks were a violation of the privileges of the House, because, in substance, they charge Members of the House with being responsible for bloodshed, and they also, by inference and reference to newspaper items, reflect upon a Member of the other body.

There is no connection whatsoever, at least I can see none, between the death of those miners and the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act. If reference had been made to some legislation which had to do with conditions in the mines or with safety regulations, then perhaps the statement would have been justifiable as a statement of opinion. But certainly there is nothing in the Taft-Hartley Act that by any stretch of the imagination can be construed as creating conditions which are responsible for the death of those men.

I was wondering why it was that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] made that statement. Then a colleague from Pennsylvania suggested perhaps it was because of the attitude of some of the gentleman's constituents.

Now, I have no information as to how the gentleman voted on teller votes except what I get from the papers and our colleagues. I do recall that when the Wood bill was before the House the leadership, at least according to the press, had a substitute, the Sims amendment, and that, when the Sims amendment came on the floor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and if he desires to dispute it or deny it, of course, I will accept his statement—according to apparently reliable witnesses, went through the tellers and voted for the Sims amendment. It is also said that the Sims amendment was opposed by the members of the United Mine Workers.

I find in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 4, 1950, at page 5, Ingrid Jewell, byline, this statement:

The administration lost a good chance to obtain middle-of-the-road labor legislation when the Sims bill failed. Some Democrats blamed the United Mine Workers in part for this defeat. The United Mine Workers sent telegrams to many Congressmen Tuesday saying, "The United Mine Workers support only the Lesinski bill. It will consider a vote for the administration-sponsored substitute or for the Wood bill the same as a vote for the present Taft-Hartley Act."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] went

through the tellers the way the gentleman states?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I do not, of my own knowledge; two of my colleagues who opposed the Sims amendment so advised me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under those circumstances, does not the gentleman feel that it would be better to find out first, before making a statement which intimates that, and which might be misconstrued? In other words, the gentleman from Michigan does not know whether or not the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE]—and I do not, I assure the gentleman—voted for the Sims substitute or not. Is that correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is correct that I do not know of my own knowledge how the gentleman voted. I have no information on that except as I gathered it from Members, as I gathered it from his colleagues. Two of the gentleman's colleagues told me that he voted that way. But it does not make any difference. He undoubtedly voted in accordance with his convictions, as was his right.

As a matter of fact, it is none of my business, nor the business of any other Member, how he voted, although we have a right to refer to the fact that the gentleman voted one way or the other. I am not criticizing him for voting that way. I am just trying to get some explanation as to why the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] made that very serious charge on February 2 which reflects upon a Member of the other body, upon the House as a whole, upon every Member who voted for the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I am not passing into the other question, except that my friend made the remark he did without any other comment whether or not he knew it himself. On the Taft-Hartley law, I remember that the gentleman from Michigan was one of the most severe critics of what he termed to be the dictatorial power exercised by the general counsel, Mr. Denham. You remember in the Eightieth Congress you had a committee investigation, and you made a very strong report attacking the dictatorial power of the general counsel. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; that is not quite correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, I remember it well. I think the gentleman should refresh his memory on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will be glad to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Because the gentleman and the majority report wanted to have the general counsel suspend action, pending an opportunity for the gentleman's committee to consider and report legislation. As I remember, there was a severe condemnation of Mr. Denham, that he was usurping power in a dictatorial manner, and Mr. Denham said he was simply carrying out the law. I thought the gentleman's committee made the best argument that I heard against the Taft-Hartley bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five additional minutes in order to answer the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Well, there are 50 or 60 minutes of special orders, however, if there is no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker.

Inasmuch as you have narrowed down the issue, I will say "yes," and here is what it was: Your first proposition was a broad, general one, that I condemned Mr. Denham generally. That is not quite accurate. On the whole and to date he has done a good job, straying but very few times from his job.

Here is what I did do. I remember the occasion to which the gentleman refers. It was when Mr. Denham proposed to interpret the law contrary to all previous holdings, and to bring within its terms and subject to its provisions as construed by the NLRB all of the employees of hotels, restaurants, bars, and similar business organizations. When the Hotel Owners' Association and the head of the Bar Tenders' Union came here and protested, a committee held hearings, Mr. Denham testified, and I certainly did, in the strongest words at my command, condemn that attempt of Mr. Denham to put another interpretation upon the law which we had written, an interpretation different from interpretations which had always previously been given it and had been acted upon for years.

In that particular instance, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is right in his contention that I criticized Mr. Denham and Mr. Denham just forgot his proposed interpretation. There is no question about it. And I thank the gentleman for calling my attention to it, because it enables me to emphasize the point that an administrative officer is always too prone to legislate, just as courts are sometimes prone to legislate by judicial interpretation.

But the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], who is a past master at the art, has again today drawn what is sometimes referred to as a "red herring" across the trail and, perhaps foolishly, I have been so enchanted that I have followed him off the main road, away from my purpose, which was to, if I could, cause the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] to give us some explanation as to why he so inaccurately charges those who are responsible for the Taft-Hartley Act—and that, as has been so many times stated, includes more than two-thirds of the Members of each House—with the responsibility for the death of those miners.

If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] denies, on his honor as a Member, that he voted for the Sims amendment, then, of course, his colleagues will accept his denial and I will look for some reason for his unfounded charge of February 2 other than that it grew out of displeasure on the part of those who were members of the United Mine Workers.

My information is, as stated, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE], on the teller vote, voted for the Sims substitute or amendment to the Wood bill, and it was suggested that the United Mine Workers, for whom he sometimes so eloquently speaks here on the floor, were displeased.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan said, "If the gentleman from Pennsylvania denies it."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; if he denies it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The burden is on the gentleman from Michigan to prove that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] went through the tellers and voted for it. It is up to him to support the affirmative, not to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to support the denial. The gentleman from Michigan takes the affirmative.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I sure do; and I will say that according to two of his colleagues that is just what he did. If he says he did not I will accept his denial on the theory that he ought to know what he did and that his colleagues may have been mistaken.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan is too good a lawyer to proceed on that theory.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will say that I am not practicing law since I came here, like so many do.

And I will say further that, if a Member can only act on what he himself sees or hears, then our activities will certainly be circumscribed here in the House.

If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] told me today that last week some other Member voted in a certain way, I would certainly accept his word until I learned that he was mistaken.

As to what happened when the Sims amendment was up for consideration, permit me to quote Fred W. Perkins in the Pittsburgh Press of May 3, 1949. Mr. Perkins wrote:

> Mr. RAYBURN emerged from a top level conference of House Democrats and announced that a new bill would be introduced today as a substitute for the Lesinski labor bill which was backed by the Truman administration * * * so it appeared that the House leadership, convinced that a coalition of House Republicans and southern Democrats was too strong to beat down, had grabbed the ball from the White House. * * * The new labor bill (Sims) will be introduced in today's House session under a parliamentary situation that gives it voting priority over the Wood bill.
>
> Chairman LESINSKI of the House Labor Committee, a staunch opponent of the injunction provision, indicated he was not too happy about the compromise bill but he said, "I feel bound to go along with the majority."

On May 4, 1949, referring to the passage of the Wood bill, Mr. Perkins wrote:

> In addition to being a slap at the President, acceptance of the Wood bill also amounted to a repudiation of the leadership of House Speaker RAYBURN, of Texas. It was he who had whipped up a compromise bill (Sims). The compromise was designed to attract the votes of the wavering southern Democrats, and apparently it succeeded.

Referring to the Sims amendment, Russell Nixon, Washington representative of the left-wing CIO Electrical Workers, complained bitterly:

That compromise beat us. It dissipated our strength

The Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, referring to the Wood bill and the Sims amendment, on May 4, 1949, carried this statement:

The Wood bill was approved after the House had repudiated (311 to 183) a compromise measure put forward by the Democratic leadership. This bill added six amendments to the original administration repealer including the Taft-Hartley antistrike injunction. * * * House Speaker RAYBURN * * * "They thought it would attract votes and have a better chance of passage than the original Lesinski bill. * * * The leadership compromise instead of winning southern Democrat support antagonized northern prolabor Democrats who called for its defeat."

My query is this: The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] charges more than two-thirds of those who were Members of the House and of the other body when the Taft-Hartley bill became law, and many who are today Members of one or the other body, with the responsibility for the death of 534 miners. He said—and these are his words, as you will find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 1376:

For the first 11 months of 1949 the friends of the Taft-Hartley law have upon their heads the blood of 534 of these our fellow men who went down to the collieries, never to return alive.

Why did the gentleman from Pennsylvania make that monstrous statement? Was it because it was reported that he did vote for the Sims amendment, not realizing that it carried most of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, and that, on the 2d of February 1950, he wanted his people to know that he was not in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act or any of its provisions, and so made the quoted statement?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] is too intelligent, has too much common sense—at least, that is my opinion—to, after sober consideration, attempt to connect the death of those unfortunate miners with the Taft-Hartley Act, or to believe that the blood of those miners is upon the heads of those who voted for that act.

I hope that sometime from the well of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] will tell us just what he was trying to do when he made that 1-minute speech on February 2.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING ON AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION ACT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit the following privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 additional copies of the hearings conducted before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1632, Eighty-first Congress, first session, to amend the Immigration Act of October 16, 1918, as amended. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRESS ON THE HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit the following privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 1158, Eighty-first Congress, first session, entitled "Progress on the Hoover Commission Recommendations," of which 3,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, 1,000 copies for the Senate document room, and 500 copies for the House document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HENRY J. BACKOF

Mrs NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 459) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Anna M. Backof, widow of Henry J. Backof, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Henry J. Backof.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a brief statement.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

HOT POTATOES!

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, now that the Republican $1—tax payed—Lincoln Day chicken box dinner and the Democratic $100—tax free—per plate Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner are matters of history and the food has been consumed, it may be advisable to proceed to the consideration of other matters. Although more than 12,000 enthusiastic Americans attended the Republican dinner, I have learned that the Republican committee just about broke even on the cost after paying the Bureau of Internal Revenue around $2,400 in taxes on admissions. I understand, however, that the Democrats took in $530,000 at their hundred-dollar-plate dinner, and paid no taxes to the Government on admissions. That money is in the bag for use in the coming congressional campaign.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman gets into that will he yield for a question?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished and able Representative from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the gentleman tell me from first-hand knowledge, not hearsay, as to whether the Democrats had wine where we only had coffee?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know that we only had coffee at the Republican dinner with some delicious chicken, potatoes, rolls, and ice cream.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. First-hand now.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was not present at the $100 Democratic dinner. They did not invite me or any other Republican, and I cannot tell the gentleman, from first-hand knowledge, if wine or other liquor was served to the 5,300 money-flushed Democrats who each paid $100 for their dinner, and no tax.

Today I will talk about potatoes—hot potatoes. From what I read in the papers, Agriculture Secretary Brannan is taking care of the potatoes. It seems rather strange, and almost sinful, to learn that the Secretary intends to dump and destroy 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes, when the law specifically authorizes him to give these potatoes and other surplus food owned by the Government to needy Americans through both national and local relief agencies.

I was wondering if the Democrats served potatoes at the $100 per plate—tax free—Jackson Day dinner the other night. I looked over the menu which appeared in the newspapers, but I could not find either Irish potatoes or any Canadian potatoes which are coming into this country in millions of bushels through the courtesy of the Truman administration. However, I found an item on the menu in French which read Pommes Rissole. I looked it up in a French dictionary and found Pomme de Terre to mean Irish potatoes, and Rissole meant baked brown and basted.

Speaking about Rissole potatoes, I would have thought that Mr. Charles Luckmann, late of Lever Brothers, one of the largest oleomargarine manufacturers in the world, who was in charge of the Jackson Day $100 per plate—tax free—dinner, would have arranged to have had these Pomme Rissole—Irish potatoes—dipped in oleomargarine in honor of the Dixiecrats. But my investigation discloses that he did not dip the Pomme Rissole in oleo. I understand that they used butter for basting, and it probably came from my home State of Minnesota. I feel strongly honored that butter was used by Mr. Luckman and his Democratic associates, and particularly at this time, when the Democratic Party is gleefully and willfully legislating to liquidate millions of small dairy farmers in the United States by legalizing the manufacture and sale of yellow colored oleomargarine to imitate butter. The

use of butter at the Jackson Day dinner demonstrates that the Democrats still prefer butter. Butter, that fine and healthy natural product, produced by millions of American dairy farmers, will always be used at Republican dinners. There is no substitute for butter.

Mr. Speaker, the potato-dumping program has been given a lot of publicity by Secretary Brannan, and most Americans are concerned about it. Good food should not be wasted where there are hungry people. Something should be done about it, and the Secretary of Agriculture can now do a great deal to correct the administration of the program, if he will follow the law.

I have been very critical about the administration of the potato-support program for the past 3 years. My ire was aroused when I found that the Department of Agriculture ordered kerosene poured on thousands of bushels of new potatoes in the State of Alabama at a time when Canadian potatoes were being imported to take care of the needs of people in many parts of the United States. It was difficult for me to understand why the Truman administration ordered the destruction of potatoes grown by American citizens, and then, permitted the importation of Canadian potatoes. Considering that the Secretary of Agriculture and the President had full authority to stop potatoes from coming into this country, it will always remain a mystery to me why they did not act to protect American producers and the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I am wondering why the gentleman is so much concerned about potatoes now when a year ago he did not have any concern whatsoever when the administration tried to do something to rectify the potato program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the administration tried to do to rectify the program?

Mr. GRANGER. What they tried to do was to put the potato program under acreage control and to put into effect the Brannan plan so far as it affected potatoes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, I know they had authority to do that. I may say to the gentleman that the biggest complaint has come from the cost of the program for the 1948 crop which was $225,000,000. I think the gentleman will agree that is the largest amount of potatoes that the Government has ever bought. Mr. Brannan says that the Republicans were responsible for the potato program so far as the 1948 crop is concerned. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. GRANGER. I do; absolutely. The Congress and the Committee on Agriculture cannot sit here and blame the potato program on something else. We have been writing farm legislation and certainly some of that responsibility is ours and so far as I am concerned, I am ready to take what blame is on me and do something about it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman I will do likewise, but in placing the blame it should be placed where it belongs.

On September 21 of last year Mr. Brannan blamed the Republicans for this expensive potato program, at which time he said that the Government had spent $225,000,000 to support the price of potatoes and most of them were dumped. Now, just what are the facts? If I may have the attention of the gentleman from Utah, I am sure he will agree with me when I say the gentleman recollects that back in 1946, on December 31, the President of the United States, the present incumbent, issued an order to terminate the Steagall amendment. In that order it was provided that the support price program as provided for in the Steagall amendment of 90 percent of parity for potatoes and other commodities, would not expire until January 1, 1949, so that this expenditure of $225,000,000 on the 1948 potato crop came under the Democratic law that was extended by President Truman on December 31, 1946, for a 2-year period.

The expenditure of $225,000,000 was made under the old Steagall amendment which did not expire until January 1, 1949.

In addition to calling the attention of the gentleman from Utah to the expiration of the Steagall amendment on January 1, 1949, which governed the support price of the 1948 potato crop at 90 percent of parity, I would also like to remind him that the Secretary of Agriculture did not propose his Brannan plan until April 7, 1949, and, under no circumstances could his plan have operated for the 1949 potato crop. The Secretary proposed, and the Democratic majority on the Committee of Agriculture agreed, that a trial run on potatoes be tried out for the 1950 potato crop. I am sure, that the gentleman agrees with me on the time of the application of the trial run for potatoes.

The Hope Act, to which the Secretary undoubtedly referred, did not go into operation until January 1, 1949. In that act we put in the provision—and the gentleman was a party to it—that potatoes should be supported at between 60 and 90 percent of parity.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I want to say to the gentleman and to the House that to my knowledge the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before our committee for the last three successive years and asked our committee and asked the Congress to do something about the potato program, and he pleaded with us to put a limitation on the production of potatoes, and we refused to do it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We did do something about it in the Eightieth Congress by reducing the support price from 90 to 60 percent of parity.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I would like to say this to the gentleman from Minnesota. I think it is more important to solve this potato difficulty that we now face than it is to ask or indicate whose fault it is or who is to blame. But let me give the gentleman a little illustration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman will do that in his own time, I would appreciate it.

Mr. HILL. I want to show the gentleman what has happened.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman wanted to do something to solve it——

Mr. HILL. I did.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He wants to tell me what happened.

Mr. HILL. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will yield a litle later.

Mr. HILL. I put it in the RECORD last year, showing what they had done.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If the gentleman will permit me to say, I think the gentleman from Utah should not overlook the fact that when the potato growers of California came down here and asked the Secretary to reduce the subsidy on potatoes, the present Secretary was not willing to do so. So, I do not want somebody to put the entire blame on either political party or the potato growers themselves.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, the Secretary of Agriculture I may say, is using the Congress, this Democratic Congress, as a whipping boy to destroy the support program for American agriculture, and no gentleman on either side of the aisle can dispute it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I notice this, though, that before election time the Democrats were claiming all the credit for getting this potato subsidy to the growers. Now that the thing has not worked out they are following their usual and customary course of trying to blame the Republicans. They claim it when it is a benefit to them, but when it kicks back—oh, no, they did not have anything to do with it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Speaking of potatoes, and the reason the Secretary has to dump 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes which he says the Government owns, I think we ought to analyze that and correct it. The gentleman from Colorado has suggested we ought to correct it.

Mr. HILL. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As a matter of fact, the Government has not purchased 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes. To date the CCC has purchased 25,000,000 bushels of potatoes, so they have another 25,000,000 to go. I do not doubt a bit that the CCC will be forced to buy another 25,000,000 bushels, and the program is going to be expensive, because of the importation of millions of bushels of potatoes from Canada.

LARGE CANADIAN POTATO IMPORTS MAKE UNITED STATES PROGRAM EXPENSIVE

The potato support program will be very expensive because the Truman administration has failed to carry out laws passed by Congress with reference to stopping imports of Canadian potatoes when the support program is in operation. The Secretary of Agriculture and President Truman could stop all imports of potatoes, but they refuse to do so. Canadian potato growers increased their 1949 potato production by 39 percent, and it is now estimated that from 12,000,000 to 20,000,000 bushels of Canadian potatoes will enter the United States from such crop during the market season. For every bushel of potatoes coming into this country from foreign countries the United States Government will be forced to buy 2 bushels of American-grown potatoes in order to hold the price to support levels. As a matter of fact, our Government is supporting the price of foreign-grown potatoes and providing a market for them in the United States. If 20,000,000 bushels reach our domestic market, the cost of the potato support program will be at least $40,000,000 more than it would have been if the Secretary of Agriculture and President Truman had carried out existing laws stopping imports.

I am not criticizing Canadian producers. They are good businessmen. But why in the name of common sense should American taxpayers be called upon to support the price of Canadian-grown potatoes or any other commodity produced in a foreign country. I insist that the President and the Secretary should immediately invoke the provisions of section 22 of the AAA to stop these imports and thereby save the American market for domestic producers and stop this waste of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. He does not want to say there is no barrier against the importation of potatoes into the United States from Canada. The gentleman well knows there is a 75-cent per 100 pounds tariff on it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. On the first 5,000,000 bushels the duty was 37.5 cents. That quota has been filled up, and we have over 6,000,000 bushels in here, and they are paying 75 cents a bushel duty import over the quota. No duty is paid on potatoes bootlegged into this country. Canadian growers think it is profitable and want to ship the potatoes down here for whatever they can get out of them, which is a few cents under the support price. They are getting the benefit of our American program.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman remembers the effort that was made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] and others to call to the attention of the House that this very thing was going to happen, that this potato program would ruin the whole support program if it were put into operation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is why the committee fixed it at 60 percent of parity.

Mr. GRANGER. You fixed it at 60 percent of parity, but the Secretary of Agriculture told you that was not enough, that he could not even support them at any price unless there was acreage control on them. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have served on the Committee on Agriculture for a good many years, and under several Secretaries of Agriculture, but the gentleman knows that the present Secretary of Agriculture has given very little cooperation to the committee in the shaping of constructive policies for American agriculture. Since April 7, 1949, the Secretary of Agriculture has fought the support program which the gentleman from Utah and other members of the Committee drafted into law, and we have had little or no help from him since that time. He has been too busy playing politics with the welfare of American farmers, and I, for one, refuse to play politics with the future welfare of our farmers. It seems to me that those of us, who are really interested in the prosperity and success of American farmers should work together free from political partisanship in our aim to enact constructive legislation. That is the way it has been on our committee until the Secretary injected politics into the shaping of farm policies.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Does not the gentleman see in the Secretary's position some ulterior motive to try to scuttle the present farm-support program so that he can force on the Congress the so-called Brannan plan?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is the way it would appear to me, and I think it appears that way to the general public.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman well knows that when we sat in that meeting the Secretary of Agriculture would not specify the products on which he wished to carry along this experiment; neither would he even estimate the cost of carrying out that type of program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. As to the acreage of potatoes the Department of Agriculture requested the potato growers to produce in the United States, the gentleman will remember that they asked for an increase in 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, and it is my recollection that they asked for an increase of the potato acreage in 1948.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right, and the potato producers have always been under the goal suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HILL. Further, they cut the potato acreage 36 percent in the United States while the Department of Agriculture was asking to increase it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. You would probably like to know where some of these Canadian potatoes are going. It sounds like a train caller in a union station calling the stations where these Canadian potatoes are going. They are going to Buffalo, they are going to the Dakotas, to Duluth, Minn., in my own State, down to cities in Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, and Maine. They are even going into Maine, just think of it, where last year the Secretary spent $65,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to buy up about 65 percent of the Maine crop. They are going to Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, New York, North Carolina, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Puerto Rico, even, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia, the State of Washington, the District of Columbia, and many other points for domestic consumption at a time when the Secretary is ordering the destruction of American produced potatoes.

Mr. GRANGER. Where do you think they should go?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They are going into the areas where we already have surpluses of potatoes and where the Government is buying them and keeping them off the market.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota this question. I want to refresh my own memory. Was not he one who objected in the conference with the Secretary of Agriculture when we were trying to work out the McNary-Haugen bill in committee when he wanted to impose his thought entirely upon our operations? I remember there was much opposition in committee and I am asking the gentleman whether or not he was one who objected?

Mr. AUGUST H ANDRESEN. I am proud to say to the gentleman from Ohio who was a very distinguished and able member of the Committee on Agriculture, that I was one of the members who was for the McNary-Haugen bill and on all occasions helped to put it through the House as the gentleman did, too. And it was vetoed by President Coolidge. I do not know whether that was imposing my will upon people, but if we had the McNary-Haugen bill today we would have some pretty sound constructive legislation because it would give the American farmer the benefit of the home market for that part of his product which is consumed in this country and then he would be assisted in disposing of his surplus in the world market.

Mr. McSWEENEY. If I may ask the gentleman to yield further, the gentleman has not quite cleared my own mind on the question. Did we not, and I remember the gentleman joined at that time, did we not in some way resent the imposition of the Secretary's ideas on that bill, over the ideas of the committee?

In other words, we as a committee wanted to act independently and tried to

work out a program. Was not that the situation in 1922 and 1924?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes, I think we did. We did not have any pressure from the Executive.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Now, the gentleman objects because the Secretary of Agriculture does not impose his thoughts and ideas on the committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want the Secretary of Agriculture and the President to carry out the laws we have enacted here in Congress. I want a proper administration of the law and not maladministration. That has been the trouble with the potato program ever since it went into operation.

It has been said that if they put the Brannan plan into operation where they let the price of potatoes sink down to a supply-and-demand level price this program would all work out and the people would eat more potatoes. I am somewhat skeptical about that. I think they are eating all the potatoes they care to eat. But I know the price will go down. The Secretary says that the potato farmers should receive an average of $1.59 a bushel for their potatoes. That is under the Brannan plan.

Last year we produced 402,000,000 bushels of potatoes. The surplus is from fifty to seventy-five million bushels. You can imagine what would happen to the price of potatoes if we let them sink down to whatever they would bring on the market. I estimate that they would probably go down to 35 cents a bushel. To be fair about it, let us just say that they went to 59 cents a bushel. Under the Brannan plan the farmer is entitled to $1.59 a bushel on 1,800 units, or around 16,000 bushels. If the prices went down to 59 cents a bushel that would mean that the Government would pay the farmer a dollar a bushel on 16,000 bushels, under the 1,800-unit plan, or $16,000.

So the farmer would have to get a check for a dollar a bushel on those potatoes in order to receive the income standard provided by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question? I think this is important.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know it is.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Was the gentleman in favor of the farm-support price program and parity?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman voted for the support program. But that has nothing to do with this.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I would like to know if the gentleman was in favor of the support-price program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not yield further to the gentleman, because the gentleman is not sticking to the subject.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. But this is important. I am asking for information.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman can look up the record. He will know then that the gentleman supported the Democratic farm bill which was approved by the conference committee. While I was not satisfied with all provisions of the bill, because it did not give equality of treatment for dairy, poultry, and meat products, it was the best that we could get from a Democratically controlled committee and Congress. Does that answer the gentleman? I am not satisfied with the administration of the support program. It can only fail if present methods are continued.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That answers the question. But criticism is being made——

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I refuse to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The Brannan plan is one of the most important issues before the House.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am going to tell you about it.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I refuse to yield further.

The Secretary says that he does not have any law. We have found out that there is a joker in the bill——

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I refuse to yield for a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I would like to have it noted in the RECORD that the Republican side demanded the regular order when I wanted to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I refuse to yield and I have the floor, Mr. Speaker.

I have discovered that in the Department of Agriculture they found a joker in the Agricultural Act of 1949, the act that was put through by the Democratic majority in Congress, aided by a great many Republicans who wanted to get some kind of farm legislation. I point out that you have the Brannan plan in the act of 1949. They have discovered it in the Department, and I am wondering why the Secretary does not put it into operation.

Section 407 of the act, under subparagraph (d), the Secretary has authority to make contracts with potato producers and handlers so that the farmers who produce those potatoes will get either 60 or 90 percent of parity, whatever he fixes the price at. He can let those potatoes sink as low as they will go. He can fix the price on them. Then he can go to the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is asking for $2,000,000,000 more, and use such funds to pay the handlers and producers the difference between what the farmers get for their potatoes—and he fixes the prices on them—and the price that they should have gotten under the parity-support program. Now, it is in existing law. Why does he not use it? I will put the section in the RECORD, and I will quote the exact law. He has not used it. It appears that he wants to destroy the support program rather than to improve it and make it workable. I am not satisfied with the present support program. However, I am willing to sit down with my colleagues on the committee to work out a constructive program for agriculture, and the Secretary should be willing to cooperate.

I am inserting hereafter section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, approved by President Truman on October 31, 1949, and call your particular attention to clause D which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to sell perishable commodities owned by the Government at prices fixed by him. This section of the law has been used by the Department on two different occasions, and in both instances in dealing with potatoes, which I will shortly relate.

SEC. 407. The Commodity Credit Corporation may sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at any price not prohibited by this section. In determining sales policies for basic agricultural commodities or storable nonbasic commodities, the Corporation should give consideration to the establishing of such policies with respect to prices, terms, and conditions as it determines will not discourage or deter manufacturers, processors, and dealers from acquiring and carrying normal inventories of the commodity of the current crop. The Corporation shall not sell any basic agricultural commodity or storable nonbasic commodity at less than 5 percent above the current support price for such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges. The foregoing restrictions shall not apply to (A) sales for new or byproduct uses; (B) sales of peanuts and oilseeds for the extraction of oil; (C) sales for seed or feed if such sales will not substantially impair any price-support program; (D) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there is a danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage; (E) sales for the purpose of establishing claims arising out of contract or against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity; (F) sales for export; (G) sales of wool; and (H) sales for other than primary uses.

But, suppose that the Secretary would put the Brannan plan into operation on potatoes raised in 1949. The Department estimates the 1949 crop at 402,000,000 bushels. The Secretary states that farmers should receive an average of $1.59 per bushel for potatoes. Assuming that the average market price of potatoes would drop to 59 cents per bushel, and I believe that the price would be lower, the Secretary would pay the farmer $1 per bushel as a production payment, if Congress appropriated the money. Each farmer would be entitled to receive protection on 1,800 units or 16,000 bushels of potatoes which would amount to $16,000 for every farmer that produced 1,800 units, or a total cost to American taxpayers of $400,000,000 to provide production payments on the 1949 potato crop. Can you imagine this or any other Congress providing such a staggering sum to subsidize a few potato producers.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRANGER. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me finish this statement, please, and then I will yield. I repeat, with the assumption that potatoes would go to 59 cents a bushel if we had the Brannan plan—I think they would go probably to 30 or 35 cents a bushel—but assuming they went to 59 cents a bushel, the Secretary would take out of the taxpayers of this country a dollar a bushel and pay the producers, and the program would cost for the 1949 crop over $402,000,000. I understand that the experts in the Department have been figuring out how much this Brannan program would cost for all commodities. They got the figure. I could not get it. They would not release it. But I understand the figure is so stupendous that they have suppressed publication of the amount.

I now yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Of course, the gentleman can make any assumption he wants on what the potato program would cost, if he says it is going to be so much a bushel and says nothing about what the production will be. The gentleman well knows that when you are figuring on what the support price would be on potatoes, the Secretary was figuring on a reduction in acreage, which would make all the difference in the world in what the gentleman is trying to say. Furthermore, let me say that the law which the gentleman says has been discovered has not been discovered. We discussed that in the committee. We discussed it with the Secretary, and he told you and he told me that he did not think he had the authority and he did not want to exercise it without direct authority from the Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, he has the authority. They have discovered they can use it, and they have used it before. In fact, they used the same provision of law back in 1943 when the Secretary of Agriculture made contracts with 25 potato handlers from Maine to Idaho, and they purchased 6,469,000 hundredweight of potatoes, and the Secretary fixed the price of those potatoes at 67 cents per hundredweight below the support price, and he wrote checks out of the United States Treasury to reimburse handlers and producers for the loss. It cost the taxpayers $4,341,561.25. The same section of the law was used by the Secretary for the 1947 potato crop at a cost of $32,000. The facts are that the Secretary can use existing law to sell Government-owned perishable commodities in the domestic market at low prices, without loss to the producer.

I doubt very much if the Secretary is serious about enacting the so-called Brannan plan as a solution of the farm problem. He would rather use it as a political issue as it promises everything to all people without mentioning that the beneficiaries will pay the bill in higher taxes under a regimented economy that will leave all controls in the hands of bureaucratic Washington. Furthermore, if Congress would fail to appropriate the billions of dollars necessary to carry out his plan, the Secretary knows that the farmers under the program would wind up in bankruptcy and without any farm program whatsoever. Under the Brannan plan, farmers would be completely dependent upon the Federal Government for a substantial proportion of their farm income. Failure to make producer payments would result in a bankrupt agriculture and a beginning of a Nationwide depression of staggering proportions, which would destroy our entire economy. To avoid such a disaster we must have a sound program that will assure prosperity for agriculture as the one basic industry in our American economy.

While the Secretary may claim that he needs additional authority or direction from Congress to put his plan into operation for potatoes and other perishable commodities, it is ironical that he demanded the repeal of the Agricultural Act of 1948, which he and his solicitors claim gave him full authority to put the Brannan plan into operation. It seems to me that we have a right to question the Secretary's sincerity.

COST OF 1948 POTATO SUPPORT PROGRAM

Secretary Brannan has made many public utterances as to the cost of the potato-support program for the 1948 crop. The program cost $225,000,000. As stated earlier in my remarks, the Secretary attempts to place the blame for these excessive costs on the Eightieth Congress and the Republicans. The facts are that the support program for the 1948 potato crop was handled under the Democratic law continued for a 2-year period by President Truman on December 31, 1946. The Hope provisions of the act of 1948 did not become effective until the potato crop of 1949. The Hope Act specified potato supports at from 60 to 90 percent of parity. If it were not for large imports of Canadian potatoes in 1949 and 1950, the cost of the 1949 potato program would be at least 50 percent under the figures specified by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Secretary of Agriculture consistently refused to supply me and other members of the committee with detailed information on the cost of the 1948 potato-support program. When I requested him to supply me with information as to the amount of individual payments made to large potato producers, he refused to give it to me. Shortly after he denied my request for information a well-known and able newspaper reporter published all of the information in a Washington paper. This news story disclosed that several commercial potato producers had received as much as $500,000 from the Government. This newspaper report had all of the facts. If the Secretary did not have this vital information, I would like to know what employee in the Department supplied the information to the reporter and withheld it from the Secretary.

Facts in my possession disclose that around $200,000,000 was divided or paid to less than 30,000 large commercial potato producers for their 1948 crop. The small producers got very little out of it.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield for a question, not a speech.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I wish to ask the gentleman if the Brannan plan is not a simple business proposition. If the manufacturers of the supplies that the agricultural industry must use charge such tremendous prices and make such tremendous profits, does not the Brannan plan furnish an answer? I will give the gentleman an illustration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Take barbed wire, at $8.50 a roll.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is never used on potatoes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Yes, it is.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; out in the gentleman's country they do not fence their potatoes in.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The only way in which the farmer can get money to buy the equipment and machinery he needs is by selling the produce he raises.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not yield further; I understand the gentleman's point of view.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. How can he pay the increased prices and swollen profits of those manufacturers if he does not receive a support price that keeps our economy in balance?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understand the gentleman's philosophy, and I agree with him that our economy must be kept in balance. Surely, if farm prices are permitted to sink to whatever the market will bring, the farmer will be out of line on all of the items he is required to buy, including barbed wire and farm machinery. The support program was enacted to provide a floor under farm prices, with the aim that agricultural purchasing power would be on a parity with other segments of our economy. It should be obvious to the gentleman from Idaho that farmers cannot long continue in business if they get low prices for farm products and pay high prices for the things they must buy.

The gentleman has referred to swollen profits of manufacturers of farm machinery and equipment, and suggests that they be required to finance the Brannan plan that he wants enacted into law. I hold no particular brief for manufacturers. They have been making large profits. But the gentleman overlooks that all manufacturers and business concerns collect their costs and profits from consumers and buyers of farm machinery and other consumer goods. Consumers pay the bill. They also pay the cost of government largely through taxes hidden in the price of commodities and articles consumers purchase. The farmer and people living on fixed incomes are the only groups that cannot pass on their taxes to other consumers. I say to you frankly that the high cost of government is responsible for the high cost of living. Reduce the

cost of government and you reduce the cost of living.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. If you withdraw support from the agricultural industry the factories will have no market for their output. The Brannan plan offers the only solution by drawing off these excess profits and paying them where they belong, to support our national economy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with you that if supports are withdrawn from agriculture, the Nation will experience a serious depression. The support program is intended to maintain agricultural purchasing power in order to avoid or prevent a depression.

I cannot agree with you that the Brannan plan is the only solution. When we consider that the success of the Brannan plan wholly depends upon annual appropriations made by Congress, the gentleman from Idaho should have enough experience to realize that such appropriations will not be made—especially at a time when the Truman administration is running a deficit of $5,000,000,000 a year. Again I say, that if Congress fails to appropriate the billions of dollars necessary to carry out the Brannan proposal, the farmers will be headed for bankruptcy and without any farm program whatsoever. That will result in a Nation-wide depression.

I would also like to point out that a farm plan similar to Brannan's proposal has been in operation in Socialist England for the past 5 years. The Socialist government soon liquidated the large income individuals by heavy taxes, and after that the rank and file of the people paid the bill through higher taxes. Then the American taxpayer began financing this Socialist experiment. The first contribution to England from this country was in the nature of a $3,750,000,000 loan in 1946, and after that we have kicked in over $1,000,000,000 a year. Mind you, this money came from American taxpayers. In England, the farmers are regimented and controlled by the Socialist government, and further, they have become dependent upon their government for a substantial portion of their income, and American taxpayers are helping to finance the bill. No, my friend, the Brannan plan is not the solution for American farmers.

But getting back to potatoes again, out in the gentleman's country they raise so many potatoes it is unbelievable; they put a lot of fertilizer in the ground and they get tremendous production. We in Minnesota can raise only 150 to 200 bushels an acre, but out in his country they raise 600 bushels to the acre; and they are good potatoes because they ship a lot into my own section. It shows how thrifty and vigorous they are in producing abundance even on a reduced acreage.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. If the gentleman will yield further, I will say something he will like to hear.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I should be delighted to yield under any circumstances if the gentleman has something pleasing to say to me.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. It is my conclusion that if you have support prices and unlimited production the only answer is to keep the foreigners from coming in and taking your markets, as they are doing with potatoes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman thinks that is all right, does he?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. So that makes me a protectionist to that extent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman make that admission.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I knew the gentleman would like to hear that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We must protect the American workers and producers from this flood of imports that are coming into the United States. If we do not, we will go down with the rest of the world and the outcome will be socialism or communism in the United States.

Congress is blamed for the expensive fiasco in the potato-support program by the Secretary of Agriculture. He wants to destroy the general agricultural support program and remove the price floor from diversified products produced by farmers in Northern States. If he succeeds, farm prices on dairy and poultry products, hogs, fresh fruits, and vegetables will drop to depression levels and these farmers will be headed toward bankruptcy.

The trouble with the potato-support program is not in the law but mainly in the administration of it by the Secretary of Agriculture and the failure of the Truman administration to stop imports of large quantities of foreign-produced potatoes.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you, in all seriousness, that those who seek to play politics with the welfare of 6,000,000 farm families living in this country are jeopardizing the entire economy of the Nation. Agricultural prosperity is vital to the security and happiness of every American, and we, as legislators and officials in Government, must get together in a cooperative and nonpolitical spirit to draft policies that will assure equality of opportunity for American farmers so they, too, may fully enjoy all benefits of our American standard of living.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. DONOHUE (at the request of Mr. FURCOLO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

THE POTATO SITUATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with another aspect of this potato situation. It relates to those people who are in charge of the responsibility of administering welfare in all of our communities at a greatly increasing cost to the average taxpayer. It also deals with people who could eat these potatoes if we could get the potatoes to them but who are unable to purchase the potatoes on the open market. It deals particularly with a procedure which I think is practical especially now through which we can be of some assistance in those cases. It will take about 15 minutes for me to place this information before the House. Then I shall be happly to yield to anyone who wishes to add any comments.

I would like to report briefly on the developments in Greenfield, Mass., with reference to obtaining surplus potatoes from areas immediately adjoining Greenfield, and for the use of persons certified to be in need of them, but unable to purchase them.

I think you will all recall that there was a meeting of the Senate Committee on Agriculture with the Secretary of Agriculture on January 31. Prior to the hour of that meeting, the Secretary had issued a press release covering his statement to be made before the committee. I shall insert the full release in the revision of my remarks, but I want to deal now with one specific sentence. It is as follows:

> However, section 411 of the act of 1949 requires that section 32 funds be devoted principally to perishable nonbasic agricultural commodities which are not designed for mandatory price supports by the act. Potatoes are designed for mandatory support, and it is therefore not possible to continue using these funds to finance potato disposal on a paid-freight basis.

This was brought to the attention of the Secretary and he called upon Mr. Edward M. Shulman, associate solicitor in charge of production and adjustment, Commodity Credit Corporation, to testify. Mr. Shulman stated:

> I do not think it is a prohibition.

The junior Senator from New Mexico inquired:

> Do you regard it as a prohibition?

Mr. Shulman replied:

> No, sir.

This was extensively discussed in the other body on February 2 and 3. I called specific attention to page 1427 of the RECORD where certain important facts are set forth, and specifically to the remarks of the former Secretary of Agriculture, the junior Senator from New Mexico, as follows:

> I call attention to the fact that in the 1949 Farm Act there is provision that commodities in danger of spoiling can be handled in several specific ways. The Thomas amendment provides, first of all, that such commodities shall be available to Indians and other needy persons within the United States. The school-lunch program and charitable institutions * * * I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin, I would like to see that provision of the act tried and tried vigorously before we turn to the alternative of seeking at this late date to establish a stamp plan which has tremendous administrative difficulties.

Nevertheless, on Friday evening, February 3, the Secretary ordered the field men of the Federal Department to start

dumping the 50,000,000 bushels of surplus edible potatoes and predicted that the total to be destroyed in the next few weeks would be between 25,000,000 and 40,000,000 bushels at a cost of $1.25 per bushel. That would be between $31,250,000 and $50,000,000. This precipitous action was tragic in the face of the statement of former Secretary of Agriculture ANDERSON in the Senate Friday afternoon that the 1949 act gave the Secretary discretion to make these surplus commodities available to school-lunch programs, to welfare and charitable institutions, and to the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

On February 9 I was requested by responsible constituents in Greenfield, Mass., to inquire as to the possibilities and procedures for obtaining some of these potatoes for persons in need of them but unable to purchase them. After conferences with the Division of Food Distribution Program Branch of the Department, I reported that I had been advised that the Department was willing to cooperate in this effort, and that it would send me copies of agreements which were available for completing arrangements for such distribution.

I shall include copies of two agreements in the revision of my remarks known as Form FP–51, Agreement with the United States Department of Agriculture for Distribution and Use of Commodities, and the State agency, and Form FP–53, an Agreement Between Distributing Agency and Recipient Agency for Commodities Donated by the United States Department of Agriculture. At this time, however, it is necessary to refer only to two sentences in these forms.

In Form FP–51 there is the following sentence:

> Such distribution or use shall not be in excess of the maximum rates of distribution established by the Department.

In Form FP–53 there is the following sentence:

> Commodities will be requested and accepted only in such quantities as can and will be fully utilized but not to exceed the rates established by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Let me emphasize those words, "not to exceed the rates established by the United States Department of Agriculture."

On July 1, 1949, effective immediately, the Federal Department issued a schedule of maximum quantities of section 32 commodities that may be issued to various-sized welfare families during 1 month. I shall include that schedule in the revision of my remarks, but for present purposes I need only refer to the schedule for Irish potatoes in particular. It provides the following maximum quantities:

	Pounds
For 1 person	10
For 2 persons	20
For 3 or 4 persons	25
For 5 or 6 persons	35
For 7 or 8 persons	45
For 9 or 10 persons	55
For 11 or more persons	65

These maximums, particularly in the middle groups are absurd. I have made a request for an immediate review and revision and shall report the results of the request as soon as I have them.

The full press release follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
January 31, 1950.

THE PRESENT POTATO SITUATION

(A statement by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at 10 a. m., January 31, 1950)

Once more I find it necessary to call to the attention of Congress a serious situation which has developed in the carrying out of mandatory potato price-support operations.

The 1949 potato crop is now estimated at 402,000,000 bushels—nearly 40,000,000 bushels greater than the August-September official estimates of 363,000,000 bushels, and 52,000,000 above the production target of 350,000,000 bushels upon which the 1949 acreage goals were based.

In other words, increased yields as a result of exceptionally favorable growing conditions have added about 40,000,000 bushels to the crop since the early fall estimates. And these 40,000,000 bushels have been added to the surplus which will have to be handled in carrying out price support.

In terms of the price-support job, the situation is this: To date we have bought a little less than 20,000,000 bushels of 1949 potatoes. Our men now estimate that we will have to buy a total of around 65,000,000 to 70,000,000 bushels from the 1949 crop in order to meet mandatory price-support commitments. This means that we will still have to buy from 45,000,000 to 50,000,000 bushels, in addition to the potatoes already handled.

It appears now that the final cost will range from a low of $80,000,000 to a high of $100,000,000, depending on the policy which is followed in disposing of the surplus stocks acquired from now on.

This situation again points up the fact that we do not have an adequate mechanism to help farmers bring their production in line with the demand. The only medium available to us under the existing legislation is to reduce price support. We did this, taking full advantage of the provisions of the law by dropping the support on 1949 potatoes to 60 percent of parity—the bottom of the permissive range. At the same time, I pointed out in the public announcement of this decision on November 17, 1948, that I was doing this with reluctance, that it was not a desirable or adequate way to get production adjustments, and that I was taking the action only because no other effective way was available.

Acreage goals for potatoes are not a positive and effective way of securing downward adjustments in production. When they are not backed by marketing quotas—and they cannot be under existing legislation—they become largely voluntary. The fact is that the only effective mechanism which we are authorized to use in supporting prices is the purchase and withdrawal from the market of enough of the potato supply to maintain market prices at the predetermined support level. This tends to nullify the effectiveness of acreage goals or allotments. With the whole market supported, the producer who plants beyond his acreage allotment suffers no real penalty. He can simply sell in the open market at the support price, even if he is ineligible to sell directly to the Government under price-support operations.

Acreage goals were in effect for the 1949 potato crop on as realistic a basis as possible in terms of production requirements, average yields per acre, and equitable distribution among the States. The national production requirement, or target for production, was reduced by 25,000,000 bushels from the 1947 and 1948 levels. Commercial acreage was reduced by 20 percent. The assumed yield was increased by 17 percent over that used for 1948, up to 186 bushels per acre. This assumed yield for 1949, as the basis for setting acreage allotments, was the average of actual yields in 1946 and 1947, and the then available estimate for 1948—the years of the three highest yields of record.

Most farmers went along with their allotments and total potato plantings in 1949 were in line with the national goal, but there were some decreases in low-producing areas and some increases in high-producing regions. Yields went up to 211 bushels per acre, in spite of the fact that in the summer it was officially estimated that they would be only slightly higher than the assumed yields which were the basis for goal establishment. Practically all of this increase took place in the 18 late-surplus States, where the yield reached an average of 238 bushels per acre. It was obviously not possible for the official crop reporters or anyone else to foresee the developments which would cause the late crop to progress so favorably. At that, the yield averages for 1949 as a whole did not vary nearly as greatly from the assumed yields as they had in 1947 and 1948.

For 1950, we lowered the estimated requirement figure by another 15,000,000 bushels—or to 335,000,000. We raised the yield estimate to 200 bushels per acre. We have cut the commercial acreage another 7 percent in establishing allotments. These steps should work toward production more nearly in line with demand for the 1950 crop, but as already pointed out we will be dependent not only on the weather but also upon the compliance of growers—especially those commercial producers in the higher-producing areas.

The immediate problem is what to do with the potatoes we will have to take off the market in the weeks ahead in order to keep prices at the required support level. There are alternate courses which can be followed with regard to the basic policy of disposal. We can continue to move all stocks to some diversion outlet, setting aside and spending the money necessary to see that the potatoes go into some secondary use. On the other hand, we can save something like $15,000,000 by simply permitting the potatoes to remain in the areas where they are produced.

In the late spring of 1947, a Subcommittee on Food Shortages of the House Agriculture Committee recommended that the Department of Agriculture avoid dumping of potatoes entirely, even if this required "marketing in areas distant from that where the local surplus exists." This has been regarded as a mandate to save potatoes regardless of cost, and the Department has dumped no potatoes since that time.

Carrying out this diversion-at-all-cost policy has been very expensive. While the net cost for 1948 crop potato price support was $224,000,000 it has been estimated that the commodity cost of the potatoes bought from that crop—the prices paid to producers, including grading and sacking—was less than two hundred million. Around $25,000,000 of the net cost represented transportation charges, above any payments by recipients, in order to get the surplus potatoes to diversion points so that somebody would use them. The commodity costs themselves could be reduced materially, of course, if grading, sacking, and other marketing services which are necessary when potatoes are to be moved out of the area were dispensed with. On the 1948 crop, it is estimated that these services involved an additional cost of about $30,000,000.

In other words, an extra cost of about $55,000,000 in handling price-support operations for the 1948 crop could have been saved by abandoning the potatoes right where

they were produced. And we could save about $15,000,000 in handling the rest of the 1949 crop surplus if we dropped long-haul distribution.

Certain provisions of our new legislation, the Agricultural Act of 1949, are complicating our current potato-distribution operations and adding to an already difficult situation.

In previous years, we have distributed large volumes of potatoes for human consumption in school lunch programs and nonprofit welfare institutions. Believing that this was an extremely desirable type of distribution, we have encouraged it to the limit through the use of the so-called section 32 funds for paying transportation and handling charges, in addition to the commodity cost itself.

However, section 411 of the act of 1949 requires that section 32 funds be devoted principally to perishable nonbasic agricultural commodities which are not designated for mandatory price supports by the act. Potatoes are designated for mandatory support, and it is therefore not possible to continue using these funds to finance potato distribution on a paid-freight basis.

The act provides (in sec. 416) for donation of commodities such as potatoes to school lunch and welfare outlets, but they must be donated f. o. b. at shipping point. In other words, we can no longer pay transportation charges on this type of distribution.

However, there is provision in the act for distribution for livestock feed of commodities which are threatened with loss through spoilage, without the restriction on the payment of transportation or handling charges. The paradox of a situation in which we would pay transportation costs on potatoes going for livestock feed, but would be forced to assess such charges to those who wanted them for human food, is so obvious that we feel obligated to discontinue paid-freight distribution for livestcok feed.

The result of this whole situation is that our purchases could not be stepped up as much as needed for support purposes in recent weeks, because purchases beyond currently available disposal outlets would obviously create an untenable situation.

With a lag in purchases, market prices are dipping below the support level. Growers, principally in the Northeast and North Central areas, are rightfully complaining. They have been promised price support at a mandatory level, and they are entitled to it. The present situation must not be permitted to continue. Decisions must be made promptly so that support operations can be reactivated to protect potato farmers.

I want to make one thing clear. The Department of Agriculture has done and is continuing to do everything it can to move surplus potatoes under the provision of the act of 1949. We have offered them to United States exporters at 1 cent a hundred pounds for shipment outside the country, and while we are working aggressively on this and have had some inquiries it is obvious that any possible export outlets will not move a significant volume. Large enough orders are not available now when needed.

We have offered potatoes for donation under the terms of section 416 of the act, and have made every effort to stimulate this type of distribution. We have been in touch with the Munitions Board and other agencies which might be interested in exchanging potatoes for strategic materials produced abroad. We have notified the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all public and private domestic welfare agencies that the potatoes are available without cost. We have given similar notice to private welfare organizations which might be interested in shipments to relieve needy persons outside the United States.

In spite of our best efforts to encourage these donation outlets, the agencies concerned are not showing any great desire to place requests. As pointed out before, the fact that school-lunch programs and welfare agencies will now have to pay the transportation costs may actually slow down this distribution. In any event, it is apparent that all these donations and export outlets will not correct the situation we now face in the potato-producing areas—a situation which is growing more aggravated daily.

It is now time for a decision on potato-distribution policy. It would be possible, of course, to continue all-out efforts to divert in order to avoid the unpleasant task of seeming to destroy potential crop values. Alcohol plants, for instance, would probably accept substantial shipments of potatoes if we make them available at practically a zero price and pay all costs of transportation to their plants. It must be borne in mind, however, that there is no scarcity of end products such as alcohol or starch. In fact, diversion of potatoes to these products will contribute to surplus problems for other commodities.

After the most careful consideration, and in view of all the factors involved, we have decided that the soundest and most practical course for us to follow in handling the rest of the 1949 potato crop surplus is to limit distribution to outlets which will not involve cost to the Government beyond the commodity cost itself. In other words, we intend to move all the potatoes we can through practical diversion channels, generally in or reasonably near the areas of production. But when these outlets have been used we will dispose of surplus potato stocks in the least expensive way, which will at times mean dumping them locally.

This is the course we will follow, unless the Congress directs us to do otherwise.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I will be glad to. The gentleman also filed one of the four bills.

Mr. KEATING. I asked the Bureau of Human Nutrition to break-down for me the number of pounds of potatoes per family of four persons that each family could get out of the surplus amount they have on hand, and they tell me that every family of four persons in the land is entitled to 80 pounds of potatoes out of this surplus. Of course, as the gentleman knows, there are many families that do not need this help with their grocery bills which should make available all the more for those that do. I certainly agree with the gentleman, therefore, that these maximums should be raised.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman for that comment. I might say that I took the trouble Saturday, and I should have them some time today, to order pictures taken of what those quantities would be. I think the Members will be amazed to find out that it amounts in the neighborhood of seven to eight medium-sized potatoes for a family of three persons for a week and the same number of slightly larger potatoes for a family of four persons for the same period.

To go on:

My constituents from Greenfield had been assured of cooperation on the part of the commodity distribution division of the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare and over the week end all of the clergy of that town, together with the Council of Social Agencies, conducted a complete survey in order to provide exact information. They did this because they had been advised it would be necessary to make this survey and to report definite figures.

Then, we ran into insistence by the State office that these potatoes which were largely located within a radius of 6 to 10 miles of Greenfield would have to be transported south to Springfield, a matter of some 25 miles, unloaded, weighed, and rebagged presumably into these lots of 10, 20, 25, 35, 45, 55, and 65 pounds constituting the maximum amounts. Of course, they would then have to be brought back through these communities where they are now stored and delivered at Greenfield. All of this was in the face of the willingness by the Salvation Army at Greenfield to use its truck in going a few miles to obtain these potatoes, take them to Greenfield, store them and be responsible for their distribution. I not only got in touch with the Department here, but I wired Governor Dever of Massachusetts, requesting his cooperation to remedy this.

On February 15, I wired the Secretary of Agriculture stating the entire background, including the fact there were approximately 7,000,000 pounds of surplus potatoes now available for food in the Connecticut Valley, and included the following sentence:

> In view of complete reliability and good faith of clergy of Greenfield, Council of Social Agencies, and Salvation Army and of extra unnecessary expense to the taxpayers of Massachusetts and United States if rigid compliance required and under all circumstances in terms of providing these potatoes for food for people who need them now, I respectfully urge your prompt action in ordering the requirements of FP-51 and FP-53 waived so that these potatoes may be made available promptly and without expense to these people.

This is a perfect illustration of the sheer impossibility of a Federal department undertaking to manage a far-flung program affecting all of our communities, large and small, without providing flexibility, without recognizing that the officials and citizens of our communities not only have ability and integrity, but that they can do a far better piece of work in carrying out the details of any such program than can State or Federal officers undertaking to handle the entire program.

I am glad to report that on Saturday the board of public welfare at Greenfield formally agreed to act as the storing and distributing agency for potatoes in the town of Greenfield, and so informed the director of commodity distribution in Boston. I hope that this has met with approval in Boston by this hour and that these potatoes can be started from storage spots to people who are in need of them within the matter of hours.

All this points up the immediate necessity of consideration by the Committee on Agriculture of the identical bills filed on February 2—H. R. 7135, H. R. 7136, H. R. 7137, and H. R. 7138. I shall include a copy of that brief resolution in an extension of my remarks, so it may

be readily available. I urge all who are interested in providing clear and specific authority which will prevent waste and destruction of these enormous quantities of food commodities to join in requesting an early hearing upon these bills.

The bill is as follows:

H. R. 7137

A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the "Agricultural Act of 1949"

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to prevent the waste, and to assure proper utilization of food commodities acquired through price-support operations, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation are authorized and directed to make available such commodities as follows in the order of priority set forth: First, to school-lunch programs; and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Federal, State, and local public-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy Indians and other needy persons; second, to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States; third, to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons outside the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture shall first determine that any such commodities are in ample supply over and above such reserves as may be required and deemed in the public interest. The Secretary of Agriculture and Commodity Credit Corporation shall make any such commodities available at point of storage, at no cost save handling and transportation costs from point of storage. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation may advance as against handling and transportation costs in making delivery up to the equivalent of 6 months' storage costs on any such commodities turned over.

Finally, as soon as these potatoes in the Connecticut Valley have been distributed, I shall attempt to provide a brief memorandum covering the procedure which, in this instance, diverted these potatoes from destruction to food purposes. With this clear precedent, I am confident that others who may be interested can provide their communities with all the information necessary to accomplish this purpose. Yet, may I point out that unless these resolutions, to which I have referred, are enacted in some form, this precedent will only serve those communities located within a reasonable distance from the places of storage and that this, of itself, leaves a clear inequity in the program. I hope to have very shortly official figures as to the cost of storage on these several food commodities. Based upon the information I have been able to obtain, I think it is safe to assume that storage charges on a limited list of food commodities are running well in excess of a million dollars a month. Furthermore, if the Secretary was accurate in stating that the cost of destruction of potatoes alone would run between thirty-one and a quarter million to fifty million dollars, it is obvious that this is a situation which required the immediate consideration of Congress.

May I conclude by inserting a copy of a letter signed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.] and myself and sent today to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. I hope a great many of you who are concerned as to this matter and feel that some prompt action must be taken will support our request by letter or by personal efforts.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1950.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Re: H. R. 7135, H. R. 7136, H. R. 7137, H. R. 7138.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: May we call your attention to these identical resolutions filed in the House February 2, 1950, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Because of the urgent nature of the problem presented in terms of the proposed destruction of edible surplus potatoes, some of this destruction we understand having been carried out, we request your full cooperation in setting these resolutions down for hearing at the earliest possible date. We believe the full facts should be developed as quickly as possible so that this destruction may be avoided and this particular commodity made available for food. We are confident that you and all members of the committee recognize the emergency nature of the problem, and we hope that you will believe that we have tried to make a constructive suggestion in the interest of the American taxpayer and in the interest of those millions of Americans who unfortunately are not able to purchase this fine food commodity in the open market.

We are informed that the latest figures show 2,715,751 persons receiving old-age pensions, 1,486,404 receiving dependents and children's benefits, 92,000 blind people receiving help, and 543,000 on the State and local relief rolls. With this total minimum figure of 4,837,155 people who could make use of these potatoes if they could be given to them, there are many thousands more who clearly are not able to pay the current price of potatoes and therefore are not purchasing them.

According to the Commodity Credit Corporation, as of December 31, 1949, it held approximately 277,480 tons of 10 surplus food commodities which can be eaten without further processing. The Corporation's official report shows that the total cost was approximately $265,000,000. We hope we have made a suggestion which can be utilized to get this food to deserving people rather than to pay additional amounts for storage and ultimately hire more people and pay further amounts to destroy this food.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Thirteenth District, Pennsylvania.
KENNETH B. KEATING,
Fortieth District, New York.
JOHN W. HESELTON,
First District, Massachusetts.
HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.,
Sixth District, Pennsylvania.

I now include the full texts of Forms FP–51, FP–53, FP–53A, FP–53B, the schedule of maximum quantities of section 32 commodities that may be issued to various families in 1 month, together with the texts of certain regulations and instructions issued by the Department in this field designated FDP 842.1, 843.1, 843.2, 843.3, and 844.2. Together they are clear, compelling evidence and a classic example of regulation. You will find in them little, if any, recognition that the people in our communities know anything of their problems or that they have the intelligence to deal with them honestly and capably. But the tedious course forced upon the people of Greenfield before they could find a way through this tangled maze of red tape and the resulting silly results should ease the course and efforts of people in other communities, if they are in a position to obtain some of these potatoes for people who need them.

Form FP–51 (7–31–46)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION.

AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR DISTRIBUTION AND USE OF COMMODITIES

The ----------
(Name of agency)

(Street and No. or RFD Box No.)

(City) (County) (State)

hereinafter referred to as the agency, hereby makes application on behalf of itself, and other agencies which may subsequently designate the agency to act in their behalf, for commodities donated by the United States Department of Agriculture, hereinafter referred to as the Department.

The agency agrees to accept the responsibility for the distribution or use of any commodities donated to the agency and to provide or cause to be provided proper facilities and arrangements for the acceptance and distribution or use of such commodities in accordance with the following minimum terms and requirements:

1. To designate a representative who shall be charged with the responsibility for the proper management and control of all activities pertaining to the distribution or use of commodities. He shall be authorized to sign on behalf of the agency requests for commodities, reports, or other documents necessary in the operation of the direct, distribution program.

2. To accept and distribute or use the commodities in a manner which will assure that they will be used in addition to, and not in substitution for, commodities normally purchased or funds normally provided.

3. To confine distribution or use of commodities received from the Department to or by persons, groups, agencies, or other recipients determined to be eligible, in accordance with instructions issued by the Department, to receive donated commodities. Such distribution or use shall not be in excess of the maximum rates of distribution established by the Department.

4. That care will be exercised at all times to prevent donated commodities from being distributed or used in such quantities or manner as to encourage waste, deterioration, or misuse.

5. To furnish adequate personnel and proper facilities to receive, handle, store, distribute, and, in the case of institutions and school lunch or child-feeding programs, to prepare and serve the commodities in accordance with instructions issued by the Department.

6. In the case of institutions and school lunch or child-feeding program, food will be served in a common dining room, wherever possible, and there will be no discrimination or segregation whatever between paying and nonpaying persons in the type of meals served and the manner of serving.

7. That representatives of the Department may make inspection at any reasonable time of the commodities in storage, or of the

facilities or warehouses used in the handling or storage of commodities.

8. To assume full responsibility for demurrage or any other charges which may accrue after a car has been placed for unloading by the delivering carrier at the point designated in Form FP-54, delivery order, or if such placement is prevented by any cause attributable to the consignee or any agent of the agency.

9 The agency will maintain true and accurate records pertaining to the receipt and distribution or use of the commodities. Such records shall be retained by the agency for a period of at least 2 years and shall be available during such period for inspection by representatives of the Department at any reasonable time and place. The agency will submit monthly reports on Form FP-155 to the Department on or before the 10th of the month following the monthly period covered by the report.

10. Containers received with shipments of donated commodities from the Department will be used exclusively in the redistribution or storage of commodities received or will be sold promptly. Such sales will be carefully supervised and made at a price level which will not disrupt the market for similar products or otherwise interfere with the manufacture and sale of similar containers. The funds derived from the sale of such containers will be used by the agency only for costs involved in distributing or using donated commodities.

11. The agency further agrees to investigate promptly all complaints received in connection with the distribution or use of the donated commodities and to correct any irregularities disclosed, reporting promptly to the Department in each instance. The Department shall have the final determination as to when a complaint has been properly adjusted, whereupon it shall be considered closed.

12. The agency is (check type of agency):

a. One to which commodities will be donated solely for redistribution to eligible recipients with which the agency, acting as an agent of the Department, has executed agreements.

b. One to which commodities will be donated solely for distribution to or use by persons whom it serves or assists.

c. One to which commodities will be donated both for redistribution to eligible recipients and for distribution to or use by persons whom it serves or assists.

13 The agency is: (Check one—if 12a above is checked, omit this item).

☐ A nonpenal eleemosynary institution.

☐ A private hospital serving some cases without cost to the patient.

☐ Operating a nonprofit school-lunch or child-feeding program serving children of high-school grade or under.

☐ A State welfare agency
☐ A county welfare agency
☐ A local welfare agency
☐ A private welfare agency
☐ Other; specify

} which will restrict distribution to persons eligible to receive commodities.

14. There are ------ persons (check one—if 12a above is checked, omit this item).

Who are patients served without cost by the private hospital.

Who are served meals daily by the school-lunch or child-feeding program.

Who are receiving assistance from the agency.

15. The agency or the department may terminate this agreement by giving 30 days' notice in writing to the other party. The Department may cancel this agreement immediately upon receipt of evidence that the terms and conditions thereof have not been fully complied with by the agency. Subject to such notice of termination or cancellation of the agreement, the agency agrees to comply with the instructions of the Department either—

a. To distribute all remaining inventories of commodities donated by the Department in accordance with the provisions of this agreement; or

b. To redonate such inventories to the Department and to transmit such reports as are required by the Department to record final disposition of such inventories.

All reporting requirements of this agreement have been approved by, and subsequent reporting and record keeping requirements will be subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with the Federal Reports Act of 1942.

(Name of distributing agency)

By ---

(Title)

Date ---

Approved:
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

By ---

(Title)

Date ---

EXHIBIT A

Form FP-53
(5-13-48)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN DISTRIBUTING AGENCY AND RECIPIENT AGENCY FOR COMMODITIES DONATED BY THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The below-named recipient agency hereby makes application for commodities donated by the United States Department of Agriculture to the below-named distributing agency.

The recipient agency is (check type of agency):

☐ Operating a nonprofit school-lunch program and is serving ------ persons of high-school grade or under daily. (Average daily participation.) There are ------ children enrolled in the school.

☐ Operating a nonprofit child-feeding program (other than a public or private school), such as summer camps, child-care centers, playgrounds, etc., and is serving ------ children daily.

☐ A nonpenal, charitable institution with ------ persons residing therein.

☐ A public/private welfare agency with ------ persons receiving assistance from the agency. Distribution is restricted to persons eligible to receive commodities.

Only schools will fill in one of the boxes below:

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH INDEMNITY PROGRAMS

Only schools that have an agreement with a State agency under which they operate in the national school lunch program will submit the requested information in this box. The children are served the following type lunch (check applicable box or boxes and fill in number of children served each type of meal):

Type A ☐

(No. served)
Type B ☐

(No. served)
Type C ☐

(No served)

NOT IN NATIONAL SCHOOL-LUNCH INDEMNITY PROGRAMS

Only schools which do not have an agreement to operate a national school lunch program will submit information in this box.

This school conducts one of the following type programs (check one):

☐ Hot lunch prepared and served each day.

☐ No cooking facilities installed, but fresh and/or dried fruits and juices (milk) are distributed when available.

The recipient agency hereby agrees to the following terms and conditions:

1. Commodities will be requested and accepted only in such quantities as can and will be fully utilized but not to exceed the rates established by the United States Department of Agriculture.

2. Commodities received under this agreement will be used solely for the benefit of those persons served or assisted by the recipient agency and will not be otherwise disposed of without prior written approval of the distributing agency. Under no circumstances will the United States Department of Agriculture commodities be sold or traded. Such commodities will be used in addition to, and not in substitution for, commodities normally purchased, and expenditures for food will not be reduced because of receipt of such donated commodities. (The preceding sentence does not apply to commodities distributed under the terms of section 6 of the National School Lunch Act.)

3. Facilities for the proper handling and storing of commodities requested and accepted will be provided. The distributing agency and the United States Department of Agriculture are authorized to inspect at any reasonable time the commodities in storage or the facilities or warehouses used in the handling or storage of commodities.

4. These foods will be served in a common dining room, wherever possible, and there will be no distinction or segregation whatever between paying and nonpaying persons in the type of meals served and the manner of serving.

5. Containers received with the commodities donated by the United States Department of Agriculture will be used in accordance with instructions prescribed by the distributing agency.

6. Books and records pertaining to the receipt and use of commodities will be kept, for a period of not less than 3 years, and reports furnished to the distributing agency as required. As a minimum, these books and records will contain the following: (a) a record of all commodities received, including date, and quantity; (b) an inventory record of donated commodities on hand at the end of each month; (c) a record of container use and an accounting of all funds derived from the sale of empty containers; and (d) a daily record of lunches served to children and institutional inmates (for schools under the national school lunch program, the present daily record of lunches served, form FP-9, will suffice). The distributing agency and the United States Department of Agriculture are authorized to inspect such books and records at any reasonable time and place to insure compliance with the above conditions. (The record keeping requirements contained herein have been approved by the Budget Bureau in accordance with the Federal Reports Act of 1942.)

7. Either agency may terminate this agreement by giving thirty (30) days' notice in writing to the other party. The distributing agency may cancel this agreement immediately upon receipt of evidence that the terms and conditions thereof have not been fully complied with. Subject to such notice of termination or cancellation of the agreement, the recipient agency agrees to comply with

the instructions of the destributing agency, either (a) to distribute all remaining inventories of the United States Department of Agriculture commodities in accordance with the provisions of this agreement or (b) to return such inventories to the distributing agency, and to transmit such reports as are required by the distributing agency to record final disposition of such inventories.

(Address of recipient agency)

(Title)

(Name of recipient agency)

(Signature of authorized representative)

Approved and certified for the period of ---------- ------ ------ to October 31, 19--.
(Month) (Day) (Year)

(Address of distributing agency)

(Title)

(Name of distributing agency)

(Signature of authorized representative)

EXHIBIT B

Form FP-53A
(5-13-48)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN DISTRIBUTING AGENCY AND RECIPIENT AGENCY FOR COMMODITIES DONATED BY THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The below-named recipient agency hereby makes application for commodities donated by the United States Department of Agriculture to the below-named distributing agency.

The recipient agency thereby agrees to the following terms and conditions:

1. Commodities will be requested and accepted only in such quantities as can and will be equitably distributed and fully utilized by eligible schools as listed on the attached Form FP-53B, but not to exceed the rates established by the United States Department of Agriculture.

2. Commodities received under this agreement will be used solely for the benefit of those persons served or assisted by the recipient agency and will not be otherwise disposed of without prior written approval of the distributing agency. Under no circumstances will USDA commodities be sold or traded. Such commodities will be used in addition to, and not in substitution for, commodities normally purchased, and expenditures for food will not be reduced because of receipt of such donated commodities. (The preceding sentence does not apply to commodities distributed under the terms of sec. 6 of the National School Lunch Act.)

3. Facilities for proper handling and storing of commodities requested and accepted will be provided. The distributing agency and the United States Department of Agriculture are authorized to inspect at any reasonable time the commodities in storage or the facilities and warehouses used in handling or storage of commodities.

4. These foods will be served in a common dining room, wherever possible, and there will be no distinction or segregation whatever between paying and nonpaying persons in the type of meals served and the manner of serving.

5. Containers received with the commodities donated by the United States Department of Agriculture will be used in accordance with instructions prescribed by the distributing agency.

6. Books and records pertaining to the receipt and use of commodities will be kept, for a period of not less than 3 years, and reports furnished to the distributing agency as required. As a minimum, the recipient agency will maintain the following books and records: (a) A record and supporting related documents of all commodities received, including date and quantity; (b) a record of the distribution made to schools and receipts from the individual schools supporting such distribution; and (c) an accounting of container funds. The recipient agency will be responsible for the maintenance of the following records by each school eligible to receive commodities under this agreement: (a) A record of all commodities received, including date and quantity; (b) an inventory record of donated commodities on hand at the end of each month; (c) a record of container use and an accounting of all funds derived from the sale of empty containers; and (d) a daily record of lunches served to children. (For schools under the National School Lunch program, the present daily record of lunches served, Form FP-9, will suffice.) The distributing agency and the United States Department of Agriculture are authorized to inspect such books and records at any reasonable time and place to insure compliance with the above conditions. (The record-keeping requirements contained herein have been approved by the Budget Bureau in accordance with the Federal Reports Act of 1942.)

7. Either agency may terminate this agreement by giving 30 days' notice in writing to the other party. The distributing agency may cancel this agreement immediately upon receipt of evidence that the terms and conditions thereof have not been fully complied with. Subject to such notice of termination or cancellation of the agreement, the recipient agency agrees to comply with the instructions of the distributing agency, either (a) to distribute all remaining inventories of United States Department of Agriculture commodities in accordance with the provisions of this agreement, or (b) to return such inventories to the distributing agency, and to transmit such reports as are required by the distributing agency to record final disposition of such inventories.

(Name of recipient agency)

(Address of recipient agency)

(Signature of authorized representative)

(Title)

Approved and certified for the period of ------ ------ ------ to October 31, 19--.
(Month) (Day) (Year)

(Name of distributing agency)

(Address of distributing agency)

(Signature of authorized representative)

(Title)

Form FP-53B (5-13-48) — U. S Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration — County — Page of pages — Form approved Budget Bureau No. 40-R1835

ATTACHMENT TO DIRECT DISTRIBUTION AGREEMENT FORM FP-53A SCHOOLS

Name and address of recipient agency

Name of school	Address	Average daily attendance	Average daily number of meals served				Able to use fresh and/or dry fruits and juices only. Insert check (✓) mark, if applicable	Approximate closing date of lunchroom for summer vacation
			By schools participating in national school-lunch program			By schools not participating in national school-lunch program		
			Type A	Type B	Type C			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)

The above information is true and correct according to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Date---------- Signature----------

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING COLUMNS 1 THROUGH 9 OF "ATTACHMENTS TO DIRECT DISTRIBUTION AGREEMENT FORM FP-53A SCHOOLS"

Column 1: "Name of school."

For schools eligible to participate under the National School Lunch Act the school name should be entered exactly as it appears on the school-lunch agreement. For all other schools the official name of the school should be entered.

Column 2: "Address."

For schools eligible to participate under the National School Lunch Act the address should be entered exactly as it appears on the school-lunch agreement. For all other schools the complete mailing address of the school should be entered.

Column 3: "Average daily attendance."

This figure should represent the average number of children attending school daily. This column should not reflect the school enrollment figure.

Columns 4, 5, and 6: "By schools participating in NSL program."

These columns will be completed only for schools participating in the national school-lunch program, and should reflect the average number of children eating in the lunchroom by meal type served.

Column 7: "By schools not participating in NSL program."

This figure should represent the average daily number of meals served for schools that do not have an agreement with a State agency to operate under the terms of the National School Lunch Act, but that do operate a nonprofit school-lunch program.

Column 8: "Able to use fresh and/or dry fruits and juices only."

This column should be checked (√) for schools that do not have facilities to provide a noonday lunch, but that can serve fresh and/or dry fruits and fruit or vegetable juices. In the event the school can serve fresh and/or dry fruits, but does not have facilities to serve juices, this fact should be noted in this column also. Where column 6 (type C) is used column 8 should also be completed.

Column 9: "Approximate closing date of lunchroom for summer vacation."

The date entered in this column should be the best estimate of the closing date of the lunchroom for summer vacation. This date may or may not be the school-closing date.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION, FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS BRANCH

Schedule of maximum quantities of sec. 32 commodities that may be issued to various sized families during 1 month, effective July 1, 1949

Commodity	Unit	1 person	2 persons	3 or 4 persons	5 or 6 persons	7 or 8 persons	9 or 10 persons	11 or more persons
Apples:								
Fresh	Pounds	6	12	20	28	36	42	50
Canned	do	2	4	8	12	16	20	22
Dried	do	½	1	2	3	4	5	6
Applesauce	do	2	4	7	10	14	18	20
Apricots, dried	do	½	1	2	3	4	5	6
Beans, dried	do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cabbage	do	2	5	8	12	15	18	20
Eggs, dried	5-oz. package	½	1	1½	2	2½	3	3½
Grapefruit juice	46-oz. can	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Peaches, dried	Pounds	½	1	2	3	4	5	6
Potatoes, Irish	do	10	20	25	35	45	55	65
Potatoes, sweet	do	2	5	8	11	15	18	20
Prunes, dried	do	½	1	2	3	4	5	6
Raisins, dried	do	½	1	2	3	4	5	6
Dried fruit, when 2 or more are distributed during the same month	do	1	2	4	6	8	10	12
Potatoes, when Irish and sweet are distributed during the same month	do	10	20	25	35	45	55	65

United States Department of Agriculture
Production and Marketing Administration
Food Distribution Programs Branch

FDP 842.1

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

I. Purpose and scope: The purpose of this instruction is to set forth the requirements which govern the eligibility of organization(s) to receive and use commodities donated by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).

II. Definitions: For the purpose of this instruction the below-named terms will be construed as shown:

A. Tax exempt: Exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the United States Internal Revenue Code, the pertinent part of which reads as following: "The following organizations shall be exempt from taxation under this chapter: (6) Corporations, and any Community Chest fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for * * * charitable, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children * * *, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, * * *."

B. Nonpenal: Determination as to whether an institution is nonpenal shall be based upon the State statute or constitution establishing the institution, or other appropriate State legislation, or upon a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction or a legal opinion of the State attorney general or other authorized State legal official.

C Section 32 commodities: Commodities acquired by USDA pursuant to section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended, and related legislation.

D. Section 6 commodities: Commodities acquired by USDA pursuant to section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, Public Law 396, approved June 4, 1946.

III. General: In order to be eligible to receive and use section 6 or 32 commodities donated by the USDA, an organization must meet the qualifications hereby established and be a party to an agreement as set forth in FDPB 843.2.

IV. Eligibility requirements pertaining to receipt of section 32, commodities: The following types of organizations are eligible to receive section 32 commodities provided they meet the requirements set forth:

A. Schools: Public schools, Indian schools operated by the Office of Indian Affairs, and tax-exempt (nonprofit) private schools provided they are of high school grade or under and operate, or propose to operate, a nonprofit school-lunch program. Schools not serving complete meals, but otherwise meeting the above requirements may receive commodities that do not require preparation for serving.

NOTE.—No part of the net earnings of any school-lunch program may inure to the benefit of any shareholder or individual or to any other school activity.

1. Eligible recipients: All children attending an eligible school are eligible to consume section 32 commodities.

B Welfare agencies: Public or private welfare agencies provided they serve or assist relief recipients.

1. Eligible recipients: Persons receiving the following types of assistance are eligible to receive section 32 commodities:

(a) Direct relief.
(b) Old age.
(c) Aid to blind.
(d) Aid to dependent children.
(e) Any similar category of assistance.

C. Public institutions: Tax-supported institutions, other than those supported by Federal funds, provided they are nonpenal and perform charitable functions by providing for needy persons.

1. Extent of eligibility: Section 32 commodities may be distributed to public institutions on the basis of the number of persons served who are unable to pay the full charge for the services provided to them.

NOTE.—Commodity distribution rates are established on a monthly basis. Therefore, organizations that serve eligible persons for portions of months must convert the days into equivalent months of care or assistance provided. Where the number of monthly eligibles, as computed above, is relatively stable the number of such eligibles as obtained from records of the last preceding month may be used. Where the number of monthly eligibles, computed as described above, fluctuate from month to month, a monthly average of such eligibles will be computed from records of the last preceding year.

D. Private organizations: The following types of private organizations in the manner and to the extent shown below:

1. Tax-exempt organizations, including subsidiaries thereof, or activities supported by tax-exempt funds or foundations, provided that they are engaged exclusively in providing assistance and care for needy persons.

(a) Eligible recipients: All persons served by such an eligible organization are eligible to consume section 32 commodities.

2. Tax-exempt organizations that are not engaged exclusively in providing assistance and care for needy persons provided that they serve some such persons.

(a) Extent of eligibility: Commodities will be distributed on the basis of the number of persons served who have been certified as unable to pay the usual charge for the care provided to them.

NOTE.—The note under paragraph IV, C-1 above, is also applicable to this paragraph.

E. Emergency and disaster relief organizations: Any organization providing emergency or disaster relief is eligible provided specific authorization is granted by the area office.

F. Experimental or testing agencies: Organizations or agencies, public or private, that are engaged in legitimate experimental, testing or demonstration work for the sole benefit of eligible schools, institutions, agencies, or organizations are eligible to receive section 32 commodities for such purposes.

V. Eligibility requirements pertaining to section 6 commodities: The following are eligible to receive section 6 commodities provided they meet the requirements set forth.

A. Schools: Only schools serving type A or B meals under the national school-lunch program are eligible to receive section 6 commodities.

1. Extent of eligibility: Unless otherwise authorized, section 6 commodities will be distributed to schools on the basis of the number of children who are served type A or B meals for which reimbursement is authorized and claimed under the National School Lunch Act. Children who are being served type C meals are not to be considered as a part of the basis for distributing section 6 commodities.

B. Agencies conducting workshops or experimental programs: Organizations or agencies that are engaged in legitimate experimental or demonstrational work for the sole benefit of the national school lunch program are eligible to receive section 6 commodities for such purpose, provided the State agency administering the national school lunch program within the State, approves the particular demonstration, experiment, or test for which the commodities are needed.

1. Extent of eligibility: Section 6 commodities may be distributed to approved agencies in the specific amounts approved

by the State agency administering the school-lunch program.

(a) Requests from eligible agencies: Eligible agencies wishing to use section 6 commodities must make written application for such commodities to the State agency administering the school-lunch program. This application should include details as to the type of experiment or demonstration, the period during which it will be conducted, the approximate number to be in attendance, the quantity of commodities that would be required, sponsors, and other pertinent information that would permit determination of the merit and needs of the applicants. The approved application will be forwarded by the State agency administering the school-lunch program to the D/A. The D/A may then distribute, under regularly established operating procedures, commodities in such amounts as are indicated.

VI. Referral to area office: If the eligibility of any organization is still doubtful after applying the standards established in this instruction the specific problem should be referred to the area office. Such referrals will include all pertinent information, together with reasons for the referral.

United States Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration, Food Distributions Programs Branch

FDP 843.1

SCOPE OF DISTRIBUTION AGREEMENTS

Distribution of commodities acquired by the Department of Agriculture will be made only to those distributing agencies which have executed and have in effect an agreement with the Department. Distributing agencies cannot, under any circumstances, redistribute commodities to recipient agencies or groups unless eligibility has been determined (FDP–842) and a bona fide subagreement has been executed between the distributing agency and the recipient agency.

United States Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration, Food Distribution Programs Branch

FDP 843.2

DISTRIBUTING AGENCY AGREEMENT WITH THE USDA FOR DISTRIBUTION AND USE OF COMMODITIES, FORM FP–51

I. Distributing agency defined: A distributing agency may be any agency such as a State department of education, department of welfare, department of agriculture, county welfare agency, or any other responsible organization. To act as a distributing agency, the organization must accept the responsibilities established in form FP–51 and effect distribution of donated commodities without profit.

II. Form FP–51, agreement with the United States Department of Agriculture for distribution and use of commodities: This agreement (copy attached) is a combination of form CCC–369 (formerly FDA–797) and form CCC–127 (formerly FDA–798). It sets forth the conditions and requirements under which commodities will be donated by the Department and accepted by a distributing agency. Basic legal requirements under section 32 are incorporated and the provisions are almost identical with those in the two former agreements with the exception of the addition of section 12.

A. Preparation:

1. Form FP–51 must be prepared by the distributing agency and submitted in duplicate to the Area office of Food Distribution Programs Branch for approval.

2. Sections 12, 13, and 14 are designed to supply necessary information for determining eligibility and capacity of the outlet:

(a) Section 12–a should be checked if the distributing agency will accept commodities solely for redistribution to recipient agencies with which it has executed (or will execute) subagreements (Form FP–53 or a similar form). A State Department of Education, a State Department of Welfare, a State Department of Agriculture, or a State Board of Administration, which accepts commodities solely for redistribution, are examples of such agencies. If section 12–a is checked, no information need be shown for sections 13 and 14.

(b) Section 12b should be checked if the distributing agency will accept commodities solely for distribution to, or for use by, persons whom it serves or assists. County and local welfare agencies, or nonpenal eleemosynary institutions, which accept commodities solely for use in feeding their own patients or others whom they may assist, are examples of such agencies.

(c) Section 12c should be checked if the distributing agency will accept commodities for both (1) its own use, and (2) redistribution to agencies with which it has executed (or will execute) subagreements. An eleemosynary institution accepting commodities for its own use and also for redistribution to eligible schools is an example of such an agency. In recording the number of persons in section 14, this agency would show those persons which it serves, not those covered by subagreements.

B. Other conditions of FP–51:

1. The standard form of agreement, FP–51, covers commodities distributed to schools under section 6 of the National School Lunch Act as well as commodities donated for relief purposes under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended. Both section 6 and section 32 commodities may be distributed only to those schools which request such commodities, and the quantity distributed must be in accordance with the needs of the schools as determined by the local school authorities.

2. Paragraph No. 2 in Form FP–51 prohibits the distribution or use of donated commodities in substitution for commodities normally purchased. It is essential that the provisions of that paragraph be complied with in the distribution or use of section 32 commodities. However, that paragraph does not apply to section 6 commodities.

3. Paragraph No. 3 in Form FP–51 states that the distribution or use of commodities donated by the Department must be confined "to or by persons, groups, agencies, or other recipients determined to be eligible, in accordance with instructions issued by the Department, to receive donated commodities." The only recipients eligible to receive section six commodities are schools participating in the school-lunch-cash-indemnity program under the National School Lunch Act. Requirements for eligibility for other groups are outlined in (FDP–842).

4. Paragraph No. 4 in FP–51, which requires care to be exercised at all times to prevent donated commodities from being distributed or used in such a manner as to encourage waste, deterioration, or misuse, applies equally to section 6 and section 32 commodities.

C. Approval:

1. The agreement may be approved and signed for the Department by the area field supervisor of the Food Distribution Programs Branch, or his authorized representative upon determination that eligibility requirements have been met and provided the standard Form FP–51 is used. If any revision of the agreement is requested, the altered agreement must be submitted to the Washington office, Food Distribution Programs Branch, for approval. Notice of approval of an altered agreement must be received before it may be made effective.

2. The original of Form FP–51 shall be retained by the area field supervisor and the signed copy returned to the distributing agency.

D. Termination of agreement:

The agreement, Form FP–51, is a continuing agreement. However, the agency or the Department may terminate this agreement by giving 30 days' notice in writing to the other party. The Department may cancel this agreement immediately upon receipt of evidence that the terms and conditions thereof have not been fully complied with by the agency. When such notice of termination or cancellation of the agreement is received by the agency, it must comply with the instructions of the Department, either—

1. To distribute all remaining inventories of commodities donated by the Department, in accordance with the provisions of the agreement; or

2. To redonate such inventories to the Department; and

3. To transmit such reports as are required by the Department to record final disposition of such inventories.

JULY 29, 1947.

United States Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration, Food Distribution Programs Branch, Washington, D. C.

FDP 843.3

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN DISTRIBUTING AND RECIPIENT AGENCIES

I. Purpose and scope: This instruction describes the forms that contain the minimum terms and information that must be included in agreements entered into by distributing agencies (D/A's) and organizations that are eligible to use and/or redistribute donated commodities. It further describes the purpose and use of such forms and the procedure to be followed in their preparation and distribution.

A. Approved agreement forms.—Forms FP–53, FP–53A, and FP–53B have been prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) for use by D/A's in entering into agreements with eligible organizations. Use of these forms is not mandatory as D/A's may prepare their own agreement forms which must contain, as a minimum, the provisions of Forms FP–53 or 53A (see exception, subpar. 1). D/A's who prepare their own agreement forms must submit them to the area office for approval before they are put into use.

1. Exception to minimum provisions.—The provisions contained in section 6 of Forms FP–53 and 53A are optional. Recipient agencies (R/A's) will keep such records as are prescribed by the D/A who is party to the agreement. The record keeping requirements prescribed by D/A's will be subject to approval of the area office.

II. Definitions:

A. Recipient agency: Any organization that has executed an agreement to accept commodities for its own use.

B. Subdistributing agency (sub-D/A): Any organization that has executed any agreement to accept donated commodities for redistribution to subunits over which it has administrative control and authority, or to R/A's over which it has authority because of contractual obligations accepted by such R/A's.

NOTE 1.—A parent administrative body may act for all of its subunits without the necessity of entering into contracts with such subunits. However, where a sub-D/A is accepting commodities for and issuing them to R/A's over which it has no administrative control or authority, it is necessary that an agreement be entered into between such sub-D/A and such R/A's.

NOTE 2.—An agency may both use and redistribute commodities and will, therefore, be both a sub-D/A and an R/A.

III. Form FP-53: The Form FP-53 (exhibit A) or other like agreement form will be used in making agreements between D/A's and R/A's and between sub-D/A's and R/A's.

A. Preparation and distribution: The Form FP-53 will be executed by the R/A in duplicate and sent to the D/A or sub-D/A for approval and execution. Upon execution by the D/A or sub-D/A, one copy of the FP-53 will be returned to the R/A and the original filed.

NOTE.—When the agreement is between a sub-D/A and an R/A the FP-53 may be amended by placing a diagonal (/) in front of the words "distributing agency," wherever they may appear, and inserting the word "sub."

IV. Form FP-53-A: The Form FP-53-A (exhibit B)—or other like agreement—will be used in making agreements between A/A's and sub-D/A's.

A. Preparation and distribution.—The Form FP-53-A will be executed by the sub-D/A in duplicate and sent to the D/A for approval and execution. Upon execution by the D/A, one copy will be returned to the sub-D/A and the original filed.

V. Form FP-53-B: The Form FP-53-B (exhibit C)—or other like form—is an attachment to the Form FP-53-A and will always be a part of and accompany it.

A. Preparation.—The Form FP-53-B has instructions on its reverse side concerning its preparation.

NOTE.—Although the format and wording of the FP-53-B indicates that it is to be used solely for schools under the jurisdiction of a sub-D/A this form may be modified to include information regarding other types of R/A's. For example, a county school superintendent may be acting as a sub-D/A for all schools under his jurisdiction and for a county institution with whom he has executed a Form FP-53. In such instances the county institution, as well as the schools in the county, will be shown on the FP-53-B

1 Column (7).—The instructions concerning the completion of column (7) should be supplemented by the following: "This column should also contain an entry when a school participating in the NSL program is serving prepared meals to children who are not participating in the NSL program. This entry should be the total of the figure shown in column (4) or (5) plus the figure representing the average daily number of children who are served a prepared meal but who are not participating in the NSL program."

VI. Effective period of agreements: Effective November 1, 1949, all agreements then in force may, if so desired by the D/A, be continued in force indefinitely provided that R/A's and sub-D/A's will furnish the D/A's on or before November 1, 1949, and on or before each succeeding November 1, the following information:

For recipient schools:

Name and address.

Average daily attendance.

Average daily number of meals served by type (if participating in national school lunch program).

Average daily number prepared meals served (if not participating in national school lunch program).

Number of children able to use fresh fruits and/or juices.

For all other recipient agencies:

Name and address.

Average daily participation.

NOTE.—The Form FP-53-B may be used to supply this information.

VII. Schools approved for participation in national school-lunch program: In States where separate offices administer the direct distribution and the national school-lunch program, or where the area office administers the national school-lunch program in private schools, the State school-lunch agency or the area office, is responsible for providing the following information:

(a) Name and address of schools approved for participation in the national school-lunch program.

(b) Number of approved participants in each school, by meal type.

(c) Date of approval of schools for participation.

As changes occur, that is, as new schools are approved, old agreements canceled or changes occur in the number and/or type of participants, supplemental information will be provided.

A. Area-office responsibility: The area office will determine that the above-described information is furnished to the D/A's concerned.

B. D/A responsibility: When the above-described information is received by the D/A, it will be checked against the Forms FP-53, 53A, or 53B—or other like agreements—on file to ascertain that schools claiming participation in the national school-lunch program (and thereby eligible to receive sec. 6 commodities) are actually approved for such participation.

AUGUST 22, 1949.

United States Department of Agriculture
Production and Marketing Administration
Food Distribution Programs Branch

FDP 844.2

SCHEDULE OF MAXIMUM QUANTITIES OF SECTION 32 COMMODITIES THAT MAY BE ISSUED TO VARIOUS SIZED WELFARE FAMILIES DURING 1 MONTH

I. Purpose and scope: The purpose of this instruction is to provide the requirements for use of the attached schedule of maximum rates of distribution of individual section 32 commodities which may be issued to welfare recipients eligible for participation in the direct distribution program as set forth under FDP 842.1.

II. Authorization for welfare distribution: This schedule does not in itself authorize distribution of any commodities to welfare recipients. Such authority must be contained in the notice of allocation sent to the area FDPB Office when commodities are made available.

III. Schedule of maximum rates of distribution. Distribution to welfare recipients is authorized on a month-to-month basis and in no case may commodities in excess of the amounts listed on the attached schedule be issued during any 1 month.

Based on the quantity available, eligible case load, food habits, storage and distribution facilities, local supply, and other pertinent local factors, the actual distribution rate may be and in some cases should be, less than the maximum rate indicated.

A special grouping of rates for dried fruits and potatoes listed on page 2 of the schedule is to apply as the maximum where two or more dried fruits or where Irish and sweetpotatoes are being distributed during the same month.

The attached schedule is effective July 1, 1949, for those localities where distribution to welfare recipients has been approved, and for those commodities already authorized for such distribution.

Revisions of, or additions to, this schedule will be issued from time to time as necessary.

JULY 1, 1949.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. Gladly. The gentleman has supported the suggestions made in the resolutions and has been of invaluable help in trying to obtain their consideration.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I wish this talk could be heard by everybody in the United States. I want the gentleman to make clear that these are administrative regulations and not in the law enacted by the Congress.

Mr. HESELTON. Very definitely, that is true, and I am glad the gentleman emphasizes that. I have here the suggested agreements prepared by the Department and their schedule of maximum quantities made effective July 1, as well as the voluminous regulations and instructions. It is entirely an administrative matter.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I think the Agriculture Committee should give a prompt hearing to these bills.

Recently the Secretary of Agriculture following his usual fashion appeared before a congressional committee and attempted to pass the buck, threatening to dump or destroy 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes unless Congress stopped him. His immediate predecessor, now Senator ANDERSON, was able to show the following day that Secretary Brannan had lied and misled the committee, when it was shown that he had not only the authority but also the funds available for the payment of transportation of surplus potatoes to school children and needy Americans.

It was admitted by a representative of the Solicitor's Office of the Department of Agriculture, who was pinch hitting for his chief, the Secretary of Agriculture, that they had authority to spend section 32 funds for transportation charges for cattle feed and presumably for school children. How long can this maladministration be tolerated? How long are Americans to go without while we give away and waste needed food?

On the question of the administration, or maladministration, the gentleman said in the House here recently, and I should like to recall it to his mind at this time, that the Secretary of Agriculture not long ago, following his usual fashion, appeared before a congressional committee and attempted to pass the buck, threatening to destroy or to dump 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes unless Congress stopped him. His immediate predecessor, now Senator ANDERSON, was able to show the following day that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, had either deliberately falsified the truth or misled the committee when it was shown that he had not only the authority but also the funds available for the payment of transportation of surplus potatoes to school children and needy Americans.

It was admitted, as the gentleman will recall, by a representative of the Solicitor's Office of the Department of Agriculture, who was pinch hitting for his chief, the Secretary of Agriculture, that they had authority to spend section 32 funds for transportation charges for cattle feed and presumably for school children. There seems to be considerably more concern with the problems of livestock or the industrial alcohol users than there is with those of people. How long are we going to tolerate this maladministration? How long are we going to go without while we give away and waste needed food?

It seems to me we ought to have a hearing at the very earliest possible date by the Committee on Agriculture. I know how the gentleman feels about it, and I understand there are a great

many Members of this House who think that a hearing before the Committee on Agriculture is already too long delayed.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman. I shall reach that point in just a second, if I may.

I should like to add right here that there is another fact in terms of this maladministration I think should be in the RECORD. This Congress last June passed a Commodity Credit charter bill. By the terms of that bill the President was instructed to appoint an advisory board of 5 persons whenever the Secretary should arrive at a situation he felt made their advice desirable and necessary. That advisory board was not appointed until February 1 of this year, in the face of the fact that the Secretary appeared before the Senate Committee on January 31 of this year. This had the effect of taking the props right out from underneath this advisory board, which Congress had authorized last June for the very purpose that the Secretary indicated led him to come before the Legislative Committee of the other body. It is incredible, I submit, that the United States Department of Agriculture with its far-flung organization could not foresee months ago that this situation was going to arise. And certainly no one would seriously contend that our legislative committees would or should accept the responsibilities of supervising the details of administering the laws we enact. And if our committee were to undertake to do so, everyone knows the reaction which would come from the Executive Department.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Would it not be to the advantage of the Department of Agriculture, if it were desirous of bringing the existing law into hatred, ridicule, and contempt, to maladminister it as much as possible in the hope of putting over the Brannan plan, or something of the sort?

Mr. HESELTON. Many responsible people certainly agree with that observation, including the leading Democratic newspaper of New England, the Boston Post, which closed an editorial entitled "Potato Dumping" by saying:

> Mr Brannan seems more intent on showing that the farm price-support program, which he wants ditched in favor of one of his own, is not working out in getting the maximum value for the millions invested.

One of the Post's contemporaries, the Boston Herald, discussed this matter in some detail and concluded as follows:

> But whether the Brannan plan is practical or not, the administration is going to make the present system as unpalatable as possible. It is said that an offer by Spain for some of our surplus potatoes has been turned down, and there are reports that the Government has not been buying as many for school-lunch programs and welfare institutions as in the past. To make the thing look even more threatening, the majority leader in the Senate, LUCAS, has suggested scuttling the potato-support program.
>
> All this evidence of political manipulation of the farm program by the administration is pretty damning. It suggests that the party which makes so much of its solicitude for the farmer, is really simply using the farmer for its political ends. Not merely by promises it cannot fulfill, which is bad enough, but by the actual perversion of administrative functions.

A third New England newspaper, the Springfield (Mass.) Union, concluded an editorial, as follows:

> But the Brannan plan has been so thoroughly discredited that it will take more than aroused public sentiment against waste under the present program to demand a trial for the Brannan production payment idea. Particularly when it is suspected that the Department of Agriculture is actually putting obstacles in the way of distributing the surpluses.

I have already quoted the wire which I sent to Secretary Brannan asking for his cooperation.

On February 17, I received the following telegram from Governor Dever:

> Receipt of night letter and telegram acknowledged. State department of public welfare actively cooperating. Has supplied local welfare department with necessary forms and made concessions with regard to transportation from nearby Deerfield in order to eliminate or reduce cost of transportation of surplus potatoes. However, it is felt requirements that local welfare department assume responsibility for proper storage and distribution is reasonable and waiver of it by Department of Agriculture should not be requested.

I agree thoroughly with the last sentence and had intended to make clear at all times that there should be responsible authority accepting the necessity for proper storage and distribution. But this is a far cry from executing forms FP–51 and FP–53 only to be confronted with this maze of bureaucratic red tape involving long transportation, with the added cost of unpacking, weighing, and rebagging. I do want to give credit to Governor Dever for helping to break through and waiving that senseless requirement. Incidentally, he is a good Democrat. If there is any inclination to escape consideration of this problem by dismissing the facts as political, I want to emphasize that we, who are supporting this possible solution of this situation have stated that we have not presented it as a solution of the problem of a sound agricultural program. We know that is another, broader, vital program. But this Nation is confronted with a condition, not a theory. It was precipitated by this order of destruction. The official who gives such an order should be willing to consider its full implications. Stubborn insistence on the execution of the order will not be acceptable to the American people. As further evidence of the nonpolitical approval toward a solution I call as witnesses the former Secretary of Agriculture, the junior Senator from New Mexico, and the majority leader in the other body, the senior Senator from Illinois. Finally, I quote from a news dispatch by INS from Washington February 10, as follows:

"President Truman has ordered Congress and the Agriculture Department to investigate 'and do something about' the Government's $50,000,000 potato-dumping program." If some of us are trying to do something about it, even though we interpret his "order" as a "request," any charge of politics has a hollow ring. The dispatch continues: "The President summoned his congressional farm leaders to a White House conference, following which one of the conferees disclosed that Mr. Truman has received a "barrel of letters" protesting the plan to destroy up to 40,000,000 bushels of potatoes."

To continue, upon receipt of Governor Dever's telegram, I discussed these developments with the Associate Director of Food Distribution here. He said that the plans which had been made were entirely satisfactory to the Department; that the Form FP–53 would not have to be used; that all that will be required is a simple agreement or a letter stating that the local board of welfare would assume responsibility for proper storage and distribution of these potatoes.

The previous afternoon, I had a lengthy conference with Mr. Dittrich, in charge of the northeastern area, food distribution program branch, and his assistant, Mr. Philip Hearn. All this led, I am sure, to a final recognition on the part of the Department here and on the part of the Massachusetts State Welfare Department that rigid insistence upon the exact compliance with the Federal agreements and regulations, not only would make it utterly impossible for Greenfield to obtain these potatoes economically, but would, in effect, prohibit the disposition of these potatoes or any other food commodity now owned by the Federal Government to the American people who need them and would only support this order of destruction.

At this point may I call your attention to the fact that in the RECORD for February 13 I listed the total amount of food commodities and their cost, which was contained in the official report of the Commodity Credit Corporation at the end of December last year. They run through dried milk, dried eggs, butter, cheese, prunes, raisins, edible dried beans, rice, turkeys, and canned Mexican meat. There are in excess of 277,480 tons of these surplus commodities and they have already cost the Government over $265,000,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. At this point, if the gentleman is willing, I should like to insert a letter which I wrote the other day to Secretary Brannan setting forth a break-down of just how much of each of those items every family of four persons in the land would be entitled to receive. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert at that point in the RECORD my letter to Secretary Brannan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRIMBLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

HON. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Deparment of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Several people in my district in western New York State have written to ask how they may obtain their rightful share of the Government-owned surplus food you are now holding. They have read about your failure to dispose of our surplus potatoes abroad, even at 1 cent

per bag, and that you are now planning to destroy them. These people fear that you will permit the same thing to happen to the Government's stock of other surplus foods, and they are anxious to withdraw their fair share immediately.

I have secured from the Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Human Nutrition, a break-down of some of the surplus-food figures into terms that my people could readily understand. The following table has been prepared from the information they were good enough to furnish.

Item	Total surplus in storage	Surplus per family of 4 persons
Cheese	23,000,000 pounds	About ¼ pound
Dry milk	215,000,000 pounds (860,000,000 quarts) reconstituted.	24 quarts.
Prunes	50,000,000 pounds	11½ pounds.
Dried beans and peas.	9,000,000 hundredweight (900,000,000 pounds).	24 pounds.
Raisins	23,000,000 pounds	½ pound.
Potatoes	50,000,000 bushels (3,000,000,000 pounds).	80 pounds.
Dried eggs	70,000,000 pounds (2,520,000,000 whole eggs or 210,000,000 dozen, reconstituted).	5½ dozen.

The people who have written to me feel entitled to receive the above amounts for their families inasmuch as you have purchased the food with their money. They point out that the food could be shipped parcel post to their homes at no additional cost to the Government. They are very much opposed to your apparent desire for a planned scarcity. They feel that destroying food is sinful.

These people also tell me they are fully-paid-up Federal taxpayers. But after paying the taxes that support your department and the other constantly expanding departments of the Government, they could use some help in meeting their grocery bills. Probably there are those who do not need this help which should make all the more food available for those who do.

Cordially yours,

KENNETH B. KEATING.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RICH. I congratulate the gentleman on trying to get this food put into channels for consumption by those who need cheaper foodstuffs in order to maintain life. I think whenever the Federal Government raises the price so high that people cannot buy it, and then turns around and destroys it, that is a sin. We all hate it. We are all like Calvin Coolidge. We hate it. I wonder whether the gentleman knows whether these men down in the Department of Agriculture, who receive such large salaries, who are handling this affair, attended the $100 dinner last Friday night, and whether they had potatoes at this dinner; and if they did, if the potatoes were given to the banquet or whether they paid for them. More than that, whether they paid the $20 tax that they were supposed to pay when they hold a dinner at a price like that and have amusement. It is high time that the people of this country investigate the terrible things that are going on in this administration.

Mr. HESELTON. I cannot give the gentleman full information because I did not attend the dinner personally.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I cannot yield now. I want to give the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] a further answer. I do understand that when the Secretary of Agriculture was introduced he was very enthusiastically greeted, and that one well-informed Member of the other body, and, of course, a Democrat, said "They are the boys from the Department out there." Does that help the gentleman?

Mr. RICH. He attended that dinner. He can pay $100 for a dinner, but when it comes to the poor people of this country getting potatoes, he wants to destroy the potatoes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. Certainly.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman is doing a fine service in bringing out the weaknesses which exist in the administration of the present subsidy law, but it looks to me, as the previous speaker stated, we should have a re-exploration of the entire idea known as the Brannan plan, because I am convinced, after listening to the discussion today, that the Brannan plan, as discussed last April, is not similar to the Brannan plan that we are talking about today. I call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] brought out the fact that the entire authority for putting these programs into effect without any action by the Congress rests in section 407 of the law. So I wish to support the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.] that there should be a hearing on this subject as soon as possible by the Committee on Agriculture. I congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts again for the very concise and informative statement which does service to the people.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to join the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] in expressing my gratitude to the gentleman from Massachusetts for the service which he has rendered in bringing these facts to the attention of the Department, the Congress, and the American people. As the gentleman knows, I introduced a companion resolution along with the gentleman and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT]. I join wholeheartedly in the request for early action and an early hearing on this bill. I can think of nothing more pressing to which the Committee on Agriculture should give its immediate attention.

In my own community I have started action somewhat similar to the course the gentleman has been pursuing in his district. I feel very strongly, that it is sinful to have these potatoes or any other good food destroyed when there are people hungry both in this country and abroad.

I have made a little investigation of dried eggs. We have heard a great deal about potatoes, but it seems to me that this dried-egg scandal, under the Secretary of Agriculture, is probably the smelliest of the lot that has been uncovered. The Commodity Credit Corporation owns or has under contract to purchase nearly 83,500,000 pounds of dried eggs, acquired at a cost of over $105,000,000. That is the equivalent of practically 260,000,000 dozen eggs.

All these eggs are in storage, and most of them are nearly 2 years old. There is no domestic market, and such users as there are have been buying dried eggs imported from Communist China.

The State Department declares that they have no authority to stop these imports, and the Secretary of Agriculture refuses to act. The Department of Agriculture, however, continues to buy dried eggs in an alleged attempt to support egg prices at 25 cents a dozen. The farmers' wives for the most part have been lucky to receive 20 cents a dozen. The cost of the dried eggs to the Department of Agriculture in terms of shell eggs is 32 cents a dozen.

I am advised also that there are only 18 companies now selling dried eggs to the Department of Agriculture. I would like to know, and I feel there are a lot of other people who would like to know, why they have to pay for these things out of their pay envelopes, why the Secretary of Agriculture continues to waste the taxpayer's money on such a stupid and impractical plan.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I also would like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts not only for the energy and thoroughness with which he has gone into this particular matter, but recall to your memory what he did to get enough oil for heat for his freezing communities from an equally incompetent Federal bureau and the important accomplishments that he was able to report some months ago. He has been a most useful Member of the House, and the people in his district are very fortunate in having him here.

I do not like unjust and inaccurate statements. I am concerned with a statement reportedly made by the President at the hundred-dollar-a-plate dinner—on which no tax was paid—the other night. The President referred to the Eightieth Congress as the "do-nothing Congress." I am very much concerned about things down here. We have taken some time this afternoon to point out effectively something that the Department of Agriculture and the Committee of Agriculture may do to advance the cause of the needy and the impoverished in this country, to see that the food is distributed to the people who can use it, to save the money of the taxpayers. At the same time we have the President telling us that the Eightieth Congress was a do-nothing Congress, but let us look at the record of accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress. In the month of January it passed not a single law and this despite the fact that the Senate was in session 19 days for 94 hours, and the House was in session 17 days for 54 hours. In the month of February it had passed only seven public laws. In this current do-nothing Congress, unless those of us

on this side of the aisle are able to get something affirmative done for the people of this country as the gentleman is now trying to do, with the surplus food commodities program, nothing is going to be done. We may have to take another afternoon soon to counsel Mr. Truman and his other tax-dodging friends at the dinner and let them know that the only party which does take affirmative action on the floor of the House and in the other body is the Republican Party. I can enumerate a dozen things right off for which we stand affirmatively, and I could name a good many others if I but had the time.

Mr. HESELTON. I might add by way of factual statement that the resolutions to which reference has been made were filed on February 2, and here it is February 20. There is no indication yet that we will have any hearing at any time. We must take this method of letting the American people know what we want to do for them.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I was very much interested in the gentleman's discussion of the Brannan plan.

The administration's farm program should be exposed for what it truly is—it is hardly the so-called Brannan plan. But let us suppose for the moment that the administration and the Secretary of Agriculture really believed in their fraud—the so-called plan.

Who would be in charge and have the responsibility for its administration? The Secretary of Agriculture? One Charles F. Brannan, the present Secretary of Agriculture?

If so, and the President very reluctantly discharges his trusted aides—I commend for serious study the report of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the House Committee on Appropriations. The first 50 pages of part 1 should be particularly interesting. They deal with the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture and his philosophy. I should also commend to the Member's attention part 8—the testimony of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. One can see how the Secretary of Agriculture discharges his duties, particularly in his own back yard—Denver, Colo. Read of three times normal rates paid for airplane rental—read of high-school boys paid at the rate of $1.87 an hour. Read of the waste of millions in the grasshopper campaign—a fiasco that experts testified will threaten the bread basket of the country this coming year, extending as far east as Ohio and to Texas and the west coast.

Mr. HESELTON. I have read that report with care and great concern. As the gentleman says, it is worthy of serious study not only here in Congress but throughout the country. The answers of the Secretary to questions asked by all members of the subcommittee are revealing. There you will find the exact figures for a trial run during the war on a similar plan. You can form your own estimate of the probable cost of the proposed plan and then judge its effect upon agriculture, the consumers, the taxpayers, direct and indirect, and upon the economy of this Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 20 minutes, following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain tables and letters.)

THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing prevalent in the country today, it is confusion arising from so many people going in so many different directions. Since I have been a Member of Congress I have tried to deal with facts.

The other night I heard the President of the United States, Mr. Truman, say that he, too, likes to deal with facts and does not like to have any of these scare things perpetrated by the Republicans. After listening to him I began to wonder whether I have been wasting all of my time since I came to Washington.

There is not much use making constructive proposals to anyone in the Eighty-first Congress. Up to this Congress one could feel as if he were a player on the team and could work for the general good of American agriculture. I offered an amendment in the conference of the 1949 agricultural act to provide surplus food for the private welfare organizations.

The other night when President Truman was telling what he had done for agriculture he left off 10 percent of agriculture very appropriately. He did not say what had happened to the poultry industry. He did not say that in January 1950, after 17 years of the more and more abundant life eggs were selling at 62 percent of parity. This is the lowest they have been in many years. As a matter of fact, during the last Republican administration that we hear so much about they averaged 71½ percent of parity. The 2 years the much maligned Eightieth Congress was running the country they averaged 91½ percent of parity. So it gets kind of tiresome to listen to all the cheap politics that is continually being injected into an issue that not only affects the welfare of the American farmer but the whole economy of the country.

I shall place the official table in the RECORD which will prove the statement I have made at this point.

Mr. Speaker, the following official table from the BAE shows the percent of parity for eggs since January 1929:

Eggs: Price received by farmers as percentage of parity price, adjusted for seasonal variation, United States, by months, 1929–50

Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Average
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
1929	78	92	98	87	92	97	94	93	92	89	88	91	91
1930	92	94	76	82	78	71	67	67	71	65	67	58	73
1931	59	46	67	69	57	61	60	64	61	64	64	64	62
1932	54	49	48	50	52	53	55	61	61	71	71	79	60
1933	78	48	52	55	63	53	62	55	55	62	62	58	59
1934	60	63	66	64	64	62	61	66	71	67	71	70	66
1935	82	98	82	91	99	97	92	88	73	82	78	78	87
1936	79	96	80	80	87	92	86	85	80	79	82	81	84
1937	78	77	85	87	79	77	78	74	73	72	71	72	76
1938	76	65	73	72	81	85	84	82	84	81	77	81	79
1939	71	70	75	74	73	71	71	69	68	68	68	60	69
1940	69	85	69	69	70	68	69	67	69	70	69	79	71
1941	76	71	74	89	91	106	101	96	92	84	84	91	88
1942	107	100	99	98	100	108	100	103	95	92	88	95	98
1943	118	116	124	120	120	121	111	113	106	106	101	102	112
1944	96	99	103	92	89	89	92	92	89	90	93	100	94
1945	110	106	106	106	107	112	109	112	98	98	100	104	105
1946	106	92	98	98	97	96	91	90	98	102	86	85	94
1947	86	90	97	98	97	93	98	94	98	93	86	93	93
1948	85	91	92	95	90	91	89	91	89	88	92	82	90
1949	85	87	88	94	96	95	90	93	94	86	77	66	87.7
1950 [1]	62												

[1] Adjusted average price as a percentage of effective parity.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Division of Statistical and Historical Research. Computed from Agricultural Prices BAE.

The announced parity price of eggs obtained yesterday is 49.2 cents per dozen. For the Nation this is 62 percent of parity. The announced support price for January and February of 25 cents per dozen is 50 percent of parity. In the Midwest many eggs have sold for as low as 39 percent of parity. These prices are ruinous to the poultry industry.

Let me give you another example. In connection with labor I noticed also he did not say anything about the fact he had not changed that 25- and 32-cent minimum under the Sugar Act for labor, nor has any member of the Cabinet done so. He did not seem to worry about that any more than he worried on December 31, 1946, when he did not want the farmers of this country to have a support program which provided for 50 cents or 60 cents an hour. He killed that by issuing Executive Order No. 2714. This whole issue has been nothing but a political football since that time.

Now we have heard so much about the potato business. May I say if the rest of the States had followed the program as Wisconsin followed it they would not be in the trouble they are in today, because we kept our production down. These same States that we hear about having so much trouble are the States that have overproduced potatoes which in turn has caused this trouble. But this is just the beginning.

I have here a letter from one of the outstanding dairy co-ops in the United States. They just take the issues as they come along. In this letter it is stated in part:

In 1949 the Government purchase of butter amounted to 100,000,000 pounds. It would appear that Government purchase program for butter will reach 250,000,000 to 300,000,000 pounds.

In other words, they are trying to meet their problem. Now, you just add one after the other of these agricultural products onto the load that is being carried, and it is time that somebody does a little forward thinking. I have never subscribed to the present reciprocal trade treaty program; promoted by the New Deal or not by the Fair Deal, because, as I have said many times, it is honeycombed with deceit and dripping with deception. Sure, they bring in a program and mislead the League of Women's Voters and others, who go out and carry the banner for them. When one analyzes it, what do you find? You will find that during the last 15 years they have erected more vicious trade barriers than at any other time in the history of this country. Did you ever hear of a tobacco bill introduced prohibiting the exportation of tobacco seed? That does not take into consideration the embargo on cotton imports. You notice that the duty on certain kinds of tobacco is pretty near up to $1 a pound. Take the duty on peanuts, has that ever been changed? Oh, no; 7 cents a pound, which is more than the crop brought for 25 years before the war. So, the present reciprocal trade treaty has not been reciprocity; it has not been good neighbor policy, and I would like to have some one tell me how long they wish to work both sides of the street. A good example was cited last Saturday right here in Des Moines, Iowa. I have here a clipping from the Washington Post of yesterday that says:

Brannan tossed responsibility for the potato mess at Kline by asserting that the country needs a revised farm program. He called for "methods that let American potatoes compete for the American market, instead of letting our own potatoes go to costly waste while consumers buy and eat Canadian potatoes because they are cheaper even after paying 75 cents import duties.

Personally, I have just stated what I thought about the present plan of the reciprocal trade treaties. But, I think any normal person believes in the philosophy of a good-neighbor policy, and we are spending enough billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to perpetuate such a program. They believe in the general outline of William Howard Taft—yes, you can go away back to McKinley. I am willing to be back there with him so far as the principle of reciprocity is concerned.

So, I say today you cannot, out of one breath, say we believe in friendly relations between nations, that we believe in a good-neighbor policy, and then in the next breath, say you are going to use another new formula, an indirect way of preventing surpluses by putting down the price on commodities that will prevent imports. If you do not have the fortitude to stand up and do it by direction, I do not think it is wise to do it by indirection.

You might have noted last night that Mr. Drew Pearson, over the radio, took note of that and said that Canada was going to retaliate by stopping the importation of other agricultural commodities from the United States. Let us consider the McNary-Haugen bill and bring it up to date. No one in the world ever proposed a fairer across-the-board program than that. But, instead of having surpluses dumped on the markets of the world, then we should take up the proposals of the FAO and try to divert these surplus foods of the United States into a secondary market. Then we will not have any of this feeling existing between countries so far as imports and exports are concerned.

Just a minute on this so-called trial run business. One of my good colleagues over here the other day said, "You are going to have a chance to get another trial run in this session."

What were the commodities? Let us analyze them. Wool was one, was it not? Potatoes was another, and eggs was a third. Anyone that has been able to get elected to Congress, especially if he is able to get on the Committee on Agriculture after he became a Member of Congress, should know the price relationship between the different classes of foods. It seems to me anyone should know that the relationship between the four main protein foods which are eggs, cheese, pork, and beef. No one can do anything to disturb the price of any one of those commodities without having an effect on the others of those commodities.

We may be going to have a trial run proposed. If anyone proposes another one, I hope he is careful on the commodities selected for the trial.

We have seen the butter industry in jeopardy. Now we are asked to add insult to injury and ruin the cheese industry of this country. You cannot put any trial run on eggs or have the price go down to 5 or 10 cents a dozen without dragging the price of pork, beef, and cheese down. There is, I repeat, a long time price relationship between all these protein foods.

Just so you will not think we are always sleeping at the switch and always looking backward—we look forward once in a while—and see another one in the background. The only thing that has held up its introduction as a bill is the fact that this oleo bill has not been going through quite so smoothly as they thought it was going to go through. People are beginning to catch on to what it is all about.

This is the legislative gadget that is already in the background. Certain interests want to repeal the filled milk law. That is just another step. I will put it into the RECORD, so anyone who wants to can know about it at this point:

[Public, No. 350—74th Cong.]
[H. R. 6361]

An act to amend the Filled Milk Act

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to prohibit the shipment of filled milk in interstate or foreign commerce" (U. S. C., title 21, ch. 3) be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to make and enforce such regulations as may in his judgment be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

Approved August 27, 1935.

If you want to know what filled milk is, I wish to say they take the skim milk and add vegetable oil and then evaporate it and sell it in competition with natural evaporated milk. Since Wisconsin makes nearly 30 percent of the evaporated milk, and there are many evaporated-milk plants in our State, it is a very serious question: First the butter is weakened, second the cheese industry is at stake, and then the filled-milk threat is proposed. How much can one session of Congress accomplish? What is worrying me is what is to happen to agricultural prices and our economy before any plan is worked out as permanent legislation. I have not spent time trying to belittle the Brannan plan, but I do not intend to sit idly by and see the Brannan plan or any other plan work to the disadvantage to the people in my State. I want to know the facts. The people will decide these issues if they know the facts.

At the present time what the Brannan plan proposes is to provide a fixed mandatory price for the so-called storables and to let the so-called perishables find their own level. In the first place there is a chance for argument as to what is a storable and what is not. In effect, it means that States like Wisconsin, with 85 to 90 percent of its farm income from livestock and livestock products, will accept the plan to allow their product not only to reach its normal level or an abnormal low level. Then the Congress will be asked to appropriate the funds for the difference. This will apply to all the livestock States as well. But the Southern States will keep their mandatory supports for cotton, wheat, tobacco, and rice, and so forth, and will not take a chance on waiting for congressional action for appropriations for their commodities. A Brannan plan straight across the board is one proposal, but it is a wholly different plan when certain sections of our country and certain States are picked out for the experiment. If the plan is advisable, then it should be beneficial for all. Who is there that can say that canned meat is not storable, as peanuts of high oil content? It is fair to ask and support legislation that applies to all segments of our agriculture. It is unfair to let one segment take mandatory support for their products and then be so eager to let someone else hold the bag.

Mr. KEEFE. We are talking about a horrible situation which exists because the Government has bought surpluses that came onto the market in the form

of eggs, potatoes, butter, cheese and everything else.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have three additional minutes in order that I may ask this question which I think would be interesting to everyone.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of Members, who have special orders to follow, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin may have three additional minutes. I think this colloquy is very informative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. As a matter of fact, whether it was right or not on the part of the Department of Agriculture operating through the Commodity Credit Corporation to go out and buy these surpluses of eggs, butter, cheese, milk, potatoes and everything else, they have gone out and have bought them. I recall hearing person after person standing up on the Floor of the House and telling about the price of eggs going down and the price of potatoes going down and the price of this, that and the other going down, and demanding that the support-price be paid and that the Secretary of Agriculture go out and support those prices. I would like to ask the gentleman in all fairness if these surpluses have developed, and they have these surpluses now in storage, and we are attempting to do something with them to get them into the hands of the people so that they may eat them rather than have the commodities destroyed, and all movements of that kind I am in complete accord with. We are not by doing that dealing with the fundamental question which has brought about those surpluses.

Did the Secretary of Agriculture in acquiring those surpluses do so in accordance with existing law? That is the question that I would like to have answered.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the distinguished majority leader be kind enough to get me time to answer that?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has obtained three additional minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But I have only 1 minute left, and that is quite a question.

Mr. KEEFE. Can that not be answered "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In general I imagine that the interpretation of the law has been followed. The Department and Members of Congress have not always agreed as to the interpretation of law. Our recent consideration of cotton is a good example. There is nothing in the world that should stop them from distributing it. But we lead ourselves right into another trouble because it is going to be pretty hard to unscramble those eggs after we get them scrambled up too much. The gentleman wanted the answer, and here it is.

We should get rid of these surplus products that we have accumulated under this support program and then should turn right around and have this food diverted though normal channels of trade because we are going to have the grocers of this country complaining very bitterly if we are going to have the Government itself furnish a large percentage of the groceries for a large percentage of the people of the United States. The National Council of Co-ops do not wish to be eased out of their marketing activities either. What is the future of farm crops? We should get rid of the surpluses we have on hand. Just analyze it. Out of the $2,900,000,000 worth of food, $2,700,000,000 of it was nonlivestock products and we only had $200,000,000 worth of livestock products. There is not very much food, in volume, to dispose of. If the law is not clear we could easily change it. We are in constant session.

I have tried for a month and I know many other members of the Agriculture Committee from each party have tried to have hearings on this subject. Up to now they have not been held. I repeat, the hearings should be held, if the law should be clarified and changed; we should as a committee, recommend it. Future surpluses could be diverted into normal trade channels. This would be one method of preventing a storage and waste problem. Then we should shift over into a stamp plan, so that the corner grocer could take his rightful position, as he is entitled to, under the system under which we are operating in the United States. Any other course will break down the normal channels of trade.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

UNBRIDLED AND PROFLIGATE SPENDING MEANS BANKRUPTCY AND DOOM FOR FREE ENTERPRISE AND HUMAN FREEDOMS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the continuation of the unbridled and profligate Federal spending of this administration means bankruptcy for the United States and spells doom for free enterprise and human freedoms.

The late President Roosevelt said in 1932:

Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns, but you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse.

The habit has continued since then, except for the short time the Republicans controlled the Eightieth Congress.

Thomas Jefferson, the great Democrat, said:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. * * * To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. * * * We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. * * * If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. * * * If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

Although wide publicity has been given to the comparison of expenditures of the 32 Presidents from George Washington to President Truman, I fear that many Americans may have failed to appreciate the significance of this comparison and the headlong march toward the complete destruction of the financial foundations of our Nation. I want especially to emphasize the gravity of a continuation of the unbridled Federal spending of this administration as shown by the following tabulation:

Spent by 32 Presidents from Washington to Roosevelt (through second term):	
Washington	$34,083,486
Adams	34,262,668
Jefferson	72,424,289
Madison	176,473,964
Monroe	147,237,899
Adams	65,427,017
Jackson	152,969,968
Van Buren	$122,325,142
Harrison and Tyler	108,904,678
Polk	173,477,220
Taylor and Fillmore	179,631,529
Pierce	255,154,244
Buchanan	272,933,490
Lincoln	3,252,380,410
Johnson	1,578,557,645
Grant	2,253,386,743
Hays	1,032,268,037
Garfield and Arthur	1,027,742,757
Cleveland	1,077,629,089
Harrison	1,412,315,899
Cleveland	1,441,674,174
McKinley	2,093,918,514
T. Roosevelt	4,655,450,505
Taft	2,799,211,854
Wilson	46,938,260,143
Harding	6,667,235,429
Coolidge	18,585,549,115
Hoover	15,490,476,636
Roosevelt (8 years)	67,518,746,001
Total	179,620,113,645
Spent by President Truman from fiscal year 1946 to September 30, 1949	191,081,394,191

Thirty-two Presidents in 156 years spent $179,620,113,645.

One President in less than 5 years has spent $191,081,394,191.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the present administration is determined to continue to the bitter end this orgy of profligate spending. The administration seems bent on putting two tax collectors in every garage. It should not be forgotten that the money that is being spent is your tax dollars earned by your sweat and self-denial. These wasted funds could be profitably used for a better standard of living, financing new in-

dustrial enterprises and expanding old ones so that jobs may be made available for the ever-increasing army of the unemployed now approaching 5,000,000.

The estimated budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, is $46,000,000,000. This means $1 out of every $6 spent in the United States will be spent by Uncle Sam. We have a public debt of $252,770,359,860.33 as of February 15, 1950, with a deficit estimated for the end of the fiscal year exceeding five billions. We will have to engage in deficit financing for the next fiscal year if we continue the present rate of spending. The debt is $1,800 for every individual in the United States. Every child that is born inherits $1,800 of this debt. The national debt represents a hidden mortgage of $6,000 on every home in America. In a single month this year the United States Government during peacetime spends as much as the total cost of the Government in the 4 years of the Civil War, namely $3,350,000,000. There is a bottom to Uncle Sam's Treasury and unless we curtail the wasteful and reckless spending, balance the budget, reduce the debt, and conserve our resources the financial stability of the country will be doomed.

Ours is indeed a spendthrift Government. Every day here in Washington we feel the impact of reckless government spending and were shocked to hear the recommendations of the President for the next fiscal year which will involve an expenditure of over $5,000,000,000 more than revenues coming in. Our efforts to stop wasteful and profligate spending by the Government and bring expenditures and receipts into balance are overridden by the administration. I agree with economists and experts who hold that in times of prosperity such as these we should not only live within our income but should make some substantial payments on the Federal debt, which is increasing by leaps and bounds.

While we exert every effort to curtail unnecessary expenditures, we should not make the error of failing to provide for our own domestic welfare and to preserve, develop, and put into full utilization the great natural resources of our own country and build up our industries and American enterprise so that we can keep our own country strong, the wheels of industry turning, and our great labor forces employed. During all my service in Congress I have fought to develop and utilize the great resources of the Northwest, particularly the land, water, and power resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries. It would be foolish economy to fail to appropriate the necessary funds for the development of these great natural resources. The funds put to this use are investments in profitable enterprises which will return to the Government manyfold the moneys invested. This is not the place to make our cuts and savings in expenditures. In fact, we should increase the investments in these great enterprises so that we may produce the goods and services needed to meet our necessary obligations at home and abroad.

There are many places, however, even in our domestic economy where large savings can be made in the lavish expenditures of the administration. The Hoover Commission's report offers an opportunity to achieve some savings by its adoption, which should be done. The Hoover Commission has made 288 recommendations. One hundred and twenty-four of these require legislation. Thirty-six of this one hundred and twenty-four are already law. I hope Congress will go forward with enacting into law more of these recommendations.

Substantial savings can be made by economies and reductions in European rearmament, the Marshall plan, and in other foreign-aid programs as well as our own national-defense program. War expenditures, past, present, and prospective wars, take 70 percent of our national budget.

A straw in the wind shows which way it is blowing and small matters indicate the trend and spendthrift philosophy of the present administration. For instance, you may have seen in the press that the administration is securing 10 passenger cars for the use of the President and the White House which will cost $30,000 apiece. They have 12-cylinder motors, a speed of more than 100 miles per hour, and gold-plated interior accessories. While it is true these cars will be acquired on a rental basis it does not require much imagination to reach the conclusion that Uncle Sam, in the end, pays the bill for these 10 de luxe cars.

Mr. Speaker, a glaring example of wasteful expenditures brought home to us in Oregon is the tragic destruction of the battleship *Oregon* by an ungrateful government. You will recall that the *Oregon* was yanked from its moorings in the Portland harbor where it was maintained as a shrine, by a grateful people, endeared to the hearts of the Oregon school children and all patriotic citizens, and doomed to destruction for junk. The Government disposed of the old battle wagon to a junk dealer for $35,000 and then turned around and bought back portions of the salvage from the battleship for which the Government paid $101,731.73, and the Government is still subject to a lawsuit for a further payment for the hull which was repossessed by the Government. The hull, the last remnant of the heroic ship now floats and rusts away in ignominy near Guam in the waters of the far Pacific.

Another glaring example of profligate waste of Federal funds is the hot potato, half-baked program of the administration. The administration's potato program is a national scandal. The Department of Agriculture recently announced that it planned to destroy some 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes which the Government has purchased under the support program. Last year a similar policy was followed by the administration and great quantities of edible potatoes were destroyed by being saturated with gasoline, dumped, allowed to rot, or converted into fertilizer. Uncle Sam with your tax dollars pays about $2.10 per 100 pounds or approximately $1.25 a bushel for these potatoes and has already spent $30,000,000 on the 1949 crop and it still contemplates buying 45 or 50 million bushels more. The housewife here in the Nation's Capital pays 6 cents a pound for potatoes. About 13½ million bushels have been sold at 1 cent per 100 pounds, for livestock feed. The details of one transaction were made public following a report of a farmer in East Grand Forks, Minn., who sold 160,000 pounds of potatoes to the Government for $1.46 a hundredweight. Then he bought them back at 1 cent a hundredweight. The potatoes stayed on the farm, while the farmer and the Government representative exchanged checks. In many cases the Government has paid the freight charges in addition and sacked the potatoes in sacks which cost 12 cents second hand and which the farmer can sell and save 12 cents on each 100 pounds for which he pays Uncle Sam 1 cent. Not a bad profit. Sometimes the potatoes are soaked with chemicals or coloring to make them unfit for human consumption. Secretary Brannan stated that the Government is prepared, if necessary, to dump 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes. The administration's potato program from its inception has cost almost one-half billion dollars, namely $495,169,000 for the period 1943 to 1949. The administration has further bungled the problem by importing large quantities of Canadian potatoes which are underselling the American potatoes and thereby cutting the throats of American producers as well as mulcting Uncle Sam for heavy payments under the support program. In addition to potatoes the Commodity Credit Corporation is holding 465,000,000 bushels of wheat which is about 40 percent of last year's total crop, valued at approximately $1,000,000,000. Its estimated holdings of corn total 510,000 bushels or 13.5 percent of the 1949 crop, valued at almost three-fourths billion dollars. It holds 6,000,000 plus bales of cotton which is 27.45 percent of the 1949 crop, valued approximately at $1,000,000,000.

In addition the Commodity Credit Corporation is holding the following:

	Amount	Costs
Dried milk....pounds..	254,490,784	$31,615,535.72
Dried eggs.....do....	49,445,878	98,645,444.68
Butter.....do....	[illegible]675,801	61,004,323.06
Cheese.....do....	23,[illegible]35,157	8,030,266.80
Prunes.....do....	49,[illegible]85,455	5,006,203.64
Raisins.....do....	22,972,380	2,210,133.26
Edible dried beans hundredweight..	4,850,795	42,859,926.40
Rice .....do..	431,820	2,935,252.60
Turkeys .....pounds..	725,480	309,173.80
Canned Mexican meat pounds..	49,445,878	12,468,074.26

This involves some 277,480 tons of surplus commodities costing $265,000,000. These huge Government surpluses of edible products are mounting day by day.

It is reprehensible to destroy nourishing edible foods which have been produced by American farmers and paid for by American taxpayers. I therefore introduced, on February 8, 1950, a bill, H. R. 7208, prohibiting the destruction of these surplus foods and making it mandatory on the Federal Government to make surplus food products available to charitable institutions, schools, welfare agencies, and thousands of needy Americans who are receiving starvation allotments from welfare agencies.

The immediate problem is the disposition of the huge surpluses which the Government now is holding, which have

been purchased with the hard-earned tax dollars of the American public. We are confronted with a condition and not a theory. It would be a scandalous procedure to dump or destroy these edible foods and not make them available to American citizens in need. However, the larger problem is the maladministration of the Federal Government under its present controls in failing to solve this great industrial and agricultural problem—the production and distribution of the necessities of life without piling up huge surpluses paid for by taxes.

As a nation, under our mass production, labor-saving machines, and skilled workmen, we are able to produce more of the necessities of life than the existing markets will absorb. The Government is boosting the market price of these products, potatoes, eggs, butter, cereals, to the consumer by purchasing vast quantities of the products with tax dollars. Thus the taxpayer is hit twice, first, by having the prices of his everyday needs boosted skyward, and, secondly, by hooking him with a heavy tax to pay for controlling the market, buying up the surpluses, and as is now proposed, destroying them. The administration not only has not solved the problem but is hopelessly bogged down in a program which if pursued to its end will bankrupt the Nation and bring disaster to the potato farmer. I want to see potato farmers as well as all farmers secure a fair price for their produce in the market place. The administration's program, however, if carried through will bring disaster to the potato farmer and is a fraud on the consumer. Potato farmers are deeply concerned over the huge cost of the support program and they themselves have been making major adjustments, reducing acreage 43 percent since 1943 and supporting a 60 percent support price instead of 90

How true today are the words of Jefferson, himself a farmer who designed the modern plow, when he said, "Were we to be directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want bread."

Under the administration's regimentation program no farmer is permitted to sow controlled crops until he gets an O. K. from the Big White Father in Washington. We should break the hold of the executive department over legislative processes and regain the independence of the Congress Senator BYRD, the great modern Democrat, fighting for the preservation of our financial integrity, truly said:

> We are rapidly approaching a financial crisis in the fiscal affairs of our Government. When Congress convenes next January, it will be in the fateful position of determining whether: (1) To retrench drastically; (2) to impose staggering new taxes; (3) to embrace deficit spending again. To me the third course would be the road to certain ruin, for if we again deliberately embark on deficit spending during peace and prosperity, it is doubtful whether we shall ever balance the budget thereafter. The only course remaining open is to reduce expenditures to the point of a balanced budget under existing taxes. Reduction in tax rates would have a wholesome influence if it could be done without deficit spending. The solvency of our Government can be preserved only by the mobilization of public sentiment.

Senator BYRD also said recently the President is traveling "a nonstop, high-speed highway to socialism."

Mr. Speaker, there are only two ways to achieve a balanced budget. One is to reduce expenses and the other is to bring about an increased business volume from which increased tax receipts can be derived. A dynamic economy can bring in larger tax revenues but that means sound policies to encourage rather than discourage business expansion. The indefensible wartime excise taxes should now be repealed in the interests of sound economy since the war has been over for more than 4 years.

As reported in the United States News and World Report in a recent issue, deficit financing is dangerous in the face of our enormous public debt. It was not hazardous in the early thirties when the public debt was about $17,000,000,000, having been reduced from $27,000,000,000 by Republican administrations. Even at $45,000,000,000 in 1939, the Federal debt was small in comparison to the total private debt estimated then at $139,000,000,000. But to start deficit financing when the Federal debt is $252,000,000,000 in addition to a huge private debt is risky. It could mean loss of confidence in the integrity of the dollar. It could mean the flight of the dollar from savings to the purchase of commodities and tangible articles. It could mean run-away prices and worse inflation than we have ever had before. Such an inflation ruined Germany and brought Hitler as the alleged savior. The Communists in Russia have been predicting it would happen again and in America. How long can Europe hold if the United States is in the midst of economic chaos? Since the war's end we have expended overseas alone over $27,000,000,000. Very little, if any, of it will ever be returned to our Federal Treasury. Through the 22 programs of foreign aid devised in the first 4 years after VJ-day we managed to spend $27,100,000,000 through June 30, 1949. This averaged approximately $18,500,000 per day, or $750,000 per hour, or $12,500 per minute, or $200 every time your watch has ticked since the last gun was fired.

Uncle Sam, it is later than you think. It is high time to stop, look, and listen, and curb the orgy of wild and profligate spending both at home and abroad, oust the Communists and spendthrifts from our Government and places of authority, reduce the back-breaking tax load on the American people, end the war excise nuisance taxes, balance the Federal budget, put an end to deficit spending, adopt the Hoover report economies, free the Congress from executive domination, and thereby save free enterprise and human liberty in America. It is high time to invest some of the taxes thus saved in America for the upbuilding of our own country and the welfare of our own American citizens. It is time to adopt a Marshall plan or an ECA for the old people of America so that they in their twilight years may have social security giving them sufficient income from the wealth they have helped to create to provide food, shelter, clothing, and medical care according to the American standards of living.

Let us save the American system, free enterprise, and human freedoms by following the sound advice often erroneously attributed to Abraham Lincoln:

> You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
>
> You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
>
> You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.
>
> You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.
>
> You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.
>
> You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
>
> You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
>
> You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.

We need an Abraham Lincoln today to lead us back to sanity and an abiding faith in the promises of a just God. With more faith in spiritual values and with a judicious handling of our governmental affairs, more common sense and less war and devastation, we would be able, from savings alone without increasing the taxes, to take care of our own people here in America, provide a decent living retirement for all of our old people in need, the widows, the injured, and the orphans, and still have billions of dollars left over for schools, churches, libraries, hospitals, and for the upbuilding and rehabilitation of this great Republic.

We are overlooking the admonitions of the Sermon on the Mount and the great spiritual values of life and placing our dependence on material things, the war engines of destruction, and the atomic bomb.

> For heathen heart that puts her trust
> In reeking tubs and iron shard—
> All valiant dust that builds on dust,
> And guarding calls not Thee to guard.

Mr. Speaker, the Great Architect of the universe has been good to America. He has given us the greatest country on earth. It is rich in natural resources; we have great fertile fields, broad rivers charged with almost boundless hydroelectric power, great forests, an industrial system with skilled workmen, the greatest and most productive for human welfare and needs in all history, and a garden spot in which to spend our days during the short span we are permitted here on earth.

We have, indeed, a wonderful world to live in, yet we are spending most of our time in petty, intolerant jealousies, selfish grasping for wealth and power, and in waging world-wide wars, preparation for war, or the sordid business of cleaning up the mess after death and devastation wrought by war. We need in America today more good will among men and less war, more of the spirit of cooperation, brotherly love, and fellow feeling and less of selfishness, hatreds, animosity, and jealousies which are abroad in the world.

Let all loyal Americans join together in unison to win lasting peace, to build a country in which every citizen may make the most of his skill, initiative, and enterprise, and to hold aloft the inspiring torch of American freedom, opportunity, and justice. As we in the minority party in the Congress recently

announced, our people must arouse themselves to preserve our precious liberties and freedoms—the right to worship God in our own way; to speak freely our minds without fear; to conduct our lives and our affairs without officious meddling by a too-powerful Government. We must revivify those qualities of diligence, economy, courage, initiative, and patriotism which enabled our forefathers to make this Nation great.

God save America!

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] on the subject which he was discussing with his colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], as I understand it, under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture does have the power to curtail acreage to prevent this country from getting into such a mess as we are in with a lot of these surplus commodities that we have on hand. It is a situation that should have been foreseen and prevented by prompt action.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think it should be evident to most anyone that you cannot run a support program and come out with an even number of bushels of any particular commodity. You can run a 100-yard dash and stop at a hundred yards; but naturally you will have some surpluses, but it should not cost over two or three million dollars, if it is operated in a conservative way. However, I do not think you can pin-point it right down to the bushel or right down to the dozen eggs.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman that you cannot stop at an exact point, but certainly 50,000,000 bushels, in the case of potatoes, or these tremendous amounts of eggs that are on hand is a long way from what I would characterize as good administration. I wanted to say that for the benefit of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] who I felt had not been entirely accurately informed by his colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] for attempting to clear up this situation. In view of the complexity of the situation and with so limited time to discuss it, I am serving notice that I am going to ask for a special order with sufficient time to discuss this proposition and to submit to the Congress and to the people of this country what I conceive, and what many other people who have cooperated with me in the effort, conceive to be a real step forward in the solution of the problem that has brought about the very situation that we have here now. Any law that we pass at this time, in my opinion, simply deals with an existing situation that is atrocious, the disposition of this surplus material that has been accumulated. Legally or illegally or what not, we have the surpluses on hand, and all we are talking about now is how we can get those surpluses to move out in forms of charity so that they will be eaten rather than destroyed. It seems to me that before a new crop comes on in this country, under the present price-support program, it is the duty and obligation of the Congress of the United States to take another look at this situation and have an opportunity to enact some form of legislation that will take care of the situation and prevent the accumulation of these vast surpluses which bring about the atrocious situation we now complain of. It is in that direction that I think the members of the Committee on Agriculture ought to work and the Members of Congress also. It does not look good to criticize after the fact unless we have a program to submit to the American people that will be a better program than any of the other programs under which we have operated up to date.

Mr. ANGELL. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. I now yield to the gentleman from Idaho for a question.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I wish to ask a simple question of the gentleman from New York; can he tell us how the Secretary of Agriculture through the exercise of his power of limitation of acreage could control the surplus supply of eggs?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York to answer, if he so desires.

Mr. KEATING. If the gentleman would like to know, I thought he was a farmer and represented a farming area.

Mr. ANGELL He is a miner.

Mr. KEATING. I am essentially a man who represents an industrial area; but as I understand, hens have to be fed and the acreage of their food has a lot to do with the amount that is available for the hens, and the number of hens has a lot to do with the production of eggs; and I may say to the gentleman from Idaho that it is hens that lay eggs in this country, in case the gentleman is not aware of that fact.

Mr. ANGELL. Does not the gentleman from New York agree that not only do hens have to be fed but human beings like to be fed also?

Mr. KEATING. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I should like to answer the question. We had one great industrialist shed light on this important question, a man by the name of Mr. Luckman, who is the head of Lever Bros. He said that even if we did not feed hens any feed they would still lay eggs. I think he had some secret formula he had prepared, probably sawdust.

Mr. ANGELL. Perhaps he would feed them soap.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Maybe he mixed the sawdust with a little soap. But he does not make soap any more; he severed his connection with that company; but at that time he was urging that we limit production not only by not feeding hens but by not feeding livestock. In that way we could get rid of the feeding problem.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. If the gentleman will yield, I think that Mr. Luckman, as chairman of a hundred-dollars-a-plate, tax-exempt, non-tax-paying dinner, who was fired the other day, also laid an egg.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in my previous remarks I discussed the order bringing in some other crop-control programs which as you know will run into the hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal expenditures, much of which has been wasted. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. There are two problems involved in the problem of surpluses under crop control; one is that we have these large surpluses on hand of edible foods which the American taxpayers have paid for and they are now being wasted, because the Secretary of Agriculture has announced he will cause them to be destroyed. It is not fair to farmers who produced them or to the consumers who are in dire need. It is a scandalous program. I introduced a bill (H. R. 7208) to prevent just this sort of thing, to prevent the destruction of edible foods and to require and make it mandatory that the Federal Government through the Department of Agriculture or any other department that has charge of these foodstuffs make them available for human consumption to our people here in America who are in need, school children, old people on welfare, starving Indians, and others in need of food. Let me say that there are millions of people here in America today who are not getting enough to eat; they are on a starvation diet, if you please; they are starving to death. In my own city, for instance, a little while back a notice appeared in the local press of the death of a man who was on relief. The old man died and the diagnosis of his case was that he had starved to death.

Mr KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ANGELL. Just a moment and I will yield.

The average payment to these old people under social security is $25 a month, which is $11 less than to those who are on public relief; and I say to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the country that it is certainly a tragedy for this great rich country of ours to spend billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money buying up these surplus foods to increase the price so the ordinary individual cannot buy them and then take the edible foods, cover them with gasoline or other chemicals, or otherwise destroy them. That, I say, is indefensible.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. And I wish to call attention to the great work the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] has done throughout his service in Congress to try

to render aid to the aged people of this country. And I want to say to him that I hope there is incorporated in this social-security bill that is pending in the other body, a bill which was passed by this House, a provision for a stamp plan, if you please, that would permit beneficiaries under title I, the contributory old-age system, and the beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance title and the public relief title and general security, a provision to give to the beneficiaries of those titles the use of these surpluses and the direction to see that they are directed thrcugh the normal channels of distribution under that stamp plan. That program is a part of the program I am going to submit in the next few days to the Congress which I believe is a well worked out and a well thought out plan that will have all of the benefits of the Brannan plan for consumer appeal but will wipe out the situation such as exists today where we have the surpluses confronting us and no way that anybody can think of to get rid of them. There is an opportunity in the Senate today to write a provision into the Social Security Act that will offer the avenue where we can take care of these aged people, give them a little additional income above the measly, pitiful pension and annuities which they get, either under the insurance program or the contributory program or the noncontributory program and allow those payments to be made in the form of food declared surplus by the Secretary of Agriculture, issue them monthly stamps to buy it with at the same time their checks for these pensions are issued. It is a simple plan and would be a most workable plan, it seems to me, and one that will solve the thing in the interest of doing something for the people who need it the most.

I thank the gentleman for raising this question in this debate.

Mr. ANGELL. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin. Let me say further that he will recall when H. R. 6000, the social-security bill, came before the House for consideration it came here under a gag rule and we were not permitted to offer a single amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. ANGELL. If we had been permitted to do so we would have offered these amendments which would have accomplished the things the gentleman and I are now discussing.

I started to say a moment ago that there are two problems before us in connection with the disposition of surplus commodities now held by the Federal Government. One is the immediate problem, a factual one, of getting those foodstuffs into the possession of American citizens and others who may use them for food, particularly the needy people. The Government has them and let us make them available to the needy. That is one problem. Let us not destroy them. The other and the larger problem, however, is the long-range program in connection with the production and distribution of the foodstuffs of America, and other commodities for human needs, so that the Federal Government will not have to take the taxpayer's money to pay for them, then pile up large surpluses, such as potatoes for instance, then be at our wit's end as to how to destroy them, either by sinking them in the sea or covering them with gasoline or chemicals or by turning them back to the farmers at 1 cent per 100 pounds when Uncle Sam has paid $2.20 a hundred pounds for them. The housewife is forced to pay 6 cents a pound for potatoes for her table. In many cases Uncle Sam sacks them in addition so that he is paying 12 cents for second-hand sacks or 22 cents for new sacks to put the potatoes in. They are then turned over to the farmers for 1 cent per hundred pounds including the sack. The farmer himself could dump those potatoes in the back yard of his farm, take the sacks and sell them and make 11 cents apiece and if a new sack he would make 21 cents apiece. The farmers are not to blame for the bungling of the program. The farmers have cooperated with the Government. I want the farmer to get a fair price in the market place.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I want to assure the gentleman and the membership that those who filed these resolutions which we have called to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture and the House are addressed only to this immediate urgent problem. We are not indicating that we do not recognize the over-all and equally important matter that the gentleman has pointed out. But I would like to add right here in terms of what the gentleman has said that according to the latest figures there are 2,715,751 persons receiving old-age pensions in this country, there are 1,484,404 persons receiving dependents and children benefits, there are 92,000 blind receiving help and 543,000 on State and local relief rolls. I think the gentleman is entirely right that when we have some 278,000 tons of edible food we should find some way of bringing those people and that food together. These are more than statistics.

Mr. ANGELL. I agree with the gentleman and thank him for his contribution which is very pertinent to this discussion.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that the Government is buying the best potatoes? It seems to me that the potatoes that I have been securing are the worst that I have eaten for a great many years.

Mr. ANGELL. That is true, the Government only buys top grades which the Secretary of Agriculture has announced he is ready to destroy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And Canadian potatoes are selling at a lower price than our own.

Mr. ANGELL. That is correct. I thank the gentlewoman for bringing Canadian potatoes into the discussion. Is it not nonsensical for this Government to dip into the Treasury and buy American grown potatoes and support and raise the price so that the ordinary citizen cannot buy them, and then let down the bars and ship in thousands of carloads of potatoes from Canada, or allow them to be shipped in, from Canada, to undersell the potatoes grown in America, and then use American dollars to support the price for the potatoes the Canadian potatoes displace? If that is not nonsensical, I would like some gentleman to point out to me what is.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are allowing Swiss watches and Swiss watch parts to come into this country, underselling our own and putting our own industry out of business.

Mr. ANGELL. That is quite true.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho for a question.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I want to say to the gentleman, in all this discussion about potatoes I have never heard a practical and feasible way of preserving those surpluses. We have in Maine and in Idaho vast dehydrating plants, and it would be a simple matter to turn the potatoes, which is a highly perishable product, into a staple, by dehydrating the potatoes and making them available for shipment to people that are starving. I want to also commend the gentleman for his stand on feeding the hungry and for his views on social security, increasing the compensation for people who are dependent.

Mr. ANGELL. May I say to the gentleman from Idaho that we have a very acute problem in my own district. Many of you know that the city of Portland is the greater portion of my congressional district. We have some 500,000 people in that area. We have some very critical problems in reference to many of the needy people, particularly some of the newcomers who have come into our State. Many of them are unable to find the necessary funds and to find the foodstuffs to maintain their existence. As a matter of fact, Oregon is the fastest-growing State in the Union. A large percentage of those people coming to Oregon are in my congressional district. Just this week I had up with the Secretary of Agriculture this question as to why we could not make available to these needy people in Portland welfare agencies, school lunches, schools that are taking care of veterans and maintaining cafeterias that are not run for profit, and other welfare groups—why we could not make available to the people in Portland these surplus commodities, particularly the potatoes which are to be destroyed, and I have not yet received a favorable answer from any Government agency or official.

I have been very much intrigued by the argument made on this floor by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], the very scholarly and convincing arguments he has made with reference to that very problem, and the fight that he is putting up for the people in his district, similarly situated to many in my own district. I am doing the same thing in my district, particularly for the people of Portland, and I have not yet received any favorable response from the Department of Agriculture or the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Government agency as to how they will make available to those needy people

these surplus commodities which the Secretary of Agriculture has announced he is going to destroy.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. It seems to me that we are wrestling with a problem that is of supreme importance. While it is important to deal with this immediate problem of surpluses, it seems to me the more important over-all question that the Congress ought to direct its energy and attention to is the rewriting of an entirely new over-all program, or the incorporation of old ideas into a new program to deal with this problem. The Brannan plan proposes a system of production payments with some other refinements that no one knows exactly what it is going to cost. It may be assumed, however, that it will not cost less than the present system which is geared to a system of price support. In either event, whether under the present system or under the Brannan plan, if the cost is three or four billion dollars a year, it is going to be financed through deficit financing, and your children, and great grandchildren, are going to be called upon to ultimately pay that bill. Now, I ask you again in your thinking to raise the commensurate benefit that will accrue to your grandchildren out of either the present program or the Brannan plan, if it is enacted. They are the ones that are ultimately going to have to pay for it. It seems to me, if we are going to have to pay in any event to maintain the balance in our economy as between agriculture and the other segments of our economy and make that balance available through deficit financing, adding to the national debt, as we are doing, we ought to adopt a program of compensation to the agricultural population of this country that would not only insure them an adequate income but would gear that income to soil conservation, to tree planting, to reforestation, and to crop practices that will give to future generations some benefit on account of the money they in after years are going to be called upon to pay. We are not doing it today.

Mr. ANGELL. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his able contribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time since I have been a Member of this House that I have stayed through special orders, and I am glad I did. I have enjoyed the mutual-admiration society that my friends to my left seem to be enjoying. In fact, it reminds me a good deal of a lawsuit that was tried down in southern Indiana, back in the years when I was a young lawyer, before a justice of the peace. The jury disagreed. The young lawyer that was defending the case met the foreman of the jury after the trial was over and said, "I wonder why you couldn't agree upon a verdict?" The foreman said, "Well, the truth of the matter is we did agree. We decided that this was the best lawsuit that had been tried in Shelby County in 25 years, and we just thought we ought to have it over again."

So I suppose we will have these potatoes over again in potato patties and in various ways.

It reminds me of the remark that was made last year in a column by Dan Kidney, who writes for the Scripps-Howard papers, when a prominent Member of Congress was investigating Howard Hughes and had to call off future hearings because he got poison ivy. Mr. Kidney wrote that it was the first case in history of a man getting poison ivy from handling a hot potato.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have listened to a lot of remarks today about the potato situation Many of us predicted this last year. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is the only one who has spoken this afternoon that has approached it in its proper level and in a proper way.

The responsibility rests upon Congress. Every other Member who has spoken has been shadow-boxing, ducking their own responsibility. We passed the law. The Secretary of Agriculture has to administer the law, whether he likes to or not. We directed him by law what to do.

Most of those who spoke today, if not all of them, voted for the bill they passed last year. We warned last year, those of us who advocated the adoption of the Brannan plan as an experiment, on three farm products, that you were going to hurt the whole farm program. By law you provided that the Secretary of Agriculture could not do anything except what he is doing. We even provided by law—I did not, but a majority of the Congress did—that the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of a surplus could pay the transportation charges when the food was to be used for animals, but in the case of potatoes he could not pay one penny of transportation charges to let those surplus potatoes get into the hands of human beings. So let us face the situation. It is everything the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] said. I agree with him—it is a sin. But the sin or the cause of the sin rests upon the Congress. Let us take our own responsibility.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time this afternoon more or less upon a point of personal privilege. On the 1st day of February the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] came into the well of the House and in his inimitable way took the Democrats over the coals about certain things. After he had finished I came down into the well of the House to answer him. Among other remarks I said this, and I quote from the RECORD:

> I think these differences—
>
> Meaning the differences between the Democrats and Republicans—
>
> are explained to a great extent, by that sage remark that was made by our colleague from Pennsylvania, the immediate past chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. He said that the Republican Party was constituted of the very best people in this country; cultured folks.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Will the gentleman yield, since he has mentioned my name?

Mr. JACOBS. May I finish the quotation and then I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am asking the gentleman to yield at this time for a special reason.

Mr. JACOBS. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I wrote the gentleman a letter in which I said to the gentleman that the statement which he imputes to me is false; he had no proof of it and if he attempted to repeat it again, I would brand it to his face and in his presence as an utterly false, untrue statement. If the gentleman has authority or witnesses, he should produce them before imputing to me a statement which I never made, and which there may be some reason to believe he knows I never made.

Mr. JACOBS. I rose today to prove you did say that. I have the proof here and I shall proceed to submit it.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACOBS. I do not yield further.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Then the gentleman has no proof.

Mr. JACOBS. Well, I have 27 minutes left. Let us wait and see whether I have the proof.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. May I suggest to the gentleman he will need not only 27 minutes, but 27 years to prove something that never happened.

Mr. JACOBS. Of course, you would like us to accept the statement that it never happened before the witnesses are heard.

Now, I will proceed to read what I said. Continuing the quote:

> Of course, since they have taken all the best people of the country, he figures there is no one but riffraff left for us Democrats. Consequently, we often see things in a different light than does the gentleman who associates only with the best and most cultured people.

In taking this up chronologically, if the gentleman had not risen, I would still have called attention to his letter which he wrote me in which he said it was not true. I will read one sentence from his letter at this time. It is dated February 2:

> This is to say specifically and emphatically that I never did make the statement you attributed to me or any statement carrying that intent or purpose.

You will observe that I did not purport to quote his exact language. I paraphrased what I understood he had said. When I received his letter I realized that anyone might be in error and I might have been misinformed. If I had been misinformed and if I felt now that I was misinformed, I would be the first man to come into the well of the House and publicly withdraw the statement and apologize for having made it.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. For what, a question or a speech?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. For a question.

Mr. JACOBS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman has had since the 2d of February to make that apology, or to make that investigation. There were between 550 and 600 people in the hall when the remark which the gentleman imputes to me is alleged to have been made. Has the gentleman spoken to or interviewed any one of those 550 or 600 people?

Mr. JACOBS. I will come to my proof in a moment, but the implication is unfair as I shall show you. Since I made my investigation I notified you on the 7th that I would on the following day, if granted time, comment upon it. Up until now I have not had an opportunity to gain the floor. I notified you that if I did this morning I would comment on it this afternoon, and you are here.

Now I am going to proceed to submit proof that the gentleman did say something that meant exactly what I paraphrased. Bear in mind, his statement was that he did not make any statement carrying that intent or purpose.

First, I think it is well to qualify the witness. You call a witness. Those who are going to listen to the witness want to know something about the witness, so I am going to tell you whom I am calling as a witness in this case and the circumstances under which the witness testifies. I am going to call none other than the Philadelphia Inquirer, a daily newspaper that is published in the gentleman's own district, or the city from which he hails. It is a newspaper that is thoroughly Republican. I shall prove before I finish that it is extremely friendly to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and extremely unfriendly to the Democrats as it is friendly to the Republican Party.

I shall further show that the circumstances under which this witness testifies are circumstances under which it could not be in error, because it so happens that the quotation that I will refer to is attributed by this friendly witness to the gentleman from Pennsylvania in a story in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania had denied a similar statement by Mr. Philip Matthews, who was chairman of the Pennsylvania State Democratic Central Committee.

I shall first give the quotation, and then I shall qualify the witness. You will remember I said that the gentleman had said that the Republican Party is constituted of the best people and the most cultured folks. What Mr. Matthews had previously said, sometime previous to June 29, 1948, was that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.] had made this statement:

> We are the best stock. We are the people who represent the real grit, brains, and backbone of America.

This is quoted in a story printed under the headline in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania denies that statement and brands it as a lie. In the story the gentleman from Pennsylvania is quoted as saying:

> In short, it is a lie.

He proceeded to say:

> Actually, I said then and I think now that the Republicans are of the stock of Abraham Lincoln; that we have the best party; that in that party we have the best guts and brains in America.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. If the gentleman will yield right there, I would like to congratulate the gentleman on having for the first time in his address made an accurate statement. That last statement is exactly what I said.

Mr. JACOBS. I am glad to have the gentleman admit it. It will probably dispense with the proof that is necessary to qualify the witness, although the proof is rather a boring, if you consider some of the editorials and cartoons. I feel like I did one time when I was in a lawsuit, and I had 25 witnesses to prove all of the gory details of an accident, and I was getting ready to murder the other side, and the lawyer on the other side got up and admitted the fact. I felt rather disappointed.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Does the gentleman expect me to apologize for having said that the Republican Party is the party of the stock of Abraham Lincoln?

Mr. JACOBS. No. I am going to discuss what you said. It just dispenses with my having to qualify the witness. I was wondering if you were going to dispute the Philadelphia Inquirer. We will discuss what the gentleman said. Now, remember I said that he had said that the Republican Party was constituted of the best people. Well, as one who grew up in the same neighborhood in which Abraham Lincoln spent his life from the time he was 9 until he was 21, we folks down there think that Abraham Lincoln and those who admire him and his principles are of the best people in the world; and if you are of the stock of Abraham Lincoln, then what he said is true, that you are of the best people. So what I cannot understand is why the gentleman got so excited when I said that he had said that the Republican Party was constituted of the best people.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. In just a moment, I would like to make this comment. What he meant, of course, was that the Republican Party had a monopoly on the stock of Abraham Lincoln, because it was a political speech the gentleman was making, and what point would there have been in saying that you had people of the stock of Abraham Lincoln if the Democrats also had people of the stock of Abraham Lincoln? He would not have intended to make it, so obviously that is what he meant.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman say that I am in error in the assumption that the Democratic Party and its orators, the Republican Party and its orators; yes, the Communist Party and its orators have all claimed that they were following the principles of Abraham Lincoln?

Mr. JACOBS. Oh, I think so; it is a good deal like saying that the Devil quotes the Scriptures.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They have all claimed credit as his followers, have they not?

Mr. JACOBS. Sure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, when you read the life of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, Abraham Lincoln was really a disciple of Thomas Jefferson; he was the progressive of his day; as a matter of fact, Theodore Roosevelt said that if Abraham Lincoln had lived then he would be classed as a radical progressive. If Lincoln were alive today he would be a Democrat

Mr. JACOBS. I think that is quite true. But I would like to proceed further with this statement. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania says that this statement is accurate, that that is what he said and I am still trying to figure out——

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR If the gentleman will yield, I will say that the last statement the gentleman made was accurate and that it was the only statement the gentleman had made today that was accurate.

Mr. JACOBS. I understand, and I believe these people here have intelligence enough to understand that point. A person does not have to keep reminding them of it; there are some good people here, some people with brains, so what I would like to do now is to go ahead and discuss it.

Mr. Matthews said that the gentleman had said, "We represent the real grit." Now, he says that what he actually said was "In this party we have the best guts." Well, what is he quibbling about? He is a Philadelphia lawyer; he knows that they both mean the same thing, undoubtedly. I will not argue with him about whether they have the best guts or not, but I will tell you what I will do, I will agree that they have the most abundant; and I will tell you why I will agree to it. The truth of the matter is that when I came down here and made that statement I was intending to "rib" the gentleman from Michigan; that was a parenthetical remark. There was no feeling of hostility toward the gentleman from Pennsylvania; I paraphrased what he had said. I submit it to the fair judgment of everyone who heard both statements that it was a fair summary of what he said and did not warrant addressing a letter to me in which he used the word "lie." I submit that it is a fair paraphrasing of his remark that he had admitted to here on the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. In just a moment. Whether they have the best guts or not they certainly have the most abundant of them, because the gentleman was over here and they were having a great time and they enjoyed it; and I did, too, as far as that is concerned, when the gentleman from Michigan was on the floor. I did

not agree with him, but he does an excellent job when he comes down here and uses the fish scaler on us Democrats. I enjoy art for art's sake.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, I just wanted to thank him for his compliment.

Mr. JACOBS. We Democrats have enough sense of humor to enjoy art for art's sake; we recognize art when we see it. We do not say anything nearly as strong as what the gentleman from Michigan said or what the gentleman from Pennsylvania himself has said since. I remember one place where he referred to the Democrats as practicing hypocrisy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The word "applause" was kept in the RECORD which I observed with some amazement because for years we were not supposed to put that word in the RECORD. But it is a mark of respect for the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JACOBS. It only shows how fair we are to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There are two things I should like to say. The applause was put in the RECORD because it was a part of the proceedings, I suppose, but there was left out of the RECORD my thanks to the gentlemen from whom it came. I do not know how that happened. The gentleman from Indiana said a moment ago that he went down in the well to rib the gentleman from Michigan. I assume he referred to me.

Mr. JACOBS. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why did you not do that and lay off the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.]? I would not care. He is sore about it.

Mr. JACOBS. I will tell you why. Because the gentleman from Pennsylvania belongs to the same party and he is your former national chairman. Frankly I had never met the gentleman from Pennsylvania but I just assumed he was a good sport like the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He is.

Mr. JACOBS. I was apparently mistaken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He is, but he does not like to be ribbed. I do not care so much unless it is something serious.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman has just implied that I am not a good sport. I want to suggest that anyone who can sit here and listen to these wanderings incubated in the gentleman's own cerebrations has to be a good sport in order to sit here and listen to them.

Mr. JACOBS. I appreciate the fact. I have seen a smile on the gentleman's face. However, it would seem he was quite outraged over this paraphrasing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I remember, in connection with the question of exclusiveness, Governor Driscoll and five other Republican governors sent a telegram recently to the chairman of the national committee protesting among other things against the exclusiveness of the Republican Party. That means the group in control. They were protesting their exclusiveness as distinguished from the people themselves and the Republicans as a whole.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. If the gentleman will yield, I can explain that. It is not so long ago that some of them excluded me out, so I am not in any clique.

Mr. JACOBS. I just want to comment a little further on this question of the gentleman saying that they were of the stock of Abraham Lincoln and had the best guts in the country. You know, that is what we call puffing in law school. We are puffing our own wares, our own stock. I do not see anything wrong in that and I do not understand why the gentleman from Pennsylvania should take offense at it.

Let us proceed now to the next statement. He said, "We have the best brains in America." Well, of course, that is where I got the idea they felt they were the most cultured folks in America. So, after all, when I received the gentleman's letter I thought to myself: Well, after all, you may be mistaken about this. If you are mistaken about that, the manly thing to do is go on the floor and admit it.

But I always investigate when I am challenged. I investigated and I feel quite clear that the gentleman did make the statement which is attributed to him by the Philadelphia Inquirer. I do not think there can be any question but what it means exactly the same thing as I said when I was on the floor the other day. I would have thought that all he meant was that they were advocating the best principle, consequently the people who think most clearly fall in behind them and support their principles.

But one of the reasons that it occurred to me the gentleman might have meant something else was the fact he took umbrage at what I had said.

In regard to this matter of being of the stock of Abraham Lincoln, I am reminded of what happened during the Lincoln dinners just recently. I would like to read to you from an article appearing in the Indianapolis Star:

LINCOLN'S PITHY QUOTES BELONG TO SOMEBODY ELSE

WASHINGTON.—Sadder and wiser speech writers were vowing around here yesterday to stick to the Gettysburg Address from now on.

Many of them had sent their Senators and Congressmen out for the Republican Lincoln Day festivities armed with this quotation:

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

Republicans starting out on the annual speech-making tour in tribute to Abraham Lincoln found these tempting statements. There is no denying that they sum up the criticism of the Fair Deal that Republicans have been making for a long time.

The only trouble is, Abraham Lincoln never said them. The Cleveland Plain Dealer editorially said it "bet that Lincoln would be sorry that he didn't think of (them) first."

Actually, the statements started on their way about 10 years ago when a group of Jeffersonian Democrats in California laid them down as a credo.

Somehow they were picked up in a folder issued back in 1942 by the committee for constitutional government and mistakenly attributed to Abraham Lincoln.

Then Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, Ohio, put them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, although she said she did not pretend to vouch for them.

Eventually Look magazine came out with an article offering the quotations as genuine.

This, of course, set off Life and Time with an exposé of the quotations.

But all this made no impression on the speech writers.

When Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER started for Chicago with his Lincoln Day speech, he had the quotes neatly set down as the base of his address Hurried telephone calls set the Hoosier Senator right.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART'S research expert sent him homeward with the quotations among his notes, although there was hope now he might not use them.

Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, was all set to refer to them in a speech in Arizona.

Meantime, the Library of Congress' legislative research staff was getting phone calls by the dozen asking for confirmation of the Lincoln quotations' authenticity.

The Library staff sadly reported that the quotations were not from Lincoln. They sent inquiring congressional offices photostatic evidence of their origin.

The inquiries became so numerous that the research staff finally got out a general letter explaining the whole situation.

So, if my Republican friends consider themselves experts on Abraham Lincoln, or, if they think they are of the exclusive stock of Abraham Lincoln, it is a rather strange thing that they would start out making all these Lincoln Day addresses throughout the country with a false quotation from Abraham Lincoln.

I want to say this, in closing, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. When I made the comment on the 1st of February I had absolutely no intention of offending the gentleman at all. I understood that he had said that, or that in substance. If I had not thought that it was true, I would not have said it in the first place. If I had found that it was untrue, I would come down here and admit it and I would apologize to the gentleman. It is my opinion that the entire truth is now in the RECORD, both the way I paraphrased the remark and the exact remarks that the gentleman admits are correct.

I wish to say in closing that I have no feeling of animosity toward the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It was more in fun than anything else. The only thing that makes it serious to me is that the gentleman did take offense at the remark, and I want to assure him that it was not personal so far as I was concerned at all.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I wanted to say that when the gentleman refers to false quotations attributed to Abraham Lincoln, that he has already established himself as an expert witness on false quotations, and I would accept that. But, I wish, if the gentleman is to quote a letter which I wrote to him, that the gentleman would be good enough to include the entire letter, or so long as he has not done so, I will be glad to include it.

Mr. JACOBS. I will put the correspondence in the RECORD.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I take no umbrage at any accurate statement, and since the gentleman admits that he did accuse me of making a false quotation, attributed not to me but to the chairman of the Democratic State Committee of Pennsylvania, but now admits that I made merely the correct quotation which refers to the stock of Abraham Lincoln, I accept his apology subject to the right of further comment in the special order I shall have very shortly.

Mr. JACOBS. Is the last quotation attributed to the gentleman in the Philadelphia Inquirer correct?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. No; the last quotation is not correct. "We are the stock of Abraham Lincoln," is correct from there on.

Mr. JACOBS. How about the following, that we have the best party, that in that party we have the best guts and brains in America, does the gentleman deny that?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I do not deny it. I am a good Republican as the gentleman is a good Democrat. I was speaking at a Republican meeting, and I do not withdraw a word of it. The gentleman called it "puffing." Perhaps he should call it salesmanship.

Mr. JACOBS. I am perfectly willing then to let those who have heard what I said and what the gentleman admits he said judge as to whether or not my paraphrasing was inaccurate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is in an amiable frame of mind. Does he not think he ought to apologize to me? The gentleman wrote me a letter asking me to come over, that he was going to talk about me, and he has not done it, and I am disappointed.

Mr. JACOBS. After all——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman some other time?

Mr. JACOBS. I will talk about the gentleman some other time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right.

Mr. JACOBS. I am sorry I did not mention the gentleman any more than I did. I do apologize for not mentioning him. By the way, I will not talk about him, but I will give him some advice.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Wait a minute; is the gentleman going to charge for it?

Mr. JACOBS. No, no. As I told you the other day, I am not practicing law for fees at all. According to my friend Westbrook Pegler I made $150,000 a year practicing law, so this advice ought to be worth something, and it is free.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I hope it is worth more than it costs me.

Mr. JACOBS. It should be.

The gentleman, I understand, has a lawsuit pending against a colleague for libel. In my experience in practicing law for 21 years, I have found there is one great danger to a libel suit, and that is the danger that the other fellow is liable to prove it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman mean to state, now——

Mr. JACOBS. I am speaking abstractly, the gentleman understands. I know nothing about the case.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I guess you do not know anything about the case. Although I do not love lawsuits, and I am sure he does not, if the gentleman wants to repeat outside the statement that the other gentleman made, I can guarantee him a lawsuit.

Mr. JACOBS. Of course, I know nothing about the fact

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. This has moved west.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I understand that. I am afraid the gentleman will forget me. I want to get the benefit of further conversation with the gentleman.

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman has had plenty of benefit. I have paid more attention to him than to anybody else.

Also while the gentleman from Michigan was on the floor that day he was talking about the gentlewoman from California. He was telling how she was coming out of the ladies' room downstairs, and had met some lady going in, and had told her, "This is only for Congresswomen." This is not legal advice. I could not charge the gentleman for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is not rest-room advice, is it?

Mr. JACOBS. No; it is just plain, practical advice, based on the legal advice I gave the gentleman on the dangers of a libel suit. Let me make a suggestion. The gentleman had better be watching that libel suit instead of the door to the ladies' rest room.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do not charge me with being near the rest room. I do not even know where it is.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a part of my remarks correspondence consisting of three letters exchanged between myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and also an article from the Indianapolis Star dated February 11, 1950, which contains the entire quotation to which I referred earlier in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1950.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JACOBS: Each time the old lie bobs up I have to nail it. Although you did not give me the courtesy of any advance notice when you launched your attack on me on the floor yesterday, let me, at least, have the opportunity to advise you against making the same particular mistake again. This is to say, specifically and emphatically, that I never did make the statement you attributed to me, or any statement carrying that intent or purpose. It was false when first used, it was false when used by you, and the purpose of this letter is simply to request that you do not again fall into the same error; if you do, I shall be under the obligation of publishing this letter and alleging that the statement is a lie, that I informed you that it was a lie, and that you have repeated it. I assume you will do no such thing to another Member of the House and I would appreciate your so advising me, as, of course, I cannot always be present on the floor when you are and have no other means of knowing whether you intend to make unwarranted and inaccurate attacks upon one who has certainly given you no cause for such action.

I may add, my own people were people of very modest circumstances, that they were all Democrats, and that I have never made any distinction between peoples of any race, color, or creed in my whole life; my judgment of people is based on their conduct and their actions, and that, of course, is the way I would judge you and the way I would expect you to judge me

Very truly yours,

HUGH D SCOTT, Jr.

FEBRUARY 7, 1950.

Hon HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: Responding to your communication of February 2, 1950, please be advised I will, if granted time as requested, comment upon its contents on Wednesday, February 8, 1950.

May I say I regret your umbrage at what I considered good-natured ribbing.

Them that can't take it, shouldn't dish it out.

Yours truly,

ANDREW JACOBS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1950.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JACOBS: I have never objected to good-natured ribbing. I simply like people to stick to the truth.

Very truly yours,

HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SOIL CONSERVATION FOR SOUTH CAROLINA'S PIEDMONT AND THE NATION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter the other day from a long-standing friend and neighbor of mine, suggesting that I make a speech here in the House on soil conservation. This man,

Mr. S. B. Huff, of route 2, Piedmont, S. C., is just a plain, practical farmer. But he has a great passion for conserving our soil and water resources, and restoring the productiveness of some of our farming lands which have suffered much through years and generations of neglect or abuse.

Mr. Huff is chairman of the board of supervisors of the Greenville County Soil Conservation District. He knows what he is talking about when he says that an adequate soil-conservation program must constitute the basis of any long-range agricultural program. My personal observations likewise confirm his statement that this is a matter of great interest and importance, not only to his neighbors and himself in the South Carolina Piedmont country, but also to farmers and other people everywhere. A permanent healthy agriculture is a matter of direct concern in every State and in every congressional district in the country. We, whose business it is to pass upon a great variety of legislation affecting the welfare of agriculture, certainly should take the time occasionally to discuss the progress and needs of such basic undertakings as those for conserving our production farmlands, our forests, our wildlife, and our other natural riches.

William Jennings Bryan said one time:

> Burn down our cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms, and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country.

Although I am a city man, I agree with Bryan's reasoning in this regard. No one needs to remind me, for example, that it was South Carolina land that actually provided my own education and has helped to support me in my law practice since. For it was cotton produced on the land around that kept the spindles turning in the Greenville mills where I worked for 15 years while going through school. And it is cotton, livestock, peaches and other products of this same land that today still provide the wealth upon which I and my fellow townsmen depend for our living. It is most certainly true that if agriculture succeeds, industry thrives; and if agriculture languishes, industry and all our business in town suffers accordingly.

Grass has not grown in the streets of Greenville, Laurens, Union, or Spartanburg, but we undeniably have paid a price through the years for agricultural setbacks in our part of the country. Not all of these can be charged against the cotton insect infestations of years past or to economic upsets. Thinking people know, even without the experts telling us, that wasteful use of our land and of the water which enables it to produce has reduced crop yields and lowered farm income and purchasing power. We know, too, that generations of preponderantly row-crop farming—cotton and corn—took heavy toll in damage to our farms, our mills and our public facilities such as highways, railroads, and industrial and city water supplies.

Sloping fields gashed with ugly, unproductive gullies; roads relocated one to several times because the old wheel tracks grew into impassable ditches where runoff water sluiced down them from bordering cropland; and muddy streams and silt-clogged ponds and reservoirs—these are our constant reminders that we have not always used our land and managed our rainwater too well in the past. I can show you more than one reservoir that has silted full or nearly so behind dams built in my day, filled with soil washed off the fields upon which we depend for growing our food, feed and fiber crops. This process of man-made soil and water waste started long before my time, of course; but it is important to keep in mind that when our forefathers took over from Nature the job of managing the land and the waters of our Piedmont country, the land was covered with timber and our streams were, in the words of early-day writers, "of surpassing transparency." It has been a long, long time since anything like that could be said of our streams such as the Saluda, Enoree, Reedy, Tiger Rivers and others.

Today, in fact, siltation of our reservoirs, streams and harbors and flood damage along most of the country's rivers are of major concern to all of us. We spend a great deal of time here in Congress, as you know, considering flood control survey reports and appropriations. I think we all are pleased that, since the Flood Control Act of 1936 was enacted, proper weight now is being given to the important watershed phases of flood control, up on our farmlands and timber lands, with soil and water conservation playing a major part in such planning and operations by the United States Department of Agriculture through the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service.

In South Carolina, for example, preliminary examinations have been completed by the Soil Conservation Service and flood-control surveys are scheduled to start during the 1951 fiscal year in the Santee-Cooper watershed in which my counties lie, as well as on the lower Pee Dee and the Tar-Neuse watersheds and in the coastal drainage from the Savannah River to the Albemarle Sound. That is most of the State, except for the part included in the Savannah River watershed, on which a survey already is well under way. I certainly hope to see this important work carried on through.

My part of the country, of course, does not have any monopoly on our unenviable history of land and water use. It came about, not deliberately or maliciously, but through the course of conventional settlement and development of the land in the best accepted American tradition. I feel sure that the land story follows a similar pattern in most of your States and districts.

We can profit in looking back, though, only to the extent that we employ the lessons of the past in shaping our course for the present and the future. We lawyers find past court decisions indispensable in building up our cases day by day. Nature has rendered some sharp decisions on man's occupancy and use of the land; we who hold title to or rent the land today will do well to study those decisions and weigh the penalties and awards which have resulted. Frankly, I believe we have been doing a pretty honest job in this respect in recent years; and the good results are much in evidence.

Great strides have been made, as you know, in the last 17 years in many phases of our economy. We can think of an imposing list, ranging from the guaranteeing of bank deposits to social security and housing aid. The advancements in the field of agriculture have been especially noteworthy. Some of those we now accept as a matter of course as permanent, everlasting, stable improvements include: rural electrification, now expanded to extend rural telephones; Federal crop insurance; Farmers Home Administration lending for farm ownership or production and subsistence needs, with 28 percent of the ownership loans already paid up in full 30 or more years in advance, and the remainder paid an average of 2 years in advance; and the varied Production and Marketing Administration functions, from its marketing service and the school-lunch program to the agricultural conservation programs.

But I have no time to talk about these various worth-while activities today, even though some of them contribute materially to furthering of the country's soil- and water-conservation accomplishments. The agricultural conservation payments, for example, have helped the farmers to do more conservation work. Progress of soil conservation likewise has been hastened because of the educational program of the Extension Service; the cooperative research work of the experiment stations and the State colleges with the Soil Conservation Service; and the United States Forest Service's conservation and research on national forest lands. I shall confine my remarks principally to the work of our Greenville County Soil Conservation District and the approximately 2,200 other districts organized and run by local farmers of the 48 States and 4 Territories and insular possessions.

Generally speaking, I think that soil conservation as it is being carried on through these democratic, locally voted and managed districts is perhaps the greatest program in agriculture that has been hit upon in recent years, if not in all time. The purpose of soil conservation is to help all agriculture. Any number of our scientific agricultural achievements are of incalculable value or indispensable, such as crop, livestock and poultry improvements, insect- and disease-control methods, and so on. But none of these alone can produce a bale of cotton, a pound of beef or pork, or a board foot of lumber unless there is productive land on which to grow our food, feed, fiber, oil, and timber crops.

Our Greenville County soil-conservation district is 9 years old. It is one of the 33 such districts which blanket the entire State of South Carolina—one of 8 States which are 100 percent covered by these districts. The other soil-conservation districts in my congressional district are the Laurens County district, of which Mr. Ryan F. Lawson, of Clinton, is chairman; the Spartanburg district, Mr. J. A. Bridwell, of Moore, chairman; and the Broad River district in Union

County, Mr. W. C. Camp, of route 2, Gaffney, chairman. Each of them has its own report of splendid conservation accomplishment; but I have time to discuss in any detail only the work of the Greenville County district, with which I naturally am most familiar.

I can say with certainty that the conservation work they report is actually out there on the land. I have been out and have seen the results of this soil- and water-conservation planning and land treatment. I have observed the systems of terracing, the conservation drainage improvements, the conservation farm wildlife developments that are proviidng us with better hunting and fishing, the cover cropping, the farm ponds, and other practices and measures. Thus I have had the opportunity of observing at first-hand the great contribution these farmer districts have made toward restoring the permanent productiveness of the farm lands in our part of the country, where cotton has placed a heavy drain on the land.

In the Greenville County district's 1949 annual report which Chairman Huff sent me, I was impressed by such indicators of healthy progress in district accomplishment as the growth in the number of conservation farm plans. That has been from 75 plans covering 7,599 acres at the close of 1940 to 865 plans covering 90,000 acres at the end of 1949. Some of the individual accomplishments reported included about 4,000 acres of pasture established, more than 6,000 tons of lime, and a thousand tons of superphosphate used, 100,000 trees planted, and 162,000 pounds of summer legume seed and 34,000 pounds of winter legume seed planted.

The Soil Conservation Service, as the technical agency which helps the Greenville County and the other districts in conservation surveying, planning, and initial application of these measures, at the request of the district supervisors, has supplied me with some additional figures. They show, among other accomplishments, that our Greenville County district farmers to the first of this year have done 17,000 acres of contour farming and developed 3,700 acres of new cover crops, done nearly 13,000 acres of strip cropping, built 1,428 miles of terraces, and put conservation woodland management into effect on 18,000 acres.

Those figures, you understand, represent only a few of the conservation measures actually put on the land in the one soil-conservation district in one county. I could give you comparable facts about the others in my congressional district, elsewhere in South Carolina, and for the country as a whole. I think it is enough to point out at this time, though, some more general State and national figures. For example, I find that to January 1 approximately 29,000 complete conservation farm plans had been worked up by district farmers and assisting Soil Conservation Service technicians in South Carolina. These plans called for the treatment of 4⅓ million acres, and the land treatment reported as already applied totaled more than 3 million acres in our South Carolina soil-conservation districts.

Also, I was interested in knowing that 11¼ million acres in my State alone already have had the benefit of detailed conservation surveys, which the Soil Conservation Service assists the districts to make to find out what conservation treatments the land needs on each farm, and how each acre may be used most profitably and safely. If any of you are not acquainted with this basic land inventory on which the districts' conservation planning and land treatment are based, I am sure you would find it worth while to post yourselves on it.

These land capability surveys, as I understand them, develop for every acre on every farm such pertinent information as to the type of soil, the slope of the land, the amount of erosion it has had in the past, and its susceptibility to further erosion under prevailing climatic conditions with different kinds of use cultivation, pasture, and so forth. With such facts available it is then possible for the farmer to separate the best land from the less productive and more hazardous lands, and plan his farming accordingly. It seems to me this ought to be good information for us to have for the entire country, and that such a national land inventory could have many important uses in the planning and carrying out of almost all the different agricultural programs, whether they be strictly soil conservation, farm credit, production allotments, or whatever.

Dr. H. H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, tells me that by the first of this year, January 1, 1950, detailed soil conservation surveys adequate for farm planning had been made on 321,000,000 acres in the country as a whole. He pointed out, though, that the demands from the districts for help in planning and applying conservation measures had been so heavy that the survey work had not been able to go forward as rapidly as it should of late.

I also asked Dr. Bennett for other Nation-wide soil conservation accomplishment figures. They showed that up to January 1, 1950, about 807,000 complete soil conservation plans had been prepared in districts alone, covering nearly 222,000,000 acres. More than 112,000,000 acres of that had been treated with needed conservation measures by the first of this year, just in the soil conservation districts and not including past work done in the erosion control demonstration projects, CCC camp areas, and through other programs in which the Soil Conservation Service has participated. Nor do they include the important soil and water conservation research activities which this agency is carrying on all the time in cooperation with the State experiment stations.

But enough for figures. Meantime, let us go back to Mr. Huff's report from the Greenville County Soil Conservation District and consider a couple of points brought out which I think are most important in connection with the successful undertaking of our whole conservation program. One is the local community-group approach which our Greenville County farmers are using to help speed up their programs. I find that just about everybody agrees on the need for going ahead as fast as possible with this soil- and water-conservation work; and I understand that this group-action procedure is getting splendid results, both in our local district and in other districts all over the country.

As it is worked out in the Greenville County district, this method consists of organizing communities into groups for the purpose of getting a pattern of soil conservation over entire neighborhoods, without regard to farm boundary lines. The district has five of these neighborhood groups, with two Negro groups. These organized farmers select a leader for each group within the soil-conservation district; and, as Chairman Huff points out, these farmer-leaders have in many instances "become true conservationists and are rendering a real service to the cause of soil conservation." I think you will agree with me that this is the basic, democratic way of going about a job of this kind. It is no wonder that our Greenville County conservation groups have attracted the attention of agricultural leaders from different parts of the United States and from foreign countries.

Closely related to this successful farmer-group approach to the conservation problem is the emphasis which our Greenville County district is giving to community-wide support of its program. As Mr. Huff wrote:

> As we soil conservation district supervisors understood our duties better, we came to believe that people, other than farmers, have a responsibility to the land. As we saw the success of groups of farmers working together, we realized that the help of these other people would give impetus to the soil-conservation program and that it would be well to seek this outside help and give them the opportunity to have a part in the soil-conservation movement. In considering the fact that every citizen has a stake in the land, district supervisors have called upon all types of business, banking, manufacturing, commerce, and industry to help with the job. We have sought the help of teachers, preachers, newspapers, radio, civic clubs, and private citizens.

I personally can vouch for the success which has attended their efforts in this common-sense attitude toward the conservation program. For example, I had the pleasure of attending the Greenville County district meeting in Mauldin at the close of the district's 1949 pasture contest, which the supervisors have sponsored each year since 1947. Business firms of Greenville furnish prizes in the contest and put on a dinner at the close of each year's event. The supervisors report that these pasture contests have resulted in the planting of 4,000 acres of fescue and Ladino clover. I wish I had time to tell you of some of the outstanding results which our individual district farmers have had with their pasture-livestock programs.

The Greenville County district supervisors call attention in their report to what I agree is a particularly significant phase of this whole matter of conserving our soil and water resources. That is, "the tremendous influence for good among young folk of the community—influence that will keep these boys and girls on the farms, continuing the type of farming their fathers advocate." During the past year, the Greenville County

district also sponsored a soil-conservation contest among 4–H Club boys, with prizes provided by the Greenville Kiwanis Club through its agricultural committee.

The district supervisors also are cooperating with veterans' classes, by getting motion pictures for the classes and cooperating with the instructors in observational tours. Over the country generally, I understand that a most constructive soil conservation training program for veterans has been under way. Also, that many veterans are among the approximately 16,000 private contractors who have found most profitable opportunities in terracing, drainage, pond building, and other conservation-construction work for soil conservation district farmers.

I want to mention another outstanding conservation contest activity in my county. That is the 2-year Piedmont communities soil-conservation contest. Originally sponsored by the Spartanburg Herald-Journal, the second contest now under way is being sponsored by supervisors of the Spartanburg, Laurens County, and Broad River, Union County, soil-conservation districts in my own congressional district and the districts in Cherokee, Polk, and Rutherford Counties. I am told that 370 farmers and 28 groups are participating in Spartanburg County, with $10,000 in prizes offered by business firms; 145 farmers in 10 groups in Union County, with $3,000 in prizes; and 269 farmers in 14 groups in Laurens County, with $2,800 in prizes. Every cotton mill in Laurens County is offering a prize in the contest. This will give you a further idea of the way all of us down in my part of the country believe in getting behind this important work of soil conservation.

Nor is this just another do-good movement that all these varied interests enter into because it seems to be a genteel and proper thing to do. Our mill owners and business and professional people of all kinds appreciate all too well the fact that we people in town are not going to prosper unless the farmers of Greenville County and the rest of the country can keep up their income and maintain their purchasing power. Soil-conservation farming, it has been demonstrated over and over, is the most efficient and hence the most economical and profitable. It enables the farmer to adjust his production best to meet changing market and other conditions.

As I have pointed out to this body before, my home is the center of the South's thriving and growing cotton textile industry. None of us, naturally, want to see cotton driven from the South; but neither do we want to see our good land needlessly exhausted in growing quantities of cotton which may not be needed at a given time, or our already depleted and low-producing lands needlessly pushed to produce surplus cotton. Instead, we want to grow the cotton which is needed on our good land, economically and profitably, and produce other, needed commodities like feed and livestock, fruit, timber, and so on on the lands best suited to produce them safely and profitably. I should say that the same general goal would hold for the Wheat Belt and other cash-crop areas.

The agricultural pattern in our southland already is changing definitely in that very direction, to the everlasting benefit and well-being of us all. While our industries thrive, many of our people are living better than they ever did before. Soil-conservation farming unquestionably has played an important part in this. And new agricultural developments are bringing new prosperity to many localities. In my home district, for example, peach growing has become an important part of our agriculture in recent years. In fact, Spartanburg County has become one of the Nation's peach centers, now that South Carolina has forged ahead of even Georgia in peach production in some recent years.

Mr. Huff in his letter reminded me that the farmers of Greenville County and the Nation are concerned over the type of agricultural legislation that may be considered and passed by Congress this year. We now are working under the greatest pressure to economize and are trying to slash off every unnecessary expenditure possible. But for us to curtail or hinder this sound soil-conservation program which is so successfully under way would be false economy, and the resultant loss to the country would be too terrible to contemplate.

As you know, busy farmers like Mr Huff do not sit down and write letters to their Congressman just to be doing something. He and his fellow farmers are sincere in their efforts to help improve our agriculture and our whole economy with it. They are standing on their own feet, and giving liberally of their own time and sometimes cash money to get the job done. All they ask is that we make available to them such facilities which they need as the technical assistance provided by the Soil Conservation Service, along with the continued educational help of the Extension Service and PMA conservation incentive payments.

Dr. Bennett tells me that the demands from soil-conservation districts for Soil Conservation Service technical aid continues to be far in excess of the personnel available for giving such assistance. In my own State, for example, the backlog of farmer applications for conservation surveying, planning, and application help through their districts totaled about 2,850 on January 1. I know that this agency is just about as efficient as it could be in assigning all but a very small percentage of its employees to work directly with the farmers or to duties involved specifically in getting conservation onto the land. I have visited the Service's southeastern regional office in Spartanburg, and am personally acquainted with Dr. T. S. Buie, the regional director, and different members of his staff in Spartanburg and in the field offices in my counties. I also have had the pleasure of attending a meeting of the local chapter of the Soil Conservation Society of America, composed of members from different agencies and groups and individuals whose work has to do with soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation.

It is good to see all these people working together toward the common objective of conserving and making more satisfying use of our land and other resources—the farmers, agricultural and other scientists, business and professional people, and just about everybody else. This teamwork is going to continue to pay us big dividends. And, as Mr. Huff wrote:

Until—

The soil-conservation district—

supervisors can add all our State and National lawmakers to the enlisted group of Americans who are helping farmers to save the soil, then we will be minus an assistance that can do much to encourage good land use.

I hope it may be said of all of us here that we are going to meet this challenge squarely and wholeheartedly.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no measure pending before the House of Representatives is of more importance to the eventual welfare and security of the American people than that providing for Federal grants in aid to the several States to maintain a more adequate system of public elementary and secondary education. The American people, as well as the Members of Congress, know the value of education. However, some of those same people, and particularly the Members of Congress, have not always been willing to do those things which are imperative to the satisfaction of the educational needs of our children. I believe the people are ahead of the Congress in their thinking on this matter and desire this legislation.

It is not necessary to argue the importance of public education. However, it is important to note that influential businessmen in America have in recent years arrived at conclusions which those in the teaching profession have maintained for years. Recently the United States Chamber of Commerce, through its education committee, made a comprehensive study of education in all of the States and in most of the countries of the world. On the basis of this study, these businessmen concluded: First, that there is a direct relationship between the level of educational attainment of people and the level of their economic well-being; second, that education is an effective instrument through which business, agriculture, and industry can expand in rising degree; third, that there should be in every community a sufficiently comprehensive public-school program to not only develop the productive skills and techniques of the people, but, also to develop their desires for the things that are produced; fourth, that the preservation of our democratic institutions and ideals, together with our economic institutions and ideals, is dependent upon the maintenance of a sufficiently adequate system of public education to develop the capacities and the willingness of our people to govern themselves effectively; fifth, that the money spent on education is not an assessment but an investment in the future of America.

These are conclusions of businessmen with which, in my opinion, the vast majority of the people of America wholeheartedly agree. When these conclusions are evaluated in the light of conditions which prevail among the public schools of America, the importance of Federal aid legislation begins to emerge in its true perspective. The need for immediate action by the House of Representatives becomes more evident.

A number of committees and commissions, both public and private, have studied the needs of public education in America during the past generation. Each of these has discovered the economic fact that the high concentration of economic wealth in certain areas of the Nation inevitably results in the fact that certain other areas of the Nation do not have sufficient taxable wealth to maintain an adequate system of public education. Each of these has discovered the sociological fact that many areas of the Nation have a greater proportion of children to be educated than other areas. Each of these has discovered the further fact that the children and the economic wealth are not necessarily in the same areas.

In every instance where a committee or commission has recommended a solution based upon these facts, the recommendation has been that the only way by which certain areas of the Nation can give any semblance of decent educational opportunities for its children lies in the Federal Government utilizing its power to tax wealth wherever it is in order to educate children wherever they happen to be. This means Federal aid to education.

While there are Members of Congress who sincerely question the need for Federal aid to education, I do not believe that this question is the real issue. It is my considered judgment that the vast majority of the Members of the Congress, as well as the vast majority of the people of America, agree that Federal aid to education is necessary. The real question now pending before the House is not, "Should Federal aid for education be provided?" but rather it is, "In what form shall Federal aid for education be provided?"

It is unfortunate that the debate on Federal-aid legislation, both in and out of Congress, has centered around the question, "Should public funds be provided for parochial or sectarian schools?" This debate, of course, has raised issues pertaining to the principle of the separation of church and state. I yield to no one in my adherence to this principle. I agree with the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States that "The first amendment has erected a wall between church and state" and that "That wall must be kept high and impregnable." It is certain that direct payments of public funds to all types of private sectarian schools is unconstitutional. In the words of the Supreme Court, "no tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."

Since the Constitution prohibits the use of public funds for private sectarian schools, the debate in and out of Congress is actually centered around the question, "What constitutes aid to private sectarian schools?" It is unfortunate that many people seem to think that the answer to this question lies in statutory enactment. As a matter of fact, however, this is a question for judicial determination, a question of judicial interpretation of amendment 1 to the Constitution of the United States. In my opinion, there are two ways of securing a comprehensive answer to this question. One is by the process of securing judicial determination through the courts of each alleged violation. The other is an amendment to the Federal Constitution which specifically spells out an answer to the question by enumerating those practices which are prohibited.

A thoughtful study of the situation forces one to the conclusion that the educational issues involved in the principle of the separation of church and state cannot be resolved by statutory enactment. These issues may be complicated by statutory enactment but they cannot be resolved. These issues are already with us and certainly they cannot be resolved by the failure to enact Federal aid to education legislation.

In this situation there seems to have developed three schools of thought. One school of thought is represented in section 6 of S. 246, which passed the Senate of the United States last year by a vote of 58 to 15. The advocates of this point of view hold that the most significant issue in Federal-aid legislation is the preservation of State and local control in the determination of educational policy. They recognize that the character of education under our decentralized system differs in type and quality from State to State and community to community. They believe that this variety of education has promoted freedom of thought and consequently a material progress greater than that of any other country in the world. They recognize that the educational issues involved in the principle of separation of church and state cannot be resolved by passing a law, but they have studiously avoided any provision which will complicate the issues further. In spite of charges to the contrary, proponents claim that section 6 of Senate bill 246 does not in any way compromise the principle of the separation of church and state. It is an open unequivocal facing up to the situation that actually exists. The advocates of this position do not claim for it virtues which it does not possess, but they do claim that it in no way compromises or complicates the principle of the separation of church and state. It forecloses Federal dictation of policy in education in any sense. It is purely a States' rights bill.

The ideas of the advocates of the second school of thought are embodied in the Barden bill. They seek to avoid the sectarian issue by the simple expedient of limiting the use of Federal funds, in their definition of current operating expenses, to those services about which there has already been judicial determination. The advocates of this point of view seem to think that the passage of such a bill will resolve the educational issues involved in the principle of the separation of church and state. Proponents of Senate bill 246 contend that this is not the case. The issues are with us already, and they will be with us even after the passage of such a measure. You cannot, they contend, resolve issues by avoiding them. It is true, however, that such a procedure does not complicate the educational issues involved in the principle of the separation of church and state. But it is equally true that such a procedure would not resolve them.

Advocates of S. 246 are disturbed by the fact that many advocates of the Barden bill are claiming for it virtues which it does not possess. The realistic facing up to the situation which actually exists, embodied in section 6 of S. 246, is no more of a compromise of the principle of the separation of church and State than is the procedure of avoidance as embodied in the Barden bill, they contend.

As a matter of practical operation in the several States, there is no basic difference between the Barden bill and S. 246. For example, if the Barden bill were enacted there is nothing to prevent a State in which the constitution and laws authorize the providing of transportation service for children in nonpublic schools from allocating additional State funds for this service and replacing these State funds with Federal funds authorized by the Barden bill. Some insist that the Barden bill if passed would tend to make the National Government superior in the determination of educational policy—the very opposite of States' rights.

Neither the Barden bill nor the Senate bill resolves the issues involved in the principle of the separation of church and state in the area of education. Neither the Barden bill nor the Senate bill complicates the issues involved in the principle of the separation of church and state in the area of education. Neither the Senate bill nor the Barden bill discriminates against children attending nonpublic schools since the schools which both bills seeks to assist are open to all children.

The third school of thought is represented by the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The advocates of this school of thought insist that any Federal aid to education bill must embody the principle of the Federal Government withholding a portion of the funds authorized and appropriated and the allocation of these withheld funds directly to nonpublic schools in all States regardless of the provisions of State laws and constitutions. This principle does complicate the issues involved in the principle of the separation of church and state in the area of education. The adoption of this principle by the Congress would mean that the Congress would assume the responsibility for the determination of educational policy and provide for the enforcement of this policy by bypassing State laws and constitutions. This would be a violation of the principle of the preservation of the State and local

control in the determining of educational policy. It would be the precedent for a course of action which, followed to its logical conclusion, would mean the complete alteration of our traditional system of public elementary and secondary education.

Opponents believe that it is error for the advocates of this principle to picture it solely as a simple matter of human justice, when, as they contend, there is a basic and fundamental principle involved. The principle that is immediately violated, however, is not the separation of church and state, although I can see that ultimately this principle would be involved. The immediate principle which the procedure would violate is the principle of the preservation of State and local control in the determination of educational policy.

The answer to a complex problem can never be found by the expediency of avoidance. As each succeeding Congress has failed to assume its liability to realistically face the issues involved in Federal-aid legislation, the problems have become more complex and the needs for action have become more acute. If we refuse to assume our responsibility now, a clear, sound, and defensible solution will be more difficult in the future. There is a sane and sensible way to provide Federal grants in aid to satisfy the educational needs of the children of America without violating any fundamental principles. If the members of the Education and Labor Committee can find sufficient time to ascertain the facts, principles, and issues involved in this legislation, and will deliberate upon these findings in an unemotional and unbiased way, as I am sure they will, they can report out a bill which will meet the approval of a majority of the Members of the Congress. If individuals and groups in the committee and out continue to claim for their ideas virtues which they do not possess, as a clear analysis of these ideas will reflect, then the Congress, by its inaction, will condemn another generation of children to a life of inadequate educational opportunities.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just want to say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] while he is here, in reference to the last remark that the report about the Member from California came to me from an employee of the Democratic Party and my statement was not based on anything that I saw. I did not make the statement on the basis of anything I saw. The gentleman's insinuation that I was watching the restroom door is just an indication of his type or style of argument.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in order that I may comment on that?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman. Then I have a few things to say which I think will be of interest to the gentleman.

Mr. JACOBS. I am very glad to be corrected. But the reason I was so certain that the gentleman himself had seen it is because the gentleman is a lawyer and I do not assume he would indulge in hearsay evidence.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course a lawyer never testifies. He calls witnesses. The gentleman, in his long speech today, gave us nothing but hearsay when he referred to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If you want it, I will let you know where I got the information. It was an employee on the Democratic side of the House who reported the incident, and it came to me as a Republican because it was thought it might be of some use in the debate on FEPC.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] referred to hearsay evidence. That is all we have heard from him today with regard to the remarks about the gentleman from Pennsylvania. So I think it scarcely lies with him to criticize hearsay evidence.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I agree with the gentleman. Of course all that he has said today refers to remarks which he learned or says he learned from his own Democratic State chairman of the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I only have 15 minutes. The gentleman had twice as much time. Suppose I yield to the gentleman now, and then may I ask the gentleman to permit me to proceed without interruption.

Mr. JACOBS. I should certainly like to correct the statement that the gentleman just made. I referred to a quotation in the Philadelphia Inquirer which the gentleman himself admits is accurate.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman referred to two quotations, one which he now himself admits and knows to be inaccurate and is attributed to Philip Matthews, State chairman of the Pennsylvania Democratic Party; and another one which is a report of what I actually said, which the gentleman accepts as true, and so do I.

I must say there are times when one is reminded, and I will ask the brilliant gentleman from Indiana if he is not also reminded, when some people take the well here, of what John Randolph of Roanake once said about another brilliant wit, a person given to quips and courtroom anecdotes, that he reminded him of a mackerel in the moonlight—that he shines and stinks. I am afraid that any logorrheic effort on the part of the gentleman from Indiana really does not call for or deserve any particular comment from me. I am sure the gentleman will not think I am assuming any superior attitude if I tell the gentleman that logorrhea is a Greek word meaning a rush of words to the mouth. I am sure, then, that any logorrheic effort on the part of the gentleman from Indiana needs no further comment. The gentleman has been in labor for years and he has found it quite painless. So painless indeed that the evidence indicates before the Committee on Education and Labor that on one occasion he, as a lawyer, received a fee of $65,000 from, I believe, the Carpenters' Union and he refers to me as being a Philadelphia lawyer with the implication that I am the success which the gentleman asserts that he is. I assure the gentleman I never in my life either charged or received any sum of money anywhere remotely similar to that and I certainly have never taken from the pockets of the working man $65,000 singly or collectively in one or any number of fees.

I have had the privilege of representing certain A. F. of L. unions. I have, in fact, been a member of a CIO union in Philadelphia, but then, of course, not quite being in the same class as the gentleman admits he himself is in, my own fees in such cases ran to $75 or $100 or $150. So that when the gentleman has established, first, that he is a lawyer; second, that he is a good lawyer; and third, that he is a high-charging lawyer, I will not dispute him on any of those counts and will be very glad to admit it. I came here today because the gentleman has sent me many communications stating that he intended to make various attacks on me, which I judged to be personal. I find that the mountain in labor has produced a mouse. I will ignore them other than to say that my letter of February 2 to him, having been placed in the RECORD, would seem to be an answer.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I refuse to yield further.

The concluding paragraph of that letter ought to be an answer in itself. It reads:

> I might add that my own people are people of very modest circumstances.

There has never been a $65,000 fee in the family.

> That they were all Democrats.

That is, my original ancestors.

> That I have never made any distinction between peoples of any race, color, or creed in my whole life. My judgment of people is based on their conduct and their actions. That, of course, is the way I would judge you and the way I would expect you to judge me.

Had the gentleman intended to make a full-throated, big-hearted apology, as the latter part of his statement would indicate, he would at least, I hope, have included that paragraph from my letter.

I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. The truth of the matter is that the reason I did not read it is because I did not have time, as I yielded so often to you. Although I think you would consider it a favor, because perhaps you would not want to disclose the fact that you were a Democrat or that your ancestors were.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I never was, if you want to get the story straight. I answered the gentleman by saying that

many of my people were Democrats, but that I came to my city to practice law at the age of 21 and I learned to read and write meanwhile. But I did not give the gentleman the full answer that I had intended. I was also, like the gentleman, born a New Dealer, but I remained a New Dealer only until about the age of 3 when I learned to dress myself. Does that answer the gentleman?

Mr. JACOBS. No. I have known Democrats who could dress themselves before they were 21. But I should like to comment on that, if the gentleman feels as he expressed himself in the letter, which I did not read in full because I had tried to be generous in yielding to the gentleman when I had the floor; if he does feel as he expressed himself in that letter, I want to say to him that the Democrats would welcome him back with open arms any time he wanted to apply for membership.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I can see why the gentleman would be glad to have me back, and I appreciate the invitation, but I assure him that I long ago made my choice, and I am very happy in it. I much prefer to be here, contending for the things in which I believe than to be out charging labor unions $65,000 fees.

Mr. JACOBS. I have never been able to figure out what you folks do believe in. It might even hit me if I could figure out what your party stands for.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. We do not believe in Alger Hiss. We do not turn our backs on men who are loyal to the country, it is true, but we do turn our backs on men who are accused of perjury—perjury which is based upon treason. I would like to know whether the gentleman has some comment on Alger Hiss, and which way he turns his back when treason of that type is involved

Mr. JACOBS. I certainly hold no brief for Alger Hiss. I say the law should take its course. I have always said so. I would like to comment in that regard, if the gentleman will yield. I never charge a political party with responsibility for the people within it, who fall from grace. I will give you a little instance.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am afraid I cannot yield to the gentleman for a speech.

Mr. JACOBS. Of course, the gentleman cast an aspersion. I yielded to you on numerous occasions. I expect you used about one-fourth of my time.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I do not yield further, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to hear any more of the gentleman's courtroom stories for the reasons which I have indicated. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JACOBS. You are quite generous, are you not?

SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE OF HOUSE AND GENUINE SMALL-BUSINESS GROUPS OPPOSE S. 1008

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow week, February 28, the House will likely vote on a motion to send S. 1008, the so-called basing-point bill, back to conference and appoint new conferees.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Has there been an agreement that we will vote on the 28th of February on this subject?

Mr. PATMAN. If I correctly understood the colloquy today, it is set down for the 28th, with the understanding that an agreement will be reached before the calendar is gotten out by the majority leader at the end of this week.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I did not understand it quite that way. I gathered from the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that he would not schedule it until he knew definitely what time it would be taken up. The gentleman is here. Let us hear from him.

Mr. McCORMACK. My statement was that it was incumbent on those interested to confer with the leadership. Among those I mentioned was the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the gentleman from Pennsylvinia [Mr. WALTER], and I assume also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]; that they would let me know definitely so that I could advise the House that it was generally understood to be next Tuesday, but I was not accepting that as a definite assignment.

Mr. PATMAN. As I understood it the gentleman did not state that it was definitely scheduled or would be until there had been a further conference.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly; and I assumed that they would confer with me before that.

Mr. PATMAN. But the gentleman had not announced a definite date.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct; I think the gentleman understands the situation.

Mr. PATMAN. Really, then, it will not come up before next Tuesday, February 28.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact we all know that the gentleman from Texas is opposed to bringing this matter up. He has written letters and is doing everything he can to prevent it. I do not want the House to be placed in a position that the time when this bill comes up depends upon an agreement to which the gentleman from Texas is an important party, because if the gentleman from Texas has his way this bill will never go to conference.

Mr. PATMAN. The reason that a conference was held with the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and myself, was because we had agreed heretofore that it would be brought up tomorrow, and they felt they should ask me if I objected to the proposed postponement. I said certainly. I hope the gentleman from New York sees the error of his way and never brings it up. They felt that—we having had several conferences about the matter—they should say something to me about it; because we have to make preparation on our side just the same as the gentleman has to make preparation on his side. We are as much entitled to advance notice as those on the other side.

Mr. MICHENER. But there are Members of the House who want it to come up, Members, who like the gentleman from Michigan now speaking, believe that the ordinary procedure of the House should be followed. The Senate passed the bill 1008, the House passed the bill 1008 with amendments. Each House has legislated on this subject. It seems to me therefore that we ought to follow the regular rules and send it to conference and try to work out an agreement, because whatever agreement is worked out the report of the conferees must come back to the House for a vote, yes or no.

Mr. PATMAN. That is a question that will come up when the motion is made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that the whole attitude of the gentleman from Massachusetts who is now talking, as majority leader, is to protect the other Members of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. I am sure that is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. My whole desire is to protect the Members of the House, and I am imposing this condition, that we be consulted. That means that the minority leadership will be advised; whatever we program we will advise the minority leadership. The purpose is that we may have some kind of control, some understanding, so that I can advise the House in ample time that the Members may be here to act. My whole effort is for the benefit of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. That is as it should be, and I commend the gentleman. The only thing I am worried about is that if this bill is not sent to conference until the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] agrees that it shall go to conference, there will never be a conference. It has been postponed now week after week.

Mr. PATMAN. I have never tried to unduly delay it or block it; the gentleman is not charging that, I hope.

Mr. MICHENER. No; I am not charging that.

Mr. PATMAN. I am perfectly willing for it to come up at any time. All I want to know is the exact date. I think that is fair.

Mr. MICHENER. That is what we are interested in also; we want a day certain fixed.

Mr. PATMAN. We want that too, for we must meet the issue. We were ready for it to come up tomorrow and expected that it would come up tomorrow. But the House is in this ridiculous attitude:

The conferees agreed to something and the Senators wanted the House to adopt it; the House did over my protest. Then the bill went back to the Senate and they postponed it from October 1949 until January 20, 1950. Then so much was shown as to how devastating it would be to the antitrust and other laws that the Senate unanimously sent it back to conference and asked that the House appoint new conferees. That does not leave the House in a very favorable position; so I think it should be defeated, a new bill introduced, public hearings conducted, and then if any part of the bill can be justified the Congress can consider passing it.

It is certainly a violation of the laws, rules, and regulations of our legislative system to pass a bill of such great magnitude without committee hearings. S. 1008 has never been considered by a committee of either during public hearings. Such a thing would not be noticed in a totalitarian government.

In this connection, I wish to refer to a resolution signed by a majority of the members of the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I have the honor to be chairman, opposing this move to send the bill back to conference.

This resolution points out that there have been no public hearings on this substitute bill either by the House Judiciary Committee or the Senate Judiciary Committee, and this resolution has been approved in its entirety by the following members of the Small Business Antimonopoly Conference, called together by me to confer on various subjects:

Associated Retail Bakers of America.

Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Cooperative League of the United States.

International Association of Machinists.

National Association of Retail Druggists.

National Candy Wholesalers Association.

National Congress of Petroleum Retailers.

National Farmers' Union.

National Federation of Independent Business.

National Food Brokers Association.

National Grange.

United States Wholesale Grocers Association.

The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION BY MEMBERS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN OPPOSITION TO THE BILL S. 1008

We, the undersigned members of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, hereby resolve as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States (2d sess., 80th Cong.; 1st and 2d sess., 81st Cong), has been importuned to enact legislation purportedly designed to clarify the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case (April 26, 1948), and other decisions dealing with collusive formula pricing and price discrimination under our antitrust laws; and

Whereas various bills have been introduced in the House and the Senate in the nature of moratoriums and permanent legislation which, if enacted, would have the effect of weakening our antitrust laws and lessening the effectiveness of our Federal enforcement agencies; and

Whereas the bill S. 1008, now before the Congress, was a substitute bill on which no public hearings were held by either the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate or the Committee on the Judiciary of the House; and

Whereas the bill S. 1008 is designed as permanent legislation, amending our antitrust laws, the effects of which are not generally understood because there have been no full and complete public hearings thereon; and

Whereas the proposals embodied in S. 1008 are opposed by many bona fide small-business organizations and by the members of such organizations as threatening their existence through the weakening of the antitrust laws (Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act); and

Whereas we believe the Congress of the United States has the duty and the responsibility in the public interest of holding full and complete public hearings on legislation affecting our antitrust laws; and

Whereas one of the primary considerations of the Select Committee on Small Business is the protection of the small-business institutions of our country and the preservation of our free-enterprise system: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the undersigned members of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, urge the Members of the House to vote down the motion to again send the bill, S. 1008, to conference in order that this legislation to amend our antitrust laws may be considered only after full and complete public hearings by the appropriate committees of both the House and the Senate.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
8th day of February 1950.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT FOR THE NATION'S RAILROAD WORKERS AFTER 30 YEARS OF SERVICE OR 60 YEARS OF AGE AT HALF PAY BASED ON THE FIVE HIGHEST YEARS OF EARNINGS, AND AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO THEM—WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP OF AN IMPROVED RETIREMENT SYSTEM TO THE JOB-DISPLACEMENT PROGRAM OF THE WALL STREET RAILROAD BANKERS WHO DOMINATE THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY, AND HOW CAN THE RAILROAD MEN PROTECT THEIR JOBS?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1949, after consultation with and at the express request of the Chicago Committee for Progressive Railroad Labor Legislation, I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill (H. R. 2146) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60.

Tens of thousands of railroad men, members of all 21 standard railroad labor organizations have supported this bill by petition since its introduction. These endorsements have come from 1,637 railroad towns across the Nation on all major railroad systems. Great numbers of local and system officers of the brotherhoods, AFL and CIO railroad unions, as well as local lodges of these organizations, have endorsed and are advocating this measure as their own. I am speaking here in behalf of these railroad workers. From the tremendous and widespread support this bill is receiving, I do not hesitate to say that the rank-and-file membership of the standard railroad unions are practically 100 percent behind this measure.

My bill has also the endorsement of the American Labor Party and the Progressive Party of the United States in line with the railroad workers' plank in the 1948 Presidential election platform adopted by that party in their national convention in Philadelphia on July 25, 1948, at the request of over 50 local lodge and system officers of the standard railroad unions who were delegates to that convention.

The petitioning railroad workers have endorsed and addressed the following message, now transmitted through me, to the Members of the Eighty-first Congress:

We, the undersigned railroad workers, urge the Eighty-first Congress to enact into law H R 2146. Enactment of this legislation will enable thousands desiring retirement to apply for annuity, thus providing better job security for younger employees. The Eighty-first Congress will be serving the best interests of our Nation by taking this step to stabilize employment on the railroads. Railroad workers are paying their own way for retirement benefits and it needs only the sanction of Congress to give them the retirement provisions stated above and now long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, in the present critical job situation in the railroad industry, railroad workers feel that the inclusion of a provision of voluntary retirement after 30 years of service or 60 years of age at half pay is the next logical and necessary step in the improvement of their retirement system.

Railroad workers are faced with the most dismal job situation in their history. They see another depression bearing down upon them. The fact of the matter is that as far as the railroads are concerned 255,000 workers have lost their jobs in the past 12 months. This is a drop in railroad employment of 19 percent below October 1948.

What is the meaning of these railroad layoffs? Are tens of thousands more to be squeezed out of the industry in the next few years? Where else are they to find employment? What are the aims of the job-displacement programs of the J. P. Morgan, Kuhn Loeb & Co., bankers of Wall Street who own and control the railroads, and how can the railroad men protect their jobs?

These are the questions agitating the minds of the Nation's railroad men today and make the 30-year retirement program advocated by them imperative.

SLAM-BANG SPEED-UP THROWING MEN OUT OF WORK

There is great dissatisfaction and unrest among railroad men which links strong and positive feelings concerning

retirement with their dread of unemployment because of a slam-bang speed-up campaign of the railroad financiers and a program of mechanization and modernization of equipment, including, notably, the introduction of Diesel power. With workers' efforts being rapidly speeded up on new machinery and bigger and faster equipment that is throwing more men out of work literally by the hour, it becomes obvious to them that one partial answer to this problem is the improvement of their retirement system that will make possible the voluntary retirement of the older workers to make way for the younger men.

HIGH TAX JUSTIFIES DEMAND FOR HIGHER OLD-AGE BENEFIT PAYMENTS NOW

And when viewing the exceptionally large 6 percent tax which railroaders have to pay toward financing their old-age retirement system, compared with the 1½ percent tax which most other workers now pay under social security, they cannot understand why more liberal retirement payments at an earlier retirement age cannot be established immediately to help meet this critical job situation. This tax burden is especially heavy to great numbers of men in both operating and nonoperating departments who are now working part time—on the extra boards—many on a 5-hour day, who have a gross wage to begin with that is not enough to feed a family.

No wonder, then, that these railroad men are demanding more progressive retirement measures at this time. In their desperate fight for jobs and old-age security they see clearly how the two are linked together—how a larger number of older men retiring from service would give, at the same time, more jobs to younger men raising families.

PRESENT LOW PAYMENT MEANS LESS RETIREMENT

The passage of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 was intended to provide railroad workers with old-age security, that is, with adequate pensions when they retire from railroad service But the defects of the act are now coming to the surface in the postwar economic crisis. After 13 years of its operation this law, meeting its first major test, is found wanting. Its main defect is that it fails to provide for adequate annuities to men desiring to retire on pension. The law, therefore, is now in need of further improvement to bring it up to date and to increase its old-age benefit provisions in line with the present financial possibilities under the act.

The exceptionally high proportion of older workers in this industry is common knowledge. Also well known is the difficulty which younger men experience in getting into the industry and of maintaining any semblance of steady employment once they are in. Such problems are only accentuated for younger workers by the growing lay-offs and part-time employment, while older workers in declining health are forced to continue in their jobs because of retirement benefits that have always been extremely inadequate and are now especially so in view of the present high cost of living.

What should be done with these men who are too old to work and too young to die?

AVERAGE MONTHLY RETIREMENT PAYMENT ONLY $83.98

The present Railroad Retirement Act provides for retirement with maximum benefits after the employee has reached 65 years of age. The average monthly payment to retired workers is now only $83.98—Railroad Retirement Board's Monthly Review, November 1949, page 238.

SOME REVEALING FACTS

According to the direct testimony of Mr. William J. Kennedy, Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, speaking before the subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in May 1948, less than one-third of those employees over 65 and eligible for retirement benefits have seen their way clear to quit railroad service and take their pensions because of the relatively low retirement annuities now being paid under the act. We quote directly from the testimony of Mr. Kennedy:

LITTLE INCENTIVE TO RETIRE

It is startling, but nevertheless a fact, that there are now more living persons over 65 who have credits under the Railroad Retirement Act, but who have not applied for annuities, than there were when the 1937 act was adopted. There are approximately 90,000 such persons, over 60,000 of whom are still working on the railroads. This is bound to create dissatisfaction. A retirement system normally is intended to enable the retirement of superannuated employees so as to provide opportunities for promotion of the younger men, otherwise, the industry would be burdened with an unduly large number of men in the older years I submit that the present situation offers very little incentive for older men to retire from service.

RAIL WORKERS TAKE UP THIS CHALLENGE

Mr. Kennedy's testimony reveals in a very mild way the fact that 60,000 of those presently working at the age of 65 or over cannot afford to quit and live on the retirement annuities at present provided for under the railroad retirement law. This situation presents a challenge for improvement of their retirement system which the Nation's railroad workers have taken up. The tremendous petition Congress has received verifies the existence of the great dissatisfaction among railroad workers with the totally inadequate retirement payments now provided for, which Mr. Kennedy refers to. It also indicates that the act as it now stands has not removed the haunting fears of insecurity of railroad workers during their remaining years of life, when they reach the age of retirement.

It will be recalled that in recent years certain amendments have been made to the Railroad Retirement Act which were beneficial to the railroad workers, but these amendments did not remove the basic defect of the present law—they did not lower the voluntary retirement age or provide a sufficient amount of annuity to enable those desiring retirement to apply for their pensions.

THE REMEDY

Therefore, the railroad workers have come back to Congress with a request to correct these defects in their retirement system. They call for positive and affirmative action by Congress at this session for passage of my bill which has been designed to correct these very defects pointed out by Mr. Kennedy, defects which are so obvious to all rank-and-file railroad men.

THIS BILL RAISES RETIREMENT PAYMENTS AND MEANS MORE RETIRED WORKERS

My bill would meet and correct this situation in two ways: by raising the benefit payments to those who retire and by increasing the number of those who are eligible to retire.

The proposed bill will very materially raise the average retirement benefit payments of $83.98 a month now paid to retired workers by providing that monthly benefits be equal to one-half of the worker's regular compensation as calculated by taking the monthly average of his five highest years of earnings, whether or not such years are consecutive, but not to include earnings of over $300 in any one month, since such earnings over $300 are presently not taxable.

WOULD RAISE RETIREMENT PAYMENTS OF ALL

This simple method, setting the amount of the retirement monthly payments at half pay, would especially benefit the lower-paid worker. It would not substantially increase the retirement payments of higher-paid workers, however, since the present maximum payment of $144 per month would only be increased to $150 per month. Nor will my bill take anything away in future payments. The present system will permit an individual to receive over $150 per month after 1967. My bill will protect that feature. Such a system of retirement payment particularly benefits those most in need while at the same time raising the benefits of all retired railroad workers. These increased retirement payments will in themselves act to induce many more men than at present to retire voluntarily as they become eligible for full retirement benefits.

MORE RETIREMENT ALSO BY LOWER RETIREMENT AGE

Of even greater importance, however, is the fact that the bill will greatly increase the number of workers eligible for full benefits by, in the first place, reducing the voluntary retirement age from 65 to 60, and, secondly, by introducing an alternative opportunity for retirement after 30 years of service regardless of age.

ONE-THIRD NEVER GET A CHANCE

Figures which have been released by the Railroad Retirement Board in its press release No. 48–5, dated April 12, 1948, reveal that out of 100 railroad men who are now 30 years old, 33 will not live to 65 years, that is, roughly one-third on the average of the industry's workers never get a chance at retirement under the present law. These workers are making an investment in a nonexisting future under the present retirement system.

TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND WOULD BE ELIGIBLE

The proposed amendments will materially help to alleviate that situation by making 225,000 men in the industry still

under 65, but who have completed 30 years of service, eligible for immediate retirement along with all those men between 60 and 65 who have less service.

Another important matter which will be included in my bill when it comes up for action in Congress, is the waiving of the medical reexamination requirement for vocational disability annuitants who have 20 years or more service and are 55 years of age or over.

BILL INCREASES EMPLOYMENT AND PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

The twin provisions of the proposed amendments to the present law, that is, of raising retirement benefits to half pay and of increasing the number of employees eligible for retirement, would thus yield the obvious advantage of decreasing lay-offs in the industry, providing for steadier employment for younger workers, increasing opportunities for promotion, and giving greater security and a few more years of leisure to older workers before they are ready for the grave.

INCREASED ANNUITIES TO BE PAID FOR OUT OF CURRENT COLLECTIONS

Mr. Speaker, critics of my bill have stated that retirement at half pay is impossible without raising the tax on the workers' pay checks still more, or else otherwise leaving the retirement fund bankrupt.

For the sake of their own selfish political ambitions or desire to curry favor with the right people in the right places they attempt to confuse and mislead railroad workers in their efforts to deny such workers the money which is rightfully theirs, and which they paid into the fund in all good faith in the belief that it would come back to them in old-age benefits. These critics of my bill know, as well as I know, however, that this good faith of the railroad men has been seriously taken advantage of, as huge unused funds rapidly accumulate year after year under the railroad retirement system instead of such money being paid back in old-age security to the workers as they had naturally expected would be the case.

Not even the most conservative person can challenge the figures published by the Railroad Retirement Board in its own annual reports, which show that this unused, so-called reserve fund, has grown over the years of the act, as follows:

June 30, 1938	$60,741,671
June 30, 1947	810,253,361
June 30, 1948	1,382,746,064
June 30, 1949	1,725,095,898
September —, 1949	2,061,690,640

Figures taken from the annual reports of the Railroad Retirement Board, except figure for September 1949, which is taken from the Board's Monthly Review of November, page 239.

FIGURES SHOW PROVISIONS OF BILL CAN BE PAID OUT OF CURRENT COLLECTIONS

These figures reveal the fact that the already huge unused surplus in the fund has far more than doubled in the past 2 years, and is still mounting. This unused surplus is now accumulating at the rate of approximately $400,000,000 a year. This growing surplus is the result of the fact that only 45 percent of the money currently coming into the fund is being paid out in actual benefit payments to retired railroad workers and their survivors, while 54 percent is placed in the unused reserve.

This is a situation that is obviously not keeping good faith with railroad workers for whose benefit the act was supposedly set up. Nothing is more clear from all this than the fact that much higher benefits could be paid retired railroad workers merely by making the money paid out of the fund equal to the money currently taken into the fund. The huge unused surplus already piled up also could be reduced to a considerable degree without jeopardizing the soundness of the system in any way. The fact of the matter is that the huge unused reserve of $2,061,690,640 now in the fund is greater than the whole amount of money paid out in all forms of retirement benefits in the entire 13 years the railroad retirement fund was in operation, which amounted to $1,872,956,093—Railroad Retirement Board's Monthly Review, November 1949, page 239.

Some of the critics of my bill and those who maintain the present act to be wellnigh perfect try to justify this huge surplus collected from the pockets of the railroad workers by hinting that somehow it is necessary to protect increased benefit payments in the dim distant future. All railroad workers can easily see, however, that with a continuously smaller labor force being employed on the railroads, there will, in all likelihood, be less money needed to pay future retirement benefits, rather than more. It is also obviously ridiculous to contend that railroad workers will all suddenly reach the age of 65 and retire all at once and altogether demand their retirement benefits at the same time. To use such an argument to attempt to justify this huge surplus can never make any sense whatever to the workers on the railroads.

THE BIG RETIREMENT SWINDLE OF THE RAILROAD CORPORATIONS

The railroads perpetrated a monstrous swindle on all railroad workers at the inception of the present Retirement Act in 1937. For it was in this year that they saddled the entire cost of transferring 48,500 pensioners—1949 Report of the Retirement Board—of their former private pension systems onto the Federal retirement fund. This maneuver of the railroads simply has meant that all railroad men have had to chip in since 1937 to help pay all the costs of former pension systems set up and operated by the railroads to the tune of $222,539,972 to date—costs which were the sole obligation of the railroads and should have been met entirely by them but which they neatly wiggled out of. Such an underhanded trick of the railroad corporations has never been pulled, to my knowledge, in any other industry.

WALL STREET RAILROAD MAGNATES SHOULD BE MADE TO PAY

It would only be just, therefore, if the railroad magnates of Wall Street were made to pay back part of the retirement money, which they already owe the men working on the railroads by providing for benefits which went even beyond the scope of my bill.

The brazen falsehood of those who oppose my bill that it would mean a higher tax on the hard-earned pay checks of the workers is thus shown up for what it is. The improved retirement provisions of my bill not only should be, but can be financed without raising taxes on the workers under the present Retirement Act.

The Retirement Board's figures show that funds are available to provide for retirement after 30 years of service or 60 years of age at half pay. With the necessary funds on hand in the United States Treasury already credited to the retirement fund, all that is required is the passage of my bill and the appropriation of sufficient funds by act of the Congress to be placed in the Railroad Retirement Account to be used for the payment of the increased benefits provided for in this bill.

LAY-OFFS SWEEPING THE INDUSTRY

Mr. Speaker, for tens of thousands of railroad men conditions in the industry are growing more desperate by the hour. The job situation is the No. 1 problem that must be solved on the railroads.

Let us look at a few cold-blooded facts to find out what is happening to railroad jobs.

THE BEHIND-THE-SCENE PICTURE

America's railroad men are under attack. Their employment conditions, their jobs, their very well-being is at stake. Today in the lay-offs sweeping the industry railroad men are beginning to see the clear outlines and feel the full effects of a 20-year onslaught against their jobs which is depriving them of their security, their skills, and for hundreds of thousands, their livelihood.

In the past few decades, the entire railroad employment picture has changed drastically. And what is this picture?

THE HUMAN PICTURE

The railroads were once the Nation's largest industrial employer. But here are the figures showing railroad employment cut-backs since 1920:

1920 October	2,022,000
1945 October	1,420,000
1947 October	1,352,000
1948 October	1,327,000
1949 October	1,089,714

Here we see that over 900,000 workers have been driven out of the industry in the past 29 years.

This huge displacement of jobs has taken place while the volume of railroad traffic increased almost 90 percent, showing the tremendous increase in productivity per worker. In other words, about half of the 1920 labor force today is handling almost twice as much traffic, which means the productivity per worker has increased almost three times. Of course, I must point out that "increased productivity" is only a fancy word for speed-up.

THE PROFIT PICTURE

While 900,000 workers were being squeezed out of the industry, the Wall Street railroad magnates were reaping a golden harvest—they raked in billions. "All the traffic will bear and the public—and workers—be damned," has ever been their slogan.

In 1948, for example, they hit at all-time high, the largest peacetime profit since 1920, many of the roads doubling and trebling their 1947 profits. Despite declining carloadings last year and slightly reduced net profits, the Wall

Street railroad financiers look for plenty of gravy in 1950. They expect to extract it out of the hides of even fewer railroad workers and the public.

STREAMLINED OUT OF JOBS

All-Diesel railroading is likely within the next 10 to 15 years. With the Diesel the length of trains are doubled and trebled. They haul a hundred carloads of coal. Road and yard crews are cut in half. One train crew today does the work of two or three train crews of a few years back.

"How does the board look this morning?" "Who's going to be furloughed next?" "How many crews were cut off today?"

These are questions heard in every railroad yard office in the country, since the advent of the Diesel. How the Diesels slaughter the jobs of road and yard crews can be seen at a glance at any railroad division point in the United States.

What the Diesel is doing to the jobs of road and yard service workers it is also doing to the jobs of railroad shop workers. Plans now being perfected for the "package replacement parts" system of repairs for Diesel engines are completely revolutionizing railroad locomotive repair and maintenance practices. The plan is a standardized factory-made replacement parts system, similar to that in the automobile industry. Under this system, heavy repairs, the removal of an entire power plant or generator in a Diesel locomotive and the installation of a new one, can be made in a few hours' time and the locomotive put back in service with little delay. Light or minor repairs can be made while the Diesel is in operation. This is doing away entirely with the old railroad practice of having skilled mechanics machine the parts to fit. It eliminates the need for the skill and craftsmanship that railroad locomotive mechanics have spent years in acquiring. The steady increase in the use of Diesel power will doom the jobs of unnumbered thousands of railroad men, unless steps are taken to provide them with better job protection.

SHORTER HOURS AND MORE RETIRED WORKERS WILL REDUCE LAY-OFFS

The men working on the Nation's railroads do not intend to suffer at the hands of speed-up and resulting lay-offs which the railroad corporations are even now inaugurating along with the 40-hour week in their efforts to get as much work from each man in 40 hours as he formerly was able to do in 48 hours. These workers are fully aware that lay-offs are caused directly by speed-up methods on the job, by the lumping of many jobs into one job, by the introduction of labor-displacing machinery, and by the stepped-up consolidations of small lines and transportation facilities, as well as by the general falling-off of business.

SHORTER HOURS FOR ALL

It is only natural, therefore, in their efforts to protect their jobs that railroad men throughout the industry are asking in no uncertain terms for a genuine shorter workweek for all with no reduction in present take-home pay and with no speed-up strings attached; for national full-crew and train-limit laws, and a third man on the huge multiple Diesel locomotives for safety reasons; as well as for an improved retirement system that will enable more men to take their pensions.

Here it is necessary to call attention to the plight of the Negro railroad workers. Certainly the discriminatory practices of the railroad corporations against these workers is only too well known. They are the last to be hired and the first to be fired. Consequently, like in all other industries, in the current railroad lay-offs and unemployment the Negro workers are hardest hit. They are denied employment in most railroad departments, as well as advancement and upgrading to higher paid jobs.

In view of these facts, the present retirement pension is especially inadequate for the Negro railroad workers, who, because of these discriminatory practices, earn low wages, are subject to greater periods of unemployment, and faced with higher living costs.

It is necessary also to call the attention of the Congress to the award handed down in December 1948 by a Presidential fact-finding board concerning railroad dining-car workers, who are predominantly Negroes. While other railroad workers covered in this award were granted the 40-hour 5-day week, with time and one-half for overtime, dining-car workers were awarded a 205-hour month, with no overtime until after 240 hours' work. This is one of the most shameful, discriminatory, Jim Crow awards ever handed down by a governmental body appointed by the President in the history of the railroads. I intend soon to introduce a measure establishing a 170-hour workmonth—this would be equivalent to a 40-hour week on a monthly basis—for dining-car workers and pullman porters who are now compelled to work such inhumanly long hours.

Such evil practices on the railroads should be outlawed by act of Congress, and adequate measures taken to protect Negro railroad workers from them. Such action would basically improve and advance the conditions of all railroad workers—Negro and white.

TO PREVENT LAY-OFFS, NO MEASURES ARE TOO EXTREME

It is evident that my bill makes no pretense at solving the basic problem of lay-offs in the railroad industry in and by itself, but that it must be combined with these other current demands of the railroad workers in order to approach any effective solution of the menace of unemployment on the railroads. These workers know from the misery of their sad experience in the last depression that no measures along these lines are too extreme in order to try to avoid another great era of poverty, and of furloughed railroad men by the tens of thousands walking the streets.

There is nothing fantastic, visionary, or radical, about the railroad workers' 30-year retirement proposal any more than there is about their other measures for protecting their jobs and combating lay-offs and unemployment in the industry. To those who sneer at any suggestion of advances in the working conditions and job security of laboring men anywhere at any time, all such proposals are fantastic, impossible, and radical. So was the railroad 8-hour day in 1916. So was the railroad workers original retirement bill in 1930.

RETIREMENT FUND SHOULD BE USED TO BETTER SECURE RAIL WORKERS' OLD AGE

In summary of my bill, it must again be emphasized that the railroad workers are paying into the retirement fund a larger share of their hard-earned wages than any other single group of workers in any other industry in the country.

Because of their much larger contributions, the railroad workers are accumulating a fund which does enable the payment of proportionately larger benefits. It is this self-created retirement fund which the Nation's railroad men desire to put to use to better secure their old age, rather than to have such a fund permanently at the disposal of the Government through the device of Treasury bonds, as at present, available for the prosecution of the cold war and the Marshall plan dictatorship over foreign countries. The actual use to which the Government is currently putting this huge fund should be of the most grave concern to the Congress, just as it is to the railroad workers. It is high time that the Congress of the United States begins to play square with the railroad workers

TRAIL BLAZERS

The Nation's railroad men can justly pride themselves on being the pioneers in the field of social security and retirement pensions back in the late twenties and early thirties. The original railroad-retirement law, passed in June 1934, was followed by the enactment of the Social Security Act more than a year later. Now the railroad workers are opening up a new frontier in this field and leading the workers of the entire Nation to a new social-security system of voluntary retirement at half-pay after 30 years of service or 60 years of age. If they succeed, with the help of others, they will be blazing the trail for a similar advancement by the workers in all other industries.

More steady work and advancement for younger workers, more security for older workers and more jobs available to all, make this legislation as necessary to the general welfare of the Nation as it is to all railroad workers

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. DOUGLAS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for February 20 and 21, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 21, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1236. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a defi-

ciency estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $715 and supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $111,215 for the legislative branch; (H. Doc. No. 471); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1237. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the first quarterly report on the administration of the advance planning program, authorized under Public Law 352, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 13, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works.

1238. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting proposed amendments of H. R. 5472 relative to the Columbia River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

1239. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1240. A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, transmitting copies of agreements entered into pursuant to the act of June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1252), as amended by the act approved June 17, 1944 (58 Stat. 280); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1241. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1242. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report on operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and the program for the purchase and sale of tin metal during the 6 months ending December 31, 1949, pursuant to Public Law 125, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1243. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Fourteenth Annual Report of the National Labor Relations Board, for the year ended June 30, 1949, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1244 A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting lists containing the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1245. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Inland Waterways Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H. Doc No. 472); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1246 A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts, pursuant to section 53 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1247. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce, covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1248. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on proposed improvements in the Columbia River Basin for development of the Pacific Northwest, pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (H. Doc. No. 473); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1249. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 14, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative study for beach erosion control of the shore line of the State of Connecticut, area 2, Hammonasset River to East River. This investigation was made under the provisions of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 474); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 15 illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McSWEENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 479. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3105, a bill to extend the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1665). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 480. Resolution for consideration of S. 2734, an act to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1666). Referred to the House Calendar

Mr MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 481. Resolution for consideration of H R. 874, a bill to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities, without amendment (Rept. No. 1667). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs NORTON. Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 69. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of immigration hearings before a judiciary subcommittee, without amendment (Rept No. 1668). Ordered to be printed

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration Senate Concurrent Resolution 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report 1158, Eighty-first Congress, first session, entitled "Progress on the Hoover Commission Recommendations"; without amendment (Rept No. 1669). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs NORTON: Committee on House Administration House Resolution 459. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' gratuity and $350 funeral expenses to Mrs Anna M Backof, widow of Henry J. Backof, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No 1670). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr ASPINALL:

H. R. 7339. A bill to abolish the Holy Cross National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7340. A bill to amend section 5192 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the reserves of certain national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 7341. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Anacostia River in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H R 7342. A bill to provide for the boundary adjustments of the Badlands National Monument, in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 7343. A bill to equalize taxation by imposing income taxes on cooperative corporations and on the business income of certain other tax-exempt corporations and organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H R. 7344. A bill to authorize an appropriation for cooperation with the Gallup Board of Education, New Mexico, for the construction, extension, improvement, and equipment of school buildings to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr HARRIS:

H R 7345. A bill to designate the lake created by Narrows Dam in the State of Arkansas as Lake Greeson in honor of the late Martin W. Greeson, to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R 7346. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States and to authorize participation in a cooperative endeavor for assisting in the development of economically underdeveloped areas of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7347 A bill to permit certain war-service indefinite employees to acquire competitive civil-service status and permanent tenure by qualifying in noncompetitive examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 7348. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILES:

H R 7349. A bill to authorize an appropriation for cooperation with the Gallup Board of Education, New Mexico, for the construction, extension, improvement, and equipment of school buildings to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr MOULDER

H R 7350. A bill to amend section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, relating to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, to increase the maximum insurable deposit or trust fund and to provide for a lower assessment rate on insured banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 7351. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RICH:

H. R. 7352. A bill to guarantee to American employers the free exercise of certain prerogatives in the selection of personnel for employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 7353. A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7354. A bill to provide allowance of death pension when death in service is denied service connection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7355. A bill to define misconduct for compensation and pension purposes under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 7356. A bill relating to telephone and telegraph service for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 7357. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relative to the peanut acreage allotment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R 7358 A bill to provide for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees separated from the service of the Federal Government or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H R. 7359 A bill to establish the United States Air Force Academy at Camp McCoy, Sparta, Wis.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7360. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act with respect to the definition of hotel, restaurant, and table; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H R. 7361. A bill to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H J. Res. 419 Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate the measures which can be taken to insure the continuous operation of the Government of the United States in the event of attack by a foreign power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICH:

H. J. Res. 420. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a term of 4 years for Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOOD:

H Res. 482. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to securing additional financial aid for the Waltham Watch Co. from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the removal of existing taxes on admissions to high-school athletic contests or athletic contests conducted by charitable and nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, requesting that an immediate, thorough, and exhaustive study and investigation be made of the loyalty of the members, officers, and employees of the State Department; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, requesting the enactment of the social-security bill, H. R. 6000, in such form as to extend Federal social security to include State and local government employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 7362. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Willard Thulin (formerly Miss Jutta Mainke); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 7363. A bill for the relief of Suzuko Yagi and Anne Yagi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7364. A bill for the relief of Miss Jenny Irene Benson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 7365. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Winnie Plenty Stars Crazy Hawk; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 7366. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helena Piasecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R. 7367. A bill for the relief of Domenico La Torraca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 7368. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and enter judgment on the claim of the P. Dougherty Co. for the value of three wooden barges, that the War Shipping Administration of the Maritime Commission ordered be junked and destroyed in order to obtain from them the metal equipment for war purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 7369. A bill for the relief of Ann Arbor Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 7370. A bill for the relief of Kiyoko S. Barr and Harue Barr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7371. A bill for the relief of John Fleckstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7372. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of Robert Frederick Teitel, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7373. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gerald K. Doo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1867. By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, relative to securing additional financial aid for the Waltham Watch Co. from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1868. Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, for Congress to remove existing taxes on admissions to high-school athletic contests or athletic contests conducted by charitable and nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and means.

1869. By Mr. HAGEN: Resolutions adopted by Simonson Betcher Unit, No. 26, American Legion Auxiliary, Ada, Minn., signed by Mrs. Joel W. Johnson, president, and Mrs. Delford Johnson, secretary, in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1870. By Mr. JACOBS: Petition of the Council of Agencies of Disciples of Christ, through the international convention, to take any necessary action to give and to deliver to the peoples of the world the surplus foodstuffs which the Government now holds in storage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1871. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to remove existing taxes on admissions to high-school athletic contests or athletic contests conducted by charitable and nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1872. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry residents and citizens of Beloit, Rock County, Wis., urging passage of House bill 5940, particularly relating to multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1873. Also, petition of Lake Geneva Women's Club, Lake Geneva, Wis., protesting against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1874. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Memorial of the Mississippi Legislature, to put American surplus agricultural products into world trade; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1875. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Dr. Joseph J. Tronolone, city clerk, Buffalo, N. Y., relative to naming a new veterans' hospital at Buffalo, N. Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1876. Also, petition of W. J. Storie, clerk, Board of Supervisors of the County of Delaware, Delhi, N. Y., opposing the construction of a proposed flood-control dam on the Charlotte River in the town of Davenport, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

1877. Also, petition of Fred Correll and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1878. Also, petition of Josie B. Gardner and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1879. Also, petition of Mrs. R. M. Dillon and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1880. Also, petition of R. Burres and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, O Thou by whom the meek are guided in judgment and light riseth up in darkness for the godly, grant us in all doubts and uncertainties

the grace to ask what Thou wouldst have us to do, that the spirit of wisdom may save us from all false choices; and that in Thy light we may see light, and in Thy straight path may not stumble. In all the deliberations of this day keep our motives clean, our vision clear, our patriotism undefiled, our speech guarded, our appraisals fair, and our consciences unbetrayed. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 20, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 17, 1950:

S. 1096 An act for the relief of Abe Lincoln and Elena B. Lincoln; and

S. 2031. An act for the relief of the Willow River Power Co.

On February 18, 1950:

S. 485. An act for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel; and

S. 1604. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of F. DuWayne Blenkley.

On February 21, 1950:

S 1353. An act for the relief of G H Lazarus, Jr , and Jesse F Bewley.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2328) to increase the number of examiners in chief in the Patent Office, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R 4316 An act to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes;

H. R 6539. An act to amend Public Law 626, Eightieth Congress, relating to the Army Institute of Pathology Building;

H. R 6562. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations and the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide additional compensation for the loss or loss of the use of a creative organ; and

H R. 7220 An act to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases.

REPORT OF AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC NO. 476)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the Report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 21, 1950.*

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MCCARRAN, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McKellar
Chavez	Hendrickson	Martin
Cordon	Holland	Maybank
Darby	Ives	Neely
Donnell	Johnston, S C	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Knowland	Taft
Flanders	Leahy	Wherry
Gillette	Lehman	Withers
Graham	McFarland	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. THYE, and Mr. TOBEY answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

The following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names: Mr. BURTON, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

After a little delay, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WILEY entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the information of Senators the Chair would like to make an observation concerning the application of the unanimous-consent agreement under which the Senate is now operating. Instead of providing a definite hour for a vote to be taken, it provides that not later than 4 o'clock the vote shall be had, but that no vote shall be had on any amendment earlier than 12 o'clock. The Chair interprets that to mean that at any time between 12 o'clock and 4 o'clock, if debate runs out, there may be a vote either on amendments or on the bill itself. No amendment can be offered which has not been presented and printed before today. The Chair has no way of knowing whether there will be any vote before 4 o'clock, but under the unanimous-consent agreement, which is a little different from the usual unanimous-consent agreement for a vote, a vote may be had at any time between 12 o'clock and 4 o'clock on any amendment or on the bill itself, if debate ceases.

The time from now on is divided equally between Senators who favor Senate bill 75, and those who oppose it, the time being controlled by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield as much time to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] as he may desire.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, from which was rendered a favorable report, by authority of the committee, recommending the passage of Senate bill 75, known as the central Arizona project bill. I wish briefly to explain, as I see them, some of the reasons why the committee acted favorably upon this measure.

Throughout the discussion of the bill, there has been standing in the Senate Chamber a large map which shows the Colorado River Basin. That map, however, does not indicate the fact that the problems of the development of the vast

water resources of the Colorado River system have been before the Congress for 30 years and still remain unsolved. In 1922, by authority of Congress, commissioners from seven States, all of which, save California, have some portion of their area within the Colorado River Basin, met to work out an interstate compact by which the utilization of the water of this interstate stream could be equitably made for the benefit of all the States. Six years elapsed before there was written a compact which could win the support and approval of the Congress. The interstate compact for the Colorado River Basin was approved by Congress in 1928.

Under the terms of that compact the basin was divided into two subbasins, the upper and the lower, by reason of technical facts with respect to the flow of the stream and the distribution of the water.

I think it should be pointed out, however, Mr. President, that this river system encompasses, in the main stem and its tributaries, from the northernmost waters in the State of Wyoming to the headwaters of the Gila River in Arizona, a distance of almost 1,000 miles. The drainage of this basin covers 250,000 square miles, of which only 2,000 miles are outside the United States, in the Republic of Mexico. These 248,000 square miles are distributed among the States of Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, California, and Arizona, with Arizona having 102,900 square miles in the basin and California only 13,800. Next to Arizona, the State of Utah has the largest area, namely, 40,200 square miles.

After the signing of that compact, the Congress authorized the building of what we call the Hoover Dam, behind which there has been backed up the great Lake Mead. I remember so well, Mr. President, the occasion when I first had the opportunity of traveling from Los Angeles to the Hoover Dam by airplane, covering this entire terrain. Building that river system from the Mexican border to Hoover Dam, I marveled at the ingenuity and the courage and the vision of the men who conceived the plan of developing this water system for the benefit of mankind. To look down upon that river system and visualize what it was before the works of man had been constructed made one proud of the achievements of the men who saw what could be done and undertook to build the structures by which we have begun to harness that stream and transform it from a raging, destructive torrent to a servant of man.

It happens that that system does not receive any of its supply of water from any part of the State of California. Eighty percent of the flow of that river rises in the upper basin States and passes down through the basin until it empties into Mexico. Congress authorized the construction of the Hoover Dam, as a result of which water from the Colorado River system is diverted into the State of California, as a result of which there is a tremendous output of power, electrical energy, most of which is also being used now in the State of California. Developments in the other States have been retarded. There was no development in the States of the upper basin because California and Arizona were not agreed and because there had been no subagreement among those States as to the division of the water supply. The interstate compact authorized such subagreements for the upper basin and for the lower basin. It took a great deal of time and labor and the expenditure of much brain power to work out an agreement for the upper basin. Finally, last year a compact among those States of the upper basin was submitted to the Congress for approval. It was signed by commissioners from all the States of the upper basin and it has been approved.

I am happy to make acknowledgment here that much of the credit for the signing of the agreement goes to my friend and colleague the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] who at the time was Governor of the State of Wyoming, and who threw all his great influence behind the effort to obtain a compact.

Because there had been no compact, there was no development in the upper basin States embracing the States of Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah. There is still no development there.

New Mexico with 13,500 square miles, Utah with 3,000, Nevada with 12,000, Arizona with 96,000, and California with 13,800 square miles, are all in the lower basin. To date, Mr. President, they have made no agreement among themselves. A controversy arose between the States of Arizona and California as to the meaning and effect of the original interstate compact, with respect to the distribution of the water supply available to the lower basin States.

It is unnecessary for me in the short time that is available this morning to undertake to analyze the reasons for the failure of the lower basin States to agree. The important fact is, they did fail. And because they failed to agree, little has been done to save the Hoover Dam to utilize this vast resource of water, a great natural element for the improvement of the living standards of the people in the entire lower basin; just as nothing has been done as yet in the upper basin.

UNITED ACTION NEEDED

It was the conviction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that it is essential to settle the controversy. If ever there was a time in the history of the United States when all the States and all the people of the United States should be working in harmony and in unity for the development of natural resources, this is the time. We cannot pick up a newspaper in the morning or in the evening, we cannot turn on the radio, we cannot receive communication in any manner, without realizing that mankind is today facing one of its greatest trials. The international dilemma in which our people find themselves—a people who are united in the desire of winning world peace, safety from destruction by the inventions of science—the dilemma, I say, which they face is one which makes them wonder how they can carry conviction to the people of other lands that America does not want war or conquest really is interested in building up the standard of living for all people here and elsewhere. We are being hurried along the road to war in an appalling armaments race. We talk about A-bombs and H-bombs. The people here are fearful, people everywhere are fearful; and unless we are careful, it may be difficult to avoid drifting into a third world war that would destroy civilization.

We wonder how to get behind the iron curtain with our message of peace. I have long been convinced, Mr. President, that the best way to get behind the iron curtain is for the people of the United States to cooperate in the stabilization of our economy here at home and in the building of a higher standard of living among ourselves here in the United States, by the development and utilization of all our resources. We cannot do it if we permit ourselves to become involved in endless battles over the distribution of the great rewards of industry, and the great opportunities afforded by our natural resources, instead of uniting to make sure they are developed.

I believe that the most effective contribution we can make to world peace is to improve and stabilize the economic conditions in the United States, because nothing, no iron curtain, can ever keep the information of our unity and our improvement from the minds of people everywhere. It was thought we could retain the secret of the atom bomb. We know now that there is no way to place restraint upon the human mind and the communication of the ideas which are developed by the human mind.

THE COMPACT MUST BE CONSTRUED

So, Mr. President, in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, we were concerned with taking steps that would promote the development of this great natural resource. What were the obstacles? The principal obstacle was the failure of the lower-basin States to agree upon a compact, and the failure of the State of California and the State of Arizona to agree upon the meaning of the existing compact. The State of Arizona three times sought to have the matter decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. Three suits were filed, and three times the Supreme Court rejected the petition upon the ground that there was no controversy of which the Supreme Court could take cognizance. Resolutions were afterwards introduced in the Congress, in both the Senate and the House, by which it was provided that the controversy should be relegated to the Supreme Court and that the consent of the Congress should be granted to make the United States a party. The fact that the United States was not a party was one of the reasons why in one of the three cases initiated by the State of Arizona, the Supreme Court declined to take jurisdiction. So, after study of the measure, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs decided that it would be well to have the question referred to the Supreme Court in such a manner that rejection of jurisdiction would not be the result.

The problem which was presented to us is easily explained by a glance at the Constitution of the United States. That document defines the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court as including controversies among the States and between the United States and the States.

Section 2 of article III of the basic law of the United States, the Constitution, provides that the judicial powers shall extend to controversies to which the United States shall be a party, and to controversies between two or more States. The problem, therefore, is to define what constitutes a controversy. The Supreme Court has clearly announced in case after case that a controversy is not a mere request for a judicial opinion as to the effect of any law or of any compact. A controversy is something very much more definite and complete.

In the case of *Missouri* v. *The United States* (200 U. S., 496), at page 521, it was clearly held that the Court will not grant relief against a State unless the complaining State shows an existing or presently pressing injury of serious magnitude.

Again, in the case of *Alabama* v. *Arizona* (291 U. S., 286) the Supreme Court said:

> The Court will not grant relief against something feared as liable to occur at some future time. This Court may not be called upon to give advisory opinions or to pronounce declaratory judgment. * * * Its jurisdiction in respect of controversies between States will not be exerted in the absence of absolute necessity.

In the New River case, *United States* v. *Appalachian Electric Power Company* (311 U. S., 337), it was held:

> To predetermine, even in the limited field of water power, the rights of different sovereignties, pregnant with future controversies, is beyond the judicial function.

It seemed clear, Mr. President, to the members of the committee that the Constitution of the United States has been correctly interpreted by the Supreme Court and that there was no possibility of obtaining an adjudication of the basic controversy between California and Arizona except by the authorization of the project. When that authorization is made and not till then, Mr. President, there will be a controversy within the meaning of the Constitution which the Supreme Court can adjudicate. The Congress cannot solve this problem; it cannot repeal the interstate compact which it has approved. The compact stands. The road to unity, the road to the settlement of the controversy, is the road which is provided in this bill by which authority to make the United States a party is granted, for lack of which the Supreme Court once declined to pass upon the case and by the authorization of the project which creates a constitutional controversy. By this bill, Mr. President, we provide that the compact may be construed by the Supreme Court.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, believing and knowing, as I do, that my colleague is perhaps the best informed authority in the United States on reclamation and interstate river compacts——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President. There are many more able and more authoritative than I.

Mr. HUNT. I am entitled to my opinion in the matter. I should like to ask my colleague if he sees any danger in this bill, if there is any remote possibility that the Supreme Court, by its decision, could in any way rule previous river compacts as between the upper and lower basin States and as between the four upper basin States null and void or in any way adjudicate water already divided among the States by compact.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very glad to be able to say to the Senator that I do not think there is any such possibility. The action which has been taken by the committee in recommending the amendments which are sections 12 and 13 as the bill was reported to the Senate, has been endorsed, without reservation, by the most eminent legal and reclamation lawyers in the upper basin States. There was filed with the committee, and it will be found in the hearings at page 154, a resolution of this group urging the specific action of which I speak. I shall be glad to place in the RECORD at this point a resolution which has been adopted by the Basin States Committee, signed by Clifford H. Stone, chairman, and adopted unanimously on September 20, 1949, approving the action taken by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and recommending that the Committee on Public Lands of the House take similar action.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Colorado River Basin States Committee, an organization composed of official representatives of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and open to the States of California and Nevada, in meeting assembled at Grand Junction, Colo., this 20th day of September 1949, That—

Whereas this committee approves the provisions of S. 75, as amended and reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the Senate of the United States on August 3, 1949, a bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam, and incidental works, in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; and

Whereas this committee is in full accord with the majority report of said Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on said S 75, as amended Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee commends the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate upon its thorough and careful consideration and report on S 75, as amended; and be it further

Resolved, That this committee urges the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives to give favorable consideration to the provisions of said S 75 as amended by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in its consideration of H. R. 934 and 935; and be it further

Resolved, That this committee respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take favorable action upon said S. 75 as amended by the said Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and reported to the Senate of the United States on August 3, 1949; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman of this committee is requested to send copies of this resolution to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate, to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the said Public Lands Committee, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and to each member of the congressional delegation of the participating States.

Adopted unanimously September 20, 1949.

CLIFFORD H. STONE,
Chairman.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to my colleague for his answer to my question. His answer will, I know, be received very kindly by the four upper-basin States.

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT NOT POSSIBLE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there is one decision of the Supreme Court which, it seems to me, is particularly pertinent. The suggestion was made that a declaratory judgment under a recent statute might be made by the Supreme Court. That precise point was raised in the case of the United States against West Virginia, which is reported at Two Hundred and Ninety-fifth United States Reports, page 463. In that case the Supreme Court dismissed a bill brought by the United States Government to enjoin West Virginia and certain corporate defendants to which the State had issued permits from constructing a hydroelectric dam in a river alleged to be navigable and for a declaratory judgment that the rights of the United States in the stream were paramount. The holdings of the Court is to be found on page 473 of the report.

I read:

> There is presented here, as respects the State, no case of an actual or threatened interference with the authority of the United States Until the right asserted is threatened with invasion by acts of the State, which serve both to define the controversy and to establish its existence in the judicial sense, there is no question presented which is justiciable by a Federal court.

With respect to the power of the court to render a declaratory judgment, the Supreme Court said, at page 475, volume 395, United States Reports:

> No effort is made by the Government to sustain the bill under the Declaratory Judgment Act of June 14, 1934 (ch. 512, 48 Stat. 955). It is enough that that act is applicable only in cases of actual controversy. It does not purport to alter the character of the controversies which are the subject of judicial power under the Constitution.

Mr President, it is utterly impossible, in my judgment, and in the judgment of the committee to expect a declaratory judgment. I may say that the distinguished and able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who is a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, shares that opinion, as is evidenced by the fact that the amendment, in the form of sections 12 and 13 of the bill, was worked out and presented to the committee by the distinguished Senator from Colorado and by the chairman of the committee. The outstanding qualifications of the Senator from Colorado as a lawyer are recognized by all.

So, Mr. President, by providing for the authorization of this project, the committee seeks to bring about the conditions which will in turn create a justiciable controversy which the Supreme Court can settle. Then we shall understand, clearly and definitely, and with authority, what the respective rights of California and Arizona are to this water.

JUSTICE TO OTHER BASIN STATES

The evidence before us is clear upon the fact that the State of California, while having enjoyed the benefits of power and water as a result of the construction of the Hoover Dam, has not yet used all the water which is acknowledged on every side, including the State of Arizona, to have been rightfully allocated to the State of California. All the rest of the basin, the States in which the water rises, may not successfully develop the possibilities, whatever they may be, until there is a settlement of this controversy.

I remarked the other day to my distinguished and able and eloquent friend the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who is an ornament to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as well as an ornament to the Senate, that I was very much perturbed on reading the speech which he made a few days ago when I found, at page 1633 of the RECORD, that he stated—regretfully, he said—that in his opinion there is not a feasible project in the whole basin.

No one, it seems to me, could have visited the Hoover Dam; no one, it seems to me, could have gone into the power plant in the Hoover Dam; no one, it seems to me, could have seen with his own eyes the great engineering feats by which the power and the water of this river system are transported hundreds of miles across the mountains and into the State of California, for the great benefit of that State and its people, without conceiving also that it is within the power of the American people, through their engineers and skillful workers, to make additional use of this water for the benefit of other States, as well as for California.

Mr. President, we are in danger of having this great water resource, not a drop of which rises within the State of California, locked up forever for the sole and exclusive use, some time in the future, of the people who may be attracted to California by its undoubted and unquestioned resources, and by the amiability of its people. But that is not the method by which we can provide for the utilization of the natural resources of the United States at a time when it is the greatest objective which we can carry out. We can do more to win permanent peace for all the peoples of the world by uniting to utilize our resources than we can by raising obstacles in the path of our neighbors and our neighboring States with respect to the development of re-resources which belong alike to all.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope the Senator from Wyoming as he proceeds will go a little more into detail as to where the waters of the Hoover Dam come from.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator from New Mexico has mentioned that. I have already stated—the Senator was otherwise engaged at the time—that 80 percent of the waterflow of this system comes from the upper basin.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The upper basin States——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Which are interested in that water and under the compact are entitled to their share of it. There is no reason whatsoever why one State should get all the benefit of the project.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am merely uttering a plea to the Members of the Senate to join with the considered opinion of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and vote to authorize this project, in order that all the States of the Colorado River system may have an opportunity to see whether or not this water may not improve conditions within their borders.

Mr. President, that Arizona needs more water, no one can deny. The State is there, the people are there. That they chose to go to Arizona instead of into California was an exercise of their American privilege. They are there. We encouraged many of them to go there. Shall we now undertake by obstructive tactics, by delay and harassment, by failure upon our own part as Senators of the United States, to act positively, shall we thus punish them and deny the only means by which this controversy can be settled?

Ah, Mr President, we are told that the cost of the project is fantastic. The cost is high, but the revenues will be high, too. The senior Senator from Arizona and the junior Senator from Arizona have already explained in detail what proportion of this authorized expenditure will go for the development of power and how much smaller an expenditure for irrigation. There is a market for power. There is a market for every kilowatt of power which can be produced in the Colorado River Basin under the pending measure.

It will be wasteful, we are told, if any part of the power revenues is devoted to the diversion of Colorado River water to the dry acres of Arizona. Mr. President, we tried to answer that question, too, because we provided in the amendment that no expenditure should be made for the irrigation features of the program if a suit were filed, and during the pendency of the suit.

I think it is worth while reading this provision into the RECORD at this point. It is as follows:

SEC. 13. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided,* That no moneys appropriated under the authority of this act shall be expended for the construction of works authorized by this act which are required solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona, during the period of 6 months after the enactment of this act and during the pendency of any suit or suits in which the United States shall be joined as a party under and by virtue of the consent granted in section 12 of this act. The pendency of a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint shall be considered pendency of a suit or suits for the purposes of this act: *Provided further,* That power sales contracts shall be made with a view to the reservation of generating capacity sufficient for the operation of all features of the project and that rates for power shall be fixed in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws; and that revenues derived from the sale of power shall be credited in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 291, 318).

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. With reference to section 13 of the bill, which the Senator from Wyoming has just read, I should like to ask him a question. First, I will say I am not an attorney, but, speaking as a layman, I should like to have the Senator's opinion as an attorney as to whether the language of section 13 is not so loose that in the event suit was filed and adverse decision was rendered as against the State of Arizona, under the wording of the section it would still not be an authorized project? I may say that I raised that question with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] the other day and my interpretation of his answer was that in his opinion it would still be an authorized project, though he doubted whether the Congress would appropriate for it under those circumstances.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the committee in drafting the amendment considered the inclusion of language which would in effect provide that in the event of an adverse decision no expenditure would be made. But, after study of the subject from every point of view, we came to what we believe is the inescapable conclusion that that would have killed the whole purpose of providing a justiciable controversy, because with such language in the amendment it would only be saying to the Supreme Court "Give us a declaratory judgment." That is the reason, I will say to the junior Senator from California, that the amendment has been presented just as it is.

I have no hesitation in saying that this is an authorization—it must be an authorization if there is to be a judicial determination of the issue. Let me add, however, if the Supreme Court, after hearing the parties to this case, should decide that Arizona does not have the right to the water which it claims, it is beyond the possibility of doubt that the Congress of the United States would not make the appropriation.

It was precisely for that reason that we carefully drafted the amendment so as to make a clear authorization. We said in section 13:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated * * * such sums as may be necessary—

Then follows the proviso:

Provided, That no moneys appropriated under the authority of this act shall be expended—

And so forth. So even though the Congress, under the authorization, should make an appropriation, nevertheless we have said the moneys shall not

be expended while this question is before the Court for determination. I think in all common sense we must come to the conclusion, as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs did, with the exception of my distinguished friend the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], that this is a correct and proper and an apt method, in section 12 and section 13, of placing the interstate pact, which was approved by the Congress of the United States in 1928, before the Supreme Court for interpretation and construction. I had hoped we could have the support of both Senators from California in obtaining the submission of this case to the Supreme Court of the United States in the only manner in which, in the judgment of our committee, it is possible to get it there.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DOWNEY. Did the distinguished Senator mean to say that the vote of the committee on this bill was unanimous except for the Senator from California? If so, that statement is made in error.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not say that. I did not mean that. Only the Senator from California signed the minority report. Two other Senators did not approve the bill.

HAVE FAITH IN THE FUTURE

Mr. President, I think I have covered briefly the point of view which the committee entertains. There are many things which could be said about this great project, and the need for the full development of the Colorado River. It is worthwhile, in looking at the map at the rear of the Senate Chamber which shows the central Arizona project in the Colorado River Basin, to remember what I said with respect to the origin and the flow of the waters, to bear in mind that this stream flows through an extraordinary area, one of the most extraordinary, one of the most stimulating that men could ever hope to see. I have told the Senate that these streams constitute a flow of almost a thousand miles. I recall to Senators the fact that that water rises at the upper reaches of the Green River in the State of Wyoming, and flows down the mountainsides through Colorado and Utah and the other States until it empties across the boundary of Mexico. In its course, that water traverses much of the basin in canyons along the walls of which are exposed geological formations exceeding an aggregate thickness of 20,000 feet, almost 4 miles. The granites and sedimentary rocks through which the river has cut its channel are so varied in color and composition that their exposure by erosion has created an area of beauty and grandeur unsurpassed on this earth. The Grand Canyon National Park encompasses the finest portion of that canyon scenery.

In this area there are great natural resources. There is no man who can envision what the engineer and the scientist can do with the resources of this vast area.

There are three great river systems in the United States, the Missouri River system, the Colorado River system, and the Columbia River system. I come from a State which contributes water to all three of these basins. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] opens his eyes. I will say to my friend from Mississippi that within an area of less than 20 square miles in my State water rises and flows into these three river systems. I can take the Senator to a spot in the State of Wyoming where a mountain stream reaching a rock divides in two, and one branch flows into the Pacific and the other into the Atlantic. I say to all Senators that if they come to my State I will take them to the spot where they can kneel down and put their right hands into the waters that go into the Atlantic, and their left hands into the waters that go into the Pacific.

Mr. President, we are dealing with great natural resources. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which asks Senators' support of the bill, is looking forward to the future. With great regret I say that my friends from California are telling the Senate that there is no future for these other States in the basin; that only California can enjoy the triumph of engineering; that only California may have the water, that only California may have the power.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr CHAVEZ. The Senator from California would be making a correct statement if we were going to permit California to have all the water that belongs to all the other States. In that event there would be no future for the other States, because we in the other States are dependent for development upon that natural resource just as much as is California. If we in the upper-basin States were to lose that water, or if any States within the basin were to lose that water, naturally there would be no future for those States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, let not the Senate of the United States turn its back upon the States of the Colorado River Basin. Let us authorize the proposed project. Let us get the controversy settled. Let us have an end to the delay which has already lasted 30 years. Let us see what we can do with what nature has deposited in this great basin Let us move on, Mr. President, to the future with faith in ourselves, and faith in our capacity to work together, instead of attempting to throw obstacles into one another's paths.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in connection with Senate bill 75, now being considered by the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated February 21, 1950, addressed to me by J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel of the National Grange.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This letter is written in response to your telephone request for the views of the National Grange on the proposed Bridge Canyon project of the Colorado River.

It is our judgment that the authorization of this project at the present time is unjustified for the following reasons:

1. There is no other major watershed in the United States where the use of water for irrigation power and other purposes is as important to the welfare of the watershed as in the Colorado watershed. As yet there hasn't even been a pretense of a careful over-all study of the comparative economic uses of water of the Colorado River in all its possible alternative uses. Until a careful study of the best potential use of the water resources of the river is made no one will be able to judge soundly and wisely on such piecemeal projects as is proposed for the Bridge Canyon. Such a project if built, or if construction is begun, would establish irretrievable priority of water use that may or may not be the best possible use of the water. From the evidence presented, the Bridge Canyon irrigation use appears to be indeed among the most wasteful of possible uses of the resources of the river.

The National Grange at its last annual session stated that "we recognize the urgent need for coordinated development and use of resources on major watershed area"; and we recommend that a watershed board be set up for each major watershed to coordinate the watershed planning and development and thus forestall just such uncoordinated wasteful projects as the proposed irrigation portion of the Bridge Canyon project appears to be. We therefore believe that this project should not be authorized until it can be adequately studied and fitted into its rightful position in an over-all watershed plan of development for the Colorado.

2. We are also opposed to authorizing this project which involves the fixing of water usage rights between States that is still in bitter controversy. In our 1948 annual session we passed a resolution opposing the assignment of the use of water in controversy between States until the dispute had been referred to the Federal courts and adjudicated by them. In stating this we are aware of the amended provisions of the bill but fear that if the bill were passed appropriation might also be passed and irretrievable commitment of water might be made or wasteful construction might be started.

3. We are also opposed to authorizing the irrigation portion of the Bridge Canyon project because (1) it is reported that the actual cost of putting the irrigation water on the land would be over $1,700 per acre. If this is true it is in violation of our policy as passed by the last annual session of the National Grange, that we are opposed to approving any project for expenditure of funds unless a sound appraisal shows benefits in excess of costs. This applies both to a project as a unit and any integral part of a project. We are quite certain that the irrigation portion of this project does not meet this important policy of requiring that benefits from the proposed works must exceed the cost of them.

We would like to see both new authorization and new construction of such major resources development be held to a minimum pending an effective balancing of the Federal budget and pending the development of an over-all plan of watershed development and administration that will prevent such uncoordinated authorization or commitments of vast sums as are involved in the Bridge Canyon project.

Very sincerely yours,

J. T. SANDERS,
Legislative Counsel.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I yield unto myself whatever time I desire to take in making the remarks I shall present at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, knowing as I do the logic and the brilliant intellect of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I am not amazed that in almost an hour of discussion he dared not, by a single word, for 1 second of time, face the true issue here, namely, whether the taxpayers of the United States and the power users should be burdened down with a cost of thousands of dollars an acre for the benefit of 225,000 acres of rather inferior crop land. All the charts and all the arguments display this project to be one of such waste and extravagance that if its principles were extended into the other States of the Union, only national bankruptcy could be the result. So I am not surprised that my beloved and distinguished friend, the Senator from Wyoming, was unwilling to bring his voice and his intellect to the evaluation of the economic benefits, such as they are, of this fantastic and wasteful project.

I am glad to agree with my friend, the Senator from Wyoming, and I take it that all Senators within the sound of my voice likewise agree, that we are living now in a critical period; that the next decade will test to the very limit the enduring strength of our people and of our Government. Because we face the threat of great nations abroad, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming arrives at the conclusion that we must unify ourselves, and that California must give way to Arizona. That may be desirable in a proper case; but what is the ultimate result in this case? The ultimate result is to spend the money and the material and the manpower of the Nation upon a project which at first glance is seen to be so absurd that it is remarkable to find it here before the Senate of the United States.

I prophesied that because of the extravagant nature of this project, it would never appear on the floor of the Senate. I have been proved wrong, because here is this proposal.

Let us analyze it; let us evaluate it. As I go through the figures which I shall present regarding it, every one of which I believe to be not only accurate but conservative, I ask for interruptions, in my time, if any Senator doubts that I can produce the certain proof, from the Bureau of Reclamation and from the Senators from Arizona, of what I have to say.

We have attempted to tell this story as briefly as we can, Mr. President, by means of several charts.

First, let me say to the Senators now present that the situation with which we are dealing is not a simple one. We are dealing, first, with a great hydroelectric development on the Colorado River, and then we are dealing with a proposed irrigation development in central Arizona. Under the majority report and under the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Government will advance more than $700,000,000 to construct the first phases of this project. All that money will come out of the Treasury of the United States. There is envisaged a secondary project, one for the construction of canals, amounting to $550,000,000 more. Under the interpretation of reclamation law as espoused by Mike Straus, this bill provides, and the majority report so sets forth, that the project, after construction, shall be liquidated, with a 10-year development period intervening, in 70 years. During that 70 years, the Treasury of the United States will waive all interest. So, in effect, in our present unfortunate financial condition we shall borrow the $700,000,000, and later half a billion dollars more; and it will be used to construct the project. That project will continue for 70 years after the development period; and in that time the taxpayers of the United States, already heavily burdened, will have to pay all the interest on both the irrigation investment and the power investment. It is contemplated, then, that the interest upon the power development and the profits upon the power will be set aside to pay off the irrigation investment.

So let us remember, as we study this bill, that the interest on the entire amount, for a long period of time—not limited in the bill, but it might well be a century, and at least 90 years from now is contemplated—will be paid by the Treasury, and the principal indebtedness will be paid by the power users.

I wish to say here—and I shall present the figures to prove it if any Senator desires to call for my authority—that the farmers of Arizona will not even be able to pay for their own distribution system. No one before now ever has had the temerity to seek to have authorized a reclamation project under which the farmers cannot at least pay for their distribution system. No, Mr. President; those, like the great aqueduct and the dam, will be paid by poor Uncle Sam, by the taxpayers and the power users. The farmers are unable to pay a single dollar on the irrigation development. I know of no other project which remotely approaches this one, in respect to freeing the farmers of all burdens, and placing the entire burden upon the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, figuring on a very conservative basis the interest during the course of construction on the full $700,000,000, the interest during construction would be $129,000,000. That item alone approximates $600 an acre, to benefit land worth $150 or $200 an acre. That is the first item. Under the original bill the Government of the United States was to assume $75,000,000 of the cost of the dam because of scenic benefits and fish and wildlife benefits. The Senators from Arizona, being partly guided, I hope by what we from California have been saying, have submitted an amendment which provides that the obligation of the Federal Government to assume the nonreimbursable construction cost of $75,000,000 shall be eliminated.

Let me say, however, that someone still has to distribute and invest that $75,000,000, and someone must pay for it. It will no longer be charged against the Federal Government as a principal item, but it will be put in with the rest of the investment, to run probably for 90 years; and the Government will have to pay the interest charge upon that $75,000,000, although by this method the Government will escape the principal charge, and the power users will have to retire the principal. So although the item of $75,000,000, under the amendment offered by the Senators from Arizona, would be stricken out, in lieu thereof there would be an interest item of about the same amount of money.

Assuming a 70-year repayment period, and figuring the interest at 2 percent—which I think is too conservative—the interest to be paid by the Federal Government on the average outstanding investment would amount to $451,000,000 more. Our accountants have carefully checked these figures. If any Senator desires to have them verified, we shall be very happy to give him all the assumptions of the Bureau of Reclamation, so he can easily verify the figures.

So, Mr. President, for the initial project alone, the bill authorizes, as its main authorization, the construction of an 80-mile tunnel through the mountains, to carry water to 225,000 acres of grain and cotton land—an 80-mile tunnel. I know of nothing in the United States remotely approaching that. I know tunnels of 5 or 10 miles which have been considered of enormous extravagance, but a tunnel of 80 miles to carry water from the dam to the Phoenix area is something so amazing to me that I do not see how the human mind could contemplate it.

Mr. President, the interest figured on the average amount of investment during construction is $110,000,000. The interest connected with paying off the cost of the tunnel, which as I have said is $550,000,000, amounts to $385,000,000 more. As I shall later show, there is involved here only 225,000 acres. Dividing that into the contemplated cost of the tunnel and certain other facilities adjacent thereto, I think the one item alone comes to almost $3,000 an acre. It is merely one item of the cost. But figuring on the interest basis, the total obligation and interest payments over a period of 70, 80, or 90 years, which must be paid by the Government, will be $1,150,000,000, and that will end the obligation, unless we find that the power users cannot afford to pay off the principal. They are to be stuck on the principal of $1,200,000,000. That is the climax of the central Arizona project—more than $1,000,000,000 to be paid by the taxpayers in estimated interest, more than $1,000,000,000, by the power users.

Mr. President, we are proposing to embark upon a plan which is so extravagantly foolish that it is not within my power to define it. Here we have a great public power plant that could do partly for us what has been done for the TVA in the Southern States. We are loading it down, making expensive power out of cheap power, to irrigate land, worth $200 an acre commercially, at a cost of several thousand dollars an acre.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is familiar with the telegram which has been sent I believe to most of the Members of the Senate. But since it relates

to the power situation, I think it may be interesting to read it into the RECORD at this point. It is addressed to me, and it is signed by Mr. Carlton L. Nau, general manager of the American Public Power Association. The telegram reads as follows:

Respectfully urge recommittal to committee S. 75, central Arizona project, for following reasons:

1. Colorado River is glaring example of lack of over-all coordinated planning for most effective use of resources of entire basin. Its development as a whole should be carefully studied by an impartial board to assure most economical use of all its resources.

2. Reclamation features of project contrary to power policy statement adopted by APPA. Power rates overburdened with $400,000,000 capital irrigation investment which irrigators cannot pay. Spending such vast sums to reclaim land to produce agricultural products which now are surplus is totally without economic justification.

3. President's Water Resources Policy Commission is currently studying need for subsidies for irrigation, feasibility standards, relation between water and hydroelectric power, etc. The bill should not be approved until Commission has opportunity to study and report.

CARLTON L. NAU,
General Manager, American Public Power Association.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank my colleague for the introduction of the telegram into the RECORD.

Mr. President, in our next chart we try to carry the melancholy information to the different States as to just what their share of this titanic burden will be. As we all know, the State of New York, with its huge taxes, would pay more than any other State. If the project is worked out according to the prognosis of the Bureau of Reclamation, the State of New York over the next 70 years will be paying for the benefit of Arizona the sum of $168,705,000, which is about $700 per acre for this cotton and grain land, of which we now have in the United States 35,000,000 excess acres. The Department of Agriculture says that our economy will never be in proper condition until we reduce by 35,000,000 the present cotton and grain acreage. Half of this Arizona land is now in cotton; the great bulk of the remainder is in grain. Ninety percent of the land is in ordinary field crops. I do not know what attitude the Senators from New York will take, but if they can see any justification for their taxpayers paying $700 an acre to help land worth $150 or $250 commercially to produce crops already surplus, constituting a further burden on the Treasury, they, in my opinion, are very easy-going taxpayers. But anyway, Mr. President, here is the chart—chart B—in which we have attempted to set out the amount of money the various States of the Union, according to the taxes they have been paying into the Treasury, will have to pay upon this project.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, realizing that the project as an irrigation project is wholly indefensible, has in very extreme terms heretofore said to the Senate, "We have 650,000 or 750,000 acres of irrigated land around Phoenix. Our whole prosperity is dependent upon that land. If we do not get this water, all that acreage is going out of cultivation. Two hundred and fifty thousand of our people out of 750,000 will be driven out of the State of Arizona by poverty and necessity, to become burdens upon the other States." The truth is that the water which is in controversy will meet irrigation requirements for 225,000 acres. That is at the rate of about 5 acre-feet per acre for the water delivered at the end of the aqueduct. So if the calculations of the Bureau are correct—and we think they are far too favorable to the Arizona viewpoint—if the project is not built, a maximum of 225,000 acres in the Phoenix area may go out of production. Observe the statement of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] upon which I stand. I can produce five other statements made at different times by the junior Senator from Arizona, innumerable statements from the reports, showing that the junior Senator from Arizona, with precision and accuracy, has stated the ultimate fact. The junior Senator from Arizona testifying, as it appears on Senate bill 75, at page 35, spoke accurately and rightly—and I applaud him for his precise and accurate statement—as follows:

According to the report, if this water supply is made available for the project, 73,500 of the 105,790 acres formerly irrigated but now idle for lack of irrigation, can be irrigated. In addition to this amount, as shown in table B-5 of the report, it would be possible to sustain irrigation of an additional 152,520 acres which would otherwise have to be retired from irrigation. This would mean a total of 226,000 acres, which would otherwise be compelled to remain forever idle, could be maintained in production by this project.

So, Mr. President, what we are dealing with here is not with the rescue of 750,000 acres of land, not with the irrigation of that area of land; but with a quantity of water that would irrigate 225,000 acres. If that water is not made available, the junior Senator from Arizona is correct in saying the land would otherwise be compelled to remain forever idle.

Mr. President, let me say the 73,500 acres of this land have been idle for many years. The acreage that would have to go out of cultivation is perhaps 150,000 acres. Their local plans will take care of another 30,000 acres. So this rescue project is reduced to approximately 120,000 acres, constituting less than 20 percent of the area, and as the land which would go out of cultivation would be the poorer, inferior land, it would amount to a reduction of approximately 10 percent of the farm output of the Phoenix area. That is according to the Bureau of Reclamation.

Phoenix is one of the great tourist cities of the United States. It has large manufacturing, mining, and other income far exceeding all the income it receives from all its agricultural products. To say that Arizona needs some kind of disaster relief is, to my mind, almost a stultification. I know the pioneer character of the able citizens of Arizona. The mere fact that they are going to lose a small amount of inferior land does not appall those pioneers of the West. I am surprised that distinguished representatives of the State of Arizona would even argue that point.

In the neighboring State of Nevada were great mines around which were important cities. There were mines which provided huge amounts of gold and silver for the Federal Government in its hour of need. Many States of the Union have cut-over forest lands from which the topsoil has blown away, lands which have gone alkali, lands on which there has been an overuse of water. To claim that the Federal Government at a cost of billions of dollars should step in to rectify a situation in which farmers have overdrawn their water supply, seems to me so extreme that it is difficult for me to realize how anyone could favor this bill.

Mr. President, we come to chart D, the final chart on this side. In that we take only the irrigation features of the initial project, placed by the Bureau of Reclamation at $392,000,000. We take the 225,000 acres of land, in round figures, which the junior Senator from Arizona says will go idle if this project is not developed, and we find that the United States taxpayers will pay $1,650 an acre in the taxes which they will assume, and the power users will pay $1,750 an acre.

Mr. President, those figures are so extreme that we can hardly comprehend them. But that is only for the initial project. Here are shown the total figures on a per-acre basis, to be paid, it is true, over 70 years by the power users and the taxpayers on both projects, the preliminary and the final, coming to $8,000 an acre.

As I have said, Mr. President, I stand here and invite interruption or challenge on the accuracy of these charts or on any fact which I may state.

Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the junior Senator from Arizona, I shall yield 30 minutes of my time to the senior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, may I ask how the time stands?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from California has 105 minutes' unexpired time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Chair tell us how much time we have consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The quorum call took 16 minutes of the time of the senior Senator from California and he has consumed 29 minutes.

The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, at the outset, let me say that it would be my desire to support this bill if it were properly protected and properly safeguarded. Therefore, with a view of being able to support it by my vote, I have had printed, and there are now lying on the desk, certain amendments which I shall offer and which I deem to be essential.

Mr. President, as I pointed out in the statement which I placed in the RECORD yesterday, this bill, while its title speaks of "authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams

and canals," actually has as its main objective the authorization of the diversion of Colorado River water for an irrigation and reclamation project in central Arizona. The Bridge Canyon Dam is a means to that end, but not the only means; its greatest usefulness in connection with the central Arizona project would be for the production of power to be used for pumping water nearly 1,000 feet high, and it has not been demonstrated that the proposed Bridge Canyon Dam would be the only possible source of such power. Indeed, it has not even been demonstrated, and it may be questioned whether it can be demonstrated, that the proposed Bridge Canyon Dam would even be the cheapest source of such power.

This bill does not contain only authorization for construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam; it also contains various other authorizations and grants of authority, some of them extremely broad in their nature. Indeed, in some respects the language of the bill is so vague that it is difficult to say just what it does authorize.

For example, the language contained in subparagraph (4) of section 1, beginning on page 2 of the bill, in line 22, and in subparagraph (4) of the same section, beginning on page 3 of the bill, in line 3, is susceptible of being construed as a tremendous grant of power to the Secretary of the Interior. Construction of this legislative language, if enacted, will rest, in the first instance, with the Secretary of the Interior, and past experience leads us to believe that the language in question, under such circumstances, will not be narrowly construed.

At this time, Mr. President, I invite attention to my amendment No. 1, reading as follows:

On page 2, in line 22, after the word "plants", insert the words "(other than steam plants for the production of electrical energy)."

My amendment No. 1 will amend the language of subparagraph (4) of section 1, which, as I have pointed out, appears in its present form, to embrace authority for the construction of steam plants for the generation of electrical energy, without any limitation upon the number or capacity of such plants, so long as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem such plants to be incidental structures suitable for the fullest economical development of electrical energy generated from water at the works constructed hereunder. Senators will note the Secretary is not even required to find that steam plants are needed; he need only find that they are suitable. If it is not desired that the Secretary of the Interior be given authority to construct steam plants, this section of the bill should be amended as I propose.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to state very frankly that there is neither any necessity for the authorization nor any desire on the part of the sponsors of this bill to authorize the construction of steam plants for the production of electrical energy. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], if he will offer the amendment we shall be very glad to accept it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I send forward the amendment, which I understand the Senator from Arizona will accept.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEAHY in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 22, after the word "plants", it is proposed to insert the words "(other than steam plants for the production of electrical energy)."

Mr. HAYDEN. So far as I am concerned, we can vote on the amendment now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, my amendment No. 2 goes to the question of what authority the bill shall give to the Secretary of the Interior to construct power-transmission lines. The language on page 3 of the bill, beginning in line 4, which reads, "including interconnecting lines to effectuate coordination with other Federal projects," could be construed to refer to power-transmission lines. I believe it would be so construed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Under this language, so construed, the Secretary of the Interior would have blanket authority to construct a network of power-transmission lines which would tie together the generators to be installed at the Bridge Canyon project and those at Boulder Dam and at Davis Dam. He could even go further and extend the interconnecting network to tie in the power production at the Shasta Dam in northern California. Construction of such a tranmission-line network has long been an objective of the Interior Department, and the pending bill, if enacted without amendment, could be deemed to give the authority for such construction, which has hitherto been denied by the Congress.

It might be a good thing to tie Boulder Dam power and Davis Dam power and Bridge Canyon Dam power together in a single system, so that power from Boulder Dam and Davis Dam might be supplemented with power from Bridge Canyon Dam. But there is nothing in the bill now pending before the Senate which would guarantee the accomplishment of that purpose. The objective of supplementing Boulder Dam power and Davis Dam power with power from Bridge Canyon Dam necessarily involves a flow of power from Bridge Canyon Dam toward Boulder Dam and Davis Dam, and an allocation of Bridge Canyon power to be pooled with the power from Boulder Dam and Davis Dam. But power-transmission lines work equally well in either direction, and it would be perfectly possible under the language of the bill, once such lines had been established connecting the three dams named, to turn the flow in the other direction and take power from the Boulder Dam and Davis Dam projects and allocate it for use or sale in connection with the Bridge Canyon project.

This would involve violation of contracts already in existence providing for the disposition of power from Boulder Dam, and, in the opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada, that is exactly what would happen.

On the basis of the estimates of power revenues, prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, it seems perfectly clear that the Bureau intends to "firm up" Bridge Canyon power by supplementing it with power produced at Boulder Dam. Furthermore, it seems perfectly clear that the Bureau intends to accomplish this by simply transferring and crediting Boulder Dam power to the Bridge Canyon project, and to do this without charging any of the cost of the Boulder Dam to the Bridge Canyon project. Such a plan necessarily entails a totally unwarranted invasion of the rights of those who have contracted for power from Boulder Dam. The rights of the State of Nevada to power from Boulder Dam are thus threatened, and that is a matter which greatly concerns the senior Senator from Nevada.

Such an extremely broad grant of authority for the construction of power-transmission lines is unjustifiable and indefensible. If that is the way the bill is intended to be construed, then the bill should be defeated. If that is not the way the bill is intended to be construed, then the bill should be amended. My amendment No. 2 will give the Senate an opportunity to express its will on this point, and I now offer the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether he knows of any instance under any other reclamation project when there was a separate authorization for transmission lines?

Mr. McCARRAN. Perhaps my answer should be "No," because it does not come to my mind at the moment, but the relationship of the power projects on the Colorado River is different from any other power set-up in the United States. It is entirely separate.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the different power plants are operated as a unit, so to speak, just as now the Hoover Dam and Bridge Canyon Dam and Parker Dam are operated as a unit, water can be released from one place at a time when it is needed at another place, and it is advantageous to do so. I have had 20 years' experience with respect to reclamation authorizations, and it has always been taken as an essential incident that power once generated can be transmitted without any special authorization by Congress being required for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the Senator take issue with my statement that power may be transmitted in either direction, and could not the power from Boulder Dam be transmitted to Bridge Canyon Dam, and thus supplement the Bridge Canyon power; and could not the charge of the Boulder Dam thus be reflected to Bridge Canyon Dam, and could not it affect the rates for power which would be developed at Bridge Canyon Dam?

Mr. HAYDEN. That would clearly violate the contract which the Secretary of the Interior has made with respect to

the delivery of power at Boulder Dam. I do not see how it could possibly be done.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then could my amendment do any harm? Would it not be a protection to the whole set-up?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it could do harm. It would require special authorization for any piece of transmission line. I do not know of any vast number of transmission lines either to be built or contemplated at this development. Some more wires may be hung on existing power lines, and I expect that all the dams will be connected, because that is best for management, but I see no sound reason for requiring special authorization for transmission lines.

Mr. McCARRAN. I send my amendment forward and ask that it may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that unanimous consent would be required to take up the amendment at this point.

Mr. McCARRAN. My undertsanding is that we can vote on these amendments at any time between 12 o'clock and 4 o'clock. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the committee amendments have not yet been agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the present order of business the consideration of the committee amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. McCARRAN. In that event I call attention to the fact that there are at present about six Senators on the floor. Any explanation that I have made, or which may be made by any other Senator, will be lost to those who are not here. All we can do is offer amendments and remain silent, and no one will know what they really mean in the whole set-up.

I do not like to be continually suggesting the absence of a quorum in my time, which is very much limited, but I see no other way of getting consideration.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, is a motion in order that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A request for unanimous consent to that effect is in order, before the announcement with respect to a quorum is made.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Am I to understand that I cannot offer my amendments at this time due to the fact that the committee amendments have not been acted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendments cannot be offered except by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may present my amendments now seriatim, and that the Senate proceed to dispose of them as they are presented.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am compelled to object, because I believe the committee amendments should be first disposed of. They have received careful attention by a committee of the Senate, and they deserve prior consideration by the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the able Senator from Arizona that the amendments I shall offer have been carefully considered also, and were prepared accordingly, and they are germane to the subject. However, if the Senator from Arizona objects, I can do nothing more than proceed, without having my amendments considered, which I am sorry to have to do.

Mr. President, I understand unanimous consent for the offering of my amendment has not been granted. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the amendments which I propose to offer, being 11 in number.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I may be entirely mistaken, but that violates all precedents of the Senate. Committee amendments are supposed, at least under the rules of the Senate, to deserve prior consideration to amendments offered from the floor. I rather doubt the wisdom of substituting a new rule and permitting amendments which were prepared by a Senator, submitted overnight, which we have just had an opportunity to look at in printed form this morning, to take precedence over the committee amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is something in what the Senator from Arizona says. I do not desire to establish a precedent or attempt to do so. If the Parliamentarian advises us that it is a precedent, as I take it to be, that the committee amendments be first considered, I do not care to violate that rule. But I should like to have some concession from the Senator, in view of the fact that, in connection with our procedure under the unanimous-consent agreement, we now have in the Senate Chamber only half a dozen Senators, for the consideration of a bill which involves a billion and a half dollars, more or less, and is vital to the entire economy of the country.

It seems to me we should either have a quorum or have some change in the rule.

The agreement is that we shall vote at not later than 4 o'clock. The very small attendance now on the floor of the Senate seems to me to be rather out of line, but we cannot do otherwise.

So I withdraw the motion.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator, because I am sure he would not want, any more than I would, to have established a precedent which would rise to plague us in the future.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my view, and that is exactly true.

Mr. President, my amendment No. 3 is intended to limit the repayment period to a reasonable time.

The last proviso in section 3 of this bill—on page 6, beginning in line 7—would give the Secretary of the Interior the absolute discretion to fix the repayment period for the costs of the project. The only limitation placed upon this discretion would be that the repayment period to be fixed by the Secretary should not exceed the useful life of the project. The question of how the Secretary determines the useful life of the project would be left to the Secretary. He would not be limited to the period within which it is probable the reservoir to be created by this dam would be entirely filled with silt. That might be anywhere from 30 to 50 years, depending on whether Bluff Dam is constructed; and let us remember that the construction of Bluff Dam is prohibited under the Watkins amendment, which was adopted by the committee, and which consists of the matter in italics beginning on page 3, in line 20. In its estimates the Bureau of Reclamation has talked about a 70-year repayment period; but there is nothing in the bill which would limit the repayment to 70 years. As a matter of fact, it seems perfectly clear that the project cost could not be repaid in 70 years, and that undoubtedly some longer period will be necessary. The Secretary of the Interior could make that period 100 years, or 150 years, or 500 years, as he saw fit. I do not mean to be facetious, but there is nothing in this proposed law which would prevent the Secretary of the Interior from determining that the dam had a useful life of 1,000 years or 2,000 years, and making the repayment period 10 centuries or more. I do not say he would do it, but he could do it under the language of this bill.

Furthermore this bill applies the reclamation laws with regard to repayment, which means that during the entire period of repayment—whether it is 70 years, or 100 years, or 500 years, or whatever it is—no interest is to be charged on the construction cost. There may be good justification for such a provision in the case of a project which is to be repayable within 50 years, as the present reclamation law provides; but there is very little, if any, justification for it in the case of a repayment period which may be 2 or 3 or 10 times the period now provided for in the reclamation law.

Mr. President, following the practice, I offer my amendment No. 3; and I understand that, although it cannot be voted upon at this time, it will come up in the regular order.

My amendment No. 4 is designed to provide for an equitable allocation of power by providing that power not needed in connection with the central Arizona project shall be divided equally among the States of California, Nevada, and Utah.

The Bridge Canyon Dam and the central Arizona project are tied together in this bill because the construction of the dam will provide one means of generating the huge amounts of power necessary for the successful accomplishment of the central Arizona project. Personally the senior Senator from Nevada

would much prefer, and believes that other Senators would much prefer, to see the Bridge Canyon Dam constructed as a separate entity. However, this bill as it now stands does provide for tying together the Bridge Canyon Dam and the central Arizona project; and it has the effect of earmarking approximately one-third of the power to be generated at the Bridge Canyon Dam to be diverted for the uses and purposes of the central Arizona project. If that is to be done, Mr. President, it seems only right and fair that the rights of other States to the remaining power should be adequately protected.

I now offer my amendment No. 4.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to know why the Senator did not include the States of Colorado and New Mexico, along with California, Nevada, and Utah.

Mr. McCARRAN. Because this is a group of States that is interrelated. One-third of the power which is proposed to be generated will go to Arizona; and the other States which border on that region and belong to that region should have an equal share or at least an equitable share. California certainly is entitled to a share. Nevada is entitled to a share. The dam would be between Utah and Arizona; therefore, Utah would be entitled to a share.

Mr. HAYDEN. I beg the Senator's pardon. When we argued the Boulder Canyon Act, it was admitted that the dam site was located on the boundary between Arizona and Nevada and occupied a natural resource of the two States, a natural resource which, if developed by private enterprise, would be taxed. On that basis, we subsequently obtained for each State a payment in lieu of taxes. Again, that was based upon a TVA precedent.

But inasmuch as this site is wholly located in the State of Arizona—neither the dam nor the reservoir touches any other State—it seems to me that argument does not apply.

Mr. McCARRAN. It certainly is between the States of Utah and Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not; the boundary of Utah is farther north.

Mr. McCARRAN. If I read the map correctly, it is.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will take a second look at the map, he will see what the situation there is.

Mr. McCARRAN. What is more, when the Boulder Dam project was authorized, there were no other dams or projects in that area. But now there are four projects there; and by means of this bill, all of them are to be united in the general production of power within that region, and all of them are to be united for the carrying out of the Bridge Canyon project.

Mr. President, I must say to the Senator from Arizona that I am limited in my time. I think the Senator from Arizona can answer these questions in his own time. I hope he will do so.

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not want to have the RECORD contain a statement that the dam is between the two States. The dam is wholly in Arizona.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Arizona may be correct about that. My map does not show it.

Mr. President, my amendment No. 5 is to guard against land speculation and unjust enrichment of landowners. It has already been pointed out in this Chamber repeatedly during the debate that this bill contains provisions for unprecedented Federal subsidies, amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. The amount which is mentioned in the minority report, and which is referred to as an outright gift, is $850,000,000. If we are to authorize subsidies on any such scale—or, for that matter, if we are to authorize subsidies at all—we should write into the bill the strongest provisions we can to guarantee against land speculation or the unjust enrichment of those, if any there be, who may already have speculated in land, in contemplation of the possible enactment of this measure. Fortunately, we have a precedent in this regard, for provisions of this nature were written into the law when Congress authorized the reclamation of a large area in the Columbia Valley in connection with the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam. My amendment follows the lines of that precedent. It will remove incentive for speculation in the lands proposed to be irrigated under the project which this bill would authorize.

I respectfully refer to the statute in this connection, namely, Fiftieth United States Statutes at Large, at page 208. The language of my amendment is identical with the language of the statute as applied to the Grand Coulee Dam. If there was good reason for putting that language in the Grand Coulee Project Act—as there was; and Congress so considered it, and it was put into that act, after long consideration, in the first place, in the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys—certainly there is reason for including that language in this measure.

Mr. President, at this time I offer my amendment No. 5.

My amendments Nos. 6 and 7 concern the provisions respecting court adjudication of Colorado River water rights. I have already pointed out the danger that the very enactment of this proposed legislation might itself have a bearing on the adjudications of the Supreme Court with regard to Colorado River water rights. To remove this danger, sections 8 and 9 of the bill should be amended so as to make it perfectly clear that the Colorado River contract, the water-delivery contract between the United States and the State of Arizona, dated February 9, 1944, the Mexican water treaty, signed February 3, 1944, the protocol thereto, dated November 14, 1944, and the understanding recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, are to be controlling as construed by the Supreme Court through the adjudication contemplated in section 12.

My amendments Nos. 6 and 7 will accomplish this. I offer them.

My amendment No. 8 is designed to protect the right of the State of Nevada to water from Mead Lake. There has long been substantial controversy over the rights of the several States to the use of water from the Colorado River. It has been the consistent contention of the State of Nevada, and of the senior Senator from Nevada, that under existing law, the State of Nevada is entitled absolutely to 300,000 acre-feet of water annually from Mead Lake, primarily for the production of power at Boulder Dam. Other States have made other claims, but I shall confine myself at this point to the claim of the State of Nevada. It has been stated, most irresponsibly, that Nevada has no such right to water from Mead Lake. The senior Senator from Nevada is not content that this bill should be enacted without protecting Nevada's right to water from Mead Lake.

Because the 300,000 acre-feet per year to which Nevada is now legally entitled, under existing law, is by no means the full amount of water to which the State of Nevada has an equitable claim, my amendment No. 8 specifies 1,000,000 acre-feet of water per year. I offer the amendment.

My amendment No. 9 is intended to provide some safeguard against the possibility that this new law itself might be construed as limiting or coercing the action of the Supreme Court in adjudicating Colorado River water rights. Section 12 of the bill before us is deficient because it contains no provision which will protect the Supreme Court. In its adjudication of actions brought under authority of this section, from the possible argument that Congress, by enacting other provisions of this very bill, has determined at least some of the issues involved.

The committee amendment to the bill which is contained in section 12, beginning on page 9, line 16, purports to accomplish the purposes of Senate Joint Resolution 4, by authorizing an original action in the Supreme Court to adjudicate claims of right to the use of waters of the Colorado River; and the succeeding section, which is section 13, also a committee amendment, purports to provide a measure of protection by deferring the construction of works "required solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona" until after water rights have been adjudicated under the provisions of section 12. There is grave doubt, however, whether the committee amendments actually do what they purport to do in this regard.

Section 12 contains no provision protecting the adjudication of Colorado River water rights by the Supreme Court, for which that section purports to provide, from being affected by other provisions of the proposed legislation. Since the whole measure will become law at the same instant, the act will necessarily be effective before any action can be brought under the provisions of section 12; therefore, section 12 should contain some safeguard against the possibility that the new law itself might be construed as limiting or coercing the action

of the Supreme Court in adjudicating Colorado River water rights. I offer my amendment No. 9.

My amendment number 10 is designed to protect against a possible undesirable construction of the law, with respect to when construction shall start on works for the diversion of water into Arizona, and to leave no possible room for any construction difference from the construction intended by the Congress.

Section 13 of the bill refers, on page 10, beginning in line 19, to "works authorized by this act which are required solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumption use in Arizona." There may be some question whether the language includes the aqueduct from Lake Havasu to and connecting with the main canal, and the pumping plants to raise water from Lake Havasu, which are authorized in section 1 of the bill. Certainly there should not be any such question, for it is obvious that these works are intended to be included in the language quoted. As a matter of fact, they are the primary works which are intended to be so included. But I say there may be some question whether they are included, because the language of section 1, on page 4, does not in terms provide that these works are to be "solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona." What section 1 says, on page 4, is that these works are to be authorized "in order to provide a means of diversion of water from the Colorado River to the main canal pending the construction of said tunnel and said portion of the canal and"—Mr. President, mark this language—" and for use thereafter as supplemental and stand-by works." I cannot conceive what use the Secretary of the Interior might decide to make of the aqueduct and the pumping plants, except "for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona"; but if such other use can be found, however inappropriate and uneconomical it might be, the Secretary of the Interior would be in a position to contend that the works in question are not comprehended within the language of section 13. In fact, it might even be argued that since section 1 contemplates that the canal and the pumping plants shall be used at some future time as "stand-by works," it means that they are not to be used solely and forever "for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona", and therefore that the works in question are not comprehended in the language of section 13.

Since it is clearly intended that the construction of the canal and the pumping plants shall be deferred, pursuant to the provisions of section 13, until the adjudication of any suit or suits which may be brought under the provisions of section 12, and since it can do no possible harm to guard against a possible misconstruction, my amendment should be adopted. I offer the amendment. I take it the Senator from Arizona has considered it, and I am wondering whether he is not willing to have it adopted.

Mr. HAYDEN. I beg the Senator's pardon. My attention was distracted. What is the number of the amendment?

Mr McCARRAN. It is No. 10.

My amendment No. 11 would further perfect section 13 of the bill. The section purports to defer construction of certain works during the pendency of any action brought under section 12; but it would permit the period of deferral to end as soon as the Court had handed down its opinion in the last of any suits so filed. This is a reasonable result only if the Court's decision should give Arizona enough water to make the central Arizona project feasible. Obviously, if the Court should decide that Arizona does not have the right to enough water to make the project feasible, then the construction of works "solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona" should either be deferred indefinitely, until the plan can be revised in line with the Court's decision, or should not be authorized at all.

The report of the Bureau of Reclamation shows that the central Arizona project, as now designed, will require a water supply of approximately 1,200,000 acre-feet per year. Adoption of the amendment, which I now send forward, would mean that if the final adjudication of the Supreme Court showed an available water supply materially less than 1,200,000 acre-feet per year, the project would be halted until it could be redesigned, and reauthorized by the Congress, to fit the available water supply, whatever that may be.

Mr. President, the amendments which I propose to offer, and which I have discussed here, are not suggested, and will not be offered, for any captious, or dilatory, or obstructive purpose. The sole purpose of the amendments is to improve the bill, to guard against possible improper construction at some future time, and to erect safeguards which fairness and equity dictate. There is a reason for each of the amendments, and I have stated those reasons. I am not sure, Mr. President, whether I can bring myself to vote for the bill, in any event; but so long as there is any chance that the measure may be enacted by Congress, I feel it my duty to seek to perfect the bill in every possible way, because the interests of the State of Nevada, which I have the honor in part to represent in this honorable body, are vitally concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the committee amendments have been disposed of, the 10 remaining amendments offered by the Senator from Nevada be laid before the Senate and voted on, in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator modify the unanimous-consent request to provide that his amendments shall be taken up after the committee amendments, plus the amendments to the committee amendments, have been acted upon? Those have priority over everything else. There are few of them pending. When we once dispose of the committee amendments, we can take up amendments to the committee amendments

Mr. McCARRAN. They have priority anyway.

Mr. DOWNEY. But under the unanimous-consent agreement they would not have priority.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that is what disturbed me. The Senator from Nevada was asking precedence for his amendments over committee amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I do not desire to displace the committee amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that three of the amendments printed as intended to be proposed by the Senator from Nevada are to committee amendments. They would take precedence over amendments offered by individual Senators to the bill itself.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. I believe the Senator from California also has amendments to the committee amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it, Mr. President, that there is objection and that I do not have unanimous consent. I must take my chances and get my amendments in as I can.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, we have no objection to a unanimous-consent request under which, after the amendments to the committee amendments have been disposed of, the amendments of the Senator from Nevada may then be considered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Reserving the right to object, and I do not mean to object so long as one thing is clear, I would not want the unanimous-consent agreement to be understood as foreclosing a motion to recommit, which, in the normal course of procedure, under the rules of the Senate, would have priority.

Mr. McCARRAN. It may be that my request would be confusing, so I shall take my chances on the floor with respect to my amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A motion to recommit may be made at any time before the passage of the bill. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McFARLAND. I object.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have withdrawn my request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request is withdrawn.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 20, after the word "affected", it is proposed to strike out "*Provided, however,*" and insert: "*Provided,* That this authorization shall not include (a) any works, dam, or reservoir at the Glen Canyon site or any other site in the upper Colorado River Basin, or (b) any dam, reservoir, or works in the lower Colorado River Basin which would flood the Glen Canyon site."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have an amendment, which is numbered 5, to that committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from California to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 25, after the colon, it is proposed to insert "*Provided, however*, That the construction of Bridge Canyon Dam and of works for the utilization of the waters of the main stream of the Colorado River, herein authorized, shall not be commenced unless and until the Congress shall have authorized the construction of reservoir capacity in the upper basin of the Colorado River in a total amount which the Secretary of the Interior shall find to be adequate to assure, by the control of silt, a useful life for the Bridge Canyon Reservoir not less than the repayment period, and to assure river regulation required for the production of firm power during such repayment period in the annual quantities contemplated by the report of the Department of the Interior on the central Arizona project contained in House Document No. 136, Eighty-first Congress, first session."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California to the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we object to the amendment for the very sound reason that it is wholly unnecessary. It assumes that silt will be deposited above the reservoir at a much earlier date than has been estimated by the Reclamation Service. It is simply another illustration, as I pointed out not long ago, of the fact that if the dam were built simply for power purposes we would hear nothing about any worry regarding silt, because what everyone wants in that area is power, but when the power generated must be called upon to bear some part of the costs of irrigation, these objections are raised.

I should like to address myself for a moment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada which places a 40-acre limitation on lands which are to receive water from the central Arizona project. It is very difficult for me to understand why the Senator from Nevada would want to apply it to land already in cultivation, the average acreage of which, as it stands, is approximately 100 acres to the farm. All lands were taken up under the homestead law. There were no Mexican and Spanish land grants such as existed in California and which have caused great difficulty in that State. One company in Kern County, Calif., owns approximately 250,000 acres of land. When we apply the 160-acre limitation to it, it arouses great opposition from large landowners.

The provision which the Senator quoted from the Columbia Basin Act applies to raw desert land belonging to the Government of the United States. It is not in private ownership. The intriguing thing, to my mind, is that the senior Senator from California has consistently, through the years, opposed the adoption of the 160-acre limitation in the Central Valley project in California. A further intriguing thing is that the Senator from Nevada had enacted into law a bill which he introduced. The act was approved November 29, 1940, and reads as follows:

> That the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to land in the Washoe County Water Conservation District, Nevada, irrigated from the Boca Reservoir, Truckee River storage project, Nevada, nor to the Pershing County Water Conservation District, Nevada, irrigated from the Humboldt River Reservoir, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into a contract with said districts, amending, in accordance with this act, the contract of December 18, 1936, between the United States and the Washoe County Water Conservation District, and the contract of October 1, 1934, between the United States and the Pershing County Water Conservation District.

The Senator from Nevada proposes to take the lid completely off, and water can be served to any area of land in those projects. I am very curious to know by what process of reasoning the Senator from Nevada can say that in Arizona the limitation shall be not 160 acres, but 40 acres.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. There was absolutely no opportunity for land speculation in that case. Those lands had all been taken up by pioneers in that section. There were farms already cultivated and in existence. There were water rights which had been adjudicated by the Federal court to the respective water users. So there was no chance for speculation. What happened in the Grand Coulee?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to point out——

Mr. McCARRAN. No. I think the Senator should be fair. He asked for my reasoning, and I want to give it to him.

In the Grand Coulee the matter was in controversy in this body, and the committee carefully prepared this language:

> That every such contract with any district shall further require that all irrigable land held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of 40 irrigable acres, and all county and State lands which may be subscribed to or irrigated under this project, shall be designated as excess lands and as such shall not be entitled to receive water from said project

It also provided that no owner of any such excess lands on the project should receive water if and so long as he refused to sell any excess lands owned or held by him under terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and at prices fixed and approved as provided. That was when speculation was rife in the lands surrounding the Grand Coulee. What is going on in Arizona to prevent similar speculation? What is to prevent, I ask, the buying up of great tracts of land? Is there any statutory provision? None whatsoever.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; there is. There is the same 160-acre limitation which applies to all the lands on the Salt River project and on the San Carlos project. That limitation is applicable at this moment. In the second place, the average ownership throughout the project is less than 100 acres. In the Salt River project it is approximately 40 acres in ownership. So there is no great tract of land and there is no group of land speculators. All the land is now in private ownership. What we want to do is to supply the 30,000 farmers with water. There is no speculation going on at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is exactly the statement that was made with reference to Grand Coulee. It was made repeatedly before the committee when I was a member of the committee. I recall it distinctly. It was said there was no chance for speculation. But there was a chance for speculation, and Congress put up the barrier so that there could not be any. That is all we are asking here.

Mr. HAYDEN. If it should apply in Arizona I cannot see why it should not apply in Nevada, and in California as well.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself a few minutes. I wish to place in the RECORD some letters which I have received in regard to the amendments proposed by my colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] and me. I understand that there is no objection to the amendments which we have proposed, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to take up the first one, which is numbered (b). I send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be taken up at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 11, it is proposed to strike out the word "less" and insert in lieu thereof the word "more."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, we did not hear the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 11, it is proposed to strike out the word "less" and insert in lieu thereof the word "more."

Mr. DOWNEY. We have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the next amendment, which is marked (a), be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, lines 8 and 9, strike out "silt control."

On page 5, line 9, strike out "river regulation."

On page 5, line 9, strike out "recreation."

On page 5, line 10, strike out "general salinity control."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of an amendment to an amendment of the committee which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 12, line 2, in the amendment of the committee, after the word "properties", to change the period to a colon and insert the following:

> *Provided*, That before designating any tribal lands, or any easements, rights-of-way, or other interests in tribal lands, the

Secretary shall make every reasonable effort to negotiate a contract for the purchase of such lands or interests on reasonable terms from the tribe of Indians concerned, and that the Secretary shall proceed with the designation of lands or interests under this section only if he finds that reasonable efforts to negotiate with the tribe of Indians concerned have been made, but have not resulted in, and are not apt to result in, a mutually satisfactory agreement. The Secretary is authorized to provide in any such contract for the payment of compensation in the same forms through which compensation may be made pursuant to a designation under this section, and any tribe of Indians entering into such a contract is authorized to execute the conveyances or other instruments needed for its effectuation, notwithstanding any provision of law or of any tribal constitution or charter to the contrary.

On page 12, line 11, after the period following the word "act", to insert the following:

Any Indian tribe or individual Indian owning lands or interests designated under this section who is dissatisfied with the determination of compensation made by the Secretary shall have a right of action against the United States to recover such additional sums of money, if any, as may be requisite under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or under any treaty or agreement made by the United States, to provide just and equitable compensation for the taking of the lands so designated. Such action may be instituted in the United States district court for the district where the lands or interests are situated or in the Court of Claims, at the election of the plaintiff.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Commissioner of Reclamation, which shows that with the elimination of nonreimbursable items, which were provided for in the second amendment, just agreed to, this project will pay out in full in 73 years. With the elimination of nonreimbursables, the project is wholly reimbursable, with the exception of $9,000,000.

I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1950.

Hon. ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCFARLAND: In response to your request, we have examined the payout aspects of the central Arizona project, if Bluff Dam and Reservoir were not included in the project, if no nonreimbursable allocations were made to silt control, recreation, salinity control, and river regulation.

Under the above criteria, the total cost of the project, based upon unit prices of July 1947, would be $708,760,000. Our examination and study indicate that the project, under these criteria, would be economically justified and the reimbursable costs could be repaid in about 73 years.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH MARKWELL,
Acting Commissioner.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, dated February 7, 1950. I should like to read one portion of the letter, as follows:

While some of our recent bids on canals show a decrease of more than 15 percent below the engineers' estimates, there is still too little information to forecast whether this drop establishes a trend.

I should like to have the letter printed in the RECORD in order to show that the costs are now 15 percent or more below the engineers' estimates.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BURFAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1950.

Hon. ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCFARLAND: In response to your request, I can advise you that the present trend in reclamation construction costs is slightly downward. While some of our recent bids on canals show a decrease of more than 15 percent below the engineers' estimates, there is still too little information to forecast whether this drop establishes a trend. Any decrease will, of course, not affect existing obligations but could well apply to potential projects.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH MARKWELL,
Acting Commissioner.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Newton B. Drury, Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, in regard to the height of the dam.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, February 7, 1950.

Hon. ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCFARLAND: I appreciate very much your calling me today concerning the Bridge Canyon Dam in Arizona, at which time you made inquiry as to its adverse effect on the Grand Canyon National Park.

The purpose of this letter is to confirm my telephone conversation with you to the effect that if the Bridge Canyon Dam is constructed at an elevation of not more than 1,877 feet, which is in accordance with the present plan, there will be no material damage to Grand Canyon National Park. While it would be preferable from a national-park standpoint to construct the dam at a lower elevation to eliminate all flooding of national-park lands, nevertheless, we have agreed to an elevation of 1,877 feet. Senate bill S. 75 provides on page 2, lines 11 and 12 "* * * dam shall be constructed to an elevation of not less than 1,877 feet above sea level." If no height limitation is placed on the reservoir, inestimable damage might be done to Grand Canyon National Park.

In discussing this matter with representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation, we have been informed that they do not intend to construct a dam above 1,877 feet. With these facts in mind, I believe that friends of the national parks would be relieved if S. 75 definitely placed 1,877 feet as a maximum elevation for the height of the dam.

Concerning the recreational use of the reservoir, I believe you are familiar with the fact that the National Park Service did make a study of its recreational potentialities. The development plan proposed boat docks and related facilities in the vicinity of the dam, and we feel that sport fishermen would derive considerable enjoyment from the reservoir. Boating, particularly in the spectacular box-canyon section, should have appeal to many visitors.

We deeply appreciate your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,
NEWTON B. DRURY,
Director.

Mr. HAYDEN. With respect to the height of the dam, Mr. President, I think there should be included also a letter from the American Planning and Civic Association, signed by Harlean James, the executive secretary, of which Horace M. Albright is the chairman of the board. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD in connection with the height of the dam.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 13, 1950.

Hon CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: I am very much pleased to learn that you and Senator MCFARLAND will suggest the proposed amendment to S. 75 changing the wording from "not less than 1,877 feet" to "not more than 1,877 feet"

Very sincerely yours,
HARLEAN JAMES,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the Hualapai Indian Tribe, together with a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior in regard to this amendment.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 209 OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE HUALAPAI TRIBE OF THE HUALAPAI RESERVATION, A FEDERALLY CHARTERED INDIAN CORPORATION

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States legislation known as Senate bill 75 covering the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam on the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, and for other purposes; and

Whereas in the event said Bridge Canyon Dam project should be constructed and operated, the lands and rights of the Hualapai Tribe would be materially affected in that the dam, and the townsite for the dam and a great many of the rights-of-way would be on the Hualapai Reservation, and unless said lands and rights of the tribe are protected, the tribe and its members will be severely damaged; and

Whereas there has now been proposed a compromise amendment to section 14 of said Senate bill 75 which compromise amendment in substance meets the major requests of the

Hualapai Tribe for the protection of their rights and interests by giving the Indians a chance to negotiate a voluntary sale of their land and a right to a fair jury trial on compensation if no voluntary agreement is reached; and

Whereas the Hualapai Tribe realizes the great importance of the Bridge Canyon project to the State of Arizona and in the interest of the people of the State of Arizona the Hualapai Tribe now desires to lend their endorsement and support to S. 75 with the attached proposed amendment to section 14 being made a part thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Hualapai Tribal Council in meeting assembled this 16th day of February 1950, That it endorses S. 75 as amended by the attached proposed amendment; and be it further

Resolved, That the Hualapai Tribal Council, expressing deep appreciation for the sympathetic support for the protection of the tribe, given by civic and labor organizations, and by many Senators, respectfully urges Senate endorsement of S. 75 as amended; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the members of the Arizona Congressional Delegation and to other members of Congress and other organizations concerned with the protection of Indian rights.

CERTIFICATION

I, the undersigned, as secretary of the Hualapai Tribal Council, hereby certify that the Tribal Council of the Hualapai Tribe is composed of nine members, of whom eight, constituting a quorum, were present at a meeting thereof this 16th day of February 1950, and that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by an affirmative vote of 8 members.

LEO B. ANDREWS,
Secretary.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1950.

Hon. ERNEST W MCFARLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCFARLAND: Reference is made to the various conversations which you have had with representatives of this Department concerning the Indian land acquisition provisions of S 75, a bill "Authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes."

Section 14 of this bill, in the form in which it was reported by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, sets up acquisition procedures which give substantial protection to Indian rights. However, this Department is in accord with your thought that some revision of these provisions would be desirable in the interest of perfecting the safeguards which should be afforded the Indians. Accordingly, the following amendments of section 14 would be acceptable to this Department:

1. Page 12, line 2, after the word "properties", change the period to a colon and insert the following:

"*Provided,* That before designating any tribal lands, or any easements, rights-of-way, or other interests in tribal lands, the Secretary shall make every reasonable effort to negotiate a contract for the purchase of such lands or interests on reasonable terms from the tribe of Indians concerned, and that the Secretary shall proceed with the designation of lands or interests under this section only if he finds that reasonable efforts to negotiate with the tribe of Indians concerned have been made, but have not resulted in, and are not apt to result in, a mutually satisfactory agreement. The Secretary is authorized to provide in any such contract for the payment of compensation in the same forms through which compensation may be made pursuant to a designation under this section, and any tribe of Indians entering into such a contract is authorized to execute the conveyances or other instruments needed for its effectuation, notwithstanding any provision of law or of any tribal constitution or charter to the contrary."

2. Page 12, line 11, after the period following the word "Act", insert the following:

"Any Indian tribe or individual Indian owning lands or interests designated under this section who is dissatisfied with the determination of compensation made by the Secretary shall have a right of action against the United States to recover such additional sums of money, if any, as may be requisite under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or under any treaty or agreement made by the United States, to provide just and equitable compensation for the taking of the lands so designated. Such action may be instituted in the United States district court for the district where the lands or interests are situated or in the Court of Claims, at the election of the plaintiff."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of the foregoing views for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

C. GIRARD DAVIDSON,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD certain articles, editorials, letters, and resolutions bearing on the subject of displaced persons and the administration of the displaced persons law in the United States.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 16, 1950.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: About 30 days ago I wrote you re DP's; am enclosing clipping from Chicago Tribune, today's issue, relating this alarming situation and how this community is being affected by this intrusion. I am taking this liberty because I am a patriotic American woman. I stand ready for organization against the "leaky" immigration system.

Loyally yours,

MRS. HARRIET HORNUNG.

[From the Chicago Tribune of February 16, 1950]

LIBERTYVILLE FACES ARRIVAL OF 1,000 DP'S—COUNCIL ARGUES HOUSING AND JOBS ISSUES

(By Leigh Atkinson)

Problems of providing housing and employment for 1,000 displaced persons were argued by Libertyville's village board and a group of taxpayers Tuesday night in the village hall.

The Europeans have been arriving in bunches in the suburban community under sponsorship of St. Sava Serbian Monastery on Milwaukee Avenue, near Libertyville. Some 250 persons, most of them single men, and all reported to be Serbians, have been received by the monastery. Some have been placed in temporary homes in the area and some are employed in local industry.

Residents said Libertyville is a village of nearly 6,000, though the last census listed it at 3,900. Manufacturing plants number about 12, a businessman said.

FEAR TOO MANY AT ONCE

Plans are for all of the displaced persons to settle in other parts of the Middle West, a spokesman for the monastery said. Libertyville and the monastery are serving as a reception center for the group.

Because only a fraction of the expected 1,000 has arrived, the monastery fears that the remaining number might be shipped in groups too large to handle. Fearing this also are clergymen of the community and citizens who have organized to find places for the Serbians in private homes.

It is this group the village board took issue with at its January 31 meeting, when it adopted a resolution criticizing "the groups sponsoring the movement in question."

ALREADY OVERCROWDED

In the resolution it was pointed out that "Libertyville already has an overcrowded condition in housing"; that "scores of applicants, including numerous local residents, are now being refused employment daily by industries"; and that "it seems highly questionable whether it is practicable or possible for this community to assimilate such large numbers of displaced persons."

The resolution was signed by John J. Jaeger, village president. Jaeger was not present at Tuesday's meeting. Board members attending were Francis Berry, Jack Dowden, J. C. Forney, A. J. Carstensen, C. L. Schaffer, and W. A. Nicholas.

E. L. Badenoch, Libertyville resident, who is studying for the Episcopalian ministry, addressed both meetings in behalf of the churchmen who are helping place the Serbians. Badenoch said responses to pleas for living quarters for the DP's have been encouraging.

PASTOR FAVORS PROJECT

The Reverend Paul Turk, pastor of the Methodist Church, said he approves heartily of the displaced-persons' project.

John Pyle, owner of a printing company, who has been working to find places for the Serbians, said he became interested in helping the people after listening to their stories of Communist oppression.

All but 20 of the first 250 to arrive have been located away from Libertyville, he said.

Guy Grinnell, poormaster and member of the Lake County Board of Supervisors, said he has no grievance with placing the DP's in Lake County. "They don't become wards of mine," he added. "The law requires that they be returned if they can't support themselves."

CALLS PROJECT TOO BIG

Arne Makela, a businessman, said the project is too big for such a small community.

Miss Ila Haven, real-estate agent, said she doesn't think the community can take care of the Serbians.

"There's unemployment here as it is," she declared. "As far as homes go, we turn away a number of local people every day who are looking for places to rent. And who is to say," she concluded, "that the displaced persons placed here temporarily will not stay?"

LABOR LEADERS PROTEST

Village Trustee Forney, personnel manager of a manufacturing company, pointed out that his firm has to reject several applications from residents for employment every week.

Percy Snow, president of the Lake County Central Trades and Labor Council, has protested in the council publication the bringing of DP's into Lake County. "These people should not be taking jobs here at the expense of American taxpayers," he said.

Snow said a large number of displaced persons has been employed by a Waukegan tannery.

[From the Los Angeles Evening Herald and Express of January 31, 1950]

WE ADMIT THOUSANDS OF DISPLACED PERSONS AS JOBS GET SCARCER

Strange policies are pursued by those who control our national economy.

In one news item we read that a total of 2,418,000 persons in the United States today have claimed and are getting unemployment insurance from the Bureau of Unemployment Security. This total is an increase of 164,000 cases over the unemployment rolls of the preceding week.

In a second news item, also emanating from Washington, we read that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has approved a bill to admit 320,000 displaced persons to this country by June 30, 1951. This bill requires that 30 percent of the displaced persons must be agriculturists and that 40 percent must be from occupied countries. The bill specifically bars Communists, Marxists, and persons who bore arms against the United States in the last war.

These two news items are unrelated and yet the one definitely has a bearing on t) other.

Even an economic dullard can see that unemployment in this country is rising and that more and more persons are finding it impossible to find work.

Any taxpayer who studies the costs of county, State, and Federal government can see at a glance that one of our largest items in each budget is the money we must pay to give food, lodging, and clothing to those who can't or won't support themselves.

The taxes we pay to give a living to the unemployed is slowly wrecking the national economy.

Rather than giving unrestricted entry to all, we should return to our long-established immigration policy of limiting, screening, and carefully investigating all who seek to make our country their country.

We must take care of our problems here at home before we go too far toward saving the unfortunate of the world.

MARYLAND BIBLE SOCIETY,
Baltimore, January 23, 1950.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senator for the State of Nevada,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I wish to thank you for the pamphlet Displaced Persons: Facts Versus Fiction, which came to my desk this morning.

I have long been aware of the serious threat to our country's future welfare by the influx of undesirables from Europe. I know very well that there is one pressure group responsible for this. I am also deeply conscious of the problem involved in stopping this flood; but, in the name of our American liberties, of our reformation heritage, and of all that our fathers have fought, bled, and died for, do everything in your power to stem this tide and to hold the quota to the lowest possible minimum.

The rank and file of our people are hesitant about expressing their opinions, but I know you lawmakers desire us to do so and I am 100 percent for clamping down on this impure stream that is flooding into our national life and damming it at its source.

Thanking you again for this valuable bit of information and assuring you I am with you with all my heart and strength in the battle to stem this tide, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EDGAR CORDELL POWERS.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK,
FOURTH DISTRICT,
Watertown, N. Y., January 26, 1950.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senator, Nevada.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I received your statement on displaced persons bill H. R. 4567, and I am enclosing copy of letter to Senators LEHMAN and IVES of New York. Hope that they will take it to heart and act for the best.

I have pointed out to them what overcrowding has done to New York City—no water.

Seven or eight million people and water for three million.

Three million men walking the streets looking for work and they, the sponsors of H. R. 4567, want to add more to the ranks.

It just doesn't make sense, and I will help all I can in my humble way. This bill stinks to high heaven.

And I wish you all the luck there is in the world in its defeat.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY J. MILLEN,
Commander, Fourth District, Department of New York, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK,
FOURTH DISTRICT,
Watertown N. Y., January 26, 1950.

Hon. IRVING M. IVES.
Hon. HERBERT H LEHMAN.

MY DEAR SENATORS: May I ask your careful and honest consideration on the displaced persons bill H. R 4567?

And I ask this in the name of the Fourth District Department of New York Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

The fourth district of New York are the counties of Herkimer, Jefferson, Lewis, Madison, Oneida, Clinton, Essex, Franklin, and St. Lawrence.

And we believe that if the bars were let down on immigration as H R 4567 indicates they would, the morale of all true loving Americans would be shattered and the faith we have placed in the men who we have sent to Washington would be gone.

Let us look at what overcrowding will do. New York City out of water; one of God's great gifts to man and beast.

There is just as much water now as there was back in 1925 or 1930 but there are two times the population in New York City.

Millions of men are walking the streets in our cities looking for work. Why do the sponsors of H. R. 4567 want to add more to ranks of unemployed?

And it would make more sense to get more help for immigration officers and investigators to stop the illegal entries into this country.

We live in a great land, a vast big land, but do not overcrowd it.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY J. MILLEN,
Commander, Fourth District, Department of New York, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

AMERICAN LEGION,
RUDDER CLUB POST, NO. 1444,
Brooklyn, N. Y., November 14, 1949.

DEAR COMRADE COMMANDER: VE-day in Europe in 1945 meant freedom and a return home for many millions of DP Frenchmen, Belgians, Italians, and others who had been forced into slave labor by the Nazis. Not so for nearly a million DP's from the eastern European countries. These Poles, Lithuanians, Latvians, Ukrainians, and others also were liberated by the western allies. But most of them had no desire to return to their homelands, then overrun by Soviet Russia, communism, and the Russian Gestapo known as the NKVD.

Our great Republic, blessed by Almighty God with so much, provided food and shelter, clothing, and security for these homeless DP's. Together with our western allies and other free nations, plans were made for their resettlement lest they and their children live the rest of their lives in a state of dependency, maintained chiefly by American charity—and taxes.

Since the war began in 1939, America has afforded asylum to hundreds of thousands of refugees or displaced persons. And, from the end of the war in 1945 until mid-1948, our country allowed an additional 44,000 to enter. Therefore, let no American who has the interests of our country and humanity at heart ever say that the Nation has not and is not now doing its share, and then some.

The 1948 Displaced Persons Act provided for 200,000 DP entries by June 1950. This is a fair law despite much propaganda against it from persons and organizations who view the problem in a different light than the American Legion and most other veterans' associations. The Legion has O. K.'d 200,000 DP admissions but stands firm against any measures to increase that number

For your information, we enclose copy of a resolution passed at our last regular meeting. It would be our recommendation that action along similar lines be taken by the energetic posts that make up the American Legion in Kings County.

Yours for God and country,

VINCENT A. PENNA,
Commander.

Whereas approximately 1 year ago, the post membership approved a resolution for an expenditure of funds to aid displaced persons; and

Whereas under the displaced-persons law, which expires June 30, 1950, about 100,000 of the 200,000 persons authorized have been resettled in our country as of this date: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Rudder Club Post, No. 1444, American Legion, Department of New York, meeting in regular session at 653 Hicks Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., on November 7, 1949, continuing our policy of helping to resettle some of these displaced persons throughout the United States, again do hereby approve of a contribution totaling $15 to be forwarded in equal amounts to the following three religious agencies assisting in this immigration program.

1. Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, 425 Lafayette Street, New York City, N. Y.

2. National Catholic Resettlement Council, 149 Madison Avenue, New York City, N Y.

3. National Lutheran Council Resettlement Service, 12 East Forty-sixth Street, New York City, N. Y.; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent, for information purposes, to other American Legion posts in Brooklyn and for publication to various newspapers.

VALLEY STREAM COUNCIL, NO. 41,
JR. O. U. A. M., INC.,
Valley Stream, N. Y., February 3, 1950.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a regular meeting of this council, held this evening, your report "Displaced Persons Facts Versus Fiction" was read and thoroughly discussed.

We, as members of a patriotic native-born American organization are most grateful that you have taken up this cause and are backing

you up by writing to Senators IVES and LEHMAN, of New York, asking them to vote against bill H. R. 4567.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE BISHOP,
Councilor.
EARL F. CARTER,
Secretary.

WINNETKA, ILL., *February 18, 1950.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing this letter in opposition to two provisions of H. R. 4567, the displaced persons bill now in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, but which may be reported out any day.

I am opposed to changing the cut-off date, namely the test date by which an alien must have become displaced, from December 22, 1945, as in the present law, to January 1, 1949.

I am opposed to increasing the total number of displaced persons to be admitted from 205,000, as in the present law, to 320,000

Already there has been serious evidence before the Senate Judiciary Committee of frauds in obtaining admissions of displaced persons. But making the test date for becoming displaced as late as January 1, 1949, is almost an invitation to fraud. It surely makes it easy for fake displaced persons to enter.

The Stratton bill providing for the admission of displaced persons was introduced in the House on April 1, 1947 Thereafter any dissatisfied persons in central Europe knew that the easiest way to get into the United States was to become displaced. He might well have said, "So, that's the way to do it, is it? Become displaced. I shall proceed to displace myself at once"

H R. 4567 allows 15 months after the Stratton bill was introduced in which he could have displaced himself.

The war ended in Europe on May 6, 1945. The present law allows 7 months after the end of the war in Europe for a person to register as displaced. It is no answer to say that people have become displaced since December 22, 1945, as the result of internal troubles in their countries. Our country simply cannot let in displaced persons whenever there is a revolution or war in any country. There are 800,000 displaced Arabs. There may be soon millions of displaced Chinese. They have as much right to preferred treatment as being displaced as any of the persons in Europe. We cannot take in all the distressed people of the world, any more than in case of the death of many parents in an epidemic one family could adopt four children without doing injustice to its own three children.

There is not unlimited room in this country. The Census Bureau last July estimated our population at over 150,000,000. There are sound students who believe that that is 15,000,000 more than a desirable population for our country. At any rate we are near if we have not passed the desirable limit of our population Yet it is proposed to admit 320,000 immigrants in advance of the quotas. It is true that the displaced persons now admitted will be charged against the quotas for later years. But I estimate that it will take 15 years for the quotas to absorb the displaced persons admitted in advance. For all that time we could not, in effect, reduce our immigration quotas, for they would be mortgaged to the future.

And it is safe to predict right now that long before 15 years are up, we will be beset with urgent, fervent pleas, backed by all the political pressure, indeed terrorism, that the friends of the immigrant know so well how to employ, that we soften our hard hearts and give those countries back their quotas.

H. R 4567 means that the already grievous diversity of our population will be further increased. In 5 States and in 15 cities of over 100,000 population, 40 percent or less of the white population is of native parentage. These proportions are ominous. I do not mean that the foreign born or their children are less worthy or law-abiding than the old native stock, but I do mean that all of us are handicapped by this excessive diversity. Democracy, law, and law enforcement, even literature, need for their best development a people that has lived a long time together, who understand each other, with common standards and traditions, stirred by what Lincoln called the same "mystic chords of memory"

Our politics has long been bedeviled by the propaganda of alien-minded groups. The late Chief Justice Taft was only one of many competent observers who felt that our woefully diverse population was one of the chief causes of our bad record in crime and in law enforcement.

And now with a serious housing shortage, with serious unemployment, the displaced persons bill would add 115,000 persons to the number to be admitted under the 1948 act

I believe deeply that H. R. 4567 should be defeated

Very truly yours,

EDWARD R LEWIS.

P S—As a matter of identification, I may say that I am the author of "America. Nation or Confusion, a Study of our Immigration Problems," published by Harper & Bros. in 1928, and of "A History of American Political Thought, from the Civil War to the World War," published by the Macmillan Co. in 1937 I am a member of the American, Illinois and Chicago Bar Associations

E. R L.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Butler	Holland	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Murray
Cain	Ives	Neely
Capehart	Jenner	O'Conor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Darby	Kem	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Leahy	Taft
Ecton	Lehman	Taylor
Ellender	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	Lucas	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Wherry
Gillette	McFarland	Wiley
Graham	McKellar	Williams
Green	McMahon	Withers
Gurney	Magnuson	
Hayden	Malone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of Senate bill 75 as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It was my privilege to be a member of that committee during the many months it considered Senate bill 75. I personally attended the hearings of the committee for many weeks, during which time representatives of some of the great States of the Union presented their views with respect to the proposed project, and made their arguments upon it.

Mr. President, the battle now being waged is a battle for water. Many speeches have been made on the floor of the Senate dealing with the cost of the proposed project. The speeches have been profound and persuasive. But in the final analysis, the comparative importance of the cost of the project to the settlement of the title to the water is insignificant.

The battle for water is not new among the people of this land nor among the people of this earth. In the first book of the Bible, we read of one of the historic struggles of antiquity for water. In the twenty-sixth chapter of Genesis, we learn that in the early dawn of the life of the race, water was a controlling factor in the welfare of man. I read from Genesis 26:

> And Isaac digged again the wells of water which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father; * * *
>
> And Isaac's servants digged in the valley, and found there a well of springing water
>
> And the herdmen of Gerar did strive with Isaac's herdmen, saying, The water is ours * * *
>
> And they digged another well, and strove for that also. * * *
>
> And he removed from thence, and digged another well, and for that they strove not and he called the name of it Rehoboth; and he said, For now the Lord hath made room for us, and we shall be fruitful in the land.

Mr. President, a strange modern counterpart to that story from antiquity took place before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and also has taken place here on the floor of the Senate.

I wish to say that the committee was impressed by the viewpoints which were discussed; by the statements of facts which were made; and by the arguments which were presented to us. The committee was impressed by the sincerity and the effectiveness of both sides. The committee decided that there were equities in favor of those who had the viewpoint that the State of Arizona had title to this water and also equities in favor of those who took the position that the water belonged to other States.

The committee sought to protect the rights of both sides. It felt that if Arizona owned the water rights that were in controversy and if the project she proposed was economically sound, it should be authorized. On the other hand, the committee felt that in view of the fact that the great State of California claimed an interest in this water, she had a right to her day in court; and the committee sought a solution which would meet the requirement of giving

both these States the rights to which they were in fact entitled.

The evidence showed that the project was economically justified if Arizona in fact owned the water.

In the debate, statements have been made with reference to how many acres are involved and how much the cost per acre is.

As I sat in the committee, week after week, listening to the testimony in this controversy, I became convinced that more than 100,000 acres were involved. I became convinced more than 225,000 acres were involved. I became convinced that this matter involved more than the 725,000 acres of irrigable land which Arizona showed were involved. I became convinced that the 73,000,000 acres of land in the State of Arizona were involved in this controversy; that no accurate figure of per acre cost could be arrived at that did not recognize that the total number of acres was 73,000,000. I became convinced that if this project were authorized, it would be the economic Magna Carta for a great State. I became convinced that it represents the difference between growth, progress, and prosperity, on the one hand, and stagnation and creeping paralysis, on the other.

As I understand the figures which have been given to the committee, and which are to be found in the authorization measure now pending, the total amount is for $708,000,000, of which the Bridge Canyon power project involves $441,000,000, and the irrigation project involves $267,000,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Does not the Senator know there is an additional authorization for a huge project, beyond the figures the Senator has given, an authorization for tunnels and other facilities amounting to $550,000,000 more?

Mr. KERR. As I understand the bill, that is not a direct authorization provided by the legislation now pending before the Senate. The bill in that regard will speak for itself.

Mr. President, among the parties interested in this matter there is no controversy with reference to the economic feasibility of the $441,000,000 authorization for the Bridge Canyon power plant dam and program. The controversy is over the $267,000,000 authorization to carry approximately 1,250,000 acre-feet of water a year to central Arizona for irrigation purposes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Does not the Senator know that the Bureau of Reclamation estimates the irrigation benefits of the first item of this project at approximately $400,000,000?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, we have seen a considerable decrease in the cost of construction during the past 12 months. A few minutes ago, I was called from this floor by the president of the YMCA in my home city of Oklahoma City, where the board of directors have just opened the bids for the building of a great YMCA plant there. The estimates had ranged up to $1,750,000. The low bid they have just received is for $1,250,000, or approximately 30 percent below what the estimates have been.

I have the feeling that the $267,000,000 will be ample to pay for the irrigation phase of this great development program.

In that regard, the evidence is ample to sustain the conclusion that the sale of the power from the power project will reimburse the Government, with interest, for the power dam and power project, and for the total cost of the irrigation project, without interest, in a period of 73 years. This, I understand, is with the exception of approximately $9,000,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Does the Senator mean, by the remark he has just made, that the Government of the United States will be recouped for the interest upon the great power investment? If that is the Senator's meaning, I wish to say it is totally erroneous.

Mr. KERR. That is my understanding of the figures.

Mr. DOWNEY. Then, if I may say so, if the Senator from Oklahoma believes the Treasury of the United States will be recouped for this huge sum of interest on the power investment, that is not the project that is before us. So, if the Senator knew the facts, I think he would probably change his conclusion.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am making my statement based upon the evidence which was adduced before the committee, of which I was a member. The distinguished senior Senator from California was there. He is as able as any living human to make his viewpoints known, and to do so as effectively as anyone can. I wish to say that I have enjoyed the portions of his presentation I have heard, and I look forward with pleasure to the rebuttal which I know will soon be presented.

Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion here in regard to what this power would be worth if it were devoted to industrial development within the State of Arizona. It has been in criticism of a proposal to use a certain percentage of the power to pump into the irrigation district of central Arizona the water which will be made available. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I believe that the people of Arizona are in the best position to judge in what manner they would like to have their part of the power used. It is not difficult for me to understand that they would have some desire to have a "say" in respect to how the power is to be used. After all, this project is located entirely within their State. And, after all, agriculture is, within itself, their greatest industry. In fact, agriculture is the greatest industry in the Nation. It is the basis of all industry. I have had some trouble in my own mind figuring out what would be the basis of the support of an industry, no matter how advantageously it might be using available power, if there were not agricultural production to give food and clothing and shelter to the people engaged in and dependent upon the industry, as well as other people living in the State. In view of the fact that the program is the only foundation upon which the present agricultural structure of Arizona can continue to rest, and in view of the fact that the project is the only foundation upon which a greater agricultural structure can be developed in that great State, I can understand why her citizens take the position that a part of the power developed at this great power project should be used to pump Arizona's part of the water to the important agricultural center of the State.

On the other hand, it was the conclusion of the committee that if California owns this water, she should be entitled to use it. I want to say that while we have a great respect and regard for Arizona, we have an equal regard and affection for California. It was my pleasure to visit that fine State a little while ago, while I was Governor of Oklahoma. The distinguished Governor of California said to me, "What do you think of our State?" "Oh," I said, "it is a marvelous State, one of the greatest in the Nation." He said, "Why, you are really enthusiastic about it, aren't you?" I said, "I certainly am. I would not insult the intelligence of 150,000 Oklahomans who have deliberately chosen to move to California and to live here, by arriving at any other conclusion." [Laughter.] California has one of the proudest histories and records of achievement of any State in the Union. She has developed an economy second to none. On my visit to California a little while ago, I was led to the conclusion that in all probability she will become the most populous State in the Nation by 1960. I think she really will. I warned her that unless she conserved her other water resources——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield 7 minutes more to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 7 minutes more.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I warned her that unless she conserved a greater part of her water resources, by 1970 some other great State, like Texas or Oklahoma, would have gone around her and would have achieved first place. California is a proud State with a great people. I know that she does not want the water unless it is hers. On the other hand, I know that she does not want Arizona's development retarded, if the water is rightfully that of the State of Arizona. Therefore, the committee adopted the amendments offered by its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and of one of its great Republican members, the junior Senator from Colorado, wherein provision was made that the entire project above the Bridge Canyon power project and the irrigation project would be authorized, that the Congress would be entitled to

appropriate money immediately for the power project and dam, which were unanimously approved; that, at the same time, the State of California or any other State that had an interest in the controversy would be authorized to go into the Supreme Court and there seek to establish title to any part of the water; that if such action were taken, no appropriation would be made by the Congress for the irrigation part of the project, until such time as title to the water had been declared legally vested in the State of Arizona.

The amazing thing about it is that the State of California was before the committee seeking favorable action upon a bill giving her a right to go to court to settle title to the water. We were reminded that on two previous occasions Arizona had taken California into the Supreme Court to settle that very question, and that in both cases California had come there to say to the Court that it had no jurisdiction of the controversy; among other reasons, for the reason that there was no justiciable issue. I think that is a kind of technical term known to the law as a legalized or duly recognized argument. At any rate, Arizona had California in the Supreme Court twice. California said, "There is no justiciable issue." The Supreme Court said California was right, and dismissed the cases. Lawyers have advised the committee, and it is my opinion, which was agreed to by the other members of the committee, that there can be no justiciable issue on which California could maintain a case in the Supreme Court, even were she authorized to go there, unless and until a project were authorized which would constitute an actual threat to California's right to use the water.

Therefore, the committee did that which recognized the claims of both sides to the controversy. On the basis of the economic justification of the project, if the water were available, it recommended its authorization. On the basis of California's desire to have her case litigated, she was given that permission, if she would exercise it within 6 months from the passage of the bill. And in the event she, or any other State in the Colorado Basin should take the case to the Court for action, that would automatically stop any appropriation of the Congress with reference to the irrigation project, until the question was settled. So the controversy was resolved in order that the two States might live together in peace and harmony, and the water rights of both be equitably settled. If the waters belong to Arizona, she will not be denied victory in the hour of her triumph by having been delayed during the years the case would have been in Court, and then have to start over again in order to get the project with which to maintain her economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. If I may be permitted a concluding sentence, Mr. President, I submit in wisdom and equity and justice, the committee reported the bill on a basis which recognizes the rights of both States, and makes such provision that the rights which they may have, as determined by the Court, will be recognized and honored and developed by the Congress.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains available to us?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 46 minutes; the Senator from Arizona, 30.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

NEVADA—THE COLORADO RIVER

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Senate today is considering setting a very dangerous precedent. The Congress has never, to the knowledge of the junior Senator from Nevada, appropriated public money to divert water from an interstate stream system in the absence of an interstate agreement, or an adjudication by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I continue to hear of the controversy built up between California and Arizona. It should be emphasized again that there are five States in the lower basin not two, and that they include Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, California, and Arizona. It must also be emphasized that not one of those States at this time has any definite amount of water allocated to it from the Colorado River.

This will be the first time, Mr. President, in the history of this body, if it sees fit to do so now, that the Congress of the United States has appropriated a substantial sum of money, practically $1,000 000,000, to be appropriated to assist a State on an interstate stream system to appropriate water that may belong to other States in the basin of five States, in the absence of an interstate compact, or an adjudication by a court of competent jurisdiction.

It has never been done, certainly so long as I have been a member of the committee or have had any knowledge of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It has never even been considered. Mr. President, I have attended committee hearings presided over by the chairman, the senior Senator from Wyoming. The first question he always asks is, "Do the Governors and State engineers of all the States included in this basin agree to this, and is there an interstate agreement?"

Mr. President, this project, S. 75, has been the only exception.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The junior Senator from Nevada is very familiar with the Boulder Canyon Act, is he not?

Mr. MALONE I am.

Mr. HAYDEN. That act authorized construction of the All-American Canal for the benefit of the people of California, did it not?

Mr. MALONE. It authorized the construction of Boulder Dam now Hoover Dam.

Mr. HAYDEN. Was the consent of the State of Arizona obtained to the passage of that bill?

Mr. MALONE. Six of seven Colorado River Basin States signed the Colorado River compact before the project could be started. There was an interstate compact dividing the water between the upper and lower basin.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has just stated that Congress has never passed a bill to assist a State on an interstate stream, when more than one State was interested in the water, without first having obtained consent of all the interested States.

Mr. MALONE. I did not say that. I said that this body had never appropriated money to take water out of an interstate basin in the absence of an interstate compact dividing the water—or an adjudication by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. HAYDEN. There was no interstate agreement, there was nothing; Congress simply appropriated the money in that instance, over the protest of Arizona, because we had some right to the waters for irrigation purposes. So that is one precedent, which I am sure is very old and very sound, against the proposition that Congress cannot act without the consent of all the States.

Mr. MALONE. I beg to differ with the Senator. I have very little time, but I want to clarify the issue. There was an interstate agreement between the upper and the lower Colorado River Basins, which was approved by the Senate of the United States. It was a six-State agreement. The interstate agreement was approved by the Senate of the United States and only then could the money be appropriated.

There is no interstate agreement here, and the entire five lower basin States are included, not just the two States of California and Arizona. The Senator from Arizona will remember that in 1927, when I think the senior Senator from Arizona had just arrived in the Senate, and when I was State engineer for the State of Nevada, and we were both very close to the Boulder Dam project, and there was definitely an interstate agreement, which was signed by six States, as approved by the United States Senate before construction could be begun on Boulder Dam.

The Senate judged that the upper basin was fully protected under the Colorado River compact when approved by six of the seven States of the basin, including the California limitation, which was the question at issue.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. That was a power plant. I am talking about irrigation works which divert water from a stream about which there is a dispute.

Mr. MALONE. It was one authorization, the dam and the canal.

Mr. HAYDEN. There was a provision in the bill which resulted in the irrigation of 400,000 acres of land in California, Arizona is in that basin, and its consent was never obtained to the legislation. Is that not a correct statement?

Mr. MALONE. Again, I must beg to differ with the Senator. In the first place, there were not 400,000 acres put under cultivation. Flood control and water stabilization was provided for a considerable part of the 400,000 acres. The 400,000 acres was mostly in cultivation at that time, before the project was constructed, and before the All-Ameri-

can Canal was constructed. I beg the pardon of the senior Senator from Arizona. There was an interstate agreement dividing the water between the upper and lower basins and six States signed it to protect the upper basin's water supply before anything was done on the project.

Furthermore, I want to emphasize that no new water was taken out of the river except to put on land already irrigated out of the same river.

Mr. President, as I have said before, this will be the first time that the Congress of the United States has seen fit to appropriate a large amount of money to help one State appropriate water out of an interstate stream system which never before had been utilized, even in flood-times. There has always been, so far as the junior Senator from Nevada knows, either an adjudication by a court of competent jurisdiction, as in the case of the Platte River in Colorado and other interstate rivers. The litigation in each case was finally settled before the Congress of the United States appropriated a substantial sum of money for the construction of any project.

In this case there is no interstate agreement and no adjudication yet it is proposed to appropriate public money to assist one of the basin States.

In order to make my point clear, Mr. President, in our western country, where water is the lifeblood of the State, the limit of a State's development is the limit of that State's water supply.

A State can appropriate water out of an interstate stream if it furnishes the money through private sources or State appropriations. They might then appropriate water belonging to another State. But when a State comes to the Congress of the United States for such an appropriation they have always been sent back for an interstate agreement or for an adjudication by a court of competent jurisdiction prior to consideration by this body.

Mr. President, I want to read briefly from a letter from the Secretary of the Interior which accompanied the report on this project. I shall read a very small portion of it:

> Assurance of a water supply is an important element of the plan yet to be resolved. The showing in the report of the availability of a substantial quantity of Colorado River water for diversion to central Arizona for irrigation and other purposes is based upon the assumption that the claims of the State of Arizona to this water are valid.
>
> It should be noted, however, as the regional director and the Commissioner of Reclamation have pointed out, that the State of California has challenged the validity of Arizona's claim. If the contentions of the State of Arizona are correct, there is an ample water supply for this project. If the contentions of California are correct, there will be no dependable water supply available from the Colorado River for this diversion. While the necessary water supply is physically available at the present time in the Colorado River, the importance of the questions raised by the divergent views and claims of the States is apparent. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior cannot authoritatively resolve this conflict. It can be resolved only by agreement among the States, by court action, or by an agency having jurisdiction. The report is, therefore, transmitted to the Congress for its information and such action as it deems appropriate under these circumstances. I feel confident that, in considering the project, the Congress should and will give this conflict the full consideration it deserves. The submission of this report is not intended in any way to prejudice full consideration and determination of this controversial matter.

Mr. President, I digress for a moment to say that in 1935 a committee of State engineers was appointed to determine the supply of water necessary for the lower-basin States. The junior Senator from Nevada was State engineer for Nevada at that time, and he and the State engineer of California and the State engineer of Colorado constituted the committee. I shall not go into detail relative to the report. It will be found on page 1503 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6. Suffice it to say that the committee found that the State of Nevada could beneficially utilize 900,000 acre-feet of water. The letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs did not take Nevada into account. It merely took into account the claims of California and Arizona.

During the time I was State engineer of Nevada, from 1927 to 1935, it was necessary to establish the claims of the State of Nevada above the clamor of the two States of California and Arizona. As junior Senator from that State from 1947 until the present time, we now have problems of again identifying the claims of the State of Nevada. So I say it is time that the claims of other States are considered here. Neither Nevada, nor any other lower-basin State at this moment has any water whatever allocated to it from the Colorado River through an interstate agreement or adjudicated to it by a court of competent jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point Senate Joint Resolution 145, which, in our opinion, if adopted by this body, would provide for an adjudication of the water, and there would be no objection to any feasible project after the water is divided by an interstate agreement or by a court of competent jurisdiction.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) to authorize commencement of an action by the United States to determine interstate water rights in the Colorado River, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas the development of projects for the use of water in the lower Colorado River Basin is being hampered by reason of long-standing controversies among the States in said basin as to the meaning and effect of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act, the California Limitation Act (Stats. Cal. 1929, ch. 16), various contracts executed by the Secretary of the Interior with States, public agencies, and others in the Lower Basin of the Colorado River, and other documents and as to various engineering, economic, and other facts: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved, etc.*, That, for the purpose of avoiding a multiplicity of actions and expediting the development of the Colorado River Basin, the Attorney General is hereby directed to commence in the Supreme Court of the United States of America, against the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah, and such other parties as may be necessary or proper to a determination, a suit or action in the nature of interpleader, and therein require the parties to assert and have determined their claims and rights to the use of waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the Lower Colorado River Basin.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the long-standing precedent of demanding an interstate agreement or an adjudication by a court of competent jurisdiction should be maintained by the Senate of the United States.

The basic fact—long recognized by this body—that the Congress cannot determine and adjudicate water rights among the western arid States has not changed.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I now yield 10 minutes to the junior Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington does not take lightly or derive any pleasure from the delivering of a statement in opposition to a resolution favored by citizens generally in Arizona.

I have recently been in Arizona. I have seen the country which would be affected by the central Arizona project. I have flown over it, up and down every river and lake, and have traveled over it by car. More than that, I have talked at great length with many of the fine Arizona people who are sponsoring this project. There are no finer people anywhere. I have listened with real sympathy, understanding, and, as they have described their need for more water, and their hopes of getting it from the Colorado River. I should like to see some way found for them to get it. I am convinced that some reasonable way must be found for them to get it.

Nevertheless, I am going to vote against Senate bill 75, feeling that it does not serve the best interests of the Nation, or of the reclamation States, or even of Arizona itself, for the following reasons:

First. The President, on January 3, 1950, created by executive order a Water Resources Policy Commission to study and report, not late than December 1950, on the whole field of reclamation policy, including the very issues that are tied up in this bill. In his budget message he asked that major water resources legislation be deferred until that Commission reports. The work of that Commission is too vital to the whole reclamation West, to undermine it in advance by piecemeal legislation for projects of this magnitude.

Second. Senate bill 75 is an example of blank-check delegation of power to administrative officers. The bill does not disclose the cost of the project, but authorizes appropriations without limit. It fixes no repayment period other than the useful life of the project, as determined by the Secretary, with no control by the Congress.

Third. The central Arizona project will cost at least $700,000,000, according to the majority report, and I note that

section 1 of the bill authorizes, in addition, an 80-mile tunnel which would cost several hundred million more. The proponents of the project tell me that power revenues will pay it all back; they admit that the irrigators cannot pay much more than the bare operation and maintenance costs. And even if the capital is recovered in that fashion, no one has been able to tell me where the money is coming from to pay the interest to the Federal bondholder from whom the money is borrowed to build the project. I have seen figures showing that, even if all the capital is recovered, the tax burden will approximate a billion dollars in this way, of which the taxpayers of the State of Washington would bear about $18,000,000. One of the questions we have been told is intended for study by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission is this question of accounting for interest. Without expressing any opinion either way at the moment, it does seem that the Commission ought to have a chance to consider that question before we close the door by a record-breaking precedent of this kind.

My fourth reason for opposing S. 75, Mr. President, is that there exists a long-standing water controversy over the waters of the Colorado River. I remember that in the Eightieth Congress, and again in this Congress, the Senators from Nevada and California joined in a resolution granting the consent by Congress to a suit in the Supreme Court, which is apparently the only way of determining the controversy. This was opposed by Arizona. I am in favor of speeding that issue to the Court. Now I find that Arizona, reversing her earlier position, has seized upon the consent to sue, has annexed her whole project to it, and that we find in S. 75 both a consent to suit and an authorization for a billion-dollar project. I am against that way of doing business. I do not want to be committed to all the economic innovations, included in the resolution, which the President's Water Commission was created to consider, just to resolve one additional issue—and an important one—namely, the water supply. Someone has called that "burning down the house to roast the pig."

In conclusion, I am in favor of doing one of two things; either of recommitting S. 75, or, preferably, striking out all after the enacting clause and providing for consent to suit, in order that litigation may promptly get underway.

I believe the Senate should hold the rest of the bill until the President's Water Commission reports next December, just 10 months from now. Then we will know how much water the project is to be designed for, how much it will cost, and whether it can be built under feasibility standards which the Commission will approve for the whole West; not just one project.

I am impelled to these conclusions because I am for the fullest development of the West by every sound, economical project. The central Arizona project admittedly does not meet the standards of the present law, and we will not know until the President's Commission reports what general standards we may be asked to approve. It is not good for the West, or the Nation, if we approve this one project, as an exception to the law that binds the rest of us, tying up a very large portion of the reclamation budget for the whole country, until we know what the rules of the game are going to be for the other reclamation States.

When the water rights have been determined by the courts, and the Water Resources Commission has reported, I shall willingly support any feasible project which will provide Arizona with the additional water which it is entitled to and must have.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, we have approximately 28 minutes left, and I yield to my colleague, the junior Senator from California, whatever portion of that time he desires to take.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say at the outset that there is no animosity on the part of the State of California or the representatives of California in the Senate toward the aspirations of Arizona or any other State in the Union to have the economic development to which it is entitled. By the very nature of our Federal system, each of the States of the Union, small or large, sits here with an equal voice and an equal vote. As one who in part represents one of the great reclamation States of the West, I have tried not to look with any narrow viewpoint on the problems of not only the reclamation States of the West, but of the States in the TVA area and other areas of the country. I believe that has been the general viewpoint of other Members of the Senate.

My objection to the proposed legislation, Mr. President, is that it in fact breaks down the sound standard of reclamation laws which has served the Nation for a period of 50 years or more. In fact, it throws away the yardstick. I should like to say to the able Senators who represent other States in the West which may have reclamation projects in being or in prospect that there is nothing which would be more detrimental to the future of western reclamation than the adoption of projects which are unsound from a technical and an economic point of view.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that the authorization under the pending legislation is in the neighborhood of a billion and a quarter dollars. That is a great deal of money in a period when the national debt is in excess of $250,000,000,000, when, under the budget of the President of the United States, we will be operating $5,000,000,000 in the red for the next fiscal year, and when we will close the current fiscal year with a deficit of more than $5,000,000,000.

The able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, this morning tried to draw some comparison between the project we are discussing, unsound and uneconomic as it stands in the pending bill, with the Boulder Canyon Act and with the Hoover Dam construction. There is no fair comparison between the two. The fact is that the entire reimbursable cost of the Hoover Dam is being repaid into the Treasury of the United States, with interest at 3 percent. Originally the interest was set at 4 percent. Before a bit of concrete was poured for the Hoover Dam it was required that contracts be in being, primarily with public and private power interests, and irrigation interests in the State of California agreeing to take the part of the output of power which was allocated to the State of California, and pay for it, whether they had any use for it at that time or not. Firm contracts were required.

The fact is, I underscore and repeat, that every dollar of the reimbursable cost of the Hoover Dam is being paid back in principal into the Treasury of the United States, with interest at 3 percent. That is not the case with the central Arizona project. So I submit there is no comparison between the two.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Wyoming made the argument that in the critical period in which our nation now finds itself, with the cold war perhaps becoming a little warmer, it is important that all the States and all the Senators unite and avoid controversies in regard to projects. He at least threw out the suggestion that such division of opinion might jeopardize our solidity at this time. I am for sound projects wherever they may be located, be they in the valley of the Tennessee, in the New England States, in the Middle West, in the great South, in the Pacific Northwest, or on the Pacific coast, but I submit that for the Senate to approve a project which is unsound on its face would not contribute to the economic stability of the Nation, or to the solvency of the Federal Government, and I submit that if we undermine the solvency of the Federal Government, and if we undermine the sound economic stability of the Nation, by adopting unsound projects, we do not contribute to the national strength. To the contrary, we contribute to national weakness.

Mr. President, the time we have at our disposal is very limited. One of the great difficulties we have had to face on the floor of the Senate has been caused by the very heavy program which every Member of the Senate has to deal with. There have been only a handful of Senators on the floor of the Senate available to listen to the arguments. There are some who think this is merely a controversy between the State of California and the State of Arizona. The able Senator from Nevada has made perfectly clear that that is not the case because there are other States which are directly involved in the question of water allocation. Far more important than the matter of water allocation so far as the Senate of the United States is concerned is the question, what will this bill do to the sound reclamation laws under which we have operated for a long period of time?

I have already mentioned the fact that the pending bill on its face throws the yardstick away. What do I mean by that? Under the present laws we have a yardstick, namely, that in order for a project to be feasible it must be possible that it be repaid in a period of 40 years, without interest so far as the irrigation features are concerned, and with interest so far as the power features are concerned. There is a 10-year period of grace allowed in the case of some proj-

ects, so that it may be said there is a period of from 40 to 50 years.

Mr. President, that means that there is a standard which applies not only to California, Arizona, Nevada, the Upper Basin States, and the Lower Basin States, but to every State which may have a project, so that it can be measured and it can be seen whether it is feasible or not.

Mr. President, what is the fact about the project we are considering? It tears up the yardstick. It throws it away. No longer is there a 40-year period, no longer is there a 50-year period, no longer is there a 60-year period, no longer is there a 65-year period, no longer is there a 70- or 75-year period. The decision is left entirely in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. The only limitation is that he himself must find that it does not exceed the useful life of the project. There have been Roman aqueducts which lasted for periods of hundreds of years, and Roman roads which have lasted for much longer periods of time. I believe that the bill leaves things so wide open that the Secretary of the Interior could set 100 years or 150 years, were he inclined to do so. Even by the admission of the proponents themselves, it will take at least a period of 75 years to repay the cost of this project. If there is any Senator in this Chamber so naive as to believe that once we destroy the yardstick, once we throw it away, we will be able to turn down other projects as uneconomical and as unsound from a fiscal point of view as this one, then let him stand up now, because any other project in any other State of the Union which is as unsound from a fiscal point of view, as unsound economically as this one can come in and under the old theory of the camel getting his nose under the tent, and say, "Why, you threw away the yardstick for the Arizona project. Now throw away the yardstick so far as we are concerned." How can we deny the same consideration of other States with projects of their own who want precisely the same terms and conditions as Arizona receives? Having taken that step, the Federal Treasury is opened to a vast log-rolling, pork-barrel type of situation. We will have opened the doors not to $1,250,000,000 in this project, but ultimately to billions upon billions of dollars which must be paid by the already overburdened taxpayers of the Government.

But that does not end the story, because once having given these terms and conditions to this one project in central Arizona, then how can we deny them to projects which are now under construction, and hold them to tougher terms? Are we going to require the great Boulder Canyon project to repay every dollar in principal, with interest at 3 percent if the same requirements are not attached to the project we are now considering and to other projects? How can we place a yardstick on projects which are now in building if we destroy the yardstick in the case of the project now under consideration?

Mr. President, $1,250,000,000 is a great deal of money. I submit that even though the argument is made that the terms of the initial part of this construction project are only $708,000,000, yet the terms of this authorization itself provide that once the Appropriations Committee has appropriated as much as $100 for the specific purpose of the central Arizona project, with its tunnels, then $500,000,000 becomes authorized without further authorization action by the Senate of the United States. So I submit again that it is a $1,250,000,000 authorization project.

Let us now consider a few comparative figures. If Senators will turn to page 1946 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday they will find that, in order to give the Senate some comparisons, I placed in the RECORD what the total authorizations for river and harbor development and for flood control are in a number of State groups.

Take the New England States, for example, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Altogether the total authorization for rivers and harbors and for flood control, general, is only $348,400,000, roughly one-quarter of what would be the cost of this one project in the State of Arizona.

Let us take the North Central States, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin. The total authorization for rivers and harbors and flood control, general, is $1,265,000,000. Almost precisely the same amount as is included in this one project in the State of Arizona.

Let us take the Middle Atlantic States of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. The total authorization for rivers and harbors and flood control, general, is $988,000,000, substantially less than the $1,250,000,000 of this one project in the State of Arizona.

Mr. President, that is a great deal of money. I am sorry that we do not have more time and a larger attendance on the floor of the Senate of the United States, so I could call to the attention of more Senators, and at greater length, some of the documents which I placed in the RECORD on February 8. Perhaps if any Senators have their copies of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS before them they will be interested, in the time before the vote, to look at some of the letters I placed in the RECORD. I shall briefly quote from a few of them. One is a letter written by Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army. I shall quote from it, but I am not taking what I quote out of context. It contains the general substance of his remarks. It appears on page 1651 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8. I read as follows:

> The legal and economic premises upon which the project as a whole is based appear to be open to serious question, particularly with respect to water rights and to the analysis of the economics of the works.

I shall now read from a letter written by Charles F. Brannan, under date of May 5, 1948, when he was Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture. The project was submitted to the Department, and this is what Mr. Brannan had to say in his letter, which appears on page 1652 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> We cannot help but feel that, in the long run, piecemeal planning and authorization of the basin program will be inefficient and wasteful.

I now read from a letter from the Federal Power Commission on the same question. The letter appears beginning on page 1652, and I read from page 1653 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

> The Commission staff believes that the Glen Canyon Reservoir project on the Colorado River upstream from the Bridge Canyon site should be initiated very soon after the Bridge Canyon Reservoir is constructed. This will be necessary to prolong the period of usefulness of the storage capacity at Bridge Canyon, which would otherwise probably be entirely filled with silt in from 40 to 50 years.

The testimony of the best experts of the Government indicates that the cost of the project cannot possibly pay out in 70 years, because the dam will be filled with silt in from 30 to 50 years. So, unless large works are built above this dam to guard it from accumulation of silt, the project cannot possibly be made to pay out on any sound economic basis.

I now wish to read from a couple of messages by the President of the United States. I am sorry there are not more Members of the Senate present on the Democratic side of the aisle. There are times when I do not agree with the President of the United States. But I think in these messages he sent to the Congress vetoing some bills which contained unsound proposals, he did state some good doctrine, which I should like to read.

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sorry, but——

Mr. WITHERS. I merely wish to ask the Senator the one question: How many Republican Senators are there present?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There are not as many present as I should like to see. I have already pointed that out. I am sorry that the full membership of the Senate, except those who are necessarily absent by reason of sickness, cannot be on the floor at this time.

This is what the President of the United States said in his message to the House of Representatives in returning House bill 3788:

> I wish also to point out to the Congress that H. R. 3788 deals with another issue which I believe should be first considered in basic law. I refer to the authorized period of repayment. There has been a tendency during our some 45 years of experience under the reclamation laws to increase the period of repayment of construction costs. Despite this trend I believe the matter of further extensions to periods greatly in excess of the 40 years (plus, in some cases, a 10-year development period) now generally authorized, is a matter of such vital concern to the Nation as a whole that it should be carefully reviewed as a principle of general application.

I believe the President of the United States is eminently sound in that position.

Now what has he done and what new factor has come into the picture since the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs acted? The President has appointed a water policy commission for the purpose of considering some of these facts, considering some of these yardsticks. I am entirely sympathetic with the point raised by some of my friends in other reclamation States that due to

increased costs, due to the fact that some of the easier projects have been built, it is no longer possible to keep them within a 40-year period. I personally would have no objection and would be inclined to favor any reasonable extension in such cases from 40 to 45 years, perhaps even to 50 years. There might be some conditions under which the period could be extended to 60 years, but if that were done it should be done by general legislation so we would still have a yardstick, and would not be destroying the yardstick, as we are proposing to do by the pending bill I am willing to support legislation of that kind. But I say that the pending proposal would be destructive of sound reclamation in the West and destructive of sound projects all over the country.

Mr President, my time is drawing to a close Despite the courtesy of my colleague from California, I wish to leave at least 5 minutes of time for him to conclude the remarks he began this morning and ably presented.

I pointed out to some Senators who were present a telegram which had been received by me from Mr Carlton L Nau, general manager of the American Public Power Association I shall not take the time to read the entire telegram, I shall read only section 3 of it.

(3) President's water resources policy commission is currently studying need for subsidies for irrigation, feasibility standards, relation between water and hydroelectric power, etc The bill should not be approved until commission has opportunity to study and report

I hold in my hand a letter addressed to Hon ALEXANDER WILEY, under date of February 21, 1950, from Mr J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel for the American Grange I read the last paragraph of that letter:

We are also opposed to authorizing the irrigation portion of the Bridge Canyon project because (1) it is reported that the actual cost of putting the irrigation water on the land would be over $1,700 per acre If this is true it is in violation of our policy as passed by the last annual session of the National Grange that we are opposed to "approving any project for expenditure of funds unless a sound appraisal shows benefits in excess of costs" This applies both to a project as a unit and any integral part of a project We are quite certain that the irrigation portion of this project does not meet this important policy of requiring that benefits from the proposed works must exceed the cost of them

Mr President, at this time, before yielding the floor, I wish to submit a motion, which I shall read

I move that the bill (S 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, be recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for further study and report.

Mr. President, I make that motion because I believe the proponents of the measure themselves admitted by their amendment, earlier today, in striking out the nonreimbursable features, that the bill had not been given the careful study it should have. The President's Policy Commission is to make a report. This bill does violate sound reclamation practice. I believe the proper way for us to proceed is to recommit the bill and await the report of the President's Policy Commission.

Mr. President, I submit the motion.

I yield now to my colleague the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator request the insertion in the RECORD of the letter and telegram to which he has previously referred?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; I do

The PRESIDING OFFICER Without objection, they will be printed at this point in the RECORD

The letter and telegram are as follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1950.

Hon ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C

DEAR SENATOR WILEY This letter is written in response to your telephone request for the views of the National Grange on the proposed Bridge Canyon project of the Colorado River

It is our judgment that the authorization of this project at the present time is unjustified for the following reasons

1 There is no other major watershed in the United States where the use of water for irrigation power and other purposes is as important to the welfare of the watershed as in the Colorado watershed As yet there hasn't even been a pretense of a careful overall study of the comparative economic uses of water of the Colorado River in all its possible alternative uses Until a careful study of the best potential use of the water resources of the river is made no one will be able to judge soundly and wisely on such piecemeal projects as is proposed for the Bridge Canyon Such a project if built, or if construction is begun, would establish irretrievable priority of water use that may or may not be the best possible use of the water From the evidence presented, the Bridge Canyon irrigation use appears to be indeed among the most wasteful of possible uses of the resources of the river

The National Grange at its last annual session stated that "We recognize the urgent need for coordinated development and use of resources on major watershed areas", and we recommended that a watershed board be set up for each major watershed to coordinate the watershed planning and development and thus forestall just such uncoordinated wasteful projects as the proposed irrigation portion of the Bridge Canyon project appears to be We therefore believe that this project should not be authorized until it can be adequately studied and fitted into its rightful position in an over-all watershed plan of development for the Colorado

2 We are also opposed to authorizing this project which involves the fixing of water usage rights between States that is still in bitter controversy In our 1948 annual session we passed a resolution opposing the assignment of the use of water in controversy between States until the dispute had been referred to the Federal courts and adjudicated by them In stating this we are aware of the amended provisions of the bill but fear that if the bill were passed appropriation might also be passed and irretrievable commitment of water might be made or wasteful construction might be started.

3 We are also opposed to authorizing the irrigation portion of the Bridge Canyon project because (1) it is reported that the actual cost of putting the irrigation water on the land would be over $1,700 per acre If this is true it is in violation of our policy as passed by the last annual session of the National Grange, that we are opposed to approving any project for expenditure of funds unless a sound appraisal shows benefits in excess of costs. This applies both to a project as a unit and any integral part of a project We are quite certain that the irrigation portion of this project does not meet this important policy of requiring that benefits from the proposed works must exceed the cost of them

We would like to see both new authorization and new construction of such major resources development be held to a minimum pending an effective balancing of the Federal budget and pending the development of an over-all plan of watershed development and administration that will prevent such uncoordinated authorization or commitments of vast sums as are involved in the Bridge Canyon project

Very sincerely yours,

J T SANDERS,
Legislative Counsel.

FEBRUARY 19, 1950

Hon WILLIAM F KNOWLAND

Respectfully urge recommittal to committee S 75, central Arizona project, for the following reasons

1. Colorado River is glaring example of lack of over-all coordinated planning for most effective use of resources of entire basin Its development as a whole should be carefully studied by an impartial board to assure most economical use of all its resources

2 Reclamation features of project contrary to power policy statement adopted by APPA Power rates overburdened with $400,000,000 capital irrigation investment which irrigators cannot pay Spending such vast sums to reclaim land to produce agricultural products which now are surplus is totally without economic justification

3 President's Water Resources Policy Commission is currently studying need for subsidies for irrigation, feasibility standards, relation between water and hydroelectric power, etc The bill should not be approved until Commission has opportunity to study and report

CARLTON L NAU,
General Manager, American Public Power Association

Mr DOWNEY Mr President, in the very brief time remaining to me, I wish first to reassert the accuracy and validity of the charts which are displayed in the Chamber When both the distinguished Senators from Arizona were on the floor, I challenged any Member of the Senate to question or deny the accuracy of these charts I agreed to yield from my own time to permit such objection to be made. So I think it would be unfortunate if, during the closing period, when there is no opportunity to reply, any attack were made upon the accuracy of these charts I say that particularly because there has been no argument here by any Senator, except by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr KERR], asserting the economic feasibility of this project.

I say in all kindness, because I have for the great Senator from Oklahoma deep respect and love, that he made several serious errors in his statement, three of them being of very great importance.

In the first place, the Senator from Oklahoma evidently is not aware that, under this grotesque plan, the interest upon the power investment does not go into the Treasury but goes to help finance the farms. The Senator from Oklahoma admitted his misunderstanding of that; and my statement is correct.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma assumed as the allocation for farm benefits, $272,000,000. He is wrong in that case by almost $150,000,000, because the Bureau of Reclamation allocated approximately $400,000,000, which, of course, includes the allocation for the power benefits to the farm enterprises. But the farm allocation is approximately $400,000,000.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma evidently did not realize the clear, unequivocal language of Senate bill 75 in providing, in the authorization of the additional tunnels, an additional threat of $550,000,000 against the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. President, I have no time to read into the RECORD at this point that provision of the bill, but I ask unanimous consent to have the appropriate provision, which I shall identify later, inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the portion of Senate bill 75 referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That construction of the tunnel and that portion of the canal hereinabove described from the reservoir above the dam at Bridge Canyon to a junction with the aqueduct hereinafter authorized shall be deferred until Congress by making appropriation expressly therefor has determined that economic conditions justify its construction, and in order to provide a means of diversion of water from the Colorado River to the main canal pending the construction of said tunnel and said portion of the canal and for use thereafter as supplemental and stand-by works the Secretary is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate from appropriations authorized by this act an aqueduct from Lake Havasu to and connecting with the main canal in the vicinity of Cunningham Wash, and pumping plants to raise water from Lake Havasu to such elevation as may be required to provide gravity flow of such water to the main canal.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, a difference as to facts has arisen on this floor before. I have asserted, and I now reassert, that under the pending proposal, the farmers of Arizona cannot build their own distributing system after the water is brought to them, water that is pumped 1,000 feet and carried across 300 miles of desert. They cannot even build their distributing system—the first time that has ever occurred in the history of reclamation, Mr. President. They cannot pay $1 upon either the principal or the interest of either the power or the farm benefits.

O Mr. President, we are told that large profits and great prosperity will come to Arizona if this project is constructed. Yet here is a bill under which the farmers of Arizona will pay not one cent upon any portion of the project, including the building of their own distributing system. The Senator from Arizona denied that. Let me explain what it is.

The Bureau of Reclamation estimated $4 50 per acre-foot to be the ultimate which could be paid by the farmers, and stated that that would not even provide for operation and maintenance. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have a statement on this matter printed at this point in the RECORD, inasmuch as there is not sufficient time for me to read it to the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL ARIZONA IRRIGATION PROJECT—REVENUE FROM SALES OF IRRIGATION WATER COMPARED TO OPERATING EXPENSES

Paragraph (3), page F-24, of Report on Central Arizona Project, Appendixes, December 1947:

"(3) Project returns: Revenues accruing to the project are derived from the sale of irrigation water, municipal water, and electric energy. Irrigation returns are based on an average delivery to the farm head gates of 636,000 acre-feet annually during the 50-year repayment period It has been determined by various economic studies described in appendix C of this report that $4 50 an acre-foot represents the practical limit of the farmer's payment ability."

Annual revenue: 636,000 acre-feet, at $4.50, makes the annual revenue from the sale of irrigation water	$2, 862, 000
Annual expenses: Annual irrigation, operation, and maintenance expenses, and reserve for replacements (table F-8, pp. 209-210 of H. Doc No. 136, central Arizona project)	3, 104, 000
Deficit of revenues to meet annual expenses	242, 000

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona takes the figure of $4 75, instead of $4.50, as the correct figure for operation and maintenance; and he says the extra 25 cents an acre-foot will go for the payment of the capital or interest of this project. Mr. President, that 25 cents an acre-foot, even if it should ever eventuate—and the statement of the Bureau of Reclamation does not show that it will, for the Bureau fixes $4 50 as the ultimate capacity of the farmers to pay—will not make even a dent in the huge hundreds of millions of dollars and billions of dollars with which we are dealing in connection with this matter.

Mr President, in conclusion, let me say that the Senate will do itself no good by placing the seal of its approval upon an extravagant, wasteful project in this fateful period

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, no issue presented to the Senate in a long time has been so thoroughly debated as has this one. It certainly places a great many Members of the Senate in a very difficult position, to have to decide between the arguments of the distinguished and able Senators from California and the arguments of the equally distinguished and able Senators from the great State of Arizona. I know that many Members of the Senate would like to be able to agree with the position of both the Senator from Arizona and the Senators from California, but, of course, that is not possible.

So, in a situation such as this, we can only try to consider the project and the debate on it from the viewpoint of what, in the long run, will be in the best interests of the country.

I am glad to have these very few minutes to explain the reasons why I feel compelled to vote for approval of this project.

In the first place, Mr. President, all of us are agreed upon the fact that the only way the United States can progress in these critical times, can pay something on the great national debt, and can keep an increasing population employed, is by the correct and scientific development and use of our natural resources. So, in connection with the Bridge Canyon Dam, there seems to be no question that the dam is a correct development of the water of the Colorado River at that point. I have a feeling that we ought to be making plans—as indeed we are—for the development and use of all our falling waters; I believe that is one of the greatest assets the Nation has.

The Bridge Canyon Dam does require a great deal of the money to be authorized under this measure; and as to that there is no question.

The second proposal, and, of course, the one that it bitterly contested, is that dealing with reclamation and the use of water in the State of Arizona.

In the first place, however desirable it may be for the development of Arizona and for the people of Arizona, they do not have a right to this water if there is a Supreme Court decision to the contrary. So the question as to the right to the water will have to be determined; and it cannot be determined, as I understand the matter, unless there is a justiciable case before the Supreme Court. So provision is made for that.

The next consideration is this: If Arizona should be determined by the Supreme Court to be entitled to the use of this water, then I think all of us agree that the 200,000 people of Arizona and the great amount of acreage in Arizona should have water from somewhere I have not heard any Member of the Senate explain where else the necessary water for them will be obtained, unless from this project.

Mr. President, I concede that the cost figures, as presented by the charts which are now displayed in this Chamber, and which are uncontroverted—although we may reach different conclusions from them—seem to be high. Yet, as I have listened to the argument and as I have read portions of the hearings, it seems to be fairly well substantiated that the annual benefits will exceed the annual cost; I believe the ratio set forth is 1.63 to 1. So the project is feasible, even though it will take a long period of time to pay for itself.

But, Mr. President, what if the project is not carried forward? What if the people of Arizona, if it is decided that they are entitled to the water, are not furnished the water? I think we should consider what would happen then.

It seems to be to be uncontroverted that approximately 200,000 people are very vitally affected, that many of them

will have to leave the State of Arizona for economic reasons, and many of them will be unable to carry on and support themselves there, unless this water is furnished to them. So, Mr. President, there will be a direct benefit to the Federal Government, by virtue of the fact that those people will be able to sustain themselves and to contribute to the economy of the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield one more minute to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for one more minute.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, one of the great benefits flowing from projects of this kind is the increased purchasing power of the people, the increased income taxes they pay. It has been shown on the chart which is displayed before us that this project will cost the taxpayers of other States large amounts of money.

Of course, Mr. President, any great project is a burden, in the beginning, on the taxpayers of other States; but it should be borne in mind that the people who will be benefited will be able to make an additional, a larger, contribution to the tax income, and they will purchase farm equipment and farming implements and other things which will add to the economy of the people in other States of the Union. So there are great indirect benefits from having the people immediately affected in a better economic condition and in using the land in the State of Arizona.

Mr. President, it has been stated here that, as to cotton and certain other crops which would be raised to a larger extent if the land were developed, we already have surpluses in those commodities, and that we do not need larger production.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield the Senator one more minute.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on that basis, our whole conservation and agricultural program would stand condemned, because that has been the purpose of the improvement of our soil, and, in an expanding economy, I think it highly necessary that we bring into useful production, through reclamation and irrigation projects, all the land we can, and that it is a part of the healthful development of this great country. So, with all due deference to the splendid attitude the opponents of the project have always manifested toward such a project, and recognizing the enlightened public attitude they have taken, I feel that for these reasons I shall be compelled to vote for the pending measure.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senators from California have freely asserted that if this bill should pass both branches of the Congress that the President will be sure to veto it. With that assertion I most respectfully disagree. I base my judgment as to what he will do upon what the President said at Phoenix, Ariz., on September 24, 1948:

> The harnessing of the Colorado River for beneficial uses is a dramatic thing as well as a matter of good business. It's the kind of empire building I like. I want to see the day when all the waters of that mighty river will be put to their best possible use.
>
> Today half of the water that could be supplied by the Colorado River system is still flowing down to the sea without being used. That water ought to be put on the land and used to turn out power. That's where it is needed for homes and crops and industry.
>
> The big problem, of course, is to settle the division of the waters among the States of the Colorado River Basin, since there is not enough to meet all needs. The upper-basin States have recently arrived at a basic agreement, which I hope will soon be translated into a working compact.
>
> The question of the water rights of the lower-basin States is a tough one and involves many complex problems.
>
> This is of tremendous importance in Arizona, because your population and your industry and agriculture have advanced more rapidly than water resources have been made available to sustain them. The lack of water is the limiting factor in your development right now. And in order to plan intelligently for the future you need to know how much water you can count on.
>
> The Secretary of the Interior has just sent to the Congress a detailed report on a vast project for bringing water to central Arizona. He has found that investigations made over a period of years show this project to be economically feasible But it depends on taking a lot of water from the Colorado. And the Secretary pointed out that Arizona's right to take this water from the Colorado River is challenged by her sister States. His recommendation for favorable consideration of the project was therefore conditioned upon Arizona's claims to the water being substantiated.

Harry Truman, as the Indians say, does not speak with a forked tongue. This bill, S. 75, does just what he asked to have done when he spoke in Phoenix. As reported to the Senate, with the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment, it provides a way for a final determination by the Supreme Court as to whether Arizona's claim to water from the Colorado River can be substantiated If that Court decides against Arizona, then the central Arizona project will not be economically feasible and will not be built. We, in Arizona, are willing to do just what the President suggested and take our chances on the result of a Supreme Court decision.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I wish to discuss some of the special interests of the State of Colorado in the pending matter.

Colorado furnishes about 70 percent of the water in the river at Lee Ferry, the dividing point between the upper basin and the lower basin, and 64 percent of the water in the river at the Mexican boundary.

Colorado development, prosperity, and welfare depend upon the beneficial consumptive use of that share of the water of the Colorado River available to Colorado under the 1922 Colorado River compact and the 1949 upper Colorado River compact.

The protection of Colorado's interest in the Colorado River requires that the documents which constitute the law of the river be given full validity and be construed and applied in accordance with their true spirit and intent. The documents constituting the law of the river are:

First. Colorado River compact of 1922.

Second. The Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928.

Third. The California Self-Limitation Act of 1929.

Fourth. The Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940.

Fifth. The United States-Mexico water treaty of 1944.

Sixth. The upper Colorado River compact of 1949.

The long standing quarrel between California and Arizona is a serious impediment to the necessary and orderly development of the Colorado River Basin, in which every State in that basin has a most important interest. The issues involve the integrity and the application of the documents involving the law of the river. For example, there are two points in conflict between California and Arizona, which are of vital interest to the upper-basin States. These are, first, the method of measuring consumptive use of water, and, second, the method of charging reservoir evaporation losses.

Senate bill 75, authorizing the central Arizona project, affords a workable method for composing the vexatious disputes which concern the construction and application of the documents which constitute the law of the river.

It appears that, for any Supreme Court litigation to determine effectively the rights to the use of Colorado River water, the United States is a necessary party. The bill as amended in committee gives the consent of the United States to its joinder in such an action to determine the right to the use of Colorado River water under the documents constituting the law of the river.

In my judgment, the effect of several of the California amendments would make it impossible for the Supreme Court to take jurisdiction because there would not be a justiciable controversy.

I wish to add one more comment. It seems to me the Congress, at every stage of the matter, will be in complete control of the situation. It can handle itself according to the economic condition of the country. It can handle itself according to the decision of the Supreme Court. This is a practical method of bringing to the Supreme Court, and ending for all time to come, these vexatious disputes which have kept the river basin in a state of turmoil, and have made uncertain the proper development of that great stream.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in the few minutes that I have remaining in which to sum up the arguments that have been presented in behalf of the project, I may say I am not unmindful of the great responsibility resting upon me. Our State has a long history of irrigation. As has been pointed out, a prehistoric people with their own hands dug canals and developed irrigation systems. The water shortage forced them to leave the State. Our modern-day irri-

gation system dates from the 1860's. To be exact, construction on the first canal was begun in 1867. With horse-drawn machinery and their bare hands these pioneer citizens again began the building of what is now an agricultural empire. There is not time this afternoon to outline that history. I mention it only because I feel that the Senate must recognize the importance of the project to the people of the State of Arizona.

There is now in cultivation in central Arizona, and there will be affected by the project, some 725,000 acres, practically all of which will receive supplemental water. The controversy in regard to Colorado River water has been long drawn out. In the meantime, over a period of 20 years, we have overdeveloped by borrowing from our underground water supply at the rate of more than 468,000 acre-feet per year, according to the Bureau of Reclamation. In the end this will spell disaster to the people of the State of Arizona. However, this will not recur in the future since the State of Arizona has adopted an underground water code which prevents overpumping. There is no salvation except the authorization of this project.

I appreciate the fact that the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] have afforded us the means of fighting this out in the courts. We have tried to get into court on several occasions. At every step of the road we were faced with opposition from California. For the first time, on the last day of the hearings on Senate bill 75, the opponents filed a resolution authorizing litigation. They wanted to defeat the pending bill. They wanted to delay the project, while we went into court again. But the Supreme Court has said on several occasions, "There does not exist a justiciable issue, because there is not a project which is threatening the interest of the State of California." That is what the Court said in the past. I personally feel that we should not be required again to go into court, but the opposition wanted to litigate. We are now willing to litigate. Are they? No.

Now they come before the Senate of the United States and argue, "This is a costly project."

Mr. President, I want to say a word in regard to the amendments. The amendments which have been offered are crippling amendments, pure and simple, designed to defeat this bill and this project. I hope the Senate will vote them down. Time does not permit a detailed discussion of them, but I want the Senate to know that the committee, composed largely of Senators learned in irrigation law, and other Senators familiar with irrigation problems generally considered every phase of the project, including everything proposed in the amendments, and favorably reported the bill with amendments. Last night, at the last minute, 11 amendments were submitted for the first time. They have been analyzed by representatives of the upper-basin States. In the analysis, which I have on my desk and which I have not time to read here, the representatives of the upper-basin States have said that these amendments are crippling amendments, designed to defeat the bill. I think the Senate will agree that the bill should be voted up or down on its merits, and not killed indirectly by crippling amendments. In all 28 amendments have been submitted for this purpose. That is not a fair or proper way to do business.

The opponents of the project talk much about the cost and call it "a fantastic project." But it is their figures which are fantastic. The Bureau of Reclamation has made a report showing that the project is feasible if water is available. The Bureau's engineers have reported that the benefits are 1.63 to 1. The choice before us is: Shall we accept the arguments of those who are opposing this project and who would oppose any project? If we were to follow their own statements, there is not a single feasible project in the Colorado River Basin. Are we going to stop development on the Colorado River? Are we going to allow 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 acre-feet of water to run wastefully into the ocean? I hope the Senate will not approve that kind of inconsistency this afternoon.

We have heard much about the costs. But we have eliminated the nonreimbursable cost to the point where there is approximately only $9,000,000 left in such nonreimbursable items. The basic law itself authorizes for such items. The opponents like to talk about the Boulder Canyon Project Act. It provided $25,000,000 for nonreimbursable cost. That money went to subsidize the power interests of Southern California, according to the testimony before the committee. That is the situation as we find it.

Our Arizona people have testified they are able to pay $4.75 an acre-foot for water. The Reclamation Bureau has found such a sum can be paid. According to the testimony of Mr. Vaud Larson, representing the Bureau of Reclamation, that sum would pay not only the operation and maintenance cost, but a part of the construction cost. Compared with the rate in other States, the power rate is fair and reasonable. It provides a subsidy of only 0.72 of a mill as compared with 0.68 of a mill for the Central Valley of California project. That subsidy rate is less than the Big Thompson project in Colorado, which is 0.89 of a mill. It is far, far less than the amount provided for in the Missouri Valley project, where it is 2.47 mills. These figures demonstrate, I believe, that this project will pay out; and the Bureau of Reclamation figures prove it, as their own report shows.

It is true, Mr. President, that we shall not pay interest on the irrigation features of the project. These controversial features amount to approximately $267,000,000. But no other irrigation project in the Nation is compelled to pay interest on the irrigation features. That is our national policy. The flood-control people get their money for nothing, and I am glad of that. I have voted for such a policy and shall continue to vote for it.

I invite attention to the fact that of all the reclamation projects authorized in the entire United States, the great State of California gets 22 percent of the total. I do not regret that. I am willing to help the State of California or any other State. We are not as large as California and we gratefully accept our smaller share of the funds that are made available for reclamation purposes. That is all we are asking for now.

Mr. President, what is this argument all about? It has become abundantly clear during the course of this debate. It is simply a question of whether Southern California power users shall receive cheaper power or whether the people of Arizona will be able to survive. If proof was needed, it was revealed this afternoon by the introduction of a power company telegram. They admit they are willing to construct the power end of the project. They say, "Just take the irrigation off, and we are willing to let it go. Let our power users in California have cheaper power."

It has not been denied, and cannot be denied, that unless the East and West Mesa projects in the Imperial Valley are developed, California does not need and cannot use a single drop of additional water beyond its own self-limitation act. Yet these are the very projects which California's own university says are uneconomic, have not soil fit for agricultural development, and should not be developed. In fact, the Secretary of the Interior has held in the Bureau's feasibility report, based on the land classification of California's own university, that these lands are not irrigable, and, therefore, he will not permit their irrigation.

That is the situation. Are we going to save Arizona from disaster? It has been estimated that up to 250,000 American citizens will be made displaced persons if this project is not authorized. We have built up an agricultural empire in Arizona. Our people depend upon an agricultural economy. It has been pioneered by men like the father of my colleague [Mr. HAYDEN]—men who went out there and, with their bare hands, through toil and sweat, cleared the fields.

Mr. President, this is one of the soundest projects ever reported for Senate approval. There is no reason for all the propaganda and argument against it, except to give California industrial interests cheaper power which would allow the water to flow on down to Mexico as it is doing now. That is the issue before the Senate today.

Let me say again, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who are acknowledged authorities in this field and unbiased in this matter, have presented a solution. They have heard the testimony and have read the record, which has been long and voluminous. They are impartial. They want to see each State receive what it is entitled to. The amendments which have been submitted by them afford that opportunity. I know of no better lawyers in the United States Senate, or in the United States, for that matter, than these able Senators. I would take their judgment on any matter concerning irrigation law because they have made a life-long study of it. I hope the Senate will vote in accordance with the recommendation of these eminent Senators.

This is the only way we have of ever settling this problem because, unless this

project is authorized, there would not be a justiciable issue. That is all there is to it—a justiciable issue.

All we are asking for here this afternoon is an opportunity to have this controversy finally settled judicially. That is the issue; there is no other. I feel certain that the people of California as a whole, apart from those who have special interests, would join us in this endeavor. It is to mutual welfare of both Arizona and California—and to the United States as a whole—that we all get together in the interest of irrigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Butler	Holland	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Murray
Cain	Ives	Neely
Capehart	Jenner	O'Conor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Darby	Kem	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Leahy	Taft
Ecton	Lehman	Taylor
Ellender	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	Lucas	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Wherry
Gillette	McFarland	Wiley
Graham	McKellar	Williams
Green	McMahon	Withers
Gurney	Magnuson	
Hayden	Malone	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. Under the unanimous consent agreement debate is concluded, and the Senate will proceed to vote now on all amendments and motions, and the final passage of the bill.

There are a number of amendments which have been printed and are lying on the table. Several of them are to committee amendments, and they will have to be considered first, as the committee amendments will first be disposed of. There are other amendments to different portions of the bill.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has made a motion to recommit the bill, and that takes precedence of all amendments, and will be voted on first.

The question now is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORDON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withold my vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is absent on public business. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], who is absent on public business, would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate, and his pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has been announced previously.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—30

Aiken	Flanders	O'Conor
Brewster	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Cain	Kem	Taft
Donnell	Knowland	Tobey
Douglas	Lodge	Tydings
Downey	Malone	Wherry
Dworshak	Martin	Wiley
Ferguson	Mundt	Williams

NAYS—56

Benton	Hoey	McKellar
Butler	Holland	McMahon
Capehart	Hunt	Magnuson
Chapman	Jenner	Maybank
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Connally	Johnson, Tex	Morse
Darby	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Eastland	Kefauver	Neely
Ecton	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kilgore	Russell
Frear	Langer	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Leahy	Sparkman
George	Lehman	Stennis
Gillette	Long	Taylor
Graham	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Green	McCarran	Thye
Gurney	McCarthy	Watkins
Hayden	McClellan	Withers
Hill	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—10

Anderson	Myers	Vandenberg
Bridges	Pepper	Young
Cordon	Robertson	
Humphrey	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to recommit was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will not entertain the different amendments which have been submitted unless the sponsors of the amendments rise and offer them. The Chair is advised that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has an amendment to a committee amendment which is now pending, and which will be stated. The amendment was submitted by the junior Senator from California on behalf of himself and his colleague [Mr. DOWNEY].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 25, in the committee amendment, after the colon, it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided, however,* That the construction of Bridge Canyon Dam and of works for the utilization of the waters of the main stream of the Colorado River, herein authorized, shall not be commenced unless and until the Congress shall have authorized the construction of reservoir capacity in the upper basin of the Colorado River in a total amount which the Secretary of the Interior shall find to be adequate to assure, by the control of silt, a useful life for the Bridge Canyon Reservoir not less than the repayment period, and to assure river regulation required for the production of firm power during such repayment period in the annual quantities contemplated by the report of the Department of the Interior on the central Arizona project contained in House Document No. 136, Eighty-first Congress, first session."

Mr. KNOWLAND. On that amendment, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. As I understand, the vote is on the amendment heretofore offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] for himself and his colleague, to the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORDON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is absent on public business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate, and his pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has been announced previously.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official busi-

ness and is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—29

Brewster	Hendrickson	O'Conor
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Butler	Ives	Smith, N J.
Byrd	Kem	Taft
Cain	Knowland	Tobey
Douglas	Lodge	Tydings
Downey	McCarran	Wherry
Ferguson	McClellan	Wiley
Flanders	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Martin	

NAYS—56

Aiken	Hill	McMahon
Benton	Hoey	Magnuson
Capehart	Holland	Maybank
Chapman	Hunt	Millikin
Chavez	Jenner	Morse
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Darby	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Dworshak	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kerr	Russell
Ecton	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Ellender	Langer	Sparkman
Frear	Leahy	Stennis
Fulbright	Lehman	Taylor
George	Long	Thomas, Utah
Graham	Lucas	Thye
Green	McCarthy	Watkins
Gurney	McFarland	Withers
Hayden	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Myers	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Pepper	Vandenberg
Cordon	Robertson	Young
Humphrey	Saltonstall	

So the amendment offered by Mr. KNOWLAND, for himself and Mr. DOWNEY, to the committee amendment, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was on page 3, line 20, after the colon to strike out "Provided, however," and insert "*Provided*, That this authorization shall not include (a) any works, dams, or reservoir at the Glen Canyon site or any other site in the Upper Colorado River Basin, or (b) any dam, reservoir, or works in the Lower Colorado River Basin which would flood the Glen Canyon site; *Provided further*."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, is the vote on the first committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. Without objection, the first committee amendment is agreed to.

The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The next committee amendment was on page 9, after line 11, to strike out section 12, as follows:

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment proposed by my colleague [Mr. DOWNEY] for himself and for the junior Senator from California, No. 12.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, it is proposed to restore the matter proposed to be stricken out in lines 12 through 15, and to insert at the end of line 15 the following:

Before any money is appropriated for the construction of any works authorized by this act, or any construction work done or contracted for, the Secretary of the Interior shall make provision for revenues by contract, in accordance with the provisions of this act, adequate in his judgment to insure payment of all expenses of operation, maintenance, and replacements of said works and (a) the repayment of construction costs allocated to power, with interest thereon at not less than 2 percent per annum from the date of expenditure, within 50 years from the date when electric energy is first ready for delivery from the Bridge Canyon power plant, and (b) the repayment of construction costs allocated to irrigation, without interest, within 60 years from the date of completion of the main irrigation works, and (c) the repayment of construction costs allocated to water supply for municipal and domestic purposes, with interest thereon at not less than 2 percent per annum from the date of expenditure, within 50 years from the date when water is first delivered for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the amount to be repaid in net revenues from the delivery of water for irrigation purposes shall be not less than the cost of the irrigation distribution system and drainage system to be constructed under this act, and in addition thereto 25 percent of the other estimated costs allocated to irrigation."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr KNOWLAND] for himself and his colleague [Mr. DOWNEY] to the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate. If he were present and voting, I am advised that he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is absent on public business. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—31

Aiken	Ferguson	McCarran
Brewster	Flanders	Malone
Bricker	Frear	Martin
Butler	Gillette	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Hendrickson	Taft
Cain	Hickenlooper	Tobey
Capehart	Ives	Wherry
Douglas	Jenner	Wiley
Downey	Kem	Williams
Dworshak	Knowland	
Ecton	Lodge	

NAYS—54

Benton	Johnson, Colo	Millikin
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Connally	Kefauver	Murray
Cordon	Kerr	Neely
Darby	Kilgore	O'Conor
Donnell	Langer	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Leahy	Russell
Ellender	Lehman	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Long	Smith, N J
Graham	Lucas	Sparkman
Green	McCarthy	Stennis
Gurney	McClellan	Taylor
Hayden	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Hill	McKellar	Thye
Hoey	McMahon	Tydings
Holland	Magnuson	Watkins
Hunt	Maybank	Withers

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Myers	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Pepper	Vandenberg
George	Robertson	Young
Humphrey	Saltonstall	

So the amendment offered by Mr. KNOWLAND, for himself and Mr. DOWNEY, to the committee amendment, was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there is another amendment to the committee amendment—No. 13, offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and myself. I ask that it be read at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair advises the Senator that the amendment comes to a section of the bill other than the one affected by this committee amendment. The amendment to which the Senator refers relates to a renumbered section.

The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, after line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 9, beginning in line 16, to insert a new section 12, as follows:

SEC. 12. If any State or States within 6 months after the effective date of this act shall begin a suit or suits in the Supreme Court of the United States to determine the right to the user of water for diversion from the main stream of the Colorado River

through aqueducts or tunnels to be constructed pursuant to this act for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona, and to adjudicate claims of right asserted by such State or States or by any other State or States, under the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the California Self-Limitation Act (Cal. Stat. 1929, ch. 16), and the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), consent is hereby given to the joinder of the United States of America as a party in such action or actions. Any State of the Colorado River Basin may intervene or be impleaded in such suit or suits. Any such claims of right affected by the project herein authorized and asserted by any defendant State, impleaded State, or intervening State under said compact and statutes, or by the United States may be adjudicated in such action. In any such suit or suits process directed against the United States shall be served upon the Attorney General of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is any amendment proposed to the committee amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 13, to insert a new section 13, as follows:

SEC. 13. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That no moneys appropriated under the authority of this act shall be expended for the construction of works authorized by this act which are required solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona, during the period of 6 months after the enactment of this act and during the pendency of any suit or suits in which the United States shall be joined as a party under and by virtue of the consent granted in section 12 of this act. The pendency of a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint shall be considered pendency of a suit or suits for the purposes of this act: *Provided further*, That power sales contracts shall be made with a view to the reservation of generating capacity sufficient for the operation of all features of the project and that rates for power shall be fixed in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws; and that revenues derived from the sale of power shall be credited in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 291, 318).

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I call up our amendment No. 13, which is offered on behalf of the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, beginning with line 16, it is proposed to strike out all through the colon in line 4, page 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 13. Consent is hereby given to the joinder of the United States of America as a party in any suit or suits, which any State of the lower basin of the Colorado River as that basin is defined in the Colorado River compact may move for leave to file in the Supreme Court of the United States within 6 months from the effective date of this act for the adjudication of claims of right asserted by such State, by any other State, or by the United States, with respect to the waters of the Colorado River system as defined in said compact In any such suit or suits, process directed against the United States shall be served upon the Attorney General of the United States.

SEC. 14 No authority shall be exercised hereunder and no work shall be commenced and no moneys appropriated or expended on or in connection with the works or structures provided for herein which are required for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona unless and until the right of the State of Arizona to take and use 1,200,000 acre-feet of water per annum from the main stream of the Colorado River by means of said works or structures shall have been determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, and if the Supreme Court does not determine that the State of Arizona is entitled to so take and use said quantity, the authorization for the construction of said works shall cease

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senators from California to the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORDON (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is absent on public business. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate, and his pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has been announced previously.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—27

Brewster	Ferguson	Malone
Bricker	Hendrickson	Martin
Butler	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	Smith, Maine
Cain	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Lodge	Taft
Douglas	McCarran	Wherry
Downey	McCarthy	Wiley
Dworshak	McClellan	Williams

NAYS—58

Aiken	Hoey	Maybank
Benton	Holland	Millikin
Capehart	Hunt	Morse
Chapman	Jenner	Mundt
Chavez	Johnson, Colo	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Darby	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kefauver	Russell
Ecton	Kem	Schoeppel
Ellender	Kerr	Sparkman
Flanders	Kilgore	Stennis
Frear	Langer	Taylor
Fulbright	Leahy	Thomas, Utah
George	Lehman	Thye
Gillette	Long	Tobey
Graham	Lucas	Tydings
Green	McFarland	Watkins
Gurney	McKellar	Withers
Hayden	McMahon	
Hill	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Myers	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Pepper	Vandenberg
Cordon	Robertson	Young
Humphrey	Saltonstall	

So the amendment offered by Mr. KNOWLAND, for himself and Mr. DOWNEY, to the committee amendment, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, after line 13.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment is the one on page 11, after line 11, inserting section 14, as amended by the amendments heretofore proposed by Mr. MCFARLAND.

Without objection, the amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, is as follows:

SEC. 14. (a) In aid of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the works authorized by this act, there is hereby granted to the United States, subject to the provisions of this section, (1) all the right, title, and interest of the Indians in and to such tribal and allotted lands, including sites of agency and school buildings and related structures, as may be designated from time to time by the Secretary in order to provide for the construction, operation, or maintenance of said works and any facilities incidental thereto, or for the relocation or reconstruction of highways, railroads, and other properties affected by said works; and (2) such easements, rights-of-way, or other interest in and to tribal and allotted Indian lands as may be designated from time to time by the Secretary in order to provide for the construction, operation, maintenance, relocation, or reconstruction of said works, facilities, and properties: *Provided*, That before designating any tribal lands, or any easements, rights-of-way, or other interests in tribal lands, the Secretary shall make every reasonable effort to negotiate a contract for the purchase of such lands or interests on reasonable terms from the tribe of Indians concerned, and that the Secretary shall proceed with the designation of lands or interests under this section only if he finds that reasonable efforts to negotiate

with the tribe of Indians concerned have been made, but have not resulted in, and are not apt to result in, a mutually satisfactory agreement. The Secretary is authorized to provide in any such contract for the payment of compensation in the same forms through which compensation may be made pursuant to a designation under this section, and any tribe of Indians entering into such a contract is authorized to execute the conveyances or other instruments needed for its effectuation, notwithstanding any provision of law or of any tribal constitution or charter to the contrary.

(b) As lands or interests in lands are designated from time to time under this section, the Secretary shall determine the just and equitable compensation to be made therefor. Such compensation may be in money, property, or other assets, including rights to electric energy developed at any of the generating plants herein authorized. In fixing such rights to electric energy, including the rates and other incidents thereof, the Secretary shall not be bound by section 4 of this act. Any Indian tribe or individual Indian owning lands or interests designated under this section who is dissatisfied with the determination of compensation made by the Secretary shall have a right of action against the United States to recover such additional sums of money, if any, as may be requisite under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or under any treaty or agreement made by the United States, to provide just and equitable compensation for the taking of the lands so designated. Such action may be instituted in the United States district court for the district where the lands or interests are situated or in the Court of Claims, at the election of the plaintiff. The amounts of money determined as compensation hereunder for tribal lands shall be transferred in the Treasury of the United States from funds made available for the purposes of this act to the credit of the appropriate tribe pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560). The amounts due individual allottees or their heirs or devisees shall be paid from funds made available for the purposes of this act to the superintendent of the appropriate Indian agency, or such other officer as shall be designated by the Secretary, for credit on the books of such agency to the accounts of the individuals concerned.

(c) Funds deposited to the credit of allottees, their heirs or devisees, may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary, for the acquisition of other lands and improvements, or the relocation of existing improvements or the construction of new improvements on the lands so acquired for the individuals whose lands and improvements are acquired under the provisions of this section. Lands so acquired shall be held in the same status as those from which the funds were derived, and shall be nontaxable until otherwise provided by Congress.

(d) Whenever any Indian cemetery lands are required for the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, in lieu of requiring payment therefor, to establish cemeteries on other lands that he may select and acquire for the purpose, and to remove bodies, markers, and appurtenances to the new sites. All costs incurred in connection with any such relocation shall be paid from moneys appropriated for the purposes of this act. All right, title, and interest of the Indians in the lands within any cemetery so relocated shall terminate and the grant of title under this section take effect as of the date the Secretary authorizes the relocation. Sites of the relocated cemeteries shall be held in trust by the United States for the appropriate tribe, or family, as the case may be, and shall be nontaxable.

(e) The Secretary is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to prescribe such regulations as he may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section.

(f) Nothing in this act shall be construed as, or have the effect of, subjecting Indian water rights to the laws of any State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I call up at this time amendment No. 7, offered by my colleague [Mr. DOWNEY] and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 18, it is proposed to change the semicolon to a colon and insert: "*Provided*, That unless the Secretary determines that the net revenues from the delivery of water for irrigation purposes will be at least sufficient to return to the United States the cost of the irrigation distribution system and drainage system to be constructed under this act, and in addition thereto 25 percent of the other estimated costs which can properly be allocated to irrigation, then the irrigation works authorized in this act shall not be constructed."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for himself and his colleague [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is absent on public business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay." and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—28

Aiken	Flanders	Martin
Brewster	Frear	O'Conor
Bricker	Hendrickson	Taft
Butler	Hickenlooper	Tobey
Byrd	Ives	Tydings
Cain	Kem	Wherry
Capehart	Knowland	Wiley
Douglas	Lodge	Williams
Downey	McCarran	
Ferguson	Malone	

NAYS—58

Benton	Holland	Maybank
Chapman	Hunt	Millikin
Chavez	Jenner	Morse
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Darby	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Donnell	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Dworshak	Kerr	Russell
Eastland	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Ecton	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Lehman	Sparkman
George	Long	Stennis
Gillette	Lucas	Taylor
Graham	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Green	McClellan	Thye
Gurney	McFarland	Watkins
Hayden	McKellar	Withers
Hill	McMahon	
Hoey	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—10

Anderson	Pepper	Vandenberg
Bridges	Robertson	Young
Humphrey	Saltonstall	
Myers	Thomas, Okla	

So Mr. KNOWLAND'S amendment, on behalf of himself and Mr. DOWNEY, was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send forward the last amendment which I intend to offer, which is numbered 9, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 7, beginning with the colon, it is proposed to strike out all through line 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "as provided in this act: *Provided*, That the repayment period for costs allocated to power shall not exceed 50 years from the date when electric energy is first ready for delivery from the Bridge Canyon power plant: *Provided further*, That the repayment period for costs allocated to irrigation shall not exceed 60 years from the date of completion of the main irrigation works: *Provided further*, That the repayment period for costs allocated to water supply for municipal and domestic purposes shall not exceed 50 years from the date when water is first delivered for such purposes."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] who is absent on public business. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr.

HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business, and is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—31

Aiken	Ferguson	Malone
Brewster	Flanders	Martin
Bricker	Gillette	Mundt
Butler	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Taft
Cain	Ives	Tobey
Capehart	Kem	Wiley
Douglas	Knowland	Williams
Downey	Lodge	Wherry
Dworshak	McCarran	
Ecton	McClellan	

NAYS—54

Benton	Hunt	Maybank
Chapman	Jenner	Millikin
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Connally	Johnson, Tex	Murray
Cordon	Johnston, S C	Neely
Darby	Kefauver	O'Conor
Donnell	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kilgore	Russell
Ellender	Langer	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Leahy	Smith, N J.
George	Lehman	Sparkman
Graham	Long	Stennis
Green	Lucas	Taylor
Gurney	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McFarland	Thye
Hill	McKellar	Tydings
Hoey	McMahon	Watkins
Holland	Magnuson	Withers

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Myers	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Pepper	Vandenberg
Frear	Robertson	Young
Humphrey	Saltonstall	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORDON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] who is absent by leave of the Senate. If present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is absent on public business. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], who is absent on public business. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate and his pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has been announced previously.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—55

Benton	Hunt	Magnuson
Butler	Jenner	Maybank
Capehart	Johnson, Colo	Millikin
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Chavez	Johnston, S. C	Mundt
Connally	Kefauver	Murray
Darby	Kerr	Neely
Eastland	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Ecton	Langer	Russell
Ellender	Leahy	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Lehman	Sparkman
Gillette	Long	Stennis
Graham	Lucas	Taylor
Green	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Gurney	McCarthy	Thye
Hayden	McClellan	Watkins
Hill	McFarland	Withers
Hoey	McKellar	
Holland	McMahon	

NAYS—28

Aiken	Flanders	Smith, Maine
Brewster	Hendrickson	Smith, N. J.
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Taft
Byrd	Ives	Tobey
Cain	Kem	Tydings
Donnell	Knowland	Wherry
Douglas	Lodge	Wiley
Downey	Malone	Williams
Dworshak	Martin	
Ferguson	O'Conor	

NOT VOTING—13

Anderson	Humphrey	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Myers	Vandenberg
Cordon	Pepper	Young
Frear	Robertson	
George	Saltonstall	

So the bill (S. 75) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 204. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche;

S 229. An act for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.;

S. 309. An act for the relief of Gabe Budwee,

S 321. An act for the relief of Lloyd D. Lyles;

S 481. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Clarence Herbert Hartman, a minor;

S 563. An act for the relief of the P. S. Cook Co.;

S 914. An act for the relief of Gladys Inez Greenwood;

S. 1449. An act for the relief of Robert B. Workman,

S 1916. An act for the relief of Edna A. Bauser;

S 1933 An act for the relief of C. L. Leffingwell and others; and

S. 2520 An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted devised land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and

S. Con. Res. 45 Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1990) to amend section 429, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the act of August 5, 1882, as amended, so as to substitute for the requirement that detailed annual reports be made to the Congress concerning the proceeds of all sales of condemned naval material a requirement that information as to such proceeds be filed with the Committee on Armed Services in the Congress, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITION

Mr. ELLENDER presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from J. Segari & Co., of New Orleans, La., by Joseph O. Segari and Elliott W. Fassbender, Sr., partners, relating to the importation of potatoes from Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE—RESOLUTION OF DELAWARE STATE DENTAL SOCIETY

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by the

Delaware State Dental Society on February 15, 1950, memorializing the Congress to refrain from imposing upon the citizens of this Nation any form of compulsory health insurance, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American people now enjoy the highest level of health, the best standards of scientific medical and dental care and the finest medical and dental institutions ever attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas these accomplishments of American medicine and dentistry are the results of a free people working under a system of free enterprise; and

Whereas in all countries where government has assumed control of medical and dental care the experience has been a progressive deterioration of medical and dental standards and care, to the detriment of the health of the people; and

Whereas this problem has been adjudged so serious by the people of Delaware that resolutions from its State legislature have memorialized Congress not to pass such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Delaware State Dental Society:

1. That the Congress of the United States be asked to refrain from imposing upon the citizens of this Nation any form of compulsory health insurance, or any system of medical or dental care containing the principles of federalized compulsory health insurance;

2 That the Honorable JOHN J WILLIAMS, the Honorable J. ALLEN FREAR, JR, and the Honorable J CALEB BOGGS, Members of the Congress of the United States from Delaware, be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation;

3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Congressman from Delaware.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by priests and members of Our Lady of Vilna Parish and their guests assembled in the parish hall, Worcester, Mass., on February 16, 1950, in celebration of the thirty-second anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. The resolution favors recognition of the independence of Lithuania. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States of America has ever defended the God-given right of all nations to determine for themselves the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas the United States of America with Great Britain signed the Atlantic Charter, the principles of which guarantee all nations, both large and small, this right of self-rule without interference of any kind from any outside and alien source; and

Whereas the United States of America joined with the Allies in World War II to assure for the entire world a just and lasting peace which can and shall exist only when all nations, both large and small, live as free and independent nations in accordance with recognized principles of justice and charity; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, a small freedom-loving nation, which made astounding advancement and progress in all fields of endeavor during the 21 years of her independence (1918-39), has been forcibly and unjustly denied the exercise of this right by a cruel and ruthless Soviet and has been refused a place and a voice in the United Nations by the great powers who have acquiesced to the unjust and immoral demands of the Soviet; and

Whereas authoritative sources of information clearly indicate that the present policy of Soviet Russia calls for the shameless commission of the international crime of genocide upon liberty-loving Lithuania by the complete destruction and annihilation of Lithuania's Government and of her cultural, educational, economic, industrial, and agricultural systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States of America continue to maintain and uphold its present policy of recognizing the de jure independence of Lithuania despite the unjust absorption of Lithuania's territories within the Russian orbit; be it further

Resolved, That the United States of America insist upon invoking the principles of the Atlantic Charter, thereby guaranteeing the immediate and positive restoration of the independence of Lithuania; be it further

Resolved, That the Republic of Lithuania be admitted and accepted as an active member of the United Nations and that her officially appointed representatives be permitted to enjoy with full privileges the status of duly-elected delegates of that organization, be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States of America ratify the Genocide Convention, ratification of which would open up the way for Lithuania to present her case against Russia to the entire world, be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency, the Honorable Harry S. Truman; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson; to the head of the United States delegation to the United Nations, the Honorable Warren R. Austin; to the chairman of the Senate subcommittee now considering ratification of the Genocide Convention, the Honorable Brien McMahon; to the Senators of Massachusetts, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr, and the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall; to the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts, the Honorable Harold D Donohue, and to the press

CONSTANTINE A. VASYS,
Chairman.
Mrs TEKLA MAZEIKA,
Secretary

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr HOLLAND:

S 3089. A bill for the relief of Antonino Firetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 3090 A bill for the relief of Lieutenant (junior grade) Charles W. Ireland, Supply Corps, United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S 3091. A bill for the relief of Master Stanley (Zachne) Hiller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 3092. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Incorporated, a national non-profit nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 3093. A bill to amend section 82 of the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to the supreme court of the Territory of Hawaii and temporary vacancies therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S 3094. A bill for the relief of Miriam Rosenblum; to the Committee on the Judiciary

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced Senate bill 3095, to assure that expenditures under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, for education and training yield a proper return both to the veteran and to the Nation as a whole, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading)

SERVICEMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, at the request of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and recommended by the President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing a servicemen's educational and training program, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me, together with a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, under date of February 20, 1950, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Utah will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 3095) to assure that expenditures under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, for education and training yield a proper return both to the veteran and to the Nation as a whole, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanatory statement and letter presented by Mr. THOMAS of Utah are as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

As will be recalled the letter of transmittal of this draft legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by the Vice President, also referred to the message of the President of the United States to the Congress dated February 13, 1950.

Mr. President, the subject matter of this draft legislation poses one of the most difficult problems before the Congress On the one hand we have the natural desire to give to every veteran his full share of earned benefits through service in the late war, and, of course, in World War I. On the other hand we must be vigilant with respect to any exploitation or attempted exploitation of the veteran for unconscionable private gain.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare invited, in fact urged the Administrator to present a solution in the form of a draft bill, and these efforts are appreciated. Sober consideration will be given to the proposals reflected in this draft, in the light of the considerations mentioned, and in the light of the fact that this committee unanimously reported a bill containing features believed to be greatly in the public interest, a bill which passed the Senate but which had not been acted upon in the House during the closing days of the first session, or this session prior to the President's message.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1950.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At the request of the President, there is transmitted herewith a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to assure that expenditures under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, for education and training yield a proper return both to the veteran and to the Nation as a whole"

This draft bill is furnished for the use of the Congress in its consideration of legislation to implement certain recommendations contained in the report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget which accompanied the message of the President of the United States to the Congress, dated February 13, 1950 (copy of House Doc. No. 466 enclosed), concerning the education and training program under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. The specific recommendations to which the proposed draft relates are Nos. 5, 6, 7, and 8, under the general heading "Recommendations" in the concluding part (pt. IV) of the mentioned report.

Certain other recommendations (Nos. 2 and 3) contained in the report submitted to the Congress by the President are not included in the enclosed draft for the reason that they are embodied in the budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year 1951, previously submitted by the President and appearing under the heading "Readjustment benefits" (p. 136, pt. II, House Doc. No. 405).

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrator.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "HIGHWAYS AND THE NATION'S ECONOMY"

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 232), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Highways and the Nation's Economy," prepared for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 638) to amend title 28, United States Code, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LEHMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5472, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WHERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. HENDRICKSON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House Joint Resolution 398, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H R. 4316. An act to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6539. An act to amend Public Law 626, Eightieth Congress, relating to the Army Institute of Pathology Building; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H R 6562 An act to amend the Veterans Regulations and the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide additional compensation for the loss or loss of the use of a creative organ; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 7220. An act to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR WILEY FROM THE NORTHWEST REPUBLICAN

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article in tribute to Senator WILEY from the Northwest Republican, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BUSINESS OUTLOOK IS WHAT WE MAKE IT—ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce, before the Economic Conference on the Business Outlook, in Chattanooga, Tenn., February 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED-PERSONS LEGISLATION—MINORITY REPORT

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Minority Report," from the New York Times of February 19, 1950, with respect to the displaced-persons bill, which appears in the Appendix]

WILLIAM P. ROGERS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, entitled "Modern Investigator," paying tribute to William P. Rogers, published in the Washington Post of February 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

BOUNTIFUL FUTURE—ARTICLE BY DAVID CAMELON

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bountiful Future," written by David Camelon and printed in the February 19, 1950, issue of the American Weekly, which appears in the Appendix.]

ONE BIG BILL—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "One Big Bill," published in the Washington Daily News of Monday, February 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADVICE TO THE CAB—ARTICLE FROM AMERICAN AVIATION MAGAZINE

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Advice to the CAB," published in the American Aviation Magazine on February 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM A. MILLEN

[Mr MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to displaced persons, written by William A. Millen, and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERMENT SERVICE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it goes without saying that the address delivered yesterday by the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] presents some very serious charges against the State Department, whether the charges be considered singly or together. I believe that those who have read the RECORD, or those who heard the statements made by the Senator from Wisconsin, will not deny that the charges cast a dark cloud of suspicion upon the loyalty of many persons who are now serving in the State Department of the Government. I believe also, after reading the RECORD this morning, that the charges present serious implications to the safety and security of the Nation. In my humble opinion, the charges can neither be ignored nor bargained with. It seems to me that a complete and thorough investigation of the charges should be made.

On last evening, in the debate with the able Senator from Wisconsin, I advised the Senator that we would with all convenient speed act to have the charges investigated. After a discussion of the question this morning at a meeting of the Democratic conference and the Democratic policy committee, and after discussing it with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY], we have agreed upon a resolution, which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 231), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are employed by the Department of State as charged by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the resolution, but I should like to say that last night when the Senator from Wisconsin made his charges I asserted at once the matter was so important that, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I would move to have the committee investigate the charges, and today

at the meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations I renewed that statement. I am glad, of course, that the majority leader has recognized the importance of the subject, about which there must be no misunderstanding at all. I believe the charges should be promptly and thoroughly investigated.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make one further statement for the RECORD. I appreciate what the Senator from Massachusetts has just said. I know of his statement of last evening.

The Reorganization Act, under the caption "Committee Powers," provides as follows:

SEC. 134. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures (not in excess of $10,000 for each committee during any Congress) as it deems advisable. Each such committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, may report such hearings as may be had by it, and may employ stenographic assistance at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words.

The only reason the Senator from Illinois, together with members of the policy committee, decided to submit the resolution was to make certain that the Senate take affirmative action, declaring that the Foreign Relations Committee is the proper committee to handle the investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska reserves the right to object, and is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of the proposed investigation. The distinguished majority leader has provided in the resolution that the investigation shall be conducted by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is perfectly agreeable to me that that should be done; but the question arises, whether the appropriate committee is the one mentioned, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Committee on the Judiciary, or some other committee. If the resolution is properly referred it will receive the treatment it should receive. I merely make the general suggestion. I shall not object to the request. I have looked over the resolution very hurriedly. Does the resolution contain a provision for power of subpena? Should not such a provision be contained in the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. I believe committees have that general power.

Mr. WHERRY. If it is certain that the committee has such general power I shall not insist that a provision of that sort be contained in the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under section 134 of the Reorganization Act the committee does have that power.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to raise the parliamentary inquiry as to whether the resolution will require open hearings. I want to make a brief comment on the question of the nature of the hearings which are proposed to be held under this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will depend on the committee. The resolution itself makes no provision about it. That is a matter which is within the control of the committee or any subcommittee.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I thought, Mr. President. I want to suggest an amendment to the resolution, because in my opinion this matter has already been made the business of the Senate. It was made the business of the Senate, in my judgment, by the address made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] last night.

I want to point out to the Senate that I think we need to be on guard in America these days about star-chamber proceedings, and about keeping from the American people the people's business. I do not know of anything of more vital concern to the American people, nor that is more their business than questions as to whether there is being housed within the Government of the United States persons disloyal to our form of government—disloyal persons who are seeking, as termites, to undermine this great democratic system of freedom of ours.

Mr. President, one of the essentials of American freedom is an open-book policy. By that I mean that our judicial processes, our investigatory processes, our trial processes should be conducted in open hearings subject to the checking of public opinion. I happen to be one who believes that we have already gone too far in America in very recent years toward secrecy and more secrecy in conducting the affairs of our Government and in particular in determining the loyalty of our citizens. We are developing within the minds of the American people a secrecy complex which is resulting in fear and suspicion, so that good neighborliness almost no longer exists across our land. People are beginning to suspect their next-door neighbors, which, of course, was one of the patterns of totalitarianism built up in Germany, against which we went to war. It is also a pattern of totalitarianism that characterizes the police state of Russia. I think that right now is the time to call a halt to trial by secrecy and rumor in America. I think the resolution gives us an opportunity to call a halt to this police-state approach to loyalty investigations. The charges made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] concern the business of all the people of the United States. They should not be examined behind the closed doors of any Senate committee.

Mr. President, I should like to suggest that the Senate go on record this afternoon as making perfectly clear that there is going to be no executive session when examination is made into the question as to whether the people's Government is becoming undermined by Communists in the State Department or elsewhere in the Government. I think the time has come for a return to the open-book approach to the protecting of our judicial processes and our investigation processes in this country.

The innocent will not be injured by an open hearing nearly as much as they will be by the rumor, smear, and gossip that will ooze out of closed sessions of a committee whose proceedings are not available to a free press and a free people.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to see Members of the Senate stand up and be counted on whether they are willing this afternoon to say that such investigations as are made by the Foreign Relations Committee shall be made in open hearings so that the people of the United States who have the right to have their business transacted in an open-book fashion, will know what facts are brought forth in support of the serious charges made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. We do not have to keep disclosed from the American people the facts with respect to what is happening in connection with the Government. I think that here is an opportunity for us to call a halt to a tendency toward secrecy.

If the Senate is to consider and act upon the resolution, Mr. President, I shall write out an amendment on a pad in a moment which will add the provision that not only shall the hearings be held, but that they shall be open public hearings. I want open hearings so that the people of the United States may see and hear all the evidence presented in regard to this most serious charge which, if true, presents to us something which threatens the very security of the country and of the people themselves.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say I cannot disagree too much with what the very able Senator from Oregon has just said, but I should like to point out to him that the method he proposes also contains dangers. Many an innocent person may be victimized by charges and careless statements made under such a process. Before following the suggestion made by the Senator from Oregon I think we would do well to consider that side of the question.

Mr. President, I do not like to see this particular investigation limited to the charges made by one particular individual. I have a very high regard for the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin, but if we are going into this matter it seems to me that we very definitely should not limit the investigation to those charges. If there are conditions in the State Department which ought to be investigated they certainly ought to be investigated in full, and the investigation should not be limited in any respect.

Therefore, I move to amend the resolution——

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not in order until the Senate proceeds to consider the resolution.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I was going to say that it was my purpose to move——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot move to amend the resolution until it is under consideration.

The question now is: Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I intend at the proper time to move to amend the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois by deleting the words "as charged by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]." That would give us a clear investigation of the type which it seems to me should be undertaken if any investigation at all is to be conducted.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, while I am very happy that the Senator from Illinois has gone as far as he has with his resolution, I think the investigation should not be restricted solely to the cases I have developed. I do not claim and never have claimed to have knowledge of all those in the State Department who are communistically inclined and all those who are disloyal. I believe that if the investigation is to be of any value it must go beyond merely an investigation of the cases I have disclosed.

Mr. FERGUSON rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Michigan reserving the right to object?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, Mr. President, I reserve the right to object. I wish to say that I am heartily in agreement with the proposed investigation. It is clear from the language of the resolution itself that the Senate is asked to vote upon the question as to whether the committee shall investigate, not in accordance with the provisions of section 134 of the Reorganization Act, which gives a committee the right to investigate without any resolution being adopted by the Senate. Therefore I believe there should be added to the resolution the provision that all files and documents relating to matters to be investigated shall be delivered to the investigating committee so that the committee may make a complete investigation for the Senate. If this were a matter which would be acted upon by a committee under the rules of the Senate, the subject matter and extent of the investigation would be within the discretion of the committee. But when the Senate orders an investigation, as it can do by adopting the resolution, then we should be certain that all the documents and all the files and all the records required will be given to the committee so that the Senate will know, when the report is made by the committee, that it has had complete knowledge of the matters the Senate wants to have investigated.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in response to the Senator from Michigan. There can be no question that under the provision in section 134 respecting committee powers Senate committees have the power to which the Senator refers. In other words, by the proposed resolution the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations cannot be given more power than it already has under the Reorganization Act. All we are trying to do is to give the Committee on Foreign Relations jurisdiction of the proposed investigation, rather than have the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments or some other committee immediately take jurisdiction which, in my opinion, any one of those committees can do under the Reorganization Act. But if the Senate acts upon the resolution now proposed to be considered, we would have the judgment of the Senate established, and then we would have a standing committee of the Senate conduct the investigation. The sole reason for presenting the resolution is that we may not have two or three committees investigating the matter simultaneously. If we adopt this resolution, we throw the prestige of the entire Senate behind the investigation. It was only last night that I observed during the debate that Members of the Senate serving on three committees were sparring a bit to see if the investigation could be channeled into this committee or that committee or some other committee. As a result of that, it occurred to me that perhaps it would be the better part of wisdom for the Senate itself to make that decision. That is the basic reason we have brought forth the resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BREWSTER, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, who previously has spoken on this subject.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as I understood, the Senator from Illinois stated last night that he wanted a complete, thorough investigation to be made. The point was raised on the floor, time after time, that an iron curtain has been lowered around the files with regard to the loyalty to the United States Government of its employees. Certainly unless that curtain can be raised, I think there will be no real investigation into this matter.

Therefore, when the Senate authorizes this investigation, it authorizes and directs the committee to make the investigation—not within its discretion, but as an order from the Senate; and I think the resolution should say, both in effect and in words, that the investigation should be complete, in that all files should be delivered to the committee, so that a complete investigation could be had.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wished to ask the Senator from Illinois whether he contemplates that adoption of the resolution he has offered, directing the Foreign Relations Committee to make the investigation, will deprive the Appropriations Committee or any other committee of any power given it by law to make investigations in the course of its work. The resolution, if adopted, will not deprive the Appropriations Committee of the right to make investigations; will it?

Mr. LUCAS. Obviously, Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee or any other Senate committee could investigate anything it might desire to investigate, if it felt that the subject matter were under its jurisdiction under section 138 of the Reorganization Act.

However, if the Senate adopted the resolution referring the investigation to the Committee on Foreign Relations, it would seem to me to be somewhat out of line for some other committee immediately to begin to investigate the same subject matter. That is the sole reason the Senator from Illinois, along with other members of the Democratic policy committee, believed it advisable and the better course to bring this matter directly to the Senate and have the Senate act upon it, so that we shall know exactly where we are going.

Mr. AIKEN. Although the resolution is in the nature of a directive to the Foreign Relations Committee, at the same time it will not deprive any other committee of any of its legitimate rights to ascertain facts; will it?

Mr. LUCAS. No; if three other committees desired to make an investigation of the same subject matter, I assume that they could do so. But I think it would be very bad taste for them to do so, after favorable action by the Senate on a resolution of this kind.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—but speaking apropos of the point raised by the Senator from New York, which I think is a very good one, I wish to read into the RECORD a letter which I addressed to the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, under date of January 26, 1950:

JANUARY 26, 1950.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On March 21, 1947, the President issued Executive Order 9835 which established a procedure for the investigation of the loyalty of Government employees. This order was issued 34 months ago and it seems reasonable to assume that a final decision should have been rendered as to the loyalty of employees who were employed by the Department of State prior to July 1949.

I would appreciate it if you would advise me whether there are any individual cases where a final decision has not been made as to whether the employee is considered loyal as set out in Executive Order 9835. If a final determination has not been made, I would appreciate knowing the total number of cases not yet cleared for loyalty and the number of those who have assignments in the Far Eastern Division.

I will be pleased to receive the above information as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Under date of February 3, 1950, I received a brief acknowledgment from Mr. John E. Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary, reading as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 3, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I refer to your letter of January 26, 1950, in which you

request certain information with regard to the progress of the loyalty program in the Department of State.

The material requested by you is being gathered and will be forwarded to you as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. PEURIFOY,
Deputy Under Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Then, under date of February 16, I received the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 16, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I refer to your letter of January 26, 1950, and to my acknowledgment of February 3, 1950, with regard to the progress of the loyalty program in the Department of State.

As of June 30, 1949, the Department and the Foreign Service had a combined total of 13,917 American employees on its rolls. Of this number, all of those who are presently employed have been completely processed under Executive Order 9835, except 326, which are receiving active attention. Two of these individuals are employed in the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs. A careful analysis of the administrative operations of the Department's participation in the loyalty program indicates that the preponderance of those cases on whom final results have not been achieved are those whose forms had been returned by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for clearer fingerprints, inaccuracies, and for incompleteness. The Department and its 291 field posts throughout the world initiate several thousand personnel transfers in a single year. Due to distances and time required to recontact employees, it has been established that a considerable time lag necessarily develops between the initial submission of a loyalty form and the resubmission of the corrected form which is acceptable to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its loyalty-checking purposes

I should like to emphasize that in addition to the Department's participation in the President's loyalty program all persons proposed for employment in the Department and the Foreign Service are investigated for security and suitability prior to appointment. During these preappointment investigations available sources which would indicate subversive activities are checked and persons are appointed only after the Department is satisfied as to their security.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E PEURIFOY,
Deputy Under Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Upon receipt of that letter, I addressed the following communication to Mr. Peurifoy, under date of February 20, 1950:

FEBRUARY 20, 1950.

Hon JOHN E. PEURIFOY,
Deputy Under Secretary,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PEURIFOY: Your letter of February 16 has been received in reply to mine of January 26. I wish to thank you for sending me the information and would like clarification on the following points:

1. In addition to the 326 who are now receiving active attention, how many (a) resigned during the course of the investigation, or (b) were removed by administrative action?

2. When an employee resigns while under investigation or is removed as a result of the investigation, does such a notation show on his record, or is he free to go to some other Government department and gain a position of responsibility without the previous facts being known to the employing agency?

3. Of the 326 cases which are receiving active attention, will you please break them down to show how many of them have been pending for 1 month, 2 months, 3 months, etc., up to 1 year, and how many of them have been pending for over 1 year's time?

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

I have not yet received a reply to the last letter, but, of course, the time has been a little short for the Department to have replied to it by now.

Mr. IVES, Mr. BREWSTER, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California still reserve the right to object? Otherwise, debate is out of order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object, in order that I may yield to the Senators who have asked to be yielded to.

I yield first to the Senator from New York, who was first on his feet, I believe.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether he thinks the proposed amendment to the resolution, as referred to by the Senator from New York, is not only in order but desirable.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is not only in order but essential.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Maine reserving the right to object?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I expect to object, I should like to state briefly the reasons why I shall do so.

I am very much gratified that the majority leader and his associates have acted so promptly in this matter, and I wish to give whatever commendation they will accept from me in that behalf.

I note that they consulted with the Democratic policy committee and with the Democratic conference. Certainly, that is most appropriate. But I suggest that the matter is of such importance that the question of whether the resolution in its present form is completely adapted to secure the objective all of us have in view is worthy of at least one night's consideration.

So I should like to have the Committee on Foreign Relations, which I believe to be probably the appropriate body to go into the matter, and its distinguished chairman, given an opportunity to consider whether the form of the resolution is completely calculated to accomplish its objective.

Therefore, I object to consideration of the resolution at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection having been made, the resolution will lie over for 1 day, under the rule.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment, and yield to me?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Personally, I think the sooner we can set the machinery in motion, the better. However, perhaps one very important amendment should be made to the resolution. Whether we adopt the resolution tonight or tomorrow does not concern me greatly, but I believe that unless we provide that whatever committee is given this task shall have the right to subpena such records as it considers necessary, the investigation will be completely meaningless. In other words, if we begin an investigation, and say to the State Department, "We shall not ask for your files or for information from you," then there is no purpose in beginning the investigation.

I was in hope that the resolution could be adopted tonight; but, if not, I trust that by tomorrow the Senate will consider very seriously the wisdom of adding to the resolution an amendment empowering the committee to subpena any record it considers necessary—keeping in mind that we are not attempting to obtain information as to the source of the information possessed by any investigative agency, for I believe to do so would be a great mistake I do not think we should ask the FBI or any other investigative agency to disclose the source of its information; because if we were to do so, we would greatly hamper its work. But I think we are entitled to call for the information to which I have referred.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr President, permit me to suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that this investigation may or may not prove to be a somewhat historical one, in view of the conflict of opinion which has been developing in recent years in regard to the respective rights of the executive and the legislative branches of the Government. The Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, last night pointed out that that question had been raised throughout the century. Certainly, within the last few years, it has become very much more acute as a result of the position of the Executive, particularly the present President, in ordering executive departments not to permit evidence to be disclosed. If the matter is to be gone into properly, I think at least the Senate should be assured that whatever appropriate provisions in the resolution can and should be made, will be taken care of. I should certainly welcome the opinion of the Committee on Foreign Relations as to the precise form of authorization they would desire in order to do justice in the case.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the matter is far too important to dispose of in any such fashion as that suggested here tonight. Without questioning in any way the form of the resolution or the position of the majority, I think the whole Senate should have at least 24 hours in which to think it over, to consider whether amendments are desirable, and to consult the various authorities, in order that it may be determined eventually whether the legislative branch has the right to subpena subordinates in the Executive Departments and demand they produce the files, or whether the President of the United States by issuing an Executive Order has the right to block completely the investigatory powers of this body.

We are speaking of something that is very fundamental, and I suggest to the Senators on the other side that it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that some day there may be a President who is not in complete accord with Senators on the other side, and that at such time they themselves might also desire to have the legislative body possess power to secure information vital to the exercise of its functions.

Mr. McCARTHY and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine has objected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, just a moment, if the Senator will withhold his objection. I want to make this statement. I have conferred with the Senator from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and with other Members of the Senate. We believe that the amendment which was suggested by the able Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is in keeping with the best interests of what we believe to be a thorough and fair investigation. I should like to modify my resolution by striking out, if I may, the words, "the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]."

Mr. IVES. "As charged."

Mr. LUCAS. "As charged by the Senator from Wisconsin."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can modify his own resolution.

Mr. McCARTHY and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine withhold his objection?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; I shall be happy to withhold it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield, I suggest to the Senator from Illinois as another amendment, to add "that in the conduct of the investigation the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is instructed to procure, by subpena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the State Department."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not going to agree to any amendment of that character or of that scope at this time. It seems to me we should have complete confidence in the Committee on Foreign Relations to make a thorough, fair and impartial investigation. The Committee on Foreign Relations has the power to investigate this subject tomorrow, if it so desires, without the resolution. To start now, tying the hands of the Committee on Foreign Relations, it seems to me would be a very unwise course.

The only purpose of the Senator from Illinois and those on this side of the aisle who are extremely interested in pursuing the proper course here, is to see that one committee does the work, and does a thorough job; that is all. Otherwise, there would be no point in offering the resolution. In other words, if we are to start tying this amendment onto the resolution, and that amendment onto the resolution, we shall merely refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and they can proceed to do what they choose to do. I merely make that suggestion for whatever it is worth. There is nothing in the Legislative Reorganization Act which compels the Senate to adopt the resolution. I was only attempting to pursue a course which I thought to be fair and feasible, and one through which we could get the best results from a thorough investigation of the subject matter discussed by the Senator from Wisconsin last night, or any other charges that may be leveled against anyone in the State Department.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. BREWSTER. I withhold the objection, though I am not changing my mind.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take but a minute to make a comment on the remark of the Senator from New York in regard to my proposed amendment, which I shall send to the desk at the close of my remarks. I want to say I am in complete agreement with the Senator from New York in respect to his amendment. I am in complete disagreement with the Senator from New York in his evaluation of my proposed amendment, and for the following reasons.

I want to point out, Mr. President, in our country, under our judicial system, whenever anyone is falsely accused of crime and indicted therefor, a great damage must necessarily be done to him as the result thereof, and is done to him. Yet, we have found over the decades of our existence that, after all, the best way to protect the innocent and the surest way to convict the guilty is through the open courtroom, through public trial. Public trial is simply basic to the conception in this country of what a fair trial is. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to what I think is a demonstrable fact, namely, that the executive branch of the Government today, throughout its departments, is honeycombed already with a great deal of fear and suspicion on the part of a great many innocent and loyal and fine Federal employees. Many of the Federal employees are disturbed about the gossip about disloyalty charges which are running through the hallways of most of the executive departments of the Government today. People by the thousands are working for this Government under the shadow of suspicion as to their loyalty, because I think we have mishandled the whole loyalty program of the Government. Congress has mishandled it, too, in the form of executive committee sessions. We mishandled it when we walked away from a basic concept of American justice, namely, that people accused of wrongdoing, including disloyalty to our form of government, should be tried in public. A charge of disloyalty is a charge of treason. Disloyalty, treason, Communist allegiance are all one and the same to me. In many respects disloyalty is the most heinous of crimes. I say when we walked away from the open trial, when we walked away from that basic American right of an individual citizen to be confronted by his accusers, to meet in the open courtroom his detractors, to have the opportunity before the American people who, in the last analysis, must be his judges, to submit his evidence and his answers to accusations we started down a road toward police-state procedures in America. When we started down that road, Mr. President, I tell you we started on a wrong course in America. I cry out today in plea to my fellow citizens—turn back, turn back before it is too late.

Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. MORSE. We will be continuing on that course under this resolution, if we do not make perfectly clear that these very serious charges of the Senator from Wisconsin, which have thrown not 200 people in the State Department, but all the people in the State Department today, under serious suspicion, be heard by the American people through their Senate committee in the broad daylight of public hearing examination.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In just a moment. I think, Mr. President, we are dealing here with something that is fundamental to the rights of the innocent in this country.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I take it for granted, Mr. President, I think the presumption at least is very great, that some of these people covered in the blanket accusation of the Senator from Wisconsin will be proved to be innocent. I want their innocence established in an open hearing in America. I want to do my part to bring to an end the growing tendency in America of convicting people in secret, of condemning them among their coworkers, under a shroud and cloud of suspicion, when they have not had the opportunity that I thought was basic to American justice and jurisprudence, namely, of establishing their case in an open court or in an open hearing.

Mr. President, you cannot get away from the fact that when you go into this type of a Senate hearing you are going into something that in all respects is a trial. Men's reputations, men's veracity, men's character, one of the things that is dearest to a man, his reputation of loyalty to his government, all are going to be on trial in these hearings. I do not want these precious human values on trial, Mr. President, even before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate in an executive session, where the records of the session cannot be made available to the American people. Furthermore, as we all know, executive sessions of Senate committees are being conducted these days by leaks. We know that if these hearings are executive what will get out of the committee will be report by leak after leak after leak—but twisted and distorted reports, Mr. President. Unfortunately, report by rumor, report by leak, seeping out of executive committee hearings do not protect people who are on trial before a committee of the United States

Senate. I want to say as a lawyer, and I mean no reflection on any other lawyer in this body, but I can speak for myself, Mr. President, and I want to say as a lawyer here this afternoon I should be ashamed of myself did I not raise my voice here for an open hearing on the question as to whether some 200 people in the State Department are guilty of what I think is the most heinous crime—treason. We are proposing to investigate charges that more than 200 State Department employees are Communists or Communist sympathizers. If they are guilty of treason, if they are Communists, if they are Communist sympathizers, I want them proved guilty in an open hearing, not in the secrecy of star-chamber proceedings by any committee of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I say that you cannot get away from the basic principle for which I am arguing this afternoon. You cannot get away from the fact that we are dealing here with the rights of free Americans to have established in an open hearing charges that any given Federal employee is disloyal to our Government. Any citizen of high or low position is entitled to public hearing on the accusations of the Senator from Wisconsin. Character assassination by rumor, gossip, smear cannot go on successfully in a public hearing where the accused can confront his attackers. There is no adequate substitute for the good old Anglo-Saxon public trial as a procedure for establishing both innocence and guilt.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In just a minute. I think the time has come, Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I think the time has come when we should put a stop to trial by secrecy in America. We should come back to the open court room that our founding fathers established. After all, it is the soundest system of judicial process yet established by men in this world. I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. In view of the Senator's statement, I wonder if he would go along with me wholeheartedly with an amendment providing that the committee have the right to get material which is now denied them, to subpena records, and so forth.

Mr. MORSE. I would always go along with the Senator on that point subject to the rules of jurisdiction and of evidence.

Mr. McCARTHY. I intend to propose such an amendment tomorrow. I am not concerned with whether the Senator's amendment is agreed to. So long as we have a hearing, determine the facts, and have available to us the files when necessary, whether the hearing be in public or in executive session is no concern of mine. I am ready to present the information which I have.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator, because I am certain he wants to do the right and fair thing for all Federal employees, if he would not feel that there might be some comparison, not to a trial in which a man is actually found guilty, but rather a grand jury proceeding to ascertain whether to prefer charges.

Mr. MORSE. The grand jury by analogy in this case has already returned an indictment in the form of the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. It has been broadcast from coast to coast. I say, Let us have the proof in support of the charges and have it in an open courtroom.

Mr. LONG. I do not consider the Senator from Wisconsin to be a grand jury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BREWSTER. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over, under the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, under the rule the resolution goes over. I understand we can bring it up tomorrow by adjourning today. That is what the Senator from Illinois proposes to do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate adjourns today, the resolution will come up automatically tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. My suggestion was that it lie on the table, and therefore we could get away from the morning hour.

Mr. LUCAS. The hour is getting rather late. It is 10 minutes before 6. Tomorrow is Washington's Birthday, and, immediately following the reading of Washington's Farewell Address, we shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending resolution and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, be printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should simply like to clarify my previous statement concerning the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] which might be misunderstood. I feel that the charges made by the Senator from Wisconsin certainly do not stand in the position of a charge made by a grand jury. I am sure the Senator is acting in all good faith in wanting to see that all persons suspected of disloyalty to this country are investigated, and if there is any substantial basis for the charges, they will be preferred against them. I feel that the Senator has not had an opportunity to hear the defense of those persons against whom he prefers charges. Therefore we are in no position to feel that a grand jury has acted and has preferred charges, because, in all probability, we shall find that the great majority of the persons investigated will have a reasonable and probably a good defense against any charges which are preferred. I do not feel that we can properly look upon any of them as persons who have actually been charged by a grand jury, or that we should look upon any of the charges as being correct until we have actually heard their defense, have heard both sides, and are in position to say there is a substantial basis for the charges.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Louisiana feel that the Senator from Wisconsin is in the analogous position of a prosecutor who has filed an information or prosecutor's indictment? The Senator from Wisconsin has released his serious charges to the American people. Therefore do we not have what amounts to an indictment by way of a prosecutor's information against these State Department employees? Are we not confronted now with the job of passing judgment on whether we think there is a prima facie case supporting the information? Under our system of justice that certainly should be done in public and not behind closed doors.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me more as though the Senator from Wisconsin is in position of one who merely suspects an unknown person of having committed some crime or some offense. No names have been given. In this instance I do not even consider it comparable to a case in which a private citizen goes to the district attorney and asks the district attorney to bring a case before the grand jury.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Louisiana were an employee of the State Department today, would he think the charges which have been made against the State Department employees would reflect on him as an employee, irrespective of the fact that no names have been mentioned?

Mr. LONG. There is some reflection, but I do not believe the average person feels that the employees of the State Department are Communists or are disloyal to this country, unless and until there has actually been some proof of the accusation that certain unnamed persons have been disloyal. I am inclined to feel that the loyalty review boards are doing their job, and when they review a person and find him to be loyal, they are probably acting in the best interests of the Nation. I have confidence in them. I am strongly inclined to doubt that we shall find a great percentage of the accused persons are Communists.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator have any question about the fact that many employees in the State Department feel, as a result of these charges, that their loyalty has been besmirched by these nameless accusations against approximately 200 employees? I think that those who make such charges should

have to prove them in public. I think those accused are entitled to a public hearing. I think the public is entitled to sit in judgment on this case and hear for itself what proof if any exists.

Mr. LONG. There is no doubt in my mind that all loyal employees of the State Department should be and will be exonerated by a proper investigation.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I do not feel that the charges made by the Senator from Wisconsin in anywise put any of those accused persons in the position of being charged by a grand jury. In that case it would be necessary that they be exonerated by a petit jury.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS TOMORROW

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to announce that under the previous order of the Senate the first order of business tomorrow will be the reading of Washington's Farewell Address by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR].

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Don G. Shingler to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul L. Styles to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. SPARKMAN Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Merited Promotion of Paul Styles," from the Huntsville (Ala.) Times of Friday, February 3, 1950. This editorial pays tribute to Paul L. Styles, who has just been confirmed by the Senate to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERITED PROMOTION OF PAUL STYLES

It is a long way and a far cry from a worker in a cotton mill, and a linotype operator in the composing room of the Huntsville Times, to a member of the five-man National Labor Relations Board, one of the major agencies of the Government.

Yet that measures the climb that Paul Styles, formerly of Huntsville, but of recent years a resident of Atlanta, has made in little more than 15 years.

He has made it because of a lot of natural ability and good, hard common sense, plus continuous study and improvement of himself.

We have had opportunity to watch him closely over the years, and to know the efforts he has made to grow, and to prepare himself. The latter includes attendance at, and graduation from, an Atlanta law school. This was accomplished by long, tedious study, outside his office hours, to attend night-school classes.

It is perhaps not beyond the facts to say that he is the foremost authority in the South on labor law. He has been a regular speaker on this new and complicated subject before law classes in the leading colleges and universities of Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, and the Carolinas.

Business Week, in a recent issue, classed him as a middle of the roader, as a man fair equally to management and labor, and impartial in his decisions as head of the regional office of the NLRB at Atlanta.

His selection for the post on the NLRB was almost nonpolitical. The very large number of endorsements in his behalf came almost equally from the management and labor, and were submitted voluntarily.

His promotion and advancement are due to his splendid and impartial work in the Atlanta post, and to his clear mind, innate ability, and courageous devotion to duty, as he saw it in critical and difficult cases.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George W. Whitehurst to be United States district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank A. Hooper to be United States district judge for the northern district of Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately of all confirmations of today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. LUCAS. Before we adjourn for the day I should like to make an announcement with respect to the work of the Senate in the days ahead. After the reading of Washington's Farewell Address is finished tomorrow, the morning hour is concluded, and the Senate takes action on the resolution, now lying on the table, which I submitted a few moments ago, we shall proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 398, Calendar No. 1283, to which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has offered an amendment. Following that we shall take up H. R. 4567, Calendar No. 1247, an act to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

The change in the program has been made because the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, expects to leave Washington on the 5th of March on important business, and in order to accommodate him we shall take up H. R. 4567 following the disposition of House Joint Resolution 398. Following that, we shall take up Senate bill 1498, Calendar No. 563, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the Senate recessed last night, a motion to proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 398 was pending.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, so far as the minority is concerned, there will be no objection to taking up the so-called cotton-potato bill by unanimous consent, when the majority calls it up for consideration, so there will be no time lost in arguing the motion.

As I understand the program, after the so-called cotton-potato bill is out of the way, it is the intention of the majority leader to take up H. R. 4567, Calendar No. 1247, which is the displaced-persons bill. May I ask the majority leader whether the Senate will be in session on Thursday and Friday?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the majority leader contemplate holding any night sessions?

Mr. LUCAS. We shall not have any night sessions unless my friends on the other side of the aisle defeat me on a motion to adjourn.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, so far as I am personally concerned, I shall cooperate with the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. I noticed that last night. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, February 22, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 21 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mary C. Barlow, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to fill a new position.

Thomas C. Scalley, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to fill a new position.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Whitfield Y. Mauzy, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 30, 1949.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 21 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Don G. Shingler (colonel), Corps of Engineers), to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Paul L. Styles, of Alabama, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term expiring December 16, 1954.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

Senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Daniel J. Daley

Surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Richard H. Linn — Wayland J. Hayes, Jr.
David D. LeGrand — Clarke W. Mangun, Jr.

Senior dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Donald J. Galagan

Sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

O. John Schmidt — Joseph A. Boyer
Kenneth C. Lauster — Ross W. Buck

Pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Joseph P. Crisalli

Senior nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

L. Dorothy Carroll

Senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Norma Russell

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

George W. Whitehurst, to be United States district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida.

Frank A. Hooper, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Georgia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all goodness, we are again uniting our souls in the fellowship of prayer, seeking together those needed blessings which none can ever find or enjoy alone.

We pray that daily our lives may be brought under the spell and sway of the Master's spirit in order that they may be transformed into His own glorious likeness.

Grant that in our problems and tasks we may have the interpreting and guiding light of His Spirit.

May it be the supreme desire of our hearts to do Thy will for in the doing of Thy will is our peace.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On February 14, 1950:

H R. 587. An act for the relief of the estate of Dick Walock, Alfred L. Woods, and Edward Kimokteak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the morning Post.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; to include in one an address delivered by Commander Henry Selvitella, of the Italian-American World War Veterans; in one, the legislative program of the same organization; and in one, an address he delivered before the Lithuanian Citizens Club of Lawrence, Mass.

Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the American Legion.

Mr. QUINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to the Secretary of State regarding Robert A. Vogeler, Jr.

Mr. GORSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution and certain miscellaneous excerpts.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Republicans of Wright County, Iowa.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Hagerstown Herald.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Middletown Times-Herald, a daily newspaper in her district.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO EGYPT

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of history the Middle East has been the most strategic area in the world. Within the Middle East lies the bridgehead to three continents. Today, the Middle East finds itself caught physically in the middle of the ideological war between the east and west and if a shooting war comes, the importance of the Middle East to the United States is immeasurably increased.

No military authority claims we could hold Europe against an onslaught of the Red army. Since Russia has the atomic bomb, it would be unsound indeed for us to count on bases in England.

Until our Air Force is developed with sufficient range to base in America, to win the battle of the air over Russia the United States will need overseas bases. The Middle East offers bases which could be held by our Ground and Naval Forces and from which we could win the initial round in the battle of the air against the Red air forces.

It is my view that Egypt is as far north and east as we could hold bases with reasonable assurance. Doubtless Russia realizes this fact and one of her initial moves in the event of war would be to occupy Egypt by an air-borne Red army. Realizing her plight, Egypt is desperate for defensive military equipment. It is vital to the United States in the event of war that the Red air-borne army not be permitted to deny us bases in Egypt. I am reliably advised that Great Britain, sensing the strategic value of Egypt, is willing to give Egypt considerable defensive military equipment which she obtained from us through lend-lease. By the terms of lend-lease, however, England must secure our permission before releasing this defensive military equipment. I am reliably advised further that a desperate attempt is being made by a pressure group in the United States to prevent this essential military equipment being given to Egypt. This pressure group has hired a former secretary to the President, Mr. Clark Clifford, to intervene with the President and his initial fee is reputed to be $30,000. Doubtless he will receive much more if he is successful in blocking the proposal.

I submit to my colleagues in Congress and to the American people that it is to the interest of the United States that we grant permission to Great Britain to extend this military assistance to Egypt. It would be to our interest also to see that Egypt is provided essential military equipment for a small defensive force, capable of meeting an air-borne invasion of the Red army. There is no evidence that Egypt would use this equipment offensively. She has accepted the verdict of the United Nations in the Middle East and is living up to the verdict in spirit and in fact.

If war comes it could be that the denial of Egyptian bases to the Red forces and the making of these bases available to us might be the difference between defeat and victory. We cannot afford to let Egypt go by default and I urge the President of the United States to authorize military assistance to this friendly, freedom-loving country—Egypt.

SURPLUS POTATOES FOR FOOD

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report that I was informed about a half hour ago that the Greenfield authorities have received authorization from the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare to order 5 tons of surplus potatoes from storage in the immediate vicinity of Greenfield; that the Salvation Army plans to pick up these potatoes on Thursday—tomorrow being a legal holiday in Massachusetts; and that they will then be available for distribution to the needy people of Greenfield for food.

I attempted to report yesterday in some detail as to the steps which were necessary to bring about this result. I promised to put this in concise form for the use of my colleagues in assisting their communities which may wish to receive some of these potatoes. I do that now.

You will find the full Greenfield experience in the RECORD for February 20, but I am confident that with their experience a great deal of red tape can be eliminated and a great deal of direct action is possible.

Any community must conduct a survey through responsible agencies. In Greenfield this was done by the entire clergy of the town with the council of social agencies. The report of the number of needy families should be submitted to the local board of public welfare, be approved by it, and forwarded to the responsible State official. I have obtained a list for the New England and North Atlantic Seaboard States. They are:

Connecticut: E. C. Geissler, supervisor of purchases, department of finance and control, purchasing department, State Capitol Building, room 408, Hartford, Conn.

Maine: John E. Collins, supervisor, surplus commodities and property, department of education, Statehouse, Augusta, Maine.

Massachusetts: John C. Stalker, director, food distribution division, department of public welfare, 600 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.

New Hampshire: Harold Theney, purchasing agent for State of New Hampshire, Statehouse, Concord, N. H.

Rhode Island: George E. Helliwell, deputy commissioner, State of Rhode Island General Store, Howard, R. I.

Vermont: Burton N. Sisco, deputy commissioner, department of institutions and corrections, 51 Court Street, Montpelier, Vt.

Delaware—two agencies: A. Tarumianz, assistant business manager, Delaware State Hospital, Farnhurst, Del. Schools: George R. Miller, Jr., State superintendent, department of public instruction, box 191, Dover, Del.

Maryland—two agencies: J. M. Patterson, director, Maryland State Department of Public Welfare, 120 West Redwood Street, Baltimore, Md. Schools: T. G. Pullen, superintendent, Maryland State Board of Education, 1201 Mathison Building, Baltimore, Md.

New Jersey: James S. King, State supervisor, commodity distribution, department of economic development, division of commerce and municipal aid, 520 East State Street, Trenton, N. J.

New York: Distribution in New York is handled through each of the county departments of public welfare. Each county has its own set-up. State provides no distribution agency at a central point.

Pennsylvania: Paul Worcester, Pennsylvania State Department of Property and Supplies, bureau of purchases, room 178, Main Capitol Building, Harrisburg, Pa.

This official in each State has full authority to issue authorization for the withdrawal of the required number of potatoes, once the local board of public welfare has voted to accept the responsibility for the proper storage and proper distribution of these potatoes. I shall include at the end of my remarks the letter sent by the Greenfield board which resulted in immediate authorization. It is not necessary to execute the Form FP-53, the contents of which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday.

I trust this information will be useful to my colleagues. I shall be glad to furnish any further information requested

I should repeat that I have raised the question of the adequacy of the minimum quantities provided in the Department's table which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday and I hope soon to have a realistic recognition of the amount any normal American family can properly use as food during a month. I can state that Mr. Stalker has met that situation temporarily by authorizing the immediate delivery of a 3 months' supply and I have requested him to provide the revised amount as soon as possible since I understand that the area office in New York, located at 139 Centre Street, eighth floor, New York 13, N. Y., Mr. John Dittrich has full authority to immediately approve a State-recommended revision.

May I again point out that this procedure will probably be useful only in those communities located within a reasonable distance of storage locations. This admittedly is inequitable so far as other communities are concerned. The only solution which occurs to me is a prompt hearing on the identical bills introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.], and myself. You will find the text of those identical bills at page 2000 in the RECORD of February 20. You will also find a letter which we sent to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture yesterday, asking for a prompt hearing. We shall appreciate your cooperation in urging that hearing.

The letter sent by the Greenfield board which resulted in immediate authorization read as follows:

FEBRUARY 18, 1950.

MR. JOHN C. STALKER,
Director of Commodity Distribution, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. STALKER: At a meeting of the welfare board of the town of Greenfield on the above date, it has been agreed that we will act as the storing and distributing agency for surplus commodities (potatoes) in the town of Greenfield.

It is understood that there will be no expense connected with the procuring of these potatoes at the source, and it will not be necessary to sign any contract governing this distribution, and the source will be in the immediate vicinity of the town of Greenfield, such as Deerfield, Sunderland, or Whately. This is in accordance with my conversation over the phone with Representative JOHN HESELTON and his understanding with you. These potatoes will be distributed in accordance with the schedule established, limiting the quantity to a 3-month supply, based on this schedule.

Very truly yours,

BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
WILLIAM B. HAYES, *Secretary.*

SURPLUS POTATOES

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] on having obtained results so satisfactory for his district. I had the pleasure of joining in a letter from him, from the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], and from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture on February 20, in which we asked for action on the identical bills introduced by each of us and referred to his committee. The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1950.

Re H. R. 7135, H. R. 7136, H. R. 7137, H. R. 7138.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: May we call your attention to these identical bills filed in the House February 2, 1950, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Because of the urgent nature of the problem presented in terms of the proposed destruction of edible surplus potatoes, some of this destruction we understand having been carried out, we request your full cooperation in setting these bills down for hearing at the earliest possible date. We believe the full facts should be developed as quickly as possible so that this destruction may be avoided and this particular commodity made available for food. We are confident that you and all members of the committee recognize the emergency nature of the problem, and we hope that you will believe that we have tried to make a constructive suggestion in the interest of the American taxpayer and in the interest of those millions of Americans who, unfortunately, are not able to purchase this fine food commodity in the open market.

We are informed that the latest figures show 2,715,751 persons receiving old-age pensions, 1,486,404 receiving dependents' and children's benefits, 92,000 blind people receiving help, and 543,000 on the State and local relief rolls. With this total minimum figure of 4,837,155 people who could make use of these potatoes if they could be given to them, there are many thousands more who clearly are not able to pay the current price of potatoes and therefore are not purchasing them.

According to the Commodity Credit Corporation, as of December 31, 1949, it held

approximately 277,480 tons of 10 surplus food commodities which can be eaten without further processing. The Corporation's official report shows that the total cost was approximately $265,000,000. We hope we have made a suggestion which can be utilized to get this food to deserving people rather than to pay additional amounts for storage and ultimately hire more people and pay further amounts to destroy this food.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Thirteenth District, Pennsylvania.
KENNETH B. KEATING,
Fortieth District, New York.
JOHN W. HESELTON,
First District, Massachusetts.
HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.
Sixth District, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the committee will set an early date for hearing on these bills.

LENTEN SERVICES

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the problems of this hour illustrate very clearly the need of us all to deepen and strengthen the spiritual foundations of our national life.

As has been done in previous years, there will be a daily 20-minute Lenten service for the Capitol Hill community in the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, opposite the Folger Shakespeare Library. This is within quick walking distance of the House and Senate Office Buildings and the Capitol. This service is held each weekday from 12:10 to 12:30 except Saturdays. The service will be addressed by ministers of the various Protestant denominations of the Washington area. Everyone will be welcome.

I commend these services to my fellow Members of the Congress for their personal attendance. I make a suggestion, also, that we make it possible for our staff members to attend. The services start on Ash Wednesday, February 22, and continue through Lent.

Services also will be held every Wednesday evening at 8 o'clock.

ORDER OF BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I feel sure all of us are delighted that no conflict in viewpoint on pending legislation is being allowed to interfere with the reading tomorrow of that inspiring masterpiece, Washington's Farewell Address. I am certain also, that we on this side of the aisle are very anxious to get on with the business tomorrow and do everything possible to complete the consideration of the legislation to be submitted to us with reasonable dispatch.

I am hopeful that the same is true on the other side of the aisle. The reading of the Farewell Address, I am told, will consume about an hour. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN and Mr. HERLONG objected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to move that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. That is not a privileged motion.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FEPC LEGISLATION

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time Members on the floor of the House make reference to the great leaders of American history. I too have done so. Today I simply want to again remind the House that the founding fathers of this country, particularly Washington and Jefferson, believed passionately in the equality of all men under the law. That is exactly what those of us who favor the FEPC are asking for when the bill comes to a vote tomorrow. We want all men to have economic equality under the law as well as political equality. I hope that tomorrow the debate on this measure can be kept at that level and will not descend to recriminations and interpretations that have absolutely no foundation in fact. If we do that I think we can debate a great basic issue in a scholarly and dignified manner which will add to the prestige of the House. I hope such will be the case, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

VISITING MEMBERS OF JAPANESE DIET

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that there are a number of members of the Japanese Diet in the gallery. A number of people who have been sent here at the suggestion of General MacArthur in order that they might see at first hand the operations of democracy. It was my privilege to be in Japan in November with a group from the Committee on Public Lands. We were entertained in the Japanese Diet. The Speaker or President of the Japanese Lower House met with our committee and expressed the thought of the Japanese people that amity would continue between our two countries.

The Japanese are a hard-working, industrious people. They have changed their way, their concept of government. They seek a true form of democracy for Japan. I am happy to call your attention to the fact that they are here and that the future of this country rests in the Pacific Basin. Just as what was once an enemy at the beginning of the century and became a staunch ally in World Wars I and II as the result of American tutelage, so the potentialities of the Japanese people under democracy to aline themselves with this country against communism means the front line of our defense against that form of political enslavement is strengthened and extended.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I should like to commend the gentleman for his statement and to say that I subscribe entirely to the sentiments he has expressed. The difficulties in which his State found itself at the beginning of the war has probably been my particular gain. I come from Chicago, and we have one of the largest colonies of nisei anywhere in the country. They are upright, industrious, hard-working citizens and are doing much for the benefit of the city and for the community generally.

Mr. MILLER of California. The most decorated outfit in the American Army was the One Hundredth Battalion, of nisei, American citizens of Japanese origin.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. I, too, was a member of a different Congressional mission that was in Japan during September and October. I do not recall any place during our tour of the Orient where we received a more generous reception than was accorded to members of our group as we visited the Japanese Diet. I am sure that the American people are pleased to have this distinguished group of Japanese people in our country.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

In closing, I want to say that I know I speak your sentiments when we welcome to the House of Representatives the delegation of the Japanese Diet now in the gallery. [Applause.]

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority members of the Select Committee on Small Business may have until midnight tomorrow in which to file brief minority views to be appended to the report filed by the chairman of the committee today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. SIKES) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a memorial.

ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCE FOR TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced H. R. 7356, which would increase the Members' telephone and telegraph allowance from $500 to $1,000 per year.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the $500 limitation holds whether you live 10 miles or 2,000 miles from the District of Columbia. Since telegraph and telephone bills are computed in large measure upon distance, those of us who do not live near the District of Columbia are penalized to begin with.

May I point out further, Mr. Speaker, that any amount of this money not required for a Member's service to his people automatically reverts to the Treasury, and none is lost to the Government by reason of nonuse. Many of us have used all or practically all of the money which is now available. We feel that more is necessary, if we are to give to our constituents the service we feel they are entitled to receive. I urge and I hope that all interested members will urge that the Committee on House Administration will speedily act upon this matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of last week the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] made certain remarks concerning the fact that he is no longer a member of my subcommittee, and in those remarks he indicated that he had heard a rumor to the effect that the Administrator, Mr. Wickard, was at least in part responsible for his not being on my subcommittee. Mr. Wickard wrote to me about this on February 14th. I believe that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will like to make some comment in connection with a quotation that I should like to read from Mr. Wickard's letter. Mr. Wickard said:

> I want to unequivocally and categorically deny that I ever made any request at any time in connection with an effort to have Mr HOFFMAN removed from the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would say in answer to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] that the information did come to me from what I considered a reliable source, right out of the Department of Agriculture. I have a copy of the letter Mr. Wickard wrote to the gentleman. I have a copy of the letter I wrote in reply. It reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1950.

Mr. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKARD: Yours of the 14th, which came by special messenger, together with the copy of your letter to PORTER HARDY, JR., at hand.

The last sentence reads as follows:

"I make this request not so much because I wish to be personally exonerated, but because of the insinuation that there is something so bad in my organization that this extraordinarily improper action is being taken to cover it up."

Am in accord with the statement that my arbitrary and unprecedented removal from a subcommittee was, to quote you, "extraordinarily improper action" and trust that the majority party will without delay take steps to correct that improper action.

Sincerely yours.

P. S.—Rereading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, am striking the next to the last paragraph in the first column on page 1813, daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as the substance appears on page 1776 of the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

(Copy to Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR.)

If the gentleman states that Mr. Wickard insists that he did not have anything to do with my unauthorized removal from the subcommittee, that is all right with me, I will be glad to accept his statement. Over the years I have heard of these rumors about what individuals in the Departments said and were doing. Sometimes they are good, accurate—in accord with the fact—sometimes they are not. Now, I remember the rumors about Hiss and some others in the executive departments. When we called attention to them sometimes we were told: "Oh, well, you are just listening to the wind." But if the court sustains the conviction in the Hiss case Hiss is going to wind up in jail and the so-called rumors we heard about Hiss resulted in his exposure.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I felt sure the gentleman would like to correct any unfair statement that he said he had received.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not accept the characterization of my statement as unfair but if the gentleman says he did not have anything to do with my removal from the Hardy subcommittee and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] says Mr. Wickard did not ask for my removal then I accept that as the fact. I would accept the word of the gentleman from Virginia for almost anything.

Mr. HARDY. I am grateful to the gentleman.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader if there has been any change in connection with the announced program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. After the termination of Calendar Wednesday——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman any idea when that will be?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will notice that I said "after the termination of business on Calendar Wednesday." If there is any time remaining for the rest of the week I intend to program the bill S. 2105, a bill relating to the mining industry. A rule making the bill in order has been reported out of the Committee on Rules and I understand that the committee in charge of the bill is going to propose a couple of amendments to the bill which will remove a substantial part of the opposition that existed to the bill as reported out of the committee originally.

That is the only change I know of at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will there be any further additions for the rest of this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Without binding myself I have no intention now, unless something pressing arises—and I have no knowledge of it—the strong probabilities are that there will not be anything further this week.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the gentleman give us any estimate as to how long we will be in session tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish I could. The gentleman's estimate is just as good as and probably better than mine. Frankly, I am unable to state.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. We will be in session until Washington's Farewell Address is read.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Mississippi is very optimistic. I hope that will not be so.

Mr. RANKIN. I was expressing the American wish, with which I am sure George Washington would agree, if he were here.

SURPLUS FOOD

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.] in urging that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House promptly proceed with hearings on the bill, H. R. 7135. Throughout the length and breadth of this Nation we have tens of thousands of people on relief, we have millions of dollars worth of surplus commodities going to waste, and I believe that the situation is sufficiently serious that the merits of this bill for the relief of the people who have helped pay for these stored-up goods should be considered at once.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about the program for tomorrow—Washington's Birthday. Ever since I have been a Member of Congress Washington's Farewell Address has been read to the Members of the House on Washington's Birthday. May I say that the membership of the House could do no greater service to the country than listen attentively to what Washington said in his farewell address which he delivered to the Congress of the United States at that time. Then heed his advice. It gives us a lot of instructions as to what we should do and what is best for this country and, in my opinion, the suggestions made in his farewell address are as important today as they were when Washington delivered that memorable address.

If the membership of the House wants to do something good for their country they should listen attentively to the address and when the reading of it is concluded, the Members should go to their offices or homes and think carefully about what has been stated in Washington's address. Then heed it. If they do that, they will be doing the greatest good for this country that they could possibly do. Certainly they would keep us out of war and out of foreign entanglements. He was, in his wise counsel and advice, the Father of his Country. He did not believe in perpetuity of office. He stood for America—for freedom. He worked for liberty, and he did not believe in socialism—the way we are traveling under this administration. Again I admonish you Members of Congress—heed Washington's advice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem on water.

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include newspaper and other material.

Mr HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he previously made and to include excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FILING OF MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. PATMAN Mr. Speaker, in the event minority views are filed to the report of the Committee on Small Business today, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to file additional views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H DOC. NO. 476)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the Report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 21, 1950.*

HEALTH INSURANCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to petitions from members of the American Legion Auxiliary, of Ashby and Westford, Mass., against any compulsory health insurance plan under national bureaucratic control reading as follows:

Whereas the American veteran in two world wars has defended the American free enterprise system, which has made possible the development in this country of the highest standards of medical care and finest medical institutions attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas having experienced the shortcomings of impersonal, assembly-line medical care inherent in the form of Government-controlled medicine necessary in time of war, the veteran understands the dangers of imposing such a system permanently on the entire population; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would impose an unjust tax on the veteran's pay check for medical care to which he is now entitled free of charge as a reward for his service to his country; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would force a tax of 3 percent on the income of the employed veteran, rising to a tax of at least 6 percent within a few years, creating new financial burdens which increase the costs of necessities of life and lower the standard of living for veterans and other citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion Auxiliary does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of Massachusetts, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

Signed by the president and the secretary.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

NICOLETTA AND GUILIA PONTRELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 677) for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any orders of deportation which may have been commenced in the cases of Nicoletta Pontrelli and Guilia Pontrelli.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 and section 18 of the Immigration Act of 1917, the aliens, Nicoletta Pontrelli and Guilia Pontrelli, upon payment by them of the required head taxes, shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States at the port of New York as of the date of the enactment of this act, if they are not inadmissible on any grounds other than the fact that Nicoletta Pontrelli is feeble-minded and Guilia Pontrelli is an accompanying alien whose protection or guardianship is required by the feeble-minded alien."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORIO CANCILLER EVANGELISTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1866) for the relief of Honorio Canciller Evangelista.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Honorio Canciller Evangelista, upon payment of the required head tax, be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence at the port of San Francisco, Calif., on January 17, 1948. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Philippine quota of the first year that the same Philippine quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Honorio Canciller and Nancy Ting Evangelista, who were admitted to the United States as temporary visitors, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their entry into the United States at the port of San Francisco, Calif., on January 17, 1948, upon payment by them of the required head tax and visa fee. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the Philippine quota and one number from the nonpreference category of the quota for Chinese persons of the first year that such quota numbers are available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Honorio Canciller and Nancy Ting Evangelista."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARTIN KENNETH IKEDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2705) for the relief of Martin Kenneth Ikeda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding persons of certain races from permanent admission to, and from naturalization as citizens of, the United States, Martin Kenneth Ikeda, minor son of Ichio Ikeda, a citizen of the United States, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed and without presenting an immigration visa or other travel documents, and may become naturalized as a citizen of the United States upon compliance with other requirements of the naturalization laws applicable in his case and consistent with this act. Upon the admission of the said Martin Kenneth Ikeda to the United States for permanent residence, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Japanese quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 161–162; 50 Stat. 165; 46 Stat. 581; 8 U. S. C. 213 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States for permanent residence persons who are ineligible to citizenship. Martin Kenneth Ikeda, minor son of Ichio Ikeda, a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to be admissible to the United States for permanent residence, provided he is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the first available quota for nationals of China."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAMILLA FABRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3018) for the relief of Camilla Fabris.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

KATE LAURSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4015) for the relief of Kate Laursen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Kate Laursen, the wife of a citizen of the United States, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the words "act of", strike the balance of the line down to and including the word "laws", on line 8, and insert "1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), insofar as concerns any act or acts of Kate Laursen of which the Department of Justice has notice at the time of enactment of this act, the said Kate Laursen may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is not found to be otherwise inadmissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. TA FU WU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4532) for the relief of Dr. Ta Fu Wu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence in the United States of Dr. Ta Fu Wu as of June 30, 1948, the date on which he lawfully entered the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Chinese persons of the first year that such quota is hereafter available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. AGOSTINO DELISI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5566) for the relief of Dr. Agostino DeLisi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Agostino DeLisi who entered the United States on June 26, 1948, to continue his medical studies, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of such date, to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Italy for the first year such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAMAKO AMANO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6271) for the relief of Hamako Amano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of law relating to racial ineligibility and the provisions of the law relating to prerequisites to the issuance of a visitor's visa, Hamako Amano, the fiancée of Harry Schneider, an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, shall, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, be deemed eligible for a visitor's visa for the purpose of contracting marriage with said Harry Schneider: *Provided*, That said marriage shall be contracted within a period of 90 days after the arrival of Hamako Amano in the United States: *Provided further*, That upon the contracting of the marriage aforesaid within the period of 90 days after the arrival of Hamako Amano in the United States, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to adjust the status of Hamako Amano to that of a permanent resident of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Harry Schneider (nee Hamako Amano), the wife of a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harry Schneider."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. WILLIAM Y. IMANAKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6344) for the relief of Mrs. William Y. Imanaka.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mrs. William Y. Imanaka, wife of Corp. William Y. Imanaka, a citizen of the United States who is serving in Japan with the armed forces of the United States, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon

application hereafter filed and without presenting an immigration visa or other travel documents, if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. Upon the admission of the said Mrs. William Y. Imanaka to the United States for permanent residence, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the Japanese quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. William Y. Imanaka, a native and citizen of Japan, of the Japanese race, the wife of Corp. William Y. Imanaka, a citizen of the United States who is serving in Japan with the armed forces of the United States, and that if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws she shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHIKAKO MARY OHORI HORI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6414) for the relief of Mrs. Chikako Mary Ohori Hori.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding from permanent admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mrs Chikako Mary Ohori Hori, a natural-born citizen of the Dominion of Canada and the wife of Soichiro Hori, Pacoima, Calif, a citizen of the United States, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Chikako Mary Ohori Hori, a native and citizen of Canada of the Japanese race, the wife of a citizen of the United States, and that if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws she shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MITSUE MIYAMOTO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6589) for the relief of Mitsue Miyamoto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion from the United States of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Mitsue Miyamoto, the Japanese fiancée of Cloice Howard Bryan, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II. The said Mitsue Miyamoto shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months if the appropriate administrative authorities find that the said Mitsue Miyamoto is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Cloice Howard Bryan and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. If the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Mitsue Miyamoto, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). If the above-named parties are married within 3 months after the entry of the said Mitsue Miyamoto, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Mitsue Miyamoto, as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon payment by her of the required fees and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MITSUKO UEMURA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6689) for the relief of Mitsuko Uemura.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion from the United States of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Mitsuko Uemura, the Japanese fiancée of Clement Don Jones, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II. The said Mitsuko Uemura shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months if the appropriate administrative authorities find that the said Mitsuko Uemura is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Clement Don Jones and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. If the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Mitsuko Uemura, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). If the above-named parties are married within 3 months after the entry of the said Mitsuko Uemura, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Mitsuko Uemura, as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR CHEN SHU JEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6756) for the relief of Arthur Chen Shu Jee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to cause an immigration visa to be issued to Arthur Chen Shu Jee, born on August 2, 1946, at Soochow, China, the son of Dr. Kenneth Chen Huan Jee, who is a native-born United States citizen, if he is found by the United States consul to whom application for visa is made, to be admissible under all the provisions of the immigration laws other than the annual-quota limitations.

SEC. 2. Upon the admission of Arthur Chen Shu Jee to the United States the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Chinese persons for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of existing immigration laws Arthur Chen Shu Jee, born on August 16, 1947, at Soochow, China, the son of Dr. Kenneth Chen Huan Jee, who is a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant if he is admissible for permanent residence under the provisions of the immigration laws other than the annual quota limitations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS KYOKO NAKAMURA KORNHAUSER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6787) for the relief of Mrs. Kyoko Nakamura Kornhauser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Kyoko Nakamura Kornhauser, a native and citizen of Japan, of the Japanese race, the wife of David Henry Kornhauser, a United States citizen who is an honorably discharged veteran of the United States armed forces during World War II, and that if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws she shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. NOBUKO ETO HEARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6894) for the relief of Mrs. Nobuko Eto Heard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Nobuko Eto Heard, a native and citizen of Japan, of the Japanese race, the wife of Thomas James Heard, a United States citizen who is presently serving in the armed forces of the United States, and that if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws she shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HISAKO SAKATA IKEZAWA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7035) for the relief of Hisako Sakata Ikezawa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Hisako Sakata Ikezawa, the Japanese spouse of Michael Akira Ikezawa, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence as a nonquota immigrant upon application hereafter filed, if she is otherwise admissible under immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

P. S. COOK CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 563) for the relief of the P. S. Cook Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the P. S. Cook Co., of Lincoln, Nebr., the sum not exceeding $2,545.76, which the Public Housing Commissioner certifies, after such audit as he deems advisable, to be the amount of losses sustained by such company in performing its cost-plus-fixed-fee subcontracts for plumbing and heating on Federal Public Housing Authority projects Neb.-V-25136 (Blair, Nebr.), Ia.-V-13148 (Red Oak, Iowa), and Ia.-V-13112 (Shenandoah, Iowa), which losses were caused by increased labor costs, no adjustment for which was allowed by the Public Housing Administration, and such payment shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of such company against the United States for reimbursement for such losses: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLADYS INEZ GREENWOOD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 914) for the relief of Gladys Inez Greenwood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gladys Inez Greenwood, of New London, Conn. (widow of Col. Donald R. Greenwood, O-6290, United States Army, who died on July 7, 1946, at Hot Springs, Ark., while en route under Army order to La Jolla, Calif., his official residence of record), an amount equal to the travel allowance to which she would have been entitled had her husband not died at Hot Springs and had he completed his journey to La Jolla, Calif., his official residence of record: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AERO-BOCKER KNITTING MILLS, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1047) for the relief of Aero-Bocker Knitting Mills, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Aero-Bocker Knitting Mills, Inc., New York, N. Y., the sum of $14,439.80. Such sum represents the amount such corporation paid, under protest, to the United States to cover the excess cost to the United States of purchasing 25,000 pounds of knitted worsted fabric elsewhere than from such corporation. The said Aero-Bocker Knitting Mills, Inc., was unable to carry out its contract to furnish such fabric to the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, United States Army, because of a typographical error in the bid submitted by such corporation. Such bid read "$1.45" a pound as the price for which such corporation undertook to furnish such fabric instead of "$2.45" a pound which was the price which such corporation intended to submit: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES W. WULF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1290) for the relief of Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ROBERT B. WORKMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1449) for the relief of Robert B. Workman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert B. Workman, of Lincoln, Maine, the sum of $4,125, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for household and personal effects destroyed on December 17, 1938, when the station building in which he was residing with his family while serving as an employee of the Civil Aeronautics Authority at the United States Airways Communication Station, Knight Field, Evanston, Wyo., was destroyed by fire caused by a defective flue and chimney in the communication station: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. B. TERRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1464) for the relief of W. B. Terry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $446 to W. B. Terry, of Orange, Orange County, Tex., in full payment of all claims against the United States as refund for bond forfeited for Deason Childress, who has been apprehended and turned over to the Federal authorities: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM KRAUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1699) for the relief of the estate of William Kraus.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to the estate of William Kraus, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said William Kraus, who was killed as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Tenth Avenue and Twenty-ninth Street, New York City, on January 6, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$5,452.73."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. L. LEFFINGWELL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1933) for the relief of C. L. Leffingwell and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a), notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to pay, out of the appropriation otherwise available for the reimbursement of expenses incurred in traveling and moving household effects by employees of the Railway Mail Service of the Post Office Department, to the persons named in subsection (b) hereof, such amounts for expenses as were incurred by them in connection with their transfer from one duty station to another on orders of officials of the Surface Postal Transport Division between the dates indicated following the names of each of such persons: *Provided,* That the amounts to be paid shall in each case be subject to administrative determination by the Post Office Department and audit by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further,* That no part of the respective amounts authorized to be paid by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim of any person hereinafter named, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

(b) James H. Barrow, for expenses incurred between December 3, 1945, and July 23, 1947; Walter L. Robinson, Jr., for expenses incurred between April 20, 1947, and November 3, 1947; Allyn W. Reimund, for expenses incurred between July 24, 1947, and November 25, 1947, Walter E Patterson, for expenses incurred between July 6, 1947, and November 9, 1947. Harold L Marsh, for expenses incurred between February 3, 1947, and June 3, 1947; Malcolm R. Clark, for expenses incurred between August 14, 1947, and December 16, 1947; Marshall B McRee, for expenses incurred between October 12, 1947, and February 13, 1948; Charles L. Leffingwell, for expenses incurred between July 28, 1947, and March 3, 1948; Eugene Attkisson, for expenses incurred between November 23, 1947, and October 1, 1948.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

I D COSSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2719) for the relief of I. D. Cosson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, whereas injuries, suffering, and hardship sustained when saturation bombs were dropped in the yard and near his home by a United States Army plane on August 11, 1944, resulted in I. D. Cosson's being permanently paralyzed from the waist down and in his right leg subsequently being amputated in the midthigh, that in addition to sums heretofore authorized, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to the legal guardian of I. D Cosson, of De Funiak Springs, Fla., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENO E. STITELY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2765) for the relief of Reno E. Stitely.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MRS DOROTHY MANIOUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2929) for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs Dorothy Manious, Nebraska City, Nebr, the sum of $10,000 in full settlement of her claim against the United States arising out of the death of Alvin C Manious, her husband; and the sum of $2,500 in full settlement of her claim against the United States arising from injuries received while a passenger in an automobile which was struck by one being driven by Private Jeter Maxwell in Munich, Germany.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, after the sign "$" strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, medical expenses, and loss of earnings sustained by her as the result of an accident involving an Army truck, which occurred in Munich, Germany, on January 31, 1948: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS ELIZABETH GARDNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3725) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Gardner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Elizabeth Gardner, the Samuel and Nettie Eowne Hospital, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., the sum of $25,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation on account of personal injuries and medical and hospital and other expenses incurred by her as a result thereof, sustained by her when an automobile in which she was traveling collided with a United States Army truck driven by Pvt. George A. Green, while proceeding on Route No. 55, near the town of Poughquag, N. Y., on February 3, 1944: *And provided further,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to" insert "the estate of."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$25,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000 "

Page 2, line 4, after the date "1944·", strike out "*Provided*", and insert in lieu thereof. "*Provided,* That the acceptance by the said estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Gardner of the amount appropriated by this act shall not be construed as affecting any claim or claims that she may desire to assert against any other person or persons on account of damages growing out of this same accident: *And provided further.*"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Gardner."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Y S HU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4301) for the relief of Y. S. Hu

Mr POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

J. R HOLDEN, R C BIGGADIKE, AND JOHN HOFFMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H R 4342) for the relief of J. R Holden, R. C. Biggadike, and John Hoffman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two objections are required.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HARRY TANSEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5546) for the relief of Harry Tansey.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALCIDE RAYMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6051) for the relief of Alcide Raymond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to enter in the records of the Department of the Army the following: That Alcide Raymond, Army serial number R-2030?8, sergeant, Battery A, Thirteenth Coast Artillery, shall be held and considered to have been retired on November 14, 1936, after more than 30 years' service

SEC. 2 The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,965 67 to Maud E. Raymond, widow of Alcide Raymond, which amount represents full retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of active-duty pay of a sergeant from November 14, 1936, to and including January 31, 1948, the date of the death of Alcide Raymond: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL D BANNING

The Clerk called the bill (H R 6691) for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $12,366 33, of which amount (a) not to exceed the sum of $406 89 shall be credited in the accounts of Paul D Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department; not to exceed the sum of $144.16 shall be credited in the accounts of E. J Brennan, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department; not to exceed the sum of $623 67 shall be credited in the accounts of Guy F Allen, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, to the extent necessary to adjust overdrafts in their accounts as described in House Report No. 1609, Eighty-first Congress, second session; (b) not to exceed the sum of $9 shall be used to reimburse B H Willis, cashier, office of the collector of internal revenue, Jacksonville, Fla., for the amount paid by him to the Federal Reserve bank in settlement of a discrepancy caused by a deposit of a $1 note which had been raised to $10; (c) not to exceed the sum of $20 shall be used to reimburse Miss Vera Dixon, window teller, office of the collector of internal revenue, St. Louis, Mo., for the amount paid by her to the Federal Reserve bank to replace a counterfeit $20 bill; (d) not to exceed the sum of $20 shall be used to reimburse J. L Schrum, cashier, office of the collector of internal revenue, Greensboro, N. C., for the amount paid by him to the Guilford (N. C) National Bank to replace a counterfeit $20 bill, (e) not to exceed the sum of $10 shall be used to reimburse James Howley, teller, office of the collector of internal revenue, Chicago, Ill., for the amount paid by him to replace a counterfeit $10 bill; and (f) not to exceed the sum of $11,132.61 shall be credited to public-debt receipts to correct discrepancies resulting from the failure of issuing agents to account for bond stock supplied to them.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of the following certifying officers, former certifying officers, and a disbursing officer of the Treasury Department for amounts disallowed in their accounts as enumerated in House Report No. 1609, Eighty-first Congress, second session, in sums not to exceed those hereinafter stated: Charles S. Bell, $7.50; Edwin H. Dressel, $50, Harry C. Westover, $1,151.68; Mrs Pluma J. O'Farrell, $28 86, E F Kelm, $25.20, Frank J. Kuhl, $39 30, Earl G Loser, $6 24; J C Breaud, $903 87; O. V Powell, $354 33, and Denis W. Delaney, $9 99.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table

SGT. BLAINE W. HUGHES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6692) for the relief of Sgt Blaine W. Hughes

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Sgt Blaine W. Hughes, AF 19036079, United States Air Force, be, and he is hereby, relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $203 28, representing the amount of pay received by him from the United States for work performed by him as a temporary civilian employee in the capacity of automotive mechanic, grade 12, between October 8, 1945, and November 11, 1945, both dates inclusive, at the Sierra Ordnance Depot, Herlong, Calif., while he was on furlough. In the settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for all payments made to the said Sgt Blaine W Hughes for the services so performed by him

SEC 2 That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sgt. Blaine W Hughes, United States Air Force, the sum of $69 60 ($82 40 less $12 80, withholding tax), to be exempt from Federal income tax, which sum represents the net balance of the compensation due to the said Blaine W. Hughes for the services performed by him between October 8, 1945, and November 21, 1945, both dates inclusive, at the said Sierra Ordnance Depot, while he was on furlough: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERVIN HAAS AND LENO VESCOVI

The Clerk called the bill (H R 6694) for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the instructions of the Navy Department contained in Navy Civilian Personnel Instructions (NCPI 250, Rev. II), Ervin Haas, former fire chief, United States naval submarine base, New London, Conn., from January 26, 1942, to October 2, 1944, and Leno Vescovi, former fire chief, United States naval submarine base, New London, Conn., from October 5, 1944, to May 5, 1948, shall be held and considered to have been entitled to occupancy of public quarters without charge while serving as fire chief at the afore-mentioned naval submarine base; and such persons shall not be subject to charge for the accumulated appraised value of the rental and utilities furnished for such periods in the amounts of $645 65 and $360 66, respectively: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table

EDGAR F RUSSELL; LILLIAN V RUSSELL, HIS WIFE, AND BESSIE R WARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6695) for the relief of Edgar F. Russell; Lillian V. Russell, his wife; and Bessie R. Ward.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edgar F. Russell and Lillian V. Russell, his wife, the sum of $903 25, and to Bessie R. Ward, the sum of $135 75, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the value of personal property destroyed by fire on June 14, 1944, in a Government building at Hoonah, Alaska: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE B. WILLIAMS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6696) for the relief of Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lawrence B Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams, the sum of $1,437 08, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the value of personal property destroyed by fire on March 19, 1946, in a Government building at Savoonga, Alaska: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENIO MAISTERRENA BARRENECHE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 204) for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of January 2, 1950, the date upon which he was temporarily admitted into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PIETER CORNELIS TEN WOLDE AND FAMILY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 714) for the relief of Pieter Cornelis ten Wolde and family.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws the aliens Pieter Cornelis ten Wolde, his wife, Mrs. Johanna Cristina ten Wolde, and their two minor children, Christol Henny ten Wolde and Loekie Helena ten Wolde, of New Orleans, La., who entered the United States at Miami, Fla., on September 2, 1947, for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence at such place and on such date. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to make appropriate deduction of four numbers from the quota for the Netherlands.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JOHN KAUDY, FORMERLY STELLA CAPPLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1170) for the relief of Mrs. John Kaudy, formerly Stella Cappler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Mrs. John Kaudy (formerly Stella Cappler), the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the Act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, Seventy-ninth Congress), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "residence" strike out the balance of line 9 and line 10 down to and including the word "Congress)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GABE BUDWEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 309) for the relief of Gabe Budwee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Gabe Budwee, the husband of an American-born citizen of the United States, and the father of two minor citizens of the United States, who aided in the war effort by his employment as a civilian by the United States Army in Australia, during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the Immigration Act of 26, 1924, if he is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SOLVEIG NORMANSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2232) for the relief of Mrs. Solveig Normanson.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

THERESE HOHMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3330) for the relief of Therese Hohman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Therese Hohman, residing in Bethlehem, Pa., who was admitted into the United States at the port of Boston on a temporary visa, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of December 17, 1948; the departure bond shall be canceled upon payment of visa fees and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category from the German quota for the first year said quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALFRED ZORGIS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4604) to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills, namely Alfred Zorgis, Teodor Egle, Karlis Fogelis, Vasily Kils, and Aleksanders Zelmenis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State and the Attorney General be, and are hereby, authorized and directly jointly to provide for the temporary admission of Alfred Zorgis, Teodor Egle, Karlis Fogelis, Vasily Kils, and Aleksanders Zelmenis, who are foreign specialists possessing special and unique skills vitally needed for the operation of a textile mill by Robert Hirss, of Woonsocket, R. I.

If, at the expiration of 12 months immediately following the admission into the United States of these foreign specialists, the Attorney General shall, upon application filed with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization by these named aliens, find that such persons have maintained employment with Robert Hirss, he is hereby authorized and directed to amend the record of such aliens' temporary admission to show admission for permanent residence as of the date of their respective actual entry into the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Alfred Zorgis."

Page 1, strike out line 10 and lines 1 to 9 on page 2.

Page 2, line 10, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. If the Attorney General finds that any of the above-named aliens has failed to maintain a satisfactory employment status at any time within the year after the date of his temporary admission, such alien shall be deemed to have remained in the United States for a longer time than permitted and shall be subject to deportation as provided in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills, namely, Teodor Egle, Karlis Fogelis, Vasily Kils, and Aleksanders Zelmenis."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VERONICA JOLLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4781) for the relief of Veronica Jolly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Veronica Jolly, of Washington, D. C., shall be held and considered to be found lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her actual entry into the United States, upon payment by her of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to deduct one number from the quota for Australia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PRIVATE LAW NO. 463, SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5541) to amend Private Law No. 463, Seventy-sixth Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Private Law 463, Seventy-sixth Congress, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That, for the purposes of section 5, of the act entitled 'An act in reference to the expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad,' approved March 2, 1907, as amended,

William Lawrence Tan, of Honolulu, Hawaii, the minor child of Wilma Alberta Geary, a citizen of the United States whose American citizenship was resumed on March 30, 1935, notwithstanding that he is inadmissible for entry into the United States for permanent residence he shall not be deported.

"SEC. 2. The Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of William Lawrence Tan as of December 1, 1934, at the port of Honolulu, Hawaii."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARUKO TERAMOTO

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 6577) for the relief of Haruko Teramoto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Haruko Teramoto, Hyogo-Ken, Japan, the Japanese fiancée of Dale O. Nichols, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Haruko Teramoto may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months. *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Haruko Teramoto is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Dale O. Nichols, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Haruko Teramoto, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after entry of said Haruko Teramoto, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Haruko Teramoto as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head taxes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. W. EATON COAL CO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 229) for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,103.24, to E. W. Eaton Coal Co., of Belfast, Maine, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of transportation cost in excess of normal rates of transportation prevailing prior to January 1, 1942, on coal received on and after April 1, 1944, to December 31, 1944, in and around New York Harbor area and in New England, on anthracite coal from district No. 3 in northern West Virginia: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LLOYD D. LYLES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 321) for the relief of Lloyd D. Lyles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lloyd D. Lyles, of Asheville, N. C., the sum of $231.69 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the difference between the salary paid him under grade CAF-2 by the General Accounting Office for the period December 5, 1947, to January 24, 1948, and the salary of grade CAF-8, the duties of which he performed during such period after having been erroneously separated from the higher grade: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE HERBERT HARTMAN, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 481) for the relief of the legal guardian of Clarence Herbert Hartman, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to the legal guardian of Clarence Herbert Hartman, a minor, of Clearwater, Fla., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said minor on June 7, 1943, near Pinellas Army Air Field, St. Petersburg, Fla., when a rope suspended from an Army airplane struck him on the neck and threw him to the ground: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDNA A. BAUSER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1916) for the relief of Edna A. Bauser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edna A. Bauser, postmaster at Bunker Hill, Ill., the sum of $366.71, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement for the expenses incurred by her in providing temporary quarters for the post office following a tornado which destroyed the former quarters: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-6690437, Abbott, Colin Cedric

A-5011697, Acosta, Catalina Avila De, or Katie Acosta or Louisa Avila.

A-6436032, Akins, Mei Lin Liu, or Marion Liu Akins (nee Mei Lin Liu).

A-6910024, Albert Joseph Armand.

A-6717538, Alexandropoulos, Nicolaos.

A-3017010, Amador, Casimiro Moreno.

A-2840055, Amador, Flores De, or Maria Ignacia De Jesus.

A-6314074, Andronis, Agnes, or Agni Androni (nee Vatzakis or Batzakis or Bodzarki).

A-6152797, Armitage, Edith Elizabeth.

A-6943217, Atilano, Encarnacion, or Encarnacion Atilano Navarro or Jose Encarnacion Atilano Navarro.

A-6943218, Atilano, Rosa Cordero de, or Rosa Aldama Cordero.

A-6094890, Ayyob, Rayyah Mitri, or Ayoob or Ayoub

A-6173823, Badillo-Molar, Gabriel.

A-6237469, Baltes, Leontina Elvira (nee Leontina Elvira Moga).

A-9502310, Bergersen, Arne Johan.

A-9679280, Bergersen, Astrid Hedvig (nee Christiansen).

A-6191247, Best, Paul Wardlaw

A-2100536, Bik, Chan Pui, or Esther Chan or Mrs. So Bing Sun

A-6625650, Biondi, Angelina Vecchio.

A-3044839, Bisconti, Guiseppe, or Joseph B. Bisconti

A-2815577, Booth, Alfred Smallwood.

A-6746235, Bozzay, George.

A-2813968, Bribiescas, Ascencion.

A-2809223, Bribiescas, Petra Nieves (alias Petra N. Bribiescas alias Petra Nieves).

A-2961471, Bucewick, Albina Alzbieta, or Albina Alizabeth Bucevicius (nee Valentos).

A-5614072, Burt, Arthur Frederick Jasper.

A-6248877, Calogero, Glyceria (nee Dariva).

A-2488694, Camano, Enrique.

A-6590339, Chapman, Phyllis Eileen.

A-6224753, Churchill, Diane Cecilia.

A-2447000, Coffaro, Paolino (alias Paul Joseph Coffaro).

A-6708393, Cooper, Herbert Roy.

A-6581215, Coronado, Ramon Elizondo.

A-6138488, Couris, Victoria Hantzaras.

A-6677213, Cuevas, Armando Jose Lopez y.

A-6510561, Cybulski, Mieczyslaw Prawzic, or Mieczyslaw Cybulski.

A-1117811, D'Andria, Pietro or Peter.
A-6094851, Dean, Faith.
A-5935194, De La O-Favila, Jesus (alias Pedro De La O or Pedro Regalado).
A-6642958, Dvorak, Zdenek.
A-2933876, Facca, Guerino (alias Jerry Facca).
A-6836711, Fierro, Gregorio, or Gregorio Fierro-Parras.
A-6836710, Fierro, Sanjuana Carillo de, or Sanjuana Carillo.
A-6644965, Finkelstein, Marie, or Maria Popovici.
A-4391431, Fong, Mon Lai.
A-4391432, Sang, Chang Hung.
A-3074701, Foros, Petros, or Pete Foros or Peter Foros.
A-6780431, Garcia, Maria Calderon de (alias Maria Carrasco alias Maria Carrasco de Garcia).
A-6928132, Garcia, Petra.
A-6384469, Garcia, Oscar Raimundo Y. Chaple.
A-6653996, Garcia, Carmen (nee Carmen Estevez Betancourt).
A-4815907, Garonzik, Ray, formerly Raella, or Ray Gilman (nee Raella or Ray Ruckenstein).
A-5874797, George, Lilly Belle.
A-6479308, Gerchow, Maria Eugenia.
A-3984244, Glikis, Panagiotis, or Panagiottis Pantelis Glikis or Pangrottis or Pete Glikis.
A-2725829, Goldberg, Sarah (nee Hyman).
A-2594809, Gomes, Luis Manuel.
A-6143141, Gonzalez, Aurelio Vigao Y.
A-6332553, Graham, John Francis.
A-6352479, Graham, Marguerite Enid.
A-6838567, Granado, Estefana Reza De (alias Estefana Reza alias Estefana Rivera).
A-6677332, Griott, Alice Agnes.
A-6420400, Gross, Ludovic.
A-6484147, Gruetzmann, Clara (nee Bass).
A-6665732, Gutman, Rasela (nee Politzer).
A-2478152, Hansen, Emanuel Edward, or Emanuel Hansen.
A-2702213, Hansen, Eigel Mogens (alias Egil Mogens Hansen).
A-9741937, Hansen, Hans.
A-2796185, Hanson, Hans Richard.
A-6689466, Held, Elsie Johanna (alias Elsie Johanna Wilde).
A-9059070, Hermo, Manuel Paz, or Manuel Paz.
A-5339010, Holzli, Paul.
A-6786987, Humphreys, Rosemary Bernadette.
A-6786986, Humphreys, Adrienne Marie-Louise.
A-6509198, Hurtado, Felipe Dominguez.
A-5327808, Inanovitz, Abraham Leib, or Louis Norvin.
A-6930159, Jackson, Marjorie Alice.
A-6930160, Jackson, Michael Thomas.
A-1675694, Jadegba, Augustine Kumakpibe (alias Augustine Thompson).
A-6041608, Javadi, Esfandiar, or Jimmie Javadi.
A-6042303, Jendrzejewski, Kazimierza (nee Kazimierza Janiszewski).
A-6477150, Johnson, Richard Arlan, formerly Richard Arlan Westby.
A-6350827, Katsaros, Marika (nee Tzika).
A-4116771, Kiang, Phoenix Shih Feng (alias Phoenix Kiang).
A-3537628, Killeen, Raymond Michael, or Michael Raymond Killeen.
A-4776991, Kim, Sae Sun, or Hak San Kim.
A-9662769, Klingen, Jack.
A-4985554, Kozich, Stella Jean.
A-7569224, Kraus, Bohumil.
A-7528919, Krausova, Matylda.
A-7528920, Krausova, Marie.
A-2455188, Krikorian, Alex, or Aghiag Krikorian.
A-2544843, Kvart, Stephania Nowak (alias Bromislawa Nowak alias Stephania Nowak alias Katherine Nowak alias Stephania Dzierba or Katherine Dzierba).
A-6817859, Kwiatkowski, Marek Jerzy Drobner (alias Mark Post).
A-7707327, Lambert, Judyann.
A-7513902, Landeta, Emilia Martinez y Aldanese De.
A-3296238, Lech, John.
A-6369909, Lee, Hannah Margaret.
A-6181955, Leonardi Michele.
A-1368471, Levy, Corin (nee Franco).
A-7780799, Leyba, Altagracia Mercedes Joaquina Perez, or Joaquina Perez-Leyba (alias Joepuina Bido de Perez Leyba and Altagracia Mercedes Joaquina Bido).
A-5997352, Lopez, Jesus, or Jesus Lopez Alvarado.
A-5997355, Lopez, Teresita, or Teresita Lopez Alvarado.
A-5997473, Lopez, Salvador, or Salvador Lopez Alvarado.
A-6186420, Louis, Juliana.
A-2065717, Madrid, Carmel Quiroz De.
A-6438935, Maloney, Annie Jean (nee Kearsey).
A-6438936, Maloney, Sharon Anne.
A-6790948, Mikela, Heidrum Kirkutis (alias Heidrum Crow).
A-6947452, Miller, Douglas George.
A-5397290, Milstein, Aron.
A-5240771, Mione, Stefano Francesco, or Stefano Mione.
A-2585562, Mitchell, Anna (nee Anna Ford).
A-6929703, Montgelas, Carl Maximilian, or Carl Maximilian Maria Adolph Joseph Montgelas.
A-6138480, Mount, Milagros Josefina (nee Llorente).
A-4446894, Mullinas, Georgios, or George Dennis Mullinas or George Mollis.
A-5018764, McDonnell, Elizabeth Yvonne.
A-6153450, McKirdy, Colin.
A-5619399, Nagle, Florence Tyson (nee Tyson).
A-4294912, Needleman, Renee (nee Gross alias Grutz y Vuchonicka alias Riveca Grutz Y Zuchonicka).
A-6170351, Nelle, Frederick James.
A-6170350, Nelle, Elizabeth Louise.
A-6170349, Nelle, Dorothy Bertha.
A-3081341, Ness, Sigurd (alias Sigurd Naess).
A-5238841, Nibbs, Ernest Albert.
A-5734583, Nibbs, Elenora.
A-6929879, Nieto, Zacarias.
A-6106967, Nunez, Roberto Rivas, or Robert R. Nunez.
A-6191698, Oddo, Mary (nee Maria Starchenko).
A-6367354, Olsen, Ragnhild Konstanse (alias Ragnhild Jerkill, nee Larsen).
A-4189079, Osuna, Maria Concepcion Parra de.
A-2916516, Ottochian, Dionisio.
A-5593205, Overton, Randolph Lee.
A-3599556, Panton, Leslie Alexander.
A-6702281, Papapostolou, Aliki Constantino (nee Kamtsika).
A-1221717, Perez, Benigno Boo.
A-6401710, Perry, Margaret, formerly Sands (nee McCartney).
A-6038914, Pineda, Salvador, or Francisco Pichardo or Salvador Pinedo De La Rosa.
A-3333079, Pirrone, Antonino.
A-6571104, Plessas, Dimitra Thomas.
A-6085700, Prata, Adelaide Lopes.
A-7773100, Ramirez, Fausto Arturo, or Fausto Arturo Ramirez y Benet.
A-3176813, Regues, Francisco, or Francisco Regues y Torregrosa (alias Francisco Torregrosa Regues).
A-6698999, Reinert, Joseph, or Josif Reinert.
A-1579856, Rene, Joseph Albert.
A-2326767, Rerecich, Guiseppe Gregorio (alias Joseph Rerecich).
A-6149433, Ricci, Victor Alan.
A-6904437, Rivera, Carlos, or Carlos Rivera Aguilar or Carlos Aguilar.
A-3310811, Rizzo, Josephine (nee Matteliano).
A-1656998, Robbins, Christopher (alias James Church).
A-6637067, Robertson, Amy Theresa.
A-6953105, Robledo, Gregorio, or Gregorio Robledo Clanez.
A-6953104, Robledo, Socorro Martinez De or Socorro Martinez.
A-1187347, Rodrigues, Antonio.
A-6919985, Sachsenhauser, Rudolph or Rudolf.
A-6652820, Salazar, Gumesindo Beltran, or Jose Beltran-Salazar.
A-6821713, Saldana, Anita Marmolejo de.
A-6104289, Sanchez, Francisco Magallon.
A-6677176, Sawicki, Hilary Ferdinand.
A-3229985, Scavo, Lucia Vitale.
A-3983279, Schuldt, Charles Bruno Karl Max, or Charles Bruno Schuldt.
A-6919820, Schutz, Walter.
A-6948076, Schutz, Marie.
A-9576879, Selja, Johannes or John.
A-2291078, Selja, Maret (nee Raid or Kristine Juurmann).
A-452[illegible]199, Shotkowski, Josephine Mary.
A-640[illegible]536, Smale, William Ronald (alias Donald William Grey).
A-6922[illegible]71, Smith, Cynthia Lauretta.
A-3173252, Socha, Caroline (nee Gargulinska).
A-1261126, Somers, Amos Urias (alias Amos Sommers or Somers).
A-9799985, Sotto, Romula, Aliferos.
A-6457944, Spinola, Carlo, or Marquis Carlo Spinola or Carlo Luigi Spinola.
A-4382612, Spoor, Johanna Catharina (nee Porton).
A-2230005, Stanatiotis, Ioannis Dimitrios, or Ioannis Stanos or John Dimitrios Stanos.
A-6650377, Stensland, Carl Ola.
A-6650792, Stensland, Inger.
A-6285048, Stewart, Muriel Eulalie (nee Foote).
A-6688387, Stoll, Else, or Elizabeth Stoll.
A-6199479, Saint Vincent, Howard Roy.
A-9728296, Tammsaar, Johannes.
A-6183204, Tapinis, Peter, or Panagiotis Tapinis.
A-7750886, Targal, Ali Kami.
A-2044869, Thefterios, Elefttherios G.
A-6574319, Thame, Victor Ralph.
A-4224673, Thellemann, Elsa Frieda.
A-1872455, Thibodeau, Kathleen Georgia.
A-6815680, Thomas, William Barry Garland.
A-6195364, Thompson, Pearl Estella, formerly Pearl Estella Wright.
A-2094041, Tiranno, Cologero, or Charles Tiranno.
A-6164965, Torres, Altagracia, or Cancela Recio.
A-6380231, Traag, Socorro.
A-6852416, Trovato, Teresa (nee Feda).
A-7729663, Trujillo, Bernardo.
A-6083857, Tsao, Han Sun.
A-3175382, Tschauder, Wolfgang Dietrich.
A-2584603, Tsohos, Michael Antoniou Koulouris, or Michael Antoniou Tsohos.
A-1740907, Tziotis, Argyrios.
A-3147723, Urruchua, Juan.
A-6146848, Urrutia, Acracia (nee Herrero-Garcia).
A-6877600, Valenzuela, Manuel.
A-6246802, Vian Anastasia, formerly Anastasia Xenias (nee Sotiriadis).
A-6172669, Violagis, Eftyhia Constatin (alias Eftyhia Violacis or Violantzis nee Cosmides).
A-9526618, Wallestad, Arild Martin.
A-3416156, Witriol, Meyer.
A-6846949, Yaker, Mordco, or Marco Yaker.
A-3461003, Yancsics, Klara, or Klara Schmidt.
A-2645628, You, Lee Kee.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 5, line 20, strike out the registration number and the name, "A-6509198, Hurtado, Filipe Dominguez."

On page 8, line 23, strike out the registration number and the name, "A-3599556, Panton, Leslie Alexander."

On page 9, line 6, strike out the registration number and the name, "A-3333079, Pirrone, Antonino."

On page 10, line 11, strike out the registration number and the name, "A-6677176, Sawicki, Hilary Ferdinand."

The concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 45, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-7759876, Ackermann, Rose (nee Leider).
A-6688781, Bell, Trevor Reginald.
A-1381702, Bennardo, Pasquale.
A-6141778, Blin, Maurice Edme Lucien Roger
A-2617650, Brehme, Julius Frederick Franz.
A-3895754, Cruz, Ismael or Isabel.
A-6178548, Dahlseide, Sharon Beverly.
A-4688615, Dahmen, Fernando.
A-6505623, David, Tuma, or Tuma Nasser David or Tom David.
A-6508984, Davidson, Judith Barbara.
A-2527936, Delgado, Martin Lopez, or Martin D. Lopez.
A-4604550, Di Pino, Salvatore.
A-6341132, Emmanuel, Alexander Anastasios
A-6172764, Emmanuel, Panorea Psaloudi or Panorea (Nora) Emmanuel (nee Panorea Synteli).
A-6713078, Falco, Maria Anna Elisabeth (nee Stumm).
A-6840140, Fidler, Archibald Raymond.
A-6211679, Fleischer, Joseph.
A-6920686, Ford, Elaine Lucy.
A-6485945, Gardis, Argyro (formerly Argyro Velendza nee Karra).
A-7713579, Goldman, Sylvia Cherill, or Cherill Sylvia Pastman or Sylvia Pastman or Sylvia Mazelow.
A-6787040, Gomez, Ernesto Gonzalez (alias Ernest Gomez Gonzalez).
A-5952737, Greaux, Paul Marceau.
A-6827838, Guement, Joelle Beatrix Therese Marthe.
A-2133711, Gutierrez, Jacinta (nee Luna).
A-4973912, Hopkins, Muriel Blanche (nee Mac Leod).
A-6697157, James, Josephine Constance, or Josephine James also Josephine Constance Matthews.
A-6358005, Kessenides, Agapi, or Agapi Efstathrou Tsavdaridis or Agapi Kessinidi.
A-6602733, Kochan, Anne Betty (nee Birovcak).
A-4828807, Lenkiewicz, Antonina (nee Tracz).
A-6642540, Lerma, Aurora Saez.
A-2197906, Lopez, Herminia Aldaco de.
A-6664449, Mascolo, Vittoria Lo, or Vittoria Perrino (maiden name) Vittoria Perrino Lo Mascolo.
A-2827195, Metz, Conrad.
A-6095050, Michos, Nicoleris Anastase.
A-4764938, Mikulsky, Edith Mary Mott (alias McClusky nee Mott).
A-5852743, Miniconi, Francois.
A-2387754, Murillo, Inez Murillo de.
A-6222812, McDonald, Barry Francis.
A-1385505, Papadelis, Emmanuel John.
A-6868639, Parra, Armando, or Armando Parra-Hernandez.
A-2060168, Parsons, Albert Earnest, or Bert Clark.
A-6743740, Perego, Viovanni Luigi.
A-6405637, Power, Melvin John.
A-6334558, Providence, Maude (nee Braithwaite).
A-9537786, Rasmussen, Aage.
A-9632307, Rebane, Paul, or Paul Fuks.
A-6867152, Robichaud, Helen Edna, or Helen Edna O'Brien.
A-7596063, Robinson, Alice Anna Antonia (nee Casagrande).
A-7596067, Robinson, Marula Arthur.
A-7596066, Robinson, Harald Denis.
A-3252615, Roy, Marie Blanche Yvonne (alias Marie Blanche Yvonne LaPierre).
A-5522588, Schoenherr, Mary Elizabeth.
A-5351772, Scopinich, Anna Maria, or Anna Maria Tuna.
A-5312452, Simone, Celestina F. De. (nee Francescutti).
A-1873028, Stevens, Herta Maria Juliana (nee Zarnikow).
A-6728297, Veldhuis, Cornelia Antonia.
A-7514694, Villasenor, Emilia (nee Emilia Parguian Castro).
A-4507171, Walnunsky, Berco Gelwan.
A-6698837, Williams, Doris Ismay.
A-9550601, Wright, George Frederic (alias George Frederico Wright).
A-6476905, Yu, Teh Fu.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike out the registration number and the name, "A-6505623, David, Tuma, or Tuma Nasser David or Tom David"

On page 3, after line 2, insert the following two registration numbers and names:

"A-6369006, Karpman, Itzhak Jakob."

"A-6643689, Karpman, Estera nee Goldfinger"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VICTOR V. GREG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 633) for the relief of Mrs. Victor V. Greg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, to Mrs. Victor V. Greg, of 3155 Annapolis Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Civilian Conservation Corps truck, near Joliet, Ill., on December 22, 1935: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out $10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MERLE LEATHERBURY PYLE AND PATRICIA M. PYLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1133) for the relief of Mrs. Merle Leatherbury Pyle and Patricia M. Pyle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, Lawrence A. Pyle, late employee of the Interstate Commerce Commission, who died on August 8, 1947, shall be held and considered to have died subsequent to February 28, 1948, and Mrs. Merle Leatherbury Pyle and Patricia M. Pyle, widow and minor child, respectively, of the said Lawrence A. Pyle shall be entitled to the benefits of such section 12 (c), beginning the first day of the second month following the month in which this act is enacted, if all amounts paid out of the civil-service retirement and disability fund on account of the death of the said Lawrence A. Pyle are redeposited in such fund not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUF DER HEIDE-ARAGONA, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1606) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and the same hereby is, conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and through it the claims of its subcontractors, against the United States arising out of the performance of a contract with the Veterans' Administration for the construction of a hospital building at Fort Howard, Md: *Provided*, That if the said court shall find that the United States through any of its departments or agencies delayed the issuance of priorities which resulted in subjecting the said contractor and its subcontractors to additional costs, including overhead expense, or if the said court shall find the United States, through any such department or agency, including Defense Plant Corporation, sponsored any work program in the general area of the contractor's work which rendered it impossible for the contractor and its subcontractors to achieve that degree of labor performance which they would have achieved had any such work program not existed, or made it necessary for them to pay higher wages for such labor as was available than they would otherwise have had to pay, and that these conditions subjected the contractor and its subcontractors to additional cost and overhead expense, then the said court shall in either event enter judgment for the contractor and its subcontractors in the amount of such additional costs, including a reasonable allowance for profit based upon such excess of cost and overhead expense.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILDRED SMITH BUTLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1697) for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, to Mildred Smith Butler, sister by legal adoption and beneficiary of the national service life insurance issued to John Cronin, deceased.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert: "That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay to Mildred Smith Butler, of Jasper, N. Y., the proceeds of National Service Insurance Policy No. N13047458 issued to John Cronin, late sergeant, Third Student Training Regiment, Fort Benning, Ga., whose death occurred in line of duty on March 16, 1944. Although Fred Butler was designated by the insured as beneficiary of such policy, his claim for payment thereunder was disallowed by Veterans' Administration on the ground that he did not stand in loco parentis to the insured within the meaning of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. Mildred Smith Butler, legally adopted sister of John Cronin, and wife of Fred Butler, beneficiary of said policy, is next in line to receive insurance."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EARL L. DOSS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3080) for the relief of Earl L. Doss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Earl L. Doss, postal money order clerk in the United States Post Office at Savannah, Ga., the sum of $145.56. The payment of such sum shall be in reimbursement for the payment of an equal amount by the said Earl L. Doss to the Post Office Department on account of the payment without fault on his part, of two forged post-office money orders Nos. 194242 and 194243, issued at Estill, South Carolina, August 30, 1947, in the total amount of $145.56

With the following committee amendment.

At the end of the bill add "*: Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS P. MURPHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3506) for the relief of Louis P. Murphy, United States immigrant inspector, El Paso, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $725.50, to reimburse United States Immigrant Inspector Louis P. Murphy, of El Paso, Tex., for the value of personal property lost in a fire which detroyed a United States Government truck in which Inspector Murphy was being conveyed on official Government business while en route from El Paso, Tex., to Guaymas, Sonora, Mexico, on October 3, 1948: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AGNES EMMA HAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4380) for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay, Coalinga, Calif., the sum of $5,000 The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay against the United States on account of the loss of her husband, Charles William Hay, who died on September 19, 1944, as the result of personal injuries sustained when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle on September 16, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdeameanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM J. DRINKWINE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4608) for the relief of William J. Drinkwine.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,325 to William J. Drinkwine, of 5029 Seventh Avenue, Kenosha, Wis., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of wages and expenses resulting from being unjustly suspended from the Kenosha, Wis., post office for violation of the Hatch Act in June 1939 and restored to duty July 1940: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$2,325" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,100."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STELLA AVNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4720) for the relief of Stella Avner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Stella Avner, Washington, D. C., the sum of $5,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Stella Avner against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her (while an employee of the Personnel and Administration Division, Office of Military Government for Bavaria) when she was shot by a sentry of the Army of the United States on the A6 South Autobahn, near Neubiberg, Germany, on October 16, 1946: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS A. GUNN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5274) for the relief of Francis A. Gunn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Francis A. Gunn, of South Weymouth, Mass., the sum of $6,984.82. Such sum represents reimbursement for actual additional costs incurred by the said Francis A. Gunn in constructing a building to be used as quarters by the South Weymouth branch of the Boston post office, such additional costs being caused by delay in the granting of the Civilian Production Administration authorization necessary for such construction: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of

10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after "building", strike out "a" and insert "to."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED I. MASSENGILL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5523) for the relief of Fred I. Massengill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred I. Massengill, postmaster at Terrell, Tex., the sum of $1,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Fred I. Massengill against the United States by reason of his being required to pay such sum to the United States for postage stamps lost, without fault on his part, from the post office at Terrell, Tex., during December 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEAN CLARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5753) for the relief of Jean Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jean Clark, of Huntington Station, N. Y., the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving an Army vehicle, occurring on January 28, 1944, at South Huntington, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,232."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WINNEBAGO RESERVATION, NEBR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2520) to authorize the sale of certain allotted devised land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell the trust allotment No. 110 of George Tebo, Jr., deceased Winnebago allottee, described as the east half of the northeast quarter of section 9, township 26 north, range 8 east, sixth principal meridian, Thurston County, Nebr., containing 80 acres, conveyance to be made by deed or the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser and to disburse the proceeds of such sale to Walter Tebo for his benefit.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PINE RIDGE INDIAN RESERVATION, S. DAK.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6521) to authorize the sale of certain land on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, S. Dak., allotted to Lucy Arapahoe Iron Bear.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to sell at a price not less than $2,500 the trust allotment numbered 5145 of Lucy Arapahoe Iron Bear, described as the southwest quarter of section 2, township 37 north, range 38 west, of the sixth principal meridian, South Dakota, conveyance to be made by deed or the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser and to disburse the proceeds of such sale to Lucy Arapahoe Iron Bear for her benefit: *Provided*, That the proceeds shall be regarded as trust funds and shall not be subject to liens or attachments of any character whatsoever except obligations due the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Y. S. HU

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 600, the bill (H. R. 4301) for the relief of Y. S. Hu, and I withdraw my previous objection to its consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Y. S. Hu, Honolulu, T. H., the sum of $446.66. Such sum represents full payment for 51 days' annual accumulated leave earned by the said Y. S. Hu, as an employee of the Bureau of Customs of the Department of the Treasury, during the period beginning January 1, 1933, and ending May 16, 1940. The said Y. S. Hu did not take all of his leave in the years 1933 and 1934 because of lack of help in the Bureau of Customs and was denied the accumulated leave upon his resignation, May 16, 1940: *Provided*, That part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEAT RESEARCH

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1950, it was my privilege to introduce H. R. 7330, urging upon the country research and development affecting one of its greatest untapped resources—peat.

Never before in the history of our country has there been a greater need for such full and complete development of its native materials as now. It is needed for our economic health, industrial strength, and national security.

Development of our national resources is a responsibility of the Federal Government and the necessity of the present times requires that we undertake action quite promptly. Successful research has long been conducted with wood, lignite, bituminous, and anthracite coals. Research in peat, geologically between wood and lignite, has been neglected. Yet such research holds promise of unlocking new and valuable treasures.

The State of Minnesota has the largest deposits of peat, about 7,000,000,000 tons, which corresponds to about 2,500,000,000 tons of bituminous coal. It exists in great volume in many other States.

Total lack of nearby supplies of fuel constitutes an element of both economic and strategic danger, due to the cold war and the danger of other emergencies. The cost and vulnerability of long overland and overwater transportation of fuel must be seriously considered in the present economic picture.

It should be mentioned here that the necessity for processing taconite as a substitute for our large iron-ore supplies makes it imperative that an economical short-haul fuel be available. This is a situation which will soon prevail in Minnesota.

Proper utilization of peat will result in generating power at a low cost—gasification, use of gas turbines, low-temperature distillation. The preliminary studies already indicate that high pressure electric generating stations can be built. Such plants are self-liquidating and the cost of electric power can be considerably reduced. This will encourage small business and industry to take advantage of low-cost power. It should be empha-

sized that the largest and most valuable uranium and radium deposits were found where identical peat conditions exist.

The most significant byproducts of the utilization of peat, to mention only a few, are production of char from low-temperature distillation, high value fertilizer—which will help the development of industry and agriculture—ammonium sulphate, paraffin, acid and acetates, paper-making processes, certain forms of wallboard and insulation material, certain so-called exploded materials similar to exploded wood fiber, artificial wood and other building materials, plastics, packing materials, improvement of timber grades, reforestation, other basic chemicals, and soil reclamation.

Only scientific research can tell more and more economical applications.

Peat is very widely used in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Ireland, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Hungary. And according to recent reliable reports, the new central heating system of Moscow is entirely based on the use and utilization of peat. Furthermore the Soviet Union uses it rather successfully for agricultural and industrial purposes.

Summarizing, the utilization of peat is in the interests of national defense and security; commercial, industrial, and agricultural expansion needs; broadening of the mineral fuel supply; less expensive electric power generating, enabling the dispersal of industry, avoiding the density of industrial targets; lessening the overburdened transportation facilities in peace or war, making areas of the country more self sufficient, if and when those become isolated by the attacks of war or by natural catastrophes.

I urge every Member of the Congress to give this plan serious study.

REHABILITATION OF NAVAJO AND HOPI TRIBES OF INDIANS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 480 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of Senate bill 2734. A similar bill was passed before, but it was vetoed by the President. Since that time the committee has eliminated all of the objectionable features in the original bill and has agreed unanimously on the Senate bill. I do not think there can be any opposition or objection to it; consequently I am not going to take up any time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2734, with Mr. BATES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, at the last session the bill S. 1407 was passed by the Senate and House of Representatives. As I recall, this body passed it unanimously and I believe the other body also passed it unanimously.

The bill, however, was vetoed by the President. In his veto message among other things the President said:

I have withheld my approval with reluctance and only after the most careful consideration of all of the provisions of S. 1407. The bill contains many meritorious features. In fact, its only objectionable provisions are those of section 9, which, with some qualifications, extend State civil and criminal laws and court jurisdiction to the Navajo-Hopi Reservations which are now under Federal and tribal laws and courts. Section 9 is heavily weighted with possibilities of grave injury to the very people who are intended to be the beneficiaries of the bill. Its many and serious defects outweigh, in my judgment, the merits of the rest of the bill.

That was the observation of the President of the United States in his veto message on S. 1407. The bill we have for consideration today is exactly S. 1407 with the objectionable feature eliminated. Since the objectionable feature has been eliminated, and since the bill passed both houses last session, overwhelmingly, and since there is no opposition or at least no serious opposition that I know of anywhere, I feel I should take but little time on this occasion to address the committee.

We have so many important matters to consider that I feel we should never waste time. I believe it was Shakespeare who said, "I wasted time; now time wastes me." So I certainly do not want to waste your valuable time in just talking.

I might say this one thing in conclusion. This bill contemplates spending, over a period of 10 years, $88,570,000 for the purpose of promoting the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations.

If we are to keep faith with these people, according to the treaty that we made with them in 1868; if we are to do justice to this great group of people whom we subjugated by force of arms; if we are to help relieve these people from misery and want; if we are to help alleviate suffering among them; if we are to help raise their standard of living to even a bare minimum of what it should be; if we are to give them the educational opportunities which we promised them, by treaty, or anything close to such opportunities; if we are going to help reduce the infant mortality which is, as I recall, something like four times as great as the average over our great land; and if we are going to reduce mortality from tuberculosis and other malignant diseases that bear so heavily upon these people—in other words, if we are going to do just simple and substantial justice to the people that we have subjugated, and who are not at fault themselves, yes, if we are going to live up to our treaty obligations and our obligations from a humanitarian standpoint, I think we ought to pass this bill and pass it expeditiously, without further ado.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I would like to compliment the gentleman for his interest in this great problem. I join with many Members from the West in congratulating him on the fine effort he has made to bring some justice to these unfortunate people. As the gentleman has said, there is much to be done. This is a step in the right direction, and I am glad to support the gentleman's views.

Mr. MORRIS. That compliment from the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is greatly appreciated, because I know how sincere the gentleman is. I am sure I do not deserve the compliment that he has given me, but I do know that it is sincere, and coming from the source from which it does come I sincerely appreciate it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to second the remarks made by my colleague from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], and emphasize them if I were able to express my thoughts adequately as to the splendid work of the gentleman from Oklahoma, Chairman MORRIS. The gentleman from Oklahoma has done well to generations yet unborn among our Indian citizens. I want to thank him from the bottom of my heart for the careful, painstaking way in which he has handled this legislation, and to express my appreciation of his work, in the strongest possible terms, on behalf of these Indian people.

Mr. MORRIS. I appreciate those remarks from the gentleman from Arizona. I will say that no man has been more diligent in furthering this legislation than has he. His heart, his industry, his time, and his mind have all been employed in an effort to bring this proposed legislation to a successful conclusion

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the distinguished former chairman of this subcommittee of which I now have the honor to be chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. I heartily agree with the others as to the good job which the present chairman of the committee has done with this legislation. He has struggled with it, even in face of a veto. He has done a splendid job.

There is one question I would like to ask the gentleman. The first year the Appropriations Committee appropriated approximately $10,000,000 for the furtherance of the program that is contained in this bill. This year the Bureau of the budget recommended $10,000,000 more, or thereabouts, which will doubtless be appropriated. Is that included in the $85,000,000 in this bill, or is that in addition to the $85,000,000 that is in the bill?

Mr. MORRIS. I am sorry, I am not able to answer that question. I have been wondering about it myself. I have not had an opportunity to examine all the facts and find out whether or not it is. No one can be hurt in the matter, however, for the reason that if it is, it is already done and when this authorization bill is passed and becomes law, the Appropriation Committee will of course take all matters pertaining to this whole situation into consideration, I am sure.

May I also say that if this bill does become law, and I believe it certainly will, a great deal of the credit must go to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], who, with his subcommittee, when he was chairman of the full committee, visited the Navajo and Hopi Reservations and gleaned firsthand information in regard to the situation existing there. He has been diligent ever since in his efforts to further the interests of this legislation, and I appreciate all that he has done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such further time to the gentleman from Oklahoma as he may need; I know the gentleman from New York wishes to interrogate him.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Section 9 of the bill, as I interpret the section deals with the Social Security Act.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Has section 9 been taken up with the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. MORRIS. I may say that our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], took the matter up informally, I believe, with some members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PETERSON. I may say with reference to section 9 that we went into it and considered it germane. As far as the whole rehabilitation program was concerned we called it to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means. They did not object, nor did they agree to it; but we did want them to be advised on it so they would have a right to object if they wanted to.

This provision is the result of a study which was made and a serious effort on the part of the administration to deal with this problem. The section does not actually levy a social-security tax, but is, rather, a method of distribution of a sum equal to that under the Social Security Act.

Mr. TABER. As I interpret that section it provides that the States shall receive 80 percent of the total amounts expended by the State under State plans approved under the Social Security Act for old-age assistance and all that sort of thing. Would not that mean that they would be given not only the regular contribution of the Federal Government, $15 out of the first $20, but in addition 80 percent of what they had paid? That is the way I interpret the language as it now stands. For instance, if they had paid out $20 and received in return $15 they would get another $16; so, instead of being out $5 they would be $11 to the good. I may be wrong in my interpretation, but that is the way it looks to me, although I have just started to study it.

Mr. MORRIS. The way the matter actually works, I may say to the gentleman from New York as I understand it, and I may say I have studied this matter pretty thoroughly, is that it will be somewhere between 80 percent and 90 percent. The expense of the administration of the act as I understand it is going to fall on these States. If we are to be just and fair with these States we must take this into consideration.

I may say to the distinguished gentleman from New York in the first place that these States are very sparsely settled compared with most of the other States of the Union.

In addition to that they have a much heavier impact of Indian population upon them than the others do. In fact, the Navajo Tribe now comprises about 65,000 members. Those people in the States effected cannot possibly carry on with the same kind of social-security program as to Indians that the rest of us carry on with in the usual circumstances. Then may I call this to the gentleman's attention: In Arizona out of 72,691,200 acres of land the Government owns 50,471,920 acres or 69.43 percent. The State, of course, receives no tax revenue whatsoever from that land owned by the Federal Government. It is all tax free. In New Mexico out of 77,764,040 acres the Government owns 35,479,713 acres or 45.62 percent. In Utah the Government owns 71.33 percent.

Getting back to the gentleman's specific question, this particular language has been worked out very carefully by the gentlemen in the other body, particularly by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and with the Interior Department and others. As it actually results, as it appears to me the State will pay about 20 percent of the program.

Mr. TABER. Not the way I read it.

Mr. MORRIS. I think it does the way it reads. May I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] who comes from that State and who may be able to throw further light on the matter.

Mr. MURDOCK. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the spirit and intent of this measure is that the Federal Government shall bear about 90 percent of the total burden as it applies to Indians, the State bearing the other 10 percent; but not in the way the gentleman from New York indicated a while ago.

Mr. TABER. That is the way it reads. If you are not going to take language the way it reads and construe it just as it reads, you are going to be in trouble. You are going to find that, instead of being 80 percent, in a good many cases it is 140 or 150 percent. That is something that would be going a little stronger than it seems the most ardent Arizonian would want to go.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is exactly right; there is no such intention on the part of anyone that I know of from Arizona to provide for that, but I am sure the language of the bill does not so provide.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid it does. That is what it says.

Mr. MORRIS. Getting back to the exact langauge, may I say to the gentleman from New York, with all of the astuteness and the ability which the gentleman has, together with the clarity of thought which he usually shows, he is in error, because the bill says that the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay what? Pay "an amount, in addition to the amounts prescribed to be paid to such State under such sections, equal to 80 percent of the total amounts expended during the preceding quarter by the State."

In other words, we take the ordinary set-up of what the Federal Government would contribute anyway to any State. The Federal Government makes a contribution which is usually something more than 50 percent in the ordinary instance. As proposed in this bill the Federal Government will make that same contribution, then it will also reimburse the State 80 percent of what the State has paid of the State's funds. That is very plain to me. I think the language is apt, I think it is clear.

Mr. TABER. The trouble with the gentleman's reasoning is this says 80 percent of what the State shall pay. The State makes the whole payment of whatever is paid; then it is reimbursed under the Social Security Act for three-quarters of what is paid up to $20 and for half afterward. But this would give them, in addition to the other thing, 80 percent besides, and they would not have contributed anywhere near that amount toward it. Now that is the way the thing would work.

Mr. MORRIS. No; I am sure it would not work that way, from the conferences I have had with those responsible for the language. They feel that the State will be reimbursed 80 percent of the money of the State, that the State has paid. I am sure that is the intent of it.

Mr. TABER. That may be the intent, but that is not the way it reads.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, I disagree with the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this proposed legislation. I have visited this reservation on different occasions, the last time last fall, when I spent a whole day with the agent on the reservation going over the problems that faced him following the appropriation of the $10,000,000 a year ago for rehabilitation of these Indians.

I think there is a more serious situation on this Navajo Reservation than on any other spot in the United States. These Indians are exceedingly poor. Their income is very, very low. Their soil and their resources are limited. Erosion has taken place to a serious extent. Many of their resources, such as they have, have not been developed. There is an excess of population. Even after we appropriate the $85,000,000 and expend it over the 10 years proposed in this bill, according to the best surveys we have up until now, the reservation will not support over half of the people that we find on it. The population is increasing at the rate of around 1,200 people a year; in other words, we have a very serious sore spot in our economy and in our social life on this particular reservation.

This bill is an attempt to deal with some of those problems and alleviate them as we can. It proposes to provide education in a spot where 80 percent of the children now do not have education. It proposes to improve the roads. It proposes to make minerals and other resources available. It proposes to develop some 78 irrigation projects and enlarge and extend them, and other efforts will be made under this bill to help these people that so seriously need our help.

The bill is not all that I would like to see it; in fact, I am going to offer an amendment at the proper time that I think will improve the bill dealing with civil law on the reservation. It does not settle anywhere near all of the problems that we find on this reservation. There is difficulty between the Navajo and the Hopi as to the boundary between the two tribes. That is quite a problem, and one that needs to be solved, and one that the Department of the Interior has not really tried to solve over the years. We discussed it in committee and proposed to bring in an amendment in regard to that particular problem, but we decided it was one that we could not handle in this bill.

There is the problem of excess population. A year or two ago we developed a plan whereby we could help these Indians to get jobs off the reservation. We are providing funds in this bill for that purpose. Last year we had more jobs for these Indians on the Navajo Reservation than there were Indians to fill those jobs. They are good workers. The railroads like to have them in their employ. The mining companies come back year after year to get them. They help in the beet fields and in the harvest of the vegetables in that area. We are providing under this bill for guidance in getting off-reservation employment. When they leave these reservations, there are certain social problems that develop. We do not solve those problems in this bill; in fact, we do not solve very many of their social problems at all.

There is the question of the ownership of tracts of land after they are developed. Ownership is not in the individual Indians themselves, it is left in tribal ownership. I believe that is a mistake. I think legislation should be brought out so that they can have pride in ownership, individual ownership, as the white man has in other places.

Inheritance is not decided under this bill, another problem that certainly needs legislation. If we are going to encourage an Indian to develop his tract of land or develop what resources he has, he must have an incentive. One of those incentives is to pass property he has developed down to his children. That is not in this bill.

In fact, there are a number of problems that I would like to see handled but they are not in this legislation. I am going to offer an amendment that will provide for the application of certain State laws on the reservation, that I think are necessary. The President in vetoing the bill objected to that section in the original bill, and I think perhaps with some justification. I took that section to the drafting service that helps us, and they have written this section that I think meets the objections of the President and that I will offer at the proper time. It will provide for civil law in certain cases on the reservation. That, I think, will help the objective we have in this bill, which is to bring these people to a higher standard of living and a better economy, so that they can better fit into our civilization.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to thank the gentleman from Montana, as I did my colleague from Oklahoma, for the interest he has all along taken in this matter, and particularly for the initiatory work done in the preceding Congress. These Indians in the far Southwest in the present generation and in generations yet to come will have you two men in charge of the legislation to thank far more than they know.

Mr. D'EWART. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. My interest has been largely stirred up by his anxiety over the welfare of these Indians. I take pride in working with him and with the chairman of the committee in helping to rehabilitate these Indians, who so much need our help at this time.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I should not take all of my time because I want others to speak on this bill, but I want to point out that we have been struggling most energetically with this problem now for the last four or more years. That is why I wanted to say a good word for the work done not only in this Congress but in the Eightieth Congress by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], who was on the subcommittee at that time. I have publicly spoken before on the floor of the House on the work done at that time by the full committee under the chairmanship of the late Richard Welch. However, it takes a great deal of effort to get attention directed to a great problem like this when we have such a multiplicity of other problems pressing us, as we do these strenuous days.

The church people all over America have been writing us, as well as other right-thinking citizens who feel that we have been neglecting our American citizens of Indian blood. We have neglected them. Indeed we have neglected them through many, many years.

May I say to my friends from Montana that it was the coming of a small subcommittee headed by him to Window Rock, Ariz., in the autumn of 1947, I believe it was, that was the starter of this long overdue legislation.

While we had our attention called to it by the press, and the pulpit for that matter, it was the trip out there that counted and we have given our attention to it. Now, we have done as we did in preceding Congresses that which was necessary for temporary and direct relief but this is the all-important thing—the bill before us—which is a matter of long-range rehabilitation. It is going to take several generations to lift these people to the full stature of American citizens. That takes education and many other social benefits which we must provide them and which we are duty bound to provide them.

Perhaps there are Indians living who recall when Kit Carson led the United States Army into that country and drove the Navajos into their deep canyons and destroyed their peach orchards and made a treaty with them. In that treaty we promised to give them a schoolteacher for every 30 pupils. But that promise has been sadly neglected. Ninety percent of these Indians are now illiterate. They did make a great contribution to the Second World War, but they would have made a greater contribution if so many of them had not been rejected because of illiteracy as well as because of physical defects as a result of undernourishment, and that sort of thing.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I have in my district the Santee Sioux, the Ponca, the Winnebagoes and the Omaha Indians on the four reservations. I am honored to be a member of all four tribes.

I want to ask the gentleman this question: In alleviating the sufferings of the Hopis and other Indians, are we discriminating against the other tribes who

in some manner are up against the same problems that the Hopis and others are?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I would say we are not discriminating. We are merely attacking the worse phase of the whole Indian problem here and now to deal with others later.

Mr. STEFAN. Will we, in the deficiency bill for relief, be able to send some relief to the Winnebagoes and the Omahas who today are suffering from malnutrition and, in many cases, hunger?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; we must do that. We have a general appropriation which applies to all Indians aside from this rehabilitation bill. I simply say to the gentleman from Nebraska that the Navajos, consisting of 65,000 Indians living on a high plateau, need this help.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand that perfectly because I happen to be a member of the committee which made appropriations one time for their relief and to help them. But while we were doing that there were other members of other Indian tribes who were equally suffering and who got no attention whatsoever. Today, on the reservations of the Omahas, the Santee Sioux, Poncas, and the Winnebagoes, there is a great amount of unemployment because the young Indians who were in the war have come home and have lost their jobs and are still on the reservations. The educational problem is serious. The police problem is serious. Some help must come to these other Indians.

While we are talking about giving help to the Navajos and Hopis, I hope the committee which had the bill for Indian services in charge will do something with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to alleviate suffering in other places as well as amongst the Hopis and Navajos.

Mr. MURDOCK. I certainly agree with the gentleman, and I pledge my support for assistance to all Indians both for immediate relief and long-range betterment

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the statement made by our distinguished colleague with reference to the problems of the Indians in his district is one which likewise is giving me serious concern. The Navajos and Hopis seem to be the No. 1 problem in the Nation. But there are other problems which have been called to our attention and we have instructed our staff to make an intensive study.

Mr. Peden, a former Member of the House, is now getting data with reference to the problems of these other tribes. We hope to work out legislation and we will keep in touch with the distinguished gentleman because he has been diligent and has on other occasions called the problem to our attention. His knowledge of the problem and his intense interest is well-known to our committee. We will cooperate with the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the particular bill under consideration, I will make my statement brief because what we actually have today is a bill which has already passed the House after full debate, including the amendments which the House itself placed in the bill at the time. But we have eliminated section 9, which was the controversial section at that time. I am impressed with this fact: The chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council in appearing before the committee asked to have a chance to help themselves. Briefly, he said this:

> There are about 65,000 of us, and there are more than 24,000 school-age children among us. We want as many schools built on our reservation as there is water available for. We want new schools, we want some of the old ones made larger, we want repairs made to those that are nearly falling down with age, and we want our day schools converted to boarding schools. We want a school system on our reservation big enough to take care of all our children. Give us the schools and we will make education compulsory. We will see to it that our children attend. Our people are poor and sick, it is true. But we are not asking for more than the chance to help ourselves If you will give us a start, we will carry on from there, and we will become good citizens of this country. Our needs are really urgent.

There is a sincere appeal of one elected by their members to present to the Congress their problems. In testifying about the lack of roads in the area, there were certain sections which they could not get into during certain seasons of the year. They are taking care of 65,000 people on an area that can normally support only one-tenth of this number.

The tuberculosis rate is about five times that of the normal tuberculosis rate of the white citizens of the area.

I hope this bill may be passed.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. PETERSON. I have no further requests, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to further the purposes of existing treaties with the Navajo Indians, to provide facilities, employment, and services essential in combating hunger, disease, poverty, and demoralization among the members of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes, to make available the resources of their reservations for use in promoting a self-supporting economy and self-reliant communities, and to lay a stable foundation on which these Indians can engage in diversified economic activities and ultimately attain standards of living comparable with those enjoyed by other citizens, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to undertake, within the limits of the funds from time to time appropriated pursuant to this act, a program of basic improvements for the conservation and development of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, the more productive employment of their manpower, and the supplying of means to be used in their rehabilitation, whether on or off the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations. Such program shall include the following projects for which capital expenditures in the amount shown after each project listed in the following subsections and totaling $88,570,000 are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

(1) Soil and water conservation and range improvement work, $10,000,000.

(2) Completion and extension of existing irrigation projects, and completion of the investigation to determine the feasibility of the proposed San Juan-Shiprock irrigation project, $9,000,000.

(3) Surveys and studies of timber, coal, mineral, and other physical and human resources, $500,000.

(4) Development of industrial and business enterprises, $1,000,000.

(5) Development of opportunities for off-reservation employment and resettlement and assistance in adjustments related thereto, $3,500,000.

(6) Relocation and resettlement of Navajo and Hopi Indians (Colorado River Indian Reservation), $5,750,000.

(7) Roads and trails, $20,000,000.

(8) Telephone and radio communication systems, $250,000.

(9) Agency, institutional, and domestic water supply, $2,500,000.

(10) Establishment of a revolving loan fund, $5,000,000.

(11) Hospital buildings and equipment, and other health conservation measures, $4,750,000.

(12) School buildings and equipment, and other educational measures, $25,000,000.

(13) Housing and necessary facilities and equipment, $820,000.

(14) Common service facilities, $500,000.

Funds so appropriated shall be available for administration, investigations, plans, construction, and all other objects necessary for or appropriate to the carrying out of the provisions of this act. Such further sums as may be necessary for or appropriate to the annual operation and maintenance of the projects herein enumerated are hereby also authorized to be appropriated. Funds appropriated under these authorizations shall be in addition to funds made available for use on the Navajo and Hopi Reservations, or with respect to Indians of the Navajo Tribes, out of appropriations heretofore or hereafter granted for the benefit, care, or assistance of Indians in general, or made pursuant to other authorizations now in effect.

SEC 2. The foregoing program shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of this act and existing laws relating to Indian affairs, shall include such facilities and services as are requisite for or incidental to the effectuation of the projects herein enumerated, shall apply sustained-yield principles to the administration of all renewable resources, and shall be prosecuted in a manner which will provide for completion of the program, so far as practicable, within 10 years from the date of the enactment of this act. An account of the progress being had in the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and of the use made of the funds appropriated to that end under this act, shall be included in each annual report of the work of the Department of the Interior submitted to the Congress during the period covered by the foregoing program.

SEC. 3. Navajo and Hopi Indians shall be given, whenever practicable, preference in employment on all projects undertaken pursuant to this act, and, in furtherance of this policy, may be given employment on such projects without regard to the provisions of the civil-service and classification laws. To the fullest extent possible Indian workers on such projects shall receive on-the-job training in order to enable them to become qualified for more skilled employment.

SEC 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to make loans from the loan fund authorized by section 1 hereof to the Navajo Tribe, or any member or association of members thereof, or to the Hopi Tribe, or any member or association of members thereof, for such productive purposes as, in his judgment, will tend to promote the better utilization of the manpower and resources of the Navajo or Hopi Indians. Sums collected in repayment of such loans and sums collected

as interest or other charges thereon shall be credited to the loan fund and shall be available for the purpose for which the fund was established.

SEC. 5. Any restricted Indian lands owned by the Navajo Tribe, members thereof, or associations of such members, or by the Hopi Tribe, members thereof, or associations of such members, may be leased by the Indian owners, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for public, religious, educational, recreational, or business purposes, including the development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases. All leases so granted shall be for a term of not to exceed 25 years, but may include provisions authorizing their renewal for an additional term of not to exceed 25 years, and shall be made under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Restricted allotments of deceased Indians may be leased under this section, for the benefit of their heirs or devisees, in the circumstances and by the persons prescribed in the act of July 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 745; 25 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 380). Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to repeal or affect any authority to lease restricted Indian lands conferred by or pursuant to any other provision of law.

SEC. 6. In order to facilitate the fullest possible participation by the Navajo Tribe in the program authorized by this act, the members of the tribe shall have the right to adopt a tribal constitution in the manner herein prescribed. Such constitution may provide for the exercise by the Navajo Tribe of any powers vested in the tribe or any organ thereof by existing law, together with such additional powers as the members of the tribe may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, deem proper to include therein. Such constitution shall be formulated by the Navajo Tribal Council at any regular meeting, distributed in printed form to the Navajo people for consideration, and adopted by secret ballot of the adult members of the Navajo Tribe in an election held under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at which a majority of the qualified votes cast favor such adoption. The constitution shall authorize the fullest possible participation of the Navajos in the administration of their affairs as approved by the Secretary of the Interior and shall become effective when approved by the Secretary. The constitution may be amended from time to time in the same manner as herein provided for its adoption, and the Secretary of the Interior shall approve any amendment which in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior advances the development of the Navajo people toward the fullest realization and exercise of the rights, privileges, duties, and responsibilities of American citizenship.

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of existing law, the tribal funds now on deposit or hereafter placed to the credit of the Navajo Tribe of Indians in the United States Treasury shall be available for such purposes as may be designated by the Navajo Tribal Council and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 8. The Tribal Councils of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes and the Indian communities affected shall be kept informed and afforded opportunity to consider from their inception plans pertaining to the program authorized by this act. In the administration of the program, the Secretary of the Interior shall consider the recommendations of the tribal councils and shall follow such recommendations whenever he deems them feasible and consistent with the objectives of this act.

SEC. 9. Beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1950, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay quarterly to each State (from sums made available for making payments to the States under sections 3 (a), 403 (a), and 1003 (a) of the Social Security Act) an amount, in addition to the amounts prescribed to be paid to such State under such sections, equal to 80 percent of (1) the total amounts expended during the preceding quarter by the State, under the State plans approved under the Social Security Act for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the needy blind, to Navajo and Hopi Indians residing within the boundaries of the State on reservations or on allotted or trust lands, with respect to whom payments are made to the State by the United States under sections 3 (a), 403 (a), and 1003 (a), respectively, of the Social Security Act, not counting so much of such expenditure to any individual for any month as exceeds the limitations prescribed in such sections, reduced by (2) the total amounts paid to such State by the United States for such quarter under sections 3 (a), 403 (a), and 1003 (a) of the Social Security Act with respect to such Indians.

SEC. 10. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "committee"), to be composed of three members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate to be appointed by the chairman thereof, not more than two of whom shall be from the same political party, and three members of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the chairman thereof, not more than two of whom shall be from the same political party. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

(b) It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the programs for the administration and rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and to review the progress achieved in the execution of such programs. Upon request, the committee shall aid the several standing committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over any part of such programs, and shall make a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, from time to time, concerning the results of its studies, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs at the request of the committee, shall consult with the committee from time to time with respect to his activities under this act.

(c) The committee, or any duly-authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

(d) The committee is authorized to appoint and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and organizations thereof, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman.

Mr. PETERSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. D'EWART: On page 11, following line 2, add a new section numbered 11 to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. From and after the effective date of this act all Indians within the tribal or allotted lands of the Navajo and Hopi Reservations shall be subject to the laws of the States wherein such lands are located, with respect to (1) school attendance, (2) malfeasance or misfeasance in public or tribal office, (3) embezzlement or misappropriation of funds, (4) regulation of automotive traffic, (5) marriage and divorce, (6) elections, and shall have access to the courts of such States for the enforcement of these rights and the redress of these wrongs to the same extent and in the same manner as any citizen thereof."

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, when the President vetoed the original bill he vetoed it because of section 9 that had provisions in it with regard to civil law. He vetoed it on two grounds. I will quote very briefly from his remarks:

In the first place, the meaning of section 9 is obscure.

"In the first place, the meaning of section 9 is obscure." We have taken great pains in the drafting of this proposed amendment, consulting our legal staff and the drafting section so that I think there is no question about the meaning of this amendment. In other words, we have overcome the first objection of the President to the provision.

The second major objection, and I quote again from the President's veto of section 9:

A second major objection to section 9 is that its avowed purpose of accomplishing a broad-scale extension of State laws to the Navajo and Hopi Reservations is in conflict with one of the fundamental principles of Indian law accepted by our Nation, namely, the principle of respect for tribal self-determination in matters of local government.

Broad scale extension we have eliminated by definitely limiting this proposed amendment to certain provisions and no others; thereby, we hope, taking care of that objection of the President.

We have the right to legislate in regard to law on the Indian reservation. I will quote very briefly on that point from

the Handbook of Federal Law, chapter 6, page 117, section 14. I will include the whole quotation. This statement is:

It is enough for the present to note that the domain of power of the Federal Government over Indian affairs marked out by the Federal decisions is so complete that, as a practical matter, the Federal courts and Federal administrative officials now generally proceed from the assumption that Indian affairs are matters of Federal, rather than State, concern, unless the contrary is shown by act of Congress or special circumstance. Thus, without questioning the constitutional doctrine that States possess original and complete sovereignty over their own territories save insofar as such sovereignty is limited by the Federal Constitution, a sense of realism must compel the conclusion that control of Indian affairs has been delegated, under the Constitution, to the Federal Government and that State jurisdiction in any matters affecting the Indians can be upheld only if one of two conditions is met; either that Congress has expressly delegated back to the State, or recognized in the State, some power of government respecting Indians; or that a question involving Indians involves non-Indians to a degree which calls into play the jurisdiction of a State government. Of these two situations, the former is undoubtedly more definite and therefore simpler to analyze. Such an analysis requires a listing of the acts of Congress which confer upon the States, or recognize in the States, specific powers of government with respect to Indians. (Handbook of Federal Indian Law, ch. 6, p 117, sec. 1)

That is what I propose to do in that amendment. There is a gap in the law on Indian reservations. The Federal law as it applies to the Navajo and Hopi Reservations applies only to 10 major crimes. They are found in United States Code, title 18, page 544, section 548:

United States Code, title 18, page 544, section 548: Indians committing certain crime; acts on reservations; rape of Indian.

All Indians committing against the person or property of another Indian or other person any of the following crimes, namely, murder, manslaughter, rape, incest, assault with intent to kill, assault with a dangerous weapon, arson, burglary, robbery, and larceny on and within any Indian reservation under the jurisdiction of the United States Government, including rights-of-way running through the reservation, shall be subject to the same laws, tried in the same courts, and in the same manner, and be subject to the same penalties as are all other persons committing any of the above crimes within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States: *Provided*, That any Indian who commits the crime of rape upon any female Indian within the limits of any Indian reservation shall be imprisoned at the discretion of the court: *Provided further*, That as herein used the offense rape shall be defined in accordance with the laws of the State in which the offense was committed.

The foregoing shall extend to prosecutions of Indians in South Dakota under section 549 of this title.

In addition to that we recognize to a certain extent tribal custom and usage, but between tribal usage and custom there is a whole lot of civil law that is necessary if we are to have the orderly development of these Indians. In my amendment I mention those specific ones; for instance, there is no law whatsoever governing school attendance. If a child does not want to go to school, there is no way of insisting that he go. Even here in the District of Columbia we can compel attendance of a child of school age at school, but there is no way to compel attendance at school on the Navajo or Hopi Reservations. I therefore include school attendance in my amendment.

Malfeasance or misfeasance in public or tribal office: There is nothing in tribal law that governs those matters. Certainly tribal custom does not concern itself with malfeasance or misfeasance in public office and we are proposing to give these tribes some responsibility under this law. We propose to delegate certain powers to the council, but if they do not carry them out as they should be carried out, there is no course of action under State or Federal law. I therefore propose that we apply State law in regard to those things.

Embezzlement or misappropriation: We are turning over in one provision of this act the tribal funds to the tribal council or business council. We are not providing against the possibilities of embezzlement or misappropriation. If those funds are embezzled or misappropriated, and that has happened on other reservations, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has protested to me because he had no way to handle this kind of situation—I say we are going to turn over a large sum of money to this tribal council and there is no law, State or Federal, if those funds are dissipated or stolen, or mismanaged, to punish the guilty.

Highways and automotive traffic: We are going to be spending very large sums on road construction in these reservations. There is going to be heavy truck traffic within the reservation and heavy tourist traffic on the roads, but there are no traffic laws on either the Hopi or Navajo Reservations. Certainly there should be regulation of traffic on the reservations. If you should have an accident inside the Navajo Reservation, there would be no law governing that accident.

Marriage and divorce on those reservations: There are plural marriages. We find Indian fathers leaving their families. One of the difficulties in the management of this reservation is to determine definitely and surely whose children are whose and as we apply the social-security laws that will be more difficult. Certainly, if we are going to go ahead with the rehabilitation of this tribe, if we are going to fit them into our civilization, we should have some kind of laws governing marriage and divorce.

In 1948 the election laws applied on this reservation.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Would the gentleman's amendment require that when Indians are married under the tribal laws they have to have a divorce under a State law?

Mr. D'EWART. I gather that would be a question of whether you have common-law marriage in your State.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. We have no common-law marriage in our State.

Mr. D'EWART. If you have common-law marriage and the Indian man and woman lived together, your State would doubtlessly recognize that.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. We have no common-law marriage in New Mexico. That is not recognized. Our supreme court has passed on that point. I was wondering whether the gentleman's amendment would require all Indians who are living together now to go and get married under State laws.

Mr. D'EWART. If there is no common law and they wanted their marriage to be recognized, it would have to take place under the laws of the State, if my amendment is adopted.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If they do not get married under the State law and are married under tribal law, they do not have to have a divorce if they separate, even with the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Did I understand the gentleman to say there will be no recovery in the event of an automobile accident on a reservation?

Mr. D'EWART. Yes. I have a citation in regard to that. This does not apply to the particular reservation, but the situations are similar:

Recently, as a result of the economy drive, the position of special officer was abolished and we are now back where we were before; petty offenses are committed on the reservation and nothing much is being done about it. Recently police officers of the local community attempted to arrest several Indians who were driving a car while intoxicated; the Indians got over the reservation line; one of them got out of the car and shot at the local officers; it was just fate the officer was not killed. Indians get drunk and beat their women and get into fights. Recently a white man was severely beaten by drunken Indians. Theoretically, these petty offenses are within the jurisdiction of so-called Indian courts, but there is no provision made for their punishment even if such Indians are tried by said local Indian courts. It is a deplorable situation. Something should be done to rectify this unbelievable situation.

That letter was signed by George L. Grobe, United States attorney.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I ask the gentleman whether he has talked this over with anyone to see whether we might not be heading into another veto? True, his amendment is somewhat restricted as compared with the cause of that veto last session. I am for it in spirit and in principle, but I would hate to see this measure run into another veto.

Mr. D'EWART. I would like to have the gentleman question the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], in regard to that, who, I understand, took it up with the executive office. I did not personally. I submitted this amendment

to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], chairman of the committee, and it is my understanding he went further with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the chairman's understanding, if any, in regard to this proposal? Is it not the same thing that led to the veto before, or is this a minor extension of State law which does not go as far as the earlier extension went causing the veto?

Mr. PETERSON. It is an extension that does not go as far as that which caused the veto, but I have not been able to get any assurances it would be approved. The situation is such we have been trying to get action. They only heard from the Department of the Interior this morning. But they are not in position to assure us it would be approved. There are some objections still pending.

Mr. D'EWART. I would like to say that we did submit this on February 3d, so it is not our fault that we have not had a complete answer. I would like to say further that I have tried, and the attorneys who helped me in the drafting of this, to obviate the two conditions the President expressed that I read earlier in my remarks concerning his veto.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct. Just about a month ago he submitted it and we had been hoping to hear from him. He did submit it, and there is considerable merit in it, but we did not want to run into a veto again. Then I started calling, and this morning they said they had received a report from the Department of the Interior. While they did not go as far as the other, they felt they would have to still object to this amendment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Certainly, the principle is the same, unless the President has had a change of heart. I do not see how he could not veto it if this amendment goes in, because the very reason he vetoed it was that the Indians were not sufficiently advanced to be placed under State law, and this amendment certainly does place them under State law to a very large extent, including marriages, which is one of the things that was bothering the President, I am sure.

Mr. D'EWART. To quote the President's exact words:

> The ultimate acceptance of State jurisdiction is a logical consequence of our policy of assisting the Indians to develop their natural talents and physical resources in ways that will enable them to participate fully in our free and vigorously competitive society.

Those were the exact words of the President. I think, since I am offering this limited amendment, and since his two objections were, first, that the meaning of the amendment was obscure and, second, that it was a broad scale extension, we have obviated those two objections, and I believe that we have met his objections.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. What would be the objection to passing or accepting the gentleman's amendment and having this bill go to conference?

Mr. D'EWART. I can see none whatsoever, and then we would have time to find out what the President's position was.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the gentleman's amendment restricted to the Navajo and the Hopi Indians, or does it include all Indians?

Mr. D'EWART. No; this is Navajo and Hopi, and no others. I agree with the gentleman that it should apply to other reservations. We have the same situations in other reservations, and I could tell you circumstances that would surprise you showing the need of this kind of an amendment, but this only applies to these two reservations.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask the chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Could the gentleman state whether legislation of this kind is to be considered by his committee, namely, to include these other matters?

Mr. PETERSON. The D'Ewart amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. PETERSON. If the D'Ewart amendment came to the committee as a separate bill, I would ask the committee immediately to consider it. There is lots of merit in the D'Ewart amendment, and, frankly, I favor a portion of it, but I do not want to run head-on into another veto or a long deadlock in conference while the Navajos are suffering. But there is a lot of merit in the amendment, there is no question about that, and if it were a separate bill I would try to get it out and get action by the House. I am not saying that to stall off his amendment, because there is merit in it, but I am sure it would run into a veto.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Would the gentleman please again state to the House in as few words as he sees fit just what his amendment will do?

Mr. D'EWART. This amendment extends State laws with respect to school attendance, malfeasance or misfeasance in public or tribal office, embezzlement or misappropriation of funds, regulation of automotive traffic, marriage and divorce, and elections, and nothing more.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, being a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House which deals with Indian problems, this very thing has come to the attention of that committee on a number of occasions and the need for such a provision in our laws.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana will be adopted because of the great merit it has. If we adopt that amendment, the conferees can work this matter out to the satisfaction of the Interior Department and the Indian Service. Surely every member of the committee dealing with these Indian problems recognizes the merit in this amendment. There could be nothing wrong in adopting it and then calling on the Interior Department to cooperate in working out language which would be beneficial to the Indians and the other people this amendment affects.

Mr. D'EWART. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

There is one more provision I have not discussed, which refers to elections. In 1948 these Indians voted for the first time. There are no election laws that govern on this reservation. They will vote for Senators, they will vote for Congressmen, they will vote for President, and they will vote for the governors of their States, but there are no election laws to govern their voting. That is certainly a strange situation. This amendment proposes that the State election laws be applicable on these reservations. It seems to me it is almost mandatory that be the case.

I earnestly appeal for the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, fundamentally, I agree with this amendment. I agreed with the original provisions of section 9, which were broader than the proposed amendment. However, the very practical situation is this: If we insist on putting this amendment in the bill, which it is not necessary to do because we can put it in general legislation if it is of great importance, or in subsequent special legislation, then we will jeopardize this bill. We had the experience last session of the bill being passed with this subject matter in it, and the President vetoed it. I am afraid that if this provision is in the bill we will meet with another veto. If we do, I think we are doing a great injury to these Indians by following such a procedure.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman not admit there is great need for and merit in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. MORRIS. I think there is merit in it, yes; and I think there is need for it.

Mr. JENSEN. Will not the gentleman also admit that a law passed and signed by the President without a part, at least, of the provisions of this amendment would be a law which would not be worthy of the name of a United States law?

Mr. MORRIS. No; I cannot agree to that at all, because these people are not without law. Do not think they are a lawless people, or that they are a society without law. They have two sets of laws now, their tribal law and the Federal law. They are not without law. They are getting along reasonably well in this regard, I would say. So I cannot agree with that at all.

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly would be the last person in the world to accuse the Indians of being lawbreakers to any greater degree than the rest of the American people.

Mr. MORRIS. I am sure the gentleman would not so accuse them and I do not make any such inference. The gentleman knows the high respect I have for him.

Mr. JENSEN. And the gentleman knows the high respect I have for him also—if we must pass a few compliments. The fact is our Indians themselves are very much in favor, generally speaking, of the very provisions of the D'Ewart amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. The fact is that the Indian Tribal Council voted down the amendment last time which pertained to this very subject matter. The President in his veto message gave that as one of the salient reasons why he vetoed it—because the Indians did not want it. We have no assurance at all that the Indians will want even this limited provision in the bill. I think we would be very unwise to put it in because we can put it in later, may I say to the gentleman, if after mature reflection and consideration we feel that such a provision should be in the law. We can then put it in without much trouble, I believe.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As a matter of fact, as I view the situation this amendment leaves out that portion of section 9 that the Indians wanted; that is that portion of the amendment which would give them the opportunity to go to the State courts for the settlement of their own problems among themselves. The amendment includes the things that the Indians do not want, and that is the laws with respect to marriage, divorce, and criminal laws.

They do not want that. But they are willing to take that if they were given the other parts, such as having some law among themselves, and the opportunity of going to the courts in settlement of their own problems among themselves. That is being left out. So this amendment, or the part that the Indians want is left out, and what the Indians do not want is put on. I agree that something is going to have to be done about these laws. I think we should have a general bill applying to all reservations. I think it is needed in all reservations.

Mr. MORRIS. May I point out to the membership, Mr. Chairman, that the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, who has addressed us, of course, knows more about these matters than we can possibly know who do not live there. He has expressed an important fact. I think we are treading on dangerous ground when we are seeking to put something in the bill which the Indians themselves do not want, and which the President may feel is so important that he may veto it again. Let us move on with this legislation. Let us not take a chance of doing injury to these Indians just because we want this, that, or the other thing in. We should not do that unless it is imperative and it is not imperative because it can be taken care of in subsequent legislation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree thoroughly with the last statement that the gentleman made, and I am afraid that this will lead to a veto of this necessary legislation, and that the legislation will be handicapped or stymied. We do, however, need an extension of State law over Indian reservations. I would like to see general legislation to that effect.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] received this letter from Charles S. Murphy, administrative assistant to the President——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, the letter is as follows:

JANUARY 10, 1950.

DEAR JOHN: This is in response to your request that we ascertain whether the present version of the Navajo-Hopi bill (S. 2734, 81st Cong.) meets the objections raised in the President's veto of a predecessor bill (S 1407).

We have made a check of this matter and find that S 2734 does meet the objections raised by the President in his veto of the previous bill, and that the bill in its present form is approved by the administration.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLIE

(Charles S. Murphy),

Administrative Assistant to the President.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we know that the provisions of the present bill was passed by both Houses before and will meet with the approval of the President. If, as the saying goes, we should start monkeying around with it and change it here and there in important features, we may endanger the entire bill for this session. Let us not do that. These people need this legislation. Let us not delay it longer.

I would like to make this further suggestion in regard to this important matter: When the time comes I will join with the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] or any other Member in efforts along this line. I hope we may work out the problem where our Indian friends will eventually be completely assimilated into our society. But, after all, we must consider them as we go along. We must do that in fairness and in justice. In this particular bill they voted against this subject matter. Let us observe and respect their wishes in this particular bill. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] I dislike to oppose any amendment that he might offer because I recognize the sincerity of his position always. He is not only a distinguished Member of this Congress but, as former chairman of this subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman now, he has always been deeply interested in justice and fair play for the Indians, and I respect him. However, I cannot agree with him on this occasion.

I wish also to pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Lands (Mr. Peterson). In all my experience I have never worked with a man who, to my knowledge, had a higher and nobler purpose in mind, who was more industrious and worked harder to bring about good generally for society. He has been responsible for much good legislation. I have never seen a man in all my life who was quite such a human dynamo and steam engine in really getting legislative things done in a fine and expeditious way. He is a Rock of Gibraltar when it comes to a matter like this. I realize the burden that falls upon me, a comparatively new Member of the House as chairman of this subcommittee. I have been here 3 years, and that is not a very long time as a legislator. I feel his great strength of character, ability and experience and I want to publicly express my appreciation of it on this occasion.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank my distinguished friend. It is a fine committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, and it has been an inspiration to make possible the work that I have done.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. WIER. Would you feel that it was wise, as long as you are subjecting the Indians in these two particular States to the civil laws of those States, that in return they ought to be respected by those laws in their right to buy a drink?

Mr. MORRIS. I believe that issue has been presented once to the House, and it may be presented again, but I do not think it should come into the discussion of this bill at this time. I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman directly, because I do not think we ought to get off onto a lot of ancillary matters in connection with this important measure.

Mr. WIER. You are off on a lot of them now.

Mr. MORRIS. I am sorry, I cannot yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it necessary for me to speak at length, but I do want briefly to make my position clear on this matter.

I absolutely agree with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART]. He has worked hard and sincerely to figure out what can be done concerning this conflicting jurisdiction with respect to Indians. I am in agreement with him that this sort of legislation is necessary. I have worked with him and he has worked with me in putting in the amendment the last time, which was vetoed. That amendment was approved by the Indian council, because the Indian council and the Indians themselves—as a matter of fact, the Indians more than the Indian council—have been demanding the right to go to the State courts in conflicts between themselves and between individual Indians and the tribe or tribal council. That is what they wanted. So, because they wanted that they were willing to take this other also. They also want that part of the previous amendment which required that the State curriculum be applied to the Indian schools. That is left out of this amendment; in fact, this amendment leaves out the very things that the Indians wanted and puts in the things that we wanted but that they did not and do not want. Under these circumstances, I am very fearful that the President will veto it. I know positively that Collier will again set his people in motion to put the pressure on the President to veto it, because he does not believe in Indians coming under State law with respect to marriages. Former Secretary Ickes agrees with Collier, and, as you will recall, the press reported shortly after this bill was vetoed that there was a conference between former Secreary Ickes and the President in which, the press reported, this very point was stressed. Referring to this conference, the Washington Post on November 9, 1949, said in Drew Pearson's column:

One of the things Ickes talked to Truman about was the plight of the Navajos and the veto of a bill just passed by Congress, putting the Navajo under State laws of Arizona and New Mexico.

The Catholic Church has been worried over the divorce and remarriage systems of the Navajos by which they merely appear before their own tribal authorities if they wish to divorce.

However, both Ickes and Truman felt that the Indians were entitled to their ancient tribal customs.

Clearly, this amendment does violence to what it is reported the President believes in, and it certainly flies in the face of the well-known views of former Commissioner Collier and former Secretary Ickes with respect to Indian marriages and divorces. These men and their influence over Nation-wide organizations of Indian friends would put the pressure again on the President to veto this bill, and I fear that if the amendment is adopted it may bring about another veto.

I repeat that if we adopt this amendment we are putting in that which the Indians do not want and taking out that which the Indians do want.

I think this matter ought to be brought up in a general bill before the committee and that we should have additional hearings on it, particularly if it is to be a general bill applying to all the reservations. For example, up in Taos right now a suit has just been tried in the Federal court in which the tribe ejected the husband of an Indian from her property because he came from another Indian reservation. This pair had lived together in the Taos pueblo for years, they have three children, but now the tribe has decided that they do not like this Indian who married the girl in Taos and have ordered them to move out. The Federal court has held that the tribal council is supreme and that the Federal Government cannot interfere. Under State law the rights of this couple and their three children could be protected.

There are so many fundamental problems involved that the changes should be considered in a general bill during which all these various angles can be considered, what the Indians want, what the State wants in order to protect its society as well as the Indians, and what the Indian Office wants to assist them in the ultimate objective of integrating the Indian into the citizenship of the State. I sincerely hope that the Members of the House, although some of us fought hard for this amendment before, will not vote for it now. The adoption of a similar provision before gives notice of the policy the Congress desires to have pursued. With the veto of the President the question has received national attention, and both Indians and non-Indians are and should be studying the problem. Since the chairman has stated that a separate bill will be considered, it would be wiser not to endanger this important bill by another attempt here to solve this problem of law and order, and of the Indians' civil rights as citizens of the State to have access to its courts for the enforcement of rights and the redress of wrongs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. D'EWART) there were—ayes 27, noes 23.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. D'EWART and Mr. PETERSON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 35, noes 28.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 8, line 12, after the word "amounts", strike out "expended" and insert "of contributions by the State toward expenditures."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope this amendment will not be as controversial as the one the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] just offered.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON. As I understand it, that is the wording the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], discussed a few minutes ago?

Mr. SAYLOR. It is.

Mr. PETERSON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has put into form an amendment suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. We have no objection to it and will consent to the amendment on this side.

Mr. SAYLOR I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments to offer and I ask unanimous consent that they be read and considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. PETERSON: On page 9, line 6, strike out "chairman thereof" and insert "President of the Senate" and page 9, lines 9 and 10, strike out "chairman thereof" and insert "Speaker of the House of Representatives"

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 480, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the D'Ewart amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put the other amendments en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. D'EWART: On page 11, following line 2, add a new section numbered 11, to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. From and after the effective date of this act all Indians within the tribal or allotted lands of the Navajo and Hopi Reservations shall be subject to the laws of the States wherein such lands are located, with respect to (1) school attendance, (2) malfeasance or misfeasance in public or tribal office, (3) embezzlement or misappropriation of funds, (4) regulation of automotive traffic, (5) marriage and divorce, (6) elections, and shall have access to the courts of such States for the enforcement of these rights and the redress of these wrongs to the same extent and in the same manner as any citizen thereof."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment on which a separate vote was demanded.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. D'EWART) there were—ayes 37, noes 31.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 143, nays 196, not voting 92, as follows:

[Roll No 52]

YEAS—143

Allen, Calif.	Gwinn	Murray, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Hagen	Nelson
Anderson, Calif	Hale	Nixon
Andresen, August H.	Hall, Leonard W	Norblad
Angell	Halleck	O'Hara, Minn.
Auchincloss	Hand	O'Konski
Barrett, Wyo.	Harvey	Pfeiffer, William L.
Beall	Heselton	Phillips, Calif.
Bennett, Mich.	Hill	Phillips, Tenn.
Bishop	Hinshaw	Plumley
Blackney	Hoeven	Potter
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman, Ill.	Poulson
Bolton, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich	Reed, Ill
Bramblett	Holmes	Reed, N. Y.
Brehm	Hope	Rees
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Rich
Burdick	Hull	Rogers, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jackson, Calif.	St. George
Canfield	James	Sanborn
Case, N. J.	Jenison	Saylor
Church	Jenkins	Scott, Hardie
Clevenger	Jennings	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Cole, Kans.	Jensen	Scudder
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson	Shafer
Corbett	Jonas	Short
Cotton	Judd	Simpson, Ill.
Crawford	Kean	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Kearney	Smith, Kans.
Curtis	Kearns	Smith, Wis.
Dague	Keating	Stefan
Davis, Wis.	Keefe	Stockman
D'Ewart	Kilburn	Taber
Dolliver	Latham	Talle
Dondero	LeCompte	Tollefson
Ellsworth	LeFevre	Towe
Elston	Lemke	Van Zandt
Engel, Mich.	Lovre	Vorys
Fellows	McConnell	Vursell
Fenton	McCulloch	Welchel
Ford	McDonough	Werdel
Fulton	Mack, Wash.	Widnall
Gamble	Macy	Wigglesworth
Gavin	Martin, Mass.	Williams
Gillette	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Golden	Merrow	Withrow
Goodwin	Meyer	Wolcott
Graham	Michener	
Gross	Miller, Md.	
	Morton	

NAYS—196

Abbitt	Andrews	Bates
Abernethy	Aspinall	Battle
Addonizio	Barden	Beckworth
Albert	Barrett, Pa.	Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen	Hardy	O'Sullivan
Biemiller	Hare	Pace
Blatnik	Harrison	Passman
Boggs, La.	Hart	Patman
Bolling	Havenner	Patten
Bolton, Md.	Hays, Ark.	Perkins
Bonner	Heller	Peterson
Bosone	Herlong	Philbin
Boykin	Hobbs	Pickett
Breen	Holifield	Poage
Brooks	Huber	Polk
Bryson	Jackson, Wash.	Preston
Buchanan	Javits	Price
Buckley, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Burke	Jones, N. C.	Quinn
Burleson	Karst	Rains
Burnside	Karsten	Rankin
Burton	Kee	Redden
Byrne, N. Y.	Kelly, N. Y.	Regan
Camp	Kennedy	Rhodes
Cannon	Kerr	Ribicoff
Carlyle	King	Richards
Carnahan	Kirwan	Rivers
Carroll	Klein	Rodino
Cavalcante	Kruse	Rooney
Celler	Lane	Roosevelt
Chesney	Lanham	Sabath
Christopher	Larcade	Sasscer
Chudoff	Lesinski	Secrest
Clemente	Lind	Shelley
Combs	Linehan	Sheppard
Cooley	Lyle	Sikes
Cooper	Lynch	Sims
Crook	McCarthy	Smith, Va.
Crosser	McCormack	Spence
Davis, Ga.	McGuire	Steed
Davis, Tenn.	McKinnon	Sullivan
Deane	McMillan, S. C	Sutton
DeGraffenried	McSweeney	Tackett
Delaney	Mack, Ill.	Tauriello
Denton	Madden	Thompson
Dollinger	Magee	Trimble
Doughton	Mahon	Underwood
Doyle	Mansfield	Wagner
Durham	Marcantonio	Walsh
Eaton	Marsalis	Welch
Elliott	Marshall	Wheeler
Engle, Calif.	Miles	White, Calif.
Evins	Miller, Calif.	White, Idaho
Feighan	Mills	Whitten
Fernandez	Mitchell	Whittington
Fisher	Morgan	Wier
Flood	Morris	Wilson, Okla.
Fogarty	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Forand	Moulder	Winstead
Frazier	Multer	Wood
Fugate	Murdock	Woodhouse
Furcolo	Noland	Worley
Gordon	Norrell	Yates
Gorski	O'Brien, Ill.	Young
Granger	O'Hara, Ill.	
Grant	O'Neill	

NOT VOTING—92

Allen, Ill.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Patterson
Allen, La.	Harden	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Arends	Harris	Powell
Bailey	Hays, Ohio	Rabaut
Baring	Hébert	Ramsay
Brown, Ga.	Hedrick	Riehlman
Buckley, N. Y.	Heffernan	Rogers, Fla.
Bulwinkle	Herter	Sadlak
Case, S. Dak.	Howell	Sadowski
Chatham	Irving	Scrivner
Chelf	Jacobs	Smathers
Chiperfield	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Ohio
Colmer	Kelley, Pa.	Staggers
Coudert	Keogh	Stanley
Cox	Kilday	Stigler
Davenport	Kunkel	Taylor
Davies, N. Y.	Lichtenwalter	Teague
Dawson	Lodge	Thomas
Dingell	Lucas	Thornberry
Donohue	McGrath	Velde
Douglas	McGregor	Vinson
Eberharter	McMillen, Ill.	Wadsworth
Fallon	Martin, Iowa	Walter
Garmatz	Miller, Nebr.	Whitaker
Gary	Monroney	Wickersham
Gathings	Murphy	Willis
Gilmer	Murray, Tenn.	Wolverton
Gore	Nicholson	Woodruff
Gossett	Norton	Zablocki
Granahan	O'Brien, Mich.	
Green	O'Toole	
Gregory		

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Lichtenwalter for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Mr. Wolverton for, with Mr. Gary against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Green against.

Mr. Case of South Dakota for, with Mr. Jones of Missouri against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Stanley against.

Mr. Nicholson for, with Mr. Brown of Georgia against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Chatham against.

Mr. Kunkel for, with Mr. Donohue against.

Mr. McMillen of Illinois for, with Mrs. Douglas against.

Mr. Miller of Nebraska for, with Mr. Fallon against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mrs. Harden for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Velde for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Sadlak for, with Mr. Smathers against.

Mr. Patterson for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Scrivner.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the yea and nay votes be included as part of today's Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the request that the yea and nay votes just recorded be made a part of today's Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that it always is made a part of the Journal.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Boston Herald.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include certain editorials.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement released by him today.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include questions and answers by Paul O. Peters.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, February 15, in an extension of remarks, I included a newspaper statement pointing out the great dangers inherent in the packing of the Federal Reserve Board with pliant men who may fail to carry out the intent of the law which created that Board. Today I have a few remarks of my own to make which, I believe, will show how a board such as this can be packed. I draw my material from the Board's own records.

The spirit of the Banking Act of 1935 was clearly violated in the past by the appointments of Rudolph M. Evans; the late Lawrence Clayton; M. S. Szymczak, and to a certain extent, Marriner S. Eccles. I shall take these cases on in their order.

First of all, let me point out that the law provides that no more than one Governor shall be appointed from the same Federal reserve district at the same time, and it also provides that no member of the Board who has served a consecutive 14-year term shall be eligible for reappointment.

In the case of Governor Evans, he was appointed from Virginia presumably a resident of that State, whereas as a matter of fact he was a permanent resident of the State of Iowa until the time he was appointed to the Corn-Hog Section of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Department of Agriculture, in 1933 by Henry A. Wallace, a long-time personal friend. In fact, he is regarded as a protégé of Mr. Wallace. While serving in the Agriculture Department he was a landowner in the State of Iowa and maintained continuously large holdings and business interests and every year made several extended visits to his residence for the purpose of looking after his interests. He had a Washington address, of course, in Alexandria, like thousands of other Federal workers, but I am certain that he, like thousands of others, regarded it as a temporary address until the question of his legal residence came up in March of 1942 when he was being considered for appointment as a member of the Federal Reserve Board. President Roosevelt was apparently advised that he was a bona fide resident of Virginia and apparently the Senate was likewise advised because the appointment was confirmed as a bona fide resident of Virginia. Since his appointment I understand that he has maintained his activities in Iowa, has absolutely no interest, commercial, political, or otherwise, in Virginia, except that of his living quarters. I am sure he still regards himself as an Iowan and spends much time each year in Iowa. The only reason for the deliberate evasion of the spirit of the law in connection with this lush appointment, 14 years at $15,000 a year, was that Evans was a very close friend of Henry Wallace, and was a close friend of Marriner Eccles, who wanted him on the Board of the Federal Reserve System and found that it was impossible to have him appointed from Iowa because that State is located in the Seventh Federal Reserve District, Chicago, and the district already had a member on the board, Mr. M. S. Szymczak.

Another obvious violation of the spirit of the Federal Reserve Act, if not the letter, is apparent in the reappointment of M. S. Szymczak. The Federal Reserve Act provides that no member of the Board of Governors, having served a consecutive 14-year term, shall be eligible for reappointment as a member of the Board.

M. S. Szymczak, of Chicago, was first appointed to the Federal Reserve Board in June 1933 and served continuously until February 1, 1936, when the technical status of the whole Board was changed to that of Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Without a break in service he was designated by the President to continue on with the changed organization and received a 12-year appointment dated February 1, 1936, and expiring February 1, 1948. It will be noted that at the expiration of the term in February 1948, he had served approximately 15 years as a member of the Federal Reserve Board.

In the face of this continuous service in excess of 14 years, Szymczak's appointment was urged by Chairman Eccles and was finally agreed to by the President and he was reappointed in February 1948 for a full term of 14 years. At the conclusion of this present term in 1962, he will have served continuously as a member of the Federal Reserve Board for approximately 29 years and will have reached the age of 68 before his term expires.

It is admitted that the Congress never intended that one man should serve so long on the Federal Reserve Board, or else the Congress would not have placed in the law the positive prohibition against the reappointment of any man who had served a 14-year term. The trick here was the placing in the act by the man who wrote the bill of the word "continuous."

Lawrence Clayton, recently deceased, was appointed as a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on February 14, 1947, to fill a vacancy which had been left unfilled 8 or 10 years previously. In this appointment the spirit of the law was violated in the same manner as it was in the appointment of Evans, because although Clayton was appointed as a resident of Boston, he had been, in fact, a resident of the State of Utah since childhood.

Clayton was born in Salt Lake City in 1891. In 1924 he became associated with Marriner S. Eccles in the First National Bank of Ogden and continued in that capacity as one of Eccles' right-hand men until 1934, when Eccles brought him to Washington as Special Assistant to the Chairman—Eccles—in December 1934.

In January 1945, Eccles had Clayton moved to Boston, Mass., where he assumed the nominal position as president of Clayton Securities Corp., of Boston, a company owned and operated by Clayton's brother. It was said at the time that the purpose of this move was to make Clayton eligible, either for a position as president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, or for appointment to the Federal Reserve Board from the Boston District to succeed John K. McKee, whose term was to expire in February 1946. It is understood that President Roosevelt had agreed to this appointment. Unfortunately for Clayton, Roosevelt died, Truman became President, and Governor Vardaman was designated for the appointment to succeed McKee.

The Board of Directors of the Boston Federal Reserve Bank did not look with favor upon making Clayton president of that institution, and instead of him, they selected Laurence Whittemore.

Eccles then went to President Truman and demanded that Clayton be appointed to fill the long standing vacancy on the board and Clayton was, therefore, appointed, presumably, as a resident of Boston, Mass., in the First Federal Reserve District. In fairness to President Truman, it should be said that he was told that Clayton was a bona fide resident of Boston and had been there for many years; and this same misinformation was passed on to the United States Senate, and Clayton's appointment was confirmed in February 1947.

The necessity for evading the law in this case is obvious. Clayton was and had been widely known as Eccles' "Man Friday" for more than 20 years, and was known to do Eccles' bidding without question in all matters official and most matters personal. Since Eccles himself was appointed from the Twelfth Federal Reserve District, San Francisco, in which Utah—Clayton's real home—was located, it was necessary to move Clayton to a district from which no Governor was then serving, and because of the location of Clayton's brother in Boston, that locale naturally suggested itself. The Boston district embraces the States of

Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, and yet in all of that area—one of the most important and intelligent and wealthiest districts in all America—not one bona fide resident was offered the appointment, but this temporary resident, hand-picked and moved into the district for the purpose, was selected to represent the great area embracing the New England States, on the Federal Reserve Board, when he had been a temporary resident of that area less than 2 years.

Clayton died in December 1949.

I made a study of these interesting developments in the Federal Reserve Board after I read a statement which I inserted in the RECORD last Wednesday, and I want to assure the public that packing the Federal Reserve Board is entirely possible, as the record reveals.

Of course, we are unable to deduce that there was not a very good reason for this packing, and many of us feel that we know what the reason is. There is one thing that will lead us away from democracy toward fascism more quickly than anything else and that is the attempt to seize power in this country through the banks. If the banks can control it by one man or a little clique, industry will be the next to fall in line.

We have a lot of worries in this country, many of them from abroad, but I think it is time for us to do some worrying here at home. I am interested, for the sake of the future of our Republic, to determine what effect this deliberate packing of the Federal Reserve Board has had upon the actions of the Board in the past few years.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

COMMUNISTS IN PUBLIC OFFICE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last night I was over in the other body until 11:30. Part of what took place, I suppose all of it, is in the RECORD. I think it would be most interesting and certainly disturbing if every Member of the House would know what happened over there.

I do not know whether or not it is within the rules of the House to refer to what was said, so I will say only this, that a Member of the other body from documents before him which he said came from the investigators of the State Department or the FBI, cited case after case where statements of fact concluded with the statement that the individual to whom reference was made was a Communist or associated with Communists. The individuals to whom reference was made, except three or four, are in the State Department.

Then, as appears in the morning papers, when the Member of the other body was asked to put the names on record, he declined to do so. There was much criticism because he would not name the individuals. There would have been more had he done so.

My thought is this: If the public wants to know the names of the individuals to whom the gentleman is referring, if the public wants the record, the facts, all of the facts, as disclosed by the files, all that needs to be done is for the President of the United States to issue an order releasing those files to the public. Overlong the Congress has been denied information to enable it to legislate wisely and well. The very first words of the Constitution are these, "All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." The Supreme Court has held time and again, notably in McGrain against Daugherty, that the House and the other body have the right to information which is in the files of the executive department in order to enable them to carry out their legislative duties.

Most assuredly when it is charged as it has been charged that there are Communists not only in the State Department, but in other departments of the Government, the executive branch of the Government, it would seem, before the Congress appropriates money to enable those departments to carry on their functions, with those individuals as employees, that we should be entitled to have the record, force the President to make public the record, of any communistic activities, especially when that record is compiled by the department's own agents. Certainly this is true when the record discloses, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning shows, and as the newspapers indicate that a number of those employees—more than 50 of them—are Communists or associated with Communists and follow Communist practice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

FEPC LEGISLATION

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. For too long the average person has been complacent and undisturbed while the Communists, Socialists, and radicals have been working to remake our free Government into one patterned after European dictatorships.

Too many have said, "It can't happen here," while actually it was happening here day by day.

Too many have refused to believe we face any real danger of losing freedom, while actually it was being nibbled away bit by bit.

Now we have come to the point where those who, in the past, laughed at warnings of Communist activities, realize that Russia and the Communists have for years stolen from us secrets of the most vital nature, and used for the purpose not only their own foreign agents but native-born Americans serving as public officials and Government employees, who betrayed the country as foully and shamelessly as ever Benedict Arnold did.

We have seen Russian communism take over governments and countries one by one, until now 14 countries are in the cruel grip of communism; and communism is still going full speed on its conquering march.

We see our national debt, already two hundred fifty-six and two-thirds billion dollars, increasing day by day for long periods of time at the rate of approximately a million dollars an hour.

We see the Nation's coal pile dwindle to a week's supply in the dead of winter, bringing suffering to those without fuel, and unemployment to tens of thousands engaged in railroading and other industries dependent upon coal to operate.

While these things exist and grow worse day by day, we see the administration and the Congress, who ought to be concerning themselves with the important task of correcting these conditions, ignore them.

Instead we see the administration, heedless of the people's needs, heedless of the country's welfare, itself bidding for the support of politically active minority groups, demand of a subservient Congress that it enact into law one of the most vicious and bureaucratic measures which ever became a part of the Communist Party line—namely, the so-called and misnamed Fair Employment Practices Commission Act, usually referred to by the initials FEPC.

So, on the two hundred and eighteenth anniversary of the Father of our Country, we have the sorry spectacle of those who are willing to cater to minority groups combining their forces to bring out this vicious, bureaucratic, communistic, un-American bill on the day which heretofore has been set aside exclusively to respect and revere the memory of that great man who led the patriots of this country into the formation of our free Government in 1776.

For a time it seemed that the advocates of this vicious measure intended to ignore Washington's Birthday, even to the extent of breaking the long-established custom, followed for many years, of reading Washington's Farewell Address on his birthday anniversary. Seeing that a storm of indignation and resentment was about to descend upon their heads, the FEPC group now plans to share Washington's Birthday with Washington. They plan to proceed to press for the FEPC bill after the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

What is the FEPC bill, and who are those who are loudest in their insistence upon its enactment?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman assure the majority leader that if unanimous consent were asked that Calendar Wednesday be put over until the next day, Thursday, and that day would be used as Calendar Wednesday, that the consent would be granted?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Certainly the gentleman knows I could not assure him that, before he asked the question.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman that a survey has been made and the gentleman has received information that if such request were made there would be objection, but not from those in favor of the FEPC. I simply say that

so that the RECORD may be clear, but not in any way to inject myself into my friend's speech. Just so that the RECORD may be clear. As far as I am concerned, I would be glad to have the next day utilized the same as Calendar Wednesday, but it can only be done by unanimous consent; and as far as I am concerned, I have made a survey and I have reached the conclusion that it cannot be done.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, I have yielded to the gentleman for the purpose of making a statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You might in turn ask the distinguished majority leader if it would be agreeable to him to ask that we dispense with Calendar Wednesday on tomorrow by unanimous consent, in order that this bill may go over and come up a week later, out of deference to George Washington.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, I would say that it is a matter of a great deal of surprise to me that after these months and years of dispensing with Calendar Wednesday, whatever may have been the reason for it, that on this particular day which has always been set aside to honor the memory of George Washington by reading his Farewell Address and then adjourning, it suddenly becomes imperative to call up this iniquitous FEPC bill.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. If time is so pressing that we have to bring up the FEPC tomorrow, perhaps it would be in order that we should object every Thursday to adjourning over until Monday.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It is a peculiar thing that at this particular time it became necessary to call up the FEPC bill on this anniversary of Washington's Birthday. While the subject is up, I would like to offer this remark also, that while the various advocates of the FEPC bill apparently are vying with each other to claim credit for its introduction and to claim credit for the machinery for getting it up, some of these days the people of the United States are going to wake up to the fact of what is being perpetrated upon them if this iniquitous bill is passed, and some of those who are so anxious to be known as its authors and fathers and sponsors are going to want to be on the other side of the fence when an outraged people finally find out what has been going on here and what it means to the country.

On last Wednesday, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] pointed out on this floor that it was the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] who in 1942 introduced the first FEPC bill in this Congress.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], as everyone knows, has probably been more active than any Member of this House in opposing the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and in seeking to destroy it. The House Committee on Un-American Activities is the group which, next to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has done more than any other group or body to expose Communist activities in this country, and to bring to justice those traitors who have betrayed America to the Communists.

It is a peculiar thing that, throughout the years, those who have been most vocal and most active in fighting the Committee on Un-American Activities have likewise been the most vocal and most active in pressing for the enactment of this Communist-supported FEPC legislation. As is the case with so many Communist-supported policies, this iniquitous act is dressed up with a liberal and appealing label. It bears the title, "Federal Fair Employment Practice Act." If the bill adhered to the purpose set forth in its title, it would be supported by many who now oppose it. It is not a Fair Employment Practice Act. On the contrary, it is unfair. It is dictatorial. It is destructive of freedom. It is coercive in its provisions.

We had a so-called Fair Employment Practice Bureau set up during the war by Executive order. The people of America have not forgotten by any means the coercion, the unfairness, and the dictatorial practices indulged in by those who operated the wartime FEPC.

When the wartime FEPC was in operation we had a good example of what may be expected if another FEPC is created.

To begin with, the majority of the wartime FEPC staff were Negroes. There were a few renegade whites who were willing to become a part of such an organization, and they were given positions in some of the offices.

The personnel of the regional FEPC office in Atlanta consisted of one Negro man, one Negro woman, two white men, and one white woman. This personnel, with their positions and salaries, consisted of the following:

Regional office, Atlanta

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon	Regional director	White	$4,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner	Colored	3,800
McKay, George D.	do	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer	do	2,000
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	1,800

From the best information I have been able to get, in January 1946 this motley bureau employed a total of 114 persons in its 14 regional offices and 7 administrative offices. Of the 114 persons, 61 were Negroes. This was more than half the total number, while the Negro population in the United States, roughly, is only 10 percent of the total.

Thus the example set by the Commission itself was one of rank discrimination. This indicates that ending discrimination is the last thing in the minds of those who sponsor this FEPC Commission.

Do you remember some of the dictatorial, asinine, silly activities of this black and tan group while it was having a field day during the war years?

It was brought to my attention at the time that one of its black and tan would-be Mussolinis issued an order in the State of Texas that a person who wanted to hire a colored employee in Texas could not insert an ad in the want ad section of the newspaper, which read: "Wanted, colored porter."

The prospective employer was ordered to insert his ad in this fashion: "Wanted, porter."

Of course, an order of that kind would not be obeyed in the State of Texas. It was not obeyed, and while it is very likely that if this legislation ever is enacted, similar orders will be issued, I believe it is a safe prediction that they would not be obeyed now.

There is no limit to the unreasonable, foolish, impossible requirements of the impractical, short-sighted advocates of this communistic theory. For instance, here are some of the regulations and rulings issued by the FEPC Commission in New York State, as outlined in a speech by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] on the floor of the House February 13, 1947.

Unlawful practices:

Inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise.

Inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relatives.

Unlawful to require that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate

Unlawful to inquire into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed. Unlawful to inquire whether an applicant for employment is an atheist.

An applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization.

Unlawful to inquire into the complexion of an applicant for employment.

Unlawful to inquire whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship; whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship.

Unlawful to require that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers.

Unlawful to inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin.

Unlawful to inquire into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment.

Unlawful to inquire into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment.

Unlawful to inquire into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquire into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment.

Unlawful to inquire into the general military experience of an applicant for employment.

Unlawful to inquire into the whereabouts of an applicant for employment during the First World War, i. e., during the period from 1914 to 1919.

Thus under these New York FEPC rulings and regulations it would be unlawful

to find out whether an applicant for employment is a Baptist, Methodist, Catholic, or other denomination.

It would be unlawful to find out whether the applicant is a veteran of World War I or not.

It would be unlawful to inquire whether the applicant is an atheist or not.

You could not find out whether an applicant for employment is a Communist or not.

You could not inquire whether the applicant is white or colored.

You could not find out anything about the applicant's parents, wife, husband, or other close relatives.

You could not find out where a person was born.

You could not even find out whether he was a native of the United States or of a foreign country, and if you accidentally found out he was a native of a foreign country, you could not find out whether he had become a naturalized citizen of the United States or not.

The whole thing is so silly and simple, it condemns itself.

The real purpose of this legislation is not to end discrimination in employment, or give equality of opportunity in employment.

It is one phase of the efforts of misguided persons with warped and twisted minds who seek to tear down all barriers between the races, and force social intermingling, and intermarriage between whites and blacks.

This is something which cannot be forced upon the people in my section. I give you fair warning that such efforts cannot be successful. They will only bring bloodshed, and will bring about more antagonism and friction between the races than has existed at any time since reconstruction days when the last attempt to accomplish this purpose miserably and utterly failed.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday, February 27, for 1 hour following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FLOODS IN THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, every newspaper and report reaching me from Louisiana is filled with stories of swollen rivers and flooded lands. We are in the midst of a period of floods on the lower Mississippi and huge amounts of water have been moving down the streams from the upper reaches of the Mississippi Valley and into the lower Mississippi Basin. It is predicted that the lower Mississippi and tributaries will reach a still higher level than it has reached at the present time and thus the flood stage in the next few weeks will approach a crisis. Thus far the work of the Army engineers has stood up well against the pressure of water moving toward the Gulf of Mexico. No levee has broken and no crevasse has thus far occurred but as weeks go by the levees will become waterlogged and they then will meet their severest test. The improved channel permits an orderly movement of water down stream and the use of reservoirs which have been completed holds up thousands of acres of water to be released when it can be safely channeled down stream to the Gulf of Mexico. Thus we have a more orderly handling of the floodwaters that come from the 32 States of the Union constituting the land between the eastern divide in the Allegheny mountains and the western divide in the Rocky mountains.

Mr. Speaker, the water that is presently being channeled through Louisiana is not Louisiana water. It comes from many States, north, east, and west of the State of Louisiana. It is the floodwaters coming from areas along such streams as the Ohio, Cumberland, Tenn., upper Mississippi, Missouri, Arkansas, White, and upper Red Rivers into Louisiana on its way to the Gulf.

Thus our problem in the lower part of the Mississippi Basin is not a Louisiana problem but a national problem made thus by the laws of nature improved by the methods of men to drain the greatest valley in the world of excess water.

While these floodwaters pouring down on us today come from other States and other sections of the country, they are nonetheless most destructive and dangerous. A year or two ago we had a crevasse at Baton Rouge, La., which was due to the sloughing off of the levee on the west bank of the Mississippi above Baton Rouge.

The destructiveness of this crevasse was reduced by the brilliant work of the Army engineers in immediately curbing and preventing the break-through of the levees at this point from spreading. As I said before, thus far no such levee break has occurred but in certain areas in Louisiana the backwater has filtered in, covering many thousands of acres of fertile land in our State. That water is water which because of the height of the main channel backs up into the tributaries and finds its way out of the stream channels at points not fully protected. In this way much damage is done.

Reports reaching me indicate in Louisiana at the present time that over 2,000,000 acres are now under water. I am informed over 9,000 people have been removed to higher ground where they will be safe until the floodwater recedes. This backwater area should be the subject of attention by Congress and an appropriation of funds by us at an early date. This situation is progressively getting worse.

Mr. Speaker, at many points along Red River, we find flooded areas at the present time. Red River is a stream which rises in far west Texas, flows some 1,300 miles east and southeast until it empties into the Atchafalaya near its confluence with the Mississippi River. At points around Cypress, for instance, the Red River backwater areas have become distressingly acute and this floodwater is causing a great deal of destruction and damage to property.

I have in my hands photographs taken in the last few days and flown here to Washington showing the extent to which this floodwater is covering the land along the Red River, especially on the west bank of the river in the vicinity of Cypress and Zimmerman, La. Some of these pictures are especially interesting as they show the efforts of cattle to protect themselves from drowning by seeking higher ground.

I mention these pictures especially because there is presently before the Appropriations Committee a proposal for a cloture and floodgate at Colfax, La., on the right descending bank together with a diversion channel. It is extremely important that this diversion channel be built. This project would provide for locks and for an "unlevee'd" canal permitting drainage of backwaters down Cane River.

As these papers indicate, at the present time seventy to eighty thousand acres of very fertile land in the Red River Basin are under water near Colfax because of the need of this flood control diversion channel. If the locks and the channel are built separately, it will cost $1,350,000. If these are both built at the same time they will ultimately become a part of the Overton Red River Lateral Canal which has been authorized by this Congress. Thus these two items may be built jointly at the present time at a saving of from $600,000 less than the $1,350,000 which this project might otherwise cost. In other words, by combining the projects a saving of $350,000 might be effected. In addition to this, the State of Louisiana has agreed to contribute $250,000 as an incentive toward getting this project started. Thus by starting the project at the present time the United States Government will save $600,000 in the overall picture of the development of this area.

Nor is this all. Up and down the Red River at many points backwater has inundated fertile land, rendering it impossible for cultivation, killing livestock and poultry and causing great damage to property in the areas covered. The Mississippi has fanned out over many parts of the district represented by my colleague, the honorable OTTO PASSMAN, threatening whole towns and cities and causing millions of dollars of damage.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I have just looked at the pictures which the gentleman has passed around here, and certainly I can understand why the gentleman is so greatly concerned about this matter. There is some relief in sight, at least to a degree, and it is coming pretty fast, because we in the Missouri Valley, which covers one-sixth of the United States, and which waters ordinarily drain right down through the gentleman's district and his State, are beginning, at least,

to build enough dams up there to hold a lot of that water in that great area on the tributaries and the main streams, and that is going to give you folks some relief.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to thank the gentleman for that contribution. We are deeply interested in the reservoir problem in the United States which will hold the floodwaters up in your section long enough for the other floodwaters to go through the lower Mississippi and permit them to pass safely through the State of Louisiana.

Mr. JENSEN. My district is bordered by the Missouri River for some 120 miles, from the State line of Missouri up to within about 20 miles of Sioux City. Of course, my problem is flood also. We have floods no end, but we are gradually whipping them. The farmers of the upper reaches of the Mississippi and the Missouri and the Ohio are doing the best job in holding this rain water where it falls by contouring and terracing the land, holding the water where it falls, and keeping the silt out of the streams, and by that soil-conservation program and the program we now have of building these dams on the upper reaches it will be, in a few years, a great help to you folks down there.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman very kindly. I know that the farmers are always doing a good job in their terracing, and that will help us a great deal.

The story of the flood of 1950 is now being written, but many weeks will pass before we can finally tabulate the tremendous losses resulting from the madstorm waters of the central United States as they rushed toward the sea.

So high has the Mississippi River become that the Bonnet Carre spillway, above New Orleans, has been opened, and I am informed that 250,000 per second cubic feet of water is being channeled through the floodway from the Mississippi to Lake Pontchartrain at the present time. This has taken the pressure off the New Orleans levees to some extent, but the situation on the Atchafalaya River is still in great difficulty. My able colleague from this part of Louisiana, Henry Larcade, who lives in the Atchafalaya Basin, yesterday gave the Senate Committee on Appropriations figures showing the volume of water which the Atchafalaya River is compelled to handle at this time, and he stressed the fact that tremendous pressure was being placed upon Atchafalaya levees. There is presently the threat of opening up the Atchafalaya floodway; and if this is done, tens of thousands of acres of fertile land within the Atchafalaya Basin will be flooded. Although the Atchafalaya floodway was authorized by law many years ago, the levees in this area have not been completed because of lack of money, and the use of this floodway in its present uncompleted condition will cause tremendous flood damage to south Louisiana. This session of Congress should certainly give this project enough money to completely build the Atchafalaya floodway.

I have in my hands newspapers and newspaper clippings giving the flood news in Louisiana. One Associated Press dispatch before me gives the flood gage reading at the present time and the predicted river crest on the Mississippi, Red, Atchafalaya, and other tributaries of the Mississippi. All of these figures indicate that a further rise and consequential flood damage is to be expected. The National Guard has been called out in certain areas, and tented cities have been laid out to take care of flood refugees.

Last year I read of the criticisms of some, who referred to flood control and navigation projects as "pork-barrel" legislation. I have no patience for these criticisms. Those who would level such criticisms should now take time out to go down to the great State of Louisiana and try to traverse the major highways there which are under water; look out over the land, covered with the swollen, muddy, ugly waters; visit the tented cities of flood refugees; and note the frantic efforts of cattle as they look for high ground to save their lives. These people, who have in the past been critical, should visit this area and note the distress and the hardship and the privation visited upon these people in my State, who have been thus penalized through no fault of their own, but merely because through our rivers we are seeking to drain the floodwaters of 32 States of the United States. They will go away as strong advocates of the Federal Government meeting this situation by full appropriations in the working out of the major flood-control and navigation plans, which will make our rivers servants of mankind rather than the destroyers of our people and our property. They will help us with the great problems of the lower Mississippi Basin, and especially of Louisiana, by providing us with the money which we need to build these critically needed flood-control projects. Surely this Congress can do no less.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

THE FEPC ISSUES

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked for 1 hour's time to discuss certain aspects of the so-called civil-rights program because it seemed to me with the very limited time that would be allowed under the rules of the House in the event that the FEPC bill is called up for consideration tomorrow with only 2 hours provided for debate, there would not be an opportunity for many Members of the House to discuss some of the fundamental issues involved in so substantial a change in our national policy. Therefore, today I expect to yield freely of my time as soon as I have completed a preliminary statement regarding this issue.

I think perhaps that some of the Members who have been interested in my point of view since a year ago when I described what has sometimes been called the Arkansas plan will want to share the time with me.

There never has been a time in recent years when the need for national unity was so great. While I differ profoundly with my friends, who have urged this legislation upon the House, I recognize that there are some conditions throughout the country which explain the ferment of opinion which has brought this issue before us.

It behooves us all to think in terms of the national community. I have been on the west coast in recent months. I have seen many members of the Negro race who were formerly residents of our region finding better opportunities on the west coast. It is in the interest of Arkansas and all the States which have built their economy on an agricultural foundation to have a thriving industrial life in other parts of the country for the good of our people who are squeezed out of agriculture and who are seeking to improve their economic situation.

I know, too, that we of the South who complain that this legislation is opposed to our region have indicated our interest in the problems of other regions, sometimes in a way that might have offended residents of those communities. I refer, for example, to the labor bills which have been before the House. I know when most of us from rural districts supported the Taft-Hartley measure some of our friends representing the labor point of view from industrial centers which conflicted with ours said, "Why should you take it upon yourselves to make this grave decision which affects our communities so vitally?" Our answer is again that ours is a national community and it is very much in our interest to avoid industrial conflict and thus to provide that the automobiles which roll off the assembly lines in Detroit shall come in full volume so that the farmers of our section shall have automobiles and tractors and the other products of our American industry.

So I think any recriminations along that line should be avoided and we should undertake to think in terms of our common interests and the relationship of industry and agriculture.

It is very difficult too, sometimes, to understand why some residents of other parts of the country would be so concerned about court procedures in the South. Yet I want to be consistent. Just as I have insisted that we in rural areas must be concerned about industrial production, so I freely grant that the holder of negotiable paper for the purchase of an automobile by a southern resident is and must be just as much concerned about the enforcement of his rights in our courts as we are in his industry and that he has a right to examine the judicial system if a breakdown is threatened at any point. So, with personal rights, the character of our courts is a defense against injustice that belongs to everyone, regardless of residence.

Mr. Speaker, I have said these things in order to speak with a background of agreement on that point—that our interests are so interlocked that residents of other sections have every right to

inquire about the progress being made in the South in providing for opportunities for the minority group—and I refer, of course, to our most important racial minority, the Negro race. It is a delicate issue, and I think it is always difficult for a member of the majority group, a white man, to speak with complete understanding of the point of view of the minority. I have done the best I could to put myself in the position of a member of the minority group. All of my adult life I have been interested in the problems and the welfare of the Negro people of my State. I am sure no one challenges that. It is not necessary to say it, but I crave your indulgence as I say it, because I would like to fortify it. I have done everything I could, as one citizen, for the improvement of the conditions of our minority people.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman uses the word "minority." Can the gentleman tell us in how many counties in the South the Negro people stand in the majority?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The Negro people in the South stand in the majority in a number of counties. I do not have the exact number. They are nationally a minority group. They are regionally a minority group. I see no point in arguing whether or not they are in certain localities a majority group, because, of course, the policies we discuss here are related to the Nation and not to the locality.

I am not sure that I understand the implications of the gentleman's question. If he intends only to point out that they are in the majority in certain communities, of course, that is true. But since they are not, in any State, the majority group, what I have said about the group as a minority will stand.

Booker T. Washington, a revered Negro leader, as early as 1884, in a meeting of the National Education Association, raised the question of the civil-rights bills—interesting enough, it was the same language in 1884 that we use today, for there were bills pending that were referred to as civil-rights bills—Booker T. Washington answered the question himself. He said:

> The best thing to do is to leave it alone and it will solve itself.

If Booker T. Washington were alive I believe he would stand by his statement, looking at the present situation and considering the great progress that the Negro race has made in cooperation with the white people where they live—in other words, the progress that has been made by both groups working together. He would probably say, as a philosopher and teacher—and he was a great teacher—that human problems are never finally solved. Even if my friends who so vigorously urge the FEPC bill have their way, and if the President should accept their recommendations as to the personnel of the FEPC, a year from now, no matter how vigorously enforced, they would not be satisfied with the results. The problem would still exist. Problems of this kind are never finally solved. That may be a fine commentary on human nature. It may be something that the Creator planted within us, a restlessness that drives us forward. The fact that some insist that the problems are not solved does not mean that Booker T. Washington was wrong in what he said about the civil rights bills in 1884, "Leave them alone." Booker T. Washington was right in placing reliance upon a common attack upon poverty, poor health, and limited educational opportunities rather than force legislation in Washington.

I shall not burden the House with a recital of the great progress that has been made in the States within the last 12 months in equalizing educational and other opportunities. There are those who offer the FEPC as a solution of one problem, who would agree that underlying that is a graver problem, a more fundamental problem, which is the education of our people. That does not have racial implications, except that of course for a long time, following their emergence from slavery, opportunities for the race were not abundant. Neither was the Negro always prepared to take advantage of such limited opportunities as were offered. It is no evidence at all of a lack of benevolence or humanitarian interest in the Negro on the part of the white majority that those opportunities were somewhat limited. I think it is a wholesome thing that the Negro has been insisting that opportunities be made more equal. Many measures for equalization awaited merely the insistence that they be granted. The interesting thing is that as the Negro asks for better opportunities in every field of endeavor he receives them. My city, the city of Little Rock, has just voted to put itself in debt to the extent of $359,000 to equalize the recreational activities for white and colored. That is related to this problem because you see there is resistance in the South to the extreme kind of legislation that FEPC supporters offer. The resistance to it is explained partly by reason of certain social relationships; and on that point, in all frankness, there will be no change. I would like to say that without offense. I am dealing with what I think is a reality. Our people believe that there should be no social intermingling, and I am not talking now in terms of social equality; it is not a question of one race being superior and another race inferior. A lot of talk on that line is wholly irrelevant. What I am saying is that the South has decided that under present conditions, some decisions and some activities based upon them must be governed by each group living its separate life in separate communities.

Now, I am anxious not to misrepresent our Negro leaders; I am sure that the Negro leadership of the South theoretically stands opposed unanimously to compulsory segregation; they have said so. No one in the South on the majority side questions their right to say so. We recognize the implications of it, but the best proof in the world of their sound thinking is in the statement that a group of Negro leaders made in 1942, in the famous Durham Conference that they recognized that the real progress to be made for their people must be within the framework of our own democracy in the Southern States; and I should add that no one should ask them to desist in their efforts to secure changes. But when it comes to a question of Federal policy, surely, as practical men, we should recognize that the decisions must be left to the States and to the localities.

When I discussed the President's message a year ago, 1 year after he had offered his civil-rights proposals, I pointed out that not a single one of his recommendations had met with congressional approval. I point out now that another year has gone by that this is still true and I do it primarily for the purpose of suggesting that if the program cannot receive congressional approval after this lapse of time surely there must be some valid objections to it. On the other hand, since agitation for it continues we who have objected to it must agree that since the agitation for it persists there must be some merit in it. That is the reason I have gone to the very bottom of it, into every phase of the program with such facilities as I have at my disposal to find the good that is in it. Having found some good in it, for the life of me, I do not understand why the administration turns down every effort to find the answer as reasonable men to a difficult question, a question that has divided our country, divided us in an hour when we ought to be united.

I do not know whether it is true or not, as many say, that this is a crucial hour in the life of humanity; I do not know whether it is true that decisions must shortly be made by millions of the world's people as to which road they will travel, our free way, or the totalitarian way. I do not know whether the men who speak in such grave terms as to eminent crises are right or not; if they are, we must have greater unity, and in any event, I am convinced that as far as our domestic happiness and peace is concerned, there is every reason for us as legislators to be calm, and to be fair, and to be reasonable as we approach this potentially explosive issue.

I have said that I could see in the FEPC issue only an indirect phase of the segregation problem. I suggested that I could understand the objections that are made by some to present practices, that there are indeed some harsh and even cruel aspects of segregation. What I have insisted upon as governmental policy is that those grievances must be addressed not to the National Congress, but to the municipalities and to the State legislatures. It is not our task. If we undertake to legislate in that field we will bungle the situation. We will find new divisions to plague us, and new and more severe problems will arise.

What does that have to do with FEPC? Oh, they say, it is an economic question, it has nothing to do with social relations, it has nothing to do with race relations. Well, now, the wartime FEPC was given power of a very limited character to deal

with these delicate human situations armed by an Executive order to do just one thing and that was to see that fair employment policies were adopted in war plants and in Federal agencies. Mind you, the wartime FEPC had nothing like the sweeping powers that Mr. POWELL'S bill proposes to give, nothing like them. It was empowered only to deal with wartime activities and with Federal employment, that is all, and had authority only to prescribe fair employment practices. But if a war agency equipped by Executive order to deal with problems in a limited area should so disregard its authority as to issue orders breaking down patterns of life in the city of Baltimore and dealing with delicate social questions which have no relation to employment, if a wartime agency of that kind could assert such extensive powers, what would happen if we should adopt the committee FEPC bill and give an agency authority over practically every industry in this country? The Baltimore incident created tensions and accounts for some of the fears regarding sweeping legislation of this type. It obscured some worthwhile things the agency accomplished in situations like the Sun Oil Co. plant in Houston and justifies some of the fears now expressed.

Mr. Speaker, we are therefore dealing with a very fundamental problem—a problem that touches dangerous situations. It deals too with one of the foundation principles of our society, which is that of a free industry. Whenever any law undertakes to say that an employer shall hire applicant A instead of applicant B and shall be fined or imprisoned for not following a Federal agency's decision as to which employees may be discharged, surely there are alerted dangers for us to consider. As reasonable men, as legislators with responsibilities to maintain a nonviolent community and a just order wherever Federal authority is projected, we are challenged to exhibit the finest intelligence and ingenuity that this House can summon.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Utah

Mr. GRANGER. I want to compliment the gentleman on the splendid statement he is making and on the effort I know he has made in trying to solve a difficult problem. I just suspect that if more of us were in the same frame of mind as the gentleman addressing the House at this time there would not be any difficulty in getting our views together on this problem that is facing the Congress. I do want to say to the gentleman that he has done an exceptionally fine job of research in trying to find the answer to a difficult question, and if it were myself sitting down with him I think we could satisfy ourselves on this question that is dividing the Congress, dividing the Democratic Party and dividing the people of our country.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to my friend from Utah. I resolved at the outset since it is an issue that touches the deep emotions of life I would undertake to avoid it in this case. I am not sure it is possible. I grew up among Negro people. I have respect and affection for my Negro constituents. I would regard myself as unfit to sit in this House if I were indifferent to the point of view of the 50,000 Negroes who live in my district. I am sorry, in this instance, that the Negro community is divided; that some have said I am doing the right thing for them, and others that I am not. Dr. J. M. Robinson, of Little Rock, a prominent Negro leader, writes me emphatically that I am right and that the Negroes of the South should endorse my position. On the other hand, others have said something else about it. What I have tried to do is to say with candor the things I do believe, though it conflicts with the point of view of many official Negro spokesmen. I have tried to say it with kindness, and yet with vigor, because this is no time for evasion, no matter how much regard we have for the sentiments of those with whom we differ.

I have taken heart, though, when I get messages such as this one. Here is a letter from Hon. Arthur W. Mitchell. Many of you served in the Congress with him. I have not gotten down to the substitute that I hope to offer for the Labor Committee bill, but Arthur W. Mitchell, one of the most distinguished Negroes in America writes me: "I have given your bill all of the time and study I could spare, and I am of the opinion that it is a workable bill and one that will help remedy the discriminatory practice in the labor field as it applies to minority groups." Then he says he would be glad to appear in support of it if a hearing is ever given. That is the word of a trusted Negro leader, a former Member of this House.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am aware of the sincere work that our colleague from Arkansas has given this subject for perhaps 25 or 30 years, practically all of his adult life, as he has said, and I want to compliment the gentleman. Certainly, if there were ever a time when we need more light on this subject that is before us, it is today and tomorrow. I humbly suggest that if we are to make constructive headway with this problem that will stand the test and remain with us, it will be somewhere in the field that our colleague from Arkansas now indicates.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas I am very grateful for that statement.

You see, there are three divisions of us. We fall into three groups. There are those that are so earnest about this thing that they want to do everything overnight, and they want to do it by Federal law, and they are unyielding. Now, there is another group that, in spite of their humanitarian impulses and their attitude of kindness toward the minority groups, do not want to do anything; they say there is nothing to do. Then right in the middle of these groups there is that third group, and I hope that is where my friend from Washington will find himself. There is that third group that holds that discrimination is an evil, it is a national problem; that the ideal of equal pay for equal performance should be pursued; that we should seek to grant to every man, whatever his race or religion an opportunity to earn a livelihood and to be paid in accordance with his contribution to society, that these are rights to be cherished. Since it is not always easy to maintain universally for reasons that sometimes bewilder us, it creates a problem that ought to have the notice of the Congress. I think then that we will find some common agreement in this middle area of a Federal declaration that the denial of equal opportunities or refusal to pay men in accordance with their productiveness should engage the thoughtful attention of the Government but not to clothe an agency with power to choose between applicants or employees or place fines or penalties upon any employer who does not follow their solution or recommendations. But, if we simply, as a matter of law, declare that the policy of the Federal Government is to seek equality and to give to some agency a mandate to enlarge upon opportunities for all people, and use conciliation to end discrimination, then I think we will be making headway; we will be taking forward steps. That is as far as I am willing to go.

I want to get down before I close to the real issue in this case, because I have not yet stated it. The question is, Shall we have a bill that contains on the part of a Federal agency the power to fine an employer or to imprison him for not following their orders? Is that what the Congress proposes to do? The committee bill gives such power. That is the issue, because the committee bill does have such enforcement powers. That is the reason I am raising my voice today against such an extreme measure.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman admits there is a problem with which Congress must deal. The gentleman, of course, is now recommending what is commonly known as a process of gradualism with respect to this problem.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I hope the gentleman will not attribute that to me. The word "gradualism" has been tossed around so much that I would prefer that the gentleman use another word, if he does not mind.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In my opinion, that is the only way I can adequately describe the gentleman's position. Of course, I may be in error. What I should like to point out to the gentleman is that there has been no civil-rights legislation since 1875.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. And have we not done pretty well?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No; we have not.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Does not the gentleman think that the American

Negro is the best-off minority in all the world, the best paid, and the freest?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will answer the gentleman. The gentleman has now just given us a marvelous picture of Jim Crow and segregation. I think the best answer to that question is the answer the Negro himself gives you. He refuses to live any longer under Jim Crow and segregation. He resents being treated as different from anybody else. So the gentleman may travel all over the world and try to make comparisons, and one may disagree as to comparisons, but that is not the point at all. The point is that we here in America have to face this problem. We have refused to face it since 1875.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Not in my country have we refused to face it. We have worked pretty hard at it down in Arkansas. If I know the South, we have been working hard at it, and that is where 70 percent of the American Negroes live. I agree, of course, that we should have as our standard—not the other countrys' but the American ideal—an ideal still to be pursued for both races.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If you have worked so hard at it, you have certainly cemented more than ever before your system of segregation and Jim Crow.

That you cannot challenge. You know it is true. As a matter of fact the gentleman's whole speech is based upon the perpetuation of that system.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I disagree with my friend from New York. I think the gentleman will look in vain for words of mine to sustain that statement.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I think the gentleman is eminently fair. I think he is doing a scholarly job here this afternoon and I, for one, appreciate the spirit in which he is conducting this discussion, although I disagree with him. The gentleman's position is, and I think if the gentleman reads back through his speech he will find it so, he has stated here that the system of segregation is one that exists, has existed, and must stand, and that we cannot change it. That is the gentleman's fundamental basis, is that not true?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I have said that changes to be made anywhere that there are harsh and cruel aspects of it must be made by the municipality or by the legislature and not by the Congress, and if you have in mind the abolishment of Jim Crow, frankly tell us so. I do not think you have said that yet.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I definitely have. Oh, yes; definitely I am opposed to Jim Crow in any form or any aspect of it. I have made no bones of my position on this thing.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Let me ask the gentleman, if he does not mind, and I will yield to him to answer: Is your support of the committee bill due to your enthusiasm—let me put it another way—are you supporting the committee FEPC bill because you believe it will do away with segregation?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I say it will be a tremendous step toward abolishing discrimination in employment.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. If I may interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am going to answer the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I hope he will, because you brought in segregation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. If it is segregation you are trying to attack, that is, the problem of segregation instead of the problem of unfair employment, let us be honest about it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. You cannot separate one from the other. They are integrated because once you establish the proposition that a person cannot be deprived of employment because of the color of his skin, then of course you begin to break down even social segregation. Are you in favor of breaking down social segregation? I ask the gentleman—he has asked me so many questions, I ask him that question: Is he in favor of breaking it down, either by municipal legislation or Federal legislation in any manner, shape, or form?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. My answers will be provided in the choice of policies I make and my action as a citizen in the State and in the locality and not in the Congress.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not think the gentleman is being as frank as he started out to be at the beginning of his speech.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think I have said a good deal about the aspects of segregation that are not consonant with our professions of equality. I have only tried to define the forum in which grievances are to be expressed and adjustments sought. If the gentleman thinks it is the Congress of the United States that must determine whether a bus traveling from the east side of Atlanta to the west side of Atlanta shall have a nonsegregation policy, then, of course, it is quite all right for him to entertain that view, but I do not want him to have that in mind and vote with that in mind in voting ostensibly to provide fair employment in the city of Atlanta.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have answered the gentleman, I think, when I stated that once you have prohibited discrimination in employment you are beginning to attack one phase of segregation. But coming back to the gentleman's position, because the gentleman has taken the floor to state his position, and I would like to have it clearly defined, the gentleman seems to find objection to this type of legislation because he says it is not within the province of the Federal Government but within the province of the local authorities. Is that the gentleman's position?

Then, may I ask him this question: Is that the gentleman's only objection to wiping out segregation? Let us assume the gentleman had the power within the local framework of Government to wipe it out, would he do so?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is raising moot questions here which have no relation to the problem.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No, I am not. I am referring to this specific problem.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas Then the gentleman will begin to ask me about the dog-license ordinance in the city of Little Rock, and I am not going to discuss that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Of course not.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I simply want to make one statement that I think has some bearing on questions which the gentleman from New York has been raising. In my own district there is one of the greatest Negro medical colleges in the world, Meharry College. I checked the enrollment yesterday. There are more Negroes from the State of New York enrolled in Meharry Medical College in my district than are enrolled in the city of New York in all of the seven medical schools where there is no segregation whatsoever. Why is that true? Because they cannot compete on a competitive basis for admission to those schools in New York. They are away down the list. The come down to Meharry Medical College and become good doctors. I think that has some bearing because it deals with a noncompulsory type of segregation. If the gentleman will check the record, he will find there are more Negro students from the State of New York enrolled in the medical college in my district than are enrolled in the entire city of New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield briefly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am not at all trying to defend New York. As far as New York is concerned, there is more hypocrisy on this question than there is in many other places. We are hypocritical about the problem. We preach a sermon but we practice otherwise. That is, the ruling groups. The ruling economic and social groups of the city of New York have taken the attitude and position that you gentlemen of the South take toward the Negro people. As far as colleges are concerned, there is so much discrimination in those colleges that you can cut the atmosphere of discrimination with a knife. Of course, the Negroes are not excluded from New York colleges because they cannot compete. They are excluded because of the color of their skin, right in the city of New York. I am ashamed to make that confession for my State, but it is true.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. There is not a great deal of time remaining.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. I am sure we all appreciate the splendid statement being made by the gentleman from Arkansas. Several of us have from time to time during the past several weeks, advised and worked with the gentleman from Arkansas in the hope that we could evolve a sane and sound approach to this serious subject.

In asking the gentleman to yield I wanted to make this observation.

Within recent days I have heard words of criticism on rulings made by our distinguished Speaker, as we have approached the subject of the legislation which is expected to reach the floor of the House on tomorrow. I cannot but feel that the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body will support our Speaker in the rulings he has and shall make. The Speaker has been eminently fair in all of his rulings and has thus maintained the dignity and prestige of this House.

On tomorrow, if FEPC is taken up, there will be serious questions, and every parliamentary maneuver possible made to advance or slow up the progress of this legislation. I rise just to voice the hope that I am sure is in the mind of every Member of this distinguished body, that the rulings of the Chair will receive the respect and admiration of every Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this, too, before I take my seat, that I commend the views expressed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]. In my own State of North Carolina we are paying to our colored teachers the same salaries, based upon their certificates, as we pay to the white teachers. Our distinguished governor has named a Negro to the State Board of Education.

If it be true that the proponents are doing so with the thought of casting reflections on the South they are making a serious mistake. We do not claim to have a perfect economy but our progress does not have the best national press. Somewhere between the Hollywood version of plantation life and the Broadway conception of Tobacco Road lies the real South of today. We read in Life magazine within recent days that the greatest transformation since the opening of the West is taking place in the South today. Surely we can take advice, but the proponents of this legislation will discover that the South is far ahead of many sections of this Nation in its program to assist the Negro.

I wish again, Mr. Speaker, to commend the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas for the fair and impartial way in which he is presenting this subject.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish before the gentleman sits down he would tell us clearly what the Federal Government would do in the event of a violation of what the national policy might be. Are there to be penalties? And also, specifically, would he tell us what the State and municipal governments ought to do with this problem? I have listened with much interest to his discussion and have learned something, but I would like to have the gentleman deal with this phase, the enforcement phase of the proposed legislation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. With the permission of the House I shall insert in the RECORD an analysis of the bill which I offered for the consideration of the committee. My bill will be offered as a substitute. I will also offer for publication in the RECORD a bill introduced some time ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], which differs in some respects from my proposed nonpenalty bill. Neither the bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania nor my bill include enforcement powers. That states the issue. Under the committee bill, I am satisfied that a jail sentence or heavy fine could be imposed for violation of a cease-and-desist order issued by the FEPC.

With all our good will, with all of our sensibilities against wrong and discrimination, this Congress is surely not going to confer that kind of power. But let me repeat that is the issue; there will be no other issue where the House considers the FEPC. Sincere reasons will be advanced by some for not accepting the plan which I have proposed; in other words, some who have consistently opposed what they call bureaucracy would say, "Why create another agency?"

They ask, Why make this gesture? I would respect that point of view, though I differ with it. I think the opportunity to do something that indicates our sympathies with those who have reason to feel that equal opportunities have not always been afforded, I think that our sympathies should lead us to go this far, that much I propose that we do.

Before I analyze these two bills, the one offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, H. R. 6841, and my own, H. R. 6668 and make a comparison between them and the committee bill, let me say that I consider the committee bill an amazing thing. In an effort to bolster its constitutionality its drafters state that it is to promote the observance of rights and freedoms undertaken by the United States under the United Nations Charter and to further national policy with respect to the universal declaration of human rights proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Is not that a commentary upon the legislative processes? Here we are in a free country under a sovereign government undertaking to justify a questionable statute by saying that because we have agreed with certain other nations many of whom have not come anywhere close to the high standards we have erected in jurisprudence because we have agreed with them about certain rights, we, the Congress of the United States, must adopt a questionable act. It comes under the provision of the Constitution to the effect that the law of the land is the law of treaties that we have entered into; so, because this treaty was made confirming what we have always believed, we will pursue this course, although of questionable constitutionality. That is not my idea of good craftsmanship.

An analysis of the committee bill (H. R. 4453), which I will insert, was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service. But Mr. Freeman Sharp, who prepared it, advises me that the committee made these interesting additions: It will be unlawful, if this bill is adopted, to discriminate against anyone, not only for reasons of race, creed, or color, but ancestry, which means now that a Hatfield would have to employ a McCoy, and a McCoy could not discharge a Hatfield. That is the bill.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN. It has been said over and over again that most of the agitation for this is below Fourteenth Street in New York where they have FEPC. I find that true in my district. Could the gentleman tell us where we can get authentic information about how the colored people of the South feel about this compulsory legislation? Is there anything published or any committees formed that would give us a true picture of their own attitude in the South as distinguished from Fourteenth Street?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman has asked me a very difficult question because if I am going to be true to my standard of honesty I am going to have to tell him that except for a few thoughtful people like former Congressman Mitchell who now lives in Virginia and Dr. Robinson, the Negro physician of my city whom I mentioned and others, I have not found a great deal of support among the colored people of the South for my point of view. I say that not to indicate that they repudiate my approach, but simply in an effort to speak with complete candor to say that the thinking of most Negroes who have had occasion to weigh it, is congealed. And I suppose that observation applies to some extent to all of us.

They are told that FEPC is in their interest. So they are for it A great many of them have been told that by a Negro press, which is not uniformly serving their interests from my point of view and which because of a rather violent attitude, sometimes a prejudiced attitude, fails to lay the full facts before them. This does not apply to all Negro newspapers by any means. A great many Negroes so advised feel that the issue is much simpler than it really is and that to deny them FEPC is to deny equality. The gentleman knows that is not the case.

Mr. GWINN. I had reference particularly to the compulsory feature. Do they know this means jail, fine, and all that?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I doubt that they do. I doubt that they have been fully advised. What I am trying to say is I have not been able to find, among Negroes except in the isolated instances to which I referred, a great deal of support for my middle-of-the-road position. I am sure they have been very charitable to me. I have spoken of the problem in Negro churches. I have received some support where I have been able to reach them. The warnings I have issued on that point, of course, are valid and they should interest the Negro because he would be the victim.

This bill is not in his interest. The force bills following the Civil War were

not in his interest. They retarded the progress of the Negro and caused a lot of bitterness and hardship. It was not a southern Democrat who said that there was more bitterness caused following the Civil War by utterances in the Halls of Congress than by incidents on the battlefields of the South.

But Thaddeus Stevens' point of view was repudiated by sound-thinking people who observed the injustices growing out of the use of force. I appreciate the efforts made by many outside the South to understand our history and our current problems.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to my colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to also, Mr. Speaker, compliment my colleague for the very fine spirit in which he has approached this problem and the very scholarly way in which he has discussed it to the House today. On the point that was just asked by the distinguished gentleman from New York, so far as our people down in our State are concerned, is it not true that they have been wholly misinformed as to what actually is proposed in the legislation her reported by the committee?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think so, at least in many instances.

Mr. HARRIS. And is it not also a fact that when you have an opportunity to discuss it with those sounder thinking people there they do understand, and then they immediately and automatically reflect the impression that they are not in favor of such a proposal, but to those who are following the leadership and the conjectures of the organizations who get this propaganda sent down to them, it reflects the thinking that was expressed by the gentleman propounding the question a moment ago?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman has made historical reference to Thaddeus Stevens and his position. His position, if adopted, would have solved this problem many years ago. Forty acres and a mule would have given economic implementation to the Emancipation Proclamation, and that is what we are still fighting out now.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Of course, the gentleman knows that he will not find much support for that point of view.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an analysis prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the committee bill, H. R. 4453, and an analysis prepared by the same office of the McConnell bill, H. R. 6841, and the bill that I introduced, H. R. 6668, and other extraneous matter, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I wonder if he would include a list of the States which have enacted FEPC or civil rights legislation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I will include that, Mr. Speaker, and will indicate on that list those who have included enforcement power.

I said at the outset that this is a thing that I hope will linger in the minds of every person in this Chamber tomorrow. The real issue is whether or not you are going to enforce an agency's findings with reference to employment, whether or not you are going to impose fines and jail sentences upon employers who have their own employment policies to work out.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I just wanted to ask the gentleman to yield to say that I want to congratulate him on the fairness and the impartiality with which he has advocated his position Whatever Members of the House may disagree as to the solution of this problem, I am sure that none of the Members of the House will disagree with the fact that the gentleman approaches all of these questions sincerely and honestly, and we all respect him very highly for his opinion on this matter as well as other legislation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It is very kind of the gentleman to say it and I propose now to conclude in just a moment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I have been pleased to remain here during the period of this special order because I know of no other man in this House for whom I have a more profound respect than I have for the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas. He is a Christian gentleman, and everyone in this House understands that.

In this week dedicated to tolerance and brotherhood, with commentators and writers all over the country calling attention to the necessity for tolerance in our attitudes and in our thinking and in our speaking, it is refreshing indeed to find in the discussion of this very difficult problem the magnificent manner of approach that has been adopted by our distinguished friend from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. KEEFE. May I add just this to my friend. May I say that in the discussion which is to come about tomorrow I hope the high level of intelligent approach and the approach of tolerance that has been manifested by my friend from Arkansas will be maintained during that debate.

I have just one little inkling in the interrogation by the gentleman from New York of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas that leads and points the way to the thinking of some of those who for years have been most militant in the advocacy of those problems that hew close to the Communist Party line, when he raised the question as to whether or not the gentleman from Arkansas is a believer in the gradualist policy of solution of this problem.

I can say that when I was privileged to serve on a committee of this House that brought before it men who were known to be of the Communist philosophy and associating with Communists, they invariably denounced what was known as the gradualist policy of solution of these problems and advocated the sharp break of revolution as the solution.

That came up here inferentially today in the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York. It should be pin pointed, and we should put our fingers upon it for what it is here today.

I hope the Members of the House will listen attentively tomorrow to gentlemen of the character of the gentleman from Arkansas in the consideration of this very important and vital question.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to add to what has been said truly with regard to the Christian spirit of tolerance and brotherhood demonstrated by our friend and colleague from Arkansas that perhaps even more impressive, if possible, is his courage, his political courage. In trying to find a middle road of progress which will lead toward a solution of this exceedingly difficult problem and will not create in some areas the exact opposite of what is desired, he inevitably alienates some of his friends and supporters in his own State, who may call him a traitor to the South, and at the same time alienates some of his liberal brethren, who may decide he is just a southern reactionary because he does not believe brotherhood can be achieved by compulsion. Such a stand takes political courage. He doubtless will get little credit and plenty of criticism from both sides because he is trying to find a just and workable solution to a problem for which there is no quick, easy, and ready solution. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is very kind. Whatever my feelings of loneliness when I find myself between two extremes, I have felt in very good company today, among warm-hearted friends, whether they agree with me or not.

I want to say to all in closing that it does move me deeply to have these things said. It does not matter that they are exaggerated and uncalled for

For example, my friend the gentleman from Minnesota, WALTER JUDD, speaks of courage. I would not regard it at all as courage. What I have tried to do at home is to say, "Now, here is the sensible thing, as I see it." I have taken the people of my district into my confidence, and I have talked this over with them in that spirit. But I am grateful for what you have said.

Let me bring this to a conclusion quickly. I would join with what has

been said here so eloquently by our beloved Speaker when he speaks of this as the highest honor that can come to men, to serve in this House. This idea of representative government is ours to cherish. I have justified my reference to my Negro constituents on that basis. I must not forget their interests. At the same time I have spoken with vigor on the question of force and with complete compatibility, I think, with this other sentiment because we will work against the Negro's interest if we adopt these measures of compulsion. The fact is that the interests of the races are bound together. No social practices can untie them. I have stood at the graveside of too many loved ones of my father's family, the victims of tuberculosis, for example, not to realize that if we conquer disease that has caused such suffering, we must conquer it by fighting it wherever it appears among the Negro race or among the white race. I know that if we advance as a people we must advance educationally by providing opportunities to both races.

It is a wise saying that the white man cannot hold the Negro in a ditch without staying there with him What I have said of our beloved Southland is, I trust, not from the sectional point of view. We have demonstrated our ability pretty well, I think, to forget the past. We have acknowledged the error of clinging to old traditions which have been outmoded. There is a new South and that South marches on. The South recognizes itself as part of a great Nation So, while now and then we make mistakes, we may band together at times to protect an idea which might well be discarded, but nevertheless, we are conscious of our responsibilities as citizens of the Nation.

The key to it all is justice. If there has been an element of suffering growing out of our poverty, something we do not speak of often and yet the complete picture requires it, the picture of eroded hills and limited markets, if we speak of suffering, it is because an element of suffering affects us all and draws us together. Emil Brunner put it like this, "All suffering is bitter. Suffering that is unjust is doubly bitter. Suffering that is of destiny unites. Suffering that is unjust divides."

We must heed the cry of suffering wherever it is said that it is the result of a faulty Federal policy. I want to meet that challenge, in order that there may be no suffering among any minority group, whether it is racial or religious, and in order that there should be no feeling that they are not wanted. Our Negro people, and every group, whatever their faith are wanted in this great land.

It is up to us to work toward a policy of perfect justice for all men. And when our labors are done I will be content if we apply that simple standard of justice for both worker and employer and find a greater unity in the happiness of people who resolve their conflicts on such a basis. It will fortify equal justice in the courts in the provision for equal facilities to all people in all public services and in equal opportunities for men of every race.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following:

Ten States have adopted Fair Employment Practices Acts, as follows:

	Enforcement powers
Connecticut	Yes.
Indiana	No.
Massachusetts	Yes.
New Jersey	Yes.
New Mexico	----
New York	Yes.
Oregon	----
Rhode Island	----
Washington	----
Wisconsin	No.

ANALYSIS OF H R 4453 (BY MR POWELL)

A. Name of act (sec 1): 1. Federal Fair Employment Practices Act.

B. Findings and declaration of policy (sec. 2): That persons are being denied employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; that it is essential to the general welfare that these rights be protected; and that this act is necessary (1) to remove obstructions to commerce; (2) to insure complete enjoyment of constitutional rights; and (3) to promote observance of rights and freedoms undertaken by the United States under the United Nations Charter and to further national policy with respect to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations

C Definitions (sec 3): Definitions include

"Employer"—a person engaged in commerce employing 50 or more, except States and political subdivisions or nonprofit organizations which are of a religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian character.

Exempts employers of aliens working outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions (sec. 4).

D Unlawful employment practices (sec. 5): It shall be an unlawful practice—

(a) For an employer

(1) To refuse to hire, to discharge, or discriminate against a person with respect to terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

(2) To utilize in hiring any employment agency, placement service, or other source which discriminates.

(b) For a labor organization:

(1) To discriminate against any persons.

(2) To limit, segregate or classify its membership because of race, color, etc.

(c) For either an employer or a labor organization. (1) To discharge, expel, or discriminate against a person because he has opposed such unlawful employment practice or participated in any proceeding under this act.

E Fair Employment Practice Commission (sec. 6): Creates a Fair Employment Practice Commission in the executive branch composed of five members appointed by the President with advice of the Senate for 5-year terms

The Commission shall have—

(a) Powers:

(1) To appoint officers and employees under civil service rules.

(2) To cooperate with regional, State, local and other agencies.

(3) To pay witnesses the same fees as in United States courts.

(4) To furnish technical assistance to further compliance with the act.

(5) To assist an employer whose employees refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effecting the provisions of the act.

(6) To make technical studies to effectuate the act.

(7) To appoint local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils to aid in effectuating the act and to make studies and recommendations for that purpose.

(b) Investigatory power (sec. 9):

(1) To issue subpenas

(2) To administer oaths, examine witnesses and receive evidence.

(3) To apply to United States district courts to enforce subpenas, etc., against contumacious persons.

F. Self-incrimination (sec. 9 (e)): No person shall be excused from testifying or producing evidence in obedience to a subpena on the ground that the testimony or evidence may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture but no such person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture on account of such testimony or evidence except perjury in so testifying.

G Prevention of unlawful employment practices (sec. 7):

The Commission shall have exclusive powers to prevent unlawful employment practices under the act but may cede jurisdiction to State and local agencies where State and local acts are comparable to this act The Commission on a written sworn charge shall investigate and endeavor to eliminate the unlawful practices through informal conference, conciliation, and persuasion

On failure to obtain voluntary compliance by informal methods, a formal hearing may be held before a member of the Commission or designated agent with the right to counsel and to cross-examine witnesses, etc At conclusion of the formal hearing the record thereof shall be transferred to the Commission (or three designated members) for decision. The Commission shall then issue a cease-and-desist order or an order of dismissal. The whole proceedings hereunder shall conform to the Administrative Procedure Act.

H Judicial review (sec. 8): Provides for a petition, by either the Commission or a party aggrieved by a final order of the Commission, to the United States Court of Appeals under the procedures established by the Administrative Procedure Act. Decision of the Court of Appeals is subject to a review by the United States Supreme Court.

I Enforcement of orders directed to Government agencies and contractors (sec 10):

Authorizes the President to make Federal practice conform to the policies of the act and to prescribe administrative remedies by Executive order with no judicial review. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with the Commission's orders

Authorizes the President to make regulations to prevent Government contractors (contracts exceeding $10,000) from continuing unfair-employment practices. The Commission shall enforce such regulations.

J Notices to be posted (sec. 11): Requires employers and labor organizations to keep a notice prepared by the Commission, with excerpts from the act, posted in conspicuous places on their premises under penalty of a $500 fine.

K. Forcibly resisting the Commission or its representatives (sec. 14): To forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a member, agent, or employees of the Commission in the performance of duties under the act or because of the same is punishable by a $500 fine and/or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.

L. Veterans' preference (sec 12): This act shall not modify Federal, State, Territorial, or local veterans' preference.

M Rules and regulations (sec 13): The Commission shall make, modify, and rescind rules and regulations to carry out the act. The regulations must conform to the Administrative Procedure Act.

N Separability clause (sec. 15): The usual provision.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION—AN ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON OF H. R. 6668 AND H. R 6841, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

H. R. 6668 (HAYS)

A Name of act (sec. 1): Minorities Employment Act

B Declaration of policy (sec. 2): Declares it to be the policy of the United States:

1 To eliminate discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry in regard to: (a) opportunity for employment, (b) tenure, terms or conditions of employment; (c) membership in labor organizations; and

2. To encourage to the fullest possible extent a policy of nondiscrimination throughout industry.

C Administering agency (sec 3): The Secretary of Labor (creates a Minorities Employment Bureau to perform functions delegated to it by the Secretary; see F, below).

D. Functions of the Secretary (sec 3): The Secretary shall—

(1) Receive and investigate complaints charging discrimination because of race, religion, color, etc., in regard to employment opportunities, tenure, terms, or conditions of employment; or membership in a labor organization.

(2) Endeavor by mediation and conciliation to eliminate any discrimination;

(3) Investigate and study the character, causes, and extent of discrimination in general,

(4) Study the best methods to eliminate discrimination and formulate plans to that end;

(5) Publish and disseminate the results of such studies and investigations (exempted from sec 306, Penalty Mail Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1049) which prohibits distribution of Government documents without a prior request therefor); and

(6) Cooperate with employees, labor organizations, and private and public agencies to formulate programs, educational and otherwise, to eliminate discrimination.

E. None.

F. Minorities Employment Bureau (sec. 4): Creates a Minorities Employment Bureau within the Department of Labor headed by a Director appointed by the President with the advice of the Senate to perform delegated duties under the supervision of the Secretary of Labor.

G. Local advisory councils (sec. 5): The Secretary of Labor may create local, regional or State advisory councils to—

(1) Study the general problem of discrimination and investigate specific instances in their respective areas;

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION—AN ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON OF H. R. 6668 AND H. R. 6841, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

H. R. 6841 (M'CONNELL)

A. Name of act (sec. 1): Fair Employment Practices Act.

B. Findings and declaration of policy (sec. 2): Declares that the denying of employment opportunities and discrimination against properly qualified persons by reason of race, creed, or color deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, and defense, and burdens, hinders and obstructs commerce. Declares it to be the policy of the United States to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, or color in employment relations.

C Administering agency (sec. 3): Creates a Fair Employment Practices Commission composed of five members appointed by the President with advice of the Senate for 5-year terms.

D. Powers and duties of the Commission (sec. 3): The powers of the Commission shall be to—

(1) Appoint officers and employees,

(2) Cooperate with and utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies and to use volunteer and uncompensated services;

(3) Pay witnesses the same fees as in United States courts,

(4) Make, amend, and rescind in such manner as prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, rules and regulations to carry out the act;

(5) Serve processes and other papers, etc.; and

(6) Make technical studies to effectuate the purposes of the act.

The duties of the Commission shall be to (sec 4)—

(1) Make comprehensive studies of discrimination in various sections of the country and of the best methods of eliminating it;

(2) Formulate plans in cooperation with interested public and private agencies for its elimination;

(3) Publish reports relating to elimination of discrimination;

(4) Cooperate with and furnish technical assistance to employers, labor unions, and other public and private agencies;

(5) Receive and investigate complaints; and

(6) Make specific and detailed recommendations to interested parties for the elimination of discrimination.

The investigatory powers of the Commission shall be to (sec. 5)—

(1) Examine and copy evidence;

(2) Issue subpenas;

(3) Administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence, and conduct investigations; and

(4) Apply to United States district courts to enforce subpenas, etc., against contumacious persons.

E. Self-incrimination (sec. 5 (f)): No person shall be excused from testifying or producing evidence in obedience to a subpena on the ground that the testimony or evidence may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture but no such person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture on account of such testimony or evidence except perjury in so testifying.

F. None.

G. None.

H. R. 6668 (HAYS)

(2) Foster good will, cooperation and conciliation in their areas through community effort or otherwise; and

(3) Make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to his functions under the act.

Council members are to be citizens of the area, serve without pay and be assisted by technical and clerical employees appointed by the Secretary without regard to civil-service laws

H. National Advisory Council (sec. 6): The Secretary may create a National Advisory Council on Minority Problems composed of 7 members representing employees, employers and the public with equal representation as between employees and employers.

The National Advisory Council shall—

(1) Consult with the Secretary; and

(2) make recommendations to the Secretary in regard to his functions under the act.

I. None.

J. None.

K. Annual report (sec. 7): The Secretary shall submit to Congress and the President an annual report covering his activities under the act together with such further information and recommendations for further legislation as he deems advisable.

BASING-POINT SYSTEM—MARYLAND THE GAINER BY ENDING THE SYSTEM—SUPREME COURT DECISION AN ECONOMIC BLESSING, INSTEAD OF A CALAMITY, AS ALLEGED—MARYLAND'S EXPERIENCE TYPICAL—REGIONAL EXPANSION RESULTS FROM ENDING THE BASING-POINT SYSTEM—IMPARTIAL SURVEY AND REPORT MADE BY MARYLAND STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes, revise and extend my remarks, and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Maryland State Planning Commission has issued a report which is of great significance in the basing-point controversy. The report is entitled "Survey of the Impact of f. o. b. Mill Pricing on Maryland Manufacturers." I have asked for an analysis and summary of this report, which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD, with the permission of the House, as part of my extended remarks.

MARYLAND BENEFITS FROM ELIMINATION OF BASING-POINT SYSTEM

In November 1949 the Maryland State Planning Commission issued a report titled "Survey of the Impact of f. o. b. Mill Pricing on Maryland Manufactur-

H. R. 6841 (M'CONNELL)

H. None.

I. Discrimination in employment by the Federal Government (sec. 6): The Commission shall make a study of discrimination in the Federal Government and recommend to Congress a specific plan for its elimination together with the necessary legislation.

J Willful interference with Commission agents (sec. 7): To forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate or interfere with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission in the performance of duties under the act or because of the same is punishable by a $5,000 fine and/or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.

K. Annual report (sec 4 (b)): The Commission shall submit to Congress and the President an annual report describing in detail the investigations, proceedings, and hearings it has conducted and their outcome, the decisions it has rendered and the other work performed by it and may make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable. The Commission may make such other recommendations to the President or any Federal agency as deemed necessary to effectuate the purposes of the act.

---

ers" This is a factual report prepared by the staff of the Maryland State Planning Commission. It is based in part upon replies to some 1,000 questionnaires sent out in July 1949 to manufacturers accounting for 67 percent of the total industrial employees in Maryland. It is also based upon actual market data for several industries; that is, the known quantities of certain products produced in the State and the known quantities of these products purchased or consumed within the State and within adjoining market areas.

This report should be of interest not merely to Members of Congress from the State of Maryland; it should be of interest to all Members of Congress in their deliberations upon the pending legislation to legalize the basing-point system of pricing, Senate bill 1008. While the factual data presented are applicable only to Maryland, and to some extent to other eastern seaboard and New England States, these data will serve in an illustrative way to clear up many of the general misapprehensions concerning the effects of the Cement and Rigid Steel Conduit decisions upon other areas of the country. One of the quite pointed lessons demonstrated by these data is the general industrial expansion and the increased volume of industrial investment which will be possible throughout the country, provided industry can be ridded of the restrictive effects of the basing-point system.

One feature which greatly enhances the usefulness of the Maryland study is the simplicity with which it handles the legal issues involved in the present basing-point controversy. It avoids the uncertainties which might arise from varying understandings as to what forms of freight absorption and phantom freight are legal and under what circumstances. In short, it avoids the questions of which, if any, Maryland manufacturers might be participating in an illegal pricing scheme. The investigators simply asked themselves, and asked the Maryland manufacturers, what the effect would be if all industry sold f. o. b. mill. As it turns out, a majority of the industries of the State would not be affected at all by such pricing. Products of these industries are now marketed in the same way agricultural commodities are sold; that is, the producer does not absorb freight and, conversely, does not charge phantom freight. A producer's net price, exclusive of freight, is the same at any particular time for all buyers Similarly, these industries do not depend upon supplies or materials which are sold on a basing-point system or zone-price basis, or the materials which they do buy on such a basis are so unimportant that a shift to f. o. b. pricing would not affect their production costs. These industries are as follows: Food and kindred products; tobacco; textile mill products; apparel and other finished products; furniture and fixtures; printing, publishing, and allied industries; leather and leather products; machinery and transportation equipment; professional, scientific, and controlling instruments; miscellaneous industries.

On the other hand, several Maryland industries would be, or have been, affected by a shift to f. o. b. mill pricing—either because of their own selling methods, or because of the selling methods of the industries from which they obtain supplies. Some of these would be affected in very slight degree, some in more important degrees. In some instances, the effects would be disadvantageous to Maryland manufacturers; in other instances they would be advantageous to Maryland manufacturers. Those industries which would be affected in any degree are as follows: Iron and steel; lumber and wood products; fabricated metal products; paper and allied products; chemicals and allied products; rubber and allied products; stone, clay, and glass products.

On the whole, manufacturers, employees, and consumers would benefit from the elimination of unnecessary transportation costs, and from a general industrial expansion. But on this point the report speaks for itself. The summary of the findings appearing on pages 81 and 82 is as follows:

The study of the effect on the Maryland manufacturers of a compulsory shift to f. o. b. mill pricing has indicated that a major portion of the manufacturing industries of the State will be affected very slightly.

Some sections of the chemical and fabricated-metals industry could very well be adversely affected if an f. o. b. mill-pricing system were made compulsory, but the adverse effects should not be large. On the other hand, one might expect a slight expansion in the paper, cement, and lime industries, which might more than overbalance any loss in chemicals or metal fabricating.

The one industry that would be very noticeably affected by a shift to compulsory f. o. b. mill pricing is the iron and steel industry. Maryland steel manufacturers could greatly benefit by f. o. b. mill pricing. An expansion of over 50 percent in Maryland's steel capacity is a reasonable guess if the basing-point system is abolished in favor of f. o b mill pricing.

Of course, while over-all sales or employment in an industry may not be seriously affected, a large reshuffling or swapping of customers may well occur under f. o. b. mill pricing The local mill will tend to sell products in or near Maryland and, where possible, to buy supplies from local producers.

This "drawing in" of sales by local producers will tend to minimize transportation costs, and, consequently, many local firms will either realize a larger average mill-net price or will lower their f. o b. mill prices so that customers will be able to purchase more cheaply, or a combination of both will occur. This minimization of transportation cost might conceivably result in lower prices to the final consumer or a larger take-home pay for the Maryland industrial worker, or both.

A point-by-point summary of the effect on Maryland follows:

1. A major portion of Maryland manufacturers will not experience any effect because: (a) They do not sell on any identical delivered-price system; and (b) they purchase little or no supplies from firms selling on a basing-point or zone system.

2 Other manufacturers who sell on a basing-point or zone system will experience only a slight loss or gain in sales because the result of swapping customers with competitors will tend to balance. That is, the loss of distant customers will be balanced by the gain in local purchasers.

3. Manufacturers who purchase a major portion of their supplies from firms selling on a zone or basing-point system will shift their sources of supply to the nearest producer wherever possible. If the nearest supplier is not in a position to fill orders placed by a manufacturer, or will not supply him for any other reason, the manufacturer may experience an increase in the cost of supplies.

4 The steel industry may expand as much as 50 percent in the next 10 years, because of the apparent deficit production on the east coast.

5 Transportation costs will tend to be minimized, thereby causing larger mill-net receipts, or lower prices to consumers, or both.

6. Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and Anne Arundel County may experience an increase in employment as a result of expansion in the steel industry. The total increase in employment as a result of expansion in the steel industry could be over 10,000 directly, and many more indirectly.

7. The other sections of Maryland should not be noticeably affected, favorably or adversely.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may address the House for 40 minutes, and that he may revise and extend his remarks on that occasion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 8 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative business of the day, and any other special orders heretofore entered.

FEPC

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr Speaker, I would not have taken the floor except for the insistence of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that my remarks, injected into the speech delivered by the very able gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], be pin pointed. What is it exactly that he wants to have pin pointed?

First, that I criticized the gentleman's position as one of gradualism. I do not know if the gentleman from Wisconsin heard my remarks fully. I make no apology for them. I reassert them now in the hope that he will understand them.

I pointed out that the policy of gradualism has brought us nowhere in this problem, and that not a single piece of civil rights legislation has come out of this Congress since 1875; that the objectives of the men who fought for freedom in the Civil War have been completely negated since 1875; that one of the greatest travesties of the history of this country is the calumny that has been heaped on the men who fought to carry out and fulfill the objectives for which many men died in the Civil War. The gentleman infers that it is communism to insist, as I have been insisting, that there must be an end to Jim Crow; that you can never solve this problem by degrees, by gradualism. The Negro people have waited too long and have suffered too much under Jim Crow to wait for the success of gradualistic solutions. He implies that I am intolerant. I am intolerant. I am intolerant of any one who would tolerate conditions of segregation and Jim Crow. I am intolerant of inequality. I am intolerant of those Jim Crow conditions, and I shall continue to do all that I can in my limited capacity to destroy them. So, if that is intolerance, if it is communistic, as the gentleman from Wisconsin would call it, then all I can say about it is that I accept that charge. I do it with pride. There is a fundamental difference of opinion between us. I simply say that I prefer to stand by my position and I apply that position to FEPC. I say that it is gradualism to come here, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] does, and advocate merely a statement of policy. You cannot have any guaranty against discrimination in employment unless you do give the Fair Employment Practice Commission the power to apply for and obtain cease and desist orders. That is the committee bill. The gentleman's substitute, as well as the substitute of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], do not provide for enforcement and are therefore gradualism. I am opposed to that because I oppose inequality. I am not for 50 percent equality. I am not for 90 percent equality, because anything less than 100 percent equality is not equality. There is only one kind of equality, I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, and that is 100 percent full equality. Call it communism, call it what you please, but that is the only solution to this problem.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin

Mr KEEFE. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the speech which the gentleman from Arkansas made was dedicated to the proposition that involves fair employment practices legislation to come before this House tomorrow. The gentleman from New York, as he always does, attempted to pervert the purposes of that argument so as to include an extraneous argument relating to segregation and Jim Crowism.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have heard the gentleman; I will answer him.

Mr. KEEFE. I just want to answer the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I wish to continue my answer.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to yield, he used my name.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Very well; I will yield to the gentleman, although I do not have to. This is my time and I do not have to yield to him, but I will.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like the gentleman to understand, and the record is clear, that the point at issue is not Jim Crowism or segregation. When he states that, he is stating something which the record will not sustain and which my record in this Congress will not sustain, as the gentleman well knows. The gentleman has admitted that this gradualist policy which he objects to faces the very objection that the Communists of this country have urged time and time again, which they have urged in their writings and in their speeches. They are opposed to the gradualist policy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has answered himself. The Communists are opposed to a policy of gradualism with respect to this problem. That does not change the validity of the opposition to the policy of gradualism because the Communists oppose it. If the Communists opposed nudist colonies the gentleman would be in favor of them.

Mr. KEEFE. But your Communist friends advocate them and defend them time and time again.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman must be an expert on this subject.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly what they advocated, nudist colonies.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then if the Communists condemned them the gentleman would also advocate nudist colonies. He says the Communists are opposed to gradualism and because the Communists oppose gradualism, therefore, gradualism is good. So if Communists opposed nudist colonies the gentleman would rather have them. That is how sound his argument is. That is his super logic, but that is not the point. The gentleman has left himself wide open. Here is what it is. It is the crux of the entire argument between him and me.

The gentleman says that I injected extraneous matters into this discussion, that I was injecting the question of segregation and Jim Crow. The gentleman says that is extraneous. This demonstrates how shallow his argument is. Is it extraneous? Is FEPC extraneous to Jim Crow and segregation? Are we not dealing with Jim Crow and segregation when we are dealing with the problem of discrimination in employment? The two are simply different phases of the same problem. One is the phase in the industrial life of the Nation; Jim Crow and segregation exists in the industrial life, and FEPC is aimed at that; so, Jim Crow and segregation are not extraneous to this problem; and the fact that the gentleman from Wisconsin says that they are extraneous demonstrates that the gentleman from Wisconsin does not have any real understanding of the whole issue involved. He has a superficial attitude toward this issue. This issue is much more fundamental than FEPC. FEPC is just a phase of it. This issue goes back to the days of the thirteenth amendment. When the thirteenth amendment was under consideration that issue was raised in this House by a man whose memory has been done violence here and by Hollywood, Thaddeus Stevens; and it was raised by Republicans, by real Republicans, the anniversary of whose leader you have just been celebrating this last week. Those real Republicans stated right here in this House that emancipation meant nothing if there was no economic implementation; in other words, you did not free the Negro if you did not give him full equality and the wherewithal with which to live. It was proposed right here in this House by Thaddeus Stevens that every emancipated slave be given a 40-acre farm and a mule. It would have meant breaking up the big landed feudalism of over 200 acres. Radical, is it not?

If that policy had been adopted, if there had been no betrayal of the ideals for which men died in that Civil War, we would not be having this problem here today. You would not be having,

for instance, the so-called Black Belt of the South with 5,000,000 Negroes exploited and subjected to the vilest form of racism, with 180 counties in which the Negro people constitute a majority ranging from 50 to 85 percent, subjected to the Bourbon rule of a minority.

What is this business you are perpetuating? You have perpetuated a political and social and economic scheme to deprive the Negro people of the democracy to which they are entitled, to deprive them of that political power with which they can protect themselves from economic slavery. So this system has been solidified, it has been perpetuated. Do you want to deal with that system gradually? Do you want to temporize with it? Do you want the bill of the gentleman from Pennsylvania or the bill offered by the gentleman from Arkansas which says that we declare for the principle of equality here in this Congress but we refuse to enforce that principle; we refuse to have any power given to the Federal Government to step in. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] made a statement. Maybe I misunderstood him. He referred to it as a police-state system? Does the gentleman think that is a police-state system? Did the gentleman refer to it as a police-state system?

Mr. JUDD No; I did not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the struggle that is going on here in reference to FEPC is an old struggle It goes back to the very establishment of slavery in the United States. We witnessed that struggle in the enunciation of the Declaration of Independence, we witnessed the debate on continuation of the slave trade in the Constitutional Convention, we witnessed the debates in Congress You remember the Dred Scott decision which said that no Negro had any right that any white man must respect. We saw Americans shed their blood in the Civil War to wipe out that vicious decision of our Supreme Court. But then all that was negated. A presidential election took place, the Tilden-Hayes election, a dubious presidential election which was won only by agreeing to the withdrawal of Federal troops from the South and as a result the implementation of emancipation, the economic, political, and social implementing of that emancipation was stopped. Since 1875 not a piece of civil-rights legislation has come before this House.

Mr. Speaker, if it is communism to fight against temporizing with inequality, then I accept the challenge.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to make this comment on what the gentleman from New York has said. He apparently equates legislation with social progress. He implies that because no legislation has been enacted on civil rights since 1875, there has been no progress in civil rights for the Negro people in this country. Yet no people in history has made more progress in education, health, better living standards and employment at skilled, as well as unskilled, employment than the Negro people have made in this country in the last 90 years. Everyone admits the task is far from complete and there is a long way to go, but it is not right to allow the impression to go out that lack of legislation on this point means no progress has been made

Mr KEEFE. That is exactly why I asked for this time to answer the spurious argument of the gentleman from New York which I have heard him repeat almost weekly ever since I have been a Member of Congress, 12 years.

There is nothing new in the statements of the gentleman from New York He has been making the same type of argument in all the years I have been here and the remarks which he has made are an indictment, whether he meant it or not, of the colored people of this country whom he attempts to champion. He let the impression go out that there has been little or no progress since 1875 because he challenges the fact that the Congress of the United States has not legislatively developed this program in accordance with his concept as to what ought to have been done. He fails to realize that this whole great question is one of human relationships, and I say to him that the colored people of this country have made tremendous strides economically, physically, mentally, morally, spiritually, and every other way beyond any comparable race that I know of anywhere. And, they have done it because they have had the courage and the ambition even in the face of frustration, which I well know about and which the gentleman from New York knows I have tried in my humble way to eliminate in various aspects of this problem. They still have made tremendous progress and they have been encouraged to make that progress gradually just as the States and the citizens of those States have gone along with the gradual policy of providing security, economic and otherwise, for the colored people of this country.

The gentleman assumes in his argument that because the Congress of the United States has not legislated in this field that therefore the colored people have been denied any opportunity for progress. Now, I am not so naive as to stand here and not admit that so far as I am concerned I know the frustrations incident to Jim Crowism and incident to segregation. You do not have segregation in New York, so I am told, but you have voluntary segregation by which the colored people themeselves are located substantially in one area in the great city of New York.

I do not know what the answer is unless it is education, constant and everlasting education, and the opportunity given to the colored people of this country to secure education and the right to prepare themselves for economic advancement in their jobs and in their positions, and I have fought for that very situation as the gentleman well knows in my work as a Member of the Congress to see to it that they have opportunity for advancement, and I have not got over two or three colored people in my district. I am not motivated by political implications nor by political expediency, perhaps, as some Members are who have large foreign-born populations in their districts to whom they must constantly appeal in order to get votes.

So, when I made the statement which I did this afternoon as to the attitude of Communists—you find it in book after book, paper after paper, speech after speech, all of which are part of the records of this Congress, it indicates that as one of the basic party lines, "We are through with gradualism; we cannot wait for constitutional processes to take place." They advocate the sharp break of revolution and they have done so for years, and the gentleman well knows it, and that is one of the fundamentals of the Communist Party line. I am surprised to hear him attack the integrity, if you please, of the gentleman from Arkansas, because he has the courage to stand here and advocate what he has described as a policy of gradualism I will say to the gentleman that in my humble opinion, from my observations of this problem in the North and in the South, if the people were to follow the leadership of the gentleman from New York, the minorities would be in a much worse position than they are at the present time by following the policy that has been indulged in all these years, which has lifted the economic opportunity of these minority groups, and is gradually breaking down the age-old intolerance that has existed and, may I say to the gentleman in my humble opinion, when you attempt to jam it down the throats by force you are attempting to create just what the gentleman from Minnesota well described as the utilization of police state methods. I do not want any part of that so far as I am concerned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. WHEELER), for 1 day, on account of illness.

To Mr. GARY (at the request of Mr. HARDY), for Tuesday, February 21, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S 1990 An act to amend section 429, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the act of

August 5, 1882, as amended, so as to substitute for the requirement that detailed annual reports be made to the Congress concerning the proceeds of all sales of condemned naval material, a requirement that information as to such proceeds be filed with the Committees on Armed Services in the Congress

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 22, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1250. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to assure that expenditures under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, for education and training yield a proper return both to the veteran and to the Nation as a whole"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1251. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 3, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Deep Creek, Accomack County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc No. 477); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1252 A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 22, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Guadalupe River, Tex., with a view to providing a harbor of refuge for fishing craft at or near Seadrift, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 15, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 478); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1253. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels,' approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c)"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1254. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to the subjects of such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1255 A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business Report pursuant to House Resolution 22, resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; without amendment (Rept. No. 1675). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. KEATING. Committee on the Judiciary. S. 567. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorraine Malone, with an amendment (Rept. No 1671). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. S 2125. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of J N Jones and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1672). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H R 1082 A bill for the relief of the Bunker Hill Development Corp., with an amendment (Rept. No 1673). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr KEATING Committee on the Judiciary. H. R 4041 A bill for the relief of Paris Bros., with an amendment (Rept No. 1674). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 7374 A bill to prohibit annuity payments under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, in the case of any person hereafter convicted of a felony committed while serving as a Member of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H R 7375. A bill to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the amortization deduction for emergency facilities, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr GORSKI:

H R. 7376. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide full annuities at half salary or wages, based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who shall have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONAS:

H R. 7377. A bill to authorize the commercial operation of the vessels *Cornwall, Johnstown,* and *Saucon* on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEE:

H R. 7378. A bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 7379. A bill to provide pension for certain widows of recipients of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 7380. A bill to assure that expenditures under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, for education and training yield a proper return both to the veteran and to the Nation as a whole; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 7381. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H R. 7382. A bill to terminate the war tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr MARCANTONIO:

H R 7383. A Bill to repeal section 2385 of title 18, United States Code (54 Stat. 670); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H R. 7384. A bill exempting from tax the transportation of Boy Scouts and Scouters to the National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America to be held at Valley Forge, Pa.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H R. 7385 A bill to amend section 410 of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to cooperation with State commissions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

By Mr. KLEIN:

H R 7386. A bill to extend and protect the rights of Federal employees, to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr MORRISON:

H R. 7387. A bill to provide for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees separated from the service of the Federal Government or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

By Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H R 7388 A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs

By Mr TRIMBLE:

H Res 483 Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Works to determine a policy to govern the use of public land acquired in the course of the construction of flood-control dams; to the Committee on Rules

By Mr MACK of Illinois:

H Res 484 Resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit to the Abraham Lincoln Association at Springfield, Ill., copies of certain Abraham Lincoln documents; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to the Senate urging the defeat of the attempt to eliminate or reduce the depletion allowance now made in connection with income taxes on producers of natural resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to the House urging the defeat of the attempt to eliminate or reduce the depletion allowance now made in connection with income taxes on producers of natural resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 7389. A bill for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 7390. A bill for the relief of Erika Kuebart and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 7391. A bill for the relief of Bernard R. Novak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 7392. A bill for the relief of Columbus Finley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 7393. A bill for the relief of Francisco Blanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7394. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Celine Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 7395. A bill for the relief of Endel Jakob Kolde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1881. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress with relation to the amendment of the retirement requirements as they apply to soldiers, sailors, marines, and National Guard men so that those otherwise eligible for retirement after 20 years of service may receive the benefits for which they would be entitled without having reached the minimum age therefor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1882. Also, resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress in plea for cooperation by the United States Army engineers for the removal of wrecks in Narragansett Bay and Providence Harbor; to the Committee on Public Works

1883 By Mr. HALE: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, urging the Members of Congress to pass legislation authorizing the issue of a postage stamp and the striking of a coin to mark the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox, friend of George Washington, who held the distinguished position of head of the Department of Artillery in the American Revolution, 1776–83, and was Secretary of War in the National Government, 1785–94; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1884. By Mr. JENISON: Petition of the property owners of that part of the village of Palestine, Ill., that is endangered by flood from the Wabash River, petitioning for assistance from the Federal authorities in building protection necessary to protect their lives and property; to the Committee on Public Works

1885. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petitions of residents of Cooperstown, N. Y., advocating passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising and its broadcasting over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1886. By Mr. RICH: Petition of members of St. Agnes Parish, Lock Haven, Pa., in opposition to Barden and Thomas Federal aid-to-education bills; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1887. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of Holmes, Curran, Bennett Unit, No. 361, American Legion Auxiliary, Ashby, Mass., against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1888. Also, petition of American Legion Auxiliary Post, No. 159, Westford, Mass., against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1889. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, to remove existing taxes on admissions to high-school athletic contests or athletic contests conducted by charitable and nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1890. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Weldon Chambers, president, Brown County local unit, Texas State Teachers Association, Bangs, Tex., opposing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1891. Also, petition of Rear Adm. William Rea Furlong, Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D. C, relative to resolutions pending before the Congress proposing world government or proposing a change in the United Nations, and stating its opposition to any form of supergovernment, being contrary to the essentials of liberty and national independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1892. Also, petition of Helen S. Kurtz, president, Women's Board of Doctors Hospital, Cleveland, Ohio, opposing any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1893. Also, petition of Paul Wooton, president, Society of Business Magazine Editors, Washington, D. C., opposing the continued use of the facilites of the periodical press galleries by representatives of the State Department or any other Government agency and asking that no relaxation of the rules regarding admission be permitted; to the Committee on Rules.

1894. Also, petition of S. M Felton, president, American Railway Car Institute, New York, N. Y., relative to excise taxes on railroad fares and shipment of freight and requesting that these excise taxes be abolished immediately; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1950

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, with clamorous voices demanding our ears we would this day listen again to the calm and reassuring voice of the first President of the Republic, who still stands among us in lofty reserve. Being dead, he yet speaketh, with unerring judgment exhorting us to union and harmony. May his warning sentiments bequeathed for the meditation of all future generations come to us with undimmed freshness as a message for these troubled times. By patience and faith may we, like him, rise above the difficulties, discouragements, and dangers which confront us, in this day of desperate battle around the world, between truth and falsehood, liberty and tyranny.

So, as the ages roll on, may a grateful Nation cherish the luster of his virtues and the greatness of his service. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 21, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H R 633 An act for the relief of Mrs. Victor V. Greg;

H R. 677. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R 714 An act for the relief of Pieter Cornelis ten Wolde and family;

H. R 1047. An act for the relief of the Aero-Socker Knitting Mills, Inc;

H. R. 1133. An act for the relief of Mrs. Merle Leatherbury Pyle and Patricia M. Pyle;

H R 1170. An act for the relief of Mrs. John Kaudy (formerly Stella Cappler),

H R 1464. An act for the relief of W. B. Terry;

H R 1606 An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc, and certain of its subcontractors against the United States,

H R 1697. An act for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler,

H R. 1699 An act for the relief of the estate of William Kraus,

H R 1866. An act for the relief of Honorio Canciller and Nancy Ting Evangelista;

H R 2705 An act for the relief of Martin Kenneth Ikeda;

H R 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I D Cosson, a minor;

H R 2929. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious;

H R 3080. An act for the relief of Earl L. Doss,

H R 3330. An act for the relief of Therese Hohman;

H R. 3506. An act for the relief of Louis P. Murphy, United States immigrant inspector, El Paso, Tex;

H R 3725 An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs Elizabeth Gardner,

H R 4015. An act for the relief of Kate Lausen,

H R 4301 An act for the relief of Y. S. Hu;

H R. 4360. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay,

H R. 4532. An act for the relief of Dr Ta Fu Wu;

H. R 4604 An act to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens porsessing special skills, namely, Teodor Egle, Karlis Fogelis, Vasily Kils, and Aleksanders Zelmenis;

H. R. 4608. An act for the relief of William J. Drinkwine;

H. R. 4720. An act for the relief of Stella Avner;

H. R. 4781. An act for the relief of Veronica Jolly;

H. R. 5274. An act for the relief of Francis A. Gunn;

H. R 5523. An act for the relief of Fred I. Massengill;

H. R. 5541. Ar act to amend Private Law No. 463, Seventy-sixth Congress;

H. R. 5566. An act for the relief of Dr. Agostino DeLisi;

H. R. 5753. An act for the relief of Jean Clark;

H. R 6051. An act for the relief of Alcide Raymond;

H. R 6271 An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry Schneider;

H. R 6344. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Y Imanaka;

H R 6414. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chikako Mary Ohori Hori;

H R. 6521 An act to authorize the sale of certain land on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, S Dak., allotted to Lucy Arapahoe Iron Bear;

H R 6577 An act for the relief of Haruko Teramoto;

H. R 6589. An act for the relief of Mitsue Miyamoto,

H R 6669. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Uemura,

H R 6691 An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes,

H R 6892 An act for the relief of Sgt. Blaine W. Hughes;

H R 6894 An act for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi;

H R 6895 An act for the relief of Edgar F. Russell; Lillian V Russell, his wife, and Bessie R Ward;

H R 6896 An act for the relief of Lawrence B Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams,

H. R 6753 An act for the relief of Arthur Chen Shu Jee;

H R 6737 An act for the relief of Mrs. Kyoko Nakamura Kornhauser,

H R 6894 On act for the relief of Mrs. Nobuko Eto Heard, and

H. R 7035 An act for the relief of Hisako Sakata Ikezawa.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Malone
Benton	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Butler	Holland	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Myers
Capehart	Ives	Neely
Chapman	Jenner	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S C	Russell
Darby	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Downey	Kilgore	Smith, N J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Stennis
Ecton	Leahy	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Taylor
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Long	Thye
Frear	Lucas	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarran	Tydings
George	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wherry
Graham	McFarland	Wiley
Green	McKellar	Williams
Gurney	McMahon	Withers
Hayden	Magnuson	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on January 24, 1901, ordering the reading on the 22d day of February of each year of the Farewell Address of George Washington, the Chair having heretofore designated the Senator from Maryland [Mr O'CONOR] to read the address, the Senator from Maryland is now recognized for that purpose.

Mr. O'CONOR advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows.

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot

end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining

within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution of modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One

method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There

can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perserverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak 4 minutes at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Maryland on his discerning and intelligent reading of Washington's Farewell Address, which by emphasis and clarity has been of such pronounced assistance in enabling us who have heard his rendition to understand the profound meaning of this immortal address.

Each year we are impressed with its close applicability to current problems. The observation that the Constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all; the observation that it is important likewise that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding, in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another; the admonition that if, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates, but let there be no change by usurpation—these are but examples of the truths which are immortal in this great address of the Father of his Country.

Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers.

Mr. President, Daniel Webster said:

America has furnished the world the character of Washington. And if our American institutions had done nothing else, that alone would have entitled them to the respect of mankind.

It was Lord Brougham of England who said:

Until time shall be no more, a test of the progress which our race has made in wisdom and virtue will be derived from the veneration paid to the immortal name of Washington.

Today, Mr. President, our thoughts may appropriately include that other great American, the birth of whom our people celebrated earlier in this month, Abraham Lincoln. As our contemplation embraces these two great figures of history, let us recall a tribute to Washington in words of matchless beauty left by Lincoln to us. Listen to his words:

To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Washington is alike impossible. Let none attempt it In solemn awe pronounce the name, and in its naked deathless splendor leave it shining on

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the psalmist David, in one of his Psalms, in speaking to God Almighty, wrote—

Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against Thee

What David meant was that the truths and the inspirations and the teachings of Holy Writ were hid in his heart so that when the temptations of sin came into his life he could call up their assurances as armor to protect him against the wiles of evil.

As I sat here this morning, Mr. President, joining with my fellows in listening to the address of our great first President, perhaps the greatest of all American citizens, all things considered, I harkened to his appeal to mankind, not only those of his day, but to us, as well as generations yet to come, calling our attention to the soundness of thrift, to religion and prudence, to right foreign relations, to sound credit and finance, but, above all, integrity and common honesty.

I reflected, as I listened, would that we in the Senate of the United States, and the people in the hinterlands of America, might hide those principles in our hearts, that when false doctrine or great temptations came, when insidious wiles of national and international evils presented themselves to our souls, we might call up these teachings, and give back a strong answer, that here we stand, true to the principles of Washington and Lincoln and other great leaders who have gone before us, building something with foundations great and strong for generations yet unborn.

If that were true in my life and yours, Mr. President, and in those of our fellows, then it might be said in truth, Washington being dead, yet speaketh to us today. God grant that may be true.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

FORWARDING AND RETURN OF CERTAIN MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

relating to the forwarding and return of second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, the collection of postage due at the time of delivery, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DEMURRAGE CHARGES ON UNDELIVERED COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY PARCELS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of persons involved, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reason for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF PLANE PERSONNEL BOAT TO LAKE COUNTY, CALIF.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the county of Lake, Calif, had requested the Navy Department to transfer a plane personnel boat, or craft of similar type, for use by that county in rescue operations and in the discharge of other functions of the county; to the Committee on Armed Services

STATISTICAL TABLES REFLECTING BUSINESS TRANSACTED BY BANKRUPTCY COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts, fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Letters in the nature of petitions from Unknown Soldier Post, No. 875, Los Angeles, Calif., signed by F. F. Collins, quartermaster adjutant; the Wyandotte County Council of Kansas City, Kans., signed by Harry Cox, Jr., commander; Halvarson-Bowers Post, No. 187, of Minneapolis, Minn., signed by Albert Johnson, commander; and the Legislation Action Committee, of Sunburst, Mont., all of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, praying for the enactment of House bill 4167, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by Lion Mountain Auxiliary to Post No. 276, of Whitefish, Mont., and the Beirne-Webster Post, No. 1568, of Towanda, Pa., both of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, favoring the enactment of House bill 4167, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, of Washington, D. C., favoring the establishment of a conference on disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Supreme Officers of the Pan-Messenian Federation, of Boston, Mass., relating to the return to Greece of certain abducted children; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from Nicolas Estates, Inc., of Manila, P. I, signed by Mr. and Mrs. Eugenio Corpuz Nicolas, transmitting a resolution relating to amendment of the United States-Philippine war-damage law (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations

A resolution adopted by the Delaware State Dental Society, of Wilmington, Del., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry;

"Senate Resolution 25

"Whereas the growing and marketing of tobacco in Kentucky produces more cash income than is produced from any other crop grown in Kentucky; and

"Whereas Kentucky produces, grows, and markets more burley tobacco than any other State in the United States of America, and

"Whereas the growing and marketing of burley tobacco is very vital to the economic life and to the general welfare of the people of Kentucky; and

"Whereas the burley tobacco growers in Kentucky, by overwhelming vote, have repeatedly approved the establishment of quotas for the growing and marketing of burley tobacco under the terms and provisions of the Federal Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and

"Whereas uniform standards of type, quality, grade, and other characteristics need to be established and maintained to prevent manipulations and evasions which would unreasonably and adversely affect the prices received by tobacco growers in Kentucky to the great detriment of such growers; and

"Whereas the classification of tobacco according to type, grade, and other characteristics and the use and application of uniform standards for such classifications and inspections are imperative for the protection of growers of burley tobacco and the protection of the public interest of the people of Kentucky and of other States growing burley tobacco; and

"Whereas abnormally excessive supplies of burley tobacco adversely affect the price of tobacco which is grown under quota and marketing restrictions; and

"Whereas tobacco has been grown in large amounts in Kentucky which is a cross or variety of burley known and designated as type 31-V tobacco which has been grown without being under the quota and marketing restrictions applicable to other growers of burley tobacco; and

"Whereas the ruling and regulation of the United States Department of Agriculture establishing type 31-V tobacco, classification amended July 18, 1947, effective July 23, 1947 (12 FR 4144; 12 FR 4879), restrictions and contract issued November 13, 1947, effective January 2, 1948 (12 FR 5478; 12 FR 8041), have resulted in the evasion of the quota restrictions with respect to the growing and marketing of burley tobacco in Kentucky; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky is strongly of the opinion that the aforesaid regulation, classification, and contract made by the United States Department of Agriculture is in direct violation of the intent of the Congress of the United States with respect to quota, marketing, and other regulations with respect to the growing and marketing of burley tobacco; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky very strongly believes that said ruling, regulation, classification, and contract are unfair and unjust and are against the best interest of the burley-tobacco growers of Kentucky and of other States growing burley tobacco; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky very strongly believes that said ruling, classifications, restrictions, and contract have resulted, and will continue to result, in abuses and evasions and manipulations which, if not corrected, may lead to the destruction of or great damage to the burley-tobacco industry in Kentucky and in other States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the senate and the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States be requested immediately to revoke and rescind the rulings, classifications, and contract hereinabove set forth; and in lieu thereof, promulgate and adopt rules and regulations prohibiting the growth of type 31-V tobacco except under existing quotas, penalties, and other marketing conditions, regulations, and provisions which are now applicable to the growing and marketing of burley tobacco; and

"(2) That the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States immediately promulgate and issue appropriate and effective regulations to prohibit the consideration, historically or otherwise, of type 31-V tobacco in computing or determining the allotment or base for the growing of burley tobacco on any farm or farms by any person, firm, or corporation; and

"(3) That the clerk of the senate be, and is hereby, directed to send an attested copy of this resolution to each Member of the House of Representatives from Kentucky and to each Member of the Senate of the United States from Kentucky and to the President and Vice President of the United States; and, that they and each of them hereby are requested immediately to use their good offices in urging that the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States immediately take the action hereinabove requested, or upon his failure so to do, that appropriate legislation be prepared and presented to Congress for passage to accomplish the objectives and purposes hereinabove set forth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, upon request of the President, the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army have completed, and by their agreement of April 11, 1949, have coordinated their plans for development in the Columbia River Basin, which plans supplement and complement each other; and

"Whereas your memorialists, heretofore during the thirtieth Idaho legislative session, represented to you the urgency and importance of immediate authorization of certain of the projects proposed to be constructed in the Columbia River Basin in the interests of irrigation, flood control, navigation, power, and other beneficial uses; and

"Whereas the Payette unit of the Mountain Home project is among those of the highest importance to the State of Idaho, since, if carried to completion as a balanced and unified program of irrigation development, it would serve to utilize the vast natural resources of the State, and particularly those related to agriculture, with a maximum benefit to the citizens of Idaho as well as to the citizens of the entire region, and would effectively preserve for the benefit of the irrigation phases of the project the self-liquidating features of the power-producing facilities incident thereto which have been recommended for authorization and construction in the recently announced program of the President; and

"Whereas it is of vital importance that there be no delay in carrying forward the irrigation-development features of the Payette unit of the Mountain Home project because of the rising demand for homemaking opportunities for war veterans and others seeking agricultural lands; and

"Whereas it is inherent in the policy of the State of Idaho that the rights, privileges, and benefits pertaining to and arising from utilization of the natural resources of the State shall be protected for the citizens of Idaho. Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge that, through an appropriate amendment to H. R. 5472, now pending before the Senate of the United States, Congress authorize construction of the Payette unit of the Mountain Home project in its entirety as embodied in the joint agreement of April 11, 1949, as hereinbefore referred to, with the provision that no funds shall be expended on other than the following features: Upper Scriver Creek power plant, lower Scriver Creek power plant, Smiths Ferry Dam, Smiths Ferry-Scriver Creek tunnel, Scriver Creek Dam and Reservoir, until the Secretary of the Interior with the approval of the President has submitted to the Congress a supplemental report and finding of feasibility under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, taking into consideration the participation of this project in the Columbia Basin account; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, directed to forward copies of this memorial to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"This joint memorial passed the senate on the 8th day of February 1950

"D. S WHITEHEAD,
"President of the Senate.

"This joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 11th day of February 1950.

"JOHN HOHNHORST,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the social-security bill, H. R. 6000, in such form as to extend Federal social security to include State and local government employees

"Be it resolved by the Senate of South Dakota (the house concurring therein):

"Whereas Federal social security should be extended to include provision for State and local government employees; and

"Whereas this may be accomplished by enactment of the Federal social-security bill, H. R. 6000, in proper form; and

"Whereas such legislation is necessary to give effect to chapter 233 of the South Dakota session laws of 1949: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the house concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact the legislation required to extend Federal social security to include provision for State and local government employees; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to United States Senator CHAN GURNEY, to United States Senator KARL MUNDT, to Congressman FRANCIS H. CASE, and to Congressman HAROLD LOVRE.

"R TERRY,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of Senate.
"A. E. MUNCK,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

FEPC—RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

Mr IVES. Mr. President, this afternoon the Legislature of the State of New York completed action on a joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact with all convenient speed House bill 4453, which is known as the fair employment practice bill. In that connection, I point out that this memorializing resolution was adopted by the assembly, in which the membership is 150, with only 7 votes in opposition, and in the State senate, where the membership totals 58, with only 2 votes in opposition.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. President, I ask to have the text of the resolution incorporated in the RECORD, and be appropriately referred.

The joint resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 42

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, a bill, House Resolution No 4453, known as the Fair Employment Practice Act, the purpose of which is to establish a permanent agency of the Government to eliminate discrimination in employment; and

Whereas the State of New York has been among the pioneers of the States of the Union to enact such legislation which has been successful in reducing or eradicating such discrimination in the industries of this State, and

Whereas all citizens, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin, are entitled to equal opportunity to be gainfully employed, and it is in the public interest that such unfair practices, which tend to engender bitterness and unrest among large segments of our population, be eradicated as opposed to the principles of our form of Government; and

Whereas during the last war when it was essential for our war industries to keep production at their highest level, the fair employment practice committee was highly successful in reducing or eliminating such discrimination in such industries: Now, therefore be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That it is the sense of the people of the State of New York, expressed through the considered judgment of their representatives in the legislature, that the enactment of such legislation is of the greatest importance to the people and will tend to unite the country and create greater respect for our institutions among the other peoples of the world, and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed House Resolution No. 4453 or such other, similar, appropriate legislation as will accomplish the purposes of this resolution, and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to do all within their power to bring about the enactment of such legislation.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

In assembly, February 21, 1950, concurred in without amendments.

By order of assembly:

ANSLEY BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM, 1949

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71), submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Utah on January 31, 1950, reported it without amendment, and the concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 1,000 additional copies of the hearings conducted before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 1106, S 1456, S. 1581, and S. 1679, Eighty-first Congress, first session, parts 1 and 2 of the national health program, 1949. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION (S. DOC. NO. 138)

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 225), submitted by Mr. HAYDEN on February 6, 1950, reported it without amendment, submitted a report (No. 1278) thereon, and the resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the fifty-second annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ending April 1, 1949, be printed as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT"

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 226), submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on February 6, 1950, reported it without amendment, and the resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Employment and Unemployment," prepared for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, be printed as a Senate document.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 3096. A bill for the relief of Efstratios Maravelios, alias Steve Maravelias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3097. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. S. Rees, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 3098. A bill to amend section 104 of title 28 of the United States Code so as to create a Greenville division in the northern district of Mississippi, with terms of court to be held at Greenville; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 3099. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of the vacancy in the office of district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S 3100. A bill for the relief of Annetta Bachis, Anna Bellani, Angelina Colombo, Maria Grazia Impari, Franca Porricino, and Antonia Tirabassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S 3101. A bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 3102. A bill to enable the States to make more adequate provision for special services required for the education of physically handicapped children of school age, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S 3103. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make provision for public schools in connection with the construction of Federal reclamation projects involving new public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. GEORGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SERVICE OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on the 20th of February the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] introduced Senate bill 3078, to define the service of certain members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance. The bill does not deal with pensions directly, but merely by definition places in the category of the recipients of pensions the members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who were engaged in active military service in World War II.

The Finance Committee does not have jurisdiction of the bill, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF INFORMATION RELATING TO SPACE REQUIREMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE (S. DOC NO. 137)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document information relating to space requirements of the United States Senate, prepared by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA (S DOC. NO 139)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated January 23, 1950, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on Lake Pontchartrain, La., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted on October 11, 1947, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be referred to the Committee on Public Works, and printed as a Senate document, with an illustration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H R 633 An act for the relief of Mrs. Victor V. Greg;

H. R 677. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H R. 714. An act for the relief of Pieter Cornelis ten Wolde and family;

H R. 1047. An act for the relief of the Acro-Bocker Knitting Mills, Inc;

H R. 1133. An act for the relief of Mrs. Merle Leatherbury Pyle and Patricia M Pyle,

H. R. 1170. An act for the relief of Mrs. John Kaudy (formerly Stella Cappler);

H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of W. B. Terry;

H. R 1606. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States;

H. R. 1697. An act for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler;

H. R. 1699. An act for the relief of the estate of William Kraus;

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Honorio Canciller and Nancy Ting Evangelista;

H. R. 2705. An act for the relief of Martin Kenneth Ikeda;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor;

H. R. 2929. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious;

H. R. 3080. An act for the relief of Earl L. Doss,

H. R 3330. An act for the relief of Therese Hohman;

H. R. 3506. An act for the relief of Louis P. Murphy, United States immigrant inspector, El Paso, Tex.;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Gardner;

H. R. 4015. An act for the relief of Kate Laursen;

H. R 4301. An act for the relief of Y. S. Hu;

H. R 4380. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay;

H. R. 4532 An act for the relief of Dr. Ta Fu Wu,

H. R. 4604. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills, namely, Teodor Egle, Karlis Fogelis, Vasily Kils, and Aleksanders Zelmenis;

H. R. 4608. An act for the relief of William J. Drinkwine;

H. R. 4720. An act for the relief of Stella Avnet;

H R 4781 An act for the relief of Veronica Jolly

H. R 5274. An act for the relief of Francis A. Gunn,

H. R. 5523. An act for the relief of Fred I. Massengill;

H R 5541 An act to amend Public Law No 463, Seventy-sixth Congress;

H. R 5566 An act for the relief of Dr. Agostino DeLisi;

H R 5753 An act for the relief of Jean Clark;

H. R 6051. An act for the relief of Alcide Raymond;

H R 6271 An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry Schneider;

H R 6344. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Y Imanaka;

H. R. 6414. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chikako Mary Ohori Hori;

H R 6577. An act for the relief of Haruko Teramoto;

H R. 6589. An act for the relief of Mitsue Miyamoto;

H. R 6689 An act for the relief of Mitsuko Uemura;

H R 6691. An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H R 6692 An act for the relief of Sergeant Blaine W. Hughes;

H. R. 6694 An act for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi;

H. R. 6695 An act for the relief of Edgar F. Russell; Lillian V. Russell, his wife; and Bessie R. Ward;

H. R. 6696 An act for the relief of Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams;

H. R. 6756. An act for the relief of Arthur Chen Shu Jee;

H. R. 6787. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kyoko Nakamura Kornhauser;

H. R. 6894. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nobuko Eto Heard; and

H. R 7035. An act for the relief of Hisako Sakata Ikezawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6521 An act to authorize the sale of certain land on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, S. Dak., allotted to Lucy Arapahoe Iron Bear; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THE FARMER AND THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ANDERSON

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the relations of the farmer to the chamber of commerce, delivered by Senator ANDERSON, at the Association of Commerce banquet in Bloomington, Ill., February 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARSHALL PLAN—ARTICLE AND EDITORIAL BY EDWARD LINDSAY

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article and

editorial regarding the Marshall plan, written by Edward Lindsay, and published in the Herald and Review, of Decatur, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LINCOLN PHILOSOPHY OF GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address entitled "The Lincoln Philosophy of Government," delivered by him at Tucson, Ariz., on February 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE AMERICAN LAWYER—ADDRESS BY LUTHER L. HILL

[Mr GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, What's Wrong With the American Lawyer, delivered by Luther L Hill, publisher of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, before the Harvard Law School Forum, at Cambridge, Mass., February 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESOLUTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE YOUNG REPUBLICAN LEAGUE OF MINNESOTA OPPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF THE HYDROGEN BOMB

[Mr THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Young Republican League of Minnesota on January 29, 1950, in opposition to the construction of the hydrogen bomb until all possible means of international control of atomic energy through cooperation with the U. S. S. R have been exhausted, which appears in the Appendix.]

COAL: THE ELEVENTH HOUR—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Coal: The Eleventh Hour," from the New York Times of February 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATLANTIC UNION—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Atlantic Union," from the Washington Post of February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

COOPERATIVE ACTION AGAINST WATER POLLUTION—ARTICLE FROM CONSERVATION NEWS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Water-Pollution Control Board Takes Action," from Conservation News of February 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Where the 'One World' Effort Runs a Little Wild," by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of February 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

"IN THE SHADOW OF THE SUN * * * AND DEATH!"—POEM BY S. BAKOVE

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "In the Shadow of the Sun * * * And Death!" by S. Bakove, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. J. SKELLY WRIGHT, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 1, 1950, at 1:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. J. Skelly Wright, of Louisiana, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana. Judge Wright is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

IMPORTATION OF POTATOES FROM CANADA—TELEGRAM FROM J. SEGARI & CO

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on yesterday I presented a telegram from J. Segari & Co., of New Orleans, with reference to importation of potatoes from Canada, which was merely noted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I now ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD in full.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *February 10, 1950.*

Hon ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

The undersigned, J Segari & Co., wholesale produce merchants of New Orleans, are currently being cited in Associated Press dispatches and radio comments on having purchased and imported from Canada a certain cargo of potatoes which cargo was unloaded in New Orleans Tuesday, February 7, 1950.

We wish to present to you, our Senator, the circumstances surrounding this routine business transaction, urging you to present the facts as herein stated on the Senate floor, to the Department of Agriculture and to any and all interested parties.

During the month of October of last year it came to the attention of J. Segari & Co. that potatoes from Canada were arriving in the port of Jacksonville, Fla., and were being quoted to our customers f. o. b. Jacksonville in carload or truckload lots at much lower prices than we ourselves could buy potatoes in the United States. These same Canadian potatoes were also being offered through local brokers in New Orleans and were being purchased by many of our customers and competitors. J. Segari & Co. could not compete and found little market for its stores of domestic potatoes.

J. Segari & Co. thereupon purchased Canadian potatoes out of Jacksonville. Thereafter we made direct contact with F. W. Pirie Co., Ltd., Grand Falls, New Brunswick, Canada, requesting potato shipment to New Orleans, thus saving costs of overland transportation from the Jacksonville market. Transportation charges thus eliminated amount to 60 cents per hundred pound sack, which economy could be shared by our customers and ultimately by the consumer.

On February 6 aboard the steamship *Vretaholm*, in response to our order, there arrived in New Orleans from the Pirie Co. of Canada 8,648 bags of Canadian potatoes, weighing 100 pounds each. We paid the shipper $27,223.60 as per draft in full settlement. Also, we paid full Federal import duty in the amount of $6,486 on the potato cargo.

As Canadian potatoes at lower prices have been imported regularly by other merchants through Jacksonville since October and have been upon the local and Gulf markets via Jacksonville, it seemed only sound business and prudent economy to route our shipment directly through the port of New Orleans. We simply bought the potatoes at the best available price and had the cargo delivered to our home office via the most efficient means. That is why and how the certain cargo of Canadian potatoes happened to be unloaded in New Orleans on February 7.

J. Segari & Co. are produce merchants conscientiously striving to serve their trade to the best of their ability. How or why this ordinary business transaction merited national publicity is a matter beyond our province.

Do know, however, and please do state and publicize, that no criticism of Federal administrative policy was intended or conceived of, as may have been implied in certain editorials and comments. Political significance or implications were equally as far removed from this, as are they in any other of our everyday business operations.

J SEGARI & CO.,
By JOSEPH O. SEGARI, and
ELLIOTT W. FASSBENDER, Sr.,
Partners.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—LETTER AND RESOLUTION FROM THE NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have before me a communication from the secretary of the State Board of Education of the State of New Jersey, under date of February 14, 1950, together with a resolution adopted by that body on April 1, 1949.

The resolution has already been incorporated in the RECORD of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, but, Mr. President, because of the importance of the subject matter thereof, and its relationship to the urgent need for action on S 1946, or some appropriate counterpart thereof, I ask that both the communication and the resolution be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Trenton, February 14, 1950.

Hon. ROBERT C HENDRICKSON,
United States Senator from New Jersey,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENDRICKSON: At its regular meeting on February 3, 1950, the State board of education adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the board be instructed to send to each New Jersey representative in the United States Senate and House of Representatives a copy of the resolution adopted on April 1, 1949, in regard to Federal aid for education, together with the following paragraph quoted from a letter sent by President Hunziker, of this board, to Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll:

" 'Insofar as the Governor had asked us to suggest ways and means to raise additional funds for educational purposes, that seems to us to involve questions and considerations on which we do not have sufficient information to make definite recommendations; but since the Governor has asked for some suggestions we think if any new taxes or public financing is to be recommended, attention should be called to the fact that the Federal Government is now taking from the State 10 times as much in taxes as the entire State expenditures, and that probably there is no

ultimate proper solution except a readjustment of the respective areas of State and Federal taxation'."

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN H. BOSSHART,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NEW JERSEY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION ON APRIL 1, 1949

We, the New Jersey State Board of Education, believe that our American system of public education is vital to the perpetuation of our free society and therefore it is in the national interest that the system be maintained at a high level of efficiency and that adequate public funds be provided for this purpose.

We believe that the responsibility for maintaining good public schools and for providing the necessary funds is the function primarily of our State and local governments

We believe that financial assistance from the Federal Government should be supplied for public schools only and when it is demonstrated beyond doubt that there are certain States whose people are economically unable to raise sufficient tax funds to support acceptable minimum standards of public education and therefore require assistance from their sister States by means of Federal grants-in-aid.

We do not favor any plan for Federal aid for public schools which contains provisions for any Federal control or supervision whatever over the policies established by State laws or local school ordinances relating to the administration, operation, or financing of public schools. We would insist that constitutional safeguards be set up, if necessary, to insure against any degree of Federal control of public education.

In view of fears publicly expressed against Federal control of education by many State Governors, including the Honorable Alfred E. Driscoll, of New Jersey, and by an increasing number of educators, we believe that the Congress should investigate more carefully than it has heretofore the possibilities contained in proposed legislation for subjecting our school systems to unwelcome Federal supervision or control in part or to eventual complete federalization: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this body request both Houses of Congress to subject all proposed Federal school-aid legislation now before it to the most careful, thorough, and objective review through adequate public hearings and through committee investigation determine the ability and willingness of the States and their local subdivisions to pay for public education, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Governor of New Jersey, to New Jersey's Representatives in the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and to the chairmen of the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee and the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF PASTORATE OF DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS—PRAYER BY REV. RALPH C. JOHN

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a prayer offered on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the pastorate of Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, present Chaplain of the Senate, at Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., by Rev. Ralph C. John, William Fraser McDowell professor of religion, the American University.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, Thou in whom perfection in love and goodness resides, and whose will is the welfare of Thy children, with thanksgiving we draw near unto Thee in these hallowed moments. Thou has revealed Thy truth in the face of Thy well-beloved Son, and because of it our understanding is enlightened. Thou hast made Thy compassion manifest, and with confidence we confront whatever the days may hold, believing that in life and death Thy mercy underlies. Thy spirit is within our souls, and we claim a sufficiency which Thou alone canst give. It comes to us, O God, as joy and gladness to sing praises to Thy name, to worship Thee in the beauty of holiness

On this day, when we pause in recognition of a relationship which has enriched the life of this church and which has been a witness to the good and the beautiful to the far corners of the earth, from this our Nation's Capital, we do thank Thee that there are those, set apart by Thee, who say before Him who is our King and our Redeemer: Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth. Indeed, how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings—of him through whom Thou dost make manifest the gospel of redemption and release

The reward of Thy faithful is with Thee Yet, on this anniversary occasion we linger to make our stammering acknowledgment of gratitude and devotion to him who has been both eloquent and searching in his proclamation of the riches of Thy grace, both understanding and helpful before the problems that have come to this people, to him who is a faithful friend and a wise counselor

As Thou hast been with the beloved pastor of this church, whom we today honor, and with her who is his faithful and queenly companion in the way, in the days now recorded in the annals of time, make them even more conscious of the constancy of Thy presence in the years which extend ahead. And may we be responsive to the inspired leadership which they bring, a leadership which belongs not to the past and the present alone, but—thanks be unto Thee—to the future as well.

Hear us, O God, and redeem us unto Thyself, through Him who is Thy Son, our Saviour. Amen.

REPRESENTATION IN SENATE PRESS GALLERY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the suggestion has been made that the Senate Press Gallery should be opened to persons officially representing the information office of the Department of State. The objection to this procedure as an invasion of time-honored privileges of a free press seems to me to be forceful and valid. In connection with this proposal I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND NOW—A FIFTH ESTATE?

It is to be hoped that the standing committee of correspondents—newspapermen chosen by their brethren to administer the Capitol Press Galleries—will stand firm against the State Department's application for admittance to these galleries of its own news-gathering representatives.

For if the State Department can present a rational thesis for the admittance of its news gathers, there is no logical ground on which to turn down the propaganda and public relations agents of other Government departments who may be expected to seek identical privileges. There are more of them now than there are accredited press representatives in the galleries.

Perhaps the State Department, in its relatively new undertaking of distributing propaganda on a world-wide basis, should have its own reporters at the Capitol. But let us keep them out of the Press Gallery, up to this time reserved for bona-fide representatives of the independent newspaper press of the United States. Let the Government, if it is committed to the business of gathering and dispatching news for propaganda purposes, set up its own gallery, appropriately labeled "Government propaganda gallery."

The Press Galleries stand as a symbol of the fourth estate—separate from and independent of Government. Once the infiltration of Government agents begins, this symbol is endangered. It is worth preserving.

EDITORIAL, RESOLUTIONS, AND LETTERS DEALING WITH DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hunger and DP's," published in the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, together with resolutions and letters dealing with the subject of displaced persons.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUNGER AND DP'S

I am an American—born American. My children are Americans; my husband—who lost his life with "flu" while waiting to go overseas—was an American. Yet I am out of work—let out after 5 years of faithful and conscientious work for the Government—along with 1,500 others who, like me, were only numbers on a chart in Washington.

I know we are only "numbers" and the lower numbers must make way for the higher ones. Of this I do not complain. But when I read the news in the Times, February 1, of the loads of DP's arriving from other countries with jobs and food awaiting them in California, I grew almost violent in my rebellion.

I, who had walked streets for months seeking any job at all to feed my two babies, must now sit back and watch these foreign folks step into ready-made jobs, just because they are DP's and it is good United States policy to help the unfortunate folks of other countries.

Sure it is—and my heart goes out also to the thousands of hungry and unfortunate little children I know right here in California. But if I should let my own children starve while I fed all the unfortunate children I know, you and your readers would be the first to rise up in fury against me.

What is the difference, I ask you? And our hungry stomachs are asking that also.

KATHLEEN COVERT.

LONE PINE.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *January 30, 1950.*

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I am sure you will be interested in the enclosed.

I sent the booklet which you recently sent me on to where I thought it would do some more good.

You are doing good work for our country and deserve all credit for your efforts.

Yours sincerely,

MARGARET E. SMITH.

[From Country Gentleman for February 1950]

DP'S LEAVE FARMS

Displaced persons from overseas given work on Maryland farms are being attracted by city life, according to that State's grange. Pointing out that many Maryland farmers have gone to considerable expense and trouble in housing and training DP's, only to have them soon depart for city jobs, the

Grange recommends closer screening of refugees to make sure that they have a farm background It also suggests that farm-to-city migration be more closely watched by supervising authorities.

PARK COUNTY TRADES AND
LABOR COUNCIL,
Livingston, Mont., January 17, 1950.

President WILLIAM GREEN,
A. F. of L., A F. of L. Building,
Washington, D C

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: At our regular meeting January 16, your communications in regard to admitting more displaced persons was again discussed by the delegates who instructed me to write you as follows, with copy to Senators MURRAY and SPARKMAN.

"Whereas there are in the United States approximately 4,000,000 unemployed, and

"Whereas account of the vast shortage of housing to shelter the working people in the United States, and

"Whereas account of the small payments by social security to those who have reached the retirement age, they are unable to retire; and those that do must double up with friends or relatives, or go on relief: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the delegates go on record, protesting the admittance of any more displaced persons by any act of Congress, until the Congress.

"A Amend the social-security benefits to a living level of payments.

"B Pass the Sparkman bill, so that every citizen in the United States may own their home, by borrowing from our Government at a rate not exceeding 3 percent, with at least 30 years to repay principal and interest

"C. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation saved millions of citizens' homes and made a profit for the Government and the Sparkman bill would enable millions of workers to build their own homes, thus increasing the prosperity of every city in every State in the Union"

Fraternally yours,
W. J. PRIEST, *Secretary.*

MOUNT VERNON COUNCIL,
No 10, JUNIOR OUAM,
Washington, D C., January 30, 1950.

Hon PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We of Mount Vernon Council, No. 10, Junior OUAM, have read and have had read to every Junior within hearing your report on displaced persons: Facts versus Fiction. It is wonderful to think that a man who has so much to do would take the time to report to the small people his findings abroad and we would like to let you know we think everything you say is true and we are 100 percent against this kind of immigration to our beautiful America.

Senator, our organization was founded 96 years ago, and we have been fighting from the beginning to reduce the number of immigrants legally entering our country. We are reminded that prior to the beginning of World War II the number of unemployed in the United States was estimated to be about 5,000,000 and that there were about that number of aliens in our country, a majority of whom were taking jobs from citizens, and who had made no effort to become citizens. We are, therefore, opposed to any movement that will end in letting down the bars to admit any more alien refugees to this country.

This organization, as a matter of fact, is in favor of shutting off all immigration until the world has cooled off and peace has been restored everywhere. We also feel that there are many foreigners now in our midst whose actions make it appear that they are not living up to that specification.

May God give you strength, Senator, to carry on your wonderful work. You give us inspiration to fight harder with you after reading your wonderful report.

Respectfully,
MOUNT VERNON COUNCIL,
No. 10, JUNIOR OUAM.

Attest:
R C SMALLWOOD,
Recording Secretary.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *January 24, 1950.*

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Thank you for the pamphlet on displaced persons. I would appreciate a number of these copies for circulation amongst my friends.

I enclose a letter to Mr. W. W. Stevens, State legislative chairman of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers in which I ask that our local division take suitable action on the matter.

Very truly yours,
FRED C. TOWER.

DAUGHTERS OF THE
AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
State of Illinois, January 23, 1950

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: The following is a resolution reaffirmed last spring at the Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution regarding immigration:

"Whereas the economic, social, and spiritual mind of the United States is under increasing pressures and conflicts, and there is growing evidence of a determined effort by foreign blocs to break down our immigration laws, and

"Whereas the immigration laws of 1924, now threatened with change, have restricted immigration to a quota system allocating a definite number to each nationality mentioned, such allocation not to be interchangeable among quotas.

"*Resolved*, That for the purpose of protecting the interest of all our citizens, and particularly our veterans, and for the purpose of excluding foreign elements imbued with political ideologies wholly at variance with our constitutional system of government, the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution urge upon the Congress that no immigration over and above the present quota system shall be permitted into the United States, either by special legislation, unused quotas, or Executive order"

I hope you will do everything in your power to defeat H. R 4567 or any similar bill.

Sincerely yours,
HELEN R HERFURTH
(Mrs. Charles A Herfurth).

WALTER HECKLIN POST, No. 1791,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Chaska, Minn.

At the last meeting of the Walter Hecklin VFW Post 1791 the subject of displaced persons, and particularly H. R. 4567, was discussed. The members of our post were very much concerned with regard to this matter since most of them had some personal experience and contacts with displaced persons while in the service. After considerable discussion it was resolved that the post go on record as opposing any increase in the number of displaced persons now being permitted to enter into this country; that the displaced-persons laws now in effect should not be expanded but should be more rigidly enforced, that the officers of the post be directed to bring this resolution to the attention of all Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota.

Trusting that you will give the above matter your attention, we remain,

Respectfully yours,
CYRIL B. ESS,
Commander.
ALBERT A. VOJTISEK,
Quartermaster.

WENATCHEE, WASH., *February 13, 1950.*

Hon PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It is our understanding that the United States Senate is scheduled to debate H. R. 4567 soon, and we wish to register our opposition to this bill.

Very truly yours,
C K MILLER, M. D.
M G. RADEWAN, M D
L E. HILDEBRAND, M D

STATE FAIR GROUNDS POST,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
St. Paul, Minn., February 14, 1950.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C

DEAR SIR: The State Fair Grounds Post, No. 1947, Veterans of Foreign Wars, St Paul, Minn., has gone on record as being emphatically opposed to H R 4567.

Yours in comradeship,
BENJAMIN LARSON,
Adjutant.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF ALABAMA,
Montgomery, Ala., February 2, 1950.

Hon PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN. Reference is made to your letter of January 19, and you are advised that the copies of your statement on the floor of the Senate with reference to the admission of displaced persons into the United States has been received and distributed to our posts.

We have also requested our delegation in Congress not to vote for any legislation which would remove the quota limitations on immigrants into the country.

Yours very truly,
JOSEPH M. DICKERSON,
Department Adjutant.

DEFICIT SPENDING—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have made relating to deficit spending, together with tabulations.

There being no objection, the statement and tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

A REPLY TO MR. TRUMAN

The President of the United States recently gave Mr. Arthur Krock an exclusive interview of universal interest. Mr. Krock is a brilliant journalist whose dispatches are meticulously accurate. The President has confirmed the accuracy of the report.

My name was mentioned in that part of the interview relating to the Federal fiscal situation. Under the circumstances, in the interest of both accuracy and clarity, I am compelled to comment on certain of the President's statements with respect to deficit spending, taxes, and reduction of Federal expenditures.

Deficit spending

The President told Mr. Krock that "in no sense does he tolerate deficit spending." He

said "he hates deficit spending as much as HARRY BYRD ever could, and it is only a temporary condition brought on by necessities which could not be removed by any genius of statecraft known or available to him."

In the five fiscal years President Truman has been in office the budget has been balanced twice and both of these occasions were during the Eightieth Congress. In 1947 there was a surplus of nearly $1,000,000,000. In 1948 there was a surplus of $8,500,000,000. For the coming year, beginning July 1, he does not even go through the formality of proposing a balanced budget, with or without additional taxes. In fact—in his budget message, in his economic report, and in his tax message—the President has advised Congress three times since January 1 against balancing his 1951 budget. From his record it would appear that he not only tolerates deficit spending but, in effect, he also recommends it.

If the President regards chronic deficit spending during peak prosperity as a fatal menace to our form of government and free enterprise, as I do, the Federal budget would be balanced now with the full influence and prestige of his office brought constantly to bear on this objective.

The President today is the chief obstacle to balancing the budget. I feel justified in saying this because he is now urging upon Congress the adoption of a budget more than $8,000,000,000 in excess of actual expenditures in 1948. This he calls a "tight" budget and he is resisting any reductions by Congress. In our fiscal affairs the President is taking the easy course of procrastination waiting for some unspecified time in the future to do what he should and can do now.

How many times have we heard that before? President Roosevelt used to say we'll balance the budget when we get out of depression and into prosperity. Now President Truman says we'll balance the budget when prosperity is greater.

If the Federal budget can't be balanced in years such as this when income and employment are at or near their peak, when there are no domestic emergencies, and when the need for economic assistance abroad is supposed to be diminishing, when can we balance it?

How long is "only a temporary condition" mentioned by the President in referring to deficit spending? If we follow the President's recommendations, a whole generation within the coming year will have reached its majority under a deficit-financed Government. We have been on a deficit basis in all but 2 years since 1930 and the President proposes it again for the coming year. If Congress, at the insistence of the President, authorizes the expenditure of billions more than the revenue during the year beginning July 1 it is probable that the budget never will be balanced again until we go over the precipice of financial disaster.

How long can we pile new deficits on a postwar debt of more than a quarter of a trillion dollars and expect democracy and free enterprise to stand the burden? Neither can exist in insolvency.

Two years ago the Federal Government spent $34,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1948. We balanced the budget and there was a surplus. In that year, which ended only 19 months ago, when we spent $8,000,000,000 less than the $42,400,000,000 expenditure budget the President is requesting now, our economy did not disintegrate, our national defense was not impaired, and we were spending more for foreign assistance than the President now proposes. In the field of foreign spending the President in his pending budget proposes to spend $4,700,000,000 as compared to $4,800,000,000 in 1948 when total spending was $8,250,000,000 less than he now recommends.

Of the $8,250,000,000 difference between these two budgets $5,300,000,000 is for increased domestic-civilian projects, excluding foreign assistance, excluding national defense, excluding interest on the debt, and excluding the cost of veterans' programs. The President now proposes to spend $12,200,000,000 for domestic-civilian projects, with all of the exclusions just mentioned, as compared with $6,900,000,000 for domestic-civilian projects in 1948.

These figures show that domestic-civilian expenditure increases total more than the $5,100,000,000 deficit for the coming year as estimated by the President. It follows that the deficit may be attributed largely to increases in expenditures for activities and programs which are not related to past wars or future defense. Compilation of increases in the domestic-civilian categories explodes the President's contention that the budget cannot be cut because of fixed charges resulting from previous wars and the requirements of our defense in the future.

Taxes

The President told Mr Krock that "there wouldn't be any (deficit) if the Republicans had not cut the income taxes in the Eightieth Congress." He said tax changes should not be made piecemeal at any time, but they should conform to a general plan. He told Mr. Krock "this was equally true when he approved the repeal of the excess-profits taxes and he wishes he had not done this" But, he said, he was new at the job.

In his February 16 speech, the President repeated his reference to the Republican tax cut and said "much of our present financial difficulty is the result of it."

This is not the first time the President has said deficits this year and next are attributable to tax reductions by the Eightieth Congress He has also said the same thing about the deficit last year. This is another red herring of which he has made frequent use

What are the facts?

He admits his own indorsement of a $6,000,000,000 reduction in excess-profits taxes on corporations enacted in 1945 when there was a $20,000,000,000 deficit, but he blames all recent, current, and future deficits on the Eightieth Congress, which followed up his corporation-tax reduction with a $4,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 reduction in individual income taxes made effective in fiscal year 1948 when there was a surplus of $8,500,000,000.

As to his February 16 speech, the President now says the 1948 income-tax reduction was ill-timed and irresponsible, but in his state of the Union message dated January 7, 1948, he justified a 1948 income-tax reduction proposal of his own, as follows: "During this period in which the high cost of living is bearing down on so many of our families, tax adjustments should be made to adjust their burden." No tax proposal could be more piecemeal or conform less to a general tax plan than his scheme to reduce each individual's income-tax bill by $40, with its $3,200,000,000 loss in revenue to be compensated by an increase in corporate profits taxes.

This proposal urged by the President instead of the 1948 tax bill, which he criticizes so bitterly, did not have a single advocate on the Senate Finance Committee, and it never mustered sufficient appeal to be presented in the Senate as an amendment or otherwise.

Let us recapitulate the President's tax policy.

What tax proposals by the President have not been piecemeal? What tax proposals by the President constitute a general plan to which we may conform?

With respect to corporation taxes: In 1945 he indorsed the $6,000,000,000 reduction in corporation excess-profits taxes. In 1948 he proposed to restore $3,200,000,000 by increased taxes on corporate profits. In 1949 he proposed in the winter to increase corporate taxes by $4,000,000,000. In the summer he withdrew the proposal. By autumn he was talking again about increasing them. Now in the winter of 1950 he proposes to increase corporation taxes by half the amount he proposed a year ago.

With respect to individual income taxes: In 1948 the President proposed his own reduction of $40 per taxpayer, opposed the formula which was approved by both the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate, ignored the community-property amendment which had the support of both parties in Congress, and vetoed the 1948 tax bill, as passed, including the community-property-tax provision.

With respect to social-security pay-roll taxes on individuals as well as business: He proposed last year to increase them by $2,000,000,000, and this year he is proposing an increase of $1,750,000,000 In neither case would the pay-roll taxes requested for socialized medicine even begin to finance the program he proposes.

As to excise taxes: He now proposes to withdraw some, but not all, of the wartime levies.

How can private enterprise plan its expansion under such inconsistent and constantly changing tax proposals by the President of the United States? How can investors calculate their risks? How can heads of families assure their security? How can the Government keep its fiscal affairs in order?

Is it logical for the President to excuse his own approval of a $6,000,000,000 tax reduction in a deficit year and at the same time blame past, present, and future deficits on the Eightieth Congress which reduced individual taxes by a lesser amount in a surplus year?

It would seem by the record that, if throughout future years we are to blame Federal deficits on the tax reductions in some prior year, the President must assume much of this responsibility.

Expenditures

The President told Mr. Krock: Senators GEORGE and BYRD call for a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in the budget. They know it can't be done. He said he is an old hand at budget making. He told Mr. Krock he has cut the budget for fiscal year 1951 as much as can be done in consideration of the basic needs of the foreign program and the dynamic domestic economy he seeks to create and maintain.

It is gratifying to learn that the President knows the economizers have a blueprint for the budget. For years he has been saying no one would tell him where to cut it. Now, the platitude is changed to say Senator GEORGE and I know our proposals can't be accomplished. As a former Senator the President knows how difficult it is for Congress to reduce Federal expenditures without at least a sympathetic attitude by the President, and he knows it is practically impossible against open opposition by the President such as he has voiced three times this year since he sent in his new budget. Perhaps the President had this fact in mind when he said Senator GEORGE and I know it can't be done.

To the contrary, I am confident that a majority of Congress believes the budget can and should be reduced to a balance now and the fact that he is the principal obstacle will not deter determined efforts in Congress to bring this about.

I have suggested how it can be done in a budget outline detailing expenditures totaling $36,000,000,000. This reduction would be at least $6,000,000,000 under the President's requests. Senator GEORGE, a hand of nearly 30 years' experience at Federal budget making, has announced his support for such a reduction.

A $36,000,000,000 budget would be $2,000,000,000 more than the budget of 1948, which was balanced by the Eightieth Congress, whereas in comparison with 1948 figures the President proposes to increase expenditures

by over $8,000,000,000, more than half of which—I repeat for emphasis—would be in domestic-civilian expenditures unrelated in all respects to wars or rumors of wars. In this period of less than 2 years what has developed on the home-front horizon to justify an increase in domestic-civilian expenditures of nearly 100 percent?

It is not enough to say these expenditures are less in proportion to the national income than they were 10 years ago. The fact that the Federal tax-take alone out of the national income has increased 500 percent in the same 10 years is only one of the many factors which must be considered along with such a statement.

The record shows that as such programs as foreign assistance begin to expire more domestic-civilian programs are added.

The prosperity we have is suspended dangerously from the unpredictable economics of a Federal debt already more than a quarter of a trillion dollars. The President proposes that we increase the debt at the rate of nearly a half billion dollars a month. Under such a policy how long can we expect to maintain the domestic economy, the private-enterprise system or our form of government?

Democracy and freedom here and throughout the world depend upon the preservation of our solvency which is being jeopardized by growing debt and chronic deficits.

Suggested Byrd budget with comparisons

[In billions of dollars]

Expenditure categories	Fiscal year 1948 (which ended June 30, 1948), actual	Fiscal year 1950 (which will end next June 30), estimated (Jan 9, 1950, revision)	Fiscal year 1951 (which begins next July 1)	
			Byrd 36-billion-dollar budget	President's Jan. 9 proposals
I. Domestic civilian (exclusive of veterans and interest)	6 9	11 4	8 9	12 2
Social welfare, health, and security	1 9	2 3	1 9	2 7
Housing and community facilities (including RFC secondary mortgages)	.1	1 0	1 0	1 3
Education and general research	.1	.1	.1	.4
Agriculture and agricultural resources (including Commodity Credit Corporation)	.6	2 7	2 2	2 2
Natural resources	1 1	1 8	1 2	2 2
Transportation and communication (including postal deficit)	1 3	1 9	1 2	1.7
Finance, commerce, and industry	1	.2	.1	.2
Labor	2	2	2	2
General Government	1 5	1 2	1 0	1 3
II. National defense	11 0	11 1	11 3	13 5
III. Veterans	6 6	6 9	5 3	6 1
IV. Foreign	4 8	6 0	4 8	4 7
V. Interest on the Federal debt	5 2	5 7	5 7	5 6
Grand total expenditure budget [1]	34 2	43 3	36 0	42 4
Revenue	[2] 42 2	[3] 37 5	[3] 37 5	[3] 37 5
Deficit or surplus	[2] +8 0	[4] −5 5	[3] +2 0	[4] −5 1

[1] Detailed figures may not add precisely to totals due to rounding and omission of reserves
[2] Actual
[3] Maximum estimate
[4] Minimum estimate.

What the taxpayers of each of the 48 States would save by the adoption of the $36,000,000,000 Byrd budget for the fiscal year 1951, as compared with the cost to each State of President Truman's proposed $42,400,000,000 budget

State	Percent of Federal taxes borne by State [1]	Cost of Truman budget	Cost of Byrd budget	Saving under Byrd budget	State	Percent of Federal taxes borne by State [1]	Cost of Truman budget	Cost of Byrd budget	Saving under Byrd budget
United States total	100 00	$42, 439, 000, 000	$36, 000, 000, 000	$6, 439, 000, 000	Nebraska	0 86	$364, 975, 400	$309, 600, 000	$55, 375, 400
					Nevada	.13	55, 170, 700	46, 800, 000	8, 370, 700
Alabama	1 17	496, 536, 300	421, 200, 000	75, 336, 300	New Hampshire	29	123, 073, 100	104, 400, 000	18, 673, 100
Arizona	.37	157, 024, 300	133, 200, 000	23, 824 300	New Jersey	3 29	1, 396, 243, 100	1, 184, 400, 000	211, 843, 100
Arkansas	.72	305 560, 800	259, 200, 000	46, 360, 800	New Mexico	28	118, 829, 200	100, 800, 000	18, 029, 200
California	8 32	3, 530, 924, 800	2, 995, 200, 000	535, 724 800	New York	14 67	6, 225, 801, 300	5, 281, 200, 000	944, 601, 300
Colorado	80	339, 512, 000	228, 000 000	51, 512, 000	North Carolina	1 59	674, 780, 100	572, 400, 000	102, 380, 100
Connecticut	1 67	708, 731, 300	601, 200, 000	107, 531, 300	North Dakota	34	144, 292, 000	122, 400, 000	21, 892, 000
Delaware	.40	169, 756 000	141, 000, 000	25, 756, 000	Ohio	5 78	2, 452, 974, 200	2, 080, 800, 000	372, 174, 200
Florida	1 29	547, 463, 100	464, 400, 000	83, 063, 100	Oklahoma	1 17	496, 536, 300	421, 200, 000	75, 336, 300
Georgia	1 40	594, 146, 000	504, 000, 000	90, 146, 000	Oregon	1 01	411, 365, 000	374, 400, 000	66, 965, 600
Idaho	32	135, 804, 800	115, 200, 000	20, 604, 800	Pennsylvania	7 62	3, 233, 851, 800	2, 743, 200, 000	490, 651, 800
Illinois	7 59	3, 221, 120, 100	2, 732, 400, 000	488, 720, 100	Rhode Island	.59	237, 058, 400	201, 600, 000	36, 058, 400
Indiana	2 29	971, 853, 100	824, 400, 000	147, 453 100	South Carolina	.76	322, 536, 400	273, 600, 000	48, 936, 400
Iowa	1 58	670, 536, 200	568, 800, 000	101, 736, 200	South Dakota	.36	152, 780, 400	129, 600, 000	23, 180, 400
Kansas	1 15	488, 018, 500	414, 000 000	74, 018 500	Tennessee	1 37	581, 414, 300	493, 200, 000	88, 214, 300
Kentucky	1 20	509, 268, 000	432, 000, 000	77. 268, 000	Texas	4 38	1, 858, 828, 200	1, 576, 800, 000	282 028, 200
Louisiana	1 22	517, 755, 800	439, 200, 000	78, 555, 800	Utah	.34	144, 292, 000	122, 400, 000	21, 892, 000
Maine	41	186, 731, 600	158, 400, 000	28, 331, 600	Vermont	.18	76, 390, 200	64, 800, 000	11, 590, 200
Maryland	1 68	712, 975, 200	604, 800, 000	108, 175, 200	Virginia	1. 49	632, 341, 100	536, 400, 000	95, 941, 100
Massachusetts	3 40	1, 442, 926, 000	1, 224, 000 000	218, 926, 000	Washington	1 65	700, 243, 500	594, 000, 000	106, 243, 500
Michigan	4 71	1, 998, 876, 900	1, 695, 600, 000	303, 276, 900	West Virginia	.92	390, 438, 800	331, 200, 000	59, 238, 800
Minnesota	1. 86	789, 365, 400	669, 600, 000	119, 765, 400	Wisconsin	2 10	891, 219, 000	756, 000, 000	135, 219, 000
Mississippi	71	301, 316, 900	255, 600, 000	45, 716, 900	Wyoming	.18	76, 390, 200	64, 800, 000	11, 590, 200
Missouri	2 53	1, 073, 705, 700	910, 800, 000	162, 905, 700	District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska	1 48	628, 097, 200	532, 800, 000	95, 297, 200
Montana	.35	148, 536, 500	126, 000, 000	22, 536, 500					

[1] The formula used in estimating each State's share of Federal expenditures consists of 3 factors. (1) The percentage of individual income taxes collected from each State (2) the proportion of corporate income taxes borne by each State, measured by the State's percentage of the national income, and (3) the proportion of excise and miscellaneous taxes (excluding social security taxes), borne by each State, measured by the State's percentage of total population. Thus we get a picture of Federal taxes borne by, rather than collected from, each State, which we believe more nearly reflects the true distribution of the Federal tax burden Each of the 3 factors is weighted according to the percentage each tax bears of the total Federal tax revenue (1949 figures)– individual income taxes, 47.52 percent, corporation taxes, 30.42 percent, and excise and miscellaneous taxes, 22 06 percent, total, 100 percent.

Source Federal Spending Facts, prepared and published by Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Jan. 24, 1950.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 204. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche;

S. 229. An act for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.;

S. 309. An act for the relief of Gabe Budwee;

S. 321. An act for the relief of Lloyd D. Lyles;

S. 481. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Clarence Herbert Hartman, a minor;

S 563. An act for the relief of the P S. Cook Co.,

S 914 An act for the relief of Gladys Inez Greenwood,

S. 1449 An act for the relief of Robert B. Workman;

S. 1916. An act for the relief of Edna A. Bauser,

S. 1933. An act for the relief of C. L. Leffingwell and others; and

S 2520. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted devised land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from the previous day, which the Secretary will read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 231), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are employed by the Department of State. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the pending question the unanimous-consent request to proceed to the consideration of the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not necessary. The resolution comes before the Senate automatically.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Malone
Benton	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Butler	Holland	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Myers
Capehart	Ives	Neely
Chapman	Jenner	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S C	Russell
Darby	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Downey	Kilgore	Smith, N J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Stennis
Ecton	Leahy	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Taylor
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Long	Thye
Frear	Lucas	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarran	Tydings
George	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wherry
Graham	McFarland	Wiley
Green	McKellar	Williams
Gurney	McMahon	Withers
Hayden	Magnuson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 231.

FISCAL POLICIES AND THE ADMINISTRATION'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to extend my congratulations to the very able junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] for the splendid manner in which he read the immortal Farewell Address of George Washington. Other Senators have already commented upon some of the passages in that address. It is always inspiring to hear it read or to read it.

Mr. President, I agree with those who feel that many of the admonitions of Washington's Farewell Address apply to our present-day problems. The advice contained in that Address is sound and wise and should well serve as a guide to us in our present-day deliberations and decisions.

I wish to refer to only one part of the Farewell Address, which has a very persuasive appeal as related to our present situation, and I quote:

> As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it, avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear.

In view of the fiscal situation which we confront today, Mr. President, I think it is well for us to contemplate and deliberate upon some of the proposals pending at this session of Congress.

I should like to remind my colleagues and the people of the Nation that in a speech at Pittsburgh, Pa., October 18, 1932, candidate for the Presidency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, said:

> If a nation is living within its income, its credit is good If in some crisis it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms. But if, like the spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing up to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

Mr. President, I subscribe to the wisdom of that philosophy. If it was true when Mr. Roosevelt said it—and it was—it is truth now, and it cannot be lightly brushed aside by a shrug of the shoulders, relegated to oblivion by any process of mental acrobatics, or dethroned by the false ideologies of bamboozling do-gooders and reckless spenders. Any who assert that this philosophy can be so treated, in my judgment, speak with a confusion of tongues and irresponsibility. Those who are now trying in our fiscal policies to ignore and refute it may be able to crush it to earth for a season, but it will surely rise again. It cannot be destroyed. If by wanton disregard and with impudent indifference we attempt to trample beneath our feet this irrefutable and indestructible truth, we can rest assured that such an offense carries with it certain severe retributions and inescapable penalties.

We are now in the midst of a world crisis of a scope and magnitude that challenges the stability and ingenuity of our civilization. The fate of human freedom is inextricably interwoven with the destiny of our own Nation and our power and ability to meet and surmount this crisis. The responsibility is ours to provide the intelligent, dynamic leadership that will inspire and command the confidence of other nations and peoples to follow and support us in our efforts. We cannot win or make secure the peace of the world standing alone, but if, as a government and as a nation we falter and fail, human liberty will surely perish. To meet these fateful responsibilities that have been thrust upon us, we must be strong and we must keep strong by being prepared and willing to mobilize all of the moral, material, and spiritual forces that we can command. To do this, it is first necessary that we have a proper concept of what makes us strong and what are the principal ingredients or elements of our strength.

I shall not attempt to enumerate all of the factors involved, but among the few and important ones are love of freedom, eternal vigilance, fortitude, and willingness to make the sacrifices that the price of freedom requires. In another category I would place our material resources, our productive capacity, and our numerical strength. Next, but not least, is faith in God and the righteousness of our cause.

Surely the complete marshaling of all these forces would give us terrific striking power against any enemy aggressor. In the past that has been sufficient; we have succeeded in defeating all enemies who have attacked us, and we have won the final victory in every military conflict in which we have ever been engaged. But, Mr. President, we cannot complacently rely upon our past achievements and military victories for our future peace and security, nor can we safely assume that we shall always be able to mobilize all of those forces and elements of potential strength in time or sufficiently to be equal to any emergency that may confront us. Nor can we, Mr. President, keep available to us this great reservoir of power if, in flagrant disregard of the natural laws of economics and common sense, we dissipate our strength by pursuing fiscal policies that lead inevitably to insolvency.

It is in recognition of these self-evident truths, that some of us in this Chamber, along with millions of sound-thinking Americans, now entertain grave concern regarding present-day fiscal policies of our Government and the Administration's legislative program that is now before the Congress.

In some quarters of high sources and from the pen and tongue of certain columnist and radio commentator propagandists—who find a ready market for their product—those of us who are daring to advocate a reduction of Federal expenditures and warn of the dangers of continuous deficit spending and its attendant consequences are branded as "reactionaries"—whatever they mean by that term. In attempts that are made to hold us up to public ridicule as being "obstructionists" to social gains and progress, we are frequently maligned and slandered. But these indignities, coupled

with implied threats of political reprisal, will not deter or prevent us from speaking out and warning the American people of the dangerous road we are traveling and its fateful, disastrous end.

For 16 of the last 18 years our Federal Government has run a heavy deficit. In only 2 of those 18 years have Federal revenues exceeded expenditures. That means that we have continuously and tremendously increased the national debt from about $20,000,000,000 to some $256,000,000,000. We may readily concede that most of those deficits and our increased debt were occasioned by war and by the acute economic depression that preceded it. The necessity for such expenditures in a period of real crisis is not challenged; but in this postwar period of high-level national income and prosperity, spending on a scale and to the extent of creating huge annual deficits can neither be justified nor long pursued if we are to possess and maintain the economic strength and power that is essential and indispensable to our survival.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McCLELLAN I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Arkansas agree with the Senator from Oregon that in discussing the matter of economy, irrespective of what labels may be attached to people, even every liberal, if he is a true liberal, ought to be standing in these days for a balanced budget, elimination of deficit spending, and a sound tax program which will return the value of the dollar to somewhere near 100 cents?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the able Senator, except that I would not restrict it to men with labels. I would simply say that every real American who loves his country ought to be imbued with that desire and purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I made the comment I did because the Senator from Arkansas said those who were standing for elimination of deficit spending are deemed to be reactionaries and conservatives. I happen to be one who believes that every liberal, too, ought to be standing for a balanced budget and the elimination of deficit spending and a sound tax program. The Senator from Arkansas and I may disagree as to the procedure by which we should accomplish it; we may disagree as to whether we should give the President of the United States certain arbitrary powers to cut the budget at his discretion after we get through with it in the Senate: but we do not disagree, I may assure the Senator from Arkansas, as to the duty of the present session of the Congress to proceed to do those things which are necessary in order to balance the budget.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am very glad indeed to have this expression from the Senator from Oregon. I hope the general sentiment and conviction expressed will prevail among all Members of the Senate, irrespective of whether they style themselves liberals or whether they are branded as reactionaries.

When the President's budget for the present fiscal year of 1950 was submitted, on a basis of anticipated revenues and recommended expenditures, an $873,000,000 deficit was expected to accrue. The Secretary of the Treasury, however, has since reported that the deficit for the present fiscal year will probably be six times greater than was anticipated at the time the 1950 budget was submitted. Instead of the deficit being only $373,000,000 for this fiscal year, it will be $5,523,000,000.

The budget now before the Congress estimates on the basis of anticipated revenues and the President's recommended expenditures a deficit of $5,133,000,000 for fiscal 1951. That is probably an understatement of what the deficit will actually be if the Congress conforms to the budget and makes appropriations in the amounts recommended by the President.

So, Mr. President, on the basis of appropriations necessary and requested to administer existing laws and provide the governmental services they require, we have what appears to be a fixed annual deficit of $5,000,000,000 or more. Obviously then, we cannot possibly meet current obligations and balance the budget, unless we are willing to dispense with some of the governmental services that are now provided, discontinue some programs we are now supporting, and drastically reduce the costs of others.

Mr. President, that is a reasonably correct and accurate statement of the situation now existing. In other words, without our enacting any new laws, without instigating, authorizing, or appropriating for any new service or function of the Government or any new program, and without raising taxes, the prospects are that our Government under present spending policies is destined year after year to spend more than it collects in revenues, and by that process pyramid the national debt higher and higher rather than to reduce it.

But, Mr. President, that is not the whole picture. That is only one phase of our fiscal problem. There is another aspect that not only accentuates our present difficulties but which makes doubly certain they will be both enlarged and aggravated beyond any hope of solution. I refer and invite attention to the administration's legislative program which we are asked to consider and urged to enact at this session of the Congress. In view of its scope and the impact it would have upon our already strained fiscal condition, I can well understand why the President of the United States in his messages to the Congress and in public addresses to the Nation is unwilling and unable to give any reliable assurances that the budget can or will ever be balanced again. Mr. President, as I see it, we are being irrevocably committed to a program and policy of deficit spending that can have but one ending—economic collapse and national disaster.

Mr. President, in order to get as much factual and authoritative information as is presently available, I recently had the staff of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments make a survey and estimate of probable costs of some but not all of the measures now pending in the Congress to carry out the administration's legislative program. After making the study I requested, the staff prepared and submitted to me a table listing the estimated annual cost of some 15 new programs and expanded governmental services, for which legislation is now pending in the Congress and which is in conformity to and in implementation of the legislative program of the President, as submitted to the Congress in his state of the Union and other messages to it. The aggregate annual cost of these new services and programs is more than $25,000,000,000. That means, Mr. President, if the Congress carries out this legislative program and enacts these measures into law, that within the next 4 or 5 years when these new programs and services get into full operation the cost of operating the Federal Government will increase by at least $25,000,000,000 annually. The incurring of new and increased obligations to that amount will compel an annual budget in excess of $65,000,000,000 within the next 5 years. The prospect of this is frightening. It is simply a tragic example of throwing all discretion to the winds, and embarking on a fool's paradise highway to bankruptcy and destruction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the table to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Potential cost of new program legislation proposed by the President (fiscal years 1950–51)

Proposed program	Estimated initial annual cost of program	Estimated annual cost of program in full operation
SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND EDUCATION		
National health insurance	$15,000,000	$7,000,000,000
Expansion of social security	250,000,000	6,000,000,000
Industrial safety program	3,000,000	5,000,000
Aid to education	300,000,000	500,000,000
National Science Foundation	15,000,000	100,000,000
National Commission against Discrimination in Employment (FEPC)	600,000	5,000,000
Special assistance for rental and cooperative housing	10,000,000	50,000,000
Labor Extension Service	3,000,000	27,000,000
NATIONAL DEFENSE		
Universal military training	600,000,000	3,000,000,000
Housing and public works	600,000,000	1,400,000,000
St. Lawrence seaway:		
Operating costs	8,000,000	30,000,000
Construction costs	100,000,000	100,000,000
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS		
Technical assistance to economically underdeveloped areas (point 4 program)	35,000,000	500,000,000
AGRICULTURE		
Farm parity program (Brannan plan)	5,000,000,000	6,000,000,000
NATURAL RESOURCES		
Commercial production of natural resources	11,000,000	400,000,000
Incentive payments for development of minerals	70,000,000	70,000,000
Total	7,020,600,000	25,187,000,000

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am not here undertaking to discuss or pass final judgment upon the merits or lack of merits of each and all the above-proposed measures, and the additional services they would provide. Some of them I already know I am definitely opposed to. The desirability of others might well be established, the necessity for some in connection with our national defense and security may be established. But where they are only shown to be desirable, their enactment and the placing of them into operation should be deferred until such time as our fiscal condition will reasonably and safely permit us to assume the additional financial obligations that their enactment will incur. Only those, if any, that we conclude are imperative to the general welfare and indispensable to national security should be undertaken until we have been able to set the financial affairs of our Government in order and are again living within our revenues.

The foregoing table and estimates of cost of these proposed new and expanded governmental services may be assailed as being inaccurate and misleading by those who favor the program. Of course, Mr. President, everyone is entitled to his own opinion, but I accept and present them as being the best estimates of cost that can be determined at the present time.

The committee staff did not simply take these figures out of the air, and they by no means represent the highest estimates that have been made by competent authority.

In arriving at these figures the staff made a study of estimates of cost given in committee hearings by both the proponents and opponents of these measures together with estimates compiled and submitted from impartial sources. These figures do not represent either the highest or the lowest, but in most instances they range closer to the lowest than they do to the highest estimates submitted in hearings on the different bills. To enable those who are interested in evaluating these estimates, I shall ask at the conclusion of my remarks to have printed in the RECORD the identity and number of bills that are pending, covering each of the above items, together with a summary of estimates that have been submitted to committees having jurisdiction of those measures. These data, Mr. President, will reveal the source of some of the staff's information and will indicate the computation made to arrive at the annual cost of these new services and programs when in full operation.

Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious that the 15 proposals listed in the foregoing table do not cover, by any means, the entire legislative program. The table I have submitted excludes potential Federal expenditures under the various guaranty and loan programs recommended to the Congress such as the 20-year housing program, aggregating approximately $5,000,000,000 on loans to be guaranteed through the FHA and the RFC, and Federal guaranties of bank deposits through the FDIC. It also excludes the cost of the Columbia Valley Authority and the Missouri Valley Authority. In addition to these measures there are possibly hundreds of other bills now before the Congress which would add to the annual operating cost of government if they should be enacted into law.

It would be very easy, Mr. President, for Congress to increase the annual cost of government up to $65,000,000,000 or $75,000,000,000 by simply enacting at this session of Congress the legislative program which the President of the United States has submitted to us. If we do that, the Congress must assume the responsibility for the inevitable results and consequences that it will entail. There is no pressing necessity or circumstances to justify or warrant us in taking such a course. We shall not find exoneration at the bar of public opinion by attempting to invoke any alibi of excuse in mitigation of such folly.

A simple arithmetical calculation reveals that if this $25,000,000,000 program is to be enacted into law and operated on a pay-as-you-go basis, our tax burden will be increased by $166 annually for every man, woman, and child of the 150,000,000 American people. This new program of $25,000,000,000 annually, added to our present operating cost of more than $40,000,000,000, will bring the annual expenditure budget of the Federal Government up to $65,000,000,000. Another simple calculation, Mr. President, and we find that to support such expenditures on a pay-as-you-go basis will impose a tax burden of $433 anually for every man, woman, and child in America. That means, on the basis of our present national income, 30 percent of all of the earnings of the American people would be the tax take required to support the Federal Government. This, added to the amount of taxes already levied for the support of State, county, and municipal governments throughout the Nation, will make the annual tax obligation of the American people more than 40 cents out of every dollar they earn. So far as I know and can ascertain, Mr. President, only one other nation today, among the free peoples of the world, has a tax obligation in comparison, and that is England—and England, as we all know, now has an austerity standard of living which we, by gratuities of a billion dollars a year, are helping her to support.

The prospects of our traveling the road that England has taken are appalling. The Congress has the power, but I hope it does not have the will to do it. The lessons of history reject such a course. I sincerely hope the Congress will exercise courage, statesmanship, and common sense in dealing with this vital issue and will refuse to saddle upon the economy of this country and upon the already tax-burdened wage earners, producers, and consumers of this Nation this crushing burden of new legislation and taxation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, the calculations made and the sources of the information, through the staff of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to which I have previously referred.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National health insurance

S. 1679:

Initial cost	$15,000,000
When in full operation	7,000,000,000

Information concerning this program was obtained from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Federal Security Agency.

According to the various estimates that have been submitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the cost of the program, when in full operation, will vary from a minimum of $7,000,000,000 to a maximum of $15,000,000,000. Usually, the lower figure was submitted by proponents of the legislation, while the opposition's estimates were much higher.

Studies made by the Federal Security Agency, and information contained in the August issue of the Social Security Bulletin of the FSA of August 1949, indicates that this program will cost from $7,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 a year. The Council of State Chambers of Commerce estimated that national health insurance, as proposed, would cost from $5,000,000,000 to $6,500,000,000 per annum. Senator DOUGLAS estimated that the President's compulsory medical-insurance plan would cost $5,300,000,000 per year. (Washington Post, November 25, 1949.) In order to attempt to strike a conservative average, the total annual expenditure under this program has been estimated at $7,000,000,000.

Expansion of social-security program

H. R 6000, H Rept. No. 1300:

Initial cost	$250,000,000
When in full operation	6,000,000,000

There are so many unknown factors involved under this program that a reliable estimate is difficult to obtain. According to estimates available, the annual cost of the program, provided it includes extension of benefits, disability insurance, coverage for farm and domestic employees, self-employed persons, etc., will run approximately $6,000,000,000.

The staff of the House Ways and Means Committee estimates that expansion of the Social Security Act to provide additional assistance for old-age and survivors insurance, child welfare, and other purposes will cost about $256,000,000 the first year and increase to over $7,000,000,000 per annum when fully effectuated.

The Federal Security Agency has compiled figures which estimate the program cost at approximately $4,000,000,000 in 1951 and $5,000,000,000 by 1960; whereas the Bureau of the Budget estimates that with the extension of coverage proposed, including the health-insurance program and the continuation of public assistance on a more liberalized basis, would cost $2,500,000,000 in 1950, of which $1,600,000,000 comes from trust-fund accounts, and by 1960 the cost would have increased to $12,200,000,000, of which $10,000,000,000 would be paid from the trust funds established under the program and $2,200,000,000 would be paid from general revenues. The $6,000,000,000 total in the summary is, therefore, only a conservative estimate.

Industrial safety program

S. 1432, S. Rept. No. 850:

Initial cost	$3,000,000
When in full operation	5,000,000

The Industrial Safety Section of the Department of Labor submitted an estimate of $5,000,000 for the operation of this program, based on the President's recommendations for appropriations. The staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare estimates that the program, as proposed under S. 1432, would cost approximately $5,000,000, and indicated that the program could be

very broadly extended into unlimited activities which would far exceed this figure, but the Department of Labor indicated that local and State agencies would carry on these activities at no additional cost to the Federal Government.

Aid to education

S. 246, H. R 4643:
Initial cost $300,000,000
When in full operation 500,000,000

The estimates submitted in connection with this program were procured from the Bureau of the Budget and verified through the Federal Security Agency as being the best available at the present time. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress estimates, based on an article in the National Education Association Journal, that the higher-education program, not included in the estimated initial cost, would aggregate $53,000,000 in the initial year, increasing annually by the same amount through the following 3 to 4 years, for the purpose of assisting the States in maintaining and expending publicly controlled institutions of higher education. In addition, the capital outlay is estimated at $200,000,000 per annum. The President's budget estimates included only elementary and secondary education programs, estimated at $300,000,000 for the first year.

The Senate bill (S. 246) would authorize annual grants to State educational systems of $300,000,000, whereas the House bill (H. R. 4643) would authorize $314,000,000 per year. The Office of Education advises that if the administration's proposal became law $261,000,000 would be allocated to the States. This Office further advised that in subsequent years under present economic conditions the cost should decrease about $25,000,000. If unemployment should increase and the States are unable to increase their support, Federal aid would increase substantially.

The Council of State Chambers of Commerce reported that this program would cost $750,000,000 annually, with a potential top figure of $2,000,000,000.

National Science Foundation

S. 247, S. Rept. No. 90:
Initial cost $15,000,000
When in full operation 100,000,000

The President estimated that an appropriation of $2,500,000 and $12,500,000 of contract authority would be required to establish the organization. Sponsors of the legislation creating the NSF find it difficult to forecast what the annual expenditure will be after the program gets under way, since there are several important intangibles to be considered.

The estimate of $100,000,000 is ultraconservative, but was supplied by the Bureau of the Budget as being the most accurate estimate that could be procured. The President's Scientific Research Board recommended annual appropriations of $50,000,000 for basic research, outside of the Foundation's own laboratories, in the initial stages of the program, and estimates that the total annual cost of this phase of the program would exceed $250,000,000 by 1953. The extent of the scholarship phase will depend on authorizations granted by Congress, and the figures shown in the summary are estimated to cover the present proposed program. Including scholarships, research expenditures, and other phases of the program, the total will approximate $350,000,000 annually.

National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment (FEPC)

S. 1211:
Initial cost $600,000
When in full operation 5,000,000

The potential operations cost figure included in the summary, of $5,000,000, is based on information obtained from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Bureau of the Budget, and other sources. It is based on the cost of the old FEPC program, and on the further assumption that operation of the law will be effectuated without enforcement set-ups and necessitating only isolated prosecutions. The amount indicated will be required to meet the needs for establishing State and local offices, legal and investigating staffs, etc., and if opposition is encountered to the operation of the law, the cost may go as high as $10,000,000 and, under serious stress and actual general opposition, any estimate of annual cost would be a mere guess.

The cost of administering the Wages and Hours Act, a somewhat comparable operation to the enforcements proposed in the FEPC bill, carries a budget request of $10,567,000 for fiscal year 1951.

Special assistance for rental and cooperative housing

S 2246:
Initial cost $10,000,000
When in full operation 50,000,000

This program is intended to provide additional housing for the middle income group of American wage earners. It provides for establishing a corporation in the Housing and Home Finance Agency empowered to issue capital stock to be purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury in amount of $100,000,000, and to issue capital stock to cooperative borrowers in the amount of $50,000,000 but not to exceed $300,000,000. The President may increase the capital stock issued after July 1, 1951, to $1,700,000,000.

No estimates are available as to how much will be obligated or expended during fiscal year 1951 but if this proposal becomes law it is quite likely that from ten to fifty million dollars will be expended from the United States Treasury each year without giving any consideration to administrative costs, or losses which may accrue by an increase in unemployment, or a slump in real-estate values.

Labor Extension Service

S. 110, H. R. 1380:
Initial cost $3,000,000
When in full operation 27,000,000

The President, in his state of the Union message of January 4, recommended the establishment of a Labor Extension Service in the Department of Labor which would administer a program providing for the training of wage earners in the principles of writing collective-bargaining agreements, labor-management relations, research, and other related subjects.

The program is intended to operate in the same manner as the Agricultural Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. Certain colleges and universities would be given Federal aid for providing classroom study and lectures in these subjects, to be conducted at night, or on Saturdays, to aid in the education of wage earners. Using the appropriation for the Agricultural Extension Service as a basis for estimating similar operations proposed under this program, the cost would approximate $28,000,000 per annum.

Universal military training

S 66:
Initial cost $600,000,000
When in full operation 3,000,000,000

Information obtained from the Bureau of the Budget, Senate Appropriations Committee, Committee on Armed Services, and the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, and other sources, indicates that this program will probably reach a total annual expenditure of $3,000,000,000, depending on the extent of the program, length of the training period, and the equipment provided. The estimates vary all the way from $1,500,000,000 to $3,000,000,000, but when the establishment and operation of military training facilities in connection with the program are included, it appears that the $3,000,000,000 figure is conservative. That, I believe, is the accepted figure as to the potential annual cost of this program when fully activated.

This program has been temporarily suspended and a policy of selective-service registration adopted instead, but it still remains as a part of the President's program.

Military housing and public works

S 2440, S. 960, etc.:
Initial cost $600,000,000
When in full operation 1,400,000,000

This program was intended to authorize the construction of multiple and other dwelling units for housing military personnel on duty at Army, Navy, and Air Force stations throughout the United States, its possessions, and at certain overseas stations.

The construction and alteration of buildings at Army, Navy, and Air Force stations for storage purposes, research and development work, and various other public-work projects, such as wind-tunnel buildings, radar- and air-warning sirens, long-range proving grounds (for guided missiles), Alaska housing, Okinawa housing and repair, National Guard armories, and the Alaska communications system.

The Army, Navy, Air Force public-works bill recently approved by the Senate authorizes $504,000,000. Other related projects are estimated to involve annual expenditures approaching $1,500,000,000.

St. Lawrence seaway

S. J. Res. 99:
Initial cost:
Operating costs $8,000,000
Construction costs 100,000,000
When in full operation:
Operating costs 30,000,000
Construction costs 100,000,000

The staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations advises that the cost of this project will depend on several factors such as the depth and width of the canal, the size and number of power units installed, etc. Some of the witnesses, including prominent engineers, have estimated that the total cost would run to approximately $1,000,000,000 and would require an estimated 10 years for completion. It has also been estimated that the operating costs after completion would run as high as $50,000,000 annually.

The Council of State Chambers of Commerce has estimated that the project would cost $8,000,000 in the first year and $100,000,000 annually thereafter until completion. The Bureau of the Budget estimates that the total cost will not exceed $573,000,000.

Technical assistance to economically underdeveloped areas (point 4 program)

H R. 6834:
Initial cost $35,000,000
When in full operation 500,000,000

This program of technical assistance to economically underdeveloped areas of the world will enable the peoples of these areas to learn, and to adapt to their own needs, modern technological and scientific knowledge in such fields as agriculture, health, education, transportation, and industry.

The Department of State estimated that if this program is approved $65,000,000 will be expended during the first year, and about $100,000,000 per annum when in full operation.

The staff of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs advised that an amortization of $35,000,000 for the first year, and its annual cost thereafter cannot be determined with any degree of accuracy. This is equivalent to a world-wide WPA project, and may run into billions of dollars, and the estimated potential cost of $500,000,000 per annum is considered to be conservative.

Farm parity program (Brannan plan)

S. 2318, H. R. 5345 (Public Law No. 439):

Initial cost	$5,000,000,000
When in full operation	6,000,000,000

Opponents of the Brannan plan indicated that it would cost the American taxpayers $20,000,000,000 a year. Secretary Brannan countered in a speech before the Farm Grange that this amount was too high, but did not state what he thought it would cost.

He testified before the House Committee on Agriculture that the Brannan plan would not cost any more than the price-support plan which is presently in effect. Other authorities on farm parity have indicated that the Brannan plan would cost from five to ten billion dollars per annum, and former Secretary of State Byrnes indicated that socialized medicine and the Brannan farm plan would cost $12,000,000,000 annually. Technicians and specialists employed by the Legislative Reference Service have estimated that from studies conducted by them it is believed that the Brannan plan would cost between five and ten billion dollars each year

Commercial production of natural resources

S. 6 (1950 budget, p M70):

Initial cost	$11,000,000
When in full operation	400,000,000

The Department of the Interior indicated that the bill may be amended to authorize advance of public funds for operating expenses in order to obtain for Government use special products not available commercially, or to bear the cost of plant operations during an emergency.

It is intended to encourage and facilitate the production of synthetic liquid fuel so that in the event of a national emergency adequate supplies will be available for both military and civilian use

This proposal is intended to authorize the RFC to make loans to persons proposing to construct synthetic liquid fuel plants with a daily capacity of at least 5,000 barrels. It requires the Secretary of the Interior to study and appraise the action taken by private industry in the construction of such plants, if they fail to conform to the program, he will certify to the RFC, with approval of the National Security Resources Board, that additional plants of 30,000 barrels daily be constructed, and the RFC shall undertake, under contracts with private industry, to construct and operate such plants as the Secretary of the Interior may specify.

The first year cost is estimated at $11,000,000, increasing successively each year until the fourth year when it is expected to reach $400,000,000. The Department of the Interior further estimated that $650,000,000 will be expended during the first 6 years of activation of the program, of which about $1,000,000 will be required for administrative expenses.

Incentive payments for development of minerals

S 2105 (1950 budget, p M70):

Initial cost	$70,000,000
When in full operation	70,000,000

This program provides for the establishment of a Minerals Conservation Board consisting of the Secretaries of Interior, Defense, Commerce, and Treasury.

The program is intended to stimulate exploration for, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals. If enacted into law, a producer could apply to the Secretary of the Interior for financial assistance to facilitate exploration and production of strategic and critical minerals.

The Department of the Interior estimated that $70,000,000 would be expended during the first year for both administrative and direct aid to explorers and developers.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 231) to investigate whether there are employees in the State Department disloyal to the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 231.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Malone
Benton	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Butler	Holland	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Myers
Capehart	Ives	Neely
Chapman	Jenner	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S C	Russell
Darby	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Downey	Kilgore	Smith, N J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Stennis
Ecton	Leahy	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Taylor
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Long	Thye
Frear	Lucas	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarran	Tydings
George	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wherry
Graham	McFarland	Wiley
Green	McKellar	Williams
Gurney	McMahon	Withers
Hayden	Magnuson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the resolution goes to the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 231.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 231) to investigate whether there are individuals in the State Department disloyal to the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I make a parliamentary inquiry as to whether, if I ask to have my amendment considered, it would be in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Amendments are in order.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to proceed with a very brief discussion of my amendment, and I desire to have it considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I should like first to make a statement with regard to certain modifications in the amendment.

In my discussion of the amendment yesterday I said that all hearings conducted by the committee should be public hearings. I used the term "hearings" as a lawyer would use it. I took it for granted that it would be assumed to mean the taking of evidence and testimony in regard to any charges of disloyalty leveled against any particular individual. That, of course, is the meaning of the word "hearings" as a matter of law when used in a resolution such as the one under consideration.

There is nothing in the amendment intended to prevent the Foreign Relations Committee from meeting in executive session to decide on the procedure it wishes to follow in conducting the investigation. There is nothing which would prevent the Foreign Relations Committee, to use the analogy mentioned yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], from functioning in executive session as a sort of grand jury. What my amendment seeks to do—and I think it is fundamental—is to guarantee that any charges of disloyalty brought against an individual shall be heard in public when it comes to taking evidence and testimony in respect to those charges.

The revised wording of my amendment as I should like to submit it, Mr. President, is this:

On line 6, before the word "The" insert the following: "All hearings conducted by the committee for the purpose of taking evidence and testimony on any charges of disloyalty against any individual shall be public hearings."

Since I have been a Member of the Senate I have been involved in debates and controversies on some very important issues, but I should like to say for the record that I do not believe I have ever raised my voice since I became a Senator on any matter so fundamental to the preservation of the liberties and the freedoms of the American people as the amendment for which I am fighting in this instance.

As I indicated yesterday afternoon, I am greatly alarmed over certain trends in this country. The road we are following will lead to limiting more and more the basic judicial guaranties of American citizens, one of which is that charges leveled against them shall be proved in public hearings, so the great public can be the judge. After all, it is the public behind the court system of America which makes our system of American justice work. Our free press should always have available to it a public record of the evidence and the testimony on the basis of which any tribunal is asked to convict a citizen of a crime or a wrong. In turn every citizen should have the right to present his defense and rebuttal evidence in public. In this instance fellow citizens are being charged with what I consider to be as heinous a crime as there can be, because when we boil the charge down to its real meaning, these persons are in fact being charged with treason. If there are traitors or disloyal workers in the Federal Government, I want them weeded out. But I am such a firm believer in American judicial processes that I am convinced that innocence or guilt can be established by the existing procedures and under the existing rules of evidence which characterize the great American judicial system. I cannot think of any sound reason for saying that any citizen of this country accused of being disloyal or traitorous

to the Government should not be heard in public.

The resolution in fact amounts to the establishment of a special committee, because the Foreign Relations Committee in this instance would function as a special committee under the direction and mandate of the Senate. In my view, we not only have the right but we have the duty to say to the Foreign Relations Committee: "Because these charges are so serious and because they are so vital to the security of the American people, we, the Senate of the United States, insist that a procedure be followed whereby the taking of evidence and testimony on any charges brought against any person under this resolution shall be in a public hearing, as we use that term in the law."

Mr. President, I shall not take the time to read from the legal dictionary which I have in front of me. I believe Senators will take my word for it. A "hearing" means in this instance the taking of evidence and testimony in connection with charges leveled against persons accused of crime, as applied in this instance——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. President, it is not an unfair limitation on the Foreign Relations Committee, if we say, "After the Committee has met in executive session, and has become convinced that it should go forward with the investigation of specific charges against Mr. X or Miss Y, the taking of evidence and testimony on that particular case or those particular cases shall be in a public hearing, so that the gentlemen of the free press, so that the American public, so that those representing the American radio, can bring the information to the American people, who then will be in a position to judge for themselves whether the Government of the United States is being termited and undermined by disloyal persons."

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the position now taken by the able Senator is just a little different from what I understood it to be last evening when he submitted his amendment. He has now made a fuller explanation of what the amendment means.

I appreciate the argument he is making now, because he says to the Foreign Relations Committee, as I think is correct, that it has the right, under his amendment, to go into executive session and, in executive session, consider the charges, and if the Foreign Relations Committee feels that some person is guilty of being disloyal to the Government, then the hearings should be held in the open, after the committee makes that decision.

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly what I meant by hearings yesterday. I believe the Senator is correct. I did not make my position clear as to the type of hearing I had in mind. What I am saying is that the Foreign Relations Committee can hold all the meetings it wants to hold in executive session respecting what procedure it is going to follow in getting the hearings started. But I assume, and I believe not wrongly, that as the result of the serious charges made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] the Foreign Relations Committee is going to proceed to take evidence and testimony with respect to certain individuals in the State Department and elsewhere in the Government who it may find should be charged with disloyalty. I say that when the committee decides that it should proceed with an investigation of such charges in respect to any individual, and begins to take evidence and testimony in respect to the formal charges, we should make it clear that the committee must proceed in the sunshine of open publicity so that all of us can pass judgment on whether or not there is even probable cause for believing that a particular individual charged with disloyalty is guilty, and also so that every person who may be charged in such hearings may have the right—and I insist it is a precious right—to stand up before the American public and present in public his case in reply and answer those who seek to make out of him a disloyal and traitorous person.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos of the question raised by the majority leader calling the attention of the junior Senator from Oregon to the amendment which he has offered, I will say that the wording of the amendment, I believe, confirms the original understanding of the majority leader, rather than the more complete statement which is now being made by the Senator from Oregon, because the wording of the amendment is "before the word 'the' insert the following: 'all hearings conducted by the committee shall be public hearings'."

That wording of the amendment would indicate that there need not be executive hearings of the type which the Senator has now pointed out, quite properly, in his judgment should be held to consider the preliminary phases of such an investigation.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from California. I believe he is correct in stating that the junior Senator from Oregon last night should have defined what he meant by "hearings," and should have made clear that he was using the term "hearings" in its legal sense, and its dictionary sense. In that sense it is the taking of evidence and testimony in respect to charges leveled against an individual, as in this instance, in regard to which a committee has taken jurisdiction. It is only that type of hearing that I insist ought to be public.

I have modified my amendment, I say again for the record, and so that the Senator from California may understand the modification, it is as follows:

All hearings conducted by the committee for the purpose of taking evidence and testimony on any charges of disloyalty against any individual shall be public hearings.

That language in no way limits the committee in its executive sessions to deciding how it wants to proceed with its investigations, and against whom it wishes to proceed with its investigations.

So there may be no misunderstanding, let us suppose that in executive session the committee decides that it is satisfied there is not even any probable cause for proceeding against Mr. X. That ends it. But if the committee decides that there is probable cause to proceed against Mr. X, or Miss Y, then I say that individual ought to be proceeded against in public hearings. The preliminary investigation can be made in executive session, but any hearing involving the taking of evidence and testimony insofar as formal charges are concerned must be a public hearing under my amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator in the course of his remarks is going to discuss the problem that may arise respecting the FBI. Let us assume that the FBI has an undercover man as it did in the New York Communist trial, which, of course, was a different situation because the individuals were being proceeded against for violating the laws of the country. Suppose the FBI has an undercover man who is currently working in a Communist cell. Is not the problem presented, that the causing of that witness to come before the committee in open session may destroy the effectiveness of the FBI in uncovering Communist apparatus that may be existing in a far more extensive fashion than it is involved in the respect to one particular person?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator from California raised the point. It is so fundamental that we simply have to face the issue. I think the findings of the FBI can be submitted in the public hearing, and the committee would be under no obligation or duty in that instance to bring the FBI informant before the committee. But I want to say to the Senator from California that we must be protected even from evidence submitted by the FBI that cannot be submitted to the test of cross-examination in an American courtroom. If the reports of the FBI are not in such evidentiary shape as to be usable in an open hearing then they should not be accepted by the committee as a basis for finding a person to be disloyal. I insist that treason and disloyalty should be established by evidence that can stand up under the rules of evidence essential to giving our citizens a fair trial within the meaning of our Constitution.

I say here and now that I do not believe there is a single Communist or disloyal person in this Government whose communism and disloyalty cannot be established under existing American judicial procedures without relying upon evidence, the source of which cannot be disclosed, or upon witnesses who cannot be brought before an American

citizen accused of crime, and subjected to cross-examination. I do not believe it is the intention of the FBI—and no one has a greater admiration for the great director of the FBI than the junior Senator from Oregon—that any of its so-called information shall be used in the darkness of secrecy to convict persons of treason without giving them an opportunity to examine that evidence.

Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. FERGUSON rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in a moment. I believe the Senator placed his finger on something which is going to determine whether or not in American judicial procedure we are going down the line of a police-state procedure, or whether we are going to keep open the courtrooms and the hearing rooms of America as contemplated by the procedures established by the founding fathers when the Constitution itself was penned. I cannot reconcile with the constitutional concept of a fair trial any position that will keep in the darkness of star-chamber proceedings of a Senate committee so-called information or evidence submitted to the committee, the source of which we cannot check. I say it is not fair to the accused. It is still pretty good American doctrine that it is better to have the guilty go free than to have one single citizen sentenced for a crime he did not commit.

Mr. President, there is a great danger in the way evidence is being used, particularly by congressional committees these days, in respect to protecting the innocent. I believe we can weed out Communists by a procedure that can stand the test of a cross-examination process carried on in a public hearing. I may say to my good friend from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that I believe that what the FBI can offer which will be of help to the committee can be offered in an open hearing. If it cannot be, then I believe we had better use some other investigation process. We had better use some other means—means that can stand the test of an open hearing—of checking and testing Communists, so we can get them out in the open.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I simply wish to call to the Senator's attention the fact that he used the words "the findings of the FBI." The FBI makes no findings. It has never made any findings. If I correctly understand the testimony of Mr. Hoover before the Appropriations Committee, he does not want ever to be placed in the position of making findings. All the FBI does is to collect evidence and submit it to its chief, I assume, the Attorney General, or to whomever it is to be submitted. It makes no findings and reaches no conclusions.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. If I used the term "findings" in connection with the FBI, I used it in error. I am saying to the Senator from Massachusetts, however, that whatever evidence or statement the FBI thinks the Senate committee should use in reaching its findings in answer to the question as to whether a given employee is a Communist or is disloyal to the Government, should stand the test of a public hearing. If that kind of procedure is not followed, in my judgment we are going to play into the hands of those who in the not far distant future will be favoring some rather definite star-chamber proceedings, which, to me, spell a repetition of the type of police-state methods in Germany against which we so notably fought.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under the La Follette-Monroney Act, the law under which we are now proceeding, the committee is required to hold the hearings in public, except where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session. Would not the Senator from Oregon trust the judgment of the committee or the subcommittee which hears this matter in determining that question for itself?

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that it is not a question of trusting the judgment of a Senate committee. When we provide for an investigation such as this—which is going to be historic in nature, in my judgment—it is a question of whether we think it is in the interest of sound public policy to say it shall be the policy of the Senate in such cases to have a public hearing for the purpose of taking evidence and testimony.

As the Senate I think we have a right—I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts does not question it—to express ourselves on this question of public policy; and I think it would be salutary for the entire country to have the Senate go on record today in support of the proposition that when it comes to taking testimony and evidence against fellow citizens, in respect to their loyalty or charges of treason, the proceedings shall be conducted in open hearing.

Mr FERGUSON, Mr. KNOWLAND, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, who first asked that I yield to him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in order to have in the RECORD an interpretation of the Senator's amendment, let me inquire whether he would consider that an open hearing would be required in case the committee desired to see the file—only the file—of the State Department concerning a certain individual?

Mr. MORSE. I think that goes to a question of procedure which would not involve a public hearing at all.

Mr. FERGUSON It would not involve a public hearing?

Mr. MORSE. No. What the committee does with the files afterward may involve a public hearing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I wish to have the RECORD clear on that point. Suppose that under the charges of the Senator from Wisconsin, who has indicated that the records of the State Department's security file show certain facts, the committee first wished to see that file, and subpenaed it. Would that hearing have to be an open hearing?

Mr. MORSE. That would not have to be an open hearing. But let us consider the situation after the committee obtained the file. Suppose the committee examined it, and the committee members concluded that we have in the State Department a person whom the file shows obviously has been guilty of such and such disloyal conduct, and that that person should not be employed further by the State Department. At that point the committee would be proceeding against that individual in personam, as we say; and I think at that point he is entitled to a public hearing to answer charges which the committee feels would, if proved, justify his dismissal from the State Department. When it comes to the point that an individual is involved, and action may be taken against him as an individual, he should have the advantage of being able to answer the charges in public.

Mr. KNOWLAND and other Senators addressed the Chair

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield now to the Senator from California, to whom I previously promised to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr President, I think the Senator from Oregon is clearing up somewhat, in answer to these questions, what has been in the minds of some of us in regard to his amendment.

But at the moment I still am not in agreement with the Senator from Oregon in respect to the way in which he compares as parallel cases the proceedings in a court of law where a person is subject to being sent to jail or heavily fined, or fined at all, and the investigative responsibilities of the Senate of the United States.

I wish to call the attention of the able Senator to the fact that, although it is not a parallel case, yet the Canadian Royal Commission proceeded in executive session until it had followed the entire Communist apparatus in Canada, before it had any public hearings—in fact, I doubt whether it had any public hearings at all—or before it released the testimony taken by it and its findings and a statement of what had taken place.

Had it proceeded on a basis of public hearings, it is quite possible that the Canadian spy ring might never have been uncovered, because of the fact that a chain reaction is set off. The fact that one person was brought before the committee might disclose to other persons who were connected with him that the committee was hot on the trail, and therefore they could either disappear or could make themselves unavailable.

Because I know the Senator from Oregon is as interested as anyone else is in uncovering anything improper which may exist, if anything of that nature does exist in the Government, I feel sure that he does not wish to have us obstruct at its inception the possibility of finding out just what the facts are.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is the last argument of the Senator from California, in respect to what might have happened in Canada if there had been a

public hearing, with which the Senator from Oregon does not agree.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on that point, I wonder whether the Senator will yield to me, in order to permit me to clear up that matter.

Mr. MORSE. First, I should like to complete my answer to the Senator from California.

I wish to say that the evidence in regard to the charges against these employees in the State Department referred to by number in the speech by the Senator from Wisconsin exists now; if it exists at all, it is in being now. The committee can proceed in executive session to consider what is presented to it, for the purpose of determining whether that information justifies the holding of a public hearing. The question whether the evidence which is brought to the committee or the evidence which, to their knowledge, is available, is evidence which should result in the filing of charges against a certain individual, will be for the committee to determine. It may reach those decisions in executive session under my amendment. However, I say that when the committee reaches the point of decision that probable cause exists for proceeding against a certain individual on a charge of disloyalty then let it conduct its hearing in public. Let it do so by way of taking testimony and evidence in public, in keeping with what I think is a rather fundamental right in this country, namely, the right to be protected from false accusations in so-called star-chamber proceedings, against which the accused has no way of protecting himself, unless he can draw out the charges in the full glare of a public hearing.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that exactly what the Senator from California suggested about the Canadian spy ring case did occur. One of the two chief malefactors in that case, one of the two chief criminals who sold out their country, goes scot free today because after publicity was given, the only connecting witness who could hook up the treacherous conduct of that man became unavailable, for various reasons, and the Canadian commission had to dismiss the case against a man who was clearly and palpably criminally negligent in regard to the Canadian spy ring.

I am not arguing the point one way or the other; but that exact situation occurred One man was convicted of treason. The other man, who is equally guilty, goes free today because the witness to convict him became unavailable when publicity was given.

Mr. MORSE. I think the statement of the Senator from Iowa suggests its own obvious answer, in my judgment, namely, a rather inefficient trial group, a rather inefficient police group, a rather inefficient prosecutor group functioned in that case if they failed to hold their witnesses for public trial. The argument implied in the statement of the Senator from Iowa is, I think, very dangerous, in this respect: We are hearing justification advanced for the use in this country, of so-called undercover techniques for bringing persons to judgment outside of an open trial. Wire tapping is a perfectly good example of it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to clear up that point.

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield after I finish this statement.

I say that I think the weakness of the argument of the Senator from Iowa is that he should be supporting a stronger prosecuting system, a stronger police system, and a stronger investigating system in advance of the public trial.

But when we reach the point of preparing to pass judgment on the question of whether a certain individual is or is not guilty of disloyalty to his government, then I say that, in the name of the American public trial system, let us not go behind closed doors or adopt star-chamber proceedings. I do not accept the assumption of the Senator from California and the Senator from Iowa in regard to the Canadian situation at all. Apparently the Canadians did not do a very good job of getting their case prepared if they let witnesses slip through their fingers or get away from them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to clear up that point, because the Senator from Oregon is utterly misinterpreting what I said.

Mr. MORSE. If I did, I had no intention of doing so, I may say to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I specifically stated that I was not arguing the merits or demerits of that procedure; I was merely verifying the fact that in the Canadian spy ring case, a circumstance which was suggested by the Senator from California did occur, in fact. The merits or demerits of the conduct of that case, I may at some later date discuss. At the moment, I am not discussing the righteousness of their procedure or the particular methods by which they proceeded.

I was merely verifying the existence of the fact; I was not presenting an argument either for or against it. I have my own views in regard to wire tapping, and I have my own views in regard to investigative methods. At this time I do not care to discuss them or to be understood as discussing them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that I had no intention of misinterpreting his remarks. I say to him that I think the preparation of the case is one thing; the procedure that is to govern the trial is quite another thing. It is with respect to the procedure governing the trial itself that I am raising my voice here today, because I want that procedure to be one which requires a public hearing. I do not want any secrecy or action behind closed doors, because to try these persons behind closed doors would, I think, jeopardize certain basic American freedoms.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment, Mr. President. I am also of the opinion that we can establish the guilt of these persons without secret hearings or secret trials. I have so much faith in our American system of justice as to be convinced that in America it is possible in the case of anyone who in fact is guilty of treason to proceed against him in an open courtroom, with proper investigation preceding the trial, and to convict him. I have tried to make it clear that I assume the investigation has been made or, if it has not been made, it will be made, in respect to the persons who have been charged by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] with disloyalty, and that when the evidence is ready for presentation, it will be presented in an open public hearing. That is the weight of my argument, and that is all there is to my argument. My amendment in no way limits the committee in its investigation preceding the actual trial, but does provide that the taking of evidence and testimony in respect to the individual charged shall be in a public hearing.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. MUNDT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, and then I will yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure I understand the Senator, but I want to make as clear as possible his view of the procedure he is discussing. If the Foreign Relations Committee should decide to hold an executive session on A, let us say, they would be permitted in executive session to take testimony against A on the question of his alleged disloyalty. Then, after having taken all the testimony they could find against A, if the committee reached the conclusion that A was guilty of disloyalty, it is at that point that the Senator says their verdict would not be sufficient, but that A must be given an opportunity to defend himself in public. Am I correct?

Mr. MORSE. If a Government official, X, brought a file to the committee in executive session, told the committee he believed that probable cause existed against A on the ground of disloyalty, and the committee in executive session looked at the file and a majority voted "we think so, too," then I say at that point—and that is the point where there arises the question of judging the innocence or guilt of an employee—at that point, evidence and testimony shall be taken in a public hearing in order to establish either the guilt or innocence of the accused.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure I understand the Senator. Will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the amendment would in no wise deny the Committee on Foreign Relations the right in executive session to take all the

testimony it wanted to take, in order to ascertain definitely——

Mr. MORSE. Whether the committee wants to proceed with the charge?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Of course.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. MUNDT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I promised to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with that explanation of the amendment, it seems to me it may well be a procedure which could be generally supported by Members of the Senate. The thing which disturbs me is, I cannot make the language of the Senator's amendment conform with his explanation. It seems to me the amendment should be rewritten somewhat to make clear the position the Senator has now explained in answer to questions by the majority leader. What the Senator is endeavoring to do, as I understand, is to make sure no one who has been publicly accused, or whose name has been publicly brought into the matter as a result of the hearing, shall be denied the right to respond publicly. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. I think probably the difference between us is over the definition of the word "hearing" in contrast to the word "investigation." My amendment reads in terms of a hearing, and when I use the word "hearing," I am using it technically to refer to the hearing to be held with respect to an individual accused of a certain offense.

Mr. MUNDT. In the process, however, the committee is going to have to meet in executive session, is it not?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; for purposes of investigation.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; for purposes of investigation I do not think we should deny the committee that right.

Mr. MORSE. I do not deny it that right.

Mr MUNDT. I completely agree with the Senator's statement of the principles, in the manner in which he has defined them in response to questions by the majority leader. It sounds like a very correct procedure. But I am afraid the language in the Senator's amendment itself does not make that clear.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The proposal now made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon is quite different from that contained in the original amendment. I understand what the Senator is trying to accomplish. I think it is a laudable purpose. But I believe it is very important that the language of the amendment be very carefully scrutinized. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator, in line with what he has said to the majority leader in the last few minutes, would accept an amendment, or would rewrite his amendment, to read as follows: "Any person charged with disloyalty by or before the Foreign Relations Committee shall have the right to a public hearing by said committee." That, I believe, would take care of the actual taking of testimony directed to the charges. It would make it clear that the committee could have private hearings in connection with its study and investigation of the entire subject, and it would not drag into the public notice accusations, charges, and rumors which have no substantiation, because there is no proof to sustain them. Such a provision, however, would give the right to every man accused, by or before the Foreign Relations Committee, the right to be heard in public.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon are apart at all in the objective we seek, but I wonder whether it would help clarify the RECORD if I put it this way: The committee has full authority to proceed with what in law we call a preliminary investigation or a preliminary examination of the question as to whether probable cause exists, or whether a prima facie case exists for bringing a charge against Mr. X or Miss Y. My only point—and that is why I used the technical term "hearing"—is that when a hearing is begun for the purpose of taking the evidence and testimony on a charge made against an individual, it should be in public. In my judgment, in this instance, a charge is not made until the Foreign Relations Committee brings out of its executive session a list of names of persons who, in the opinion of the committee, ought to be tried or heard on the question of their loyalty. It is at that point I say the hearings should be public, and I think it is only fair to the individuals to make the hearings public at that point.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is what I was trying to accomplish by this qualifying suggestion. I am afraid that unless the wording of the amendment is very clear, some question may arise with regard to the public character of the original hearings.

Mr. MORSE. May I read my revised amendment again to the Senator? Then, after I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, I shall take my seat and I shall then have a consultation with the Senator from New York, if we are unable to agree from the floor.

The revised amendment reads:

All hearings—

When I am referring to hearings, it should be remembered I am talking about hearings to take evidence and testimony on a charge made against an individual; that is the only kind of hearing I have in mind—

All hearings conducted by the committee for the purpose of taking evidence and testimony on any charges of disloyalty against any individual shall be public hearings.

If the Senator will keep in mind the sense in which I use the word "hearings," not covering the so-called preliminary examination or investigation into the question as to whether probable cause or prima facie evidence exists for bringing charges, then I think my amendment accomplishes the same purpose which he suggests. Certainly the RECORD in explanation of my amendment would by now accomplish the purpose for the benefit of the committee. My amendment would in no way estop the committee from going into executive session and looking into whatever records or information might be brought to the committee on the question as to whether the committee should bring charges of disloyalty against any particular individual. But, once it decides to bring the charges, then I think the hearings should be public.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The first thing I should like to ask is, Is it the Senator's intention that all the records which would be available, whether held by one Federal agency or by another—and when I say one or the other, I mean that no file should be separated, but every document in the file should be made available to the committee having the responsibility of investigating—should be used by the committee in the preliminary investigation, in secrecy or in executive session, so that no one would become familiar with or have access to the file, except committee members and whoever may be their counsel, so none of the documents would be held out? The committee could do that in secret, and if they then determined that there was a justification on the part of the committee to hold official hearings, the hearing must be conducted in public. Is that the Senator's intention?

Mr. MORSE. I shall answer the Senator from Minnesota, and I want the Senators from Massachusetts and California to listen to me very carefully in my answer to that question because I think it is very fundamental.

Mr. THYE. I should like to make a further comment before the Senator answers. We are dealing with a philosophy and ideology. This is not like a criminal action, for example, a case involving murder or theft, in which the evidence may be connected with tangibles and physical things. We are dealing here with an ideology which justifies perjury and every conceivable method of concealing identity, such being considered an honorable and laudable thing in the society in which the witnesses may travel and associate themselves For that reason, we have a different problem here.

Mr. MORSE. I understand.

Mr. THYE. It is different from what ordinarily would be found in a criminal case. So the thought I have in mind is whether any Federal agency could hold back any of the documents or factual material in the files when they were submitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for examination in executive session.

Mr. MORSE. I quite agree with the Senator from Minnesota. When we are dealing with communism we confront an

ideology so detestable that, as I have said before, there is not anything to which a Communist will not stoop in order to gain his ends. I hate it so much that I want to show that democratic processes are superior to it and that we can defeat it through democratic processes. I do not want to make even a gesture to the police-state methods of Russia. I do not want to use secret hearings in America to establish the communism of a disloyal person in this country. I do not think we have to do that. I think we are dealing with the type of situation which we frequently meet in criminal-law cases, when we know there is obtained from illegal sources which cannot be divulged in the open courtroom, some very important leads establishing the guilt of persons who have committed crimes. It has been said in case after case—and the number of cases is longer than my arm—that such evidence itself cannot be used in the courtroom to establish guilt, but we know it is constantly being used to get leads which can be used in the courtroom for establishing guilt.

In regard to the files which would be made available to the Committee on Foreign Relations on this subject, of course the committee has the right to go through the files, and I think it should have that right I have not shared the view of those who think that when it comes to the matter of protecting the security of the Nation, Government files should be protected from the study and analysis of the people's Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment.

In those files, I imagine, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has pointed out, there will be some information we know we cannot make stand up in a public hearing or in a public courtroom. I think it is only fair that when we reach the point of establishing the guilt or innocence of a person the committee should be required to use only evidence that can stand up. Evidence which cannot be presented in an open hearing should not be used by the committee to convict a person by finding that he in fact is a traitor or is disloyal if he has not had an opportunity to test such evidence by proper cross-examination and rebuttal. That is all I am saying. To me, it is such a simple and precious right that I am at a loss to understand why a fight has to be made for this principle. It is so obvious, so necessary, in protecting the rights of all American citizens, that I think we should unanimously say to the Foreign Relations Committee, "Of course, you can look into what the files show, but when you come to charging Mr. X or Mr. Y with treason or disloyalty to the Government, you must bring out into the open the evidence supporting the charge and permit the accused to present relevant evidence in answer, and also to be cross-examined.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I share the same conviction the able Senator from Oregon holds as to the stage of the case in which a person is brought before the committee to answer questions or to be cross-examined. I share the conviction that that part of it might well be public. But when it comes to the committee's examining the records, the case history of a person—the case history which is naturally on file within the Federal agency—is it the Senator's contention that that stage of the examination should be public? If it is the Senator's contention that that stage of the committee's action should be public, then I cannot concur with him, because the committee would have to examine a great number of case histories in order to determine whether there was any legal reason to suspect the loyalty of the individual. If it was made public it could do irreparable injury. But once the committee has reached the conviction that a certain person is disloyal, then it is important that not even a half-page of the file should be removed, because that would leave a question in the minds of the investigating committee as to the contents of the file. I served on an investigating committee for two terms, and I know the question which was left in our minds when it was found that a serial number had been tampered with. So, for that reason, I say that if the files are made available to the committee, without any question as to whether any part of any document may be missing, the committee can go into executive session, and if it finds that the accused person is disloyal, it might cross-examine him in a public hearing. Then the public would have an opportunity to know his answers in the exact manner in which they are given, rather than in the manner in which they might be conveyed by someone who thought he was doing an excellent job of eavesdropping.

Mr. MORSE. It is the intention of the junior Senator from Oregon that the so-called preliminary part of the investigation shall be conducted in executive session. When the committee reaches the point in a given case where it believes probable cause exists for charging an individual with disloyalty to his Government, then the hearing must proceed in public and the committee must come forward in that public hearing with such evidence as it wishes to advance on which to base its finding of disloyalty.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to this point, particularly in view of his colloquy with the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. As I understand the suggested amendment of the Senator from New York, it goes far beyond the scope of the resolution submitted by the majority leader. I do not understand that this body, either through a recommendation of its committee, or through a vote in the body, has a right to discharge an employee of the executive department.

Mr. MORSE. It has a right to recommend discharge on the ground of disloyalty.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It has a right to make recommendations.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I am sure that the Senator would not question the fact that a recommendation of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that Mr. X is guilty of disloyalty would constitute, in fact, a finding that he is disloyal.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I read the resolution, I would not say the committee would necessarily have to state names if it did not want to. I bring this up because I listened to what the Senator from New York said, and I do not agree at all with the language suggested by him, and I hoped that the Senator from Oregon would not agree, because I think it goes far beyond the scope of the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I think the language of my amendment, with the explanation I have made as to what I mean by legal hearing, is adequate and will safeguard the particular principle for which I am arguing. If the very serious charges made by the Senator from Wisconsin are substantiated, he has rendered a great service to the country, because if there are disloyal persons in the State Department, let us get them out of there. But I want to say to my good friend from Massachusetts that I do not see how we can proceed under this resolution, in view of the question which has been raised across the country as to the possible extent of disloyalty within the Government, without dealing with specific cases and giving full public hearings to determine whether the accused persons are disloyal.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If my memory serves me correctly, the Senator from New York used the words "charges against the individual." I do not understand that this resolution necessarily makes any charge against any one individual, X, Y, or Z. It is to authorize a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are employed by the Government.

Mr. MORSE. My amendment refers to charges.

Mr SALTONSTALL. The Senator's amendment refers to hearings conducted for the purpose of taking evidence and testimony.

Mr. MORSE. Based on charges.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On charges against any individual.

Mr. MORSE. Until the charges are made against some particular person we shall not be presented with the problem of taking evidence and testimony in the type of hearings about which I have been speaking.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator agree with me that the committee can make its study and recommendations without specific charges against any person?

Mr. MORSE. I say, for hypothetical purposes, only, it would be possible for the committee to meet some afternoon and listen to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. I am sure the Senator will not read into this anything I do not intend. After listening to him the committee could vote unanimously to drop any further investigation. That is hypothetically possible. I do not think

it is very probable, but it is hypothetically possible. Of course, the adoption of the resolution does not mean that the committee will necessarily get to the stage of making charges of disloyalty against particular persons. It is possible that the committee might find in executive session that there is no basis in fact or any probable cause that would justify a charge against an individual. But once the committee reaches the point of charging a person with disloyalty, believe me, I want that person to be heard in public, and I want him to have the right to be heard in public.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask one question, which possibly may have been answered by the Senator in his last statement. As the Senator knows, Monday night I read from the recommendations made by the Security Division of the State Department that certain individuals should be discharged because of their communistic connections. I showed that those individuals were still on the State Department rolls, and that they were cleared for top-secret material after the Security Agency said, "These people have communistic connections." I made the statement that a sizable number of men in the State Department are disloyal to this Nation.

At that time the Senator from Illinois demanded that I make the names public on the floor of the Senate. The Senate will recall that I said I would not do that unless it was the judgment of the Senate that I should, for the reason that further investigation by the committee might possibly clear some of the individuals. At that time I said I would not make their names public unless the Senate so desired.

So that the Senate will know what the resolution does in that respect, I should like to ask the Senator whether or not it would require that at the initial hearing these names are to be made public; and I hope I shall be invited by the committee to come and give them the information I have, and give them the names. Of course, it is of no personal concern to me; I do not care, personally, whether the Senate says "Yes" or "No."

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "No."

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to supplement my answer by saying that in executive session the committee will decide whether or not they think the material which the Senator from Wisconsin has filed establishes probable cause for believing that any particular individual should be charged with disloyalty. If it reaches a conclusion in the affirmative as to any individual, then at that point the hearing should be public, and at that point the Senator from Wisconsin would be invited to come to the hearing. If I were a member of the committee, at that point I would notify the Senator from Wisconsin to bring forth in public hearing the evidence and the material which he has.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not get an opportunity to read the amendment, and I should like to be clear as to what the Senator meant when he said that open hearings would be held after the charges were made. Of course, all legal proceedings would be in the open. After an indictment is found against anyone, there is a formal hearing. However, in order to make it a little clearer to me, I should like to ask whether prior to that time, in any investigation by the committee, it is the intention of the Senator to use the word "charges" against an individual? That stage would come after a formal charge was made against an individual.

Mr. MORSE. After the committee has formally charged an individual with being disloyal, he must have a public hearing.

Mr. WHERRY. Where there is a formal charge, an indictment against an individual. That is what the Senator has in mind, is it not?

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator wish to insert the word "formal" in the amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. It seems to me that would help tremendously.

Mr. MORSE. "Formal charges"? I accept the Senator's suggestion that the word "formal" before the word "charges" makes clear that under my amendment no public hearing need be held until the committee finds that there is a probable cause basis for formally charging some particular employee with disloyalty.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator, in answer to the question, means what I am saying, that it refers to a case after formal charges are made against a person and he is indicted, I cannot see that there is much difference between our relative positions. What occurs prior to that is what worries me.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator prefer that we preface the statement with "after formal charges have been made"?

Mr. WHERRY. That would be better. I think it would help.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Nebraska asked almost the same question I had intended to ask the Senator from Oregon. If a person is accused of disloyalty and he is haled before the committee and he does not desire to have his appearance before the committee made public, would the Senator require that the hearing before the committee be made public?

Mr. MORSE. Believe me, if anyone in fact is disloyal, I certainly should like to have it established in a public hearing. I will not give sanctuary, secrecy, or privacy to any person to hide his guilt. If the committee finds any person to be in fact disloyal, I would have the committee drag him out in public. What the junior Senator from Oregon is fighting for is a public hearing procedure to prove the innocent innocent and to prove the guilty guilty.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose the man is innocent and his name has not been made public, and he says to the committee, "I can explain this to you, but I do not want to talk about it to the whole world." Would he have the right to be protected?

Mr. MORSE. That illustrates one of the risks of citizenship in a free country. After all, a person must be ready and willing to prove his innocence, too. If a committee of the Senate really believes that probable cause exists for leveling a formal charge against an individual, he must assume the risk as a citizen of establishing his innocence. I do not believe the committee should have the discretion in that instance of saying, "We are going to protect you in a secret hearing, and unless we become satisfied through secret hearing that you are disloyal, we will not say anything about it publicly."

Mr. AIKEN. My question assumed that the man was completely innocent.

Mr. MORSE. That would be established in the public hearing.

Mr. AIKEN. After an accusation is made against a person and it is spread all over the United States, he is seriously injured, even though he may be proved innocent later.

Mr. MORSE. The formal charge presumably is not going to be made, we have a right to presume, unless the committee is acting on the basis of probable cause. If the committee says, "We think there is probable cause to believe that Mr. X is disloyal," I think Mr. X should be tried in public.

Mr. AIKEN. May we not also assume that the guilt or innocence of a person would not be determined before the committee at all?

Mr. MORSE. I think it would be determined at the hearing.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield for a question or two, I shall ask him to clear up my understanding of his position. I may say at the outset that the question of the Bill of Rights is not involved in the resolution, though, of course, I find myself in agreement with the Senator's statement that no one should be deprived of life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness without due and proper indictment and trial. I do not wish to argue that point with the Senator at the moment. He has made his position clear. I do not believe the question is at all involved in the resolution we are discussing. I believe I am in general agreement with most of the Senator's views, I may be in thorough agreement with all of them.

However, there are various grades of either guilt or suspicion which are involved. The public interest is involved Sometimes it is in the public interest to make things public. Sometimes it is definitely to the public interest to refrain from making things public.

I should like to ask the Senator this question, if he cares to express his view on it: Let us assume that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] makes the allegation that Mr. X is strongly suspected of being subversive, and let us assume he works in the State Department. I take it from what the Senator from Oregon has said that he

believes that the committee, if the resolution is adopted, should look into the background of Mr. X, and that the committee could do that.

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And the committee could do that in executive session.

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let us assume, further, that the investigative file on Mr. X did not completely prove, with such evidence as could be sustained at a trial, that Mr. X was in fact subversive. However, let us suppose that the file strongly indicated that he was sympathetic with subversive activities, that he was in intimate association with known subversive persons, and that he had expressed himself from time to time as being sympathetic with subversive activities and unsympathetic with American ideals, but that there was no proof of criminality on his part, except as he thought and as he acted. Let us assume that the committee came to the full conclusion that Mr. X was a dangerous person because of his general tendencies and his associations and his known contacts; that therefore he was a dangerous person to be trusted with top-secret material, for instance, in the State Department. To go a little further——

Mr. MORSE. If I may interrupt the Senator, I do not wish to interfere with his trial of the case, as we say, but the Senator should have my answer at this point. Then he may supplement his statement.

The Senator is now talking about passing judgment on the loyalty or disloyalty of Mr. X. Whether it be done by subpena or otherwise, at that point I would bring him into the public hearing and establish on the public record that there was a basis for the suspicion that he was not the type of person who ought to be working in the State Department. I think he has that much coming to him.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am talking about the province of an investigative committee of this body. Let us suppose we had gone that far. Let us suppose that the committee said, "There is serious cause for suspicion. We cannot prove everything in this file, but there is a great deal of smoke here that is bad, and we must now consider the public interest." Should this man continue on or should he be removed from this position of confidence and trust? Therefore we shall now say, either to the State Department or to this man himself, "Here is this strong suspicion. Here are the facts about which we make up our minds. We have come to the conclusion that the best interests of the public would be for you to be separated from access, if you please, to highly secret information." Suppose that man said one of two things. Suppose he said, "All right, I will quit."

Mr. MORSE. Common sense tells me that under those circumstances, if that is his position, the case should be dropped.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is exactly what I wanted to find out from the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Drop the case right there.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Because I can envision any number of cases, in fact I have knowledge of a number of cases, where that exact situation exists.

Mr. MORSE. That is what we call, as the Senator knows, "copping a plea." We very frequently present evidence in a criminal case in a hearing before a grand jury or before a prosecutor of one crime, and the defendant says, "I think this is hot enough, so I will plead guilty to a lesser degree of the same crime." Thus we find prosecutors accepting a plea of guilty to simple larceny instead of grand larceny when they think it is a fair disposition of the case or when they are not too sure that their evidence will convict of the greater crime. In the Senator's hypothetical if the employee says in effect to the committee, "I want to drop this whole thing by resigning my job," and the committee decides that such a solution to the case would be a satisfactory one without a public hearing, there is nothing about my resolution which would prevent the committee from handling the case that way. But if the employee denies the charges of disloyalty I think he should be given a public hearing for reply.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Suppose he is permitted to resign after he is consulted. Now, suppose a case of this kind: Suppose there was a very suspicious situation, and the head of the State Department, or his authorized representative, was called in by the committee, still in executive session. The man's name has never been mentioned. The case has never been brought out publicly. Suppose the committee says to the Secretary or his duly authorized deputy, "Here is the way we look at this matter. We do not know for sure whether this man is guilty of actual subversive acts or not, but the record is bad. The opportunity is there. His whole history is not good. We think perhaps you ought to get rid of this man administratively just for the good of the service. Now, if you want us to, we can go further, but if you want to get rid of him administratively we do not see enough here to go to a formal trial and charge but we think the overriding best interests of the country would indicate that he ought to separate himself from the service."

Would the Senator think that that would be unmoral or unfair?

Mr. MORSE. At that point I may say that the individual's rights come into the picture. He may be entirely innocent. It may be a great injustice to him to discharge him on the evidence which was before the committee in executive session. I think he is entitled to the chance to answer that evidence in a public hearing. I do not know how we are going to protect individual rights in any other way.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand. Let us go another step. Let us assume that in the file there is proof positive of subversive acts on the part of an individual—and I will say to the Senator that I know of cases where this exact circumstance has existed in the past—there is proof positive not only in the file but the proof can be produced of the fact that the individual has committed subversive acts which are traitorous, in the delivery of highly secret information. A public trial, however, cannot be had under the theory which has been pursued. A public trial cannot be had of this individual because to produce the evidence which laid the basis for the subversive act would be to give away very vital secrets affecting the security of the United States of America. Now, in a case such as that, if it were the administrative decision not to prosecute that individual at the moment because the evidence upon which he would have to be prosecuted could not be brought out into public light by reason of the public safety, would the Senator say that other means of separating that man from the service and other actions taken toward him would be justified, or would the Senator advocate the trial of that man under any circumstances, when the production of the evidence might be extremely dangerous to the safety and security of the United States? Perhaps that is a little complicated.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, no.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not mean——

Mr. MORSE. I know that argument is hypothetical. It is a good argument.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is not an argument, I may say to the Senator. I am saying to him that there are instances where such a situation has actually existed.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Iowa knows of them; I do not; but I believe that if he knows of them we ought to proceed as far as we can to secure the kind of evidence which will stand up in a public hearing so we can put such disloyal employees where they belong.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator that I have made efforts in the past to do just that. Up to this time it has not been done.

Mr. MORSE. I wish the Senator great success in his efforts. But let us take the Senator's hypothetical. If he gives me an extreme case which meets all the tests of that hypothetical, and it is correct to assume that the security of the country and the welfare of the people of the country would be put in jeopardy, if at that time formal charges were made against the individual, I would say, postpone the charges temporarily until we can get into a position——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But——

Mr. MORSE. Wait a minute. Into such a position that we can move in on him. In the meantime I certainly would say to the Secretary of State and, in such an instance, to the President of the United States, "It is necessary in this case to use discretionary powers in order to prevent this person jeopardizing the security of the Nation until we can get the evidence on him that we know is available and pending our securing it." But——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. How about removing him from his job?

Mr. MORSE. But, in my judgment, the case is so exceptional that when it comes to a matter of principle I would never vote in the Senate of the United States

against a public hearing for any individual against whom formal charges of disloyalty are made by the committee. Of course there can be concocted a hypothetical set of facts so extreme in nature that I would be the first, or at least I would join with the Senator from Iowa in saying that in that particular hypothetical we must take extraordinary measures to protect the security of the Nation. In the case put in the hypothetical by the Senator from Iowa, I would agree that the Secretary of State should take the individual off his job or transfer him to a harmless one until all the evidence needed for a public hearing could be marshalled. I would not keep him on a job if I believed the security of the Nation was endangered by him to any degree whatsoever. However, I would bring him to public hearing just as soon as the evidence could be marshalled against him.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will yield further—I did not intend to give him a strained case——

Mr. MORSE. But it is.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Or a hypothetical case.

Mr. MORSE. But it is. By its own terms it is.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I beg the Senator's pardon. In my view it is not, because there are more than one, there today are several cases that meet those suppositions. So it is not a fantastic, imagined situation.

Mr. MORSE. They are highly extreme cases. They certainly do not fall within the two-hundred-and-some cases mentioned by the Senator from Wisconsin, and to which the committee is going to be devoting most of its attention.

Furthermore, let me say, the Senator having put a hypothetical to me, that I would not want to pass judgment on that hypothetical in terms of the facts the Senator from Iowa has in mind, because it is difficult for me as a lawyer to believe that in this country we are so weak from the standpoint of securing evidence on individuals that we cannot secure the evidence on the persons covered by the Senator's hypothetical and establish guilt in a public hearing. I believe we can. I would delay the hearing in that case until the facts were marshalled. I would have the Secretary of State suspend him until the evidence is ready for hearing.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But we have the evidence.

Mr. MORSE. Then I think it should be brought out.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But the evidence was such as to justify, in the minds of certain persons, failure of prosecution, because the evidence, if produced, would endanger the safety of the country.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for having yielded to me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. I promised him some time ago that I would yield to him.

Mr. IVES. As the able Senator from Oregon will recall, the Senator from New York was at least somewhat apprehensive yesterday regarding the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon. However, by changing the verbiage, as the Senator from Oregon has indicated, the apprehension expressed by the Senator from New York has been somewhat removed. I understand the Senator from Oregon has modified his amendment even further, and in order that my understanding may be perfectly clear I should like to read the amendment as I now have it. Will the Senator from Oregon kindly listen?

Mr. MORSE. I am listening although looking at this paper. The Senator may be surprised, but I heard everything he said.

Mr. IVES. I read:

After formal charges have been made by the committee against any individual all hearings conducted by the committee for the purpose of taking evidence and testimony on such charges shall be public hearings.

Is that what the Senator has in mind?

Mr. MORSE. With the addition of two words, after the word "charges", the words "of disloyalty." After formal charges of disloyalty are made by the committee. I assume the resolution goes to the whole matter of charges of disloyalty.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York is fully satisfied now, after the explanation made by the Senator from Oregon

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New York is very kind.

Mr. LUCAS, Mr. McCARTHY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr MORSE. I promised the Senator from Illinois I would yield to him. Then after that I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr LUCAS. I am satisfied that the Senator's amendment will do exactly what we all want to have done. However, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has a substitute which I wish the Senator from Oregon would examine. The substitute language seems to me to clear up all the complications involved. I think the effect of the amendment would be perhaps a little different from what the Senator from Oregon interprets it, even with the modification made by him. I want to accept the amendment of the Senator from Oregon if he will accept the language of the Senator from Massachusetts, or I will accept the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, as modified. I want to have the argument settled.

Mr. MORSE. I do also.

Mr. President, the suggested modification of my amendment, offered by the Senator from Massachusetts would make it read as follows, and this is to follow the present printing of the resolution:

And if said recommendations are to include charges of disloyalty against any individual, then the committee before making said recommendations shall give said individual open hearings for the purpose of taking evidence or testimony on said charges.

Mr. President, I always try to be a good horse trader. I sometimes get licked in my trades, but if the language offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is not identical with the meaning and intent of the language of my amendment then I do not understand the King's English.

If the suggested modification will get more votes for my amendment, I am perfectly willing to accept it; and I do accept it. However, I wish it to be understood that the modifying languague of the Senator from Massachusetts, if it is accepted, means that after the committee reaches the point of presenting charges against the loyalty of a particular person, at that point the committee will go into an open hearing in taking testimony and evidence on those charges. If that is the meaning—and I am sure it is the meaning of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]—I accept with pleasure and appreciation the language offered by my good friend, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, who first requested recognition; and thereafter I shall yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, before the Senator from Oregon accepts the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, I should like to have an explanation of one item, if the Senator will yield

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr FERGUSON I wish to refer to one statement the Senator from Oregon made in answer to the distinguished Senator from Iowa, namely, that if a person is called in, given an opportunity to resign, and he does resign, that should end the matter. I take it, then, that, under the resolution, the Senate and the people would never hear of that particular case. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator should not forget that the hypothetical, in connection with the question propounded to me, was that the committee was not satisfied that it had sufficient evidence to prove the disloyalty of the person.

I answered a previous hypothetical question by saying that if the committee is satisfied that it has evidence of the disloyalty of anyone who is serving in the Government, the committee will owe it to the American people, in my judgment, to call that person before it in open hearing and establish the evidence.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I wanted to establish.

Mr. MORSE. I answered that in my reply to a specific hypothetical question which raised those assumed facts.

Mr. FERGUSON. And a mere resignation would not end it. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is right. If I were a member of the Foreign Relations Committee in conducting this investigation, and if I and a majority of my colleagues became satisfied that Mr. X was guilty of disloyalty, he could not bargain with

me in executive session; he could not resign his job and thus go scot free. I would insist upon establishing his disloyalty in open hearing.

Until we do that, I do not think we can get very far in satisfying the puzzlement and the suspicion of the American people today as to what is going on, in connection with all the talk of disloyalty among Government employees. Today the American people are greatly confused about the matter. If there is any evidence in regard to any of these persons, they should be brought before a public hearing and the evidence should be established there.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I temporarily left the floor; and when I returned, the Senator from Oregon was discussing with the Senator from Iowa some hypothetical questions in regard to disloyalty.

I should like to ask the Senator a question, which may not be completely apropos of what we are discussing, but I think it is worth considering at this point. Let us consider some of the actual cases which were covered the other evening here in the Senate. Let us consider the case of an individual who has been investigated by the investigative agency of the State Department, and thereafter the agency placed in the file a statement that that man is a bad security risk, and the agency showed his connections with members of an espionage ring, and showed the number of Communist-front organizations to which he belonged; and subsequently the Department said, "We will give this man top-secret clearance."

Incidentally, Mr. President, let me say that I am basing this question on material taken from the records; this is not simply a matter of conjecture.

Let us assume that man's case was presented to the committee in executive session, and let us assume that the committee felt that there was not sufficient evidence to prove that he actually joined the Communist Party on a certain date. Assume that the committee believed the investigative agency of the State Department was correct, however, when it said the man was a bad security risk and should be gotten out of the Government.

Is it the Senator's thought that that should never be made public, but that it should be hidden in the files of the committee; or does the Senator believe the public is entitled to know that John Jones, for instance, is still enjoying top-secret clearance, despite all his Communist connections?

Mr. MORSE. I would say that such facts should be brought out. They should be spread on a public record in open hearing. The hypothetical——

Mr. McCARTHY. This is an actual case.

Mr. MORSE. The question answers itself. I think that evidence should be brought out in a public hearing, and the associations and the conduct and the actions of the individual which spell, in accordance with the Senator's own premises, a danger to the security of the Nation, should be spread on the public record.

Mr. McCARTHY. Even though the committee does not feel that it can definitely prove that he joined the Communist Party on a certain date?

Mr. MORSE. I do not think proof of actual membership in the Communist Party is essential to proof of disloyalty to our form of government.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank and heartily agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me——

Mr. MORSE. I beg the pardon of the Senator from Maine; I owe him an apology, for I previously promised to yield next to him. However, if the Senator will permit, I shall yield briefly to the Senator from Nebraska, at this point.

Mr. BREWSTER Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, a while ago, when the Senator from Massachusetts had a colloquy with the Senator from Oregon, I suggested that if he would use the words "formal charges"——

Mr. MORSE. I agreed to that suggestion, and I think it has been accepted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wrote in the word "formal," and I told the Senator from Oregon we could accept it.

Mr. WHERRY. Who accepted it?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, suggested it, I think; so he has accepted it along with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the majority leader [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. MORSE I yield, gladly.

Mr BREWSTER. A question of procedure is always developed in congressional investigations. Customarily they are preceded, as the Senator indicated, by getting the evidence from records or from various other sources, and the committee examines the evidence. At some point during the course of that procedure, following the analogy of the grand jury and the trial jury, congressional committees very frequently have asked the person who is under suspicion to come before them in executive session and answer questions. I am very much interested to know the attitude of the Senator in regard to that point.

As a matter of fact, two men are now in prison because of their betrayal of their Government, and they were convicted primarily because of the falsification of their replies at such an examination.

What is the view of the Senator from Oregon as to procedure of that character?

Mr. MORSE. In my opinion, in that particular case the individual should have the right to say, "I will appear in a public hearing and will answer charges brought against me."

Mr. BREWSTER. But if he elects to say that, instead of saying, "I do not care to come before an executive session of the committee and reply," the Senator feels that he would be entitled to take that position. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. I feel that he should have the right to be heard in public on that matter.

Mr. BREWSTER. But the Senator would not criticize the committee if it did ask him in executive session for replies, if he saw fit to make them?

Mr. MORSE. No. The Senator from Maine and I know what judgments we sometimes form when a man stands mute in the courtroom. When a man does that, we are suspect that he may be afraid to testify.

I know how I would feel, as a member of the committee, if such a person refused to come before the committee and answer questions within the committee. I know what I would think under such circumstances. I would not have any hesitancy in holding him for a public hearing on a question as to his loyalty unless no evidence at all existed against him.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am fearful that the phrase "formal charges" may render the procedures extremely difficult. I think that has been the experience of committees which have proceeded in such matters in the past.

Mr. MORSE. In what way?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator appreciates that, aside from an impeachment trial which we may conduct here, the committees of investigation are primarily, not for trial or conviction, but for legislative purposes.

Mr. MORSE. But that is not the immediate purpose of this resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER I conceive that the only ground on which we can constitutionally justify it is from the standpoint of whether the safety of the Government is being endangered. That is our primary purpose.

Mr. MORSE. Out of our findings in these cases, we may come to legislation; but our first and immediate concern is to ascertain whether there are disloyal persons in the Government.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is an incidental purpose of these investigations, but not the primary and the overriding problem. The overriding problem is whether the negligence of the executive departments has been such that that sort of thing has been permitted to develop; and that sort of conclusion might come out of a very widespread inquiry. In fact, during the war that was continually the experience of the Truman investigating committee; and although in many instances individuals were found guilty, that was always incidental to the far broader problem of trying to bring home to the executive agencies their majority responsibility to see that things of that character did not develop.

Mr. MORSE. I will not quarrel with that analysis, except I think it is perfectly clear that we are moving into this matter as a result of the charges, brought by the Senator from Wisconsin, to the effect that there are a large number of disloyal persons ir the State Department. We want to find out whether

those charges are true or false; and if they are true, I want to get rid of those persons.

Mr. BREWSTER. As to that, I think we could appropriately point out the contempt with which the original suggestion of these charges was treated by those high in executive authority; and even after the conclusion of an extended judicial hearing and court trial, the next to the highest official still insisted that he would not turn his back on the person who had been convicted.

Certainly both those things, while perhaps they have little to do with the individual responsibility of the persons who have been referred to in the debate here by numbers, have a very great deal to do with our determination as to whether the public security is being adequately maintained; and that brings us to the question of whether we shall have the right to get the records from the executive department. As I understand, the Senator from Oregon thinks that should be well within our powers, although the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the majority leader, has apparently indicated some doubt regarding that.

Mr. MORSE. I think we have the duty, in protecting the security of the Nation, to get the records of any evidence that will help us in determining whether there are disloyal persons within the Government.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to call a particular point to the attention of the Senator from Oregon, who is working toward a goal which I think is shared in common by virtually every other Member of the Senate, but which seems to be exceedingly hard to define in terms of an amendment.

Mr. MORSE. It is not hard to adopt the principle.

Mr. MUNDT. That is true.

If I understand the Senator's purpose, it is solely to make sure that no one will be deprived of his job or be convicted of disloyalty or be accused publicly without being given an opportunity to make a public rejoinder. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly I concur 100 percent with that.

It seems to me the language suggested or offered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] provides for that almost exactly.

Let me point out what worries me about the present language of the proposal, as I understand it. As I understand it now, before a public hearing would be held at all, the committee would have to make a formal charge of disloyalty against the individual. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. If the committee finds that probable cause exists for believing that Mr. X is disloyal to the Government, he ought to be given a chance to meet the charges.

Mr. MUNDT. But would not that be done only after the committee has made a formal charge?

Mr. MORSE. The committee is not going to bring a charge, unless it finds there is a basis for making it. It is not going to act in a vacuum.

Mr. MUNDT. No, but I think the amendment goes so far as to say that the committee must make a formal charge first, before there can be a public hearing.

Mr. MORSE. All the amendment does is provide that in case the committee decides in executive session that probable cause exists for believing that Mr. X is disloyal the committee must convene a public hearing so that Mr. X can face the charges, hear the evidence against him, and defend himself in public in answer to the charges.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not that place a heavy burden on the committee, requiring that its decision be made in executive session prior to a gathering of all the evidence in an open session? I mean, the committee almost has to arrive at a verdict, first

Mr. MORSE. No. It is only a question of whether, as we lawyers would say, before going to trial—a question of whether there is sufficient evidence on which to go to trial. It is a question of the existence of probable cause

Mr. MUNDT. But there again we come to the purpose we have in mind, with which I agree. The language it seems to me would have to be incorporated, that the committee would have to make a charge before a formal hearing.

Mr. MORSE. That is what a formal hearing involves. We do not go to a formal hearing unless we think there is enough evidence to establish at least a prima facie case against the accused. There would be no purpose in having a formal hearing, if in the executive session the committee was satisfied there was no basis for going ahead with the case involving Mr. X. It would be dropped. That would be the last that would be heard of it. But if the committee were to say, "This case looks pretty bad, we had better find out what a full hearing will show as to the loyalty of Mr. X; we had better hold this fellow for a hearing," then my amendment for the first time would become applicable.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is a great deal more persuasive, a great deal more lucid, in his explanatory remarks, than in the amendment. I seem unable to get the two together. May we have the amendment read again?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the clerk read the amendment as modified by my good friend from Massachusetts?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On line 6, before the word "The", it is proposed to insert the following: "All hearings conducted by the committee shall be public hearings, and, if said recommendations are to include formal charges of disloyalty against any individual, then the committee, before making said recommendations, shall give said individual open hearings for the purpose of taking evidence or testimony on said charges."

Mr. MUNDT. The amendment retains the original language, then, that all hearings are to be public, does it not?

Mr. MORSE. I thought that language had been stricken, I may say to my good friend from Massachusetts. I do not think the clerk read the language submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts in modification of my language in just the form submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that would place in the discretion of the accused the right to a public hearing, would it not? Is that what the Senator from Oregon understands?

Mr. MORSE. No, that is not my understanding of the language which was handed me by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. There is some mistake in language as contained in the clerk's copy.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the understanding I have from what was read.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from Michigan but the clerk has the wrong slip from which he is reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the clerk read the right amendment?

Mr. MORSE. He did not read the one I thought the Senator from Massachusetts showed me. Let us get the original language as offered by the Senator from Massachusetts in modification of my amendment. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts will hand to the clerk the original statement, which he will ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read it again.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 8, after the word "desirable", it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a comma, and the following: "and if said recommendations are to include formal charges of disloyalty against any individual, then the committee, before making said recommendations, shall give said individual open hearings for the purpose of taking evidence or testimony on said charges."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. That pretty well substantiates the point I was trying to make. The only way in which public hearings will eventuate at all is after the committee has made charges of disloyalty against an individual. Let me cite one "liberty" case as an example of how that would work. Let us take the case of Alger Hiss, a "liberty" case which we know something about. The Committee on Un-American Activities, after first having heard in private or executive session the testimony of Whittaker Chambers, concluded that the evidence was substantial, and was sufficient to justify an open hearing. Chambers then testified in an open hearing. Alger Hiss then requested the right to be heard, and we heard him the next day. That would conform to the pattern, I am sure, which the junior Senator from Oregon has in mind. But had the committee of the House been in a position similar to the one in which the Senator's amendment would place the Committee on Foreign Relations, at that stage of the game we certainly never would have concluded that there was substantial evidence, sufficient to launch a charge of disloyalty against Hiss. There would have been no public hearing. There would have been no disclosure, and no conviction.

Mr. MORSE. I think all it means is that the committee would not have completed its investigation at that time. But I do not think the point has application to the resolution which is before the Senate. This committee is going to go ahead It is going to listen to the Senator from Wisconsin; it is going to look into whatever files may be submitted to the committee in order to decide whether it should proceed in a hearing on formal charges of disloyalty against X, Y, and Z, or whomever the committee might bring charges against.

Mr. MUNDT. Under the terms of the amendment, the House committee would have been required to arrive at a verdict of disloyalty against Hiss before a public hearing was held.

Mr. MORSE. It would have been a question of whether probable cause existed for thinking there was sufficient smoke to justify their looking for the fire.

Mr. MUNDT. It was the public hearing which disclosed the evidence. By virtue of the fact that it was a public hearing, it enabled the committee to arrive at its conclusion. The Senator's amendment would require the Senate committee to reach the conclusion before having a public hearing.

Mr. MORSE. I see what is troubling the Senator. The resolution does not say that the Foreign Relations Committee must make the finding, as a matter of fact, before a public hearing, that Mr. X is disloyal; not at all.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it not required to so find before making recommendations with respect to the charge of disloyalty?

Mr. MORSE. Not at all. The committee has to be satisfied only of the existence of probable cause, by reason of which any given accused ought to be given a public hearing at which to defend himself. That is all my amendment seeks to guarantee.

Mr. MUNDT. Then I may have to request the Senator to read the amendment again. It does not so state, as read by the clerk, unless my hearing of it was entirely erroneous.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the point I attempted to make was that before any recommendations could be presented to the Senate, naming X, Y, and Z, a public hearing would have to be given them. In the case cited by the Senator from South Dakota, had the committee been convinced reasonably by the testimony of Mr. Chambers that further evidence should be taken on the subject, it could have proceeded further perhaps in executive session. When the committee reached the point where it thought recommendations should be made against Mr. Hiss, then, before making a recommendation, it would have had to hear Mr. Chambers' evidence in public. The committee would have to have heard Mr. Hiss in public, and they would have had to have the whole thing aired in public, because of the charge against Hiss. That is what it means.

Mr. MUNDT. The only difference between us is, I want to give the committee the right to conduct public hearings before arriving at a conclusion.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, the committee has that right. Under the Legislative Reorganization Act, the committee has the right, on the face of the resolution, I may say, to proceed with no executive sessions at all, if they want to do that. They can proceed from the beginning with public hearings. Everything done by the committee could be done in a public hearing, if the committee desired. There is nothing in my resolution to prohibit the committee from having all its sessions in public. All we are saying is, when it comes to the stage where the committee feels that probable cause exists for believing an individual to be disloyal, he must be given a chance to be heard in public. That is all the resolution as proposed to be amended says. After all, are we not now almost getting to the point where we are of common mind as to the principle we are trying to protect? The record we have made here this afternoon is itself an instruction to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and his colleagues as to what our objective is. I submit the language offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, as I have accepted it, carries out the principle. I do not think there is any danger that the committee is in any way going to be hamstrung in its procedure, either before or after the public hearing in view of the prolonged and thorough discussion we have had here this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor, but I shall be glad, in the Senator's time, to answer questions.

Mr HOLLAND. I may say to the Senator from Oregon I recall that when the Senator from Wisconsin was going into this matter the other night, he referred in his remarks to several employees of the State Department, who he stated were Foreign Service employees. I recall that in one case he said a particular Foreign Service employee was stationed at Madrid. I am not sure but that the amendment as revised may probably take care of the point to which I refer, but it seems to me that in addition to the question of providing for proper protection of the rights of the individual, there is in connection with public hearings always the question of safeguarding against the disclosure of improper matters, from the standpoint of the national interest. I am asking the Senator from Oregon therefore whether he would mind relating what would be the course taken, in the event there should come to the attention of the Committee on Foreign Relations, through the Senator from Wisconsin, or otherwise, matters causing the committee to question the loyalty of a Foreign Service officer in the Embassy or consulate at Madrid. What would be the course of the investigation? My purpose in asking is so that the RECORD may show clearly that the interests of the Government in its relations with friendly countries will be safeguarded.

Mr. MORSE. If the committee decided that probable cause existed for believing the person to be disloyal, they would ask to have him brought into a public hearing and ask to have him returned to this country for that purpose. Why not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the Senator, Is there any machinery provided, with respect to questions which may be thought by the State Department to be of great importance to the Nation and to its relations with a friendly foreign power? Would the committee be free to go into such matters in executive session?

Mr. MORSE. I have no doubt that under the able leadership of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the matter could be worked out without in any way jeopardizing the interests of the State Department or the Foreign Service of the United States. But if we got to the point—I do not want any doubt to exist as to where I would stand on this final step—if we got to the point where the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate actually believed it had found someone belonging to the Foreign Office of the State Department, in Madrid or elsewhere, who was disloyal, the committee should do what it could, within its jurisdiction, to bring that person to a public hearing. If it were discovered that the committee did not have the power to do that, the publicity of that fact alone, I think, would force the administration to take a necessary course of action which would protect the American people against the wrongdoings of such a person.

Mr. HOLLAND If the Senator will yield for one further question——

Mr. MORSE I yield.

Mr HOLLAND. Am I to understand that regardless of how important the friendly relations between our country and another power might be, in order to go into such matters that person would have to be brought into a public hearing and could not be brought into a private or executive session?

Mr. MORSE. Insofar as the rights of the individual are concerned in respect to a charge of disloyalty against him I think he should be given a public hearing. I believe, however, the Foreign Relations Committee would handle the other problems which are inherent in the Senator's question, without a public hearing. But so far as the rights of the individual are concerned, it makes no difference to me whether he works in a foreign office, in the State Department, or works somewhere as a janitor, he is still an American, and is entitled to all the guaranties of a public hearing for which I have been fighting all afternoon

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I was about to yield the floor, but I shall yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. In the colloquy between the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the junior Senator from Oregon, I understood the junior Senator from Oregon to say that the committee has a right to hold open hearings right up to the point of formal charges. Under the Reorganization Act, I understand it has the right to hold either closed or open hearings. Does not the resolution override and supersede that?

Mr MORSE. I do not think the resolution or my amendment overrides the

rights of the Foreign Relations Committee under the Reorganization Act. The effect of the resolution, with my amendment in it, is to say to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "Whenever you reach the conclusion in your deliberation that probable cause exists for believing that any particular employee is disloyal to our Government, the committee shall then conduct a public hearing on the charges and evidence of disloyalty and give to the employee accused of disloyalty a full opportunity to be heard and defend himself in a public hearing." That is all the resolution, with my amendment, means. We should not overlook the fact that in this instance the Foreign Relations Committee is functioning as a special committee of the Senate, carrying out the mandates of this special resolution. There is nothing in the Reorganization Act that takes away from the Senate its right and prerogative to instruct one of its committees as to the type of procedure which should be followed in conducting an investigation into the loyalty of Government employees. The Foreign Relations Committee is a creature of the Senate, subject to the instructions of the Senate as a whole in regard to the procedures which are to be followed in carrying out such an investigation as is called for by this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have three amendments which I shall send to the desk, and I wish to speak on them at this time.

First, I wish to read the resolution without the last amendment which is going to be accepted by the majority leader:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are employed by the Department of State. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

Mr. President, it will be noted that the resolution reads "who are disloyal to the United States are employed."

That is in the present tense and would mean as of the time of making the examination.

I have an amendment, to insert, on line 5, after the word "are", the words "or have been." The charges made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin indicated that some of these persons were leaving the Department or had left the Department, and that the investigation should be made as to those who were in the Department. So the language would be amended to read "or have been employed by the Department of State."

Will the Senator from Illinois accept such an amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, that would cover a long period of time.

Mr. FERGUSON. It will be within the discretion of the committee. The charges were made, and they are in the RECORD at the present time, as to certain persons. I think that is what the Senate wants to know about, and that is what the public wants to know about.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope the able majority leader will accept the amendment. The matter will still be under the control of the committee. But I want to say that it is my judgment that the people of the United States are not very happy about the statute of limitations which apparently runs under our law, in regard to disloyalty to the United States. In the Alger Hiss case, the statute had run, and the only thing for which he could be tried was perjury in answering questions as to whether he had turned over documents from the Government of the United States to an espionage ring. I do not think we should have a statute of limitations running in cases of disloyalty to the Government of the United States The committee will still have control over the situation, but, in my opinion, we should foreclose ourselves, because I cite to the able Senator from Illinois the fact that it might happen that someone had left the Department of State and had been disloyal during the period he had been there, perhaps had resigned, and is now in a position in some other department and doing equal damage to the Nation which he purports to serve

Mr. LUCAS I do not have any particular objection, Mr. President. It seems to me that the amendment might go back 25 or 30 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would be merely in the discretion of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. It would be solely within the discretion of the committee as to how far back it should go.

Mr. FERGUSON. The amendment would so authorize the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall modify my amendment in line with the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The second amendment is to insert in line 5, after the word "State," the words "or any other agency of the Government concerned with the intercourse of the United States with other nations."

The reason for that, Mr. President, is that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin indicated there were persons directly employed by the State Department who were disloyal to the United States and were transferred, or permitted to be transferred, or who removed themselves to some other agency which is directly connected with the relations of the United States with foreign nations. As I understand, the purpose of the investigation is to bring out the facts as to those persons who are disloyal to the United States and who have an opportunity of harming the United States in its relations with other nations.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator might add "whoever they may be and wherever they may be."

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is included in the amendment.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator's mind works along with my own to that extent, does it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. That is the desideratum, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

We have an amendment which merely says "or any other agency of the Government concerned with the intercourse of the United States with other nations."

I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Illinois would accept that amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. What other agency does the Senator have in mind as being encompassed by that definition?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have in mind the officers of the Commerce Department which embrace men who are in the Division of Export Control, whose activities are directly related to those of the State Department. The Departments work very closely together, and I think they have an over-all board. I would say that there would be certain services having to do with foreign matters. I do not know whether some of these are under the direct control of the State Department or not. There is the matter of immigration, for instance.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator include such an agency as Mr. Hoffman's organization?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; where they deal directly with another nation The Senator's committee for instance, has been conducting hearings on ECA. That organization deals directly with other nations, just as the State Department does. It has an over-all or roving ambassador.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It seems to me that the Senator is branching out into every agency of Government. We started out originally with the charge of disloyalty in the State Department. Practically every so-called charge made by the Senator from Wisconsin was leveled against persons in the State Department. I should like to say that if in the course of its investigation the Foreign Relations Committee should discover any ramifications which would lead into another department of the Government, they would certainly have the right, even without authority of the resolution, to investigate. It seems to me that adoption of the proposal would be adding an amendment which is not really needed. If this amendment were adopted, every agency of Government would be brought under the investigation. It was the idea of the Senator from Illinois and of other Senators on this side of the aisle, when

we started the discussion of the investigation, that we should follow more or less the idea presented by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and confine the investigation to the State Department. As the majority leader, I assure the Senator that if the investigation to be conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee shows that the examination leads into another department of the Government, certainly the members of the committee would not hesitate for a moment to go into that department. They would have the right to do that under the Reorganization Act. Surely the members of the committee would do it. However, I dislike very much to accept the amendment and place the burden upon the Foreign Relations Committee to investigate every department, so to speak. In other words, it would be a catch-all amendment which would give the committee the right to go fishing into every department of the Government. I do not believe that should be done.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. What I have to say bears on what has been said by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at its meeting this morning had before it a resolution, proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr MALONE], to investigate a man connected with the Commerce Department.

Mr. FERGUSON Mr Lee?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. Lee He is with the Export Division of the Commerce Department. Lee is his present name His name used to be of Russian origin. I believe he was born in Russia. He is in charge of exports in the Department of Commerce. The committee voted unanimously to make an investigation, and we asked for an appropriation of $10,000 in order to conduct the investigation. That is an instance of one standing committee which is going ahead on its own initiative on one phase of a subject which comes within its purview.

Mr. LUCAS It is perfectly within the province of the committee to do that. It seems to me that the amendment should not be adopted, because it would give the Foreign Relations Committee the exclusive power to investigate all branches of the Government. As in the case of the Department of Commerce, if the amendment were adopted, the investigation could be broadened to include other departments. Such investigations should perhaps be made by other committees The charges which have been leveled by the Senator from Wisconsin deal strictly with the State Department, and I should like to confine the investigation of charges to the State Department.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator will recall that on Monday night, when I cited cases for the RECORD, I noted that some of the individuals had left the State Department, and are now in other branches of the Government. If the committee finds that John Jones, for example, who had been in the State Department up to 6 months ago, with top-secret clearance, is now in some other department of the Government, in order to do a thorough job the committee should have the right to follow him, to find out whether he was a part of an espionage ring. Unless we broaden the scope of the resolution, I believe the hands of the committee will be too thoroughly tied.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The amendment offered by the able Senator from Michigan, which was accepted by the Senator from Illinois, covers the situation of any individual who has ever been connected with the State Department and who has gone to some other agency. The committee can go after such a person under the amendment which has just been accepted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the statement just made by the majority leader. I do not know whether the Senator from Wisconsin was in the Chamber at the time, but I believe that the amendment which had been offered just prior to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan covered the point which the Senator from Wisconsin raises. Any person who in the past has been connected with the State Department and who has moved into some other agency is now covered under the terms of the amendment which has already been accepted.

Mr. McCARTHY. When I left the Chamber about 3 minutes ago the Senate was debating the amendment. Do I understand the amendment has been accepted?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. Mr. President, this is what was brought out by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. This is in effect new authority being given to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The authority given by the rule in general is an authority which the committee could have exercised without any resolution of this body. But it is now proposed that we confer upon the committee certain authority which it may not have under the general rule.

Let me read the matters which would come within the province of the committee under the rules laid down without the pending resolution. I read from page 33 of the Senate Manual:

(1) Committee on Foreign Relations, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.
2. Treaties.
3. Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.
4. Protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation.
5. Neutrality.
6. International conferences and congresses.
7. The American National Red Cross.
8. Intervention abroad and declarations of war
9. Measures relating to the diplomatic service.
10 Acquisition of land and buildings for embassies and legations in foreign countries.
11. Measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.
12. United Nations Organization and international financial and monetary organizations.
13. Foreign loans

Mr. President, the amendment proposed is designed to give the committee jurisdiction of related matters which would be under agencies of Government other than the State Department concerned with intercourse with foreign nations. It concerns itself with those who are working for agencies which could give vital assistance and aid to foreign countries. It is not the purpose of the amendment at all to cover local domestic agencies; it relates only to those dealing with foreign nations.

I am satisfied that the Senate and the public are interested in knowing about those who may be disloyal in the State Department. There is likewise a desire for knowledge as to whether there is any disloyalty in any other department of the Government which deals directly with foreign nations. It is in order that we may satisfy the public once and for all, that the amendment is offered. I think that both the Democratic and the Republican sides of the Senate should be interested in having it brought out that we do have or do not have disloyalty among those who are dealing directly with foreign nations. I hope that the Senate will later adopt the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I desire the floor in my own right.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have not concluded. I began by saying that I had three amendments to present.

The last and final amendment is the one which I wish to have voted on first, and I offer it in behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

It is, on line 8, after the period, to insert the following:

In the conduct of this study and investigation the committee is directed to procure, by subpena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and such other agencies against whom charges have been heard.

Mr. President, I think it is vital that the Senate go on record as being of the opinion that the only way the record can be made complete for the people of the United States and for their representatives in the Senate, is that the files of the departments relating to the loyalty of those persons who are to be investigated should be turned over to the committee.

When the junior Senator from Michigan served upon the War Investigating Committee, the now President of the United States was the chairman of that committee and on two occasions it was necessary that the chairman of the committee issue subpenas to the Attorney General of the United States, who had refused to give up certain papers and

records to the committee. As soon as he was subpenaed, the Attorney General of the United States delivered those papers to the investigating committee.

As I have said, this language is a direction to the committee by the Senate of the United States which represents the public in general. It, in effect, says to the committee that the Senate is of the opinion that it should speak out and say that the departments should turn over to the committee all the records and files needed in order that a complete investigation can be made. If the committee ever undertakes to make an investigation of the matter and does not subpena the records and the files of every department of Government, I say that then the Senate of the United States will not be satisfied and the public will not be satisfied, because there can be no complete investigation made unless all the files are turned over to the committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe the Senator's statement may be misunderstood. The Senator said the investigation could not be complete unless the committee subpenaed all the files of all the departments of Government, which is a pretty broad statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. The amendment provides:

> The complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and such other agencies—

And so forth.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wanted to clear up that point. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY and Mr. WHERRY rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment I will yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The Senator from Wisconsin indicated that he was reading into the RECORD from the files of the State Department charges of disloyalty against persons who were employed by the Government. If the files of the State Department cannot be secured, then no effective investigation of the charges made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin can be made by the committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator that I believe that unless the committee has the power and exercises the power to subpena the files of all those individuals who are suspected of communistic activities, then the investigation will be completely useless, it will be a complete farce, and nothing but a whitewash. The only way we can have an investigation of any value whatsoever is to say to the President, "We want to examine those files. We want to see why you are giving top secret clearance to men who have been named by your own security agencies as Communists. We want to find out why you are retaining on Federal pay rolls men who have been listed by the top investigative agencies as members of espionage rings."

Unless we secure those files there is no use of even starting the investigation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. It will be recalled that last night the junior Senator from Nebraska made certain statements respecting whether a standing committee now has the power to subpena the very records the distinguished Senator from Michigan is speaking of. At that time I made a parliamentary inquiry. My inquiry was whether a standing committee was given such a power of subpena under section 134 of the Reorganization Act. It is my understanding that the junior Senator from Michigan states that section 134 of the Reorganization Act authorizes each standing committee to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, and to take testimony, and so forth. Even though section 134 of the Reorganization Act gives the committee power of subpena, as I have stated, the question arises whether the committee would choose to exercise the power. The Senator, by his amendment, would instruct the members of the Senate committee to procure by subpena the files in connection with cases in which charges are made. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator has stated it correctly.

Mr. WHERRY. I join with the Senator in what he proposes to do by his amendment. The committee is authorized, by section 134 of the Reorganization Act, to procure documents by subpena. The act does not require a committee to exercise that power. Therefore, I feel that if there is to be an exhaustive research into and investigation of the cases which have been mentioned the Senate should instruct the committee to procure the files in connection with the cases. I believe that to be a very vital point.

When, last night, that point was under discussion, and when I made inquiry about the matter, I thought the action we now seek to take would be taken under the provisions of the Reorganization Act. It is now my opinion that it is very doubtful whether that can be done. If there is to be an investigation, Mr. President, and all Senators seem to be willing to go along with the idea that an investigation should be had, I think the least we can do is to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan. If it is unnecessary to take such action it will not do any harm if we take it. However, such action would take care of the point I made last night. I said then I would not object to adoption of the resolution. I am just as anxious that it be adopted as is anyone else.

I now ask the Senator from Michigan whether in his opinion it is necessary to adopt his amendment, in order to procure the files in question, rather than to rely upon the authority given under the Reorganization Act, which is merely an authorization which gives power, but the power might not be exercised.

Mr. FERGUSON. My amendment if adopted, would be a directive to the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I most emphatically say to the Senator from Nebraska that I do not believe we should fool ourselves by what is now proposed to be done. I agree with the principle of what the Senator from Michigan is trying to do, but I call to his attention the fact that the La Follette-Monroney Act, in section 134, authorizes the committee to acquire by subpena or otherwise correspondence, books, papers, and documents.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I just read that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But that does not mean papers of the United States Government in the executive department. We want to get those papers. I hope they will be given to us. But we cannot pull ourselves up by our own bootstraps. When the committee issues a subpena directed to the Department of State, that does not necessarily mean that the committee is going to obtain those papers. We should not fool ourselves.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I might say to the Senator from Michigan that another reason why I think it is important that at the very start the direction by the Senate of the United States be given to the committee to subpena the records, is so that we can find out whether the executive branch of the Government is going to comply with the subpena of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, and it is vital.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If it is not going to comply with the subpena of the United States Senate and give us records which are necessary in order for any kind of an effective job to be done, then the Congress of the United States, in the exercise of its responsibilities under the Constitution, may be forced to take such other steps as are necessary with the power it has under the Constitution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the second point I was going to bring out in my questioning of the Senator. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the observation made by the junior Senator from California. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that when the question was asked last night I gave the impression that I felt that under the provisions of the Reorganization Act all the files necessary would be furnished to the committee. I am now of the opinion that they will not. I believe the files may not be obtained unless the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan is agreed to. Under its provisions the files necessary to make a complete and exhaustive research could

be obtained. Unless such files are obtained, no effective kind of investigation, such as the Senator from Oregon has been talking about, or that the majority leader has been talking about, can be made. An effective investigation cannot be made if we rely simply upon the authority granted under section 134 of the Reorganization Act.

I submit that the Senate should give the amendment favorable consideration. I hope the majority leader will accept it. Adoption of the amendment will give us the kind of investigation which I believe to be mandatory if we are to clear up the records of the 57 persons involved.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. May I inquire of the Senator from Michigan again the exact language of his amendment on this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. In line 8, after the period, I proposed to insert the following:

> In the conduct of this study and investigation the committee is directed to procure, by subpena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and such other agencies against whom charges have been heard.

In other words, if there is a charge made to the committee against a certain person, it will be the duty of the committee to direct a subpena to the department asking for the files and records of that employee.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will permit me, I will say I am in thorough agreement with the statement that a special committee is being set up. A standing committee is being selected, but it is being charged with a specific duty and responsibility. Therefore it becomes a special committee. That can always be done. The Senate itself can appoint another special committee, or the Senate can select for that purpose any one of its standing committees.

I am also in agreement that, upon specific authority, the production of the confidential files of the State Department or of any other department would have to be ordered and directed by the Senate. I do not think that would be within the power of the Foreign Relations Committee or of the committee constructed under this resolution.

But would it not be better for the committee itself, if it saw fit to go into any of those records, to come back to the Senate and request specific authority to do so? If the committee were going to do its duty at all, presumably it would do exactly that. If it started to operate a dragnet of this kind in the beginning, a hopeless situation would be developed.

Mr. FERGUSON. In reply, let me say that very serious charges were made against certain employees of the State Department and against certain persons who had left the State Department and who had entered the service of other Government departments. Those charges were to the effect of disloyalty to the United States. The Senator from Wisconsin indicated that he had obtained his information in regard to such disloyalty from the files and records of the State Department and of other departments. If the Senate of the United States does not direct this special committee, which is the Foreign Relations Committee, having charge of matters concerning the Department of State, to subpena those files and records, how could we ever be said to have actually investigated the charges?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. GEORGE. Did the Senator from Wisconsin specify the persons; did he go into details?

Mr. FERGUSON. He did not specify them by name, but he did specify them by number.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well. Then, what the Senator is proposing is that the special committee begin to use a dragnet and bring in all the files. When that is done the committee and the Senate itself will be so involved that they will be able to get nowhere.

But if the committee, in investigating any of these charges and in looking into them, finds specific names of persons who are charged with disloyalty, then the committee can come to the Senate—and presumably would have to come on more than one occasion—and can ask for some specific direction and authority. I agree that it should do so. But I do not see any common sense in going into all the departments now and asking that all their personnel files and loyalty files be brought up here.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not include any dragnet. I include only the files and records of the persons against whom charges are heard by the committee. The Senator from Wisconsin has indicated that he will voluntarily go before the committee or any other committee of the Senate and will give the names and the information he has. Therefore, this provision would apply only to those whom he has charged with some particular disloyalty. There is no intention to begin a dragnet or anything of that sort; the intention is merely to see that the charges now out in the public will be investigated by the Senate, and that the Senate will use every weapon it has, every agency it has, every authority it has, to investigate thoroughly and give to the public the answers to all the questions as to whether there is disloyalty.

Again I say that until that is done, until the public is satisfied that the Senate of the United States has aired every one of these charges and has used every weapon it has and every agency and every authority it has to air them for the benefit of the public, either in open or in closed session, the public will not be satisfied that we have done our duty.

Mr. President, I am in fact asking only for a thorough investigation. Having served on a number of investigating committees, I know how essential it is to get all the records and all the papers, in order to make a complete investigation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Would this involve the Federal Bureau of Investigation in any way?

Mr. FERGUSON. If that Bureau had loyalty files on a State Department employee, it would require the subpena of the committee to that agency to get that particular file on that particular person.

Mr. LUCAS. And whatever was in that file, regardless of what it was, would be spread before the committee. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. That is why I asked the junior Senator from Oregon whether that could be done in private. He said that under his amendment, and the one accepted by the Senator from Illinois, it could be done in private, and therefore no harm would be done to those records or to that agency.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has been a Member of the Senate a good while, and he knows how much privacy results from executive sessions of committees. I have attended a considerable number of them, and I have yet to find an executive session which I have attended from which the news did not subsequently appear in the headlines, either the same day or the following day, in regard to what went on in the executive session. There is always a leak.

So someone will obtain, somehow, or in some way, the information. It seems to me the information in the files will be bound to get out to the public. I am in favor of a full and fair investigation, but I am also in favor of protecting the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which, in my judgment, is the greatest agency of the Government operating today for the protection and safety of America.

I believe I know how Mr. J. Edgar Hoover feels about files, as a result of what happened in the Judith Coplon case. As the Senator from Michigan knows, in that case there was a question of whether all the files would be opened, with the result that a number of innocent persons would be smeared, or whether the files would not be opened, with the result that certain evidence relating to the person on trial might not be developed. The former course was pursued, and the effectiveness of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and certain of its sources of information was destroyed.

I raise this point because of what the opening of files may do to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I should like to have the Senator reply regarding that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall reply at once.

Mr. President, the public, the citizens of the United States, will never be satisfied that the Senate has performed its duty if it does not look into all pertinent files, including the files of the FBI in regard to the disloyalty charges which have been brought against State Department employees. Suppose that in the FBI records today there is clear and convincing evidence which would prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a certain person has been disloyal to the United States, and suppose the committee did not request those files. Would the public or would the Senate be satisfied that it had all the evidence in regard to whether the Department of State was free and clear from the

charges of disloyalty which have been made in the Senate against such persons if that file was not thrown open in this investigation?

For months, there have been charges of disloyalty on the part of certain State Department employees. We well remember that a charge was made by the Un-American Activities Committee, of the House of Representatives, against Alger Hiss; and we well remember that the United States Department of State did not open its mouth about the charges, even though in its files there was evidence of guilt.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. In just a moment.

Mr. President, not only that, but the President of the United States said, "All these charges against Mr. Hiss are nothing but red herrings."

Mr. President, in a court of justice—in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, in fact—a jury decided that Mr. Hiss was guilty of perjury, which in effect proved that he had been disloyal while serving in the Department of State, by passing out certain records and files. That proved beyond any doubt that the President of the United States was wrong when he said the charges against Mr. Hiss were nothing but red herrings.

I say that unless the people of the United States can have a thorough and complete investigation of every one of the charges which have been made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin, there will still be a cloud over the State Department of the United States. America cannot afford that. America will not stand for that. So everything should be done to complete the airing of that charge; and the only way that can be done is to see the loyalty files of the Department of Justice and the loyalty files of the Department of State.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin has said that the Loyalty Division of the Department of State recommended the discharge of certain employees on the ground of disloyalty. I say that those files should be subpenaed. The junior Senator from Michigan has served on the Appropriations Committee, and before the issuance of the Executive order preventing congressional committees from seeing such files, certain files were brought to the Appropriations Committee and were exhibited to it.

I say to the Senate of the United States that if it could see all those files, I am sure the Senate would find a situation of this sort: that a person's loyalty had been questioned—so much so, that the departmental agency in charge of security had put in the file itself a memorandum saying that person should not see top-secret papers.

The department head under whom the person worked was never notified of the order in the file. He stated to the committee that the person had access to all papers in his office, top secret and otherwise. Those are the kinds of files that must be subpenaed before the committee. They are the files which will show whether there are disloyal persons within the Department of State. Again I say there is but one way to clear up the matter. That is for the United States Senate to speak. It is for the United States Senate to say they will have a complete investigation; and, to be sure that the public will know it is going to be a complete investigation.

The amendment is a directive to the committee to subpena the file, and to let us have a show-down. Let us have a show-down once and for all as to whether in a matter so important as the one now before the Senate and before this great country, a committee of the Senate can see the records and files and ascertain whether there is disloyalty within our Government. We must satisfy the people, because ours is a Republic. I say, Mr. President, it is no more nor less than a direction by the Senate to its committee, to seek, through the avenue open to it, which is the avenue of subpena, to obtain the files. It is not that the committee should make a request, but that it be authorized to issue a subpena, the highest authority of the Senate, to obtain records from the Department of State and all other agencies. It has been said by the junior Senator from Massachusetts that rule 134 may apply only to individuals outside the Government of the United States. The rule reads:

COMMITTEE POWERS

SEC. 134. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures (not in excess of $10,000 for each committee during any Congress) as it deems advisable.

The Senator has indicated it is very possible that that applies only to witnesses not in the employ of agencies of the Government. I do not share that construction of its language. I think the language clearly covers all witnesses. But we do not want the State Department or any other department or agency of the Government to hide behind the language of the general rule. The amendment now proposed would leave no doubt that a subpena would apply to Government witnesses and Government records and files. For that reason we should have a vote upon this important amendment, if it is not accepted by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. McCARTHY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois. I will yield after that to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to get back to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I am satisfied every Senator has the utmost confidence in that agency of the Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have. I want to say publicly I have such confidence.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to do anything that is going to injure the effectiveness or the efficiency of that great institution of Government, and if I read the amendment correctly, there is no limit to the number of files that may be brought in. In other words, the records of all Government employees within the State Department and within other agencies, against whom charges have been made may be subpenaed under this amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. If the charges were made against someone in the State Department, I suppose there would be a hearing.

Mr. FERGUSON. And it would be necessary to get the files.

Mr. LUCAS. It would be necessary to get the files. Since there is no end to the number of people who can be brought in, there would also be no end to the number of files which could be subpenaed for production before the committee, if charges had been made.

The Senator from Illinois is just as anxious as is anyone else to root out the Communists, if there are any, in the State Department or any other agency of Government. But at the same time the Senator from Illinois does not want in any way to break down the efficiency of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I should like to know whether the Senator from Michigan has ever obtained the opinion of J. Edgar Hoover on this very thing?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; the junior Senator from Michigan has not spoken to Mr. Hoover. Mr. Hoover is entirely under the direction of the Attorney General.

Mr. LUCAS. I was coming to that.

Mr. FERGUSON. I say again, if we cannot in this investigation examine the files and records of the one agency whose duty it has been, and which has received millions of dollars of the public taxpayers' money for the purpose of obtaining evidence of any disloyalty on the part of people within the United States, if an executive session of the great Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate cannot see those files, then I say the public will never be convinced that we have looked into the question of the loyalty or disloyalty of persons within the State Department.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. McCARTHY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield to the Senator from Wisconsin after I have yielded to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. This is extremely important, and I am trying my best to go along with the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the Senator can do so.

Mr. LUCAS. I feel the investigation is very necessary. On the other hand, I cannot get away from the value of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the country, to its safety and security. When the Committee on Foreign Relations, in executive session, after hearing all the testimony, and having before it, the file which has come from the FBI, has finally determined a certain man to be disloyal and a man who ought to be tried, then, under the Morse amendment, the man

will be given a public hearing. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Then the file of the FBI, regardless of what is in it, becomes open to the public, regardless of what anyone says.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; that is not the idea of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. He limited it to such competent evidence as may be in the file.

Mr. LUCAS. Anyway, with the file before it, it is up to the committee to make a determination as to what is to be made public, and what is not.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Supposing the committee decided all of it should go in?

Mr. FERGUSON. Presumably, then, it should.

Mr. LUCAS. It should all go in?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Then it would make no difference how many persons might be involved or might be mentioned in the file; just as in the Judith Coplon case, they would be smeared by the opening of the file, regardless of whether they were guilty or innocent.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Illinois has been a lawyer all his life.

Mr. LUCAS. I was, until I came to the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, all his adult life. [Laughter.] But, Mr. President, the Senator knows that in every trial—yes, in every civil trial and every criminal trial—there is evidence that people would not like to have disclosed, but which justice, as it is administered in the United States in open court, requires be brought out to establish certain facts, and therefore it is essential. The distinguished Senator from Iowa has indicated that today there are men in America who are guilty of crimes, who are not being tried, because the United States Government feels it cannot prosecute them without laying the evidence before the public, evidence which the Government does not want the public to know. Mr. President, if the United States Government does not want to produce such evidence, it will never seek an indictment by a grand jury. But the evidence showed that the secret files of the United States, files in the Department of Justice and the FBI, were being seen by Judith Coplon. She has been convicted of having removed from those files certain records. Then Senators stand here to say the Foreign Relations Committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Texas, should not see a file of the United States Department of Justice.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I do not like to have him place me in a position which is not justified.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have sought to interpret the position in which the distinguished Senator has placed himself.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois has not placed himself in any such position as that suggested by the Senator from Michigan. All the Senator from Illinois is trying to do is to obtain the viewpoint of the able Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I have been trying to get the Senator's viewpoint with respect to what the production of the files will do to the effectiveness of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Senator cannot put words into my mouth, in an argument of that kind. That is all I am trying to do, and I think it is a legitimate and fair approach the Senator from Illinois is trying to make on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am trying to answer the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think there is a very easy way of meeting the objection of the Senator from Illinois. As the Senator from Michigan knows, there are two parts of a file. There is the part containing the evidence and the conclusions. There is also that part which divulges the sources of information. I am sure neither the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Wisconsin, nor any other Senator wants to obtain the latter part of the file, which deals with the sources of information. So, I think it should be made clear at this time that it is not the desire of any Senator to require the production of any part of the file other than that having to do with the evidence itself and the conclusions. That is all that is needed. We do not need to inquire into the sources of information, the tip-offs, within the State Department or anywhere else.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amendment is clear The amendment says the Foreign Relations Committee shall have the right to see the file. As indicated by the Senator from Oregon, who proposed an amendment to require public hearings, the committee may sit in executive session, and I am assuming the subcommittee, or the committee as a whole, which is to conduct the examination, will use such portions of the file and in such way as will not harm the security of the United States. But it will assure the public that a committee of the Senate has seen the file and that the committee knows all about the employees of the State Department who have been charged with disloyalty, and that the committee will determine whether charges should be made. Then, and then only, will the public be satisfied that the Senate has discharged its duty.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from California, who was on his feet first.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Michigan clarified the point which may have been in the mind of the Senator from Illinois, and perhaps also in the minds of some others of us. In his earlier statement, it appeared as though perhaps the production of all the records of all the employees would be required. Obviously the Senator never had that in mind. What he has in mind, as I understand, is that when charges have been made, when the Senator from Wisconsin or anyone else comes before the commitee to say, concerning Mr. X, Mr. Y, or Mr. Z, "We have evidence and indications that those persons have been active against the best interests of the United States," the committee, then, acting in its capacity as a representative of the Senate of the United States, will, under the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Michigan, subpena, by direction of the Senate, the specific records and the specific persons.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is not a general dragnet. It will be applied only as against those persons who have been named before the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Assuming the committee decides to place a charge against X, and does so on the basis of information which is in the files furnished by confidential informants of the FBI, and the committee is now ready for an open hearing, in what position is the committee, I would ask the Senator, as to whether it should call the FBI to disclose the confidential informants so that they could be placed on the stand to give testimony against X in his open trial?

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee itself would determine its position in such a case. This is only a directive to procure the file and to examine the file.

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; but I want to point out to the Senator——

Mr. FERGUSON. It does not say that the committee shall call J. Edgar Hoover or any other particular witness. That will be solely within the discretion of the committee. The thing the Senate would do by this directive is to see that the committee gets the file. The Senator from Michigan is of the opinion that if the Senate speaks by this amendment, the committee will get the files. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Michigan is not interested in his amendment merely for the purpose of getting some files so that they may be examined. He wants those files so that the committee may proceed upon the basis of the information contained therein. Is not that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I expect the committee to act with diligence.

Mr. McMAHON. Let us suppose the case of Mr. A—we have before us in executive session the FBI file on Mr. A, and we find 10 confidential informants listed. The Senator has seen the files and knows how they are listed. They are listed as one, two, three, four, and so forth, as having informed the FBI that Mr. A is disloyal; he has been reading the Daily Worker, and so forth. We say, "All right; we shall put Mr. A on trial." We then put him on trial. Do we then

say to the FBI, "Produce one, two, three, four, your confidential informants, for the purpose of making a case against Mr. A"? At that point, how does the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations proceed?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Because I think this is in point——

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Michigan is getting himself a lawyer.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; the Senator from Michigan is as able a lawyer as can be found in the Senate Chamber, and the Senator from California happens to be a newspaperman. I have served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with the able Senator from Connecticut, and I think I am somewhat familiar with some of the problems which the Senator has in mind. It seems to me that the committee will deal with each case based on the importance of the case. If, after examination of the record of the FBI, it shall determine there is another Alger Hiss holding a position of responsibility in which he can do great damage to the Government of the United States, it may call in Mr. Hoover and say to him, "Mr. Hoover, this is a matter of such paramount importance to the Government of the United States that we feel the informants should disclose themselves, and the public service will be better served if they do."

If, on the other hand, it is a matter of a chauffeur in the Department and the disclosing of the informants would not be worth while, the committee, in its judgment, might determine it would not be worth the effort and the damage which might result. I would say that each case must stand on its own feet.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt that each case would stand on its own feet. This debate is bringing out the fact that unless the committee gets the records, it will have nothing on any of these persons as to disloyalty, because the evidence of disloyalty is in the files. The committee is not going to make an independent check; it is not going to start from scratch to make an investigation of a particular person. It is first going to say, "What is shown by the records of the departments which have already investigated the subject?" If we are to start at scratch, we shall get nowhere in the examination.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know the Senator disagrees with the point which was made that there is no authority to get records by subpena from a department official if the President orders to the contrary.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator is attempting to do by this amendment, and is clearly doing by it, is to put the burden of proof on any department head who refuses to give the Senate committee the records. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, the Senate committee will be trying its best to make just as full an investigation and as fair an investigation as it is possible to make, but it can only do so if it gets the records.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the records are refused, the burden of proof is on the executive branch which refuses the records, is it not? Is that a fair statement?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is a fair statement. That is why I think the committee would want this amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the resolution should be agreed to and the committee should proceed to carry out the intention of the resolution to find out about the charges made by the Senator from Wisconsin, is it not a fact that under section 134 there is no authority for a senatorial committee to get the files of one of these disloyal persons?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would not go that far.

Mr. WHERRY. The committee has the authority to get them, provided the agency which has the files will give them to the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. If the agency refuses, then there is no authority unless it be established under this amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it is at least a special committee being created, and we should, in the creation of the committee, provide for the power of subpena.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not necessary that this amendment be placed in the resolution to accomplish the very purpose about which I have just asked the Senator?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Why should not the Senate committee see the files?

Mr. FERGUSON. I know of no reason, if it is going to make an investigation.

Mr. WHERRY. Are not Members of the Senate entrusted by agencies of the Government with information, such as atomic-energy information, the hydrogen bomb, top military strategy, and things of that nature? Are not the Members of the Senate entrusted with such information? If so, why in the world cannot the members of the Foreign Relations Committee see what they want to see in the files?

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no reason why the Foreign Relations Committee should not see the files.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that if a representative of some Government agency presents himself before a committee and says, "Now, here is the file; ask me questions about it, and if there is anything that is of interest I will answer them"—does the Senator feel that is a sufficient examination of a file to prove the charges which the Senator from Wisconsin has made against 57 persons?

Mr. FERGUSON. It does not go to prove them at all.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, it seems to me, if we are to have the kind of investigation which has been suggested by the majority leader, which is to go to the bottom of the question and clear those who are innocent and, if possible, secure evidence to place charges against those who are guilty, the committee must have the authority to demand of any department its files, so as to make a complete examination of them.

I wish to ask the Senator one more question. When I joined with the Senator it was to say that, so far as I was concerned, I believed the Senate had a right to examine any file. Hundreds of employees examine the files. They have a right to look at the files. Why should not 96 Senators have a right to look at them? If we do not wish to look at all the files, we can look at the files of those against whom charges have been made. Certainly the files should be forthcoming as to those against whom charges have been made, if the committee wishes to examine them to see whether the charges of disloyalty can be proved.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe that I shall have to answer the question propounded by the distinguished Senator, because I believe he has answered it himself.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the objectives of the Senator, and I should like to ask him a question. Like the Senator from Nebraska, I do not believe that there is any question about entrusting a file to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Top secrets have been entrusted to many committees. During the war the topmost secret of all was entrusted to a committee. But I wonder what would happen in a case I have in mind. We are talking about an open hearing, and about being fair. Let us assume that in connection with its investigation of Mr. A the committee looks at all the files, including confidential files, FBI files, and top-secret files, and the committee either charges him, or feels that there is enough evidence to warrant charging him.

They bring Mr. A in, and he says, "Well, I would like to know what the basis of these charges is." The committee says, "We have read it in certain files." They make that general statement, without divulging anything further. Suppose the accused says, "I think I should be confronted with the files from which you accuse me." What would be the situation? Suppose the person were to say, "I would like to know who said it. I would like to know where it came from. I would like to know who accuses me." And so on, and so forth. Would not the effect be, if the committee granted the request, to bring all the files out in the open, including the FBI files?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator answers his own question. What he says to the committee is, "Please don't look at any files, because if you have any knowledge someone may

come in and ask you what knowledge you have."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no.

Mr. FERGUSON. How can a person be investigated if the files are not obtained?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not mean that. I did not say the committee should not see the files. Suppose the accused says, "I would like to know who said it. I would like to know who told the FBI that."

Mr. FERGUSON. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], I understand, will be the chairman of the subcommittee. If that be true, he being the head of the Atomic Energy Committee, I take it for granted that he has used a good deal of discretion in that committee, and that he will use discretion in the investigating committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are not in disagreement. Do I understand the Senator to say that if the accused were to say, "I would like to see the files from which I am accused," the committee would have to use its discretionary power if it involved an FBI file, and say, "We cannot give you that information?"

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee may do that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; the committee may do that. They could say, "In the interest of security, we cannot tell you that." Or they may say, "We simply cannot tell you that."

Mr. MAGNUSON. I come to my last question. They will have to use a great deal of discretion, because these persons have been accused of selling top secrets. When files are brought into an open hearing, and sometimes even in an executive hearing, I wonder where our top secrets go.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we do not wish to look at the files and do not wish to get the evidence, we will never satisfy the public that an investigation has been made.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I very much regretted that the majority leader was called upon to refer to the possibility that committees of the Senate were not able to retain confidences. I know he spoke rather facetiously. Sitting a little behind the majority leader is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. McKELLAR], who, along with several of his colleagues, possessed the most vital secret during the entire course of the war. They not only had knowledge regarding it, but they provided funds for it. I think it was one of the best-guarded secrets in history, so far as the American people were concerned. As a matter of fact, the Truman Committee, of which the President, when he was a Senator, was chairman, and of which I was a member, in trying to find out what in the name of heaven the Senator from Tennessee was doing with so many billions of dollars, fell upon the same information, and again, so far as I know, the secret was never disclosed to any unauthorized soul; although we now learn that Russia was apparently fully informed regarding it for a long period.

I see the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] in the Chamber. I have always supposed, until this moment, that the Atomic Energy Committee, of which he is the chairman, possessed a vast fund of secret information. Certainly, he has repeatedly referred to the great care with which the committee must move. I assume that there are a vast number of things they know about atomic energy which perhaps no other Members of the Senate know. I believe the majority leader, in arguing the question of this extension of power, would do well to consider whether or not any Members of the Senate—and I do not confine it to the Committee on Appropriations, or the Committee on Atomic Energy, or the Committee on Foreign Relations, which certainly has a vast amount of information regarding our foreign relations—should be brought under suspicion because of the unfortunate fact that unquestionably there have been leaks. There have been leaks in the House and elsewhere. I believe the Senate has confidence, and I see no other way of having constitutional processes and functions unless we seek to build with confidence, as I believe would be warranted by the procedure here contemplated.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not like to remain silent after what the Senator from Maine has said I cast no reflection on any Senator. I merely know what has happened since I have been in the Senate. I have been in many executive sessions considering different matters, and seldom have I been able to find that a secret was kept. Someone heard about the subject of the meeting in a short time, and the newspapers usually got the news before I got out of the room. I think that is pretty generally understood around the Senate.

I, of course, realize that no doubt some of the top secrets have been kept. There is no question about that. If they are right at the top, it may be possible they are kept. But there is nothing too serious about most of the executive sessions, which keeps some of the participants from talking, or the clerks occasionally talk, and somehow commentators and reporters get the news after executive sessions are held. I am merely speaking from long experiences I have had with executive sessions. Perhaps I have been in the wrong group during those sessions.

Now let me ask the Senator a question with respect to his amendment. He says in the amendment "and such other agencies," so that it would read "records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and such other agencies," and so forth. Would the Senator be willing to add there, "so far as the committee deems advisable"? The phrase "such other agencies" takes in a great deal of territory.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan does not see how he can accept that modification. Under the wording "such other agencies" the committee itself would be allowed to determine the agencies which might have the records it desired.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me get the amendment straight. The amendment applies directly to employees of the State Department?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. It applies directly to the employees of the State Department against whom charges have been filed?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The amendment applies only to those employees of the State Department against whom charges have been filed which have been heard by the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. In the event it is determined that some former employee of the State Department was at one time accused of being guilty of disloyalty to the Government, and he has moved to some other department, that is the individual the Senator is after when he says "other agencies"?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senator is really confining the amendment to State Department employees, whether they are employed there now or have been employed there heretofore?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection to the amendment. I shall accept the amendment, but I say, in accepting it, that I am sure the Senator is fully familiar with what has been observed since the days of George Washington with respect to the battle between the legislative branch of the Government and the executive branch.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am familiar with that.

Mr. LUCAS. It is all in the law books. I remind the Senator of a current event, to show how jealous the legislative branch of the Government is of its rights. Recently in the trial of one Cristoffel indicted for perjury, the judge of the court issued a subpena duces tecum on the Clerk of the House of Representatives to bring in the confidential records of a special committee of the House, and the House of Representatives on three different occasions voted to tell the judge where to go. By their action they said they were not going to deliver up the secret minutes of the committee which they had in their possession in the House of Representatives. In other words, the House of Representatives flouted the judiciary. That is what has been going on through all the history of this great Republic. The legislative flouts the judiciary. The judiciary flouts the legislative branch. So it goes. I merely mention that in passing because the latest example of how seriously the legislative branch of the Government is guarding its rights and keeping its records from going to another branch of the Government can be found in the action taken by the House of Representatives.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, following the discussion which has taken place between the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan and other Senators on the

floor, and since it is the purpose under the resolution only to investigate those who are charged, and particularly those who are charged under the evidence offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, I ask to withdraw my second amendment which provides "or any other agency of the Government concerned with the intercourse of the United States with other nations."

I understand that the Commerce Committee is making an investigation of its own, and any other committee which is concerned with any other department of the Government, can make investigations of its own. While we wish to have an investigation of all those charged who are or have been in the State Department, including those who may once have been in the State Department but are now employed by another department or agency, we want to avoid any conflict with a possible investigation by another committee. It is for that reason that I ask to withdraw my second amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I simply would like to ask the Senator from Michigan if he is not a little concerned over the statement just made by the majority leader, who represents on the floor of the United States Senate the administration in control of the White House? It seems to me that while it is true that historically there has been this difference of opinion, yet in the case of ferreting out those who may be disloyal to the Government of the United States, the executive branch of the Government and the legislative branch of the Government should act as members of the same team together. They should not act at arm's length. The executive branch should not attempt to throw technicalities in the way of the Senate of the United States doing its job to help clean out any subversive elements that exist in the Government of the United States. I cannot believe that the distinguished President of the United States, a former Member of this body, will interpose any obstacles, based on technicalities, to prevent a full and complete investigation so that once and for all we may determine whether there are any subversive elements in the executive branch of the Government of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from California for his statement. I think it will impress the President and all concerned that this is the time and place for teamwork between the executive branch and the legislative branch. There is no better place to have bipartisanship. I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for accepting the two amendments, because that shows a spirit of cooperation in the attempt to have a thorough and complete bipartisan investigation in order to satisfy the public.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very glad the Senator made that last statement, in view of what the Senator from California just said. I do not say that there was an implication, but there is a possible implication on the part of the Senator from California that the Senator from Illinois, because he happened to make a statement of fact concerning what existed throughout the history of the country from the beginning of the Republic in respect to quarrels between the executive and the legislative branches, was telling someone in advance as to what is going to happen.

So far as I am concerned, I will tell my distinguished friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] now that I will do everything within my power to cooperate with the committee to see that whatever is necessary is done in order to ferret this thing out. I want the Senate to know that and I want the country to know that. I want to have investigated the charges which have been made by the Senator from Wisconsin. I want the Senator from Wisconsin to go before the committee and give the names. I want him to tell the committee where he obtained his information. I want him to tell the committee what it is. I want him to go into details before the committee, because the responsibility on the Senator from Wisconsin is a heavy one as a result of the speeches he has made throughout the country and as a result of the speech he made here on the floor of the United States Senate. It is his duty and his obligation to lay before the committee every fact, regardless of what it may be, respecting where he obtained the information, and to lay everything that is in his files before the committee. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin will do that.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan wants the same thing.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know why the Senator from Illinois continues to repeat exactly the same thing I have previously said respecting what I will do. I do not need his advice. I have said that I would give all the information I have. The Senator from Illinois has heard me say that the names are available. Therefore, why he continues to advise me to do what I have a dozen times said I would do, I do not know.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not advising the Senator from Wisconsin to do anything. I doubt whether any Senator on this side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle can effectively advise the Senator from Wisconsin.

What I am trying to do is to help the Senator from Texas. However, I am sure he does not need it, because he is no green hand in such investigations, having had such a long and distinguished career in this body.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, before I yield the floor I want to say that the hypothetical case I cited earlier actually was an instance of what a file showed in relation to a certain State Department employee. However, that employee is no longer with the State Department. So far as the Senator from Michigan knows he is not connected with any Department. It follows that no reflection is cast upon the State Department by the reference to that disloyal employee.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to notify the Senator from Illinois about one thing. I notice that he said that he hoped I would go before the committee and tell exactly where I received all the information I have. I know the State Department is very eager to know how some of us now know about the unusual activities in that Department. For example, I know they are curious to know how we know that in their files there are recommendations that certain individuals be dismissed, and that after those recommendations were made those individuals were given top secret clearance.

I want to assure the Senator from Illinois and the Senate that I do not intend to so enlighten the State Department. If I went before any committee and gave the names and said, for example, "John Jones from the State Department has given us access to certain information" that man's job would not be worth a tinker's damn. I am going to give out nothing to satisfy the curiosity of the State Department officials or the Senator from Illinois by telling how I developed or where I developed all the information I have. All the information will be made available. Everything I make available will be confirmed by the State Department files.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement in reply to the Senator from Wisconsin. We now find that the Senator from Wisconsin is not going to give to the committee the sources from which he obtained the information with respect to those against whom he has made charges. Yet the Senator from Illinois has just accepted an amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan which seeks to bring in FBI files with all the information therein. We want Mr. Hoover and his men to tell everything to the committee. Yet the Senator from Wisconsin now says he is not going to give the committee any information respecting the sources of the information he obtained, and which he gave to the country and to the Senate the other night.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate committee will insist that the Senator from Wisconsin gives to the committee the sources of his information. If a committee of the United States Senate is going to do an effective job it must know exactly where the information came from. The committee must know that. The Senator from Wisconsin is the one individual more responsible for the investigation than any other individual, by reason of the charges he has made. He cannot hide behind the sources of the information, which, if true, threatens the security of our country. If all the individuals he charges with disloyalty to the Government are guilty, it is his duty as a United States Senator and as a citizen of the United States to tell exactly where he obtained the information. He has as much responsibility in

that respect as the FBI would have. It was stated by the Senator from Michigan that the FBI should lay its files before the committee. If its files are laid before the committee and charges are made against A, and there are four informants or a dozen informants, and it becomes necessary to put those informants on the stand in order to prove disloyalty to the Government, they ought to be placed on the stand so as to let the people know who informed the country with respect to the disloyalty of a certain individual or certain individuals. The Senator from Wisconsin is in the same position with respect to his informants as we may find the informants in the FBI file.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me tell the Senator from Illinois that it is of no concern to him or anyone else as to how I secured the information from the State Department files. It is information to which the Senator from Wisconsin or any other Senator should be entitled. To obtain the information which I read to the Senate I succeeded in penetrating the iron curtain, Truman's iron curtain, of secrecy. I have freely given this information to the Senate, and under no circumstances would I give the names of any Government employee who may have aided me in securing that information. If such there were and I were to give their names, their jobs would not be worth that much.

Mr. President, so that there will be no question in the minds of any Senators or in any other citizens, the Senator from Wisconsin will not ever give the names of any Government employees who may have helped him secure the information which he presented to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not surprised that the Senator will not give up the information. Yet every Senator knows that we are now proceeding into an investigation which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said would probably be a historic one. Yet the Senator from Wisconsin, who is responsible for bringing on this investigation, who knows the facts with respect to those who are charged, says now he will refuse to give to the committee any information respecting the source of his information.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me it is very important for the Senate to distinguish between the type of information the Senator from Wisconsin says he does not intend to reveal and the type of information coming from persons who have information regarding disloyalty in the Government of the United States.

I have no knowledge of the documents the Senator from Wisconsin has or the facts upon which he made his charges; but it seems to me that the basic matter for the committee to investigate is whether there is available in the files of the State Department or in the files of the FBI information indicating that there are in the State Department persons who are disloyal to the Government or who are bad security risks.

It does not seem to me that it is the duty of the Senate or of the committee to leave that issue and go to the question either of trying the Senator from Wisconsin or of closing up the source of the information he has.

I think that every Member of the Senate and, I am certain, every newspaperman in the country, recognizes that on many occasions there have been available to them sources of information whereby the press has for the first time disclosed to the Congress and to the public information which the Congress and the country otherwise would not have had. The newspapermen have always taken the position that they would not disclose the source of their information. Why have they done so? Because once they did disclose it, they would dry up that source of information.

I think the Senator from Wisconsin in this particular is in the same position that a newspaperman would be in.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for his contribution.

I wish to make this closing statement, and then I shall be through: Whoever may be the persons, either in the State Department or in any other agency of the Government, who are charging various individuals with disloyalty to their Government, and are going through the back door in order to get that information out, they should have the intestinal fortitude, if they are the right kind of Americans, to come forward themselves and give such information to the committee and to the people of the United States. I hope that, somehow, in some way, we shall be able to learn of the identity of these informants.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. In a moment.

Mr. President, I am not attempting to try the Senator from Wisconsin, as has been indicated by the Senator from California. But if we are going to get all the facts and if everyone wishes to be on the square with this investigation, if we are going to drag in the FBI files, we should have all the information available from every source. Certainly, as the Senator from Wisconsin well knows, in a court of law the information he has presented here so far would not stand the legal test. In other words, those who are the fountainhead of that information would be compelled to come before a court and to give that testimony.

I know we are not serving as a court; but, Mr. President, the charges are so serious and far reaching that we should not overlook or withhold anything in attempting to learn the facts from everyone who has been interested in this matter from the beginning. If we can discover the employee——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me make myself absolutely clear: When I say that I will not divulge the source of any information, the Senator can rest assured that if I give any hearsay evidence that was received from anyone, obviously those names will be given to the committee.

However, I will not under any circumstances give to the committee the name of anyone who has furnished me with documents, because a document speaks for itself, and it is no business whatever of the committee where I got such documents.

I do know that as of today the State Department is very curious to know whether someone in the State Department has given me any documented information on any communistically inclined employees. Any documented information which I supply the committee can be checked with the original State Department files.

That is one reason why the Senator from Michigan has offered to the resolution the amendment providing that the original files shall be available.

Again, Mr. President, when I say that I will not divulge the source, I repeat that I have no intention of giving the name of any person who may have furnished me with any document, because, as I have said, the document will speak for itself.

On the other hand, if I give any hearsay evidence that has been received from some person, the Senate can rest assured that I will give the names of such persons to the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, we find ourselves in a very anomalous situation, namely, that we will open to the committee everything in the FBI files, but the McCarthy files are sacred.

I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois agree to modify the resolution by accepting the two Ferguson amendments as modifications of the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I agree to those modifications.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question, then, is on agreeing to the resolution as modified. [Putting the question.]

The resolution (S. Res. 231) was agreed to.

The resolution, as agreed to, is as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are or have been employed by the Department of State. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable, and if said recommendations are to include formal charges of disloyalty against any individual, then the committee, before making said recommendations, shall give said individual open hearings for the purpose of taking evidence or testimony on said charges. In the conduct of this study and investigation, the committee is directed to procure, by subpena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and such other agencies against whom charges have been heard.

REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT CONTRACTS ON RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there is pending on the calendar, No. 1280, Senate bill 3001, to expedite the re-

habilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases. The bill was introduced by the two Senators from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN and Mr. JOHNSON]. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was unanimous in reporting the bill favorably, with an amendment.

Since it was reported to the Senate, on February 14, the House of Representatives has passed and sent to the Senate an identical bill, calendar 1285, House bill 7220. That measure amends a law which was enacted at the last session of Congress with respect to rehabilitation and betterment contracts on reclamation projects. A provision of that law is to the effect that when a contract for rehabilitation or betterment is made between the Secretary of the Interior and the water users upon a project, it shall be submitted to the Congress and shall remain there for 60 days before anything can be done regarding it.

In the State of Colorado an emergency situation has arisen by reason of damage to a tunnel. It is essential that the contract which has been agreed upon shall not have to wait for the 60-day period required by the law.

So the bill will merely authorize the committees to act within that time.

I have consulted the majority leader and the minority leader regarding this matter, and I find there is no objection to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask one or two questions. Is it the purpose of the Senator from Wyoming to request unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed immediately to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether a bill similar to the Senate bill has been passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In reply to the Senator from Nebraska, let me say that a similar bill has been passed by the House of Representatives, and is now on the Senate calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, let me say that I understand that authorizations for this matter have already been made; is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I further understand that because there is an emergency in Colorado, it is desired to advance the date, without waiting the full 60 days, in order that the emergency may be taken care of.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The purpose of this measure is to amend the existing law merely by adding the words:

Except that any such determination may become effective prior to the expiration of such 60 days in any case in which each such committee approves an earlier date and notifies the Secretary, in writing, of such approval.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. President, there is no objection to the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of House bill 7220.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7220) to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill 3001 be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 3001 is indefinitely postponed.

ELIMINATION OF OVERLAPPING, DUPLICATION, AND WASTE IN GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in the first session of this Congress, I introduced what I deemed to be a highly important measure which appears in the RECORD as Senate bill 810. Its purpose was to create a commission to study the whole question of intergovernmental relations, with a view to the elimination of overlapping, duplication, and waste in governmental operations at all levels.

This measure was properly referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and, as a result of lengthy hearings, was reported as Senate bill 1946, on June 13, 1949.

Despite the merit of the measure, Mr. President, despite the fact that it carries out one of the Hoover report recommendations, despite the distinguished list of cosponsors who joined with me in this worthy effort to attain a better balance in our governmental structure, the bill was repeatedly objected to by the majority at each call of the calendar from the date it was reported to the present time.

Now, Mr. President, I have no pride of authorship in this measure, but I sincerely hope that either this bill or some appropriate counterpart thereof will have consideration by the Senate at this session.

I have referred to its importance. Why, Mr. President, it could well be that the recommendations of the agency which the bill would create, would bring to the Congress of the United States, or might well bring to the Congress of the United States, a complete solution of such major issues as Federal aid to education, because the whole subject of grants-in-aid and Federal subsidies generally is involved in the studies contemplated under this measure. And so, Mr. President, as I indicated in my remarks earlier today, I hope that the majority will see to it that in the course of the next few weeks we are all given a chance not only to discuss thoroughly our views on this important issue but also to vote our convictions on what I consider to be one of the most vital measures before the Senate today.

DOOMSDAY BOOK FOR SCOTLAND—LETTER OF GEORGE WASHINGTON TO SIR JOHN SINCLAIR

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this being Washington's Birthday, I desire to read briefly into the record a letter which was written by George Washington on the 15th day of March 1793, to Sir John Sinclair, of Scotland, a former President of the Board of Agriculture of Great Britain, commenting very favorably upon the statistical account which Sir John initiated in Scotland in 1791. The object of the statistical account, in the words of its author, was to find out "the state of the country, for the purpose of ascertaining the quantum of happiness enjoyed by its inhabitants and the means of its future improvement." George Washington was so impressed with the object and purpose of the inquiry that was carried on by Sir John Sinclair—who, by the way, sent out about 850 questionnaires containing 200 questions each to every parish in Scotland—that, on March 15, 1793, he wrote the following letter:

I cannot but express myself highly pleased with the undertaking in which you are engaged (that of drawing up the Statistical Account of Scotland), and give my best wishes for its success. I am full persuaded, that when enlightened men, will take the trouble to examine so minutely into the state of society, as your inquiries seem to go, it must result in greatly ameliorating the condition of the people, promoting the interests of civil society, and the happiness of mankind at large. These are objects truly worthy the attention of a great mind and every friend to the human race, must readily lend his aid towards their accomplishment.

Mr. President, I think it rather significant that the first President of the United States, the man who presided over the Constitutional Convention, was moved to write such a letter to the sponsor of what was in effect the first inquiry into the condition of society in Scotland as long ago as 1793.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1283, House Joint Resolution 398, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 23, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 22, 1950:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Patrick J Gilmore, Jr, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 1, district of Alaska. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 7, 1950.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm John D Price, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief, Naval Air Training

Vice Adm. Donald B Duncan, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for this day when we unite to commemorate the life of George Washington, whom we reverently and affectionately call the Father of his Country.

Our hearts expand with pride as we think of his spirit of adventure, his fortitude in times of hardship, and his fidelity to the principles of righteousness and justice which inspired him to champion the cause of the oppressed colonists.

We rejoice in his testimony to a lofty idealism when he urged his fellow men to labor to keep alive within their breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience.

We thank Thee above all for his humble spirit and devout faith which sent him down upon his knees in prayer in order that he might know how to march in step with the eternal will and wisdom of God.

Grant that the memory of his life may strengthen the soul of our Republic and inspire us to labor in faith, in faithfulness, and in the fear of the Lord for the blessedness of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee and Mr. RANKIN made the point of order that a quorum was not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 75. An act authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No 53]

Allen, Ill.	Gilmer	Poulson
Allen, La.	Gregory	Powell
Arends	Hall,	Rabaut
Bailey	Edwin Arthur	Ramsay
Bates	Harden	Sabath
Blatnik	Hedrick	Sadowski
Boykin	Herter	Shafer
Bulwinkle	Jacobs	Smith, Ohio
Chatham	Jones, Mo.	Thomas
Chiperfield	Moulder	Towe
Davies, N Y	Murdock	Van Zandt
Dingell	O'Neill	Withrow
Fellows	Patterson	Woodhouse

The SPEAKER. On this roll 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the Journal be read in full.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal.

The Clerk read the Journal.

Mr. FULTON (interrupting the reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I move that further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. That can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. STEFAN (interrupting the reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 54]

Allen, La.	Harden	Pace
Arends	Hedrick	Rabaut
Blatnik	Herter	Sadowski
Bulwinkle	Hope	Simpson, Pa.
Burdick	Jacobs	Smith, Ohio
Byrne, N. Y.	Jennings	Towe
Case, S. Dak.	Jones, Mo.	Van Zandt
Chatham	Macy	
Davies, N. Y.	Marsalis	
Gilmer	Miller, Md.	
Hall,	Norton	
Edwin Arthur	O'Neill	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 401 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE JOURNAL

The Clerk continued reading the Journal.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was approved.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there is a camera in the gallery. Whoever has that camera will remove the camera or remove themselves and the camera immediately. That is a violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

In that case, is it not the rule to clear the gallery?

The SPEAKER. Not necessarily.

Mr. RANKIN. To clear them of those who are violating the law.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just made that suggestion.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 16, 1950, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McSWEENEY] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we ought to have the membership here. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighteen Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McSWEENEY].

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly honored by the opportunity that the Speaker has given me to read to the Congress of the United States the prophetic as well as the immortal words of the immortal George Washington.

As I grow older I am more and more of the belief that a gracious providence has blessed America in many ways. Among his greatest blessings has been the gift to us of men, unselfish men, like George Washington, to serve us in the crucial and critical periods of our history.

Charles Phillips, the great Irish orator, in going over the famous leaders of the past, attributed to them each their special abilities, and their special contributions to mankind, but he adds in these words:

In individual instances, no doubt, there are splendid exemplifications of some single, peculiar qualification, but it is reserved for George Washington to blend them all in one; and like the lovely chef d'oeuvre of the Grecian artist to exhibit in one glow of associated beauty, the pride of every model, and the perfection of every master.

I think you and I here as we are today would like to put this great question to the peoples of the world relative to Mr. Washington: "How shall we rank thee upon glory's page, thou more than soldier and just less than sage?"

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Washington's Farewell Address to the people of the United States:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by service faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and

water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of the party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit

of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, soonor or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties

from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy,

the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 75. An act authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S 204. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche;

S 229 An act for the relief of E W. Eaton Coal Co ;

S 309. An act for the relief of Gabe Budwee;

S 321. An act for the relief of Lloyd D. Lyles;

S 481 An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Clarence Herbert Hartman, a minor;

S 563 An act for the relief of the P. S. Cook Co ;

S 914. An act for the relief of Gladys Inez Greenwood,

S 1449. An act for the relief of Robert B. Workman,

S. 1916. An act for the relief of Edna A. Bauser;

S 1933. An act for the relief of C L Leffingwell and others, and

S 2520 An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted devised land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr Cox moves that as a further mark of respect to the memory of George Washington the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 127, nays 278, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—127

Abbitt	Brooks	Davis, Ga.
Abernethy	Brown, Ga.	Davis, Tenn.
Albert	Bryson	Deane
Allen, Ill.	Bulleson	DeGraffenried
Andrews	Burton	Dolliver
Barden	Camp	Doughton
Bates	Carlyle	Durham
Battle	Chelf	Elliott
Beckworth	Colmer	Evins
Bennett, Fla.	Combs	Fernandez
Bentsen	Cooley	Fisher
Boggs, La	Cooper	Frazier
Bolton, Md	Cox	Fugate
Bonner	Crawford	Gary
Boykin	Curtis	Gathings
Gillette	Meyer	Sims
Gore	Miles	Smathers
Gossett	Mills	Smith, Kans.
Grant	Morrison	Smith, Va
Gregory	Murray, Tenn.	Stanley
Hardy	Nicholson	Sutton
Hare	Norrell	Tackett
Harris	Pace	Teague
Harrison	Passman	Thomas
Hays, Ark	Patman	Thompson
Hébert	Peterson	Thornberry
Herlong	Pickett	Trimble
Hobbs	Plumley	Underwood
Hoffman, Mich	Poage	Vinson
Jensen	Preston	Vursell
Jones, Ala.	Priest	Wheeler
Jones, N C.	Rains	Whitaker
Kerr	Rankin	Whitten
Kilburn	Redden	Whittington
Kilday	Regan	Williams
Lanham	Rich	Willis
Larcade	Richards	Wilson, Tex.
Lucas	Rivers	Winstead
Lyle	Rogers, Fla.	Wood
McMillan, S C	Shafer	Woodruff
Magee	Short	Worley
Mahon	Sikes	
Mason	Simpson, Pa.	

NAYS—278

Addonizio	Eberharter	Kelly, N. Y.
Allen, Calif.	Ellsworth	Kennedy
Andersen, H Carl	Elston	Keogh
Andresen, August H.	Engel, Mich.	King
Angell	Engle, Calif.	Klein
Aspinall	Fallon	Kruse
Auchincloss	Feighan	Kunkel
Bailey	Fellows	Lane
Baring	Fenton	Latham
Barrett, Pa	Flood	LeCompte
Barrett, Wyo.	Fogarty	LeFevre
Beall	Forand	Lemke
Bennett, Mich	Ford	Lesinski
Biemiller	Fulton	Lind
Bishop	Furcolo	Linehan
Blackney	Gamble	Lodge
Blatnik	Garmatz	Lovre
Boggs, Del	Gavin	Lynch
Bolling	Goodwin	McCarthy
Bolton, Ohio	Gordon	McConnell
Bosone	Gorski	McCormack
Bramblett	Graham	McCulloch
Breen	Granahan	McDonough
Brehm	Granger	McGrath
Brown, Ohio	Green	McGregor
Buchanan	Gross	McGuire
Buckley, Ill	Gwinn	McKinnon
Buckley, N. Y	Hagen	McMillen, Ill
Burdick	Hale	McSweeney
Burke	Hall, Leonard W	Mack, Ill
Burnside	Halleck	Mack, Wash.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hand	Madden
Byrnes, Wis.	Hart	Mansfield
Canfield	Harvey	Marcantonio
Cannon	Havenner	Marsalis
Carnahan	Hays, Ohio	Martin, Iowa
Carroll	Hefferman	Martin, Mass
Case, N J	Heller	Merrow
Case, S Dak.	Herter	Michener
Cavalcante	Heselton	Miller, Calif.
Celler	Hill	Miller, Md
Chelf	Hinshaw	Miller, Nebr.
Chesney	Hoeven	Mitchell
Chiperfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Monroney
Christopher	Holifield	Morris
Chudoff	Holmes	Morton
Church	Hope	Moulder
Clemente	Horan	Multer
Clevenger	Howell	Murphy
Cole, Kans.	Huber	Murray, Wis.
Cole, N. Y.	Hull	Nelson
Corbett	Irving	Nixon
Cotton	Jackson, Calif	Noland
Coudert	Jackson, Wash	Norblad
Crook	Jacobs	Norton
Crosser	James	O'Brien, Ill.
Cunningham	Javits	O'Brien, Mich.
Dague	Jenison	O'Hara, Ill.
Davenport	Jenkins	O'Hara, Minn.
Davis, Wis.	Johnson	O'Konski
Dawson	Jonas	O'Neill
Delaney	Judd	O'Sullivan
Denton	Kaist	O'Toole
D'Ewart	Karsten	Patten
Dingell	Kean	Patterson
Dollinger	Kearney	Perkins
Dondero	Kearns	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Donohue	Keating	Pfeiffer, William L.
Douglas	Kee	Philbin
Doyle	Keefe	Phillips, Calif.
Eaton	Kelley, Pa.	Phillips, Tenn.
Scott, Hardie	Vorys	
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Wadsworth	
Scrivner	Wagner	
Scudder	Walsh	
Secrest	Walter	
Shelley	Welchel	
Sheppard	Welch	
Simpson, Ill.	Werdel	
Smith, Wis.	White, Calif	
Spence	Wickersham	
Staggers	Widnall	
Steed	Wier	
Stefan	Wigglesworth	
Stigler	Wilson, Ind.	
Stockman	Wilson, Okla	
Sullivan	Withrow	
Taber	Wolcott	
Talle	Wolverton	
Taurlello	Woodhouse	
Taylor	Yates	
Tollefson	Young	
Velde	Zablocki	

NOT VOTING—26

Allen, La	Harden	Poulson
Anderson, Calif.	Hedrick	Rabaut
Arends	Jennings	Sadowski
Bulwinkle	Jones, Mo	Smith, Ohio
Chatham	Kirwan	Towe
Davies, N Y.	Lichtenwalter	Van Zandt
Gilmer	Macy	White, Idaho
Golden	Marshall	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Morgan	
	Murdock	

So the motion was not agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Van Zandt against.

Mr. Jones of Missouri for, with Mr. Davies of New York against.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana for, with Mr. Rabaut against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr Arends for with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Bulwinkle for, with Mr Morgan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Lichtenwalter.

Mr. Marshall with Mr. Macy.

Mr Murdock with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. VURSELL changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO DISPENSE WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense for the day with the operation of clause 7, rule XXIV, providing for the call of committees on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Must not the motion be in writing?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The motion is in writing.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida moves to dispense for the day with the operation of clause 7, rule XXIV, providing for the call of committees on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, do the rules provide for recognition on the motion?

The SPEAKER. Yes; 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is not that motion subject to a motion to table?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would not think so.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard read the Farewell Address of George Washington, the Father of our Country, who was first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his fellow-countrymen. In that message he enjoined unity and harmony among the people of this Nation.

He called upon the North; he called upon the South; he called upon the East, and he called upon the West to cooperate and work together in harmony and unity for the perpetuity of this great Nation. Yet today we are attempting to call up FEPC, a measure that will bring dissension, that will bring turmoil, confusion, and hatred among our people at a time when we should have unity, when we should have harmony and cooperation. In the greatest law-making body in the world this measure embroils discord, engenders dissension, and brings about confusion. There is on the part of some an effort to jam down the throats of others a measure, a principle, that is contrary to American ideals, to American liberty, and to the American Constitution and our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, the FEPC is a measure that will take away from that man who is in business the freedom and the liberty of choosing those who may work in his plant or who may get into his employment. It takes away a constitutional liberty which the employer should enjoy. It takes away from the employer the right and liberty to say whether he will employ one man or another. If this measure is passed, the employer's choice of selecting who shall work for him and be placed on his pay roll will be taken away. Is that right? Is that Americanism?

To me that is a step toward dictatorship. To me that is a step toward totalitarianism which all of us good Americans are supposedly fighting against.

Let me make the suggestion to you Members who are anxiously crying for FEPC for political purposes. Take it back to your State legislatures, for this is a State function for the legislatures of the various States.

If the people of Florida do not want this legislation, for God's sake do not put it upon them. Go back to your State legislatures. That is the place for this type of legislation. That would be democracy. Let the people of the various States say whether or not they want this legislation. If they do, put it into effect; Congress should not undertake to dictate to the several States in this type of legislation. If you will do that and the States pass it, that is up to them; that is local self-government.

Let me say now to those who are such stanch supporters of this legislation, if you will go back to the States with it you can give more employment than under this measure because this measure only applies to interstate commerce, or to those who produce goods by interstate commerce. Many thousand more employees will be taken care of if you go back to your States. So, if it is good at all, go to your State legislatures and let them do it. I think that should be done. If we are to be free, we must preserve State's rights against national power, and protect the rights of the States and the people in their freedom. Let us recall in this solemn hour what Thomas Jefferson said: "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread," and paraphrasing this—if Congress is to tell our people whom to hire in their own business, then sooner or later there will be no private enterprise, but only Government business.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman's motion prevails, then this House will have done that which it has done from time immemorial, since the time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, and that is to adjourn after the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This Congress has always adjourned in memory of the Father of our Country after the reading of his Farewell Address, and to refuse to adjourn now and take up this controversial and unconstitutional measure is a desecration of the memory of the Father of our Country, who stood for peace, unity, and harmony.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman a member of the committee?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman a member of the committee?

Mr. MORTON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion that we dispense with Calendar Wednesday proceedings. Regardless of how any one of us may feel on the question of this legislation, it is high time that this body took action. The issues involved have been debated, not only in this well and on this floor but on every street corner of America, for several years past. These continuing arguments have been generating passions and emotions which are directly contrary to the elimination of prejudice. Every man in this body is interested in the elimination of prejudice and intolerance.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. And everywhere that they have discussed it thoroughly they have taken it up in the legislatures and beaten the fire out of it.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I am not arguing the merits of this bill; I am arguing only this motion.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Do not the States have a right to make their own laws and run their States as they please without the Federal Government doing it?

Mr. MORTON. I agree with the gentleman, and I am not arguing that point. I am arguing the point of whether here today and now we will settle this issue by voting one way or the other or whether we will continue this travesty on the greatest legislative body in the world.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I think the RECORD ought to show that an offer was made by the majority leader to postpone Calendar Wednesday until Thursday of this week in deference to George Washington's Birthday anniversary, but such a move would have to be by unanimous consent, and the opponents of this bill objected.

Mr. MORTON. I am not interested in getting into the politics of the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let those who would perpetuate this crime on the American Constitution——

Mr. MORTON. I yielded for an observation in connection with the motion, and not a speech.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is not what the gentleman is saying directed solely to the point that it is always said that a majority could control this House, and what the gentleman asks is that we act?

Mr. MORTON. That is exactly it. I think it is time that we face up to this issue and not hide behind parliamentary tricks, or the Committee on Rules, or anything else. You know, we raise a lot of horses and we race them down in Kentucky. It is a funny thing that this FEPC bill seems to be a part of that stable that runs so poorly at this time of year. The horses in that stable seem to run their best in November. Now, let us run FEPC one time during the winter while Congress is in session and vote it up or down.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it might be an opportune time to point out to Congress and to the country that those of us who contend and have contended that the rules of the House, in respect to the Committee on Rules, need not be changed in order that matters reported by legislative committees be brought on for action have had our position justified in the

fact that today under the call of Calendar Wednesday the FEPC measure will be before the House for consideration and action if the majority of the Members of the House so desire and act in furtherance of that desire.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that in order for this motion to prevail to suspend Calendar Wednesday, it must be by two-thirds vote.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I recall, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] made the observation that the majority of the House could control its actions. That is all very true, but every time I have heard him speak he has been speaking in favor of the minority ruling in business.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of this session of the Eighty-first Congress are just about zero. One reason is that we have spent most of our time ducking the issue of FEPC. Now let us quit stall walking and get to work.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PICKETT. On that motion, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does it take a two-thirds vote on this motion?

The SPEAKER. It does.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 121, nays 285, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—121

Abbitt	Fisher	Murray, Tenn
Abernethy	Frazier	Nicholson
Albert	Fugate	Norrell
Allen, Ill.	Gary	Pace
Andrews	Gathings	Passman
Barden	Gillette	Patman
Bates	Gore	Peterson
Battle	Gossett	Pickett
Beckworth	Grant	Plumley
Bennett, Fla	Gregory	Poage
Bentsen	Hardy	Preston
Boggs, La.	Hare	Priest
Bonner	Harris	Rains
Boykin	Harrison	Rankin
Brooks	Hays, Ark.	Redden
Brown Ga	Hébert	Regan
Bryson	Herlong	Rich
Burleson	Hobbs	Richards
Burton	Hoffman, Mich	Rivers
Camp	Jensen	Rogers, Fla.
Carlyle	Jones, Ala	Shafer
Chelf	Jones, N C.	Short
Colmer	Kerr	Sikes
Combs	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	Kilday	Sims
Cooper	Lanham	Smathers
Cox	Larcade	Smith, Kans.
Curtis	Lucas	Smith, Va
Davis, Ga	Lyle	Stanley
Davis, Tenn	McMillan, S C.	Sutton
Deane	Magee	Tackett
DeGraffenried	Mahon	Teague
Doughton	Mason	Thomas
Durham	Meyer	Thompson
Elliott	Mills	Thornberry
Evins	Morrison	Trimble
Underwood	Whittington	Wood
Vinson	Williams	Woodruff
Vursell	Willis	Worley
Wheeler	Wilson, Tex.	
Whitten	Winstead	

NAYS—285

Addonizio	Green	Morris
Allen, Calif.	Gross	Morton
Andersen, H Carl	Gwinn	Moulder
Andresen, August H.	Hagen	Multer
Angell	Hale	Murphy
Aspinall	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray, Wis.
Auchincloss	Hall, Leonard W	Nelson
Bailey	Halleck	Nixon
Baring	Hand	Noland
Barrett, Pa	Hart	Norb'ad
Barrett, Wyo.	Harvey	Norton
Beall	Havenner	O'Brien, Ill.
Bennett, Mich	Hays, Ohio	O'Brien, Mich
Blemiller	Heffernan	O'Hara, Ill
Bishop	Heller	O'Hara, Minn
Blackney	Herter	O'Konski
Blatnik	Heselton	O'Neill
Boggs, Del.	Hill	O'Sullivan
Bolling	Hinshaw	O'Toole
Bolton Md	Hoeven	Patten
Bolton, Ohio	Hoffman, Ill.	Patterson
Bosone	Holifield	Perkins
Bramblett	Holmes	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Breen	Hope	Pfeiffer, William L
Brehm	Horan	Philbin
Brown, Ohio	Howell	Phillips, Calif
Buchanan	Huber	Phillips, Tenn
Buckley, Ill.	Hull	Polk
Buckley, N. Y	Irving	Potter
Burdick	Jackson, Calif	Poulson
Burke	Jackson, Wash	Powell
Burnside	Jacobs	Price
Byrne, N Y.	James	Quinn
Byrnes, Wis.	Javits	Rabaut
Canfield	Jenison	Ramsay
Carnahan	Jenkins	Reed, Ill
Carroll	Johnson	Reed, N Y
Case, N J	Jonas	Rees
Cavalcante	Judd	Rhodes
Celler	Karst	Ribicoff
Chiperfield	Karsten	Riehlman
Christopher	Kean	Rodino
Chudoff	Kearney	Rogers, Mass.
Church	Kearns	Rooney
Clemente	Keating	Roosevelt
Clevenger	Kee	Sabath
Cole, Kans	Keefe	Sadlak
Cole, N Y.	Kelley, Pa	St George
Corbett	Kelly, N Y.	Sanborn
Cotton	Kennedy	Sasscer
Coudert	Keogh	Saylor
Crawford	King	Scott, Hardie
Crook	Kirwan	Scott, Hugh D Jr
Crosser	Klein	Scrivner
Cunningham	Kruse	Scudder
Dague	Kunkel	Secrest
Davenport	Lane	Shelley
Davis, Wis.	Latham	Sheppard
Dawson	LeCompte	Simpson, Ill.
Delaney	LeFevre	Smith, Wis.
Denton	Lemke	Spence
D'Ewart	Lesinski	Staggers
Dingell	Lichtenwalter	Steed
Dollinger	Lind	Stefan
Dolliver	Linehan	Stigler
Dondero	Lodge	Stockman
Donohue	Lovre	Sullivan
Douglas	Lynch	Taber
Doyle	McCarthy	Talle
Eaton	McConnell	Taurello
Eberharter	McCormack	Taylor
Ellsworth	McCulloch	Tollefson
Elston	McDonough	Velde
Engel, Mich.	McGrath	Vorys
Engle, Calif.	McGregor	Wagner
Fallon	McGuire	Walsh
Feighan	McKinnon	Walter
Fellows	McMillen, Ill	Welchel
Fenton	McSweeney	Welch
Fernandez	Mack, Ill	Werdel
Flood	Mack, Wash.	White, Calif.
Fogarty	Madden	Widnall
Forand	Mansfield	Wier
Ford	Marcantonio	Wigglesworth
Fulton	Marsalis	Wilson, Ind.
Furcolo	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Okla.
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Withrow
Garmatz	Merrow	Wolcott
Gavin	Michener	Wolverton
Golden	Miles	Woodhouse
Goodwin	Miller, Calif.	Yates
Gordon	Miller, Md.	Young
Gorski	Miller, Nebr.	Zablocki
Graham	Mitchell	
Granahan	Monroney	
Granger	Morgan	

NOT VOTING—25

Allen, La.	Gilmer	Smith, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Harden	Towe
Arends	Hedrick	Van Zandt
Bulwinkle	Jennings	Wadsworth
Cannon	Jones, Mo	Whitaker
Case, S Dak	Macy	White, Idaho
Chatham	Marshall	Wickersham
Chesney	Murdock	
Davies, N Y	Sadowski	

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof), the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr Gilmer and Mr. Jones of Missouri for, with Mr. Van Zandt against.

Mr Allen of Louisiana and Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Davies of New York against.

Mr. Arends and Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Bulwinkle and Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Towe against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Chesney with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Wickersham with Mrs. Harden.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Case of South Dakota

Mr Murdock with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Marshall with Mr. Jennings.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and seven Members are present; not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Allen, La	Hedrick	Plumley
Arends	Herter	Sadowski
Beckworth	Hope	Smith, Ohio
Bolton, Ohio	Johnson	Thomas
Bulwinkle	Jones, Mo.	Towe
Cannon	King	Van Zandt
Chatham	Macy	Wadsworth
Combs	Mahon	Whitaker
Davies, N Y.	Marshall	White, Idaho
Doughton	Meyer	Whittington
Engle, Calif.	Murdock	Young
Gilmer	Patman	
Harden	Phillips, Calif.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that proceedings under the call of the House have not been completed; and I ask that they be completed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and there were—yeas 290, nays 115, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—290

Addonizio	Gore	Martin, Mass.
Allen, Calif.	Gorski	Merrow
Allen, Ill.	Graham	Michener
Andersen, H Carl	Granahan	Miller, Calif.
	Granger	Miller, Md.
Anderson, Calif	Green	Miller, Nebr.
Angell	Gross	Mitchell
Aspinall	Gwinn	Monroney
Auchincloss	Hagen	Morgan
Bailey	Hale	Morris
Baring	Hall,	Morton
Barrett, Pa	Edwin Arthur	Moulder
Barrett, Wyo	Hall,	Multer
Bates	Leonard W.	Murphy
Beall	Halleck	Murray, Wis.
Bennett, Mich	Hand	Nelson
Bentsen	Hart	Nixon
Blemiller	Harvey	Noland
Bishop	Havenner	Norblad
Blackney	Hays, Ark.	Norton
Blatnik	Hays, Ohio	O'Brien, Ill
Boggs, Del.	Heffernan	O'Brien, Mich.
Bolling	Heller	O'Hara, Ill.
Bolton, Md.	Herter	O'Konski
Bolton, Ohio	Heselton	O'Neill
Bosone	Hill	O'Sullivan
Bramblett	Hinshaw	O'Toole
Breen	Hoeven	Patten
Brehm	Hoffman, Ill	Patterson
Brown, Ohio	Holifield	Perkins
Buchanan	Holmes	Pfeifer,
Buckley, Ill	Hope	Joseph L.
Buckley, N Y	Horan	Pfeiffer,
Burdick	Howell	William L.
Burke	Huber	Philbin
Burnside	Hull	Phillips, Calif.
Byrne, N Y.	Irving	Phillips, Tenn.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jackson, Calif.	Polk
Canfield	Jackson, Wash.	Potter
Cannon	Jacobs	Poulson
Carnahan	James	Powell
Carroll	Javits	Price
Case, N J	Jenison	Quinn
Cavalcante	Jenkins	Rabaut
Celler	Jennings	Ramsay
Chesney	Johnson	Reed, Ill.
Chiperfield	Jonas	Rees
Christopher	Judd	Rhodes
Chudoff	Karst	Ribicoff
Church	Karsten	Riehlman
Clemente	Kean	Rodino
Cleveuger	Kearney	Rogers, Mass.
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Rooney
Cole, N Y.	Keating	Roosevelt
Corbett	Kee	Sabath
Cotton	Keefe	Sadlak
Coudert	Kelley, Pa	St George
Crook	Kelly, N Y.	Sanborn
Crosser	Kennedy	Sasscer
Cunningham	Keogh	Saylor
Curtis	Kilburn	Scott, Hardie
Dague	King	Scott,
Davenport	Kirwan	Hugh D., Jr.
Davis, Wis.	Klein	Scrivner
Dawson	Kruse	Scudder
Delaney	Kunkel	Secrest
Denton	Lane	Shelley
Dingell	Latham	Sheppard
Dollinger	LeCompte	Simpson, Ill.
Dolliver	LeFevre	Spence
Dondero	Lemke	Staggers
Donohue	Lesinski	Steed
Douglas	Lichtenwalter	Stefan
Doyle	Lind	Stigler
Eaton	Linehan	Stockman
Eberharter	Lodge	Sullivan
Ellsworth	Lovre	Taber
Elston	Lynch	Talle
Engel, Mich.	McCarthy	Tauriello
Fallon	McConnell	Taylor
Feighan	McCormack	Tollefson
Fellows	McCulloch	Towe
Fenton	McDonough	Velde
Fisher	McGrath	Vorys
Flood	McGregor	Wadsworth
Fogarty	McGuire	Wagner
Forand	McKinnon	Walsh
Ford	McMillen, Ill.	Walter
Fulton	McSweeney	Weichel
Furcolo	Mack, Ill.	Welch
Gamble	Mack, Wash.	Werdel
Garmatz	Madden	White, Calif.
Gavin	Mansfield	Wickersham
Golden	Marcantonio	Widnall
Goodwin	Marsalis	Wier
Gordon	Martin, Iowa	Wigglesworth
Withrow	Woodhouse	Young
Wolcott	Worley	Zablocki
Wolverton	Yates	

NAYS—115

Abbitt	Gossett	Rains
Abernethy	Grant	Rankin
Albert	Gregory	Redden
Andrews	Hardy	Regan
Barden	Hare	Rich
Battle	Harris	Richards
Beckworth	Harrison	Rivers
Bennett, Fla	Hébert	Rogers, Fla.
Boggs, La	Herlong	Short
Bonner	Hobbs	Sikes
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	Simpson, Pa.
Brooks	Jensen	Sims
Brown, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Smathers
Bryson	Jones, N. C	Smith, Kans.
Burleson	Kerr	Smith, Va
Burton	Kilday	Smith, Wis.
Camp	Lanham	Stanley
Carlyle	Larcade	Sutton
Chelf	Lucas	Tackett
Colmer	Lyle	Teague
Combs	McMillan, S C.	Thomas
Cooley	Magee	Thompson
Cooper	Mahon	Thornberry
Cox	Meyer	Trimble
Crawford	Miles	Underwood
Davis, Ga	Mills	Vinson
Davis, Tenn	Morrison	Wheeler
Deane	Murray, Tenn.	Whitten
DeGraffenried	Nicholson	Whittington
D'Ewart	Norrell	Williams
Durham	O'Hara, Minn.	Willis
Elliott	Pace	Wilson, Ind.
Evins	Passman	Wilson, Okla
Fernandez	Patman	Wilson, Tex.
Frazier	Peterson	Winstead
Fugate	Pickett	Wood
Gary	Poage	Woodruff
Gathings	Preston	
Gillette	Priest	

NOT VOTING—26

Allen, La.	Engle, Calif.	Plumley
Andresen, August H.	Gilmer	Reed, N Y
	Harden	Sadowski
Arends	Hedrick	Shafer
Bulwinkle	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Ohio
Case, S Dak.	Macy	Van Zandt
Chatham	Marshall	Vursell
Davies, N Y.	Mason	Whitaker
Doughton	Murdock	White, Idaho

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Van Zandt for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Mr Davies of New York for, with Mr. Jones of Missouri against.

Mr. Sadowski for, with Mr. Allen of Louisiana against.

Until further notice:

Mr Hedrick with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Whitaker with Mrs. Harden.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Macy.

Mr. Marshall with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Doughton with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GAVIN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BEALL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. NICHOLSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ALBERT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SIKES. I wonder if it will not be in order, in view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that we cannot during the remainder of the day possibly give due consideration to the measure it is proposed to bring up——

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not listen to the gentleman make a speech. If the gentleman desires to propound a parliamentary inquiry, he should state it.

Mr. SIKES. Would it be in order to move that further proceedings under the call of the Calendar of Committees be dispensed with?

Mr. SABATH. That has been voted down twice.

The SPEAKER. That has just been voted on.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, that has been voted down twice.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Where a point of order of no quorum has been made and the Speaker directs the calling of the roll, and at the conclusion of the calling of the roll a quorum is established, what further proceedings under the call are contemplated that require the making of a motion that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with, and force another roll call on that issue?

The SPEAKER. It might be possible that the Members present would want to call other Members to the session; they might want to send out to get absent Members.

Mr. KEEFE. With all due deference to the Speaker, I am merely seeking information. I have been here 12 years and this is a matter that has always bothered me and bothered many other Members of the House. Is there any reason why further proceedings should be had once the call of the roll indicates the presence of a quorum?

The SPEAKER. That is a matter to be decided by the membership of the House. They may want other Members here for the consideration of certain business; they could have a further call of the House and send out and get the absent Members.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Speaker is absolutely correct, but may I not add the further thought that when a quorum call is made the doors are closed, and the Sergeant at Arms is directed to notify absent Members. There are certain procedures that must be followed after the calling of the roll, such as the opening of the doors. Furthermore, when a quorum call is made it presumably continues or could continue until Members

are sent for. That motion is made to bring it to a definite conclusion.

Mr. KEEFE. Theoretically the doors are closed. That is what I have observed since I have been here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order on the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I submit the motion to adjourn is dilatory. While I recognize that intervening business has been transacted, such as voting on the motion to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business, it seems to me that the House has expressed its will on this matter about an hour ago and the House refused to adjourn. I think it is obvious to the Speaker that the House has refused to adjourn and the motion, therefore, is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already entertained the motion. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 127, nays 284, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—127

Abbitt	Fugate	Poage
Abernethy	Gary	Preston
Albert	Gathings	Priest
Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Rains
Andrews	Gore	Rankin
Barden	Gossett	Redden
Bates	Grant	Regan
Battle	Gregory	Rich
Beckworth	Hardy	Richards
Bennett, Fla.	Hare	Rivers
Bentsen	Harris	Rogers, Fla.
Boggs, La	Harrison	Shafer
Bolton, Md.	Hays, Ark	Short
Bonner	Hébert	Sikes
Boykin	Herlong	Simpson, Pa.
Brooks	Hobbs	Sims
Brown, Ga	Hoffman, Mich	Smathers
Bryson	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Burleson	Jones, Ala	Smith, Va.
Burton	Jones, N C.	Stanley
Camp	Kerr	Sutton
Cannon	Kilburn	Taber
Carlyle	Kilday	Tackett
Chelf	Lanham	Teague
Colmer	Larcade	Thomas
Combs	Lucas	Thompson
Cooley	Lyle	Thornberry
Cooper	McMillan S C	Trimble
Cox	Magee	Underwood
Crawford	Mahon	Vinson
Curtis	Mason	Vursell
Davis, Ga	Meyer	Wadsworth
Davis, Tenn.	Mills	Wheeler
Deane	Morrison	Whitten
DeGraffenried	Murray, Tenn	Whittington
Dolliver	Nicholson	Williams
Doughton	Norrell	Willis
Durham	Pace	Wilson, Tex.
Eaton	Passman	Winstead
Elliott	Patman	Wood
Evins	Peterson	Woodruff
Fisher	Pickett	
Frazier	Plumley	

NAYS—284

Addonizio	Bailey	Boggs, Del.
Allen, Calif	Baring	Bolling
Andersen, H Carl	Barrett, Pa	Bolton, Ohio
	Barrett, Wyo	Bosone
Anderson, Calif.	Beall	Bramblett
Andresen, August H	Bennett, Mich	Breen
	Blemiller	Brehm
Angell	Bishop	Brown, Ohio
Aspinall	Blackney	Buchanan
Auchincloss	Blatnik	Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Brien, Ill.
Burdick	Holifield	O'Brien, Mich.
Burke	Holmes	O'Hara, Ill.
Burnside	Hope	O'Hara, Minn.
Byrne, N. Y.	Horan	O'Konski
Byrnes, Wis	Howell	O'Neill
Canfield	Huber	O'Sullivan
Carnahan	Hull	O'Toole
Carroll	Irving	Patten
Case, N. J.	Jackson, Calif	Patterson
Cavalcante	Jackson, Wash	Perkins
Celler	Jacobs	Pfeifer, Joseph L
Chesney	James	
Chiperfield	Javits	Pfeiffer, William L.
Christopher	Jenison	
Chudoff	Jenkins	Philbin
Church	Johnson	Phillips, Calif.
Clemente	Jonas	Phillips, Tenn.
Clevenger	Judd	Polk
Cole, Kans	Karst	Potter
Cole, N Y	Karsten	Poulson
Corbett	Kean	Powell
Cotton	Kearney	Price
Coudert	Kearns	Quinn
Crook	Keating	Rabaut
Crosser	Kee	Ramsay
Cunningham	Keefe	Reed, Ill.
Dague	Kelley, Pa	Reed, N Y
Davenport	Kelly, N. Y	Rees
Davis, Wis	Kennedy	Rhodes
Dawson	Keogh	Ribicoff
Delaney	King	Riehlman
Denton	Kirwan	Rodino
D'Ewart	Klein	Rogers, Mass
Dingell	Kruse	Rooney
Dollinger	Kunkel	Roosevelt
Dondero	Lane	Sabath
Donohue	Latham	Sadlak
Douglas	LeCompte	St George
Doyle	LeFevre	Sanborn
Eberharter	Lemke	Sasscer
Ellsworth	Lesinski	Saylor
Elston	Lichtenwalter	Scott, Hardie
Engel, Mich	Lind	Scott, Hugh D , Jr
Fallon	Linehan	
Feighan	Lodge	Scrivner
Fellows	Lovre	Scudder
Fenton	Lynch	Secrest
Fernandez	McCarthy	Shelley
Flood	McConnell	Sheppard
Fogarty	McCormack	Simpson, Ill
Forand	McCulloch	Smith, Wis.
Ford	McDonough	Spence
Fulton	McGrath	Staggers
Furcolo	McGregor	Steed
Gamble	McGuire	Stefan
Garmatz	McKinnon	Stigler
Gavin	McMillen, Ill	Stockman
Golden	McSweeney	Sullivan
Goodwin	Mack, Ill	Talle
Gordon	Mack, Wash	Tauriello
Gorski	Madden	Taylor
Graham	Mansfield	Tollefson
Granahan	Marcantonio	Towe
Granger	Marsalis	Velde
Green	Martin, Iowa	Vorys
Gross	Martin, Mass	Wagner
Gwinn	Merrow	Walsh
Hagen	Michener	Walter
Hale	Miles	Weichel
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Calif	Welch
	Miller, Md	Werdel
Hall, Leonard W	Miller, Nebr	White, Calif.
	Mitchell	White, Idaho
Halleck	Monroney	Wickersham
Hand	Morgan	Widnall
Hart	Morris	Wier
Harvey	Morton	Wigglesworth
Havenner	Moulder	Wilson, Ind.
Hays, Ohio	Multer	Wilson, Okla.
Heffernan	Murphy	Withrow
Heller	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Herter	Nelson	Wolverton
Heselton	Nixon	Woodhouse
Hill	Noland	Yates
Hinshaw	Norblad	Young
Hoeven	Norton	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—20

Allen, La.	Gilmer	Murdock
Arends	Halden	Sadowski
Bulwinkle	Hedrick	Smith, Ohio
Case, S Dak	Jennings	Van Zandt
Chatham	Jones, Mo.	Whitaker
Davies, N. Y.	Macy	Worley
Engle, Calif.	Marshall	

So the motion was not agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Van Zandt against.

Mr. Jones of Missouri for, with Mr. Davies of New York against.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Engle of California with Mrs. Harden.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Macy.

Mr. Marshall with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Jennings.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. LESINSKI (when the Committee on Education and Labor was called). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Education and Labor I call up the bill (H. R. 4453) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor has not been properly directed to call up the bill under the rules and precedents that are required to be followed in keeping with the practice on Calendar Wednesday, and on that I should like to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has been heard.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was authorized by the committee to use all parliamentary means to bring the bill before the House.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point or order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman very briefly. The Chair has the most recent rules of the House before him and desires to read them. The Chair feels that possibly their reading will satisfy the gentleman.

Mr. PICKETT. If I am not satisfied with what the Speaker reads may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly now.

Mr. PICKETT. My point of order is based on the precedents of the House annotated on page 460, paragraph 898, of the House Rules and Manual, where it is stated that authority to call up a bill on Calendar Wednesday must have been given by the committee, and a member not authorized to do so may not call up such bill. The annotations refer to Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, paragraphs 3127 and 3128; and the Hinds' Precedents, volume 7, paragraphs 928 and 929. I wish to call these paragraphs to the attention of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Those paragraphs have already been called to the attention of the Speaker.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, further in reference to the point of order, if it be contended that the Reorganization Act of 1946 which became effective on January 3, 1947, at section 133 thereof, paragraph (c), empowers the chairman of this committee to call up the bill, in view of the language that it directs him to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote, then my response to that would be that one of the necessary steps to cause this bill to be brought to the attention of the House for a vote is to comply with the requisites and get his committee to give him specific directions to call this bill up on Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] has already stated that the committee did give him this authority. The present occupant of the chair has read the minutes of the committee and thinks the gentleman from Michigan is correct.

Also the latest rule on this matter is section 133, paragraph (c), of the Legislative Reorganization Act, and there is very good reason for this rule because in times past the chairmen of committees have been known to carry bills around in their pockets for quite a while and not present them.

The rule is as follows:

It shall be the duty of the chairman of each such committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, any measure approved by his committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 287, nays 121, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—287

Addonizio	Burdick	Davenport
Allen, Calif.	Burke	Davis, Wis.
Andersen, H Carl	Burnside	Dawson
	Byrne, N. Y.	Delaney
Anderson, Calif.	Byrnes, Wis	Denton
Andresen, August H.	Canfield	D'Ewart
	Cannon	Dingell
Angell	Carnahan	Dollinger
Aspinall	Carroll	Dolliver
Auchincloss	Case, N J.	Dondero
Bailey	Case, S. Dak.	Donohue
Baring	Cavalcante	Douglas
Barrett, Pa.	Celler	Doyle
Barrett, Wyo.	Chesney	Eberharter
Beall	Chiperfield	Ellsworth
Bennett, Mich.	Christopher	Elston
Biemiller	Chudoff	Engel, Mich.
Bishop	Church	Engle, Calif.
Blackney	Clemente	Fallon
Blatnik	Clevenger	Feighan
Boggs, Del.	Cole, Kans.	Fenton
Bolling	Cole, N. Y.	Flood
Bolton, Ohio	Corbett	Fogarty
Bosone	Cotton	Forand
Bramblett	Coudert	Ford
Breen	Crawford	Fulton
Brehm	Crook	Furcolo
Brown, Ohio	Crosser	Gamble
Buchanan	Cunningham	Garmatz
Buckley, Ill	Curtis	Gavin
Buckley, N. Y.	Dague	Golden
Goodwin	Latham	Potter
Gordon	LeCompte	Powell
Gorski	LeFevre	Price
Graham	Lemke	Quinn
Granahan	Lesinski	Rabaut
Granger	Lichtenwalter	Ramsay
Green	Lind	Reed, Ill.
Gross	Linehan	Reed, N. Y.
Gwinn	Lodge	Rees
Hagen	Lovre	Rhodes
Hale	Lynch	Ribicoff
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McCarthy	Riehlman
	McConnell	Rodino
Hall, Leonard W.	McCormack	Rogers, Mass
	McCulloch	Rooney
Halleck	McDonough	Roosevelt
Hand	McGrath	Sabath
Hart	McGregor	Sadlak
Harvey	McGuire	St George
Havenner	McKinnon	Sanborn
Hays, Ohio	McMillen, Ill	Sasscer
Heffernan	McSweeney	Saylor
Heller	Mack, Ill.	Scott, Hardie
Herter	Mack, Wash.	Scott, Hugh D , Jr
Heselton	Madden	
Hill	Mansfield	Scrivner
Hinshaw	Marcantonio	Scudder
Hoeven	Marsalis	Secrest
Hoffman, Ill.	Martin, Mass	Shelley
Holifield	Merrow	Sheppard
Holmes	Michener	Spence
Hope	Miller, Calif.	Staggers
Horan	Miller, Md.	Steed
Howell	Miller, Nebr	Stefan
Huber	Mitchell	Stigler
Hull	Monroney	Stockman
Irving	Morgan	Sullivan
Jackson, Calif.	Morris	Tallie
Jackson, Wash.	Morton	Tauriello
Jacobs	Moulder	Taylor
James	Multer	Tollefson
Javits	Murphy	Towe
Jenison	Murray, Wis	Velde
Jenkins	Nelson	Vorys
Jennings	Nixon	Wadsworth
Jensen	Noland	Wagner
Johnson	Norblad	Walsh
Jonas	Norton	Walter
Judd	O'Brien, Ill	Welchel
Karst	O'Brien, Mich.	Welch
Karsten	O'Hara, Ill.	Werdel
Kean	O'Hara, Minn.	White, Calif.
Kearney	O'Konski	White, Idaho
Kearns	O'Neill	Wickersham
Keating	O'Sullivan	Widnall
Kee	O'Toole	Wier
Keefe	Patten	Wigglesworth
Kelley, Pa.	Patterson	Wilson, Ind.
Kelly, N. Y.	Perkins	Wilson, Okla.
Kennedy	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Withrow
Keogh		Wolcott
King	Pfeiffer, William L.	Wolverton
Kirwan		Woodhouse
Klein	Philbin	Woodruff
Kruse	Phillips, Calif	Yates
Kunkel	Phillips, Tenn	Young
Lane	Polk	Zablocki

NAYS—121

Abbitt	Evins	Mills
Abernethy	Fernandez	Morrison
Albert	Fisher	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, Ill	Frazier	Nicholson
Andrews	Fugate	Norrell
Barden	Cary	Pace
Bates	Gathings	Passman
Battle	Gillette	Patman
Beckworth	Gore	Peterson
Bennett, Fla	Gossett	Pickett
Bentsen	Grant	Poage
Boggs, La	Hardy	Preston
Bolton, Md	Hare	Priest
Bonner	Harris	Rains
Boykin	Harrison	Rankin
Brooks	Hays, Ark.	Redden
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Regan
Bryson	Herlong	Rich
Burleson	Hobbs	Richards
Burton	Hoffman, Mich	Rivers
Camp	Jones, Ala	Rogers, Fla.
Carlyle	Jones, N. C.	Shafer
Chelf	Kerr	Short
Colmer	Kilburn	Sikes
Combs	Kilday	Simpson, Ill.
Cooley	Lanham	Simpson, Pa.
Cooper	Larcade	Sims
Cox	Lucas	Smathers
Davis, Ga.	Lyle	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	McMillan, S. C	Smith, Va.
Deane	Magee	Stanley
DeGraffenried	Mahon	Sutton
Doughton	Mason	Taber
Durham	Meyer	Tackett
Elliott	Miles	Teague
Thomas	Vursell	Wilson, Tex.
Thompson	Wheeler	Winstead
Thornberry	Whitten	Wood
Trimble	Whittington	Worley
Underwood	Williams	
Vinson	Willis	

NOT VOTING—23

Allen, La.	Gregory	Plumley
Arends	Harden	Poulson
Bulwinkle	Hedrick	Sadowski
Chatham	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Ohio
Davies, N Y.	Macy	Smith, Wis
Eaton	Marshall	Van Zandt
Fellows	Martin, Iowa	Whitaker
Gilmer	Murdock	

So the House decided to consider the bill.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Van Zandt for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Mr. Davies of New York for, with Mr. Jones of Missouri against.

Mr. Sadowski for, with Mr. Allen of Louisiana against.

Mr. Hedrick for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Macy against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr Fellows

Mr Chatham with Mr Martin of Iowa.

Mr. Murdock with Mr Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4453) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. If the House were now to adjourn would the first order of business tomorrow be the consideration of this bill by the Committee of the Whole?

The CHAIRMAN. The parliamentary inquiry is directed to a state of facts that does not exist. The House has resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole, and the Committee of the Whole cannot adjourn.

The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Federal Fair Employment Practice Act."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that, despite the continuing progress of our Nation with respect to protection of the rights of individuals, the rights of some persons within the jurisdiction of the United States to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin are being denied, and that such infringements upon the American principle of freedom and

equality of opportunity are destructive of the basic doctrine of the integrity and dignity of the individual upon which this Nation was founded and which distinguishes it from the totalitarian nations, force large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, foment industrial strife and domestic unrest, deprive the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, and thereby adversely affect the interstate and foreign commerce of the United States. The Congress recognizes that it is essential to the general welfare that this gap between principle and practice be closed, and that adequate protection of such rights of individuals must be provided to preserve our American heritage and prevent serious damage to our moral, social, economic, and political life, and to our international relations.

(b) The Congress, therefore, declares that the right to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin is a right of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and that it is the national policy to protect the right of the individual to be free from such discrimination.

(c) The Congress further declares that the succeeding provisions of this act are necessary for the following purposes.

(i) To remove obstructions to the free flow of commerce among the States and with foreign nations.

(ii) To insure the more complete and full enjoyment by all persons of the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution of the United States

(iii) To promote universal respect for, and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race or religion, in accordance with the undertaking of the United States under the United Nations Charter, and to further the national policy in that regard by securing to all persons under the jurisdiction of the United States effective recognition of certain of the rights and freedoms proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

DEFINITIONS

SEC 3. As ed in this act—

(a) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, or any organized group of persons and any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any Territory or possession thereof

(b) The term "employer" means a person engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce having in his employ 50 or more individuals; any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any Territory or possession thereof; and any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or association, not organized for private profit, other than a labor organization

(c) The term "labor organization" means any organization, having 50 or more members employed by any employer or employers, which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, wages, hours, terms or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

(d) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States; or between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession; or between points in the same State but through any point outside thereof.

(e) The term "Territory" means Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(f) The term "possession" means all possessions of the United States, and includes the trust territories which the United States holds as administering authority under the United Nations trusteeship system, and the Canal Zone, but excludes other places held by the United States by lease under international arrangements or by military occupation.

(g) The term "Commission" means the Fair Employment Practice Commission, created by section 6 hereof.

EXEMPTION

SEC 4. This act shall not apply to any employer with respect to the employment of aliens outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions.

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

(1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion, or national origin; and

(2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, color, religion, or national origin

(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any labor organization to discriminate against any individual or to limit, segregate, or classify its membership in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive such individual of employment opportunities, or would limit his employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee or as an applicant for employment, or would affect adversely his wages, hours, or employment conditions, because of such individual's race, color, religion, or national origin

(c) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer or labor organization to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this act

THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

SEC 6 (a) There is hereby created in the executive branch of the Government a commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, and one for a term of 5 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 5 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission, and one member to serve as Vice Chairman. The Chairman shall be responsible on behalf of the Commission for the administrative operations of the Commission. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence or disability of the Chairman or in the event of a vacancy in that office.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members thereof shall constitute a quorum.

(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) The Commission shall make an annual report to the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which shall be its activities during the preceding fiscal year, including the number and types of cases it has handled and the decisions it has rendered; and shall report to the President from time to time on the causes of and means of eliminating discrimination and make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

(e) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of $17,500 a year, except that the Chairman shall receive a salary of $20,000 a year

(f) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet or exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. Any such agent, other than a member of the Commission, designated to conduct a proceeding or a hearing shall be a resident of the judicial circuit, as defined in title 28, United States Code, section 41, within which the alleged unlawful employment practice occurred

(g) The Commission shall have power—

(1) to appoint, in accordance with the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations, such officers, agents, and employees, as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

(2) to cooperate with regional, State, local, and other agencies;

(3) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the Commission or any of its agents the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States;

(4) to furnish to persons subject to this Act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this Act or any order issued thereunder;

(5) upon the request of any employer acting in good faith, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action;

(6) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies; and

(7) to create such local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils as in its judgment will aid in effectuating the purpose of this act, and the Commission may authorize them to study the problem or specific instances of discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and to foster through community effort or otherwise good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population, and make recommendations to the Commission for the development of policies and procedures in general and in specific instances. Such advisory and conciliation councils shall be composed of representative citizens residents of the area for which they are appointed, who shall serve without compensation, but shall receive transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S C. 73b–2), for persons serving without compensation; and the Commission may make provision for technical and clerical assistance to such councils and for the expenses of such assistance.

PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unlawful employment practice as set forth in section 5. This power shall be exclusive, and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, code, law, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the Commission is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State, Territory, possession, or local government, to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases even though such cases may involve charges of unlawful employment practices within the scope of this act, unless the provision of the statute or ordinance applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of this act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith

(b) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved, or a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission, that any person subject to the act has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall investigate such charge and if it shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Nothing said or done during and as a part of such endeavors may be used as evidence in any subsequent proceeding. Any written charge filed pursuant to this section must be filed within 1 year after the commission of the alleged unlawful employment practice.

(c) If the Commission fails to effect the elimination of such unlawful employment practice and to obtain voluntary compliance with this act, or in advance thereof if circumstances so warrant, it shall cause a copy of such written charge to be served upon such person who has allegedly committed any unlawful employment practice, hereinafter called the respondent, together with a notice of hearing before the Commission, or a member thereof, or before a designated agent, at a place therein fixed, not less than 10 days after the service of such charge

(d) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such written charge and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses

(e) The Commission or the member or designated agent conducting such hearing shall have the power reasonably and fairly to amend any written charge, and the respondent shall have like power to amend its answer.

(f) All testimony shall be taken under oath.

(g) The member of the Commission who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing thereon or in a trial thereof, except as a witness

(h) At the conclusion of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission, such member or agent shall transfer the entire record thereof to the Commission, together with his recommended decision. The Commission or a panel of three qualified members designated by it to sit and act as the Commission in such case, shall afford the parties an opportunity to be heard on such record at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice. In its discretion, the Commission upon notice may take further testimony.

(i) With the approval of the member or designated agent conducting the hearing, a case may be ended at any time prior to the transfer of the record thereof to the Commission by agreement between the parties for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms.

(j) If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that any person named in the written charge has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring him to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of the act: *Provided, however*, That interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the person or persons discriminated against shall operate to reduce the back pay otherwise allowable. If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that no person named in the written charge has engaged or is engaging in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

(k) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the case may at any time be ended by agreement between the parties, approved by the Commission, for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms, and the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

(l) The proceedings held pursuant to this section shall be conducted in conformity with the standards and limitations of sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to petition any United States Court of Appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court or other United States court of the territory or place within the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, or wherein the respondent transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(b) Upon such filing the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

(c) No objection that has not been urged before the Commission, its member, or agent shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

(d) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission, its member, or agent and to be made a part of the transcript.

(e) The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

(f) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals, if application was made to the district court or other United States court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

(g) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in any United States court of appeals of the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person transacts business, by filing in such a court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding certified by the Commission, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Commission under subsection (a), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the petitioners or the Commission such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

(h) Upon such filing by a person aggrieved the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(i) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (a) or (g) of this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.

INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this Act, the Commission, or any member thereof, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(b) Any member of the Commission, or any agent designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

(c) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States, including the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

(d) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this act, any district court of the United States as constituted by chapter 5, title 28, United States Code (28 U. S. C. 81 et seq.), or the United States Court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, within the jurisdiction of

which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application of the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Commission, its member, or agent, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(e) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying. The immunity herein provided shall extend only to natural persons so compelled to testify.

ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS DIRECTED TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND CONTRACTORS

SEC. 10 (a) The President is authorized to take such action as may be necessary (1) to conform fair employment practices within the Federal establishment with the policies of this act, and (2) to provide that any Federal employee aggrieved by any employment practice of his employer must exhaust the administrative remedies prescribed by Executive order or regulations governing fair employment practices within the Federal establishment prior to seeking relief under the provisions of this act. The provision of section 8 shall not apply with respect to an order of the Commission under section 7 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any Territory or possession thereof, or of the District of Columbia, or any officer or employee thereof The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with such orders.

(b) The President shall have power to provide for the establishment of regulations to prevent the committing or continuing of any unlawful employment practice as herein defined by any person who makes a contract with any agency or instrumentality of the United States (excluding any State or political subdivision thereof) or of a Territory or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, in any amount exceeding $10,000 Such regulations shall be enforced by the Commission according to the procedure hereinbefore provided.

NOTICES TO BE POSTED

SEC 11. (a) Every employer and labor organization shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises a notice to be prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth excerpts of the act and such other relevant information which the Commission deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the act.

(b) A willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $500 for each separate offense.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

SEC 12. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify any Federal, State, Territorial, or local law creating special rights or preference for veterans.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 13. The Commission shall have authority from time to time to issue, amend, or rescind suitable regulations to carry out the provisions of this act. Regulations issued under this section shall be in conformity with the standards and limitations of the Administrative Procedure Act.

FORCIBLY RESISTING THE COMMISSION OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 14. Whoever shall forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission while engaged in the performance of duties under this act, or because of such performance, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 15. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. LESINSKI (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It is difficult for us to follow the reading. I would like to know where the Clerk is reading and when the offering of a substitute will be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. A substitute cannot be offered until general debate is completed. The Clerk is reading on page 2.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. He is reading the bill the first time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCONNELL. Do I understand that after 2 hours of general debate and under the 5-minute rule will be the time to offer amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, there are 2 hours of general debate. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] for 1 hour.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes; and the balance, 55 minutes, I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], who will control the time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LESINSKI Mr. Chairman, first I wish to say to the Members of the House that I hope they will stay on the floor in a number not less than 100 so that we may avoid all types of roll calls. I wish to assure the membership that I will stay here until 6 o'clock in the morning or until we pass the bill.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LESINSKI. I am sorry; I cannot yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, it is with a feeling of real satisfaction that I bring this bill before the Members of the House of Representatives. FEPC is no newcomer to Congress. Besides appropriation measures for the wartime FEPC body, created by President Roosevelt's Executive order and continued by President Truman, FEPC legislation was introduced in the Seventy-eighth, Seventy-ninth, and Eightieth Congresses, as well as in this, the Eighty-first. With the additional reports from both Houses in the current session, this legislation has been reported seven times. However, to date we have not had the privilege of debating it upon the floor. Now after a total of 43 days of hearings since August 1944, 2,231 pages of testimony, and 254 witnesses overwhelmingly in favor, the House is getting a chance to vote on the FEPC bill. This latter fact is not surprising, since FEPC has been and is a platform promise of both political parties, and has the support of countless church, civic, business, labor, and fraternal organizations.

In speaking for this measure, I feel it important to stress that it is not aimed at any particular section of our Nation, nor is it a bill designed to benefit one or a few segments of our population. It is truly a national bill, and its benefits are widespread.

All minority groups in America are subject to discrimination of some sort at various times and places. Discrimination is not limited to the major portion of America's 15,000,000 Negroes, nor to her 5,000,000 Jews, 26,000,000 Catholics, 3,000,000 Spanish- or Mexican-Americans, nor even to her 34,000,000 foreign-born and children of foreign-born members of various sects that make up the so-called majority group in this land—white protestants—often find themselves in a minority, and subjects of discrimination. All of these manifestations of intolerance and bigotry must be removed. They must be removed not only for the sake of the immediate victims, but for the sake of those who discriminate, and for the sake of America as a whole. For the act of discrimination takes both a moral toll from the person practicing discrimination, and a multibillion annual burden upon our economy.

In hearings held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor last May, economist Leo Cherne estimated a minimum annual loss from discrimination as $15,000,000,000. Other competent economists have arrived at varying figures—but all run into the billions. Whatever the exact figure, there can be no doubt that a huge amount is paid annually for discrimination. To name a few of the gutters down which this sum flows, there is the cost of training those whom we deprive of the opportunity to use their training; the cost of industry of selecting personnel from an artificially limited manpower pool; the creation of economically depressed islands in minority communities, which

ripple out to the surrounding communities; the break-down in morale—and the resultant drain on health services—among those who know that they will not be permitted to utilize their highest degree of skill in the Nation's economy. Even these few examples indicate what a body blow America receives from the un-American practice of job discrimination.

Let us not forget that throughout the world, and perhaps here at home, as well, the Communists eagerly await a breakdown in the free enterprise system, so as to prove the validity of their claim that capitalism is doomed. How well we play into their hands when we permit job discrimination to drain off our efficiency into nonproductive channels.

The Commies also like to point to discrimination in this country as an example of our failure to practice what we preach. As far back as 1946, Dean Acheson observed that the existence of discriminations against minority groups in the United States is a handicap in our relations with other countries. He explained that our opponents make much of these situations, causing an atmosphere of suspicion and resentment which becomes a formidable obstacle to the development of mutual understanding and trust between the United States and other nations. How ridiculous then for us to appropriate billions for the cold war, and then sink other billions into weakening our own side of that conflict.

We have seen the economic and foreign policy arguments for enactment of FEPC. Surely there can be no question of the moral persuasiveness of this measure which every leading religious body in the land—Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant—supports. What then, can be said against such a measure? All that I, for one, have heard have been arguments attacking some bill other than the one now before us—attacks on a radical, novel measure which would force an employer to hire workers he did not want, which would wreck the small-business man, which would subject private industry to government interference, and so forth. These critics must have some other bill in mind than H. R. 4453. Nothing in this bill makes any employer hire anyone he does not need or want, nor anyone who is not qualified for the job; all that is insisted upon is that capable, qualified workers shall not be denied the opportunity to compete for a job solely because of their color, religious belief, or origin. Nor does the bill contain features that would wreck any businessman; rather, it would help innumerable businessmen, by making available to them a wider manpower pool from which to choose employees. Also, since the FEP Commission would screen all allegations of discrimination and throw out unwarranted charges, the employer has additional protection for irresponsible attacks that he does not have today. As for Federal interference with business, it is traditional that the Government set certain minimum standards of health, welfare, working conditions, and so forth. Here is but another similar case—one which says that an American employer has a responsibility not to flout the Constitution in the running of his business.

One final point. Here in this body we represent the citizens of all the United States. We ourselves come from all the States of the Union and we, therefore, bring to the Congress the varying experiences of our States. Let us profit from these experiences. Let us note not only that wartime FEPC met with some degree of success, but that eight States now have FEPC laws similar to the proposal now before us. Nowhere has there been trouble. Officials in every case report the workability and success of their laws. The time for guesswork and experimentation has passed. The time has come for us to utilize the laboratory experience of our States—eight States which cover about a third of our population—and enact an FEPC law which will bring America closer to fulfillment of the democratic ideal of freedom for all, and success according to individual merit and ability.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my thanks to the members of the FEPC subcommittee for the cooperation they gave me in the hearings on this bill. I would like to publicly thank our colleague from Ohio [Mr. BREHM], whose cold has been plaguing him and developed into laryngitis. His actions on the subcommittee were greater than any words he could utter today. Also I want to thank members of the full committee on Education and Labor, and I refer to Members on both sides, those who agreed and disagreed, for the cooperation and understanding that we had in committee. I trust that further debate on this bill will be in an atmosphere of dignity, even though we may oppose it bitterly or we may be in favor of it wholeheartedly.

I have allotted myself only 5 minutes because there are scores of Members who want to talk and I do not want to cover myself with any personal glory.

I would like to say one or two things concerning the bill so that we can remove from our minds anything that we may not know concerning the details.

A. GENERAL BACKGROUND

Bills before committee: S. 1728—Senator McGrath—and S. 174—Senator IVES. Senator IVES, testifying before a House subcommittee in favor of H. R. 4453, identical to S. 1728, said:

> There are a few differences between H. R. 4453 * * * and Senate bill 174 * * * [which] are not very vital. * * * I endorse specifically H. R. 4453.

Previous consideration of similar measures:

Senate: Seventy-eighth Congress, S. 2048; hearings in August and September 1944, Report No. 1109; Seventy-ninth Congress, S. 101; hearings, Report No. 290; Eightieth Congress, S. 984; hearings June and July 1947, Report No. 980.

House: Seventy-eighth Congress, H. R. 3986; hearings, Report No. 2016; Seventy-ninth Congress, H. R. 2232; hearings, Report No. 187; Eightieth Congress, H. R. 2824; no hearings; Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 4453; hearings May 1949, Report No. 1165.

Witnesses appearing at 1949 House hearings:

Opponents: Five Representatives and one private individual, a constituent of another Representative.

Proponents: Thirteen Representatives, three Senators, and the Secretary of Labor; various State commissioners of local fair employment practices commissions, and former staff members of wartime Federal FEPC; the Catholic Church, Federal Council of Church of Christ in America, National Baptist Convention, National Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, Friends Service Committee, Methodist Church, and the Synagogue Council of America; American Civil Liberties Union; CIO and AFL; NAACP; Urban League; Americans for Democratic Action and Students for Democratic Action; Improved BPOE of the World; American Jewish Committee; American Jewish Congress; American Veterans Committee and Jewish War Veterans; National Council of Jewish Women, Jewish Labor Committee; Japanese-American Citizens League; National Community Relations Advisory Committee, National Council for Permanent FEPC, and so forth

Previous and present FEPC's: Wartime Federal FEPC, created by Executive Order 8802 and continued by 9346 and 9664. First established, June 25, 1941; final report dated June 28, 1946.

States: New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey have for several years had laws similar to the proposed S. 1728; also, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Oregon had anti-discrimination statutes of a weaker nature. This year FEPC's were created in Rhode Island, New Mexico, and Washington, while Oregon changed its law so as to give it strength.

B. BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Declaration and findings: The bill declares a right to freedom from employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin—the House committee added ancestry—and finds that this right is being denied some persons.

Scope and outlawed practices: Violation of this right is made an unfair employment practice when committed by an employer of 50 or more individuals engaged in commerce. Such employers include labor organizations, but exclude other religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian groups. Unfair practices include discharges, refusals to hire, and discriminatory terms, conditions, or privileges of employment; they also include union practices which would adversely affect the individual's employment opportunities.

Procedure: The named rights are protected by a five-man Commission which is empowered to investigate sworn written complaints; where preliminary investigation indicates probability of such charges, the Commission must attempt to secure compliance by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Failing in these, the Commission may proceed to formal hearings, which—in case of findings of violations—result in cease-and-desist orders, plus affirmative action where appropriate; these orders are enforceable in United States courts, to which appeals may also be

taken by persons aggrieved by such orders. The Commission also has authority to cede jurisdiction to appropriate agencies of any "State, Territory, possession, or local government."

C. THE SUBSTANTIVE ARGUMENTS INVOLVED

I. Does job discrimination exist?: There can be no serious question that employment discrimination is widespread. In its final report, the wartime FEPC predicted that even such gains as it had made were dissipating and predicted further, accelerated dissipation. Rather than provide an independent survey, there is hereto attached the findings included in the recent House report—see appendix.

II. Should it be eliminated?: Without going into the vast wealth of detail available in answer to this question, it should suffice here to indicate briefly some of the areas adversely affected by employment discrimination.

(a) The democratic principles on which the Nation was founded are flaunted by discrimination. Any violation of these principles has an adverse effect. Furthermore, the general moral code to which we pay allegiance, demands that all men be considered as individuals and rated according to their individual worth. As the bill states, "it is essential that this gap between principle and practice be closed."

(b) Our foreign relations are hampered by the publicity our enemies give to our discriminatory practices. Secretary of State Acheson describes discrimination as "a handicap in our relations with other countries." Senator Dulles, when a United States delegate to the UN said that FEPC is necessary to "erase what today is the worst blot on our national escutcheon." The United States is bound by its international agreements to eliminate discrimination—for example, the Inter-American Conference in Mexico City, 1945; the Charter of the UN; and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaimed by the General Assembly.

(c) The economic waste of discrimination cannot be totally computed. One economist estimated before the House subcommittee that we send at least $15,000,000,000 annually down the drain because of discrimination. Contributing to this total is the cost of training those whom we will not allow to use their training; the cost to industry of using artificially limited pools in selecting what should be the most skilled manpower; the creation, in minority populations, of a disproportionate degree of unemployment, resulting in an island of depression which affects its surroundings—"a man who can't earn can't buy"; the break-down in morale among those who know that no matter what their skills, they cannot compete on an equal basis with those whom they are taught to believe are their equals; the personality difficulties resulting from lack of home life when mothers are forced to work to supplement inadequate income brought in by fathers.

The only remaining question, then, is—

III. Can S. 1728 properly do the required job? Since the testimony at the various hearings in support of FEPC, combined with the analysis of the S. 1728 above, seems to make out a prima facie case for an affirmative answer to this question, it would appear sensible to put the burden on the objections raised.

The chief ones are as follows:

(a) "The bill is unconstitutional; it violates States' rights."

But, first, the Federal Government has the right to impose any reasonable regulations regarding its own employment relations, including regulations against discrimination—United Public Workers against Mitchell.

Second. It can do likewise re employment relations of those who contract with it—Perkins against Lukens Steel Co.

Third. It may regulate the employment relations of private businesses engaged in commerce—NLRB against Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

Fourth. It can therefore impose regulations against discrimination in such businesses, (i) logically, from first, second, and third above, and (ii) on the basis of cases like New Negro Alliance against Sanitary Grocery Co.

(b) "Even if constitutional, this matter should be left to the States; it is a southern problem."

But, first, the problem is not a southern problem—nor a Negro, or Jewish, or Catholic, or Mexican problem. Discrimination exists in the North, South, East, West, and middle of America; it is an American problem.

Second. Cutting across State lines as it does, discrimination is of national legislative concern.

Third. In general, the greater number of discriminators in a given area, the more difficult to enact local antidiscrimination laws; so the areas which do practice the most discrimination will be just those with no statutory inhibition.

Fourth. Many large businesses have their affairs spread out into many States; where one sells may not be where it hires. Federal legislation is the only feasible way to meet this problem.

(c) "Maybe so, but it won't work in some areas, particularly the South."

But, first, wartime FEPC, much weaker than the proposal now before us, achieved some notable successes in the South. Public opinion in many cases actively supported FEPC. Alabama may be considered a typical State for this purpose: The leading newspapers in Birmingham, Montgomery, and Anniston editorialized in favor of the wartime FEPC, spring 1942.

Second. Many unions in the South have insisted upon and obtained integrated working conditions; many locals have Negro officers.

Third. Industry, too, has found integration can work; for example, International Harvester with 25 percent Negro workers in Memphis has absolute integration in all operations.

(d) Closely related to (c)—"Workers won't accept FEPC."

But, first, see answers to (c).

Second. State FEPC experience shows many instances of workers threatening to strike when informed of a new integration policy in their plant. But where the program has nevertheless been carried out, there has not once been a case of a strike or even of a worker quitting. Wartime FEPC reported a similar pattern.

Third. The railroad brotherhoods were perhaps the most intransigent violators of wartime FEPC, which was in the last analysis powerless to invoke effective sanctions. However, the brotherhoods testified before the House subcommittee that if S. 1728's enforceable FEPC becomes law, they will comply.

(e) "But what of the worker's right to pick his associates?"

First. No worker has such a right even without an FEPC: His only right is to quit if he doesn't like someone who is hired. FEPC does not affect this right.

Second. As above, no case of any worker quitting upon introduction of minority group members to the work situation.

Third. This argument carries a presumption of invalidity arising from fact that CIO and A. F. of L. support FEPC.

(f) "How about the employer's right to hire someone he doesn't want?"

First. FEPC does not make him hire anyone. No new jobs are created; no percentage of jobs for race, and so forth, is set up; no duty is created to hire anyone who does not meet whatever standards the employer may set, and such standards may be as strict as he desires, even may be completely irrelevant to the job's demands so long as such irrelevancies are not the particular few named in the act. No special privileges are conferred on any group.

(g) "Well, what about the general right to run one's own business?"

First. We regulate many business procedures for what we realize to be the best interests of the community.

Second. FEPC only affects business with over 50 employees, not including sectarian, and so forth, groups. This means big business, which generally does not have intimate and personal employer-employee relationships. The employer's interest is chiefly in obtaining the most efficient work force.

(h) "People naturally seek to segregate themselves"; "You are trying to force social equality," and so forth.

But, first, this bill deals only with employment discrimination. Nowhere does it mention, or sanction interference with, segregation or any social customs, or, in fact, discrimination any place but on the job.

(i) "You can't outlaw prejudice, look at prohibition," and so forth.

But, first, this is not a bill against prejudice, but only against the overt acts that prejudice leads to; it is therefore not like a bill to outlaw driking, but like one which outlaws driving while drinking.

Second. Although laws against murder do not eliminate murder, the punishment of most murders cuts down the incidence greatly.

(j) "This is just a communistic measure."

But first, the Republican Party and Democratic Party platforms have for several years endorsed FEPC. S. 1728 was written by the White House and the Justice Department.

Second. Many prominent industrialists and businessmen support FEPC—for example, William L. Bett, Allen W. Dulles, Paul G. Hoffman, Eric Johnston, Harry R. Luce, Dwight R. G. Palmer, Martin Quigley, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Beardsley Ruml, Spyros P. Skouras, Herbert Bayard Swope, Charles H. Tuttle, and so forth. See also the program of International Harvester, mentioned above.

Third. The Catholic Church supports FEPC, as well as leading Protestant and Jewish groups.

Fourth. The Communist Party would give special rights to minority groups—for example, a Negro nation in the South. This bill merely grants equal rights.

(k) "Why can't the problem be handled in the courts?"

First. Courts are overburdened already, and the additional load of FEPC cases would break them down altogether.

Second. The Commission is able to screen worthless complaints, which protect employers and saves them time, money, and so forth. The testimony before the House subcommittee by the various State commissioners discloses a high number of rejected complaints.

Third. Commission procedures and determinations are speedier than those in courts.

Fourth. Uniformity—1 agency instead of 94 Federal courts.

Fifth. Expertise—the Commission devotes full time to the problems and all its facets.

Sixth. Commission procedure avoids the necessity of criminal penalties, which juries hesitate to invoke.

(l) "Education is the answer, not legislation." This is the chief argument of those who propose eliminating the enforcement provisions of the act.

Agreed that education is necessary and desirable, but, first, note that the bill instructs the Commission to use informal methods. However, such methods lose their effectiveness without the existence of sanctions in the background. Wartime FEPC experience was that compliance was very often secured once the violator attended an informal session. But the most adamant violators refused to discuss the matter with the Commission, knowing that nothing could be done to them anyhow. The sanctions are needed to make the violator willing to come in and talk things over; once he does that, in a great majority of cases he will comply with the Commission requests.

The State commissioners before the House subcommittee testified that they had never used their sanctions, but that their informal methods would have failed without the existence of such sanctions.

As an impartial study made by the Library of Congress states, education alone is not sufficient to do the job.

APPENDIX I

A. Discriminatory employment practices based on race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry are widespread throughout the United States, and increasing.

Discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry is practiced by government, by business, and by labor unions. It is manifested by a refusal to hire, by a denial of in-service training or upgrading opportunity, by wage differentials, by the formation of auxiliary unions lacking the usual benefits of union membership, or by blanket exclusion from such membership. Today, with unemployment at its highest level since before the war, the fear of discriminatory discharges weighs heavily upon all who have ever known the frustration and bitterness of job discrimination, notably upon the approximately 26,000,000 Catholics, 15,000,000 Negroes, 5,000,000 Jews, 3,000,000 Americans of Mexican or Hispanic origin, 11,000,000 foreign-born, and the 23,000,000 children of foreign-born, who have contributed so much to the building and to the defense of this country.

The familiar maxim "last hired and first fired" as applied to minority-group workers, unhappily, is once again proving itself all too valid. Data released by the Bureau of Census reveal that whereas unemployment among whites increased 176.4 percent between July 1945 and April 1949 there was an increase of 280 percent in unemployment among nonwhites during the same period. The Census Bureau concluded that because of the tendency to lay off Negroes before whites, and because of the relative lack of skill required in jobs usually assigned to them, Negroes will suffer an increasingly higher percentage of unemployment in any recession that may overtake us.

Contrary to the general impression, discrimination is not confined to any particular geographical area, industry, or group.

A survey of the Illinois labor market by the Illinois Interracial Commission revealed that private fee-charging employment agencies did not even list nonwhite applicants. Ninety-five percent of private employment agencies reported that Jewish applicants faced serious discriminatory barriers in attempting to qualify for jobs; substantial percentages reported similar discrimination against Catholic workers. The survey also revealed that over 100,000 discriminatory "help wanted" ads were published annually in newspapers in the State of Illinois; that of 1,600 Illinois business firms polled, over half reported no nonwhite employment; that 70 percent of all financial and 75 percent of all accounting, advertising, and other service firms in the State had no nonwhite employees; that only 3.6 percent of the employees of the public utilities of the State of Illinois are nonwhite.

In Missouri, a special committee of the House reported on March 2, 1949, to the general assembly on its investigation of violations of equal rights under the Missouri Constitution. Among these violations, the committee enumerated discrimination against colored workers in job placement in the metropolitan areas of St. Louis and Kansas City, exclusion of Negroes from membership by certain building trades and other craft unions, and other evidence.

A Minneapolis self-survey conducted by the mayor's commission on human relations found that Jews, Negroes, Japanese-Americans, and other minority group members are widely discriminated against by employers. Of 523 Minneapolis firms from which reports were tabulated, 63 percent hired no Jews, Negroes, or Japanese-Americans; 37 percent hired one or more Jews, Negroes, and/or Japanese-Americans; 13 percent hired Jews only; 5 percent hired Negroes only; 2 percent hired Japanese-Americans only; 9 percent hired Jews and Negroes; 3 percent hired Jews, Negroes, and Japanese-Americans.

Within the past 2 months, the Ohio State Employment Service reported that two out of every five job openings referred to its offices bore openly discriminatory specifications. A survey of employment opportunities for Jews in public accounting in Cincinnati revealed that the 15 largest public accounting firms employing a total of 286 accountants have only 3 Jewish employees, and have employed a total of only 11 Jews over the past 30 years.

The Michigan State Employment Service reported as of May 1948 that "about three-quarters of recent job listings for unskilled workers were not open to nonwhite workers."

Recent reports from the Colorado State Employment Service contain the following observations:

No openings in professional or managerial jobs were found for minority applicants registered at the Denver office of the CSES in January 1949 * * *. Nationality is a factor explaining unemployment among persons under 40 * * *. Race stood in the way of jobs for one-fifth of all Denver veterans receiving unemployment compensation under the GI bill of rights.

A survey by the Salt Lake City Council on civic unity contains the following findings:

Sixty-one of one hundred and sixty-seven employers who responded to a questionnaire excluded colored citizens from certain types of employment. Forty-seven out of one hundred and sixty-two employers said they were unwilling to give colored citizens the same seniority rights as other citizens. Twenty-seven out of one hundred and seventy-eight employers were unwilling to pay the same wages to colored people, even though the colored employees have equal skills with whites.

Since 1941 the school district of Philadelphia has been collecting data by race based on the records of its employment certificating service. These records show that prior to World War II only 2.7 percent of the employment certificates were issued to Negro boys and girls 16 and 17 years of age. According to a statement by the Philadelphia school system:

The percentage of employed youth increased steadily during the war years until 1945 when 17 percent of all 16- and 17-year-old youths working full time in Philadelphia were Negroes. Then the employment of Negro youth began to decline. In 1947 only 5 percent of the 18,924 full-time employment certificates issued for 16- and 17-year-old youths in Philadelphia were for Negroes. This is especially pertinent since Negroes make up 17 percent of that age group.

This same statement went on to say:

We can assume from this that when wartime pressures and manpower problems decreased, discrimination against Negroes increased.

In a report on segregation in Washington, the National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capital revealed the shocking extent of all forms of racial discrimination here in this very city, the seat of our National Government. Here are but a few points in the indictment:

Negroes are excluded from most skilled trades by the craft unions, and from whole industries by management policy. In retail trade, utilities, communications, and transportation they have little chance. The telephone company employs no colored mechanics or linemen. The big department stores deny Negro women a chance to become clerks—even one large bargain store whose customers are two-thirds Negro. In 1940 three-quarters of all Negro job holders were employed as laborers, domestics, or service workers while only one-eighth of white employees were in these categories. Even in the city government, a Negro cannot get a job as a water-meter reader, a building inspector, a weights-and-measures inspector, or as a guard in a jail.

These various studies, together with the testimony presented during the hearings on H. R. 4453, demonstrate all too strikingly that in virtually every section of this country qualified workers are being denied an opportunity of making a living—and a life—solely because of their race, color, religion, or national origin.

Gentlemen, let us conduct this debate in dignity. Let us now proceed to the business of restoring integrity to this body. Both parties and Presidential nominees pledged this in their platforms and we will now show the world that at least the House of Representatives is a place that keeps its word.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the exploiting of the Negro started when the first shipload of those unfortunate people were landed by force on North American soil. This occurred in 1619 when a Dutch man-of-war landed on the soils of Virginia bringing 20 Negroes which were captured or kidnaped on the African coast, recaptured in the West Indies, and sold to the Colonists.

Since the freeing of the Negro from human bondage and the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, there has been an improvement in their lot. There is still room for much more uplifting in their case.

The lynching of any human being is wrong from every standpoint. Adequate laws can legally condemn any criminal violation. The poll-tax qualification and Jim Crow cars should be eliminated. The Negro and any so called underprivileged group should be given every possible moral and educational uplifting. They should be given employment at good wages and under proper working conditions.

Mr. Chairman, it, to me, is a national disgrace that both major political parties and their leaders are trying still to exploit the Negro for political purposes. As 1 of 435 Representatives in Congress, I do not propose to be a party to it.

I do not believe the right-thinking Negro wants to be exploited by the two major parties. I think the Negro wants an educational opportunity for his children. He wants the same opportunity to purchase a decent home, to be in business, farm or become a professional person. He or she wants the same opportunity for advancement as any other American, and they do not believe you can legislate them into these positions. This or any other congress cannot legislate any American, regardless of race, creed, or color, into such a position either. These things must be worked for and not handed to anyone, notwithstanding race, creed, or color; otherwise, this republican form of government will fail.

H R. 4453 has to me some serious defects. Under "Definitions," section B, page 4, the term "employer" means a person engaged in commerce having in his employ 50 or more individuals. This means if you employ 50 persons or less you are exempt if this legislation becomes Public Law. This is discrimination itself in the rankest form. If this legislation, as a whole is fair and good, why should there be any exemptions? The employer of 50 or less can hire or dismiss at will. The employer of over 50 must conform to regulations. So, the unfortunate person working with 50 or less is still discriminated against if such discrimination exists.

This situation I again do not propose to be a party to.

H. R. 4453 under "unlawful employment practices" defined under section 5 (a), paragraph 2, "To utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school, or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, creed, color, or national origin" would make any employer responsible for acts of discrimination absolutely beyond his control.

Why should an employer seeking help through an agency be held responsible if that agency discriminated which under this section they could do?

H. R. 4453 on page 7 under the Fair Employment Practice Commission sets up a commission of five members for staggered terms at $17,500 per year with $20,000 for the chairman. This means another Government bureau in Washington with State set-ups employing more and more and more people.

H. R. 4453, under investigatory powers, page 19, section E, states:

No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture, but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-discrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying. The immunity herein provided shall extend only to natural persons so compelled to testify.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to be a violation of constitutional rights, and again I will not be a party to it.

The report to accompany H. R. 4453 on page 2 states, as follows:

Today, with unemployment at its highest level since before the war, the fear of discriminatory discharges weighs heavily upon all who have ever known the frustration and bitterness of job discrimination, notably upon the approximately 26,000,000 Catholics, 15,000,000 Negroes, 5,000,000 Jews, 3,000,000 Americans of Mexican or Hispanic origin, 11,000,000 foreign-born, and the 23,000,000 children of foreign-born, who have contributed so much to the building and to the defense of this country.

This, Mr. Chairman, by inference is a total of 93,000,000 people in this country who are discriminated against and which I do not believe exists. If it is the truth as stated in the report, then by the same inference the ones doing this discriminating in this country are the Protestants. This I do not believe for one moment.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is un-American, I think, from many angles. An American should still have the right to work or not as he or she sees fit. An employer, under our form of government, should still have the right to hire, and for cause, discharge. For my part, I do not propose to change it

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I realize that it is late in the day to make a plea for cool heads, and reason, and reality, but I feel that I should be derelict if I did not do so. I would like, if possible, to remove from our thinking some of the passions and emotions that have become injected into this picture and bring it down to its very basic reality.

This has become known as a bill to eliminate discrimination. Of course, in fact, it is a bill whose purpose it is to eliminate discrimination that is coupled with prejudice. One cannot attack discrimination, per se, for discrimination in itself is a part of freedom. A medical school selects 100 students out of perhaps 600 or 700 applicants. Of course they discriminate against the 500 who have not the academic preparation that the 100 enjoy.

First, let me state my own position and then give you the reasons My position is this: I opposed the bill before us, the Powell bill, in committee. When the Legislative Committee, of which I happen to be a member, voted that bill out, I came to the conclusion that it was not my obligation or right to oppose the legislative processes by which that bill would come before this body. I have done nothing in the months since our committee voted this bill out to prevent its coming out on the floor. My votes have been in such a direction that would permit it to come up on this floor and to permit the Members of this House to say "Yea" or "Nay."

I favor the substitute that will be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] and shall vote for it in committee. I shall support it if it prevails in committee when we go back into the House, and vote for it on final passage if it is then the pending question. If the bill offered by the gentleman from New York prevails in committee, I shall vote against it on final passage.

I want this to be clearly understood, that I appreciate the sincerity behind those who are the proponents of this bill as well as the opponents of this bill in our committee and in this House.

Now, to reduce this to its basic realities, I think I will use the lyrics from a song in a very popular show today. I will not try to reduce today's travesty to its complete asburdity by singing that song, but I will attempt to quote the lyrics as I remember them. It comes from the popular show, South Pacific. If you are lucky enough to get tickets and you can afford them—they are pretty steep over there—I can recommend it.

The words to the song, as I remember them, are:

You've got to be taught to hate and fear,
You've got to be taught from year to year.
It's got to be drummed in your dear little ear,
You've got to be carefully taught.

You've got to be taught to be afraid
Of people whose eyes are queerly made,
People whose skins are a different shade;
You've got to be carefully taught.

You've got to be taught before it's too late,
Before you are six or seven or eight,
To hate the people your relatives hate;
You've got to be carefully taught.

The words of that song express what is so fundamental in this bill. We come into this world as God created us, without prejudice in our hearts and minds. We are taught prejudice. It is not part of our birthright, certainly not.

How will we develop tolerance and remove prejudice? By the same methods, by teaching, by leading men away from the hates and the prejudices of this world. That must be done. That is a fundamental, moral concept underlying this entire problem. That can be accomplished, and great good can be accomplished through a measure such as that offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I think that these things should be brought into the open. I think that employers should be required to submit records and show whether or not they are discriminating because of race or creed for the purposes of employment. I think we can carry the message to those employers and accomplish a lot of good.

Before I came to this body I made a living traveling in the South. I suppose I have been in as many counties south of the Ohio and Potomac and east of the Mississippi as any man here. I was traveling for a company out of Louisville, but traveling into the deep South. I think I know something, and perhaps objectively, of the problems there.

I tell you that if we approach this thing on any basis except a voluntary basis, the basis of education, the basis of taking men by the hands and leading them into the right path, then we are in deep water. If we try to force them into that path or kick them into that path, we are going to do great harm to the principal minority race in this country.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill introduced by the gentleman from New York on these two basic grounds: First, morally, I can see in it great danger to a people who constitute a substantial segment of our society, for the most part in the Southern States; and, second, that if we want to do something for those people, and I do, the only thing that will be done by this Eighty-first Congress, the only bill that can be passed—and we are political realists in this body—the only thing that can possibly be passed is a bill such as the substitute to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

For these reasons I commend to you the substitute bill, and for these reasons I urge you to oppose the bill offered with all sincerity and good faith by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, may we turn our hearts from votes and hate. May realism prevail. May we once more attain the courage of our heritage.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], a member of the FEPC subcommittee.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, it was with a great deal of satisfaction that I received my assignment from the Committee on Education and Labor to the subcommittee dealing with the fair employment practices legislation. I had some previous noticns on this legislation, because I had a great deal to do with employment generally in my vocation in life, so that I felt I had some knowledge which I could bring to the subcommittee, to the committee, and to the Congress. I was very happy to have the opportunity to listen to the testimony before the subcommittee and to evaluate the evidence which was submitted to the subcommittee on this piece of legislation.

My idea at the outset was that contrary to the belief of many people in this Nation this type of legislation is not the conferring of some new right. Some right which does not exist in people. But rather it is what I believe to be the real concept of law. That is that law has no reason for existence unless it protects and guarantees the free exercise of either natural or constitutional rights of people. I believe that this legislation would furnish necessary protection and guaranty of free exercise of natural and constitutional rights.

The barriers that have been set up, based on race, creed, color, and national origin, to me have always been artificial boundaries between people, boundaries that really have no logical reason for existence. To ask that people recognize those boundaries as a condition of employment I have always felt was trampling upon a natural and constitutional right that people have as citizens of a great country such as ours.

I have heard in the last few days many of the statements made against this legislation. I can understand the feeling of many people because of the conditions peculiar to the sections from which they come. But I want to assure all of those people that certainly the motives of most of those who are proponents of this legislation are such that they feel this legislation is not directed at any particular section.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the evidence submitted to our subcommittee seems to indicate that this legislation is needed, so far as the Negro people are concerned, as much in the North as in the South.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, during the maneuvering which has taken place here in the House today I have voted on all occasions to continue consideration of this measure. I have felt that the part of true democratic processes would be best served if the membership of this House were permitted to express its will on the measure. I respect the deep convictions of the many Members of this body who have sought by every legislative device to delay that moment when FEPC would come to a vote. However, I do feel that this matter should be squarely confronted and that we should, out of the depths of our own personal convictions and out of our own sense of obligation and duty, come to the point very soon when we can all stand up and express our own beliefs with respect to the legislation.

In these days of confused social and economic thinking, it is one of the most difficult of tasks to determine on some occasions the will of the people whom we all have the great honor to represent in this body. We cannot in good conscience simply weigh the letters of those who oppose and those who endorse any given legislative proposal and cast our ballots in terms of ounces, pounds, and tons. Life would be much more simple if it were possible to follow this course of action.

However, after a short period of legislative responsibility in this House one comes to the certain knowledge that forces and pressures artificially stimulated and highly organized often create a clamor entirely out of proportion to actual numbers and, like the long line of soldiers marching around and around a hill in sight of the enemy, gives an impression of strength which is deceptive and misleading.

There has been a great deal said with respect to the action of the California electorate in repudiating at the polls a compulsive FEPC proposal in the general elections of 1946. It is well known that in spite of an all-out campaign to insure passage of the measure, every county in the entire State joined in sending the bill down to unqualified defeat. The voters of California did not want to delegate to the State government some of the constitutional rights which reside with the individual, and are a matter of personal conscience and responsibility.

Unlike Federal antilynch legislation and anti-poll-tax measures, which many of us have supported to the limit of our

individual abilities, Federal legislation on employment is a horse of another color.

In this field one departs from the well-defined area of minority rights and enters the even greater area of the legal civil rights of majorities. It is an area in which the social and economic aspects of American life become so inextricably intertwined as to comprise a bedlam of claims and counterclaims and of vexatious controversy.

It must be remembered that those who employ and are responsible for the conduct of millions of small-business enterprises in this country are also citizens with certain clearly defined rights and obligations. Having invested the finances necessary to the creation of any given enterprise, it then becomes necessary to make the business work. If it fails, both the employee and the employer lose, but the employer's loss may entail bankruptcy and many additional years of toil as he seeks to clear his name and reestablish his credit. True, until he can make other arrangements for employment the worker is idle, but no financial responsibility falls upon his shoulders.

It follows, then, that employment policies are not only a question of social and civil rights, but of economic considerations as well. If to be required to employ a member of any given minority group in a situation where the credit and the future of a small business is concerned is to mean in economic terms that the employer will suffer economic loss as a result, then any legislation which seeks to impose qualifications upon the employer is to place in jeopardy the employer's right to a fair exercise of his privilege of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In repudiating, by an overwhelming margin the FEPC proposal the voters of California were simply restating an individual and collective belief in the rights of all Americans, majorities as well as minorities. It is unfortunate that other States which have adopted the restrictive practice have not given their citizens an equal opportunity to obtain the consent of the governed.

Now, what was the California law? What did it provide? In almost every major instance it provided exactly what is provided in the bill introduced by the gentleman from New York. It declared as a State policy, that all persons have the right of equal opportunity to secure employment. To effect such policy it made it unlawful to refuse to hire and discharge or to discriminate in conditions of employment against any person because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. It established a commission to prevent such unlawful practices by conciliation or order, and by education. It provided for judicial review of the commission's orders and appropriated a sum for the commission.

And what happened in the State of California? From the northern part of the State bordering on Oregon to the southern part of the State bordering on the Republic of Mexico, every county from north to south and from east to west in the sovereign State of California repudiated FEPC by a vote which varied from 2 to 1 to 5 to 1. What were the totals? Out of the total vote cast of 2,358,343 citizens of California, 1,682,664 voted "no" and 675,697 voted "yes" on FEPC, and that expression was given in the only referendum which has been held upon this important subject in which the basic rights of every citizen in this country stand at stake.

The Sixteenth District of California, which I have the honor to represent in this body, is a progressive and enlightened one. In economic and social respects it is perhaps as liberal a district as can be found anywhere. The population is comprised of many elements generally considered to be minority groups. Democrat registrants far outnumber Republicans. Every race, creed, color, religious faith, and economic group is represented in the district. To my mind it is a characteristic congressional district.

However, in that district, when the question of adopting FEPC legislation appeared on the ballot, an emphatic repudiation of the legislation was registered, and there is no reason for me to believe that the opinion expressed at that time has changed materially in the interim.

I do not intend to labor the academic question as to whether or not it is possible to legislate morals, or instill fraternity and brotherly love through the legislative process. The people of my own district and the people of California have answered this particular question to the extent that a compulsory Fair Employment Practices Act is concerned.

It is unfortunate that this measure does not come to us as a constitutional amendment. In that manner and only in that manner could we truly determine the wishes of the people of the United States as a whole. This is far too important a subject to be taken lightly or voted upon quickly, expressing as it does an entirely new, novel, and possibly dangerous concept of human relationships.

Mandates are generally fuzzy affairs. One person interprets a so-called mandate to mean one thing, while a second will interpret the same vote to mean something entirely different. In the present instance, however, the mandate is clear and impelling. Here was no political clash of opposing personalities, no involved or complex proposal. Here was simply a legislative proposal put before the people of the State of California for their answer in the American way. Their answer was unmistakable and clear. That answer was a resounding "no" to a compulsory and penalty-providing FEPC. I may be required to tell 24,814 voters why I voted against compulsion on this measure, but I can also tell 99,549 voters who opposed FEPC in my district that I have followed the explicit instructions given me in this connection.

I shall oppose any provision in this or any other measure which will jail an American citizen for an entirely proper exercise of judgment in the conduct of his affairs. I will not become a party to the bootlegging of employees under the counter nor force citizens to evasion of the law in employment matters. We Americans have come a long way toward true civil liberties since slaves were sold to the highest bidder from the auction block, and we still have a long way to go, but we are not going to progress through legislation of this type and character. You can lead a horse to water, but you cannot lead a free-born American citizen to the willing abdication of his constitutional rights.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, the question of fair employment is before us—this is not a question that affects the South only, and not a question to be decided by the South—the question of fair employment affects all of the United States. Mr. Chairman, we know that we have discrimination in some instances in the United States in our employment practices, discrimination because of race, color, creed and national origin. We know that. We know that when we found ourselves in war these practices of discrimination greatly hindered our war effort. We know that the President, therefore, issued an Executive order setting up a national FEPC. We know that it worked. Since the end of the war FEPC legislation has been introduced in Congress after Congress—I have worked for the passage of legislation to guaranty fair employment to all American citizens since I first came to Congress in 1945, the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The war is over but can we return to a situation where again we tolerate discrimination in our employment practices? Shall we idly sit by and ignore such discrimination now that the war is over? I do not think we can. Not only because discrimination undermines democracy here at home but because it seriously handicaps us in our efforts to help build a democratic world. Remember that the majority of the people of the world are colored and we do not endear ourselves to those people by talking out of one side of our mouth abroad and out of the other side of our mouth at home.

The gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] of the Sixteenth Congressional District has just informed you that in California a majority of voters voted against FEPC legislation. He is right. They did. Do you know how FEPC was discussed in California? There were billboards from one end of the State to the other—screaming that this was a communistic program. The majority of the people in the State in my opinion, misunderstood FEPC. Many of the people who are discriminated against in California, the Mexicans, the Filipinos and the Negroes did not understand what the FEPC was. How could they understand. Many thousands of dollars were spent to misrepresent the issue—wild statements were made and deliberately misled the voters—but these same people knew, when they went to get a job for which they were qualified but were turned down, why they were turned down—because of their national origin or because their skin was black—and they resented it. And to the degree they felt they had been unfairly used—democracy was weakened—and communism had struck a telling blow. Had they

understood that FEPC would guarantee them a fair chance to obtain employment for which they were qualified—they would have voted for it also. The reason FEPC was defeated in the State of California was the way it was presented, the fact there was a vast sum of money spent in the campaign to defeat it and that it was deliberately misrepresented to the people. The committee against FEPC was guided by such people as the Reverend James W. Fifield of spiritual-mobilization fame. It was stated throughout the State that the bill denied the right to fair trial, that no court review was possible and so forth.

I might also point out to the gentleman from California that the housing program that was presented to the people of California last election was also defeated.

Again this proposal was misrepresented—again vast sums of money were used—does that mean the majority of California voters are against decent housing? No. They were misled by the propaganda.

Housing was not defeated in my district, because I got out and explained to the people what the proposal before them was. And I want to say that some of the folks who voted against these things in Congress were defeated in the recent elections, and I do not think that I am overstating it when I say that some of those who will vote now against progress to strengthen democracy in this Congress will be defeated in the future. The voters have a way of catching us with bogus issues. Given time, a majority always endorses and votes for those proposals that are designed to strengthen and develop our democracy.

The direct objective of the bill before us is to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. This civil-rights objective—protection of the wage earner in his basic right to seek a livelihood without arbitrary discrimination—has more than ample justification. But I would contend that H. R. 4453 has a larger objective and an even wider justification.

It is a bill that provides for the common defense in an era of critical world tensions. It is designed to strengthen the conduct of American diplomacy by removing a blot of America's leadership in world affairs. It is designed to promote America's economic self-interest by raising living standards and by increasing market opportunities. It is designed to strengthen our free enterprise system by strengthening the most basic enterprise of earning a living against unreasonable, bigoted interference. Finally, the bill is designed to carry out the moral principles of our religious heritage in a practical program suited to our day. National morality and national conscience dictate that we close the gap between some American practices and American ideals.

When we are charged with catering to minority interests, with fishing for minority votes, we assert that this is a truly national program, as devoid of sectional gain or partisan interest as any legislation that ever came before the Congress.

The discrepancy between American ideals and American practice—between our aims and what we actually do—creates a moral dry rot which eats away at the foundations of our democratic faith. Democracy cannot thrive in a climate of hypocrisy. Democracy cannot prosper in a land where 40,000,000 people—members of one minority group or another—are denied the basic assurance of healthy community life, the assurance that they belong, the assurance that they count, the assurance that there is only one class of citizenship and that they enjoy it. Our national morality based on our religious heritage demands an end to discrimination rooted in bigotry. In the words of George Washington, "to bigotry, no sanction."

And I hope it is as significant to you, as it is to me, that every major church denomination in the United States has endorsed the provisions of this bill.

During the war, we found that we lacked skilled workers for many vital jobs. This dangerous shortage might have been avoided if minorities had not been denied opportunities for training and experience. Now we find that job discrimination continues to cripple business opportunities. Hundreds of business leaders have come forward to testify that fair employment practices are good business practices. They tell us that denying jobs to certain people denies markets for other people—and such a policy drags down the whole economic level in a vicious cycle They have discovered that they cannot sell electric refrigerators to a family that cannot afford electricity because its principal breadwinner is denied an opportunity to work at any but the most menial trades. They understand that real economic progress requires that the whole nation move forward at the same time without artificial barriers erected by ignorance or intolerance. Prejudice produces no wealth. Discrimination is bad business. And so I insist that our fair employment practice bill is a real and significant contribution to America's productive capacity and to the preservation of our free enterprise system.

Today democracy as we know it is on trial throughout the world. In the last analysis that trial will not be won by our magnificent airlift, or unmatched industrial strength, or our stock pile of atom bombs. Ultimately, our way of life will win out only if its promise of moral and spiritual leadership is fulfilled.

Fair treatment for racial minorities in America is basic to our chance for a just and lasting peace. The world will not trust us if we talk out of both sides of our mouth—if we are on one side abroad and on another side at home. Two-thirds of the world's peoples are colored. We cannot expect that they will respect our good faith or our avowed purposes if we continue to practice an ugly discrimination here at home against our own minorities. We will have to fight a rear-guard battle in Europe and Asia so long as each lynching is carried in the headlines of foreign newspapers, so long as our enemies can point out the fact that so many millions of our people are not full partners in our democracy. For the sake of our national defense we must not permit prejudice and discrimination to become our Achilles' heel.

We are a Nation blessed by God with material riches beyond all others. Our mountains, our plains, our rivers, our harbors have given us industry and commerce, agriculture and mining resources, that are the envy and despair of the rest of the world. But our richest and our greatest resource is people—people living under free and fair institutions which permit them to develop fully the talents God gave them. We waste this resource if we sanction discrimination.

I. THE NEED FOR LEGISLATION

While there is no precise measure of the extent of employment discrimination, there is convincing evidence that discrimination is increasing. So the Committee on Fair Employment Practices reported to President Truman in June 1946 upon the completion of its task.

The United States Census Bureau survey reveals that in April 1947 the proportion of unemployed among white workers was 3.8 percent and among nonwhites 6 7 percent. Also significant is the fact that the unemployment ratio had increased since 1945 about 150 percent among white workers but more than 300 percent among nonwhites. An analysis of the report indicates that the problem is not confined to any one section of the country but is equally acute on the Pacific coast, in Detroit, Ohio, and New York.

A survey made by the Ohio State Employment Service indicated that 24 percent of the job requests received carried the condition "white only." Negro workers did not even have an opportunity to discuss with prospective employers their qualifications for doing the job which he needed done. Of course, the 23-percent figure must be considered a minimum since we know from ample experience that a substantial number of other job openings were discriminatory although not specified as such.

At the same time that discrimination increases at the hiring gate itself, we have noted that there has been a forced retreat by Negroes from skilled and semi-skilled jobs into the common-laborer classifications, and from production jobs to service jobs. The Labor Market Reports issued by the United States Department of Labor illustrates this point by quotations from surveys of industry after industry—agriculture, machinery, hosiery, prefabricated housing, telephone communications, bakeries, and so forth.

Employment discrimination is, of course, not limited to Negroes. The 1948 annual survey of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith reports "a spot survey of private employment agency registration forms conducted during September 1948 in 33 of the 48 States showed that 60.6 percent of these asked questions about religion; 33.9 percent about nationality; 28.4 percent inquired into place of birth; 16.5 percent asked about descent; 11.9 percent asked about race."

Similar discrimination, often in more aggravated form, is suffered by countless other Americans whose mode of worship, national origin, or skin color served to disqualify them for securing employment commensurate with their ability—Jap-

anese Americans, Mexican Americans, Indians. Their story is set out in convincing detail in the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights.

II. FAIR EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION IS EFFECTIVE

"This form not to be used in the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey" reads the heading of a 1948 application blank of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. The application for a position with this giant American corporation then goes on to ask such questions as religion, lineage, father's birthplace, and so forth, and says: "Please attach recent photograph of yourself. This is essential. Otherwise your application will not be considered." Here in dramatic summary form is an example of what has been accomplished by FEPC legislation. The four States listed at the top of the application are the States which for the past 3 years have had fair employment practice acts with enforcement provisions.

Prior to the passage of these State laws, statements were made to the effect that business would leave the State, white employees would quit their jobs, and employers would be harassed with irresponsible charges. These dire predictions have proven groundless.

We have the sworn testimony of the chairmen of the commissions of the three States with the longest experience with antidiscrimination laws. All report that there has not been a single instance of a business leaving a State, of a mass walk-out, or a complaint by any employer that compliance with the law has resulted in the loss of either customers or revenue. Quite to the contrary, they testified that a growing number of companies had come to the conclusion that antidiscrimination laws helped business by promoting a more efficient utilization of labor. As one executive put it, "Some of the people I have hired under the new law are outstanding. You ought to point out to employers the advantages they get from an increased labor market where they have access to so many qualified workers."

The three commission chairmen were unanimous in declaring that the FEPC laws in their respective States had resulted in a marked decline in discriminatory practices and in the virtual elimination of discriminatory advertisements and employment application forms. Especially significant is the fact that they reported a total of 1,220 cases, and in not a single case was it necessary to go beyond the processes of conferences, conciliation, and persuasion to effect a satisfactory adjustment. They were unanimous, too, in the opinion that enactment of a Federal statute would strengthen and facilitate the administration of their own laws. The experience of the States is fortified by experience on the Federal level by the record of performance of the wartime FEPC. During its most active 2 years, FEPC closed an average of 250 cases a month. About 100 cases a month were closed as having been satisfactorily adjusted. Some warplant gates were thereby opened to minorities hitherto refused admittance. Government and industry were persuaded to advance many minority workers to their established skills.

The effect of these cases on the morale of minority-group workers is not precisely measurable. That the effect was far-reaching and beneficial was shown by the minimum of interracial friction during World War II as compared with World War I. Vociferous threats to strike if minorities entered a plant evaporated when responsible workers and employers took a firm position against discrimination.

The record of the Federal FEPC is concededly not as successful as the State FEPC's. The reason is clear. The Federal Government program lacked enforcement powers.

The chairmen of the State commissions who have testified on the subject are unanimous in emphasizing that although no State had as yet found it necessary to invoke legal sanctions, the very fact that it is part of the procedure has had its effect and has helped make possible the really remarkable record of cases settled through conciliation alone.

We know of instances where State commissions have succeeded while the Federal Commission failed. In New York, for example, the commision successfully concluded an arrangement with a number of railroad unions to eliminate discriminatory clauses in their constitutions and bylaws. The Federal FEPC, lacking the reserve power of enforcement, failed to do this.

III. THE NEED FOR ENFORCEMENT POWERS

It is significant that the foes of this legislation have all joined with us in professing their oposition to discrimination, and that hardly a voice has been raised in defense of such practices. The attack is always on method. We are told that racial or religious prejudice can be eliminated only by education and that legislation in this delicate field will promote strife and conflict.

The opposition ignores a fundamental distinction between prejudice and discrimination. Prejudice is a state of mind and discrimination is an overt act. Our system can indulge a man's individual prejudice however wrongfully conceived, so long as they remain a state of mind. But our democratic system cannot permit a man to translate his prejudices into action which infringes the rights and liberties of others. This is a fundamental premise of our civil and criminal law. When prejudice is translated into active discrimination whereby men, solely because of their race, religion, color, or national origin are denied an opportunity of earning a livelihood for themselves and their families, it is the proper function of government to prevent such practices.

Nor does experience justify the fear that passage of this legislation will promote strife and conflict. Decency and fair play have never fostered strife. On the contrary, such tension and conflict arise more frequently when people feel they cannot obtain redress from their government for a recognized evil. We are more likely to have disorder and riot when a government disregards the demand for justice. We should not expect members of minority groups who have fought and bled for our democracy to sit by indefinitely when they are told in effect "you have won freedom for the peoples of all the world, but it is to be denied you here at home." The purpose of this legislation is in accord with traditional concepts of the role of government in promoting the general welfare—in providing an orderly official procedure for dealing with a recognized evil, employment discrimination.

To those who say that education rather than legislation is the answer, we reply that they have offered us false alternatives. There is no conflict between education and legislation. It is the educators who have told us that we learn best by doing. It is the legislators who tell us that law constitutes one of the most powerful instruments of education. The complementary character of education and legislation is aptly summed up in the fact that it became necessary to pass laws making school attendance compulsory before our education system itself was able to function effectively. As Bishop Francis J. Haas put it:

> Frankly, I become a bit impatient with persons who insist that the whole matter of securing fair employment opportunity is solely the business of education. In too many instances their position amounts to holding that a just social order is to be built brick by brick, but that only one brick is to be laid every hundred years We may not resign ourselves to such a policy of defeatism and of doing nothing.

We are also told that the program of civil rights contravenes the principle of States' rights. Let us put the issue more accurately. The legislation before us is designed to protect the right of all Americans to earn a livelihood at any trade without discrimination because of race or creed. Surely this is a basic right. Surely this is one of the foundations of the dignity of the human person. And surely it must be preferred over the arid principle of States' rights—or, to be more accurate, the principle of States' wrongs. For what rights are involved in our opponents' program—the right of States to prevent people from finding jobs because of their color? If this were not a State's wrong—instead of a State's right—this issue never would have arisen.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I have three amendments at the desk. I wish I could have made them available to all of my colleagues sooner, but they can be seen there, and in view of the time limitation I simply want to try to explain them in the hope that they may appeal to all of you.

We have an FEPC law in Massachusetts. It was enacted in 1946, and it is working, and well, and with the approval of practically everyone in Massachusetts. I was pleased to find that in subsection 7 of section 6 the committee adopted practically the identical language of the Massachusetts statute, but I was disturbed to find that although it is only

slightly different, it is still different from the Massachusetts statute when you consider subsection (b) of section 7. I believe that goes to the heart of this legislation. I believe that you have a clear precedent, and I believe it will be helpful, constructive, and certainly not destructive if this amendment is adopted.

I placed in the RECORD on February 2 an analysis and comparison of the committee bill, the bill offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and the Massachusetts law. If this amendment is adopted, it is my considered opinion that the committee bill will be almost identical with the Massachusetts bill.

May I call your attention to certain statements made by the commission in Massachusetts with reference to the working of that bill. Their first report, the commission said in part:

> It has not chosen to conduct a punitive expedition in Massachusetts but has preferred to steer a conservative course of educating employers and workers alike as to their responsibilities and obligations under this law

Their second report, filed in 1948, said:

> From the beginning, this commission has recognized that the elimination of discriminatory employment practices based upon individual and group prejudices could be accomplished most effectively by reason instead of force.

And I am pleased to state that in the last report filed in November of 1949 the commission was able to report that not a single complaint in Massachusetts has been taken to the courts, and they call attention once more to this significant statement of policy:

> Once more the commission acknowledges the wisdom of the provision of the law requiring that the first efforts to adjust complaints be made through conference, conciliation, and persuasion

Those are the words in that subsection, and I suggest to you Members that where you have had 3 years of experience in a highly industrialized area and where a commission can make that sort of a report and add, "This process invites cooperation and is the antithesis of swinging a big stick," you will have an opportunity to write into this law the law that has been on the books 3 years and has been demonstrated in that fashion.

I hope you will support the amendment.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, first, as a southerner, I want to say I admire the good faith of the gentleman from New York in presenting this legislation to us for consideration. I have been treated with eminent fairness by him and his subcommittee in all the considerations we have had in our committee. I disagree with him, of course, on the legislation, and I oppose it most vigorously.

The question is whether or not we, acting as a national legislative body, can pass legislation which will change the customs and the traditions of the people of the country. That is the intention of this bill and there can be no denying it. Those who sponsor this legislation want to change the customs. They are desirous of creating social equality. They are desirous of bringing the minority races into every opportunity which exists for the majority races in this country. I do not criticize them for that but I do criticize them for the means which they are using in order to achieve this objective. It cannot be done by legislation.

The gentleman from Massachusetts spoke in high praise of his Massachusetts law. I happen to know of my own personal knowledge that the Massachusetts law is not effective in that State simply because employers up there will not advertise in the newspapers for employees. They will not go to an employment agency seeking employees. The reason they do not is that they want to select their own employees, and this FEPC there is preventing people of minority races from getting the jobs they would secure through want-ad pages or through employment services.

It should bear some significance to this debate that two of the three members who have spoken in favor of this legislation from the committee have mentioned the fact that this is not aimed at the South. "Methinks, my friend, that thou protesteth too much." It is aimed at the South and they cannot honestly deny it. It is aimed at the South because the preponderance of colored people in this country live below the Mason and Dixon's line. You want to change our customs down there and force us to follow a Federal law which directly violates all of our traditions and our customs in the South.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The proponents of this bill are merely using the Negro as a smoke screen; they are not trying to help him. That is bunk. They are not trying to help the Negro. They do not give a tinker's damn about it.

Mr. LUCAS. I am seriously afraid they are not helping the Negro. Actually they are hurting the Negro.

Mr. RANKIN. They are depriving him of a home.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] has raised an excellent point in stating that this legislation should be handled at the State level. It should be. If it is not aimed at the South, then what objection would you have to letting each State determine whether or not such a law as this should be enforced within that State? I believe so strongly in that that I am going to offer an amendment, for which I ask your consideration. It reads:

> SEC. 16. This act shall take effect in each State on the date on which the State by law (1) declares that the rights of some persons within the jurisdiction of the State to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin are being denied, and (2) establishes or designates an agency of the State to accept jurisdiction of cases under section 7 (a) of this act.

If this bill is not directed at the South, if it is not aimed at the South, will you support my amendment? If you believe this is not aimed directly at the South, then you will permit the Southern States and every State to determine, as has the great State of California, whether or not they shall have legislation of this character within the States.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I hope the bill to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission will never be enacted because it strikes the very vitals of all free enterprise, without which our Nation could never have become the greatest and richest country in the world. It is a measure which would substitute the whims and dictates of a Federal bureaucracy for the judgment and common sense of the great people who have carried our Nation through nearly two centuries of progress to the pinnacle we now enjoy.

The FEPC was created during the war years by Executive order for the purpose, it was claimed, of obtaining full manpower strength and allegedly preventing possible discrimination in employment of any person because of his race, creed, color, or national origin. The record shows, however, that the FEPC often hindered instead of helping in war production, and caused a break-down in the race relations rather than building up better understanding. After the war emergency, this trouble-making agency died, but now it is proposed to bring it to life permanently with still greater jurisdiction over practically every kind of work and walk of life.

It is regrettable that there appears to be so many who are unable to understand that progress is attained through understanding and education—and not legislation. The past half century has been the most progressive period in history. Many changes have come about in the American way of life. This applies particularly to the South and my own State of Georgia. Negroes have advanced further in education, business, religion, science, and the professions in this period than in any other time in history. Approximately 4,000,000 people who were uneducated and unskilled in any trade except farming were set free to find gainful employment and make their living at a time when the whole country was suffering the aftermath of the Civil War. The southern whites and their former slaves, even then, had become reconciled and had worked out an understanding between themselves and jobs and homes were given the Negro by their former masters. There is a vast difference in the status of the southern Negro today from what it was at the turn of the century. Moreover, it should be noted that the South is attaining more and more a diversified and well-balanced economy—and is attracting industries from other areas because of its many advantages such as sufficient and satisfied labor, even weather, proximity to supply, and increased transportation facilities.

The constitutionality of the proposed measure is most doubtful. No case has been made for its constitutionality—and it attempts by the mere recital of words to make a legislative finding of fact that

the so-called ills it seeks to cure are now adversely affecting the interstate and foreign commerce of the United States. That is a surprising conclusion—especially in a period when our interstate and foreign commerce are at the highest peak in our history. It becomes the more amazing when one stops to trace our trade and business growth during the last 30 years. If the investigations, compulsory testimony, compulsory production of records, compulsory attendance at hearings conducted by incompetent clerks, and the other indignities that this measure would foster upon the taxpaying American citizen is constitutional for the purposes this measure sets forth, then it certainly becomes clear that the individual rights of the States and the people reserved in the Constitution are in actuality surrendered under the commerce clause.

The bill does not even purport to be exercised for the citizens of this country. It flatly states as a finding of fact that "the rights of some persons within the jurisdiction of the United States to employment are being denied"—it does not say "citizens," merely "some persons." That could mean that it is intended that every alien, no matter what his country of origin, is to be given all the Federal Government help and assistance possible to secure the job of Americans who have fought and won two world wars to make their homeland safe to live in. Is this a proposal to secure every Communist, not only a foothold in America, but gainful employment at the expense of the livelihood of the American veteran who is merely seeking to enjoy an economic status in which he may raise his family in the American way?

The Commission proposed in the bill is not limited to functioning in the United States or areas subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. Section 6 (f) of the bill specifically provides that—

> The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet or exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary.

Section 2 (c) states that one of the purposes of the bill is "To promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all." Section 6 (g) (6) further empowers the Commission "to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies." It would seem clear that the Commission might devote its energies to investigating the undesirables of other nations and then assure them of employment when they came to America.

Although the bill purportedly is designated by its proponents to eliminate discrimination, its very terms are discriminatory themselves. It provides that where the Commission finds an alleged "unlawful employment practice" it may "petition any United States court of appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court or other United States court for the enforcement of such"—the Commission's—"order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order." But if a person is aggrieved by the Commission's order he can only obtain a review of the order in a United States court of appeals. The aggrieved party does not have jurisdictional access to a United States district court or other United States court, if the court of appeals is on vacation. He just has to wait until their vacation has ended—and in the meantime he must obey the Commission's order which could be to hire someone he does not want or need, or would not want because the person is incompetent even if he did need someone, and would have to pay that person back wages even though the person never worked during the period.

It is impossible to conceive of a measure which would so completely deter, burden, confuse, befuddle, add untold costs to, and even destroy American business and the American way of life as the proposed Fair Employment Practice Act would In place of individual judgment based upon years of knowledge and experience, a Federal bureaucracy would be set up in every community in the Nation with every legal weapon conceivable available to it—including rendering its own binding orders—to tell every businessman whom he could hire, whom he could fire, what the terms of this one's employment should be, what the terms of that one's employment should be, and anything else they could think of. If an employer should find a few years later he hired someone when the Commission thought he should have hired someone else, he would have to pay the back wages to the one he did not hire, then hire him, probably have to fire the first man and lose his experience and skill, and wind up with an incompetent whom he had to continue to employ, contribute to his social security, provide medical services and the many other benefits that most employees receive. If this would not adversely affect the interstate and foreign commerce of the United States, it is difficult to conceive of anything that would. And all this so an alien could put an American veteran on the relief rolls.

Our American system of free enterprise has succeeded because it is flexible and provides rewards and promotions to those with skills and ability. People with talents and skills move to the higher places and the lazy and inept remain where they are until they decide to go to work. Under this proposed new system of regulating the employee and the employer by the FEPC a person's ability and competence would be incidental. There would be an endless chain of grudges and grievances and spying, and a man would be unable to operate his own business. There would always lurk in the shadows the fear of unlawful employment practices and every employer would hesitate to use his own judgment in the selection of those he thought could best fit in his business and successfully carry on the work.

In addition to the incalculable costs the measure would add to the price of goods and services to the consumer, there would be added to the already back-breaking tax load the average American is shouldering, the cost of a new Federal bureaucracy with agents in every part of the country, and possibly the world, their cost of travel, the immense costs of conducting hearings, trials, and lawsuits, and every other cost that a Federal Bureau incurs.

We in the Southland realize our problems; we have seen the progress that has been made; we feel that in time the South will work out its salvation through education and the increased spirituality of our people. We have a background of experience, knowledge, and understanding with which to deal with them for which legislation is not merely a poor substitute. but no substitute at all. Senator Borah, a brilliant statesman from Idaho, said many years ago that the southern people had met the race problem and dealt with it with greater patience, greater intelligence, and greater success than any people in recorded history dealing with a problem of similar nature.

This FEPC proposal if enacted on a Federal level would result in greater confusion in all areas, and in the South particularly its effect would be complete demoralization and utter devastation. The progress the South has made would be overturned and in place of the South's understanding and experienced approach to these matters would be substituted a coercive, threatening, blundering statutory program impossible to enforce and capable of only one net result—chaos.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield for a question.

Mr. HARRISON. Is this bill, as reported by the committee, based on the findings and report of the President's Commission on Civil Rights?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It is my understanding that it is.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], former chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, of course you know I am in favor of this bill. I have asked for this time to discuss a bill dear to my heart and to the heart of every American who believes in human rights and fair play—the bill to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission. I have long been interested in legislation which would create through statute a permanent FEPC, and as many Members know, I have introduced in the past three Congresses bills which could create such an agency. Although one was reported to the floor of the House by the Labor Committee in the Seventy-ninth Congress, it was prevented from ever coming to the floor by the determined action of the House Rules Committee to pigeonhole it. Unfortunately, the House has never had an opportunity to vote on any FEPC bills and what has happened today is merely a repetition of the tactics which have been used in other Congresses to keep FEPC legislation from being considered by all Members of the House. There is before us today not only the question of whether FEPC should become law—although I hope that it does—but also the question

of whether the House should be denied the right to consider a bill such as this. The bill in essence prevents the same type of high-handed tactics which are being used today on the floor of the House, and I sincerely hope that all Members will have an opportunity to cast their vote on this legislation.

As I have said, I have been the author of several FEPC bills, all of them to prevent discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, and so forth. In our America, where we are all striving to preserve our fundamental freedoms and liberties, we should not be afraid of any legislation which would give Americans the right to earn a living on an equal basis with all other Americans, regardless of race and creed. We preach tolerance for other peoples, but, unfortunately, we forget that, right in our own country, a minority of our own citizens must suffer discrimination. We are sending thousands of dollars to countries overseas to curb and prevent the spread of communism, while at home we foster the very conditions which lead to communism. Men will not turn to communism in America if they are given equal opportunities for employment, and through this employment secure for themselves and their families a decent standard of living.

I am not afraid of the consequences of a permanent FEPC. The original FEPC established through Executive order by President Roosevelt brought no dire results. In fact, records show that it was most successful in its operation, and I believe that its fair and just administration helped to spread in an effective way the idea of tolerance and brotherhood.

In these troubled times we may be again forced to ask the men and women of our country to serve in the armed forces and protect once more all that we hold dear—God forbid that this will happen—but if it does, how can we ask our young people to give of themselves, and perhaps even their lives, if we do not assure to them at home the very freedoms for which they may have to fight. That kind of service is not predicated on color or ancestry or any creed, but merely on a common love of freedom and justice and a determination to preserve these priceless gifts. If we are honest with ourselves, we will today show to those who suffer from discrimination at home and to those abroad who are looking to us for leadership that we truly believe in the ideals which Americans have espoused since the founding of the Republic—tolerance and liberty. There is one way to prove our good faith, and that is to consider FEPC legislation and vote in favor of it.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 32 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York 56.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, we are fighting the very old struggle here today and we might just as well recognize it; for the United States is no longer a confederation of sections, nor is the United States a conglomeration of individual States; we are now a nation. We are not trying to legislate morals, which, I think, is an oversimplification of what we are trying to do here today; we are trying to implement a very old, a very honored, a very treasured right in our country—to protect a person inviolate in the possession of his life and his property and his right to the pursuit of happiness. Equality of economic opportunity is just such a right.

In this legislation we are trying to keep up with modern times which dictate that we have to pass a law which in its application, is only keeping up with modern times.

We must also pass a law which has teeth in it or we are saying to ourselves that the right to equality of economic opportunity which we are trying to assert and preserve and maintain is not dignified enough to have Government enforcement. That is the fundamental problem here. Everybody who wants FEPC, who wants it sincerely and deeply and understands what it means as an American, wants it effective. We know that you cannot have a policeman for every violation, and we know that enforcement powers is what makes for deterrence against violation. The Legislature of the State of New York knows that, too, for it has memorialized the Congress by Resolution passed concurrently, dated January 31, 1950, to pass this very bill, and I am going to put that memorial in the RECORD. It says and I quote:

> * * * the enactment of such legislation (H R 4453) is of the greatest importance to the people and will tend to unite the country and create greater respect for our institutions among the other peoples of the world * * *

I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We have heard a lot about the reverses which the United States has taken in the Far East in foreign policy; and we have taken serious reverses there, but let us not forget that we are asking Asiatic peoples to adopt democracy. We are asking them to learn the freedom that democracy means, this billion people in the Far East who have yellow skins, and the 140,000,000 people in Africa who have black skins. We ask these peoples to have faith that democracy is fair and just and honest and does exactly what it promises to do. We can say that so much better and without questioning whether we are deceiving ourselves if we extend this elementary measure of justice to our own colored citizens in the United States. Good faith in our acknowledged responsibility to spread the ideas of freedom to all peoples demands that we pass this bill and pass it today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, today another great American custom is being thrown aside to make way for FEPC, one of the most un-American bills which has ever been brought before the Congress of this great country. I do not have to remind anyone present that for over 100 years it has been the custom for the Congress of the United States to honor the birthday of George Washington, the Father of our Country, by assembling, reading his Farewell Address, and then adjourning in honor of his memory. But not so today. We must wrangle with this vicious measure which is designed as vote bait to serve the interest of selfish politicians—for this is election year. What a shame that this has to be with so many grave issues facing us at this time, when, for example, children, old people, and sick people everywhere are suffering from our inability to settle the coal strike which has this country practically paralyzed. What a shame that our President, who is leading the fight for passage of this legislation, has not used his authority to settle so grave a situation. And if he does not have authority to do this, the Congress is equally at fault for not having given him the authority necessary. It is a grave fact that children as well as adults look upon John L. Lewis as being all-powerful. Only this morning, for example, my 6-year-old son, who has been ill for approximately 4 weeks with measles and chicken-pox, called me, said he was cold and asked me if I would get in touch with John L. Lewis and see if something could not be done about heat for our apartment.

With the race our country is having with Russia for atomic-energy control, and the inability to get Communists off our Federal pay roll, with many other equally serious problems facing us, we still have to consider, on George Washington's Birthday and at the expense of pressing problems, legislation, which, if passed, will mean complete regimentation of business and the creation of more bureaucracy and add tremendously to the taxes now being paid by businessmen—both large and small.

Contrary to what the advocates of FEPC would have the people believe, this is not a matter which concerns only the Southern States, even though it is true that Representatives of the South have previously prevented this measure being enacted into law. It is true that the South was first to realize that something much more fundamental was involved than we were led to believe in the move to establish a permanent FEPC. Perhaps this is why this whole matter has come to be regarded by many people as a southern problem, inasmuch as the race question is involved and since a large percentage of the population of the South is Negro. Even the civil-rights program, which seeks to destroy the South's way of handling the race question, and which has been tested and proven to be the best method for both races, is not all there is to this measure, which its proponents are so frantically trying to force on the people.

This proposed FEPC legislation has correctly been called a violation of the traditional American system of free enterprise. In taking away from the employer the right which, under the Constitution, he has always enjoyed in selecting employees according to his own be-

lief in their qualifications, loyalty, and so forth, this legislation, if enacted, would invade deeper into the rights of the individual by dictating to the employee for whom he must work. I would like to quote from Donald R. Richberg, writing for the Washington Star, January 4, 1948, when he said:

Unless government is to destroy an economic system of competitive freedom and social system of free association, it cannot undertake to level down the inequalities that result from differing abilities and opportunities, or to interfere with the voluntary selection of one's associates in work or play.

Mr. Richberg goes further in his statement by saying:

No one would dare to propose that an employer be given the right by law to compel a man to work for him That would be "involuntary servitude"—slavery. Yet it is solemnly proposed that an employer shall be forbidden the right to refuse to employ a "qualified" man because of his race, color, or religion. This means, in practical effect, that if a Government regulator says that a man is "qualified" and rules that he has been denied employment because of race, color, or religion, then he must be employed It seems to be forgotten that an employer works for his employees just as they do for him. He is obligated by law to do a great many things for his employee. So the proposed law would force an employer into involuntary servitude to men who are under no obligation to work for him.

Taken in its broader sense, an employer must either comply with the regulations of the Fair Employment Practice Commission or be punished by fine or imprisonment without being able to claim the right of trial by jury. Think for a moment of our Atomic Energy Commission in the event of the passage of this legislation, the provisions of which make it unlawful to discriminate in Federal positions against any applicant for a job because of his natural origin or ancestry. This serious threat to AEC security alone is enough to show the danger of such legislation. As a matter of fact, it would be unlawful, under this proposed legislation, for the Atomic Energy Commission to ask any questions of the applicants as to his place of birth, citizenship, race or any question of that nature, which we have always regarded as necessary from the standpoint of national security.

To point out the effect this legislation would have on business in general, I ask you to imagine if you can an agent or agents whose job it is to travel over the country, interrupting the business day by questioning the employees with view to making charges against the employer because of his failure to employ, or failure to fire, someone because of his race, religious beliefs or national origin. As an example of what could happen if FEPC legislation is passed, I quote from a communication received from Mr. T. J. Priestley, Jr., of Philadelphia, Pa. In a pamphlet entitled "FEPC, the American Gestapo at Work," Mr. Priestley relates his experience with inspectors for the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor during the war when his firm was engaged with the war effort. His statement follows:

During September 1943, there came to the office of the Priestley Printers, singly and in pairs, eight or nine able-bodied draft-deferred men, who demanded to see the payroll books of both the Priestley Printers and the Priestley Engineering Co. At different times they spent hours taking the names and addresses of employees. They pressed our typists into their service. They mailed questionnaires to the employees which encouraged them to oppose their employer, and when the workers failed to return them, others followed, so that no less than three questionnaires were received. * * * They annoyed the employees at their homes and called them on the telephone as late as 11:15 p. m., after they had retired They worried the employees and interfered with our production. They entered, without permission, into our engineering department through a door having a sign "No admission" and endeavored to have a machinist break his contract with the Priestley Engineering Co. They demanded and took from our unsuspecting clerk samples of printed matter containing the names and addresses of our customers, to whom they addressed letters having the effect of belittling the prestige of the Priestley Printers.

Let it be borne in mind that, even though it appears that pressure for this legislation is aimed at the South as a punishment measure, such a law would mean that employers everywhere, regardless of the section of the country, would be drawn into line according to the dictation of Government regulators. I should like to call to your attention parts of a report of a vacation journey by youthful editors below Mason and Dixon's line which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, August 6, 1949. In discussing the racial relationship in the South, these editors had this to say:

The racial relationship in the South is different from what we were led to expect. We thought we might find some kind of racial persecution and real misery among the Negroes. We can truthfully say that the Negroes we have seen and spoken to seemed, almost without exception, happy and on the whole the relationship between black and white in the South was more friendly, more cooperative, more understanding, and more constructive than many relationships between, say, white management and white labor in the North. * * * As one colored university professor said to us: "We are in a healthy and constructive process of evolution." * * * And strangely enough, while the Negroes themselves are anxious to have full economic and educational equality (but much less anxious than some of their white northern friends) they would certainly not welcome the abolition of racial segregation. This fact constituted, perhaps, our greatest surprise. Over and over again, Negroes said to us that they are proud of their race, that they would like to keep their race apart, and that while there should be other equality, while there should be the friendliest cooperation, they themselves would like to see the continuation of segregation.

Such findings must come as a great blow to the advocates of FEPC legislation who hope that by its passage to bring about social intermingling among the races.

From time to time, in this and past discussions of this proposed legislation, it has been pointed out that this measure is definitely un-American. Is it impossible to believe that either party would sponsor such a measure as this, under the terms of which every businessman in the United States would be told from Washington who to employ and who to fire, if it were not for their desire to obtain the votes of the radical groups who sponsor such measures, including the Communist? As you know, it is true that the Communist Party is and has always been active in support of FEPC legislation. We might well ask ourselves just why the Communist have such interest if indeed this legislation is not Communist-inspired.

May I bring to mind the reported words of the President himself, spoken in connection with criticism of one of his aides, when he said: "No ——— can tell me who to hire or who to fire." This, coming from the President of the United States, is one of the strongest statements one could imagine against this so-called fair employment practices legislation. Why, Mr. Chairman, would you want to force upon the people of this country a policy which you personally refuse to follow?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill.

It is a sad commentary that this undemocratic, unconstitutional, unfair, and communistic-supported legislation is being considered on the birthday of the beloved Father of our Country, George Washington. It is highly unfortunate and regrettable that the House sees fit to celebrate the birthday of the immortal George Washington with the consideration of such ill-timed legislation. Article 123 of the constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is the authority and forerunner for this type of vicious legislation.

I charge that the proponents of this measure are not interested in the welfare, well-being, and success of the minority races in the Southern States, but that they are directing this legislation at the South for political purposes. They are simply using the Negro in the South as a political football. The white southerner is the best friend the Negro race ever had. The great majority of the people of the United States are not supporting this legislation and the little popular support it has today comes mainly from pressure groups, radical organizations, Communist-front groups, and representatives of minority racial organizations.

The fair employment practice bill, H. R. 4453, is revolutionary, dangerous, and drastic legislation, which should not be enacted by Congress. In my opinion its enforcement would absolutely destroy free enterprise and private industry, as it would create intolerable conditions in the management of any business. It would mean bureaucratic control and regimentation of all private industry. It would be a serious blow to our present form of government and would finally result in a totalitarian form of government. It is the most far-reaching effort ever attempted to control and direct business. Not only would it subject private industry to dictatorship by our Government, but it would also strike a real blow to the freedom and control of labor unions by their members.

The bill would take away from private business its right and privilege of hiring and firing its employees. It would encroach upon the prerogatives of management to pass upon the qualifications of persons seeking employment and would deprive it of the right of selecting its own employees. The measure would control the selection or fitness of applicants for membership in our union labor organizations and would pass upon their right to discharge members from their unions.

This contemptible legislation is sponsored and supported by all radicals, left-wingers, Communists, and those opposed to our present form of government and to private enterprise.

It would set up a colossal bureaucracy with vast and dangerous powers of control and regimentation. It would deprive the employer of using his own good judgment of choosing qualified, capable employees and labor unions in selecting their own members.

NEW ERA OF RACKETEERING

Any dissatisfied applicant for a job could file a complaint with the FEPC, could force the employer to leave his business and submit to a kangaroo hearing as to why the disappointed job seeker was not hired. Any disgruntled person who has been discharged could likewise file a complaint with the FEPC and force the employer to submit to a hearing as to why he was fired.

The passage of the bill would set up a new era of blackmailing and racketeering. It would result in thousands of complaints and hearings by the FEPC due to shysters and agitators who would claim that they were either refused employment or were discharged in violation of the act. They will file ungrounded complaints with the hope that the employer will pay off to them rather than to go to the trouble and expense of a FEPC hearing.

This legislation would be a crushing blow to private enterprise, individual initiative, and to the freedom of labor unions in choosing their own membership. It is inimical to the best interests of our country.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] 3 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, regardless of what has been said here about this legislation being directed toward the Negro, there is the argument that it does not involve the Negro solely. There has been discrimination in this country amongst many groups. Anyone who has ever lived or traveled in an industrial area of this country certainly has observed that. We all realize today that something should be done about it. Many minority groups are still suffering from discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, there is another aspect that has been touched upon by a previous speaker. That is, in connection with our foreign relations we belong to many of the international organizations and we must associate with all of those nations, 60 or 61 of them, with people of different color, of different religions, and of various races in the world. We have voiced our admiration and our adherence to nondiscrimination against minority groups, then we proceed to violate those principles, and we are, therefore, thought by people over the world as being hypocrites. It is injuring our relationship with foreign nations, to say the least. It has been and is embarrassing to any United States citizen who is assigned to a principal position on one of our international organizations to sit with those people and pose as being something that we are not. Certainly we can enhance our prestige and our influence the world over with those people if we will do what we say we will do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the minute that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] yielded back to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] for debate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have been in session for a long time. It is now almost 7 o'clock, and it is obvious this bill cannot be seriously considered and concluded during this session of the House. I think most of the Members are very tired. It is about time we were getting away from here. I think a good many of them are ready to get away.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he realizes I am feeling very wide awake and I have no desire to leave until we complete the business of the day.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman is a good deal younger than some of us and I congratulate him. I admire him, I like to see him up here jumping around and going on. But I think it is about time we quit. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yielded 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia only for debate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition on my own to offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yielded to the gentleman from Virginia for a particular purpose. The motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia is not in order at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I now move, on my own time, that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has no time. The gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Pennsylvania have control of the time.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SIMS] for debate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, having some time of my own, I now move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina was yielded 4 minutes time for debate. He in turn yielded to the gentleman from Virginia but he cannot yield to the gentleman from Virginia for the purpose of offering that motion.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair be sustained?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, is that appeal debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the 5-minute rule; yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized. The Chair will say that the discussion is now on the appeal.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that I ever knew Members of the House to have to edge in in this way to be recognized for a motion for the Committee to rise.

In my opinion that motion is privileged, and any Member has a right to make it at any time.

I do not propose to discuss this monstrosity at the present time. I will do that under the 5-minute rule. But I secured this time to support the appeal of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

In the first place, we are going to be here all night, if this goes on.

I am sure that Joe Stalin heard that applause, because you are driving through here a piece of communistic legislation that Stalin promulgated in 1920, and you could not pass it in a single county in the United States by a popular vote, as was shown in California. You are trying to ram this thing through here by intimidation, in order to bring about a condition that the American people do not want. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has made the motion that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Mississippi must direct his remarks to the question of the appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to comply with the request of the leader of this FEPC program the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], and

I want to confine myself within the rules of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from Mississippi is one of the most astute parliamentarians of the House, and he has had long experience here. Now, we frequently have bills come up here by rule on which there is general debate lasting for 2 and 3 days, on which time is allowed for those pro and con. The gentleman understands from the ruling of the Chair that we might now be placed in a position where we could never rise.

Mr. RANKIN. If the ruling of the Chair is correct, we could be held here for 3 days and nights.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Is it not the custom and the usual practice in this House, whenever they are ready to rise, that somebody does make a motion right in the middle of debate?

Mr. RANKIN. Absolutely, and that motion is privileged. That is what I am trying to tell the House I do not want to irritate the leader of this movement, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], and that was not my intention at all.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. He is not only the leader, but he is the father of this monstrosity

Mr. RANKIN. I mean the father of this program.

Mr. RIVERS. "Monstrosity" is the word.

Mr. RANKIN Father of this monstrosity. I have been in this body for some time I have had as many parliamentary battles as any other man in this generation, and I am here to tell you that the gentleman from Virginia is correct. Unless this motion is privileged, we might go on here from day to day for the next week or 10 days, or the next month, and nobody would be permitted to make a motion that the Committee rise.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sure the gentleman did not mean by his reference to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to attribute legitimacy to this offspring, did he?

Mr. RANKIN. No, no. The gentleman misunderstands me.

Mr. RIVERS. He is the foster father. Stalin is the father.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from South Carolina suggests he is the foster father.

But I want to talk about the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. Any Member has the right to move that the Committee rise, and it is privileged, and if it were not privileged, why, we could be compelled to sit here from day to day. We all know we will be here until daylight, at least, unless this motion is carried.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. If that were not true, then whether we would ever adjourn or whether the Committee ever rises would depend upon the one who has charge of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. We might just sit here from day to day. So I am supporting the appeal made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], in the hope that the House votes on it and lets us go home and get a good night's sleep, and try to forget this crazy measure.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to th ~ motion

May I just briefly state the situation, that if we do not support the Chair we will go back into the House, and when we go back into the House we will go through the same filibustering tactics, a motion to adjourn, which we will defeat, because we have the votes, and quorum calls, and then we will go back into the Committee of the Whole again. In other words, this motion is not offered sincerely because if it were offered sincerely it would mean that we were trying to expedite this matter. But this will prolong the situation for at least another hour and a half. We are going to finish debate according to the clock in 2 hours, not by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] or myself, who control only the division of the 2 hours. If this ruling is not sustained, we are merely going to prolong staying here and again go through the whole filibustering tactics which we have just defeated.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I ask what the parliamentary situation is?

Mr. POWELL. I do not yield for a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate is on an appeal from a decision made by the Chair.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. We are under the 5-minute rule. No Member, no matter what his position is on the committee, has the right to yield of his time to anybody else. He may yield for an interruption, but he cannot yield time.

Mr. POWELL. I am yielding for an interruption.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has control of the time.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I am not making an interruption.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am not going to take much time to debate the point raised by the gentleman from Virginia nor to enter into a discussion of the bastardy proceedings in which the gentleman from Mississippi has engaged. The question is very simple. We are proceeding under the rules of Calendar Wednesday. Time is fixed for 2 hours of general debate. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] yielded to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SIMS]. When the gentleman from South Carolina yielded to the gentleman from Virginia, he could not yield for the purpose of making that motion. Therefore, the ruling of the Chair is entirely in accordance with the rules and should be sustained, notwithstanding the objections of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the oration of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair be the judgment of the Committee?

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 123, noes, 77.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. POWELL and Mr. SMITH of Virginia.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 148, noes 83.

So the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SIMS] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this legislation; I am opposed to any legislation of this type, because I do not believe that civil rights is an end in itself. I do not believe there is anything sacred about civil rights legislation; I think that whether civil rights legislation is right or wrong depends entirely on whether it accomplishes its ultimate end of attaining and preserving human rights. As I understand the enactment of civil rights is merely putting human rights into law; consequently, if by passing the law you do not attain and preserve human rights then I feel that civil rights legislation is wrong.

I feel the same way about States' rights legislation. Here again we have a means toward accomplishing an end. States' rights legislation is certainly not right if it does not attain that ultimate goal of reaching and preserving human rights.

It is my belief, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation will succeed only in setting up in the South irritants, will succeed in encouraging the Ku Klux Klan, will succeed in destroying liberalism in that section of the country which needs liberalism most. It certainly is not conducive to harmonious race relations.

Every liberal here today should vote against this FEPC measure. Liberals should not be tied to an FEPC slogan. They should look behind the slogan and see if the bill really accomplishes its objective.

I have been very much impressed by some of the arguments which many of the proponents of this legislation have urged before the subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, one of the greatest liberal leaders in the Senate for whom I have the highest respect, points

out that "job discrimination against Negroes is directly weakening national unity and is giving other Communist opponents of our democracy a propaganda weapon"—1949 hearings, page 231. I certainly agree with Senator DOUGLAS that job discrimination against Negroes, as well as the race problem in general, is a Federal as well as a State problem and that Federal action as well as State action is necessary if we are to be successful in our efforts to solve the problem of two races living together harmoniously with human rights for all people.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, considered by many to be the civil-rights leader of the Senate, in his testimony before the FEPC subcommittee last year, based his arguments for FEPC on the principle of government that the fundamental task of the Government is "to provide them with at least one thing—opportunity"—page 99. I agree with Senator HUMPHREY in his statement that the fundamental task of the Government is to provide the people with at least one thing—opportunity.

The distinguished gentlewoman from California, the Honorable HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, who is recognized as one of the most outstanding liberal leaders in this body, testified before the FEPC subcommittee and stated that—

> We are told that racial and religious prejudice can be elimnated only by education and that legislation in this delicate field will promote strife and conflict.

She continues by saying:

> The opposition ignores a fundamental distinction between prejudice and discrimination. Prejudice is a state of mind, and discrimination is an overt act * * * Our system can indulge a man's individual prejudices. * * * When prejudice is translated into active discrimination, * * * it is the proper function of government to prevent such practices.

I agree with the distinguished gentlewoman that it is the proper function of government to prevent the overt act of discrimination if the Government can accomplish this good without accomplishing even more evil But I wonder if the distinguished gentlewoman would not agree with me that it is also the proper function of government to attempt to eliminate the causes of prejudice and that through eliminating the causes of prejudice we may be able to eliminate more of the overt acts of discrimination than we can through legislation outlawing discrimination. In other words, I am not one of those that holds that racial and religious prejudice can be eliminated only by education. I believe, as does the distinguished gentlewoman, that we need education and legislation. But perhaps I differ with the distinguished gentlewoman in believing that the legislation should be designed to eliminate the causes of prejudice rather than to outlaw the overt act of discrimination.

Senator IRVING M. IVES, known as the father of FEPC in that he was the driving force behind the enactment of the first State FEPC law in New York in 1945, makes several statements before the FEPC committee which I think should be included in the record here, and which I personally agree with. First he states that—

> If you have to enforce this kind of undertaking by punitive measure, by legal compulsion, it is going to fail. Unless you can convince the rank and file of people that it is inherently right * * * and get them to cooperate in backing it up, your undertaking cannot succeed.

Senator IVES states further:

> And the success or failure of it—

Meaning FEPC—

> rests not primarily on the terms of the statute or the substance of the statute, but primarily on the type of administrator you get.

Now before going into the needs that exist in America which the proponents of this legislation are trying to meet and before going into what FEPC would actually do in attempting to meet this need, I would like to make several observations.

Fair employment practice legislation is new. As a matter of fact, the first acts of this specific character were adopted in the legislative session of 1945. It is common knowledge that it oftentimes takes a period of a generation of experience for an observer to make a fair appraisal of the effectiveness of this new law. As a matter of fact, we have operated in a tight labor market during the entire time the FEPC legislation has been law. The tendency to discriminate is obviously rather slight during a period of full employment as compared with the temptation to discriminate during a depression. I want to make the point that if it were conclusively proven—and it has not been—that State FEPC laws have worked successfully, that this is no indication that they will continue to work successfully during a period of widespread unemployment.

Another observation which I would like to make is this: In those Southern States where the minority group represents a very large proportion of the population, you have an entirely different problem than you have in a State where the minority represents a very small proportion of the population. It is entirely possible that the type legislation necessary in Minnesota, for example, where they have, according to the 1940 census, less than 10,000 Negroes, is not the type legislation that would be needed in Mississippi, where there are more than 1,000,000 Negroes. And it consequently follows that, even if FEPC legislation is proven to be desirable in the States in which it has been tried, it has not been tried in any State in which a single minority group represents a large percentage of the total population of that State.

In considering any legislation designed to help the members of a minority race it is necessary to consider the whole problem of two races living together harmoniously with human rights for all. This issue is of particular importance and significance to those of us who live in a section of the United States which is faced with this very real problem every day in the year. All through FEPC hearings we find the statement over and over again by the proponents of FEPC legislation that this measure is not pointed at the South. Almost without exception the proponents of FEPC have stated this measure is not pointed at the South. But I say to you that any legislation which is designed to help the members of a minority race should be pointed at the South because that is where the largest numbers of the members of minority races are located. In other words, any bill that is drawn up to help members of the minority race should certainly be drawn up so that it will work in the South because here is where the greatest opportunity for doing good exists In any bill to help members of a minority race, the situation in Mississippi should be given more consideration than the situation in Minnesota because a law which would help members of a minority race would help over a million Negroes in Mississippi, while there are only about 10,000 that could be benefited in Minnesota.

I am not a traveling man. I am not familiar with the problem of discrimination as it affects most of the minority groups. I am fairly familiar with the problem of the Negro and the white man living together in the South, particularly in South Carolina. In five of the eight counties which I represent there are more Negroes than whites. I am very anxious to pass legislation that will help the Negroes in South Carolina and over the Nation but I am convinced that the proponents of FEPC fail to see clearly the real need that exists.

FEPC legislation, even if it were enforceable and we all know it is not going to work in the South but even if it did work all over the United States it would help a very few members of the Negro race. If we pass FEPC and if FEPC works, we as a government would still fail miserably in our effort to provide opportunity for all. Opportunity does not begin when a man becomes 21 years of age and is ready to go to work. There are millions and millions of members of the Negro race who have never been given an opportunity to receive an education. There are millions and millions of Negroes who have not been given the opportunity to receive adequate medical care. In other words, there are millions and millions of Negroes who have not been given an opportunity to develop their personalities and capabilities. What good does it do a man to say that you shall be given a job in line with your abilities, if he has not been given the opportunity to develop those abilities. FEPC is a farce as far as giving a man equal opportunity is concerned.

If the proponents of FEPC really want to give the Negroes in America equal opportunity, if the proponents of FEPC accept the minority problem as a national problem and I agree with you, it is a national problem, then the proponents of this legislation should step boldly forward with a program for providing basic needs to this minority group—basic needs so that they can properly develop their personalities.

The argument is used by proponents of FEPC that we cannot sell democracy and the idea of equal opportunity to the world

if we do not practice it at home—that we must close the gap between principles and practices. I agree with them completely that solving the race problem and providing equal opportunity is a national problem. Let us face it realistically.

Let us not make the same mistake that we made in America back in the nineteenth century when slavery was abolished. The problem then was exactly the same problem as it is today; that is, two races living together harmoniously with human rights for all. What was the situation then? We had many people from outside of the South shouting, "Pass a law that makes all people equal and then we will have political freedom and human rights." And on the other hand, within the South you had an equally loud group that were so busy shouting "States rights" that they did not have time to try and solve the race problems that did exist in the South. Neither group recognized the problem of the South for what it was, an economic problem.

Perhaps the War Between the States could have been avoided, if, instead of abolishing slavery, the slaves had been bought by the Government, and freed, and had been given education, and training, and land, and an opportunity to be economically independent individually. But Congress then did not recognize the problem as an economic one. They thought that by passing laws they would secure political freedom and human rights for the Negro. Let us not make that same mistake again.

Fair-employment practice legislation will not give to the Negro an opportunity to become economically independent. Let us give the Negro the opportunity to develop his personality and his capabilities. After all, the Christian religion uses as a standard the development of the personality, to determine right from wrong. The Christian religion is not nearly as concerned with the rewards that one receives on this earth, even if that reward be fair employment, as they are with the opportunity to develop one's personality.

Education is certainly one way toward solving this problem. But education is not enough. Education should be coupled with legislation and that legislation should be designed toward providing those basic needs for all people. Actually, legislation designed toward lifting up those people on the bottom rungs of the economic ladder will, in the long run, eliminate most of the causes for prejudice and will provide opportunities for millions and millions of Negroes who are not given an opportunity to develop their abilities.

However, if the proponents of FEPC legislation feel that we cannot wait on legislation designed to lift up all people who are on the bottom rungs of the economic ladder because of our position as the leading advocate of democracy in the world, I suggest that we pass legislation designed specifically to provide these opportunities to the Negro minorities.

I suggest, first, that we make a huge Federal appropriation to the States on the basis of their Negro population for the purpose of providing adequate educational, health, housing, and recreational facilities for the Negro. I suggest, secondly, that we establish a minority employment agency for the purpose of finding jobs for Negroes all over the United States. In other words, it would encourage voluntary migration of Negroes from the South to those parts of the United States where better employment opportunities exist. And, thirdly, that a national education program should be conducted with the objective of eliminating discrimination by education and publicity.

My suggestion of legislation to eliminate the causes of prejudice would help the common man within the Negro race. It is not designed like FEPC to help only a small percentage of the Negroes, perhaps 3 to 5 percent who could be classified as the elite members of that race.

My objection to FEPC is, first, that the Commission will, in my opinion, use its authority in an effort to end segregation in the South. Secondly, FEPC legislation, or the consideration of FEPC legislation, stirs bitterness and hatred among the races in the South. It does not work toward harmonious race relations and the rank and file of the people will not accept it—consequently, it will be unenforceable.

If this FEPC law were passed it is reasonable to assume that the President of the United States in appointing members for the Commission would appoint people genuinely interested in the success of the legislation. I think that it is also reasonable to assume that all of the members of the commission would feel that segregation is discrimination in itself and that, consequently, they would have no sympathy at all with the people in Southern States who are opposed to ending segregation. I think it is entirely reasonable to assume that these people would agree with the report of President Truman's civil-rights committee that the Nation should force the South to end segregation and that they would use what authority they have toward furthering this aim. I think that the activity of the wartime FEPC justifies these expectations.

President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights recommended that the Nation force the South to end segregation by withholding Federal funds. And, since the South would not end segregation, it would be bled economically—just as it has been bled by discriminatory freight rates, high protective tariffs, and so forth. This would destroy human rights by lowering per capita income, lowering ability to meet basic needs in a section of the country with an already low per capita income.

A vote for FEPC is not a liberal vote—it is a vote against human rights. I refuse to vote to throw a sop to minority agitators not genuinely interested in the Negroes in South Carolina. I shall continue to oppose vigorously this and similar legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the enactment of the legislation now before the House in Committee of the Whole, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

This act known as the Fair Employment Practice Act, H. R. 4453, has been on the calendar of the House since August 2, 1949, when it was favorably reported with amendments by the Committee on Education and Labor.

Bills to establish a Federal Fair Employment Practice Commission have been before the House continually since 1944. These bills have been considered by committees of the House on three separate occasions, resulting each time in a favorable report and recommendation that the legislation be passed.

Both Republican and Democratic Party platforms have pledged enactment of such legislation. Major religious, labor, civic, veterans, and racial organizations have declared FEPC to be the most fundamental of all pending civil rights bills.

The bill comes before the House today only after every parliamentary tactic at the disposal of the opposition has been utilized. At times the efforts made by opponents to prevent this bill from being considered by the membership of the House have been a travesty on parliamentary law and procedure. This is especially true when it is considered that parliamentary law is designed to enable the majority to work its will. However, with reference to this bill the rules were used to prevent rather than facilitate action. It is gratifying, however, that at last the persistency of the Members in favor of the legislation has won and the bill comes before the House for action, and, what will in my opinion be favorable consideration.

The bill is designed to protect those rights of freedom and equality of opportunity which are guaranteed to every person by the basic principles upon which our Nation is built; to help make it possible for all our people to enjoy a decent standard of living, to remove from our social fabric a practice which weakens its foundations; to promote a better mutual understand and good will among our people, drawn as they are from many races and embracing as they do many creeds; to help assure that domestic tranquillity and industrial peace which is so necessary to the realization of our tremendous productive potential as a Nation; to elevate the level or our moral, social, economic, and political life; to preserve and enhance the dignity of the individual which chiefly distinguishes this Nation from the totalitarian nations of the world.

Because we all subscribe to these objectives, it should be possible to approach this problem without political partisanship. The enactment of Federal fair-employment practice legislation, as I have said, has been pledged in the platforms of both major parties. The presidential standard bearers of both parties have advocated the establishment of a Fair Employment Practice Commission. Members of both parties have introduced bills to accomplish this purpose in the

Senate and the House of Representatives.

It is my hope that this unanimity of purpose will make possible a bipartisan approach to the problem that will result in the speedy enactment of this bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, no people have ever had greater rights and liberties than our people reserved to themselves in the Constitution. Specious argument may try to show that Negroes and others are entitled to special consideration. But the instigators of the agitation intend, not to add to the rights of the American people, but to stir up friction, envy, hatred, and discontent. This is a cardinal aim of Communist strategy. It is designed to give small minorities special privileges at the expense of the majority. When these special privileges are granted—or usurped—the majority lose important rights, and most if not all of their freedom.

Those familiar with communism know it is based upon the theory of class struggle. The interests of the working class are supposed to be different from the interests of every one else. Therefore, they contend there is irrepressible enmity between the working class and every one else. Communism is dedicated to the ruthless suppression of individual rights, as well as destruction of any political or social system which respects them. But to weaken the unity of a free people, to destroy faith in the integrity of free institutions, Communists have found that agitation for civil rights can pay big dividends. It is perfectly adapted to stirring up conflict, setting race against race, employee against employer, one religious group against another. So Communists and fellow travelers, with pretended pious concern for civil rights undermine the only free society on earth in which civil rights are really respected.

FEPC legislation destroys the free market for goods and services upon which our economic system and our political liberty both depend. In a free market for services, both employer and employee are free to bargain and need not agree unless mutually satisfied. An FEPC law, by bringing the State as a third party into the market—a party who can say, "You must employ this man"—destroys the free market. Thus, a worker, instead of remaining as one of two free bargainers, becomes a slave in a market controlled by the State. Nothing more destructive of the rights of labor could be devised.

FEPC legislation assumes that any applicant for a job has acquired, by the sole act of applying, a vested interest in that particular job—an interest enforceable at law. A man may say, "You refused to hire me because I am colored," or "because I am a Jew," and if he can get a commission or court to believe him, then the State may order the applicant employed with full pay from the date of his first application.

The State thus becomes the final arbiter in all hiring. If the people once concede this right, then both employer and employee are bound by its inexorable consequences.

One of the basic human rights God has given man is the right to make his own estimates of others, to like them or to dislike them, to trust them or to distrust them, to associate with them or to avoid them, for any reason or for no reason. The moment that right is taken away, freedom becomes a mockery. And the civil-rights agitation is designed to destroy that element of freedom.

To attempt force is to threaten national unity and to invite disruption. To attempt it now, with communism overhanging the world, is to play straight into the hands of Moscow. I warn you that the people are tired—very tired—of unnecessary regulations and Government meddling. We are now overregulated by Government bureaus, commissions, and Federal snoopers. The old mantel clock no longer beats a soothing, restful "tick-tock, tick-tock," but a rapid "regulate, regulate, regulate, regulate." I repeat, our people have grown very tired of an overdose of Government regulations.

If private enterprise, or even governmental agencies, can be forced to employ a certain percentage of Negroes, or a certain percentage of any minority group, irrespective of seniority rights or qualifications, then in the not too distant future will we not be confronted with forced proportionate employment of minorities within a minority group, such as so many blacks, browns, tans, yellows, or so many halfbloods or even quarterbloods? If this is lawful, then those of the various religious faiths could demand equitable distribution of employment among their respective sects and there would follow the forced hire, in every business, shop, and office of a certain percentage of Protestants, Catholics, Hebrews, Mormons, Mohammedans, Buddhists, atheists, sun worshipers, moon gazers, and so on and on and on. Why even Communist Russia and Hitlerite Germany would bow in shame at such dictatorial orders.

Mr. Chairman, do you know that the FEPC would abolish trial by jury insofar as the FEPC is concerned? Do you know that FEPC legislation would destroy the GI bill of rights insofar as it gives preference to veterans? Do you know that a man who worked all his life to establish a business, using his money and toil in doing so would not be allowed to surround himself with employees of his own choice if the FEPC became a law?

Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking as a Democrat, I am not speak as a southerner, but I am speaking as an American. I am deeply concerned over the effect that this legislation would have upon every element of American society, on those true Americans who love local self-government. The FEPC proposal is class legislation. It is contrary to the fundamental principles of democracy which believes in equal rights for all and special privileges for none. The FEPC is nothing more than an arterial highway to regimentation and serfdom. Consult the American businessman, the American farmer, the American banker, the American merchant and see if they will submit to such regimentation and dictatorial powers as are proposed in this vicious FEPC legislation. It is time the American people knew just what this evil bill proposes to do. This bill would hound, badger, restrict, and discourage private enterprise; destroy local self-government; and, in my judgment, do more to Hitlerize and communize America than any legislation ever submitted to Congress. It is a wolf in sheep's clothing. The name of the commission is deceptive and the title misleading.

At this very hour the Nation is troubled with grave foreign problems, the spread of communism, an ever mounting national debt, high taxes, deficit spending, farm failures, mounting unemployment and scores of other problems of serious consequence and extreme emergency. It is rather ironical that the FEPC legislation should be treated with equal importance at this hour.

Mr. Chairman, I am truly concerned over the effect this proposed legislation would have upon our Nation—the greatest, richest country in the world—a nation to which thousands upon thousands of discouraged, despondent, hungry aliens migrate every year looking for a share of the riches and blessings and happiness which this great America holds for its peoples. I know of no proposal or program which would do greater harm to the freedoms now enjoyed by the American people—and which freedoms those from other countries come here to find—than the FEPC as proposed in this legislation.

The bill is not fair. On the contrary it is unfair. It will not create a single new job for a minority worker. On the contrary it will more than likely decrease his opportunty for employment. In the interest of the general public, including minority groups, the bill ought to be defeated and I trust that the Members of the House will so vote.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, on this day when we celebrate Washington's Birthday and listen attentively to his Farewell Address, I cannot understand why we take up legislation of this kind, for it certainly is not to the best interests of our country, something which Washington enjoined us all to keep close to our hearts.

Ever since I first heard of this legislation I have investigated and studied the subject. I have reached the conclusion with a great deal of conviction that we cannot legislate morality; it is an impossible thing to do; it is not the right thing to do. It will not work. For this reason I am against this legislation and shall oppose it in every way I possibly can, because I believe that it is going to do harm to our country. You cannot force righteousness on people. You must educate them to do the right thing.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] a few minutes ago said that this was bad legislation for the South. If it is bad legislation for the South, then it is bad legislation for the North, and it is not going to help anybody.

I can best state the basis of my opposition to this legislation by reading the 15 reasons that French Jenkins, of Archbold, Ohio, gave against it. He said that the bill in its present form was objectionable for the following reasons:

WHY I OPPOSE A COMPULSORY FEPC LAW

(By French Jenkins, Archbold, Ohio)

1. It would create distinctions between citizens and set group against group, class against class, race against race, and sect against sect.

2. The sponsors deliberately ignored the fact that the elements of intolerance and prejudice are present in the minds of those who favor as well as those who object to the proposed legislation to further confuse and divide citizens.

3. It is discriminatory to the extent that constitutional rights would be denied employers in order to satisfy the demands of those who allege deprivation of rights.

4. The burden of proving that an applicant is not qualified for an available job would fall upon the employer. Charges of unfair employment practices would be easy to make but difficult to disprove.

5. An employer would be required to comply with interpretations and decisions made by partisan or prejudiced administrators.

6. The burden of expense in contesting allegations made by a claimant would fall upon the employer, whereas claimants would be dismissed without cost or prejudice.

7. An employee belonging to a self-styled minority group who is discharged for incompetence, insubordination or other just cause may accuse the employer of discrimination, thus subjecting the employer to harassment and costly litigation.

8. Such a law would not only irritate and aggravate, but also make both employers and employees acutely conscious of race, color, and religious differences.

9. It would deprive an employer of the right to select employees on the basis of experienced judgment and result in injustices, inefficiencies, and misunderstandings

10. It outlaws free speech by prohibiting an employer from making any inquiry whatsoever about the character, ability, experience, or background of an applicant for an available job and also could jeopardize the security of our country in case of war.

11. It deprives an employer of the right to select employees while giving an applicant the right to pick and demand an available job.

12. It deprives employers of rights which are preserved or retained for unions, lodges, educational institutions, churches, political parties, government agencies and departments, bureaucrats, legislators, judicial bodies as well as Federal and State executives, officials and administrators.

13. It will impose burdensome expense on employers and cost the taxpayers more than the benefits that could be gained by those for whom it is proposed.

14. It is "class" legislation in behalf of a few people who may be correctly classified as deserving special consideration.

15. It is sponsored and noisily supported by the undercover agents of a movement that is determined to bankrupt industry and government for the purpose of establishing a foreign dictatorship.

You cannot do anything better for your country than to vote against this piece of legislation. It is morally wrong, unethical, and unsound. It is like sin—I am against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act now under consideration by the House is the most important of the four civil-rights recommendations set out by President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights.

The four essential rights which this committee recommended for congressional consideration were:

First. The right to safety and security of the person.

Second. The right to citizenship and its privileges.

Third. The right to freedom of conscience and expression.

Fourth. The right to equality of opportunity.

The fourth of these fundamental rights of American citizenship is the one that we are considering today in this legislation, H. R. 4453.

Any citizen, regardless to what minority group he belongs, is entitled to equal opportunity and nondiscrimination by reason of his American citizenship.

I personally believe that intolerance and racial discrimination against others cannot be cured by legislation, but I do think the legislation which will make it illegal for a person or group of persons to maliciously discriminate and inexcusably prohibit an American citizen from enjoying equal rights under the law, will be a great step forward and eventually cause the outlawing and banishing of so-called second-class citizens.

We all know that the opposition to FEPC is well-organized, and it will require constant application and diligence on the part of all people who believe in equality of citizenship to eventually succeed in their efforts.

To my mind, intolerance and prejudice are the basic reasons for the fact that this legislation is necessary. Intolerance and prejudice have done more to retard the progress of world civilization than any other one scourge. Intolerance and prejudice are the primary causes for discrimination. Discrimination is destructive not only to those who are on the receiving end but to the perpetrators of such evil. It should be clear to every American that when we erect barriers against individuals and groups on the grounds of race or religion, we hamper and retard our own progress both from a cultural and economic standpoint.

The essence of a free democracy is based on our recognition of the dignity of the individual regardless of national origin to which the people of our Nation dedicated themselves when both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were written. It is the spiritual value and citizenship equality of democracy which distinguishes us from totalitarian nations which subordinate the rights of the individual for a statism and materialistic philosophy.

I firmly believe that the four great citizenship rights which I set out at the beginning of this speech should be required reading in every high school and college of America. These four rights set out a goal which should be the desire for every true American to have our Government accomplish. Our great American heritage is based on the importance of the individual citizen. From the earliest moment of our history, we have believed that all American citizens have an essential dignity and integrity which must be respected and safeguarded. Moreover, Americans believe that the welfare of the individual is the final goal of group life. And furthermore, to secure these rights, each man must be willing to respect the rights of other men. We again come back to the basic moral principle that all men are created equal as well as free. If we follow this principle, we have an obligation as Members of Congress to guarantee equality of opportunity to all men. Without this equality, freedom becomes an illusion

The question of civil-rights legislation, and especially FEPC legislation which we are considering today, should not be a partisan question. Both of our great political parties at their conventions in 1948 went on record endorsing civil-rights legislation, particularly FEPC legislation. The Republican Party in its platform was equally emphatic along with the Democratic Party in its declaration on this subject.

In the last paragraph of chapter 4 of the 1948 platform of the Republican Party, adopted at its Philadelphia convention, it said the following:

One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States; it was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic.

This right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic.

On January 27, 1950, I mailed a letter to Guy George Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee; a letter including the above section from the Republican national platform. On February 2, 1950, I received the following letter from Chairman Gabrielson:

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1950.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: This will acknowledge your letter of January 23 expressing your interest in the FEPC bill (H. R. 4453). I note you advise that the bill is being held up by the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives.

I appreciate your bringing this information to my attention, and I shall plan to discuss your suggestion with Congressman JOE MARTIN.

Sincerely yours,
GUY GEORGE GABRIELSON,
Chairman.

Had Chairman Gabrielson followed up on that letter, this legislation would be on the floor in the regular way and not filibustered on Calendar Wednesday.

It is indeed unfortunate that this bill did not come on the floor of the House through the regular legislative procedure by being favorably reported through

the Rules Committee. Unfortunately, through a bipartisan split, the vote to report this bill from the Rules Committee was 6 to 6. Therefore, we are confronted today with the considering of this important legislation under the handicap of the Calendar Wednesday procedure.

If the Members of both political parties will follow the dictates and recommendations of their party platform, this FEPC legislation will be passed by this body before adjournment this evening.

We realize that every legislative trick will be resorted to to defeat this bill. To my mind it is as much the duty of Republicans and Democrats who believe in their partly platform to remain constantly on the floor in order to prevent unnecessary quorum calls as it is to vote favorably on this legislation for final passage. I hope both the Republicans and Democrats cooperate on this nonpartisan and necessary piece of legislation.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, this is a weapon that is aimed directly at the heart of the institution of private property. It has as its aim the outlawing of private ownership. Mr. Chairman, I would not pay the price to go to heaven that the supporters of this monstrous fraud are paying to stay in Congress.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] just called attention to the Republican national platform. I want to say to him and to the Members on the other side that since Mr. Roosevelt was elected on a platform which promised a 25-percent reduction in national expenditures and employment and to which he did not adhere, there has never been a platform that his party has followed. Platforms, as many people know, are made to garner votes, not to guide the party after the election.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those Republicans that believes that it is a responsibility to live up to the party platform.

It is stated that one of the most effective selling points for communism is that it guarantees to every citizen in the Communist countries a first-class citizenship. It is time the United States of America made definite that we guarantee first-class unlimited citizenship to each and every citizen regardless of race, creed, or color. And I am strongly for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order for me at this time to ask that all Members be allowed to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. It is entirely in order, and without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. I will have to object for the time being, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE]

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many Members of this House know how it feels to be classified and treated as a second-class citizen. People of my faith and people of my blood have experienced that feeling and treatment for many, many years. The fact that people of my faith were among the earliest colonizers did not save them from the wrath of the bigot. The fact that Washington's army was made up of nearly 50 percent Irish was soon forgotten.

Every war and emergency throughout our history found the Irish and the Catholic rushing forward to defend the Republic. They built solid communities, erected hospitals, homes for the orphans, the blind, indigent, and infirm. They pushed the railroads across the prairies to make this a greater and stronger land. Yet all of these things were cast aside by those who lived in the blindness of intolerance.

We found it necessary to have laws passed in the early days before we could practice our religion and open our schools. We spent 10 years of fear, degradation, and shame during the know-nothing movement. During those days we saw our churches befouled, our schools and convents burned to the ground, and our fellows hanged from lampposts. In this century many of us lived in constant fear in many small communities of the depredations of the Ku Klux Klan.

The signs on places of employment, "No Irish or Catholic Need Apply," are not forgotten, although they have been forgiven. One Irishman, tired of reading signs of this nature, appended one of them with the lines:

> The man who wrote that
> Wrote it well,
> For the same is written
> On the gates of hell.

In my own lifetime I can remember the advertisements in New York newspapers in the help-wanted columns and by the resort hotels that had the inserted provision "No Irish or No Catholics." Twenty-five years ago it was necessary for the Catholic people in New York to threaten to close their accounts in certain New York banks before those institutions would employ Catholics. Even today there are communities that will not employ school teachers if they are of the Catholic faith.

Conditions such as these make it impossible for us to achieve the destiny planned by the founding fathers. The Republic cannot endure when great minorities are denied the privileges guaranteed by the Constitution. The contract of citizenship is not a unilateral one calling for sacrifices and not bestowing privileges. Our citizenship is a precious right which must not be profaned by restrictions because of race, creed, or color. The right to serve our country inherently begets the right of her blessings and gifts. The citizen who is anxious to love our land and share its responsibilities must not be denied all of its guaranties.

No Member of this body tonight can honestly say that all of the people within our borders are treated equally in the light of education, housing, and employment. Such lack of fairness is degrading to the character of every Member of this House. We profess to be Christians, but we forget the Sermon on the Mount.

If we believe in God we know that all human creatures were made in His image and likeness. Hence, we are bound to respect all of our fellow men and to treat them with the dignity that His likeness commands.

Whether we came into this world white or black, Catholic, Jew, Protestant, atheist or agnostic, we are His creatures and we are entitled to receive from each other the love He bade us give.

Tonight we have at last been given the opportunity to adjust an injustice that has endured too long. Tonight when we have the chance to make this the America it was meant to be, let us pass the bill that is before us so that all Americans regardless of faith, color, or creed may finally feel that they are first-class citizens.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman and the gentleman from California a while back were speculating as to what the vote in California meant. Whenever I hear people try to figure out what a vote like that means, I am impressed by the fact that not everyone always understands what he is voting about.

I do not suggest that all the people of California did not know what they were doing, but I do believe the vote taken there was not a good expression of the will of the people even of that State, on this subject.

I do not believe the people of this country are opposed to eliminating discrimination in employment. I prefer to take as my guide to the will of the people the expression of the platforms of the two major parties for the last several conventions. Let me read again what the 1948 Republican platform said on that subject:

> This right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic.

And more than that. Would any of us urge he had met his responsibility in respect of the issue before us, or any other issue, for that matter, merely by mechanically registering what he calculated would be the result of a vote taken in his district at any particular time. What Edmund Burke said to the electors of Bristol in 1774 applies with equal force to us today: "You are entitled not only to my industry but to my judgment as well." In my judgment, this legislation is vitally needed both to eliminate deep-seated injustice at home

and to maintain our prestige and leadership among the nations of the world.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that time is so limited that an opportunity is not afforded for a more adequate discussion of this important subject, but I want to make at least a brief statement clearly indicating my position.

I am strongly opposed to the pending bill, H. R. 4453, which is commonly referred to as the FEPC. I have always strongly opposed legislation of this type and I am still opposed to it.

It is my conviction that this legislation is unsound in principle and impracticable in application and it certainly should not be enacted into law.

To say by the strong arm of the Federal law to a free American citizen that he does not have the right to exercise his choice in the selection of his employees is a violation of some of the most cherished and time-honored principles of our system of government.

The enactment of this legislation would seriously disturb and in many instances destroy the friendly and cordial relationship existing between employers and employees.

It would likewise force many employees to work and associate with other employees who are very disagreeable to them.

In adopting this type of program the Federal Government would be extending a measure of control over our people that would be entirely untenable. To set up a Government agency as the arbiter of employment in private business would place a burden on the private enterprise system that it should not have to bear—this private enterprise system that has contributed so largely toward making this the greatest country in all the world.

It is certainly my intention to vote against this bill, and to continue to exert my best efforts to defeat all legislation of this type which strikes at the very heart of our glorious democratic way of life.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I favor passage of this bill.

This week has been designated as Brotherhood Week. Throughout our Nation meetings are taking place to review our ways of democracy and to search for the means to promote a better understanding of human behavior and man's relationship to his fellowman.

It is particularly appropriate that this bill, H. R. 4453, the FEPC bill, should come up for consideration this week, for in our deliberation we must face frankly the question whether we shall continue to condone or correct discriminatory practices by which many of our people are deprived by other people of their constitutional right to earn a living without regard to race, creed, color, or religion.

The bill has been a long time in coming up. Since we convened about 7 weeks ago, this House has been literally in a state of siege, as proponents of the bill have struggled to capture the floor for its consideration. Its opponents, successful until now, have fought just as desperately to prevent it. It appears that the siege is now over.

Few measures have provoked such fervid emotionalism. During the past few weeks those of us who favored the bill's passage have been accused of forsaking principle and resorting to cheap political chicanery to attract votes from minority groups. A deliberate attempt has been made to damn the bill as communistic and its adherents an anti-American in the hope of thus deflecting support from the bill.

It seems incredible that these arguments should be advanced seriously. Those who accuse us of trafficking in votes cannot deny that they are the politicians in this matter, playing upon the strings of human prejudice in order to charm the votes of those whom they want to reelect them. Proudly and piously they clothe themselves in principle knowing full well that the principle they uphold is archaic, the relic of a decadent system which cannot be sustained in reason; that their principle is in conflict with the wishes of the great majority of the people in this country.

Their argument that only Communists are interested in protecting the civil rights of minorities is not only false, but grossly so. What a monstrous condemnation they impose upon the American people in their assumption that Americans are not genuinely devoted to our democratic ideals, and that the task of protecting and preserving our constitutional rights rests exclusively with a non-American, subversive element. The contrary is so true that their challenge scarcely needs denial. The American people as a whole will fight for the justice and the liberty proclaimed by our Constitution in order that its blessings may be assured to each of our citizens.

This argument is but another example of the effort of those who oppose necessary legislation to kill it by deliberately denouncing it as communistic, seeking to conjure up in our minds the horrors which the term "communistic" brings. Deception frequently walks in splendid raiment, and more and more we find patriotism being used to cloak private purpose. This approach is as insidious as that employed by the Communists themselves, in posing as liberals in order to exploit our weaknesses, to create doubts and suspicions, to develop dissension in our ranks.

As long as opponents of this bill insist upon preventing social reform, they will drive oppressed minority groups into the Communist orbit, for as the prejudices and hates which this bill seeks to curb are permitted to go unchecked, communistic propaganda designed to inflame those injured by such evil forces must of necessity find sympathetic appeal. No American enjoys relegation as an inferior to second-class citizenship.

From time to time much has been said on this floor of the enemies within our gates. No greater enemy lies within our gates, seeking to destroy our democracy than race hatred, prejudice, intolerance, and discrimination. How long can we expect swelling resentment against such forces to remain bottled up within those subjected to their influences before some explosion takes place? It cannot be denied that hate engenders hate.

A short time ago Jackie Robinson, the first Negro to be permitted to play in the major baseball leagues, was requested to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in connection with the question of loyalty to the United States of large numbers of the Negro race. His testimony had real significance and substantiated completely the writing of one psychiatrist that—

> Even though their personalities seem well accommodated to the caste system, it should not be thought that the Negroes are too stupid to realize the nature of the situation. They understand it quite well, in fact much better than do members of the white caste who naturally wish to disguise and extenuate it out of loyalty to our democratic theory which does not countenance caste and class lines.

Listen to what Jackie Robinson said:

> Just because Communists kick up a big fuss over racial discrimination when it suits their purpose, a lot of people try to pretend that the whole issue is a creation of Communist imagination. But they are not fooling anyone with this kind of pretense, and talk about Communists stirring up Negroes to protest, only makes present misunderstanding worse than ever. Negroes were stirred up long before there was a Communist Party, and they'll stay stirred up long after the party has disappeared—unless Jim Crow has disappeared by then as well.

Let no one delude himself into believing that Negroes are not thinking these things through.

Those who oppose passage of this bill have advanced many arguments. They speak of States' rights—that this is interference by the Federal Government with the right of each State to determine the rights of its citizens and of administering its police powers, and they charge that this bill is unconstitutional.

Perhaps the best answer to this charge has been given by a group of southerners themselves in the statement issued by the executive committee of the Southern Regional Council on September 15, 1948, entitled "An Honest Answer in the Civil-Rights Controversy":

> "States' rights" has been a much abused term, and here again probably the courts must be the final authority. But one thing is clear States' rights must not be used to defend indefensible violations of human rights, as has sometimes happened in the past. States' rights mean nothing without States' responsibilities, and it is on this score that the rest of the Nation is unconvinced. Every honest Southerner must admit that the Southern States have often been less than scrupulous in meeting their responsibilities to all citizens—and some of the States where the cry of States' rights has been the loudest have been the most at fault. Unfortunately, in the present controversy there has been almost no official public statement of the determination of Southern States to meet their responsibilities squarely.
>
> There would no doubt be disagreement as to just what "States' responsibilities" include. Without attempting the heroic task of defining the term completely, we might consider one of its more obvious aspects. The State government, like any government, is designed to be the servant of the people. Through it, the people can justifiably expect certain of their rights to be protected and

certain public services and facilities to be provided. The duty of the State is to serve not merely a segment of the population but the entire population. This duty is not met when the government represents only the interests of the dominant group. In many of the Southern States today, we see the spectacle of officials deciding matters affecting the colored population without making the slightest effort to determine the wishes or opinions of the group concerned. All too often, responsible Negro opinion is neither sought nor seriously considered when it is volunteered.

With respect to the constitutionality of this bill, let me point out the obvious fact that the Supreme Court of the United States is the only body which can determine that question, not representatives in this House.

This act will apply only to industries engaged in interstate commerce, undeniably the province of the Federal Government. Were we to speculate as to the constitutionality of the act, we would find much support in decisions of the Supreme Court. For instance, in the case of *Hirabayashi* v. *U. S.* (320 U. S. 81, 100), Mr. Chief Justice Stone wrote for the court: "Distinctions between citizens solely because of their ancestry are by their very nature odious to a free people whose institutions are founded upon the doctrine of equality."

Again in *New Negro Alliance* v. *Sanitary Grocery Company* (303 U. S. 552, 651), Justice Roberts, speaking for the unanimous court, said:

> The desire for fair and equitable conditions of employment on the part of persons of any race, color, or persuasion, and the removal of discriminations against them by reason of their race or religious beliefs is quite as important to those concerned as fairness and equity in terms and conditions of employment can be to trade or craft unions or any force of labor organization or association. Race discrimination by an employer may reasonably be deemed more unfair and less excusable than discrimination against workers on the ground of union affiliation.

But in spite of the fact that many representatives from the South would have you believe that this bill is directed against the South, because of the great number of Negroes there, the problem with which we are concerned in this bill is not only a problem of the American Negro. The South has no monopoly on prejudice and discrimination. This is a national problem, applicable to every community which houses members of a minority group, hyphenated Americans who have met with frustration and futility in their efforts to obtain equality of opportunity in employment. German-Americans, Italian-Americans, Polish-Americans, Japanese-Americans, Mexican-Americans, Catholics, and Jews—peoples of every ethnic group and religion are affected, peoples who, while enjoying broad American citizenship, cannot break through the barriers of prejudices which deny them the opportunity to earn a living on the same basis of equality as other Americans. This act will be a weapon to fight those anti-American forces which would destroy interracial and religious understanding among the American people.

American democracy has flourished because of differences—differences of peoples, religions, and cultures, all fused in freedom and working together for the common good. The idea that opportunities for employment shall be predicated upon sameness in religion or color of skin or the shape of eyes, has no place in our society; otherwise we will have accepted the concept of a master race, a single superior race or religion. This bill does no more than recognize the fact that American citizenship belongs to no privileged group—that all citizens are entitled to equality of economic opportunity. This bill goes no further than to safeguard the right to work, free from discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Another argument which has been advanced against passage of the bill is that racial prejudice cannot be eradicated by legislation. Perhaps it is true that passage of the act will not in itself abolish prejudice, but it cannot be doubted that it will help in this direction. Experience has shown that legislation can create conditions favorable to the disappearance of racial hatred, that it makes progress much less gradual. We do not here propose that this legislation is the sole cure-all. It must be supplemented by economic and educational advancements, for one approach without the others cannot make its mark within any reasonable time. We stand ready to assist in pressing for such economic and educational advancements. Can many of those who fight passage of this bill say the same in the face of their consistent opposition to legislation which would provide higher wages, better housing, and improved educational facilities?

One commissioner of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination has stated:

> Critics of fair-employment laws used to claim that long-established habits of discrimination could not be changed by legislation. Their argument has been unmistakably answered today. Nearly four years' experience in New York—and similar experience in New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Washington, Oregon, New Mexico, and Rhode Island, all of which have passed antidiscrimination legislation modeled after the New York law—indicates conclusively that wise legislation creates a climate of opinion in which discrimination tends to disappear.

Equally convincing is the reaction of employers operating under such an antidiscrimination statute. And in that connection let us take the case of the Sperry Gyroscope Co. which began employing Negroes in 1941 and steadily progressed until 3 years later one-third of its Negro employees were in highly skilled occupations, one-third in semi-skilled occupations and the remaining one-third in other jobs. President Gillmor of the company had this to report on the company's experience:

> The initial employment of Negroes and each subsequent extension of their employment into new categories was received with doubt by the supervisors, and, in some cases, by rumblings and even threats of trouble from some groups of white workers. The threats never materialized, the doubts disappeared and were succeeded by friendliness and cooperation in helping the Negro to learn his new job and to progress to a better one. I know of no instance now where the Negro worker is not judged entirely on the basis of his competency and without consciousness of his race.

Those who indulge in racial prejudice do not dislike the individual members of the affected group. It is the group itself in the abstract, a broad blur, to which their prejudice is directed. They may on occasion find one or two individuals objectionable, and this offers reason to them for condemnation of the class to which the individuals belong. Where they admit and recognize talent and fine qualities in one or two individuals, they nevertheless refuse to permit them to emerge from the group. The fact that individuals may differ means nothing; all are ignominiously lumped together. Mr. Chairman, racial prejudice will disappear when appraisal is given on an individual basis, as it should be, rather than on the basis of class or group.

How can this be achieved? Normal contacts between peoples of varying ethnic backgrounds diminish prejudice; enforced segregation intensifies it. Race relations are improved by living together, working together, and getting to know people of different racial heritage. Prejudice is not instinctive or hereditary. It is kept alive by man-made barriers, and this act offers the chance to break some of those barriers. If this law is to be effective it must contain provisions for making it so. While much good has been done by conciliation and publication, and this act looks to these methods for eliminating discrimination in the first instance, enforcement is necessary when conciliation breaks down. Otherwise, the act may very well be meaningless.

Mr. Chairman, in a world where more than three-quarters of its people have eyes, religions, and skins different than ours, the paternalism which found general acceptance in the past as "the white man's burden" is being vehemently rejected, because paternalism is synonymous with exploitation. If we are to live in this swiftly moving world, if we hope to gain the confidence of its people whom we want to accept our democratic standards as their own, we must eliminate our own depressing paternalistic patterns. We cannot continue to be silent witnesses to social injustice if we are to retain responsible world leadership.

Discrimination in employment, a real barrier to economic opportunity, is such an injustice. This bill will help to correct it and I certainly hope it will be passed.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, it is to be regretted that we do not have the time to talk on the merits of the bill now pending. A great deal has been said about the sincerity of the Members. I want to make a case for my own sincerity. Although I am opposed to this bill, I happen to be a coauthor with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] of an FEPC bill. It is too bad we do not have more time, but I think the time has come when we ought to forget what we have been talking about, which is something with a label called FEPC. The time has come when we ought to

forget the label for a minute and look at the law itself. This law is a long ways from being what the label would lead you to believe it is. I think the time has come when you Members ought to know a few things about this before you get to vote on it.

This bill is being represented to the people of the country as being a bill to help minority peoples get a better break in this country. The exact opposite is the truth, and I base that statement on the very language of the bill itself. No bill has ever come before this Congress which discriminates more against citizens of this country and particularly against a minority than does this bill, because by the language of the bill itself you will find that not only will they lose all the privileges they now have, but they will not be able to get any privileges at all except at the will and pleasure of the bureaucrats which this bill will set up.

This bill is selling these minorities down the river because the terms of the bill itself specify that it shall not apply to any factory employing less than 50 people.

In other words, if anyone has the misfortune to work where there are only 49 people or less, and you are saying to the people that you say you want to help, "It does not make any difference—you cannot be discriminated against until you get in a crowd of 50 or more people." In other words there cannot be any such thing as discrimination until there are more than 50 people in a plant.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. In that connection the testimony before the Committee on Rules and at the hearing shows that the gentleman whose name is on the bill as its author, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] would have his own employees exempted from the provisions of the bill because he does not have 50 employees in his office.

Mr. STEED. Certainly. Anyone employing less than 50 people is exempted and that goes for all Members of Congress. We are here trying to tell the employers of this country whom they can hire and yet we do not want to practice what we preach when it comes to our own office staffs. You can find that out for yourselves.

I want to bring out another point. No member of a minority race can have any justice under this bill unless some bureaucrat says he can. He cannot file any charges if the bureaucrat says he does not have a case or does not have the evidence. Why, according to this very bill, if a bureaucrat wants to file a complaint for him against his will he can do that. In this bill, in subsection (c) of section 9, you have authority here which gives the bureaucrat the right to take a person from any place in the United States or its territories and can make him go to Bangor, Maine, or Honolulu to answer a charge. He could make a man appear there Tuesday and then compel you to be anywhere else they want you to go at noon the next day. There is such power in this bill that if the Commission so desires, they can bankrupt any company in the United States by forcing them to go all over the country to defend themselves against a bunch of frivolous complaints.

Furthermore in subsection (b), section 2 of this bill you have something here which discriminates against not only minorities in this country but against every decent American citizen. It says all persons in the jurisdiction of the United States shall have these rights. An enemy alien in this country is within the jurisdiction of this Government and automatically you here give him rights that he never has had before. You are setting up something here which would make the employment officer at the atomic energy plants subject to criminal prosecution.

Mr. Chairman, trying to eliminate discrimination through this bill is just as silly as a farmer burning down the barn to get rid of the rats.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, today we have witnessed upon this floor a sight that will long remain in the memories of some of us newer Members of this body. A small group endeavoring to filibuster, delay, and defeat a bill that provides for the equal treatment of all of our citizens in the matter of employment; a bill that merely expresses into law the Golden Rule "Do ye unto others as you would have them do unto you." Yet upon this floor today we have heard the proponents of this measure accused of trying to force a communistic measure upon the country. They speak of constitutional rights; rights of the employers to discriminate, and so forth. Yet basically all the FEPC bill does is to guarantee to every worker the right of employment regardless of his color or his creed.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, it is later than we think. America is looked to by the entire world for leadership and example; the governments of this world that would destroy our form of government are quick to point out our many mistakes and frailties, and we make many, and have many; we are spending billions of dollars to help this stricken world, yet today on a bill that is elementary in its basic principle of right, we hesitate, we filibuster, we delay, we speak harshly; and behind the iron curtain our enemies say, "See, they do not practice what they preach, they claim to be a Christian Nation, they claim to love their brothers; yet they do not do anything for the minorities of their own Nation." My friends, there is just no answer to such a statement; we know that it is not true in its entirety, but what can we say to the Indian, to the African, yes, to those countries behind the iron curtain. We cannot explain our conduct of today. It is unexplainable. We have, if we defeat this measure, destroyed the good will purchased by our blood, our resources and our money.

Not so many months ago one of the senior Members of this House and a leading opponent, if not the most vocal, of FEPC stated that some of the freshman Members of Congress were serving two terms in one, "their first and last." I think many of us today, in this group, agree with this gentleman; that it would be better to return to our homes and our families than to serve in this body where so many of its Members place racial prejudice above that of Christian precepts. If we fail in our efforts today, we will have failed our God, our country, and ourselves.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the provisions of the pending bill are substantially the same as those of H. R. 2232, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, reported by the Committee on Labor but never passed by the House. I submitted the best arguments that I could in opposition to that and similar bills on July 5, 1945, and on July 12, 1945, as I had previously submitted the best arguments that I could on May 26, 1944, against similar legislation.

THE NAME

There is something in a name with which to conjure It sounds all right to provide for fair-employment practice. All citizens want to be fair, but a name may be deceptive. The proposal is by regulation and by statute to require all employers with 50 or more employees and all Federal departments and agencies to eliminate discrimination in regard to hiring, and terms or conditions of employment because of race, color, religion, ancestry or national origin. The proposal sounds well, but a name may be misleading. The important matter is not the name but the purpose behind the name The bill might better be called "Unfair Employment Practice Act."

THE PURPOSE

The purpose is to prohibit discrimination because of race or color. There are prejudices against creeds and there are prejudices against races. These prejudices are not created by law and they cannot be changed by law. The relation between employer and employee, like the relation between master and servant under the common law, is intimate. We like to select our associates. We like to employ those who are congenial. We want to know about their fitness. We are to be the judges. The liberty of choosing employees is a part of free enterprise. It is a liberty protected by the Constitution. Under the fifth amendment, a citizen cannot be deprived of his life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

TWO APPROACHES

There are two approaches to the difficult problem of employment. One is voluntary, is by mediation, is by education, and is by tolerance. The other, and that is the matter that is pending now, is rather in the nature of compulsion.

RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICES

I oppose religious prejudices. I oppose racial prejudices. I believe, however, in the freedom of religion. I believe in fairness for all races. Force and compulsion are the wrong way to correct. They will stir up racial and religious prejudices. The proposal strikes at the

fundamentals of liberty and of free enterprise. Racial feeling will be accentuated. The proposal is social and political dynamite. We are throwing the experience of the ages to the winds. The proposal plays into the hands of those who would remake and reform our institutions and our economy to conform to their social views. The purpose, to eliminate discrimination, can best be achieved by cooperation.

Through the ages, moral and ethical values have not been frozen at a new level by the passage of laws. The proposal will set the clock back and will hurt the people it is intended to help. It will make the life of every employer miserable. It will result in unhappy, if not violent disturbances everywhere.

History and experience prove that you cannot legislate tolerance and morals into people. Compulsion injures the cause to eliminate discrimination. Force will retard the educational progress now being made Man has always responded more willingly to a plea than to a command. I know of no better ethics than the Sermon on the Mount. I know of no fairer philosophy than the Golden Rule. But I am not a Socialist. If a citizen believes in the principles of the Socialist Party, I accord to him the freedom of his conviction. I think it would be a mistake to force any creed, any ethics, or any philosophy on any people. The better way is freedom of choice and the tolerance of views.

Burning resentment from forced employment will furnish fuel for racial disturbances and will foment rather than eliminate racial prejudices.

BIG BUSINESS AND SMALL BUSINESS

Generally the large business firm is able to take care of itself. They are familiar with labor problems. They have their lawyers. But the small-business man has trouble enough with bureaucracy now. The pending legislation will further harass him. He already has to comply with too many rules and regulations. There are too many investigators. The crux of the pending bill is that it will absolutely paralyze small business.

HYPOCRISY

The argument that the bill implements fair-labor practices is pure hypocrisy. The bill takes away the right that every American enjoys of choosing his own employees It subjects the employer to the charge of prejudice and discrimination every time he hires and discharges, but that is not all. The bill makes the charge a criminal offense and at the same time deprives the citizen the right of trial by jury. No bill ought to deprive the citizen of his right to trial by jury in a criminal prosecution.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

The bill is applicable to all employers, including merchants. It strikes a fatal blow at free enterprise. A man's success or failure in business and in farming depends upon his employees, upon a merchant's or a farmer's ability to select dependable, loyal, industrious employees to assist him in the operation of his business or his farm or his enterprise. Under the terms of the bill the commission could say: "You must hire this man. You must fire that man. You must promote the other man."

COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM

Communists and many Socialists advocate compulsory Federal laws to compel men to associate, whether in work or play, with persons with whom they are unwilling to work or play. Communism thrives on strife and disorder. The Communists know that the pending bill will promote disorder. They know that it will foment strife. I am unable to see how those who favor the private enterprise or capitalistic system can support compulsory employment. Through the ages the moral right of free men to choose companions is so clear and the moral wrong of compelling him to accept an offensive companion is so apparent that it is difficult to conclude that those who believe in free enterprise can support the pending bill or similar legislation.

PROVISIONS

I shall not discuss in detail the provisions of the bill. I believe it to be thoroughly unconstitutional. I refer to only a few provisions of the bill. The proposed judicial review is a misnomer. I have always opposed the refusal of a trial by jury for a criminal offense. The Federal agents are both jurors and prosecutors. The citizen is denied, I repeat to emphasize, the right to trial. He may be in contempt for failure to pay back wages.

UNENFORCEABLE

A moment's reflection will convince a thoughtful man that the bill is unenforceable. How can a commission in Washington regulate and provide employees for all of the employers in the 48 States of the Union? It would be the super-duper bureaucracy of the age.

RACKETEERS

The enactment of the bill would provide a fertile field for racketeers, blackmailers, and shysters. Merchants and farmers would be subjected to harassment by troublemakers and disgruntled job seekers. The small-business man, rather than hire a lawyer, rather than go to court, rather than take up the matter with Washington, might choose to pay the disgruntled employee rather than be supervised by the Commission.

CONSTITUTIONALITY

There are grave constitutional objections. The bill declares that the right to work without discrimination is an immunity. The immunity and privileges of citizens can only be provided by the Constitution. They cannot be provided by statute. While the bill undertakes to relate employment to commerce, this is not the final hurdle. The fifth amendment to the Constitution still obtains. The right to employ, I assert, is a liberty within the meaning of the fifth amendment.

CONCLUSION

The bill will not provide a single job. There is no occasion for the legislation. The remedy is good will. The remedy is voluntary, not compulsory. All Americans believe in the Constitution. That Constitution protects the privileges and immunities of all citizens regardless of race, creed, or color. Any statute that undertakes to restrict or deprive a citizen of such privileges or immunities would be in violation of the Constitution.

Legislation regulating employment is for the State. Congress is without authority to regulate employment. The bill undertakes to implement employment with interstate commerce. I do not believe, however, the implementation will make the legislation constitutional. New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, as I understand, have adopted so-called fair-employment acts. California, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and other States have declined to pass such acts. The jurisdiction is for the State and not for the Federal Government.

The bill, if passed, would do more harm than good. It would hurt business. It would be unfair to employers. It would not help employees. In fact, it would do employees a distinct disservice.

It is said that the pending bill will be of benefit to Negroes. The vast majority of Negroes live in the South. There is no material demand from the South, either from the white or Negro race for the passage of the pending bill. We know that all of the legislation conceived by man, implemented by police force and courts, cannot change man's thoughts, if he is not willing for that thought to be changed. We know that making laws is not enough We know that there must be understanding. There must be tolerance. There must be cooperation. And in the South today there is understanding and cooperation between the white people and the colored people of the South. I emphasize that the pending bill would do the Negro race vastly more harm than good.

Under labor legislation it is a discrimination to refuse to employ a person because he is a member of a union. Why not extend and make it unlawful to refuse to employ a person merely because he is not a member of a union?

Commissions and associations whose aim is to prevent discrimination by cooperation is one thing, but commissions and associations to force employment and by compulsion to prevent discrimination is another thing. The pending bill is not only unconstitutional but it is unworkable. It would hurt the people it is intended to help. It is destructive to the American way of life and to the American system of free enterprise. It is destructive to American business. It is un-American and ought not to be passed.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, here on Washington's birthday, we, of all times, are considering the notorious FEPC bill. I am sure that all of us listened intently to the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address. We find many warnings that should be heeded.

From the time of Washington down to this good hour, this Nation has been able to prosper and to become the envy of the world. This has been possible because of a minimum of Federal regulation. The more we regulate the individual citizen, the further we go along the road to socialism. There has been much said the past several years by employees of the State Department to the

effect that we must have this type of legislation in order to show the rest of the world that we believe in civil rights. I note that this declaration is written into the present bill under discussion. It does not seem sufficient for this Nation to burden future generations with a huge tax burden and deplete our national resources in keeping up the rest of the world, but now, in addition thereto, and in an effort to get the rest of the world to accept our benevolence, we must pass such legislation.

In other words, we must copy the totalitarian government's philosophy in order to combat communism. This is the wrong approach. No nation on earth today allows as much freedom of employment as ours. When our Government tells an employer just who he can employ and who he cannot employ, we are then following the nations whose philosophy we claim to be fighting.

I appreciate the fact that it is claimed in this legislation that it makes for security of the employee, but, as General Eisenhower correctly stated some months ago, if that is all we want, "security can be secured by going to jail." During the war, by Presidential order, a so-called FEPC was set up, something of a volunteer system. No one made any serious objections at that time, as there was a war to win. However, after the war, it was the same old story. A bureau had been built up and instead of folding up, as everyone expected, they began an agitation to build up a big organization and it was hard to kill them off, although there was no legislation by Congress establishing such agency.

This is dangerous legislation. I have heard some express themselves to the effect that it would be a good thing to pass this legislation and then let the country see just what shape it would place us in. I want to warn you right now against any such idea, for once you set up this measure it will grow by leaps and bounds, and it will be hard for us to get rid of it, no matter how bad it becomes, for once the people give up their liberties it is hard to get them back again.

This legislation is unconstitutional. However, I know how futile it is to argue this point today. I am not one to charge the proponents of this bill as being Communists. I yield to them that degree of sincerity that I know they yield to me. The tragedy of the whole thing is that the Nation is looking in the main to southern Representatives to defeat this legislation I say this is tragic, because I believe that it is a great national question and not a sectional one. I know that the great majority of the southern Members of Congress are interested in the people that they serve, without regard to race, color, or creed. The best friend that the Negro has in the South is the white man. The destiny of each race is indelibly linked with that of the other. If one race makes progress so does the other. The Negro race has held down the South because of his economic status. We of the South have been intelligently attempting to raise the economic status of the Negro. We have been making progress in this effort. We need the help and cooperation of other sections of the country and not so-called do-gooders, who cannot separate social equality from economic equality. What chance does a Negro have to be a bellboy or waiter in the clubs and hotels of the North? I recall that when war was declared upon Germany, Italy, and their allies, that many of the waiters here in Washington had to be interned because they were aliens. Some of the proponents of this legislation will turn down a good Negro and then give a job to some alien who cannot speak English very well. Then they jump on the South for the treatment that we give the Negroes. Economic opportunities to the Negro in the South are opening faster and faster. They are employed in places in the South where you would not employ them in many other sections of the country. So do not criticize southern Congressmen for objecting to this bill. It will not help the Negro I wonder what is behind it anyway when you provide that an employer shall not discriminate against anyone because of national origin? Does this mean that a foreigner can come to the shores of this country and stand on the same footing as an American citizen? This seems to be the intent of the legislation. This one thing alone should defeat the bill.

The enactment of this legislation would do more harm to the Negroes of the South than anything else. It is unfortunate that the South must bear the burden of opposition to the bill. A majority of the people of all other sections of the country are against this legislation In many States where a referendum has been held similar to that in California, the people overwhelmingly voted against it. This bill makes many pious statements which are not based upon facts What does it provide? First, it shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to refuse to hire, discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin Now, let us see what happens The person who claims that he was aggrieved can file a charge, or someone else can file it on his behalf, or a charge can be filed by a member of the Commission. Now, that is taking in a lot of territory. You will note that it is not limited to the aggrieved person, but to any outsider who is interested in fomenting and stirring up race hatred. Not only that, but it provides that any member of the Commission, and for the purpose of this legislation, the term "Commission" means any employee or agent of the Commission, can file charges. This means that there would be thousands upon thousands of meddlers and agents continually stirring up trouble. It could become worse than the Gestapo. It could drive honest people out of business. It is cruel and despicable legislation.

Talk to me about civil rights, what civil rights does an employer have under this legislation? Absolutely none. Let us go a step further. When this charge has been filed, the Commission investigates and, after such preliminary investigation if it finds the proper cause exists for such charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful employment by informal conferences, and so forth. If this does not secure the results required by the Commission, then the employer is given notice to appear before the Commission or an agent of the Commission for trial. Now, let us see where the trial is to be held. Is it in the county where the employer lives? Is it in the State in which he resides, or somewhere else? The employer can be hauled before an agent or the Commission at any place that it designates—in Washington, D. C., Los Angeles, Calif., or Portland Maine. This is infamous legislation, adverse from every fundamental concept of Anglo-Saxon justice.

Say, for instance, that A is a man of bad repute He is shiftless and lazy, or the employer believe that he is a man of bad character. A is refused employment. A or some agent of the Commission files a statement, stating that he was refused employment upon one of the grounds set out in the bill The employer's defense is that A is a man of bad reputation, that he is shiftless and lazy, or that it is believed that he is a man of bad character. The burden of proof is upon the employer. He must prove that the reason that he turned the would-be employee down is based on some fact other than race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin. In other words, the burden of proof is upon him and not upon the person who makes the charge

We have prided ourselves in this Nation "that a man is innocent until proven guilty." Under this legislation, he is guilty unless he proves himself innocent, that is exactly what the bill says Is the right to employment without discrimination a civil right? This word "discrimination" covers a lot of territory. Take for instance a man operating a business who has an opening for a secretary. He might object to a blond, a brunette, a redhead, or he might object to a fat person or a lean person or to a tall or short person, or to hundreds of other things that go to make up physical and personal appearance. Would any of these be a defense to a person who is turned down on account of any one of them? It certainly would not. No, the so-called ills that the proponents of this legislation claim to cure would make it a thousand times worse. If the proponents of this legislation want to argue that this is the moral way to prohibit discrimination, I want to say to you that you cannot legislate so-called morals into the people in this manner

This bill, if carried to its final conclusions, would mean the closing of every business concern in the Nation Instead of FEPC standing for "Fair Employment Practice Commission," I think it stands for "free enterprise perishes completely."

You ask for some information concerning the number of employees this outfit will have. Ten thousand—perhaps 100,000, or a million. The sky is the limit. How much will it cost the taxpayers—one million or one hundred million? No one knows or dares make an

estimate. There would necessarily have to be a large number of snoopers and investigators. Once the camel gets his head under the tent, he is going all the way under.

This should not be a government of oppression. There is no burden placed on the would-be employee. This legislation sets up a unilateral contract, and nothing else. I have always considered it fundamental that in a hiring, there must be a meeting of the minds. There is none here.

I cannot understand how some of the labor unions can be misled into supporting this legislation. When the time comes that the Federal Government says to a person who he can and who he cannot employ, as sure as the night follows the day, the time is also coming when the Federal Government will say to the worker where he can and where he cannot work. This is inevitable.

This legislation will lead us down the road from which there can be no turning. It is dressed up in flowery language, but just the same, it stinks and is dangerous, and should not and must not be enacted.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of the FEPC bill, H. R. 4453. The principle of fair employment proposed in this bill is of the greatest concern to the people of our Nation. This proposal clearly has an eminent position in the American program of improved welfare and security for all. It is our obligation to meet this issue squarely, here and now If we believe in the essential dignity and integrity of every human being, it is our duty to adopt this proposal before we conclude this legislative day

In speaking in support of this FEPC legislation, I speak for the great majority of citizens of my State, for the Washington State Legislature adopted State fair employment practice legislation. The same is true of the Oregon State Legislature.

It has been argued here today that fair employment practices legislation would disrupt the economy of the South and cause untold damage and disaster. We cannot deny the vexing problems that would be presented to the South by such legislation. Neither can we deny that progress has been made in improvement of race relationships and in broader opportunities for Negroes. However, I wish to record my profound conviction that the South will make even greater progress, its people in the days to come will be happier and more prosperous, if its economy is grounded squarely on the principles of equal opportunity for all. No nation, no part of any nation, was ever destroyed by vesting in its government the responsibility for promoting greater equality among its citizens.

Our Nation was founded on the concept that all men are created free and equal, that they are entitled to seek their livelihood and pursue their callings to the fullest extent of their individual capacities. The Old South was destroyed by slavery, not by freedom. The South of today, a region of change and progress, will gain in the long run by utilizing to the utmost the talents, skills, and abilities of all its people.

What I say regarding the South applies equally well to any other part of the country. America is a land of people ever moving in search of greater opportunity, of better livelihood. The interchange of population among States creates special problems in the labor market and responsibilities on the part of Government to keep open the avenues of employment for all people regardless of the color of their skin, the way they worship, or the place they were born.

In the Pacific Northwest we pride ourselves generally on the fair-minded and democratic way in which we regard all people. As an area of rapid growth, accustomed to receiving large numbers of new settlers, we are eager to facilitate their adjustment and integration into community life. We recognized problems of discrimination in employment, some precipitated by the influx of recent newcomers, some of longer standing. We met these problems by creating a State agency to help bring about their solution.

A short 6 months following the enactment of the Washington State legislation the Reverend Fountain W. Penick, who is one of the members of the commission executing the law, wrote to me stating:

> The law against discrimination in employment in the State of Washington was enacted about 6 months ago and therefore cannot be evaluated so soon, however, I think it is quite significant that there has been no appreciable opposition on the part of the employer group Neither has there been any opposition, worthy of note, during the period which the law was under consideration in the House and Senate I believe the law is quite favorably accepted by the citizens of our State in general.

However, this generally favorable report on Washington State's FEPC laws should not be taken to mean that local measures, however well intentioned and valuable, will suffice to cope with this problem. The problem is a national one because of the national dimensions of the labor market, and legislation on that level is necessary, as with the problems of old-age security and labor relations. Local laws are perforce limited in their jurisdiction. The great interstate corporations recruit their personnel, the great national unions draw their membership, from all parts of the country. For personnel supervisor and union alike a national law is needed to insure adherence to the desired employment practices.

The bill recognizes that State or local agencies have an important place in promoting fair employment. But it is not enough to stop short with local agencies where national standards of decency and fair play must prevail. Just as collective bargaining is a national policy supported by commensurate legislation, so must we proceed in the case of fair employment practices, which likewise involve our economic and physical well-being, as well as our international security.

It is obvious that today many men and women are denied the opportunity of working in the jobs for which they are best fitted. This hurts them as individuals. Equally important, it hurts America. Its damage can be counted both in the direct economic sense of denying to American production the best available skills, and in the moral sense of weakening our claim to world leadership in the ways of democracy. Discrimination in employment is a wastage of human resources and a blight on the democratic spirit.

This is the hour when we must correct this weakness in our public character. We must move forward in such a way that there can be no question of our sincerity and good faith. The first step must be taken now by adopting the bill before the House, H. R. 4453.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made by the committee reporting H. R. 4453 that it "is a bill designed to protect those rights of freedom and equality of opportunity which are guaranteed to every man by the basic principles upon which our Nation is built; that this bill will help make it possible for all our people to enjoy a decent standard of living"

Gentlemen, the people of this great country are presently enjoying the highest standard of living which this country, or any other country, has ever known. And let me emphasize that we are not presently operating under an FEPC law. The American standard of living has been on the upgrade ever since the pillars of our Government were laid about 200 years ago. There is no reason for thinking that it would not continue to improve without an FEPC.

Our progress can be directly attributed to our system of free enterprise. A person in the United States has always had the freedom to go into business, to use his own judgment in employing whomever he deemed best fitted for the job at hand. This freedom has made the United States the leader of nations. The proposed legislation will take away that freedom. It will extract a most vital organ of democracy.

FEPC will have a disastrous effect upon private enterprise. Under the provisions of this legislation the discretion of the individual will be supplanted by the discretion of the Government. An employer could have a dozen, or a hundred, or a thousand cases pending against him at one time. He could be subjected to a lawsuit before a Federal agency by every person who applied for and was denied a job of any sort. Thus, it appears obvious that any pressure group who decided to put a man out of business could do so by a multiplicity of lawsuits.

If this measure is made a law, it could be administered in ways which would shock those Americans who are not familiar with its far-reaching proposals. Those proposals are contrary to the American way of life because we do not believe in a totalitarian government. Those proposals are deceptive; they would serve as a yoke to fetter individual freedom. They would be a burden and imposition on the American people. Such proposals are contrary to the tenets of George Washington; they are contrary to the beliefs of Thomas Jefferson; and they are contrary to the teachings of Abraham Lincoln.

Among other things, this bill states that its provisions are necessary "to remove obstructions to the free flow of commerce among the States and with foreign nations." That statement is typical of the farcical and superficial character of the entire bill. The only obstacle to the free flow of commerce among the States and with foreign nations today is not discrepancies in employment practices, but rather the whimsical nature and practices of certain labor leaders. This bill will not correct those practices.

Let us be frank and practical about the matter. There are too many minorities who are today trying to capitalize on this word "discrimination." There are too many elements within those groups who are interested only in personal motives, completely ignoring the principles of constitutional government. If we cater to those groups forever and create a tempest every time the word "discrimination" is thrown in our direction, then we are certainly not upholding those sound principles upon which our predecessors have built and maintained the greatest Nation in the world.

We are here to represent the majority. If this bill were subjected to the vote of the American people, I am of the firm opinion that it would be overwhelmingly defeated. No one denies that it would receive a majority in certain areas infested with Communists. The advocates of FEPC should know that. Minority groups are endeavoring to use Congress as a means to invoke their selfish interests upon the American people. Let us not be a stooge for their vice.

Once, when a young attorney was about to begin the practice of law, his father, an experienced lawyer, said: "Son, I wish to give you some advice. In the trial of cases, if the facts are against you, argue the law. If the law is against you, argue the facts. If the law and facts are both against you, muddy the waters." The waters have certainly been muddied in considering this legislation. The picture is distorted and magnified. All American citizens who are capable of working, who are willing to work, and who make a sincere and honest effort in that direction, can obtain work. This advantage does not hold true for Communists, aliens, and their type. But, my friends, if FEPC is not defeated employers subjected to the act could be forced to give employment to such undesirables. That is not the American way.

Gentlemen, this House is a citadel for the preservation of the fundamental rights of the American people. It is natural to expect that attacks, secretly and in disguise, be made upon this fortress. All good Americans must be prepared to defend it. It is our duty to stand guard, to watch for the enemy, and to defend these fundamentals of freedom.

As a Member of this body, I have given much thought and studied consideration to this FEPC proposal. I have found it to be a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is an attack, a secret attack, directed at the ramparts of our freedom and designed to catch the American people off guard. It is made by those who appear as "friends bringing gifts." Many Americans have already been deceived.

The bugle is blowing; the time has come for us to stand up and turn back the enemy before liberty slips from our grasp. Vote for principles, not politics. If this measure becomes law, it will be the greatest blunder made by any Congress in the history of republican government.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Chairman, the civil-rights program was initiated by President Truman, based on the report of his Committee on Civil Rights. He sent the Congress his recommendations on civil rights, and among them are anti-poll-tax legislation and the Fair Employment Practice Commission. Last summer, we in the House passed the anti-poll-tax bill, but the Senate failed even to consider it in committee. Since the beginning of this session, we have been fighting for FEPC. The issue is very simple. Many people try to make it complicated.

It is ironical that we here in America—where we consider all men to be equal—that we should even have to have a bill of this kind. But it is necessary.

FEPC is simply a program to guarantee the right of every man, regardless of his race, creed, or color, the same opportunity to employment that everyone else has. Liberty is of little value to any man unless he can support himself, unless he can earn a decent living at the work for which he is best qualified by his natural skill.

The FEPC bill has as its primary objectives the fundamentals upon which our Nation is founded. As a true American who steadfastly believes in justice and protection of human rights, I would be derelict in my sworn duty to the people I represent if I did not support these ideals.

The United States of America is known throughout the world as a nation with the highest level of technological development and cultural achievement. It offers to the peoples of the world a realization of the dream for a better life, a guarantee of full freedom, and the pursuit of happiness. Yet these promises have fallen far short of their objectives when we consider the history of disgraceful and abusive practices of discrimination in granting equality of opportunity for all men who desire to earn a living and who seek to enjoy those inalienable rights of a human being.

In an enlightened nation such as ours no longer can we continue to boast about our democratic principles and forsake these ideals in practice. This measure before us is not untimely. It is presented as a practical means of eliminating oppressive abuses of the full use of manpower and productivity which has robbed our Nation of both utilization of human resources and full productive capacity. It is economically unsound to refuse employment to an individual because of the color of his skin, his religion, or his national origin.

A Government agency to eliminate unfair practices in employment has as its foundation years of practice during the war through the successful operation of the Fair Employment Practice Commission. During peacetime the patriotic spirit of fair play has lapsed into an attitude of indifference to a large extent. But the experiences in the four States which have created commissions for fair employment practices since the war has fulfilled more than the fondest hopes. In New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, as well as in other States and cities which have established these commissions, the reports show overwhelming approval and progress.

My own native State of New York, which pioneered State legislation in this field, has found that the operation of its commission against discrimination has won support and has been patterned by numerous States and cities. The fears of some persons that such a legislative body would lead to rioting and economic chaos have been proven to be baseless. The belief that the persons who are benefited by such a commission would flood the agency with complaints has been disproven by experience. In fact, every attack upon the principles set forth by the commission has been overcome by the wholehearted approval of the operation of the program.

The report of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Commission after 2 years of operation has reinforced the New York experience in pointing to its success in an attempt to substitute understanding for intolerance.

Massachusetts has not conceived the fair employment practices law as an instrument of compulsion—

The 1948 annual report states—

rather it has regarded the statute as presenting an opportunity to wipe out fears which men have of other men who are different with respect to color, religion, or national origin.

Thus all persons have today economic opportunities which they have never had before. These people are sharing now the benefits of American citizenship along with its obligations.

The administrators of the State commissions against discrimination in New Jersey and Connecticut as well as municipal commissions have reported that compliance with the provisions of the laws has been accomplished without recourse to the courts.

However, these successes are overshadowed by a desperate need for Federal legislation to deal with discrimination by interstate corporations. Although such situations might be reduced by interstate cooperation, there must be the authority exercised by the Federal Government under that provision of the Constitution granting it supreme power over interstate commerce.

No voluntary system will abolish this evil. Discrimination in employment is a cancer in our society. All over the world, the Communists can point to it as proof of the fact that we do not practice what we preach.

Another interesting fact to keep in mind is that witnesses have testified before House and Senate committees that an FEPC will save our economy from three to ten billion dollars in waste in employment which is now occurring.

Those estimates have been made by economists and industrial leaders. They know what discrimination means in dollars and cents.

It is incredible to me that legislation of this kind should not be allowed to come before the Congress to permit us to discuss it, to debate it, and then to act on it according to our best judgment.

This week is Brotherhood Week. It is the week which we have set aside to reaffirm our faith and trust in God and to rededicate ourselves to brotherhood under God through all the people of all races and all creeds.

In my mind, there would be no more fitting time in which to pass a bill which would guarantee the right of opportunity of employment to every man, regardless of his race, creed, or color. Such action would indeed be a demonstration of the true spirit of brotherhood.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, the culmination of a long effort to enact an FEPC law is a shining example of the power of a vociferous minority group. The consideration of this legislation today is concrete evidence of what a determined handful of people can bring to pass while an apathetic majority sits quietly by in the hope that Congress will have good judgment enough to reject this proposal. If the businessmen of America were as demanding and as noisy in opposition to this legislation as the minority group has been in favor, I dare say that there would not be 50 votes cast in favor of this bill on final passage. Almost every extreme measure enacted into law by Congress originated with a small body of people rather than with a great majority of the people. So I think it can be safely said that one of the greatest dangers to the free-enterprise system and to a constitutional form of government is the apathy of a majority of the citizens of this great Nation.

Despite what anyone may say to the contrary, we must in all frankness admit that the FEPC issue has been reduced to a racial issue. This is because advocates of the colored race have been in the forefront throughout the long effort to bring into existence an FEPC law. It is indeed a pity that this issue has been reduced to a racial level when, in point of fact, the real issue is whether American business people can continue to enjoy the constitutional right to conduct business in a free and unhampered manner. When we divorce from this bill all thoughts of race, creed, or religion and think of the law objectively, it simply says that the American merchant will no longer be free to hire persons of his own choice. The Congress of the United States has never gone this far even during periods of war. The Congress has never seen fit to conscript labor during wartime, yet we would today by this measure before us take a step in peacetime so drastic that it was not even employed in wartime except as an Executive order devoid of congressional approval.

One of the most disturbing thoughts about this whole matter is that there are many Members of Congress who will vote for this legislation today, if a vote is taken, who have privately admitted to other Members that they are personally against the bill in principle but that a vote against the measure would spell political doom for them in their districts. This does not necessarily mean that a majority of the people in their districts are for FEPC, but it does mean that the active minority through the process of block voting easily could bring about their defeat. If every Member of Congress voted his real convictions on this issue, the bill would be soundly defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read at this point section 5 of the Powell bill:

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

(1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; or

(2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, color, religion, or national origin.

(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any labor organization to discriminate against any individual or to limit, segregate, or classify its membership in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive such individual of employment opportunities, or would limit his employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee or as an applicant for employment, or would affect adversely his wages, hours, or employment conditions, because of such individual's race, color, religion, or national origin.

(c) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer or labor organization to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

The above section in addition to robbing management of many of its powers of control and free choice will also abolish segregation in labor unions and in all business establishments. I call your attention particularly to subsection (b) wherein it states that it shall be unlawful employment practice for any labor organization to discriminate against any individual or to limit, segregate, or classify its membership, and so forth. This, in effect, throws the doors of all labor unions wide open to every class or type of person and will strike at the very foundation of labor unions. It will, indeed, limit and impair its effectiveness as a bargaining agency.

Another objectionable feature of this bill is the power of subpena given to the Commission to require witnesses and parties to appear at any place in the United States or its possessions. It destroys our long-established system of jurisdiction designed to insure that complainants and parties might have issues settled in local courts. Every paragraph of this bill is packed and crammed with dangerous language usurping rights Americans have long enjoyed under the protection of our Constitution and Bill of Rights. It will, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, be the saddest day in American history when and if the President affixes his signature to the FEPC Act. The consequences of this bill, if enacted, have not been considered and cannot be fully anticipated by many who plead for its passage. I say to you in all sincerity that this bill, if enacted, will do more to disturb racial relations in this Nation than anything that has been done since the Civil War. It will retard the advancement of the colored race in the South for many years. It will close the doors of many business firms in America operated by people who will refuse to accept the tyranny imposed by this legislation. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I fear that today we are modeling a weapon with which to destroy ourselves.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of FEPC bill, H. R. 4453.

I am now and have always been heartily in support of FEPC bill, H. R. 4453, and shall vote against all crippling amendments to this bill as well as any substitute bill offered in this body.

I feel that I am obligated to do this because such legislation is contemplated by the 1948 Democratic platform in plain, understandable words. In the greatest Presidential campaign known to our Republic, our greatest Democratic champion, President Harry S. Truman, the real spokesman of the Democratic Party, boldly campaigned for FEPC.

Furthermore, during the national campaign the majority of the States of the Nation voted for President Truman who openly and everlastingly advocated the passage of such legislation.

From the election of President Truman we can truthfully say that the latest national vote shows that the majority of the people of the Nation in voting for President Truman and his program placed their stamp of approval upon this FEPC legislation.

As a Democrat I campaigned actively for FEPC legislation and my opponent who then had served three terms in this Congress did not so campaign, and he was roundly defeated for his fourth term.

Because the Democratic platform contemplates this bill, President Truman recommends it, his civil rights committee recommends it, and I have pledged myself to support it after I had in all good conscience thought it was right. I must support it today.

In answer to the point made by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], that California voters had turned a State FEPC bill down by a crushing vote, I say to him that in the last election President Truman, the vigorous champion of national FEPC, carried California, and consequently from that fact I feel that I can claim, and rightfully, that California voters have endorsed a national FEPC.

The claim is also made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] that the present bill with teeth in it, is not the proper approach to do away with bigotry and discrimination. He argues that a real educational program carried on preferably in the early formative years of boys and girls is the only way to proceed. This sounds good, but does he realize that there is a need right now for FEPC, and that we cannot wait all the long years for education to jell,

and my honest opinion is that we would have to wait forever to educate some of the bigots and discriminators of this Nation.

If the reasoning of the gentleman from Kentucky was correct, then all laws should be self-executing—all laws should be drafted without penalties—and a great educational program should be conducted to appeal to the consciences of the law violators. The Jewish and Christian religions recommend the keeping of the Ten Commandments, and thousands of years have been spent trying to educate people as to their correctness and the wisdom of observing them, but that was unavailing.

Human laws had to be passed with stiff penalties against such offenses as murder, theft rape, false testimony, fornication, adultery, blasphemy, and laws relating to observing the Sabbath, all of which are contemplated by the Ten Commandments No, my friend, a specific law denouncing discrimination, whether founded upon bigotry or not, is but an idle legislative gesture unless there is available in that very same law such civil and criminal penalties as will make prospective offenders stop, look, and listen, and reform before they offend.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr RICH] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr O'HARA] make the claims that you cannot legislate effectively concerning one's morals, which is, indeed, a strange pronouncement from such big and respectable Republicans That is the same old claim which has oft been made by the red-light districts in many cities of the Nation, gambling institutions, and illicit liquor sellers and others who do not think constructively. No; I say that we must have human laws with real teeth in them to teach immoral people to be moral, Mr. RICH and Mr. O'HARA to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, the advocates of this measure say that it is in the interest of labor and the Negro. I believe that my voting record in the 15 years I have been in Congress shows that I have been a consistent friend of labor; and I believe I can show that I have been a consistent friend of the Negro.

I was born in Baton Rouge, grew up in Mississippi and I believe I know and understand their problems better than the Northern advocates of this bill.

The bill to coin 5,000,000 Booker T. Washington Memorial half-dollars was written in my office and favorably reported by the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures of which I was then Chairman, to commemorate the birth and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of that great American Negro, Booker T. Washington. These coins are now being sold at a premium to establish trade and industrial schools for Negro youth through the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, a nonprofit organization to bring industrial training to Negro youth, thereby improving the economic status of the Negro as well as our entire national economy.

I have today written a favorable report on a bill to make a national monument of the birthplace of George Washington Carver, the eminent Negro scientist, whose agricultural experiments have added millions of dollars in value to southern agriculture.

I believe that adequate industrial training and education will make the Negro self-sufficient and able to hold his own in the labor market and build up a measure of economic security for himself and family. After that, and with the full approval of the white South, where the majority of Negroes live, an equitable place will be found for the Negro as a citizen. He is rapidly reaching that place now.

But this so-called Fair Employment Practice Act will not help him and it will not help our country. I believe it is an instrument designed by Communists to cause trouble and discord, and contribute to the destruction of our country.

As a friend of labor and a friend of the Negro, I cannot accept the principle of this bill.

Note: Five million coins are purchased from the United States Treasury at 50 cents each and are being sold for $1. Gross profit $2,500,000 less cost of selling.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to this bill and urged its defeat. I have listened with undivided interest to some of the specious arguments which have been advanced here today in support of this measure and I must confess that I am amazed at some of the proposals advanced. I suppose that certain Members should be congratulated upon their eloquence—but certainly not on their logic as they have argued for the most fantastic measure ever to come before the Congress.

There are many reasons why this measure should not be passed. I have my own bill of particulars—and they are many—and I am also sure that many more valid arguments can and will be cited—but I shall mention only a few—which I believe are sufficient and should carry weight with reasonable men.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, this proposed bill is unconstitutional and a violation of the Bill of Rights.

Secondly, such a bill, if enacted into law, is totally unenforceable. Sound law is based upon public acceptance and this bill is designed to upset and change the economic and social and moral pattern of the lives of our citizens—being unacceptable—it would be unenforceable.

Third, such a bill, if enacted, would disrupt the operations of business and creditable labor unions and keep them in a constant state of turmoil, insecurity, and fear. It would result in chaos, social and economic unrest, and perhaps bloodshed.

Fourth, Mr. Chairman, this bill would establish a set of intangibles beyond the power of the Government to interpret and administer except by mass coercion and by the total usurpation of the rights of our individual citizens—rights which we have always cherished and maintained in our country.

Beyond these, Mr. Chairman, I think there is an additional argument which is not rebuttable and answerable and that is this:

If we thus make this body a party to any scheme to give the state—the Federal Government—power to compel nondiscrimination, we have made ourselves a party to a tyrannical usurpation of freedom by granting the state the power to compel discrimination. If we could legislate legally nondiscrimination in a matter of individual employment, we could pass a bill directing discrimination in favor of a certain class, color, or creed. We would thus be laying the groundwork for totalitarianism of the most complete pattern—and I refuse to be a party to such an unheard of scheme—tyrannical in its inception and purpose.

It is a possibility which permits of no compromise, no substitute action—only defeat.

We have heard the Bill of Rights cited at every turn and twist of the multitude of the arguments in support of this so-called fair employment practices bill. I deny that such action as this is called for in the Bill of Rights. Rather than furthering the Bill of Rights, this measure makes a mockery of our Nation's inherent and written fundamental law. The Bill of Rights, as we have come to know it, is the assertion of the purposes set forth in the first 10 amendments of our Constitution. And the one thought and precept paramount in the first 10 amendments of our great Constitution is the strict prohibition—on both the Federal Government and the States—of interference with religion, life, liberty, and freedom of our citizens. This was our first and foremost assertion of the right of the individual over the State and throughout our history the same basic and fundamental concept has been restated in many different ways—but no more eloquently than by that great Democrat and great American—Thomas Jefferson—who said over and over again—that the path of progress towards true democracy does not consist in granting more power to the Government—but in vesting more power in the people. I say, therefore, that this piece of legislation which has been brought before us is not only unconstitutional but a mockery of our Bill of Rights.

To those who bring into play the Bill of Rights in setting forth the purposes of this legislation—I can only say that it proves the truth of the Shakespearean line that "the devil can quote Scripture to his own purpose."

In emphasizing the unenforceability of this proposal, I would like to cite a statement made not so long ago by Mr. Donald Richberg, of Illinois, who formerly lent his talents in Government service.

Of an FEPC—in any form—Mr. Richberg declared:

> Unless the Government is to destroy economic system of competitive freedom and social system of free enterprise, it cannot undertake to interfere with the selection of one's associates in work or play.

On another occasion—quite recently—Mr. Richberg, who, I remind you, is not a southerner, but a man who speaks from the fullness of legal knowledge and just plain common sense, stated:

> Under this act, as similar laws have been administered, no employer could exercise his freedom of speech or freedom of the press, even to inquire as to race, color, or religion

of applicants for work or of his employees. Under this act, Federal bureaucrats could override an employer's judgment as to whom he should hire or promote. The employer would be forced to accept this outside, arbitrary judgment, or else engage in expensive lawsuit—not to vindicate his freedom of choice—but to demonstrate that his motives were free from any taint of a politically created immorality.

This bill does not confine the question of employment strictly to the act of initial employment. It follows the employer and his employees throughout all relations of employment. It touches any advancement, transfer, change, or promotion that might be made within a business—it burrows down deep into the most intimate details of a man's business and would have the effect of denying to any businessman the right to speak freely about the management of his own affairs. It would provide an excuse for every incompetent and unruly employee to bring lawsuit—ruinous lawsuit—against an employer if he is not advanced in his job according to his own—not his employer's—estimate of his abilities. I say to you frankly that this measure could be the most completely ruinous thing that could conceivably apply to the economic life of our Nation—and I may add that businessmen everywhere—not just in the South—hold this to be a true evaluation of the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I think I do not have to delve too deeply into ancient history to cite a most devastating example of the arbitrary attempt to enforce laws that will not be enforced—that are impossible of enforcement. I refer to the tragic era of the reconstruction in the South. Anyone who cares to go back to reconstruction days will see what happened in the South as a whole when it was attempted by misguided zealots and by predatory and venial carpetbaggers and opportunists to enforce laws in which the people of the South did not believe. It is simply impossible—and from the time of the ancients it has been the accepted course—to build our statutes and our laws upon the reality of enforcement without public approval and acceptance.

I know that many of the proponents of this measure are sincere men espousing their honest convictions. I know also that this measure has become a thinly veiled cause around which have rallied many insincere men and women. We of the South who are proud to bear the burden of this fight to kill this measure or any measure like it come with clean hands. We know what is in this bill—we know what it will do—we have studied it—and we feel that anyone else who has studied it closely will recognize in it things which they little dreamed could possibly lie within a bill presented to this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the true answer to the proposition which arises in connection with this legislation lies not in the passage of a force bill or penalty legislation, but in the influences of religion, tolerance, education, and the processes of culture. No law of human making can provide the answer—and we all know that, whether or not we sit on this side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle—whether or not we represent the North or the South—whether or not our constituents are crowded into city tenements or are sparsely settled amid agriculture lands.

This bill will never pass—it should not pass—unless we choose to repudiate the basic freedoms of our forefathers and tear down our house of democracy—destroy our basic freedoms and rights—and thus create a situation whereby the disciples of a totalitarian form of Government can walk in and pick up the pieces.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that reason will prevail in this body—and I am sure that it will—for I have unbounded faith in the temper and judgment of reasonable men—and as reasonable men we have each been accorded the honor and distinction of representing reasonable and temperate and just citizens.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, this House has a solemn duty to perform, and in good conscience, it can no longer ignore that duty. FEPC must be enacted into law now.

Because the people of this Nation demanded it, a permanent FEPC as well as other civil-rights measures, were promised by all political parties in their platforms. Definite pledges were made, and I, for one, will keep mine.

President Truman, in his state of the Union message delivered to Congress, stated that the surest guide in the days that lie ahead will be the spirit in which this great Republic was founded. He said we must make our decisions in the conviction that all men are created equal, that they are equally entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that the duty of Government is to serve these ends. In other words, he said that discrimination has no place in this country—it is undemocratic and un-American.

In his message, he reemphasized the need and urged the Congress to enact the civil-rights proposals he made in February 1948. He stated in his message that—

> As we go forward in achieving greater economic security and greater opportunity for all our people, we should make every effort to extend the benefits of our democratic institutions to every citizen. The religious ideals which we profess, and the heritage of freedom which we have received from the past, clearly place that duty upon us.

It is a sad commentary upon the workings of this great legislative body that we have ignored for so long the proposals submitted by our President, and the commitments we have made. We have appropriated many millions of dollars to reach persons abroad: to feed, clothe, and rehabilitate them. More important, our aim was to sell them our belief in democracy as opposed to any other ideology. How incongruous that at the same time Federal funds are spent in this country to maintain colleges and schools which discriminate against students by reason of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin.

One of the prime objectives of education is to promote understanding among men. From our institutions of higher learning come our professional men, statesmen, teachers, and leaders in our communities. Rank discrimination is practiced when any group has as one of its admission requirements that "members must be white persons of full Aryan blood." Such discrimination breeds lack of understanding—even hatred—and man commits crimes against his fellow men because of it. Yet we know that secret clauses such as the one quoted are contained in constitutions of many national fraternities, which have great influence in our colleges and which help mold the thinking of our youth. I was happy to note that Lafayette College of Easton, Pa., decided, after public pressure recently, to refuse a bequest of $140,000 left it, because of a clause that would have barred Catholics and Jews from obtaining Lafayette scholarships.

Our Federal Government in taking the stand it has abroad, cannot afford to be a party to this discriminatory and undemocratic system. The same is equally true with regard to the practice of discrimination in employment against properly qualified persons because of race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry. In my opinion, such practice has brought shame to our Nation. This practice is rampant—the results of it are tragic. Its victims are forced into substandard conditions of living; they are deprived of their equality of opportunity as guaranteed them under our Constitution. Since the United States is looked upon by all as the land of opportunity, our entire economic system is based upon the theory that a man shall be allowed to utilize his talents and training, and then reap the rewards of his industry and individual striving. We find that while these promises and assurances are taken for granted by many, and enjoyed by them—there are millions in this country whose ambition, training, studies, and qualifications avail them nothing. A young man may graduate at the head of his class and then find that because of the color of his skin—even though he may be a doctor of philosophy and wishes to teach—he is finally forced into menial employment. A young woman, qualified to be a good secretary, answers an ad in the newspaper, but is refused employment because of her religion or ancestry. There are many glaring examples of discrimination in employment—and they have come to the attention of all of us.

The effect of such discrimination is disastrous. Those who bear the brunt of it are unhappy and resentful, and rightly so. Initiative and ambition are lost, and the worker, refused his rightful chance to make good at his chosen occupation, becomes dispirited, and lacks that ambition which makes an efficient employee. In turn, production and business lose potentially valuable people, and the general welfare of the Nation is undermined.

For these reasons, I urge that the entire civil-rights program of the President be enacted into law during this session of Congress. I am not a newcomer in this fight. As a member of the New York State Legislature, I led in the fight in Albany, to wipe out such disgraceful practices. I have continued my efforts since becoming a Member of the Eighty-first Congress. In January 1949, I introduced an anti-Jim Crow travel bill;

an FEPC bill; an antilynching and anti-Jim Crow armed services bill. I also introduced a bill which would prohibit the use of Federal funds for housing where there is any discrimination against occupants on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, and national origin, as well as a bill providing that no Federal funds could be used for schools which discriminate between students by reason of race, color, religion, ancestry, and national origin.

H. R. 4453, the FEPC bill, is now before us for action. This would wipe out the un-American practice of discrimination in employment. Although nothing would have pleased me more than to have the bill under consideration bear my name, because of my deep interest in this problem, I am extremely happy to speak in favor of H. R. 4453.

At this time, we, as a Nation, are sending our emissaries throughout the world to say that our ideology is best, and that our people live under a true democratic system. Those who oppose us in our program of selling democracy to others, have a potent weapon against us when they point out how undemocratic we really are in our discriminatory practices, and that this land is indeed not one of equal opportunity. Our Government, engaged in its present struggle against communism, cannot afford to allow such discrimination to continue, and must take effective steps to end it. Our obligation as a signatory of the United Nation's Charter, "To promote universal respect for, and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion" are sacred. We should fulfill those obligations at once, and not be forced to observe them.

I quote again from the state of the Union message of our President, when he said:

> The ideal of equal opportunity no longer means simply the opportunity which a man has to advance beyond his fellows. Some of our citizens do achieve greater success than others as a reward for individual merit and effort, and this is as it should be. At the same time, our country must be more than a land of opportunity for a select few. It must be a land of opportunity for all of us. In such a land, all can grow and prosper together.

This is the ideal upon which this Nation was founded, and for which our forefathers sacrificed so much to achieve.

This House should consider it a signal honor that it has the opportunity to pass the bill now before it, which will insure true freedom and equal opportunity to all—but which now is only a myth to countless persons in the United States.

Let me make my views clear and unmistakable. Discrimination cannot be compromised. It must be eliminated. Our duty is obvious and can no longer be shirked; FEPC, demanded by our people, must be provided at once.

Democracy is on trial before the world, and we are being asked to practice what we preach. A vote for FEPC is a vote for democracy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for H. R. 4453, the fair employment practices bill, because I believe that it is a step toward the elimination of discrimination in the economic field of employment.

I do not believe that it is a final or perfect answer to prejudices and social taboos, which unfortunately are deeply imbedded in the minds of many of our people. I do believe that it will establish certain legal claims to employment by deserving people, who are now precluded from employment because of their race, color or religion.

By the establishment of legal claim to employment, as provided for in H. R. 4453, we do not thereby guarantee that all persons will be employed. We only say that no person shall be refused employment because of his race, color, or religion. There still remains many necessary qualifications for employment such as education, skill, experience, technical knowledge, and so forth.

This legislation, if enacted into law, will present many problems of administration because it lies in the uncertain area of human relations.

Human relations and attitudes cannot be changed suddenly by the enactment of a law. Such reversal or change can only occur gradually. However, the difficult objective of correcting the defects in our society—in this case, discrimination in the field of employment—should not deter us from making an attempt to reach a proper goal.

The merit of a law, in many instances, depends on the wisdom used in its administration. This is particularly the case in legislation which seeks to control or influence in the field of human relations, habits and attitudes.

Unless great wisdom is used in the administration of this law, the whole purpose of the proponents will be lost. If the intended beneficiaries of this legislation rely on legality alone to enforce their rights, I fear they will be grievously disappointed. Moderation in the pressing of claims to employment is equally desirable to wisdom in administration.

The most important justification in my opinion for passing H. R. 4453 is that it expresses clearly, and for the first time, our desire as a people to eradicate from our society one of its glaring and undemocratic defects.

We, in effect, admit that there has been, and continues to be, a withholding of economic rights which are basic for the full fruition of political democracy.

We admit that undemocratic prejudices, which still remain, are excluding certain groups in our society from part of the benefits of democracy.

Because we do believe that all of our citizens should have an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; because we wish to reaffirm our belief in those rights; and because we wish to assure every individual, regardless of race, color or religion, that he shall have those rights, we, the proponents of this legislation, intend to vote, if given the opportunity, for the Fair Employment Practices Act, H. R. 4453.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, the statements and testimony of the witnesses who appeared at the public hearings held before the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor last May in support of H. R. 4453 entitled "Federal Fair Employment Practices Act," bring to my mind vivid recollections of the work of the New York Temporary Commission Against Discrimination, which functioned under the chairmanship of Hon. IRVING M. IVES, our distinguished United States Senator from New York. It was my high privilege, as a member of the New York State Senate, to serve as the secretary to this commission, which held hearings in a number of cities throughout the State of New York. In all, a total of approximately 160 witnesses were heard from all walks of life. On the basis of the recommendations of the commission, the Ives-Quinn bill prohibiting discrimination in employment was approved by the State legislature on March 12, 1945. The act declared that the opportunity to obtain employment without discrimination is a civil right and emphasized education and conciliation as a means of remedying discriminatory practices. I would like to refer to the comprehensive provision of this pioneer measure later. Now, I wish to refer to certain economic and social aspects of this problem of discrimination in employment.

The right to equality of opportunity of each individual to obtain useful employment without regard to race, color, creed, and national origin is essential to the well-being of the individual and to the progress of our society. A witness before a congressional committee recently stated:

> Discrimination in employment damages lives, both the bodies and the minds, of those discriminated against and those who discriminate. It blights and perverts that healthy ambition to improve one's standard of living which we like to say is peculiarly American. It generates insecurity, fear, resentment, division, and tension in our society.

In private business, in Government, and in labor unions, the war years saw a marked advance both in hiring policies and in the removal of on-the-job discriminatory practices. Several factors contributed to this progress. The short labor market, the sense of security among the people, and the leadership provided by the Government all helped to bring about a lessening of unfair-employment practices. Yet, we did not eliminate discrimination in employment. The final report of the Federal Fair Employment Practice Committee, established in 1941 by President Roosevelt to eliminate discrimination in both Government and private employment related to the war effort, makes this clear. Four out of five cases which arose during the life of the Committee concerned Negroes. However, many other minorities have suffered from discriminatory employment practices. The FEPC reports show that 8 percent of the committee's docket involved complaints of discrimination because of creed, and 70 percent of these concerned Jews.

A survey conducted by the United States Employment Service reveals that of the total job orders received by the USES offices in 11 selected areas during February 1–15, 1946, 24 percent of the orders were discriminatory. Of 38,195

orders received, 9,171 included specifications with regard to race, citizenship, religion, or some combination of these factors

The National Community Relations Advisory Council studied hiring practices since VJ-day. A 1946 survey of the practices of 134 private employment agencies in 10 cities disclosed that 89 percent of these agencies included questions covering religion on their registration forms. A companion study of the help-wanted ads conducted in eight major cities during corresponding weeks in 1945 and 1946 showed that while the total volume of help-wanted advertising had declined, there was an over-all increase of 195 percent in discriminatory ads for 1946 over 1945.

The minority job seeker often finds that there are fields of employment where application is futile no matter how able or well-trained he is. Many northern business concerns have an unwritten rule against appointing Jews to executive positions; railroad management and unions discourage the employment of Negroes as engineers or conductors. If he can get himself hired, the minority worker often finds that he is being paid less than other workers. This wage discrimination is sharply evidenced in studies made of individual cities. A survey by the American Federation of Labor shows that the average weekly income of white veterans ranges from 30 to 78 percent above the average weekly income of Negro veterans in 26 communities, 25 of them in the South.

While private business provided almost 70 percent of all cases docketed by the FEPC for the fiscal year 1943–44, about a fourth of the complaints were against the Federal Government itself. A case study, conducted in one Government agency by the National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capital, demonstrates a pattern of discrimination existing in Government service. It was found that the white workers had received 12 grade promotions in a total service of 22 years. This was an average of one promotion for each two man-years of service. The Negro workers had received two grade promotions in a total service of 28 man-years. This was one promotion for each 14 man-years of service. In other words, of the 503 whites and 292 Negroes inducted into the agency in the fiscal year 1946 from which 40 pairs were found perfectly matched for the variables of age, sex, marital status, educational level, length of service, division in which inducted, and job title and grade at which inducted, it took the average Negro seven times as long as the average white to get a promotion.

Finally, labor unions are guilty of discriminatory labor practices. Six percent of the complaints received by the FEPC were made against unions. It should, however, be noted that great strides have been made in the admission of minorities to unions. Both the A. F. of L. and the CIO have repeatedly condemned discriminatory union practices. But the national organizations have not yet fully attained their goals. Some railway unions have Jim Crow auxiliaries into which Negroes, Mexicans, or orientals are shunted, with little or no voice in union affairs. Furthermore, there is a rigid upper limit on the type of job on which these members can be employed. A witness, who testified as recently as last May before the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor, stated that five major railroad unions bar Negroes, Mexican-Americans, and Japanese-Americans from membership entirely.

As pointed out in the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, economic discrimination prevents full use of all our resources. During the war, when we were called upon to make an all-out productive effort, we found that we lacked skilled laborers. This shortage might not have been so serious if minorities had not frequently been denied opportunities for training and experience. In the end, it cost large amounts of money and precious time to provide ourselves with trained persons.

One of the principal economic problems facing us and the rest of the world is achieving maximum production and continued prosperity. The loss of a huge, potential market for goods is a direct result of the economic discrimination which is practiced against many of our minority groups A sort of vicious circle is produced. Discrimination depresses the wages and income of minority groups. As a result, their purchasing power is curtailed and markets are reduced. Reduced markets result in reduced production. This cuts down employment, which of course means lower wages and still fewer job opportunities. Rising fear, prejudice, and insecurity aggravate the very discrimination in employment which sets the vicious circle in motion.

Minority groups are not the sole victims of this economic waste; its impact is inevitably felt by the entire population. Eric Johnston, when president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, made this point with vividness and clarity:

> The withholding of jobs and business opportunities from some people does not make more jobs and business opportunities for others. Such a policy merely tends to drag down the whole economic level You can't sell an electric refrigerator to a family that can't afford electricity. Perpetuating poverty for some merely guarantees stagnation for all. True economic progress demands that the whole Nation move forward at the same time It demands that all artificial barriers erected by ignorance and intolerance be removed. To put it in the simplest terms, we are all in business together. Intolerance is a species of boycott and any business or job boycott is a cancer in the economic body of the Nation. I repeat, intolerance is destructive; prejudice produces no wealth; discrimination is a fool's economy.

Mr. Chairman, there is a danger that some of our wartime gains in the elimination of unfair employment practices will be lost unless prompt action is taken to preserve them. In its final report, the FEPC pointed out that the wartime gains of Negro, Mexican-American, and Jewish workers are being lost through an unchecked revival of discriminatory practices. The committee urged that steps be taken by the Government to meet the evil of unequal opportunity among Americans. Although emphasis was placed upon the efficacy of informal negotiation, community educational efforts, and public hearings in dealing with instances of discrimination, the committee expressed the belief that "no device will solve the problem short of the enactment by Congress of fair employment legislation."

On July 29, 1949, H. R. 4453, which embodies the administration's fair employment practices program, was approved by the House Committee on Education and Labor. This bill, which stresses the voluntary compliance and educational approach, prohibits discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and creates a permanent national commission against discrimination in employment to prevent such discrimination. The bill, which covers agencies of the Federal Government, employers of 50 or more persons whose operations affect interstate or foreign commerce, Federal contractors and subcontractors who employ 50 or more persons, and labor unions whose practices affect interstate commerce, extends protection against discrimination in employment to such principal minority groups as 13,000,000 Negroes, 5,000,000 Jews, 20,000,000 Catholics, 3,000,000 Americans of Mexican and Hispanic origin, and 11,000,000 persons of foreign birth. The Commission is empowered to investigate each written sworn charge of discrimination in employment, to consider the employer's or union's explanation, and to appraise all the surrounding circumstances in each case. The burden of proof is on the complainant and not on the party accused. If the Commission believes the charge has merit, it will take steps to adjust it by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. A feature of the bill provides for the setting up of regional, State, and local conciliation councils to promote fair-employment practices by information, education, and conciliation. Where settlement is not possible by conciliation, the Commission will conduct a full and fair hearing in which the party charged has the right by counsel to present his version of the facts and to cross-examine witnesses. After the hearing, the Commission will issue a decision and order. If the order is not complied with, the Commission will appeal to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals to enforce it. Defiance of the court order will subject the respondent to penalties for contempt of court. The Commission's orders are enforcible only by the courts after full hearing. The bill itself provides no criminal or civil penalties, except a penalty from $100 to $500 for refusal to post in work places notices regarding the act, and a fine of up to $500 and imprisonment up to 1 year for forcibly interfering with a member or employee of the Commission in the performance of his duties.

The Commission is empowered to dismiss all groundless charges on its own initiative, without formal hearings and before there is any contact with the accused employer. The FEPC dismissed two-thirds of all the complaints filed with it. It thus served as a necessary safety valve for persons who thought they were discriminated against. The Commission, likewise, would fill this need.

The bill places no restriction on the employer's right to employ or to upgrade an employee on the basis of his own judgment of the candidate's training, experience, ability, personality, or whatever standards he may choose to set. Nor does the bill force business to hire any person or refrain from firing any specific person. On the contrary, it protects the employer in his right to choose the best candidate without regard to race, religion, color, or national origin.

To repeat, an employer may hire or reject anyone he pleases, on any basis and for any reason, so long as a needed and qualified person is not rejected because of his race, religion, color, or national origin. Nor does the bill require an employer to hire a particular percentage or quota of Negroes or of any other minority group since such a practice is itself discriminatory.

The bill helps to eliminate unfair price cutting by competitors who pay lower wages to members of minority groups. It will promote smooth working relationships, reduce labor turn-over and interruptions, and thereby promote efficient production at lower unit costs. Establishing fair employment will add, in the case of Negro wage earners alone, a new domestic purchasing power and market of approximately $10,000,000,000 a year, according to estimates by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

It is not wishful thinking on my part when I state that the bill, if enacted into law, will prove very successful in operation. No better proof can be offered than the experience of my home State of New York and the experience of three other States—New Jersey, Massachusets, and Connecticut—which, since 1945, have banned discrimination in employment and labor-union membership. Two more States in the Midwest have passed anti-discrimination laws since 1945. A recent report of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress shows that 36 States and 5 cities as of May 1948 passed laws and ordinances providing for the elimination of discrimination in one or more fields of employment. Twenty-three State legislatures in all considered FEPC legislation this year.

In general, the laws in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut make it unlawful for employers to discriminate in hiring, firing, or conditions of employment, or for labor unions to exclude, expel, or discriminate, because of race, color, creed, or national origin. The use of discriminatory help-wanted ads and job applications by employers and employment agencies are prohibited. The State commissions are empowered to investigate complaints, to hold hearings, to attempt to conciliate, to issue cease-and-desist orders, and finally, to seek court enforcement of these orders. The progress that has been made in New York under its fair employment practice act is made very clear by the first annual report of the State commission against discrimination. In its introduction, the report states:

> The operation of the law has definitely resulted in progress in the elimination of illegal discriminatory practices. The testimony of people actually engaged in job-placement activities reveals that fields of opportunity previously closed to certain groups are now open to all, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. Resistance to the law has lessened as demonstrated by the fact that employees of all groups are being hired and upgraded into new occupational categories Preemployment discriminatory inquiries are now the rarity, rather than the rule.

Conciliation proceedings conducted by the New York State Commission Against Discrimination in the first year of its operation met with marked success. During that time the commission passed upon more than 300 complaints charging discrimination in employment. It was not necessary in any case which reached the conciliation stage to advance beyond it to the next stage—that of a formal hearing. In this connection it is worth noting that a total of 1,200 cases a year are being settled under the fair employment practice statutes in the States of New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey, but not once have they used their powers of enforcement. Not once have any of them gone as far as public administrative hearing on a complaint. As one observer of the operation of these fair employment practice statutes stated:

> Embarrassment, not harassment or punishment, is the chief sanction—embarrassment over being caught not living up in deeds to American principles of fairness we all acknowledge in words.

One employer of hundreds of workers, who made changes in his practice after a charge of discrimination, expressed satisfaction with the results in these words:

> Some of the new people I've hired are outstanding This is a good law. I'm glad I've hired these workers. You ought to point out to employers the benefits they get from an increased labor market when they have access to so many more qualified workers

In a detailed report on its operations and accomplishments covering the first 3½ years up to December 31, 1948, the New York State Commission Against Discrimination referred to a number of industries which were opened to employment for Negroes without the need for the commission to issue cease-and-desist orders The commission also stated that 17 unions agreed to eliminate discriminatory membership policies.

This problem of prohibiting discrimination in employment cannot be handled by the States themselves. Federal action is needed to protect States having such laws against unfair competition in other States that do not have such laws. Federal action is also needed because most large employers or trade-unions have plants or locals scattered throughout the country in every State. The administration's bill does not impair or conflict with existing State laws, nor does it invade States' rights. In fact, the bill authorizes the Commission to turn complaints over to State and local authorities where there are parallel laws prohibiting discrimination. The bill does not apply to State or municipal employees or to any State agency, nor does it apply to small retail stores, small farms or domestic servants. In applying only to those employers who are engaged in interstate commerce or in operations affecting such commerce and who employ 50 or more persons, the bill supplements and dovetails with State laws. Furthermore, the bill does not repeal or impair veterans' preferences. All veterans' preferences are explicitly continued in effect.

The administration's bill has nothing to do with personal or social relationships. It is concerned only with equality of job opportunity. Will such a bill, if enacted into law, cause riots or bloodshed? On the contrary, it will lessen the danger of such violence because orderly governmental procedure will be substituted for mob action. After the last war there were 26 major race riots. A repetition must be avoided. If enacted, this bill will do that job.

As pointed out in the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, our position in the postwar world is so vital to the future that our smallest actions have far-reaching effects. We have come to know that our own security in a highly interdependent world is inextricably tied to the security and well-being of all people and all countries. Our foreign policy is designed to make the United States an enormous positive influence for peace and progress throughout the world. We have tried to let nothing, not even extreme political differences between ourselves and foreign nations, stand in the way of this goal. But our domestic shortcomings with respect to civil rights are a serious obstacle. In a letter to the Fair Employment Practice Committee on May 8, 1946, the Honorable Dean Acheson, then Acting Secretary of State, stated that—

> The existence of discrimination against minority groups in this country has an adverse effect upon our relations with other countries. We are reminded over and over by some foreign newspapers and spokesmen, that our treatment of various minorities leaves much to be desired While sometimes these pronouncements are exaggerated and unjustified, they all too frequently point with accuracy to some form of discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin Frequently, we find it next to impossible to formulate a satisfactory answer to our critics in other countries, the gap between the things we stand for in principle and the facts of a particular situation may be too wide to be bridged An atmosphere of suspicion and resentment in a country over the way a minority is being treated in the United States is a formidable obstacle to the development of mutual understanding and trust between the two countries We will have better international relations when these reasons for suspicion and resentment have been removed
>
> I think it is quite obvious * * * that the existence of discriminations against minority groups in the United States is a handicap in our relations with other countries. The Department of State, therefore, has good reason to hope for the continued and increased effectiveness of public and private efforts to do away with these discriminations.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat here what I stated before that the right to equality of opportunity of each individual to obtain useful employment without regard to race, color, creed, and

national origin is essential to the well-being of the individual and to the progress of our society. We abhor the totalitarian arrogance which makes one man say that he will respect another man as his equal only if he has my race, my religion, my social position. Our American heritage teaches us that to be secure in the rights he wishes for himself, each man must be willing to respect the rights of other men. We have the democratic opportunity and responsibility to build social institutions that will guarantee equality of opportunity to all men. Without this equality freedom becomes an illusion. As stated by a great American, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, "The strength of this Nation shall not be diluted by the failure of the Government to protect the well-being of its citizens." It is for the Congress of the United States to implement this pledge with action by the speedy enactment of H. R. 4453 into the law of the land.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Chairman, to date the record of the Congress of the United States on civil rights matters is one of dire inaction. The American people do not want it that way, Mr. Chairman. The American people voted for a President in 1948 who meant what he said about civil rights and for a party that had the courage to take an uncompromising stand on this most vital issue of the twentieth century.

If this Eighty-first Congress had a mandate for anything, it surely had a mandate to enact the President's civil-rights program The platform of the Democratic Party in the 1948 elections stated clearly and specifically full support of fair employment practices legislation. However, it would be foolish for me to overlook the opposition to FEPC within my own party. I know the objections of my friends from the South. I respect their convictions, but I am equally convinced that they are dead wrong. Even though they may be liberal on many issues, they are afflicted with a sense of blind opposition to all measures designed to eliminate racial discrimination. I appreciate the historical background that lies at the base of their prejudices. If it were only a matter of prejudice, I would not be so concerned. As long as prejudice remains within the workings of a man's mind, it is an individual problem; and we may hope that someday the blot of prejudice will be wiped from the minds of Americans. However, when prejudice becomes an overt act of unfairness in employment against any person because of his race, color, or creed, it is no longer an individual's problem. When a citizen is denied a job only because he is a Negro, or a Jew, or a Catholic, or because he belongs to any other minority, we have a social problem—a problem for all of society against which we the people can and must act.

I will agree with the point that my southern colleagues have repeatedly brought out that discrimination is not only a problem of the South but that discrimination takes place in the North as well. It happens all over the country and that is even more reason for a Federal law to protect the individual's rights everywhere in this great Nation of ours.

Let us turn for a moment to look at the economic aspects of job discrimination. This can be done in cold dollar and cents terms. The last census showed that the median annual income for the white high-school graduate was $1,454 compared to $775 for the Negro high-school graduate. Twenty-three out of every 100 white high-school graduates had incomes of over $2,000. Only 4 out of 100 Negro high-school graduates had incomes that high. Here are Negro and white citizens with the same amount of education and training—but discrimination makes sure that the Negro citizen gets less money for this work. These are not the only fruits of discrimination; delinquency, criminality, illiteracy, social tension, poor health, and racial unrest all spring from this undemocratic process.

I have heard it said by many, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot solve this problem of discrimination by legislation. Many of my southern friends have said that education is the only way. Well, I am for education; it is easy to be for education, and many of us are too willing to make it a cure of all evils. But let us remember this: Racial and religious discrimination in employment are morally wrong. They are truly un-American. They make a mockery of all that we have praised so highly in the Brotherhood Week just concluded. They violate the ethics of fair play and equality as we were taught as children and which we teach our children today, and I say to you, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, that we must make these wrongs illegal. We can make it clear that we disapprove of these practices by putting them outside the law. I have never heard anyone argue that a law against robbery stops robbery or a law against murder stops murder, but it makes robbery and murder illegal; and whoever commits these crimes is liable to punishment.

I do not deny the value of education. I say to you that we need more education, particularly in the field of human relations, but I say further that progressive liberal FEPC legislation which gives force to our moral principles is in itself educational. We must keep faith with the American people and vote FEPC today.

Mr. RODINO. Mr Chairman, it is obvious that the conscience of the American people is aroused about the great moral and economic issue of FEPC—Fair Employment Practices. I know that the opinion and conscience of the citizens of my district favor enactment of FEPC. They believe, and I am sure that the American people believe, that enactment is long overdue.

More than 20,000,000 members of minority groups—Negroes, Jews, Catholics, Protestants—are daily suffering the discrimination, the humiliation, the hardship, and the bitter disillusionment of discrimination in employment. The hard fact is that today unemployment is twice as great among members of minority groups as it is among the population as a whole.

Every index of public opinion supports the conclusion that the American people want this legislation and want it now. All church groups are for it. The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations are for it. Even the Gallup poll, which is not noted for overrepresenting the liberal position on any issue, has in recent weeks reported a majority for FEPC.

There is no use in beating around the bush on this issue. Procrastination and delay play into the hands of those who fear and fight FEPC. The victory for democratic processes won on January 20 must be followed through to victory for FEPC, at least on the floor of the House and on the record by which we shall be judged in the 1950 primaries and the elections.

FEPC means democracy in employment, democracy on the job. It means fairness in the hiring of qualified workers, in the upgrading and promotion of workers on the basis of performance and ability.

The misrepresentations that have been made about FEPC are many—too numerous to deal with in these brief remarks. Let me deal here only with one. It is stated that FEPC is an attempt to legislate against prejudice, that prejudice cannot be dealt with by legislation, and that any attempt to do so is as doomed to failure as was prohibition.

In the first place, FEPC is not addressed to prejudice; it is not aimed at prejudice; it does not pretend to abolish prejudice What FEPC is aimed at is discrimination in employment, which is the exercise of prejudice either by employers or by labor organizations. FEPC proposes to see to it that qualified workers are not discriminated against either in employment or in promotion because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. It does not provide for the firing of individuals, or the hiring of individuals.

The FEPC bill provides that fair practices shall be observed by both employer and labor organizations It is a tribute to organized labor that the two great organizations of labor, the A F. of L. and CIO, have not only accepted this bill, but have been among its most active supporters Many individual employers join with them and with all the organized religious groups in demanding enactment of this bill.

It is true that prohibition was a failure, but it is not true that laws against driving while drunk are a failure. They are effective. Similarly, FEPC, which does not attempt to act against prejudice, but only against the irresponsible, socially and economically harmful expression of prejudice in discrimination in employment, will work. It will be accepted by the American people, by employers, by workers and their organizations.

This is not a mere expression of faith and hope. It is based upon experience. It is based upon the experience of my home State of New Jersey, and on the experience of the States of New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, even the experience of the city of Minneapolis which enacted a municipal FEPC years ago.

In most of these States, FEPC was not adopted and is not administered as a

partisan measure. It was adopted and is applied as a nonpartisan measure. That is the way it should be dealt with here. I believe it will be.

One more point before I conclude: The FEPC bill is an effective bill because it has provision for enforcement by judicial review and court order, and penalty for defiance of that order. This bill, like the model State laws from which it was adapted, prescribes preliminary steps which must be taken one at a time before the charge of discrimination can be either made the subject of a commission hearing or come before a court. Those steps are information, education, conciliation, and mediation. The experience in my own State and in the other States which have nearly identical laws shows that these preliminary steps are sufficient to reduce the work toward the complete elimination of discrimination in employment.

Some say, "Well, since it has not been found necessary to resort to formal public hearings and to court trials for enforcement, why keep them in the bill?" The answer is that if you take out of this bill the power of subpena, the power to require attendance at the conciliation and mediation sessions; the power to require the production of books and papers; and the ultimate power to hold public hearings and go to the courts for enforcement of commission orders, you will have observance of FEPC only by those who will be fair anyway. Those who practice discrimination would, in the absence of the power to require appearance and the power to enforce findings and orders, simply thumb their noses at even the most tentative suggestion that charges of discrimination should be discussed.

It is my deep feeling that this measure is just, it is long overdue; that it will meet the needs of many millions of our people, will satisfy the opinion of the conscience of the American people, and will strengthen the confidence of the American people in this House and its operation.

Three years ago, when hearings were being held on this bill, spokesmen for minority groups pointed out the daily injustices and hardships that were being suffered by members of those groups. They gave statistics. They gave examples. They pointed out that the establishment of FEPC would improve wages, would strengthen and sustain purchasing power, would morally and materially strengthen our national security in the global contest between the principles and practices of freedom and the unprincipled practices of totalitarianism.

It was said at that time, and it is truer now than then, that "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick."

Let us not longer defer the hope of the American people. Let us record our votes in favor of this proposal to establish justice in employment for all our people.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman, I would that I had the power to make you see and realize the injustice and irreparable injury that will be caused by the passage of this legislation.

The bill before the House, H. R. 4453 proposes to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion or national origin.

This bill seeks to set up for the imaginary protection of a certain class—a new supposedly civil right, and, in order to do this, its proponents ask Congress to tear down and over-ride the Constitution of the United States and its amendments.

The act is unconstitutional, and in my opinion, no court would ever hold it constitutional. It takes away the rights of the individual as guaranteed by the Constitution, and attempts, by an act of Congress, to bestow upon other individuals' rights which do not exist and never should exist.

It denies to the employer the right to employ in his business or factory whom he desires and it brazenly tells him that he must employ a member of a certain class even if it means the disruption and final destruction of his entire business.

Section 5 (a):

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—(1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin, or (2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other sources which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, color, religion, or national origin. It seeks to tell labor organizations who shall or shall not be entitled to membership and employment benefits by providing as follows—

Section 5 (b):

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any labor organization to discriminate against any individual or to limit, segregate, or classify its membership in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive such individual of employment opportunities, or would limit his employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee or as an applicant for employment, or would affect adversely his wages, hours, or employment conditions, because of such individual's race, color, religion, or national origin.

It is an invasion of the rights of the States to manage their own internal affairs. The proponents of this legislation entirely or purposely overlooked the first ten amendments to the Constitution known as the Bill of Rights which enumerate certain natural rights which Congress shall not abridge, including, in the first amendment, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of speech and freedom of assembly.

The ninth amendment makes clear that other rights than these enumerated do exist and are retained by the people.

The tenth amendment expressly limits the power of the Federal Government to those delegated to it by the Constitution and reserves all other powers to the States or to the people. The Supreme Court of the United States has held uniformly that any power to create a civil right, unless specifically delegated to the United States by the Constitution, has been reserved to the separate States.

In support of this position I call your attention to *Hodges* v. *United States* (203 U. S. 1); *United States* v. *Wheeler* (254 U. S. 281); *National Virginia Board of Education* v. *Barnett* (319 U. S. 638); *Douglas* v. *City of Jeanette* (319 U. S. 157). Numerous other cases can be cited.

They seek to avoid and get around these barriers by use of the frayed and time-worn interstate and foreign commerce subterfuge.

But I contend the problem dealt with in this bill is one with which the individual States should deal. If your State wants to set up an FEPC it has the power to enact such laws. But it is apparent the States want none of it.

In a number of States where the people had an opportunity to vote on such legislation it has been defeated. This includes California and other Western States. And where it has been adopted, I am told it has been a complete failure. While this legislation is sectional in part and you may feel that it will affect the South alone, in this you are sadly mistaken.

It is of such far-reaching proportions and will have such detrimental effect upon our country as a whole, that I feel it is my duty to appeal to you gentlemen from the North, the West, and the East to join with us from the South in defeating this bill.

No legislation brought before this House, since the days of reconstruction and the iniquitous force bill is so vicious in character and of such a nature as to create such dissension among citizens, and set group against group and class against class, race against race, as this bill.

What does the bill do? It arouses intolerance and prejudice in the minds of all involved. It injures those who its proponents claim to be interested in helping. It is class legislation of the extremist type. It abrogates the right of contracts. The constitutional rights of the employer are denied by this legislation. It is discrimination to the extent that constitutional rights would be denied employers in order to satisfy the demands of those claiming to have been deprived of their rights. It can be ruinous to the man who has spent a lifetime building up a business:

First. Charges of unfair employment practices would be easy to make by an unscrupulous and irresponsible applicant and hard and costly to disprove.

Second. The burden of proving that an applicant is not qualified for a job would fall upon an employer.

Third. Employers would be required to comply with interpretations and decisions made by a partisan or a prejudicial administration.

This bill provides for the appointment of a Commission composed of five members, the Chairman receiving $20,000 and the other members $17,500 each, and it further empowers this Commission to appoint such officers and as it deems necessary to assist in the performance of its functions—no limitation to the number of employees that could be retained, to send from one end of the country to the other to pry into the business of every free-born American citizen who happens to employ 50 persons or more. The cost to the taxpayers of this country can be tremendous. While its enforcement will

practically be impossible, it further proposes to pay witnesses whose depositions are taken, or who are summoned before the Commission, or any of its agents, the same fees and mileage paid in the courts of the United States.

Mind you, gentlemen, these fees are paid, not for the purpose of trial, when a law has been violated and an indictment returned as in the United States court, but also for the purpose of investigating to see if this act has been violated. It does away with the right of trial by jury. It compels the alleged violators to give evidence against himself, an unheard of procedure in American jurisprudence, and in direct violation of the sixth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Section 9 (e) provides:

No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpœna of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty of forfeiture, but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for, or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying. The immunity herein provided shall extend only to natural persons so compelled to testify.

While this section does provide that no individual shall be prosecuted or subject to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction or matter he is compelled to testify or produce evidence. It does provide that the individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury in so testifying and the immunity shall extend only to natural persons.

Under this act a swarm of Federal investigators could be employed to camp on the doorstep of every factory in America.

Bear in mind, my colleagues, that this act does not apply to the South alone. It applies to the great manufacturing plants of the North, East, the Middle West, and the West.

You Republicans who speak so often and so loudly of your love for free enterprise, stop and think before you vote for this legislation, for if you support it, you are sounding the death knell of all free enterprise in America.

Some of you may be laboring under the delusion that this act will not affect your section, but I say to you frankly and in all sincerity that, in my opinion your sections will suffer just as much by its enactment as the South.

There are many places in the United States where the Negro is not even permitted to stop, much less to seek employment or a place to live and educate his family, and that is not in the South. I know of no place in Tennessee, or Georgia, or Alabama, or Mississippi, or Louisiana, or any Southern State where a black man or a man of any other race or religion is not permitted to live in peace and in happiness and does not enjoy the opportunity to earn an honest and decent livelihood.

I think I can safely say to you, that the black man has received fairer treatment in the South where he is known and understood than he will ever receive anywhere else on earth. Our factories, our lumber mills, and farmers have employed and are employing him and have done so since he was freed. We have provided schools for him and have sought to educate him both morally and industrially. In the South, there exists an affection and loyalty between blacks and whites as in no other section.

While the white people of the South have paid 95 percent of the taxes, the Negro has received his full share of its benefits. We of the South have no grudge against the Negro. We know his faults and his weaknesses and we overlook both, and recognize his virtues. The Negro has made great progress in the past 85 years. In my section we have Negro doctors, lawyers, merchants, farmers, teachers, preachers, operators of trucking and taxi lines, architects, contractors, and carpenters. They have entered into all kinds of professions and businesses. They have prospered and are respected in the community. Only a few days ago I read in the paper of my home that a Negro lawyer had announced his candidacy subject to the Democratic primary for one of the judgeships on the session court of our county, and in doing so, he stated:

Hamilton County has heretofore honored Negroes by electing them on justice of the peace courts, and since race relations here are fine, I believe that today is no exception.

I merely sight that instance to show that good feeling exists in the South between the two races, and it will continue to exist if we are left alone to work out our own salvation without interference from selfish propagandists from the North who know nothing of our problems and care less.

In the hope that you, my colleagues, on the left of this chamber will be influenced by the wisdom of one of your really great statesmen of the past, I quote from Senator Borah's speech in the United States Senate on January 7, 1938, when discussing another bill dealing with civil rights he said:

Notwithstanding anything that has been said or that may be said, this is a sectional measure. It is an attempt upon the part of the States practically free from the race problem to sit in harsh judgment upon their sister States where the problem is always heavy and sometimes acute.

In my opinion, the southern people have met the race problem and dealt with it with greater patience, greater tolerance, greater intelligence, and greater success than any people in recorded history dealing with a problem of similar nature.

And in conclusion, the Senator from Idaho said:

The progress, the development, and the advancement of the South, including the last 70 arduous years, her history from Washington and Jefferson down, rich with the names of leaders, orators, statesmen, her soil, her sunshine, her brave and hospitable people, her patient and successful wrestling with the most difficult of all problems are all a part of the achievement of our common country and constitutes no ignoble portion of the strength and glory of the American democracy.

I will cast no vote in this Chamber that reflects upon her fidelity to our institutions, or upon her ability and purpose to maintain the principles upon which they rest.

No manufacturer, no businessman, no employer, wherever he may be situated, is willing or wants the United States Government to tell him who he may employ or who he may discharge, and that is exactly what this bill undertakes to do.

I urge you to defeat this bill, for it can do naught but bring trouble and dissatisfaction to a reasonably happy people.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SIMS], whose sympathy with many liberal viewpoints has won him the friendship of liberals from the North, has sought in his presentment of the southern viewpoint on the pending bill to make a distinction between civil rights and human rights. His opposition to this bill he bases upon his conclusion that its effects would place civil rights in priority to human rights.

I am afraid I cannot agree with the distinguished gentleman. That which for convenience in reference we call a bill for civil rights stems from the human right of all men and women to live. Men and women in a complex industrial society, unless born of families of means, cannot live unless they have gainful employment. Shelter, food, clothing, everything necessary to keep body and soul together, must come from the proceeds of that employment.

This bill aims at affording all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States an equal opportunity in obtaining and holding such employment without any discrimination based upon racial and religious prejudices.

I fail to see where there could be any human right more fundamental than the right to live, and it is to establish that right to live on the part of millions of our countrymen now discriminated against that this proposed legislation has been presented. I don't care what you call it—civil rights, as is the easy term in the vocabulary of its proponents, or something sought to be forced upon us in priority of human rights, as the gentleman from South Carolina says. I do not think the good men and women in the galleries above us are interested in labels. No matter what you call it, this is a bill to give human beings the right to live and to enjoy equal opportunities in employment when possessed of equal qualifications.

I can conceive of a situation when a period of great unemployment, such as was visited upon us in the early thirties when the policies of reactionary government brought us to a wreck, those men and women in the groups discriminated against, being the first to be dismissed, and the last to be reemployed, would be doomed as individuals and as a group to unwarranted privations and in many instances to actual starvation.

No, Mr. Chairman, the right to live of all human beings, without regard to color

or race or religion, can never be inferior to any of the rights of a more fortunate and numerous group. I know of nothing in the Constitution of the United States, certainly nothing in the law of God, that establishes the right to discriminate against one's brother in priority to the brother's right to live.

Mr. Chairman, this day in this Chamber, where so many great battles have been fought and won for human rights, will long be remembered. Today an old and passing order made its last stand.

The galleries in this Chamber have been filled for the many hours that we have been here. Until the general debate began, 5 hours after we convened at noon, there was little of excitement to command the interest of those packed galleries. The monotonous calling of the hundreds of names on one roll call after another was all that we, the Representatives of the people in what has been termed the greatest deliberative body in the world, had to offer.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, those galleries have remained packed hour after hour, and they will be packed, I venture to say, all night and all day tomorrow if it takes that time to bring this bill to a vote.

I ask my colleagues to look upward at the faces of the men and women looking down at us. There is nothing of idle curiosity in those faces. I have never seen reflected in the faces of any gathering more sincerity of feeling, more intensity of emotion, the greater marked because restrained. With rapt attention from the galleries above they look upon everything which is transpiring.

If I read aright the expression in their faces it is one reflective of their joy that on this day and in this Chamber the good fight has been made and is on its way to triumph—the good fight to end discrimination in the opportunity to get and hold a job—the good fight for the human right to live if everyone, even those of other races, creeds, and color.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that in the Second District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent, the sentiment for the passage of this bill is overwhelming. In Chicago we do not like any sort of discrimination.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me I would like to make clear why I am opposed to the FEPC bill. It has been said before but I would repeat that you do not give one person more liberty by taking liberty from another. This bill would do just that. In taking the right of an employer to determine who he wants to hire, how he wants to promote them, or who he may want to fire, is in my opinion, destructive of his constitutionally guaranteed individual freedom.

At the same time such legislation is discriminatory toward all employees in that it attempts to coerce them into working along side of or with other persons with whom they may not be compatible. We know from long experience that you cannot make people like each other by passing a law saying that they should. The improvement of relations between various groups is going to come from education and not from the decrees of Congressmen. This bill would be destructive of the harmony now existing between the races in the South. Great strides have been made in education, job opportunity and living conditions in recent years; this bill would stop that. It would also interfere with the operation of labor unions.

Furthermore, the enforcement of the technical provisions of this bill would result in taking away from our American citizen his constitutional rights to refuse to testify against himself on the grounds of self-incrimination.

This legislation would establish a giant bureaucracy where the definition of discrimination would vary and change in accord with opinions of those individual persons administering the law.

This legislation, in my opinion, would be destructive of the powers reserved by the States in our Constitution and it is unfortunate that this impractical proposal should be used to make a political issue of the problem of racial relations. To impose these unwanted Federal regulations on the individual States would be to act in complete disregard of the certain consequences of discord, strife, and disunity.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the enactment of the proposed FEPC bill. Regardless of the motivation for such a law, it will not accomplish its avowed objectives. There never has been a human being or a group of human beings with sufficient insight into the minds of men to determine whether or not unfair discrimination is present in any particular instance. Such a law would be impractical. It would be merely a source of litigation, strife, and harassment.

The South favors segregation. In the North there is apparently a desire by some people to enact laws against segregation, not only for the North but for the entire Nation. FEPC would seek to destroy segregation of the races, at least in the employment phase of social behavior. This would not improve the opportunities of colored people.

Segregation is a natural thing. Everywhere in nature we find it. It is manifest that there are not even approximately identical individuals, regardless of the question of race. In human nature segregation is natural. For example, young people who habitually attend Christian Endeavor meetings seldom find their usual companionship among young people constantly frequenting taverns and bars.

The laws of nature cannot be changed by human laws. Laws not first written in the souls of men, like tracings by finger tips in wet beach sands, dissolve by force of the superior laws of nature.

Aside from the impracticality of the FEPC bill, the objectives of better opportunities for all are more readily achievable in a segregated system of society. The northern approach of abolishing segregation has resulted in fewer opportunities for colored people than the southern approach of preserving segregation. This we can see from even a casual study.

Recently a colored man from the North visited the South and affirmed in widely distributed news releases that opportunities for Negroes are better in the South than they are in the North. He pointed out that Negroes could be taxicab drivers in the North but could not get franchises to run taxi companies as they could in the South.

The same can be said for opportunities in professional groups. For instance, out of every 1,000 Negroes in the South, 7 Negroes have professional jobs in education, while in the rest of the Nation the ratio is only 1 out of every 1,000 Negroes. The ratio—on a per capita population of Negroes basis—is 7 to 1 in favor of the segregated system of the South.

In the North there are today less than 100 Negroes in medical and dental schools, while in the South in two segregated medical schools alone there are 1,100 Negroes enrolled. For example, there are more Negroes from Pennsylvania in one of these southern schools than there are Pennsylvania Negroes in all of the medical schools in Pennsylvania.

In the South, where segregation in employment is practiced, Negroes traditionally do certain types of work; and if they have the desire to advance themselves they have a better chance to achieve employer status and professional types of work than they do in the North. There are Negroes in my home town who employ many other Negroes in such varied fields as construction and insurance. In my section of the country there are substantial numbers of Negro lawyers, doctors, preachers, and educators. From the observations and statistics available to me, this segregated pattern of the South seems to offer more opportunities to the colored people than the system urged by some people in the North.

There are many other objections to the contemplated FEPC bill. Besides denying the right of an employer to select agents and employees to handle his affairs, it would deny the rights of employees to choose their associates in business. It would deny employees the right to bargain collectively in this field. It would deny the employer the right to hire, promote, or discharge employees on the basis of efficiency or faithfulness, because the legal prohibition of discrimination could often be raised when the employer would have difficulty in explaining the intangible things which enter into a determination of confidence between employer and employee.

Under this proposed law, an employer could be compelled to pay wages to persons who had never been in his employment. The right to contract in this specific field would be abridged. The right of trial by jury is also destroyed in this field, and the employer would be required by law to give testimony against himself and to expose his private papers to public scrutiny. Employers would be subject to investigations, harrassment, fines, and penalties without end.

FEPC has been considered in about a score of States. Sixteen of these States have rejected the proposal. California recently turned it down by about a million votes. Clearly, intervention in this field is against the will of the vast majority of those who have spoken on the subject.

Who then seeks such a law? There are some misled idealists who have endorsed such legislation. There are some people who think that backing such legislation would be politically helpful to themselves. Finally, there are the Communists who welcome the disunity that is inherent in the agitation for this law. They also have the most to achieve by the passage of the bill. Because of the potential expansion of such a law into attempts to control thought by law and in the further regimentation of people through socialistic bureaucracy, the Communists would make the only real gains that would come out of such an enactment.

I submit that the proposed FEPC legislation is impractical, that better means are available for helping colored people and they are now being used in the South and that the bill violates fundamental American rights and would be just another step toward statism and totalitarianism.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, with the passage of this FEPC bill, H. R. 4453, a new era in Government affairs will have been ushered in. It will be known as the era of regimentation and red tape. It will be the era of complete Government control and domination over every phase of business and industrial life of this country. It will, in fact, be the era of totalitarianism. We can, in fact, bid our democracy good-by.

This measure provides for the creation of a board to enforce this law which will have full power and authority to enter into any business or industry and dictate the terms of employment, of hiring and firing, and even the conditions of work. It will make the members of the board for the enforcement of FEPC czars with an interest, fortified with a legal right, to meddle in every phase of our business activity. The days of the independent businessman will be at an end.

I have seen boards and bureaus operate here in Washington for many years. Most of the time they start out with fairly good intentions. After a while, with power and authority, the boards become aggressive and are prone to overstep even the authority which the Congress has given them. In points often distant from the seat of government, they work with the fortitude of a zealot and the misdirected energy of a crusader. The average citizen is sometimes powerless to resist them.

Thomas Jefferson, a great patriot and the father of the Democratic Party, once said, "The best-governed are the least governed." I subscribe to this philosophy. But the Jeffersonian philosophy as stated above is not the rule of this iniquitous FEPC bill. The FEPC rule is one of more government, more regulation, and more regimentation. Such inevitably will lead to centralization and concentration of power.

This bill is a bad one. It is a bill which will result sooner or later in changing the form of our government and it should not pass.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, as everyone in this House and nearly all the people in the country knows by this time where I stand on this important question, and realizing that I cannot at this late hour change the views of those determined in their opposition to this meritorious and humane legislation, I shall briefly answer the statements of some of the gentlemen who find fault with our consideration of this bill on Washington's birth date and at this late hour.

Oh, these gentlemen know this late session today is not the fault of those of us who are in favor of this bill, but that it is due to the actions of these very men who raise these objections because they are the ones who have been delaying consideration of this measure, not only for hours and hours today, but for months—yes, for years.

The record is very clear that I endeavored to secure the consideration of this legislation in the Seventy-ninth Congress—again during the first session of this Eighty-first Congress, and that I have continuously endeavored, since this present session convened, to secure action for a rule for the orderly consideration of this bill, but due to the filibustering tactics that have been carried on in the Committee on Rules I have been unable to secure the approval of such a rule. I have tried and tried and tried to bring about the orderly consideration of this measure, providing sufficient time for each and every Member to express his views, but my efforts have been frustrated by these very gentlemen who now complain, and who have, during this entire day—for the past 6 or 7 hours—delayed its consideration by their frivolous actions and delaying motions requiring so many roll calls.

And though it is late in the day, and it may take until midnight or longer to secure a final vote on this measure, I shall insist that we remain until the final vote is recorded I shall insist on it because nearly every outstanding church, labor, liberal, fraternal, social, and humanitarian organization has urged and pleaded for the enactment of this legislation. Other speakers have mentioned these organizations by name and I shall not burden the record with repetition, but I wish to insert at this point five representative telegrams received from such organizations located in my home city of Chicago:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 20, 1950.*
ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D C.:

On behalf of our 200,000 CIO members we urge your support FEPC bill (H. R. 4453) February 22. Urge you to remain in close attendance floor of House all day to prevent parliamentary delays and vote passage of bill without amendments.

ALBERT TOWERS,
President, Chicago Industrial Union Council, CIO.

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 21, 1950.*
Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH:

Chicago Federation of Labor is interested in having the FEPC bill (H. R. 4453) passed without further delay. We urge you to stay on floor of House tomorrow and do your utmost to stop filibustering speeches and vote for passage.

WILLIAM A. LEE,
President.
WILLIAM F. CLEARY,
Secretary.

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 21, 1950.*
Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Local 194, FTA, with 4,000 members in Chicago urges you be present in House of Representatives on Wednesday, February 22, and vote "No" on adjournment. We further urge you use your influence and your vote for passage of Powell FEPC bill. Can think of no better way to honor memory of George Washington who led Revolutionary War to free all citizens of United States than to pass FEPC law on this date.

JOHN GALLACHER,
President,
ELIZABETH WROTON,
Legislative Director,
Local 194, FTA.

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 20, 1950.*
Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you attend continuously House session Wednesday until FEPC is voted upon.

Rabbi MORTON M. BERMAN,
Chicago Division, American Jewish Congress.

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 21, 1950.*
Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand FEPC vote scheduled Wednesday 22d. We urge your close attendance to prevent parliamentary delays and your favorable vote for H. R. 4453 without amendments.

Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, Catholic Youth Organization; American Civil Liberties Union; Sidney Williams, Chicago Rabbinical Association; Catholic Labor Alliance; Japanese-American Citizens; League Independent Voters of Illinois; National Association for Advancement of Colored People; Young Women's Christian Association; National Council of Jewish Women; American Jewish Congress; Church Federation of Greater Chicago; Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination; Bureau of Jewish Employment Problems

As I stated in the letter I sent to many Members of this House yesterday, urging them to be and remain on the floor of the House until final action is taken, while suggesting that they should not fall for any of the substitutes or amendments offered "not by the friends but by the enemies of this legislation", I hope they will come to the conclusion that my request and advice was timely and that they will not yield to any sinister influences that are endeavoring to destroy the real bill endorsed by these fair-minded and well-intentioned organizations. There will be two such substitutes offered. Neither deserves the support nor vote of any friend of civil rights.

This undignified—yes, this imprudent procedure witnessed here tonight should serve as a reminder to the membership of this House and to the American people that sound legislation on fundamental principles cannot be expected from such farcical procedures; and that in the future the Committee on Rules will not deny rules as it has in this case and prevent the orderly consideration of vital legislation.

Let us unite as real Americans in giving this measure an overwhelming vote of approval, demonstrating to the American

people that the oft-repeated pledge of both great political parties on this fundamental issue is to be finally carried out.

NO NEED FOR FEPC

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, we are here today, on the birthday of the Father of our Country, called on to enact legislation which would cause George Washington to turn over in his grave. If it were at all possible for this great man to be reincarnated and come today to this Chamber he would have much more to say to us than he said in his farewell message.

One of the first things George Washington would say to us in no uncertain terms if he were allowed to speak in person to us today would be to tell us that we cannot successfully legislate morals into a people and that we cannot legislate traditions from the consciousness of a people. He would remind us that freedom was not legislated into the existence of the first American patriots who followed his lead in working out for themselves a brand of freedom and liberty which has come to be unique in a world peopled by human beings. He would cite for us the example of the hardy Americans of his time who gained freedom and liberty only as they prepared themselves to receive it.

Mr. Chairman, did the patriots under Washington at Valley Forge and scores of other battlefields, where liberty was bought at the price of blood, die for the kind of freedom which would allow a bureaucratic government to deny an employer the basic right of choice in selecting the employees who work for him? Did they die for a way of life which would deny employers the right of contract? Did they die for a way of life which would deny the employer the right to hire, promote, or discharge employees on the basis of their efficiency, merit, or faithfulness? Did the patriots under Washington die fighting for the establishment of a way of life which would subject employers to endless investigations, harassment, and possible fines and imprisonment as determined by a commission? If we have proper respect for truth we must admit that the patriots did not shed their blood in order to establish a system of government which would deny an employer the right of trial by jury and give him no right to a review of the facts founded by a commission composed of bureaucrats. One of the basic things for which they fought was the right of every man to a trial by a jury composed of his peers. It is to shame the name of the glorious dead that we even consider legislation on today, of all days, which, if enacted, would deny Americans the basic rights for which our forefathers died.

Mr Chairman, the whole so-called civil-rights program of which the measure we debate today is most iniquitous, has been conceived in iniquity and nurtured with the milk of corruption. The proponents have sinned grievously in playing upon the ignorance and prejudices of certain minority groups of our citizens. They have held out to these groups the promise of something to be bestowed upon them in the name of liberty which is not liberty at all but the most reprehensible form of slavery. They have told these groups that a form of liberty and freedom can be legislated for them which these people have not had time to earn for themselves. It would be so much better if the proponents of this measure would tell the Negroes and other minority groups in this country the truth and let them know that freedom does not come by legislative decree but by hard work and devotion to ideals which lead to liberty.

I am reminded, Mr. Chairman, of the story of a man who was watching the chrysalis of a moth as the aborning moth was undergoing the pains and pangs attendant to breaking away from the shell of the chrysalis. This man watched with pain in his heart the struggles of the baby moth as it fought to break the bonds of the enclosing chrysalis As he watched the painful struggles of the insect which was aborning he suffered the vicarious pains of the struggle After watching the painful struggle of the baby moth for awhile he reached the place where he could not bear to witness the agony any longer In order to put an end to the pain of the struggling insect he got a pair of scissors and cut the chrysalis which confined the moth thus freeing it from the agony by bringing it prematurely into the world it sought to enter He had performed a humane and charitable deed for which he congratulated himself but his joy was short-lived for he found that, although he had spared the moth the final pangs of birth, the moth could not fly or even walk In helping the moth be born he had forgotten that the blessings of this life do not come easy to those who would enjoy them He had failed to remember that strength is gained through struggle and is not something which is donated or granted by legislative decree.

The story of the chrysalis being shorn prematurely from the body of the moth aborning simply emphasizes the fact that there are no easy short cuts to the mountain tops of human experience in the human existence of mankind. We must all go through the green-apple stage of development, as it were, before we can hope to attain the ripened stage where fruition of human ideals is attained.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday there was announced in this hallowed Hall the true purpose of the so-called FEPC by the gentleman from New York who introduced the original FEPC bill. In a colloquy between the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] stated that if the policies espoused by the notorious Mr. Thaddeus Stevens had been followed immediately subsequent to the termination of the War Between the States, there would now be no need for such legislation as the FEPC. The particular policy to which the gentleman referred was that which demanded that each and every freed slave be given 40 acres of land and a mule. Knowing of the gentleman's adherence to the Communist Party line this statement comes as no surprise since the taking from those who have and giving to those who have not is a cardinal principle of the Communist Party. In stating this communistic policy, however, the gentleman has emphasized the fact that the FEPC is inspired and sponsored by the Communists who leave no stone unturned in sowing discord in this country.

It is said by the proponents of this measure that we are playing into the hands of Russia when we fail to enact the FEPC. They say that the Russians point to discrimination in America as the Achilles' heel in our armor of democracy. In answer to this argument I am made to wonder if we have grown so weak and spineless as to be driven to do those things which we know to be wrong simply because our arch enemy, the Communists, suggest that we do them. Are we called on here today to do those things which will be pleasing to Russia or are we concerned with the things which have to do with the life and liberty of American citizens who have made the system of free enterprise work in such a way as to astound the entire world?

When the Russians have allowed to their citizens one small fraction of the freedom and liberty which is automatically allowed even the least deserving American citizen in this country then they can have earned the right to criticize any facet of the picture which makes up our American society. I am made to wonder if the gentleman from New York, [Mr. MARCANTONIO], would have the Negroes in this country trade their present lot for the lot of the average Russian living today under Stalin's form of so-called democracy. It may be that some of his constituents who live in the ghettos of New York City where there is not supposed to be any such thing as discrimination would trade their lot for that of the Russians but I am sure that there are no Negroes living in my district down in south Georgia who would trade with them. The fact of the matter is that the thinking Negroes of my district would not trade lots with those who sleep in the gutters in the ghettoes of Harlem.

We are not hypocritical in the South with reference to the problems attendant to the living side by side of two different races. We realize that social barriers must be maintained if the integrity of the races is to be kept inviolate. We recognize the fact that a half-breed born by cohabitation of the two races will not be recognized by either race. We know that this cohabitation will be encouraged by destruction of the social barriers and we are not willing to be accessories before and after the fact in doing that which will help lead innocent children to be born into a society where they are not recognized either by the race of the father or the race of the mother.

We do not hate the Negroes in the South. We accept them on the basis of the worth they have earned as individuals. The best story I have heard to illustrate this point has to do with the elderly Negro man who had come North at the instance of his son and who did not tarry long in Yankeeland. Upon his return to Georgia he was asked why he had returned from the land of his dreams. His answer was to this effect, "Boss, de Yankee loves us Negroes as a race but hates us as individuals. You

white folks in the South hates us Negroes as a race but loves us as individuals. As far as I am concerned I prefers to stay here where I am accepted as an individual instead of as a member of a despised race." This story does graphically illustrate the feeling between the southern white man and the southern Negro.

Mr Chairman, we southerners are not proud of the lack of educational facilities afforded our people. We realize that there is a grievous lack of educational opportunity afforded our people. This lack is not confined to the Negro race. We would like very much to be able to furnish all of our southern children with more adequate educational facilities, for we are convinced that many of the pressing problems attendant to the living side by side of two different races could be solved by education and the raising of living standards. We are doing our very best to provide these facilities but are falling short of our goal simply because we are not financially able to do the job.

If the proponents of the pending FEPC legislation really and sincerely want to help us solve our racial problems in the South they can best do the job, in the true spirit of brotherhood, by sharing with us their wealth sufficiently as to make it possible for us to raise our educational standards in the South. We will accept this financial aid and do our very best to be worthy stewards of it in doing the very best job possible in raising the level of educational accomplishment in our section of the country.

I believe it worthy of note that the South would not need financial aid for our educational system if we had no Negro population. The truth of the matter is that the average Negro pays little or no taxes in spite of the fact that his children must be educated along with the white children. Due to this fact a double burden is placed on the white taxpayer. The truth of the matter is that the average Negro in Georgia has had made available to him by the white taxpayers educational facilities for his children totally out of all proportion to the amount of taxes the Negro pays. It will be said that more taxes would be paid by the Negroes if they were afforded more economic opportunity. This leads to the old question as to which came first, the chicken or the egg. The Negro cannot avail himself of additional economic opportunity until he has been given the educational opportunity to prepare himself for it. If we can get aid in giving him this educational opportunity I sincerely believe that the economic opportunity will be forthcoming.

Mr. Chairman, in an effort to propitiate the gods of petty politics by appealing to the vanity of certain sniveling pressure groups composed of people who suffer from a monumental inferiority complex, we are asked here today to pass into law legislation which would deny American businessmen the right to hire employees of their choice. Mr. Chairman, I am sure you would not vote for a measure which would require an employee to work for an employer against his will. Therefore, by the same token, you should not vote for a measure which would require an employer to hire an employee against his will. Do you not think that the American businessman is already harassed almost to the point of distraction by bureaucratic rules and regulations coming out of Washington? Will you not at least leave to him the right to hire and fire employees at his own discretion instead of at the direction of some bureau in Washington?

It is a distressing spectacle and a strange commentary on contemporary America to listen one day to certain Members of Congress condemn the police state methods of government employed by Russia and other communistic countries and then on the next day listen to these same people advocate the adoption of the same type of measures in this country. If police state methods are bad for other countries they are even worse for this country where we have a heritage of freedom behind us. It is more than distressing, it is disgusting to hear certain Members of this House who are publicly most vociferous in their demands that FEPC be passed, admit privately that the legislation will not work and that they are really not for it but must give the appearance of being so in order to be elected. Ethics will not allow me to divulge the names of these Members who have been heard to express such sentiments, but the truth is that some of those who have been vieing for credit on this measure have been heard to make such statement. Can we wonder that our fair land is beset on every hand by vexing trouble when we have in this Congress men who resort to such arrant demagogery? Have we so completely lost faith in God and man as to allow politics to completely dictate our every action? A man who will espouse a cause publicly which he denies in private does not merit a seat in this great body and should be repudiated by an aroused constituency. I pray for the day when only legislation will be passed on the record which would have been passed if the vote had not been a matter of record. If that day ever comes you will not see such legislation as we have before us today passed, for I sincerely believe that if every Member here today were to vote his honest convictions FEPC would not pass.

Mr. Chairman, the mere fact that the proposed legislation would make it possible for an employer to be brought before the Commission, tried, convicted, and sentenced without trial by jury should be prima facie evidence of the unconstitutionality of the act. One does not have to be an astute student of the Constitution of the United States of America to know that one of the basic concepts upon which it is founded is trial of all Americans by a jury composed of their peers.

The so-called Powell FEPC bill would, if enacted into law, establish in this country a veritable gestapo cloaked with the power of the judiciary and with the further power to issue rules and regulations having the full weight and force of law without the prior approval of the Congress. This legislation is one more step the Congress will have taken in the direction of delegating legislative powers to the executive branch of our Government. We need not take many more steps in this direction before we will have reached the place where the Congress might as well dissolve itself and let the President run the affairs of the country through his executive department. Surely, Mr. Chairman, we have not reached the place where we are willing to leave the destiny of this country in the hands of one man no matter who that man might be. Surely it is time that the Congress began to look to the recapturing of some of the power it has already relegated to the executive department instead of giving it more power as the proponents of this bill propose to do here today.

Mr. Chairman, have we reached the place in this country where a law-abiding free American citizen can no longer call his soul his own without the fear of being investigated and haled before some quasi-judicial body to answer to some specious charge cloaked with the general term "discrimination." Mr. Speaker, if the proponents of this bill are honestly exercised over alleged discrimination in the field of employment in this country they might well add an amendment to this bill which would make it an unlawful practice to refuse employment to a person because of age or sex We all know that it is extremely difficult for people over 45 years of age to get employment in this country and we also know that women are discriminated against in certain fields of employment. If discrimination can be abolished by legislative decree then the discrimination because of age and sex just as easily as that which attends race, color, creed, and so forth can be abolished.

If the people of the State of New York or any other State want the kind of law which is proposed here today then it is their right to pass such a law in any State. We do not want it in Georgia. The people of the great State of California do not want any such law as they so clearly testified when they defeated just such a proposal by a resounding majority. It has been said here today that the people of the State of California did not know what they were doing when they voted down FEPC in their State. This statement is an insult to the intelligence of the people of California and gives Members from that State just ground to arise in the well of this House and address themselves to the point of personal privilege in the behalf of their insulted constituency.

Mr. Chairman, to further show that the proposed bill would be a travesty on justice it will be noted that there is not a single thing in this bill which would require that an applicant for a job be required to possess any degree of qualification for the job sought. In other words, the bill simply says that an applicant must be hired regardless of qualification or else the employer will be subject to the police powers of a bureaucratic commission exercising gestapo powers. This is too much to ask the people of America to take. It will not be taken without untold amount of attendant trouble and dissension. It will cause racial tensions to be accentuated instead of lessened and will cause bitterness to supplant a growing understanding between the races. The South is

progressing in the field of racial relations, but the passage of this bill will do much to undo the great good that has been done in recent years.

Mr. Chairman, you will find recorded in the Holy Bible the story of how the Master asked a question in the form of a parable which has been ringing down through the ages since the time of its enunciation as the very best defense of the system of free enterprise which has made America great. The Master, in Matthew 20: 15, quoted the employer as saying: "Is it not right that I do what I will with my own?" Mr. Chairman, need more be said as to the religious implications of this legislation?

The pending legislation is said to be a bill which will wipe out all discrimination caused by prejudice. In order to remove an effect you must remove the cause, and you can no more legislate prejudice out of existence than you can effectively pass a law requiring all men to become Christians. The bill purports to give to employees rights which they do not now enjoy. The truth of the matter is that it only gives to employees whatever rights some governmental bureaucrat determines they are to have. It is this bureaucratic police-state agent who has the right to determine where prejudice exists. The question surely, then, must rise as to whether any agent of government is better qualified to determine the existence of prejudice than is the employer himself?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] has said here on the floor today, in effect, that Russia does not like the way we do things here in America and, therefore, we should mend our ways in such way as to please Mr. Stalin. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has said that the greatest argument Russia has in the world today is that she guarantees all people first-class citizenship. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many people in America want first-class citizenship in a prison camp. If that is the kind of citizenship which the gentleman holds up to the American people as the ideal existence then I am made to wonder how the gentleman's constituency would like to have this kind of first-class citizenship imposed on them.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill becomes law thousands of Negroes will suffer because of it. Many of them will lose their lives as a result of the violence engendered by this legislation. This blood will surely be on the hands of those who support this iniquitous bill. They will not be able to absolve themselves of guilt before God by claiming that they were trying to help those who will have paid for this stupid mistake with their lives. In God's name and for the sake of thousands who will suffer because of it, let us not commit the utter folly of passing this terrible legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed fitting that the Farewell Address of George Washington should be read annually to the House on the anniversary of his birth. His message is neither outdated nor is it merely a pleasing collection of meaningless platitudes.

Those who listened discernedly to the reading of this great document a few hours ago heard these words of Washington, which, perhaps, more than any other, are applicable to the circumstances under which this crime against America is being committed today:

> Real patriots, who resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

It is desecration to the extent of sacrilege that this iniquitous legislative monstrosity should be presented to this body on the anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country.

Apparently, the gods of politics must be served, though, even if it means legislative repudiation of everything this great country stands for, and the abolition of the individual liberty which made it great.

We, who cherish the governmental perfectionism embodied in our Constitution; we, who embrace still the faith of freemen in the great vehicle through which our freedom has been preserved, are appalled at the subtle but deadly attacks to which constitutional government is being subjected tonight. As the Pied Piper lured the children of Hamelin to their destruction, so are the selfish minorities seducing American democracy into the pitfalls of atheistic communism. When will America awaken to the real dangers of this communistic maneuver? Will she wait until it has destroyed every vestige of freedom guaranteed to us under our Constitution, and has smothered individual initiative and dignity under a blanket of dictatorial bureaucracy? Will she wait until she has been subjected through this legislation to the tyranny of a Federal police state, not unlike the evil gestapo of Nazi Germany?

America must awaken now before it is too late.

Can anyone deny that the success of our democratic form of government came about through our constitutional divisions of power between the Union and the States, and through the intricate system of checks and balances, limiting and double checking the powers of our Federal Government among the three great branches: the executive, legislative, and judiciary?

Can anyone deny that it is this system that has guaranteed freedom and liberty to all who are so fortunate as to be Americans? Are we to allow the sacrifices of ourselves and our forefathers, since the birth of our Nation, to have been made in vain?

Are we to hold for naught the wisdom of Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and those other patriots through whose courage and ability the foundations of the world's greatest nation were laid?

Thomas Jefferson was not unaware of the dangers of overcentralization; he might well be on our side in this fight today.

More than a hundred and fifty years ago, he warned us that—

> Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread. * * * The support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns are the surest bulwarks against anti-Republican tendencies.

By the same token, George Washington said in the message read to this House but a few hours ago:

> It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution to those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional sphere, avoiding, in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another.

And Washington also stated the case against interference into State affairs, when he said, in that same Farewell Address, these words:

> The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing it into different depositories * * * has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our own country, and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them.

It is a sad commentary on American politics when the Democratic Party—saved from oblivion more than once by the people of the South, and led by a man who owes his position to the action of white people of the South in the 1944 convention—places its best friends on the altar of political expediency. We of the South have been betrayed in the house of our fathers; we have been driven from our political home by those willing to substitute alien philosophies for the time-honored principles of our party.

Those who would throttle the South and the Nation into economic and political suffocation through this vicious legislation have resorted to trickery, deceit, and misrepresentations in their efforts to destroy the meaning and force of our Constitution. They have so colored the barbs that they would thrust into the flesh of constitutional government that we, who oppose their vicarious arguments are subjected to being called bigots and race baiters. Are they not conscious of the fact that the people of the South are civilized; that we are a God-fearing people, and that, despite their facetious arguments to the contrary, that our Negroes are happier and better satisfied than in any other part of the country? Might we not well reply by saying: "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam from thine own eyes, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast the mote from thy brother's eye?"

There is no doubt but that this is sectional legislation, aimed at the social and economic processes of the democratic South. Are we, the South, really the tail that is trying to wag the dog? Or is it the other way around? We have 13,000,000 Negroes as against the rest of the Nation's three million. Should we not be best qualified to speak on the subject of harmonious race relations; as our section, alone, can boast of freedom from race riots and like racial disturbances? There is no agitation from the southern Negro to have this iniquitous legislation inflicted upon the people of the United States.

Does anyone honestly believe that such legislation can accomplish the ends allegedly desired? Our Nation is dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, but what you are trying to do here is to keep all men equal. You profess to fight communism; yet you further its interests through acts such as this today.

Is it not, as Lincoln said, true that—

You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred.

And—

You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

There is no real desire on the part of most of the proponents of this type of regimentation to elevate the position of the Negro. What is the crux of the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights labeled "To secure these rights"? There is a deadly conspiracy behind this report and this legislation, to carry out its stated purposes Here is the philosophy of those who drafted this ridiculous report—and I quote from page 6 of the report:

It is the purpose of government in a democracy to regulate the activity of each man in the interest of all men.

What better definition could be given of the aims and purposes of communism, if that principle is not applicable? Surely there is no man here, willing to be honest with himself, who would subscribe to such an alien philosophy of government.

By what stretch of the imagination might that be considered to be the American way, the purpose of government in a democracy to regulate the activity of each man? I say it reeks with the putrid odor of communism.

Such regimentation is not a function of government in a democracy. It is in complete and abject violation of article IX of the American Constitution:

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people

Can anyone deny that through this legislation you would deny the employer his constitutional right of free choice in the selection of his employees? Can anyone deny that?

And the next article of the Constitution, article X, states:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

These two statutes, fundamental in any construction of our Constitution, specifically forbid the enactment and enforcement of such discriminatory laws as the one proposed here.

There is no doubt about the unconstitutionality of this legislative outrage. Is the Congress to stultify itself by enacting into law that which it knows to be a violation of the American Constitution? Let me remind my Republican friends, who spent several hours the other night nibbling yellow-legged chickens at a dollar a plate in the guise of paying homage to Abraham Lincoln, that he held:

No man who has sworn to support the Constitution can conscientiously vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, no matter how expedient he may think it.

You will not be doing yourself, your constituency, or your Nation any good by the enactment of this legislation. To direct punitive measures at the South may be politically popular back home. It may get you votes you need when you need them. Do not forget—however—that this law will be applicable to your section as well as the South. Your people will also be subjected to the tyranny of a police state and made subservient to the whims of an appointed bureaucracy should this bill become law. You will be forced to share with the southern people the miseries and humiliations inflicted by a totalitarian bureaucracy, and your freedom will also be reduced to a glorious memory.

Do not be deceived. Those in America who realize the implications of this type legislation do not want it. It has been defeated in every State that had the courage to put it to a vote of the people. A Nation-wide poll, conducted by psychologists Link and Feinberg, shows only about 11 percent of the people, North and South, endorsing the idea of legislation as a cure for our racial ills. On the other hand, 77 percent of northern and western opinion and 89 percent of southern opinion favors a program of education as a cure. Yet the same crowd of agitators who wail the loudest about the plight of the Negro is the same crowd that has blocked every effort of the Southern States to provide educational opportunities for our Negroes. This was evidenced last year by the refusal of Congress to ratify the pact of the Southern States in setting up regional schools for the Negroes.

The very man—who represents the so-called ADA in the other body and who was responsible for the resolution in the Democratic Convention that ejected the South from its own party—the same man who is loudest in his demands for this very legislation, has also introduced legislation in the other body to deny Government employment to persons harboring certain religious beliefs, including anticatholicism and anti-Semitism. Where is the real sincerity among proponents of this legislation? "Consistency, thou art a jewel"

Let us all heed the words of Booker T. Washington, real leader—not only of his own race, but of America as well—surely he had the interests of his people at heart. Listen to this, spoken by the greatest Negro of all time:

Brains, property, and character for the Negro will settle the question of civil rights. The best course to pursue in regard to * * * civil rights * * * in the South is to let it alone. Let it alone, and it will settle itself

Mr. Speaker, not only is this bill unenforceable per se, and discriminatory in concept; but its inevitable result is chaos, confusion, tension, animosity, and hatred. We of the South do not fear its immediate effects. We have always been a suffering people—the victims of a total war, and 12 years of unprecedented persecution in its wake. We know what it is to sacrifice, and we are not afraid of adversity.

But our fears, Mr. Speaker, lie in the ultimate goals of this legislation, which we interpret as the weapon by which our Government and liberty will be assassinated.

No representative government since the birth of civilization has existed successfully for so long a time as has the democratic constitutional Government of the United States, though we are still young in the sisterhood of nations. The system under which we live—the division of powers under our Constitution between the States and Federal Government—has been the chief contributor to the continuation of our democratic form of government, and our Constitution is the pillar on which that system rests.

If our Nation is to endure as one nation, we must recognize certain truths. We must, in each section, respect the rights and sympathize with the problems, of other sections.

As one who was born and reared in the South, and as one who holds the southern way dear to his heart; as one who knows what it means to sacrifice for America, I ask, in conclusion that you heed these immortal words, spoken by Henry W. Grady:

The future holds a problem, in solving which the South must stand alone, in dealing with which she must come closer together than ambition and despair have driven her, and on the outcome of which her very existence depends. This problem is to carry within her body politic two separate races, and nearly equal in number.

This burden no other people bears today—on none has it ever rested Without precedent or companionship, the South must bear this problem, the awful responsibility of which should win the sympathy of all mankind and the protecting watchfulness of God alone, even unto the end.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, my first objection to the proposed FEPC legislation is that it violates the Constitution of the United States and as a corollary invades the province of the States and the personal freedom of individual employers.

Subsection B of section 2 of the proposed act provides, and I quote:

The Congress therefore declares that the right to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin, is the right of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States and that it is the national policy to protect the right of the individual to be free from such discrimination.

It is to be noted that this declaration of principle and policy is not based upon the provisions of the Constitution of the United States or of any amendment thereto.

Section 1 of the fourteenth amendment provides:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citi-

zens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction, the equal protection of the laws.

Obviously the proposed FEPC is not justified under this section of the Constitution.

The only other possible justification under the Constitution is what is known as the commerce clause, which delegates to the Federal Government the right to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations. In subparagraph I, section 2, the act in question attempts to justify itself under this section of the Constitution in these words, and I quote:

To remove obstructions to the free flow of commerce among the States and with foreign nations.

I maintain that present employment practices in no way obstruct the free flow of commerce. On the other hand, I am sure the converse of this proposition is true and that the enactment of the FEPC would disrupt industry throughout the country and would bring to a trickle the flow of commerce between the States.

This legislation is certainly unnecessary to protect the rights guaranteed to every citizen of the United States under the Constitution. Every citizen at present has equal protection under the laws in that he can now appeal to the courts if he thinks one or more of these rights have been violated.

Not only is the present legislation not authorized under any provision of the Federal Constitution, but its enactment would be a violation of the property rights of every individual employer in America. I maintain that this proposition is true because it is obvious that an employer's business could be totally destroyed and the employer, whether individual, partnership, or corporation, brought bankruptcy because of the provisions of this act. By what possible means could an employer prevent one group of employees from quitting their jobs if they did not choose to work with employees imposed upon the employer by a decision of the Fair Employment Practice Commission proposed to be established by the FEPC Act?

In the second place, I maintain that the proposed legislation would violate the fundamental principle of freedom of choice as to persons to be employed by an employer.

In the next place, it would make the employer subject to the harassment by a horde of investigators snooping through the plant and the books and records of the company. Already they are subjected to enough and too much of this sort of thing from bureaucratic Washington. This could well be the straw that breaks the camel's back and could very well result in a depression such as we have never known before.

Moreover, in the South, at least, and I am sure on the west coast where the yellow race is involved, enactment of the FEPC proposal would stir into flame, latent passions and antagonisms that are generally being smothered and overcome by the process of education and the forces of social evolution and change. I maintain that whatever unfair hiring or employment practices may now exist, cannot be eliminated by legislation. They must be gradually eliminated as I have suggested, by education, by the raising of the economic level of minority races and groups and by the sometimes slow process of social force.

These forces already are bringing about great changes in the South. Of course, fundamentally the opposition of the people of the South to the entire so-called civil-rights program is based upon the fear of our people that the segregation of the races will be broken down, which in turn will lead to the intermarriage of persons of different races. The inevitable result will be a mongrel race of half-breeds

While discrimination in employment is not so closely related to this ingrained social feeling, nevertheless, it is in the background of the thinking and feeling of the people constantly.

As far as mixed employment of the two races is concerned, progress is being made in the South. I can illustrate what I mean by telling you of a small but popular restaurant in my home city of Rome, Ga. When I was there last I was struck by the fact that in this restaurant, which is patronized by the white business people of the city, Negro girls and white girls and at least one Negro man were employed in the establishment. I asked the employer if there had been any question raised about the fact that the white girls and the colored girls were working side by side. He replied that no patron and no employee had ever raised the question.

To enact this FEPC legislation would reverse this trend and leave the minority race in our midst in far worse condition as a result.

Finally, I am opposed to the enactment of FEPC legislation because it would set up a new commission with a horde of employees to swarm over the land like a plague of locusts at great expense to the taxpayers. And this at a time when the administration is at last awakening to the necessity for making partners of private enterprise in the most necessary effort to maintain an expanding economy in America.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, at the Yalta Conference of the Big Three, Russia, whose armies had taken over Poland, agreed and declared and guaranteed to the Poles free and democratic government and the holding of free and unfettered elections. But the whole world knows that, notwithstanding those glittering phrases and promises, the iron curtain was rung down and now the Poles are slaves.

The same promises were made to the people of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and other countries now behind the iron curtain. Their liberty is gone. Their citizens are puppets of the state. They, too, are slaves.

And so it has always been with those who seek to destroy democratic government. Those who seek to destroy always employ sugar-coated phrases to lull to sleep their intended victims.

Now we have before us another high-sounding attractive phrase. You are going to bring on the kingdom of utopia by the creation of a Fair Employment Practice Commission. Nobody objects to those words. No one could fail to admit that, honestly spoken, the objectives contained therein should be sought after by all governments and all people. These words are just as attractive as the free and democratic government and unfettered elections that the Russians have been promising the gullible all over the world. The results will be the same—destruction of the rights of man, the wrecking of democratic government, the paving of a highway to dictatorship. Under the sugar-coated words "fair employment practices," we are by this devious phrase, playing into the hands of those who expect some day to erect a supercommunistic state in America.

There are possibly some here who honestly believe that the passage of this act will do the things claimed for it. If so, they should read the history of the last 30 years. However, the majority of those supporting this measure are doing so with their tongues in their cheeks for passing political benefit. They have their eyes and ears cocked to the minorities who will vote in a block at the next election.

I would say to them that it is more than coincidence that every Communist in our country, every fellow traveler, every "pink," is in favor of this damnable bill. They are the only downright, wholehearted supporters of this measure. They know what they want to do to our democratic government. They know that this bill will help them do it.

Do they want to see our free-enterprise system continue? Do they want to see democracy work? The answer is obvious. No; what they want to do is destroy the sovereign States of the Union, make man a puppet of government, concentrate all power in Washington, and, when they undermine the Constitution by placing it here, they will pluck the ripe fruit wher the time for revolution comes.

This bill is primarily intended to destroy the free-enterprise system. There is no Member of this House who does not give lip service to the free-enterprise system. It is the bone and sinew of our democratic way of life. Through private enterprise, which like all other systems has not operated perfectly, this country has, during the last three decades, won two great World Wars and produced enough not only to make our people prosperous but also enough to prevent starvation of the people of a good part of the world. Through this system, our country has progressed from a wilderness to the greatest Nation the world has ever seen. Under it, the individual with ability, initiative, and industry has only the sky as a limit to his accomplishments. Under it, the laborer has the best wages and the highest standard of living known in the world. The great labor leaders of our country have time after time announced their belief and faith in the free-enterprise system. Through all the striving of the common man for better opportunity and greater returns for his labors, never has

it been suggested that he might better reach his goal by surrendering his individual liberty to the superstate.

I assert again that there is no one here who would dare say that he does not believe in the free-enterprise system. Yet you would destroy this system by the enactment of this FEPC proposal—by giving the American people this wolf in sheep's attire.

What incentive will there be for big business or little business to put shoulder and mind to the wheel of greater and better production when the Government agent comes down from Washington and tells him whom he must employ and whom he must fire? Free enterprise just simply cannot be run that way.

Mr. Chairman, everybody knows that this bill, while blanketing the Nation, is primarily aimed at the South, where two great races live side by side in growing understanding and respect for each other. No situation just like it has ever been seen in the world before. No problem of such gravity and magnitude has been handled with so little bloodshed and misunderstanding. While there can be no perfect written formula for solving all the interrelations problems of the white and Negro races, we are, with the help of God, working it out, and all we need is to be let alone by those who understand little and care less.

To you, both Democrats and Republicans, and fellow travelers too, who seek to ram this thing down our throat, I say, read the history of the reconstruction days in the South, when Thaddeus Stevens, the tyrant of this House, backed by a great army, in his hate placed over my people the scum of humanity, both white and colored, in an effort to exterminate our southern civilization. Remember, though, that when the South was disarmed and prostrate, without a single battalion of troops at her command, she rose up and drove the carpetbaggers and scalawags out. I say to the little Thaddeus Stevenses of this House today, and there are some here, the South will do the same thing again if necessity requires. Please take warning.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, there is little doubt in the minds of the realistic that the present breast thumping in behalf of FEPC by many of its most vociferous advocates is the cheapest sort of demagoguery. Those who are truly interested in protecting civil rights of minorities would do well to disassociate themselves, as much as possible, from the agitators who are principally concerned in winning votes for themselves rather than bettering working conditions for anyone. There is also a tendency to imagine or exaggerate conditions for the purpose of having something to denounce and for which to demand corrective action. The sincere friends of civil rights would do well to remember the words of the great Negro leader, Frederick Douglass, who was born in my home county of Talbot in Maryland, 133 years ago this month.

Speaking in 1880, he said:

When we shall possess in the colored people of the United States a class of men noted for enterprise, industry, economy, and success, we shall no longer have any trouble in the matter of civil and political rights.

Fred Douglass realized that an industrious and skilled workman needs no legal compulsion to assist him is securing employment. Free American enterprise in the long run gives opportunities to those who are ready and able to give fair value either as an employer or employee. No amount of laws on the statute books will do as much for the colored people or other minorities as their own energy and skill have accomplished and will continue to accomplish.

Levi Jackson became captain of the Yale football team, not because of any doctrine of recognizing minorities, but because of his ability and character. He has been the only Negro ever to play on the football teams of my own alma mater, yet he was elected captain by his teammates without any coercion. If there had been an intercollegiate FEPC, I wonder if the result would have been the same. In any case, it would have tended to detract from any honors done him.

Joe Louis and other champions have won their honors without legal aid. It has been well and often said that morals cannot be legislated. On February 17, the Sun, of Baltimore, in an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman and FEPC" said of the proposed administration-backed measure:

Mr Truman's position is so remarkable that we venture to quote a part of it The reader should be reminded that, by custom, the President is rarely quoted directly and that his words are therefore paraphrased:

"The President would not support * * * any legislation which deprived a citizen of the right to run his own business * * * as he thought best. The President does not agree that the administration's FEPC bill would have any such result * * * Under him it would not be so administered"

So much for one aspect of the President's position. Now for the rest of it:

"But opportunities to get jobs for which applicants are fitted * * * must not be denied in this country on grounds of race, color, or any similar discrimination The value of the FEPC bill will be to give this position the dignity, strength, and clarity of a national policy * * * For that reason he wants the bill passed, even if it were only to serve as a club in the closet"

It may be possible to make these two contiguous parts of a single statement jibe, but it would take a special kind of rationalization to do it. For our part we do not see how a man can be free to run his own business and at the same time be forced to employ people he does not want to employ.

Perhaps the revealing part of Mr Truman's declaration of policy on FEPC is to be found in the phrase "a club in the closet"

The editorial closes with these paragraphs:

Thus the whole proposal reeks with the most unpleasant and debilitating kind of politics. But that is perhaps not its worst feature. The bill contains a direct invitation to any person who believes that he is being discriminated against to lay information against the employer. This invitation is extended not to Negroes alone but to any person who imagines that he is being discriminated against because of "ancestry." The bill contains that very word and the report which supports it makes the allegation that employers do in fact discriminate against those whose parents came from other lands.

Thus, a second or third generation German or Pole or Italian or Irishman or Englishman can, on his own initiative, charge that his failure to secure a job or his discharge from that job is in fact racial discrimination. The opportunity thus provided for disgruntled would-be or former employees to harass decent businessmen is greater than that in any legislation, existing or proposed, that we have ever heard of.

The bill as it stands is therefore a disgraceful measure. It cannot possibly be enforced in any real sense. But it can be used by evil-minded persons in and out of Government to play havoc with ordinary business practices.

For the people it is supposed to benefit, the FEPC bill is a palpable fraud, concocted for the cheapest of political purposes. For the employers it is supposed to coerce, it is a malevolent threat out of which they can expect only harassment by competitors, political enemies, or disgruntled employees.

Mr. Chairman, the Baltimore Sun traditionally has championed the causes of minorities. It is a great democratic newspaper that even now is throwing its full weight—as it has for many years—in favor of repeal of Maryland's Jim Crow laws. Its views are worthy of serious consideration.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the Members of this Congress are faced today with one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation to the entire Nation that has come before this body in years. I refer to H. R. 4453, which is chiefly the product of Representative POWELL and Representative MARCANTONIO, of New York.

If this bill is passed, it will set up a great bureaucracy here in Washington, and smaller bureaucracies working under the direction of the Washington bureaucracy, in every county, city, and town in the Nation. It will regiment, annoy, harass, investigate, and coerce any and every little businessman it seeks to disturb throughout the Nation.

It can subpena and compel him to bring all of his business records thousands of miles into any court they designate at his own expense to defend himself against any charge of discrimination alleged against him from any applicant for a job who he does not employ if he selects another applicant when he needs to hire a man or woman in his store, shop, or factory.

This bill takes away from any employer the right to freely hire or discharge employees needed in his business.

It will discourage the businessman from expanding his business and giving more jobs and employment to more people. It will deprive men and women of a chance to work and earn their living. It will defeat the very purpose set out in the act. It will add to the unemployment rolls that now stand at 4,000,000 people in the Nation. It will lower the national income and the productivity of the Nation. It will mean less jobs for good men and women who need them the most.

It is my conviction that this legislation is unsound in principle, impractical in application, and certainly should not be enacted into law.

The ideas embodied in this proposed legislation were conceived and born in Russia.

The first government job ever held by Joseph Stalin, the present Russian dictator, was in 1917 when he conceived an FEPC under a different name in Russia.

Surely the membership of this House will not intentionally follow the leadership in enacting legislation first conceived and applied in Russia by Joseph Stalin.

His ideas finally crossed the Atlantic and have been embodied in this iniquitous bill whose chief sponsor and supporter is Mr. MARCANTONIO of New York.

The first supporters and agitators for this type of legislation was the Communist Daily Worker newspaper of New York, and was endorsed by all Communists in our land who seized upon this opportunity to further stir up class hatred throughout the Nation in the hope of destroying this Republic. Later the officers of the CIO, which organization was permeated with hundreds of Communists in its ranks, seized upon it and endorsed it in the hope by the deception of its promises to add to its dues-paying membership in an attempt to largely organize the colored working men and women in our Nation.

Most of the supporters of this bill now seek to exploit it for political purposes. Were it not for the political advantage most of the supporters of this bill hope to gain it would not be before this Congress today. Politics has brought it before this body. If a secret vote could be had without a written record being made, it is my judgment that less of the membership present would vote to fasten this dangerous bill on the people of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the main purpose of this bill is to secure the votes of the great majority of the Negro voters in the Nation. It will hurt their opportunities for jobs, their opportunity for advancement in the future. It is a cruel deception of which I will have no part. It is grossly unfair to them and against their every interest.

Mr. Chairman, I have always had a keen interest in the personal advancement and welfare of the colored people of this country. They are among our best American citizens. Coming from slavery into freedom about 75 years ago, by their own efforts, they have justified my confidence and the confidence of the people in the Nation by making the greatest advancement in education, business, the arts and sciences of any people placed in a like situation in the civilized world.

I want to see their lot improved. I want to see them continue their proud record of advancement in the future, and I am confident that the passage of this bill will make it more difficult for them to continue to advance, succeed, and continue their great contribution as good American citizens to this Republic.

I am and always have been, and always will be opposed to any discrimination against their welfare.

Mr. Chairman, if any legislation is to be enacted, it should approach the problem through mediation, conciliation, and investigation, seeking to bring about better race conditions and better opportunities for all minority groups.

You cannot bring about better relations by passing another law. You cannot change the thinking and the hearts of any people by legislation. This problem must be worked out by a developing of a greater tolerance toward all people, beginning at the grass roots of every small community in the land. Instead of passing a law that will increase prejudice, we must approach it through Christian principles by leading men away from the hates and prejudices of this world. That can be done. That must be done. That is the fundamental, moral concept underlying this entire problem.

If we approach this matter on any other basis except a voluntary basis, the basis of education, the basis of taking men by the hands and leading them into the right path, we make the problem worse, and will do great harm to the principal minority race—the colored men and women of this Nation.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, in their anxiety to pass legislation, I fear that the proponents have not closely studied the bill. Section 7 (a) delegates power to delegate to even a municipality or a possession the dangerous powers in this bill. It overrules other laws and contracts. It violates the Constitution. It invades the rights of the sovereign States. Section 9 requires unconstitutional self-incrimination. The provisions, instead of granting civil rights, infringes basic constitutional rights. Records and persons may be dragged to Washington to appear before subordinate employees. Delegation of congressional powers should always be guarded. We will rue the day when we delegate powers to delegate powers. We are doing it here.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I have noted with considerable interest the vigorous way in which the two gentlemen from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. POWELL] are working for FEPC. The result of their efforts can be of little concern to the people of their own districts, because New York already has an FEPC law. Now, they want everybody else to have one. In connection with this, no truer expression was ever uttered than "misery loves company."

The alleged purpose of this legislation is to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin. Just what is discrimination? And who is supposed to be practicing it against whom? Have any of the proponents of this legislation ever taken the trouble to look in the dictionary and see what discrimination means? It is defined as "unfair or injurious distinction." I tell you that any distinctions that have been made in the South have been and are operating to help the Negro; and if twentieth-century carpetbaggers would let us alone, the Negro in the South would make more and more progress. You can lead some people with a silk thread where wild horses will not drive them. This is particularly true of southerners, but to a certain extent it is true of Americans generally. We have never relished having something rammed down our throats. Whenever the word "discrimination" is used, many people outside the South gang up and point their fingers at the South. I wonder how many of those finger pointers have made a sincere effort to find out what goes on in the South, or have they chosen to get their misinformation from communistically inspired sources. It is logical to believe that these troublemakers are disturbed because things are going so well in the South and they have inspired this means to stir up trouble.

Since the War Between the States, the Negro has made great progress in the Southland. I believe they have come further during this comparatively short period of the world's history than has any other race—and this with the leadership and assistance of the friendly white people of the South. Does this progress indicate that the Negro has been wrongfully treated? These outsiders who say that they want to help the Negro have, by their very proposal of this type of legislation, set back the cause for the people they say they want to help by another 25 years, and if this type of legislation should pass it will further set their cause back by another 25 years. They have opened all the wounds of the past 85 years and have put the spotlight on isolated instances, refusing to look in fairness at the over-all picture of accomplishment. They have, in many instances, aroused a feeling of racial intolerance in both races where none had existed before, or where it had all but died down.

The principal objective of most people in life is to acquire happiness. May I remind you that happiness is not so much a matter of position as it is of disposition. People who know will tell you that the southern Negro is the happiest person in the world. He is happy because he is secure in the knowledge that regardless of any bad luck that may befall him, his white friends will look out for him. In those States that have FEPC laws, how many people would, in the event of illness of one of these Negroes, provide and pay for medical care and treatment for him without any hope or expectation of return or reward? How many businesses operating in these States would permit a Negro employee in seasonal work to continue to get money on which to live when he was not working and when there was no work for him? How many people in these States would spend any time trying to help a Negro get out of trouble which he had gotten into as a result of a riotous Saturday night? This type of helpfulness is the rule in the Southland, rather than the exception.

The proponents of this legislation do not know this, and should not be expected to know it because they do not know anything about the real situation. All they know is to stand back and point a finger at someone else.

It is up to those of us who do have reason to know and do actually know the real facts to do everything we can to prevent the passage of legislation designed only for political purposes and legislation which will result only in injury to all the people of our great country.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, when the original bill to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission was introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress I found myself, after careful study of the text of the bill, unable to approve some of its provisions, despite

my wholehearted support of its objective of eliminating or reducing to the minimum discrimination in employment on the basis of racial or religious prejudices.

For example, the bill authorized the FEPC, a Commission appointed by the President, to issue complaints; to hold hearings and require attendance of witnesses at any place in the United States that it designated; to carry on investigations; to examine or copy any evidence of any person being investigated; to make findings of facts; to make judgments on its own findings of facts; and then to enforce its own judgments.

Whenever it is proposed that any agency of government be given such great powers, it is imperative that there be adequate assurance that its decisions will be fair; that is, that they will be subject to proper judicial review. But the bill provided that the Commission's findings of facts were to be final, if supported by evidence. No matter how flimsy the evidence might be, no court of appeals could examine or review it. Thus the bill in seeking to insure the right of a citizen to secure employment for which he is qualified, without regard to his race, creed, or color, abridged another of the fundamental rights of every American citizen: namely, the right to go into a regular court of justice and ask for a full review of any action against himself which the citizen believes to be unfair Surely, to correct one admitted and shameful discrimination, it is not necessary or wise to commit another discrimination. To give some of our citizens long overdue justice, it is not necessary or wise to deprive other citizens of justice. What we should have is equal justice under law for all, equal opportunity both to get jobs and to go into court.

So in the Eightieth Congress I introduced a bill, H. R. 3273, to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission, with changes to correct the above and other defects. I have continued to support proposals for such legislation. I think a good case can be made for the passage of such a bill, especially in those States where a substantial majority of public opinion supports the legislation and thereby makes it enforceable.

I must state frankly, however, that the more I have studied this whole problem, the more doubts have arisen as to the wisdom or the practicability of a Federal law for the whole country which would require the Federal Government to impose practices which, while quite acceptable in some States and areas, simply are not acceptable to a majority in others and in those States might well injure rather than aid the cause it is desired to advance. To try by compulsion or governmental sanctions to enforce in an area measures which public opinion in that area will not support, usually leads to cynical disregard or violation of the law in question, and tends toward the same attitude with regard to other laws, too. It could halt or even reverse the genuine progress that has been made in recent decades in reducing discrimination based on race or creed. So I have come to view the McConnell substitute bill with more favor, or at least with less hostility, than have some of the supporters of FEPC legislation.

A further factor in favor of the McConnell amendment is that there is a real chance it can be passed by both Houses and become law, whereas the prospects of H. R. 4453, the Powell bill, being passed by the Senate during this session are slim, indeed. It can be argued that it is better to get something than nothing, and that this McConnell amendment is the only way that we can get anything in this session that represents real gain. Might it not, therefore, be better for those who are in greatest need of the services of a Fair Employment Practice Commission, to recognize the practical realities, unite on the McConnell substitute and give it a fair trial, rather than hold out adamantly for "all or nothing"—and probably get nothing? I have real sympathy with those who take the above position, and with their further contention that if experience demonstrates that good results cannot be achieved by the processes of conference, conciliation, persuasion, investigation of facts, and developing public opinion based on such facts—then the Congress can amend the act at any time to add enforcement procedures. We would thus take the first bite now, the only bite we can probably get, and hope that it may prove adequate. If not, then take a second bite, if and when experience demonstrates that it is necessary. I have come to a recognition that when one considers our country as a whole, the McConnell substitute may be the best way to get the greatest amount of genuine progress.

In summary, I shall support the Powell bill, H R 4453, which is substantially the same as I introduced in 1947. There are some questions about at least one of the enforcement powers which, in the hands of a Commission so inclined, could lead to abuses of power which might defeat the purpose intended. But the author of the bill is aware of the ambiguity and has given assurance that he is willing to accept clarifying amendments to prevent any such developments.

However, if the McConnell bill should be adopted by a majority of the House as a substitute for the Powell bill, I shall then vote for it on final passage It will at least get something started through the legislative mill, and break the roadblock which has stalled all bills of this sort for so many years

To vote against the McConnell bill, if it is the only thing before us on final passage, would be to vote for no legislation at all during the present Congress, and I cannot believe that would be in the best interests of all concerned.

Mr HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, although the debate on this proposed legislation has been on the usual high plane, the demonstration and activities we have observed all during the afternoon and night and up until this late hour in the morning clearly shows the real objective in my opinion which motivates the determination of the proponents to force such a far-reaching and dangerous legislation on the people of this country.

The proponents would have you believe that it is the sound thinking American public insisting on this tightly controlled and binding legislation, that would strangle the lives and the actions and the freedom of our business economy and political life.

I am opposed to this kind of legislation. Not only am I opposed to the Powell bill, which is the committee bill, but I am opposed to any such legislation which in my opinion is in complete conflict and obnoxious to our American way of life It is well known that I believe such legislation to be contrary to the American way.

However, at this point and realizing the circumstances, I will support the McConnell substitute in the Committee and vote for it as a substitute when we return to the House.

I believe it to be the best procedure at this point.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no need of anyone trying to sugarcoat or leave the impression that this legislation has any justification whatsoever.

The debate in this House Tuesday on this issue was a most outstanding example of the most ardent proponent of this legislation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] frankly admitted that its real purpose was to do away with segregation and what he called Jim Crowism To be sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], the author of this bill, said it was not directed at the South, it was not directed at segregation, it was not directed at anything except fair practices in employment. He came on the scene only 2 or 3 years ago but the gentleman from New York [Mr MARCANTONIO], the most consistent sponsor of this legislation, has been trying for years and years to impose it upon the free peoples of this country He should know the real purposes and intent.

Ah, yes, its aim is to establish a commission, a Government agency, with unlimited authority, the most far-reaching powers of the business and economic life of this country ever given throughout our entire history.

It has been appropriately designated as a monstrosity. I believe firmly it to be a most dangerous control with far more implications than the OPA Administrator during the war or any other agency in the war emergency.

Is it not easy to understand that if there are five men with unlimited powers who can say to any business throughout the United States, who they must hire, who they must fire, thereby determining the policies and largely the success of that business, that those five men actually control the economy of our people. What business will dare or can afford to do anything other than comply with the bidding of these five men.

Isn't it easy to see then that when five men all powerful over business and the economy of the country can with their manipulations from Washington draw a political noose around the necks of the people of this country. What business or group would fail to abide by the wishes in a political sense? Don't for one moment let us kid ourselves about what this will do. It cannot possibly work to strengthen democracy, the right of people to govern themselves, but on

the other hand, it will inevitably lead to dictatorship and totalitarian policies.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] was so right in my opinion when he said that he hoped he would never see the day when our Government would tell us who we must employ and what doctor we must bring into our homes.

For me I had enough Government regimentation by order and regulation during OPA days, and I want to say to my own colleagues, my Democratic friends, there is no doubt whatsoever in my opinion that we lost control of the Congress in 1946 because of such regulation and regimentation of a people that will not be bound and tied by executive flat.

And I want to say further, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, if the great leaders of our party persist on such an all-powerful Government agency of five men, it will not only destroy our party but it will so divide our groups that we cannot hope to continue to win elections.

We have done pretty well in this country. It has been because of the rugged free individualism, the opportunity that no other people has ever had in all the history of the world.

Yes, we have become a strong, powerful, and leading nation. Our influence is felt throughout the world. We are in this position because our people had an opportunity to make us strong. We have had the determination, the fortitude, the courage, the determination to give us the stability of a strong nation. It is the freedom, the civil freedom, the rights and privileges under our form of government that is responsible for it.

Yet with all this progress, the opportunities that are offered our people, some would wipe it out with one stroke by such legislation as we have before us.

Let us not go the way of some of the other countries.

I am encouraged by the interest in this debate. It is heartening to see so many rise up and express their fears and say publicly that this is not American.

Certainly I do not believe in rank discrimination because of race, color, or creed. No one has a kinder feeling for those that need help or should have help than I do and this applies not only to the colored people but a lot of white people. You cannot direct the social life of the people of this country and force social life among all people by legislation, but evidently that is the ultimate objective.

What alternative is there? Destroy business, then where are your jobs coming from? Where are you going to get your employment? Sure the Government will do it, but what do you have? You have a completely social form of Government which has never worked to the best interest of the people. Not only is it revealed by history but we have continually experienced it in other countries, some of which we are trying to help this very day.

I join my other colleagues, Mr. Chairman, in saying this just must not prevail.

MAKING A LIVING SERIOUS BUSINESS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, there are some basic facts in the economic and political life of America which are not very pretty. There is a glaring gap between our ideals of equality and our practices, not only in the serious business of American citizenship and its rights, duties, immunities, and privileges, but in the even more serious business of making a living.

I have already said much of this to the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor—to those with whom I once served on the committee, and whom I esteem as my friends and my colleagues.

It is a fact, a deplorable fact but a real one, that in many parts of the United States American citizens who happen to be Negroes have a harder time making a living than anybody else. It is a fact that in some parts of the United States employers will not knowingly hire Jews, or will hire them only for subordinate or unpleasant tasks, in a pattern of discrimination which is similar to that practiced against Negroes.

There are other localities in which Roman Catholics, and especially Roman Catholics of Italian, Spanish, or Mexican descent, feel the sharp lash of discrimination, and have difficulty in obtaining jobs in preferred occupations; or if they can get a job they cannot gain promotion. Discrimination in employment against orientals, or citizens of oriental descent, is very widespread; and in some States the very first Americans, our own American Indians, have the same trouble.

AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP IS ABSOLUTE AND INDIVISIBLE

Mr. Chairman, American citizenship is absolute and indivisible, except by due process of law; and economic freedom and equality are even more important to the Nation's and the individual's material welfare than political and intellectual freedom. A man with an empty stomach is not a particularly good citizen. The interests of all Americans are so tightly bound together that you cannot take away any part of the rights of one without chipping off a little bit of the rights of all.

Now, there are some people with so little faith in what America stands for that they think discrimination against groups of people, and against individuals of that group, is somehow imposed by Heaven and not by the Devil. By and large, these are the kind of people who say that to bring to light abuses or lapses in our American way of life is somehow communistic, and that it is most communistic of all to try to do something about those lapses or defects, as we are trying to do in fair-employment legislation. Curiously enough, the people who are most vociferous in their correspondence to me about this legislation, which simply spells out the right of every American to get a job on his own merits, are very likely to be the same ones who demand antiunion legislation in the name of giving workmen the right to get a job.

Calling this kind of legislation communistic is sheer nonsense.

We don't know if strong and enforceable legislation can be passed; and if it is passed we who advocate strong and enforceable legislation do not know with certainty that it will work the way we hope it will; but we also know that legislation of this kind will strengthen American democracy and will make America stronger against its enemies. We know that if FEPC legislation is communistic, then Thomas Jefferson was a Communist, George Washington was a Communist, Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt were Communists, and Harry S. Truman is of the same breed. The argument falls of its own weight.

We who plead for strong fair employment practices legislation know that we would be faithless to our commitments, faithless to our party, faithless to our principles, and faithless to our country if we did not do everything in our power to stop discrimination, in employment or elsewhere.

AMERICA FOUNDED ON INDIVIDUAL DIGNITY

This Nation is firmly founded on the high ethical concept—an ethical concept inherent in every great modern religion, in Judaism, in Christianity, in Buddhism—of the essential and divine dignity of the individual man. When any man or woman is judged as to employability on any other standard than his own worth as an employee, that concept is outraged and flouted. The individual is degraded, and so is the employer who commits this crime against democracy.

I am always dubious of experiments in legislating public morality. I wish that I could be so optimistic as to believe that this law could be made unnecessary by public education and general acceptance of the principles on which it rests. That would be wishful thinking. As a realist, I know that education is too slow. Discriminatory practices, especially in times of economic stress, grow and crystallize faster than they can be combated.

New York State has proved that it is possible to legislate successfully in this field. We have not stopped economic discrimination in New York; but we have certainly discouraged it. Let us make our kind of democratic living work right here in America before we try to reform the rest of the world.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my gratefulness to the ranking Republican Member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] for granting me a few minutes to express my sincere opposition to the Powell bill.

Someone has well said: "That the right to live is certainly a fundamental civil right. The ability to get food and drink is essential to life. You might argue, and I might agree with you, that you ought to have a civil right to have the Government feed you, if necessary. But I hope that you will not argue that you should have a civil right to compel any private citizen to whom you apply to supply you indefinitely with food and drink. For the same reason no one should contend that the moral right to earn a living provides a basis for creating in anyone a civil right to compel a private citizen to employ an individual in private business. I hope that it will be admitted that making it unlawful for

an employer to refuse to hire a man is simply a way of compelling that employer to hire such a man."

Mr. Chairman, it is tragically unfortunate, and perhaps it may be a moral wrong, for people to be bigoted or prejudiced against a person because of race, religion, or creed, or their racial origin, but we are no more able by legislation to remove that prejudice or that bigotry than we are to legislate that the sun shall not rise tomorrow morning. That, Mr. Chairman, is a matter of education and time, and all of the things that must go to remove racial and religious prejudice, and in no other way. It does seem to me that the proponents of this bill, with all their sincerity—and I know they are sincere—are attempting to say, and do say by this bill, that an employer shall associate himself with an employee whether he is personally prejudiced against him or not. To me that is wrong. I think one of the fundamental rights is the right of an employee to select an employer, as it is the right of the employer to select his employee. I cannot imagine wanting to work for anyone who had a prejudice against me and did not want to employ me.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. One or two gentlemen have taken the floor and harped on the fact that this was written into the Democratic and Republican platforms I call attention to the fact that Rabbi Wise stated before either one of those conventions even met that it was written into the Communist platform. I saw his statement today.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Of course it is unfortunate, and it is an example to me of tawdry politics, in the face of our American way of life; I think it is unfortunate for both parties.

If you will pardon a personal reference, let me say that I served with a colored battalion and had command of a colored battalion for some time in World War I. I was honored by my association with them and enjoyed it tremendously and had the highest respect for those colored men. In only one instance did I have the slightest trouble in the matter of discipline.

Yet, when I think of my own associations I realize that I come from a district that is overwhelmingly Protestant; they sent me, a Catholic, to this Congress to represent them. I am thinking in terms of the hundreds of little-business men in my district who would be subject to a bunch of official snoopers coming out to investigate them if somebody filed a complaint that he was being prejudiced because he was not employed or was discharged.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for one additional minute

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the language in the report on page 2. I presume the gentleman is familiar with it.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I am; I have read the bill carefully.

Mr. JONAS. I refer to the lower part of page 2, where the statement is made:

> The fear of discriminatory discharges weighs heavily upon all who have ever known the frustration and bitterness of job discrimination, notably upon the approximately 26,000,000 Catholics, 15,000,000 Negroes, 5,000,000 Jews

Does the gentleman infer from that that all these people are discriminated against?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Why, of course not; the gentleman knows that. Certainly there is prejudice and discrimination, but there will always be. You can pass all the laws in Christendom and not be able to remove it.

Mr. JONAS. I agree with the gentleman, but it would appear that those who wrote this report wish the reader to draw the inference from this statement that these people would not discriminate against each other, but that those not of these races would discriminate against them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is no stranger to this House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to touch briefly on the major sources of support for this legislation. We have heard it called Communist; we have heard it said that it was Communist-inspired; we have heard it referred to as being part of the Communist platform before it was incorporated into the Democratic and Republican platforms.

I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if simply because the dictator of Russia, Mr. Stalin, in 1944, I believe, announced that he was in favor of freedom of religion in Russia the gentleman from Mississippi would automatically oppose it here in the House of Representatives and in the United States of America?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am asking the gentleman a question; yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman asked me my attitude. I just want to say that I would not believe Joe Stalin or any Communist on oath, or off of it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Then, I assume that because this Communist platform carried FEPC before the Democratic and Republican conventions the gentleman feels that they should not have carried it.

Mr. RANKIN. I am opposed to it as a matter of principle.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. This bill has its moral basis in the very essence of the Catholic, the Protestant, and the Jewish faiths; and the clergy and lay leaders of every major religion have emphasized this with all the earnestness and hopefulness at their command before the committees of the House and the Senate. I have here a very brief list of some of these religious leaders. The first is Bishop Sherrill, presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I just want to say that Sherrill does not speak for me.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am not saying that he speaks for the gentleman; I am just saying that in his position as the presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church he did favor this FEPC legislation.

Other religious organizations and leaders in favor of this act are: Rev. Samuel Cavert, of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ; Bishops Haas and Sheil; the National Catholic Welfare Council; the Catholic Interracial Council; Rabbi William S. Rosenbloom; and, yes, the late, and in my opinion very great, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, are in favor of this legislation. The Synagogue Council of America and others are in favor of this legislation.

The spokesmen of almost every labor union are for it, and they represent millions of Americans who know that the future of our country, in fact the future of a free world, depends upon the fulfillment of the American dream that every man has a fair chance for economic advancement regardless of his race, of his creed, or of his religion.

There are several businessmen, representing business over this land, who are in favor of it.

The bill which we have before us is, unfortunately, no stranger to the House of Representatives.

FEPC bills were introduced in the Seventy-eighth, the Seventy-ninth, and the Eightieth Congresses. This is, moreover, the third time that our Committee an Education and Labor has favorably reported on FEPC. A majority of us, as legislators, have a past-due obligation to vote for it because our parties are pledged for it, and because our conscience dictates it. If we fail to enact H R. 4453 this time, then we shall have to answer to the people of the United States—indeed to the people of the world—for our failure to match promise with deed.

The extensive hearings which have been held by the two Houses of the Congress—with testimony and messages from representatives of every significant group in America—are not devoid of meaning. For this bill has its moral basis in the very essence of the Catholic, the Protestant, and the Jewish faiths—and the clergy and lay leaders of every major religion have emphasized this with all the earnestness and hopefulness at their command.

It is, in short, clear reflection of this first statement in our own Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal.

Spokesmen of almost every major labor union have urged it on behalf of the millions of the organized workers of America, who know that the future of our country depends upon the fulfillment of

the American dream—that every man has a fair chance for economic advancement, regardless of his race, his creed, or his religion.

It is, therefore, no accident, Mr. Chairman, that representatives of every region of the United States have pleaded for this bill and that American statesmen of every political persuasion, of every race, color, and creed, are on record and actively in favor of it.

Every responsible student of international affairs has declared that this bill will strengthen America's political position on the world scene. I have heard no one deny this. The Secretary of State has clearly said how urgently our United Nations and diplomatic representatives need this bill. The Secretary of Defense has indicated that making democracy work so that racial and religious discrimination will cease is "a basic ingredient of the national security."

The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are proving their agreement by their actions to forward democracy in all of the services.

As a Democrat, I am proud that President Truman has missed no opportunity to reaffirm his conviction that we need an FEPC. Like most Americans, the President realizes that this bill merely advances what all of us say we believe in, the dignity of man and equality of economic opportunity.

I was honored to serve as vice chairman of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights, and to gain personal knowledge of the depth of the President's profound conviction on this great issue. Both parties, Republicans and Democrats alike, said they were in favor of FEPC in their convention platforms of 1948. And over and above this, a mass of research evidence based on the experience of 10 States with various forms of anti-job discrimination laws, is eloquent proof of the effectiveness of the approach proposed in H. R. 4453.

I am sure that every liberal Member of this Chamber, regardless of his party, will vote for this bill. I believe that every conservative Member must also vote for it—or else stand convicted of hypocrisy.

Why? Because the conservative Members of this House have talked so much about economy, about the need for balancing the budget, about the need for preserving free enterprise and individual initiative, about the need for an effective answer to communism at home and abroad.

If they mean what they say on these issues, they will vote for FEPC. If they vote against it, the country will know that they are self-seeking vote chasers.

Let me call these facts to the attention of those conservatives who have inveighed so strongly against the size of the national debt. They speak eloquently about the need for meeting the deficit in our national budget. But how much does discrimination in employment cost us? Three estimates were made to the congressional committee. One, by a businessman, Eric Johnston, conservatively put the figure at $2,000,000,000 a year. Another, by a labor economist, put the figure at eight to ten billion dollars a year. A third, by an economist who is adviser to hundreds of business enterprises, set the cost at upwards of $15,000,000,000. Since then, Elmo Roper has finished a survey which established the cost of job discrimination as at least $4,000,000,000.

We have often been told by leading Government and private economists that the seven to ten billion dollars in goods which we export represents the critical margin between American prosperity and depression. Here we have an equally critical margin of anywhere between two and fifteen billion dollars, and I rather think the true figure lies midway between those two estimates. Can any reasonable person doubt that adding this much purchasing power would help us to achieve a stable American prosperity?

Perhaps that is why businessmen of the stature of Charles E. Wilson, Charles Luckman, William Batt, Beardsley Ruml, Allen Dulles, Henry Luce, Paul Hoffman, and Nelson Rockefeller are all unqualifiedly on record in favor of FEPC. These men know whereof they speak. They know what is good for this country's business. They know that FEPC will add to that reservoir of skilled labor which is one of our greatest resources in America. They know that FEPC will help free the initiative and the enterprise of millions of Americans whose energies and potentialities for constructive work are now crippled by discrimination. They know that as job discrimination goes down, purchasing power goes up. And they know full well that that purchasing power will mean more seed capital for small business, more revenue for Government, more wealth for the entire country.

Mr. Chairman, has there ever been a measure of such tremendous and forceful significance which has been so universally sanctioned, so universally wanted, and so universally needed as this. There has been more than enough talk, more than enough study, more than enough deliberation. It is, Mr. Chairman, time for action. It is time to prove that we believe in the American promise of freedom, the American promise of equality, the American promise of opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL], a member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think I can speak with some understanding of this legislation now before us and with some experience in this field. When I was a member of the State Legislature of New Jersey, I was the first one to sponsor such a bill in the House of Assembly. Later during that session the bill was picked up by the Republican majority and passed. It has been working in very fine shape ever since then. It has not solved all of our problems in the field of discrimination but it has immensely reduced the onus, and has given employment in many lines of endeavor, to the people who were not employed before that act went into effect. The working of the act has proven that many of the fears, that many, some sincerely and some otherwise, had as to the dire effects and results of such legislation were unfounded. It has demonstrated that most of those things just have not happened. The legitimate and orderly functioning of business has not been interfered with. Many organizations and individuals who were skeptical and fearful of such a law have come back and said that the law has not interfered with business. It has produced results and it has had a fine effect on the guaranty of civil rights in New Jersey.

One of the main reasons why we need a Federal law at this point is the fact this is a national problem and despite the fact that many exhaustive studies have been made and many attempts have been made in a general way to prohibit discrimination in employment, through education, the fact still remains much discrimination exists in that field. Improvement has been very slight. This type of legislation is needed if we are going to make the democracy that we talk so much about and proclaim to the world, really work and function for all groups in our various communities.

It has been suggested that many of the supporters of this legislation are not sincere in their support but that they support this legislaiton for political and for vote-getting reasons. For one, I can say, I do sincerely believe this legislation is worthy and needed and I feel that many other Members of the House are sincerely convinced this type of legislation is needed. There may be a few instances here and there of persons who will vote for it for political expediency; there may be also a few who will vote against it for political expediency, even though the dictates of their own hearts tell them it is fair legislation.

I think that this type of law, with the proper administration and proper handling, and with emphasis at the conciliation level is the type of a law modeled after the State laws of various States where it has been shown that it can work, if wisely administered, and fairly and honestly prosecuted, and that we will not have the trouble even in some of our southern States that so many of our Members have predicted will cause all kinds of havoc not only in some northern States, but in the South. I sincerely believe that this type of thing will not happen, and with proper administration a lot of fears that many of you have expressed will not materialize, and that we can go on and make some real progress in this field which means so much to many people in many minority groups. There is very little that we can do in this field unless we pass this kind of a law.

I urge your support of this bill as presented, and hope a real effort will be made to obtain its passage in the other body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues in the Congress, the decision you are going to make here this afternoon is an important one; important not only to the 16,000,000 citizens of which I am a

member, but important to many other minority groups, and important to every man and woman in these United States of America.

The question of fair employment is not alone a question of the South; it is a question relating to every section of this country. It is a question whether or not this great country of ours will afford to its citizens an opportunity to work and live on an equal basis. I repeat, it is not a question of the South alone. It is a question for all America. It is a question for all America, because the thing we do here, and the attitudes we take toward this question of the right of every citizen to work, and similar questions, based upon the identity of some of the citizens of these United States, will affect the relations of the United States with other nations of the world at a time when the very life of the Nation is at stake.

Do you believe in the Constitution? Do you believe in what is within the four corners of that document? Then, what gives any citizen the right to deny to any other citizen the basic rights that every citizen is guaranteed therein: the right to live, the right to exercise the liberty to go to the polls and have something to say about those who make the laws; those who interpret the laws and those who execute the laws? This is the question today, gentlemen, whether or not you will tell 16,000,000 that "You are not first-rate citizens of this country, the Constitution notwithstanding."

I am from the South. I was born in the South, and I will say this to the South. Do not make this question a race question. I will say to you that there are 12 Southern States but there are also 36 other States that are interested in the welfare of the citizens of the United States. I stand before you here today in a dual capacity. The Constitution says that every person born or naturalized within the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof is a citizen of the United States and a citizen of the State in which he resides. So every citizen in the United States does have a stake in what happens to me and mine in these United States.

The South can no more isolate itself in the matter of treatment of citizens where the right to work is concerned from the rest of the Nation than can this Nation isolate itself from the rest of the nations of the world on questions affecting them all.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you to pass this Fair Employment Practice Act and thereby outlaw conditions which constitute a disgrace on our country.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I seem to have been destined by fate to be closely involved with some of the most volatile and emotionally difficult bills coming before the Eighty-first Congress. I hope most sincerely and humbly that providence will give me the wisdom and the emotional balance to deal justly and fairly with the problems, and with my fellow man. I realize also, that the moral code of the universe inexorably dooms to failure any law that is deliberately fashioned to trick or harm an individual.

Today, we are considering the problem of alleviating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color. Jobs are being denied to many Americans because of social background, or religious faith, or because of the color of their skins. Our duty is to devise a workable and just method to bring about a correction of this practice. There is a real problem and a challenge to all of us. Ignoring it will not suffice—we must come to grips with it. I will do my best to meet it.

In attempting to work out a solution, we must recognize that the type of discrimination we are considering is deeply rooted in the beliefs and feelings of human beings. Even though he is not personally prejudiced, an employer may feel it necessary to be discriminatory because of the prejudice of his employees, or his customers—the public. A business enterprise is fundamentally a team of individuals who work together as a unit to efficiently produce goods. One discordant note can break down that necessary smooth-functioning group to the detriment of all.

Furthermore, we must recognize that ingrained prejudices, which have been developed over the centuries, might easily be turned into hatreds. An improper and ill-considered solution could tear our country asunder, as the subversive elements would have it. I believe this problem can be worked out without playing into the hands of those who would see us disunited for their own selfish reasons.

Chairman LESINSKI of the Education and Labor Committee has brought up H R 4453 This bill was reported favorably by the committee by a vote of 14-11. I voted against it and am opposed to its enactment. My principal objection is to the enforcement and penalty sections of the bill.

I believe our major controversy will occur over those provisions. They will point up certain definite questions

Should civil suits be permitted in Federal courts by a party claiming job discrimination because of race, creed, or color?

Should it be made a criminal act to discriminate for those reasons?

Should an administrative agency, with powers usually given only to courts, be established—as provided in H. R. 4453? Even making it a crime to discriminate in employment because of race, creed, or color, would give the accused a fairer hearing than is provided in this bill.

The Constitution requires criminal statutes to specifically define the acts which are criminal. The accused is protected by the Constitution from illegal search and seizure of his records. Only legal evidence is admissible against him, and his guilt must be proven to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. There are no such protections in the bill H. R. 4453.

If job discrimination were made grounds for a civil action, it would have to be proven by legal evidence. Damages would also have to be proven. The defendant would be entitled under the Constitution to a jury trial, and the verdict would have to be based on a preponderance of the evidence. Where are such protections in H. R. 4453?

If a commission were established to hear complaints of job discrimination, should legal evidence be required? Should the constitutional protection against illegal search and seizure apply? How much evidence would be required for conviction—a mere scintilla, a preponderance, or would guilt have to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt? Should the offense be carefully defined so that each employer knows exactly what is required of him?

In addition to the problem of procedure in hearing complaints of discrimination, there are other questions which must be answered before an equitable law can be written. For example, should everybody who has been denied a job be permitted to bring an action by alleging some motive of discrimination? We are all members of some minority group. Should employers be harassed by such charges of discrimination whether or not they are well founded? Should not an employer be permitted to sue to recover costs of defending an action which was brought maliciously? These are only a few of the many matters which should be considered if we are going to be fair. If we enact a law which does not cover these points—it may cause present prejudices to grow into hatreds Racial and religious groups may become more antagonistic—the Nation may be divided against itself.

Many of us who favor the principle of a Fair Employment Practice Commission are compelled to oppose H. R. 4453. The provisions of that bill are inadequate and incomplete. None of the problems I have mentioned are properly met in the bill. The end result could be injurious to the very groups we are trying to aid and protect.

If discrimination in employment is to be eliminated, some attempt must be made to remove its cause—prejudice. I have introduced a bill which provides what I believe is the best approach to eliminating job discrimination and its causes. This bill would establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission. It would be the duty of the Commission to bring about the removal of discrimination in regard to hire or tenure, terms or conditions of employment, or union membership, because of race, creed, or color—

First, by making comprehensive studies of such discrimination in different metropolitan districts and sections of the country and of the affect of such discrimination and of the best methods of eliminating it;

Second, by formulating, in cooperation with other interested public and private agencies, comprehensive plans for the elimination of such discrimination, as rapidly as possible, in regions or areas where such discrimination is prevalent;

Third, by publishing and disseminating reports and other information relating to such discrimination and to ways and means for eliminating it;

Fourth, by conferring, cooperating with, and furnishing technical assistance to employers, labor unions, and other private and public agencies in formulating and executing policies and programs for the elimination of such discrimination;

Fifth, by receiving and investigating complaints charging any such discrimination and by investigating other cases where it has reason to believe that any such discrimination is practiced; and

Sixth, by making specific and detailed recommendations to the interested parties, in any such case as to ways and means for elimination of any such discrimination.

The bill also authorized the Commission to make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable. By concentrating on the problem, I believe the Commission could devise fair methods and procedures to eliminate job discrimination.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Before the gentleman goes into a description of his bill, I would like to get one thing settled in my own mind. Is there anything in the pending legislation that would in any way prevent discriminatory practices among fellow employees in a plant covered by this bill, one which employs 50 or more, and in which plant you compel the management, perhaps, to employ some certain individual whom it is alleged discrimination has been practiced against. Is there anything in this bill that would prevent the employees in that plant from practicing discrimination, and making it so unpleasant for such employee that he would have to leave of his own volition?

Mr. McCONNELL. I would say to the distinguished gentleman that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] wishes to answer that. I will let him answer, and then I will conclude.

Mr. POWELL. The bill clearly spells out the prevention of any form of discrimination: First, in the offices of trade unions; second, in plants in which there are unions. It is just as rigidly spelled out against the unions as it is against the employers. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] asked the same question before the Rules Committee.

Mr. KEEFE. That does not answer the question. I think the gentleman well knows there are many plants in this country, employing 50 or more, that are not unionized. They have certain types of people in those plants. Somebody makes an application for employment and it is turned down, and it is finally decided that discrimination was practiced by the employer against that individual.

What I want to know is, If that individual is put into the plant is there anything in the bill to prevent the employees in that plant from discriminating against this new man that is brought in under those circumstances?

Mr. McCONNELL. I would like to say to my colleague I do not believe there is real protection in the bill against the discrimination he speaks of.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going into the details of my own bill, because I will be mentioning it under the 5-minute rule when I offer it as a substitute amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I would like to proceed, if I may.

There is another aspect of my bill which is important to those of you who sincerely want an FEPC law on the books this year. I believe that it would not be suffocated in a Senate filibuster while H. R. 4453 would face almost certain death.

I will offer my bill as a substitute amendment to H. R. 4453. I believe my bill is a practical approach to the problem and it has a practical chance of enactment in this session. It should have the support of those who sincerely want a Fair Employment Practice Commission as a reality.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I should like to clear up one matter for the benefit of the House. Some statements have been made that the people of California did not know what they were voting on when they voted on FEPC. I should like to say, for the benefit of the House, that the people of California are as thoroughly cognizant of things which pertain to the welfare of this country as the people of any other State. They knew very well what they were voting on. It was not a Communist plot. It was not painted to them to be a Communist plot. They voted it down for what it was—a restriction upon fundamental American rights. I think that should be in the record. The people of California knew exactly what they were doing when they voted down FEPC.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a sad day for those of us who are thinking of the next generation rather than the next election.

In my considered judgment if the bill before us now, the FEPC bill, is ever enacted into law, it will cause more bloodshed than did the Civil War.

Today is the birthday of George Washington, the Father of Our Country. What would he think if he were here to observe first-hand what the pressure groups are endeavoring to legislate down the throats of the American people?

This is a sad day in my life, in that I realize that if the so-called FEPC bill ever becomes law, we will enter upon a new phase of life—a life we have not been accustomed to here in America. It simply means that those of us who operate businesses will be deprived of our right under the Constitution to exercise our own considered judgment in employing our personnel.

The bill before us is utterly without merit and is purely political. It will only cause heartaches, bloodshed, and general turmoil throughout our beloved land.

I repeat, the bill before us for consideration is purely political. A great number of my colleagues from the East, North, and West have told me they are opposed to this unworkable, unjustifiable, and damaging legislation, but they further stated that on account of their geographical sections and the type of constituencies they represented, that they had to demagog and vote for something they knew to be wrong and without merit in order to preserve their political future.

I wish every Member of this honorable body would retire to some secret chamber so that he, too, could meditate and realize what a great injustice he is doing to his children and his children's children. It is not important that I be returned to the Congress, but it is important that I vote and act so as not to penalize the generations that are to follow. Certainly for the benefit of those who are to follow us, it would be well and wise for us to think of the next generation rather than just the next election.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] was ordered to the naval hospital on Monday, February 20. Mr. ALLEN was suffering from a very severe attack of influenza which has now developed into pneumonia. Even under these circumstances he tried to prevail upon Dr. Calver to let him leave the hospital long enough to be here for a vote on the FEPC bill, but Dr. Calver informed the gentleman that he did not propose to add to his list of deaths among Members of Congress. He absolutely refused to permit Mr. ALLEN to leave the hospital which, of course, was the proper thing for Dr. Calver to do.

Mr. ALLEN has manifested his opposition to the bill under consideration from its inception. Being unable to be present, he dictated a statement from his sick bed and asked that it be placed in an appropriate spot in the body of the RECORD. For him I ask unanimous consent to insert his statement at this point of the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the terrible day which we of the South have fought against for years has reached us. Today the legislative machinery is greased to put over the FEPC bill, which, in my opinion, is the most dangerous piece of legislation ever proposed in the United States Congress. We of the South have known all along that on a showdown, record vote the cause would go overwhelmingly against us because we know that nearly all of the Republicans and all of the northern Democrats will vote to put this legislation over the American people. We are making the fight right down to the very last and I for one will never surrender my convictions on the matter.

Everybody knows that this legislation is aimed at the South. I fully appreciate the fact that probably not one thing that is said here today on this bill will change a single vote because the lines are drawn, but I think that it is well to remind those gentlemen who intend to push this legislation down the throats of the American

people that the bill will hurt all over the United States. The damage it does will certainly not be confined to the South. I want you who are voting for this legislation to be assured that this will come back to plague you many days hence.

Everybody knows that this bill is purely political. If the bill could be voted on by a secret vote it would never pass, but the minority groups in this country have been prodding most of you for years to pass this bill and the political threat has been constantly dangled before the eyes of the American Congress. The bill is utterly without merits and it is difficult for me to see how any fair-minded person could undertake to argue for it.

I do not see how anyone can escape the fact that this proposed legislation strikes at the very fundamental principle of Americanism. If there is any one thing in this world that sent our forefathers westward to found this American Nation more than all other reasons, that was the freedom of choice. They came to escape oppression and to assert their right to choose their friends, choose their churches, choose their politics, and choose their associates. And yet here a comparatively few short years later we find this House proposing to put over an issue which, if enacted, would strike at this very foundation principle of freedom of choice. Mr. Chairman, the thing sounds so absurd and so ridiculous that the descendants of those hardy pioneers would now take this step—yet that is what is facing us.

We have been waging a fight in this Congress against communism. This Government has been spending billions of dollars, it has claimed, to prevent the spread of communism. In the face of all of that, the leadership in the Democratic Party and the leadership in the Republican Party are championing this FEPC bill which, in my opinion, will be the greatest help to Communists in this country in further infiltrating themselves into government and every other walk of life. This is so, Mr. Chairman, because if this bill becomes a law, it will be impossible, yea even unlawful, for any employer and even for the Government itself especially in some agencies such as the Atomic Energy Commission to as much as inquire into whether one is a Communist before he is employed. If this bill becomes a law every employer and certain Federal agencies will find themselves hogtied in trying to keep out Communist infiltration. You will not be permitted to ask where an applicant was born, what his race is, what his religion is, or anything else which may directly or indirectly touch upon the question of race, religion, or national origin. We hear it said now every day that our Federal agencies are infiltrated with Communist and Communist sympathizers. Well, if this bill is passed, the Communists in Federal Government employment will increase manyfold. Yes, Mr. Chairman, this whole proposition is so dangerous for the well-being of America it does look like sensible and reasonable men would not be swayed by minority pressure groups but would stop, look, and listen before they become a party to this nefarious proposition.

We who are opposing this legislation are not actuated by malice. We do so because we love Americanism more and we are persuaded, Mr. Chairman, that instead of lessening malice and racial intolerance, the effect of this legislation would be to increase it. Anybody who thinks that the American people are going to take this supinely just does not know the heart and soul of America. I think it can be said with absolute certainty that there is less prejudice in the South than there is in any other section of the country. Our people in the South do not hate the Negro. We want to help him and we are helping him. There is a very fine spirit in the South today. The right-thinking southern Negro knows that the passage of FEPC would hurt him and would create such turmoil that it would set his own cause back for a long time. Just a few days ago, Mr. Chairman, a Negro minister from the South came to my office and said that he had something to say to southern Members of Congress on this subject. I did not have the slightest idea what he was going to say. He then informed me briefly, and as a result of his own broad experience as a minister of the gospel, that, in his opinion, the passage of the FEPC bill at this time would be disastrous to the cause of the Negro. Moreover, he proceeded to say that he felt that some of those who were leading the parade for the passage of this bill were actuated by politics and were not sincere and he called the names of some persons in very high places in America. I relate this because I want you gentlemen to know that some of the fine Negro leaders in the South are trying to think this thing through and desire that whatever is done may be of lasting benefit to the entire country and these Negro leaders know that it is certainly not to their interest to continue to have pushed before the American people the proposal contained in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is a tragic hour. This means that the Congress of the United States is yielding to minority pressure groups. I would to God that this House not make this fatal mistake and thrust upon the American people the turmoil which is bound to come from the passage of this bill. It may well be that the historian of the future will mark the beginning of the final disintegration of our glorious Government from this point. It may well be that the Communists will accept this as the greatest opportunity ever handed to them to subjugate the American people. Make no mistake about it that when you rejoice over the passage of this act, there will be great rejoicing in Moscow also.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has raised objection to the committee bill and distinguishes it from his own bill on the basis of the fact that the committee bill provides for the obtaining of a cease-and-desist order. The gentleman contends that such an order may be obtained without evidence that would be necessary to convict a person of a crime. Certainly, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who supported the Taft-Hartley bill, must bear in mind that under that act injunctions are obtained against members of organized labor precisely by more extreme means, an ex parte application to the court supported merely by an allegation on the part of the Department of Justice or the attorney for the National Labor Relations Board.

The difference between myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is that he prefers that system in enforcing employers' interests against labor; I prefer the system provided in the committee bill to protect people against discrimination. I therefore oppose the bill offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I do so also because his bill completely frustrates the very objective of FEPC. Every real enemy of FEPC supports his bill.

Now, as to the fundamentals of the committee bill, we find its roots all the way back in the struggle against slavery, and in the Emancipation Proclamation. Today this legislation is aimed at what? It is intended to protect the Negro people and other minorities against discrimination in employment. In protecting the Negro people against discrimination this legislation deals a real blow at that which is the main prop of exploitation of all working people, including even descendants of the *Mayflower* who work for a living.

This legislation is a tremendous step toward the establishment of equality, and let me say, and I use the word advisedly toward the overthrow of white supremacy.

Let us recognize that. Let us recognize that that fact is what really has caused the opposition we have had, the violent opposition, the filibustering tactics and the bitterness which has just been engendered into this debate. Today the false concept of white supremacy has been extended from the South up into the North. So we find not only the last vestige of feudalism in the South using the racist doctrine of white supremacy for the exploitation of people there, not only do we find the new ruthless industrialism of the South using it for exploitation there, but we find monopolists in the North as well, using it as a weapon for exploitation, as a weapon for dividing and ruling the working people in the North. That explains to a great extent some of the lukewarm support and some of the avowed opposition to this legislation from the industrial sections of the North.

So that what is involved here is not the freedom of anyone to employ whom he pleases. What is involved here is the tyranny of anyone to refuse to give employment to any person because of race, color, or creed. If discrimination is freedom, then, certainly, we are perverting the definition of freedom, indeed we are subverting the very concepts of freedom as we have known them in these United States since our country was founded.

FEPC is a blow for equality, equality which will help overthrow white supremacy which is the main prop of the exploitation of all working people everywhere in these United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute to answer a question propounded by the gentleman from Wisconsin: Does this bill, H. R. 4453, protect employers who act in good faith whose employees discriminate?

The gentleman will find the answer on page 9, subsection (5) of section (g) reading:

Upon the request of any employer acting in good faith, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to have the honor to conclude the general debate on the FEPC bill. The issue before us is a matter of simple right and wrong, of fundamental justice, of human decency. It challenges us to live up to the religious ideals we profess, to take a firm stand in favor of the patriotic ideals on which our country was founded.

It is a very strange thing to see that the Members of this House who quote the Bible most frequently, who wave the flag most conspicuously on every occasion, are now the most anxious to repudiate the fundamental principles behind this legislation. They are all in favor of the Declaration of Independence—but they want to forget the part about "all men are created equal." They can recite the preamble to the Constitution, but they want to forget the amendments, especially the ones which freed the slaves and gave them equal rights.

We freed the slaves from involuntary servitude. And now it is up to us to free their descendants from involuntary unemployment. The right to earn a living is at the basis of every other right in our country. The chance to take his place on an equal footing with other citizens in the struggle for existence ought to be the most elementary right of every citizen of this Republic. When a man is denied a job for which he is qualified in every other respect, because of the color of his skin, or his religion, we are condemning him to involuntary unemployment which is as unjust as involuntary servitude. The FEPC bill is a new Emancipation Proclamation against job discrimination.

Who is behind this legislation? Both national parties declared themselves in favor of it at their national conventions in 1948. I am proud to be one of those who helped prepare and put through the plank at the Democratic Convention held last June in Philadelphia. That plank read:

We again state our belief that racial and religious minorities must have the right to live, the right to work, the right to vote, the full and equal protection of the laws on a basis of equality with all citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution. We highly commend President Truman for his courageous stand on the issue of civil rights. We call upon the Congress to support our President in guaranteeing these basic and fundamental rights: (1) The right of full and equal political representation, (2) the right to equal opportunity of employment, (3) the right of security of person, (4) the right of equal treatment in the service and defense of our Nation.

The Republican Party also adopted a plank favoring civil rights, though in slightly less specific terms.

The 1948 election showed that the people of all but three States accepted the principle, and counted on their elected Representatives to do something about the practice of civil rights.

The churches of America favor the enactment of FEPC legislation. Religious organizations who have passed resolutions endorsing it include the Catholic Interracial Council, Catholic War Veterans, the Presbyterian General Assembly, the United Council of Church Women, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Boards of the YMCA and YWCA and the National Council of Student Christian Associations, the General Conference of the Methodist Church and the Methodist Ministers' Union, the Council for Social Action of the Congregational-Christian Churches, the General Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, the American Friends' Service Committee, the American Unitarian Association, and the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

The last-named organization states its position clearly, so clearly that I want to read you their statement on this issue.

The right to work—

Says the Federal Council of Churches—

is a divine right. So just and so in harmony with Christian ethics that all Christians and church agencies have a deep responsibility to stand for that clear Christian and democratic principle. We believe that Government should take such necessary legislative and administrative action as will protect the right to work from any such discrimination.

An equally clear moral statement was issued by the National Catholic Welfare Conference urging not only that Catholics should support FEPC legislation but that they were obligated to practice nondiscrimination, with or without a law. They state:

Christian moral teaching requires every employer to maintain and enforce nondiscriminatory policies in hiring, upgrading, and discharge. In addition, it requires each employer not only to cease opposition to the enactment of Federal and State FEPC laws, but to use his influence in his association and with his fellow employers to secure the passage and assist in the enforcement of such statutes

Perhaps the finest statement on the question from a religious point of view came from Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago, auxiliary bishop of the largest Roman Catholic archdiocese in the World:

A fair employment practice law—

Said Bishop Sheil—

would give legal recognition to that God-given dignity which every human being possesses. If we are truly Christian, we cannot preach one thing and practice another. Economic discrimination is immoral. It is clearly sinful. How long are we expected to sit by while children of God find their paths blocked at every point by the forces of bigotry and discrimination?

This is National Brotherhood Week. What better way can we find to show our belief in the principles of Christian brotherhood than to extend the right to work, free of discrimination, to our citizens of every race, creed, and color? Today, on Ash Wednesday, the beginning of the period of penance and sacrifice observed by the Christian church, we can and should take a stand in support of a law to permit our brothers to advance through their own efforts, without discrimination, as far as their ability will take them.

The idea behind Brotherhood Week, and behind the whole Christian ethic, is that we are all children of God. There was no special provision made in the Bible for an inferior place in the world for God's stepchildren, and we discarded that idea in America when we passed the constitutional amendments to set the slaves free and give them a vote

At least most of us discarded it. There are still some people who honestly believe that slavery was a good idea and that we should not have abolished it. I think there are many more people who believe that, than are willing to say so. I received a few days ago a copy of a newspaper called the Southern Conservative, which made it pretty clear where the editor stood on this question. She says:

Southern people know how to get along with members of the colored race. They have been doing it successfully for more than a hundred years, and if Communist sympathizers from the North will stop meddling they will do it for a hundred years more.

Do you remember what the racial issue was 100 years ago, in the year 1850? The issue was not, Has the Negro a right to a job, or has he a right to a vote? It was simply, Is he a human being? That was the point at issue in the fugitive-slave law. And the answer was given in the Dred Scott decision, "No, he is not a human being—he is a form of personal property."

Most Americans look back with horror on that era, and the ideas it sought to perpetuate. Most Americans think that it was a disgrace that this Nation, conceived in liberty, should have suffered the degradation of human slavery for more than 70 years—many years after it ceased to be tolerated by any other civilized nation in the world. And today most Americans believe that job discrimination based on race prejudice is a hangover from slavery which must and should be abolished by law, if we are to live up to our pretensions to be a free country.

Not long ago I was talking to a Hindu, who asked me questions about America which I could not answer to his satisfaction or mine. He wanted to know why, when we voted to free the slaves nearly 80 years ago, we still did not assure them a vote and a job. I could give historical explanations of the persistence of prejudice, but he still shook his head in bewilderment.

"How can it be possible," he asked me "that after two generations of freedom and education, you still do not give to

the colored people civil rights?" It was a tough question. I hope I can give a better answer if I meet him again tomorrow.

Our failure to enact civil rights and FEPC legislation so far has branded us a Nation of hypocrites in many parts of the world. We are trying to win the confidence of the rest of the world to form a union of democracies against communism. Yet we exclude from our own democracy a large section of our people who are ready and willing to take their places in thousands of jobs now barred to them, not by their incompetence, but by prejudice.

A very large portion of the people on this earth are nonwhite. If America is the leader of the democratic nations, and America stands for race prejudice, why should they support democracy against communism? Those who howl the loudest against communism and Russia are driving millions into the arms of the Communists by their refusal to legislate against race discrimination.

I have spent a good deal of time discussing the problems and principles of discrimination against the Negro. But there are many other minorities who suffer unfair oppression in this land of the free because of their religion, or their national origin, or the color of their skin. In addition to the Negro, the Catholic, the Jew, the American Indian, the American-born citizen of Asiatic origin, find it harder to get jobs, or to win advancement, than the white Protestant.

The President's Commission on Civil Rights found that the members of minority groups were the last hired and the first fired. The National Community Relations Council found in a 1948 study that 80 percent of American Jews had experienced job discrimination. The United States Census Bureau figures show that in 1947 unemployment was 3 8 percent among white workers—but 6 7 percent among nonwhites.

I do not propose to quote more figures to show that there is discrimination today. We all know that there is discrimination. The question before us on this floor is, Do we approve that discrimination and seek to perpetuate it? Do we not want to give people an equal opportunity to work? Do we want to keep the best jobs, the advancements, the pay raises, for a certain kind of Americans? If there were job equality, it would lead to proof that there is no fundamental difference between Jew and Gentile, black and white. And the case for race prejudice would collapse.

So, think the opponents of FEPC, we must maintain race discrimination in principle and in practice, to protect the jobs which we may not be able to hold on the basis of ability.

This is un-American, un-Christian, and un-Democratic. It is a policy which we, as the elected representatives of a great nation must repudiate. The time for prejudice is past—long past. As I said on this floor a few days ago, it is now just four score and seven years since the Great Emancipator signed the proclamation freeing the slaves. In 87 years we have failed to give to our minority groups the full measure of that freedom which we hoped to bestow upon them at that time. Must we wait another 87 before true equality of opportunity becomes a reality?

I want to close my remarks with the words of one of our greatest Presidents—Franklin D. Roosevelt. In his celebrated prayer for the United Nations, he concluded:

> Yet most of all, grant us brotherhood, not only for this day but for all years—a brotherhood not of words but of acts and deeds. We are all of us children of the earth—grant us that simple knowledge. If our brothers are oppressed, then we are oppressed. If they hunger, we hunger. If their freedom is taken away, our freedom is not secure. Grant us a common faith that man shall know bread and peace—that he shall know justice and righteousness, freedom and security—an equal opportunity and an equal chance to do his best. And in that faith, let us march forward toward the clean world our hands can make.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc —

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Federal Fair Employment Practices Act"

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move that we now adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order in Committee.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHAFER) there were—ayes 105, noes 167.

Mr. SHAFER and Mr. COLMER demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr SHAFER and Mr. POWELL.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 107, noes 179.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCONNELL.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania to offer his amendment. The gentleman from Mississippi cannot obtain the floor by means of a preferential motion at this stage.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi will be recognized after the amendment has been reported.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows.

Amendment offered by Mr. McCONNELL: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That this act may be cited as the 'Fair Employment Practice Act.'"

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Is it in order for this amendment to be read in full at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course it must be read in full.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. At what stage will it be open for amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be open for amendment after it has been read. The Clerk will read the amendment.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk continued to read the amendment as follows:

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(a) That the denying of employment opportunities to, and discrimination in employment against, properly qualified persons by reason of race, creed, or color is contrary to the principles of freedom and equality of opportunity upon which this Nation is built, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production and defense, and burdens, hinders, and obstructs commerce.

(b) That it is the policy of the United States to bring about the elimination of discrimination because of race, creed, or color in employment relations.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

SEC 3 (a) There is hereby created a commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, and one for a term of 5 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 5 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President upon notice and hearing for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members of the Commission shall at all times constitute a quorum

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The bill before the House has not been read. Should this amendment be adopted would it be read under the 5-minute rule? Would we have an opportunity to offer amendments to it?

The CHAIRMAN. It is open for amendment before it is voted on.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but the Clerk is reading rapidly, and there is so much confusion in the House we cannot hear what is going on. The Clerk is reading at a high speed. If we are going

to have to vote on this legislation we ought to have a copy of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained; the Committee is not in order. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. RANKIN. We ought to have copies of it so we could at least offer amendments.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. And I am very serious in propounding it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is sure of that.

Mr. COLMER. Do I understand that the whole bill will be read through, that is, the amendment that the Clerk is now reading, before any amendments are offered? Or are amendments to be offered at the end of sections as the Clerk concludes them?

The CHAIRMAN. This is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the bill. The amendment will be read in its entirety and then will be open for amendment

Mr MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Because of the confusion we were unable to hear. Am I correct in understanding that this amendment strikes out all of the committee bill after the enacting clause?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not true that the amendment at the desk is substantially the bill H. R. 6841, copies of which are available?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands, with the exception of section 7 which the Clerk will read.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So that it would be possible for Members to follow the reading by getting a copy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 a year, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(e) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agencies as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States.

(f) The Commission shall have power—

(1) to appoint such officers and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions;

(2) to cooperate with or utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies and to utilize voluntary and uncompensated services;

(3) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the Commission or any of its agents or agencies the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States;

(4) from time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in such manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

(5) to serve process or other papers of the Commission, either personally, by registered mail, or by leaving a copy at the principal office or place of business of the person to be served; and

(6) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested Government and nongovernmental agencies.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC 4 (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to bring about the removal of discrimination in regard to hire or tenure, terms or conditions of employment, or union membership, because of race, creed, or color—

(1) by making comprehensive studies of such discrimination in different metropolitan districts and sections of the country and of the effect of such discrimination, and of the best methods of eliminating it,

(2) by formulating, in cooperation with other interested public and private agencies, comprehensive plans for the elimination of such discrimination, as rapidly as possible, in regions or areas where such discrimination is prevalent;

(3) by publishing and disseminating reports and other information relating to such discrimination and to ways and means for eliminating it;

(4) by conferring, cooperating with, and furnishing technical assistance to employers, labor unions, and other private and public agencies in formulating and executing policies and programs for the elimination of such discrimination;

(5) by receiving and investigating complaints charging any such discrimination and by investigating other cases where it has reason to believe that any such discrimination is practiced; and

(6) by making specific and detailed recommendations to the interested parties in any such case as to ways and means for the elimination of any such discrimination.

(b) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President describing in detail the investigations, proceedings, and hearings it has conducted and their outcome, the decisions it has rendered, and the other work performed by it, and may make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable. The Commission may make such other recommendations to the President or any Federal agency as it deems necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act.

INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC 5 (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or its authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have the right to examine or copy any evidence of any person relating to any such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(b) Any member of the Commission shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(c) Any member of the Commission, or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence, and conduct investigations, proceedings, or hearings.

(d) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

(e) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this act, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing; any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by it as a contempt thereof

(f) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC 6 The Commission shall make a study and investigation of discrimination in regard to hire, or tenure, terms, or conditions of employment, in the departments and agencies of the Federal Government because of race, creed, or color, and shall recommend to the Congress a specific plan to eliminate it and such legislation as it deems necessary to eliminate it.

WILLFUL INTERFERENCE WITH COMMISSION AGENTS

SEC. 7. Any person who shall willfully resist, impede, or interfere with, any member of the Commission or any of its agents or agencies in the performance of duties pursuant to this Act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment as a substitute to the Powell bill. This amendment is a new bill to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission. The Commission would have two principal purposes: First, to study the problems and to recommend a procedure to Congress for eliminating job discrimination because of race, creed, or color. Second, to begin immediately to find methods to eliminate job discrimination, and to seek to create employment opportunities for members of minority groups, without the use of compulsion.

Mr. Chairman, right here I would like to digress for just a moment. There is a reasonable background, in my opinion, to the idea of an FEPC bill without the use of compulsion and in this connection I would like to read from the hearings on the Federal Fair Employment Practice

Act before I proceed with the description of the amendment.

During the hearings the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] made the statement to Senator IVES along this line: "The first actual FEPC law placed on the statute books anywhere in the United States was the Ives bill."

That is the FEPC legislation in New York A little later on Senator IVES, who was the author of the first FEPC legislation in the United States, made this statement:

I happen to be one that is convinced that if you have to enforce this kind of undertaking by punitive measures, by legal compulsion, it is going to fail. Unless you can convince the rank and file of people that it is inherently right, which it is, and get them to cooperate in backing it up, your undertaking cannot succeed.

Then he goes on to say that it is educational in a broad sense, speaking of the statute of New York, and also the proposed legislation we are considering today.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. According to the interpretation to be implied, it is this, that Senator IVES, who was the author of the New York bill, placed in the bill the principle the gentleman is offering here tonight.

Mr. McCONNELL I would say that I could receive just such an idea from that testimony.

The bill I offer declares a national policy to eliminate discrimination in employment relations because of race, creed, or color. It would establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission of five members appointed by the President with the advice of the Senate. In carrying out the policy of the act, the Commission is authorized to make investigations, hire employees, cooperate with State agencies and accept voluntary services, subpena witnesses and pay them mileage fees, to serve process, to make and rescind rules and to make studies and publish the results of such studies.

Further, the bill imposes upon the Commission the duty of seeking to eliminate job discrimination—

First, by making comprehensive studies of such discrimination in different metropolitan districts and sections of the country and of the effect of such discrimination, and of the best methods of eliminating it;

Second, by formulating, in cooperation with other interested public and private agencies, comprehensive plans for the elimination of such discrimination, as rapidly as possible, in regions or areas where such discrimination is prevalent;

Third, by publishing and disseminating reports and other information relating to such discrimination and to ways and means for eliminating it;

Fourth, by conferring, cooperating with, and furnishing technical assistance to employers, labor unions, and other private and public agencies in formulating and executing policies and programs for the elimination of such discrimination;

Fifth, by receiving and investigating complaints charging any such discrimination and by investigating other cases where it has reason to believe that any such discrimination is practiced; and

Sixth, by making specific and detailed recommendations to the interested parties in any such case as to ways and means for elimination of any such discrimination.

A duty is also imposed on the Commission to make a report each year to Congress and to the President. In addition to describing in detail the investigations, proceedings, and hearings it has conducted and their outcome, the decisions rendered and the other work performed, the report may make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

The Commission is given legal power to make investigations and to examine relevant records, to subpena evidence and witnesses from anywhere in the United States, and to administer oaths. Federal courts are given jurisdiction to issue injunctions to enforce the Commission's subpenas and a complete immunity clause is provided to give the Commission greater freedom in demanding testimony which might otherwise be unavailable from a witness.

The Commission is also required to make a study of job discrimination which may be practiced by the Federal Government and to recommend a specific plan to Congress for its elimination.

A $500 fine is provided as a penalty for anyone who forcibly interferes with a member or agent of the Commission in the performance of his duties under the act

Most of us agree that the injustices of discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color, should be eliminated Those of us who agree to this principle disagree in some respects on how it can be best accomplished The problem, simply stated, is this: "Is the administrative process the proper method of making and enforcing decisions where the facts in dispute are simple and the decision rests largely on the veracity of witnesses?"

There are practical objections to the administrative process for this purpose:

First, administrative procedure can substitute the judgment of a single individual for that of a jury in deciding questions of fact and the credibility of witnesses.

Second, administrative procedure permits a hearing examiner to act as judge and jury—yet he cannot be removed as a juryman by a challenge for cause—nor can he be removed as judge by an allegation of personal bias.

Third, in an administrative proceeding, there are no rules for the admissibility and exclusion of evidence. This is important because a decision can rest on any evidence that finds its way into the record, whether or not it is legal evidence.

Fourth, a reviewing court cannot reverse an administrative decision unless it is apparent from the naked record that the decision is arbitrary or capricious. A court cannot review the facts, nor can the court substitute its discretion for that of the administrative agency. The administrative decision may rest solely on evidence which would be barred in a court of law—or evidence which a jury might have rejected because it was given by a witness which was not credible—yet the court cannot reverse the agency if there is any evidence in the record to support the administrative decision.

I do not believe the administrative procedure provided in the Powell bill insures justice in the enforcement of rules to eliminate job discrimination because of race, creed, or color.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL In quoting further from Senator IVES' testimony before our subcommittee, the gentleman did not read the last paragraph of the section he was reading, and that paragraph states:

Naturally, you have to have compulsion here or nobody will pay any attention to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi

Mr. WILLIAMS. I might ask the gentleman if there has ever been an arrest in New York State under this law.

Mr. McCONNELL. Well, I can answer the gentleman right there. There has been no arrest under State law.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Senator IVES is the author of the FEPC bill. In Senate Report No. 951 he says very distinctly:

The experience of the wartime Committee on Fair Employment Practices and of the several State commissions indicates strongly that appeals for voluntary cooperation are inadequate unless supported by enforcement powers.

Mr. McCONNELL. I will quote again so that we can get it very straight. I do not want to imply that the Senator is talking on both sides, but he says here:

I happen to be one that is convinced that if you have to enforce this kind of undertaking by punitive measures, by legal compulsion, it is going to fail.

That is very simple language, and I think we understand English.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, there is a very serious penalty included in the New York law, is there not?

Mr. McCONNELL. I understand so. I call your attention to one change I have made in my bill before offering it as a substitute as compared with the bill I originally put in the hopper. I refer to page 8, section 7, of H. R. 6841. Originally it read:

Any person who shall willfully resist, impede, or interfere with, any member of the Commission or any of its agents or agencies in the performance of duties pursuant to this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

I feel that that fine is too heavy. I have changed the word "willfully" to "forcibly," which is the same as in the Powell bill. I have changed the fine from $5,000 to $500, which seems to be more in reason. I have also dropped out the penalty of "imprisonment for 1 year."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this McConnell amendment is the whole heart of the fight to pass an FEPC bill. If this amendment succeeds, then we will have nothing but a statement of policy. Inscribed on the wall over our Press Gallery are the words of an immortal statesman who once walked these aisles, Daniel Webster. I would like to read a further quotation from Daniel Webster, and that is this:

A law without the penalty is simply good advice.

If we accept the McConnell amendment we are merely accepting good advice.

Now, let us get back to Senator IVES, whom I admire and know personally, who came before our subcommittee and gave us possibly the most enlightened testimony of all May I read from the official report of the FEPC subcommittee at page 63, middle of the page:

I desire, however, most heartily to endorse this type of legislation. Moreover, I endorse specifically H R 4453 as being based on the principles I have cited.

Then I will go to another point where the Senator and your humble servant were having a discussion. I read the two paragraphs which the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not read following the sentence which he did read:

First, I think, Mr. Chairman, that your bill provides for mandatory mediation, conciliation, conferences, and persuasion. That is very essential, that part of it. And you also provide for these conciliation councils to be set up in the various communities, big and little, in the whole area of the United States, by which through the voluntary approach you enlist the support of citizens in those communities. That is the way it is done.

Naturally, you have to have compulsion here or nobody will pay any attention to it. But let me point out this, that if any undertaking of this kind is ever made and the emphasis is placed on that aspect of it, the rest of it will be ignored obviously and the whole business will crash in defeat.

Following that quotation, may I say at this point that we do not place the emphasis in this bill on compulsion. We place it on conciliation, mediation, conferences, persuasion, and local councils set up in the various communities of our country whether they are small or large communities.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. I recognize the value of community action by local agencies. That is provided in the substitute bill which I have offered. I would like to ask the gentleman this one question: How many cases have come before the FEPC Commission in New York State?

Mr. POWELL. I think 1,047 as of January this year.

Mr. McCONNELL. How many were settled?

Mr. POWELL. The actual statistics are here in my committee's report. I can find them in a minute.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thought the gentleman had them at hand, and will not ask him to go to that trouble. Does the gentleman know how many cases were dismissed?

Mr POWFLL. I think, roughly, about one-third were dismissed.

Mr. McCONNELL. One-third of approximately a thousand cases?

Mr. POWELL. 1,047.

Mr. McCONNELL. Is that for the city of New York?

Mr POWELL. No, for the State of New York.

Mr. McCONNELL. Out of millions and millions of people, then, they have only found those few cases of discrimination?

Mr. POWELL. That is right.

Mr. McCCNNELL. It seems rather remarkable. I wonder where the widespread discrimination is, then, under a method where compulsion generally has not been used.

Mr. POWELL Some of these cases involve thousands of workers. Some of them involve plants which may employ 10 or 15 thousand people, such as the telephone company, for instance, which is a State-wide company.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr POWELL. Further, our own Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress last year made an impartial report on antidiscrimination legislation. Listen to this quotation:

In company after company, in spite of theoretical willingness to employ Negroes, it took the law to get the employers past the hump of dreading what customers and other employees might say So the mere passage of a law with teeth in it, before any actual attempt to enforce it, brings some changes in employment practices in order to conform.

In other words, as the commissioners of New York State, Massachusetts, and other States which have FEPC, testified before our committee, we have not had to use the power, but because we had the power, we have been able to persuade and conciliate and mediate a little bit better.

Further, may I also give you an example from the city of Chicago. The city of Chicago has an FEPC with no enforcement power. This is the report of the Illinois Inter-Racial Commission last year, reporting on the FEPC:

With few exceptions, the 91 firms analyzed, which supplied goods and services to the city of Chicago on a contract basis, violate their signed pledge to adhere to fair-employment practice

The State of Oregon passed an FEPC law with no compulsion. After it was in effect for some time they found out it did not work. Last year the Oregon Legislature revised the State FEPC law which had no compulsion and put sanctions in that law.

Mr McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. If such a position was found to be necessary in the future, the way would be open for such amendment.

Mr POWELL. Certainly. Very nicely said. You halfway agree with us. I appreciate that fact, because in the Seventy-ninth Congress the gentleman from Pennsylvania was one of those who helped us write the present law that we now have. He was in favor of it then.

Mr. McCONNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. I did not help write the present bill. I agreed that some type of compulsion was necessary at that time

Mr. POWELL. That is correct.

Mr. McCONNELL. But I have become more wise as I have become older. Therefore, I realized that compulsion was not necessary.

Mr. POWELL. Some people grow old two ways I have grown older also.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is not the crux of the issue defined by the alinement on the gentleman's substitute? I think it is obvious to everyone that the overwhelming majority who oppose any kind of FEPC will support the gentleman's substitute—that is, the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. POWELL. That remains to be seen. But if it is true that those who are against any kind of FEPC will support the gentleman's amendment, then it is obvious that it is nothing but a subterfuge to kill FEPC. I can assure you that the people of this Nation who are in favor of FEPC are not in favor of the McConnell substitute about which they know nothing. They are in favor of H. R. 4453 which has been before them for 6 years, since the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. MASON Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. MASON. When the gentleman says that this halfway amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] is offering is a subterfuge

and that anyone who supports it is supporting it as a subterfuge, I disagree.

Mr. POWELL. May I correct that. I said the majority of the people in this Chamber who are against any form of FEPC will probably support the McConnell substitute.

Mr. MASON. I am one of those who is opposed to FEPC. The logic is, if I have to take it I would rather take it in a mild form than in the full form.

Mr. POWELL. Yes, that is the truth, you want FEPC when it means nothing; when it is weak; when it is sugar-coated; when it is, as Daniel Webster said, nothing but "good advice."

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. The gentleman means he would rather take Castoria than castor oil.

Mr. POWELL. That is it.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. By the same token, if you can accept half a loaf it is better than no loaf at all.

Mr. POWELL. I have never subscribed to that opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has expired.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEED as a substitute for the McConnell amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States—

"(1) to eliminate discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry in regard to (A) opportunity for employment, (B) tenure, terms, or conditions of employment, or (C) membership in labor organizations; and

"(2) to encourage to the fullest possible extent a policy of nondiscrimination throughout industry.

"FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF LABOR

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Labor (referred to in this act as the "Secretary") shall—

"(1) receive and investigate complaints charging any discrimination of the nature described in clause (1) of section 2 (referred to in this act as "discrimination"), and investigate other cases where he has reason to believe discrimination is practiced;

"(2) endeavor, by methods of mediation and conciliation, to eliminate any discrimination disclosed by any such investigation;

"(3) investigate and study the character, causes, and extent of discrimination in general;

"(4) formulate plans for eliminating discrimination, after studying the best methods to accomplish that end;

"(5) publish and disseminate (without regard to section 306 of the Penalty Mail Act of 1948) reports of the results of such studies and investigations in such form as may be most useful in accomplishing the policy declared in section 2; and

"(6) cooperate with employers and labor organizations, and other private and public agencies, in formulating programs, educational and otherwise, to eliminate discrimination.

"(b) In the performance of his functions under this act the Secretary may utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel.

"(c) The United States Employment Service shall cooperate fully with the Secretary in effectuating the policy declared in section 2.

"MINORITIES EMPLOYMENT BUREAU

"SEC. 4. There is hereby created in the Department of Labor a Minorities Employment Bureau, to be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be paid a salary of $ a year. The Director shall perform, under the direction and supervision of the Secretary, such of the Secretary's functions under this act as the Secretary may delegate to him.

"LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCILS

"SEC. 5. The Secretary may create such local, regional, and State advisory councils as in his judgment will aid in carrying out the policy declared in section 2. Any council so created shall, at the request of the Secretary, (1) study the general problem, and investigate specific instances, of discrimination in the area for which it is created; (2) foster, through community effort or otherwise, good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the various groups and elements of the population of such area; and (3) make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to his functions under this act. Each member of a local advisory council shall be appointed by the Secretary from among resident citizens of the area for which the council is created, and shall serve without pay, but shall be reimbursed under Government travel regulations for expenses incurred while performing duties under this section away from his place of residence. The Secretary may, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, employ and fix the compensation of such technical and clerical employees as may be necessary to assist advisory councils under this section.

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

"SEC. 6. The Secretary may create a National Advisory Council on Minority Problems to consult with him and make recommendations to him in regard to his functions under this act. The Council shall be composed of not more than seven members to be appointed by the Secretary, representing employers, employees, and the public. The number of members representing employers shall equal the number representing employees. Each member of the Council shall be paid compensation at the rate of $25 per day while engaged in the performance of duties under this section and shall be reimbursed under Government travel regulations for expenses incurred while so engaged away from his place of residence. The Council shall have access to all files and records of the Minorities Employment Bureau.

"ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 7. As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year the Secretary shall submit to Congress and to the President a report covering his activities under this act for such year, together with such further information and recommendations for further legislation with respect to the policy declared in section 2 as he deems advisable."

Mr. KEEFE (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Would it be proper to offer a pro forma amendment during the reading of this amendment by sections? Or must we wait until the entire amendment is read?

The CHAIRMAN. This amendment will have to be read in full.

(The Clerk concluded reading the amendment.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] is recognized.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, a preferential motion.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask whether amendments pending at the desk to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will still be in order after the amendment to the substitute is voted upon?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and return the legislation to the committee with the enacting clause stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order at this time. The gentleman may move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHAFER) there were—ayes 113, noes 180.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. POWELL and Mr. SHAFER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 118, noes 161.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes in order to explain his amendment.

Mr. CORBETT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I am not going to object at this time, I feel that further talk on this subject is of no avail. They have already taken polls as to how they are going to vote, so I am serving notice that from here on I shall object to requests for additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing quite a bit of talk here this afternoon about where this FEPC bill came from. Unfortunately, we have had to listen to more beautiful speeches on the theory and philosophy of FEPC and we have heard very little about what is actually in the bill behind that label.

As to the original bill, H. R. 4453, that is now before us, if you will turn to page 70 of the printed hearings I think you will find the answer to where this bill came from. I should like to read a few lines from that page for you. It starts at the top of the page with Senator IVES saying this:

Senator IVES. May I ask a question of you, Mr Chairman? Are you going to have Charles Tuttle down here?

Mr. POWELL. Charles Tuttle will be the next witness on Tuesday for the State commissions.

Senator IVES. With all due respect to everybody else, he is the most valuable witness that you will be able to get before you, because he has had direct experience for many years in this field; he is an eminent lawyer. He largely drafted—in fact, he completely drafted—the New York statute—and he is the one who has done more in drafting the bill you have and the bill I have than any such other person.

Mr. POWELL. Including ourselves.

Senator IVES. That is right.

So if you want to know who wrote this monstrosity, you can give the credit to Charles Tuttle, whoever he may be.

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING rose.

Mr. STEED. I cannot yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to explain to the gentleman who Charles Tuttle is.

Mr. STEED. The amendment I have offered is better known to the Members of this House as the Hays bill. All I did was to take that bill, H. R. 6668, and change the title the gentleman from Arkansas had, of "Minorities Employment Act," to a title I liked better, the "Fair Employment Practices Act."

Actually the basic philosophy behind my amendment is the same as that behind the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL]. I think in all the main features involved here he and I are in absolute agreement. The major difference between our bills is largely in the mechanics of how a program would operate I said a while ago that I did not have much time under general debate and had hoped that some of the Members who did have some time would actually go into some the language that is in the bill H. R. 4453. It is a sad and tragic thing that the Members of the House and the people of the country have not had an opportunity to have this whole thing explained to them and find out actually what we are trying to do here behind this label called FEPC. I have tried every way I know to get the attention of the Members of the House and the people of the country diverted from that label and directed to this proposed law.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. REDDEN. Is there anything in the platform of either the Democratic or Republican Party advocating FEPC legislation from which we can infer that either of those parties intended to promote this type of legislation and to provide its enforcement by penalty of law?

Mr. STEED. I will answer the gentleman in this way: Anywhere that you see anything stated about this in the party platforms, they state their belief in a principle, and not a law to carry out that principle.

The most sincere people in the world would not want to do what is being done and what will be done if this bill passes, because this bill is not going to do for the minorities of this country what I give all you gentlemen who are fighting their battle credit for wanting done. I think it is time that we stopped and gave some consideration to that. That is why I offered this substitute amendment because I could not find any way to amend this bill.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. Is it not a matter of fact that the President of the United States said no s. o. b. can tell him whom to hire or fire?

Mr. STEED. The gentleman knows as much about that as I do.

The proposition that I am trying to impress upon you is when you are asked to vote for the substitute for this bill, we are not trying to kill off the FEPC. We are trying to kill off this bill that calls itself an FEPC bill. For instance, I called your attention to two or three things in the bill a while ago. I am a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and so far as I know, if any member of that committee knows anything at all about what is in this bill he found it out outside of the committee because he had no opportunity to find out what was in it in the committee; because it was jammed through, and very little consideration was given to it, and only one little amendment was considered.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman refers to a particular bill. There are three bills before us.

Mr. STEED. I am talking about H. R. 4453. I am talking about the Powell bill.

For instance, I would want to call your attention to some of the things in this bill. Section (a) of section 7 at page 11 of the Powell bill, in part, reads as follows:

> The Commission is empowered as hereinafter provided to prevent any person from engaging in any unlawful employment practice as set forth in section 5

Now, get this. I have not found anybody in the Congress, and I have talked to all those old-timers, who have said that they ever heard or saw anything like this in a bill before. It says:

> This power shall be exclusive and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, code, law or otherwise

If my interpretation of that is correct, and it is borne out by numerous people that I have discussed it with, we are in fact saying here that we can never even amend this law. What is an act of Congress but a law? A State code or a collective bargaining agreement could be thrown aside if it conflicted with the ideas that any of these Commissioners had under the vast power that they are given here. Some labor leaders have endorsed this bill. I think after they know what is in it, and if it ever becomes a law, they will have some hard explaining to do to their unions when they find out in effect that they have sold the labor unions down the river, and have fixed it so that the Commission could take a collective bargaining agreement and rip it to pieces.

There is a little about section 14 that I want to talk about. You have to read these hearings over and over to find out what they mean. I finally found in the testimony of Professor Davis, a professor of Lincoln University, who was in the FEPC during wartimes. He complained about that section because he said it left it open so that a man might get a jury trial. He said he did not think a man ought to have a jury trial; that he ought to be completely at the mercy of the Commission.

What I interpret that to be—and I have found no one to dispute it—it means that if an employee becomes dissatisfied when his employer tries to follow this law and hires somebody to work with him that he does not like, he says, "All right, thank God this is a free country, I am going to quit." Under section 14 he would be subject to a fine of $500 and imprisonment. I am talking about the workingman now; not the employer.

There are a lot of things in this bill that ought to be discussed at length. I am one man in this House who went to the Rules Committee and asked for a rule to try to get us enough time to discuss it. I am sorry we could not get it that way.

The mere fact that I am talking about this bill does not mean I do not have any interest in the minorities of this country. I will check my vote on civil rights with anybody in this House. I have done everything I could to get it up here. This is a real problem in my district. As editor of a newspaper I have been criticized when I tried to do something for the underdog. I probably have as many minority groups in my district as anybody here. Between the colored people and the Indians, I have a large minority vote. But I talked to them about this bill, and, with few exceptions, they told me that they preferred a voluntary program. We are making progress in my State in a voluntary way. If we ever had the misfortune of having this bill become the law of this land, every liberal man in the South who is trying to bring about better relations will be made to look silly. He will have no defense

I want to explain to you what the amendment I have offered does. It simply does this: It sets up in the Department of Labor an agency that has the right to take cognizance of complaints of discrimination. It gives it the power to investigate the merits of those complaints. It gives it the power to make those complaints known.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr RANKIN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended 5 minutes.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that. The gentleman does not seem to want Congress to have all the facts concerning this vicious measure.

Mr. Chairman, this FEPC bill is the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this country has ever been threatened.

That demonstration of protest you heard just then came from the Reds, or fellow travelers, in the gallery, who are down here pushing this measure.

They seem to have a mandate.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], who objected to my having an additional 5 minutes, said before the Rules Committee that this bill was not directed at the people of the South, but was directed at the people of the Northern States. That is where your trouble is going to come from. If it became a law, it will do more to demoralize industry, it will do more to discourage men who are trying to carry on the business enterprises of this Nation than anything that has ever occurred.

Oh, I know some of these gentlemen who are behind the iron curtain—that is, in New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Jersey—who have this FEPC bill on their statute books, hanging like a sword of Damocles over the head of every businessman, want to force it on you people in other sections of the country.

They tried it in Ohio twice. We sent the members of the Legislature of Ohio the information and beat it both times, even though the Governor had a majority of his own party in the legislature the last time and was leading the fight for it.

In Pennsylvania, with the Governor and the majority of his own party in control when they tried to put it over on the people of Pennsylvania, we sent them the information and they defeated it in two legislatures.

In Michigan, where they are trying now to demoralize the industries of Michigan with this kind of stuff, they tried to pass it there, and the Legislature of Michigan killed it; they voted it down or voted for a referendum that they knew the court would not uphold.

In the State of Illinois they did the same thing.

In the State of Minnesota they recently tried to pass it, with all the help they could get from both these Members of the House and the other body, and the legislature killed it as dead as Hector.

They tried the same thing in Colorado last year and they killed it in the Legislature of Colorado.

They put it on the ballot in California and it lost by a clear majority in every single individual county in California.

You could not pass it in a single county in a single State of this Union if you gave the people the right to vote on it and informed them what it means, and every one of you know it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wish to suggest to the gentleman that he not overlook the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] let the cat out of the bag when he truthfully said the purpose of this bill was to overthrow white supremacy everywhere.

Mr. RANKIN. I inserted in the RECORD yesterday some of the regulations under the New York law. I do not have time to read them—but I sent to New York and got them. They have a gang of snoopers going around tantalizing the business people of New York. I do not care what they tell you. I sent and got those regulations, and I read 18 of them into the RECORD, things that you could not ask an applicant for employment; I read them into the RECORD; and those facts, when brought to the attention of the legislators in Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio and other States were largely responsible for killing it.

You had one here in Washington. What are you gentlemen talking about? They had one right here in the city of Washington.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I cannot yield.

They had one set up here in Washington by Executive order. It was a hideous monstrosity. You Republicans helped us Democrats kill it by defeating the appropriation, because it was set up by Executive order and stacked with racial minorities. You know that. Why do you not come across now and help us bury this thing while you have a chance, and not wreck the business interests of America?

If this thing passes, and becomes law, it is going to result in driving business enterprise out of the United States; they will move into Canada; they will move into Mexico; they will move into England, they will move into Europe If you pass this crazy measure, you will be doing the business interests of America the greatest harm you could possibly visit upon them.

Another thing, you people are always talking about the Negroes. You do not give a tinker's dam about the Negro, or you would not be baiting them this way, using the Negro as a smoke screen. The Negroes have never been treated better in all the history of mankind than they are treated in the southern States today. You are doing them infinite harm with this agitation.

The truth is that this legislation is not even intended to benefit the Negroes, and everyone of you know it.

This measure is being sponsored by a communistic element that has flooded into this country from Russia and what are now Soviet satellite states.

Many of them are outright Communists and are using this measure as one of their methods of undermining this Government and destroying the American way of life.

I pointed out a moment ago that the people in certain States in the Northeast, such as New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, had this vicious measure imposed upon them without having an opportunity to be heard or to vote upon it. The indications are that if the supreme courts of those States ever get a chance to pass on them, these vicious laws will be declared unconstitutional.

Some time ago I read into the RECORD 18 of the regulations under the New York law, showing what you cannot ask an applicant for work under the FEPC Act in that State.

I am reinserting those remarks at this point, and I defy any Member of Congress to submit those 18 questions to the people of his district, and then get their approval for a measure of this kind.

If we were taking a secret ballot on this bill, I daresay it would not get 50 votes in this House. Members who are supporting it are praying that it will either be defeated in the House or that it will be buried in the Senate. It is useless to try to water it down with amendments. All the perfumes of Arabia would not sweeten it sufficiently to make it palatable to patriotic Americans, who know what this vicious measure means.

In order that everyone who reads this RECORD may have the full picture before him of what this communistic monstrosity would do to the American people as a whole, and how the people feel where they have had an opportunity to vote on it, or where their legislators have had an opportunity to vote on it, after being fully informed, I am inserting as a part of these remarks my speech in the House on Tuesday, February 21, including my remarks of February 13, 1947, and of July 12, 1945.

I hope every Member of this body will read them before he votes, and every Member of the other body will study them carefully, if this monstrosity ever reaches the floor at the other end of the Capitol.

In addition to reciting the regulations under the FEPC in New York, I am also showing what white Americans had to endure under the FEPC which was set up here in Washington by Executive order—until the Congress killed it by refusing to appropriate money for its maintenance.

The speech referred to reads as follows:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if George Washington could come back tomorrow and see the communistic FEPC program that is being proposed on his birthday, and especially if he could look up and see that hideous distortion of the United States seal, and the American eagle, right over our heads, he would be shocked beyond measure.

The FEPC bill which is to come before the House tomorrow is the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this country has ever been threatened.

If it should become a law, it would do more to drive industry out of this country than anything else that has ever been done by the Congress of the United States.

CALIFORNIA

Remember that it was referred to the people of California for a popular vote, and was defeated by a clear majority in every single individual county in the State.

Are you Members from California now going to vote to impose this hideous monstrosity on your people who have said by their votes, by more than a million majority, and by a clear majority in every single individual county in the State, that they do not want it?

PENNSYLVANIA

Are you Members from Pennsylvania going to vote to impose this monstrosity on your people after the legislature of your great State has killed it twice?

Do you want to drive industries out of Pennsylvania by harassing them with a program of this kind that could not pass the Legislature of Pennsylvania?

OHIO

Do you Members from Ohio want to force this monstrosity on your people after the legislature of your State has killed it twice?

Do you want to drive your industries to Canada, or to some other foreign country by harassing them with this monstrosity?

Remember that this is going to be an issue in every congressional district in the United States in the primaries this year.

MICHIGAN

Do you Members from Michigan want to drive your industries out of the country by imposing this monstrosity on your people, after your legislature refused to pass it?

If you were to place it on the ballot in the State of Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio, or any other State in the Union, and let the people vote on it, they would kill it in every county just as they did in California.

ILLINOIS

Do you Members from Illinois want to impose it on your people after your legislature has killed it as dead as Hector?

Do you want to run industries out of Illinois and across the border into Canada, or to some other foreign country?

You know, and I know, that it would not carry in a single county in Illinois, if left to a popular vote and explained to the people who would do the voting on it.

MINNESOTA

They tried to pass it through the Legislature of Minnesota last year, but when the members of the legislature of that State found out what it meant they refused to pass it.

Are you Members from Minnesota now going to impose it on your people and drive your industries across the line into a foreign country?

It would not pass in a single county in Minnesota if left to a popular vote.

COLORADO

Take the State of Colorado They tried to pass it through the Legislature of Colorado last year and failed.

Are you Members from Colorado now going to vote to impose it on your people, when the legislature has said they do not want it, and when you know it would not pass in a single county in Colorado by a popular vote?

The same thing applies to every other State from Iowa to Maine, from North Dakota to Florida.

You cannot pass this thing in a single county in a single State in this country if left to a popular vote of the people if they are told what it means.

NEW YORK

They rammed this measure through the Legislature of New York and appointed a commission to enforce it, with the result that they have tantalized and annoyed the business people of New York beyond measure. The best thing the Legislature of New York could do would be to repeal it.

If they had left it to a vote of the people of New York, it would have been buried worse than it was in California.

And the same thing would have happened in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.

I am inserting at this point excerpts from a speech which I made on this FEPC in New York in 1947, and am setting out 18 different questions that you cannot ask a person seeking employment in that State.

I want every Member to read them and see whether or not he would like to have these restrictions, these paralyzing restrictions, imposed upon the people of his own State

Here are some of the things you cannot do under the law of New York:

"Unlawful employment practices before hiring anybody."

Those words are written in capitals, and here is the first unlawful practice:

"First:

" 'Inquire into the original name of the applicant for employment, whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise.'

"If you inquire as to his name or what his name used to be you violate the law. You commit an unlawful practice. For instance, take this man who writes for PM, who calls himself I. F. Stone. His name was Isadore Feinstein, as Cordell Hull once pointed out. Suppose he comes to you asking for employment and you ask him that question. Then you will have committed an unlawful act.

"Second. Here is the next one:

"It would be unlawful practice to make 'inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relative.'

"How would you like that in Iowa, Illinois, Texas, or Nebraska? In California I know you do not like it, because you have just voted on it.

"Third. Here is the next unlawful practice:

" 'Requirement that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate.'

"That would be an unlawful practice under this FEPC Act in New York.

"I was surprised to see Governor Dewey get his mustache in the wringer on this proposition. I do not see how he is ever going to get loose from it

"Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. RANKIN I yield.

"Mr. MASON. What about this requirement during the war that every person employed in certain industries had to prove that he was born here before he could get a job?

"Mr. RANKIN Certainly. If we had had this law all over the country then, the Japs would have had a spy at the elbow of every man in a key position; so would the Germans, and so would every other enemy country.

"I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his timely suggestion.

"Fourth. It is an unlawful practice in New York, under this law, to make 'inquiry into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist'

"Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist is forbidden, although you may be publishing literature for the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, or any other denomination.

"Fifth Another thing, an applicant for employment—and I am reading from the rules laid down by this commission:

" 'An applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization'

"In other words, if you are in the business of publishing religious literature, you cannot even give him that information under this law which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] now proposes for the whole country, including Illinois.

"Sixth Here is another unlawful practice:

" 'An applicant for employment may not be told that the following holidays will be observed by the firm and no others, naming the holidays; e. g , Decoration Day and July the Fourth, etc'

"You cannot tell them under the laws, rulings, and regulations of the State of New York that they may observe the Fourth of July.

"Seventh. Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur.'

"Frankly, I did not know there were any such days until the last few years.

"Eighth. Another thing, it is an unlawful practice under this New York law to make 'inquiry into the complexion of an applicant for employment.'

"Inquire into his complexion and you are likely to get yourself tangled up with the law of the State of New York.

"Ninth. Here is another unlawful practice:

" 'Requirement that an applicant for employment annex a photograph.'

"That would be an unlawful employment practice. You are not supposed to know how he looks.

"Remember, this is not in Russia, but in New York.

"Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. RANKIN I yield.

"Mr. MASON. And yet the State Department, in order to grant a visa, requires a photograph of the person to be presented with his application.

"Mr. RANKIN Certainly, and they ought to do so. Much as I respect the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I certainly would not want to employ him unless I knew how he looked. If I had never seen him, I would certainly want to see his picture.

"Tenth. Here is another unlawful practice:

" 'Inquiry whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship, whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship.'

"You cannot inquire into those questions under this FEPC law in New York.

"Eleventh. Here is another unlawful practice:

" 'Requirement that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers.'

"He may lie to you and tell you that he is a naturalized citizen, but you cannot ask to see his papers.

"Twelfth. Another unlawful practice in New York is to 'inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin.'

"You remember a few years ago the Dallas News inserted an advertisement for a colored janitor, and this FEPC outfit down the street ordered them to take it out; said it was an unlawful practice.

"One member of this FEPC outfit here in Washington went into the office of Swift & Co. in Chicago. This FEPC man asked them: 'How many Negroes do you have on your board of directors?'

"The answer was 'None.'

"Then the FEPC man asked him: 'Why haven't you?'

"That was the FEPC down here in Washington a few years ago before it died because a few radicals could not browbeat Congress into perpetuating it

"But it is now in force in the State of New York.

"Thirteenth. Here is another unlawful practice under the New York law:

" 'Inquiry into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment.'

"Fourteenth. It is an unlawful practice to make 'inquiry into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment.'

"I am reading from the records at Albany.

"Fifteenth. Here is another unlawful practice:

" 'Inquiry into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquiry into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment.'

"The other day we had the Eislers down here. One of them has been shown to be representing the Comintern, according to his sister's testimony. He has a brother out in California who seems to be poisoning the public mind through the moving-picture industry. He tries to defend his brother and refers to this woman as 'my former sister.' If you wanted to employ any of them and check the name of at least one of them as given here, you could not inquire into those names at all—if you are trying to do business in the State of New York—even though one of them has a half dozen aliases. You could not even ask where they came

from or when they got here or when they changed their names

"Sixteenth. Here is another unlawful practice in New York:

" 'Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant for employment.'

"Seventeenth. I wish every ex-serviceman could read that, and the next one.

"Here it is' It is an unlawful practice to make 'inquiry into the whereabouts of an applicant for employment during the First World War, i. e., during the period from 1914 to 1919 '

"In other words, inquiry as to his whereabouts in the period from 1914 to 1919 is forbidden as an unlawful practice in the State of New York.

"Is that what you want in Colorado? Is that what you want in Massachusetts?

"Mr. GIFFORD. We have it.

"Mr. RANKIN. Get rid of it, and we will help you.

"Is that what you want in Kansas, in Ohio, and in other States?

"Let your States vote on it. Michigan is going to vote on it right away. If you will tell the people of Michigan the whole truth, let them know the whole truth about this monstrosity, I will guarantee you they will beat it worse than they did in California.

"Eighteenth. Here is another unlawful practice:

" 'Inquiry into the organizations of which an applicant for employment is a member, including organizations the name or character of which indicates the religion, race, or national origin of its members.'

"I presume, if they should ask me if I am a member of the Masonic Lodge, I could have them jerked up and brought before this inquisition board or probably prosecuted at various places throughout the country.

"Mr Speaker, I am not criticizing the people of New York. I have long since learned in going from one State to another that real Americans are about the same everywhere. I believe if they had a vote on it the people of New York would beat it, just as they did in California.

"They are having a vote on it in Michigan because a little minority group has been attempting to browbeat the Legislature of Michigan into passing it. I dare say when it goes on the ballot in Michigan and the people of Michigan understand what it means they will defeat it more thoroughly than they did in California. The same thing would happen in probably every other State in the Union.

"Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

"Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

"Mr AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are in New York?

"Mr. RANKIN. In addition to being harassed to death with orders and directives to cease, desist, rehire, and so forth, there is a punishment provided of 'imprisonment in a penitentiary or county jail for not more than 1 year or by fine of not more than $500, or by both.'

"Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

"Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remind the gentleman that we have that law in Massachusetts.

"Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

"Mr. GIFFORD. I was thoroughly amazed when I looked into it; I had not learned what the rules were. But, perhaps we carried it too far. I am so sorry, and I have been, and I am not in favor of this, I can assure the gentleman.

"Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman is not, and I am sure the people of Massachusetts would not favor it if they had a vote on it.

"Mr. GIFFORD. Employers always inquire and must know whether you come from a respectable family or not. They are so careful. Perhaps they overdid it. But I think a man ought to be able to find out whether he came from a respectable family.

"Mr. RANKIN. There are a great many questions that should be asked, which are forbidden under this law.

"FEPC IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

"Mr. Speaker, in order to give the new Members an idea of what a mess this FEPC was here in Washington during its existence under Executive order, I insert a speech I made on this subject in 1945.

"It reads as follows:

" 'FEPC A BETRAYAL OF WHITE AMERICANS

" '(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, July 12, 1945)

" 'Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means, there would be such a roar of protest coming from every State in this Union that it would never see the light of day.

" 'If every Member of Congress would "screw his courage to the sticking place" and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 50 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

" 'It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of control by alien or minority racial groups that has been known since the Crucifixion.

" 'When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

" 'To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into this bondage, herded, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctrine of Karl Marx that is based upon hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

" 'It is a manifestation in legislative form of that infidelity that has closed thousands of Christian churches in Europe and been responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings.

" 'This measure is not directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for alarm. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, "we wrested the South from such domination 'when Federal drumbeats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer to the ballot box of the South than it ever will again in this Republic.' "

" 'But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities if this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

" 'Do not forget that the returning servicemen know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

" 'Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty, is going to join these men, and those other patriotic forces that are fighting to save American institutions for which these boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

" 'If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this crazy FEPC, and its subdivisions throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left who vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

" 'For your information, and for the information of the American people generally, I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember, this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to nose into and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

" 'The next thing they are going to try to do is get control of your schools and force their communistic henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

" 'Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not 1 out of 10 on these rolls is a white gentile American

" 'Here is the official list:

" *'Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Washington, D. C., office of the chairman*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy Chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Maceo	Hearings examiner.	do	5,000
Bloch, Emanuel	do	White	5,600
Copper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to Chairman.	do	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to Chairman	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to Deputy.	do	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Banting, Myra	do	White	1,800

" 'You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

" 'Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

" 'This is the organization Members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

" 'FIELD OPERATIONS

" 'Here is the Division of Field Operations:

" *'Field operations*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will	Chief	White	$6,500
Mitchel, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Davidson, Eugene	do	do	5,600
Beall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Rogers, Eleanor	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Saito, Otome	do	Japanese-American.	1,800
Thompson, Mildred	do	Colored	1,800
Cornick, Emma	do	do	1,620

"'You will note that it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

"'Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate.

"'It would be interesting, and probably enlightening, to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

"'Members of Congress had better do this now, before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

"'The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shout to the people of his district that "I am a Republican" or "I am a Democrat."

"'More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

"'REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

"'Now look at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt and how other white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer, when they are harassed out of business.

"'Here is the list:

"'*Review and Analysis Division*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst	do	3,800
Colightly, Cornelius	Compliance analyst	do	3,200
Hemphill, India	do	do	2,600
Coan, Carol	do	White	2,600
Davis, Jov P	do	Colored	2,600
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	do	Colored	1,800

"'You will note that it consists of six Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Coan and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

"'Now, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

"'LEGAL DIVISION

"'But if you want a real laugh, look at this Legal Division.

"'*Legal Division*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reeves, Frank D	Attorney	Colored	$4,600
Stickgold, Simon	do	White	4,600
Gordon, Jernevive	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

"'You will note that this so-called Legal Division consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

"'INFORMATION DIVISION

"'Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit, write to this Division:

"'*Information Division*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist.	Colored	$3,800
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"'You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

"'BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

"'Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list

"'*Budget and administration*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer	do	3,200
Baker, Vivian D	Clerk-stenographer	do	2,000
Jackson, Rosales A	Clerk-typist	do	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A	do	do	1,620
Hollomon, Irving	Clerk	do	1,440
Selby, Ralph R	Chief, fiscal	do	2,600
Ross, Sylvia B	Voucher auditor	do	2,000
Nelson, Otelia	Accounting clerk	do	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth	do	do	1,620
Brent, Pearl T	do	do	1,620

"'This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes, and no whites at all, not only makes up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen, farmers, and exservicemen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

"'MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

"'Now, here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

"'*Mail and Files*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files	Colored	$2,600
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	do	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	do	1,620
Phillips, Rose	do	do	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	do	1,380
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	do	1,440

"'You will note that this division is composed entirely of Negroes—six Negroes, and no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

"'REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

"'Now, let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

"'*Regional office, New York*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Jones, Madison S	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Robert G	do	do	3,800
Donovan, Daniel R	do	White	3,800
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	2,000
Asepha, Tillie	do	White	1,620
Schwartz, Soma	do	do	1,620

"'This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessmen of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

"'Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

"'REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

"'Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the City of Brotherly Love At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

"'*Regional office, Philadelphia*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G James	Regional director	Colored	$5,600
Greenblatt, Mildred	Fair-practice examiner	White	3,800
Manly, Milo A	do	Colored	3,800
Risk, Samuel R	do	White	3,800
Grimmage, Willard	do	Colored	3,200
Gorgas, Helen	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Klinger, Karyl	do	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	do	Colored	1,440

"'You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

"'Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area?

"'REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

"'Now, here is the regional office in Washington, D C., the Nation's Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years Here is the list:

"'*Regional office, Washington, D. C.*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Houston, Theophilus.	Fair-practice examiner	do	3,200
Kahn, Alice	do	White	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Urback, Dorothy	do	do	1,620

"'You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

"'REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

"'Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office.

"'*Regional office, Cleveland*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William.	Regional director.	Colored	$4,600
Abbott, Olcott R.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Glore, Lethia	do	Colored	3,200
Kelley, Berniza	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,620
Wasem, Edna	do	White	1,800

"'You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

"'Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?

"'CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

"'Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

"'*Cincinnati*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practice examiner.	White	$4,600
	Clerk-stenographer.		1,800

"'DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

"'Now let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

"'*Detroit*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge	Colored	$4,600
Sese, Doris K	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	1,620

"'You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

"'I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentlemen from Detroit when you get home next summer, if you support this vicious measure.

"'REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

"'Here is the list of the regional office in the Windy City:

"'*Regional office, Chicago*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elner	Regional director	Colored	$5,600
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Schultz, Joy	do	White	3,800
Williams, Le Roy	do	Colored	3,200
Zeidman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Ingram, Marguerite S.	do	Colored	1,620

"'You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Shultz, and Penny Zeidman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, "We have no Negro members on our board of directors." Then the question came back, "Why haven't you?" This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

"'REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

"'Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

"'*Regional office, Atlanta*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director	White	$4,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
McKay, George D.	do	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	1,800

"'You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites; the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this group. I may have more to say about them later.

"'REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

"'Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

"'*Regional office, Kansas City*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hoglund, Roy A.	Regional director	White	$5,600
Ormabee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer	Colored	1,620
Schlien, Helene G.	do	White	1,620

"'You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area

"'ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

"'Here is the list of the regional office at St. Louis:

"'*St. Louis*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge	Colored	$3,800
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	3,200
Armatha Jackson	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

"'You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select these particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

"'REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

"'The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

"'*Regional office, Dallas*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director.	White	$4,600
(Vacancy)	Fair-practice examiner.		3,200
Gutleben, Willetta	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

"'You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy V. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Gutleben seem to be in charge of the office at the present time. This is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, the director, held the same position that he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

"'REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

"'The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

"'*Regional office, New Orleans*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Don	Regional director.	White	$3,800
Morton, James H.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Ronning, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

"'You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate

"'REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

"'The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

"'*Regional office, San Francisco*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner	do	4,600
Ross, Bernard	do	do	3,800
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant	do	2,000
Mazen, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"'This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is I am unable to say.

"'LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

"'The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

"'*Los Angeles*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600
Brown, Robert E.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	do	White	3,800
Vetter, Vera G.	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Lerna, Marie	do	do	1,620

"'You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of the Los Angeles area are receiving at the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

"'Mr Chairman, this FEPC is a supergovernment of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

"'We have no right to pass such a drastic revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government, while these boys are away from home

in uniforms, fighting to sustain American institutions.

" 'As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

" 'This is a battle for the survival of free constitutional government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

" 'It is a battle to save America for Americans.' "

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 101, noes 161.

Messrs. RANKIN and WILLIAMS demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RANKIN and Mr. POWELL.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 106, noes 163.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Steed amendment and all amendments thereto close at a quarter after 10.

Mr. COLMER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Steed amendment and all amendments thereto close at a quarter after 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr POWELL) there were—ayes 143, noes 149.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SMITH of Virginia and Mr. POWELL

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 140, noes 167

So the motion was rejected.

Mr HOBBS Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr HOBBS At the end of the amendment offered by Mr. STEED insert: *"Provided, however,* That nothing in the pending bill shall mean nor be construed to mean that any person who lacks the qualifications necessary to fit one to perform the duties of the job for which that person may be applying, must be employed in spite of his disqualification."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. What is the opinion of the Chair with reference to the time for debating amendments? In other words, I have an amendment on page 1, line 9, of the Steed substitute. When will the Chair recognize me to discuss that amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, there are just two points that I desire, very dispassionately, to make.

The first one is that never in a single one of these so-called FEPC bills has there been stated any affirmative requirement that anyone seeking employment should have any qualifications whatsoever for the job he is seeking.

Suppose there are two stenographers applying for a job with you, will you show any discrimination between the two persons who are applying if one of them never saw a typewriter and does not know how to spell "cat," and you give the job to the other one? Is that discrimination? Suppose a man never plowed a furrow in his life and he asked for a job with you on your farm. If he does not know a plow from a niblick will you give him the job in preference to one who does know the business? Of course you will show discrimination, and you ought to; yet there is not a word in any of these bills that requires efficiency or any qualification whatsoever. My amendment simply states that you cannot force an employee on an employer unless there is some showing that the man or woman seeking employment knows something about the job.

The other point I wish to make is one which I have made repeatedly on every single one of the occasions when FEPC has been up in this House, and I have yet to have my challenge answered by anybody except the gentleman from New York [Mr MARCANTONIO], who still insists, brilliant man that he is, that the thirteenth amendment against slavery is an answer—which, of course, is absurd, with all due respect to the gentleman. My point is that this FEPC is utterly unconstitutional, and no man can read the Hodges case in Two Hundred and Third United States Reports, page 1, and reach any other conclusion but that the Federal Government has no right to intrude into the police powers of the sovereign States. Congress has no right to regulate private employment between citizens of the States And, whether you like it or not, you have got no more right to intrude there than you have to fix the price of butter on Mars.

That is all I wanted to say except this in reply to the gentleman who quoted so eloquently the Churches of Christ in America and their alleged deliverance. But I go to the fountainhead and call your attention to our Lord and Savior Himself who in a sermon gave us a parable about a labor dispute where several men were employed at different hours of the day. The employer's question was—and it has never yet been answered, and there is no answer to it in this bill: "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" That is the question that has been ringing down the ages for 2,000 years; and you cannot take my job away from me and put somebody in it whether he be qualified or not merely because of the color of his skin. That is all I have to say, and I appreciate your attention.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In order to clarify the parliamentary situation, to what amendment has the gentleman from Alabama offered his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama was to the Steed substitute.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to answer one particular point that has been made to the Committee. That is in reference to the application of penalties in the bill now under consideration. I have heard it stated on a number of occasions on the floor here that you can send a man to jail for violating the provisions of this bill. I did not know what the gentlemen were talking about—several of them made the statement—until finally a Member of this House came and pointed out section 14 to me. He pointed out that it provided a penalty of $500 in fines or downward or a 1-year sentence or downward.

I then realized what they were talking about. I had read that section before, of course, but I had no idea that was the one to which they referred. Therefore, I take this time to explain exactly what that section is and let us get it clear in our minds so that the Members who referred to it will know what it is. I believe they were somewhat confused. Some of them are not lawyers. I used to be a lawyer.

Section 14 provides a penalty for anyone who resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates, or interferes with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission while engaged in the performance of duties under this act or because of such performance. Then the penalty is provided

If you will go to your general code you will find that is a very normal, ordinary provision. The Federal Code, title 18, sections 253 and 254 outlines a great number of different officers of the United States Government who are given protection against assault, interference, and so forth, while engaged in the performance of their duties. If this bill had made sections 453 and 454 applicable instead of writing a new section 14, the penalty would be 3 years imprisonment. So I want to make this clear: Section 14, which provides that penalty in essence, means that if you commit an assault against an officer who is charged with the responsibility of enforcing this act while discharging such responsibilities, then that officer as an officer of the Federal Government is afforded the protection that Federal officers are normally afforded under Federal statutes. The bill we are considering has nothing to do with the enforcement of the law itself.

The truth of the matter is, and if I had sufficient time to explain it I would go into the matter in detail, the general concept of the prohibition in this bill, the enforcement of in case of violations of that prohibition is exactly like it is in the Labor Relations Act, the general

labor act, that is on the books today. It proceeds upon a charge of violation and hearing thereon. If there is a finding of an unfair labor practice, there follows an order to cease and desist. If that order is not obeyed the enforcing agency may proceed into the courts to procure a judgment to enforce it.

The only way a man could be put in jail under this act—let us get this clear so that nobody will be confused about it—would be to resist a Federal officer; then he would be subject to a milder Federal penalty as compared with the general law that would be involved in such case, or, for him to disobey the injunction of a court after he has had a hearing before the court for failure to comply with the order to cease and desist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time in order to make some comments regarding the difference between the Steed substitute and the McConnell amendment. We are now considering the Steed substitute for the McConnell amendment. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] has stated to the committee that he adopted my bill, H R. 6668, with the exception of the title I do not object to his title "Fair Employment Practice Act." I want to discuss the purposes of the substitute, and to distinguish between it and the McConnell measure.

I believe we have made this much headway in the consideration of the legislation, and that is that the only issue is whether or not we are to have compulsion or sanctions or shall we have a voluntary program based upon conciliation.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] enlightened us on that, because he finally stated that under the Powell bill a court could hold one in contempt, and that means a jail sentence for not obeying a cease-and-desist order. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has stated time and again, and so have others, that enforcement powers are necessary to carry out the provisions of the FEPC bill. On the contrary, it is the philosophy of the McConnell amendment and the Steed substitute that there shall be no sanctions. The Steed substitute proceeds entirely on the basis of conciliation; that through education and mediation there shall be adopted, throughout industry, equality of opportunity. It is to promote equality, and therefore to take steps toward the American goal.

Now, the McConnell amendment, I agree, is designed to achieve the same thing, but here is the weakness in it. Section 7 provides harsh penalties for interfering with the Commission and ought to be stricken. Although Mr. MCCONNELL'S amendment proposes to eliminate the jail sentence and leave it on the fine basis, his amendment provides for investigatory powers and for subpena power. Also it proceeds on the theory that there is a quarrel, a dispute. The McConnell amendment provides for five high-powered judges. They are called Commissioners, but they operate under quasi judicial procedures. The theory is that the Commission must choose between two sides. Our bill proceeds on the other theory. It establishes a fair employment practice agency in the Department of Labor and gives a mandate to carry out the philosophy of this bill. There is danger, therefore, if we adopt the theory of mediation rather than compulsion, in setting up a commission procedure to regard the parties as antagonists, as applicants for jobs that are not accepted, or as employees that are discharged, when actually the legislation is designed to advance us through educational methods toward a desirable goal.

Now, I think the House recognizes that I have come a long way to come to this point of conceding that some legislative action ought to be taken by the House on the problem. I think there are grave reasons why we should take action. At the same time, I have made it equally clear, with these elements of compulsion incorporated, that I could not at any hazard vote for the Powell bill. But, I am extremely interested in this matter, and my measure has been offered in good faith, and the gentleman from Oklahoma has sponsored it in good faith. So, we ought to proceed consistently with this theory of mediation, leaving out all elements of compulsion. For that reason the Steed measure sets up advisory councils, National State, and local, with representatives of management, labor, and the public to advise with the Secretary in promoting equality of opportunity.

There are three principal differences between the Steed amendment and the McConnell amendment: First, a director and not a court or a commission of five. The Steed bill provides a director to be paid $15,000, the McConnell bill five men to be paid $12,000 each. You will save some money. Second, as to the investigatory powers, the Steed amendment has no investigatory powers, no subpena powers and no sanctions whatever. The McConnell bill does have them to the extent indicated. Finally by providing advisory councils the Steed substitute emphasizes conciliation rather than coercion in the promotion of job opportunities.

I was in a clinic in a southern city the other day where there are Negro technicians and other employees. I said to the doctor, "How did it happen?" He said, "I am glad to help Negro technicians and clerks. Soon after I hired some colored people I had to discharge one. Some said it was because she was colored and not because she was incompetent. If there were an agency telling me what I had to do it would have been another story." Here was good proof that voluntary methods will work. But such experiences should be passed on to others, and employers who try to help in such programs should be spared harassments from a Federal agency.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HESELTON. Is an amendment to the Steed substitute amendment proper while the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is still pending?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will have to be disposed of first.

Mr. HESELTON. Further, can an amendment be offered to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it can.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: Page 11, line 19, after the word "discrimination", insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"(b) After the filing of any written complaint, the Director of the Commission shall designate one of the Commissioners to make, with the assistance of the Commission staff, prompt investigation in connection therewith, and, if such Commissioner shall determine after such investigation that probable cause exists for crediting the allegations of the complainant, he shall immediately endeavor to eliminate the unlawful employment practice complained of by conference, conciliation, and persuasion"; and renumber paragraph (b) of section 4 to read paragraph (c) of section 4.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALE. To what amendment is the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] being offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts stated that he offered his amendment to the McConnell amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that amendments to that amendment are not in order until the Steed amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. No; an amendment can be pending to each of the McConnell and Steed amendments.

Mr. RANKIN. But the Steed amendment is a substitute for the McConnell amendment; therefore, it seems to me it should be voted on before we go on to amend the McConnell amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The two amendments may each have amendments pending to them.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. The amendment was offered to page 11, and there are only 8 pages to the bill.

Mr. HESELTON. It should be changed to page 5. I am sorry for that.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment be corrected to read "page 5."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I just went to the reading clerk to ascertain what amendment it was that he just read. As I understood it, it related to page 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state to the gentleman from Wisconsin, for the purpose of clarifying the situation, that the gentleman from Massachusetts just obtained unanimous consent to change the number of the page from 11 to 5.

Mr. HESELTON. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TACKETT. Is there any objection to reading all of it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is about to read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TACKETT. I would like to have unanimous consent to read the whole bill again.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN Objection is heard.

The Clerk will reread the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON to the amendment offered by Mr McCONNELL: Page 5, line 19, after the word "discrimination", insert a new paragraph as follows

"(b) After the filing of any written complaint, the Director of the Commission shall designate one of the Commissioners to make, with the assistance of the Commission staff, prompt investigation in connection therewith, and, if such Commissioner shall determine after such investigation that probable cause exists for crediting the allegations of the complainant, he shall immediately endeavor to eliminate the unlawful employment practice complained of by conference, conciliation, and persuasion", and renumber paragraph (b) of section 4 to read paragraph (c) of section 4

Mr HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for any confusion that may have arisen as a result of the offering of this amendment and will explain it to you briefly. I also apologize to any who may have heard me say some 3 hours ago that I was going to offer this type of amendment to the committee bill as I am sure that the committee will accept it. I wanted to offer it to the bill filed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania because I believe he can be induced to accept it and I have been assured by the gentleman from Arkansas, who is the original author of the other bill, that he would accept it.

I am going to vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas and he knows it. He is one of the best men there is in the House and I pay tribute to him publicly for his sincerity and integrity in his approach to this problem.

I am going to vote against the bill offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania, and he knows it, and he accepts that in the same spirit that he has always accepted any differences of opinion between him and myself. I hope we can leave this Chamber tonight with everybody knowing we have the highest respect for each other, even though we do not agree with each other in this instance. I am offering this for a constructive purpose. If you will look at the committee bill you will find that they took verbatim the language of the Massachusetts statute which was enacted in 1946, so far as the outline of the general purposes is concerned, but for some reason unknown to me they preferred to insert language which I believe is more limited in terms of authorizing the director—not only authorizing him, but telling him that we want him to do this. We want him first to resort to conference, conciliation, and persuasion. That was because in Massachusetts the commission which came into existence in 1946 after legislative investigation of 1942, 1944, and 1945 has this to say in its first report:

It (the commission) has not chosen to conduct a punitive expedition in Massachusetts, but has preferred to steer a conservative course of educating employers and employees alike as to their responsibilities and obligations under this law.

A year later they refer to it again. They say:

From the beginning the commission has recognized that the elimination of discriminatory employment practices, based upon individual and group prejudices, can be more effectively accomplished by reason instead of force.

Finally, last November they said—and I want to call your attention to this because of the fears which have been expressed here tonight as to what would happen if we pass this bill

On November 30, 1949, the commission reported that out of all the cases, some 562 cases, initiated and received, of which 341 were closed after investigation and conference, not a single one had required judicial review. Every one had been settled.

That is a policy that I think we can tell these newly appointed commissioners, if this matter becomes law, is our determined wish. I say to you as one who is going to vote for this bill, if the Commission maladministers this law and fails to carry out the congressional intention, I will be the first one to join in a move to abolish that Commission. I am delighted to see the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] in agreement.

Listen to just this one statement:

Once more the Commission acknowledges the wisdom of the provisions of the law requiring that the first efforts to adjust complaints must be made through conference, conciliation, and persuasion. This process invites cooperation and is the antithesis of swinging the big stick.

I want no part of any swinging of any big stick or of any force.

On page 248 of the hearings you will find the testimony of the commissioner of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practices Commission before this committee. In answer to the fear that this would drive business out of Massachusetts, let us go to the record. The Boston Chamber of Commerce was against this in 1946. In 1948 they filed a report, after 3 years of administration, and said that since the fair-employment-practice law was in effect 36 new businesses had been established in metropolitan Boston. Further than that, 58 new firms had begun construction work.

When I used to try cases I tried them on the evidence. I do not think that evidence would lead anybody to fear that if we enact this law business will be adversely affected. Every area is going to benefit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may continue for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I just wanted the gentleman to yield for the purpose of calling his attention to the fact that in Philadelphia we have had a similar ordinance to the committee bill for the past 2 years. Not only has that bill worked without the necessity for resorting to any enforcement clause whatsoever, but more and more business has come into Philadelphia. There has been no difficulty whatever in the application of the ordinance. I thought the gentleman would be interested in having those facts.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman. I think that is true also of New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, and I think it is true of every State that has this law.

Let us dispel this cloud of fear, accept our responsibility, and finish this job at once.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. I see nothing wrong with the amendment that the gentleman has proposed.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCONNELL. I would like to ask the gentleman what the word "immediately" might cover. What do you understand by the word "immediately"?

Mr. HESELTON. Written complaints, under the language of the bill, ought to promptly set the agency at work to determine whether it is a valid complaint. If it is not, he ought to toss it out. If it is, he ought to go ahead and settle it.

Mr. McCONNELL. Has it been determined what the word "immediately" means in your Massachusetts statute?

Mr. HESELTON. I do not know. I suppose it means "at once."

May I quote the language of the Massachusetts law to which I previously referred, being subsection 8, section 3, chapter 368, of the acts of 1946:

To create such advisory agencies and conciliation councils—local, regional, or Statewide—as in its judgment will aid in effectuating the purposes of this chapter, and the commission may empower them to study the problems of discrimination in all or specific fields of human relationships or in specific instances of discrimination because of race, color, religious creed, national origin, or ancestry, in order to foster, through community

effort or otherwise, good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population of the Commonwealth, and make recommendations to the commission for the development of policies and procedures in general and in specific instances, and for programs of formal and informal education which the commission may recommend to the appropriate State agency. Such advisory agencies and conciliation councils shall be composed of representative citizens, serving without pay, but with reimbursement for actual and necessary traveling expenses; and the commission may make provision for technical and clerical assistance to such agencies and councils and for the expenses of such assistance.

I am delighted that the committee bill provides for these agencies "in order to foster, through community effort or otherwise, good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population of the Commonwealth." As I stated, the committee bill wisely incorporates that recommendation.

Having referred to the testimony of Mr. Elwood S. McKenney, commissioner, Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission, at page 248 of the hearings, let me quote portions of that testimony as evidence which I think is pertinent and convincing. I do not know Mr. McKenney personally but I know him by reputation. I am told by our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], that he is one of the persons primarily responsible for the great success of the law in Massachusetts who has an excellent background for practical advice to us:

In 1942, 1944, and 1945 investigations were made by the legislative committees in Massachusetts with respect to the extent of employment discrimination in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Those investigations revealed, as late as the one in 1945, that there was without doubt considerable discrimination in utilities, most manufacturing concerns, retail stores, and other places of business.

* * * * *

I would like to examine our experience in the 3 years of this law in Massachusetts. Prior to the enactment of the statute in Massachusetts the representatives of industry said that the passage of FEPC legislation would create such a burden upon employers that the most damaging effect it would have would be to drive business out of the State. Well, the 1948 report of the Boston Chamber of Commerce speaks for itself. That report said that during 1948, the third year that the fair-employment-practice law was in effect, 86 new business organizations had been established in metropolitan Boston, and, further than that, 58 existing firms had begun new construction at a cost of $300,000,000.

* * * * *

It is also significant that after 2½ years of FEPC in Massachusetts, the Associated Industries in Massachusetts and the Boston Chamber of Commerce both issued statements that although they were not in favor of the law as a matter of principle, they were satisfied legislation of that type could be administered without causing a burden upon industry.

* * * * *

In Massachusetts there were many, many businessmen, and there still are, who are not in favor of the principle of FEPC legislation, but because it is the law we have considerable evidence that they have given voluntary compliance to it.

* * * * *

There is little doubt that the experience in Massachusets, New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut has convinced the legislatures, industries, and the people in these States that the FEPC can be effective.

* * * * *

From the beginning of its administration in the fall of 1946, the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission has processed over 500 complaints of economic discrimination involving business organizations employing over 400,000 persons.

* * * * *

I think a Federal act, provided the persons who administer it are chosen intelligently, can be administered just as well as the acts in the States of Massachusetts and New York.

Let me emphasize that, for I think it is the very heart of the success of the Massachusetts act as Mr. McKenney asserts and you will note he also makes the same reference to the New York administration.

I cannot say too emphatically that if the persons who may be named and will have the responsibility of administering this law learn from the experience in Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, and other States and apply that experience, there is every reason to believe that no one will be injured but that all will be benefited.

I realize that the debate no longer seems to be of any great importance here in Washington in determining congressional intent. I regret that that has too frequently been the case in construing a law in our courts. However, I do state with all the emphasis at my command that I want you to vote affirmatively on these amendments if, and only if, you want them to be construed by the Commission and by the courts as a legislative mandate which must be recognized and applied, and cannot, under any circumstances, irrespective of the personnel of the Commission, be distorted or disregarded. Please be assured that while I feel keenly this is the proper approach, I prefer that you vote against the amendments if you want to give this Commission any more inclusive power or if you want to give them any reason to believe that this amendment does not mean exactly what it says.

This should not be a punitive venture in the United States nor should it give any person named to this Commission any shadow of authority to engage in a club-swinging effort. I repeat that, if any do, I am entirely confident a great many of those who tonight or tomorrow morning work for this bill will work endlessly and successfully to abolish that Commission at the earliest possible date on the ground of their complete disregard of the purposes and intent of this law as clearly stated in the House version.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BRYSON. I yield briefly.

Mr. COLMER. As I understand it, before any other amendment can be offered to either of the pending amendments, the pending amendment to the amendment will have to be disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. I would like to ask further when those questions will be put.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the Chair does not know how many Members will endeavor to speak for or against the several amendments.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, we are not surprised that our colleague from New York, Mr. VITO MARCANTONIO, continues to insist upon the enactment of legislation designed to set up a permanent so-called Fair Employment Practice Commission. In the squabble between the present Democratic and Republican leadership for first honors in this fight, it should not be forgotten that neither of the great political parties can rightfully claim to be the father of the child.

Those of us who have served through the years with the gentleman from New York know of his strange ideas and philosophy. It will be remembered that as we prepared our sons for World War II, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] did not vote for a penny to defend this country or to equip our boys until after Germany invaded Russia.

The ideas embodied in this proposed legislation, the Fair Employment Practice Commission Act, were conceived and born in Russia.

The first government position ever held by Joseph Stalin was in 1917, commissar of minority nationalities. Surely the membership of this House would not intentionally follow the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] or Mr. Stalin.

Mr. Chairman, legislation providing for the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission carries the blessings of the President. Both of the great parties have pledged themselves to the enactment of this iniquitous un-American philosophy. Representatives from each of the great political parties stand where I now stand, in the well of the House, and call upon Congress for the enactment of this legislation. Frankly, I seriously doubt the sincerity of the leadership of either of the two great parties or the President in advocating the legislation. It is a strange paradox to find the President himself apparently is unwilling to be bound by the provisions of this proposed law.

Imagine our surprise and consternation when the President, confronted with a practical application of the measure, repudiated it in colorful language and in no uncertain terms. The incident made front page news all over the Nation; but it is improbable that many noted a connection between the President's plainly stated attitude and this section of his civil rights program.

A radio and newspaper columnist demanded that President Truman dismiss his military aide, in view of the latter's alleged connections with certain influence peddlers in Washington. To this demand, the President made this classic answer, "No one"—exact epithet deleted—"tells me who to hire and fire."

This incident reminds us of the ancient adage concerning whose ox is gored. An attempt to dictate to the President on matters of employment pertaining to his personal staff aroused his ire. Yet he

urges Congress to pass a law which provides—and I quote—that "the right to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin is a right of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States."

Should this measure become law, employment and promotion based on merit would be superseded by Government decree. The seeds of dissension would be sown among the workers. Each would look upon the others with suspicion and distrust. No average American worker could feel secure. This effort, purporting to secure recognition for minority groups, actually gives employment of members of such groups a preference; and once employed, the member of the minority group is given extraordinary protection against discharge or dismissal. In a measure which has "fair" as part of its title, I can imagine nothing more unfair and discriminatory against the average worker than this bill which threatens the employer with dire retribution should he raise a finger against one of these sacrosanct minorities

Let us assume a situation under the law. A plant has occasion to lay off several employees. Minority groups represent about 20 percent of the factory's personnel. To avoid the delays, costs, and possible punishment of being called before the Commission on charges of discrimination, it is much simpler to let the Americans go even if they were better workmen than those who could claim discrimination. The effect of this action on the efficiency of the plant and the lowering of morale and productivity of the workers can readily be seen.

The proposed act provides for the issuance of rules and regulations by a commission, which is lawmaking by the executive branch of the Government under authority delegated by Congress. But since Congress obviously has no power to take the action proposed in the bill, Congress has no power to delegate to a rule-making body.

The State of New York has a fair-employment statute which gives an indication of the type of restrictions a Federal commission might introduce. Ponder this: You cannot mention color or religion in advertising for employees. You cannot ask for the photograph of an applicant. You cannot inquire as to his birthplace, his original name, or what holidays he celebrates. The rights of free speech and free opinion would receive an awful drubbing from such a regulatory body.

A further aspect of the proposed legislation which has been generally overlooked is the welcome offered to subversive groups by the measure. Since the bill also applies to the Federal Government and its multitudinous instrumentalities, as well as to private business, such agencies as the Atomic Energy Commission is forbidden under the law from asking an applicant where he was born, whether he is a naturalized or native-born citizen, what his race is, or even what his original name might be. He may not be asked to show his naturalization or first papers. He cannot be questioned as to membership in racial or religious organizations. The successful search for disloyal Federal employees is difficult enough now, even with an elaborate program of loyalty checks. The proposed law would make the task far harder by prohibiting simple inquiries that might throw light on a subversive background. That such an open door to saboteurs is considered at all seriously by the Nation's lawmakers is incomprehensible.

Now let us examine the constitutionality of the bill. The Constitution's Bill of Rights enumerates certain natural rights which Congress shall not abridge. Included in the first of the ten amendments are those of freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press and freedom of assembly. The ninth amendment makes clear that other rights than these do exist and that they are retained by the people. The tenth amendment expressly limits the powers of the Federal Government to those delegated to it by the Constitution, and reserves all other powers to the States or to the people.

This measure violates the first amendment by abridging freedom of speech, freedom of religion and freedom of association. It violates the fifth amendment by denying an essential liberty of a free people through arbitrary restraints on freedom of association in business, in schools, and in labor organizations; by denying liberty of contract in attempting to compel employers to hire undesired persons and to deny employment to desired persons; by denying to a minority of those operating private enterprises the same liberty of contract and the same freedom of association which are preserved for the majority. This violates the constitutional guaranty of "equal protection of the laws" implicit in the fifth amendment. It violates the sixth amendment by denying trial by jury. It violates the ninth amendment by proposing that Congress usurp rights retained by the people. It violates the tenth amendment because Congress would assume a power reserved for the States. And it violates the thirteenth amendment by imposing an involuntary servitude upon certain employers.

If such a Federal law, with its many flagrant violations of the Bill of Rights, can be enacted and held constitutional, the American people may as well kiss their sacred rights farewell. This measure is the entering wedge. Under it there is no constitutional protection against laws which first deprive employers of their rights, as is attempted in this measure, then deprive employees of their rights, as is partially attempted in this measure, and finally deprive all persons of their rights previously regarded as permanently preserved and safeguarded by the guaranties of individual liberty set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

Under the Constitution there has been no question of the right of an individual to establish himself in legitimate business and to select his employees according to his own standards without interference or hindrance. Personal freedom of contract is a fundamental of our free-enterprise system. It is the American conception of individual freedom.

But should this measure become law, liberty of contract is violated because it possesses the power of compelling contracts. The entire field of employer-employee relations would be invaded. With every act of an employer or his subordinates in hiring, discharging, promoting, or otherwise regulating employment subject to complaint and investigation on the grounds of alleged discrimination, the plight of business under such circumstances would be lamentable.

Menaced by a commission with wide powers of rule-making, investigation, and issuance of cease-and-desist orders, orderly plant management and efficient production would disappear under a torrent of inquiries and investigations that would arise to harass business. The small-business man, already overburdened, would find himself buried under an avalanche of new regulations, investigations, hearings, and litigation far beyond his time, his energy, or his cash reserves.

To declare that legislation of this sort is necessary to protect the rights of minorities is to use communistic language. There are no minorities in the American way of life. There are only Americans. This is not a country of majorities or minorities—it is a country of individuals who possess inalienable rights under the Constitution of the United States. One of the most deplorable tendencies of modern political science is the growing disposition to legislate in behalf of classes. Every American citizen has recourse to the courts when any of his real rights are denied. No American worthy of his citizenship has any need of legislative Pablum which nourishes him at the expense of self-sustaining fellow citizens.

To violate the rights of the individual is to violate the Constitution. It is as simple as that. That is the way it must be considered and ruled upon. No person has any special rights simply because he is a member of a minority. And no person has any of the fictitious rights outlined in this ridiculous piece of legislation.

The proposal to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission under a Federal statute is not an assault on the South alone. It is equally dangerous to all industry in our great free country. As I have stated, evidently the President does not believe in it himself, no matter how much he protests, for in his own words he has said that he does not believe that anyone has a right to tell him whom to hire and whom to fire. And I believe a principle that is wrong when applied to the President is wrong when applied to the average American businessman. I call upon you, my colleagues, to defeat this measure without delay so we can go on with essential national business.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize the parliamentary situation here is a bit confused by the number of amendments pending and, of course, we have to take this sort of as a catch-as-catch-can proposition.

I am going to send an amendment to the Clerk's desk and at the proper time we are going to get a vote on it. We may not have further opportunity to discuss it. But if you will hear me for a minute, in my opinion, there will not be a vote against this amendment, certainly not more than one or two.

I pointed out to the committee on last Wednesday a fact that I do not think anybody can dispute, that this is a political matter purely and simply. I am bringing something close home to you in this amendment and that is the defense of our country. You may be agreeable to playing politics on this question of the color of a person's skin or where he came from or something of that sort, but you will not play politics with this. I have enough confidence in all of you to say that.

This is an amendment to the Steed amendment:

Page 1, line 12, after the words "labor organization", insert: "*Provided, however*, That it shall not constitute discrimination under this act for a contractor for the Atomic Energy Commission to refuse to employ aliens."

There is nothing in this bill or in any of these amendments that will protect the Atomic Energy Commission or your country. As a matter of fact, as these bills are now written, the Atomic Energy Commission could not discriminate against an enemy alien so far as employment is concerned in this vital matter that affects not only the safety of this country but the safety of the civilized world.

When the amendment comes to a vote I am going to ask your consideration and your vote upon the amendment. Mr. Chairman, it is one thing to play politics here on the eve of an election. I pointed that out to you last Wednesday That is why this matter was deferred until this time so that under the lash of your primaries and your general elections in this approching fall you would have to yield to the organized minorities.

In the half minute I have remaining, I want to just give you this to think about on that political aspect, because the chances are I will not have another opportunity. This country today is being ruled and run by organized minorities. I call your attention to the fact that the great mass of the unorganized in this country is greater in all of its power than the organized minorities, and when you are considering the political implications of this thing you better think about the question of the unorganized masses. Some day—and it is the only answer that I know to this question, and not only this question but other questions that are leading us down the road to totalitarianism—the unorganized masses will organize in opposition to the organized minorities.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. Briefly.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would just like to correct the statement that the gentleman from Mississippi made in regard to atomic energy employment. The Atomic Energy Commission at this time has special legislation which makes it possible for them to employ or discharge any employee of that Commission without cause and without explanation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. At Oak Ridge, Tenn., the gaseous diffusion plant which manufactures and separates fissionable material, such as uranium 235, is operated by a contractor, the Carbon & Carbide Corp., which would be subject to the provisions of this bill.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Is it not also true that up until this legislation is enacted, if it should be, that everybody has a right to fire or hire whom they please, but this legislation would supersede it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think the gentleman a few moments ago voted to shut off debate at a certain time. I understand the gentleman has now spoken twice.

Mr. JACOBS. That is not correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have seen him on the floor twice. Maybe he was not talking.

Mr. JACOBS Well, I say I did not vote to shut off debate. If the gentleman was interested and had had his eyes open, he would have known it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of this body for 14 months and sat with this body for approximately 12 months. I have never taken it upon myself at any time to question the motive of any Member because of any position that he took. I have grown a little weary of certain Members, and to be brutally frank, the Member that just left the well of this House, getting up before this House and imputing political chicanery to those Members who disagree with him. I say to the Member, I surrender my patriotism to no one, including the gentleman, and yet I favor this legislation. I favor enforcement clauses. The gentleman favored them also in the Taft-Hartley law and asked that they be enforced against John L. Lewis. The Member who is addressing you today requested the President of the United States to invoke the Taft-Hartley law in the present emergency, although I disagreed with the emergency procedure. But at least I am consistent. I do not take one position one time, and another another. I do not know whether it will make any votes in my district to support this measure or not. There are more white people in my district than there are Negroes. I do not know whether the gentleman from Mississippi judges me by his own motives or not.

There are more white people in his State that vote than there are Negroes. I am getting a little tired of this Holy Willie prayer down here in this well. You recall Bobbie Burns' Holy Willie, who thanked the Lord in a congratulatory vein that he, Holy Willie, was not wicked like his neighbors. I have friends from below the Mason and Dixon's line and I respect every one of them, and I have reason to believe that many of my friends below the Mason and Dixon's line respect me. But I say to you that there are people who come down here and talk about the other fellow having political motives. They remind me of the old fable of the three peas in the pod who saw that the walls of the pod were green; and so they thought the whole, wide world was green. Now let us quit this Holy Willie prayer business and get down and consider the legislation itself.

Mr. Chairman, I say again that I surrender my patriotism to no man, but I also say that I believe that one of the great historic documents of our country, the Declaration of Independence, when it said that everyone is entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, laid down the great American proposition. Some of you may think that is radical. If you do, read the article, The Greatest Opportunity on Earth, that was published in the glamour magazine of business, Fortune, in October of 1949, in which it is graphically illustrated how the right to life is meaningless to a man who lives in a metropolitan area and who cannot get work, because if he cannot get work he cannot get money, and if he cannot get money he cannot eat. If he cannot eat he cannot live. The right to life in order to be of some meaning to that man must mean the right to work.

While I am talking about the right to work, do you observe that the gentlemen who talked here so much about the right to work about a year ago when labor legislation was being considered do not seem to be so much interested in the right to work today. At least, I think we should be consistent.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. I respect the gentleman, for I noticed that during the labor debates and the other debates had on the floor of the House he has always been eminently fair even to those who oppose him. May I ask the gentleman whether or not he believes that this Congress should enforce against the rest of the people of this country that which they will not impose upon themselves? How many Members of this Congress that are proponents of this legislation are working Negro employees in their own offices?

Mr. POWELL. That is one reason why we have this provision exempting businesses that employ less than 50 people.

Mr. TACKETT. In order to take care of the Congressmen.

Mr. JACOBS. I can answer for myself. I took over my predecessor's experienced staff and I have maintained it.

Let me say this in closing: The gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] made a point of the fact that there would be certain rights of a majority that would be violated. The very thesis of the American Government is that there are some rights a minority enjoys that no majority can take away. I believe the right to work in an industrial, interdependent economy is one of those rights. I do not believe the minorities can enjoy those rights without legislation of this type. One hundred and forty-nine million people against 1,000,000 cannot tell me how to worship God in this country. I believe that the right of a man to have a job and to work is one of those inalienable rights of the American citizen.

The American Government, under its Constitution as amended pursuant to emancipation guarantees such rights.

I favor this legislation as a practical implementation of that right.

The nature of those who oppose it is theirs; it rests in the crucible of their own consciences, as does my motive.

I cannot see their motives, so I do not impugn them; I see no reason why they should be less gracious to me and anyone who agrees with me.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you feel this evening as I do? Well, if you do, you must have a great feeling of frustration in your heart. There have been many speeches made in the well of the House preaching the spirit of tolerance and brotherhood and of the right of people to earn their daily bread and their right to jobs and to work. There is not a person in this Chamber who will not wholeheartedly subscribe to that thesis. I recall, and I am not an eminent theologian, that the most tolerant man that ever walked in human flesh on the face of this earth was born into a world torn by intolerance and injustice. Jesus, the Nazarene, Son of God, came into this world preaching a doctrine, if you please, a spiritual doctrine that has lasted over 2,000 years. His ministry has been carried forward all these years, a doctrine of tolerance, of faith, of decency, of brotherhood, of justice. And what do we see in the world today? The forces of hate, the forces of intolerance, the forces of injustice, the forces of greed and avarice and the forces of antichrist and antigod marching on all over the world. What is the answer to the situation? The answer here today is the FEPC—they say. Two thousand years of Christian effort trying to put into the hearts and souls of the people of the world the spirit of brotherhood of tolerance of charity and justice has failed to eliminate discrimination and intolerance and to establish here the true brotherhood of man. I confess that I have grave doubts that the proposed bill will achieve that result.

Now, I would ask the chairman of this committee a question with respect to this specific bill. I ask it honestly. I do not see him on the floor. I mean the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] the gentleman in charge of the bill. He himself said that it was a very fair and a very decent question and it ought to be answered. I would like to get the answer to the question. The question is this: How are you going to deal with the fellow employees who practice discrimination? There is nothing that will deal even remotely with this problem in the present bill.

Let me illustrate. An employer hires an individual who is not accepted by his fellow employees. The employer has not practiced discrimination, yet the employee referred to is treated so badly by his fellows that he is forced to quit. The only provision of the pending bill which even remotely touches that question is found in subsection 5 of subsection (g) of section 6. I have studied it and conclude that this provision is utterly ineffective to deal with this problem.

What is the "other remedial action" that is referred to in that section? Will the gentleman from New York answer that question, please?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes in order that I may receive an answer to that question.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. KEEFE. I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] in his own time to give me a decent answer to that question. I am sure he will do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the pending bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. We have had one preferential motion. The Committee has voted on it. There has been no change in the bill, and therefore this motion is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is correct.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SUTTON. I expected that objection. I impugn the motives of no Member of this Congress. I realize that this is a political situation that we are in now. No one can doubt the patriotism of the speaker who is now addressing you. As the highest decorated Member of this Congress, no one can doubt my patriotism. But I realize, as I speak here this evening, that I am speaking to deaf ears. I am speaking to Members that have to play politics. I am not playing politics. I am speaking from the heart. I realize that those fellows north of the Mason and Dixon's line have to vote for FEPC through political obligations. I realize that those fellows south of the Mason and Dixon's line speak their convictions when they say they are against FEPC, and I am one of those.

Mr. Chairman, I would gladly leave this up to the votes of the populace of the States throughout the 48 States, not only to the volunteer State of Tennessee but to the State of Massachusetts, the State of Maine, the State of New York, or any other State, for those States to vote how they feel on FEPC.

I am firmly convinced, Mr. Chairman, that should the population of those States vote, there would not be a State in the United States that would vote for FEPC.

I have a picture here that I would like to show to this House. It is a picture of a boy who is the brother to a sister who works for my wife back in Tennessee. This boy I hope will attend college in Tennessee. I will help him out because I believe in education and not legislation in connection with FEPC. This boy does not believe in FEPC. He believes in education. The entire family of this colored boy is one of the most devout Christian families and one of the greatest believers in God in the State of Tennessee. This boy does not want FEPC in the State of Tennessee. He is completely happy with the situation in Tennessee, because we are giving him the same educational privileges that we of white origin have in Tennessee. We will give him a fair trial should be come to a court of justice. His entire family is happy with the situation there. I would like to show you the picture of this boy back in my home town of Lawrenceburg, Tenn.

I challenge any man in this House to show me a man who is happier than this boy in this picture. It is the picture of a boy, a Negro who is eating a watermelon. If you will show me a man in the United States who is happier than this boy I will buy you the best suit of clothes there is in Washington, D. C.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I cannot yield at this time. I regret I have but 5 minutes. I tried to get more but I knew the gentleman who objected would object. I am sorry for I would like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

I hope this bill is defeated because it is against the best interest of the American people, not only in the South but throughout the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this House has been in session nearly 24 hours. If we had an electric voting device I think we could have saved 4 hours' time since 12 o'clock noon today. We have used up at least 4 hours in taking at least eight or nine roll calls. These roll calls and quorum calls could have been accomplished in a few minutes or a few seconds by an electric voting machine. The facilities of this House are really obsolete, in my opinion, in that we do not have an electric voting device. Many legislative bodies, including the General Assembly of Iowa, now have electric voting equipment. I realize that a great many of the Members feel that it would be difficult to keep up with their office work and at the same time have an electric voting device, but I believe they would save so much time on the floor that they could take

care of their correspondence without any difficulty and actually expedite the transaction of business in the House.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Very briefly.

Mr. RIVERS. Along with the electric voting device will we get an electric car to travel from our office over here?

Mr. LECOMPTE I imagine that young folks like the gentleman from South Carolina will not want an electric car.

Mr. RIVERS. I am trying to take care of my brother.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I cannot yield further unless I can get more time.

Mr. Chairman, as I approach this question I am having more difficulty than I have experienced on any measure that has come before the House in the 11 years I have served in this body. I respect the sincerity of purpose of every Member of this House. I believe that every Member on both sides of this question have approached it seriously, conscientiously, and in an effort to reach a fair and honest conclusion. My own feeling in the matter is that in spite of what may be said and after I have heard the debate all afternoon and evening—and the clock is approaching midnight—I cannot escape the conclusion that the ultimate objective of this kind of legislation is to compel the man in the small institution like a small grocery store, a small law office, a small print shop, a small bakery, a small barber shop, the proprietor who pay the wages to say to him: "You have got to hire the man whom the Commission says is qualified under rules laid down by the Commission," regardless of the fact that he may not fit into the job in your small town and your small institution.

I cannot escape the conclusion that the ultimate objective of this legislation is to force employers to hire men and women who do not fit into their institutions. I realize that the gentleman from New York has said correctly that the bill does not apply to institutions employing less than 50 people, that it does not apply to institutions that are doing a wholly intrastate business, that it does not apply to family institutions or religious institutions; but I believe it is an opening wedge that will ultimately lead to the control, regulation, and regimentation of every small-business institution in the United States, and that the employer will find that he is curbed and controlled by rules and regulations laid down by a commission here in Washington.

I would go as far as any man in this House to do something for the underprivileged. I would walk from here to Iowa to help those who are in distress and need help. I have a very good friend who graduated from the State University of Iowa with me 40 years ago, a very intelligent Negro, who immediately on leaving college went to Mississippi and established a college for the underprivileged people of his race down in the deep South, known as the Piney Wood School of Mississippi. I refer to my friend Lawrence Jones. Some of the Representatives from Mississippi may know about the Piney Wood School. I know very little about it except that my friend Lawrence Jones has put in 40 years laboring to improve the conditions of the people of his race in the South. He has accomplished a great deal, although he has not had anything like enough support to accomplish as much as he would desire. I have the confidence of this man to the extent that he asked me to investigate an offer of several thousand acres of land to be donated to his school in return for a rather elaborate annuity for the man who gave it. I investigated the offer and had to recommend that the offer be rejected because I feared the title to the land was in great doubt and a great deal of time and expense would be required in litigation, and perhaps the case would be lost in the end. At this late hour I hope the House may adjourn or recess, because I believe Members are in no frame of mind to legislate carefully and wisely after 12 long hours of wrangling.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have two letters I would like to read in connection with certain matters that have been discussed here today.

The first came on January 21, 1950, from the Church of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, D. C., and is signed by Joseph E. Gedra, and reads as follows:

CHURCH OF THE
IMMACULATE CONCEPTION,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1950.

The Honorable GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: It is only because of the far-reaching and bewildering effect, I truthfully believe, the passage of the FEPC bill will have upon the fundamental structure of our society, that I write to ask you kindly to consider these few important facts before casting a favorable vote:

1. Cries of antiracial, antisemitism, anti-Catholic, etc., will skyrocket beyond calculation. Then, to prove all alleged charges will mean jamming our courts, with the resultant confusion.

2. Such a bill is contrary to the God-given gift of selectivity. For instance, we select our food, literature, forms of entertainment, friends, etc. People should exercise that right with regard to employees. There are abuses, of course. But the right which a person enjoys from above will be so smokescreened if the FEPC bill is passed that one will lose sight of this right.

3. Forced consideration, by pressure groups, of one's race, religion, nationality, rather than his qualifications will undermine our national set-up.

There appear to be some advantages in this bill. For instance, Catholics may see in this bill a way paved for a Catholic to become President of the United States. But apart from this the bill can inflame the emotions of our people, making them supersensitive to their color, race, and religion. Herein lies the grave danger. That something should be done, everyone agrees; but I believe the solution of this acute problem will not be found in the FEPC.

With every best wish, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH E. GEDRA.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York made a statement in his opening remarks that this bill had the support of Catholic and other religious organizations. The gentleman now addressing the Committee is reading a letter which gives very definite information that the gentleman from New York and the committee did not give to this Committee when he said this bill had the support of the Catholic denomination.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, this is a forthright and logical conclusion to be drawn about this bill.

The second letter that I would like to read came to me recently from a colored man, Davis Lee, publisher of the Telegram Newspapers of Newark, N. J.

THE TELEGRAM NEWSPAPERS,
Newark, N. J.

Congressman GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For the past several months I have been a "lone Negro voice crying in the wilderness" in an effort to paint a true word picture editorially of the fine race relations existing in the South between Negroes and whites, hoping that through my efforts the advocates of civil rights, from the President down, would discover the ultimate harm which will result.

However, it is now apparent that certain groups in this Nation have succeeded in pushing the administration so far out on the civil-rights limb until nothing can prevent a showdown on this ill-timed proposal.

You have read my views which were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, and you no doubt have read some excerpts in your local papers.

As a Negro, naturally I want to see my race enjoy ever right, every privilege, and every opportunity enjoyed by every other American, but I am convinced by experience and keen observation that he is acquiring these privileges, opportunities, and rights as he is capable of utilizing them, and that to enact such drastic legislation now would precipitate the very thing which we are seeking to avoid, racial conflict. The only real, sensible, and practical solution to this race problem is a broad educational program.

It might be possible to convince the advocates of civil rights that the Negroes and whites in the South are making rapid progress in finding a workable solution to the so-called race problems, and should be left alone. This might be accomplished by comparing the progress, wealth, and achievements of the southern Negro with that if his northern counterpart. Concrete examples of southern racial cooperation and good will should be extensively publicized.

In the past northern Negro newspapers have lambasted southern Representatives in Congress without cause or provocation. However, starting next week the Telegram Newspapers will begin a series of articles on the Senators and Congressmen from the South and their contributions to Negro progress. This assignment will be handled by me personally. I trust that I shall be able to see you during my visit there. Won't you kindly let me know if this be possible?

Yours truly,

TELEGRAM NEWSPAPERS,
DAVIS LEE, *Publisher.*

Mr. Chairman, this bill is, in my opinion unconstitutional and very definitely un-American. If enacted into law you will see a huge Government agency spring up overnight. The cost of the operation of such agency will be staggering and will be borne by the taxpayers. The cost would be at least a half-million dollars. A Commission of five members will receive $17,500 each for the four members and $20,000 for the Chairman of the proposed Commission.

The budget of the United States Government should be balanced. Creating new and expensive Government agencies is no way to balance the budget.

The opposition to this bill should not be confined to the South. It should come from Americans everywhere, North, East, West, and South.

If this bill becomes law it might well be the last straw that will break the back of free enterprise in America—that system which has meant so much to so many and made America the greatest Nation on earth.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the very able and distinguished gentleman and lawyer from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS]—and I hope he is on the floor—will the gentleman come down in front—held forth a few moments ago, very eloquently and very convincingly, upon his sincerity and his consistency, and I do not challenge him as to either—I concede he is both sincere and consistent, but I am forced to question slightly, very slightly, his recollection. Did not the gentleman, who convinced us that we should not deprive a man of his right to work, oppose the Taft-Hartley Act? Just yes or no.

Mr. JACOBS. I do not know of any law that requires me to answer yes or no.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman vote for the Taft-Hartley Act or did he not?

Mr. JACOBS. I was not in Congress when it was passed, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. Did not the gentleman oppose the Wood bill? Did the gentleman support the Lesinski bill? He was here then, when it was offered.

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, and there were some amendments that I offered myself.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is all right.

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman does not want the answer?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has answered today. He has had plenty of time. He spoke twice from the well here the last time at length and persuasively on the right to work. That was the gentleman's text. He asserted repeatedly and with great force that no man should be deprived of his right to work. The Lesinski bill, which he supported, had it been adopted, would have deprived a man of his right to work unless he joined the union. Where, I say to the gentleman, is your consistency? Where was your support for the right to work when you voted against the Wood bill for the Lesinski bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for one observation?

Mr. BARDEN. No, please. I am afraid the gentleman will get me mixed up with himself and the gentleman from Michigan. I do not want to get mixed up in that. I know the gentleman from Indiana and I am very fond of him. He is very sincere in his work on legislative matters. But I am not going to be a party to carrying on that discussion.

Mr. Chairman, there have been a lot of things said here on the floor that I guess might just as well have been left unsaid. I happen to be one who for many years has been interested in improving race relations in the State of North Carolina. I do not think anyone in this House or anywhere else would say that we have not done an excellent job in North Carolina. I have been in some tough school fights. Fights for both the colored and white schools in North Carolina, at a time when it was pretty tough going, but it has paid off. It has paid off marvelously well.

Before we begin to name too many folks as discriminators, I suppose there are 435 discriminators in this House. We are discriminating in our taste, we are discriminating in our choice of clothes, we discriminate when we employ our office personnel, and we will continue to do it. We are not going to pass any law that will interfere with that right. The Democrats discriminate against the Republicans when they are in office, and I can tell you that the Republicans discriminate against us when they get in office. We are not going to solve all the troubles of the earth by passing this kind of bill.

I think it would be well to think for a moment while you are discussing the Negro race that they have many things to be proud of and the other people of this country have many things to be proud of, because the Negroes have traveled further and made more progress economically, socially, and educationally in 75 years than any racial group on earth. They did it by working together. And by working with those who desired to help them and this country.

Now that we think we have about reached the point where we can be proud of our accomplishments in America, here comes an ambitious group of headline hunters who want to jump up now and pass an FEPC bill and say, "We are responsible for it all."

I once heard of an old Bancroft's barnyard rooster who every morning just before the sun came up would rise up on his roost, flap his wings, and let go a mighty crow. Then, in a few minutes after the sun came up, he would strut around the barnyard among the hens and say, "Tut, tut. See what I did?" Now who is it appearing upon the scene that is waiting to say, "Now see what we did?" I am not so sure that even if you succeed you are going to be proud of your accomplishments. I am not so sure that those of you who have been so interested in the closed shops are not going to bring about confusion, conflict, and disturbance with your closed shops and with your contracts. So far as my own State is concerned, I know you are wrong. There is not a man in this House who has spent more time working with the colored people of North Carolina than I have. I am pleased to say that they respect me and I respect them. They are my friends, and I am theirs. I do not have to go any further than the author of this bill, who knows of my interest in them and who knows that when it comes to educational matters we never have a moment's conflict over taking care of them. But right now we are dealing with a matter which is inflammatory. It is dangerous. To some it may be just a political move. But to others it is a most serious question on which we have very strong, sincere, well-founded convictions. I for one do not want my Government telling me who I must employ, for that same philosophy might go so far as to say who I must work for whether I liked it or not. In either instance it is such an invasion of individual rights as to be inconsistent with and repulsive to our American way of life. I say to you in all seriousness that those of you who now are urging this come from sections of the country that have not dealt with this problem and did not deal with it when it was really bad and tough. Where were you back yonder when we were having all the trouble in lifting ourselves up by our own bootstraps? I hope we can get along without this thing which I believe will be bad for the American people.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there seems to be some thought here that the people of California do not know what they are doing when they go to the polls, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the county by county vote in the State of California on the fair-employment practice issue.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman would have to do that in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that it is a compilation made by the gentleman.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

Constitutional amendments and initiative measures

Counties	Fair Employment Practices Act—Initiative Declares State policy that all persons have the right of equal opportunity to secure employment To effect such policy makes it unlawful to refuse to hire, to discharge, or to discriminate in conditions of employment against any person because of race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry. Establishes a commission to prevent such unlawful practices by conciliation or order and by education Provides for judicial review of commission's orders Appropriates sum for commission	
	Yes	No
Alameda	64,252	181,961
Alpine	26	36
Amador	529	1,387
Butte	3,211	7,629
Calaveras	500	1,542
Colusa	560	1,742
Contra Costa	17,869	28,527
Del Norte	575	853
El Dorado	884	2,164
Fresno	13,428	34,193
Glenn	614	2,218
Humboldt	4,322	7,504
Imperial	1,579	4,556
Inyo	667	1,342
Kern	7,075	23,639
Kings	1,591	4,939
Lake	692	1,969
Lassen	1,119	1,876
Los Angeles	291,938	758,641
Madera	1,218	3,519
Marin	5,443	13,618
Mariposa	410	774
Mendocino	2,022	4,664
Merced	2,488	6,604
Modoc	393	1,118
Mono	114	269
Monterey	4,217	14,389
Napa	2,518	7,001
Nevada	1,471	3,836
Orange	9,508	40,580
Placer	2,566	5,857
Plumas	1,093	1,780
Riverside	7,396	25,124
Sacramento	15,539	37,096
San Benito	768	2,172
San Bernardino	13,274	41,725
San Diego	31,961	84,006
San Francisco	69,651	141,959
San Joaquin	7,989	25,985
San Luis Obispo	3,150	7,532
San Mateo	12,964	32,201
Santa Barbara	5,801	14,880
Santa Clara	18,693	41,616
Santa Cruz	3,971	11,269
Shasta	2,120	4,069
Sierra	217	390
Siskiyou	2,047	4,252
Solano	6,517	13,802
Sonoma	6,202	13,578
Stanislaus	4,902	14,210
Sutter	891	3,222
Tehama	840	2,459
Trinity	486	805
Tulare	4,548	16,807
Tuolumne	1,112	2,273
Ventura	4,785	14,410
Yolo	1,606	5,085
Yuba	1,174	2,954
Total	675,697	1,682,646

Mr. TABER Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a great deal of discussion here this afternoon about this bill and the reasons why one should be for it, because certain other folks are for it. For me it is not a question of who is for it. It is not a question of politics. It is a question of what is the right thing to do. Unless the House comes to that conclusion and looks the situation squarely in the face, I fear the results of the action that may be taken.

On page 2, in the last full paragraph on that page of the committee's report, there is an indication that 83,000,000 of the population of the United States, better than 55 percent, are being discriminated against. For my own part I have not been able to find cases where there was that discrimination. I believe that the incentive which the employer has to see that a good job is done inspires him to hire the very best people who present themselves to him for employment. I do not believe it is possible to create a commission of tinhorn politicians who will, without knowing anything about the problems that that employer has to face, be able to tell him whom he shall employ, what he shall pay them, when and how he shall promote them.

I believe if we undertake to do that kind of thing, ultimately we will destroy everything in the nature of private industry and private employment of our people, and revert to a socialistic state and the inefficiencies that go with it.

It was my privilege in 1947 to go to Europe. In Germany there was put on for our edification the most magnificent military drill that I have ever seen, by a colored company, trained by colored officers, and capable of performing with precision every movement that was required for that drill. That indicates what those people can do in a free economy, with a free opportunity and the right of those people to be judged on their merits. The minute you get to the point where an employee is not to be judged on his merits and what he is ready to produce, that minute you destroy the initiative of the American people, and you are telling him that he has got to deal in some underhanded way if he is going to procure advancement and a better way of life in the world.

I do not believe that we need fear the straightforward consideration of this bill I hope that the Congress of the United States will meet it on its merits and say "No"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Has any business been transacted in connection with the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That is immaterial. The motion is in order at this time.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHAFER) there were—ayes 142, noes 164.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. SHAFER and Mr. POWELL.

The Committee again divided, and tellers reported that there were—ayes 172, noes 165.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4453) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. BIEMILLER demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand, the roll call now is on the motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. If the motion to adjourn is not agreed to, then what will be the parliamentary situation?

The SPEAKER. It will be Calendar Wednesday business.

Mr. HARRIS. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Do we automatically then go back into Committee?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Michigan calls the bill up again, yes.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 239, answered "present" 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—165

Abbitt	Fernandez	Peterson
Abernethy	Fisher	Phillips, Calif.
Albert	Frazier	Pickett
Allen, Ill.	Fugate	Plumley
Andersen, H Carl	Gary	Poage
	Gathings	Preston
Andresen, August H	Gore	Priest
	Gossett	Rains
Andrews	Grant	Rankin
Barden	Gregory	Redden
Bates	Hagen	Reed, Ill.
Battle	Hale	Reed, N. Y.
Beckworth	Hardy	Regan
Bennett, Fla	Hare	Rich
Bennett, Mich	Harris	Richards
Bentsen	Harrison	Rivers
Boggs, La	Hays, Ark.	Rogers, Fla.
Bolton Md	Hébert	Sanborn
Bonner	Herlong	Shafer
Boykin	Hill	Short
Bramblett	Hobbs	Sikes
Brooks	Hoffman, Mich	Simpson, Ill.
Brown, Ga	Hope	Simpson, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Jenison	Sims
Bryson	Jenkins	Smathers
Burleson	Jennings	Smith, Kans.
Burton	Jensen	Smith, Va.
Camp	Jones, Ala	Stanley
Cannon	Jones, N. C.	Steed
Carlyle	Kerr	Stigler
Chelf	Kilburn	Sutton
Chiperfield	Kilday	Taber
Christopher	Lanham	Tackett
Church	Larcade	Teague
Clevenger	LeCompte	Thomas
Cole, N. Y.	Lucas	Thompson
Colmer	Lyle	Thornberry
Combs	McMillan, S. C.	Towe
Cooley	Magee	Trimble
Cooper	Mahon	Underwood
Cox	Meyer	Velde
Crawford	Michener	Vinson
Curtis	Miles	Worsell
Davis, Ga.	Miller, Nebr.	Weichel
Davis, Tenn.	Mills	Wheeler
Deane	Monroney	Whitten
DeGraffenried	Morris	Whittington
D'Ewart	Morrison	Wickersham
Dolliver	Murdock	Williams
Dondero	Murray, Tenn	Willis
Doughton	Nicholson	Wilson, Okla
Durham	Norrell	Wilson, Tex.
Elliott	O'Hara, Minn	Winstead
Engle, Calif	Pace	Wood
Evins	Passman	Worley
Fellows	Patten	

NAYS—239

Addonizio	Hall,	Morgan
Allen, Calif.	Edwin Arthur	Morton
Anderson, Calif.	Hall,	Moulder
Angell	Leonard W.	Multer
Aspinall	Halleck	Murphy
Auchincloss	Hand	Murray, Wis.
Bailey	Hart	Nelson
Baring	Harvey	Nixon
Barrett, Pa.	Havenner	Noland
Barrett, Wyo.	Hays, Ohio	Norton
Beall	Heffernan	O'Brien, Ill.
Biemiller	Heller	O'Brien, Mich.
Bishop	Herter	O'Hara, Ill
Blackney	Heselton	O'Konski
Blatnik	Hinshaw	O'Neill
Boggs, Del.	Hoeven	O'Sullivan
Bolling	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Toole
Bolton, Ohio	Holifield	Patterson
Bosone	Holmes	Perkins
Breen	Horan	Pfeifer,
Buchanan	Howell	Joseph L
Buckley, Ill.	Huber	Pfeiffer,
Buckley, N. Y.	Hull	William L.
Burdick	Irving	Philbin
Burke	Jackson, Calif	Phillips, Tenn.
Burnside	Jackson, Wash.	Polk
Byrne, N Y.	Jacobs	Potter
Byrnes, Wis.	James	Poulson
Canfield	Javits	Powell
Carnahan	Johnson	Price
Carroll	Jonas	Quinn
Case, N. J.	Judd	Rabaut
Case, S Dak	Karst	Ramsay
Cavalcante	Karsten	Rees
Celler	Kean	Rhodes
Chesney	Kearney	Ribicoff
Chudoff	Kearns	Riehlman
Clemente	Keating	Rodino
Cole, Kans.	Kee	Rogers, Mass
Corbett	Keefe	Rooney
Cotton	Kelley, Pa	Roosevelt
Coudert	Kelly, N Y.	Sabath
Crook	Kennedy	Sadlak
Crosser	Keogh	St. George
Cunningham	King	Sasscer
Dague	Kirwan	Saylor
Davenport	Klein	Scott, Hardie
Davis, Wis.	Kruse	Scott,
Dawson	Kunkel	Hugh D., Jr
Delaney	Lane	Scrivner
Denton	Latham	Scudder
Dingell	LeFevre	Secrest
Dollinger	Lemke	Shelley
Donohue	Lesinski	Sheppard
Douglas	Lichtenwalter	Staggers
Doyle	Lind	Stefan
Eberharter	Linehan	Stockman
Ellsworth	Lodge	Sullivan
Elston	Lovre	Talle
Engel, Mich.	Lynch	Tauriello
Fallon	McCarthy	Taylor
Feighan	McConnell	Tollefson
Fenton	McCormack	Vorys
Flood	McCulloch	Wagner
Fogarty	McDonough	Walsh
Forand	McGrath	Walter
Ford	McGregor	Welch
Fulton	McGuire	Werdel
Furcolo	McKinnon	White, Calif.
Gamble	McMillen, Ill	White, Idaho
Garmatz	McSweeney	Widnall
Gavin	Mack, Ill.	Wier
Golden	Mack, Wash.	Wigglesworth
Goodwin	Madden	Wilson, Ind.
Gordon	Mansfield	Withrow
Gorski	Marcantonio	Wolverton
Graham	Marsalis	Woodhouse
Granahan	Martin, Iowa	Yates
Granger	Merrow	Young
Green	Miller, Calif.	Zablocki
Gross	Miller, Md.	
Gwinn	Mitchell	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Martin, Mass.

NOT VOTING—26

Allen, La	Harden	Smith, Ohio
Arends	Hedrick	Smith, Wis.
Brehm	Jones, Mo.	Spence
Bulwinkle	Macy	Van Zandt
Chatham	Marshall	Wadsworth
Davies, N. Y.	Mason	Whitaker
Eaton	Norblad	Wolcott
Gillette	Patman	Woodruff
Gilmer	Sadowski	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Van Zandt against.

Mr. Jones of Missouri for, with Mr. Davies of New York against.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Gillette against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Wolcott against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Brehm against.

Mr. Wadsworth for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Spence against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Patman with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Marshall with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Eaton

Messrs. HINSHAW and JOHNSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from New York, Mr. WADSWORTH, been taken care of by a pair?

The SPEAKER. He has not.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present" and may say that if I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." The gentleman from New York, Mr. WADSWORTH, would have voted to adjourn if present and voting.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Education and Labor I call up the bill H. R. 4453.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House consider the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 271, nays 133, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—271

Addonizio	Case, N. J	Fenton
Allen, Calif.	Case, S Dak.	Flood
Andersen,	Cavalcante	Fogarty
H. Carl	Celler	Forand
Anderson, Calif.	Chesney	Ford
Andresen,	Chiperfield	Fulton
August H.	Christopher	Furcolo
Angell	Chudoff	Gamble
Aspinall	Church	Garmatz
Auchincloss	Clemente	Gavin
Bailey	Cole, Kans	Golden
Baring	Corbett	Goodwin
Barrett, Pa.	Cotton	Gordon
Barrett, Wyo.	Coudert	Gorski
Beall	Crawford	Graham
Bennett, Mich.	Crook	Granahan
Biemiller	Crosser	Granger
Bishop	Cunningham	Green
Blackney	Dague	Gross
Blatnik	Davenport	Gwinn
Boggs, Del.	Davis, Wis.	Hagen
Bolling	Dawson	Hall,
Bolton, Ohio	Delaney	Edwin Arthur
Bosone	Denton	Hall,
Breen	D'Ewart	Leonard W.
Brown, Ohio	Dingell	Halleck
Buchanan	Dollinger	Hand
Buckley, Ill.	Dolliver	Hart
Buckley, N Y	Dondero	Harvey
Burdick	Donohue	Havenner
Burke	Douglas	Hays, Ohio
Burnside	Doyle	Heffernan
Byrne, N. Y.	Eberharter	Heller
Byrnes, Wis.	Ellsworth	Herter
Canfield	Elston	Heselton
Cannon	Engel, Mich.	Hill
Carnahan	Fallon	Hinshaw
Carroll	Feighan	Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.	McGregor	Rabaut
Holifield	McGuire	Ramsay
Holmes	McKinnon	Rees
Hope	McMillen, Ill.	Rhodes
Horan	McSweeney	Ribicoff
Howell	Mack, Ill.	Riehlman
Huber	Mack, Wash.	Rodino
Hull	Madden	Rogers, Mass.
Irving	Mansfield	Rooney
Jackson, Calif.	Marcantonio	Roosevelt
Jackson, Wash.	Marsalis	Sabath
Jacobs	Martin, Iowa	Sadlak
James	Martin, Mass	St George
Javits	Merrow	Sanborn
Jenison	Michener	Sasscer
Jenkins	Miller, Calif.	Saylor
Jensen	Miller, Md.	Scott, Hardie
Johnson	Miller, Nebr.	Scott,
Jonas	Mitchell	Hugh D., Jr.
Judd	Monroney	Scrivner
Karst	Morgan	Scudder
Karsten	Morris	Secrest
Kean	Morton	Shelley
Kearney	Moulder	Sheppard
Kearns	Multer	Staggers
Keating	Murphy	Steed
Kee	Murray, Wis.	Stefan
Keefe	Nelson	Stockman
Kelley, Pa	Nixon	Sullivan
Kelly, N Y.	Noland	Talle
Kennedy	Norton	Tauriello
Keogh	O'Brien, Ill.	Taylor
King	O'Brien, Mich	Tollefson
Kirwan	O'Hara, Ill.	Vorys
Klein	O'Hara, Minn.	Vursell
Kruse	O'Konski	Wagner
Kunkel	O'Neill	Walsh
Lane	O'Sullivan	Walter
Latham	O'Toole	Welchel
LeCompte	Patten	Welch
LeFevre	Patterson	Weidel
Lemke	Perkins	White, Calif.
Lesinski	Pfeifer,	White, Idaho
Lichtenwalter	Joseph L.	Wickersham
Lind	Pfeiffer,	Widnall
Linehan	William L.	Wier
Lodge	Philbin	Wigglesworth
Lovre	Phillips, Tenn.	Wilson, Ind.
Lynch	Plumley	Withrow
McCarthy	Polk	Wolverton
McConnell	Potter	Woodhouse
McCormack	Poulson	Yates
McCulloch	Powell	Young
McDonough	Price	Zablocki
McGrath	Quinn	

NAYS—133

Abbitt	Gary	Rains
Abernethy	Gathings	Rankin
Albert	Gore	Redden
Allen, Ill	Gossett	Reed, Ill
Andrews	Grant	Reed, N. Y.
Barden	Gregory	Regan
Bates	Hale	Rich
Battle	Hardy	Richards
Beckworth	Hare	Rivers
Bennett, Fla.	Harris	Rogers, Fla.
Bentsen	Harrison	Shafer
Boggs, La.	Hays, Ark.	Short
Bolton, Md.	Hébert	Sikes
Bonner	Herlong	Simpson, Ill.
Boykin	Hobbs	Simpson, Pa.
Bramblett	Hoffman, Mich	Sims
Brooks	Jennings	Smathers
Brown, Ga	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Kans.
Bryson	Jones, N. C.	Smith, Va.
Burleson	Kerr	Stanley
Burton	Kilburn	Stigler
Camp	Kilday	Sutton
Carlyle	Lanham	Taber
Chelf	Larcade	Tackett
Clevenger	Lucas	Teague
Cole, N. Y.	Lyle	Thomas
Colmer	McMillan, S. C.	Thompson
Combs	Magee	Thornberry
Cooley	Mahon	Towe
Cooper	Meyer	Trimble
Cox	Miles	Underwood
Curtis	Mills	Velde
Davis, Ga.	Morrison	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	Murdock	Wheeler
Deane	Murray, Tenn	Whitten
DeGraffenried	Nicholson	Whittington
Doughton	Norrell	Williams
Durham	Pace	Willis
Elliott	Passman	Wilson, Okla.
Evins	Peterson	Wilson, Tex.
Fellows	Phillips, Calif.	Winstead
Fernandes	Pickett	Wood
Fisher	Poage	Worley
Frazier	Preston	
Fugate	Priest	

NOT VOTING—27

Allen, La.	Gilmer	Sadowski
Arends	Harden	Smith, Ohio
Brehm	Hedrick	Smith, Wis.
Bulwinkle	Jones, Mo.	Spence
Chatham	Macy	Van Zandt
Davies, N. Y.	Marshall	Wadsworth
Eaton	Mason	Whitaker
Engle, Calif.	Norblad	Wolcott
Gillette	Patman	Woodruff

So the House agreed to consider the bill

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Van Zandt for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Mr. Davies of New York for, with Mr. Jones of Missouri against.

Mr. Sadowski for, with Mr. Allen of Louisiana against.

Mr Gillette for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Hedrick for, with Mr Arends against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Brehm for, with Mr. Wadsworth against

Until further notice:

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Spence with Mr Norblad.

Mr. Marshall with Mr. Woodruff

Mr. Patman with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Engel of California with Mrs Harden.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. RICHARDS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Mr. CORBETT changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H R. 4453) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, in order to see if we can arrive at an agreement as to time on the McConnell amendment and all amendments thereto, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the McConnell amendment and all amendments thereto close at quarter of 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HESELTON. Is this the amendment that followed the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama?

The CHAIRMAN. This is the amendment that the gentleman from Massachusetts offered to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL].

The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HESELTON) there were—ayes 186, noes 54.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the McConnell amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:30 a. m.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the McConnell amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:30 a. m.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MCCORMACK and Mr. SHAFER.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 192, noes 64

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POWELL. What is the situation now? Will the Chair kindly state what is before the House now?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Hobbs amendment was again reported

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 178, noes 81.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr: COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr COLMER to the Steed amendment On page 1, line 12, after "labor organizations", insert *"Provided, however,* That it shall not constitute discrimination under this act for a contractor for the Atomic Energy Commission to refuse to employ aliens"

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment about which I spoke to you a moment ago. It involves the security of this country as it may be affected by the employment of aliens in the production of atomic energy and atomic bombs. I am not going to take up your time since limitation has been placed upon debate, and others will want to speak. I ask for an affirmative vote on this amendment.

I call your attention to the fact that in spite of what the gentleman from California said, and regardless of what the present law may be, this law would supersede any existing law. If I am in error about that, and I do not think I am, then let us play on the safe side.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, is the Chair disposed to divide the time in view of the fact that it has been limited, and to announce the Members who will be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that one hour and a half remains for debate, and since it was impossible for the Chair to determine the number of Members who were on their feet, I believe it is advisable to follow the strict rule.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, needless to say, I think we all should support this amendment. But I have taken this time to express a few thoughts in connection with the pending bill. I realize at this late hour not many votes are going to be changed. But you cannot help thinking that the efforts to pass this FEPC bill are predicated upon the desire that we frequently see when somebody finds some situation with which they are displeased. They always say, "There ought to be a law against it."

I am sure from the statements made here and elsewhere in many of the northern areas there is discrimination in employment in some cases. But from all the information I have received from people in those areas the trouble is not with the employer in most cases but with the employees, who do not wish to work with groups of certain other races, or other minorities. Certainly this bill to force employers to hire and fire at the direction of a Federal commission is not going to correct that situation. There is one thing I think should be pointed out here, and that is that while you may pass this FEPC bill and you may provide that five commissioners may subpena the books and records of any company in this country and they may drag the officials of such company to Washington or any place else in the country, and while you may say to those men who they must hire and who they must fire, this bill does not and cannot say to the man in business that he has to stay in business, nor can you make him go into business.

Gentlemen, unemployment has become serious in recent weeks. As a result of the present unemployment we see our friends on the other side of the Capitol and our friends here making every effort to provide capital and to interest people in going into new businesses. We recognize there must be a business establishment if there is to be employment, and there must be new enterprises, and if you continue, through this type of legislation, to regiment and to bedevil the men who are in business, you will destroy the very thing you seek, and that is employment for the American people, whatever the race may be that they belong to.

I recognize that those who suffer from this discrimination in the northern areas—and that is where they are—they are not in the South—wish something to be done. Like all those with a cause to carry, they feel that if they could

just get a Federal law on the subject, if they could get the Federal Government behind their cause, they would bring about a correction of those ills. The records of history do not bear that out. This country was settled by people who came from the countries of Europe because by fiat or by law the governments in those countries required all people to conform to one pattern. That is the chief reason most of our people came here. They came here so as not to have to follow the state religion, or to avoid various other oppressions by the various countries from which they came, whereby the powers that were tried to make everybody fit a given pattern. Those countries could not do it then. You cannot do it here.

I served, and many of you have served, in the capacity of district attorney, for almost 9 years. You cannot prosecute a whole people. If you try to you will not succeed. You may pass this law but if you do you cannot enforce it. If this bill passes you can bedevil business, you can drag men around, you can cause the closing up of some business and prevent the opening of new businesses, but if you pass this law you are not going to make folks hire and fire men whom they do not wish to hire or fire. I say that the President's action when he responded with an epithet when someone told him what to do is representative of the action of many men in this country, when the Government tries through five commissioners to tell them what they have to do.

If you get this act, you may say to a man that he has got to hire or fire somebody, but you cannot say to him that he has got to go in business. You cannot require that he stay in business. After all, the businessman, the employer who has this business, is the only place where these employees are going to find a job. In my judgment, this type of legislation is defeating the chances of employment on the part of our people, and you are killing the goose that lays the golden egg, because it is business that employs labor, and unless there is business there is no job for labor, and that is true, whatever your race, religion, color, or what have you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] should be defeated, for two reasons.

First, for the reasons stated by the gentleman from California, who is a member of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee.

Second, because the committee bill itself, which is before us, says:

(b) The President shall have power to provide for the establishment of regulations to prevent the committing or continuing of any unlawful employment practice as herein defined by any person who makes a contract with any agency or instrumentality of the United States (excluding any State or political subdivision thereof) or of any Territory or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, in any amount exceeding $10,000. Such regulations shall be enforced by the Commission according to the procedure hereinbefore provided.

As the gentleman is serious about security in the atomic-energy program, he should want to leave that flexibility in the Commander in Chief.

I would like to address myself, too, to this idea which is contained in both the McConnell amendment and the Steed substitutes of omitting any enforcement powers for FEPC. I address myself to those who are for FEPC, particularly those who are from the great industrial areas, in the hope that you will not deceive yourselves about the fact that if you vote for the McConnell amendment or the Steed substitute tonight—though I do not believe many will do that—you are voting for the kind of FEPC so many people have been fighting for. FEPC has got to have the backing of penalties to do its full job in the elimination of discrimination in economic opportunity. You do not have to take my word for that, but read what some practical businessmen have to say in a telegram contained in the committee hearings. William L. Batt, president of SKF Industries; Spyros P. Skouras, president of Twentieth Century Fox; Beardsley Ruml, then chairman of the board of R. H. Macy & Co.; and Henry R. Luce, editor of Time, Life, and Fortune magazines, say as follows:

We like the reliance which the bill puts upon education and conciliation. On the other hand, we recognize the necessity of governmental sanctions when conciliation breaks down.

We are not dealing with a privilege. We are dealing with a fundamental civil right. Members ought to agree that the dignity of government requires that that fundamental right—not privilege—shall be implemented with the full power to enforce it. When voting tonight on the McConnell substitute, it is not a question of voting on something that is not as good, or that is a half a loaf instead of a whole loaf, but an "aye" vote on the McConnell substitute is just not giving needed power to do the full job, while a "no" vote shows a determination to give such power. If you believe in the job to be done—and you must if you believe in FEPC—then your vote must be "no" on the McConnell substitute when the Committee votes shortly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this measure so-called FEPC. There is no employment in it and certainly no fairness to the measure, but I am supporting this amendment. Yesterday, in the Committee on the Armed Services, we reported out a bill which carried a provision to permit aliens who are top-ranking scientists to work when properly cleared in probably one of the most important installations this Government has. I am not sure how this legislation would affect it, and I do not believe anyone on the floor knows how it would affect the employment of the atomic-energy plants. The history of this matter goes back to 1937, but I do not have time to relate it here. At that time we brought a good many aliens to this country who were important scientists—men whom we desired, but who have not yet received their citizenship. We brought from Penemunde men to work in a program of wind tunnels, which is one of the most important that we have today in regard to our whole airplane program, and I fear what might happen if these people were barred. Many of them have already applied for citizenship in this country. I would at the present time hate to see these people barred from employment because I believe them to be essential in carrying forward a program that is necessary.

In regard to the atomic-energy program, it is not clear to me, as the gentleman from New York stated, as to whether many of the people whom today we are employing for that purpose could be employed under this restrictive bill we have before us tonight. I certainly hope this House will adopt this amendment to clarify this matter at least until this question can be studied to the point where we can be convinced whether or not these people are eligible for employment, and I trust and hope this body will vote down this measure in toto.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to make a small contribution to our thinking on this particular subject. There is nothing in this particular bill which will preclude the Atomic Energy Commission or any contractor asked to do so by the Atomic Energy Commission from excluding any individual on security grounds. Race, color, and national origin are included in the bill, to be sure, but security matters are not included in this bill, and any individual can be excluded from any facility of a subcontractor, contractor, or the Atomic Energy Commission on security grounds, if so desired.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution. He emphasizes one of the points I wanted to make, that I think we are, as far as this amendment is concerned, talking about something that is unnecessary. The Atomic Energy Committee at the present time has full and ample power to cover any security risks under existing legislation. The amendment now pending would not affect that at all.

I would like in the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman, to devote myself to the question of the basic theory behind both the Steed and the McConnell amendments. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who spoke a few moments ago, that any legislation that is passed which pretends to be FEPC legislation but does not carry enforcement provisions is meaningless and has little value. This is a point that ought to be clearly understood by those

who are favorable to the passage of FEPC legislation.

I would regard the passage of a bill which does not contain governmental authority to enforce the kind of legislation that we want as being a mere shadow of the substance that we need. For example, I have in my hand a telegram from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in which they point out that the kind of legislation contemplated under both the Steed and the McConnell substitutes has been tried out in the city of Cleveland and it has been found wanting. The city of Cleveland has taken steps within recent weeks to change this legislation from the purely voluntary type, as is proposed in the McConnell and Steed amendments, to one that does carry enforcement provisions.

Actually our experience has been that where you have enforcement provisions conciliation and similar procedures work much more expeditiously. You do not have to use the enforcement provisions. But unless that authority is given the governmental body which is in charge of carrying out the FEPC legislation you do not get a full and complete chance to eliminate discrimination.

There is no point in kidding ourselves. You can have all kinds of voluntary authority. That works in many fields. In many cities and in many States we have mayors' commissions on civil rights, we have governors' commissions on civil rights. They are doing a fine educational job, but they are not able to see to it that you get good results in terms of eliminating discrimination in employment possibilities.

In my own city of Milwaukee during the war we did succeed in breaking some of the bottlenecks that had previously existed in discrimination against certain racial groups in terms of employment. The wartime FEPC with the authority of the Government behind it, did succeed in persuading some of the largest corporations in the city of Milwaukee to employ Negroes for the first time in history. As a result today Negroes are being employed in those same corporations. There have been no incidents whatsoever, employment is proceeding on an even keel, the work record is good and there has not been the kind of employee discrimination that certain Members of the House have referred to. In general a very beneficial result has been obtained. That is what I think we can do under the Powell bill.

Furthermore, we have ample examples in testimony before the committee, particularly the testimony of Mr. Lewis Hines who represented the American Federation of Labor, that Negroes and whites can work together in harmony. I trust we will reject the pending amendments and adopt the Powell bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman's amendment to the McConnell amendment?

Mr. RIVERS. I have an amendment for any bill the chairman has on the desk. Which bill is under consideration?

The CHAIRMAN. The only amendment that can be offered now is to the McConnell amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. I have an amendment to that one too.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS to the McConnell amendment: Add a new section as follows:

"Any State or possession or any territory over which the United States has jurisdiction, control, or mandate which by a majority vote of the legislature or its governing body elects to be exempt shall not be covered by the provisions of this act."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is on all fours with the amendment we adopted to the Rent Control Act. We permitted each State to terminate rent control when the respective governing bodies having jurisdiction desired to terminate it.

This amendment gives the people of the State of California that right, and I disagree with the gentlewoman from California. I do not believe that 90 percent of the people out there do not know what they are doing or did not know what they were doing. On the contrary, I believe that 90 percent of the people did not want FEPC. I want to see that California and the other States who wish to outlaw this iniquitous concoction of goodness knows what may do so. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has a name for it. I am in favor of giving those States the opportunity, when they do not want some of these glorious benefactors from afar coming and imposing something on them which they do not want, to say so.

Unless we do have some sort of referendum this thing will be kicked into a cocked hat in the other body—and brother, it will be, you can depend on that, and I do not care what they say over here—it is going to be killed as dead as Job's turkey, if you catch the point. But, on the other hand, if we have a referendum in these States on which you want to impose—those of you who are shedding crocodile tears now for the FEPC—and I have got a name for that—those of you who are shedding crocodile tears I want to tell you if they have a referendum, and you come back here after the next election, if you do, you will come back here with a changed attitude. California had an opportunity, and by over 1,000,000 votes they turned this thing down so fast that it would make your head swim. They got it around more ways than a country boy can go to town. I do not believe the California boys like to be talked about, brother, and I want to tell you this: I believe those Californians knew what they were doing, and any other State, if they have the secrecy of a ballot, and they have a referendum, will beat this thing so fast you will never know what happened. All I want to do is to give my State, your State, if they do not want to come under this concoction from Moscow, the opportunity to say so. What else do you want? The Supreme Court, of all people, have ruled that the States of North Carolina and Arkansas could have a closed shop. Brother, when they say you can have a closed shop, you can have one with the present membership.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Do I understand that under the gentleman's amendment the law would go into effect in a State unless it took action to exclude itself?

Mr. RIVERS. If they take action to exclude them they do not go under it. But I do not want anybody in South Carolina to run a business like Dewey is doing in New York. He is losing all the business in New York. The port of New York is shrinking up like a California prune. That is your FEPC that Dewey signed with 40,000 pens, the Dewey who is now presiding over the liquidation of the Republican Party by his "me, too" attitude. It is driving industry out of New York like rats from a sunken ship. The Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts got up and shed crocodile tears because industry was headed South. Why? Because they got the land of opportunity. All I want to do, my colleagues, is to give the people of this Nation an opportunity for self-determination, and if you vote for that opportunity, many of you will come back here, if you come back, with a different tune.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The gentleman from Wisconsin who just addressed the House quoted from Mr. Hines, of the American Federation of Labor, and I should like to quote further from his testimony on this bill:

One of the things that has made us fearful at times has been the fact that we have had so much experience with, shall I say, bureaucratic agencies. I do not like to use that term. You set up a commission and the commission goes in business, and they have to have something to do, and they sometimes are looking for business I am just a little bit afraid they may overreach themselves and drag us through a lot of court procedure. I strongly urge that you put some protective measure in here to prevent these fellows from dragging everybody in before the Board. Conciliatory methods are the best.

I know, for instance, from my experience in trade-union work, going back a good many years, 37, to be exact, that there are some fellows in the unions who would just welcome the opportunity to use this Board as a means of venting their spite on some of the officers of some of the unions.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to bring up a question in connection with section 7 (a) of the Powell bill, or any other related section in the bill, for that matter. I find in this bill no limitation of time whatsoever within which a complainant may make a sworn complaint. In other words, he may complain 1 month, 1 week, 3 months, or 3 years later. There may be somewhere a statute of limitations that might govern it ultimately, but that complaint can be brought at any distant time so far as this bill is concerned. I believe that the statute that was offered by initiative petition

and referendum of all the people in California did have such a limitation of time for filing complaints, which this bill does not.

This bill provides, of course, that the Commission can require the hiring of complainants or the rehiring of discharged employees with or without back pay, and allow for the possible interim earnings or amounts that would be earnable in that time, but nobody knows what the ultimate penalty may be.

The worst thing about it, as I see it, is that the man who gets the job is never going to know whether that job is his or not until that statute of limitations, if any, may have run upon the filing of the sworn petition of a dissatisfied complainant before the Commission. If someone can tell me where there is a limitation of time I would be glad to know where it is. I have searched the bill through and through, and I can find no limitation of time for the filing of a sworn complaint before the Commission.

Why, people can be dead and gone or be in one of a hundred other places in the time the people who make these complaints have to make them. In consequence of that, the evidence will have been dispersed, if that is the way you want to look at it. Or if you want to look at it the other way, they can bring a complaint in 2 or 3 years, and then how can the employer support his position, if it is an employer that is being complained against? It is just impossible. I can see no possibility of it at all. I would like somebody to explain it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not only that, but how much must the employer pay this man who brings the complaint? There is no telling.

Mr. HINSHAW. He must pay him his back pay for nobody knows how long less any credit that may go in against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; but he can wait 10 years or 2 years or indefinitely.

Mr. HINSHAW. Whatever the time limit if any there be, he can wait to bring the complaint. In the meantime, perhaps a long time, the person hired has no job security. The Commission some day may order him replaced by a long-forgotten complainant.

Mr. MORTON. I mentioned the gentleman from Wisconsin. I now yield to him.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I just want, in addition to the part of the testimony of Mr. Lewis Hines of the A. F. or L. which the gentleman from Kentucky read, to call to your attention the very first paragraph in his testimony:

> I appear before you today on behalf of the American Federation of Labor to urge prompt enactment of H. R. 4453, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment.

While I have no quarrel with the part of the testimony that the gentleman read, and it is there in the RECORD, there was a minor amendment adopted by the committee to meet Mr. Hines' objections. The American Federation of Labor is firmly behind H. R. 4453. I should like to have the RECORD make that point.

Mr. MORTON. The gentleman has made no point. I will agree with him. At the same time, Mr. Hines did express grave doubts as to the compulsory features, and favors the conciliatory features of the bill.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, again I wish to remind the House of Representatives that I have the distinguished honor of representing the district which was formerly represented by one of the greatest statesmen this country has ever produced, a former Vice President, and one of the foremost exponents of the theory and principles of government as enunciated by Thomas Jefferson. I refer to that gentleman and scholar, the Honorable John C. Calhoun. I regret that he is not alive today and that he is not a Member of this Congress. If he were among us today I am sure that he would exercise his best judgment and infinite wisdom in opposition to the proposed fair employment practice bill. I feel that I am unworthy to loose the latches of his shoes, but I sincerely hope that I have inherited at least some of his political philosophy and integrity and that God has given me the ability to express an opposition to this measure which will term me as a worthy successor of his.

I want to observe at the outset that some of the observations I shall make on the bill now before us have heretofore been made, but I want to repeat or express my views as emphatically and as forcibly as it is possible for me to do so.

I further wish to observe that I have not seen or heard of anyone with recognized great ability who is following in the footsteps of either Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Alexander Hamilton, or Abraham Lincoln, who has openly espoused or advocated what is known as the civil-rights program.

On the contrary, without reflecting upon the personal character or integrity of any individual, I think it will be generally conceded by the American public that the most ardent advocates of these proposals, and especially the FEPC, will be found among those who do not fully subscribe to the political philosophy of either of the great founders and preservers of what has been our two great political parties.

Mr. Chairman, it is particularly pleasing to me to say that it is not necessary to make any apologies or do any beating around the bush or engage in any demagoguery in expressing my opposition to H. R. 4453, a bill to create and make permanent what is known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission. This is true because it is my impression and belief that such bill violates every specific concept of our system of government and is the most unconstitutional proposal ever presented to this Congress. In fact, it is shocking to realize that an American citizen would even entertain the idea of the proposal before us.

In order to keep the records correct, let us look into the history of the FEPC. If my review of the history is accurate, the first decree repealing all restrictions and discriminations against national minorities was in Russia on April 2, 1917, after the downfall of the Russian monarchy. Even with this decree, racial prejudice continued to exist in Russia because in 1921, after a visit to that section of Russia known as Georgia, Joseph Stalin remarked and complained that nationalism had developed and that there were too many anti-Armenian, anti-Tartar, anti-Georgian, anti-Russian, and other such nationalistic expressions to be heard. Shortly thereafter, Joseph Stalin wrote a law known as the all-races law. That law outlawed discrimination because of race, color, or national origin. At this point, I wish to call particular attention to the fact that H. R. 4453, which is now before us for consideration, is far more drastic and communistic than the original FEPC law as written by Joseph Stalin. That is true because the present measure before us not only prohibits discrimination because of race, color, and national origin, but it also includes religion and ancestry. Thus, with the inclusion of religion and ancestry it is far more iniquitous and offensive to the human rights of American citizens. Appreciating that background, how can any sensible and patriotic American citizen honestly tolerate the idea of such proposal, much less give support to it?

I shall not attempt to refer to all of the provisions of the bill, but I wish to call attention to the following. In section 5 we find:

> SEC. 5. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—
>
> (1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; or
>
> (2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, color, religion, or national origin.
>
> (b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any labor organization to discriminate against any individual or to limit, segregate, or classify its membership in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive such individual of employment opportunities, or would limit his employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee or as an applicant for employment, or would affect adversely his wages, hours, or employment conditions, because of such individual's race, color, religion, or national origin.
>
> (c) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer or labor organization to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

The first thing to be noted is that the law will apply to all employers regardless of what their business is. That is, the law will apply to the employer in a textile or industrial plant, the employer in a department store, filling station, grocery store, restaurant, bank, garage, the trustees of public schools, including the person or board who employs instructors in private schools, parochial schools, hospitals, and so forth. Without question from anyone, one of the most cherished

individual rights guaranteed by our Constitution is the freedom of religion. That freedom has been more jealously guarded by our system of government than any other of the guaranteed freedoms which we enjoy. To show how absurd this proposal is, it would be an unfair labor practice for a Lutheran, Baptist, or other Protestant seminary to refuse to hire an individual who is by his religious faith a Catholic priest. Does that not violate every concept of our guaranty of religious freedom by the Constitution of these United States?

The proponents of this measure argue that the law would not be enforced to such an extreme. I do not know how far or to what extent the law would be enforced, but I am sure that there are millions of citizens in this country who will bear me out and testify to the accuracy of the statement that "if you give the Federal Government an inch it will take a mile"; and that is the case regardless of what the intentions of this Congress may have been.

In order to show how the law would operate, let us consider a few examples. Suppose John Doe owns a textile mill in any State of the Union and that he has 200 employees and that all of his jobs are filled. Suppose all of the employees of his mill are skilled and experienced craftsmen and that all of them are white persons. Suppose an individual of color approaches Mr. Doe and makes a request for employment and says that he is able and qualified to fill the job efficiently. If Mr. Doe refuses to employ such individual of color, regardless of what his reason may be, the applicant could then file a complaint alleging that Mr. Doe had refused him employment because of his color. Mr. Doe would then be called and directed to appear before the Commission to answer such charge. The Commission could easily and probably would direct Mr. Doe to employ the individual of color because the Commission would probably take the position that in view of the fact that Mr. Doe employed 200 white persons and no person of color that such was a prima facie case of discrimination. How can any reasonable thinking American subscribe to such a philosophy?

Referring to section 5 (a) (2) above, you will note that it will be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to utilize, in the hiring of individuals, any training school which discriminated against individuals because of their race, color, religion, or national origin. I wish to call your attention to the fact that in most of the 48 States in this Union the practice of segregation among races is followed. That is unquestionably so because the States and local authorities deem it advisable and for the best interest of all races concerned. Thus, if this measure should be passed, it would mean that it would be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to hire an individual trained under the veterans' training program if such individual were trained in a high school or college which practiced segregation in accordance with its State laws. How can the American public subject themselves to such an unconstitutional and dictatorial order from the Federal Government?

Mr. Chairman, the purposes of this bill are not only absurd but are ridiculously so. The time has come when the people of this country, as individuals, must rise to the situation and not continue to be lulled to sleep by civic indifference if they expect our cherished institutions to survive. It is time for the people to realize that many of their elected representatives in the Government, both on a State and national level, are promulgating a philosophy of government which is either communistic or socialistic under the guise of liberalism. Many of us are liberal in our thoughts and are willing to support and espouse liberal measures for the welfare of all mankind, but not to the extent of violating the original concepts and precepts of our Constitution. The time has come and in fact is far past due when the people of this country must stop, think, and take stock of their own individual political philosophy. It is incumbent upon each of us to rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles of democracy as enunciated by Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and other of our founding fathers, or else we can only expect to pull the roof in on our own heads by developing a centralized government; a government that would direct and control the individual in his daily actions and enterprise. That is exactly what the Communists desire us to do and that is exactly what the proponents of this measure would have us do, regardless of what they say.

We must remember that every individual in this country has several kinds of rights. First, every individual has what is known as constitutional rights, and then he has what is known as legal rights, both of which are guaranteed by our Constitution and enforcible in the courts of law. Then every individual has what is known as civil rights—rights common to all persons—and it has been decided time and time again that the jurisdiction of our Government over civil rights is limited and that no power to regulate them has been granted or given to the Congress. The right to work, the right to establish a business, the right to own property are all civil rights and belong to every American regardless of whether he is white or black, Jew or gentile, male or female. It is a civil right for an individual to employ whom he pleases and to run his business as he desires. It is his civil right to employ only bald-headed men, only red-headed women, only colored men, only Chinese, only men with false teeth, only one-legged men, if he so desires, and he violates no law when he exercises his choice and thereby discriminates against all other classes of persons. This Congress has no right nor constitutional authority to tell an American citizen whom he shall employ in his own business, how many people he shall employ, or whether he shall employ anyone, or whether any percentage of those he does employ shall be white or colored, or whether any percentage shall adhere to a particular creed or spring from any particular ancestry, or whether any percentage shall be of any particular national origin. Yet, the intent and purpose of H. R. 4453 is for the Government to compel an individual to employ whom the Government says and to run the individual's business and leave nothing to the individual himself to say about his own business. If that is not communism, I do not know what is.

The operation of this bill, if enacted into law and administered as it is written, can only mean that the man of color, the person of a particular nationality, race, or creed will be able to select and demand the job he wants, leaving the average white man to take a job only where he can find it and then content himself with it because there is nothing in this bill that will assure or guarantee him anything except being required to give his place to someone else

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, at this late hour it is neither my intention nor desire to trespass upon your patience; but the measure before us is so far reaching in its consequences, so momentous in its results, that I feel every Member of this House, and I mean on both sides of the aisle, should proceed most cautiously and carefully in its consideration.

Four years ago last month, in January 1946, this measure was debated at long length, with great philosophical insight and historical knowledge, and political acumen, I will add, in another body in this Capitol. At that time I read the debates as assiduously as I did my Bible. I have reread those debates during the past 24 hours while you were answering roll calls and heckling one another. I read them with profit. I only wish that every Member present could read the intelligent, logical, irrefutable arguments advanced by the junior Senator from Georgia in another body, without rancor, without malice, without envy, and I could say much more.

You pass this bill and you strike a death blow at liberty. Oh, I know the high-sounding titles—fair employment. It is the most unfair thing that was ever concocted in the mind of any man. I am the only Republican left in Missouri. Perhaps I will not be here next time; but that matters little. Thank God my father came from Tennessee and my mother from Kentucky. I love the colored people. They understand me and I understand them. We have not had their votes for 15 years. You all know it, but I have received my share in my own district. Nationally we have received a small percentage. And if any of you Republicans are silly enough to think you are going to get them by voting for this particular measure, you go jump in the lake. It is not for votes or against votes. The colored people are too good and too intelligent to be misled. You cannot fool them. My grandfather fought to free them. Here is a thing that absolutely places a halter around the neck, tightens the noose around the heads of American business. Jew, gentile, white, and colored are bound by it.

I do not care whether they are colored or white, Greek, barbarian, Jew, or gen-

tile, you are going to try to tell the people of this country whom they can hire and whom they can fire, and when and how. The board you set up will act as prosecutor, judge, and jury. None of us want that. You should have had enough experience under OPA and WPA to teach you Democrats a little lesson. But you live so long and learn so little. God help all of us.

It is only out of my solicitude for your welfare that I am offering you a little sound advice. Now, do not do this. Do not do this thing. For the sake of us all, do not do it. I know, whether from Missouri or Indiana or Mississippi or any other State, if you try to force something upon the people in another State that are outnumbered do you know what you are going to do? You are going to stir up class consciousness and conflict and strife. You are going to get some good people killed.

It is safe to bet your dollar against the hole in a doughnut that if any northerner lived in Alabama, Mississippi, or Louisiana, he would feel exactly as do the residents of those States. Practically all lynching and violence has been exterminated because of patriotic southerners, and I dare say that the most ardent advocate of this vicious bill—whether he comes from New York, New Jersey, or Wisconsin—would feel exactly as do the citizens of all our Southern States, Georgia, Florida, et cetera, if he lived there.

Lincoln once said, in essence, that as long as you keep the Government close to the people the Government will be safe, but when you direct the Government from afar, we are in grave danger.

Mr. Chairman, certainly every Member of Congress, and I dare say every schoolboy knows that we have a dual form of government: Federal and State.

What powers are not granted unto the Federal Government are reserved to the States under our Federal Constitution. Why should we at this hour, after displaying such unity and interest of purpose, be divided in this most difficult postwar period? There is no reason whatever why Kansas should tell Mississippi what to do any more than Alabama should tell New York what to do.

Yet, there are Members of this body so unschooled, uneducated, and inexperienced that they would impose the will of one sovereign State upon another. That is not only absurd and ridiculous, but is contrary to the fundamental law of this land, which is the Constitution under which we live.

Mr. Chairman, no good can come from this radical proposal, though it be cloaked in the name of humanitarianism and wear the masquerade of civil rights. In many States where the vote has been taken in the State legislatures—with the exception of New York and New Jersey—this proposal has been overwhelmingly defeated. Every Member of this House wants to protect every citizen of our country, but if you pass this bill you are once more going to stir up the strife, bitterness, and hatred that led to a war between ourselves, and, as a friend of the colored people, whose forebears fought to set them free, I dare say you are going to get a lot of people killed. I do not want that to happen.

At this particular time, above all others, when we need unity and solidarity among our citizens, I am sure that the colored people, as always, particularly those who think for themselves, will not hesitate to join us to see that this evil thing does not happen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize at this late hour there is very little that can be said that will change votes one way or the other. Like the preceding speaker, I think this measure is very far-reaching and will have such tremendous potential effect upon the economic future and body politic of this country that I do not want to see it passed without saying at least something in reference to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I spent my legislative life on the Committee on the Armed Services. When I look at this or any other far-reaching measure presented to this body for consideration, I think of it, naturally, in terms of the committee on which I have the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives. Tonight when I approach this measure I think of it from the standpoint of its effect or possible effect upon the national defense of the United States.

The Colmer amendment to date is the only one which in my judgment has brought to the forefront any discussion whatever as to the possible effect this might have upon the defense of our country. I have heard no argument or any discussion whatsoever by either side in reference to the matter; and, yet, Mr. Chairman, I know that not only do we have these atomic-energy contracts throughout the country; but also we have many other contracts covering scientific exploration, covering electronics, and covering other matters such as guided missiles that are extremely secret and extremely vital to the defenses of the United States, and I am wondering—and I should like to hear someone tell me—just how the establishment of a board such as this to preside over the matter of the hiring and firing of men and women in those industries of a private nature that have these secret contracts is going to affect the defenses and the security of the country. I do know that up in the great State of New York where General Electric has so many highly secret and highly confidential contracts that General Electric has had a great deal of trouble getting proper employees who were trustworthy, who could be depended upon and relied upon to be loyal to this country and maintain the secrecy which is naturally imposed upon them when they gain employment in a secret project.

It seems to me that is tremendously important to the committee and whether you are out at Los Alamos with an atomic-energy contract, whether you are down in Florida with a guided missiles contract, whether you are in New York State, or Massachusetts, or Washington, or Oregon, the same problem is coming up: Will this legislation injure national defense by making it possible to block our scientific advancement and development, hurting those projects in our national defense which are highly confidential and highly secret and in which complete confidence must be maintained, or will it aggravate the situation which we have seen uncovered in the last few months? Will it lead to a further betrayal of the secrets of this Nation to an alien enemy? I think this Congress ought to think seriously of that matter. I do not believe this feature of the bill has been carefully thought out. I am afraid it has been overlooked and I am concerned that our national safety is being jeopardized.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from California who raised the question in regard to limitation to page 12, lines 8, 9, and 10, which read as follows:

> Any written charge filed pursuant to this section must be filed within 1 year after the commission of the alleged unlawful employment practice.

I think that answers his question.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, the pending Colmer amendment, in my opinion, will be acceptable to my bill and I think it would not take anything away from the McConnell bill. If applied to the original Powell bill, however, it will mean absolutely nothing because section 10 of the Powell bill tries to deal with that subject and I submit to you again that so long as the remainder of the Powell bill is permitted to stand as it does, section 10 does not have any meaning at all.

Again, I would like to call your attention to subsection (b) of section 2 which says that these rights are to be had for all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States Government. You know, when you have enemy spies, or enemy aliens get into this country, they are within the jurisdiction of this Government. I call your attention also to subsection (a) of section 7.

Section 5 sets up what is unfair-employment practices and subsection (a) of section 7 says that the power to enforce these provisions against unfair practices is an exclusive power and shall not be affected by any other means that have been or may be effected by agreement. So under that language section 10 would not mean a thing. This Commission, if it saw fit under the language of section 2 and section 7, could make the Atomic Energy Commission hire anybody that they saw fit if he claimed he was a member of a minority race, even if he were an enemy spy. I do not think anybody can successfully dispute that because the language is very plain.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The able and very earnest gentleman from Oklahoma has put

his finger right on the nailhead. Does he know of any minority group anywhere in all this country who is being persecuted or discriminated against?

Mr. STEED. I do not.

Mr. SHORT. Does he not know that every minority group anywhere in the world is eager to get into this country?

Mr. STEED. That is right. There is one other thing I want to submit to the committee. It is very difficult for me to follow the line of consistency in some minds here. I remind you that about a year ago we had the Lesinski bill up to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and these same so-called northern liberals were up here pounding against that law. They said that we did not need the power, the injunction power, that collective bargaining and public influence would be enough. Yet today these same men say that they have to have the punitive power in the FEPC.

You heard the gentleman from New York in a threatening tone say, "You vote for this Powell bill or you will get the consequences." He says that you cannot vote for my bill or the McConnell bill that do all these terrible things.

Since when has the dependency upon the sense of fairness, of common sense, and common decency of the American people been something that is so bad? Why can we not here in this program accept mediation, conciliation, and education and an appeal to the common sense and fairness of the people of this country to get results?

The gentleman from Wisconsin said here that you have got to have the power, you have got to have a knife at the throat of the employer before you can make him conciliate, yet, in the next breath he brags about the great progress they have made in Milwaukee without any law or without any force at all. To me, if my understanding of language is correct, the man contradicts himself before he gets the words out of his mouth.

Gentlemen, this is a large country and it has problems that are peculiar to different sections. We are trying to come here with a program that is fair and reasonable, that has a chance to work, because it has the most potent power in a democracy that you can get for its enforcement, the power of public opinion. The substitute bill that we have pending here sets up the machinery to bring public opinion into force.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to inquire how many amendments are on the desk to the pending substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. According to the latest count, there are 46 amendments.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry. The pending amendment has been debated now for about 35 minutes. Is there any indication that there will be a vote on the pending amendment, giving time to other Members who have amendments to have an opportunity to discuss them before the time limitation for debate ends at 2:30?

The CHAIRMAN. If the Committee desires that there be a vote on the amendment, of course, it can express that desire; that is, on the Rivers amendment to the McConnell amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIVERS) there were—yeas 118, noes 126.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RIVERS and Mr. POWELL.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The limitation on time fixed the time at a precise hour rather than so many minutes. The effect of teller votes, then, is simply to take time out of the time allowed for debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, it comes out of the time.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 134, noes 134.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair votes in the negative.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: At the end of the McConnell amendment insert a new section 8 to read as follows:

"Nothing in this act shall mean, nor be construed to mean, that any person who lacks the qualification necessary to fit one to perform the duties of the job for which that person may be applying must be employed in spite of his disqualifications."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, this is substantially the same amendment that we have already adopted to the Steed amendment, or substitute bill, so I do not care to make an argument on it again, except to simply say that whatever was said then we want you to consider again. And we hope that you will take the same action with regard to amending the McConnell bill that you did with regard to the Steed bill and adopt this amendment.

The parliamentarians tell me that I should offer to amend both.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir. Gladly.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, a while ago I called attention to the fact that there was no limitation of time for an aggrieved person to file a complaint. I find, after listening to the gentleman from Indiana, who said that there was time, namely, 1 year, as contained in line 10 on page 12, that that refers only to the written charges filed by the Commission and not to the sworn written charges that have been filed on behalf of the person claiming to be aggrieved. Therefore I was right in the first instance.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, sir.

Mr. JACOBS. I would like to say to the Members, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from California is correct. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] called it to my attention and I have put an amendment on the Clerk's desk to strike out the word "written" so that it would apply to both written and sworn charges.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman for his acknowledgment of the situation.

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman is correct. And I want to express gratitude to the gentleman from Wisconsin for calling it to my attention.

Mr. KEEFE. I, too, thank the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir, with pleasure.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there are some 40 amendments pending at the Clerk's desk and the time has been fixed for 2:30, I ask unanimous consent that hereafter those who are recognized to speak on their amendment be limited to 30 seconds. That will give everybody a chance to say something.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. SIKES, Mr. TACKETT, and Mr. JENNINGS objected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 149, noes 91.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I know there are two of us here who have been trying to get the floor for a few minutes since 3 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon. This gentleman has had the floor three or four times.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TACKETT. If that is not discrimination I do not know what is. We have discrimination right here in this House of Congress.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out again what I stated earlier, that under the Powell bill the Commission is not empowered to find anyone guilty of a crime at all; that is not correct, according to my understanding, and I have read the bill. The Commission makes a finding as to whether or not there has been an unfair-employment practice. A cease-and-desist order is then enforcible by the court and the only way a man can get put in jail under that procedure would be for him to refuse to obey the order of the court.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Is not the same procedure provided under many administrative acts, such as the Securities and Exchange Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Labor Relations Act, and many others? Is not that the standard procedure?

Mr. JACOBS. Certainly it is. The only criminal provision in this bill—let us get that straight again—is where an individual would resist or interfere with an officer of this Commission, which would then be an offense and there is provided a fine up to $500 or a year in jail. But that is not for an unfair-employment practice. It is for resisting or interfering with an officer of the Government. Now, that is the fact of the case.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. Of course, the opportunity to interfere comes from the fact that the Commission under administrative procedure is enabled to put an order on a man which he does not choose to obey. That order may have been put on him without a real opportunity to present all of the necessary evidence. By that process a man is subject to fine or imprisonment, if the courts would so hold.

Mr. JACOBS. That is quite true, I agree with the gentleman. It is the same as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] pointed out a moment ago. This is true in many administrative acts. The truth of the matter is the criminal provision you are talking about would not be triable before this Commission at all. It would be triable before a court.

Mr. McCONNELL. But the court follows a commission's order.

Mr. JACOBS. Oh, no, the gentleman is confused on that. Let me straighten him out. Under section 14 it would proceed to an indictment against a man for interfering with an officer of the United States Government. The Commission would not have a thing to do with that.

Mr. McCONNELL. The Commission would start the whole process.

Mr. JACOBS. Oh, no.

Mr. McCONNELL. Oh, yes, by saying in an administrative order of the Commission originally that an employer has to do certain things or cease and desist.

Mr. JACOBS. Does not the gentleman understand that under your administrative procedure where you get a cease-and-desist order, that may eventuate into a court order and disobedience thereof, then a contempt proceeding.

Mr. McCONNELL. But it arises from the Commission's original order.

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, but it does not arise under section 14, the criminal provision. What I am trying to point out is that under section 14 you merely have a provision which is similar to title 18, sections 453 and 454, protecting Federal officers in the discharge of their duty. A man violating section 14 would not come before the Commission at all. He would be indicted, he would have a hearing before a court. It would be triable before a jury. That is the thing I am afraid some Members are confused on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are several amendments to the Steed amendment pending at the Clerk's desk. Is it proper to offer amendments to the Steed amendment while the Colmer amendment is still pending before the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Not until the Colmer amendment is disposed of. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida to the bill, H. R. 6841: Page 1, line 9, after "creed" insert "sex."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, while I am opposed to this bill because I think it is unconstitutional, un-American, and an infringement upon the freedom of choice in selecting employees, however, I am proposing this amendment so the women of this country will have equal rights with men, should this measure become a law. The only thing my amendment does is to add the word "sex" after the word "creed", so that it will read as follows:

That properly qualified persons shall not be discriminated against by reason of race, creed, sex, or color.

That takes care of any discrimination against the women of this Nation. The bill without this amendment is the rankest kind of discrimination against the women citizens of our Nation. There can be no reason why the feminine segment of our population should not be included if such a law should be passed, so I propose by this amendment to place women on an equality and on the same level with men in the employment field.

Here we are supposed to be passing a Fair Employment Practice Act without any discrimination, and you discriminate against the women of this Nation. I might state to those Members of the House who are supporting this bill purely for political purposes, that in failing to take the rights of the women into consideration, you are overlooking the fact that the women of this Nation constitute a majority of the voters. In the general election of 1940 the women cast 51 percent of the votes and in 1944 they cast 53 percent and possibly a larger percentage than this in 1948. So I am sure that with this information you can strain your conscience and support this amendment.

I hope that the membership of this House will take this amendment seriously, because I am serious when I propose it. I say "There is nothing too good for our women" as I have heretofore said about our veterans.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. The gentleman is always sincere, and certainly we should not exclude the women if we are going to see that everybody is treated fairly in this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I trust my gallant friend from Florida is not suggesting that this legislation will accomplish the same purpose as was alleged last June or July with reference to another piece of legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. We are right now beginning to give equal treatment to the women. There is now pending what is known as an equal-rights amendment giving equality of treatment to the feminine sex—and it is high time that they be given such consideration. I might state that nowhere in the Constitution of the United States does the feminine gender appear. The nearest approach is when the franchise was granted to the women and even there the amendment read that no one shall be deprived of the right to vote because of sex. I believe we ought to take care of the women in this bill and I trust my amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were—ayes 182, noes 105.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr SMITH of Virginia to the amendment offered by Mr. McCONNELL: On page 6, line 25, after "place", strike out "in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "within the area of the United States District Court in which the hearing is held"

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. I consider this a good amendment, and I accept it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps I had better take half a minute to say what the amendment is about.

Under the bill as drafted this commission can drag a witness or a defendant from California to Maine, and make him bring all his books, papers, and witnesses with him. The purpose of this amendment is to confine that jurisdiction so that he cannot subpena people outside of the Federal district court area in which the action is pending If they want to have the hearing in California, let the Commission go to California, instead of all the citizens coming here.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia and all

the other amendments that have been adopted to the McConnell amendment and to the Steed amendment, but primarily to the McConnell amendment, accomplish only one thing, and that is the torpedoing of FEPC. I think this has become obvious. The McConnell amendment started out as a bill to nullify FEPC. If there were any doubts of it, these amendments that have been added definitely nullify the very objectives of FEPC. A vote for the McConnell amendment is a vote against FEPC. You are only voting for words, that is all, when you vote for the McConnell amendment. You are not voting for FEPC, and you are not going to fool anybody by the title. You are not going to fool the American people by it. You are not going to fool the American people by just giving us a bare bill, with merely a title. That title is empty. The McConnell bill is now being used to sabotage genuine FEPC legislation in this House. I hope you will bear that in mind when you vote on the McConnell amendment.

Mr. McCONNELL. Does the gentleman not admit that we set up an FEPC Commission?

Mr MARCANTONIO. You set up an FEPC Commission and then you nullify every principle of FEPC.

Mr. McCONNELL. Is not that progress?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No; it is not. This is what you have done to FEPC, you have taken out the molars, you have taken out all the teeth, you have sawed off the arms and the legs and cut off anything that counts in FEPC.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LESINSKI) there were—ayes 211, noes 116.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER to the amendment offered by Mr. MCCONNELL: Page 8, line 4, insert a new paragraph as follows

"None of the provisions of this bill shall apply to employment by the Atomic Energy Commission or any contractor or licensee of the Atomic Energy Commission."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that those Members who have amendments at the Clerk's desk at this time and who have not had an opportunity to be recognized for debate, may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who want to extend their remarks in favor of the McConnell amendment as such may be permitted to do at this point, even though they do not have individual amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES to the amendment offered by Mr. MCCONNELL: Add a new section:

"*Provided, however*, That the mere absence of individuals of a particular race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry in the employ of any person shall not be evidence of discrimination against individuals of such race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry."

Mr. SIKES. The amendment which I offer, Mr. Chairman, is not a whimsical or time-killing amendment. I read it for full understanding of the membership:

Provided, however, That the absence of individuals of a particular race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry in the employ of any person shall not be evidence of discrimination against individuals of such race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that failure to adopt my amendment may leave it in the discretion of some board of the future to hold that the absence of such individuals in the employ of any person is discrimination.

Quite obviously such a situation would permit the Nation's business to be throttled by bureaucracy. The courts of the land could be hopelessly clogged with unwarranted evidence of interference with business and trade under the cloak of discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, we are seeking to avoid that most dangerous of all governments—government by minority. Majorities have rights, Mr. Chairman, and I fear that we are prone to lose sight of the fact that democracy is government by the majority.

The FEPC measure is not a bill for the good of the majority. It seeks to give undue control to a minority—a very small minority.

Hitler was a minority product, Mr. Chairman, and ruthlessly using a minority for his own purposes, Hitler forced his will upon the German people. The rest is history.

I fear, Mr. Chairman, that if we pass an FEPC measure we shall be treading much too close on Hitler's heels. My amendment will afford some measure of protection and I hope it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the McConnell amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT of Florida to the amendment offered by Mr. MCCONNELL: On page 1, line 9, after the words "by reason of", insert "physical disability."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE to the amendment offered by Mr. MCCONNELL:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "three", insert "political affiliation."

On page 2, line 5, insert "political affiliation."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I believe, is largely noncontroversial. If the intent of this Committee is to enact legislation designed to protect the rights of United States citizens to employment without discrimination, then, I believe it will willingly accept this amendment designed to deal with perhaps the greatest employment-discrimination practice of all, the denial of jobs to men and women because of their political affiliation.

I want to make my position clear upon the bill we are presently considering. If a bill is reported to the House in substantially the same form in which it was reported from the Committee on Labor, I shall vote against it. I am strongly opposed to legislation which would attempt to make men's attitudes rather than their actions a basis for legal penalty.

Further than this, however, the original bill is based upon the false premise apparent in so much legislation offered today—the false premise that we can solve basic problems by dealing with their effects rather than with their cause.

Discrimination, and I do not deny that it exists, is an effect, not a cause. Discrimination is caused by prejudice, and we will not remove prejudice by legislation which can only excite the passions of men. It seems clear to me that this bill will merely inflame prejudice by forcing men to do what they are not prepared to do in their hearts and minds. We have never yet succeeded in curing an ill by passing a law against its symptoms. We could not force men who wanted to drink to stop drinking; we only made their thirst greater. We could not command prices to remain stable as long as our money was inflated, supply was short, and demand was heavy; we only raised prices higher by increasing the demand and intensifying the shortage. We cannot deal with causes by passing laws prohibiting their effects.

I believe there is a chance to deal with the problem of prejudices and the effect of prejudices, employment discrimination, through voluntary means, through education, conciliation, and mediation.

It is with that hope that I support this noncontroversial amendment. I need not speak at length concerning the necessity for it. It is sufficient for me to say, I believe, that this Government, your Government and mine, is presently in the process of hiring some 160,000 men for temporary assignment to the 1950 census. On practically every one of those jobs there is an invisible, but very real, qualifying requirement. That requirement reads, "Members of the party

in power only. All others need not apply."

Those jobs Mr. Chairman, are being let at this very instant, by your Government and mine, while we sit here and talk, in the abstract, about discrimination, because of man's belief, if you please, in private employment. Let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, some 160,000 jobs are now being filled by your Government and mine, and it is well understood throughout this great Nation that the prime requirement for one of those jobs is an ability to satisfy the hirer of party regularity.

I sincerely hope the Committee will adopt my amendment, and that we can then proceed, in the American way, through voluntary persuasion, to persuade the party in power of the basic immorality of this large-scale job discrimination.

AMENDMENT TO H. R. 4453, THE FEPC

Page 1, in the title; page 2, line 1; page 2, line 20; page 6, line 3; page 6, line 9; page 6, line 18 and page 10, line 11, after the word "ancestry", insert the words "political affiliation" and a comma, and after paragraph (g) of section 3, add a new paragraph, as follows: "(h) The term 'political affiliation' means membership in or affiliation with a political party or adherence to or belief in the principles of a political party: *Provided*, That the term 'political party' shall not include the Communist Party or any political organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or any illegal or unconstitutional means."

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. STEED.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REDDEN to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. STEED: On page 1, line 12, after the words "labor organizations", insert *"Provided, however*, That the fact of having an individual of a particular race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry in the employ of a person shall create a presumption that such person has not and does not discriminate against persons of that race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATTLE to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. STEED: On page 2, line 12, strike out the word "eliminate" and insert "persuaded the person charged to eliminate."

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, the enactment of H. R. 4453 would be a serious mistake. Such legislation is unconstitutional, unenforcible, and unwise. This is clearly a proposal for too much government.

Discrimination of itself is a bad practice, of course. I am not here to defend it. I would like to state why I feel this bill is not the way to attack discrimination in employment. In the first place, H. R. 4453 is unconstitutional. What part of the Constitution gives the Government the right to establish a Federal agency that can bypass the State government; that can bypass the local government; that can go into a union or business and judge whether or not someone has been discriminated against? The bill would invade a realm of human activity which is not subject to legislation. Why not enact laws requiring all people to be kind or to like everybody else? They would be just as sensible. How can an agent of the Government peer into a man's soul and tell whether he acted through discrimination or for a dozen other reasons? Is it the prerogative of the Government to decide that an employee was dismissed because of his church affiliation rather than because he was an inferior worker? If Government ever assumes this right, America cannot call her soul her own.

The American Bill of Rights guaranteed certain freedoms to the individual. This bill would deny some of those basic rights. Freedom of contract, freedom to choose those who work with you or for you—these would be destroyed by H. R. 4453. Under this bill you would even be denied the right of trial by jury—as fundamental as any civil right.

First then, the bill is unconstitutional. Second, it is unenforcible. Imagine the enormous network of Federal agents required to ferret out and report cases of so-called discrimination throughout the land—to investigate and hold hearings. An army of investigators could never scratch the surface. Business and labor unions would be constantly disrupted by Government investigations; employees would feel insecure and suspicious of each other. Morale would be destroyed. Actually the bill would discriminate against the majority by giving special privilege to the minority. A union or an employer would hesitate to take any action at all involving a member of a minority group for any reason on matter how valid.

As was pointed out in the minority report on S 984 of the Eightieth Congress, a similar bill:

In any large establishment employees and applicants for employment are certain to include persons of different races, religions, and color. Any selection and treatment of a particular person can plausibly be complained of as an unlawful discrimination.

Small-business men and unions would not have the time nor the money to spend for going to court to appeal unfair decisions of the Fair Employment Practice Commission.

H. R. 4453 prohibits discrimination against "properly qualified" persons. But who decides whether a person is "properly qualified"? Is the employer no longer to have that right? And who has the final say as to whether an employer or a union acted through discrimination? These are intangibles beyond the power of Government to decide.

Apart from these arguments, there are certain communities which by tradition and heritage are deeply opposed to enactment of this kind of law. In these places such a law could not be enforced except by mass coercion. Mr. Walter Lippmann puts it this way:

There are certain kinds of laws which, though enacted, cannot be enforced by any means that the majority is able or willing to employ. These are laws to which a sizable region, even though it is numerically a minority in the Nation, is so deeply opposed that it will resort to nullification, resistance, passive and active disobedience, to thwart enforcement—and in the extreme and ultimate cases to insurrection and rebellion.

The cost, the trouble, the futility, and the danger, of trying to enforce laws under these conditions are so great that the majority will not, as a matter of fact, insist on enforcing them. If it is wise, it will not enact such laws.

Of the more than half a million people who live in my district an overwhelming majority agree with Mr. Lippmann that this type of legislation is unwise. This is not because the majority of our people are unintelligent or uneducated or biased. It is because our people—the wisest and most forward looking—the true leaders of both races—are convinced that the delicate problem of race relations must be met by enlightened action from within—not by coercion from without. This is a problem which is exceedingly intricate and far reaching—not to be dealt with lightly or with expedience. To understand the problem requires first-hand study over a considerable period. It is something which must be lived with. Only then can a realistic solution be worked out. To be successful, legislation in the field of race relations must be grounded in the good will of the people who are to carry it out. It must be local in origin and spirit.

Of course, this implies a responsibility of a community to meet its minority problem squarely with an enlightened program—with constructive action. This we are doing in the South. Substantial progress has been made and is being made—progress which would be seriously retarded by the enactment of legislation such as H. R. 4453. As an example, in the city of Birmingham we have 41 percent Negroes in our population. You will probably be surprised to learn that they receive over 41 percent of the funds available for education while contributing perhaps less than 10 percent of the taxes. Some people are more interested in making political capital out of this issue than they are in investigating the facts. As further illustration I cite two recent news items which are self-explanatory:

[From the Birmingham Post of January 31, 1950]

MONUMENT TO GOOD WILL

Long overdue and twice postponed in the past year to avoid conflicts with other fund-raising efforts of our community, Jefferson County's campaign to raise $150,000 for the building of a hospital for Negroes will get under way tomorrow.

For many years the need for such a hospital has been recognized by everyone familiar with the facts but little of a concrete nature was done about it until the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, a Catholic order widely experienced in the operation of hospitals, became interested and accepted responsibility for its operation once it is built. A square-block site in the Tuxedo Junction section of Ensley was acquired and by private subscription $103,000 was raised for building purposes. Since then plans have been drawn and a commitment has been made by the Federal Government, under the Hill-Burton Act, to provide $500,000 toward the program when the $150,000 now sought is in hand.

That will make a total of $750,000 available for the building and its equipment. It will make available 60 badly needed additional hospital beds and other facilities for Negro patients. Of equal importance and significance it will provide a suitable place to practice for the 37 Negro doctors in Jefferson County who are without such facilities today.

Part of the money to be raised will come from our Negro citizens themselves but most of it must be made up of gifts from among their white friends.

It would be a grand thing if every white citizen in the county would give something toward this worthy undertaking. We could ask no better opportunity than, by raising this $150,000 in record time, to make this institution of healing and mercy a monument to the good relations and mutual esteem which exists between the white and colored citizens of our community.

[From the Birmingham News of January 31, 1950]

LET'S BUILD THIS HOSPITAL AS A MONUMENT TO HEALTH AND TO UNDERSTANDING

To the People of Birmingham and Jefferson Counties:

Tomorrow is the opening of a campaign to raise $150,000 to build and equip a hospital for Negroes in Birmingham.

The humane and economic needs which inspired this campaign are beyond conception until we realize the fact that although 45 percent of Birmingham's population are Negroes, only 348 hospital beds are generally available to them.

Medical and public health authorities in Alabama have long reminded our people of a serious shortage in the number of doctors and the pitiful lack of hospital facilities. Thirty-seven Negro physicians are practicing among their people in Jefferson County, and yet there is no hospital in Jefferson County where they may treat their patients. If they are fortunate enough to find an available bed in any hospital when hospitalization is required, the immediate result is that other doctors, surgeons, and hospital technicians must take over for them.

From the standpoint of simple humanity, the toll of pain and suffering has been great. There is no way of knowing how many Negroes have died or suffered needlessly because these conditions exist. Economically, the citizens of Jefferson County, white and colored alike, are constantly paying the penalty of this lack. Disease, wherever it exists and in whatever form is not merely a menace to health. Sick men and women cannot work; eventually they must be fed and clothed and housed at public expense—or left to die unheeded, which is unthinkable in the code of humanity.

Not only the Negro who works in the confines of our homes or public places as cook, nurse, or waitress, but all who ride the busses, walk the streets, or work in plants and shops are in constant contact with the white citizens of Jefferson County. What threatens their health also threatens ours.

In the erection, equipping, and operation of this hospital exclusively for Negroes, we have a common cause for all the people of Jefferson County. It is one which merits the most generous contribution that any of us can afford.

The early work which has made possible the complete project was accomplished by the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, the Catholic order which will operate the hospital on a completely nonprofit basis when it is completed.

Through their own efforts they have already bought and paid for the land, an entire block located in the Tuxedo Junction section at 1915 Nineteenth Street, Ensley. They have also raised by private subscription, and have in cash for the building and equipment $103,000.

The building site, together with the $103,000 in cash at hand, will be added to the $150,000 which the interdenominational committee will raise. The project has been submitted under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act and has been approved for a grant of $515,000 of matching Federal funds.

The hospital will provide 60 beds, operating, X-ray, delivery and emergency rooms, and an out-patient clinic. It will be self-supporting, and should any deficit occur, the operating agency will meet the deficiency and guarantee continuous operation. The agency, the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, operates many of the large and successful hospitals of the Nation.

The erection and operation of such a hospital in Birmingham will be a distinguished mark of credit to the people of Birmingham—an answer in part to the sponsors of legislation in Washington who seek so ardently to intervene in the affairs of our State. It is an affirmation and a humane answer to the critics who do not believe, or do not wish to believe, that the southern people will act to improve the well-being of the southern Negro. It is an answer to both communism and socialism.

Above all, we and countless others of all faiths, believe that the people of Birmingham are both wise and humane. We feel that every contribution, whether it be large or small, is an expression of faith not only in our city but in our way of life

Since it is impossible for the committee to call upon everyone, it is necessary that we call upon many to send or bring their contributions to the campaign headquarters. This headquarters has been set up in the offices of the Birmingham Junior Chamber of Commerce in the Hillman Hotel. Checks should be made payable to Walter E. Henley, treasurer.

We are confident that the people of Jefferson County will be glad and feel privileged to share in a project which will live throughout the years to come as a blessing to both races and a monument to our mutual desire to make Jefferson County a healthier, a happier, a better place in which to live.

Sincerely,

DONALD COMER,
Chairman.
LOUIS PIZITZ,
Cochairman.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN LAURIE C. BATTLE, JANUARY 17

By strictly political maneuvers the administration is isolating the South from the rest of the country more every day.

If FEPC or so-called civil rights is the issue on the pending vote to change the rules, I will definitely vote for the change in order to stop this continued strangulation of the South.

However, no one knows at this time whether there will be a show-down vote on FEPC before the proposed rules change is debated—or just what we will be voting on.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I join the many liberal, realistic thinkers throughout the country who feel that enactment of FEPC would be unwise. To make political sport, as some would do, of issues which form the very fabric of life in many States and which affects the day-to-day lives of millions of our people is short-sighted indeed. To enact such a bill as H. R. 4453 would set back by many years the accomplishments of generations in the field of race relations. It would be a sad day for the courageous, high-minded men and women of both races in the South—who are working against odds, but persevering toward the solution of one of the most challenging problems a people were ever called upon to meet.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PICKETT to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. STEED: On page 1, line 12, after the words "labor organizations", insert *"Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall require a church of one religion to employ individuals who adhere to some other religion."

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, there can be no question in the mind of any person who seeks to be informed that I am unalterably opposed to the establishment of an FEPC in any form. I have made my position clear on so many occasions it is beyond argument.

However, the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] fails to take into account one of the fundamental concepts of our Constitution. The first amendment to the Constitution provides in part:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

That provision puts into words a basic principle our ancestors labored to establish, the separation of church and state.

The pending proposal in no way takes that principle into account. My amendment will offer some modicum of protection to members of various religious sects to prevent any imposition on them and their organizations. It should be adopted.

I regret the necessity for even engaging in debate on such an issue as FEPC. It is one of the planks in the President's civil-rights program, against which I have spoken and opposed on numerous occasions. My sentiments on the most controversial features of that program, including FEPC, were expressed at length on the floor of the House August 2, 1948. I would like to reiterate them at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the civil-rights program. Ever since I came to Congress I have been one of the most active opponents of the things included in the President's so-called civil-rights program.

While there are other points in the civil-rights program, the most controversial are: First, the enactment by Congress of an antilynching law; second, Federal legislation to abolish the poll tax; third, Federal legislation to eliminate segregation; fourth, passage of a Federal Fair Employment Practice Act.

These proposals, first, violate the Constitution; second, are an encroachment on States' rights; third, are wrong in principle; and, fourth, will not work in practice.

ORIGIN OF PROGRAM

The program was inspired by agitators who want to make the South a political whipping boy. Not all who favor the

civil-rights program are Communists, but it is certainly true that all who are Communists do favor it. They have now set up Henry Wallace as their straw man spokesman. They use him to help create prejudice and confusion for their own ends.

PURPOSE OF PROGRAM

The program seeks to establish racial and social equality where none was decreed by the laws of God. Enactment of such proposals into law would add chaos to the already existing confusion in the national picture at a time when all of our energies should be devoted to a solution of problems of the greatest magnitude, both at home and abroad. All of those proposals have a political inspiration, which seeks the votes of the minority groups in the big cities of the North and East in order to perpetuate their sponsors in office. They are an invasion of the principles of States' rights as conceived by that great Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, and followed through the years by those of us who cling to Jeffersonian principles.

NO NECESSITY FOR PROGRAM

There is no need for such legislation because the history of the progress of racial relationships in the South, where such problems are said to be acute, reveals that much has been done to solve them. The Negro has no better friend than the southern white man. We give him work to earn his livelihood. We feed and clothe him when he cannot provide for himself. We supply him with medical care and drugs when he is ill. We provide educational facilities for his children, contribute to the construction of his churches, advise with him when he is troubled. His progress has been remarkable in the last 80 years. All of that is contrasted with the treatment the Negro receives in the North, where none save his own kind cares what becomes of him.

HISTORY OF PROGRAM

So much controversy has arisen over the Truman civil-rights program that it might shed some light on the subject to review its history briefly. The civil-rights doctrine originated in the minds of a few misguided zealots, whose clamorings to get political recognition from certain minority groups resulted in the establishment of a Fair Employment Practice Commission by Executive order in 1941. More will be said about that later.

The first major step in the formation of the civil-rights program occurred when President Truman appointed a Committee on Civil Rights in December 1946. After more than a year that committee submitted a 178-page document which serves as a basis for the program.

In his state-of-the-Union message delivered to Congress January 7, 1948, the President discussed, among other things, the question of so-called civil rights, and stated he would send a special message to the Congress on that subject.

On February 2, 1948, the President sent the special message.

The civil-rights program became a major point of controversy at the Democratic National Convention in July 1948, and split the Democratic Party into segments. Its submission as a subject to be considered by the Congress at this special session has resulted in a situation that has delayed consideration of important legislation in the other body.

On February 2, 1948, the President sent the special message.

ANTILYNCHING

The record of lynchings in the United States during the past 50 years shows in 1900 there were 115; in 1910, 76; in 1920, 61; in 1930, 21; in 1940, 5; 1944, 2; 1945, 1; 1946, 6; 1947, again only 1 lynching. The figures show that lynching has practically disappeared in America without a Federal antilynching law. Therefore, there is no need for such a Federal statute.

On the other hand, the vociferous advocates of an antilynching law make no suggestion that there be a Federal statute enacted against murder, rape, robbery, theft, burglary, and so forth.

In New York City, where a large part of the agitation for a Federal antilynching law comes from, in 1946 there were 325 murders, 14,525 other felonies, and a total of 697,734 crimes reported to the police. That is the record of one city in 1 year. Yet among the 140,000,000 people in the entire United States there were only 6 lynchings.

Lynching is another form of murder and is prohibited by statute in every State in the United States. Why do not the advocates of an antilynching law seek Federal legislation to punish the commission of other forms of murder and other felonies? Obviously, in view of the record of New York City and other metropolitan centers in the United States, the crimes are so commonplace there is no vote-getting glamor in seeking Federal statutes for the punishment of crimes generally. Equally obviously, the demand is raised all out of proportion to the justification, based on the record that lynching has almost entirely disappeared in this country.

Do not those victims of murder, robbery, rape, and so forth, have some civil rights? Certainly. Again, they have no spokesman for their rights seeking the enactment of Federal laws for punishment of the offenders, because there is no political benefit accruing from such a program.

ABOLITION OF THE POLL TAX

Only 7 States in the 48 levy a poll tax as a means of registration to establish eligibility for voting. In many of them, including Texas, most of the revenue derived is devoted to the maintenance and operation of the public schools. If the people of Texas want to abolish the poll tax and substitute some other requisite to vote, that is their business; but I am opposed to the Federal Government telling Texas how and what to do about it.

A law enacted by Congress to abolish the poll tax is unconstitutional, in my opinion. The Constitution provides in article 1, section 2:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Numerous cases have been decided sustaining my viewpoint. In Breedlove against Suttles, decided by the United States Supreme Court in 1937, Mr. Justice Butler, speaking for the Court, said:

> Payment as a prerequisite is not required for the purpose of denying or abridging the privilege of voting. It does not limit the tax to electors; aliens are not there permitted to vote, but the tax is laid upon them if within the defined class. It is not laid upon persons 60 or more years old, whether electors or not. Exaction of payment before registration undoubtedly serves to aid collection from electors desiring to vote, but that use of the State's power is not prevented by the Federal Constitution.

Other cases have followed the principle announced in that case.

Enactment by Congress of a law to abolish the poll tax would be an invasion of the rights of the States to establish their own electoral systems.

The poll-tax issue is another one of those that is raised for pure vote-getting purposes by those in the North and East who are agitating for a Federal law on the subject. The issue is politically inspired to get the votes of a minority group in the big city areas in doubtful States. That is where the cry to abolish the poll tax comes from.

I could go on at length discussing this subject, but to do so would unduly burden you. Let me direct your attention to the fact that I led the debate on the floor of the House in opposition to the proposal on July 21, 1947, when that subject was up for consideration. The speech I made on that occasion in opposition to the legislation contains a full analysis of my views on the subject and the law in support of my position.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION TO ELIMINATE SEGREGATION

Segregation is not discrimination. It is a means of affording people of all races an opportunity to be and associate with their own kind. It avoids friction. It promotes harmonious relationships. It prevents discord. It eliminates opportunities for disagreement and strife.

What does elimination of segregation by law mean to the average citizen? It means that the American would be prohibited from choosing his associates in the church, in the school, in fraternal organizations, in every walk of social life. It means that you and I must accept as associates in our daily lives persons of race and color other than our own regardless of our personal feelings in the matter. In order to eliminate segregation and to prevent discrimination it would result in the establishment of a Federal bureau with gestapo powers. The employees of such an agency would have a right to tell the free American citizen with whom he could associate regardless of the citizen's personal desires in the matter. Carried to its ultimate conclusion, the agents of such a bureau could require the churches to accept membership from those it did not want. It could compel us to send our children to school with companions other than their own seeking. It could require us to occupy the

same travel accommodations, the same hotels, and eat at the same restaurants in company of persons we did not voluntarily choose.

All of those things could be done in the name of civil rights. To do them would be to disregard the rights of a majority of the people.

THE FEPC

The establishment of a Federal Fair Employment Practice Commission by law to prohibit discrimination in private employment would be a terrible imposition on the American people. It would simply mean this: that no employer could employ or discharge persons from employment without being supervised by agents of that bureau. It would mean that the employee would be required to work side by side with individuals he would not associate with except by compulsion. Assume 75 percent of the population in a given town were white and 25 percent black. Under such a law every employer would have to accept one-fourth of his employees from among the colored race regardless of the nature and type of employment. If a merchant had four clerks, one of them would have to be a Negro. If a contractor wanted to hire four carpenters, one of them would have to be a Negro. If a board of school trustees wanted to employ four teachers, one of them would have to be a Negro.

Illustrations of this nature could be noted in countless numbers.

We have a history in the establishment of an FEPC. In 1941, by Executive order, the President of the United States established an FEPC. That organization was broadened and enlarged in scope and number of employees during the ensuing years. In 1944 it employed more Negroes than whites; had Negroes supervising white employees within the agency; paid the Negroes an aggregate salary larger than it paid the white employees; required employees of the agency to use the same rest-room facilities regardless of their race; ordered the railroads of the Nation to employ Negroes indiscriminately as engineers, firemen, and conductors, regardless of qualifications. The activities of that Commission resulted in strikes, riots, and other friction between whites and Negroes of this country.

MY ACTIVE OPPOSITION

That agency existed when I took the oath of office as Congressman in 1945. One of the first things I did as a new Congressman was to call together a group of other new Members to discuss ways and means to eliminate the FEPC. As a result, we set upon a course to do everything possible to prevent further enlargement of that bureau and to eliminate it as soon as possible. Those of us who opposed the continuation of the FEPC were continually devising ways and means to destroy it.

The chance to kill the FEPC came during my first term in Congress. H. R. 5890, a bill to make appropriations for certain agencies of the Government, was called up on the floor of the House for consideration. The bill provided for money to continue the FEPC to the end of the fiscal year. I made the point of order that struck that sum of money from the bill and forced the agency out of existence. It has not been revived since.

My record of opposition to the proposals in the civil-rights program is well known to all Members of this House and to all others who have been regular readers of the newspapers. I have helped arrange and attended many meetings in protest of specific proposals in the civil-rights program. On the numerous occasions when Members of the House, such as Messrs. Marcantonio, Isacson, and Powell, offered amendments to various bills seeking to write into those bills language in keeping with the civil-rights program. I have always been on the floor and active in my opposition to their amendments. I have been instrumental in notifying other Members what was taking place and getting them to vote against those amendments. As a result of our concerted activities, no such proposal has been enacted into law in the last 4 years.

I was one of the 78 Members of the House who formed an organization to oppose actively the President's civil-rights program after he delivered his message to the Congress on February 2 of this year. I feel that our opposition in the past has been effective in preventing enactment into law of any of the legislation sought to be adopted. I expect to continue my opposition to such a program as long as I am in Congress and afterward so long as I am able to oppose it.

Let me call your attention to the slogan of those who foment this civil-rights hysteria, "equality." One of the great purposes of the Constitution was to secure the blessings of liberty so that men could be free to be different and realize their differing ambitions with their differing abilities, not to achieve an impossible equality among unequal human beings. Every proposal seeking to give a man a right to do something which as a freeman he cannot secure for himself results in imposing burdens and restraints on the freedoms of others. We must watch and defeat every effort to create by law the right in one man to compel others to associate with him or accept obligations to him in the realm of private enterprise and private life. We must realize that freedom of association in work and in leisure is one of our most precious liberties.

Let us recall the words of the late Justice of the Supreme Court Mr. Brandeis, whom no one could rightfully accuse of intolerance or prejudice. He wrote:

> The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings, and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure, and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.

CONCLUSION

To sum it up, in the name of civil rights the proponents of this program would violate the very fundamentals of the Bill of Rights and force on the individual an association with persons and conditions of living not of his own choosing. In short, it would deprive the individual of his right to live under his own vine and fig tree in his own way. These things he would have to surrender to bureaucratic control and dictation from Washington, where some Government agent could tell him whom he should employ, what he could do, and with whom he must associate. Thus, in the name of civil rights they would destroy the very liberties upon which this Government was founded and under which it has grown to be the mightiest nation in the history of the world.

I reiterate with all of the emphasis at my command I have opposed the civil-rights program. I am now opposed to the program. I will continue my opposition to that program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKETT) there were ayes 197, noes 74.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HARRISON to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. STEED: On page 1, line 12, after the words "labor organization", insert *"Provided, however,* That it shall not constitute discrimination under this act for a religious organization to refuse to employ an atheist."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering at this time represents an effort to curb, in one small but significant area, the disruptive effects this FEPC legislation is certain to have if it becomes law.

I think the fact such an amendment as mine appears necessary furnishes startling proof of the far-reaching and iniquitous consequences implicit in this legislation. The proponents of the FEPC bill, Mr. Speaker, intend to jettison—finally and completely—the basic American principle of an employer's free choice of employees.

Under the deceptive banner of "civil rights," the forces of non-American, centralist philosophies of government propose to threaten the employers of the Nation with heavy fines and jail terms, if they do not hire and fire in conformity with the edicts of a new Washington bureaucracy.

We have before us two ideas of a Federal Fair Employment Practice Commission. One contemplates an agency that would have power to subpena an employer from any part of the Nation to any other place in the Nation to answer a complaint by a disgruntled job-seeker or former employee. It would be authorized to order an employer to hire certain persons, or to take back others he had discharged for what he considered incompetence but which the fired worker fancied to be a racial or religious bias.

It would give the competent worker nothing he now requires; it would hand the incompetent a club, give him special privileges, assure him a livelihood at the expense of the diligent and skillful.

The other type of FEPC purports to be all things to all men. It would be a Federal commission without the power to issue cease and desist orders and get them enforced in the Federal courts under threat of fine or imprisonment. This agency would investigate—snoop, in other words—cooperate—interfere, in other words—and make reports on what should be done about the discrimination which civil-rights agitators claim is rampant in the United States.

To those of us who still profess some respect for individual rights, this sort of FEPC is held out as something harmless, something innocuous. We are asked to "go along" with it on the argument that it cannot hurt us.

To FEPC advocates, it is held out as "a step in the right direction"—probably the longest step that can be forced at this moment.

These two FEPC proposals are of a piece. The voluntary concept is only very slightly less ominous and abhorrent than the compulsory one. I want no part of either.

I realize, however, the temper of many of my colleagues. They have been hypnotized by the civil-rights agitators.

In this atmosphere, there would be no purpose in arguing the injustice and insensibility of precluding an employer from inquiring into the birthplace of a prospective employee, of prohibiting him, even in these uncertain times, from asking to see the naturalization papers of a foreign-born applicant.

It probably is useless to suggest that an employer who wishes to give some preference to veterans of the wars of the United States should be allowed to ask an applicant whether he was in the armed forces—another question that is verboten under regulations promulgated where FEPC is in effect.

And I do not think those who are contending so strongly here for FEPC will be moved to concern for the employees who might like to feel that their employer had some control over the composition of the working force—the selection of those with whom they are to labor.

Inasmuch as we have heard much emotional argument uttered by the devotees of bureaucratic overseeing of hiring and firing, even the suggestion that a religious organization should be permitted to select employees of its own faith probably will fall unheard.

But I am offering now an amendment to which I believe even the most rabid exponent of the totalitarian FEPC principle could bring himself to support.

Even if the sponsors of FEPC contend a pastor should not be permitted to ask a prospective church organist whether he or she is of the same religious persuasion, they might concede that the pastor need not place himself in the shadow of a jail cell when he asks whether the applicant subscribes to any religion.

I urge, most earnestly, that our religious organizations be provided an iota of protection from the indignity of being forced to hire an atheist.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN to the amendment offered by Mr. MCCONNELL: Add a new section at the end of the bill as follows:

"*Provided*, That any person who is a member of an organization which has been cited by the Attorney General and/or by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as a Communist organization or as a Communist front organization is excluded from the provisions of this bill."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the number of ridiculous amendments that have been adopted I ask unanimous consent that the remainder be adopted en masse.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING to the amendment offered by Mr. MCCONNELL: On page 2, line 15, after the period insert a new sentence reading as follows: "Not more than three Commissioners shall be members of the same political party."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

The substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TAURIELLO) there were—ayes 236, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4453) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARDEN. Do I understand that the vote now is on the McConnell amendment?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. BARDEN. And later the vote will be on final passage of the bill?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr BIEMILLER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BIEMILLER I understand the parliamentary situation to be that if the McConnell amendment is rejected, that then the vote will recur on the original Powell bill.

The SPEAKER That is correct.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 178, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—222

Abbitt	Engle, Calif	McMillan, S. C.
Abernethy	Evins	Magee
Albert	Fallon	Mahon
Allen, Calif	Fellows	Martin, Iowa
Allen, Ill	Fenton	Martin, Mass.
Andersen, H Carl	Fernandez	Merrow
Anderson, Calif.	Fisher	Meyer
Andresen, August H.	Ford	Michener
Andrews	Frazier	Miles
Auchincloss	Fugate	Miller, Md.
Barden	Gary	Miller, Nebr.
Barrett, Wyo	Gathings	Mills
Bates	Gavin	Monroney
Battle	Golden	Morris
Beall	Goodwin	Morrison
Beckworth	Gore	Morton
Bennett, Fla	Gossett	Murdock
Bennett, Mich	Graham	Murray, Tenn.
Bentsen	Grant	Murray, Wis.
Blackney	Gregory	Nelson
Boggs, La	Gwinn	Nicholson
Bolton, Md	Hagen	Nixon
Bonner	Hale	Norrell
Boykin	Halleck	O'Hara, Minn.
Bramblett	Hardy	Pace
Brooks	Harris	Passman
Brown, Ga.	Harrison	Patten
Brown, Ohio	Harvey	Peterson
Bryson	Hays, Ark	Phillips, Calif.
Burleson	Hébert	Phillips, Tenn.
Burton	Herlong	Pickett
Byrnes, Wis	Hill	Poage
Camp	Hinshaw	Poulson
Carlyle	Hobbs	Preston
Case, S Dak	Hoeven	Priest
Chelf	Hoffman, Mich	Rains
Chiperfield	Hope	Rankin
Christopher	Horan	Redden
Church	Jackson, Calif.	Reed, Ill
Clevenger	James	Reed, N. Y.
Colo, Kans.	Jenison	Rees
Cole, N. Y.	Jenkins	Regan
Colmer	Jennings	Richards
Combs	Jensen	Rivers
Cooley	Johnson	Rogers, Fla.
Cooper	Jonas	St George
Cotton	Jones, Ala.	Sanborn
Cox	Jones, N. C	Sasscer
Crawford	Kearns	Scrivner
Curtis	Keefe	Scudder
Dague	Kerr	Shafer
Davis, Ga	Kilburn	Short
Davis, Tenn.	Kilday	Sikes
Davis, Wis.	Kruse	Simpson, Ill.
Deane	Lanham	Simpson, Pa.
DeGraffenried	Larcade	Sims
D'Ewart	LeCompte	Smith, Kans.
Dolliver	LeFevre	Smith, Va.
Dondero	Lichtenwalter	Stanley
Doughton	Lovre	Steed
Durham	Lucas	Stefan
Elliott	Lyle	Stigler
Ellsworth	McConnell	Stockman
Elston	McCulloch	Sutton
	McDonough	Taber
		Tackett

Talle	Vursell	Williams
Teague	Welchel	Willis
Thompson	Werdel	Wilson, Ind.
Thornberry	Wheeler	Wilson, Okla.
Towe	White, Calif.	Wilson, Tex.
Trimble	Whitten	Winstead
Underwood	Whittington	Wood
Velde	Wickersham	Worley
Vinson	Widnall	

NAYS—178

Addonizio	Hall,	Moulder
Angell	Edwin Arthur	Multer
Aspinall	Hall,	Murphy
Bailey	Leonard W.	Noland
Baring	Hand	Norton
Barrett, Pa.	Hart	O'Brien, Ill
Biemiller	Havenner	O'Brien, Mich.
Bishop	Hays, Ohio	O'Hara, Ill.
Blatnik	Heffernan	O'Konski
Boggs, Del.	Heller	O'Neill
Bolling	Herter	O'Sullivan
Bolton, Ohio	Heselton	O'Toole
Bosone	Hoffman, Ill.	Patterson
Breen	Holifield	Perkins
Buchanan	Holmes	Pfeifer,
Buckley, Ill.	Howell	Joseph L.
Buckley, N. Y.	Huber	Pfeiffer,
Burdick	Hull	William L.
Burke	Irving	Philbin
Burnside	Jackson, Wash.	Polk
Byrne, N. Y.	Jacobs	Potter
Canfield	Javits	Powell
Cannon	Judd	Price
Carnahan	Karst	Quinn
Carroll	Karsten	Rabaut
Case, N. J.	Kean	Ramsay
Cavalcante	Kearney	Rhodes
Celler	Keating	Ribicoff
Chesney	Kee	Richlman
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa	Rodino
Clemente	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Mass.
Corbett	Kennedy	Rooney
Coudert	Keogh	Roosevelt
Crook	King	Sabath
Crosser	Kirwan	Sadlak
Cunningham	Klein	Saylor
Davenport	Kunkel	Scott, Hardie
Dawson	Lane	Scott,
Delaney	Latham	Hugh D., Jr.
Denton	Lemke	Secrest
Dingell	Lesinski	Shelley
Dollinger	Lind	Sheppard
Donohue	Linehan	Staggers
Douglas	Lodge	Sullivan
Doyle	Lynch	Taurlello
Eberharter	McCarthy	Taylor
Engel, Mich.	McCormack	Tollefson
Feighan	McGrath	Vorys
Flood	McGregor	Wagner
Fogarty	McGuire	Walsh
Forand	McKinnon	Walter
Fulton	McSweeney	Welch
Furcolo	Mack, Ill.	White, Idaho
Gamble	Mack, Wash.	Wier
Garmatz	Madden	Wigglesworth
Gordon	Mansfield	Withrow
Gorski	Marcantonio	Wolverton
Granahan	Marsalis	Woodhouse
Granger	Miller, Calif.	Yates
Green	Mitchell	Young
Gross	Morgan	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—31

Allen, La	Jones, Mo	Smith, Ohio
Arends	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Wis
Brehm	Macy	Spence
Bulwinkle	Marshall	Thomas
Chatham	Mason	Van Zandt
Davies, N. Y	Norblad	Wadsworth
Eaton	Patman	Whitaker
Gillette	Plumley	Wolcott
Gilmer	Rich	Woodruff
Harden	Sadowski	
Hedrick	Smathers	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wadsworth for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Jones of Missouri for, with Mr. Davies of New York against.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Brehm against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Marshall with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Smathers with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Spence with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Chatham with Mrs. Harden.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DAVIES of New York (at the request of Mr. CELLER), for an indefinite period on account of illness in family.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is a motion to recommit in order at this time?

The SPEAKER. Not until after the third reading of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, that means the House will have to stay in session until the engrossed copy is secured?

The SPEAKER. It does not.

Mr. RANKIN. We cannot take a recess on Calendar Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. The House can adjourn.

Mr. RANKIN. We can adjourn but that ends Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered and the next time the House meets, whether this week or any other week, it is the pending business.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. Can the Speaker advise us when the engrossed copy will be available and when the vote will be taken?

The SPEAKER. Not until the gentleman from Massachusetts makes a request about adjournment or offers a motion.

The Chair wants all Members to understand that on the convening of the House at its next session, the final disposition of this matter is the pending business.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman cannot do that. As I understand it, we must come in at noon today for the Thursday session unless unanimous consent is secured to go over until Friday. Is that the proper parliamentary situation?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman makes that point.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman ought to proceed in the regular way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman is absolutely correct. I was trying to have an adjournment to a definite time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next at 12 o'clock.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until 12 o'clock today.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 19 minutes a. m.), the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon of Thursday, February 23, 1950.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6480. A bill to revise title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure"; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1676). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 7273. A bill to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1677). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM. Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5074. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1685). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6655. A bill for the relief of Tacko Suzuki; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1678). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7054. A bill for the relief of Mieko Miyazaki Malloy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1679). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7047. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tomo Nonque Rosevear III; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1680). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7013. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yae Bennett; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1681). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6942. A bill for the relief of Hisako Nakane; without amendment (Rept. No. 1682). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6793. A bill for the relief of Fujiko Fukuda; without amendment (Rept. No. 1683). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7094. A bill for the relief of Kazuyo Dohi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1684). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H R 7396. A bill to enable the States to make more adequate provision for special services required for the education of physically handicapped children of school age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7397. A bill to provide for the promotion of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service in recognition of longevity of service, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H R 7398. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R 7399. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 104, subsections (a) and (b), to create a Greenville division in the northern district of Mississippi, with terms of court to be held at Greenville, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD:

H R 7400. A bill to enable the States to make more adequate provision for special services required for the education of physically handicapped children of school age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H R 7401. A bill to allow to a retail dealer in gasoline a refund of the Federal tax paid on gasoline which is lost by the retailer through evaporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R 7402. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs DOUGLAS:

H R 7403. A bill to amend the Social Security Act in order to prohibit the requirement of support from relatives as a condition of granting old-age assistance or aid to the needy blind, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H R. 7404. A bill to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, so as to make permanently effective the provisions of title I of such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H R 7405 A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site for, and the construction of, a Federal building in Scranton, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R 7406. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in west Texas, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 7407. A bill to provide for issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the opening of the Erie Canal in New York State; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

By Mr. DURHAM:

H Res. 485. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 7058, a bill to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Rules.

H Res 486. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5074, a bill to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H Res 487. Resolution to take off all taxes on bread and butter; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R 7408 A bill for the relief of Christos Haralmos Marasaglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H R 7409 A bill for the relief of María Rozas Espiñeira de Colchero Arrubarrena, Fernando Colchero Rozas, and Fernado Colchero Rozas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H R. 7410. A bill for the relief of Mrs Kiyoko Tanaka Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R 7411. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Ruth Sattler McLaughlin, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H R. 7412 A bill for the relief of Roberto Nicolas Nassor, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr MCSWEENEY:

H. R 7413 A bill for the relief of James T. M Fong, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr RODINO:

H R 7414. A bill for the relief of Teresa Gentile and Galliano Gentile, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr SIKES.

H R. 7415. A bill for the relief of Clifford D. Smitherman, to the Committee o the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7416. A bill for the relief of Miss Suzuko Takanashi, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1895. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to securing additional financial aid for the Waltham Watch Co from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1896 Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to remove existing taxes on admissions to high-school athletic contests or athletic contests conducted by charitable and nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1897. By Mr. MACK of Washington: Resolution of the South Bend, Wash., Chamber of Commerce, asking immediate action by Congress to stabilize our national economy; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1898 By the SPEAKER: Petition of Lewis E. Park, chairman, Industrial Arts Club, Kansas City, Mo., endorsing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1899. Also, petition of Philipp N. Poulleys, president, Pan-Messenian Federation of America, Boston, Mass., relative to the treatment being given Greek children from the Province of Messenia, Greece, by the Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1900 Also, petition of Dr. Louis Kreshtool, secretary, Delaware State Dental Society, Wilmington, Del., requesting that compulsory health insurance be not imposed upon the citizens of this Nation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1901 Also, petition of Mercedes Mennecke, president, American Legion Auxiliary, Summit, Ill., opposing the Hoover reports pertaining to proposed changes in the Veterans' Administration and in the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1902 By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Resolution of Queen Annes County Petroleum Industries Committee, Centreville, Md., requesting repeal of the Federal gasoline tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D. offered the following prayer:

God our Father, we thank Thee for the unquenchable impulse toward Thee which Thou hast planted within us. Open our eyes to see Thee and our hearts to feel Thee, not just out on the rim of the universe, in some distant star, but in human love which hallows our own lives, which at its best bears witness to Thee and alone can heal the hurt of the world. Conscious of Thy overshadowing presence, we pray for fidelity as we face the issues of these momentous days. Committing our souls unto Thee, who knowest the way we take, bring us forth as gold tried in the fire. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 22, 1950, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Benton	Hickenlooper	Malone
Brewster	Hill	Martin
Bricker	Hoey	Maybank
Butler	Holland	Millikin
Byrd	Humphrey	Morse
Cain	Hunt	Mundt
Capehart	Ives	Murray
Chapman	Jenner	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Darby	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Knowland	Sparkman
Ecton	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Leahy	Taylor
Ferguson	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Long	Thye
Fulbright	Lucas	Tobey
George	McCarran	Tydings
Gillette	McCarthy	Watkins
Graham	McClellan	Wherry
Green	McFarland	Wiley
Gurney	McKellar	Williams
Hayden	McMahon	Withers

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD and for printing in the Appendix, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLEAR RADIO CHANNEL—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, in Chicago, Ill., on January 12, 1950, relating to clear channels for rural radio service.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEAR CHANNEL RESOLUTION, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES, ADOPTED JANUARY 12, 1950, CHICAGO

RURAL RADIO SERVICE

Knowing that radio service is vital to our rural population, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives hereby expresses its opposition to any legislation which would impair or prevent the improvement of rural radio service, which at best is quite inadequate.

Many of the rural people depend to a large extent upon clear-channel stations for their radio service and such service should be protected and improved. This is even more true now because we realize that television, now available to large metropolitan areas, will not be available to many rural areas for an indefinite period.

Therefore, the council requests that no action be taken by the Congress or the Federal Communications Commission which would allow the breaking down of clear channels serving rural areas. On the contrary the council urgently recommends that such clear-channel stations be granted sufficient facilities to serve farm communities and rural areas not presently enjoying the superior radio service available to all metropolitan areas.

In recent months the United States has been a party to an international radio frequency allocation conference with other North American nations. During that conference the council vigorously protested the demands of the Cuban Government for broadcasting rights on channels which are so essential to the people of the United States. The council again requests that the United States Department of State maintain a firm stand against the attempted inroads of foreign nations on radio channels utilized by stations in the United States.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID TO LOCAL SCHOOLS—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the extent to which public opposition has developed on the principle of Federal financial aid in support of local schools is forcefully pointed up by a resolution adopted February 8 by the Nebraska State School Boards Association, in convention at Grand Island, Nebr.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and that it be appropriately referred for the consideration of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEBRASKA STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION ADOPTED IN CONVENTION FEBRUARY 8, 1950, AT GRAND ISLAND, NEBR.

FEDERAL AID

Whereas it is recognized by the convention delegates here gathered that taxes are mushrooming under all kinds of subterfuges, and that the greatest percentage of total taxes are exacted by the Federal Government; and that the present trend will lead to an impossible burden on farmers, laborers, businessmen and all other citizens; and

Whereas it is further recognized that however vital the need may be, in individual cases, further Federal aid for any purpose to any special interest will be only an entering wedge, and that more and more grants will be demanded and allowed. It is recognized that there is already alarming dissipation of funds between Federal-tax collections and net productive expenditures for specific projects, with the result that Federal aid to schools will require far more tax collections than will finally arrive at the local classroom; and

Whereas we recognize that further tapping of the Federal Treasury for any form of Federal aid to education must necessarily be financed from some form of additional taxes on all American citizens, including those of Nebraska; and

Whereas it is felt that the Nebraska State Legislature had not made full and exhaustive use of our own resources to meet the educational crisis within our own boundaries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska State School Boards Association take a strong stand opposing all new forms of additional Federal aid to education, except in areas disturbed by military installations, and that all human forces of our State be mobilized in a concentrated effort to focus the attention and action of our State legislature on the financial needs of Nebraska schools, in an effort to keep the Federal Government from forcing its way into the schoolrooms of Nebraska to solve our problems for us; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to every Member of the United States Congress and the Nebraska State Legislature; and be it finally

Resolved, That this association make every possible effort to recruit the coordinated assistance of all educational, community, farm, labor and business associations and social clubs of Nebraska to obtain adequate State financing for our own Nebraska educational program.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1151. A bill to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1279).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 4502. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain easement near Fort Belvoir, Va., in exchange for another easement elsewhere on the same property; without amendment (Rept. No. 1280); and

H R. 5503. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to release and quitclaim a portion of a right-of-way easement to Langley Air Force Base, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1281).

By Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H R 5921. A bill to terminate lump-sum benefits provided by law to certain Reserve officers of the Navy and Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 1282).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 23, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 204. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche;

S. 229. An act for the relief of E. W Eaton Coal Co.;

S. 309. An act for the relief of Gabe Budwee;

S. 321. An act for the relief of Lloyd D. Lyles;

S. 481. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Clarence Herbert Hartman, a minor;

S. 563. An act for the relief of the P S. Cook Co.;

S. 914. An act for the relief of Gladys Inez Greenwood;

S. 1449. An act for the relief of Robert B. Workman;

S. 1916. An act for the relief of Edna A. Bauser;

S. 1933. An act for the relief of C. L. Leffingwell and others;

S. 1990. An act to amend section 429, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the act of August 5, 1882, as amended, so as to substitute for the requirement that detailed an-

nual reports be made to the Congress concerning the proceeds of all sales of condemned naval material a requirement that information as to such proceeds be filed with the Committee on Armed Services in the Congress; and

S 2520. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted devised land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Oscar M. Jonas, of Milwaukee, Wis., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Wisconsin;

Craig Pottinger, of Nogales, Ariz., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Nogales, Ariz;

Louis T. Rocheleau, of Woonsocket, R. I., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R. I; and

Ellis Campbell, Jr., of Dallas, Tex, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas, vice John B. Dunlap, resigned.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S 3104 A bill to protect the National Security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr ROBERTSON introduced Senate bill 3105, to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading)

By Mr DWORSHAK·

S 3106 A bill to authorize appropriations for the eradication and control of halogeton on public lands; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Virginia will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 3105) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF BILL BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

In 1947 the Board of Governors brought to the attention of the Congress the need for more adequate building facilities at branches of the Federal Reserve banks, pointing out that this need could not be met because of a provision in the law placing a limit of $250,000 upon the cost of any such building (exclusive of the cost of vaults, permanent equipment, furnishings, and fixtures). At that time, in order to take care of the most urgent needs for additional construction, Congress provided that this limit should not apply as long as the aggregate of such costs thereafter incurred for all branch bank buildings, with the approval of the Board of Governors, was not in excess of $10,000,000.

Under that authority, with the approval of the Board, a building has been purchased in Cincinnati, Ohio; construction has been undertaken at Portland, Oreg., Seattle, Wash., and Detroit, Mich.; and funds have been earmarked for construction at Jacksonville, Fla. However, major additions are badly needed at Los Angeles, Calif, Pittsburgh, Pa., and Omaha, Nebr., to provide satisfactory working conditions, and, on the basis of present estimates, it would not be possible to complete these programs within the existing limitation

Most of the buildings occupied by branches of the Federal Reserve banks were acquired or constructed more than 20 years ago, and, in view of expanded activities since that time, additional space is needed at a number of other branches. For that reason, additional construction is contemplated at Buffalo, N Y., Louisville, Ky., San Antonio, Tex, Baltimore, Md, Charlotte, N C, Birmingham, Ala, Nashville, Tenn, Denver, Colo, Oklahoma City, Okla, El Paso, Tex, Houston, Tex, and Salt Lake City, Utah. It is clear that this additional construction cannot be undertaken within the limitation in the existing law, and for that reason the amendment which I am proposing will increase the limitation to $25,000,000

It should be borne in mind that all expenses in connection with the construction and enlargement of Federal Reserve branch bank buildings are met by the Federal Reserve banks out of their own funds. No appropriation of Government funds is involved. Moreover, the Board of Governors, as an agency of the Government, is vested with the general supervision of the Federal Reserve banks, and in the exercise of its supervision all construction projects with respect to branch bank buildings come before the Board of Governors for its approval. In each case the Board considers the proposal in the light of the needs of the branch, the type of building to be constructed, the reasonableness of the cost, the availability of materials, whether the construction at the time is generally in keeping with the prevailing economic situation, and other pertinent considerations.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MALONE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCARRAN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment of the committee to House Joint Resolution 398, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WHERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment of the committee to House Joint Resolution 398, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

LINCOLN REPUBLICANISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR IVES

[Mr IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Lincoln Day address entitled "Lincoln Republicanism," delivered by him at a meeting held under the auspices of the Republicans of Schenectady County, at Schenectady, N. Y., on February 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA, WORLD LEADER AGAINST IMPERIALISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GILLETTE

[Mr. HUNT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject America, World Leader Against Imperialism, delivered by Senator GILLETTE, at the Arlington Jewish Center, February 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MANKIND AT THE CROSSROADS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

[Mr. GRAHAM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator KEFAUVER at the young Democrats' rally in Greensboro, N. C., February 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

WHAT THE REPUBLICAN POLICY STATEMENT REALLY SAYS ABOUT A BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

[Mr MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "GOP Policy on Bipartisanship," published in the Daily Plainsman of Huron, S. Dak., together with a statement by himself, which appear in the Appendix]

WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED?—ADDRESS BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject What Have You Learned? delivered by David Lawrence, at the commencement exercises of Temple University, February 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NYLONS AND LIPSTICKS RUIN MARSHALL PLAN—ARTICLE FROM KANSAS CITY STAR

[Mr KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Nylons and Lipsticks Ruin Marshall Plan," published in the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of February 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

THE DANGER TO AMERICA—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "With the World on Fire," published in the Arizona Republic, the Indianapolis News, and the Muncie (Ind.) Press, which appears in the Appendix]

SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE OF POLICE OFFICERS

[Mr HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a communication and statement of Howard J. Devaney, president of the New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, Inc., relative to the opposition of the association to H. R. 6000, which appears in the Appendix]

RESCUE OF GREEK CHILDREN—PLEA BY ARCHBISHOP MICHAEL

[Mr. GRAHAM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a plea by Archbishop Michael that Greek children be rescued, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW MUCH OF THE WORLD?—ARTICLE BY LIVINGSTON HARTLEY

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How Much of the World?" written by Livingston Hartley and published in Freedom and Union for January 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME—AMERICAN DAY CONTEST ADDRESS BY ANNE PINKNEY

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a prize-winning address by Anne Pinkney, of Trinidad, Colo., in the 1950 I Am An American Day contest, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COAL SITUATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Miners' Rebellion," from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of February 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRAYER FOR PEACE—POEM BY JAMES PATRICK McGOVERN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Prayer for Peace," composed by James Patrick McGovern, which appears in the Appendix.]

THESE DAYS—ARTICLE BY GEORGE SOKOLSKY

[Mr. CHAPMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "These Days," by George Sokolsky, published in the Washington Times-Herald of February 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS — EDITORIALS, NEWSPAPER COMMENT, AND LETTERS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD editorials, newspaper articles, and letters from responsible persons in the United States bearing on the subject of displaced persons.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of February 20, 1950]

DP'S ARE APT TO LEAVE SUDDENLY, FARMERS IN NEARBY STATES FIND

(By William A. Millen)

An up-to-date version of How You Gonna Keep Em Down on the Farm? is plaguing Maryland and Virginia farmers who have employed displaced persons.

A tendency of the recently arrived Europeans to move out without warning was cited by area farmers as probably their greatest fault.

L. M. Walker, Jr., Virginia commissioner of agriculture and State DP committee chairman, put it this way:

"The biggest all-around objection is that the DP's leave suddenly, and the farmers are left high and dry. The farmer provides a house and some furniture. But he still is worried whether the DP will be there next week or will move to the big cities—Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore, or Washington."

He blamed the screening of DP applicants in Europe—an apparent failure to select farm people for farm work.

Virginia has about 120 DP families now. About 40 percent of these originally employed on farms have switched to other occupations. More than half the Virginia DP's are Ukrainians, with Lithuanians and Poles making up most of the others.

Dr. T. B. Symons, dean of the School of Agriculture at the University of Maryland, figures Maryland has between 400 and 500 DP's.

In addition to a need for screening, Dr. Symons believes the DP program would be improved by a follow-up check on performances, a requirement that DP farmers remain on farms for a reasonable time, and that they be registered for a reasonable period.

Anne Arundel County's members resigned recently from the Governor's Committees for the Resettlement of Displaced Persons. They charged the DP program has been haphazard.

Anne Arundel County Agent Stanley E. Day said that often farmers turn out to be tailors, beekeepers or florists.

To illustrate, he told how one DP family, given a chicken by a farmer, had to ask him to kill it for them.

Other difficulties arise from the difference in languages. Some farmers, believing they were more than generous in wages and living quarters, were amazed to find DP's walking out on them at a minute's notice, Mr. Day said.

At Joyce Lane, Md., Dr. Charles E. Iliff, a Baltimore eye specialist, invited a young Ukrainian family to work on his farm last May. The DP's were given a third-floor apartment in the large farmhouse, with their own bath, radio, and a large fan to keep cool in the summer.

The Ukrainian woman did not know how to cook, so Mrs. Iliff patiently coached her. The immigrant often talked about how nice things were back home and said that someday, when the Russians left, they would move back. Almost without warning last month, the Ukrainians left the Iliff farm.

On the Arnold, Md., Angus cattle farm of Charles B. Lynch, there's an empty house. It was prepared for another Ukrainian family last April. Last month the tenants shoved off for parts unknown.

In Montgomery County, where some of the first DP's landed, there has not been a request for a DP farm family in 10 months.

S. Gilbert Brown, manager of the Silver Spring office of the Maryland Employment Security Department, said, "they went sour on us and the word spread like wildfire."

Now, instead of the 14 DP families in the county, there are four such groups, all Lithuanians, he said.

Montgomery County Agent O. W. Anderson said the DP's "showed they were interested only in getting into this country and then going their own way."

Dissatisfaction also was expressed by Agent P. E. Clark of Prince Georges County, where 30 foreign families still reside on farms.

"They should be called in many cases misplaced persons instead of DP's," he said, "They are chosen like picking a pig out of a bag. They land in Baltimore and the farmer is told to meet them there. The DP's have pictured to them that this is a land of milk and honey, and somebody will take care of them."

But not all the criticism of DP farm families is derogatory. Many hard-working groups have proved satisfactory, as tomorrow's concluding article will describe.

PHILADELPHIA, *February 7, 1950.*

Senator McCARRAN:

Please note editorial herewith from the Philadelphia, Pa., Bulletin of February 4, 1950. Then eye front-page story of today (Feb. 7) Philadelphia, Pa., Inquirer on subject DP's. In the light of almost 4,500,000 unemployed in the United States of America, why admit DP's.

Also, I think our over-all population in the United States of America is 150,000,000 and there is no need of any folk from Europe or Asia.

With this four million and a half unemployed, many of whom are GI's, let's try to help them. I'm looking at it from a purely American angle. Do not listen to pressure groups—let's help our own American born. We owe it to them as do our Congressmen and Senators. I hope you agree.

Yours truly,

J. P. DEVIR.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of February 4, 1950]

A NEW BLOW AT DP'S

When Senator PAT McCARRAN assented to release of the DP bill from the Judiciary Committee, where it had so long been kept in pickle, it was assumed that he was ready to see the measure passed in the form that the committee had given it. But he has now shown his invincible opposition to relief for these unfortunate people by proposing a strangling amendment.

He would prohibit further admissions under the act if the country's unemployment total should exceed 4,000,000, or if the number of married couples doubled up with others in dwelling units should be above 2,000,000. Unemployment in December was estimated at 3,500,000. The number of doubled-up persons was reported to be 2,040,000 in April last.

Now that the bill is before the Senate the mischief which the Nevada Senator can do would be limited to the number he can muster in support of the amendment. A bill for removal of discriminating features of the present act has passed the House, and is expected to be approved in some form by the upper branch of Congress.

Relief of the displaced persons is backed by the administration, and has been supported by national leaders of both parties. It is now the responsibility of the Senate to see that a measure is passed that fulfills all reasonable requirements. The measure approved by the Judiciary Committee still retains restrictions that limit the effectiveness of the relief sought. The Senate committee bill is some improvement on the present law, but it would be better to bring it more into line with the House measure.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 7, 1950]

FOUR MILLION FOUR HUNDRED AND EIGHTY THOUSAND IDLE IN UNITED STATES; HIGHEST TOTAL SINCE WAR

WASHINGTON, February 6.—The Census Bureau reported today that unemployment rose to a postwar high of 4,480,000 in mid-January. Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer said it was due largely to seasonal lay-offs.

The estimated number of jobless on January 14 was 991,000 greater than on December 10, and 1,816,000 greater than January 1949.

Sawyer stressed the fact that industrial employment did not appear to be materially affected.

INCREASE EXPECTED

He said an increase in joblessness was expected between December and January because of curtailment in seasonal industries, and bad weather in many parts of the country which caused lay-offs of construction and farm workers.

Total employment was estimated at 56,947,000 persons, down 1,609,000 from December. (The drop in employment was greater than the rise in unemployment because some part-time workers left the labor market.)

Employment last year at this time was 57,414,000 persons.

INDUSTRIAL LAY-OFFS

Sawyer pointed out that unemployment figures rose similarly between December 1948 and January 1949. That rise was more serious than the present one, he indicated, because industrial lay-offs were an important factor.

Unemployment, fed by continuing industrial lay-offs, rose steadily throughout the winter and spring of 1949 to reach a peak of just over 4,000,000 in last summer's recession.

PREDICTED PROSPERITY

The jobless total dropped last fall to about 2,700,000 and most economists began the new year with optimistic statements that

the country had snapped back from the recession and was due for a relatively prosperous 1950.

The Census Bureau broke down its total employment figures into 50,749,000 in nonagricultural work and 6,198,000 agricultural jobs. The comparable figures for December 10 were 51,783,000 and 6,773,000.

SWANTON, VT., *January 25, 1950.*

Senator PATRICK MCCARRAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Recently received your "Displaced Persons: Facts Versus Fiction" and am very glad to know that there are some people in Washington, D. C., that are not afraid to call a spade a spade.

I am a member of the Memorial Methodist Church of Swanton, Vermont, holding the position of Charge Lay Leader, a member of Memphremagog Lodge, No. 65, F. & A. M., Newport, Vermont, a member of the Franklin County Farm Bureau, Franklin County Vermont, a member of the Vermont Society of Mayflower Descendants, member of the Vermont Society, Sons of the American Revolution, member of the Swanton Board of Trade.

With the unemployment situation as bad as it is I believe that it is the height of folly to admit so many displaced persons

I am very well acquainted with the unemployment situation—Robert W Shaw was graduated from the Swanton High School last June. The only work that he could find was working for the State of Vermont painting bridges and cutting grass for 75 cents per hour. Wonder what Robert thinks of the American Way of Life. However, Robert is taking a course of study with the Franklin Institute of Rochester, New York, and hopes eventually to land a job working for the Government.

Very sincerely,

ALDEN K SHAW.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Kansas City, Mo., January 11, 1950.

Mrs. C. WALTERS,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MRS. WALTERS: This will acknowledge your letter of January 7, 1950, to the commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars, regarding the displaced persons' situation.

This organization has consistently fought against displaced persons being brought into the country and have testified in Congress on the present bill which would allow 200,000 more of Europe's displaced persons to enter the United States over and above the regular immigration quota.

Very truly yours,

JAMES K. FRY, *Assistant,*
(For George L. MacElroy, Chief,
Division of Employment.)

NEW YORK CITY COLONY,
NATIONAL SOCIETY NEW ENGLAND WOMEN,
Douglas Manor, N. Y., January 21, 1950.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you so much for your statement before the Senate on January 6, 1950, on displaced persons, copy of which I received yesterday.

For a long time I have been in favor of a reduction in immigration quotas and a cessation of all immigration for at least 5 years, increased patrol of our Mexican border and the Gulf of Mexico shore line through which countless immigrants enter the United States.

I could make good use of 25 extra copies of your statement and hope I am not asking too many. Will you be good enough to have your secretary send them to me?

With appreciation of your effort to control the displaced persons matter, including immigration to the United States, which really means "conquest by immigration," I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPHINE W. OTTMAN,
Chairman, National Defense,
New York City Colony, NSNEW.

P. S.—Please keep up your good work. H. R. 4567 should be defeated.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 17, 1950.*

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Congratulations on your splendid opposition to the DP advocates who would deliberately or thoughtlessly intensify our domestic unemployment situation.

Personally I feel that our obligation to the 60,000,000 American children, rapidly growing up and entering the job market, is in itself an overwhelming argument not only to stop the DP movement but to halt all immigration indefinitely if not permanently.

You will note from the enclosed clipping that my views on this subject recently appeared in the Chicago Tribune.

May your good work continue.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. ROGERS.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 18, 1950]

DP'S AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES

CHICAGO, December 27.—Every few days we read that two or three thousand more DP's are arriving in this country. At the same time our unemployment problem is becoming more acute. Government and AFL figures show there are now more than 5,000,000 Americans seeking employment. Any suggestion that still more DP's or other immigrants be admitted is preposterous, if not an actual crime against American labor. It's time to wake up and stamp out this DP racket and also crack down on the thousands of aliens being smuggled into our country.

The unemployment situation alone justifies the complete stoppage of all immigration, but there is another reason vastly more important. I refer to our obligation to the 60,000,000 American children (50,000,000 under 16), most of whom will be in the job market during the next two decades. That's twice the number of adults who will die or retire during the same period and never before have we faced such an awesome challenge. The least we can do is preserve every job opportunity for our own progeny.

The Truman administration claims to be a friend of American labor and the American family. Now is their chance to prove it.

R. W. ROGERS.

LAFAYETTE COUNCIL, NO. 59,
ORDER OF INDEPENDENT AMERICANS,
Hazleton, Pa., February 1, 1950.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Senator from Nevada,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Have received one of your phamphlets of your talk on immigration and displaced persons and those who have unlawfully come into our country, which was a good article and very interesting.

We being considered a small country along side of some of the European countries, and with all of these people coming into our country unlawfully and otherwise, and when here we will have to care for them along with all the unemployed that we have to care for, it will be coming to a point where it will be creating chaos for us.

I have written to both Senator MARTIN and Senator MYERS, from Pennsylvania, asking them to use their support and influence against this bill H. R. 4567, and also asking them to use their influence toward appropriating enough money to deport all these aliens to the countries of their origin.

A copy of what was sent to the other Senators:

At a regular stated meeting of Lafayette Council, No. 59, Order of Independent Americans, held January 31, 1950, the following resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, We advocate that the Displaced Persons Act be strictly enforced. And that bill 4567 be defeated in its entirety: Be it further

"Resolved, That Congress appropriate sufficient money to deport the 3,000,000 or more people who have come into our country unlawfully back into the country of their own origin."

I trust that you can muster enough votes to hold the lines and defeat these people who are for everlastingly trying to force this issue for personal gains more than anything else.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE C. SCHATZ.

FREDERICK, MD., *February 3, 1950.*

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Please accept my thanks for your kindness and courtesy in sending me a copy of your remarks on displaced persons, which, I am happy to say, I heartily approve and concur in. As a matter of fact, I would go even a step further and stop all immigration for the next 50 years. If we ever have another recession in this country (which I hope and pray we will not, but I fear that we will) it will simply mean that we will just have so many more people to take care of. Sooner or later we are going to realize we just can't take care of the entire world, and we must stop somewhere along the line.

I am sending you a clipping from the local paper that I feel sure you will appreciate. What is our country coming to? I am just an old retired soldier, one who loves his country dearly, but it makes me wonder sometimes as to just where are we headed for?

It was especially pleasing to me to see on your folder (not printed at Government expense). Would that more and more of our leaders would do likewise. Again my thanks for your courtesy.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. HOLT,
Colonel, United States Army, Retired.

[From the Frederick (Md.) News of February 1, 1950]

A SOCIALISTIC U. S. A.?

Would you like to live in a Socialist America? Most Americans wouldn't. But there's a real danger that we will—whether we want it or not.

One of the main roads to socialism is government ownership and control of important businesses. The electric light and power business is one—and this map shows how far the Government is in it already.

Every white dot—209 of them—on the map marks an electric power plant now operated or financed by our Federal Government. Every black dot shows where another Government power plant is being built, expanded, or proposed. In all, over 700 places in 44 States. And a long step toward a socialistic U. S. A.

Most of the people who speak for more Government control over American life don't want a socialistic nation. They have other reasons for Government control.

But when Government, moving step by step, controls enough things, we'll have a

Socialist government, whether we want it or not. And, instead of our freedom, we'll have Government control, not only over business but over churches, schools, homes—our whole lives.

THE POTOMAC EDISON CO.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 14, 1950]

DP RACKET BARED TO ENTER UNITED STATES ON FALSIFIED RECORDS

(By Josephine Ripley)

Many displaced persons have been attempting to enter the United States illegally under fraudulent documents, and some have succeeded, Congress has been told.

This is reported to be part of a fairly widespread racket among the DP's who have been bribing German police officers to falsify residence documents in order to establish eligibility for United States emigration.

About 500 fraudulent registrations have been uncovered in the Munich area alone, Donald W. Main, senior officer for the Displaced Persons Commission in Munich, informed a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.

Of these, probably 100 slipped into the United States before this illegal activity was disclosed, Mr. Main estimated.

ELIGIBILITY DATE FRAUD

Purpose of this fraud, it was explained, was to establish record of a German residence prior to December 22, 1945. This is the date after which displaced persons seeking sanctuary are ineligible for emigration to the United States. It is a cut-off date which has barred many who are eligible in every other way

Under the new displaced-persons bill just reported out by the Senate Judiciary Committee, the eligibility date is moved up to January 1, 1949.

The only bribe of which Mr. Main knew personally was one involving a suit of clothes which was promised to a German police officer in exchange for the false residence paper

The Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army and the Displaced Persons Commission became suspicious of this racket with the sudden influx of some 300 applications giving Schneitse, Germany, as the place of residence Prosecutions by the military government in these cases are now in process, Mr. Main informed the committee.

Fraudulent registrations also have been reported by CIC in nine other towns, he stated.

Mr. Main indicated that the CIC had only scratched the surface of this practice. He said he had been told by the CIC in the Munich area that if it had the authority to check police registrations in every locality within its jurisdiction, which covers about half of Bavaria, it felt fraudulent records would be uncovered in 80 percent of these towns.

There was no evidence given before the subcommittee to indicate that these fraudulent records involved the efforts of Communists or other subversives to gain entry to the United States When questioned as to how many Communists may have come in as displaced persons, Mr. Main said he had no knowledge or opinion He did assert, however, that it would be possible for spies or Communists to enter under the displaced-persons law or as regular immigrants.

It is impossible, he said, to frame a law which will positively screen them out.

Mr. Main spoke somewhat critically of the policies of the Displaced Persons Commission, with which he frequently disagreed.

He reported that on cases which he recommended be turned down, he frequently was reversed by higher-ups in the Frankfurt headquarters. Mr. Main estimated that in about 10 percent of the cases which he had handled, his recommendation for nonadmission had been reversed by higher authorities.

He reported, however, that in 9 percent of these split-decision cases he had been upheld by the United States consulate, the office issuing the final visa under the regular immigration laws.

It was apparent from Mr. Main's testimony that the dispute arose over an interpretation of the law. The Commission took upon itself authority to pass on the eligibility of the applicant only with relation to the requirements of the displaced-persons law, and not with relation to immigration regulations which it left to immigration authorities. Mr. Main, an immigration officer on loan to the Displaced Persons Commission, construed it as his duty to consider the record of the applicant from both aspects.

OFFENDERS TURNED DOWN

Most of those which he had questioned, he said, had records which he felt would make them inadmissible on the grounds of moral turpitude. He spoke of two cases of minor thefts, one involving six shoestrings, and another a can of spam. In both cases the offender had been convicted and so had a record. In both cases the displaced persons were turned down by the consulate.

Mr. Main testified that he was never overruled by the Displaced Persons Commission authorities on cases involving previous involvement of the applicant with Fascist or Communist organizations, although the Displaced Persons Commissoin had ruled that membership in the VVN—an organization of persecuted displaced persons—did not necessarily bar the applicant from emigration to the United States even though the organization of persecuted displaced persons was 40 percent Communist.

The purpose of the Senate subcommittee in investigating this situation is to find out whether subversives are entering the United States as displaced persons, and in what way the displaced-persons law or the regular immigration law may be tightened to prevent such infiltration.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF UTAH,
Salt Lake City, Utah, January 25, 1950.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Senator from the State of Nevada,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We received your letter of January 19, setting forth the resolution that was passed at our national convention held in Philadelphia, in August last year.

Be assured that the department officers of the American Legion from Utah concur with this resolution.

The pamphlets you mailed to this office have been received and a thorough distribution of your statement will be made to all post commanders and adjutants in the department.

We commend you for the attitude you have taken relative to our immigration laws and we wish to encourage you in your official capacity as chairman of this committee for the stand you are taking. The American Legion is cognizant of the reactions that can come should our immigration laws be modified in favor of foreign emigration. The displaced persons coming to the United States are a positive liability; some adjust themselves immediately, but most of them never become adjusted. The group in the latter category can reasonably be referred to as undesirables and they are a fertile field for the alien propagandists to cultivate undercurrents of un-Americanism.

We are always happy to cooperate with you in promoting anything which will have a tendency to strengthen us as a nation, and we wish you continued success in your endeavors.

Respectfully yours,
GEORGE E. LARSEN,
Department Adjutant.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,
February 10, 1950.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE MCCARRAN: I have observed with interest various news items given by you, as well as your statement before the Senate on Friday, January 6, regarding displaced persons, Facts Versus Fiction, and I want to compliment you on your stand. I think it is way past the time that other Members of Congress should become familiar with the fact that various illegal entries of subversives and others are being made by way of Canada, Cuba, Mexico, etc., into our country. As a matter of fact many entries are being made by members of a sinister cult, the majority of whom are unassimilatory and a danger to our way of life and of a Socialist-Communist variety, regardless of the screening through which some of them go but many of whom avoid. Some are slipped into our country for a mere thousand dollars.

I would like to call your attention, although you may have seen it, to the item in the October 6 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representatives YATES, of Illinois, Subversive Activities of Hate Groups.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT DONNER.

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.,
February 16, 1950.

Senator PATRICK A MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Although not a constituent of yours, I am taking the liberty of sending you herewith a copy of a letter which is self-explanatory and which may be of interest to you.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the splendid fight you have made and are making to keep undesirable aliens out of our country? With all good wishes for your continued success, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
HOMER G. RICHEY.

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.,
February 16, 1950.

EDITOR, RICHMOND TIMES DISPATCH,
Richmond, Va.

(Attention Voice of the People)

SIR: I should first like to acknowledge Mrs. Virginia Hurt's gracious and courageous remarks in her letter to the VOP of February 7. In view of a spate of letters in the VOP of February 16 concerning the DP problem, I should like to point to some ramifications of this problem which have received but little public attention.

It is often argued that present DP legislation discriminates against Jews and Catholics I fail to see that it discriminates against Catholics at all. Nor does it discriminate against Jews as such, although it is intended to preclude, and properly so, the entry of large numbers of Polish Jews into this country who voluntarily left Poland for Germany in 1946—long after Hitler's forced deportation of DP's had come to an end.

A dispatch of February 13 from Munich in the Chicago Tribune tells some interesting things about the International Refugee Organization, the international group in charge of DP resettlement. A DP in Vienna from one of the Baltic countries insisted that "the Russians have some way of getting information from the IRO. Several times after someone has admitted his anti-Communist feelings * * * it would filter through some place and get into Russian hands."

The dispatch goes on to say, "Most displaced persons will tell you that, although it would be hard to prove that there are

Communist sympathizers among the IRO, it definitely was a disadvantage in getting cleared for United States immigration if one were known as an anti-Communist" (sic).

Instead of passing a liberalized DP bill, Congress ought to start an investigation of the IRO This organization is supported principally by United States funds and the American taxpayer has a right to know whether he is subsidizing a group composed largely of fellow travelers whose chief mission is to get subversive aliens into the United States. If Congress is in an economizing mood, I can think of no better place to start than the IRO

HOMER GILMER RICHEY.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
February 7, 1950.

Hon PAT MCCARRAN,
Member of the United States Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: As a member and vice chairman of the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I was very much interested in your statement made in the Senate of the United States on Friday, January 6, 1950, copy of which I received recently in the mail

As you know, our organization has consistently maintained the stand, which has been well expressed by you in this statement The statement furnishes us with very valuable information which will be of assistance in the drafting of our legislative program

The entire membership of the second district of the VFW, comprising representatives of all the VFW posts in the second district, city of Seattle, State of Washington, has requested that I write to you reaffirming our position on this matter of displaced persons.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. YOTHERS,
Vice Chairman, National Legislative
Committee, VFW.

TASKER L ODDIE, OF NEVADA

Mr. MALONE Mr. President, former United States Senator Tasker L Oddie, of Nevada, died on February 17. The story of his political and professional life is parallel to and an integral part of the history of our State of Nevada during the early part of this century.

He dedicated the greater part of his active life to public service.

Tasker L. Oddie served with great distinction one term as Governor of Nevada, from 1911 to 1914, and two terms as United States Senator, from 1921 to 1933.

He was closely associated with Jim Butler, who discovered the great silver mines of Tonopah, Nev., early in this century and continued his interest in mining to the end of his distinguished career.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada, was very close to Senator Oddie during the period from 1927 to 1932, including the period of the development of Boulder Dam, now Hoover Dam, and other public projects affecting the State of Nevada and the other Western States and understood his keen interest in the development of worthy projects.

Senator Oddie played an important part in perfecting the legislation providing for Federal aid to the States in the construction of public roads during the early part of his first term in the Senate. He was also closely connected with and had a very active part in securing the naval ammunition depot at Hawthorne, Nev., together with Samuel S. Arentz, the Congressman from Nevada, Gov. Fred B. Balzar, and State Senator John H. Miller.

Throughout his long period of service his integrity and ability were unquestioned, and his long record in active public service demonstrated his loyalty and devotion to his State and his country.

Senator Oddie's loss will be deeply felt in our State of Nevada, and throughout the Western States, where he was active both professionally and politically for more than a third of a century.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a news item entitled "Death Takes Tasker Oddie," which appeared in the Reno Evening Gazette on February 18.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEATH TAKES TASKER ODDIE, FORMER GOVERNOR, UNITED STATES SENATOR—RITES MONDAY

Tasker L Oddie, whose political career in Nevada spanned the first third of the century, died at his San Francisco home late Friday afternoon at the age of 79

He was Nevada's twelfth governor, the eleventh man to represent this State in the United States Senate, and he had also served in the State senate and as district attorney of Nye County Playing an important part in Nevada mining development during the Tonopah boom days he also contributed to the progress of his adopted State in many other ways.

Senator Oddie was one of the men responsible for the Hoover Dam project. As a member of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads he succeeded in securing Federal highway money for Nevada. He was prominent in the fight to raise the price of silver to a basis profitable to Nevada mining enterprises It was also largely through his efforts that Hawthorne was selected as the site for the naval ammunition depot in 1926

SUCCESSFUL GOVERNOR

Regarded as one of Nevada's most successful governors, he took office January 1, 1911, the first Republican to occupy the chief executive's chair in 16 years, and with the aid of a split in the Democratic Party. Always an advocate of good government, he placed public duty above political considerations, insisted on strict economy, and administrative efficiency. He secured the provision of a State tax commission, and sought to abolish numerous boards and offices he thought were unnecessary Oddie believed that public expenditures should be governed by the rule of whether or not the State would derive benefits therefrom in excess of cost. He was long an advocate of good roads and he also held the office of State engineer to be the most important in the State. Too, he thought the State should interest itself in reclamation projects.

Just before he took office an act prohibiting gambling had gone into effect and he insisted on its strict enforcement During his term, too, the legislature in 1911 passed a workmen's compensation act. Legislation was also enacted for protection of miners from injury and death underground by requiring modern safety and fire-fighting appliances. During his term, too, the legislature ratified the sixteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, authorizing imposition of Federal income taxes As Governor he directed a reform of the old methods of assessing property for taxation. In February of 1912 he called the legislature into session to authorize the State to borrow from the State school fund a sufficient amount to enable the State to transact business on a cash basis.

BROOKLYN BORN

Tasker Lownes Oddie was born at Brooklyn, N. Y., October 20, 1870. He was educated at East Orange, N. J., and at the age of 16 came west to ride the range. Returning east he clerked in a wholesale grocery house and studied law, receiving his diploma from New York University in 1895.

He came to Nevada in the employ of Anson Phelps Stokes in 1898, intending to stay for a short time to inspect certain mining claims and railroad interests. He elected to remain and grow up with the country, making his headquarters at Austin. The decision led him on the trail of fortunes, which he made, lost, and made again, although at his death he was not regarded as a wealthy man.

From Austin he went to Tonopah with Jim Butler, who was that district's original discoverer. Oddie was Butler's close legal and financial adviser in the pioneering days when a large portion of the mining world flocked to Tonopah, and later swarmed to Goldfield, and the two were associated with Wilson Brougher He was a conspicuous figure in the camps but a large part of the fortune he accumulated was expended in grub stakes and in subsequent developments which turned out to be unprofitable He always believed in Nevada's mining possibilities, and after he left the United State Senate in 1933 he went to look for another fortune in the gold and silver districts, spurning a possible political comeback He had faith, too, in the agricultural and livestock possibilities of the State.

Admitted to the State bar of Nevada in 1898 he did some law practice in Tonopah and served as Nye district attorney from 1900 to 1902 While serving in the State Senate from 1904 to 1908 he was a proponent of labor legislation and supported the 8-hour law for railroaders and the full crew law. Later as governor nearly all the acts on the statute books in the interests of railroad workers were passed and signed by him.

POLITICAL CAREER

He was elected governor in 1910 after a strenuous campaign, and was defeated for reelection by Emmet D. Boyle in 1914. He again opposed Boyle for the governorship in 1918 In 1920 he was elected to the United States Senate, serving two terms. Between 1921 and 1933 he served on numerous influential committees and was chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, was on the Committees on Mines and Mining, Naval Affairs, Reclamation, Public Lands and Appropriations.

After he went down during the Democratic landslide in 1932 he was appointed special advisor to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on mining loans. Then he came back to mining in Nevada. More recently he had lived in San Francisco, spending his summers at Lake Tahoe and still calling Nevada home.

His funeral will be private, and will be held at Gray's Parlor on Divisidero Street, Monday at 1 30 p. m. The request has been made that no flowers be sent.

Senator Oddie married Daisy Rendall, of Los Angeles, November 30, 1916. She survives him as does a brother, Clarence M Oddie of San Francisco, and a sister, Mrs. Frederick Siebert of Palo Alto He was a member of the Bohemian Club of San Francisco, was a Knight Templar Mason and Shriner and a member of Reno Lodge, No. 597, BPO Elks. He was a member of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers. During World War I he was chairman of the highways transportation committee in the

Nevada State Council of Defense and chairman of the Nevada District of War Resources Committee.

Senator Oddie was a direct descendant of men who wrote their names in large letters in the history of the Nation's capital in Washington, D C. He was sixth in line from Christopher Lowndes, early day merchant and shipbuilder in whose ships grain and tobacco were sent to Europe. He was also a descendant of Governor Tasker, one of the early royal governors of Virginia, and of Thomas Bladen, for whom a village was named. Oddie himself gave his name to a mountain in Nevada. He was related to Gen. Tasker E. Bliss, and his great grandfather was Benjamin Stoddert, first Secretary of the Navy and one of the original owners of the land on which the National Capital is built.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask that there be printed at this point an editorial entitled "A Notable Nevada Leader," from the same newspaper, the Reno Evening Gazette of February 18.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NOTABLE NEVADA LEADER

For more than 40 years, Tasker L Oddie was a leading figure in two of Nevada's important fields—mining and politics The death of the former governor and United States Senator in San Francisco Friday brought to a close a career that paralleled Nevada history in the first half of this century.

Coming to this State in 1898 to look after the mining interests of some New York clients, Oddie remained in Nevada to take part in the discovery of the rich Tonopah mines, and he took an active interest in mining that never left him. With a talent for political affairs, he became district attorney of Nye County, was a member of the State legislature, and then was elected governor when the Republican Party was able to break the power of the allied Democrats and Silver Party followers that had held control of the State for 16 years.

Oddie was elected to the United States Senate in 1920, and he achieved a notable record during his two terms in the upper House of Congress. A conservative Republican, he was an able legislator and his advice carried considerable weight in national affairs. He thoroughly understood the needs of the western States, and was responsible for much Federal legislation for the improvement of this section. He carried on the fight that finally brought about the Boulder Dam project, at that time the largest river and power development that the Federal Government had entered into. The Federal Highway Aid program, in which the Government shared the cost of building roads through the public lands States on a basis of Federal land ownership, was one of Senator Oddie's achievements. Senator Oddie and Nevada's Republican Representative Samuel S. Arentz were responsible for the location of the naval ammunition depot at Hawthorne.

Like many another able and experienced Congressman, Senator Oddie was swept out of office in 1932 Six years later, he was again a candidate, but he could not hope to win against the combined powers of the Federal and State office holders, the regimented relief vote and the millions of boondoggling dollars that were distributed just before election time.

Although he had been retired in recent years, Senator Oddie kept in close touch with political affairs as one of the elder statesmen of the Republican Party, and he retained extensive mining interests in the State.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a part of a column entitled "Nevada Politics," by the Observer, from the Nevada State Journal for February 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEVADA POLITICS

(By the Observer)

When Senator Tasker L. Oddie, whose death occurred Friday in San Francisco, landed in Washington, D. C., as a United States Senator early in 1921 he and Mrs. Oddie were greeted with open arms by some Washington oldtimers because of the Senator's family background and Mrs. Oddie's former residence in the Capital. Here's an excerpt from a story in one of the Washington papers published at that time which gives information not generally known here:

"The new senatorial hostesses take rank with the Cabinet women in the social interest of Washington, and in many instances surpass them in the local sense. Senator Oddie, of Nevada, is, for instance, a direct descendant of men who have written their names in large letters in the history of the National Capital, and before its existence, in Virginia and Maryland. He is sixth in line from that veteran merchant and shipbuilder of Bladensburg, Christopher Lowndes, in whose yards were constructed those stout ships in which the planters of the entire section sent off their grain and tobacco to Europe and the east, and in this number must be counted the illustrious planter of Mount Vernon. Mr. Lowndes married Rebecca Tasker, daughter of one royal Governor of Maryland, and the sister of another, that Thomas Bladen, for whom the sleepy village of the eastern branch is named.

"One of Mrs. Lowndes' sisters married Councilor Robert Carter, of Nomini Creek, Va., and these two figured in history as the grandparents of Robert E. Lee. The new Senator from Nevada and Mrs. Oddie will be kept very busy for weeks to come meeting their kindred, who are numerous in and about Washington.

"There is Gen. Tasker E. Bliss, who is likewise descended from the royal Governor Tasker, now in command of the Soldiers' Home. Another illustrious great-grandfather of the Nevada statesman is Benjamin Stoddert, first secretary of the Navy and one of the original proprietors of the land on which the Capital City is built. Mr. Stoddert, a Revolutionary hero, besides his other claims to greatness, married Rebecca Lowndes and reared a large family in the fine old Stoddert mansion, Prospect Hill, in Georgetown. Mrs. Oddie is not a stranger to Washington, since she spent several years here in her girlhood as a student at the National Park Seminary in Forest Glen."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask that there be inserted an editorial entitled "Men of Integrity," from the same newspaper, the Nevada State Journal for February 19.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEN OF INTEGRITY

Nevada's fortunes in mining were at a rather low ebb in May of 1900 when the great silver discovery was made in the rugged mountains of Nye County and Tonopah sprung up almost overnight. Into that district poured miners and prospectors, promoters, and businessmen by the thousands. Roads were almost nonexistent but the desert and mountain areas some distance from the south end of Smoky Valley and the wastelands beyond the southern Nevada terminal of the old C. & C. Railroad at Rhodes were soon populated by men and women lured there by the Tonopah strike.

Prospectors had roamed those hills before but now they were out in force and it was not long before they found gold on the desert and the camp of Goldfield, 30 miles to the south, gave Nevada mining the greatest impetus since the days of the Comstock.

Tonopah and Goldfield, rivals, friendly, booming, and populated by men of vision, courage, and the spirit of give-and-take, exercised great influence on the affairs of Nevada and spurred on mining development elsewhere at a pace that spawned one of the most prosperous periods in the State's history.

Among the men of courage, vision, and ability who was on the ground when Jim Butler's burro (so the story goes) wandering away from camp kicked a silver laden rock loose from an outcropping was Tasker L. Oddie, young lawyer turned mining man. He had the rock assayed at Austin and then the excitement began.

Millions of dollars were produced by the Tonopah mines and Tasker Oddie, one of the original quartet to locate claims there, received a substantial share and spent it in the development of other mines, some of which were failures. But he found time, too, to devote to other things and became a leader of men in a community that needed sound leadership.

Honest, straightforward, and possessed of a real insight into human affairs, it was no accident that he was chosen by his fellow citizens to represent them in the State senate at Carson City and neither was it an accident that he was selected less than 10 years after the discovery of Tonopah as a candidate for Governor of Nevada on the Republican ticket.

As Governor Mr. Oddie helped to straighten out labor troubles that had beset the State and particularly the mining districts of southern Nevada. His was not a spectacular administration but it was a sane and safe one. Though defeated for reelection to the governorship he retained the affection and the confidence of the people of Nevada of all political faiths and as one of the outstanding leaders of the Republican Party won the party nomination and subsequent election to the United States Senate in 1920 and served two full terms.

Though he engaged in many spirited political contests not a single opponent ever once questioned his integrity.

He took victory and defeat in stride and always came up smiling, characteristic of the times and the fine caliber of citizens with whom he worked and enjoyed life.

Nevada is indebted to such men as Tasker Oddie for their contributions to the State's advancement. They in turn felt they owed to the State a debt of gratitude which they generously shouldered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Tasker L. Oddie was a great governor, a great United States Senator, and a great citizen.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY RESPECTING CONFERENCE REPORT ON OLEO BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared with reference to the conference report on House bill 2023, relating to oleomargarine, and I also ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "How Dairying Serves Mankind," by Milton Hult, president of the National Dairy Council, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

THE FINAL CONFERENCE REPORT ON OLEO BILL SHOULD BE DEFERRED; ITS GRAVE IMPLICATIONS SHOULD BE STUDIED

Mr. President, the Senate-House conference committee on H. R. 2023 has completed its actions. This committee was composed of some of the ablest Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, and I say that irrespective of the fact that their actions were, I believe, deeply harmful to the American dairy industry and to 150,000,000 American people as a whole.

I say that not in disrespect of these conferees, whom I admire as individual Senators and Representatives, but I say that on the firm conviction that the conference majority, which is going to report this bill back to the Senate and House of Representatives, has taken an action whose repercussions will be felt by our generation and future generations to come in adverse ways which we can barely estimate today.

In making these statements, I direct my principal objection to the omission by the conference committee of that provision which we adopted on the Senate floor, and which Senator FULBRIGHT accepted, which would have provided that oleomargarine as retailed be sold in triangular prisms.

The failure of the conference committee to include that one vital provision can spell a death knell to the American butter industry and a body blow to American dairying as a whole.

WHY TRIANGULAR PROVISION WAS NECESSARY

I have in my hand a copy of the bill, H R. 2023, as it was rewritten by the committee. I will not discuss at this point its weakening of various phases of the bill, such as the definition of margarine, etc, because I do not believe that we should divert our attention from the one main issue, and that is, that oleo should be sold in triangular form if it is to be properly identified by American consumers. The conference report provides, to be sure, that oleo must be sold in 1 pound or less packages; that the word oleomargarine or margarine must be printed in type at least as large as the lettering elsewhere on the label; and that a full statement of the ingredients shall be included on the package. To be sure the conference report states that the lettering on each individual quarter-pound wrapper shall refer to oleomargarine or margarine in a type not smaller than 20-point size.

The big question, Mr. President, is: How many consumers will actually bother to read the type, to look at the wrapper, to closely study the over-all package? The answer is: Very few, indeed.

On the other hand, a triangular package would have been both feasible and desirable because it would have provided the one way by which the great mass of oleomargarine as purchased could have been easily identified by consumers.

The oleo trust professed no objection to the idea of proper identification of their product. However, we now see the proof of what we have contended all along, that the oleo trust wants to masquerade its product as butter in every way, shape, and form, and that is why it fought to eliminate Senator FREAR'S amendment for triangular packaging.

Let me point out that several manufacturers have furnished the dairy industry word that machinery could fairly promptly be devised for triangular packaging of oleo. That certainly could not have been a legitimate objection, therefore, to the effect that machinery was not available.

RESTAURANT PROVISION IS INADEQUATE

Let me point out that the provisions of the conference report requiring that oleo shall be sold in triangular pats in restaurants, while they may look good on paper, will not have very concrete results. Why? Because in the first place they will undoubtedly not be enforced unless we are to have an army of inspectors, tens of thousands strong, to invade every restaurant in the Nation.

Secondly, we note that the amount of oleo consumed in restaurants is comparatively very small in relation to the over-all total of oleo consumed in the Nation. No one has accurate estimates, but I have seen guesses ranging from 1 percent to 5 percent. In other words, the conference committee has taken care of 1 percent of the problem and has left 99 percent of the problem to shift for itself.

ARTICLE ON DAIRYING

I have in my hand an article written in the latest issue of Think magazine by the president of the National Dairy Council.

This article came out almost simultaneously with the unfortunate action of the conference committee. The article points out that some milk is produced on at least 75 percent of the Nation's farms; it points out that the dairy industry contributes $10,000,000,000 to the Nation's retail commerce; it cites the fact that 118,000,000,000 pounds of milk were produced in 1948.

Where is the ocean of milk to go if the butter market is destroyed? Does the oleo trust want the milk to be poured into the gutters, or does it want the Government to buy up the surplus butter which cannot find a market?

This year it is predicted that the Government will have to buy 225,000,000 pounds of butter which will fall below the parity price.

What a ridiculous inconsistency for the Federal Government to buy up surplus butter on the one hand and to take an action which will cause more butter to be in surplus on the other hand.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senate should defer final action on the conference report on H. R. 2023 for a minimum of 1 month in order that the grave implications of the conference report may be thoroughly studied. The bill could still go into effect on July 1 if we acted, let us say, on the 1st of April one way or the other on the conference report.

We are not making any unreasonable demand in this respect. The oleo bill was enacted as the first item on the Senate Calendar this year. There is ample precedent for delay of final action on a conference report I refer particularly, for example, to the decision to hold over the final action on the basing-point bill from October 1949 to January 20, 1950.

I believe that the American consumers will come to see that it is not they who have won a victory in the conference report, but 30 large corporations seeking to destroy the butter market. The American consumers will see increasingly, as they have already begun to see, that they were sold a false bill of oleo goods.

Oleo, unidentified as such, will drive butter from the market, and when it does the implications will be grave to every housewife, every infant, every adult, every farmer, every workingman, every businessman in the United States. The implications to soil conservation, the implications to the supply and demand of other dairy products will be grave.

I urge my colleagues, therefore, to defer action on the Senate-House report until they have had an opportunity to analyze the grave repercussions of the omission of the triangular packaging amendment.

HOW DAIRYING SERVES MANKIND

(By Milton Hult, president of the National Dairy Council)

Today dairy products comprise more than 25 percent of the food consumed by the Nation's 150,000,000 people. These men, women, and children sit at dining tables three times a day 365 days of the year to consume more than 118,000,000,000 pounds of dairy foods at 164,000,000,000 meals.

Milk, known as nature's most nearly perfect food, is constantly in the limelight as 60,000,000 quarts of fresh milk and cream are distributed daily to consumers through doorstep deliveries and stores.

The health of the Nation, to a large degree, has improved as invention and science have stimulated progress in finding new food values in milk and its products for the human diet.

Milk was an important article of food long before 6000 B. C. when the oldest written records of the human race were recorded in Sanskrit and preserved in India. To the early peoples of central Asia the cow was so important that wealth was measured in numbers of cattle. In fact, the cow at times was made a sacred animal and is still so considered by a substantial portion of the population of India.

When the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth in 1621, they failed to bring with them a cow to provide children and adults alike with milk, butter, and cheese. The colonists became ill, and many died for lack of nourishing food. But conditions changed several years later when the ship *Charity* brought new settlers and cows from England. As the early Americans moved westward, their covered wagons were always followed by two or three cows.

Several hundred years slipped by before significant changes took place in methods of producing milk or manufacturing dairy products. One outstanding development that stimulated growth in the dairy industry in the United States and foreign countries was the invention of a test to measure the content of fat in milk. Discovered by Stephen Moulton Babcock in 1890 and known in the trade as the Babcock Test, it serves as a major instrument in handling and processing dairy foods.

To Louis Pasteur, the noted French scientist, goes the credit of adding another major link to the chain of progress in the dairy industry. His painstaking research led to the discovery of the pasteurization process which guarantees the purity and keeping qualities of milk and milk products.

Among other noteworthy inventions in handling milk and its products are the cream separator, pasteurizer, milking machine, churn, cooling systems, filling machines, ice cream freezers, evaporating and milk drying equipment and scores of other essential machinery, all playing an important role in speeding production and improving the quality of dairy products. Contributing to this trend toward modernization were the railroads, which began to build special refrigerated milk trains to ship milk from milk sheds to industrial centers for processing milk for delivery at the Nation's doorsteps and for manufacturing butter, cheese, ice cream, and a myriad of other products. Then came tank cars and huge tank trucks, all of which enable the dairy industry to haul milk and its products many hundreds of miles every day of the year. Back of these important mechanical developments which contributed immeasurably to the growth of the dairy industry was an ever-increasing fund of knowledge from, the country's leading scientific laboratories where men toiled incessantly to discover the dietary values contained in dairy foods.

The flow of milk from the Nation's 22,935,000 cows in 1948 amounted to 118,337,000,000 pounds. Of this, 44,500,000,000 pounds was bottled in glass or paper containers and consumed as milk and cream in cities and villages, and 12,306,000,000 was utilized on the farms. The remaining milk supply, 61,531,000,000 pounds, was manufactured into a variety of dairy foods to satisfy the needs and

desires of the buyer on Main Street. These manufactured products, and the amount of milk required to produce them, were as follows: 1,214,000,000 pounds of creamery butter from 25,000,000,000 pounds of milk; 1,097,000,000 pounds of cheese, from 10,920,000,000 pounds of milk; 568,000,000 gallons of ice cream, from 7,900,000,000 pounds of milk; 3,434,000,000 pounds of evaporated milk, from 7,390,000,000 pounds of milk; 172,980,000 pounds of dry whole milk, from 1,810,000,000 pounds of milk; and 658,000,000 pounds of nonfat dry milk solids, from 5,663,000,000 pounds of defatted milk.

About 120,000,000,000 pounds of milk were produced or consumed in the United States in 1949. It is difficult to visualize that amount of milk, but if milk produced in this country in a single year were placed in tank cars, each of which would hold 56,000 pounds of milk, it would require 42,857 trains of 50 cars each. A single day's production would require 117 such trains.

Although milk and its products are generally considered as food for human consumption, they are also used in a wide variety of industrial products, such as plastics, textiles, paper coating, paint, flue, films, pharmaceuticals, insulation, fertilizer, insecticides, penicillin, plaster, dyes, animal feed, preservatives, explosives, and electroplates.

The magnitude of the dairy industry is apparent when it is considered that one out of every 15 families in the United States is dependent on milk for a livelihood. Actually, the dairy industry employs full time at least 1,500,000 people in the production, processing, and distribution of milk and dairy products.

Ten million persons depend upon the dairy industry for their livelihood. Nearly every segment of the country's manufacturing, technical, and professional skills are drawn into the industry at one point or another. Among them are veterinarians, building suppliers and construction men, fabricators of milk cans, milkers, filters, machinery of all types for processing and manufacturing, producers of raw materials from lumber through most of the metals, and transportation, including rail, truck, and ship.

Although dairying is national in scope, in 11 States it is the principal source of farm income. These States are: Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wisconsin. Some milk is produced on at least 75 percent of the Nation's farms, and about 10 percent of the farms, or 585,900, are specialized dairy farms.

Every American family is a part of an industry that employs millions of people and produces billions of pounds of dairy foods. Dollarwise, cash farm income from dairy products is around $4,000,000,000 annually, but in addition the dairy farmer receives about $2,000,000,000 for the sale of dairy cattle for beef and veal. Significantly this income to the farmer is on a daily or monthly basis while most of his other receipts from agricultural products are seasonal. On a retail basis the dairy industry contributes $10,000,000,000 to the national commerce.

Dairying has always been a stable branch of agriculture. It has fluctuated less than the national income. A productive dairy herd proved the salvation of many a farm family during the last depression when net income from other livestock and grains was entirely wiped out. Today the average dairy cow will produce annually 5,036 pounds of milk compared with 2,360 pounds in 1850. In fact, improved herds will average around 8,835 pounds. This increased production is the result of improved feeding and breeding programs stimulated by leaders in the dairy industry, breed associations, and the colleges of agriculture in land-grant schools across the country.

The dairy industry has spent and is spending now millions of dollars in the interest of finding new food values and new uses for its products. The dairy chemists are constantly engaged in converting what was formerly a waste into additional income for the farmer and into new, improved products for the consumer. To illustrate, defatted milk, totaling well over 10,000,000,000 pounds annually, is worth about 40 cents per hundred pounds today, while 20 years ago it was practically worthless. Both industrial research and nutrition research insure security for the future of farming as a sound business.

Research in nutrition makes clear the fundamental reason why milk is an essential part of the diet under conditions of modern civilization. Without milk the human diet would be so lacking in certain essential factors, particularly vitamins and minerals, that civilization as now developed could not exist That's why health authorities across the Nation recommend a quart or more of milk for every child and as close to that amount as possible for adults, both young and old.

It was Dr. E. V McCollum, a noted scientist at Johns Hopkins University, who singled out milk as the basic product in the dairy industry and showed how it served mankind so significantly in the diet from the cradle to the grave. Said Dr McCollum: "The people who have achieved, who have become large, strong, vigorous people, who have reduced their infant mortality, who have the best trades in the world, who have an appreciation of art, literature, and music, who are progressive in science and every activity of the intellect, are the people who have used liberal amounts of milk and its products."

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has before it House Joint Resolution 398, a complete substitute for which the committee has reported. The substance will be regarded as the text of the joint resolution for purposes of amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks about the pending joint resolution. The Senate was told a few days ago by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] what the joint resolution would do if enacted. I should like to give the Senate some reasons why a measure of this character is necessary at this time.

It will be recalled that during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress we enacted Public Law 272 In that law it was provided that the 1950 national cotton acreage quota shall be not less than 21,000,000 acres. When the time for the distribution of those acres was at hand, the county committees, which had the duty of distributing the acreage, were in considerable trouble. It will be recalled that the main reason was that since 1942 we had no cotton acreage allotments in the cotton-producing States. During the war a farmer could plant any amount of cotton he desired, without restriction. There was no necessity for the existence of county committees such as we now have. So it can be seen that no accurate record was kept of the amount of acreage planted during the years 1942–49, as had been kept before 1942.

The question soon arose as to how to distribute the 21,000,000 acres of cotton to be allocated under Public Law 272. The county committees were at a loss. The Department of Agriculture was consulted, and ways and means were devised by it as to how best to distribute the acreage. Questionnaires were sent to cotton growers throughout the country. From what I am told, unsatisfactory data were furnished, therefore the Department of Agriculture resorted to statistics compiled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in order to ascertain as nearly as possible the amount of cotton acreage planted during the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. The method pursued by the bureau to ascertain the acreage was to obtain from cotton gins throughout the Nation figures showing the amount of cotton ginned. Then the bureau, by dividing the number of pounds of cotton produced in a given area by the average number of pounds produced per acre, for that area, established a figure for the number of acres devoted to cotton throughout the cotton States during those 3 years.

I may say that, later, when this method did not prove satisfactory, a further attempt was made to have the farmers give their acreage figures during the 3 years 1946, 1947, and 1948. I should like to read into the RECORD some of the figures given by the farmers throughout the Cotton States for the purpose of establishing the number of acres planted, in contrast to the number of acres ascertained by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Here is what was found: For the year 1945, Alabama had in cultivation, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1,390,000 acres of cotton. According to the farmers who reported, however, the acreage was 2,029,707, or a difference of 46 percent more than the figures arrived at by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Let us take the case of Arizona: There the difference was only 6 percent Now let us take the case of Arkansas: For 1945, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics figured the cotton acreage as 1,554,000 acres; but when the farmers of that State were questioned in regard to how many acres of cotton they planted during the same year, they reported 2,422,341 acres, or 55 percent more acreage than that reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

During the entire year, for all the Cotton States, the number of acres figured by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics aggregated 17,560,665, whereas reports from the farmers indicated 24,169,506 acres, or 37.6 percent more than the figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics had shown. The same thing occurred for 1946, proportionately; the same thing occurred for 1947; and the same thing occurred, likewise, for 1948.

It can readily be seen, then, that the job the committees had in allocating among the various cotton farmers of the States the 21,000,000 acres of land for cotton, was a huge task; it was most difficult for them properly, adequately, and equitably to apportion the cotton acreage. Especially is that true, Mr. President, inasmuch as in the previous year the cotton farmers of the Nation had

planted approximately 26,000,000 acres of land in cotton.

So the administrators of the new cotton law, Public Law 272, in each State, were at a great disadvantage. Many of the local committees had no experienced men. Many of them did not utilize to the fullest extent all the provisions of the law. There was no compulsion for the committees to use them, it is true; but it will be recalled that under the law the Congress provided for setting aside 10 percent of the acreage in a State, and further, that the committee for each county or parish had 15 percent of its allocation which could be set aside and used in order to remedy, as far as possible, inequities which might occur in the distribution of acreage.

Mr. President, in order to try to adjust this situation—and I may say it is very serious—the House passed House Joint Resolution 398.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

At this point I am reminded that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr EASTLAND], who has just requested that I yield to him, likewise proposed a measure to meet the situation. He was joined by several other distinguished Senators, including the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Incidentally, when the committee had this problem before it for consideration, it considered the measure introduced by the Senator from Mississippi, as well as the House joint resolution.

Now I gladly yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator spoke of the necessity for the enactment of this measure. Is not the real necessity for the enactment of the joint resolution the fact that in a great number of counties throughout the Cotton Belt there are hundreds of farmers in each county who planted 5 acres or less of cotton, and when the cotton allotment was set aside, the farmers who planted 5 acres or less were exempted, under the bill we passed last fall; they took no acreage reduction. When the county's allotment was set aside and the acreage of the farmers who were exempt was charged against the allotment for the county, that left nothing for the farmers with tenants who planted 40 or 50 or 60 acres of land in cotton. The allotment being gone, those farmers and their tenants were faced with bankruptcy and with losing their property unless a system could be devised to give them an equitable acreage.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, that was one of the main reasons for the Senate's action.

The Senator's measure, of course, will correct to some extent the inequities to which he refers, and I have no doubt that it will do a great deal of good. However, it will not satisfy all of the farmers.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course it will not.

Mr. ELLENDER. It will not satisfy many of the farmers who are in the position the Senator now describes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. It will take care of every hardship case, as I have described them. It is true that it will not satisfy everyone. But I tell the Senator that it will take care of the hardship cases, the cases of farmers who will lose their property, and the cases of tenants who will have no land to work unless this measure is enacted. It is designed solely and exclusively to take care of that class.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about that, Mr. President. As a matter of fact, the record shows that more than 90 percent of the cotton farmers of the Nation were unaffected by the passage of Public Law 272. The farmers the Senator now describes are the ones really affected; that is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. In my judgment, 95 percent of the cotton farmers have a fair and equitable acreage allotment and are satisfied with it. They have what acreage they are entitled to.

But there are a few—I refer now to the larger operators in counties where there are hundreds of farmers who are exempt—who, because of the provision of the act which exempted the 5-acre and the 3-acre cotton farmers, have no acreage, and face bankruptcy. They are the only ones who are entitled to relief.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator refers to 95 percent of the farmers, I presume he refers to farmers within the State of Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think evidence was produced to show that about 90 percent of the farmers throughout the Nation received a fair allotment; that is, what was to be expected under the act as passed by the Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to say to the Senator that in one county in Tennessee we have had particularly numerous complaints about the working of the present act. The complaint is based upon the evidence adduced that the committee did not accept the PMA report. That is the farmers' own report, as I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that is what I was explaining a few moments ago.

Mr. KEFAUVER. They relied upon the report of the BAE.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But the farmers themselves, in trying to establish a higher production, actually went to the gins and obtained the figures of the ginnings for the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. They then computed, on the basis of those ginnings, that the PMA report was substantially correct, and very much higher than the BAE report. If their acreage could be based upon the actual ginnings, where based upon the information they got from the ginners themselves on their production, they would be satisfied with the result of this amendment. I want to ask the Senator whether, under the amendment, the county committee or the State committee, or whoever has charge of which formula is to be used, can take the actual report from the ginners and figure the acreage on that basis?

Mr. ELLENDER. The national acreage allotments as now figured will stand. Under the pending joint resolution, no provision is made to change the method by which the present allotment has been made. What the resolution really provides is that an additional acreage shall be made available. The additional acreage is to be taken from the "frozen acreage," which I expect to discuss in a few moments. The facts produced by us show that, although a ceiling of 21,000,000 acres was put on cotton plantings throughout the cotton States, the Department of Agriculture did not expect that more than 19,000,000 acres would be planted. Therefore it was anticipated that there would be approximately 2,000,000 acres of cotton land which would not be planted. With respect to that acreage, that is, the cotton acreage which would not be planted and which is considered to be frozen, the pending measure provides that it shall be reallocated among the farmers of the State with preference being given to the needs of farmers within the same county in which it was released.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator will yield further, it would solve satisfactorily the problem we have in Macon County.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is, provided the State committee allocated a sufficient amount to this particular county, and the county committee then tried to make up the deficits in hardship cases.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I may point out to the Senator, in the joint resolution as reported to the Senate, there is a provision whereby a farmer shall receive acreage equal to 60 percent of the average cotton planted by him in 1946, 1947, and 1948.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The difficulty about that is, taking the BAE reports, not sufficient acreage is allotted to some of our 15- or 20-acre farms to let them get along.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, may I answer that question, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. In answer to the Senator from Tennessee, let me say that the joint resolution provides that the acreage surrendered shall be reallocated by the State committee, preference being given to the county in which the acreage is located. It must be satisfactory to the farmers in that county before any acreage can be taken out. That would solve practically the problem in every county.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am afraid it would not be a full solution; it would be only a partial solution.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is impossible to satisfy everyone. In fact, we shall not get very far if we try to satisfy everyone.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate that, but some of the farmers have been cut down from 20 acres to 6 or 7, and it is going to be very hard for them to get along.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senator will read on page 6, I think the question will be found to be answered there:

Determination of the average acreage planted or regarded as planted on any farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948 shall be made by the county committee after consideration of such evidence as may be submitted by the owner or operator, and shall be subject to review by the State committee.

I think that will answer the Senator's question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That, I believe, is the present law.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The difficulty is that while they consider the statement of the owner or operator, they actually take the BAE figures, even though they may also consider and take a look at the owner's statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question that the allocation which has already been made will not be disturbed. But the excess cotton acreage will be used in order to adjust inequities which resulted in the past. I know of no better way of doing it. Of course, as I pointed out, there has been a great difference in the number of acres reported as having been planted, according to the BAE, in contrast to the self-serving declarations made by the farmers, and it will be a difficult matter to resolve. I fear that, notwithstanding the fact that we may pass the joint resolution, there will still remain inequities. However——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have just indicated, the Senate version of the joint resolution provides for a minimum of 60 percent of the average acreage for 1946, 1947, and 1948, and there is a further provision which states, in effect, that no such allotment shall be increased by reason of this provision, to an acreage in excess of 40 percent of the acreage of the farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation as determined under the present law, excluding from such acreage the acreage devoted to other crops subject to acreage restrictions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may ask the Senator whether he does not feel, however, that the language on page 6, which has been read by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, will give the county committee the right to consider the statement of the farmer himself?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. And evidence other than the report of the BAE?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. However, as I have previously stated, no authority exists or is given to change the allocations already made and which were accepted by the farmers when they voted for acreage controls a few months ago. BAE figures will have to stand, and I believe they will, in all counties.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, if there are cases wherein the county committees obtain evidence to show grave injustices, the committees would have the right to adjust those cases. But no effort is to be made by the Department of Agriculture to change the method which has been in effect since December with reference to the allocation of cotton acreage to the various States, as I have stated on several occasions.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator decline to yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in a case such as the one to which I have referred, in which the individual farmers have collected information to show that the BAE report is incorrect, or at least they have carried the burden of proof of showing that the BAE report is incorrect, then there is no prohibition on the county committee or the State committee to prevent it from considering the newly-discovered evidence. Is that not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no prohibition whatever.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then, how will the individual farmers obtain rectification of the allotment, after they have shown that the BAE report may be incorrect?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will depend on the amount of acreage which the county committee will have available for distribution. Under the law as it now stands, the county committees can reserve, out of the amount allocated to a county, 15 percent, and they can put that acreage wherever they deem proper, in order to assure equitable treatment for all farmers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I understand that, but how about the State committees? Suppose the evidence shows that a particular county should have received a considerably increased allotment. Of course, the discrepancy cannot be made up by the committee of the particular county. There would have to be action by the State committee. How can the farmers in a given county get the State committee to do something about it?

Mr. ELLENDER. The additional cotton acreage provided by this measure is to be distributed by the State committee; preference, however, is to be given in those cases in which inequities are involved; the remainder can be distributed according to certain regulations which may be devised by the committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator has been very generous in explaining this matter so clearly. Suppose the State committee refuses to act in line with the plain evidence in the case in rectifying inequities: Is there any right of appeal to the Agricultural Department or to the Cotton Acreage Control Board, or is the decision of the State committee final?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is final, as I understand. I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is not this the system which will be used under the provisions of this joint resolution, that if a farmer claims he has an inadequate acreage, not in accordance with the standards established in the law, he files a written request with his county committee and can present any evidence he desires to present to the county committee to claim an acreage of 60 percent of the land which he had under cultivation in 1946, 1947, and 1948, provided it does not exceed 40 percent of his cultivable acreage?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. EASTLAND. There must be someone to pass on these matters and wring the water out if we are to have any acreage controls at all. Under joint resolution as passed by the House, the principal difference is that the farmer could plant 70 percent of what he planted in 1946, 1947, and 1948, but the county committee must take the word of the farmer. I submit that under that language we would have no effective control.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] says that the individual farmer, if he did not have adequate acreage, would have no right of appeal, no right to go beyond the State committee. Last fall, acreage allotments were made to farmers before an election was held. After each farmer received the acreage allotment he was to have in 1950 an election was called, a vote was had, and by a vote of 12 or 14 to 1, the action was ratified. If a farmer was not satisfied with his allotment at that time it was his duty to vote against acreage allotments for this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. It may be that the answer I made to a question a few moments ago left some confusion in the minds of a few Senators. What I had in mind was that the allocation of cotton acreage on a national basis had to stand, and that this measure contains no provision which would permit a change in that situation. Therefore, the administrators of this measure, if it be enacted into law, will have to use the facts as they find them, since there is no law nor any section of a law which would provide for a reallocation of cotton acreage on a national basis.

Mr. EASTLAND. That could not be done, because the farmer's acreage was assigned to him, and certainly we could not now take away from him acreage which has been assigned, because he has a vested right in it by agreement with the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I tried to clarify that a moment ago. Perhaps my answer was not completely clear.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The statement has been made on the floor that the so-called small cotton producer has been taken care of under the present law.

Mr. ELLENDER. The owner?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. That applies only to the owner; it does not apply to the small tenant who may be included along with many other tenants on a 50- or a 100-acre farm.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I should be glad if the Senator would explain that point more fully.

Mr. ELLENDER. The 5-acre allotment which was provided in the original act, in Public Law 272, of the Eighty-first Congress, and in this joint resolution does not change that situation. The 5-acre minimum is first allocated to all the cotton farmers who own their land in a particular county or parish.

Mr. President, I should like to state that if it had been possible for cotton acreage to have been allotted to the States and then to the counties on the basis of accurate records and if 10 percent of the State allotment had been set aside, and also if the 15 percent county allotment had been set aside, there is no doubt in my mind that Public Law 272, passed by the Eighty-first Congress, would have been adequate. That law provided means for adjusting most of the inequities. We provided that a certain percentage of the cotton acreage could be used by the administrators of the law for adjusting such inequities as have appeared since December 1949.

NEVADA COTTON ACREAGE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. The problem in the State of Nevada is one with reference to long-staple cotton. One hundred and ten acres have been allocated to the State of Nevada for 1950 as compared to 1,150 acres planted in 1949.

There are approximately 16 cotton States with about 21,000,000 acres. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER The ceiling fixed is 21,000,000 acres, but I do not believe the allocation under the Department of Agriculture quite reached that figure.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator's question pertain to this subject?

Mr. EASTLAND. It does.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall gladly yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to tell the distinguished Senator from Nevada that the allotment granted his State, as I recall, is several thousand acres. I think it is 3,000 or 5,000 acres. One of those figures is in my mind. I think it is 5,000 acres. But the point I desire to make is that at a meeting in the city of Memphis, Tenn., a year ago of the farmers and farm groups, in which the Senator's State was represented, his State was given the acreage allotment which the farmers of his State requested, with no questions asked. It was written into the law. The State of Nevada is the only State in the Union in which cotton producers were given the acreage they requested.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I am getting some further details and shall perhaps have them in a half hour, but the record of a 110-acre allotment of cotton to Nevada for 1950 does not in any way resemble 3,000 to 5,000 acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has answered the question, because, as I understand, he was present at the conference at which all the cotton States were represented.

Mr. EASTLAND. I was not present at the conference. I was in Washington, but I was not present at the conferences at which the matter of the Nevada acreage was discussed. I have repeated the statement that was made.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall—and I am sure the distinguished Senator from Mississippi will also recall—the bill which was enacted during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress and which is now law, was approved in advance by cotton growers throughout the Nation.

Mr. EASTLAND. The recommendations of the cotton growers were adopted in toto. In fact, Congress merely ratified what they asked us to do.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I mentioned, I have no doubt that the law would have worked exactly as we had contemplated, if it had been possible to obtain accurate data regarding cotton plantings for 1946, 1947, and 1948, and further, if the State committees and the county committees had set aside the 10 and 15 percent, respectively, to each State and county, so that adjustments might be made.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield first to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. In order to clarify the subject further for the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and other Senators I may say that I have before me Report No. 1509, House of Representatives, Union Calendar No. 628, dated January 21, 1950. Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the report. The individual acreages are given on page 6 of the report. Nevada is given 110 acres as of 1948. It shows 100 as the percentage reported by BAE.

Mr. ELLENDER. Those initials stand for "Bureau of Agricultural Economics."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The figure represents acreage planted in the years mentioned. There was no acreage control in those years. However, the law provides for acreage controls beginning in 1950. I state unequivocally that the Senator's State was given the acreage which was requested by the growers of his State. The liberal treatment thus given to the Western States caused great criticism in the eastern end of the Cotton Belt. I believe it was right to deal liberally with the Western States, but the State of Nevada was dealt with more liberally than any other State in the Union, and far more liberally than the State of California.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means with respect to cotton planted in the past.

Mr. EASTLAND. The big acreage in the six States was planted in 1949, as I recall it.

Mr. ELLENDER. There was no acreage planted in Nevada in previous years, so far as the record shows.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator have a report which shows the acreages included in the earlier bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. To which bill does the Senator have reference?

Mr. MALONE. I understood the Senator to say that Nevada was given the acreage which it had requested. The only acreage figure I can find is 110 for 1948.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the number of acres planted in the year which has been mentioned—1949.

Mr. EASTLAND. That was the number planted in those years. The Senator from Nevada knows as well as the Senator from Louisiana and I know that the acreage planted in his State is entirely new acreage. The year 1949 was the first year in which any appreciable acreage was planted.

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the Senator's statement, the report states that the acreage for 1950 will be 110 acres. I understand that raising cotton is a new industry in Nevada, but it involves long staple cotton, and it has very little to do with southern acreage. Nevada is a new State, agriculturally, still developing and still has, perhaps, less than 1½ percent of its area in cultivation.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is a surplus in the production of long staple cotton in the United States, just as there is a surplus in the production of short staple cotton. The statement quoted by the Senator shows that the allotment is 110 acres. I stand corrected. The Senator's State has taken no reduction, according to the figures which the Senator read.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is absolutely correct. As I understand it, the law is intended to deal with States which have actually planted cotton, and not with those commencing the growth of it. I may state to the Senator that under the pending measure, as well as under the existing law, a certain amount of cotton acreage is allocated to a State, or to a county, which is to be used by the committees for new growers. That is the only provision I know of which exists in any law for such growers.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. My statistician has handed me some figures which show that the acreage under cultivation in Nevada on July 1, 1949, was 1,150 acres. The allotment for 1950, however, will be 110

acres. I submit to the distinguished Senator that it is just a little silly to have 110 acres allocated to an entire State. According to the reports we are receiving about potatoes, as well as reports on other sections of the farm program, I have no doubt that our lack of information is catching up with us. At the same time, it seems to me that a State should be allocated an acreage which would make sense while in the development stage. According to the amendment which has been offered, potato acreage would be frozen. Apparently acreage is going to be handled from the Senate floor believing that acreage controls the amount of the product. The only thing we forget on the Senate floor is that if we pay enough for potatoes and pigs, in 2 years we will have potatoes and pigs 10 feet deep all the way from Washington, D. C., to San Francisco. We apparently know very little about what we are doing, and only hope that the taxpayers' money holds out until we learn.

Mr. EASTLAND. How much acreage would the Senator desire for the State of Nevada?

Mr. MALONE. I should say there should be a minimum of 5,000 acres. There were 1,150 acres last year.

I was wondering whether the distinguished Senators would entertain an amendment to the pending bill to make the minimum for a sovereign State 2,000 acres, or some other reasonable amount.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is totally unreasonable.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think it would be totally unreasonable. I have figures before me showing the acreage for the State of Missouri. According to the BAE statistics, these figures were almost 100 percent out of the way—almost as bad as the Nevada figures.

Mr. MALONE. How much did they have?

Mr. ELLENDER. BAE statistics showed in 1945, 268,000 acres. However, Missouri farmers reported that they had planted in the same year 540,174 acres. The error was almost exactly 100 percent.

Mr. MALONE. Two thousand acres for a sovereign State would not be very much.

Mr. ELLENDER. Personally, I should be glad to consider an amendment, provided it remained in line with the actual plantings of last year, minus a reasonable cut.

Mr. MALONE. It was 1,150 acres last year. Would the Senator accept an amendment of that kind?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am merely one member of the committee, and I should prefer that the Senator submit his amendment to the Senate, and let the Senate pass upon it. I will say frankly, however, that I think he has a very fair request to make of the Senate in submitting the amendment.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will yield for one moment, I might say that we can carry crop control to ridiculous proportions in dealing with States, especially in a case where there has been practically no acreage, and it becomes an economic necessity to rotate crops. I shall be very happy to prepare an amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was attempting to point out to the Senate the essential difference between the joint resolution as it passed the House and the measure reported by the Senate committee as a substitute. The joint resolution passed by the House would increase the acreage by at least twice as much as would be the case under the joint resolution as reported by the Senate committee. The House measure provides for the larger of 70 percent of the average cotton acreage planted during the years 1947, 1948, and 1949, or 50 percent of the highest planting in any of those years.

In addition to that provision, which would increase the acreage considerably over the amount provided under the Senate version of the joint resolution, there is another provision which would, in my opinion, increase the acreage over the Senate version. The language to which I now refer provides:

> That this section shall not operate to increase the cotton-acreage allotment of any farm above 40 percent of the acreage on such farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

That means that with respect to any cotton farm, no matter if sugarcane or sorghum or wheat or rye have been planted on it, 40 percent of the entire acreage is considered as being within the purview of the law insofar as the acreage limitation is concerned.

The Senate version of the joint resolution provides, that instead of 70 percent, only 60 percent of the average planting for 1946, 1947, and 1948 shall be the limit. The 50-percent provision for the highest year, is left out altogether, and the 40-percent limitation, although retained in the Senate version, is further limited to tilled acreage minus any acreage which may have been planted to any crop other than cotton. In other words, the law as it now stands on the statute books—and it was enacted in 1938—remains as then written.

Those points, Mr. President, represent the essential differences between the Senate version and the House version of the joint resolution.

As was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] when he addressed the Senate a few days ago, the facts adduced before the Senate committee show that there will be increased plantings under the Senate version of from 600,000 to as much as 790,000 acres of cotton. Under the House version, there might be an increase of from 1,400,000 to as much as 2,000,000 acres.

The Department of Agriculture has figured that although a ceiling of 21,000,000 acres was fixed in Public Law 272, it is probable, as I mentioned previously, that there will be at least 2,000,000 acres "frozen"—that is, they will not be planted. Therefore if the joint resolution as reported to the Senate is enacted it will mean that we are not going over the 21,000,000 acres provided for 1950 in Public, 272 and the chances are that the actual amount of acreage which will be planted to cotton in 1950, should the Senate version be enacted, will be 1,200,000 acres below the 21,000,000-acre quota.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. At the time the Senate passed the cotton acreage allotment bill last year was it estimated that these 2,000,000 acres would be frozen, or was it considered that most, if not all, of the 21,000,000 acres would be planted?

Mr. ELLENDER. The evidence shows that it was anticipated that not more than 19,000,000 acres would be planted.

Mr. LONG. That was at the time the bill was passed last year?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The basis for that statement was the following: The Congress passed an act in 1942 or 1943 providing that all war crops planted in the cotton States would be considered as planted in cotton for the purposes of cotton allotments in the future, and, of course, that resulted in much difficulty. Because of the existence of that law it is now felt that although a quota of 21,000,000 acres has been established for 1950, only 19,000,000 acres will be planted. If the Senate version of the House joint resolution is enacted, it will mean that probably a maximum of 800,000 acres will be added to the 19,000,000 acres the Department says will be planted under the present law.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Department of Agriculture figures that the measure would add about 800,000 acres. The cotton trade estimates that it will run about 400,000 acres. I am frank to say that I believe the Department of Agriculture has better facilities and that its figure is more nearly accurate. But I believe, as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico said, that the figures of the Department are liberal, and that the joint resolution before us, if enacted into law, will not result in an increase of 800,000 additional acres.

The States of Texas, Oklahoma, and Georgia have surplus acreage because of the credits they received for war crops, and with the enactment of the Senate version of the joint resolution will not plant the minimum acreage which is provided for in the previous legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, I think the evidence shows that even if the joint resolution as passed by the House were enacted, although it provides for a greater acreage than does the Senate version, the 21,000,000-acre ceiling would not be reached.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Actually in many cases the effect of taking the BAE figures has been that as applied to the individual farmer who might have correctly stated his acreage—he will not be given what his proper share of the acreage allotment would have been. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. It results in that, yes.

Mr. President, unless the Senators have some questions to ask, I am about to conclude. There is only one other

portion of the joint resolution I did not explain. That is section 2, which provides:

No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

As I recall, there was quite a discussion on that section a few days ago when the distinguished Senator from New Mexico obtained the floor. I desire to say that I believe that one of the most serious mistakes the Senate has made in the enactment of farm legislation was to provide for support prices without any means in the law to curtail production, either by a marketing quota system or on an acreage allotment basis. I do not believe that any kind of a farm program can long survive unless it contains the means of controlling farm production while supporting farm prices. The primary purpose of any type of agricultural adjustment legislation of this kind is to bolster prices and enable farmers to secure a fair market value from their crops; when the program becomes a dole for the farmer, and crop production exceeds all bounds of consumption and demand, the taxpayer will refuse to foot the bill. If the farmer wants to be able to count on his Government to protect him by assuring a minimum price, he should, he must, be willing to agree to controls on his acreage and production. The American farmer may well consider that runaway production under a price-support program might kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

AMENDMENT TO COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, under the cotton acreage allocation the State of Nevada was allocated 110 acres for 1950, while there were 1,150 acres actually in cultivation in Nevada during the year 1949. In the debate with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] this morning he indicated he would entertain an amendment to bring the acreage for Nevada at least up to the 1949 acreage.

Mr. President, Nevada is a new State. Less than 1½ percent of its acreage is in cultivation, and it is a growing State. It is necessary to have crop rotation. It probably is not too well known that the southern boundary of Nevada, approximately on the thirty-fifth degree of latitude extends as far south as the northern boundaries of Mississippi and Alabama.

It is realized that subsidies naturally call for acreage restriction, but some judgment may be exercised in respect to a sovereign State which is a new State and in a state of development. Therefore I submit the following amendment, to be added to the joint resolution as a new section:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law there shall be allotted to the State of Nevada for the production of cotton in 1950 not less than 1,150 acres, which is the acreage planted to cotton in Nevada in 1949. The additional acreage required to be allotted by this section shall be additional to the national acreage allotment.

Mr. President, I submit the paragraph just read as an amendment to the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY AND THE AIR FORCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I report from the Committee on Armed Services certain nominations involving routine promotions in the Army and the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). Without objection, the nominations will be received.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration and confirmation of these routine promotions in the Army and the Air Force, and that the President be notified. The highest promotion on this list is to the rank of colonel. The promotions are all routine promotions. They have been in the committee for the prescribed period. No objections have been heard to them. I ask for the immediate consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland for the immediate consideration of the nominations?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator again state what they are.

Mr. TYDINGS. They are nominations involving routine promotions in the Army and the Air Force, the highest of which is to the rank of colonel. They come from the committee with a unanimous report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations?

The Chair hears none; the nominations are confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order. The Senator from Maryland has no right to yield the floor to any Senator after he relinquishes the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to proceed to make a statement. I shall not yield to any Senator. I thought the Senators who rose wanted to make insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment. However, if the Senator from Vermont wants the regular order, I shall defer.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the regular order is preferable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will wait until I can secure the floor in my own right; but I appreciate the offer of the Senator from Maryland to yield to me for the purpose of making an insertion in the RECORD.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, if the Senator from Maryland will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield for that purpose, provided I may have the floor after the presence of a quorum is established.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BREWSTER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the calling of the roll be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the request made to vacate the order for the calling of the roll because we do not have a quorum?

Mr. TYDINGS. That might be. But many Senators are eating their lunch; and if the Senator does not mind, I should like to proceed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Very well; I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for a call of the roll is vacated, and further proceedings under the call are suspended.

PROPOSAL FOR A WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the great preponderance of the United States in the field of atomic and hydrogen weapons has given to the free peoples of the world the reasoned belief that no nation on earth will dare attack us or them for fear of the frightful consequences of quick retaliation.

Statesmen and military men of the greatest eminence in the western world have repeatedly stated that the possession of a huge stock pile of these great bombs by the United States has been the greatest single force in keeping the world at peace during the past several years.

In their search for security in a troubled world, the people of the democratic nations of western Europe have based their justifiable hope for safety upon the solid rock of the military might of the United States. They have done this voluntarily in spite of the ideological, political, economic, and military pressures that have been applied to make them turn away from us.

Until these western Europeans can rehabilitate their ravaged and war-torn countries and provide more adequate military strength of their own, they have realistically taken refuge under the wings of the American eagle. They know that the claws of this great eagle can carry large numbers of deadly bombs which, if necessity demands, could be loosed quickly on any aggressor.

At present the United States has pending in the United Nations two disarmament proposals. These are being currently considered by two separate committees of the United Nations. The first

committee seeks to reach an agreement with the member nations to outlaw completely the A, H, and other bombs, to destoy the means of making them, and to control for peacetime purposes the raw materials from which they are made. The second committee is concerned with achieving disarmament on conventional weapons only.

Negotiations on the part of both of these committees have proceeded since 1946, down to approximately January 19, 1950, when the Russian representatives withdrew from the United Nations. This work has therefore ceased. Presumably, negotiations will be renewed if and when the Russian representatives return. So far agreements to accomplish the objectives of the two committees have not been reached.

The proposal of the United States to achieve disarmament is a civilized and proper undertaking. These proposals were first made in 1946, when the Allies had just won a long, costly, devastating, and bloody struggle. The differences between them then were of a minor nature. The United States entertained the fond hope that upon the wreckage and ashes of a war-ravaged world a firm peace could be built. Our country quickly seized the leadership in this quest and offered to destroy its greatest weapons and the means of making them if other nations would agree to its proposal. It was then the hope of this country that if an agreement to outlaw the great bombs was reached, it would immediately be followed by other disarmament agreements which would lift the fear and burden of a new war from the hearts of men.

Steadily since that time the powerful Allies who won World War II have drifted apart. Disagreements have been frequent. The schism between east and west has continued to widen. The threat of war between former allies has at times been imminent. Slowly and surely the great nations have divided into two hostile camps, with Russia the leader of one school of thought and action, and the United States the leader of the other.

Instead of disarmament, as was proposed, rearmament is now being practiced by those mighty allies, who but 5 years ago stood shoulder to shoulder against a common enemy. Lately the rearmament has been accelerated. Russia is now devoting to her military forces five-sixths of the same effort she devoted to it in the first year of her war against Hitler. Even today Russia is devoting to her military might two-thirds of the effort that she devoted to it in 1945, the last year of the war.

Russia is now maintaining 200 divisions, many of them armored. As at present constituted, we have approximately 10. The U. S. S. R. is building up a mighty air force. In some categories, it is superior to ours in quantity, and high in quality. In certain categories of long-range, heavy bombing planes Russia is lacking. However, she is diligently working to fill this void. Much of our great Navy, in the category of ships, has been put in mothballs and is substantially on a stand-by basis.

Russia is building up steadily a large fleet of new, efficient, and powerful submarines. Reports indicate she is constructing heavier surface craft also. Both the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. are increasing their stock pile of A-bombs, and undoubtedly both of them are working on the construction of H-bombs.

This over-all general comparison of the armed might of Russia with that of our own country shows, I believe, that the present advantage in military might, taking into account our commitments overseas, lies with the United States. This is primarily because of our large stock pile of atomic bombs and Russia's relatively small stock pile of this most decisive weapon ever invented for use in war.

One of our pending proposals in the United Nations is to achieve the prohibition of the manufacture, possession, and use of the A- and H-bombs. If the proposal is accepted by Russia, it will mean a tremendous reduction in the armed strength of the United States, with no compensating reduction in the armed strength of Russia.

It will mean we give up the very thing which experts have proclaimed to be the greatest single factor for keeping the peace. Considering our great distance from the European Continent, it would likely threaten our military preeminence in Europe as well as at home.

Therefore, Mr. President, further effort on the part of the United States to achieve prohibition of the manufacture, possession, and use of the A- and H-bombs, without accompanying and compensating disarmament programs by Russia and other nations, may lead the United States and the democratic nations associated with us into the abyss of disaster.

More than anything else, the possession of a large stock pile of these decisive weapons has given to our country and the democratic nations allied with us a feeling of firm and irreplaceable security. We are so far ahead in stock piling the bombs that no other country can match us in the reasonable foreseeable future.

Our country has access to the largest part of the known world supply of uranium. Russia does not have access to a similar volume of raw materials indispensible to the making of the great bombs

The scientific and mechanical ability and know-how of the United States and the thousands of great industrial establishments where this knowledge and ability can be translated quickly into weapons give the assurance to our people and to the North Atlantic Security Alliance that we are not lagging behind in the great essentials of modern defense.

All these factors taken together have poised the peoples of the free democratic world upon the highest peaks of national and international defense. We are infinitely stronger than any other nation, in the number and quality of the most decisive weapons known.

But, Mr. President, if we continue the laudable course of disarmament in the United Nations through the medium of two separate committees therein we are inviting grave dangers. With one committee seeking to achieve agreement for the outlawing of atomic weapons and the other working for a scaling down of other conventional weapons, we could be placed in an untenable position.

For example, if the Russians, at some future date, should accept our proposals for the prohibition of the manufacture, possession, and use of A- and H-bombs, without agreeing to our other proposals for the scaling down of conventional weapons, we would be caught in a trap. We cannot afford to agree to the prohibition of the A- and H-bombs only. There must be accompanying and compensating disarmament in the field of conventional weapons, to offset this sacrifice of our armed might. Otherwise, our own people and the people of western Europe would strongly oppose it, and I believe the United States Senate would not vote to ratify any such agreement, for the simple reason that it would transfer military dominance, particularly in Europe, from ourselves to Russia.

We would be embarrassed by the acceptance of the very proposition we put forth. The Russians could say: "All right, we agree to your proposition to outlaw the great bombs. Now let us proceed to do it. We have accepted it. What are you waiting on? Are you going to break faith upon the very proposal which you yourselves made?"

Thus if we refused to carry out the plan after agreement was reached to outlaw the great bombs, we would stand indicted before the world as having welshed on our own disarmament proposal.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those who are standing in the Senate Chamber will please be seated. Senators will find seats. Let there be order.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we secure Russia's acceptance and carry out the plan, we consequently raise Russia's might greatly while reducing our own. We shatter the present strong faith of western Europeans that they can look to us for protection. We place Russia in a position where without any bombs she can renew all the various pressures on the countries of western Europe.

If the two proposals pending in the United Nations are not henceforth handled by the same committee, so that any disarmament by one great nation is compensated for by equal disarmament by others, then we ought to recall our offer from the United Nations. The establishment of two committees to deal with two different kinds of armaments no doubt sprang from the best of intentions. However, such a policy is neither sound nor wise, nor likely to be rewarded by real accomplishment.

One European country, Norway, has more than 100 miles of her northern frontier adjoining the frontier of Soviet Russia. If there are no bombs in our arsenal with which to come to the aid of Norway and other such countries, they might begin to question whether, under the new alinement of armaments, they would be as safe as they formerly were.

From Italy northward all along Europe's Atlantic coast, Russia would un-

doubtedly try to pick off first one, then another of the democratic countries allied with us. So great would be her comparative might—already poised on the borders of these countries, with ours 3,000 miles away—that the mere threat of armed intervention plus other pressures would make it difficult for the western Europeans not to try for the best terms they could get from such a formidable and threatening power.

We should realize that the prohibition of A- and H-bombs, taken singly, might result in the destruction of the democratic world to a large degree.

If I were a Norwegian or a Dane, a Dutchman, a Belgian, or a Frenchman, and there were no great A-bombs in existence and all the other armed might of the world remained as at present distributed, I would make a new calculation of the existing power of Russia on the one hand and that of the United States on the other.

I would know that Russia had 200 divisions, many of them heavily armored. I would know that the United States had but 10. I would know that for purposes of war in Europe, without the bombs, the Russian air force was at least on a par with that of the United States. I would know that the great United States Navy, powerful though it is, is not equipped beyond a limited degree to defend the borders of western European countries where the Russian Army is already poised.

Mr. President, may we have order, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those who are standing in the Senate Chamber will please find seats.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would likely have a feeling that the West had lost the war of ideas with the East, so far as Europe was concerned. As threat after threat mounted, as pressure after pressure from Russia increased upon western Europe, I would begin to wonder whether I had best not make what terms I could with a powerful enemy on the spot, rather than rely upon the smaller forces of my friends and allies more than 3,000 miles away.

That, I believe, would be the reasoning of the great masses of the people of western Europe. The North Atlantic Security Alliance might be dealt a blow from which it could not recover. If this came to pass, the United States would then stand isolated in a world where strong Russian and allied forces stood on the borders of the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Arctic Oceans.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall refuse to continue unless there can be order in the Chamber. I simply cannot shout against the conversations of everyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Senate and in the galleries. Let everyone including the occupants of the galleries, be quiet while this important proceeding continues.

Does the Senator from Nebraska ask to be recognized?

Mr. WHERRY. No. I merely wanted to request the Presiding Officer to preserve order in the Senate Chamber. The Senator from Maryland has made the request three or four times. Conversations are going on in the Senate Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let everyone be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to say that I feel that order certainly should be preserved. It is a very important speech, and I personally am anxious to hear every word of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. TYDINGS. That, Mr. President, is the grave danger in proceeding with world disarmament on a partial basis. It is a hazard to ourselves and the North Atlantic Security Alliance when two separate committees of the United Nations are trying to solve this great problem on a dual basis. To institute atomic controls and prohibitions alone would strike a deadly blow at our own defenses—a blow calculated to dismember the North Atlantic Security Alliance and weaken the whole democratic world.

The means for avoiding this danger, if disarmament is to be the continuing quest of the United Nations, is to consolidate these two committees. Disarmament must be equal, not one-sided. No nation can be asked to give up its preeminence in a single field of military might without accompanying and compensating disarmament by other nations in the same or other fields. Disarmament by example is not disarmament at all.

In essence, this shows the fallacy of trying to achieve world peace by disarmament unless the whole subject of world disarmament is confronted, analyzed and solved so that all nations shall disarm proportionately. In other words, the outlawing of atomic weapons, unless accompanied by the outlawing and elimination simultaneously of other weapons is a snare and a delusion.

All treaties calculated to achieve any measure of disarmament are based upon the indispensable ingredient of world-wide inspection. No nation will trust another's word as to the amount or extent of disarming which it is putting into effect. Each nation must know the actual practices being carried out, through inspection, by its own representatives. Without inspection there can be no disarmament. It is the sine qua non of the whole proposition.

So long as large armaments remain, even without bombs, the threat of war lingers. It has not been reduced to its irreducible minimum, but only by a degree. Thus if war comes—and it could come by the use of the permissible weapons—the moment it starts, all inspection ceases. Obviously, if we were at war with Russia, we would not permit her representatives to inspect our country, nor would she permit our inspectors to enter her borders.

As inspection is an indispensable part of every treaty, these treaties would provide that the disarmament agreements remain in effect only while inspection is possible. So when inspection ceases at the outbreak of war, the treaties are abrogated and declared null and void. It is then permissible for the nations who are parties to the disarmament pact to begin rearmament in all categories, including A- and H-bombs. Each belligerent capable of doing so would at once begin the manufacture of these deadly weapons. As soon as they were produced they would likely be used, just as they were used, as soon as we made them, in our war with Japan.

So what have we gained, Mr. President, if disarmament carries through, even equitably, only in the top category of major atomic weapons? We have gained only a truce between wars. During the period between wars the great weapons would not be used anyhow. You have merely delayed their use somewhat. For immediately upon the advent of war, they are certain to be manufactured and used, as they are acknowledged to be the most decisive weapons known to bring the enemy to his knees.

All we have done by such a process is to march the hopes of mankind to the summit of peace, only to find that we must march them all down again.

Twenty years ago, Maxim Litvinoff, the Russian representative at the World Disarmament Conference in Geneva, said this: "The way to disarm is to disarm."

One cannot be saint and sinner at the same time. If the world wants peace through disarmament, it cannot achieve it by being a Roman rider, with one foot on the horse of disarmament and one foot on the horse of rearmament. There are no short cuts, magic keys, or miraculous formulae for the achievement of real world peace, other than through world disarmament.

Nor will the cause of peace be aided by partial disarmament in any category of weapons by the great nations unless with such agreement there is accompanying and compensating disarmament by all the parties thereto.

Therefore, today I again raise my voice for two purposes: First, to end the procedure in the United Nations where two committees are working to secure agreement on two separate phases of the disarmament program. This must be a single undertaking, either in or out of the United Nations. The present division of work and effort of these committees is fraught with the grave dangers I have pointed out. If this work is to continue, it should be done by a single consolidated committee, to avoid misunderstanding and irreparable loss of our prestige before the world.

Secondly, I renew my plea for a real world disarmament conference, where this subject will be considered in its entirety. I ask for a conference devoted to this one purpose. So long as the threat of war remains, as it will remain without world disarmament, there is little or no real prospect of settling the other disputes of men and nations on any permanent basis.

Finally, in the face of the resurgence of Russian military power on land, sea, and in the air—and in the field of atomic bombs—we must review our total military potential and that of those associated with us. If this arms race is not halted, it will mean more rather than less defense; more rather than less taxes, for military purposes; more rather than less sacrifices; more rather than less

concern for the ultimate fate of mankind.

Mr. President, this is something which I think may interest the Senators who are present.

The present announced policies of the State Department seem to condemn us to this course. In an article published in the Reader's Digest for March 1950 entitled "Is War With Russia Inevitable?" Mr. George F. Kennan, the able counselor of the State Department, says war is possible. He says it may come either by accident, or from the fear of the Russians that someone is going to attack them. Speaking for the State Department, he tells us that there are only three alternatives open to us: "(a) a return to isolation and armed neutrality; (b) war, or (c) to continue the policy of throwing our weight into the balance wherever there are relatively good chances that it will be effective in preventing the further expansion of international communism."

There Mr. Kennan closes the door. We must either retreat back to America and pursue a policy of armed and isolated neutrality, or go to war with Russia, or just hold fast as we are.

All imagination, energy, ingenuity, and diplomacy on the part of our Government and people are by such a policy completely and unmitigatingly discounted. They are all deposited in a steel-riveted sphere of frozen vacuity.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to finish my remarks, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Without additional State Department policy, the American Nation and those associated with us are compelled to live on the other side of an iron curtain already hiding nearly half of the world and its people.

Mr. Kennan's three alternatives, taken together, are mountainous in their defeatism. They are not in the American tradition. They place a new low on American ingenuity. They offer nothing but the ultimate expectation of the incineration of mankind. Like Mr. Micawber, the State Department seems willing to wait for something to turn up.

Evidently the recent words of Dr. Einstein that "annihilation of all life on this planet is now within the realm of technical possibility" seem to have been completely overlooked. Like Nero, we seem to show a willingness to fiddle while our world burns. We seem to have no plans, other than those stated, to break the stalemate

There is little hope held out by these alternatives either to our own people or to the people of western Europe. There is no hope held out to those nations, once free, that are now behind the iron curtain. This lethargic statement parades us before the world as impotent, devoid even of the will to try, and exhibits a paucity of thought and action in the face of a gathering storm which could sweep away all Christendom, all civilization, all living things.

I would offer another alternative to the three which the State Department says are our only recourse: the alternative of taking the initiative, stating our objective before all the world and carrying our message in every manner possible to all people behind the iron curtain.

I would start it by calling a world disarmament conference, by going to the very core of the matter, at the beginning. There are excellent precedents for this in time of great national trial and danger. Woodrow Wilson did it in his fervent appeal to the people of other nations, over the heads of their own governments, with his fourteen points which helped crack the resistance of the enemy in World War I. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill did not hesitate to appeal to the people of other nations by setting forth the allied objectives in the Atlantic Charter. Would not a ringing appeal for real world disarmament under adequate guaranties against bad faith tear the mask of propaganda, crimination, and recrimination from the face of those who would keep the world in an armed camp?

We are the greatest advertisers and salesmen the world has ever seen. The dynamic quality of our business life is built largely upon advertising and salesmanship. Why not employ these great American attributes to carry an honest message behind the iron curtain? It would say in effect:

"We in America, the most powerful Nation in the world militarily, economically, and financially, are offering to the governments of all other peoples the proposition to disarm to the lowest possible degree, retaining only such forces as are necessary to keep law and order within our countries."

This would be a hard message to explain away to the people on the other side of the iron curtain. It shows clearly and precisely where the United States stands, what our motives are and what we desire.

There must be many Russians who want to be relieved of the awful burden of slaving not for themselves and their families but for the waste of giant armaments. There must be millions of Russians who would like to be relieved of the threat and fear of war. This is a difficult invitation for any government to reject. Sooner or later people will begin to realize that much that they need and desire could be obtained if this policy were adopted.

Yes, there is a fourth alternative—a call for world disarmament. The impact of that message, properly framed, will stir millions in every land all over this earth. It will stir them particularly when they come to know that the alternative is as Dr. Einstein has said, the possible incineration of all mankind.

Let us tell the people of the world precisely what our purpose is. If we do, we will reap a good harvest in the verdict of millions of people all over the earth. They will come to know that America is the friend of the common man. They will learn who opposes and destroys the ideal which we seek.

We cannot win the cold war by dynamic negativism or by burying our heads in the sand in the illusion that the enemy will pass by. We can win it by strong, aggressive, imaginative, diplomatic action.

That is the call of the hour. It is the call that millions are waiting for.

I renew my plea for the President of the United States to call a world disarmament conference. It is fraught with great possibilities for good, even though it fails. It is burdened with blessings if it succeeds. It is the call that stems from strength. It is a call that all but a few will heed. It is a call to end both the cold war and the hot war. It is a call to restore to mankind those inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—with which our Creator has endowed us.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the thought which came to my mind as the Senator was speaking about the vacuum was that what he was endeavoring to do by his splendid statement was to break the seal which was causing the vacuum, and get some action by the State Department and by the President and other nations in an endeavor to come to some type of world-wide agreement on the armament question.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. I should like to commend the Senator from Maryland. I have listened to him with keen interest. I certainly hope that not only the President, but the State Department, will heed the warning and the message which he has given us.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his generous support. At the expense of reiteration, it seems to me that if we were to utilize every possible means which we have at hand, and accentuate all the means at our command to carry the message, that the United States, the strongest nation in the world, militarily, economically, and financially—I will not say spiritually and morally—is proposing to all the governments on earth a world disarmament conference down to the lowest possible point necessary to keep law and order in each country, so that the millions who now slave for the waste of building great armaments may devote their energies to their homes, to schools, hospitals, roads, food, clothing, and shelter, provided their government and the other governments would only join with us in that quest, it would be a powerful and revolutionizing statement, even if its objective were not realized, which might bring great results in ways which we cannot even now see. If the idea were carried to its ultimate conclusion and such a conference were held, it would be a great blessing to all mankind.

Mr. THYE. In other words, our silence as a nation might be interpreted as evidence of confusion on our part and a hesitancy to take the aggressive leadership necessary to bring about the disarmament which is absolutely necessary, particularly in view of the hydrogen element from which we are now attempting to build bombs.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has put his finger on the important point. We are going to have disarmament, or, if we have a war at some period in the future, there is no man in this Chamber who can be certain that when it is all over the place we now stand on and the

people who are young will still be here. There are potentialities inherent in the type of warfare with which we are now confronted which lead, as Dr. Einstein said, to the possibility ultimately of all life on this planet being wiped out. That message, together with the one I have briefly outlined, ought to find lodgement in the dullest intellect in the world, wherever it may be.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I enjoyed the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maryland, particularly his concluding comments. I was reminded of the world situation back in the days when, from this country, there came forth the idea enunciated in the Declaration of Independence. It spread throughout the peoples of the world a flame of desire for nobler things and for freer government, and it was the beginning of the disintegration of autocracy. It seems to me the present situation is analogous. The peoples of earth are hungry for "the way out"—out of fear, out of tyranny, out of debt, out of war. They are looking for more light. I am satisfied that if the aggressive and dynamic suggestion and the idea which has been so ably presented on two occasions by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, were properly presented with force, energy, and dynamics by our State Department, it would cause hope to spring afresh in the hearts, and minds, and souls of the peoples of earth; even as the Declaration of Independence did in 1776.

Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senate that there have just come into the gallery some 25 or 30 young men and women from Europe. Their coming is a gleam in the darkness. They are here to spend a year to get acquainted with America, with American ideals, and American ways of life. They belong to the Moral Rearmament Group, which is really doing a great job. The Senate will remember that it was only last year that the Chaplain of the Senate visited Caux. He came back spiritually exhilarated. He wrote two articles for the Sunday Star, as I recall, and they have been placed in the RECORD. He wrote of the spiritual uplift and experience he had when he was at Caux.

Yesterday we heard read the Farewell Message of George Washington. In it Washington stressed the importance of religion in a people of morality and spirituality. Today the Senator from Maryland has given us a lift with an idea—a liberating idea. At noon I took lunch with this fine group of young men and women and I received a similar lift. I feel there are forces working for good. The world situation is critical but not hopeless. We Americans have adequacy in our blood. Always, with the help of God, we have proved equal to the emergency. In the days of Valley Forge, when things looked darkest, and when Washington was in doubt about the future, a young man named Lafayette came from France and brought with him to Washington and his leaders the message, in substance, that the eyes of Europe were looking with hope and expectation toward America, with its new ideas, with its new political and liberating concepts. From that young man came encouragement and direction to Washington to carry on.

I say, Mr. President, that today the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] by his proposal and our young European friends by their presence, furnish a good omen for the world of tomorrow.

I am an optimist. With courage, with the desire to adventure—casting out all doubt, fear, and self-distrust—undaunted by present conditions, with faith, hope and confidence, we will ultimately find the answer, Mr. President.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before I yield the floor I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that his illustration respecting the wide effect of the publication of the Declaration of Independence upon the world is very apt. What he said respecting that document shows that if an idea is what we believe to be moral and spiritually right, and if it is honestly projected and widely understood, as I believe a simple message of the kind I have outlined would be, no one can measure the force of that idea down through the corridors of time. No man can measure its contribution, even if the proposal fails, toward causing a ferment among the people on both sides of the iron curtain who want to have a better way of living than the one they now have.

In my opinion one of the reasons the Russian revolution succeeded was that there was just enough apathy concerning the retaining of the old Czarist regime, and enough resurgence toward establishing a new regime, so the new regime was able to seize power because the people of Russia thought it offered a better promise for them, whether it did or did not really do so.

I believe that now there is a God-given opportunity for leadership by the United States to utilize every agency at its command, to use all its efforts, all its salesmanship ingenuity, all its advertising ingenuity, in sending this simple message out all over the world. It cannot do any harm. It springs from strength. The world knows how strong we are. We defeated one nation almost by ourselves, and contributed materially toward defeating two others, and in doing so we had to go across two great oceans. We do not have to apologize or to explain our position. The world knows how strong we are. The force of that message might conceivably rend some of the curtains and tear down some of the barriers now standing between the East and the West.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I pay my respects to the very able Senator from Maryland for an address which he not only presented forcefully, but which contains much merit.

Getting back to the practical side of the situation, I should like to ask the Senator several questions. Does the special counselor whom the distinguished Senator quoted reflect the position or the philosophy of the present head of the Department of State, or is the Senator speaking for himself? In other words, I should like to know from the Senator from Maryland, because of the position he occupies as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, if the appeal is a reflection of the present leadership in the State Department?

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe I can answer your question affirmatively for three reasons. First, he says substantially what the Secretary of State said in his extemporaneous remarks of 10 days ago.

Secondly, it comes from the counselor of the State Department, who obviously would not take a position opposed to the position of his chief.

Thirdly, the Reader's Digest very generously waived its copyright to the article so that it might have the widest examination in reprints all over the country.

I believe any one of those three reasons is sufficient, but taking the three factors together there can be only one answer: Yes; what I read and quoted is the present position of the State Department of the United States of America.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his answer.

I should like to ask him another question if he will yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for another question.

Mr. WHERRY. Could the appeal proposed to be made to the leadership of the world and to all the peoples of the world, be made through the United Nations?

Mr. TYDINGS. That opens up a tremendous field for argument. I should prefer to answer the question in this fashion: I believe there is a better way to do it than through the United Nations. I believe the dramatics of the United Nations have now pretty well passed away. I believe that we have a great opportunity for presenting a dynamic proposal. I believe the call would have to come from a very high peak of authority and eminence in order to carry the conviction that it came from a source that was strong and powerful, that it came in a sacrificial sense, that it came from one who would give up more than anyone else to achieve an ideal.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his answer. I should like to ask one more question, if the Senator will yield for a final question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator from Maryland agree with me that this dramatic appeal which is proposed to be made, which would be judged by the whole world, should be made in the open? Would it not, with all the dramatics going with it, when given to all the world—even though in the end the satisfactory results the Senator hopes for might not be achieved—be more effective if made openly?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; certainly. There are many who live behind the iron curtain whose labor, sometimes under conditions almost of slavery, goes into a giant armament system instead of into the production of houses, of food, of clothing, and so on, who, if they heard

the message, would question whether the government under which they were forced to live ought not to be replaced by some other form of government. There are many ramifications growing out of the proposal other than simply the matter of disarmament, but the greatest advantages to be achieved are those resulting from disarmament.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his remarks.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. There are some points the Senator has made with which I am not in agreement, as the Senator knows from our private conversation, but as to the necessity for hard and constructive thinking about the affairs of the world we are in complete agreement.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. I congratulate the Senator upon the spirit which has moved him, and I hope his spirits will not flag, and that he will not fail to continue to rise on the floor of the Senate and express his belief and his thoughts on a subject which we must continue to examine and reexamine in behalf of the peace of the world.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his remarks. Before I yield the floor I should also like to thank him for his own efforts to try to achieve a new approach to the stalemate which exists between the east and the west.

I would not want to surrender the floor without saying what I do not believe is necessary to say, that, of course, until we secure disarmament which gives us the same security we feel with armament, we must keep our defenses very, very strong. This is not a plea for unilateral disarmament, for disarmament by example, or any kind of disarmament which would leave us relatively weaker in any respect than we are now. It is a plea for strength in the interim up to disarmament, and for disarmament whenever it is possible.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] I send to the desk the amendment lettered "G" which I ask to have stated, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "planted" and insert in lieu thereof "harvested."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Section 2 of the bill as it is now written has the effect of repealing all price support on potatoes which are planted after the enactment of this measure. The amendment which I have offered on behalf of myself and other Senators, by changing the word "planted" to "harvested" would have the same effect except that it would apply to all potatoes which are harvested after the enactment of the pending measure. The reason I offer it is that if such provision is not made there is a certain area in the United States in which farmers are now engaged in planting, and it will be impossible to tell who has or has not planted prior to any given date. During the 2 or 3 weeks' period the bill may be in conference, or during the period while it is awaiting the signature of the President they will have an incentive for engaging in an almost round-the-clock planting. The result would be that next summer, we will have the greatest congestion of potatoes ready to harvest at one time the country has ever seen, and the result will be a completely demoralized market.

I have discussed the question with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the majority leader, and I understand he has considered the merit of the amendment and might be willing to accept it. Will the Senator from Illinois respond to that statement?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret I did not hear the statement made by the Senator from Delaware. I was discussing another very important matter with my friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Candidly I was not paying attention to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was pointing out to the Senator that the reason for offering the amendment is that it would prevent a congestion of potatoes on the market next summer. Without this amendment the farmers would have an incentive for planting faster during the next 2 or 3 weeks. During that time the farmers would have a price-support incentive for all-around-the-clock planting. I understood the Senator from Illinois recognized the merits of the amendment, and was willing to accept it.

Mr. LUCAS. I did advise the Senator from Delaware that I thought his amendment was sound. After talking over the matter with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] I found that I might have been slightly confused. The Senator from Florida will have something to say about the amendment. There is no doubt that the amendment, as now worded, is discriminatory.

However, as I said in my speech the other day on the floor of the Senate, on this subject, it seemed to me that it did not discriminate very much, because most of the potatoes which are planted now and some which are now on the market in the extreme southern section of the country sell on the market for a price higher than the support price. There may be a few exceptions to that; but on the whole, as I understand from the Department of Agriculture—and the Senators from the South can correct me if I am wrong as to this—I think probably 90 percent of all the potatoes which will be produced in the next month will sell at a price higher than the support price. So the support price really does not have too much effect on what we call the early potatoes which are grown in the southern area of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if we accept the statements by the Senator from Illinois as correct, then there would be no objection at all to my amendment, because if the support price is not necessary to the southern potatoes, it would not make any difference whether we change this provision, and the amendment would eliminate the discrimination in respect to the farmers, from Virginia and North Carolina west to the California coast.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the Senator from Delaware that in view of the opposition of my distinguished friend the Senator from Florida, who is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I should like to have the Senator from Delaware present the amendment, and I should like to have the Senate vote on it, rather than to adopt it as my own at the present time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, in line 12, it is proposed to strike out the word "planted" and insert in lieu thereof the word "harvested."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as I have pointed out, I think my amendment is most necessary because of the planting season in North Carolina and Virginia. The potato farmers in those States are now in the midst of planting. In the next 3 weeks, given reasonably good weather, the potato farmers in North Carolina will be able to complete the planting, if it is necessary that they do so in order to get under the deadline; and the same thing is true in regard to most of the potato farmers in Virginia.

As evidence of the fact that a large percentage of the potatoes from that area do move through Government channels, under the support program, I shall show how the potatoes from North Carolina were moving in 1948. I do not have the 1949 records with me; however, so far as I know, the 1948 figures present a fair comparison with those for 1949.

On June 22, 1948, the State of North Carolina shipped 195 carloads of potatoes. That area would be involved under this particular amendment. Of the 195 carloads of potatoes which North Carolina shipped on that day, 155 of these went under the Government support program and were diverted from the normal channels of trade.

On the same date, the Eastern Shore of Virginia shipped 132 carloads of potatoes. Sixty-five of those carloads of potatoes, or nearly half, went to the Government support program.

The Norfolk section of Virginia, south of Chesapeake Bay, where the potatoes could be planted in time to come under this proposal, shipped on the same day 73 carloads of potatoes, and 64 carloads of them were sold under the Government support program.

So a large proportion of the southern potatoes can and do move under the Government support program and can result in just as great destruction of potatoes as we are now experiencing.

To show that June 23 was not an unusual day, so far as shipments of potatoes are concerned, if we refer to the situation on the following day, we find that on that day North Carolina loaded 149 carloads of potatoes, and only 16 carloads of those potatoes went into the normal channels of trade, whereas 133 carloads of them were diverted to alcohol factories or for use in other ways.

On the same day the Eastern Shore of Virginia shipped 264 carloads of potatoes, and 176 carloads of them went under the Government support program.

I do not think it is necessary for me to read the figure for all the States which shipped potatoes on that day; but the records show that as to the potatoes produced in the intermediate States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Georgia, and the States to the west of them, a large proportion of the potatoes move into the support program, as much so as do the northern potatoes. If at this point we are going to try to correct the potato situation by repealing price support so far as all northern potato farmers are concerned, then let us repeal price support so far as all the potato farmers throughout the country are concerned.

As the Senator from Illinois points out, when we do that at this time, it is discrimination against one group of farmers, because then we have singled out as a guinea pig, we might say, the potato farmers. However, if we are going to single out the potato farmers, because of the scandal insofar as potatoes are concerned, let us do so with respect to all potato farmers, not merely those in one section of the country, because it has been costing just as much money to administer the price-support program for southern potatoes as it has for northern potatoes.

Another reason, and to my mind the most important one, why the Senate should adopt this amendment is that if it is not adopted the result will be that all the potatoes which are planted prior to the enactment of the law will have price support, whereas those which are planted after the enactment of the law will not have price support. Consider the situation, for instance, in Virginia or in North Carolina or in any other State of the Union, for that matter: There would be no way on earth by which the Government could tell whether John Jones planted his potatoes before midnight of a certain day or whether he planted them the following morning, after the bill had been signed. There would be no way to tell which group of farmers planted their potatoes before the joint resolution was signed and which group of farmers planted their potatoes after it was signed.

Under those circumstances, there is no way on earth by which a law based on the exact time of planting could be administered. Therefore, any law enacted under those circumstances, when we have knowledge of that situation, is ill-advised and unsound.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think we have no alternative but to repeal price support all the way across the board, or else drop the project in its entirety.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEAHY in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Was there any implied promise to those who planted potatoes that they would continue under existing supports? Would the present proposal result in our violating what might be called an implied representation or promise to them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would say, in reply to the Senator's suggestion, that the proposal of the Senator from Illinois under section 2 constitutes a violation of an implied promise on the part of the Government to the potato farmers. But my point is that if we are going to violate that promise, let us violate it to all the farmers, not merely to a few farmers in the North, and leave the southern farmers unaffected by that violation. In other words, my point is that it is impossible to separate the groups of farmers, so far as this matter is concerned.

I think the Senator will recognize, as I do, that if the farmers of Colorado today are in the midst of planting, there will be no way on earth 3 months from now to tell whether the farmers planted their potatoes today or tomorrow. In fact, any farmer would run his tractors all night, in order to get all his potatoes planted ahead of the effective date—and so would I, if I were in his position.

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois could not be enforced; there is no way on earth by which it could be enforced. The result would be that the farmers would plant exceptionally heavy during the next 3 weeks; consequently, when the harvesting season came, all those potatoes would be harvested in the same period. That would result in a great congestion of the potatoes next summer and a completely demoralized market. All of them would be harvested at one time, and that would cost the Government an amount of money which could hardly be imagined.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As to the farmers who plant their potatoes after the measure becomes law, would there be the same degree of violation of implied promises?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That would depend entirely on how far——

Mr. MILLIKIN. I mean to say, the farmer would be planting his potatoes at that time with his eyes open; he would know what was ahead of him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Colorado will agree with me, I think, that it depends entirely upon how soon a time following enactment of the measure the Senator from Colorado has in mind. As to Maine, I agree with the Senator, but I am referring to farmers in the area where potatoes are now being planted. Such a farmer—John Jones, let us say—might plant his potatoes today. John Smith, with the same intentions and the same promise from the Government that his price would be supported, has bought his seed potatoes and has bought his fertilizer and has plowed the ground and has done everything except put the potatoes in the ground. In respect to this proposal, we would have the same responsibility with respect to the man who is planting his potatoes tomorrow as we would with respect to the man who is planting his potatoes today, because each of them has made his investment and has no alternative but to proceed.

The amendment of the Senator from Illinois proposes such a violation of a promise; but if we are going to violate the promise, we should do so for the entire group, because, as I have said, 3 months from now it will be impossible to obtain sufficient enforcement agencies to be able to determine just when the potatoes were planted. Unless we are going to make a division on geographical lines and say that the distinction shall apply to all potatoes south of a certain line, it will be impracticable to make such a division.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS There is no question about the force of the argument presented by the Senator from Delaware, and there is no question about the discrimination or about the repudiation of the implied promise on the part of the Government.

I do not think the Senator from Colorado was in the Chamber the other day when we were discussing the potato situation. My only purpose in offering the amendment, I may say to the Senator from Colorado, is that from the standpoint of the Treasury of the United States, the potato situation is so serious that the time has come when the Congress must take some action with respect to the potato program. Otherwise, the potato program alone, which has cost the taxpayers half a billion dollars, will ultimately destroy the foundation stones of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which has done so much for the farmers of the Nation.

When the Senator from Illinois submitted the amendment the other day before the committee—and it was carried in the committee—he came to the floor of the Senate immediately thereafter and presented a measure which would place the potato growers of the United States under the same strict, rigid controls as the ones presently applying to the farmers who are producing the basic commodities, such as wheat, corn, tobacco, and cotton. I propose to follow that through immediately with hearings, and to have reported to the Senate a bill which will place the potato growers under such controls, to the end that we shall not have a potato surplus every year.

My thought was, I may say to the Senator, that the only way we can get quick action on that matter is to cut off the support price entirely until we can act on a bill of the kind I have mentioned. If we do not do so, we may not get down to business on a bill and, in the end, we may lose at least $50,000,000 upon the 1950 potato crop. I am trying to save that for the Treasury.

Senators on the other side of the aisle, as well as Senators on this side of the aisle who are talking about economy all the time should realize that here is an opportunity to save $50,000,000, without hurting anyone. The potato growers have fared better than any other group of farmers in America. We cannot continue these large subsidies.

I am not blaming anyone. The Congress of the United States, Democrats and Republicans alike, are responsible. We had the program during the war. We followed it after the war. The Eightieth Congress followed the same mandatory price-support program, and at the present time, in the Anderson bill, potatoes are placed under a mandatory price support of from 60 to 90 percent. The move proposed by the amendment seems to be in the right direction, although I admit it repudiates an implied promise, and is drastic legislation. But sometimes drastic legislation is necessary in order to arrive at a solution of an existing problem.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the able Senator from Illinois pointed out the possibility that $50,000,000 might be saved through the enactment of the amendment he proposes. I think that is a fine saving; heaven knows I am for it. But it occurs to me, and I should like to ask the able Senator from Delaware whether it is not correct, that if by the operation of the proposal of the Senator from Illinois, $50,000,000 can be saved, cannot a substantially greater amount be saved by accepting the perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unquestionably. I should say that about half the cost of the program will apply to the potatoes which would be planted prior to the possible enactment of the legislation. I agree with the Senator from Illinois it is drastic legislation, and I also agree with him that drastic legislation perhaps is necessary if we are to clean up a situation which has become a national scandal. I have criticized the potato program on numerous occasions during the past 3 years, yet we have never been able to get any legislation which would correct the situation.

I understand the Senator from Illinois has introduced a bill which he considers a step toward a solution of the problem. I think we should approach the problem with the thought in mind of solving it, not of going through another year, 1950, throwing away another $100,000,000 and destroying a large volume of good edible food. I shall support the Senator from Illinois in his effort. As to whether his bill is what I would go along with, I do not know; I have not studied it. But I think we should take some action to obviate the wholesale destruction of potatoes, and not sit idly by and have a repetition in 1950 of what has happened during the past 5 years.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I want to thank him for the statement he has just made. I am very grateful to him for his viewpoint, which coincides with that of the Senator from Illinois. I am not so much interested in the word "planting," as against the word "harvesting." I think, however, the Senator from Delaware has a very valuable point with regard to the substitution of the word. My amendment involves a deeper principle. I am trying to get something done with the potato program which will prevent a repetition of the scandalous things which have happened under the potato program year after year, and which have disturbed the press and the people of the country. It simply does not seem to me to be fair and right that potatoes should be subjected to no controls when other commodities, such as the basic commodities I mentioned a moment ago, are under rigid support controls.

I am tremendously concerned with the wheat program, the corn program, and the soybean program in Illinois and the Middle West. I am trying to do something to stop the criticism and public condemnation of the entire program which has been enacted by the Congress over the past few years. That is all the Senator from Illinois is trying to do. I am trying in the long run to eliminate the objectionable features from the potato program, and these include the exorbitant subsidies; in this way we may save the rest of the agricultural program.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like first to reply to the Senator from Illinois, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL Very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not question the intentions of the Senator from Illinois, nor do I object to what he is trying to achieve. I point out, however—and I think perhaps the Senator will agree with me—that in trying to achieve his goal by means of his amendment to the joint resolution in the manner in which he has written it, there is a possibility that it would cost the Government several million dollars more than would be necessary, as a result of encouraging the farmers, by placing the incentive before them, to plant more rapidly for the next 3 or 4 weeks' period.

The Government would have to buy those potatoes at the particular time of the year when many of them could not be stored for an indefinite period. They would rot. Therefore, they would be removed from the market channels and within 3 or 4 weeks thereafter there would be a shortage of other potatoes coming into the market. It would result in exorbitantly high prices to the consumers. Therefore without my amendment, I think we would defeat the purpose we have in mind. We might save $25,000,000 or $50,000,000 in one place, but we could very well lose more than half of it in another place, and thus benefit no one. I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I shall ask the Senator from Delaware a question in a moment. I shall have to precede it by a very brief statement, so I can make my question intelligible. I noticed with some concern the confession made by both the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Illinois that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois involves a repudiation of an implied agreement. I do not like to be put in the position, and I do not think any other Member of the Senate does, of voting for an amendment which amounts to a repudiation of an agreement, expressed or implied.

What I want to ask the Senator is this: Is not this the correct actual situation: Whenever Congress passes a law, such as the price-support law, it does so with the entire moral and legal right both to repeal and change the law at any time the national welfare shall make it advisable so to do, and therefore, even though the law be in effect at the moment of planting, any farmer who plants and makes his investment in advance, as was indicated a little while ago, does so subject not only to the legal right but to the moral right of the Congress in safeguarding the interests of the Nation to change or repeal the law at any time. I do not at all agree with the view that in adopting the amendment, whether it be with the word "harvested" or with the word "planted," we are violating any agreement, expressed or implied I ask the Senator whether he does not think my statement is a correct statement of the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Missouri is correct—that Congress has a right to repeal or change any law which may have been passed. While I feel that there is an implied promise to the farmers, I point out to the Senator from Missouri, as a reason why I have no objections to going along with the change at this time, that when the support price was first passed as a wartime measure, we told the farmers that within a certain period after the war the price-support program would be discontinued. The farmer, therefore, fully expected no supports in the postwar period, yet Congress did extend such supports. By the same token, we are changing it now. It may be said we violated an implied promise when we projected the price-support program for another year or two, yet there was no objection. The fact that we projected it beyond the period when we said it would cease does not preclude our perfect right to stop it at any time we wish.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I merely wanted to make it perfectly clear at this point that, if I vote for the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, I shall not consider

that I am violating any moral obligation of the Government any more than I am violating a legal obligation. If I thought it violated a moral obligation, I do not think I should vote for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Missouri about that. I think we have to weigh the other factors involved, such as the effect on agriculture generally and on the Nation as a whole if we fail to take this action.

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the other factors outweigh the consideration of the immediate welfare of the potato growers, then we have no alternative except to vote for the amendment to repeal the potato-support program.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. In other words, I take it the Senator agrees that the Congress, the legislative body of the Nation, is charged with a duty and responsibility of taking care, so far as legislation can do it, along these lines, of the welfare of the people of the United States as an entirety.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. And when we pass price support law, particularly as the Senator has well pointed out, during the war conditions, we pass that law with the moral as well as the legal right to change it whenever in the judgment of Congress the best interests of the Nation will be subserved by such change. Is not that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the way I feel. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, much as I always dislike to disagree with the able lawyer from Missouri, the distinguished Senator [Mr. DONNELL], I am constrained to say that, in my opinion, the passing of the so-called Anderson bill occurred at a time when the potato farmers of the country had already planted potatoes. There can be no question about that so far as the South is concerned. At the present time they are operating under the law. When we follow through with the amendment I have offered, if it should become law, we are absolutely repudiating not only an implied, but an expressed promise written into the law. In the opinion of the Senator from Illinois, we have a right to repudiate it because of the great emergency which exists in the potato-subsidy situation. That is my reason for offering the amendment. In other words, I am willing to do what I am trying to do because I believe it is a step in the right direction toward saving the entire farm program from complete collapse. As I think every Senator knows, public confidence is pretty low with regard to the potato program. If the economy of the Nation demands such a drastic step, I am willing to take it. If any Senator says that we are not repudating an implied promise, I cannot agree with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Regardless of whether we are repudiating an expressed or implied promise, there is no more repudiation in changing the wording as I suggest than would otherwise be the case.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a different proposition. The whole tenor of my amendment is not changed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was my understanding that the Senator from Illinois was attempting to work out some correction of the potato problem.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. If I had not introduced a bill following this amendment my conscience would not be very clear. But we shall have a bill before this session of Congress which will place the potato growers of the Nation in the spot in which I think they want to be. In other words, I believe they want complete and rigid controls from here on. They do not want to be placed in their present situation any more than does any other farmer in the Nation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. We have had much discussion about morality, and particularly about the manner in which things have been carried on by the administration. I had never suspected that the Senator from Missouri would take a more liberal view, let me say, on this question than has the administration. I want to read what I think is an entirely accurate statement:

> It has been the historic policy of the Department of Agriculture not to change a program in the middle of a crop season. The Department policy in this respect has been repeatedly stated by numerous high officials.
>
> The most recent official reiteration of record of the Department's policy was the testimony of Mr. Ralph S Trigg, Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration, and President of the Commodity Credit Corporation.
>
> Mr. Trigg, while testifying on September 19, 1949, before a Senate subcommittee hearing on S. 2482, to repeal price support on potatoes and eggs, stated the policy of the Department, in reply to a question, in the following language.
>
> "If there are any adjustments to be made, we think they should be made at the end of a marketing season of a commodity, whether it is a calendar-year basis or another basis, but not in the middle of a program to the extent of removing supports entirely."
>
> We have been assured today, by other top-ranking officials of the Department of Agriculture, that that policy has not been changed.

In other words, they recognize that there is some obligation, certainly moral and possibly legal, when we have announced a program and farmers have proceeded under it to carry on. Our wartime program was to be carried on for 2 years after the war. We lowered the support price of potatoes from 90 to 60 percent. We continued the program on the other basic commodities. That was a carefully considered action. This is the first time there has been a responsible suggestion that a change in the middle of a season did not constitute some degree of repudiation of certainly an implied obligation. I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Illinois, who frankly recognizes that is the case, although he feels that the circumstances justify it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I want the Senator from Maine to understand that the Senator from Illinois is doing this on his own responsibility, and not as majority leader. I conferred with the Department of Agriculture concerning this amendment, and also concerning the bill which I introduced, and representatives of that Department helped me prepare the bill. I think the Secretary of Agriculture, if he were called to testify, would probably take the same position he took in September.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, since the validity of the moral pronouncements of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has been called into question, may I defer my request for recognition? It is such a strange and unusual situation that I should like to hear what the able Senator has to say about it.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not think it is necessary for me to say much more, because I think my position is perfectly clear and sound. I appreciate what the Senator from Maine has said. I assume he was reading from—was it someone's testimony?

Mr. BREWSTER. It was a statement by the Potato Council. The quotation which I read was from Mr. Trigg's testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Illinois was kind enough to say that the Secretary of Agriculture would confirm the statement that we did not contemplate changing the program in the middle of the season.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I can well understand that the policy of not changing the program during the middle of the crop season is perfectly sound and should be followed, but I do not think that alters the fact that the Congress of the United States is entitled at any moment to use its best judgment as to whether existing laws, whether they be price-support laws, tariff laws, or whatever they may be, should be changed or repealed. When I vote for a bill which is to be enacted into law, unless there is some provision which says how long it shall remain in effect, I think every Member of the Congress has a perfect right, if we find conditions changed to the extent that it is advisable to act from the standpoint of the welfare of the Nation as a whole, to vote to repeal such a law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I concur with the Senator from Missouri in the statement that we have a perfect right to do so. We have a perfect right to change a law at any time. This is not the first time it has happened.

The price-support law was supposed to expire 2 years after the war. In 1948,

in the latter days of the session, we enacted the so-called Hope-Aiken law. Had it not been enacted, there would have been no price-support provisions. The potatoes in Maine were in the ground at that time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator is in error. The potatoes were in the storehouses.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We enacted that law in June. It was during the planting season in Maine. We enacted it about the 19th of June, because it was almost the last act of Congress at that session. The same is true of 1949, when we enacted the Anderson bill. We changed the rules in the middle of the game with regard to the wheat farmers, who planted wheat in the fall. After the wheat was planted, we changed the rate of support. Congress has done that on other occasions. I think we have a right to change the rules the other way.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The actual facts are that potatoes are planted certainly before the end of June. They are usually planted before the 1st of June. The Senator says we changed the law. As a matter of fact, under the marketing practices, Maine potatoes are all in storehouses by November. I think the Senator from Delaware must be familiar with that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. In other words, on December 31 potato prices were still supported at 90 percent. Every potato in Maine necessarily must have gone into the hands of the Government unless there was some assurance that they would be supported for the remainder of the marketing season. It is quite true that the wartime program could have expired on December 31, but everyone with common sense recognized that unless there was some support of the 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 bushels of potatoes remaining in the northern market at that time they would all be turned over to the Government. It was for that very practical reason that the support price on potatoes was extended for 6 months, the remainder of the marketing season. In my judgment that was nothing other than a recognition of a practical solution of the problem. It does not seem to serve as an example of changing the situation in the middle of a crop season.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not questioning the right of Congress to extend the program 6 months beyond the first of the year in order to give them time to market the potatoes.

Mr. BREWSTER. It saved the Government millions of dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Otherwise the Government would have had many more potatoes at the end of December. I recognize that fact.

Mr. BREWSTER. Those potatoes would have been turned over to the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the fact remains that in 1948, after the potatoes were planted, Congress did change the rules of the game for the subsequent year. Last year, when Congress projected 90-percent support on wheat for this year's crop, again Congress changed the rules of the game. Had the Anderson Act not passed, the flexible provisions of the Aiken law with its lower price supports would have been in effect. So that we have on other occasions during the crop year changed the level of support on agricultural commodities. When we adopted the support program at the beginning of the war it was all new legislation.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder whether the Senator will recognize the fact that there is a moral obligation which the Government owes to the potato and wheat growers. If the Government decides to increase the allotment, certainly there is no violation of any moral or legal obligation, but if the Government decides to curtail and reduce the allotment, the situation is quite different. No one is suggesting that the Government does not have a legal and moral right to be more generous. Whether the Government has a right to repudiate an obligation already existing is the issue which is presented here.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I deny that there is any obligation existing. I do not believe there is.

Mr. BREWSTER. I said that is the question which is presented here.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator indulge me, please. I would appreciate it if the Senator would permit me to finish my statement. I agree that in a normal situation there should never be any change made during a crop season. I fully agree with that. I believe it would take an extraordinary situation to justify Congress to change rules during a season. However, I think that if Congress, in its wisdom, determines that the situation is such that the best interests of the Nation as an entirety will be served by a change during the season, Congress has a perfect right, not only legally, but morally, and indeed, the duty, under some circumstances, to do it.

Mr. President, if I may I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Delaware. Does the Senator from Delaware believe that merely because Congress provides a certain tariff level, let us say, on a particular commodity, which leads investors to erect buildings and make their investments, Congress is thereby precluded from changing the tariff whenever, in its judgment, the best interests of the Nation as a whole may make it advisable to do so?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It has always been recognized that Congress can change any law which it has enacted, and that it should change a law at any time the best interests of the country as a whole justify the change. It is more unfortunate that the correction was not made at the time of the enactment of the law last year.

Last year when the Anderson bill came back from conference, I was one of the Senators who voted against the bill, because, as I pointed out at that time, I felt it would not work, and that it would ultimately result in the greatest wholesale destruction of food which the country had ever known. I still feel that way about it. I believe that section 2 is a step toward correcting the potato situation. We may see other food-destruction programs if we do not now recognize the fact that we have on the statute books a farm program which cannot be supported by the Treasury. The program must be lowered, not only on potatoes, but on other commodities. I intend to introduce another amendment to the pending resolution which I believe will partly take care of the situation. If we do not lower the support prices, potatoes will be only a small fraction of the overall loss.

Mr. MILLIKIN and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have little remaining interest in the debate, because the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri has restored the pillars to the temple, and I am satisfied with his definition of the law. I should like to remind the distinguished Senator from Delaware that of course the purpose of agricultural acts is to serve notice on the farmer how he can plan his life, do his work, and how he can invest his capital. I agree that we can change any law. We can make a tax law retroactive, within certain limits. We can, as the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri has suggested, change our tariff laws. We can change anything we have passed. We can undo it and we can amend it. The question is still whether we should do it. I did not want what is proposed here glossed over with any kind of fancy semantics. We have passed a law under which people have planted crops. The question is whether we should change the law before the crops are harvested, and after the farmers have spent their money, and after they may have changed their ways of life. Perhaps the situation warrants it. A very strong argument can be made that it is an extravagant law, that it provides unjust windfalls, or a law that we cannot see through, and that a change is warranted. However, I should like to see this debate proceed on the basis of what is really involved, without any glossing over with fancy terminology. We changed our gold-clause contracts at one time on the ground of paramount public interest. We have done all kinds of things of that type. Some of them, I think, were unfortunate. I think we should always be extra cautious in pulling back any implied promise to people. We should have a very strong case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The point I am making is that we should not take one group of farmers and penalize them alone. Let us take all potato farmers and put them in one group. Let us not draw a geographical line across the

country and say that we are going to repeal supports on only those farmers north of the line. If we do not do that, we do a severe injustice to farmers who are in the midst of the planting season because it would encourage them, by dangling our price supports, to go ahead and plant potatoes in the next 2 weeks that they would normally plant in late March or early April.

If Congress is going to take this drastic action, if that is what we decide to do, I think we should not upset what might remain of our so-called free market by now taking action which will completely demoralize the potato market next June and July.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has answered in part an objection which I raised to his argument awhile ago—that is, he points out an administrative difficulty. I still suggest that there is a difference between changing the rule on someone who has already planted his crop and changing it on someone who has not planted his crop. The Senator answers by saying that there is a dead line that causes administrative and policing difficulties. That situation exists as to every piece of legislation in which there is provided an effective date.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not to the extent to which we have it in this case. If it were not for the fact that the law could not possibly be enforced, as I see it, I would not propose the change. I can see a greater responsibility with regard to the acres which are planted than as to those which are not, yet there are borderline cases in which we have an equal responsibility. When a man who has now gone to the extent of investing his money ready for planting we do have the same responsibility. That is the difficulty of trying to correct the situation in the middle of the season.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Colorado is not now taking any position in this matter. I have listened with great interest to the debate, but, as I said before, we should know what we are doing, and know the implications.

Mr. THYE and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I wish to say that the Senator from Delaware is entirely correct in calling to our attention the fact that unless some emphasis is placed upon the question of the acres to be harvested, there will be a rush to plant additional acres before the measure goes into effect, thereby causing greater difficulty to the administrators, and possibly placing a heavier drain upon the Treasury than otherwise would be placed on it.

I also call to the attention of the Senate the fact that there are times when the rules are changed. For instance, take the poultry producer whose flock of pullets comes into production in the fall of the year. The Department of Agriculture reduced the support price for eggs 8 cents as of the first of the year. The pullets to which I have referred are grown throughout the summer of the previous year, and come into production in the late fall. They are actually in production now, and the producers are receiving 8 cents a dozen less for the eggs than they actually anticipated at the time they placed their orders for the baby chicks, and grew the pullets.

Mr. President, that group of farmers are certainly placed under a handicap, in view of the high prices of grain, such as corn and wheat, under the high-support levels. They are being placed under a further handicap because they are the buyers of this high-priced grain which they must acquire in order to produce the eggs. So I say that the producers of poultry and the producers of eggs have been placed under a handicap in the past 2 months because of the new announced support price on eggs.

I believe the amendment offered by the able Senator from Illinois, by which he proposes immediately to strike off any support to potatoes does not go far enough. To that amendment there should be coupled an actual acreage control or a marketing agreement provision so as to cover it all But that cannot be done on the floor. Such proposed legislation should go to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and an intelligent program developed through hearings. Producers should be allowed to come before the Senate committee. In that manner it could be determined what should be embodied in the legislation. Then it could be brought to the floor and enacted. In that way the producers would have greater confidence that all of us were trying to get to the bottom of the question, and draw up the legislation in the proper manner.

At the present time of the farmers who are engaged in the production of potatoes there are those who have held back a certain amount of seed stocks which are now in warehouses to be planted this spring. They probably lost an opportunity either to sell seed potatoes to the producers in the deep South or they have lost the opportunity to place their potatoes on the market. I think we are changing the rules at a time when it is going to be most embarrassing to the farmer who held back seed stock which he proposed to sell to the southern producers when the southern producers asked for seed last fall.

Mr. President, I share the feelings of the Senator from Illinois. I know he is sincere in his efforts, and that he is just as grieved over the fact that we must change the rules at this late date, as any other Senator could possibly be. But I honestly believe that we should not confuse the growers any more than they are already confused, by agreeing to the amendment, unless we can couple the amendment with some expression that we intend to deal with the subject by legislation which will embody marketing agreements and also acreage controls, so that when the producers see us in action here they will know that they are going to be protected in the end, rather than that all support is going to be taken off.

The earlier potatoes are already coming to market. Some of the potato farmers have already had the benefit of the 60-percent support on crops they have now harvested. So I say that before we act on the amendment let us embody acreage control or marketing agreements so that we may know what we will have in the legislation, and where we will be after the legislation has been enacted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I think it is most unfortunate that we are trying to write this legislation on the floor. Nevertheless, we are confronted with the fact that we have pending on the calendar a measure which is now before the Senate by which it is proposed to repeal the price support of all potatoes which are planted thereafter. If we are going to do that, let us do it with our eyes open, and let us do it across the board Let us not divide the potato farmers into two groups, but do it all across the board, and thereby remove or do away with the congested period of potato harvesting, which would not only upset the economy of the farmers, but also increase the cost of the program so far as the Government is concerned.

The Senator from Minnesota has overlooked one thing. He pointed out that only on the basis of acreage control can we hope that a reasonable quantity of potatoes will be planted. I was not necessarily referring to that fact.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator permit me to correct my own statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me finish, and then I will yield.

It is not a question that the potato farmers will plant more potatoes than they would with or without the law. What I am trying to point out is that Farmer John Jones would at an earlier date plant the 10 acres he is going to plant, perhaps the first of April He will rush and get them in the ground the latter part of February or the first of March, thus trying to get them under the deadline. The result will be not more acreage planted, but simply a congestion for a period of 2 or 3 weeks of potato planting, whereas the planting of potatoes should be spread out over the usual period. That is the reason why I offered the amendment, so that if the legislation is enacted, it will not result in upsetting the economy for the marketing season in the months to come.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield long enough so I may correct my own statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Instead of saying acreage quotas I should have said marketing quotas. I should like to correct the RECORD in that respect. Then we would overcome the difficulty the Senator from Delaware has called to our attention. If we have marketing quotas we would overcome the difficulty the Senator from Delaware has outlined.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think the Senator understood me. Let us consider for example the county of Wicomico in Maryland immediately below where I live. If the legislation took its

normal course, up to the time of the signing of the measure by the President, the farmers in that county could rush their planting and get most of their potatoes into the ground ahead of the deadline. Under the marketing quota they are still entitled to plant the potatoes when they get ready to do so, and they can market them when they get ready to do so. What I am contending is that unless the amendment I have offered is agreed to, farmers will rush to plant their potatoes in a 2- or 3-week period, earlier than they otherwise would, and they would be ready at a time when the North Carolina potatoes would come into the market Marketing quotas do not provide that a farmer can market only so many potatoes at a given date. It merely provides that so many potatoes may be planted, but the date for planting may be earlier or later.

Mr. THYE Mr. President, at the outset I said I approved of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware to the committee amendment because it went further than the latter and would have the effect of protecting the Treasury against the potatoes now in the ground or that could be planted in the next few weeks. But I went even further and said that unless we provided in the law for marketing agreements, marketing quotas, we would confuse the producers or growers of potatoes, rather than clarify the situation for them. It is for that reason I said that while the Senator from Illinois is absolutely correct in offering his amendment and the Senator from Delaware is absolutely correct in proposing his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, yet both of them leave a problem still unanswered, and that we should enact legislation which would provide for marketing agreements and marketing quotas, and which should go through the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where hearings could be had. In that way confidence on the part of the producer would be developed, because he would have an opportunity to be heard before the legislation was enacted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement in response to what the able Senator from Minnesota has said. The Senator from Minnesota was not present last week when I introduced a bill on the subject of potatoes. Previously an amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois had been placed in the joint resolution The Senator from Illinois made a short statement respecting it, and followed that by introducing a bill.

It is the opinion of the Senator from Illinois that the only way that legislation affecting potatoes can be passed in the present session of Congress is to adopt the amendment.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has now returned to the Senate. He introduced a measure similar to the one I recently introduced. I am satisfied, from his attitude the other day, that he is willing and ready to hold hearings immediately upon that bill. So long as we have in the joint resolution the amendment I proposed, we are bound to get a potato bill this year. But just so sure as the amendment is not agreed to, the hearings will drag out over weeks, and we may not have any action in the House. What will then happen is that we will have another year of large potato surpluses, with no relief for the taxpayers of America. That is what I want to point out to the Senator from Minnesota.

Furthermore, if the potato program is permitted to continue, and potato growers are subsidized out of all reasonable proportions, then, as I have said many times before, our entire farm program dealing with the basic commodities will be seriously threatened. The potato growers are not objecting, as I understand, to being placed under rigid control through marketing quotas and marketing agreements. But what I fear is that if we do not agree to the amendment we will not get a potato bill through the present session of the Congress. If we do not get it passed during this session of the Congress, not only will the Treasury lose a great deal of money, but the farmers and the people generally will lose confidence in the entire farm program. The Senator from Minnesota is no more anxious to pass a bill of this sort than is the Senator from Illinois.

The Senator from Illinois made it very clear in his speech that he was ready to go forward at the proper time and have hearings on the potato bill which I introduced. That bill is rather a long one. It is technical in nature Hearings will be held upon it. Such a bill cannot be written upon the floor of the Senate and acted upon on the floor of the Senate Therefore, it seemed to me the wise thing to do was to offer a simple amendment which everyone can understand, and the adoption of which will definitely produce a potato bill this year.

Mr THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator does agree, then, that he will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware because that would cover all potatoes, and not impose a drastic hardship on those growing potatoes in the latter part of the season or the latter part of the year It would affect all growers of potatoes whose potatoes would be marketed today and marketed henceforth.

Mr. LUCAS I told the Senator from Delaware that I was very much in sympathy with his amendment and I thought it proper that I should go along with him in substituting the word "harvested" for "planted."

But after talking to my good friend, the Senator from Florida, who is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I suggested to the Senator from Delaware that he had better present the amendment and let the Senate vote upon it, because the Senator from Florida is much opposed to it.

But I am in total sympathy with what the Senator is trying to do.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure we appreciate the position of the Senator from Illinois and we know how greatly he is concerned about the matter. I appreciate also the degree of influence which he wields on the floor of the Senate and the control he exercises over the program we take up here. So there could be no Member of the Senate who would be more likely to be able to redeem his assurance that this will be taken care of in due course.

But I think even he recognizes, in view of the history of legislation, that the execution of the potato growers at this time, as is accomplished by his amendment, coupled with the assurance of the Senator from Illinois that subsequently there will be legislation which will take care of them, does leave them in a somewhat precarious position, particularly because I believe the Senator from Illinois will agree that legislation looking to this matter has been before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for 5 months, but no hearings have been held. If hearings had been held, we could have gone into this matter. The potato producers are ready to go into hearings on it, and I can assure the Senator that there will be no delay so far as the potato growers are concerned. The delay which has occurred thus far has been due to other legislative problems.

We are not critical; but we feel it is a little drastic, particularly when we are not the cause of the delay, for the Senator from Illinois to cut off price supports now, with the assurance that subsequent action will be taken.

Mr. LUCAS Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that it is a little drastic, but not in view of the potato situation, particularly when potatoes have had support preference over any other agricultural commodity, either basic or nonbasic. So I think the potato growers could stand a complete loss this year and still would be far ahead.

However, I am not proceeding on that theory in any way whatsoever. I am proceeding on the theory of getting a potato bill passed at this session, so that we can stop the trend of a detrimental public attitude, a lack of public confidence in the entire program, and also save $50,000,000 or $75,000,000 of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. BREWSTER. What the Senator from Illinois is doing speaks so loud that it is difficult for us to hear what he says If only the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would have a hearing on the quota bill of the Senator from Illinois or the quota bill of the Senator from Oklahoma, then we would be very greatly reassured.

Mr. LUCAS I guarantee the Senator from Maine that there will be a hearing upon the potato bill. I do not know whether the Senator from Oklahoma is now in the Chamber, but I know exactly how he feels about the matter; and there will be a hearing.

The only way we shall get a hearing and the enactment of a bill on the subject is by adopting this amendment at this time, because the protests among the potato growers will then be so strong for the enactment of the kind of a program envisioned by the bills which have been introduced that we simply will have to hold hearings.

Mr. BREWSTER. The potato growers have not been able thus far to influence the Senator from Illinois to adopt their viewpoint, so we are not sure that it will be possible to do so subsequently. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has had full power to hold hearings at any time in the last 5 months.

Mr. LUCAS. I am only one of the members of the committee. During that period the potato growers have not talked to me at any time about holding any hearings whatsoever. I think they perhaps have written to the chairman of the committee. But the Senator can count on having the Senator from Illinois cooperate with the potato growers in obtaining the passage of the proposed legislation to which I have referred and thereby prevent the recurrence of potato surpluses.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. When the Senator refers to the bonanza for the potato growers, that may be true of some of those who have been growing potatoes for a long time; but I am thinking of some of the thousands and thousands of young men who have started in that business since the end of the war, and who probably have obligated themselves not only to produce potatoes but also in respect to certain seed stock. Such young men now have their seed stock on hand for planting in the coming season. I am thinking of them. By the action proposed here today, we would take everything away from them.

Senators say that if this amendment prevails, they promise the potato growers a day in court, so to speak, a day before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I know the Senator from Illinois will see that there will be a Senate committee hearing on his bill. I know he will do that. I will help him, if necessary, to get it; but I do not think he will need my help.

Nevertheless, we will go through the entire spring season with argument on the proposed legislation, and we may not be able to secure its enactment, for in the measure now before us there is no mandatory provision on our part, in respect to the enactment of such legislation.

As a result, we leave in a serious predicament the young potato grower who has assumed the obligation of purchasing high-priced machinery and paying inflationary prices and paying high prices for seed. We leave him with no assurance that he will get any relief in the future, although, probably, he was one of the young men who carried the responsibilities of the Nation by fighting on the battlefields in the recent war; and since that time, over a period of the last 3 or 4 years, perhaps, he has gone into farming. We would do away with all price supports so far as he is concerned, and we would do so just as he is preparing to plant his crop.

Therefore, I think we should deal with the entire question now, and not now cut the price supports from under him; and perhaps later, perhaps in 3 or 4 weeks, begin a hearing, but perhaps by the conclusion of the session not give him any support.

The young man who incurred many obligations in order to have a chance at the bonanza to which the Senator from Illinois has referred will not be the one who will be protected; the one who will be protected will be the man who has made his bonanza, and who probably will be in Florida, and can stand the change.

I am not talking about the latter group. I am talking about the young men who, during the past 3 or 4 years, in a time of inflationary prices, have had to purchase the equipment and have already made that investment.

That is why I do not wish to see this amendment prevail, because it will take everything away from such young men, and will leave them dependent upon the possibility of the taking of future action by the committee and by the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not think it is possible to enact any law which does not have an adverse effect upon someone. The argument the Senator from Minnesota is making can always be made, namely, that someone will be adversely affected. It is true that a man who went into the potato business last year or this year may be hurt a little. But that always is the case; someone is always getting economically hit, so to speak, as a result of the enactment of legislation. If that argument were valid, and if we had to follow that theory from beginning to end, no legislation affecting the economy of the country would ever be enacted.

The Senator can take that position, of course; and it is perfectly logical for him to do so if he wishes to. But I am one who cannot continue to see the editorials and the articles which are written about potatoes, and continue to receive the hundreds of letters from people in my section of the country who ask, "What, if anything, can you do about potatoes?" without attempting to do something about them.

The Senator from Minnesota and I both know that the potato growers have had half a billion dollars in subsidies since the war—more than the subsidies paid for all other commodities, basic and nonbasic, put together. When anyone tells me that the potato growers have not had a bonanza out of the subsidies, and that we should not stop it, for fear of injuring some young fellow in Minnesota who has just started in business, I point out that he is not the only one who is injured by the present situation.

Mr. THYE. Let us not single out Minnesota; let us also include North Dakota, Alabama, and many of the other States.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, yes; and we can include Illinois, too. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota was thinking of some of the young fellows in Minnesota who are of voting age, and I do not blame him for doing so.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Illinois does not want the words "voting age" included in the RECORD. He and I do not operate that way; at least, I never have operated that way.

I am thinking of the young man who went into farming following the war. All we have to do is to look at the record, and we find that that young man paid $2,300 or $2,400 for a tractor last fall, and nearly $400 for a spreader, and he has commenced to obligate himself for the purchase of planting machinery and insecticide spraying machinery. The Senator and I have no conception of what his obligations are unless we examine the figures. Otherwise, we have no conception of what the young farmer who has begun farming in the past 2 or 3 years has had to obligate himself for.

At the present time it costs anywhere from $5,000 to $6,000 or $7,000 to begin farming. This young man has obligated himself for $7,000 or $8,000 or $10,000 in order to get a crop. If the Senator and I take the props from underneath his price support this afternoon, without assuring him that adequate legislation on the subject will be enacted, he will have nothing to take to the banker when he asks for a renewal of his note or for a little additional credit in order to be able to carry himself through the coming planting season. In such event, he simply will not get any credit.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry I used the words "voting age." Let us substitute the words "legal age."

Mr. THYE. Let us drop that from the RECORD. We do not want the RECORD to convey the idea that the Senator and I are trying to get votes by what we do here. I do not have to get my votes until 1952. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is one of the able members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think he will agree with me that there is not a single member of that committee who will not vote for the kind of bill the Senator from Illinois has been talking about, after we have had hearings and have perfected the bill. We have discussed this whole matter pro and con across the table, both in executive session and elsewhere, and I can assure the Senator from Minnesota, so far as I am concerned, that hearings will be held within the next 10 days on this bill.

I am saying to the Senator that the only way we shall obtain the enactment of such a bill at this session of Congress is by the adoption of this amendment at this time. If we do not, this matter may drag out over a long period, and perhaps there will not be any legislation of this sort passed by the House of Representatives. But if we vote for this amendment, and if it is adopted, everyone will see to it that hearings will be held.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has referred to the adoption of his amendment as the only way by which the enactment of a potato bill can be forced at this session of Congress. Let me ask him who he thinks will be forced.

Mr. LUCAS. No, I do not say it is probably the only way, but it is the only sure way, I may say to my friend from Vermont, to get a potato program this year. We have gone a long time, and

nothing has been done about potatoes. This is the first time it has been seriously considered by the committee and the Congress and this has been wholly the result of the little amendment which the Senator from Illinois proposed to the joint resolution respecting cotton and peanut acreage allotments. It has created quite a bit of controversy.

Mr. AIKEN. If we have been unable to have a hearing on the joint resolution within the past 6 months, what causes the Senator from Illinois to hope we shall be able to have hearings on it before the end of the potato-planting season, so the law can be enacted before the end of the potato-planting season this year?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know. The Senator from Illinois does not have very much influence around here, but I believe he has enough to get the potato legislation considered. I think the Senator knows that if we have hearings there will not be a member on the committee who will not vote for the bill

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder whether the Senator would have the same enthusiasm for repudiating a contract with potato growers in the State of Illinois, if Illinois were not the State having the lowest potato yield of any State in the Union, or approximately so? Suppose the potato growers of Illinois produced 400 bushels an acre, instead of 100

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is now asking a hypothetical question having nothing whatever to do with the issue. The Senator from Illinois does not care to be dragged now into a dead-end street on some other issue which is not before the Senate

Mr. AIKEN Does the Senator believe that the same moral right to violate or repudiate a contract made by the Government with potato growers would hold good for the repudiation of a contract with the cotton grower, the corn grower, the hog grower, or the wheat grower?

Mr LUCAS Whenever the question is raised, the Senator from Illinois will answer it.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from Illinois should tell us now where he stands. Who knows but what someone will come in tomorrow with a proposition to repudiate price support for the corn grower?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois will cross the bridge when he gets to it. The only question now before the Senate is the one regarding the price support of potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. And the repudiation of the contract with the potato growers.

Mr. LUCAS. That is all right; if the Senator from Vermont desires to offer an amendment taking the support prices away from corn, wheat, cotton, or some other basic commodity, the Senator from Illinois could answer that in due course.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont believes that the integrity of the Government should be binding, and that when the Government makes a contract, even though a bad one, it should comply with the contract and then hope to profit by the experience.

Mr. LUCAS. There have been many instances cited. The Senator from Minnesota cited one a short while ago, with regard to the lowering of the support price on eggs by the Department of Agriculture, which was done by regulation. The Senator from Colorado called attention to the repudiation of the gold clause.

Mr. AIKEN. But is it not a fact that in lowering the support price on eggs, the Department of Agriculture kept within the law?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. Though the Department kept within the law, it still might have been a hardship to many farmers and seemed to them to have been a repudiation But that is neither here nor there We have only one issue before us today, and it can be decided any way the Senate desires. I have done my best to present to the Senate something which will perhaps get us out of the trouble we are in with respect to potatoes. How Senators representing potato-growing States can continue to ask for this kind of subsidy, on the theory that otherwise there would be the repudiation of an implied promise, when they have had half a billion dollars of subsidies since the war, more than those of all other basic and non-basic commodities put together, is a little more than I can understand. If Senators representing potato-growing States do not want to correct this situation, and are insistent on obtaining the subsidy, then let them vote the amendment down, and, when the amendment is voted down, let the Government go ahead and pay another $50,000,000 or $75,000,000 out of the Treasury to potato growers, who destroy the potatoes after raising them, under the present program. Senators may do as they wish. When I have finished, I shall have done all I can to apprise the Senate and the country of what the situation is. I am doing the best I can in that regard.

Mr. ROBERTSON Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am in thorough sympathy with the objective of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I know the potato program has been an undue burden upon the taxpayer. The law may not have been perfect, and certainly the administration of it has not been perfect, in my humble opinion. But I want to call the attention of my distinguished colleague to a possible result which I do not think he intends. As I understand his amendment, it will not apply to potatoes already planted when it becomes the law. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, unless the amendment is adopted——

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am assuming I shall support the Senator's amendment. In Princess Anne and Norfolk counties, in Virginia, a good many potatoes have already been planted, but not all of them. On the Eastern Shore of Virginia, and extending into the Eastern Shore of Maryland, a few potatoes have been planted, but not a great many. The joint resolution will have to go back to the House for action, and to the White House to be signed. It will probably be the 8th of March at the earliest before it can become a law. In the meantime we have gotten almost up to the full planting period in Tidewater Virginia and the Eastern Shore of Maryland, yet there will be a few farmers who had wet land or some other condition which made it impossible for them to plant, whose potatoes will not be planted by the time the joint resolution becomes effective, unless we are going to make them lie about it. In fact, who is going to say, "The potatoes were planted just today"? The farmers are operating by days now. I was wondering whether my distinguished colleague would be willing to eliminate an administrative feature which I think would be very difficult to enforce. Certainly it would be most unfair to say to one farmer, "You planted on the 7th of March; you will get paid," and to another, "You planted on the 8th of March, and you can get nothing." If the Senator would be willing to fix a definite date, let us say, the 15th of March, it would take care of all the other potatoes that go to market in June. There are a good many winter potatoes in Virginia, as there are also in the North and in the West; and we can look into the subject when we have a little more time.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator puts it on the 15th of March, the farmer who planted on the 16th will lose out.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But I am saying that in these areas that bring potatoes to the market in June, they have got to plant them by the 15th of March, otherwise the potatoes will not mature.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can offer an amendment of that kind. If he does, I shall be glad to consider it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I hope, if I do, the Senator will accept it.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I cannot undertake to say that.

Mr ROBERTSON. The Senator would not vigorously oppose it, though.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not vigorously oppose anything the Senator from Virginia does.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I want to cooperate, but I should like a little reciprocity. [Laughter.]

Mr AIKEN. Mr. President, there is no question that the dramatization of the potato program by the Department of Agriculture and the metropolitan press has done a great deal of harm to the entire farm-support program in the United States. We do not want to forget that the farm-support program helped America win the war just as war contracts in industry helped. Under the law, we were bound to continue the farm-support levels for 2 years following the war. We are not bound to continue the supports at that level from now on. There have been several factors which have contributed to the present unfavorable situation regarding potatoes. I should like to point out before I go any further that potatoes are not the only crop by any means. It is true that immediately following the war, and even respecting the 1948 crop, it cost $224,000,000 to support the price of potatoes. It will probably cost $80,000,000 this year. But potatoes are not the only crop. It will cost at a minimum about $70,000,000 to support peatnuts for last year. It will cost about $75,000,000 or so for the support of eggs When the books are all balanced, a few years hence, it will be

found that the cost of supporting some of the grains and other commodities will have amounted to as much for the year 1949 as the cost of supporting potatoes. But let us see how we came to be in the present situation. The Department of Agriculture, as authorized by law, allocates to each State each year a certain acreage which the State is permitted to plant in potatoes, and to be eligible for price supports. They have done so. Each year since 1943 the potato farmers have planted fewer acres than have been allocated to them by the Department of Agriculture—fewer acres than the Department has estimated were necessary in order to produce the amount of potatoes needed by the country for human consumption. But the yield per acre has been increasing. I am very happy that is true. It has been increased with respect to other crops also. Some of the tobacco growers have doubled their yield per acre. The peanut growers, while taking a cut in acreage last year, increased their yield by 8 or 9 percent per acre. It is a very proper thing for farmers to use their land to its best advantage, and they have a limited number of acres to plant, of course they are going to try to get the most out of those acres. So the increase in the yield per acre has been a factor in the overproduction we have now. We also have many more small fields, I believe, than had been planted in previous years, fields that would produce from 25 bushels up to 200, 300, or even 500 bushels, which do not come under the classification of commercial producers. That has added to the crop materially. We have also had, as a factor contributing to our difficulties, a gross underestimation of the yield of potatoes for last year. In September it was estimated that the yield of potatoes would be 363,000,000 bushels. That was the estimate of the Department of Agriculture. It would have been approximately the amount of potatoes which the United States needed during the last year. But between September and December the estimate on the yield increased from 363,000,000 to 402,000,000 bushels, some 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 bushels more than the country needed. It is incredible that such an error could have been made in estimating the size of the potato crop, but nevertheless the error of 40,000,000 bushels crept in somewhere. The growing season was pretty nearly over by the last of September, in all parts of the United States, and yet, when the potatoes were counted, it was found there were 40,000,000 bushels more than the Department of Agriculture had estimated there would be.

We have been afflicted, from the viewpoint of the potato growers, with a considerable decrease in the per capita consumption of potatoes. That has been due to several causes, but is principally due to the fact that persons who work in our plants and factories have had in recent years more money with which to buy meat and poultry, and they have bought more meat and animal products and fewer potatoes, until we are now probably at an all-time low in the history of the United States with regard to potato consumption per capita.

We might add also to the trouble of the potato industry the great increase in the cost of transportation and handling which at this time makes it unprofitable to ship potatoes from the surplus area of Maine into the interior part of the United States and to dispose of them in that way. In fact, it appears to be cheaper for the port cities on the Gulf coast and the Atlantic coast to buy Canadian potatoes, which our Government permits to enter this country unrestricted, and to pay the price, including the duty and water transportation. Canadian potatoes can undersell the potatoes which are produced in this country.

Those are some of the reasons, Mr. President, why we find ourselves in the difficulty we have had with reference to potatoes. I might say, and I think I could prove it, that the situation has been very badly handled this year, not only through an overestimate of the acreage over-all, but through a gross overestimate of the acreage allocated to the commercial potato areas. Furthermore, there has been, to my knowledge, no serious effort to increase the distribution of potatoes through the normal channels of trade, although under the Agricultural Act of 1948 and the act of 1949 the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to move the surplus crops through the normal channels of trade and increase their use, if it is possible to do so.

A month ago Washington celebrated Broiler Week, which resulted in moving immense numbers of broilers to Washington. Every restaurant in the city served broilers, whether we wanted them or not. There has been no comparable movement in behalf of the potato crop.

Another rather unfortunate circumstance has been that nonprofit institutions and the poor people of the country have not been able to get potatoes as they should for human consumption. The potatoes are available, the need is present, but the rules and regulations established for their distribution are such that most institutions do not bother to try to unravel the red tape necessary to get the potatoes. In my own State, the overseers of the institutions for the poor do not bother to go through the rigmarole necessary to get potatoes for the families which are being assisted by the public.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] said there may have been an implied agreement on the part of the United States Government to support the price of potatoes this year. I say there has been no implied agreement, but there has been a direct contract on the part of the Federal Government to support the price of potatoes this year. A notice to the potato growers was issued on November 16, 1949. It was issued at that early date in order that the potato growers, both North and South, could make arrangements for their seed and fertilizer to prepare to produce the 1950 crop. In the South, probably as far north as Washington, D. C., a great part of the expense of the crop has already been entered into. In the North, where fertilizer is such an important item, I know that if the potato growers have not already made their purchases of fertilizer they will probably be out of luck in getting it this year, because of the shortage of potash and possibly of other ingredients.

The commitment which the Government entered into with our potato growers on November 16, 1949, has some modifications in the program in which we engaged last year. First, there is a reduction in the support price of potatoes from $1.08 a bushel to 96 cents a bushel. Then there is a reduction in the amount of acreage which each commercial potato-growing area can plant. The Department has insisted on a reduction of 86 000 acres for the 1950 crop, as compared with the 1949 crop, and each State has already had allocated to it the number of acres it can plant to commercial potatoes.

Maine has been allocated 120,400 acres.

North Dakota has been allocated 102,800 acres.

California was allocated so many acres for late potatoes and so many acres for early potatoes, and so forth.

The allocations have all been made, but they have been reduced from those of last year to the sum total of 86,000 acres which the Department of Agriculture estimates will produce an over-all potato production of 335 000,000 bushels.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does that take into consideration the experience in the past few years in which potatoes have been planted more closely together and have been more highly fertilized?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I think the Secretary has estimated 100 bushels to the acre in Illinois and 450 bushels to the acre in Maine. There have been some differences in the methods of planting, but not to the degree which some persons would have the public believe. Many of the planters who used to place their rows 36 inches apart now place them 34 inches apart. If they put them too close, the law of disminishing returns sets in. The farmer cannot properly cultivate and take care of the crop. Thirty-four inches apart is considered to be the minimum feasible distance, but there is no question that potato growers have found out how to produce much more efficiently than they did in prewar days.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand that potentiality has been taken into consideration in fixing support quotas for the growing year.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand my distinguished colleague is of the opinion, if we have no additional legislation, that there will be no great surplus for the Government to buy on the basis of the present quotas.

Mr. AIKEN. Unless the Department of Agriculture has grossly underestimated again. But, with the experience of the past few years, there is no reason why that should be the case. It seems that the potato industry has just about reached the maximum of its production at the present time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator think that the Department might make the same mistake three times in succession?

Mr. AIKEN. It should not make the same mistake three times in succession. I am advised that the Department is allocating an acreage which it is expected will produce 335,000,000 bushels of potatoes, some 17,000,000 bushels less than would normally have been required in the year 1949.

There was in the Agricultural Act of 1948 a provision which was continued in the Agricultural Act of 1949, as follows:

> Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices prescribed by the Secretary may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support.

That was intended to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to require compliance with marketing agreements, and orderly marketing of the potato crop if the grower expected to benefit from a support price guaranty.

This provision of the law was not enforced last year. I understand that the Department felt that there was not time to put it all into effect last year, and, further than that, certain commercial areas of the country, particularly, one out in California, as no doubt the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] recalls, refused to enter into a marketing agreement.

Although there was authorization for the Secretary to require marketing agreements last year as a qualification for price support for potatoes, yet for various reasons that was not done. I am advised that had marketing agreements been in effect it would have been possible to save at least two-thirds of the cost of the potato program at this time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What was the reason assigned for not doing it?

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the Department said that there was not time to get these agreements into effect and enforce them last year. I have not had any discussion with the Secretary directly on this subject. Furthermore, California refused to come in. At that time it was felt by the Department that the crop might be short, or at least not much more than was needed—in the middle of September the estimate was only 363,000,000 bushels—and that those who did not enter into the agreement would profit by reason of the support price which was being given to those who did enter into it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I quote from the statement made this year on the 1950 crop:

> Eligibility for price support will be conditioned on having appropriate marketing agreements and orders in effect and in operation.

It goes on to say:

> It should be possible for all such areas to have programs in operation for 1950.

I take it that answers the question why they did not feel it was necessary last year, but do feel, and have so declared, it is necessary for this year. The report was issued in November 1949.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Department felt it was not feasible to put the program into operation effectively last year. I believe also that at least during the early part of the season the Department felt it was not going to be needed. They are going to carry it out this year. The amendment which I shall offer a little later will strengthen the hand of the Department of Agriculture by making the requirement for marketing agreements mandatory instead of simply permissive for the Department.

There is no use considering the support program in terms of Maine potatoes or Florida potatoes, because, as a matter of fact, they are all in the same boat. Florida cannot blame Maine for the trouble. Maine cannot blame Florida for the trouble.

With the situation as it is now, most of the surplus which would be destroyed is left in the State of Maine and on Long Island. If, instead of supporting the price, the potatoes are taken off the market and the Government says, "Put them all on the northern markets"—and they are A1 potatoes—I am afraid that the price for the early Florida potatoes would be subjected to a disastrous drop. On the other hand, the situation could be reversed. So we should not consider the problem in terms of Florida, Maine, Idaho, Minnesota, Winconsin, or Illinois, with its hundred bushels to the acre. That does not enter into the picture at all. It should be considered in terms of the potato situation throughout the United States, the needs of the growers and the needs of the consumers.

The Senator from Illinois has proposed an amendment, which was approved by the committee last week and is printed in the pending bill. It provides that no support can be given to potatoes which are not already planted at the time of the enactment of the bill. That means that we would probably have support for all of potatoes as far north as Virginia, with the possible exception of western North Carolina, Kentucky, and the neighboring area, but no support for the potatoes north of that latitude. As has been admitted by the Senator from Illinois, that is just plain discrimination against northern potatoes. However, he said he would take care of the matter by having hearings promptly and by enacting a quota law which would bring all potatoes within a quota requirement. That is a mechanical impossibility.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I called the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture this morning relative to hearings on the bill to establish potato quotas, and he said there was no prospect of an early hearing. So I believe that instead of talking about immediate hearings, in order to hurt nobody we had better talk to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. It is utterly ridiculous to say that we should let potato growers force hearings. Who can better force hearings than the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture? I believe the talk about putting the responsibility on the potato growers and passing the buck to them by cutting all supports off from under them so that they will do something, is hot air.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator from Idaho is entirely correct. I do not see any more indication of a hearing on the potato quota bill in the near future than there has been in the last 6 months since the bill was introduced. I think the President might well plan to sign the potato quota bill as an act of this session on the same day that he plans to sign the anti-poll-tax bill into law, because there is just about the same likelihood of getting it through in time to affect this year's potato crop.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that in the committee, in the discussion of the bill which has been introduced by the majority leader, I think it was the consensus, on the part of the chairman and others present, that we would immediately have hearings on the bill. Is not that a fact?

Mr. AIKEN. That was discussed, but there was no assurance that there would be early hearings, and certainly the time which might be denominated "immediately" has already passed, as that happened a week ago, and there still has been no move to call for any hearings on the potato quota bill. I think we should at an early date consider a potato quota bill, but I do not think it is possible to enact one into law and get it into operation until at least three-fourths, if not all, of the 1950 potato crop has been planted.

Then what do we do? We require those who have already planted their potatoes to comply with quotas. We cannot require those who have already dug their potatoes to comply with them, because those potatoes have gone on the market under the old law. What do we do then? We require those who have planted more than their quota to destroy the crop at their own expense—or what? The situation is so complicated we cannot put any new law on the subject into effect this year.

Madam President, I think we should hold hearings on the subject and get some kind of law, if it appears advisable, before the end of the present session, to take effect next year. But potato growers have to know in the fall what they are going to do about their crop in the following year. In fact, the Senator from Illinois knows the potato-quota bill contains a requirement that the allotments or allocations shall be made by September—either the 1st or the 30th—of the previous year. We cannot go back to last September now and determine how many potatoes each State shall have for its quota or each grower shall have for his quota. It is simply a mechanically impossible proposition which the majority leader is putting up to us.

I should like to make one other comment respecting the remarks of the Senator from Illinois. He said that if we do not do something about the potato program, even repudiate it, it would break down the whole farm-support program. I maintain that the repudiation of an agreement by the United States Government with the producers of a certain crop will do more than anything else to destroy the confidence of the farmers of the country in their Government. If we repudiate an agreement with the potato growers, can the wheat grower or the cotton grower or the peanut grower or the tobacco grower or the egg producer or the honey producer or the wool producer or any other producers who are guaranteed support prices by the Congress and by the executive branch of the Government, depend upon the Government to carry out its agreement with them?

I should like to have those beguiled advocates of the Brannan plan to take note of what is going on here today, and seriously consider whether they want to depend for their income upon a check from the Government contingent upon an appropriation by Congress, when the majority leader of the Senate advocates the repudiation of the price support promised the potato growers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Vermont doubtless is familiar with the considerable uproar which arose recently when the House of Representatives failed to vote funds for Korea. He will recall that there was a great outcry made that we had a moral commitment to Korea. Does not the Senator think that a moral commitment to our own citizens, namely the potato growers in this instance, is as important as a moral commitment to Korea?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont has always believed that the word of the United States Government should be as good or better than the word of the best of its citizens. We do have that moral commitment, and we have no right to break an agreement.

I admire the courage of the Department of Agriculture in taking the stand it is taking. Frankly, I thought the amendment was offered to take the Department off the hook. I hear that the Department is very much provoked that Congress should require them to break a contract with the farmers in the middle of the season.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the Senator will agree that the integrity of the Government is a priceless asset, and that any government which becomes corrupt and whose word is no longer good, cannot long exist. We certainly have a splendid example of that before us in the case of the government of Chiang Kai-shek. His government was corrupt, and look where it is now. I think this is a very late date for our Government to start breaking its word, even though it may be with only a small unfortunate group of potato growers, not even with all the potato growers, but simply with a part of them. I think we had better keep our word with them.

Mr. AIKEN. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that it is just as important for the United States Government to keep its word with a small group of potato growers as it is to keep its word with the next-greatest nation on the face of the earth. We must maintain the integrity of our Government.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, what was the document from which the Senator read a while ago, which represented, I believe, in his opinion, a promise from the Department of Agriculture to the farmer?

Mr. AIKEN. It is a document released by the Department of Agriculture on November 16, 1949.

USDA ANNOUNCES 1950 POTATO PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

A 1950 price-support program for Irish potatoes, continuing price support at the 60-percent-of-parity level in effect this year and setting a lower national commercial acreage allotment of 1,137,800 acres for 1950, was announced today by the Production and Marketing Administration.

These steps, taken in recognition of decreased potato consumption and increased yields per acre—

That answers the question asked by the junior Senator from Virginia a moment ago—

are designed to effect a better balance between potato production and requirements.

I have only this to say in reference to the two amendments which are now before us, the committee amendment sponsored by the Senator from Illinois, which would prohibit supports for any potatoes except those already planted, and to which I am opposed, and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which would prohibit supports for any potatoes not already harvested. So far as I know the only ones harvested so far are in southern Florida and perhaps in the extreme lower coast portion of some of our other States.

I feel a good deal like the Senator from Illinois does about the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. If we repudiate our agreement with half the potato growers, it is only fair to repudiate it with all of them. But after the amendment of the Senator from Delaware has been acted upon I will offer an amendment which is printed and on the desks of all Senators, and which reads as follows:

On page 7, strike out lines 11 through 14, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

'SEC. 2. No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas hereafter authorized by law, or marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes."

As Senators have heard, the Department of Agriculture intends to exercise its authority in that respect. I think it will have a very beneficial effect if the Congress backs up the Secretary of Agriculture in his effort by making use of the marketing agreements providing for the orderly marketing of potatoes and keeping the cheap grades off the market when they are not needed. I think that will make it mandatory instead of simply permissive.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the opinion of the distinguished Senator would that amendment, if agreed to, and if it became law, together with the other restrictions which have been suggested by the Department of Agriculture, keep the situation clean this year?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would, and I believe the Department thinks that if it can enforce marketing agreements—and I admit there is going to be a job in policing any potato program or any other crop program—and if the growers can keep within their acreage allocations, which they have done for many years, and with the lower support price, dropping from $1 08 to 96 cents a bushel eliminating certain production in very high-cost areas, that the potato program should somewhere near break even this year. I do not know how we can be sure of having enough potatoes in any year without asking for a few more than we think we are going to need, because sometimes we will have a bad crop year.

We had just about the finest year for growing potatoes last year that the country has ever seen. We obtained an unexpectedly large crop, even where improved production methods were not in effect. Even the Senator from Vermont planted a bushel of potatoes and got enough for himself and the neighbors.

Mr WHERRY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the Senator's opinion that if the amendment he proposes to offer is agreed to it will be necessary for the Department of Agriculture to go further than simply enforce marketing agreements? I understand the Senator provides not only for marketing agreements, but also for marketing quotas. But what is the judgment of the Senator as to whether the Department of Agriculture could accomplish the purpose we seek?

Mr. AIKEN. I personally think the Department of Agriculture has enough authority to accomplish the purpose of control, of jurisdiction over marketing agreements and orders and marketing practices. When we were considering the Agricultural Act of 1948 representatives of the Department of Agriculture asked for inclusion of that provision in the law, which we put in for them for this very purpose. That was continued in the Agricultural Act for 1949.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the judgment of the Senator that if that is done next year it will be unnecessary to put a program of marketing quotas into effect? That to me would seem to involve a much more difficult program, and enforcement, and all that goes with it.

Mr. AIKEN. I have always believed that the exercise of this authority would control the marketing of the potato crop so that the expense of the taxpayers would be reduced to a minimum or to a

negligible amount. If it does not succeed, then I think the entire potato program is definitely jeopardized. But I believe it will succeed. That is why I supported the provision for the last 3 years.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask the Senator one more question. Does the Senator feel that if the marketing agreements had been in full force and effect during the present year—and the Senator said the Department of Agriculture has authority to enforce such agreements—the situation in which we now find ourselves could have been averted?

Mr. AIKEN. I am advised by some of the persons in the Department that they think if it had been in effect last year, the cost could have been reduced by about two-thirds. It could not have been completely eliminated, because the enormous crop, due to the perfect growing season, could not have been exactly foreseen.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask this final question: In view of the Senator's experience and in view of the statements just made, if the Department of Agriculture would use the authority it now has relative to marketing agreements, and with the average production we are supposed to have, is it the Senator's opinion and judgment that, everything included, the purpose relative to the surplus of potatoes could be accomplished?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that to be a fact.

I would also say that we have spent only $24,000,000 or $25,000,000, to date, on the potato program. The rest of the expenditure is anticipated, from now on. The Government could, if it saw fit to do so, push the potatoes of the 1949 crop on the market, and could pay the loss on the 1950 crop of southern potatoes. I do not think that would be the wise thing to do. Nevertheless, the Government could carry over a great deal of the expense from the 1949 crop to the 1950 crop if it wished to operate in that way. That is what I had reference to when I said we cannot consider this matter in terms of Florida, Maine, Louisiana, and Idaho, but we must consider it in terms of the potato crop of the entire United States.

Mr. DONNELL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator tell us what marketing orders under the Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 are included?

Mr. AIKEN. Marketing agreements, as I understand, are agreements entered into between the Secretary and handlers in a particular marketing area, whereby it is agreed to market the crop in an orderly manner and to keep the second-grade production off the market, unless the market demands it; and whatever marketing order is issued by the Secretary as a result of the agreement must be approved by the producers.

I am informed that all potato-growing areas in the United States now have marketing agreements, or have them practically completed. One county in California, as I have said, rejected the marketing agreement last fall; but I am advised that they have informed the Department that they wish to vote over again on that matter, and that they will approve the marketing agreement, so that all potato-growing areas in the United States will undertake the orderly marketing of their crop.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry I did not hear all the discussion that took place; I was serving on one of the committees just now.

The Senator does not contend, does he, that under a marketing agreement the Department can curtail acreage this year?

Mr. AIKEN. No; but the same provision of law which permits the Department to require compliance with the marketing agreements also gives the Department the right to announce production goals and acreage allotments. That is under the same provision of law.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, as to the production goals which are announced, there is no way by which the acreage can be controlled, is there?

Mr. AIKEN. Not unless we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator from Vermont think that is the most effective way to control production?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the repudiation of an agreement with the potato growers which was made on November 16 is the most effective way of handling this situation. In other words, if we were to do so, we would say, "We are going to let your crop fall apart and go to pieces, with no support at all." That is what it amounts to.

Let me reconsider the statement I have just made, and say that what the Senator from Illinois has proposed would doubtless be an effective way, but it would not be a very honorable way.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Vermont is familiar with the efforts put forth by the House of Representatives in order to get the potato growers to adopt an arrangement whereby acreage could be controlled, is he not?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not familiar with the efforts the House of Representatives has made in that respect.

Mr. ELLENDER. For the past 3 years, efforts have been made by the House of Representatives to secure the enactment of such legislation, and to put potatoes in the same category with cotton and other basic crops in so far as acreage controls are concerned. But the only answer the House received from the potato growers was, "Let us look a little further into it." They never have been able to get together on it, apparently.

Mr. AIKEN. But what is done by the House of Representatives does not excuse the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I grant that. But, as I have always contended before the Senate committee, it strikes me quite forcefully that no farmer should expect this Government to protect his crops by price supports unless at the same time he is willing to enter into an agreement to curtail production by reducing the acreage. The only way I can see that this matter can be handled is by forcing the issue.

Mr. AIKEN. But the law already permits the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the acreage, and he has done so.

Mr. ELLENDER. However, there are just a few noncooperators who will not abide by the marketing agreements; and they usually plant all they can plant. Both the cooperators and noncooperators use more fertilizer than they should and they plant their potatoes closer, all of which results in greater yields. The first thing we know, there is a very large surplus which affects adversely those who have entered into the marketing agreements.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me point out that the noncooperating areas have, as I understand, agreed to cooperate this year; and the Secretary has served definite notice on them that if they do not cooperate, they will not get any price support at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. They should obtain no support, unless they do cooperate. I am sure the Senator will concede that under the marketing agreements, however entered into, the only thing the Department can do is to try to prevent those who enter into the agreements from selling their culls; otherwise, insofar as the sale of potatoes on the market is concerned, no effort is ever made to prevent that.

Mr. AIKEN. The marketing agreements entered into by the producers in different commercial areas have to be approved by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. This year the marketing agreement for our State excludes No. 1 potatoes up to 2½ inches in size. Those are not culls at all. But we have excluded them, under the marketing agreements. We also have complied with the acreage quotas in every instance; in fact, we are away under the acreage quotas.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator from Vermont permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; if I may have unanimous consent for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Maine has stated that all growers in Maine have complied with the marketing agreement. Have all of them agreed to it? I was informed differently.

Mr. BREWSTER. The compliance in Maine with the acreage quotas is the highest in the country. It is between 85 and 90 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, in Maine there are from 10 to 15 percent of the farmers who have not complied, but who are growing potatoes to the extent of their ability?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And of course that situation necessarily adversely affects the potato growers who cooperate.

Mr. BREWSTER. But only in a very small way. The production is away down. We have reduced our total production this year by 10 percent, which is

the same as the national quota. If it had not been for the very fine growing season and for the 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes being brought in from Canada, we would not have had any problem at all. Those are the only two factors which have caused the problem this year.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, the very amendment I offer will require the 10 to 15 percent of growers to come under the marketing agreement; otherwise, they will not get any support at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. How will the Senator's amendment accomplish that?

Mr. AIKEN. By providing that compliance with marketing agreements or marketing quotas, if established by law at a later date, shall be a requisite for price support.

Mr. ELLENDER. But only as to cooperators.

Mr. AIKEN. There are thousands of noncooperators who are exempt from any of these programs at all. Those who produce less than 3 acres are not covered by any of the programs, as I understand. I said earlier today that they are, in part, responsible for the surplus we have this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose the Senator's amendment were to be adopted—would the 10 to 15 percent of Maine growers who have not——

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, if the Senator will permit an interruption, let me say that I find I must correct the statement I made a few moments ago. I have just been handed the official figures, which are that 93 percent cooperated on acreage and 100 percent cooperated on the marketing agreements.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator perhaps would be correct if he stated that from 10 to 15 percent of the total growers of the country have not done so.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sorry I was in error in my previous statement.

Mr. AIKEN. When we give the percentages, we should consider that the crop last year was approximately 10 percent larger than was needed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to ask the Senator this question: Regardless of when we should do it, does the Senator not believe that the only effective remedy we can provide is to pass a marketing-quota law giving the Secretary of Agriculture the same power that he now has with respect to cotton and other basic crops, in an effort to control potato production?

Mr. AIKEN. That may be true not only with respect to potatoes but with respect to every other crop.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. But as to whether it would be effective, only experience can tell.

As I said a little earlier in my remarks, it will be a terrific job to police any program of this nature, and probably will be more difficult in the case of potatoes than, let us say, in the case of cotton, which goes through a certain number of bonded warehouses, or in the case of wheat or similar crops. It will be difficult to police any kind of a potato program.

However, I think what I am proposing is the best thing to try this year. What I object to is a repudiation of the agreement the Government has made with the potato farmers, and I understand the Department of Agriculture does not want to have it repudiated in the middle of the season.

I think what is proposed will bring any cost to a minimum, if not to the vanishing point. If it does not, than I shall be perfectly willing either to abandon the program altogether, or to have a strict quota law put into effect for the 1951 crop.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the Senator's amendment, I notice that he suggests that no price supports shall be made available to farmers unless marketing quotas hereafter authorized by law are established.

Mr. AIKEN. Or marketing agreements. Marketing agreements can be put into effect for this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. So far as I am concerned, and judging not only from the experience I have had in my own State, but also from what I have read and heard, I do not believe the marketing agreements will do the job. We might just as well discard it so far as production of potatoes and probably quite a few other commodities is concerned. But the question I want to address to the Senator is this——

Mr. AIKEN. I want to answer the Senator's first question, first. If marketing agreements and the control of marketing practices do not do the job, then the Department of Agriculture did not know what it needed in order to do the job when it asked for that provision of law.

Mr. ELLENDER. That may be true. I want to ask the Senator this: He says that no price support should be made available unless quotas hereafter authorized by law are established.

Mr. AIKEN. Or marketing agreements.

Mr. ELLENDER Does the Senator want to introduce a bill to that effect, or will he support a bill during this session of the Congress, so that the Department of Agriculture can effectively carry out the program?

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, I have been favorably inclined toward providing quota provisions, not only for potatoes but for other crops which may come under the price-support program. But I am opposed to repudiating in the middle of the season an agreement already made, particularly when it leaves part of the crop, let us say 30 percent of it, already planted, and the other 70 percent not planted, and therefore excluded from the support program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the views of the Senator be tempered in the event the law provided for the 1951 crop and omitted this year's crop?

Mr. AIKEN. The views of the Senator from Vermont would be very much tempered, but he would still be opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, which cuts off the support for two-thirds of the potato growers of the country in the middle of the season.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator has referred a number of times to marketing agreements. I notice in his amendment the term employed is "marketing orders." Are the terms "marketing agreements" and "marketing orders" synonymous?

Mr. AIKEN. Marketing orders must be approved by the producers. The Senator is probably familiar with the marketing agreements and marketing orders in the case of fluid milk, but in that case the Department of Agriculture actually sets the price of the product from month to month, usually under the terms of a formula which has been arranged for the particular area involved.

Mr. DONNELL. In noting the contents of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, I observe that there is a reenactment of certain sections, namely, section (b)—that is to say, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act—which is described in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 as "relating to market agreements." There is then a reenactment of section 8 (c), which is described in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 as "relating to orders."

I was wondering whether the term "marketing orders," as set forth in the Senator's amendment No. 15, of February 20, 1950, means the same as the marketing agreements, in view of the distinction made in what I very hastily observed in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

Mr. AIKEN. As the Senator from Missouri knows, I am not a lawyer and not too familiar with legal terms, but I understand the marketing orders are made under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. The Senator will recall that the first Marketing Agreement Act, which was passed along about 1934 or 1935, was declared invalid in part by the Supreme Court.

As a result, the price of milk in my State went down to a little over 1 cent a quart, and something had to be done and done in a hurry. In the early part of 1937 the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act was enacted, which met the objections of the Supreme Court, and which has worked effectively in most of the fluid-milk centers since that time. As to the term "marketing orders," and its relation to the marketing agreements, these two provisions augment each other. Usually the agreements are the terms agreed upon, and the orders put teeth into the agreement. The orders must be approved by the producers.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator I am not asking this question from any mere technical aspect, but I want to be sure I understand, in considering the Senator's amendment, just what marketing orders are.

Mr. AIKEN. May I say to the Senator from Missouri the amendment has been considered by lawyers who are familiar with this type of law, and they have advised me, who am no lawyer at all, that the wording is proper.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Vermont has advised the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture already has authority to impose upon the potato-growing industry marketing practices or agreements.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the Senator from Vermont advise us whether under the existing law the Secretary has authority to impose marketing quotas upon the industry?

Mr. AIKEN. No; only in terms of acreage allotments. He cannot impose them in terms of bushels marketed, except as required under a marketing agreement.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, it is stipulated that marketing quotas must be in effect before there can be any further price supports. Can the Senator tell us about how long it would take to put into effect a system imposing marketing quotas upon potatoes?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the 1950 crop undoubtedly would be 90 percent planted before it is possible to get that type of legislation passed. There have been bills before the Senate for the past 5 or 6 months, and no action has been taken on them and no move made to hold hearings on them. Senators on the floor were advised this very afternoon that the chairman of the committee said, so far as he knew, there was no date in the immediate future which had been set for a hearing on the marketing-quotas bill, although I may say I think we should hold hearings before long.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Then, in effect, the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois goes far beyond what we may now believe, when it requires the imposition of marketing quotas, because it would require several months to perfect such a program. Is that not correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would take a considerable length of time even to set up the machinery to invoke marketing quotas even after a bill is passed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Again I want the Senator to understand that this question is not asked from any captious or technical aspect, but I want to be sure whether the right words are being used. After all, if we adopt the amendment, we want to know that it is going to accomplish what the Senator from Vermont sincerely desires it to accomplish. I notice in Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, that section 8 (c) seems to be the one applicable to so-called orders, and as I mentioned a moment ago, it appears, as I read, very hastily, and possibly mistakenly, the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, there is a distinction between marketing agreements and orders recognized by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. The amendment, Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act, describes orders in this way:

ORDERS

SEC. 8 (c) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture shall, subject to the provisions of this section, issue, and from time to time amend, orders applicable to processors, associations of producers, and others engaged in the handling of any agricultural commodity or product thereof specified in subsection (2) of this section. Such persons are referred to in this title as handlers. Such orders shall regulate, in the manner hereinafter in this section provided, only such handling of such agricultural commodity, or product thereof, as is in the current of interstate or foreign commerce, or which directly burdens, obstructs, or affects, interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity or product thereof.

I am wondering just what it is the Senator has in mind as being covered by the marketing orders to which his amendment refers.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator from Missouri that perhaps the Senator from Vermont could answer captious questions better than technical ones.

Mr. DONNELL. I did not mean the questions in either sense.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe it is the type of wording which the Department of Agriculture will use. Whether the suggestion originally came from that source, I do not know, but I will undertake to reassure the Senator from Missouri as to the wording, within the next 15 or 20 minutes. If it is not exactly what we mean to provide for, it will be changed so that it will mean what I think it now means. I think it is the proper wording, but I shall find out and reassure the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. I very much appreciate his courtesy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he takes his seat?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator not think that for the record it would be well to restate the two differences between the terms as used in the amendment in the phrase "this joint resolution unless marketing quotas hereafter authorized by law, or marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended." For the record, what is the difference between marketing quotas and marketing orders?

Mr. AIKEN. The marketing quotas would have to come under a law which does not exist.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Marketing agreements are in existence. The Department contemplates requiring the use of them this year, and the amendment would back up the Department in requiring the use of them and make mandatory the provision which has been permissive up to this time.

I see the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has come into the Chamber. Perhaps he can tell us more about the plans for hearings on the marketing-quota legislation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Madam President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield, I should like to make a very brief statement.

Mr. AIKEN. With the unanimous consent of the Senate, I shall be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The committee knows, and I think the Members of the Senate know, that I am for high prices for farm products. I am for high prices because it is necessary to have high prices for farm products as well as to have high wages and high salaries, in order to build up a large national income so that the people can make enough money to pay the enormous taxes which they must pay. That is the basic reason why I am for high prices for farm products. On that basis I am for a support-price program for potatoes, but the present program has not operated very well. In order to get a better support-price program the amendment which is now before the Senate was placed in the joint resolution in order to serve notice on those persons interested in potatoes that they must help us work out a program which we can support.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Oklahoma recalls that all but two members of the committee voted to approve this amendment. I do not understand that they bound themselves to support it word for word, but they believed it should be brought before the Senate for action at the earliest possible date.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is exactly what happened in the committee.

There is before the committee at the present time a bill proposing to provide money for the Commodity Credit Corporation. We have not acted on it officially. I hope that within the next few days we can report that bill. The next bill that is to be considered, from my viewpoint, if the members of the committee will go along with me, is a potato bill which was introduced by me in the last session, and was introduced in this session by the majority leader. If the pending amendment is adopted, those Senators interested in potatoes will be interested in coming before the committee and helping us work out a program which we can all support. That is what I shall work toward.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the intention of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma to include a provision which will establish marketing quotas for potato growers as well as the growers of other crops?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. On potatoes, especially, I want to establish a support price, provided there shall also be established not only fair controls, but mandatory and enforcible controls. Otherwise, I shall not go along with a support-price program. We cannot subject the Treasury to demands for money for support prices unless we give power to the Secretary to impose controls and power to enforce them. I think we should raise enough of the basic com-

modities to supply the domestic demand and the export demand, and then we should have a carry-over. Perishable products cannot be carried very long.

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Can that be accomplished with only marketing agreements which the Senator from Vermont says we now have, or would it require additional legislation? I am very much interested in the Senator's reaction to that question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma Personally, I hope for limited production based on a limited acreage.

Mr WHERRY. In the final analysis, would the Senator care to state, if he is ready to make a statement, that the legislation should carry a provision for establishing marketing quotas in addition to what the Senator has just said?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma I would be for that if I could get the committee to go along. I want to have rigid controls I want the farmers to raise all the potatoes they can, to be sold at a fair price I want enough to export and enough to have a carry-over at least during the year.

Mr WHERRY. That necessitates marketing quotas.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct

Mr WHERRY. That involves a question which has always confronted me. How are we going to enforce marketing quotas? It is a very broad field.

Mr THOMAS of Oklahoma That is a matter which must be worked out.

Mr WHERRY. If the Senator will permit me to make this last observation, I should like, if it can be done under marketing agreements, to have support prices paid in the market place, which, it seems to me, would be much more satisfactory

Mr AIKEN. I should like to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that before he entered the chamber I expressed to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr ELLENDER] sympathy toward a marketing-quota bill, but expressed doubt, and even opposition, with regard to attempting to impose a marketing quota on potatoes this year, knowing full well that most of the potatoes would be planted before we could get such a bill enacted into law. Therefore, I thought if the Department requires compliance with marketing agreements and orders for this year's crop, we can see how it works. There could still be a marketing-quota bill on the books, and the Secretary not be required to use it if the other provisions work

In reply to the question asked a few minutes ago by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] as to the difference between a marketing agreement and a marketing order, I have a communication from my assistant, which reads as follows:

A marketing agreement may be entered into between the Secretary and the handlers of a commodity following public hearings. If the Secretary finds such agreement will effectuate the purpose of the act, an order is issued by the Secretary which controls all handlers subject to it. The order must be approved by two-thirds of the producers of a commodity.

This two-thirds vote of producers is the same as for marketing quotas. So marketing orders, which are accepted by producers—and I understand the commercial potato producers have expressed their willingness to accept them—would virtually have the force of a marketing quota, at least for this year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Missouri asked a question a moment ago on which I might be able to shed some light by reason of the fact that I participated on two occasions in connection with hearings dealing with marketing agreements affecting citrus fruit in the peninsula of Florida. As I understand the law and the procedure which would be followed under it, this is what occurs: If the Secretary feels that a marketing agreement would tend to bring about the results which are desired under the act, namely, more effective regulation of the flow of the product and a better distribution and a better and fairer price, he calls hearings, and at those hearings the affected parties, both producers and handlers, are given an opportunity to appear and state their views. The hearings generally are rather extended and are held in various parts of the area affected When they get close to the end there may be a final hearing in Washington. After the agreement has been worked out in a form that seems to be most acceptable to the industry affected and is also in such form that it can be approved by the Secretary, he reduces it to a fixed formula, an agreement between the parties, himself, and the persons who shall sign it, the handlers The handlers are given the opportunity to sign that agreement In the case of Florida citrus fruit producers—and I would not pretend to make my statement apply to other products because there may be other provisions applicable to other products—the requirement was that not less than two-thirds of the growers by number of growers, or growers who produce not less than two-thirds of the fruit, should by referendum vote approve the proposed agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture.

It was also the requirement that 50 percent of the handlers should execute the agreement. However, that was not the entire prerequisite, as I remember it. The approval by not less than two-thirds of the growers by number of growers, or who produced not less than two-thirds of the volume, was an absolute prerequisite. In other words, democratic rule was provided for, in that a two-thirds majority of the growers was required to approve the provisions embodied in such an agreement, as a condition prerequisite to placing that agreement in effect or issuing an order based upon it. Naturally the agreement would affect only the parties to it, that is the handlers actually signing it. But the next step provided by the Agricultural Marketing Act was that in order to make effective the terms of the agreement and make them applicable to and enforcible against the dissident handlers, the Secretary of Agriculture could and did issue marketing orders in exactly the same form as the marketing agreements. The marketing orders became enforcible as against all persons in the industry, whether or not they were signers of the marketing agreement.

Under the terms of the two marketing agreements which have been in effect with reference to Florida citrus fruit, we have had two different types of control. First, as I recall, was a volume control. It fixed the volume which might move in interstate commerce. The volume was allotted at certain fixed period by governing committees which made recommendations, on which the Secretary of Agriculture acted. In that way the movement of only a sufficient quantity of fruit to supply the markets at reasonable prices was permitted. Distribution of loss of the surplus was effected within the industry.

The other agreement, the present one, which has been in force now for some years, controls the grades and sizes of fruit which may be moved in interstate commerce from week to week, or over periods of weeks. In that way both the flow of fruit and the quality of the fruit are controlled

In each case the marketing agreements were supported by orders, which were enforced by the maintenance of an inspection service, not only through the transportation companies—the railroads, and the ships—but at various key bridges and places on the highways, so as to control the movement by truck out of the peninsula of Florida. The flow of fruit was accurately controlled and this proved highly effective in bringing about better conditions in the industry.

As the junior Senator from Florida understands, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont, which is identical with the first amendment proposed on this subject in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry——

Mr AIKEN. I may say that the Senator from Florida is the author of the wording which I have in my amendment. I did not recall it until the Senator explained the marketing agreements.

Mr. HOLLAND The amendment as proposed by the Senator from Vermont makes no reference to marketing agreements, but only to marketing orders. It is the understanding of the junior Senator from Florida that the existence of marketing agreements is a prerequisite to the existence of marketing orders, which will adopt the same form. Much as the Senator from Florida would like to see the problem dealt with effectively through marketing agreements and orders, as it undoubtedly could be, provided the industry cooperates, it still is his view that dissident areas in which the growers refused to approve proposed marketing agreements or to subject themselves to orders, could rather effectively break down any proposed control. It was for that reason that the Senator from Florida felt that the quota conditions should be stated in the proposed amendment, as well as the marketing order conditions.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Florida understand that all the commercial potato areas have now indicated their willingness to come under marketing agreements? I realize that that will leave probably 500,000 or 600,000 acres of potatoes, grown in small quantities throughout the country in small fields, which will not come under any program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no information on the subject, but I did see in the press, a day or two ago, an article emanating from Bakersfield, Calif., stating that one very important producing area there wanted no continuing control or support program. Whether the article properly related the attitude of that important producing area the Senator from Florida is unable to say.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary of Agriculture has served notice that anyone who does not come under the marketing agreements and orders will not get any support. He is within the law in doing that.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida believes that it would be effective if all the large-growing areas would come under marketing agreements and orders. If two-thirds of the growers of a great separate production area, highly competitive with the rest of the industry, declined to come in, it might break down the whole program.

Mr. AIKEN. I will say frankly that if such an area refuses to come in, feeling it would cash in under the price supports given to other areas, the entire potato price support program will have to go, if it cannot be controlled.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask the Senator whether the procedure which he has in mind for marketing orders for potatoes is similar to the successful procedure being followed in the New York milkshed in connection with the marketing of milk?

Mr. AIKEN. In general, I would say that they are similar. I think it would differ in this respect, that in the case of milk the Secretary of Agriculture actually names a price to be received from month to month, although the price which he names is arrived at under a formula which represents the consensus of agreement in the area as to what a good formula should be. In the case of marketing agreements, he has to approve the marketing methods.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I recall, the milk-marketing agreement had to be approved by two-thirds of the dairy farmers in the New York milkshed

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. It is also true of any marketing orders for fruits and vegetables.

Mr. DONNELL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. First, I should like to thank both the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for taking the time and giving careful attention to answering my questions. I should like, if I may, to have the attention of the Senator from Florida for a moment to ask him if there are marketing orders, as he understands them, which may be made without marketing agreements. In that connection I invite his attention to the heading above section 9 of Public Law 322, Seventy-fourth Congress, which is an act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which heading reads "Orders with or without marketing agreements."

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that that is the case in some industries. As to which industries, I am unable to say. That was not true in connection with the citrus industry. I have had no experience whatever with orders independent from marketing agreements, and certainly they would depart entirely from the theory which has been used in the citrus industry, where there has been required first united effort, cooperative effort, by a great controlling majority of the industry, that is, two-thirds of the growers and more than half of the handlers as a basis for any order. Irrespective of the attitude of the handlers, however, I believe that an order can be entered if two-thirds of the growers have given their approval

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator again for his kindness.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, if I still have the floor, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, I should like to ask a question, because up to this point no one, to my mind, has made a clear-cut statement of what a marketing agreement is. As I understand marketing quotas, they have reference to amounts that can be sold, bushels, or heads of livestock, or heads of cabbage.

Mr. AIKEN That is correct.

Mr WHERRY. Marketing agreements usually run to restricted acreages.

Mr. AIKEN. As used in the case of potatoes, I am sure the term "marketing quota" refers to the number of bushels which may be marketed. The Secretary already has authority to set the number of acres which can be grown.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I was about to raise. The contention of the distinguished Senator from Vermont is that under the present act, the marketing agreements, if carried through, would restrict acreage. Is not that true?

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary has already allocated the acres.

Mr. WHERRY. Then what are we providing in this legislation which the Secretary does not already have authority to do?

Mr. AIKEN. We are making the use of that authority mandatory, and backing up the Secretary in the use of it.

Mr. WHERRY. Are we making mandatory that he can use marketing quotas under some order before we pass the legislation?

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. WHERRY. We have not passed marketing quota legislation to apply to potatoes yet, have we?

Mr. AIKEN. He cannot require the use of marketing quotas, because there is no legislation to that effect.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the use of including that in the amendment, then?

Mr. AIKEN. That is in anticipation of the proposed marketing quota law being enacted before the end of this session.

Mr. WHERRY. If that is the understanding, I suppose there can be no objection, but there is much difference between a marketing quota and an agreement the producers and handlers arrive at themselves.

Mr. AIKEN. I might also point out that the Secretary is trying to control the production of grain crops this year though acreage allotments. In the case of wheat, there was a 17-percent cut in the acreage. However, the indication as of January 1 was that the crop would not be very far below last year's crop, due to the fact that when acres are cut, growers discard their poorest acres, and try to raise more on the acres which are left. The Secretary has the power, under the law, but he evidently hopes not to have to use it, and there has been talk to the effect that if acreage allotments fail, then quotas will be necessary in the case of grain crops next year.

Mr. WHERRY. Before that is done, legislation will have to be enacted.

Mr. AIKEN. In the case of potatoes, that is true, but not in the case of such grain crops as wheat and corn.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The additional authority in line 4 that the Senator from Missouri has been talking about, and I refer to the words "or marketing orders" authority which the Secretary does not now have?

Mr. AIKEN. He has it now, and I understand he intends to use it this year.

Mr. WHERRY. So that is not a new authority. That is an authority he already has?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Before I take my seat, Madam President, I should like to state that the State of Vermont last year raised 100 percent, exactly, of the amount of potatoes allocated to the State by the Secretary of Agriculture. There were four States in the Union which raised the exact amount which was expected of them. Others raised more. Others raised less. South Dakota, for instance, raised only 50 percent of the amount its farmers were entitled to raise, because of a poor crop year. But South Dakota was almost the only State that had such a miserable year for raising potatoes.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that marketing agreements are wholly voluntary?

Mr. AIKEN. They have to be approved by two-thirds of the growers, and marketing quotas have to be approved by two-thirds of the growers.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; but we do not have any law upon that subject. The agreements are voluntary.

Mr. AIKEN. No; we do not have a law on potato quotas. But if we did have, the consent of two-thirds of the growers would be required to put it into effect.

Mr. LUCAS. In the case of potatoes the only control we have is through voluntary agreement at the present time, which I understand was attempted, and some success was had with it last year.

Mr. AIKEN. No; they are not voluntary. The acreage plantings are not voluntary. The Secretary of Agriculture can put into effect acreage allotments, and he can issue marketing orders, and if they are not approved by the growers, he can deny price supports to those commercial areas which do disapprove them.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not understand that the Secretary has anything to do with acreage allotments, unless they are voluntary upon the part of the grower himself.

Mr. AIKEN They are voluntary to this extent: The Secretary denies support price to those who fail to comply with them.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course.

Mr. AIKEN. And they do comply with them. There has not been a year since 1943, that the over-all planting of potatoes has not been less than the amount requested by the Secretary.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont one more question. Does the Senator agree with me that the Secretary, under the marketing agreements and orders which have been issued pursuant to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, has succeeded in bringing only 55 percent of the 1949 crop under marketing agreements?

Mr. AIKEN. That might have been true last year. However, he did not make compliance with marketing agreements a qualification for price support last year. Had he done so, no one knows how many would have agreed to come under marketing orders.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows that certain sections of the California growers have definitely said that they would not come under marketing agreements?

Mr AIKEN. Yes, last year.

Mr. LUCAS. I have telegrams in my office from farmers in a large section in Pennsylvania who voted on the referendum question, who refused to come under the agreement.

Mr. AIKEN. But may I ask the Senator if that vote was not taken last year? And is it not true that the California areas have indicated to the Department that they would like another vote on the marketing orders, and indicated their intention of coming under them?

Mr. LUCAS. That I cannot say.

Mr. AIKEN. And the Secretary has also informed them that if there is no compliance with marketing orders, there will be no support price for 1950. I think he has acted very properly in that case.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that his amendment, if it is adopted by the Senate, would have no effect whatsoever, but would leave us just where we are?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot agree with my distinguished friend. I think that is exactly what it means, and that is what the Secretary of Agriculture says it would mean.

Mr. AIKEN. I remind the Senator from Illinois that this provision of the law was requested by the Secretary of Agriculture for the very purpose for which I think he should have used it last year. If he had done so I am told he might have cut out more than $50,000,000 for the expense of supporting the 1949 potato crop, and he would not have had any more than the poor people in the institutions of this country could have used had he made it possible for them to secure the surplus crop.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a conclusion the part of the Senator from Vermont, and I cannot confirm it or deny it.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont thinks it is a correct conclusion. No sufficient effort was made to move the surplus potatoes, either through increased consumption in the ordinary channels of trade or by making them available to poor people or to nonprofit institutions.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator from Vermont, as I understand, wants to continue this situation as it is at present, regardless of what is the attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont wants to require the Secretary of Agriculture to use this provision of the law, which he did not use last year.

The Senator from Vermont further understands, while we are discussing the desires of the Secretary of Agriculture, that the Secretary of Agriculture is not at all in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, and has put in writing that he does not believe we should change this program after the agreement with the farmers has been made.

Mr. LUCAS. I have stated before, if I may reply without violating the rules of the Senate too much, that I have offered this amendment upon my own responsibility. The Secretary of Agriculture did not know anything about it.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand he did not know about it, and that he even does not approve it.

Mr. LUCAS. And the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture does not change my opinion at all as to the merits of my amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. And the Secretary of Agriculture has had very much less success in changing the opinion of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator from Vermont has been quoting what the Secretary of Agriculture says, and has been standing upon it when he has had to stand upon it to make his point.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that we both quote the Secretary of Agriculture when it serves our purposes to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can speak for himself along that line, because I did not bring up that subject first.

Mr. AIKEN. The influence on the Senator from Illinois is obvious.

Mr. LUCAS. It apparently has not had much influence on the Senator from Vermont, because the Senator from Vermont insists that we go on with the potato program regardless of what the cost may be.

Madam President, it does not make any difference what the Secretary of Agriculture should have done last year, or what he should do under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont. The truth of the matter is if we do not get a bill in the present session of Congress dealing with this program, and dealing with price supports under rigid controls, acreage allotments, marketing agreements, marketing quotas on bushels or bags of potatoes, the program will continue as it is now, and as the Secretary of Agriculture said it should continue, which will cost in the neighborhood of $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 or $70,000,000 more than it ought to cost or would cost if we would adopt the simple amendment I have offered, and finally secure adequate legislation respecting the potato program.

I do not know whether the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry said on the floor of the Senate that he was ready to hold hearings at once and report a bill, but he came to the Senate floor for that purpose. I left the Chamber for a moment. He told me definitely that he was ready to go into the question and hold hearings and report a bill and get some action at the present session of Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry did appear in the Senate Chamber and gave as his opinion that we should hold hearings, and that in the not far future, but not the immediate future; that there would be hearings upon a bill providing marketing quotas for potatoes.

There are two bills before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. One was introduced about the middle of last year by the Senator from Oklahoma, the chairman of the committee, and one was introduced more recently by the Senator from Illinois.

There is one marked difference between the two bills, as I understand. The bill introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma would grant authority for compensatory payments, whereas the bill offered by the Senator from Illinois would not grant authority for compensatory payments. I am sure the Senator from Illinois will agree that when witnesses and the committee members engage in a discussion as to whether compensatory payments which are now played up as the backbone of the Brannan plan come under discussion, that the discussion is not likely to be brief either in the committee or on the floor of the Senate or on the floor of the House. For that reason we cannot expect to have a potato quota law enacted. I advised the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] while the Senator from Illinois was off the floor, that I would look sympathetically on such a law. We cannot expect to get it passed before most of this year's potato crop is planted.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator in favor of putting the potato growers under rigid controls?

Mr. AIKEN. I stated during the absence of the Senator from Illinois that if the proposal which I am making now fails to control the potato situation this year, that I would either favor abandoning the support program altogether or adopting rigid marketing controls.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In all fairness does not the Senator from Vermont, capable and able and efficient as he is, feel that the potato grower in this country has had quite a fair trial as to matters dealing with the growing of potatoes?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Department of Agriculture has had an even fairer trial and an even better opportunity to profit from the experience of the potato programs of the past few years. The overestimate of the amount required, and an underestimate of the yield, plus certain other mishandled phases of the program, have placed us in our present position. As late as September 1949, the Department of Agriculture estimated the potato yield at 363,000,000 bushels. That was after potatoes had been dug in two-thirds or three-fourths of the States of the Union. Yet in December they found the yield to be 402,000,000 bushels—just a slight error of 39,000,000 bushels in estimating the crop.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is utterly unfair to place the responsibility upon the Secretary of Agriculture in view——

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator permit me to conclude?

Mr. AIKEN. The responsibility rests upon him. The Department is responsible for the application of the law.

Mr. LUCAS. The Secretary is responsible for the application of the law, but I cite to my good friend from Vermont the testimony that was given here the other day by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], when he read into the RECORD several letters which he wrote when he was Secretary of Agriculture, calling upon the Congress of the United States to pass effective laws dealing with potatoes, and we completely ignored his request.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator from Vermont was ready to undertake to review the potato laws at the time.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator just now told me that he was not in favor of a law which would provide another chance to find whether the marketing agreements or marketing orders would operate effectively.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that is not what the Senator from Vermont said. The Senator from Vermont said he would look sympathetically upon a potato-quota law. He would not only look sympathetically upon it, but he would oppose putting a potato-quota law into effect this year, after most of the crop has already been planted.

After the potato growers have gone to the extent of purchasing fertilizer and seed and planting their crop under the agreement made with the Department of Agriculture, I would not require them then to be forced to destroy part of their crop which has already been planted at their own expense.

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have just one more question. The Senator from Vermont had me convinced that this amendment was the proper one, and I was ready to vote on it. I was convinced on the statement which was made that the Senator is not asking for any additional authority, but only that the present statute shall be mandatory and that the Secretary will have to use it.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. As the Senator said, if he had used it this year, two-thirds of the cost would have been eliminated.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that about two-thirds of the cost would have been eliminated if the agreements had been effectively enforced.

Mr. WHERRY. So the Senator from Vermont is telling us that he wishes to make the present authority obligatory upon the Department of Agriculture. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And if that is done with the marketing agreements, those agreements in themselves will go a long way toward solving the situation, if not completely solving it; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I said that if that fails, I will be in favor of abandoning the support program altogether or else imposing rigid marketing controls.

Mr. WHERRY. So the responsibility rests squarely upon the Secretary of Agriculture for not making the statute mandatory or at least for not using it in 1949.

Mr. AIKEN. He had the authority he asked for.

Mr. WHERRY. And because he did not use it, we find ourselves in this situation. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. But in fairness to him, I think it should be said that last year he did encounter considerable resistance which is not being put forward now.

Mr. WHERRY. But he could have used it, regardless of that.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; he could have used it, resistance or no resistance.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I am convinced.

BUDGETARY PROBLEMS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I hold in my hand a speech delivered by Mr. E. C. Sammons, president of the United States National Bank of Portland, Oreg. It was delivered by him before the Credit Policy Commission of the American Bankers' Association, at Chicago, Ill., on January 25, 1950. Madam President, this is one of the best speeches dealing with problems concerning the budget of the United States Government that I have read in many a day. It is such an able discussion of the budgetary problems of our Government and of what Mr. Sammons thinks the American people and the United States Congress should do about them, that I ask unanimous consent to have his speech printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks. I wish to make several comments on the speech, if I am given permission to have it published in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY E. C. SAMMONS, PRESIDENT, THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL BANK OF PORTLAND, OREG., BEFORE CREDIT POLICY COMMISSION, AMERICAN BANKERS' ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL., JANUARY 25, 1950

The late humorist, Will Rogers, once said if all the economists in our country were laid end to end in a straight line, their opinions still would point in all directions. This year's prophecies are not that way. They all seem to be alike in pointing in one direction—toward good business. Frankly, I am not an economist—don't pretend to be one—never have studied the technique of an economist—I am just one of the rank and file bankers of the country, and I am going to talk to you from that point of view.

You have already heard excellent discussions here in this meeting on various subjects of vital interest to all bankers. My assignment is Banking Credit in 1950. The topic is so broad it gives me plenty of latitude to discuss almost anything, and while it is a little early in the day to talk about food, I am going to give you a little "verbal hash"—a "little of this and a little of that!" If you will listen to at least one phase of it, I know you will be better off, and so will the country

Banks in America as a whole prospered in 1949, there were plenty of opportunities to lend funds—to individuals or corporations at fair returns, or to segments of Government at lower rates. I think the same opportunities will prevail this year. While we had something of a shake-out in business the first half of 1949, the recovery was substantial in the second half of the year, and closed with a pretty fair tone.

Business is entering 1950 with a good deal more confidence and with fewer troubles than it had a year ago. You will recall that at this time last year, when we met in this room, a downturn was beginning to make itself felt, and there was naturally considerable anxiety over the probable depth and its duration. Unemployment was rising and a cautious consumer-public was beginning to hold back on its spending. The outcome was not bright. The inventory recession of 1949 was getting under way. No such worries are in evidence today. Business is enjoying a healthy rebound in consequence of the settlement of the coal and steel strikes. The strikes created steel shortages which will take some time to overcome Purchasing power will be increased by the veterans' insurance refunds of $2,-800,000,000 during the first half. Continued Government expenditures for national defense, foreign aid, and public works will also be stimulants to business activity during the first half.

I have read a good many prognostications during the past 30 days on the part of bankers, economists, business executives, and editors, and they all point to but one conclusion—good business ahead for the near term. Seldom has there been such unity of opinion on the business prospect for any given period. President Truman and his advisers must have been reading the same prognostications, for they seem notably optimistic.

Business for the year as a whole just cannot be as good as predictions indicate, and I am sure the banking fraternity as represented at this meeting recognizes the possibility of moderate contraction later in the year; and will make their loans on a constructive if moderately restricted basis. There should be good opportunities nevertheless for banking volume and bank profit during the year. It seems reasonable to believe that expenses of banks, which have

been trending upward for some time, will be at a less rapid rate in 1950. These things are on the credit side; but I wish to talk to you in the next few minutes on some things that are not quite so rosy. I want to discuss our public financing.

There is a "cock-eyed" idea which seems to have gained much momentum in this country—and that is that "the Government can spend itself rich." This thought has reached dangerous proportions and I believe the bankers of America must do something about it. I further believe they can do something about it, and I am going to conclude this brief dissertation of mine with some concrete suggestions and recommendations. But, first, I should like to analyze with you, as some of the previous speakers have, what has been going on

Our budget surplus has now disappeared and the Director of the Budget indicates a deficit of $5,500,000,000 for the 1950 fiscal year; and the present program of the Government calls for continuing large deficits for the 1951 fiscal year. Constantly increasing expenditures are demanded by Government bureaus in amounts greater than the population should be asked to pay in taxes; and as far as I can detect from reading Government statements, there is no thought of cutting back, despite the definite knowledge that there is a great deal of waste in Government operations

I am not alarmed by temporary deficits, but our Government has been running at a deficit for 17 out of the last 21 years With the exceptions of the years 1929, 1930, 1947, and 1948, we have been in the red. Naturally we can understand the reason for deficits during the war years, but we can and should become alarmed about huge deficits in these postwar years It is the momentum of Government spending that presents the biggest danger In the 12 nonwar years in this 21-year period, our Federal debt increased more than $57,000,000,000, and it is intended to add still further to this vast debt. I think it is time that our people make it plain to the Government that deficit in these prosperous years should be avoided If our people do not do so, we can have serious doubts as to whether we will ever again see a balanced budget It seems perfectly obvious now that the budget is out of control. There isn't a banker in this room who would let his bank's budget get out of control, so let's examine for a few minutes some of the details of your Federal Government—for it is your Government—and my Government. You and I are stockholders in our Government, and we have a right and a duty to see that the managers of our corporation handle our business properly. It is time to ask, "Is our Government well organized and economical?"

The Hoover Commission finds that we are paying heavily for confusion, overlapping, and waste. Here are some more facts worth considering about the Hoover report

In an effort to organize the executive branch of the Government to relieve the President of a part of a superhuman burden, the Congress—upon recommendation of President Truman—created by unanimous vote, a Commission to Organize the Executive Branch of the Government.

This occurred in July 1947. The Commission was bipartisan, with six members from each party. It was but natural that the chairmanship should fall to Herbert Hoover. Always rated among the ablest administrators of all time, he alone of the 12 appointees knows intimately the problems which confront President Truman.

The Hoover Commission made a characteristically thorough approach to its mighty task. It began by defining some 24 of the principal problems of Government management Having thus cut its cloth, it created special research committees called task forces These comprised 300 leading researchers, some of the most eminent specialists available in each field. After periods of 10 to 14 months, these task forces returned to the Commission with their findings.

The result was the most imposing collection of facts, figures, and opinion on government that has ever been assembled—some 2,500,000 words of basic data of the most valuable sort. From this massive bulk, the Commission carved out its model of a streamlined modern government.

Herbert Hoover and his associates have presented the American people with a blueprint for good government. This is of the utmost significance, since, as a people, we have reached the point at which the size and cost of government can easily impair the effectiveness of our economy and lower our standards of living.

When Mr Hoover was President, the Government employed 600,000 persons, and cost $4,000,000,000 a year to operate. Today the budget is more than $42,000,000,000 and the Government employs more than 2,000,000 persons, and comprises a maze of departments, bureaus, sections, divisions, and what-have-you—consisting of 1,816 different organizations. Manifestly, no President can carry a responsibility for personal direction of this establishment and have any time left for the broader duties of his office.

I crave your indulgence while we examine a few phases of the Hoover Commission report of Government inefficiency. First, let's go back to Wheeling, W. Va., on October 19, 1932, and hear Franklin D Roosevelt talking. This is what he said:

"If this Nation wants to know what is wrong with its National Government, I will give them the answer in one word. That word is 'mismanagement'"

Well, he was talking about four billions a year and 600,000 employees Imagine the situation today as revealed by these facts regarding the 1950 budget·

The Army asked for funds to buy 838,000 tropical worsted uniforms at $129 each—enough for all enlisted men in the Army and then some. How many of you are wearing suits that cost you $129?

The Air Force requested funds to build 910 homes for families in Alaska that would have cost $58,350 each, without any land cost, and on the island of Guam they asked for 828 family houses at a cost of $48,000 each

The present budget of the armed forces represents about $100 per capita for the Nation, as contrasted with some $2 25 before the First World War. Our task force reports that the current preliminary budget estimates of the three military departments for the fiscal year 1950 were for more than $30,000,000,000. Such a budget would be justifiable only if the Nation were actually involved in warfare. It would require a sharp reduction in production for civilian consumption, precipitate the need for controls over the economy, and enormously increase inflationary pressures. It reflects a lack of realistic understanding by the three military departments of the economic and social factors of national security. Moreover, military budgets are not drawn with careful consciousness of cost factors. For example, an examination of the 1950 budget revealed estimates requesting modernization of 102 more tanks of a certain type than the Army actually possessed In another case, a misplaced figure added some $30,000,000 to budget estimate.

This year you will help pay a loss of $500,000,000 by the Post Office. It is possible to cut $200,000,000 of this loss by the use of modern methods and equipment and rates to help hard-working postal employees

The Bureau of Indian Affairs employs one person for each 32 of the 393,000 Indians under its care.

The Veterans' Administration takes five times as long to settle insurance claims as private companies—uses four times the manpower per policy.

The Government owns three and one-half typewriters for each employee using these machines.

After dismantling a $16,000,000 camp in Alaska, the Army shipped the resulting lumber to Seattle. The Department of the Interior took over the lumber and shipped it back to a point 10 miles from where it originally stood.

There is so much duplication in the Department of Agriculture that a farmer received conflicting advice about fertilizer from five different units of that Department.

To prevent the flooding of Cherry Creek, a small stream near Denver, the Army engineers tore down a dam which local engineers considered adequate and built a $15,000,000 dam, 3 miles long and 140 feet high.

Some Government bureaus are stocked up with supplies 50 years in advance. The Government owns $27,000,000,000 of supplies and materials There is no central inventory of this vast property. We can live on this fat a long time.

Federal jobs are so frustrating that 500,000 persons quit the Government each year; yet it often takes months to secure the resignation of unsatisfactory employees

The Hoover Commission also found that 40 Federal agencies rendered medical services; that half of the agencies of the Federal Government conduct medical or health activities of some kind, all competing for doctors and money, that the Federal medical activities cost $2,000,000,000 in the last fiscal year, or 10 times more than in 1940; that these activities are utterly devoid of any central supervision. They found also that it cost the Government up to $51,000 per bed to build hospitals, whereas the average cost of private hospital construction is $16,000 per bed; that the Government is so concerned with building hospitals and providing treatment that only 4 percent of its medical funds are used on research to prevent illness.

Herbert Hoover, in a speech at the Shoreham Hotel on December 12, last, reported that as an indication of waste, there already existed in Federal hospitals at the time of the Hoover task force investigation, beds for 225,000 patients and only 155,000 were occupied. Yet Congress had made appropriations for, or authorized, hospitals with 50,000 additional beds, despite the fact that 70,000 are empty. The cost of the additional hospitals is estimated at $1,300,000,000 President Truman canceled out $300,000,000 of this program, but Congress restored the authority.

I have mentioned the Army and medical situations. Let's take one look at the Navy, whose Bureau of Ships is financed from 27 different appropriations; and the task force that studied that division tells us the Navy cannot even tell how much it costs to run a ship. How long do you think your business could survive such practices?

Let us remember that Government is your business, that you are paying for it, and it is within your power to help bring about reforms.

While it was impossible for the Hoover Commission to investigate all the work in the agricultural division, they did claim that it is a loose confederation of independent bureaus and agencies. A spot check disclosed that there were 47 agents from 7 separate services working with 1,500 farmers in one cotton-producing county in Georgia; there were 88 agents working among 3,400 farmers in 1 county in Maryland. Since we bankers work closely with farmers, we can safely say that the farmer would be twice blessed by the adoption of the Hoover report, for he would find his dealings with Federal agencies much less confusing and irritating and he would share with all other taxpayers in the benefits of reduced Government costs.

I will dramatize the vastness of the Federal budget. I hold in my hand a current

issue of the Sears, Roebuck catalog. It contains 1,377 pages; you can see the size of it The Federal Budget is 241 pages larger than this Sears, Roebuck catalog; it is 1,618 pages. As to its size in dollars, the combined amount of the budget is $43,297,000,000, so the average expenditure for each page of the Federal Budget is more than $26,000,000,000. Assuming that a million dollars of the budget could be checked and approved each hour, a Senator or Congressman working 40 hours a week, 50 weeks a year, would be at the task for 21 years 7 months 20 days. That gives you a slight idea of how much of our money is being spent to run the Government.

David Lawrence, in an article dated December 12, says this: "Democracies cannot spend their way out of trouble. Sooner or later they have to realize that there is no such word as 'cannot' when reduction of expenses becomes imperative. The slogan of the future is not going to be the New Deal or the Fair Deal but one that will make its appearance soon—the Honest Deal. This means that the person who puts a dollar in the bank should be able to get back somewhere near a dollar in purchasing power in future years when he draws it out or when the life-insurance policies he now is paying for are paid to his beneficiaries."

Inefficient government apparently at one stage of his career was uppermost in the mind of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, because in his address in Sioux City, Iowa, September 29, 1932, he said: "I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration in peacetime in all our history. It is an administration that has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs and the reduced earning power of the people. Bureaus and bureaucrats, commissions and commissioners have been retained at the expense of the taxpayer."

If what he said was true then, what of the situation today when we have 1,816 bureaus, commissions, and other segments of Government, manned by approximately 2,100,000 bureaucrats?

On March 10, 1933, Mr. Roosevelt, in his message to Congress said: "Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy."

If he was right then—and the people thought he was, judging by their votes and their support—think how much more imperative it is now to look at our fiscal policy.

Two weeks ago last Tuesday, 3,296 shareholders, either in person or by proxy, reelected our board of directors to tell me, as the pilot of their ship, how they wanted their property managed. All of you in this room had similar experiences within recent weeks, and I want to call your attention to the fact that you and I, and each and every one of us are shareholders in the greatest corporation in the world—the United States of America. We elect directors to manage our properties—but call them by different names; we elect Congressmen for 2 years; we elect another group called Senators for 6 years; but how many of us attempt to guide them in their handling of our properties? Mighty few of us, but we have got to begin to do it, and this is the challenge I leave with you and our fellow bankers over America—we ought to do something about the consequences of a loose fiscal policy. There isn't a one here who would permit our lending officers to advance money to customers, corporations, partnerships, or to any type of business if those individuals or businesses attempted to spend themselves rich. And we have got to make the citizens of America "at the grass-roots of America" understand the forces of inflation if we are to survive. And, speaking of politics, an analysis shows that 76 out of the 96 Senators—79 percent—are elected by rural majorities, and that 54 percent of the Representatives represent more rural counties than urban counties. For the purpose of the study, a rural county was considered to be one in which there is no community with more than 10,000 population. The point I make is that in spite of the growth of cities, this is still a grass-roots country. People on the farm, in the villages, and in the small municipalities have the dominant voice when it comes to electing the men who make our laws. The future of America is in their hands, and I urge the country bankers in this audience to be as alert and as vociferous as any banker.

Our colossal public debt and our tremendous budget cost reminds me of a wisecrack made by a chef in Portland, Oreg. He was asked how he would cook an elephant. He said, "I would cut it up in small pieces and cook it a little at a time." Well, our public debt and our budget are like that elephant—we will have to cut it into small pieces and work on those pieces. The piece that we should cook first is the Hoover organization plan.

If the heads of the 15,000 banks in America would each undertake to talk to one group of citizens a week through the rest of this year, I believe we could alert the populace—at least the thinking portion of it—to the dangers of increasing Government spending. As a starting point, we can all talk about the importance of getting the Hoover report adopted in its entirety. It is now but 20 percent approved. A lot more than that must be done, but at least that would be a start in the right direction. There is no reason why it should not be done—President Truman asked for the Committee, asked for the study to be made; Congress voted for the report unanimously; the facts are available, and I believe if put before the people clearly, the people will respond. Of course this program is political, but this is your country and mine, and we should say our say in support of it "You cannot have your cake and eat it too" and yet so many politicians kid the public into believing they can. For instance, during the most recent elections, we saw many platforms which called for greater unemployment benefits, greater pensions for the aged, more support for farm prices, more aid to public works, added support for schools, greater veterans' budget, and of all things, "a fight against inflation, and lower taxes." People who present such platforms are either fools or liars.

This whole program is like a diamond—it has many facets. I have merely presented one or two of them. The appeal I make to you, my fellow bankers, is that you study the problem by procuring the data furnished by the Hoover Commission and follow up on that program.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt said in his address at Pittsburgh on October 19, 1932—"I have sought to make two things clear: First, that we can make savings by reorganization of existing departments, by eliminating functions, by abolishing many of those commissions, which, over a long period of years, have grown up as a fungus growth on American Government. These savings can properly be made to total many hundreds of thousands of dollars a year."

He spoke of thousands of dollars; the Hoover report talks of millions of dollars.

Now to summarize—the American people delegate to one man in the White House and to 531 men and women in Congress the job of running America, which in turn means the job of maintaining peace in a troubled world. But these elected representatives do not exercise absolute power as in a dictatorship—the sovereign power is public opinion. They constantly watch public opinion.

Fortunately within the huge mass of people there is an intelligent class of men and women who really care what goes on in Government, who manifest their interest not only by their votes on election day but by their constant alertness to what goes on every day. This intelligent class is an active group of great influence and great power. It comprises those American men and women who make or unmake public opinion on vital issues, irrespective of which party is in power. These people furnish the leadership in our American system; they even affect the ebb and flow of world-wide tides of economic power. They are the active leaders in business, in labor, in agriculture, in industry, in education, in the church, in the professions, in finance, and even in the Government itself.

We have been considering in this meeting, and particularly in this speech, the question of the Federal budget—so have many others. For instance, Tom McCabe, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in his appearance before the Douglas Committee of Congress on Fiscal Monetary and Credit Policy, gave this testimony, and I quote:

"There is no antidote to inflation equal to the development of a budget surplus, and the use of that surplus to retire debt."

So you can see that if we become vociferous on the subject, we are in very good company.

I wish to be more specific as to how to do this job of alerting the people. Ask those in your audience to write personally to their Senators and Congressmen; tell them also that the most important thing is to get their wives interested, and get them to write letters personally. Get the subject discussed at such groups as the League of Women Voters, chapters of the Association of University Women, and other groups of business and professional women. That's the way public opinion is formed; it's the only way it is formed. Pressure groups of other kinds are working to get more money for spending—we should bring pressure in the direction of economy and lower taxes.

In the Preamble to the Constitution—of this, the greatest country the world has ever seen—our forefathers referred at the very outset to "we the people." And at its rebirth at Gettysburg, Abraham Lincoln, the savior of the people, again referred to "The Government of the people, by the people, for the people." This is our Government—it belongs to the people and we (you and I) are part and parcel of that phrase "we the people" and by our action we shall, as Lincoln also said, "either nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope on earth."

We as bankers should accept our undeniable responsibility and take our proper part in forming and guiding public opinion, and help stimulate the people into action to reverse these dangerous trends. We thereby will have strengthened the base for bank credit in 1950. But if we sit passively by and "let George do it," we shall get into trouble. Collectively, the banks of the Nation have 44 percent of all assets invested in Government bonds which will waste away in value under continued deficit spending However, their value can be preserved by a sharp and prompt reversal of present Government financial policies. Our patriotic obligation is to work earnestly to that end.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I should like to commend a reading of the speech of Mr. Sammons particularly to my Republican colleagues in the Senate. The Republican Party, acting through an appropriately appointed committee selected from the Republicans of the Senate and the House of Representatives, in conjunction with a committee selected from the Republican National Committee, issued, a couple of weeks ago, what I thought was an exceedingly able statement of general Republican policy which would be presented by the Republicans to the American people in the congressional campaigns of 1950. I thought it was a remarkable statement, Madam President, because to

the extent that we can accomplish a degree of party unity by way of issuing policy statements or platforms. I thought that the recent Republican policy statement augured well for bringing about a remarkable degree of harmony among the various groups within the Republican Party. As we Republicans join forces in another congressional election this year I hope that we will be able to point to specific legislative proposals implementing our policy statement which the RECORD will show we tried to get passed into law by the Eighty-first Congress in its second session.

Regarding the statement of policy the Republican Party enunciated a couple of weeks ago, through the committee I have just mentioned, I wish to point out that it is an implementation of the great, progressive platform the Republican Party adopted at the convention in 1948. I think it needs to be read and interpreted in light of the party's official platform of 1948. I think the recent statement of Republican policy, Madam President, must be read as an interpretation, effectuation and implementation of the Republican platform of 1948.

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Not just at the moment; I shall yield before I get through.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wondered whether the Senator had read the statement.

Mr. MORSE. I not only have read it, but I have digested it very carefully. I have given a series of speeches across my State in support of the statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. It uses the word "supplementing."

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Maine, who also is chairman of the Republican senatorial elections committee, that in those speeches across my State, I pointed out what I considered to be the very fine provisions of the recent policy statement. I pointed out that within the statement itself it is perfectly clear that it was enunciated for the purpose of making clear that we propose to carry out our platform of 1948.

Mr. BREWSTER. We distinctly said "supplementing the 1948 platform," in order to avoid any question of repudiation.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I am not raising any question of a repudiation of the 1948 platform. I am trying to point out, if the Senator from Maine will bear with me, that what the new policy does is to implement and effectuate the 1948 platform; and those are stronger words than "supplementing."

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I would even prefer to add the word "effectuate" and have it put into the statement.

But I started to say, Madam President, that although I think the recent Republican policy statement is a very fine one to submit to the American people, in the 1950 congressional campaigns, nevertheless we must relate it to the 1948 platform by offering specific legislation in this session of Congress aimed at keeping the promises of the 1948 platform. I am offering this very able speech on the budgetary problems of the United States Government, delivered by Mr. Sammons, in Chicago, on January 25, 1950, as my exhibit A, today, of some of the specific things which I think the Republican Party needs to do about economy in government. When? Right now, at this session of Congress, in both Houses of Congress, in order to make perfectly clear to the American people that we mean political business when it comes to carrying the fight to the Democrats in the campaign of 1950, in putting into practice the principles and recommendations of the 1948 platform.

Thus, Madam President, this afternoon, on the basis of the points made by Mr. Sammons in his able speech of January 25, 1950, I offer once again to my party, by way of specific recommendations for legislative action at this session of Congress—the second session of the Eighty-first Congress—the following proposals:

First, the adoption of the major recommendations of the Hoover Commission reports for the reorganization of the executive branch of our Government, and for the bringing about of some true economy in the administration of the affairs of our Government. I ask my Republican colleagues, what is wrong with making the Hoover Commission reports not only the recommendations of the Republican Party, as intimated, may I say, in the policy statement of 1950, but what is wrong with making those reports the legislative policy of the Republican Party in terms of specific legislative proposals during this session of Congress?

Madam President, this has been the position of the junior Senator from Oregon ever since the Hoover Commission reports were issued and ever since the Senator from Oregon had an opportunity to study them.

I wish to say that if we would take the major recommendations of the Hoover Commission reports and, as a party, would put them into legislative form, we would be keeping faith with the pledges and the promises we made in the Republican platform of 1948 and in our supplementary statement, as the Senator from Maine calls it—and rightly so, of 2 weeks ago, when again we made clear that the Republican Party is going to the country in 1950 on a program of true economy. If Senate hearings show that the facts warrant making some changes in the Hoover Commission recommendations I am willing to consider those changes. However I think it should be agreed that a presumption favors the adoption of the Hoover recommendations as submitted unless a clear showing of a need for amendments is made.

There should be some legislation introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives effectuating the Hoover economy recommendations and then a determined fight, in my judgment, on the part of the united Republican side of the aisle, to show that we mean political business in trying to pass those recommendations in the interest of a sound budget for the country. As Mr. Sammons says in this very able speech, the budget has to be balanced. I consider it an outrage that we have a deficit of over $5,000,000,000 in our present budget, Madam President, and I do not share the view that the deficit cannot be eliminated from the budget. On the contrary, I happen to hold to the point of view that if the Republicans in this session of the Congress will use both ends of the lead pencil, a sharp pencil point, and a good eraser on specific item after specific item, we could carry such a hot fight to the Democrats on the other side of the aisle that they could not escape the force of the logic of our position in support of sound economy. The budget can be and should be balanced in this session of the Congress.

To do it, we must do more than issue policy statements. To do it, we must offer legislation which will accomplish it, and as a united Republican group we must stand behind such legislation. So, on this first point, I ask again, What is wrong with making the major recommendations for economy in Government of the Hoover Commission reports the specific legislative proposals of the Republican Party in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress? In taking that position, Madame President, the junior Senator from Oregon does not vary from the consistent position he has taken ever since the Hoover Commission reports were released to the American people. He repeats this afternoon what he has said elsewhere. Those reports constitute the most scholarly, the most scientific, the most authoritative reports on Government economy ever presented to a Congress of the United States.

The second recommendation I offer in supplementing the platform of the Republican Party of 1948, implementing and effectuating the platform, is the major tax recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development, which have been before the Senate of the United States now for more than 3 years. For more than 3 years some of us on the Republican side of the aisle have taken the position that the problem of taxes in this country is not a problem of tax reduction or of tax increases at all, but the problem which confronts us in the field of taxation is a problem of tax revision. Our tax problem is basically one of tax revision aimed at getting the gross inequities out of the existing tax structure, so we can accomplish—what? So we can accomplish an expanding of our economy. Without that expansion of our economy there is in my judgment no hope at all for meeting the fiscal problems confronting the country. We must deal with the gross inequities in the tax structure of the country, and that is exactly what the tax revision report of the Committee for Economic Development is aimed at. I have yet to hear in all the debates on the floor of the Senate a single word of substantial criticism or condemnation from either the Democratic or Republican side of the aisle, against the tax revision program of the Committee for Economic Development, a program which has been before us for over 3 years, Madam President.

I ask again, Why do we not do something about it? I ask my Republican colleagues, What is wrong with it? I ask my Republican colleagues to point out wherein the junior Senator from

Oregon is in error when he says that this side of the aisle, the Republican side, ought to put into legislative form and give support to the tax recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development. Some of us have put these recommendations into legislative bills and they have been here on the floor of the Senate for over 3 years. I think it only fair for the American people to ask the Republican Party what is wrong with the tax-revision program of the Committee for Economic Development. The outstanding business leaders of America are for it. The outstanding tax authorities in America are for it. In fact, Madam President, those who have come to study the tax problems of the country invariably point to the recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development as constituting the first steps in the legislative reform of taxes that the Congress of the United States should take.

I am satisfied that a majority of the Republicans in this country—in fact, I am satisfied that a majority of my colleagues here in the Senate do not quarrel with me at all on the need for a tax-revision program. I am satisfied they do not quarrel with me when I say the tax-revision program offered by the Committee for Economic Development ought to be the starting point for any tax legislation adopted by the Congress. Across the land, in the 1948 campaign, when I spoke night after night under the sponsorship of the Republican National Committee, before audiences in that campaign which, I may say, many times were not overwhelmingly friendly to the Republican cause, I talked in terms of the need for a thorough-going tax-revision program. What was the response? A response of enthusiastic acceptance of the principle. I would say to my Republican colleagues today, I think the No. 1 domestic issue facing the American people, and the No. 1 domestic issue on which they want action in this session of the Congress, is the issue of tax reform. I am satisfied that the Republican Party in this session of the Congress has the ability and the foresight and the courage to go forward with legislation in the tax-revision field. If we do not, we are going to play into the hands of the Democratic Party, with its program of continued deficit spending and its program of adopting a "soak the rich" tax policy. The tax policy of the Democrats seems to be the false economic theory that all that needs to be done to meet the fiscal problems of the country is to impose higher taxes on existing wealth. Where will that program lead us? It will lead us into an out-and-out state economy.

In the 1950 campaign the junior Senator from Oregon will be heard to say that what the Republican Party must do in order to meet the tests of constitutional liberalism for which the junior Senator from Oregon is constantly pleading is not to adopt the type of tax program which the Democrats are offering, namely, a soak-the-rich program, which involves placing higher taxes on existing wealth, but to eliminate those gross inequities from the present tax structure which are discouraging business incentive. It is those gross inequities which are an impediment to an expansion of our economy. They are making it impossible for us to develop the wealth we need from which we can obtain the new tax dollars with which to meet the obligations of our budget.

I close with a third recommendation, which is that in this session of the Congress the Republican Party should consider all issues from the standpoint of doing what is best in the interest of winning the peace. We should not, Madam President, consider a single one of the major pieces of legislation facing us in this session of the Congress without relating that legislation to the question of peace. I probably should not confess it, but I confess, Madam President, a growing pessimism on the state of world affairs.

I confess a pessimism in regard to the trend of the cold war. I do not see in the cold war at the present moment a trend of victory for the United States. I think things are going badly for the United States in the cold war. I think this matter of winning the peace is superior to and should supersede in our consideration every other issue which confronts us. We Republicans should not let the American people forget that the greatest defense weapon America has is a sound economy at home. Therefore, as we proceed to consider questions as to what we should do in order to turn the tide of the cold war from one of defeat to one of victory in winning the minds of men around the world in support of democratic ideals and freedom of choice, which is the essence of democracy, I suggest that the Republicans at least keep their eyes on the importance of a sound economy. I am one who has come to the conclusion that our domestic economic problems must be solved in the interests of a sound economy if we are to be in a strong enough position to meet Russia in case the cold war should turn into a hot one. I am just pessimistic enough to believe, Madam President, that it will turn into a hot war whenever Russia believes we have so weakened our domestic economy that we cannot beat her in a hot war.

The time has come for us to meet the question of a balanced budget, the question of a sound tax-revision program, not in terms of talk, but in terms of votes on the floor of the Senate in support of specific pieces of legislation. I recommend that my Republican colleagues start with two, the Hoover Commission recommendations for economy in government, and the recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development with reference to the tax-revision program, in the field of taxation.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, some time ago I introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an exchange of letters I had with the Secretary of State concerning our policy in the Far East, specifically with regard to Formosa and China.

I have recently received a letter from a Mr. H. G. McNeary, of Hong Kong, China, who, although he has been in China the greater part of 30 years, is one of my constituents. His family home is at Cornwall on the Hudson. Mr. McNeary writes to me suggesting that one of the positive courses we could follow in China would be to encourage a spirit of resistance to communism among Chinese students in America. He also suggests that action groups could be founded among the Chinese workers and merchants in the United States, some of whom might aid in the resistance movement in China.

Such activities, Mr. McNeary points out, would also have the advantage of counteracting the work of Communists and Communist agents among the Chinese in this country. Obviously, much of this program would need to be inspired by the Chinese themselves, but the United States Government could certainly encourage and aid these movements. I am merely citing this as one worth-while suggestion for the consideration of the State Department.

Mr. McNeary also sent me two editorials, one from the Hong Kong Sunday Herald, and the other from the China Mail, also published in Hong Kong, dealing with the far-eastern situation. These editorials give, in my judgment, a sober evaluation of the situation by persons who are on the scene and who know what they are talking about when they talk about China.

The views set forth in these editorials correspond with some of the conclusions which I have reached without the benefit of the intimate knowledge and the facts available to these writers.

I invite the Members of the Senate and the country at large to read these editorials, not because they necessarily reflect absolute truth, but because they represent an informed opinion.

I also commend to the attention of those interested the proposal I have cited by Mr. McNeary.

I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert into the RECORD at this point the editorial from the Hong Kong Herald and the editorial from the China Mail.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hong Kong Sunday Herald of February 12, 1950]

DESTINY CAN WAIT AWHILE

Time was when we all had plans and programs for China. We were all as busy as could be, in all sorts of different ways. The Japanese got busy in Manchuria, and the Lytton Commission went in to see what business they had to be so busy. There were Boxer fund commissions, parliamentary delegations, tariff commissions, mediation commissions, alphabetical bodies, military advisers, plans, representations and what-not.

Now all that is ended. We are on the outside looking in, and nobody quite knows what to do about it. Washington has retorted to the childish little jibe about her alleged reluctance to carry out the withdrawal of the consuls by naming dates for those remaining to go out. It is certainly a vast change compared with 2 years ago, and none are more acutely conscious of it than the Americans. It is a sort of great western withdrawal.

A few years ago half the Continent of Asia was occupied by the Japanese. The Allied forces overwhelmed them and capitulation alone saved Japan herself from invasion in force. The west came to the east in such panoply of power as was undreamt of a decade before. Caesar in all his glory was never arrayed like MacArthur and Mount-

batten. The volume of power and the distances covered were alike without parallel.

We mention it just in case it has been forgotten—and because the contrast today is almost incredible. But then, so was the contrast between 1945 and 1942. Great tidal waves have been moving across the Continent. Changeless Asia has become preeminently the world focus of change. The end of it is not yet, whether one thinks of such gigantic units as China or India. Nor is anybody certain just what will be the shape of events to come in Japan.

There are a number of very vocal people who want to do something about this sudden reduction of the west to the modest role of mere spectators in China. And some of the things they want to do are plain silly. Some want armed intervention, direct or indirect. Some say the day is lost throughout Asia from the Indian Ocean eastward, and that the best thing to do would be to get out of these areas and let the Communist wave sweep over them. The American Secretary of State is hardly a happy man these days, but he has kept his head amid all the counsel and criticism to which he has been subjected

In his exchange of letters a few days ago with Senator LEHMAN, the former head of UNRRA, Mr. Acheson emphasized that hasty or ill-considered action might do irreparable harm He fully understood the public uneasiness over the fact that no positive course for the United States to follow within China suggests itself But he agreed with the Senator that there was a positive course, and in the long run, a most important one The United States, he said, should seek to maintain the friendliest relations with the peoples of Asia, and to show the Chinese people that its desire, as always, was the advancement of their welfare and interest.

"It is for us during this period to extend with tact and understanding a helping hand where we can, and a guiding hand where this will not be resented, and above all to see that the peoples of Asia have a true picture of us and a true picture of Soviet communism and a clear understanding of what each stands for In a sense, we are thus on trial before the peoples of Asia."

Americans like red-blooded policies. There are none available in this period. There is little beyond pussyfooting to be done just now except in propaganda It may be exasperating, but it is true just the same. The case for the west was never better—the facilities for direct influence on events never worse They were made still worse by the impetuous decision to withdraw all the consuls The provocation was acute, but the decision delighted those whose provocation was specifically directed to this end. The British decision went the other way, and we are convinced it was a better decision It was better morally, however slow practical results may come. And it was better politically, for all the taunts about loaded godowns in Hong Kong. It is probable Mr. Acheson thinks so too, but he has been badgered into defensive tactics when others would have given more promise.

Happily, a stronger line in southeast Asia seems to be foreshadowed in Dr. Jessup's statements. In Singapore, he suggested that the United States might give military as well as economic and political aid to help the peoples of that area to resist communism. That is certainly a lot better than intervention in China, or defeatism in southeast Asia, or looking to Japan as the sole potential saviour of Asia.

[From the China Mail, Hong Kong, of February 15, 1950]

CLEARING THE DECKS

The conference of American diplomats on the Far East has opened in Bangkok. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have concluded their tour of the Pacific and Japan and have presented their report on American defenses in these areas. At the same time, reports from Moscow indicate that the protracted negotiations between the Chinese Communist leaders and the Kremlin may be about to end. From these three major sources, therefore, the material will soon be available on which the administration can frame its detailed policy.

In these days, policy has to be global in scope, but that does not mean it cannot be flexible. Just as in war, strategy and tactics cannot be quite the same on every front, though there is fundamental agreement on the principle of containment of aggression. We regained the initiative in Berlin and in the West generally as a result of the purposeful policy of the past year. In the Far East we had the initiative after the war, but have now lost it in the larger sense.

Mr Dean Acheson however, has cut his way through much deadwood to first principles In these days of raucous and vociferous confusion that at least is something to be thankful for. He at least knows where he stands, even if neither he nor anybody else—pending the slow unfolding of events in China—knows precisely where we go from there, or when. That will have to be considered in the light of facts and the recommendations of the experts. Meanwhile, Mr. Acheson has made his way through the mists of confusion in one of the most remarkable series of statements any American statesman has ever made. He has dealt as faithfully with those with a pain in the neck as with those shuddering with a pain in the heart. His long silence before the recent uproar over Taiwan left the field almost wholly to the Republican critics That has since been remedied, at least in the tactical battle for public opinion.

The critics know their own mind, of course, and what they would do. Senator KNOWLAND has just laid down a five-point program. Under this, there would be no recognition of the new regime in China. General MacArthur would coordinate all far eastern affairs. A military commission would go to Taiwan to play the same role there as in Greece. Conditions are completely different now, however similar they might have been when the Chinese Communists, like the Greek Communists, were mere guerrillas and not in occupation of the entire mainland The Far Eastern Division of the State Department would be reorganized, because of its Alger Hiss influence A demand would be lodged with the Communists that all American nationals be liberated at once, with an American naval blockade of the coast if it were rejected

The objectives seem much too limited for the risks entailed. The plan does not restore influence on events in the mainland; if anything it removes all that remains, or that may develop in a measurable distance of time Its political content is shrill, not tough And toughness is the supreme need. If any synthesis is possible between this program and the general principles of American policy—always its greatest asset—it will have to be based on the purely strategic ideas of the Chiefs of Staff.

There is, too, another aspect of the battle for public opinion. It relates to the reaction to the atomic bomb, and now the hydrogen bomb. A few days ago Mr. Acheson again got down to first principles on this. He declared bluntly that no fresh approach was being made. It was open to the Russians to accept the Baruch plan for control or to suggest reasonable modifications. One such suggestion that has again been made is that is should be removed altogether from the domain of national sovereignty.

But, said Mr. Acheson, atomic agreement is not the fundamental question. What comes first is the establishment of friendly understanding between the countries. On this the State Department has not given up hope. Continuing attempts were being made to extend the area of possible agreement with Russia. Once this is sufficiently wide, it should be possible to lay down this fact in black and white.

"Time after time we have seen that agreements with Russia are useful when they register facts which exist, and that they are not useful when they are merely agreements which do not register existing facts. An arrangement which meets the interests of both parties will stand. It will be founded on fact. Anything else will sooner or later be proved to be waste paper."

In other words, it is essential to take the psychological mainsprings of Soviet policy into account—and play from strength. Soviet policy was a mixture of ideology and imperialism, and all in all it was incompatible with world peace and the freedom of peoples. At the same time the Soviet Government was highly realistic and could adapt itself to facts So in matching realism with realism Mr Acheson's policy is based on an analysis of Soviet psychology. And realism consists in building situations so strong that their strength would be recognized by the Soviet Government. And in Asia no less than in Europe.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, may I inquire what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. I expect to call it up at the proper time in the course of the debate on the potato question.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4406) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KEE, Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. EATON, and Mr. VORYS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. PACE, Mr. GRANGER, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4453) to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating

discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4406) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GREEN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

REHABILITATION OF NAVAJO AND HOPI TRIBES OF INDIANS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, which were on page 8, line 12, strike out "expended" and insert "of contributions by the State toward expenditures"; on page 9, line 6, strike out "chairman thereof" and insert "President of the Senate"; and on page 9, lines 9 and 10, strike out "chairman thereof" and insert "Speaker of the House of Representatives."

Mr McFARLAND. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. ECTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 4453) to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 24, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 23, (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Victor Z. Gomez et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 6, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Victor Z. Gomez and ending with the name of Marcus L. Whitfield, on page 1510.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Clement Anthony Siwinski et al., for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 16, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Clement Anthony Siwinski, which appears on page 1867, and ending with the name of Elizabeth M Nichols which is shown on page 1868

The nominations of the following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and title III of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948.

To be lieutenant colonels

Della Josephine Angst, AL80067.
Martha Leola Cross, AL80206.
Mary Lois Kersey, AL80016.
Kathleen McClure, AL80200
Virginia Justin Phelps, AL80020
Marie Louise Ray, AL80119
Emma Jane Riley, AL80056.
Margaret Johanna Steele, AL80199.

To be majors

Pauline Estelle Abell, AL80053.
Evaline May Absalom, AL80041.
Margaret Andrews Bacchus, AL80031.
Laurie Marie Ball, AL80047
Ruth Lucile Blind, AL80033.
Anna Lee Briggs, AL80052
Margaret Goodman Brown, AL80063
Charlotte Gage Butterfield, AL80050
Lucile Caldwell, AL80027.
Virginia Christina Dietz, AL80030.
Kathryn Grace Ecke, AL80062.
Mary Elma Elrod, AL80054
Anna Marie Frost, AL80061
Wilma Rebecca Hague, AL80034.
Elizabeth Tunstall Hickson, AL80231.
Marjorie Ostrander Hunt, AL80049.
Rachael Ann Johnstone, AL80037.
Kathryn McConnell Ludlow, AL80044.
Dorothy Page Martin, AL80028.
Margaret Elizabeth McEnerney, AL80051.
Gladys Emma McManimie, AL80040
Mary Elizabeth McPherson, AL80224.
Willa Mae Mizell, AL80058.
Jacquelin Mozelle Mooneyham, AL80043
Gladys Myrabelle Nelson, AL80494.
Genevieve Kelly O'Brien, AL80213.
Helen Emeline O'Day, AL80068.
Maimie Pauline Oliver, AL80488.
Rose Ethel Panowski, AL80223.
Bernice Cecelia Philipps, AL80032.
Margaret Louise Philpot, AL80048.
Bertha Pinckes, AL80038.
Elizabeth Ray, AL80214.
Myrl Dean Stiles, AL80482.
Marion Eliza Swan, AL80046.
Mildred Elsie Thomas, AL80036.
Edith Margaret Toffaletti, AL80479.
Janna Tucker, AL80039.
Frances Works Van Pelt, AL80029.
Kathryne M. Walls, AL80495.
Margaret Mary Werlein, AL80045.

To be captains

Jean Doris Armstrong, AL80106.
Joan Elizabeth Bennett, AL80094.
Virginia Marie Blanchard, AL80086.
Carolyn Elizabeth Boatwright, AL80083.
Madelen Cassidy, AL80105.
Alberta Marie Courchene, AL80080.
Elizabeth Narcissus Cox, AL80082.
Doris Dee Diamant, AL80109.
Elsie Ovedia Ellingson, AL80097.
Harriet Marion Fivenson, AL80099.
Mary Elizabeth Flannagan, AL80104.
Virginia Spence Gary, AL80107.
Elizabeth Guild, AL80096.
Alice Hoyt Hartley, AL80079.
Verdia May Hickambottom, AL80084.
Bonnie Turnbull Martin, AL80190.
Virginia Eloise Martin, AL80075.
Ruth McCraw, AL80078.
Murial May Moran, AL80103.
Shirley Theone O'Dell, AL80093.
Rita Elizabeth O'Donnell, AL80085.
Frances Oppenheimer, AL80076.
Viola May Peschel, AL80087.
Ruth Ramee, AL80100.
Lillian Tombacher Robinson, AL80091.
Cora Edra Sharon, AL80081.
Albina Helena Shimkus, AL80088.
Mary Ellen Shull, AL80095.
Flora Mary Smothers, AL80101.
Mary Helene Strong, AL80092
Ruth Ellen Vorkoeper, AL80090.
Ruth Lamar Williams, AL80069.
Jean Smollen Wilson, AL80102.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Joseph G. O'Rourke, St. Joseph's Church, Marshall, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, with our whole soul we thank Thee for the great gift of the holy year. Heavenly Father, Thou who seest all things, who searchest and dost guide the hearts of men, make them responsive, in this time of grace and salvation, to the voice of Thy Son. May Thy grace enkindle in all men love for the many unfortunate people, whom poverty and misery reduce to a condition of life unworthy of human beings. Arouse in the hearts of those who call Thee Father a hunger and thirst for social justice and for fraternal charity in deeds and in truth. Grant, O Lord, peace in our days—peace to souls, peace to families, peace to our country, peace among nations. May the rainbow of peace cover with the sweep of its serene light the land sanctified by the life and passion of Thy Divine Son. God of all consolation, deep is our misery, grave are our faults, countless our needs. But greater still is our trust in Thee. Conscious of our unworthiness, we lovingly place our lot in Thy hands, uniting our weak prayers to the intercession and the merits of the most glorious Virgin Mary and all the saints. Grant to the sick resignation and health; to young men, the strength that is born of faith; to young girls, the gift of purity; to fathers, prosperity and holiness for their families; to mothers, success in their mission of rearing their children; to orphans, affectionate protection; to the refugees and prisoners, their fatherland; and to all men Thy grace, in preparation and in pledge of the unending happiness of heaven. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7220 An act to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S Con Res. 71. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare additional copies of the hearings on the national health program, 1949

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No 64]

Allen, La	Gilmer	Murray, Wis
Bosone	Hedrick	Sadowski
Bulwinkle	Herter	Shelley
Chatham	Holifield	Smith, Ohio
Crosser	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Wis
Davies, N Y.	Jones, Mo	Withrow
Dawson	Macy	Wolcott

The SPEAKER On this roll call, 410 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with

THE FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The SPEAKER The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of H. R. 4453. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Fair Employment Practice Act"

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC 2 The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(a) That the denying of employment opportunities to, and discrimination in employment against, properly qualified persons by reason of physical disability, race, creed, political affiliation, sex, or color is contrary to the principles of freedom and equality of opportunity upon which this Nation is built, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production and defense, and burdens, hinders, and obstructs commerce.

(b) That it is the policy of the United States to bring about the elimination of discrimination because of race, creed, political affiliation, or color in employment relations.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, and one for a term of 5 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 5 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. Not more than three Commissioners shall be members of the same political party. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President upon notice and hearing for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members of the Commission shall at all times constitute a quorum.

(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed

(d) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 a year, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(e) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agencies as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States.

(f) The Commission shall have power—

(1) To appoint such officers and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions;

(2) To cooperate with or utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies and to utilize voluntary and uncompensated services,

(3) To pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the Commission or any of its agents or agencies the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States,

(4) From time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in such manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

(5) To serve process or other papers of the Commission, either personally, by registered mail, or by leaving a copy at the principal office or place of business of the persons to be served, and

(6) To make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested Government and nongovernmental agencies.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC 4 (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to bring about the removal of discrimination in regard to hire or tenure, terms, or conditions of employment, or union membership, because of race, creed, or color—

(1) By making comprehensive studies of such discrimination in different metropolitan districts and sections of the country and of the effect of such discrimination, and of the best methods of eliminating it;

(2) by formulating, in cooperation with other interested public and private agencies, comprehensive plans for the elimination of such discrimination, as rapidly as possible, in regions or areas where such discrimination is prevalent;

(3) by publishing and disseminating reports and other information relating to such discrimination and to ways and means for eliminating it;

(4) by conferring, cooperating with, and furnishing technical assistance to employers, labor unions, and other private and public agencies in formulating and executing policies and programs for the elimination of such discrimination;

(5) by receiving and investigating complaints charging any such discrimination and by investigating other cases where it has reason to believe that any such discrimination is practiced; and

(6) by making specific and detailed recommendations to the interested parties in any such case as to ways and means for the elimination of any such discrimination.

(b) After the filing of any written complaint, the Chairman of the Commission shall designate one of the Commissioners to make, with the assistance of the Commission staff, prompt investigation in connection therewith, and, if such Commissioner shall determine after such investigation that probable cause exists for crediting the allegations of the complainant, he shall immediately endeavor to eliminate the unlawful employment practice complained of by conference, conciliation, and persuasion

(c) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President describing in detail the investigations, proceedings, and hearings it has conducted and their outcome, the decisions it has rendered, and the other work performed by it, and may make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable. The Commission may make such other recommendations to the President or any Federal agency as it deems necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act.

INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 5 (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or its authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have the right to examine or copy any evidence of any person relating to any such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(b) Any member of the Commission shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing

(c) Any member of the Commission, or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence, and conduct investigations, proceedings, or hearings

(d) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place within the area of the United States district court in which the hearing is held.

(e) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this act, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing; any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by it as a contempt thereof.

(f) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience

to the subpena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

(g) None of the provisions of this act shall apply to employment by the Atomic Energy Commission or any contractor or licensee of the Atomic Energy Commission.

DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 6. The Commission shall make a study and investigation of discrimination in regard to hire, or tenure, terms, or conditions of employment, in the departments and agencies of the Federal Government because of race, creed, or color, and shall recommend to the Congress a specific plan to eliminate it and such legislation as it deems necessary to eliminate it.

WILLFUL INTERFERENCE WITH COMMISSION AGENTS

SEC. 7. Any person who shall forcibly resist, impede, or interfere with, any member of the Commission or any of its agents or agencies in the performance of duties pursuant to this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500: *Provided*, That any person who is a member of an organization which has been cited by the Attorney General and/or by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as a Communist organization or as a Communist-front organization is excluded from the provisions of this act: *Provided, however*, That the absence of individuals of a particular race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry in the employ of any person shall not be evidence of discrimination against individuals of such race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

SEC. 8 Nothing in this act shall mean, nor be construed to mean, that any person who lacks the qualifications necessary to fit one to perform the duties of the job for which that person may be applying, must be employed in spite of his disqualifications.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BREHM. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BREHM moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 177, nays 239, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—177

Abbitt	Evins	Patten
Abernethy	Fernandes	Peterson
Albert	Fisher	Pfeifer,
Allen, Ill.	Frazier	Joseph L.
Andersen,	Fugate	Pickett
H Carl	Gary	Poage
Anderson, Calif.	Gathings	Powell
Andresen,	Gore	Preston
August H.	Gossett	Priest
Andrews	Grant	Rains
Angell	Green	Rankin
Arends	Gregory	Redden
Aspinall	Hardy	Reed, Ill.
Barden	Hare	Reed, N. Y
Bates	Harris	Regan
Battle	Harrison	Rich
Beckworth	Hays, Ark.	Richards
Bennett, Fla	Hébert	Rivers
Bennett, Mich.	Herlong	Rogers, Fla
Bentsen	Hobbs	Sadlak
Boggs, La	Hoffman, Mich.	Sanborn
Bolton, Md.	Huber	Sikes
Bonner	Hull	Simpson, Ill
Bosone	Jenison	Simpson, Pa
Boykin	Jones, Ala.	Sims
Brehm	Jones, N. C.	Smathers
Brooks	Karst	Smith, Va
Brown, Ga.	Kelley, Pa	Spence
Bryson	Keogh	Stanley
Buchanan	Kerr	Steed
Burke	Kilburn	Stigler
Burleson	Kilday	Stockman
Burton	Klein	Sutton
Camp	Lanham	Taber
Canfield	Larcade	Tackett
Cannon	Lodge	Teague
Carlyle	Lucas	Thomas
Carroll	Lyle	Thompson
Chelf	McGrath	Thornberry
Church	McGregor	Trimble
Colmer	McMillan, S. C.	Underwood
Combs	McMillen, Ill.	Vinson
Cooley	Magee	Wadsworth
Cooper	Mahon	Walter
Cox	Marcantonio	Wheeler
Crawford	Marsalis	Whitaker
Crosser	Mason	White, Idaho
Curtis	Mills	Whitten
Davenport	Monroney	Whittington
Davis, Ga.	Morgan	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn	Morris	Williams
Deane	Morrison	Willis
DeGraffenried	Murdock	Wilson, Okla
Dollinger	Murray, Tenn	Wilson, Tex
Doughton	Nicholson	Winstead
Durham	Norrell	Withrow
Eaton	Norton	Wood
Eberharter	Pace	Woodhouse
Elliott	Passman	Woodruff
Ellsworth	Patman	Worley

NAYS—239

Addonizio	Chudoff	Ford
Allen, Calif	Clemente	Fulton
Auchincloss	Clevenger	Furcolo
Bailey	Cole, Kans.	Gamble
Baring	Cole, N. Y	Garmatz
Barrett, Pa.	Corbett	Gavin
Barrett, Wyo	Cotton	Gillette
Beall	Coudert	Golden
Bieniller	Crook	Goodwin
Bishop	Cunningham	Gordon
Blackney	Dague	Gorski
Blatnik	Davis, Wis.	Graham
Boggs, Del.	Dawson	Granahan
Bolling	Delaney	Granger
Bolton, Ohio	Denton	Gross
Bramblett	D'Ewart	Gwinn
Breen	Dingell	Hagen
Brown, Ohio	Dolliver	Hale
Buckley, Ill.	Dondero	Hall,
Buckley, N. Y.	Donohue	Edwin Arthur
Burdick	Douglas	Hall,
Burnside	Doyle	Leonard W.
Byrne, N Y.	Elston	Halleck
Byrnes, Wis.	Engel, Mich.	Hand
Carnahan	Engle, Calif.	Harden
Case, N. J.	Fallon	Hart
Case, S Dak.	Feighan	Harvey
Cavalcante	Fellows	Havenner
Celler	Fenton	Hays, Ohio
Chesney	Flood	Heffernan
Chiperfield	Fogarty	Heller
Christopher	Forand	Herter
Heselton	McCulloch	Rabaut
Hill	McDonough	Ramsay
Hinshaw	McGuire	Rees
Hoeven	McKinnon	Rhodes
Hoffman, Ill.	McSweeney	Ribicoff
Holifield	Mack, Ill.	Richlman
Holmes	Mack, Wash.	Rodino
Hope	Madden	Rogers, Mass.
Horan	Mansfield	Rooney
Howell	Martin, Iowa	Roosevelt
Irving	Martin, Mass	St. George
Jackson, Calif	Merrow	Sasscer
Jackson, Wash	Meyer	Saylor
Jacobs	Michener	Scott, Hardie
James	Miles	Scott,
Javits	Miller, Calif	Hugh D., Jr
Jenkins	Miller, Md.	Scrivner
Jennings	Miller, Nebr	Scudder
Jensen	Mitchell	Secrest
Johnson	Morton	Shafer
Jonas	Moulder	Shelley
Judd	Multer	Sheppard
Karsten	Murphy	Short
Kean	Murray, Wis	Smith, Kans
Kearney	Nelson	Staggers
Kearns	Nixon	Stefan
Keating	Noland	Sullivan
Kee	Norblad	Talle
Keefe	O'Brien, Ill	Tauriello
Kelly, N. Y	O'Brien, Mich	Taylor
Kennedy	O'Hara, Ill	Tollefson
King	O'Hara, Minn	Towe
Kirwan	O'Konski	Van Zandt
Kruse	O'Neill	Velde
Kunkel	O'Sullivan	Vorys
Lane	O'Toole	Wagner
Latham	Patterson	Walsh
LeCompte	Perkins	Weichel
LeFevre	Pfeiffer,	Welch
Lemke	William L	Werdel
Lesinski	Philbin	White, Calif
Lichtenwalter	Phillips, Calif.	Widnall
Lind	Phillips, Tenn	Wier
Linehan	Plumley	Wigglesworth
Lovre	Polk	Wilson, Ind
Lynch	Potter	Wolverton
McCarthy	Poulson	Yates
McConnell	Price	Young
McCormack	Quinn	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—15

Allen, La	Hedrick	Sadowski
Bulwinkle	Jones, Mo	Smith, Ohio
Chatham	Macy	Smith, Wis.
Davies, N Y	Marshall	Vursell
Gilmer	Sabath	Wolcott

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr Sadowski against.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana for, with Mr. Davies of New York against

Mr Jones of Missouri for, with Mr. Hedrick against

Mr. Macy for, with Mr Wolcott against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Marshall with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Messrs. KEOGH, CROSSER, SPENCE, BOYKIN, ANDREWS, and BATTLE changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. CELLER, BAILEY, and BLATNIK changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL and Mr. COLMER demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240, nays 177, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—240

Addonizio	Auchincloss	Barrett, Pa.
Allen, Calif.	Bailey	Barrett, Wyo.
Angell	Baring	Beall

Biemiller	Hart	Murray, Wis.
Bishop	Harvey	Nelson
Blackney	Havenner	Nixon
Blatnik	Hays, Ohio	Noland
Boggs, Del.	Heffernan	Norblad
Bolling	Heller	Norton
Bolton, Ohio	Herter	O'Brien, Ill.
Bramblett	Heselton	O'Brien, Mich.
Breen	Hill	O'Hara, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Hinshaw	O'Konski
Buckley, Ill.	Hoeven	O'Neill
Buckley, N. Y.	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Sullivan
Burdick	Holifield	O'Toole
Burnside	Holmes	Patten
Byrne, N. Y.	Hope	Patterson
Byrnes, Wis.	Horan	Perkins
Canfield	Howell	Pfeifer,
Carnahan	Hull	Joseph L.
Case, N. J.	Irving	Pfeiffer,
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson, Wash.	William L.
Cavalcante	Jacobs	Philbin
Celler	James	Phillips, Calif.
Chesney	Javits	Plumley
Christopher	Jenkins	Polk
Chudoff	Johnson	Potter
Clemente	Jonas	Poulson
Cole, Kans.	Judd	Price
Cole, N. Y.	Karst	Quinn
Corbett	Karsten	Rabaut
Cotton	Kean	Ramsay
Coudert	Kearney	Rees
Crook	Kearns	Rhodes
Crosser	Keating	Ribicoff
Cunningham	Kee	Richlman
Dague	Keefe	Rodino
Davis, Wis.	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Mass.
Dawson	Keogh	Rooney
Delaney	King	Roosevelt
Denton	Kirwan	Sabath
Dingell	Klein	Sadlak
Dolliver	Kruse	St George
Dondero	Kunkel	Sasscer
Donohue	Lane	Saylor
Douglas	Latham	Scott, Hardie
Doyle	LeCompte	Scott,
Ellsworth	LeFevre	Hugh D., Jr.
Elston	Lesinski	Scrivner
Engel, Mich.	Lichtenwalter	Scudder
Engle, Calif.	Lind	Secrest
Fallon	Linehan	Shelley
Feighan	Lodge	Sheppard
Fenton	Lovre	Staggers
Flood	Lynch	Stefan
Fogarty	McCarthy	Sullivan
Forand	McConnell	Talle
Ford	McCormack	Taurlello
Fulton	McCulloch	Taylor
Furcolo	McDonough	Tollefson
Gamble	McGregor	Towe
Garmatz	McGuire	Van Zandt
Gavin	McKinnon	Velde
Gillette	McSweeney	Vorys
Golden	Mack, Ill.	Wagner
Goodwin	Mack, Wash.	Walsh
Gordon	Madden	Welchel
Gorski	Mansfield	Welch
Graham	Martin, Iowa	Werdel
Granahan	Martin, Mass.	White, Calif.
Granger	Merrow	Widnall
Gross	Meyer	Wier
Gwinn	Michener	Wigglesworth
Hagen	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Ind.
Hall,	Miller, Md.	Withrow
Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.	Wolverton
Hall,	Mitchell	Woodhouse
Leonard W.	Morton	Yates
Halleck	Multer	Young
Hand	Murdock	Zablocki
Harden	Murphy	

NAYS—177

Abbitt	Bolton, Md.	Colmer
Abernethy	Bonner	Combs
Albert	Bosone	Cooley
Allen, Ill.	Boykin	Cooper
Andersen,	Brehm	Cox
H. Carl	Brooks	Crawford
Anderson, Calif.	Brown, Ga.	Curtis
Andresen,	Bryson	Davenport
August H.	Buchanan	Davis, Ga.
Andrews	Burke	Davis, Tenn.
Arends	Burleson	Deane
Aspinall	Burton	DeGraffenried
Barden	Camp	D'Ewart
Bates	Cannon	Dollinger
Battle	Carlyle	Doughton
Beckworth	Carroll	Durham
Bennett, Fla.	Chelf	Eaton
Bennett, Mich.	Chiperfield	Eberharter
Bentsen	Church	Elliott
Boggs, La.	Clevenger	Evins
Fellows	McMillan, S. C.	Sikes
Fernandes	McMillen, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Fisher	Magee	Simpson, Pa.
Frazier	Mahon	Sims
Fugate	Marcantonio	Smathers
Gary	Marsalis	Smith, Kans.
Gathings	Mason	Smith, Va.
Gore	Miles	Spence
Gossett	Mills	Stanley
Grant	Monroney	Steed
Green	Morgan	Stigler
Gregory	Morris	Stockman
Hale	Morrison	Sutton
Hardy	Murray, Tenn.	Taber
Hare	Nicholson	Tackett
Harris	Norrell	Teague
Harrison	O'Hara, Minn.	Thomas
Hays, Ark.	Pace	Thompson
Hébert	Passman	Thornberry
Herlong	Patman	Trimble
Hobbs	Peterson	Underwood
Hoffman, Mich.	Phillips, Tenn.	Vinson
Huber	Pickett	Vursell
Jackson, Calif.	Poage	Wadsworth
Jenison	Powell	Walter
Jennings	Preston	Wheeler
Jensen	Priest	Whitaker
Jones, Ala.	Rains	White, Idaho
Jones, N. C.	Rankin	Whitten
Kelley, Pa.	Redden	Whittington
Kennedy	Reed, Ill.	Wickersham
Kerr	Reed, N. Y.	Williams
Kilburn	Regan	Willis
Kilday	Rich	Wilson, Okla.
Lanham	Richards	Wilson, Tex.
Larcade	Rivers	Winstead
Lemke	Rogers, Fla.	Wood
Lucas	Sanborn	Woodruff
Lyle	Shafer	Worley
McGrath	Short	

NOT VOTING—14

Allen, La.	Hedrick	Sadowski
Bulwinkle	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Ohio
Chatham	Macy	Smith, Wis.
Davies, N. Y.	Marshall	Wolcott
Gilmer	Moulder	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Davies of New York for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Mr. Sadowski for, with Mr. Allen of Louisiana against.

Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Jones of Missouri against.

Mr. Hedrick for, with Mr. Chatham against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Marshall with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. THOMAS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in the bill which has just been passed there is language in an amendment which I offered that used the word "director" when it should have been "chairman." I therefore ask unanimous consent that on page 5, line 23, of the engrossed copy of the bill, the word "director" may be stricken from the bill and that the word "chairman" be substituted therefor in conformity with the rest of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. You cannot correct a bill after it has passed. If that is a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD correction that is another matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is asking unanimous consent to make the correction.

Mr. RANKIN. I doubt if you have a right to go back and change a bill that has already passed the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MILITARY CREDITS BILL FOF POST-OFFICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader when he will program House Resolution 87, the military credits bill for post-office employees?

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman is very much interested in that bill. Under his leadership a rule came out of the Rules Committee. I understand the gentleman would like to have me program the bill.

Mr. DELANEY. As soon as possible.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall program it. I appreciate very much the fact the gentleman made the inquiry of me and I will be only too glad to program it for next week.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to join the gentleman from New York in making that request.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I ask the majority leader about our hospital bill that is bottled up in the Rules Committee? I understand we have a right to call it up next Monday. Is that on the program?

Mr. McCORMACK. The matter of recognition on Monday is one that rests with the Speaker. In a few minutes I will announce the program as I have it, at which time I will answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. RANKIN. We have been waiting for months to get this hospital bill before the House. Members are appealing to me and veterans' organizations all over the country are appealing to me to bring it up and get it passed.

I am going to use every parliamentary method I possibly can to get a vote on it next Monday.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what the program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to. There will be no District bills on Monday However, Monday is discharge day and for the information of the membership the Speaker, as I understand, will recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] to call up H. R. 4846, the National Science Foundation bill.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday the following bills will be called up: I have been advised that on Tuesday a motion will be made to send the basing-point bill to conference, so that will be the first order of business. Then will follow H. R 2392, rural rehabilitation trust funds; H R. 331, statehood for Alaska; H. R. 49, statehood for Hawaii. Then the next order of business will be H. R. 87, postal service, military service, that the gentleman from New York has just inquired about, and that the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is interested in; H R. 3105, vocational education, Virgin Islands; and H R 874, library service demonstration bill Of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether that program could be altered for the consideration of emergency legislation to deal with the national emergency that now exists in the coal fields? Today I have introduced a bill dealing with that matter; I am sure that other Members have also. A condition has developed in the country that if the President will not act, or if he needs some suggestion from the Congress, they should make those suggestions and point a way to meet the real threat that envelops the country today. Would it be possible in the program for next week to give prompt consideration for emergency legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, my friend is well aware that the gentleman from Massachusetts cannot very well program a bill that is not reported out of committee, and on which there is no rule. As a matter of fact, the mining bill that I stated would come up this week cannot be programed. I understand that a motion to reconsider has been made in the Committee on Rules, and so far as I know it has not been passed upon, and therefore I am not programing it for next week.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Massachusetts will recall that in the case of a threatened railroad strike we took very quick action, and almost too precipitant action here one day at the request of the President. However, the President in this situation seems to hesitate to act. If the situation continues as it has, something must be done.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, if anything develops, the program is always subject to change with the proper notice to the House and to the leadership on the gentleman's side. I am preparing a program, and I can only do it at this time based on the bills reported out of committee and the rules that have been reported out of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

POTATOES

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, the subject of potatoes has humorously been referred to as a hot one these last few weeks. It is appropriately named and seriously named too. My colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has given us a splendid speech on the potato surplus and the difficulties of distributing the surplus where it is most needed, because of the complicated regulations which were set up by the Department handling it. I am glad to know that in the last day or two some of those complicated regulations have been removed. Because everyone in the country is interested in food and because of the many well-founded complaints we are all receiving about the tremendous waste of food stuffs, I include with my statement the names of persons handling the distribution of surplus food, including potatoes, and dried eggs, and dried milk, in our Western States. Before applying for this food a city must make a survey of needy families or institutions, report to the local welfare agency, which in turn should contact the person in charge of distribution for that State. The list follows:

California—three agencies: Mr. George E. Hogan, deputy superintendent, State department of education, Library and Courts Building, Sacramento; Mr. J W. Hughes, manager, purchasing and stores department, county of Los Angeles, 1660 East Lake Avenue, Los Angeles; Mrs. M L. Johnson, buyer, California State Purchasing Division, room 107, State Office Building No. 1, Sacramento.

Arizona—two agencies: Mrs. May B. Price, director, school lunches, State department of public instruction, 212 Capitol Building, Phoenix, Mr. George C. Wells, district supervisor Indian education, Office of Indian Affairs, 4120 Scattergood Place, Phoenix.

Idaho: Mr. E. Marion Hoyt, school-lunch division, State board of education, Boise.

Montana—two agencies: Mr. Leslie L. Brown, director, school lunches, State department of public instruction, Helena; Mr. Paul D. Golden, purchasing agent, State purchasing department, Capitol Building, Helena.

Nevada: Miss Mildred Bray, superintendent of public instruction, State department of public instruction, Carson City.

Utah: Mr. Rodney A. Ashby, director, school-lunch program, State department of public instruction, Salt Lake City.

Wyoming: Mrs. Florence P. Lyster, director, school-lunch program, State department of education, Cheyenne.

Washington—three agencies: Mrs. K. R. Larson, buyer, department of public institutions, division of purchasing, Olympia. Mr G W. Van Horn, supervisor, school-lunch program, State superintendent, public instruction, 20 Old Capitol Building, Olympia; Mr. V R. Farrell, administrative assistant, United States Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs, Alaska Native Service, 2400 Fourth Avenue, Seattle.

Colorado: Mr. Charles W Burton, director, commodity distribution, department of public welfare, 1543 Wazee Street, Denver.

New Mexico: Mr. R. B Darden, director of commodity distribution, department of public welfare, 1835 North Broadway, post-office box 1347, Albuquerque

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H R. 7402.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Fair Employment Practice Committee.

Mr. GORSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the New Haven Register.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in regard to the Hoover Commission.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial that appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle.

Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain proposals of the Medical Society of New Jersey.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made yesterday and include certain excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY COAL ACT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a brief resolution which I introduced today on the coal-mine situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the following bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress finds a stoppage of coal production and a shortage of fuel at this time of the year have seriously and adversely affected the flow of commerce between the States and have created a national emergency seriously endangering the national welfare, public health, and safety.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to call upon all persons normally engaged in the production of coal immediately to resume their normal duties and to make a special effort to produce the coal needed to alleviate the dangers to public health and safety now existing and to restore the normal flow of interstate commerce.

SEC. 3 The President is further requested to ask the governors of the several States to employ such components of the National Guard as may be necessary to afford full protection to those workers, mine owners, and operators who seek to comply with the requests made pursuant to section 2 of this act.

SEC. 4. The President is further requested to direct the Attorney General immediately to institute efforts to determine whether there is any concerted effort on the part of any persons or organizations to interfere with the production of coal in this emergency and to take such legal steps as may be necessary to end such interference.

SEC 5. The President is authorized and directed to name a Coal Mine Inquiry Board of five persons to look into all phases of conditions affecting the production or nonproduction of coal and to make a report of findings with recommendations to the Congress not later than June 1, 1950.

SEC. 6. The President is authorized and directed to utilize such facilities and personnel of the executive agencies of the Government as may be needed to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. The President is hereby authorized as the agent of the Congress to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided, however*, That the emergency declared and the powers and duties created by this act shall expire not later than May 31, 1950, unless as otherwise provided herein, or unless Congress by joint resolution shall otherwise direct.

SEC. 8. This act may be cited as the National Coal Emergency Act of 1950.

CAN WE LICK THE SURPLUSES?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a short excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 20 I discussed on the floor some of the phases of the fiscal policy of the United States and my remarks are found on pages 2010 to 2015 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. At that time I stated that a continuation of the unbridled and profligate spending of this administration means bankruptcy of the United States and spells doom for free enterprise and human freedoms. I called attention to the fact that President Roosevelt in 1932 said:

Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns, but you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse

I set forth a tabulation of the expenditures of all the Presidents of the United States to and including the first 8 years of the Roosevelt administration, which aggregated a total of $179,620,113,645, while President Truman from the fiscal year 1946 to September 30, 1949, spent the colossal sum of $191,081,394,191. In other words, the President in less than 5 years has spent more than all of the other Presidents to and including the first 8 years of the Roosevelt administration.

Uncle Sam, it is later than you think. It is high time to stop, look, and listen and curb the orgy of wild and profligate spending both at home and abroad, oust the Communists and spendthrifts from our Government and places of authority, reduce the back-breaking tax load on the American people, end the war excise nuisance taxes, balance the Federal budget, put an end to deficit spending, adopt the Hoover report economies, free the Congress from executive domination and thereby save free enterprise and human liberty in America. It is high time to invest some of the taxes thus saved in America for the upbuilding of our own country and the welfare of our own American citizens. It is time to adopt a Marshall plan or an ECA for the old people of America so that they may have social security giving them sufficient income from the wealth they have helped to create to provide food, shelter, clothing, and medical care according to the American standards of living in their twilight years.

Let us save the American system, free enterprise and human freedoms by following the sound advice, often erroneously attributed to Abraham Lincoln:

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.

You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.

You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.

You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.

We need an Abraham Lincoln today to lead us back to sanity and an abiding faith in the promises of a just God. With more faith in spiritual values and with a judicious handling of our governmental affairs, more common sense and less war and devastation, we would be able, from savings alone without increasing the taxes, to take care of our own people here in America, provide a decent living retirement for all of our old people, the widows, the injured, and the orphans, and still have billions of dollars left over for schools, churches, libraries, hospitals, and for the upbuilding and rehabilitation of this great Republic.

We are overlooking the admonitions of the Sermon on the Mount and the great spiritual values of life and placing our dependence on material things, the war engines of destruction, and the atomic bomb.

For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard—
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding calls not Thee to guard.

Mr. Speaker, I also called attention to the hot half-baked potato program under which the administration has expended $495,169,000, a little less than half a billion dollars of American-tax dollars for the period of 1943–49. Under the program the Government has expended $30,000,000 on the 1949 crop of potatoes and contemplates buying 45,000,000 or 50,000,000 bushels more. When the Secretary of Agriculture announced that he was ready to cause to be destroyed some 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes, I introduced on February 8 H. R. 7208, which would prohibit the Federal Government or any of its agencies from destroying edible foods purchased under the support program and would compel these Government agencies to make these surplus products available to welfare agencies, school-lunch programs, the needy under the welfare program, as well as to needy Indians and other needy persons. I also called attention to the fact that the Federal Government is holding 277,480 tons of surplus commodities costing $265,000,000 in the categories of dried milk, dried eggs, butter, cheese, prunes, raisins, edible dried beans, rice, turkeys, and canned Mexican meats.

I now desire to read an article which appeared in the Farm Journal of February 1950, as follows:

CAN WE LICK THE SURPLUSES?

(By Vernon Vine and Robert D. McMillen, in Farm Journal, February 1950)

Tomorrow morning's breakfast—enough to fill a plate for every man, woman, and child in the United States—is buried in a limestone cave near Atchison, Kans. Sunk in that air-conditioned hole in the ground are 12,250,000 pounds of dried eggs, and 33,500,000 million pounds of dried prunes and raisins. This enormous hoard is only a small part of the vast stock of farm products the Federal Government has bought while propping prices. Few will ever eat any of those eggs or prunes, unless the Government gives them away, or sells them at an enormous loss. And there are many other

items in Uncle Sam's stock pile that are filling caves and moth-balled Liberty ships.

Can all of this go on forever? Taxpayers are getting fed up. City consumers are convinced that they are paying their grocery bills twice—once when they receive their food, and again when they pay taxes. Something has got to be done soon, for those eggs in the Atchison cave are not moving, and the corn piled up in airplane hangars won't go away either.

"Though the people support the Government, the Government should not support the people."—Grover Cleveland.

Mr. Speaker, when the Secretary of Agriculture announced that the Federal Government was ready to destroy through its agencies some 50,000,000 bushels of edible potatoes I at once took up with the Secretary, as Chairman of the Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the fallacy of such a program and urged that neither these potatoes, nor any other edible foods, be destroyed, but be made available to these needy persons whom I have described, and I protested vigorously against such destruction particularly in the State of Oregon, a portion of which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, and urged that these food products be made available to the school-lunch program, welfare agencies, and others in need thereof in my congressional district and elsewhere in Oregon.

I am advised that Roy W. Remington, purchasing agent, State board of control, 109 State Capitol, Salem, Oreg., is the distributor of surplus commodities in Oregon. Mrs. Laura P. Wells is director of the school-lunch program, State department of education, Salem, Oreg.

I have also commnicated with these officials, urging that surplus potatoes be made available in Oregon to our needy citizens. Up to this time I have not received definite information from any source as to whether or not these foods have been or will be made available to the thousands of persons in need thereof or whether they will be destroyed or allowed to spoil. It is my information that the latter part of 1949 the Portland schools did receive their proportion of the 186,000 sacks of potatoes distributed by the Government to Oregon schools and State institutions, which had been acquired under the price-support program, and that additional orders were placed for 1,080 sacks for the remainder of the school year which had not been received before the January ice and sleet storms blanketed much of the Oregon area, including the city of Portland, in my congressional district.

I have urged the Committee on Agriculture of the House to give immediate consideration to my bill, H. R. 7208, and to the other bills introduced on the same subject having for their objective the disposal of these surplus edible foods acquired under the support program to the needy in the various areas of the United States where such food products are held by the Federal Government. Many of my colleagues are joining in a common effort to secure early action on this legislation. Thus far, the leadership of the administration has given no assurance that the legislation will be given the green light as emergency legislation for early passage. In the meantime, the food products are deteriorating and the hungry go unfed.

THE FEPC BILL

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, although debate on the Powell FEPC bill, H. R. 4453, is over, several Members have nevertheless suggested to me that I call the attention of the Congress to one section of that bill that may need to be amended in fairness to the employer, the employee, and the general public. The feeling of those Members to whom I have spoken is that perhaps the attention of the Senate and any possible conference committee should be directed to the matter. Perhaps at that time the amendment I have in mind may be fully considered.

The amendment I plan to discuss had been filed with the Clerk when the Powell FEPC bill was being considered, but, due to the parliamentary situation that developed, there never was an opportunity to present it to the House.

Section 5 (a), on pages 5 and 6, of the Powell bill defines unlawful employment practices in detail. The words to which I wish to address myself are as follows:

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

* * * * * *

(2) To utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any * * * labor organization * * * which discriminates against individuals because of their race, color, religion, or national origin.

Everyone who is in favor of any FEPC bill believes that a provision to that effect should be included in the bill.

However, in my opinion at least, an amendment is needed reading substantially as follows:

Page 6, line 9, after the period, insert "*Provided*, That no employer shall be penalized under this act for utilizing in good faith any labor organization that has been duly certified and is acting as bargaining representative or agent under the terms of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended"

If such an amendment is not adopted, both the employer and the employee may be seriously handicapped in their bargaining activities. Let me illustrate just how that could happen.

Assume a union has been certified by the National Labor Relations Board as the representative to bargain for employees with an employer. The employer must bargain with that labor organization or else run the risk of being brought before the Labor Relations Board for an unfair labor practice. The National Labor Relations Act compels the employer to bargain with that particular labor union.

Now the employer is also faced with an FEPC bill which subjects him to criminal penalties if he deals with a union that discriminates on grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin. Let us further assume that the particular union that the National Labor Relations Board has compelled him to recognize and deal with is discriminating against individuals because of their race, color, religion, or national origin.

The employer is in this position: If he deals with that labor union, he will be punished under the FEPC law. If he does not deal with that union, he will be punished under the National Labor Relations Act. Under such conditions, the employer is compelled to violate either the National Labor Relations Act or the FEPC law, regardless of any good motives or desire she may have to abide by the terms of both. He is whipsawed.

Up to now I have been discussing an employer with the highest of motives. Let us assume in another illustration that we have an employer who wishes to use any possible excuse to avoid bargaining with the union. Such an employer may refuse to bargain with a labor union on the excuse that the union discriminates on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin, and that such discrimination on the part of the union excuses him from bargaining further on the theory that continued bargaining with such a union is a violation of the FEPC law and that, under such circumstances, the National Labor Relations Board cannot punish him for a refusal to bargain.

Even if such an argument on the part of the employer might not be valid and might not be sustained in any hearing before the National Labor Relations Board, I think all of us will agree that the National Labor Relations Board would be much more lenient in its punishment of any such employer because the argument the employer presented—at least taking it at face value—was a justifiable excuse for refusing to bargain. Any lawyer can appreciate the great weight such a defense would be in mitigation of an employer's refusal to bargain.

Such a situation is, of course, extremely detrimental to the best interests of employees and the labor unions that represent employees. It tends to defeat the bargaining relationship and places the employees and the labor unions representing them at a tremendous disadvantage. An employer who wanted to take advantage of such a situation to avoid bargaining could easily find one or more employees who would claim the union had discriminated—and that would give the employer his excuse for refusing to bargain on the theory that bargaining would subject him to punishment under the FEPC law.

The situation could easily be disruptive to bargaining conditions throughout the Nation. It could work to the detriment of the employer, the employees and the general public. If many employers seized upon the excuse outlined above, it could well cause chaos in the industry of America.

It seems to me that if the amendment I have suggested is added to section 5 (a) of the Powell FEPC bill so that—as far as the point we are discussing is concerned—that section would read substantially as follows:

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to utilize any labor

organization which discriminates against individuals because of their race, color, religion, or national origin—

Then adding my amendment—

Provided, That no employer shall be penalized under this act for utilising in good faith any labor organization that has been duly certified and is acting as bargaining representative or agent under the terms of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

That amendment does not change the FEPC law in any way, but merely tries to do this: First, protect an employer, who is in good faith, from being placed in a situation where he cannot avoid being punished by either the FEPC law or the National Labor Relations Act, no matter how much he tries to live up to the terms of both; second, protect the labor union and the employees by insuring that the FEPC law is not going to disrupt the bargaining relationship with the employer; third, protect the general public by not allowing the FEPC law to be used as a means of causing chaos in industry through disruption of the relationship between the bargaining representatives of labor and management.

It seems to me that, whether you are for or against any FEPC law, you will be in favor of such an amendment. If the principle of FEPC legislation is good, this amendment in my opinion improves such legislation. If the principle of FEPC legislation is bad, this amendment in my opinion makes such legislation less bad.

If your interests lie with the employer, you should want to protect the employer from being placed in a position of double jeopardy.

If your interests lie with employees or labor unions, you should want to protect them from anything that decreases their bargaining power.

If you are interested in the welfare of the general public, I believe you will want the amendment for the protection that it is intended to give the general public from any industrial unrest.

Before offering the amendment discussed above, I took it up with members of the Labor Committee in charge of the FEPC legislation. While they must speak for themselves of course, I am of the belief that they intended to support my amendment. I also discussed the amendment with several Members on both the Republican and Democratic side and they felt it should be included in any FEPC legislation. Some of those Members were in favor of FEPC, some were against—but they all favored the suggested amendment.

I have outlined the above in the hope that it may be of some possible help to those who will be considering FEPC legislation from now on.

FOREST SERVICE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous censent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, PACE, GRANGER, HOPE, and AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

DEBATE ON FEPC BILL

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the House to a matter that may not generally have been noticed. On yesterday and last night throughout that long and hard battle over FEPC there was very little of bitterness, very little of personal animosity, injected into the debate. It was a hard-fought battle, but it was marked with good humor and good sportsmanship. I think the House can well be proud of the way it conducted itself on that occasion.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to vacate the special order granted him to address the House for 1 hour on Monday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, February 22, entitled "Middle Income Housing."

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by the Governor of Kansas, a former Member of the House, Hon. Frank Carlson, before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House with reference to percentage depletion on gas and oil production.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY SEIZURE ACT OF 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the administration is said by the press to be waiting for a seizure bill to be introduced in order to deal with the bituminous coal emergency. I call their attention to the fact that as far back as June 6, 1949, I introduced H. R. 5006, the National Emergency Seizure Act of 1949, especially to take care of just such national emergencies as have now arisen.

The five major points in this bill are:

First. The property is not to be operated on a strike-breaking basis, but is to be operated by the Government only to the minimum extent required to preserve the public health or security.

Second. The employees—those who choose to remain on the job—are to be paid not less than prevailing wages in the area, and a special board is to consider the wage scales during Government control.

Third. The Government is to pay only just compensation for the value of its use of the seized property, and is not to operate for the account of the employer as if it were a going concern.

Fourth. The property is to be restored to its owner when normal labor relations have been restored.

Fifth. The President is given authority, not direction, and may act through an officer or department.

I call on the Committee on Education and Labor to immediately hold hearings on H. R. 5006 as this is a practical—and indeed liberal—plan for dealing immediately and realistically with the emergency created for the Nation by the coal strike.

It will be recalled that as far back as the original consideration of the Taft-Hartley law in 1947—which I was against—I offered amendments and argued for just such national seizure provisions as are contained in my bill. I was convinced then as I am now that the security of the Nation was paramount to all other considerations and that this security required residual power in the community to continue to operate in the event of labor difficulty of a national emergency character, and that a plan for this purpose could be practicably effectuated which neither made men work by injunction or force, or immobilized the Government from action.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech.

SURPLUS FOOD COMMODITIES

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I am including a list of names and addresses of the several State offices in the Midwest who can approve applications by local boards of public welfare for surplus food commodities for distribution to needy people. This supplements the list submitted by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

SOUTHEAST

District of Columbia: H. A. Gardner, District of Columbia school-lunch program, 1640 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

West Virginia: W. Waggy, supervisor, State department of public welfare, State Capitol Building, Charleston, W. Va.

MIDWEST

Illinois: P. W. Cahill, State director, Illinois Public Aid Commission, 160 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Indiana: R H. Schweitzer, department of public welfare, 141 South Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

Iowa: C. W. Bangs, supervisor, department of public instruction, Des Moines, Iowa.

Michigan: R. J. Budd, department of administration, 415 State Office Building, Lansing, Mich.

Minnesota: A. R. Taylor, community school-lunch program division, 307-308 State Capitol, St Paul, Minn.

Missouri: Handled by medical welfare office, O. F. Beyer.

Nebraska: O. F. Beyer, area supervisor, 623 South Wabash, Chicago, Ill.

Ohio: Carl Graves, department of public welfare, 1115 Atlas Building, 8 East Long Street, Columbus, Ohio.

Wisconsin: G. W. Gunderson, State department of public instruction, 147 North State Capitol, Madison, Wis.

SOUTHWEST

Kansas: Frank Long and E S Eachran, State department of social welfare, 801 Harrison Street, Topeka, Kans

Oklahoma: Jay Lee, administrator, State board public welfare, State Capitol, Oklahoma City, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STOCKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

FEPC LEGISLATION

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER Is there objection the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr Speaker, the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act makes the right to employment without discrimination a Federal right. Makes it an unlawful employment practice: First, for an employer of more than 50 persons to discriminate in employment, because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, or to obtain assistance in hiring from sources discriminating for such reasons; second, for a labor union of 50 or more members, on the same grounds to discriminate or to limit, segregate, or classify membership in any way which would adversely affect employees or applicants for employment; and, third, for an employer or a labor union to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person because he has opposed an unlawful practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

Establishes a Fair Employment Practice Commission of five members, appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, to investigate, conciliate, and adjudicate complaints of such unfair employment practices, to order their cessation and appropriate affirmative action, including hiring or reinstatement of employees with or without back pay. The Commission may petition circuit courts of appeals to enforce certain orders, and so forth, and parties aggrieved by orders of the Commission may obtain review.

Laws, as we in a civilized society are familiar with them, are designed to promote a constructive end, to further the ends of our society and civilization. Before any proposition becomes garbed in the regal cloak of law, it must be determined whether or not such a proposition is likely to attain those objectives for which it is designed. The intention and probable effects of a given law are exclusive features in themselves, and to the extent that the probable effects diverge from the desired objectives, to that extent is a proposed law rendered undesirable.

Let us at this point examine the current and controversial proposal, FEPC, relevant to intention and probable effects By so doing we can arrive at a conclusion as to whether or not that particular bill should remain a proposal, or should, instead, become incorporated into our laws; whether or not the plan has merit; whether or not it is just a vain attempt.

The prime intent of the FEPC is to eliminate discrimination on the part of employers in the process of hiring employees. Now that the intent is known, let us look at the means to be employed to effect the desired end. Then we will see the proposal in full perspective.

In order to effect the desired objectives, the act provides that there be established a Fair Employment Practice Commission of five members appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, to investigate, conciliate, and adjudicate complaints of unfair-employment practices, to order their cessation and appropriate affirmative action, including hiring or reinstatement of employees with or without back pay. The Commission may petition circuit courts of appeals to enforce certain orders, and so forth, and parties aggrieved by orders of the Commission may obtain review.

The intent and the means are now established. It is evident that the Federal Government intends—through its agent, the FEPC—to attain its objective of fair-employment policy by forcing the employer, via threat of prosecution, to comply with the established provisions of the act.

Now, we might ask, what would be some of the probable effects of such a Government-sponsored program?

For one thing, it is highly probable that an employer who is interviewing two prospective employees, one a minority representative with limited ability, the other a majority representative with considerable ability, would, because of fear of prosecution by the Government for unfair-employment practices, hire the minority representative instead of the majority representative; he would hire the inefficient instead of the efficient.

It takes little imagination to visualize the detrimental effect on our whole economy if such a procedure were to be carried on in large scale. Production would be curtailed and efficiency would be discouraged. The direct result would be the elimination of marginal firms, increased unemployment, and reduced supplies of available goods. Such a condition is more than a possibility—it is a probability, and it deserves consideration as such.

Too, relative to the economic, it is highly probable that such a plan might prove detrimental to investment, the backbone of our economy. Many employers would, owing to the curbing of their power to hire whom they desire, refrain from expanding their businesses. Others would, rather than be regulated by some powerful agent of control, discontinue their business pursuits and derive psychological and monetary reward in other quarters. Then there would be others, potential investors in nature, who because of the control measure would develop a considerable degree of skepticism and refuse to invest their money so badly needed by the economy. Here again there would be reduced employment and reduced supplies of available goods, two prime requisites for a dynamic economy.

In such a plan there is also the likelihood that the employer is apt to become conscious of something of which he had not before been conscious. Here we would find that some employers who had never entertained any concepts of discrimination in hiring employees would, because of the force measure rebel against it and resort to subtle means to evade its provisions. In this instance we would find the paradoxical situation where the plan was creating the very thing it ostensibly purports to destroy. This is an undesirable end.

The plan, too, has a certain lopsided fairness about it that would not, in all probability, produce a very desirable result. There is not, for instance, any compensatory feature for the employer's willfully submitting to the provisions of the plan. He receives no guaranty that he will get an efficient performance from those minority elements which he has been forced to hire. In fact, the only guaranty he receives is a negative one, that being that those whom he has been forced to hire would be able to protect their inefficiency through the protecting features of the plan. If this is fairness, it is a one-sided fairness that breeds no good for either the individuals concerned or the economy at large. And for those who claim that the employer has the right of reference to the court, it can be said that he would, in all probability, find it more advantageous to tolerate the inefficiency than to resort to expensive legal proceedings which would probably net him no satisfaction nor any benefits. Here again such a result would prove as detrimental to the economy as it would to relationships between the employer and minority groups.

The plan, too, has qualities about it that suggest another probable step toward complete regimentation. Personal liberties sacrificed on the altar of Government control mean another step closer to the undesirable goal of totalitarianism, and close scrutiny at the degree of control now exercised by the Government will reveal with startling clarity that one or two more steps in this direction could well prove catastrophic to an American way of life. Taking a well-earned and deserved liberty from one element of the society and

granting it to another element in accordance with the arbitrary dictates of a strong central power upsets the balance of a society. It is little more than a process of taking away from one element a power which has been wielded with some degree of reasonableness, and giving this power to an element whose power to wield it has proved questionable. In short, there is not sufficient evidence to prove that the minority groups warrant such power, and there is the real danger that they would abuse rather than use that which has been so generously tendered them by a paternalistic Government.

Likewise, because of the nature of the plan, there is the real danger that political greed and graft would be given an opportunity to thrive. It is highly probable that there would be considerable collaboration between corrupt politicians and unprincipled employers to the detriment of the very group for which the plan has been designed. Realizing the administrative features that would be required to prosecute such a program, it is quite easy to see that there would be an abundance of fertile ground in which corruption of all sorts might quickly take root.

Then, too, relevant to the workings of the plan, it seems highly improbable that the courts would be able to, with any reasonable degree of accuracy, determine when an employer was guilty of turning down an employee because he was a member of a minority group. The courts would find themselves engaged in the exhausting task of weighing and determining the relative efficiency of applicants for a given job. The aid of technicians and experts would be required if the court's decision were to be a "fair" one. And even then the decision so rendered would not be infallible or just, because there would be such imponderables as the psychological and physical health of the individuals concerned at the time of job application which could not be accurately measured or determined. Such a program would be one that demanded of the court too much of the unreasonable.

Too, there is the real probability that the FEPC program might well disrupt what progress has already been made in relationships between minority and majority groups. Even in the South, where the minority group has long been a vital issue, progress has been and is continuing to be made; there is no doubt that, in time, a satisfactory solution for all concerned will be arrived at. Of course it is true that it takes time and that the process seems slow in finding a solution for this problem. But on the other hand it must be realized that learning is a slow process and that habits formed and concepts realized can succumb to only the onslaughts of time and education. And, too, once we have learned by understanding, we do not easily forget, for our learning becomes so deeply ingrained in us that it becomes a part of us. It is easy to see that FEPC might, by its very nature, tend to destroy that progress which has to date been made, relative to majority and minority groups.

All of my previous references have been probabilities, but as a final measure I would like to point out the fact that the FEPC proposal would, if it were law, destroy and violate the sanctity of contract. It would automatically destroy that prime right of contract which men have for long enjoyed, rightfully and deservedly. Where previously the right of contract had been controlled by law, it would now be destroyed by law, and any existing contracts subsequent to such an act of the Government would be in effect pseudo rather than intrinsic contracts; they would be little more than the expression of dictates by a strong central power with little or no emphasis on the individual to the contract. The surrendering of such a right in one area quite naturally leads to the surrendering of the same right in other areas, and the direct result would be one where the only existing entity qualified to make a contract would be the Government. It might be well to mention that Russia has a similar arrangement, and it goes without saying that once having become a little like her, it will be easy to become a lot like her. And in due course of time we would find such stringent measures as the 5-year plans, State regulation, and stereotyped functions superimposed upon the policy of destruction of the right to contract. We as a country will be adopting policies and programs upon which we have spent billions of dollars and considerable effort to curb and destroy. It is, in fact, just about time that we, as Americans, begin to indulge in a little consistent thinking and acting. And if we do not start today, tomorrow may well be too late.

Our review then proves that the plan, the Fair Employment Practice Act will not, in measures of probability, attain those objectives for which it was ostensibly designed. It is evident that it will, in fact, do little more than make something malignant out of something now benign. In fact the evidence against its merits is so strong that there is a suggestion that the proclaimed intent is not the real intent. There is something about the Fair Employment Practice Act that strongly hints that it is a device concocted as a political instrument, and is designed to win votes at the expense of creating chaos in an already turmoiled society. In fact, in considering the nature of the probable results, one could not be justifiably condemned if he were to label the act as something devised by elements without to destroy rather than ameliorate that which is within.

It is my strong conviction that no proposal worthy of being called law should court the probability of promoting such drastic ends. Because of this, I firmly believe that the Fair Employment Practice Act and all of its counterparts should be forever barred from donning the princely raiment of law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on George Washington.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editrial from the Buffalo News.

IMPORTS FROM RUSSIA

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Russians have opened a new offensive. This time it is directed not against Greece, not against Finland or Poland and not against China. It is aimed at American business, American labor, and American employment.

I say this because I am reliably informed that within recent weeks the Russians have dumped 59,000 cases of canned Russian crab meat, valued at about $3,000,000, into American seaports. Unless the State Department and other departments take steps immediately to halt this dumping of Russian canned crab onto the American market, our Atlantic and Pacific coast crabbing industry with its millions of dollars of investments and its thousands of workers, faces extinction.

American fishermen and American cannery workers cannot compete with the slave labor of Russia and none of us should expect them to.

During the 12-year period between 1927 and 1939, according to the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Japanese had an average annual crab pack of 445,102 cases. Of that average annual pack, 55 percent, or about 250,000 cases, was shipped into the United States. This supplied 85 percent of the American market for canned crab.

Under postwar agreements entered into by us with Russia, the Russians were given control and jurisdiction over the Asiatic crab fishing waters, formerly fished by the Japanese crab fishing fleets. The Russians can, and no doubt will, henceforth pack half a million cases of canned crab annually. Obviously, it is their intention to dump this Russian canned crab onto the American market.

By doing so they will accomplish a twofold purpose. They will obtain 20,000,000 to 30,000,000 American dollars and at the same time they will be destroying an American industry and force its thousands of fishermen and cannery workers into unemployment. It seems unthinkable that the State Department complacently should sit idly by and permit this calamity to happen to one of our great fishing industries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in this session of the Congress I have called attention to the shortage of coal in the State of Michigan. We are now having a blizzard in Michigan with almost zero weather. As far back as October, I telegraphed the President regarding the shortage of coal in our State; to date the situation has not been alleviated. I am receiving from two to three telegrams a day, from different cities in my congressional district, to the effect that they are without coal or will be within 48 hours.

In some cases there is a threat that schools will be closed because of the shortage of fuel. For that reason I cannot urge the President too strongly to act and act immediately in order to save our people from suffering and in order to keep our schools and hospitals open and operating.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the Delaware State Dental Society.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances, in two to include letters concerning excise taxes, and in another to include an editorial.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

POTATOES

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I suppose this might be called the final report on "project potatoes."

I am glad to read a telegram which I have received from a young man who worked on this project, an employee of Station WHAI of Greenfield, Mass., who has carried through to the finish. I believe I am correct in saying that he was a former Air Force man.

The telegram reads as follows:

Mission accomplished 10:55 a. m. Five tons potatoes crossed town line into Greenfield. Greenfield plan in action. Letter will follow.

I am now including a further list of the names and addresses of area offices of the food-distribution-programs branch, and also of certain offices in the State of New York.

This supplements other such data submitted Monday and today:

AREA OFFICES OF FOOD-DISTRIBUTION-PROGRAMS BRANCH

Atlanta, 449 West Peachtree Street NE: Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Kentucky, Alabama.

Chicago, 623 South Wabash Avenue: Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, South Dakota, North Dakota, Michigan, Missouri, Minnesota, Nebraska, Wisconsin.

Dallas, 101 Norman Building: Kansas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Colorado.

New York, 641 Washington Street: Maine, Delaware, New Hampshire, Vermont, West Virginia, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Maryland, District of Columbi , Massachusetts.

San Francisco, 30 Van Ness Avenue: Montana Wyoming, Nevada, California, Arizona, Washington, Idaho, Oregon, Utah

Honolulu, T. H., 416 Dillingham Building: Hawaii.

San Juan, Puerto Rico, P O box 4349: Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands.

New York distributing agents, commodity distribution program

Name of distributing agency	Title	Address	County
Chester A. Halman, director, New York City area office for marketing	Director	90 Church St., New York 7, N Y	Nassau, New York City, Orange, Putnam, Suffolk, Westchester, Rockland
Bernard F Fitzpatrick, Albany County D P W	Commissioner	City Hall, Albany 7, N Y	Albany
Walter J Bensley, Broome County D P W	Deputy commissioner	County home, Binghampton, N Y.	Broome, Cayuga, Chemung, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware, Jefferson, Madison, Onondaga, Oswego, Otsego, St. Lawrence, Schuyler, Tioga, Tompkins
H. E. Robinson, Cattaraugus County D. P W.	Commissioner	Machias, N. Y.	Allegany, Chautauqua, Steuben, Wyoming.
Albert H Hunt, Erie County purchasing department.	Assistant purchasing agent	134 West Eagle St., Buffalo, N Y.	Erie
Allen F. Lockwood, Fort Ann Central School	Superintendent	Fort Ann, N Y	Clinton, Columbia, Dutchess, Essex, Franklin, Fulton, Greene, Hamilton, Montgomery, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Schenectady, Schoharie, Sullivan, Ulster, Warren, Washington
Jesse B. Hannan, Monroe County D P W	Director	1460 South Ave, Rochester, N Y	Livingston, Monroe, Ontario, Wayne, Yates (Seneca County pending.)
George T Williams, Oneida County D P W.	do	Room 54, Courthouse, Utica, N Y	Herkimer, Lewis, Oneida.
Milton E. Switzer, Niagara County D P W	Commissioner	Box 457, Lockport, N Y.	Genesee, Niagara, Orleans.

NOTE.—Rockland and Seneca Counties still pending.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the current calendar. The back page indicates that only one bill has been passed up to date, and that an urgent deficiency bill. So that there may be no confusion about it, I checked the record of the Eightieth Congress, which the President continues to belabor. At that time they had already passed the independent offices appropriation bill, a large bill; the civil functions bill; an urgent deficiency bill; and a major bill, the income-tax reduction bill. By March 15 we had passed eight of the major appropriation bills. Now the House Appropriations Committee has not completed hearings on the one bill which we are told will be taken up by March 15. Think of it. The Congress has been in session almost 2 months and the Senate has not passed a single bill worthy of mention on the calendar. The House has only passed a deficiency appropriation bill in addition to the bill passed today. It is a disgraceful record, and proves the complete inability of the Democratic leadership to operate the Government effectively.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

MONUMENT ERECTED TO MEMORY OF CONFEDERATE SOLDIERS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed by the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Florida who called attention to the lack of acrimony and passion in the debates in connection with the FEPC bill.

In that connection may I say that on a recent visit to Arlington Cemetery I took occasion to minutely inspect a beautiful monument erected there to the memory of some Confederate soldiers who are buried in Arlington Cemetery. I obeserved that that monument was erected by the Daughters of the Confederacy. I was so impressed that I read the inscription upon that monument. Many Members of Congress have asked me to place it in the RECORD. It is a beautiful expression that ought to enter the hearts of all people who believe in tolerance.

This is the inscription on that monument:

Not for fame or reward, not for place or for rank, not lured by ambition or goaded by necessity, but in simple obedience to duty, as they understood it, these men suffered all, sacrificed all, dared all and died.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

THE FEPC BILL

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, this House today had the opportunity to perform an outstanding service to the cause of the democratic liberties upon which this great country was founded. Unfortunately, the action finally taken in enacting the amended version of the Fair Employment Practice Act paid only lip service to those liberties. This is a course of action long familiar and well suited to those responsible for substituting the so-called McConnell amendment to the Powell bill. But it is a course of action which cannot but arouse feelings of bitterest disappointment in those of us who, as I have, have spent their lives in the struggle to eliminate the inequalities of opportunity which, despite our 174 years of existence as a nation devoted to the ideals of democracy, still confront large segments of our population.

The Republican proponents of the emasculated substitute version of the original Fair Employment Practices Act proposed by Mr. Powell claim that the Commission set up by their measure will provide a medium through which a great educational job can be accomplished. To circulate this claim as the feeling of this House will be but to perpetuate a fraud upon the country as a whole, and may lull into a false sense of accomplishment those who have some sense of the existence of the problem of discrimination but no real realization of the urgent nature of the need for effective curative measures of a positive kind. Those of us who proposed and fought for a real FEPC, myself among others, have effectively refuted this claim. We pointed out that even our basic educational system requires so-called compulsive features demanding school attendance by children of school age. To say that a voluntary educational program such as that set up by the McConnell amendments will provide an effective substitute for the enforcement features of the Powell bill is at best a well meant delusion, and at worst a deliberate device to perpetuate the chains of near slavery which still bind so many of our people.

The Fair Employment Practices Act, as now constituted, is all froth and no substance. It lacks the teeth necessary to provide that substance. However, in view of the practical impossibility of forcing any other more effective measure through the Congress at this time, many friends of FEPC, myself among them, have felt it incumbent upon themselves to vote for the act, weak though it may be. It has one valid claim to support in that it does place this House on record as at least establishing the principle of Federal Government taking some steps to deal with the problem of racial discrimination.

It is my confirmed and studied belief Mr. Speaker, that if and when the presently enacted Fair Employment Practice Act does become law its inherent weaknesses will render it innocuous and almost completely ineffective. This result may serve the ends of those who have so bitterly opposed effective action by this House, but it cannot and will not be allowed to stand as the final word upon the problem of racial discrimination with all its attendant evils. The great mass of freedom-loving people who have watched our action today will remember what we failed to do here. The RECORD stands for all to read. Those who read carefully will know that the Members of this House who voted to substitute the McConnell amendment for the text of the Powell bill as reported to the House either do not understand the problem, are blind to the existence of a problem, do not understand how to solve it, or do not want it solved. "By their votes ye shall know them."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extracts from printed statements.

Mr. BARING asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

HOW THE UNHOLY ALLIANCE AND COALITION OF REPUBLICANS AND DIXIECRATS DISREGARDED THE ADMONITION, ADVICE, AND CHALLENGE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON IN HIS FAREWELL ADDRESS, AND IGNORED LINCOLN'S WORDS OF WISDOM

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Nation and the House observed George Washington's birthday, but only for a short time. The House not only disregarded Washington's admonition and advice as contained in his Farewell Message, the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, but it failed to remember Abraham Lincoln's words of wisdom when he said:

> You can fool some of the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

Several times during the debate on the civil-rights bill, Jefferson's words in the Declaration of Independence were called to the attention of the Membership, that is wherein he stated:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal.

Thomas Jefferson repeatedly appealed to the people and the Congress for their undivided support of the Constitution. His insistence on the inclusion of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution is a matter of history. Has all of our great history been forgotten?

To me, Mr. Speaker, yesterday's performance surely did not add to the dignity and decorum of this great body nor comply with the wishes of the aforementioned great Americans. The action of the Republicans and the southern Democrats after more than 15 continuous hours in session, to bring about the emasculation and abortion of the FEPC bill—known as the civil-rights bill—by means of dilatory and filibustering tactics, succeeded in doing indirectly what they would not dare to do directly, namely, passing a real FEPC bill. Yesterday's performance was nothing new to me, Mr. Speaker, as I received the run-around in the Seventy-ninth Congress and again in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, as well as during the first 6 weeks of the present session. I was frequently assured by members of the Rules Committee, as its chairman, that favorable action would be taken on granting a rule for the civil-rights bill on many occasions, but when the true test came, the Republicans, under one pretense or another, failed to vote to grant a rule so that orderly proceedings could be had on this worth-while measure. As I said on the floor yesterday, nearly every church, labor, liberal, fraternal, social, and humanitarian organization urged and pleaded for the enactment of a real FEPC bill.

If the Republican Party and the Republican members think that they have fooled the American people by voting for the McConnell subterfuge and monstrosity of an FEPC bill, then they are badly mistaken, for I again wish to call your attention to Lincoln's pearls of wisdom when he said:

> You can fool some of the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

I believe they will find that Lincoln's words are absolutely true, because, regardless of their manipulations, they cannot hide or conceal from the American people the fact that they were against civil-rights legislation from its very inception.

The Republican Party promised and assured the American people that they would vote for a real FEPC measure. The Republican Party in its national convention went on record in unmistakenable terms, to wit:

> One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States; it was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic. The right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country or origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic.

Since that time, various Members, yes, most of the Members, during their election campaigns promised the people of this great country that they would carry out their pledge in fact, and not in name only, and vote accordingly in favor of a real FEPC bill. The Republican Party failed to keep its word to the people as

demonstrated by 11 roll calls on yesterday, each one lasting some 40 minutes, in an effort to delay, if not cease further consideration of the civil-rights bill before the House. Oh, yes; they finally voted for the makeshift, meaningless, skeleton of a bill that in no way carries out the original intent and purposes behind the bill. Witness the many amendments that they agreed to. The original committee bill, known as the Lesinski bill, in no uncertain terms would have provided for the elimination of discrimination in employment on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, and it would have provided for the enforcement of same. But instead, they preferred to favor a bill which had no teeth whatsoever, and lacked all semblance of any enforcement provisions.

The Republicans shrewdly and connivingly maneuvered all of us who honestly and truly favored a fair employment practice bill into a position wherein we were obliged to vote for the McConnell bill in the hope that the Senate will substitute the real Lesinski bill in its stead. Of course, being familiar with the other body's activities, as I am, I do not now entertain the great hope that the American people can expect favorable action thereon in the Senate, and in fact, the same coalition of Republicans and Dixiecrats that exists in the House may or may not succeed in the other body in ignoring the principles outlined in the Declaration of Independence as well as in the Democratic and Republican platforms.

Mr. Speaker, during the long debate on this bill I heard many fears expressed as to the serious effect that this bill will have, but, Mr. Speaker, in the years gone by I have heard these same fears and unjust criticisms expressed by the very gentlemen who always oppose liberal legislation whenever we consider liberal and humane legislation, the last being the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act wherein the minimum wage level was justly raised. None of these fears ever materialized, and on the contrary they were proved ill-founded. The real facts are that the country as a whole has benefited tremendously by the liberal and humane legislation that was enacted during the last 18 years and which lifted the country from chaos and the throes of a Republican depression to the greatest prosperity our Nation ever enjoyed.

I cannot help but recollect the words of our late revered and loved President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who said: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

Mr. Speaker, in view of the multitude of telegrams and letters that I received this morning from many sections of the country and from outstanding individuals and organizations resenting and condemning the failure on the part of the House to act on a real civil rights bill, I fervently hope the error of yesterday will be rectified by the other body.

THE RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I would feel remiss in my duty if I did not take the floor to clarify the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. The gentleman from New York has just said that we had passed no bills in this House so far this year and referred to many appropriation bills that had been passed by the Eightieth Congress up to this date.

We are proceeding this year in the Committee on Appropriations under a new system, namely an omnibus appropriation bill. The various subcommittees have been in regular and almost continuous session, and the consistency of the labor of the appropriation group is well known to every Member of Congress. Under the new plan we will not report individual bills out as we did previously. The gentleman from New York knows that very well, so it is just a matter of a change in the system that accounts for the absence of appropriation bills on the floor up to this date.

These bills will come forth this year in the form of chapters in one omnibus appropriation bill. Then the fact will be revealed to the country that Congress is striving to the best of its ability to keep expenditures within the limit of the anticipated revenue of the Treasury. The Nation refers to this, and refers to it correctly, as balancing the budget.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4406) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KEE, RICHARDS, RIBICOFF, EATON, and VORYS.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 488) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That EDWARD J. HART, of New Jersey, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I wish to make a statement. As a member of that committee I would be remiss if I did not say to the House today that the full committee has had only one meeting this year and that meeting lasted less than 15 minutes. We have never had full committee consideration of the so-called one appropriation bill approach for all expenditures. It is true, of course, that the various subcommittees are diligently pursuing their labors, some having completed the major portion of their year's work prior to House action on the final measure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by President Truman yesterday.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into an extended discussion today about the Committee on Appropriations except to make a few remarks in reply to my good friend from New York [Mr. TABER] and his statement in reference to the Eightieth Congress. I can understand his position and why he is disturbed, but we Democrats view his disturbed state of mind with tolerance. The fact is that the country repudiated in a very clear way in November 1948, the Eightieth Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Appropriations Committee, may I say that I do not know of any committee the members of which work harder than do the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof. They meet at 10 o'clock in the morning in very small rooms—I call some of them dungeons. They are there until 12 or 12:30, at which time they go out for a quick lunch. Then they reconvene and work all afternoon until 5:30, 6, or 6:30 in the evening. They start this routine in December and go through the various months until the appropriation bill is reported to the House.

I want to publicly congratulate all of the members of the Committee on Appropriations without regard to party for the diligent manner in which they perform their duties. I know of no more laborious task than being a member of the Committee on Appropriations. They deal with figures all day long. I know the arduous duties imposed upon them and I think it is only fitting and proper that the few remarks I have made calling attention to their devotion to duty and the long hours they put in should be made out of a sense of justice not only to the committee as such but to all mem-

bers of the committee without regard to party.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the power of the House to act when it desires was demonstrated yesterday and this morning. The lack of inclination or courage on the part of the House to act when pressure groups are on the other side of the issue has been demonstrated over the months by our failure to do anything about a situation which is developing in the coal industry. Some people are asking why the miners and the mine owners are having trouble. My own opinion is that we have too many miners and too small a market for coal.

The introduction of machinery has enabled miners to produce in perhaps 3 days a week all the coal that can be used in our country; hence the miners are beginning to find themselves without full-time jobs and, being human, they do not like the idea of making a quick, but perhaps unprofitable, change to some other occupation just as long as they can continue to get increases in pay, and they get $14 plus a day, and 30 cents a ton levied on all of the coal produced for pensions and other benefits, such as insurance and sickness. They would be less than human if they did not try to get the granting of first one demand, then another, all to their advantage.

That situation, the excessive production of coal, a dwindling market with resulting unemployment, I think, is what has caused them to continue their efforts for more benefits, ever-higher wages. Over the years the people and the Congress have gone along. It took the Congress more than 10 years to get the first amendment to the old Wagner Act, to get through the Taft-Hartley Act, and always has the Congress, partly because the individual Members wanted to give the man who worked with his hands the advantage in a controversy, and partly because of political pressure, increased the power of the unions and of the union leaders, not only to bargain collectively, but the power of the leaders to oppress their own union workers.

There have been several instances of that recorded in the press in recent days. Perhaps the most familiar one is where the miner on strike, unable to get coal himself, wanted to install an oil or gas burner in his home. He was fired by the union from the union. That is just one of many instances, some of which have found their ways to the courts.

I do not know what the situation with reference to the lack of coal is in other States, but I do know in my own State of Michigan people are cold. I do not think they are beginning to get cold. They are cold now. I do know that in some communities in Michigan there is practically no coal on hand.

Into my office this morning walked a gentleman from New York, prominent in civic affairs. He said that unless there was relief shortly they were going to be forced to close some of the public institutions in New York. If relief did not come within a few days—and I asked him how many, and he said, well, four or five—if they do not get coal there will be suffering and perhaps deaths. And, worse than that, if possible he said, there will be a shut-down of some of the public utilities. He insisted you cannot heat the city by burning pavements or fire hydrants.

I am not an alarmist. I have never been very badly frightened, although perhaps I should have been, about the atomic bomb or the hydrogen bomb; perhaps because those are things in the future, but I am worried about this coal situation. I realize that you cannot have coal in Virginia, or in Indiana, Pennsylvania, or some other places, and if there comes what we call a cold snap, and the mercury drops down—and in some places in Michigan it has been 12 below zero, drops down overnight—I realize that you cannot just twist the telephone dial, call up and get a load of coal. That coal may be in the fields of Indiana, it may be down in Pennsylvania, or down here in West Virginia, and you are not going to get it across the highways or the railroads by morning or before the fire goes out in house or factory.

So, I do fear, I have a very acute fear, that our people will actually suffer. Possibly some of them will be frozen.

Where does the responsibility rest? We cannot lay it on the President of the United States entirely. We—the Congress—are in part responsible. We have sat here year after year and we increased the powers of unions until they have a grip upon industry which enables them to impair the public health, safety, and welfare, our national security. What are we to do about it? I do not know whether John Lewis made the statement, but some of the labor leaders, United Mine Workers officials, made the statement that you cannot mine coal with bayonets or injunctions. I grant that. But, one thing those gentlemen forget is this, that you can use bayonets to keep the strikers and the goon squads from preventing men who want to work from working and mining coal. That is one thing that some of these United Mine officials have forgotten. They have forgotten there are strip mines in this country.

Another thing they have forgotten is the lesson that I get out of history. The lesson has always been that violence begets violence, and that sooner or later, if these gentlemen continue their violence, if these men keep on with their goon squad activities, they will be met in a like manner. Unlawful violence has never won when it came in contact with lawful violence. There is no argument but that if people begin to suffer acutely from cold, if someone dies because he is frozen to death because of lack of coal, some folks are going down to mine coal, work strip mines, and if strikers are in the way, there will be a pitched battle, and the goon squads will not get by unscathed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is speaking with respect to the Government's controlling the actions of the individual workers. The thought that strikes me is that if the Government steps into that field, why should it not step into the field of finance and business and control business also? That would be regimentation, it would be absolute control of all business transactions and all business activities, as well as labor activities. It is all right for the gentleman to advocate that the Government say to the individual worker, "Now, you must go to work," but——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I do not say that. Do not quote me as saying that. I agree with the gentleman. The Government, in my opinion, cannot force—I am not talking about the legal end of it now, by injunction—I do not contend that the Government can or that it should force the gentleman or me to accept any particular task, except perhaps in time of war. The gentleman mistakes me entirely. My theory is that if you want to strike or I want to strike and quit work, that is your privilege, that is my privilege. Just stay on strike as long as you want to. But do not do as the unions insist, prevent the other man from going to work when he wants to work, especially in an industry the slackening of which will endanger the public health, safety, and welfare.

That is my position. I agree with the gentleman on the other points. If the gentleman wants to control things, if he wants a socialized government, if he wants a communistic government, if he wants the Government to control business and industry and labor, if he can get the majority of the people to accept that there is nothing I can do about it. I will object to it, I will contend against it as long as I can, and then if you get it and I do not like it, I will move away if there is any place left for me to go, where I may be free.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am sure the gentleman does not want to impute to me by indirection or insinuation that I am for a socialized government. The gentleman's mention of that leaves that impression. I am not for a socialized government or anything like that. I am very much against it. But whenever you try to regulate unions, necessarily you must also regulate business, in order to be fair.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We do. We have antitrust laws, we have all sorts of laws regulating business.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am afraid the gentleman is stepping in the wrong direction whenever he wants to regulate union organizations. Necessarily it must follow that if you are going to regulate union organizations you are going to regulate business organizations, and therefore the gentleman is more for socialized government than I am. That is my contention.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is just nonsense. We are all regulated to a certain extent. I do not see how the gentleman figures it out at all that way, because as a matter of fact, and I know

the gentleman knows it very well because he is a skillful and learned lawyer, the gentleman knows very well that business is regulated from the time a fellow hangs up his sign until he asks the court in bankruptcy to give him a discharge. The gentleman knows we have many, many laws about unfair practices in business, just as we have in industry. We have laws against monopoly in business, but we do not have any law against monopoly by or in labor.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman said exactly what is right. We have many statutes against unfair practices. The gentleman put that in himself and I agree with him. This Government is organized to prevent unfair practices.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is true.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is regulation. We do not want to go too far in regulating union organizations. We do not want to go too far in regulating business organizations. But you use the word "unfair."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is why we are a Congress here and I am afraid you are going too far.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, maybe so, in exempting labor unions—strikers—from responsibility for violence—from destruction of property.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am afraid you are going too far in what you want to call fair and unfair.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I go too far, it will be along the line of being conservative and it will be along the line of not spending too much and trying to keep a little in my own pocket or in the coffee pot in the shelf. It will be along the line of staying on my own side of the fence when I do not agree with my neighbor and not butting into his business and telling him how to run his business, but tending to my own business. The gentleman spoke of unfair regulations. The gentleman knows that in the Wagner Act there were provisions which prohibited unfair practices on the part of the employer and which defined such practices while there was not one single penalty which applied to a union or a union man—not one. You tell me of any law which unfairly restricts the right of a union or of a union employee—tell me one.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The present statutes provide that a closed shop is not only unfair, but illegal.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; it is not. You can have a union-security shop.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am talking about a closed shop.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is no difference except 30 days, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I know there is a difference.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The difference is 30 days.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman knows there is a difference.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot yield further.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman knows there is a difference between the closed shop and the union shop. Of course, you know that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, and I will tell you what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further, until I tell you what the difference is. I hate to start an educational campaign here because I am not a licensed teacher. Anybody who knows what a closed shop is knows that a closed shop is where a man in the beginning must be in the union in order to get a job. Union security is a situation where a man is either in the union when he starts to work or within 30 days must get into the union or get out of his job.

That is the difference. There is a 30-day difference between the two and that is all the difference there ever was, and that is what the difference is today. What I am talking about is unfairness of the situation where in connection with services upon which our public health and safety, and so on, depends, and an organization or man says that they do not want to and will not work and at the same time insists that no one else may work there. That is my point. You cannot get around the unfairness of that situation.

By what right or by what logic do you say it is unfair if I say that the miners in your country, if they do not want to dig coal, must step aside and let somebody else dig the coal which the people in the cities and on the farms must have if they are to cook their meals, if they are to avoid freezing to death. Is there anything unfair about that?

Is there anything unfair in saying to Mr. Jones, "Mr. Jones, you do not want to work. Get out of the way so Mr. Smith can work."

There is nothing unfair in that. It is said any man has a right to work or not to work, as he chooses. I will agree—but no man has the right by violence to deprive another of the right to earn a livelihood.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, no; I decline to yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course, you have the floor, and you have the right to refuse to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You can get time. We must have an end to violence.

I saw a piece in the paper. I do not know whether it is accurate or not. It may be just a rumor again. A group of women, the wives of miners, caught the son of a man who was operating a nonunion mine and they put some 16 or 17 holes in him by shoving their hatpins in him. Of course, that is not typical. That is just one exceptional instance. But here is one you often find in the papers. Here is one which appeared in the papers on February 20.

Mr. EBERHARTER. What paper?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know. I do not have it; this is just a clipping. But it does not make any difference, even if it was not in the Chicago Tribune, and thank God for the Chicago Tribune. I know how you dislike their policy and their news items, but I know how you always read them so as to know what is going on. It makes me think of a newsletter that I used to send out. A fellow sent the envelope back to me and wrote, "Do not send me any more of this trash." I wrote him back and said, "Brother, I won't." I told him he did not have to read it. He wrote, "You put it in the papers," and said he did not like it. I said, "Why do you read it?" He wrote me another letter, and we had a nice correspondence. He wrote, "I read what you write because I am wondering what you are up to."

Mr. EBERHARTER. Were they subsidized?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield. May I have the protection of the Chair?

Permit me to read:

GOONS INVADE TWO MINES AND PISTOL-WHIP ELEVEN

BARBOURVILLE, KY., February 20.—A gang of 100 armed hoodlums, apparently United Mine Workers, today attacked two coal companies near here, beat up 11 persons, including UMW men employed by the two firms, and engaged in a vicious rampage of property destruction.

Deputy Sheriff Eugene Knuckles said none of the gangsters was identified, and authorities have made no arrests Knuckles said they were believed to be miners from Harlan County, Ky.

The terrorists first entered the property of the Kentucky-Jellicoe Coal Co., 6 miles south of Barbourville. The company operates a large mine, normally employing 300 UMW workers, but the mine has been closed recently by the UMW strike and only 5 maintenance men were there this morning.

BEATEN WITH PISTOLS

The sheriff's office said the invaders, without pausing for any conversation, seized the UMW maintenance men and beat them with pistol butts.

The goons smashed all the windows in the mine office, and swept through the interior in a destructive fury, overturning and smashing furniture and littering the office with papers from ransacked files.

Two automobiles owned by the mine employees were virtually destroyed. All the windows in both cars smashed, the tires of one were slashed off, and the body of the other ripped to pieces by hoodlums swinging miners' picks.

MOVE TO NEXT PLANT

The mob next moved in on the Richland Coal Co, a coke plant on the outskirts of Barbourville.

Douglas Noonan, one of the operators, said the leaders of the mob asked if the company had a contract with the UMW. Noonan said it did not, but that the plant was operating under the Taft-Hartley law, and with UMW employees.

The terrorists brushed aside his explanation and began battering his head with pistol butts. Douglas Blair, cooperator of the coke plant, tried to rescue Noonan and received similar brutal treatment, as did four employees of the plant.

One employee, Earl Martin, reported that a shot was fired at him as he ran from the mob. He was not hit, however.

The mobsters gave the Richland Co. office the same treatment given the Kentucky-Jellicoe office, smashing furniture, tearing a telephone off the wall, and ransacking the files and scattering papers throughout the place. In the coke plant yard they overturned all the trucks except one, which they ran up a ramp and dumped into the coal-sorting bins. Windows of all the trucks were broken.

MAY CLOSE PLANT

A representative of the Richland firm estimated the damage caused by the invaders would force closing of the plant for a "considerable time."

Both Blair and Noonan were treated at a local hospital for severe bruises suffered when they were pistol whipped.

After the two raids the mob joined a larger mob of some 500 at Pineville, 17 miles southeast of here, but no further acts of violence were reported.

It is the usual characteristic story. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and put this in.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Here is an editorial.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Here is an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I object.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You object to what? What do you object to? Do you object to putting this in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asked unanimous consent to insert the article in the RECORD and the gentleman from Pennsylvania objected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. I will withdraw the request. I received that permission when I first rose. I have that permission now.

Now, the gentleman, as I understand it, was appointed by the President to a Federal judgeship. I refer to this only because I want to call attention to the gentleman's legal learning, his ability and his familiarity with the rules of the House. Yet he stands on his feet like the—well, I will not say that. You know the miners quit work. I am supposed to have the floor but the gentleman insists on standing and talking. I just have to ask that the gentleman sit down, Mr. Speaker. I will make it short.

Here is this editorial which I will insert:

INSURRECTION

Utility companies are ordering dim-outs. Steel mills are shutting down blast furnaces. Many railroads are able to provide only skeleton services. Coal for domestic heating is virtually unobtainable, and cold and sickness threaten millions of homes.

John L. Lewis sits back and may even regard with arrogant pride the misery he has inflicted on the people of the United States. A Federal court has enjoined the strike. He has told the miners to go back to work. They have not done so. They think he did not intend the strike to end.

He says, "You can't mine coal with injunctions." He says, "You can't mine coal with bayonets," anticipating possible Federal seizure of the mines. He says, "The miners won't work without a contract," and waits for the country to accept a contract containing his terms and no other.

These are all untruths. Mr. Lewis, in his own phrase, is lying by the clock. He is conducting an insurrection against the people of the United States. His miners, operating in goon armies hundreds strong, are engaged in that insurrection. When Lewis says that you can't mine coal with injunctions, or bayonets, he is defying the country to do anything about his insurrection.

When Lewis asserts that the miners are disobeying his wishes in their refusal to return to work, he disqualifies himself as their bargaining agent. If he and his union cannot control its members, any contract they negotiate is worthless.

Experience shows, however, that he does control the miners and that he is contemptuous of the American people, their laws, and their courts. He thinks, and the miners think, that their lawless minority can set itself against all of the other people of the country and hold them for ransom.

The miners are committing economic treason against the United States, even though their rate of pay is now the highest paid in any large industry in the land. If the United Mine Workers Union makes it impossible for the United States to operate, the United States will surely find a way to operate without a United Mine Workers Union.

I could multiply that editorial a dozen times or 50 times. So you say, "Why talk about it? You do not have a remedy." We heard our colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] mention the fact that he had introduced a bill dealing with this situation. I will introduce one myself tomorrow. It is very, very simple. All it does is to provide that when individuals or unions go on strike or cause a strike in an industry, which if it fails to function will, by that failure, endanger the public safety, health, and welfare, then those employees who are endangering the public shall, after a certain specified time—be sent to jail? Oh, no. Made to work? Oh, no. Let them go on where they want like free Americans; but they should lose their rights and privileges, their special rights and privileges which we have given them as employees. They lose their status as employees. That is to say, if they make a free choice and they decide, as, for instance, in the public transit here, in the utilities which supply us with water and with electricity, if they have decided that they do not intend to work at all until their demands are met, then they cease to be employees. They cease to have the benefits of the Labor Relations Act which we have passed, and of other laws, which give labor special privileges; if they will not play the game—under the rules—then they are out of the picture.

Now, what is wrong with that? They are either workers or employees, or else they are not. If they are not actually doing something, then they should not have these special benefits given men who work.

So much for that subject.

Mr. Speaker, now I wish to talk on another subject.

WE SHOULD REMAIN LOYAL TO THE REPUBLIC

Mr. Speaker, if we become a part of a world federation, we will lose our individual liberty, our prosperity, our national security.

We will lose our individual liberty because it is proposed that the international organization will enact legislation of world-wide application, imposing its civil-liberties program upon the citizens of all member nations.

We will lose our prosperity because the world organization will levy upon our taxpayers the assessments which it deems necessary for its activities—a burden which our people cannot carry.

We will lose our national security because, by the contributions exacted, we will be impoverished, rendered unable to provide means of adequate defense. The right to declare or refrain from declaring war will be taken from us—that authority vested in the international organization. Repeated wars will destroy the most powerful of nations.

On Thanksgiving Day, November 23, 1944, Winston Churchill, addressing a London audience in which were hundreds of American servicemen, said that Americans never had more justification for thanksgiving than on that day, and I quote:

> When we see that in 3 or 4 years the United States has, in sober fact, become the greatest military, naval, and air power in the world.

Well might he have added that we were, in addition, the greatest productive nation in the world; the nation where the individual citizen enjoyed the greatest degree of individual liberty, of prosperity, and of happiness.

That was undoubtedly our world position at that time, and, except as that position has been weakened by exorbitant aid given to other nations, by legislation, and Executive order curtailing our individual freedom, it so remains.

OBJECTIVES OF WORLD ORGANIZATION

To end war, to establish peace, to give to individuals throughout the world the same opportunity, the same degree of freedom, which our citizens enjoy—all desirable objectives—it is now proposed that the United States of America forsake its established form of government, surrender at least a part of its sovereignty and join some world-wide organization, sometimes called a United States of the World, sometimes referred to as Atlantic Union, as a United Nations of the World, sometimes designated as Union Now.

However desirable the objectives of the proposed organization, however sincere and patriotic in thought and purpose be the intent of those who advocate our participation in such an organization—and their patriotism and sincerity is not questioned—the result, in my opinion, and that is all anyone can express, however dogmatic may be his assertions—the result would be similar to the purpose of the Communists, who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force—the end of our existence as a nation of free people.

It is matter of common knowledge that the Constitution has given to the individual citizen of the United States the greatest degree of individual liberty, of freedom of action, of equality of opportunity, of material prosperity, enjoyed by anyone anywhere.

Proof? One need but to compare the lot of our average citizen with the status of the average citizen in any other part of the world. If further evidence is needed, it is found in the desire of so many people of so many other nations to come to our land, subject themselves to our laws, obtain the benefits of our form of government.

Until recently, except as the curtailment of the liberty of the individual citizen has been made necessary in order to protect all members of our society, man here may go his way free to act as he will.

It is quite true that, in perhaps the last 10 or 15 years, the liberty and the freedom of action guaranteed by the Constitution have been materially impaired by restrictive laws, sustained by the Supreme Court.

Some of those laws, like the Wagner Act, curtailed the liberty of members of one group while giving special privileges and consideration to members of another group. Members of one group have had their incomes increased at the expense of members of another group whose property has been taken from them without just compensation.

Nevertheless, on the whole, it is still true that, here in the United States of America, the average citizen enjoys a greater degree of personal freedom than elsewhere.

Likewise, it is yet true that the average individual here enjoys a greater degree of prosperity than does the citizen of any other land.

If the statement of Mr. Churchill made in 1944, that we were then the greatest military, naval, and air power in the world—and concededly we then were, and concededly we were then also the most productive nation in all the world—even though we have since fallen behind in military might—we still have—our people have—the ability, the resourcefulness, the courage, and the endurance, if they be not betrayed from within, to successfully defend our national integrity, protect our future from aggression from whatever source it may come.

To doubt that is to doubt we still possess the characteristics of our people which have made us great, to admit that, instead of having advanced, our people have retrograded; that we of today have less of courage, of ability, and determination, than had our forefathers.

No truer words were ever spoken than those uttered by Abraham Lincoln when, speaking at Springfield, Ill., of the danger to our Republic, he said—and I quote:

> At what point then is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide.

THE PROPOSAL

Stripped of deceptive and confusing language, the present proposals, naked, stand forth as a clear attempt to induce us to scrap our Constitution, surrender our sovereignty, our right to plot our course in world affairs—surrender our national independence, become a part—but only a minor part—of a world organization.

Strange and unfortunate is it that there are those among us who have so little faith in the principles enunciated in the Constitution, in the capabilities of our people, in our resourcefulness, in our idealism, that they would surrender our sovereignty, haul down the Stars and Stripes, and cravenly seek protection under the banner of a federation of nations which deny equality, liberty of action, freedom of expression, to their own people; which have all too often, as shown by history, been quarrelsome and war-seeking.

It matters not what be the name of the proposed world organization. The intent and purpose of those who advocate our becoming a member of such an organization is that we join with other nations in forming a new world-wide supergovernment.

Of necessity it follows that that world government be supreme; that to it we and our people, in common with other nations and peoples, must owe allegiance to, yield obedience to its rules, regulations and laws.

In this proposed organization hereinafter referred to as the United Nations of the World, we would be but one of several members. The other nations, if history be accurate, are intensely nationalistic, jealous of their rights, resentful of any invasion of their territory, antagonistic to any disagreement with the religious views of their people and frequently engage in war.

The issues for which, in the past, they have fought, are those with which we have but little concern unless it be conceded that the United States of America intends to extend its power throughout the world.

Had the proposals to form a world government advanced in 1941 and 1942 by Mr. Davis, by Mr. Streit, by Mr. Justice Roberts, and others, been carried out, we would today be a satellite of Russia.

Keeping in mind the recent spread of communism, Russia's acquisition of territory and people, the ease with which her spies find sanctuary in our State Department, in our economic life, and the gullibility, if not worse, of some of our public officials, the present danger to our Republic comes not from the threat of armed invasion but, as Mr. Lincoln said—from within—from a lack of vigilance in guarding our liberty. Our Nation can, as he suggested, commit suicide.

Many of us recognize the present proposal that we join some form of a world organization, whatever may be the objective, the good intentions of those who advocate it, as an attempt to overthrow, or, perhaps more accurately, destroy our form of government.

I do not know the exact terms of the proposed world federation of nations. I do not know what flag its armies, its police force, is to carry.

I do have a flag purchased in New York in 1941, which it was then proposed should be the flag of the world government of which we should become a subject.

The proposal then was, and the proposal now is, that we haul down the Stars and Stripes, masthead in its place an international flag.

It is evident that inasmuch as we are to be but one member of the world federation of nations, if we join, our freedom of action will be destroyed.

The World Court, or the World Military Staff, or the World Council, or whatever the governing body of the federated nations may be called, will determine the amount of our contribution to the world organization to the furtherance of its purposes. Associated as we have been with, aiding as we have, other nations which had, or claimed to have, less than we have, with the idea thoroughly established throughout the world that we are a rich people; that we have an obligation to contribute to the welfare of the rest of the world, it is evident that an overwhelming portion of the burden of maintaining the world government, of carrying out whatever purpose or program might be by it labeled "humanitarian," would fall upon taxpayers of this Nation. That burden is beyond our ability to carry.

We have already voluntarily impoverished ourselves by our contributions of billions of dollars for foreign aid. Impaired our national defense program.

If we establish this world supergovernment, we no longer would be permitted to confine our contributions to those we wished to make, but being one of the family would be obligated not only to rehabilitate but to support all other members of our world family.

Not only would the representatives of other nations tell our taxpayers how much they should contribute in dollars and material to the welfare of the world, but they would tell us when and where to fight.

No longer would the Congress have the sole authority to declare war.

The international organization would determine that issue. No longer would our Congress decide whether or when the youth of the land was to be drafted—the international organization would determine when and how many of our young men and women should be called. Those young men and women—and the women are now in the armed services—would be under the command of officers named by the international military staff. Yes, and if the proposals of the extremists be adopted, the international organization would write the laws, make the rules under which our people should live here in America.

The proposal to form a superworld organization, a statement of its objectives, that is, the provision for the peace of the world, the good of all mankind, is most alluring.

A consideration of what must inevitably happen to our freedom as individuals, our independence as a nation, our national security, under such an organization is appalling.

The proposal is suicidal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCHANAN). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

FOR CONGRESS TO REDUCE DIRECT SALES TAXES ON CERTAIN ITEMS AND THEN MAKE UP THE DIFFERENCE BY INCREASING HIDDEN TAXES ON OTHERS IS A PALPABLE FRAUD ON THE TAXPAYERS

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in substance this Congress has been asked to do away with the direct and visible taxes which the public now pays on certain luxury goods—jewelry, luggage, cosmetics, railroad tickets, and other services.

At the same time request is made that we place an additional $200,000,000 annual tax upon the oil and the gas industry of this United States, which tax, although hidden, will be paid indirectly by the people.

Not alone is that administration request economically and financially unsound, but it asks for something which, if enacted into law, will seriously retard the development of new domestic sources of gas and oil now so sorely needed in these United States.

This proposal to change the rate of depletion is diametrically opposed to all other administration-sponsored recommendations to reduce or entirely eliminate excise taxes on furs, transportation, amusements, and a host of other wartime tax measures.

It is a double-dealing arrangement—a proposal that this Congress enact legislation "to rob Peter in order to pay Paul."

It is a proposal to remove tax laws that were to be operative only in wartime, and that are now visible to the people. These were the taxes placed on telephones, railroad and theater tickets, cabarets, and other services and activities, and in their stead to substitute a new hidden tax that the people will have to pay indirectly on the oil and the gas that they use in heating their homes, or that they use in their automobiles.

It will increase the cost of every article produced in the mines, mills, factories, and on the farms that use petroleum or any of its derivative products

Moreover, the increased cost of maintaining the armed services of the Nation, which today use directly and indirectly hundreds of millions of gallons of various types of gasoline, lubricating oils, and gaseous fuels, will have to be met by increasing the appropriation that we in this Congress will have to make for our Army, Navy, and our Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, hear me well on this. The proposed change in the rate of depletion on oil wells that has been historically used in the tax structure of our country since away back in the administration of Herbert Hoover might well mean that actually less revenue will be taken in by the Federal Treasury than it is now receiving because we will have legislated to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs.

The proposed decrease in the depletion rate would so tend to retard gas and oil development in these United States that we in the future would be obliged to import even greater amounts of petroleum products than we do at present, and in that wise entirely dry up the sources of our domestic revenues obtained from the sale of our own domestically produced oil and gas.

It would, moreover, be a death-dealing blow to the development of new and more extensive oil fields in these United States. It would add to the now-increasing unemployment of our peoples, and certainly entail a loss to our own national economy which would outshadow any additional tax revenue that might temporarily be collected by the Federal Government in the next 12 or 24 months.

Second only to the defense of this Nation and the continuing efforts to promote peace throughout the world is the problem of keeping our people gainfully employed.

Mr. Speaker, I noted in the press on Wednesday last that unemployment in these United States is now markedly on the increase. The United States Bureau of the Census today reported that there are now 4,500,000 unemployed in these United States. Furthermore, they pointed out that this figure had risen 1,000,000 between December and January to a new postwar high of 4,500,000 persons on the rolls of the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, there is no proposal before this Congress today so replete with danger to the Nation's labor, agricultural, financial, and commercial economy, as well as its defense, than is the question of retaining the historic rate of depletion established more than a quarter of a century ago on our national production of oil and gas. Neither is there one about which, in my opinion, there is a greater dearth of understanding on the part of a large cross section of the membership of this House than there is on these rates of depletion.

In addressing myself to the question of the current rate allowed, I am talking about something of which I should have a vast fund of knowledge gained in my business activities and experience during these past 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish in any sense to convey to my colleagues the impression that I regard myself as an expert in this matter. I am not an oil man, neither am I a gas man. I do not deal in these commodities.

I am speaking, about oil and gas and the rate of depletion under which those industries have operated for a quarter of a century, as farmer and a lumberman. I am speaking as one who realizes that every farm and every forest in these United States, yes, every highway, cemetery, river bottom, and last acre of land is potential oil-producing land, until some venturesome spirit has spent the money to actually drill that area and has ostensibly proven it to be otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, even then you cannot be sure that if the operator had drilled just a few feet further away, or had drilled deeper into the very same hole, that he would have struck oil or gas in his operation. How clearly that fact was demonstrated in the State of Texas when governmental and even independent geologists and geophysicists fallaciously pronounced east Texas to be a nonproducing oil area.

Mr. Speaker, I need not remind you, sir, that had it not been for the God-given faith of old Dad Joiner in the ability of east Texas land to produce oil, with a faith that was second only to his faith in God, he continued his drilling under the most dire of financial handicaps.

With a broken-down rig and an unpaid derrick crew, he brought in the first well in east Texas thereby proving and developing a field which will long stand as one of the greatest oil-producing areas ever developed in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I had the skill and the ability to evaluate for the benefit of my colleagues in this Congress just how much of the victory that came to our country in World War II is directly traceable to the hundreds of millions of barrels of petroleum and the untold value of other petroleum products which east Texas contributed in the oiling and fueling of World War II.

There is no well-informed Member of this body who would say that we could have even won that war had it not been for the tremendous supply of oil and other petroleum products that gushed forth from wells—brought in through the reinvestment of hundreds of millions of dollars of venture capital which would not have been available, had it not been for the rates of depletion enjoyed by the oil industry of that day and sunk back into developing the east Texas fields.

Mr. Speaker, in the time that I have been allotted to address the House on this all-important subject, I am not going to discuss at length just what baneful effects any change in the rate of depletion would have upon the State of Alabama.

I do, however, hold in my hand a photostatic copy of an article written by Dr. Walter B. Jones, State geologist of the University of Alabama. The article published in the January 1950 Oil Forum is entitled "Alabama's Promising Gas and Oil Possibilities."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to read a few excerpts from that article and I want every Member of this House to realize that what has been written with respect to Alabama oil and gas possibilities is true of every last State in this great Union of States.

Dr. Walter B. Jones writes in part as follows:

> Discovery of oil in the Gilbertown field, Choctaw County, Ala., February 17, 1944, has brought about a geophysical and drilling program sufficient to indicate that Alabama is destined to become a major oil-producing State within the next few years Subsurface geology can now be interpreted and appraised with some measure of confidence. More than one-half of the area of the State is considered to be possible oil and gas territory.

Mr. Speaker, now note this well: Dr. Jones states that "more than one-half of the area of the State of Alabama is now considered to be possible oil and gas territory."

For the sake of clarity and brevity he continues:

> This province is now considered to be the brightest prospect in the State, and includes the Gilbertown field. In 1945, the No. 1 Boykin well in the northern part of Mobile County, drilled to a depth of 7,500 feet, gave fairly conclusive proof that the area is a deep salt basin. In such basins, piercement salt domes might be expected. Therefore, we were not at all surprised when one was found a few months ago, near McIntosh, in Washington County. The salt core is 422 feet from the surface where it was encountered in a single core hole. No further prospecting has been done, so the diameter of the salt body and whether or not oil and/or gas is in association, remains to be seen. Other salt domes may be expected in the province.
>
> The proven petroliferous Hatchetigbee anticline, in Choctaw County, and the Jackson fault in southern Clarke County, both long known to geologists, are prominent surface features. Inasmuch as surface outcrops

range from Eocene to recent in age, it is reasonable to assume that other structures exist, but are obscured by later sediments which do not permit the structures to show at the outcrops.

Mr. Speaker, it is altogether beside the point that I have some land holdings in and near McIntosh in Washington County, Ala. The facts are that I took my own money, matched it with the money of others, and drilled Boykin well No. 1 in the northern part of Mobile County to a depth of 7,500 feet and brought in a dry hole.

My associates and myself took our losses, but there is oil there, Mr. Speaker; it lies deep in the ground awaiting the day that other venturesome men with more new venture capital will drill and redrill until it gushes forth from out of bowels of the earth.

As previously stated, I am a farmer and a lumberman and not an oilman. Alabama is an agricultural and a mining State; our people have little knowledge and even less experience in the development of oil and gas. What is true with respect to the inexperience of the people of the great State of Alabama is true with respect to experience of the peoples of these United States who live far from the oil-bearing areas.

It is to the oil operators in Pennsylvania, the oil and gas developers of West Virginia, Ohio, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi, that we in other States must look for the future exploration and development of gaseous liquids and solid fuels with which to fire the boilers that power the ponderous presses of this Nation.

It is to the fearless and intrepid oilmen who send their money, their geologists, their leasemen in to take up leases on lands from farmers, and other land owners, and who follow up when the leasing is done, by the investment of millions of dollars in geodetic, geologic, and other development work in order to develop the oil potentialities before moving in with more untold millions of dollars in rigs and in labor to drill their wells.

Mr. Speaker, you and myself are of one mind in knowing that there is no financial hazard in which a man takes greater risk than when investing his money than in the development of oil production. I remember having heard it said by someone, sometime that "an oil man is usually a man who is 1 foot away from a million dollars, or else, he is a man who is a million feet away from a single dollar."

Even while I am speaking, those daring men who finance and ride the derricks and the walking booms have taken leases on a two-hundred-thousand-acre tract in the State of North Carolina and are as of this very hour moving in and around their exploratory crews to make investigational studies of the surface as well as into the deep geology of that terrain. It will not be long before their tortional balances and seismiographs are set up, and the earth begin to vibrate under the explosions of tons of nitroglycerine, set off in the never ending quest to determine on the scales of their most delicate instruments the presence of salt domes or other indications that look to or promise the "black gold" that they are ever and always seeking.

Mr. Speaker, I need not tell you that these millions of dollars of venture capital that have been and are currently being paid out for oil leases and development were not provided by the constituents so ably represented by my good friends and colleagues, Congressman BONNER and Congressman BARDEN, of the First and Third Districts of North Carolina.

The burden of all moneys which are now being currently expended for leasing as well as actual development work looking to oil production in the many States outside of the regular oil producing territory is not the capital provided by local interests or local citizens.

The depletion reserves established constitute a sort of a revolving fund for future exploration. They are largely the reinvestment of the funds that our major oil companies as well as the independent and "wildcat" oil men have recaptured in the wells which they have developed in the great Southwest. In their true American spirit they have left their home States, take this revolving fund, go elsewhere, and bring in more and greater reserves of oil with which to support the oil economy of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that this problem is of vital interest to every Member of this Congress I here state that the proposed change in the tax rate applicable to depletion will have serious repercussions not alone upon the lives and the fortunes of the farmer lessors and the oil men and the drillers, but upon more than 10,000,000 other people living in every congressional district who now find gainful employment in the refining processes, transportation, marketing, and selling of products of the petroleum industry, a major American industry which reached out into every village and hamlet of these United States.

Not alone will it adversely affect those directly engaged in the industry but indirectly it will also affect the eleemosynary institutions as well as institutions of higher learning in our many States which are today in a large measure dependent upon and largely supported by funds derived by oil leases, bonuses, rentals, and rental renewals.

I know that the University of Texas and other schools of higher learning associated thereto own or are otherwise possessed of the fee in nearly 500,000 acres of land in that State. From these lands the regents of the State of Texas receive in the form of leases, bonuses, rentals, renewals, and royalties the major part of the income that supports these schools. The institutions of higher learning associated thereto, not alone in Texas, but in other States have also accumulated sizable reserves from their petroleum interests. A large part of these funds are now invested in securities, the proceeds of which are used to finance new oil developments.

These are only in part the benefits derived from the present rate of depletion made applicable to oil and gas operations. This rate now permits the exploratory operations by developers requiring huge sums which are now being expended to develop the great resources of oil still to be discovered in our farm soils by the scientists concerned with exploring and developing new lands for oil production.

Mr. Speaker, not only during my official life here in Congress but prior thereto I have long encouraged our people to lease their lands to those furnishing the venture investment capital in order to develop the mineral and other resources in the soil of the State of Alabama. I did so because the money that has long been enjoyed by our people from oil leases, bonuses, rentals, and renewals has long afforded a tremendous amount of gainful employment to the people of my district and my State.

The Alabama agriculturists, cattle and dairy men, orchardists, cotton and peanut planters, as well as those in other States of the Nation have been immeasurably benefited by the enterprise of the native Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kansas, Texas, and Oklahoma, as well as other oil men who have come into my State and likewise into practically all other States in the great Mississippi Valley Corn Belt. For these reasons it becomes evident that our cotton, our livestock economy, general agricultural and forest industry—deriving this supplemental income from their lands—find their entire economic life inseparably bound up with the oil economy and the historical rate of depletion that that industry has enjoyed during this last quarter of a century.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that if the Members of this House from the great Empire State of New York, those who sit in the body from the great metropolitan cities of Chicago, Detroit, and Boston could but induce a bunch of daring Texan-Oklahoman oil operators to go to work in their States—they would more than likely find plenty of oil in the subsoils, not only in the rural regions of the States but under the very asphalt pavements that cover their magnificent avenues, boulevards, streets, and drives.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question but if this adverse change is made with respect to the rate of depletion on oil, you are going to upset the economy of this Nation.

As I am addressing this House I am reminded of a great speech delivered by our colleague, the able and gracious FRANCES P. BOLTON, representing the Twenty-third District of Ohio. In that talk Mrs. BOLTON was addressing herself to the problem of national health and certainly there is none in this House who has devoted more of his time or substance to the promotion of national health in the fields of preventative as well as curative medicine as well as nursing than has the distinguished Congresswoman from Ohio.

In her talk, Mrs. BOLTON clearly and lucidly outlined the need of insuring the peoples of our Nation an adequacy of medical and nursing service under a voluntary system and—by and with the expansion of historically employed facilities and services. The remarkable thing about the speech was the point that Congresswoman BOLTON made with respect to the drying up of the sources of in-

come that have long supported the medical fraternity of these United States by the establishment of medical and surgical research foundations, laboratories, schools, trusts, and other centers of learning.

Quoting her source of information, she pointed out how in the last 10 years, 1939 to 1949, the total amount that was bestowed and expended by existing foundations was in the round sum of $2,500,000, and that in the 10 years prior thereto it had been in the sum of $65,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, now note this well. This sum of $67,500,000 was the total that had been expended in the 20 years subsequent to the increase in the gift, inheritance, transfer, and high-income tax rates that were made applicable by this Congress to the income of our people in the last 20 years.

The Congresswoman pointed out, however, that prior to the imposition of these latter-day taxes and the great increases in the rates of income, inheritance, gift, and other taxes, that in the 20-year period prior thereto, the prodigious sum of $1,163,000,000, or more than $1,100,000,000 had been given as gifts, grants, and in trust for medical and surgical and other researches and foundations.

From these figures, the destructive power of taxation becomes evident at least insofar as national health, preventive medicine, and medical research are concerned. With these sources of private bequests dried up by the enactment of national tax legislation, is it any wonder, I ask, that we now hear a clamor on the floor of the House to enact new tax laws that will cost billions in order to afford people an adequacy of preventive medical service and national health that never before in history had to be paid for out of the Federal Treasury and by tax money collected from the people themselves.

What a parody upon realism that we who but in recent years have voted billions of dollars for the welfare and health of foreign peoples, just a few short weeks ago put on an amateur vaudeville show in which many in this House participated, myself included, in order to help raise a mere $100,000 heart fund for medical research in heart and other coronary diseases.

It is because of the foregoing that I make dire prediction that if the day ever dawns that this House takes affirmative action on the bill to decrease the existing rate of depletion on oil and gas wells that we will in 24 months thereafter be faced with a proposal for the Federal Government to appropriate funds in order to do the exploratory work on bringing in oil and gas with taxpayers' money rather than to continue oil and gas development by the use of private capital and by people who know how, in the manner historically followed, and in the American way.

Even as I speak, the Federal Treasury has been tapped and already more than $5,000,000 has been appropriated in order to do research into the development of oil from shale in order to increase the proven reserves of our oil supplies.

Mr. Speaker, I am persuaded that if any downward revision is made in present depletion rates, the Congress in the next decade will be compelled to appropriate many times the increased revenues if we are to continue to provide an adequate amount of oil for this Nation to oil itself for peace as well as for war.

Instead of decreasing the rate of depletion, I am personally persuaded to the belief that this Congress in behalf of our national oil economy, should increase the amount from its present 27½ percent to a more equitable one of 33⅓ percent as has been urged upon the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

I think it is high time that we should lift the heavy hand of the Federal Government from off the shoulders and the backs of those who in private industry and through private initiative have long continued to serve this country plentifully with an adequate supply of liquid and gaseous fuels that have become as necessary to the American way of life as the very air we breathe.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 8 minutes.

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include a bill she has introduced relating to psychological warfare and to include other matters.)

THE COAL SHORTAGE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state that Massachusetts also is suffering from a shortage of coal. Massachusetts is going on rationing. Shortage of coal means illness. I do not know what is in the bill introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], but I think it is vital that the Congress do something so that the production of coal and other things can continue when an emergency exists.

There will be a great deal of illness, a great deal of suffering if some action is not taken. I know in talking with a lady who was having a great deal of difficulty in getting coal the lady told me: "I had rather be warm than have food." It is a great pity that you cannot burn potatoes, for there is such a tremendous surplus of potatoes in the country today; it is really scandalous. Some of them are being used for food, but unbelievable quantities are being destroyed. Why can we not in the future have a stock pile of coal so that when the need faces us the stock pile can be drawn upon and suffering prevented?

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has asked today if the Speaker is likely to recognize him on Monday to call up the hospital construction bill which provides for the construction of facilities to provide 16,000 additional beds for the veterans of the war. I wish to remind the leadership of the House, the Speaker, and others, that the money has already been authorized and appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations for the construction of these hospitals and provide these beds that are needed, so it will not be an added cost to the Government. The Treasury and Budget ought not to object to it. This expanded program will mean a lot to men suffering from mental illness, especially men who went through the last World War. Frequently a few weeks' treatment in a properly equipped hospital will restore these men to mental health. Congress authorized this construction a long time ago; the money has already been appropriated. It should be proceeded with.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentlewoman tell the Members something about the Cushing Hospital in Boston where we have, so they say, something like 300 or 400 extra beds that cannot be used because the local authorities say the buildings do not meet fire law requirements?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is true. The Veterans' Administration is very careful in their construction to see that the fire laws are adequately complied with. There was a fire at Walter Reed Hospital at the close of the First World War in one of the psycopathic wards which was of temporary construction; it was very difficult to get mental patients out. There was quite a fire in one of the veterans' hospitals. Then in Boston, for some reason or other, they say they are going to close the Waltham Hospital, borrowed by the Army, a very much needed facility, and one which I understand meets all fire law requirements. It seems to me there has been a well-directed drive on to give the veterans less hospitalization, less care than they have been getting, and it is extremely unfair.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the resolution I introduced last October, which is as follows:

House Resolution 374

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of ascertaining the means by which the national interest may best be protected and served in time of peace by the conduct of international information services and in time of war or threat of war by a civilian psychological warfare agency.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether

the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing another bill which is more far reaching. I feel that the Voice of America, which is the only voice over the radio sent out from the United States, is really not efficient. The staff has very small quarters in New York instead of in Washington. I suggest that we have a Radio Washington, as they have a Radio Moscow or a Radio Rome or a Radio Paris. CBS in London is really Radio London.

I would like also to suggest that the people in this country be informed what is being said to the people of other countries. Today Americans do not know what the Voice of America is saying, because they speak in a foreign language and it is not broadcast in this country. So we, in this country, do not know what the State Department is saying about us to the people of foreign countries. The people of America are entitled to know what is being said about the United States to foreign countries.

The personnel of any radio station which has the semblance of a Government broadcasting station which broadcasts to foreign nations should be very carefully screened. I should like very much to have an investigation made of what is now being done through the Voice of America. With the hydrogen bomb and the atomic bomb we should do more than ever before—everything to bring about peace through psychological and other methods.

I would like very much to have President Truman and Mr. Stalin meet in some neutral country, meet alone first. While we must not relax in our military preparedness, we should do everything we can insofar as nonmilitary preparedness is concerned also. The United States craves peace and friendly relations with all nations whenever possible.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentlewoman may recall that I first made that very same suggestion on the floor of the House on November 25, 1947, after I returned from a congressional tour of Europe, at which time I saw the then cold war growing hot. I made that suggestion, but it was not well received at that time by some Members of the House. I am glad to know that many of our national leaders, including the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, think it worth while to hold such a meeting on the highest level. Anyone who knows anything about Mr. Stalin or the Russian mind knows that those people have a tendency not to recognize the low-level approach. I desire to commend the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for her very timely thought today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should be extremely glad to work with anyone along that line.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman for the remarks she has just made. It is high time that somebody in this country sit down with somebody over there so that we can have some peace. The gentlewoman is to be congratulated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We all want peace. Every Member wants peace. I very well remember the psychological warfare that was conducted during the war by Admiral Zacharias, of the United States Navy, which was considered so successful that even if the atomic bomb had not been used Japan would have capitulated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has just announced that statehood bills for Hawaii and Alaska will come up next week.

Without intending to minimize the very important role which Hawaii plays in our national defense I wish to point out here that the comparative roles of Alaska and Hawaii have been reversed since the end of the last war. During World War II Hawaii was our main bastion of defense, the base from which we could operate, first, to defend our own shores along the Pacific, and, then, to wage the ultimately successful counteroffensive. At this time Alaska was not at all unimportant but played a secondary role to the Hawaiian Islands. You will remember that we spent millions of dollars in defense and development measures both to hold Alaska and to recapture those three Aleutian Islands which were the only portions of the North American continent to feel the impact of foreign invasion. But we spent even more to defend the already developed Hawaiian Islands and to use them as a base of operations.

I submit that these positions have been entirely reversed in the light of postwar developments. Hawaii is still vitally important. Without this base our naval operations and our control of the Pacific Ocean would be in serious jeopardy. But upon Alaska depends primarily our defense of the continental United States. Actual invasion or damaging air raids upon our important cities are possibilities which would be all too likely if we do not fortify and develop Alaska. Air striking power, combined with the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb, and the vulnerable situation of our industrial cities, have rendered us open to the approach of an enemy over the Arctic and sub-Arctic regions, perhaps in the initial stages of the conflict. Therefore, we should consider every way in which we can improve the defense facilities of Alaska. I contend that the most fundamental way to effect general improvement in such defense, is to grant statehood to Alaska.

OTHER REASONS FOR STATEHOOD IMPORTANT BUT SECONDARY

There are, of course, many other good reasons why Americans should favorably consider statehood for Alaska. Such an act would be consistent with our long-professed ideals of self-rule, it would confer the advantages of citizenship upon people who legally are already American citizens and who, for the most part, originally came from the continental United States. Statehood for Alaska would demonstrate to the peoples of the Pacific that we are in that portion of the globe; and that we do extend the principles of government and conduct about which we do so much preaching. The act would in this way have a profound and beneficial effect upon those areas of the world which are at this time concerned about a choice of economic and political systems. All these things and more, statehood for Alaska would do.

THE PRIMARY REASON FOR STATEHOOD IS OUR OWN DEFENSE

But why is it to our interest in the continental United State that statehood for Alaska be granted as soon as possible? Because only through statehood can Alaska be developed to the point that it can support economically the subsidiary measures of the defense mechanism which is necessary in this area for the protection of the whole United States. Only through statehood can Alaska develop the conditions necessary for sound logistics to supply our defense bastions.

The saying that "in union there is strength" is not so trite as to be without meaning. The very nature of union is such that common advantage is derived. It would be a mistake for those of us here in the States to consider only the advantages we can give to Alaska out of our beneficence. There are mutual advantages to be gained, and not the least of these is that the security of Alaska, dependent largely on statehood, is vital to the security of the entire Nation.

ALASKA: THE STRATEGIC BRIDGEHEAD TO AND FROM THE EURASIAN CONTINENT

There is only one nation in the world strong enough to fight a major war against us today. It is only with that nation, and with her satellites, that we have any basic conflict. From this fact emerges a new importance for Alaska. Alaska is the bridge between the continental United States and the Soviet Union.

A glance at a polar projection map of the world, or an azimuthal equidistant chart, will show graphically the practical juxtaposition of Alaska with Soviet Siberia. It is only a short air distance over the Arctic regions and an even shorter distance across the Bering Straits. Indeed, at one point only 3 miles of water and at another only 54 miles of water separate Alaska from the Soviet Union, and, at several points along a goodly distance, the shoreline of

Asia is visible to the naked eye from this United States Territory.

Mere proximity, however, is not the real clue to the importance of Alaska in our defense planning. We must examine its utility potential both to us and to our possible enemies, on the land, sea, and air.

It is reasonably clear that large-scale land operations in the far nothern area would be limited Human beings can survive in spite of the rigidity of the climate and weapons can stand it and still operate, but most of the energy of troops would be devoted to the task of living and very little would be left over for effective operation. However, if our defenses are at any time inadequate, as they seem to be now, a surprise attack by a small number of troops could capture all, or strategic parts of this region by rather simple invasion tactics involving paratroop or landing operations across the Bering Sea or even, perhaps, the Arctic, and once occupied, Alaska could become an important base of air and naval operation against us. Only superior defense forces backed by a large and alert population can effectively thwart this danger.

Naval operations in the northern regions would not be impossible Admiral Richard E. Byrd is authority for the statement that "invasion of North America could be made by way of the Arctic Ocean. It is not a cold area. Weather over the Arctic is far better than over the North Atlantic and the North Pacific. This Nation has four ships that would without difficulty reach the Arctic Pole, and it would not be a problem to build ships that would take convoys of ships through the Arctic Ocean." The Navy found in its "Operation Frostbite" of 1946, that, with minor changes, all United States warships can operate, in far northern latitudes. If the United States warships can so operate, I submit that the Russian Navy can also traverse these regions.

But it is in consideration of air strategy that the value of Alaska really shows forth. Suppose, for an awful moment, that our defenses of Alaska did fail and that a full-scale war is upon us. What would be the possible effect upon our war potential? If the enemy were to capture Alaska they would have a most excellent base for the saturation bombing of our Pacific seaboard and our industrial Midwest. Air Force representatives have publicly stated that the Russians have a type of plane, and in great numbers, which can easily make a bombing mission of 4,400 miles round trip. It is not unreasonable to assume that even greater distances will be achieved soon. With this in mind it is somewhat of a jolt to realize that from Fairbanks, Alaska, it is only 1,855 miles by air to Helena, Mont.; that it is only 2,480 miles by air to Minneapolis, Minn. With longer range bombers a certainty, one could fly from Point Barrow, Alaska—the northernmost settlement—to the Great Lakes region as well as to Los Angeles or San Diego, Calif. Truly, in that type of warfare which can threaten the destruction of our industrial complex and inflict untold damage upon our innocent civilians and their property, Alaska is a very important door.

But let us drop this dismal assumption of a lost Alaska. Even without the occupation of Alaska it might be possible for enemy bombing raids to come in any future war directly over the Arctic regions. To be sure such missions would be hazardous, but so, indeed, was our famous Doolittle raid over Tokyo in the early part of World War II. And air raids over the Arctic, even if kept at a nuisance level, on the main industrial complex of the North American Continent might result in pressure to keep forces at home in such strength as to handicap our war effort elsewhere. Such injudicious deployment of strength could turn the tide of war against us.

Radar screens and interception facilities radiating from Alaska would be our best assurance against such devastating raids That the Air Force is concerned with the rapid construction of such facilities is made clear by the recent announcement by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg that the Air Force has canceled or reduced other approved projects to the extent of $50,000,000 from its regular 1950 appropriations to speed completion of the first phase of a radar system for the United States and Alaska. Nearly two-thirds of this amount is going to the Alaskan portion of the project. It is only in Alaska that the United States can erect such installations for use in the Polar regions upon her own soil It is only in the Polar regions that interception, or general alarm for later interception, can save our cities from disastrous, or perhaps fatal, bombing.

COMPARISON OF ACTIVITY IN SOVIET SIBERIA AND ALASKA

The Russians are apparently very much aware of the strategic importance of the northern areas To be sure, the Soviet Union is not advertising all that it is doing in Soviet Siberia, but Governor Gruening of Alaska has pointed out that in the region roughly corresponding to Alaska, which includes about 600,000 square miles and extends up to about 500 miles west of the Bering Strait, the Russians are not stagnant. There seems reason to believe that close to 5,000,000 people are now in this area. The Russians have established a system of highways and communication. Every 100 miles there are agricultural experiment stations which seem to be closely tied up with the military establishments. The Soviets have pushed the borders of agriculture farther north than has ever before been possible by experimenting with new types of grain and crops, and by integrating agriculture with mining, industry, and military establishments. There are reports of Russian airfields on islands off the coast of Siberia across from Alaska, and there are rumors of Russian submarines in the area.

By contrast to all this flourishing activity on the part of the Russians, our own defense facilities would appear rather inadequate. It would be detrimental to our security to examine figures giving our present strength and position in Alaska. But we can simply look at what we do not have. Governor Gruening warned Congress on January 17, in testimony before the House Appropriations subcommittee, that Alaska is now so weak that Russia could take it tomorrow with 1 or 2 parachute divisions coming across the Bering Straits. He also pointed out that once the Russians occupied Alaska it would be difficult to get them out. Various observers have noted that installation after installation has been abandoned by the United States military forces. The temporary buildings and facilities erected during the war quickly go to ruin in the harsh climate of the outer regions, and cannot be reclaimed. William L. Worden has quoted one important military planner as saying:

> We must pour millions of dollars into Alaska now to prepare a reasonable defense, or else blow up the bases, destroy the airfields, and tear out the communications in order to deny them to any enemy. And then go home

The need for urgency in the strengthening of our defenses in this vital region has been implicit in all the foregoing discussion, but it bears reemphasis. The temptation for aggression might well be too great if we do not keep all of our defenses in good condition. And, as I have pointed out, Alaska is not the least of these defenses.

CONSIDERATION OF THE PROBLEMS OF ALASKAN DEVELOPMENT

There are, however, certain very large and important problems to be considered if our defense is to be made adequate. It is in the consideration of these problems that the need for granting statehood to Alaska will become immediately apparent.

It is necessary that Alaska be developed economically and agriculturally if it is to be integrated with the huge defense forces needed. Such development can only come after statehood is granted. This has been borne out in many examples in the history of the present 48 States.

That there exist in Alaska those resources which can be developed there is no doubt. What, then, is needed to develop these resources and how does this need tie up to the needs of defense?

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation and supply routes are at once apparent as necessities for both civilian population growth and for the military. Let us examine what Alaska has in this regard and how and why statehood would help.

One of the reasons that living costs are so high in Alaska is because of the shipping problem. There are two steamship lines with a viselike grip on shipping, to and from Alaska. These two noncompetitive companies are owned by the same Seattle family. Possibly because the same family operates a salmon brokerage, cannery supplies enjoy a shipping rate only about half as expensive as general cargo, such as food and clothing. The only competition to this shipping monopoly, which could be so disastrous in time of war, exists in the vessels of three Canadian lines. However, the

Jones Act of 1920 expressly forbids the use of Canadian vessels to haul freight or passengers between Alaska and any point in the continental United States.

The entire development of Alaska has been hampered and even crippled by the conditions created by the Jones Act. This would not have been the case had Alaska been a State. The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that this act would be unconstitutional if Alaska were a State. Moreover, it is probable that the Jones Act would not have existed if Alaska had had senatorial representation and votes in the Congress in 1920. Only Territories can be so discriminated against; and only Alaska, of all the Territories, suffers from such a specific exemption from the use of Canadian services. In time of war or national emergency it would be too late to institute sufficient supply haulage. It must be done now by allowing free competition and healthier and more efficient growth to take place in the shipping facilities.

Now what about the famous Alcan Highway which was built as a means of supplying Alaska under the impetus of the last World War? Since the war there has been very little done to improve the highway. To be sure the Congress has recently voted appropriations, but this road still remains in a condition that will not support military traffic. And what is worse, it is the only overland means of transportation and communication with Alaska. Recently a railroad to Alaska on a route somewhere near the coast has been proposed. This proposal has received some support, but Alaska has not the proper representation in Congress to press the point.

Internally there are very few highways in Alaska and these are not of the type which can serve adequately as military highways. If Alaska were a State she would be eligible for grants-in-aid from the Federal Government as are all of the States, and would be able to tax her own wealth in order to build a system of highways compatible with the American idea of what such roads should be and with military necessity.

The Air Force and the Army are at present interested in rehabilitating the antiquated roadbed and facilities of the Alaska Railroad. Millions of dollars have been appropriated for this task. But unless the civilian economy is integrated to the newly developed potential of the railroad, and this can only be done under statehood, there will be insufficient cargo to make the line worth operating and it will lapse into obsolescence whenever the military forces are reduced for a few years. This is not a way to long-term economy, nor is it calculated to keep our defense potential at a security level.

HOUSING

It is of vital importance that our defense installations be bolstered by a large reservoir of trained civilian workers for maintenance, services, and all of the many jobs which are normally given to civilians. It is imperative that the military installations be based upon a substantial civilian population and a good solid economy. These things are impossible as long as the housing situation remains as critical in Alaska as it is today. Not only do civilians pay more for totally inadequate housing, if they can find it, than their incomes warrant, but members of the armed forces and their families are in a state of extremely poor morale because they face the same housing shortage. For several years now various observers have been telling us about the shacks in which our military personnel live in Alaska and at the Great Falls (Mont.) Air Base—the door from the States to the Territory. Recently these observers were backed up by no less a group than the touring joint chiefs of staff who called the housing situation atrocious and sent Secretary of Defense Johnson a telegram which he termed the strongest message he had ever received. This very winter there are wives and children of enlisted men and officers living, at temperatures which sometimes drop to 60° below zero, in wooden shacks without any plumbing facilities; and for this they pay rents in excess of $100. It is difficult to recruit men into an army which has to put up with such conditions in peacetime, it is even more difficult to get men to reenlist after they have served in Alaska and have tried to keep their family together. And these soldiers and these civilians are dependent upon the Congress for any relief. I submit that if Alaska had the proper representation in Congress which she would have under statehood, and if the Legislature of Alaska could tax and plan with a view to relieving the housing situation in Alaska, which she could do if she were a State, these deplorable conditions could be relieved, and more of the so necessary population could be attracted and more reenlistments of the personnel already trained for defense in Alaska would be had.

SUPPLIES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES

We have already discussed the supply problem as it relates to transportation, but there is another aspect which deserves mention here. There are many things which Alaska could supply herself were she sufficiently developed. Almost all kinds of hearty vegetables and berries and some grains can be raised in Alaska. Potatoes are a standard crop and grow in abundance. Dairies have been most successful as a principal farm activity. But agriculture is hindered because of transportation and because Alaska, as a Territory, cannot make the vast public-land holdings available to settlers. The fishing and hunting industries are already well known. Gold mining, too, is an activity long ascribed to Alaska. Other mineral resources, such as mercury, antimony, tin, coal, copper, iron, lead, platinum, and oil, are known to exist, but await the coming of capital, labor, and transportation which statehood will afford. Timber, which exists on a vast scale, can neither be exported in quantity nor used effectively on the spot to ease the housing shortage until more transportation becomes available. Timber suitable for a pulp-and-paper industry is sufficient to make Alaska the newsprint capital of the world and supply work for 35,000 people. The vast potential of hydroelectric power is almost untouched. Alaska can supply our defense forces with much of their needed food supplies and even matériel if her resources are developed in the way that only a larger population can develop them. It is obvious that improved transportation facilities and better housing conditions—both of which wait upon the conditions of statehood—would open the way for increased settlement. This population would itself be less dependent than the present smaller one on imported supplies because the resources of Alaska are still in an undeveloped condition awaiting manpower and investment—just as was the case with many of our present Western States at the time of their admission to the Union. All these things together will form the basis for the practical development of Alaska as an important defense area—a portal of the Nation. With an economy so geared to defense and with the shipping lanes carrying more supplies and matériel and land transportation opened up, the potential of Alaska would grow even greater.

STATEHOOD

All of these benefits of development and growth will come with statehood. It must be further remembered that when Alaska becomes a State, Federal projects and Federal aid now being furnished will not be cut off. On the contrary, in those areas in which the granting of Federal aid will benefit national security and the economy of the whole Nation, Alaska's Senators and Representatives will be in a position to point out the need, to exercise their voting privileges and otherwise exert the pressures normally exerted by Members of Congress. In addition to this, however, there will be the funds which the State of Alaska can achieve by the additional, albeit normal, taxation powers now denied here as a Territory. Further, it is possible that by careful husbanding an efficient State organizations will be able to divert existing funds into channels where they might do even more good in the development of Alaska. And we must emphasize the point that whatever helps Alaska, will, in the long run, help the security of the whole United States. Economic development and defense are inseparable.

At present as a Territory Alaska is operating under an antiquated Organic Act which was passed in 1912, and has not been substantially revised since. Under this act the territorial legislature may not authorize bonded indebtedness or create any debt. It may not alter, amend, repeal, or modify the fish and game laws passed by Congress. The amount of general property taxes which may be levied is fixed by Congress. And Alaska has no voting representation in the House and no representation at all in the Senate. The effect of this situation is to create absentee exploitation from such places as Seattle; corporations located there can exploit the resources of Alaska, not even using Alaskan labor, and very nearly tax free. No wonder Alaska fails to develop her own resources and cannot attract the population so necessary to our defense plans. No won-

der Alaska is unable to supply adequate housing for those civil and military defense personnel so sorely needed. No wonder Alaska cannot cope with her problem of public health; and tuberculosis, closely related to the housing problem, is much more prevalent there than in the States.

STATEHOOD A NONPARTISAN GOAL

The question of statehood for Alaska is not a party issue. The people of Alaska have voted in referendum for statehood. Both political parties in the Territory have as planks in their platforms the advocacy of statehood. The governors of the Western States were unanimous in resolving that Alaska should be admitted to the Union as a State. The issue is what I have just pointed out. Do we or do we not want Alaska to develop as a sister State to the point that our own security becomes better assured? I think the statement by the late Gen. H. H. (Hap) Arnold might well be our own answer to this question. General Arnold said:

Upon Alaska our future may well rest. What, then, would be better; what would insure a greater provision for our future than to recognize that most important area and make it a State, equal to our other 48 States?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. GOLDEN, for an indefinite period, on account of death in his family.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S Con Res. 71. Concurrent Resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare additional copies of the hearings on the National Health Program, 1949, the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 27, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1256. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, relative to the transfer of a plane personnel boat, or craft of similar type, by the Department of the Navy to Lake County, Calif., a subdivision of the State of California, for use in rescue operations and in other functions of the county; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1257. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1949, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1258. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1259. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the forwarding and return of second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, the collection of postage due at the time of delivery, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1260. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Heather Mary Bocko or Heather Mary Gill, A-6555471 CR 23403, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1261. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Fanny Sara Moritz or Fannie Sarah Moritz, A-3465033 CR 26740, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr SPENCE· Committee on Banking and Currency. H R 7402. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept No 1686). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 7417. A bill to declare an emergency and to create the National Coal Emergency Act of 1950; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware.

H. R. 7418. A bill to increase the amount of the deduction allowed for income-tax purposes with respect to medical and dental expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 7419. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7420. A bill relating to the renewal of contracts for the carrying of mail on star routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 7421. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land in Michigan to the State of Michigan for use in National Guard training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 7422. A bill to assure that expenditures under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, for education and training yield a proper return both to the veteran and to the Nation as a whole, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 7423. A bill to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain judges, as an alternative to impeachment: to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 7424. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in west Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 7425. A bill to amend Public Law No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 7426. A bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1931, relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public buildings, to extend coverage to architects, technical engineers, draftsmen, and technicians; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. J. Res. 422. Joint resolution designating the period beginning May 1 and ending May 7 of each year as National Correct Posture Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 423. Joint resolution authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to make a study and investigation of the production, transportation, refining, and distribution of petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr DOYLE.

H R 7427. A bill for the relief of Mrs June Noda Loman; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr LOVRE·

H R. 7428 A bill to admit Mrs Erna Tvedt to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1903. By Mr. HAGEN: Resolutions adopted by the American College of Allergists in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1904. Also, resolutions adopted by the Fairfax-Andover Social Club, of Crookston, Minn., in opposition to Government control of health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

1905. By Mr SHAFER: Letter and resolution of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, protesting Post Office Department regulations governing duties of mail handlers, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1906. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. C. Michael and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1907. Also, petition of Maurice H. Thatcher, Society of Mayflower Descendants, Washington, D. C., opposing any form of world government such as proposed by resolutions pending before the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1908. Also, petition of W. Dudley Gunn, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, New Orleans, La., favoring the passage of Senate bill 1545, by Senator McCarran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as we bow at this high altar of the national life, preserve us from praying with our lips only, and not with our hearts and minds. We come in an anxious hour of human destiny, solemnized by the tangled tragedy in which all human life is caught. Help us in these trying days to rise above all that is base and small and to work together in glad and eager harmony for the honor, the safety, and welfare of our Nation and of all the peoples of this stricken earth who unite with us in mutual good will, determined to open the gates of a new life to all mankind. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 23, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Martin
Benton	Hoey	Maybank
Brewster	Holland	Millikin
Bricker	Humphrey	Morse
Butler	Hunt	Mundt
Cain	Ives	Murray
Capehart	Jenner	Myers
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kefauver	Russell
Darby	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Schoeppel
Downey	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Langer	Sparkman
Ecton	Leahy	Stennis
Ellender	Lehman	Taft
Ferguson	Lodge	Taylor
Flanders	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McCarran	Thye
George	McCarthy	Tobey
Gillette	McClellan	Tydings
Green	McFarland	Watkins
Gurney	McKellar	Wherry
Hayden	McMahon	Wiley
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Williams
Hickenlooper	Malone	Withers

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and several other Senators may be absent from the sessions of the Senate next week. I make the request so that I and other members of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may be permitted to visit Mexico in connection with the foot-and-mouth-disease-eradication program being conducted in Mexico by the United States Government. Those who, as at present I understand, intend to make the trip, are the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Iowa [Mr HICKENLOOPER], and I. We are members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, for the purpose of participating in the work of the subcommittee alluded to by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attending all meetings of the Senate during the coming week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate next week. I am a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, headed by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], which will make a trip to Mexico, as announced by the Senator from Minnesota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to give notice of hearing on the nomination of a very distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, EUGENE WORLEY, of Texas, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 3, 1950, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of EUGENE WORLEY, of Texas, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, vice Hon. Charles S. Hatfield, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the Pennsylvania lodge, Fraternal Order of Police, of Harrisburg, Pa., signed by John D. Coleman, recording secretary, relating to the internal security of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTEST AGAINST COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from the conservation chairman of the Wisconsin Garden Club Federation opposing the Columbia Valley Administration bill, S. 1645. The chairman, Mrs. Alfred Kieckhefer, has presented four important reasons for opposition to the CVA bill, which is now pending before the Senate Public Works Committee.

I have heard from many other conservation organizations in Wisconsin which are also deeply concerned about this bill. I, for one, certainly share their apprehension over granting more Federal authority to a three-man board or a five-man board or any other small group of individuals who would be vested with practically life and death authority over an entire region of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from the Wisconsin Garden Club Federation be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN GARDEN CLUB FEDERATION,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 20, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As the conservation chairman of the Wisconsin Garden Clubs, I am writing you about bill S. 1645 which is to come up shortly before Congress. We have a total of over 100 clubs with a membership of well over 3,000. Our primary interest in the bill is the threat to all the conservation projects already undertaken in that region as well as those about to be begun. We also are troubled by the way the authority is handled. We object to this bill on the following grounds:

1. The sacrifice of natural resources to water power.
2. Confiscation of more Indian lands.
3. Destruction of natural waterways.
4 The entire set-up, giving a three-man board such absolute authority, undermining all State and local control.

It will be to the best interests of all of us, if you and your colleagues will vigorously oppose this bill.

Yours very truly,
ALLISON MORE KIECKHEFER.
Mrs. Alfred Kieckhefer.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H R. 4393 A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1283); and

H. R 4594. A bill to amend sections 10, 11, and 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia"; without amendment (Rept. No 1284).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

S 2113. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to clarify the status of freight forwarders and their relationship with motor common carriers; with amendments (Rept. No. 1285).

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—ADDITIONAL AMENDMENT REPORTED

Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an additional amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill (S. 2246) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 1286) thereon.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Stanford C. Stiles, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S 3107. A bill for the relief of Boleslaw H. Drobinski, his wife, Marjorie, and his daughter, Janina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S 3108. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. THYE for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG introduced Senate bill 3109, to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading)

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 3110. A bill relating to the conveyance of certain property in Shawnee, Okla, by quitclaim deed, to Alfred F. Hunter; to the Committee on Banking and Currency

S 3111 A bill to provide for the leasing of the lands and real estate of members of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma who do not have certificates of competency, and for other purposes; and

S 3112 A bill to provide for the conveyance to William Sandmann of certain real property in Coal County, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S 3113 (by request). A bill to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3114. A bill for the relief of Zakia Antaky Ackad, and

S. 3115. A bill for the relief of Nellie A. Ridings, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr HUMPHREY also introduced Senate bill 3116, providing for the repeal of section 601, title VI, of the Revenue Act of 1941, pertaining to the Committee To Investigate Federal Expenditures, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S 3117. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c); and

S. 3118. A bill relating to the forwarding and return of second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, the collection of postage due at the time of delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S 3119. A bill to amend Public Law No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes; and

S 3120. A bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1931, relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public buildings, to extend coverage to architects, technical engineers, draftsmen, and technicians; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. KEM introduced Senate bill 3121, for the relief of Mario Juan Blas Besso-Pianetto, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 3122. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., Akron, Ohio, an easement for sewer purposes in, over, and across certain Government-owned lands situated in Maricopa County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 3123. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of February 26, 1944, entitled "An act to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3124. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, with respect to distribution of proceeds of mineral leases on unsurveyed public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. WHERRY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 154, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgage insurance under section 608 of such act, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial commemorating the contributions of Americans of all faiths and ethnic origins to victory in World War II; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DEVELOPMENT OF SHIPPING ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DOUGLAS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. FERGUSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the senior Senator from North Dakota (Mr. LANGER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. WILEY), the junior Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG), I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, which is intended to help meet the need for reviving the package freight facilities on the Great Lakes. Development of these facilities, which have been curtailed as a result of the diversion of Great Lakes ships during the war is meeting the immediate national requirements of our war effort, is of the greatest importance to the commercial development and economic well-being of the entire Great Lakes region. For that reason, I wish to add that I shall welcome the support of other Senators from those States who may wish to join as cosponsors of this legislation.

I introduced a similar bill a year ago, and it is before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the present time. I feel that the bill I now introduce is an improvement over the bill introduced a year ago.

The bill (S. 3109) to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THYE and other senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MARIO JUAN BLAS BESSO-PIANETTO

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may make a short explanation of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, because the courts have ruled they are without jurisdiction to review the matter, I am introducing a bill to stay deportation proceedings against Dr. Mario Juan Blas Besso-Pianetto, an outstanding surgeon of St. Louis, Mo.

According to his associates, Dr. Pianetto, a native of Argentina, is a skilled thoracic surgeon, and his deportation will be a loss to the medical profession in the St. Louis area. They say Dr. Pianetto's absence will be felt particularly by many who are suffering from tuberculosis. At the present time, Dr. Pianetto is resident physician at Koch Hospital, the St. Louis tuberculosis sanitarium; he is surgeon instructor at St. Louis University and consulting surgeon at the State psychiatric hospital, in St. Louis.

His friends and patients believe that Dr. Pianetto's present difficulties, which will end in his deportation unless the Congress intervenes, are due to a mistake made by a draft-board clerk during the war.

It is contended that a draft-board clerk at a time when she was under pressure in her work, gave him the wrong form to fill out; and that Dr. Pianetto at that time, not understanding English too well, filled out the form handed to him without question.

The form which he was given to fill out, and which he did fill out, did not correctly describe his status at that time. It is contended by the immigration authorities that the error was grievous enough that the Government had no alternative save to deport him in the absence of congressional action. Attached to the form which he signed there appeared a statement to the effect that in signing it, he would forever be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States. The immigration authorities state that as an alien disqualified to become a citizen he is ineligible to remain in this country.

The form which he was given was Form 301, which was for registration of resident aliens. He should have been given, and should have filled out, Form 302, for registration of nonresident aliens, since he was an exchange student on temporary stay in this country. There seems to be no question about that, but the Immigration and Naturalization Service claims they have no alternative except to proceed under the statement which he did sign. Their position in this respect seems to be sound. The form Dr. Pianetto should have signed, Form 302, does not contain the statement concerning ineligibility for citizenship.

The United States district courts in St. Louis and in Washington, D. C., have ruled they have no jurisdiction to review the case. Therefore, Dr. Pianetto's only recourse is to Congress.

The case was brought to my attention recently when I was in St. Louis, by some of Dr. Pianetto's patients and friends. Some of the leading physicians and surgeons in St. Louis are interested in the effort to save Dr. Pianetto from deportation. They contend that his deportation will be a serious loss to the medical profession.

Meantime, the St. Louis Star-Times, an outstanding newspaper in my State, has become interested in the case. I am informed by Harry Wohl, of its Washington bureau, that they have succeeded in locating the draft-board clerk who is alleged to have given Dr. Pianetto the wrong form to fill out. The clerk has admitted the probability of error.

I want to make it clear that in introducing this bill, I am not importuning the Congress to permit an alien who should be deported to remain in this country. Neither am I asking that the consequences of executing Form 301 be waived if Dr. Pianetto executed that form knowing of its contents and the resulting effects. But if this man, a potential benefactor of the sick, is subject to deportation through the error of a representative of the Government, then I hope that Congress will right the wrong and permit him to remain in this country.

In 1946 Dr. Pianetto went to Canada, applied for a permanent visa, and reentered the United States to apply for citizenship. Then came the warrant for arrest, based on the draft form which, it is contended, he mistakenly filled out.

I am not one who advocates breaking down our immigration barriers, or who is opposed to the deportation of undesirable aliens. I have no desire to assist anyone who has consciously dodged the draft. I ask that an investigation be made by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. If the facts are proven to be as alleged by Dr. Pianetto, I believe the Congress should pass a bill to permit this accomplished surgeon to remain in the United States.

The bill (S. 3121) for the relief of Mario Juan Blas Besso-Pianetto, introduced by Mr. KEM, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUNT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and other Senators) to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4567, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment of the committee to House bill 4567, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and other Senators) to House bill 4567, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. ROBERTSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STORY OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON AS TOLD BY SENATOR VANDENBERG

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Story of Alexander Hamilton as Told by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG," published in the February issue of the magazine Sons of the American Revolution, which appears in the Appendix.]

FANTASTIC LUSTRON CASE—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH (PA.) PRESS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fantastic Lustron Case," published in the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of recent date, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR THYE

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by him at Sacramento, Calif., on February 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

STALIN'S STOOGES LEFT IMPRINT ON AMERICAN POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stalin's Stooges Left Imprint on American Policy," published in the February 25, 1950, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIBERTY IN CRISIS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Liberty in Crisis," delivered by him at the thirtieth anniversary dinner of the American Civil Libertes Union in New York City on February 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

COSTS OF ELECTION IN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN—ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding election costs in the United States and in England, by Gould Lincoln, from the Evening Star of February 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SOUL SEARCHERS FIND NO ANSWER—ARTICLE FROM LIFE MAGAZINE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Soul Searchers Find No Answer," published in the current issue of Life magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INDIANA STATE BANNER—REMARKS BY MRS. ROYAL EASON INGERSOLL

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a paper entitled "The Indiana State Banner," read by Mrs. Royal Eason Ingersoll, designated representative of Mrs. Roscoe C. O'Byrne, president general, Daughters of the American Revolution, at the Indiana State Society of Washington celebration of the sesquicentennial of Indiana Territory (1800–1950) on February 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACHESON LOGIC—COMMENT BY REV. JAMES M. GILLIS

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column of comment entitled "Acheson Logic," by Rev. James M. Gillis, CSP, published in the Witness, of Dubuque, Iowa, for February 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

OLD ORDER PASSETH—LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE CINCINNATI INQUIRER

[Mr CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter entitled "The Old Order Passeth," written by Ed Wimmer to the editor, and published in the Cincinnati Inquirer of January 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BANKRUPTCY RESULTS IN DICTATORSHIP—ARTICLE BY HASSIL E. SCHENCK

[Mr CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bankruptcy Results in Dictatorship," written by Hassil E. Schenck, president, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., and published in the Hoosier Farmer, February 1950 edition, which appears in the Appendix.]

BYRD JOINS GOP ATTACK ON TRUMAN—ARTICLE BY EDWARD T FOLLIARD

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "BYRD Joins GOP Attack on Truman," written by Edward T. Folliard, and published in the Washington Post of February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

INTO STALIN'S VESTIBULE—ARTICLE BY "HEPTISAX"

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Into Stalin's Vestibule" written by "Heptisax" and published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

THE SAME OLD ANSWER—EDITORIAL FROM THE PALLADIUM-ITEM, OF RICHMOND, IND.

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Same Old Answer," published in the Palladium-Item, of Richmond, Ind , February 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY—CONTEST PAPER BY ROBERT SHANKS

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the original script of a contest paper entitled "I Speak for Democracy," by Robert Shanks, of Lebanon, Ind , written in October 1949, which appears in the Appendix]

APPRAISAL OF MILITARY DEFENSES OF THE UNITED STATES—EDITORIAL FROM LIFE MAGAZINE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Elemental Facts of 1950," published in the current issue of Life magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT—ARTICLE BY JERRY KLUTTZ

[Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to Communists in Government employment, by Jerry Kluttz, from the Washington Post of February 19, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DEFENSE BUDGET—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the defense budget, by David Lawrence, from the New York Herald Tribune of February 24, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT—STATEMENT BY GOV. VAL PETERSON

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement relating to the Missouri River Basin development, made by Gov. Val Peterson, of Nebraska, before the War Department Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, on February 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY—ESSAY CONTEST—ESSAYS BY MARIE JESAKOW, W C. BEATLY, AND LAWRENCE J MELLON, JR

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the three winning essays in the I Speak for Democracy essay contest among the high-school students of Philadelphia, which appear in the Appendix]

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF EXAMINERS IN CHIEF IN PATENT OFFICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S 2328) to increase the number of examiners in chief in the Patent Office, and for other purposes, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 482 of the Revised Statutes (35 U S C 7) is amended by adding the following paragraph:

"The Commissioner, when in his discretion considered necessary to maintain the work of the board of appeals current, may designate any examiner of the primary examiner grade or higher, having the requisite ability, to serve as examiner in chief for periods not exceeding 6 months each, and any examiner so designated shall be qualified to act as a member of the board of appeals. Not more than one primary examiner shall be among the members of the board of appeals hearing an appeal."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 482 of the Revised Statutes relating to the Board of Appeals in the United States Patent Office."

Mr. WILEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSED HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to read a letter from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and to comment briefly upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say that last evening the Committee on Banking and Currency voted to report a housing bill by a vote of 9 to 4. Certain members of the committee reserved the right to file minority views, and others reserved the right to file individual statements or amendments.

The amendment, which is a substitute for a bill now on the calendar, will be filed later today, but the report on it will not be filed until the members of the committee have had an opportunity to file whatever minority views they desire to present. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] will file the minority views, and some of the other members of the committee may also file individual statements. In the meantime Congress is confronted with the fact that section 608 of the old law will expire March the first, together with other authorizations for mortgage insurance.

Last October 5, in the Senate, there was some dissatisfaction, I might say, on the part of some Members of the Senate, as well as by various organizations, when we failed to act on permanent legislation, but instead passed a joint resolution extending the housing program until March 1 of this year. The bill I shall file today is the bill we shall report Monday as a substitute for the bill then pending on the calendar.

I stated at that time that when Congress met again this year we would immediately take up the housing legislation, and that I hoped for once and all we would settle the many differences. The Committee on Banking and Currency realizes it is its duty to report a bill and to submit a majority report, as well as to allow the opportunity for the submission of minority views. We realize that, after all, the committee is a creature of the Senate. Thus I shall file the amendment to the bill on behalf of the committee today and the report on Monday.

In the meantime there is great confusion among contractors, insurance companies, banks, and other lending institutions throughout the United States, because section 608 will expire on the first of March, and it is doubtful whether we can within 2 days pass the bill which is to be reported. I share that doubt; I do not believe we can. In the past when section 608 has expired there were likewise periods of no existing authorizations and no insurance guaranties until Congress acted. Usually it has taken 2 or 3 weeks to get action on the matter of renewal but the section has always been renewed.

Now businessmen, insurance companies, contractors, and all others interested in housing fear that because of the new bill, which does not extend section 608 but substitutes for it a revised section 207, they might have to file all over again.

I wish now to read a letter which brings that matter before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, has been conscious of the fact that there would be a deadline with respect to section 608.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I talked with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency about that deadline. It is my understanding that the Senator from South Carolina has conferred with the Housing Administrator with respect to what would happen in the event section 608 should expire without further action being taken, and I understand the Senator from South Carolina has a letter explaining that matter, which he desires to read to the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what I wish to do, so that banks, insurance companies, contractors, and others interested may know exactly what the law

will be after the Congress passes the bill to be reported.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will there be an opportunity, under the order of business, to ask a question, if the letter is to be read?

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be very pleased to answer any question.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely desire to make it clear to the Senator from Nebraska that last October 5, when this matter was before the Senate, and the expiration date was fixed at March 1, I stated that as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee we would act on a housing bill and we could decide once and for all what we would do about these housing problems.

I shall now read the letter, so that there may be no misunderstanding as to the present situation.

Mr. Foley, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, after I had a conference with him yesterday and again this morning, addressed a letter to me as to what the Housing and Home Finance Agency will do under the bill which will be reported to the Senate on Monday. He says in the letter:

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK As you know, the authority of the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages on large-scale rental projects under the emergency 608 program expires on March 1. As has always been the case when the expiration date for any FHA-insuring authority is approaching, an unusually large number of applications are filed with the FHA offices in order to beat the deadline.

Mr. President, that has occurred every time we approached an expiration date.

This situation has again prevailed in connection with the approaching expiration of section 608 This has been the case, notwithstanding the fact that this agency has repeatedly indicated that no extension of section 608 would be recommended.

I think it would be a matter of interest to you to know that because of the large volume of applications being received by FHA field offices and the accompanying pressure to process section 608 cases before the March 1 expiration date, instructions were issued to all field offices under date of January 28 reiterating the FHA policy of quality rather than quantity processing In addition, field offices were instructed to notify all mortgagees submitting section 608 applications that if the case was processed to the point where cost estimating was completed but no commitment was made prior to the expiration date, the fees would not be returned. Of course, if cases are not processed to the point where the fees are earned, the fees will be returned to the sponsor.

Mr. President, this is one of the questions which is of much concern today to all the contractors, architects, and engineers throughout the country.

The last paragraph of the letter is the most important of all:

The FHA field offices were also instructed to notify sponsors that in any case where section 608 applications were processed but not committed prior to the March 1 expiration date, the sponsor would have the option of converting to a section 207 application and being credited with the examination fees paid. While no new application is necessary in order to convert to a section 207 application, insurance could not be issued unless all of the requirements of section 207 were met.

For the benefit of Senators who are not on the Committee on Banking and Currency, the main difference, as I understand it, between section 608 and section 207 in the new bill which I filed today, is that section 608 provided a guaranty on loans up to 90 percent of the cost of a project. Section 207 provides for guaranty of 90 percent on the first $7,000 value of the project and 60 percent on any additional value up to $10,000. The maximum is $8,100, to be allowed on a project which has an average of four and one-half rooms. The maximum otherwise would be $7,200.

Mr. President, when the committee amended section 207, it in effect extended section 608 but on a less liberal loan basis. There will still be a 90-percent loan on anything up to $7,000; but when the value of the project exceeds $7,000, there is not to be a 90-percent loan, unless the project provides what your committee considers adequate space for the average family, not one room and efficiency units as are provided in so many of the 608 projects being built throughout the United States.

Mr. WHERRY Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who has so ably presented the features of the new section, which I understood him to say would constitute section 207——

Mr. MAYBANK. It is section 207 of the clean bill which the Banking and Currency Committee ordered to be reported in place of the bill now on the calendar. It has, in addition, title 1 and title 2; title 3, which is quite controversial; title 4, covering direct grants to veterans; and title 5, covering school and university housing loans. Section 608 has, in effect, been transferred to the new section 207.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that it is hoped by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that the proposed section 207 will be written into law, when the measure covering it comes before the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. I hope it will be. Let me say it authorizes $1,750,000,000 for title 2, which includes section 207.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield further?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. First, in attempting to lay a foundation for a question I should like to ask, let me say that the conditions under section 207 are different from those under section 608, as I understand, in the respect that under section 608, if I correctly recall, the insurance guaranty was 90 percent up to $9,000 per unit.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I now understand that under section 207 the proposal is that the guaranty applies up to $7,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; and 60 percent for the difference between $7,000 and $10,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not sure that those conditions can be met or will be met or should be met by contractors who already have filed applications, and some of whose applications were placed on file as early as November 1949, according to some of the letters I have received.

So I am asking the distinguished Senator from South Carolina this question: In the case of contractors who have made a great outlay of funds or to anyone else who has done so, in making application under section 608, if the applications have already been filed—I am not asking the Senator to extend beyond March 1 the deadline under which applications might be made under section 608 in the future—since there has been a bottleneck, and the applications could not be processed, although through no fault of those who made the applications, does not the Senator think it would be only fair that there should be an amendment to section 207 or else a special resolution, or something of the sort, to provide relief for those whose applications are on file and have been on file, and yet have not been processed, but through no fault of their own?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I always regret exceedingly that I cannot give a direct "Yes" or "No" answer to a question. However, the situation is that yesterday the President released an additional $300,000,000 to take care of a large number of applications which had been filed; and also I must remind the Senator that the FHA notified in plenty of time all those who were interested that they could give no assurance that all the applications received could be processed. My information is that at the present rate applications, by March 1, will amount to between $1,000,000,000 and $1,500,000,000.

Yesterday we revised the authorization in the bill downward; we reduced from $6,000,000,000 to $3,600,000,000 the authorizations and insurance, because of the testimony of representatives of the Federal Reserve Board that otherwise the bill would be inflationary. We did all we thought necessary to remove any inflationary features that may have existed in the bill.

The Senator has asked me a direct question. I can see his point, of course; but I would not say that it would be right to act or to grant all the applications, they would run, perhaps, into the hundreds of thousands in number. I am advised that the applicants have been notified that they were taking a risk in filing them. The President has used all the money authorized by Congress last year for this purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am perfectly willing to leave the date of notification the way it is, and I am not asking that any of the applications be granted. Certainly they should stand the test, just as all other applications should.

I agree that the inflationary aspect of the matter should be given every consid-

eration. I am not asking at all that the date be extended. But inasmuch as the conditions under section 207 are different from those under section 608, I ask the distinguished Senator whether it is not fair that applicants who had made their applications as far back as November 1949, should at least have opportunity to have their applications processed. Of course, they can be turned down if they do not comply.

Mr. MAYBANK. I could not differ with the Senator from Nebraska if all the applications had been on file since November 1. But what the agency is confronted with is applications running up to the hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, probably beyond a billion dollars, which have just been filed because of the deadline of March 1.

But I agree as to applications which were filed in November.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to state the exact date after which applications shall be turned down or rejected. I have hoped that the Senator would handle this matter before the bill comes up on the floor. If he can do so, I shall be very glad.

Under the circumstances, I think the only thing for me to do is to offer an amendment to be considered when the bill covering section 207 is brought up.

I hope the Senator from South Carolina will be able to assure us that section 207 will accomplish the desired purpose. If it does not, it seems to me the only thing to do is to wait and to debate the issue when the bill is considered. But I humbly submit to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who I know has done a great deal of work on this matter—and of course I know it is a difficult task—that it seems to me the applications which have been made under section 608, but have never been processed because of the bottleneck in getting to the applications, at least should be considered. If they can comply under section 207, that will be satisfactory with me. If they cannot comply, that likewise will be satisfactory. But it seems to me they should at least be considered and the applicants who made them should be given an opportunity to have their applications examined under section 608, because it is no fault of theirs that their applications have not been handled before now. If they made the offer in good faith and if they filed the contract in good faith, certainly their applications at least should be processed. If the application does not meet with the approval of the Federal Housing Authority, certainly it should be turned down.

I am not asking the distinguished Senator to extend beyond March 1 the date up to which applications may be filed. But it seems to me it is only justice, in the case of those who have made a great outlay in filing their applications, that they should at least be given an opportunity to have their applications processed.

I should like to have the distinguished Senator from South Carolina go along with that idea, because I know he has done so much work on this matter. I should like to have had his complete assurance, of course. I do not wish to take up any further time now, however.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that no one has a greater regard for him than I have, and of course we have worked together on many housing projects. But the Housing and Home Finance Agency, through the FHA, notified these persons in January. I may say that on February 1, in an attempt to try to beat the deadline of March 1, there were applications in the amount of $800,000,000 under section 608; and my information is that by March 1 the amount will be $1,500,000,000.

As chairman of the committee, I certainly do not want to approve anything that will lead to any further inflation. But if the Senator submitted such a resolution, I would be only too glad to hold hearings on it. Of course, I know there are two sides to this question.

I believe we can work out something which will be fair to those who have filed applications, as well as fair to those who have the responsibility for this tremendous amount of authorizations and insurance guaranties.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is perfectly satisfactory with the Senator from Nebraska.

As to the applications which have been jammed in yesterday and the day before, I completely agree with the Senator from South Carolina. I am not certain what the cut-off date should be.

So I think I shall introduce a joint resolution, and hope that it will be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, and that it will be regarded there with favor, so that some cut-off date can be established, and also so that applications which were filed back in November can receive some consideration.

I think that will be the best thing to do, so far as housing is concerned; and I hope the matter will be handled in the next few days.

(Mr. WHERRY subsequently introduced the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 154) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgage insurance under section 608 of such act, which was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.)

Mr. MAYBANK. I assure the Senator that, as he knows, we shall certainly be happy to have hearings and shall certainly look into the matter. When I say that applications in the amount of $800,000,000 were rushed in on February 1, and a great deal more are on file today, I know the Senator will agree that the subject does deserve careful consideration. There is always an attempt to beat the deadline by those who desire to undertake projects.

Mr. WHERRY. That is right.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is done by those who desire to have the Government guarantee the insurance or the loan. In substance, their profit is also guaranteed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that the evidence we have been getting before the Committee on Banking and Currency is to the effect that under section 608 the Government is frequently lending more to the contractors than is required to build the housing projects; and that in many cases section 608 projects are being built with Government-guaranteed loans substantially exceeding the actual cost of constructing the project, and that, in large measure, is what has been responsible for the large flow of loan applications. Furthermore, the Committee on Banking and Currency last year recommended that the guaranty be reduced from 90 percent to 80 percent, recognizing the fact that many of the loans represented no actual equity in the investment at all on the part of the person who would own the properties and that they were very high-rent properties, which, in many cases, are now standing vacant because the rents are so high.

Mr. MAYBANK. I must agree with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that most of the section 608 loans do not benefit the poor people of the United States.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, in my section of the Nation many housing units are standing idle today because of the high rents demanded. Otherwise, people would be in housing they could not afford. They cannot pay the high rents required by a program of this kind.

Mr. MAYBANK. After we heard the evidence of Mr. McCabe, of the Federal Reserve Board, and after there had been pointed out the dangers of inflation, in connection with titles 1 and 2 and 3, I hesitate to say to my good friend from Nebraska that I shall be willing to make any yes-or-no statement concerning a matter which involves $1,500,000,000, but I think those who have filed their applications have a right to be heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. Does the Senator from South Carolina feel that any kind of loan, in connection with which there is no equity investment, and where the amount of the loan actually exceeds the cost to the contractor or to the person owning the property, is sound and in the interest of the Government to guarantee?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I certainly do not, and for that reason the committee amended title III to require a 5-percent stock subscription, plus an additional 5 percent over a period of years, in order that the Government might have a 10-percent equity under title III, plus the one-quarter of 1 percent reserve for losses, all of which will liquidate the loans in approximately 36 years, if I remember correctly.

Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MAYBANK. I promised to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina certainly

understood the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MAYBANK. Oh, I certainly did.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not sanction, certainly, the practice referred to by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. I agree with him 100 percent. The difficulty has arisen because of the administration of the act. The point I am making is simply this: Is it not fair, considering the way in which the act was administered and is being administered now, that the applications which have been on file for months at least should be processed? That is all I am asking.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Nebraska that the applications which have been on file for a reasonable length of time should be processed. I refer to applications which were filed in an effort to beat the deadline. That was my point.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement. We are now on the so-called cotton and peanut acreage allotment resolution, House Joint Resolution 398. It is the desire of the Senator from Illinois and of Senators on the other side of the aisle to finish action on the joint resolution this afternon, even though it may necessitate a night session.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the majority leader mean that in the event the joint resolution is not finished by 5 or 6 o'clock, there will be a night session?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I assure the distinguished majority leader that the minority will cooperate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I shall ask recognition for the purpose of speaking on the pending amendment to House Joint Resolution 398.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

REPORTS BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a report presented on February 14, 1950, for printing in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a report of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures. It is my belief that the press release pertaining to this report, as well as the report itself, presents a distorted picture of Federal employment. The joint committee's press release, seeking to create the impression that Federal employment is increasing, states in its first paragraph:

> Federal employment in civilian agencies of the executive branch turned sharply upward during December with over-all increases averaging more than 143 a day.

However, Mr. President, in the third paragraph of the same release, the joint committee states that:

> The net decrease of 4,803 in the executive branch as a whole brought total employment down to 1,981,156, which, again in December, was a new low since 1942.

This type of presentation, Mr. President, is typical of the type of report filed by this joint committee.

I am also forced, Mr. President, to protest the statements made in the same release concerning the Post Office Department. Again I quote:

> Such reductions as were made in other civilian agencies of the Government were largely nullified by the steady addition of permanent employees in the Post Office Department. In the decade since 1939 average employment by the Post Office Department has increased by more than a quarter of a million, from a 1939 average of 297,191 to an average over the past 6 months of 529,735, an increase of 78 percent.

Mr. President, during this same period, 1939 through 1949, the weight of the mail carried by the Post Office Department increased 104 percent, special services increased 70 percent, and the number of pieces of mail handled 64 percent.

As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I must protest this type of presentation.

Mr. President, in view of the nature of the report, I wish to send to the desk a bill, which I ask be properly referred. Also, I ask that I may make a brief statement in reference to the bill, in order to explain its purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal title VI, section 601 of the "Revenue Act of 1941," Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress.

This title established, in 1941, a committee to investigate Federal expenditures, which has since become known as the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, or the Byrd committee. The legislation creating the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, provided that—

> It shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved in 1946, exactly the same duties were assigned to the House and Senate Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as standing committees, that is, "studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency." Therefore, since 1946, the Senate and House have each had two Expenditures Committees, with overlapping and duplicating functions.

Let us now look at the intent of Congress in passing the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The prime objectives of that act were to reduce the myriad of committees, and to clearly define their duties and responsibilities so they would not have overlapping and duplicating activities. In effect the Congress superseded the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the creation of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, with all expenditures functions vested in these standing committees. The Eightieth Congress took cognizance of this situation by refusing to further appropriate for the joint committee. However, the joint committee did secure funds in the Eighty-first Congress in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act.

Dr. George Galloway, an outstanding authority on legislative reorganization, supported the abolition of the joint committee at hearings held by the Senate Expenditures Committee considering amendments to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, in February 1948, when he stated that the functions of the joint committee duplicated the functions allocated to the Committee on Expenditures. I quote, Mr. President, from his statement before the committee:

> In the second place, I suggest that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures be discontinued. This committee was established by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 "to make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential.

Dr. Galloway continued, saying that—

> Its function overlaps that of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which, having been rejuvenated by the Legislative Reorganization Act, are now equipped to assume their historic responsibilities in this field.

Therefore, the continued existence of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is a violation of the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act, as well as a waste of the taxpayers' dollar.

I bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that here is a committee which, supposedly, by its title, is created to reduce expenditures and to eliminate waste, but I charge that it is a waste of the taxpayers' money and is a fundamental violation of the purpose of the committee.

The only reports which this joint committee has produced are monthly personnel statistics, which are prepared largely at the expense of the executive agencies themselves, and the cost of preparation has been estimated at a quarter of a million dollars for an 8-year period.

Recalling that its function is spelled out as "making a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential," we find that it has devoted itself almost exclusively to personnel statistics, and that without any justification whatsover it has regularly issued general statements calling for blanket reductions in Federal personnel. Even the most naive management engineering firm would never think of making recommendations concerning personnel reductions without

submitting detailed reasons for such reductions consistent with disclosed facts, and indicating where they should take place.

Yet, Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures in the Federal Government has not submitted a detailed documented statement as to why it believes the Federal employee rolls should be reduced. It merely makes a blanket charge, in the name of what it calls economy, that there should be a drastic reduction in personnel.

I also submit, Mr. President, that these blanket charges are often given the notoriety of newspaper headlines, indicating to the American electorate that the reductions are essential and that there is great waste going on in the Federal Government. To be sure, there may be some waste, but the charge of waste should be fully documented, and the documentation, I submit, has not been presented by reports of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures.

Mr. President, I submit that the continued existence of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is a wanton waste and extravagance, and that the expenditure of, first, over $100,000 in appropriated funds; second, $250,000 worth of time and effort of the executive branch of the Government in compiling the joint committee data; and, third, undetermined additional funds for printing, is unwarranted, and stands as the No. 1 example of waste and extravagance which the joint committee itself should have recommended be eliminated.

It is my firm conviction that this committee serves no useful purpose, and is merely used as a publicity medium. It deals only in generalities and violates the purpose for which it was created by wasting public funds rather than conserving them. Its demands on Federal agencies for monthly detailed personnel data is a heavy expense that must be borne by the executive branch with no return being made for the time and funds consumed in the compilation of such reports.

It is high time that certain elements in the legislative branch abandon their punitive attitude toward executive departments and agencies, and in turn that the executive departments and agencies develop a conscientious, cooperative attitude toward the legislative branch.

Since coming to the Senate just about a year ago I have been invited many times to indulge myself in one of two very popular indoor sports currently practiced by Members of the Congress and the executive branch. To date I have refused to become a participant, and today I shall assume the role of critic of these sports.

The first sport is known as persecute and prosecute, and is indulged in by legislators when dealing with members of the executive branch. This is strictly a punitive game with everyone concerned the loser, the legislator, the executive, and the department or agency.

The other sport is known as button, button, who has got the button, and is indulged in exclusively by members of the executive branch, as a defense mechanism against the punitive methods of the legislative branch. This is a game of concealment, containment, evasion, and misrepresentation, and again everyone is generally the loser, and no one the winner.

Mr. President, may I suggest that in the interest of better government, and particularly in the interest of better relations between the legislative and executive branches that these sports be forever barred from use, and that since the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures is one of those that has most frequently indulged itself in one of these sports, that it also be barred from participation by dissolvement.

The continued existence of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is not conducive to the success of our efforts for the reduction of Federal expenditures, to which many Members of this body are committed, and I cannot urge too strongly that this joint committee and its wasteful activities be abolished. I hope that other Senators will join with me in protesting the allocation of further funds for this joint committee, and in the passage of the bill I have introduced providing for its abolition.

Mr. President, I ask that the other Members of this great body join with me in strengthening the standing committee rejuvenated by the act of 1946 which would have the responsibility for watching over whatever waste or extravagance there may be in the Federal Government and bringing to the attention of the Congress of the United States means and methods of economy and efficiency of operation in the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill and ask for its appropriate reference. It provides for the repeal of section 601, title 6, of the Revenue Act of 1941, pertaining to a committee to investigate Federal expenditures, and for other purposes, and I ask that the bill be given, as quickly as possible, consideration by the appropriate committee. Let those who talk so much about economy and do so little about it make the first all-important move toward economy by abolishing a committee which has no right to exist, a committee which has merely existed because no one has spoken up to ask that it be dissolved, a committee which violates the Reorganization Act. I ask that it be done in the name of economy, so we can positively say we have really made a start on economy. I ask that it be done in the name of sound legislative practice, whereby standing committees of the Senate perform the duties assigned to them.

The bill (S. 3116) providing for the repeal of section 601, title VI, of the Revenue Act of 1941, pertaining to the Committee to Investigate Federal Expenditures, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

TRANSFER OF PLANES TO CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain newspaper articles regarding the award to the Chinese Communists yesterday by the British Hong Kong court of 71 airplanes belonging to the company operated by Gen. Claire Chennault.

The first insertion is an article from the New York World-Telegram dated February 23.

The second is a dispatch from Hong Kong by the noted New York Times world correspondent, Burton Crane, dealing with the same subject.

The third is an article which appears in today's Washington News entitled "China Reds Can't Wait To Grab Chennault's Planes," by Oland D. Russell, and an editorial which appears on the opposite side of the same paper under the headline, "How can we win?"

I also wish to have included a press dispatch which has just come over one of the tickers in our lobby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONG KONG.—Chinese Communist officials began taking over Nationalist property in Hong Kong today on the strength of a supreme-court decision granting them 71 former Nationalist airplanes.

A small vanguard moved into the offices of the Central Trust, an organ of the Nationalist Government, and began examining records.

Other Nationalists' properties scheduled to be taken over by the Communists include a number of banks, a shipping line with about 300,000 tons of ships in operation, and the Nationalist consular offices.

A Communist spokesman said the 71 planes granted them yesterday will be used to establish regular air service between Hong Kong and Communist China shortly.

[From the New York World-Telegram of February 23, 1950]

REDS AWARDED CHINESE AIR LINE

HONG KONG, February 23.—The Hong Kong Supreme Court, dismissing a claim by Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault, today granted the Chinese Communist government possession of $20,000,000 in Chinese Nationalist air lines' equipment.

The equipment included some ground equipment and 40 transport and passenger planes owned by the China National Aviation Corp. and the Central Air Transport Corp.

General Chennault claimed the planes for his Civil Air Transport Co. on grounds he had bought up all Hong Kong assets of the two Nationalist companies when they transferred operations to Formosa last fall.

CLAIMED BY REDS

General Chennault, wartime commander of the Flying Tigers, recently petitioned the court to appoint a receiver for the two air lines' property in Hong Kong.

The planes were taken over by the Hong Kong court last fall after a number of air crews of the CNAC and CATC defected and flew 11 planes to Communist territory.

The Chinese Communist regime at Peiping claimed the remainder of the planes on grounds they belonged to the Chinese people

and should be turned over to the Chinese Communist administration.

Pro-Communist air-line employees, anticipating the court's decision, have been painting red flags on the ships' fuselages and overhauling the engines during the past few weeks. It was expected they would be flown into Communist China within a few days.

The two Nationalist air lines fled Hong Kong last November in fear that Chinese Nationalist property here would be turned over to the Communists by the Hong Hong court.

Today's decision was the first in a number of pending cases. Other Nationalist property still in Hong Kong includes banks and shipping.

[From the New York Times of February 24, 1950]

HONG KONG COURT GIVES REDS PLANES—DENIES RECEIVERSHIP PLEA OF UNITED STATES CONCERN FOR 93 FORMER CHINESE NATIONALIST CRAFT—INJUNCTIONS ARE LIFTED—"SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY" CITED BY BENCH—ONLY REGISTRY BARS SHIPS' FLIGHT TO PEIPING

(By Burton Crane)

HONG KONG, February 23.—Under Hong Kong Supreme Court decision today, 93 planes, paid for largely by United States taxpayers, are being turned over to the Chinese Communist government.

Despite the decision, which denied a receivership application and vacated two injunctions granted last autumn, the Chinese Communists are unable at present to fly the planes to their territory. They are not registered under Hong Kong laws Thus some time remains for possible action from Washington or elsewhere

[According to the Associated Press, a spokesman for one of the air lines involved said the planes would be flown to Peiping, seat of the Chinese Communist government, probably within a week.]

The case concerned three corporations. The largest was the China National Aviation Corp., a prewar subsidiary of Pan American Airways. It was reincorporated in 1946, with the Chinese Nationalist Government taking 80 percent of the stock by virtue of its contribution of planes and equipment it received from the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the Economic Cooperation Administration, Lend-Lease, and other forms of United States aid.

The second concern, the Central Air Transport Corp., was owned 100 percent by the Nationalist Government's Communications Ministry.

When the Communists began to overrun China both companies removed their planes to the Kaitak Airport in Hong Kong. Eighty percent of the Chinese employees of both air lines defected to the Communists last November 9 and flew away several planes.

The two corporations asked the protection of the British Government, which then still recognized the Chinese Nationalist regime. The corporations were told they would get protection if they first applied for an injunction, according to Richard Heppner, one of the lawyers representing Nationalist and United States interests in the case. Mr. Heppner was wartime head of the Office of Strategic Services in China and a law partner of Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, retired, over-all head of the OSS.

The two Nationalist Government air lines asked and got an injunction forbidding the defecting employees to touch the planes, which include four Skymasters and six Convairs. Shortly thereafter the Communists got an injunction preventing Nationalist sympathizers from going near the equipment.

Mr. Heppner declared tonight that the Americans and the Chinese Nationalist involved in the case had objected strongly because only the second injunction ever was enforced. Communists were permitted to work on the planes and service them, he said, and the British refused to withdraw the airfield passes issued to the Communists as employees even though they had announced they were no longer connected with the two concerns.

Early last November, the Nationalist Government attempted to extricate itself from this dilemma by selling all planes of both air lines to Civil Air Transport, Inc., a Delaware concern formed for that purpose by Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault and his associate, Whiting Willauer. Civil Air Transport declared in court that it had paid $3,900,000 for the planes of the first two companies

On January 6 Britain recognized the Chinese Communist Government shortly after inspectors from the United States Civil Aeronautics Authority appeared with an announcement that the former Central Air Transport and China National Aviation planes had been registered by Civil Air Transport with the United States Government. They said they wished to inspect the planes and place United States markings on them British authorities refused to allow them to tamper with the planes.

Civil Air Transport then filed applications with the Hong Kong courts for the appointment of receivers for both companies

Today, Sir Leslie Gibson, Hong Kong's chief justice, handed down a decision declaring that the "doctrine of sovereign immunity operates to prevent the court from entertaining an application to appoint a receiver" He also declared that all proper parties were not before the court and that the plaintiff corporation had not established a sufficiently strong case

"I have held that the assets are in possession of the Central People's Government (Communists)," he said. "If I am wrong in this, then, in my opinion, they are clearly in possession of the corporation (China National Aviation) Neither the Central People's Government nor the corporation is a party to these proceedings or has consented to the appointment of a receiver"

The Chief Justice dismissed the American contention that the Communist government had got possession only through infringing the November injunction and declined to admit the validity of the minutes of China National Aviation of December 31, approving the sale to Civil Air Transport The court ordered the plaintiffs to pay $8,000 as costs.

According to the Nationalists' intelligence, possession of the planes will triple the Communist air force.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 24, 1950]

CHINA REDS CAN'T WAIT TO GRAB CHENNAULT PLANES

(By Oland D. Russell)

The Chinese Communists were expected to lose no time in flying out of Hong Kong the 70-odd transport planes which have in effect been handed over to them by the supreme court in the British crown colony.

The planes, including communications and maintenance equipment, belong to an American corporation, headed by Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault, of Flying Tiger fame.

They make up the biggest air fleet in China and for months have been sought by the Chinese Communists. They can be used to ferry military supplies to China from Russia, for dropping parachutists into Indochina, or for an amphibious assault on Formosa.

The Hong Kong court invoked sovereign immunity in deciding it could not take the planes under its protection by appointing a receiver for them. The court took the view that since the British had recognized the Communists, the Peiping regime was the legal and sovereign ruler of China and could not be disturbed from its possession of the planes.

ALREADY, RED FLAGS

Though the American owners and representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Authority have been denied the access to the planes, pro-Communist employees of the two former Nationalist air lines have been permitted to board them at Kaitak Airfield where they are impounded. Anticipating a court decision in favor of the Communists, those former employees already have painted Red flags on the ships and have been overhauling the motors in preparation for a quick getaway.

British authorities in Hong Kong have been trying for 3 months—even before London recognized the Red regime—to find a legal way of turning over these two completely equipped air lines to the Chinese Communists

Communist pressure on the local British authorities has been great and the British themselves have not been unmindful of the trade benefits and good will that might accrue to them if they handed over the planes to the Commies.

Still other pressures have been exerted on the Hong Kong British by the London foreign office and the United States State Department for recognition of General Chennault's legal title to the planes.

GODOWN SHOW-DOWN

The show-down came this week According to word received here, the Communists got word to the Hong Kong court that for every plane denied them, one British business establishment in Communist-occupied Shanghai would be taken over. "A godown (warehouse) for every plane," as the Reds tersely put it.

Facing this situation realistically, the Hong Kong court yielded to the Communists, taking advantage, according to observers here, of the British election following Washington's Birthday when communications with London and Washington would be at a minimum effectiveness.

The court in effect washed its hands of the whole affair, dumping a ticklish question on the London foreign office, but by choosing the holiday and election day period, it gave some time leeway to the Communists to get the planes away from Hong Kong.

If any restraint is now to be used, it will have to be done on orders from London for some sort of executive action.

AMERICAN REPRISALS

At stake now is whether American diplomatic power can be used effectively to prod London into measures which still might save some or all of the planes from falling into Communist hands. The State Department has, through representations and notes, backed the Chennault claim to title of the planes and has insisted that the Hong Kong court conduct a trial to establish legality of this title.

But Washington consistently has refused to get tough about it, with the result that the Communists have slugged it out—and apparently have won—in the Hong Kong courts.

Some demands were heard here yesterday for American reprisals against the British through the ECA. It was pointed out that the British by letting planes and equipment valued at $20,000,000 be grabbed off by the Communists, in effect have given an American air fleet to the Reds topping in value what the British will get in air equipment from the ECA.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 24, 1950]

HOW CAN WE WIN?

Now that the United States and Britain have recognized the French-sponsored Bao Dai regime in Indo-China, French military circles are asking for a common western

policy in the Far East, as well as immediate military aid.

A list of the equipment wanted, including light tanks, jeeps, reconnaisance cars, and small-arms ammunition, has been given to our Government, with an additional request for a $100,000,000 economic rehabilitation loan.

Since we are here being asked to buy into a war, it will be well to get all the facts on the table. We ought to know what we're getting into, and just what chance, if any, we have to win From this distance, the chance looks dim.

The French, having had an army of 160,000 men in the field for 3 years, have inflicted no serious injury to Ho Chi-minh's Communist forces. Now, according to a Paris report to the New York Times, "an effective blockade of Communist China" is regarded as one of the essentials if victory is to be achieved.

The idea of a blockade of Communist China can be discarded, now that the British court in Hong Kong has awarded the Red Government at Peiping 70 transport and passenger planes which Major General Chennault had purchased from the Chinese Nationalists. That decision probably spells the doom of Formosa, as well as killing any prospect of saving Indochina from the Reds.

Some heads should be examined in the State Department and the British Foreign Office Britain recognized the Chinese Reds, and now has given them the planes they need to continue their campaign of aggression. The United States has recognized the Bao Dai forces in Indochina, and now is asked to put up the money and the arms to defeat the forces of Ho Chi-minh, which are said to have the active support of the Chinese Reds. Russia, of course, is backing both Red forces.

How can the West hope to win under this kind of leadership?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of Members of the Senate the fact that this is one of the greatest blows to the non-Communist world that has been delivered in that part of the globe. The granting of these 71 planes, which in equity belong to the firm of General Chennault, and before that belonged to the Nationalist Government of China, furnishes the Communists the tools which they can later use for an attack upon the island of Formosa, for an air-borne attack upon southeast Asia, and ultimately perhaps for an attack upon the islands of Japan or the Philippines.

I think that if the Government of Great Britain does not recognize its responsibility in this matter, and take immediate administrative steps to prevent those 71 planes, which are American planes, from getting into the hands of the Communists, the Government of the United States must itself take drastic action in that regard, in the way of representations to the British Government. The British can no longer expect assistance from us to help to stop communism in Europe while the British Government, by their recognition of the Communist regime, and by this latest action of turning over 71 planes, actually accelerate the spread of communism in Asia.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article appearing in Time magazine for February 27 dealing with the situation in Formosa.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINA BEFORE STORMS AND WINDS

Along south China's invasion coast, facing the Nationalist islands of Formosa and Hainan, Communist generals are drilling a million men, assembling thousands of junks and sampans for amphibious assault. How firmly will Nationalist China hold out in her island remnants? Last week Time Correspondent Wilson Fielder surveyed Fomosa's defenses. His report:

"In the foothills of southern Formasa's terraced mountains, youthful soldiers shout 'Sha! Sha!' (kill! kill!) as they lunge at practice dummies with bayonets. The huge military training camp at Fengshan echoes with machine-gun chatter, and squads of infantrymen work under live ammunition fire. Fengshan's combat course is modeled after the training system used in the United States in World War II, and the camp's officers call it "the cradle of the new Chinese army."

"From the training camp, troops graduate to the volcanic black sand beaches not far away. There, facing the mainland, they build concrete pillboxes, string barbed wire, drill endlessly to repel the invasion from the sea. In their off-duty hours, the soldiers sing a new army song:

" 'The fields of the Motherland are calling,
The blood of 500 million is throbbing,
Let storms and winds buffet us,
The goddess of Liberty is smiling,
We are the vanguard of antiaggression.' "

FROM VMI

The morale of the new Nationalist Army seems to be good, and officers credit the improvement to the work of trim, greying General Sun Li-jen, 49, who learned the elementary facts about soldiering at the United States' Virginia Military Institute. Sun served ably against the Japanese at Shanghai and later in Burma, where he commanded the snappy, United States trained Thirty-eighth Division As one of the Nationalists' top commanders in Manchuria after VJ-day, he beat the Communists consistently. In 1947, Chinese clique politics led to his transfer to Formosa and the Fengshan training camp.

The islanders soon learned that Sun was no carpetbagger. He set up six "don'ts" for his troops. "Don't molest the populace; don't go to prostitutes, don't gamble; don't 'squeeze', don't be false; don't be lazy." He asked Formosans to help enforce discipline. Villagers still talk about the lieutenant who walked the streets of the small towns near Fengshan carrying a big sign listing his crimes.

Sun learned more than discipline at VMI. He has an American zest for sport. Recently he took part in a Fengshan soccer game, told the other players: "On the playing field, I'm no general." An enlisted man bowled him over with a well-executed block. The general rose groggily. "Guess I'm not as young as I used to be," he said, but he insisted on finishing the game

Last month the Nationalist Government offered 4,500 young Formosans a chance to serve in the island's defense, and thousands of volunteers were turned away. General Sun was heartened. With the troops he had already trained and those in training (well over 100,000), he feels that he can stand off at least the first waves of a Communist invasion. He has shaken up the officer corps, though too much deadwood still remains. He needs more matériel and more parts for vehicles. But he insists that his "boys are working like beavers because they know now what they are fighting for."

AGAINST DISAFFECTION

The Nationalists' 300-plane air force, commanded by amiable Gen. Chou Chih-jou, could be Formosa's most effective defense (so far, the Reds have fought without planes), but until recently Chou was plagued with disaffection among his airmen. Last week in Taipeh, Chou opened a lengthy "self-examination" meeting where airmen could talk over their personal worries with top brass. He is also promoting better housing for their families, now thinks that the morale problem is on the way to being solved.

Disaffection has also considerably weakened the Nationalist Navy. Following the lead of turncoat airmen, sailors have surrendered at least 12 ships (including the navy's only cruiser, the *Chungking*, formerly the British *Aurora*) to the Communists. To combat disloyalty chubby Admiral Kwei Yung-ching has clamped several senior captains in irons. He has also promoted relatively liberal pay raises, hopes that what is left of his navy is loyal.

CRUCIAL FRONT

Beyond its shaky defenses the specter that haunts Formosa is economic collapse. If Nationalist military expenditures cannot be held within the limits of Formosa's productive capabilities, the Communists might just as well be invited to come on over unopposed. As General Sun says, "If prices double, we get just half the food we need for our men. What do you think will happen if we can't feed our men and their families?"

The commander on the economic front is indefatigable, Princeton-trained Gov. K. C. Wu, former mayor of Shanghai. To set a good example, Chain Smoker Wu gave up cigarettes because "cigarettes are smuggled into Formosa, and represent, therefore, a drain on our financial structure." Since he became Formosa's governor last December Wu has stopped speculation with government pay rolls by military and civilian bureaucrats. He has tried resolutely to tap wealth. Automobiles have been classed as luxuries, and their owners must now buy a certain amount of war bonds; residents applying for passports must purchase bonds equal to the amount of their transportation costs; taxes on restaurant meals and motion pictures have been upped from 20 to 60 percent.

The real key to a stable economy is industrial expansion. In this field Wu is pressing as hard as he can with the limited means at his disposal. Formosa's power plants have reached the peak levels of production achieved under the Japanese. Cement production has surpassed the best Japanese mark. The island's meager foreign exchange has been reinvested in irrigation projects for richer crops. But even the most enthusiastic Nationalist admits that all of this will eventually come to naught unless Formosa receives more financial and technical aid from the United States.

Like other Nationalist leaders, honest Governor Wu is conscious that the United States Government, to put it kindly, is impatient with Nationalist shortcomings. He answers, "When your heart is for reform, you must sometimes be patient." And if the Reds take Formosa as they have taken China, what price reform?

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, there are pending before the Senate several amendments to the pending resolution, and I desire at this time to offer another amendment to the so-called potato amendment, and ask that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "the

enactment of this joint resolution" and insert "March 15, 1950."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered amends the same line of the bill which the pending amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] proposes to amend. I assume, therefore, that the Senate will vote first on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware. However, I have sent my amendment to the desk and asked that it be read, in order that Senators may have before them at the time they vote on the Williams amendment an alternate proposal.

I make parliamentary inquiry as to which of these amendments takes priority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I assumed that would be the case.

Mr. President, I wish now to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the so-called Lucas amendment to the pending cotton joint resolution is aimed at partially correcting a most unfortunate situation growing out of the bill providing price support for potatoes. As I stated on the floor yesterday, when the Senator from Illinois was kind enough to yield to me, his amendment creates some inequalities, plus some additional difficulties of administration.

So there are pending before the Senate now, Mr. President, four different proposals. First, there is the Lucas amendment, which provides that there shall be no support for any potatoes planted after the joint resolution becomes law. We do not know exactly when that will be. When we pass the joint resolution it will go to the House. We may assume that the House will not accept the Senate amendments, and will ask for a conference. The House will appoint conferees, and the Senate will appoint conferees. The conferees will meet. After several days of deliberation, perhaps, they will agree on a report. The report will go back, first to the body in which the bill originated. In this case the House would vote first on the conference report. If adopted by the House, the conference report will come to the Senate, and the Senate will vote on it. If the Senate adopts the report, it will go to the White House for the signature of the President. He will have 10 days in which to have the Department of Agriculture, and anybody else he might think should be advised with, consulted about proposed changes in the general farm-support program. So it is quite difficult to say when the joint resolution will become law. It is fair to say, however, that it might easily be 2 weeks—and perhaps longer—before it will become law. However, the very minute it becomes law, under the Lucas amendment no potatoes planted the next minute can get any support.

We have pending before us an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which provides that no potatoes harvested after the joint resolution becomes law shall have any support. That ignores the fact, apparently, if we are to try to do complete justice to the whole situation, that potatoes have been in the markets from Florida since early January, and by the time the joint resolution becomes law the bulk of the Florida crop will have been harvested. The so-called Williams amendment unintentionally draws a cut-off line just north of Florida. The Lucas amendment draws a cut-off line about 25 miles south of Chesapeake Bay, leaving out that great and wonderful potato-producing area in Norfolk and Princess Anne Counties on the Virginia side, and Northampton and Accomack Counties on the peninsular, or Eastern Shore side, of Virginia. Those counties surround Chesapeake Bay. But the Lucas amendment cuts a little south of them, and does a nice job for North Carolina and everything south of North Carolina. But it leaves this particular potato area out of the picture.

I admit, Mr. President, it is not an easy thing to find a perfect solution for the potato problem. In fact, it is but a part of a much larger problem for which we do not have an adequate solution. There is one solution of the farm problem to which we in the United States must eventually give more consideration. When the Marshall plan ends in the fiscal year 1952 our American farmers are going to lose an export market of more than $1,000,000,000 a year. Everyone knows that we have not worked out a satisfactory solution of the farm problem even with the give-away program of the ECA. Of course, the people of those foreign nations could have eaten all our surplus potatoes, and would have been very glad to have obtained them, but apparently we did not have the shipping necessary, and the transportation of the potatoes might have required the use of refrigerator ships. I do not know what the problem was by reason of which the Secretary of Agriculture said that about 50,000,000 bushels of a very wonderful food had to be destroyed. In fact, it is the type of food which is eaten practically all over the world, although in some of the southern countries they use a little different variety, which we call the sweetpotato or the yam; but potatoes of some kind seem to be pretty nearly a world-wide food in civilized countries.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Virginia informed that since that announcement, whenever it was made by the Secretary of Agriculture, a very large volume, amounting to thousands of tons of the surplus potatoes, has already been taken by our foreign friends in Portugal, in Spain, in Greece, in Morocco, and other countries? Therefore it seems as though a very large proportion will be utilized in one manner or another rather than to be dumped, which I think is a matter of gratification to everyone.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course, there is so much hunger and distress in the world it is most repugnant to every American to see food needlessly destroyed and wasted. I have read in the newspapers that some of these nations were willing, at the nominal price at which the potatoes had been offered for sale, to buy a considerable quantity, but the delivery was dependent upon their securing ocean transportation, and apparently there was some doubt about the quantity of potatoes which could be delivered before the weather became so warm they would spoil.

Mr. BREWSTER. The ships are now coming to the Atlantic coast to take these potatoes. It is quite practical to ship potatoes from the northern ports for another month or two.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That, of course, is somewhat encouraging, because it means all the potatoes will not be lost.

Mr. President, I think I should now mention the substitute for the three pending amendments, which would come to a vote when either the Williams amendment or my amendment is adopted or rejected. Then we would come to the substitute for the whole measure, offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. That substitute provides that instead of having a cut-off date or a cut-off line here, there, or yonder, all potatoes will come under the program, provided the Department of Agriculture will put in a compulsory form of acreage control and marketing agreements.

Mr. AIKEN rose.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont if he wants me to do so. Do I understand from the author of the substitute that its provisions have been correctly stated by me?

Mr. AIKEN. I just came into the Senate Chamber.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I stated that the Senator's substitute provides that all potatoes this year, regardless of when planted or when harvested, would come under the support program provided the Secretary of Agriculture put into effect a compulsory allotment and marketing control.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have stated the four proposals which are before the Senate. I feel that in the interest of fairness and justice to my constituents, I owed it to them, before action was taken on the Lucas amendment and on the Williams amendment, to offer the amendment which I sent to the desk, and on which I will ask for a vote as soon as the Senate has voted on the Williams amendment. My amendment strikes out the language of the Lucas amendment in line 12 on page 7 which provides that potatoes which are planted after the joint resolution becomes law shall be out, and inserting the provision that potatoes planted after March 15, 1950, shall be out.

In this connection I wish to call to the attention of the Senate that during the past year the Government lost very little on the early potatoes, and at the present time, of course, is not losing anything on the Florida new potatoes. Yet I frankly admit that if the Government had not taken up the Maine and Idaho potatoes and other thick-skinned winter potatoes, rather than having them dumped on our southern markets at whatever the market would pay, the Florida producers would not have secured cost of production for what they were selling, because the other potatoes would have been so much cheaper, even though some people like the little marblelike

potatoes which can be boiled. They would have used the winter-grown potatoes, because price is a factor. So the whole problem, I submit, is closely interrelated.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder if the Senator from Virginia is informed that the Government is buying Florida potatoes at the present time to the extent of several thousand bushels a day in order to support the market? That, I think, affords an interesting observation on the situation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was under the impression that the Government was not buying the Florida potatoes at the present time.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Government has been buying them for some time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I may be misinformed. The Senator from Maine, of course, is a potato expert, and I do not claim to be one. No doubt he has kept in closer touch with the situation than I have. If he says that the Government is now buying Florida potatoes, far be it from me to say that he does not know what he is talking about. But I say it can be seen how palpably unfair it is, if the Government is now buying Florida potatoes, for the Lucas amendment to be adopted, since it says, "We will add to the other potatoes the Carolina potatoes." And if the Mississippi potatoes, or Georgia potatoes, or wherever else in that region potatoes are grown, are included, the potatoes grown in the area up to Chesapeake Bay will be taken in, but potatoes will be cut off at that Chesapeake Bay line. I say I do not see the justice of such action.

Let us include them up to the March 15 period. That will do what? It will take care of the early spring potatoes, even those in California, which really have given us in Virginia sharp competion. The California potatoes come on the market at the same time as our Virginia potatoes do. The California potatoes are a little larger, but more watery than ours. However, they are packaged and well graded, and they give us tough competition.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator not realize that the sun moves north, and does not recognize any geographical boundary at all? I certainly appreciate the force of the argument made by the Senator from Virginia, who does not want Virginia potatoes eliminated. That reminds me of the story of the farmer who said he didn't want very much land; he just wanted what "j'ined" his.

I am sure the people just north of Virginia will be equally interested because in the latter part of March and in the early part of April potatoes will be planted in Maryland and further north.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But I remind my colleague of the fact that in Aroostook County, Maine, the farmers grow a thick-skinned potato which can stand adversity. Our little thin-skinned potatoes cannot take as much rough treatment. They do not keep very long. Aroostook potatoes raised and harvested the previous fall can even be sent down to us in March as seed potatoes to be planted for our fall potatoes.

There is this much more. We evidently have to work out a general farm program.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let us be frank about the matter. We cannot go ahead with a 90-percent support program and practically unlimited production, with surplus piling up, and a potentiality of two or three or four billion dollars a year of support by reason of surpluses we do not know what to do with. This is the most acute part of the situation. We do not have a full remedy, but I am offering a very minor amendment to the pending amendment which I think, pending a more permanent and better adjustment, would at least do justice and be fair to the early crop of potatoes clear across the board from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean. My amendment would take them all in. Then I shall be glad to join with my distinguished colleagues from the colder area to work out a program to take care of the whole situation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Virginia did not intend to leave any implication that potatoes were receiving 90 percent support now, did he?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No. I was talking about the 90-percent support provision which was adopted over my protest and over my vote at the time of adjournment last October, which was continued on the insistence of the House for another year on certain basic crops. That could amount to a very large sum of money. But that was for only 1 year.

Mr. BREWSTER. But potatoes came under the 60-percent support program last year, and we are still operating under the 60-percent program. Potatoes are the only major crop—I do not say basic crop but major crop—as to which that is true.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The potato growers tell me that at current prices they do not receive the cost of production, in view of the present price of fertilizer and the high cost of living. If they were to get $2 a hundred pounds, they might come out all right. Last year, when they got $2.40 a hundred pounds, I am informed they made a little profit on the potatoes they sold to the Government. However, the present support price merely serves to minimize the potato farmer's loss. That is the situation in Virginia.

For some reason—I do not know whether it is because there is better land in Maine or whether the Maine farmers are smarter, or what the reason is—in Maine more potatoes are produced to the acre than in Virginia. I think the Senator from Maine knows that is true. I think there are cases in Maine, particularly in Aroostook County, where the production is four times as great as it is in Virginia; and that situation makes a considerable difference.

Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate further on this matter. The amendment is simply stated, but of course some of our simplest problems are the hardest to solve. I confess I do not know the real answer. However, I am offering an amendment which in my opinion will make the Lucas amendment, should it be the will of the Congress, fairer than it is at the present time, for my amendment will apply clear across the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, on the March 15 date, which will take care of every farmer who raises potatoes which come on the market in June.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief remarks in connection with the farm program.

There has been much discussion of the farm support program and the impression has been created that this is costing the Government a tremendous sum of money, and many questions have been raised as to the advisability of continuing price support for farm products generally.

I think it would be well to get a clear picture of just what has happened in connection with the farm support of prices. As to the benefit which the farmers have reaped from this program, I need only say that the total income of the farmers in America in 1933 was only $7,000,000,000, in round figures, whereas in 1948 it amounted to $35,000,000,000.

The prosperity of the country depends in a very large measure upon the prosperity of the farmers, and the money spent by the Government in support of farm prices has been returned manifold to the Government in taxes paid by farmers and in the general contribution made by farmers to the total prosperity of the Nation.

The present measure relating to the allotment of cotton acreage is both necessary and essential, and it is important that it be passed without delay. It is an emergency measure; and for that reason, I favored considering it on its own merits, without having the issue confused by injecting into the consideration of this measure the potato amendment or amendments touching other farm products

It will be recalled that last year the cotton-acreage allotment bill provided for the reduction of cotton acreage from 27,000,000 to 21,000,000 acres for 1950. That was a very decided cut, but one that was fully justified; and the cotton farmer has made no objection to this reduction in acreage, but has agreed to accept it as a necessary protection for preventing the accumulation of an unnecessarily large surplus.

When the allotments were made, however, the Agriculture Department proceeded upon the basis of its Bureau of Agricultural Economics report as to the acreage planted to cotton in the various States and in the counties of the several States. That report was not accurate. As a result of that and other provisions in connection with acreage allotments, a great many inequalities and injustices resulted, so that many farmers

suffered a reduction of 40 percent, 50 percent, and sometimes nearly 100 percent in their acreage, whereas the across-the-board reduction was supposed to be around 20 percent.

This measure is for the purpose of correcting some of these inequalities and injustices. Unless it is passed, many farmers will be denied their just rights, by virtue of the method in which acreage allotments have been made. This measure does not give as much increased acreage for the purpose of adjusting these inequalities as was proposed in the House measure, but it will afford substantial relief, and will not add more than probably six or seven hundred thousand acres to the total, and will still leave the number of acres actually planted to cotton below the 21,000,000 authorized in the allotment bill last year.

In this connection, I think it should be known that this price-support program for cotton has been in effect for about 16 years; and during this entire period, up to December 31, 1949, the entire cotton support-price program has not cost the taxpayers a single cent. Instead of the Governments losing money on the cotton program, it made a net profit, as of the first of the year, of $236,359,485. In view of these facts, no one could have any just complaint about the small measure of relief this measure will give the cotton farmers.

In this connection, I may say that another very important crop which has benefited from Government price support, and which likewise has not cost the taxpayers a single cent during the 16 years it has been administered, is the tobacco program. Instead of the Government's losing any money on the tobacco program, which has been one of the best administered programs in the entire farm schedule, there was a net profit, for the Government, as of December 31, 1949, of $5,295,280.

Of course, other farm-support programs have lost money, and the taxpayers have suffered as a result; but these losses have not been anything as great as the public has been led to believe. For instance, the total loss on the wheat program up to December 31, 1949, for the whole period that this price-support has been in effect, was $40,597,175. On peanuts, the Government has lost $57,988,756 for the entire program, over the years.

The big loss has been in the potato program, and this is the one which has caused so much popular resentment. Up to December 31, 1949, the total loss on this program was $346,498,858.

It is generally admitted that the potato program has not been well handled. Many things have entered in to complicate this problem. The heaviest loss occurred last year. It arose because the crop was underestimated; and because of weather conditions, an exceptionally large crop developed. I realize the necessity of remedying this situation and of taking drastic action to prevent a recurrence of the waste which has developed by virtue of the destruction of so many potatoes for which the Government paid the support price.

The chief criticism results from the fact that instead of giving these potatoes to charitable organizations and making them available for use by relief agencies, hospitals, and other institutions, they have been permitted to go to waste or be destroyed or be sold for a penny a bushel and fed to cattle, although there was so much human need in the world. There is no defense for this situation.

The question now confronts us as to what remedy should be applied. I am going to support the Aiken amendment because I think it will enable the Agricultural Department to meet the present situation, and I do not believe we should take the proposed drastic action of repudiating the Government's contract with the farmers in the midst of the planting of their crops. I regard a contract with the Government as being as vital and as binding as a contract with an individual. This Government would not permit an individual to repudiate a contract with his Government, and therefore I do not believe the Government should repudiate its own contract with its citizens. We must maintain the integrity of the Government, even though some loss in dollars might occur as a result thereof.

I am definitely in favor of the legislation proposed for a strict and rigid potato control program for the future, but I think we should adopt the Aiken amendment now, and then follow it by the enactment of a control program that will give reasonable price support to the farmer and at the same time will lessen the cost to the Government and will make available to the relief agencies and other charitable organizations, both at home and abroad, the surplus potatoes, so that they may be utilized for human consumption, and not again have the spectacle of waste and extravagance which has been manifest in the present and past year.

I am very happy to say that the potato situation in North Carolina has resulted in very little, if any, loss to the Government, because our growers have strictly complied with the marketing agreements of the Agriculture Department and have sought to make the program work successfully. Our farmers have not overplanted. They have observed all the requirements in connection with the operation of the total potato program.

As to peanuts, it is gratifying, likewise, to know that the peanuts produced both in North Carolina and Virginia, known as edible peanuts, have cost the Government practically nothing in the way of support by prices. These have been selling above the support price practically all the time. Only about 15 percent of the cost of the peanut program has been attributable to peanuts grown in North Carolina and Virginia, which constitute the bulk of the edible peanuts produced in the United States. Peanuts grown in other sections are known as the oil-producing peanuts, and they sell at a lower price; and the loss in the operation of the program has occurred in connection with the marketing of these peanuts.

Upon the whole, the farm program has been a great success, and the price supports have enabled the farmers to realize a profit on the farm. Thus we have buttressed the prosperity of the Nation and have maintained our economy at a high level.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 398, which now is before the Senate, is proposed legislation of an emergency nature, as I see it.

In a very few weeks the farmers of South Carolina and of the entire Cotton Belt will be ready to plant their 1950 crop. In some States it will be even sooner.

This measure can mean the absolute livelihood of many farmers in the southeastern section of the United States.

There is no question in the minds of the farmers as to the value of this bill.

It will not cure all the inequities, but in my opinion, and in the opinion of the other members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry it will cure many more inequities than even the House joint resolution, because it uses a different method of determining the amount of acreage which was actually planted in the years 1946, 1947, and 1948, rather than taking without question the statistics of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The purpose of the pending joint resolution is to take care of the situation only where gross inequities now exist.

Last year when the present cotton-acreage allotment program went into effect, my office was flooded with mail. The cotton growers in South Carolina told me that their cotton allotments had been cut as much as 60 and 70 percent in some cases. Last year in my State the cotton crop was almost a 100-percent failure due to excess rainfall which brought on the boll weevils. As for the farmers who depend on cotton as their sole money crop, they were left in destitute circumstances. Many of them had borrowed money to buy fertilizer for the 1949 crop which failed to produce. Mr. President, today there are farmers in my State and in every State in the Cotton Belt who are wondering how they will be able to operate this year.

During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, Public Law 38 was enacted, which set up a revolving fund for the Department of Agriculture to make disaster loans to farmers whose crops had been lost due to unpreventable conditions. Last year the entire State of South Carolina was included in the disaster area. This has been a tremendous help. This will help provide the farmers with money to buy fertilizer, but what good will fertilizer do if the farmers only have 5 or 6 acres allotted them in 1950 for cotton planting.

Mr. President, I well realize that we must have strict acreage control if the Government is to sponsor high-price support for cotton or any other commodity. I am for cotton support, but I want to remind you that cotton support is to assure the farmers of this Nation of a livelihood.

Twenty-one million acres have been allotted throughout the Nation under the present program. The Department of Agriculture estimates that under the existing law there will be planted approximately only 19,000,000 acres.

If House Joint Resolution 398, containing the Lucas amendment, is passed, the

Department of Agriculture estimates that an additional 800,000,000 acres will be added, but some have estimated that it will be much smaller than that amount. However, if it is passed, it will wipe out some of the gross inequities which are now in the program.

One of the main reasons for these inequities is the BAE figure which has been used in determining a farmer's allotment. It is known by the Department of Agriculture, the farmer, and by us that these figures are incorrect. They never should have been used in the first place. The way in which the BAE figures were obtained is in a great many instances responsible for the incorrectness of the figures. In my State 150,000 letters were sent to the farmers. Answers were received to approximately 20 percent of the letters. That percentage which was received were multiplied by 5, and the allotment was determined in that manner. In certain counties, of course, only the big farmers replied; in other counties the small farmers replied in big numbers. As a result of this hit and miss and guess on the part of the BAE, some of the farmers were cared for, while many others were not properly allotted acreage for the future.

The farmers should have been permited a chance to prove his cotton acreage history for the past 3 years. I refer only to those who have suffered gross inequities.

Mr. President, this joint resolution would give less than 800,000 additional acres to the Nation and these extra acres will go where they are justified and badly needed. It has been predicted by the Department of Agriculture that the total amount of cotton planted in the United States in 1950 including the extra acreage provided by this bill will fall short of the 21,000,000-acre national allotment.

What I am pointing out is that many farmers have been treated unjustly in the program. The bill being considered today, while adding very little to total national production, will correct many of the gross inequities. Every cotton grower who deserves it will be able to plant enough cotton for his tenants and his own family, too.

I call attention to the fact that it will assist the many very small farmers. A few moments ago I said it might be a matter of 5 or 6 acres. Some of them have been cut less than that. It will be said, "How can that be done when the joint resolution states that a farmer shall have 5 acres?" The answer is easy. Where the farmer-owner has tenant farmers under him, and in some instances can ration only 2, 3, or 4 acres to the tenant farmer. The joint resolution will assist many people, who now have allotted to them 3, 4, and 5 acres. It will give them probably 1, 2, or 3 acres additional, and will be their salvation during the coming year.

The Agricultural Committee has reported the joint resolution, as amended, by unanimous vote. This amendment was first introduced in the Senate under joint sponsorship of Senators EASTLAND, MCCLELLAN, HILL, STENNIS, and myself, and the substance of it now replaces the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. The American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Cotton Council support the provisions of this bill. Mr. Walter L. Randolph, president of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation, said in his testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee that the provisions of this bill would give sufficient relief to the cotton farmers while the House bill goes too far and does an injustice to the majority of those farmers who would not benefit from the extra acreage proposed in the House bill. It should be clear in your minds that this bill is necessary for the economy of the farmers. We in the Senate Agriculture Committee, by the adoption of the Senate version of the cotton-acreage allotment bill, have cut the extra acreage from 1,400,000 acres to less than 800,000 acres.

Another advantage in this bill is that it can be worked in the years to come. If the joint resolution, as amended by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, is not passed, we shall have the same problem in the future.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will be glad to yield to the able Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am glad the Senator from South Carolina has brought out the fact that the Senate bill is an attempt at a permanent solution to the cotton-acreage problem. As the Senator well knows, the permanence of this proposed legislation, which he has worked on so diligently and faithfully on the Senate Committee on Agriculture, is one of the best aspects of it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am glad also the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out the aid and assistance that this amended bill gives to the small farmer. As he has so pointed out, in many areas of his State there are many farmers who grow less than 5 acres of cotton. Under the bill as passed last fall, small farmers who have one or two tenants on their farms and grow in excess of 5 acres of cotton were so discriminated against that many of their tenants were forced to move and seek employment elsewhere in his State. The Senator has just ably presented this subject, but I wanted to voice my concurrence and point out that the same situation which exists in South Carolina also obtains in my State. I want to take this occasion to express my sincere thanks to the Senator from South Carolina for the earnest and hard way in which he has worked to be helpful to the small farmers of his State and to other States with identical problems. The very able Senator from South Carolina has been particularly helpful in bringing this controversy to a successful and quick conclusion, for the Senator knows that both in his State and throughout the Cotton Belt the farmers will have to start planting their cotton very soon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; it is so close to planting time that I think we ought to stay here in the Senate all night if necessary to get this bill passed and to send it to conference so that it can become law within the next few days.

Mr. EASTLAND. I certainly agree with the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As the very able Senator from Mississippi has pointed out, if the amended joint resolution can be enacted, it will be a great step, not only toward the relief of the cotton growers but toward a better program for next year and years to come. If we find that we want to reduce the acreage, we probably can do it. The easy way to do it is on a percentage basis

The continual debate about cotton acreage will be eliminated to a large extent. The farmers will benefit each year from the provisions of this bill and the cotton-acreage-allotment program will be set forth to the Department of Agriculture, and it will be a problem solved to a very large extent in the years to come.

Hundreds of tenant farmers have been asked to leave by the land owners. These people have no place to go. This bill, which would only in a very small way, if any, impair the cotton support and control program in the years to come, means the absolute existence of many families in the Cotton Belt.

Planting time is just around the corner. It is very important to farm economy that this bill be enacted at the earliest moment.

This is true because the farmer, whether landlord or tenant, must prepare now for the planting of the cotton; he must make arrangements to borrow money with which to finance him during the year. The House joint resolution containing the Lucas amendment is, in my opinion, an emergency piece of legislation, and a good one, and should be passed immediately.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, certain communications, newspaper articles, and resolutions bearing on the subject of displaced persons.

There being no objection, the communications, newspaper articles, and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENESEE MILK PRODUCERS' COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Batavia, N. Y., February 21, 1950

Hon. Senator PATRICK D. MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I read with particular interest in the February 19 issue of the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, your stand on the entry of displaced persons into this country as written by Sigrid Arne of the Associated Press

I agree wholeheartedly with your viewpoint. Out of 10 cases in this vicinity, including our own experience, only one seems to appreciate the opportunity offered by this country.

I could furnish in detail facts referred to in the article such as coming here under

false pretenses, have had little or no farm training and were unwilling to stay on such jobs, kicking about wages, and being told too rosy a story about living conditions in the United States.

It is my contention that American people should have some rights; that displaced persons who come to this country under false pretenses and who will not make good citizens should be deported. I believe that entry of displaced persons should be halted until a law has been made to that effect.

I am glad to know that there is one Senator who is aware of the danger of these dissatisfied displaced persons and is taking a definite stand about it.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES B. BROOKS.

ALTADENA, CALIF., *February 20, 1950.*

Hon. PATRICK MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: A great many of us want to send thanks to you for your able handling of the DP situation. If you could keep all of them out for several years, that would be a great benefit in many ways.

Frankly, while it may be true that we might find some desirable people in the many that might come in, we feel that you are absolutely right, very right, that too many undesirables are coming in. In a recent shipment of over 300 that came in here, practically all of them were listed as gardeners. That was the joke, because they were dancers and writers and actors for the movie center in Hollywood, and most of them had plenty of money, buying properties here and paying cash. The first part was from the papers giving their pictures and their true activities, the latter part from real-estate dealers.

We feel and believe that most of these people have low standards of morality and do not make good citizens. We judge of all that from their statements. And from what little we hear of your hearings, you have already found that out.

Is it possible to obtain a copy of the proceedings of your committee? Would appreciate a copy when the hearings are finished. You are doing a great job. Keep it up.

Sincerely yours,

L. W. SCHERER.

P. S.—Another thing, these DP's are taking jobs away from veterans who are unemployed, and they are taking houses that veterans and others would be glad to have. There is a whole subdivision near Long Beach, Calif., that was started as a rental section shortly after the war, and now the tenants have to move as the houses are being sold at about double their worth. Who gets them? Ha!

PAST DEPARTMENT COMMANDERS' NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
SONS OF UNION VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR,
Easthampton, Mass., February 20, 1950.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just received a copy of your address in the Senate on January 6, 1950, regarding the displaced persons and the problems that have arisen in connection with their being admitted into this country.

I sincerely hope that your several investigations will prove beyond a doubt to your colleagues in the Senate that House bill 4567 should not be enacted by your august body.

We who love America and its many advantages do not want to jeopardize our national and natural way of living by the admittance of those who will be trained to destroy all we hold as truly the American way of life.

May I take this opportunity to thank you for a copy of this address and that your efforts will not go unrewarded.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. EMERY,
National President.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *February 17, 1950.*

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Thought you might be interested in the letter, Report on DP's, in the current issue of the Tablet, Catholic weekly of Brooklyn and Long Island.

Sincerely,

JOHN L SCANLAN.

[From the Tablet, Brooklyn, N. Y., February 18, 1950]

FIGURES ON DP'S

DEAR SIR: From its office at 80 Centre Street, New York, N Y., the New York State Committee on Displaced Persons has issued an information bulletin of some 22 pages. Its contents covers the characteristics of DP's settling in New York State from October 1948 to October 1949. There is full information concerning the marital status, sex, age, country of birth, size of family, schooling, occupations, and assurances of these new immigrants. Undoubtedly many of your readers will be interested in this report which can be had for a penny post card.

I should like to point out what appears to me to be significant omission of characteristics, namely, that of religion. Most of us average citizens will recall the campaign waged against the 1948 DP law, not by persons like myself who favor limiting immigration, but rather by those who say they want to liberalize this law and our general immigration laws. It was said again and again, by leading names of all political parties in our State, by other important persons, and most of the press that the 1948 law discriminated against Catholics and Jews. Perhaps it some day will be realized that the originators of this vicious campaign of falsehood and vilification were none other than the Communists and fellow travelers.

In view of the above, maybe some of our State legislators can tell us why the "religious characteristics" were omitted from the report In view of rising popular sentiment against communism, I think the citizenry of our State would be interested in knowing how many God-fearing people are among our new settlers.

Of the 100,000 DP's who entered our country during the above period, 28,941, or approximately 29 percent, came to this State. Of our total, 7,168 settled up-State and 21,773 settled in New York City. As I stated in my letter which was published in the Tablet of September 11, 1948: "Furthermore, one of the reasons for the disastrous housing situation is the fact that too many refugees and displaced persons already have settled in New York City"

I think it's about time to call a halt.

JOHN L. SCANLAN.

FEBRUARY 21, 1950.

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I would like to enter a protest against DP's being admitted to our country during these unsettled times.

My husband was born and raised in this country and yet it is impossible for him to get a job. He has been unemployed since October 15, 1949. In one instance, I know he could have a job, if it were not for two DP's who are working there. We have been living on unemployment insurance and also on our savings of a few hundred dollars, which was to have been a down payment on a home this spring.

I have a son who just graduated from high school and can't get a job.

I say keep the DP's out and take care of our own people first.

My husband and I were married the year of the depression—we struggled through that period and raised a family—and now, when our goal was in sight, it has been swept away again.

I realize I am not the only one in this situation, but I want to get on my own two feet and stay there. It's up to you gentlemen in the Senate to help Americans first.

Yours truly,

(MRS.) MARIE BANNAN.

WOODSIDE, N. Y.

JAMES DISTILLERY, INC.,
Baltimore, Md., January 23, 1950.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Copy of the statement, made by you regarding displaced persons, received. I am enclosing copy of a letter which I sent to our Maryland Senators and which is self-explanatory.

I applied for two families of displaced persons the latter part of 1948 to work on my farm, Goldsborough Hall, Kent Island, Md. The tenant houses provided for the families are well furnished and have all modern conveniences. My farm manager did all possible for their welfare and contentment. Consequently, I feel certain that they planned to stay only long enough to become acclimated to our country and then seek employment in the city. The situation is unfortunate, when you consider the expense in preparing for them.

Respectfully,

FELIX V. GOLDSBOROUGH.

JANUARY 23, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR: If I am not mistaken, there is a bill now pending in Congress to increase the number of displaced persons to entry in our country. I want to vigorously protest the passage of this measure unless the method in assigning these families is entirely changed.

The families should be properly culled, so that when one applies for a farmer he will not get a shoemaker, and conversely. What is happening now, people are being sent to farms that know nothing of farm life, and do not want to know about it. Their only thought seems to be to stay long enough to gain sufficient information to know how to make a change. This is not right as far as the displaced persons are concerned, and it certainly is not proper treatment for those of us who are willing to take them in, giving them a home with all comforts and going to the expense of teaching them how to farm, only to learn, later, that they are dissatisfied and preparing to leave.

As an illustration, I have two families of displaced persons—the first family came on February 3, 1949, and are preparing to leave the 1st of this February. The reason, the son and daughter, who are 17 years and 16 years, respectively, desire to come to the city. Their father, who is a good worker, seems to have little or no control over them or his wife, who is equally as guilty in her desire to create discontentment. The second family, who came to me on March 10, 1949, seems to be very much more contented, although the first family is doing everything possible to create discontentment.

In the tenant houses that I had reconditioned for their comfort they have bathrooms, electricity, gas ranges, and even a radio, and are well furnished. So I have gone to considerable expense. Now, in addition to the necessity of having them properly placed, or culled, there should be some plan whereby they would spend at least 2 years with the ones to whom they are assigned, unless it could be shown that they were not getting proper treatment.

This family is leaving me to come to Baltimore in the hope of getting suitable employment. I think all will agree that the labor

situation here, for our own people, is none too good, and they, apparently, will have to be a burden to someone, to say nothing of the fact that if they do get employment, they will be taking the place of others.

I merely bring all of this to your attention because I believe it is a serious situation, and I do not believe that those of us that have been willing to open our doors to these displaced persons should be subjected to such treatment.

Respectfully,

FELIX V. GOLDSBOROUGH.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND, INC.,
Baltimore, Md., January 24, 1950.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: We have received your letter and separate enclosure of displaced-persons statement.

We have brought this matter to the attention of our posts and at this very moment are conducting an intensified campaign tied in with the recent suicide of a veteran in this city.

It is our hope that this tragic circumstance will bring home to our citizens the inequities caused by the displaced-persons program.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

DANIEL H. BURKHARDT,
Department Adjutant.

JAMAICA, N. Y., *January 25, 1950.*

Hon. HERBERT LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am keenly aware of the bill before the Congress that would permit increasing the number of displaced persons to be brought to this country during 1951.

As a New Yorker yourself, you are undoubtedly well aware of the fact that there is an acute housing shortage in the city. There are many thousands of unemployed and several hundred thousand people on the relief rolls here in New York and all of these factors are not improving. On the contrary there has been a marked increase of unemployment benefits, more people going on relief, and the housing situation is becoming more critical.

From a common-sense point of view I cannot see the wisdom of bringing more and more of people who will need a place to live, a job, etc., when we cannot take care of those already here. A great many of these displaced persons have quite large families and this only adds substantial sums when these persons are given relief.

If our distinguished representatives in Washington do not know these facts—the same conditions as exist here in New York exist throughout the country—then I think it is high time they made a down-to-earth survey before passing legislation detrimental to the interests of the people who sent them to our Nation's Capital to serve as our representatives.

I should be pleased to know what you think of my views on this very important subject.

Very truly yours,

(MRS.) HENRIETTA CRAFT.

PASSAIC, N. J., *February 7, 1950.*

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: The Senate Judiciary Committee is doing good work in investigating the workings of the Displaced Persons Commission in giving preference to Communists and admitting them to the United States.

But you should also investigate the workings of the IRO, especially the review board in Geneva, and field offices.

Enclosed is a clipping, which shows rejecting honest people and admitting criminals. I know of these cases, because I am sponsoring the entry of the honest man, Michael Marincak, to the United States. The criminal, General Ferjencik, was admitted under the pretense that no witnesses against were available. The clipping will tell you why.

Regarding Michael Marincak I wrote a letter to the IRO office in Washington dated January 28, addressed to Mr. Stone, revealing how the board of review in Geneva works.

A letter dated January 7, I sent to the IRO office in behalf of Imrich Stolarik, whose entry to United States I am also sponsoring, as I found out that he is an honest man and his family.

It is important for your investigation that you go through the files of the IRO office (1346 Connecticut Avenue) to find out about the IRO in Geneva.

There is the case of ousted Communist high officials of the Benes regime in Czechoslovakia who were kicked out because they tried to be included in the Marshall plan. They all were elected to office with Communist approval, then were kicked out in January 1948 and admitted to the United States. This shows how Czech Communists get in easily because they have some pull at the IRO.

I am glad you took up this investigation and wish you much success.

L. KOZAR.

[From the Falcon of December 21, 1949]

FORGING AHEAD

We received letters of appreciation for our Forging Ahead columns of November 30 and December 7, with the encouragement to keep up the hot stuff.

It makes us feel better when we get recognition for our presentation of facts on current events.

But it is significant that we did not receive any denunciations of our stand against injustice perpetrated by those who are in power. They could easily accuse us of not presenting true facts.

Our friend suggests that we all write to our Congressmen (Senators and Representatives) about the topics presented in the Forging Ahead column pertaining to social improvements and adjustments.

Many individuals among us have a superficial knowledge about our struggles for justice here and abroad. Many of us want to be isolated, to refrain from mixing in troubles of distant countries. They do not realize that our isolation and detachment led us into the second war.

Therefore, everybody who has a deeper knowledge of causation, should spread his knowledge to others.

A letter from a Slovak refugee in Austria discloses that he was excluded from the International Refugee Organization with insufficient explanation for the cause.

Last January he applied again for admission and in October was given a hearing in Linz. To his surprise he was asked about his tobacco factory. He explained that he conducted a little store, and not a factory, where he sold tobacco among other merchandise.

After the hearing he was notified from headquarters in Geneva about his rejection. Some excuse was given in German, something about a signature—whatever that meant. He sent us the original of this rejection and we could not determine the meaning of the excuse, although we know a little German.

He informed us that the witnesses were Germans and Communists.

This is IRO in action—against honest people.

A Communist, General Ferjencik, applied for admission to the IRO and was readily admitted, no pertinent questions asked and was recommended for passage to the United States.

In New York some public-spirited citizens were informed about his past activities, and caused his detention, resulting in a hearing.

The judge wanted testimony of eyewitnesses.

To procure testimony against a Communist general is a hard task, because the eyewitnesses were killed off behind the iron curtain and those who are here would not testify, because the Communists would kill their relatives left behind the iron curtain.

Consequently, the culprit was set free conditionally. If a witness would be willing to testify against him, he would be summoned to another hearing.

This is an example of how easy a Communist may enter the United States when he carefully wipes out all disagreeable testimony.

There is much speculation about the future movements of the Russian anarchists.

The Germans, under Allied control in west Germany, should be armed so they could readily defend their country, if attacked by the Russian anarchists.

The military problem of western Europe is the counteraction against the Soviet Army, which is considered to be stronger than the combined armies of western Europe.

Western Germany, mobilized, would considerably increase the strength of the Allied army and the Russian terrorists would not start war against such big odds.

The French are much afraid of an armed Germany, but they should consider that the Germans would get the necessary ammunitions and armaments from the Allies.

The manufacture of arms and ammunition would be under control of the Allies.

Any weapon is useless without ammunition and if the Germans do not get ammunition for their rifles and cannons, they cannot do any harm.

All this considered, the Germans in west Germany should be armed, so that they may hold the Soviet Army in check and eventually drive them back to their own country—where they belong.

PORTLAND AMERICANIZATION COUNCIL,
Portland, Oreg., January 27, 1950.

The Honorable PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It has come to the attention of this council that House Resolution 4567 is now under consideration in the United States Senate and, after careful study of the effects of this resolution, should it become a law of our land, we feel it would cause a great deal of hardship and lowering of the standard of our American way of life. Therefore, we earnestly seek your active support in defeating this resolution.

Our National Government has already appropriated and spent billions of dollars for rehabilitation and relief under the Marshall plan in order that the countries involved, or so covered, could take care of all groups, including displaced persons, and the time has now arrived when our Congress and National Government must recognize the needs of our own people by rejecting the provisions of House Resolution 4567.

We most respectfully request that you carefully analyze the following reasons for opposing House Resolution 4567:

1. We now find over 15,000 World War II veterans are and have been unemployed in the last 6 months in the State of Oregon.

2. The daily press informs us that the unemployment rate among all types of craftsmen has reached the highest peak since 1939, which is a further indication that House Resolution 4567 would be detrimental to the economy in this Nation.

3. The birth rate of the United States during the past 5 years has reached an all-time

high and, in just a matter of 15 years, these new American-born citizens will be in competition with the immigrants and their families, which will further reduce the standard of living within our country.

4. The relief budget of the State of Oregon and various counties has reached such staggering proportions that it was necessary for the Governor of the State of Oregon to request from the State emergency board an additional $11,000,000 to feed and clothe the needy of our State for the balance of this fiscal year.

5. The educational facilities in the State of Oregon are so overtaxed at the present time that school districts are at a loss to find the money necessary to take care of the present needs, let alone any further population expansion by opening our gates further to immigration.

6. According to the best reports, nationally and particularly in the State of Oregon, the lack of housing for families in the low- and medium-wage brackets is such that further admission of displaced persons would endanger the home life of thousands of Oregon families.

7. Pressure groups are now being organized to insist on preferential employment of displaced persons who are coming within our State, to the detriment of Oregon veterans and laboring people in general. It has already come to the attention of this council that certain city, county, and State officials have employed displaced persons in top positions, while our own college and university graduates go begging for jobs.

The executive board of the Portland Americanization Council, at a meeting held January 26, 1950, directed the undersigned to transmit the action of the council to you.

Very truly yours,

PORTLAND AMERICANIZATION COUNCIL,
By GEORGE E SANDY
MRS. D. E. NEWSOM,
GEORGE J. CHURCH.
MABEL SUMMERKAMP.
VIOLA ORTSCHILD.

DULA HOSPITAL,
Lenoir, N. C., February 16, 1950.

SENATOR PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Thank you for sending me reprints on displaced persons

I agree wholeheartedly with you in your attitude against H. R. 4567 and all its implications. I feel very definitely that we can very easily destroy the whole way of life of America if we do not carefully control immigration.

I am reminded especially of the refugee doctors who came to our shores in flight from oppression and danger and who remained here to firmly establish themselves in more desirable medical practice than they could have had elsewhere, instead of returning to the fight against their oppressors. Once they arrived here it was no longer their battle, it was ours, and they took advantage of the patriotic doctors of this Nation who had gone forth to fight against the same oppressors from which these spineless arrogant beggars had fled

Keep up your fight and do not let America be the haven for all those who are unwilling to fight the battle over there and yet who would just as willingly precipitate us into just such a battle here.

Yours very truly,

FRED M. DULA, M. D.

STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., February 3, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR: I enclose herewith copy of an article dealing with the displaced-persons bill (H. R 4567), shortly coming before the Senate, which appears in the February issue of the Steuben News.

Will you be good enough to give the arguments set forth in the article your kind and careful consideration. At the same time I call to your attention once again the testimony given by this society before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the problem of the expellees (displaced persons of German ethnic origin) on August 5.

It is the feeling of the membership of this organization that the benefits accruing to the expellees by virtue of section 12 of the pending bill will be nullified by the provisions of section 13. As the 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 expellees in western Germany may well become in a short time a serious problem to the people of the struggling German Republic, as well as to the American taxpaver via the Marshall plan, it is our considered judgment that a small percentage of farm laborers, skilled artisans, and others among these industrious people should be siphoned off the overflow and admitted to the United States of America under the displaced-persons legislation.

I feel that the arguments against certain phases of section 13 have been set down most carefully, after a thorough study of the entire problem.

May I ask you to judge our suggestions on their merits and to favor any changes and/or amendments during the coming debate on the Senate floor which might provide an equitable solution of the expellee question within the framework of H. R. 4567.

Thanking you for your interest, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THEO. H HOFFMANN,
National Chairman.

[From the Steuben News for February 1950]

THE SENATE DP BILL AND THE EXPELLEES—THE AMENDED HOUSE BILL WILL COME UP FOR DEBATE IN THE SENATE VERY SOON—SPIRIT OF RETRIBUTION STILL RAMPANT—THE OBNOXIOUS SECTION 13—WHAT ANY GOOD CITIZEN CAN AND MUST DO ABOUT IT—PROMPT ACTION IS NEEDED

A displaced-persons bill differing in several points from that which was passed by the House of Representatives on June 2, 1949, H R 4567, introduced by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, in order to "liberalize" the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, has been approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee and will come to the floor of the Senate during the current session of Congress.

Those who follow the workings on Capitol Hill closely will remember that the House-approved bill was "bottled up" in the Senate Judiciary Committee, according to those who wanted rapid action and were unable to get it during the last session of Congress. Quite some pressure was exerted on the Senate, and finally, just before it adjourned last fall and during the absence of Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, the committee chairman, in Europe, the upper House ordered the Judiciary Committee to report out a DP bill by January 25, 1950.

Whatever the true merits of the House bill and of the Senate version, there is no doubt whatsoever that the Senate Judiciary Committee has done a conscientious job in the face of many difficulties.

MANY HEARINGS HELD

During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, there have been many, many hearings before the Senate committee, and, whatever his personal attitude on DP legislation may be, no fair and unbiased person will entertain doubts as to the diligence and impartiality of the Senator from Nevada. The record, which will be in print very soon, speaks for itself—representatives of many groups and organizations, as well as individuals, were heard by the committee, and their testimony is reflected in the Senate bill.

The chairman was trying scrupulously to hear every side of an extremely difficult argument, and more than once had to submit to violent attacks by witnesses and by newspaper writers who seemed to be unable to take questions of basic attitudes on immigration—and of geography—into consideration.

Before comparing both bills in detail, it their testimony is reflected in the Senate bill. like the House bill, will not please everyone.

In fact, it will please very few.

It is the logical product of compromise and the just as logical result is that practically everybody will find fault with it. Some people, after careful study, have even gone so far as to call it a typical case of political log rolling.

TRYING TO PLEASE ALL

With so much testimony on hand and subject to the natural desire to please all those who have taken a special interest in displaced-persons legislation—pro and contra—it is well possible that the Senate Judiciary Committee, in the principal issues of the proposed legislation, may not have satisfied any one.

Certain changes made in one section of the rather long-winded bill, have been weakened or practically nullified in another section which fact caused an observer on the scene to remark pointedly· "The committee giveth and the committee taketh away."

This case of Senatorial log rolling, to a large extent, must be attributed to the fact that the displaced-persons legislation became a political football, last fall, during the election campaign. It stands to reason that the deliberations of the Senate on the bill, during the coming weeks, and the joint committee sessions after passage in the upper House, will be held in the shadow of the extremely important 1950 congressional elections—a fact which will make clear-cut decisions on the true merits of this legislation more than illusory.

THERE WAS NO DISCRIMINATION

It is highly regrettable that even the President of the United States attacked the legislation of 1948 as discriminatory on religious grounds, notwithstanding the well-proven fact that Jewish as well as Catholic displaced persons predominated among those admitted here under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 through November 1949. Only recently (January 10, 1950), a spokesman for the National Catholic Resettlement Council stated categorically that present legislation was not anti-Catholic, as has been charged by President Truman and others who had called the restrictive features of the Displaced Persons Act and anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic.

The official figures of the State Department (up to and including November 1949) are as follows: Jewish, 33,479 (26 percent); Roman Catholic, 53,402 (41 percent); Protestant, 20,279 (16 percent); Greek Orthodox, 19,283 (15 percent); others and unknown, 1,423 (2 percent).

The Senate Judiciary Committee further stated that under the President's directive admitting displaced persons prior to the enactment of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, 12 percent of the visas issued were to persons of non-Catholic and non-Jewish faith, while 88 percent of the visas issued were to persons of Catholic or Jewish faith.

Any fair-minded person will agree with the committee's opinion that these statistics flatly refute the charges which have frequently been made to the effect that the present law discriminates against the persons of Jewish or Catholic faith.

Unfortunately, the bland assurance with which these persons in high places make their ill-founded statements for the sake of political expediency have already done immeasurable harm and will continue to make their weight felt during the coming deliberations in the Senate.

WHERE THE BILLS AGREE

These are the points in which the House bill and the proposed Senate bill generally agree:

Both extend the cut-off date—the date before which refugees must have arrived in the western zones of Germany and Austria, to be considered eligible DP's. Under the old date, December 22, 1945, many persons fleeing political or religious persecution in eastern Europe during 1946 and 1947, were excluded. Under the new date—January 1, 1949—they may be admitted to the United States.

AND WHERE THEY DIFFER

These are the points in which the House bill and the proposed Senate bill differ:

The House bill repeals a provision of the 1948 act which required that 40 percent of admitted DP's come from "areas which have been de facto annexed by a foreign power" (Baltic nations). The Senate version retains this provision.

The House bill kills a provision that 30 percent of admitted DP's be farm workers. The Senate version retains the provision and strengthens it by requiring 2 years of farm experience

The House bill, as originally presented, had changed the International Refugee Organization's (IRO) definition of "displaced persons" by making provisions for the expellees (Volksdeutsche driven from eastern Europe into rump Germany by the decisions of Yalta and Potsdam, endorsed by the late President Roosevelt and by President Truman). It had, however, preserved the authority of the IRO within the framework of the bill.

The Senate bill goes further. It not only stipulates that half of the German and Austrian immigration quotas, until July 1, 1952, "be available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Russia, or Yugoslavia," but it adds, "and areas under the control and domination of any such countries," and it furthermore stipulates that "the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to immediately resume general consular activities in Germany and Austria to the end that the German and Austrian quotas shall be available for immigration visas pursuant to the immigration laws" and that "it shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete investigation of the problems of persons of German ethnic origin who were expelled from the country of their residence into Germany and Austria and are presently residing in those countries." Finally the Senate version proposes a complete divorce from the activities of the IRO.

Taken as a whole, the Senate bill would admit roughly 320,000 DP's as compared to the 339,000 provided for in the House bill. About 125,000 have already been admitted under the 1948 act.

These are the bare facts of the Senate provisions and of the bill passed by the House last June.

CASE OF THE DP'S

We have the fullest measure of compassion for those unfortunate people from the east who became Hitler's slave laborers during the war years. We want them to be treated justly and in accordance with the traditional humaneness of this great Nation. We also feel strongly for those Poles, Greeks, and Czechoslovaks for whom the Senate bill makes special provisions.

However, we feel just as strongly for the ten to twelve million of expellees—those Volksdeutsche who had prospered and cultivated the soil for hundreds of years in eastern and southeastern Europe, and who were driven from their homes, with often less than the bare essentials on their backs, into a devastated Germany by the unilateral action of the victors, as pronounced at Yalta and at Potsdam—in one of the most brutal and most stupid deeds ever committed by fellow human beings.

It is with extreme bitterness that we state the seemingly unalterable fact that human kindness as well as a minimum of self-enlightened self-interest are still subjected to hatred and a burning desire for retribution—5 years after the end of the war. The acrimonious remarks of Representative EMANUEL CELLER, the constant drumfire of powerful pressure groups in Washington, and the mockery of the influential New York Times are united to kill all those provisions which might enable a very small proportion of those millions of unfortunate and depressed expellees—so highly skilled in farm labor, artisanship, forestry, and many related professions—to enter this country under the Senate DP bill.

THE FIGHT IN THE SENATE

During the coming debate these forces have to be counteracted. Section 12 of the pending Senate bill favors the admission of DP's of German ethnic origin under the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, up to and including the deadline set for July 1, 1952. If this section stood by itself and, by the action of both Houses, would be made into law, just an infinitesimal percentage of the ten to twelve million expellees might find a new home in this country and serve their new nation, to the best of their rich abilities.

But, in accordance with the age-old law to please everybody, section 12 of the bill is followed by section 13, which might well make it impossible to admit a single one of these persecuted people into the United States.

KILL SECTION 13

Section 13 states, first of all, that no person who is or has been a member of the Communist Party or (amended) a Marxist, may enter the United States.

I agree fully and completely with the ban on the adherents of the Communist doctrine. But, I want to ask the distinguished Senator who introduced the amendment, "or Marxist," whether he has studied this question carefully. I, personally, have an entirely different outlook on political-economic affairs than that promulgated by those whom I want to call the classical Marxist theorist."

I am, however, reasonably sure that a German Social Democrat steeped in the theories of Marx and Bebel—or a Socialist of any other European nation—could contribute mightily to the cause of unionism and fair play between employer and employee in this country. Section 13, automatically, would exclude him—be he even a valiant fighter against Nazism who had to suffer the horrors of the concentration camps.

This sentence, which may have grown out of the fear complex of certain people, will have to be changed in order to avoid discrimination and to leave the field wide open for any subaltern employee in any American consulate in Europe to interpret the law in accordance with his own whims and prejudices.

The same holds true—and much more so—for that paragraph in section 13 of the Senate bill which provides that any one shall be excluded who has borne arms against the United States or who has been a member of * * * any movement hostile to the United States or the form of government of the United States.

IT MIGHT BE INTERPRETED

This, again, may well be interpreted by a consular underling to halt all and any immigration from Germany and Austria into the United States completely. There is good cause to believe that certain groups in this country are in favor of these paragraphs, as the most effective stop to the influx of immigrants of German ethnic origin under the new law.

In all fairness, I wish to state that "major offenders" and all those who have been found guilty by allied and German courts to be Nazis, should be excluded from entry into the United States.

But a rigid interpretation of the wording would make it impossible for all those who, at the outbreak of World War II, were called for service in the German Army or Navy, etc., or who, being civil-service employees, artisans, workers, etc., were forced to become members of one of the innumerable Nazi labor organizations, to ever enter the portals of the United States—practically the entire population of the German Nation at war.

I am firmly convinced that this is not the purpose of the Senate bill. Most of the Germans "who ran with the mob," but did not participate actively, have been cleared by allied courts and fully restored to citizenship.

They were frail human beings subject to pressure like anyone else and should not be subjected to an undeserved hardship which, if interpreted verbally, would eliminate German immigration entirely. If it had been the purpose to kill German immigration, section 12 in itself would constitute nothing but an empty gesture, with no solid foundation behind it. Or, do the apostles of perpetual hatred enjoy such an influence in the Senate Judiciary Committee that this "joker" was slipped in for a very definite purpose?

It is hard to believe. If, however, such is the case, I have ill forebodings for the future harmony and tolerance among the many groups and nationalities of this country.

I also do not agree with the assertion of the United States High Commisioner in Germany, John J. McCloy, and with the attitude of certain spokesmen in our own State Department that the "expellee" problem is a problem to be solved by the Bonn government, exclusively.

It is a problem to the solution of which the Government of the United States must contribute to a large extent and to the best of its knowledge.

It is a problem primarily of our making; moreover, a problem which this nation will have to tackle under international law and the stipulations of the Hague Conventions which govern the duties of an occupying power.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES RISE

There are close to two million unemployed in the Bonn Republic and there are no signs of an improvement in the labor market. To siphon off at least a small percentage of the highly skilled expellees would undoubtedly help the infant German Republic and—the American taxpayer. Moreover, this, our Nation would benefit from the ingenuity, the industry, and the will to succeed of the German immigrant who has contributed so mightily to the growth of this land and of the United States for the past 275 years.

The debate on the DP bill in the Senate will be bitter and prolonged. Mighty and ruthless adversaries will be at work to eliminate German immigration, altogether.

But the record as laid down by religious, civic, labor, and patriotic organizations in the hearing files of the Committee on the Judiciary of the upper House, will speak for itself.

It is the bounden duty of any one, with expellee relations in Germany or with the desire to see harmony restored to the western family of nations, to write, immediately and without reserve, to his Senators and to urge them to strike out section 13 of the amended bill H. R. 4567 completely or to amend it in such a way that the benefits of section 12 of the bill to the displaced persons of German ethnic origin (expellees) will not be completely nullified by the utterly vicious and obnoxious section 13 of that bill.

The Members of the Senate will listen to the voice of the people. But it is vitally necessary that that voice be heard—promptly and decisively.

J. H. MEYER.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 23, 1950.*

Miss ADAMS,

Executive Secretary, Senator Pat McCarran, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS ADAMS: When I wrote Senator MCCARRAN about the DP bill last summer, I noticed you had signed the reply since the Senator was in Europe. I thought you might like to have this clipping from the Chicago Tribune of this date to put in your files, since it represents the opinion of men who are in the employment field and in a position to know the conditions.

Yours very truly,

BUREN BOUNELL.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 26, 1950]

UNITED STATES ALLOWING DP'S TO SPONSOR OTHER REFUGEES—CITIZENSHIP NOT A TEST, STATE DISCLOSES

Displaced persons who have streamed into the United States from Europe during the last 16 months under the 1948 DP Act are being allowed by Federal authorities to act as sponsors for other refugees seeking admittance to this country, an official of the Illinois Displaced Persons Commission disclosed yesterday.

Such sponsors—homeless and largely destitute themselves until they arrived from Europe—are finding it possible to sign vouchers for new refugees before the sponsors themselves even have applied for first citizenship papers, it was explained.

CITIZENSHIP NOT REQUIRED

"There is nothing in the DP Act which specifies that the sponsor of a displaced person in Europe must be either an American citizen or the holder of first citizenship papers," the Illinois commission official said.

"A resident displaced person can sponsor another refugee if he can guarantee the new refugee will be provided with a job and housing without displacing an American citizen and can also guarantee that the new refugee will not become a public charge," the official explained.

Eight or ten cases, in which displaced persons settled in Illinois have filed sponsorship papers for refugees still in Europe, are pending before the Illinois commission, it was said. More are expected in the future.

ONLY TWO ON COUNTY STAFF

It is the commission's duty, in such cases of individual sponsorship of refugees, to determine whether the sponsor is financially able to stand back of the guaranties he gives for the new refugee. Apparently, however, the commission makes no attempt to investigate such sponsors thoroughly.

"We have a staff of only two persons in Cook County," it was explained. "Therefore we generally have to take the word of the sponsor that he is financially able to sponsor a new displaced person."

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 23, 1950]

CHANCES OF JOB FOR OLDER MEN GROW DIMMER—MANY CLOSED TO THEM IN VARIOUS FIELDS

What to do about the elderly but still capable job hunter is becoming a No. 1 problem of society, employment counselors here agreed yesterday.

They referred to the man who has passed about 46 or 48 years of age and who, for this reason alone, finds many jobs closed to him; the man who may have had many years of experience in responsible positions and is still mentally alert and healthy, although he may be physically incapacitated for certain types of work; the men who may be ineligible for social-security benefits for one reason or another but is too proud to ask for charity.

Agencies here estimated that 1 out of every 20 applicants today are in that category. Robert Bell, an official of one agency, said that the number was increasing rapidly "but we still find the doors of employers locked and sealed in our efforts to help them."

FEW SOLUTIONS SUGGESTED

There are many explanations for the trend, but few solutions suggested.

Bell suggested as a solution that charitable agencies devoted to the aged might be willing to help elderly people find jobs if they knew the need. For each man they helped get a job, there would be one fewer potential inmate of old folks' homes or one fewer habitue of skid row.

Others, typified by Charles Leland, president of a counseling service specializing in executive positions, felt the solution was to convince management that age need not be a draw-back.

"The reluctance of industry to use the ability of these men," said Leland, "is becoming a serious problem. Too often their first—and sometimes their only—question of an applicant is 'How old are you?' Many of them tell us they won't take anyone over 50."

WANT EXPERIENCE IN YOUNG

"A great weakness of top management is that they are looking for a man with 50 years' experience at the age of 35 They like to feel that they can count on a man's usefulness for 30 years or so, even though past experience has shown that the average tenure of a key man is no more than 6 years."

The experience of various agencies shows that it is easier for an elderly laborer to get a job as a laborer than for an elderly teacher or executive with valuable experience to get a job even as a clerk.

Another obstacle is the high pension cost incurred by hiring older men

The increasing number of elderly job hunters was generally attributed to the Nation's increasing life expectancy, which increases the ranks of the aged.

Bell, in addition, placed some of the blame on immigration under the displaced persons law.

"Too much latitude in administering the law," he said, "has permitted DP's to move away from the jobs for which they were admitted and into others for which we already have a surplus of applicants, thus creating another job barrier."

[From the Washington Post of February 23, 1950]

DP DANGER

It has become smart and fashionable for cartoonists to lampoon American citizens who are opposed to the admission of displaced parasites as illiberal and bigoted, and for editors to denounce them as un-American. The fact is that these Americans are putting the interests of the U. S. A. first, whereas the advocates of relaxed immigration laws are putting first the interest of the DP's.

In one recent issue of a metropolitan daily there were: an editorial advocating admission of more DP's, a story of the water shortage in New York (and impending shortages in other regions, including Maryland), and a story of increasing unemployment in this country. These three items are closely related, and all points to the inability of this country in coming centuries to support its population. More recently, Washington papers carried the story of the failure of the DP program in Maryland, because of the unwillingness of the DP's to remain on the farms.

The issue is simple. Our population, with further immigration, is increasing rapidly; our resources are being exhausted rapidly. Water is only one example but perhaps the most important. Our national unity is being further diluted by the admission of racial and religious groups who have no loyalty to the United States. The claim that Communists and undesirables are being screened out is patently absurd. If we cannot keep Communists and spies out of the State and Justice Departments, how can we screen them out of a mob which will swear to anything to gain the haven of the United States? Because Senator MCCARRAN is defending the interests of the United States against the interests of foreigners, he is being abused by the racial and religious pressure groups as if he were a traitor as virulent as Benedict Arnold.

F. S. WILSON.

CHEVY CHASE.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Mississippi wishes to point out very briefly that the cotton section of the joint resolution now pending before the Senate is, after all, a very conservative measure in the number of acres which will be involved in its administration, or the number of acres which will be added to the total number of acres which can be planted. It is estimated that from 600,000 to 700,000 acres will be sufficient to take care of the provisions of the joint resolution. It is not a grab measure. It is not an attempt on our part to get all the extra acres we can. Rather, it is a request for acres which are absolutely necessary in order to eradicate and eliminate, not all but some of the inequities which have arisen with reference to the application of the bill passed in 1949, the cotton acreage control bill, which, as a whole, in my opinion, is a very fine bill. It can be improved from year to year by legislation, as all such matters can be, and the pending measure is one of the steps which I submit are necessary. It arises solely through the application of the 1949 act.

I should further like to point out that fair estimates, made by those in a position to know, are to the effect that even after the joint resolution becomes a law and the acreage is allowed, the total amount of acres planted for the 1950 crop will not equal the 21,000,000 acres allowed by the 1949 law.

In other words, Mr. President, it is fairly clear that there will be perhaps a million, a million and a half, or possibly 2,000,000 acres under the 21,000,000-acre allotment which will not actually be planted. The allotment has been made, but the seed will not be placed in the ground. So, even if we can add in the additional acres referred to, we shall still be within the limits of the 21,000,000 acres established in the 1949 act. There does not seem to be any contest about the facts with reference to that point.

Mr. President, there is one statement which has been made on the floor of the Senate, and that is, that this resolution is mainly to take care of the larger projects. I think it should be pointed out again, and, to borrow a phrase, it should be "underscored," that this resolution is not simply for the purpose of remedying the situation with reference to the large mechanized farms or the larger projects,

as that term is ordinarily understood. It is true that the 1949 law pretty well takes care of the small producer who owns his land. When I say "small producer" I mean the man who plants 5, 10, or 15 acres of cotton. He is a land owner, and the application has worked out fairly and he is taken care of. But the small man who has been injured by these inequitable applications, in some counties, is the tenant farmer. He is a tenant on a farm of 50, 60, 75, 100, or more acres. He does not have control over the land. He does not receive a direct allotment under the terms of the law, whereas his neighbor, who owns the land on which he lives, receives an independent allotment and he has been taken care of.

The actual operation is that the landowner who has 40, 50, 60, 75, 100, or more acres of cotton, who has been hit particularly hard in the reductions, will receive some extra acres, but that acreage will really accrue, in a large number of instances, to the small tenant farmer. He is the man who does not know whether he will be able to remain on the land. He does not know what the situation will be this year. There are no acres available to apply to such farms in some of the counties, and the only way to reach his problem this year is to pass a measure along the lines of this resolution. Therefore, to say this resolution takes care of the larger projects, and stop there, is to leave a misleading impression. A great part of the acreage under this resolution will actually be used in filtering down to the tenant farmers who would otherwise be left high and dry. It varies from county to county. From correspondence and information in the area in which I live and from other areas in the Cotton Belt, I am sure my facts are correct. I am further sure that the application of the resolution will meet the situation as to some of the tenants, not all, because some of them are going to have to move; but, after all, it is a cotton-acreage-reduction program and everyone engaged in cotton growing cannot be taken care of.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi this question: Whether a man be a small or a large cotton grower, and has not been cut as much as 40 percent down to 60 percent over the average years 1946, 1947, and 1948, this resolution would not affect him at all? Is not that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If he had tillable land, he could not plant more than 40 percent of it in cotton. Is not that a fact?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is entirely correct.

This resolution, it is true, without any named number of acres as a limitation, opens up the power to allocate new and additional acreage, without naming any number of additional acres which can be allocated. But there are two very effective safeguards, as the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out. There are two very effective safeguards which will keep any board, be it in Washington, on the State level, or on the local level, from running away with the bridle and bit, so to speak, in connection with the application of new acres. No owner, large, small, in between, or any other, under this resolution, can receive an allotment of acreage which exceeds 60 percent of his average acreage for cotton for the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. I am omitting last year.

Another limitation and safeguard is that in no event can an operator, middle-sized or large, receive more than 40 percent of his tillable acres. That means the total of all crops. So, with those limitations written into the resolution, and with scientific information at hand upon which they are based, we can assure the Congress, I think, that there is no way for it to result in a runaway proposition, with the piling up of acreage just for the sake of trying to make money out of it. Most of the acreage allowed under the resolution would be used in an effort to make a living and to get the necessities of life. A great part of the acreage will apply to the family-unit-size farms and will be for the benefit of the farmer.

There is one further matter, Mr. President, which I wish to mention. I should like to remind the Senate that it is already cotton-planting time, and beyond, in a great portion of the cotton-growing areas. It will take time to consider the resolution in conference. It will take time for the President to make a study of it. It will take time for it to become law, and it will take time for the Department of Agriculture to set it in motion. It must work down to State level and then to the county level. Thousands of persons will be involved in the operation of it. All of these matters take time.

In addition to that, the land has to be prepared for planting. Fertilizer has to be obtained. This measure is long past due. It is a great pity it was not possible to reach the resolution earlier, but there were obstacles in the way.

I want to thank the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for its consideration of the matter. But time is running out. We are burning daylight. I hope Congress will see fit to adopt the resolution immediately, because time is of the essence.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In order to get clearly into the RECORD an interpretation of the resolution, I want to read one sentence and then to explain it briefly:

> Determination of the average acreage planted or regarded as planted on any farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948 shall be made by the county committee after consideration of such evidence as may be submitted by the owner or operator, and shall be subject to review by the State committee.

Is it the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi that that language means they do not have to rely absolutely upon the BAE figures?

Mr. STENNIS. That is my understanding. It is put more or less on the basis of such evidence as may be brought to the committee from any source, and then the State committee has the final say.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is also my impression.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to hear the observation of the distinguished Senator relative to the evidence which should be used for the purpose of establishing a county quota. I have in mind one particular county in Tennessee, Lincoln County, where there has been more complaint about the operation of the act than there has been in any other county.

The BAE figure is considerably below what the committee ascertained to be the actual figure after getting the result of ginnings in the various gins which processed the cotton from that county. It would seem that in fairness to the cotton growers of that county, where they do present definite, substantiated evidence, which is not just guesswork, but where they have gotten actual figures, the county committee and the State committee should consider and take those calculations, rather than the BAE figures, which we all admit are more or less guesswork and are not held out as being absolutely accurate. Does not the Senator agree that that should be done?

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator from Tennessee is correct, except that, of course, it is a wise provision to have this added clause, "and shall be subject to review by the State committee." With that there is plugged up a loophole, so that if any county should become arbitrary, or should run away with the acreage, so to speak, then the State committee, which is keeping an eye on the operation of these matters throughout all counties, could have those matters brought up before the State committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I admit that that is a wise provision.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the procedure set up in the bill is very sound and workable.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator does agree with the Senator from South Carolina and the junior Senator from Tennessee that evidence other than that of the BAE should be taken into consideration, and if it is more accurate, should be adopted rather than the BAE calculations?

Mr. STENNIS. Absolutely. I think that is entirely correct, but I think the BAE evidence is worthy of consideration. In some areas I understand they do splendid work.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield the floor.

RESULTS OF AMERICAN FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN THE ENGLISH ELECTIONS

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, American dollars bought the election yesterday in England. Without the constant rolling of American dollars into the empty tills of the British Socialist Government it would have collapsed long ago from its own wasteful extravagance.

The English election results confirmed what many of us have long suspected: the hand-out state at the expense of somebody else is unbeatable. Our British friends decided not to turn their backs on their American Santa Claus.

Since the British Socialist Government came into power in 1945 it has squandered its way through more than $6,500,000,000 in American gifts. The Honorable Clement Attlee, Sir Stafford Cripps, and their associates have used our dollars to finance experiments in socialism, one after another. American dollars made possible the Socialist subsidies on food, enabling British housewives to buy groceries for as little as one-fourth the price our housewives pay here at home for the same items. American dollars made possible the British program of socialized medicine—replete with free wigs and false teeth for all.

American dollars—Marshall-plan dollars—made possible the Socialist acquisition or nationalization of 10 of Britain's most important industries. To have done this without American aid would have bankrupted the British Government. More than $500,000,000 worth of Marshall-plan counterpart funds have been used to reduce the British national debt, swollen by the purchase, with Government bonds, of nationalized industries.

American dollars made it possible for these nationalized industries to absorb staggering losses, which would otherwise have disrupted the British economy. The Government-owned transport system, for example, is running into the red at the rate of $1,500,000 every week. At least part of the losses of the socialized industries was covered by short-term borrowing. This, of course, also increased the British national debt, which we have taken under our wing, and which we are permitting to be reduced by Marshall-plan counterpart funds.

American dollars have spared the British people from the inevitable hardships which would have otherwise resulted from their Government's attempt to put into practical operation the theories of Karl Marx.

Socialist leaders in Britain have used our dollars to drug a majority of the British people into a state of happy acquiescence in the creeping destruction of their liberties.

In short, as I have said before in the Senate, American dollars have been used as a great political slush fund to keep the Socialists in power. As Winston Churchill recently said:

> Fancy the Socialist Government in England keeping itself alive economically and politically by these large annual dollops of dollars from capitalist America.

And is that Socialist Government grateful for the assistance we have given them? Again I quote Mr. Churchill:

> They—
>
> The Socialists—
>
> seek the dollars, they beg the dollars, they bluster for the dollars, they gobble the dollars, but in the whole of their 8,000-word manifesto they cannot say "thank you" for the dollars.

Mr. President, the Socialists in Britain spared no effort to insure that victory would be theirs. In 1949 the Government enacted a new election law severely limiting the activities of British candidates. Under the new law, a candidate's expenses during the campaign are limited to £450 sterling—about $1,260—plus a small stipend for each voter in his district. It is true that these limitations apply to Conservative and Socialist candidates alike. But why should the Socialists worry about limitations on their candidates' campaign expenses when the American dole was ready at hand? Since July 1, 1949, ECA made available more than $730,000,000 to the British Socialist Government. Mr. President, let us understand that clearly. That money was made available, not to the British people directly, but to the British Socialist Government. During the past 7 weeks, a total of more than $120,000,000 was granted. I repeat, during the past 7 weeks, a total of more than $120,000,000 was granted. Shall we call this a last-minute campaign kitty? Is it any wonder, then, that the tide ran red in England when so many dollars were available for the Socialists to use, and which were used in so many ways to sweeten the otherwise unpalatable doses of their socialistic experiments?

The Socialists did not see fit to express a word of thanks for American aid in their party manifesto. They did not hesitate to bribe and to lull the British electorate with promises of still more sweetness and light in the form of gifts from America. Sir Stafford Cripps, on January 9, 1950, pointedly remarked that he hoped a second round of dollar talks with the administration—that is, the Truman administration—would not be long delayed. Foreign Secretary Bevin, only 4 days before the election, told a political audience in Croydon that his Socialist regime is discussing steps with the United States to get economic assistance when the Marshall plan ends in 1952. Mr. Bevin said at that time:

> We are already discussing with the United States the situation which may arise (when the Marshall plan ends) * * * We are working hard to see whether we can bring about a new payment scheme in exchange.

Apparently the British electors were persuaded that a Socialist government would get the maximum cooperation from the present administration in the United States.

Last year, when Mr. Hoffman appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee in his annual quest for additional funds, he expressed himself as convinced that the Marshall plan was the way to check the advance of socialism in Great Britain. He seemed to think that the Marshall plan would make the British so happy and contented that they would turn back from socialism. Well, the results of the British election should serve to rid Mr. Hoffman of that one delusion, at any rate.

Now, as a matter of course, the Socialist government will carry out its plans to liquidate what remains of the British free-enterprise system. The all-important iron and steel industry will be nationalized on January 1, 1951, pursuant to a law enacted last year. The Socialists have announced that they will also seize the sugar industry, the cement industry, water works, wholesale meat, fruit, and vegetable markets, slaughterhouses, and all suitable mineral deposits. And unless the Congress decides otherwise, this socialization program will be financed by Marshall plan dollars. On Tuesday, last, Mr. Hoffman proposed that Congress authorize the expenditure of about $3,000,000,000 for the third year of the Marshall plan. Of this sum, the British Socialist Government, as usual, would receive the lion's share, or more than $687,000,000.

Mr. President, last year I submitted an amendment to the Marshall plan which would have prevented the allocation of dollars to any Marshall plan country nationalizing additional basic industries. As I saw it, there was a pressing need for such an amendment. A majority of the Senate thought otherwise at that time. But, in my opinion, yesterday's development in Britain has thrown an entirely new light on the situation. I shall again submit this amendment when the Marshall plan authorization bill is brought to the floor of the Senate this session.

The American people are tired of wet-nursing the Socialist regime in Britain. They want to halt the flow of free-enterprise American dollars for British socialism. They oppose any more dollar doles for Socialist doodling and dawdling.

DISPLACED PERSONS LEGISLATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from a bipartisan group of 10 eminent and distinguished Americans, including Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Gen. Lucius Clay, Gen. William J. Donovan, and Mr. Fred Lazarus, on the subject of displaced persons and the displaced-persons legislation now pending before the Senate. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert the text of this telegram, which is very brief, in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 23, 1950.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As Americans we are deeply concerned that our country fulfill our moral obligation and international commitment to find new democratic homelands for the helpless displaced human beings under our care in Europe. Therefore we respectfully petition the Members of the United States Senate to approve the substitute amendments to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 presented by Senators FERGUSON, GRAHAM, and KILGORE. It is our sincere and heartfelt conviction that without these amendments it is impossible for us to create a displaced-persons law that will enable our Nation to admit our share of displaced persons in a just, humane, and fair way.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, James A. Farley, Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, James F. O'Neil, Judge Joseph Proskauer, James L. Kraft, Mark Ethridge, Fred Lazarus, Harry Bullis.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. HOLLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Neely
Benton	Hunt	Robertson
Bricker	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Butler	Kem	Smith, Maine
Cain	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Leahy	Sparkman
Cordon	Lucas	Taft
Darby	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Magnuson	Thye
Ellender	Martin	Tydings
Green	Maybank	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Williams
Hill	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Mississippi objects, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the calling of the roll be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been disclosed, and the Senate cannot give such unanimous consent at this time.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MALONE, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. WITHERS entered the Chamber and answered to their names, when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the majority and minority leaders have put Senators on notice that, if we do not complete action upon the joint resolution during daylight hours today, we are to be held in session tonight. There are about 10 amendments to be voted on. Under the circumstances, since the matter has been pending some time and since most of the Members of the Senate have, I assume, reached their conclusion as to what they are going to do, I hope we may have the cooperation of everyone to the end that we may finish the bill without a night session.

Mr. BREWSTER. I share the Senator's view.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly in opposition to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the so-called Lucas amendment, which appears as section 2 in the printed joint resolution. I think it may be well to recite briefly the history of the so-called Lucas amendment, so that Senators may understand the action of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and what, insofar as is known to me, was the intention of the committee in taking the action it did. Two meetings were held upon this particular measure, before it was reported; or, let us say, the two last meetings held upon it were the meetings at which the measure was discussed. In the first instance the Senator from Illinois, in conjunction with the junior Senator from Florida and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], proposed at the first of the last two meetings the amendment which is now referred to as the Aiken amendment, which, if adopted, would replace the so-called Lucas amendment. For the purpose of the RECORD I read it, as follows:

SEC. 2. No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas hereafter authorized by law or marketing orders under the agricultural marketing agreement of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

At the adjournment of the first of the two meetings which I mentioned, it had been tentatively agreed in committee that the amendment should take that form. The committee requested the staff to draft the amendment in such form as to state clearly the intentions of the committee. The second of the two meetings, which was the last meeting held by the committee, took place the next day following the day I have just mentioned. On that day the exact text of the Aiken amendment, as it was then called, was produced for consideration by the committee. The Senator from Illinois in the meantime had decided he felt it would be advisable to eliminate that part of the proposed amendment which had to do with marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. So the committee voted upon two measures. The first proposal was whether the reference to marketing agreements or marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 should be omitted from the proposed or discussed amendment. Upon the vote on that proposal, the provision relative to marketing orders was omitted. The Senator from Illinois then offered his amendment, which was attached to the bill, and now appears as section 2 of the printed bill. For the RECORD, I read it, as follows:

SEC. 2. No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

In other words, the action as taken by the committee, which finally passed upon the Lucas amendment, omits any reference to marketing orders, and instead attaches the Lucas amendment in the form in which it now appears as section 2 of the printed joint resolution.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is the discussion, which was a lengthy one, was on the method or manner of passing upon this matter in such a way as to assure as quickly as possible affirmative action by the Congress which would do away with the possibility of gross abuse, which had been sustained not only by the potato support-price program but by the agricultural price-support program in general, as a result of excessive production of potatoes. I think all members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who are present will agree that that was the objective of the committee, and a majority of the committee finally decided that that result would best be produced by the adoption of the Lucas amendment, now appearing as section 2 of the printed joint resolution.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate, however, to the fact that when the amendment was adopted, and at all times in the discussion of the committee prior thereto, it was agreed that what we were trying to do was to insist upon action being taken within a minimum possible time, but not to bring about any condition under which summarily and overnight producers who had relied upon the representation of the United States Government made through the Secretary of Agriculture, that a price-support program would be effective as to their crops this year, provided they reduced their acreage in the figures stated by the Secretary of Agriculture would be cut off. There was no thought of depriving of price support producers who had proceeded in complete good faith upon the strength of the representations and offer made by the Secretary of Agriculture in his release of November 1949. So I call particular attention to the fact that, as adopted by the committee, the Lucas amendment states that—

No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes—

And I call the attention of the Senate particularly to the words which follow—

planted after the enactment of this joint resolution.

It is to the words "planted after the enactment of this joint resolution" to which I want to address myself briefly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Can the Senator from Florida tell us what methods the Department of Agriculture plans to use to determine whether a farmer in Virginia, say, has or has not planted his potatoes directly after the enactment of the joint resolution? In other words,

how would the Department plan to enforce the joint resolution if it is passed without the amendment I have offered?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am unable to tell the Senator what would happen, but I may tell the Senator that I know from experience in programs of this kind that it is not a highly burdensome matter to have agents of the Department visit each field. For instance, in the tobacco industry, in which there are many more fields and the plantings are much smaller, we had one year a requirement that leaves of a certain kind be not taken from the stock but be left on the stock, which required a check on the ground of every planting. Many of the plantings, as the Senator knows, are under 1 acre, and there was no difficulty at all in making the check. I think there would be no practical difficulty in the making of the check which the Secretary would be required to make under the joint resolution, and which I think he would make without difficulty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to point out to the Senator from Florida that there is no comparison between the two situations, the situation he has explained and that of the potato farmer. As I see it, there is no way on earth by which, 3 or 4 months from now, the Secretary of Agriculture can determine whether John Jones or Joe Smith planted his potatoes in Virginia, let us say, after the enactment of the joint resolution, or whether he did it this morning. The only possible way it could be done would be to have a sufficient number of agents to go into the States which are planting potatoes overnight, and be there the following morning to see what is being done. It cannot be enforced.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator wants information about the practical matter in connection with the administration of the act, and I would simply say I know it would not be difficult, in the present situation, with PMA and other agricultural agencies which are available and which have a very large number of employees, as the Senator knows, to make a spot check at any time, within a very few hours.

To proceed with the matter, it is certainly completely clear that the amendment as suggested affords a period of time which the committee at least thought would be adequate to enable the Congress to enact legislation which will bring firmer terms into the potato price-support program.

Whether this is in a form which the Senate would approve is still another question. The Senate might wish to follow the suggestion made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], to fix a definite cut-off date in the future. The Senate may prefer to follow some other suggestion. But the point I am making is that it was never for a moment considered that the committee was recommending anything which would result overnight in the enactment of a law which would cut off the support prices and the benefit of them to persons who had planted their potato acreage under the terms of an express proposal made by the Secretary of Agriculture, who was named by Congress as the agent of the Government to represent it in the matter, particularly when that proposal involved, as it did, the reduction of acreage—when a grower had accepted that proposal and had reduced his acreage, planted it, fertilized it, cultivated it, and was actually harvesting it at the time of the passage of the joint resolution. It was never for a moment contemplated that such action would be considered fair practice or moral practice, and it certainly was not within the purview of the committee's action to cut off the price-support program in that particular way.

Mr. President, so far as the potato growers of Florida are concerned, they have very little interest in the price-support program. When the time comes, and I hope it will come soon, when we may have a vote on the complete discontinuance of the potato price-support program under terms that are fair and reasonable, it will be found that the Irish potato industry in Florida has affirmatively taken the position that it does not care to have continued any longer the price-support program. In order that the record may be entirely clear on that point, I shall ask the Senate to indulge me for a moment while I read a letter from the Florida Potato Council, dated February 20, 1950, and addressed to me. I read as follows:

FLORIDA POTATO COUNCIL,
Orlando, Fla., February 20, 1950.

Hon SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: The Florida Potato Council is an affiliate of the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, and its directorate is composed of members representing the producers of more than 80 percent of the white potatoes produced in the State of Florida. On February 12 the board voted unanimously to authorize its chairman to advise the National Potato Council and the Members of the Congress that the council was in favor of the elimination of potatoes from the price-support program.

This action was later considered by the Dade County Potato Growers Association, the North Florida Potato Growers Association, the Lee County Potato Growers Association, and a majority of the potato producers in the Lake Okeechobee area (where more than 90 percent of Florida potatoes are produced), and in each instance the action of the board of directors was approved unanimously

The letter means 90 percent of our production in the four areas mentioned.

Objection to the price-support program is based on a number of factors, including (1) its fundamental unsoundness for perishable commodities; (2) the abuses that have arisen and which could not be avoided; (3) a conviction that the potato industry should solve its own problems rather than lean on Government; and (4) a sincere belief that the adoption of marketing quotas would result in the potato grower losing his independence and in his becoming a vassal of Government, entirely dependent on the whims of a Federal agency which has shown no aptitude for making such programs work.

We trust you will use your good offices as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to help potato growers to free themselves from price supports and the evils that accrue therefrom.

Sincerely yours,

LA MONTE GRAW,
Secretary-Manager.

I have read that letter in detail into the RECORD, Mr. President, because I want to make it clear that at least the growers of one potato industry in the Nation which produced more than 5,000,000 bushels last year are not in accord with the price-support program, which, in their opinion, is not a reasonable program. They have stated their reasons in their communication to me. I glory in the spunk and independence of that particular group of potato growers, and I am happy to report to the Senate of the United States their position on this matter.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator aware that up to February 22 of this year 25,000 bushels of the present Florida crop had been bought by the Government at a price of $1.41 a bushel

Mr. HOLLAND. I was coming to that. If the Senator will let me develop my remarks and then ask me any questions he cares to ask, I should appreciate it, because I want to go into the matter of the amount of help which the Florida potato farmers have had from this program, and since the Senator has three or four times referred to the Florida situation, I want to refer to the Maine situation, because it is clear that the potato growers in Maine have been the chief offenders, bringing the price-support house down about the ears of the potato producers of the Nation.

Mr. BREWSTER Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I had just said that I should prefer to conclude my remarks, after which I should be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Senator from Florida declines to yield at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, while speaking on this point, I should like to place in the RECORD the figures given me yesterday by Mr. Claude S. Morris, of the potato section of the United States Department of Agriculture, giving the facts of the situation in Florida through February 20. I do not have the figures down to February 22, because yesterday afternoon this was the latest compilation available. Up to that date, Mr. President, of the present crop of Florida potatoes the Department of Agriculture, under its price-support program in Florida, had bought 11,221 sacks, which at 1⅔ bushels to the sack, makes 18,702 bushels of potatoes, or a little less than 4 percent of the amount marketed up to that time. In order that the RECORD may show what was done with those potatoes and the affirmative fact that none of them had to be destroyed, here is a break-down of what was done with them:

Nine hundred and fifty sacks were acquired by the school-lunch program.

Eight thousand five hundred and seventy-three sacks were acquired for the feeding of livestock in areas closely adjoining the production area.

One thousand six hundred and ninety-eight sacks went to penal institutions, State and local, close by.

In each instance the sales represent f. o. b. sales, either to the school-lunch

program or to the other recipients, without any added expense for the Department of Agriculture or for the people of the United States, but, to the contrary, with some nominal returns.

The purchase of 11,221 sacks, or 18,722 bushels, represents, as I understand, a little less than 4 percent of that portion of the Florida crop which has been marketed since January 18 when the first purchase of this year's crop was made, or in the period of January 18 to February 20, inclusive. I would not have it appear that those figures represent the full purchases this year, because the marketing is still under way.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know whether the potatoes which have already been purchased in Florida, with the exception of those furnished to the school-lunch program and those diverted to livestock feeding, were potatoes which could not be marketed under the marketing order?

Mr. HOLLAND. That would depend upon what the order required.

Mr. AIKEN. The inference would be that probably the potatoes did not qualify for regular sales under the marketing order.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe a marketing order prevails at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know. I was asking for information.

Mr. HOLLAND. As to whether it would be affected by the terms of any marketing order would depend entirely upon the terms of the order.

Mr. AIKEN. There are, as the Senator from Florida knows, a great many good potatoes which are not put upon the market because of marketing orders but which are classed as No. 1, or No. 2 potatoes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Continuing on this subject, I think it would be informative to the Senate and to the Nation to have appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation covering the years 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948, and the operation during those years of the potato price-support program by States throughout the Nation. This tabulation has been compiled, as I understand, from the files of the PMA, F. and V., the Potato Division, and other branches of the Department of Agriculture, and is dated September 20, 1949. I offer it for the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Potatoes: Surplus removal, 1945–48

State	Quantity purchased (in thousands of bushels)					Percent of crop purchased				
	1945	1946	1947	1948	1945–48 average	1945	1946	1947	1948	1945–48 average
						Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Maine	5,999	35,868	14,310	42,706	24,721	11	46	23	58	34
New York:										
Long Island	1,129	9,306	5,366	9,273	6,268	6	39	27	49	30
Up-State		2,032		7,163	2,299		11		37	12
Pennsylvania	48	730	277	2,215	817		4	2	11	4
Michigan	1,344	2,749	437	2,601	1,783	7	15	4	16	10
Wisconsin	216	598	27	2,053	724	2	5		19	6
Minnesota	2,419	4,052	1,276	4,380	3,032	13	23	9	26	18
North Dakota	2,849	6,575	522	6,975	4,230	12	35	3	34	21
South Dakota	402	757	137	961	564	14	27	7	38	22
Nebraska	507	727	134	615	496	4	6	2	5	4
Montana	7	261	1	682	238		12		28	10
Idaho	61	5,935	4	9,490	3,872		13		22	9
Wyoming	47	507	5	385	236	2	20		16	10
Colorado	701	1,768	536	7,690	2,689	4	9	3	37	13
Utah	1	597	2	930	382		18		32	12
Nevada	13	100		77	48	2	15		26	11
Washington	23	1,614		5,761	1,809		15		49	16
Oregon		1,523	5	2,905	1,108		11		25	9
California (late)		557		2,953	878		4		20	6
New Hampshire		205		102	92		16		17	8
Vermont		147	10	312	117		11	1	24	9
Massachusetts	174	805	800	1,855	783	6	22	25	38	23
Rhode Island	16	815	336	508	294	1	18	22	35	19
Connecticut	31	792	600	760	546	1	18	18	23	15
West Virginia										
Ohio		107	3	532	160		1		8	2
Indiana		63		158	55		1		4	1
Illinois										
Iowa	30	180	13	157	95	1	6	1	11	5
New Mexico	4	43			12	1	13			4
New Jersey	2,822	4,985	5,650	8,273	5,435	23	35	43	64	41
Delaware		122	75	33	58		35	22	15	18
Maryland	34	727	540	800	400	4	62	49	30	36
Virginia	16	3,048	1,701	4,000	2,191		41	27	47	29
Kentucky										
Missouri		32	15	162	52		4	5	20	10
Kansas	21	23	32	27	26	4	3	5	4	4
Arizona	10	887		78	244	1	51		4	14
North Carolina		4,228	683	3,323	2,058		55	14	51	30
South Carolina		255	198	200	163		10	11	25	12
Georgia		48	25	7	20		9	6	3	4
Florida		510	77	8	149		9	3		3
Tennessee		225	4		57		31	1		8
Alabama		655	117	130	226		21	6	5	8
Mississippi		200	9	3	76		71	5	3	20
Arkansas		210	3		53		40	1		10
Louisiana		75	8	12	24		6	1	1	2
Oklahoma		93	16	8	29		78	27	9	28
Texas	647	1,122	628	482	720	21	25	19	14	20
California (early)		8,432	199	2,762	2,848		25	1	9	9
Total	19,631	104,780	34,790	133,507	73,177	5	23	10	32	18
Fiscal branch	22,835	107,870	34,193							

Commercial early production only in early and intermediate States

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in order that there may be at least some discussion in the RECORD as to what is contained in this complete compilation, I want to advert, first, to the Florida situation. It is shown that in the year 1945, no potatoes were purchased in Florida under the price-support program by the United States Department of Agriculture. It is shown that in 1946, 9 percent of the crop of that year was purchased, that in 1947, 3 percent of the crop of that year was purchased, and that in 1948, the last year covered by the compilation, less than a single percent of Florida potatoes were purchased under the program. That resulted in a total average of 3 percent, covering the 4 years of production of potatoes in the State of Florida, being purchased under the price-support program during those 4 years of operation.

I should like to have that in the RECORD, because I want it to be crystal clear that the area in Florida which produces Irish potatoes has not been an offender against the planning for the potato industry which was laid down in Congress and which, through the price-support program, has offered assistance to potato

growers, for which the potato growers should have been grateful. I believe that in most cases they have been grateful.

The Senator from Maine has on three occasions made reference to what happened in Florida. For that reason I think it is only fair that the RECORD should show what happened in Maine in these same 4 years under the price-support program. In 1945 a total of 11 percent of the production in Maine was bought by the United States Department of Agriculture. In 1946, 46 percent of the Maine production was bought by the Department of Agriculture. In 1947, 23 percent of the Maine potatoes was so purchased. In 1948, 58 percent, or considerably more than half the production of Irish potatoes in Maine, was bought by the Department of Agriculture.

For the 4 years in question, 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948, the average of the production of Maine potatoes which had to be bought up by the Department of Agriculture in pursuance of the price-support program, was 34 percent of the total production of potatoes in that very fine potato-producing State.

I am told that the figures for 1949, when available, will even increase that figure. I do not state that of my own information, or from this compilation, because I do not have the latest figures on what happened in Maine in 1949. However, I do want it to be very clear that that is the comparative situation between these two States, which have had much cause to be grateful to a Government which has been trying to let them down easy after the war increase, when in the interest of war production the potato growers of the Nation were urged to increase production, and later were given the benefit of the so-called Steagall amendment, and subsequently other legislation, in order to enable them to adjust themselves to postwar conditions.

I shall not read the figures with reference to any other State. They will appear in the RECORD. The whole compilation which I have mentioned has been introduced into the RECORD.

Mr. President, I may say further that the Secretary of Agriculture, on his appearance before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with reference to certain of the late producing areas, including the State of Maine, said that the overproduction in the last year, which was very great—as I recall, about 15,000,000 bushels beyond what was calculated to be produced in Maine in 1949—resulted, at least in large part, from the fact that potato growers had increased the thickness of their planting, by diminishing the width of the rows, and perhaps by stepping up the thickness of the planting in the rows, and likewise, by increasing the fertilization of the potatoes thus planted. So I want it to be very clear that not the potato industry as a whole, but particular parts of it—and the potato industry in Maine is not the only portion which has offended against the program—in large measure are to blame for the troubles which have come upon the industry. I want that statement to be in the RECORD immediately following the showing of the attitude of the Irish potato industry in the State of Florida, which has said in so many words that it is sick and tired of the whole business and would like to see price supports entirely terminated.

I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in the first place, I certainly regret any differences which may exist between the State of Florida and the State of Maine on this subject. Certainly I do not want the RECORD to show that the State of Maine was responsible for raising any such issue. The first mention I heard of it was in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, when the Senator from Florida, in pursuance of his obvious responsibility, raised the question regarding the State of Maine. Naturally, I was somewhat sensitive regarding it. Certainly we are in accord in wanting an amicable solution of this problem. I should like to say—and I think the Senator from Florida will confirm the correctness of the statement—that last year the Nation as a whole reduced its potato production by approximately 10 percent. Is that correct, according to the Senator's figures? Is it correct that the production was reduced from 450,000,000 bushels to 402,000,000 bushels? That was somewhat more than a 10-percent reduction.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it correct that the State of Maine reduced its production by approximately the same percentage, from 72,000,000 bushels to something in the neighborhood of 66,000,000 bushels? In other words, that is approximately a 10-percent reduction in the production of potatoes in the State of Maine.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will let me state the figures, the Maine production was 74,305,000 bushels in 1948, and 67,065,000 bushels in 1949.

Mr. BREWSTER. Which is approximately 7,000,000 bushels less, or approximately a 10-percent reduction. In other words, the State of Maine reduced its production of potatoes by almost exactly the same amount as the national average.

I further point out that weather conditions, of course, affected the situation. Our growing season happened to be favored by good weather conditions. South Dakota had bad weather conditions. So there is a certain latitude to be taken into consideration. I think it is also fair to have in the RECORD—although I realize the Senator from Florida has some mitigating circumstances to point out—that the State of Florida last year had increased its potato production from the preceding year by 40 percent. I realize the explanation which the Senator from Florida has as to that. However, that increase of between one and two million bushels was, of course, a factor in bringing about the present situation.

It seems to me fair also to point out that the overproduction in Florida was approximately 169 percent, again undoubtedly the result of favorable growing weather conditions and the restricted production in the 1948 season.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine. The Senator from Maine himself, some days ago, brought in on the floor of the Senate these figures affecting Florida, and I have not seen fit to make any reply until today, though I told the Senator privately what the explanation was, and he well knows what it is.

As a matter of fact, in the production year 1948, which included the winter of 1947–48, so far as Florida production was concerned, we were just coming out from under the water of the worst flood Florida has ever had, and we had limited production that year, as the Senator well knows, not only in the field of potatoes, but in other fields. Therefore, there does appear the large increase in production of potatoes in Florida between the two years.

However, I call the attention of the Senator from Maine to the fact that, in the first place, that is not the real measure of the compliance with the program of 1949 exhibited by the respective areas. The program of 1949 reduced the acreage of potatoes, and did so in the effort to reduce the production of potatoes. The figures calculated by the Department of Agriculture as to the prospective production from each State better show the goals to which each area was progressing.

In the case of Florida, the goal advanced by the Department of Agriculture, based on the average production in Florida over the years 1938 to 1947, was 4,240,00 bushels, whereas the actual production was 5,428,000 bushels, or, let us say, the actual production was up 1,200,000 bushels.

In the case of Maine, the goal presented was 52,758,000 bushels, whereas the actual production was 67,060,000 bushels, up, therefore, 14,500,000 bushels from the goal which had been presented to Maine, and which was defeated, at least in large part, by reason of the overplanting and the overfertilization to which I have already referred.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator indicate the figures as to the amount of increase in each State in support received?

Mr. HOLLAND. The actual figures indicate that at no time has the State of Florida impinged heavily on the support-price program, or realized heavily from it, or had to sell any large proportion under it. The figures show that for the 4 years the part of the Florida production which had to be supported by purchase by the Government was 3 percent, whereas the same figure for the State of Maine was 34 percent during the same period. As I stated to the Senator a few moments ago, my information is that when the 1949 history is written the figure may go up very heavily, even above the 34 percent.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is a very able and diligent member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am not a member of that committee, but, as a matter of information, if the Senator has available in his tables the figures as to Virginia and Maryland, comparing the 2 years, I should like to

know what the situation was, so that I might move, if we are in error, to help correct the error.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be happy to furnish the Senator the compilation, which appears from a crop-production report as of December 1949 of the United States Department of Agriculture. If the Senator would like to have the figures for Maryland, I shall be glad to give them.

In the case of Maryland the 1948 production was 1,965,000 bushels. The 1949 production was 1,537,000 bushels. The goal toward which Maryland was working was 2,037,000 bushels. In other words, Maryland in 1949 is well under both its production goal and its production for the prior year, 1948. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has answered the question. I did not know what the figures were, but I am highly gratified to know that the potato farmers of Maryland have not contributed to the surplus which is costing so much money, and resulted in so many bushels of potatoes going unused.

I wonder if the Senator would likewise give me the figures as to Virginia, because the potato-growing section in Maryland, the lower Eastern Shore, primarily, and much of the potato-growing area of Virginia, abut. I was wondering whether this cycle which the Senator has defined for Maryland carried over into Virginia for the years mentioned.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator, basing my statement upon the same crop report which I have just mentioned, that a similar performance is shown in the Virginia Irish potato industry for the 2 years in question, 1948 and 1949, as shown in Maryland, and I give the figures as follows: the 1948 production in Virginia was 11,529,000 bushels. In 1949 it was 9,126,000 bushels. The goal which was presented, based upon the several years' average preceding, and on the reduced acreage, was 8,808,000 bushels. So that in the case of Virginia, Virginia produced about 300,000 bushels more than the goal, but more than 2,000,000 bushels less than the production for 1948.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask him if he knows, now that the planting part of the potato season is here, of any other way that we can adequately deal with the matter on an immediate basis so as to serve notice on the industry, other than in some such substantial form as the Senator from Illinois has proposed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say to the Senator that in the committee a majority of the members felt—and the Senator from Florida was one of that majority—that the proposal of the Senator from Illinois would serve notice, and afford an adequate period of time, for correction of the situation by including the provision—and I quote from the Lucas amendment:

> No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution.

There is a considerable time elapsing, of course, between planting and marketing, and it was felt that that period of time was adequate to force the problem to an issue. But I say to the Senator again what I said before he came to the floor, that it was never for a moment contemplated by the committee, nor in the arguments advanced by the Senator from Illinois and others who supported the amendment, to have a fixed cut-off date at the time of the enactment of the new law so as to deprive persons who were then operating under the program of the chance of any benefits from the support for a period of weeks, or perhaps a couple of months, and then bring back the other producers of the Nation, after the corrective legislation was passed, under the terms of the price-support program. Such an idea never entered into the mind of the junior Senator from Florida, and never entered into the discussion of the matter in the committee. I am sure there was not a member of the committee who wanted it on that basis, because, to the contrary, the amendment, as voted, makes it very clear that this leeway, this warning, was given by exempting from the exclusion from price support, potatoes which had actually been planted before the enactment of the law, and including within the purview of the amendment, as proposed, potatoes which were planted after the enactment of the law.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. I take it also that the great potato-producing areas of America are for the most part in the northern part of the United States. In other words, the areas from which potatoes are usually harvested are above rather than below the Potomac on a line running across the country. Is that observation correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. The fact of the matter is that the State of California is one of the great producing areas. It has two areas—an upper and a lower area. I read for instance, just for the RECORD, the figures of production of the early potato area in California in 1949. It was 30,030,000 bushels. In the late potato area, 16,200,000 bushels. Or a total production of potatoes in that State in the year 1949 of 46,000,000 bushels of potatoes as compared with the heaviest production of all, that of the State of Maine, 67,000,000 bushels.

Mr. TYDINGS. However, while there were exceptions to the general observation the Senator from Maryland made, is it not a fact that the upper half of the United States produces more potatoes than the lower half of the United States does, as shown by past history?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that is correct, and it is certainly correct east of the Mississippi.

Mr. TYDINGS. While I should like to see a policy that would not put one part of the country at any disadvantage compared to other parts of the country, I think we are on the horns of this dilemma. We must either look forward confidently to a repetition of what we have been complaining about, on the one hand, or making up our minds to deal instantaneously with it and correct as much of it as we can, upon the other hand. Certainly if we do not do anything to deal with the situation until another year, if we do not give notice to the industry which has not yet started its planting season, it seems to me that we will be open to a charge of bad faith if later on we tried to do it. And, in the second place, if we do not deal with the situation now, or later on, we will have a tremendous possibility of another large potato surplus, which will result in a great cost to the country. Many of the potatoes will rot. Is that wrong or right as shown by the evidence produced before the Senator's committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. The evidence before the committee showed that as to 1949 production too much of it is excess, and will either rot or be used for some inconsequential purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. And for the possibilities of 1950, without the Lucas amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. Without the Lucas amendment, or without some amendment which would bring early correction of the situation into play.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to ask one more question. I will be through in a moment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to ask the Senator the question because I know he is very well informed on the subject.

We receive the impression that the evidence before the committee, which was adduced by the Department of Agriculture and others interested in this program, is to the effect that the early potato is not as much of a contributing factor to the surplus as the potatoes which are grown later. Is that correct or not? Before the Senator answers I may say that we have formed that assumption upon the belief that when early potatoes come in there are not so many of them, and the consumption pretty well keeps up with the supply. But when the whole harvest comes in there is such a great amount of potatoes that that is the time when most of the surplus accumulates, since potatoes are not a commodity which can be stored for a long period of time. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator that in general his observations are correct, as I understand the facts. The facts, as shown by the compilation which I just placed into the RECORD, and which has gone to the reporters, so I do not have it before me, show that for the 4 years immediately prior to 1949 only 3 percent of the total production in Florida had to be bought by the Department of Agriculture under the price-support program. I am sorry I cannot give the figures for Georgia and Alabama, but they were very close to that. My recollection is that it was 4 percent in one of those States and 8 percent in the other.

Mr. TYDINGS. So the conclusion, then, to flow from what the Senator has said is that the production there is almost immediately demandable and consumable, wheras when we get the full harvest later on from the section which produces more than half, that is the time when we are confronted, rather than in the beginning of the season, with the surplus problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. Of course, there are two other factors which enter into the matter. After people have gone through a hard winter, when they have the opportunity to obtain a fresh vegetable, particularly of the uniform excellence of Irish potatoes as produced in Florida, they simply cannot resist the temptation to buy heavily and to eat heartily. Therefore there is a good, firm, demand for a fresh product. But, with all inclination to claim that as the sole reason, I would have to say to the Senator that there is another very compelling factor in this matter, which is that those early potatoes are not susceptible of being stored for long periods of time. They are quite succulent and quite watery, and they are therefore produced by an industry which knows that the potatoes have to be consumed very promptly after they are harvested.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure the Senator from Florida will agree that the greater part of the cash expense in producing potatoes comes from the cost of seed and fertilizer, and that expense is incurred a considerable time before the actual planting of the potato takes place. Undoubtedly at the present time the potato growers of the State of the Senator from Maryland have incurred the major part of their cash expense in producing their potatoes.

Therefore, if the support were limited only to those potatoes which are planted at the time the joint resolution becomes law, which probably could be the early part of next week, they would have incurred the expense, and a few States along the southern tier of States would be guaranteed support, and all the States north of that, even though they had incurred the expense, would not be in a position to receive the support.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield in a moment. I desire to answer the Senator from Vermont. I think the Senator has overlooked the fact that he has included in his proposed amendment exactly the same factor that is in the Lucas amendment; that is:

No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes—

And I accent these words—

planted after the enactment of this joint resolution.

In other words, the Senator in the drafting of his amendment is following exactly the line of thought which prevailed in the committee. We were trying to fix a period of time in which we felt that a better situation could be brought about and enforced.

I may say that I was with the Senator from Vermont in his feeling that we should not limit ourselves to the enactment of new marketing-quota legislation, but we should give both the Secretary of Agriculture and, particularly, the industry—because it had this available before, but did not accept it—the opportunity to come under marketing orders which would be entered, as I understand, only after two-thirds of the producers in the area affected voted to do so.

Therefore, Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont felt that we should have two procedures open, as follows: The one already open under the law; the other, the one to be approached under the law. I was in thorough agreement with that approach; but I called to his attention the fact that the time factor in the Lucas amendment, which will protect those who already had gone so far that they need protection, is identical with that provided in the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to explain——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Florida yields to the Senator from Vermont, if he will permit me to comment on the Senator's observation as it affects my own State, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield, in order to permit the Senator from Maryland to make answer to the observation of the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that the Senator from Maryland is aware of the fact that many potato farmers have bought their seed and have placed their orders for fertilizer, as the Senator has said; and it is regrettable that a few of them may be penalized in some degree by that circumstance. But as I understand the proposition, the only way we can keep the potato program going is to get for it the public support throughout the entire country that it must have if it is to survive.

So we are confronted with the question of whether we shall injure to only a small degree the people in the potato seed and fertilizer field, on the one hand, or whether we are going to allow the situation to fester to such an extent that public demand will be such that the program is likely to be swept away.

The fertilizer the farmer has purchased will not be lost at all. There is no ground for assuming that the fertilizer he has bought cannot be used profitably on his farm. If he would reduce his acreage even one-tenth or one-twentieth, or whatever is required, by planting that much less seed, he would not lose all the seed, as is implied by the Senator's observation; on the contrary, he would lose only a small percentage of the seed.

Therefore, it seems to me that what he would get by trying to meet the difficulties which now confront the Congress and the country, on the one hand, by the adoption of the program now under consideration would so far outweigh in its over-all benefits to him the very small mite that he would lose by helping to conform to the situation and to put the agricultural program in balance, that although the argument which has been made in his behalf is one which should be considered and should receive some weight, I do not believe it is in the sphere of being really determinative, in the final solution, of this problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to reply?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In reply to the Senator from Maryland, I would remind him that the Secretary of Agriculture has already made an agreement with the potato farmers throughout the country and already has set the price for the coming year at 96 cents a bushel, as compared with $1.08 last year. He already has limited the number of acres they can plant, and that will constitute a reduction of 86,000 acres from the acreage allotment last year; and he already has advised the potato farmers that they must market their potatoes in an orderly manner, as approved by the Department of Agriculture, in order to qualify for any support at all. That should result in a reduction of somewhat more than 10 percent in the potatoes marketed—which the Senator from Maryland thinks would be a fair amount.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think all those things are very fine contributing factors to limiting the difficulty in the future. But the fact remains, I should like to point out to the Senator, that I do not know of a small thing—I say that in a relative sense—that has so aroused the housewives and consumers in the towns and cities of the United States as the fact that we are appropriating more money to produce more food than can be consumed, and it is going to waste. People do not like that. Whenever we meet a situation of that kind, we are confronted with an actuality, not a theory. Unless that condition is remedied, there will be growing opposition to the entire agricultural program, much of which can be justified.

I say now to the Senator that no one is attempting to pick out the potato industry and sandbag it over the head and leave it lying prostrate in the road. But we must be fair enough to promulgate the policies which will keep the potato industry on a parity with other agricultural industries, and not at the same time bring down on its head the wide wave of justifiable criticism which has been encountered in view of the practices followed in the past, and perhaps for the year to come.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Florida will permit me to reply, let me say it is not difficult to agree with that statement of the Senator from Maryland. But the position I would take, and I am sure it is the one the Senator from Maryland would take, is that once having made an agreement, the United States Government should not repudiate it with one segment of our people, any more than it would be justified in repudiating an agreement with a foreign nation. An agreement which is made should be kept.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has a point there.

Nevertheless, his other alternative is this: Would the potato farmer prefer to have his tentative and pending agreement abrogated to a small extent now, with the result that he could continue to have this beneficial agreement continued in the future with the support of

the people of America; or would he prefer to stick to a strict, legal conformity, and as a result gather additional ill will of the American people, and face the prospect of having no reasonable agreement in the future?

What we are doing here should be for the benefit of both the potato farmers and the consumers and taxpayers of America. The potato farmer is all three of those; he is both a potato producer, a consumer, and a taxpayer. Unless he, too, like the rest of us, takes the long-range view of the matter, and unless we proceed on that basis, we shall be doing him a real disservice if we insist upon a continuation of a program which is causing widespread disapproval among the people of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I may reply further to the Senator from Maryland, with the permission of the Senator from Florida, let me say that I think the Department of Agriculture, in the light of the last 3 years' experience, is attempting this year to bring the supply of potatoes into line with the demand.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, it is doubtful whether that can ever be done exactly; for if we are to be sure that we shall have sufficient potatoes for human consumption in the United States, it is likely that we shall have to plan upon raising a few more than we need each year in order to guard against unfavorable weather conditions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, my final comment to the Senator from Vermont—if the Senator from Florida will permit—is just this: We must not lose sight of the fact that when our Government makes contracts with potato farmers it represents all the people of America, and it also has an implied contract with all the people of America not to use their hard-gained earnings, which it siphons off in part in the form of taxes, to continue a program which encourages the production of food in such volume that large parts of it, after it is created, simply rot. If that situation develops, then the consumer says to himself or to herself, "Why should I pay taxes to a government that has a program that destroys millions of dollars' worth of good food?"

In short, Mr. President, every Member of Congress has a running and continuing implied contract with them that we will not squander their money, and, in my opinion, that contract is just as binding as the express contract we make with any particular group of our citizens.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to permit a final brief comment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that the Lucas amendment does not propose to repudiate in a small way part of the agreement made with the potato farmers of the country; it simply proposes to repudiate entirely the agreement made with the potato farmers, but not to repudiate the agreements made with other farmers.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, let me say that if we keep on as we have proceeded in the past year, we shall repudiate our implied contract with the taxpayers of the United States not to siphon off their tax dollars and let them go down the drain. I think we must take steps to avoid doing that.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that remark would have been in order at any time during the past 10 or 15 years.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senators for their observations. I shall attempt to conclude my remarks in a few minutes.

It seems to me that what is being proposed by the Lucas amendment—and I am a party to it—is to try to bring this matter to a head within a reasonable period of time, so that by that time corrective legislation can be enacted.

It was never intended to shut off the support program entirely to the portion of the industry which happened to be active now, and then bring the support program back into effect 60 days from now to the portion of the industry which happens to be located farther north in the United States.

Mr. President, I see that the Senator from Georgia and also the Senator from Alabama have just reentered the Chamber. I call the particular attention of those Senators to the fact that their own States are shown by the compilation I have placed in the RECORD not to have been serious offenders against the price-support program, not to have abused it, not to have relied heavily upon it for the purchasing of any large proportion of the Irish potato production of their own States.

I do not have to call to the attention of those Senators the fact that in their States the Irish potatoes are already planted, they are already in the ground, and that if the amendment of the Senator from Delaware should be adopted, and then, following that, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, we would have a situation under which their States and all similarly located, in which plantings have already taken place or in which marketing may even be going on, as is now the case in Florida, would find themselves completely cut out of the program, looking to the day, 60 days from now, or 90 days from now, whenever it may be, when corrective legislation should pass, thereby bringing into the program and back to the farmers in the large producing areas of the Nation, the benefit of a price-support program, which would have been thus completely denied to the Irish potato producers of Georgia and Alabama, in part to the Irish potato producers of Florida, and in part to the producers of Louisiana, southern California, south Texas, and other areas, which have already planted or which may be nearly production.

Mr. President, let me say to Senators that insofar as the direct effect upon the potato industry of the State of Florida is concerned, it will be decidedly less than it will be upon the potato industry in the States that are a little farther north. I stated in the beginning of my argument that the marketing of the Florida crop was begun in January, that it has already come along a good way; that in the very nature of things, before the legislation can pass and become law, it will have come still further along, and while a part of the industry of my State will be affected, I call to the attention of Senators the fact that many States will be affected as to their entire production. As to them the adoption of the Williams' amendment would in effect stay entirely any price-support program until a fairer one can be worked out. It would not cut off a price-support program for all areas in the Nation from this time forth, but instead, would simply work undue hardship upon areas that will be marketing before the remedial legislation can be passed and placed in effect.

I note on the floor the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], who made some comment on this phase of the situation yesterday, and I should like to advance for his consideration this particular aspect of the matter. He spoke yesterday of the fact that no legislator ever surrenders the right to terminate legislation which he thinks is operating in a way which is not to the good and to the benefit and for the general welfare of his country. Of course, no one could argue the point with him, because he is so right in it. But I call to his attention two facts which he may have overlooked. First, the fact that the offer as made last November by the Secretary of Agriculture, the official agent of the United States Government named in the legislation passed by the Congress to represent it in this program, stated there would be a price-support program, and that that program would be available to potato growers of the various States of the Nation who would reduce their acreage by amounts which he named and would comply with other provisions and conditions which he prescribed. When there has been actual reduction of acreage and when there has been compliance with these terms and when the expense of the growing of the crop has already been sustained—in the State of Florida it has been fully sustained, all except the marketing in that part of the crop which has not been marketed and in the States immediately north of Florida, it has been sustained in large part—it seems to me that a strong case is made for the essential morality of the recognition of the situation and of the allowance of a proper period of time, as is allowed by the Lucas amendment, in which remedial legislation can be passed, but without bringing any deprivation to those growers who have thus accepted the offer made by the Government and through its agent, without removing from them the protection of the system which they have earned by complete compliance with the conditions stated to them. The acreage reductions in my own State have not been heavy, but they have been a good deal heavier on the growers who were producing last year than is shown by the figure of over-all reduction of 3 percent, which is applied by the order of the Secretary of Agriculture.

As I happen to know from having been active in the matter some weeks or months ago, when the question was

ironed out, there were a goodly number of new growers, particularly servicemen, who wanted to come into the picture, and their acreage had to be considered and taken into account out of the reduced acreage allowed to the State as a whole. I am unable to say what the reduction was on the growers who produced in last year and in prior years, but it is a good deal more than the 3 percent which is set forth in the order of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The order of the Secretary of Agriculture as affecting Georgia and Alabama, required a reduction of 7 percent, and I believe that the average reduction required all over the Nation was about 7 percent. It seems to the junior Senator from Florida that a strong, moral case is made in behalf of the continued recognition by the Congress and by the Nation of a situation under which citizens have been offered a proposal which they have accepted and acted upon, and have spent their money and time and employed their labor in growing a crop which has been produced in accord with the proposal of the Government. There is, it seems to me, a very strong, moral question as to whether properly action can now be taken which cuts them off, but still looks forward to the time, 60 or 90 days hence, when the program may be reinstated by remedial legislation to all others in the Nation who happen to plant and produce their crops a little later in the year. Mr. President, if there is any morality in that sort of action, I find it difficult to see it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator from Florida any assurance that legislation including marketing orders will be enacted in regard to potatoes? Does he see any possibility of getting marketing-order legislation enacted this year in time to take effect on the present crop before it is planted?

Mr. HOLLAND. Marketing-order legislation is already in effect, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. AIKEN. I mean quota legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Because I felt the quota legislation probably could not be made applicable as early as the other, I am in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. As the Senator will recall, in committee, I voted for the amendment, first.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Only when the marketing order part was eliminated did I support the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. It seems to me that earlier action is possible through the marketing-order procedure than is available under the establishment of quotas. But it seems to me also that if the potato industry finds it wholly to its interest and welfare, as I believe it to be, it will come here almost as one man to insist upon the enactment, and the early enactment of the quota legislation, which will free it from the very just censure of the great public of the United States, who feel that this program, remedial in its effect and designed to help farmers, has been grossly abused by at least certain factions and factors of the Irish-potato industry.

Mr. AIKEN. Then do I correctly understand that the Senator from Florida feels that an improvement can be made by reliance upon marketing orders for the year 1950?

Mr. HOLLAND. By reliance in part upon marketing orders. The Senator from Florida, by no manner of means, wants to cut himself off from the possibility of enactment of quota legislation, because he thinks it is so tremendously needed that the Congress should give it time and attention immediately to its enactment.

Mr. AIKEN. I confess I did not understand the Senator from Florida when I was on the other side of the Chamber. Do I understand that the Senator will approve the amendment which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may enforce the marketing orders for this year?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not marketing quotas.

Mr. AIKEN. No; that is true. We hope the marketing orders will suffice for future years, too.

Mr. HOLLAND. I stated as clearly as I could that I was in support of the approach embodied in the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, which added to the available remedy of marketing orders, which is at once available, a quota system which should be made available under speedy legislation action, and that the quota legislation was, in the judgment of the Senator from Florida, the most powerful, the most effective, the most helpful, and that we should press immediately for its enactment, though at the same time we would hope that real progress would be made under the marketing-order procedure.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the able Senator from Florida. I think we are in agreement both as to the importance of the use of marketing orders, and then the enactment of legislation which will provide for marketing quotas, in the event the Secretary finds it needful to control the production and marketing of the crop in another year.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida with his characteristic fairness and integrity, has referred to the question of the moral principle involved in the prospective legislation. I am sure he has made a very strong case for the growers who have relied, in reducing their acreage, upon the announcement made to them, as I understand, by the Secretary of Agriculture. I should say the Senator's argument is one of especial force, and appeals, of course, to the innate sense of equity and justice in the heart and mind, I trust, of every one of us. I agree with him as to the general rule. As indicated yesterday in the debate, there has been the general rule. According to the statement introduced in evidence here by the Senator from Maine, it has been a general rule, followed by the Department, not to change rules or assurances during a given crop season. It was pointed out in the debate yesterday, however, that there have been various exceptions to the rule. I submit most respectfully, Mr. President, that regardless of the fact that inequities may result to the individual grower, to whom the Senator from Florida has alluded, nevertheless the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make an assurance to the growers is strictly limited by the terms of the law under which he acts, and in the second place, any measure of this type—in fact, so far as I now see it, the most important measure passed by Congress, unless there be some specific limitation of time therein placed—is subject to the power and the duty of Congress, in the event the general public interest demands it, to repeal or amend the legislation, even though some injury may result to individuals because of such action.

To summarize my view in regard to the remarks of the Senator from Florida along this line, I think he presents a very strong case, entitling his argument to the very careful consideration of this body. I can well see that some would think the illustration he has offered to be controlling, and that we should not at this time change the law applicable to the growers. To my mind, we have, however, that duty not only to the individual growers, but to the entire Nation, to all the people of our country.

We have a situation in which wartime legislation has in recent years and recent months proved productive of bad results, productive of perhaps inefficient administration, certainly an administration which has aroused widespread public criticism. It appears to me that the heavy liability which rests upon the Government, which is another way of saying, upon all the people of the Nation, justifies the Members of Congress who shall consider that the duty of preserving the interests of all is superior to the duty of preserving the interests of some particular group. I say that the facts in the case warrant the exercise of discretion by the Members of Congress in determining which attitude they shall take with respect to the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I ask unanimous consent to ask a few questions of the Senator from Vermont in regard to his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I state to the Senator the understanding which I have of the purpose of the Lucas amendment as preliminary to the first question I desire to address to the Senator from Vermont. It is my understanding that the purpose of the Lucas amendment is to terminate, until the enactment of a quota law for potatoes, the liability of the Government arising from its obligations contained in the Agricultural Act of 1949, Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, to support prices of potatoes except as to those potatoes which shall already have been planted when the Lucas amendment, if adopted, shall go into effect.

I ask the Senator, first, whether his understanding of the purpose and effect

of the Lucas amendment is as I have just outlined.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator has stated the purpose correctly.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator from Vermont, also, whether, in his judgment, the liability of the Government to which I have referred can, if the Lucas amendment shall be enacted into law, be revived only by the enactment of a quota law for potatoes?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator whether he considers that the Lucas amendment is subject to the objection that inasmuch as there are now no quotas to potatoes provided for in exitsing law, there may be no price support for potatoes planted after the enactment of the Lucas amendment, because it is uncertain whether there will be a quota law passed for potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree completely with that statement.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator also, whether the Aiken amendment has as its purpose to limit the Government's liability arising from its obligations contained in the Agricultural Act of 1949 to support the price of potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. That would be the effect of the amendment which the Senator from Vermont has offered. It would strengthen the hand of the Secretary of Agriculture by making mandatory the use of that provision of the law which permits the Secretary of Agriculture to require compliance with marketing orders as a qualification for price supports, and the Secretary is authorized by the law to deny price supports to those who do not comply with the marketing practices which he approves.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in understanding that the limitation of Government liability which would be brought about by the enactment of the Aiken amendment would not apply to potatoes planted before the enactment into law of the joint resolution?

Mr. AIKEN. Potatoes planted before the enactment of the joint resolution would be subject to the provisions of the law as it exists at the present time, the curtailment of acreage, the reduction in price support, and the requirement of marketing agreements which have been prescribed by the Secretary for the 1950 crop.

Mr. DONNELL. In order to be sure that I understand the Senator correctly, under the Agricultural Act of 1949, the price of early, intermediate, and late Irish potatoes, respectively, shall be supported through loans, purchases, or other operations at a level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of the parity prices therefor. Am I correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is a correct statement of the law, as I recall it.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator with respect to his own amendment, the Aiken amendment, which is very brief, and which reads as follows:

SEC. 2. No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas hereafter authorized by law, or marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont how his amendment would accomplish the purpose by limiting the Government's liability as to potatoes planted after the enactment into law of this joint resolution, and exactly how the resulting limitation would come about?

Mr. AIKEN. Marketing agreements are already in effect in nearly all the potato-producing areas of the country, and it is understood that such agreements can be put into effect in any remaining potato-producing areas before harvesting gets underway. I should like to add that the Secretary, in his announcement of the 1950 potato support-price program said:

Growers are reminded that the development and use of marketing agreements and orders in all commercial producing areas will be a prerequisite and eligibility for price support.

In other words, he intends to require the marketing of commercial potatoes in accordance with marketing orders which he himself must approve, and he evidently believes that will be effective, or he would not have made any such requirement.

M DONNELL. May I ask the Senator whether the marketing orders to which his amendment refers are those which are provided for in section 5 of Public Law 320 Seventy-fourth Congress, which was approved on August 24, 1935?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not certain as to the section, but, knowing that the Senator from Missouri is always correct, I am sure he is correct in this case.

Mr. DONNELL. I assure the Senator that in many instances I am not correct. I think, however, the orders to which the distinguished Senator has referred are the ones I have mentioned as being in section 5

Mr. AIKEN. I would certainly accept the statement of the Senator from Missouri about that.

Mr DONNELL. That is my best judgment. I have not found any others referred to.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether there is any provision in the law creating the right of making marketing orders by which the acreage of potatoes can be required to be reduced.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. The Secretary can withhold support from growers who fail to keep within their acreage allotments which he has already proclaimed. In fact, they were proclaimed last November. If they do not keep within the acreage allotments prescribed by the Secretary, if they do not market their crop in accordance with marketing orders approved by the Secretary, then they are not eligible for price support.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator whether the provisions of the orders as set forth in the section to which I have called his attention, section 5 of Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, relate only to limitations of quantities to be marketed or transported, to allotments of amounts which handlers may purchase, allotments of amounts which handlers may market or transport to various markets, that would determine or provide the methods for determining the surplus of such commodity and provide for the control and disposition of such surplus and for the establishing or providing for the establishing of preserved foods? I might say that I have very much abbreviated the terms, but I was reading from the language of section 5, and I am referring particularly to subdivisions A to E, both inclusive, of subdivision 6 of section 8–C created by section 5.

Is not that the sole content the orders may cover?

Mr. AIKEN. The matter of acreage allotments would not come under marketing agreements. It is the handling end of the marketing only which would come under those agreements. I am looking for the provision in the official document of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that covers the marketing orders, but acreage control is under another provision, which is covered by the grower's right to refuse support.

Mr. AIKEN. I have found the language in the document, published by the Department of Agriculture, which states:

Regulations for specialty crops, such as tree fruits, tree nuts, and vegetables, govern the quantity, quality, and rate of shipment from the producing area to all markets, but not the price This control, however, tends to strengthen prices of the commodities under regulation.

As the Senator from Maine has stated, and as I have said, the matter of acreage allotment does not come under the marketing-agreement law, but is in the Agricultural Act of 1948, as continued in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the entire contents of subdivision 6, to which I have referred, which contains subdivisions A to E, both inclusive, relating to the contents of the orders under the appellation "Terms—other commodities."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(6) In the case of fruits (including pecans and walnuts but not including apples, and not including fruits, other than olives, for canning) and their products, tobacco and its products, vegetables (not including vegetables, other than asparagus, for canning) and their products, soybeans and their products, and naval stores as included in the Naval Stores Act and standards established thereunder (including refined or partially refined oleoresin), orders issued pursuant to this section shall contain one or more of the following terms and conditions, and (except as provided in subsection (7)) no others:

(A) Limiting, or providing methods for the limitations of, the total quantity of any such commodity or product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, produced during any specified period or periods, which may be marketed in or transported to any or all markets in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or so as directly to burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity or product thereof, during any specified period or periods by all handlers thereof.

(B) Allotting, or providing methods for allotting, the amount of such commodity or product, or any grade, size, or quality thereof, which each handler may purchase from or handle on behalf of any and all producers thereof, during any specified period or periods, under a uniform rule based upon the

amounts produced or sold by such producers in such prior period as the Secretary determines to be representative, or upon the current production or sales of such producers, or both, to the end that the total quantity thereof to be purchased or handled during any specified period or periods shall be apportioned equitably among producers.

(C) Allotting, or providing methods for allotting, the amount of any such commodity or product, or any grade, size, or quality thereof, which each handler may market in or transport to any or all markets in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or so as directly to burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity or product thereof, under a uniform rule based upon the amounts which each such handler has available for current shipment, or upon the amounts shipped by each such handler in such prior period as the Secretary determines to be representative, or both, to the end that the total quantity of such commodity or product, or any grade, size, or quality thereof, to be marketed in or transported to any or all markets in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or so as directly to burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity or product thereof, during any specified period or periods shall be equitably apportioned among all of the handlers thereof.

(D) Determining, or providing methods for determining, the existence and extent of the surplus of any such commodity or product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, and providing for the control and disposition of such surplus, and for equalizing the burden of such surplus elimination or control among the producers and handlers thereof.

(E) Establishing, or providing for the establishment of, reserve pools of any such commodity or product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, and providing for the equitable distribution of the net return derived from the sale thereof among the persons beneficially interested therein.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question. His amendment, as I understand, instead of providing that no price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of the joint resolution, unless marketing quotas shall be in effect with respect to such potatoes, offers the additional alternative that if marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes, the price support shall be made available. Am I correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. However, in order that there may be no misunderstanding or misinterpretation at all, I should like to insert in my amendment the words, "or marketing agreements and," so that my proposed amendment would read as follows:

SEC. 2. No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas hereafter authorized by law, or marketing agreements and marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

I simply add the words "or marketing agreements and." I do not think that adds anything to the joint resolution, because usually there are not marketing orders without marketing agreements, but in order to satisfy anyone who might be in doubt, there is no harm in inserting the words I have suggested, so as to read, "marketing agreements and marketing orders."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator whether or not Public Law No. 320, of 1935, does not only cover orders with marketing agreements, but orders with or without marketing agreements, so there may be orders, may there not, without marketing orders?

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that may be so, but I do not know of any cases where it has been done, or may be done.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, this is my last question in this series of questions. As I understand from the Senator's earlier answer, the purpose of his amendment is to restrict the liability of the Government to maintain price supports as to potatoes and to restrict it as indicated, namely, that no such price support shall be made available unless either marketing quotas shall be hereafter authorized by law, or marketing orders, under the Agricultural Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. I am unable to satisfy myself that the insertion by the Senator from Vermont of the provision granting price supports in the event marketing orders are in effect is going to insure any decrease in the liability of the Government.

The point I have in mind is this, and I shall try to state it as clearly as I can: The existing law, the Agricultural Act of 1949, particularly title 2, states the following:

The Secretary is authorized and directed to make available * * *.

The price of * * * potatoes shall be supported through loans, purchases, or other operations at a level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of the parity price therefor.

I see nothing in the act of 1949, from which I have quoted, which would limit the obligation of the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain that support price to potatoes which pass in commercial operations.

Does not the Senator from Vermont agree that under the 1949 law there is an obligation on the part of the Government to provide a price support for all potatoes, except possibly culls—which I understand are not good potatoes—regardless of whether or not they move in commerce, and, since we have here a marketing-order insertion in the Senator's amendment which applies, as I see it, only to matters relating to the commerce end of potatoes, the disposal of surplus, and the limitation of quantities to be marketed, I am unable to see where there is any restriction at all in the general obligation to provide price supports for all potatoes, because the orders, as I understand, simply refer to potatoes which either pass in these respective methods through commerce, or are to be disposed of as surpluses. In other words, if I may clarify it perhaps a little better than I have, on the one hand, as I see it, in the 1949 act, which is the present law, there is an obligation on the part of the Government to maintain a support price as to all potatoes, and the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, on the other hand, provides that no price support shall be made available for any potatoes unless either quotas or marketing orders come into effect. I see nothing under the marketing-order provision which limits the obligation of the Government under the general provision of the 1949 act. Am I not correct in that statement?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the Senator is quite correct, because in the same law, in the middle of page 4, paragraph (c) reads:

Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices—

It was clearly understood that marketing agreements would come under the heading "Marketing practices"—

(including marketing quotas when authorized by law), prescribed by the Secretary, may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support.

Then, a marketing order, which follows a marketing agreement, is referred to, quoting from a Department bulletin:

Regulations for specialty crops, such as tree fruits, tree nuts, and vegetables, govern the quantity, quality, and rate of shipment from the producing areas to all markets, but not the price. This control, however, tends to strengthen prices of the commodities under regulation.

Mr. President, as I interpret that statement, potatoes which do not comply with the regulations or the marketing orders would not be supported. I am fully aware of the fact that there has been passed around today a statement that the Secretary says this is meaningless. If it is meaningless, why did the Secretary in his announcement of the potato price-support program on November 16, 1949, state:

Growers are reminded that the development and use of marketing agreements and orders in all commercial producing areas will be a prerequisite to eligibility for price support.

If that provision is meaningless, why is the Secretary using it for the 1950 crop? I wish to qualify my earlier statement. I do not know that the Secretary has made any such statement. It is simply a rumor which has been communicated to me recently.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois, with the understanding that I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall state exactly what the Secretary of Agriculture has said in regard to marketing agreements:

Marketing agreements have very certain and very definite weaknesses and by no means——

Mr. AIKEN. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. LUCAS. From a memorandum which has been prepared by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. For him, or by him?

Mr. LUCAS. For me, on the very point under discussion.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask when it was prepared?

Mr. LUCAS. I received it this morning, as a result of the very interesting debate which the Senator and I had yesterday about his amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator expect to put the whole memorandum in the RECORD?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall put the whole memorandum in the RECORD, or anything else I have with respect to the potato situation, and which the Senator desires to have included in the RECORD. I now read from the memorandum:

Marketing agreements have certain very definite weaknesses and by no means are a cure-all for the potato-support problem. The first weakness is that the Government still has price-support obligations on all withheld grades of potatoes—except culls—which are produced by eligible growers. Therefore, if there is a surplus, marketing agreements in themselves do not assist in any way in reducing the amount of that surplus. Although such agreements are beneficial to consumers, they do not directly benefit the Government insofar as reducing its obligations for any given amount of surplus.

That is the important point I have been emphasizing all through my argument. It does not relieve the Government of the United States from its obligations to the cooperators. It must support not only the potatoes that go to market but also the ones that are kept at home.

I quote further from the Secretary's memorandum:

Another thing that marketing agreements will not accomplish is any positive control of surplus production. At present, the only effective measure for attempting to control production are the voluntary acreage allotments Reduction of potato production from its recent average of over 400,000,000 bushels down to a reasonable supply figure is the primary problem at present. Marketing agreements can be used to control the merchantable grades and sizes which are moving into commercial channels but cannot be used to reduce the total surplus itself since under existing legislation the Government is responsible for supporting the price on all commercial grades of potatoes whether or not they are sold in commercial channels.

This statement verifies the argument which is being made by the very able Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] with respect to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me so I may ask the Senator from Illinois a question?

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Secretary express an opinion as to the desirability of terminating supports on all potatoes not planted at this time?

Mr. LUCAS. That does not have anything to do with the point we are discussing at all.

Mr. AIKEN. It has everything in the world to do with it.

Mr. LUCAS. Not at all.

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly it has.

Mr. LUCAS. We are talking about the effect of the Senator's amendment, and what it means with respect to the present law. I told the Senator yesterday that what I am proposing to do by my amendment, I am doing on my own responsibility. The Senator read into the RECORD, as I recall, that the Secretary said that when he starts with a program he wants to go through with it. That is his opinion. I have a different idea about what ought to be done with potatoes. I am not consulting the Secretary on that particular point at all. But I did ask the Secretary about the marketing agreements. I have now read from the memorandum he wrote for me.

Mr. AIKEN. But does not the Secretary believe that requiring the use of marketing agreements and marketing orders as a qualification for price support will have a beneficial effect in handling the potato situation this year?

Mr. LUCAS. He says it will help the consumers, but it will not relieve the Government of its obligations with respect to payment of the money to the potato producers. That is the point the Senator from Illinois has been trying to stress all through the argument.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the interpretation by the Secretary is very valuable and enlightening at this time, because I take it to mean that he believes that if potato growers are required to keep No. 1 potatoes off the market, are prohibited from marketing them, in other words, that they should be reimbursed to the extent of the support level. Is that the understanding of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Vermont knows there are certain standards prescribed by the Department of Agriculture which the potato grower is compelled to meet in order to get the potatoes into commercial channels. The potatoes which get into commercial channels are supported, and the potatoes which stay in the cellars at home, with the exception of 10 percent which are known as culls, are also supported. The trouble we are having at the present time is that the potatoes that are now in the cellars which cannot find a market are still costing the Government many millions of dollars.

Mr. DONNELL. Under the law, the price support applies to potatoes which are in the cellars as well as to those which are in the market.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I inquire if the Secretary of Agriculture registered any objection to requiring the use of marketing agreements and marketing orders?

Mr. LUCAS. The Secretary of Agriculture does not make any suggestion along that line at all. The only thing the Secretary is saying is that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont is absolutely futile and useless because the Secretary is doing the very thing now under the present law that he would do under the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. The Senator's amendment does not do a single thing toward meeting the problem in which the Senator from Illinois is interested.

Mr. AIKEN. It is true that the Secretary is using that provision of the law, evidently expecting that it will work. I believe it will work. I think it would have worked if it had been applied last year. But I understand that the Department felt that there were extenuating circumstances which made it impracticable last year.

Mr. LUCAS. Regardless of what the Senator from Vermont thinks the Secretary of Agriculture should have done, or what I may think about it, the Secretary is at this very time following the same course as is provided for in the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. The Secretary advises me that the Senator's amendment will in no way whatsoever change the present policies of the Department of Agriculture. The Department is not empowered to take the course proposed by the Senator from Illinois and thereby save the taxpayers some 50 million, 60 million, or 70 million dollars this year on the 1950 crop. Regardless of what the Senator believes his amendment would accomplish, the Secretary of Agriculture is now pursuing the same course that the Senator by his amendment wants him to follow. Therefore the amendment would accomplish absolutely nothing so far as settling the problem is concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I will simply say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will make mandatory the use of this provision in future years unless a law is enacted which provides for marketing quotas on potatoes. With the explanation made by the Senator from Illinois, I would come to the conclusion that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Senator from Vermont are pretty much in agreement as to how the 1950 crop of potatoes should be handled and supported.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true.

Mr. AIKEN. But I should like to strengthen the Secretary's hand by the adoption of my amendment. I am opposed to cutting off the support for all potatoes which are not planted up to this time, cutting it off arbitrarily after the Secretary has made an agreement to support the price, has named the price, and allocated the acres which can be planted in each State. I think I am entirely correct and consistent, and I believe the Secretary in the program he has laid out this year is on the right track, and is profiting from some of the mistakes made last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont if he does not believe that in the event we are going to repeal price supports on certain potatoes, it would be better to repeal price supports across the board?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct, but I do not think we ought to repudiate our agreement with the farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If it is proposed to repeal price supports on potatoes, it

should be done in such a manner that the law could be enforced.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Government of the United States were to go back on its promise to some of the potato growers, it would be just as well for the Government to go back on its word to all the other potato growers.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to submit for the consideration of the Senate that, as I understand, under the Lucas amendment the price support for Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of the joint resolution is cut off. We know that that amendment would stop the obligation of the Government with respect to all Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of the joint resolution. The obligation will have ceased and terminated and under that amendment no further money will have to be paid by the Government.

Now as I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont offers another condition under which price supports shall be made available. He sees, of course, as we all do, that under the present condition of the law there is no requirement or provision for marketing quotas for potatoes. But the Senator from Vermont would permit a price support not only after the enactment of a new law, if one be passed, providing for marketing quotas, but he would permit—and I know he does it with the very best of intentions, and he may be correct, I am not sure of that—he would permit a price support to be made available for any Irish potatoes with respect to which marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect as to any potatoes, regardless of when planted

Mr. AIKEN. Providing they comply with the acreage allotments which the Secretary has prescribed for this year, and marketing practices as prescribed by the Secretary.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say, Mr President, that the proviso which the Senator proposes to place in the joint resolution, of course is to be found elsewhere in the law. I am not contradicting the Senator's statement. He may be quite correct. But as to the amendment, which seeks to attain the same objective in substance as does the amendment of the Senator from Illinois——

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. DONNELL. With respect to the determination of the restriction of the liability of the Government, as I see it, there is this difference between it and the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois absolutely terminates the Government's liability. The Senator from Vermont provides for a price support with respect to all potatoes concerning which marketing orders, under the act of 1937, are in effect.

Mr. BREWSTER. Marketing agreements.

Mr. DONNELL. The language is "marketing orders."

Mr. AIKEN. Marketing agreements and marketing orders.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator say "marketing orders"?

Mr. AIKEN. It may be superfluous wording, but it does not hurt the amendment any, and it may satisfy some persons who may question the language.

Mr. DONNELL. The subject matter of the agreements would be substantially the same as the subject matter of the orders. The orders would be the same as agreements, would they not?

Mr. AIKEN. The orders are issued to the handlers by the Secretary of Agriculture, based upon an agreement with the handlers, but cannot take effect until the agreement is approved by 50 percent of the handlers and the orders are approved by two-thirds of the producers.

Mr. DONNELL. The point I make in that connection is this: It seems to me that under the terms of section 6, which I placed in the RECORD this afternoon, it is possible for every potato to be the subject of a price support, because of the fact that subdivisions (d) and (e) of the series of things that may be included in the marketing orders, cover all potatoes, not merely some of them, but all of them, because they refer, in the case of subdivision (d) to potatoes which are included in the surplus. And they include in the case of subdivision (e) those which may be put into reserve pools which are established.

Mr. AIKEN. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. If I may, I should like to complete the statement of this point, and then I should like to have the views of the Senator from Vermont, because I may be incorrect, as I have said. I wish to pay tribute at this time to the fine ability and knowledge of the Senator from Vermont, exceeding mine by many, many fold, as I see it.

But here is an amendment which says that there can be price support for all potatoes with respect to which marketing orders and/or agreements are in effect.

I assume that the orders merely carry into effect the agreements; and the subject matter of the orders, as prescribed in the statute, may be sufficiently broad to include all potatoes.

Therefore, the minute the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is adopted, price support will be available—the words of the amendment are "shall be made available"—as to all potatoes with respect to which marketing orders are in effect, and the Secretary of Agriculture could put the marketing orders into effect, under subdivisions (d) and (e), relative to surpluses and pools, as to all potatoes.

So it seems to me that, on the one hand, we have the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, which, regardless of any demerits it may have, has the merit of cutting of all liability as to price support for potatoes which are planted after its enactment; and, on the other hand, we have the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, which seeks to reduce the liability, but gives no assurance of any reduction of liability because, for the reasons indicated, the potatoes which must be covered by price support under his amendment may include all potatoes, not merely a small portion of them.

I shall certainly be glad to hear the Senator from Vermont on that point.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall give the Senator from Missouri good reasons why the use of marketing agreements and marketing orders should be required. In the first place, the Secretary of Agriculture would not be utilizing that provision of the law this year unless he felt that some good would come from it.

In the second place, we must remember that sometimes marketing agreements and orders are necessitated because of the disorderly marketing of a commodity. For instance, if a market is overloaded, the price breaks, and drops below the support level.

We must also remember that if marketing agreements are required, a grower who does not abide by it is not entitled to any support at all.

We do not know what that amounts to. The Senator from Maine tells us that in the State of Maine last year approximately 2 percent of the potato producers did not comply with the potato program. The Secretary of Agriculture would deny them any support at all for their potatoes, or he could have done so last year, had he required the use of marketing agreements. That is where one considerable saving can be made.

If the Secretary of Agriculture does not use the provision of the law requiring marketing agreements and orders to be in effect, he would have to support the price of No. 1 and No. 2 potatoes for all growers. But if he does require it, then he has to support the market price only for the potatoes of growers who comply with the marketing order.

I do not know what it will amount to. I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture knows what it will amount to. I do not think anyone knows. But evidently the Secretary of Agriculture thinks it will amount to something, and I think it will amount to something; and I should like to have that provision in the law, so that it will have to be used in future years, following 1950, unless a marketing quota law is enacted at this session of Congress.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator a further question: Does he not agree with me that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois does absolutely terminate the obligation for price support as to all potatoes planted after the enactment of the joint resolution? There can be no doubt of that, can there—namely, that under the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, the liability of the Government for price support as to potatoes planted after the enactment of the joint resolution is terminated. That is true under the Lucas amendment, is it not?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; under the Lucas amendment, that is entirely true.

Mr. DONNELL. But under the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, there is no absolute termination; there is a termination only as to such potatoes as are not embraced within the marketing orders or marketing agreements. Is not that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. And we cannot tell what potatoes will or will not be embraced within the marketing orders or agreements. Is not that true?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have had handed to me an example of what we have been discussing with regard to marketing agreements and orders. In the Red River Valley there is a marketing agreement and a marketing order for the potato growers, and the order which is in effect prohibits the shipment of culls and No. 2 potatoes. The eligible grower can sell his No. 1 potatoes and his No. 2 potatoes, I understand, under price support; but the ineligible producer, the one who fails to go along, must keep his No. 2's at home, with no payment whatsoever.

The Senator from Missouri understands that, under the marketing agreement, if two-thirds of the producers agree to the marketing order, it automatically becomes binding on the rest of the growers in that area. If they refuse to comply with that order, they are denied support for the No. 2's and the culls.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, with this final remark I shall yield the floor: It seems to me that we are confronted with a choice as between two amendments. One is the Lucas amendment, which absolutely terminates the liability of the Government for price support as to the potatoes planted after the enactment of the joint resolution. Let me say in that connection that I am inclined to favor the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, making the provision applicable to all potatoes harvested after the enactment of the joint resolution, in which event the cessation of the liability would be applicable to all potatoes harvested after the date of enactment of the joint resolution, regardless of when they were planted. At any rate, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, either as he has stated it or as the Senator from Delaware would amend it, has the merit of providing for absolute termination of governmental liability for price support on the potatoes to which the amendment refers.

It seems to me, I say most respectfully, that under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont, there is not such a complete cessation of governmental liability for price support as will be accomplished either by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, as it has been submitted, or by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois as it would be amended by the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

I think the matter is one of choice; I think it is for the Senate to determine whether it desires to terminate the liability and to know where the Government stands; or whether it will adopt an amendment under which, as I see it—inasmuch as any marketing order and agreement made in pursuance of the 1937 act would make the potatoes embraced within the order and agreement immediately subject to the obligation that price support shall be made available—we have a highly uncertain effect; we do not know how much, if any, the Government will save by the adoption of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont.

I wish to thank him and the other Senators for the assistance they have given me in responding to my questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware to the committee amendment.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Martin
Benton	Hill	Maybank
Brewster	Hoey	Millikin
Bricker	Holland	Morse
Butler	Humphrey	Mundt
Caln	Hunt	Murray
Capehart	Jenner	Myers
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Connally	Kefauver	Russell
Cordon	Kem	Saltonstall
Darby	Kerr	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, N J.
Eastland	Langer	Sparkman
Ecton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Lodge	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Taylor
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McCarran	Thye
George	McClellan	Tydings
Gillette	McFarland	Watkins
Green	McKellar	Wherry
Gurney	McMahon	Wiley
Hayden	Magnuson	Williams
Hendrickson	Malone	Withers

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michiga [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	Hendrickson	Mundt
Benton	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Humphrey	O'Conor
Bricker	Jenner	Saltonstall
Butler	Kem	Schoeppel
Caln	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Langer	Taft
Darby	Lehman	Taylor
Donnell	Lodge	Thye
Dworshak	Lucas	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Frear	Malone	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Williams
Gurney	Morse	

NAYS—31

Chapman	Holland	Maybank
Chavez	Hunt	Millikin
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Ellender	Kefauver	Russell
Fulbright	Kerr	Sparkman
George	Long	Stennis
Green	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McClellan	Withers
Hill	McFarland	
Hoey	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson	Graham	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Ives	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Douglas	Leahy	Tobey
Downey	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Flanders	Neely	Young

So Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. While the Williams amendment was pending, I sent to the desk an amendment to the same line in the same portion of the resolution, with the request that it be called up as soon as the vote was taken on the Williams amendment. I ask whether my amendment can now be considered, or would the Williams amendment eliminate consideration of my amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment which has just been adopted apparently does not affect the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia. The Senator's amendment was sent up to lie on the table and to be called

up at his pleasure. The Chair has now recognized the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia was under the impression that he had asked the Chair to have his amendment considered as soon as the Williams amendment was voted on, and the Chair ruled the other amendment had to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Only one amendment can be considered at a time. When an amendment is disposed of, any Senator who wants to offer another amendment, regardless of whether it has been sent to the desk to be printed and to lie on the table, is supposed to receive recognition to offer his amendment. The mere fact that the amendment had been sent up previously has no parliamentary effect. The Chair did not know the Senator from Virginia was seeking recognition.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia would like to propound another parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There has been printed an amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] relating to the cotton quota. As I understand, he is now asking to leave the potato section and to take up an amendment relating to cotton. I make the point of order that the Lucas amendment, as amended, is now the pending question, and that we cannot leave it to consider an amendment relating to cotton.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no division as between the Lucas amendment and the committee amendment. It is all a part of the same amendment. Therefore the Chair is impelled to overrule the point of order.

The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and without reducing any farm-acreage allotment determined pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, in the case of any State with an allotment for 1950 amounting to less than 3,000 acres, the allotment for such State shall be increased by an additional acreage of 2,000 acres to be used for establishing allotments for new farms in 1950. The additional acreage required to be allotted under this paragraph shall be in addition to the county, State, and National acreage allotments and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand my amendment is satisfactory to the Senators in charge of the joint resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday, during the debate, it developed that Nevada had an allotment of only 110 acres, and I suggested to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who had an amendment, that, speaking for myself, I would be willing to take the matter to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to call up my amendment——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the Senator from Virginia should be recognized.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to call up my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "the enactment of this joint resolution" and in lieu thereof to insert the words and figures "March 15, 1950."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the effect of my amendment is this: The potato amendment provides that there shall be no price supports for potatoes planted after this resolution shall become law. That might be March 6, March 8, March 10, or some other indefinite date. An amendment has been adopted which strikes out "planted" and inserts "harvested." So my amendment, if adopted, would strike out both the provision of the Lucas amendment and the language of the Williams amendment and provide support prices for potatoes planted prior to March 15 and not after that date. The purpose is to equalize the treatment of all who produce early potatoes. The Florida potatoes start to market in January. The marketing will be practically concluded by the 1st of April. In North Carolina some potatoes have been planted. A few have been planted in Tidewater Virginia, but on the Eastern Shore of Virginia none have been planted. By March 15, from the Atlantic Ocean to California potatoes will be planted, and the potatoes which will be harvested are thin-skin potatoes which will not keep. They will be covered by this provision. Otherwise, we will have a situation, even under the Williams amendment, in which potatoes from Florida, which have already been sold, will receive the benefit of the support prices.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I correctly understand the situation, the Senator from Virginia proposes to change the language of the amendment which has just been adopted. I would like to inquire whether that is in order at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not affect the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware, which was agreed to a while ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Senator from Virginia to say it did affect my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not affect it in a parliamentary sense.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. From every other point of view it would be affected, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is a question which the Chair cannot pass on.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may the clerk read the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia as it is written?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will again state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "the enactment of this joint resolution" and in lieu thereof to insert the words and figures "March 15, 1950."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment simply fixes a different date.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to point out to the Senator from Virginia that I think he is somewhat confused, because his amendment will not in any way affect Virginia potatoes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, then the amendment has not been properly drawn, because it was certainly my intention to affect Virginia potatoes. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I point out to the Senator from Virginia that we have changed the word "planted" to "harvested," and since it is impossible to harvest the Virginia potatoes prior to March 15, therefore the Virginia potatoes could not be affected by the amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to amend my amendment. The situation is changed. [Laughter.] I wish to add to my amendment by striking out the word "harvested," and then perhaps it will do some good for Virginia, if we adopt it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would change the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware and agreed to by the Senate. That can only be reached by moving to reconsider the vote by which the Williams amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I respectfully bow to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia withdraw his amendment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do I have to withdraw it, Mr. President, or could the Chair rule it out of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator either has to withdraw it, or there will be a vote on it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment presented by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, it is proposed to strike out lines 11 to 14, inclusive, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 2. No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas hereafter authorized by law, or marketing agreements and marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this amendment is identical with the one that

was printed and was on the desk, except that after the comma, following the word "law," the words "or marketing agreements" were added. Personally I do not think this addition makes any difference whatever in the amendment, but those words are inserted to satisfy anyone who might be in doubt. I am informed that it does not change the meaning of the amendment in any way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator offer this as a substitute for section 2?

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment as I offered it is as I wanted it. I merely modify the one which was printed and was on the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is now offering an amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. I am offering an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is, in effect, a substitute for section 2.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the action taken on the Williams Amendment, by which the word "planted" was changed to "harvested," would the Senator from Vermont consider changing his amendment in line 2 by striking out the word "planted" and substituting "harvested"? I do not suppose it makes much difference.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think it will make much difference, except the Secretary has already advised those areas which are planted that they must come under marketing orders.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest that there might be some question of interpretation. I think that if there is no objection, it would clarify the amendment, if the Senator would make the change.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont modify his amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think it changes the effect of the amendment in any way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is an exceedingly important amendment. If it is agreed to by the Senate, the discussion we have had with respect to potatoes will be meaningless and futile.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield for the present.

Mr. LUCAS. I base the statement I have just made not alone upon my own interpretation of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, the 1949 act, but also upon what the Secretary of Agriculture says this kind of an amendment means. I should like to remind the Senate that, irrespective of what the distinguished Senator from Vermont may say that the amendment means, irrespective of how he may construe the law, regardless of how he would like to have it administered, it so happens that the Secretary of Agriculture, the official who is to administer the potato law, and is doing so at the present time, has given his views of the effect of such an amendment. In view of the colloquy we had here yesterday with respect to this matter, I requested the Secretary of Agriculture to give me his opinion upon marketing agreements, and how this amendment would affect the amendment I have have offered for the purpose of clearing up what seems to me to be a rather scandalous situation. This is what the Secretary said about marketing agreements:

> Marketing agreements have certain very definite weaknesses and by no means are a cure-all for the potato-support problem. The first weakness is just the Government still has price-support obligations on all withheld grades of potatoes (except culls) which are produced by eligible growers. Therefore, if there is a surplus, marketing agreements in themselves do not assist in any way in reducing the amount of that surplus.

In other words, it is not only the potatoes which meet the requirements of the marketing orders so far as grade and size are concerned for commercial marketing, which are supported and purchased, but the potatoes which are now in the cellars of the farmers in Maine, Idaho, Michigan, Illinois, and all other States, unless they are culls, are also under the price-support program.

If this amendment is agreed to, the Secretary of Agriculture, so far as the 1950 crop is concerned—and he says so—will go on doing exactly what he is doing at the present time.

The Secretary says further in his statement:

> Although such agreements are beneficial to consumers, they do not directly benefit the Government insofar as reducing its obligations for any given amount of surplus.

Mr. President, that is the point. This amendment will not in anywise reduce the obligation of the Government insofar as surplus potatoes are concerned, and the surplus potatoes are the potatoes which are on the farms at the present time and cannot be disposed of.

The Secretary further says:

> Another thing that marketing agreements will not accomplish is any positive control of surplus production. At present, the only effective measure for attempting to control production is the voluntary acreage allotments. Reduction of potato production from its recent average of over 400,000,000 bushels down to a reasonable supply figure is the primary problem at present. Marketing agreements can be used to control the merchantable grades and sizes which are moving into commercial channels but cannot be used to reduce the total surplus itself since under existing legislation the Government is responsible for supporting the price on all commercial grades of potatoes whether or not they are sold in commercial channels.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have read in the newspapers of, let us say, 160,000 bushels of potatoes being bought by the Government and then sold back to the farmer for 1 cent a bushel. If I heard the Senator's statement correctly, will there not be a great unfairness created between the man who now has his potatoes on the farm from his crop of last year, which he has not sold to the Government, and the man who has sold his to the Government and gotten his money at the support price?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I presume the Senator could offer a number of examples of cases in which there would be unfairness. As I said on the floor yesterday, we do not pass a law without injuring someone, somewhere. The question here does not concern the 1949 crop. I am attempting to do something about the 1950 crop.

Why it is, after the expenditure of all the money we have paid out in behalf of the potato growers of this country, that those who are primarily interested in potatoes still try to protect the potato growers in their efforts to get the very last dollar they can out of the potatoes, is a little more than I can understand.

As I said yesterday, the potato growers have taken from the Treasury of the United States half a billion dollars in subsidies. This is more than the producers of all the other basic and nonbasic crops put together have received. Surely it is time to call a halt, regardless of some injury here and some injury there.

Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture spent $224,000,000 on the 1948 crop of Irish potatoes. The allotment in 1949 for commercial potatoes was 1,200,000 acres. That would approximately be $187 per acre that the taxpayers of America have given to the potato growers for their surplus potatoes.

In 1949 there were harvested in the United States approximately 87,000,000 acres of corn, 77,000,000 acres of wheat, 27,000,000 acres of cotton, and one and a half million acres of tobacco. If the Federal Government had lost $187 per acre on merely these four major crops not counting the millions of acres of oats, barley, rye, sorghum, and so forth, the farm program in that one year alone would have cost approximately $36,000,000,000, which is in excess of the total gross farm income in 1949 from all sources, which was only $35,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I mention these figures to show what we have been doing for the potato farmer of America. Notwithstanding all the money which has been spent for the potato grower, we find Senators clamoring on the floor of the Senate, "Just give us another year of these subsidies. Do not do anything to us now."

Mr. President, I told my good friend, the Senator from Vermont, and also the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry told the Senate that

hearings would be held on the bill which I introduced, which is similar to the one the distinguished chairman of the committee introduced last year dealing with potato surpluses. When the Senator from Vermont was told that hearings would be held immediately upon that bill so that rigid controls could be applied to potatoes, as they are now applied to tobacco, corn, wheat, and cotton, the Senator from Vermont said he would look with sympathy upon that kind of legislation.

The potato farmers have had a greater bonanza than any other group of farmers in America, Mr. President. Adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont and the potato growers will continue doing exactly what they have been doing for the past 5 years.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "Unholy and Unjustifiable," appearing in the February 18 issue of the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNHOLY AND UNJUSTIFIABLE

No matter how one looks at it, the potato situation obviously adds up to a nonsensical fantasy rivaling anything to be found in Alice's topsy-turvy Wonderland. But though it has its comic side, there is no real fun in it for either the taxpaying American consumer, the Federal officials involved, or intelligent agriculturalists (including their representatives in Congress) who rightly regard it as a scandal that threatens to undermine the basically necessary over-all program for the support of farm prices.

In effect, stated with some oversimplification, the situation is one in which the grower earns a handsome Federal reward for doing precisely what the Government has been urging him not to do. In other words, he has an advance guaranty that if he overproduces potatoes—even when he knows there is no market for an excess—he will profit. There is no risk in it for him; he will still receive a good price for something that there is too much of already. The guaranty, of course, is fixed by law. Under that law, he can count on getting a certain minimum for his spuds. If he cannot get it from the consumer, then Washington will give it to him by buying up his surplus at a high figure (it has averaged $1.85 per 100 pounds) and then selling the whole business back to him for a penny per 100, on condition that he use it for fertilizer or livestock feed.

As far as the American consumer is concerned, this program may well be described as one that has added insult to injury. The injury is this: That he has been forced to pay a potato price so artificially high, and so much out of line with the economic law of supply and demand, that food brokers in many eastern cities (including this one) are now importing tubers from Canada at a cost considerably below that of shipments from Maine. As for the insult—an insult to the intelligence—it consists of the fact that the average citizen, besides being thus penalized in the market place, must fork over taxes to support the system that imposes the penalty. To date, according to Agriculture Secretary Brannan, the Government—which means the taxpaying public—has lost about a half billion dollars trying to make the thing work, but the results just seem to get crazier and crazier.

Indeed, the results have been so bad that Senate Majority Leader SCOTT LUCAS has now been moved to describe the subsidies involved as being nothing less than "unholy and unjustifiable"—at least to the extent that they are granted without adequate controls over production. Under present law, the only control in operation provides for a limitation on acreage, but the growers have circumvented this, and doubled their output per acre, by an intensified use of fertilizers and by planting rows closers together. Accordingly, with the overwhelming backing of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. LUCAS is pressing for action to attach to the House-approved cotton bill a rider to deprive the 1950 crop of all price supports unless strict marketing quotas are in effect. Along with others, he is pressing also for additional checks to deal with the long-range problem of potato surpluses.

Certainly, the situation cries aloud for corrective action. Like our agricultural products in general, the lowly spud may have to have some form of continuing support. But the present system—which serves as an incentive to overproduction—is plainly too cockeyed to be tolerated much longer.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not disposed to argue the merits of marketing agreements or marketing orders with the Senator from Illinois. Nowhere do I find that the Department of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture endorse the proposition of the Senator from Illinois. I do understand that the Secretary states that the Department expects anyway to put into effect the provisions of the amendment which I am proposing now. But what the Senator from Illinois is proposing to do now is precipitantly to do away with the supports for all potatoes in all States where they have not yet been harvested. That means that only those potatoes already harvested in southern Florida and perhaps in southern Texas would be eligible for any support this year. With the adoption of the Williams amendment prohibiting support for any potatoes not yet harvested at the time of the approval of the joint resolution, we will have a situation under which we can either approve the amendment I propose, which will continue support for potatoes under certain restrictions of the Department of Agriculture, or we can accept the proposal made by the Senator from Illinois, and kill all potato support in States both North and South at this time. That is what the bill will accomplish if enacted as it now reads with the Williams amendment in it.

There may be some argument for killing all potato support at this time, even those already planted in South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, and Louisiana. There may be some argument for that, and we may come to doing it some time. But the situation now is that our Government has entered into an agreement with the potato growers of this country to support the price of potatoes at a reduced rate from that of last year, on a reduced acreage from that of last year, and with the requirement that marketing agreements and orders be observed—otherwise, the growers will not be entitled to any support whatsoever.

So the question now is: Shall we kill potato-support prices completely, or will we adopt my amendment?

Mr. President, on my amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in Virginia we raise two types of potatoes; those which are planted early in the spring and harvested in the summer, and those which are planted later and harvested in the fall. I offered an amendment to the Lucas amendment because I thought the Lucas amendment was unfair to those who would not have planted potatoes by the time the joint resolution became law.

In my opinion, the Williams amendment, against which I voted, made it still more unfair, because that, as the distinguished Senator from Vermont has just pointed out, would have taken care of the potato growers of Florida and of a part of Texas, but no other potato growers.

But now, Mr. President, we are faced with the situation of changing the rules in the midst of the game. Growers have either planted potatoes or they have bought the seed potatoes and the fertilizer, to plant them, on the assumption that they would have the same type of price support, which is not a great deal, but 60 percent of parity. Is that what it will be?

Mr. AIKEN. Sixty percent of parity.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Sixty percent of parity. I offered my amendment with the view of covering potato growers clear across the continent who were in that peculiar situation. My amendment would at least take care of them. My amendment was not adopted. I listened quite attentively when the distinguished Senator from Vermont explained his amendment, and he predicted that if its provisions were properly administered—of course, I cannot guarantee that they will be—that there would be no appreciable surplus of potatoes.

Then the distinguished Senator from Illinois read a statement, I believe prepared by the Secretary of Agriculture, saying that if we should adopt the Aiken amendment we would leave everything in status quo, we would have no big surplus and no big loss to the taxpayers.

Mr. President, earlier today, fearing that not a sufficient number of my colleagues would see my viewpoint respecting my amendment, and that we might have to reach the situation by some other approach, I discussed the problem with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I should like to propound a question to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, who I am happy to see is on the floor. What was the testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the potato expert from the Department of Agriculture on a proposal such as we are now about to vote upon? I should like to have the Senator from North Carolina answer that question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from North Carolina may answer the question.

Mr. HOEY. The representatives from the Department of Agriculture stated

that they were now putting into effect the same thing that is recommended and included in the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. They indicated that they thought they would be able to control the situation so that there would not be the sort of surplus which has accrued heretofore, and the same kind of loss previously entailed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand that the representatives of the Department of Agriculture came before the committee and said that without any action on the part of the Congress, they were going to do what the Senator from Vermont says should be done by the amendment he proposes to place in the law, otherwise we will not have any price support at all. Is that correct?

Mr. HOEY. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont makes mandatory what the agricultural commissioner says they are doing already.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then, do I understand that my distinguished colleague from North Carolina believes, from his long and wide knowledge of farm matters, and from serving on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that the Aiken amendment will safeguard the taxpayers as well as do justice to the farmers?

Mr. HOEY. I am supporting the Aiken amendment. I supported it in the committee. I did not think it was fair in the middle of a planting season to repudiate the contract which the Government has made with the potato grower, any more than I would thing that the Government ought to repudiate any other contract it makes with any of its citizens.

I believe in the integrity of the Government, in the maintenance of its contracts, even though it may occasion some loss of money. I believe that by proper administration by the Department of Agriculture a vast amount can be saved. I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would tend to a great deal of confusion. I do not believe that another bill could be passed quickly enough to remedy that situation.

I am extremely anxious that the Government shall save money on the potato program. I believe that as a result of the discussions which have been held on the floor of the Senate, which indicate the sentiments of the Senate, the Department of Agriculture will go forward with this program in an earnest effort to reduce the losses. Furthermore, I believe that disposition can be made of the potatoes in such a manner as not to cause resentment on the part of the public, which has been aroused by reason of failure to use the surplus potatoes for proper purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Aiken amendment. I do not feel that I should add anything to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for himself and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], as modified, to the committee amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Hendrickson	Mundt
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler	Hill	Robertson
Cain	Hoey	Schoeppel
Capehart	Holland	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Hunt	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Darby	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Taylor
Eastland	Lehman	Thye
Ecton	McClellan	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	
Gurney	Morse	

NAYS—35

Benton	Johnson, Tex	McMahon
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Maybank
Connally	Kefauver	Myers
Donnell	Kem	O'Conor
Ellender	Kerr	Russell
Frear	Kilgore	Saltonstall
George	Leahy	Taft
Gillette	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Green	Long	Tobey
Hayden	Lucas	Tydings
Humphrey	McFarland	Williams
Jenner	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson	Graham	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Douglas	Magnuson	Withers
Downey	Neely	Young

So Mr. AIKEN'S amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Aiken amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment was just agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I offer the amendment lettered "D", which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment, it is proposed to add the following new section:

That whenever the supply of Irish potatoes in the United States is, or is practically certain to be, in excess of the goal of production or national production allotment set by the Secretary of Agriculture, pursuant to section 401, Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, the President shall proclaim that fact, and thereafter, until such time as the President may determine and proclaim that such a surplus no longer exists, no Irish potatoes or products thereof shall be imported into the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have had two amendments printed and have requested that they lie on the table.

This one is lettered "D." It leaves out the quotas or the marketing agreements. I shall explain that point later.

The amendment is very simple and to the point. It would prohibit the importation of potatoes when we have or when it appears certain that we shall have a surplus of our own. The logic behind it is that when we have a surplus, we shall concentrate on the disposal of it, and not absorb or dispose of the surpluses of other countries.

The amendment is not the answer to the entire problem of potato surpluses in the United States, of course; but it would remove one very aggravating feature, namely, that of greatly increased surpluses because of the importation of large quantities of the very commodity of which we have too much. At least we can ease the situation to that extent.

Section 22 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which I think incorporates a vicious principle which should never have been enacted into law, and should be repealed, provides—and I quote now from page 3, subsection (f), under section 22:

> No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party.

Mr. President, my amendment, however, in no way runs contrary to that section, which is still the law of the land. The amendment I offer to the committee amendment is not in contravention of any foreign-trade agreement; it does not contravene any of the reciprocal-trade agreements. As a matter of fact, the general agreement made at Geneva, to which Canada, the United States, and some 25 other nations adhere, specifically provides for the very action I am now asking to have taken when surpluses of an agricultural product or a fisheries product occur. The countries foresaw the possible need for the very thing the amendment seeks to accomplish.

Mr. President, the amendment is urgently needed. Certainly it is an unwise policy for us to permit imports of commodities of which we already have surpluses. That cannot be brought home I think any better than by quoting a colloquy between the junior Senator from Nebraska and the junior Senator from New Mexico, on February 16, at the time the distinguished majority leader introduced the so-called quota amendment to the joint resolution which is now pending.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Would it not be wise for the Senator to add to the statement about importing a product into this country of which there is a surplus, the words "a surplus, the price of which the Government has guaranteed"?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it would suit me very well, but, to draw an amendment which does not run counter to the law to which I have referred requires that it be drawn as I have drawn it, and I shall explain it later. I was one who voted with the distinguished Senator from Washington to eliminate section 22.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator's amendment is, of course, similar to the over-all amendment I proposed last year to the agricultural bill, except that it applies directly to potatoes.

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President, the Senator is misled. The amendment is not similar to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to make the observation. If it is not similar, it is all right.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree, however, with the amendment the Senator offered, but the Senator's amendment ran immediately into guaranties made and agreements entered into under the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade. I may point out to the Senate that there is a provision also which permits the amendment I am here offering to be made without interfering in any way whatever with the agreement. It is different from the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington; with which I am in complete agreement, by the way. I would support it again, if the Senator were to reoffer it on the floor. But I am satisfied the amendment represents the practical way of reaching the objective, as I shall show when I get to that point in my argument. It does not interfere with trade agreements.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to make the observation that I have intended to reoffer the proposal. I had thought possibly I might offer it as an amendment to the pending joint resolution, since it involves the same problem, but, upon considering the question further, it seemed to me it would be much more in point to offer it in the manner suggested by the Senator from West Virginia, in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Washington can offer it at that time, and, of course, the same arguments will then be made against it that no doubt were made before. But I want to make clear at this point that my amendment relates only to potatoes. While it is only a small part of the over-all objective of the Senator from Washington, yet it can be adopted without running head-on into the very trouble the Senator encountered when he offered his amendment last year, which I supported.

I should like to refer to the colloquy between the junior Senator from Nebraska and the junior Senator from New Mexico, for the reason that the junior Senator from New Mexico has been the Secretary of Agriculture and has, therefore, had wide experience in the question of meeting the problems of surplus. At the time the distinguished majority leader was making his able address in favor of his own amendment, I asked the majority leader a question, which was, in part, as follows:

> I am also interested in another phase of the question which the distinguished majority leader did not mention in his remarks. I am asking for information. Recently I read in a newspaper the statement that in the city of New Orleans a million pounds of potatoes which were imported from Canada were being sold in that market, and of course they received the benefit of the support price.
>
> At the same time the Government is selling potatoes for 1 cent a hundred pounds in order to get rid of the surplus. I should like to ask this question: Has there been any extension of the agreement which was once made between our State Department and Canada and other nations which import potatoes relative to the quotas which the distinguished majority leader has mentioned? It is my understanding that there have been imported into the domestic market from other countries millions of pounds of potatoes which have had the benefit of the support price, and, if I am correctly informed, the Canadian farmers last year increased their acreage 10 percent while our farmers decreased their acreage 10 percent. Does the Senator have anything in mind along that line relative to restrictive legislation?

The honorable majority leader replied:

> That question was not discussed in the committee. It is of importance, of course. It is my understanding that the potatoes which have gone into the market at New Orleans were shipped by water from Canada.
>
> Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. At the same time they were sold in direct competition with the American producer who was operating under the support price.
>
> Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, no doubt, but it has nothing to do with the problem which is before us. The problem that we are concerned with here would exist whether there were potato imports or not.

At that point the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] rose in the Senate Chamber, addressed the Chair, and requested the majority leader to yield. The majority leader yielded, and the junior Senator from New Mexico said:

> I discussed this matter briefly with the distinguished minority leader a minute ago when he asked me the same question. I could not give him a very satisfactory answer. That particular matter came up at a hearing and was brought to the attention of the committee by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. There was an agreement between Canada and the United States limiting the quantity of potatoes which could be delivered to this country.
>
> I regret to say that I do not recall when the agreement terminated, but it was some time during the year 1949. The Senator from Maine asked who had allowed it to lapse, and, so far as I know, the question was not answered, and I do not know who allowed it to lapse. I do think it is an important question and ultimately should be answered.
>
> Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico a question. Does he know whether the Secretary of Agriculture, or possibly the Secretary of State, has the authority or used the authority to terminate the agreements about which he is talking?
>
> Mr. ANDERSON. I regret to say that I do not know. What I do know is that the Canadian Government has certain rights to export to the United States at a certain lower rate of duty potatoes which would ordinarily carry a higher rate of duty. Theoret-

ically they could export a good many potatoes to this country, but the Department of State, working with the Department of Agriculture, negotiated an agreement with Canada whereby Canada would not export, in either 1948 and 1949, more than a certain number of potatoes. I understand that agreement has been terminated. I do not know whether it was terminated by its own limitations, or whether it was terminated at the request of the Canadian Government, or was terminated at the request of our Government. I merely say to the distinguished minority leader that that was a question the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] raised, and which was not answered. I think it is an important question to be answered, but I do not have the information, and I do not think any member of the Committee on Agriculture was furnished the information.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for the answer he has given me. I hope the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may propound that question, in discussing and considering proposed legislation.

I should like to ask another question of the Senator from New Mexico. Realizing that the distinguished Senator has been Secretary of Agriculture, and has had wide experience, does he feel that the importation of potatoes from other countries has had an impact upon the domestic market, or does he feel that such importation is a minor question at this time?

There has been much talk around the Senate, Mr. President, to the effect that the slight imports coming in make no difference. About the first thing that is asked Mr. Hoffman, when he comes before the Appropriations Committee to testify, is a question about surpluses. The answer is, "Well, they are so small in comparison to our production that they make no difference, anyway." There were editorials in the newspapers saying, "We had a production this year of about 400,000,000 bushels, so what does 10,000,000 or 15,000,000 bushels amount to, as far as a surplus is concerned?" When it is analyzed, it makes a great deal of difference. It was for that reason that I asked the question of the former Secretary of Agriculture, I now want to read his answer relative to what he calls "these small surpluses that affect the market." So far as potatoes are concerned, potatoes are only one item. We have thousands and thousands of other commodities and materials being imported, with like effect and with similar impact upon the economy of the United States of America. Potatoes represent but one commodity; scores of other commodities raise the same question. I read now the answer of the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico:

I think it has a very great impact on the American market. I am not an economist, as the Senator knows, but distinguished economists who have been consulted by the Department of Agriculture have worked out estimates as to what happens when there is a surplus. If there is a surplus of 5 percent—

Mind you, Mr. President, "a surplus of 5 percent." In 1949 the goal of production was 350,000,000 bushels of potatoes. That is the amount the Department of Agriculture really thought would be consumed in the domestic market. The domestic market did not consume quite that many potatoes, I am now told, but something like 350,000,000 was what was estimated to be consumed. It is also stated by the Department of Agriculture that the amount of potatoes produced in this country last year was 402,000,000 bushels. So that leaves a difference of 52,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes thrown on the markets of the United States. I shall give statistics later to show that the amount of potatoes shipped to this country last year was in the neighborhood of 9,000,000 bushels, and this year, at the rate at which they are being imported, the amount may reach 15,000,000 bushels. So, if we take the importation of 15,000,000 bushels and the surplus of 50,000,000 or even 60,000,000 bushels, there are being imported to this country an amount which is practically one-fourth of the surplus which is causing us difficulty at this time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator recall that while we were reducing our production by 10 percent, at the request of the Agricultural Department, and the citizens of Maine were reducing their production by 10 percent, the Province of New Brunswick, Canada, increased its production by 10 percent?

Mr. WHERRY. I am aware of that fact, but I thank the Senator for his observation.

The point I wish to stress is this:

But distinguished economists who have been consulted by the Department of Agriculture have worked out estimates as to what happens when there is a surplus. If there is a surplus of 5 percent, it does not result in the price dropping 5 percent; ordinarily it may drop 10 percent, or if there is a surplus of 10 or 20 percent, it might result in a drop of 50 percent.

Five percent would be 3,000,000 bushels; 10 percent would be 6,000,000 bushels.

That is an illustration of the effect that is created upon the domestic market of the United States by these importations. So, when Washington newspapers say, "What is the difference?", they have apparently not given to the subject the analysis which is being given by the economists of the Nation, that it is the percentage of potatoes coming into this country against the surplus we have which results in such a great impact upon our domestic economy.

Mr. President, I continue with the answer of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]:

Every time there are a few more bushels, it disturbs a market which is already in trouble. When there was demand for the product in this country slight importations were insignificant, but when, as this year, there is a surplus of potatoes, any aggravation of it is many times more effective than in ordinary periods.

Mr. President, I am taking some time to bring the point to the attention of the Senate because what is true of potatoes is true as to scores of other commodities, the impact of which is causing difficulty in the American market. They may not be so dramatic as potatoes, because they have not received so much publicity.

I mentioned Mr. Hoffman, who contends that these slight importations have no effect. In a statement in the press attributed to Paul G. Hoffman, Economic Cooperation Administrator, he said that the administration's drive to increase imports from Europe to balance international trade would create unemployment in a few localities, necessitating special unemployment programs.

He anticipated special unemployment programs because of the dislocations which he says will actually happen.

I read from the newspaper article:

But he insisted, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that the extent of unemployment resulting from competition from imports was greatly exaggerated. Compared to total American production, he said, these imports would be a mere drop in the bucket, with negligible effect on the whole economy.

That is the point I want to illustrate. There are produced 400,000,000 bushels of potatoes and about 15,000,000 bushels will be imported this year, but that does not reveal the full story of the impact caused by the importation. It is responsible for a quarter, if not for a third of the surplus.

Mr. Hoffman goes on and says that what we should do is to lengthen the period of unemployment insurance, institute job-training programs to teach workers other skills, and management-training programs aimed at getting businesses blocked by foreign competition to turn to new products, so as to permit the importation of products into this country.

That is his answer to the questions asked about the dislocations caused by importations of similar commodities.

Mr. President, I think it is an unwise policy to continue to permit imports into this country of commodities of which there is a domestic surplus.

The United States owns enough linseed oil so that we would not need to produce any for more than a year. That is the situation, also, with reference to eggs. All Senators have heard about that situation. They are scattered all over the United States. The situation is known in every section of the country.

A number of other agricultural products are in surplus. How could it be otherwise at this particular time, when the huge output under pressure to feed the whole world has caught up to and exceeded the demand? It will take a little time to adjust our domestic output, as the rest of the world is rapidly catching up with and exceeding the prewar production.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that 2 years ago when the junior Senator from Nebraska pleaded against controls and asked the Senate to take them off, and not to impose price ceilings, he was criticized severely from one end of the land to the other. I said at that time, "If you remove the controls and give the producers an opportunity to produce, they will produce all the food that is necessary, and the prices will be so low that you will be asked for relief from surpluses rather than from price ceilings."

That was true of meat. Steers in the feed-lots are selling for half the price at which they sold 2 years ago. The same is true of hogs. They have to be mighty fine hogs to bring $15 a hundred pounds. As to eggs, the bottom has fallen out of the market. A good fat hen will not

bring enough to pay the freight to ship her to market.

The restrictions under this resolution are the most strict that have ever been imposed. A potato farmer might go to the other extreme and, within 6 months or a year, say, "Why in the world did you hold down production? Why not let it operate in normal channels?" If the Aiken bill had been in effect, as the Senator has already stated, two-thirds of the difficulty would have been eliminated.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is very likely that there would not have been any surplus if the Secretary had appointed an advisory committee.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. We are dealing with the economy of the country. I do not want to make any exaggerated statement. The potato situation is bad, and I am offering an amendment which I think will help to correct the situation. The importations of potatoes should be stopped, because they are adding to the surplus we already have. What is true of potatoes is true of many commodities which are coming into this country.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator will be interested to know that two shiploads of potatoes from Canada are now on the way to Florida. The cargo amounts to 50,000 bushels. On their admission the Government will simply have to buy 50,000 bushels of Florida or other potatoes to make up for the quantity in that shipment.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Maine for his observation. It is very much in point. On the same market there will be potatoes sold at 1 cent a hundred pounds, the price of which we are supporting for no good reason.

The people of the United States, however, stirred up by the Government order to destroy millions of bushels of potatoes, and by the constant importation of huge quantities which force the destruction of even more of our own, are demanding that something be done.

Potatoes are perishable. Storage for any length of time is impossible. They are grown in every State of the Union, mostly, in fact, almost entirely, by small, individually owned farm units. It is not sound economics nor is it fair to all these millions of farm families to saddle them with the burden of foreign surpluses on top of our own.

I repeat, these very surpluses are largely a result of expanded planting and improvement of yields when much of the world was starving and needed all the food the United States could produce. Now we are retrenching at home. Can there be any objection from any source against some kind of similar retrenchment concerning imports, especially where there are no acreage limitations or where, in many instances, the acreage limitations have increased by leaps and bounds?

I want to invite the attention of the Senate to some statistics.

Our production goal for potatoes in 1945 was 408,000,000 bushels. We actually produced 418,000,000 bushels.

In 1946 our goal was 377,000,000 bushels. We actually produced 484,000,000 bushels.

In 1947 our goal was 375,000,000 bushels. We actually produced 389,048,000 bushels.

In 1948 the goal was 375,000,000 bushels. We actually produced 445,850,000 bushels.

In 1949 the goal was 350,000,000 bushels. We actually produced 401,962,000 bushels.

In 1950 the goal will be 335,000,000 bushels. With the Aiken amendment and with the pending amendment, it is my opinion that there will be no surplus. In fact, if we have adverse weather conditions we may wonder why we placed these strict quotas on the farmers who are producing potatoes.

Let us see what the imports were. In 1938, they were 764,000 bushels, with a value of $581,000. In 1939, 1,564,000 bushels, with a value of $1,527,000. In 1940, 1,324,000 bushels, with a value of $1,272,000. In 1941, 1,267,000 bushels, with a value of $670,000.

As I did with the other figures, I now skip the war years and go to 1946. In 1946, the importations were 2,260,000 bushels, with a value of $3,279,000. In 1947, 5,258,000 bushels, with a value of $7,454,000. In 1948, 6,176,000 bushels, with a value of $9,130,000. In 1949, 9,574,000 bushels, with a value of $12,920,000.

If the estimates which the Department of Agriculture gave me hold good for the remainder of the year, the maximum amount of importations—they tell me, but they are not sure about it—according to their conservative estimates, will be 15,000,000 bushels, with a value of $19,000,000. That shows how potato importations are growing. Yet with the growing importations, we are placing restrictions on our own potato growers.

Use of potatoes in the United States varies, but it is estimated we are going to use in the United States around 335,000,000 bushels, so that the difference between the production goal and the actual production is what gives the surplus, and that is what we must watch out for.

So that taking the goal next year and the production this year, there is a surplus of about 65,000,000 to 70,000,000 bushels of potatoes.

And if we import 15,000,000 bushels into this country this year, that does have a decisive effect upon price of potatoes in the open market.

CLASSES OF IMPORTS; CERTIFIED SEED AND OTHER

There are two classes of imports—certified seed and other.

The latter is generally designated as table stock, although it may include small quantities used in the making of starch, flour, or similar products. In the act of 1930, all potatoes were dutiable at 75 cents a hundred pounds. The present rate of duty is a little complicated.

Imports of seed: The first 2,500,000 bushels imported in any crop year, beginning on September 15 of each year, are dutiable at 37½ cents a hundred. Imports above the 2,500,000 bushels are dutiable at 75 cents a hundred.

Imports of other potatoes: The first million bushels imported in any crop year are dutiable at 37½ cents a hundred; imports above that amount are dutiable at 75 cents a hundred; provided, that if production in the United States, as estimated on September 1 of each year by the Department of Agriculture, falls below 350,000,000 bushels as many more table potatoes may enter at the 37½-cent rate as the production estimate is under the 350,000,000 bushels.

In other words, every time our production drops 1,000,000 bushels below 350,000,000 bushels, the importing countries can add a million bushels at the duty of 37½ cents a hundred pounds.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will not the Senator call attention to the fact that our goal for this year is 350,000,000 bushels?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. So that if we were successful, and if everybody cooperated, and we were to produce only 335,000,000 bushels, Canada would be able to send to the United States 15,000,000 additional bushels at a duty of 37½ cents a hundred pounds.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point which I was about to make. I thank the Senator for making the observation. According to the schedule I have, if we reach the goal of 335,000,000 bushels, under the general trade agreements—and there are 23 of them—foreign countries can ship into our country 15,000,000 bushels additional at a duty of 37½ cents a hundred pounds.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator has partly answered my question. His statement is based on our having reciprocal trade agreements with Canada and other potato-producing countries. Am I correct?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. The general agreement is implemented by the schedule I have, which arrives at the figure of 350,000,000 bushels. That is covered in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. WATKINS. If we produce under that figure, the foreign countries may increase their imports.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. There is no limit to the quantity of potatoes that may enter the United States at the 75-cent rate of duty. It is unlimited, at 75 cents duty.

SEPARATE AGREEMENT WITH CANADA TO LIMIT SHIPMENTS OF POTATOES TO THE UNITED STATES

The substantial surplus of potatoes resulting from a bumper crop in 1948 caused considerable pressure on the administration to limit imports.

The President, with the Secretary of Agriculture, had authority to apply a quota or otherwise clamp down on the importation of foreign-grown potatoes, but he chose the alternative of making a separate arrangement with Canada. That is the agreement referred to by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. AN-

DERSON]. It has nothing to do with the reciprocal trade agreements, however.

An exchange of notes resulted in the mutual signing of a document in which Canada agreed to try to limit the shipments of potatoes to the United States to those marked "Certified seed" until the end of the current crop year. I cite Public Document No. 3474, Joint Agriculture and State Department Release No. 954, November 26, 1948.

In return for a bona fide effort on the part of Canada to send only seed, and to send it to the usual seed markets, and only during the usual shipping season, the United States promised not to assess quotas or other limitations on imports during the 1948–49 season. That agreement was not renewed. I speak with authority when I say that there has been an attempt to renew it, but, of course, Canada does not want to renew that agreement when under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act they get the benefits from importations which they are now enjoying.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. That agreement, I think it is fair to assume, is clearly the result of the power in the hands of the President to set quotas or to stop importations. Does the Senator know why, in view of the surplus this year, with which the authorities have been familiar for the past 6 months, no steps have been taken by the President or the Secretary of Agriculture, so far as we know, to institute restrictions on Canadian importations?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the $64 question. There is no reason given for it. I am told that strenuous efforts are being made to renew the agreement, rather than use the power of the President to do the very thing the Senator has suggested. Why it has not been done, I cannot tell.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Secretary of Agriculture was asked about that, and he said before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that he had no information as to any attempts to renew the agreement this year, and he did not know whether it had lapsed or had been denounced. Is it possible there was anyone interested in increasing the apparent surplus of American potatoes in order to dump them at a critical moment and persuade the American people that a change was desirable?

Mr. WHERRY. My answer is that someone must have been interested in doing it, because at this moment the surpluses are much larger than they were when the agreement was made a year ago, so if it is necessary, and the President had the power then, he certainly has the power now, and the Secretary of Agriculture has been negligent in failing to exercise his power to stop importations of potatoes, which have had such a disastrous effect on the potato market, and which are causing us to make undue payments at the expense of the taxpayers which otherwise would not be made.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would it not be well for those who are so interested in the matter to urge the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to take the steps which would in the next 3 months save the American Treasury $20,000,000, beyond peradventure?

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly think so. That is the conclusion I was about to announce. I think that if the amendment shall be agreed to, it will become mandatory that the administration do something about importations of potatoes.

Mr. President, I should be glad indeed to answer any questions. If there are no questions, I should like to have action on the amendment as quickly as possible.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate very long, because I am as anxious to see action completed on the bill as is any other Senator. I was going to say that I frankly admit that I did not know until today the volume of the importations of potatoes from Canada. This afternoon I have ascertained that the average over a period of years has been about 1,000,000 bushels, and that for 1948 it had reached 9,500,000 bushels. I believe the Senator from Nebraska said that when it did that, stimulated by our support program, giving a market that was artificially supported, and so very profitable that potatoes could be brought into the United States over the tariff barriers, the President acted under section 22 of the Agricultural Act of 1948 to reach a gentleman's agreement or some kind of agreement limiting the amount that could come in. I think that the amount heretofore estimated to come in in 1950 is probably excessive, because I have been informed this afternoon, and, I believe, officially so, that the outside estimate is now 13,000,000 bushels. But in any event I want to say that this unconsumable surplus on our hands is too much.

I for one will certainly bring to the attention of the White House my remarks made on the floor today respecting the power which the President has under the Agricultural Act of 1948, to reach some agreement not to permit Canada to take advantage of our agricultural program, which has not been well handled, we will admit, but which was designed in good faith to help our farmers and our potato growers, and which has thereby created a market which was never intended when our reciprocal trade agreement with Canada was negotiated and the tariff was fixed under it respecting competitive Canadian potatoes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield briefly because I do not want to hold the floor long.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the able Senator from Virginia a question. The President does have, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the power to regulate or fix the number of bushels of potatoes, or the volume of potatoes, which may come into the United States. He does have that power now, does he not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is an escape clause in all the reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. THYE. That clause can be put into effect when what we call the peril point is reached?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. Moreover, the President can act under section 22 of the Agricultural Act of 1948, which provides:

> Whenever the President has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program of price supports or production controls, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, with due notice to interested parties, with an opportunity for hearing.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Then I should say to the able Senator from Virginia that there is now legislation on the statute books, there is now authority reposed in the Secretary of Agriculture to declare that potatoes are surplus, and when he so declares, the President, or the State Department, can regulate the importation of any commodity or any product or produce. For that reason, while the legislation proposed by the able Senator from Nebraska would specifically deal with the question, yet the President has the authority and the power under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to close out or shut off any importation of potatoes when there is danger of a surplus.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the Senator whether the amendment would not in effect make mandatory a statutory declaration of a peril point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Oh, the amendment would do more than apply a peril point. It would cut off all importation of potatoes. It would smack our best friend in the face. Senators speak of $9,000,000 worth of potatoes coming in from Canada. For every dollar of potato importations from Canada, Canada buys three or four dollars' worth of fresh fruits and vegetables from us. By smacking our best friend in the face in the manner proposed by the amendment we would cut off the market in Canada for Florida oranges and grapefruit, for Texas oranges and grapefruit, for California fresh fruits and dried fruits. Over and above that, Canada is the best customer we have in the world. Senators talk about $9,000,000 worth of potatoes. Canada buys $500,000,000 worth of goods from us, and she pays for them. It is not a give-away proposition under the Marshall plan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would not the adoption of the amendment mean the application of the statutory peril-point provision?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will say that it is worse than the peril point, because in

that event at least the Tariff Commission could make investigation and recommendation, on which the President could act. The amendment would shut off all importations of potatoes from Canada immediately. I think that would be a most ill-advised thing to do. We would be acting as though Russia did not have the atomic bomb. We would be smacking our best customer in the face over some potatoes, when we have a law under which we can handle the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment only provides that the authority which the President now has shall be made mandatory. That is all it provides. It would apply only at a time when there is a surplus, and the surplus will be determined on the basis of the allocations and the national allotments made by the Secretary of Agriculture. The occasion may never arise to put this provision into force, but if the occasion should arise, it then would become mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to do exactly what the law now provides he shall do. It does not change the law.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Nebraska has presented two amendments which are printed. I do not know which of the two he is now offering. The amendment I have in my hand says "if a surplus exists." Everyone knows a surplus does exist. The other says "if a quota is imposed." Perhaps the Senator is going to offer that amendment also. I say, Mr. President, that in my honest opinion, if the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is adopted, it will immediately shut off all importation of potatoes from Canada.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. It will do so only when there is a surplus. That language is taken out of the agricultural act. The Senator goes as far afield as can be when he says that adoption of my amendment would shut off all business from Canada. The amendment provides only that when allocations are set and national allotments provided, if there are surplus potatoes the provisions of the amendment become effective. It applies not only to Canada, but to 23 other countries. They shall not continue to ship potatoes into the United States so long as the condition of surplus exists.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is the Senator from Nebraska trying to get the Senator from Virginia to say that he never reads the newspapers, that he has never heard of any surplus of potatoes in the United States, that he has not heard that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked Congress, "What shall I do with 50,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes? If you do not tell me what to do with them, I will sell them for 1 cent a bag, or destroy them." I know there is a surplus. Everyone in the country knows there is a surplus, and the Senator from Nebraska knows that everyone in the country knows there is a surplus. Does the Senator think Canada does not know what the effect of his amendment would be? Does he believe that Canada does not know that adoption of the amendment would stop the importation of all potatoes into the United States from Canada?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Virginia that if the amendment is adopted, and if an order is issued prohibiting the importation of more potatoes from Canada, that will immediately be followed by Canada placing a restriction against imports of some of our own agricultural products, and the net result will be to injure the American farmer and not help him a single bit.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There can be no doubt about that. But the situation is that the Canadian Government is not shipping potatoes into the United States. The potatoes are shipped here by the Canadian farmer, who finds a good market here and takes advantage of it. No one can blame the Canadian farmer for doing that. But if the amendment is adopted by congressional action, the Canadian Government immediately comes into the picture. By adopting the amendment we will have struck at the Government of Canada. Adoption of the amendment would mean that we have, in my opinion, violated our treaties with that Government. The shutting off of imports of potatoes from Canada by the proposed action would, in my opinion, mean the violation of a trade agreement with Canada under which we agreed to take potatoes of a certain type, but we did not place the quota. Since then we have adopted an escape clause. We now have section 22 of the act of 1948.

I for one shall certainly communicate with the White House, because when we are paying our taxpayers' money to support the potato price, I do not condone any action which will permit Canada to step up her normal export of potatoes to us from 1,000,000 bushels to 13,000,000 bushels. Everyone knows that the importation of potatoes from Canada has been stepped up, because the support price has made ours an attractive market. But let us not ask the Congress to go on record as now proposed, by the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, and thus smack in the face the best friend we have in the world.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I resent those words, and I have the right to speak, because I submitted the amendment. I am not smacking anyone in the face. I am asking that there be done exactly what the President of the United States did last year. Last year he did exactly what we are now proposing to ask him to do this year. But he has refused to act. So far as that is concerned, our business with Canada has been fine, and will continue to be fine, whether my amendment is adopted or not. All we ask the President of the United States to do is exactly what is provided in the legislation now on the books. He took action a year ago. The President refuses to take such action now, as was so ably pointed out by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who would like to know why such action is not being taken now.

The idea is that we are asking that something be done in a mandatory way which is similar to that which was done a year ago. If the Senator from Virginia had been on the floor when I offered the amendment he would have known which amendment I offered.

I think I gave the Senate a very fair presentation of it. I said that not only is Canada shipping potatoes into the United States, but is shipping potatoes into our territories. All in the world the amendment does is to provide that there shall be no further importation so long as there is a surplus of this commodity in the United States. That surplus is defined by the allocation and the national allotments fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture himself .

Mr. ROBERTSON. I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that he did not see me on the floor for the same reason that I could not hear him. I was sitting behind him, and I do not hear so well when I am behind the speaker as I do when I am in front of him. Neither does the Senator see so well those who are behind him.

I will read one of the amendments offered by the Senator from Nebraska, which I assume to be the one on which he now asks action:

> That whenever the supply of Irish potatoes in the United States is, or is practically certain to be, in excess of the goal of production or national production allotment set by the Secretary of Agriculture—

That is one situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Pursuant to section 401 of the present law. That is the amendment I am offering.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

> Pursuant to section 401, Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, the President shall proclaim that fact.

Everyone knows that at this time we have an excess of potatoes. Everyone knows that while the amendment would ask the President to proclaim it, he has now no option but to proclaim it. Everyone knows it will be congressional action, through the President, immediately cutting off any imports of potatoes from Canada. We may call it hostile action or ill-advised action, or we may call it, as the Canadians would call it, I believe, a slap in the face. I do not think Canada would regard it in any other way. The Canadians might not say officially or over the radio or in talking to the President, "You have slapped us in the face," but at the same time it seems to me the language here proposed would mean just that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that in the past we have enacted legislation of this nature, doing the same thing with respect to cotton?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We have had in the Agricultural Adjustment Act an escape clause to protect our cotton growers from the importation of cotton, and then we would put on a quota.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We had a gentlemen's agreement affecting cotton piece cloth from Japan, at one time.

Mr. President, I see no objection in the world to asking the President to do what we would like to authorize him to do; but I contend that is not what this amendment would do. I contend that this amendment immediately would cut off, by congressional action, the importation of potatoes. I think that would be unwise and shortsighted, and would be calculated to invite retaliation or reprisals.

For years Canada has purchased far more from us than we have purchased from Canada. Canada has been buying our fresh fruits and vegetables and other commodities, and has bought far more from us than we have bought from her.

Mr. President, I shall yield the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Very well; I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Virginia familiar with the provisions of the Canadian trade agreement, which I hold in my hand, which expressly contemplates the very situation we now face? I read now from page 23, article XI, section 2, in which the very action we have just referred to is contemplated. The provisions of section 2 are, in part, as follows:

The provisions of paragraph 1 of this article—

Which provides about not imposing quotas or restrictions—

shall not extend to the following:

* * * * *

(b) Import and export prohibitions or restrictions necessary to the application of standards or regulations for the classification, grading, or marketing of commodities in international trade.

(c) Import restrictions on any agricultural or fisheries product, imported in any form, necessary to the enforcement of governmental measures which operate—

(i) to restrict the quantities of the like domestic product permitted to be marketed or produced, or, if there is no substantial domestic production of the like product, of a domestic product for which the imported product can be directly substituted; or (ii)—

This comes directly to the matter now under our consideration—

to remove a temporary surplus of the like domestic product.

Mr. President, could there be a better description of the product here involved?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not think so; I think that is a perfect description. I have not challenged that under the reciprocal trade agreement we have the power to act or that under the Agricultural Act of 1948 the President has the power to act. I have said that I did not know until now that this many potatoes have come in. I did not know the President had the right to act.

Mr. BREWSTER. He had the power to act, and has had it for 6 months, but he has not acted. He has taken that position when conditions have been building up to the tragic situation of today, which has led the Senator from Illinois to demand that all supports be wiped out. Despite that, they have calmly admitted 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes, which is one-third of the surplus we are arguing about; and neither the President nor the Secretary of Agriculture has lifted a hand to stop the importation of those potatoes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I shall not yield further.

I have tried to make it clear that I wish to go along with the efforts to reach the goal the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has in mind, but I cannot endorse the method by which he is proposing to reach it.

Mr. LUCAS Mr. President, it is apparent that it will take some time to reach a vote upon this amendment alone, because other Members of the Senate desire to speak upon it. It is practically a part of the reciprocal trade agreements.

In view of the fact that there are other amendments to be voted upon, I wonder whether we can obtain unanimous consent to vote on Monday, at either 2 or 3 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder whether the distinguished majority leader would propose that the vote be taken at 3 o'clock. I myself would not object to having the vote taken at 2 o'clock, but I think 3 o'clock probably would be generally satisfactory.

Mr. LUCAS. When I stated earlier today that we would have a night session, a number of Senators immediately came to me and said they had dinner engagements Of course, I do not like to disappoint them.

Mr MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr President, reserving the right to object, the proposal is that we shall vote at 3 o'clock on Monday—on what, please?

Mr. LUCAS. On everything—all the amendments to the joint resolution and on the joint resolution itself.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire who would have charge of the time.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the committee, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. WHERRY. I asked that question because the wheat amendment is still to be discussed, is it not? I do not know how much time will be required for that purpose.

I might inquire of the Senator from Colorado whether 3 o'clock would be satisfactory, in view of the fact that the wheat amendment has not yet been reached.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has an amendment. My colleague from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and I have an amendment

This is a rather talkative subject, of course.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] also has an amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. It has been disposed of.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wonder whether it would be better to provide for the voting to begin at 4 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have an amendment. I am perfectly willing to offer it for consideration in conference; if it is accepted, I should be glad to let it be handled in that way. Otherwise, I should wish to have perhaps 30 minutes, or approximately that much time, to discuss it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am endeavoring to accommodate the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] as much as possible, in connection with the measure we expect to take up following this one, and he is trying to have it brought up as soon as possible. I was trying to help him out.

But I shall be glad to provide in the unanimous-consent agreement for the voting to begin at 4 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, who will have charge of the time?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. WHERRY. That is satisfactory.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will it be understood, in connection with the agreement, that the Senator from Georgia will have 30 minutes, if necessary, for his matter, and that my colleague from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and I will have 30 minutes for our matter, if necessary?

Mr LUCAS. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is chairman of the committee and is in charge of the bill. Whatever is agreeable to him will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have it understood that I shall have at least 30 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, we could convene at 11 o'clock on Monday, and could arrange to have the voting begin at 3 o'clock that would give us 4 hours.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With the understanding that I shall have 30 minutes?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Delaware, I suppose, would wish to have time allotted him by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is not now in the Chamber.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure that can be arranged between those Senators; the Senators on the other side of the aisle never have difficulty in making arrangements with one another.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; we are one happy family.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not in favor of a "not-later-than" provision in the unanimous-consent agreement, for when such a provision is included in an agreement, Senators are in doubt as to the exact time when the voting will begin and are unable to make definite arrangements with regard to their time during the preceding hours on that day.

So I suggest that the agreement definitely provide for the voting to commence at 4 o'clock on Monday. If the majority leader wishes to have the Senate convene at 11 o'clock on Monday, that will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next,

following the recess of the Senate from tonight until Monday, the Senate proceed to vote on the pending joint resolution (H J. Res 398) and all amendments thereto, at 4 o'clock p. m.; provided, that no amendment which is not germane shall be considered; and provided further, that the time between 12 o'clock noon and 4 p. m. on said day shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS Mr. President, in that connection, I ask unanimous consent that we waive the requirement for having a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

Without objection, the agreement is entered into.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 27, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 24 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George A Garrett, of the District of Columbia, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Ireland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Leon L. Cowles, of Utah.
Robert F. Hale, of Oregon.

John F. Fitzgerald, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Harold M. Granata, of New York.
Edward S. Parker, of South Carolina.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James E Bowers, of North Carolina.
Thaddeus C Martin, of Arkansas.
Harold M Midkiff, of Virginia.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Osborne A. Pearson, of California, to be Assistant Postmaster General. (To fill vacancy created by appointment of Vincent C. Burke to the position of Deputy Postmaster General under authority of sec. 2 of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1949)

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Robert A. Riddell, of Los Angeles, Calif., to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of California, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

EUGENE WORLEY, of Texas, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, vice Hon. Charles S. Hatfield, deceased.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Richard T. Ackley	John L Appel, Jr.
William Acosta	Robert J. Armstrong
Robert D. Albright	Henry J. Arnold
John R. Allen	Richard W. Arnold, Jr.
Roger D. Alling	Paul W. Arthur
Allen E. Alman	Anthony A Attardi
Daniel G Anderson, Jr.	Robert I. Backstrom
	Donald C. Buseck
Lyle C Anderson	James E. Johnson
Ralph E Anfang	Jack C. Scarborough, Jr.
William M. Apgar	

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950.

Francis B Quinlan	John B. Sherman
Alois E Schmitt, Jr.	Max L. Washington

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950.

Renato D Stefano, Jr.	Harvey M Soldan
Byron A Nilsson	Gene F. Straube

James H Longworth (Naval Reserve aviator) to be an ensign in the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

William N. Grammer
Ray B. Mueller

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Lawrence B Frey, Jr	Donald C. Olson
Thomas R Haufe	Burton D. Ostergren

Goldie D. Greer to be an ensign in the Nurse Corps of the Navy.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercies, in a world swept by violent forces with which unaided we cannot cope, Thou only art our help and our hope. Through all the mystery of life Thy strong arm alone can lead us to its mastery. Thou hast made of our very restlessness a sign that without Thee we cannot be satisfied.

Fronting the claimant duties of this new week, steady our spirits with the realization of untapped power available to servants of Thy will if only they go quietly and confidently about their appointed tasks. Forgive us the distrust of ourselves, of life, and of Thee, and for the cowardly doubts which blind us to the heights which are full of the chariots of God. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 24, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 25, 1950, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1990) to amend section 429, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the act of August 5, 1882, as amended, so as to substitute for the requirement that detailed annual reports to be made to the Congress concerning the proceeds of all sales of condemned naval material a requirement that information as to such proceeds be filed with the Committees on Armed Services in the Congress.

The message also announced that the act (S. 2681) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, to be held at Lexington and Concord, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950, having been presented to the President on February 14, 1950, and not having been signed by him within the 10-day period prescribed by the Constitution, had become a law without approval.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S 2328 An act to amend section 482 of the Revised Statutes relating to the Board of Appeals in the United States Patent Office; and

H R. 7220 An act to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases.

ABDUCTION OF GREEK CHILDREN

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the problem of the displaced Greek children ever since it was brought to the attention of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans in 1948 by the Greek Government, which charged that thousands of Greek children were being forcibly abducted by the guerrillas for Communist indoctrination in the eastern European countries and as a means of further terrorizing the Greek countryside. The findings of that special committee revealed that approximately 25,000 children had been removed to Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and other countries in eastern Europe. We all know that the efforts of the United Nations and of the International Committee of the Red Cross have so far failed to succeed in remedying this truly tragic and unjustifiable condition. I have asked the

Secretary of State on several different occasions to use every means at his disposal to underscore the position of the United States with respect to the resolutions adopted by the United Nations. If we Americans can take the leadership in inspiring world opinion against what is one of the blackest marks on the Soviet record, we will have done a humane and a manly thing. I will continue to do whatever I can as an individual Senator to achieve this result.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. LODGE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SALTONSTALL was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. AIKEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the week beginning today.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHOEPPEL was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DARBY, because of official business, was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that the Senate is proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement, under which the time between now and 4 o'clock is divided between the proponents and opponents of the pending joint resolution, and controlled respectively by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may proceed with what might be termed the morning hour until the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] shall reach the Senate, because he is in control of one-half of the time, unless some other Senator has been designated to control the time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent. I ask unanimous consent now, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont, that he may have leave of the Senate to be absent today and tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont has asked that in his absence I take charge of the time which was given into his control when the unanimous-consent agreement was made.

I would say, for the information of the majority leader, that it is perfectly agreeable to me that a quorum be called, and that routine business be transacted, provided the time is taken out of the time allotted to both sides.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement be modified so as to substitute the Senator from Nebraska for the Senator from Vermont to control the time on behalf of the opponents of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma obtained the floor.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Bridges	Hoey	Mundt
Butler	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	Myers
Cain	Ives	Neely
Chapman	Jenner	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S C	Russell
Darby	Kerr	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N J.
Downey	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Leahy	Stennis
Eastland	Lehman	Taylor
Ecton	Lodge	Thomas, Okla
Ellender	Long	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lucas	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Withers
Hayden	Malone	
Hendrickson	Maybank	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and by unanimous consent, the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations were excused from attendance on the session of the Senate this afternoon and the Committee was authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the time consumed in the transaction of routine business will be charged equally against both sides.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Resolution 42

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, a bill H. R 4453, known as the Fair Employment Practice Act, the purpose of which is to establish a permanent agency of the Government to eliminate discrimination in employment; and

"Whereas the State of New York has been among the pioneers of the States of the Union to enact such legislation which has been successful in reducing or eradicating such discrimination in the industries of this State; and

"Whereas all citizens without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin are entitled to equal opportunity to be gainfully employed and it is in the public interest that such unfair practices, which tend to engender bitterness and unrest among large segments of our population be eradicated as opposed to the principles of our form of government; and

"Whereas during the last war when it was essential for our war industries to keep production at their highest level, the Fair Employment Practice Committee was highly successful in reducing or eliminating such discrimination in such industries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved (if the assembly concur)*, That it is the sense of the people of the State of New York, expressed through the considered judgment of their representatives in the legislature, that the enactment of such legislation is of the greatest importance to the people and will tend to unite the country and create greater respect for our institutions among the other peoples of the world; and be it further

"*Resolved (if the assembly concur)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed H. R. 4453 or such other, similar, appropriate legislation as will accomplish the purposes of this resolution; and be it further

"*Resolved (if the assembly concur)*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to

the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to do all within their power to bring about the enactment of such legislation.

"By order of the senate:

"WILLIAM S KING,
"Secretary.

"In assembly, February 21, 1950. Concurred in without amendment.

"By order of assembly:

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
"Clerk."

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to lower the high cost of food

"Whereas the laws which guarantee farmers high prices for their commodities were enacted to relieve an acute national economic emergency affecting the farm industry which no longer exists; and

"Whereas the new law is plainly designed to keep basic foods as high in price as they have been, and

"Whereas this is plainly inflation of a most painful nature; and

"Whereas it overlooks the fact that most of the income of the American family pays for food; and

"Whereas according to laws of supply and demand in a free market food becomes cheaper the more it is produced, while under the law in question the taxpayers' money is used in ever greater amounts as food becomes more plentiful to prevent the consumer from the taking advantage of the natural action of economic law which has made America the greatest nation in history, and

"Whereas the Government has under loan or has taken title to four-fifths of all the flaxseed produced last year, third of all the cotton, nearly a third of all the wheat, more than half of all the peanuts, two-fifths of all the potatoes and dried edible beans, nearly half of the stored butter, and

"Whereas the present new farm price-support program will cost billions which will come from the same people who will pay the resulting high prices, and

"Whereas the farmers are becoming more and more dependent upon the Government: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact laws that will be in keeping with a peace time economy, and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, February 13, 1950.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 16, 1950.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to pass anti-poll-tax legislation

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to pass legislation which would remove payment of poll tax as a prerequisite of the right to vote in elections; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, February 13, 1950

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 16, 1950.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; ordered to lie on the table:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to pass antilynching legislation

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to pass legislation seeking to make it a Federal offense for any person to engage in the crime of lynching, and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In the house of representatives, adopted, February 13, 1950.

"LAWRENCE R GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 16, 1950

"IRVING N HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

INDEPENDENCE FOR LITHUANIA

Mr. WILEY Mr. President, I have in my hand a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanian-Americans in my State of Wisconsin in commemoration of the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of independence in Lithuania The resolution pertains to the unspeakable crimes which have been committed against the heroic freedom-loving Lithuanian people.

Mr. President, each of us I am sure, in the Senate recognizes that in spite of the Soviet occupation of the Baltic areas, the people of those three countries are as deserving of freedom and are as unalterably opposed to Soviet oppression as are any other peoples trapped behind the iron curtain. I believe that the United States Government should resolutely oppose any action which would indicate that we agree to the occupation of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; on the contrary, we must make unmistakably clear that we will never agree to such violation of the rights of free peoples.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD the text of this resolution adopted by the Lithuanian-American Council Branch of Racine, Wis., and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committtee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT A MASS MEETING OF THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS, HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LOCAL BRANCH OF THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC, IN COMMEMORATION OF THE THIRTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE IN LITHUANIA, AT SOKOL HALL ON THE 12TH OF FEBRUARY 1950

Whereas Lithuania, the country of our fathers, has been, and still is, unlawfully occupied by the Soviet military and police forces, and

Whereas the Government of the United States, though recognizing the independence of Lithuania, has failed to condemn the unlawful acts of the Soviets in the occupied country, and to extend any help to their victims; and

Whereas the Soviet rulers apply ever harsher methods of opposition and outright annihilation of the indigenous population of that country: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian descent and ancestry, shall continue to support the efforts of Lithuanian people to regain freedom and reestablish an independent Lithuanian Republic, be it further

Resolved, That we appeal to the Government of the United States to denounce openly the Soviet policy of destruction of native population, the crime of genocide, and take effective steps to make Russia respect the principles of the declaration of human rights; be it further

Resolved, That we go on the record as favoring the immediate ratification of the convention outlawing genocide by the United States of America Senate, be it also

Resolved, That we urge the Government to use its power and influence to help Lithuania and other Baltic States regain their freedom and soveriegn rights in accordance with the principles of Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations, and not to make any peace settlement with the Soviet Russia until this has been achieved, and be it finally

Resolved, That the Resolution forwarded to the President of the United States, and copies thereof sent to the Secretary of State, the Senators and Representatives of the State of Wisconsin, and to the press

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY COMMITTEE,
GEORGE KAPOCIN, *Chairman.*
MARTIN KASPARAITIS, *Secretary.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations

H. R. 7207. A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1287).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 298. A bill for the relief of John Rowland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288);

S 915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Dagnall; without amendment (Rept. No. 1289);

S. 1169. A bill for the relief of Christina Shalfeieff; without amendment (Rept. No. 1290);

S. 1261. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Ardans; without amendment (Rept. No. 1291);

S. 1262. A bill for the relief of Juliana Mendiola Alastra; without amendment (Rept. No. 1292);

S. 1484. A bill for the relief of Augustino Marlia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293);

S. 1524. A bill for the relief of Edith Scheiber; without amendment (Rept. No. 1294);

S. 1798. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Minda Moore; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1295);

S. 1929. A bill for the relief of Anna Samudovsky; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1296);

S 2156. A bill for the relief of Sister Edelrudis Clara Weskamp; without amendment (Rept. No. 1297);

S. 2308. A bill for the relief of William Alfred Bevan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1298);

S. 2393. A bill for the relief of Martin Albrecht; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1299);

S. 2431. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Kato; without amendment (Rept. No 1300);

S. 2479. A bill for the relief of A. D. Strenger and his wife Claire Strenger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1301);

S. 2568. A bill for the relief of Carmen E. Lyon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1302);

S. 2611. A bill for the relief of Roland Roger Alfred Boccia, also known as Roland Barbera; without amendment (Rept. No. 1303);

S 2655. A bill for the relief of Mrs Evelyn M Hryniak; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1304);

S. 2811 A bill to amend section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code, with respect to the importation or transportation of obscene matters; without amendment (Rept. No. 1305);

S 2812 A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce; without amendment (Rept. No 1306);

S 2934. A bill for the relief of Julius Elzas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307);

H. R. 1025. A bill for the relief of Waymon H Massey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1308);

H. R. 3138. A bill for the relief of Arthur Holbert; the estate of Ernest L Gass, deceased; and the estate of James L. Thomas, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 1309); and

H. R. 6694 A bill for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1310).

S Res. 202. Resolution to investigate interstate gambling and racketeering activities; with amendments (Rept. No. 1317); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S 274 A bill for the relief of Constantin E. Aramescu; without amendment (Rept. No. 1312);

S. 2277. A bill for the relief of George A. Voregarethsos (George Spiro Chatmos); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1313); and

S 2427. A bill for the relief of Masae Marumoto; without amendment (Rept. No 1314).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2071. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Willmarth; without amendment (Rept. No. 1311).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R 1024 A bill for the relief of Jacob Brown; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1318).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 3482. A bill granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Canadian River by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1319).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1315) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 75) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-4048507, Alvarez, Jose Gonzalez.

A-2095740, Arrighi, Arrigo.

A-4648315, Augustine, Albert Gustave.

A-6872585, Ballingall, William.

A-4582467, Barriero, Modesto, or Modesto Barriero Pereiras

A-4761012, Baxter, Mary (nee Mary Ramsay or Mary Robertson).

A-6244274, Beaumont, Richard Louis

A 1209360, Bernd, Karl Johan, or Carl Johan Bernd

A-3220706, Bokwa, Josef.

A-5429061, Bouma, Anna (Anna Novak) (nee Anna Vojtova).

A-4238831, Bronk, Margaret Elizabeth (nee Blackwell).

A-5940317, Brown, David Emanuel.

A-6262197, Calengas, Leonardos Petros, or Leonardos Kalengas.

A-6052567, Chang, Shou-Lien, or Sheldon Shou-Lien Chang.

A-6172679, Chiotelis, Anna, or Anna Hiotelis (nee Anna Hadjinicolaou).

A-4337869, Chow, David Ta Wei, or Chow Ta Wei or David T. W Chow.

A 4587482, De Gonzalez, Carmen Pardo, or Carmen Pardo Vda De Vega.

A-5346987, De Putter, Theodule Joseph or George De Putter.

A-3526012, De Regt, Leendert, or Leo De Reget or Leo De Regt.

A-3884367, Divitcoff, Petre George, or Petros Georgios Divitcoff.

A-5081920, Drechsler, Karl.

A-5724435, Espeneda, Nellie (nee Scholes aka Nellie Peterson or Nellie Perry or Nellie Churchill).

A-6788094, Fieber, George John.

A-5906975, Fong, Wone, or Fong Wone or Harry Wone or Rev. Harry Wone.

A-6960675, Gomez-Diaz, Parfirio, or Porfirio Gomez-Madina.

A-4709443, Grenoski, Joseph Frank, or Frank Stroda or Franzisek Grenowski or Frank Grenowski.

A-6083456, Herman, Josephine Moreno.

A-5164076, Jasnoch, Felix Bruno or Jassnoch.

A-5422397, Johansson, Nils Sigvard, or Nils Hohansson or "Nick" Johansson.

A 9618508, Johnson, John Moore.

A-9702404, Knutsen, Bernt Mathias.

A-6262159, Koufoudakis, Aristides Dimitrios.

A-6245684, Koufoudakis, Eftihia Aristides.

A-6843908, Larsen, Sigurd.

A-6743645, Lee, Anna Dorothy.

A-5924981, Lefert, Joseph Emil.

A-5829039, Lettsome, Ellen Rebecca, or Ellen Rebecca Jennings.

A-4769464, Lettsome, Hueroy Alpheous, or Hugh Roy Lettsome "Angel."

A-5931974, Lolax, Einar William, or Einar Lolax.

A-6261601, Lucas, Vaia Stamati (nee Asime).

A-4580115, Luzzi, Domenico.

A-4052215, Makritzky, Alexander Edward or Makritsky or Makrickits or Makricki or Mokricki or Makrickys.

A-3764722, Makritzky, Michalina Maria.

A-1074052, Mallis, Antonios Apostolis.

A-4869382, Marshall, George Falkner.

A-1793554, Migliore, Caterina (nee Dionigi or Catherine Migliore or Leonarda Savolardo or Saviordo or Guiseppa Bagarella).

A-1783420, Migliore, Anthony, or Antionino or Antonino Migliore or Salvatore Migliore or Antonino Joseph Migliore.

A-2307727, Migliore, Rose, or Rosa Migliore or Guiseppa Migliore or Rose Mary Migliore.

A-2155981, Min, Ng Yick, or Ng Yik Nin or Eng Yick Min.

A-9190465, Morfessis, Telemachos (alias Telemachos Morfessis).

A-7118357, Muller, Carl Christian Frederick Vilhelm, or Carl Fred Lem or Carl Fred Muller Lem.

A-3993801, Nevarez-Alarcon, Nanfa.

A-1959816, Nigo-Gonzalez, Leonardo, or Leon Nigo

A-6795961, Noakes, Romkje Anna.

A-6072143, Ojeda, Domingo.

A-6972142, Ojeda, Manuel.

A-4793221, Paraskevopulos, Peter Kostas (alias Peter Kostas Parras).

A-5967020, Patronas, Minas

A-5678915, Peavey, Fred Washington, or Fred W. Peavey.

A-5648749, Perry, Amy Jane (nee Donaldson).

A-3316027, Petersen, Alice Marie.

A-6664488, Peterson, Dorothy (nee Arron or Dorothy Lewis).

A-3800060, Petrone, Domenico, or Dominick, alias Leonardo Ricciardi.

A-5642085, Piovesan, Vittorio Giovanni.

A-4683822, Propst, Anna (nee Perrault or Ethel Georgeanna Perrault Propst).

A-6768116, Pukansky, Joseph.

A-6767390, Pustelnik, Stefan Pawel.

A-4996573, Rausch, Eva (nee Bieler or Evette Rausch or Chawa or Ewa Bieler).

A-3392003, Reyes, Jose Billegas.

A-4461206, Roland, Elizabeth Allen (nee Allen).

A-6136932, Rosario, Maximo.

A-7044248, Rose, Maria Alexandra.

A-6392231, Salgado, Jorge, or Jorge Salgado-Rodriguez

A-6868037, Sandoval-Silva, Epitasio.

A-4721106, Schachter, Herman Max.

A-6344539, Schulhof, Bernard or Bernat.

A-4671903, Seeber, Eugene John.

A-6735481, Sikaras, Helen (nee Martoulas or Helen Stellos Martoulas).

A-5045298, Silver, Isidore aka Icko Iola, or Izzo or Izzi or Icek or Itcko Igla.

A-5970137, Simmonds, Delia Hortencia.

A-1170976, Simone, Tommaso (also Thomas Simone).

A-1904276, Skordas, Lambros.

A-6958757, Smith, Emma Maria Valdes (nee Valdes).

A-1701220, Stathapoulos, Stephanos, or Steve Stathes.

A-4040449, Stettler, Emma (nee Emma Sbaschnig).

A-6097430, Stevens, Peggy Joan (nee McCartney).

A-4510827, Taberlet, Fred Romolo, or Romolo Taberlet.

A-6817646, Touliatos, John.

A-5138238, Tronrud, John, or John Wilhelm Tronrud.

A-1161491, Tschinkowitz, Valentin, or Walter Bayer.

A-4398037, Vaz, Manuel Viegas.

A-6921094, Warwick, William.

A-3263373, Wiessgarber, Barbara (nee Spanier).

A-3263372, Wiessgarber, Nikolaus

A-4034372, Wolff, Hedwig Sadie (nee Schauer).

A-6172745, Zakos, Sophie Kretekos, or Sophie Kretekos (nee Perides).
A-6318230, Zachou, Theodota (nee Theodota Goussi).
A-5074052, Zarensky, Isaac, or Zarebski or Zarembsky.
A-6905274, Just, Reinhard.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1316) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 76) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.
A-5291150, Becerra, Jose Guadalupe.
A-2960766, Bianco, Anthony Lo.
A-6236755, Cochran, Graham, Rayman, or Graham Reginald Boske.
A-4600090, Colantonio, Michele.
A-6592617, Conran, Judy Lynne.
A-1265760, Cumella, Raymond, or Raimondo Cumella.
A-9771239, Giatrakos, Elefterios
A-4426384, Ginararis, Avgerinos George.
A-6721979, Klimenko-Gurewska, Helene (now Helen Kuntz).
A-4757164, Koesling, Grete Hedwig
A-2246831, Lam, Caroline Han Fang Wang (alias Caroline Han Fang Wang Lim).
A-4068687, Liu, Len Hee (alias Len Hee Lee or Liu Hen Hee).
A-9776877, Loolam, August Reginald.
A-3694104, Mavrakis, Stratos Antoniou.
A-1536223, Merani, Globatta Alessandro, or Emilio Globatta Merani, or Emilio G. Merani.
A-5438346, Mitchell, Aurelia.
A-4751973, Oh, Sydney Bah, or Sydney Scott Bahoh.
A-4691270, Rodrigues, Jose.
A-1371419, Rupa, Amir Bin.
A-3171881, Schneider, Victor.
A-7145695, Squazza, Assunta, or Assunta Giungi
A-7145696, Squazza, Fernanda, or Fernanda Giungi
A-5242646, Teijeiro, Olegario, or Olegario Teijeiro Garcia.
A-6062104, Young, Virginia Josephine.
A-4490814, Cividanes, Jesus Vieiro.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 27, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2328) to amend section 482 of the Revised Statutes relating to the Board of Appeals in the United States Patent Office.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:
S 3125. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lutfu Lahut Uzman, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. BUTLER:
S. 3126. A bill to revise the basis for award of disability pension; to the Committee on Finance.
S. 3127. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Eva Peneaux White Thunder;
S. 3128. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John D. Decora;
S. 3129. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mr. and Mrs. Charles Whitford, heirs of Anna Louise Whitford, deceased; and
S. 3130. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lot Smith and Helen Seymour Smith, heirs of Charles Smith, deceased; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENNER:
S 3131. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William I Spaulding, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr McCARRAN:
S. 3132. A bill to incorporate the American Society of International Law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr LANGER:
S 3133 A bill for the relief of Anthony B. Estella, his wife and two children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S 3134 A bill to provide for a 25-percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to railroad employees and to their survivors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. HOEY):
S 3135. A bill to amend the peanut-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):
S 3136. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the town of Mills, Wyo, a sewage system located in such town, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

By Mr. LANGER:
S 3137. A bill for the relief of Carmine Amedeo;
S 3138 A bill for the relief of Mohammed Bulbool;
S 3139. A bill for the relief of Asmoth Ali, Angob Ali, Esrail Ullah, Mufaffar Ullah, Moraham Ali, Miftahuj Jaman, Moskod Ullah, and Mascador Ali;
S. 3140. A bill for the relief of Azman Ali;
S. 3141. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Katal Miah (or Kutal Miah); and
S 3142 A bill for the relief of Mohammed Hanif, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):
S. 3143. A bill to provide for the conduct of a periodic census of governments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and Mr. IVES):
S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to permit certain war-service indefinite employees to acquire competitive civil-service status and permanent tenure by qualifying in noncompetitive examinations, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRINTING OF COMMITEEE REPORT ENTITLED "LOW-INCOME FAMILIES AND ECONOMIC STABILITY"

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 233), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Low-Income Families and Economic Stability," printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, be printed as a Senate document.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. IVES, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. THYE) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MAYBANK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5472, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H R. 7207) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 6, line 17, strike the period after the word "law", insert a colon and add: "*Provided further*, That hereafter, the amount of annual leave for Government employees, including the employees of the Postal Service, shall be at the rate of 20 days per year, and the amount of sick leave shall be at the rate of 12 days per year for classified and wage board employees."

Mr. DOUGLAS also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7207, making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

[Mr HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator KNOWLAND at a Lincoln Day dinner at Des Moines, Iowa, on February 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISTREATMENT OF GREEK CHILDREN—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD various statements regarding the mistreatment of Greek children, which appear in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ABOLISHING ELECTORAL COLLEGE

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Constitutional Amendment on

Elections," published in the Chicago (Ill.) Daily Calumet of February 4, 1950, and the other entitled "Lodge's Amendment," published in the Rockford, Ill., Star, February 5, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED AIRPLANE TRIP TO THE NORTH POLE—ARTICLE FROM THE DAILY ALASKA EMPIRE

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Airplane Scheduled To Make Landing at North Pole Next Summer; Hubbard on Flight," published in the Daily Alaska Empire of Juneau, Alaska, February 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE WATERSHED TREATMENT PROGRAM

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the supplemental statement to the 1950 report of the Soil Conservation Service to the Subcommittee on Wildlife Conservation of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE H-BOMB: HUMANITY'S NEW PERIL—ARTICLE BY CLARENCE POE

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The H-Bomb: Humanity's New Peril," written by Clarence Poe, and published in the March 1950 issue of the Progressive Farmer, which appears in the Appendix.]

LET'S EXPLORE YOUR MIND—ARTICLE BY ALBERT EDWARD WIGGAM

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column entitled "Let's Explore Your Mind," by Albert Edward Wiggam, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTES OFF THE RECORD, BY GERTRUDE PIERSON

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the column entitled "Notes Off the Record," by Gertrude Pierson, published in the Cashmere (Wash.) Record, which appears in the Appendix.]

RENT CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "End of Rent Control," published in the Washington Post of this date, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPEAL TELEPHONE EXCISE TAXES—STATEMENT BY T. H. SANDERSON

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement under the heading "Repeal telephone excise taxes," prepared by T. H. Sanderson, director of the Wisconsin State Telephone Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

McCARTHY'S CREAKING LIMB—ARTICLE BY PETER EDSON

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "McCarthy's Creaking Limb," written by Peter Edson, and published in the Washington Daily News of this date, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIAL SECURITY AGAINST RAILROAD-RETIREMENT MONTHLY SURVIVOR BENEFITS—A COMPARISON

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to use 2 minutes to make a statement and an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not object. The junior Senator from Nebraska has asked unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak for 2 minutes. The senior Senator from Nebraska, however, controls but half of the time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] controls half the time for debate on the pending measure.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I shall ask that I be granted only 1 minute of time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall yield that much time, 1 minute, to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on several previous occasions I have introduced into the RECORD facts and figures relating to tax payments and the benefits of those covered by our two great Federal retirement systems—the Social Security System and the Railroad Retirement System. From the tabulations I have prepared to date, it appears that the terms offered to those covered by social security under the legislation now being considered by the Senate Finance Committee are more favorable than the terms offered to railroad employees under the Railroad Retirement Act.

I now have a tabulation comparing benefits payable out of the two funds to the dependents of insured employees. Dependents' benefits are perhaps even more important than retirement benefits. So long as a man is still alive, he may be able to continue working and support his family, or if he has been successful he may have been able to accumulate something to help him out when he retires. Dependents' benefits are primarily intended to take care of cases where the breadwinner dies relatively young and there must be some provision to take care of his wife and children.

The tabulation I have, which I now want to insert in the RECORD, is labeled exhibit D and compares benefits for widows and children under the Railroad Retirement Act, under the present Social Security Act, and under the provisions of H. R. 6000, as passed by the House of Representatives. It will be noted that in every case the benefits provided for dependents under H. R. 6000 are higher than those provided for men covered by the Railroad Retirement Act. This is true despite the fact the pay-roll tax on railroad men is four times as great as that on employees under the social-security system. Even under the rising scale of tax payments provided in H. R. 6000, the pay-roll deduction from the wages of railroad men will always be about twice as great as that from employees under the social-security system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have referred may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT D.—*Social-security versus railroad-retirement monthly survivor benefits—a comparison*

	Social security, 1950	H. R. 6000, social security proposed	Railroad retirement, 1950
Maximum survivor benefits possible			
Aged widows	$34 20	$48 30	$40.61
Widows with children	34 20	48 30	40 61
Children	22 80	[1] 48 30	27 08
Widow and 1 child	57 00	96 60	67.69
Widow	34 20	48 30	40 61
And 2 children	22 80	[1] 48 30	27. 08
	22 80	32 20	27 08
Total	79 80	128 80	94. 77
Widow and 3 or more children or 4 or more children	21 25	37 50	27 08
	21 25	37 50	27 08
	21 25	37 50	27 08
	21 25	37 50	27 08
Total (prorated equally)	85 00	150 00	108.32
Maximum	85 00	150 00	108 32
Parents	22 80	[1] 48.30	27 08

[1] 75 percent of the primary insurance amount for first child, and parents.

Source: Rail Pension News, published by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Pl., Chicago 43, Ill.

The above exhibit D has been submitted to the Senate Finance Committee now holding hearings on H. R. 6000 for their study and consideration that rail workers should receive the same ratio of increases in benefits now proposed for those covered by social security and has been submitted by Mr. Thomas G. Stack, president of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc. (a voluntary organization of union and nonunion rail workers), February 1950.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton- and peanut-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it is now 12:30. That leaves 3 hours and 30 minutes for the discussion of amendments to the bill, which are now pending, and such amendments as hereafter may be offered. Am I correct in assuming that each side will have one-half of the time, or 1 hour and 45 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the understanding of the Chair; and the Senator from Oklahoma controls half of the time and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] the other half. The time is to be divided equally, allowing for the time required for the roll call and for the transaction of routine business. The Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Nebraska will each have control of 105 minutes, assuming there is no further interruption.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending joint resolution and ask that the amendment be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. An amendment is pending. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma can only be read for the information of the Senate at this time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I submit my amendment and ask that it be read

at the desk for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and lie on the table, and will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, at the end of section 2, it is proposed to add the following: *"Provided,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to offer for sale at the point of storage any potatoes produced in surplus areas and now in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation to wholesalers, jobbers, retailers or consumers, for distribution and consumption in deficit areas, at prices per bushel which will return to the said Commodity Credit Corporation its total investment in such potatoes, including handling and carrying costs· *And provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized to define surplus areas with respect to the production of potatoes and also deficit areas where such potatoes may be distributed: *And provided further,* That this proviso shall be complied with prior to either giving away or the destruction of any potatoes now in the possession of the said Commodity Credit Corporation."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield to myself 15 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The amendment which has just been read for the information of the Senate provides that before the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be permitted to give away any of the potatoes which it now possesses, it shall offer them for sale. The potatoes involved will be the potatoes produced in areas, such as Maine, where there are surplus potatoes. The Commodity Credit Corporation will be authorized by the amendment to sell such surplus potatoes in deficit potato areas, or areas where there are not sufficient potatoes raised to supply the demand. The amendment provides that the surplus potatoes shall be sold in the deficit areas at a price which will return to the Commodity Credit Corporation its cost, considering its purchase price, or take-over price, and its handling and carrying charges. I will ask later that the amendment be called up for consideration by the Senate and for a vote. I hope we may take the amendment to conference and see what we can do to work out a plan for the disposition of our Government-owned potatoes so as to save as much money as possible and at the same time make such potatoes available to consumers in areas where not enough potatoes were produced to serve the demand for such commodity.

Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senate an amendment which is now printed, and which will be offered later. The amendment is known as the Williams-Ives-Saltonstall-Hendrickson amendment. I ask that the amendment be read for the information of Senators, and then I shall state my reasons for opposing the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

That paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (Public Law No. 439, 81st Cong.) and section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as added by subsection (c) of section 409 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, are hereby repealed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this amendment, if it should become the law, would repeal portions of the act which was passed and signed last October. If the amendment should prevail, then the 90-percent support price which the law now provides with respect to certain crops in 1950, would be repealed. It provides that the full flexible support price scheduled for all basic commodities, save tobacco, shall go into effect immediately. That means that the provisions for 90-percent support price for the basic products, save tobacco, for 1950, and the minimum of 80 percent of parity for 1951, shall be repealed.

In fact the amendment, if enacted, will repeal and destroy the present farm-price-support law and program.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is that substantially the bill on this subject the Senate passed early last fall?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is somewhat along that line. It is not the same, but it is substantially the same.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Oklahoma will recall that the Senator from Virginia voted for the Senate bill; he was opposed to the House bill which continued provision for a mandatory 90 percent of parity for the basic crops for this year.

The Senator from Virginia would like to vote again as he voted before, if he can get a clear understanding as to how close this amendment is to what he has previously supported.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The amendment, if agreed to, will repeal the provision of existing law authorizing the use of the highest of either the parity price for the basic commodities, as computed under the old formula, or the price as computed by the modernized formula for a 4-year period.

Mr. President, this amendment brings up the old fight between high prices and low prices for farm products. It seems that the representatives of the industrial East are demanding that those who live in their area receive high prices for the things they produce and at the same time, they are demanding low prices for the things that they consume—products such as food, and cotton and wool for clothing.

Mr. President, I remind those who reside in the industrial East that if the prices of farm products go down, then wages will go down, production will drop, the prices of the things the East produces will go down, and a depression will come again to our country.

We cannot have a prosperous economy with one-fifth of our population—which is what the farmers constitute—receiving for the things they produce prices so low that they are unable to buy the goods produced by industry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will agree with me, I am sure, that even though the amendment I have proposed is adopted, it still will leave the support prices of cotton, wheat, tobacco, and corn higher than the prices the farmers have received for those commodities during the past 10 years. So we shall not be repealing the support prices, for the farmers still are receiving for those commodities more money on the average than they have received for them in the past 10 years.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate rejected a proposed amendment on the theory that we should not change the program after certain crops have been planted. But now it is proposed in connection with the consideration of this amendment, that we make such a change.

Mr. President, I have only a limited amount of time. Although I shall be glad to yield for questions and suggestions, I must yield a part of my time to other Senators. For that reason, I wish to make this issue plain.

Mr. President, in order that this country may survive, in order that the States, the cities, and the counties may survive, all being a part of our Nation, we must have high prices. We must have high prices for farm products; we must have high wages; we must have high salaries; and we must have high prices for the articles produced by industry generally. In no way can we have a high national income, except through high prices. At the present time the goal for farm products is full parity prices. The present law provides a 90 percent of parity as support prices for basic commodities—such as wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. The amendment, if approved will repeal and destroy even the 90 percent of parity support price for the basic farm products.

Mr. President, the record shows that the farmer receives only a relatively small part of the consumer's dollar. When a consumer goes to the store and buys a dollar's worth of bread or a dollar's worth of meat or a dollar's worth of potatoes or any other commodity produced by farmers, the farmer does not receive all of such dollar. The record shows that the farmer gets less than 50 cents of the consumer's dollar. Only in times of unusually high prices do farmers receive as much as 50 percent, or 50 cents, of the consumer's dollar.

Who gets the remainder of the money the consumers pay for food and clothing? The railways receive their full share for transporting the commodity from the place of production to the mill or factory. The railroads have fixed tariff rates so they receive their full share or 100 percent of their rates.

After the commodity reaches the mill where it is processed, the mill receives its full share—not 60 or 80 or 90 per-

cent, but 100 percent of its cost, plus its profits, in connection with the work of processing the commodity.

When the product is processed, it goes to the wholesaler or the jobber, as the case may be, and the wholesaler or the jobber gets his full profit. After the wholesaler or jobber receives his profit, the product goes to the retailer for distribution; and the retailer receives his share in profits for handling the processed commodity.

So when the consumer buys the finished product, he pays for the transportation of the commodity back and forth; for processing, for jobbing or wholesaling, and for the retailer's profit. Then what is left, if anything, the farmer receives. At the present time the farmer receives some 37.8 percent or less than 38 cents out of each dollar consumers pay for their food and clothing. The result is that in times of low prices for farm products, when others who handle such products are receiving 100 percent of their profits, the farmer receives what is left—if anything is left.

So, Mr. President, I am for high prices in order to assure the farmer a fair share of the consumer's dollar. He can get his fair share only when we have relatively high prices for the commodities which he produces.

Mr. President, there is another reason for my opposition to the amendment. At the present time we have a national debt of some $257,000,000,000. We have a national budget of some $42,500,000,000, which must be paid in the form of taxes, if the budget is to be kept in balance. In addition to the Federal budget, we have State, county, city and district budgets totaling some $17,000,000,000, which, added to the $42,500,000,000 Federal budget make a grand total of some $60,000,000,000, which the taxpayers must pay in order to keep the various units of our Government going concerns.

Mr. President, how are we to get $60,000,000,000, in taxes from low price schedules? It has not been done in the past. It is not now being done, and it cannot be done in the future. Only a few years ago, at a time within the memory of every Senator, we had low prices. For example, during 1930, 1931, and 1932, the total income of all the people would not have been sufficient to pay the Federal tax bill for the current year. The only way by which high national income can be developed and maintained is through high prices—high prices for farm commodities, high wages, high salaries, and high prices for the products of industry. Then, of course, in order to be just and fair, all prices must be equalized, so that no group will have an advantage over any other group.

Mr. President, we see today economic conditions wherein industrial prices are rising, wherein wages are increasing, and at the same time we see prices of farm products falling day by day. Mr. President, such conditions cannot be permitted to continue in the United States and I oppose the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, late last Friday afternoon, I undertook to participate in the debate on the pending Wherry amendment, which I interpreted as placing certainly for the time being an embargo on potatoes from Canada. Frankly, I had had no opportunity whatever to study the problem or to prepare anything on the subject, so I requested the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma to give me 10 minutes this morning in which I might attempt to clarify one or two things I had said Friday, and to enable me to give the Senate the benefit of certain information I secured this morning from the State Department

I recall that I said Friday, Canada was our best friend and our best customer. I repeat the statement. I said Canada took $500,000,000 worth of goods from us. What I intended to say was that Canada took $500,000,000 more goods from us than we took from Canada. Canada last year bought from us approximately $2,000,000,000 worth of goods, and we took from Canada approximately $1,500,000,000 worth of goods. I said Canada took from us between three and four times the amount of fresh fruits and vegetables—which, of course, includes potatoes—than we took from Canada. I was unable to answer Friday the charge that the President of the United States and the State Department were negligent in their duty in not restricting imports of potatoes from the 1949 crop, as they had done with respect to the 1948 crop.

This morning I got from the State Department an answer to the question, which is this: Last week the Department of Agriculture approached the State Department with respect to the importation of Canadian potatoes, and the State Department in turn approached the appropriate representatives of Canada, to discuss the matter. In the discussion, the facts were developed that up to last week 6,000,000,000 bushels of Canadian potatoes had been imported by us, and that according to their very best estimates, not more than 3,000,000 additional bushels of potatoes would come into this country, to be divided along established lines between seed and table potatoes. That would be the total of our importation of Canadian potatoes this year out of the crop harvested last fall, and it would be 200,000 to 300,000 bushels less than we took from the 1948 crop under the agreement to curtail importations because of our support price.

So, Mr. President, I think we are now facing a situation in which we are going to get fewer potatoes from Canada than we did last year. Only 3,000,000 more bushels of potatoes, if nothing is done, will be imported, and yet we are asked to enact into law a mandatory embargo upon Canadian potatoes to become effective immediately, because the President would have to take immediate action because of our surplus production; but the law would also stand on our statute books for an indefinite period in the future.

So I wish to invite the attention of my distinguished colleagues to two pertinent facts. One is that we are proposing to do something which will have no practical effect upon the economy of our Nation at this time. Second, the action would be construed as a highly unfavorable action by the Canadian officials, and I fear would have more serious repercussions than that. Why? Because we all know that ECA Administrator Hoffman has been pleading, urging, and almost demanding that the nations of western Europe integrate their economy, break down their tariff barriers, and engage in freer trade among themselves, and in connection with the time when her dollar aid will end he has held out to them the hope that one billion of American dollars they will need can be secured by our accepting an equivalent amount of European goods in our domestic market, which, Mr. Hoffman said, would amount to approximately 1 percent of our total production, and therefore could not possibly hurt this Nation. But if, because of about 3,000,000 bushels of potatoes we put an embargo against a nation which is buying from us $500,000,000 worth of goods more than we buy from it and which spends every dollar it receives for potatoes for our citrus fruits, machinery, or whatever we are selling, why will not European nations believe that when a competitive situation arises we will not treat them with the same kind of selfishness which this amendment proposes that we extend to our neighbor, our best friend, and our best customer?

So I say, with those broad implications, the Senate should not go on record in favor of an amendment of this kind.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia demonstrates how dangerous it is for Members of the Senate to consider an amendment such as that offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] without complete and exhaustive hearings before an appropriate committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. We are living in a dangerous world which is now engaged in a cold war which could some day eventuate into a shooting war. We are living in a world in which we need friends. We still have considerable weight in international affairs, but the situation which now confronts us indicates that we cannot afford to throw it around. I think we should not do something which could easily be construed not only in Canada, where we have good friends, but in other parts of the world where we are trying to get good friends as meaning that we are not dedicated to the fundamental principle of live and let live, and that as soon as we feel that the danger of atomic bombs and other types of bombs dropping on our heads is eliminated, we are going to return to a program of every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield myself one additional minute. A moment ago I had read from the desk an amendment which I shall call up after 4 o'clock today. In order that I shall not then take unnecessary time, I wish to submit a copy of a letter which I sent to Secretary Brannan on February 24, 1950, and I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed immediately after the reading of the amendment, which will come after 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have had made an analysis of House Joint Resolution 398 and Senate bill 2919, which will be in conference. This analysis comes from a man who is competent to make such an analysis. His name is Horace Hayden. I ask unanimous consent that the analysis be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA COTTON GINNERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Oklahoma City, Okla., February 24, 1950.

Subject: Analysis of House Joint Resolution 398 and S 2919, correction of 1949 cotton acreage allotment law

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: The cotton acreage allotments laws have become so terribly involved and complicated and there are so many unknown factors that it is difficult to make an analysis with assurance that conclusions will be entirely correct.

In the 1938 law there was provision by which the total tilled acres of every cotton farm was taken into consideration From the total tilled acres was deducted the acreage devoted to other basic crops, the remainder left the total acreage available for cotton This total acreage was divided into the county allotment which gave a percentage factor to be used by the county committee in alloting acreage. The law provided that all farms should be given the same percentage of its available cotton acreage The effect of this provision was to cut down the man specializing on cotton and increasing the acreage of the farmer who only planted a small amount of cotton

In preparing the 1949 cotton acreage law, we from Oklahoma and several other States objected to that method of arriving at cotton allotments. We requested that the law provide that after the cotton history had been established for all farms in the county, that the cotton history be adjusted percentagewise to the county's allotment It is a simple way of handling the matter and to our way of thinking it is the only fair way to handle this allotment We were told that the Department insisted on the tillable acres formula rather than the cotton history formula. It looked so involved to a number of us and we felt it would create many inequities and hardships. During hearings the Department apparently made no objections to the tillable acres formula and left us with the impression that they would insist on that method in arriving at farm allotments We now understand that the Department claims that this formula is too complicated and creates many inequities and that they would much prefer to have the cotton history formula used It is too late to make that change for 1950.

The tillable-acres formula was further complicated by reason of war crops as provided in Public Law 12. That created cotton farms that have long since changed their cropping system and are not in position to plant cotton. They still have allotments granted them, even though a great many are surprised in receiving a cotton allotment and would be more than willing to surrender their allotment for use by other farmers in that county.

You will recall that in the Senate bill 1962, provision was made by which any unplanted acreage could be either surrendered permanently or for 1 year, in order to correct the inequities of the tillable acreage formula That provision was eliminated in the House, and it is our opinion that this particular point is causing most of the difficulties throughout the cotton South. Oklahoma experienced this difficulty under the 1938 law, and we were quite anxious that we not experience it again Texas had a similar experience, but not quite as severe as in Oklahoma We felt at the time that many other States would experience similar difficulties, principally by reason of changes in cropping systems and by reason of cotton credits created under Public Law 12

It is our understanding that some of the States which objected and helped eliminate the reallotment provision of S. 1962, have now admitted that this was an error

So far as I can learn, all States are fairly well satisfied with the total cotton allotment for the State as provided in Public Law 272, but the method of making allotments to farms is causing general dissatisfaction over the entire belt. In Oklahoma we feel that Public Law 272, if unchanged, will cause 30 percent of our allotment to be unplanted We had hoped that could be corrected to a larger extent by the surrender and reallotment of unused acreage and were prepared to get most of the unplanted acreage released for reallotment

House Joint Resolution 398, together with a flood of other bills in both Houses, was introduced in an effort to correct the mistake made in eliminating the reallotment provision of S 1962

We believe the meat of the whole situation is some method of getting the States' allotment planted and not increasing the allotment for any State above the amount provided in the 21,000,000-acre national allotment We believe that can only be accomplished by leaving to the discretion of county committees and not by application of a fixed rule laid down by the Secretary.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 398

Section I of that bill provided that every farm shall have a minimum of—

(a) 70 percent of the acreage of the 1946 47-48 cotton acreage; or

(b) 50 percent of the highest acreage of any one of those years. (Both of the above provisions include acreage in War Corp Credits), but

(c) No farm shall be allotted more than 40 percent of his total tilled acreage

Section II of that bill provides that acreage which will not be planted to cotton may be released by holder of allotment and deducted from his allotment, to be used to supply the minimum acreage as provided in section I.

Any surrendered acreage remaining after providing the minimum acreage described above may be reapportioned in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable to other farms in same county receiving allotments, which the Secretary determines are inadequate.

The legislative report on that bill reads, "In the absence of some very exceptional circumstances, however, no farm having a cotton history could be said to have an inadequate allotment if its allotment was equal to the larger of 70 percent of the amount planted or regarded as planted during the years, 1946 47 48; or 50 percent of the highest acreage planted or regarded as planted in any one of such years, and not in excess of 40 percent of the acreage tilled annually or in regular rotation."

You can see from the above that any acreage surrendered over and above the amount necessary to provide minimums set out above, must be used on small farms or new farms In fact will not be used at all.

If unplanted acreage is surrendered in sufficient volume to provide the minimums set out above, the County and State will not suffer in future years If the unplanted acreage is not surrendered in sufficient volume then the acres necessary to provide the minimums as set out above are only temporary and will be eliminated in considering the actual planted acreage for future years. Under this provision there is no incentive for the farmer to release his acreage because it is released almost permanently. We believe that provision will mean the reduction in Oklahoma's cotton history of at least 200,000 acres for 1951 and future years. This is indicative of what will happen to many other States.

It is only a stopgap for 1950 and will cause terrific repercussions and distortion of all State allotments after 1950

S 2919

The Senate has deleted the entire House bill and substituted the principal provisions of S 2919, changed slightly in view of later thinking

The Senate version provides in the first section that any unplanted acreage may be surrendered without reservation by the farmer who has changed his cropping system and does not intend to plant cotton in the future. Illustration. (Turned to grass, legumes or other crops that cannot be easily changed from year to year) or if the farmer is planting cotton in a rotation with other crops he may surrender his cotton allotment for 1 year without reducing his allotment in future years by such surrender

The Senate bill reads that acreage so surrendered may (should read shall) be reapportioned to other farms in the State, preference being given to other farms in the same county as original allotment. Reapportionment to be made to farms with inadequate allotments in view of past production records.

Up to this point the Senate bill does the thing that we believe should be done. It eliminates the mathematical formula which has been written into previous laws or bills.

We do not believe that any mathematical formula can be used without creating serious handicaps and hardships in many areas, if not all of them We believe that if the bill should stop at that point, it would probably serve the purpose of correcting many of the inequities caused by Public Law 272.

The next section of the Senate bill provides that no farm shall have less than 60 percent of the average of the 1946–47–48 planted acreage or acreage regarded as having been planted, but contains a limitation that not more than 40 percent of the tilled land after deducting from farms the acreage devoted to other basic crops.

In Oklahoma this means that the wheat and peanut acreage shall be deducted before arriving at the acreage to be devoted to cotton. On most farms deduction of acreage in other basic crops will have no effect because the majority of the farmers are specialists just like manufacturers and they are either specializing in cotton or some other crop. However, on an estimated one-sixth of the farms in this State this limitation will work a serious hardship

The 60 percent of the average or 40-percent limitation of S 2919, is an effort to force diversification or rotation of crops. We believe that the 70-percent provision with a 40 percent of total tilled acres as provided in the House bill, will accomplish that result with much less hardship than the provision of the Senate bill This rigid limitation with low average of cotton history will force a

great deal of land to be left entirely out of cultivation for the reason that those farmers do not have the equipment, training or the type of land to be devoted to other crops. We really believe that provision in the House bill is almost too rigid in itself to be imposed on farmers without notice. Certainly the provisions of the Senate bill are entirely too stringent.

It is our conclusion after intensive study with all agencies concerned that if the first section of the Senate bill could be used alone without the provisions of the average planted acreage or the limitation of cropland to be devoted to cotton, the county committee could work out most of the hardship cases, but we do believe that the reapportionment of surrendered acreage should be left to the county committee and not under arbitrary rules that may be set up by the Secretary for use in every county of the belt. It is impossible for one rule to work equally in all counties

If it is necessary to have a limitation on the average planted acreage and a limitation on the crop land to be devoted to cotton, then we believe the minimums as provided in the House bill would cause less hardship, not only in Oklahoma but every other State, than the limitation as provided in the Senate bill.

Both bills provide that the farmer may have a reasonable length of time in which to make application for adjustment under the revised law We believe that should be retained. The House bill provides for 15 days period and we presume that this means 15 days after the passage by both Houses of the bill. The Senate bill does not set a time limit. We feel that 15 days is too short a time for the committee to acquaint all cotton farmers of their privileges Even though planting time is near, we believe that time should be increased to 20 days

We also believe that the Senate bill can be handled as a permanent revision which is not in the House bill.

Without question, if the House version is adopted in the present form, it will call for another bill to correct the 1951 and future acreages. Otherwise the allotments in 1951 will be in a much worse shape than they are now.

Very truly yours,

HORACE HAYDEN,
Secretary.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield myself 25 minutes. I have no exception to take with reference to the amount of business done between Canada and the United States, but I state that a close analysis of the subject, if the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the majority leader had made such an analysis, would disclose that the difference in the balance of trade is not based wholly on exports from the United States to Canada or imports from Canada to the United States. I want to stress that my amendment, which would stop imports of potatoes only when we had more than we knew what to do with, is being objected to on the ground that some foreign countries might resent it. It simply will not work out that way.

The purposes and principles of the amendment were not objected to. The distinguished Senator from Virginia said that he agreed with the objectives of the junior Senator from Nebraska, but that he disagreed with the methods by which the result was to be accomplished. That is the interpretation I placed on what the Senator said.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Nebraska has made a correct interpretation of my statement.

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Nebraska wants, therefore, to explain his amendment in terms of foreign relations, to demonstrate that it is logical and sound from every angle, and that the method of procedure is entirely correct.

It involves no ill will and will cause none.

The nations which signed the multilateral agreement at Geneva in 1947 and 1948, foresaw the possibility of surpluses. They foresaw that it would be manifestly unfair to force one nation to add to its own surpluses by absorbing those of other nations, and they specifically provided for just such a contingency.

Under this agreement, any nation with a surplus might, with complete peace of mind, and without in any way antagonizing another nation, prevent that surplus from being swelled by additional imports.

Our neighbor on the north, shut off shipments of table potatoes to the United States by agreement made pursuant to the terms of the earlier trade agreement the United States had with that country.

It will be seen that Canada did so, because the Geneva trade agreement provided for just exactly that means of protecting America's agricultural price-support programs.

The principal supplier of potatoes imported into the United States, has rigidly restricted imports of agricultural and other products from the United States and has completely shut off many American products. No element of retaliation on the part of either nation was involved. The diplomats of our State Department realized that Canada's embargoes, quotas, import licenses, and other restrictions on imports of goods from the United States, were born of necessity, exactly as is the amendment which is before the Senate.

The countries which signed the Geneva trade agreement have already consented to this amendment.

Article 11 of that agreement, to which most of the countries which export potatoes to the United States adhere, is headed "General elimination of quantitative restrictions" I read paragraph 1. This is the over-all statement:

No prohibitions or restrictions other than duties, taxes or other charges, whether made effective through quotas, import or export licenses or other measures, shall be instituted or maintained by any contracting party on the importation of any product of the territory of any other contracting party or on the exportation or sale for export of any product destined for the territory of any other contracting party.

Paragraph 2 reads:

The provisions of paragraph 1 of this article—

Which I just read—

shall not extend to the following—

This is the first exception—

Import restrictions on any agricultural or fisheries product, imported in any form, necessary to the enforcement of governmental measures which operate—

Now I read indentation 2, under subparagraph (C)—

to remove a temporary surplus of the like domestic product.

That is as plain as the English language can be, and it takes care of the very situation we have at hand.

How could we do other than admit that the signers of this document intended to, and did, provide for limiting imports of a product that was in surplus in the importing country?

There was a complete meeting of the minds on this point that it would be applied, and it has been applied, on a number of occasions by other countries for reasons of State, such as exchange difficulties. We realized that and we continued to operate under that provision of the exception to the general provision.

Indentation 1 of subparagraph (C) discusses marketing and production limitation. That was brought out by the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who asked why we should permit surpluses as long as we have marketing limitations and quotas in this country and provide price supports for all the surpluses from other countries. This provision states that the general elimination of quantitative restrictions made effective by article 11 shall not apply to agricultural products which are domestically controlled by marketing or production programs.

In this instance, however, unlike the paragraph in which surpluses are mentioned, that is, subparagraph 2, a provision at the end of the article states that import restrictions because of marketing or production programs "shall not be such as will reduce the total of imports relative to the total of domestic production as compared with the proportion which might reasonably be expected to rule between the two in the absence of restrictions."

Therefore the exception to the exception barred the amendment which I originally offered, because we have marketing quotas and restrictions imposed in the United States. That is the whole thing in a nutshell.

It then goes on to say that in determining this proposition due regard shall be paid to a previous representative period.

It seems clear that we should only limit imports to the normal proportion when we have a domestic marketing or production program. If we restrict domestic output or sales, then we can restrict imports in the same proportion.

Surpluses were specifically and intentionally considered different problems, requiring more drastic measures That is why this surplus clause was placed in the agreement, and we should take advantage of it just as Canada has.

The agreement does not in any sense infer nor state that they should not be eased by shutting off imports. If there had been any intention, even the slightest intention, to prevent this amendment or similar amendments from being adopted, then surely the agreement would have so stated. It did

so state in the case of marketing programs, as I just mentioned, and by the very omission of such a statement with regard to surpluses it provided for just exactly what is proposed here.

My desire to maintain rigidly the foreign commitments made by our State Department, much as I disagree with some of them, led me to revise my first proposed amendment so that it would conform to the spirit as well as the letter of the Geneva agreement. That is exactly why I did it, because the exception to the exception eliminated the amendment so far as the letter or the spirit of the law was concerned, even though marketing quotas were imposed. Here is a provision by which the surplus is taken care of. There is no exception to it. We are supposed to rely on it, as are Canada and the other 23 countries.

It should be clear that we are following exactly the course that was provided for in that agreement. It is the course other countries would follow in similar circumstances.

It is the logical, sensible course, as was foreseen by those who drafted and signed the controlling trade agreement. There is no room for the slightest feeling of retaliation. There could not possibly be any inference that we, by the adoption of this amendment, would be "taking a crack" at any nation or group of nations. It is a business proposition operated in the friendliest of terms and one forced upon us by the circumstances that created a surplus in this country and in other countries as well.

When the 1948 crop turned out to be larger than our requirements, Canada, with no ill feelings on the subject, responded to an appeal by this country to limit exports of potatoes. A willingness to compromise indicated a knowledge on the part of both countries that drastic action was necessary. It was recognized that the United States could have completely eliminated all imports under the terms of all our domestic laws and foreign agreements concerning potatoes.

It was also recognized, as it should be now, that the net result would be the same no matter how the agreement was negotiated, namely, that of preventing imports from swelling the large surplus in the United States.

Mr. President, I desire now to read from the actual text of the official letter, which is a part of the agreement which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] mentioned when we were debating this matter in the Senate. This was sent to the Canadian representative and signed by Robert A. Lovett, Acting Secretary of State of the United States. This quotation states our quid pro quo or share in the agreement:

In view of the adverse effect which unrestricted imports of Canadian potatoes would have on the potato programs of the United States and the fact that it is anticipated that the Canadian proposal will substantially reduce the quantity of potatoes which would otherwise be imported into the United States, and in the interest of international trade between the United States and Canada and other considerations, the United States Government assures the Canadian Government that it will not hereafter impose any quantitative limitations or fees on Canadian potatoes of the 1948 crop imported into the United States under the system of regulating the movement of potatoes to the United States outlined in the Canadian proposal.

Mr. President, those are the very words which were used. That was the proposition made a year ago. It is the same we are asking for now. It was not retaliation then, and it is not retaliation now.

The United States was wielding a big stick in that agreement.

The Canadian Government knew, and we knew, that we could shut off imports of those potatoes, and that public opinion would probably force that action. So there was an agreement.

There was no thought of retaliation. There was no intention on the part of Mr. Lovett or anyone else to create any ill will between countries. There was no antagonism between the negotiators, and there certainly is none now.

The result of all this was just exactly the same as we have in mind now, except that the former agreement did allow the shipment of potatoes marked for seed. The situation then was not nearly as bad as it is now, and we are going a little further than did the former agreement.

The present situation calls for quick, decisive action. It comes several months later in the year than did the November 1948 agreement. Imports are much larger, and we are already destroying millions of pounds of our own 1949 crop. None of this congressional action would be necessary otherwise.

I cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, believe that Canada will take it unkindly, or even think of retaliation. Their business sense will certainly point out to them the fairness of a proposition which would designate to each respective nation the job of taking care of its own surpluses. If they have a surplus of potatoes, then they have our deepest sympathy, because we are afflicted with the same malady, only to a much greater extent

Let there be no equivocation or misunderstanding. The amendment would require us to cease importing potatoes only when and if we had more than we could find use for, as is provided in the amendment.

What could be more fair or businesslike? What infinitesimal ground for retaliation is there? With respect to that angle, I may state some very interesting facts which bring out this friendly attitude between our countries.

Canada issued an order on November 18, 1947, prohibiting—not just limiting, but prohibiting—the importation from the United States and other countries of a wide variety of agricultural and other commodities.

This embargo had a serious effect on a great many farmers, fruit growers, and manufacturers in the United States. These men and these companies, for many years, had marketed a part of their output in Canada. Suddenly, without prior warning, shipments were shut off.

Among the items affected were fresh fruits; all fresh vegetables, except potatoes and onions; most dried fruits; most canned and packaged goods; beans, peas, rice, peanut butter, honey, molasses, cigars and cigarettes, poultry, eggs, and meat. In addition, typewriters, radios, automobile tires, furniture, pianos, fur coats, and many, many other articles were affected. Apples, onions, and citrus fruits were permitted to enter, but only up to 50 percent of the 1946 level.

A month or so later the embargo list was considerably enlarged to include paper sacks, facial tissues, wax-coated paper, plywood, and a number of other articles.

Was there retaliation on the part of the United States? Certainly not. Did we take action to nullify, insofar as possible, any of these restrictions? Certainly not. Our farmers and manufacturers objected, for their loss of markets was quite serious to them.

This country, however, realized that these actions by our northern neighbors seemed to those promulgating the laws advisable and necessary and we did not take it as any slap at the United States.

Here is an interesting feature of these strict embargoes and quotas adopted by Canada. The announcement was officially made just 4 hours after the publication of the signing and effective date of the comprehensive tariff reductions made under the Geneva trade agreement. In other words, our agreement for the mutual reduction of tariff barriers to which Canada was a party was announced just 4 hours before that country rendered almost all her concessions ineffective.

The United States did not retaliate. Of course not. The friendly, though businesslike, relations between the two countries were not affected.

It is only fair to say that many of the severe restrictions placed upon shipments of goods from the United States to Canada have been modified Quotas have been enlarged and import licenses are granted more freely than before.

Canada, however, has little ground on which to object to this one single restriction on potatoes, when we have too many of our own.

Speaking of potatoes, Canada issued an order on April 21, 1948, prohibiting the importation of potatoes, including sweet potatoes, from scheduled countries, including the United States. This prohibition was for the period April to June to shut out the early potatoes from the Carolinas, Virginia, and other southern areas. No one retaliated.

In May of 1948 Canada prohibited the importation of a number of new items, including parts for repairing radios and many kinds of machinery.

In June of 1948 another list of new items under prohibition was issued.

On November 1, 1948, the severe restrictions on imports into Canada of lettuce and tomatoes were eased somewhat.

It was then announced that restrictions would later be eased on imports of cabbage, celery, spinach, and carrots.

The official proclamation specifically stated that the relaxations would occur later as they were to be timed so as not to prejudice the normal marketing of Canadian produce.

I quote the Foreign Commerce Weekly of November 15, 1948:

Imports (into Canada) of each of the commodities will be authorized only when advancing prices or short supplies indicate depleted domestic stocks.

I submit, Mr. President, that is all the pending amendment seeks to do. In fact, we do not intend to go nearly that far. We would limit imports only when we have an undisposable surplus.

The amendment conforms with the trade agreements. It comes within the letter of the law and it comes within the spirit of the law. A year ago we took similar action. Action along the same lines can now be taken, and it should be taken, because the potato surplus is greater than it was a year ago.

On that particular subject I wish to say for the record that up to date the importation of potatoes from Canada has been 6,000,000 bushels. The figures given to me by the experts of the Department of Agriculture, in conjunction with those of other agencies, show that the estimate of imports for this crop year is about 15,000,000 bushels, not 6,000,000 bushels or 9,000,000 bushels. Translated into dollars and cents it means upward of $20,000. If the majority leader is desirous of economizing, here is the best place I know to begin economizing, for a saving of $20,000,000 can here be made. It can be made by an action which is within the law. We insist that surpluses in this country not be supported in the case of farmers who have no acreage or marketing quotas. Why should Canadian farmers who have no acreage or marketing quotas be protected by us, when we do not protect our own farmers who have acreage or marketing quotas?

So, in summary, the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska conforms to existing law. It complies with international trade agreements. Action similar to that I propose was taken by the Administration a year ago, and it can be taken again if Congress desires to do so.

Everyone can see there is a tremendous surplus of potatoes, and everyone knows that Congress is obligated to act.

Adoption of my amendment is necessary as a temporary expedient for the protection of the American economy.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. President, how much more time has the junior Senator from Nebraska?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4½ minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply regret that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is not now on the floor. I want the Senate to know that the facts I have given relative to surplus potatoes were authenticated and given to me by officials of the Department of Agriculture. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is on the floor. He is deeply interested in this particular legislation. I appeal to those who are acquainted with the subject and with the present emergency. The estimate of surplus potatoes is in the neighborhood of from sixty to seventy million bushels. If 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes are shipped into the United States from a country whose farmers are not affected by United States quotas or United States restrictions with respect to planting, and that country receives the benefit of our price support for their surplus potatoes, what does that mean? What are we doing with our own surplus of potatoes? We are selling them for 1 cent a hundred pounds. Mr. President, I say it is the duty of every Senator to save the taxpayer every dime that can be saved to him, and a considerable sum of money can be saved by the adoption of my amendment, which comes within the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act. It is our duty to take advantage of such an opportunity. We should do so this year in face of a surplus which, it seems, will be nearly twice as large as that of last year. If potatoes are imported into the United States at the same rate as importations during the first part of the crop year—and the importations during the first part of the year were 6,000,000 bushels—there will be upward of 15,000,000 bushels imported. I base that statement on the estimate made by the Department of Agriculture experts. In view of that fact, I say the amendment should be adopted. The amendment would do this year exactly what the administration did last year.

Mr. President, there will be no retaliation as a result of the adoption of my amendment. No one has more sympathy with nor greater good will toward Canada than has the junior Senator from Nebraska. I appreciate every dollar's worth of business we receive from Canada. But why should we guarantee to the growers of potatoes in a foreign country a price support for their potatoes on a vague theory that it is good business for us to do so. I say it is not good business for us to do so. I repeat, there will be no retaliation for the action proposed by my amendment. Such action should be taken now. I hope the Senate will adopt my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend ment offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma if he cares to use any of his time now.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have agreed to give those who sponsor the wheat amendment 30 minutes of the time controlled by me. I prefer that the time be taken on the question now before us, before I yield 30 minutes on the wheat amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] desires to speak, but he wishes to speak after the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has presented his amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, it occurs to the Senator from New York that it might be well to proceed with the other amendment prior to the one to be offered by the Senator from Delaware, because the amendment of the Senator from Delaware is a complete substitute.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, at the present time the proponents of the so-called wheat amendment are not on the floor. In order that we may not lose time I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to present arguments in favor of an amendment to be later offered for himself and in behalf of Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and Senator HOLLAND, of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, each amendment will be argued separately and voted upon at 4 o'clock. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Voting will begin at 4 o'clock.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment, which I submitted last Friday, be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. . For the crop year of 1951 and thereafter no price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose here to discuss again in detail the potato amendments. It will be recalled that last Friday the Senate adopted the so-called Aiken substitute amendment to the Lucas amendment. One of the main reasons advanced for the adoption of that substitute amendment was that it permitted the Government to carry out its moral obligation to the growers of potatoes throughout the Nation, in contrast to the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. It will also be recalled that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois provided that no price support would be made available to any Irish potato grower for his 1950 crop after the enactment of the joint resolution, which meant that Congress would have to take affirmative action almost immediately in order that the potato growers of the Nation might be in a position to receive 1950 support prices.

The Aiken amendment, on the contrary, provided that until the Congress acted, the farmers growing potatoes would be entitled to price support.

My amendment simply provides that Congress must act by 1951 in order that potato farmers may be in a position to receive price support for the 1951 crop. My amendment does not in any manner affect the potato growers insofar as price supports are concerned for the 1950 crop. It affects growers only for the 1951 crop and thereafter.

Mr. President, as I pointed out some time ago, I know that the Agricultural Committee of the House as well as the Agricultural Committee of the Senate have tried on many occasions to provide an effective law dealing with potato surpluses, that is to say, a law which would sufficiently encourage the farmers who produce potatoes to agree to curtailment of their acreage in production. That is the only way we can prevent these huge surpluses. I can see no reason why a potato grower should be in a different position from that of a cotton farmer, a wheat farmer, or a producer of any of the other basic crops. In order that a wheat farmer or a cotton farmer may obtain support for the price of his commodity, it is necessary that the farmers producing that commodity vote among themselves to impose a quota restriction—a curtailment of their acreage. I contend that the same method should be imposed on the growers of potatoes. There is no reason why it should not be done.

As I pointed out last Friday, the marketing agreements have been ineffective, insofar as they have been used in an effort to curtail a surplus of potatoes. As late as September of last year, only 55 percent of the potato growers of the Nation had agreed to marketing agreements; the others did not enter into any agreements at all. We should note that last year the Department of Agriculture made an effort to support not only potatoes produced under marketing agreements which amounted to 55 percent of the 1949 crop, but also potatoes produced not subject to any sort of marketing agreements—45 percent of the last season's yield. As a consequence of price support of this type an enormous surplus of potatoes has been produced each year. We cannot curb the surplus production unless and until Congress passes a law permitting the potato growers to impose upon themselves the same kind of quota adopted by the wheat growers or the cotton growers.

I repeat, Mr. President, as I said on Friday, any farmer who expects his Government to support the price of his commodity should be willing to impose quota restrictions upon himself. A number of persons have said that means regimentation. That may be; but I say this is done by the farmer in a democratic way, after an affirmative vote by two-thirds of the growers. Only if the cotton farmers or the wheat farmers or the corn farmers agree to vote curtailment of their acreage, will there be a curtailment and I believe that the same, identical method should apply to the producers of potatoes.

The amendment I propose simply gives notice to the potato growers of the Nation that if they expect price supports from their Government during the year 1951 and thereafter they must lend their support to the enactment of a law which will permit the Department of Agriculture to say to the potato growers, "You may plant only so many acres of potatoes each year." If the potato growers give their unqualified support, I am satisfied that Congress will enact such a law. They are entitled to a price-support program if they are willing to accept marketing quotas.

As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] stated last Friday, his committee now stands ready to begin hearings on legislation to carry out that proposal. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Mr. President, I wish to say that I shall cheerfully and gladly assist, to the extent of my ability, in the enactment of a law which will permit the potato farmers of the United States to impose upon themselves a quota system similar to that which now applies to the producers of all of our basic crops. At the proper time, I should like to submit my amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have proposed an amendment, and I shall offer it at the proper time.

However, I think perhaps the distinguished chairman of the committee and other members of the committee with whom I have conferred will accept the amendment for the purpose of taking it to conference and there considering it.

I should like to put into the RECORD at this point section 359 (b) of the law as it pertained to the use of excess peanuts for oil purposes, prior to its repeal. I also offer for the RECORD, in that connection, a statement explanatory of that portion of the law and how it was administered under the law as it has heretofore existed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Is there objection?

There being no objection, section 359 (b) and the explanatory statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 359 (b) was as follows:

"Beginning with the 1941 crop of peanuts, payment of the penalty of 3 cents per pound upon the marketing of peanuts as provided in subsection (a) above will not be required if such excess peanuts are delivered to or marketed through an agency or agencies designated each year by the Secretary or if the producer pays to the United States, with respect to excess peanuts which, when marketed, were identified in the manner prescribed in the regulations of the Secretary as quota peanuts, an amount determined under regulations of the Secretary to represent the amount received for the peanuts in excess of the amount which would have been received had such peanuts been delivered to a designated agency as excess peanuts. Any peanuts received under this subsection by such agency shall be sold by such agency (i) for crushing for oil under a sales agreement approved by the Secretary; (ii) for cleaning and shelling at prices not less than those established for quota peanuts under any peanut diversion, peanut loan, or peanut purchase program; or (iii) for seed at prices established by the Secretary. For all peanuts so delivered to a designated agency under this subsection, producers shall be paid for the portion of the lot constituting excess peanuts, the market value thereof for crushing for oil as of the date of such delivery less the estimated cost of storing, handling, and selling such peanuts but not less than prices established by the Secretary pursuant to authority contained in existing law. Any person who, pursuant to the provisions of this subsection, acquires peanuts for crushing for oil and who uses or disposes of such peanuts for any purpose other than that for which acquired shall pay a penalty of 3 cents per pound upon the peanuts so used or disposed of and shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both, for each and every offense. Operations under this subsection shall be carried on under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, and the operations of any agency designated to receive and market peanuts may be separate from or combined with operations of other agencies."

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The peanut program operated under this provision The Secretary of Agriculture designated the peanut co-ops as his agencies to receive and market the excess peanuts which were grown.

Those co-ops were the VA-NC Peanut Co-Op, for Virginia, North Carolina, and a part of South Carolina, the GFA for Georgia, Florida, and Alabama and possibly some border States which produced limited quantities of peanuts, and the Southwest Peanut Association for Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, etc

These co-ops, as buyers or agents for the Secretary, maintain buyers at the principal peanut markets and they received and stored the excess peanuts. Then in turn the co-ops sold the excess peanuts to the mills to be crushed into oil.

One year at least, there developed a shortage in quota peanuts for edible purposes, and it was fortunate that these excess peanuts were available and a good quantity of them were sold to the edible trade at the full support price Later, the profit made on these excess peanuts was distributed among peanut growers

There were, of course, some cases where the peanut producer undertook to market some of his excess peanuts as quota peanuts But no excessive number of violations were ever reported to me and in addition there have since been some changes in the law which tends to make such violations less likely. These changes are contained in Public Law 323 of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I also offer for the RECORD, and ask to have printed at this point, a copy of the act to amend the peanut-marketing provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, approved August 1, 1947, together with an explanatory statement.

There being no objection, the act and explanatory statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Public Law 323—80th Cong.]

[Ch. 445—1st sess.]

[H. R. 4124]

An act to amend the peanut-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That section 358 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., title 7, sec 1358), is amended by striking the last sentence of subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The amount of the marketing quota for each farm shall be the actual production of the farm acreage allotment, and no peanuts shall be marketed under the quota for any farm other than peanuts actually produced on the farm."

SEC. 2. Section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (U. S C., title 7, sec. 1359), is amended as follows:

(1) By changing the first sentence of subsection (a) to read as follows: "The marketing of any peanuts in excess of the marketing quota for the farm on which such peanuts are produced, or the marketing of peanuts from any farm for which no acreage allotment was determined, shall be subject to a penalty at a rate equal to 50 percent of the basic rate of the loan (calculated to the nearest tenth of a cent) for farm marketing quota peanuts for the marketing year August 1–July 31."

(2) By striking out the last sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Peanuts produced in a calendar year in which marketing quotas are in effect for the marketing year beginning therein shall be subject to such quotas even though the peanuts are marketed prior to the date on which such marketing year begins. If any producer falsely identifies or fails to account for the disposition of any peanuts, an amount of peanuts equal to the normal yield of the number of acres harvested in excess of the farm acreage allotment shall be deemed to have been marketed in excess of the marketing quota for the farm, and the penalty in respect thereof shall be paid and remitted by the producer. If any amount of peanuts produced on one farm is falsely identified by a representation that such peanuts were produced on another farm, the acreage allotments next established for both such farms shall be reduced by that percentage which such amount was of the respective farm marketing quotas, except that such reduction for any such farm shall not be made if the Secretary through the local committees finds that no person connected with such farm caused, aided, or acquiesced in such marketing; and if proof of the disposition of any amount of peanuts is not furnished as required by the Secretary, the acreage allotment next established for the farm on which such peanuts are produced shall be reduced by a percentage similarly computed."

(3) By striking subsection (b) and redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g), as subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

Approved August 1, 1947.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

From this act you will observe:

1. That the marketing quota for each farm is confined to the actual production of the allotted acreage, while previously the marketing quota was either the actual production or the normal production, whichever was greater;

2. That the penalty on the marketing of excess peanuts was increased from 3 cents per pound to 50 percent of the support price;

3. That if any producer falsely certifies or fails to account for the disposition of any peanuts, he will be deemed to have marketed excess peanuts to the extent of the normal yield of the total excess acreage;

4. If a producer misrepresents peanuts produced on one farm as having been produced on another farm, then the acreage allotments in the future for both of such farms shall be reduced by the same percentage that the falsely certified peanuts bears to the marketing quotas for each such farm.

It must be admitted that these changes and additional penalties will make violations far less tempting and far less likely than they were under the program previous to the passage of this act.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about this amendment. It has been in the law; it is not new. It only permits the crushing of excess peanuts—that is to say, peanuts grown over and above the quota—for oil purposes at the market price. There is no subsidy, no support price, in that regard.

Question has arisen that perhaps in complete fairness to the producers of soybeans, I should modify or amend my amendment. At the proper time I shall offer to it an amendment or modification simply providing that if the Secretary imposes acreage controls and marketing controls on soybeans, then, notwithstanding the provisions of this act, he shall have full power to impose restrictions upon the marketing of oil produced from peanuts grown on excess acreage.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The price paid for peanuts which are to be crushed for oil is lower, is it not, than the 40 percent of parity paid for other peanuts?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; very much lower.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator give us some idea of what that price is?

Mr. GEORGE. Peanut oil is now selling for about 14 cents a pound. At present market prices, it is not feasible to plant peanuts to be used for the production of peanut oil. The peanut oil is produced only from the extra peanuts. Under the Marketing Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to reduce the peanut acreage to the point which will meet only the trade requirements for edible peanuts. Therefore, such a provision would eventually eliminate the production of peanut oil, unless oil from peanuts produced on excess acreage could be sold at the prevailing market price.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask another question, to bring out what I have in mind. Let us say that a farmer produced peanuts which would not be acceptable at price support, under the parity formula. Could such a producer of peanuts go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and, even though the peanuts would be used to produce peanut oil, be able in any way to receive the support price under the 90 percent guaranty provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act?

Mr. GEORGE. Not at all. Any excess peanuts must be used only for oil purposes by agencies designated by the Secretary of Agriculture himself.

Mr. President, as I have said, I wish to add to my amendment, by way of amendment or modification of it, a further provision reading in substance, that in the event the Secretary imposes acreage restrictions or marketing restrictions on soybeans, notwithstanding the provisions of this act, he shall have the same power and authority to control the planting of excess peanuts, even for oil purposes.

Mr. President, peanuts already are under strict quotas. The one real difficulty in that connection arises from the fact that the penalty for any excess planting is very high. The penalty now is 50 percent of the support price, if the farmer overplants his acrage and undertakes to sell in any way at all the peanuts produced on the excess acreage.

So, Mr. President, I amend or modify my amendment before I offer it. After modifying it in the way I have just indicated, I now offer the amendment.

In this connection, I ask that a brief statement in connection with the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The proposed amendment to again authorize the planting of excess acreage of peanuts is very necessary for the following reasons:

1. Peanut acreage has already been reduced approximately 40 percent, that is, 20 percent in 1949 and another 20 percent in 1950. Such reductions have already substantially reduced the economic welfare of peanut growers.

2. Another reduction in peanut acreage, of between 10 and 20 percent, is quite likely in 1951 as it is anticipated that a normal crop on the 2,100,000 acres allotted for 1950 will produce a surplus of peanuts for edible purposes. Such further reductions next year will mean that the acreage of the peanut producer will be reduced at least in half, if not more

3 For the most part, peanuts and cotton are produced in the same areas. Marketing quotas are now also in effect for cotton and this year the cotton growers will suffer a substantial reduction in cotton acreage, some more than 50 percent if the pending resolution is not enacted, and many as much as 40 percent if the pending resolution is enacted While the national cotton acreage for this year is 21,000,000 acres, resulting in these reductions, the Secretary will be required under the Cotton Quota Act to further reduce cotton acreage in 1951 to about 17,500,000 acres Reduction in the acreage even below that figure is contemplated in 1952.

4. A reduction in peanut acreage of 50 percent or more, together with the reduction in cotton acreage in an equal amount, will make idle millions of acres of land in the cotton-peanut areas and will make it impossible for the farmers in those areas to produce sufficient crops for the support of their families.

5. It is not contemplated, nor would it be worth while, for any farmer to plant only excess peanut acreage, because the price of peanuts to be crushed into oil is not sufficient to cover cost. But, as the farmer must have the labor and equipment to plant his allotted acreage, he can in some cases plant additional acreage as excess peanuts for oil without any great additional expense and possibly at a small profit.

6. Mention has been made that the production of the peanuts for oil would be unfair inasmuch as this additional vegetable oil would be made available. But there are no controls of any kind on soybeans and the small quantity of oil produced from excess peanuts would be insignificant compared to the oil derived from soybeans. Cotton growers are not permitted to plant the acreage taken out of cotton and peanuts but reports reaching us indicate that millions of acres to be taken out of corn production this year under the corn-acreage-allotment program will be planted in soybeans and will quite substantially increase the soybean production for this year. Certainly it would be most unfair to permit the corn growers to put their idle acres in soybeans and to refuse the cotton growers to put some of their acreage in peanuts for oil.

7. Nor is there any control of any kind on the production of hogs, from which lard is made. Reports indicate that there is a substantial increase in the pig crop, which will result in more hogs and more lard. The small quantity of oil produced from excess peanuts will not equal the increased lard derived from the increased number of hogs.

8. For years efforts have been made to establish a market for refined peanut oil,

both for edible and cooking purposes. Peanut oil is a superior oil, more nearly like olive oil. These efforts have resulted in the establishment of a market for refined peanut oil and this needs to be greatly expanded. There is a good market today for a blend of peanut and olive oil. Peanut oil is needed for the cooking of peanuts for the salted-peanut processors. Peanut oil is needed where high-temperature cooking is required inasmuch as peanut oil will not smoke as quickly as lard and other oils. Peanut-oil-refining plants have been established and represent considerable investments. Peanut-oil mills where peanuts are crushed into oil are located all over the peanut-producing area and represent millions in investment.

9. But, under the peanut marketing quota law no provision of any kind is made for the production of peanuts for oil. The Peanut Marketing Quota Act requires the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to reduce the peanut acreage until only the exact amount needed for edible purposes can be produced. This will mean that there will be no peanuts to crush into oil; there will be no peanuts to crush for these plants; there will be no peanut oil to refine in the peanut-refining plants; there will be no peanut oil in which to cook salted peanuts; there will be no peanut oil for cooking purposes, for salads, or for any other purposes. Certainly we must not wreck the economy of these people or deny the public a commodity they want.

There are one or two areas which have never produced anything but edible peanuts and the growers in those areas are not interested in the production of excess peanuts for oil. But they have been broad-minded enough to understand the problems facing the peanut growers of other areas and they are not objecting to this amendment.

However, they are asking that the last paragraph of the amendment be enacted. This paragraph provides that any acreage planted in excess of allotted acreage shall not be considered in the future in establishing acreage allotments. We believe this provision is fair and have incorporated it in this amendment.

I may add that under the present law, the acreage planted in excess peanuts may after 3 years be taken into account to a limited extent in determining the peanut acreage allotment for the farm on which such excess peanuts have been grown. The language of the present law on the subject is as follows:

'SECTION 358 (D)

"Any acreage of peanuts harvested in excess of the allotted acreage for any farm for any year shall not be considered in the establishment of the allotment for the farm until the third year following the year in which such excess acreage is harvested and the total increases made in farm-acreage allotments in any year based on such excess acreage shall not exceed 2 percent of the national acreage allotment for such year. *Provided*, That in the distribution of such increases based on such excess acreage the total allotments established for new farms shall not be less than 50 percent of such increases."

The last paragraph of the pending amendment changes this so as to provide that the excess acreage shall not be considered in establishing future farm acreage allotments for the farm at any time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is ready to proceed with the wheat amendment, I yield to him whatever time he may desire, up to 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, my colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], is present; and I prefer to have him proceed now.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Very well; I yield 15 minutes to the senior Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Colorado and myself, to the pending resolution, House Joint Resolution 398, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. MILLIKIN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the farm acreage allotment of wheat for the 1951 crop for any farm shall not be less than the larger of—

(a) 50 percent of—

(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1949, and

(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1948 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1949, or

(b) 50 percent of—

(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1948, and

(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1947 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1948;

adjusted in the same ratio as the national seeding for the production of wheat during the calendar year 1950 (adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trend in acreage) bears to the national acreage allotment for wheat for the 1951 crop; but no acreage shall be included under (a) or (b) which the Secretary, by appropriate regulations, determines will become an undue erosion hazard under continued farming. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no allotment increased by reason of the provisions of this section shall exceed that percentage of the 1950 allotment for the same farm which (1) the acreage allotted in the county to farms which do not receive an increase under this section is of (2) the acreage allotted to such farms in 1950. To the extent that the allotment to any county is insufficient to provide for such minimum allotments, the Secretary shall allot such county such additional acreage (which shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments otherwise provided for under the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended) as may be necessary in order to provide for such minimum farm allotments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the pending joint resolution that is a continuation of a relief plan which the wheat growers of the country worked out last year for the purpose of affording relief in the matter of wheat acreages. Until 1948 the Department of Agriculture had been calling upon the wheat growers to increase their acreages of wheat, and thereby to increase the production of wheat. In 1949, however, the tune was changed very suddenly, and wheat growers were threatened with a restriction and a reduction of acreage. It so happens that in producing agricultural crops it is not a matter of turning on the faucet and then turning it off, at will; the process is more complicated than that. Especially is that true in the light of modern farming practices, including crop rotation on the one hand, and, on the other hand, summer fallowing. It requires more than 1 year in which to raise a crop of wheat. In many instances, under crop rotation procedures and practices, it requires a great many years in which to produce a crop of wheat. So when the world came very suddenly in 1949 that the crop would of necessity have to be reduced, it meant of course a considerable readjustment, a readjustment which would adversely affect many of the farming practices of the country.

When the veterans returned from the war, many of them purchased wheat farms. Wheat land is relatively cheap, compared with other farming lands. The veterans purchased the land. They did it innocently enough, not anticipating that changes would be made and restrictions imposed and insisted upon in the reduction of acreage. So the veterans are left in a very bad way. Last year the Congress acted to ease the situation, to work out a gradual reduction in the wheat acreage, so as not to inflict particularly heavy punishment upon wheat growers who had come into the picture very late.

During the past few years we have had favorable wheat-growing seasons in Kansas, Nebraska, and eastern California, especially. In eastern Colorado large acreages have been plowed up and planted to wheat. In Colorado we are new growers of wheat. The older growers of wheat in other sections are taken care of more or less in the plans of the Department of Agriculture to reduce the crop, but the new grower found himself completely wiped out, his business completely destroyed, should he comply with the suggestion made by the Department of Agriculture with respect to the reduction of his acreage. He was not given a place in the picture at all.

The amendment which we were successful in having adopted by the Congress a year ago gave some wheat farmers in certain areas advantages over so-called old growers receiving allotments on their 10-year adjusted acreage. It also provided for the addition of too many acres to the 1950 allotments, to fulfill the requirements of the amendment.

The amendment we are offering today meets these two very serious objections. It provides that the basis of adjustment to the proposed allotment for 1951 shall be compared to the seedings in the fall of 1949 and spring of 1950, for the 1950 harvest. The act passed last year, Public Law 272, in section 5 provided that the allotment should be compared to the 10-year average, adjusted for trend. The provision this year requires that no farm shall be given more acreage than the average of the other farms in a county receiving allotments on the 10-year adjusted acreage formula of the 1948 AA Act.

Had this plan been adopted last year, 10 percent less acres would have been required, or 1,712,000 instead of the 4,507,000 that were needed. Approximately 7.6 percent represented reduction on so-called new farms, and this formula would have brought the national average reduction to a little over 17 percent.

So, Mr. President, it can be seen that the amendment we are offering today is very modest, when compared with the amendment offered a year ago.

While the amendment was adopted primarily to assist those States which were responding to the pleas of the Department of Agriculture by sharply increasing their acreage, and was believed at the time to be limited to six or seven Western States, it actually assisted wheat farmers in 40 of the 48 States whose plight was such that a formula based on 50 percent of their wheat land being fallow or involved in rotation and soil conservation practices helped them out.

I shall read a list of certain of the States which received assistance. The figures are those of the Department of Agriculture:

Ohio	71,846
Indiana	118,235
Illinois	170,222
North Dakota (estimated)	300,000
South Dakota	243,856
Nebraska	303,527
Kansas	398,278
Montana	473,109
Idaho	305,424
Colorado (the largest)	789,225
New Mexico	59,070

From the beginning of the war years until 1948, the Department of Agriculture, as I have already said, asked for increased production. For the first time, in 1948, caution was suggested. Acreage was not reduced in 1948, but farmers were cautioned that it might become necessary.

During this period, much new ground was broken and sold to returning veterans, who were not aware of allotments or quotas or controls of any kind, and who bought the land in good faith. It is this group who require time in order to make their adjustments. They are the States showing the greatest additional number of acres under the provisions of the summer fallow amendment.

The purpose of an allotment program is to bring voluntarily the supply into relation with the demand. The programs, to be effective, must receive compliance. The real test of the summer fallow amendment is whether seedings were reduced.

It is one thing to issue orders and make suggestions; it is another thing to obtain compliance of the orders and suggestions. The Department of Agriculture figures, based on a limited survey, show 561,000 less acres were planted than would have been the case otherwise. In other words, had the Congress not adopted the amendment last year with respect to wheat acreages, the farmer would have planted 561,000 more acres than were actually planted as a result of the amendment.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter received today from a wheat grower in eastern Colorado, which explains how the formula operates. The letter is addressed to me. It is dated Arapahoe, Colo., February 22, 1950, and reads as follows:

> Your support of the agricultural summer fallow bill is hereby recommended. This letter is in confirmation of my recent wire to you and to expand on same a bit.

The writer telegraphed me saying he was supporting the summer fallow amendment which the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and I have been sponsoring. The letter continues:

> My planted wheat acreage for harvest this year is 1,047. If it had not been for the summer fallow bill passed by Congress late last summer I would have planted 2,200 acres for 1950 harvest. The first wheat-acreage restriction bill passed by Congress in 1949 only permitted me to plant about 750 acres for 1950 harvest or approximately one-third my total cultivated acres. Of course, I would rather have taken a chance on the production from 2,200 acres at an open-market price than be assured of a Government-support price on one-third my total cultivated acres.

I hope Senators will catch the significance of that statement. It is simply this: The only punishment inflicted on a farmer if he plants more acres than permitted under the Department regulations is that he is not assured of a Government support price. So long as his neighbors are getting a Government support price for their wheat, the farmer who has not complied can take chances and may sell his wheat at a pretty good price. If he sells it for less than the support price, it will, of course, make it more difficult and more expensive for the Government, and will increase the support price of all other wheat. That, I think, ought to be evident. So it is to the advantage of the country, to the advantage of the Department of Agriculture, and to the advantage of everyone else concerned with the problem, to find a solution in an orderly way, and effect compliance. Had we not adopted the amendment last year, the amount of wheat grown, the amount of acreage planted would have been a great deal more than it was. The same thing is true now. The amendment we are offering today carries as it should carry, greater limitations than the amendment adopted the last year.

The philosophy used in agreeing to the amendment last year was that it would gradually ease off the problem, and we are carrying out that same philosophy at this time.

To proceed with the letter:

> I am only one of many wheat farmers in Colorado operating under similar circumstances. A serious handicap to the thriving new wheat industry of Colorado will be a terrific blow to the continued prosperity of all other Colorado business.
>
> Most of us farmers are only asking to plant 50 percent of our total cultivated acres. We want to conserve our land, if possible, but we must make a living and be able to pay off our mortgages too. That would be difficult to do on only about one-third or less of our possible productive capacity.

The farmers are fighting for their life in my State. This man's letter makes it specific as to just how this amendment would apply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Oklahoma yielded me more than 10 minutes. He is not present at this time, but he told me to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The farmers found it to their advantage to retain this allotment after Congress passed the bill, because that is what they want to do; they do not want to do other than that. Congress met their problem squarely and gave them an increase which they could accept in a reasonable way and still make a living on their farms. They accepted it and went ahead.

The compliance would have been better if the amendment had been adopted 30 days earlier. Some early plantings were in and the farmers, in many instances, had ignored their allotment. In other instances, land prepared for seeding had to be planted. The amendment pleased the farmers because it provided a means to consider their particular problem on the basis of the farm and to get away from inequities resulting in distorted acreage statistics.

If a farmer goes outside the program, under allotments his only penalty is that he does not receive a Government loan to support the price he receives. His production adds to the total supply and must be considered when computing, under the formula, the next year's allotments. The end result is that those farmers who do comply are compelled to take a deeper cut; that is, to divide up a smaller number of allotted acres. The mere fact that a farmer is not eligible to a loan is of no help to cooperators. Actually, what happens is that when a man knows he is not going to get support and is going to have to sell his wheat on the market, and it is expected to be sold under the support price, he plants more acreas to make up for the lower price he expects to receive. So that failure to provide a "livable" program actually results in aggravating the supply program.

I hope Senators will realize the force and the logic of that argument. The only penalty is that the farmer does not have the loan privilege. He can grow any amount of wheat he wants to grow, under the law, but he cannot get a Government loan on his wheat. He must sell the wheat on the open market. When the price of wheat is held up to a higher level, the farmer who grows it outside the program will not have very much difficulty selling his wheat. He will possibly sell it at a slightly reduced price.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a digest of letters received and comments on this subject.

There being no objection, the digest and comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIGEST OF LETTERS IN THE FILES OF THE COLORADO GRAIN GROWERS ASSOCIATION AND THE NATIONAL WHEAT GROWERS ORGANIZATION

> Please reenact the summer-fallow amendment as it made it possible for me (us) to plant within the allotment.
>
> There were many thousands of acres of land not sown because Congress granted us sufficient acreage so it was possible for us to comply.
>
> Its wheat growers and the State of Colorado itself were being unduly penalized by the first wheat allotment and I know that only a

small percent of the farmers could cooperate. Under the present program, section 272.5, I don't know of but one farmer who is not cooperating and he will another year if the program remains as it is at present.

As I am a small-grain grower, the first cut would have about put me out of business. I sure welcomed the amendment. To my knowledge, all of my neighbors have complied with their new allotments.

I was much pleased with the last wheat allotment which our Congressmen got for us wheat farmers. I have stayed under the last allotted acreage granted me and I believe that most of my neighbors have.

If these allotted acres had not been raised to a reasonable level, I would have disregarded the whole thing and planted twice the acres I now have in. In my fall plowing, I let my idle acres lay fallow.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Wheat is not perishable and the Government has usually made money on the stocks it has taken over as it takes only a small disaster, drought, or disease, to wipe out surplus.

There is adequate storage and CCC has contracted to rent and pay for space whether it is used or not. The problem of storing a commodity such as wheat is not great.

Wheat is a food used throughout the world The Asia situation is such that wheat may be a deciding factor in a cold war.

There has been 15 unbroken years of bumper crops. The high plains area of eastern Colorado and western Kansas is droughty now.

The farmers desire to cooperate and are in accord with the provisions of House Joint Resolution 398 They are willing to go along.

Wheat farmers cannot stand a huge slash in operations in any one year and must have the opportunity to adjust their operations to a declining income Large machinery replaced with lighter; lands sowed to pasture with income from livestock takes time.

Soil conservation requires gradual adjustment of acreages, otherwise an erosion hazard is created as well as a weed problem.

Important. One more year of a provision such as House Joint Resolution 398 will bring the adjustments for trend up to a point where relief will not be needed. This request is to bridge the adjustment period.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. How much time has been consumed by the senior Senator from Colorado?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirteen minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield the remainder of 20 minutes to the junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to lend my endorsement to the very fine presentation of the subject made by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The question of allotments for wheat is vital in Colorado and in a number of other Western States.

Pursuant to the request of the Department of Agriculture to meet the food needs of the Nation in time of war and in the readjustment period after the war, many persons went to the eastern prairies of Colorado and to the western portions of Kansas and Nebraska, opened up new land, and planted it to wheat. Those persons included many veterans. They spent their own money or borrowed money for the purchase of the heavy and expensive machinery required. They perhaps should have known, but they did not know, about allotments, quotas, controls, and so forth and so on. Perhaps they thought they were fighting a war for freedom. But, in any event, they went into that country and opened up new lands. By opening up new lands they did not have the benefit of the 10-year formula which applies to the old wheat farmers, and, under the law as it was last year, prior to the amendment which was adopted last year, those farmers would have had their acreage cut as much as 80 percent of what it had been. It would have been a ruinous thing. It would have been disastrous to a great part of the State of Colorado and of other States finding themselves in the same situation. In the heavy wheat-growing sections of Colorado the economy of dozens of towns turns on the money received from the production of wheat. That, in turn, fertilizes the economy of that whole portion of the State. The figures are large enough and the money is important enough so that it can favorably or very adversely affect the economy of the entire State.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is not that condition generally true in the two or three western tiers of counties in the State of Kansas adjoining the State of Colorado?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say the situation is precisely the same, and for the same reason.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the position which the senior and junior Senators from Colorado are taking in this most important situation which affects the western third of the State of Kansas.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I appreciate the Senator's statement very much indeed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I gladly yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not also true of the western counties in Nebraska? The Senator knows well that there are several counties in western Nebraska which can be placed in the same category with those counties in Colorado of which the Senator is speaking.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The situation is exactly the same. In fact, it has happened that men have been in western Kansas and in the part of Nebraska to which the Senator is referring, thinking they were in Colorado, or vice versa. There are some classic campaign stories with reference to Colorado politicians who wound up in Kansas or in Nebraska trying to convert voters to our own causes in Colorado. The line which has been laid between the States is an invisible one. The soil is the same, the climate is the same, and economic conditions are the same.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment offered by the distinguished senior and junior Senators from Colorado is an extension of what was done in the prior Congress, is it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct. I may say to the distinguished Senator that it is an improvement over what was done last year. The distinguished senior Senator from Colorado has pointed out that by interpretation of the amendment which was adopted last year, or possibly by a misinterpretation of it, we took in more than we intended to take in. We benefited 40 out of 48 States. We did not intend to reach that far. We were aiming to encourage the practice of summer fallowing in the dry-land States.

But the amendment of last year was interpreted by the Department of Agriculture to include also the situation resulting from the normal practices of crop rotation in States other than dry-land States. The result was that much acreage was added which we never anticipated would be taken in. This year we have tailored our new amendment in the light of the facts we have learned, so that it will more nearly meet the special situations which we are discussing. I do not see how there can be any possible objection to it. The over-all effect on the allotment does not exorbitantly increase it, but it meets an extreme emergency in the parts of the country to which the distinguished Senators from Kansas and Nebraska have referred.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. It is the principle I am talking about.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The principle is the same. We have an amendment here which is intended to promote soil conservation by promoting summer fallowing. We are not giving the benefit of the amendment to those who come in and in one big single shot break up the sod, and possibly open a large extent of country to a future dust bowl. We are trying to restrict the benefits to those who follow sound dryland farming practices.

In that connection it should be added, perhaps, that out in the western section of the country it is impossible to turn from wheat to oats, to barley, to potatoes, or follow the usual rotation routines of the older parts of the country. It is wheat country. Perhaps in the course of time it may be possible to put some of it in grass and turn it into livestock country. However, it takes money to buy livestock, and it takes time to get a grass coverage going. These veterans, these people we are talking about, are already in debt paying for the machinery necessary to grow wheat.

I believe that brings me fairly to a point which was touched upon by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. We believe that within another year, if we could have this amendment for one more year, the farmers in Colorado will then be in shape to adjust themselves to the regular formula, and will not need special consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the junior Senator from Nebraska is well aware of farming practices in his State, and I think I am quite familiar with the prac-

tice of summer fallowing, to which both Senators from Colorado have referred. However, for the record, I wonder if the Senator would expand a little on summer fallowing. Just what does it mean? I suppose every Senator knows what it is, but I know there are some Senators who are wondering about summer fallowing, and they would like to know how it helps the land, and why it is a soil conserving practice. If the Senator would care to do so, I think it ought to be made clear.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not hold myself out as an expert agronomist. But the point is, first, that we want to keep out those who rush in, trying to take advantage of the high price of wheat, opening up large areas of land without regard to conservation of the land, and putting all of it in wheat, and making a single shot at a good market and pulling out and leaving the country to blow away. Our practice is to put roughly half our land into fallow for 1 year, and to work it the next year, to rotate it in that way. We have better crops, and better cover on our land. It enables us to avoid, at least in part, the dangers from "dust bowling" and from losing our topsoil.

Mr. WHERRY. The purpose is to induce the farmer to do that. Of course, the good farmer does that voluntarily. In some cases it is the practice to use one-half the land, and in other cases it is the practice to use one-third the land. In my section of the country, it is usually a third of the land which is summer fallowed and taken out of production. So in reality the farmer is actually producing only on half his farm, if he takes half for summer fallowing, or he is producing only on two-thirds, if one-third is out of production. Fallowing builds up the soil. It gets rid of weeds, and it makes for a sound farming program. Is not that true?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is exactly correct

The formula which we are presenting this year assumes that half the land would be so treated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The formula which we are discussing this year gives this top advantage to the farmer who puts half his land in summer fallow. I do not believe any soil conservationist could ask for a fairer dedication of land to conservation purposes than that.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr SCHOEPPEL. Is it not generally advocated by men who are well versed in conservation practices that an owner in the western section of the country should utilize half of his land and summer fallow the remainder?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is my understanding that that is the constant preaching of the experts on soil in that part of the country, that half the land should be allowed to fallow in alternate years.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to clear up the discussion of summer fallowing. Is it not true that those who summer fallow the land do not get any benefits from any crops on that land?

Mr. MILLIKIN. They do not get the benefit of a single acre. Credit is given on the land which is planted. Let us assume a total of 1,000 acres. Credit is given on the 50 percent planted in wheat, let us say. On the other 50 percent, which is idle, no credit is given. However, if 50 percent of the land is not fallowed, the program does not apply, and the farmer does not receive the benefit of the 10-year formula or the benefit of price support.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no return to the owner of land on the part that is summer-fallowed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is no return to the owner of the land on the part that is summer-fallowed. I should like to emphasize again that, unless a man follows sound practice, if he puts all his land in wheat, he does not get the benefit of the formula I am discussing, and does not get the benefit of the 10-year formula, and his wheat is without support

Mr. President, that brings me to something the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado emphasized several times, and I do not feel there would be any harm in mentioning it again, because there may be one or two Senators now in the Chamber who were not present when it was referred to.

We are trying to encourage the wheat farmers in the western section of the country to adopt conservation practices, and we found, by the operation of the amendment last year, that if we give them a little incentive, a little encouragement, they will abide by those practices and follow the formula, whereas if they do not have that encouragement there will be a different result I think all those from the older States who are interested in wheat should pay particular attention to this. It is possible to open up a great deal of the land in the area to which I am referring with heavy machinery, and the cost per bushel of producing is relatively cheap.

What do they do? They beat the game by opening up two or three times more land than if they were following the formula. The distinguished senior Senator from Colorado made that very clear. What is the consequence? It is that the base of wheat production is increased, with the result that when we come to make next year's national allotment, we have to reduce the allotment to everyone. So that it is distinctly in the interest of every "old grower" to approve the formula which we have proposed, because it tends to hold down the gross national production of wheat, and, in addition, tends to encourage sound conservation practices.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know how much this amendment would increase the national wheat-acreage allotment?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I can give the distinguished Senator an estimate. Assuming that everything remains the same as it was last year, there would be added approximately 1,250,000 acres, as distinguished from approximately 4,500,000 acres added by last year's amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. What in the Senator's amendment would cause him to believe that would result?

Mr. MILLIKIN. First, because last year's amendment was tied to the 10-year average. This year we are tying it to the relation of 1950 to 1951. The change in that part of the formula, plus the change in interpretation by the Department of Agriculture, would, I believe, cause that reduction. We have designed the amendment to produce that very result.

Mr ELLENDER My reason for asking the distinguished Senator the question is that I have a letter from the Department which I think challenges the statement, and I expect to read it in a few moments, for the information of the Senate

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think the Senator will find that the amendment last year overreached more than we had intended, for two reasons. First, it was tied to the 10-year average instead of being tied to a later and more limited period. Second As I said a while ago, they interpreted conventional rotation in the old wheat States to be the same as dry land summer fallowing, which let in acreage which we did not intend to be included.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am informed that when the present law, Public Law 272, was enacted, in which is contained virtually the same amendment as is now proposed, the evidence produced showed that the amendment would not have the effect of increasing acreage over the national average to more than about 2,000,000 Is that not so?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I forget what the estimate was, but I very frankly say that the acreage under last year's amendment exceeded what we had anticipated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. My information is that there was some evidence to the effect that the increase over the national acreage allotment would be less than 2,000,000, or about 2,000,000. But as the record shows, it was increased 4,600,000 or 4,700,000, as I remember. As I recall, the amendment, when enacted last year, was supposed to take care of certain counties in western Kansas, in Oklahoma, some in Idaho, but when it came to apply it, it had to be applied to every State in the Union. Therefore, the greater increase over the national average resulted.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In view of the Senator's statement, let me say that the benefits under the act were larger than we anticipated. That came about through an error in the formula, which I have explained, and it came about through interpretations of the formula which counted in normal rotation, whereas we intended to limit it to dry-land summer fallowing.

Mr ELLENDER. If the Senator has already explained that, I do not want him to go into it further.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The next thing I should like to emphasize is that in this year's formula we have drafted a provision to get away from that. We have

also provided specifically—which overcomes another defect—that no farmer benefiting from this formula can benefit more than the old-wheat farmer in the same county. We found some situations where under the formula of last year a new wheat farmer might take 7½ percent reduction, and the old-wheat farmer 17½ percent. We intended nothing of that kind, and we place a specific limitation in the measure this year whereby the new-wheat farmer will not have a greater benefit than the average of the old-wheat farmers in the same county. I think that is a very equitable solution.

I should like to emphasize again, for the benefit of the Senator from Louisiana, who was momentarily called off the floor, that with this limited amendment, and with 1 year of it, we believe we can get ourselves adjusted so we can fit in with the national pattern.

There has been some objection to this amendment on the ground that some organizations were studying the whole wheat problem. We have no objection, of course, to people doing skull practice on the wheat problem. I should like to emphasize that the organization which proposes to start next week to study this subject, is studying a long-range program for wheat. We are limiting this amendment to meet a short-term situation, an emergent situation. We encourage their study of the long-term wheat problem as we encourage the study of all similar problems. But we think it is a confusion of an important subject matter to ask us to give up a position we must take to meet an emergency situation in the Western States, which will solve itself within a year or so, simply because someone is thinking on long-range problems. The same is true in the House of Representatives. They are engaged in a comprehensive study of the wheat problem. They have made a start with it. They will probably be continuing the study all through the remainder of the session, and I hope good will come from it. But our people must know what they can plant. They must know what machinery they must obtain. They must know about seed. They must finance themselves. The amendment is intended to meet that temporary purpose, as distinguished from measures which I hope will turn out to be better long-range wheat problem solutions.

I believe the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] amply emphasized the fact that we really do not solve our problem by withholding this temporary aid. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana whether he heard the discussion having to do with what will happen if we do not bring these people within the formula?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I did not. I am sorry I was not on the floor at that time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thought the senior Senator from Colorado developed a very striking point. We want to bring farmers within the formula so they will adjust and follow proper soil service practices. If they are left without the formula, the way for them to beat the game is to open three or four times more land than would otherwise be planted; therefore three or four times more wheat will be produced than otherwise, which in turn will increase the national gross production, which in turn will make necessary deeper cuts in the next national allotment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Gladly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The only penalty for increasing the acreage is that a Government loan cannot be obtained on the support price. That is the only penalty the grower suffers if he goes outside the program.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct. There is no prohibition against his doing it at all, but if he does so he does not obtain the support price for wheat. He may have to sell it for less, but he can sell it for considerably less if he doubles and trebles and quadruples his acreage, and can still come out with as good a financial result. But we have found that the effect of the amendment has been to encourage the growers to comply, and they have complied. It has had a very wholesome result.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator taken into consideration the suggestion that was made last year, and again recently, by the Department of Agriculture, and I read from a letter, as follows:

> That a national reserve of approximately 1 percent of the national allotment would be adequate to provide additional acreage needed to relieve distress areas. This national reserve would be apportioned by the Secretary to such counties as he finds would suffer undue hardships under allotments determined under existing legislation.

In other words, rather than have the Senate adopt an amendment which would be applicable to the country as a whole, the Department would set aside, as I understand, 1 percent of the national allotment and use that in order to take care of such cases as the Senator has discussed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. My objection to the 1 percent does not necessarily go to the principle of a reserve. The 1-percent reserve is regarded as inadequate by the wheat farmers with whom I have discussed this matter.

They do not like to have the thing completely within the discretion of the Department of Agriculture. The present formula is a formula which can be followed by all who can read. It applies uniformly wherever it applies, and hits everyone equally, and without discrimination, who finds himself in the situation to which the amendment is applicable.

Mr. ELLENDER. The only difficulty, as I understand, stems from the fact that the adoption of the amendment would increase considerably the national acreage allotment. As I shall point out in a few moments, the amendment differs from the pending so-called cotton amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would respectfully answer the Senator by saying that in real effect I do not believe it would result in any increase. By its first initial impact there will be an increase but this year's formula reduces by perhaps 60 or 65 percent the increase resulting from the amendment of last year. The reason I say that in ultimate effect I do not believe it in fact would increase anything is that if we do not give the farmers in question the benefit of securing this compliance they will multiply their wheat lands, grow more wheat, and ultimately we will have a larger national wheat production on which we will have to figure our national allotment, and no one will come out to the good on that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Sentaor yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I made an attempt to compare the language contained in the law respecting the 1950 crop with the language in the pending amendment, and I do not see much difference. Can the Senator specifically point to the new language in the pending amendment which will cause the acreage to remain stationary rather than to increase it over the national average?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me invite the Senator's attention to the language of the amendment beginning on page 2, line 2. After setting out the summer fallowing formula——

Mr. ELLENDER. Which is the same as in the present law?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes. After setting that out—and there is a slight difference in comparison, and I will bring that to the Senator's attention—I read beginning in line 10 on page 2, as follows:

> Adjusted in the same ratio as the national seeding for the production of wheat during the calendar year 1950 (adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trend in acreage) bears to the national acreage allotment for wheat for the 1951 crop;

Last year we tied that to the 10-year acreage. This time we have a limited comparison between the 2 years which are mentioned in that language. The experts who have consulted with me tell me that that will produce the effect we desire.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the basis for the reduction, from a national standpoint, will be decreased by using the 1951 acreage planted, rather than the 10-year average.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there anything else?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It was tying ourselves into the 10-year average that caused a great deal of our trouble. I assure the Senator that it was entirely unintentional. It caused some windfall results which none of us anticipated, and which we did not want.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator concedes, however, does he not, that the language of the bill will be beneficial to all wheat growers, and will not be confined to those in Idaho, Colorado, and Kansas who now are suffering because of the lack of a provision of this sort in the law?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It will apply to those who come within the following provisions:

> (a) 50 percent of—
>
> (1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1949, and
>
> (2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1948 which was fallowed

and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1949, or—

As an alternative—

(b) 50 percent of—

(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1948, and

(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1947 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). The time of the junior Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr WHERRY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma will grant more time to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield one additional minute to the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma very much.

Mr JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield now to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I hope the Senator in charge of the bill will take the amendment to conference and will see what can be worked out there The Department of Agriculture has offered an alternate plan. Perhaps when the conferees on the part of both Houses meet in conference, they will be able to work out a satisfactory provision, as between this plan and the alternate plan proposed by the Department. I most sincerely urge upon the Senator from Oklahoma that he give us at least the consideration of taking the amendment to conference. Of course, if the conferees on the part of the Senate are not able to work out the matter with the conferees on the part of the House, that will be one thing Perhaps the conferees will adopt the language proposed as an alternate plan, providing for about 700,000 acres, I think; or perhaps the conferees will adopt the language which we think proper, permitting the acreage we think necessary, namely, just twice that much. The Senator said 1,250,000. Perhaps there will be some meeting of the minds of the conferees and the matter can be worked out and adjusted in conference. Certainly that is the place where adjustments should be made, rather than here on the floor of the Senate

So I hope the Senator who is in charge of the bill will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to add my own earnest solicitation to the same effect.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute further to the junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

I shall take a part of that minute to add my plea to that of my distinguished colleague. I hope the great chairman of the committee will take the amendment to conference and will see whether it will be possible for the conferees to work out something to relieve the distress of our people in that area of the country.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I understand that the Department of Agriculture proposes an amendment. I yield now 15 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana, for a presentation of the Department's viewpoint.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to state at the outset that I am very sympathetic with the situation which exists in Colorado and in several other of the wheat-growing States in the western part of the country.

After a study of this amendment, I find that it does not accomplish the same purpose that it sought to be accomplished with respect to the cotton amendment. As to the cotton amendment, both the House version and the Senate version of the joint resolution were studied by the committee in the light of a considerable amount of evidence which was adduced by the growers, by the Farm Bureau, and also the Department of Agriculture itself A reading of the hearings, will disclose that all witnesses, including those from the Department of Agriculture, are in agreement that the adoption of the cotton amendment will not increase the 21,000,000-acre ceiling which has been fixed in Public Law 272. The evidence shows that although a 21,000,000-acre ceiling was fixed, yet there will be in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 so-called "frozen" acres; in other words, acreage which will not be planted by the farmers, although they could plant it if they desired to do so.

It is a portion of the 2,000,000 "frozen" acres which the cotton amendment seeks to distribute among the cotton growers of the cotton-producing States, so as to adjust the inequalities which resulted from the present statute.

With respect to the wheat amendment, I desire to inform the Senate that in the committee we heard no witnesses on this amendment. There is no way to judge from the record how much the amendment will increase the wheat acreage. As I pointed out a moment ago, when a similar amendment was added to Public Law 272 the evidence produced then indicated that the increase in acreage would be less than 2,000,000 acres, as I recall the figure. However, it developed as I shall point out in a few minutes, when I refer to a report from the Department of Agriculture with respect to this amendment, that instead of increasing the acreage by 2,000,000 acres, which was the top estimated figure, the so-called wheat amendment in fact increased wheat acreage more than 4,000,000 acres. Further, the amendment which was adopted and passed as a part of Public Law 272, applied not only to the areas for which my friends, the Senators from Colorado, tried to make adjustments, because of inequalities, but also to the country as a whole. The letter which I propose to read shows that the amendment had the effect of giving wheat acreage to a number of localities which did not deserve it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, when we had the amendment before us a year ago, we had no idea that it would be applied to crop rotation States, where summer fallowing is not practiced at all. Alabama, Michigan, and many of the other States, in various sections of the country, which never practice summer fallowing, received large acreages for wheat, and that increased the amount of wheat produced.

Actually, we were thinking about summer fallowing. But the Department of Agriculture interpreted summer fallowing to be crop rotation, which is quite a different matter, and one which we did not contemplate.

A year ago we did not think the amendment would increase the wheat acreage by more than 2,000,000 acres. We are very certain this time that the acreage will not be increased more than a million and a quarter acres, at the most, a million and a half acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is referring to the national acreage, is he not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; the national acreage.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. According to Mr. Trigg, the Administrator, in the memorandum he presents on this matter:

It is estimated that continuation of the Public Law 272 provisions with respect to wheat, as proposed in H. J Res. 398, would result in an increase of approximately 4,000,000 acres over and above the national acreage allotment for the 1951 crop of wheat, assuming a national allotment equal to that proclaimed for 1950.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I intend to submit to the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. President, as I understood the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], he sought to change the law so as to have it provide that instead of making the 10-year average the yardstick, the Administrator would use for that purpose the wheat planted in 1949. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Or in 1950.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, whichever year is used does not make a great deal of difference for the purpose of my question.

I should like to know how that would change the situation. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator be permitted to give me an answer to that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection permission is granted.

Mr. ELLENDER. The summary following is included in the amendment, with which we are now concerned, just as it was included in the amendment which was previously added to the present law. The language itself is not changed in that respect, hence the Administrator is apt to put the same interpretation on summer fallowing as he did in Public Law 272. Unless the Senator can point out in his amendment some language which would change that

situation, I doubt that the amendment would have the effect the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] just pointed out.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In last year's amendment, after going through what we have referred to as the fallow-acreage part, the amendment provided—

Adjusted in the same ratio as the national average of seeding for the production of wheat during the 10 calendar years 1939–48 (adjusted as provided by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended)—

And then it continued, as follows—

bears to the national average allotment for wheat for the 1950 crop.

In this year's amendment, the comparable language is:

Adjusted in the same ratio as the national seeding for the production of wheat during the calendar year 1950—

We know what the national seeding is—

(adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trend in acreage) bears to the national acreage allotment for wheat for the 1951 crop—

Which is the forthcoming allotment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me point out that the distinguished Senator said the Department misinterpreted the use of the provision regarding fallow land; that is to say, instead of using what we know as fallow land, the Department included all other land not put into cultivation, including crop rotation. My question is this: Is there in this amendment language which will cause the Department not to follow the same interpretation of fallow-land as it did under Public 272?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should think the debate here itself would cause the Department not to follow the same course.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator think it would be better to make specific provision for that in the law?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is No. 1. There were several departmental interpretations. In the State of Colorado, for example, they required a man to choose; they gave him a choice as to whether he wished to come under the 10-year formula or under this formula. In many of the States the procedures were rigid, and that choice was not made available—perhaps through a misconstruction of the act. I am not challenging anyone's good faith; but through the whole series of constructions and interpretations, we found ourselves with something on our hands much bigger than we thought it would be I am told that the difference between tying it in the way I have said—in other words, to a short period of recent years, rather than to a 10-year average—will perform the principal function of saving acreage for us.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to read for the information of the Senator the letter to which I referred a few moments ago. The letter is dated February 27, and is addressed to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. It reads as follows:

This is with reference to House Joint Resolution 398 which, in effect, proposes extension of the essential provisions of Public Law 272 with respect to wheat to be applicable to the 1951 crop of wheat.

We have carefully reviewed this proposed legislation and have come to the conclusion that its enactment would result in inequitable wheat acreage allotments and a needlessly excessive increase in the total wheat acreage allotment such as resulted from the application of Public Law 272 in 1950.

Our position is based on the following considerations:

1. The provisions of Public Law 272 were originally designed to relieve producers in summer-fallow areas where, because of material expansion in the acreage seeded to wheat, the regular trend formula as provided under basic legislation, did not permit adequate adjustments for such acreage expansion. The principal areas for which this legislation was to bring relief were the summer-fallow areas of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, and Idaho.

2. The provisions of Public Law 272 which were applicable to all farms in the United States, resulted in additional farm wheat acreage allotments totaling about 4,500,000 acres over and above the original national wheat acreage allotment as proclaimed. Analysis of the distribution of this additional acreage as between the different States reveals that at least half of the total increase was allotted to farms and areas where there did not exist a problem of adjustment of the original allotments as determined under the provisions of basic legislation. The provisions of Public Law 272, taking the higher of the acreage seeded to wheat in 1948 or 1949 as a basis for determining minimum farm acreage allotments, proved to be particularly objectionable in that it granted allotment increases where the wheat acreage was abnormally high because of unfavorable weather conditions having interfered with the normal planting of other crops

3. A study of the areas for which relief was needed, and to which Public Law 272 was principally intended to apply, indicates that there were only about 50 counties where such adjustments were justified. These counties are largely in eastern Colorado, western Kansas, southeastern Idaho, and north-central Montana

A map is attached showing the location of these distress counties.

I may say I have the map on my desk, and any Senator who may be interested has the privilege of looking at it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, if this is a convenient place?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Returning to the difference between the revised average we are using this year as compared to the one we used last year, the 10-year average is substantially under the high average which was planted in the past 2 or 3 years. The 10-year average is about 74,000,000 plus acres. The 10-year average figure made a reduction of 7.6 percent on the basis of the 10-year average, whereas on the basis of last year, compared with this year, it would have been a 17-percent reduction. That was the enormous slippage which occurred according to an erroneous comparison.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I see.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to invite the Senator's attention again to the fact that we specifically say in the pending amendment that—

Notwithstanding the foregoing, no allotment increased by reason of the provisions of this section shall exceed that percentage of the 1950 allotment for the same farm which (1) the acreage allotted in the county to farms which do not receive an increase under this section is of (2) the acreage allotted to such farms in 1950.

That in itself will have a very restraining influence so far as enlarging the acreage is concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think there can be any doubt about that, I may say to the Senator; but the thing that puzzles me is why the Department had to allow so much of the acreage to States other than the ones for whose benefit the law was enacted. It interpreted "fallow land" as being any land not in cultivation, even crop rotation; in fact, the sky appeared to be the limit under the Department's definition of so-called fallow land. I understand there is nothing in the pending amendment to change the definition, or that would require or even induce the Secretary of Agriculture to interpret the term "fallow land" differently from the way he interpreted it last year.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The debate last year, just as it has done this year, stated exactly what we meant by "summer fallow land." I do not know how it could be made more definite, even though we were to use 500 words to define it in the joint resolution. I doubt whether it can be made any clearer than it has been made in the course of the debate. Is the Department of Agriculture completely immune from the debate and the interpretations which are to be put upon laws as a result of what takes place in the Senate?

Mr. ELLENDER. Evidently it is, in this case.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Department not only applied normal legislation affecting farming in sections where fellows are operating perhaps on a 5-year plan, but it applied all kinds of soil-conservation practices as being within the conception of "summer fallow." It did not have to do a number of things it did, things which caused a lot of trouble to the Department itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. The greater part of the trouble resulted from the inability of the Department to determine the meaning of "fallow land." It appears to me that you Senators, the proponents of this amendment, should give consideration to a definition of what is meant by "fallow land," so that acreage will not be increased to the extent that it was increased under Public Law 272. You should not rely on what is said in debate. The Senator admitted a few moments ago that when Public 272 was debated fallow land was discussed in debate, but the Department took no heed of the interpretation placed thereon as Senators understood.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, it is as clear to us in our section of the country as the word "cotton" is to the distinguished Senator who has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it may not have the same meaning in Ohio, and it may not have the same meaning in Louisiana.

We have fallow land in the rice fields in Louisiana. There may be some land with characteristics similar to the rice land in Louisiana or the wheat lands in Colorado, but such land given a different name, or a different interpretation is placed thereon when considered in the light of fallow land. The Department found itself obligated to treat all lands alike, if they had the same characteristics

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I may make the statement, the Department felt itself obligated, not found itself obligated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I presume the Senator from Louisiana will be a conferee on the part of the Senate when the joint resolution goes to conference with the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. I imagine so; I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I hope he will be.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished chairman has just informed me that I probably will be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is good news to all of us, because we know how capable the Senator from Louisiana is and how well qualified to work out the question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield three additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield, getting to the point, will he consider taking to conference the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Colorado and myself, for the purpose of working out the solution to the problem, and will he also take with him the staff from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to see what can be worked out as between the two proposals? Would the Senator object to doing that?

Mr ELLENDER. Speaking for myself, not for the committee, I would consider doing that. But I should prefer that the matter be left to Senators, and that is my reason for stating the views of the Department, in order that Senators in turn may make their own decisions. The Department, as I shall show in a few moments, does not favor the amendment, because it will not accomplish the purpose the distinguished Senator has in mind, but, on the contrary, will further aggravate the enormous wheat surplus we now have on hand. That is the difficulty.

If the proposal could be worked out in a manner whereby the national wheat acreage would not be increased, there might be some justification in our endeavoring to reach some kind of an agreement in conference. With that in mind, if the Senate should approve this amendment, I wish to state to the distinguished Senator that I shall work to that end. But I also want to state to my good friend that I was at first opposed to the cotton acreage resolution now pending before the Senate, believing that it might increase the ceiling fixed in the present law. However, when evidence was introduced to show that the measure would add about 800,000 acres of the 2,000,000 acres which were frozen, and would leave a balance of 1,200,000 acres, under the ceiling fixed by the Department, I then decided to support the joint resolution. I understand that under the pending wheat amendment, in the light of information furnished to me by the Department, the wheat acreage would be increased in excess of 4,500,000 acres.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course we do not agree with that interpretation, but the 2,000,000 acres of frozen cotton of which the Senator speaks is, I think, comparable to the 4,500,000 acres of wheat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield two additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I shall continue reading from this letter, for the information of Senators. I think it is very important. There were no hearings on the amendment, and I should like the Senators present to have the full benefit of the views expressed by the Department after a study of the amendment. I read further:

Instead of confining the allotment increases essentially to these areas, the application of the provisions of Public Law 272 resulted in allotment increases for all wheat-producing States, and in most cases the additional allotments outside of the distressed areas were totally unwarranted, and have given rise to problems of inequities as between farm allotments. Furthermore, the needlessly large increases in the total wheat acreage allotment assigned to farms, if continued, would seriously impair the effectiveness of the adjustment and price-support programs

4 It is estimated that continuation of the Public Law 272 provisions with respect to wheat, as proposed in House Joint Resolution 398, would result in an increase of approximately 4,000,000 acres over and above the national acreage allotment for the 1951 crop of wheat—

That is a far cry from the estimate just made by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, of approximately a million and a quarter acres. It is three times more—

assuming a national allotment equal to that proclaimed for 1950 A smaller national wheat acreage allotment for 1951 than for 1950 would not materially reduce the estimated additional allotment required to meet the minimum farm acreage allotment provisions of the proposed legislation. In fact, a lower national allotment may even cause a larger increase in the additional acreage because of the greater number of individual farms which would become eligible for adjustment under these provisions

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the letter be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remainder of the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

5. The change in the 10-year base period, by which the national wheat-acreage allotment is apportioned to States and counties, from 1939–48 to 1940–49 as applicable to the 1951 crop of wheat, will, of itself, result in a natural shift of larger acreage to the distressed areas. For example, the State of Colorado would receive approximately 210,000 acres more than in 1950, assuming the same national allotment. Obviously, the problem of providing special adjustments for these areas will be less acute in 1951 than it was in 1950.

6. The Department is taking the position, and has testified to that effect before a subcommittee on wheat of the House Committee on Agriculture, that a national reserve of approximately 1 percent of the national allotment would be adequate to provide the additional acreage needed to relieve distress areas This national reserve would be apportioned by the Secretary to such counties as he finds would suffer undue hardships under allotments determined under existing legislation.

For the foregoing reasons, the Department recommends that the provisions of House Joint Resolution 398 not be enacted.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this afternoon, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will vote on House Joint Resolution 398 and all amendments pending. At that time, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself I shall call up our amendment H in the hope that the Senate will give it favorable consideration.

This amendment proposes to reduce the support prices on all so-called basic commodities by repealing, effective immediately, the rigid 90-percent support formula and making all agriculture commodities subject to the sliding scales of support levels set up in subsections (a) and (b) of section 101, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949. This is the so-called flexible formula.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 provides price support at 90 percent of parity for the 1950 crop of any basic agricultural commodity, if marketing quotas or acreage allotments are in effect and marketing quotas have not been disapproved. Paragraph (2) of such subsection (d) provides price support at not less than 80 percent of parity for 1951 crops under the same circumstances. Repeal of these two paragraphs would make the sliding scales of support levels set out in subsections (a) and (b) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 effective immediately, instead of waiting until January 1, 1952.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as a part of my remarks an analysis of this amendment as prepared by the legislative counsel:

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 provides price support at 90 percent of parity for the 1950 crop of any basic agricultural commodity, if marketing quotas or acreage allotments are in effect and marketing quotas have not been disapproved. Paragraph (2)

of such subsection (d) provides price support at not less than 80 percent of parity for 1951 crops under the same circumstances. Repeal of these two paragraphs would make the sliding scales of support levels set out in subsections (a) and (b) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 effective immediately. The support level for tobacco whenever marketing quotas are in effect would, of course, continue to be fixed at 90 percent of parity by subsection (c) of such section 101; and any price-support levels announced by the Secretary prior to repeal of paragraphs (1) and (2) would not be affected by such repeal. I was advised by the Department today that no support level has been announced as yet for the 1950 crop of any basic agricultural commodity.

Mr WILLIAMS In October 1949 when Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, the Anderson farm bill, was passed, I voted against the bill and pointed out at that time my reasons:

First. That the cost would be prohibitive from a taxpayer's standpoint,

Second Under the rigid controls proposed it would mean the complete regimentation of our farmers, and the ultimate socialization of American agriculture,

Third. I warned then that the proposed high support prices for the basic agriculture commodities would benefit none but the large landowners in established areas. The cut-back in acreage necessitated by the high support price that would have to be imposed upon the small farmers would force many of them out of business.

The fact that I was correct is borne out by subsequent developments. The fact that here today we have the different groups—cotton, wheat, peanuts, and potatoes—all seeking corrective legislation to increase their acreage allotments for the small farmers proves that the law has not been satisfactory.

But I repeat my previous warning that the enactment of this bill today increasing acreage allotments for all these interests will not permanently correct the situation Without adopting a provision to lower the support prices it might well prove to be the straw that broke the camel's back and destroy the entire farm program

The American taxpayers are revolting against the enormous cost of this farm program The consumers are becoming enraged at the wholesale destruction of food by the Government for the sole purpose of creating artificial shortages and thereby maintaining high prices.

Every acre added to the wheat, cotton, and peanut allotments under this bill will be directly at the additional expense of the taxpayers and prove of no benefit to the consumer unless we take some action to lower the support prices.

Already under this program of high support prices, as of December 31, 1949, the Government had accumulated under loans and inventories agricultural commodities totaling $3,645,129,317.

The joint resolution before the Senate today proposes to increase the cotton acreage by 800,000 acres over what the Department of Agriculture lists as necessary, notwithstanding the fact that as of December 31, 1949, the Government already had in inventories and under loans over $955,000,000 worth of cotton. Nearly $1,000,000,000 in cotton has been purchased at a price approximately 5 cents per pound more than the 10-year average farm price for this product.

We are also being asked, with the understanding that the Government will buy all the output, to increase the wheat acreage. Yet on December 31, 1949, the Government was holding under loans and inventories over 465,000,000 bushels of wheat at a cost of $996,719,026.

We are being asked to increase the peanut acreage; yet the Government has spent over $55 000,000 since June 30, 1949, alone to hold the market on peanuts at its high price of 10½ cents per pound against an average farm price, 1940–49, of only 7½ cents.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] charged this morning that this amendment proposes to go back to 1932, but I call his attention to the fact that the adoption of this amendment, assuming the lowest support price would be in effect, would still leave the support price higher in most instances than the prevailing prices at the farm in the past 10 years. This period includes the wartime years. That certainly is not depression legislation.

The same situation is true of practically all agricultural commodities under the support program and in order to save time I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a chart listing over $3,645,000,000 in commitments as of December 31, 1949, which includes $1,725,064,794 27 in actual inventories and $1,920,064,523 in outstanding loans under price-support operations.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Inventories

Program, commodity branch, and commodity	Quantity	Value (cost)
PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM		
Cotton		
Cotton, American-Egyptian ....bales	582	$166, 251. 16
Cotton, upland ..do ..	3, 711, 811	617, 712, 330 47
Cottonseed ... tons	66, 352	3, 342, 280 18
Flax fiber.....pounds	178, 145	84, 019 76
Dairy		
Butter..... do	96, 200, 088	59, 518, 796 82
Cheese .....do....	23, 148, 193	7, 780, 437 48
Milk, dried.....do....	215, 779, 300	27, 399, 459 87
Fats and oils		
Linseed oil.....do....	394, 827, 620	111, 337, 599. 73
Peanuts		
Farmers stock pounds	70, 594, 445	7, 440, 703 50
Shelled ... do....	2, 131, 420	314, 041 88
Fruit and vegetable		
Fruit, dehydrated or dried		
Prunes ...pounds	49, 985, 455	5, 006, 203 64
Raisins.....do....	22, 972, 380	2, 210, 133 26
Potato starch....do....	10, 632, 658	630, 095. 76
Potatoes, Irish hundredweight	2, 190	2, 864. 14
Grain		
Barley.....bushels	24, 626, 019	35, 088, 095. 71
Beans, dry edible hundredweight	4, 850, 795	42, 859, 926 40
Corn.....bushels	76, 099, 828	116, 817, 457. 77
Flaxseed.....do....	13, 943, 222	88, 344, 527. 19
Grain sorghum hundredweight	6, 151, 995	17, 314, 716. 92
Oats.....bushels	11, 258, 146	9, 596, 728. 32
Peas, dry edible hundredweight	2, 048	10, 306. 32
Rice.....do....	431, 820	2, 936, 252. 60
Rye.....bushels	775, 905	1, 379, 900. 18
Seeds, hay and pasture.....pounds	725, 422	146, 515. 37
Soybeans.....bushels	3, 028, 865	7, 497, 729 94
Wheat.....do....	162, 114, 483	398, 776, 466. 37

Inventories—Continued

Program, commodity branch, and commodity	Quantity	Value (cost)
PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM—continued		
Livestock		
Wool		
Appraised pounds	61, 000, 168	$48, 843, 993. 62
Unappraised do	8, 313, 732	4, 669, 473 47
Poultry		
Eggs		
Dried.....do....	69, 036, 207	89, 317, 232. 90
Liquid or frozen do....	6, 264	2, 026. 48
Turkeys.....do....	725, 480	309, 173 80
Tobacco		
Naval stores		
Rosin.....do....	210, 837, 798	17, 110, 905. 49
Turpentine gallons	2, 032, 177	1, 100, 967. 77
Total price-support program	.....	1, 725, 064, 794 27

Loans

Commodity	Quantities of collateral pledged	Value loans outstanding
Wheat.....bushels	303, 112, 461	$597, 942, 500
Corn.....do....	434, 554, 857	596, 311, 277
Cotton..... bales	2, 324, 777	337, 397, 041
Tobacco.....pounds	367, 258, 290	151, 891, 629
Other	.....	236, 522, 016
Total.....	.....	1, 920, 064, 523

Included under "Other" above were loans on flaxseed, peanuts, soybeans, potatoes, barley, dry edible beans and peas, grain sorghum, oats, rice, rye, rosin, turpentine, etc

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, immediately following this list of inventories I ask unanimous consent to have inserted another chart showing the actual support price of these commodities as compared with the 10-year average price the farmer received for the same commodities.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Support levels and 10-year average prices received by farmers on commodities now being supported by the Commodity Credit Corporation either under 1949 or 1950 price-support programs

Commodity	Unit	Support price [1] (actual price)	10-year average price received by farmers 1940–49
Corn	Bushel	$1. 40	$1 16
Peanuts	Pound	.105	0755
Rice	Bushel	1. 78	1 80
Wheat	do	1 95	1 49
Dry edible beans	Hundredweight.	6 55	[2] 6 30
Dry edible peas	do	3. 07	[2] 4 29
Potatoes	Bushel	96	1 24
Sweetpotatoes	do	1. 72	1 86
Cotton	Pound	.272	.225
Cottonseed	Ton	49 50	53 20
Wool, shorn	Pound	.423	403
Tobacco, flue-cured	do	.425	[3] .363
Barley	Bushel	1 09	98
Grain sorghums	Hundredweight.	2 09	1. 88
Oats	Bushel	.69	.656
Rye	do	1 27	1 19
Soybeans	do	2 097	2. 03
Tung nuts	Ton	60 00	79. 30
Butter	Pound	.60	.498
Eggs	Dozen	.37	.366
Milk	Hundredweight.	3. 07	[4]
Cheddar cheese	Pound	.31	.278
Turpentine	Gallon	.40	[5] .582

See footnotes at end of table.

Support levels and 10-year average prices received by farmers on commodities now being supported by the Commodity Credit Corporation either under 1949 or 1950 price-support programs—Continued

Commodity	Unit	Support price [1] (actual price)	10-year average price received by farmers 1940-49
Rosin (grade N)	Hundredweight	$6 72	[2] $4 87
Flaxseed	Bushel	3 744	3 46
Hay and pasture seed			
Clover			
Alsike	Pound	25	[3] 235
Ladino [4]	do	1 25	1 113
Red	do	.35	[2] 279
Sweet	do	12	[2] 086
Grasses			
Orchard [4]	do	15	[2] 168
Sudan [4]	do	.05	[2] 045
Timothy [4]	do	06	[2] 054
Northern alfalfa	do	32	[3] 284
Common lespedeza	do	16	[3] 191
Turkeys	do	.31	.291
Hogs			
January 1950	Hundredweight	14 90	15 20
February 1950	do	15 50	
March 1950	do	16 20	

[1] Support levels listed are those most recently announced. 1949 support price listed if 1950 program not yet announced.
[2] 1939-48 average
[3] Not available
[4] Certified seeds only.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unless some action is taken by Congress in the immediate future to correct this situation no one dares estimate the amount of next year's inventories

The wholesale destruction of food and give-away programs which are inevitably a part of continuing this unrealistic program will prove to be a major national scandal, and might well result in complete repudiation of all agricultural benefits.

Not only are the taxpayers and the consumers clamoring for some action to correct this odious situation, but the eastern dairy and poultry farmers are also being forced out of business through the unwarranted high support on grain products.

We cannot continue this policy of supporting the western farmers at a level of wartime prosperity at the direct expense of the eastern farmer and city consumer. As evidence that this situation is being viewed with alarm by the eastern farmers I read into the RECORD a copy of a telegram received from Mr. J. A. McConnell, general manager of the GLF, of Ithaca, N. Y.:

ITHACA, N Y, *February 20, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN J WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building:

Following is the text of a telegram sent today to New York and New Jersey Senators and other Congressmen from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania: "Position of dairymen, poultrymen, and other northeastern farmers is rapidly deteriorating under present price squeeze. Grain prices supported at artificially high levels in the face of falling milk and eggs are making an intolerable situation. While consumers are benefiting from lower milk and egg prices, production of these foods cannot be maintained indefinitely unless costs can be reduced. Most Members of Congress are on record against further restrictions on food production, yet present situation is heading us right toward such. CCC has been pushed by existing support legislation into asking for $2,000,000,000 more, to lock up more grain supplies, which will further aggravate squeeze on animal industries and half of which will be almost certain further loss to the taxpayers Dairy and poultry farmers, already pinched, face worse prospects ahead. Egg prices now scarcely cover cost of feed alone, hens almost unsalable. Milk price continues downward. Present situation of vast grain surpluses held in dead storage with further action of same kind looming is intolerable We urge immediate congressional action to lower grain support prices to 75 percent of parity or to a point that will unlock those vast frozen supplies"

J. A MCCONNELL,
General Manager, Cooperative GLF Exchange, Inc.

The adoption of our amendment advancing the effective date of the flexible provisions of the parity formula from January 1, 1952, to read "effective immediately," will not solve all of this problem, but it will be a step in the right direction.

I think Congress should start working toward the elimination of all wartime subsidies, and this farm subsidy is only one of the many affecting various segments of our industries, and which are being carried forward at an enormous annual expense to the American taxpayers. Now that we are enjoying relatively high prosperity, they are unnecessary.

Mr. President, now what would be the effect of making the flexible provisions of the Anderson Act effective immediately? It would mean that instead of maintaining a rigid 90-percent support level, the support price would be allowed to fluctuate between 75 percent and 90 percent on the basic commodities with the actual level depending upon supply. With today's heavy investments the support price on many of the basic commodities would drop to the 75-percent level

Corn at 90 percent parity is being supported at $1.40 per bushel. Under the flexible formula the support price of corn would fluctuate between $1.22 and $1.40. This minimum of $1 22 would still be 6 cents higher than the 10-year average farm price for corn.

Wheat at 90 percent parity is being supported at $1 95. Under the flexible formula the price of wheat could fluctuate between $1.60 and $1 95. I call attention to the fact that this minimum price of $1 60 is still 11 cents higher than the 10-year average farm price for wheat. The 10-year period includes the war years.

Cotton, instead of being supported at rigid 90 percent, or 27.2 cents per pound, would be allowed to fluctuate between 22½ cents and 27 cents, depending upon supply. This minimum of 22½ cents on cotton is still equal to the average price the southern farmers have received for cotton during the past 10 years.

I will not take the time to enumerate how this amendment will affect all commodities, but these are fair examples. It is understood that the amendment will directly affect only those commodities now under the rigid 90 percent support. However, all other commodities not under the 90 percent formula which are supported at a lower level will be lowered somewhat, in that one of the factors used in computing their base is their price relationship to the basic commodities, and as other commodity prices are lowered, the result is a general lowering across the board.

In view of the Government's huge commitments under this program, representing over $3 500,000,000, and in view of the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has already warned the Congress that he will need an additional $2,000,000,000 to continue this farm program at its present level, I feel that Congress has no alternative except to take some immediate steps to lower the cost of the program. We must do this not only to protect the consumer and to avoid the loss of billions of dollars, but we must take immediate action to safeguard the future security of every American farmer. That is what our amendment proposes to do.

Under this wasteful and destructive program of planned farming—and planned distribution—the American farmer is gradually losing his previous marketing system represented by free enterprise. Many of his traditional markets are being taken over by foreign producers. The producers of substitute products are taking over much of the domestic market. I know of no better way to illustrate this than to cite how the Canadian potato farmers have profitably increased their acreage, and at the same time increased their sales in American markets, at the expense of our domestic producers.

Again I cite how the manufacturers of rayon and nylon have expanded the use of their products, both in this country and abroad, at the expense of cotton and wool. This rapid expansion for their products has been possible largely as a result of cotton and wool being withheld from normal channels of trade through Government monopoly. Prices of cotton and wool are being maintained at artificially high levels and as long as this situation exists substitutes will continue to make inroads on their markets.

Mr. President, I have before me today's issue of the Wall Street Journal, on the front page of which an article calls attention to the fact that rug manufacturers and many garment manufacturers are using substitute products because of the excessively high costs of cotton and wool.

The farmers have lost many of their normal export markets since recently their former cash customers have been educated to expect American agricultural products as free gifts. They now refuse to even consider outright purchases.

Peanuts have been converted into oil for export because that procedure was more profitable under the existing high-support program. This has resulted in a gradual reduction in the consumption of peanuts through normal distribution channels.

Today farmers in all sections of the country are directing their attention to the production of high level supported crops, with the result that unless these

artificial high-support prices are lowered soon the western and southern farmers are going to wake up and find their monopoly on production gone never to be regained. Peanuts, cotton, tobacco, wheat, and corn are all being produced today by farmers in areas never intended to produce these crops under normal conditions.

The day of reckoning will be hard not only for these marginal producers, but also for the farmers in the South and Midwest, for unless they soon recognize the danger, they will never again regain their present position.

The American people should not be fooled by the socialistic proposals of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan. He has presented as a perfect solution for the agricultural problems a proposal whereby he promises to—

First. Give the farmers more money than they now receive;

Second. Give the consumer lower food prices; and

Third. Cost the American taxpayers less money.

At a later date I shall discuss this fantastic plan in detail. In the meantime I would suggest that if anyone is interested in knowing how the Brannan plan of Government-controlled production and Government-controlled distribution will affect American farmers, he should read the farm program as it is now functioning, under the socialistic regime in England.

I urge that the Members of the Senate join with us today in removing the farmers from the political auction block by taking this first necessary step toward restoring some degree of sanity in our agricultural program. Let us begin a sytematic reduction in the unrealistic support prices. Let us put a stop to the scandalous policy of wholesale destruction of good edible foods in a country where many of our own people do not have the actual necessities of life.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware and his colleagues would bring into operation in the present crop year the reduced sliding scale of parity protection which would come into operation in 1952 under the normal operation of the so-called Anderson bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Would it be considered to be what has been described as an orderly procedure for getting an equitable adjustment for the farmer by dropping him sharply as much as 15 percent in 1 year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. This would apply only in one or two instances. For instance on wheat it would apply because it is in excess supply. I point out to the Senator from South Dakota, however, that there is nothing wrong with our changing the rate at this time. It was in October of last year, after the 1949 crop had been harvested and after the winter wheat crop which will be harvested in 1950 had been planted, that Congress took action to extend the 90-percent provision. Congress increased last October the parity guaranty on this crop last October after it was planted and we have now a perfect rate to reduce it to its previously scheduled rate. Had the Congress not taken that action last October the flexible provisions of the Hope-Aiken law would have gone into effect on January 1, 1950, which would have provided a sliding scale between 60 and 90 percent, a little lower than that now proposed.

What is proposed today is the putting into effect of the flexible provision of the Anderson Act, at a time prior to the planting of the 1950 corn or cotton or spring wheat. We are within our rights to change the law before these crops are planted, in exactly the same manner as we increased the rate in October 1949 after the fall wheat crop was planted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that since the enactment of the Steagall amendment, in 1938, the farmer has been operating under one set of regulations guaranteeing him a firm parity support price of 90 percent. The Senator now proposes to drop that by 15 percent, especially in the case of crops produced and harvested in the Midwest, therefore precipitating what I am sure would result in farm-operating chaos in that section of the country. When the prosperity of this great farming area in the Middle West is adversely affected or destroyed, the entire structure of our economy and prosperity throughout the country are jeopardized, because seven times the production of this section of the country each year amounts to the total national income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think I have used only 20 of the 30 minutes which had been allotted to me and I will yield the remainder to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. WHERRY. How much time does the Senator want? Does he desire 10 minutes more?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 10 more minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to point out to the Senator from South Dakota that there is nothing proposed under our amendment which would in any way affect the normal prosperity of the farmers to whom he refers. If the amendment shall be agreed to, the support price on corn at the 75-percent minimum would still be $1.22 a bushel. That certainly is not a depression price. The average price the farmers have received for the past 10 years for corn, including the war years—was $1.16 a bushel. The support price at the minimum would still be 6 cents higher than the average price they had received in 1940–49.

The average price of the wheat sold in the West was $1.49 for the period between 1940 and 1949. The amendment would drop the support price from $1.95, so it could fluctuate as low as $1.60. This is 11 cents higher than the 10-year average farm price. We cannot continue to maintain these prices in the Midwest at 25 to 30 percent higher than the wartime level, at the expense of the taxpayer and the eastern dairy and poultry farmers, and the city consumers.

Mr. MUNDT. In the interval the Senator has described, however, the prices which the farmers have been compelled to pay have steadily gone higher instead of going lower. When the Steagall amendment was written, the farmer, who is the greatest consumer in this country, was paying his fair share of a 40-cent minimum wage, and now he is paying a 75-cent minimum wage throughout the country.

Correspondingly, all his other prices are going up, at a time when the Senator from Delaware proposes to drop his support price 15 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that while that is true, at the same time the prices at which the eastern farmers, the eastern poultrymen and dairymen, are selling poultry and dairy products in the East have been declining. At the same time, the Government has been taking their tax moneys and supporting the western farmers at an extraordinarily high level. Their earning power has been reduced and their taxes increased as a result of this extravagant and wasteful program. We surely do not want a repetition of 1932. I agree with the Senator in that respect. But that does not mean that we can afford to continue to take money out of the Treasury and support a level of prosperity for the western farmers higher than that which they enjoyed during the war.

I should like to have the Senator from South Dakota answer me this. What plan does he have to get rid of the $3,500,000,000 of surplus agricultural products which we have today—it may be $5,500,000,000 worth next year, since the Secretary says he needs two more billion dollars? What are we going to do with these products unless we destroy them? Surely the Senator from South Dakota does not advocate that we destroy them? You cannot overlook the fact that our inventories are continuously to grow larger under the present program.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for the very eloquent and articulate manner in which he defends the poultry farmers of the East. Looking at the sponsorship of this particular proposal I recognize it to be from among Senators who are particularly interested in the poultry interests of the East.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In reply, I will say that the poultry and farmers to whom he has referred, whose interests I have at heart, yes, have so far operated without coming to the Government and asking for any subsidy; which is more than the Senator from South Dakota can say for his farmers. I wish the Senator from South Dakota would join with me in taking his farmers off the back of the taxpayers. The eastern poultrymen voted again the other day that they did not think the answer to their problem was Government subsidy. They went on

record again against asking the Government to underwrite their losses. I feel that the least the western farmers can do is to accept a lower support price—to take some of their own risk. Do not expect the Government, out of the Treasury, to guarantee the farmers of the Midwest a margin of profit greater than that which existed during the war. A continuation of this unsound policy will ultimately result in repeal of all farm-support legislation.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator's farmers in Delaware are to be commended for being able to continue on their own. I do not blame the Senator one bit for defending his farmers. The poultry farmers of America have their own organization, and they can speak for their own industry. But it certainly seems to me there must be some other solution to the problem than facing the dire prospect of an immediate depression affecting the great portion of our population represented by the diversified farmers of the Midwest.

If the Senator from Delaware will yield to me a little longer, because I have some measure of interest in the 10 minutes additional time allotted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I should like to point out further to the Senator that I concur with him that the Anderson bill does not provide good, adequate, permanent farm legislation. I think we must have better legislation than that. I think the Anderson bill misses entirely some of the features that farm legislation should have. But obviously, in a 10-minute postscript to the speech of the Senator from Delaware, we are not going to devise a comprehensive farm bill for America. Until we have such legislation available, however, I do not think we should drive the dagger into the back of the American farmer in the Midwest and say, "You take this 15 percent cut. You get into the slough of depression. You go ahead and make it easier for the poultry farmers of the East." The poultry farmers of the East have their problems, but after all they are not the majority of the farmers of the country, and their problems do not represent the greater portion of the farm problems of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are not proposing to bankrupt the farmers in the West. Also, the poultry farmers in the East are not solely the ones interested in this problem. One hundred and forty million Americans, as taxpayers and consumers, are interested in the bill. They are becoming greatly concerned over the fact that the Government is piling up huge surpluses of agricultural products respecting which no one apparently has a program of disposal, except one of destruction.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not asking the Department to destroy them. There is now enough legislation on the statute books to provide for disposition of the surpluses in an orderly and economic fashion. The fact that the Department does not do so is no reason why they are authorized under the law to refrain from properly disposing of the surpluses.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no way to dispose of $3,500,000,000 of agricultural commodities except to lower the price. I point out that what we are proposing to do today is to lower the price from the artificially high level at which it is now being maintained, higher than the wartime level of prices. Even then the prices would be higher than those received during the past 10 years. The minimum, under our amendment, would in many instances be higher than the price the farmers of the Midwest received during the war. The Senator cannot tell me that his farmers in the Midwest went broke during the war. The farmers of the Midwest have simply been spoiled.

Mr. MUNDT. The costs which the farmers are paying are rising steadily. The prices of things the farmers had to buy were fixed during the war years. OPA fixed prices and wages. Now control of such prices have, rightfully, been taken off, and the prices of the things the farmers are buying are skyrocketing. While the prices of goods the farmers buy are skyrocketing, the Senator from Delaware proposes to bring down the prices of products he is selling. I cannot, right in the middle of a Monday afternoon, think of a better way to bankrupt the farmers than the proposal which is now made to bring down the prices of the commodities he has to sell.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If they cannot operate efficiently, some of them should go out of business. If they cannot produce corn today as cheaply as during the war, there is something wrong.

Mr. MUNDT. There is nothing wrong with the farmer. What is wrong is the economy of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are headed for even more severe postwar inflation unless Congress takes recognition of and acts to stop the many spending programs proposed to be put into effect. Programs which are going to cost billions and billions of additional dollars of the taxpayers' money. We will have the inflationary spiral which the Senator has been describing and lamenting this afternoon unless we begin reducing the cost of government.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the Senator agree with me that the way to deal with postwar inflation is to push prices down horizontally, and not simply permit certain prices to remain at their artificially high level while the prices paid to the farmers for their products are driven down?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say to the Senator that wherever we begin there will be those who say, "Begin with the other fellow first." We must begin somewhere, somtime, if we are going to restore any degree of sanity in the cost of government. There is no better time to begin than now.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is now absent from the Chamber, allotted me 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to speak in support of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] designed to require the President to exercise the power which he very clearly has under the existing law, but which during the past year he has failed to exercise. I share the concern of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] as to economy in Government. While I cannot agree with him on the repudiation of what I believe to be the Government's obligation in connection with the current program on potatoes, it is plainly within the province of the administration, and the exercise of authority it possesses, to exclude the potatoes from our neighbor to the north, which are simply adding to the surplus we now have. Some five or six million bushels have already come in, and it is estimated that eight or ten million additional bushels will come in, which will cost us from ten to fifteen million dollars. While I realize that ten to fifteen million dollars is a small sum, in view of our current deficit, the saving of that amount, at any rate, would be a substantial contribution, and one which could be achieved without doing injustice to anyone.

A good deal of question was raised as to our relations with Canada. The suggestion was made that this was one of the ways that Canada could pay her debts to the United States; that her trade balance was adverse; that she was buying here more than we bought from her; therefore that this was one way to permit her to accumulate her balances. I can appreciate the force of that argument, but at the same time I think our first obligation is to make sure the maintenance of a strong economy here at home, and one which shall not unduly tax us.

In addition to the annual trade balances, which are adverse as between us and Canada, there are the very large sums which are being invested in Canada by Americans. More than 500,000,000 American dollars are invested in Canada in various enterprises. While that does not appear in our current trade statistics, it is a very substantial contribution to the balance of payment, and explains some of the reasons why we find that Canada during the past year has exercised a prudence in this matter which is conspicuous by its absence in our own agricultural and trade policies.

I am very happy to quote from the Foreign Commerce Weekly, published by the United States Department of Commerce, Charles Sawyer, Secretary, Office of International Trade, Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., Director. This covers the field surveys of the Department of Commerce, and it contains a report on the policies pursued by our Canadian friends, which are in glittering contrast to the policies pursued here. To those who are concerned as to whether we will injure the Canadian economy by prohibiting the importation of potatoes which we do not need, and which simply contribute to our surplus, I would commend the careful consideration of this report by the Department of Commerce, on page 15, of the issue of November 15, 1948, entitled "Tariffs and Trade Controls—Import Restrictions Relaxed on Certain Fruits and Vegetables."

The article shows us the policy pursued by Canada.

Lettuce and tomatoes may be imported into Canada from any source under open general permits, effective November 1, 1948, according to an announcement of the Canadian Minister of Finance in Ottawa, on October 19. Later in the winter similar general permits will be authorized for cabbage, carrots, celery, and spinach.

I ask Senators to note carefully what follows:

These latter relaxations will be timed so as not to prejudice the normal marketing of Canadian produce.

We should consider that carefully, Mr. President.

I read further:

Imports of each of the commodities will be authorized only when advancing prices or short supplies indicate depleted domestic stocks.

Mr. President, if that is good policy for Canada, why is it not good policy for the United States? If the Canadians have the intelligence to protect their own agricultural economy, why have not we here in the United States? The President exhibited that intelligence a year ago when he took steps to stop this inundation. I am wondering whether the curious inaction of the administration in the face of these mounting surpluses, with the inundation from Canada threatening our own economy, is a result of stupidity, is a result of ignorance, or is a result of a calculated determination to accentuate the potato problem for the benefit of those who are advocating solutions of our agricultural problem other than the one we have been seeking to pursue. If this was a deliberate attempt to sabotage the existing farm program, it could not be better calculated to accomplish that objective.

So, Mr. President, Senators on either side of the aisle who suggest that we must not under any circumstances stop the importation of Canadian potatoes, because that is the only way by which the Canadians can get United States dollars, may well take a lesson from our Canadian cousins, who recognize that their primary responsibility is to the people and the industries and the agriculture of their own area.

Mr. President, I read further:

For specified periods during the summer months, imports of cabbage and carrots were permitted under general permit. Lettuce, celery, tomatoes, and spinach, however, have been prohibited importation since November 18 of last year.

There we have it operating.

I note the very interesting report on their own economy and their own farm income:

For the fourth quarter of 1948, import quotas for citrus fruits, fruit juices, potatoes, onions, and apples—

I call the reference to apples to the especial attention of my good friends the Senators from Virginia—

have been increased from the present 50 percent to 70 percent of imports during the base year, July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947.

In other words, all the commodities about which our friends express so much concern are under automatic restrictions and quotas in respect to what can be sent into Canada. I commend the Canadians for their wisdom and foresight and patriotic self-protection.

I read further:

Also for the last quarter, grapes—

I think they have been mentioned in connection with California—

which have been wholly prohibited importation, may be imported under quota on the basis of 70 percent of the dollar value of each importer's base year imports.

All the above products will be subject to maximum mark-up controls under the Canadian wartime prices and trade regulations.

Mr. President, so much for the question of whether we have a right and a duty to restrict importations, if we follow the Canadian policy, inasmuch as the Canadians are under the same trade agreement that we are.

Now let us look at the record in respect to how this is operated for the Canadian farm income. I read further:

A cash return of approximately $974,212,000 was realized by Canadian farmers from the sale of farm products during the first 6 months of 1948, according to preliminary estimates of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. This amount compares with cash returns of $620,193,000 and $732,704,000 during the corresponding periods of 1946 and 1947, respectively.

In other words, their income was rising to maximum heights.

I read further:

With the inclusion of supplementary cash payments (i. e, cash payments made under the provisions of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act in 1946, 1947, and 1948; the Wheat Acreage Reduction Act of 1946 and 1947; and the Prairie Farm Income Act in 1946), cash receipts during the first 6 months of 1948 amounted to $989,572,000—

Practically a billion dollars—

as compared with $742,626,000 for the corresponding period a year ago and $636,244,000 in the first half of 1946.

Mr. President, I shall not read further figures; but the article also states:

The rising return from the sale of farm products is paralleled by the upward trend in prices received by Canadian farmers for agricultural products. The index of farm prices registered a new high of 250.8 (1935–39=100) during the month of July as compared with 248 6, the previous high, recorded in June 1948, and 203.1 in June 1947.

In other words, the Canadians not only are conducting their own affairs prudently, with regard to their international trade relations, but also they are demonstrating their success by the results in terms of their own farm income.

So I earnestly hope the appropriately drawn amendment of the Senator from Nebraska will receive the support of the Senate, and that we will tell the President in no uncertain terms that there is no reason for buying 10,000,000 bushels of Canadian potatoes, while at the same time dumping 10,000,000 bushels of American potatoes. Certainly, Mr. President, he who runs may read the significance of that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire how much time I have remaining.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is recognized.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly in behalf of the amendment which has been offered by the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], in behalf of himself, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and myself. That amendment would make effective immediately the flexible price support provision in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. President, I listened with considerable interest while the able Senator from South Dakota was questioning our colleague, the Senator from Delaware. In that connection, I point out that the great problem with which we in the Northeast are faced, when it comes to the cost of grain, is the problem confronting the dairy industry, and only in part the problem confronting the poultry industry. The price of grain has become so high that the cost of production of milk is completely out of line with what the producers of milk are now receiving for it. That comment also applies to the present situation in the poultry industry and to the prices that poultry producers are now receiving.

I do not think the Senator from South Dakota was in the Chamber when the Senator from Delaware read the telegram from Mr. J. A. McConnell, general manager of the Cooperative GLF Exchange, Inc. I wish to read a couple of statements appearing in that telegram, as follows:

Position of dairymen, poultrymen, and other Northeastern farmers is rapidly deteriorating under present price squeeze. Grain prices supported at artificially high levels in the face of falling milk and eggs are making an intolerable situation.

Mr. President, I happen to know that the farm conditions in the Northeast are worse today than they have been at any time for at least 15 years. That is how badly this price support situation is affecting the Northeast.

It is unfortunate that in formulating the agricultural bill last fall, we stopped where we did, or perhaps that we went as far as we did, depending upon how one desires to view it. In this connection, I am constrained to quote in part from my remarks during the debate on that bill, as some may remember, was passed by the Senate on October 19. I read the following from the speech I made in the Senate at that time:

There is not a Member of the Senate who believes that this bill is a fair bill. We all know that it is not. There is not a Member of the Senate who does not know that it has serious defects.

* * * * *

I would be strongly in favor of this conference report or any other bill of this type, for that matter, if it were only to provide high prices for the producers. But, much as this bill may conform to that requirement, there is much more to it than that. If that were all there were to it, our problem would be a very simple one.

This bill may provide high prices for producers. That is expected. That is its pur-

pose. But at the same time it means even higher prices for consumers. It means ever higher governmental expenditures.

* * * * *

It is high time for us to take stock of our position and to come down to earth and consider existing conditions. We want as high prices as reasonably can be obtained for the producer, but at the same time we must recognize the rights of the consumer and the taxpayer, as well as the rights of the American people generally. All these rights are not being recognized in this particular piece of legislation.

This legislation is not geared for the welfare of all the American people. It is not even geared for the ultimate welfare of those in agriculture. As surely as we are in session here today, if this bill is enacted and left in force, Senators who support it * * * will be haunted by the action they are taking

Mr. President, again I am constrained to observe that, verily, chickens do come home to roost, because if there is anything that is evident today, in the light of what has happened, insofar as potatoes are concerned or insofar as other crops are concerned, it is that the statement I made at that time was absolutely correct. Of such is my chief objection to the bill now before us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. IVES. May I have two more minutes?

Mr WHERRY. I am glad to yield the Senator from New York two more minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes more.

Mr. IVES. This legislation, Mr. President, is going to make the conditions which I have cited even worse, if such a thing be possible. There is no cure for anything in the pending measure. It seems to me that we should now be taking action to correct conditions and not to make them worse. This is why I feel so strongly that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware is so much in order. I do not say the amendment, in and of itself and alone, provides a complete solution to the problem; but very definitely, any solution, if there is ever to be one, must lie in the direction toward which the amendment points. For that reason I am especially glad to give it my wholehearted support.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it seems to me the arguments we have been listening to from the Senator from Delaware and New York demonstrate very clearly the fact that we do not presently have adequate farm legislation in the Anderson bill. With that I concur completely. It is a piece of legislation which removes from the statute books the Hope-Aiken bill, which I thought was exceedingly bad legislation, which was passed in the hurly-burly hours of the closing days of the Eightieth Congress, and which I opposed and voted against.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware and other Senators associated with him would put us right back where we were, with the Hope-Aiken bill, plus 10 percent, because it would drive down the prices of certain commodities, especially in the middle-western area and certain regions of the South, to 75 percent of parity. The Hope-Aiken bill theoretically would have permitted them to fall to 65 percent of parity. So it puts us back to the Hope-Aiken level, plus only 10 percent, and, with or without the 10 percent, and with the formula devised under the Hope-Aiken bill, with its low production floors, there might be precipitated a national crisis and a world-wide depression. If we start tampering with the economy of America, resting as it does upon farm prices and farm prosperity, by casually adopting in the middle of a debate on potatoes an amendment which will revolutionize the entire farm program, under which the country has been operating for more than a decade, we are then flirting with a fate which may be far beyond the boundaries of anything envisioned by the two fine eastern Senators, with their interests, and their understandable interests, in the chicken farmers and the dairy farmers of the Northeast.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will agree with me, will he not, that in 1952, January 1, the same bill will go into effect, and if it is such a dangerous piece of legislation that it is going to bring all the dire circumstances the Senator has just described, how does he account for the fact that we are going to operate as proposed in 1952?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the Senator raised that question, because I have addressed a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who is on the floor, suggesting that as one Senator I feel that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should bring forth a new bill, new legislation which will better provide for a farm program than the Anderson bill. I have received a nice letter from the chairman, indicating that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is giving the idea some thought and consideration, thus at least affording some hope that that kind of legislation is going to be forthcoming from the committee before the present session of the Congress adjourns.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. In a moment.

I hope, however, it will receive more consideration, as I am assured, than a revolutionary approach to the farm program, tossed into the debate in the middle of a Monday afternoon on what to do about potatoes in Maine, Idaho, South Dakota, and a few other potato-raising States.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senator recognizes, however, does he not, that the crisis among northeastern farmers is, as the Senator from New York has indicated, and that the crisis has been brought about largely because of the present farm law, particularly that portion relating to farm prices?

Mr. MUNDT. I recognize that there is a crisis. I do not think the Senator has put his finger on the cause of it, because in testimony recently given before the House committee Secretary Brannan pointed out that about 50 percent of all the consumers pay for the products of the dairying business and egg business of the East is added to it after it reaches the limits of the cities in which they are distributed. I think there is a considerable amount of correction to be done in the processes by which milk, eggs, and butter are distributed in the eastern cities.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MUNDT. Not at the moment, because I do not want the two Senators to believe that it is only the farmers of the East who are in difficulty, or the consumers. I quote now from a statement recently made by Secretary Brannan in testifying before the House Committee on Appropriations, requesting appropriations for agriculture for 1951. Says the Secretary of Agriculture:

Farmers have been making less every year for the past few years. Last year they had less than four-fifths as much as in 1947. Next year they may have only two-thirds as much as in 1947.

Since 1947 gross farm cash income has fallen more than $2,000,000,000, and cash expenses have gone up by more than $1,000,000,000.

The statement of the Secretary bears out the fact I was stating a little earlier in my colloquy with the Senator from Delaware, that the farmer of the great agricultural area of the Middle West is caught between a very vicious pair of mill stones, one of which is constantly raising against him the pressure of prices going higher on the things he has to buy; the other, the pressure pushing down against him from people wanting to sell his products at less than 90 percent of parity; yes, at less than 85 percent of parity, down as low now as 75 percent of parity; abruptly changing in the course of a few months a situation which he is envisioning as coming along by 1952, and which he and many of us hope to correct before that time, a situation which would precipitate the farmer into chaotic conditions as of 1950.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. IVES The Senator from New York would like to point out at this time to the Senator from South Dakota that those conditions do exist now to a substantial extent in the dairy industry area of the Northeast, and in part for the reasons the Senator has pointed out. The real difficulty is that the cause is due largely to the high prices which are required to be paid by those farmers for the feed that must be fed to the cattle and poultry. It is not a matter of distribution that the condition is largely attributable, not at all. The Senator from New York has had considerable

experience going into that subject. Efforts have been and are being made to curtail those costs of distribution. They are being curtailed. But when it comes to the minimum point of distribution costs, below which it is impossible to go, the dairy farmers and the poultry farmers of the Northeast are still out of luck, due to the high costs of feed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. May I have two additional minutes?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield five more minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for five more minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator. I should like to say it is unquestionably true that some progress is being made in reducing the costs and the complications of distribution, but a greater amount of correction is still to be done in that area, and certainly it cannot be expected if the grain-producing farmers of the Middle West are going to have to operate consistently at a loss, in order to correct a situation existing in the dairying and egg-producing region; all of which it seems to me tends to build up an argument for the consideration by this body of new farm legislation, which is comprehensive, which is equitable, which recognizes the farmers' right to a full parity price, certainly for that portion of his crop which is domestically consumed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Before yielding further, I should like to point out a few more melancholy facts revealed by the Secretary of Agriculture concerning the farmers of the country. He said:

Last year—

That was 1949—

farm operators had about $14,000,000,000 after paying production expenses. This was 15 percent less than they had in 1948, and at least 20 percent less than in 1947.

I should like to call attention in passing, and particularly the attention of Republican Senators, to the fact that in this testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, Secretary Brannan appeared in the rather unusual and novel capacity of a great witness in support of the kind of prosperity existing under the Republican Eightieth Congress, because he says that consistently and without exception the farmer has been getting worse treatment steadily since the adjournment of the last session of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Before yielding, I want to continue with a few more facts from the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture:

The farm-family purchasing power, in terms of 1947 dollars, dropped about $2,000,000,000 in 1948, and about $2,000,000,000 more in 1949. It could drop another $2,000,000,000 in 1950 or another 15 percent if farm prices aren't improved. Farm living expenses, of course, are not coming down as fast as net income.

So the farmers of the great farming area confront the inevitable fact that the prices of everything they buy are steadily rising, in part because, out of consideration for a vast portion of the population on the eastern coast, people who are naturally and understandably concerned about the 75 percent wage minimum, the farmer has had to have that additional burden shouldered upon him. It is simply impossible for him to continue to pay more and more money for a tractor, more and more money for an automobile, more and more money for the combines and other machinery he needs, and at the same time have his prices pushed lower and lower.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A few minutes ago the Senator described the amendment which is now pending, the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, the Senator from Delaware, and other Senators as being revolutionary in character. I point out to the Senator from South Dakota that there is nothing revolutionary in our proposal. The flexible provisions which we are proposing to advance, effective immediately, were acted upon after lengthy hearings last year by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senate voted on the measure. The pending proposal is exactly the same as that which the Senate has approved, effective immediately. However, when the bill came back from conference last year the provision had been eliminated.

Mr. MUNDT. May I point out the reason for its having gone to conference?

Mr. WILLIAMS Both political parties have endorsed the flexible provisions. So has the Farm Bureau, the greatest farm organization in the country.

Mr. MUNDT. If I may point out the reason why it went to conference, in the first instance, it was because, by the help of the Vice President, a tie vote was broken and there was written a firm parity floor under farm prices. The bill went to conference, and when it came back it contained again the old sliding parity formula, which looked so bad that even its sponsors said, "While we ask Senators to vote for it, we cannot possibly expect them to go home this summer and explain it. We cannot hope the farmers are going to accept it. We think it is so distasteful, so unworkable, we do not want to put it into effect until 1950 or 1951. It would immediately disrupt the whole farm program, including the farm price-support program."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot yield at the moment, because I have already given my good friend a greater percentage of my 10 minutes than he gave me. I want to keep the thing equitable.

The Secretary of Agriculture, testifying through his assistants, pointed out that the farmers today are not the fine, privileged characters they have been described, but that they have less stay-on-the-farm income, less money for themselves, than they received in 1947, 1948, or for a long time prior to that. The testimony points out that most of the farm commodities are bringing less than parity——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield one more minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot yield if I have only 1 minute. Prices are now unfairly low. Prices have dropped 23 percent since the high point in January 1948, and 12 percent in the past year.

Let me point out how illogical we shall appear before the farming population of America if, in the middle of a debate to solve an urgent problem regarding potatoes, we should casually adopt an amendment which would change the whole program under which the farmers have been operating since 1938.

I urge Senators to reject emphatically the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. How much time do I have remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eight minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield 1 minute to the junior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able senior Senator from Georgia what his attitude would be regarding the peanut amendment which would permit the growers of the Virginia type of peanuts, which are raised in North Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and South Carolina, to have increased acreage allotments so that the production would meet the market demand.

Mr. GEORGE. I would not oppose it, because I believe in permiting our farmers to meet the actual demand for their own products. The amendment does not increase acreage at all. It merely permits the sale of the product from excess acreage at the market price. No subsidy is involved.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield the remainder of my time to the majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have listened rather attentively to the debate on the various farm problems which we have been discussing in the Senate for the past week. I am somewhat disturbed at the trend which the debate has taken and by the convictions which have been expressed by a number of Senators with reference to different commodities in which their sections of the country are vitally interested.

We find coming over from the House a joint resolution which seeks to increase the acreage of peanuts. The resolution which is before the Senate seeks to increase the acreage of cotton, and there is justification for that increase, because it has been definitely stated before the committee that under no circumstances

would there be more than 21,000,000 acres planted to cotton. On that theory I supported the cotton amendment. We now find an amendment offered by the two distinguished Senators from Colorado increasing the wheat-acreage allotment by approximately 4,000,000 acres, which, according to the Secretary of Agriculture, on an average of 16 bushels to the acre, would cost the Treasury of the United States approximately $60,000,000, assuming that the wheat yield will be the same as it was last year. Last week the Senate of the United States decided that it was not advisable to save $60,000,000 with respect to the potato farmers, after a rather lengthy debate the Senate defeated the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois which would have eliminated price supports until marketing quotas were in effect. This action demonstrated that those Senators who are particularly interested in the potato farmers are more interested in seeing that those farmers get what they think they are entitled to, rather than in saving many millions of dollars for the taxpayers of the country

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I have only 5 minutes, but I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Illinois just stated that the amendment offered by the Senators from Colorado would increase by approximately 4,000,000 acres the wheat-acreage allotment.

Mr. LUCAS. That is one estimate, and it has also been stated that it would increase the acreage approximately 1,000,000 acres.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Secretary of Agriculture is incorrect in his estimate.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my good friend from Colorado that even if it is only a million acres there can be no question that it is another increase in the acreage allotment, so far as wheat is concerned. The Farm Bureau Federation and the Secretary of Agriculture are both against the amendment.

Mr. President, I repeat what I previously said, that I am disturbed when I see Senators from various sections of the Nation asking for more acreage on which to raise certain commodities, when we have all the acreage we can take care of at the present time, when it comes to disposing of the surpluses grown on this acreage.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot help yielding to my friend, because I have great affection for the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The junior Senator from Colorado is disturbed about these conditions, but he is also disturbed about the plight of farmers in western Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, Idaho, and Colorado who will be out of business if they do not receive an equitable share of the whole allotment.

Mr. LUCAS. The same argument was made last year by the distinguished Senator from Colorado. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to have the amendments go to conference and let the conference wrestle with them. I am merely trying to point out to the Congress what we are doing with the present agricultural program, I am greatly disturbed about the proposed increases in acreages of the various basic commodities. I was certainly disturbed by our failure to take vigorous action on potatoes a few days ago. Most of the 43 votes against my amendment were cast by Senators who are the first to cry "socialism." They are the ones who are the most vocal in their denunciation of Government subsidies, and in their protests against Federal spending. They justified their stand on continuing the potato subsidy by declaring that there was an implied contract for the 1950 crop. That argument was answered, to all intents and purposes, by the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] during the debate. Despite this fact, the supporters for more potato subsidies said, "We must go on giving this subsidy to the potato growers of the country at the expense of the taxpayers of the Nation."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senators who cry "economy" and then vote for another agricultural subsidy of $60,000,000 or more will have difficulty justifying their actions to the taxpayers of America.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, those who cry "economy" on one hand and then vote and continue to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska are just as inconsistent if not more so, because the majority leader is against the amendment which would prevent surpluses caused by imports of foreign nations in which there are no restrictions or marketing quotas, from being dumped on to the markets of the United States of America.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska is now the pending question, and it will probably be voted upon first. I say once again that it has nothing to do with reciprocal-trade agreements. It has not a thing to do with peril points. There is a provision under article XI, subsection (c), paragraph 2, which provides for the very thing asked in the amendment of the junior Senator from Nebraska. Last year the Secretary of Agriculture was in favor of the amendment. This year he is not in favor of it. We receive conflicting stories with reference to the State Department not agreeing with the Agricultural Department. I shall not go to Nebraska and talk to the potato farmers and tell them I was willing to vote marketing restrictions against them and, at the same time, permit those who produce potatoes in a foreign country to send them to our market without any quotas or restrictions and receive the complete benefit of price supports about which the majority leader has been speaking. The amendment I have offered is completely consistent with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It is only a temporary measure; it is not a permanent measure.

Regardless of the estimate given by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Department of Agriculture advises me that the imports of Irish potatoes this year, if they should continue at the present rate, will be 15,000,000 bushels. That is more than one-third of the entire surplus about which we are speaking. If we are going to start to do anything about eliminating surpluses, certainly the place to start is with importations from nations which impose no restrictions and no marketing quotas but are able to take advantage of our markets under price supports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Humphrey	Mundt
Butler	Hunt	Myers
Byrd	Ives	Neely
Cain	Jenner	O'Conor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S C	Russell
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Darby	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Smith, N J.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Leahy	Stennis
Eastland	Lehman	Taylor
Ecton	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Long	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lucas	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	
Hickenlooper	Maybank	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the committee amendment the following new section:

That whenever the supply of Irish potatoes in the United States is, or is practically certain to be, in excess of the goal of production or national production allotment set by the Secretary of Agriculture, pursuant to section 401, Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, the President shall proclaim that fact, and thereafter, until such time as the President may determine and proclaim that such a surplus no longer exists, no Irish potatoes or products thereof shall be imported into the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Florida

[Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—31

Brewster	Gurney	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Butler	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Cain	Jenner	Tobey
Cordon	Langer	Watkins
Darby	McCarran	Wherry
Donnell	McCarthy	Wiley
Dworshak	Malone	Williams
Ecton	Millikin	
Ferguson	Morse	

NAYS—46

Byrd	Connally	Ellender
Chapman	Douglas	Frear
Chavez	Eastland	Fulbright
George	Knowland	O'Conor
Graham	Leahy	O'Mahoney
Green	Lehman	Robertson
Hayden	Lodge	Russell
Hill	Long	Sparkman
Hoey	Lucas	Stennis
Humphrey	McClellan	Taylor
Hunt	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Johnson, Colo.	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Tex	Magnuson	Tydings
Johnston, S. C.	Maybank	Withers
Kerr	Myers	
Kilgore	Neely	

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken	Holland	Saltonstall
Anderson	Kefauver	Taft
Benton	Kem	Thye
Capehart	McFarland	Vandenberg
Downey	Martin	Young
Flanders	Murray	
Gillette	Pepper	

So Mr. WHERRY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer my amendment lettered H, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. For the crop year of 1951 and thereafter no price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

Mr. ELLENDER. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the roll was called.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—64

Byrd	Connally	Douglas
Cain	Cordon	Downey
Chapman	Darby	Eastland
Chavez	Donnell	Ecton
Ellender	Kerr	O'Conor
Ferguson	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Frear	Knowland	Robertson
Fulbright	Leahy	Russell
George	Lehman	Schoeppel
Graham	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Green	Long	Sparkman
Hayden	Lucas	Stennis
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	McKellar	Tobey
Humphrey	McMahon	Tydings
Hunt	Magnuson	Watkins
Ives	Maybank	Wiley
Jenner	Millikin	Williams
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Withers
Johnson, Tex.	Myers	
Johnston, S. C	Neely	

NAYS—14

Brewster	Gurney	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Langer	Taylor
Butler	McCarran	Wherry
Dworshak	Malone	

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken	Holland	Pepper
Anderson	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Benton	Kem	Taft
Capehart	McFarland	Thye
Flanders	Martin	Vandenberg
Gillette	Murray	Young

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and myself, I offer the amendment lettered H, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

That paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (Public Law Numbered 439, Eighty-first Congress) are hereby repealed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I am informed that if he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold by vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and

the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent and his pair has been announced previously by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 59, as follows.

YEAS—17

Bricker	Hendrickson	Smith, N J.
Bridges	Ives	Tobey
Byrd	Knowland	Tydings
Cain	Lodge	Watkins
Ferguson	O'Conor	Williams
Frear	Robertson	

NAYS—59

Brewster	Hoey	Malone
Butler	Humphrey	Maybank
Chapman	Hunt	Millikin
Chavez	Jenner	Morse
Cordon	Johnson, Colo	Mundt
Darby	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Donnell	Johnston, S. C	Neely
Douglas	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kilgore	Russell
Dworshak	Langer	Schoeppel
Eastland	Leahy	Smith, Maine
Ecton	Lehman	Sparkman
Ellender	Long	Stennis
Fulbright	Lucas	Taylor
George	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Graham	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Green	McClellan	Wherry
Gurney	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	Withers
Hill	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—20

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Anderson	Holland	Saltonstall
Benton	Kefauver	Taft
Capehart	Kem	Thye
Connally	McFarland	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Young
Gillette	Murray	

So the amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS, on behalf of himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer and send to the desk an amendment, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and myself, to repeal paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of section 101, effective January 1, 1951. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

That paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (Public Law No. 439, 81st Cong.), are hereby repealed effective January 1, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. WILLIAMS and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If he were present and voting, I am informed that he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent and his pair has been announced previously by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—20

Bricker	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bridges	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Tobey
Cain	Lodge	Tydings
Cordon	McCarran	Watkins
Ferguson	Morse	Williams
Frear	O'Conor	

NAYS—55

Brewster	Hoey	Maybank
Butler	Humphrey	Millikin
Chapman	Hunt	Mundt
Chavez	Jenner	Myers
Darby	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Donnell	Johnson, Tex	O'Muhoney
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Downey	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Langer	Sparkman
Ecton	Leahy	Stennis
Ellender	Lehman	Taylor
Fulbright	Long	Thomas, Okla.
George	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Graham	McCarthy	Wherry
Green	McClellan	Wiley
Gurney	McKellar	Withers
Hayden	McMahon	
Hill	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—21

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Pepper
Benton	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Taft
Connally	McFarland	Thye
Flanders	Malone	Vandenberg
Gillette	Martin	Young

So the amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS, on behalf of himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment, which I have modified, and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) That section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(g) Beginning with the 1950 crop of peanuts, payment of the marketing penalty as provided in subsection (a) will not be required on any excess peanuts which are delivered to or marketed through an agency or agencies designated each year by the Secretary. Any peanuts received under this subsection by such agency shall be sold by such

agency (i) for crushing for oil under a sales agreement approved by the Secretary; (ii) for cleaning and shelling at prices not less than those established for quota peanuts under any peanut diversion, peanut loan, or peanut purchase program; or (iii) for seed at prices established by the Secretary. For all peanuts so delivered to a designated agency under this subsection, producers shall be paid for the portion of the lot constituting excess peanuts, the prevailing market value thereof for crushing for oil, less the estimated cost of storing, handing, and selling such peanuts. Any person, who, pursuant to the provisions of this subsection, acquires peanuts for crushing for oil and who uses or disposes of such peanuts for any purpose other than that for which acquired shall pay a penalty to the United States, at a rate equal to the marketing penalty prescribed in subsection (a), upon the peanuts so used or disposed of and shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both, for each and every offense. Operations under this subsection shall be carried on under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

'(h) For the purposes of price support with respect to the 1950 and subsequent crops of peanuts, a 'cooperator' shall be (1) a producer on whose farm the acreage of peanuts picked or threshed does not exceed the farm acreage allotment or (2) a producer on whose farm the acreage of peanuts picked or threshed exceeds the farm acreage allotment provided any peanuts picked or threshed in excess of the farm marketing quota are delivered to or marketed through an agency or agencies designated by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (g) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary

"(i) The provision of this section shall not apply with respect to any crop when marketing quotas are in effect on the corresponding crop for soybeans"

(b) That the second sentence in paragraph (d) of section 358 is amended to read as follows: "Any acreage of peanuts harvested in excess of the allotted acreage for any farm for any year shall not be considered in the establishment of the allotment for the farm in succeeding years."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator ask to be recognized?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a statement of one sentence respecting the pending amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The House joint resolution carries a provision respecting peanuts, and the committee has no objection to the pending amendment, because the question will be considered in conference, anyway.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. TOBEY. Could this be characterized as peanut politics? [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. [Laughter.] The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—49

Byrd	Hunt	Millikin
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Tex	Neely
Connally	Johnston, S. C	O'Conor
Douglas	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kilgore	Robertson
Eastland	Leahy	Russell
Ecton	Lehman	Schoeppel
Ellender	Long	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lucas	Stennis
George	McCarran	Taylor
Graham	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McMahon	Tydings
Hill	Magnuson	Withers
Hoey	Malone	
Humphrey	Maybank	

NAYS—28

Brewster	Gurney	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Ives	Tobey
Cain	Jenner	Watkins
Cordon	Knowland	Wherry
Darby	Langer	Wiley
Donnell	Lodge	Williams
Dworshak	McCarthy	
Ferguson	Morse	

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken	Holland	Saltonstall
Anderson	Kefauver	Taft
Benton	Kem	Thye
Capehart	McFarland	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Young
Frear	Murray	
Gillette	Pepper	

So Mr. GEORGE'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 16.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understand the Senator in charge has no objection to the amendment's going to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is not in order.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the farm acreage allotment of wheat for the 1951 crop for any farm shall not be less than the larger of—

(a) 50 percent of—

(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1949, and

(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1948 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1949, or

(b) 50 percent of—

(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1949, and

(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1947 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1948;

adjusted in the same ratio as the national seeding for the production of wheat during the calendar year 1950 (adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trend in acreage) bears to the national acreage allotment for wheat for the 1951 crop; but no acreage shall be included under (a) or (b) which the Secretary, by appropriate regulation, determines will become an undue erosion hazard under continued farming Notwithstanding the foregoing, no allotment increased by reason of the provisions of this section shall exceed that percentage of the 1950 allotment for the same farm which (1) the acreage allotted in the county to farms which do not receive an increase under this section is of (2) the acreage allotted to such farms in 1950 To the extent that the allotment to any county is insufficient to provide for such minimum allotments, the Secretary shall allot such county such additional acreage (which shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments otherwise provided for under the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended) as may be necessary in order to provide for such minimum farm allotments.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a telegram received from the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it is in the nature of an argument for or against the joint resolution, it would not be in order.

Mr. GURNEY. I am not asking to read it; I am asking that it be printed in the RECORD at this point. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a point of order. Would it be in order by unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it would be in order.

Mr. GURNEY. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAMOURE, N. DAK., *February 27, 1950.*

Senator CHAN GURNEY:

I believe Senate approval of Millikin-Johnson amendment would be serious blow to whole wheat support program and may well lead to another surplus situation which the same as we now have with respect to potatoes If we are to maintain present price support, production must be reduced and not by favoritism to any particular area. Present legislation adequate to permit Secretary of Agriculture to make necessary adjustments. Secretary has 4,507,000 acres to make adjustments between States. Colorado received from this pool 789,225 acres, North Dakota 300,000 acres, South Dakota 243,856 acres. Historically, Colorado ranks lower in production of wheat than either North or South Dakota. There is widespread dissatisfaction in spring wheat area now on part of wheat farmers. They feel, and rightfully so, they are being discriminated against. Acreage this area has remained approximately constant for many years, while other areas have increase. Extension of Millikin-Johnson amendment as contained in Public Law 272 would make our producers in spring wheat area bear an unreasonable share of necessary reduction while other areas would be given increased base. Most reliable authorities here predict that if Millikin-Johnson amendment is approved, at least 25 percent of farmers in spring wheat area will not comply with acreage reduction requirements This area already bearing brunt of reduction program and in greater need of special legislation than most other areas Millikin-Johnson amendment was not presented to Senate Agricultural Committee. Did hold hearings, but refused to take a permanent action. Hope you can make this telegram a part of records.

Regards.

MILTON R YOUNG,
United States Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 16, offered by the Senators from Colorado.

Mr. LODGE and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—49

Brewster	Hayden	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Myers
Butler	Hill	Neely
Cain	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Hunt	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo	Schoeppel
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Darby	Kerr	Stennis
Downey	Long	Taylor
Dworshak	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McClellan	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Watkins
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wherry
George	Malone	Withers
Graham	Maybank	
Gurney	Millikin	

NAYS—24

Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Byrd	Kilgore	O'Conor
Donnell	Knowland	Robertson
Douglas	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Leahy	Smith, N J.
Green	Lehman	Tobey
Hickenlooper	Lodge	Wiley
Ives	McMahon	Williams

NOT VOTING—23

Aiken	Holland	Murray
Anderson	Humphrey	Pepper
Benton	Jenner	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kefauver	Taft
Cordon	Kem	Thye
Flanders	Lucas	Vandenberg
Frear	McFarland	Young
Gillette	Martin	

So the amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. MILLIKIN was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendments, the question is on committee amendment as amended.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which has been sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, at the end of section 2, it is proposed to add the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to offer for sale at the point of storage any potatoes produced in surplus areas and now in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation to wholesalers, jobbers, retailers, or consumers, for distribution and consumption in deficit areas, at prices per bushel which will return to the said Commodity Credit Corporation its total investment in such potatoes, including handling and carrying costs: *And provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to define surplus areas with respect to the production of potatoes and also deficit areas where such potatoes may be distributed: *And provided further*, That this proviso shall be complied with prior to either giving away or the destruction of any potatoes now in the possession of the said Commodity Credit Corporation."

(On request of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and by unanimous consent granted earlier during the course of today's debate, the following letter, addressed by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to the Secretary of Agriculture, was ordered to be printed at this point in the RECORD:)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
February 24, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES F BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR SECRETARY: During the hearings and consideration of the so-called Anderson farm bill, I made two suggestions which did not meet with the approval of your Department.

The first suggestion was that an Assistant Secretary be provided for the express purpose of developing and supervising a marketing department for the disposal of commodities taken over under the CCC loan and purchase program.

The second suggestion was that in communities where surplus commodities have been or are being taken over, that such commodities should be made available to citizens in the deficit areas

At the present time potatoes have been or are being taken over at approximately $1 per bushel, while the average price received by farmers throughout the entire country is some 81 percent of parity, or $1 36 per bushel. In some parts of the country potatoes are selling as high as $2 85 per bushel, as in Florida, and $2 45 per bushel in Mississippi; such prices are being received by farmers.

Insofar as I can learn, potatoes are not being sold at any point in the United States at a figure as low as the Government's support price. To me this means that with a little effort the potatoes on hand could be distributed throughout the United States and sold in deficit areas at such a price as would enable your Department to either make a profit or lose but little money in the handling of such commodities.

The argument against this policy heretofore has been that if the Government initiated a policy of distributing its surplus commodities, that such commodities would come in direct competition with like products produced locally and that such a policy would, in effect, defeat the over-all price-support program.

If my information is correct, I do not believe this argument is sound. In the past we have taken over great quantities of cotton and later the Government has disposed of such cotton locally and, in many cases, at a substantial profit.

I understand that the CCC is now selling corn and other products taken over under loans at prices below the loan or support price.

My motive for making this suggestion with respect to potatoes is to try to check an obvious uprising of criticism against our entire

support price policy. I have been in my State recently and everywhere I went I was confronted with this potato problem. The people are unable to understand why they have to pay 3½ to 5 cents per pound for potatoes at a time when our Government has millions of bushels on hand and is seeking a way to destroy the product, rather than trying to distribute the potatoes among the people who are in need and want such product.

I am advised that the CCC has recently made a contract with the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. wherein such railroad company has granted a substantial reduction in freight rates on shipments of potatoes sold and delivered to the Publicker alcohol plant located at Philadelphia. I am further advised that the Publicker plant is receiving the potatoes at the cost of 1 cent per hundredweight, plus the reduced freight rate that has been secured by the CCC.

Of course, I think it better to dispose of the potatoes as indicated rather than to destroy them, however, such program cannot be explained satisfactorily to the people who are having to pay rather high prices for this commodity Further, it is my opinion that under the Agriculture Act of 1949 you have the authority to dispose of these potatoes either by destruction or by sale at a nominal price, or at any price you can get for such commodity.

Under section 407 of such act the CCC may sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at any price not prohibited by said section

Under subdivision (D), it is provided that "sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there is a danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage"; which means, as I understand the law, that there is no restriction against the sale of such commodities at any price that may be obtained for same.

If my interpretation of the law is correct, then the issue resolves itself into a question of policy, and inasmuch as the Government has heretofore sold and distributed commodities domestically, it occurs to me that such a policy should be worked out and carried into effect with respect to potatoes

I submit the foregoing suggestions to you for such consideration as they merit.

Yours most cordially,

ELMER THOMAS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—71

Brewster	Hendrickson	Maybank
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bridges	Hill	Morse
Butler	Hoey	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Myers
Cain	Ives	Neely
Chapman	Jenner	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S C	Russell
Darby	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Downey	Langer	Smith, N J.
Dworshak	Leahy	Sparkman
Eastland	Lehman	Stennis
Ecton	Lodge	Thomas, Okla
Ferguson	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarran	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tydings
George	McClellan	Watkins
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Withers
Hayden	Malone	

NAYS—6

Donnell	Knowland	Taylor
Ellender	Long	Wherry

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Anderson	Kefauver	Taft
Benton	Kem	Thye
Capehart	McFarland	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Young
Gillette	Murray	
Holland	Pepper	

So the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—53

Byrd	Hunt	Mundt
Chapman	Johnson, Colo	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Tex	Neely
Connally	Johnston, S. C	O'Conor
Darby	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Kilgore	Robertson
Douglas	Leahy	Russell
Downey	Lehman	Schoeppel
Eastland	Long	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Lucas	Smith, N J.
Fulbright	McCarran	Sparkman
George	McClellan	Stennis
Graham	McKellar	Taylor
Green	McMahon	Thomas, Okla
Hayden	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Hendrickson	Malone	Tydings
Hill	Maybank	Withers
Hoey	Millikin	

NAYS—24

Brewster	Ferguson	Lodge
Bricker	Frear	McCarthy
Bridges	Gurney	Morse
Butler	Hickenlooper	Tobey
Cain	Ives	Watkins
Cordon	Jenner	Wherry
Dworshak	Knowland	Wiley
Ecton	Langer	Williams

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Anderson	Kefauver	Taft
Benton	Kem	Thye
Capehart	McFarland	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Young
Gillette	Murray	
Holland	Pepper	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) was passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary be authorized to make the title conform to the text of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution relating to farm acreage allotments for cotton and wheat under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and to price support for potatoes and peanuts."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution, as passed, be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Resolved, That the joint resolution from the House of Representatives (H. J. Res. 398) entitled "Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended," do pass with the following amendments: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 344 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(4) Any part of the acreage allotted to individual farms in any county under the provisions of this section which will not be planted to cotton in the year for which allotted and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotments to such farms and may be reapportioned within the State in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, preference being given to other farms in the same county receiving allotments which the Secretary determines are inadequate and not representative in view of their past production of cotton. Any transfer of allotment under this paragraph in any year shall not operate to reduce the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm from which acreage is transferred; except in accordance with paragraph (1) (B) and the proviso in paragraph (2) of this subsection: *Provided*, That any part of any farm acreage allotment may be permanently released in writing to the county committee by the owner and operator of the farm and may be reapportioned in the manner set forth above

"'(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and without reducing any farm acreage allotment determined pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, each farm acreage allotment for 1950 shall be increased by such amount as may be necessary to provide an allotment equal to 60 per centum of the average acreage planted to cotton (or regarded as having been planted to cotton under the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) on the farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948; but no such allotment shall be increased by reason of this provision to an acreage in excess of 40 per centum of the acreage on the farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation, determined in the same manner and with the same exclusions as provided for by paragraph (2). Determination of the average acreage planted or regarded as planted on any farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948 shall be made by the county committee after consideration of such evidence as may be submitted by the owner or operator, and shall be subject to review by the State committee. An increase in any 1950 farm acreage allotment shall be made pursuant to this paragraph only upon application in writing by the owner or operator of the farm within such time as may be prescribed by the Secretary, and the amount of any such increase shall not exceed the amount requested in such application. The acreage allotment computed in accordance with paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection (f) for each year subsequent to 1950 for each farm receiving an increase in its 1950 acreage allotment pursuant to this paragraph shall be increased by such amount as may be necessary to provide an allotment equal to its allotment for the preceding year increased or decreased, respectively, in the same proportion that the county acreage allotment is greater or less than the county acreage allotment for the preceding year; but no allotment shall be increased by reason of this provision to an acreage in excess of the largest acreage planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) to cotton on such farm during any of the preceding 3 years. To the maximum extent possible, the Secretary, and State, and county committees shall carry out the provisions of this paragraph in 1951 and subsequent years by use of the acreage reserved under sections 344 (e) and 344 (f) (3) and by reallocated acreage under paragraph (4) of this subsection. The additional acreage required to be allotted to farms under this paragraph shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota.

"'(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and without reducing any farm-acreage allotment determined pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, in the case of any State with an allotment for 1950 amounting to less than 3,000 acres, the allotment for such State shall be increased by an additional acreage of 2,000 acres to be used for establishing allotments for new farms in 1950 The additional acreage required to be allotted under this paragraph shall be in addition to the county, State, and National acreage allotments and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota'

"SEC. 2. No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes harvested after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas hereafter authorized by law, or marketing agreements and marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to offer for sale at the point of storage any potatoes produced in surplus areas and now in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation to wholesalers, jobbers, retailers, or consumers, for distribution and consumption in deficit areas, at prices per bushel which will return to the said Commodity Credit Corporation its total investment in such potatoes, including handling and carrying costs *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to define surplus areas with respect to the production of potatoes and also deficit areas where such potatoes may be distributed: *And provide further*, That this proviso shall be complied with prior to either giving away or the destruction of any potatoes now in the possession of the said Commodity Credit Corporation.

"SEC. 3. For the crop year of 1951 and thereafter no price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

"SEC. 4. (a) That section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsections:

"'(g) Beginning with the 1950 crop of peanuts, payment of the marketing penalty as provided in subsection (a) will not be required on any excess peanuts which are delivered to or marketed through an agency or agencies designated each year by the Secretary. Any peanuts received under this subsection by such agency shall be sold by such agency (i) for crushing for oil under a sales agreement approved by the Secretary; (ii) for cleaning and shelling at prices not less than those established for quota peanuts under any peanut diversion, peanut loan, or peanut-purchase program; or (iii) for seed at prices established by the Secretary. For all peanuts so delivered to a designated agency under this subsection, producers shall be paid for the portion of the lot constituting excess peanuts, the prevailing market value thereof for crushing for oil, less the estimated cost of storing, handling, and selling such peanuts. Any person who, pursuant to the provisions of this subsection, acquires peanuts for crushing for oil and who uses or disposes of such peanuts for any purpose other than that for which acquired shall pay a penalty to the United States, at a rate equal to the marketing penalty prescribed in subsection (a), upon the peanuts so used or disposed of and shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both, for each and every offense. Operations under this subsection shall be carried on under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"'(h) For the purposes of price support with respect to the 1950 and subsequent crops of peanuts, a "cooperator" shall be (1) a producer on whose farm the acreage of peanuts picked or threshed does not exceed the farm acreage allotment or (2) a producer on whose farm the acreage of peanuts picked or threshed exceeds the farm acreage allotment provided any peanuts picked or threshed in excess of the farm-marketing quota are delivered to or marketed through an agency or agencies designated by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (g) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"'(i) The provision of this section shall not apply with respect to any crop when marketing quotas are in effect on the corresponding crop for soybeans'

"(b) That the second sentence in paragraph (d) of section 358 is amended to read as follows: 'Any acreage of peanuts harvested in excess of the allotted acreage for any farm for any year shall not be considered in the establishment of the allotment for the farm in succeeding years.'

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the farm-acreage allotment of wheat for the 1951 crop for any farm shall not be less than the larger of—

"(a) 50 percent of—

"(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1949, and

"(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1948 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1949, or

"(b) 50 percent of—

"(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1948, and

"(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1947 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1948,

adjusted in the same ratio as the national seeding for the production of wheat during the calendar year 1950 (adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trend in acreage) bears to the national acreage allotment for wheat for the 1951 crop; but no acreage shall be included under (a) or (b) which the Secretary, by appropriate regulations, determines will become an undue erosion hazard under continued farming. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no allotment increased by reason of the provisions of this section shall exceed that percentage of the 1950 allotment for the same farm which (1) the acreage alloted in the county to farms

which do not receive an increase under this section is of (2) the acreage allotted to such farms in 1950. To the extent that the allotment to any county is insufficient to provide for such minimum allotments, the Secretary shall allot such county such additional acreage (which shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments otherwise provided for under the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended) as may be necessary in order to provide for such minimum farm allotments."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HOEY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. THYE conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Because of the importance of the joint resolution which has just been passed, and the interest in it which is prevalent throughout the country, I ask that as many copies as the Secretary of the Senate may deem proper be printed for use of the Folding Room and the Document Room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE—FIRST REPORT OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for two or three minutes. It will be recalled that a few days ago the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 231, dealing with charges as to loyalty of employees in the State Department, and so forth. The Foreign Relations Committee met on last Saturday and authorized the chairman to appoint a subcommittee. The Senator from Texas, as chairman of the committee, appointed the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to be members of the subcommittee.

The subcommittee met today and formulated a statement which it desires the chairman to make on the floor of the Senate. I send the statement to the desk, and ask that it be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

FIRST REPORT OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 231

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 231, herewith makes its first report.

1. The committee met Saturday, February 25, and appointed the following subcommittee to pursue the work encompassed in said resolution. The subcommittee is as follows: Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, chairman; Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island; Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut; Senator HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa; Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts.

2. In order that the subcommittee and the full committee may discharge their task in accordance with said resolution, the subcommittee was instructed as follows:

"To make a full and complete study and investigation of all Government employees now in the Department of State and former employees of the Department of State now in other agencies of the Government against whom charges are made in order to determine whether or not said employees are or have been disloyal to the United States, and to use the power of subpena whenever necessary."

3. It was further resolved by the subcommittee and later by the full committee that the scope and procedure outlined above be brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the second paragraph of the report purport to follow the terms of the resolution under which the committee was directed to act?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say, first, that the subcommittee was unanimous, and the full Committee on Foreign Relations was unanimous in making this report. The subcommittee made it for the reason that, as Senators will understand if they read the first section of the resolution adopted by the Senate, we did not know how far back we should go. We could go all the way back to Thomas Jefferson, and, of course, no one assumed that the Senate would want the committee to go back that far. The resolution provides for an investigation of all charges made against persons who are now employed or who have been employed by the State Department and have gone to another agency of the Government. The committee instructed the subcommittee to do that, though it was not necessary, so as to try to inform the Senate that we were going to do what the debate seems the Senate wanted us to do, although the resolution, in the ambiguous way in which it was drawn, might leave us under the impression that we were to do things the Senate did not have in mind when it adopted the resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was on the floor at the time of the adoption of the resolution and was present during the debate on it and I offered an amendment to the resolution. In view of that fact, the Senator from Michigan cannot see how the report complies with the resolution itself. One amendment was offered to extend the language from "then in the employ of the State Department" to "or have been in the employ of the State Department," for the specific reason, as was said in the debate, that charges have been made against persons who have been in the employ of the State Department and who have been discharged. Under the present interpretation by the committee, it is apparent that if an employee left the Department before the date of the adoption of the resolution—even the day before—he or she would not be investigated, under the interpretation by the committee, unless he or she went to another department.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it the purpose of the Senator to have us investigate persons who are not now in the employ of the State Department, who are not employed by any other agency of the Government, and who have been out of the Department for 10 or 15 years?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, what length of time shall we consider? The resolution does not specify any length of time. That is the point. If the Senate wants us to investigate all persons charged who have left the Department, and who are not now employed by the Government, or have not been within a 5-year period or a 3-year period or a 10-year period or a 25-year period, we can do that. But as it stands we do not know whether we ought to go all the way back, as I have said, to the time of Thomas Jefferson, or where we ought to start.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was clear by the language of the last amendment adopted that investigation should be made of all persons against whom charges were made or against whom charges had been heard. Charges were placed in the record of the Senate by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] against numbers rather than particular persons. As I understand, the Senator from Wisconsin indicated that he will give to the committee the names of all those persons. It was the intention of the Senate, as I read the resolution, that all persons against whom charges were made were to be investigated, whether they then were in the State Department, in other agencies, or were out of Government.

Mr TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Since the Senator from Michigan offered the amendment, and since that is what he expected to be accomplished by the adoption of the amendment, and since the amendment was adopted without calling the committee together, I think I can say to the Senator on behalf of all the members of the committee that whatever charges the Senator from Wisconsin brings against present or past employees of the State Department, irrespective of where they are now, will be investigated even though not physically included in the charges presented to the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is a fair explanation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I only wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate this matter which I submitted to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that there ought to be some limitation, and

the Senator from Michigan has marked out the area which I will be glad to pursue. I think the Senator will see that without this discussion, however, the committee might conceivably have been charged with bad faith in not going back beyond the McCarthy charges.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I think the debate clearly indicated that the resolution meant to include persons against whom charges have been made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me for a moment before he yields to the Senator from California?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the Senator from Michigan and to others who are interested, that all the charges preferred by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], whether the employees are now in the Department, whether they have left the Department and are not employed by the Government, or whether they have gone to some other agency, will be fully investigated. I do not want, however, to leave the resolution with no bottom, because the first paragraph is so general that the committee was afraid there might be an ambiguity, which it wanted cleared up before it launched its investigation.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator whether he will yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum. I believe it is most important that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] be present.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Wisconsin knows about this.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have him present. If a quorum call is had, I shall be glad to have the order for the calling of the roll rescinded if the Senator from Wisconsin comes to the floor. We have sent for him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment——

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment, Mr. President; I have the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. There are other Senators, in addition to the Senator from Michigan, who have requested that I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have asked the distinguished Senator from Texas whether he will yield to permit the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not do so at the moment. I think we probably can get one.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am endeavoring to find in the RECORD the debate I had with the distinguished Senator from Michigan last Monday, as I recall, when I called to his attention the very point which has been raised by the Senator from Maryland. At that time I asked whether the committee would be compelled to go back 50 years in making the investigation. The Senator from Michigan replied "No." As I recall he said the question as to how far back the investigation would go would be left to the discretion of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan also said in the debate that he was including in the language of the amendment the words "against whom charges have been heard," and at least those persons were to be investigated.

Mr. CONNALLY. Those words are in the resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. The same applies to the subpena. The language of the resolution, as adopted by the Senate, is that—

> The committee is directed to procure, by subpena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files.

And in the language submitted in the first draft of the resolution, we find the words:

> To use the power of subpena whenever necessary.

The debate on the floor of the Senate indicated that subpenas were to be issued, and not wherever the committee thought it necessary to do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield, to permit me to interrupt the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose I were to ask the Secretary of State or any other official to give our committee the loyalty files, and suppose he were to do so. Would the Senator from Michigan then want us to issue a subpena anyway, notwithstanding that what we had requested was presented to us?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; if the Senator had the loyalty files, I would not expect him to issue a subpena.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what I have said. In other words, we would expect to use a subpena wherever necessary. Of course, if we make the request and the material is presented, there is no sense in issuing a subpena.

Mr. FERGUSON. But I do not understand that is the language which has been used.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, yes; that is the language.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that is what the Senator has in mind, namely, that the request will be made first, and that if the files are not delivered, then a subpena will be issued, in the regular course, to obtain the files——

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course; but we do not wish to start out by issuing a subpena when it is not necessary to do so. At least we should submit a request to the head of the Department and should obtain either an adverse or a favorable answer.

We do not want to take the position that they will not give us what we ask for. I take the position that they will give us what we ask for.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that is the interpretation of the language, I think it conforms to the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On the point raised by the Senator from Michigan—and I think it should be very clearly understood here on the floor—let me say that the resolution as adopted by the Senate provides that—

> In the conduct of this study and investigation, the committee is directed to procure, by subpena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and such other agencies against whom charges have been heard.

That is the language of the Senate resolution by which the committee was directed to make the investigation.

Are we now to understand that in conformity with the resolution adopted by the Senate, the committee is first going to request of the Department the complete loyalty and employment files of all Government employees in the Department of State—in other words, that the committee is not merely going to request a portion of them—a portion which the Department might present—but that the committee is going to request, in conformity with the Senate resolution, all the files? If they are not forthcoming, are we to understand that the committee then is going to proceed, under direction of the Senate resolution, to subpena them, so that the net effect will be that, either by request or by subpena, the committee will get all the records outlined in the Senate esolution? Is that correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Insofar as the Senator from Maryland has any voice in conducting the investigation, he is going to assume in advance that any reasonable request made by the committee will be honored pronto, and that would include a request for everything the committee needed, whether it is within the purview of the resolution or beyond it. But the Senator from Maryland thinks he can be a gentleman without being a criminal persecutor and prosecutor at one and the same time.

So I would first make a request, in proper phraseology, for the full and complete files on any individual against whom charges have been made. If the request were not acceded to, I would then employ the power of subpena.

But I certainly would not feel like insulting Government officials unnecessarily by having them summonsed or having them subpenaed duces tecum, to bring the files in question, without first making a request in proper language.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say that the Senator does not need to feel affronted by the question raised by the Senator from California. I probably would not have raised the question if the newspapers had not carried stories to the effect that at a White House conference

the President of the United States said the Senate was not going to get the loyalty files. Inasmuch as that statement was made at a press conference by the President, I think the question is a perfectly pertinent one to raise on the floor of the Senate.

I am very happy if the Senator now has information that the President has reversed the position——

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment, Mr. President; I have no information. The Senator should not attempt to put words into my mouth.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, judging from the press conference held by the President at the White House, it appears that a subpena will be necessary in order to get the information the Senator's committee has been directed to get.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. All I can say to the Senator from California and to all other Members of this body is that the Senator from Maryland—and he thinks he can speak for all other members of the committee—will do a full and complete job of investigation and will employ every power necessary, whether provided for in the resolution or not provided for in it, to make that kind of an investigation. It is not going to be a witch hunt or a whitewash or be made a partisan football.

So far as I can control it—and I believe the members of the subcommittee can control it—we are going to be fully on guard, in carrying out the evident and expressed intent of the Senate, in pursuing the objectives set forth by the resolution.

I have raised this point and have asked the chairman of the committee to bring this matter before the Senate simply because we wish to start with a full comprehension of exactly what we are going to do.

Now that the Senator from Michigan has pointed out what seems to be an area which should have been encompassed, I think I can say to him that we will take care of the matter he has suggested.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

REARMAMENT BY THE ARAB NATIONS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, less than 12 months ago, the sound of battle ended on the shores of the eastern Mediterranean, and a succession of agreements was signed between the Arab states and the new Republic of Israel. Those agreements were instruments of armistice. Since then, the government of Israel and the individual governments of the Arab nations have been holding conversations looking toward the negotiation of peace treaties. Those conversations have not been fruitful. The relations between those countries are still in the nature of an armistice.

While the struggle through which the people of Israel maintained and established their sovereignty was going on, the security council of the United Nations voted an embargo upon the shipment of arms to any of the belligerents. On August 9, 1949, that embargo was lifted, despite the fact that the relations among the nations involved continued to be that of simple armistice. But in recognition of this circumstance, the security council declared that shipments of arms by the great powers to the middle eastern countries should not exceed "those necessary for the purpose of maintaining law and order by the governments concerned." The American representative of the security council, the Honorable Warren Austin, said at the time that these arms shipments should be "strictly limited to such arms as are within the scope of legitimate security requirements."

Today, and for the past several months, there has been going on a large-scale rearmament of the Arab nations most heavily involved in the fighting against Israel, namely, Egypt, Iraq, Transjordan, and Syria Egypt, above all, according to authoritative reports, has been acquiring destroyers, corvettes, heavy tanks of the General Sherman type, and heavy bombers. The 1949–50 budget of the Egyptian Government provided roughly $200,000,000, or one-third of the entire national budget, for armament.

Mr. President, it does not seem to me that such an expenditure for armaments is necessary to maintain internal order in Egypt. Internal order might be better assured in that country—though I am not presuming to give advice to Egypt on the ordering of her internal affairs—by expenditures for economic programs to raise the standard of living of the impoverished people of that country.

But, Mr. President, the point is that these arms are being furnished to Egypt and these other Arab countries largely by Britain, while Britain is, at the same time, turning to the United States for more arms. I am wholly in accord with the program of helping to arm Britain and our other allies in Europe and to make Europe better able to resist aggression from any quarter. But I am not willing to help arm Britain or any other country in order that such a country may arm Egypt to renew warfare against Israel, which is the focus and the center of the new democratic order in the Near East.

Today's newspapers, Mr. President, report that the Israel Government has asked the United States Government for permission to purchase additional arms in this country. Now the Government of Israel, so deeply absorbed with economic problems, must turn its attention to rearmament. This is the traditional pattern of the armaments race, productive of nothing but waste and war.

Mr. President, the simple facts appear to be about as follows:

First. During the past few months, Egypt has steadily increased her air power, originally consisting only of Spitfires, to include modern jet fighters and heavy bombers in considerable number.

Second. Egypt's ground forces are being reequipped with heavy mobile units. Egypt's surface forces have been vastly enlarged by the addition of heavily gunned destroyers, corvettes, and frigates of recent design.

Third. The armed forces of Iraq, Syria, and the Hashemite kingdom of Jordan have undergone less substantial, but still significant transformations into better-equipped and efficiently trained groups.

Fourth. The equipment involved in this rearmament program has come almost exclusively from Britain through the arms-assistance treaties which the United Kingdom has with Egypt, Iraq, and Jordan.

These are the facts. They are not denied either by the Arab Governments, by Britain, or by our own State Department. These facts must be weighed in connection with the further circumstance that some officials of the very governments which are being armed have recently been making statements of an increasingly warlike nature. The press of the countries neighboring upon Israel has again begun to be marked by its inflammatory tone, whipping up popular sentiment for a resumption of hostilities against Israel. Nor can these facts be denied.

The attention of our own State Department has been called to these circumstances. Secretary Acheson has replied that although the facts are largely as alleged, the State Department does not interpret them as indicating any new danger of an outbreak of hostilities against Israel.

Although our Government originally took the position that no arms should be shipped to these countries in excess of the needs for internal security, the State Department is now taking the position that this rearming of the Arab countries may be considered as part of the program for strengthening these countries against Soviet aggression. Our State Department thus recognizes the fact that this rearmament is in excess of the needs of these countries for internal law and order.

Mr. President, no one is more deeply committed than I am to the strengthening of all nations against the threat of Soviet aggression or of Communist subversion. But I do not see how, in view of all the facts, we can blind ourselves to the much greater threat of renewed aggression against Israel. The geographical and strategic factors are very clear and simple. There is no more imminent threat of a Soviet thrust across the Mediterranean into Egypt than there is a threat to Libya or to Saudi Arabia. The much more immediate threat is to Israel. Until the Arab nations make peace with Israel, and until the Middle East is stabilized as to the nations which comprise that region, the continuation of large-scale armament of the Arab states can only brew trouble and war. In that trouble and in that war lie the only immediate hopes which the Kremlin may have for successes in the Middle East.

I admit that the interpretation of these events is a matter of judgment and that the opinion of our State Department officials on this subject may be superior to that of others here and abroad who fear that these military preparations are directed at renewing the war against Israel. But in my view, the evidence at hand to support the war theory is weighty indeed.

In any case, the outbreak of war in this region would be a tragedy of world importance. We must not be responsible for such an event merely because of a mistake in judging the motives of nations that are openly and speedily rearming.

Therefore, I must ask the State Department to review this potentially dangerous situation as quickly as possible in order to ward off the slightest chance of a renewal of the Palestine conflict.

The best means of averting such a conflict would be to make representations to the British Government to stop any further shipments of arms until a proper investigation of the entire arms situation in the Middle East is made by a United Nations committee.

Mr. President, I am addressing these words to the Senate, and also to the Secretary of State. I am asking him to reassess his judgment of the situation as I am asking the American public to beware of complacency.

Mr. President, we are about to consider amendments to our Displaced Persons Act. We are about to consider additional steps to help liquidate the tragic displaced-persons situation in Europe. But in the last year, Mr. President, the most dramatic contribution to the relief of that situation has been by the little Republic of Israel which has received almost 150,000 of these unfortunate people, and is now involved in the heroic task of resettling and assimilating these and 200,000 more of the uprooted and disinherited people of Europe.

Let us not strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Let us not close our eyes to the real danger in this situation. Let us hold fast to our real allies. Let us warn those who would break the peace in the Middle East, as we continue to warn those who would break the peace in Europe. Let us advise our friends in Britain that they must not permit political expediency and imperial diplomacy to lead them and us into a situation whose consequences would be tragic and intolerable.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 1274, Senate Resolution 228.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator prefer to make the resolution the unfinished business?

Mr. MYERS. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 228) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to employ additional personnel from March 1, 1950, to January 31, 1951, and increasing the limit of expenditures, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "subsection", to strike out "(g) (2) (B)" and insert "(k)"; in line 4, after the word "Senate", to strike out "or any other duties imposed upon it" and insert "or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946"; on page 2, line 1, after the figures "$80,000", to strike out "in addition to any unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 177, Eighty-first Congress, first session, agreed to October 13, 1949"; and in line 5, after the word "committee", to strike out "or subcommittee, as the case may be", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on March 1, 1950, and ending on January 31, 1951, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $80,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1247, House bill 4567, a bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 4406, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4406) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15; and agree to the same.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
BRIEN MCMAHON,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN KEE,
JAMES P. RICHARDS,
ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of William A. Carroll, of New York, to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York, vice James E. Mulcahy, resigned, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles F. McLaughlin, of Nebraska, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further reports of committees, the secretary will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ellis Campbell, Jr., of Dallas, Tex., to be a collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Oscar M. Jonas, of Milwaukee, Wis., to be a collector of internal revenue for the district of Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Craig Pottinger, of Nogales, Ariz., to be customs collector for customs collection district No. 26.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Louis T. Rocheleau, of Woonsocket, R. I., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stanford C. Stiles, of Texas, to be

United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 27 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

William A. Carroll, of New York, to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York, vice James E. Mulcahy, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 27 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Ellis Campbell, Jr., to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas

Oscar M. Jonas to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Wisconsin.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Craig Pottinger to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Nogales, Ariz

Louis T. Rocheleau to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R I.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Stanford C. Stiles to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, grant us this day a vital and vivid experience of Thy presence and power as we address ourselves to responsibilities which are far beyond our own wisdom and strength.

May all our desires and decisions be a clear and commanding witness that we are striving to manifest the splendor and preserve the continuity of the Master's ideals and principles.

Give us the courage to believe that His kingdom of righteousness and peace, which we are called upon to seek and establish, is emerging and that the day is dawning when our quest will be a conquest and our hope a blessed reality.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 23, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2328. An act to increase the number of examiners in chief in the Patent Office, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4406) entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GREEN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States, numbered 50–16.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of rule XI (2) (c), I call up House Resolution 321, which has remained in the Committee on Rules for more than 21 days without being reported.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H R. 4846) to promote the progress of science; to advance the public health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 67]

Allen, La.	Hall,	Murphy
Bailey	Leonard W.	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Halleck	Nixon
Boggs, Del.	Hand	O'Brien, Mich.
Brooks	Hart	O'Toole
Buckley, N Y.	Havenner	Pace
Bulwinkle	Hays, Ohio	Pfeifer,
Burton	Hedrick	Joseph L.
Byrnes, Wis.	Heffernan	Pfeiffer,
Canfield	Heller	William L.
Carlyle	Herlong	Phillips, Calif.
Carroll	Hill	Pouge
Case, S Dak.	Hoffman, Ill.	Powell
Chatham	Holifield	Redden
Chudoff	Jackson, Calif.	Regan
Corbett	Javits	Roosevelt
Coudert	Jenison	Sadlak
Davies, N Y.	Jones, N C.	Sadowski
Davis, Tenn.	Judd	St George
Dawson	Kelley, Pa.	Secrest
Dingell	Kennedy	Shafer
Dollinger	Keogh	Shelley
Donohue	Klein	Sheppard
Douglas	Kunkel	Smathers
Engle, Calif.	Lathrum	Smith, Ohio
Feighan	Lesinski	Taylor
Gamble	Lichtenwalter	Walsh
Gilmer	McGrath	Whitaker
Golden	McGuire	White, Idaho
Goodwin	Marcantonio	Widnall
Granahan	Morgan	Woodhouse
Green	Morrison	Yates
Gwinn	Multer	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. CROSSER Mr. Speaker, in support of the pending resolution, I desire to call attention to the long history of hearings and favorable actions taken by both Houses of the Congress with respect to National Science Foundation legislation.

In July 1946, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, a Science Foundation bill passed the Senate, but the House was unable, due to the pressure of business, to reach this legislation. During the first session of the Eightieth Congress both Houses of Congress passed a Science Foundation bill.

This bill, however, died by pocket veto because of administrative objections that the President entertained. He expressed regret, because otherwise he was favorable to the bill.

During the second session of the Eightieth Congress the Senate again passed a Science Foundation bill. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee favorably reported such a bill to the floor, but due to the pressure of other business it did not receive consideration by the House. Finally, during the present session, the Senate passed unanimously a Science Foundation bill, which is substantially identical with H. R. 4846 now before the House, which this resolution would bring up for consideration.

Mr. PRIEST, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health, Science and Commerce of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, introduced this bill and presided over the hearings conducted by the subcommittee. He

will explain in detail the provisions of the measure.

I desire to urge very earnestly upon the House that the House vote favorably to consider House Resolution 321 in order that the House may have an opportunity to consider H. R. 4846, the National Science Foundation bill, to which I have already referred.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no legislation that has been, or will be, passed by the present Congress that is more important or far reaching in its scope and possibility of enhancing the welfare of our Nation and its people than the bill now under consideration, H. R. 4846, entitled "A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes." It is generally known as the National Science Foundation Act.

This legislation has been thoroughly studied by both Houses of Congress over the past 5 years. I think most of the Members are familiar with the purpose of the legislation and the provisions of the bill. However, there are many new Members in the House who have not had the opportunity to hear the discussions that have taken place on previous occasions. I trust that what is now said will be helpful to them, as well as refresh the minds of those who have heard previous discussions.

The Congress has long been aware of the need for legislation of this type. It is my considered opinion that a National Science Foundation is more essential to the health, education, industrial progress, and security of the Nation today than it was 5 years ago when Dr. Vannevar Bush, then Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, and his aide, Mr. John H. Teeter, discussed the problem with a small group in June 1945. It was my privilege to be one of that group. We gathered together one evening and heard Dr. Bush review his report to the President known as Science, the Endless Frontier. This document has been the basis of the National Science Foundation legislation in the ensuing years.

The history of this legislation actually begins in November 1941 when President Roosevelt wrote a letter to Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director of the wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development, asking him to prepare for him a report on a postwar science program. President Roosevelt, however, had passed away when the report was finished in June 1945.

When, in September of 1945, President Truman called Congress into special session to enact a 21-point postwar domestic program, one of the points urged the establishment of a single Federal research agency. Following the President's request, hearings were begun in both Senate and House on the various Science Foundation bills which were introduced.

In the following year, the Senate committee reported out S. 1850, which would have made extensive changes in the patent laws of the United States with respect to inventions made with the financial support of the Federal Government. The bill also would have placed considerable control in the President of the United States.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce late in 1946 held hearings on H. R. 6448, introduced by Representative MILLS. This was a revised version of his original Science Foundation bill.

In July 1946 the Senate passed S. 1850 by a vote of 48 to 18. The House took no action and all bills died with the close of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

During the Eightieth Congress S. 526 was sponsored by a bipartisan group of six Senators and the House had also before it a number of Science Foundation bills. The Senate bill was passed by the Senate in May by a vote of 79 to 8.

In the House, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I then had the honor and privilege of serving as chairman, held extensive hearings, and, as a result of the hearings, H. R. 4102 was introduced by me as chairman, reported favorably by the committee, and passed by the House, its text being substituted for that of S. 526.

S 526 and H. R 4102 then went to conference and both Houses approved the conference report. The bill died by pocket veto. President Truman stated in a memorandum of August 6, 1948, that he had vetoed the bill with great reluctance for he was convinced of the urgent need for the establishment of a National Science Foundation, but he felt that the bill passed by Congress vested the determination of vital national policies and the expenditure of large public funds in a group of individuals who would be essentially private citizens. This, the President stated, was a marked departure from the sound principles for the administration of public affairs to which he could not give his approval.

In 1948, during the second session of the Eightieth Congress, new bills were introduced both in the Senate and in the House—S. 2385 and H. R. 6007 by me in the House. These bills were identical and constituted a compromise worked out following conferences between some Members of Congress and Presidential advisers. In May 1948 the Senate passed the new measure by a voice vote. In the House this committee held brief hearings and reported favorably H. R. 6007, which differed in a few respects from S. 2385, passed earlier by the Senate. The bill failed to reach the House floor because the Rules Committee did not grant a rule for its consideration, and therefore, the Science Foundation legislation did not materialize during the Eightieth Congress.

In the Eighty-first Congress, in the Senate, there was introduced S. 247 which is identical with S. 2385, the last Science Foundation bill passed by the Senate during the second session of the Eightieth Congress. This bill passed the Senate without amendment and in the House was referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. In the House seven bills were introduced which fall into three categories. Four of these bills were identical with H. R. 6007, reported favorably by this committee during the Eightieth Congress, which differ in some respects from S. 247. These bills are H. R. 12, H. R. 185, H. R. 311, and H. R. 2751.

The second category consists of H. R. 1845 and H. R. 2308 which are in all respects identical with S. 247.

The third category consists of a single bill, H. R. 359, which differs substantially from the bills in the first two categories with respect to the organization of the foundation and patent provisions.

Although the 4-year history of proposed legislation on this subject encompasses over 1,200 pages of testimony by 150 of the Nation's leading authorities in science, education, and medicine, the committee further reviewed the legislation in public hearing, on March 31 and April 1, 4, 5, and 26, 1949. In the light of this additional information the committee modified slightly the Science Foundation bill that it reported favorably during the Eightieth Congress. As a result, a new bill, H. R. 4846, was introduced by Mr. PRIEST, chairman of the subcommittee on Public Health, Science, and Commerce. Hearings were held and the full committee approved H. R. 4846, as amended, and reported the bill favorably to the House. It is now before us for consideration. It meets the objections expressed by the President in his memorandum of August 6, 1948, with respect to S. 526, and, in form as well as content, provides a good workable law that should have the support of this House.

PURPOSES OF THE BILL

The bill provides for the establishment in the executive branch of the Government of an independent agency to be known as the National Science Foundation. The Foundation shall consist of a National Science Board and a Director and is authorized and directed—

First. To develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of research and education in the sciences;

Second. To initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering and other sciences, by making contracts, or other arrangements, including grants loans, and other forms of assistance;

Third. After consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense;

Fourth. To award scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;

Fifth. To foster interchange of scientific information;

Sixth. To correlate the Foundation's scientific research program with those undertaken by Federal Government

agencies, by individuals and by public and private research groups;

Seventh. To establish such special commissions as the board may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of the act; and

Eighth. To maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel.

To carry out the purposes of the Foundation the bill provides that there shall be four divisions within the Foundation, as follows:

First. A Division of Medical Research;

Second. A Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences;

Third. A Division of Biological Sciences; and

Fourth. A Division of Scientific Personnel and Education.

There shall also be within the Foundation such other divisions as the Board may from time to time deem necessary.

WHAT THE ACT WILL ACCOMPLISH

The Foundation provided for in this bill is intended to aid scientists and institutions of science to contribute more rapidly and effectively to the store of knowledge and scientific principles needed as the foundation on which technological developments, industrial growth, and enhancement of the national economy rest

It will aid in the development of medical science and thus lead to improvement in the national health.

It will aid in the development of basic sciences on which the national defense will rest in the future.

It will lead to the development of increased numbers of highly qualified scientists, engineers, physicians, dentists, and others who are essential to the accomplishments of the above-mentioned aims.

THE IMPORTANCE OF BASIC RESEARCH

The work of the Foundation is intended to relate entirely to basic scientific research in the natural sciences as distinguished from applied scientific research. The latter is merely ascertaining the ways and means to make practical use of the fundamental knowledge of natural laws resulting from basic research. Thus, basic research in electronics made possible, first, new industries: radio, television, for greater prosperity and pleasure; second, X-ray, electron microscope, and so forth, for better health; third, radar, proximity fuze, and so forth, for greater national security.

From these illustrations it can be readily seen that basic research adds to the stock pile of knowledge and understanding from which applied research obtains the fundamental information needed to make the developments which determine our progress in industry, agriculture, health, and security.

To the extent that basic research ceases or lags, applied research is diminished or stopped. It is necessary to keep up the stock pile of basic knowledge or otherwise applied research would in time exhaust the stock pile of basic knowledge and stagnate. Thus our progress in health, economic welfare, and national security depends upon the extent to which we increase our stock pile of basic scientific knowledge. Thus basic research is the pacemaker of all technological progress. As it explores new frontiers of knowledge it opens new possibilities for future progress and enjoyment of mankind.

PRESENT SITUATION AS TO BASIC RESEARCH

If time permitted a detailed study could be presented that would show the desperate need that exists today for basic research. Summarized it would show:

First. That during the war basic research was reduced in favor of applied research to such an extent that about 3 years' production of basic knowledge was lost so that our stock pile in 1947 was only what it would have been in 1944 without the war;

Second. That production of basic scientific knowledge was also greatly curtailed in Europe by the war;

Third. That, on the other hand, applied research was greatly stimulated by the war so that by 1947 annual expenditure for such research had increased to over three times that in 1940;

Fourth. That as a result of the combination of greatly increased applied research and greatly curtailed basic research, both here and abroad, our stock pile of basic knowledge has been seriously depleted, especially in certain areas;

Fifth. That there is, therefore, urgent need for doubling the amount of basic research currently being done; and

Sixth. That private enterprises and private institutions cannot be depended upon to increase basic research to the desired level.

BASIC RESEARCH IN OTHER COUNTRIES

In the past this country has depended largely on basic knowledge imported from other countries and has done less than its share of basic research. From Europe we imported most of the fundamental laws and discoveries in physics and chemistry upon which our technological progress during the nineteenth century and later has been based. Even such recent developments as the revolutionary sulfa drugs, penicillin, atabrine, and DDT had their beginnings in German, English, or Swiss laboratories; and the discovery of nuclear fission which enabled us to develop the atomic bomb was made in Germany.

The war greatly changed the situation in most European countries. Many of their laboratories were wrecked, many of their scientists were killed or dispersed, and they were impoverished. It will take years for these countries to restore basic research to the prewar level; moreover, results obtained in countries behind the iron curtain will largely not be available to us. Evidently, we can no longer depend upon Europe as the major source of new basic scientific knowledge.

SHORTAGE OF BASIC KNOWLEDGE

The increased amount of applied research since 1940 and the curtailed amount of basic research, strongly suggest that our stock pile of basic knowledge has been seriously depleted as a result of the war but do not prove that this is true. As direct evidence that important applied research is now hampered by a shortage of basic knowledge we have the testimony of scientists who were closely associated with Government research during the war and are thoroughly familiar with the present research situation.

Vannevar Bush writes:

> The tremendous effort in applied research exerted during the war has in many fields pushed the application of fundamental knowledge to the limit of that knowledge.

Karl T. Compton, as Chairman of the Research and Development Board of the National Military Establishment, wrote that the Board more and more often meets problems the solution of which is retarded or temporarily prevented by lack of basic knowledge, and that this is true also in the research activities of other Government agencies and of industry. "We have literally exhausted the stock pile of fundamental knowledge in many fields," he testified. According to Harry P. Hammond, a man from a very important laboratory at Wright Field stated that they were stalled in their attack on certain problems because of lack of basic knowledge. "We have seriously drained our storehouse of basic knowledge."

Lessons learned during the war period point clearly to the need for an appropriately constituted agency of the Government, to function in time of peace or war, to promote and foster fundamental research in the sciences which is not likely to be carried on privately because of the size and difficulty of the problems and because of lack of immediate promise of commercial value.

The committee is deeply impressed by the fact that while the United States has been for many years and still is eminent in the fields of applied research and engineering development, it does not occupy a comparable prominent position in the field of fundamental or pure research. Dr. Vannevar Bush, the wartime head of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, in his final report entitled "Science: The Endless Frontier," states as follows:

> Our national preeminence in the fields of applied research and technology should not blind us to the truth that, with respect to pure research—the discovery of fundamental new knowledge and basic scientific principles—America has occupied a secondary place. Our spectacular development of the automobile, the airplane, and radio obscures the fact that they were all based on fundamental discoveries made in nineteenth century Europe. From Europe also came formulation of most of the laws governing the transformation of energy, the physical and chemical structure of matter, the behavior of electricity, light, and magnetism In recent years the United States has made progress in the field of pure science, but an examination of the relevant statistics suggests that our efforts in the field of applied science have increased much faster so that the proportion of pure to applied research continues to decrease.
>
> Several reasons make it imperative to increase pure research at this stage in our history. First, the intellectual banks of continental Europe, from which we formerly borrowed, have become bankrupt through the ravages of war. No longer can we count upon those sources for fundamental science. Second, in this modern age, more than ever before, pure research is the pacemaker of technological progress. In the nineteenth century Yankee mechanical ingenuity, building upon the basic discoveries of European science, could greatly advance the technical arts. Today the situation is different. Fu-

ture progress will be most striking in those highly complex fields—electronics, aerodynamics, chemistry—which are based directly upon the foundation of modern science. In the next generation technological advance and basic scientific discovery will be inseparable; a nation which borrows its basic knowledge will be hopelessly handicapped in the race for innovation. The other world powers, we know, intend to foster scientific research in the future.

The field of pure or basic research has traditionally been left to institutions of higher learning. Private sources of support for these institutions have not kept step with the increased need for basic research.

I urgently recommend the prompt enactment of this legislation. Nearly 5 years have passed since the activities of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the proposed Foundation's wartime predecessor, was terminated. The need to establish a National Science Foundation is today more urgent than ever. No nation can long maintain its leadership without constantly renourishing its fund of basic scientific knowledge and its supply of scientifically trained manpower. The Nation's preeminence in applied science remains unquestioned, but we have seriously drained our storehouse of basic knowledge. Our national health, prosperity, and welfare, and, indeed, our national defense, are dependent on pushing forward the frontiers of basic science.

It is my sincere belief that few pieces of legislation have received more careful study and scrutiny than has been the case with respect to the science foundation bill. The need for this legislation has not been seriously questioned in these 4 years of study and scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to act favorably and promptly on this bill to create the National Science Foundation I do so because of the firm belief that it will promote the welfare of our citizens and our security as a Nation in an age where science, both in peace and war, takes on an importance that cannot and must not be ignored.

THOSE WHO SUPPORT THE BILL

There is nothing that emphasizes more forcibly the need for scientific research of the kind contemplated by the provision of the bill than the great number of national associations of scientists, engineers, physicians, educational institutions, labor, manufacturers, and others, a partial list which is as follows:

SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS

American Association for the Advancement of Science, represented by Dr C. F. Kettering, president, Dr F R Moulton, permanent secretary, and Dr Howard A. Meyerhoff, secretary.

American Documentation Institute, Dr. Watson Davis, president.

Association of Oak Ridge Scientists (Manhattan project), Dr. H. J. Curtis.

Association of Los Alamos Scientists (Manhattan project), Dr. Robert Wilson.

American Council of Learned Societies, Dr. Mortimer Graves

American Chemical Society, Col. Bradley Dewey, president-elect.

Engineers Joint Council (representing the American Society of Civil Engineers, the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, and the American Institute of Chemical Engineers), Dr. Boris Bakhmeteff.

National Research Council, Division of Biology and Agriculture, Dr. Robert Griggs.

American Biological Society and Union of Biological Sciences, Dr. C. V. Taylor.

Ecological Society of America, Alfred C. Redfield, president

Society of American Bacteriologists

Mycological Society of America, Dr. Frank D. Kern, president

American Medical Association, Dr. Morris Fishbein, secretary.

American Council on Rheumatic Fever, American Heart Association, Dr. David D. Rutstein.

Physician Forum, Dr Henry B. Richardson.

American Pharmaceutical Association, Dr. Robert P. Fischelis

American Osteopathic Association, Dr J. S Denslow

EDUCATIONAL AND RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS

American Council on Education, Dr. George F Zook, president

Guggenheim Foundation, Dr Henry Allen Moe, secretary-general

Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities

Engineers Council for Professional Development.

American Society for Engineering Education.

OTHER NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Congress of Industrial Organizations, Philip Murray, president

National Association of Manufacturers, R J. Dearborn, chairman of committee on patents

American Federation of Labor, Lewis G Hines, legislative representative.

National Farmers' Union, Russell Smith, legislative secretary.

American Veterans' Committee, Capt Orville Freeman

Disabled American Veterans, Dr Harry Mallsoff

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

(The official position held by the individual at the time his testimony was given is listed)

Vannevar Bush, president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington and wartime Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development.

Gen. H H. Arnold, Army Air Forces

Karl T Compton, chairman, Research and Development Board (representing the National Military Establishment).

Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor

John Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education.

Vice Adm. Ross T McIntire, Surgeon General, Navy Department

Maj Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General, United States Army

Carroll L Wilson, general manager, Atomic Energy Commission.

Charles F. Brannan, secretary, Department of Agriculture.

Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War.

James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy.

Dr J. C. Hunsaker, chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Harold D. Smith, director, Bureau of the Budget.

James E. Webb, director, Bureau of the Budget.

Maury Maverick, chairman, Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Paul A. Porter, chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

Casper W. Ooms, Commissioner of Patents.

A. N. Richards, Chairman of the Committee on Medical Research, Office of Scientific Research and Development.

Watson B. Miller, Federal Security Administrator.

Sumner T. Pike, acting chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

Oscar L. Chapman, Under Secretary of the Interior.

J. Donald Kingsley, acting administrator, Federal Security Agency.

Ernest A. Gross, assistant secretary (for the Secretary of State).

OUTSTANDING CITIZENS AND SCIENTISTS

(Institutions listed as of the date of testimony before congressional committee)

Bernard M. Baruch.

Dr. Harold C. Urey, University of Chicago.

Dr. E. G. Nourse, vice president, Brookings Institution.

Dr. Irving Langmuir, associate director, General Electric Laboratories.

Ralph McDonald, executive secretary, National Education Association.

James Bryant Conant, president, Harvard University

Robert E. Doherty, president, Carnegie Institute of Technology

Charles E MacQuigg, Engineering College Research Association, dean of engineering, the Ohio State University, past president American Society for Engineering Education.

A A Potter, executive director, Patent Planning Commission, dean of engineering, Purdue University, past president, American Society for Engineering Education, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, American Engineering Council

Roger Adams, chairman, board of directors, American Chemical Society.

H P Hammond, dean, School of Engineering, the Pennsylvania State College, past president, American Society for Engineering Education

Thorndike Saville, dean, College of Engineering, New York University, president, American Society for Engineering Education.

Dr R J Oppenheimer, director, New Mexico Laboratories, Manhattan project.

Dr. L A. DuBridge, director, Radiation Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Bruce K. Brown, vice president in charge of development, Standard Oil Company (Indiana)

Edwin H Land, president and director of research, Polaroid Corp.

R E. Gillmor, Aircraft Industries Association; president, Sperry Gyroscope Co.

Dr. Henry DeW. Smyth, chairman, department of physics, Princeton University

Dr I I Rabi, Columbia Radiation Laboratory, Columbia University

Dr Abel Wolman, professor of sanitary engineering, Johns Hopkins University

Dr Walter Rautenstrauch, professor of industrial engineering, Columbia University.

Dr Edmund E Day, president, Cornell University

Dr John M Potter, president, Hobart and William Smith College

Dr Louis H. Weed, National Academy of Sciences.

Dr. A N Richards, chairman, Committee on Medical Research, Office of Scientific Research and Development.

Dr. Francis G. Blake, dean, Yale School of Medicine.

Rev. J C S O'Donnell, president, Notre Dame University.

Dr. L. C. Dunn, chairman, Department of Zoology, Columbia University.

Dr. D. W. Bronk, director, Johnson Research Foundation, University of Pennsylvania (later president of Johns Hopkins University).

Dr. Edmund W. Sinnott, director, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University

Dr. W. M Stanley, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.

Dr. Raymond Zirkle, director, Institute of Radiobiology and Biophysics, University of Chicago.

Philip R. White, associate, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.

Leonard Carmichael, president, Tufts College, former director, Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel.

Ewing Cockrell, United States Federation of Justice.

John T Cox, Jr., American Institute of Chemical Engineers, Engineers Joint Council.

George E. Folk, National Association of Manufacturers.

Dael Wolfle, secretary, Intersociety Committee for a National Science Foundation.

M H. Trytten, director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council.

Sidney D. Kirkpatrick, editor, Chemical Engineering, on behalf of the Associated Business Papers and the National Conference of Business Paper Editors.

Carl D Anderson, Nobel laureate; professor of physics, California Institute of Technology.

A G Christie, past president, American Society of Mechanical Engineers; professor of mechanical engineering, the Johns Hopkins University.

Paul R Elicker, executive secretary, National Association of Secondary School Principals.

F. Malcolm Farmer, fellow and past president, American Institute of Electrical Engineers.

Walter S. Rogers, director, Institute of Current World Affairs

Robert L Stearns, president, University of Colorado.

E. H. Volwiler, director of research, Abbott Laboratories.

Warren Weaver, director, The National Sciences, Rockefeller Foundation.

Robert E Wilson, chairman of board, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana.

John H. Teeter, representing the American Cancer Society.

R. G. Gustavson, chancelor, University of Nebraska.

Dr. Hugh Wolfe, professor of physics, New York City College, Federation of American Scientists.

The above is an imposing list of individuals and organizations, leaders in their respective fields of activity, favorable to this legislation. I know of no one of similar character and standing opposed to this legislation. This legislation represents as near as any legislation can ever represent a unanimous opinion upon the part of those qualified to speak on this important matter. The bill is entitled to the support of this House. I earnestly and sincerely ask that you give it your support as a great forward step that will promote the welfare of our citizens and the security of our Nation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68]

Allen, La.	Burton	Davis, Tenn.
Andresen, August H.	Canfield	Dawson
Bailey	Carlyle	DeGraffenried
Barden	Carroll	Dollinger
Blatnik	Chatham	Donohue
Boggs, Del.	Chudoff	Douglas
Brooks	Corbett	Engle, Calif.
Buckley, N. Y.	Coudert	Feighan
Bulwinkle	Crawford	Fugate
Burleson	Davies, N. Y.	Gamble
Gilmer	Klein	Ramsay
Golden	Kunkel	Redden
Goodwin	Latham	Regan
Green	Lichtenwalter	Rogers, Fla.
Gwinn	McCulloch	Roosevelt
Hall, Leonard W.	McGrath	Sadlak
Halleck	McGuire	Sadowski
Hand	Marcantonio	St George
Hart	Monroney	Saylor
Harvey	Morgan	Secrest
Hébert	Morris	Shafer
Hedrick	Morrison	Shelley
Heffernan	Multer	Short
Heller	Murphy	Smathers
Herlong	Murray, Wis.	Smith, Ohio
Hill	O'Brien, Mich.	Smith, Wis.
Hinshaw	O'Toole	Steed
Hoffman, Ill.	Pace	Stigler
Jackson, Calif.	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Taylor
Javits	Pfeiffer, William L	Walsh
Jenison	Phillips, Calif.	Whitaker
Jones, N. C.	Poage	Wickersham
Kelley, Pa.	Potter	Widnall
Kennedy	Powell	Withrow
Keogh		Yates
		Young

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Hollywood Citizen-News.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 4406) the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4846) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 4846, the National Science Foundation Act of 1949, with Mr. THOMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I believe that in the discussion of the rule the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member have given very excellent and complete statements on the background to this legislation. In reality we may say that this legislation started with the founding of the Republic, for George Washington, very early after he was inaugurated as the first President of the United States asked Dr. Benjamin Brush of Pennsylvania, if he did not believe, in the interest of the promotion of science for the Republic, that there should be established a University of the United States.

I shall not at this time attempt to trace down through the years since that period the development of this idea. The background for the present legislation has been very well developed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

I do want to call attention to the fact that this legislation, in very much the same form as the bill now before you, was passed by the Eightieth Congress. That bill, as you know, was vetoed or, rather, it suffered a pocket veto, largely because of an administrative feature of the bill which the President found to be undesirable.

Let me briefly mention this administrative provision. In the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress provision was made that the director of this Foundation should be selected by the Foundation itself. This director, of course, would have considerable responsibility in the disbursing of public funds, whatever public funds might be made available for carrying out the work of the Foundation. He was not to be confirmed by the Senate. The President felt that from the standpoint of good administration the director of such a Foundation and with such responsibilities should be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Very reluctantly he allowed the bill to suffer a pocket veto because of that administrative provision.

Following the death of that bill by pocket veto a number of conferences were held. The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] attended a great many of these conferences, in which discussions were held with the top-bracket scientists of the country and with members of the Senate committee, the House committee, and the executive office of the President. As a result of these conferences there has been pretty general agreement as to the administrative provisions of the present bill.

The need for this legislation has been stressed by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr.

CROSSER], and by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. In yesterday's New York Times I found a story with this headline: "Nation faces shortage of scientists." I shall not read the article, but it is fully in line with statements made by others who have spoken on the bill that insofar as scientists of the first rank are concerned, those with doctor's degrees and those well trained in pursuing basic research, we do face a tremendous shortage. Some figures have been given you that in 1941 we had 2,000 scientists who received their doctor's degree in that year. We have not yet anything like approached that number since the war. The number has fallen off considerably. We have gained a few. But a recent survey indicates that it will be many years before we can reach 2,000 doctorates that were conferred in the fields of science in 1941.

Mr. Chairman, the war taught us several important lessons. One thing we learned as the result of the war was that we can no longer depend on Europe to do our basic research for us. I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that the whole emphasis of this particular legislation is on basic research rather than applied research.

We have led the world, as it has been pointed out already, for generations in taking the discoveries of the laboratories, the basic discoveries, and doing something with them in applied research. But, we have lagged far behind in the question of basic research. What has been done in this country for quite a number of years prior to the war in the field of basic research largely has been done by institutions supported by private funds. I think all of us are aware of the fact that the income from private funds has dwindled to such an extent that we can no longer depend on institutions supported by private funds to do the amount of basic research that we feel the security of our country requires.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us why these funds have dwindled?

Mr. PRIEST. It is not necessary to belabor that point. Of course, we are all aware that income from private funds and endowments have dwindled considerably because of our present tax laws, made necessary to support the Nation, to support the Government, and to pay off a war debt that we had to make in order to remain free. I think that is the reason, and I would not belabor the point at all. I hope that answers the question.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the testimony before our committee indicates that there is likely to be a very acute shortage in the years ahead in the number of scientists who might well pursue basic research. In the remaining time I want to discuss just one or two other features in this bill that no doubt there will be some questions asked about later on.

A great many Members have asked me in the last few days "What will be the cost of this bill?" In the 1950 budget—on the belief that this bill would become legislation in time for the 1950 fiscal year budget to be effective—an estimate was made of $2,500,000 of direct appropriations and $12,500,000 in contract authorizations.

However, in the 1951 estimate only half a million dollars is requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Now, as to the ultimate cost, the best estimate that anybody has been able to give on the subject of the ultimate cost of the legislation, is that it should level off in perhaps 5 years at a maximum of about $25,000,000 per year.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder what would be the figure from which it would level off down to 25.

Mr. PRIEST. It would never go above. I used the words "leveling off." I intended to imply—and perhaps it was not the best phrase—that it would never go above that figure; that would be the ceiling, a maximum.

May I say also to the distinguished ranking Member of the Committee on Appropriations that in two or three particular places in the bill we have written in language that restricts any amount that can be expended to the amount of available funds so specified for such purpose in the appropriation. We did that in scholarships and in fellowships. The money is to be earmarked by the Committee on Appropriations for these particular expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I ask the gentleman in that connection, while you are restricting these expenditures in some respects, why it would not be well to put an over-all ceiling on this entire bill, because there is not any ceiling at all at the present time? Now, many Members are loath to vote for authorizations where the sky is the limit.

Mr. PRIEST. It has this language "such appropriations as may be necessary are hereby authorized."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is not any ceiling at all.

Mr. PRIEST. No, that is not a ceiling. The ceiling I give is an estimate of the cost of it. There is no ceiling on the Atomic Energy Commission, so far as I know. We do not know what the future will bring. I think it would be unwise to fix a rigid figure of any amount as a ceiling in a bill of this sort. I think the legislative history will indicate that the cost is not expected to run beyond the $25,000 000, and always the Appropriations Committee is in charge in that respect. However, if the committee desires to limit the amount by language I shall not object.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I find on page 2 of the committee report, in subsection 5, under the subheading "Purpose of the bill," this language:

> To foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries.

I am aware of patent interchanges and of the necessity for the interchange of scientific information generally. May I ask the gentleman what is the attitude of the committee with reference to this point, or whether it was discussed?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes, I assure the gentleman it was discussed rather considerably. It was felt, I am sure, by a great majority of the committee, that such an authorization would be very helpful insofar as interchange of information with those nations with which we have amicable relations—let us put it that way—are concerned, where there might be some mutual assistance going back and forth by exchanging the information. We felt the language in the bill was entirely safe insofar as safeguarding any information that we did not want to exchange with some nation that might not be on such friendly terms.

Mr. FLOOD. On the same point, did the committee direct its attention to the so-called Fuchs incident in connection with the atomic energy expose?

Mr. PRIEST. May I say that the so-called Fuchs incident had not developed when the committee was working on this legislation. This bill was reported last August, I believe, and this incident had not developed at that time. Of course, no consideration was given to such an incident as such, but the whole general picture of the exchange of scientific information was considered by the committee.

Mr. FLOOD. On the same point, in view of the developments of the Fuchs incident with reference to the exchange of scientific information and scientists, will the gentleman address himself to any special measures that might have to do with security dealing with the interchange of information or of scientists? What would be the gentleman's opinion? What does the gentleman think should be done with special provisions having to do with security on just this one thing?

Mr. PRIEST. Does the gentleman mean with reference to this legislation or in a general way?

Mr. FLOOD. No, this legislation and this particular section of it.

Mr. PRIEST. If the gentleman will refer to page 15 of the bill he will find this language:

> The authority to cooperate in international scientific research activities as provided in subsection (a) of this section, shall be exercised only after consultation with the Secretary of State, to the end that such authority shall be exercised in such manner as is consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I would call my colleague's attention specifically to subsection (j) on page 20 of the bill which deals with that particular point.

Mr. PRIEST. Yes; I was going to call attention to that provision in the bill.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. On page 9, subdivision (4) we find this language:

A Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall be concerned with programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

Some of us are concerned about the limitation of this measure. Did the committee try to confine this to the graduate level? Under this language you would go to the undergraduate level in granting scholarships. What I think we are trying to get at here is to take scientists at the graduate level. Certainly I am interested in that. I think it is necessary. But in granting scholarships to undergraduates, it seems to me that you are getting into a mighty wide field with no limitation on the number of scholarships.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman I do agree with his position. I want to make it part of the RECORD at this point that the emphasis is on graduate scholarships. It was felt, however, that it might well be left to the Foundation without tying it so rigidly.

Mr. DURHAM. But it is not confined to that. A man entering college could get a scholarship under this measure in his first year.

Mr. PRIEST. Under the terms of the bill as written it is possible.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman asked a question as to the possible cost of this undertaking. He indicated that there is at present in the budget $500,000 for 1951.

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. There was suggested $2,500,000 and $12,500,000 of contract authority, or a total of $15,000,000. He further stated it was expected it would level off at $25,000,000.

I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact, and ask whether or not it is true, that the cost he is referring to is in addition to all present research costs that are being carried on by the Federal Government.

Mr. PRIEST. Certainly that is true.

Mr. KEEFE. And your report so states.

Mr. PRIEST. There is no question about that. That is true.

Mr. KEEFE. Therefore, when we are discussing costs on this thing it contemplates that the present level of expenditures for research supported by the Federal Government will be maintained and that this will be an ultimate $25,000,000 in addition. Is that not true?

Mr. PRIEST. Insofar as the provisions of this bill are concerned, that is true. It is believed that by certain correlation of scientific research provided in this bill some of the others might be reduced and some duplication eliminated. But so far as this bill is concerned the gentleman has stated the situation correctly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of those who may not as yet be familiar with the function and organization of the National Science Foundation, I want to outline briefly what H. R. 4846 provides in this regard.

The National Science Foundation would be established in the executive branch as an independent executive agency consisting of a National Science Board and a Director. The Board would consist of 24 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director who is likewise to be appointed by the President and to be confirmed by the Senate would be a member of the Board ex officio.

Members of the Board must be persons eminent in the fields of the basic sciences, medical science, engineering, agriculture, education, or public affairs, and are to be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service. Moreover, appointments are to be made in such a way that scientific opinion in all areas of the Nation is fairly represented. In making nominations for appointment, the President is requested to give due consideration to any recommendations which may be submitted to him by scientific and educational organizations.

The functions of the Foundation are as follows: The Foundation is directed to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences. The purpose of such a policy is to encourage governmental and private research agencies and educational institutions to adopt programs which will not conflict with each other and which will lie in the most fruitful fields. The Foundation will have no authority to exercise any dictation or control over research or education in the Nation.

The Foundation is directed to initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences. It is to do this by making contracts or other arrangements, including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance for the conduct of such research.

The Foundation is directed to award scholarship and graduate fellowships in the basic sciences. It is directed to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and abroad. The Foundation is directed to evaluate scientific programs undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups, including programs of Federal agencies, and to correlate its own research programs with the programs of these others. The Foundation is directed to establish from time to time special commissions as it may deem necessary for the purposes of the act. Finally, the Foundation is to maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways to provide a central clearinghouse for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States.

The Foundation will be divided into several divisions, a Division of Medical Research, a Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences, a Division of Biological Sciences, and a Division of Scientific Personnel and Education.

In order to increase the number of scientifically trained persons available to do advanced basic research, the Foundation, within the limits of available funds, is to inaugurate a scholarship and graduate fellowship program for scientific study at accredited nonprofit American or foreign institutions of higher learning. The selection of the institution is up to the recipients of the scholarships and fellowships. Only citizens of the United States are entitled to receive scholarships and fellowships and they are to be selected solely on the basis of ability.

After extended hearings in three different Congresses, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has become convinced that legislation of this character is essential to our security and general welfare. The committee has become deeply impressed by the fact that while the United States has for many years been eminent in the field of applied research and engineering development, it does not occupy a comparable prominent position in the field of fundamental or pure research.

Finally, some explanation of the patent provisions contained in H. R. 4846:

First of all, let me stress that the importance of patents in connection with Science Foundation legislation has been greatly overemphasized. Few, if any, patents are expected to materialize in connection with research sponsored by the National Science Foundation, since this research is to be concentrated on the basic sciences and patents related to the applied sciences rather than to the basic sciences. The patent provisions of H. R. 4846 have the support, among others, of the Commissioner of Patents, the patent adviser to the National Association of Manufacturers, and four major engineering societies

The provisions are extremely clear and simple. They direct the Foundation to insert in all research contracts provisions with respect to patents which will protect the interests of the Government as well as the equities of the individuals entering into research contracts with the Foundation. Employees of the Foundation may not secure patents for inventions made in the course of their employment. The Foundation has the authority within the limits of available appropriations to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, personal property, and real property of all kinds necessary for the exercise of authority granted by this act. This authority would include the authority to acquire patents. However, no authority is granted to the Foundation to acquire patents through the power of condemnation.

In order to assure the fullest publicity with respect to all dealings of the Foundation in patents H. R. 4846 provides for the inclusion in the Foundation's annual report of a full and complete statement of all of the Foundation's activities with respect to patents.

This explanation of the patent provisions of H. R. 4846 should allay any suspicions which might be harbored in anyone's mind that the Foundation might

become a giant patent holding company or that the Foundation would be authorized to condemn valuable patents to the injury of individual patent owners and to the detriment of our national patent system.

In conclusion, I want to say that the creation of a National Science Foundation is indispensable in the interest of the national security and the national welfare. We cannot take the continuing satisfactory growth of our knowledge of basic scientific principles for granted. As Dr. Bush explained and as other scientists have emphasized, we have depended for such knowledge on the discoveries of European scientists. The European centers of science have been destroyed, or work under severe economic and political handicaps. Therefore, we must make a strenuous effort of our own to increase the stock pile of basic scientific knowledge in this country and toward this end the creation of a National Science Foundation can make an important contribution.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, this is one of those pieces of legislation about which a good case can be made on either side. I have argued with myself a good deal about this bill and have come to the conclusion that I must support it. I quickly recognize that there are certain aspects of the bill which can be and probably will be attacked on the floor of the House.

Of course each Member of the House must make up his own mind as to how he proposes to vote. Already some of those aspects have been alluded to. For example, the financial aspect. Under the provisions of this bill the only real limitation on the amount of expenditure is the limitation placed upon it by the Congress in making appropriations. Certainly the bill may be subject to criticism on that score.

Likewise, there may be some criticism of this bill on the political basis. The Eightieth Congress passed a similar bill which was given a pocket veto by President Truman, on the ground that he was not satisfied with the administrative provisions of the bill. Likewise, some very serious objections can be made, upon that basis, to the provisions of this bill, in that it places in the hands of the Executive tremendous power.

The rationality that is behind my thinking on this bill goes beyond this. The last frontier in American life is the scientific frontier. Our forefathers came to this country, some of them 300, some of them 100, and some of them 5 years ago, perhaps. During the period of time that the North American Continent has been occupied by white people it has been conquered physically by them. The last remaining frontier for us is the scientific frontier, and unless we take all steps possible to enlarge our scientific frontier, inevitably, it seems to me, our kind of civilization must deteriorate.

This bill applies specifically to the idea of basic scientific research as contrasted with applied science. Recently I had an opportunity to observe a number of instances of application of basic science to industry; such as oil, coal, shale, natural gas, and aviation. A great many applications of basic science appear in all these industries, and in others as well. Basic science is being profitably used by industry in the United States today. Of course that is their business.

For example, the oil industry spends millions of dollars annually to apply to their industry the basic scientific knowledge which comes out of our scientific institutions. But the place where we lag in the United States today, as has already been stated by Members who have spoken, is in the field of basic science; that is, into these esoteric areas:—those ideas which apparently have no practical application but may find practical application 20 years, 50 years, or 100 years hence. That is the field that this bill is designed to strengthen; and that is the field that is being neglected today in the American scientific world.

There was a time, as I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] pointed out, when in the universities in the Old World, Germany, Austria, Italy, England, and France, that basic knowledge was being accumulated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. DOLLIVER Alas, that is no longer the case. Scientific research in the Old World is virtually at a standstill, and the burden, therefore, comes upon us.

Somebody says, "Why not do this in a different way? Why not go out and insist that private charity and private philanthropy take care of this field? It has already been discussed in the colloquy between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] on this floor. The reason that is not possible today is because of the tax situation in this country. There are no funds available today from private philanthropy to carry on this work, because we have taxed that kind of money out of existence. The alternative, of course, is to revise the tax laws so that basic science may have some support. That is the question I struggled with. But I see no immediate prospect that tax revision or that reduction of the tax load would take place regardless of what party were in power. I now yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thought that the corporations today, in spite of taxes, were making greater profits than ever before in the history of the country.

Mr DOLLIVER. Experience has been, and the evidence before our committee showed, that funds were not available from private sources for basic scientific research. There are ample funds from that source for applied scientific research, but not for basic science.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I come from the Second District in Illinois, where is located the great University of Chicago. From the distinguished members of the faculty, the great scientists of the University of Chicago, I have received over 100 letters expressing approval of this bill. These men of learning who know the field of science and the requirements in that field tell me that there is no legislation pending that, in their opinion, is more necessary to continue the predominance of the United States in industry as well as in science, and to assure its security, as this legislation that we are now considering; so to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle I bring this message from these men of learning who have no concern except that which will bring benefit to America. They stand in support of this pending legislation.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I am very proud to say that in my district is located Northwestern University. I am proud to say that I have received only one or two letters from its learned professors advocating this bill. I come from a district and a university section where its people believe that private enterprise can do as well as it has done heretofore and better if taxes are reduced, instead of increased as this bill will do. Today the main complaint over the United States is: "You are taking away the individual's freedom; you are taxing industry in this bill and denying it its freedom to spend money for basic science—taxing them to death." So you ought not use more public funds for this kind of a bill. I am proud to have had not more than one or two letters from my great university pressing for the passage of this bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. In reply I say that I regret that my friend from Chicago is speaking for a school that I attended, Northwestern, has chosen this occasion to make a political speech. I shall be glad on another occasion when we have not such important legislation pending, to sit down with my friend and my colleague from Illinois and discuss these matters of politics.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman knows I am making no political speech, and he will realize that when I tell him that I have no opposition at the present time. I am sorry the gentleman takes that position. If he has a hundred letters from his people, who is making the political speech?

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CROSSER. Does the gentleman know that the president of Harvard, the president of Cornell, the president of Columbia, and the presidents of any number of the other big institutions that rank with the institution to which the gentleman from Illinois referred have been begging for this legislation?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution in making it perfectly clear that the great educators of the Nation are

pretty thoroughly in accord in their endorsement of the plan for a National Science Foundation as set forth in the measure before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked how I can possibly be for this bill which contains no limitation as to the expense involved with relation to the scholarship program. My answer is that I do not like the absence of any limitation, but I have every confidence in the Appropriations Committee. I wish it were not necessary for us to be relegated to that solution of the particular problem; however, I know of no other way by which this particular measure can be handled.

I am moved, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] was, by the evidence before the committee to the effect that there are no funds available from private industry to accomplish this purpose, that there are no funds which will permit the development of research in the basic sciences from private industry. I know that among organizations favoring this bill are the Disabled American Veterans, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the National Association of Manufacturers, chairman of the committee on patents. I am sure if it were felt by the manufacturers, for example, that funds for this purpose were available from industry they would have come to the committee and said so.

I am moved also by consideration of the provisions in the bill providing for a Medical Research Council. I am aware of the fact that the isolation of the virus of the common cold, for example, has not yet been acomplished, the prevention of which colds would save millions of manhours of productivity that, even more urgently, the cause and the cure of cancer has not yet been discovered, that the treatment of or even the method of onset and the pathological course of unknown ailments of the human race which may develop in the atomic age are far beyond the limited means of a tax-ridden and tax-burdened economy.

For these reasons I may quarrel with myself on possible inconsistencies as regards the cost, but I am obliged, and reluctantly, to come to the conclusion that the bill ought to be supported, and I am going to support it. I cannot reconcile any other course with my conscience.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred twenty-one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, we are confronted here today with a fundamentally important issue. I am painfully aware of the fact that I am not competent to discuss all of the details of this proposal. I am concerned about one or two aspects of it; deeply concerned.

Mr. Chairman, this is but one of a series of measures that is coming before the Congress which, if enacted, will increase the future financial commitments of the Government of the United States, this in spite of the fact that the Treasury is faced with a $5,000,000,000 deficit for the fiscal year in which we are living; and in all probability a deficit of equal size will show up in the next fiscal year. We may say that this does not cost much, or that does not cost much, or that some other thing does not cost much, but every time we pass a bill of this sort we add to the national debt.

I listened with deep interest, indeed, to the observations made by some of the gentlemen supporting this bill who admit that our tax system has reached the point now where people cannot save enough money to endow efforts of this kind, and that therefore we must spend the money out of the Federal Treasury, which means of course, that eventually we must increase the tax burden. I leave that thought in your minds, having to do not only with this bill but several others that are on what might be termed the "conveyor belt," against which I have protested several times in the past. Whatever is the cost of this bill, we have not the money in the Treasury, whether it be $15,000,000 or $25,000,000; and I never knew any of these undertakings to stay within the limits estimated at the time they were authorized. Almost invariably they grow and grow just as bureaucracy always grows if you give it a chance.

This measure itself goes far beyond the objective emphasized by its supporters. You only have to read it to understand where it goes. The emphasis is placed by its supporters on subsidies, and that is what it means, subsidies or grants to encourage and support basic research.

But, the bill does not stop with basic research. It goes into any kind of scientific research. I could call your attention to some of the provisions which make that statement of mine perfectly clear. On page 2, line 15, we read:

After consultation with the Secretary of Defense—

Whatever "consultation" means, I do not know; it may be over the telephone—

After consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense—

The word "basic" is left out, although it is used in the preceding paragraph.

If we turn over to another provision on page 12, we find language that—

the Foundation is authorized—

And that is a rather extraordinary proposal—

to enter into contracts—

That means the payment of money in return for services—

or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, of such basic scientific research activities and such scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense.

They do not have to stop with basic research, they can go on with any kind of research. There it is in black and white.

I may call your attention to the fact that these contracts or other arrangements which can be made with foreign citizens, citizens of other countries, as well as with foreign governments, with respect to the national defense, may be entered into "without legal consideration, without performance or other bond, and without regard to section 3709 of the revised statutes." My recollection is, and my best information is that section 3709 of the Revised Statutes is that law which provides a contract shall be let in accordance with competitive bidding.

In other words, the lid is off. We might just as well understand it.

My position on this thing perhaps would not be so intense if literally this were confined solely to basic research and would not increase the future commitments of the United States Treasury. I think I am not violating a confidence when I say that I asked not only Dr. Vannevar Bush but others, and in correspondence with the Director of the Budget I asked, "Would it not be possible to promote this legislation or so amend it that it would not, if passed, add to the financial burden of the Treasury?" I have to say that I have received no encouragement.

Let us see what we are spending now and how much the passage of this bill will alter the picture. We are talking now of national defense. The Army had available funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, which is the last fiscal year, and I assume about the same sums are authorized for this year, of $51,000,000 to spend in departmental laboratories for scientific research. The Navy was to spend $60,000,000—I am giving the round figures—in departmental laboratories, and the Air Force $52,000,000, in departmental laboratories.

Then when you get into other governmental laboratories where the three armed services are authorized to make contracts and expend money, the Army is to spend $6,000,000, the Navy $6,200,000, and the Air Force $2,700,000.

The work of those departmental laboratories is costing $163,000,000 per year, and in the other governmental laboratories $15,000,000 a year.

Then when we go into the industrial field, the laboratories maintained by industries with which the Army, Navy, and Air Force make contracts, we find the Army is spending $34,800,000, the Navy $138,700,000, and the Air Force $132,600,000—a total of $306,000,000.

Then when we get to the contracts they are making and the money they are spending in university laboratories and nonprofit institutions, we find that the three forces—I shall not read the amount for each service—are spending $59,000,000 a year.

The total being spent by the three armed forces is $544,000,000 on scientific research.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, that is not the full picture. We should also add the expenditures made by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; there are many others. I am coming to them, although I may not have all the figures. They are astronomical.

In discussing this measure with eminent scientists who are most earnest and sincere in their support of it, but who, according to my way of thinking, do not look very far into the future with respect to what we can do financially in this country, I have been told that the expenditures now being made by the Army, Navy, and Air Force for scientific research are almost entirely in the field of applied science. But only a little of it is in the field of basic research. I have been told quite the opposite by other scientists who say a very considerable sum is being spent by the armed services for basic research.

However that may be, what does this bill accomplish in teaming up these agencies? I cannot see anything, for under this bill this foundation may issue grants and subsidies not only to basic research, but to applied science. I can get no assurance from anybody to the contrary. In other words, I cannot escape the conviction that this thing is going to add considerably to the burden of the Treasury and fail to accomplish the very things which some of these splendid people think it is going to accomplish. I do not mean to be impertinent in my observation concerning them, but the fact is that most of the scientists with whom I have talked about this bill have never read it. That is the trouble. It goes much further than they think it does.

Mr STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Has the gentleman added in the list of figures that he has given the $1,300,000,000 which the Air Navigation Board, the ANB, will spend in scientific research and for which we are now being asked to make an additional appropriation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; I have not. I confess my inability to make a list, without studying for weeks and weeks, of all the agencies of the Government who are spending money for research purposes.

May I call your attention to this important fact, when you consider this bill. This Science Foundation is to have nothing whatsoever to do with research in the field of atomic energy—nothing. If we are facing a crisis with respect to the A-bomb or the hydrogen bomb today, we are hard at work, through the Atomic Energy Commission, in an effort to keep up with that development. The passage of this bill will do nothing to aid or hasten that. It is already being done and at a cost of more than $500,000,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to point out, and I have not done it completely, some of the provisions of this bill which are extraordinary to my judgment. I was very much surprised to find, for example, that under this bill the Foundation is authorized to acquire real estate. What for? There is a doubt in my mind as to whether they can employ the right of eminent domain. The provision says they may purchase real estate if they make up their minds that its possession is necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. That looks to me like the establishment or the encouragement of the establishment of a permanent bureau engaged in something more than mere education. Why do they need real estate? I have never had an answer.

Another thing—they are authorized to maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and to provide a central clearing house for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States.

I may remind the members of the committee that that is already being done by the National Academy of Science.

Back in 1863, in the administration of Abraham Lincoln, the Congress incorporated, under a charter granted to the organization, the National Academy of Science. It was not incorporated as a part of governmental machinery. It is outside the Government, as contrasted with this Foundation which is to be inside the Government, and a part of Government operation.

The National Academy of Science, under its charter, is required to respond to the request of any department of the Government of the United States for aid and assistance in conducting scientific research. When so requested, and they must respond, they do so without any thought of gaining a profit In order to keep the Government informed as to what men in the United States are the better able to engage in these research problems, the National Academy of Science maintains a list of the eligible scientists that the Government may call upon at any moment. There is not the slightest necessity for this Foundation maintaining another list.

But I am more deeply concerned as to the trend which this legislation indicates. Not all of you may agree with me, but I have long since reached the conclusion that when a Federal agency, a part of the Government, is authorized to distribute subsidies to colleges, universities, and perhaps to industrial laboratories, it will gain a measure of control over the activities of those institutions. It is almost inevitable. As human beings, you all know it to be so.

This Foundation is authorized, in effect, to coordinate—and that is a terrible word, we never quite know what it means—to coordinate scientific research over the country; to see to it that there is no duplication of effort as between the institutions; and, armed with the weapon of subsidy, it may say to a great university laboratory: "Here is a subsidy for you if you will follow a certain line of investigation"; whereas another institution may be tempted to take a subsidy if its line of inquiry does not duplicate the line of inquiry pursued by the first.

The objective of this bill, as I understand, is to spread around the country amongst the institutions, collegiate, and of university character, these different efforts of research in the scientific field. Obviously, institutions accepting the subsidies must obey the schedule. It would be folly for the Foundation to give subsidies for duplication of efforts. In other words, the Foundation will eventually become the master—the master of scientific research in the United States, because it will hold in its hand that very tempting bait, money, money.

We are already holding our own in the field of atomic energy. I am not familiar with the progress made in other fields of science, except I cannot escape the conclusion, for example, that we are making extraordinary progress in the field of medicine, more so than in any country on the face of the earth today. It is being done almost entirely without Federal funds. For example, pharmaceutical companies and Armour & Co. have only recently announced medical discoveries. We can get along better without this bill in the field of medicine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we have listened to several distinguished Members of the House speak in support of the passage of this bill. They have made able and convincing arguments. The gentleman from Iowa frankly said that he had weighed both sides of the bill in his own mind and resolved to support and vote for the bill. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], whom I consider to be one of the ablest and soundest and most courageous Members of the House, made a convincing argument that I believe is unanswerable. The gentleman from New York bases his opposition on the ground of cost, stating that the passage of this bill will add to the national debt. When I think of the 13 or 14 billion dollars that we appropriate for national defense—and repeatedly before I became majority leader did I follow the gentleman from New York in an effort to increase national defense appropriations—I hope the amount of money we are appropriating for national defense, for aid, Navy, and Army, will be sufficient; but, if not, we ought to recognize our duty in the world today and provide the necessary money to establish strength, strength that would be respected by the challengers of our way of life, respect because of their fear. My friend from New York said that we are holding our own in the field of atomic energy. I do not want to hold our own in that field, I want to be ahead; I want our country to be way out front in that field.

Reference was made to paragraph 3 of section 3 on page 2 of the bill. My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] said that the word "basic" was omitted. Of course, it is omitted, because it ought to be omitted.

Paragraph 3 states that after "consultation with the Secretary of Defense"—this consultation on defense matters. Scientific research is not only basic or pure, but to be of value must also be applied. The man who works in the field of pure science is the man who develops the ideas. These ideas must then be passed to scientists and technicians for testing and proof. After the discovery and proof of scientific principles they then go to engineers and designers who reduce the new discoveries to practical use. We must pursue research in the fields of basic science, but further than that we must put the basic scientific discoveries to practical application and development and operation.

It is most important to our national welfare that basic research in all scientific fields receive the Federal aid that is promised by the establishment of the National Science Foundation.

For many years our leading scientists and many of our military leaders have urged, over and over again, that we establish this foundation which is designed to assure that our country will maintain its preeminent position in advancing national health and welfare and to stimulate scientific discovery in national defense.

The National Science Foundation will provide vital basic information which military research and development can take and apply.

The establishment of the National Science Foundation does not involve the expenditure of great sums of money. As a matter of fact, while its influence will be great, its cost over what we are now spending, will be a relatively small annual expense.

We must go forward, we cannot stand still or fall behind. The National Science Foundation is a great step forward, a very necessary step—and while the results from its work may be 10 or 20 years ahead, we must no longer delay establishing it.

We constantly read in the public press of the steps being taken to protect our country against attack. Let me dwell briefly on one phase of our protection, which generally escapes wide attention, partly because it is the nature of the activity and the men engaged in it and because its work is shadowed in secrecy in the best interests of our country.

Our basic research scientists strive to discover new phenomena, and improve everything that goes to wage successful war. They are away out in advance in their pioneering and normally it takes about 5 years for their work to come to fruition.

Following them come the development scientists and technicians who must prove the value of these scientific discoveries and it usually means that these men are 3 years in advance of the day when the equipment is distributed to our fighting men.

Then come the engineers and designers who reduce the new discoveries to practical size and try the equipment or materials out in the field. Finally come the procurement agencies, who must then place the orders for the new equipment, figure out the quantities, delivery dates, and shipping points, so that finally our Army, Navy, and Air Force receive the new military equipment and are trained in its use.

Our great power of preparedness to defend ourselves comes from outstanding scientists, our great industrial plants, and our military leaders, working closely together in a closely knit team.

Our great industries stand ready, our Army, Navy, and Air Force are prepared, but we must make sure that our scientists continue to receive all of the aid they need, and if necessary that we expand these research activities to the greatest possible extent.

Secretary Acheson has recently said in substance "The Soviet Union will not keep any agreement and the only power they will recognize is strength."

I submit to you that if our American scientists can be supreme in all phases of military scientific work, greatly superior to any country in the world, this will give us the protection against any attack that our enemies may plan. Indeed if they know of our great superiority, and they are bound to learn it as a fact and fear it in its specific application, we will have raised the greatest possible defense against a war in the future.

At the present time America still leads in many fields of military scientific work, but we must be supreme in all of them and I believe that if our scientists need more money, greater freedom of activity, more cooperation, that we should make sure that they have it.

Let us increase our military scientific work to the greatest possible degree and do it without delay, and enlist every scientist that has the capability of producing something of military value.

The statement has been frequently made that one of these quiet learned men, working and concentrating on some particular development, may at any time come forward with some new device, some new weapon, some new defense that could save the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys in the event that we are again called on to protect our country.

America must not fall behind in this international race for supremacy in military weapons and equipment. Let us all hope and pray that we will never find it necessary to use these weapons against an enemy but let us be prepared. Full preparedness is our best protection, and this includes superiority in the field of military science.

I would like to know what scientists the Soviet Union have today? I wish I knew whether they are ahead of us or we are ahead of them. It may be that as a result of the discoveries of scientists war may or may not be averted.

To an important extent, in the passage of this bill lies the future security and welfare of this and future generations. This bill will accomplish these purposes in two main ways. It will provide a central agency which will assure adequate and continuing support of basic research and it will also provide for the continuing supply of highly trained scientists in greater numbers to meet the needs of basic research.

The last 50 years has witnessed outstanding developments which have almost completely changed our way of life, and it is most certain that in the next 25 years we will see even greater accomplishments as mankind releases the forces of nature and applies them for the betterment of everyone.

The basis of this great advance lies in scientific discovery and application. Working with mathematical formulas, and studying through microscopes and test tubes, year in and year out, our basic scientists and technicians work constantly for these new discoveries. The applied scientists take these findings and develop them for our use, but no great advance could be made, unless the basic scientist first discovered a new phenomenon or a new bacteria.

Basic research is in essence that work done usually in universities or nonprofit foundations. Although frequently financed by grants from industry, basic research is seldom carried on in industrial laboratories because, practically speaking, it does not result in a thing or process which can immediately be made and sold or used for profit.

Our scientific world is without national leadership and there are many gaps in our knowledge that should be explored. This organized exploration is one of the promises of the National Science Foundation. Perhaps of even greater importance is the undeniable fact that the number of outstanding scientists in America is very limited and we must do everything possible to increase the number of qualified men and women engaged in this work.

The National Science Foundation will have the power to make scholarship and fellowship grants to promising scientists and students.

Today we are all vitally concerned with the importance of military research. We must be sure that America remains preeminent and supreme in the discovery of new weapons and military equipment. A world-wide race is going on for new and better ways of waging war.

In my opinion, one of the ways of preventing war is to be so far ahead in military scientific research and development that no country or combinations of countries will dare attack us. If we have this outstanding leadership in military research the fact will inevitably become known, even though the particular weapons or discoveries are guarded secrets and not known to those who might attack us.

The National Science Foundation will provide vital basic information which military research and development can take and apply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is making a very splendid statement. Does the gentleman understand that if this bill is enacted into law and becomes operative, the operations end of this research program that he is discussing will be taken out of the hands of the Army and the

Navy and the Air Force, and be transferred to an operating agency under the National Science Foundation.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I am not making that argument.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, does the gentleman understand whether that is or is not the purpose of this bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot say that, but I will give the gentleman a frank answer. I hope that some civilian control of our scientists will take place, because one thing that a scientist will not stand for is to be subject to discipline by an Army officer. I will state that I stood for it as a buck private, but I do not want to stand for it in civilian life. Certainly, in the Army and the Navy there has got to be discipline. But, I am frankly stating that this is a question that has to be looked into as to whether or not there is that freedom, without the attempt of discipline going on, that would permit the maximum development in the field of pure or basic science.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman's train of thought, but I think these questions are basic. Normally I am for this program, but I want to get certain basic things established in my mind so that we will understand what we are voting for when we vote for this legislation. The gentleman or no one will dispute the fact that the gentleman from New York has called attention to the various research programs of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Aeronautics Board, and so on, costing vast sums of money. Now does the gentleman understand, in advocating the passage of this legislation, that if it passes, the operating end of those research programs will be transferred from where they are presently located and established under the authority of the National Science Foundation Commission

Mr. McCORMACK. Frankly, I have no such understanding as that, and I am making no such argument.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to have that matter cleared up.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. The intent of the bill is perfectly clear. The operating research programs, particularly the Government program to which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], refers, will remain as operating agencies where they are now located; the Army, the Navy, Public Health, or whatever the situation may be.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that the gentleman's questions, I think, have been very pertinent. I hope that there is a complete understanding on the part of the Army officers and the scientists; and that includes the Navy and the Air Force. I hope there is no misunderstanding, and that resignations have not been reluctantly made, like President Compton, and men like that. We need them. God knows we need these scientists. If that is so, I hope the situation will be rectified very quickly, because one thing is certain, that the man who is a scientist is a very valuable citizen. We did not expect so much of him before; that is, the people generally, but he plays a very important part in the world of today, not only in peacetime, but particularly in time of war, and particularly in developing the ideas that might avert war or, in case of the further visitation of war, result in victory for our side.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE Does not the gentleman agree with me that any operating program under this present law must give and afford complete and absolute freedom to the scientist who may be engaged in any part of scientific research? He must have absolute freedom.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, and that means there must be understanding cooperation. I would like to know if the pure scientists in the Army are operating with the knowledge of what is going on in the Navy and the Air Force, or whether they are detached? All those things are important. We are talking about a man with a brain that the American people should realize is of great value, and that is the scientists in all fields, but particularly the scientists in the basic or pure field of science.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. CROSSER Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK In every field of science, all over America, our scientists are loyally working to develop new discoveries in military equipment, weapons, and materials, in their own individual laboratories, in groups, and in large institutions of learning.

The work is constant, never ceasing, and more than ever I am convinced that from these patriotic men must come the strongest force of our preparation, so that if the day comes that our boys must again defend our country, they will again not alone have the best equipment that brains can devise and our industry produce, but it will be so superior that there will be no question of the result.

We have to be practical. The most critical period in a democracy is when danger is imminent. That is the time we should prepare. That is the time when public opinion operates. When war exists we all have to get behind the Government to win the war. In times of peace we can struggle along, but when danger is imminent public opinion is usually inflamed and responds to emotional influences, and usually public opinion is wrong. I recognize it to be a human trait that the average individual does not want to see danger approaching. I was majority leader before Pearl Harbor. I saw the selective service extension bill pass this House by one vote. I lived 200 years in the 25 minutes on that roll call. It is when danger is imminent that democracy is weakest, because that is when we fail to do the things we ought to do.

I do not say I have the answer, for I am just a human being, a Member of this body trying to do the best I can for my country and for a future decent world, but I am convinced that the one thing that will stop war is greater power on the part of America and those countries associated with us, but mainly America, because the Communist world, the Communist countries, have only one respect, and that respect is the respect through fear of any country or countries that have greater strength and power than they.

In this particular field, in the field of science in all of its aspects, and particularly in the field of pure or basic science, any money we invest now I contend is one of the best investments we can make at this time.

Mr. Chairman, our basic research scientists strive to discover new phenomena, and improve everything that goes to wage successful war. They are away out in advance in their pioneering and normally it takes about 5 years for their work to come to fruition.

Following them come the development scientists and technicians who must prove the value of these scientific discoveries and it usually means that these men are 3 years in advance of the day when the equipment is distributed to our fighting men.

Then come the engineers and designers who reduce the new discoveries to practical size and try the equipment or materials out in the field. Finally come the procurement agencies, who must then place the orders for the new equipment, figure out the quantities, delivery dates, and shipping points, so that finally our Army, Navy, and Air Force receive the new military equipment and are trained in its use.

Our great power of preparedness to defend ourselves comes from outstanding scientists, our great industrial plants, and our military leaders working closely together in a closely knit team.

Our great industries stand ready, our Army, Navy, and Air Force are prepared, but we must make sure that our scientists continue to receive all of the aid they need, and if necessary that we expand these research activities to the greatest possible extent.

Secretary Acheson has recently said in substance "The Soviet Union will not keep any agreement and the only power they will recognize is strength."

I submit to you that if our American scientists can be supreme in all phases of military scientific work, greatly superior to any country in the world, this will give us the protection against any attack that our enemies may plan. Indeed, if they know of our great superiority, and they are bound to learn it as a fact and fear it in its specific application, we will have raised the greatest possible defense against a war in the future.

At the present time America still leads in many fields of military scientific work, but we must be supreme in all of them and I believe that if our scientists need more money, greater freedom of activity, more cooperation, that we should make sure that they have it.

Let us increase our military scientific work to the greatest possible degree and do it without delay, and enlist every

scientist that has the capability of producing something of military value.

The statement has been frequently made that one of these quiet learned men, working and concentrating on some particular development, may at any time come forward with some new device, some new weapon, some new defense that could save the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys in the event that we are again called on to protect our country.

America must not fall behind in this international race for supremacy in military weapons and equipment. Let us all hope and pray that we will never find it necessary to use these weapons against an enemy, but let us be prepared. Full preparedness is our best protection, and this includes superiority in the field of military science.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly approach this subject with a good deal of hesitation in view of the remarks that have been made by the able gentleman from New York. I recognize his sincerity and his conviction that this is bad legislation. I hope I will be able to indicate to you why I have been forced to the conclusion that this is not only good legislation but that there is no other alternative open to us this afternoon other than to support this legislation in the interest, first, of our national security, and in the interest, second of the conditions that face us as far as the economic welfare of this country and the health of the American people is concerned.

The gentleman is entirely right in calling attention to the gigantic expenditures of the Federal Government now in the field of research, both basic and applied. But there are some distinctions which I think it might be well for us to consider. On page 1118 of the budget, there is a listing of the expenditures for 1949, 1950, and 1951 for research and development in the Federal Government. It is as follows:

Expenditures for other developmental purposes

[In millions of dollars]

Research and development	1949, actual	1950, estimate	1951, estimate
Civil:			
Direct Federal programs:			
Atomic Energy Commission	114	155	176
Other agencies	85	118	119
Total, direct Federal programs	199	273	295
Grants-in-aid	11	12	12
Total, civil research and development	210	285	307
National defense:			
Department of Defense	688	630	606
Other agencies	42	49	50
Total, national-defense research and development	730	679	656
Total, research and development	940	964	963

So the total of the Federal Government's expenditures, according to the budget, is $940,000,000 actually in 1949; $964,000,000 recommended in 1950 and $963,000,000 estimated in 1951.

That gave me a great deal of concern as to where we were heading and as to whether we were actually accomplishing the purposes most of us had in mind. I am frank to say when we first considered this question in committee I was in serious doubt as to the wisdom of the legislation. The more I listened to and studied the evidence presented to us by over 150 qualified witnesses from all over the country, practically all of them earnestly in favor of some kind of legislation such as this, the more I became convinced we simply had to face the picture realistically and accept our responsibility in this field.

In that connection I urge careful consideration of the list of eminent Americans who are in support of this bill, which list is contained at the completion of the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Let me turn to another development which is, in my opinion, of extreme interest. You will recall that the Department of Defense actually spent $688,000,000 for research and development in 1949, that its estimate for 1950 in this field dropped $58,000,000 to $630,000,000 and that its estimate for 1951 dropped another $24,000,000 to $606,000,000 in 1951. That is a total reduction in a period of only 2 years of $82,000,000. Certainly such a development is not being made at the expense of our national security. Surely a substantial savings in the field of national security should point the way to other agencies which, without exception, increased their estimate in 1950 over 1949 and increased them again in 1951 over 1950. In short, while the National Defense has succeeded in reducing its program by $82,000,000 in this 2-year period, the other agencies have increased their estimates by $105,000,000

Why is this?

I think the answer is to be found in the second report of the Secretary of Defense. Let me quote briefly from that report. In the Secretary's report you will find these two paragraphs at page 16:

In the field of science, unification is working well. The Research and Development Board, with the aid and advice of the Nation's top civilian and military technical specialists, is coordinating some 13,000 specific research and development projects of the armed forces, involving an expenditure of about a half billion dollars a year. By eliminating undesirable duplication, by requiring full use of existing facilities, and by sponsoring the exchange of information on pertinent research and development, both inside and outside the Government, the Board has been able to bring about savings in some areas and to shift funds made available thereby to neglected or to more important fields. Satisfactory progress is being made in the formulation of a complete and integrated program of military research and development to provide instruments of warfare essential to our security within a budget that can be supported by the economy of this country.

Recognizing the need for technical and operational evaluation of weapons on an interservice basis, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Research and Development Board, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, established the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group early this year to provide rigorous, unprejudiced, and independent analyses of present and future weapons systems under probable future combat conditions. These analyses are being made by the ablest professional minds, military and civilian, employing the most advanced analytical methods that can be brought to bear.

The entire chapter IV, entitled "Scientific Research and Development," is worthy of careful reading and again I recommend it highly as valuable evidence for all of us to consider.

For my purposes, I would like to quote brief excerpts answering the question, Why military research and development is necessary:

If there is any one military policy on which the Congress and the public seem to be unanimous, over and beyond the determination to be strong in this period of international uncertainty, it is determination to have superior military equipment and to base war strategy on its use.

The phrases "Maginot Line complex" and "preparing to fight the next war with weapons of the last war" are familiar expressions of our concern lest we take the easy but dangerous course of reliance on the status quo in a world of accelerating progress in technology.

It was a determination to take full advantage of every possible technological superiority that led the Congress to establish the Research and Development Board as part of the national defense structure. It is the job of this Board to insure that the desired superiority is achieved.

Aircraft that can travel faster than sound, guided missiles with increasing ranges and greater accuracy, and submarines that can "breathe" under water for indefinite periods of time are a few of the potential weapons on which material progress has been made since the close of World War II

It is essential to the security of the United States that its defense be planned in terms of significant new technological advances. Already many of the remarkable weapons of World War II are obsolete or obsolescent, and planning must be done not only in terms of what exists today but in terms of those developments, the early realization of which may profoundly influence the nature of future conflicts.

Another element which plays a substantial part in research and development planning is the possibility of unconventional warfare. This term is applied to such things as biological warfare, radiological warfare, and chemical warfare in new and insidious forms. It also includes psychological warfare which affords a potential enemy many techniques for the destruction of morale and for undermining the capacity of self-defense. Except for the psychological aspects, unconventional warfare did not figure in World War II. Because it exists as a potential threat, however, full consideration must be given to adequate defenses and countermeasures.

The Army and the Navy have vigorous research and development programs which have grown up over a period of years. When the Air Force was constituted as a separate branch of the armed services, its research and development efforts represented a third important program. The size, diversity, and complexity of the fields covered by these programs make sound planning increasingly important.

It is the function of the Research and Development Board to provide a complete and integrated plan of military research and development and to assign responsibility for carrying out its various parts to the respective military departments. The Board must decide such questions as what portion of the

research and development dollar should go into studies in the defensive aspects of biological warfare, into basic research in the physical sciences, into the development of guided missiles, and so on through the whole list of weapons, equipment, techniques, and devices.

The coordinating activities of the Research and Development Board enable each department to become aware of what the other departments are doing in research and development. Unnecessary duplication is thereby located and eliminated or prevented. More difficult, but probably of greater significance, is the Board's continuing responsibility to shift emphasis and funds away from programs of lesser military promise and into those of greater value. The existence of such a coordinating agency makes it possible to stretch the research and development dollar and to cut costs.

Since the close of World War II military expenditures for research and development have averaged over a half billion dollars per year Although this is but a small percentage of the average total military budget, it is a large figure in comparison to the much smaller sums spent on military research and development before the war—in comparison, say, to the $13,000,000 obligated for military research and development in 1939, the year World War II began The amount of money currently being spent for research and development is only slightly less than the entire military appropriation for 1924, and is almost 50 percent as much as the total military appropriation as late as 1937.

* * * * *

Every citizen is naturally interested in three questions: (1) Why has it become necessary to spend large sums for research and development, (2) what are these funds buying, and (3) does the United States have the best military research and development program in the world today?

* * * * *

Basic research represents the broad base of theoretical knowledge and new ideas from which all applications, military and otherwise, must be drawn If basic research already flourished independently in our universities and industrial organizations, the need for Government sponsorship in this area would not exist, or at least it would not be required on the present scale In the past the United States has drawn heavily upon the basic research of Europe for ideas, while it excelled in practical applications and engineering .

Although there is a growing body of fundamental science in the United States today, the reservoir is not yet great enough to compensate for the drains made upon it and for the destruction of European science by the war. The military departments are therefore sponsoring limited programs in fundamental science until such time as the United States has caught up in this area. They are also supporting the proposed legislation for a National Science Foundation.

Let me repeat that: "They are also supporting the proposed legislation for a National Science Foundation." This bill was reported June 14, 1949. The report of Secretary of Defense was filed December 30, 1949.

Now to return to that report:

The country is also interested in the early rehabilitation of European science as part of the storehouse of general knowledge.

Then there is this significant section entitled "Savings Through Coordination," which continues:

By eliminating undesirable duplication, by requiring full use of existing facilities, and by sponsoring the active cross-exchange of information on pertinent research and development both in and outside the Government, the Research and Development Board has been able to bring about savings in some areas and to shift funds made available thereby to neglected or to more important areas of research and development.

Not all savings are reflected in the ledgers, however, because much coordination takes place in the Research and Development Board, when members of the military departments get together around committee or panel tables. For example, in the field of electron tubes a proposal for military work on a metal envelope cathode ray tube was not activated, since such a tube was found to be already under development by another agency.

Formally effected coordination is illustrated by recent Board action on the recommendation of the Committee on Guided Missiles, requesting that three existing projects be terminated and two others combined into one. Through this action an estimated $6,000,000 in planned obligations for the fiscal year 1950 was made available for allocation to other guided missiles projects of high priority.

The Research and Development Board also sponsors standardization wherever possible to make for greater economy and efficiency An example in the research and development field proper was the introduction of standards for a uniform system of telemetering for the flight testing of guided missiles at the several test ranges. This has reduced the vast number of different parts of equipments formerly in use by the services. Old telemetering equipment is being replaced by the new standard equipment on a maintenance basis.

To render assistance to the Munitions Board, the Research and Development Board has established a policy which urges the departments to give attention throughout the development of each project to the creation of simple, easily produced designs. Ease of fabrication, assembly, inspection, and maintenance and promotion of interchangeability wherever possible are important considerations. The departments must assure the minimum use of strategic and critical materials, the minimum number and diversity of parts, and the maximum use of standard components and accessories.

In its own operations, the Research and Development Board saves funds and avoids duplication of effort by utilizing wherever possible the established groups of other agencies to make necessary studies and investigations. The Committee on Medical Sciences, for example, is utilizing several of the medical committees and panels of the National Research Council as panels of its own committee.

* * * * *

The problem, therefore, becomes one of obtaining the maximum benefit from every research and development dollar.

* * * * *

Public opinion demands that American defenses be modern and adequate to render the country secure against attack. When the United States citizen faces his responsibilities as a taxpayer he must bear in mind that the development cost of a modern large bomber through the prototype stage, to cite but one example, may well exceed $50,000,000, including the necessary special equipment that must go with it. Similarly, the development cost of a jet fighter through the prototype stage is likely to be from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000.

The construction of prototypes is the stage in the research and development process where costs run highest. Research must, therefore, be well planned and results meticulously checked through all the earlier stages in order that costly errors may be avoided in the prototype phase.

Let me turn to still another phase of this which I think is important.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HESELTON. Gladly. Just as soon as I complete this one point.

On page 173 of this report of the President's Board entitled "Science and Public Policy," there is the only breakdown I know of which is available for our consideration of this problem of the division between basic research and applied research or development; and if you go through the budget you find practically no agency, down to the smallest, that does not have some kind of research undertaken It is easy and apparently popular to label some appropriation item "research." Then the door is wide open. It may be important and necessary. It may be relatively unimportant. And it may be a senseless, extravagant waste of time and money. And remember all the evidence is to the effect that no one knows how much is good, indifferent, or bad. I personally suspect that a very great deal of it would not be countenanced by any reputable scientist. I think it entirely possible that the National Science Foundation would find in the rest of Government much more than the 82 millions the national defense is eliminating which would be discarded without injuring anything but actually improving the Federal program by unchaining talented scientists and placing them in sound programs.

I have made reference to the report of the President's Scientific Research Board. This Board was created by Executive Order 9791, dated October 17, 1946. As it was first constituted, it consisted of John R. Steelman, Chairman; Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War; James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy; Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior; Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture; W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce; John D. Goodloe, Administrator, Federal Loan Agency; Watson B. Miller, Administrator, Federal Security Agency; Maj Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator, Federal Works Agency; Charles R. Denny, Jr., Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, Chairman, National Advisory Committee of Aeronautics; Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director, Office of Scientific Research and Development; David Lilienthal, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission; Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority; Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator, Veterans' Administration; J. Donald Kingsley, executive secretary.

Board of Alternates: Maj. Gen. H. S. Aurand, Director, Research and Development Division, General Staff, War Department; John Nicholas Brown, Assistant Secretary for Air; Rear Adm. Paul F. Lee, Chief, Office of Naval Research, Department of the Navy; Dr. Thomas B. Nolan, Assistant Director, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior; Dr. W. V. Lambert, Director, Agricultural Research Administration, Department of Agriculture; Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director, National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce; Miss Mary E.

Switzer, Special Assistant to the Administrator, Federal Security Agency; Herbert S. Fairbank, Deputy Director, Federal Works Agency; Carroll L. Wilson, General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission; E. K. Jett, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission; John P. Ferris, Director of the Commerce Department, Tennessee Valley Authority; John W. Crowley, Jr., Acting Director of Aeronautical Research, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; Dr. Paul R. Hawley, Chief, Medical Division, Veterans' Administration; Dr. Edward Cushing, Medical Division, Veterans' Administration; John T. Cox, Jr., Administrative Officer, Office of Rubber Reserve, Reconstruction Finance Corporation; Dr. Eugene W. Scott, Deputy Director, Programs Division, Joint Research and Development Board.

Its reports to the President were in five volumes, three dealing with the Federal Government's special role in the Nation's total science effort, a fourth with the problem of science and technical manpower and final report discussing research and allied science both in the Government and in the Nation at large. These reports contain a wealth of statistics and other material from which Members can obtain concrete and convincing evidence of the preeminent necessity of action in this field.

Let me read just a few sentences from the opening part of the first report:

The security and prosperity of the United States depend today, as never before, upon the rapid extension of scientific knowledge. So important, in fact, has this extension become to our country that it may reasonably be said to be a major factor in national survival.

A generation which has witnessed the awful destructiveness of the atom bomb—

And I might insert here, has now learned of the hydrogen bomb—

or which has read newspaper accounts of developments in biological warfare needs no special demonstration of the relation of science to military preparedness. In the war the laboratory became the first line of defense and the scientist, the indispensable warrior. There is no likelihood that this would be changed in the event of another conflict

It is unfortunate that any part of the case for Federal support of science should rest upon its military importance But no responsible person can fail to recognize the uneasy character of the present peace. The scientific isolationism which inevitably results increases the urgency of Federal support for science and influences the balance in any recommended program.

Scientific discovery is equally the basis for our progress against poverty and disease. This alone would provide adequate justification for public interest and support.

If we are to remain a bulwark of democracy in the world, we must continually strengthen and expand our domestic economy and our foreign trade. A principal means to this end is through the constant advancement of scientific knowledge and the consequent steady improvement of our technology.

Throughout most of our history, the living standards of our people were raised by expanding our land area and bringing more and more acres under cultivation. That route has now been substantially closed for more than a generation, and we have increased our productivity through an advancing technology. The processes and machines we use in our factories, the ways in which we raise and preserve our food, all derive from theoretical discoveries in the various sciences. The technology in which we excel and which has transformed us in some 80 years from a backward agricultural nation to a world power rests upon progress in the basic sciences. Only through research and more research can we provide the basis for an expanding economy, and continued high levels of employment.

Our technology is sufficiently advanced and our resources sufficiently adequate so that there is no immediate prospect that we shall fall technologically behind. We shall in the future, however, have to rely largely upon our own efforts in the basic sciences to provide the basis for that improvement. The danger lies in the future.

As a people, our strength has lain in practical application of scientific principles, rather than in original discoveries. In the past, our country has made less than its proportionate contribution to the progress of basic science. Instead, we have imported our theory from abroad and concentrated on its application to concrete and immediate problems. This was true even in the case of the atomic bomb. The basic discovery of nuclear fission was made by Otto Hahn and F. Strassman in Germany, founded on preliminary research in Italy, and published in a German periodical in January, 1939, just before the laboratories of Europe went dark.

That free exchange of ideas which formerly permitted us to import to meet our needs no longer prevails. Europe's laboratories are still blacked out and are likely to remain so as long as the unsettled state of the world continues. In many parts of Europe, scientists have been dispersed or slaughtered, laboratories wrecked, intricate and unique equipment destroyed. In others an iron curtain has been drawn around the work of the scientists. The strong nationalism, characteristic of these times, and the isolationism of science that results is a further barrier. The unity of western civilization has been shattered, and for the first time in our history, we are on our own so far as the extension of knowledge is concerned.

Let me quote just one more piece of evidence from these reports. It is pointed out in that most major nations of the world recognize the essential importance of science to them and are expanding their research and development budgets and then it is stated:

The Soviet Union's 1947 budget is reported to provide $1,200,000,000 as compared with outlays of $900,000,000 in 1946.

Compare that to our actual 1949 expenditures of $940,000,000.

The report goes on to say:

In addition, the Russians have embarked—

And this was in 1947—

upon a 5-year program of stepped-up scientific training, under which they are reported to be producing 140,000 engineers and scientists each year.

Compare that with the fact that in 1930 we had 49,000 scientists and technicians, 92,000 in 1940, and then in June 1947 our universities and colleges graduated only 35,000 bachelors and 1,300 to 1,400 doctors of science.

This bill deals specifically and constructively with a means of encouraging the education of more of our young men and women in this vital field. While I certainly respect the integrity, sincerity, intelligence, and ability of my colleagues who are inclined to oppose this legislation, I earnestly suggest that some of these facts in the light of the almost unanimous opinion of our responsible leaders in national defense, in the educational field, and in the business world should carry great weight with us in reaching our final decision.

Now, let me turn to the Hoover Commission Report, filed with Congress on March 25, 1949. As you all know there were certain differences of opinion among the Commissioners as to a number of the reports, but this was the unanimous report and recommendation of the 12 Commissioners. The full report on Federal research is not long and I commend it to you as additional and extremely important evidence.

For my part, I wish now to quote only certain excerpts which I believe to be of vital importance in our consideration of this legislation:

INTRADEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH

The report of the Scientific Research Board makes it plain that a satisfactorily coordinated research program for the National Government has not yet been realized.

A number of such staff groups is now in operation. These groups include the Agricultural Research Administration, the Office of Naval Research, the Office of Research Planning of the Public Health Service, and the Research and Development Division of the Department of the Army's General Staff.

Effort along these lines within individual agencies is not enough. There is need for an organization to facilitate the development of research policy for the Federal Government as a whole This was recognized in the report of the President's Scientific Research Board. That Board recommended, as a first step, the establishment of an interdepartmental Committee on Scientific Research and Development. Such a committee was created by Executive order in December 1947. It was directed to further the most effective administration of scientific research and development activities in the Federal Government, and was authorized to submit recommendations on research policy and administration directly to the President.

The full potentialities of this committee have not been realized since its members have not as yet attacked major problems of research policy for the Federal Government as a whole. This may be due in part to lack of staff and funds.

CREATION OF A NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

This points to the need for a National Science Foundation. The major functions of such a foundation should be (a) to examine the total scientific research effort of the Nation, (b) to assess the proper role of the Federal Government in this effort, (c) to evaluate the division of research effort among the scieitific disciplines and among fields of applied research, and (d) to evaluate the key factors that impede the development of an effective national research effort. Based upon its investigations, it should advise the President as to the measures necessary to establish a sound scientific research program for the Nation.

The National Science Foundation should consider most carefully the manner in which national policies with respect to scientific research are related to broader questions of educational policy. At present grants for

research purposes are being made on a hit-and-miss basis, making the award of research grants, in effect, a new form of patronage. The awarding of research grants must be put upon a more systematic basis, with due recognition given to their impact on the educational programs of our higher institutions of learning.

Finally, the Commission made two recommendations. The second is the important one for our consideration at this time. It was:

The Commission recommends that—
b. A National Science Foundation be established

We have this bill before us this afternoon. The fact that this bill in quite similar form had passed in the other body in May 1948 was known to the members of the Commission when it made that recommendation. We can take judicial notice of that fact. I think it is compelling evidence to those of us who can see in that Commission's recommendations perhaps the only solution to the fiscal mess we are in. It is the bill I sincerely believe will accomplish the purposes recommended both by the President's Board and the Hoover Commission.

I shall put in the RECORD—and I regret I do not have it completed yet—some material I think will convince you that we are duplicating now; that we are making unnecessary and unwise expenditures, and that the only way we can control it is the same way that the Department of Defense is controlling it in that important field, and that our hope lies in the National Foundation, not with many of these other Departments with their constantly increasing demands for more funds for their pet research programs, many of which they cannot explain today. These are three analyses developed from the budget as to what has been done and what is recommended, from reports as to pending legislation in this field, and as to research activities in the health field under the Public Health Service. The latter is not intended as criticism It is entirely possible that every activity is useful and should receive even stronger support. It is only to place before you the evidence as to the breadth of the activity in the Federal Government and to urge that there is an imperative necessity for a National Science Foundation to evaluate the entire activity and to advise us upon the proper course of action we should take in the future.

These analyses follow:

SELECTED ITEMS FROM 1950 BUDGET TO ILLUSTRATE BREADTH OF ACTIVITIES UNDER RESEARCH

Department of the Interior	
Bureau of Reclamation: Engineering and economic investigation, 1950	$461,500
Bureau of Mines, Scientific and technical research, 1950	18,135,807
National Park Service—Historical and archeological research without break-down— Fish and Wildlife Service.	
Research on fish and fisheries	1,736,000
Research on birds and mammals	476,700
Total	20,810,007
Department of Labor	
Child Labor and Youth Employment Research, 1950	$108,634
Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1950: The Bureau, a research and statistical organization	5,493,700
Bureau of Consumers Price Index, 1950	1,126,000
Wage and Hour Division, 1950	142,000
Total	6,870,334
Post Office Department	
Research and development program, 1950, under act of Aug. 16, 1949, Public Law 231 (Estimate of $151,900 previously carried on under this title transferred to "General administration.")	$74,000
Total	74,000
State Department	
Scientific and technical programs, 1950	$301,926
Some part of Philippine Rehabilitation, over-all, 1950	14,061,350
Some part of Institute of Inter-American Affairs, 1950	5,992,600
Total	20,355,876
Treasury Department	
Division of Tax Research, 1950	$137,600
Other departments	
Atomic Energy Commission, Physical Research, 1950	$31,377,238
Federal Communications Commission. Applied technical research and frequency allocation, 1950	383,023
General Accounting Office Development installation and evaluation of accounting systems, 1950	1,017,944
Interstate Commerce Commission. Collection and analysis of accounting and statistical data, 1950	873,840
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, 1950	43,000,000
Smithsonian Institution Research, 1950	178,250
Tariff Commission: Assembly and analysis of basic tariff, production and trade data, 1950	358,764
Department of Commerce: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, same general fields and objectives as Tariff Commission, 1950	5,017,058
Maritime Commission: Design and construction of prototype vessels, 1950, estimated cost (design and construction of naval auxiliary prototype vessels, estimated cost, 1951, $10,000,000)	4,744,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:	
Expense for research and maintenance of synthetic rubber stand-by plants	8,300,000
Synthetic rubber program, research and development	3,000,000
TVA: Fertilizer and munitions research, R & D	4,879,000
Food and Drug Administration, some part of research and development, 1950	708,725
Howard University: Resident instruction and departmental research; some part of research and development, 1950	2,478,125
Federal Security, Office of Education: Collection and analysis of statistics and grants-in-aid, 1950	100,915
Other departments—Continued	
Public Health Service:	
Clinical and laboratory research and grants-in-aid, 1950	$596,476
Control of tuberculosis—cooperative applied research, 1950	721,996
General health studies, etc., 1950	16,720,292
Control of communicable diseases studies, etc., 1950	3,070,030
Disease and sanitation investigation and control, Alaska, 1950	1,317,000
Hospital construction, grants for research, experiments, and demonstration, 1950 (1951, $1,000,000)	----------
National Institutes of Health, Basic Research, 1950	11,844,137
National Cancer Institute, 1950	20,916,000
Mental Health, 1950	9,620,794
National Heart Institute, 1950	16,161,500
Dental Health, 1950	1,934,000
Arctic Health Institute, 1951, estimate $975,000	----------
Total	189,319,107
Federal Security Administration	
Children's Bureau, Research in Child Life:	
1949	----------
1950	$86,826
1951	88,721
General Services Administration, Geophysical Institute, Alaska:	
1949	979,000
1950	575,000
1951	----------
(Plus $6,625,000 contract authority)	
Expansion Public Health Service, Bethesda:	
1949	6,723,729
1950	30,320,000
1951	10,700,000
Research Facilities, National Institute of Dental Research:	
Building 1950	85,000
Limit	2,000,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency, Housing Research Program:	
1949	332,000
1950	2,318,000
1951	3,318,000
Department of Agriculture, Solicitor's Office	
Lands, forestry research, and general legal services:	
1949	$528,466
1950	535,300
1951	560,900
Agricultural Research Administration:	
1949	2,536,044
1950	2,503,900
1951	913,500
(Working capital fund to be established in 1951, $1,500,000)	
Special research fund:	
1949	1,278,856
1950	1,262,600
1951	1,272,800
Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials:	
1949	353,408
1950	354,800
1951	517,500
Research on agricultural problems of Alaska:	
1949	434,943
1950	678,800
1951	816,200

Department of Agriculture, Solicitor's Office—Continued

Experiment stations:	
1949	$239,517
1950	236,250
1951	238,450
Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico:	
1949	139,719
1950	147,800
1951	160,950
Bureau of Animal Industry:	
1949	1,491,109
1950	1,336,400
1951	1,567,100
Research of Diseases of Animals:	
1949	1,128,298
1950	1,098,700
1951	1,271,700
For eradicating tuberculosis and Bangs disease:	
1949	6,144,476
1950	6,316,700
1951	0
Research under foot-and-mouth disease control:	
1949	258,000
1950	0
1951	0
Bureau of Dairy Industry:	
1949	1,145,038
1950	1,116,000
1951	1,371,000
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering:	
1949	2,958,464
1950	2,846,800
1951	2,971,000
Research of field crops:	
1949	2,614,688
1950	2,413,580
1951	2,649,950
Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops:	
1949	2,606,211
1950	2,406,600
1951	2,644,000
Forest diseases:	
1949	421,359
1950	442,440
1951	473,700
Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation	
1949	2,152,671
1950	2,424,500
1951	2,709,570
Agricultural engineering:	
1949	793,280
1950	870,670
1951	1,047,610
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering: Rubber investigations:	
1949	1,420,396
1950	1,843,600
1951	1,885,800
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:	
1949	3,340,184
1950	3,648,100
1951	4,021,000
Insects and plant disease control:	
1949	4,180,849
1950	4,700,500
1951	4,752,000
Foreign plant quarantines:	
1949	2,294,248
1950	2,364,000
1951	2,618,000
Citrus blackfly:	
1949	1,212,227
1950	1,175,600
1951	1,837,500
Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry:	
1949	5,845,124
1950	5,728,525

Department of Agriculture, Solicitor's Office—Continued

Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry—Continued	
1951	$5,807,000
Agricultural chemical and naval stores investigation:	
1949	628,657
1950	655,925
1951	----------
Regional research laboratories:	
1949	5,197,372
1950	5,072,600
1951	----------
Synthetic liquid fuels project.	
1949	73,742
1950	81,860
1951	115,000
Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics:	
1949	900,170
1950	919,200
1951	1,370,500
Forest Service:	
Forest and range research:	
1949	2,858,657
1950	2,719,919
1951	2,761,735
Forest products:	
1949	1,212,931
1950	1,205,500
1951	1,216,100
Soil Conservation Service: Soil conservation research:	
1949	1,650,188
1950	1,452,800
1951	1,467,850
Production and Marketing Administration. Marketing research.	
1949	1,138,274
1950	1,168,477
1951	1,197,468
Farm Credit Administration: Research and technical assistance	
1949	493,962
1950	491,200
1951	547,000

Department of Commerce

Bureau of Census:	
1949	$5,581,717
1950	5,865,000
1951	6,585,000
Civil Aeronautics Administration: Research and development of airway facilities:	
1949	91,243
1950	7,000,000
1951	9,948,000
Coast and Geodetic Survey: Earthquake investigation:	
1949	110,943
1950	111,300
1951	112,300
Bureau of Public Roads: Testing and research laboratories:	
1949	552,083
1950	447,917
1951	----------

(Funds for continuing of construction at Langley, Va., contained in appropriation of Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1949, provided by an appropriation of $1,000,000 in above act.)

National Bureau of Standards: Research and testing:	
1949	$4,891,657
1950	5,019,388
1951	4,729,000
Radio propagation and standards:	
1949	8,042,870
1950	8,100,000
1951	8,153,000

Department of Commerce—Continued

National Bureau of Standards—Continued	
Construction and equipment, Radio Laboratory and Guided Missiles Laboratory:	
1949	----------
1950	----------
1951	$6,375,000
Weather Bureau Research:	
1949	681,756
1950	626,366
1951	780,726

Department of the Army

Research and development:	
Quartermaster Corps, 1950, estimate	$8,194,209
Transportation Corps, 1950, estimate	691,348
Signal Corps, 1950, estimate	25,208,072
Medical Corps, 1950, estimate	3,551,396
Corps of Engineers, 1950, estimate (1950 program: 235 projects, 35 scheduled for completion)	5,877,351
Ordnance Department, 1950, estimate	49,017,897
Chemical Corps, 1950, estimate	102,032
Total	92,642,305

Department of the Navy

(Navy personnel—applied research program to develop more effective methods for utilizing human resources to military requirements)

Research and development:	
Aircraft facilities, 1950, estimate	$77,853,434
Ships and facilities, 1950, estimate	23,138,000
Ordnance and facilities, 1950, estimate	59,672,904
Medical care, 1950, estimate	2,767,770
Civil engineering, 1950, estimate	902,000
Engineering research facilities—operating and maintaining facilities engaged in civilian engineering research and development programs such as advance base proving ground, Port Hueneme and Arctic test station, Point Barrow, Alaska, 1950	1,872,420
Research, 1950	46,497,500
Service-wide supply and finance, 1950, estimate	958,093
Service-wide operations—refers to research and development without break-down at naval observatory	----------
Total	213,662,121

Department of the Air Force

Research and development, 1950	$213,641,584

National Defense

Department of the Army	$92,642,305
Department of the Navy	213,662,121
Department of the Air Force	213,641,584
Total	519,946,010

SOME PENDING LEGISLATION DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY DEALING WITH RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTES (S. 2591, H. R. 3943)

Numerous bills were introduced to establish separate research institutes for arthritis,

multiple sclerosis, blindness, etc. The Public Health Service opposed such continued proliferation of separate research institutes within the Public Health Service. This bill was devised as a compromise solution. It established two new institutes, one on arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases and another on blindness and neurological diseases including multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, and cerebral palsy. Also, the Surgeon General is given additional authority to expand or contract research programs. This bill passed the Senate and is pending in the health subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The House health subcommittee completed its public hearings on June 23, 1949, but did not take action on the bill.

STUDY OF CHRONIC AND DISABLING DISEASES (S. 2584)

This bill authorizes the appropriation of $200,000 to enable the Public Health Service to study and report to Congress on the best methods of obtaining periodic estimates of the amount and distribution of chronic diseases, injuries, and handicapping conditions. This bill passed the Senate and was referred to the health subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

FAMILY ASPECTS OF CHRONIC ILLNESS (S. CON. RES 17)

This bill declares it to be the sense of Congress that research on the familial aspects of chronic illness and investigation of practical methods of furnishing family health services should be expanded and intensified. Accordingly, the bill directs the United States Public Health Service to extend its activities toward this end. It passed the Senate and is now pending before the health subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

UNITED MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION (S. 2008, H R. 5182)

This bill carries out the Hoover Commission proposal for a new United Medical Administration to provide for medical care, public health, and medical research. In it would be consolidated most of the large-scale activities of the Federal Government in the fields of medical care, medical research, and public health, including Federal hospital facilities The Public Health Service would be transferred from the Federal Security Agency. Also, responsibility for furnishing medical and hospital care for veterans would be transferred from the Veterans' Administration. No hearings were held on these bills.

CHILD LIFE RESEARCH (S 904, H. R. 4465)

This bill would broaden the mandate of the United States Children's Bureau to investigate and report upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and extend its powers and duties to implement this responsibility. For this phase of its work the Children's Bureau received an appropriation of $571,000 this year. This bill calls for the appropriation of $7,500,000 for the first year to be used for research and demonstartions in child life and development, research fellowships, training and instruction in pediatrics and in child life and development, and the development of a national clearing house for information on current and proposed researches and studies. Hearings were held by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, but no further action was taken on the bill. In the House the bill was referred to the health subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which took no action on the measure.

SURVEY OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED PERSONS (S. 458, H. R. 3937)

This bill authorizes $5,000,000 to enable the Bureau of the Census to make a survey of the number and characteristics of physically handicapped persons. It was reported favorably in the Senate but was not called up for action. In the House the Post Office Committee took no action on the bill after receiving unfavorable reports from the Federal Security Agency and the Bureau of the Budget.

LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH UNITS (S. 522, H. R. 5865)

This bill authorizes increased Federal aid to encourage and assist each State in establishing and maintaining a network of local public health units organized to provide basic full-time public health services in all areas of the State. Public health services are defined to include services dealing with the diagnosis and prevention of disease, the control of communicable diseases, health education, demonstrations, sanitation, vital statistics, the training of personnel for State and local public health work and other aspects of preventive medicine. The bill was passed by the Senate without a dissenting vote. In the House, hearings were held on this subject by the health subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which reported the bill for consideration by the full committee.

SCHOOL HEALTH SERVICES (S. 1411, H. R. 3942)

This bill authorizes $35,000,000 a year for Federal grants to aid the States in developing health services for children of elementary and secondary school age. The bill calls for periodic medical and dental examinations for all school children, with treatment of conditions whenever the parents are unable to provide such treatment Treatment for all children, regardless of the economic status of parents, is left to the option of each State. Services would be available to children attending public and parochial schools. In a State whose constitution or laws prohibit the use of public funds by private schools, the Federal Security Administrator would make grants directly to the private schools instead of through the State agency. This bill passed the Senate without a dissenting vote In the House hearings were held by the health subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which reported the bill for reconsideration by the full committee.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

The United States Children's Bureau administers grants to the States ($11,000,000 annually) for maternal and child health services such as prenatal clinics, public health services, well-child clinics, immunizations, and examinations of children of school age by physicians and dentists. In addition, the Bureau makes grants to the States for services to crippled children which includes locating them, diagnosing their crippled condition, and providing or locating skilled care for them. Legislation was introduced to increase the amounts of each of these appropriations to $25,000,000 for the first year with no ceiling on appropriations thereafter. This proposal is included in part B, title VI, of article 1679, as well as in S. 2352, H. R. 5835. In the course of the extended public hearings in both branches of Congress on the major health bills, consideration was given to this proposal, but no action was taken.

MEDICAL AND HEALTH PERSONNEL TRAINING (S 1453; H. R. 5940)

These bills would establish an emergency 5-year program to increase the number of trained personnel in medicine, nursing, dentistry, dental hygiene, hospital administration, and public health. Eligible schools would receive Federal grants to help meet costs of instruction, with incentives for increasing enrollments. Grants would also be made for establishing new schools and expanding existing ones. Over the 5-year period, Federal grants would average over $55,000,000 a year. The Senate passed the bill (S. 1453) without a dissenting vote. A similar bill (H. R 5940) was reported favorably to the House, except that it includes assistance to schools of optometry. When Congress adjourned, the bill was still before the House Rules Committee.

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

HOSPITAL PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

The appropriation for this item finances the direct expenses of the Public Health Service under the hospital construction program

Technical services: The Service assists the States and their communities in making inventories of their hospitals and health centers, determining the additional facilities required, and developing a coordinated program to meet the indicated need. Proposed hospital and medical center projects for which Federal financial help is requested are reviewed to determine eligibility for assistance, and the project plans and specifications are reviewed for compliance with construction standards. To assure adequate facilities and adherence to cost limits, technical assistance is provided on architectural and engineering aspects. The Service is also authorized by recent legislation to conduct research, experiments, and demonstrations toward the effective development and utilization of hospital services, facilities, and resources. Funds are included for initiating this program. The budget includes $1,605,862 for these activities—$601,702 more than the current year's appropriation

Cooperative applied research: In cooperation with States, medical schools, and private investigators, the Service conducts studies of the effectiveness of BCG vaccine for the prevention of tuberculosis and of problems in epidemiology, diagnosis, prognosis, immunology, and therapy of tuberculosis In addition, the Service makes related studies of chest X-ray interpretation and the development and application of radiological equipment. The 1951 estimate provides for an expansion of BCG vaccine studies in Puerto Rico to include preschool children. The estimated cost of this expanded program is $856,000—an increase of $134,004.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The purpose of the activities financed from this appropriation is to foster and conduct research in fundamental problems in microbiology, communicable diseases, community health, pathology and pharmacology, physiology, biochemistry and nutrition, chemistry and chemotherapy, physical biology, and other fields.

Grants to medical schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training· The current year's appropriation of $5,995,000 is supporting approximately 565 research projects, averaging $9,700 a project, and 170 research fellowships, averaging $2,940 each. The 1951 program calls for an increased appropriation of $7,165,000 and contemplates a sizable expansion in research grants, particularly for support of extensive investigations in a new field of medical research recently opened up by discovery of the therapeutic activity of certain steroid compounds, including cortisone and adrenocorticotropic hormone (ACTH), which promises beneficial effect in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and other diseases. Of the proposed appropriation, $6,650,000 is for research projects, and $515,000 (same as current year) is for research fellowships.

Headquarter research program· An appropriation of $5,107,000 is proposed to support basic research in fundamental physiological and biochemical processes, in infectious and tropical diseases, and in biologics. The 1951 estimate contemplates expansion of studies of the causes and possible cures for the crippling diseases of the bones and joints,

with particular emphasis on rheumatoid arthritic, including research in cortisone, ACTH, and related compounds. Proposed increases are partially offset by the discontinuation of yellow-fever vaccine production by 1951.

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

Approximately 200,000 people died from cancer in 1948. It is estimated that 600,000 people are presently under treatment for cancer and that 375,000 new cases are diagnosed each year. The activities financed from this appropriation have three major purposes:

1. To foster and conduct research in the causes of the various types of cancer and in the development of improved methods of detection, diagnosis, and treatment.

2. To improve teaching in cancer problems and increase the supply of personnel trained for cancer work.

3. To assist in development and maintaining detection, diagnostic, and home-care services at the local level.

The proposed appropriation will permit continuation of this program at about the present level.

Grants for research and training: The budget includes appropriations as follows for grants to medical and dental schools and other institutions and to individuals for cancer research and training:

260 research projects	$2,600,000
155 research fellowships	500,000
105 training stipends	375,000
Teaching of medical subjects	2,250,000

All of these amounts are the same as for the current fiscal year. They provide teaching grants of $25,000 to each of 72 recognized 4-year medical schools and of $5,000 to each of 47 recognized dental schools and 2-year medical schools. No new cash or contract authority is provided to assist institutions in the construction of cancer-research facilities; $5,000,000 is included to liquidate prior-year commitments.

Grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other control services: The sum of $3,500,000 is proposed for grants to all States to strengthen State and local clinical and educational services.

Grants for special control projects: Seventy-one special control projects receive financial assistance through special grants of Federal funds ($1,000,000) to State and local health agencies, universities, hospitals, and nonprofit professional organizations to develop, initiate, or establish improved types of cancer-control techniques and devices.

Federal research and services: The budget calls for an appropriation of $3,756,000 (compared with $3,663,863 this year) for Federal cancer-research activities. Other direct operations, including consultative services to States in the development of their programs would continue at their present levels.

MENTAL-HEALTH PROGRAM

Approximately half of the beds in the Nation's hospitals are occupied by the mentally ill. A relatively large percentage of those seeking medical attention have conditions which are influenced by some form of emotional disorder. The activities financed from this appropriation have three major purposes:

1. To foster and conduct research in the causes of the various mental and neurological diseases and in the development of improved methods for their prevention, detection, diagnosis, and treatment.

2. To improve teaching in mental health and increase the supply of personnel trained for mental-health work.

3. To assist in the development and maintenance of preventive, diagnostic, and outpatient clinical services at the local level.

Grants to States for control services: The budget calls for the appropriation of $3,550,000 (same as current year) for grants to the States for detection, diagnosis, and other preventive and control activities. Federal grants have resulted in the initiation of mental-health programs in 27 States, and the expansion of such programs in 24 others. Programs include preventive and educational activities, professional services, clinical services, and training of State and local mental-health personnel.

Grants for research and training: The budget calls for increased grants to medical schools and other institutions, and to individuals for research and training as follows:

	Current year	*Next year*
Research projects	$794,000	$1,100,000
Research fellowships	100,000	200,000
Expansion of graduate teaching grants for teaching of subjects relating to mental illness	1,950,500	2,299,000
Training stipends	900,000	1,050,000

While the current year's appropriation includes grants of $10,000 each to 42 medical schools for undergraduate teaching in psychiatry, the 1951 estimate provides no funds for expanding this activity on the assumption that Congress will pass general legislation providing aid to medical schools.

Federal research: The proposed appropriation includes funds ($599,300 compared with $329,200 for the current year) for Federal research activities including:

1. Research in narcotic and barbiturate addiction.

2. Epidemiological field research in multiple sclerosis

3 A field study in Phoeniz, Ariz., to determine the mental health needs of an urban community with a heterogeneous population.

4 Initiation and expansion of neurological research, a new program of research in schizophrenia, and preliminary studies of the effects of cortisone and acth in nervous and mental disorders.

NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

Heart diseases constitute one of the leading causes of death. The activities financed from this appropriation have three major purposes:

1. To foster and conduct research in the causes of the various diseases of the heart and circulation and in the development of improved methods for their detection, diagnosis, and treatment.

2. To improve teaching in cardiac problems and increase the supply of personnel trained for research and treatment of heart diseases.

3. To assist in the development and maintenance of detection, diagnostic, and home care services at the local level.

Grants for research and training: The proposed appropriations for grants to medical schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training are the same as the current year's, with one exception. While the 1951 estimate provides $5,350,000 to liquidate last year's commitments for the construction of research facilities, no new contract authority for this purpose is given. Grants would be made as follows:

Research projects	$3,820,000
Research fellowships	300,000
Expansion of teaching of medical subjects relating to heart diseases	741,000
Training stipends	150,000

Grants for control activities: The sum of $2,000,000 (same as current year) is proposed for grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other control activities. Under this program, the States find and refer cardiac patients for diagnosis and treatment, provide services to heart-disease patients in their homes, furnish training opportunities to physicians and public-health workers in cardiac problems, and supply public information.

Federal research: An appropriation of $1,830,354 is proposed, compared with $1,407,939 for the current year, for Federal research in the development of diagnostic and case-finding instruments, the peripheral vascular system, kidney and electrolyte metabolism, high blood pressure, gerontology, rheumatic heart disease, therapeutics, and epidemiology.

DENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

The activities financed from this appropriation have three major purposes:

1. To foster and conduct research in the causes and prevention of dental diseases and in the development of improved methods for their diagnosis and treatment.

2. To increase the supply of personnel trained for dental health work and improve the utilization of dental health personnel now available.

3. To assist in the development and maintenance of preventive and clinical programs at the local level.

Grants for research and training: The fund for grants to dental schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training would be increased to $325,000, compared with $235,000 for the current year.

Federal research: The proposed appropriation of $329,225 ($237,320 this year) provides for expansion of research into the cause and possible cure of transient bacteriemia, studies relating to the reattachment of supporting dental tissues destroyed in periodontal disease, and expansion of other studies in dental disease. Last year, Congress had appropriated $100,000 for developing plans for the erection of a dental research building on the grounds of the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md. It is proposed to postpone this project until it is found that this additional space is needed.

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

The Public Health Service is currently engaged in a major expansion of its medical research facilities at the National Institute of Health in Bethesda, Md. The principal building, now in its second year of construction, is the clinical center, a research laboratory equipped with 500 research beds for clinical research in cancer, heart, mental, metabolic, and infectious diseases. Its purpose will be to provide a medical center where the best quality of hospital care can be given all types of patients under scientific observation and where laboratory facilities for adjunct studies with animals are immediately accessible. The project also includes auxiliary structures to provide power, incineration, storage, laundry, animal breeding, and shops services for the entire National Institutes of Health. It is expected that the clinical center will be finished and equipped for operation by the close of 1952. The budget calls for the appropriation of $15,125,000 which is in addition to the $18,100,000 appropriated to date for this activity.

CONTROL OF VENEREAL DISEASES

The number of reported syphilis cases has declined from a peak of 592,941 in 1943 to 353,393 in 1948 and 300,975 in 1949. The activities financed from this appropriation have two major purposes:

1. To assist States and localities in case finding and treatment.

2. To develop an immunizing agent and more effective treatment and diagnostic agents and methods.

The budget calls for an appropriation of $14,000,000 for the next fiscal year commencing July 1, 1950 (fiscal year 1951), compared with $16,000,000 for the current fiscal year. Federal grants to the States for case finding and treatment would be $1,670,000 less.

Grants for case finding, treatment, and other control activities: The proposed appro-

priation for such grants for the next fiscal year is $6,535,000, compared with $7,757,000. This estimate assumes that despite the reduction in Federal grants, the total of all Federal, State, and local expenditures in 1951 for these purposes will equal or exceed that of 1950:

1 Increases in State and local contributions are anticipated.

2 Significant increases in local services are expected to result from increased Federal grants for general public-health work.

3 Estimated decreases in State and local contributions for in-patient treatment is expected to release more State and local funds for case finding and out-patient treatment.

Grants for special in-patient treatment centers: Admissions have declined from a peak of 181,754 in 1947 to 160,066 in 1949, and average patient days per admission from 9 8 days in 1947 to 8 8 days in 1949. The forecasts of patient-day loads and estimates of the Federal share of costs in fiscal years 1950 and 1951 are as follows.

	1950	1951
Patient-days	1,280,000	1,100,000
Federal share of costs, $3 90 per day	$4,992,000	$4,290,000

Grants for special case-finding projects: The budget calls for an appropriation of $300,000, compared with $346,000 for the current year Continuing progress by States in achieving improved case-finding methods is expected to decrease the need for making Federal grants on a special project basis

Technical assistance to States The Public Health Service furnished assistance to the States in medical, nursing, and laboratory activities through field studies and demonstrations in improved case-finding methods and treatment, and through preparation and dissemination of scientific information affecting venereal diseases The proposed appropriation for these purposes is approximately 10 percent less than for the current fiscal year.

CONTROL OF TUBERCULOSIS

The reported incidence of tuberculosis in this country remains high; 138,331 cases were reported in 1948. The activities financed from this appropriation have two major purposes

1 To assist States and localities in case finding, diagnosis, and in placing cases under local medical supervision.

2 To determine the cause of the disease and the mode of its transmission and to develop improved methods of detection, diagnosis, and treatment as well as an effective immunizing agent.

The budget calls for an appropriation of $9,600,000 which is slightly less than the current year's appropriation.

Grants to States for tuberculosis control activities: Federal grants to the States would be $6,350,000—$440,000 less than the amount available for the current year. This estimate assumes that despite the reduction in Federal grants, the total of all Federal, State, and local expenditures in 1951 for this purpose will equal or exceed that of 1950 Increased State and local contributions, and increased local health services which are expected to result from increased Federal grants for general public health work, are expected to offset the cut in Federal grants for this program

Mass X-ray surveys in large cities: It is estimated that over two-thirds of the Nation's tuberculosis problem is concentrated in cities In the last 4 years, the Public Health Service has taken chest X-ray films for 2,435,835 adults. Of that number, approximately 24,571 with a tentative diagnosis of tuberculosis have been referred to physicians for diagnosis and treatment During 1950, the service is for the first time operating with two complete teams on a full-year basis. Forecasts of work load and unit costs are as follows:

	1950	1951
Chest X-ray films	2,479,362	2,900,000
Cost per film	46¢	43¢
Amount	$1,140,508	$1,247,000

Significantly lower-unit costs in 1950 and 1951 are expected to result from an increased volume of films and the introduction of improved methods and procedures.

Follow-up work after mass X-ray surveys: Mass X-ray surveys cause an increase in cases requiring follow-up, which is frequently five or six times the normal load The facilities and personnel of local health departments usually cannot effectively take care of such a rapid increase It is proposed, as a new program, to assign trained professional workers to local health departments in the two metropolitan-survey areas to be covered in 1951 for a specified period of time after the mass case-finding surveys to assist in final diagnosis and other follow-up work. The estimated cost is $105,000.

CONTROL OF COMMUNICABLE DISEASES

Despite notable progress in recent years, many communicable diseases are not yet under control This appropriation finances laboratory and field investigations and control operations designed to supplement and support the activities of the States and localities in the control of communicable diseases.

General communicable-disease control: This includes epidemiology, laboratory technological services, general veterinary public health activities, engineering, entomological and technical development activities, and training and production of training materials. The 1951 estimate provides increases for:

1. Improving the diagnostic methods and performance of State, local, and other nonprofit laboratories.

2 Expanding epidemiological studies of the mode of transmission of virus diseases, streptococcal infections, and enteric diseases.

3 Expanding studies of the health hazards involved in the use of new insecticides, rodenticides, and other commercial poisons in the control of communicable diseases.

The budget includes $2,600,000 for these purposes—an increase of $150,000.

Investigation and control of specific communicable diseases. These diseases are malaria, typhus, plague, and other rat-borne diseases, rabies, leprosy, infant diarrheal diseases, poliomyelitis, encephalitis, and other virus diseases, and "Q" fever and other rickettsial diseases. The 1951 estimate reflects reductions in control operations for malaria and typhus of 42 and 56 percent, respectively, in accordance with morbidity rates which have sharply declined from their wartime and postwar peaks. Only partially offsetting increases are estimated for investigations of infant diarrheal diseases and encephalitis. The proposed appropriation of $2,650,000 is $1,055,000 less than the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

General epidemic and disaster aid Emergency aid is furnished in disease epidemics and disasters which create problems beyond the capacity of State health departments. Seventeen States in which epidemics or disasters occurred in 1949 received aid from the communicable-disease center of the Service. The appropriation for this work is $40,000.

SANITATION AND INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE

The purpose of the activities financed from this appropriation is to supplement and support the activities of States and localities in promoting and preserving the public health through control of the basic essentials of individual and community life—air, water, food, and shelter. The proposed appropriation is $4,000,000—almost $1,000,000 more than the amount available for the current fiscal year.

Water pollution control: The present program consists of the initial development and organization of activities authorized in the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, including: technical and consultative services on prevention and abatement of water pollution; preparation of comprehensive river basin programs for pollution control; and field and laboratory investigations in devising and perfecting methods of testing for and treating certain industrial wastes. The 1951 estimate provides increases in funds for the further development of these activities to meet the objectives set forth in the act. The budget includes $1,766,820 for this program—$645,220 over the current year's appropriation. In addition, $1,000,000 (same as last year) is proposed for grants to State and interstate water pollution agencies in order to assist them in the conduct of surveys, studies, investigations, and research related to the prevention and control of water pollution caused by industrial wastes.

Milk, food, and other sanitation activities: These include consultative and technical assistance to State and local authorities and laboratory and field investigations in sanitation of water, milk, shellfish, and other foods. The 1951 estimate provides increases for a new program of certifying interstate shipments of milk and for intensification of activities in shellfish sanitation. The budget includes $715,000 for these activities—$103,880 over the current year's appropriation.

Industrial hygiene: Technical and consultative services are furnished to States, local authorities, and industry, including assistance in establishing, conducting, and improving industrial hygiene services and in making atmospheric pollution studies. Research and investigations are undertaken in the evaluation of injurious and objectional chemical, physical, and biological agents used or produced in industrial processes, and in the development of control measures. The budget estimate of $655,000 will permit operation of this program at approximately the current year's level.

Radiological health services: These include the collection, analysis, and dissemination of information relative to the hazards of handling, using, and disposing of radioactive substances and the training of personnel competent to render advisory services to Federal, State, and local authorities in radiological health problems. An increase in funds from $60,000 for the current year to $110,000 for the next fiscal year would permit the establishment of a radiological health training unit.

GENERAL PUBLIC HEALTH WORK

Latest available information indicated that little more than one-half of all counties are serviced by full-time local health units, and many of these are inadequately staffed This means that most counties lack adequate services in one or more of such fundamental phases of public health as public health nursing, public health dentistry, control of communicable diseases, and sanitation. The basic purpose of this appropriation is to assist States in meeting the need for local health services as well as to provide financial support for State health services of a general character. The budget calls for the appropriation of $26,425,000—an increase of more than $9,000,000 over this year's appropriation.

Grants to States for general health The proposed increase is primarily for assisting States to expand and strengthen local health services. The 1951 estimate of $23,450,000 for grants under this appropriation, together with the 1951 estimate of $3,550,000 for grants to States under "Mental health activities," equals the limit of $27,000,000 imposed by existing law.

Technical assistance to States The present program includes: (a) consultative services to States for local and general health services, and review and analysis of State

plans, programs, and budgets, (b) sanitation and other general training of State and local public health personnel, assistance to States in establishing training programs, and in-service training for Public Health Service officers in local health units; and (c) demonstrations in nutrition and diabetes. The 1951 estimate provides for the addition of a screening team for finding diabetes cases and demonstrating the case-finding technique to local health departments. Other increases are for strengthening the training program. The increased funds included in this budget for these purposes are as follows:

	1950	1951
Consultative services	$510,000	$540,000
Training	305,163	337,000
Demonstrations	1,301,163	1,422,000

The studies in chronic-disease problems: This budget includes a new appropriation of $105,000 for studies in: The development of techniques for screening individuals in one visit for various chronic diseases, mass screening for glaucoma, and home care and restorative services for the chronically ill.

SPECIAL HEALTH PROGRAM IN ALASKA

The activities financed from this appropriation have two basic purposes The first is to supplement and strengthen the services of the Territorial Department of Health to meet the needs of an expanding military and civilian population in Alaska. The second is to enable the Public Health Service to conduct field and laboratory investigations of the disease problems of the Territory, many of which are different from those in the continental United States An appropriation of $1,259,000 is proposed, which includes a special grant of $708,000 to Alaska for general health purposes.

Grants for research, experiments, and demonstrations· New legislation enacted last year authorizes the Public Health Service to make grants-in-aid to States, local governments, and nonprofit organizations for projects for the conduct of research, experiments, or demonstrations toward development, utilization, and coordination of hospital services, facilities, and resources. The sum of $1,000,000 is recommended for this purpose.

HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH

The Veterans' Administration conducts a continuous program of research on various phases of the administration of its hospitals Following are some examples of recent research projects·

Veterans' Administration has estimated that during the past 3 years research in connection with the design of hospital equipment alone covered some 900 major studies and resulted in an annual saving of $750,000.

In cooperation with manufacturers, a floor material was developed that meets requirements in all parts of the country and under all kinds of weather conditions.

Four items of waiting room furniture were standardized, having common replacement parts.

Test results have indicated the superiority and economy of zone-controlled heating systems

A study is currently under way to disclose a practical method of flameproofing mattress ticking and filling.

In 1947 the total research activities were given as $1,160,000,000. This includes industries and universities. Of that in the Federal Government there was $625,000,000 appropriated and only $55,000,000 went to basic research, while $570,000,000 went to applied research development.

In the War Department there was $500,000,000, but only $35,000,000 was expended on basic research, which this bill deals with, and yet $465,000,000 was expended on applied research.

Industry, $450,000,000, only $10,000,000 on basic and $440,000,000 on applied.

Universities, $35,000,000 on basic and only $10,000,000 on applied.

So I hope you will see what this committee is trying to do and why it is trying to focus attention on basic research, and why, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] and others have so ably stated, we felt it was our duty, irrespective of party, by a very heavy majority, not only to recommend this legislation to the House, but it was our duty and obligation to support it and try to convince you of its soundness as well.

Mr. TABER. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if the gentleman could point out to us any language in the bill which would authorize the so-called Foundation to do the things that you indicated was being done in the armed services in connection with the coordination activity. In the armed services they have authority to do it.

Mr. HESELTON. Yes. I think you will find that in paragraph 6, section 3 (a), on page 3. You will find in the committee bill that there is a new committee amendment recommended. I am happy to say that the members of the committee were willing to consider a suggestion that I made because of the Hoover Commission report, but unfortunately that language does not do what we intended it to do. Therefore, I propose to offer an amendment, and I hope it will be supported by members of the committee. It is as follows:

To evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government and correlate the Foundation scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups.

That, in my judgment, will properly place this new Foundation, if we create it, in a position to evaluate the whole Federal picture. It will not place it in a position where it can say to private research groups, "You must do this or else we will not give you something" or "You cannot do that or we will withdraw funds."

It leaves them to do their job by correlating this Federal activity in the overall industrial research and university picture of this country, but it definitely gives the Foundation no authority to evaluate the work of non-Federal groups or to interfere with their programs. I want to add that our colleague from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] has discussed it with me, as well as our colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] and others. I am confident that the substitute amendment meets their very proper objection to the form of the committee amendment. I want to absolve other members of the committee from any responsibility for that language. I had too little time to consider it carefully. It would not do what I intended—carry out the recommendation of the Hoover Commission. This substitute will do that. I hope it will be accepted by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and by you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Since I had prepared an amendment substantially similar, although, I admit, inferior in quality to that offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I shall support his amendment and think it is most important that it be adopted.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr Chairman, I know that the gentleman who is now addressing the House has spent a lot of time on this bill. There are a few questions I would like to try to get answered. I asked one a short time ago, and the gentleman attempted to answer it. He said that it was not the intent of this bill to transfer operating functions in the fields of scientific research, whether basic or otherwise, to the Foundation. Did I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. BIEMILLER. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Then if the gentleman has time, I would like for him to explain why on page 19, section 8 was stricken out and a new section was inserted which proposes to make the funds that have heretofore been made available to operating agencies in the field of research transferable to the Science Foundation.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin is one that I do intend to discuss in my remarks. If he will be patient for just a few moments, I will be coming back to the question he raises. I wish to spend most of the time available to me in dealing with the general basic problem which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has raised.

But first I think the urgency of the situation should be made clear.

The very suddenness with which we were catapulated into the atomic era is dramatic proof of the urgency of a Nation Science Foundation in relation to our national security. The general theories from which the practical workings of atomic energy were developed were common knowledge among the explorers of the scientific frontier long before the rest of us wakened to their shattering realities. These theories came not from the researchers who work toward a known goal within the frontier, but from the pure researchers who

explore beyond the outer limits of man's knowledge of himself and his universe.

What has that to do with this bill? Just this. This Nation is sponsoring or assisting in many research projects, public and private. The most prominent are being carried on by the Atomic Energy Commission. Almost every one of them is aimed at the accomplishment of given ends, of goals believed reachable inside the present limits of man's knowledge of the way the world works.

Meanwhile scientists from all over the United States have appeared before congressional committees to tell us that almost no pure research of the kind that first provided the atomic theories is being done. Skilled minds are applying that which the restless probers of the universe discovered years ago to the construction of a hydrogen bomb. But virtually no one is back out in that limitless scientific area where the potentialities of the H-bomb were discovered.

Pure research is enormously expensive without having any foreseeable benefits. Years of effort might result in scientific explanation of the principles of man's behavior—or in nothing. It might result in some principle of the universe that would bury the hydrogen bomb with the caveman's club—or in nothing. But pure research must be done because it is our chance that in the end science may balance the awful gift of power with the precious counterweight of control.

There are endless other potentialities in pure research, many of them almost as important. As Franklin D. Roosevelt said in November 1944:

> New frontiers of the mind are before us and if they are pioneered with the same vision, boldness, and drive with which we have waged the war we can create a fuller and more fruitful employment and a fuller and more fruitful life.

Mr Chairman, we must see the urgency in all this. The urgency in bringing to bear on our common problems not only the vast store of man's present knowledge, but that which has so far escaped him There lies our hope.

The National Science Foundation Act was written with these great needs in mind. It deals with smaller problems as well as the large, but all within the context of the urgent importance of expanding this Nation's scientific research program.

According to Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director of the wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development:

> The responsibility for the creation of new scientific knowledge—and for most of its application—rests on that small body of men and women who understand the fundamental laws of nature and are skilled in the techniques of scientific research. We shall have rapid or slow advance on any scientific frontier depending on the number of highly qualified and trained scientists exploring it.

The testimony is ample, indeed overwhelming, that the advance is not yet rapid, particularly in the pure research which is basic to applied research. It is estimated that our stock pile of as yet unapplied basic knowledge is down about 40 percent below prewar levels.

Dr. Karl Compton, well known to most of you as former Chairman of the Research and Development Board of the National Military Establishment, has written that the Board more and more frequently meets problems the solution of which is at least temporarily halted by lack of basic knowledge.

Why have existing private and public agencies failed to take up the slack? There is the problem of personnel stated by Bush, the problem of far greater expense in terms of equipment and man hours because of the huge scale of activities needed and the problem of overall direction.

What, first, is the personnel situation? If the prewar trend in this country had continued we would have had about 205,000 scientists in this country. We now have about 165,000. There are greater demands for them than ever. As a result there are unfilled research positions in almost every public or private research agency as well as on university teaching staffs.

What about equipment and laboratory space? A committee of the National Research Council indicates that the capital outlay needed by universities and colleges alone is about $130,000,000. To show the present lack of cohesive knowledge about our scientific personnel and facilities as a whole, there is no comparable figure on private needs.

And, third, what about coordination? The Hoover Commission is worried about the lack of it among Federal agencies alone, without mentioning the much worse situation of private research groups. There is a right to be suspicious of a system which produced sulfanilamide before the First World War, but got its first real use from the discovery more than 20 years later.

I think the need is pretty well established. There is, in fact, only scattered opposition to the measure. If the bill's intent were better understood, it seems likely even this opposition, mostly concerned about its effects on patents, would vanish.

The bill says only that each contract for research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the other parties to the contract—that no such provision will be inconsistent with any patent law. Only those who believe the Government of the United States can do no right would mistrust such a clause. It is a course of action that would be followed by any public agency with or without such a clause. Any agency which did not protect the rights of the taxpayer to such a limited extent would deserve and get a sound thrashing from Congress.

As one of the authors of National Science Foundation legislation, I want to discuss in some detail other advantages of H. R. 4846, the bill before you.

It is a solution to one of the crucial problems of this type of legislation. The administrative structure provides direct responsibility to the executive branch. It provides equally for participation in policy decisions by impartial, but vitally interested scientists.

Not only is the proposed foundation administratively sound, but it has properly flexible authority. It can move from subject to subject, placing its emphasis on research in the area where the national need is greatest at the time.

The bill also takes into consideration a situation created by the 4 years which it has taken to bring the foundation this close to reality. Many Federal agencies are already conducting research programs which could not and did not wait for the creation of an over-all agency. These programs are producing splendidly and are, in fact, good advertisements of what the nationally integrated program of the foundation can do on a much greater scale.

Among the agencies with the largest programs are the Atomic Energy Commission, the Military Establishment and the Public Health Service. They are performing their particular functions with distinction.

Under this legislation, it is not proposed that their programs will be taken over. The foundation would, of course, immediately assume its role as the coordinating agency, but it is expected that operating responsibility of present programs will remain in the hands of individual agencies. There are three principal reasons for this expectation. First, provision of research funds to a number of Federal sources is healthy, particularly since Federal funds are such a high percentage of the total allotted for research in this country. Second, there is an extensive network of non-Federal advisory groups now cooperating with the Federal agencies and their knowledge and uninterrupted assistance is vital. Finally, the foundation must not divert attention from the major problems of national scientific strategy to the details of individual programs already in operation.

The Public Health Service is a particular case in point. Grants for basic research in medicine and related sciences in this field are made to support investigations selected by scientists in the Nation's medical schools, universities and hospitals. The scientists and not the Public Health Service select the areas in which they wish to work. Applications for grants are reviewed by nongovernmental specialists who are leaders in their field. Their recommendations are reviewed by national advisory councils. These councils must not only approve all specific grants, but advise on policies of the total program.

Almost all this activity is directed toward the chronic diseases which are the major causes of death in this country. As now handled, this activity has been a marvelously successful case study in democratic debate and decision. There is no need to alter its operation in any major respect; indeed, there is a need to preserve its present general form and content.

The programs of the Public Health Service would require changing only as the national scientific strategy requires changing as determined by the National

Science Foundation. There, I think, is the ideal relationship between the foundation and such agencies as the Public Health Service.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Does this bill contemplate that the National Science Foundation, if established, will make requests for one over-all appropriation to cover the research indulged in by all Government agencies authorized to conduct research?

Mr. BIEMILLER. That is definitely not my understanding. I understand that the amounts requested would be (a) for the obvious operating expenses of the agency, and (b) for such operations as are not covered by any other grant made by the Congress for research by any existing Federal agency.

Mr. KEEFE. So that those present operations, such as the Public Health Service's categorical programs for public health, and the National Institute of Health, would not under this, in the judgment of the gentleman, be compelled to bid for the favor of one over-all piece of money in order to get a slice for the operation of their particular agency?

Mr. BIEMILLER. That is precisely my understanding and may I add in connection with the question which the gentleman raised earlier on page 19, subsection (h) of section 14. My understanding for the need of that section, and I ask my subcommittee chairman to check me if I am not correct, is that in the event a project had already been initiated—and let us use the Public Health Service inasmuch as that is the illustration in front of us—if there had been some project initiated by one of the Public Health Service institutes, either for their work in public health or under the grants it makes to various universities or other agencies which needed supplementing by some further grant for which the National Science Foundation might have funds, this subsection (h) gives the authority for pooling those funds and pooling the results and pooling the work that is to be done under such situation.

Mr. PRIEST. That is my understanding of the purpose of that provision. Let us say that the National Cancer Institute had some research going on at Johns Hopkins; let us say there was need for an additional amount for which the division of medical education in this bill had some funds, that the two might be pooled to further the project. That, I think, would be an example of what the language is intended to do.

Mr. KEEFE. I doubt if that is an answer to the question which the gentleman from Wisconsin now speaking has raised, because subsection (h) on page 19 of this bill definitely provides that—

> Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided.

Mr. PRIEST. That is my understanding. If the funds were provided for cancer research on that agreement between the two agencies concerned a transfer could be made. There is authority therefor.

Mr. KEEFE. They could take the funds that the Congress has granted for research for cancer, for example, if the Foundation requested transfer of those funds with the consent of the Surgeon General or the head of the Federal Security Agency who would be the person involved, I suppose, they could transfer funds from that appropriation over to the National Science Foundation?

Mr. BIEMILLER. The section goes on to say: "to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided."

In other words, you have to have the approval of the Surgeon General in the instant case and the fact that the funds must still be utilized for the purposes for which the Congress appropriated them. This is a matter of bookkeeping. It is intended for such projects as it may be more desirable to coordinate than to have go on independently; but does not affect the basic work that would be done by the Public Health Service.

Mr. KEEFE. It makes the Foundation an operating agency in that respect.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Only insofar as the Surgeon General is willing to agree.

In addition to these major advantages of a national science foundation as proposed in H. R. 4846, there are a number which are almost as important.

First. The foundation could contribute to a solution of the problem of exchange of scientific information in which the need for secrecy is matched by the need to have the information available under the safeguards written into the bill to as many scientists as possible.

Second. The foundation could give us a total picture of how many scientists are needed, the rate of production and the fields in which the most acute shortages exist.

Third. The foundation could give us our first sound understanding of what private and public scientific resources we have, how they are distributed now and how they are likely to be distributed and used in the future.

When all this has been said about the National Science Foundation; when you add to it the 4 years of discussion, public and private; when you sum it up—what more can be said?

Only this. There are those who fear any activity on the part of government. They are the government haters. They think anything the Government does is bound to be wrong. Well, we are relatively reasonable men. Every single one of us saw and helped this Government successfully prosecute a war in which the life of the Nation was at stake. Every single one of us knows of other good and important things this Government has done, in peace as in war.

There is no more important thing Congress can do at this time than pledge this democratic government to underwrite its scientific future.

The benefits of science are for all of the people of this country—and eventually of the world. It is fitting that the representatives of the people of this country once more man the outer frontiers of science with the pioneers who are our hope of a new and better world.

It is as important that those outer frontiers be manned as it is that we strengthen the bastions of our national defense. For, in the end they are the same—at once protection against our fears and hope for our future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, may I say that this is a bill upon which we have had hearings in the Seventy-ninth Congress. In the Eightieth Congress we had hearings upon the same subject, and in the Eighty-first Congress we had hearings on the same subject, and that I started out as a member of the committee in the Seventy-ninth Congress being opposed to such type of legislation. But I have been overcome by the overwhelming weight of the arguments made by the witnesses in behalf of this bill, and I listened with equal care to those opposed to it.

I think one of the most able and powerful witnesses who appeared before our committee was Dr. Karl T. Compton, and I should like to read, if I may, some portions of his testimony which are directly in answer to some of the questions which have been raised, particularly by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. Dr. Compton said, in part.

> I am here in three capacities—as representative of the National Military Establishment by designation of the Secretary of Defense, as Chairman of the Research and Development Board, which is generally responsible for planning and coordinating military research, and as a citizen with some experience in scientific research as president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology until last November. I hasten to say that in all three capacities I strongly support the establishment of a National Science Foundation. I should also add that the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force support the basic legislation and concur in this statement. In addition, the Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to presentation of this statement to you.
>
> Despite the extensive discussion during the past 4 years of legislation for this purpose, I feel that it might be useful briefly to review the essential elements of the agency with which we are concerned, for I have the feeling that there is danger of diversion of attention to extraneous issues. In so doing, it may be less confusing if I refer only to H. R. 2308 and H. R. 12, intending, of course, to include the bills identical with each. However, I should like to exclude H. R. 359 for the time being and discuss it separately.
>
> The need for a scientific foundation rests upon the major requirement in this country with respect to science. This is the dual necessity of supplementing the private resources available for the support of basic research and for the training of scientists and engineers. All other issues which have arisen in the course of consideration of National Science Foundation legislation, al-

though many are important in themselves, are subordinate to the basic need for a foundation, and within the limit of reasonableness, they should be kept subordinate.

We have in the last 10 years devoted an enormous effort to applied research, and this, although considerably reduced since the war, is still roughly three times the annual effort made before 1939. This effort, together with previous modern advances in the utilization for practical purposes of natural phenomena, is bringing us near the point of diminishing returns. We have literally exhausted the stock pile of fundamental knowledge in many fields

Further improvements are, of course, possible, but significant progress is becoming more and more difficult. I speak now from the point of view of the National Military Establishment concerned with providing for our armed forces equipment and weapons superior to those of any potential enemy, but the same thing applies to other governmental agencies and to industry as well. It is basic research which provides the data and general knowledge for use by those engaged in applied research for particular ends, and neither Government nor industry can maintain substantial technological progress without a steady increase in the quality and scope of this basic knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that that statement by Dr. Compton alone is the overwhelming argument which makes this legislation important and imperatively necessary.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. May I say that I grew up in the same town with Dr. Karl Compton, attended the same college, and have had definite correspondence with him relative to this legislation. I asked him one question which maybe the gentleman can answer. Does the gentleman believe it would stifle private industry in its efforts and research?

Mr. HALE. I quite definitely do, and I am going to develop that thought.

Nothing would please me more than to join in the chorus of praise for this legislation. It is never very pleasant to serve as a dissenter on a congressional committee, particularly on a committee as strong and able as I think the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is. It is only because I feel rather strongly that this particular piece of legislation is not really wise and salutary that I voted against it in the committee this year. I voted against it in the Eightieth Congress, and at that time made a more elaborate and extensive speech than I expect to make today.

The truth of the matter as I see it is that the effect of this bill is to inject science into politics and politics into science; and I think it is a miscegenation devoutly to be avoided.

I do not believe that you can possibly draw a bill which gives Government control over scientific-research programs and still leaves scientists the freedom I think they must have. Nobody has said any more eloquently than it was said this morning by the gentleman from Massachusetts, our majority leader, that the scientist must have his freedom. I do not care how well-meaning political bureaus or commissions or foundations may be, I do not think they can leave scientists altogether free, and free scientists must be.

The way to accomplish the result which this bill seeks to accomplish is, in my opinion, to amend our tax laws and make more readily possible private donations and corporate donations to scientific pursuits and research. I believe that amendments of this kind to our tax laws could very readily be devised. I think they would be completely effective, and would cost the Government very much less money than it will find itself spending for the support of this Foundation.

The trouble with this bill, in my opinion, is that it is one more straw in the gradual socialization of our whole national structure. I read the other night with great interest the President's $100-dinner speech in which he poked fun at the Republican Party for opposing this, that and the other measure as being socialistic. Of course, Mr. Chairman, one straw does not make a haystack. Two straws do not make a haystack. Three or 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 100, or 200 straws do not make a haystack. Finally you get enough straws—I just do not know how many it does take—but you get enough straws and you get something that everybody recognizes to be a haystack. It seems to me if you place more and more activities, whether of a business or a scientific nature, under Government regimentation, then you have—finally—a structure, the character of which no one can mistake. I have great respect for Dr. Compton and Dr. Bush and all the other distinguished scientific gentlemen who favor this legislation

I will call attention to the fact, however, that there are many distinguished scientists who are heartily opposed to this legislation. During the Eightieth Congress I inserted in the RECORD a very large number of communications which I received from distinguished scientists in opposition to a measure similar to this. But the sad truth is that too many scientists find themselves like so many farmers, manufacturers, and others unable to resist the lure of Government subsidies. I wish that this legislation might be rejected. Science will not suffer if it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the Office of Scientific Research and Development, as directed by Dr. Vannevar Bush, was an organization during the war of 5,000 scientists and 10,000 technicians. They advanced our scientific and technical knowledge 20 years in the space of 5 war years. If the Office of Scientific Development and Research was efficacious during the war, we should have a continuation of similar work during peacetime. The National Science Foundation would accomplish that—a continuation of the splendid work performed by these technicians and scientists under the able direction of Dr. Vannevar Bush. I hope a man of the caliber and stamp of Dr. Vannevar Bush will become Chief of the National Science Foundation. We could never find a better man than he to head up this outfit.

There are no longer any physical frontiers but frontiers of science are still vague intellectual regions unconquered. Indeed, they seem to recede ever further away as physicists, biochemists, biologists, medical savants make new revelations and discoveries.

To help control these ever-changing frontiers will be the function of the National Science Foundation. That problem is too gigantic for private industry or groups to cope with. Our Government must step in.

I want to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that Charles Kettering, a very noted scientist and automotive industrialist, tells us that 6,000,000 men and women are marked for death from cancer and 200,000 will die every year from that dread scourge, cancer. If a cure could be found for cancer at a cost of $25,000,000, which is the estimated ultimate cost for the National Science Foundation, I say the cost would be minuscular in comparison to the dread disease called cancer. Dr. Kettering stated:

> Cancer presents a number of curious paradoxes, such as the fact that biologically it is at the positive extreme of life and growth and is at the same time a widespread cause of death, that the more complete our medical services and the higher our standards of living, the more cancer we seem to develop; that scientists have a relatively great knowledge of the world around us, but have failed to penetrate with equal mastery the unit of man himself, the cell.

Then he goes on to ask: Why is it that 200,000 people amid us must die every year from cancer?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman understands that vast sums of money are now being spent upon research to discover the cause and cure of cancer.

Mr. CELLER. I say that the National Science Foundation, regardless of all other scientific endeavor, will specifically direct its attention to the finding of a cure for cancer.

Take the case of the common cold. The medical profession has advanced remarkably in latter years, but it is no disparagement of the medical profession to say that the doctors have not even succeeded in finding a cure for the common cold. The story is told of a man who comes to a doctor. The doctor says, "Why, you are suffering from a cold." "Well, can you help me?" asked the patient. The doctor says, "I'll tell you what you do. It is raining cats and dogs outside, take off your coat and your hat and walk about 3 miles in that teeming rain. Then come back to me."

The patient said, "But I will get pneumonia."

The doctor said, "That is exactly what I want you to get. I can cure pneumonia but I cannot cure a common cold."

If we could cure a common cold, it would be worth more than the $25,000,000 a year, the cost of estimated operation under the National Science Foundation.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not want the gentleman to be under a misapprehension, of course. The $25,000,000 that is proposed here as the cost of this bill is in no way related to the direct research in the field of cancer. If the gentleman had been here he would understand that the National Science Foundation itself is not to be an operating agency. We are going to spend $100,000,000, if necessary. Do not talk $25,000,000 in cancer. We want a hundred million dollars.

Mr. CELLER. Please do not use all my time. I will say to the gentleman that we in this House still have control of the purse strings of the Nation. All you need to do is to vote down anything above and beyond $25,000,000. I want to be economical when it comes to expenditures. Economy, yes; but not parsimony. I do not want to react toward this proposition in a pinch-penny manner. I fear that some of those who are opposing this bill are acting in a niggardly manner. The National Science Foundation will have justified itself if it finds, say, the cause and cure of heart disease. Where human life is at stake, the cost cannot be weighed as some do in the Chamber who oppose the bill. The argument of bureaucracy as advanced against the bill is the usual argument of die-hard conservatism. If another bureau will help save human lives or advance our national health and welfare, I am for another bureau.

There are scores of nonfatal maladies of which medical science knows very little. Those maladies are serious and laden with intense pain. They are not lethal. You do not die from them, but their cost in misery and suffering and the loss of man-hours is incalculable. Maybe the National Science Foundation can find a cause and give us a remedy for shingles, for gout, for arthritis, for rheumatism. Medical science has not been able to effectuate a cure for any of those diseases that I have mentioned. They do not know the causes and, therefore, know no permanent cure. Take the malady commonly called gout. It involves the one having gout in most excruciating pain. There is the idea that gout is caused from an improper accumulation of uric acid that has an affinity for the great big toe. I was afflicted with gout not so long ago. The doctor told me I had the gout. I was in terrible pain. I said, "Are you sure? I do not lead that kind of a life." "Oh," he said, "you have been reading Dickens or Benjamin Franklin's Ode to Gout." "Gout," he said, "could attack anyone; man or woman, tall or short, lean or fat; those who live richly and those who live on an austere diet." "But," he said, "we really do not know much about it." He gave a specific remedy which tended to relieve the pain, but gout can recur any time.

Shingles is a dreadful affliction. I hope nobody ever gets shingles, but I can tell you that shingles is like a thousand toothaches under your skin. It is due to some nerve condition, but the doctors know practically nothing about it except to recognize the symptoms. Maybe the National Science Foundation will yield a remedy for shingles or gout or arthritis.

Medical science and biochemistry have lengthened somewhat life's span, but there seems to be no valid reason why it should not be lengthened further. The National Science Foundation might well be the fulcrum by which our life's span might be heightened and lifted.

Too many of our own members leave us for their final reward at a time when they reach the height of their intellectual powers; when they could do their best work and create greater benefits for the Nation; when they could draw upon rich experience to help solve the problems of this hectic age. But illness besets them and the grim reaper demands his toll.

Perhaps through the National Science Foundation we can help to strengthen these men in body and mind by postponing the coming of infirmities and thus give them a longer lease on life.

I recall the lines in the second act of Shakespeare's As You Like It:

Last scene of all
That ends this strange eventful history,
Is second childishness and mere oblivion,
Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything

Perhaps the research and medical and technological advances that would be made by the National Science Foundation can prevent the second childishness and mere oblivion that comes with the seventh age of man, so that men at seventy could be strong and vigorous and still have their faculties and not be "sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything."

I also recall the lines in All's Well That Ends Well:

Let me not live
After my flame lacks oil, to be the snuff of younger spirits.

Perhaps the results of the research of the National Science Foundation can supply that oil now lacking and make the flame of life glow after seventy.

A proposed amendment would add a loyalty oath requirement for scholarship and fellowship holders. The amendment would add a part (b) to section 10 reading as follows:

No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure by the Foundation under authority of this act shall be used to make payments under any scholarship or fellowship to any individual unless there is on file with the Foundation an affidavit executed by such individual that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable in respect of such affidavits.

As to this amendment, I quote from an article by Dael Wolfle, of the American Psychological Association, as same appears in the magazine Science, published by American Association on the Advancement of Science, January 27, 1950:

This amendment was proposed to the very great regret of scientists. It was proposed last spring when Atomic Energy Commission fellowship holders were under fire from other congressional committees. It is a concession to the current temper of Congress and many citizens. But it is unnecessary; overt treason or acts of disloyalty are adequately handled by existing law, which is not strengthened by the affidavit requirement. It is also an invasion of freedom, and it is disturbing to have undergraduate and graduate students majoring in any of the sciences and supported by Foundation funds required to sign such an affidavit regardless of whether the work upon which they are engaged requires security classification or not. The affidavit is, however, a milder requirement than the FBI investigation which must now be made of all Atomic Energy Commission fellows, and accepting it may be necessary. At its meeting in New York City on December 27 the Inter-Society Committee for a National Science Foundation formally voted its disapproval of the inclusion of this proposed amendment. At the same time, if the amendment is added despite the opposition which it will arouse, the bill as a whole will have the support of the intersociety committee.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I hope there is no misapprehension among the membership of this committee and the House concerning the basic reasons why this bill is brought here. There is a very vast difference between what is called basic or fundamental research and the applied research, which is that type of research which most of us seem somewhat familiar with. Basic research is something that delves into the absolutely unknown; it delves into the very deepest unknown aspects of science. We talk a lot about virus diseases, for example; but no one yet knows what a virus is; it is a name for something they describe, but they have yet to find out what a virus is, what it looks like and how viruses differ from one another. It is said that a virus causes shingles; it is said that a virus causes the common cold, but no one yet has been able to identify either or do anything to destroy them except to know that they are there. This is one example in the field of medicine.

In the field of pure science such as that dealing generally with electronics or radiation, it was research into the very unknown, the blue, so to speak, that brought out those principles which developed in the application of that science into, among other applications, what now is known as radar. In the field of mathematics it is not the kind of mathematics that figures out some particular problem, but it is the finding of new kinds of mathematics with which to learn the answers to heretofore unsolved questions. This is basic; it is fundamental; it has nothing to do with the applications of the things that are discovered.

My good friend, the gentleman from Maine, has said that this problem might

well be solved; that is, the problem of the financial support of basic or fundamental research, if we would permit a greater exemption in the income tax for gifts to scientific institutions, and I have no quarrel with that. I believe that if instead of having a 10 percent allowable deduction from income for contributions to eleemosynary institutions, churches, and so forth and so on, it were 20 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent, or 50 percent, we might indeed get those moneys. But that is not in the offing as far as I can see into the future; I cannot see any immediate time in the future when deductions would be permitted to be made from income for these purposes so long as we have the very great national debt we now have to meet. It is important if we are going to find those basic and fundamental answers that are needed from science before we can make application of those answers to the solution of the many, many problems in our country that the Government help in establishing this foundation.

Let me point out that during the recent war when we had the Selective Service Act before us we made no exemption of scientific personnel until we found our universities stripped of some of the really great minds that were needed to train further in basic science. I offer that statement here because if we ever should consider another such bill let us not take these minds that can be developed into the very highest type and send them out to dig trenches, to bake bread, to carry arms, or whatever else the man might be called upon to do in the field of military effort. We must realize that we had a whole generation of these fellows taken out of our colleges. Today we are short of men who can think into the blue, into the unknown, and we must reestablish that broader basis of men who are interested in these technologies and scientific pursuits in order that we can keep abreast and keep ahead of our applied science which are searching for new knowledge on which to base further applications.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I had a little experience in the Eightieth Congress that impressed me with the need for an organization such as the one set up in this bill. When the Armed Services Committee was organized the chairman of that committee, the late Mr. Andrews, of New York, appointed a scientific research and development subcommittee and he named me as chairman of that committee. I learned there that the last war was won in a large measure in the laboratories of the country.

The thing that the military men and the scientific men with whom we came in contact dwelt on most was the need for basic research; that is, to expand the frontiers of science and thus learn something new. Part of the object in pursuing basic research was to block out theories they had which were not tenable, it was found, after extensive basic research.

I am not impressed with the argument that this might mean the regimentation of scientists. In our great State universities which our various States own and operate, and I have gone to two of them, that has not occurred. At the University of Wisconsin, where I was a student at one time, there was a charge that the scientists were being regimented and there was such a violent reaction to this charge that no one ever tried to regiment the scientists any more.

Also I learned as a member of this committee that the cost of basic research is so stupendous and also so essential that we must find money other than private money to finance it. The only place I can see to find that money is in the National Treasury. Even the States such as California and Wisconsin, whose activities in science are nationally recognized cannot, without private aid finance such programs. As everyone has pointed out, the private foundations are gradually dying out due to our fiscal system, which levies very high taxes on large incomes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill affords a vehicle which can do the basic research that is necessary in our national defense as well as in our national life and for the reasons stated I am going to support the bill.

We have not been as preeminent in pure research as many people believe. The following statement from Dr. Vannevar Bush from his book, Science: The Endless Frontier, which I accept as my statement, states the situation as follows:

> Our national preeminence in the fields of applied research and technology should not blind us to the truth that, with respect to pure research—the discovery of fundamental new knowledge and basic scientific principles—America has occupied a secondary place. Our spectacular development of the automobile, the airplane, and radio obscures the fact that they were all based on fundamental discoveries made in nineteenth-century Europe. From Europe also came formulation of most of the laws governing the transformation of energy, the physical and chemical structure of matter, the behavior of electricity, light, and magnetism. In recent years the United States has made progress in the field of pure science, but an examination of the relevant statistics suggests that our efforts in the field of applied science have increased much faster so that the proportion of pure to applied research continues to decrease.
>
> Several reasons make it imperative to increase pure research at this stage in our history. First, the intellectual banks of continental Europe, from which we formerly borrowed, have become bankrupt through the ravages of war. No longer can we count upon those sources for fundamental science. Second, in this modern age, more than ever before, pure research is the pacemaker of technological progress. In the nineteenth century, Yankee mechanical ingenuity, building upon the basic discoveries of European science, could greatly advance the technical arts. Today the situation is different. Future progress will be most striking in those highly complex fields—electronics, aerodynamics, chemistry—which are based directly upon the foundation of modern science. In the next generation, technological advance and basic scientific discovery will be inseparable; a nation which borrows its basic knowledge will be hopelessly handicapped in the race for innovation. The other world powers, we know, intend to foster scientific research in the future.

A matter that came to my attention while I was subcommittee chairman of the Scientific Research and Development Subcommittee was that there was a great shortage of scientists, especially young scientists. This was due in part to our failure to grant deferment to scientists who were inducted into the armed services. Britain deferred these men, but we did not. The Westinghouse Corp. is doing a marvelous work in conducting an annual contest to uncover scientific talent in our high schools. Each year they hold a dinner at which they announce the winners of their contest. This year is the ninth annual dinner which climaxes their science talent search and at this dinner 40 winners will be announced and given scholarships. This event is one of the most inspiring that I go to. I have not missed one since I was first invited. The winners who are brought to Washington receive scholarships ranging from $2,800 to $100. In addition the search reveals many more promising young scientists and 260 more are given honorable mention. The director of this great project is Mr. Watson Davis and the project is known as Science Service. The Westinghouse Corp. deserves great credit for sponsoring and financing this very important activity.

There is a great shortage of young scientists and this cannot be filled by private enterprise. Consequently I feel that a bill such as the one before us is worth passing so we may help private enterprise get the scientists that this modern world needs so badly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, until the Federal budget is balanced and payment on the national debt is at least begun, I must be convinced that H. R. 4846 or any bill, that would set up another bureau, is absolutely necessary or would be of immeasurable value to the country before I could vote for it.

Therefore, I should like to ask proponents of this so-called National Science Foundation Act of 1949 some questions.

I find in the bill absolutely no estimate as to how much the Foundation would cost the taxpayers per year. Under section 3, the Foundation would be allowed to make "grants, loans, and other forms of assistance" using, according to section 15, "such sums as may be necessary." It has been estimated on the floor that the cost would be at least $25,000,000 a year.

To me, this looks too much like another blank check at the disposal, according to section 2, of the executive branch—in other words, the President. And, although section 3 provides for the Foundation to render an annual report to the President for submission to Congress, would not section 11 amount to censorship powers of information vital to the public through allowance of funds without regard to the limitations of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor?

Except under parts of section 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, establishing the Board, director, executive committee, divisional committees, and special commission, I can find no limitations as to the number of people who could be employed. And section 14 appears to give the director power to sidestep the Civil Service Commission. Is this true? If so, would not the patronage handed over to the President be practically unlimited?

What provision is there that any individual or group of individuals could make any crucial decision or recommendation when each member of the Foundation is appointed directly or indirectly by the President? In this connection, I call your attention to the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission was not permitted to decide whether to attempt the manufacture of the hydrogen bomb. The President asserted that he and he alone would make that decision.

And nowhere in the bill can I ascertain any guaranty against duplication of the Foundation's activities with such bureaus as the Atomic Energy Commission, the United States Employment Service, the Department of Education, and the Department of Defense. The bill, under section 14, for example, calls only for consultation or concurrence with certain bureaus.

Section 11 would give the Foundation authority to receive funds donated by others Could this lead to coercion of individuals and businesses or favoritism to those able to afford contributions? Could further impropriety result through allowance of the director or deputy director to hold office in organizations making contracts with the Foundation simply by obtaining approval of the Executive Committee, as outlined in section 14?

And, under section 12, what would happen to the entire patent set-up with officers or employees of the Foundation being allowed to apply for patents under any rules and regulations that the Director might establish, even though such persons would be called nominees of the Government?

Would the bill allow the Foundation to confiscate personal property of all kinds including research facilities and patents? If not, where in the bill is such an interpretation precluded?

Under section 13, could not the Foundation grant up to a hundred percent of its funds to foreign governments and individuals? Is there any assurance that the Foundation would work primarily for the benefit of the people of the United States instead of foreign governments?

And could not scholarships, authorized by section 10, be used as subsidies for foreign universities?

If we approve this bill, will we create another bureaucracy that will grow and grow, eat up unlimited funds, roam and rule the entire arena of science and all people, businesses, associations, and educational institutions pertaining to science?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. To most of the gentleman's questions he can find answers in the report. But, the answer to the question concerning the hydrogen bomb and the Atomic Energy Commission, I will say to the gentleman that the Atomic Energy Act provides that the President, and the President alone, can make the decision as to whether or not to build it. That is the act.

Mr. GROSS. That may be true, and I think that act should be revised. I am likewise opposed to this legislation because it gives the President too much power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, it is my firm conviction that this House should pass the National Science Foundation bill. My able and distinguished fellow committee member from Tennessee has ably and lucidly explained the working provisions of H. R. 4846, how the National Science Foundation would function and how it would fill the research needs of the United States. I cannot emphasize too greatly the need for this organization. Our Yankee ingenuity has always been turned to the mass production of goods rather than to the research of a fundamental sort that makes possible these new developments. American industry deals primarily and essentially with applied science and has preconceived goals which prevents its engineers, chemists and other skilled and trained employees from delving too far into the field of basic or speculative science As a matter of fact some of our most sensational new processes and drugs have been the result of basic research on matters previously thought to have little bearing or relation to the end discovery. Such discoveries frequently come from remote and unexpected sources.

The desire of American industry for practical short term results as opposed to speculative research, which is essentially a long term proposition and noncommercial in nature, has led to a critical imbalance between basic and pure scientific research and applied scientific research. Probably less than 8 percent of the total expenditures on research activities in this country are channeled to basic research. The recent war channeled virtually all of our scientists away from basic research and the shortage of teachers, science graduates, and science Ph. D.'s has been estimated as high as 15,000, 100,000, and 3,000, respectively, for the three categories.

Further, if we look at our past spectacular development of the automobile, radio, airplane, radar, and the atomic bomb as well as other less publicized inventions it can readily be seen that a tremendous part of our basic knowledge in these fields has been borrowed from Europe. Take a look at the 149 Nobel Prize winners in physics, chemistry, and medicine from 1901 through 1948; 123 were born and received all their early training in Europe; only 22 were born in the United States and trained here. With a war-devastated Europe, devastated intellectually as well and without the financial resources to conduct expensive basic research, the time has come when we can no longer depend on other nations for our basic discoveries. As we push on to new frontiers in science basic research is going to require more and more expensive equipment and better trained personnel. Our colleges and universities, long the primary source of pure scientific work in the United States, are finding that funds for anything but the applied sciences are dwindling year by year. Endowment funds are inadequate and produce but an inadequate income from which to finance the basic research that provides the stream of new ideas and discoveries to turn the wheels of private and public enterprise.

Not only can we no longer borrow our basic scientific discoveries from Europe but we have but to peer beyond the iron curtain to see Russia midway in a 5-year program to produce 700,000 scientists and engineers and spending well over a billion dollars a year in scientific training Further than that we have but to look at war-impoverished England to see an example of a country now learning in the hard school of experience what it means to drop behind in research and development and permit her factories and laboratories to become obsolete. I cannot overemphasize the importance of the National Science Foundation It may well prove the slim margin of victory in a shooting or cold war. That is what radar proved to be in our war of attrition with the German submarine in the last war and German rockets were stilled only by capturing the launching sites.

The importance of a backlog of scientific data and research information is apparent from the development of penicillin and other wonder drugs. While war tended to accelerate the application of basic medical discoveries it was the fact of these discoveries that cut deaths from disease in the military from 14.1 per thousand in World War I to 0.6 per thousand in World War II. There remains yet a tremendous challenge in the medical research field. Heart disease, cancer and yearly scourges of infantile paralysis or polio are constant reminders of this fact.

H. R. 4846 is admirably suited to perform the functions demanded of it. The Hoover Commission in reporting on the Government's research program heartily endorsed the creation of the National Science Foundation and stated that it should have the following major functions:

(a) To examine the total scientific research effort of the Nation,

(b) To assess the proper role of the Federal Government in this effort,

(c) To evaluate the division of research effort among the scientific disciplines and among fields of applied research; and

(d) To evaluate the key factors that impede the development of an effective national research effort. Based upon its investigations, it should advise the President as to the measures necessary to establish a sound scientific research program for the Nation.

Compare that, if you will, with the functions stated in section 3 (a) of H. R. 4846; the Foundation is authorized and directed—

(1) To develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences;

(2) To initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biographical, engineering, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such basic scientific research and to appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and upon the general welfare;

(3) After consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;

(4) To award, as provided in section 10, scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;

(5) To foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries;

(6) To evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups, including scientific research programs of agencies of the Federal Government, and to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with such programs;

(7) To establish such special commissions as the Board may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this act; and

(8) To maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways to provide a central clearinghouse for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States, including Territories and possessions.

Section 3 (b) goes on to state:

In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, it shall be one of the objectives of the Foundation to strengthen basic research and education in the sciences, including independent research by individuals, throughout the United States, including its Territories and possessions, and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education.

This bill further provides that until otherwise decided by the Foundation there will be certain divisions created within it as follows:

(1) A Division of Medical Research;

(2) A Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences;

(3) A Division of Biological Sciences; and

(4) A Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall be concerned with programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

(b) There shall also be within the Foundation such other divisions as the Board may, from time to time, deem necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that the creation of this Foundation with the purposes and organization provided in this bill will greatly stimulate and will coordinate and lend direction to the scientific endeavor of this Nation. May I state at this juncture that one of the most important features of this bill is that for scholarships and research fellowships. The most important single factor in science and technology is the quality of the personnel engaged therein. Where there are always those rare individuals who will rise to the top without formal education and training they are the exception rather than the rule. Often the most talented of our youth are without means to pursue the extended education necessary to qualify them for pure science or basic research. The National Science Foundation will not only provide us with the means to educate the most talented of our youth but it will retain a register of the scientific personnel of the Nation for use in times of war or national emergency and as a clearinghouse for the full utilization of the creative potential of this group.

I want to stress, too, the fact that freedom of inquiry will be maintained and the Foundation will neither build nor operate scientific laboratories of its own. By utilizing the colleges and universities and private research facilities the Foundation will employ the most productive units of original and creative scientific thinking. This system will promote a strong sense of personal and intellectual freedom which we in America believe to be the most conducive to advancement and constructive work. Further, this agency is designed and is instructed by the terms of the bill to work to supplement and encourage private research facilities and efforts of manufacturers and others. With such a provision this bill has the support of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Another benefit that will be derived from the Foundation is the general dissemination of scientific information to all the country except that which must be retained for security reasons. Presently only large, well-established and highly integrated corporations are able to maintain a research staff with sufficient qualifications and proper equipment to carry on the long-range work necessary in basic research. As a result these units place small independent businesses at a competitive disadvantage and tends to foster monopoly of patents on new discoveries in corporations of that category. Published results of research under the National Science Foundation would be equally accessible to small businesses as large, and with equal speed.

I do not hold out the National Science Foundation to be a panacea for progress but I do conceive of it as furnishing the necessary impetus to basic research which is an essential ingredient in our search for better health, prosperity, and national security. It will enable us to raise our standards of living and to release the full creative and productive energies of the American people. It is vital to our goal of full employment and a fruitful life.

Dr. Vannevar Bush, former Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, in September 1945 dramatically pointed out that our new frontiers lie in scientific research, and I quote his words:

It has been basic United States policy that Government should foster the opening of new frontiers. It opened the seas to clipper ships and furnished land for pioneers. Although these frontiers have more or less disappeared, the frontier of science remains. It is in keeping with the American tradition—one which has made the United States great—that new frontiers shall be made accessible for the development by all American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, it is my firm conviction that the National Science Foundation will open new frontiers for all American people and help maintain this country in its present preeminent position. I urge the Members of the House of Representatives to approve it. I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Act of 1949."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions which I would appreciate having cleared up either by the gentleman from Tennessee or the gentleman from New Jersey, or both, or by some other member of the committee.

On page 13, section 11 subsection (e) gives to the Foundation the authority to acquire property by purchase, lease, loan, or otherwise. I am somewhat worried about the power of eminent domain, not so much in the field of real estate, although offhand I fail to see why it should be necessary for this Foundation to have any power to condemn property since it is not to be an operating agency, but I am particularly interested in, and the point to which I would appreciate some member of the committee directing his remarks has to do with the possible power of eminent domain over patents and patent rights.

I have received a number of communications from individuals connected with several industries in my community employing large numbers of men and women who are very much afraid that this particular language might permit the Foundation to acquire and force a concern to give up valuable patent rights through the power of condemnation.

I notice, however, on page 159 of the hearings, that when there was some colloquy on the point both the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Minnesota indicated that they did not think this power did exist. It seems to me important to have this point clarified on the record.

I have prepared an amendment to this section to exclude the power of eminent domain over patents and patent rights. If it is not necessary, I do not want to offer it, but if it is, I should like to offer it, when we reach the consideration of section 11.

I want to be sure that the Foundation cannot claim, by virtue of the provisions of this bill, that it has the right to walk into any plant, large or small, and say to the management that it must turn

over valuable patent rights to the Government without any choice in the matter or any voice except to be heard on the question of the amount of compensation.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate very much the gentleman's position in the matter. I can say without reservation that the Foundation would not have any authority under this bill or under any law on the statute books today to exercise the right of eminent domain and to condemn patents. The only general authority for eminent domain is contained in an act passed in 1888. That act restricts the right of Government agencies which have the authority under the act to real property for the purpose of public buildings, highways, bridges, and other public structures of that kind. So the question of having any right to exercise eminent domain over patents is not contained in this law nor any other law. I believe we have studied that question pretty thoroughly to determine that point.

Mr. KEATING. That has been canvassed by the committee, and that is the considered judgment of those who have studied it?

Mr. PRIEST. That is the considered judgment of those who have studied it over quite a long period of time.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. As a matter of fact there was language which would have permitted that in the original bill, as I remember it, as it was submitted to the committee. It was specifically stricken from the bill by the committee and has not been reinserted in either the Eightieth or Eighty-first Congress. There is no power whatsoever to exercise eminent domain in this bill as we understand it.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to refer to another section. At page 3, section 3, subsection (6) has to do with the evaluation and correlation of scientific research programs. As now worded, it gives authority and direction to evaluate all such programs, both those undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government and by individuals and private research groups. This seems to me to give rise to the possibility of an unwarranted intrusion into the affairs of individuals and such private research groups as are represented by the research laboratories of private industry.

Under no circumstances should this Foundation be able to claim that it is given authority under the provisions of this law to require, at least in time of peace, that private individuals or companies disclose the results of their own independent research. To permit otherwise would certainly open the door to the possibility of abuse through requiring an individual or company to make disclosure to the public, including that individual's or that company's competitors of all the results of research which had entailed immense expenditures of time and money.

I had prepared an amendment to meet this problem, which would read as follows:

(6) To evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by public research groups, and by individuals and private research groups when mutually agreeable, including scientific research programs of agencies of the Federal Government, and to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with such programs.

Since I am now informed that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] a member of the committee, will offer an amendment to limit the evaluation of the scientific research programs solely to agencies of the Federal Government, eliminate any authority for evaluation of such programs by individuals or private research groups and provide that it shall only be in the proper field of correlation that the Foundation shall have anything to do with such individual and private research groups, I shall, of course, not offer my amendment and will support the one offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Indeed, I think his language is superior to mine in making the legislative intent entirely clear that the Foundation shall under no circumstances, except by mutual agreement, be able to inject itself into the private field.

I sincerely hope that the important amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts will be adopted and I would emphatically urge its acceptance by the committee.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman, so far as I know on this side we are perfectly willing to accept it, and I feel that is true on the other side.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, enactment of H. R. 4846, the National Science Foundation bill, is vital to the welfare and security of the United States.

The National Science Foundation bill has been long in the making. It has received the most careful study by the Congress and by executive agencies of the Government over a period of years. Since July 1945, when Dr. Vannevar Bush submitted his memorable report, Science: the Endless Frontier," three separate Congresses have considered legislation and taken testimony from hundreds of witnesses prominent in our national life.

The objectives to be sought by a National Science Foundation have received virtually unanimous support and approval by these many witnesses and by other individuals and organizations throughout the country. The urgent need to foster and promote basic research in the sciences rises above any party consideration; it goes to the heart of our national welfare and safety.

True, there have been sharp differences of opinion and judgment on particular provisions of the National Science Foundation bill. The appropriate administrative structure, the disposition of patents involved in Government-financed research, the place of the social sciences in the proposed program—these and other vexing problems have been debated.

President Truman's veto of a science foundation bill passed by the Eightieth Congress indicated that the problem of administrative organization had not been satisfactorily resolved. The bill that came from the Eightieth Congress would have vested the responsibility for major policy decisions in the hands of private persons. The President has been a firm and consistent supporter of National Science Foundation legislation, but he has rightly used his veto power to insist that the public interest be safeguarded.

The bill which we consider today has attempted to work out reasonable solutions to the controversial elements in earlier bills. Although these provisions may not meet with all of our individual views, I feel strongly that the unanimity of agreement on general objectives and the urgency of the need for this legislation should persuade us to vote the bill favorably.

It is important to note that the Hoover Commission in its report of Federal research specifically and unanimously recommended that a National Science Foundation be established.

In emphasizing the need for the development and integration of a research policy for the Federal Government as a whole, the Commission noted that an interdepartmental committee on scientific research and development had been created by executive order on December 1947. However, the Commission pointed out that the full potentialities of this interdepartmental committee had not been realized, partly due to lack of staff and funds, and then stated:

An interdepartmental committee working alone and without staff is seriously limited in achieving adequate coordination and in developing over-all plans to completion. This points to the need for a National Science Foundation. The major functions of such a foundation should be (a) to examine the total scientific research effort of the Nation, (b) to assess the proper role of the Federal Government in this effort, (c) to evaluate the division of research effort among the scientific disciplines and among fields of applied research, and (d) to evaluate the key factors that impede the development of an effective national research effort. Based upon its investigations, it should advise the President as to the measures necessary to establish a sound scientific research program for the Nation.

In addition, the foundation should be given appropriations for the support of basic research and for research fellowships in fields not adequately covered by the research grants and fellowships of other Federal Government agencies. The foundation might administer the grant and fellowship programs for which it has received funds, or delegate administration to other Federal agencies. In addition, it should advise the President as to the proper balance among research grant and fellowship programs supported by appropriations given to other Federal agencies, and as to major policies that

should govern the administration of these programs.

The National Science Foundation should consider most carefully the manner in which national policies with respect to scientific research are related to broader questions of educational policy. At present grants for research purposes are being made on a hit-and-miss basis, making the award of research grants, in effect, a new form of patronage. The awarding of research grants must be put upon a more systematic basis, with due recognition given to their impact on the educational programs of our higher institutions of learning.

Also the Hoover Commission task force report on Federal medical services, emphasizing the vital relationship of basic research to the future of scientific medicine, stated as follows:

We recommend the creation of a National Science Foundation, not as a specific organizational reform in the Federal medical service, but as an obvious means of insuring the strength in basic sciences upon which our national security rests and upon which the future progress of scientific medicine depends. Some members of our committee feel that the foundation should cover the social sciences as well; others stress that it should include lay members. Our concept of a foundation, it should be pointed out, calls for very great powers and resources to sustain and, where necessary, to increase the output of basic scientists, to develop new fields of knowledge, and to support educational and training institutions.

As a people interested in the practical results of scientific research, it is difficult for us to realize how dangerously we have exhausted the scientific resources which make these benefits possible. As Dr. Bush pointed out in his famous report, more than 4 years ago, the bank of scientific brains in Europe, from which we borrowed so lavishly in years past, was shattered by the war. In our own company, we have been living on our scientific capital, so to speak, without making adequate provision for the future.

In my studies as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have been impressed with the fact that the development of atomic energy rests on a complex pattern of theoretical investigations and discoveries by scientists throughout the world for the past hundred or more years. Basic research is by no means an American monopoly, but we have new and great responsibilities to our own people and to those of other nations, facilities for conducting basic research must be greatly expanded.

Many more of our young people must be trained for scientific pursuits—for basic scientific research from which flow the practical results that increase the comforts and conveniences of daily life, that make for greater health and happiness, and that guarantee our national security in an age of unprecedented technical developments.

In this connection, I note that social sciences are not specifically excluded from the national science foundation bill as reported by the committee. I hope that the social sciences will receive their full share of attention in the work of the new foundation. We must learn how to live in this new age of science, with its enormous possibilities for human welfare or human destruction. The social sciences have a legitimate place in the work of the proposed National Science Foundation.

As the members know, a number of Government agencies, including the Atomic Energy Commission, already are conducting scientific research programs along certain lines. Section 14 (j) of the bill very clearly provides that the work of the National Science Foundation will not duplicate that of the Atomic Energy Commission. At the same time, section 14, paragraphs (g) and (h) provide a means of integrating Government activities in scientific and technical research.

Establishment of the National Science Foundation will make possible a national policy in these fields, and become an instrument for maintaining the continuity of that policy. Under the impetus of the foundation, private universities and institutions will carry on a large share of the basic scientific research. Presently these institutions cannot conduct unaided the costly programs that modern science requires. And many of our most talented youth cannot, without some financial aid, put those talents to use through education in the universities.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important bills to be considered by this session of Congress. Its enactment will have lasting benefits. It will meet a need recognized by all persons who have concerned themselves with the general welfare of our country in this scientific age.

I believe the hearings show that we had arrived at the point of graduating about 2,000 basic research scientists in 1941. This number declined during the war to about a thousand a year, and we have gradually increased it to about 1,700 a year. So we are still behind in our annual graduation of scientists before we went into World War II.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, the gentleman will agree that the reason why the number of young scientists dropped off during the war was the foolish policy that the United States had of drafting young scientists into the armed services, regardless of their ability or the need for them in the field in which they were occupied?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I agree completely with the gentleman's observation. I say that any drafting in anticipation of a future war should be done on a scientific basis, and I mean scientific by not taking those people that are most valuable to our economy in time of a crisis.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is a member the great Committee on Armed Services, is he not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, I am not, at this time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman was at one time?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was at one time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope that when we have this new so-called selective-service extension bill before the House that we will provide for proper exemption of those men who are necessary to science in time of war.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I certainly trust that if a selective service draft is inaugurated, that it shall be done in the proper manner.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think the gentleman also remembers that England followed a different policy. They exempted those scientists from military service?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is exactly right, and we had to lean on England for some of our most important scientists in the field of basic science as well as appplied science in the atomic field.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The figures which the gentleman gave with respect to the number of graduates show that the number had been reduced to 1,000 during the war and immediately thereafter. Those figures have increased to 1,700.

Mr. HOLIFIELD That is right.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And that figure of 1,700 is already 1 year old.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are still gaining.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is not nearly as desperate as that figure would indicate.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I did not mean to say that it was desperate, but I believe the gentleman will agree with me that we are facing an age now where scientific advancement is much more important than it was 10 years ago.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And more and more people are going into it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has again expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer a technical amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRIEST: On page 1, line 4, strike out "1949" and insert in lieu thereof "1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I feel that this is the last word, and that the last word is a question: Shall we be able to survive the things that we ourselves do? The burdens you place upon the taxpayers of America. This question becomes especially pertinent when it is brought out, as was done here this afternoon by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], that for scientific research in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and other branches of Government we are spending close to a billion dollars annually. A tremendous sum for research, yet you go at it again. Spend, spend, spend. Notwithstanding this huge expenditure, a bill is brought

in today to set up another organization of 24 Board members to be appointed by the President, a bill to establish a bigger and bigger government by setting up this National Science Foundation. On what foundation? A bankrupt Treasury? Apparently no consideration is given to what we may be able to do to save our country from disaster and distress by lightening the load of burdensome expensive government on the people of this country. No thought of the cost of this bill. No thought on your part of where will you get the money.

I do not know where in the world we are going; I do not know where you are headed, except for bankruptcy. Sometimes I think some of you do not care a hoot where we go.

In your own household when your funds are exhausted but somebody in the household gets the idea that a new dishwasher would be nice, a new garbage disposal unit, or a new set of cupboards, a new car or radio; you would not go ahead and obligate yourself, put yourself in debt until you had figured how you were going to be able to finance the improvements; you would try to keep your household on a good sound basis by getting along with what you had. But that is not the way this Congress does things. Just as in the country at large, so in this very House of Representatives, there are many who are always trying to establish something new, who are urging these departments all the time to go ahead and set up these great organizations without regard as to how they can be financed. Will you ever get sensible? The first thing you know our house is going to tumble down on us and we are going to be in the very position Joe Stalin predicted for us, wrecked financially. And whose fault will it be? Why it will be the fault of those men who have been advocating all these things and who have been squandering the taxpayers' money and the resources of the country, foisting the load off onto our children, and our children's children. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. Honest to goodness, you ought to be ashamed of yourselves. Sometimes I wonder if we have any sense at all. I do not say that we are fools, but certainly we do the things that fools would do. This is about as close as I can come to expressing myself adequately without being thrown out of the Chamber, but I mean every word I have said.

We are in the position right now of setting up this new organization. Two months ago the President said the state of the Nation was good, yet at the time he made that statement he knew that a lot of coal miners were not mining coal; he knew that things were getting tighter and tighter; but because he promised a lot of labor leaders that he would do away with the Taft-Hartley Act he let things go on and on in the coal fields until now there are many communities of the country without sufficient coal to keep warm in this winter weather.

He should have put the Taft-Hartley Act in operation in January and we wouldn't be where we are today, no coal, people freezing, men out of work, a mess by a messer Truman. Whose fault is that? It is due to the dilatory tactics of the Chief Executive in letting this thing go on. He is liable to bring in a bill, and many of you will support it, to nationalize the coal industry of this country. Right there we start in with his socialistic program. You are getting into it up to your neck. Who said it was the President's duty to take over these mines? Why, Bill Green. The labor leaders want it and they are going to try to force you to do it. Shame on you if you take over the coal mines. Next it will be railroads, telephones, and what not. Socialism, New Dealism—everything but Americanism. This bill is not necessary, it is not economical, it is not for the good of the country, and I am opposed to it today. Because Great Britain went socialistic last week is no reason for us doing so. Because Britain wants Attlee instead of Churchill for Prime Minister is their business, but it is our business when they want us to give them a billion and a half to keep the Socialist Government alive. It's your constituent's business and I hope they will take care of you for giving us away. I hope they will take care of our Government by watching how you vote to put us into bankruptcy. I say "be nifty and thrifty in Fifty." Vote this bill down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a few questions of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee who was in charge of the writing of this bill, as I understand it, in order that we may get definitely in this RECORD a very clear legislative intent whenever the question of interpretation of this bill might arise. Some of these questions I have asked during general debate, but I want to ask them again and pin-point them at this time in order that there may be one place in the RECORD where we can point to and say to whoever may be called upon to interpret the provisions of this bill hereafter: Here is what the Congress had in mind when it passed this particular legislation.

Most Members of Congress are thoroughly familiar with the grant and aid program of the Public Health Service and the programs of research conducted at the National Institutes of Health and the programs of research in the field of medicine and related activities that are being given gratis to the National Institutes of Health programs. If this legislation is passed, is it proposed that those programs will be taken over by the National Science Foundation and administered by it as an operating agency?

Mr. PRIEST. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I, too, think it is important that at one particular place in the RECORD, to use the gentleman's words, "we pin-point" this question in order to establish definitely legislative intent.

The answer to the gentleman's question is "No." I have a great interest in these particular grant and aid programs conducted under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service, as does the gentleman. I appreciate his interest. We have worked together in the past in connection with the Heart Institute, the mental-health program, the Cancer Institute, and other programs. I would not consent to see anything come that would in any way interfere with that categoric work being done by these institutes in the Public Health Service. I reiterate that the answer to his question is "No."

Mr. KEEFE. The answer to the question is "No" May I say to the gentleman that he well knows I have devoted the major part of my legislative work in the Congress during the past 12 years in the field of public health, and I do not want to see any interference or any obstruction of the programs that the Congress has unanimously put into action in the fields that the gentleman has just referred to.

A serious question has arisen in my mind as to whether or not if the National Science Foundation is appointed under the general provisions found in this bill some individual who might be appointed or who may head it might be of strong enough character to say: We are going to take these programs over and run them ourselves as an operating agency. He could do it under this bill?

Mr. PRIEST. I do not think so, and if the gentleman would point out any language which he believes would give the Foundation that authority, I should be happy to examine it, and I know that the committee will.

Mr. KEEFE. All I have in mind, may I say to the gentleman, is the function of the Foundation, specifically section 3, subparagraph (2), page 2, of the bill where it says that the Foundation is authorized and directed to initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, and other sciences.

My question with reference to that is this: You do not mean by that language that they are to disturb the existing programs that the Congress has already established in those fields?

Mr. PRIEST. Certainly we do not mean that they should disturb them, and they could not disturb them without having authority, in effect, to nullify an act of Congress, because all of these programs are established by law and are operating under law, and I do not believe that this language relating to initiating and supporting scientific research could quite be interpreted to mean that they could nullify an act of Congress, and we do not intend that that be the purpose

Mr. KEEFE. A further question. There are pending now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a number of bills relating to categorical programs that affect a number of the great menaces to mankind, arthritis, rheumatism, and so forth. I believe there are two.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to my colleagues that the subject of this colloquy that is taking place between the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and myself we have previously discussed, and we believe that it is in the interest of proper legislative action to have answers to these questions which I have given a good deal of study to in connection with this bill.

Now I want to ask this question: If the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce decided to pass a bill providing for a new Institute of Health to deal with the problem of rheumatism and arthritis, or multiple sclerosis, or poliomyelitis, or some of the other diseases not covered in the categorical program, you would have no idea but what, when Congress so legislated, those programs would be conducted as the categorical programs are being conducted today, and that the Science Foundation would not disturb or take those programs over.

Mr. PRIEST. I certainly would have no other idea than that any new research institute that might be set up would operate just as those already established are operating insofar as any taking over by the Science Foundation is concerned; provided they are set up on the same basis, they would operate the same, and generally we have the pattern there on which all of those research programs do operate. May I say this to the gentleman—and I want to make this clear—I do not want anything that I might say here to be interpreted as meaning that there could not be a voluntary cooperation between the Foundation and the Public Health Service, if they so desired, but there is nothing in the bill, and it is not the intention of the author of the bill or the committee that reported it to give it any authority to take over any research work.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to my distinguished friend, if the present bill did not have provision in it that would permit such correlation, I would not think it would be worth while at all. I am heartily in accord with that particular phase of it.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Every once in a while the gentleman asks the question whether or not the existing programs could be taken over and operated. May I point out to the gentleman the language on page 17 of the bill in section 14, subsection (c) as relates to operation:

> The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

That may refer to the physical plants and the operation of them and the pointing out that they cannot take them over and operate along that line.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, that does not answer the question that I had in mind. While I thank the gentleman for interjecting that, that is not a contribution to the issue that is before us, may I say in my humble opinion, with respect to the question that I asked.

The next question is this, may I say to the Chairman: It has been indicated by many who are interested as I am in the passage of this bill ultimately that they may contemplate that the National Science Foundataion itself will come before the Congress and ask for one integrated over-all appropriation dealing with the question of basic research outside of the appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission, which is exempt from the provisions of this bill. I would ask the gentleman whether or not it is his intent or the intent of the committee that the present system of having the agencies of Government that are charged with the responsibility for conducting the research come before the Congress and present their needs shall be changed in favor of one over-all appropriation request.

Mr. PRIEST. The answer to that question is that there is no intention to have any one agency come before the Congress to ask for an over-all appropriation for scientific research, and there is not contemplated any change in the present policies and practices in that respect.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for his statement in that regard.

I notice that section 3 (a) 6 of the bill has been amended on page 3 at line 6 to provide that the Foundation shall "evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups." The bill contained previous to the amendment the following language:

> To correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups.

There is a vast difference between correlation and evaluation. I should like to get it clear in the RECORD as to just what the committee had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. I notice the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is on his feet. He has an amendment which he proposes to offer, and which I propose to accept as chairman of the subcommittee—and I find no objection to it on the part of any member of the committee—which will read as follows, in lieu of the language in paragraph 6 on page 3:

> To evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government and to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups.

The gentleman will notice that the emphasis here is shifted. There is no effort to correlate the other programs with the Foundation but, after evaluating and saying what others are doing, then it is to map its own program and correlate it with the others. I think there is quite a difference there, and that that would answer some of the objections raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] earlier in the day.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman. May I ask this further question:

Is it the intent under this bill that in making the evaluation of these programs the Foundation itself shall be compelled to scrutinize and go into each individual budget and approve or disapprove the budget request made by the operating agencies?

Mr. PRIEST. That is not the intention.

Mr. KEEFE. Now this final question:

On page 19, line 6, these words are stricken from the bill:

> (h) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies authorized to engage in scientific research or development.

Why did the committee strike out that language if it is the purpose of this bill to maintain the existing research activities of the Public Health Service, for example?

Mr. PRIEST. It is my understanding that this language was stricken from the bill for one or two reasons, largely because it was believed that other sections of the bill, particularly the so-called Heselton amendment and one or two other sections, made this language unnecessary.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman in conjunction with what he has already said with the apparent consent of other members of the committee as to the purpose of the committee in striking this out as to there not being an operating agency so far as the public health is concerned in the National Science Foundation that perhaps it was thought this was not necessary because it is the legislative intent of the committee now that so far as the operating programs of the public health are concerned, they shall not be transferred to the Foundation and it shall not become an operating agency with respect to the health program. Is that correct?

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct, and that generally was the reason for striking this language—it was considered entirely unnecessary at that point.

Mr. KEEFE. I might say to the gentleman having satisfactorily cleared up these questions which I have had in my mind with respect to this bill, I shall vote for the bill because I think there is no field in the world in which we need activity more than we need it in the field of basic research.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Where in this bill is this safeguard contained?

Mr. KEEFE. It is contained in the colloquy which has just taken place between the gentleman and myself, which writes the legislative history of this bill and the construction which should be placed upon it. I realize full well that a bureau which may be set up may pay

no attention, and the Supreme Court may pay no attention to what has taken place here today, but if they follow the usual practice of legislative construction they will go into these debates and the legislative history of the bill which, in my opinion, will be helpful in determining what the Congress had in mind when it passed the bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman who is now addressing the committee and the gentleman from Tennessee have any objection to putting that language back into the bill in addition to the colloquy that you have had here? Why should it not be put back in?

Mr. KEEFE. I personally would like to see that done.

Mr. JUDD. So would I.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to see that language on page 19 retained in the bill.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman from Tennessee object to that?

Mr. KEEFE. I think it is good language and shows the intent clearly. It shows that is the intent of the Congress.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. Would the gentleman from Tennessee object?

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman, so far as I am concerned, it was not taken out at my request. It was done at the request of some Member, as I recall it, on the minority side of the committee. So far as I am personally concerned, I would not object to it. I do not think it is necessary. But I do not want to take the responsibility on behalf of the subcommittee by saying that I do not object when, as I recall it, it was taken out on motion of some minority Member. Perhaps I am mistaken about that, but I believe I am correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, for the past 5 years a proposal for the establishment of a national science foundation has been debated and discussed by people in and out of Congress. I have followed those discussions and debates with consuming interest. I am convinced that a national science foundation properly conceived and properly managed can serve a number of useful purposes. I would like to vote for the pending bill, H. R. 4846. However, I want to understand exactly what I am voting for. My primary interest is in the relationship between the proposed foundation's activities and the existing medical research activities of the Federal Government. I have as a major reward of my public career the satisfaction of having helped to form and enact the laws that have played a major part in redirecting the medical research of the entire Nation toward diseases that afflict mankind, and of expanding the support for basic medical research in the United States. Permit me to briefly explain first how medical research is being advanced through action taken by the Congress during the last few years.

The communicable diseases that once were the major causes of death are gradually becoming relatively less important. We still have not licked polio, nor do we have tuberculosis completely under control. We have yet to bring other infectious diseases under control. But, in taking death rates and illness rates as a measure, diseases which formerly took a terrific toll in human life and suffering are now under complete control or have been eliminated completely as major causes of death: Venereal disease, pneumonia, yellow fever, typhus, malaria, and many other contagious and infectious diseases have been put under control as a result of the magnificent efforts of the researchers, scientists, and practitioners who now are armed with the implements to keep them under control.

Today, however, heart disease and diseases of the circulatory system, arthritis and rheumatism, cancer and mental disorders are the major causes of suffering incapacity and death. Recognizing the obligation of the Federal Government to lead in the field of basic research in an attempt to put these killers and cripplers of mankind under control, the National Cancer Institute was established in 1937. The National Mental Health Institute was established in 1946. The National Heart Institute and the National Dental Research Institute were established in 1948. There is pending today in the House a bill which has already passed the Senate to establish an institute for neurology and blindness and an institute for rheumatism, arthritis, and metabolic diseases. Each of these institutes has or will have the authority to make grants for research and to award fellowships. In addition, they have as a result of the unanimous action of the Congress provided urgently needed funds for construction of research facilities, particularly for heart and cancer investigations. Each of these institutes has a national advisory council composed of outstanding people in each field, together with brilliant laymen who are dedicating themselves to the effort to find the cause and cure of these terrible scourges of mankind. All of the research grants made by the existing institutes are reviewed by nongovernmental specialists of the highest competence. It should be pointed out that under the laws applicable to each of these institutes, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service can approve no research grant that has not been approved by the appropriate advisory council. This system of supporting medical research is a going concern. I am proud to say that I have had a hand in devising this system and have a degree of pride in the fact that it is one system of Federal aid that has not resulted in Federal control. The present system protects the freedom of investigators in medical schools, research centers, and in universities. It is helping newer and smaller research centers throughout the country as well as the larger, well-established centers of research. It has received continuous support from people interested in public health matters, and the Congress has reflected that attitude of the general public by overwhelmingly supporting the program now in operation.

I am of the opinion that solely on the basis of dollars-and-cents return and on cold consideration of the Nation's requirements for national defense, we should be appropriating more for medical research. Time will not permit a demonstration of the cold economic facts aside from the humanitarian aspects that are involved. I can state without fear of contradiction, however, that the results already obtained and clearly indicated in the medical research field conducted under the direction of the National Institutes of Health have paid huge dividends to the American people. While the current funds available in the field of medical research are wholly insufficient, in my opinion, at the present time, I think it is only fair to say that the current levels of public expenditure are more nearly adequate than they were before the drive to conquer the chronic and degenerative diseases began in earnest. I am convinced that as a matter of public policy this expanded scale of research is sound and that any contraction would be a disservice to the Nation and the people of the world. Complete candor compels me to state that I shall continue to resist any effort to cut back and limit the efforts of the Federal Government and other public and private agencies throughout the Nation that are conducting such a magnificent fight in the public interest in these fields. This position compels me to try to understand the relationship between the proposed National Science Foundation and the existing medical research program. What will be the effect upon the National Institutes of Health and the vast research programs now being conducted in the health and medical fields?

I have studied the pending bill, and I confess that it is so general in its provisions that I presently do not have a complete answer to the problem. I doubt if there is a member of the Congress that can make a complete and satisfactory explanation. Is the National Science Foundation under the pending bill going to take over the medical research grant and fellowship activities that are now operating smoothly and in a manner that draws the highest praise from the universities of the Nation and the medical schools throughout the country? If that is the intent of this bill, then I shall be compelled to vote against it. I am raising this question during debate so that Members of Congress who feel as I do may have a definite understanding as to what interpretation of the language in the pending bill will be adopted. I suggest, therefore, that those in charge of this legislation make it abundantly clear that it is not the purpose of this legislation to take over and destroy, perchance, the efficient, smoothly operating program now being conducted by the Institutes of Health under existing law. If I were to vote for this legislation, it would be on the assumption and understanding that this will not happen.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am interested in another question; namely, will all research activities of the Federal Government be submitted to the Congress as a single appropriation requests? I vigorously oppose such a proposal. For more than 10 years I have been a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that has dealt with the appropriations for medical research. I have tried to make it my business to know the needs of

medical research and the strength and weaknesses of the Federal Government's activities in this field. I would not like to see medical research relegated to a subitem under a single research appropriation which under general ceilings imposed by the Executive in making his budget would compel those interested in the field of medical research to fight for a reasonable share of the over-all appropriation granted to the Foundation. To do so might well mean that the field of medical research so vital to the welfare of the people of this country might be subordinated to powerful pressure groups demanding funds for research in other fields.

Another question arises; namely, what is the role of the Foundation's Division of Medical Research in relation to the existing medical research grants and fellowship activities of the Federal Government? If the task of the National Foundation proposed in the pending legislation is to be assumption of responsibility for securing appropriations for and administering existing medical-research grant and fellowship programs of the various National Institutes of Health, I would oppose the bill. I would like the committee in the course of the arguments on this bill to make it abundantly clear as to just what the role of the Foundation is to be in the medical-research grant and fellowship programs presently administered by the National Institutes of Health. If I ultimately vote for this legislation, it will be upon the common-sense assumption that the Division of Medical Research created under the provisions of the pending bill would not destroy the present programs of the National Institutes of Health.

I can well see why medical research must be weighed as part of a total national program, and I can see why the full effect of these programs—particularly their effect upon educational institutions—should be carefully considered. These seem to me to be the kind of actities that should be the primary concern of the Division of Medical Research. If the Foundation is to become an operating unit rather than a coordinating and advisory unit operating in the field of medical research, then I seriously question the advisability of adopting that portion of the Foundation bill.

In concluding, may I say that I would like to have clarified the meaning of the two amendments proposed to H. R. 4846 by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Section 3 (a) (6) of the bill—page 3, line 6—has been amended to provide that the Foundation shall "evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups, including scientific research programs of the Federal Government." Does this mean that the Foundation will look at general trends in medical research for the purpose of making recommendations, or does it mean that the Foundation will review the budgets of the medical research agencies in detail? The answer to this question is necessarily involved in the answer to the question as to whether or not this program contemplates the submission to the Congress of one over-all research budget. If it is the intent of this amendment to authorize the Foundation to present to the Congress the detailed budgets of funds necessary in connection with the Federal program of research and grants, then I should be compelled to oppose the amendment. The bill as originally drafted defined the Foundation's interest in this matter in the following language:

> To correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups.

There is a vast difference between the provision as originally written in the bill and the amendment proposed. The substitution of the word "evaluate" for the word "correlate" completely changes the meaning and intent of this section. I would ask that the committee in proper time explain in detail just what this amendment means in order that the Foundation if and when created will understand what the legislative intent was.

I also note that the committee which considered the bill proposes that section 14 (h)—page 19, line 6—be stricken. If you will turn to the printed bill you will observe that the original language provided "the activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any other functions or activities of other Government agencies authorized to engage in scientific research or development." Why has this provision been stricken from the bill? I can see that it might be advisable to reshuffle many of the research activities of the Federal Government and that this clause might possibly forestall some highly desirable changes. At the same time I do not believe that the elimination of this provision should be construed as blanket authority for the Foundation to disturb research activities that are logically located and that are operating satisfactorily. I have heretofore made my position on this matter clear so far as the medical-research grant and fellowship activities of the National Institutes of Health operated by the Public Health Service are concerned. I now ask the sponsors of the bill to explain what they had in mind when they proposed deleting this clause, and whether my interpretation of their action is a correct one.

I also note on page 19 of the bill that provision is made for the transfer to the Foundation of funds to be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made, and the paragraph ends with this language: "and until such time as an appropriation is made available directly to the Foundation for general administrative expenses of the Foundation without regard to limitations otherwise applicable to such funds." This is a very broad, sweeping grant of authority and power to expend transferred funds. I would ask the committee to make it clear just why limitations on the expenditures of funds for administration written into appropriation bills by the Congress should be eliminated when funds are transferred to the Foundation. It will be noted that the appropriation authorized under this bill is without limitation, and in my humble judgment it should clearly be shown to the Congress what savings, if any, can be anticipated in the event this legislation becomes law.

I shall carefully listen to the arguments, and I trust that someone from the committee will be able to answer the questions which I have raised. My vote for or against the pending bill will be determined by the character of the answers which are received during debate to the questions which I have raised.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, merely to state to the gentleman that if the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is to be placed in the bill, for the purpose of evaluating scientific research programs undertaken by the Federal Government, then if this language in subsection (h) remains in the bill it might possibly prevent the Foundation from making a proper evaluation of whether or not there was overlapping and duplication in the Federal Government as among its various agencies in conducting basic scientific research programs. There is every reason, I believe, why the gentleman being a member of the Committee on Appropriations would want the Board to report on any such overlapping or duplication in order that due economy might be had in the expenditure of the public funds.

As a matter of fact, it is my opinion that the enactment of this bill and the establishment of the Foundation and its activities in evaluating scientific research and correlating scientific research will provide a considerable saving over the amounts now being expended. That does not mean that the Foundation would have the power to strike any budgetary item from any budget, but they certainly should take a good long look at the multitude of different research projects that are being conducted now under the aegis of the Federal Government.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is addressing himself now, as I understand it, to the proposed Heselton amendment, which has been referred to.

Mr. HINSHAW. No. I am talking about the remarks of the gentleman opposing striking out the language contained in subsection (h) on page 19, which I think it would be well to strike.

Mr. KEEFE. Why should we not leave it in?

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the committee will accept the amendment as it stands, which strikes out the language, because if you leave this language in the bill and say, "shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies authorized to engage in scientific research or development," then you may rob this agency of any right to criticize or to point out that there is duplication going on in the various Government agencies. It seems to me that it is a matter of protection for the Federal budget to take that language out.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman's statement is very appropriate in response to the suggestion that was made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. The real answer is in the next section, is it not, whereby authority is given and there may be cooperation between agencies of the Government in carrying out the functions and purposes of scientific research.

Mr. HINSHAW. That I think is very important.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point and be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SEC 2 There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Science Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation"). The Foundation shall consist of a National Science Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") and a Director.

FUNCTIONS OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC 3. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

(1) to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences;

(2) to initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such basic scientific research and to appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and upon the general welfare,

(3) after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;

(4) to award, as provided in section 10, scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;

(5) to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries;

(6) to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups;

(7) to establish such special commissions as the Board may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this act; and

(8) to maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways provide a central clearinghouse for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States, including its Territories and possessions.

(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, it shall be one of the objectives of the Foundation to strengthen basic research and education in the sciences, including independent research by individuals, throughout the United States, including its Territories and possessions, and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education.

(c) The Foundation shall render an annual report to the President for submission on or before the 15th day of January of each year to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Such report shall include in full the report of the Executive Committee to the Board, provided for in section 6 (e), and information as to the acquisition and disposition by the Foundation of any patents and patent rights.

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

SEC. 4 (a) The Board shall consist of twenty-four members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and of the Director ex officio, and shall, except as otherwise provided in this act, exercise the authority granted to the Foundation by this act. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be eminent in the fields of the basic sciences, medical science, engineering, agriculture, education, or public affairs, (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, the Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

(b) The term of office of each voting member of the Board shall be 6 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, eight at the end of 2 years, eight at the end of 4 years, and eight at the end of 6 years, after the date of enactment of this act. Any person who has been a member of the Board for twelve consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the 2-year period following the expiration of such twelfth year.

(c) The President shall call the first meeting of the Board, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman.

(d) The Board shall meet annually on the first Monday in December and at such other times as the Chairman may determine, but he shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the members so request in writing A majority of the voting members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last-known address of record not less than 15 days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

(e) The first Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board shall be elected by the Board to serve until the first Monday in December next succeeding the date of election at which time a Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected for a term of 2 years. Thereafter such election shall take place at the annual meeting occurring at the end of each such term. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Board shall elect a member to fill such vacancy.

DIRECTOR OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 5. (a) There shall be a Director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, after receiving recommendations from the Board. He shall serve as a nonvoting ex officio member of the Board and also as the nonvoting Chairman of the Executive Committee. In addition thereto he shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum and shall serve for a term of 6 years unless sooner removed by the President.

(b) In addition to the powers and duties specifically vested in him by this act, the Director shall, in accordance with the policies established by the Board, exercise the powers granted by sections 10 and 11 of this act, together with such other powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Board; but the powers granted by sections 10 and 11 (c) shall be exercised only with the approval of the Board.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established an Executive Committee of the Board which shall consist of the Director ex officio and nine other members elected by the members of the Board from among their number. The term of office of each member of the Executive Committee shall be 2 years except that (1) any member elected to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was elected shall be elected for the remainder of such term; and (2) the term of office of four of the members first elected after the date of enactment of this act shall be 1 year Any person who has been a member of the Executive Committee for six consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for election during the 2-year period following the expiration of such sixth year. The membership of the Executive Committee shall, so far as practicable, be representative of diverse interests and shall be so chosen as to provide representation, so far as practicable, for all areas of the Nation.

(b) In addition to the powers and duties specifically vested in it by this act, the Executive Committee shall exercise such powers and duties as may be delegated to it by the Board.

(c) The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of its Chairman or at such times as may be fixed by itself, but not less than six times each year.

(d) A majority of the voting members of the Executive Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(e) The Executive Committee shall render an annual report to the Board, and such other reports as it may deem necessary, summarizing the activities of the Executive Committee, making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate, and setting forth the recommendations of the divisional committees and special commissions. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Executive Committee, the divisional committees, and special commissions shall be included in such reports.

DIVISIONS WITHIN THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 7. (a) Until otherwise provided by the Board there shall be within the Foundation the following divisions:

(1) A Division of Medical Research;

(2) A Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences;

(3) A Division of Biological Sciences; and

(4) A Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall be concerned with programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

(b) There shall also be within the Foundation such other divisions as the Board may, from time to time, deem necessary.

DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES

SEC. 8. (a) There shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation.

(b) Each divisional committee shall be appointed by the Executive Committee and shall consist of not less than five persons who may be members or nonmembers of the Board.

(c) The terms of members of each divisional committee shall be 2 years. Each divisional committee shall annually elect its own chairman from among its own members and shall prescribe its own rules of procedure subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by the Executive Committee.

(d) Each divisional committee shall make recommendations to, and advise and consult with, the Executive Committee and the Director with respect to matters relating to the program of its division.

SPECIAL COMMISSIONS

SEC. 9. (a) Each special commission established pursuant to section 3 (a) (7) shall consist of 11 members appointed by the executive committee, six of whom shall be eminent scientists and five of whom shall be persons other than scientists. Each special commission shall choose its own chairman and vice chairman.

(b) It shall be the duty of each such special commission to make a comprehensive survey of research, both public and private, being carried on in its field, and to formulate and recommend to the Foundation at the earliest practicable date an over-all research program in its field.

SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 10 The Foundation is authorized to award, within the limits of funds made available specifically for such purpose pursuant to section 15, scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or nonprofit foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient of such aid, for stated periods of time. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships from among citizens of the United States, and such selections shall be made solely on the basis of ability; but in any case in which two or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Foundation to be possessed of substantially equal ability, and there are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to grant one to each of such applicants, the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships shall be awarded to the applicants in such manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 11. The Foundation shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including, but without being limited thereto, the authority—

(a) to prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner of its operations and its organization and personnel;

(b) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this act;

(c) to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, of such basic scientific research activities and such scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense as the Foundation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and, when deemed appropriate by the Foundation, such contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, may be entered into without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

(d) to make advance, progress, and other payments which relate to scientific research without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 529);

(e) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this act;

(f) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated, without restriction, other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

(g) to publish or arrange for the publication of scientific and technical information so as to further the full dissemination of information of scientific value consistent with the national interest, without regard to the provisions of section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 622), and section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270, 44 U. S. C., sec. 111);

(h) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons serving without compensation; and

(i) to prescribe, with the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States, the extent to which vouchers for funds expended under contracts for scientific research shall be subject to itemization or substantiation prior to payment, without regard to the limitations of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor.

PATENT RIGHTS

SEC. 12. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed pursuant to this act which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Foundation to enter into any contractual or other arrangement inconsistent with any provision of law affecting the issuance or use of patents.

(b) No officer or employee of the Foundation shall acquire, retain, or transfer any rights, under the patent laws of the United States or otherwise, in any invention which he may make or produce in connection with performing his assigned activities and which is directly related to the subject matter thereof: *Provided, however,* That this subsection shall not be construed to prevent any officer or employee of the Foundation from executing any application for patent on any such invention for the purpose of assigning the same to the Government or its nominee in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Director may establish.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY

SEC. 13. (a) The Foundation is hereby authorized to cooperate in any international scientific research activities consistent with the purposes of this act and to expend for such international scientific research activities such sums within the limit of appropriated funds as the Foundation may deem desirable. The Director, with the approval of the Executive Committee, may defray the expenses of representatives of Government agencies and other organizations and of individual scientists to accredited international scientific congresses and meetings whenever he deems it necessary in the promotion of the objectives of this act.

(b) (1) The authority to enter into contracts or other arrangements with organizations or individuals in foreign countries and with agencies of foreign countries, as provided in section 11 (c), and the authority to cooperate in international scientific research activities as provided in subsection (a) of this section, shall be exercised only after consultation with the Secretary of State, to the end that such authority shall be exercised in such manner as is consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

(2) If, in the exercise of the authority referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, negotiation with foreign countries or agencies thereof becomes necessary, such negotiation shall be carried on by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 14. (a) The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Executive Committee shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided,* That the Director may, in accordance with such policies as the Executive Committee shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel and fix their compensation, without regard to such laws, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this act. The Deputy Director hereinafter provided for, and the members of the divisional committees and special commissions, shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations. Neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director, as the case may be; nor shall the Director or Deputy Director, except with the approval of the Executive Committee, hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this act.

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the Executive Committee, a Deputy Director who shall perform such functions as the Director, with the approval of the Executive Committee, may prescribe and shall be Acting Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the Office of the Director.

(c) The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

(d) The members of the Board, and the members of each divisional committee, or special commission, shall receive compensation at the rate of $25 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation, and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b–2).

(e) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the divisional committees and special commissions, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Board, of a divisional committee, or of a special commission shall not be considered as service bringing him within the provisions of section 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C., sec. 99), unless the act of such individual, which by

such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves the Foundation or in which the Foundation is directly interested

(g) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals in the United States or foreign countries, including Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which, if aided, will advance basic research, and (4) encouraging independent basic research by individuals.

(h) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies authorized to engage in scientific research or development.

(i) Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made, and, until such time as an appropriation is made available directly to the Foundation, for general administrative expenses of the Foundation without regard to limitations otherwise applicable to such funds.

(j) The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel shall be transferred from the United States Employment Service to the Foundation, together with such records and property as have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of such roster as may be determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The transfer provided for in this subsection shall take effect at such time or times as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall direct.

(k) The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of atomic energy, nor shall it exercise any authority pursuant to section 11 (e) in respect to that field, without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. Nothing in this act shall supersede or modify any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

(l) The executive committee, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property (having military significance) in connection with scientific research under this act, and for the proper safeguarding of any information or property so classified.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 15 (a) To enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Foundation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Appropriations made pursuant to the authority provided in subsection (a) of this section shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in the acts making such appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, line 3, strike out lines 3 to 5, inclusive, and insert the following language:

"(6) to evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups, including scientific research programs of agencies of the Federal Government, and to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with such programs."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr HESELTON to the committee amendment: Strike out paragraph 6 of section 3 (a) on page 3, line 6 through line 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(6) to evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government and to correlate Foundation scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall speak briefly on this, with apologies to those who were here when I stated that I would offer this amendment at the proper time. In the interest of saving time, I would like to read briefly from the last page of the Hoover report:

This points to the need for a National Science Foundation. The major functions of such a Foundation should be (a) to examine the total scientific research effort of the Nation, (b) to assess the proper role of the Federal Government in this effort, (c) to evaluate the division of research effort among the scientific disciplines and among fields of applied research, and (d) to evaluate the key factors that impede the development of an effective national research effort.

The second recommendation of the Hoover Commission is:

(b) The Commission recommends that a National Science Foundation be established.

I called attention previously to the report of the President's Special Board appointed in 1946, which is contained at the beginning of page 49 of the second annual report of the Secretary of Defense. There are two paragraphs I would like to emphasize.

The Army and Navy have vigorous research development programs which had grown up over a period of years. When the Air Force was constituted as a separate branch of the armed services its research development efforts represented a third important program. The size, diversity, and complexity of the fields covered by these programs make sound planning increasingly important.

The coordinating activities of the Research and Development Board enable each department to become aware of what the other departments are doing in research and development. Unnecessary duplication is thereby located and eliminated or prevented. More difficult, but probably of greater significance, is the Board's continuing responsibility to shift emphasis and funds away from programs of lesser military promise and into those of greater value. The existence of such a coordinating agency makes it possible to stretch the research and development dollar and to cut costs.

The President's board in one of its reports has pointed out that what is needed is that each of these hundreds of agencies in our Government that are engaged in extensive research programs should review those programs, should evaluate them, should set up a long-range plan which should then be submitted to this Foundation so that we could integrate them into a national program.

Since the Second World War the military expenditures on research have averaged over half a billion dollars a year. Although this is but a small portion of the average total military budget, it is a large figure in comparison to the much smaller sums spent on military research and development before the war—in comparison, say, to the $13,000,000 obligated for military research and development in 1939, the year World War II began. The amount of money currently being spent for research and development is only slightly less than the entire military appropriation for 1924, and is almost 50 percent as much as the total military appropriation as late as 1937.

In the National Defense Establishment this committee has been able to report that it has actually brought about substantial savings through this coordination. It makes the statement on page 61:

Formally effected coordination is illustrated by recent Board action on the recommendation of the Committee on Guided Missiles request that three existing projects be terminated and two others combined into one. Through this action an estimated $6,000,000 in plant obligations for the fiscal year 1950 was made available for allocation to other guided missiles projects of high priority.

Carrying that over into the other fields of major research we can confidently anticipate, I believe, a much better and well-rounded program.

I call your attention finally to this: The proposed amendment places the emphasis upon evaluation of scientific research programs undertaken by the Federal Government, not by the universities, not by the industries, not by private research. We have no business going into that and telling them: "You shall do this; you shall not do that." That is their business and they should be permitted to plan and conduct their own business. But this Foundation, if we adopt this amendment, would be under the obligation of correlating the Foundation's program with those of individuals and of public and private research groups. I am hopeful that my colleagues in the House will see it as do my colleagues on the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman agree that the Hoover recommendation refers to Government enterprise?

Mr. HESELTON. Absolutely and exclusively.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. What assurance does private industry have that

the Government will not take it over? What is meant by the word "correlate"?

Mr. HESELTON. The language has been submitted to draftsmen and to industry, and it has been approved by industry specifically. It is to correlate the Foundation's scientific research program, nothing else; correlate our Federal program with what is being done in the country by universities, industries, and in other public-research programs. I can assure the gentleman that it has met with the approval of substantial business interests which are engaged in this field with very heavy investments.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I have my doubts about that.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word merely to say that the committee accepts the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] to the committee amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I favor this amendment and the bill.

This amendment providing for correlation in the whole field of scientific research is extremely valuable for there is nothing exclusionist about such research, nor are any particular areas of research to be included or excluded because other agencies, public or private, are working on them. It is therefore most desirable that correlation be teamed with evaluation as is done by the pending amendment. This in the best interests of the most effective and complete scientific research.

With respect to the general purposes of the bill itself it is indeed gratifying that it is now being considered and that the objections which caused the President to veto a similar bill passed by the Eightieth Congress have apparently been overcome. In a day of A-bombs and H-bomb, an effort to restore the balance between applied and pure science is entitled to our convinced support.

It is gratifying to know too that, on the whole, although there is opposition to some features of this bill on the part of scientists and others who have studied the subject because of certain inadequacies, notably those relating to the broadest distribution of research grants, and questions of patent rights and cooperation with international agencies, there appears to be strong support for the bill from scientists and educators everywhere.

My own wartime experience and that of many other Members of the House taught us the critical place in our social and economic development and in the development of our national security of fundamental research in the sciences. We have made spectacular achievements in applied science, pure research, however, is the base for all such achievements, whether done here or elsewhere. The march of the world forward demands no less of the nation on earth with the best technical equipment, and which has done the most with it for the human well-being as well as for international peace and security, than that we undertake this additional measure to make more effective our great resources for scientific research.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has very well stated that most obvious objections to this bill as I see them. There are, however, certain illomened implications in the philosophy of science, or rather of many—too many—scientists, which deserve attention from those who are to administer this act so as to remedy the tragic naïveté involved in such cases as those of Drs. May and Fuchs, and of Hiss and others in this country.

It hardly seems that the infiltration of communism in world politics can be checked while we cling to a Socialist concept of political action and, accordingly, play me-too politics with the demagogues of the Kremlin. We can hardly hope to promote world peace while democratic statesmanship consists of trying to assure the material welfare of humanity, not by compelling responsible behavior—not by confining government to the functions which maintain law and order and so assure decent incentives by the reward of economic security through private property—but by falsely guaranteeing that which can be available only through the industry, thrift, and intelligence of a responsible and abstentious citizenry.

Science, or rather scientists, seem to be telling us that we can forget what the desire for welfare, when not impelling anarchy and pillage, has always dictated, namely, abstention. Not merely the intelligent use of nature's bounties, but also prevention of the plundering of the planet under excessive population pressure, is the only possible path to permanent peace and the control of the industrial Frankenstein which scientists, as technicians, are constructing.

A government which is paternalistic, not by restraining, but by promoting, the expansion of population, cannot fail to become either a totalitarian aggressor bent on taking the earth's resources from other races and nations, or else a decadent bureaucracy seeking in vain to guarantee full employment at high wages to everyone and to assure no hardship for anyone. It is not possible to temporize with such policies—to steer a safe political course among the world's races by promoting universal abundance with the hope of thus containing communism by allaying unrest. In this situation scientists are having a disturbing influence because they are divorcing their calling from moral standards, just as are most other people, through the philosophy of materialism.

Even biologists, who should know better, are preaching that life itself is mechanistic. By drawing the red herring of their doctrinal dispute with the Kremlin's Lysenko—as to whether the promised land of milk and honey is to be reached by Mendelian or by Lamarckian theory—over the trail of their own materialism, they are obscuring the very basis of moral restraints provided by the idea of a selective struggle for survival which was instilled into Darwin's concept of evolution by Thomas Malthus. We may cite among those who are so engaged, Prof. Theodosius Dobzhansky of Columbia University who asserts, in a recent issue of Science, that competition and the struggle for life are misleading metaphors which should be removed from the vocabulary of science.

By no means all scientists are thus deluding themselves and their public. Dr. Warren Thompson, of Ohio, and other careful students of demography, that is, of human population problems, are no utopians nor do they consider that human populations tend to decline as their security advances. That the truth is exactly to the contrary should give pause in developing a foreign policy based on the idea that industrialization of backward areas will restrain population and make for peace on earth and good will among men. Permit a few observations quoted from Professor Thompson's essay in the February Scientific American. After citing figures on Swedish experience indicating that lower birth rates and higher death rates were the result of poor harvests, he says: "In the long view, Malthus was fundamentally correct when he said that man's growth in numbers was largely dependent on the supply of subsistence." Improvements in agriculture have "had exactly the effects that Malthus had predicted the provision of more ample subsistence would have on population growth. For a time it appeared that in the Western World we no longer needed to give serious attention to the ideas of Malthus, that we had learned how to produce at a rate in excess of any possible rate of population growth, and that we could look forward to an easier life no matter how high our birth rate or how low our death rate."

Now, however, "experience in Japan gives tangible support to the belief of demographers that the industrially backward areas of the world are likely to grow rapidly in population during the next century as they industrialize." In the "Malthusian countries" of the Orient, like India, "the population seems to grow whenever subsistence increases and to stop or even decline at times of scarcity and great epidemics."

Professor Thompson believes that these problems have a very direct relation to the maintenance of peace. In a world which is filling up as ours is, and which is one world whether we like it or not, the urgent question regarding the livelihood of a growing people soon becomes a matter of concern to all nations. Hence there is a need to begin to plan for such changes in population growth as will contribute best to human welfare.

It seems far less clear to natural scientists that it should be that there never has been any time in which the extent of life on earth has been found to be cumulative. It has always depended upon the amount of solar energy which plant life could, currently, capture in its synthesis of organic compounds for the sake of the plant's own offspring. Other species have intruded into a struggle over this limited supply. The struggle has begotten a myriad of forms, many now extinct in addition to those whose strategies still suffice for survival.

Man's dominance is thus not a matter of being able to control the environment in any sense of mastering the physical limitations of the planet and going on to unprecedented miracles of expansion

unrelated to other living things. The genus homo has developed a cultural, technological method of bypassing the limitations of anatomical form; this use of machinery and other techniques has produced a sudden dominance over other species. These others have become easy prey—so easy, indeed, that many species have succumbed and are extinct, which once afforded large supplies of food. Many a localized civilization has arisen and disappeared by such developments. But it will be a new and terrible experience, indeed, that seems imminent today in the currently world-wide explosion of population to be followed by inevitable disaster, unless population can be controlled by a system of enterprises that is free for all—but not free from competitive restraints which compel those who are unable to make the grade to be eliminated, not by the fury of hydrogen bombs that science seems about to release in a dysgenic holocaust, but by being good losers in a game that not every genetic element on earth can win.

If this sort of peaceful genocide is not impressed upon the human race, so that the unfit in ideological or other groups are forced to quit by failure to reproduce as fast as they die naturally, the kind of genocide which wars produce and which the United Nations Organization is naively proposing to stop by a so-called convention, will surely take up the surplus sooner or later in a state of affairs where the horrors of peace are not exceeded by those of war.

It seems to be, not venality, but rather a naive faith in materialism that is undermining the morale of our scientists and bringing about such cases as those of Dr. May and Dr. Fuchs, and, in our own midst, the academic apologies for such inane betrayals of America as we have seen among American scholars, such as Alger Hiss, who have had, personally, everything to lose and little to gain by their Communist sympathies.

The Foundation for Promoting Basic Science which these same academic interests are urging before this body seems not to be in hands which have a clear understanding of the best interests of science apart from the welfare of scientists. Indeed, the most potent factor in the advance of science seems to me to have been crowded out in the four technical divisions provided for. I see little hope, in this specialization, for escaping the Babylonian confusion which the Rockefeller Foundation has said exists in the ranks of science. The director of that foundation not long ago allotted a fund to the effort at eliminating these difficulties in the state of scientific thought. Basic science can certainly be advanced less by technological developments by specialists than by basic philosophical considerations. This could be accomplished, moreover, without the tremendous expenditures which are indicated as too much for private funds to attain while already unbalanced Federal budgets are producing rising costs which dissipate endowments at an increasing pace.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in support of this suggestion for economy and accomplishment, I present some pointed phrases taken from an essay on the Scientist—Technician or Moralist? which makes rather plain the relation of the academic scientist to the social ills that we are enduring. The author is Prof. George Simpson of the City College of New York, writing in the current issue of the magazine, Philosophy of Science, published under the editorship of Dr. Churchman of Wayne University in Detroit. I quote:

When faced with moral problems, natural scientists have developed the habit of running away from science itself. * * * As scientists they glory in being technicians; this eases their consciences by leaving ethics to moral philosophers or mystics. * * * Although he has handed over moral problems to the philosophers, the average natural scientist frowns upon philosophy as aimless speculation on the unsolvable problems which nobody but an impractical visionary would spend his time on. * * *

It would seem that the retreat from morality by science is now full, for the dominant view in social science today is that social scientists might well learn from natural scientists how to achieve a new social status derivative from what can be subsidized rather than from what requires investigation. * * *

Moral retrogression and material progress are part and parcel of the bifurcation of science and morality. The insolubility of moral problems by science gains ever more credence as material problems become more and more soluble by "applied science"; that is, technology. As industry becomes more and more rationalized," morality becomes less and less rational. * * *

Truth which is arrived at socially is proceduralized so that it loses its valuative aspect and becomes sanctimonious. It becomes a form of social worship, not a form of social understanding. * * * Nobody in this situation is supposed to question the worth of science, for science does not question the worth of so-called moral behavior. By avoidance of moral issues science reigns supreme. * * *

To engage in an attempt to help structure society so as to make possible the subservience of emotion, interest, and desire, to rationality, is to become a pariah, an outcast, a troublemaker, and, most unkindest cut of all, to be damned as uncooperative by a noncooperative society. It is small wonder, then, that the scientist is led to accept the social position he finds and to join in the mass chorus which sings his praises as a technician who will help anybody discover anything as long as he does not have to tell them what to do about it.

The full cycle is completed when the social scientist joins in the chorus and asks that he, too, be permitted to join this gallant ship's company sailing the seven seas on a social pleasure-pain cruise * * *. Truly, "Come All Ye Faithful" can be sung in praise of Mammon. Out in the cold, like the poor looking in on the banquet board, is a motley crew of philosophers who are paying the price for not devoting their lives to asking only the proper questions. Perhaps it is not too much to expect that soon philosophers too will find their way into the ranks of the technicians. * * *

Scientists have been taken in by the soft words of praise for their devotion to the cause of humanity spoken even by those who may use scientific work to defeat the ends of reason. The severing of science from morality is part of a more general process in modern society whereby means have triumphed over ends.

In the battle of pressure groups in modern society the scientist is considered as one among many, asking no quarter and seeking no quarter. The state becomes an umpire between truths, so-called; the victor need give no hostage to reason. Indeed, reason itself becomes an attribute of political victory. The final, crowning triumph occurs when truth is what political power proclaims. Aryan races, the new mythos, an elite without natural talents other than administrative, a world made in the image of man's irrationality—these are the ripe fruits of science in the service of politics which has no allegiance to social truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended by the substitute.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 10, line 20, insert "(a)" after the figure 10.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 16, insert the following:

"(b) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure by the foundation under authority of this act shall be used to make payments under any scholarship or fellowship to any individual unless there is on file with the foundation an affidavit executed by such individual that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable in respect of such affidavits."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida to the committee amendment: Page 11, line 19, after the word "unless" insert "(1)", and on page 12, in line 1, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", (2) the affidavit is accompanied by such supporting evidence as the foundation may by regulations require, and (3) the director and at least five of the voting members of the executive committee are satisfied that the statements made in the affidavit are true."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the commitee does not go quite far enough. That is the only objection I have. The amendment states that payments can be made if there is an affidavit executed by the individual to the effect he does not believe in and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

The Foundation under this verbiage, therefore, would be authorized to make payments to a Communist who files such an affidavit.

I add two propositions to this, first, that the affidavit must be accompanied by such supporting evidence as the Foundation may by regulation require.

In other words, the Foundation can pass a regulation as to what it requires in the affidavit to be filed. Everyone will know what that is by looking at the records. They can tell what those regulations are.

My second addition is that the director and at least five of the voting members of the executive committee must be satisfied that the statements made in the affidavit are true. That is a protection to the Foundation.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is simply undertaking to provide an additional precaution against taking into the organization people who are not loyal to the United States Government?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is all it is. I am glad the gentleman from Georgia asked that question. That is my only purpose. It throws some duty on the Foundation and the director to determine whether the affidavit is true or not. In the past few days Alger Hiss has been convicted of perjury. Another fellow down here, Christoffel, was convicted the other day for perjury. Now, what difference does it make to a Communist who wants to secure an advantage, who wants to take our courses over here? He would sign an affidavit and the Foundation would be absolutely justified in admitting him if the affidavit was merely on file. They do not have to go into any details. They do not have to go into the truth or falsity of it. The simple fact it is filed would justify payments of this scholarship or other fund.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman refers to Communists. Let us take a look at other applicants. Whether they are under the cloud of suspicion of being a Communist or not, will they be allowed? Suppose it is a decent citizen and not a Communist, does he have to go through the swearing that he is not a communist or does he have to submit other evidence?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Under the amendment offered by the committee you have to do that. But, this just puts a little more safeguard for them to justify his being made a payment.

Mr. DINGELL. It does not cast any reflection on the character of a man who was not a Communist.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Not at all. It casts no reflection on anybody.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman is a good one. I think the committee ought to have no doubts at all about the sincerity of the gentleman in asking for this amendment. Anybody who is communistically inclined should not be on the commission or be employed by the commission.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman. You all know of an instance—I will not call his name—in North Carolina, having to do with the Atomic Energy Commission. Why, he was there taking advantage of the courts, taking our American money, and he was a Communist. They afterwards found it out and dismissed him. This only throws a safeguard around anybody before they can take our money. As for me, I do not want a cent of American money to go to a Communist for anything; I do not care what it is.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, I understand the gentleman's purpose, and we all have the same purpose in mind. But, when you require an affidavit from a person that he is not a Communist, and he subjects himself to the laws of perjury, how can you double protect such a thing as that?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I want to say that the committee amendment provides that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. How can you strengthen that?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. He must have the supporting evidence. I hope we have enough good Americans here to adopt this amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. What kind of supporting evidence, beyond his affidavit?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. WIER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. WIER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. WIER. I desire 5 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that on the committee amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. PRIEST. On the committee amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request to make it 15 minutes. I see a number of the subcommittee seeking recognition. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. SHAFER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand, the 10-minute limitation has already been agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. That was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, reluctantly I rise to oppose the amendment offered by my good friend and our esteemed colleague and member of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]. I know that deep in his heart he is sincere; he is honest and has every good intention as is utterly possible by proposing the amendment. I respectfully submit to the committee, however, that it is certainly unnecessary to have an amendment such as my good friend proposes; in fact, it can do nothing except confuse the administration of the act as it applies to scholarships and fellowships.

I am as vigorously opposed to any funds proposed by this act for scholarship or fellowship being made to anyone that does not hold sacred allegiance to the United States, as the gentleman from Florida, or any other Member of this Congress. I am just as anxious as he or anyone else that no Communist or fellow traveler be permitted to participate in the program. I do not believe there should be any windfall or any opportunity for such another experience as occurred in a university in connection with the atomic-energy program.

The gentleman is a good lawyer. It is well known under our judicial procedure that there is a severe penalty for perjury. Therefore, we provided that none of these funds to be appropriated can be used by anyone unless there is an affidavit by such party that he does not believe in and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

And further, the committee amendment provides specifically that the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable in respect of such affidavits. In other words, the penalty provisions of the law shall apply without any possible doubt when perjury is committed.

Security, yes; we should have stringent security provisions but they should be workable. It would be wholly impractical for the executive committee of the Foundation to have to go out and make an investigation to determine whether or not a man commits perjury. The gentleman knows that it is not only administrative action but that the executive committee would be required to do the work of the law-enforcement officers and the courts.

There is no doubt in anyone's mind but what this Congress adequately and appropriately dealt with this same question in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission. The committee amendment is identical with the provision the Congress adopted as applies to the Atomic Energy Commission. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the committee

amendment included in the bill providing that before scholarship awards can be made there must be such affidavit on file to the effect that the party involved is not a Communist and has no affiliation at all with any Communist organization or any other organization that would overthrow our form of government is the correct approach.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. What is the affidavit worth when it comes to one who is disloyal to his country?

Mr. HARRIS. It is worth just what perjury was worth in the Alger Hiss case. It is worth what any other affidavit required under the laws of our country is worth, that if a man perjures himself he is subject to the penalty of the law. It is not a question for the Board or the Foundation to determine, it is a question for the institution to determine when these scholarships are awarded.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] a moment ago said that one of the grave fears he has in his mind about this legislation is the inevitable control of the institution. Are you going to set up this Foundation composed of six or more men who will tell any institution in the United States who may have a scholarship award? That is exactly what you are doing here. Talk about the control of your educational institutions. You would certainly authorize the Foundation, without any question, to determine by your amendment who will receive scholarship awards.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that irrespective of what the Foundation does the payments for these scholarships cannot be made until the director and a majority of the executive committee are satisfied that the affidavit is true.

Mr. HARRIS. The scholarship award is made through an institution who has the students. It is not altogether the determination of the Foundation on a particular student. What you would provide is for the Foundation to make any determination it wants to in any institution in the United States on any man or any student that might want a scholarship or fellowship. I believe the gentleman has not sufficiently considered the amendment he has proposed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Committee defeat the amendment.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the time allotted to him was granted to Mr. WIER.)

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the time has arrived for educational institutions to assert their positions, and I personally believe that it is obvious that acceptance of the principle of thought control, in any form or manner, will be fatal to American education, scholarship, and to democracy itself. If such regulations as those in force in Executive Order 9835 were made applicable to the student body and faculty of the University of Minnesota, there would be an instant change in the intellectual climate of the institution. Very few persons would dare discuss the merits or demerits of progressive legislation except in private with most trusted friends. The free play of ideas would be a thing of the past because no one could trust others not to be in the secret service of an organization whose duty it was to report on dangerous ideas. The university administration itself would lose authority to determine fitness for enrollment as a student or employment as a staff member. That authority would pass to a Federal board.

I have ascertained that Federal employees here in Washington have adopted the attitudes I outlined above, and I know for a fact that many competent persons have left Federal employment rather than be subject to the intellectual and emotional harassment of the loyalty order and associated investigations.

Perhaps I should make my position clear. I favor every protection of American democracy against any overt act perpetrated to overthrow it by any unconstitutional means. I would prosecute to the full extent of the law any perpetrator of such an act. If membership in any organization can be established by due process of law to constitute such an overt act leading to clear and present danger to our democratic system by unconstitutional means, I would favor construing the act of joining such an organization as a crime, and punishable, not, however, by any ex post facto law or rule. However, I believe with Bernard de Voto, who said in another connection—Harpers, July 1949, page 63—"that the right of free speech cannot be restricted unless a 'clear and present danger' to society exists—and exists with such immediate urgency that there is no time to answer idea with idea."

The road to totalitarianism is paved with bricks, each one of which exposes a face acceptable or even desirable to a majority. Totalitarianism itself is simply a system in which minorities have no rights or protection. The minority is itself a different group on every individual issue. The genius of Anglo-Saxon common law and the virtue of the American Constitution consisted first of all in the protection they afforded to minorities. If those qualities are lost, civilization is set back a thousand years.

It is my opinion that although we should have governmental assistance for the support of scientific research in this country the public interest would be badly served if such support were granted with the inclusion of a loyalty clause governing students and employees in every institution in the country expecting to use such funds.

I believe it will be obvious to you that the inclusion of such a clause would change the intellectual environment of every institution covered by it just as it has already changed the intellectual plan for workers in the Government services. It is not unsafe to predict that frank and open discussion of political problems will be very largely eliminated in American colleges and universities if Federal aid to education and science is coupled with Federal loyalty clearance. I have no doubt that the great preponderance of persons to whom such rules might apply would be cleared without question. However, the very fact that secret derogatory information might mean the loss of one's job, will encourage most persons to keep all of their ideas to themselves. I feel sure that this is not what you and other Members of our Congress desire to have happen to our academic institutions. It is, of course, incompatible with the principles of freedom for which we all stand. I intend to use my good office to prevent such a calamity from occurring in connection with Federal aid to science and education. We can better afford to go without the aid than to jeopardize our most cherished traditions which distinguish us from the totalitarian states.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to call the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] to the fact that I think he was in error when he made the contention that the awards of scholarship provided for under this bill are made to educational institutions. I have some knowledge of the scholarship awards that are made under authority of the United States Public Health Service, and I find the situation here is exactly the same, and that the scholarships are directed to individuals. The National Science Foundation selects the individuals itself, as provided for in section 10, on pages 10 and 11 of this bill. Therefore, it is of extreme importance to see to it that the individuals who are selected are people that we can trust. The Commission itself is charged with that responsibility. So the arguments that are being made that there is interference with academic freedom, and all that sort of thing, on the campuses of the universities, pales into insignificance in face of the fact that the Commission itself is charged with the responsibility of granting these scholarships and fellowships to individuals.

In my humble opinion, we cannot be too safe. I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has a very decent perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of this bill and particularly anxious to vote for the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Chairman, in the first session of the Eightieth Congress we passed S. 526, the National Science Foundation Act of 1947. This bill was vetoed by the President, but he stated that he was in favor of the Science Foundation and only objected to its administrative organization as unsound. It deprived the President

of the control of an agency which clearly fell in the executive branch of the Government. Such an administrative structure could have developed into an autonomous agency controlled by private research institutes and universities.

There is no doubt a strong popular interest among the public, and with scientists in particular, for Federal support of scientific research. The discovery of spectacular weapons of war such as the atomic bomb, hydrogen bomb, and radar has forced us to recognize that the national security, the general welfare, health, and prosperity of our people are dependent upon our maintaining strong scientific resources. The miracle of production of airplanes, tanks, and other weapons of war was brought about by the cooperation of Government, industry, workers, scientists, and engineers. This could not have been accomplished without the men of science who had the know-how and who designed the machines and taught the workers how to use them. After the battle of Britain Churchill remarked, with regard to heroic work by the RAF's fighter pilots, that scarcely in the history of the nation "had so many been so dependent upon so few." Likewise, our technicians, engineers, and scientists played a similar role in this country's war effort.

Fundamental scientific research in the past has known no national boundaries. Scientists could draw upon the wealth of scientific discovery throughout the world. But with the prostration of Europe, the source of many basic discoveries in the past, it is now imperative that the United States increase greatly fundamental research in science. Some may ask, why spend the taxpayers' money for basic research which may not have any immediate application? When Faraday, the famous English physicist, made his great discoveries in electricity, which were the forerunner of the whole modern electrical industry, he was asked by Gladstone about the use of his discoveries. He replied that it was like a newborn baby and how it developed only the future could say, but if the Government would keep an eye on it, no doubt they would find something in the future which they could tax. How true this statement was.

Since we considered this bill in the last session of Congress, there has appeared the valuable report by the President's Scientific Research Board, under the chairmanship of Dr. John R. Steelman. This Board consisted of representatives of the various agencies and included many of the ablest men in the executive branch of the Government. The report in five volumes made a thorough survey of scientific resources in the United States. No doubt the Members of this House are familiar with the Board's findings and recommendations.

This Board considered the future needs for scientific men in government, industry and in colleges and universities. For example, it is estimated that in 1957 the Nation would need 270,000 scientists, while today we have about 137,000 scientific workers. Industry must recruit more research scientists if they are to continue to produce new and better products in the next few years. In fact, the full employment of our workers and the high level of our national income are greatly dependent upon the applications of the basic laws of science developed in the research and university laboratories.

At present in some of the newly organized Government laboratories there are many scientists who have had only partial training and are not fully equipped to carry out high caliber research work. As more well-trained scientists are available this condition will be remedied. As more and better trained men are produced by the universities the level of scientific institutions will be improved. Thus our universities now face a double problem, namely, of producing enough scientists to meet the present shortage and also to train men for future scientific expansion.

In order that our universities may expand their scientific programs it is essential that the Federal Government provide assistance. When the Government embarks upon a new program, it should be comprehensive and reach into every State of the Union. Financial assistance for expansion should be granted to both colleges and universities. Sometimes the importance of the liberal arts colleges in educating future scientists and inspiring them to enter the field of science is overlooked. According to the Steelman report, of the 44 institutions which rank in the highest group, in the number of graduates who have taken the doctorate in science for each 1,000 students, 39 of these institutions are liberal arts colleges, rather than universities. The following statement is taken from the Steelman report:

During the years 1936 to 1945, Furman University—

My own alma mater—

Oberlin College, Reed College, and Miami University (Ohio) together graduated more students who later completed doctoral work in physics than did Ohio State University, Yale University, Stanford University, and Princeton University combined.

I am proud that my alma mater, Furman, is in such distinguished company and has rendered such excellent service to science.

This record is, indeed, remarkable when the total number of students in the two groups of institutions is taken into consideration. However, it should be added that not all small colleges make such an unusual record. It is well known to graduate-school faculties that our small colleges are the source of many graduate students in our universities. To raise the scientific standards of these colleges, improve their equipment and faculties will materially raise the level of graduate work in the universities. Moreover, this policy will greatly increase the sum total of the Nation's scientific resources.

At present the most important scientific centers of graduate work are almost entirely confined to three regions; namely, the northeastern part of the United States, the Great Lakes region, and California. The institutions in these three areas granted about 85 percent of the Ph. D.'s in science during the 10-year period 1936–45. In regions where scientific research has been developed to a high level the attracting of competent young people may already be approaching the saturation point. Moreover, the situation of a single science department with several hundred graduate students is not very conducive for the highest type of graduate training. As a national policy, it would be highly desirable to have a series of strong graduate schools throughout the Nation.

In the social security grants and the proposed program of Federal aid for the public schools included in S. 472 it is recognized that the States with lower economic levels are in need of greater Federal assistance. In the States of lower economic ability the colleges and universities have not yet been able to improve their educational standards because of lack of funds. The Federal-aid program for scientific research should help to bring the institutions of these regions up to the national level. In some of the smaller institutions the scientific equipment is quite meager, and the only way that their students learn about the common instruments for scientific measurements is by reading about them and from illustrations in textbooks. To give students the proper background for scientific careers they should learn the use of these instruments as undergraduates.

The direct attention to the nature of scientific research in the South, with especial interest to scientific men themselves, two important studies have been made. Dr. Wilson Gee of the University of Virginia, published in 1932 his book entitled "Research Barriers in the South," in which he analyzed and presented significant data concerning what he called the drag out of the South. In his analysis of the 1927 edition of American Men of Science, a biographical dictionary of approximately 14,000 eminent American scientists, he found that 1,094 of them had been born in the South. Of this group of southern-born scientists, only 154 or one-sixth had received their graduate training in southern universities, while the balance had been trained in universities outside of the South.

What is the situation today? Fortunately we now have a comparable study through the courtesy of Dr. M. H. Trytten, of the National Research Council, whose generous cooperation recently made available the results of his work. This study is concerned with the training and careers of 389 younger scientists from the four Southern States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and my native State of South Carolina, who took their Ph. D.'s in the 10-year period, 1936–45 Of this group of budding scientists, 95 individuals or 24 percent of the group, received their doctorates from 11 of our southern universities, although 78 of them took their degrees from the four following southern institutions, Duke, Florida, North Carolina, and Virginia. However, there were no doctorates in science conferred by institutions in the three States of Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina.

The balance of this group, 215 or three-quarters of these southern-born

scientists, earned their Ph. D.'s from 39 universities outside the South. The four universities, Chicago, Cornell, Iowa, and Wisconsin conferred doctorates upon 87 men in this group, which is only slightly less than the total number of 95 individuals who took their degrees from our southern universities. It is thus apparent that in terms of advanced scientific training the South is only slightly less dependent upon outside universities for the training of its scientific leaders than it was 20 years ago. For the 112 Ph. D.'s recipients from my own State of South Carolina, the story is substantially the same. Of this group of young scientists, only 35, or less than one-third were trained in southern universities; while the balance, almost 70 percent of the group, left the South for their graduate training.

Not only are our southern-born scientists trained in large numbers in institutions outside the South, but unfortunately, a substantial number of them find it necessary or choose to carry on their scientific careers in other sections of the country. The Gee study of 20 years ago, indicated that only 40 percent of the southern-born scientists listed in American Men of Science served in educational institutions, research agencies, government, and industry in the section of the country in which they were born and raised. In contrast, the Trytten study indicated that of the group of younger scientists, 207, or 53 percent, are now working in the Southern States. In the case of the 112 scientists from South Carolina, 57, or about one-half, are working in the South. We are glad that our southern scientists are in demand for scientific positions over the entire Nation. However, we are anxious to develop strong research centers to hold more of our promising young men and to attract superior scientists from other sections of the Nation in exchange for our southern-born scientists.

Despite this increase in the number of southern-born scientists who continue to work in the South, Dr. Gee's optimistic forecast in 1932, that "a similar analysis made 10 or 20 years from now will likely show a substantially different result due to the marked development of graduate opportunities in several leading universities" has not yet been realized. We continue to suffer from what he termed the "drag out of the South," and still export a considerable portion of that rare and much-needed commodity, trained scientific manpower, to other regions. However, this situation is not confined to the South. There is reason to believe that the training and location of scientists is not markedly different for the Rocky Mountain and Southwestern States.

It is largely by reason of data of this character and similar data that our southern educational and scientific leaders are very much interested in this legislation. They are anxious, however, that it will be so administered, particularly the scholarship and fellowship provisions, as to permit the development of a stronger group of institutions throughout the South for the better training of more scientists. We are anxious to encourage the training of a larger group of scientific leaders who will assist the South to staff properly its colleges, universities, and research agencies so as to provide a more effective basis for the development of our resources and for the training of better scientists. We do not object to the migration of our men in science or our leaders in other fields, but we want it to be more than a one-way traffic out of the South.

From the statistics made available by Dr. Trytten it is seen that the South is now producing about one-third of the scientists compared to the national average. Better and more scientific equipment and better trained professors are urgently needed. Moreover, first-rate laboratories will enable us to hold our first-rate men.

If there are scientific centers in a State, the people are more conscious of science and are more willing to support it. Also in terms of the general cultural value and the general diffusion of knowledge, a scientific center in a region is important. Therefore it would be for the advantage of the entire Nation to secure a better distribution of scientific research. More equitable distribution should apply not only to the South, but to the Southwest and the Rocky Mountain region which are lower than the national average in science training. According to the Steelman Report, institutions in 14 States granted no Ph. D.'s in science in the period 1936–45. Three of the States were in New England, 5 were in the South and 6 were in the Rocky Mountain region, and during the same period the universities in 26 States granted fewer than 4 percent of the total Ph. D.'s in science. On the other hand, the universities in 11 States granted 80 percent of the doctorates in science. By increasing the number of scientific centers there is no desire to curb or handicap our great universities, of which we are all proud. They should be equally included in this program but should not make up most of the expansion of training facilities under Federal aid. It should be remembered that northern and particularly eastern private universities have consistently been the recipients of large grants for research from foundations.

It might be argued that more research would be obtained by granting the funds to a few superior institutions. This would probably be true for the first few years. However, over a decade the general distribution of research centers would accomplish much more, and from the point of view of national security and welfare on which we are now spending large funds, the distribution of research centers over a wide area would be distinctly advantageous. During World War II a small number of the well-developed laboratories were used on research projects, since they were ready to expand and could produce results in a short time. However, the aims of a science foundation in peacetime are different and require a much more general expansion. In case of another national emergency we would have many high-grade laboratories on which to call for assistance.

The importance of this point of view was clearly recognized by the Bush report, Science, the Endless Frontier, published in July 1945, which made the following unequivocal recommendation:

> It is, in fact, essential to the healthy growth of science that the Foundation should help to spread the research spirit as widely as possible throughout the United States. If the recruitment of future scientific personnel is to proceed from a sufficiently broad base, it is important that as large a number of students as possible be made aware of the research point of view. Many of our colleges and engineering schools are not now able to support a significant amount of research.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I want to endorse the objectives and organization of the National Science Foundation. I also should like to emphasize several items in order that the Science Foundation will be of the greatest value to science and the Nation. First, it should be administered by a board with a chairman and should be a part of the executive branch of the Government with the same general controls which regulate other agencies. Second, because of the lower economic level of the Southern States and because their training facilities, universities, and laboratories, are not yet as well developed as the institutions of the North, Middle West, and the West the Federal funds should be granted more generously, at least for a few years, to the institutions of the South and the Rocky Mountain States. This would enable the institutions of these areas to overcome their present handicaps and achieve the level of scientific training of other sections of the Nation.

To follow the practice I advocate would merely use Federal funds to bring about a badly needed balance. Third, the Foundation's board should be empowered to grant research funds only to institutions which meet certain minimum standards which it would establish to carry out the aims of the Science Foundation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill whether he believes, in view of the extensive hearings held by the subcommittee, that this amendment is necessary, or whether he agrees with our colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] that the amendment is not necessary. Scientists and scholars from Columbia University and other great institutions of higher learning which are located in the district of New York which I have the honor to represent have told me that many excellent men in the field of scientific research, with excellent backgrounds and records, are quite restive over being picked out as special objects of investigation when they are trying to cooperate in connection with the scientific effort of the Government. That is particularly true of the younger men, who feel keenly on the subject.

Mr. PRIEST. While I want to safeguard any measure of this sort, I share the opinion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], after having looked

into this subject rather extensively during the public hearings, that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is not necessary for the legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe that the Committee of the Whole certainly ought to be guided by the view of the subcommittee, which has examined the matter so extensively, and which I am sure shares the solicitude for the Nation's security, which prompted the gentleman's amendment. We certainly want those who do the research to proceed with full confidence and enthusiasm and a conviction of the fairness of the rules in effect.

Mr. HARRIS. It is my understanding that language contained in this bill which was reported by the committee, this amendment requiring the affidavit, is the identical language that is contained in the bill providing for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. JAVITS. That ought to be sufficient to satisfy the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think the position taken by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] should be concurred in by the House. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I can say to you that the amendment offered by my beloved friend from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] would require an FBI investigation of everyone who is to come under this act, as none of this work can be conclusive. Let me point out to you that the really dangerous people in the United States are not these young students. They are people like this man Fuchs, who can fool everyone, because no one can find out what their connections are. They are the really dangerous people in the United States.

I hope that the House will not accept this amendment, as it would place undue restrictions, not upon the candidates for fellowships, if you please, but upon the members of the Scientific Board set up under this bill. At least five members would have to be satisfied that the affidavits were reasonably true. That is beyond the capabilities of the members of the Board.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that this bill proposes that the Board shall consist of 24 members? The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Florida confines the decision to five members.

Mr. HINSHAW. Any five.

Mr. HARRIS. Any 5 out of the 24.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Let me call attention to the fact that an executive board is set up of nine members. Five must be satisfied as to the truth of the affidavits. They have not got to get all of the members to agree; only five, a quorum, have to be satisfied.

Mr. HINSHAW. They cannot possibly be satisfied except upon an FBI investigation. They are not investigators.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment has been adequately discussed.

I appreciate the sincerity of my colleague from Florida with whom I have worked on the committee. I merely feel that the amendment in this respect is not necessary and is unworkable.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman states that in his opinion the Rogers amendment is unnecessary. The adoption of the Rogers amendment, however, would not hurt anything, would it? It would simply be another safeguard; and, as the gentleman has explained, only a majority of the executive board of nine would have to be satisfied as to the truth of the affidavit.

Mr. PRIEST. I think it might hurt something in this connection, that if you take the time of a majority of this board to establish questions of the truth or falsity of affidavits it might become an endless sort of trial and investigation. That, I think, does not belong in legislation of this sort. I am just as anxious as is the gentleman from Florida or any other Member of this House to see that we do not give any aid to Communists, but I do believe that it might impose on five members of the executive committee rather serious responsibilities that would require a procedure that would be pretty well endless insofar as satisfying themselves that an affidavit was true. They might have a chain of affidavits. That could be an almost endless investigation in connection with one affidavit.

The language here used is identical with the provision of the AEC Act, and in the opinion of the committee, it is the best solution of this problem.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROGERS of Florida) there were—ayes 49, noes 70.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PRIEST and Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 63, noes 73.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the following committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 19, strike out lines 6 to 10, inclusive.

Page 19, line 11, strike out "(i)" and insert "(h)."

Page 19, line 23, strike out "(j)" and insert "(i)."

Page 20, line 7, strike out "(k)" and insert "(j)."

Page 20, line 15, strike out "(l)" and insert "(k)."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this matter has been discussed at considerable length earlier in the debate this afternoon. The committee amendment would strike out the language on page 19 from line 6 to line 10, inclusive. It seems to me that this amendment ought to be kept in the bill. It merely makes sure that this Foundation cannot supersede, curtail, or limit any of the functions or activities of other government agencies, Public Health Service or Agricultural Department or Defense Department or other agencies which are carrying on scientific research and development.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], a while ago said he thought it was covered in the next subsection, beginning with line 11. I do not see how the two either overlap or are in conflict. The subsection, lines 11 to line 22, says that the funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research can be transferred, if the head of the Department or agency so wishes, to this Foundation. I think that is good. But, to keep the preceding language in that the committee is moving to strike out would not interfere with any Government agencies making their funds available to the Foundation if they thought that was the best way to carry on the particular functions.

I do not want to belabor the point. It just seems to me we ought to make sure that this new Foundation is not going to have authority to interfere with or impede or curtail or limit or take over any functions that are now being carried on by various research agencies or other departments of Government, unless the latter so desire.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I thoroughly understand the gentleman's concern with the elimination of that language. May I suggest to him that if you put that language back in again you will nullify the effect of the amendment I offered.

I call your attention to the fifth report of the President's Scientific Research Board, and its recommendations on policies. I think this is exactly the sort of procedure that should be conducted. It is entitled "Balancing Research." It calls attention to the fact that one-fourth of all medical research projects in all agencies are in determining etiology. It then goes on further to discuss every specific research program. Then it makes this recommendation:

> To the extent permitted by law, the agencies of the Government should move promptly to correct this imbalance. Because the research work of the Public Health Service is not directed to the medical problems of special population groups and because that agency has been charged by the Congress with responsibility for the health of the whole population, it should direct increased research effort to those diseases and impairments which are now receiving insufficient attention but which are major causes of death and disability.

I submit to the gentleman that with that type of a policy, knowing that we are ranging all over this field and perhaps placing too much emphasis on one thing and too little on another, we should give this Foundation power to examine the programs that they are undertaking, these people who are working in that field, and then tell us where the better emphasis could be made, and where we will get a sounder program. But, I think if you put that language back in you would, in effect, say, "Don't you even look at another agency's program."

Mr. JUDD. I do not see where the gentleman can find that meaning in the language. Rather, it says that the Foundation shall supplement, in full accordance with the gentleman's own quotation from the Hoover Commission report, where there is need or imbalance. It should determine and correct the imbalance by putting in additional research activities where they ought to be, if present agencies are not carrying them on adequately. But I do not want it to take over and operate programs that other agencies are now carrying on. It ought to supplement them, and there is nothing in the language to prevent its making recommendations for changes. That is good. But I have more confidence in the agencies that are already working in many fields and which have carried on the activities for a long time. They have invaluable experience. I want them to be left where they are, with this Foundation studying them and evaluating them, and then supplementing their work where there is any imbalance.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman has referred to the paragraph commencing in line 11 on page 19 in his discussion of the inadvisability of accepting the committee amendment which strikes out lines 6 to 10.

I call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota to the fact that in line 12 the phrase "scientific or technical research" is used, which has nothing to do with basic research. This is another instance of this Foundation going far beyond basic research. It can go into technical research.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I am as concerned as he about language in the bill in several places which could be construed to include functions far beyond those its sponsors have described to us.

But returning to the committee amendment, I cannot see how keeping those five lines in the bill can do any damage. It seems to me they constitute a necessary safeguard particularly during the first year or two when this new Foundation is getting under way. If experience demonstrates that its proper work is impeded under this language, and it cannot move to correct any imbalances that may exist, then we can take a second bite and strike it out later. But when this new Foundation is being set up, we ought to make clear just what we want it to do and not to do.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee I desire to support the committee amendment.

Let me call attention to the fact that the committee amendment strikes out the language contained in subsection (h) on page 19. There is a very good reason for striking out that langage. That language says that the activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies. It is not intended by the Foundation that it will supersede. Of course, it is supplementing, but in order for the foundation to take any action to correct overlapping and duplication of scientific research in the many agencies of Government that are now engaged in scientific research it certainly should have the opportunity of making any devices to the Bureau of the Budget or the President or even to an agency itself if that agency can be persuaded that it is overlapping or duplicating the work of some other agency. If this language is left in, it is quite possible that they will have no authority to make any such recommendation. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and I think he will agree that the language should go out of the bill.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree with the statement the gentleman has made, and I think the language should go out.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Do I correctly understand that with this language out of the bill the gentleman believes the Foundation could curtail the activities of other agencies, and could supersede or limit or otherwise interfere with their activities?

Mr. HINSHAW With the language out I think it is perfectly clear that the Heselton amendment, which provides that the Board shall evaluate scientific and research programs undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government, can be effective; that is, in the matter of evaluation. I do not see in any way that taking the language out would permit them to supersede. The language simply would not be in the act, and no questions could be raised as to whether or not they were superseding any functions of any other agency.

Mr. JUDD. If this language is removed from the bill, then the National Foundation, as the gentleman says, will not have the authority to supersede, but there would be nothing to prevent them from doing it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I know that the gentleman seeks every efficiency and economy in government. If he leaves this language contained in subsection (h) in the bill there will be no possibility of the Board's making any savings to the Federal Government by evaluating the overlapping and duplicating work that is now being done by the various agencies.

Mr. JUDD. But even with this language in the bill, the Foundation could still evaluate the activities being carried on by other agencies and could make recommendations regarding overlapping.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think it would impair the value of the work of the Board in doing that evaluating.

Now I should like to address my remarks to the gentleman from New York, who criticized the language in line 12, to the effect that funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research shall be available for transfer with the approval of the agency.

Sometimes there are funds for technical research or development which cannot go forward until certain basic or scientific research has been done. If an agency of the Government wants to do certain technical work, they must have the basic scientific knowledge. If, in order to obtain that scientific knowledge, they desire to transfer any technical research funds to the Board for the purpose of doing basic research, then they should be permitted to do so. I think the gentleman from New York is incorrect in his assumption. I hope the amendment of the committee leaving subsection (h) out of the bill will be approved by the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to propound an inquiry to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority floor leader. It is my understand that within a few moments a motion will be made for the Committee to rise. I wonder if the gentleman could inform us as to what the program will be, so far as the remainder of this bill is concerned, and on tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad that my friend made that inquiry so that I can advise the membership. It is true that after the disposition of this committee amendment the gentleman from Tennessee will move that the committee rise. The consideration of the remainder of the bill will go over to tomorrow. The first order of business tomorrow will be a motion to take from the Speaker's desk and send to conference the basing-point bill. Probably an hour will be taken on that particular question.

Following that, the continuation of the consideration of this bill will be the order of business and after that the rural rehabilitation trust funds bill will come up. How far we will go on that tomorrow I am unable to state, except that that will be the order of business.

To return to the program, it will be as printed—statehood for Alaska and then statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the committee amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened very attentively to the discussion of this measure this evening. I intend to vote for it. I am heartily in accord with the objects of this legislation. I did not intend to seek the floor or take any time until I saw that apparently something has happened that I never have known to happen before, and never expect to see happen again. You know usually when the lamb and the lion lay down together, the lamb is inside the lion before they lay down. That does not seem to be the case here. The Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Labor and, believe it or not, the National Association of Manufacturers are recommending the passage of this legislation. Who could object if none of them object?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4846) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD (at the request of Mr. HINSHAW) was granted permission to extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain extraneous quotations.

Mr. FORAND (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Missoulan, of Missoula, Mont.

Mr HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address prepared for delivery by the late Honorable S. O Bland.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on conditions in Spain.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article and an editorial.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Buffalo Courier.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the lobbying report for 1949, notwithstanding the fact that the estimated cost will be $881.50.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert an article from the American Magazine.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FUGATE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 4846.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HESELTON (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was granted permission to extend the remarks that he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain statistical data.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by the former Governor of Minnesota, Mr. Harold Stassen, at a Lincoln Day dinner.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the 8-month-old coal dispute has precipitated this Nation to the brink of disaster. The situation is beyond the critical stage. Domestic coal users in western Michigan are without fuel; municipal power plants and schools have insufficient supplies and manufacturing concerns where thousands are employed now have nearly empty coal bins.

The President should have foreseen this impending disaster months ago. Instead he has played politics in refusing to make use of the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act until it is almost too late.

The American public is fed up with Mr. Truman's shabby lack of concern over the public welfare. Today I received a letter from a union man who is fed up with the Democratic administration. The letter concludes by saying, "I have one-half ton of coal and no work."

The President's last minute and half-hearted use of the Taft-Hartley Act reminds me of a football game where the obviously better team is losing 7 to 6 in the last quarter. The better team, cocky and self-confident, has one sure-fire touchdown play which it wants to save for the final and winning play of the game. In the last second of the game the quarterback calls the winning play but it does not work for someone missed a crucial block. The game is lost for there is no time or chance for a second try.

Mr. Truman in the coal strike, by his eleventh-hour use of the Taft-Hartley Act, pulled the same type of a boner. The loss of a football game is relatively unimportant, but the loss of a nation, our Nation, vitally concerns us all. I wonder how long the American people will continue to put up with purely political strategists who worry about votes rather than the public welfare.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 496, which I sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Thursday, April 6, 1950, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, on which day remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWS RELATING TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 497), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, that immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H R. 7058) to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

WHITE HOUSE PHOTOGRAPHERS' ASSOCIATION EXHIBIT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the Members an opportunity to witness a rather unusual collection of photographs now on exhibit at the Statler Hotel. It is the seventh annual exhibit of the White House Photographers' Association. It will remain on display through Friday of this week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by the junior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter; also to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the Clearfield, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mrs. HARDEN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial written by Wheeler McMillen.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address recently made by Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor, on the subject of justice for Poland.

EXCISE TAX ON MOVIE TICKETS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have received from over 25,000 of my constituents, the good men and women of the Second Congressional District of Illinois, expression of their growing impatience with the unfair tax which the Eightieth Congress voted as a permanent and wholly unjustified burden upon their backs.

The tax upon tickets to the movie houses, where people of modest incomes find relaxation from the daily grind of work, was never intended to continue after the period of war necessity. It was adopted by a Democratic Congress strictly as a war measure, with the distinct understanding that when the war ended the tax would come off. While the war was on, our people were only too happy to pay this tax. Certainly when our soldiers were in the fox holes, no one in all America, fortunate enough to have movies to go to, complained about the hardship of paying a tax.

But the Republican Eightieth Congress voted to make this war-emergency tax a permanent peacetime tax. The Eightieth Congress did this in order to do a favor to the men and corporations in the high-income brackets. The Republican Eightieth Congress voted to make permanent the tax on the little people who attend movies so that it could get the money to pay off its debt to the big people to whom it was beholden.

The tax on tickets to the movie houses was imposed by a Democratic Congress strictly as a wartime measure. It definitely provided that the tax should end 6 months after the close of hostilities. I quote the exact words—"and ending on the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war."

Then came the Eightieth Congress which the elections of 1946 had thrown into Republican hands. The Republican leadership of the House was under heavy obligations to certain large corporations and individuals in the highest income bracket. These corporations and rich individuals insisted upon heavy cuts in their income tax rate. So in order to give these large corporations and rich individuals what they wanted and were demanding, and at the same time to have the money with which to run the Government, H. R. 1030 was introduced by Mr. Grant, Republican from the Third district of Indiana, now represented in the Eighty-first Congress by Mr. CROOK, Democrat. This bill was referred to the Republican-dominated Ways and Means Committee and on January 29, 1947, was brought to the floor of the House under what Mr. MCGREGOR, an independent Republican from Ohio, called a gag-rule procedure—see page 666 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1947. Nevertheless, the rule was adopted, H. R. 1030 was passed and eventually became Public Law 17 of the Republican Eightieth Congress.

Of the eight members from Cook County, Ill., in the Eightieth Congress now living not one Democratic Member voted for H. R. 1030, the effect of which legislation was to saddle upon men and women, and even children, who find their relaxation from toil and worry in movie attendance, the payment of taxes which by right and reason were the obligation of the big corporations and rich individuals most able to afford it.

In short, the Republican Eightieth Congress gave a break to the big corporations and rich individuals at the expense even of school children who in peacetimes had to go on paying out their pennies when they went to the movies.

You will find the roll call on the passage of this bill on pages 692-693 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1947 This is the way eight Members from Cook County, Ill., now living—two Members having since died—voted:

For the bill making permanent in peacetime the war-emergency tax on movie attendance: Vail, Busbey, Twyman, Church—all Republicans.

Against the bill permanently putting a tax on school children and their parents to help out the rich, high-bracket individuals and corporations: DAWSON, GORDON, O'BRIEN—all Democrats.

Not voting: SABATH, Democrat—SABATH was absent but was recorded as paired with COLE of Kansas. His position therefore was established in opposition to the bill.

Mr. MADDEN was one of two Democrats from Indiana in the Eightieth Congress. There are seven Democratic Members in the Eighty-first Congress; and perhaps that roll-call vote on January 29, 1947, which gave everything to the rich at the expense of the poor and those in moderate circumstances was a factor in the change of the political complexion of the Indiana delegation. Mr. MADDEN voted against the bill. Due to sickness, the other Democrat was absent. He has since retired after long years of faithful service. Eight Republican Members from Indiana voted for the bill.

Now, let us examine H. R. 1030, authored by a Republican and forced through a Republican Congress under what even an indignant independent Republican cried out was gag-rule procedure. I quote the exact language of H. R. 1030:

> Section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes) is hereby amended by striking out "and ending on the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war."

What the bill did was to make wartime taxes permanent taxes by striking out the date for their expiration.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], Democratic minority leader said—page 671 of the CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1947—that—

The fact remains that the bill, now before the House, calls for the fixing of these wartime excise taxes permanently. * * * Despite all the efforts—

Republican—

to camouflage, "indefinite" and "permanent" in the sense of legislation are synonymous. * * * Any time we pass a law without a termination date it is permanent legislation.

So by passing H. R. 1030 the Republican Eightieth Congress made permanent a tax which Democratic Congresses had restricted to the period of hostilities.

Now, let us get the entire picture perfectly clear. In 1947 it was pretty generally agreed that it was prudent and necessary to continue certain excise taxes that covered luxuries and fell upon people well able to pay. The country thought this was wise; the President said so. But the average person using his own common sense and wanting to do the right thing, did not think that among the excise taxes to be fixed upon our people permanently, when the war necessity was over, were those that forced a tribute from a mother buying baby oil for her infant or a family in modest circumstances going for a bit of relaxation to a neighborhood movie.

Such taxes never could have been made a permanent part of our lives if the Republican-dominated Rules Committee of the Eightieth Congress had permitted the membership of the House to vote on such items specifically, and, if the Republican Party did not pass the bill. What it did was to give to the House a bill, which included both the luxury and the necessity items, under a rule which prohibited amendments. It was a case of forcing the House to take the whole dose. This was what Mr. MCGREGOR called "gag-rule procedure."

Mr. KELLEY, Democrat from Pennsylvania, who voted against the bill, said, as reported on page 692 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1947:

While I recognize the necessity for continuing taxes in order to reduce the national debt and to balance the budget, I do not think there is a necessity for making a tax bill inequitable.

The committee brought this bill before the House with a rule which prevented any Member of Congress from offering amendments. * * * Many of the necessities of life are still burdened with wartime taxes. If they were luxuries, one could have no objections; but here is a bill that does not discriminate. Moreover, this bill continues these taxes indefinitely. To my mind that means permanent. * * * I could not in conscience support such a measure without an opportunity to amend it in order to correct the inequities which exist in it. All this talk by the majority party—

Republican—

about reducing taxes—it would be well for them to practice a little justice in the tax bills they do draw up.

This is the story of the way the Republican Eightieth Congress, which cut to the bone the income taxes of those in the highest brackets, made indefinite and permanent the tax on a mother buying baby oil for her infant and a family going out to the neighborhood movie.

The people of Chicago showed how they felt about it in November of 1948 when the Democrats—O'BRIEN, GORDON, DAWSON, and SABATH—who fought the battle for the little people, all were reelected by landslide majorities and three of the four Republicans who voted for H. R. 1030—Vail, Busbey, and Twyman—were defeated.

I can assure my constituents in the Second District of Illinois that their voice in 1948 being the mandate to my vote in 1950, I shall do all in my power and to the extent of my vote and influence to put an end for all time to this tax on mothers and movie-attending families that the Eightieth Congress in its passion to give aid and succor to its high-income-bracket friends made indefinite and permanent.

I think that I am safe in saying that the pattern set by the Democratic delegation from Cook County in the Eightieth Congress in opposing this law will be the pattern followed by the entire Democratic delegation from Cook County in the Eighty-first Congress in supporting the repeal of such taxes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By uanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. JONAS), for 15 days, on account of illness in hospital.

To Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. HAVENNER), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. YATES, for Monday and Tuesday, February 27 and 28, 1950, on account of official business.

To Mr. ROOSEVELT, for Monday and Tuesday, February 27 and 28, 1950, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H. R 7220 An act to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2328 An act to amend section 482 of the Revised Statutes relating to the Board of Appeals in the United States Patent Office.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1262. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 483); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1263. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1264. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of $100,000,000 in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year for assistance to the Republic of Korea (H. Doc. No. 481); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1265. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of $2,950,000,000 in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year for expenses of the European recovery program (H. Doc. No. 479); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1266. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $60,000,000 for assistance to the Republic of Korea (H. Doc. No. 480); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1267. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation, involving an increase of $6,140, for the fiscal year 1951 for the legislative branch, House of Representatives, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 484); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1268. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of judges"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1269. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Honora Redman"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report pursuant to House Resolution 238. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to undertake a study of immigration and nationality problems (Rept. No. 1687). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Committee on Public Lands. H. R 7302. A bill to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept No. 1688). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 7351. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 497. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7058, a bill to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and

for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1692). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KEE: Committee of conference. H. R. 4406. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments (Rept. No. 1693). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6462. A bill for the relief of Sachiko Iwai; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1690). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6490. A bill for the relief of Margarita Funakura; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R 7429. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to clarify certain authority of the Administrator of General Services with respect to transportation and traffic management, to provide for an adequate traffic-management service in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 7430. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, by creating a new title to provide for an adequate traffic-management service in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R 7431. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public school board at Walker, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R 7432. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to Jackson County public water supply district No. 1, Jackson County, Mo., an easement for pumping station and water pipe lines on lands of the United States at the naval industrial reserve plant, Kansas City, Mo.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 7433. A bill to direct the prompt distribution of the appropriation for the settlement of Sioux pony claims made by the act of December 31, 1945, Public Law 97, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 7434. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Providence, R. I., as "The Capt. Elwood J. Euart Veterans' Memorial Hospital"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 7435. A bill relating to the income restrictions placed upon the payment of certain pensions to the widows and children of veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 7436. A bill to supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize the expenditure of funds for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of roads certified as necessary in connection with the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7437. A bill to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H R. 7438. A bill relating to the forwarding and return of second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, the collection of postage due at the time of delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7439. A bill to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 7440. A bill to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the armed forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for active pulmonary tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 7441. A bill to promote development and improvement of standards for frozen fishery products and to provide for voluntary grading, inspection, and certification of such products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7442. A bill to provide for the common defense through the registration and classification of certain male persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H R. 7443. A bill authorizing the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, to acquire and improve a town site in Zapata County, Tex., for the relocation of communities in said county to be inundated by the waters of the Falcon Dam and Reservoir, being constructed in cooperation with Mexico under the water treaty of February 3, 1944; providing for the construction of a water and sewer system for such town site, for the relocation and construction of certain public buildings, and for the relocation of cemeteries; and providing for the exchange and conveyance of such properties in full or part payment for property to be acquired in connection with such reservoir; authorizing appropriations therefor; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 7444. A bill to deal with areas of serious unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H R. 7445. A bill authorizing the village of Baudette, State of Minnesota, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7446. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 7447. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to sound-recording materials for use in connection with moving-picture exhibits and news reels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7448. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 7449. A bill to authorize appropriations for the eradication and control of halogeton on public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. J. Res. 424. Joint resolution granting consent of Congress to an agreement or compact entered into between the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois for the creation of the Bi-State Metropolitan Development District and the establishment of the Bi-State Development Agency for the comprehensive development of the metropolitan St. Louis area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. J. Res. 425. Joint resolution to establish a National Children's Day, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. J. Res. 426. Joint resolution to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to increase the sugar quota for Puerto Rico from 910,000 short tons, raw value, to 1,150,000 short tons, raw value; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H J. Res. 427. Joint resolution consenting to the agreement or compact entered into between the State of Missouri and the State of Illionis for the comprehensive development of the St. Louis metropolitan area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 489. Resolution authorizing an inquiry into the progress of the denazification program in the American zone in Germany; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 490. Resolution to take off all taxes on bread and milk; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NOLAND:

H. Res. 491. Resolution relating to the installation of mechanism for visual recording and automatic counting of yeas and nays and of answers to quorum calls in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 492. Resolution providing for the employment of 10 additional telephone operators, office of the Clerk; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 493. Resolution providing for the employment of a foreman of laborers, Doorkeeper's department; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 494. Resolution providing for the employment of a secretary to the Sergeant at Arms; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. Res 495. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting an investigation by the Committee on the District of Columbia pursuant to House Resolution 340, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to lowering the high cost of food; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the pass-

ing of anti-poll-tax legislation; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the passing of antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, urging that the attempt to eliminate or reduce the depletion allowance on natural resources be defeated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H R. 7450. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Malvina Davoli, nee Passini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H R. 7451. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Fujita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R 7452. A bill for the relief of Alice Moriyoshi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H R 7453. A bill for the relief of the Farmers Mutual Fire Insurance Co. of Sumner County, Tenn ; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 7454 A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Preston Watters, the estate of Mrs. Jessie Nivens Watters, and the estate of J. W. Gillum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H R 7455. A bill for the relief of Edward C Brunett, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. KING·

H R 7456 A bill for the relief of Daniel H Dulity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH.

H R 7457. A bill for the relief of Frank Lindsen, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H R 7458 A bill for the relief of Jonna Marie Rasmussen; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois·

H R 7459 A bill for the relief of Dr. John M Maniatis; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H R. 7460 A bill to exempt certain real property in the District of Columbia from taxation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H R 7461. A bill for the relief of Edward Pittwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1909 By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of approximately 1,200 railway employees, requesting that the railway pension law be amended to read that it will be optional for railway employees to receive their annuity on reaching the age of 60 and having 20 years of railroad service or 30 years of service regardless of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1910. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 95 residents of Ellwood City, Lawrence County, Pa., in opposition to the Fogarty bill, H. R. 1570; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1911. By Mr. HAGEN: Resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis on February 9, 1950, petitioning the Congress to review the question of salaries for members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and to establish their annual salaries at levels commensurate with the responsibilities of their positions, with a view to achieving the highest type of public service in the field of monetary and banking policy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1912. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to lower the high cost of food; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1913. Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass antipoll-tax legislation; to the Committee on House Administration.

1914. Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1915. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition requesting passage of legislation that would prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

1916. By Mr MILLER of California: Petition of the commissioners of the Housing Authority of the City of Alameda, Calif., requesting passage of S 2246, a bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1917. By Mr. SHORT: Petitions of Mrs. James Mason, Dr. Kenneth Glover, Abb Hulen, Virgil Walker, and many others, of Mount Vernon and Lawrence County, urging the passage of the Langer bill, S 1847, and the Bryson bill, H R. 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1918 Also, petition of the Joplin unit of Missouri Cosmetologists Association, urging the Congress to repeal the wartime excise tax on all cosmetics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1919 By Mr SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Walworth County Petroleum Industries Committee, Walworth County, Wis., urging immediate and outright repeal of the Federal gasoline and lubricating-oil taxes and the Federal automotive excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means

1920. Also, resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanian-Americans held under the auspices of the local branch of Lithuanian-American Council, Inc , favoring immediate ratification of the convention outlawing genocide by the United States Senate; denouncing the Soviet policy of destruction of native population and take effective steps to make Russia respect the principles of the declaration of human rights; urging the Government to use its power and influence to help Lithuania and other Baltic States to regain their freedom and sovereign rights in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and Charter of the United Nations, and not to make peace settlement with Soviet Russia until this has been achieved, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

1921. By Mr. WALTER· Petition of Pennsylvania Cooperative Potato Growers, Inc., Allentown, Pa., opposing the continued price-support program of the Federal Government on potatoes in any form, to the Committee on Agriculture.

1922. By the SPEAKER: Petition of O. A. Richardson, president St. Joseph County Industrial Union Council, South Bend, Ind., supporting the enactment of S. 110 and H. R. 1380, Labor Extension Service bills; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1923. Also, petition of J. E. Batten, Jr., president, McDowell County Education Association, Welch, W. Va., reaffirming its stand in favor of Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1924. Also, petition of Mrs. Clair J. Butterfield, president, Edinboro State Teachers College, Edinboro, Pa., requesting that full support be given Senate bill 246 with certain provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious Father, as our thoughts are hushed to silence may we find Thee moving upon our minds, higher than our highest thought yet nearer to us than our very selves. Before the toil of a new day opens before us we lay before Thee the meditations of our hearts: May they be acceptable in Thy sight.

Prepare us for the solemn role committed to our fallible hands in this appalling day, with its vast issues that concern not only our own dear land, but all the continents and the islands of the sea. Make us ministers of that love which will not halt its growing sway until it joins all nations and kindreds and tongues and peoples into one great fraternity. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 27, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. MURRAY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MURRAY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and the remainder of the week.

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet briefly at 3 o'clock this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Hoey	Maybank
Bricker	Humphrey	Millikin
Bridges	Hunt	Morse
Butler	Ives	Mundt
Byrd	Jenner	Murray
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Chapman	Johnson, Tex	Neely
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Connally	Kefauver	Robertson
Cordon	Kerr	Russell
Donnell	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Sparkman
Ecton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Lodge	Taylor
Ferguson	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarran	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tydings
George	McClellan	Watkins
Green	McKellar	Wherry
Gurney	McMahon	Wiley
Hayden	Magnuson	Williams
Hendrickson	Malone	Withers
Hill	Martin	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCCARRAN obtained the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Nevada yield so the Chair can, without objection, recognize Senators who wish to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senators will be recognized for the transaction of routine business.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take 1 minute at this time to make a short statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yesterday the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "MCCARTHY'S Creaking Limb." It dealt in detail with one of the 81 cases which I discussed on the Senate floor the other night—No. 9. At that time I read from the State Department's loyalty files, which showed that this young man did not get clearance from that Department but subsequently ended up as a White House speech writer. I did not make his name public. Mr. Lloyd, however, recognized the case and stated that he was the young man described—which is true.

It is interesting to note that neither Mr. Lloyd nor Mr. Edson, the writer of this article, in any way question the accuracy of the information which I quoted from the State Department files. I gather from the article that Mr. Lloyd's defense is that he did not realize that the Communist-front organizations which he joined were actually Communist controlled—which, of course, is entirely possible. I understand further from the article that Lloyd claims that in 1945 he went to Europe and his eyes were opened, and, as he says, "it became clear" to him what the Communists were aiming for.

This article would indicate the wisdom of my refusal to go along with the demand of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to make all names public before the committee had a chance to investigate each case, in that it does indicate the possibility of some of those persons having reformed or having been dupes of the Communist-controlled organizations.

I am inclined to question Mr. Lloyd's reformation, however, in view of his subsequent actions. For example, he prepared a document entitled "President Truman's Loyalty Program," which was furnished to all the White House ghost writers as background material. In this article he very vigorously extolled the virtues of one of Russia's top espionage agents, Alger Hiss. From this article, which was written after Hiss was exposed, it appears that if this young man had his way, Hiss would be back in the State Department, handling secret material and still helping to shape our foreign policy.

I cannot help being suspicious of a reform when the reformer still pleads the old cause.

It is interesting to note, incidentally, that Mr. Lloyd wrote the President's Oklahoma City speech in which he defended his stand insofar as Reds in government are concerned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AUDIT REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report) to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Public Health Service, for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the high cost of food; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) on February 27, 1950, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2368.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of anti-poll-tax legislation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) on February 27, 1950, p. 2368, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of antilynching legislation; ordered to lie on the table.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) on February 27, 1950, p. 2368, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Josephine Hudson, and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Washington Society of Professional Engineers, of Seattle, Wash., favoring an amendment to House bill 1188, defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a board of registration for professional engineers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Worsham Post No. 40, American Legion of Kentucky, of Henderson, Ky., signed by Lucien M. Trimpe, post commander, relating to the Hoover Commission report advocating dismemberment of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Letters in the nature of petitions from Lt. Clyde Doyle, Jr., Post No. 9499, of Bellflower, Calif; the Lower Yellowstone Auxiliary to Post No. 4099, of Sidney, Mont; the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Montana, of Havre, Mont.; the Orange County Council of Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Garden Grove, Calif., and the Rayol A. Canfield Auxiliary to Post No. 1087, of Great Falls, Mont., all of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, praying for the enactment of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

A telegram signed by Louis B. Seltzer, chairman, and John Kras, secretary, of Cleveland, Ohio, embodying a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the alleged abduction and forcible detention of certain Greek children; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, of New Orleans, La., relating to submerged tidelands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Oneonta Park Chapter, Daughters of the

American Revolution, of South Pasadena, Calif., signed by Mrs C H. Oneal, corresponding secretary, praying for the enactment of legislation to more adequately protect the American flag (with an accompanying paper), to the Commmittee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Pennsylvania Lodge, Fraternal Order of Police, of Harrisburg, Pa., signed by John D. Coleman, recording secretary, relating to the internal security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by Ray-Crider-McNabb Post 5595, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Princeton, Ky., Presbyterian Woman's Association, of Xenia, Ohio, Catharine Green Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Xenia, Ohio, and the New London Business and Professional Women's Club, of New London, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Legislative Committee of the Philadelphia Joint Board of Textile Workers Union of America, of Philadelphia, Pa., signed by Oscar Dewease, chairman, praying for the enactment of the so-called labor extension bill, ordered to lie on the table

Resolutions adopted by the St Joseph County Industrial Union Council, of South Bend, Ind., and Local No. 231, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, of St Louis, Mo., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 110 and House bill 1380, the so-called labor extension bills, ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Resolutions adopted by the Frederick Junior Chamber of Commerce, Inc., and the Study Committee of the Maryland Committee for Representative Government, of Baltimore, both in the State of Maryland, favoring the adoption of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments

A petition of sundry citizens of Takoma Park, Md., praying the enactment of legislation to balance the budget and reduce the cost of government, to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Resolutions adopted by the Queen Anne's County Petroleum Industries Committee, the Somerset County Petroleum Industries Committee, and the Worcester County Petroleum Industries Committee, all in the State of Maryland, favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the excise tax on gasoline, to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Maryland, Virginia, and District of Columbia Council of Brewery, Yeast, and Soft Drink Workers, favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal Federal excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance

A resolution adopted by John R Webb Post No 3265, Veterans of Foreign Wars, protesting against the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, favoring the strengthening of the United Nations and its development into a world federation, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Council of Lithuanian Societies, of Baltimore, Md., favoring the ratification of the genocide convention; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Woman's Auxiliary to the Baltimore City (Md.) Medical Society, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INDEPENDENCE FOR LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA—RESOLUTION

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Americans of Lithuanian descent assembled on the 12th day of February 1950, in Greenfield, Mass., to commemorate the anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian nation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Americans of Lithuanian descent assembled this 12th day of February 1950, in Greenfield, Franklin County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to commemorate the anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian nation, have unanimously declared that in view of—

(a) The ethnic, cultural, and linguistic individuality and the political traditions of the Lithuanian people;

(b) The ancient Lithuanian statehood dating back to the year 1200 A. D., its splendid historical record of tolerance, of individual, racial, linguistic, and cultural liberty;

(c) The long unceasing and determined struggle of the Lithuanian people against the foreign Muscovite domination and oppression;

(d) The heroic sacrifices of each succeeding generation of the Lithuanian people in the great mass insurrections of 1794–96, 1812, 1863–64, 1905, 1918–20, and the epic Lithuanian fight for the basic human rights, for human dignity, for the freedom of the press and of the printed Lithuanian word during the 40-year suppression of all Lithuanian literary activities, 1864–1904;

(e) The imposition by the Soviet Union, by threat of superior force and connivance with Nazi German war criminals, of a mutual-assistance pact on October 10, 1939, whereby Lithuania granted and leased to the Soviet Union military bases in the strategic centers of Lithuania in exchange for a solemn Russian guaranty of the independence of Lithuania and of Russian noninterference in the domestic, political, social, and economic order of the country;

(f) The Soviet invasion of Lithuania June 15, 1940, violating all treaties—peace pact, the nonaggression pact, and the mutual assistance pact with a guaranty of the political independence and noninterference in the domestic affairs—then and now in force between the Soviet Union and the sovereign Republic of Lithuania,

(g) The Atlantic Charter declaration holding out a promise of the restoration of sovereignty to the peoples forcibly deprived of same and the subsequent embodiment of the Atlantic Charter as a part of the declaration of the United Nations including the Soviet Union on January 1, 1942,

(h) The effective Lithuanian underground liberation struggle during 3 years of German occupation and continuing to this date, directed against Soviet attempts to annihilate Lithuania as a sovereign nation Therefore, be it

Resolved, To call on the Congress of the United States to create conditions enabling—

The formation of broadly representative interim governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia,

The repatriation of Baltic deportees from Siberia and northern Russian exile, under the supervision of the United Nations;

The evacuation of the Russian troops, police, and Communist Party apparatus from the territories of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia helping the sovereign peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to restore their democratic self-governments after the harrowing experiences of three successive hostile occupations; and

The initiation of a move for an immediate admission of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, still full-fledged members of the League of Nations, into the United Nations Organization.

ANDREW W. DEDINAS,
ALEX STEFFINS.
ALBERT F. TOMULIS.
LUCY YAKIM SOKOLSKI.
ANTONINA STEFFINS.
JOHN DUNEVICH.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Pulaski Post, No. 562, of the American Legion, Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation designating October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN LEGION, PULASKI POST NO. 562, OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF., ON JANUARY 20, 1950, MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PASS, AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO APPROVE, IF PASSED, THE GENERAL PULASKI DAY RESOLUTION NOW PENDING IN CONGRESS

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Hampshire, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1949, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Pulaski Post No 562, of the City of Los Angeles and State of California:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from California.

PHILIP A. FINIE,
Post Commander.
FRANK A. HARASICK,
Americanism Chairman.
JOHN KULCZYK,
Post Adjutant.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. GREEN, Mr KILGORE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S 3144 A bill to reestablish a Civilian Conservation Corps, to provide for the conservation of natural resources and the development of human resources through the employment of youthful citizens in the performance of useful work, including job training and instruction in good work habits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S 3145. A bill to amend the act of June 20, 1949, so as to extend retroactively benefits for members and dependents of members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffered disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in training, and

S 3146 A bill to enable any commissioned officer who was discharged, retired, or released from active service without retirement pay for physical disability to obtain a review of his entitlement to retirement pay for physical disability; to the Committee on Armed Services

(Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr BENTON, Mr SCHOEPPEL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr O'CONOR, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr BREWSTER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. BUTLER, Mr DOWNEY, Mr. CAIN, Mr. FREAR, Mr CAPEHART, Mr. GREEN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr LEHMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. THYE, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOEY, Mr PEPPER, Mr WILEY, Mr HUNT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. NEELY) introduced Senate bill 3147, to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S 3148 A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chester B. Ingle, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR (by request):

S 3149 A bill for the relief of Irene Garland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr PEPPER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is a revision of S. 1946, to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, now pending on the calendar. This revised bill, I believe, satisfies all the objections raised to the original bill, namely, (1) that the Commission should be temporary in order that the Congress might have an opportunity to review its activities before establishing it as a permanent body; (2) that its membership should be reduced to facilitate prompt action; and (3) that the panel form of selection be eliminated to enable a wider selection of membership. I also point out that the creation of this Commission carries out the cardinal recommendation of the Hoover Commission in the field of Federal-State relations.

I may say that we should welcome the additional sponsorship of any and all Senators not already on the bill.

The bill (S. 3147) to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

INVESTIGATION OF MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES BY BULLION BROKERS, ETC.

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 234), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete investigation of any and all monopolistic, collusive, coercive, fraudulent, or discriminatory practices or other practices in restraint of trade or tending to lessen competition which are or may be in violation of the antitrust laws, engaged in by bullion brokers or fabricators of silver or manufacturers or distributors of silver compounds, alloys, or other silver products, including, but not limited to, (1) the degree of concentration of monopolistic power in the hands of a single bullion broker or fabricator or group of bullion brokers or group of fabricators or group of brokers and fabricators; (2) the extent of control exercised over wholesale and retail prices and over the spread of prices between or among such brokers, fabricators, manufacturers, and distributors, and the way in which and means by which such control may be exercised, (3) price discrimination, and pricing policies or practices, trade practices or other practices resulting in discrimination in favor of or against certain buyers or classes or groups of buyers, or in favor of or against certain sellers or classes or groups of sellers; (4) control or attempted control or manipulation or attempted manipulation of the world price of silver, and the extent and effects thereof; (5) control or attempted control or manipulation or attempted manipulation of the domestic price of silver, and the extent and effects thereof; (6) agreements, combinations, or concerted or collusive action intended or tending to injure, restrain, or coerce, or to prevent or hinder the establishment or growth of, a competitor or competitors.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, together with such recommendations for legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee

CARE OF MEMORIAL OF REV PHINEAS D GURLEY, FORMER CHAPLAIN OF SENATE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have been requested by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is temporarily out of the Chamber, to submit a resolution in his behalf and to precede it with the statement prepared by him which I now read:

Mr President, the grave of one of the most illustrious Chaplains of the United States Senate, Rev Phineas D. Gurley, Presbyterian minister of the New York Avenue Church of this city during the Civil War period, is badly in need of repair and perpetual care

Dr. Gurley was Chaplain of the Senate in 1858 and for some time thereafter. He was spiritual advisor to President Lincoln during the Civil War years. He died in 1868 and is buried in this city, at Glenwood Cemetery, where a monument was erected to his memory by devoted parishioners

In late years this monument and the grave have not been cared for. It will cost a sum of $425 to reset the stone and provide perpetual care for the grave.

In respect for Chaplain Gurley's service to the Senate and to President Lincoln, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution to provide for the care of his memorial.

The resolution (S. Res. 235), submitted by Mr. MARTIN (for Mr. WHERRY), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Glenwood Cemetery, Lincoln Road, northeast Washington, D. C., the sum of $425, upon receipt by him of such assurances as he may deem necessary that such sum will be used for repairs to the monument erected at the grave of the Rev. Phineas D. Gurley, a former Chaplain of the Senate, and for perpetual care of such grave.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'CONOR submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the

amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and other Senators) to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7207) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL AT THE NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD WEEK OBSERVANCE

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL at the National Brotherhood Week observance held in Baltimore on February 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington," delivered by him on February 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON THE SIGNING OF THE NIAGARA DIVERSION TREATY

[Mr LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by him on February 27, 1950, in connection with the signing of the Niagara Diversion Treaty between the United States and Canada, which appears in the RECORD]

ADDRESSES AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO HON ALBERT W. HAWKES

[Mr BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses at a testimonial dinner given to Hon Albert W. Hawkes, former Senator from New Jersey, by the New Jersey Chapter, Pro America, at Hotel Suburban, East Orange, N. J., October 27, 1949, which appear in the Appendix]

RELATIONS BETWEEN IRELAND AND THE UNITED STATES—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of February 28, 1950, commenting on a dinner in honor of Hon. Sean Nunan, retiring Minister of Eire, which appears in the Appendix]

JAYCEE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD TO ALFRED JAMES DICKINSON

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a citation awarding the Jaycee Distinguished Service Award to Alfred James Dickinson, of Richmond, Va., which appears in the Appendix]

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—EDITORIAL FROM THE EVENING STAR

[Mr STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Valuable 'Publicity Medium,'" from the Washington Evening Star of February 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS LEGISLATION—ARTICLE FROM THE LABOR RECORD

[Mr LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding displaced persons legislation, from the Labor Record of Joliet, Ill., for February 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZED GAMBLING — EDITORIAL FROM THE SAN ANGELO STANDARD-TIMES

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gambling Problem," from the San Angelo Standard-Times of February 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PUBLIC INTEREST IN ORGANIZED CRIME—ARTICLES BY BOB CONSIDINE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD six news articles written by Bob Considine, of the International News Service, relating to alleged national syndicates of gamblers, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Mary C. Barlow, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to fill a new position, and

Thomas C. Scalley, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to fill a new position.

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE AND NAVIGATION WITH IRELAND—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive H, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation between the United States of America and Ireland, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Dublin on January 21, 1950. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the treaty, and the treaty, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and Ireland, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Dublin on January 21, 1950. The enclosed treaty is a comprehensive instrument which takes into account the developments in international relationships during the past century and is intended to meet effectively the needs of the present day. I consider this treaty to be an important manifestation of the friendly relations between the United States of America and Ireland and commend it to the early consideration of the Senate.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the minutes of interpretation, initialed on the same date the treaty and protocol were signed, and a report on the treaty made to me by the Secretary of State.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1950.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, with protocol, signed at Dublin January 21, 1950; (3) copy of minutes of interpretation, initialed at Dublin January 21, 1950.)

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain editorials, newspaper articles, communications, and resolutions bearing on the subject of displaced persons.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 4, 1950]

INTERVIEWER PROTESTS AND LOSES HIS JOB

(By William Moore)

WASHINGTON, February 3.—Tired of "whitewashing" fake displaced persons for the Displaced Persons Commission, Edward M. Glazek told a Senate subcommittee today, he complained to Chairman Ugo Carusi of the DPC Carusi, Glazek said, fired him.

Glazek was an assistant selector for the DPC in Germany until last summer. He appeared voluntarily today before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, which is studying the new bill to raise the number of DP's admitted to this country.

CHARGES FRAUD, BRIBERY

He told Senator Jenner (Republican, Indiana), Richard Arens, subcommittee staff director, and Frank Schroeder, investigator, that:

1. Fake DP's are being admitted to this country through wholesale fraud and bribery.

2. Bona fide DP's are being kept out in order that their places may be given to foreigners who never were DP's.

3. Many of those being cleared for immigration to the United States were enemies of this country in the war, and these include murderers and perpetrators of atrocities

4 DPC staffs are under orders not to interview suspected applicants, and to approve their applications as quickly as possible.

5. The United States is taking those who are left after other nations have taken the "cream" of the refugees.

ACTED UNDER ORDERS

Glazek, who lives in Detroit, brought with him copies of the papers he issued to refugees. He pointed out obvious fraudulent statements by the applicants and then told how he justified the frauds to make the applicants eligible to come to the United States.

"This is how I whitewashed this one," he would say, and then give his explanation.

"I am ashamed of this whitewashing, but I was acting under orders."

"You finally ran out of whitewash and had to quit?" asked JENNER.

"That's right," replied Glazek.

ORDERED TO SHUT EYES

Glazek said the International Refugee Organization, which is the global DP unit, would not permit questioning of the papers it issues. The DPC, the American unit, he said, ordered him and the other workers not to investigate, and not to interview suspected applicants. Instructions were, he said, that adverse reports by the Army counterintelligence on suspected subversives were to be given little credence.

Applicants who inadvertently gave information that would have barred them, he said, were told how to correct their statements, and the DPC employees frequently took bribes for this service.

Sometimes, Glazek said, he violated orders and refused to admit a favored applicant. Glazek said his superiors then sent the applicant to another selector and got the applicant approved.

[From the Mobile Press Register of February 8, 1950]

VITAL FOR AMERICA TO GUARD AGAINST INFLUX OF DANGEROUS ALIEN ELEMENTS

Unless the American people are willing to see their country become dangerously infested from abroad by a new motley horde of stinkers, they had better begin listening more carefully to the warnings of such men as United States Senator PAT MCCARRAN of Nevada.

Senator MCCARRAN, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, is in excellent position to know the score on the alien menace to which a namby-pamby immigration policy would expose the Nation For one of the duties of his committee is to handle immigration legislation.

Thus when Senator MCCARRAN sounds an alarm, as he has done at the present session of Congress, his words cannot wisely be ignored or lightly dismissed.

Every American citizen who is adequately interested in the future national well-being has cause to alert himself against imminent danger in the face of Senator MCCARRAN'S statements about alien smuggling and pressure-group scheming to use the displaced-persons law as a gangplank for unloading a vast polyglot swarm of foreigners upon the United States.

Senator MCCARRAN declares that pressure groups are using a relatively few war-displaced persons, virtually all of whom are being resettled or repatriated, for the purpose of destroying our immigration barriers, to the end that this country will be inundated with a flood of aliens.

That statement of a United States Senator is something for every American who loves his country to ponder—and ponder now, before the damage emerges from a state of potentiality into a fait accompli.

The United States of America is beset by enough problems and worries without falling hook, line, and sinker for a world-wide displaced-persons racket.

Nobody who places a proper value on established American institutions and national security will ever consent to proclaiming the United States a wholesale dumping ground for all manner of foreign elements.

But the American people need to do more than simply refrain from consent. They need to respond to Senator MCCARRAN'S appeal for expressions to Congress—expressions of a character that will help hold the dikes of our protective immigration system.

Senator MCCARRAN says facts developed through study and investigation point to the inescapable conclusion that the floodgates of this Nation are being pried open for the entrance of millions of aliens, from the turbulent populations of the entire world, who are seeking admission into the United States under the guise of displaced persons.

He emphasizes that by the time this country's present displaced-persons law expires there will be hardly any bone fide war-displaced persons in the whole of central Europe.

"At the end of the war," says the Nevadan, "the Allied armies in central Europe became the guardians of approximately 8,000,000 persons who had been displaced during the war.

"Within a few months after the war, approximately 7,000,000 of these persons were repatriated to their native countries, leaving about 1,000,000 persons who, because of fear of persecution, refused to return to their homelands.

"By the expiration date of our present displaced-persons law (June 30, 1950), there will remain only a few thousand such war-displaced persons in central Europe, other than the so-called hard core who, because of social or physical disqualifications, are ineligible for resettlement."

Why, then, all the clamor to fix it so great droves of other foreigners can stream into the United States under the false pretense of being war-displaced persons?

Why should this country throw open its immigration gates to everything alien from riffraff to unknown?

If aliens fraudulently parading as war-displaced persons are to be imported into the United States on reckless scale and turned loose to do whatever mischief they choose, from swindling to spying, how does it happen that American taxpayers have been sending billions of dollars abroad to help rebuild foreign economies?

Is the real idea of the generous gift giving by the United States simply to tide over countless thousands among alien populations until they can be brought to the United States under a bogus label of having been displaced by war?

There is grave danger for the safety of this Nation in spurning caution to permit a harum-scarum alien infiltration.

Senator MCCARRAN sees unwise laxity in administering the present displaced-persons law.

Of this he says: "Inadequate screening of applicants, with little or no regard for background, political beliefs, and predilections of applicants, has opened the gates to persons who will not become good citizens and who will become ready recruits in subversive organizations to tear down the democracy of the United States."

That is a severe and shocking indictment of the administration of the law.

Senator MCCARRAN points out (and this is something else for all solid Americans to ponder) that "the Attorney General of the United States recently testified that an analysis of 4,984 of the more militant members of the Communist Party in the United States showed that 91.4 percent of the total were of foreign stock or were married to persons of foreign stock."

Americans afflicted with the kind of sentimentality that makes them easy prey of opponents of cautious immigration policy should hurry to their doctor if unimpressed by this statement of the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

On top of the alien menace that can bore its way into the country through ordinary immigration channels unless due vigil is maintained, the smuggling of aliens is a source of danger.

Senator MCCARRAN calls attention to this by reminding that during the last year 412 smugglers of aliens were arrested, but, of course, the number who were actually smuggled into the United States is unknown.

How many untrustworthy and dangerous foreigners have come into the United States within the last several years by hook or crook or other means?

How many foreign-born and offspring of foreign-born have adopted criminal careers in the United States?

Whoever assumes the number is small or anything like it does not keep up with the daily police news. Foreign names stand out conspicuously in the ranks of the Nation's underworld, among the racketeers, gangsters, and killers.

Remove the elements of alien stock, influence, and trait, and major crime in the United States would by no means approach its present proportions.

Instead of weakening its guard and relaxing its watch, the United States should show more diligent concern about the alien situation. For this situation, if neglected, threatens disastrous consequences for the United States.

Senator MCCARRAN has sounded warnings which ought to be sufficient for all genuine, thinking Americans, native and otherwise.

Many high-caliber Americans have come from abroad and meant much to the country, of course. Others will come and receive a deserved welcome. The urgent immigration job confronting the Nation is to rule out the foul and dangerous.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF ARIZONA,
Globe, Ariz., February 7, 1950.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I received your booklet relative to displaced persons. This is to inform you that the Department of Arizona, Veterans of Foreign Wars, is wholly in sympathy with your viewpoint. In fact, at a council of administration meeting at which members of the VFW from all over the State gathered, it was unanimously voted on to be against, as you state, "opening the floodgates of this Nation for the entrance of millions of aliens from the turbulent populations of the entire world." In fact, the council was in favor of making the immigration laws more stringent.

I am sending a copy of this letter to each of our Congressmen and Senators from this State

Very truly yours,
BARRY DE ROSE,
Department Commander.

HARDY, ARK., *February 11, 1950.*

Hon PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: At a regular, scheduled meeting of this combined Veterans of Foreign Wars and American Legion, Posts 4677, 92, I, as commander of the VFW, read your pamphlet on the evils of unrestrained immigration.

I'd like to impress you with the fact that the ex-servicemen in this community take this matter very seriously. As a former enforcement officer in the Immigration and Naturalization Service, I have been able to explain the ramifications of immigration and naturalization to these men. I am aware of the fact that our immigration and naturalization is, and always has been, hampered by lack of funds and personnel.

Almost every man in these two outfits has served overseas in War I or II. They have seen the evil of the radical groups and realize that there is small hope of assimilation of these pressure groups. All seem to feel that our Government should confine itself to the healthy admission of aliens on the quota and nonquota plans as heretofore worked out by Congress. All feel that some small percentage of people should, in compassion, be allowed to enter under the displaced person plan. This after very careful mental, physical, and political scrutiny.

In the matter of unrestrained admission of aliens to this country, the veterans who have by their sacrifices preserved this country, are, in this locality, unanimous in their declaration that this should not be allowed. These combined veterans' posts appeal to you to

use every means in your power to put a stop to this condition once and for all. These posts apply to you for alleviation of the abysmal ignorance on immigration that seems to be prevalent in this country and makes these abuses possible.

In the hope that you will keep us informed and assuring you of our support in your campaign, I am

Respectfully,

THOMAS E. HARDY.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
BEVERAGE DEPARTMENT,
Jacksonville, Fla., February 6, 1950.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Permit me to acknowledge and to thank you for your statement on "Displaced Persons: Facts vs. Fiction" which you were kind enough to send me.

After 34 years in the Government service, 12 of which were in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, as special agent and special agent in charge, I am thoroughly convinced that many of these so-called displaced persons are fictions and are rapidly taking jobs in our country that should go to American-born citizens, thus increasing, from year to year, our unemployed situation.

Also, permit me to state that I am in hearty accord with your reasoning on page 6 (top) in which you say:

"I am confident, on the basis of my investigation that there is a complete breakdown in the administration of the law Inadequate screening of applicants, with little or no regard for background, political beliefs, and predilections of applicants, has opened the gates to persons who will not become good citizens and who will become ready recruits in subversive organizations to tear down the democracy of the United States"

Very truly yours,

HOWARD P. WRIGHT,
Special Investigator.

JANUARY 21, 1950

Whereas for the last 2½ years a Senate committee has been investigating our entire immigration and naturalization system; and

Whereas their report shows that the floodgates of our Nation are opened for the entrance of millions of aliens from all over the world who are coming in as displaced persons; and

Whereas certain pressure groups have been lobbying in the Congress for the repeal of all our safeguards on immigration and are spending millions of dollars for the dissemination of propaganda for that purpose; and

Whereas our country operates under an immigration-quota system, whereby approximately 154,000 quota immigrants may be admitted every year for permanent residence, also United States citizens may bring in their relatives on a nonimmigration quota; and

Whereas certain pressure groups are trying to drive the Celler bill (H. R. 4567) through the Senate, which provides the admission of some 15,000 persons from behind the iron curtain who have not yet been displaced; and

Whereas an official of our principal intelligence agency (operating abroad), expressed his opinion that this provision of the Celler bill would constitute a dangerous threat to the security of the United States and would be another loophole for the infiltration of Communist agents; and

Whereas upon uncontested evidence of a complete break-down in the administration of the immigration law which has opened the gates to persons who will not become good citizens, but will become ready recruits in subversive organizations to tear down the democracy of the United States; and

Whereas during the first 6 months of 1949, illegal entries over the Mexican border were at a rate of 25,000 a month and a former American consul on the Canadian border estimated the number of illegal aliens in the United States to be from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of the Potomac, in regular convention assembled this 21st day of January 1950, That we will oppose with all our strength and will immediately inform our members of the United States Senate that they must protect our immigration system and promptly provide funds for the detection and deportation of these thousands upon thousands of aliens who have illegally entered our borders; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Senator PAT MCCARRAN, with the request that he place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MARGARET HOPKINS WORRELL,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee,
Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.

WASHINGTON GROVE, MD., *February 8, 1950*

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You may have seen the enclosed clipping in the Washington Post of February 8, 1950. If you have, or when you are through with it, will you please place it in the hands of one of your committee members, who may need it? The facts therein are not overdrawn.

It does seem to me nothing less than criminal for Congress to open our country to a horde of undesirables who are, in the main, coming here because Americans are suckers and just ripe to be exploited. Obviously many get here by fraud, bribes, perjury, and other forms of crookedness, and they will continue, when here, to have the attitude that they can continue living here by fraud, crookedness, bribes, and the like. Ten years from now, the American people will wake up to the fact that a lot of slick pressure groups not interested in the welfare of the United States, but for their own particular pals in Europe, have succeeded in saddling our country with the most undesirable of all of Europe's riffraff.

Respectfully,

OSCAR E. LANCASTER.

P S—The hordes that poured out of Russia and now are pressuring to get into the United States clearly did not leave Russia because they were opposed to communism, but because they knew they could not exploit the Communists as readily as they could exploit us.

O E L.

[From the Washington Post of February 8, 1950]

DP PROGRAM IN MARYLAND UNDER ATTACK

(By John W. Ball)

Widespread dissatisfaction among farmers in the Washington area over the resettlement of displaced persons on nearby farms was given pointed expression in Anne Arundel County, Md., yesterday.

There the three-man committee, appointed by Gov. William Preston Lane, Jr., to direct the resettlement program, resigned. A stinging criticism of the conduct of the DP program, which the three called "slovenly" as well as "wholly inefficient and uncoordinated," accompanied their resignation.

"We have been bitterly disillusioned," Benjamin Watkins 3d of Davidsonville, chairman; Charles B. Lynch, and J. Irving King wrote. "Our experiences force us to the conclusion that the program as now operated is not in the best interests of the Maryland farmer, not indeed in the best interests of the United States."

The DP situation in Maryland and Virginia has been the subject of scores of complaints. The Maryland Farm Bureau on January 11 registered bitter disappointment and asked for stiff laws governing DP's now here.

On December 31, a total of 402 families listing 196 persons had been brought into Maryland, records show.

Anne Arundel got fewer than most counties. The records a month earlier showed Queen Anne County with 41 families and 11 persons the largest. Howard had 36 families and 88 persons; Carroll 31 families and 78 persons; Charles County 15 families and 67 persons; Prince Georges 13 families and 46 persons, Anne Arundel 2 families and 36 persons; Montgomery 9 families and 30 persons; Calvert 8 families and 35 persons; and St. Mary's 2 families and 9 persons.

In January State officials estimated that 40 percent of the DP's had left their sponsoring farms, some within a week of their arrival.

A recent congressional report showed Virginia, Maryland, and Mississippi as the only three States dissatisfied with operation of the DP program.

Maryland farmers, according to David L. B. Fringer, Maryland employment service director said, suffer from chronic shortage of skilled farm labor. At the same time there is a surplus of unskilled labor. When the DP program started, it was thought Maryland offered a great opportunity to skilled farm hands.

Instead, all types of workers, from dentists and doctors to butchers, shoemakers, and even a 10-year professor of civil engineering in a large European college, were imported as skilled farm hands.

UKRAINIANS TOP LIST

The majority in Maryland were Ukrainians, brought by the United Ukrainian-American Relief Association Other agencies bringing in DP's were the National Catholic Welfare Society, the Lutheran League, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid, Church World Service, United Service for the New Americans, and the Friends Society

"We feel that in giving asylum to the oppressed and needy refugees we would be giving new hope to people desperately in need of assistance," the Anne Arundel committeemen wrote.

"We assumed that they would be carefully screened, and that we would be opening the door of opportunity to people who were qualified for the work that they had represented themselves competent to do * * * and who desired, above all things, to attain citizenship.

"DEVOID OF GRATITUDE

"It has been our experience that while some are giving a high degree of satisfaction, many who have had extraordinarily fine placements have not only been unqualified for the work they had represented themselves capable of doing, but have proved themselves devoid of gratitude or a sense of moral obligation.

"It is an uncontestable fact that no agency of the Federal Government has any clear idea of the whereabouts of thousands of refugees who have recently entered the United States."

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 24, 1950.*

The Honorable PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I wish to acknowledge receipt of a copy of your statement entitled "Displaced Persons: Facts Versus Fiction."

Personally I have not been in sympathy with opening the doors of our United States to foreigners simply because they have either moved from one place to another, or, due to

war were forced to vacate their homes, not due to causes created by our Government or its military forces.

We have already seen some of this flock early in the late war sheltered at Fort Porter, or some post in that vicinity. We believe that they bring with them too much European influence on our own foreign-born citizens and of the first American generation, and may influence legislation which is more European than American, with the consequent lowering of American standards which we, old Americans, have built up through the centuries, or at least since the signing of our Federal Constitution.

It appears that those with a foreign accent, within our borders, are these who approve of what we commonly refer to as a "police state" or a "socialistic state" merely due to the fact that they have not yet been absorbed into our American ways of life

We believe that our present administration is going too damn far in attempting to take care of the rest of the world, outside of our borders, whereas our American Indians, right in Wisconsin, are again going hungry and co'd and must rely on local aid, even though the reservation law under Federal control exists

We believe that immigration should be held to a minimum That immigrants be thoroughly screened by screened immigration officials We believe that a more effective border control be established and that those foreigners entering have their movements checked.

The foreign-born are the easiest meat for union organizers. They are used to taking orders. They are used to letting others do their thinking for them, and in turn, they are used to violence in our more or less free way of law enforcement.

We believe that from now on we should think and act for the good of the United States of America and let other nations follow our example if they so desire.

Sincerely yours,

REINHOLD C. DEDI, Sr.

NEW YORK, *January 25, 1950.*

United States Senators.

GENTLEMEN: Please no more DP's. Let Americans catch up and live Let them stay right where they are. Three hundred and twenty thousand now on relief in New York City. Three hundred thousand men die in last war, so please do not knock down our immigration barriers, so, gentlemen, let us protect our citizens.

Yours,

WM. JONES.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., *January 25, 1950.*

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: In view of the rising unemployment, continued housing shortage and the possibility of increasing the number of subversive persons in this wonderful country, I request that you vote to prevent the entrance of displaced persons.

Very truly yours,

JACQUES H. SCHINDLER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1950.

IMMIGRATION SUBCOMMITTEE,
SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing herewith a letter and a resolution addressed to this office by Mr. Robert Leiknu, Commander of American Legion Post No. 38 of Miller, S. Dak., with regard to the entry of displaced persons into this country and which I hope you will add to your study of this subject. With best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL E MUNDT,
United States Senator.

AMERICAN LEGION,
HAND COUNTY POST, No. 38,
Miller, S. Dak., January 13, 1950.

The Honorable KARL MUNDT,
United States Senator from South Dakota, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to a resolution passed by the Hand County Post No. 38, of the American Legion at Miller, S. Dak., a copy of which is enclosed, and pursuant to directions from the membership, we are writing to you on behalf of the Hand County Post. It was called to the attention of the Legion membership at the regular meeting that two ex-GI's and one other person probably have lost their employment because of the fact that their employers had applied for and obtained assurances that they would secure deposed persons from Europe to take their place, and that the regulations for the admission of displaced persons and the taking of displaced persons require that such placement of such persons shall not take away the employment of any persons or shall not reduce the number of jobs available That such employers' names and addresses are as follows. Joe Roalstad, Miller, S Dak., Roy Allgair, Ree Heights, S. Dak; W. H Molesworth, Miller, S. Dak; and that the persons who were employed by such employers before and after the application of such employers for deposed persons were as follows: Wayne Edwards, Miller, S. Dak., Maurice Hartman, Miller, S. Dak., and A K. Burgher, Miller, S. Dak. It was further called to the attention of the post from the floor that available opportunities for employment in this county are less than at any time since the war.

On behalf of the post action to request that an investigation be made into the matter of handling displaced persons and that greater care be exercised in their placement to the end that employment of ex-GI's and others be not disrupted and jeopardized both locally and the country over.

We urge that the unemployment situation be reexamined and that additional safeguards be provided against any displacement of employed citizens, particularly former GI's, by displaced persons before additional numbers be permitted to come into this country and we hope that Congress will make a general investigation as to whether unemployment will increase as a result of further admissions of deposed persons before providing further admission of additional hundreds of thousands. The membership of the post feels greatly concerned about this matter and urge that the matter be given much consideration before the vote on the new deposed-persons bill comes up.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT C LECKNER,
Commander, Hand County Post, No 38.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE HAND COUNTY POST, NO. 38, MILLER, S. DAK., AT A REGULAR MEETING HELD JANUARY 10, 1950

"Be it resolved by the membership of Hand County Post, No. 38, of the American Legion at Miller, S. Dak., That it appearing that possibly two ex-GI's and one other resident of this county have lost their employment by reason of their employers applying for and receiving assurances that they would get deposed persons from Europe to work for them, and that such actions are contrary to law and likely to cause unemployment of ex-GI's and others and that the same is unjust, that the commander of this post be authorized and directed to communicate and express our feelings to the Immigration and Naturalization Service and United States Senators and Representatives and the State and national officers of the American Legion, asking that investigation be had and that corrective measures be taken, and that the entire employment situation in this country be reviewed before additional deposed persons be admitted to this country."

The above resolution was duly moved and seconded for adoption and by unanimous vote was adopted and made a part of the minutes of the meeting, certified to be a copy of the original resolution.

ROBERT LECKNER,
Commander.
TRUMAN D. ELDER,
Adjutant.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, February 14, 1950.

The Honorable PATRICK MCCARRAN,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I have just received the reprint of a statement by you concerning displaced persons. I am heartily in accord with your statement. We have had one experience and that was in accord with your observation, namely, that the screening was very poor on the other side. I believe these individuals who came to our house were Communists, and finally, that the Church World Service is not doing a satisfactory job, in my opinion

I think your statement is very timely.

Very sincerely,

EUGENE P. PENDERGRASS, M. D.

DENVER, COLO., *February 21, 1950.*

Hon PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C

DEAR SENATOR: As a Catholic and member of the K of C I have yet to hear anyone speak in favor of the DP bill

Sincerely hope, through your efforts, this bill is defeated.

Very truly yours,

ELMER GOULD.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not necessary that a motion to that effect be made. Committee amendments are first considered in the regular course.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I know it is the regular procedure that committee amendments be first considered, but I simply wanted the Presiding Officer to indicate that that course would be followed.

Mr. President, H. R. 4567, a bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, is before the Senate, as amended by the Judiciary Committee. Much information and misinformation has been broadcast throughout the country as to the operation of the displaced-persons law, and the effect of H. R. 4567, as passed by the House of Representatives. Misstatements and misrepresentations on this subject have received such wide publicity that scores of our citizens honestly believe that the present displaced-persons law discriminates against Catholics and Jews, and that this alleged discrimination would be eliminated by a series of amendments to the present law contained in House bill 4567.

When the charge of discrimination was first made, I was naturally quite concerned because I was a member of the Committee on the Judiciary which drafted the Displaced Persons Act. I remembered that one of the paramount objectives before us at all times was to write every section and subsection in such a manner that the basic principles embodied therein would apply equitably

to each individual who qualified as a displaced person, so that there would be no discrimination against any element, group, nationality, or religion. When the charge of discrimination was made more than a year ago, I determined that this charge, as well as others, which have been given wide publicity should be thoroughly investigated. After months of hearings, study, and investigation, I am satisfied that the charge of discrimination is not founded on fact; that the Displaced Persons Act does not discriminate against Catholics or Jews, as alleged; and that this fact has been demonstrated by the record.

It will be recalled that during the present Congress there have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary some 20 bills involving many issues on the subject of displaced persons. A Subcommittee on Immigration of that committee, consisting of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], with myself as chairman, has held hearings over the past year on the various issues presented in these many bills, culminating in a series of recommendations which were presented as amendments to the so-called Celler bill, and adopted by the full Committee on the Judiciary. Because of the complexity and interrelation of these many issues, the work of the Subcommittee on Immigration has necessarily been exacting and detailed, resulting in voluminous hearings on the subject of displaced persons, as well as the effect of such legislation on the general immigration laws of the United States. We have been vigorously criticized by those who sponsor special-interest legislation for taking the time and patience to investigate the many ramifications of amendments proposed to the present law. Many of us who are vitally interested in preserving our general immigration laws have been held up to public ridicule in certain newspapers and special-interest publications, with articles and cartoons depicting us as inhuman ogres, but I am content to stand upon the record, Mr. President. The ultimate preservation of our quota immigration system more than justifies the work of this subcommittee, and I should like to take this opportunity to publicly thank the other members of the subcommittee for their diligence and hard work, and for their patience in sitting through the many hours of hearings required on this subject.

It will also be recalled, Mr. President, that when it became apparent last fall to the members of the Judiciary Committee that an investigation of the operations and administration of the present law in Europe could not be made without an on-the-spot study, because of the unavailability of witnesses in this country, the Judiciary Committee authorized me, as chairman of the committee, to make such a study, so that any recommendation of the committee with respect to amending the present law might be based upon a full knowledge of the administration of the present law. The committee recognized that the law does not expire until June 30, 1950; that there was, therefore, no immediate necessity of passing additional displaced-persons legislation during the last session; and that there was ample time to enact, during this session of Congress, such legislation as might be found to be necessary, after the committee had completed its investigation and study of the many bills pending before it.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, and notwithstanding that the Subcommittee on Immigration had not yet completed its study, during the closing hours of the last session of Congress, House bill 4567, the so-called Celler bill, was rushed to the floor of the Senate, without amendment and without recommendation. I do not question for a moment, Mr. President, the good faith of Senators who sponsored that last-minute drive, nor do I question for a moment their right to do so. But I was then, and I am now, convinced that passage of the Celler bill in the form in which it came to the Senate from the House would have been a serious and grievous mistake. I was not then, nor am I now, alone in that conviction. During my investigation in Europe, I was repeatedly told by officials of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, officials of the Consular Service, officials of the European command of the United States Army, and even officials of the Displaced Persons Commission, that the so-called Celler bill should be amended in numerous particulars, and that it would be a mistake to pass the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. I conveyed this information by cable to a number of Senators. A majority of the Senate evidently concurred in the view that hasty action might be a serious mistake, and voted to recommit the bill to the committee for further study and consideration, with instructions to bring the bill back by January 25. In compliance with this instruction, it, therefore, became necessary to incorporate the findings and recommendations of our committee in House bill 4567 by way of amendments. This we have done; and the bill as amended is now before the Senate.

I am confident that a comparative analysis of the law as enacted in 1948, with House bill 4567, as passed by the House of Representatives, and with the bill as amended and reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, amply supports the wise judgment of the Senators who voted at the close of the last session to recommit the bill for further study and consideration.

With reference to pages 2 and 3 of the bill, as reported, Senators will note that the bill as passed by the other body changes the so-called cut-off date under section 2 (c) of the act from December 22, 1945, and January 1, 1948, respectively, to January 1, 1949, as to having entered into Germany, Austria, or Italy, and being in these areas for eligibility. That is the only proposed change in this section of the existing law; and Senators should note that eligibility is dependent upon the definition of a displaced person in subsection (b), which subsection by reference incorporates annex 1 of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, and gives to that agency the right to determine who is a displaced person for eligibility under the act. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate has amended H. R. 4567 by striking out the language appearing on pages 1 and 2 of the bill, as reported, and inserting in lieu thereof an amendment to subsection (b) of the act specifically defining a displaced person. It should be noted that the so-called cut-off dates for eligibility are incorporated in the definition. The cut-off date included in the definition is January 1, 1949. Because the cut-off date on eligibility is included in the definition of a displaced person, the committee amendment amends subsection (c) of section 2 of the present act by deleting the cut-off dates set forth at the beginning of said subsection, and subsection (c) appearing on pages 4 and 5 of the bill, as reported, is what remains of subsection (c) of the act of 1948.

It should also be noted that the definition of a displaced person in subsection (b), as amended by the committee, not only includes all persons eligible under annex 1 of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, but also includes certain persons who are specifically excluded by the terms of said constitution, such as persons of German ethnic origin. The definition includes natives of Czechoslovakia, for which provision is made in subsection (d) of section 2 of the act; includes natives of Greece who are now ineligible because of the aforesaid constitution of the International Refugee Organization; and also includes certain members of the armed forces of the Republic of Poland who are now ineligible under the aforesaid constitution, and for whom special provision was made in section 4 of the bill, as passed by the House of Representatives.

The bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, amends subsection (d) of section 2 of the act of 1948 by omitting specific reference to natives of Czechoslovakia and including all countries behind the so-called iron curtain so that not to exceed 15,000 persons from these countries who are either now in, or may come into, Italy or the American, British, or French sectors of Berlin or Vienna, or the American, British, or French zones of either Germany or Austria, would be eligible displaced persons. Because of the amendment to subsection (b) of the act defining displaced persons, the bill, as amended by the committee and reported to the Senate, on pages 5 and 6 strikes out section 2 of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. Section 2 of the bill, as reported, repeals subsection (d) of section 2 of the act of 1948, as natives of Czechoslovakia are included in the definition amendment to subsection (b) of section 2 of the act of 1948.

The bill as passed by the House of Representatives amends subsection (e) of section 2 of the act of 1948 relative to displaced orphans by increasing the age limit from 16 years to 19 years of age, and by making provision for abandoned or deserted children. The bill, as reported by the committee, reletters subsection (e) as (d), restores the age limitation to 16 years as provided in the act of 1948, retains the provision for abandoned or deserted children; and, because

of the expanded definition of displaced persons in subsection (b) aforesaid, the committee has deleted the limitation of physical presence with respect to sectors and zones in this subsection of the act of 1948.

The bill, as reported, contains a new subsection (c), defining a "child" to include a legally adopted child, so that legally adopted children will not be excluded because of the general immigration laws of the United States.

Section 4 of the bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, and found on pages 8 and 9 of the bill as reported to the Senate, amends section 3 of the act of 1948, increases the number of displaced persons who may be admitted under the act of 1948 from 205,000 to 339,000 and provides for not to exceed 5,000 special nonquota immigration visas to eligible displaced orphans. Of the total numerical limitation of 339,000 quota visas, 4,000 would be issued to persons who resided in Shanghai, China, and 18,000 would be issued to certain members of the armed forces of the Republic of Poland. It should be pointed out here that section 2 of the bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, also provided for the issuance of 15,000 of the foregoing total quota immigration visas to persons who have come or may hereafter come into Germany, Austria, or Italy from so-called iron curtain countries.

The bill, as reported to the Senate, omits the aforesaid 4,000 visas to residents of Shanghai, China, omits the aforesaid 15,000 visas to persons from countries behind the iron curtain, and increases the total number of quota visas authorized to be issued from 205,000, as provided in the act of 1948, to 320,000, instead of 339,000, as provided in the bill passed by the House of Representatives. Of the total numerical limitations of 320,000 in the bill, as reported to the Senate, 290,000 visas are authorized to be issued to persons embraced in the general definition of displaced persons, 2,000 are authorized to be issued to displaced persons who are natives of Czechoslovakia, as provided in the act of 1948; 10,000 are authorized to be issued to persons who are natives of Greece, as defined in the definition in the bill as reported; 18,000 are authorized to be issued to members of the armed forces of the Republic of Poland, as defined in the definition in the bill, as reported, and as provided in section 4 of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives.

In addition, the bill, as reported, authorizes the issuance of 5,000 special nonquota immigration visas to eligible displaced orphans, as provided in the bill passed by the House of Representatives, and further provides that not more than 5,000 minors under the age of 16 years may be admitted if they are legally adopted in a court of competent jurisdiction, prior to June 30, 1951, by a citizen of the United States who is a member of the armed forces of the United States stationed in Germany, Austria, or Italy, or who is a civilian employee of the United States in Germany, Austria, or Italy. For the purposes of our general immigration laws, such persons shall be deemed to be the natural born alien children of such adoptive parent and entitled to be admitted without visa. Let me say at this point, Mr. President, the able senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was exceedingly instrumental in bringing about the amendments with reference to orphans. This provision is found on pages 12 and 13 of the bill as reported to the Senate.

Section 4 of the bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, further amends section 3 of the act of 1948 by providing that not more than 25 percent of the quota visas issued under the act shall be charged to the immigration quotas of the displaced persons' nationality in any fiscal year, instead of the limitation in the act of 1948 that not more than 50 percent of such quotas shall be so charged in any fiscal year. The bill, as reported to the Senate, restores the so-called 50 percent mortgaging of quotas as provided in the act of 1948. This section of the bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, would add a new eligibility by setting aside not more than 50 percent of the nonpreference portion of the immigration quotas, as defined in the Immigration Act of 1924, for displaced persons who have emigrated to other countries for resettlement provided that they have not been firmly resettled in such country. The bill, as reported to the Senate, omits this provision with respect to displaced persons who have been resettled in other countries.

Section 4 of the bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, further amends section 3 of the act of 1948 by deleting the requirement that 40 percent of the visas issued pursuant to the act shall be available exclusively to persons whose place of origin or country of nationality has been de facto annexed by a foreign power. The bill, as reported to the Senate, restores this requirement. It may be said here that persons covered by this limitation are the least likely to be repatriated to their country of nationality or origin.

The bill as passed by the House of Representatives, and as reported to the Senate, adds a new subsection (d) to section 3 of the act of 1948 requiring administration of the act without discrimination.

The bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, and as reported to the Senate, amends section 4 of the act of 1948 by advancing the date from April 1, 1948, to April 30, 1949, prior to which displaced persons residing in the United States temporarily may adjust their status to permanent residence.

The bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, amends section 6 of the act of 1948 by omitting the preference which is given to displaced persons who have been engaged in agricultural pursuits. The bill, as reported to the Senate, restores this preference and provides that such persons must have been for at least 2 years at some previous time or times engaged principally in agricultural pursuits, and requires that such person will be employed in the United States principally in agricultural pursuits.

Section 7 of the bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, and as reported to the Senate, amends section 7 of the act of 1948 by eliminating the priority given to displaced persons residing in displaced-persons camps and centers.

I might say at this point, Mr. President, as regards the provision in the Senate bill of 1948, and as regards the bill which is now before the Senate with reference to displaced persons coming into agricultural pursuits, that there is today a crying need throughout the length and breadth of the agricultural regions of America for farm workers. Farmers are looking for farm labor in all the great agricultural areas. They are unable to get farm labor to work on the farms. For the past several years hundreds of thousands of Mexican laborers have been brought into this country, across the Mexican line, on temporary status to work on seasonal crops. We have been bringing hundreds of thousands of persons from the Gulf islands, from the West Indies, to work on crops in the Southern States. They come in on temporary status. They are supposed to go back to their native countries. The demand for farm labor in the large agricultural States has been great. There was and is opportunity for honest farm labor to find occupation in America.

When we were drafting the 1948 bill we had in mind, first of all, the fact that we were exceedingly short in housing. Second, the farm industry of America was crying for farm labor. So we set about to select, if possible, from the thousands of displaced persons in Europe those who had been accustomed to engaging in farm work, because, first of all, they would not displace anyone who then had a job, and, second, they would not displace anyone who then had housing, because a farmer who sought farm labor had housing for his farm labor. Therefore, those persons who would come into that line of occupation would neither displace anyone from housing nor displace anyone from a job. So we thought we could do a good turn by bringing to this country those persons who had an agrarian background and who wanted farm work to sustain themselves, and that they would, in turn, aid in sustaining the economy of America.

Mr. President, it did not work out in that way, for many reasons. I shall state some of the reasons before I conclude my remarks. I shall state some of them now, as a preliminary. Many have come to this country under fraudulent pretenses and fraudulent papers. Some of them never had hold of a plow, did not know which end of a horse should go toward a plow, and had no knowledge of farming whatever, but declared, under oath and otherwise, that they had an agrarian background, in order to go to America. After coming to America and being placed on a farm, they stayed overnight, or for a week or 10 days, or a month at the latest, and then drifted toward the big centers. When they came to the farm they knew nothing about it and cared less. All they wanted to do was to get to America and then to some large center of population. So fraud has entered into that which we sought to establish as a way by which human beings with honesty in their hearts might find a way to sustain them-

selves and to become useful citizens of America.

Mr. President, we seek now to amend that provision because today there is a call for farm labor in the agricultural regions of America. Today there are farmers with housing already prepared for farm labor and with everything ready to put men to work, if they will go to work, if they want to work. There is a demand from the agricultural regions for labor. So, if an applicant for a displaced person's opportunity can show that he has had 2 years of agrarian experience, he is eligible to come under the farm labor provision of the pending bill.

There are many other phases of this matter which are worthy of consideration.

Section 8 of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives and as reported to the Senate amends section 8 of the act of 1948 by extending the term of the Displaced Persons Commission from June 30, 1951, to June 30, 1952, and requiring that the regulations of the Commission for the purpose of obtaining the most general distribution and settlement of persons admitted under the act shall be "consistent with housing and employment opportunties for resettlement" throughout the United States and its Territories and possessions.

Section 9 of the bill as reported to the Senate amends section 10 of the act of 1948 continuing the requirement for a thorough investigation and written report on each displaced person by such agency of the Government as the President may designate, providing, however, that the final determination of eligibility of applicants under the act, as well as under the general immigration laws of the United States, shall be made exclusively by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the American Foreign Service, acting through persons who are citizens of the United States, and who have not less than 3 years' experience in the Immigration and Naturalization Service or in the American Foreign Service. The bill as passed by the House contains no similar provision.

Mr. President, there was a vital reason for those provisions going into the new bill, and I shall dwell on those reasons later on in my discussion of the bill. My investigation in Europe, extending all the way from the northern border of France to southern Italy and back through France to Paris, as I reported by cable to my colleagues in the Senate, some of whom are now listening to me, showed that fraud, deceit, perjury, misrepresentation, and falsification of records have abounded in the Displaced Persons Administration. They have abounded to such an extent that printing presses, for the printing of fraudulent instruments, were found by authorized representatives of the Army. Frauds of all kinds have crept into the Displaced Persons Administration. Not only have they crept in, but they have been tolerated in the administration of the Displaced Persons Act and eyes have been blinked at them by the Displaced Persons Administration.

Mr. President, the bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, amends section 12 of the act of 1948 by advancing from July 1, 1950, to July 1, 1952, the period during which 50 percent of the German quotas shall be available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Russia, or Yugoslavia.

The bill as reported to the Senate retains in substance the language passed by the House of Representatives, and directs the Secretary of State to immediately resume general consular duties in Germany and Austria.

The bill as passed by the House of Representatives and as reported to the Senate prohibits the issuance of visas to subversive displaced persons, and section 13 of the act of 1948 is amended to require every displaced person of the age of 18 years or more to execute at the port of entry into the United States an oath or affirmation that he is not and has never been a member of any organization or movement named in this section.

The bill as passed by the House of Representatives and as reported to the Senate adds a new section to the act of 1948 which authorizes a loan of not to exceed in the aggregate $5,000,000 to the Displaced Persons Commission to be used by them for loans to public or private agencies to finance the reception and transportation of eligible displaced persons from ports of entry within the United States to places of final destination. As reported to the Senate, a further proviso is added to this section requiring the payment of interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum on such loans as are not repaid on or before June 30, 1953.

The bill as reported to the Senate adds a further new section to the act of 1948 requiring that all transportation of displaced persons to the United States shall be by ships or planes registered under the United States flag, if the cost of such transportation is defrayed in whole or in part by the Government of the United States. There is no comparable provision in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives.

Section 13 of the bill as reported to the Senate creates a joint congressional committee composed of three members of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and three members of the Judiciary Committee of the House, for the purpose of making a complete investigation of the problems of persons of German ethnic origin who were expelled from the country of their residence into Germany and Austria. This joint committee is required to report its findings and recommendations to the Congress not later than 1 year after the effective date of this section.

Mr. President, it may be interesting to Senators to know the route I followed during my investigation in Europe. The investigation was made by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee at the suggestion, at the instance, and by the authority of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. In every sector I obtained the written statements of witnesses with whom I conferred, and during the course of my remarks, I may from time to time refer to these written statements. I regret exceedingly that I shall be unable at this time to identify some individual witnesses other than by the titles of their offices or the employment in which they are engaged. I regret that I am forced to proceed in this manner because to identify with particularity the sources of much of my information would surely result in reprisals and disciplinary action against those persons who have courageously stated their experiences and observations of the operation of the present law. It had been my intention to publicize the testimony of every witness who appeared before me, but Senators will recall that some days ago, when I released the testimony of an employee of the Displaced Persons Commission, the Commission almost immediately announced that disciplinary action would be taken against this employee. This is not an isolated instance. Indeed, many Senators will recall the prompt disciplinary action taken against an official of the Visa Division of the State Department who testified before the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Judiciary Committee with respect to the entrance of hundreds of subversives into the United States. The facts have long ago vindicated this patriotic public servant, but that does not rescind the disciplinary action taken against him.

Mr. President, no one realizes better than I the criticism which will be leveled against me for referring to information without disclosing the identity of witnesses, or the sources of my information. My colleagues may rest assured that I shall do so with extreme reluctance. However, it seems to me that I am confronted with three possible courses of action. First, to withhold the information entirely and thereby conceal the facts from the Congress and the American people; second, to release the information irrespective of its confidential classification and irrespective of the consequences that may result to the witnesses. This I cannot and will not do; third, to release the information without disclosing the identity of the witnesses and to allude in general to the existence of classified information.

Mr. President, I have in my possession, and have had in my possession almost since the time I returned from Europe, voluminous confidential reports prepared by the CIC, that branch of the Army having to do with counter-intelligence. Every page of them is marked "confidential." The reports were prepared by trusted officers of the Counter-Intelligence Corps of the Army. I am advised that they were approved by Gen. Lucius Clay. I have no doubt that the advice given me in that respect is true. I wrote to the Counter-Intelligence Corps and to other officials asking for permission to use the reports which contained so much valuable information on this subject. I was denied the right to use them. I have them in my possession, and would be glad to read them to the Senate. The Senate would be startled if I were to read them. They contain many revolting facts. They disclose numerous cases of fraud, fraud of all kinds and descriptions, and disclose also the character and type of some of the displaced persons who have obtained entry to the United States

under the Displaced Persons Act. They contain much other information.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Most of the fraud disclosed in the reports had to do with documents issued by German officials. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is not correct.

Mr. KILGORE. What is the correct statement about that?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from West Virginia knows what the correct statement is, because he listened to the witnesses who came before the committee and testified in detail. The fraud was not in the documents issued by German officials. The Senator was present when witnesses testified on that very subject.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not yield for a statement. I yielded to the Senator for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I think the Senate is entitled to all the information on that subject. If there were many cases of fraud, I think the Senate should know about them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I refuse to yield for a statement. I yielded only for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr WATKINS. I noted that the Senator from Nevada called attention to a specific report or reports he has in his possession.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Did the members of the committee see the reports in executive session?

Mr. McCARRAN. Some of the reports were made known to the committee in executive session.

Mr. WATKINS. Will they be made available to the Members of the Senate, or must they be kept confidential?

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish they could be made available to the Members of the Senate. I should be glad to be able to present them to the Senate.

Mr WATKINS. I understand the Senator said he would like to read them to the Senate, so I wondered if they would be made available to the Members of the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry to say that I was denied permission to do so. I wanted to read them personally to the Senate, or have the clerk read them, but I was denied that privilege.

Mr. President, I am advised by witnesses who came before the committee that those are not the only documents which bear on the subject of fraud in connection with the administration of the law. I am advised that there are volumes showing the same trend.

Mr. President, the investigation which I made commenced in Paris, where I conferred with officials of the International Refugee Organization who were in Paris for that purpose. Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the special subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary engaged in studying the subject, participated in this conference.

From Paris I went to Frankfurt where I conferred with officials of a number of the so-called voluntary agencies operating in the occupied zones of Germany, Austria, and Italy. I also conferred with officials of the office of the high commission of Germany. In Frankfurt I ascertained the location of the principal displaced-persons camps, as well as the principal resettlement centers in Germany, and, in the course of my investigation, I visited as many of these as possible. From Frankfurt I traveled south to Stuttgart where I conferred with officials of the consular service, the United States Army, the Displaced Persons Commission, and the International Refugee Organization. From Stuttgart I journeyed a short distance to Ludwigsburg. From Ludwigsburg I traveled south to Munich where I spent several days visiting displaced-persons camps and resettlement centers in that area. Leaving Munich I journeyed back to Stuttgart, and from there returned to Frankfurt. In Frankfurt I conferred with the European coordinator of the Displaced Persons Commission, as well as his assistant, and was shown the complete operation of this office. I also conferred with the respective heads of every major voluntary agency operating in Europe. Leaving Frankfurt, I proceeded to Geneva, Switzerland, where I conferred with the director general of the International Refugee Organization, and a number of his assistants, as well as with officials of the consular service. From Switzerland I went to Italy where I conferred with consular officials in Milan, Florence, Rome, and Naples. From Rome I went south to Naples where most of the displaced persons are concentrated, and went through a number of the camps and resettlement centers in and about the Naples area.

I think it may be interesting to some Senators if I outline the steps which a displaced person must take in order to qualify as an immigrant to the United States under the act of 1948. Senators well know that the act contains a cut-off date of December 22, 1945. In other words, a displaced person, in order to qualify, must have been in one of the occupied zones of Germany, or in Austria, or in Italy, on or before December 22, 1945. This date, Senators will recall, is not an arbitrary date, but is the date fixed by the President of the United States in a Presidential directive relating to displaced persons and pursuant to which approximately 44,000 displaced persons were admitted prior to the passage of the act of 1948. It is important because of the fraudulent documentation which I shall take up later in my remarks.

Let us assume, therefore, that a displaced person finds himself in occupied Germany or Austria or Italy and wishes to be resettled in the United States. His first step is to contact a displaced-persons camp which is under the operation of the International Refugee Organization created by the United Nations in 1946. Such person is then questioned by employees of the International Refugee Organization who, in most instances, are displaced persons themselves and of the same nationality as such person, so that they may act as interpreters and assist him in filling out the necessary questionnaire to determine his status under annex I of the constitution of IRO. Thereafter, such person either contacts or is contacted by one of the American voluntary agencies operating in that area. In practice, the voluntary agency, which becomes interested in such person, is of his religious faith, so that if he is a Catholic, he will be contacted by an employee of the National Catholic Welfare Committee; if he is a Jew, it probably will be an employee of the American Joint Distribution Committee or the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society; if a Protestant, it will be the Lutheran Church World Federation, or other Protestant voluntary agencies, and so on, depending upon religion.

The voluntary agency assists our hypothetical displaced person in establishing his qualifications for immigration to the United States of America and these voluntary agencies are conversant with the specific provisions of our statute.

Inasmuch as our act contains a limitation that one coming into Germany, Austria, or Italy from other areas must have done so prior to December 22, 1945, or, if forced to flee from Germany, Austria, or Italy by the dictator regimes, one must have returned prior to January 1, 1948, documentary evidence to support the fact of entrance into these areas prior to December 22, 1945, or fleeing from these areas with return prior to January 1, 1948, is submitted to the IRO when our hypothetical person registers as a displaced person, so that he can qualify for immigration to the United States. Thus, documentation is of two types: First, proof of residence prior to December 22, 1945, which is in the form of a certificate of residence executed by police officials of the area for which residence is claimed, if such area is in the trizone of Germany, or in Austria, or Italy. If such residence is in the Russian zone of Germany, such a certificate cannot be obtained and, therefore, there is no documentation; second, proof of birth in Germany, Austria, or Italy; but, again, if the place of birth given is in the Russian zone of Germany, a birth certificate cannot be obtained; and, therefore, there is no documentation.

The International Refugee Organization then certifies the status of our hypothetical individual as a displaced person of the care and concern of the IRO, and certifies the date of entry into Germany, Austria, or Italy, or the place of birth, fact of fleeing, and date of reentry into Germany, Austria, or Italy. The IRO also certifies the family number, job experience, place of birth, and other pertinent information, which is gotten from the questioning previously mentioned.

The next step takes our hypothetical displaced person to a resettlement center operated by the IRO, where he makes his election to immigrate to the United

States, which is made known to the Displaced Persons Commission, and is supported by the IRO certifications I have just outlined. The Commission then examines the dates appearing in the IRO certifications; and if they are within the limitations of the act, and if the applicant is certified as being "of the concern of the International Refugee Organization," the applicant is certified by the Commission as eligible to immigrate to the United States; and if entitled to preference under the act, such preference is also certified.

Next is a security screen check by the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army. I shall have more to say on this later in my remarks. If the Counter Intelligence Corps finds nothing of an adverse nature which would establish that the applicant is a security risk to the United States or a known criminal, its report to the commission is usually in the form of "no comment," or "no adverse information." If something adverse is disclosed by the CIC investigation, that information is included in the CIC report, and is evaluated by the commission. If the applicant is still found to be eligible, his file, including the CIC report and a certification by the commission that he is "eligible," is transmitted to the consular service for issuance of a visa.

The applicant then applies to the consular service for a visa. He is given a medical examination by the United States Public Health Service for diseases which might exclude him under the general immigration laws. If approved medically, his case is examined by a consular officer, who is bound by the eligibility certification of the Commission and cannot go behind the Commission's certification unless there is an obvious error. He then is personally interviewed by a consular officer. In the vast majority of cases, this is the first time the applicant has been personally interviewed by an official of the United States Government. Unless the consul discovers some reason why the applicant should be excluded under the general immigration laws, his visa application is approved, and he leaves the resettlement center for Bremen.

Until February of this year, the applicant was personally interviewed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service at Bremen. However, under a recent plan of decentralization, immigration inspectors are now in operation at each of the resettlement centers, where they interview the applicant. This agency is, by instructions, precluded from examining his eligibility under the act; and unless information is developed which would exclude the applicant under the general immigration laws, he leaves for the embarkation center at Bremerhaven, where he will board ship, unless he is a hardship case, in which event he will be flown to the United States.

Briefly, Mr. President, that is the routine which is followed by every displaced person coming to the United States. There are a number of aspects of this procedure which I shall describe in greater detail at a later point in my remarks. For the present, however, I wish to call attention to the fact that four agencies of the United States Government are involved, namely, the Displaced Persons Commission, the United States Public Health Service, the Consular Service, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I also wish to emphasize that the procedure includes one international agency, namely, the International Refugee Organization, and, in most cases, at least one voluntary agency. At the hazard of repetition, I say again, Mr. President, and wish to reemphasize the point, that the procedure includes one international agency, namely, the International Refugee Organization. I wish emphatically to call attention to the last two agencies, the IRO and the voluntary agencies, because neither of these agencies is subject to Government regulation, control, or direction by the United States. I emphasize this fact because the most important steps in qualifying a displaced person for immigration to the United States are taken by these two agencies, and that comes about by reason of section 2 (b) of the present law. A brief reference to the act will disclose that a displaced person is therein defined to be a person as defined in annex I to the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, and who is the concern of the International Refugee Organization. I hope Senators will follow closely my remarks on this point.

Without going into all the ramifications of annex I, permit me to say that it is one of the most complex collections of words that could be drafted. Every section is so interrelated with one or more other sections that it is impossible to state with certainty who will qualify as a displaced person. If Senators will but glance at annex I, they will see constant reference to minutes of sundry meetings held by various committees or subcommittees of the International Refugee Organization on various dates, the contents of which are unknown to officials of our Government administering the program in Europe. Therefore, under the administration of the present act, the most important determination to be made, namely, qualification of status as a displaced person is made by an international organization which is not responsible to the Government of the United States or to any of its officials.

This organization employs a large staff of alien personnel, who in most instances are themselves displaced persons. In assisting other displaced persons, they sometimes become so zealous that they certify to alleged facts which are so patently false that the Displaced Persons Commission must return the file to IRO, even though the Commission instructions require acceptance of IRO findings. For example, while I was interviewing an employee of the Commission, he happened to have on his desk two files which he was returning to IRO for a review of their findings. In both cases, the IRO had certified that the applicants had entered Germany prior to December 22, 1945, and were in the United States zone of Germany on January 1, 1948. This is the standard language used to qualify under our act. However, in one case, the applicant was an infant born in 1946, 2 years after it allegedly entered Germany; and in the other case, the applicant was an infant born in December 1948, 4 years after allegedly entering Germany. This Commission employee stated that in his experience he had found that the IRO would certify to anything which would help a displaced person to qualify under our act.

I was advised repeatedly by officials of the Consular Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army, and by United States citizens in the employ of the International Refugee Organization, that section 2 (b) of the act should be repealed, substituting in lieu thereof a definition which did not depend upon the discretion of the IRO and which could be readily interpreted by United States officials without reference to an international organization. Mr. President, the Congress is more than capable of defining displaced persons who will be made eligible for immigration to the United States, without resorting to discretionary findings, constructions, and interpretations made by alien employees of an international organization. The Judiciary Committee, therefore, has recommended in the present bill an amendment to section 2 (b) of the act specifically defining displaced persons and expanding the definition contained in the present law, to which I shall refer later in my remarks. Responsible officials of our Government operating in Europe in every phase of our displaced-persons program stated again and again that if the 1948 act is to be amended at all, the determination of eligibilty of applicants should be centered in trained consular and immigration officers. This, of course, was the plain intent of Congress when it provided in section 10 of the act that—

> Except as otherwise expressly provided in this act, the administration of this act, under the provisions of this act and the regulations of the commission as herein provided, shall be by the officials who administer the other immigration laws of the United States.

It is written indelibly into the law as it now stands. But how it has been flouted. How it has been set aside.

The intent of Congress is made crystal clear by the debates that took place in this Chamber when we passed the act of 1948. Senators will recall that at that time an amendment was offered to vest in the Displaced Persons Commission the general administration of the law, including the determination of eligibility of applicants. But the amendment, which had been offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], was defeated. Instead, we provided in section 10 of the act that—

> No eligible displaced person shall be admitted to the United States unless there shall have first been a thorough investigation and written report made and prepared by such agency of the Government of the United States as the President shall designate regarding such person's character, history, and eligibility under the act.

It was assumed by those of us who helped draft the present law, both in the conference committee and during the debate, that the President would

designate an agency with trained personnel skilled in immigration matters. It was, therefore, possible to circumvent the intent of Congress only after the President, on the fourth day of October 1948, designated the Displaced Persons Commission as the agency to select and screen displaced-person applicants.

The bill, as amended by the committee, restores the congressional intent by providing that the final determination of eligibility of applicants, both under the displaced-persons law and under the general immigration laws, shall be made exclusively by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the American Foreign Service acting through citizens of the United States who have not less than 3 years' experience in the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the American Foreign Service; thereby insuring that this important determination shall be made by United States citizens trained in immigration matters.

Section 2 of the law provides for assurances under the act and, among other things, requires that every displaced person "shall have an assurance that such person, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment and that such person, and the members of such person's family, who shall accompany such person and who propose to live with such person, shall not become public charges and will have safe and sanitary housing without displacing some other person from such housing."

Congress intended that such assurances must be bona fide and binding upon the sponsor of a displaced person. Mindful of the backlog of unemployment and critical shortage of housing in this country, Congress intended that no person should be brought to the United States in this great humanitarian movement, unless there was on file with the Commission a valid assurance that such displaced person would not displace anyone in this country from a job or from housing. The Commission was authorized to make rules and regulations to make this section effective, and to insure that only bona fide assurances would be approved.

Instead of performing its functions of administration of the act in this country, by issuing adequate rules and regulations to make such assurances effective, and by issuing adequate rules and regulations governing the whereabouts and conduct of displaced persons after they have been admitted to the United States, the Displaced Persons Commission apparently assumed that its functions are to be exercised primarily abroad, and that the administration of the act in the United States is but incidental to a self-imposed duty to secure the admission of the total number of displaced persons authorized in the law. In other words, Mr. President, what the Commission set about to do was to fill the quota, to get 205,000 persons over here as quickly as possible, regardless of where they might be placed, of how they might be housed, or of whether they would be at all employed.

Under its rules and regulations, the Displaced Persons Commission has classified the afore-mentioned assurances in two main categories; namely, assurances for "named" displaced persons, and assurances for "unnamed" displaced persons. In each of these categories, the sponsor is required by the law to furnish evidence of having employment and housing available which will not displace any person in this country. A "named" assurance may be used only for the person named therein. An "unnamed" assurance may be used for any person who fulfills the qualifications of employment which are described in such assurance. Neither of the assurances requires the sponsor to put up any security or guaranty in any form whatsoever that either the employment or housing described therein will be available for the displaced person when he reaches the United States.

The European coordinator of the Displaced Persons Commission stated that assurances may be, and have been, withdrawn from the Commission prior to the time the displaced person reaches the United States and has an opportunity to accept the employment. In such instances, the displaced person is not prevented from coming to the United States but rather he embarks in any event on the assumption that there will be available in Washington a so-called surplus assurance; which, of course, assumes also that he will be qualified to perform the employment described in such assurance.

In addition to individual sponsors who submit assurances to the Commission, the rules of the Commission permit voluntary agencies to file so-called "blanket" assurances which contain only an estimate of the number of displaced persons that such voluntary agency believes it can place in suitable employment in the United States, together with a general assurance of housing accommodations. Mr. Carusi testified that 85 percent of the assurances approved by the Commission are so-called "blanket" assurances of the major voluntary agencies. The so-called "blanket" assurances do not require a specific statement of the type of employment available, nor a description of the skills required; nor do they require a specific statement of the housing which will be made available to such a displaced person. The most that may be said for them is that they indicate in a general way the nature of the employment in a given community, and, in a general way, they describe the community in which housing may be provided. According to statements issued by the Displaced Persons Commission, "they need not specify the particular job, nor the particular employer, nor the specific housing to be provided." The rules of the Commission also permit State commissions or State committees concerned with the problem of displaced persons to file blanket assurances. With respect to the so-called blanket assurances by regularly constituted governmental authorities within the States, it is necessary to submit in detail a specific description of the employment available, together with a statement of the necessary skills and the employer's address. Moreover, a specific description of the housing must be furnished, together with the address of the housing which will be provided. And in addition, it is necessary to furnish an assurance that the displaced person will not become a public charge if he comes to the United States.

Let us now refer back to the "named" assurances which are filed with the Commission. It is significant here to recall that 85 percent of the assurances are "blanket" assurances of voluntary agencies, and that 80 percent of all assurances are named assurances. The European coordinator of the Displaced Persons Commission testified that the voluntary agencies "have staffs over here who nominate individuals that they select on the basis of their interest in them, and they in turn nominate them to us, so that, from the standpoint of the Commission that again is a nominated case where we have no latitude but determining his eligibility." Because these named assurances specifically name or nominate a designated displaced person, they may be used only for the person named therein. In the case of a named assurance, neither the Displaced Persons Commission nor any other agency of the United States Government, makes any examination of the applicant whatsoever to see if he can fulfill the employment assurance set forth in such assurance. The European coordinator of the Commission, Mr. Squadrilli, testified:

> Now, in the majority of these cases, there is no selective activities as such. * * * Our responsibility, our job, in order to accede to the rights of the American sponsor who nominates an individual, is to determine, does this man qualify under the act? That is the field of selection.

In other words, on a blanket assurance, which has been modified in Europe to a "named" assurance, by an employee of a voluntary agency, the Commission does no selection as to employment skills, or whether such person is one likely to be assimilated in America, or in any particular whatsoever except to check the dates certified by the International Refugee Organization. Such selection as there may be, if any at all, is by employees of voluntary agencies who are not responsible to this Government, and many of whom are aliens. It is automatically assumed by the Displaced Persons Commission that the individual in the United States or the voluntary agency naming such displaced person will give him the employment described in the assurance notwithstanding that such displaced person may not have the skill requisite to perform such employment and notwithstanding that the sponsor may revoke the assurance at any time. It has been generally alleged, and I think it fair to state, that thousands of displaced persons have come to the United States on the representation that they were capable of performing certain skilled or semiskilled labors, or on the representation that they were agricultural employees when, in fact, they knew nothing about the work they were to perform. Congress never intended that dis-

placed persons should be admitted to perform specified work described in the employment assurance without an examination to ascertain that they could in fact perform such work. Congress never intended that so-called blanket assurances should be accepted whether they be by voluntary agencies, or by State commission, or by State committees dealing with displaced persons. Congress never intended that the Commission should, by its rules and practice, divest itself of the power to determine if an applicant "will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment," or if he will have "safe and sanitary housing without displacing some other person from such housing." The act of 1948 does not admit of any such construction, and I am of the opinion that the Displaced Persons Commission has failed to carry out the intent of Congress on this matter of assurances

In this connection, it may be interesting to Senators to know that in the city of New York two entire hotels are occupied solely by displaced persons awaiting assignment to some place in the United States after arrival in this country. I am reliably informed that the total capacity of these hotels exceeds 2,000 persons and that they have a complete occupancy at all times. I am also reliably informed that the reason for such a tremendous number of displaced persons awaiting assignment to some locality in the United States is that they do not have a specified employer or a specified job to which they can go upon arrival.

The effective administration of assurances as intended by Congress is vitally important. On January 16 of this year, the president of the International Farm Labor Union, Mr. H. L. Mitchell, warned the closing session of that union's convention that farm machines, Mexican nationals, and displaced persons threaten the welfare and jobs of 4,000,000 American agricultural workers. What is more, he charged that displaced persons are being used to break down the agricultural wage structure. Yes, Mr. President, the assurances provided in the act are basic and of paramount importance. However, that is not the view of the Displaced Persons Commission.

To illustrate how lightly the Commission regards these assurances, Senators may be surprised to learn that displaced persons who have been admitted to this country under the act are giving employment and housing assurances for other displaced persons to come to the United States.

I repeat that, because it is worthy of emphasis.

Senators may be surprised to learn that displaced persons who have been admitted to this country under the act are giving employment and housing assurances for other displaced persons to come to the United States. These assurances by displaced persons for other displaced persons are readily accepted and validated by the Commission. This situation is made significantly ridiculous by a comparison with our immigration laws. Under the general immigration laws, the sponsor of an immigrant must give a bona fide guaranty and pledge that the immigrant will not become a public charge, and that the sponsor will in fact be responsible for the care, maintenance, and necessities of the immigrant while in the United States. In many instances the sponsor is required to furnish a bond, running to the Government to secure his guaranty and pledge. What is more, he must establish his financial ability to perform his guaranty beyond a doubt. When it is recalled that assurances validated by the Displaced Persons Commission are neither guaranties, nor are they binding and enforceable against the sponsor, and when it is recalled that they may be revoked by the sponsor at any time, and when it is recalled that the Commission does not investigate to ascertain if the sponsor is in fact capable of furnishing employment and housing as required by the act, it then becomes apparent how lightly the Commission regards these assurances. I can conceive of no greater violation of the spirit of the law and intent of the Congress than to permit displaced persons, who themselves are experimenting with resettlement in this country, to give assurances of employment and housing for other displaced persons.

This brings up a consideration of persons likely to become a public charge. Inasmuch as the validity of the assurance is interpreted by the Displaced Persons Commission to be within their exclusive jurisdiction, neither the Consular Service nor the Immigration and Naturalization Service makes any investigation into the reliability of assurances. Therefore, the availability or unavailability of a particular job, or the skill or lack of skill of a particular displaced person in a given field, is not known to any official of the United States Government until after the displaced person has arrived in the United States and either has no job to which to go, or has no knowledge of the duties which he is to perform.

Obviously a displaced person coming to the United States under a so-called blanket assurance will not be deported simply because there is no job available upon his arrival. It is equally obvious that one whose assurance has been withdrawn will not be deported. However, he is subject to deportation under our general immigration laws if it is determined by the Immigration and Naturalization Service that he is a person who has become a public charge. The Displaced Persons Commission has, therefore, included in its regulations a proviso that "an applicant admitted under the act shall not be deemed to have become a public charge under the act by reason of receiving public services, other than financial assistance, available to persons in the community in which he resides." Therefore, such an applicant may be furnished emergency housing by relief agencies in the United States as well as food and subsistence for an indefinite period of time without being subject to deportation, if the Commission is allowed to interpret our general immigration laws by its regulations.

Senators will recall that the question of whether or not an immigrant is one likely to become a public charge is a part of our general immigration laws, and that this question is determined by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. For many months there has been serious disagreement between the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Displaced Persons Commission representatives in Europe, as to which agency is to decide this question. The Displaced Persons Commission has contended that because there is an assurance on file in Washington, D. C., there is then no question of whether or not an applicant is likely to become a public charge. Therefore, it is their contention that the Immigration and Naturalization Service is precluded from examining into the financial responsibility, either of the applicant or of his sponsor in the United States, and that admittance to the United States cannot be withheld on the ground that such person is likely to become a public charge.

Let us not forget that job and housing assurances by displaced persons for displaced persons are encouraged and accepted by the Commission. It occurs to me that a displaced person who comes to this country on the employment and housing assurance of another displaced person is very likely to become a public charge. In any event, the Immigration and Naturalization Service must insist upon their right to reject an applicant if he is likely to become a public charge, because this duty is imposed by law, and cannot be abrogated or repealed by an interpretation of the Displaced Persons Commission.

The conflict of jurisdiction in this matter of public charge was finally made the subject of a series of conferences, in which the State Department participated, culminating in an instruction by the Immigration and Naturalization Service that its employees would be bound by the findings of the Commission on the eligibility of an applicant. The language used is as follows:

> When during the course of examination for immigration purpose it comes to the attention of an officer of this Service that an error may have been made in the finding that an applicant is a displaced person or an eligible displaced person the facts should be brought to the attention of the appropriate representative of the Displaced Persons Commission. Also, if it appears during immigration inspection that an applicant has procured his eligible displaced person status through misrepresentation or fraud the facts should likewise be brought to the attention of the Displaced Persons Commission. However, when the Commission rules or confirms its finding on the basis of such facts which have been brought to its attention that an applicant is a bona fide eligible displaced person such ruling shall not be questioned by this Service.

It should be noted that nowhere does this instruction refer to "public charge" which is a ground for exclusion under our general immigration laws. Yet, the European coordinator of the Commission sent out a memo to all of his senior officers, stating:

> The instructions are interpreted by this office as confirming the authority of the Commission in the question of "public charge," since assurances in this connection are filed with the Commission, and it is the Commission which has jurisdiction in determining the validity and adequacy of such assurances

This same memo of the Commission's European coordinator further instructed Commission officers to return to the Immigration Service all cases previously rejected by the Immigration Service on the ground of ineligibility. In view of the attitude of the Commission in this regard, the Senate might well devote a few minutes to the question of eligibility under the act of 1948.

The Displaced Persons Commission has maintained that neither immigration nor consular officers have jurisdiction to examine into the eligibility of applicants, even though there may be reason to believe that the eligibility of such applicant is based upon fraudulent documents, or perjured statements.

Think of that for a moment, Mr. President. The Displaced Persons Commission, an agency of the Government of the United States, sworn to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the United States, appointed by the President of the United States, sends out the mandate that neither immigration nor consular officers have jurisdiction to examine into the eligibility of an applicant, even though there may be reason to believe that the eligibility of such applicant is based upon fraudulent documents or perjured statements Can it be possible that the administrators of the laws of America have lost all honor, all decency, all regard for an oath, all regard for the safety of the Government, so that they instruct those under them that one who has made a fraudulent document or resorted to perjury may nevertheless be rewarded for his fraud and perjury?

What is more, Mr. President, the Displaced Persons Commission has taken the position that the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army, the agency which investigates applicants from the standpoint of the security interests of the United States, has no jurisdiction to develop facts which might affect the eligibility of an applicant. Is that high-handed? Who will deny that that is a high-handed method, when the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army, an organization trained for its work, recognized by the Army for its ability, is so repudiated that the Displaced Persons Commission states that the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army has no jurisdiction to develop facts which might affect the eligibility of an applicant. If the Commission had said, "has no jurisdiction of the case," or "has no jurisdiction over the matter," that might be something different. But they used the expression, "has no jurisdiction to develop facts," the facts by which the members of the Displaced Persons Commission, acting under the law and acting under their oaths, might be guided. They say the CIC have no jurisdiction to develop the facts, and it follows that they will not of course, recognize the facts the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army develops. So if the worst Communist in all the world, a fellow who was trained and reared and whose intent it was to tear down our Government, was brought to the attention of the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army and that Corps developed the facts and presented them to the Displaced Persons Commission, that Commission would disregard those facts, because the CIC had no jurisdiction to develop facts which might affect the eligibility of an applicant.

In all matters of eligibility, the Displaced Persons Commission claims to have exclusive jurisdiction. For example, the President's directive of December 22, 1945, relating to displaced persons, was administered by our immigration and consular officials abroad. In February of 1946 at a meeting in Frankfurt, it was decided that security screening of applicants should be done by the intelligence division of the Army. By directive, published March 13, 1946, the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army was given the responsibility of screening applicants with regard to the security of the United States, and such other information as might be helpful to the consulates in determining the eligibility of applicants, as well as whether they were or were not desirable prospective citizens of the United States. The inspector general of the European command of the United States Army stated to me that under the President's directive of December 22, 1945, the Counter Intelligence Corp's screening teams tried to get information on every applicant to as complete a degree as possible; that their investigation was not merely confined to an examination of the Berlin documents center for registration of Nazis, or to military government records and German police records for disclosure of criminals or known subversives. However, even with as complete an investigation as possible, the inspector general stated:

> We felt unquestionably that undesirable people were getting through.

This was the head of the Intelligence Corps of the Army speaking to a Member of the United States Senate.

He further stated:

> After the Displaced Persons Commission came into existence—

And this will be of interest to those who read the RECORD—

> our sphere of activity was limited.

Just a few days ago, a former official of Army Intelligence testified before the full Judiciary Committee as follows:

> We became convinced with adequate evidence that deliberate attempts were being made by the Soviet Government not only to infiltrate the military installations of Berlin and Germany but to send people much farther, to the United States, to South America, and to Canada, under the guise of being displaced persons or being political refugees.

That testimony was given by a trained man who has served in the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army. His remarks are certainly worthy of our pausing to consider them.

Though it be repetition, Mr. President, I read again his testimony given before the full Committee on the Judiciary only a few days ago here in the Capital of the Nation. He said:

> We became convinced with adequate evidence that deliberate attempts were being made by the Soviet Government not only to infiltrate the military installations of Berlin and Germany but to send people much farther, to the United States, to South America and to Canada, under the guise of being displaced persons or being political refugees.

When we pause to consider that statement we find it to be a startling one. Here is a great humanitarian movement into which we have poured millions of dollars, to which we have given the very best we have. That great humanitarian movement, which comes from the pulsing heart of American humanity, which seeks to relieve those who are honestly afflicted, is being used by the Soviet Government as a method of infiltrating into this country those who would destroy the very government which affords them the opportunity to come here and obtain shelter after they do come here.

Is it any wonder that some of us are given pause when we think of this? Is it any wonder that some of us are resolved and determined that so long as we have breath in our body the law shall not again be so written that under the guise of being a humanitarian movement it can be used by those who would destroy our form of government?

Mr. President, it is no easy matter to stand before the Senate under a condemnation that has been hurled upon us by columnists, by newspapers, by hirelings of all kinds. It has been no easy matter to stand, for months, the condemnation of creatures unfitted to be recognized as a part of the press of America, who have hurled condemnations against the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate. If there is any printable name which that rat has not called me I have not been able to find it. To my way of thinking, what the skunk is to the lower animals of life, Drew Pearson is to the press of America. And he can have that from me just as long as he listens.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that we must sometimes depart from giving consideration to so serious a matter as the subject we are now discussing, but when one has been the subject of calumnation, of lies, of deceit, of every form of condemnation that human tongue can utter, one sometimes must voice his resentment.

As a matter of fact, the inadequacy of screening during the period 1946–48 was the subject of a detailed report by the inspector general of the European command to the War Department in February 1948. I regret exceedingly that this report has been classified as confidential and that I am, therefore, precluded by law from disclosing its contents.

I referred to that report, Mr. President, in the early part of my remarks. I said then and I now repeat that I am precluded by law from disclosing its contents because it is marked "confidential." I wish the Senate of the United States could read that report. That report was compiled by the head of the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army under the direction and guidance of Gen. Lucius Clay, and was approved by him. It is now in my hands, but I do not dare disclose it to the Senate of the United States, although it is an enlightening document which, if available

to the Members of the Senate and the people of the United States would give them valuable information—information collected by the most reliable source. But it is marked "confidential," and therefore I cannot disclose it or use it. However, I can state that a certain branch of the Army prepared and filed with the State Department a detailed report containing information as to the penetration of Soviet agents into the United States under the guise of displaced persons, and this report contains vast information respecting fraudulent practices in the admission of displaced persons. Notwithstanding that the inadequacy of screening was documented and reported in 1948 when the Displaced Persons Commission assumed the function of determining eligibility, it succeeded in limiting investigations of the Counter Intelligence Corps to the security aspect only.

In other words, instead of expanding the investigation functions of the Counter Intelligence Corps, which experience and sound administration of the act would require, the scope of these investigations was actually curtailed, and the sphere of the Counter Intelligence Corps was limited so that the CIC now confines its investigation to an examination of official records for criminal convictions or Nazi Party affiliation, and a cursory interview of the applicant himself. The Displaced Persons Commission justified the limitation of the Counter Intelligence Corps investigation on the ground that the development of facts affecting eligibility under the act usurped the functions of the Displaced Persons Commission; that the development of facts affecting the status of a displaced person usurped the functions of the International Refugee Organization because the Displaced Persons Commission is, in any event, bound by the certification of the International Refugee Organization; that the development of other derogatory information affecting the desirability of a displaced person as an immigrant usurped the functions of the consular service and of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; and, finally, that such investigations took so long that it would be impossible to reach the goal of 205,000 immigrants by June 30, 1950.

It might be said, Mr. President, that the personal interview by the CIC investigator affords an opportunity to check the background of each applicant, so that subversives would be screened out. Such a statement would overlook the fact that, on an average, 12,000 displaced persons a month have come to the United States for the past year, reaching a peak of 16,000 for the month of November 1949. This necessarily means that the limited force of Counter Intelligence Corps investigators, which consists of five screening teams, has not only interviewed an average of 12,000 persons per month, but, in addition, has also checked the Berlin documents center, German police records, and military government records, making an average of 12,000 checks a month. What is more, the CIC is required to submit its report within 10 days after an applicant's name is certified to it. Consequently, it is little wonder that the vast majority of the Counter Intelligence Corps reports merely state "no comment" or "no adverse information." It is also little wonder that officials who are making CIC investigations believe that more time and more thorough field checks are required for adequate screening. It is only in instances where an applicant has confided his communistic and subversive beliefs to his fellow camp occupants that a CIC investigator has a reasonable opportunity to discover this fact by the aforesaid interview and questioning of camp occupants. Obviously, Mr. President, Communist agents who have been planted as displaced persons, and who are among the best trained in the world, will have given no reason to their camp associates to become suspicious of them. These are the ones who might be screened out, however, if an adequate opportunity for thorough investigation were given to the Counter Intelligence Corps, with a reasonable time allowed to complete such investigation. In this connection, a former official of the Intelligence Division of the Army testified before the full Judiciary Committee that there are Communists among the persons who have come over as displaced persons; that our screening of applicants is inadequate from a security standpoint, but that the intelligence agencies have adequate screening facilities, if permitted to use them; and that we could screen out all of the really dangerous subversives.

As recently as February 15 of this year, Mr. Almanza Tripp, Chief Immigration Officer in Europe of the displaced-persons program, testified before the Immigration Subcommittee with respect to the laxity of thorough screening in the program. Mr. Tripp stated:

There became available to me recently, copies of the results of a fingerprint check made by the provost marshal's office in a number of cases The first group of cases in which the information became available to me related to 90-odd individuals. Immediately I checked the camp registration records, Camp Grohn in Bremen, to determine if any of the persons named had proceeded to the United States. I found that 33 of the people had already sailed to the United States.

Question. Has it not been the policy of the Displaced Persons Commission to avoid Berlin document center checks or provost marshal checks in the processing of displaced persons on the basis of a calculated risk theory of the Displaced Persons Commission?

Answer. I do not know whether I would say they did it to avoid, but what they have done is process practically all cases without receiving the returns from the Berlin document center or from the provost marshal.

Question. Those are centers where there would be criminal records on individuals?

Answer. The Berlin document center records would indicate Nazi affiliations and the provost marshal records would indicate arrest and convictions, possibly by the American authorities, in criminal cases and in some cases convictions in German courts.

Question. It was because of your check * * * that you found these 100-odd cases of criminal conviction, 33 of which had already come to the United States, is that right?

Answer. That is right.

Question. As I understand it, The CIC (Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army) sends its report back to the Displaced Persons Commission before getting an answer from the Berlin document center?

Answer. That is right. * * * the Commission felt that they could take the calculated risk and it would not slow down the flow of displaced persons.

Question. Well, how many cases have come to you from the Displaced Persons Commission since your conversation with Mr. Kaplan in which he told you of this determination that they would accept the calculated risk?

Answer. Around 125,000.

Question. Now, do you not think, Mr. Tripp, from your knowledge over this long period of years, that a calculated risk of that kind is a pretty serious thing for the security of our Nation?

Answer. I think it is dangerous.

How dangerous, Mr. President? How dangerous is it in this day and age when our country is passing through its most trying period; when our country is passing through a period in which its enemies find a place of refuge within its borders, as well as outside its borders; when today almost two-thirds of the population of the world is under the domination of an idcology that is the avowed enemy of the American form of government? How dangerous is it when, according to the testimony of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, given before the Senate Appropriations Committee only a few days ago, there are today within the United States 54,000 registered Communists and nearly 500,000 fellow travelers or sympathizers.

Mr. President, that is why some of us have paused on this matter. It is why some of us are willing, if need be, to sacrifice our political lives. It is why some of us are entirely content to battle this thing out, to the end that America may go on, and that our form of government may prevail against an enemy that is forever pitted against us from every angle. When today, we have a commission, sworn, holding office, which is willing to take the calculated risk of bringing people into this country who would destroy our form of government, I am not ready to sit down, nor am I ready to give up, nor am I ready to be smoked out by all the paid agencies in the world. A $1,000,000 lobby is recorded in the Congress of the United States, a lobby which has spent nearly $1,000,000 in lobbying. It is of record in the Congress of the United States. For what was the $1,000,000 spent? Someone, certainly not in this Chamber but somewhere else, could answer. A million dollars is not expended lightly; a million dollars is not collected lightly; a million-dollar lobby is not a small thing. It is all pitted against the question of whether we shall protect the United States of America against those who the CIC say constitute an avenue for bringing to America enemies of our form of government. Others say they were brought in through this avenue.

In other words, Mr. President, not only has the screening of applicants by the CIC been limited in scope, but the Commission does not even wait for a full report before processing and approving applicants for immigration under the act.

Mr. Donald W. Main, senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission at Munich, the only senior officer with training and experience in immigration matters, a man who has served in the

Immigration Service for years, who was lent by the Immigration Service to the Displaced Persons Commission, testified before the Immigration Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, as follows:

Question What agency of the Government actually does the investigating?

Answer. The Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army does the investigation with reference to the character and history and the security factor involved on each displaced person

Question. Do you have any complaint about that organization, that it is not properly performing its functions as an investigative agency?

Answer. In my opinion, the investigation that is conducted is not thorough enough.

Question But whom could we trust more than the United States Army, which is occupying Germany, in relation to security questions?

Answer. I do not think there is anyone whom you can trust more. However, in my opinion, the investigations should go further than they do at the present time. * * * The law requires a thorough investigation. In my opinion, the thorough investigation called for in the law and regulations is not being conducted.

Question. Do you know to what extent the CIC is under * * * pressure or persuasion to expedite its cases?

Answer. As the program was originally set up, I think the CIC was, as a pattern, supposed to complete their investigation in approximately 20 days.

Question Is that, in your opinion, sufficient time?

Answer. No, sir.

Question Do you not think that it is remarkable that you have not run into cases of more aggravated offenses than those you have mentioned and observed?

Answer. I think that if a more thorough investigation were made, without doubt more derogatory information would be developed.

During my investigation in Europe, I was repeatedly told by United States officials in every phase of the program that because of the tremendous emphasis on speed in processing applicants, the CIC check was of little or no value except as to known subversives or criminals. In this connection, Senators will recall that applicants are processed and certified by the Commission as being of good moral character, without having received the complete CIC report on criminality or Nazi affiliation.

Yes, Mr. President, security screening of applicants is inadequate, with little or no investigation of the background or political beliefs of applicants, and this has opened our gates to persons who will not become good citizens, to persons who are potentially ready recruits for subversive organizations created in this country to tear down the democracy of the United States.

The Judiciary Committee has amended H. R. 4567 to tighten up the protection and security of the United States by specifically defining displaced persons independently of any international organization; and by vesting the final determination of the eligibility of applicants in trained immigration personnel of the United States, who are citizens of the United States and who have had not less than 3 years' experience in the Immigration and Naturalization Service, or in the American foreign service.

I have stated, Mr. President, and I repeat, that under the administration of the present act persons seeking the status of displaced persons have resorted to fraud, misrepresentation, fictitious documents, and perjury in order to qualify for immigration to the United States. I am well aware that those charged with the responsibility of administering the act would have us believe otherwise, and that weazel-worded statements have been made to create the impression that no displaced person has immigrated to this country on fraudulent documents. The fact of the matter is that not only have displaced persons immigrated on fraudulent documents, but it is impossible to determine how many have come to this country on fraudulent documents. I was repeatedly told by consular officials that they had no way of furnishing the exact number, but that they did know applicants were coming through on fraudulent documents. As a typical example, a vice consul, who incidentally is a chief visa-issuing officer and a career Foreign Service employee, advised me that a consul has no power to override the finding of eligibility of the Displaced Persons Commission, even though he has good reason to believe an applicant's documents are fraudulent, unless such applicant had previously applied for emigration as a displaced person under the President's directive and had been refused by the consulate because of fraudulent documents. If such a person attempts to go through again, he is refused a visa under our general immigration laws, not because of ineligibility as a displaced person, but because of attempted fraud in an earlier application for a visa. When asked if he had many cases like that, he replied:

We have had a number I would say four or five a month.

Think of that. Four or five a month in just one consular office—and these are only in cases where the applicant had previously made an application with the consulate so that there is a consular record of his fraudulent documentation. This consular officer further stated:

If a case comes in to us as a new case so that we have no record of previously attempted fraud, the person's status as a displaced person has been determined by the IRO and the Commission, and we have nothing to do with it.

I asked him if he had any way of determining whether an applicant has previously submitted a different set of documents to the IRO and is now going through on a new set of documents which may be fraudulent, to which he replied:

No, we have no way of knowing if he has submitted fraudulent documents to the IRO, unless he had previously actually applied to the consulate for immigration on fraudulent documents.

A responsible employee of the Displaced Persons Commission stated to me that he believed approximately one-third of the displaced persons qualifying for immigration to the United States had qualified on the basis of false and fraudulent documents so as to come within the so-called cut-off date of December 22, 1945. I asked him if he could prove this statement, and if not, on what he based his opinion. His reply was that it would be impossible to prove how many persons had used fraudulent documents without a detailed examination of each case, but that his opinion was based on personal observation with more than a year of experience as an employee of the Displaced Persons Commission. The experience of this employee was confirmed by three other employees of the Displaced Persons Commission in widely separated areas. All of whom stated it would be impossible to determine the exact number of displaced persons using fraudulent documents, because where fraudulent documents were used to qualify under the act, a residence address in the Russian zone of Germany is given with knowledge that it is impossible to check the truth or falsity of such statement. An official of the Immigration and Naturalization Service pointed out an instance where 94 displaced persons gave the same address in Weisbaden as their place of residence. This is in the bizone of Germany and could be checked. He stated that thereafter displaced persons using fraudulent documents gave residences in the Russian zone of Germany and, that although an address of residence in the Russian zone of Germany is regarded with suspicion, there is little that can be done to check the fact of residence. This official believes that the percentage of displaced persons moving on fraudulent documents is, in his words, "substantial," but stated that he has no way of arriving at a percentage figure, because the basic fraud is consummated with the International Refugee Organization. A former official of Army Intelligence in Germany testified before the full committee that certain voluntary agencies advise displaced persons on how they might best evade our immigration laws and the regulations which have been set up for the handling of displaced persons, and he further stated:

It is possible for any of you gentlemen today, speaking fluent German, to go into Berlin and buy yourself any kind of documents you want.

What is more, I was advised by a high official of the inspector general's office of the European command that they had "positive evidence that two of the religious voluntary agencies had been guilty of forgery of documents in their own offices and had admitted that they would do anything to get displaced persons and persecutees into the United States." This official further stated:

We have uncovered in connection with the displaced-persons program at this time in a number of places organized rings for the purpose of faking documents.

He advised that anyone could get a fraudulent birth certificate or fraudulent police certificate of residence to file with the International Refugee Organization and qualify under our law. One of our chief consular officials in Germany drew my attention to a pending prosecution of a German police official for furnishing fraudulent documents to displaced persons and stated:

This is a prevalent practice, but we haven't been able to prosecute many cases.

This official further advised that a high percentage of displaced persons qualifying under our law were using fraudulent documents, but that it would be impos-

sible to determine either the number or the percentage without a complete investigation in each case. He further stated that because residence or birth in the Russian zone of Germany and areas behind the iron curtain are involved in most fraudulent documents cases, it would probably be impossible to make such an investigation. In his opinion, greater attention to the screening of applicants, and expansion of the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army, would prevent many fraudulent document cases.

Another consular official stated his belief that—

A large percentage of the cases which have been processed, and are now being considered, are based upon fraudulent documents, but there is no way of determining what this percentage may be.

He further stated that the only available figures on cases involving fraudulent documents are those cases which have been caught by the CIC investigation, or by the consular office upon personal interview of the applicant, and that the vast majority are not caught.

A representative of one of the voluntary agencies stated that the Displaced Persons Commission had cooperated to a remarkable degree because their sole purpose seemed to be to approve 205,000 persons before the expiration of the law, without regard to the fitness or desirability of individual applicants. This representative further stated that the Displaced Persons Commission approved qualifying information submitted by the IRO even though the file disclosed contradictory documentation and the probability of fraudulent documents, and he said:

The responsible officials of the Displaced Persons Commission perform no useful function for their high salaries. The way the law is being administered, our tax money would be better spent for clerks, bookkeepers, and IBM machines to process the paper work faster because selectors and analysts of the Displaced Persons Commission are only doing paper work and clerical checking of dates.

With further reference to the fraudulent documents phase of this subject, Mr. President, several days ago the Displaced Persons Commission charged that statements made by me concerning the role of fraud in our program were either deliberate untruths or based upon misinformation. I said then, and I now repeat, that fraud has entered into the program in every area of Europe. I now ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a copy of a letter addressed to the Secretary of State by the consul general at Munich, setting out of a number of specific cases involving fraudulent documents in that one area.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
Munich, Germany, September 9, 1949.

Subject: Possibility of fraud in connection with visas obtained by displaced persons in Amberg, Germany.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington.

SIR: I have the honor to report that it has come to the attention of the Amberg suboffice of the consulate general that 10 visas were issued between December 29, 1948, and June 16, 1949, to displaced persons who are apparently ineligible under Public Law 774 for admission into the United States. It is understood that these persons are either now en route to or are already in the United States. These persons have all made statements under oath in their visa applications which subsequent documentary evidence had shown to be probably false, and in each case the ineligibility of the person concerned was dependent upon the truth of the statements. The specific point in question is the date upon which these applicants arrived in Germany. In order to be eligible under Public Law 774, these applicants must have arrived in Germany before December 22, 1945. The recently discovered documentation indicates that these applicants all arrived subsequent to this date.

The matter was called to the attention of the consulate general by the military government officer responsible for the town of Schwandorf, Bavaria, who is at present investigating charges of bribery of a member of the city government of Schwandorf by a prospective visa applicant. The accused is said to have paid 50 marks through the wife of the president of the Jewish committee of the town, in an effort to have the city records which show residence in Schwandorf adjusted so as to make him eligible under Public Law 774 This investigation has shown that a number of displaced persons, who had already departed for the United States, had previously caused their police records in Schwandorf to be changed, and further that upon their presentation for a visa, the statements which they made under oath did not correspond with records in Schwandorf. After examining the Schwandorf police records in these cases, the records of the International Refugee Organization in Amberg (IRO area IV headquarters) were also consulted. It was shown that these records agree with the Schwandorf records and do not support the statements made by the applicants in their application.

The 10 cases in question are as follows:

1. Boltuch, Lea, was issued Polish quota visa 3227/50 on December 29, 1948. Miss Boltuch stated under oath that she had resided in Munich from November 1945 until 1946. The Schwandorf records in this case consisted of two documents, one a questionnaire which Miss Boltuch prepared in order to obtain a German identification card. On the identification card questionnaire, she stated that she arrived directly in Schwandorf from Poland in the summer of 1946. On her police registration card, a notice as to her residence in Munich has been added, obviously subsequent to her original registration. In the files of IRO in Amberg, two documents were consulted in this case, the questionnaire prepared by Miss Boltuch for the Army, which states that she arrived in Germany in July 1946 from Poland, and the IRO card and maintenance questionnaire (CM-1 form), which indicates that she resided in Munich during the time stated on her application.

2 and 3. The documents in connection with Miss Boltuch's sister and brother-in-law, Simon and Taube Haber (Polish quota visas 6028/50 and 6029/50, issued February 3, 1949) also follow the same pattern of discrepancy, i. e., the residence in Munich is added later on police registration card, the identification card questionnaire shows no residence in Munich, the Army questionnaire shows arrival in Germany in 1946, and the CM-1 form shows residence in Munich between October 1945 and August 1946. It is noted that in both the Boltuch and Haber cases the CM-1 form was prepared on May 26, 1948, at which time it was generally known that in order to qualify under the President's directive of December 22, 1945, concerning the immigration of displaced persons, the applicant must have been in Germany prior to the date of the Directive.

4 and 5. Brafman, Daniel and Anna were issued Polish quota visas 3593/50 and 3594/50 on February 2, 1949. Brafman stated in his application that he came to Germany in November 1945 and resided in the neighborhood of Schwandorf from that date on. On his Schwandorf identification card questionnaire, he states that he arrived in Schwandorf in July 1946. However, there is an entry in pencil (possibly in Brafman's own handwriting) between his statements as to residence in Piotrkow, Poland, in 1945 and Lodz, Poland, in 1946, stating that he lived in Schwandorf between November and December 1945. Brafman's CM-1 form shows residence in Lodz, Poland, uninterruptedly from June 1945 until June 1946, where he was employed as a tailor.

6, 7, and 8. Henryk, Mela, and Fedor Badrian were issued Germar quota visa 6945, Polish quota visa 5001/53 and German quota visa 6946, respectively, on April 21, 1949. Badrian based his eligibility on arrival in Schwandorf in September 1945 from Kattowice, Poland. This statement is substantiated by the identification card questionnaire in Schwandorf. However, the IRO CM-1 form shows Badrian to have been residing uninterruptedly in Kattowice from January 1945 until September 1946 and the IRO DP registration card (DP-2 card) shows the same information

9 and 10. Israel and Irena Dreier were issued Polish quota visas 5415/56 and 5416/56 on June 16, 1949. Dreier claims to have been in Schwandorf between September and December 1945. There is no record in the Schwandorf police records of this trip to Schwandorf from Poland. Furthermore, there is attached to the police records a Polish certificate of residence showing Dreier to be living in Krakow from March 1945 until March 1946. The CM-1 form does not show residence for Dreier in Schwandorf before September 1946.

The investigation of these cases and other similar cases in which visas have not yet been issued is being continued by the local Displaced Persons Commission Team, the International Refugee Organization, and Military Government, CIC, and this office, and if any other cases are discovered in which it is believed that visas have been issued to persons not eligible under Public Law 774, the Department will be informed immediately.

Information in the records in question indicates that the following persons may have made false statements in their visa applications believing that these statements were necessary in order to establish their eligibility under Public Law 774:

Albert, Solomon (Polish Quota Visa 5453/56 issued June 30, 1949.

Apfelbaum, Juda and Perla (Polish Quota Visas 5626/53 and 5627/53 issued April 22, 1949).

Taffel, Leib and Estera (Polish Quota Visas 6202/52 and 6203/52 issued March 29, 1949).

The information in the documents, however, shows that these persons were already eligible from the point of view of entry into Germany prior to December 22, 1945. These persons had been in concentration camps in Germany during the war, then returned to Poland, and apparently falsified the dates of their re-entry into Germany.

The Schwandorf documents disclosed above are in the archives of the burgermeister of Schwandorf, and the IRO CM-1 forms and DP-2 cards are in possession of the IRO Area IV Headquarters, Amberg, Germany

Respectfully yours,

SAM E. WOODS,
American Consul General.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, subsequent to my investigation in Europe, the senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe, Mr. Donald

Main, caused the CIC to make an investigation of qualifying documents issued out of the town of Schnaitsee in Bavaria, Germany. On February 14, 1950, Mr. Main testified as follows:

As a result of our suspicions, we asked the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army, in addition to their regular, routine investigation, to check into the authenticity of certain documents which were presented to us to establish residence within the required period, and also to check the records upon which the certificates were based to determine their authenticity.

Question. Do you think there is much of this fraud?

Answer I think it is extensive.

Question. Can you give us an idea as to how many cases you think there have been an attempt at fraud?

Answer. I would say that at least 500 in our particular area have been called to our attention by name.

Question Are those persons all being held up so that they will not get visas until there can be an absolutely complete investigation?

Answer. Those that have not already departed are being held * * * records for 300 persons had been established at Schnaitsee claiming residence prior to December 22, 1945, for individuals who had not lived there during the period alleged. I do not know whether or not all of those have been used by the individuals to attempt illegal immigration to the United States. Some of them have.

Question. How many of the 300 got into the United States?

Answer. I would estimate that of those that were processed in our area about 100 have already come to the United States.

Question. Approximately 100 of those 300 frauds were ultimately successful in enabling the persons to get into the United States?

Answer. That is right. * * *

Question. When did you find out about these frauds involving the 300 cases?

Answer. It was some time in January that we received the complete report from the CIC with reference to the Schnaitsee documents. * * * The finger was pointed at Schnaitsee by the CIC to us verbally by conversation with the officer in charge of the screening process.

Question. Was that report made after Senator MCCARRAN had been over in Europe?

Answer. Yes, it was.

Mr. Main further testified that the CIC investigation now in process in the Munich area has disclosed fraudulent documents and fraudulent records issued in Munich, Kaufbeuren, Furstenfeldbruck, Traunstein, Schwandorf, Weilheim, Ulm, Roding. As to the town of Roding, Mr. Main testified as follows:

Question. Have you looked into the matter of the 100 cases at Roding to determine whether the allegations of fraud are in fact correct?

Answer. I am convinced, from the evidence we were furnished by the CIC, that they are correct. We have a report from them containing the confession of the officers who established these records fraudulently. There are two of them, I should say, this individual and his assistant. The latest information I received from the CIC was that they were in jail in Roding pending the completion of the CIC's investigation and are awaiting prosecution by the military government.

Mr. Main further testified with respect to approximately 1,700 cases which were presented in the Munich area by two voluntary agencies during a 3-week period in September after these agencies had indicated they were at the end of cases in which they were interested. Because of the suspicious circumstances surrounding the presentation of these cases, all were held in suspension by Mr. Main until after the CIC could complete an investigation as to fraudulent documentation. Mr. Main indicated that the 1,700 cases related to heads of families only, and that the total number of persons involved would be approximately 3,500. Of the 1,700 held in suspense, only 700 have been documented to the point where they might be referred to the CIC for investigation. Of the 700 referred to the CIC for investigation, approximately 100 have been referred for 2 months; approximately 300 to 400 have been in the hands of the CIC for 1 month; and approximately 200 to 300 have been referred to the CIC for less than 1 month.

Of the first group sent over to the CIC, approximately 50 percent of the cases have been found conclusively to have been based on fraudulent documents. As to the remaining 50 percent, there may be some doubt about the fraud involved. That is not my statement; it is the testimony of a senior officer of the displaced persons commission in charge of the largest area in Germany.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. What was the nature of the papers in the cases which involved fraudulent documents? Were they birth certificates, or visas; or what kind of documents were they?

Mr. MCCARRAN. They were birth certificates and residence certificates. Printing presses were found in the region of some of the displaced persons camps, on which birth certificates and residence certificates were being printed. Possibly the Senator was not in the Chamber at the time, but I have previously recited statements which were made to us to the effect that anyone speaking fluent German could go into Berlin and buy almost any kind of certificate he wanted.

Mr. RUSSELL. They were forged German certificates, were they not, which would indicate that the persons forging them were German nationals?

Mr. MCCARRAN. Not necessarily. They might be nationals of any country. They were birth certificates and as a rule they were forged as to date. There were also some residence certificates which were forged as to the date when a person was alleged to have come into the area in which he was supposed to be on the cut-off date, which was December 22, 1945.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the Senator gather any information as to the nationality of the persons who possessed the forged papers?

Mr. MCCARRAN. Some. I might say that they belonged to all nationalities.

Mr. RUSSELL. All nationalities?

Mr. MCCARRAN. Of the group of nationals involved.

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me that it would be rather difficult to forge a Russian birth certificate. I can understand how it might be possible to forge a German birth certificate. However, it would seem to me to be rather difficult to forge a Russian or other type of birth certificate or residence certificate.

Mr. MCCARRAN. In the case of forged certificates showing persons as coming from behind the iron curtain, there would be no way of checking behind the iron curtain, because it is impossible to get into those countries to make an investigation. But it was no trouble to claim either birth or residence behind the iron curtain, and in that case residence in the German Trizone was claimed prior to December 22, 1945, so as to bring them within the period prescribed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the Senator receive any information which would indicate that there were involved nationals of countries behind the iron curtain who held German papers indicating that they were Germans? In other words, were there any Russians posing as Germans in this area?

Mr. MCCARRAN. My memory does not serve me as to any particular case of that kind, in which Russians posed as Germans, excepting the general statement, which was made by some of the officers who testified before us, that persons were coming in as displaced persons under Russian guidance for subversive purposes.

Mr RUSSELL. Those persons usually had Russian papers?

Mr. MCCARRAN. They either had Russian papers, or they might have had German papers, claiming to have been Germans, when, in fact, they were Russians.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the question I had in mind.

Mr. MCCARRAN. It is my belief that the number of displaced persons coming to the United States on fraudulent documents will be substantially and materially reduced by the committee amendments which specifically define displaced persons and eligibility, with the final determination on eligibility vested in citizens of the United States who are trained in immigration matters.

Passing now from the fraudulent-document phase, the investigation disclosed a practice which I can only characterize as a direct violation of the law, namely, the removal of material documents from the file on an applicant prior to transmitting such file to the American consul.

When a field analyst rejects an applicant because he believes him to be ineligible, the practice has been, and still is, to have the senior officer review the rejection. If approved by the senior officer, the entire file is then sent to Commission headquarters in Frankfurt, with an accompanying letter of rejection, setting out in considerable detail the reasons for such rejection. This case is then reviewed by the Frankfurt office. If the rejection is reversed, the file is then returned to the field office with a directive advising the senior officer of the reversal, and instructing him to write a favorable report if the applicant is otherwise eligible. It was the practice of the Frankfurt office to conclude its reversal letter with this paragraph:

Please withdraw from the file all previous Commission reports and notifications before

forwarding same to the consul. This letter may be incorporated in the file in support of the directed action.

Mr. President, here is an applicant for displaced person's status, who has been rejected by a field officer for some valid reason, a reason which the field officer believed to be sufficient for rejection, and sufficient to make the officer believe the applicant would not make a good citizen of the United States. But the head of the Displaced Persons Commission at Frankfurt would send this instruction:

Please withdraw from the file all previous Commission reports and notifications before forwarding same to the consul. This letter may be incorporated in the file in support of the directed action.

Let me say in all fairness that I am advised this practice was discontinued last fall. I call it to the attention of the Senate only for the purpose of emphasizing the inclination of Commission employees to act favorably on every displaced person who might conceivably qualify under the act in order to reach their "goal" of the maximum number authorized by law, even to the point of withholding from consular and immigration officials material adverse opinions of Commission employees in the field by withdrawing from the files official actions of rejection, together with the reasons therefor. The Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission testified before the committee that this practice was wrong and had been discontinued.

Mr. President, at the end of the war the Allied armies in central Europe became the guardians of approximately 8,000,000 persons who had been displaced during the war. Within a few months after the war approximately 7,000,000 of these persons were repatriated to their native countries, leaving about 1,000,000 persons, who refused to return to their homelands because of fear of persecution. By the expiration date of our present displaced-persons law, June 30, 1950, there will remain only a few thousand such war-displaced persons in central Europe, other than the so-called "hard core," who are ineligible for resettlement because of social or physical disqualifications. The number included in this group is reliably estimated as 170,000 persons.

This statement was made to me repeatedly during the course of my investigation by officials of every agency of our Government operating in Europe, and by former high-ranking Army and Navy personnel who are now employed by the International Refugee Organization. In fact, Mr. Ugo Carusi of the Displaced Persons Commission confirmed this statement before the Judiciary Committee a few days ago.

Because we will have exhausted most of the persons eligible for immigration to the United States by the end of the present act, June 30, 1950, in considering legislation to extend the operation of the act for 1 year, to June 30, 1951, it seems to me there are only two things that may be done, and either of these, or both, could be included in such legislation, namely, (1) to rewrite our definition of a displaced person so as to expand the category of persons who are eligible under our act, even though they may not be eligible under annex I of the constitution of the IRO, or (2) to change the so-called cut-off date of December 22, 1945, for eligibility.

I therefore recommended, as a result of our studies, that section 2 (b) of the present law be repealed so as to divorce eligibility under our law from discretionary determinations of the IRO for the reasons which I have heretofore stated, and also so that our definition of a displaced person would be expanded to include war displaced persons of World War II who are not now eligible because they are excluded by the interpretive definition of the IRO constitution. I had in mind two large categories who meet every qualification of our act, including the December 22, 1945, cut-off date, but who are nevertheless ineligible. The first of these categories is the German expellees. These are persons of German ethnic origin who resided in countries east of Germany, and who have been forcibly expelled from their country of origin by reason of the Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945. Millions of these people have been driven into Germany and Austria. They are not former Nazis nor former enemies of the United States, but they are expressly excluded from eligibility under our law by the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, notwithstanding that they are, in fact, war-displaced persons who were uprooted and torn from their homes as a consequence of World War II within the spirit and meaning of the language used in the IRO constitution.

The second category is the Greek displaced persons who have been displaced from their homes either by the Nazis during World War II or by the Communists during the Greek civil war. These unfortunate people meet every other test of our law except the definition of section 2 (b), and they have been excluded only because to be "of the concern of IRO" one must be out of his country of origin. Therefore, since these displaced persons are in their native land, they are not "of the concern" of IRO, and they consequently cannot qualify under section 2 (b) of the present law.

After due consideration, Mr. President, the Judiciary Committee approved extension of the 1948 act to June 30, 1951. The committee expanded the definition of displaced persons to include Germans of ethnic origin and natives of Greece. The committee also advanced the so-called cut-off date for eligibility from December 22, 1945, to January 1, 1949. I was, and still am, opposed to the advance of the cut-off date. The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 is based upon the fundamental humanitarian principle of resettling persons who were uprooted from their homes and native lands by the horrors of World War II. I am in hearty accord with this principle and I not only supported the act of 1948 but I also worked diligently as a member of the subcommittee and also the full committee which considered the 1948 act, to formulate legislation to carry out that principle.

The war in Europe was ended in May 1945, Mr. President. Some 7 months after the war ended the President, on December 22, 1945, issued a directive dealing with war-displaced persons. When we drafted the act of 1948 we, therefore, fixed the date of the President's directive, December 22, 1945, as a limiting classification for the purpose of segregating the persons who were displaced by the consequences of war from the "displeased" persons who had voluntarily displaced themselves. I favored then, and I still favor, such segregation, and I believe it will be destroyed if we advance the eligibility cut-off date to January 1, 1949.

I realize full well that there are thousands of persons who have wandered into Germany, Austria and Italy since December 22, 1945, and who are now unable to return to their native lands because of threats of reprisals against them. But these people, Mr. President, have not been displaced as a consequence of World War II. They have voluntarily displaced themselves and therefore should not be classed as war-displaced persons. If they desire to immigrate to the United States they may do so under our general immigration laws. There is nothing in the December 22, 1945, cut-off date which denies them that opportunity. It therefore seems to me, Mr. President, that if the cut-off date is advanced to January 1, 1949, we will have abandoned the principle on which the act of 1948 is based, we will have departed from the principle of World War II displaced persons and will have established a principle which will be used to tear down our quota immigration system.

Mr. President, I say without fear of contradiction that that is one of the reasons why there is advocacy for this change of date. Today some are asking that 320,000 persons be permitted to come into the United States between the first day of October 1948 and the last day of June 1951. At that time there will be other movements on foot, under various guises and with various excuses, for bringing in more displaced persons, and our immigration law will be set at naught.

Mr. President, there are millions of people who want to come to the United States. This is the "honey pot" of the world and they all want to come here. But will our economy support them? If the cut-off date is advanced we will have established a principle which will be used to open our gates to the turbulent populations of the world. That this is the object of special interest groups cannot successfully be denied. One such group during the course of the last 3 years already has registered with the Clerk of the House of Representatives lobbying expenditures of approximately $1,000,000, and senators may be assured that the campaign to circumvent, nullify or repeal our immigration laws will be continued.

Mr. President, if we depart from the principle of special consideration for persons displaced by the horrors of World War II, by embracing persons who have left their homeland because

of economic or political reasons more than 4 years after the end of World War II, how can we deny special consideration to persons who have been displaced as a result of other wars throughout the world? No one can deny the compelling humanitarian reasons which will be advanced to obtain special consideration for millions of unfortunate displaced victims of the war in China, or approximately 10,000,000 Pakistanian displaced persons in the partition of India, or approximately 1,000,000 Palestinian displaced persons in the Palestine war. No one can deny that the principle which would be established by changing the cut-off date from December 22, 1945, to January 1, 1949, will be used to obtain special consideration for the turbulent populations of the world to immigrate to the United States as displaced persons.

What is more, Mr. President, the chief officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in Europe, officials of the Displaced Persons Commission, consular officers, and officials engaged in CIC investigations have testified and emphasized that advancing the so-called cut-off date to January 1, 1949, will necessarily increase the security risk to the United States. These officials have pointed out that countless thousands of Communist agents and other subversives have infiltrated into Germany, Austria, and Italy since December 1945 as displaced persons. Therefore, I have been compelled to stand by the principle which we wrote into the act of 1948, and I am opposed to advancing the so-called cut-off date.

Mr. President, it has been loosely charged—and I use the word "loosely" advisedly—that the United States has not taken its fair share of displaced persons, and that our present law should, therefore, be amended so as to drastically increase the number of persons who may be admitted. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, we have taken more than any other nation; and what is more, during the period immediately preceding the war, down to the present date, we have taken more than all of the other nations of the world combined.

Mr. President, lest perchance I might be misquoted, I shall repeat that statement: As a matter of fact, we have taken more displaced persons than any other nation has; and, what is more, during the period immediately preceding the war, down to the present date, we have taken more displaced persons than all the other nations of the world combined have taken.

It should be remembered that, unlike most countries of the world, the United States operates under an immigration-quota system whereby approximately 154,000 quota immigrants may be received annually for permanent residence, chiefly from European countries. In addition, immigrants are received for permanent residence on a nonquota immigration basis without any numerical limitation. The latter group consists chiefly of immigrants from the Western Hemisphere and of relatives of citizens of the United States. As an example, during the fiscal year 1948, there were admitted for permanent residence 92,526 quota immigrants and 78,044 nonquota immigrants, or a total of 170,570 immigrants. During the fiscal year 1949, there were admitted for permanent residence 113,046 quota immigrants and 75,271 nonquota immigrants, or a total of 188,317 immigrants.

Although our general immigration laws do not provide specific categories for displaced persons, reliable official and semiofficial estimates are that during the Nazi regime, through 1947, we received into the United States under our immigration laws between 250,000 and 300,000 displaced persons for permanent residence, and approximately 200,000 displaced persons for temporary stay.

In addition, pursuant to a Presidential directive of December 22, 1945, approximately 44,000 displaced persons were admitted into the United States for permanent residence from the date of the directive to the effective date of the present displaced-persons law, June 25, 1948.

The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 provides for the admission of 205,000 displaced persons over a 2-year period, and also provides for adjusting to permanent residence the status of 15,000 displaced persons who have gained admission on a temporary basis into the United States.

Thus, it is seen at a glance that, without amending the present law, by June 30, 1950, we shall have received approximately 549,000 displaced persons for permanent residence and approximately 200,000 for temporary stay, of which 15,000 will be permitted to adjust their status to permanent residence. In addition, of the 358,887 quota and nonquota immigrants during the fiscal years 1948 and 1949, some were undoubtedly displaced persons coming as regular immigrants, but there is no reliable way of estimating the number of displaced persons arriving under our general immigration laws. So you see, Mr. President, the charge that we have not taken our fair share is not founded on fact, and this is demonstrated by the record.

The bill, as reported to the Senate, will increase the total numerical limitation of displaced persons under the act of 1948 from 205,000 to 320,000, an increase of 115,000. Of the total of 320,000 visas authorized to be issued, 2,000 will be available to natives of Czechoslovakia, as provided in the present law; 10,000 will be available to natives of Greece; 18,000 will be available to certain members of the armed forces of the Republic of Poland; and 290,000 will be available to displaced persons in the general category, as compared to 203,000 under the present law. If the 115,000 increase provided in the bill is agreed to, we shall have received for permanent residence in the United States 300,000 as regular immigrants, plus 44,000 under the President's directive, plus 15,000 temporary residents who may have their status adjusted to permanent residence, plus 320,000 under the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, or—mark this, Mr. President—approximately 679,000 displaced persons by June 30, 1951, without counting those who are admitted as regular immigrants during 1948, 1949, 1950, and 1951. In addition, the bill makes provision for the admission of 5,000 orphans or abandoned children and 5,000 adopted children. How can it be said that we have not taken our fair share, in the face of this record?

It has also been loosely charged, Mr. President, as I stated previously—and again, Mr. President, I use the word "loosely" advisedly—that our displaced persons program discriminates against persons of the Jewish and the Catholic faiths. A brief glance at the record will demonstrate that this charge is not founded upon fact.

Mr. President, I stated in the earlier part of my remarks that I was a member of the subcommittee, which acted under its very able chairman, Senator Revercomb, of West Virginia, in the Eightieth Congress, when the 1948 act was drafted. I do not think it is necessary for the senior Senator from Nevada to state that he is a Roman Catholic. I do not think it should be necessary for him to state that some of his most intimate friends, some of his best friends in all the world, belong to the Jewish faith. I do not think it should be necessary, so far as my colleagues are concerned, for me to state that there is nothing in my make-up which would cause me to discriminate against anyone by reason of his religion or his blood. Certainly it need not be stated that I would not be a party to the formation of any measure which would discriminate against the religion which was given me by my mother.

So, Mr. President, to state that there is discrimination in the 1948 act against Catholics and Jews, is to fly in the face of the record.

During the war years, of the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons who were admitted into the United States, it is reliably estimated that approximately four-fifths were of Jewish faith.

Under the President's directive of December 22, 1945, visas were issued to 23,594 displaced persons of Jewish faith; 5,924 to displaced persons of Catholic faith; and 3,906 to displaced persons of Protestant faith; in other words, 88 percent to persons of Jewish or Catholic faith, 12 percent to persons of Protestant faith.

The Visa Division of the State Department reports that under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as of November 30, 1949, visas had been issued to 127,866 displaced persons; 53,402, or 41 percent, to displaced persons of Catholic faith; 33,479, or 26 percent, to displaced persons of Jewish faith; 20,279, or 16 percent, to displaced persons of Protestant faith; 19,283, or 15 percent, to displaced persons of Greek Orthodox faith; and 1,423, or 2 percent, to displaced persons of unknown faith.

On January 23, Mr. Ugo Carusi, of the Displaced Persons Commission, testified before the Judiciary Committee that the registration of displaced persons completed by the International Refugee Organization in April 1947 showed that 60 percent were of Catholic faith, 25 percent were of Jewish faith, and 15 percent were of Protestant, Greek Orthodox, and other faiths. It should be noted that the IRO registration includes the so-called "hard core," who are not eligible for immigration to the United States, and also includes persons who immigrate

to other countries. Mr. Carusi further testified that of the approximately 130,000 displaced persons admitted under the act to the United States as of January 23, 1950, 48 percent were of Catholic faith, 25 percent were of Jewish faith, 25 percent were of Protestant, Greek Orthodox and other faiths, with 2 percent unreported. I have said before, and I repeat, there is no discrimination against displaced persons of Catholic faith or of Jewish faith. During my investigation in Europe, every representative of the religious voluntary agencies, and every employee of the Consular Service, Immigration Service, Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army, International Refugee Organization, and even the Displaced Persons Commission, testifying before me—and there were more than 50 such witnesses—stated that the 1948 act does not discriminate against Catholics, or Jews, or persons of any other religious faith. There was only one witness who testified otherwise—the European Coordinator of the Displaced Persons Commission, Mr. Squadrilli. Yes, Mr. President, those who wish to be informed know that there is no discrimination in our law. Because of the seriousness of the charge, however, and in order to prevent its repetition, the bill, as reported, contains a prohibition against discrimination in the administration of the law. It is really a prohibition.

The Judiciary Committee has had before it, at all times during its deliberations on H. R. 4567 and related bills, two major considerations—first, to draft such legislation as may be necessary on the subject of displaced persons within the framework of our general immigration laws; and second, to secure maximum protection of the security interests of the United States to assure the exclusion of subversive and undesirable displaced persons. With the exception of the advance in the so-called eligibility cut-off date, I believe H. R. 4567, with the committee amendments reported to the Senate, will accomplish these over-all objectives.

Mr. President, I am aware that an effort will be made to pass H. R. 4567 in the same form in which it passed the House of Representatives. Such a move should not, and must not, succeed for the reasons I have stated in my remarks today. I urge Senators not to vote on this important issue without of full realization of the consequences of passing the bill, either as passed by the other body, or in substantially the same form. I am confident that sound, mature judgment will emphasize the wisdom of the committee amendments, excepting, however, the advance of the cut-off date. I am equally confident that Senators who have studied this matter without bias, prejudice, or political commitment, will support the committee amendments.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

FEDERAL RENT CONTROL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, according to press reports, the Senate Appropriations Committee voted last week to cut the deficiency appropriation request of the Federal Housing Expediter from $3,600,000 to $2,500,000. In so doing, according to the newspapers, the Appropriations Committee recommended that the Senate and the Congress direct the Housing Expediter to liquidate his rent-control activities.

Mr. President, I do not know or pretend to know what the Congress is going to do about the action of the Appropriations Committee. The Committee has, I believe, every right to indicate its recommendations on this or on any other subject. But I, as one Member of the Senate, should like to serve notice that I will seek to restore the funds for the Housing Expediter to whatever level is absolutely necessary to enable him to continue functioning during the remainder of the fiscal year, without any thought of the liquidation of his activities.

As one Member of the Senate, the junior Senator from New York will use all his efforts to see that rent control is extended beyond June 30 for an additional year. I should like to see and shall propose that the rent-control law be strengthened. I should also like to see the administration of rent control strengthened.

I do not know as a fact, but I should guess that one of the reasons for the many instances, which I am sure exist, of injustices and inequities to landlords as well as to tenants, is that the Housing Expediter has had insufficient appropriations for an adequate staff to administer the law flexibly and intelligently. I am for the prevention of gross injustice to individual landlords through the inflexible application of rent controls. But I am also in favor of strengthened rent-control legislation to prevent gross injustices to tenants in localities where the shortage of adequate rental units is such that free competition does not exist, and where the tenants are not in a position to exercise freedom of choice in their selection of rental units and have no bargaining power in making that choice.

The war, with the unprecedented growth in our industrial production resulting from war demand and from the demand for our products abroad, brought us into the present housing shortage situation. It is right and proper that the Federal Government should continue to exercise its powers to protect the people, as far as possible, against the consequences of this situation. When and where we have adequate rental units, we should strike off rent controls without delay. But in those centers of population and industrial production, so essential to our national defense, we must not run the danger of upsetting the entire national economy, with the terrible consequences which might result from such a course, by abandoning rent controls.

Mr. President, the New York State legislature is now considering a measure for State rent controls. I am wholly in accord with such a measure, if it is a good rent-control law, adequately protecting the tenants and renters of New York, and if it is not a mere subterfuge to weaken rent controls, or to set the stage for their sabotage or abolition. But I am also in favor of the continuation of Federal rent controls, in which case the Federal controls would serve as a stand-by for State controls in New York; the reverse of the situation which now pertains. It is also necessary to have Federal controls for the sake of the rest of the Nation, in areas which do not have the facilities with which to institute adequate local controls, and yet have a crying need for such controls.

Mr. President, in asking the Senator from Nevada to yield, I thought he had completed his statement; otherwise I should not have made the request.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think probably I had completed it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR WARREN R. AUSTIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few days ago, while reading the Christian Science Monitor, I came across a column by Mr. Homer Metz, who is the chief of the United Nations News Bureau for that publication, in which he spoke about a distinguished former Member of this distinguished body who sat next to me in the Senate for 2 or 3 years. I refer to the United States Representative to the United National, Warren R. Austin. I desire to read a few paragraphs from this very fine column:

> In his quiet, earnest way, Warren Austin, Chief United States Delegate to the United Nations, has scored something of a diplomatic coup in his lecture tour of Central America, now drawing to a close.
>
> In any event, this appears to be indicated by reports on the former Vermont Senator's trip which have been coming back to Lake Success through various Latin-American intermediaries.
>
> Mr. Austin has long held to the theory that inter-American unity is a sine qua non of Western Hemisphere security. Apparently he has succeeded admirably in convincing some of the more doubtful Thomases among Latin-American officials of the validity of this thesis.

Then there is this statement, which I think is of tremendous significance:

> Mr. Austin is one of the most refreshing individuals to appear on the international scene in a long, long time. He has the one quality that is needed above all others in international diplomacy—rugged honesty. Disagree with him if you will, but never doubt his sincerity, his desire to be fair. Mr. Austin is a Christian gentleman. No one could possibly represent the United States more ably.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UN'S AUSTIN: HIS "RUGGED HONESTY" IS ASSET FOR PEACE

(By Homer Metz)

LAKE SUCCESS.—In his quiet, earnest way, Warren R. Austin, chief United States delegate to the United Nations, has scored something of a diplomatic coup in his lecture tour of Central America, now drawing to a close.

In any event, this appears to be indicated by reports on the former Vermont Senator's trip which have been coming back to Lake Success through various Latin-American intermediaries.

Mr. Austin has long held to the theory that inter-American unity is a sine qua non of Western Hemisphere security. Apparently he has succeeded admirably in convincing some of the more doubtful Thomases among Latin-American officials of the validity of this thesis.

Outstanding among Mr. Austin's achievements to date in Central America appears to be the influence he evidently exerted upon President Trujillo of the Dominican Republic.

President Trujillo, who for one reason or another has made himself one of the most unpopular individuals in the Caribbean area, has asked the Dominican Congress to repeal a law, enacted at his request last December, which empowered him to declare war on any neighboring countries which, in his judgment, might be harboring enemies of Dominica.

Manifestly, possession of such arbitrary powers by any individual did not contribute to that hemispheric unity which is so essential if the west is to be able to withstand the aggressive encroachments of the Soviet Union and international communism.

In some way or other, Mr. Austin appears to have persuaded President Trujillo of this fact—no mean diplomatic feat by any standards.

To those who have followed Mr. Austin's career at the United Nations, his success in Latin America is not surprising.

The former Vermont solon is not one of the most brilliant or forceful diplomats regularly assigned to the UN. His speeches have not been devoid of clichés; from time to time he has indulged in obvious attitudinizing.

And yet his earnestness, his sincerity, his idealism, if you will, has expressed itself in unmistakable fashion on almost every occasion in which he has occupied the international spotlight.

I recall a corridor discussion among diplomats and journalists after a stormy Security Council session in which Mr. Austin had made a rather long, involved, and to some extent, ambiguous speech.

Several participants gave voice to critical appraisals of the American delegate's remarks, but a celebrated western diplomat who has often crossed polite swords with Mr. Austin cut them short.

"Mr. Austin is one of the most refreshing individuals to appear on the international scene in a long, long time," he said. "He has the one quality that is needed above all others in international diplomacy—rugged honesty. Disagree with him if you will, but never doubt his sincerity, his desire to be fair. Mr. Austin is a Christian gentleman. No one could possibly represent the United States more ably."

As an observer who has followed UN sessions since the opening Security Council meetings at Hunter College, I can attest that this opinion is shared by the overwhelming majority of diplomats and journalists regularly assigned to the UN.

The former Vermont Senator has done a truly excellent job at Lake Success in one of the most difficult periods in human history, and his success on his current Latin-American tour is especially gratifying to his friends and well-wishers here.

It is Mr. Austin's intention, it is understood, to take a less active part in the future in the hurly-burly of UN debate and devote his main efforts to directing the complex affairs of the United States mission and in explaining the nuances of American policy, both at home and abroad.

It is one observer's opinion that few, if any, persons in American public life are better qualified for such a vitally important task.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have listened to a very fine talk by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] in relation to the displaced-persons statute. I believe this legislation represents one of the most important humanitarian challenges to the Eighty-first Congress, and I am sure the Senate will fulfill its Christian obligations to the displaced persons as well as to the expelled persons of German ethnic origin.

On previous occasions I have stated in great detail my position on each of the literally dozens of changes that are necessary in the present statute.

Obviously, this statute was designated in compromise form as a stopgap bill. However, now that we have seen it in operation and have noted its deficiencies, it is incumbent upon us to make necessary changes.

Throughout the consideration of this subject, I have emphasized that the thing for which most of us were hoping and praying would be a unity of the major religious and national origin groups so that the Congress would be able to act with speed and with assurances that the various groups felt the changes in turn would be equitable and nondiscriminatory in nature.

Fortunately, the various groups, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, as well as the groups representing the various ancestries of our American people have indeed united to a substantial degree, although, almost inevitably, there are some few differences particularly on the critical problem of expellees of German ethnic origin whose plight I have previously discussed on the Senate floor.

It was a year ago in February 1949, that I introduced liberalizing amendments to the present DP statute, and now at long last, I believe that the substance of my suggestions and of the recommendations made by my colleagues will be enacted by the Senate.

I have previously incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many messages from Wisconsin citizens and organizations who have rendered magnificent service in arranging for the admission and assimilation of worthy DP's to the Badger State. These individuals and organizations have been gracious in their comments regarding the activities of their senior Senator toward this same objective, and I am humbly grateful for their response. Naturally they, like myself, are interested in the careful screening of the DP's and expellees so as to make absolutely sure that in this atomic-hydrogen age, with all its potentialities for war and mass destruction, no unworthy individuals be given entry to this blessed land.

I have in my hands, Mr President, telegrams and letters from some of the outstanding religious and civic leaders and organizations in this country. I believe that the comments in these messages will be of interest to my colleagues. So I ask unanimous consent that the text of this correspondence be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because each of these letters and telegrams is an open expression of the faith and the judgment of these very fine groups and individuals.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 22, 1950.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

May we take this opportunity of commending you for associating yourself with the minority report recently introduced in the Senate to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. We are appreciative that you have found it possible to demonstrate your interest in displaced persons in so concrete a way. We are grateful for the recognition which you and your six other colleagues give to the fact that the displaced persons problem cannot and must not be solved by partial or halfway measures.

We want you to know that throughout America there continues a grave sense of responsibility for helping the displaced persons still homeless in Europe. Many American citizens have dedicated themselves to offering new homes and new opportunities of work in American to displaced persons. We feel that the substitute amendments most closely reach the objectives which have been recommended by our various groups concerned with the resettlement of displaced persons and represent an advance toward a workable, just and humane law.

Basically the modifications of the present DP act incorporated in the bill accompanying the minority report are favored by those of us actively engaged in sponsoring displaced persons.

In addition we feel it would be advisable to designate the group which is benefited by section 12 in terms that are not suggestive of distinctions according to race. We feel that referring to persons because of their "German ethnic origin" is not in keeping with our democratic tradition and heritage. We would also hope that provision could be made to cover the inland transportation for DP's we welcome to America. This will help to implement a broad geographic distribution of DP's throughout the country. We earnestly hope that the Senate as a whole will accept the corrections you have offered in the substitute amendments when the matter of adequate legislation to admit displaced persons comes before them for consideration.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. EDWARD E SWANSTROM,
Executive Director, War Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference.
Rev. WALTER W. VAN KIRK,
Executive Secretary of International Justice and Goodwill, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
Rev. CLARENCE KRUMBHOLZ,
Executive Secretary, Division of Welfare, National Lutheran Council.
Dr. BERNARD J. BAMBERGER,
President, Synagogue Council of America.

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1950.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America have long been interested in displaced persons' legislation. In two national conventions, the 1670 posts and 400 auxiliary units of our organization have gone on record requesting our Government to maintain its position as being the asylum of the oppressed.

In a matter of days, there will come before you, legislation relative to these stalwart souls who have refused to subject themselves to the materialistic will of a satanic power. We have been cognizant of this legislation and our interest urges us to request you to support the Ferguson-Graham-Kilgore amendment, which we believe will improve the judiciary bill. This amendment will add a fair solution to the displaced persons' program. We respectfully urge your support of it.

Yours in C W. V.
NICHOLAS J. WAGENER,
National Commander.

RESOLUTION, TEXAS CONVENTION, CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, JUNE 16, 17, 18, AND 19, 1949

Whereas, the United States has recognized the plight of the displaced persons in Europe by adopting Public Law 774 (80th Cong), also commonly known as the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; and

Whereas in the cause of further facilitating the admission of displaced persons to the United States, it is most desirable that this act be amended; and

Whereas there have been introduced into the Eighty-first Congress, first session, in both House and the Senate, bills to amend Public Law 774; and

Whereas recently the House of Representatives by a voice vote approved House bill H R 4567 amending Public Law 774, and

Whereas the Judiciary Committee and the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Senate has not taken action to date; and

Whereas in addition to the assistance rendered to the displaced persons by the liberal provisions of H R. 4567 there still remains a deserving group of European displaced persons not provided for by H. R. 4567 and who are presently residing outside of the occupied areas of Germany and Austria, and Italy, and who are not yet firmly resettled, and who continue to remain a serious problem; and

Whereas the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America has for the past 5 years strongly indicated its great interest in the welfare and resettlement of the displaced persons and has continually urged the adoption of legislation that would bring these fine people to the shores of our great country: Therefore be t

Resolved, That the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America in annual convention assembled at Houston, Tex., on June 15, 16, and 17 hereby records itself as praising the House of Representatives for its prompt and favorable action in passing bill H. R 4567; and be it further

Resolved, That the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America strongly urges that the Senate committee take prompt and favorable action on the displaced persons legislation now before it and further expresses the hope for early action by the Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America propose that up to 10 percent of the total number of visas authorized under H. R. 4567 be applied to these displaced persons outside Germany, Austria, and Italy who are not permanently resettled and are otherwise eligible; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee as well as to each of the Members of the United States Senate.

WASHINGTON, D C., *February 23, 1950.*
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C :

As Americans we are deeply concerned that our country fulfill our moral obligation and international commitment to find new democratic homelands for the helpless displaced human beings under our care in Europe. Therefore we respectfully petition the Members of the United States Senate to approve the substitute amendments to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, presented by Senators FERGUSON, GRAHAM, and KILGORE. It is our sincere and heartfelt conviction that without these amendments it is impossible for us to create a displaced persons law that will enable our Nation to admit our share of displaced persons in a just, humane, and fair way.

Gen. Lucius D Clay, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, James A. Farley, Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, James F O'Neil, Judge Joseph Proskauer, James L. Kraft, Mark Ethridge, Fred Lazarus, and Harry Bullis.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC
RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE,
New York, N. Y., February 9, 1950.
Hon ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have been very happy to learn that progress is being made on the displaced persons legislation and especially that you have given it your encouragement and support. A number of us have hopes that a satisfactory bill will be finally forthcoming incorporating the best features of what has been presented thus far. The following are objectives which seem to us most desirable of attainment in the amended legislation to assist displaced persons and expellees·

1. A definition of a displaced person that will not cause confusion or result in unnecessary competition with the remaining IRO displaced persons who may be eligible to enter the United States within the total number of visas authorized

2. Provision under section 12 for a number of expellees equivalent to approximately half of the German and Austrian quotas for a 4-year period Eligible expellees within this number should be provided with the opportunity for housing and job assurances, ocean transportation and remission of visa and head-tax fees as is granted displaced persons under the present law.

3 Extension of the date line to January 1, 1949.

4. Provision for orphans and children adopted by United States citizens not merely service personnel

5. Some aid to Greek displaced persons seeking permanent resettlement.

6. Opportunity for resettlement for approximately 4,000 European refugees formerly residing in China, but now in the Philippines.

7. Substitution of a suitable wording for the words "ethnic origin" at present to be found in section 12 It being understood that the new wording would apply to this same group and to no others.

8. Administration of the displaced-persons program by the Displaced Persons Commission including final declaration of eligibility. A change to another arrangement at this time would cause considerable delay in the resettlement program and would add to the expense, as new personnel would be necessary.

9. A grant for inland transportation costs, if this can be satisfactorily worked out. Some of the operating agencies feel that a grant is a better arrangement than a loan for this purpose.

A number of persons to whom I have spoken feel that the Senators have proven their interest in the displaced-persons problem through the efforts they have made for amended legislation. I hope that final action will not be too long delayed.

With all good wishes, I remain,
Very sincerely yours,
(Rev.) WILLIAM J. GIBBONS, S. J.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 24, 1950.*
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Judiciary Committee:

The CIO strongly supports the President's recommendation for liberalizing the extending the present DP law. Discriminatory and unjust laws have no place on our statute books. In its two last annual conventions, the CIO has formally voted approval of admitting a larger number of displaced persons into the United States. If we in the CIO felt that this action would adversely affect the labor market today, we would not have taken this action. It is preposterous for any one to think that a humanitarian program like this which adds three-tenths of 1 percent to the total labor force can injure labor. The CIO calls upon the Senate to pass H R. 4567 at the very earliest possible time.

PHILIP MURRAY,
President, CIO.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 20, 1950.*
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building·

Six million Americans of Polish origin united in the Polish-American Congress through their organizations, lodges, clubs, parishes, and newspapers in 26 States urge you strongly to support in the Senate the House-passed bill H. R 4567 which corrects the deficiencies of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and includes members of the valiant Polish armed forces. Your favorable consideration of this bill will be deeply appreciated by millions of your fellow citizens who are eager to assume their fair share of the humane problem of the DP's.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President Polish-American Congress.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the issue we are debating today is a very simple one. It is: Do we want a fair and workable displaced persons law, or do we not? In the next few days the air is going to be blue with circumlocutions, charges, allegations, justifications, vigorous defenses, violent attacks, but when all the smoke has lifted, the issue simply remains: Do we want a fair and workable displaced-persons law?

Those of us who wanted a workable displaced-persons law voted for the present law in 1948, not because we thought it filled that specification, but rather because we realized it was all we could get at that time. The President signed it, as he said, "with very great reluctance." As he signed the bill he said it was "flagrantly discriminatory. It mocks the American tradition of fair play."

He was referring to the bill, and not, as has been alleged at various times, to the framers of the bill. The President felt, as others of us have felt, that the way the bill worked made it discriminatory, not that its authors were trying to discriminate against anyone. For one thing, he meant that the dateline was discriminatory. The fact that even the Committee bill has changed the dateline shows that that contention is now recognized to have been correct.

At the appropriate time I, together with 17 of my colleagues, expect to offer a substitute for the House bill as reported by the committee. At that time I shall discuss the substitute at some length. I should like to invite the attention of all Senators to the fact that a printed copy of the proposed substitute amendment has been placed on all desks in the Chamber, so that any Senator who cares to do so may read and study it.

The bad points of the present law, according to the President, "form a pattern of discrimination and intolerance wholly inconsistent with the American sense of justice." Despite the fact that the present law was a bitter disappointment to those who wanted a fair and workable displaced persons law, the President signed it with the expressed expectation that Congress would amend the law, as we are now attempting to do.

We are not talking here about a matter of purely sectional or partisan interest. The platforms of both political parties have shown dissatisfaction with the present law, and committed themselves to a decent and workable law. This is perhaps one of the few occasions in recent legislative history when organized labor, organized business, and organized agriculture have jointly supported a single legislative program. The governors of 23 States, and representative organizations from all walks of life in America and from all parts of the country have urged upon the Senate enactment of a just and fair displaced-persons law.

There has been, and still is, a lack of understanding of what the displaced-persons law provides. It does not repeal our immigration law. The same requirements must be met by a displaced person which are met by any other immigrant who seeks to come here for permanent residence, plus others which must be met by the displaced person which are not required of the immigrant under normal immigration laws. He must pass the requirements of the Immigration Service and the requirements of the Consular Service. The only difference is that the displaced persons law gives the displaced person a priority on the normal immigration quota. The quotas are not changed.

Let me emphasize, Mr. President, that displaced persons are charged against regular immigration quotas.

All the major religious faiths in America—the Catholic Church, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, the National Lutheran Council, and the Synagogue Council of America—have jointly urged upon the Senate amendments to the present law, for a more satisfactory law, in the spirit of American traditions.

Editorial comment throughout the land clearly discloses an almost universal agreement that the present law must be changed and that the conscience of America is ashamed of our present niggardly, restrictive, and unfair displaced-persons law.

Those who do want a fair and just displaced persons law have come to these conclusions: First, that we do not have one now; second, that unless we do something now and do it well we will never be able to terminate the present IRO displaced persons problem, which weighs so heavily upon the conscience and pocketbook of the American people; and, third, that our willingness and capacity to assume world leadership will be forfeited unless we take forthright and fair action in this matter.

Mr. President, yesterday I had the privilege, on behalf of myself and 17 other Senators, of offering a proposed substitute for the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee to amend the displaced-persons law.

There are certain major things we must do now, Mr. President, if we are to have a satisfactory and workable and fair displaced-persons law.

First and foremost, we must change the discriminatory provisions of the present law. I am happy to say that both the committee bill and the substitute bill have extended the discriminatory December 22, 1945, date line of the present law to the fair and almost universally accepted date of January 1, 1949. The committee bill has also eliminated the in-camp priority, and here again we have a very excellent amendment.

However, Mr. President, the committee bill retains two of the undesirable provisions in the present law, and, to make matters worse, weakens a fine provision in the House-approved bill which forbids discrimination for or against displaced persons because of race, religion, or national origin, and does it in such a way as to imply that there should be favoritism because of race or national origin.

The undesirable provisions which the committee bill seeks to retain and which the substitute bill has eliminated are:

First. The 40 percent so-called de facto preference, which grants an unwarranted advantage to certain groups wholly because of national origin, and works to the disfavor of Jewish and Catholic groups. In fact, the provision is merely positive proof that the committee bill requires favoritism because of national origin.

The 30 percent agricultural preference which also carries its implicit favoritism. This restriction creates a very serious administrative difficulty, which is further complicated by a requirement of proof of 2 years previous experience.

The substitute bill has adopted the language of the House-approved bill forbidding discrimination for or against displaced persons because of race, religion, or national origin, and I submit, Mr. President, that this is consistent with the American concept of fair play and equality among groups irrespective of their race, their religion, or their national origin.

Second. I think, Mr. President, that my colleagues will agree that it is desirable to bring the IRO refugee problem to an end at the earliest possible moment. We will have contributed by the end of June 1950, a total of $212,000,000 to the IRO. That has been our share of the operating expenses of IRO. Our last annual contribution was $70,000,000 and all this money, Mr. President, has been spent in behalf of the refugees, for their care, maintenance, and resettlement under the IRO which, as we all know, was created by the United Nations—Russia, of course, excepted.

So, Mr. President, any displaced-persons law which we may pass and which is designed to solve the IRO refugee problem, has the twofold purpose of solving an international problem to which we have been committed, as well as relieving the American taxpayer eventually of a heavy financial burden. The substitute bill, I submit, Mr. President, will have this effect, but the committee bill as now reported I regret to say will not bring the IRO refugee problem to an end, but rather encourages its continuation.

Permit me, Mr. President, to explain what I mean by this statement. The present law—section 2 (b)—defines a displaced person to mean one so defined in the IRO Constitution and who is the concern of the IRO. By that is meant one who is being supported by IRO funds and being cared for out of such funds. The committee bill deletes this provision and substitutes a new statutory definition which includes not only the displaced persons for which the IRO has been given responsibility, but also some 8,000,000 expellees who are not now the concern of any international body. It is this definition which dilutes the availability to the IRO displaced persons of the authorized number of visas.

In other words, the House bill, and the proposed substitute bill, would give to the German ethnic-origin group, who compose the main part of the expellees a total of 54,744 visas. Except for certain selected groups for which we are charged, for instance Anders' Army Poles, the 10,000 Greeks, the 4,000 refugees who originally were refugees from Europe to Shanghai, and now are refugees from the Communists in Shanghai, a great many of them being in the Philippine Islands at the present time, they having fled to any place where they could find refuge—except for those persons the remainder of the bill is taken up with displaced persons within the meaning of the IRO definition. These are persons for whom we are now conducting camps, issuing food rations, in other words, who are now what might be called upon international relief, of which amount of relief we are paying almost 70 percent of the total. As I stated before, that total we contributed to the IRO amounted last year to $70,000,000.

Such definition would create very serious difficulties and would cause a break-down in the program:

First. The displaced persons within the IRO's concern are registered and have been known for some time. If the bill would add new people as to whom there are no official records, the already great problem created by restrictions maintained by the bill would be augmented to the necessities of proof.

I call attention at this point to the fact that one of the objections made in 1948 upon the floor of the Senate to the dateline December 22, 1945, was, and it has since proved to be true, that there would be great difficulty of proof in connection with that dateline because most of the people were registered at a later date. That happened to be the date the President signed the directive. But later we had to lift the restriction, due to perse-

cution from behind the iron curtain. As I said, there had been no registration. The persons had fled into the camps, had fled into Germany. By putting too strict, too low a dateline we created the very problem which has been so inveighed against in connection with the question of fraudulent applications.

Second. The new bill creates great confusion as to the emigration of Volksdeutsche or expellees by authorizing two separate agencies of the Government to engage in two separate procedures for their admission. Section 2 (b) would let them in as displaced persons under the Displaced Persons Act, whereas section 12 would let them in as ordinary immigrants with a special quota charge.

Third. The problem of the expellee is a serious one and deserves careful attention. If it is our intention to bring some remedy, small though it be, to this tremendous human problem, we have not done so through this bill. Something must be done for these expellees. But this bill does nothing for them. It plays one group off against another to the detriment of both groups. We propose to strengthen section 12 and make it an effective instrument for the admission of expellees rather than weaken section 2 and nullify opportunities for IRO displaced persons. This, incidentally, is the view of the religious and voluntary agencies involved, various church organizations and civic groups, which are of such assistance in placing displaced persons in this country, securing assurances of work, assurances of homes, without which the Government would be put to great expense in the operation of the agency.

While some people may feel that a great moral victory has been won by extending equal eligibility status to the expellees as that enjoyed by the displaced persons under the care of the International Refugee Organization, the fact is no practical results may be attained through this moral victory. It is fair to assume that it was the intent of the committee to make it possible for eligible expellees to be admitted into the United States, and therefore it is important to point out the basic reasons why the equal status cannot be applied:

(a) The processing centers have been established by the International Refugee Organization and are maintained by them. Under the IRO constitution it is impossible to admit expellees to these processing facilities.

(b) Arrangements would have to be made to set up resettlement centers in Germany and Austria independent of the IRO in order to meet the new definition of a displaced person. These resettlement centers must provide facilities for the full care of the applicants for immigration to the United States for a period of from 1 to 2 weeks. In addition, facilities must be provided for all the agencies of the United States Government identical with those that now apply in the IRO resettlement centers.

(c) Centers would have to be established at the ports of embarkation, similar to those now established by the IRO to provide for persons under its care. Experience has proven that persons approved for immigration to the United States must wait in the ports of embarkation for a period of from 5 days to 2 weeks. Since there are no available housing facilities in the port of Bremen, the complete facilities for embarkation camps would have to be provided. In other words, they would have to be built there.

(d) The IRO is responsible for providing transportation from Europe to the United States for all persons under its care who are approved for immigration to the United States. It is impossible for the IRO to provide similar service for expellees.

Thus, we would be faced with the problem of shipment. The IRO charters ships and uses them to bring to the United States the persons for whom it is responsible. It brings them to the United States in shipload lots. Those persons and the expellees could not be mixed; the IRO would refuse to accept expellees for transportation to the United States, unless the charter of the IRO were amended. The IRO cannot constitutionally consider expellees to be its charge.

Mr. President, we have the problem of getting people to a port and then examining and interrogating them, and determining, by the use of some sort of mystic wand, the ones the IRO will transport and the ones we must take care of; and then we have the responsibility of getting the two groups aboard different ships, for transportation to the United States. Either that would have to be done, or else we would have to pay the IRO for shipping them in IRO ships, even though we are now paying almost 70 percent of the cost of operating the IRO ships, anyway. But, under its charter, it cannot do this. It would be necessary for the Government of the United States to provide facilities to transport expellees to the ports of entry in the United States; and the committee bill does not make such provision.

Students of the expellee problem are agreed that it is impractical to seek a remedy for this problem through the simple expedient of changing the definition of a displaced person. There is almost unanimous agreement among the religious, nationality, and welfare groups seeking to deal with the expellee problem that the best step now would be to make section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act really effective and workable. These groups have agreed upon the desirability of the provisions proposed by our substitute amendments which have been filed with this body.

The bill would set up a joint congressional committee to study and report on expellees. To date, the problem of dealing with expellees has not been undertaken by any international body. To continue dealing with the problem without such international cooperation would tend to place the entire burden for its solution, as to the 8,000,000 expellees, upon the American people.

The substitute, Mr. President, which we expect to offer, provides for the calling of an international conference to deal on a broad basis with the important problem of expellees. This solution is likely to be more effective for the expellees and less costly for the American taxpayer. Before I depart from the subject of expellees, Mr. President, I want again to call the attention of this distinguished body to the substitute-bill provision which—and I want to emphasize this—assures 54,744 visas to expellees, and provides for their ocean transportation to the United States, something which has not been done before.

Third. I am sure, Mr. President, that fair-minded and objective people favor a continuation of the present administration of the displaced-persons program. The committee bill creates a serious and unnecessary slowdown in operations by a provision that final determination—and I stress the words "final determination," of eligibility—by that is meant eligibility to be classified as a displaced person, not admissibility for immigration—shall be made exclusively by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the American Foreign Service. In other words, the Displaced Persons Commission could make a finding that a certain person was eligible as a displaced person. Then he would appear before the Foreign Service officer for his visa. That office would go over the same ground and would make a final determination as to his eligibility to be classified as a displaced person, before it would consider him as qualified for a visa. Then he would go before the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the question of whether he was a displaced person would arise again, and that Service would make another final determination. In other words, there would be three investigations and seemingly several "final" determinations.

That is what the situation would be under the bill as reported by the committee. That bill provides that both the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Foreign Service of the Department of State shall make the "final" determination of eligibility of applicants. We cannot understand how these two agencies—acting separately and, under the normal immigration law and procedures, one after the other, the immigration officers pass upon admissibility after issuance of the visa by the consuls—can both make the final decision. In other words, the displaced persons must first appear before the consul and must satisfy him that they are eligible to come into the United States as immigrants, just as they would have to do if they were coming under a regular quota. Then they must appear before the Immigration Inspector, and must satisfy him that they come within the limitation of our immigration laws; in other words, that they will not become public charges and they are not diseased. They would have to qualify in every way that is required in the case of other immigrants. At the present time that is being done abroad by our regular Consular Service, by an outpost of immigration inspectors we have sent abroad. Normally, that would be done at Ellis Island, for instance. But now it is done abroad by some of the Government's inspectors.

At a hearing at which the chief of the European inspectors, Mr. Tripp, appeared, I asked him where he would get

a staff, if we turned this work over to him. He replied that it would take some time to train one. I asked the same question of Mr. Watson B. Miller, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. He said it would take a long time to get them, that they did not have them to spare. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, they had loaned eight men to the Displaced Persons Commission; those were all the men they could spare. Of course, immigration inspectors are not made overnight. They require considerable training and experience. Thus, it should be obvious that a change in administrative jurisdiction at this time would cause a serious delay, if not a complete break-down, in the entire program.

Furthermore, Mr. President, in respect to their particular fields, the decision of the Consular Service is final; and the same is true in the case of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Under the immigration laws, there is no appeal from its rulings. The only appeal is to an Appeals Board within the Department of Justice, and from it to the Attorney General. There is no appeal back to the Displaced Persons Commission. In other words, the Displaced Persons Commission cannot and does not overrule either the Consular Service or the Immigration Service.

Moreover, it seems to us that the committee provision would preclude the Board of Immigration Appeals, which is not a part of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Attorney General from making decisions on appeal, as under present immigration law. In other words, under the rules of the Immigration and Naturalization Service an applicant now has the right to go before the Board of Immigration Appeals, to have it determine whether the primary inspector has made a mistake.

To take one further step, does the word "exclusively" in this connection seek to remove the authority of the courts to review such "final" consular and immigration determinations? Intertwined with these complexities is the authority granted to the Displaced Persons Commission by the law, and not diminished by the committee version of the bill, to issue regulations for the admission into the United States of eligible displaced persons and eligible orphans. The consuls and immigration authorities evidently would not have to pay any attention to the clear congressional intent, because they could ignore the regulations which, when issued in accordance with the act, have the force of law.

In the administration of the present law, all determinations of admissibility under the normal immigration law are made by the Foreign Service and by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and all determinations of eligibility under the specific provisions of the Displaced Persons Act are made by the Displaced Persons Commission. This practice is based upon a mutual agreement among these three agencies as to the most effective and economical way to carry out the intent of the law, and has been working most satisfactorily. And it is obviously the congressional intention that this should have been done.

Under the present procedure, over 28 percent of all the cases preliminarily considered by the Commission for eligibility are rejected or disqualified by the Commission before they ever get to the consul, and without the necessity of the long, expensive investigation which is conducted in cases of prima facie eligibility. If final determination of eligibility under the special provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, as well as of admissibility under the normal immigration law, must be made by the consuls and Immigration Service, then the Displaced Persons Commission must forward to them all cases, even those it now rejects. This would automatically slow up the process and would cause disappointment to sponsors in America who feel that the process is now sufficiently complicated and already too slow. One of the complaints I have received is in regard to the time it takes to get a displaced person to the United States and the delay arising before a prospective employer can have a displaced person brought into the United States. The Foreign Service prefers that it not be burdened with the large number of cases which have already been turned down by the Displaced Persons Commission.

The Displaced Persons Commission has performed its functions in a diligent and satisfactory manner. Not only is there no need for the change included in the committee bill, but it is clear that such change would seriously disrupt and temporarily halt a smooth-working process, without accomplishing any useful end.

It is important to note that the Displaced Persons Commission does not admit displaced persons into the United States. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that point. It does not admit them; it can merely certify that they are displaced persons, and that it has, from a responsible person or organization, an assurance of their placement. That is as far as it can go. The rest must be done by the consular service and by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The Displaced Persons Commission does not even make a recommendation to the consuls. It processes cases for submission to the consuls, who have complete authority, under the normal immigration law, to grant or deny visas; and it processes cases for inspection by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which has complete authority, under the normal immigration law, to admit or exclude displaced persons who have been granted visas. Consequently, the committee provision is unnecessary, and serves only to create additional difficulties in an already complicated administrative operation. Perhaps it is worth adding that it is very difficult to comply with the provision's requirement that the consular service have in each of these jobs persons with at least 3 years' experience. I wonder where they would get them. They do not know.

The committee bill recommends that the present law in this respect be unchanged.

Mr. President, the proposed substitute has had firm and vigorous support by the welfare and religious organizations of America which have been devoting their energies and strength to the welfare of displaced persons. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Lutheran Council, and the Synagogue Council of America, have all endorsed it. The substitute has been espoused by a widely representative group of distinguished American citizens including Gen. Lucius D. Clay, James F. O'Neil, former commander of American Legion; James A. Farley, Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, Harry Bullis, chairman of the board of General Mills, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Fred Lazurus, of Cincinnati, Ohio, Mark Ethridge, of Louisville, Ky., Judge Joseph Proskauer, and James L. Kraft, the industrial leader.

The great labor organizations of the country have come out in vigorous support of the bill. Only as late as 2 weeks ago the executive council of the American Federation of Labor called upon the Senate to pass a bill along the lines of the proposed substitute for the committee bill. Mr. Philip Murray, the president of CIO, has written me as follows:

> The CIO strongly supports the President's recommendation for liberalizing and extending the present DP law. Discriminatory and unjust laws have no place on our statute books. In its two last annual conventions, the CIO has formally voted approval of admitting a larger number of displaced persons into the United States. If we in the CIO felt that this action would adversely affect the labor market today, we would not have taken this action.
>
> It is preposterous for any one to think that a humanitarian program like this which adds three-tenths of 1 percent to the total labor force can injure labor The CIO calls upon the Senate to pass H. R. 4567 at the very earliest possible time.

Since the receipt of the letter, the substitute has been exhibited to Mr. Murray, and has his approval. In fact, Mr. President, I think it is probably a fair statement to say that with the exception of the people who are opposed in principle to a displaced-persons law in any shape or form, the substitute proposed yesterday by 18 Senators is the generally accepted proposal for an amendment to the present law.

What are some of the major objections being raised at the present moment? By and large they are two in number. First, there are a very small number of complaints being raised by disgruntled employers or by sponsors of displaced persons in cases where for one reason or another the displaced persons have not worked out well. Of course, this is bound to happen in a program of such magnitude as this. But let us not be deceived by the occasional dissatisfaction. Let us look rather at the fact that the governors and State displaced persons commissions of at least 21 States recently reported that the great majority of displaced persons were working out satisfactorily. A special subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee submitted a report on January 20, 1950, on "Displaced Persons in Europe and Their Resettlement in the United States." It is House Report No. 1507. The report of the subcommittee was based on a Nation-wide survey, made by

communicating directly with the governors of the 48 States, the State displaced persons commissions, and with religious and welfare agencies working in this field. The overwhelming number of such reports indicate satisfactory adjustment, successful adaptation to new environment, and a desire to receive more displaced persons. The report also attests to the high grade character of the large majority of the displaced persons.

Mr. President, I received one complaint that certain persons who were sent to work on a farm did not perform satisfactorily. The reason was that they could not understand English. Of course, Mr. President, they could not understand English. Their native language was German, and they had not had a chance when they came to America, in a period of 2 or 3 weeks, to learn the English language Imagine what would happen if one of us were to go to their country and, without a knowledge of the language, go to work on a farm. We would be using the sign language largely in communicating with others, and that is what the people I refer to have had to do. Yet there has been complaint because of that

The fact is that the overwhelming majority of the displaced persons are making out very well in the United States, and are giving satisfaction to their sponsors.

A second kind of objection is expressed by people who are opposed to the program altogether and are seeking to exaggerate alleged administrative problems into a national crisis. By and large, the testimony is pitiful, and is given either by men who sincerely admit that they merely disagree on questions of legal interpretation or by other people, some of them minor employees in the program, who failed to exhibit either interest or understanding of the program's objectives. In any event, the question of administrative problems is a completely different issue from the one we are now debating and has no relevance to it at all except as part of an effort to confuse the issue and attack the merits of the displaced-persons program. I might also add that throughout this welter of unsubstantiated and frequently foolish charges the Displaced Persons Commission has never been given an opportunity to be heard in public. Mr. President, I believe these issues should be settled, but I believe they have no relationship to the problem we are now discussing and should not enter into this discussion at all.

Since we are talking about administration, it might be pertinent to call to the attention of Members of this body the conclusion of the House Judiciary Committee's special overseas survey of the displaced persons program. On January 27, 1950, the House committee reported:

> The studies and investigation undertaken in Europe have convinced this subcommittee that, on the whole, the administration of the 1948 act is being undertaken in a diligent and satisfactory manner.

In the face of an all but unworkable law, the Commission's efforts to achieve the congressional intent deserves high commendation rather than unwarranted and unsubstantiated criticism.

Let me add only one further item on this matter. Since there has been some discussion of the security aspects of the program, the great and distinguished statesman, the Presiding Officer of this body, the Vice President of the United States, has recently said:

> There has never been in my judgment, in the whole history of the United States, a more careful piece of machinery of inspection and investigation than is now in effect in regard to the administration of these displaced persons in the United States. Our Army, through its Counter Intelligence Service, all of our consuls abroad who have to pass on visas, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, the Immigration Service, everywhere—here and elsewhere—and many others which I might mention, are a part this screening process. I do not know how there would be any better system of investigation by which it could be determined that those who are permitted to come are entitled to come.

Mr. President, the present situation affords an extraordinary opportunity for a demonstration of national unity. The substitute bill, which I had the honor to introduce yesterday in behalf of myself and 17 other Senators, has found enthusiastic support throughout our Nation. It represents the point of view urged upon this body by 23 governors from all parts of the United States; it represents the united opinion of organized labor, business, and agriculture. It is the proposal recommended to this body by the leaders of our major religious faiths in America. It is in the spirit of almost unanimous editorial approval throughout the United States. It is, I believe, in the real spirit of the American tradition.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope, and earnestly urge, that all Members of this body will carefully read the substitute which has been placed upon their desks. If there are weak spots in it, we who sponsor it have not discovered them. We believe it will, if enacted, make workable the present law, which has been very difficult to administer. We believe it will remove the unfairness and the restrictions of persons getting valid certificates.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KILGORE. For what purpose?

Mr. LUCAS For a question.

Mr KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to propound a question to the Senator, dealing with quotas. Has the Senator discussed what is known as the mortgaging of quotas in his speech today?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes, to some extent.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that, under the present law, all displaced persons entering the United States must be charged to the normal quotas of the country of origin?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; a charge or so-called mortgage is placed on 50 percent of the quota of each successive year.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand.

Mr. KILGORE. In other words, we are not overlooking the quotas, and we are not increasing the eventual numbers authorized under the present normal quotas.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point exactly. The people do not understand it.

Mr. KILGORE. There is another thing I may say to the distinguished majority leader. We must remember that for a long period of time, especially during the war years, there was very little immigration even under the quotas

Mr. LUCAS. I thoroughly understand that. But I have letters in my files, and I think the press reports would indicate that in addition to the normal quotas we now have for the people of a certain country, we are also admitting an additional number of displaced persons; and that is not the fact, as I understand. In other words, the displaced persons are only given priority, so to speak, so far as quotas are concerned, and we are not increasing the quotas in any respect whatever.

Mr. KILGORE. No, no; we are not changing the quota system. We are charging displaced persons who are admitted against the quota of their country of origin. A refugee who happened to originate in Rumania is charged to the Rumanian quota.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think the Senator can make that too plain. I think it should be talked about in the debate over and over again. A great number of citizens of the United States are laboring under a delusion with respect to people who are coming in as displaced persons. I could show the Senator letters which indicate that a citizen in Illinois is under the impression that, in addition to the normal quota of persons coming, for instance, from Belgium or from some other nation, we are also bringing in displaced persons from that country, when the truth of the matter is that all we are doing is giving priority to the displaced persons, so far as quota is concerned

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. We are, thereby, bringing to an end a serious situation without in any way disturbing the normal immigration quotas.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, we are in no wise changing the present immigration laws, so far as quotas are concerned.

Mr. KILGORE. Not one iota.

Mr. LUCAS. They remain exactly as they are. What we are doing, I repeat—and I hope to talk about it again before we conclude the debate—is giving the displaced persons, as the Senator stated a moment ago, an opportunity to come in under the quota ahead of anyone else.

Mr. KILGORE. We give them a priority over other applicants, but within the authorized cumulative quotas.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator will recall that I introduced a bill to permit a certain number of war orphans to come into this country as a part of the program. I understand that that bill, at least in part, has been incorporated in the committee bill, and I think approximately 10,000 orphans will be permitted to come into the United States.

Mr. KILGORE. A total of 10,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know what evidence there was before the committee touching on this question, but I have in my office, and I think the Senator will be glad to hear it, rather striking evidence of the willingness of a great many rather prominent and substantial persons to adopt some of the orphans. For example, a celebrated doctor in Massachusetts, I think, who has a large practice and is a very substantial member of the community, would like to adopt one of the war orphan boys and, at his own expense, send him to school to become a physician, with the idea of turning over his practice to him eventually.

Another person who has communicated with me is a very wealthy man, as things go in this world, and he is very anxious to take a deserving war orphan and make him his heir.

I cite those two examples, among many, of the willingness of our people in deserving cases, to adopt orphans when there seems to be a likelihood that their hopes regarding the children will be fulfilled. That is a great tribute to the humanitarianism of Americans.

I had the privilege, approximately a year ago, of talking with a Catholic priest who had built five "boys' towns," on the American model, just outside of Rome. These towns or camps are primarily for war orphans. At the time they were started, many of the children from 6 years of age up to 14 or 15 years of age were living in ruins and stealing in order to get food, clothing, and shelter, and were on the way to becoming totally bad citizens. The Catholic priest, whose name escapes me for the moment, started to raise funds and built five camps, which many of the Senators and Representatives have visited. Good citizenship is being implanted in the minds of those Italian youngsters. They had been little more than wild animals, particularly in the period immediately following the war.

If these war orphans are reasonably screened, to insure that those who come to this country are healthy—I hate to condemn the unfit, but we must have some self-interest in the matter—are reasonably fit physically and seem to have the capabilities of making good citizens, and our citizens are anxious to adopt them, it seems to me we can make a double contribution in a practical way in being good Christian people and being good Samaritans, and, at the same time, under an environment such as I have mentioned, these young persons will become good citizens and will return dividends to the United States in many useful occupations.

I am glad the committee incorporated this idea in the bill, because I think that of all the tragedies which have resulted from the war, the tragedy of little people, particularly those under 15 years of age, whose mothers and fathers are missing, who have no relatives, and who are friendless and alone, should have a wider appeal to our humanity and to our consideration in this program than should any other class of persons of whom I could think. I am glad the committee has put a provision of this kind in a bill. I think it adds a great deal to the bill to have such a provision in it. I would further say, with the consideration that there are families ready and willing to adopt some of these children, that there is no question of public charge, and it is one of the finest things this Government has done to reconstruct and rehabilitate a war-torn and desolated Europe.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator for his observation. I may say to the Senator that there are a number of requests from some of our Army, Navy, and Air Corps personnel, and from some of our civilian personnel, who want to adopt war orphans and bring them back to this country with them. A special proviso was made that we would, up to 5,000, adopt the proceedings in a German court as if they had been had in a court of the United States so that any United States citizen could bring in such adopted child.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am likewise advised in this morning's mail that there are many societies composed of very outstanding persons of splendid background and patriotism who are organizing in an effort to find suitable homes for orphans who will be adopted and become members of the families which adopt them. That, too, is a matter of tremendous credit to our citizenship, for the building of a reconstructed and rehabilitated world is not like the building of a wall that can be constructed in a single day. It consists of many solid bricks of the character which we are discussing, which over a period of time, one after another, build the wall. I use that as an illustration of building civilization and humanity where it is desperately needed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1008) to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CELLER, Mr. WALTER, Mr. WILLIS, Mr. MICHENER, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

REPRINTS FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, until about a month ago the junior Senator from Washington had understood, and taken for granted that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was a public document, and was therefore available to all Members of the Congress to use in whole or in part as they saw fit. I was necessarily surprised when I was informed by others that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was not in fact a public document in some senses. I was informed that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was clearly a public document when there was a wish to use it in one way, but it was not a public document when Members of the Congress sought to use it in another way. This so-called restrictive policy, which I held to be entirely untenable, aroused my curiosity and concern. I think that every Member of Congress will be interested in the steps I have recently taken in an effort to restore a freedom of use to a public document, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Without prejudice to or criticism of anyone, I shall merely relate the story of how I secured permission to have reprints made of a portion of the RECORD after I had been told by others that I could not be permitted to use portions of the RECORD as I thought proper.

The Senate will recall that on Tuesday, January 17, 1950, the junior Senator from Washington moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, H. R. 3905, to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code. This bill included a section the intent of which was to reduce some of our outstanding war-created excise taxes. The Senate debated the motion on Wednesday, January 18, and it was defeated by a vote of 45 to 35, with 16 Senators not voting.

On Tuesday, January 24, 1950, I instructed a member of my staff to order through Mr. Ralph L. Harris, the Government Printing Office Congressional Record clerk, 2,000 reprints of the debate in its entirety. I wanted to make the debate available to interested citizens throughout the State of Washington. Mr. Harris accepted the order.

On Wednesday, January 25, Mr. Harris called my office to inform me that by order of the Government Printing Office the requested reprints could not be made without the written permission of the several Senators who had participated in the excise-tax debate. I took this to be merely an act of courtesy to the participating Senators, and without objection of any kind, I instructed a member of my staff to secure the required signatures. My agent, Mrs. Walker, prepared the following letter request for the Senators in question to sign:

Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I hereby grant my permission to have reprints made for Washington State distribution, of the colloquy appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1950, beginning on page 615, the first column, under the heading "Reduction and Repeal of Excise Taxes," and ending on page 622, first column, at the heading "Amendment of the Hatch Act."

Sincerely.

Mrs. Walker processed the letter and secured all the necessary signatures save one. Those who signed the letters were Senator SALTONSTALL, Senator BREWSTER, Senator GEORGE, Senator EDWIN JOHNSON, Senator WILLIAMS, and Senator MILLIKIN. The signature of the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who had been a major participant in the debate, was not secured. Mrs. Walker handed the letter to the administrative assistant of the Senator from Illinois, who presumably conferred with the Senator. She said, in substance, when returning to Mrs. Walker the letter without the Senator's signature, that "It is not the policy of Senator LUCAS to give permission for any colloquy in which he takes part to be reprinted for use by other Senators." She pointed out, however, that the Senator from Washington was at perfect liberty to delete the statements of the Senator from Illi-

nois and then have the colloquy reprinted.

After Mrs. Walker brought the letter back to me with all the required signatures save that of the Senator from Illinois, I thought first of going to the Senator to suggest that he reconsider his position, because I thought I could easily convince him that I had no desire to embarrass him or any other Senator. All I sought to have reprinted was the excise tax debate in whole. On reflection I decided that the problem with which I was confronted had but very little to do with the Senator from Illinois. The fact was that an order, the origin of which I knew nothing about, prevented a Senator from using a portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a public document, unless another Senator agreed in writing that he might do so. This appeared to make no valid sense of any kind, and I determined to test the question of whether a Senator had a right to use the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in any way he might see fit.

I instructed Mrs. Walker to have with others whatever conversations might be required so that she might advise me fully concerning the origin and background of the Government Printing Office order which would prevent a Senator from securing a reprint from the RECORD unless every Senator who was a party to a colloquy gave his written permission.

Mrs. Walker returned to Mr. Harris, the Congressional Record clerk. He stated that the order canceling my order for the reprints came from the Government Printer through an administrative officer, Mr. Herrell. Mr. Harris added that he had known of the written-permission requirement since he became the Record clerk about 9 years ago.

Mrs. Walker then talked with Mr. James W. Broderick, planning manager for the Government Printing Office. Mr. Broderick informed Mrs. Walker that the written signature permission requirement had been laid down as a precedent about 25 years ago. He did not know who had established the precedent, or for what reasons it had been established, but that he had heard of it.

Mrs. Walker then conferred with Mr. Charles L. Watkins, the Senate Parliamentarian. Mr. Watkins knew of no such precedent, and he was positive that the Senate had never established a precedent on the question. At a later date I conferred personally with the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, and he likewise said that the House had not established any precedent on the subject of restricting the use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Members of the Congress.

When Mrs. Walker told me of these several conversations I instructed her to demand of Mr. Harris, the Congressional Record clerk—who, I would say in passing, is a most excellent public servant—that he either accept my order for the reprints, or request the Government Printer to write me a letter in which he would state over his signature why my reprint order was denied. Mr. Harris said that he would tell the Public Printer of my wish that he write to me.

I put these facts down by dates and names because there are so many factors in this particular and unusual question. For the first time we now hear of a new individual involved in the question of whether or not a Senator may have reprints made of a public debate on a public question.

On Thursday, January 19, Mr. James L. Harrison, staff director for the Joint Committee on Printing, called Mrs. Walker to say that the chairman of the joint committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] had instructed him to say to the Senator from Washington that the ruling or precedent should hold, and that all signatures must be obtained before the Printing Office would fill the order. Mr. Harrison suggested that the Senator from Washington was at liberty to have the reprints made by private printers downtown Mr. Harrison attempted to establish the point that one Senator could not use the facilities of the Government Printing Office to the disadvantage of another Senator.

Mr. MORSE Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. The junior Senator from Oregon would like to be sure that he follows the Senator from Washington in the address which he is now making. I should like to put this hypothetically to him. Suppose a Senator makes a speech on X subject, that during the course of the speech a Senator rises and asks one question, and the Senator who is making the speech answers the question, and that that is the only interruption during the entire speech. Am I to understand that the Senator who is making the speech cannot have his speech reprinted unless he obtains the consent in writing of the Senator who asked him the one question during the course of the speech?

Mr. CAIN. It seems to be a fact that up until this time the Senator who had made the speech could not have made by the Public Printer a reprint of the speech, which included a question by another Senator, unless the Senator who had asked the question gave his written permission for it to be included in the reprint desired by the Senator who made the speech

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Washington, for whatever value it may be to him, that I feel compelled to confess my own guilt, because on many occasions I have had speeches of mine reprinted which included colloquy with other Senators. I knew of no such rule or precedent, and no one had ever raised any question about my right to have those speeches reprinted. I have had them reprinted in full. I thought that was my right and privilege.

Mr. CAIN. For the reason that the junior Senator from Washington is rather convinced that a good many Senators have not previously known of the so-called precedent to which I have called their attention this afternoon, I thought it proper in the most objective way I could to recite the facts involved in the present case, in a double effort, first, to inform the Senators of what has heretofore been a precedent, and, second, to hope that other Senators would agree with the junior Senator from Washington, that we can give only one construction actually to a public document, which is that it is public, and that what it contains should and ought and must be made available for use by Senators, and Representatives also, as in their judgment they deem fit and proper.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. If that is the rule, does the Senator from Washington not agree that it is going to affect debate on the floor of the Senate when it comes to the question of yielding to another Senator; because if by yielding a Senator runs the danger of a denial of the privilege of having his speech reprinted, he is going to be inclined, is he not, to proceed and make his speech and not yield to any colleague during the course of his remarks?

Mr. CAIN. My own opinion is that when Senators generally become aware of what up to this time has been a precedent on the subject, and when they have had an opportunity to think about it, they will agree that such a precedent is not in the public interest, and they will want to reach an agreement to do away with the precedent in order, as indicated by the Senator from Oregon, that the debate may be full and illuminating and free as to contributions made by all Senators.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. This matter was taken up for consideration in the Joint Committee on Printing on yesterday, and this is in part the situation as I understand it. Along in the twenties sometime, when George Moses was a Senator from New Hampshire, and was chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, a Senator printed in his speech a portion of the remarks of another Senator, which, had they been printed in full, would have conveyed a different meaning than they conveyed when only a portion were printed. The Senator whose remarks were partially printed brought the matter to the attention of the Joint Committee on Printing. At that time the Public Printer was instructed that if a Senator sent to the Printing Office a speech which contained remarks made by another Senator, the proper thing to do was to inquire of the other Senator if he had any objection to his remarks being printed together with the speech of the Senator who desired to have the reprint made. That has been the rule since that time. There was good sound reason for the rule.

There is also another reason why it is proper that such inquiry be made of Senators whose remarks appear in the speech of a Senator who wants to have his remarks reprinted. Many times the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as it appears, contains matter which a Senator did not actually say. It will frequently be noticed that on the floor a Senator will ask to have the RECORD corrected, saying that he made a statement in a certain way, but the reporters took it in another way. The other day a Senator, in speaking during the debate on the

use of Colorado River water mentioned the State of California, but in the RECORD the name "Colorado" appeared.

If one Senator's remarks are to be reprinted in connection with the remarks of another Senator, and at the request of the other Senator, it is entirely proper for the latter to ask, "Have you corrected any errors in your remarks, if any such there be?" If it is proposed that the full colloquy be printed, and a Senator who may have taken part in the colloquy knows that his remarks are correctly recorded, I do not see how anyone can prevent the printing of such a colloquy.

Mr. CAIN. I wish to interrupt the Senator for an obvious reflection. The Senator from Arizona does not know how a Senator could be stopped from having a reprint made of a debate in full, but the junior Senator from Washington, on a temporary basis, was stopped.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be true, but at the present moment I am sure the Senator from Illinois would not object if the Senator from Washington made inquiry of him if he had any objection.

Mr. CAIN. What I said was obviously without prejudice to the Senator from Illinois, because it goes far beyond the action that was taken by the Senator from Illinois. The Senator from Illinois has already, on reconsideration, thought it proper that I be permitted to have the reprint made. But let us assume that the Senator from Illinois saw fit to maintain a contrary point of view on the basis of the precedent which up until the time we began to examine it had been controlling on this question for 25 years. In that event the junior Senator from Washington and no other Senator could have had the reprint made.

Mr. HAYDEN. Nothing serious has ever developed from the precedent. The Senator will agree that as a matter of courtesy the Senator who desires to have made a reprint of a colloquy in which the remarks of another Senator appear should ask the other Senator if his remarks appear correctly in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and if the Senator has any objection to his remarks being reprinted. There would be no trouble about that.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. LUCAS. When the matter was brought to my attention for the first time, through my secretary, I paid very little attention to it, since as majority leader of the Senate I have a number of matters to consider. I temporarily forgot all about it until the Senator from Arizona called it to my attention. As I recall, there was a considerable amount of debate upon the measure. As the Senator from Arizona suggested a moment ago, before I gave my consent I wanted to read over what I had said. I wanted to read it again to determine whether everything I had said appeared correctly in the RECORD. I do not believe I ever got around to reading it because of the manifold duties which are thrust upon me from day to day.

Later on the Senator from Arizona said he had read the speech and was convinced it was a very good one, that the colloquy appeared in the RECORD as it occurred, and then I said I had no objection to a reprint being had. I am sure that if the Senator from Washington had asked me about it at the time he made his request for a reprint I would have made no objection, because, after all, granting such a request is a matter of courtesy. I am sorry I caused the Senator from Washington all the trouble he has been obliged to go to. But perhaps it is a good thing that I acted as I did, for I believe it to be fortunate and constructive that the Senator is bringing this matter to the floor.

Let me ask the Senator a question at this point.

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the query propounded by the Senator from Oregon, I wish to present an assumption. Assuming that a Senator propounded three questions during the course of a major speech delivered by the Senator from Oregon, would such Senator, by reason of the fact that he had propounded three not very important questions during a 30-minute speech delivered by the Senator from Oregon have the right to print the entire speech of the Senator from Oregon?

Let us say that during the course of such a speech I asked two questions of the Senator from Oregon, perhaps occupying 2 minutes of time, while the remaining 28 minutes were consumed by the Senator from Oregon. Would I be permitted to have a reprint of the entire speech without obtaining permission from the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CAIN. I will say, Mr. President, that I am complimented that the majority leader should appear to consider me an authority upon the subject of what can or cannot be done with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the Senator is an authority upon that subject.

Mr. CAIN. I wish to make it very clear to the Senator from Illinois that, so far as I am concerned, the RECORD is a public document, and the Senator from Illinois is entitled, or should be at any time, to have any part or all of it printed, to do with as he likes. What the Senator from Oregon does with reference to reprints which are made of his speech from the RECORD is his concern, and a different question.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the Senator from Oregon would not object were I to make a request for a reprint of his speech, whether I conferred with him or not, because his speeches are always superb; therefore, he would consider it quite a compliment if I were to use his speech. The Senator from Oregon has risen, and I believe that is what he is proposing to say. I hope I have anticipated his remarks correctly.

Mr. CAIN. I very much appreciate the comments just made by the Senator from Illinois, because I brought the question to the floor without any motive of animosity toward the majority leader, as I think he knows.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that and thoroughly understand it. The Senator from Washington has gone so far as to say that if the Senator from Illinois desires to print the entire speech of the Senator from Washington, I can do so without conferring with the Senator, and do it on my own responsibility, and it will be perfectly all right with him. Let me say to the Senator that that may be all right, but I certainly would never do so until I had conferred with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that in such a case as that to which he has referred the Senator from Washington should, as a matter of courtesy, call the Senator from Illinois, or any other Senator whose speech he wishes to print, and say: "I am going to have a reprint made of a speech in which you are a participant. I should like to know if you believe that is proper." On the other hand, if the Senator did not think it was proper, I believe I would have a right to use that material after having given due notice to the Senator, let us say, from Oregon or from Illinois, or any other Senator who might be involved.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I merely want to say that there was a reason why the late Senator Moses as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing had the directive sent to the Public Printer to the following effect: "If you receive copies of a speech wherein several Senators are involved, the proper thing is to inquire whether they have been consulted about printing the speech," because there can be errors in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That is reason number one. Moreover if a Senator participating in the debate is consulted, he may say, "I have no objection to having a reprint made, provided you print all of it. But you cannot take anything out of the context and misrepresent me." That was the trouble in the original instance.

Mr. CAIN. I am satisfied that the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing would not consider to be a valid excuse the fact that all of us, including of course, the Senator from Illinois, are very busy and often may not have an opportunity to determine whether we will give permission to have a debate reprinted. The Senator from Illinois has said that, after reflection after studying and looking at the speech, and after being convinced by the Senator from Arizona that it was a good speech and should be reprinted and distributed throughout the State of Washington, he was delighted to agree to have that done. But, Mr. President, he was delighted at my expense, for 5 weeks of time. Without antagonism or criticism, I merely say I am satisfied we are all about to agree that is not the proper thing to do in this body.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it seems to me we shall have to appoint a liaison officer between the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Illinois, so they can properly get together on matters of this kind.

Mr. CAIN. In this instance, I have been my own liaison officer, and I have proceeded to make a constructive suggestion to the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Washington

in the beginning personally consulted the Senator from Illinois about this matter?

Mr. CAIN. That is not a fact.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the way I do business in the Senate. If I have to deal with another Senator, I go to him and straighten out the matter with him.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Arizona has his own method of operation, no doubt. I think he would want me to suggest that I followed procedures which are considered to be proper, any way they are dissected. I sent a letter, in the hands of an administrative assistant of mine; I had my administrative assistant call on the Senator from Illinois, not as one Senator, but as one of eight Senators, while the Senator from Washington was busy with a committee. She successfully secured the signatures of the seven other Senators, and found that only the Senator from Illinois was temporarily too busy to give consideration to the matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. That, I think, would have been the proper time for the Senator from Washington to have consulted him.

Mr. CAIN. But had I pursued that course, I suggest that I still would have been faced with a precedent which would have kept any one of 96 Senators from availing himself or herself of a public document, namely, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Speaking facetiously for a moment—and after that I shall speak seriously—I wish to stay that my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, did not put quite the point I wished to make. My point is that if anyone wanted to spend his own money in obtaining reprints of any of my speeches, I would welcome having that done, provided he would help me out with my own mailing list, by supplying a sufficient number of copies so that I could send them to the persons on my own mailing list, and thus save me some of the heavy expense which I have had to undergo for that purpose since I have been in the Senate.

Speaking seriously now, I wish to say that I think it is well that this point has been raised, because some of us have been in error, so far as concerns the point which has been made by the Senator from Arizona. I plead guilty to having had reprints made of some speeches of mine which contain brief colloquies with other Senators, without first getting the consent of the Senators involved. Now that the Senator from Arizona has raised the point, I think I have been definitely in error in doing so. So I am glad to have this matter cleared up.

I took it for granted that after the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appeared, and after there had been opportunity for Senators to make corrections in it, if no corrections were made, we were then dealing with an official Government document which was freely available for circulation throughout the United States.

It seems to me that if Senators have reprints made of their speeches which are published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and I wish to say that I have followed this course very carefully—they should have reprints made of the entire speech, including all colloquy, and not simply have reprints made of excerpts from the speech. The reprinting of excerpts I think would not only be discourteous but would be unethical.

But after there has been opportunity for corrections to be made, if any Senator who is involved in the colloquy wishes to make corrections, I think any Senator should have the right to have the entire speech reprinted, including the colloquy which may have occurred during the course of the remarks.

Mr. President, as I have said, if that is not possible, I think it will have a very definite effect upon the procedure in the Senate so far as debates are concerned, namely, that Senators will state at the beginning of their speeches that, under no circumstances, will they yield to other Senators to permit them to make comments or to ask questions during the course of their remarks, because the speeches they are about to make are ones which they may desire to have reprinted.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his remarks, because I think the question is rather important.

I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that I am completely satisfied that he meant no harm of any kind or no loss of time or no rejection of a right or privilege, so far as the junior Senator from Washington is concerned. I simply take that to be a fact. I think what the Senator from Illinois did was done just by a busy man. I bring the matter to the attention of all Members of the Senate not in reference to the Senator from Illinois as such but in order that we may establish the various uses to which the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may be put, because, as the Senator from Oregon has stated, if every one of the 96 Senators were thoroughly conscious of the ramifications of what has apparently been a precedent in this body and in the Congress for 25 years, many Senators in preparing to deliver speeches in the Senate would commence by saying, "Under no circumstances will I permit any other Senator to ask me a question about anything," because of his fear that, by permitting interruptions, he would lose his right to use for reprints the speech which he himself was about to deliver.

Mr. President, the rest of my statement at this time will take approximately 15 minutes, I believe. It is merely a recognition of fact, at the conclusion of which I think the Senate could establish its own precedent, and would have no trouble in arriving at a reasonable solution of the problem.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. What is the Senator's conclusion, as of this moment, first, as to whether there has been a precedent—regardless of whoever established it, whether it was established by the Public Printer or by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing or by some other well-intentioned person; and if there has been such a precedent, has it been followed without the full knowledge of the Senate; and is it effective?

Mr. CAIN. I can answer all three of those questions: In the first place, there has been a precedent—at least, that seems to be undeniable, so far as I am concerned.

Second. I think most Senators are not aware of the existence of the precedent. The Senator from Oregon has just risen to say that he has broken the precedent several times, simply because he did not know it existed.

Third. The precedent to which we have referred as applying in the past, in my considered judgment at the moment is not only not effective as of the present time, but does not exist as of the present time, for I established the remaining steps to secure the reprint without securing the written permission of the Senator from Illinois. The fundamental point I shall make at the conclusion of this statement is that what has been done by the Senator from Washington likewise can be as readily and as properly done by any other Member of this body.

Therefore, if I have secured a reprint, which I have been told by those referred to as competent authorities that I could not secure, without observing certain restrictions; if that has been done—and it has been done—then we have no precedent on the subject any more; and it is up to the Senate of the United States to do as it likes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MALONE. Then what it amounts to is that we have been subject to more of a chaperonage over the Senate's ethics than anything else—not a precedent at all, but, rather, somewhat of a sitting of the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing to determine whether in his judgment at the moment a certain reprint should be made.

Mr. CAIN. In being as fair as I can, I think the precedent was established for what the then chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing thought were valid reasons. That chairman is a gentleman whose name has been lost in history, because I have conferred with such distinguished historians as Mr. Charles Watkins, our Senate Parliamentarian; and when he cannot tell who did something in the Congress in years gone by, we know it must have been done many, many years ago.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to pass on a bit of information: The late Senator George Moses, of New Hampshire, goes down in history as the inventor of the phrase "sons of the wild jackass."

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, when I was interrupted—and certainly I was pleased to be interrupted—I was reading, from my prepared remarks, a sentence which I wish to repeat by way of emphasis, because I think it indicates why at the outset the junior Senator from Washington was refused permission for the reprint in question. I shall restate that sentence:

Mr. Harrison, a member of the staff of the Joint Committee on Printing, in his conversation with Mrs. Walker, of my office, attempted to establish the point

that one Senator could not use the facilities of the Government Printing Office to the disadvantage of another Senator. It is beside the point to suggest that Mr. Harrison had not even read the debate or my letter of request. Had he done so, it would have been clear to him that I sought only to reprint in its entirety a debate in which every participant spoke fully for himself. Mr. Harrison concluded his conversation with Mrs. Walker by stating that the Joint Committee on Printing was responsible for the precedent, and that it had ordered the Government Printing Office not to go ahead with my reprints, or with reprints for any other Member of Congress unless participating Members to a colloquy had given their written permission.

As some will agree, these varied conversations were becoming somewhat confusing. My order for reprints had been denied by the Government Printing Office, but apparently the Joint Committee on Printing had established the precedent which resulted in a denial of my request. I next thought it proper to write to the Public Printer, because I had not heard from him following Mr. Harris' request that the printer write to me, and to Mr. Harrison, who had provided Mrs. Walker with so much interesting information. The letters merely stated that I wanted all of the information about the history of the precedent, and that I expected this historical résumé to be submitted in writing over the signatures of the proper authorities. These letters were written on January 31, 1950.

Mrs. Walker delivered the letter to Mr. Harrison by hand. He read the letter in her presence, and then said to her that he would rather not write me a letter because he had told me, through her, what the precedent was, and he did not think it necessary to commit the subject to paper. By then, I was both ready and able to understand his reluctance. During this conversation, Mr. Harrison told Mrs. Walker that he knew that I had written to the Government Printing Office. I wondered how he knew about that simple fact so rapidly, because I had sent the Government Printer the letter by riding page only several hours before. Mr. Harrison suggested that the Senator from Washington ought to familiarize himself with section 4 or title 44 of the United States Code, for this section was the one from which the Joint Committee on Printing had laid down the precedent many years ago.

Following Mrs. Walker's return to the office I talked with Mr. Harrison by telephone. I told him in simple, if blunt, fashion that if he did not wish to answer my letter, he ought to refer it to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing. I told him that I wanted someone to say in writing what he had said on several occasions to Mrs. Walker. I merely said, "If you mean what you say, put it down, and sign your name to it." I thought it a simple and fair request.

During this day I talked with Mr. Herrell in the Government Printing Office. I asked him how it came about that my letter to the Government Printer had been discussed with Mr. Harrison. He said that was natural enough, because the Joint Committee on Printing acted as a board of directors for the Government Printing Office and that the latter referred all questions concerning policy to the Joint Committee. I had not known that. When I learned of it, I thought it was a very reasonable position. Mr. Herrell said that so far as he knew the precedent with which I was concerned had been established a quarter of a century ago by the Joint Committee on Printing. He said also that Mr. John J. Deviny, the Public Printer, would respond to my letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, partly in an effort to save time this afternoon, that my letters to both Mr. Harrison and Mr. Deviny be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the two letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1950.

Mr. JAMES L. HARRISON,
Staff Director,
Joint Committee on Printing,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HARRISON. As you know the Senate debated on Wednesday, January 18, a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3905) to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code. This debate in its entirety will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, January 19, beginning on page 615 and concluding on page 622. On Wednesday, January 25, my agent, Mrs. Walker, and on my order, requested of Mr. Ralph L. Harris, Congressional Record clerk, that reprints of the debate be made for distribution to interested citizens. Mr. Harris informed Mrs. Walker that reprints of a congressional debate could only be authorized providing that the written permission of all participating Senators had been secured. I then instructed Mrs. Walker to resubmit my reprint order to Mr. Harris or to have Mr. Harris, if the order was refused, request a letter from the Government Printing Office, in which it would state its reasons for refusing the order. Mr. Harris said that he could not accept my order for reprints but that he would willingly request the Government Printing Office letter I desired.

On Thursday, January 26, you discussed the request I submitted to Mr. Harris with Mrs. Walker. You told her of some precedent which you thought had established the authority that written permission from participating Senators must be secured before reprints of debates would be permitted. Why you initiated a call to Mrs. Walker I do not know and I am not aware of any debate reprint policy power your committee has over the Government Printing Office. I am keenly interested in determining what the authority of your committee actually is and why an order for reprints of a public debate has seemingly been refused by your command.

All I seek at the moment is information and I wish to have it in writing over the signature of the proper official. With your help I hope to clear this question up at once. Mrs. Walker will deliver this letter to you in person and she will be guided by your advice as to when I may expect an answer and from whom.

Most sincerely,

HARRY P. CAIN.

JANUARY 31, 1950.

Mr. JOHN J. DEVINY,
Public Printer,
Government Printing Office,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DEVINY: On Wednesday, January 18, 1950, the Senate debated a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3905) to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code. The full debate on this motion will be found on page 615 through a portion of page 622 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19.

Your subscriber directed a member of his staff to have reprints made of the debate in question. Mrs. Walker, my agent, was informed by Mr. Ralph L. Harris, Congressional Record clerk, on Wednesday, January 25 that by order of the Government Printing Office the reprints could not be made without the written permission of the several Senators who had participated in the debate.

In an effort to determine the reasons for the Government Printing Office order, Mrs. Walker conferred on Wednesday, January 25 with your planning manager, Mr. James W. Broderick. Mr. Broderick stated that a precedent of some 25 years' standing was the primary reason for the order that reprints of congressional debates were not to be authorized unless all participating Senators gave their written permission.

On Thursday, January 26, Mrs. Walker informed Mr. Harris that Senator CAIN desired a letter from the Government Printing Office to cover its reasons for refusing his order for reprints of the debate. Mr. Harris willingly agreed to forward this request. No acknowledgment of the request or any letter has yet been received from the Government Printing Office.

On Thursday, January 26, Mr. James L. Harrison, staff director of the Joint Committee on Printing, informed my agent, Mrs. Walker, by telephone that he had been advised of my submitted request to the Government Printing Office and that he, Mr. Harrison, had been instructed to inform me that written signatures from all participating Senators had to be obtained before an order for reprints of any debate would be authorized.

At the moment I am not concerned with Mr. Harrison of the Joint Committee on Printing. I wish to be advised by you, or by your proper agent, and in writing, of your authority for refusing to fill my order for reprints of a debate which is carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a public document. I am anxious to have your letter in the immediate future. My intention is to secure the reprints of a debate which covers a subject of continuing interest to citizens everywhere. I can think of no reason why your position should not be committed to paper over your signature without delay.

Your prompt consideration of a matter which is of considerable importance to me will be sincerely appreciated.

Most cordially,

HARRY P. CAIN.

Mr. CAIN. For the information of Senators and all other Members of the Congress I want to read the section in the code to which Mr. Harrison referred me, and from which he claimed the Joint Committee on Printing had fashioned the so-called precedent I am talking about:

SEC. 4. Remedying neglect or delay in public printing: The Joint Committee on Printing shall have power to adopt and employ such measures as, in its discretion, may be deemed necessary to remedy any neglect, delay, duplication, or waste in the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications.

What every Member of the Congress will be much more interested in is section 185 of title 44 of the United States Code. It states in unmistakable language:

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver, upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof.

There are no restrictions of any kind, character, or description of this authority, which says extracts shall be made available on order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada is curious, as a result of hearing this argument on the restriction of the use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as to whether, if the Joint Committee on Printing so desired, it could also prohibit to the press, for the purposes of quotation, the use of any part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a public record, it might desire, the request being, in effect, somewhat different from a request for a simple reprinting of the RECORD and the mailing of it to certain citizens, or making it available to all citizens. Could the Joint Committee on Printing, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Washington, carry it a step further by prohibiting the press from quoting the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, except with the consent of Senators making the RECORD?

Mr. CAIN. I think it is obvious that the Joint Committee on Printing, or any other committee, can do anything it wants to do. What the Senate will do about action committees may take, is again quite another thing. My own conviction is that neither the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] nor the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] sought to be unfair in his treatment of the Senator from Washington. It seems to me they have had, somewhere in the back of their minds, a precedent, as to the origin of which they were not very certain, and as to what it covered they were not very clear, but which had been established presumably to maintain, insofar as it is possible, the courtesy of one Senator toward another. Their present-day construction, arrived at in haste, was, "Regardless of what the reasons may be for his resistance, you must secure the written permission of every participating Senator, before you, as a Member of this body, can have a right to a reprint." I am satisfied that the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois, meant what he said a few minutes ago when he offered the observation that the subject had been properly brought to the floor of the Senate, and that it would result in the establishment of a precedent, to become known to all—a precedent which would restrict no legitimate right of any individual Member of the Senate.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. What I had in mind was, if the use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can be restricted beyond the Senate floor, and if the material in the RECORD can be restricted from the use of any Senator, why cannot the restriction be extended equally to its use by the press or by anyone else?

Mr. CAIN. Again, the answer to the question of the Senator from Nevada it seems to me is very obvious. The Joint Committee on Printing could do as the Senator from Nevada has suggested and the Senate could condone what the committee had done, in such instance. But it is my feeling, and I feel very strongly, that neither the Joint Committee on Printing nor the Senate has any such intention, and that this body only needs to have the matter brought to its attention as factually as possible, for it to establish a different precedent by which we may be guided in the future.

I shall proceed as rapidly as I can, though there are several references yet to come, which I think are rather interesting.

The Public Printer, Mr. Deviny, acknowledged my letter of January 31, under date of February 1. I wish this letter, in full, to be made a part of my statement, so I ask unanimous consent to have it included in the RECORD at this point. I wish to emphasize this paragraph of Mr. Deviny's letter:

As was explained to you yesterday, the purpose of the custom is to assure each individual Member that the remarks he makes on the floor will not be used in any manner other than that in which he intended, and we have received no suggestion from the committee indicating a change in this practice. The policy has been uniformly applied.

In having requested a reprint of a debate in its entirety I could only conclude that every Senator engaging in the debate sought only to oppose or support the motion to which he addressed himself. I had no desire to take any comments out of the context. This means that no participating Senator could possibly be embarrassed by having anyone else read what he said during the debate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1950.

Hon HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of January 31, requesting citation of authority for requiring written permission of the several Senators who participated in debate of H. R. 3905 before honoring your order for reprints of the same.

A search of our files discloses no record of a written authority for this procedure, which has been in effect for 25 years. It is presumed there was at one time a ruling or order of the Joint Committee on Printing which covered the matter.

As was explained to you yesterday, the purpose of the custom is to assure each individual Member that the remarks he makes on the floor will not be used in any manner other than that in which he intended, and we have received no suggestion from the committee indicating a change in this practice. This policy has been uniformly applied.

As the custom was established by the Joint Committee on Printing, and as the Government Printing Office conforms to the policies and directives of the committee with respect to all congressional printing, any change in procedure must have committee approval.

With assurance of high esteem,

Respectfuly,

JOHN J. DEVINY,
Public Printer.

Mr. CAIN. Senators will be interested probably in Mr. Deviny's letter admission that no written authority appears to exist for the policy procedure which is being uniformly applied by the Government Printer.

On February 2, 1950, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], entered the picture for the first time and conferred with me about my problem. He said that the so-called precedent had been established, so far as he knew, to keep one Senator from embarrassing another Senator. He said that there was nothing in writing about the question and that he did not know how long ago it was when the precedent had been laid down by the Joint Committee on Printing. He only knew that it had been a long time ago. When I told the Senator from Arizona that all I wanted was the reprint of a debate in full he readily understood that I sought to embarrass no one. He suggested that perhaps I would like to attend the next meeting to be held by the Joint Committee on Printing for the purpose of discussing the situation. I told him that I would appreciate such an opportunity and that I hoped it would soon be forthcoming because the question of excise taxes was important to people in my State and elsewhere and I wanted them to read the reprints which had thus far been denied to me. Shortly after our conversation I wrote to the Senator from Arizona to acknowledge it and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1950.

Hon CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Printing, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: I wish to acknowledge the conversation which we had during Wednesday afternoon of this week.

During our visit you gave me a copy of a letter which the Public Printer had written to Senator KNOWLAND under date of August 13, 1946. This letter advised Senator KNOWLAND that reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are permitted only upon getting approval of Senators who interpose statements or questions. The Public Printer said that this position had long been the policy of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Public Printer.

I suggested to you that in my considered view the so-called restrictive precedent does not and could not cover the request I recently made for reprints of a public debate which took place in the Senate on Wednesday, January 18. You very frankly said that you knew little of the precedent referred to and even less concerning where it came from or by whom it was established and agreed to.

You were kind enough to suggest that I attend the next meeting of the Joint Committee on Printing. I want to accept your invitation and I trust that the meeting is to

be held in the near future. I continue to desire to have the requested reprints of the debate and I feel satisfied that I am entitled to have my order filled by the Public Printer. I have no desire to embarrass anyone and I shall discuss the problem with your committee before considering the matter further.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Most cordially,

HARRY P. CAIN.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, during my talk with the Senator from Arizona he gave me a copy of a letter which had been written by the Public Printer to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] under date of August 13, 1946. It appears that the Senator from California had been refused certain reprints several years ago, and that he had received a letter from the Public Printer, and "that was that." He assumed the Public Printer knew not only what he was talking about but that he had sufficient authority to enforce what he said. I should like to read the letter written to the Senator from California, because it goes back about 2 years, and it will further arouse our curiosity. The salutation is, "My Dear Senator," referring to the Senator from California, and the letter is signed by the Public Printer. It reads as follows:

AUGUST 13, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of July 30, addressed to Mr. Ralph L. Harris, in which you ask to be advised of the particular policy or rule under which reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are permitted only upon getting approval of Senators who interpose statements or questions, has been referred to me for consideration.

In reply, I am pleased to advise that, since the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a public document, it is not copyrighted, and matter appearing in the RECORD may be reprinted by outside sources without obtaining a clearance from anyone. As to reprints by the Government Printing Office, it has long been the policy of the Joint Committee on Printing and this Office to ask for the approval of the Member whose remarks are to be reprinted before reprinting and distributing the same.

This is purely for the protection of each individual Member—

I should like to say, in parentheses, that I have never known the day in the Senate of the United States when every one of its Members was not thoroughly qualified to protect and take care of himself. But the Public Printer wishes to give us protection as individuals, to which we are not entitled and which most of us do not want.

I read further from the letter:

This is purely for the protection of each individual Member, as it not only protects the Members whose remarks are to be reprinted, but it also protects the Member who would order and distribute the same against charges of abuse of the franking privilege, unauthorized use of Federal funds, and so forth.

The policy has been uniformly applied, and I cannot recall a single instance where a Member, when approached, has refused to give his colleague permission to have his remarks in the RECORD reprinted.

I trust this gives you the information you desire. If I may be of other service to you in this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Respectfully.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MALONE. That injects another proposition, namely, whether a Senator is to be the judge of whether he is using his franking privilege properly.

Mr. CAIN. I think I have an answer to that question.

Mr. MALONE. It seems to me it is going rather far afield to inject the question of whether the franking privilege is being properly used.

Mr. CAIN. The Public Printer considers himself and his organization to be an operating unit having no control whatsoever over matters of policy, the best example of which is what I have already used, that I send a letter in writing to the Public Printer and, having reason to confer with the staff director of the Joint Committee on Printing, a little later, I find that the director of that staff is thoroughly aware of everything I wrote in a letter to the Public Printer. I asked him the reason why, and his answer was:

That is very simple. The Joint Committee on Printing is our board of directors. We do not wiggle unless we refer all matters involving trouble to them.

That situation has changed somewhat since 1946, when the Public Printer wrote to a distinguished Member of this body, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and in his letter of August 13, 1946, said:

As to reprints by the Government Printing Office, it has long been the policy of the Joint Committee on Printing and this Office to ask for the approval of the Member whose remarks are to be reprinted before reprinting and distributing the same.

He has, in the intervening 3 years, cut out from his letter the phrase "this Office," because of his determination to handle matters of routine and pieces of machinery, but not matters concerning policy.

Mr. President, I would invite the attention of Senators to a paragraph in the Knowland letter in which the Public Printer said that he could not recall a single instance of a Member, when approached, refusing to give his colleagues permission to have his remarks in the RECORD reprinted. If Members gave their written permission without exception, that would be one thing, and no one would have a right to complain, because what we would be doing then would be merely saying to another Member of the Senate, "It is my intention to have reprints made of the colloquy in which you participated." When any Member, however, for reasons of his own, refuses to give such permission, in the case I have presented to the Senate this afternoon, that is quite another thing, a thing to which I have been addressing myself for some time.

Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 7, I happened to be acting as the Presiding Officer of the Senate. Time is marching on. We began on the 18th day of January, and now I refer to the 7th day of February. I am still looking for those reprints. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], in his capacity of chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, came to me while I was in the chair to say that he had suggested to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] that I be given permission to order the reprints. I thanked the Senator from Arizona for his efforts on my behalf. I only said I thought it was a reasonable request for him to make of the Senator from Illinois. By this time, quite obviously and naturally I was tremendously interested in what was going to happen before this case came to its logical conclusion. I continued to feel that I was on extremely sound ground in my opinion that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a public document and must be made available to all of us for any reasonable purpose, or perhaps even for an unreasonable purpose which we as individuals and as Members of the Senate of the United States, have in mind.

Two weeks went by. Then, on Monday, February 20, the Senator from Arizona again came to me and told me on the floor of the Senate that the Senator from Illinois had reconsidered, that the Senator from Arizona had advised the Senator from Illinois that what the Senator from Illinois had said had been worth saying and ought to be read by a large public, everywhere. As a result of that conversation, supported and confirmed this afternoon by the distinguished majority leader, he, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], agreed that the junior Senator from Washington might have the reprints for which that Senator first placed an order on Tuesday, January 24.

I again thanked the Senator from Arizona for his interest and concern, and I appreciated the action which the Senator from Illinois took in the matter.

On Friday, February 24, my office received for my signature the order blank for 2,000 reprints of the excise-tax debate which I had submitted a month previously. I instructed the office to return the signed order blank to Mr. Harris, the Congressional Record clerk, and to advise me when the reprints had actually been received. Those reprints were delivered to my office this morning and have already been mailed, or, at least, they are on their way to interested persons in the State of Washington.

I likewise enclosed a covering note, indicating briefly why the debate carries the date of January 18 or 19 and the envelope carries the date of the last day of February. I think that citizens, certainly in my State, and elsewhere, are entitled to know what obstructions there happen to be to progress and to the carrying on of the public business.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the original letter which Mrs. Walker processed for me to the several Senators who engaged in the excise-tax debate. This letter contains the signatures of all the Senators, except the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who were parties to the colloquy. As I have stated, the Senator from Illinois finally agreed I was

entitled to the reprints, and I have them, but the majority leader has not signed this letter as I had been told he must before I could get the reprints of a public debate.

What the junior Senator from Washington has accomplished—and I want to restate it without prejudice to any individual—in having secured reprints of the excise-tax debate without the written permission of a Senator participating in that debate can be accomplished and done by any other Member of the Senate, or, from my point of view, by any other Member of the Congress of the United States. If there has been, as is the case, a precedent for 25 years, that precedent has been broken and shattered into a thousand pieces, because one Senator in testing this question has been able to get, without the written permission of one of his colleagues, a reprint of a public debate to which, in his considered opinion, he was entitled from the beginning.

What I have accomplished, in having secured reprints of the excise-tax debate without the written permission of a Senator participating in that debate, can be accomplished and done by any other Member of the Senate, or of the House of Representatives. I think that any Member ought to be entitled to have reprints made of any colloquy which takes place in the Congress without being required to secure written permission from anyone. I believe also that if a precedent is to be established concerning the use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD it must be established by the Senate or by the House of Representatives, or by both, rather than by a committee of either or both Houses, however well directed and led the respective committees may be.

Mr. President, in all seriousness, I regret that I have consumed precious time this afternoon in an effort to establish a reasonable and logical precedent concerning the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the future. Unless the Senate thinks it proper to resolve otherwise, I will take it to be a fact that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a public document, and that any Member of the Senate is entitled to have reprints made from it on his order to the Congressional Record clerk, and without needing the written permission of any other Member of this body.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Senator from Washington has performed a very worth-while service to the Senate by raising for discussion the points he has brought out. I should like to ask him a question which I asked myself as I sat here listening to the Senator. What should be the common-sense rule for handling the problem? I ask that question because I agree with the distinguished majority leader and the Senatory from Arizona, if I correctly understood their remarks, that adequate opportunity should be given to a Senator to correct errors in any statement which he may make on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, I ask the Senator from Washington if he believes it might be merely ordinary common sense for us to adopt a rule to the effect that any debate on the floor of the Senate should be subject to reprint on the order of any Senator who wishes to have it reprinted, provided notification of the intention to do so is given by him to other Senators involved in any colloquy occurring during the course of the debate, and that after, say, 48 hours or, possibly, 72 hours, have elapsed, giving opportunity to make corrections in the RECORD, a Senator shall be free to proceed to order reprints? Would that not be the common-sense solution of the problem?

If we wish to correct the RECORD, the place to correct it is on the floor of the Senate, by asking permission to make a correction. I believe the practice which has grown up is to make corrections in the office of the official reporters. I do not believe that is a good practice. I believe the corrections ought to be made in open court, as we say in the legal profession. If there is an error in the RECORD, it ought to be corrected on the floor of the Senate. I believe that after notification to a colleague that a Senator intends to reprint a debate, so long as it is a Senator's intention to reprint the full debate, and not to take remarks out of context, I believe a Senator should be free to have the reprint made after a lapse of 48 hours or 72 hours. It would seem to me that that is all the time a Senator would need to make any official correction he was entitled to make.

I agree with the Senator from Washington that the problem should be solved by a rule of the Senate, and not by any committee of the Senate, because I think we are dealing with the rather important right of a Senator to reprint portions of the official RECORD of the Senate.

Mr. CAIN. To my mind, what the Senator from Oregon has just stated deserves to be read and pondered by all Senators. Fortunately, to my way of thinking, we are not faced with very much of a problem. I hold at least a large majority of my colleagues in very high regard. I consider them to be distinguished gentlemen. A gentleman, among other virtues, possesses courtesy, and the intention to exchange fair play with his colleagues.

I know of very few Senators—and I would rather say I know of not a single Senator—who premeditatedly, through the use of the RECORD, would try to embarrass a colleague by taking comments out of context. Therefore, it seems to me that what we need in the Senate is the approval of a resolution, or the adoption of a rule, which would act as a reminder to each Senator, that before he uses the words of another Senator he ought to lean backward in order to be certain that the other Senator has had a chance to make any corrections he wishes to make in the RECORD. Beyond that no Senator has a right to object to any other American's reading what he said on the floor of the Senate, and what he meant when he said it.

I should like to join with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who are on the floor at the moment, devising a rule not for any enforcement procedures but to remind us, as we need to be reminded occasionally, that every Senator has certain rights, and that what we seek to establish is the fact that the public document we call the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to which we address ourselves almost every day in the year, belongs not to us alone, once we have said something, but to our colleagues and to the American Nation to use as it will.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I shall gladly yield, but I ask the Senator from Nevada to permit me to conclude with the last paragraph of my statement, because what I say is with particular friendliness to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], with whom I have exchanged remarks this afternoon.

I certainly do not begrudge the time I have employed as an individual Senator in securing reprints during the past month of the excise-tax debate. In the future all Senators ought to have their orders for reprints filled without hesitation, or delay, or argument. They are entitled to the service. I am not annoyed by the time it took for the Senator from Illinois to change his mind. I am not unhappy over the unwillingness of given individuals to express themselves in writing during the last month. I can understand how difficult it was for them to talk about something concerning which they knew so little. These obstructions and obstacles had to be met in order that a free use of a public document, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, might be enjoyed by every Senator and, I hope, every Member of the House of Representatives. I think the time has been well spent, and I am cheerfully satisfied with the result.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MALONE. It seems to me that the junior Senator from Washington has done the Senate of the United States a service this afternoon. There certainly should be no restraint on the use of a public document, regardless of whether it is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or some other public document. It seems to me that the Public Printer and others who have established the precedent which has been discussed, at least have given their reasons with mixed feelings, saying that it might embarrass a Senator, but none of them gave the reason which we consider important, that the Senators participating might not have had opportunity to correct their remarks. I did not catch that reason as being among the ones given.

Mr. CAIN. No; they have never, in fact, given that reason. The statement they have made is that unless there is written permission, which in itself has nothing to do with a Senator's opportunity to correct his remarks, another Senator shall not be authorized to use what is said in a colloquy.

Mr. MALONE. Then, the statement of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon and the distinguished junior Senator from Washington give now, which is a very reasonable one and should be taken for granted, is grounded on the kind of men who are supposed to be Members of this body, and the assumption that they would give such permission in any case, without any rule. If a large amount of debate is to be reprinted, it would be only the courteous thing to say to one of the participants in the debate, "Have you made your corrections for the permanent RECORD?"

Mr. CAIN. I believe we are in complete agreement. The rule would be only a reminder.

Mr. MALONE. The two reasons which the Senators gave for the rule would, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Nevada, have no weight whatever, because the question whether a Senator would abuse the franking privilege is something entirely apart from the use of language in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That is something of which we are the sole judges at the moment, and if we do abuse the franking privilege, there is another remedy entirely apart from the Public Printer.

The second point is, if the junior Senator from Washington will permit me——

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. The second point is the fact that those in authority would not use the printing machinery of the Government for making public something which some other Senator had said, without his permission, and that is another thing far removed, because the rate for printing accorded a Senator is, like the franking privilege, a matter entirely separate from the question whether or not the language in the RECORD is to be used. In other words, it seems that over the past 25 years probably the objectives and the reasons given have been confused.

I should like to say another thing. The value of a reprint often depends on the time element. In other words, something is said today that may be important to the constituents of the senior Senator from Oregon, or the junior Senator from Washington, or the junior Senator from Nevada, but after a week or two it may have no value whatever.

Mr. CAIN. Fortunately, I should add, with reference to the excise tax question, people throughout the country continue to be as much interested in it as they were on January 19, when the subject was debated. That happens to be a fortunate circumstance. I had to wait a month to bring the people up to date. That, however, is not important.

In concluding my part of the colloquy this afternoon I should like to say that I have had a real sympathy for both the Public Printer and the Joint Committee on Printing, and that sympathy has arisen from the fact that there was nothing in front of them. They did not actually know what the rule was or what the precedent was. In their anxiety to observe a precedent with the nature of which they were not familiar, they became literalists. Well, it is impossible to be a literalist respecting an uncertainty. That is all there was to the matter in the first place. As the Senator from Illinois was among the first to say, in having had this matter drawn to his attention, I think we ought to do something about it. The precedent has already been broken, so our chief concern is to agree, for example, with the acting minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the acting majority leader, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], as to what sort of a rule would best serve the purpose of the Senate, on the assumption that none of us want unfairly to take advantage of any single one of our colleagues.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from Nevada that a rule should not be needed, but I wonder, however, if we are not exactly in the same position we were in before the case of the Senator from Washington arose. Let us suppose this hypothetical. Suppose that the Senator should proceed tomorrow to ask the Public Printer to reprint another speech in which there occurred a colloquy with another Senator. In that event does not the Senator from Nevada think the Senator from Washington would obtain the same decision from the Public Printer, namely, that the Senator from Washington would have to secure for him a letter from the Senator who took part in the colloquy, before the matter would be reprinted? Then there would occur another interval of time before the Senator from Washington could obtain the reprint he requested. Although the Senator from Washington has broken the precedent in this particular case, unless I miss my guess he is going to obtain the same sort of response from the Public Printer in the future that he received in the instance which is being discussed this afternoon.

Mr. CAIN. I would not be guilty of differing with my friend the Senator from Oregon, but I feel that is not so, because the way in which the problem has been presented to reasonable men has, I think, convinced them that the so-called precedent was never established in the first place; that it could not have been established for the purpose of keeping any Senator from securing reprints of any argument, particularly in its entirety. The reason why the junior Senator from Washington finally obtained the reprints he desired was that both the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who was a participant in the debate, agreed with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and, by indirection with me, that it was not even proper or necessary for him to give his written permission to do something which in the first place was my right as a Senator. Then the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing apparently either picked up the telephone or went to see the Public Printer, and said, "The Senator is entitled to his 2,000 reprints with or without any other Senator's written permission."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. MALONE. The interest of the junior Senator from Nevada in this matter is not entirely academic, because he has received word from the Public Printer on two or three occasions that apparently he himself has gained the necessary consent. The junior Senator from Nevada has never written any Senator, but has never had any trouble about reprints. However, I can see that I might have such trouble.

Mr. CAIN. Will my friend from Nevada permit me to suggest that, being a reasonably selfish man, I brought from that selfish point of view my own individual trouble and problem onto the floor of the Senate in high hope, not that every other Senator would be interested in my particular problem, but that he could so readily see once it had been advanced to him that similar trouble might also involve him, and that, therefore, the sooner we come to grips with the situation and improve it, the better.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly I yield.

Mr. MALONE. It seems to the junior Senator from Nevada that no rule is needed. We still have on the floor of the Senate the rule of courtesy to our fellow Members. The precedent has been broken. The subject has been thoroughly debated and the fact thoroughly established that there is in reality no precedent. Therefore, why do we now need any rule?

Mr. CAIN. The answer to the Senator's question is that there is no longer a need for a rule because the precedent has been broken. But the Senate of the United States on reflection might want a rule, as encouraging a more considered and courteous treatment of our colleagues.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I respectfully suggest to both my friends from Washington and Nevada that the test of their position is going to be made when the hypothetical is raised; when the Senator from Washington, for example, seeks to reprint a speech he made on the floor of the Senate, including a colloquy with another Senator, and the other Senator objects. Then what does the Senator think is going to be the decision of the Public Printer? I believe it is necessary to have a rule such as the one I suggested, that a Senator shall be given the privilege of making corrections within 48 or 72 hours after the request has been made, and if he does not make the corrections, or if there are no corrections to be made, then automatically, after that period has elapsed, the Senator from Washington will be free to proceed and have the reprints made at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to suggest that there are two promising factors present this afternoon. The first, and a highly practical one, is that I have been told, though the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has not said so to me personally, that the Joint Committee on Printing, having given this matter some considered thought, recognizing the merits of the case of the junior Senator from

Washington, are about to agree, if in fact they have not already agreed, to commit to writing a rule which contains the provision that any Senator desiring an argument in its entirety need ask permission of no one else. My thought, after listening to the Senator from Oregon, whose legal points of view I deeply respect, is that we ought to determine soon what action has actually been taken by the Joint Committee on Printing. It ought to come before us for a little discussion, for improvement by way of change or amendment, if that is required, or to be agreed to. Then we shall have finally closed this chapter to the satisfaction of everyone.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. What the Senator now says is the case so far as the Joint Committee on Printing is concerned. I think that will solve the problem. But there was nothing in the remarks of the Senator from Arizona made this afternoon to indicate that the committee had reached the conclusion the Senator from Washington now says they have reached. To the contrary, the Senator from Arizona left me with the impression that the Joint Committee on Printing was standing by the advice it had given the Senator from Washington in the first instance, namely, that consent of the other Senator or other Senators concerned was necessary.

Mr. CAIN. That is why I thought it proper to call my understanding to the attention of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada only wishes to add that, according to the well-documented evidence presented by the junior Senator from Washington this afternoon, it is not up to the Joint Committee on Printing to determine anything about this business——

Mr. CAIN. I think that is well established.

Mr. MALONE. Unless they change the rule with respect to the right of a Senator to order reprints at all. In other words, if the Senate sees fit to prevent any Senator from ordering reprints from the Government Printing Office, or modifying the procedure which now exists, that would be one thing. But how can the Joint Committee on Printing or the Public Printer change the law without some measure being passed by Congress? So far as meeting with opposition is concerned, I am of the opinion that the Senator will meet with no further opposition. If he does, the Senator can bring the question to the floor, and it would not be very long before some different arrangement would be made.

Mr. CAIN. It seems quite clear and logical to me that the interest Senators have shown in the problem this afternoon will in a reasonable way be shared by other Senators. Therefore, having provoked the interest in a problem that concerns ourselves, I take it to be a good solid fact that we shall have reached a satisfactory solution very soon.

NOTICE OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR McMAHON ON THE SUBJECT OF PEACE

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I give notice that I shall address the Senate tomorrow, as soon as I can be recognized, on the subject of peace, and what policy we should now pursue in securing it. I do not now ask unanimous consent to be recognized tomorrow, because I do not believe that practice to be a good one. But I give notice that I shall seek recognition as soon after the Senate convenes tomorrow as is possible.

DAVID DEMAREST LLOYD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have recently noticed reports in the press concerning David D. Lloyd, employed at the White House on the President's staff. Mr. Lloyd is an associate and an assistant to Mr. Murphy, who recently took the place of Mr. Clifford on the White House staff. Without trying to burden the Senate with too long a discussion of the subject at this moment, I do, however, want to cite a few facts concerning Mr. Lloyd and what I consider to be some of the dangers which are involved in the hit-and-miss policy of accusation, character assassination, and attack upon some of the people in our Government. I am not in a position to know whether or not the charges that have been brought to the attention of the people of the United States, and particularly to the attention of the Senate, by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], are capable of being substantiated.

I am not here either to protest or to affirm the accusations which have been made in reference to the other cases, which I believe have been substantially whittled down from the number stated in the original accusation.

It so happens that Mr. Lloyd, out of his respect for the President of the United States and for the Government of the United States, stated that he was "case number nine," that case number having been brought to the attention of the Senate by the Senator from Wisconsin. It also happens that Mr. Lloyd, in revealing that he was case number nine, revealed the facts which pertain to his case. I think it is important that those facts be known by those of us who are on the floor of the Senate, and also be incorporated in the RECORD.

The case of Mr. Lloyd is one that is characteristic of what I call promiscuous hunting without facts and without adequate evidence. Mr. Lloyd's case was first brought to the attention of a House committee in 1947. Subsequently, Mr. President, the now Deputy Under Secretary of the State Department, Mr. Peurifoy, sent a personal apology to Mr. Lloyd. The substance of that personal apology was reported by Mr. Peter Edson, in his column of February 22, in which he said that Mr. Peurifoy, now Deputy Under Secretary of State in charge of Administration and Security, included in his apology an admission that there were no questions of security or of security risk in connection with Mr. Lloyd's case; likewise, Mr. Peurifoy included an explanation that Mr. Lloyd's file should not have been sent to the House Appropriations Committee. His file was not classified as a security risk.

In other words, Mr. President, here is a young man, a man in his thirties, who is married, who is a good citizen, who has a family, who is a member of the Episcopal Church, who comes from a good family, whose mother and father are fine people; and yet this young man is suffering today by reason of an attack upon his character and his loyalty. I would think myself remiss as a friend of his, as one who has been associated with him in political work, at least during the time when I was active as one of the vice chairmen of the Americans For Democratic Action, if I did not rise at this time to say that Mr. Lloyd's loyalty should be beyond question and is beyond question. He is an avowed anti-Communist. He is a pro-democrat with a small "d", and, also, I trust, with a big "D." I believe him to be a good Christian. I believe him to be a good parent. I believe him to be a loyal Government servant.

Mr. President, so there can be no doubt as to my personal position on the matter of loyalty, I wish to quote the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from New York, a former Governor of New York, the Honorable HERBERT LEHMAN, who now is presiding over the Senate. His remarks express my feeling and my thoughts on the subject of loyalty. I quote now from an address delivered by the junior Senator from New York:

> Certainly the Government has a right to expect and demand that persons holding what are defined as sensitive positions be fully loyal to the Government, to its philosophy and its principles. Any person holding views inconsistent with our present form of Government, our own philosophy of Government, seems to me to be obviously disqualified for any position with access to policy information or confidential restricted information. This would certainly apply to Communists or fellow travelers, but it also should apply with equal strength to Fascists and to believers in racial superiority and other equally un-American concepts. I think that anti-Negroism, anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism and anti-Protestantism should be as positive grounds for disqualifying individuals for sensitive Federal Government positions as membership in the Communist Party.

Mr. President, I concur in that philosophy. I think Senator LEHMAN has presented a masterful statement on the question of loyalty. Senator LEHMAN has proven himself to be a devoted public servant and a devoted Democrat, in the best meaning of the word.

Mr. President, I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed in the RECORD an article by Edward T. Folliard, Post reporter, which appears in today's Washington Post. The article is entitled "McCARTHY's Case 9 Just 1947 Probe Slip." I wish to have the article incorporated in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, as further demonstration of the loyalty of Mr. Lloyd and also of the background material which pertains to this particular case.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McCARTHY'S CASE 9 JUST 1947 PROBE SLIP

(By Edward T. Folliard)

David Demarest Lloyd, who works for the White House, was glad yesterday that the whole story was out, and that there was no longer any mystery about Case No. 9.

He felt that his own experience might possibly show the danger of having Government departments turn over secret loyalty files to Congress.

Senator McCARTHY (Republican, Wisconsin) didn't mention Lloyd by name, but he had him in mind last week when he charged that Communist Party workers were employed by the State Department, and that a speech writer in the White House had failed to get clearance from a loyalty board when he sought a job in the Department in 1946.

CHARGES DAILY WORKER LINK

Senator McCARTHY said that Case No. 9 (Lloyd) and his wife were members of Communist-front organizations. He said that a relative * * * has a financial interest in the Daily Worker. After charging that No. 9 was not given clearance by the State Department, the Wisconsin lawmaker said he got a job in the office of the Secretary of Defense.

"And where do Senators think that man is today?" McCARTHY asked. "He is now a speech writer in the White House. That is Case No. 9."

Lloyd had no doubt that McCARTHY meant him when he read the speech. After consulting White House Press Secretary Charles G. Ross, he told his story, first, to Peter Edson of the Newspaper Enterprise Association, who had sought an interview. Yesterday he talked to other reporters.

This is his story.

He was born in New York City 38 years ago. He is married to the former Charlotte Tuttle, daughter of Charles Tuttle, a Republican, who was appointed United States attorney for the southern district of New York by former President Hoover. He and Mrs. Lloyd have two children, live at 2501 Ridge Road Drive, Alexandria, Va., and attend the Emmanuel Church on the Hill (Episcopal).

Lloyd's parents were Democrats, but many of his relatives are Republicans. The relative mentioned by McCARTHY as one with a financial interest in the Daily Worker was a well-to-do great-aunt, Mrs. Caroline Lloyd Strobell.

AUNT BECAME COMMUNIST

A one-time Socialist, Mrs. Strobell became an avowed member of the Communist Party. Louis F. Budenz, who resigned as managing editor of the Daily Worker in 1945 and returned to the Catholic Church, told about her in his book This Is My Story.

Mrs. Strobell, according to Budenz, was one of three women who became owners of the Daily Worker after it was ostensibly divorced from the Communist Party. Of these three women, Budenz said: "They were classical examples of nice people who were used to conceal undercover skulduggery against the Nation—a conspiracy of which they were totally unaware."

Mrs. Strobell died in 1941, and Lloyd recalls that the family used to say that Stalin killed her. He has reference to the shock she got when Stalin entered into a friendship pact with Hitler.

Lloyd was graduated from Harvard in 1931 and Harvard law school in 1935. An admirer of the Roosevelt New Deal, he entered Government service through the Resettlement Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

About this time, he joined the Washington Cooperative Bookshop, which offered books at a discount. He got out when he discovered it was a Communist-front outfit. He also joined the National Lawyers Guild, along with Robert Jackson, later to be a Supreme Court Justice, and other New Deal lawyers. He quit this, too, when he decided it was too far to the left.

HORRIFIED BY SPEECH

In 1945, Lloyd went to Europe with the Harriman economic mission. Over there, he says, it became clear to him that communism was trying to block European recovery. On his way back in 1946, aboard the steamship *Washington*, he read in the ship's news an account of Henry Wallace's famous speech in Madison Square Garden, a be-nice-to-Russia speech which cost Wallace his job in the Truman Cabinet. Lloyd says he was horrified by the speech.

Back in Washington, Lloyd talked with other New Dealers who felt the time had come to draw a line between themselves and the Wallaceites.

Out of this sentiment came Americans for Democratic Action. Lloyd helped draft its constitution, which has a plank forbidding membership to Communists.

About this time Lloyd applied for a job in the State Department. While his application was pending he took a job with Americans for Democratic Action, serving as director of its research and legislation division.

In 1947 Representative KARL STEFAN (Republican, Nebraska) asked the State Department for an abstract of its files on employees and applicants for jobs, which were being studied by the House Appropriations Committee. Lloyd's file was sent to STEFAN. It became part of the published hearings of the committee in 1948.

RECOGNIZED CASE

Lloyd recognized his case in the published report and protested to the State Department and to STEFAN. John Peurifoy, now Deputy Under Secretary of State in charge of administration and security, apologized. He told Lloyd that there was no question of his loyalty and said his file should never have been sent to Capitol Hill.

Representative STEFAN assured Lloyd that his statement of protest would be filed with his record. Lloyd thought that was the end of it and continued to think so until Senator McCARTHY, 2 years later, picked up the old Stefan file and publicized it as Case No. 9.

In that 2-year interval Lloyd had quit his job with Americans for Democratic Action to do research work for the Democratic National Committee. This was in the summer of 1948. As the campaign progressed he began working with Charles Murphy, then a White House administrative assistant, who was sending speech material to the Truman campaign special.

After President Truman's victory at the polls Murphy asked Lloyd to join the White House staff. Lloyd was investigated by the FBI for a month or so, was cleared, and began working for the White House in December 1948. For budgetary reasons he was placed on the pay roll of the Department of Defense.

ASSISTANT TO MURPHY

He is now a $10,305-a-year assistant to Murphy, who recently succeeded Clark Clifford as special counsel to the President. Like several other White House employees, he works on speeches, but his principal job is in the legislative field.

In talking about case No. 9 last week, Senator McCARTHY said he felt he was doing President Truman a favor by exposing his speech writer.

"I do not think he knows it," McCARTHY said. "I do not think he would have this individual there writing speeches for him if he knew it."

The story at the White House is that Mr. Truman knows all about Lloyd. Last fall he invited him to Key West, where Lloyd turned out some pretty good water colors.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that this particular case is a very good illustration of the importance of giving to the individuals concerned in the attacks upon their loyalty to the Government, full opportunity to be heard in a public hearing before the subcommittee which has been appointed to investigate the charges?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do.

Mr. MORSE. And that such a hearing would give to Mr. Lloyd the opportunity, to which I think he certainly is entitled if the facts are as I believe them to be—namely, that he is a very loyal person—to make his case, through the medium of that committee, before the American people?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly concur in the views just expressed by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, these procedural rights should be guaranteed to every American citizen.

I also wish to state for the RECORD that the loyalty of the Government employees is outstanding. When a group of employees that is investigated by loyalty boards, under careful scrutiny and observation, is found to have a record of 99.6 percent loyalty, certainly that is a very good record. I do not wish to be facetious; but, Ivory soap has been sold for years as being 99.44 percent pure, and as being as pure as any soap on the market. So I say that a group of employees with a record of 99.6 percent purity certainly is an outstanding record of loyalty.

Mr. President, it seems to me we must be extremely careful as to any charges against our fellow citizens. We should be extremely careful about making charges concerning those who are employed in either the administrative or the legislative branches of Government. Today many a Government worker feels that he has been severely injured, in terms of his over-all reputation, by the constant charges made by many persons in the Government service. Government workers have been abused, all too often, by unwarranted insinuations as to their loyalty, their efficiency, and their integrity.

Frankly, Mr. President, I submit to the Senate that, man for man, woman for woman, employee by employee, in terms of loyalty, the record of the public servants, the persons who work for the United States Government, is as good or better than the record of those who work in private industry. In fact, those who work for our Government have again and again demonstrated their loyalty.

Lest there be any misinterpretation of my remarks, let me say that if a man is a Communist, he should be dismissed, if a man is a Fascist, he should be dismissed, for such a man does not believe in our philosophy of government. I believe in the exposure of people who are proven to be Communists and in the prosecution of those who actively advocate acts of violence to overthrow the Government of the United States.

But, Mr. President, just as I believe strongly in that position, I likewise believe in the procedural rights of every American citizen, no matter what his political faith; and I also believe in the right of every man to be considered innocent until he is proven guilty—the old Anglo-Saxon principle of law. It appears to me that too often we assume the guilt of persons until they can prove themselves innocent.

Mr. President, as one who likes to feel that the most precious possession a person has is his good name and his character, I say there is a solemn obligation upon every Member of the Congress and upon everyone else in our Government to be extremely careful about the charges they may level against any of their associates in the Government service, or against persons anywhere else, as to their political affiliations or as to any other aspects of their character. A man who steals another's good name, has stolen the most priceless possession he has.

In this instance I think a gentleman by the name of Mr. David Lloyd has been seriously injured. He has been made the subject of irresponsible charges. He has had his loyalty checked and cleared by the FBI, the State Department, and the Loyalty Board. I submit there is no Member of the Senate or no Member of the House of Representatives who can judge the loyalty of an employee of the Government as well as can the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Loyalty Boards, or those who are intimately associated with the person in question.

DECISION OF HONG KONG SUPREME COURT AWARDING CERTAIN CHINESE AIR LINES TO THE CHINESE REDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been somewhat concerned about a decision which was rendered by the Hong Kong Supreme Court awarding two Chinese Nationalist air lines to the Chinese Reds. I am not in position to pass judgment on the legal soundness of the decision; but I wish to comment briefly on some of the implications and aftereffects of the decision, after I request unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, certain clippings dealing with that decision of the Hong Kong court from the Washington News for February 27 and February 28, and from the New York Herald Tribune for February 28.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 27, 1950]

CHINESE REDS HUNT FOR UNITED STATES PILOTS TO RUN $100,000,000 GIFT AIR LINE

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

HONG KONG, February 27.—Having acquired a ready-made air transport system, largely founded on the wartime bounty of American taxpayers, Red China is now shopping around for American know-how to help handle its $100,000,000 prize.

That is what it would have cost the Chinese Communists, by authoritative estimate, to amass the aviation assets to which they have now fallen heir—through bashfulness of the State Department and the good offices of the British in reallocating other people's property.

A reliable official source, who disapproves of last week's decision of the Hong Kong Supreme Court conferring two former Nationalist air lines on the Chinese Reds, said he believed Communist talent scouts were trying here, in Bangkok, Rangoon, and possibly the United States to hire American air technicians.

He supposed that British concerns in Hong Kong were preparing to handle Communist requirements for spare parts and fuel, and he wondered how this would fit into the proposed $35,000,000 American ECA appropriation to Britain for aircraft parts.

So far as he knew, Red agents thus far failed to sign any American pilots for the 71 planes Peiping won in the Hong Kong court. But he knew of three American technicians, "and possibly three besides," who had agreed to work for the Reds. He understood the Communists were offering attractive salaries in foreign currencies.

Apart from normal commercial airlifts in China proper, the Communists probably expect to use the transport fleet for an airborne invasion of Formosa

Indicating the intensive Communist planning, instructions were reported to have been sent here, 3 weeks before the supreme court decided the air-lines case, as to crating and shipping of spare parts and other equipment which the air lines' turncoat employees were guarding.

There seems to have been no doubt among the Chinese Communists how the supreme court decision would rule on the efforts of Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault and Whiting Willauer, interim purchasers of the air lines' assets, to have a receiver appointed pending a full-dress court trial for determination of title

What the supreme court actually did was to rule that as of January 6, when Britain recognized the Peiping regime, agents of that government, actually the turncoat employees of the air lines, were in physical possession of the assets and the Red Government and the air-lines assets therefore enjoyed sovereign immunity

To Chief Justice Sir Leslie Bertram Gibson it mattered not how the Reds came to be in possession of the planes Nor did it matter much that at the time of the air-line employees' desertion on November 10 and until January 6, the Chinese Nationalist Government was recognized by Britain. And during that time the assets had been sold and the planes registered under the United States Civil Aeronautics Authority.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 28, 1950]

PROTEST OVER PLANES LACKS REAL PUNCH

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

HONG KONG, February 28.—Whatever Secretary of State Dean Acheson may have said about the vigor of American conservations with the British over their gift of 71 American-registered transport planes and other aviation assets to the Chinese Reds, the State Department has been pulling its punches

The State Department has been using strong language but not strong enough to make the British back up on a deal that was cooking for 3 months as part of Britain's recognition of Red China.

United States Consul General Karl Rankin has been going as far as his instructions permit in voicing official American disapproval. But he said today there had been no actual protest over last week's ruling of the Hong Kong Supreme Court.

Representatives to Hong Kong haven't been elevated to the plane of formal notes. An official said the State Department had gone no further than to say that if a fair trial was not granted by the British to determine title to the air lines' assets, the United States would view that shortcoming as an unfriendly act.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 28, 1950]

HONG KONG RULING TO STAND

LONDON, February 27.—The British Government cannot and will not interfere with a Hong Kong Supreme Court decision handing over 90 Chinese air-line planes to the Communist government of China, a Foreign Office spokesman said today.

He confirmed that representations against the ruling have been made to Great Britain by the United States, which contends the planes passed into the hands of an American company through purchase. But, he added, the court ruling in the British colony is something over which the British Government has no control.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in regard to this problem my concern is over the point raised in one of the articles, which was written by a very able writer, Mr. Clyde Farnsworth, in which he points out the possibility that the Chinese Communist government will now seek to obtain parts for these airplanes from Great Britain, with the use of an earmarked sum of money, under the jurisdiction of ECA for the purchase of airplane parts from the United States of America by the British Government.

If Mr. Farnsworth is correct in his analysis I think the implications are very serious; that is, I think it is a serious matter for the American taxpayers to be supplying funds to ECA for the benefit supposedly of Great Britain, and then for a part of those funds to be used for the payment of airplane parts in America, to be transferred by Great Britain to the Chinese Communists in China.

I am so much concerned about the matter of dealing with Communist governments that I have inserted this material in the RECORD, only in the hope that at least it will cause someone in the State Department to take a "look-see," so to speak, to determine whether there is a basis for the conclusions which Mr. Farnsworth has reached in his very excellent article.

If it be true that, as a result of the decision of the Hong Kong court, Great Britain will proceed to buy in the United States airplane parts with ECA funds, and then make those parts available to the Communist government of China, for this huge air force—which would have cost some $100,000,000, as Mr. Farnsworth in his article says, if they had had to go out and buy them—in order to put the air force into mechanical shape for the use of the Communist armies of China, then we, the Congress of the United States, had better go into the matter when we have the ECA requests before us.

I make this statement as one with a record of support for the ECA program, and as one who intends to continue support of the ECA program, at least to the extent of providing such funds as can be shown to be needed for the economic rehabilitation of Europe, including England, but within the financial ability of the taxpayers of the United States to

make the contributions. But, as a supporter of ECA, I wish the RECORD to make perfectly clear this afternoon that I am not going to support any appropriations for ECA to be used by Great Britain to build up the Communist air force of Communist China, and if that is what the plan is, then I think we had better have a pretty frank talk about ECA funds when the issue reaches the floor of the Senate. I give the State Department this advance notice this afternoon as to the position of the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I turn briefly to another subject preparatory to introducing an editorial into the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—POWERS OF GENERAL COUNSEL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was gratifying to read in the press over the weekend that the National Labor Relations Board had revised the delegation agreement between the Board and the general counsel of the Board so as to make it clear, at least so far as the terms of the agreement are concerned, that the general counsel is to act as the agent of the Board in representing it in court. It is to be hoped that this step will to some extent diminish the area of conflict between the Board and the general counsel, although it is plain that the law under which they operate encourages the pursuit of divergent policies in this bifurcated agency. In fact, this tendency of the Taft-Hartley Act became so apparent, after 2 years of operation, that last year when revision of the law was under consideration there was no disagreement in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on the proposition that the office of independent general counsel of the Board should be abolished.

In fact, I think it is only fair and proper to point out that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], himself one of the authors of the Taft-Hartley law, in the last session of the Eighty-first Congress, reported an amendment to the Taft-Hartley law which would have carried out the identical principle for which the junior Senator from Oregon fought in 1947, one of the principles that caused the junior Senator from Oregon to vote against the Taft-Hartley law, namely, the principle of the Taft-Hartley law which gives to the general counsel, in the wording of the law, the independent power to issue or not issue complaints in accordance with his own discretion. I recall that in the debate in 1947, on more than one occasion, the junior Senator from Oregon argued on the floor of the Senate that never, with his vote, would he give to any man in Government such an arbitrary and unchecked discretionary power as the Taft-Hartley law gives to the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board when it comes to deciding to issue or not to issue complaints.

In the debate in 1947 the junior Senator from Oregon warned the Senate that if the power were granted to any individual, I cared not who, trouble was in store. Our whole experience since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law has been that the general counsel under that law has done exactly what the junior Senator from Oregon warned would be done if we ever made the mistake of giving to a mere man such sweeping, blanket, arbitrary power.

At our hearings in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, when some of us again raised the point that it was a mistake to have that section in the Taft-Hartley law, it was very gratifying to us to see that, although belatedly, the Senator from Ohio had come to the same conclusion, namely, that the power ought to be checked. I say in great respect to the Senator from Ohio, that one of his fine characteristics is that, once he can be shown on the facts and by way of experience that a mistake has been made, he does not hesitate to seek to rectify the mistake.

In the last session of the Congress, the Senator from Ohio agreed, when we concluded our hearings, that it was a mistake to give to the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board such sweeping power as the Taft-Hartley law gives to him. I wish he were present this afternoon, but I am sure that if I do not bespeak accurately his point of view, he will correct me in the RECORD at another date. I was greatly gratified to see the senior Senator from Ohio take the position in the Eighty-first Congress which the junior Senator from Oregon took in the Eightieth Congress when the Taft-Hartley debate was being waged in the Senate, that it was a mistake to give the general counsel the power the Taft-Hartley law gives him.

So, Mr. President, until the necessary legislative step is taken to check the power of the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, the existing power will continue to be a handicap in what I think is a fair administration of the law. But I believe the Board is to be commended for its recent action in seeking to minimize, to the extent that it can within the wording of the present statute, the opportunity for and the area of disagreement on basic policy between itself and the general counsel.

In this connection, I believe Senators will be interested in yesterday's editorial in the Washington Post, entitled "Insubordinate Counsel," and I ask unanimous consent that it may appear in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSUBORDINATE COUNSEL

The controversy between the National Labor Relations Board and its general counsel, Robert N. Denham, is not merely a clash of personalities. The Board is obviously concerned about proper presentation of its point of view in labor cases that are being carried to the courts. It is Mr. Denham's duty to represent the Board when its orders are challenged, and he so far forgot that duty last month as to state in a public address that he thought the Board was wrong in several cases about to go to the courts. Indeed, he seemed to invite employers to take their cases against the NLRB to the courts where he will be the Board's defender. It is not surprising that this anomalous situation should bring from the Beard an order that Mr. Denham shall defend its actions "in full accordance with the directions of the Board."

To be sure, the general counsel is appointed by the President, and the Taft-Hartley Act gives him final authority in the investigation of charges of unfair labor practices and in the issuance of complaints. But the act also says that he "shall have such other duties as the Board may prescribe." Apparently one of these is representation of the Board in court. Certainly, then, the NLRB has a right to tell Mr. Denham what kind of representation it wishes to have. Nor does there seem to be any question about the right of the Board to veto any important changes initiated by Mr. Denham in the offices of the regional directors, for the power to appoint such officials is lodged directly in the Board.

If the restrictions laid upon Mr. Denham have the appearance of a vote of no-confidence, it must be admitted that he asked for it in his unwarranted attack of January 12. Too often Mr. Denham has acted as if he were a detached agency having no obligation to cooperate with the NLRB in getting an important job done. He needs to be brought back into his proper orbit as "general counsel of the Board." NLRB officials did not invent that term to belittle Mr. Denham in the process of a clash of personalities. They copied it out of the Taft-Hartley Act. If Mr. Denham continues to conduct his office as if the Board were only a tail to his kite, Congress will have no alternative to spelling out his subordination to the Board when the T-H law is modified.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Calendar.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles F. McLaughlin to be a United States district judge.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader whether it is not true that this particular nomination comes to the floor of the Senate with the unanimous vote of the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. MYERS. That is my understanding, I may say to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. On the basis of that understanding, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed and without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 1, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

Myron Wiener, of New York, to be a member of the War Claims Commission, vice David N. Lewis, deceased.

GOVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Morris F. de Castro, of the Virgin Islands, to be Governor of the Virgin Islands, vice William H. Hastie.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Capt. Alfred C. Richmond, United States Coast Guard, to be Assistant Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a period of 4 years, with the rank of rear admiral.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Charles F. McLaughlin to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may this moment of prayer inspire us with a new awareness of our spiritual resources.

May we be impelled by a noble purpose in every plan that we present for the solution of our many problems.

We humbly confess that there are frequently such discrepancies between our promises and our performances, between our profession and our practice, between our creed and our conduct.

We pray that these may not be at variance with one another, but always in close and cordial agreement.

Grant that daily we may validate and authenticate the reality and glory of democracy by our loyalty to its ideals and principles.

In Christ's name we bring our petitions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 398. Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HOEY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. THYE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4406) entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CREATION OF CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to set up a modified version of the original Civilian Conservation Corps program. I am introducing this bill for two reasons:

First, at the present time there are some 4,000,000 acres of national forests which need reforestation. There are 2,000,000 acres of trees suffering from blister rust. One hundred thousand miles of roads need to be built into the various mountainous and wooded areas of this country. Fourteen hundred lookout towers are needed for fire protection.

Second, last month there were 1,000,000 boys between the ages of 16 and 24 who were looking for work. Unemployment at the present time is greatest in this age group.

I have long since been convinced that the thousands of boys who know nothing but the pavements of congested areas should have an opportunity to breathe the fresh air that comes from working in the out-of-doors. I believe the records will so show the health results and morale building of the CCC camps during the depression. I very definitely think that the influence of such a program has an important effect upon the future lives of these boys. It is a program of conservation all the way around.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. NOLAND addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an article by David Lawrence and in the other an editorial appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one extraneous material.

THE LATE COURTNEY WALKER HAMLIN

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty this morning to inform the House that a man who was supposed to have been the oldest ex-Member of this House died at Santa Monica, Calif., the 16th day of this month, Courtney Walker Hamlin. Perhaps some of the older Members of this House will remember Mr. Hamlin. A brief biography is as follows:

Hamlin, Courtney Walker, a Representative from Missouri; born in Brevard, Transylvania County, N. C., October 27, 1858; moved to Missouri with his parents in 1869, settled in Leasburg, Crawford County, Mo.; attended the common schools and Salem, Mo., Academy; studied law, was admitted to the bar in 1882, and commenced practice in Bolivar, Polk County, Mo.; delegate to almost every Democratic State convention since 1886; elected as a Democrat to the Fifty-eighth Congress, March 4, 1903, to March 3, 1905; elected to the Sixtieth, Sixty-first, Sixty-second, Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, and Sixty-fifth Congresses, March 4, 1907, to March 3, 1919; resumed the practice of law in Springfield, Green County, Mo., where he remained until 1935 when he removed to Santa Monica, Calif., where he passed away February 16, 1950, at the age of 92.

While a Member of the House Mr. Hamlin became an expert on the parliamentary practice of the Congress and while presiding over the Committee of the Whole House rendered a number of important decisions which have been recorded in the precedents of the House and which continue to influence the proceedings of the Congress.

A newspaper article relating to Mr. Hamlin reads as follows:

DEATH TAKES C. W. HAMLIN—OLD-TIME LAWYER, CAME FROM HERE

Courtney W. Hamlin, former Springfield attorney and believed to be the oldest living ex-United States Congressman, died Thursday night in Santa Monica, Calif., at the age of 92.

He had lived for 15 years in Santa Monica where his two daughters, Misses Pearl and Cressie Hamlin reside Mr. Hamlin also is survived by a son, Circuit Court Judge Carl O. Hamlin, of Corpus Christi, Tex.

A well-known member of the Green County Bar Association, he practiced law in Springfield for 50 years, coming here from Bolivar in 1885. He was admitted to the Missouri bar in 1882.

With the exception of one term, he represented the old Seventh Congressional District of Missouri from 1902 to 1919, serving through both terms of President Woodrow Wilson.

His campaign manager from the time he was first nominated until his last election as Congressman was M D. Lightfoot, of Springfield, who was associated with him in a political way for 20 years. They were warm friends for 45 years.

"Courtney Hamlin was an honorable and high-minded gentleman and was always conscientious in the duties of his office," Lightfoot said last night on learning of the death of his friend.

It was recalled by a nephew, Ernest Hamlin, of 1896 North Douglas, that Congressman Hamlin was in favor of woman's suffrage, while his brother, Ernest Hamlin's father, was opposed. "That was the only racket they ever had," the nephew said.

C. W. Hamlin was born in Brevard, N C., and traveled with his parents by wagon train to Leasburg, Mo., later resided in Bolivar, and eventually made Springfield his home. His wife, Mrs. Annie L. Hamlin, died in 1932.

Mr. Hamlin was a member of the Springfield School Board at the time that Jonathan Fairbanks was superintendent of schools. He was a member of First Baptist Church where he taught the men's bible class.

Hamlin Memorial Baptist Church is named for his father, James R. Hamlin.

Funeral services will be held in Santa Monica Monday and the body will be shipped here to the Alma Lohmeyer-Jewell E. Windle funeral home. Graveside rites will not be held until his son, Judge Hamlin, who has undergone an eye operation in a Corpus Christi hospital, has recovered sufficiently to make the journey.

Another nephew, Omer Long, and two nieces, Mrs. Granville Waller and Miss Bess Long, reside at North Douglas addresses.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I thought the procedure was going to be that we were going to follow right on through with the rest of the committees.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am asking unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will be compelled to object to that request.

ALASKA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Mrs. Z. V. Peterson, chairman of the legislation department of the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs, expressing the interest of that federation in the bill to admit Alaska as the forty-ninth State of the Union.

This question has been carefully and earnestly considered by the women of this organization.

In order that the Members of the House may have the benefit of this organization's opinion, under leave previously granted I am inserting the letter herewith:

GEORGIA FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Atlanta, Ga., February 24, 1950.

Congressman JAMES C. DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: The Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs is very much interested in having Alaska admitted as the forty-ninth State of the Union, and in furtherance of that passed the following resolution:

"We urge upon Congress the speedy enactment of legislation that will admit Alaska as the forty-ninth State of the Union."

We think 83 years as a possession and 37 years as an incorporated territory, presumably serving an apprenticeship for statehood, is long enough, and that Alaska now seems ready for statehood, with no public debt, a good system of schools, programs already developed for health, welfare, and social services, and with resources adequate to support a State government. Most important of all is its strategic position in the matter of defense.

The Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs will appreciate your support of this measure.

Sincerely,

GARTHA B. PETERSON
(Mrs. Z. V. Peterson),
Chairman, Legislation Department, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs.

RECORD SET FOR DEPOSITORS' SAFETY UNDER FDIC

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a statement recently carried in many newspapers. Mr. Maple T. Harl, chairman of the board of directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, has just announced that there has not been a loss to a depositor in an insured bank in 6 years. This is a very commendable record of achievement. It represents, as Mr. Harl has stated, an all-time record in the Nation's history for depositors' safety, and bank solvency and stability. I believe we cannot laud too greatly this magnificent record of Federal deposit insurance. From its inception in 1933 right on down to the present day, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has been a model of efficiency and effectiveness. From a beginning shrouded in controversy and doubt, it has developed to an unquestioned position of integrity and success.

In these times of heavy costs of government, it is refreshing to note that the FDIC, one of the most effective and efficient of the Federal agencies, does not consume any of the taxpayers' money. It is supported entirely by assessments paid by the insured banks. The Government capital invested in the Corporation at its beginning has been repaid.

There is now pending before the Senate a bill to rewrite the entire Federal deposit insurance law. From my brief reading of the bill, I gather the impression that it is, for the most part, a banker's bill, since one of its chief features is a drastic reduction in the assessments which insured banks pay to the Corporation for deposit insurance. I hope that the interests of depositors will not be forgotten when any such bill comes before the House. Federal deposit insurance was designed to safeguard depositors' funds. One hundred and four million depositors now look to the Corporation for protection. Their interests should be foremost and of the greatest concern in any legislation concerning the FDIC. It is now the only spokesman for depositors. Its successful and efficient operations should give its opinions great weight in any broad scale revision of the laws under which it must operate, and its warning of danger signals should be heeded. The very minimum that the Congress can do to guarantee the continued success of Federal deposit insurance is to provide every possible means to the Corporation to enable it to carry on its brilliant record of achievement.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each an editorial.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, entitled "Fifty States."

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. DOUGLAS (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I objected to dispensing with the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, and expect to continue to object to it until we get a vote on our bill to restore those 16,000 beds in the veterans' hospitals that were removed by Executive order.

The money was appropriated last year for this purpose. It affects every State in the Union.

In order that we may make every effort possible to get this bill to the floor of the House, I have also filed a petition, No. 24, with the Clerk, to petition it out

of the Rules Committee, that seems to have sat down on my motion for a rule.

So if you are interested just step up to the Clerk's desk and sign petition No. 24. If we cannot get it out in that way, we will just keep objecting to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday until our Veterans' Committee is reached.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ALLEN of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL BUILDING IN GLASGOW, MO.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to read to the House an item carried by the Associated Press. It says:

WASHINGTON. — Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, military aide to President Truman, is reported interested in getting a Federal building sometime in the future for his home town of Glasgow, Mo.

Representative MOULDER, Democrat, Missouri, in whose congressional district the town is located, told a reporter General Vaughan has asked him if he would have any objection in event a site were contributed by Glasgow in the hope that a Federal building later could be obtained there.

MOULDER said he replied that he had no objection.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a few questions. Will this Federal building in Glasgow be known as the Harry H. Vaughan Memorial Library? Will it have one room to house the Vaughan deep-freeze collection? Will it have a room for the perfume collection and will it have another room where the Vaughan collection of medals, including his decoration from General Peron, or Argentina, will be displayed?

I also want to inquire if it is planned to have John Steelman named as librarian of this shrine to Vaughan at the end of his White House tenure?

I think the answers to these questions will interest all Members of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it is a wise thing to keep your head on your shoulders and your feet on the ground. The President of the United States has himself in a hole on coal. As was said here, for 2 months he has been dilly-dallying around with this question until the people of this country are running out of coal. He now sees them cold. I am submitting a short editorial on why we have a coal crisis as part of my remarks.

You are going to be asked by this New Deal administration to take over and nationalize the coal industry. Then John L. Lewis will be out of the hole, but the country will be in the hole, when they bail out these broken-down coal mines because the coal miners have refused to mine coal. It is a terrible situation. It is a situation which is going to be very difficult to handle. The Members of Congress want to keep their head on their shoulders and their feet on the ground and know what they are doing if they do not want to socialize this great country of ours.

The editorial is as follows:

WHY WE HAVE A COAL CRISIS

Now the real truth about the coal strike begins to come out. While churches, schools, and industries turn cold and the public suffers, John L. Lewis and Mr. Truman are working together for a common purpose.

The first half of this purpose is to destroy public confidence in the Taft-Hartley law. The second half is to bring about Government seizure of the coal mines.

The total is to build more power for the Government at any price to the people, including John L., himself, who stands to become sucker No. 1 in the whole dirty intrigue, as it runs its course.

The plan of mine seizure clearly shows why.

Instead of applying the Taft-Hartley formula for orderly handling of the coal crisis when it first took shape, Mr. Truman has laid back until now in the moment of national desperation Congress is ready to grab at any instrument of seeming solution.

STRAIGHT TO SOCIALISM

And so, lo and behold, up pops Representative BAILEY, Democrat, of West Virginia, a known creature of John L. Lewis' will, with a mine-seizure bill. Representative LESINSKI, Democrat, of Michigan, chairman of the House Labor Committee and an equally known creature of Truman's will, announces it must be given immediate attention.

So now we know. The Government seizes the mines. Then the Government imposes conditions of operation that satisfy John L. Lewis and the mine owners have to accept these in order to get their property back. That has worked before, and Lewis is always glad to have it work again.

But it doesn't stop there.

Nobody can miss the point of administration talk about all mine earnings during seizure going to the Treasury, after reasonable compensation to the owners.

The object of the whole administration performance can now be plainly seen. Mr. Truman wants to socialize the mines as they have been socialized in Britain for that means all the more power to him. Once the Government has a solid grip on the coal industry John L. Lewis can be kicked down stairs.

The miners will all be dependent on the Government for their livings, and no doubt Kansas City Bill Boyle will teach them the price of that Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner, at $100 per plate.

WAR SCARES

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is a feeling over the country that we are on the verge of another war. This feeling is becoming tense with many people.

The people are being encouraged into this tense attitude by what they read. One of the leading weekly publications in its last week's issue had as its lead off article a story about this matter of national security. Here is what it said in its first paragraph:

Drastic wartime controls over private business and civilians for use in world war III now are in the final drafting stage. The master plan already is agreed upon by the top United States officials. The job of drawing up detailed legislation is under way.

Restrictions decided upon for the next war make those of the last war seem mild by comparison Planning is being based upon the assumption that war will come in a year like 1950 when there is full employment of a labor force in producing goods and services for civilian enjoyment.

The blueprint has been prepared by the National Security Resources Board. In its plan, just released from a confidential classification, NSRB recognizes a need for drastic crackdown on civilians to release men and materials for war, if that should come. Private building will be stopped cold.

It is well to plan for any contingency but sometimes wars are the result of frenzy attendant upon too much planning. Cannot we plan more secretively? It seems the world knows what we do even before we do it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a memorandum from the DAV regarding what the Secretary of the Treasury has requested in connection with taxation and heavy assessments against the DAV.

SIXTEEN THOUSAND HOSPITAL BEDS LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I agree heartily with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in objecting to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday until the 16,000-hospital-bed bill has been acted upon. The Congress has already authorized the building of those 16,000 hospital beds. Sixty

million dollars already has been spent on plans and so forth, but a presidential cut-back was ordered. The Committee on Appropriations has made the appropriation for the building of the beds. It will cost the taxpayers no more money. The money is already there to build those beds, but they are not being constructed. So another direction by the Congress should be made.

Mr. Speaker, it is much more difficult to secure the passage of legislation for the sick and disabled than it is for the able-bodied. There was a veto by the President of the bill to provide cars for the amputees and severely wounded and blind. That bill was vetoed. To my mind, it was the most cruel veto that has ever been made in all my service here since 1925. The President was misled by those who did not care for the pitifully disabled. It was a slap in the face of the blind and others—we should do more for the disabled.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the situation with respect to coal is indeed becoming critical. If you were out in my area where the temperature is today perhaps 12 below zero, you would realize that with a coal shortage imminent throughout the country and the actual closing down of schools and factories we are facing a very critical situation.

I have heard in the well of this House day after day and day after day repeated statements calling attention to these critical facts, and they are facts; but I have heard no one make a suggestion yet as to what the Congress could do, or anyone could do, to compel men to work and produce coal who do not elect to work and produce coal. Under our system of government we cannot compel the miners to go down into the bowels of the earth at the point of a bayonet. I would like to have the brains of this Nation directed to the question of how we can so arrange our economic affairs as to induce those who have devoted their lives to the mining situation tell us what the Congress can do, what the President can do, or what anyone can do to alleviate the present distressing situation. We have heard many caustic complaints about John L. Lewis and his miners—little has been said as to the attitudes of the operators. If coal is what we need, then it seems to me we should immediately examine the attitude of the operators. It takes two parties to make an agreement, but one party can block any agreement that will produce coal. Can it be, as has been recently suggested, that the operators want seizure of the mines, which might ultimately force the Government to nationalize the coal mines and thus pay off the owners? I do not have the answer, and the question is asked to provide some further consideration of the question.

Let us leave no avenue of discovery unconsidered.

What we want is coal.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's handling of the coal strike is not in the best public interest. Efforts to show the Taft-Hartley law inadequate, coupled with the desire to ultimately nationalize the coal industry seem to be the goal of the administration.

The Justice Department should bring into court the district leaders of the United Mine Workers today and if they failed to put the men to work, the court could then administer such punishment as is necessary. If this step were taken, coal production would be resumed in a matter of hours.

The President's unlawful handling of the steel strike some months ago has raised the price of steel to the farmers, small manufacturers and the consumers in general. A seizure of the coal mines is not the appropriate remedy. It will result in a surrender to those who are making excessive demands.

The Truman administration, if they have any concern for the consuming public and any desire to retain our system of private enterprise, should make a sincere and thorough effort to enforce the Taft-Hartley law. This has not been done to date.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

PRICE SUPPORT FOR HOGS

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, 18 Congressmen from the principal hog-raising States have joined in a letter to Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan, protesting the delay in the announcement of the details of price-support program for hogs. They demanded that the Secretary of Agriculture, who has the authority to set the support price level at any point between zero and 90 percent of parity, make an immediate announcement of the support level after March 31, 1950.

During the past year the Department of Agriculture has had a price-support program for hogs under which farmers were assured 90 percent of parity. That program ends on March 31, 1950.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1950.

Hon CHARLES F BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We, the undersigned, Members of Congress representing the principal hog-raising States of the United States and acting in behalf of the hog raisers in our districts, urge that you immediately announce the support level for hogs after March 31 It being our understanding that in Des Moines, Iowa, on February 18, 1950, you stated that the price-support program on hogs will continue. Inasmuch as you have the authority to set the support level at any point between zero and 90 percent of parity and failed to name a level, considerable confusion has resulted.

We feel that our farmers are entitled to know the details of the proposed program that is already late compared with previous announcements. We also feel that as a matter of simple justice, in preserving the farmers income and the well-being of the country's economy, that the support level after March 31, 1950, should be announced at once

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B HOEVEN, Iowa; AUGUST H ANDRESEN, Minnesota; HENRY O TALLE, Iowa; JAMES I. DOLLIVER, Iowa, HAROLD O. LOVRE, South Dakota, PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Iowa; CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska; HAROLD C. HAGEN, Minnesota, JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Minnesota; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska; A L. MILLER, Nebraska, K M. LECOMPTE, Iowa, FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa, H R GROSS, Iowa, CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio; REID F. MURRAY, Wisconsin; CHARLES W VURSELL, Illinois

NASHUA GUMMED & COATED PAPER CO., NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, a record of peaceful labor relations in a plant where management deals separately with seven unions is analyzed in the latest case study on the causes of industrial peace by the National Planning Association, a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization which has made many studies, some of them at the request of departments of the Government.

The company selected from the entire country in this recent study as an outstanding example of successful labor relations is the Nashua Gummed & Coated Paper Co., of New Hampshire, located in my district. The long record of peace-

ful, friendly relations in this company is a happy contrast to the unfriendly labor situations that receive so much publicity. It is with pride that I call it to the attention of the House. Incidentally, it indicates that New Hampshire would be a good place for industries seeking a location.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on grain speculation.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from a paper in her district.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a petition.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain material.

Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made at an REA meeting last week.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Adam Frick, of Timlin Road, Portsmouth, Ohio, a successful farmer and former member of the Ohio Legislature, recently wrote a very thought-provoking letter to the President on the farm situation as it affects the state of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by inserting Mr. Frick's letter to President Truman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made on Lithuanian independence.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, anything I may say today in regard to the coal situation would be mere reiteration of what I have been saying for the past 4 months, but I do wish to remind the Members of the House that it is 14 degrees below zero in Michigan and the people are getting colder by the hour because of the President's procrastination in invoking the national-emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

There is a law on the books that has been most helpful in alleviating our situation, namely the FHA legislation which provides for repair and maintenance loans on homes so that people may convert from coal to gas. In the city of Grand Rapids some 10,000 people in the last 9 months have converted from coal to gas. In other words, over 25 percent of the homes in Grand Rapids within a year have fortunately made this conversion. A substantial portion of these conversions were handled under title I of the existing FHA legislation.

This legislation, including title I, expires today and if we do not have a renewal of the authorization we are going to hinder and hamper conversions by the thousands which are vitally necessary for public health and welfare in a State that is terribly affected by the present situation.

I was recently informed by the officials of a single bank in Grand Rapids that applications for conversions, under title I, were being received at the rate of 30 a day. These people cannot get coal because of President Truman's failure to act promptly under the Taft-Hartley Act. The Democratic leadership now roadblocks the consideration of FHA legislation even though such a lack of action may materially add to almost universal human suffering. I condemn the Democrats for lack of foresight in both instances.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Does the gentleman know that the reason that law expires today is due to the fact the Democratic administration and leadership has failed to present it to the Congress because they want it as a magnet in drawing votes to the controversial housing bill? The Democratic leadership has deliberately permitted title I to lapse, and they inserted it in the cooperative housing bill solely to attract support for this measure. This is not the first time the Democratic leadership has used title I as a political football. The result called to our attention by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is by reason of this fast and loose Democratic playing of politics.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

A FEDERAL BUILDING IN THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to dignify the statement made a few moments ago by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], who made sarcastic and preposterous statements with reference to the proposal to construct a Federal post-office building within the Second Congressional District of Missouri. I realize his statement is pure political chicanery and is based upon political hatred.

The gentleman from Indiana well knows that during the last session of this Congress, a bill was passed providing for the acquisition of at least one site for future construction of a post-office building in each congressional district. I assume that the gentleman from Indiana has been consulted as to the site which he has or will recommend for his district, and I assure him that I am informed and well able to manage the affairs of my district without any assistance or suggestion by the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PHILBIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each an editorial.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

FEBRUARY 25, 1950.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of WILLIAM H. BATES as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-first Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. George J. Bates, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. BATES appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PRICING PRACTICES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up S. 1008, to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices, with amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its amendments to S. 1008, to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to pricing practices, and agree to the further conference requested by the Senate.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the unanimous consent request, in view of the importance of this subject and the demand for time, that the time be extended 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. KEARNS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 69]

Barden	Hedrick	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Boggs, Del.	Herter	Poage
Bolton, Ohio	Hoffman, Ill.	Powell
Bosone	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Brooks	Kelley, Pa.	Regan
Buckley, N Y	Kunkel	Sadowski
Bulwinkle	Lyle	Sasscer
Byrne, N. Y	McGrath	Secrest
Cannon	McMillan, S C	Shafer
Chudoff	Macy	Shelley
Coudert	Marcantonio	Smathers
Davis, Tenn	Marshall	Smith, Ohio
Dawson	Miles	Taylor
Douglas	Miller, Calif.	Whitaker
Engle, Calif.	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Gary	Murphy	Worley
Gilmer	Murray, Wis.	Yates
Golden	O'Brien, Mich.	
Hall, Leonard W.	O'Toole	
	Pace	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

PRICING PRACTICES

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, I wish to state at the outset that there is no disposition on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House or any of its members to weaken in any respect our antitrust laws. That is clearly indicated. For example, the Judiciary Committee through one of its subcommittees is now conducting important hearings or an inquiry into the concentration of economic power in this country. The Judiciary Committee likewise is considering a number of bills to increase penalties for violation of our antitrust laws. We passed the Celler bill (H. R. 2734) to plug holes in one antitrust law by preventing mergers by acquisition of assets and thereby causing throttling of competition. We are doing all and sundry to strengthen, certainly not weaken, the antitrust fabric.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, S. 1008, as originally submitted had as its major objective elimination of the confusion in the interpretation of the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. This confusion was due to certain obiter dicta, as the lawyers call it, indulged in by Justice Black in the Cement Institute case which obiter dicta was somewhat unrelieved by the so-called 4–4 decision in the Rigid Steel case.

If Justice Black had simply stated that any individual could either absorb the freight or sell f. o. b. his mill or factory and did not indulge in these extraneous remarks of his and did not make these extra observations, I do not think there would have been any trouble, but the erudite excursion indulged in by Mr. Justice Black caused all of the difficulty. The decision itself in the Cement case unrelieved by the observations of Mr. Justice Black simply states that an individual can absorb freight or sell f. o. b. his plant.

The businessmen and those engaged in commerce and industry throughout the length and breadth of the land when they read this decision unrelieved by the Rigid Steel case did not know where they were. The obiter dicta aforesaid created doubts and confusion. So they came to the Congress for some relief. They wanted to know whether they could or could not absorb their freight rates in their business dealings.

The Senate, in the first instance, undertook to pass a bill which would permit the individual, not acting in a conspiracy with others, to absorb the freight, but unfortunately the Senate went beyond that and added certain provisions which I think were unfortunate. Those provisions sought to liquidate some other judicial decisions, one decision in particular, the Standard Oil of Indiana case. That case has not even gone to the Supreme Court, and was decided in the Circuit Court for the Seventh Circuit. However we got the bill and we made some changes in it. The House passed the Senate bill with the amendments we prepared in the Committee on the Judiciary. The House passed the bill by a two to one vote.

The bill then went to conference. The conferees labored long. The conference report came back to the House, and the House again registered its approval of the report, indicating clearly it wanted this sort of bill. It accepted the conference report by a decisive vote. Thus the House on two distinct occasions indicated that it wanted some legislation. It passed the original bill; it accepted the conference report. The conference report went back to the Senate, and the Senate then deemed it advisable to postpone consideration. The House having accepted the conference report, the House conferees were discharged.

We are now in the position that we were when we asked that the bill go to conference in the first instance. I think it is the duty of the House now to send this bill to another conference for another try. If we try to prevent a bill, passed differently in both Houses, from going to conference, we just stymie the legislative process; we develop a stalemate. That is no way to legislate. I would say that many bills—I cannot count the infinite number—are passed differently in both Houses, and in my long experience here I do not know of a single case where there has been a refusal to go to conference. Yes, sometimes a rule is procured, but the body always approves a resolution and go to conference.

Why should there be a refusal now? I do not want to argue the merits or demerits of the bill. I personally did not sign the conference report, but that is no reason why we should not have a second try at it; no reason we should not make an honest-to-goodness attempt to come to some agreement, and those who object now—and I do not think they should object to this going to conference—will have ample opportunity when the bill comes back from conference to register approval or disapproval.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it the gentleman's disposition to maintain the strong attitude the gentleman maintained before on the amendments which were put in on the floor of the House?

Mr. CELLER. I do not think that is a fair question. I will say this, that one must bend, sometimes, rather than break. All legislation of importance is a compromise, and I may have to compromise. I am not going to compromise principles; I might have to compromise on the matter of procedure, because there is lots of procedure in this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. That is essentially the point. The gentleman does not intend to compromise principle insofar as an effort to arrive at agreement is concerned.

Mr. CELLER. My answer is that I may have to compromise. I do not know to what degree I am going to compromise. We must get some legislation here because the House, as I said before, has registered its will twice. It passed the bill by a two to one vote. We cannot negative what the House has done here before, and every opportunity should be given to let the House pass on a conference report.

Some of you might ask why I refused to sign the conference report in the first instance and fought against some of its provisions. I felt that the conference report was too vague. I could not understand it. I said on the floor it was confusion worse confounded. As I read it now, I would use the language of Churchill. The conference report that came back to us in the first instance was a riddle inside an enigma wrapped in mystery. I could not understand it. That is why I refused to sign it. But the House said, "No, we are going to accept the conference report," and did.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this bill should be permitted to go to conference.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand, the gentleman's position is that this is a matter on which the House has passed, and that it should go to conference. I take it that the gentleman is inclined to believe that with conference action between the representatives of the two bodies legislation effective and fair can be developed and worked out.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman expresses and reflects my views probably better than I could express them myself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

BASING POINT AND ANTIPRICE DISCRIMINATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have never known a proposal before a legislative body to be less understood generally than this bill. Very few Members have the time to go into the work of another committee and investigate the merits and demerits of particular bills.

NOT LEGITIMATE

This bill is not a legitimate bill. We take pride in the American way of enacting laws. The American way is for a bill to be introduced and referred to a standing committee. That committee then hears testimony of witnesses on both sides. Then they take the bill up after all the testimony is in, with every Member knowing how it will affect every Member and every congressional district and every State in the Union, and every paragraph and every sentence and every phrase and every word is gone over. After that is done, the committee makes a report, and in that report it is carefully gone over to sustain the findings of the committee.

However, this bill is not in that position. This bill was conceived on the floor of the other body, an entirely new bill, a bill upon which hearings had never been conducted by any committee of either body. The United States Senate passed that bill, a very far-reaching bill, with certain amendments hastily drawn upon the floor of the other body. Then it came over here and we thought we would have an opportunity to have public hearings, but we were denied that privilege. We were denied public hearings.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE SLAMS DOOR IN FACE OF SMALL-BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVE

A representative of a small-business group, the largest in America, came 3,000 miles from the State of California to be heard in opposition to this bill. Do you think the Committee on the Judiciary would hear him? No, they slammed the door in his face and would not let him be heard. They slammed the door in the face of every small-business group that wanted to be heard. Do you call that a legitimate bill—a bill upon which no public testimony has ever been taken—a bill which you do not know the effect of and how it will affect your districts?

AREA OF DISAGREEMENT TOO LIMITED FOR CONFEREES TO AGREE ON SATISFACTORY BILL

I am making an unusual request of you, I know, and that is to vote against sending this bill to conference. That will force public hearings upon the proposal. Then you can see how it will affect your States and your districts. There is too little disagreement between the two Houses. We know that the conferees cannot agree upon a bill which will not be in favor of monopoly and destructive of small business in this country. They cannot possibly do it. They are bound on one side by what the House did, and on the other side by what the Senate did. Knowing it is impossible to bring in a satisfactory bill, why vote to send it to conference? We voted to send it to conference once and after a conference report was agreed on, the very Members of the other body who fought for it and who favored this bill and introduced it in the other body were opposed to it and they sent it back to conference. That is not treating the House right. We ought to vote down this motion and then force consideration before a committee and have public hearings.

STEEL MILLS-CEMENT MILLS

There is a location in every district in the United States where you have water transportation for a steel mill. If the basing-point is not legalized, in other words if this does not pass, you will be able to have a steel mill. But if this passes, you will not have a steel mill. There is a place in every section in this Nation where there is iron ore for steel mills. But if this bill passes, you will possibly never have a steel mill. There is a place in practically every county in the Nation where cement can be made. But if you pass this bill, you will never have that cement plant. That is what it means. We should investigate it and look into it. The Democratic members, the majority members of the Small Business Committee, have unanimously passed a resolution, or at least are in favor of the resolution, asking the Members of the House to vote against this motion so as to compel public hearings on this proposal.

IRONICAL

It is certainly ironical that the great Committee on the Judiciary, which is trying to earn for itself the reputation of being antimonopoly, and in favor of small business, should try now to secure the enactment of a bill when no hearings of any kind whatsoever were held all during the Eighty-first Congress that is against independent and small business and in favor of monopoly.

It is ironical that they would ask for the adoption of a bill which would promote monopoly and help monopolistic steel and help monopolistic cement and help the railroads on cross hauling and help the great national chain stores. Is it not rather ironical that this committee which is trying to earn for itself the name of antimonopoly fighters should try to get a bill through like this, which would absolutely destroy the rights of small business which have been gained after decades of fighting in the Congress of the United States and in the legislatures of the 48 States. That would repeal everything which has been done. I hope the House does not become a party to such action.

PUBLIC HEARINGS—AMERICAN WAY

Since it is our American way to have public hearings on bills, and since we have not followed the American way in this instance, do you not think it is a reasonable request to ask you to vote down this motion and compel them to give us public hearings?

Here are the people who want public hearings, and were refused: The Associated Retail Bakers of America, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Cooperative League of the United States, the International Association of Machinists, the National Association of Retail Druggists, the National Candy Wholesalers' Association, the National Council for Petroleum Retailers, the National Farmers Union, the National Federation of Independent Business, the group that sent their man 3,000 miles to have the door slammed in his face and to be told, "No, we are not going to hear you, we do not want to hear you, and we refuse to hear you." The National Food Brokers Association, the National Grange, the United States Wholesale Grocers Association.

Every genuine small business group I know of in America is in opposition to this motion. They know it is against their interests. The Secretary of the Navy, Francis P. Matthews, testified before the Monopoly Committee last year and he was asked about this. He said:

> I come from Omaha, out in the Middle West, and we feel out there that the basing-point price program discriminates against industry in our section of the country and causes the concentration of industry in certain points.

I want to beg of you to compel public hearings on this, and I want to assure you that whenever you have public hearings and the information is brought out as to how it affects your districts and your States, I venture to say that they will not receive 10 percent of the votes. I make the prediction that if they do have public hearings, which they have refused to do, that this bill will never see the light of day again.

The opposition to this motion has 13 minutes out of the 60 minutes allowed to discuss this proposal. This is certainly an unfair division of time. It is typical of the ruthless and unfair methods used to enact legislation without public hearing that will help big steel, big cement, railroads, and national chain stores.

So I ask you to vote against this motion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 70]

Allen, La.	Chudoff	Herter
Barden	Coudert	Hoffman, Ill.
Bentsen	Davies, N Y	Jackson, Calif.
Boggs, Del.	Davis, Tenn	Jonas
Brooks	Dawson	Kelley, Pa.
Buchanan	Douglas	Kirwan
Buckley, N Y	Eberharter	Kunkel
Bulwinkle	Gilmer	Lyle
Byrne, N Y.	Golden	McGrath
Cannon	Hall,	Marcantonio
Case, S Dak.	Leonard W	Morrison
Chatham	Hedrick	Murphy

Murray, Wis.	Regan	Smith, Ohio
O'Brien, Mich.	Sadowski	Taylor
O'Neill	Secrest	Towe
Pace	Shafer	Whitaker
Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Shelley	White, Idaho
Poage	Sikes	Worley
Redden	Simpson, Ill.	Yates
	Smathers	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PRICING PRACTICES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in my experience in this body I have never heard more misrepresentations made about legislation nor have I ever heard of any legislation more carefully considered than this legislation now under consideration. Nearly 1,700 pages of testimony have been taken on this subject. The Capehart committee in the Senate held the most extensive hearings imaginable in the Eightieth Congress extending over many months, to which were invited everyone who could possibly have any interest in this legislation.

The gentleman from Texas has asked you to defeat this motion. He claims that there should be no conference on the bill because there were no hearings by any House committee, and that no committee had this legislation under consideration on the part of the House. I submit to you that that is the entire basis of his opposition to this motion. If that is the case, then I respectfully submit there can be no opposition to this legislation because here is a copy of the hearings held in the House last year by the Committee on the Judiciary. If you will turn to page 17 of those hearings you will find that the gentleman from Texas himself testified, not just before the subcommittee having this legislation under consideration, but before the full committee—which was a special privilege accorded to him by the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. And was that not done at the request of the gentleman from Texas to permit him to appear before the full committee?

Mr. WALTER. Of course it was.

Mr. Speaker, as to the misrepresentations made about this legislation, there is nothing in the bill, S. 1008, which will reinstate the multiple basing-point system of pricing. The Supreme Court in the Cement Institute decision several years ago, in 333 U. S. 683, outlawed that system of pricing. This bill does not make that system legal again. The only reason why we are here today considering this legislation is because, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary so well stated, one of the Justices went just a little farther than it was necessary to go in writing the opinion. As a result of this obiter dictum, business throughout the length and breadth of the land—big and little business—did not know whether they could absorb freight in quoting prices.

That is the reason for this legislation. Subsequent to that decision a district court picked up that obiter dictum in the Rigid Steel Conduit case and cited it as the law, with the result that Senator O'MAHONEY, than whom there has been no greater champion of antitrust laws in the history of the Congress, introduced this bill which makes it amply clear that the independent, good-faith absorption of freight to meet competition is not a violation of the antitrust laws. It certainly seems to me that American business is entitled to that sort of clarification.

May I point out to you in part the effects of this decision? To do so I will turn to the report which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] mentioned—the report of his own committee. Here is what he reported in the early months of 1949:

> The principal deterrent to the distribution of steel, particularly in the West and Southwest was apparently the continued unwillingness of steel producers to reduce prices by absorbing freight. Even in the East the committee had evidence of complaints of small-business men that certain steel companies were refusing to absorb freight to the old customers.

Is this not a remarkable statement for the gentleman to issue in view of his insistent opposition to any form of legalized freight-absorption legislation? It would appear to identify his views with those of the steel companies which he has in the past so chastised.

I would like to call your attention to some testimony given recently before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. This is the transcript of the gentleman from Texas. This is Mr. PATMAN speaking several weeks ago:

> Like the chairman properly brought out and correctly brought out, under existing law, since the basing-point decision in the cement case, April 26, 1948, outlawing the basing point, since that time you can still absorb the freight, Mr. Weir. The chairman agreed with me on that. So long as you do not agree and conspire with other people to fix prices. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That is right.
>
> Mr. WEIR. Of course, our counsel says we cannot absorb freight.
>
> Mr. PATMAN. You cannot have collusion and conspiracy.
>
> Mr. WEIR. Never had collusion and conspiracy.

Now, here is further testimony:

> We do not agree with Mr. PATMAN. We say the language of the Conduit case that says we may not systematically absorb freight is the troublesome thing.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That depends on what one means by "systematically."
>
> Mr. REED. The talk about realizing different mill nets is pretty disturbing. If Mr. PATMAN thinks we have the right to absorb freight, why he objects to having it said so legislatively I do not know.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. I do not understand that either.

Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot understand the opposition of the gentleman from Texas to a bill which does no more than that which he avers so strenuously is already the law, particularly when he so often makes dark predictions that the bill will destroy the Robinson-Patman Act and restore the basing-point system. This is not the case.

The bill has unfortunately acquired the discredited term of the "basing point" bill, and that more than anything else has hindered its passage. I have already characterized this undeserved appellation as being unfair and a misnomer.

Reduced to simple terms S. 1008 merely assures to sellers that, in meeting competition in good faith in distant markets, they may absorb freight provided they do so independently and not in concert. No one has raised a valid argument against this, except those extremists who would have business run by theory and straitjacketed in a mandatory, rigid f. o. b. mill-pricing system. I do not want to believe that even the opponents of this bill are so misled as to desire such an outcome. Imagine the tremendous freight advantage which United States Steel Corp. would enjoy because of their dispersion over their competitors were f. o. b. mill pricing the rule.

So much for that. Now a few words as to the Kefauver and Carroll amendments to the bill, which I thought were neatly and fairly compromised by the conference report of last year. We all know that the purpose of the Kefauver amendment was to legislate the rule of the circuit court of appeals in the Standard Oil of Indiana case, thereby placing a limit on the efficacy of good faith meeting of competition as a full defense to a charge of price discrimination. We all know that the decision of the circuit court was recently argued in the Supreme Court on certiorari. I am expectant that the Court will reverse the lower court. When that happens, gentlemen, we shall then undoubtedly witness an odd spectacle. Then you will find that those who oppose S. 1008 today and want it killed will be the most vociferous in demand for its passage so as to implant the good-faith limitation in the law contrary to what our highest Court may have ruled. This development I shall await with interest.

Finally a word on the definition section of the bill which has given us so much difficulty. You will find in the RECORD that I supported the House version of the definition of the term "the effect may be." Had that definition been rigidly adhered to I am firmly convinced that we would not have encountered the opposition of the distinguished Senator O'MAHONEY. The House definition, endorsed as it was by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, would have rejected the unfortunate rule of the Morton Salt decision, precisely its intended effect.

My time is running out. As a parting word may I impress my colleagues of the House with the nature of the motion before them. It is merely a motion to send the bill to conference, not a vote on the bill itself. There can be no valid objection to such an orderly, parliamentary procedure, for both sides of the Congress will have a final opportunity to pass on the legislation when a conference bill is arrived at.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve on the House Small Business Committee with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] ever since that committee was originally created. By and large, we have gotten along very well together in our efforts to aid small business. I think the committe has accomplished much in the way of aiding small business. But I cannot agree with him on the position he takes on this particular matter. He would have you believe that this legislation, if adopted, will adversely affect small business. I say just the exact opposite of that is really the truth of the matter.

If I can understand the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] correctly, he is against freight absorption and the quoting of delivered prices. I have been listening to these arguments, pro and con, that have been going on, for some time. And as I have listened to Members express their views, I do not think there are many more than 50 Members out of the 435 who stand with the gentleman from Texas on that particular issue. Undoubtedly some do not understand what the issue here really is.

It is sought to be established that there is something sinister in this proposal which seeks to destroy certain of the antitrust laws, like the Robinson-Patman Act, or the Clayton Act. There again I cannot agree, because I do not believe there is any such effect in this legislation.

Beyond that, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has just pointed out, this legislation as it is now shaping up, as I understand it, has been cleared by the Department of Justice, and they find nothing in it, as they have suggested it should finally be drawn, that would be in conflict with any anti-trust statute now on the books.

What is the real issue here? It has to do with the right of manufacturers to quote delivered prices and to absorb freight. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], in his very able manner, has pointed out that the question arises not because of any decision of an issue by the court, but rather because of what we lawyers call dicta, the gratuitous comments thrown in the opinion, which in this case have raised great questions in the minds of people doing business, large and small, clear across the land, as to what they can and cannot do. The matter of freight absorption and the quoting of delivered prices is ingrained in our whole economy. There are small businesses all over this land that cannot continue to exist and do business if such a procedure as that cannot be followed. And finally and fundamentally, what is wrong about it? I do not think anyone can successfully contend that there is anything wrong essentially with freight absorption and delivered prices.

What is the particular issue here? It is, Shall this measure which was adopted by the House go to conference? Let us recount the history. When the legislation was first before us it passed on a voice vote, not a record vote. It went to conference; the conferees reported back; and after a rather vigorous contention against it, headed by the gentleman from Texas, the conference report was adopted by a vote of 200 to 104 here in the House, we acting first. Then it went to the Senate. I believe it is fair to say that there the Department of Justice raised some questions about the conference action in regard to section 4 (d), the Justice Department maintaining, and I think properly, that the language that the House had written in section 4 (d) should be included in the bill. Therefore, without the other body's ever acting on the conference report, the proponents of the legislation acting on the Justice Department suggestion, decided to send this back to conference in order that it might be brought in line with what the Department of Justice believed and what the proponents of the bill believed, and what even some opponents of the bill argued should be in the legislatition. So we are down to this very simple practical situation.

Why all this talk about not sending this bill back to conference? There have been many hearings before different committees. The gentleman from Texas has belabored us in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in speeches on the floor day after day after day; we have all listened to them. We have heard all the arguments pro and con. Let us get this matter acted on; let us bring some certainty into the method of operation in respect to delivered prices and get on with something else.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CELLER Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, in the previous debates on the floor of this House on S. 1008 I clearly enunciated my position on two points. First, I said that I was not opposed to a seller, acting independently, to quote or sell his commodities at delivered prices or absorb freight. In fact, I do not believe that this practice was made illegal by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Cement Institute case. Second, I announced without reservation that I was opposed to any legislation which would have the effect, directly or indirectly, of emasculating the Robinson-Patman Act.

It follows that if legislation were presented in a separate package to carry out the first point and without damaging in any way our antitrust laws, I would support it. But the trouble with S. 1008 is that it wraps up in a single package an alleged legalization of selling at delivered price and absorbing freight with the defeat of the purposes of the Robinson-Patman law and weakens the rule of evidence in cases involving violation of our antitrust laws. This double-barrel approach of S. 1008 is the cause of the confusion in which we now find ourselves.

I was a member of the conference committee on the part of the House that considered S. 1008. We tried to iron out and resolve the differences between the views of this House and the other body. We failed to reach a common and unanimous ground of understanding. Without violating what transpired in the executive sessions of our conferences, I can say that we were advised by the Parliamentarians that the area of our discussions is so limited that I do not believe any good purpose would be served by sending the bill back to conference. I am, therefore, opposed to the motion presented by the distinguished chairman of my committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, which has for its purpose the sending back of this bill to conference. I believe separate legislation should be offered with a view of legalizing the practice of selling at delivered prices and absorbing freight if, after public hearing, such legislation should be found necessary.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it is regretted that ample time has not been authorized for the consideration of the pending measure. I am opposed to sending the bill to conference, under the circumstances, and shall vote against the proposal. There are many arguments which can be advanced against some of the contentions that have been advanced here today regarding this measure. The question before the House is whether S. 1008 is to be returned to conference. Let me state briefly the reasons why I feel this bill should not go to conference, but rather why action on this type of legislation should be held up for full and complete public hearings:

First. Not within the memory of some of the oldest Members of the House has there been so much confusion over one piece of legislation as over the charges and countercharges swirling around S. 1008. Many Members actually do not understand the full meaning and implications of this bill. This is quite understandable.

Second. The bald fact is that no public hearings have been held on this measure, either before the Senate or the House Judiciary Committees. There were short executive hearings but not public hearings on this particular bill.

Third. S. 1008 is no ordinary bill. On the contrary, it is one of the most vital and controversial measures ever to come before the Congress. From my own point of view, it is a bill which would allow the big steel companies—as well as other big companies—to fix their prices, stifle competition, and ultimately add millions of dollars annually to the prices of commodities that the every-day American consumer buys.

Fourth. I am interested here in a principle of far greater importance than S. 1008. That is the principle of passing important legislation without full and public committee hearings. I think that this principle far transcends the merits or demerits of S. 1008. I think, too, that this principle can be used as a common meeting ground for all of us, whether we are for the bill or against it. I say meeting ground in this connection because on this one issue—on the issue of passing on

legislation without full and public committee hearings—there can be little controversy. In this case, there can be no argument on the facts involved in the principle.

Fifth. To send this bill to conference would be putting the cart before the horse.

Inherent in the relationship before us and our constituents is the obligation to read, study, check, and recheck every important bill that comes to us for consideration. We frequently arrive at individual conclusions on particular legislation by reading the testimony of witnesses who have appeared before the various committees of Congress. In other cases, we rely on the judgment of committee members who have cross-examined witnesses on both sides of the question before their committees and who have become specialists in particular fields by concentrated study of specific issues.

Unless public hearings are held on vital matters, committee members would find themselves in the position of arriving at conclusions in a vacuum. Even committee members who disagree with the positions of certain witnesses always make sure that these very same witnesses have an ample opportunity of expressing their views in public. This is the historically American way of arriving at conclusions.

Here we are, then, on the eve of being asked to process legislation on which no public and adequate hearings have ever been held by either House or Senate Judiciary Committees. I do not think the membership should tolerate such legislative practice. Nor do I think we will tolerate for long the bold attempt of high-paid propagandists to insulate the Congress against the facts in this case by shutting off public hearings.

Sixth. The original S. 1008 was merely a moratorium measure, entirely different from the present S. 1008, both in purpose and in text.

S. 1008 is designed as permanent legislation. It will not be a temporary law affecting the lives and economy of a few people for a brief period. It will affect the economy for years to come. Its passage would be a relaxing of our antitrust statutes.

Seventh. This bill is, in fact, a sharp departure from our previous efforts to tighten up the monopoly laws. We should strengthen our antimonopoly laws rather than weaken them.

Eighth. Almost 2 years have elapsed since the Supreme Court outlawed the basing-point pricing system in the Cement case.

Despite widespread predictions of violent dislocation of our economy, the removal of plants and the shutting down of factories as a result of the decision, nothing of the sort has happened. On the contrary, new plants have sprung up in various sections of the country. On the other hand, quick passage of this measure, without the benefit of complete public hearings, could conceivably work great hardships on all segments of the economy of our country. We have, in short, everything to lose and nothing to gain by sending this bill to conference rather than to the House Judiciary Committee for proper and adequate consideration.

Ninth. A majority of the members of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives have endorsed a resolution urging the House to vote down the motion to send S. 1008 to conference. This action is prompted by the appeals of many small-business men throughout the country. This resolution has been urged by representatives of farm organizations and businessmen, many bona fide small-business organizations, men thoroughly acquainted with the details of this bill and its impact on the economy.

The endorsement of these businessmen and their representatives, reflecting the attitude of millions of American citizens, should in themselves constitute a warning against hasty action. Let us vote down this proposal for hasty action on this important measure.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of debate on this motion to send the bill back to conference be extended for 10 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I have a minute of the additional time if it is granted?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I amend my request and ask unanimous consent that the time be extended for 11 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have heard the statement made that there were only 50 opposed to sending it back to conference. Is that true?

Mr. CELLER. I have no way of knowing.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the opponents of the bill——

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, the sole question before the House is whether S. 1008 shall be sent to conference. In view of the overwhelming adoption by the House last year of the original conference report, I can see no reasonable objection on the part of this body in sending it to conference again.

Much harm has been done to this useful and necessary legislation by constant reference to it as a "basing-point bill." It is no more a basing-point bill than the FEPC bill, and any charge made that it would reinstate the basing-point system is without foundation. Actually the bill simply endeavors to clarify the rights of sellers to absorb freight and to sell at uniform delivered prices in the absence of conspiracy.

These rights should be clarified because of conflicting opinions given by the Federal Trade Commission and the courts. It seems to me the intent of the Congress over the years has been perfectly clear and I feel that the recent Supreme Court decision did not conform with our intent. The matter needs to be straightened out and our conference committee did a good job last year. They should be allowed to complete the job so that the Congress can pass legislation to correct what I consider was a bad decision by the Supreme Court.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees and as one who has been a member of the Judiciary Commitee and the subcommitee considering this bill, I urge that the House vote to sent this bill again to conference.

As I said before, in the course of previous discussions on this bill, we attempted, as it now seems unwisely, to do two things when the bill first came before the House. First, to do something which almost everyone agrees should be done, namely, clarify the law in reference to delivered price systems, and, two, to change the law, as it had been announced in a lower court case, with respect to the defense of good faith in meeting competition against a charge of violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

I agreed with the previous bill in both respects, but I am now clearly of the opinion it was a mistake to attempt to do the two things in one bite.

The matter went to conference. Your conferees attempted to take out the second effect of the bill. The House accepted the conference report and the Senate rejected it and it comes back with the request for another conference.

I urge everyone who feels that we should deal with this problem, everyone who does not think that noncollusive delivered pricing should be outlawed per se, to vote to accede to the request of the other body at this time so that we may accomplish the first and major purpose of this legislation which I am convinced is very badly needed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Does it appear to the gentleman that the issue here does not involve the merits of this controversy at all, but, rather, involves whether we shall follow orderly procedure and the regular democratic process by permitting this matter to go to a final determination by the conferees, then come back here for such action as the House may see fit to take?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I agree with the gentleman. It seems to be that unless we accede to the request of the other body we are in effect saying that no legislation may be enacted. I think that would be an act of the highest discourtesy to the other body as well as contrary to all precedents established in the past.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is a member of the conference. He will recall that the House adopted an amendment by a substantial vote, the Senate adopted an amendment by a substantial vote, yet the conferees when they met struck out both of the amendments and disregarded the action of both houses.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I do not agree to that at all. I did not rise to discuss the merits of the bill. But as long as the gentleman has raised the

question, may I say the conferees did not use the language of either amendment. They attempted, I thought successfully, to provide language which would meet the substantive intent of both amendments.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman not also admit a concern acting independently can absorb freight without violating the law?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I think it is possible the courts might hold that the noncollusive delivered pricing is lawful under the statutes as they now stand. But the confusion which exists because of dicta contained in court decisions makes it desirable, in fact, I think, essential, for us to pass clarifying legislation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I come from a great industrial district. The county in which I live is the third largest industrial county in Pennsylvania and it is the seventh in the Union. Oddly enough the great big manufacturers in my district are not the ones who are urging that this measure be sent back to conference. It is the small manufacturers in my district who have made this request. I was a member of subcommittee No. 1. I heard the men testify. I heard Senator O'MAHONEY and Mr. Bergson of the Department of Justice. I was present when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] appeared before our committee and stated his case.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not true that Mr. Fairless, president of United States Steel Corp., at the hearings before the committee, said that the basing-point dispute was of little concern to the United States Steel Co. because they had their plants strategically and geographically located?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON. So that it is really the small-business man that will be hurt more by reason of being in a Balkanized area where he cannot compete with a geographical area.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr CRAWFORD. May I carry this a little further? Suppose a small steel company located in the city of Lansing, Mich., wishes to sell its product in the Birmingham district, which is a steel center. Would not this bill, in the form in which it has been passed up to date, protect the Lansing firm and enable it to do business outside of the immediate Lansing area? Is not that the purpose of the bill in its present form?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is right, if done in good faith and no collusion. But, you must keep in mind now the amendment suggested by the Attorney General which is sought to be incorporated in this legislation, if it goes to conference.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman tell us what that amendment is?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will read it. "The term 'the effect may be' shall mean that there is reasonable probability of the specified effect." That is the language of the Attorney General.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, if that amendment goes in it does make it legal, in the absence of collusion, for the Lansing, Mich., firm to stay in business and survive.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now let us go another step forward. The United States Steel Corp., for instance, has plants in Pittsburgh, Pa., Pueblo, Colo., Birmingham, Ala., and Cleveland, Ohio, and so on down the line; so, with its plants scattered it is in a position to hold the trade and to pick up the trade which the Lansing firm would necessarily lose.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is, if it could not do business in the Birmingham area.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct, and that is the purpose of this amendment, to protect the small man.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So that in the absence of legislation of this type, it leaves the field wide open to the alleged monopoly of United States Steel and the other Big Four, while the bill, if it becomes law, is in the interest of the small operator throughout the United States.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is our contention.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT].

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I favor this legislation. This bill, by all means, should go to conference for further clarification.

Let us take the clothes off "old lady basing point" in the basic steel industry, and see what the bare issue is.

Is it monopoly as the gentleman from the western prairies claim? I think not, because it is the smallest producers of steel who are hurt first, and the hardest, by straight f. o. b. mill prices.

Is it price as the opponents claim? I think not, as there is under the basing-point system of steel pricing a base price for each steel product in each locality where it is produced.

Then what is the issue?

Any selfish interests in the West trying—by the force of Government action—to compel the exploitation of uneconomic resources that have been paying no return to their owners for decades?

Is the basing-point cry a smoke screen behind which selfish interests from outlying regions of the country are attempting to rape the great steel centers of America?

I come from Pittsburgh—a district that produces one-fourth of our Nation's steel, and that makes more steel ingots than all of Soviet Russia. We are against monopoly, and we are for fair prices for the consumers of steel.

But we will not stand idly by while these issues are being misrepresented by selfish interests in other regions of the Nation. We will not let the great steel plants of Pittsburgh be denuded by false theories on how steel prices are arrived at.

Under the basing-point system America has become the world leader in steel production. Pittsburgh has produced this country successfully through two wars, and contributed to the highest standard of living yet achieved by any society.

We will not allow the defamers of the basing-point system to produce a multitude of ghost steel towns in the capital of the steel industry.

We are for the wise adjustments worked out by the Federal Trade Commission in the pricing of steel.

We from Pittsburgh will not permit selfish interests from other regions to decimate our steel plants, create ghost towns along our rivers, throw thousands of working population into unemployment and poverty.

Probably no bill before the Eighty-first Congress will have such a deep effect on the economy of this Nation than the measure to permit a moratorium on the Supreme Court decisions affecting the basing-point system. We owe it to the steel industry, and to the people who derive their livelihood from the steel industry, to reinstate the basing-point system before our economy suffers an irreparable blow. If the steel industry is forced to an f. o. b. mill pricing system as a permanent way of doing business, chaos will arise with a return to a buyers' market in steel. How much simpler and more efficient to have a price which averages out all freight charges so that distant purchasers are not put to a disadvantage in competing with manufacturers close to the mill. How much fairer to the people of the Pittsburgh area whose livelihoods are tied directly and indirectly to the steel industry. Winston Churchill said, "England must export or die." And I say for Pittsburgh, "We must sell our surplus steel beyond Pittsburgh or we will have man-made depression in our midst." The capricious Supreme Court decisions regarding the basing-point system are an unprecedented and thoughtless action which much be revoked before they stunt our economic health. It is up to us to undo the damage.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I can discuss this measure in these 3 minutes without any animus or animosity toward any Member of this body, because I have no personal interest in it, and I am interested only in the effect of this measure on small business, and on the consumer.

Here is the gist of the bill:

It shall not be an unfair method of competition or an unfair or deceptive act or practice for a seller, acting independently, to quote or sell at delivered prices or to absorb freight: *Provided*, That this shall not make lawful any combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement; or any monopolistic, oppresive, deceptive, or fraudulent practice, carried out by or involving the use of delivered prices or freight absorption.

At this time in this country we have from four to five million men and women

out of employment. The one way to give them employment is to keep manufacturing concerns in operation.

There is a cement plant in my city of Knoxville. It is busy all the time. There is heavy construction work going on at all times in that section of the country. As a result of this Supreme Court dicta, which makes it appear that to absorb freight renders the person absorbing it subject to criminal prosecution in the Federal court, as the result of that opinion and that apprehension on the part of the manufacturers of cement, there were times in my district, which always has a shortage of cement, when you absolutely could not buy it.

This bill is for the benefit of the manufacturers of the necessities of life, it is for the benefit of the consumers, it is for the benefit of the men who work in industry, and by all means it should go to conference.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I refuse to yield. I am like a mummy, I am pressed for time.

We should send this bill back to conference and enact it into law. This will take the handcuffs off industry. Keep our mills and industrial plants at work. By so doing we will enable our people to buy the products of our industry at prices they can afford to pay. This measure gives our small industrial plants a market for their products anywhere in the land. This measure gives small business a purchasing power and a selling market that would otherwise be beyond its reach. To kill this measure is to play into the hands of big business.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hesitate and deeply regret to oppose my friend, neighbor, and colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] upon this particular piece of legislation. My congressional district of Arkansas joins his congressional district in Texas. However, as a member of the Judiciary Committee and after studying the basing-point proposal, I feel it my duty to strenuously insist upon the adoption of this legislation for the general welfare of the entire country, and especially that area in which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and I reside.

In the Cement case before mentioned by various Members while explaining this legislation, the Supreme Court indicated when speaking outside the involvements that no business could absorb freight when pricing a commodity for sale. In other words, the Supreme Court decision went beyond the involved subject matter of the Cement case and merely threw in a hint—which is known in the legal profession as obiter dictum—that should the Supreme Court be called upon to decide the legality of permitting freight absorption pricing, that the Court would possibly decide such action illegal, even should the practice be carried on by individual businesses without substantially lessening competition and lacking in conspiracy or collusion with other businesses.

The basing point legislation now before us merely permits freight absorption pricing by individual businesses that will not substantially lessen competition; and the bill specifically prohibits any conspiracy or collusive agreements between businesses for the purpose of lessening competition.

Should the recent Supreme Court dictum aforementioned become a reality, a small business in Arkansas, or elsewhere throughout the country, would be greatly jeopardized without the passage of this legislation.

It is true that a great number of small businesses have been led to believe that the legislation under consideration is detrimental to their interests. Such small businesses have been misled by being denied the opportunity to know the facts and by merely being told that the legislation would jeopardize small businesses. The misled small-business people are sincere in believing that this bill is detrimental to small businesses; however, the very opposite effect would be the true case.

Should the Supreme Court dictum become the law, without the passage of this legislation, small businesses throughout the country would be selling the same commodities at different prices to the detriment of their businesses and customers. Gasoline would be cheaper at the refinery than elsewhere; soap would be cheaper at the place manufactured than elsewhere; cigarettes would sell higher in my district because of the tobacco companies not being allowed to absorb the freight rates when pricing the commodity than in Salem, N. C., for instance, the manufacturing point for considerable tobacco interests.

The legislative proposal before us intends to foreclose the possibility of the Supreme Court dictum becoming a reality so as to continue the present business practices with reference to permitting freight-absorption pricing. Under the present system of freight-absorption pricing, a manufacturer of a commodity takes into consdieration all the freight that would be charged in distributing the commodity and then adds this to the price of the commodity in order that he may sell his product anywhere in the country for the same price. For instance, the American Tobacco Co. may have a million packages of cigarettes to sell within the United States. The company ascertains all the freight that would necessarily need be charged in distributing the cigarettes throughout the United States. The total freight bill is added to the total cost of the million packages of cigarettes when determining the price of each package so as to allow a person in California to pay the same price for a package of cigarettes—State taxes not being involved—as a person in Maine would pay for the same package of cigarettes.

Especially many of the drug-store people throughout the country have been led to believe that this basing-point legislation is detrimental to their businesses. Most of you have heard from the drug-store people. Actually, without the passage of this legislation, should the Supreme Court dictum prevail, there are no businesses in this country that would be hurt worse than the drug stores. These stores in my district would necessarily need pay for and sell every commodity not manufactured in my district at the normal price of the commodity plus the exact freight required to get the commodity to the stores within my district; while the people within the town where some particular drug-store commodity is manufactured would purchase the article for its normal cost, with no freight involved. It is difficult for me to know how the opponents of this legislation could have the nerve to tell the drug-store people that this basing point legislation is detrimental to their businesses. Should the Supreme Court actually rule against freight absorption pricing and this legislation be defeated, prices of every drug-store commodity in my district would necessarily rise in an amount sufficient to pay the exact freight upon each drug-store article.

The opponents to this legislation contend that its passage will create monopolies, while in truth the opposite effect is correct. The adoption of this proposal assures businesses an opportunity to compete outside their own local surroundings; and therefore prohibits a business from having a monopoly within its respective area. Surely it will not be contended that small businesses in Arkansas, where little manufacturing is carried on, should pay more for a commodity because of freight rates than the industrialized East. Of course, a manufacturer within my district of Arkansas competing with the industrialized East, without the basing-point bill, should the Supreme Court dictum prevail, would have a monopoly on a great area without and about Arkansas. That is the very purpose of the opposition to this legislation. Naturally, I would like to see Arkansas an industrialized State, and the Supreme Court dictum would assist in bringing into existence that very thing if we had equalized freight rates in the South; but so long as we have the discriminatory freight rates the small businesses of our section will be penalized by the Supreme Court dictum. Factories in Arkansas cannot compete with the factories in the East because of these discriminatory freight rates. Once we get an equalized freight rate, then I will support legislation to repeal the basing-point legislation, but during this interim, I shall not penalize the people of our State with the Supreme Court dictum.

Let us suppose that we have no soap factory in Arkansas and that it is necessary for small businesses to buy soap for resale from St. Louis. Unless the St. Louis manufacturer be allowed to absorb the freight charges when pricing the soap, the housewife in St. Louis would pay less for a bar of soap than the housewife in Arkansas. Under the provisions of the basing-point bill, by the company being allowed to absorb freight charges, the same bar of soap would sell anywhere in the United States for the same price. Should I have a manufacturing unit within my district such as a cement plant or a steel mill of some kind, naturally without the enaction of this law I would have a complete monopoly upon the cement and steel businesses within an area of several States about me. The inability of my competitor to absorb

freight charges would preclude him as a competitor. We cannot afford to penalize the welfare of our people to assist some person who happens to have the chance of a monopoly.

Some of the Members will possibly remember that immediately following the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case many of the manufacturers decided it wise to look upon the Supreme Court dictum as the law. They curtailed their operations to a restricted territory. The price of cement went up because the various plants had no competition within their respective areas. They could raise the price of cement a considerable amount and still sell the commodity cheaper than an outside competitor who would necessarily need charge the exact freight rate upon the commodity in addition to the normal price for the cement. The Supreme Court dictum will curtail business operations and promote sectional monopolies to the detriment of the consumers.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Would you apply this same principle to farms and farm prices?

Mr. TACKETT. I do not see where that has anything to do with the controversy at hand. Perishable rather than basic commodities could be involved in farm products. I believe freight should be absorbed in order to give all consumers an equal opportunity rather than favor those in the vicinity from whence the commodities are shipped.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. We in Pittsburgh want to trade with your people and buy your products, too.

Mr. TACKETT. I am certainly in accord with your idea, which can only be accomplished by the passage of this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the remarkable thing about this bill is that the big industries are completely complacent about it. The people I have been hearing from are the little fellows who have been saying to me, "We will not be able to sell our products down in Arkansas and will just have to limit ourselves to Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia. We want the bill passed to protect us and prevent limitation of our selling territory."

Our Pennsylvania businessmen want to be able to sell to the people in Arkansas and Oklahoma at the same price that we sell them in Pennsylvania. We in Pennsylvania will buy the products of California and Florida and these Midwestern States. We want to pay the same price for your products, too.

In the district of my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] there is a fine, aggressive small business called the Sharon Tube Co. The man who is president of that company, Mr. Don Sawhill, is a good friend of both Congressman KEARNS and myself. Mr. Sawhill has said that because his is a small company it will needlesly restrict him to an area about several hundred square miles in area within which he can sell tube products. This would give him probably a monopoly in his geographical area, but he wisely prefers a large market and adequate competition.

If we in the North will restrict ourselves solely to our sections of the country in carrying on business, we will Balkanize this country into small trade areas governed by small, tight monopolies.

I want to see the housewife in Washington and Oregon and down in the Southwest and in New Mexico get her pots and pans at just the same price that the Pittsburgh housewife gets hers. This bill should be sent to conference today and promptly passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in considering this very important legislation, it seems to me we have overlooked one very important thing. How about the man who works in a plant in a certain town in the United States? How about the man who owns his home in this community and has reared his family there and wants to take part in the community progress life of that community, for years and years to come? Yet the Congress of the United States may come along and say that that man has no right as a citizen to have his job in that particular community because we deem it wise, through legislation which we pass, that he move to another community and get a position in a like field some place else. Thus, he is forced to rebuild his and his family's entire future. That is really a bad situation. No one is fearful here of laws that will be for the good of everyone. Yet, I cannot understand how men engaged in the field of endeavor, and enrolled in one of our great unions could possibly let this very situation happen here in the United States.

Now, that is a bad situation.

There ought not be any fundamental uncertainty about what the law requires in any field, but especially not in a field so important to the basic economic life of this great Nation.

Therefore, it is the duty of Congress, as I see it, to clarify all existing uncertainties on this matter.

Let us declare a policy.

Let us not send this bill back to committee to die there.

Let us send this legislation along to conference and get a bill that we can act upon.

Let us end all uncertainty on this whole delivered-price question.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I favor this legislation and I urge that it be sent back to conference.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I favor this legislation and urge that it be sent back to conference immediately. While I do not care to go into the legal aspects of the Federal Trade Commission's decision or the Supreme Court cases which have made this clarifying bill necessary, I do want to mention the uncertainty and confusion under which businesses of all kinds are operating at the present time due to the obiter dicta in the Cement case.

After having read these cases thoroughly I am convinced that the term "conscious parallel pricing" which has been mentioned before this distinguished body so many times has caused more trouble and confusion among lawyers and businessmen than the Federal Trade Commission's decision itself. It further has given the opponents of this present legislation, S. 1008, an opportunity to attach themselves to a few small groups of businessmen with the purpose in mind of causing further confusion. The opponents of this legislation, if speaking frankly, would necessarily have to admit that legislation is necessary to clarify the obiter dicta in these Supreme Court cases, if for no other reason.

This basing-point bill has had ample consideration by both the Senate and House Judiciary Committees. These two bodies, composed almost entirely of capable lawyers, have recognized the need for clarification of the law concerning delivered-pricing systems. Both committees have voted unanimously for legislation to carry out this purpose. It seems to me, therefore, that Members of the House of both major parties, whether they be lawyers, businessmen, farmers, or other professional men, should give these committee deliberations and votes a great deal of attention and consideration.

The overwhelming opinion of businessmen of my district, both large and small, is in favor of S. 1008. My constituents demand that clarification of the issue of delivered-pricing systems be made by Congress immediately. This matter has been pending now for more than 2 years and certainly should be decided before Congress adjourns this summer. If the matter remains unclarified for any further period of time, it may well be that businessmen will become so confused and uncertain as to methods of pricing that serious unemployment may be caused. Business just will not continue in operation if it is fearful of every move or uncertain as to the outcome of its placing definite prices on the goods which it sells.

For the sake of the prosperity and general healthy economic condition of the American people, I therefore urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to vote for the return of this bill into conference and for immediate enactment into law.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this is a procedural matter entirely. If we follow the usual practice in Congress, we must send this bill to

conference. Do not lose sight of the fact that the House passed S. 1008, in the first instance, by an overwhelming vote. Second, that the House also adopted the conference report by an overwhelming vote notwithstanding the protests of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. Nothing new has been said today. The Senate has twice passed on this bill, just the same as has the House. So, about the only thing before the House is: Shall we send the conference report, which the Senate amended, to conference to see if there is any way that we can compose the differences between the two bodies.

The Congress should be permitted to work its will. If and when the House has demonstrated thoroughly that it desires to legislate on a given subject, opportunity should be provided for a final expression. There is no question but that the House has spoken at least twice. There is no question but that the Senate has spoken at least twice on the fundamental question. I do not know how I am going to vote when the conference report comes back. I may vote against the conference report. It all depends upon the way that report reads. Remember, there will be debate when the conference report comes back.

As far as the Robinson-Patman Act is concerned, I helped pass that law. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will agree. I favor that law. I would not have voted for S. 1008 if, in my opinion, it destroyed that law. I will not vote for the conference report if I believe it will destroy that law. Forget the Robinson-Patman Act and I do not believe there is any serious objection to S. 1008. As for the argument made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that there have been no hearings, I think that argument has been fully answered. I know there were hearings. I was not a member of the subcommittee that considered this bill, but when public hearings were announced I attended as a spectator, not as a member of the committee. I heard Senator O'MAHONEY testify. I heard the representative from the Department of Justice and others testify. At this late stage it is claimed there have been no hearings. As explained by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], there have been hearings.

Just an observation about the practice of committee hearings. The Ways and Means Committee of the House has been considering a tax bill for weeks. When it concludes its consideration it will bring in a new bill based on these hearings. The new bill is what we will consider. Someone may stand up here, like the gentleman from Texas has in this case, and say: "I am opposed to this. There has been no hearing on this particular bill." Well, that will be true. The committee on monopoly study of the Judiciary Committee will eventually undoubtedly bring in some bill, but there will not be long and extensive hearings on the individual bills which are based upon the study and hearings which have been given to the subject; that is, the bill in its final form will be the result of extensive hearings. S. 1008 was the result of prolonged hearings in the Senate. Big business, little business, and all the rest were heard.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to discuss the merits of S. 1008, which has been thoroughly debated in the House on at least two occasions. As to the objective of the bill, I quote from the remarks of the Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBERTSON. In the debate on sending this bill to conference, he said:

> The only purpose of this measure was to restore what had been accepted as a normal and necessary means of doing business, without any intention at all of weakening the antitrust laws or of violating any part of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The Senator from Louisiana, Mr. LONG, who is opposed to the bill, stated the essence of the opposition as follows:

> The question is, if the discrimination in favor of a large concern is made in good faith, should that be a defense, under the Robinson-Patman Act, against the charge of unfair price discrimination?

In conclusion, let us not forget that the vote we cast here today is not a vote for or against S. 1008. It is only a vote to permit the House and the Senate to indulge in further conference to the end that satisfactory language may be agreed upon by the conferees. If this happens, the conferees must report their handiwork back to the House. Then we will all be permitted to vote for or against the bill in its final form. What is wrong about that? I realize there is difference of opinion among our Members. There is no use in getting excited or angry. Honest disagreement in the drafting of legislation is most helpful. If we are sincere, we can disagree without being disagreeable. I impugn no one's motives and I believe a majority of the House today, as on another occasion, will follow the letter and the intent of the rules and send this bill back to conference.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, which I understand is 4 minutes, to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARROLL. The procedure under this bill, S. 1008, is so complicated that it would be very helpful at least to me and to some Members of the House with whom I have spoken, if we could have some understanding of the legislative situation. I am informed—and I should like to have the comment of the Speaker if he cares to comment—that this bill came to us from the Senate; that this body incorporated certain amendments, that the bill then went to conference, and that the other body rejected the conference report. The question I now propound is whether or not if the bill again goes to conference we are back in the situation we were some months ago where the House inserted certain amendments to S. 1008?

The SPEAKER. The conferees would have the same power they had before in considering matters in disagreement.

Mr. CARROLL. But my doubt arises on the subject matter on which they will be working, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot anticipate what the conferees may do.

Mr. CARROLL. Perhaps, if I may be permitted another question, I can make myself clear: As I recall the RECORD, on July 7 last, the House passed certain amendments; I am wondering if those amendments are the amendments which the conferees, if this bill goes to conference, will work their will upon.

The SPEAKER. The conferees could work their will on any matter in disagreement.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD will show that the opposition to this bill has had about 11 or 12 minutes out of the hour, but this record is consistent with the history which has been established throughout this legislation. This has been a bold attempt to enact into a law a proposition of vital importance to every person in this country without permitting adequate hearings so that the Members of Congress may understand the issues involved.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has referred to the so-called hearings held when this legislation was originally before the committee. Actually, if you will take the trouble to examine these alleged hearings, you will find that they are 35 pages in length, which would normally be about half an hour before a committee; and most of them are devoted to the proposition of the gentleman from Texas asking that the matter be given full and adequate hearings.

It is perfectly understandable to me, Mr. Speaker, why the gentleman from Indiana, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and gentlemen from certain other areas where there presently are large concentrations of heavy industry should be so violently interested in passing this legislation without hearings. The excuse which they give, of course, is a fantastic one; they say that this legislation is required to clear up some obiter dicta of the Supreme Court decision. I venture to say that a large percentage of the Members of this body are lawyers. I believe they understand what obiter dicta means. It means "beyond the decision of the court." It has no effect, it has no meaning, and it has no significance.

No; that is not the reason. The reasons for the passage of this legislation are: First, to remove the existing provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act which state that good faith shall only be used as evidence when an unfair competitive practice has been found. They propose to substitute for this existing rule of evidence a substantive provision of law making good faith an absolute defense. The effect would be an annulment of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The second reason, and I direct my remarks to every Member of this body from New England, from the South, and the West, is that this is an effort to maintain the present geographic structure of heavy industry in this country. Let me given you a startling illustration of what I mean.

Birmingham, Ala., is the most natural, the most logical place in this country for the production of steel because there we have an outcropping in the same place of iron ore, limestone, coal, and coke. In Birmingham, Ala., paying equal if not higher wages than Pittsburgh, steel can be produced at much less cost than elsewhere. The transportation rates from Birmingham by rail, not by water which certainly should be calculated in the consideration of this bill, are as much as 100 percent less than the transportation rates from Pittsburgh or from Gary to points in the South. Yet the Birmingham mill supplies only a small part of the demand of the South. This bill makes it impossible for the Birmingham area ever to properly develop. I refer you to the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1188. There the story is told. How any Representative from the West or the South could vote for this bill is beyond me. It makes permanent the colonization of our areas.

Now let us analyze the effect on the antitrust laws.

The principal question in case No. 107, Standard Oil Company against Federal Trade Commission, which was argued and submitted to the Supreme Court on January 9 and 10, 1950, concerns the proper construction and application of section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act which prohibits price discriminations that have the specified injurious effects on competition. The case also concerns the proper interpretation of section 2 (b) of that act which provides:

Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor.

Section 3 of S. 1008 as rewritten by the conference committee and passed by the House, would amend section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act to read as follows:

Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price the effect of which upon competition may be that prohibited by the preceding subsection, or discrimination in services or facilities furnished, the burden of showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided further,* That a seller may justify a discrimination [Kefauver and Carroll amendments both stricken and nothing substituted] by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor, and this may include the maintenance above or below the price of such competitor, of a differential in price which such seller customarily maintains, except that this shall not make lawful any combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement; or any monopolistic, oppressive, deceptive, or fraudulent practice.

The question presented in the Standard Oil Co. case is whether the proviso to section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act "that nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor" makes such a showing a complete justification for discriminations in price when it is affirmatively shown that such discriminations have had and may have the injurious effects on the competition specified in section 2 (a).

The complaint issued by the Federal Trade Commission charged that the Standard Oil Co. has discriminated in price in the sale of gasoline in the Detroit metropolitan area by selling its gasoline to four purchasers classified by Standard as jobbers at prices substantially lower than the price which Standard charges for gasoline to other purchasers whom it supplies in that area.

Since September 10, 1936, Standard has supplied gasoline in Detroit to the operators of approximately 358 service stations who are engaged exclusively in reselling such gasoline at retail. Also since that date and in the same area, Standard supplied gasoline to the four so-called jobbers, namely, Ned's Auto Supply Co., Citrin-Kolb Oil Co., Stikeman Oil Co., and Wayne Oil Co.

At the outset it should be noted that there is no magic in the word "jobber." Standard states in its brief before the Supreme Court, at page 5, that the word shall apply to one who conforms to the industry classification of the word "jobber," and who therefore may sell at wholesale, retail, or both.

Ned's was exclusively a retailer, reselling Standard's gasoline through its own chain of service stations. Citrin, Stikeman, and Wayne were engaged in reselling Standard's gasoline at wholesale and retail.

Thus, in their retail operations, Ned's, Citrin, Stikeman, and Wayne, although they were classified by Standard as jobbers, and although they bought in tank car quantities, were in fact retailers in competition with the 358 other retailers who purchased their gasoline from Standard in tank-car quantities.

It is very important to note that the Commission found, and it is not disputed by Standard, that the lower price to the four jobbers was not justified by cost savings to Standard in serving them.

The case thus presents a factual situation wherein one large gasoline retailer and three wholesalers who sold in part at retail, were able to demand and obtain from Standard, because of the quantities in which they purchased, a substantially lower price for Standard's gasoline than the price charged by Standard for gasoline of the same grade and quality to 358 other retailers who purchased directly from Standard and resold such gasoline at retail in competition with the four favored purchasers.

The Commission found that Standard's price discriminations gave the four jobbers in their retail operations a substantial competitive advantage over the 358 retailers paying the higher price. The Commission found that the price discriminations to these four jobbers have had and may have the effect of injuring, destroying, preventing competition between these four jobbers in their retail operations with other retailers in Detroit who are required to purchase gasoline from Standard at higher prices. The Commission concluded that Standard's discriminations in price in favor of Ned's, Citrin, Stikeman, and Wayne violated section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act. The sufficiency of the evidence to support the Commission's findings and the Commission's findings to support its conclusion are not disputed by the Standard Oil Co. in any manner except as to the question of interstate commerce. The Commission's order prohibiting such discriminations in price was unanimously upheld by the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

The Standard Oil Co. contends that section 2 (a) is not a complete section defining a prohibited offense, but is modified by the proviso of section 2 (b). Standard contends that a discrimination in price declared unlawful by section 2 (a) is not unlawful if the seller can show only that the lower of the two prices was made in good faith to meet a price offered by one of his competitors; and that such a showing is a complete defense as a matter of law to a charge of violation of section 2 (a), regardless of the amount of the discrimination and regardless of its injurious effect on competition among Standard's competing retailer-customers.

In short, Standard contends that all of its price discriminations were made in good faith to meet equally low or lower prices of competitors. In support of this defense, Standard introduced evidence of competitive offers received by the four dealers from distributors of both major and minor brands of gasoline. Some of these offers were made prior to June 19, 1936, and some were made subsequent to June 19, 1936. Of those offers made subsequent to June 19, 1936, some were made after the filing of the complaint herein. Standard also contended that the lower prices allowed the four dealers were made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor for the reason that said four dealers could at any time herein involved have purchased gasoline of grade and quality comparable to that sold by Standard at equally low or lower prices from other suppliers of gasoline in Detroit.

Based on the record in this case the Commission concluded as a matter of law that it is not material whether the discrimination in price granted by Standard to the four dealers were made to meet equally low prices of competitors. The Commission further concluded as a matter of law that it is unnecessary for the Commission to determine whether the alleged competitive prices were, in fact, available or involved gasoline of

like grade or quality or of equal public acceptance. Accordingly, the Commission did not attempt to find the facts regarding those matters because, even though the lower prices in question may have been made by Standard in good faith to meet the lower prices of competitors, the Commission was of the opinion that this does not constitute a defense in the face of affirmative proof that the effect of the discrimination was to injure, destroy, and prevent competition between the retail stations operated by the 4 dealers and the 358 retailers.

In substance the Commission held that the effect to be given proof of meeting competition is not a matter of law but a matter of evidence, and that such proof was not available to Standard as a defense on the facts of this case because such proof did not and could not rebut or overcome the Commission's evidence of injury to retail competition resulting from the discrimination.

The Standard Oil Co.'s contention that the proviso to section 2 (b) is a complete defense to a charge of unlawful price discrimination in any case as a matter of law, is controverted by the legislative history as well as by the language of the proviso.

Prior to June 19, 1936, when the Robinson-Patman Act went into effect, section 2 of the original Clayton Act declared discrimination in price to be unlawful where the effect of such discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, with provisos permitting, among other things, discriminations in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition. Under that proviso proof establishing that a discrimination in price was made in good faith to meet competition was a complete defense to a charge of unlawful price discrimination.

In framing the Robinson-Patman Act Congress was concerned with the growth of chain stores and the use made of mass buying power to obtain preferential prices. In fact, the Robinson-Patman Act grew out of the Federal Trade Commission's chain-store investigation made at the request of Congress. The Commission's report to Congress showed that many large chains were receiving discounts, allowances, and other advantages greatly in excess of those granted, not only to competing retailers but even to wholesalers. It was recognized by Congress that section 2 of the original Clayton Act permitting discriminations in price in good faith to meet competition made that section unenforceable in the very cases the statute was intended to reach, for under that section a chain or other large buyer, merely by finding two or more sellers of like goods willing to grant to it the same preferential price, could obtain an unearned competitive advantage over his smaller competitors and neither the sellers nor the buyer would be subject to corrective action, even though the ability of the smaller competitors to compete with the chain or other large buyer was injured or destroyed by such price discrimination.

The House Judiciary Committee in reporting the Patman bill in 1936 stated, with regard to the meeting competition proviso and other provisos of section 2 of the original Clayton Act, that "these provisos have so materially weakened section 2 of that act, which this bill proposes to amend, as to render it inadequate, if not almost a nullity"—House Report 2287, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, page 7.

In reporting the Robinson and Patman bills favorably, both the Senate and House Judiciary Committees emphasized the purpose to protect the competitive opportunity of the small-business man by prohibiting all price differentials except those which could be justified in full by cost savings. The House Committee reported that "the object of the bill briefly stated is to amend section 2 of the Clayton Act so as to suppress more effectually discrimination between customers of the same seller not supported by sound economic differences in their business positions or in the cost of serving them"—House Report No. 2287, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, page 7.

In this case, Ned's Auto Supply Co. was engaged exclusively in reselling Standard's gasoline direct to the consuming public through its own chain of retail service stations. According to Standard's version, Ned's was able to induce competitors of Standard to offer to sell gasoline to it in tank-car quantities at tank-car prices and that Standard had to do the same to meet this competition, regardless of the injurious effects upon competition at the retail level between Ned's and other retailer-purchasers of Standard's gasoline. In other words, Ned's, although exclusively a retailer, was arbitrarily classified by Standard as a wholesaler and given wholesale prices which Standard did not make available to its other retailer-customers, which resulted in injurious effects upon competition at the retail level. Under section 2 of the original Clayton Act, Standard might have justified such discriminations in price if made in good faith to meet competition. It therefore appears that Standard's discriminatory prices granted to Ned's represent the same chain-store situation which Congress found evaded the purpose of the original Clayton Act and also presents exactly the type of case which Congress intended to reach by the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The proposal that meeting competition in good faith be made an absolute justification for discrimination in price otherwise prohibited was considered and rejected by Congress in the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act. The meeting competition proviso was considered one of the principal loopholes in the original act and both the original Robinson bill and the original Patman bill omitted any provision similar to this proviso. In the Senate a provision with respect to meeting competition having the same effect as under the original Clayton Act was proposed as an amendment. In the House the Judiciary Committee reported the bill with a section substantially identical with the present section 2 (b). The conference committee rejected the Senate's version and approved the House amendment in the form enacted. With respect to the meeting competition proviso proposed by the amendment to the Senate bill the conference committee stated:

> The Senate bill contained a further proviso: "That nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price in the same or different commodities made in good faith to meet competition." This language is found in existing law, and in the opinion of the conferees is one of the obstacles to the enforcement of the present Clayton Act. The Senate receded, and the language is stricken. A provision relating to the meeting of competition, intended to operate only as a rule of evidence in a proceeding before the Federal Trade Commission, is included in subsection (b) in the conference text as follows: "*Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor. (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9414; H. Rept. 2951, 74th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 6, 7.)

In presenting the conference report in the House the chairman of the conferees explained the good faith proviso of the present section 2 (b) in these words:

> It is to be noted, however, that this does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural. It does not determine substantive rights, liabilities, and duties. They are fixed in the other provisions of the bill. It leaves it a question of fact to be determined in each case, whether the competition to be met was such as to justify the discrimination given, as one lying within the limitations laid down by the bill, and whether the way in which the competition was met lies within the latitude allowed by those limitations. * * * If this proviso were construed to permit the showing of a competing offer as an absolute bar to liability for discrimination, then it would nullify the act entirely at the very inception of its enforcement; for in nearly every case mass buyers receive similar discriminations from competing sellers of the same product. (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9418.)

With respect to the meeting competition provision of the original Clayton Act which permitted the statute to be easily evaded, the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit (173 F. 2d 210) aptly stated that—

> Congress sought to change this bypass by changing the discriminatory price, made in good faith to meet the low price of a competitor, from a defense, as it then was, to a procedural aid to enable a seller to overcome the prima facie case made by showing a difference in price to customers in the same community for goods of the same quality.

The Robinson-Patman Act in section 2 (a) continued to make it unlawful to make a discriminatory price as was provided in the original Clayton Act and kept as a defense the cost savings and other defenses of the original act, but took out of the defense category the provision for making a lower price to meet

competition. As to this, section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act in part provided:

Upon proof being made that there has been discrimination in price, nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.

In this amendment it appears to us as it did to the court below that the intent of Congress is clear and the language used to express its intent is not ambiguous. The court below was also of the opinion that the Supreme Court in the case of *Staley Manufacturing Company* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (324 U. S. 746 (1945)), has expressed the view that section 2 (b) is as the conference report says it was intended to be. To support its opinion the Court of Appeals (173 F. 2d 210) quoted from the opinion in the Staley case wherein the Supreme Court, speaking through Chief Justice Stone, in part stated:

It will be noted that the defense that the price discriminations were made in order to meet competition, is under the statute a matter of rebutting the Commission's prima facie case prior to the Robinson-Patman amendments. Section 2 of the Clayton Act provided that nothing contained in it shall prevent discriminations in price made in good faith to meet competition. The change in language of this exception was for the purpose of making the defense a matter of evidence in each case, raising a question of fact as to whether the competition justified the discrimination (pp. 752-3).

To support this statement the Supreme Court cites the conference report, House Report 2951, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, pages 6–7, and the statement of the chairman of the House conference committee, volume 80, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 9418. From this language it clearly appears that the Supreme Court has held that the good-faith proviso of section 2 (b) does not provide a substantive justification for violation of section 2 (a); that proof of meeting competition in good faith is sufficient to rebut only a prima facie case of violation of 2 (a) and, beyond that, is merely evidence to be considered by the Commission with other evidence in determining as a question of fact in each case whether the seller's competition justified the discrimination in price.

The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in *Moss* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (148 Fed. 2d 378, C. A. 2d 1944; cert. den. 326 U. S. 734) has, in effect, held that proof of a price differential in itself constituted "discrimination in price" where the competitive injury in question was between sellers.

The Supreme Court in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Morton Salt Company* (334 U. S. 37, 45 (1948)), has held that—

Congress meant by using the words "discrimination in price" in section 2 that, in a case involving competitive injury between a seller's customers, the Commission need only prove that a seller had charged one purchaser a higher price for like goods than he had charged one or more of the purchaser's competitors.

In the light of these cases the meaning of the words "discrimination in price" is clear in the first half of section 2 (b) which provides that "upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section that there has been discrimination in price the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination."

In the light of the Moss and Morton Salt cases, this part of section 2 (b) clearly means that proof of discrimination in price without proof of the injurious effects specified in section 2 (a) makes a prima facie case of unlawful discrimination and that the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation. The word "justification" clearly refers to the substantive defenses made available by the provisos of section 2 (a) and the provision relative to meeting an equally low price of a competitor in good faith is not included in that section.

The second half of section 2 (b) states:

Provided, however, That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price * * * to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.

Such a showing is not referred to as, and manifestly is not intended to be, justification for price discrimination. And neither section 2 (a) nor 2 (b) provides, as did section 2 of the original Clayton Act, that "nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price made in good faith to meet competition."

The action of Congress in deliberately taking this proviso out of section 2 of the original Clayton Act where it was a substantive defense and by transferring it to section 2 (b) where it was made a procedural section, discloses in itself the intention of Congress to reduce the legal status of the proviso from that of a substantive defense to the status of an evidentiary matter that may or may not be applicable on the merits of a charge of unlawful price discrimination.

The action of Congress in deliberately changing the phraseology of the proviso likewise discloses the same intention on the part of Congress.

It is clear that the effect of the good faith proviso of section 2 (b) extends only to the matter of rebutting the prima facie case, thereby shifting the burden of proof to the Commission on the issue of whether the discrimination has or may have the injurious effects upon competition specified in section 2 (a). Since the term "discrimination in price" was used in connection with the term "the prima facie case" Congress evidently did not intend the term "discrimination in price" to refer to all of the elements of unlawful price discrimination, including the effects upon competition set forth in section 2 (a). It clearly appears that the term "discrimination in price" as used in section 2 (b) does not include, and, as held in the Moss, Staley, and Morton Salt cases, section 2 does not require affirmative proof of actual injury to competition when the other elements of an unlawful price discrimination are established.

If proof of good faith in meeting an equally low price of a competitor is made, the Commission can no longer rely upon a prima facie case, but must show as was shown in the present case, by additional and affirmative evidence that Standard's discrimination has had and may have the injurious effects upon competition specified in section 2 (a).

This construction and application of sections 2 (a) and 2 (b) we submit correctly and clearly demonstrate that where, as in the instant case, the injurious effects upon competition have been affirmatively established, a showing that Standard was meeting an equally low price of a competitor in good faith does not constitute a justification for Standard's discriminations in price. This is particularly true where, as in the instant case, the competition injured is retail competition between competing purchasers, since the fact that the seller acted in good faith to meet the price of the seller's competitor is not inconsistent with, and does not logically rebut, the proof that retail competition between competing purchasers is injured by the discrimination.

To accept Standard's construction of section 2 (b) would mean that the individual seller's interest in discriminating in price would prevail over the public interest in protecting competition against discriminatory pricing. If Standard's construction should prevail as a matter of law, then the prohibition against discriminatory pricing in section 2 (a) will become largely a nullity and sections 2 (a) and 2 (b) taken together will become for the most part merely a declaration of the individual right to discriminate.

It has been argued that under the Commission's construction of the statute, Standard would be forced to sit idly by while its competitors took away its customers by means of lower prices. This is not so.

If a seller loses a customer to a competitor as a result of a discriminatory price offered by a competitor, the Clayton Act gives him a right of action for three times his damages, and he may also seek an injunction in the district court.

To permit retaliation in such a case would be to let one violation of law justify another. Such a contention by the Staley Co. was referred to as startling and was rejected by the Supreme Court in the Staley case.

If the competitor who offers a lower price to the seller's customer is not discriminating in price, then the situation is one of normal price competition between sellers, and the remedy is to meet that competition without engaging in unlawful discrimination. If the seller cannot meet such competitor's price in fair competition it is because the competitor either is more efficient or has some lawful advantage, such as lower transportation costs. In either case, normal competitive forces come into play, and the customer's business will and

should go to the seller able to offer the lowest nondiscriminatory price.

There is nothing in the Commission's order which would prevent the Standard Oil Co. from selling to wholesalers and retailers at a price lower than any of its competitors and thereby preventing the switch of its customers to its competitors, so long as Standard's prices are not discriminatory. Therefore, the argument made on behalf of Standard that the Commission's order would preclude it from engaging in competition to hold its customers is without merit.

It has been argued that the Clayton Antitrust Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, does not encourage hard competition. It is submitted that the full impact of competition upon Standard, compelling it to lower its entire price structure in order to hold its customers, will impose on Standard hard competition. It is soft competition that would permit Standard to discriminate in price to hold the business of some of its favored customers without being compelled to lower its general price structure.

If Standard's construction of the statute is accepted, it means that a small business located at one point cannot undersell a large corporation with many branches without the risk of economic strangulation through price discrimination although the small concern does not discriminate at all. It also means that one competitor whose differences in cost would justify a lower price, runs the same risk at the hands of its larger rival. Standard's construction would even mean that the discriminator would justify his otherwise unlawful discriminations by the discriminations of a competitor, although the latter may also be unlawful. To accept Standard's construction of the statute would mean that Congress intended to let down the bars to injurious price discrimination whenever the seller can show that a competitor is offering the same price to a favored customer. A seller in a competitive industry usually encounters such competition in selling to chains and other large purchasers and Standard's construction of the statute would license injurious and oppressive discrimination.

From the foregoing argument in the Standard Oil Co. case, the conclusion is reached that section 3 of S. 1008 as rewritten by the conference committee and passed by the House and providing "that a seller may justify a discrimination by showing that his lower price was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor," will emasculate and nullify section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act prohibiting price discriminations which have or may have the specified injurious effects upon competition. If this amendment is enacted into law, section 2 (a) and 2 (b) of the Clayton Act will become for the most part largely a declaration of the right of the seller to discriminate in price regardless of the quantity of the discriminations and the amount of injury resulting therefrom to competition. The amendment proposed by Senator KEFAUVER and improved by Representative CARROLL would sustain the application and construction of sections 2 (a) and 2 (b) by the Federal Trade Commission and the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in the Standard Oil Co. case. Without an amendment such as that offered by Senator KEFAUVER and Congressman CARROLL, retail competition among competing purchasers of a seller who discriminates in price would be afforded no protection from the injurious effects of such discriminations. Without the Kefauver and Carroll amendments sections 2 (a) and 2 (b) of the Clayton Act would revert to the same status as section 2 of the original Clayton Act which Congress found to be ineffective and unenforceable.

FREIGHT ABSORPTION LEGAL RIGHT NOW—NO NEW LAW NEEDED—PROVIDED ONLY THERE IS NO COLLUSION OR ADVERSE EFFECTS ON COMPETITION—THIS IS ALSO THE VIEW OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION—S. 1008 REALLY DESIGNED TO RESTORE BASING-POINT SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, proponents of S. 1008 state that the bill is necessary in order that sellers desiring to absorb freight may do so with the confidence that they will not be violating the antitrust laws merely by reason of such freight absorption. Are the bill's proponents sincere in their statement?

In public hearings before the Federal Trade Commission, in the matter of American Iron & Steel Institute et al., Federal Trade Commission Docket 5598, on Tuesday, February 14, and Thursday, February 23, 1950, members of the Federal Trade Commission's legal staff, including Mr. Everette MacIntyre, its Chief of the Division of Antimonopoly Trials, made clear their view that at present it is not unlawful for a seller to absorb freight or otherwise discriminate in price. They made it clear that discriminations in price, whether in the form of so-called freight absorption or otherwise, are lawful except where they operate to destroy competition and tend to create a monopoly or involve collusion. In that connection it should be noted that the views thus expressed conform to views which have been expressed by the Federal Trade Commission in its public announcements and communications to the Congress dealing with this problem. For example, on July 12, 1949, the Commission in an order disposing of respondents' motions to dismiss in the Rigid Steel Conduit case, Docket No. 4452, made it clear that its order in that case does not run against freight absorption, as such. It should be noted that prior to that date the respondents had filed a motion with the Commission for that case to be reopened for the purpose of making clear that the order did not run against freight absorption as such. The Commission in disposing of that motion, on July 12, 1949, stated:

The purpose of the requested modification is said to be to make clear that the order does not prohibit any of the respondents, acting independently, from quoting or selling at delivered prices or from absorbing freight. The Commission does not consider that the order in its present form prohibits the independent practice of freight absorption or selling at delivered prices by individual sellers. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 11, 1949, last paragraph of the first column of p. 11256; see, also, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 11, 1949, pp. 11253, 11268, 11284–11285; Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A4891; and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 10, 1949, p. 11182.)

At the public hearings before the Federal Trade Commission in a basing-point case where the steel companies are accused of collusive and unlawful price fixing, namely, the American Iron & Steel Institute et al., Federal Trade Commission Docket 5508, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission asked members of the Commission's staff what their views were concerning mandatory f. o. b. prices. To that question the Chief of the Commission's Division of Antimonopoly Trials advised as follows:

I have never held the position that the law entrusted to you provides you with the power to require anyone to sell exclusively at a single nondiscriminatory f. o. b mill price. I have held the position, and I still hold it, that the Clayton Anti-Trust Law, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, makes unlawful f. o. b. mill prices which are discriminatory with the adverse effect specified in that statute; that is, the destruction of competition or injury to competition. Likewise, the Federal Trade Commission Act prohibits the use of unfair practices, and an unfair practice is discrimination which creates or tends to create monopoly. (Tr. p. 180, lines 1–15)

To that statement was added the following:

At this time I would like further to explain my answer to this effect. It is my opinion that the law does not require either f. o. b. mill or delivered pricing. It is my position that the law does not prohibit either f. o. b. mill or delivered pricing per se. It is my position that the law does not prohibit so-called freight absorption or any discrimination not involving adverse effects specified in the Clayton Antitrust Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. Those effects are clearly specified in section 2 (a) of the Clayton Antitrust Act as amended. Its effects include hindrance, suppression, and injury to competition or tendency to create a monopoly. They are matters which must be proven as facts and included in the Commission's findings of facts before it can prohibit said practices. If there should come before this Commission a case involving price discrimination, whether or not in the form of so-called freight absorption, the Commission is without authority to prohibit its discontinuance if the facts in the case should show that the practice promotes competition and does not injure competition, promote monopoly or involve oppression or collusion. I know of no recognized dissent to that view. I suggest careful consideration of that view by those who either hold or favorably regard the thoughts expressed by Mr. Littleton in his plea to the Commission on this matter on February 14, 1950. It is recalled that he pled for the right to continue the practice of freight absorption where it promotes competition. Let us not confuse the law on that point with a finding of fact. A jury or other fact finders have the task under our system of jurisprudence of determining whether discriminations in a particular situation promote competition or destroy it.

In the last analysis, freight absorption is a reduction in price, a reduction in the net return to the seller. Nothing in the antitrust laws prohibits a seller from reducing his price, unless he does so as part of a collusive scheme, or with the effect of lessening competition. A reduction of price, accomplished by freight absorption or by direct quotation, is within the power of any seller who follows the present laws

The supporters of S. 1008 are less than frank when they state that the purpose of the bill is to clarify the seller's right to absorb freight. Section 1 of the bill does declare that freight absorption is legal. But then why do we need sections 2, 3, and 4 with their serious amendments to the Robinson-Patman Act? I ask the Members of the House to ponder on this.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 157, noes 86.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240, nays 144, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—240

Abbitt	Fallon	Lind
Abernethy	Fellows	Linehan
Allen, Calif.	Fenton	Lodge
Allen, Ill.	Fernandez	Lovre
Andersen, H Carl	Fisher	Lucas
Anderson, Calif	Flood	McConnell
Andresen, August H.	Forand	McCormack
Andrews	Ford	McCulloch
Angell	Frazier	McDonough
Arends	Fugate	McGregor
Aspinall	Fulton	McGuire
Auchincloss	Gamble	McMillan, S. C.
Barrett, Pa.	Gary	McMillen, Ill.
Barrett, Wyo.	Gavin	Macy
Bates, Mass.	Gillette	Magee
Beall	Goodwin	Mahon
Bennett, Mich	Gordon	Marsalis
Bishop	Gore	Martin, Iowa
Blackney	Gossett	Martin Mass.
Bolton, Md.	Graham	Mason
Bolton, Ohio	Granahan	Merrow
Bonner	Granger	Meyer
Boykin	Green	Michener
Bramblett	Gwinn	Miles
Brehm	Hale	Miller, Md.
Brown, Ohio	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.
Buchanan	Hall, Leonard W.	Morton
Buckley, Ill.	Halleck	Murray, Tenn.
Burleson	Hand	Nelson
Burton	Harden	Nicholson
Byrne, N Y.	Hardy	Nixon
Byrnes, Wis.	Hare	Norblad
Case, N J	Harris	Norrell
Case, S Dak.	Harrison	O'Brien, Ill.
Celler	Harvey	O'Hara, Ill.
Chatham	Hébert	O'Hara, Minn.
Chelf	Herlong	Patten
Chesney	Heselton	Patterson
Chiperfield	Hill	Peterson
Church	Hinshaw	Pfeiffer, William L.
Clemente	Hobbs	Philbin
Clevenger	Hoeven	Phillips, Calif.
Cole, Kans.	Hoffman, Mich.	Pickett
Cole, N Y.	Holmes	Potter
Colmer	Hope	Poulson
Cooley	Horan	Priest
Cooper	James	Quinn
Corbett	Jenison	Ramsay
Cotton	Jenkins	Reed, Ill.
Cox	Jensen	Reed, N. Y.
Crawford	Johnson	Rees
Curtis	Jonas	Rhodes
Dague	Jones, Mo.	Ribicoff
Davenport	Judd	Rich
Davis, Ga.	Kean	Riehlman
Davis, Wis.	Kearney	Rivers
DeGraffenried	Kearns	Rogers, Mass.
Delaney	Keating	Sadlak
D'Ewart	Keefe	St. George
Dolliver	Kennedy	Sanborn
Dondero	Kilburn	Sasscer
Donohue	Kilday	Saylor
Eaton	Kirwan	Scott, Hardie
Eberharter	Latham	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Ellsworth	LeCompte	Scrivner
Elston	LeFevre	Scudder
Engle, Calif.	Lichtenwalter	Shafer
Short	Taber	Welch
Sikes	Tackett	Werdel
Simpson, Ill.	Talle	Wheeler
Simpson, Pa.	Thomas	Whitten
Smith, Kans.	Thompson	Whittington
Smith, Va.	Towe	Widnall
Smith, Wis.	Van Zandt	Wigglesworth
Spence	Velde	Wilson, Ind.
Stanley	Vorys	Wilson, Tex.
Steed	Vursell	Wolcott
Stefan	Wadsworth	Wolverton
Stigler	Walter	Wood
Stockman	Weichel	Woodruff

NAYS—144

Addonizio	Hagen	Murdock
Albert	Hart	Murphy
Bailey	Havenner	Noland
Baring	Hays, Ark.	Norton
Bates, Ky	Hays, Ohio	O'Konski
Battle	Heffernan	O'Sullivan
Beckworth	Heller	O'Toole
Bennett, Fla.	Holifield	Passman
Bentsen	Howell	Patman
Biemiller	Huber	Perkins
Blatnik	Hull	Phillips, Tenn.
Boggs, La.	Irving	Polk
Bolling	Jackson, Wash.	Powell
Bosone	Jacobs	Preston
Breen	Javits	Price
Brown, Ga	Jones, Ala	Rabaut
Bryson	Jones, N. C.	Rains
Burdick	Karst	Rankin
Burke	Karsten	Richards
Burnside	Kee	Rodino
Camp	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Fla.
Canfield	Keogh	Rooney
Carlyle	Kerr	Roosevelt
Carnahan	King	Sheppard
Carroll	Klein	Sims
Cavalcante	Kruse	Staggers
Christopher	Lane	Sullivan
Combs	Lanham	Sutton
Crook	Larcade	Tauriello
Crosser	Lemke	Thornberry
Deane	Lesinski	Tollefson
Denton	Lynch	Trimble
Dingell	McCarthy	Underwood
Dollinger	McKinnon	Vinson
Doughton	McSweeney	Wagner
Doyle	Mack, Ill.	Walsh
Durham	Mack, Wash.	White, Calif.
Elliott	Madden	White, Idaho
Engel, Mich.	Mansfield	Wickersham
Evins	Marshall	Wier
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	Williams
Fogarty	Mills	Willis
Garmatz	Mitchell	Wilson, Okla.
Gathings	Monroney	Winstead
Gorski	Morgan	Withrow
Grant	Morris	Woodhouse
Gregory	Moulder	Young
Gross	Multer	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—48

Allen, La.	Hedrick	Plumley
Barden	Herter	Poage
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman, Ill.	Redden
Brooks	Jackson, Calif.	Regan
Buckley, N. Y.	Jennings	Sabath
Bulwinkle	Kelley, Pa.	Sadowski
Cannon	Kunkel	Secrest
Chudoff	Lyle	Shelley
Coudert	McGrath	Smathers
Cunningham	Marcantonio	Smith, Ohio
Davies, N. Y.	Morrison	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Murray, Wis.	Teague
Dawson	O'Brien, Mich.	Whitaker
Douglas	O'Neill	Worley
Furcolo	Pace	Yates
Gilmer	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	
Golden		

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Yates against.

Mr. Secrest for, with Mr. O'Brien of Michigan against.

Mr. Kunkel for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Marcantonio against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. McGrath against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Allen of Louisiana against.

Mr. Teague for, with Mrs. Douglas against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Chudoff against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Buckley of New York against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Cannon with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Smathers with Mr. Golden.

Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Redden with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Regan with Mr. Cunningham.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CARROLL moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill S. 1008 be instructed to insist upon the House amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the motion to instruct conferees be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to lay on the table the motion to instruct conferees.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CARROLL and Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana) there were—ayes 114, noes 100.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 211, nays 161, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—211

Abernethy	Davenport	Holmes
Allen, Calif.	Davies, N. Y.	Hope
Allen, Ill.	Davis, Ga.	Horan
Andersen, H Carl	Davis, Wis.	James
Andresen, August H.	Delaney	Jenison
Andrews	D'Ewart	Jenkins
Angell	Dolliver	Jennings
Arends	Donohue	Jensen
Auchincloss	Eaton	Johnson
Barrett, Pa.	Eberharter	Jonas
Barrett, Wyo.	Ellsworth	Jones, Mo.
Bates, Mass.	Elston	Judd
Beall	Fallon	Kean
Bennett, Mich.	Fellows	Kearney
Bishop	Fenton	Kearns
Blackney	Fernandez	Keefe
Bolton, Md.	Fisher	Kilburn
Bolton, Ohio	Flood	Kilday
Bonner	Ford	Kirwan
Boykin	Frazier	Latham
Bramblett	Fugate	LeCompte
Brehm	Fulton	LeFevre
Brown, Ohio	Gamble	Lichtenwalter
Buchanan	Gary	Lind
Buckley, Ill.	Gavin	Linehan
Burleson	Gillette	Lovre
Burton	Goodwin	Lucas
Byrne, N. Y.	Gordon	McConnell
Byrnes, Wis.	Gossett	McCulloch
Case, N J.	Graham	McDonough
Case, S. Dak.	Granahan	McGregor
Celler	Grant	McGuire
Chelf	Green	McMillan, S C.
Chesney	Gwinn	McMillen, Ill.
Chiperfield	Hall, Leonard W.	Macy
Church	Halleck	Magee
Clemente	Harden	Mahon
Clevenger	Hardy	Martin, Iowa
Cole, Kans.	Hare	Martin, Mass.
Cooley	Harris	Mason
Corbett	Harrison	Merrow
Cotton	Harvey	Meyer
Cox	Herlong	Michener
Crawford	Hill	Miles
Cunningham	Hinshaw	Miller, Md.
Curtis	Hobbs	Miller, Nebr.
Dague	Hoeven	Nelson
	Hoffman, Mich.	Nicholson
		Norblad

O'Brien, Ill	Rogers, Mass.	Stigler
O'Hara, Ill	Sadlak	Stockman
O'Hara, Minn.	St. George	Taber
O'Neill	Sanborn	Tackett
Patterson	Sasscer	Talle
Peterson	Saylor	Van Zandt
Pfeiffer, William L.	Scott, Hardie	Velde
	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Vorys
Phillbin	Scrivner	Vursell
Phillips, Calif.	Scudder	Wadsworth
Pickett	Shafer	Walter
Plumley	Short	Weichel
Potter	Sikes	Werdel
Quinn	Simpson, Ill.	Whitten
Reed, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.	Whittington
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Kans.	Widnall
Rees	Smith, Va.	Wigglesworth
Rhodes	Smith, Wis.	Wilson, Ind.
Ribicoff	Spence	Wilson, Tex.
Rich	Stanley	Wolcott
Riehlman	Steed	Wolverton
Rivers	Stefan	Wood
Rogers, Fla.		Woodruff

NAYS—161

Abbitt	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Multer
Addonizio	Hand	Murdock
Albert	Hart	Murphy
Aspinall	Havenner	Murray, Tenn.
Bailey	Hays, Ark.	Noland
Baring	Hays, Ohio	Norton
Bates, Ky	Hébert	O'Konski
Battle	Heller	O'Sullivan
Beckworth	Heselton	O'Toole
Bennett, Fla.	Holifield	Passman
Bentsen	Howell	Patman
Blemiller	Huber	Patten
Blatnik	Hull	Perkins
Boggs, La.	Irving	Phillips, Tenn.
Bolling	Jackson, Wash.	Polk
Bosone	Jacobs	Poulson
Breen	Javits	Powell
Bryson	Jones, Ala.	Preston
Burdick	Jones, N. C.	Price
Burke	Karst	Priest
Burnside	Karsten	Rabaut
Camp	Keating	Rains
Canfield	Kee	Rankin
Carlyle	Kelly, N. Y.	Richards
Carnahan	Keogh	Rodino
Carroll	Kerr	Rooney
Cavalcante	King	Roosevelt
Chatham	Klein	Sims
Christopher	Kruse	Staggers
Combs	Lane	Sullivan
Cooper	Lanham	Sutton
Crook	Larcade	Taurlello
Crosser	Lemke	Thompson
Deane	Lesinski	Thornberry
DeGraffenried	Lodge	Tollefson
Denton	Lynch	Trimble
Dingell	McCarthy	Underwood
Dollinger	McCormack	Vinson
Doughton	McKinnon	Wagner
Doyle	McSweeney	Walsh
Durham	Mack, Ill.	Welch
Elliott	Mack, Wash.	Wheeler
Engel, Mich.	Madden	White, Calif.
Evins	Mansfield	White, Idaho
Feighan	Marsalis	Wickersham
Forand	Marshall	Wier
Garmatz	Miller, Calif.	Williams
Gathings	Mills	Willis
Gore	Mitchell	Wilson, Okla.
Gorski	Monroney	Winstead
Granger	Morgan	Withrow
Gregory	Morris	Woodhouse
Gross	Moulder	Young
Hagen		Zablocki

NOT VOTING—60

Allen, La.	Golden	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Anderson, Calif.	Hale	Poage
Barden	Hedrick	Ramsay
Boggs, Del.	Heffernan	Redden
Brooks	Herter	Regan
Brown, Ga.	Hoffman, Ill.	Sabath
Buckley, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Sadowski
Bulwinkle	Kelley, Pa.	Secrest
Cannon	Kennedy	Shelley
Chudoff	Kunkel	Sheppard
Cole, N. Y.	Lyle	Smathers
Colmer	McGrath	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Marcantonio	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Morrison	Teague
Dawson	Morton	Thomas
Dondero	Murray, Wis.	Towe
Douglas	Nixon	Whitaker
Engle, Calif.	Norrell	Worley
Fogarty	O'Brien, Mich.	Yates
Furcolo	Pace	
Gilmer		

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Yates against.

Mr. Secrest for, with Mr. O'Brien of Michigan against.

Mr. Kunkel for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Marcantonio against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. McGrath against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Allen of Louisiana against.

Mr. Teague for, with Mrs. Douglas against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Chudoff against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Thomas for, with Mr. Buckley of New York against.

Mr Kennedy for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Cannon with Mr. Golden.

Mr. Smathers with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Dondero.

Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Redden with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr Regan with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Nixon.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, WALTER, WILLIS, MICHENER, and CASE of New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the basing-point bill, S. 1008.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4846) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4846) to establish the National Science Foundation, with Mr. THOMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. On yesterday the Committee agreed that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point. Are there further amendments?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRIEST: On page 16, line 18, strike out "1923, as amended" and insert in lieu thereof "1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURHAM: On page 20, line 8, after the word "of", strike out the word "atomic" and substitute the word "nuclear."

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the reason that at the present time it is not very clear whether or not the word "atomic" covers the new process of the hydrogen bomb. This language will, in the opinion of the members of the committee, clarify it to a certain extent.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, we are very happy to accept this amendment. I am sure the gentleman from North Carolina has stated adequate reasons why it should be accepted and we are willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 20, line 24, strike out "annually"; and in line 25, strike out beginning with "such" through the period in line 1 on page 21, and insert "not to exceed $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and not to exceed $15,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege for nearly 8 years out of this my 10 years' service in the Congress to be a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House. During this time a great many bills have come from our committee affecting the welfare and security of our Nation. I do not believe, however, there has been any legislation from the committee more important and necessary to our future security than this proposal for a National Science Foundation.

I am not presently on the Public Health Subcommittee, and, therefore, did not participate in the hearings conducted by the subcommittee during this Congress. I did participate in the extensive hearings we held in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I participated in the consideration of this proposal at that time as a member of a subcommittee designated to try to perfect the most desirable bill if possible. A bill was reported but it was in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress and was not considered by the House.

It was again proposed in the Eightieth Congress. We did not have subcommittees in the Eightieth Congress under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. All legislation was

considered by the whole committee. A bill establishing a National Science Foundation was reported and passed by this Congress. I was privileged to be a member of the conference committee between the Senate and the House. We worked out the differences and passed the bill which was vetoed by the President, because of administrative policy it contained in connection with the establishment of the Board and appointment of the Director.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, I believe that I am somewhat familiar with this proposed legislation, its purposes, design, and need.

I have been somewhat impressed with the debate yesterday and today. I have been especially interested in the fears that have been expressed in connection with this proposal. Obviously many Members are justified in raising this or that question but Mr. Chairman, this is not a glorified piece of legislation. It is not setting up a foundation as some would have us believe that would absorb and take over all scientific research in every field from private or public institutions and organizations. There is nothing to the contention that this would be a super duper agency that becomes all powerful over any other activity including educational institutions where scientific research programs are carried on.

This is a program proposed out of an experience with which all of us are familiar. It is a program out of recognizing in an emergency that we in this country were sadly lacking in a most fundamental problem, inevitably affecting our future progress and security.

As has been explained, President Roosevelt, in 1941, directed Dr. Vannevar Bush, then director of the wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development, to prepare a report on the need for a post war science program. Out of that report filed July 19, 1945, Science: The Endless Frontier, came the basis for science foundation legislation which we have here today. This is not a hurried, ill-conceived piece of legislation. It is a carefully considered proposal for now nearly 10 years.

Shortly after the submission of the report in the Seventy-ninth Congress, my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], introduced the first bill along with Senator MAGNUSON, based on the careful and scientific study contained in the report. Mr. MILLS appeared before our committee in that Congress and the hearings will reveal that he made a most commendable contribution, in the initial consideration of this legislation. He deserves much credit in initiating this program and I want to pay tribute to him now where tribute is justly due.

Now the real need, Mr. Chairman, for this legislation. As was said by Dr. Compton: "Rest upon the major requirement in this country with respect to science." It has a dual or two-fold purpose. First, to supplement private resources available for the support of basic research; and second, the training of scientists.

No one can deny that these two fundamental needs are absolute requirements if we are going to continue our place in world affairs and assume our leadership to which we are committed for a just and enduring peace.

I have offered this amendment placing a limitation of $500,000 for the first year 1951 and $15,000,000 annually thereafter. The bill as presented does not place any ceiling or limitation in its authorization which has caused many to express deep concern and I think, justifiably so.

I am just as concerned about the continuous Government spending, our Federal budget, deficit spending and high taxes, as any Member of this Congress I am convinced that it is imperative that we adjust our fiscal affairs, to not only live within the budget but that we should start applying something on the huge war debt that hangs over our heads.

But I am also concerned about the future security of our Nation. Unless we keep the pace and ahead in basic research we can have no real security. When it comes to these matters, I believe sincerely necessary to our future, I think it behooves us to reduce the appropriation in some other lesser important field and place first things first, and I consider this among the first.

The record shows there is no need for a huge sum of $100,000,000 or more but that this program in basic research delving into the unknown, under the Foundation of 24 Board members and Executive Committee and a Director would cost approximately $15,000,000 the first year and level off at $25,000,000 at the end of 4 or 5 years. This is the program contemplated by the administration.

But to assure the membership of this House that this is a limited program in comparison with the $544,000,000 or more conducted by the National Defense, Army, Navy, and other agencies, most of which is in applied science, I propose this limitation, a minimum recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the first year and each year following, or annual appropriations.

I do this, Mr. Chairman, after consultation with other members of the committee for an additional reason than the question of cost and increased burden. This will make it necessary for the Foundation to come back to this committee and to the Congress and give a full account of its activities and show the need for any additional funds or expression.

The purposes of the bill are stated briefly in the report which I will not again take the time to outline, but in addition to the explanation of these purposes it is my belief that the correlating of these research programs in basic science will not only give us a program imperative to our future, but will in my opinion ultimately reduce this burden and cost in the entire scientific field. We cannot and should not overlook such an important possibility.

The development of the atomic bomb cost the taxpayers of this country over $2,000,000,000. We were in a war emergency. It was a trial and error effort. The cost, of course, was excessive. I do not know if a program such as this proposed had been under way if it would have saved any money or not. We do know that Dr. Bush and other great scientists and educators have emphasized the possibility.

We could relate many experiments carried on in basic science research, tremendously affecting the health and welfare of the individual. In our short span of time, we have seen the effect of this research work.

It has been nearly five years since the ending of the war. I am also greatly concerned at the apparent attitude and feeling that prevails. I have seen it gradually develop and it disturbs me beyond expression.

At the end of the war most everyone throughout this country was determined that we should place the greatest possible emphasis toward efforts to assure that such another world tragedy would never occur again. Read the records of this Congress in those years. Go back and review the headlines in the papers. You will be reminded of the determination of our people toward future peace and security.

We made commitments, costly commitments. We entered upon a program of peace, United Nations organization and various other costly programs to bring about a just peace and prevent Communist aggression and other totalitarian effort to rule the world.

Yes, that was at the end of the war, but Mr. Chairman, how easy it is to forget in such a short time when the matter of our security is at stake. We all said during those years that we must remain strong, militarily and otherwise, but how easy it is to become complacent, and in the hope that it cannot happen again. We cannot afford to ever again adopt the cannot-happen attitude. So let us adopt this amendment, placing this limitation and prepare the way for the development of scientists in the country and the encouragement of research efforts among all groups, private and public, that there may be no doubt as to our place in the future of a troubled and unsteady world.

This amendment places a limitation for the first fiscal year, 1951, of $500,000. That is the amount contained in the budget submitted for fiscal year 1951, to get the organization started and underway. This is for administrative expenses. It will take some time to get it going. Then it further provides a limitation of $15,000,000 for each fiscal year therafter. That takes into account the fact that the Bureau of the Budget says that in the first year of the program after it gets underway and to make an effective program, they should have $15,000,000; that is contract authority, administrative expense, funds for scholarships and fellowships, and so forth.

In addition, it is expected that in the course of about 5 years the cost will reach a level, perhaps, of $25,000,000 a year. In limiting the authorization in the first active year to $15,000,000 and each year following, it will be necessary for the Foundation to come back to the committee and the Congress and give a report of its activities, its organizational

work as to the progress and success of the program in the first few years, and obtain increased authorizations if it needs to expand as requested to accomplish the purposes of the act. If the Foundation can show that it should have additional authority and additional funds, it will then give the Congress an opportunity to determine, when a proper showing is made, that it should have the additional authority for such expansion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In connection with the limitation on the dollars, does the gentleman's amendment do anything in the limitation of the range of power of the Commission as to its supervision over other research work?

Mr. HARRIS. I think the bill itself provides that, and you will find in various sections, particularly in the policy section, the purposes of the bill, and also in subsection (h), which was discussed on the floor yesterday, at which time the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] participated rather extensively and very timely.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman then feels that this money will be applied to basic research?

Mr. HARRIS. To basic research, yes, except in connection with national defense matters.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman did not point out, I believe, that the purpose of deliberately limiting this to $15,000,000, although it is planned that it will go more than that in, say, the second year, is to bring it back not only to Congress, but to bring it back to this legislative committee which brought this legislation in. I want to commend the gentleman on his amendment. We all have great respect for this great committee. We feel that this committee can review it much more amply when it is a going concern.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman. I have just discussed this matter with the Bureau of the Budget. As has been explained, the first year is the organizational year in which the $500,000 for administrative expenses would be needed. The second year it is estimated that it will probably cost about $5,000,000 in getting the program under way, and probably the second year it will be increased to $10,000,000, and perhaps the third year to $15,000,000, and so on, until it reaches its level. But after it goes beyond the $15,000,000 limitation, it will be necessary then for the foundation to come back to the Congress. Then we certainly can find out just what has been going on, what they plan to do, and just how effective the program is at that time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think it would be well to call the atention of the House to subsection (b) on page 21, where it states:

> Appropriations made pursuant to the authority provided in subsection (a) of this section shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in the acts making such appropriations.

This leaves the question of how long they shall be available pretty much up to the Appropriations Committee and the House pursuant to its action.

Mr. HARRIS Of course; naturally, when they come back it will be the responsibility of the committee and the Congress to take a look at the entire picture again.

One reason for placing this at the $15,000,000 level, and I thought about 5 or 7½ million level, was that they tell me that they will have some difficulty in getting the top scientists of the country to participate in the program if we make the authorization too low. I think that is a highly important matter. In other words, as one expressed it, they might take the attitude, perhaps, "Well, it is just a bugaboo program set up with nothing much to do, and we will not fool with it." I think that is highly important, because if it is to be an effective program the outstanding scientists of this country will have to participate, and I am sure they will participate.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON to the amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS. After "exceed" strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

Mr HESELTON. Unfortunately, the copy of the budget I had is temporarily mislaid. Let me ask the gentleman from Arkansas if we are not in accord that the budget itself says not only in figures in two places but in text that all they can spend in 1951 effectively is $500,000?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true, and that is the reason I made it $500,000 for the first year for administrative expenses.

Mr. HESELTON. That is right. I commend the gentleman for going that far, but I think the House is entitled to a clear opportunity here on as to how far it wants to go in the next year in the absence of any defined program and without anything like exact estimates.

There are many differences of opinion as to how far this program will go. Nobody knows. Nobody can accurately tell you what the figure will be. However, in the first annual report of the President's Scientific Research Board, on August 27, 1947, this language appears at page 31:

> The Federal Government should spend about $50,000,000 for support of basic research outside its own laboratories in 1949. From that point grants for basic research should increase rapidly until they reach an annual rate—

Not of $10,000,000, not of $15,000 000, but—

> of at least $250,000,000 by 1957.

Yet, at page 26 of the same report there is the following language:

> As a nation, we should spend each year no less than 1 percent of our national income for research and development the physical and biological sciences, including medicine.

It is true that the Board is talking in terms of national income for research and development which is an all-inclusive term beyond both the basic research we are now discussing and the much larger field of even applied research. That is one enormous difficulty in considering this problem because we find fixed into Government terminology and in budget presentations the general term of research and development.

Then consider another paragraph in that report:

> We will have the trained manpower to support a program of this magnitude by 1957. Assuming in that year a national income of over $200,000,000,000, our national research budget should then be more than $2,000,000,000.

Again, this is a suggested figure of $2,000,000,000 over all, and although it defines it as our national research budget, as I read the paragraph it is referring to basic and applied research and development in the Federal Government, in other public bodies, in industry, and in our universities and colleges

Nevertheless, I call your attention to the specific language of still a third paragraph on page 27. After discussing the sharp decline in endowment income, the limiting of sources of new endowment funds by taxation, and other factors, the Board states:

> In view of these considerations, we should anticipate Federal expenditures in support of research and development of more than $1,000,000,000 a year by 1957.

Then I am confronted, and I think all of us are confronted, with a very practical dilemma. Yesterday I pointed out that the Budget, at page 1118, lists expenditures for research and development as actually $940,000,000 in 1949, $964,000,000 estimated in 1950, and $953,000,000 estimated in 1951.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has shown me another tabulation which I understand to be an official one indicating that already the Federal budget requests are far in excess of $1,000,000,000 this year and steadily mounting.

It occurs to me that this is primarily because of the wide scope of what is called research in the Federal Government and perhaps because it appears that very substantial expenditures for construction of facilities are not classified as strictly research and development I pointed out yesterday that there is a request for construction at Langley Field, Va., which is, I think, carried in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1949 with an item of $1,000,000. I do not know whether this is classified strictly as research or not. I pointed out that the medical-research facilities at Bethesda are being ex-

pended, that the principal building is now in its second year of construction with a clinical center and a research laboratory to be equipped with 500 research beds for clinical research in cancer, heart, metabolic, and infectious diseases.

Certainly this is an excellent program of which I am sure we all approve but let me point out that the budget calls for an appropriation of $15,125,000 which is in addition to the $18,100,000 appropriated to date. Here again I do not know whether that is classified as within the research program or, rather, treated as a construction item.

My whole point is that I do not think that, with all due respect to the many people who have been interested in this matter and are interested in this matter, anyone is in a position to state with exactness, whether we will require one, two, three, five, or fifteen million dollars, as suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] and others; $25,000,000, as others so persuasively suggest as a minimum; $27,500,000, as still others suggest, or even $250,000,000, for basic research as far off as 1957. In view of all these contradictions, and for that reason, I am suggesting $1,000,000 as a ceiling in 1952. Concededly, that is an arbitrary limitation. If someone wishes to place it at $5,000,000 or $7,500,000 and can produce further evidence to support that as a figure, I should be inclined to support that amendment. But I do want to leave the record entirely clear that, in my opinion, we should deal with the facts as they are contained in the recommendations of the President in his budget message, should have presented to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee a continuing report of the development of the National Science Foundation program with accurate estimates as to what may be required in fiscal 1951, so that we will be prepared to act intelligently on any further authorization in 1952 and prepared during the ensuing 11 months to state with some authority to the House what we believe to be a proper ceiling.

Let me conclude this phase of my explanation of the reasons for this amendment with one paragraph from the Board's report at page 25.

> What is here proposed, therefore, is not a maximum, but a minimum annual national research and development budget for the future—a budget below which we cannot afford to fall. It is in the nature of a recommended floor for expenditures, rather than an optimum ceiling.

We have been talking now about a ceiling. Too frequently we have found that any ceiling becomes a floor. I commend the Board for its frankness in including this paragraph in its report and I am entirely sincere in making that statement. I have repeatedly commended this Board for the work it has done and for these excellent reports. I recognize the limitations under which it had to work, both as to time, as to funds and personnel available, and as to the extreme complexity of the subject matter with which it was dealing. But, as my chief witness on this point, I believe that the Board has proven beyond any reasonable doubt that no wise, sound figure can be suggested by any one for the fiscal year 1952. I wish the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] had taken the clear limitation recommended by the budget for fiscal 1951 and stopped there. Since he did not do so, I want the record clear as to my reasons for questioning the wisdom of placing any limitation on fiscal 1952 until we have sufficient knowledge of the program and of its requirements so that we can approve a reasonable authorization. Surely, if this bill passes and becomes law, all those interested in creating the Foundation and making it operate successfully are going to believe that the majority of this and future Congresses will recognize the necessity of supporting a soundly conceived and well administered program. Personally, I believe we can count on our scientists, engineers and other technicians to work effectively to develop such a program and to implement it. I think of them first as loyal Americans willing and anxious to work with us in the interest of the security, the economic well-being and the health of the United States. The overwhelming majority of them, with rare exceptions indeed, proved that conclusively in the crucial days in 1940–45. I certainly credit them with as much interest in and devotion to this country's security now as then and I would be amazed if as many as 6 of them declined a request to assist in creating a sound structure and program for this Foundation. We all know that public service is something this Nation has never had to buy. Why should we fear that our history would reverse itself between now and the early months of 1952?

I think the Members are entitled to all the information the committee can develop.

I have the highest regard for my friend from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] and all the members of this committee. I know they are sincere and I know they are worried, and I am worried and that is one fundamental reason for my support of this bill.

I said yesterday that in the Defense Department in research alone they have been able to cut back in 2 years $82,000,000.

I urge upon you to realize there is reason to believe if we put this law into effect and set up an effective agency, instead of increasing the cost of government, to the extent of $105,000,000 as outlined in the budget requests of agencies other than the national defense for 1950 and 1951, we can and we should save a substantial portion. Is that wishful thinking? I do not think so. If the Defense Department has attacked this thing realistically and has applied standards and has created a balanced program, as it surely has, then through the medium of the National Science Foundation, if we make this a law, we can hope not only to save all which involved even in this proposed ceiling for 1952, but many more millions of dollars. Have I any ground for saying that? I think so. This morning I talked with an executive officer in the National Defense Department. I know this is not considered classified information. I was told that out of the military budget they can turn over a minimum of $15,000,000 or a maximum of $20,000,000 in the current funds to this newly created science foundation. I concede that that will not cover scholarships. But let us be realistic about it. It will set this program going. This is the Defense Department only. What of the others? And I remain unconvinced that we can hope to start the fellowship and scholarship program going until 1952 at the earliest.

This is not the measure which has passed the other body. I personally believe it is a much better and more refined version. It has to go to conference. We can get more information and our conference committee can iron this out. But why should we project ourselves clear into 1952 by saying, "You have permission to go up to $15,000,000." Remember that is a minimum and I predict it will be so construed irrespective of what any of us say here during this debate.

I say the situation is one where we should, as the gentleman from New York has so ably suggested, stop, look, and listen. I do not want to wreck this program and I do not believe I am doing so. This is not intended as and it is not a crippling amendment. It should help to gain support for the bill and the Foundation. It is translating the President's budget message to a dollar, as I read that message. If the President and the Budget Bureau are right, I am right. If they are wrong, I shall be open-minded as to any other figure. But no one yet has offered reasons for another figure. I am concerned about some of the figures which I gave to the committee yesterday about what they are doing in Soviet Russia. They are not my figures. They come from the Department of National Defense. I call your attention to the fact that these are figures from behind the iron curtain which are believed to be accurate. The budget of the Soviet Union for 1947 is reported to provide $1,200,000,000 for this purpose as compared with outlays of $900,000,000 in 1946. What were we doing in 1949? We were spending $940,000,000.

Then there is something more.

I am told our Government does not have any figure it can isolate. But through 1948 and 1949, the total military expenditures of Soviet Russia appear to have increased by about 20 percent. But listen to this. At the same time expenditures for scientific research and development appear to have increased 80 percent. Those are increases over 1947.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the consideration of my colleagues. These final remarks move me to a deep conviction that I must support this bill. I shall support it, even though this amendment is defeated. I want the matter to go back to the committee with a new program that we can analyze. It will under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]. It will also under my

amendment. We are reaching out. We do not have any standard, any guide, any yardstick, except what we have here. The President's board frankly admits that this report constitutes only a partial analysis. We are trying to organize an effective agency without knowing what any foundation or other agency is going to do.

Now, what is our situation with regard to scientists? The Department of National Defense advised me, according to their latest figures they have for Russia, those for 1949, and this includes, apparently, all higher education, they have a pool of 450,000 specialists and 218,000 engineers, and also 232,000 teachers, doctors, and health officers. I understand that some of the latter group probably are scientists. That ought to give us something to pause and think about.

How did we stand here? I pointed out yesterday that because of the war we went back from 2,034 graduate Ph. D.'s in 1941 to 833 in 1945. We have come back slowly; 948 in 1946, 1,464 in 1947, 1,947 in 1948, and 2,320 last year. It is expected that this figure will stay about there, because our GI educational program is diminishing. That is, unless we have this bill as a law.

Turning to those receiving engineering degrees: In 1941, 17,800; in 1949, 45,000; in 1950, an estimate of 50,000. That is encouraging. But consider the estimates for 1951 and 1952. A drop of 13,000 in 1951 to 37,000. A drop of another 9,000 in 1952 to 28,000. Almost half.

How about bachelors of science: 1949, 28,000; 1950, 42,000; 1951, 44,000. After that, what? Another trend downward. I repeat, unless we have this bill as a law and an effective foundation functioning.

I do not have the information as to what they did in Russia, although I am searching for all I can obtain that is not classified security data. But Soviet Russia went into a 5-year program in 1947, and this is 1949. Under that program the Defense Department said Russia was reported to be producing 140,000 engineers and scientists each year. We are producing 80,320. That is 140,000 against 80,320. If they succeed in Russia, that will be 700,000 by 1952. Unless we act in this body we will have trained a little over half that number—about 400,000.

Are we willing to take the awful responsibility of disregarding the measured recommendation of the National Defense Department in its report filed December 30 last:

They—

The Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force—

are also supporting the proposed legislation for a National Science Foundation.

Does anyone dare suggest that General Bradley, General Collins, Admiral Sherman, General Cates, and General Vandenberg would approve such a flat recommendation without knowing the text of the bill which passed the other body in May 1948 by a vote of 79 to 8, or without knowledge of the contents of this bill as reported by our committee more than 6 months before that report of the National Defense Department? Are we willing to discard the intelligent testimony in support of this bill since Dr. Vannevar Bush undertook the difficult task in November 1944 to prepare a report on the postwar science program? Does not his brilliant report of July 1945, Science: The Endless Frontier, count as any evidence for us? Are we to brush aside the testimony of Dr. Bronk, president of Johns Hopkins University, and Chairman of the National Research Council, when he warns us:

I need not remind you that certain potential enemies of this country are fully aware of the power of science in their efforts for military strength and military power.

And adds:

Because of that consideration alone I take it that a National Science Foundation is of the utmost importance to the Nation and to the security of the Nation.

I beg that you read the short 3½-page statement by Dr. Karl T. Compton at page 112 of the hearings, when he testified as the representative of the National Military Establishment, as Chairman of the Research and Development Board, and as president of M. I. T. Read the searching questions of my colleagues of the subcommittee and his revealing answers. Recall his magnificent record in the war before you close your mind to his advice.

Then please read the six-paragraph letter on page 142 of the hearings dated March 30, 1949, and signed by the chairman of the committee on science legislation of the Engineers Joint Council, in company with scientists from California Institute of Technology, Johns Hopkins University, Carnegie Institute of Technology, University of Illinois, New York University College of Medicine, University of Minnesota, University of Colorado, and by Mr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana.

Then look at the list inserted by my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], on February 27 at pages 2409 and 2410 of scientific organizations, educational and research institutions, national organizations, Government officials, and outstanding scientists and Americans stated to be in support of this proposal. Among the individuals, I call your attention to the late Gen. Hap Arnold; President Conant, of Harvard; President Doherty, of Carnegie Institute of Technology; Dean Hammond, School of Engineering, the Pennsylvania State College; Dean Saville, of the College of Engineering, New York University; Dr. Oppenheimer, Director of the Manhattan project; Dr. Urey, University of Chicago; Dr. Smyth, Princeton University; of President Day, Cornell University; of Dean Blake, Yale School of Medicine; of Dr. Sinnott, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University; Dr. Stanley, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research; President Carmichael, Tufts College; of President Stearns, University of Colorado; of Chancelor Gustavson, University of Nebraska; and of Rev. J. C. S. O'Donnell, president of Notre Dame University.

Finally, I hope you will just look at the brief quotation from the unanimous report and recommendation of the 12 commissioners of the so-called Hoover Commission filed with Congress on March 25, 1949, which I placed in the RECORD for February 27 at pages 2420 and 2421.

Does all this overwhelming evidence count as nothing in our serious consideration of this problem? We have had two full sessions and undoubtedly will not reach a vote tonight. I hope that what the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have been trying to do in expressing their support of and their reasons for supporting this legislation will enable each of you to understand this complex and intricate problem. I am confident that the bill will pass by a substantial majority. If my efforts have contributed anything toward a decision on the part of any of you which will be satisfactory to you in years to come, I shall be more than repaid. I hope that no one of us will approach the vote, perhaps on next Thursday, without a more complete understanding of the problem and of the solution recommended, so that our votes can reflect our mature and considered judgment as to what I believe to be one of the most challenging and, even, frightening situations which has ever confronted our Nation. In terms of its security and in terms of its future economic welfare and development, in terms of the continued improved health of its people, I sincerely hope that all those of you who have any doubts at this moment can resolve them in favor of this legislation when we discuss it again either tomorrow or on Thursday.

Under permission I received in the House, I now include three significant tables for your consideration. I call your particular attention to the marked difference between expenditures in 1947 in the War and Navy Departments for basic research and for applied research and development. I am informed that there is not a very substantial variation in the situation as of this time.

TABLE II—*The national research and development budget 1947* (excluding atomic energy)*

[In millions]

Agency	Total	Expenditures in 1947	
		Basic research	Applied research and development
Total	$1,160	$110	$1,050
Federal Government	625	55	570
War and Navy Departments	500	35	465
Other departments	125	20	105
Industry	450	10	440
University	45	35	10
Other	40	10	30

Distribution of Federal funds

	Total	War and Navy	Other
Total	$625	$500	$125
Government laboratories	200	100	100
Industrial and university laboratories on contracts	425	400	25

*See appendix II for sources of estimates.

TABLE III.—*National research and development budget for 1957*

[In millions]

Type of activity	Amount	Proportion of total budget
Basic research	$440	20
Health and medical research	300	14
Nonmilitary development	1,000	44
Military development	500	22

Federal research expenditures, by agency, fiscal year 1947

[In thousands]

Agency	Expenditures	
	Amount	Percent of total
Grand total	$623,930	100.0
Navy Department	262,000	42.0
War Department	237,000	38.0
Agriculture Department	31,328	5.0
Interior Department	30,358	4.9
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	27,000	4.3
Federal Security Agency	13,236	2.1
Commerce Department	10,494	1.7
Federal Loan Agency (RFC)	4,699	.8
Tennessee Valley Authority	3,654	.6
Veterans' Administration	2,523	.4
Federal Works Agency	822	.1
Smithsonian Institution	309	(1)
Treasury Department	220	(1)
Federal Communications Commission	200	(1)
Maritime Commission	87	(1)

[1] Less than 0.05 percent

I also think it would be useful to my colleagues to have before them the survey of research and development units of the Federal Government and I call your attention to the fact that this list is suggestive, not inclusive. Consider the fact that it is reported that approximately 90 percent of the national military defense work in this field is let by contract rather than done in our Federal laboratories and I am sure you will understand why the committee wanted to provide flexibility so far as our national defense over-all program is concerned:

APPENDIX I

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT UNITS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT[1]

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Office of Experiment Stations: Stations in United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.
Bureau of Animal Industry.
Bureau of Dairy Industry.
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering.
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.
Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics.
Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry: Northern Laboratory, Southern Laboratory, Eastern Laboratory, Western Laboratory.
Agricultural Research Center (Beltsville).
The Forest Service: Forest Products Laboratory.
Soil Conservation Service.
Production and Marketing Administration.
Farm Credit Administration.

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

National Bureau of Standards.
Civil Aeronautics Administration.
Weather Bureau.
Coastal and Geodetic Survey.
Office of Technical Services.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Mines.
Bureau of Reclamation.
Fish and Wildlife Service.
Geological Survey.
National Park Service.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

United States Public Health Service: National Institute of Health.
St. Elizabeths Hospital.
Food and Drug Administration.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Operating Divisions.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

Office of Naval Research: Planning Division, Naval Research Laboratory, Special Devices Center, Underwater Sound Reference Laboratory.
Office of Chief, Naval Operations: Naval Observatory, Hydrographic Office, Operational Development and Evaluation.
Bureau of Ships: Electronics Division, Research and Standards Section, David W. Taylor Model Basin, Navy Electronics Laboratory, Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory, Navy Code and Signal Laboratory, Naval Boiler and Turbine Laboratory, Material Laboratory, Industrial Test Laboratory, Navy Mine Countermeasure Station.
Bureau of Aeronautics: Engineering Division, Humm Laboratory, Naval Aeronautics Laboratory, Naval Air Experimental Station, Naval Air Test Center, Naval Air Missile Test Center, Naval Air Material Center.
Bureau of Yards and Docks: Planning and Design Department.
Bureau of Ordnance: Research and Development Division, Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Naval Ordnance Development Unit, Naval Ordnance Test Station, Naval Aviation Ordnance Test Station, Point Mugu Special Weapons Center.
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery: Research Division, Medical Field Research Laboratory, Medical Research Department, Naval Institute of Tropical Medicine, Naval Medical Research Institute.

UNITED STATES ARMY TECHNICAL SERVICES

Chemical Corps: Edgewood Arsenal, Camp Detrick, Dugway Proving Ground, San Jose project.
Medical Department: Army Medical Center, Army Industrial Hygiene Laboratory, Army Institute of Pathology, Medical Department Field Research Laboratory, Medical Nutrition Laboratory, Veterinary Research Laboratory.
Ordnance Department: Aberdeen Proving Ground, Detroit Tank Arsenal, Frankford Arsenal, Picatinny Arsenal, Research and Development, Fort Bliss Suboffice, Research and Development, Pasadena Suboffice, Rock Island Arsenal, Springfield Armory, Submarine Mine Depot, Watertown Arsenal, Watervliet Arsenal, White Sands Proving Grounds.
Quartermaster Corps: Climatic Research Laboratory, Jeffersonville Depot, Philadelphia Depot, Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for Armed Forces.
Signal Corps: Coles Signal Laboratory, Evans Signal Laboratory, Squier Signal Laboratory, Army Electric Standards Agency.
Corps of Engineers: A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Wright Field, Yuma Test Branch, Fort Churchill, Fort Story, Fort Belvoir.
Transportation Corps.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICS

Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory.
Ames Aeronautical Laboratory.
Flight Propulsion Research Laboratory.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Research Divisions.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Research Division.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

Public Roads Administration.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Engineering Department.

[1] The difficulties of inclusion and exclusion for any list of this type are considerable. The list is suggestive, not definitive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to the amendment.

I have not checked with all members of the subcommittee. I have checked with the members on this side, and as chairman of the subcommittee I am willing to accept the Harris amendment limiting the appropriation to $15,000,000. I think it is well that we limit the appropriation for the reasons that the gentleman from Arkansas stated. Then the Foundation may come back before the legislative committee for additional authorizations 3 or 4 years from now, if necessary. I do feel it would be a great mistake to accept the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]. I feel certain that he is very sincere in offering the amendment, because he is sincere in all the work that he does on the committee. I believe the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] stated one of the very impelling reasons, as I see it, why we should not accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, limiting this appropriation to $1,000,000. If this Foundation is to do the job that I hope, and I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] hopes it will do, it must attract men of high caliber in the realms of scientific education and research throughout this country. We expect that it will do so; that they will be willing to give their time to the Foundation and to give their time to the executive committee of that Foundation toward developing the program. I feel very strongly, and I have heard some comments in that respect in the last few days, that if we limit this appropriation initially to $1,000,000, there will not be enough confidence in the continuation of the program to attract the type of men that we want.

We passed a bill providing for a National Science Foundation in the Eightieth Congress, without any limitation whatsoever on the appropriation. It was a wide-open authorization, such as originally was contained in this bill, that such funds as may be necessary for carrying out the program of the foundation are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks about my hoping that this bill would be enacted. I said I would vote for it, whatever the outcome of this amendment. But is it not true that in other sections of the bill we provide for transfers, which, as I indicated could go to the extent of $15,000,000 in the national defense alone, so that

the program could actually get under way? Would it not be better for us to take this 1 year at a time and try to get a definite program before our committee and before the House which we understand and of which we approve, before we bind ourselves to the $15,000,000 open-end authorization?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. May I observe that if we are to rely on subsection (h), as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is suggesting that funds may only be transferred for the specific purpose for which they have previously been appropriated. We have testimony before us on the part of the military establishment, in the committee hearings, that they do not have funds for the basic research, for which the National Science Foundation is intended.

Mr. PRIEST. I will yield again, and then I would like to have just 1 minute.

Mr. HESELTON. That is true, but I do not believe my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] or my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], or anybody really believes that we are going to be able to get the fellowship and scholarship program under way next September. The earliest we can do it, in my opinion, will be the following September, when we will need more money. But no one knows how much.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr McCORMACK. I am sorry the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] has agreed to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], because I think a limitation of $15,000,000 is too low. Yesterday the gentleman said we would level off at about $25,000,000; but in view of the fact that the subcommittee has agreed to accept it, I naturally will go along. However, I do hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] and there is no hostility about his amendment, because he has evidenced that from the floor—I hope that will not be agreed to, because I think it would have a very crippling effect. I say that descriptively and advisedly, because he has no such intention, I know, although it would have a very crippling effect upon the operation of the National Science Foundation. Reluctantly I will go along with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] in view of its acceptance by the Chairman of the Subcommittee.

Mr. HESELTON. Will the gentleman yield briefly that I may make a reply to my good friend, the majority leader?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield briefly to the gentleman to answer.

Mr. HESELTON. Apparently, the majority leader does not recall that the budget carries $1,000,000 for 1951.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say to my friend from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is aware of it. My recollection is that it was $500,000 for 1950.

Mr. HESELTON. And for 1951 it was $1,000,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am aware of the situation, but we are approaching this from the wrong angle. The effect of my friend's amendment, if adopted, would be to have the National Science Foundation established for 2 years, the first year at $500,000 and the next at $1,000,000; then they would have to come back for additional legislation on the part of the Congress. I believe that is a situation that should not exist. I recognize the argument that there should be a limitation, but in my opinion if a limitation is put on it should be $25,000,000. I will, of course, go along with the $15,000,000, but the further restriction is too much.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that the amendment offered by my friend from Massachusetts to the Harris amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for three additional minutes because of the many interruptions that have taken place.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. We have saved $10,000,000 at one stroke by waiting one 24-hour period. I rise to ask the gentleman if it would not be well to adjourn now to see if we could not save another $10,000,000 at another stroke.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman refers to the fact, of course, that on yesterday I stated that the ultimate cost was estimated to be about $25,000,000. For the time being an amendment has been accepted by the chairman of the subcommittee to place a limitation of $15,000,000. The bill will have to come up for consideration again within 3 or 4 years, for review by the committee which reports this legislation, review of what the Foundation has done and proposes to do, for the committee to give it a look and decide whether or not we should raise that ceiling, or lower it, or just what should be done.

I yield to the author of the pending amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that in the course of the debate yesterday on this proposed legislation, one of the greatest fears expressed was that there would be no limitation whatsoever? We now propose to place a limitation in the bill for the simple reason that it is expected that the Foundation will have to come back to Congress and give an accounting of their actions.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman is correct. May I say that as chairman of the subcommittee I accept this action because I believe there is a very strong feeling on the part of the Members that there should be some sort of limitation. I took a strong position yesterday on the floor in support of the $25,000,000 and would continue it except that in the interest of harmony and in the interest of agreeing with my good friend from Arkansas and others who believe very strongly that some reasonable limitation should be in the bill, I am willing to accept the Harris amendment; but I do hope we will not accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to the Harris amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is not only one of the most useless but one of the most dangerous propositions, in my opinion, of its kind that has ever come before the Congress.

Instead of creating more foundations, we need to get rid of some foundations that are now being used for propaganda purposes, that are now being used to undermine and destroy our Government, as well as to undermine and destroy the American way of life.

I know one of the men who has been one of the chief forces behind this thing, Harlow Shapley of Harvard University. I know he belongs to a half dozen or a dozen Communist-front organizations. We had him before the Committee on Un-American Activities and brought that information out.

I understand he and his group expect to pick the personnel of this foundation if this bill passes.

We know another thing, that a large number of the colleges of America today have on their teaching staffs men drawing pay from other sources, and many of them are spreading communistic propaganda all the way from Massachusetts probably to Mississippi and from Texas to Maine.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the time to set up an organization of this kind. America has made the greatest progress any nation ever saw. How has that been done? By that independent freedom, if you please, that we now enjoy. Suppose you had this aggregation 80 years ago, Thomas A. Edison, the greatest inventive genius of the ages, could not have got an audience with them.

Suppose you had this crowd in command 150 years ago, do you think Eli Whitney, the man who invented the cotton gin and revolutionized the industry of America, could have got an audience? No. You are taking out of the hands of many of our colleges, out of the hands of our military, out of the hands of our defense forces, if you please, the very powers that they need and are turning them over to a gang of professors, many of whom you will find are affiliated with Communist-front organizations.

I cannot support this measure under any circumstances, and for that reason I have asked for this time in order that I might give the reasons why I think this measure is dangerous and should be defeated.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. This can cost, according to their own admission, $50,000,000 or more, when it gets through the other body and therefore that much more in taxes. Is not the gentleman familiar with the fact that industry after industry, small industry and large industry, throughout the United States is begging for less taxes so that they might be able to do their own research work?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, certainly. Here you are just burdening the American people with taxes to set up a dangerous organization that if the American people knew what it is, and what is behind it, would be against it almost to a man.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman interests me with his comment about Dr. Harlow Shapley. Did the gentleman ask the chairman of the committee just what part he might have had in this matter?

Mr. RANKIN. I was already familiar with that, sir, or I would not have brought his name into the discussion. If the gentleman will look at the record, he will find Dr. Shapley is one of the chief supporters behind this proposition, and if the gentleman will go to the records of the Un-American Activities Committee, he will find that Dr. Shapley is a member of some of the most dangerous Communist-front organizations in America.

The measure should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I would like once and for all time to make a very brief statement as to the background of this legislation. My friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] mentioned Harlow Shapley, of Harvard University. All I know about the man he mentioned is that he is a member of that faculty, a scientist.

The first connection I had with this legislation dates back to the year 1945 shortly after the end of the war, when Dr. Vannevar Bush called me, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], Senator MAGNUSON, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. CHAPMAN, now a Member of the other body, and several others out to his apartment and asked us to go with him into the possibilities of the establishment of a National Science Foundation.

I never heard of Dr. Shapley and any connection he had with this bill until a few months ago when the claim was made that he was one of the instigators. I might say this, that in all the hearings before the committee—and I have here the hearings held during the last session of the Congress, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] has a volume of hearings on a previous bill in another session of the Congress, the professor from Harvard has never appeared before the committee; he has never signed a communication to the committee expressing any interest whatsoever in this legislation. Now, I state that as a matter of record. As an American citizen he had a right to appear if he wanted to, of course, but he never asked to appear.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that this legislation originated with President Roosevelt asking Dr. Vannevar Bush in 1941 to make a thorough and complete study and to report to him and to the Congress as to the need for such legislation, and that a study was under way for about 4 years before the submission of that report in 1945 from which this legislation came?

Mr. PRIEST. That is quite correct. And, I might say again to my colleague from Arkansas that his own colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] introduced the first National Science Foundation bill that was ever introduced in the House of Representatives, and I do not believe that the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. WILBUR MILLS, knew anything about any pernicious influences at the time.

Mr. HARRIS. And based on the report that had several years of study, which was submitted.

Mr. PRIEST. Exactly.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I just want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the National Defense Establishment on December 30, 1949, had this to say in its report: "They," meaning the military department "are also supporting the proposed legislation for a National Science Foundation."

We reported this bill 6 months before, on June 14, 1949. Coming from Massachusetts I want to say that there is no shred of evidence—and I do not know this man, Shapley—there is not a shred of evidence that Karl Compton, ex-president of M. I. T. and a sponsor and a witness before our committee, or President Conant of Harvard University, the director of the Sheffield Scientific School at Yale University, and literally scores of others, prominent Americans, including Gen. "Hap" Arnold, of the Air Force, are inclined to support any Communist-inspired legislation in this House.

Mr. PRIEST. Or Mr. Forrestal, or the Disabled American Veterans. I could go on and name one after another, that I believe would be convincing.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the armed forces throught that this would be set up inside of the armed forces.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I have had some misgivings about this bill, but I think it due the gentleman now having the floor that it be said of him that he conducted a very fair hearing, a very thorough hearing, and filed a magnificent report. Mr. Chairman, I am voting for this bill, gambling upon the proposition of Dr. Vannevar Bush being named Director.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank my good friend from Georgia. And, I might add, while on the floor, and make it a matter of record, that there is not a person in the country that I would sooner see head of this Foundation than Dr. Vannevar Bush. I join the gentleman in wishing that he might be named head of the Foundation.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I think we also ought to have the record show that among the corporations which appeared before the committee backing the National Science Foundation were representatives of such organizations as Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, the Sperry Gyroscope Co., and also the National Association of Manufacturers.

Mr. HESELTON. If the gentleman will yield, I should like to mention one more name: The Rev. J. C. S. O'Donnell, president of Notre Dame University.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the gentleman whether, in view of the fact that we have heard that an atomic explosion has taken place in the U. S. S. R., he can conceivably justify such complacency as the movant has shown in his remarks before the committee, we dare not in the interests of security or of economic progress be left behind in the onward progress of science of which basic research is the Foundation.

Mr. PRIEST. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this preferential motion will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Heselton amendment to the Harris amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, there is a matter in connection with this proposed limitation on appropriations that I think ought to come to the attention of the Congress that has not been discussed by any member of the committee up to date. Regardless of whether or not a maximum limitation is written into this bill, the Congress always has the right and the opportunity to examine into every budgetary estimate that is submitted, which must come annually before the Appropriations Committee, first, and then before the Congress.

I can say to you that, in my humble opinion, whether there is a limitation on the amount of ultimate appropriation

in this bill or not, the committee that is formed under the provisions of this bill would have to justify thoroughly any expenditure they might make before the proper Subcommittee on Appropriations, then before the full committee, and finally before the Congress itself. So I am not too much concerned about the question of limitation except this: It has been stated repeatedly that the purpose of this bill is to insure the production of trained scientists. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PRIEST. It is to procure the production of trained scientists plus the conduct of basic research with those we already have.

Mr. KEEFE. Plus the conduct of basic research by those who are already scientists and those whom you expect to train.

We ran against that situation in the programs carried on by the National Institute of Health, and what did we find? We found that you could not induce a young man to go into a 6- or 7-year course of study necesary to provide him with the necessary education to become a trained scientist when he is constantly subjected to the annual whims or caprices of Congress as to whether funds will be provided to carry on that fellowship when originally granted. So the subcommittee of which I am proud to be a member attempted to do something about that, and this Congress supported us when we wrote the legislation in the appropriation bill that would authorize contract authority when this man is selected to take training so that he could be assured that he would not have his training interfered with and cut off at the end of any fiscal year, and that he could go on and complete the training.

If you reduce the over-all authorization to the point where you say that it is $1,000,000, as a psychological matter it would be a great deterrent to the recruitment of young men and young women into the field of scientific learning and education to be the ones to carry on this basic research program. I sincerely think while the motive of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts is good, the psychological effect would be to defeat one of the very important purposes of this legislation.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I call to the gentleman's attention the language in paragraph (b) of page 21:

> Appropriations made pursuant to the authority provided in subsection (a) of this section shall remain available for obligation or expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in the acts making such appropriations.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand that language is there, and I presume that the hidden meaning behind the language is to take care of the very situation which I have referred to. So that when a fellowship is in fact established there will be sufficient funds available extended over a period of years necessary to complete the training to enable that trainee to complete his course. If you limit the authority to merely $1,000,000 you are putting a blanket right over the heads of those who might otherwise be induced to go into training. We have had that experience in the training programs in the Public Health Service. I do not think you want to do it here if the purpose of this act or at least the major purpose is to carry on and train scientists.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. I know that the gentleman understands that we all are working under pressure here.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. I had hoped that by submitting this amendment I could give others and myself the opportunity to make a decision. The gentleman and my colleagues have been so persuasive I am convinced that $1,000,000 is too little. I am not convinced, however, that $15,000,000 is not too much. But under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to my friend my experience on the Committee on Appropriations is that regardless of the amount of the authorization you have a pretty good scrutiny as to what is ultimately requested of the Congress. Do you want me to point out one example? You have had a $29,000,000 authorization for appropriations for vocational education. The Congress, up to date, under all of the pressures that have been exerted, has refused to appropriate more than slightly under $20,000,000 for that purpose, although the authority exists and has existed for many years to appropriate up to $29,000,000. You do have a good secondary check when the appropriations item comes before the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman I object.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I presume the real amendment which is now before us for consideration is the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas, which has in effect been accepted by the committee. I certainly believe it is advisable to have limitations in this bill so far as the expenditure of funds is concerned. I wonder though sometimes how much these limitations actually mean. In my short period of 5 years as a Member of the House of Representatives I have seen cases many times when we have come in with an open-handed proposition and in order to make it more palatable to the membership we say, "Well, we will put a limitation on this so that we will be sure to keep it within bounds."

So the limitation is put in. Then within 2 years or so another bill comes in raising that limitation. Therefore I appreciate the words of the majority leader when he said that fundamentally this it not a program for just 1 or 2 years and that basically it is a long-range program. These long-range programs are the ones which worry me the most because I wonder what we are committing future generations to by way of expenditure of funds for Government.

I would call the attention of the House to the RECORD of February 22 in which on page 2126 appears a table prepared by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the other body. You will find there listed some 16 programs and the potential cost thereof, new programs or legislation proposed by the President for the fiscal year 1950–51. They set forth the initial cost and the estimated annual cost of these programs.

It is interesting to note that the estimated initial cost of all of them is $7,020,000,000. I suppose maybe in some respects these programs are worth that amount of money, but let us look at what the estimated cost of the programs in full operation is: $25,187,000,000. What we are trying to do in too many of these programs is to sell ourselves on the idea that they are fine and needed and necessary, on the basis of the cost, which in no way has a bearing upon the actual cost of the program in full operation.

In connection with this particular piece of legislation, I think it is advisable to read what the staff of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the other body found in connection with the National Science Foundation. They state the initial cost to be $15,000,000, when in full operation the cost will be $100,000,000. But because perhaps many of you may not have available the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 22, I would like to read hurriedly their findings in connection with this legislation:

> The President estimated that an appropriation of $2,500,000 and $12,500,000 of contract authority would be required to establish the organization. Sponsors of the legislation creating the NSF find it difficult to forecast what the annual expenditure will be after the program gets under way, since there are several important intangibles to be considered.
>
> The estimate of $100,000,000 is ultraconservative, but was supplied by the Bureau of the Budget as being the most accurate estimate that could be procured. The President's Scientific Research Board recommended annual appropriations of $50,000,000 for basic research, outside of the Foundation's own laboratories, in the initial stages of the program, and estimates that the total annual cost of this phase of the program would exceed $250,000,000 by 1953. The extent of the scholarship phase will depend on authorizations granted by Congress, and the figures shown in the summary are estimated to cover the present proposed program. Including scholarships, research expenditures, and other phases of the program, the total will approximate $350,000,000 annually.

So, Mr. Chairman, I wonder what the limitation really will amount to in the long run.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has expired.

All time has expired on the Heselton amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachu-

setts [Mr. HESELTON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: On page 2, line 16, after the word "support" insert "basic."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with deep interest to the discussion that has taken place this afternoon on this bill. I cannot escape the conclusion that amongst its own supporters there is very little certainty as to where it goes or what field it covers. Their concepts of it seem to differ very materially.

Before discussing the amendment which I have proposed, I cannot resist the temptation to make somewhat of a reply to the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER], to the effect that the Sperry Gryoscope Co. is in support of this measure. I have here a telegram addressed to me, dated New York, February 28:

I understand Mr. J. PERCY PRIEST has listed Sperry Gyroscope Co. as supporting H. R. 4846, through my testimony. Have not seen H. R. 4846 or the circular Mr. PRIEST is alleged to have sent to Members of Congress. My only testimony on science legislation was given more than 4 years ago on behalf of the Aircraft Industries Association and not on behalf of any company. It was very general in character and was not in support of any bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I inquire if the telegram was signed by Mr. R. E. Gilmore?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; I should have read that: Signed by Mr. R. E. Gilmore.

Mr. PRIEST. Without taking too much of the gentleman's time, may I say that the gentleman was listed as supporting the legislation in a summary prepared by the committee of witnesses of engineering colleges at one time, although not now, on a bill with another number. The number of this bill was changed, for this bill is a clean bill. It was my understanding that he personally did support the legislation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He states very specifically here that he did not. I may say that I have two or three more telegrams from representatives of institutions of one kind or another, whose names are included in the list of supporters, who deny that they have ever authorized such inclusion; but I shall not go into that at this moment.

Mr. Chairman, the scientists in whom I have the greatest confidence, men like Dr. Vannevar Bush, Dr. Compton, and others, have from the beginning of this entire discussion insisted that the work of this foundation should be devoted to the encouragement of basic research. Quotations have been read to the committee from statements issued by Dr. Compton and Dr. Vannevar Bush, and you will note that in those statements only basic research is referred to, and the whole plea is made by those estimable gentlemen that this legislation be passed in order that basic research be encouraged in this country and saved from what might be termed ultimate extinction.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I might point out to the gentleman that subparagraph (2) of section 2 reads:

The Foundation is authorized and directed to initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences—

The paragraph to which the gentleman refers is simply a limiting provision referring to the Department of Defense research.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand, I am coming to that. I understand what the paragraph means, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not have to tell me about it.

Mr. Chairman, the paragraph reads, on line 15, page 2:

After consultation with the Secretary of Defense—

Just what that means I doubt if anyone knows. Shall the consultation be by telephone, by mail, or in personal conversation?—

After consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense.

I emphasize "matters relating to the national defense." The efforts made by the Military Establishment in scientific research today are by far the largest of all efforts in that field. As I quoted to the committee here yesterday, the armed services alone are spending at the rate of $544,000,000 in their research programs. The Atomic Energy Commission, a large measure of whose time is taken up in the interest of national defense with the A-bomb and the hydrogen bomb, is spending over $500,000,000 a year.

True, this Foundation cannot invade the field of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am very grateful to the Members for giving me this additional time.

There is a separate institution whose headquarters are at Langley Field, Va., I believe, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. They are spending millions and millions of dollars in the field of national defense, and there are other institutions spending millions of dollars in the same field. Most of their activities are not in the field of basic research. But under this paragraph the Foundation can go into the field of applied science in any institution, governmental or otherwise, which is engaged in trying to assist the national defense. That enormously expands its field, and that particular extension of power is not mentioned to the best of my knowledge and belief in any of the communications of Dr. Vannevar Bush or Dr. Compton.

As I tried to emphasize yesterday, this bill goes further than merely basic research, and it would not be at all surprising to me that if no limitation were placed on it, it would cost over $300,000,000 a year. I have endeavored to find out from Dr. Vannevar Bush and Mr. Pace, Director of the Budget, what money now being expended by the military services could be transferred to the Foundation and thus no increase in expenditures created. I have never been able to get any assurance that there will be any saving at all—none whatsoever. The gate is left wide open here.

Can anybody tell me why it would hurt the national defense or hurt the interest of basic research, which admittedly is the chief objective of this bill, to insert the word "basic" in front of the words "scientific research" in this paragraph?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that Dr. Vannevar Bush was director of the wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development, which was a very active organization during the war?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that in the course of the activities of that office they cooperated their organization with the national defense?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand that.

Mr. HARRIS. And in the interchange of those activities we had the atomic bomb come from it, is that true?

Mr. WADSWORTH. My recollection is that the atomic bomb was not developed under the jurisdiction of the Vannevar Bush organization.

Mr. HARRIS. Not at all, but out of this cooperation of the scientific research program and the national defense.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, but that is a separate organization.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that if in the case of emergency they had this interchange of activities it certainly might be very helpful?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot understand why people should say this thing is solely for basic research and insist on multiplying its field of operations five or six times beyond basic research.

Mr. HARRIS. Only in the case of our national defense.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does not say "in the event of an emergency." For example, the Air Force is experimenting with guided missiles. It may be that part of their experimentation may be termed basic research under the terms

of this bill, if properly interpreted in paragraph 2. That basic research could be taken away from the Air Force but the applied science, the experiments with the missiles that are going on by the hundreds every month, must stay with the Air Force. The same with the Navy's program, which is exceedingly broad. Their program now contains certain elements of basic research. I have never been able to find from scientists how much basic research is done proportionately in these military efforts as compared with applied science. I am sure we do not want this body to take charge of applied science in all the military services. My amendment is to clarify the purposes of this bill which are thus far clothed in confusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do so reluctantly, as no Member of this House wants to take on the very able and distinguished gentleman from New York, whose judgment we so highly respect.

In connection with his amendment, let me call attention to the fact, first, that the only exception to the general limitations to basic research that is contained in the bill is that which relates to the National Defense Establishment. The gentleman from New York would have us place words in subsection (3) on page 2 which would limit the work done for the Secretary of Defense and the National Defense Establishment to basic research only.

I would like to call the attention of the members of the committee to another page, page 19, subsection (h) where it says:

> Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made—

And so forth. Now that, of course, limits the Foundation in expending any funds transferred to it by the National Defense Establishment to the purposes which are intended by the National Defense Establishment. If the National Defense Establishment intends that any part of the funds shall be used for other purposes than basic research, it will so state. If it intends that the use of the funds transferred to the Foundation by the National Military Establishment shall be exclusively for the purposes of certain basic research, it will so state, and the Foundation has no power whatsoever to utilize those funds for different purposes.

Now, I would like to say this: As the gentleman from New York probably is quite well aware, there are certain areas of research which are rather shadowy as between whether or not the subject is one of basic research or whether it be applied research. Such research can be made, for example, into the alloys of metals. There is fundamental research, basic research to be done, in the flow of metals under heat and in compression, in tension, and so forth, in the alloys in which the National Defense Establishment is very deeply interested and highly concerned. A part of that research is definitely in the area of basic research. Some of the research in connection therewith is not so definitely in the area of basic research, but nevertheless it is a highly scientific research which is engaged in ordinarily in the laboratories of the universities of the United States. As the gentleman well stated, some $540,000,000 per annum is now being expended by the National Military Establishment in its three separate branches for the purpose of research.

Gentlemen of this Committee, if there is anything more important to the welfare of the United States than the research of the National Military Establishment, in the discovery of new basic concepts which will be for the protection of our country, I would like to know what it is. The National Defense Establishment, just as any other agency, is limited now by having reached the bottom of the barrel of knowledge in certain vitally important categories. They must go forward and find new knowledge with which they may be able to develop new techniques for the defense of our country. I think it would be a very great mistake, indeed, not to permit the National Defense Establishment, if it pleases to do so, and only if it pleases to do so, as is set forth in this bill, to assign to the National Science Foundation such research work as it deems necessary, and to be performed outside of the National Military Establishment through its general assignment of that function as it deems fit.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly the gentleman, I think, will not contend that my amendment will handicap the National Defense Establishment.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think it probably would, because the National Defense Establishment, before it could make any transfer of funds for its own purposes would have to make a determination that the funds so transferred were to be used solely and exclusively for and to come within the definition of basic research.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I call the attention of the committee to the report made by the President's board in terms of the division between basic and applied research, which the gentleman from New York mentioned a few minutes ago, within the War and Navy Departments in 1947, which is the latest information I have. A total of $500,000,000 was expended in that year, $35,000,000 for basic and $465,000,000 for applied research.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman. That indicates the necessity that these agencies have for going beyond their present field of knowledge.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the gentleman feel that it would be a desirable thing for the National Defense Establishment to be required to determine that it was basic research before they turned over an activity to this fund, which is supposed to be limited to basic research?

Mr. HINSHAW. The National Defense Establishment now has the power and the funds to contract directly for research in or along any lines it chooses. The National Military Establishment for its own purposes might like to have a bit of research that was not exactly basic, so to speak, done outside of its own agencies in order, perhaps, to obtain a greater degree of a certain kind of security. There are reasons why the National Military Establishment, for its own purposes, might like to have the Foundation do certain other research.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman contend the security would be greater under this fund than in the National Military Establishment itself?

Mr. HINSHAW. The National Military Establishment makes contracts with universities and with private establishments. Whenever it makes a contract with a university those engaged under that contract are well aware that it is a matter of national security. But they may wish to originate or make a contribution toward certain research endeavors, the favorable results of which might well contribute to a solution needed in the interest of better defense. It is quite possible that a part or the whole of such research might not come exactly under the definition of basic research.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. In speaking of the National Military Establishment and the research they are doing, they can go into most any branch of research that they choose.

Mr. HINSHAW. They do actually.

Mr. RICH. They can and they do. They are now spending over a half million dollars a year. The gentleman talks about getting at the bottom of the barrel. I say to the Members of the House that you are at the bottom of the barrel financially. Setting up this organization is only going to wreck us.

Mr. HINSHAW. That may be true; but in answer to that may I say that it is about time we got some more basic knowledge in the United States so we can proceed to better the life of our people and improve our national defense.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the Wadsworth amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to talk directly to the amendment and would like some time.

Mr. PRIEST. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes, with 4 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the Wadsworth amendment close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the thing about this measure which alarms me is it appears to be an unnecessary costly duplication of facilities we already have. One would think we had no scientists and no laboratories and no facilities. I have been laboring under the impression in view of what we did in the last World War that we have an industrial system which is the envy and admiration of the world. In the great universities of this country and in connection with great industrial enterprises of the country there are scientists and research is being carried on. There are men able to carry out the very work that is proposed to be carried on by this Foundation.

In addition to that it is designed, in my opinion, and if you will read the bill you will see that is what it means, to mushroom and spawn and multiply and increase without end, not only in this country, but all over the world. We have one remedy for all the ills that beset us and that is to spend money and more money--money that we do not have for things we can do without and do not need. That is what we are doing. You talk about getting rid of a bureau or a bureaucrat. When have we gotten rid of a bureau and when have we ever gotten rid of a bureaucrat? Few of them die and none of them ever resign. I think there is implicit in this organization an effort which, if it succeeds, will take over and absorb the agencies and functions which are now being carried on by our universities and great industrial enterprises. We built the atomic bomb. How did we do it? Did we have a Foundation of Science? Not at all. The War Department engaged the services of 1,000 scientists, many of whom never saw Oak Ridge. They did the job. Do we know how to make an airplane? I think we do. At this time those who build our airplanes—transport planes, bombers, fighters, of all kinds—have installed, are maintaining, and using air tunnels in which these planes are tested. We have facilities in which engines and guns may be tested in subzero cold. The Government and private enterprise are maintaining great laboratories and testing stations that are the equal if not the superior of any to be found anywhere in the world.

By this agency it is proposed to set up an organization world-wide in scope the purpose of which is to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and in foreign countries.

The Hisses and the Fuchses attend to the dissemination of our most intimate secrets through their betrayal to foreign enemies and they do it at their own expense. And when Senator McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, seeks to further expose disloyal elements in the State Department, those who have under their control the evidence that would establish the guilt of those who have been faithless to their trust refuse to permit the Senator possession of such evidence in order that he may introduce it against those who are accused.

There is such an offense in law as misprision of a felony, misprision of treason. What are those who are concealing these facts from the agency doing? If I understand it, they are guilty of misprision of a felony, misprision of treason. We are concerned that the world will not find out what we are doing. I think if this sprawling endless bureaucracy is fastened upon the people of this country, no man can foretell what it will finally cost, and I will look upon it as a future harbor and dwelling place for Communists and traitors in our own country and those who come to us from all corners of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] proposes to insert the word "basic" at a certain point on page 2, which would clarify the scope of the bill and the authority of the Foundation.

I have in my hand a table which was compiled by the Bureau of the Budget as of January 1950, which lists 26 agencies of the Government which have research development funds. I am not going to take time to read all of the figures in detail, but the list ranges from the Atomic Energy Commission to the Treasury Department. It includes the proposed National Science Foundation, for $500,000.

The total for this fiscal year 1951, as recommended by the Budget for research development, amounts to $1,317,223,298. If any of you are interested in the table, here it is.

In connection with the Atomic Energy Commission, they have a very sizable amount, a total of $300,000,000, for research development. Out of that, $23,000,000 in 1950 and $18,000,000 in 1951 could almost be classified as basic research. Of the $18,000,000 which the Atomic Energy Commission is asking for 1951, approximately 10 percent, or $1,800,000, is available for fellowships. That is for basic scientific research. The balance is for farming out to universities and under various contracts for research.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics asks $62,600,000 in cash, and another $15,000,000 in contract authority for research projects and to be farmed out to universities—$777,500.

One thing that concerns me about the language is that in addition to the language on page 19, to which the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] directed attention, there is language on page 12 under the heading of General Authority of Foundation, which provides that—

> The Foundation shall have the authority to enter into contracts or other arrangements or modifications thereof for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, of such basic scientific research activities and such scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense as the Foundation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

There is no requirement in this section that the Secretary of Defense should even be consulted. Under the language cited by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], the money could be transferred out of these funds I have cited, a total of $1,300,000,000, which would be expendable by this Foundation upon transfer and without appropriation. On its own motion this Foundation ought not go into national defense activities unless it does have the consent of the agency which is engaged in the applied research.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has referred to some important language on page 12, which of course is merely for the purpose of permitting the Foundation to assign work which is, in turn, assigned to it by the national defense establishment. It is not the intention of the committee that in the contracts which they would necessarily make with the university for basic research or any other form of research, that they could go beyond the reasons given for the transfer of funds on page 19.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly, the language on page 12 is pretty broad; it does not refer to the other part of the act. It seems to be the portion of the bill which sets forth the provisions of this act governing the authority of the Foundation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Authority to the Foundation is limited in this case to that given to the National Defense Establishment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It does not refer to the National Defense Establishment in this section on page 12.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the language on page 12 authorizes these contracts to be made with foreign organizations and foreign citizens.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly, the language on page 12 will have to be tightened up if the act is to conform to the interpretations many have attempted to place on it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure that if the gentleman would draw an amendment to satisfy his idea, the Committee would be glad to accept it, because that certainly is the intention of the Committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the meantime, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is accepted.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you to scan the act with me for a minute By the language of section 3, subsection (1) you will notice that the Foundation is authorized and directed (1) to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences. Subparagraph (2) states that it is to initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

If you will then go down to subsection (3) which the gentleman from New York wishes to amend, you will note that he is trying to put the word "basic" in a section which refers to a specific application of the research. Basic, of course, within the act, is defined really as meaning foundation work of broad effect, but with no immediate practical application. In the first of the two subparagraphs, therefore, you have basic research, meaning broad research of a foundation character with no practical application. If that is the definition within the first two subdivisions, if you try to put it in the third subdvision where you are talking of a practical application, you are illogical, because you are specifically saying that when the research is in connection with matters relating to the national defense that it shall be done after consultation with the Secretary of Defense. As the bill stands now, unrestricted, it provides that the Foundation shall have broad power to consult on research; but, as has been brought out by the gentleman from California, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would restrict this bill on the one thing that is the most important—national defense.

I therefore hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be defeated.

In the balance of the time at my disposal I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a question. The bill states on page 2, line 25:

> To foster the interchange o scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries.

How is it intended that that shall be done? What method does the bill provide?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. There are certain scientific publications of general circulation such as the publications of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and others that have international exchange between persons who are interested, mostly scientists. The publication of such things and the exchange of such information which is not classified comes under another section of the bill. It should be encouraged in order to have available to ourselves, for example, certain information which we need from abroad.

Mr. FULTON. So it refers, then, only to unclassified information which can be given to any country, whether behind the iron curtain or in front of the iron curtain.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is quite correct.

Mr. FULTON. But it does not relate in any way to information that is otherwise classified which might be given to a country that might be called one of the Atlantic Pact countries, for example?

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is thinking of the Atomic Energy Act, is he not?

Mr. FULTON. In particular I am thinking of information that would otherwise be classified but might be given to an Atlantic Pact country; such information would not be given to them. There is no attempt under this act to give anything otherwise classified to any country who might be our ally?

Mr. HINSHAW. Anything that is classified comes under the complete control and authority of the Department of National Defense or under the Atomic Energy Commission, according to existing law. This bill provides for classification and no exchange could be had of classified material or information.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman. Now, referring to page 3, line 12, under subparagraph (7) why does not the committee in this sentence put a limitation as to the number when it says:

> To establish such special commissions as the Board may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this act.

That would seem to me to set up unlimited bureaucracy.

Mr. HINSHAW. We attempted to place in the bill certain commissions by name. When we started out to do that, we found there were so many interests that wanted to have their own special commissions and that could apply great pressure, that in order to avoid pressure and leave it in the discretion of the scientists themselves as to what commissions should be established, we placed it in this way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] already has adequately presented the argument from the standpoint of the committee as to why this amenament should be defeated. The term "basic" is omitted with reference only to the national defense and to an agreement entered into after consultation with the Secretary of Defense.

Let me make this statement. Suppose, for instance, we were at war, or suppose that war was very imminent and it is necessary in this Nation to utilize every possible scientific research organization in the country. I feel it should be possible under a situation such as that for the Secretary of Defense, if he so desires, to request the National Science Foundation to engage in certain research and that certainly there should be authority in the act for it to do so without splitting hairs as to whether that research is basic or whether it is not basic, if the security and the safety of the Nation may be at stake and the Secretary of Defense wants it and the Foundation is able and willing to do it. We purposely left out "basic" in this paragraph because of our interest in providing in every possible way for this legislation to advance the programs of the national defense.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In line with what the gentleman said, would there be any objection to including language on page 12 to make it conform with that which is stated on page 2, to require the approval after consultation with the Secretary of Defense when the Foundation engages in general scientific and research activities?

Mr. PRIEST. I certainly would not object to any language, if it is necessary, that would require this approval. I believe the gentleman from California set that out in his reply to the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In reply to the gentleman from South Dakota I think it would add to our defense in that particular paragraph and I see no objection to it.

Mr. PRIEST. I can see no objection to it because that is the intention of the committee, to make it possible if the national defense so requires to ask this Foundation to do some research which might not be basic. I feel it is tremendously important for the Nation's welfare that such authority be granted in this legislation.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. In connection with the statement made by the gentleman from California, I call attention to the fact that in the third report of the President's Scientific Research Board it is explained that the cost of developments in World War II were switched completely from predominance within our own Government facilities into contracts. There is this language:

> At present the War and Navy Departments expended over 90 percent of the funds covered in contracts for research and development.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). One hundred forty-six Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WADSWORTH) there were—ayes 57, noes 79.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WADSWORTH and Mr. PRIEST.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 73, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 20, line 21, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(1) No person shall be employed by the Foundation and no scholarship shall be awarded to any person by the Foundation unless and until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have investigated the loyalty of such person and reported to the Foundation such person is loyal to the United States, believes in our system of government, and is not and has not at any time been a member of any organization declared subversive by the Attorney General or any organization that teaches or advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of those who were otherwise engaged and did not hear the amendment read, I want to say what it does is to require an FBI investigation as to the loyalty of students to whom these scholarships and fellowships may be given and with respect to the employees of this Foundation. I have serious misgivings about the whole bill itself. It is a wide-open proposition. The limitations are very few. There is one thing we all know about this bill. I have listened to the debate today and doubt if any of us know too much about it or what it means or what its implications are. There is one thing we do know about this bill. When this scientific foundation is set up it will have access to the most vital secrets of this Government. Having access to those secrets, it will be the place where every person of subversive inclination and where every foreign government, friendly or unfriendly, will have a great deal of curiosity about these secrets. If there is any one place in the Federal Government where we should undertake to protect ourselves, it is in connection with the loyalty of anybody who may be connected with or may have the opportunity to get at those most vital secrets. We know we are now having litigation involving two people who have betrayed the trust imposed upon them by their government in connection with the most vital secret information. What are we doing about it? I think one of them is getting a tap on the wrist for perjury. I do not think prosecution for perjury is an adequate punishment for treason.

However that may be, there is not much use in locking the barn door after the horse is stolen. What I am seeking to do is to lock the door against Communists, against fellow-travelers, and against foreign agents, and against anybody who does not believe in our form of government before the horse even gets a chance to be stolen. I cannot see what possible objection anybody can have to this amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman. But if you feel it should include anyone having any part in the program, do you not think it should be extended and made broader so that it includes all these organizations and institutions and individuals in the United States or foreign countries who are to take part in the program on research even though they are not students?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I feel I have gone pretty far, and about as far as I could very well go. If you get loyal people in, then those loyal people are going to see that no other disloyal people can mess around with your secrets. To be frank with you, I just cannot understand why anybody who has read this amendment and understands what this amendment does can object to it. It is going to be said that all employees of the Federal Government are now examined by the FBI. Well, that is just not correct. I have conferred with a member of the Committee on Appropriations who has to do with that. All the FBI does now is to receive a list of the names of proposed employees and the fingerprints of such proposed employees. They check them against what they have in their files and if nothing shows up, why, that is all there is to it. It has been suggested that we ought to cut out examining these fellows that we are going to educate through these fellowships. They are going to get from the Federal Government a free education. Will somebody please explain to me why a person who is going to be educated at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States should not be loyal to the people of the United States? Somebody answer that, will you?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. We do not require an investigation of the cadets at Annapolis or at West Point, do we?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No. The students at Annapolis and West Point do not have within their future grasp the secrets of the United States which these fellows who are being educated by these fellowships are going to have. That is the object of having the fellowships—it is to educate the people who go into this organization.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The students at Annapolis and West Point are watched and scrutinized for 4 years, and if there is anything wrong with them they are turned out.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is true.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. In all the long history of this country has any graduate of Annapolis or West Point ever betrayed his country?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not to my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire how many amendments there are now on the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. There are four amendments on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4846) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution from the Lithuanian-American Council in Waterbury, Conn.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made and include certain excerpts from newspapers and other publications.

Mr. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in regard to hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on a graduated tax on tobacco.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FURCOLO (at the request of Mr. PHILBIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a certain excerpt.

Mr. HEFFERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Daily Eagle.

Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a protest against the abduction of Greek children, and in the second to include the remarks of Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. DAGUE (at the request of Mr. GAVIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain statistica' information and extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement on the oil situation.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter he wrote to the Secretary of State and enclosures, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and will cost $225.50.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow and 10 minutes on March 6, following the legislative business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

ADMIRAL DENFELD

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I learned that today in Boston Admiral Denfeld, who was ousted as Chief of Naval Operations, left the Navy Department. He left it with the admiration of all those in the First Naval District and thousands of Americans. A salvo of guns was fired and every honor paid him as befitted a great naval hero.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Navy and the personnel of the Navy Department owe to martyred Admiral Louis Denfeld a debt of gratitude they never can repay. Some of those who did not dare to speak for our naval security will regret that they did not do so.

If additional authorizations and appropriations are made to strengthen our very much weakened Navy it will be to Admiral Louis Denfeld and a few naval officers who resigned from the service in protest over what was done to Admiral Denfeld. I understand that larger appropriations are being made and that there will be a stronger navy in the Pacific, and that some of the things that Admiral Denfeld felt obliged to recommend will be adopted. The fact that the Committee on Armed Services voted 22 to 8 today, as I have been told, that the removal of Admiral Denfeld was an act of reprisal verifies what I believe and what I have said before.

ARMS TO ARAB NATIONS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have been arming other countries I believe to the detriment of our own, and at a time while we have been weakening our own defense. I wish to read into the RECORD a letter I am today sending to the Secretary of State:

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY ACHESON: Information has come to me that great quantities of arms, tanks, planes, and submarines are being purchased by Egypt and other Arab nations from Great Britain and other European countries. This recent rearmament policy on the part of the Arab nations seems to have taken on a wartime tempo and appears to be much too accelerated a program merely for domestic security.

The citizens of the little state of Israel are alarmed, as they have just cause to be, in view of this situation. They are fully aware—and have made it known to American citizens—that the Arab leaders bluntly state, in their press and radio, that they are preparing for a second round with the Government of Israel. This is not altogether surprising, since the Arab nations have been reluctant to make peace treaties with the Government of Israel. Instead, the actions on the part of the Arab leaders indicate that they are intent on waging another war of revenge upon Israel.

The Government of the United States was the first to recognize the independence of Israel and has been giving financial assistance to the little nation. In admitting tens of thousands of Jewish DP's from Europe, Asia, and Africa, rehabilitating and settling these unfortunate men, women, and children who seek nothing more than peace and security in the land of their brethren, the Government of Israel has been confronted with an almost impossible task. This little nation needs every dollar to help these immigrants who are streaming in by the thousands daily. They can ill afford the strain on their financial resources to build a military fortress at this time. Yet, because of the hostile feeling of their Arab neighbors, they are being forced to do just that.

In view of the policy of our Government, as I see it, to sanction Great Britain's selling of arms, planes, submarines, etc., in unlimited quantities—indirectly with American dollars paid by American taxpayers—to the Arab nations, it seems to me that American citizens in general, and those of the Jewish faith in particular, must be greatly concerned and vexed that our Government is not fully aware of the danger of another outbreak of war in the Middle East region; thereby jeopardizing peace in the world.

Mr. Secretary, in your letter to Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, you have stated that "Great Britain faithfully observed the arms embargo imposed by the Security Council on the shipment of arms to the Palestine area, and now that the embargo has been lifted, it has resumed shipment of arms in accordance with its treaty obligations to the countries concerned. It should be recalled that the Arab states are but a part of the Middle East area, a region the security of which is of great importance to the west. It is desirable that the countries in this part of the world obtain from reliable and friendly sources such arms as they may need for their legitimate security requirements."

From your statement, it would be apparent that, since Israel, too, is a country in the Middle East area, she should be the recipient of necesary arms for self-defense and security purposes. There should be a balance of armament amongst the nations of the Middle East area and no discrimination where Israel is concerned.

It is my sincere hope that our Government, through your good offices, will take a firm stand, without delay, in stating its views to Great Britain, pointing out that it is unwise to permit the Arab governments to arm beyond their domestic needs for internal security.

As the eve approaches of the second anniversary of the independence of Israel, our Government should reaffirm its desire to continue assistance to the infant nation so that it may survive and grow, in security and peace. We should extend equal opportunity to Israel so that she may obtain arms and weapons necessary for the security of her people until such time when peace agreements will be drawn up between Israel and her neighboring Arab states.

An early reply will be deeply appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, from the American point of view I think it is vitally necessary that the administration and the Secretary of State accede to my request.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 10 minutes following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poll by the American Press Association.

Mr. HALLECK (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HERTER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. MARCANTONIO (at the request of Mr. POWELL), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7220. An act to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 1, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1270. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 26, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on the White River, Ark., with a view to determining the advisability of improvements of the White River in Arkansas for flood-control drainage, and other purposes in the general vicinity of Des Arc, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on April 5, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 485); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1271. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 7, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Pocomoke River, Md., from Old Rock Buoy to Williams Point, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 486); to the Committee on Pub-

lic Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

1272. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 29, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a preliminary examination and survey of Oswego Harbor, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 487); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1273. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 4, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Conn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 1, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 488); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1274. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 15, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Arkansas River above Pine Bluff, Ark., with special reference to control of caving banks in the vicinity of Hensley bar and the McFadden place in Jefferson County, Ark., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 489); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1275. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 29, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the south shore, State of Rhode Island. This investigation was made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 490); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 11 illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs S. 2541. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration," approved January 3, 1946, as amended, to extend the period for which employees may be detailed for training and research, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs H. R. 6632. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 6374. A bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the Boxer Rebellion, and their dependents; without amendment (Rept. No. 1719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 7057. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to the computation of estimated costs of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in the case of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts and other nonprofit educational institutions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 7440. A bill to amend Veterans Regulations to establish for persons who served in the armed forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for active pulmonary tuberculosis; without amendment (Rept. No 1721) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 471. An act for the relief of Lloyd Gordon Findley and Malcolm Hearne Findley, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary S 738. An act for the relief of Earl B. Hochwalt; without amendment (Rept. No 1695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S 1310. An act for the relief of Pierre E. Lefevre; without amendment (Rept No 1696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S 1394. An act for the relief of Monroe Kelly, rear admiral, United States Navy, retired; without amendment (Rept No. 1697) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S 1447. An act for the relief of John M. Hart; without amendment (Rept. No 1698). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr BYRNE of New York· Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1737. An act for the relief of George M. Vaughan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1699). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S 1764. An act for the relief of George K. Haviland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON. Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 1124. A bill for the relief of Lee Freddie Lambert; without amendment (Rept. No. 1701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1817. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE· Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2851. A bill for the relief of Carl L. Sexauer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3010. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Parks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1704). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3996. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. Carlyle Nagle; without amendment (Rept. No. 1705). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4164. A bill for the relief of Norman Otis Pippin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1706). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5341. A bill for the relief of Joseph W. Greer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1707). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5380. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Smith; with an amendment (Rept No. 1708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 5355. A bill for the relief of Szalom Malek; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1709). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. FELLOWS· Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 5581. A bill for the relief of Deborah Elizabeth Ebel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1710). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 6163. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wei Tcheng Liang; without amendment (Rept. No 1711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr CHELF· Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6656. A bill for the relief of Peter Michael El-Hini; without amendment (Rept. No. 1712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS· Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6747. A bill for the relief of Helga Holleb; with an amendment (Rept No. 1713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM· Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 7256. A bill for the relief of Mieko Nishitsuru; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7313 A bill for the relief of Lucy Teresa Morris; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1715) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7468. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs BOSONE:

H R. 7462. A bill to reestablish a Civilian Conservation Corps; to provide for the conservation of natural resources and the development of human resources through the employment of youthful citizens in the performance of useful work, including job training and instruction in good work habits; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 7463. A bill to reestablish a Civilian Conservation Corps; to provide for the conservation of natural resources and the development of human resources through the employment of youthful citizens in the performance of useful work, including job training and instruction in good work habits; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 7464. A bill to prevent military personnel from replacing civilians in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORAND:
H. R. 7465. A bill to make surplus agricultural commodities available to Federal, State, and local penal and correctional institutions, to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:
H R 7466 A bill to protect trade and commerce against interference or restraints by labor organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. KEOGH:
H. R. 7467. A bill to extend the benefits provided by title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to certain persons who served as technical advisers to the armed forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs

By Mr BYRNE of New York:
H R 7468 A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr SABATH:
H R. 7469 A bill to provide for a temporary diversion of water from Lake Michigan during the coal-shortage emergency, to the Committee on Public Works

By Mr H CARL ANDERSEN:
H. R 7470. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of profits from the sale of livestock used for draft, dairy, or breeding purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr BURDICK:
H. R. 7471. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

By Mr. GARY:
H R 7472. A bill to create a commission to study the feasibility of Federal participation in the American Negro Progress Exposition, to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr McKINNON:
H R. 7473 A bill to extend the personal rights and duties of the Indians of California, to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr O'KONSKI:
H. R 7474. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RODINO:
H. R. 7475. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise taxes on luggage, jewelry, furs, and toilet preparations; to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; and to terminate the war tax rates on admissions, telephone, and telegraph; to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
H. R. 7476. A bill to provide that aliens who have arrived in the United States shall not be excluded without a hearing, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. BONNER:
H R. 7477. A bill providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HORAN:
H. R. 7478. A bill creating a commission on Federal reimbursement to States and local governments by reason of Federal ownership of improved and unimproved real property; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERSON:
H. R. 7479. A bill to authorize the District Court for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Tampa Shipbuilding Realty Corp., without regard to lapse of time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIES of New York:
H J. Res 428. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgage insurance under section 608 of such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to effecting substantial decreases in the next Federal budget and the Federal debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting the enactment of H. R. 4453, known as the FEPC bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr DAVENPORT:
H. R. 7480. A bill for the relief of Tullio Caporale, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr GOODWIN:
H. R 7481 A bill for the relief of Chryssoula Dimitrious Halatsi, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr HARE
H R 7482. A bill for the relief of John E Cromer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN
H R 7483. A bill for the relief of Luciana Caratella, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr MARCANTONIO:
H R 7484 A bill for the relief of Salvatore Maneri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr MORTON:
H. R. 7485. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Margarite Noe, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr RIBICOFF.
H R 7486. A bill for the relief of Marguerite Micheline Bidault Barbier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr RIEHLMAN.
H R 7487 A bill for the relief of Louis Cohen, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1925. By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, requesting Congress to lower the high cost of food; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1926. Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, requesting Congress to pass anti-poll-tax legislation; to the Committee on House Administration

1927. Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, requesting Congress to pass anti-lynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1928. Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, requesting the President and the Congress to effect substantial decreases in the next Federal budget and the Federal debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1929. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to effect substantial decreases in the next Federal budget and the Federal debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1930. By Mr. KEARNEY: Memorial of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of New York, advocating enactment of House bill 4453; to the Committee on Education and Labor

1931. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging the Congress to lower the high cost of food; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1932. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging enactment of anti-poll-tax legislation; to the Committee on House Administration.

1933. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging enactment of anti-lynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1934. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging substantial decreases in the next Federal budget and the Federal debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1935. By Mr. SHAFER: Resolution of the American Warehousemen's Association, protesting deficit spending and urging reduction of Government spending; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments

1936 Also, resolution of the Oil Advisory Board of the State of Michigan, protesting change in the depletion-allowance provisions of the Federal tax laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1937. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Louis P Seltzer, chairman, Assembly of 1,000 Citizens of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio, relative to the abduction of 28,000 Greek children, and requesting prompt repatriation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

1938. Also, petition of John D Coleman, secretary, Pennsylvania Lodge, Fraternal Order of Police, Harrisburg, Pa., stating their opposition to any citizens' committee, regardless of how formed or appointed, having access to the Federal Bureau of Investigation files, to the Committee on the Judiciary

1939. Also, petition of Buddy Hays and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who art in heaven, and earth, and in all Thy works, we pause in the midst of thronging duties and confused issues to commune with Thee, source of all goodness, beauty, and truth. May we know no glory but the supreme satisfaction of rendering to the Nation and to the world our utmost service, unsullied by base motives of self-interest, as again with the golden gift of a new day we pledge at this white altar of devotion to maintain integrity of character, cleanness of hands, and unswerving firmness of purpose in the fulfillment of our high and holy calling as servants of the Republic. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 28, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 28, 1950, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1916) for the relief of Edna A. Bauser.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Millikin
Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Bricker	Humphrey	Mundt
Bridges	Hunt	Murray
Butler	Ives	Myers
Byrd	Jenner	Neely
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Darby	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Leahy	Stennis
Eastland	Lehman	Taft
Ecton	Lodge	Taylor
Ellender	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McCarran	Tobey
Frear	McCarthy	Tydings
Fulbright	McClellan	Watkins
George	McKellar	Wherry
Green	McMahon	Wiley
Gurney	Magnuson	Williams
Hayden	Malone	Withers
Hendrickson	Maybank	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 44) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were, on page 5, to strike out line 20; on page 8, to strike out line 23; on page 9, to strike out line 6; and on page 10, to strike out line 11.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were, on page 2, to strike out lines 2 and 3, and on page 3, after line 2, to insert "A-6369006, Karpman, Itzhak Jakob. A-6643689, Karpman, Estera (nee Goldfinger)."

Mr. MCCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] may have a few minutes to present a very important matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senate, as I shall make a request in connection with the bill which is now the unfinished business. The bill, as amended, and as it came from the Committee on the Judiciary, contains certain somewhat involved amendments. It may be difficult for Senators who did not hear the explanation I made yesterday, or even for Senators who heard the explanation I made yesterday, fully to understand the purport of the amendments. The committee amendments are exceedingly important. I make the suggestion, and I should like to have a stipulation made, that the committee amendments, as contained in the bill which came from the Committee on the Judiciary, be adopted now, for the purpose of then sending the bill to the printer and having a clean bill printed with the committee amendments, with the understanding and stipulation that any Senator may offer amendments to the clean bill in any particular, and that the substitute bill may be offered to the clean bill, when the clean bill is returned from the printer.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS When the Senator from Nevada asks for the adoption of the committee amendments, does that mean that the Senate will adopt the committee amendments en bloc, or if any Senator desires to oppose the committee amendments, will he have the right to do so, and will the Senate have the right to a vote on such amendments when they are presented?

Mr. MCCARRAN. My thought would be to adopt the committee amendments en bloc as they are, for the purpose of having a clean bill printed and brought back to the Senate, so that then the bill will be before the Senate with the committee amendments adopted, but subject to amendment by any Senator who may desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not quite see the advantage of adopting the committee amendments en bloc without discussion as they are respectively reported. As committee amendments are reached they are always subject to debate and amendment.

Mr. MCCARRAN. They will come up later. When the bill comes back from the printer the Senate will have a clear understanding as to what the committee amendments are, their significance, and everything about them. Then when the amendments are reached each amendment will be subject to discussion and amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. And a vote.

Mr. MCCARRAN. And a vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. All the Senator from Nevada proposes to have done is to clarify the bill itself, so it will be understandable, so it will be a clean bill. When it comes back from the printer every right Senators now have from the parliamentary standpoint will be retained. There will be no change in the parliamentary situation, so far as degree of amendments is concerned. The Senator's request is simply that so far as concerns the bill as it was reported by the committee with amendments, the amendments be adopted and the bill reprinted so that there may be a clean bill before the Senate.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. But after the bill has been returned from the printer Senators will have the same right as they now have to offer amendments, when amendments are in order, and to debate them and vote upon them, just as though we started to consider and act on them now?

Mr. MCCARRAN. That is my suggestion.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. What the Senator is trying to do is to perfect the bill as it came from the committee, ready for voting and for amendments. Is that correct?

Mr. MCCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, with that understanding, the Senator from Illinois has no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair state his understanding of the request, because it is somewhat complicated.

Under the rule, of course, when a committee amendment once is agreed to, it cannot be amended except by a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to. The Chair understands that the Senator from Nevada is requesting unanimous consent that the committee amendments be adopted en bloc and the bill then be returned to the printer, to be printed as a clean bill, including in it the committee amendments which will then have been adopted; that any Senator thereafter may move to amend or to strike out any portion or paragraph of the clean bill

which was not in the bill before the committee amendments were adopted, just as could be done if no amendments at all had been adopted, and any Senator then could move to strike out or amend any part or paragraph of the bill. The Senator is in agreement that, as to modifications or amendments, they may be made when the bill is returned from the printer in clean form.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. This suggestion is made for the purpose of clarifying the bill, so that Senators may understand it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator intend to have the amendments printed in italics, as is customary in the case of committee amendments, or as a part of the bill, just as if it had not been amended?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment, let me say that my understanding is that the bill is to be printed just as any clean bill would be; it would then be printed complete, just as a newly introduced bill would be; and the previous adoption of the amendments, on which there was agreement, would not present any conflict with respect to any amendments which might then be offered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is a little difficult to understand why it is necessary to adopt the committee amendments first, in order to have a clean bill printed. Why could not we take up the amendments in the regular order, and either adopt or reject them? In other words, if we agree to the suggested procedure, the burden of proof will be on those who seek to defeat the amendments; it will then be up to some Senator who is interested in having an amendment defeated to move, after the committee amendments have been accepted en bloc by the Senate, to strike that amendment from the clean bill. I think it would simply be shifting the burden to Senators who are opposed to certain amendments if the Senate first adopted the committee amendments, with the understanding that later there would be an opportunity for Senators to move to strike them out.

I do not wish to interfere with the agreement which has been made by the two distinguished Senators; but it seems to me that if the bill is rewritten, so to speak, in order to make a clean bill, including all the amendments, with the understanding that thereafter they will be taken up for consideration the result will be much the same as if we acted on the amendments in regular course, with this exception. It would be up to Senators who are opposed to the amendments to seek their rejection, while if the bill is left as it is the burden will be upon the proponents to adopt their amendments, where it should be.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it..

Mr. CONNALLY. If we adopt the amendments now, either singly or en bloc, when the bill returns as a clean bill, so-called, if a Senator thereafter offers an amendment to strike out one of the committee amendments, what will the Chair do?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Nevada, the Chair would hold that it would be in order to move to amend any part of the clean bill which had been amended by the adoption of a committee amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would not the same purpose be accomplished by having the bill printed as a so-called clean bill, and then having the amendments fought out when the bill comes back from printing? I do not like to have amendments agreed to en bloc in advance, and then be required later to consider them again and act on suggested changes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments are ordinarily printed in italics. There is no way to print a clean bill with the amendments in it, so that they would be subject to amendment, if first adopted en bloc, at the Senator's request, without having all of them printed alike.

In other words, the Chair would assume that the Senator contemplates that the whole bill would then be printed in italics, as a substitute for the language of the pending measure, including the committee amendments; and then it would be in order for any Senator to move to strike out or modify any part of the clean bill, including what had been contained in the committee amendments, and also including any other portion of the bill which a Senator might wish to have the Senate change.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois has stated the proposition fairly, namely, that if the committee amendments are first adopted en bloc, a burden of proof will be placed upon any Senator who wishes to move to strike out any one of the amendments, and action will have to be taken by the Senate by majority vote.

I suggest that we have a clean bill printed, without taking any action now upon the committee amendments. That will leave us in the position that each amendment will be compelled to be acted upon in the regular way, under the regular order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, how could the bill be printed any differently, may I ask the Senator, than in the form in which we already have it on our desks, if the proposed procedure is followed? Would we achieve anything by carrying out the suggestion which has been made by the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McCARRAN. No one will achieve anything by the adoption of the suggestion. In other words, if we adopt the committee amendments now and send the bill with the amendments to the printer, to have a clean bill printed, and subsequently returned to us, with the understanding that at that time the bill will be subject to amendment or to a motion to substitute, we shall have the same proposition, in my judgment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say that I cannot quite understand why the Senate should take the suggested action. The bill is now here with the committee amendments printed in italics. Those amendments are now set out in the bill, so that every Senator knows, when he examines the bill, what the committee amendments are.

If we have a clean bill printed, with the committee amendments first adopted by the Senate, then we shall not know just what the committee amendments are; and it will take some time for Senators to ascertain exactly what the committee amendments are or that they may wish to move to strike out.

I do not understand how we are going to obtain any advantage from the proposed procedure.

I talked to the two able Senators, Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. KILGORE, before we began to debate this matter; and at that time I was under the impression that there was some advantage to be gained by following their suggestion and more or less agreed to their suggestion. But as I have explored the situation, I do not see where there is an advantage at all to be gained. In fact, I think there is an absolute disadvantage, from the viewpoint of Senators who seek to defeat some of the committee amendments, because once the committee amendments are adopted en bloc and once the clean bill is printed, there will be trouble for Senators who are opposed to some of the committee amendments which then would have been adopted; in such case, such Senators would find themselves confronted with some difficulty in attempting to eliminate from the bill the committee amendments, once they had been adopted.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will quire whether, if the proposal of the Senator from Nevada is adopted, it would mean that the Senate would then be asked to vote on each of the amendments piecemeal, before hearing the debate on the entire question?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; the debate can be presented on the entire question at any time.

Mr. LEHMAN. I know; but what would be the advantage, then, of adopting the Senator's suggestion?

Mr. McCARRAN. The advantage in this case is clarity; to clarify the bill so that Senators who have not been familiar with the question may have the whole question before them, and will not have to be asking, "What does this line mean?" and "What does this line mean?" They will have the whole thing set forth in a clear way before them, in a printed bill. That is the only object of my suggestion.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KILGORE. If the proposal of the Senator from Nevada is adopted, will we then be placed under the parliamentary burden of moving to strike each committee amendment and having that motion adopted by the Senate, once the committee amendment in question has

been adopted, before an amendment to the amendment can be offered and voted upon? That is the point which worries me; in short, the situation in regard to an amendment subsequently offered, which would be in conflict with a committee amendment which previously had been adopted in perfecting the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the proposal of the Senator from Nevada is agreed to, the Chair would feel that it would mean that all the committee amendments would be, in a sense, voted on and adopted en bloc; that any Senator might thereafter, by identifying the language of the amendment as it was reported from the committee, move to strike it out; but it would be necessary for such Senator to do so, because otherwise the amendment already having been adopted, although as a part of a set of amendments, it would remain in the bill unless some Senator moved, and the Senate thereafter agreed, to strike that language from the new bill or the clean bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I see the situation, if the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada is adopted, those of us who may be in favor of the House provisions, rather than the committee amendment provisions, would have to submit amendments and would have to have them printed as amendments to the new language, even though that language might not as of that time have been adopted.

I personally favor the substitute bill and hope to vote for it, but if it should be defeated I should then prefer certain of the provisions of the House bill to the committee bill, and if they were out of print we would have to reprint them and submit them by way of amendments to the committee amendments, if I am correct in my understanding.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the matter is becoming more involved as a result of the discussion. It was very simple, a little while ago, and it would be simple if it were to go through as the Senator from West Virginia and I had agreed. I now withdraw the suggestion.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under unanimous consent agreement entered on request of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Chair will recognize Senators who desire to print matters in the RECORD, introduce bills, or present other routine matters before recognizing the Senator from Connecticut.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to effect substantial decreases in the next Federal budget and the Federal debt

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the President and the Congress of the United States to effect a substantial decrease in the next Federal budget and to lessen the Federal debt; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, February 14, 1950.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"*Clerk.*

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 20, 1950.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"*Clerk.*"

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution requesting the Senators from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to endorse and endeavor to have enacted into law H. R. 6000, to extend and improve the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system

"Whereas a bill (H. R. 6000) which has already been endorsed by the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States is one which is of the keenest interest to Rhode Islanders, namely the measure entitled 'An act to extend and improve the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, so as to include certain self-employed persons and other miscellaneous groups under coverage, to raise both the amount of benefits and the rate of contributions, and to amend the public assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, by liberalizing Federal participation in the cost of public assistance': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States are earnestly urged to endorse and endeavor to have enacted into law said H. R. 6000 so as to extend and improve the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System as indicated in the purposes of this act, and the Secretary of State is hereby directed to transmit to the Senators from Rhode Island in said Congress duly certified copies of this resolution."

TRAIN AND BUS FARE FOR ENLISTED MEN ON FURLOUGH

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., relating to train and bus fare for enlisted men on furlough.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our country is spending billions of dollars to aid European and Asiatic countries; and

Whereas men in the service now are forced to pay full railroad rates to reach their homes on furloughs.

Now, therefore, Congressman LANE and Senators SALTONSTALL and LODGE are requested to initiate legislation for the Government to pay one-half of the train fare for enlisted men who have occasion to use trains and buses during furloughs.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President of the United States, Secretary of the Armed Services, Congressman LANE, and Senators SALTONSTALL and LODGE.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 4408. A bill to amend the act approved May 27, 1924, entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," so as to grant rights to members of the United States Park Police force commensurate with the rights granted to members of Metropolitan Police force as to time off from duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 1320).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S 3150. A bill for the relief of Marie P. Sigioltzakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

S 3151. A bill for the relief of Mary Frances Yoshinaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. CAIN):

S. 3152. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 7½-cent piece and a 2½-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3153 A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Northern District of Illinois to hear and determine the claims of the Aetna Insurance Co. and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 3154. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint to the District Boxing Commission a retired member of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3155. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Shiraki, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 3156. A bill for the relief of Orange Hayward Scott; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S 3157. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carl E. Ainsworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for Mr. VANDENBERG):

S. 3158 A bill for the relief of Dr. Lorna Wan-Hsi Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HUNT (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. TAYLOR) introduced Senate bill 3159, granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Idaho and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Snake River, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. DOUGLAS), introduced Senate Joint Resolution 157, to establish a Special Bipartisan Coal Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

SPECIAL BIPARTISAN COAL COMMISSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution, and I ask unanimous consent to make a very brief comment, not exceeding 5 to 7 minutes, in reference to the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to establish a special bipartisan coal commission. This proposal is not an attempt to deal in any way with the current labor-management dispute within the coal industry. It is offered rather as a contribution toward the prevention of future disputes; it is offered in the realization that the present disput is but one of a series through which the people of the United States have suffered; and it is offered in the realization that our country cannot afford in the future the recurring coal crises we have had in the past.

The coal industry is a sick industry. To an important extent the current coal crisis is a symptom of deep, underlying economic crises within that industry, and a symptom, too, of basic problems arising from technological displacement and the development of substitute fuels.

I am sure most of us would agree that it is an oversimplification of the problem to think that any one labor leader is the cause of our present difficulties in the coal industry. Problems would exist and would cause eruptions of some kind within the industry, no matter who the head of the United Mine Workers of America might be. Unless we take steps to deal directly with the underlying economic problems in the coal industry, we will have difficulty in that industry in future years, no matter how the present crisis may be resolved. We, the sponsors of the joint resolution, therefore propose to establish a special bipartisan coal commission to bring to the Congress a concrete program to deal with economics of the coal industry.

I repeat, the proposal for this commission in no way bears upon the present dispute. The purpose of the bipartisan commission would be to "study and investigate the economic problems and prospects of the American coal industry with a view to determining what policies and programs by Government, business, labor, and others would most effectively contribute toward meeting America's needs for coal and coal products, providing a rising standard of living for the employees in the coal industry, adjusting to the problems raised by technological change and substitute fuels, and preventing or alleviating labor-management conflicts in the coal industry."

The Commission proposed in the joint resolution is modeled after the Hoover Commission—six members to be appointed by the President; six by the Vice President, three of whom shall be Senators; and six by the Speaker of the House, three of whom shall be Representatives. Three of the President's six appointees would be the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Labor.

The Commission would be expected to work promptly. Its final report would be required in January 1951. It would then be continued in existence for no more than 90 days, during which time its staff could be maintained for the purpose of congressional testimony or developing answers to questions which might be raised concerning its recommendations. The Commission would then cease to exist.

The joint resolution provides for a modest appropriation of $250,000.

If the joint resolution is acted upon promptly, the best brains in America can be mobilized for the purpose of bringing before the Congress, the President, and the public a concrete set of recommendations for maintaining labor peace, a healthy coal industry, and an adequate supply of coal and coal products.

Mr. President, it is my considered judgment that this industry can no longer be permitted to continue in its present situation without seriously threatening the economic and industrial well-being not only of the United States but of the entire world.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I requested unanimous consent only to introduce the joint resolution. But I shall yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Minnesota is bound to know that without any expense to the Congress the Committee on Banking and Currency spent a month and a half last summer taking a thousand pages of testimony on every phase of the coal situation. We found out what the situation was. But we also found out that we could not get the coal to the consumer without a change in the law. The Senator from Virginia, therefore, proposed such a change. What information does the Senator think the Commission would obtain that we do not already have in the printed records of that investigation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know; but I may say I am sure if the Commission is established, it will be more than pleased to have the information which the Senator's committee was able to obtain. I am not taking sides on the issue. I am simply saying that, in view of the catastrophe now facing the country, something needs to be done. I am willing to judge the Senator's program or bill on the basis of its own merits, as I would request him to do on the request for a special commission.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I appreciate the consideration the Senator from Minnesota is going to give to my bill.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to establish a Special Bipartisan Coal Commission, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. DOUGLAS), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. CORDON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE RISE OR SUNSET OF PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled 'The Rise or Sunset of Peace," delivered by him before the American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association, at Atlantic City, N. J., on February 26, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOD, MAN, AND THE HYDROGEN BOMB—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject God, Man, and the Hydrogen Bomb, delivered by him at the Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C., February 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE EXTRA BUSHEL—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Extra Bushel, delivered by Hon. Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, before the National Farm Institute, at Des Moines, Iowa, February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FINANCIAL STATEMENT

[Mr. MCKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a financial statement of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which appears in the Appendix]

UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS—LETTER FROM REV. PHILIP S. MOORE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding United World Federalists, addressed to him by Rev Philip S Moore, C. S. C., dean of the Graduate School of the University of Notre Dame, which appears in the Appendix.]

ABOLITION OF RENT CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not a Federal Problem," relating to rent control, published in the Washington Evening Star of February 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Neglecting Security of Nation's Seaports," published in the Seattle Times of December 19, 1949, and an article entitled "Harbors Called Open to Alien Ships With Smuggled A-bombs," written by George Fielding Eliot and published in the Washington Star of February 12, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE TRUE MEANING OF SECURITY—ARTICLE FROM THE NATIONAL LUTHERAN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The True Meaning of Security," from the National Lutheran, which appears in the Appendix.]

IT'S ONLY MONEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "It's Only Money," published in the Washington News of February 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain newspaper articles, let-

ters, and resolutions pertaining to the subject of displaced persons.

There being no objection, the newspaper articles, letters, and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Banner and Cambridge Record of February 9, 1950]

SOME WORTHY ONES WILL SUFFER

In submitting its resignation, the special committee appointed by Governor Lane to direct the displaced persons settlement in Anne Arundel County declares that "bitter disillusion" is one of the factors that caused the committee to resign and declare that its members could no longer conscientiously participate in the program.

The action is of particular interest in Dorchester County where it seems that the DP resettlement was working out better than in some counties. However, the program in this State has resulted in persistent complaint, much of it being directed at the inadequate screening of personnel abroad.

Here as elsewhere it was with high hopes that people who had been homeless would have their highest aims in life completely met if a home and an occupation were provided for them. The Anne Arundel committee said that it had felt that in giving asylum to the oppressed new opportunities would be given for people desperately in need of them.

"It has been our experience," the committee reported, "that while some are giving a high degree of satisfaction, many who have had extraordinarily fine replacements have not only been unqualified for the work they had represented themselves capable of doing, but have proved themselves devoid of gratitude or a sense of moral obligation."

Some of the sense of disappointment that the Anne Arundel committee felt has been experienced by some of the Dorchester County people, too. Among some of the displaced persons here there seemed to be considerable unrest and dissatisfaction at times that was hard to explain as a result of benefiting from living conditions which were immeasurably superior to those which displaced persons said they had encountered in concentration camps. That outside influences were responsible for some of the dissatisfaction is a possibility. However, if the displaced persons had been properly screened they would hardly have been readily influenced by forces of unrest.

For those displaced persons who have benefited from the opportunities presented to them, it is unfortunate that some of their number should cast discredit upon a program from which they derive such great benefit.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 15, 1950]

RUSH OF 3,500 TO JOIN DP'S TOLD PROBERS—FRAUD IN 35 PERCENT OF CASES BARED

(By William Moore)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—The story of a sudden attempt of 3,500 aliens to qualify as displaced persons was told to a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on DP's today by a Displaced Persons Commission executive the subcommittee had subpenaed from Munich.

The official, Donald Main, said that of 700 of their applications so far studied, the Army Counterintelligence Corps reports "conclusive evidence of fraud," in 35 to 50 percent, and that fraud is suspected in many of the others.

FAKE DOCUMENT MILLS

Other major developments of a day in which Main told his story of the DP's being sent to this country were:

1. He testified that fake-documents mills are operating in 10 German towns that he named, and that 100 of 300 applicants known to have obtained such documents in one town have been admitted to the United States.

2 He said he was pressured by Alexander Squadrilli, DP coordinator in Germany, to admit a man who had declared himself as anticapitalist. Main said he barred the applicant, but that the applicant's case has now been reinstated.

3. He said that of the six DP area chiefs in Germany, three came from welfare organizations that are helping DP's get into this country, and named them. He said Squadrilli's deputy, Benjamin Caplan, also came from one of the welfare organizations.

RECORDS REMOVED

4. Main said Squadrilli ordered the staff to remove from the files the records of applicants once rejected, so that the cases could go by Mr. Tripp, the immigration official who had the final veto.

5. Main said there is no way to weed out Communists and other subversives from the DP's, and said membership in one organization, conservatively estimated by counterintelligence to be 40 percent Communist, is no bar to entering this country.

6. He testified that he was overruled by higher officials on 25 to 50 percent of the cases he rejected before the arrival in Germany of Senator MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, Judiciary Committee chairman and critic of overimmigration. Main said, however, that the let-up which followed might also be attributed to the simultaneous arrival of Chairman Ugo Carusi, of the DPC.

EXAMINATIONS NOT THOROUGH

7. Main charged that the counterintelligence examinations of applicants are not thorough, and urged that American citizens, not other DP's, make the reports on which are based the recommendations for acceptance of the International Refugee Organization, through which the DP's come to the DPC.

8. Senator DONNELL, Republican, of Missouri, subcommittee chairman, and Richard Arens, subcommittee staff director, questioned whether the DPC has usurped major powers of the immigration officials.

Main, an immigration official on loan to the DPC, is senior officer of its Munich district, one of the six DP districts in Germany.

He testified that within 3 weeks last September his district received 1,700 applications, the bulk of them from the Hebrew Immigrants Aid Society and the United Service for New Americans.

The applications represented 3,500 persons, he said, since they were made in the names of heads of families. The great number of applications, he said, "aroused our suspicion."

"The sponsor agencies," he explained, "had previously said their work would be over in October. About the same time, one agency thought hope of amending the DP Act—to advance the date on which aliens could qualify as DP's—had been ended. It was apparent to me that these people had refrained from filing previously because they had come in—into DP zones—later. The cut-off date was December 22, 1945, and they were ineligible, but they were hoping for a change in the cut-off date.

"About 25 to 30 appeals came in from persons who had previously been rejected because their original applications had said they were not in the eligibility zones before the cut-off date. These applications now said they had been in the zones but had not thought they had been there long enough to mention it."

EVIDENCE OF FRAUD

Main said the 1,700 applications were turned over to the counterintelligence, and that it has reported on 700 of them, that 35 to 50 percent are fraudulent. That is, he said, "conclusive evidence" of fraud has been found in these and fraud is suspected in many of the others.

Senator FERGUSON, Republican of Michigan, said Main was leaving the impression that charity organizations are drumming up business. Main responded:

"I did not intend to charge the agencies with conspiracy to get these people in illegally."

Of his five counterparts in Germany, Main said that Gertrude Ruskin, Augusta Mayerson, and Michael Basheim had formerly been affiliated with agencies helping immigrants.

Coordinator Squadrilli had been in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Main said, and Squadrilli's deputy, Caplan, came from one of the voluntary organizations aiding immigrants.

THE MEISENBAUM CASE

"Do you remember the Meisenbaum case?" asked Arens.

"Yes," said Main. "That was one that came back from counterintelligence with a classified [secret for security reasons] report that the applicant had said and repeated that he was anti-Fascist, anti-Communist, and anticapitalist. Counterintelligence reported that he had apparently been in a movement hostile to the United States."

Main said he rejected the applicant and got a letter from Squadrilli, in Frankfort, that "we had no business rejecting him," and proposing another interview. He didn't say to approve the application, but we took his letter to mean that.

Main said he rejected the applicant in defiance of his superior and wrote a letter demanding to know what Squadrilli meant, but got no answer. Main said he understands the case is now pending again before counterintelligence.

TELLS OF COOLNESS

He frankly stated that there is unfriendliness between him and Squadrilli, and told of informing MCCARRAN, on MCCARRAN'S visit, of orders from Squadrilli to take rejected applications from the files. Carusi learned of this order and became angry at a staff meeting, Main said, and Squadrilli said the order had been meant to bypass Tripp.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 16, 1950]

80,000 IN UNITED STATES AS FAKE DP'S, PROBERS TOLD—CRIMINALS SLIP IN, OFFICIAL SAYS

(By William Moore)

WASHINGTON, February 15.—Thirty thousand of the 135,000 aliens admitted to this country under the displaced-persons law may not be bona fide DP's, the American immigration chief for Europe said today.

The official is Almanzo Tripp, an Immigration Service veteran.

A Displaced Persons Commission employee, who said he was demoted for refusing to admit 80 members of the Polish guard he deemed bad risks, said that in one case, speed in the admission of an alien was asked in the name of the White House on behalf of a close relative of the applicant.

Tripp told a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee investigating DP's that:

1. The burden of proof is not on the applicant to show that he is not a Communist or subversive, but is on the Government to show that he is, under DPC regulations, and that he stopped the entrance of 200 members of Hitler's SS or elite guard, with their families, after they had been approved by DPC.

PARDON FOR CONVICTS

2. One thousand aliens denied admission as DP's under the Truman directive that preceded the DP law have now been admitted, and there is evidence that many of them falsified their place of residence to qualify.

3. The International Refugee Organization maintains a legal branch to get pardons for convicts so that they may be eligible to enter the United States.

4. Of 96 persons, mostly convicts, whose fingerprints Tripp has recently received, 33 already have entered this country, and 11 of them are probably deportable.

FINGERPRINTS IGNORED

5. Fingerprint records in the Berlin document center and the American provost marshal's office are ignored in examination of applicants, although they are available. DPC actually sends for them, he explained, but takes a calculated risk and OK's the applications without waiting to receive the fingerprint records.

6. Tripp has campaigned unsuccessfully to have criminals and the physically handicapped weeded out of the applicants.

7. Under orders to accept the eligibility certification of the IRO and the DPC, he has had to improvise to protect American security and try to bar undesirables by passive resistance.

8. If applicants were rejected when it is quite apparent something is wrong, this country would be taking a long step toward safeguarding its citizens.

MURDER ADMITTED

9. One agency that sponsors DP's concealed the fact that 1 of the 2,000 it got admitted was a murderer, and when the crime was disclosed the agency's woman representative said the murder was only a political offense.

10. Tripp has been told that an effort is being made to get him for barring undesirables, and two very truthful persons have told him that Alexander Squadrilli, American DPC coordinator in Europe, have solicited them to complain against Tripp.

Tripp also said the immigration service can do the DP job better and with a smaller staff than the DPC, a statement that brought questions from Senator DONNELL, Republican, of Missouri, and Richard Arens, subcommittee staff chief, regarding the advisability of supplanting the DPC with the immigration service.

WHOLESALE FRAUD

Telling of the 30,000 whose status as bona fide DP's is in question. Tripp said these were doubtful date-line cases. The DP law requires that applicants must have been in Germany, Italy, or Austria by December 1945 to qualify, and witnesses have told of wholesale fraud in applications by persons who arrived later.

Tripp said 44,000 aliens were brought in under the Truman directive. At least 1,000 who were rejected because they had not been in the required areas before the deadline, and perhaps thousands, Tripp said, have been brought in under the DP law.

They have come in with applications claiming residence in the proper places at the proper times, he said, and have been accepted. This he said, indicates untruthfulness that should invalidate their claims of the right to come here.

Tripp said the immigration and DP laws both place the burden of proof on the applicant to show that he is not subversive. But, he explained, the DPC has reversed the obligation.

Finding that criminal records were delaying the cases of some applicants, Tripp said, the IRO set up a legal office to procure pardons. He said that a DPC employee became interested in some of the cases and complained to the IRO, which sent representatives to Tripp's headquarters to clean things up.

He testified that the fingerprint records are of especial value because they would reveal both crime and Nazi activities. The fingerprints of 96 persons from the DP camp at Bremen fell into his hands recently, he said, and although the records would have barred them, 33 had already sailed to the United States, 11 of them bearing records for which they could be deported.

Tripp said the woman who sought to have a murderer admitted was representing the Tolstoi Foundation, an organization helping DP's.

"I chided her for concealing the murder," he said, "but she told me it was justifiable because it was a political crime."

FORCED TO BACK DOWN

Tripp said one of the six DPC senior officers in Germany, a woman, showed a great interest in a number of cases before him, and insisted on admission of an applicant whose own brother, in New Jersey, had certified that the applicant was in the Russian army at the cut-off date, and who had been rejected under the Truman directive.

The burden of proof was on him, Tripp said, and not on the DPC, and he had to back down and admit the applicant.

He said representatives of two sponsor organizations had told him Squadrilli had solicited them to denounce him, when asked about reports that an effort is being made to "get" him He said these representatives are very truthful persons.

Telling of the fake papers with which he has to cope, he mentioned that 400 persons had registered from one address. None of them, he said, had ever lived there.

WHITE HOUSE REQUEST

The DPC employee who told of the White House request was Frank B. Vaughan, Jr. He said his superior telephoned from Frankfurt, Germany, that the White House wanted speedy action, and that sometimes applications bore the notation that Harry N. Rosenfeld, one of the DPC commissioners, wanted the applications speeded.

Vaughan said that Gertrude Ruskin, one of the six DPC area senior officers in Germany, sought a pardon for a prospective DP. He explained that this man had been convicted of stealing 14 eggs, but explained that food theft was a serious crime in Germany at the time of the offense.

Vaughan said DPC workers in Germany might as well remain in the United States, since they don't investigate the applicants DPC recommends. Tripp had explained earlier that the investigations are made by other DP's working for IRO and that DPC accepts IRO certification.

[From the Washington (D C.) Evening Star of February 25, 1950]

SENATOR JENNER CALLS INSIDE STORY OF DP PROGRAM SHOCKING

Senator JENNER, Republican, of Indiana, yesterday declared Americans would be utterly shocked if they knew the inside story of the displaced-persons program.

The Senator, presiding at a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee hearing, charged "fraudulent papers—forged papers" are used to get some of these people into the country. He said some of them are masters of fraud and deception."

He asked how any Government agency can check on these immigrants when they suddenly leave farms here with no trace of them kept.

Senator JENNER said there is no satisfactory screening of DP's in Europe. Investigators of the Displaced Persons Commission abroad cannot see many of the DP's to interview them, he declared, adding that the International Refugee Organization is interested in getting these people rushed to America.

Senator FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, pointed out that Americans who sponsor the DP's feel morally obligated to see they do not become public charges.

DOZEN FARM WITNESSES

The hearing was on a bill to raise the DP quota from 205,000 to 320,000 and to extend the program another year.

The subcommittee heard nearly a dozen farm witnesses from Maryland and Virginia. Some said the DP's are working out satisfactorily, while others testified the DP's are not farmers but have said they were because that is the easiest way to get into the country. Some DP's were branded as "ungrateful" and "money mad."

Former Governor Tuck, of Virginia, was among those who had unpleasant experiences with DP's walking out, according to L. M. Walker, Jr., State commissioner of agriculture. Mr. Walker is chairman of the Virginia Displaced Persons Committee.

R. H. Hudgins, county agent of Appomattox County, said he believed there are spies among these people. He said some praise Europe and criticize America and say they want to go back to Russia. He pointed out that this country is producing surplus food and said the country does not need foreign labor to help swell the surplus.

M. B. Rowe, administrative assistant of the Virginia Agriculture Department, testified that some DP's have expressed the opinion that the farmers should divide up their property and give them half.

TWO-THIRDS SATISFACTORY

Mr. Rowe said there are 118 DP families settled in Virginia through his office and 29 have left. He said about two-thirds of them are proving fairly satisfactory so far, but we do not know what to expect from one day to the next.

Mr. Rowe declared the basic difficulty in the whole program is selection and the people doing the selecting abroad are not qualified to choose farm people.

J. C. Varkentine of Beaverdam, Va , a farmer, said he came to the United States in 1923 from the Ukraine. He said DP's from 18 to 35 years old who have come from Russia have no sense of responsibility.

He said that some, educated under the Stalin system in which the state owns all property, have come to regard property as being without value.

Others who testified were Benjamin Watkins III; Charles B. Lynch; and J. Irving King; who all resigned as members of the Anne Arundel County (Md.) Displaced Persons Committee. They said they were disgusted with the program because of so many nonfarmers being supplied and confusion in the program

LANE LETTER READ

Oden A. Sansbury, Friendship, Md., farmer, Anne Arundel County Agent Stanley E. Day, Lawrence Mistr of Richmond and F. C. Nuckols, member of the Virginia State Board of Agriculture, also testified.

Edward M. O'Connor, one of the three displaced persons commissioners, questioned the witnesses. He read a letter from Gov. Lane of Maryland, who said 80 percent of the farmers were satisfied with DP's. Mr. O'Connor told Senator FERGUSON he had no break-down of DP figures dealing with farmers only, said his commission is concerned about DP's leaving farms, but declared between 80 and 85 percent of DP's are proving satisfactory.

Mr. Nuckols testified he was satisfied with the DP's he had received on his farm, but agreed a poor screening job is being done abroad. He said in view of the testimony of his colleagues, he was not sure how long he would remain satisfied with the DP's. Many witnesses said the DP's quit on short notice.

MISHAWAKA, IND., *February 24, 1950.*
Senator PATRICK MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I am deeply grateful for your stand on the displaced persons problem. My experience with displaced persons is that they want a great deal and appreciate very little. They have been a disappointment and I think that a great many other sponsors feel the same way. From the

talk of some of these displaced persons, I have gathered that many undesirables have easily entered the country by paying a sum of money. It is my hope that they are more carefully screened in the future.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. M. VERCSEG.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *February 21, 1950.*

United States Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Judiciary Committee Chairman,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of recent date containing a copy of your speech before the United States Senate on the displaced persons situation and the immigration legislation to date.

This statement and information was read to the members of Unity Council, No. 39, Jr. O. U. A. M. on a recent date.

In view of the critical situation today regards these hordes of misplaced persons and immigrants coming to our shores, the council wishes to inform you that we believe all immigration and displaced persons should be stopped now from entering the United States or any of our possessions. Further that the United States Senate and House of Representatives should enact very strict laws and regulations in the future.

We must protect our American citizens and prevent any further unemployment, economic and social unrest, this is very dangerous to the future welfare of our people. We are going through a serious crisis and many people are fearful of the future of our Nation.

Your true patriotic spirit in warning your fellow Americans and endeavors toward a more sane administration of these laws are to be commended. Thank you for your sincere efforts in this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

F. L. MURCH,
Recording Secretary.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
MARINE CORPS LEAGUE,
Havelock, N. C., January 19, 1950.

The Honorable PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: It has been my pleasure to read your statement on the displaced-persons movement in the United States contained in the prepared statement, Displaced Persons: Facts Versus Fiction, which you made before the United States Senate on Friday, January 6, 1950.

We are grateful to you for such bold disclosure of the threat which endangers the very existence of the United States and seems to be ignored by our people. Such statements as you have made to enlighten us will do much to prevent the entry of undesirable aliens through strengthening of our present immigration laws at the demand of our citizens.

The southeastern division, Marine Corps League, is very interested in this subversive movement and will do all within its power to prevent the passage of H. R. 4567 in the United States Senate. We will appreciate a list of the sponsors of this resolution and a list of the organizations supporting the resolution.

We will have a southeastern conference of all detachments in this division of the Marine Corps League and the national vice commandant of the southeastern division intends to bring up this issue before the conference with regard to the threat of the displaced-persons movement. The conference will be held in Daytona Beach, Fla., in April of this year.

Thanking you again for your statement and your patriotic attitude on this important issue.

Most sincerely,

VIRGIL V. HARTON.

WILLIAM E. TATE CHAPTER, No. 17,
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
North Charleston, S. C., February 13, 1950.

Senator MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: The William E. Tate Chapter, No. 17, Department of South Carolina, Disabled American Veterans, appreciates and extends to you our sincere appreciation for your efforts to reduce the liberalized displaced-person quota of immigrants to this country.

The courage, honesty, and patriotism requisite for your stand on this question, in face of highly organized active minority and international partisanship is fully realized.

The chapter wishes to convey to you its offer of support to the full limit of its charter, prestige, and covenant.

Your good leadership is very much appreciated.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD F. TOPPING,
Adjutant.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
INGLEWOOD POST NO. 2122,
Inglewood, Calif., January 7, 1950.

The Honorable PAT MCCARRAN,
Senator from Nevada,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In pursuance of action taken at a regular meeting of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Inglewood Post No. 2122, Inglewood, Calif., I wish to express the sincere appreciation of our members for your position on H. R. 4567 (displaced persons) bill coming before the Senate. If only all Senators and Congressmen could see the true picture of unemployment, these measures would never get to the floor of either house.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent to Senators WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and SHERIDAN DOWNEY, of the State of California

Again I wish to thank you, and hope this bill is defeated.

I have the honor to remain,

Very truly yours,

L. H. BRUGMANN,
Commander.

NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF
THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
Ashland, Kans., February 10, 1950.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am indebted to you for the several copies of your statement on displaced persons.

Thank you very much for your generosity which makes it possible for me to provide every member of the resolutions committee of the Daughters of the American Revolution with a copy.

In April the DAR will meet in its annual meeting and will reaffirm its stand on displaced persons, I feel sure. Your splendid explanation of the situation will help make this a certainty. I enclose a copy of our resolutions as passed at our annual continental congress a year ago, 1949, in which you will find our policy on immigration and other topics of the day.

It is fortunate that we have you, Senator, to plead for the rights of the American people.

Cordially,

DOROTHY BERRYMAN SHREWDER.

IMMIGRATION

Resolved, That the fifty-eighth continental congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm the resolution on immigration adopted by the fifty-seventh continental congress of 1948, namely:

"Whereas the economic, social and spiritual mind of the United States is under increasing pressures and conflicts, and there is growing evidence of a determined effort by foreign blocs to break down our immigration laws; and

"Whereas the immigration laws of 1924, now threatened with change, have restricted immigration to a quota system allocating a definite number to each nationality mentioned, such allocation not to be interchangeable among quotas;

"*Resolved,* That for the purpose of protecting the interest of all our citizens, and particularly our veterans, and for the purpose of excluding foreign elements imbued with political ideologies wholly at variance with our constitutional system of government, the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution urge upon the Congress that no immigration over and above the present quota system shall be permitted into the United States, either by special legislation, unused quotas, or Executive order."

THE GREENE COUNTY
AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK,
Palenville, N. Y., January 30, 1950.

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution approved by this organization in session at Cairo, N. Y., on January 27, 1950.

Any consideration you can give this resolution will be deeply appreciated.

Yours very truly,

WILSON C. EDWARDS,
County Adjutant.

Whereas laws recently enacted by the Congress of the United States making it possible, and inviting the importation of displaced persons from foreign countries; and

Whereas the importation of such displaced persons is sponsored by certain monied parties for the purpose of obtaining cheap labor; and

Whereas there is no labor shortage in these United States at this time; and

Whereas these displaced persons arriving in this country in large numbers are filling jobs that can and should be filled by American labor; and

Whereas these displaced persons are being furnished housing units that are greatly needed by our own countrymen and their families; and

Whereas a large portion of the labor supply of this country consists of veterans, who have fought to defend this country in times of world conflict; and

Whereas the importation of these displaced persons is depriving American veterans and laborers of employment and housing that is rightfully theirs; and

Whereas American veterans and laborers have already been replaced by such displaced persons in this area; and

Whereas there is the danger of the infiltration of Communists into this country with these quotas: Be it therefore

Resolved, That Boehm-Dodd Post No. 1604, the American Legion, Department of New York, protest the importation of such foreign labor, that is now, and as time goes on, will deprive more American veterans and labor of securing proper employment and housing in their native land; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and copies thereof forwarded to the American Legion of Greene County, and through channels to the department convention of the American Legion; Assemblyman William E. Brady; State Senator Arthur Wicks; Member

of Congress JAY LEFEVRE, and United States Senator IRVING M. IVES.

RAYMOND W. HEIDO,
Commander.
JOSEPH A. GREEN,
Adjutant.

Approved by the Greene County American Legion, at a meeting held at Cairo, N. Y., on January 27, 1950.

JOHN L. CASS,
County Commander.
WILSON C EDWARDS,
County Adjutant.

UNITED BROTHERHOOD,
CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Las Vegas, Nev., February 17, 1950.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your statement on displaced persons, Facts Versus Fiction, has been brought before carpenters local 1780 and thoroughly discussed And I wish to say that we are in favor of your statement.

We believe as a labor organization that each displaced person or refugee, immigrant, or whatever you wish to call them, coming into the United States is going to have to be employed, therefore replacing one of our own people, of which we know today that there are too many of our own people without work.

We might say further that we believe you are correct in your statement that the most Communist and other subversive organizations of the United States are of foreign stock or of persons married to foreign stock. And we, as the members of the A. F. of L., are definitely and wholeheartedly against such organizations, especially since our hands have been tied from expelling such persons from our union by the Taft-Hartley law.

We are also in receipt of a communication from farm laborers and stock-ranch employees who are being replaced with cheap Mexican and Basque or Spanish labor. We understand in our own State of Nevada, a movement is now on foot to bring in several thousand Basque sheepherders into the sheep-growing industry in Nevada. And we are definitely opposed to importing these people. We hope, Senator, that this answers your question as to just how the carpenters of local 1780, Las Vegas, Nev., feel about the question of displaced persons or any type of immigration. Thanking you for all past and anticipated future cooperation, I am,

Respectfully yours,
J. H MANKINS,
Secretary-Manager, Carpenters Local No. 1780.

BARNETT POST NO. 123,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Norwood, Ohio, February 21, 1950.

The Honorable PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Leland M. Barnett Post 123, the American Legion, Norwood, Ohio, at its last regular meeting in strong opposition to the enactment of House Resolution No. 4567 into law.

We are of the firm opinion that to pass this resolution would most seriously jeopardize the welfare, health, peace, and security of each and every American. Therefore, we earnestly request that you vote against this resolution when it comes up for consideration in the Senate.

In your acknowledgment of the receipt of our resolution, we would like, if possible, to have your thinking on this matter.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,
D. JAMES DURNING,
Adjutant.

ADHERE TO EXISTING LAWS AND QUOTAS FOR IMMIGRATION AND DISPLACED PERSONS

Whereas according to Government reports, there are more than 4,000,000 unemployed persons in the United States, which number includes a large number of war veterans and a number of recent college graduates who have been unable to secure employment upon graduation, and which number of unemployed is gradually increasing, which, along with other factors, is creating a huge relief problem and burden; and

Whereas a large number of our college students are developing a futility complex at the thought that a large number of them may not be able to find employment upon their graduation under existing conditions; and

Whereas such unfortunate circumstances and conditions tend to create hopeless despair in the minds and bodies of those affected thereby, attention being invited to the following letter published in the January 18, 1950, edition of the Cincinnati Post, a daily newspaper of Cincinnati, Ohio:

"WANTS SANCTUARY

"(By D. H., Cincinnati)

"May I have your help in finding a genuine Communist? If I can discover such a man, I have a favor to ask of him. Perhaps he would be willing to aid me in emigrating to Russia. I am without knowledge of the entry requirements, and I lack even the money for travel fare This is asking a good deal, I must admit, but the benefactor will be repaid in full, somehow.

"You may wonder why I should wish to become a Russian citizen. Well, the explanation is simple enough. In Russia there is freedom. There is the greatest of all personal freedoms, which is the freedom to earn one's bread. Even in a Soviet slave-labor camp, a man is accorded the liberty to work.

"This is not true of America. Here the problem of unemployment is ignored We ask for work, for some means of livelihood, and we are laughed at or spat upon, denied even the right to existence which is inherent slavery.

"I am tired of enforced idleness. I am strong of body and sound of mind, and I am weary of rusting away in disuse. Thus I come, like a DP in reverse, seeking to escape the oppression of America for sanctuary in Russia"; and

Whereas since the end of World War II there has been a tremendous increase in the influx of people from all over the world, both legally and illegally, there being no near conception as to the number of illegal alien entrants in this country at this time, it being thought by some that the number may be in excess of 1,000,000, and in addition thereto are a large number who were admitted during the war years presumably on a temporary basis, who have overstayed their periods of admission and are now seeking to remain here permanently; and

Whereas the American Legion, at its recent thirty-first national convention, comprehending and foreseeing the dire results of further immigration on the citizens of the United States, adopted resolution No. 554, which reads as follows.

"Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention assembled in Philadelphia, Pa., August 29, 30, 31, and September 1, 1949, demand of our Government heads that they strictly adhere to the existing laws now in force applying to displaced persons rather than place any additional burden on the people of America by increasing the quotas of immigration; and be it further

"Resolved, That we take steps to curtail as far as possible, any further immigration to this county at the present"; and

Whereas strong pressure groups are seeking to break down the barriers on immigration, and to that end have succeeded in having passed House Resolution No. 4567, designed to admit 115,000 more displaced persons than under existing law, a large number of whom were not considered displaced persons as of December 31, 1945, being more than 4 months following the cessation of hostilities of World War II, and which resolution, or any similar legislation, if enacted into law, would most seriously affect the welfare, health, peace, and security of the good citizens of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Leland M. Barnett, post No. 123, the American Legion, of Norwood, Ohio, at its regular meeting on February 7, 1950, go on record as being strongly opposed to the enactment of House Resolution No. 4567, or any similar legislation, into law; and demand that present immigration laws in force be strictly adhered to and followed; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the two Senators from Ohio, Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT, and Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER, with the urgent request that they do all possible to prevent the enactment of House Resolution No. 4567, or any similar legislation, into law; that a copy thereof be forwarded to Hon. PAT MCCARRAN, Senator from Nevada, and chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee; and such further distribution as may be deemed advisable.

[From the Washington Post of February 17, 1950]

FBI PROBING SOME UNITED STATES BACKERS OF DP SECURITY RISKS

FRANKFURT, GERMANY, February 16.—An American official said today the Federal Bureau of Investigation is checking on some Americans who have volunteered to assist displaced persons considered to be security risks.

Alex E Squadrilli, United States Displaced Persons Commission coordinator for Europe, said about 500 displaced person risks have been kept in Europe. Most are suspected Communists.

Squadrilli said he knew of FBI reports sent here on "about a dozen" Americans who offered to sponsor persons for immigration to the United States. As many as 500 other displaced persons may have reached the United States through a fraudulent scheme now being investigated, he said. Six German officials are being prosecuted.

HANNAH-CROSMAN POST, NO. 2233,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Ocean Grove, N. J, February 25, 1950.

Hon. PATRICK MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Our organization, Hannah-Crosman Post, No. 2233, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Ocean Grove, N. J., is on record as favoring your fight to have House Rule 4567 defeated as our organization believes that the further entry of displaced persons should be strictly limited or entirely stopped if necessary to safeguard our American way of life, which apparently many of these so-called displaced persons do not favor, being in some cases active in organizations opposed to our Government.

We are also writing to Senators H. ALEXANDER SMITH and ROBERT HENDRICKSON, Senators from New Jersey, telling them of our opposition to this House rule.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD M. BORDEN,
Adjutant, Acting.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS TAKEN ON HOOVER REPORTS

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, hav-

ing jurisdiction of reorganization bills and plans, generally speaking, to implement the Hoover Commission recommendations, I have constantly tried to keep the Senate informed with reference to the progress being made with reference to the controversies which arise regarding the reorganization measures.

I am submitting for the information of the Senate a letter received from Frank Pace, Jr., Director of the Bureau of the Budget, addressed to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reporting on progress made in the executive branch on Hoover Commission recommendations to be effectuated through administrative actions.

Under a digest made by the Bureau of the Budget on September 30, 1949, it was estimated that 122 separate activating steps would be required to fully implement this phase of the Hoover Commission program.

In the report just released, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget estimates that of 91 specific steps required for implementation by administrative action without the need for prior substantive or appropriation legislation, 25 have already been completed and 38 partially completed; 7 are still under study, and no action has been taken on 21. Of the latter, 6 must be held in abeyance awaiting reorganization action.

The digest also indicated that recommendations of the Hoover Commission which could be effectuated by reorganization plans required a total of 82 separate steps. The attached report states that of this number, 13 have been completed and 14 have been partially completed, with 2 being disapproved by the Senate under Reorganization Plan 1 of 1949. No action has been taken on 49 of these steps, which it is understood are now being considered by the President with a view to submitting additional reorganization plans to Congress within the next few days for implementation of at least part of these recommendations.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget pointed out in his report that 29 administrative steps and 4 reorganization steps are dependent upon prior substantive or appropriation legislation, and that two administrative steps are dependent upon action by the General Accounting Office. These have been omitted from the above tabulation.

Examples of these instances on which no action has been taken due to other contingent steps include (a) recommendations in the report on medical activities provide that the UMA should give constant attention to necessary measures for national defense, and (b) medical and other personnel for the UMA should be on a career service basis. Both of these recommendations are contingent on the recommendation to create a United Medical Administration.

Another example—that the proposal to create an Accountant General in the Treasury Department would require that the Accountant General should produce financial reports for the President, the Congress, and the public—cannot be effectuated unless an Accountant General is created.

There are other areas in which administrative action is dependent on appropriations, including the specific recommendations that "department heads should be provided with adequate assistance," in the report on general management, and that "Cabinet level and other interagency committees in the area of foreign affairs should be assisted by special institutional aids in the Executive office," in the report on foreign affairs.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1950.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: As requested in your letter of January 28, I am transmitting a report of progress to date in the executive branch on Hoover Commission recommendations that may be carried out through administrative actions. All reorganization steps which have been completed are also shown, whether carried out through reorganization plans or legislation.

This report is based on steps set forth in the Digest of Recommendations of the Commission—Classified by Possible Methods of Effectuation, dated September 30, 1949. This digest shows 29 administrative steps and 4 reorganization steps as dependent on prior substantive or appropriation legislation. It also shows 2 administrative steps as dependent upon action by the General Accounting Office. These steps have been excluded from the attached report.

Of the remaining 91 administrative steps which can be carried out by the executive branch, some action has been taken on approximately 77 percent; 27.4 percent have been completely implemented; and about 6 percent must await completion of some reorganization action. The attached statement by the President, which was released at a recent press conference, gives more detailed information about some of the work under way in the executive branch.

Of the remaining 78 reorganization steps, action has been completed on 16.6 percent and partially completed on an additional 17.9 percent. A revised report will be submitted to show the effect of any reorganization plans which the President may submit to the Congress within the next few weeks.

These additional points should be made. Since the digest is an analysis of the several reports of the Commission, a number of duplications exist. If duplication were eliminated, there would be 15 fewer reorganization steps and 4 fewer administrative steps shown. This duplication accounts for 26 percent of the reorganization steps which are reported as having no action taken.

Your committee is providing a valuable service in publishing these reports, and I shall be happy to cooperate with you in any possible way.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Director.

Progress on implementing Hoover Commission recommendation which can be carried out through administrative actions or reorganization plans, Feb. 14, 1950

Administrative actions:	
Completed	25
Partially completed [1]	38
Study under way	7
No action taken (6 must await reorganization action)	21
Total	91
Reorganization plans:	
Completed	13
Partially completed [1]	14
Disapproved by Senate	2
No action	49
Total	78

[1] In most cases these recommendations require the same steps in many different agencies; these steps have been completed in some agencies but not in all. In other cases actions to carry out the recommendations are in progress but are not yet completed.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and the Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release by the President of the United States, dated January 17, 1950, with reference to certain aspects of the reorganization program, which is based upon the report submitted to him by the Bureau of the Budget.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President today (January 17, 1950) made public the following report which had been prepared by the Bureau of the Budget at his request and presented to the President and to the President's Advisory Committee on Management Improvement. The report lists a number of the high points in the management improvement program of the executive branch for 1950. The President indicated that he had given his approval and strong support to the proposed actions as significant steps in the right direction.

"REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT ON MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

"On July 29, 1949, Executive Order 10072 was issued calling upon the heads of departments and agencies to prepare programs for the systematic improvement of management and operations throughout the Federal Government. These programs were submitted with the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1951, and were reviewed in the Bureau of the Budget as part of the budget process.

"The actions listed in this report have been selected to serve as specific examples of management improvement efforts in the departments and agencies. Many other similar actions not described in this report are under way or proposed.

"The report is divided into three types of actions: (1) certain investigations recommended by the Hoover Commission; (2) management improvement activities of Government-wide application in which central management agencies, such as the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission and the General Services Administration, will exercise leadership; and (3) management-improvement activities in individual agencies for which agency heads are responsible.

"The steps outlined in this report represent affirmative action on most of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission which

can be accomplished by administrative action.

"FURTHER STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

"In several areas the Commission on Organization recommended that further investigation be made to determine appropriate courses of action. To carry out these recommendations a number of staff studies are being set up within the executive branch.

"Federal field service

"The recommendations of the Commission on Organization for the location of management responsibilities in the executive branch have generally been adopted. The Commission found numerous deficiencies in the application of good management practices to Federal field activities, but did not provide general guides for the Government-wide improvement of field management. It stated that this is primarily a problem for the President and department heads in cooperation with the Congress. The proposed study will review present systems of field management and develop recommendations for improving this important area of governmental activity.

"Federal retirement systems

"Several different retirement systems for various groups of Federal employees are now in operation. These various systems will be examined from the viewpoint of types of benefits, conditions of eligibility, employee contributions, accounting and financing, and administrative efficiency. A study in which a number of agency representatives will participate is being organized.

"Overseas administration

"The entire problem of administering overseas operations will be studied and recommendations made for organization and operating practices which will provide for more consistent and more efficient administration of governmental programs outside the limits of the United States.

"Land management

"In view of the conflicting opinions expressed by members of the Hoover Commission on the best organization for administration of public lands, a project is being organized to appraise these views and provide recommendations.

"GOVERNMENT-WIDE MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES

"Important steps are being taken throughout the Government to improve personnel administration, property and records management, budgeting and accounting, and general management practices. The central management agencies—the General Services Administration, the Civil Service Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget—will provide leadership in these areas.

"Bureau of the Budget

"The Bureau of the Budget will exercise continued leadership in developing better management and aggressive management improvement programs throughout the Federal Government. The Bureau will review agency plans for appraising operations under title X of the Classification Act of 1949, and evaluate progress and achievements in carrying out management improvement programs as an integral part of the budget process.

"In cooperation with congressional committees the Bureau will continue to improve the budget process along the lines of the performance budget recommended by the Hoover Commission. This means further simplifying appropriation structures; improving activity classifications; and helping to improve methods of work measurement and reporting in the agencies to provide a more adequate basis for estimating budget requirements.

"Joint accounting project

"The joint accounting project to improve financial administration in the Federal Government will be carried forward cooperatively by the General Accounting Office, the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget. The major objectives during 1950 are:

"1. To complete development of a body of accounting principles, standards, and terminology to assure that accounting processes and financial reporting in the Federal Government are comparable and consistent.

"2. To further reorient the audit function toward a comprehensive audit at the site of accounting operations.

"3. To improve the central facilities in the Treasury Department for bringing together and producing information on the financial condition and operations of the Government.

"4. To improve accounting in individual agencies and integrate accounting and budgeting processes; develop the accrual system of accounting; improve cost figures on an activity or program and unit basis; and extend the use of business type budgets for Government business enterprises.

"Civil Service Commission

"To improve Government personnel administration, the Civil Service Commission will continue to give emphasis to a staff development program and will also emphasize the improvement of operations in agency personnel offices.

"The staff development program has two objectives: (1) To assure the recruitment of outstanding young people for beginning jobs in professional, scientific, technical, and administrative posts; and (2) to assure the development of capable staff to fill top executive posts as needs arise.

"To improve the operation of agency personnel offices, the Commission will define the nature and scope of agency personnel programs and develop improved operating practices and standards.

"General Services Administration

"The new General Services Administration is following closely the recommendations of the Commission on Organization in its plans for improving both the central activities and agency operations in the important fields of property and records management. These include the development of policy, sound organization, and streamlined procedures in the handling of real estate, personal property, records, and supply activities. For example, in the area of supply the Administration is making plans to expedite the development of uniform specifications and a standard catalog of supplies and equipment; simplifying bidding and contracting procedures; improving stock and inventory controls; and developing proper traffic management policies and practices. The Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the Bureau of the Budget are taking necessary steps to develop areas of understanding on the respective spheres of responsibility between the military and civilian supply systems. The Administration will also conduct surveys of agency property and records management practices to make appropriate reports to the President and the Congress.

"DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

"Department of State

"Public Law 73 of the Eighty-first Congress provided for reorganization of the State Department along the lines of the Hoover Commission's recommendations. The agency has made real progress in converting to the new basis of operation and will complete the reorganization as rapidly as circumstances permit.

"One major step remains to be considered—that is the feasibility of integrating the Foreign Service and Civil Service personnel into a single foreign affairs service. The Secretary of State has appointed a committee to give him recommendations on this problem.

"Department of the Treasury

"Major improvements are being made in organization and procedures of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Three new installations have been made to find the best systems for handling mass paper operations. As sufficient experience is obtained, additional installations will be made. The Bureau is also establishing a more adequate audit of income-tax returns.

"The United States Coast Guard and the Bureau of Customs are reviewing all their activities to simplify operating procedures. Some improvements will require legislation, but many are being made through administrative action. These programs are significant not only in relieving burdensome requirements on the public, but also in terms of our general interest in strengthening foreign trade.

"In addition to the internal management projects, the Department's fiscal bureaus will continue to modernize Treasury—Federal Reserve bank operating procedures.

"Department of Defense

"The Department of Defense will continue to make progress in unifying the armed forces and realizing possible economies without jeopardizing the effectiveness of our national defense.

"Emphasis will be given to the integration of strategic and logistic planning, unification of commands, unification of medical services, joint use of facilities and services, and coordination of programs in training and education, research and development, construction, communications, and supply.

"A comprehensive study of organization within the three services is being planned.

"Post Office Department

"The Postmaster General is setting up a small management research staff to work constantly at the job of finding better ways to carry out the responsibilities of the Post Office Department. This staff will support the work of the Advisory Board, to be appointed by the President, to consult with the Postmaster General on the solution of operating problems in that agency.

"The principal management objectives of the Postmaster General in 1950 are to modernize and mechanize mail handling and money-order procedures, and to improve motor-vehicle management. Over a period of years improvements in these areas can contribute economies and better postal service.

"If legislation permitting accounting reforms is enacted at this session of Congress, immediate action will be taken to set up an accounting system which can be used effectively by management to improve operations in the Department.

"Department of the Interior

"The Secretary of the Interior is setting up a small management research staff to give continuous attention to the whole problem of management improvement throughout the Department. Early emphasis will be given to studies of the organization structure which will be most effective in carrying out the present and future responsibilities of the Department. Studies will be directed to such problems as:

"1. Integrating the various resource conservation and development programs of the Department, with particular emphasis on their interrelationships in the field;

"2. Providing for regular and systematic review and evaluation of operations; and

"3. Determining organization and management requirements for effective execution of the new responsibility for the administration of Guam, American Samoa, and the Pacific Trust Territories.

"In addition, work is under way to revise and improve accounting and reporting systems in several bureaus of the Department. The Bureau of Land Management is plan-

ning a complete revision and simplification of the land record system which is expected to produce significant savings, increased efficiency, and better public service.

"Department of Agriculture

"The Secretary of Agriculture is making a study of Department organization. Emphasis is being placed particularly on the development of an organization which will further eliminate overlapping, improve coordination of programs at the county level and better harmonize service to individual farmers with respect to educational, production and adjustment functions. This study will include relationships between the Department and State agencies and the use of farmer committees in the administration of Federal agricultural programs.

"Department of Commerce

"The Secretary of Commerce has under way a comprehensive review of the Department's services to the business community. Programs of the Department are being geared more closely to the current needs of business, and organization and procedures are being improved to make the Department's services more effective Recommendations of the Commission on Organization, dealing with organization of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, are being fully taken into account in these studies.

"Veterans' Administration

"In 1950 the Veterans' Administration will make a distribution of dividends on national service life insurance. Approximately 22,500,000 policies are involved. Modern mechanical methods, effectively utilizing microfilm, punched cards, and electric accounting machines are being adapted to the complex problems of this mass production project.

"The agency has also developed a simplified system of processing benefit applications and preparing records by machine methods. Service testing is under way in the training program and will be extended to the medical program Studies of the system's adaptability to other programs will be made during 1950."

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no other routine matters to be presented, the Chair will recognize the Senator from Connecticut.

PEACE AND THE PROBLEMS OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, as a Senator of the United States, I feel obligated to address myself once again to the overriding and climactic problem of atomic energy.

The first step toward world sanity has been taken.

Wherever peace is cherished, men are seeking anew to rid themselves of atomic and hydrogen bombs. Everywhere men are recognizing, as never before, that we must deal with the split atom before it splits the world.

Already the atom threatens to sunder our democratic way of life. I need not tell the Senate that atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs are, by their very nature, totalitarian weapons. They are Pearl Harbor weapons. They are the natural weapons of a police state. They are the weapons of the sneak attack and the knock-out punch delivered before a democratic victim of aggression is aware that hostilities have commenced.

I need not tell the Senate that these weapons impair in a most serious way the constitutional power of the Congress to declare war The conspiracy of events has placed the power to start hostilities in the hands of unpredictable forces which are now beyond our influence or control. As a democracy, we are incapable of launching the first surprise blow. We are obliged to stand and wait. Unless we find a method to halt this mad armaments race we have no assurance that the continental United States will not itself experience a hideous day of infamy. This means that our country has lost the power to defend fully its people and its territory.

It gives precious little comfort to assume, Mr. President, that retaliation will certainly issue from the heartland of America—even though it strikes across the dead bodies of tens of millions of our citizens.

A second point requires emphasis. I need hardly say that the armaments race mocks at our hopes of balancing the national budget. More jet-propelled aircraft, new-type submarines, fast tanks. More guided missiles, atomic bombs, and hydrogen bombs. This is the price of keeping stride with the fierce pace set by the Soviet Union.

Our budget will go up, up, and up.

Even with reduced spending in Europe, the cost of containment will mount higher. In southeast Asia, in the Near East, in the Mediterranean—who knows where else—we may be forced to fight communism with dollars and goods. In fact, 10 or 15 years of intensified cold war may cost us as much as the Second World War itself.

And while our budget goes up and up, our freedoms will go down and down and down.

With the armaments race rushing onward, Mr. President, do not expect big government to grow smaller. On the contrary, its hand will fall still more heavily upon free enterprisers, free labor unions, scientists, teachers—upon all of us. We are being pushed toward more centralization, more surveillance, more regimentation. This is the way an army operates—this is the way an entire people must operate under the atom's duress.

I touch upon these matters at the outset to emphasize that we are not merely faced with the issue of physical survival—we are equally faced with the issue of saving or losing freedom. In my hierarchy of values—and I am sure I speak for all in this chamber—preserving our freedom is more important than is preserving our corporeal selves. The wisest among us have long recognized that a lasting atomic armaments race will corrupt and poison freedom even if we could somehow hope to avoid war—even if history did not tell us that armaments races always end in outright hostilities.

Today finds us in the midst of a new hydrogen crisis imposed on top of the old atomic crisis. With the passing of each day, each week, and each month, more fissionable material for atomic bombs comes into existence. This is the old crisis, and it is still unsolved. With the passing of each day, each week, and each month, we draw nearer toward that point in time when 10 hydrogen bombs or 20 or even more will be available and poised on both sides of the iron curtain. This is the new crisis.

These are the facts that impose upon us an imperious timetable, that implore us to act successfully for peace before the store of horror weapons reaches critical mass and chain-reacts into global tragedy. Overshadowing all the world's problems is the ever-growing stock of annihilation material, both in our country and the Soviet Union.

The Marshall plan is good and necessary—but dollars to Europe will not stop either Russia or America from collecting hydrogen bombs. The Atlantic Pact and the military-aid program are wise and prudent—but arms to Europe will not prevent either Russia or America from stock-piling atomic weapons. We must try to compose our differences with Russia at every point where the iron curtain divides the free world from the Communist world; but ink and parchment will not control the uranium and plutonium plants running full blast in both those worlds. Our attempt to contain the Kremlin's outward pressure is imperative; but containment will not stay the hands within the Soviet fortress now working upon the hydrogen bomb.

All these planks in our foreign policy are essential; together they might sustain peace and freedom if we lived in a preatomic age. Yet none of them comes to grips with today's real problem which, I repeat, centers upon the fact that, with each passing week and month, more material usable for mass destruction is brought into the world.

There is only one way to combat the basic problem, that is to put Russian inspectors in every American atomic plant and American inspectors in every Russian atomic plant. Such a plan, in essence, was proposed by our Government nearly 4 years ago. Such a plan is backed by the United Nations, Russia dissenting. Such a plan—as its distinguished authors took pains to explain—does not depend upon our trusting the Kremlin or the Kremlin's trusting us. It depends upon rascal-proof safeguards. It depends upon dramatic warning signals certain to be given—and given in ample time—if any nation violated its atomic pledge.

Such a plan answers those who claim that we should ignore the iron curtain, disregard the atomic arsenal being created behind it, and stake our lives upon the forlorn hope that some future blooming of confidence will banish fear. I would trust the Russian people if they were the masters and not the slaves of their own government. But I, for one, will never trust a dictator who wields absolute power within a secret world. At the same time, I do not ask and neither does President Truman ask that Stalin trust our peaceful intentions. We do ask that, acting through the United Nations, he send Soviet inspectors into America. We do ask that Stalin admit American inspectors inside Russia.

Through this realistic approach we have striven, for almost 4 years, to halt the fatal progression toward destruction of liberal values and eventual destruction of city, farm, and factory. We have striven to make atomic energy the servant of a different progression—toward

the conquest of disease and the adjournment of poverty and the glorious reshaping of man's material destiny. Our efforts have not only failed—they have signally failed. Yet the price of ultimate failure, Mr. President, is death. The specter of Hiroshima multiplied a thousand times tells us that we have no choice but to try again. All our instincts toward life demand it.

For that reason, 1 month ago, I suggested a new approach to atomic peace. It was my thought that all nations, including Russia, should agree to take two-thirds of their defense expenditures and devote these sums to world-wide economic aid and world-wide development of atomic energy for man's welfare. In exchange for our contribution we would ask effective control over atomic weapons and effective guarantees of a two-thirds cut-back in military spending. My suggestion would not mean attempting to bribe the Kremlin or to purchase a dishonorable peace with dollars. It would mean giving eloquent and visible evidence of our willingness to assume our fair load—and more—in the greatest task of our time, establishing atomic peace on this earth.

The idea of a moral crusade for peace has picked up momentum at a startling rate. It swept Britain on election eve. In France, in Belgium, in Italy, in Canada—wherever men crave peace with justice—the same pleas for redoubled efforts are heard with rising insistence. Each new speaker proves afresh that democratic discussion and debate contribute more to statesmanship than does any strategy planned behind walls of secrecy.

But correct statesmanship is now doubly difficult because the hydrogen crisis is superimposed upon the old atomic crisis. Has our thinking fully caught up with the scientific facts peculiar to hydrogen warfare? Until we chart this new area of technics can we feel absolutely sure that the United Nations plan should stand unchanged?

I do not doubt that, for the control of ordinary atomic weapons, the United Nations plan is still uniquely meritorious. I do not doubt that the United Nations plan could successfully control hydrogen weapons. A complete solution plainly calls for the general kind of technical program which the United Nations, after exhaustive study, has approved. I again warn that an ineffective plan is worse than no plan at all.

But we should make ourselves aware of every facet of the problem. Certainly the dictates of conscience decree that we take nothing for granted. We cannot permit the tiniest residue of doubt in the minds of reasonable men. We must stand before mankind in the positive knowledge that the controls we seek are written, not by our own wish, but by the atom itself—the atom of hydrogen no less than the atom of uranium. Only such controls will bring us certainty that our position is objectively just and right. Only such a position will win the support of moral beings everywhere.

As chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I intend to propose a series of closed hearings. I will propose that committee members review international control of hydrogen weapons and its relation to the existing United Nations plan. It is my hope that the joint committee will become equipped to speak helpfully on this grave matter and that, through a report, it will acquaint the Congress with its well-considered views.

But, Mr. President, is it not both unjust and presumptuous to suppose that our Nation can alone, without help, locate the wisest solution? The free world shares this crisis with us. We have no monopoly on the yearning for peace. The hydrogen bomb does not recognize national boundaries. The cities of western Europe huddle in the shadow of the new desolators no less than the cities of America. Freedom's common bond urges a common approach to our common peril.

Neither do we Americans have a monopoly of brains. Wigner, Szilard, Bohr, Chadwick, Zinn, Rabi, Bethe, Fermi, Teller—men such as these came from foreign shores to aid our wartime atomic project. Their honored names bespeak the genuis of all the free world. Once we sought its help for war. Must we not now seek its help for peace? Does not a decent sense of humility toward the wisdom and experience of our allies decree that we now take common counsel?

I will go further and state frankly—this is no time for self-delusion—that the people of the free countries abroad do not now appreciate the sincerity and the profundity of our American will to peace. We have not yet taken sufficient trouble to combat with truth the Communist lies. We have hardly tried to brand the iron curtain for what it is, the No. 1 saboteur of peace and the No. 1 reason why the atomic crisis stands unresolved today. The spirit of the free world is sick because a wall of misunderstanding conceals America's true intentions, divides us from democratic friends abroad, and obscures our mutual purposes.

I therefore propose that we act at once to demolish this wall of misunderstanding. I propose that we immediately enter into talks with our allies for the purpose of jointly agreeing upon a new approach to atomic peace. These conversations would canvass and evaluate the various suggestions that have been advanced both here and overseas. These conversations might lead to an understanding that each chief of state would go before his own people and set forth the real nature of the atomic-hydrogen crisis, and the fresh solution that all the free nations had prepared in concert and pledged themselves to support.

But I have in mind much more than merely offering the Kremlin a new peace proposal bearing the stamp of all the world's democracies.

We need to create a climate for peace.

Through the Marshall plan the free world has dedicated its economic resources to peace. Through the Atlantic Pact the free world has dedicated its military resources to peace. But the free world has found no instrument for dedicating its mental and spiritual resources to peace.

Consider for a moment what we do in time of war. We confer intimately and unceasingly with our allies. We agree upon a grand strategy. We establish joint means of executing that strategy. Today our peril surpasses any we have ever known in war. The prospect of an atomic-hydrogen blitz spells horror in letters so huge that even the bloody attacks of Hitler and Tojo seem almost petty by comparison. Yet in this, our greatest emergency, we have adopted no measures remotely equal in scope and daring to those used for the lesser emergency of the last war.

The next war, if it comes, will not begin with the gutting of New York, Detroit, Washington, and Denver. Historians, if any be left alive, will say the next war began today—in the minds of men. It is for the minds of men that tyranny and freedom now struggle—tyranny around the clock and with full fanaticism, freedom part time and with infirmity of purpose. No wonder that freedom falls back. No wonder that the iron curtain moves outward. No wonder that we are losing the contest for man's allegiance.

With today's peace more perilous than any past hostilities, with the future staked upon possession of human minds, and with democracy everywhere under attack, we are derelict unless we discover means to enlist the free world's mental and spiritual resources. I make bold to suggest that we have in existence now a potent agency for discussion and negotiation which may well serve to mobilize and unify the efforts of men of good will everywhere in a mighty crusade for peace.

This agency is the Atlantic Council, created by the North Atlantic Pact. Our Government is a signatory to that pact. Its purpose is to insure the common defense and to develop collective capacity to resist aggression. The articles of the pact demonstrate that the Atlantic Council is ideally equipped to conceive and initiate a grand strategy for peace—the goal of our democratic partnership.

Article 4 of the treaty says:

> The parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence, or security of any of the parties is threatened.

Article 9 of the treaty explicitly states how this purpose may be achieved:

> The parties hereby establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of the treaty. The Council shall be so organized as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The Council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of articles 3 and 5.

Thus we have in being an instrument which may serve, not alone to develop our common military defense, but to promote and encourage that positive drive for peace which is the only sure road away from the present impasse.

Let the Atlantic Council convene immediately. Let this peace council of the free formulate a concrete peace program. Let it invite all free countries to cosponsor that program. Let it solicit aid and support, not only among Atlantic Pact nations, but wherever men and women cherish life and liberty. Let it recruit millions of volunteer helpers.

Have this Council make known to all free peoples the free world's ardent desire for peace and its plan for achieving peace. Have this Council hurl the weight of the free world's conscience against the iron curtain.

Make available to the Council those scant radio facilities now broadcasting the Voice of America. Let the Council print illustrated leaflets by the million and in all languages, dramatizing the free world's program for atomic peace. Let it produce motion pictures for the same purpose. Let it arrange forums for public debate. Let it work with schools, churches, labor unions, and civic groups. Let it undertake the missionary work that must go forward.

This Atlantic Council, this peace council of the free, can fight the good fight in a thousand ways and along a thousand far-flung battle lines. It can be a rallying point for peace-hungry minds confused by Communist propaganda. It can overcome the challenge of the Soviet Cominform. It can unite all the scattered voices of liberty into one great clarion call for peace that will carry beyond oceans and mountains and be heard in the land of silence behind the iron curtain.

I have said already, Mr. President, that the sands are running out. On that account I sympathize with those now urging immediate high-level talks in Moscow. But I point out to them that we may already have exhausted all but our last chance. We must be sure that we do not squander it.

It has never been my view that private dickerings by a few top-level negotiators can resolve the most momentous issue that has ever plagued and vexed the spirit of men. There is nothing in this issue which lends itself to the calming atmosphere of obscurity or serenity. We must open the mind and heart of the free world, and unify its purpose, before we open the door of the conference room.

After we review the technical demands of controlling hydrogen warfare, after we concert with our allies, after we have created the climate for peace—then the day for talks will have arrived. Then, with sure intelligence and merged purpose, the free world will be ready to approach the Kremlin.

Thus equipped, we will not go as appeasers. We will go with the pooled wisdom of a billion free people. We will go with strength such as the Kremlin has never before confronted. Far from reflecting weakness or craven instincts, the approach will stem in part from quiet awareness of our military stature—yet far more from that spiritual power which is the majestic endowment of our belief in democracy, our faith in the worth and dignity of all men, and our adherence to the principles of religion.

Even now, however, I must warn against the threat that talks with the Kremlin will take place in soundproof rooms behind locked doors, and that secrecy will prevent the peoples of the earth from hearing what is said. If this is the case, the Kremlin will feel little pressure either from world opinion or from the opinion of ordinary Russians to negotiate sincerely. It will see in secret talks yet another excuse for propaganda. Unless the people everywhere attend these talks unseen, failure is foredoomed.

I have long maintained that the ordinary Russian is the master key to peace. Only his ignorance of our friendship toward him permits the Kremlin to pursue its disastrous course. Standing between the ordinary Russian and the truth is the iron curtain. As one means of piercing or at least weakening this tragic barrier, perhaps we should positively insist that any new approach to atomic peace be discussed in Moscow itself.

I do not find congenial the logic that because only Russia and America possess atomic bombs, they alone should sit down to discuss a fresh start toward control.

There is a wider fellowship here—the fellowship of the potentially doomed; and it embraces all mankind. The proper forum for new talks is the General Assembly of the United Nations. Equally, since this is the most important matter in the world, it should be treated in the most important possible way—and the heads of all the states may well choose to attend.

Meetings of the General Assembly have been held in Paris, London, and New York. Of the great powers only the Soviet Union has not yet served as host. Would we not be wise, therefore, to seek the Kremlin's hospitality? We should absolutely demand that the debates of the General Assembly be broadcast in every corner of the earth, and particularly from Leningrad to Vladivostok. If necessary, let the free world offer to bring its own radio transmitters—though surely Russian engineers capable of jamming the Voice of America are equal to this task.

If the Soviet rulers permit a real town meeting of the world in their Moscow citadel, then we may truly hope for fruitful talks. If they dare not entertain the General Assembly, all the free world will know the meaning of such a refusal. Testimony so eloquent may not be lost even on the Russian people.

Mr. President, the clock is ticking, ticking, and with each swing of the pendulum the time to save civilization grows shorter. When shall we get about this business? Now, or when Russia and the United States glower at one another from atop competing stacks of hydrogen bombs?

Senators, destiny will not grant us the gift of indifference.

If we do not act, the atom will.

If we do not act, we may be profaned forever by the inheritors of a ravished planet. We will be reviled, not as fools—even a fool can sense the massive danger. We will be reviled as cowards—and rightly—for only a coward can flee the awesome facts that command us to act with fortitude.

This time of supreme crisis is a time of supreme opportunity. The prize of atomic peace lies waiting to be won—and with it a wondrous new world and moral blessedness and the ordainment of human brotherhood.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say to the Senator from Connecticut that in my opinion, three great historic speeches have been delivered on the floor of the Senate in the present session of the Congress, two of them by the Senator from Connecticut. The third was given by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who pleaded the other day for a realistic facing of the disarmament problem which confronts the people of the world. I want to do honor to the Senator from Connecticut in these very few remarks by saying that his speech is a challenge to not only the American people but to freedom-loving people everywhere. I think he has laid before the American people once again the crisis of our generation—winning the peace. Unless we meet that crisis, in my judgment there will be no hope either for peace or for freedom in the world.

I want to say to the Senator from Connecticut that I was particularly pleased to hear him during his speech point out the importance of our negotiating with Russia through the United Nations. The United Nations, in my judgment, after all, is the only hope, of peace in the world.

I further want to say, if the Senator will permit me to do so on his time, that I believe one of the important needs at home is for the Voice of America to be heard in America, where it seems to be silent these days. As I am called into the reception room almost daily by the various pressure groups that want me to do something to advance their immediate selfish economic interests here at home, I often say to myself: "What can we do to cause the American people to understand that we cannot continue in America in this time of crisis with business as usual? What can we do to cause the American people to realize now, before it is too late, that they cannot hope to go on living their usual life in America motivated primarily, as most Americans are motivated, by their immediate selfish economic interests?"

The Senator from Connecticut has made a great contribution to America today by his historic speech, which I hope the American people will ponder upon long enough to appreciate that one voice, at least, was raised in the Senate of the United States warning them and cautioning them that now is the time for them to change their course of action and unite as a freedom-loving people in the fight to win the peace.

If the Senator from Connecticut will permit me to do so on his time, I want to make one other point, and then I shall sit down. I believe a great responsibility rests on the President of the United States in this dark hour. As a man who does not belong to his political party, I desire to say I am satisfied that if he believes the American people are ready for the type of action the Senator from Connecticut has suggested today, he will meet the crisis and the challenge

which is presented. I think our President has great qualities of leadership. I would suggest to him that one of the first steps he needs to take is to unite the Congress, and through the Congress, the American people, in support of a true bipartisan foreign policy. To meet this crisis of winning the peace I believe it will be necessary to call for a coalition of Democrats and Republicans in the field of foreign relations.

I believe one of the first steps the President should take is to bring about such a coalition at the State Department level. I think a Republican Under Secretary of State should be appointed. It is important in my judgment that we bring to bear upon the problems of the State Department the points of view and the thinking of leaders of both major parties, Republicans as well as Democrats.

It is also true that there rests upon the present administration the responsibility of advising with the leaders of both major parties in advance of negotiating any particular international agreement or understanding, because if the American people can be assured by the President of the United States that we are going to practice, henceforth, a true bipartisan foreign policy on a coalition basis, at State Department and congressional levels a remarkable unity of our people on foreign policy issues will result.

As one humble Member of this body, I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that I thank him for the challenge he has issued to the Senate and to the American people today.

I close by saying that, irrespective of the political consequences to the individuals concerned, I think every Member of this body owes it to the American people to get the facts about the international situation and take those facts to the American people. The facts will show, I believe, that the Senator from Connecticut is correct in his warning that time is short for the preservation of freedom in the world, time is short for winning the peace, time is short for the prevention of a third world war, a war from which no victor will emerge.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. McMAHON. I shall be glad to yield first to the Senator from New Jersey, and then to the Senator from Illinois.

But, first, Mr. President, after warmly thanking the Senator from Oregon for the most generous compliment he paid me, I should like to say to him that if an atomic bomb falls on America, it will not be directed at Republicans or Democrats or Socialists or any other political group, in the sense that any particular person belongs to a political party, but it will fall with an impartial crash upon all alike. There is no room for partisanship in the kind of situation we confront today. Today, in my opinion, the United States needs unity more than it needed it on Pearl Harbor afternoon. I agree with the Senator that the pleas we receive to cut expenditures—expenditures which cannot be cut without betraying America—come from a people who have not thought enough about the facts of the situation.

I yield now to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in expressing to the Senator from Connecticut my appreciation of his contribution to this subject. I wish to add that a number of us have been giving consideration to the approach the Senator from Connecticut suggested a few days ago on this floor, an approach different from that which considers merely the question of who can be strongest in a war of might.

In my judgment the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] also made a most valuable contribution in suggesting a disarmament conference.

Mr. President, I have had occasion only recently in my own State to discuss these issues and to call the attention of the people of my State to the contributions made by the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Maryland, and to invite their consideration to the fact that we are engaged in a mighty, world-wide war for the minds and thoughts of men, which greatly transcends in importance all the discussions in regard to who can be strongest in a war of might.

I feel that the Senator from Connecticut must be commended for having high-lighted this matter today and in his previous speech, and for giving us the opportunity to say that some of us are working along the same lines and are trying to find the answer in this war for the minds of men, a war in which thus far we have been defeated by the more effective technique and more effective propaganda of those who believe that a more materialistic doctrine, founded in atheism and based on Communist totalitarianism, should rule the world.

In my judgment we in the western world have something more desirable to offer to the people of the world, and we should adequately present it to the world.

I shall join with the Senator from Connecticut in calling for a wider presentation of the Voice of America program, in order to present to the people of the world the American tradition, and wonderful spirited heritage in addition to merely presenting a picture of how we conduct our affairs from day to day.

I have talked to the new Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Edward Barrett, about this matter. I have told him that I would be right behind him in that endeavor to widen the scope of the Voice of America, and I have asked him to meet with the Senator from Connecticut and with other Senators, in an effort to help him present a program which will give to the people of the world a keener awareness of America's tradition and program.

So, Mr. President, let us not be afraid to let the people of the world know about the wonderful heritage we in this country have; and let us ask the President to mobilize all of our educational and religious forces in presenting, by an exchange of views between man and man, our ideals and our realization that the problems of the H-bomb and military armament alone cannot be considered as the only answers in the present situation.

In closing, I wish to thank the Senator from Connecticut very much for the contribution he has made.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

I yield now to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I, too, would like to thank our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Connecticut, for his very moving and very statesmanlike speech.

I do not know a great deal about atomic energy; but, along with a great many others, I know the simple Einstein formula that energy is equal to matter multiplied by the square of the velocity of light. If we try to work out the implications of that formula—E equals MC^2—it comes down to the proposition that matter can be converted into energy at a rate of about 35,000,000,000 times, or matter multiplied by ten raised to approximately the tenth power, or 10^{10}.

Mr. President, no one knows how close we are to that frightening potential. No one in civilian life should inquire. But the potentiality of destruction has, I think, been only faintly hinted at by the Senator from Connecticut. It is death in its most awful form, death to millions of people from one bomb, death over more square miles than can be contemplated, death to civilization itself. For, in addition to death from the blasts themselves, there is also even more terrible and widespread death from radioactive poisoning. These are the awful issues at stake.

I am very thankful that, at this hour, the eloquent and moving voice of one of our colleagues has been raised. As I said when the distinguished Senator from Connecticut made his first speech on this subject, I felt very humble and very proud to be a member of a body which could produce a man who would speak in such tones. Today I feel prouder and more humble than I did a month ago.

I think the Senator from Connecticut touched on one very basic point, namely, that with all our desire for peace, with all our desire to preserve the beauty of life, freedom is the most important thing in the world; that if in the struggle for freedom, destruction should come, still if we were faithful in the struggle for freedom, even though physical life were to be blotted out, we would have fulfilled the destiny which God wishes for us and the destiny which is in conformity with the spirit of America.

I think the country should know that in the proposal of the Senator from Connecticut there is no sign or touch of weakness, no element of fear, no craven effort for a settlement at any cost, no approach to a second Munich, but rather the firm determination of the people to seek for peace and to take risks for it and to try to encompass, with all mankind, our desire for a life of brotherhood, a brotherhood for all peoples, wherever they may live.

It is so hard to give that message to a section of the world dominated by the theory and practice of the police state. It is baffling to try to convey to the people of Russia the fact that we mean them no ill. But, as has again and again been remarked, we must try to do so; and if we try to do so, we must not do so as a trick, but we must do so with sincerity.

I felt that spirit permeating the speech of the Senator from Connecticut. I wish to add my word of thanks for what he has said.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator from Illinois very much.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McMAHON. I should prefer to have the Senator from North Dakota withhold that suggestion for a moment. I should like to surrender the floor, but the Senator from New York has asked me to yield to him, and I have done so.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, about a month ago, when the distinguished Senator from Connecticut made his inspiring speech on the floor of the Senate, I, along with a number of my colleagues, rose to congratulate and thank him for his brilliant and courageous address. I want to tell the Senator how glad I am to be able to rise again today to compliment him. I believe the eminent Senator from Connecticut has made another real contribution to the interests of our country and of the world generally, a spiritual contribution.

I do not pretend to know precisely how we should meet the distressing, disturbing, and awesome situation with which we are confronted today. I believe, as the able Senator from Oregon has said, that when all the facts are studied and considered by the President of the United States he will reach a conclusion which will undertake to be in the interest not only of our people here in America but of the people of the world generally.

I realize, however, that two things are, or should be, perfectly obvious to all. One is that the American public should be made aware of the dangers inherent in the situation, not only to the people of this country, to the people of western Europe, of Asia and Africa, but also to the people of Russia and the other countries behind the iron curtain.

The second thing which is perfectly obvious is that we must marshal, not only the military strength of the free nations, but we must also, as the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has pointed out, marshal the mental and spiritual strength of the aroused peoples of the entire world.

I do not believe the people of Russia or of the satellite countries desire war any more than our people do. I think they are ignorant of the situation and of course cannot fully express themselves. But, even in those countries, I believe that freedom, security, and lasting peace have adherents far more numerous than is generally believed. So I fully agree with my distinguished colleague in his suggestion that we must appeal to the conscience of the world. We must marshal the spiritual strength of the entire world. Again I thank the able Senator from Connecticut for the contribution he has made to the thinking of all of us on this profound and terrible problem.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. PACE, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. HOPE, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the eyes of the world are looking today to the United States for moral, political, and spiritual leadership. Our action upon the pending legislation will have far-reaching effects. Our decision on this legislation will either buoy the spirits of the democratic peoples of the world and renew their faith in us and in our integrity of purpose, or it will dash those spirits and stifle America's strong and vibrant voice as the leader of freedom-loving peoples everywhere. These, indeed, are solemn days. America's moral and spiritual leadership cannot falter; it must not hesitate.

One of the greatest human and moral problems of the twentieth century, created by World War II, has been and still is that of the displaced persons. Some 10,000,000 human beings were driven from their homes, torn from their families, and herded into concentration camps or forced labor battalions by the Nazis.

Our victory in World War II brought an end to their existence as slaves and set them free. Many of them were free to go home. Roughly 9,000,000 displaced persons were able to return to their native lands to try to pick up the threads of their disrupted lives.

But some were not able to go back. At least 1,000,000 were faced with a new form of totalitarianism and terror that had replaced the old. Their countries were dominated directly or indirectly by the tyranny of the Soviet Politburo. To return to such lands meant, at the very least, certain deprivation of their cherished liberties, and, at the most, death.

These were the original displaced persons, the dispossessed and homeless to whom repatriation was a practical as well as a spiritual impossibility. It was they—men, women, and children of a score of nationalities, a cross-section of the great religious faiths—who were left behind when the possibilities of repatriation had been exhausted.

History was bitterly ironical. These persons were again placed in camps and became the wards of the American, British, and French authorities in Germany, Austria, and Italy. This is where I, as Director General of UNRRA, first came into personal contact with the displaced persons problem—a problem which I am sorry to say has not yet been solved, but which I am sure this Congress can and will help to liquidate.

I need not dwell on the details of the displaced persons' existence in these camps. Even though UNRRA, the United States Army, the IRO, and various authorities and agencies did all in their power to help the displaced persons, their existence was, at best, grim and hopeless. Exactly like the ancestors of millions of Americans, the displaced persons yearned to be free, to raise their families, and to enjoy a full and productive life.

That kind of a life, however, could not be assured to these people by any of the successive international agencies set up to deal with this problem. All of these agencies were, in effect, conducting only a holding operation. The displaced persons had somehow to be fed, clothed, sheltered, and protected against the day when they could return at last to their native lands or be resettled elsewhere.

All that UNRRA, the United States Army and the IRO could do was to keep them alive. No guarantee of permanent homes could be extended: On the one hand, the conditions within their homelands grew steadily worse as the iron curtain was pulled more and more tightly across Europe; on the other hand, these agencies did not have them—and IRO does not have now—any authority by which member nations could be compelled to open their doors to the displaced persons.

In theory, there are four possible solutions to the displaced persons problem:

First. The displaced persons could be compelled to live forever the half life of uprooted people in these camps if we cared to be callous toward them and indifferent toward the American taxpayer;

Second. The displaced persons camps could be closed and the displaced persons could be left to shift for themselves in the shambles of a shattered central European economy—if we were willing

to ignore the conflicts which would undoubtedly arise between the naturally resentful displaced persons and the hard-pressed indigenous populations of the affected areas;

Third. The displaced persons could be rounded up at bayonet point and forcibly returned to their native lands now under Soviet domination—if we were indifferent to the cause of justice and humanity; or

Fourth. The displaced persons could be resettled in other lands.

These alternatives were so self-evident that those nations in a position to do so began to open their gates. For example, by January 1, 1950, Canada had taken 79,000; the United Kingdom had taken 100,000; Australia had taken 104,000. And little Israel, the youngest and weakest state of all, had admitted 129,800. In fact, because of the large migration to Israel, the Jewish part of the displaced-persons problem has been virtually solved; only about 35,000 Jews remain in the DP camps today.

By January 1, 1950, America had admitted only 169,800 displaced persons. The reason for this proportionately small number was the fact that we were comparatively slow in providing for the emigration of these people. Our regular immigration quotas were so geared that relatively few displaced persons could enter. But the heart of America is big, and when the people learned the facts they joined together—regardless of religious affiliation or political party—to support the principle that America, too, must do her part. After a long delay, a special law, the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, was finally passed. Under its terms, a limited number of displaced persons began to come in.

After being screened and rescreened, and complying with requirements much more stringent than our normal immigration rules, the displaced persons were met by friends and relatives; guaranties of housing and jobs were made in advance so as to insure that the presence of the displaced persons in this country would not deprive American citizens of jobs or houses. The DP's were helped by great religious and welfare agencies in a manner unprecedented in our immigration history. Never before has the immigrant been as carefully screened or as effectively helped in adjusting himself to his new homeland.

And the result is good. Let us not be misled by those who would reject the whole because of a few exceptions to the rule. All the major religious and welfare agencies report that the overwhelming majority of the displaced persons who have come to America have adjusted or are adjusting successfully. This is an incontrovertible fact and cannot be denied. The fact that the opponents of this legislation can point to only a few isolated exceptions is indirect proof that the overwhelming number have been completely and satisfactorily resettled.

A special subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, under the able and objective leadership of Representative WALTER, of Pennsylvania, examined these religious and welfare agencies about their experiences with displaced persons. Some of the questions asked of these agencies were:

Has the selection and fitness of the DP's been satisfactory in quality?

Have they been properly placed in our communities?

Are they adjusting themselves economically, socially, fraternally, and for the better?

Can we absorb more people into our American life, and can we do so advantageously.

The committee receives clear, positive, and affirmative answers, which expressed overwhelming satisfaction with the displaced persons on these and other points. These answers came from a wide variety of agencies. These agencies embrace practically every major religious belief and every important immigration aid agency in the United States. Among them were:

Mennonite Central Committee.

War Relief Services—National Catholic Welfare Conference.

American Committee for Resettlement of Polish Displaced Persons.

Church World Service, Inc., principal organization for Protestant and Orthodox faiths.

National Lutheran Council.

Unitarian Service Committee.

Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society.

Southern Baptist Displaced Persons Office.

United Service for New Americans.

American National Committee To Aid Homeless Armenians.

United States Committee for Care of European Children.

Further proof of the good record of the displaced persons came from the practically unanimous reports of governors and other responsible public officials. These detailed and explicit statements are contained in the report of the special subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, the so-called Walter report, issued on January 20, 1950. I strongly recommend this report to the Members of the Senate and the public generally. Statements reaffirming the satisfactory adjustment made by displaced persons came from every region of the United States where these persons had been resettled: From Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota and South Dakota, in the Middle West; from California, Montana, and Washington, in the Far West; from Texas, in the Southwest; and Alabama, Arkansas, and Kentucky, in the South; and from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, in the East.

In other words, the testimony of almost every responsible State official proves that the DP's have made and are continuing to make good records, becoming a part of the fabric of our country, are a credit to themselves, and an asset to us.

But, Mr. President, the DP's are doing this under the terms of a law that was basically cruel and deceptive. It is a law full of obstacles and preferences, a law that is essentially unfair.

I need not elaborate upon the defects in the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which are so obvious that they have been almost universally condemned—the discriminatory and arbitrary cut-off date, the inadequate number of displaced persons admissible, the unfair priorities of 30 percent to agriculturalists and 40 percent to persons from annexed territories, and other features, most of which are remedied in the substitute amendment of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

The demand that these flaws be remedied has not come from an isolated few or from a single segment of our population. There is hardly a responsible national organization which has not actively urged that this Congress amend the act and abolish the injustices it perpetrates. Among the organizations which support the correction of these injustices—of all these injustices—are:

United States Chamber of Commerce.

National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

American Jewish Committee.

Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

CIO.

A. F. of L.

National Community Relations Advisory Council.

National Board of the YWCA.

World YWCA.

League of Women Voters.

United Council of Church Women.

American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.

These organizations support the minority substitute bill sponsored by Senators KILGORE, FERGUSON, and 16 others, including both the junior and senior Senators from New York.

Perhaps the viewpoint of these organizations is best expressed in a telegram, the text of which the junior Senator from New York included in the RECORD of this body last Friday, but which bears repeating now because of its particular relevance. It was signed by a representative group of distinguished Americans which included, among others, Gen. Lucius D. Clay; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt; James A. Farley; Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan; James F. O'Neil, of Manchester, N. H.; Judge Joseph Proskauer, of New York; James L. Kraft, president of Kraft Cheese Co., Chicago; Mark Ethridge, publisher of the Louisville (Ky.) Courier Journal; Fred Lazarus, of Cincinnati, Ohio; and Harry Bullis, chairman of the board of General Mills, Minneapolis. The telegram read:

As Americans, we are deeply concerned that our country fulfill our moral obligation and international commitment to find new democratic homelands for the helpless displaced human beings under our care in Europe. Therefore, we respectfully petition the Members of the United States Senate to approve the substitute amendments to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 presented by Senators FERGUSON, GRAHAM, and KILGORE. It is our sincere and heartfelt conviction that without these amendments it is impossible for us to create a displaced persons law that will enable our Nation to admit our share of displaced persons in a just, humane, and fair way.

These Americans and millions like them want this Nation to do simple justice. They want us to uphold our international commitments. We cannot forget that in the forum of the United Nations, and in the Council of UNRRA, the United States, in concert with other

democratic nations, opposed the Soviet-sponsored principle of compulsory repatriation, and in so doing pledged ourselves to find new homes for the displaced persons.

The proponents of this liberalized legislation are certain that the few additional displaced persons admitted under the proposed new provisions would not endanger our economy or our society. I know that statistics are a poor measure of human life. The worth and dignity of the human soul cannot be compressed into a decimal point. But for what such figures are worth, let us remember that the additional displaced persons who would be admitted under the terms of the minority substitute would be only 104,000 more than the number admissible under the present law, an increment of less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our total population; yet this infinitesimal addition to our population would go a long way toward the solution of the entire displaced persons problem.

The displaced persons would benefit by being given a new lease on life, and we Americans would benefit, as we always have, from immigration. New talents, skills, and strength would be added to our Nation. These people bring with them a fresh and revitalized appreciation of liberty and the democratic way of life. They know from bitter personal experience what it means to live under the whip of a totalitarian government. Let us not forget that the displaced persons were among the first of freedom's fighters. They have fought against the forces of tyranny and have survived. They know the worth of freedom at first hand. We cannot afford to deny them admittance into our country.

Mr. President, it has been alleged that the International Refugee Organization rather than the Displaced Persons Commission makes determinations of who is or is not a displaced person under the act. This results from confused thinking and from misinformation as to the actual operation of this program as well as of the present law itself.

At the very first step of the process, the Displaced Persons Commission throws out 28 9 percent of all cases forwarded to the Displaced Persons Commission by the IRO.

In other words, of every 1,000 cases on which the IRO returns documentation to the Displaced Persons Commission, the DPC at the very first step of preliminary determination of eligibility finds 289 ineligibles for one reason or other, including failure to meet the date lines prescribed in the act. At later steps in the process, particularly after the security investigation is completed, the DPC rejects others. But the important thing to bear in mind is that although, under section 2 (b) of the law, the Displaced Persons Commission is required to obtain a certification from the IRO as to whether any particular person comes within the IRO constitution and is the concern of the IRO, it is the DPC which makes independent determinations of eligibility. And after the DPC completes its preliminary findings the Foreign Service of the United States and the Immigration and Naturalization Service make their further screenings after sharp scrutiny and detailed investigation. I hope to have something further to say on this point at a later date.

Mr. President, this is not a partisan issue. This is not a regional issue. This is not an ideological issue. It is a humanitarian issue. The Eightieth Congress enacted a displaced persons law. It was not a good law. It sought to fulfill an international commitment, but did so in an ungracious, a hard, and discriminatory way.

It was therefore proposed to amend that act and to provide a more generous and gracious formula, a sounder and more practical formula. But the proposal reported out by the able and distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee is not that formula. It is the opposite of such a formula. It is not humanitarian. It does not fulfill our commitments. It would make it harder than ever for displaced persons to get into this country. It is not a displaced persons amendment at all. It is a proposal which shuts the door to displaced persons still further, until only a tiny crack would remain, while it would open the door to a group to whom we have no comparable commitment—the German expellees. However much I might sympathize with the plight of the expellees, this is not the measure to resolve that plight. What a cruel irony it would be to displace the displaced persons with those who made them displaced persons. But we must not be callous even to those who were our enemies. The minority substitute makes provision for them, too But these are details which will be amply discussed in the course of this debate.

On this issue, Mr. President, the requirements of honor and decency, the welfare of America, and the path of common sense are all joined. Let us do honor to ourselves, give benefit to our country, and reaffirm our integrity in the eyes of all men by strengthening and liberalizing the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. This can be done by supporting and enacting the minority substitute measure.

Mr. CAIN Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to say to the very distinguished Senator from New York that the junior Senator from Washington thinks he has both a sympathy for and a real understanding of the problems which beset the original displaced persons. I am not certain at the moment as to which of the several proposals on the subject of displaced persons I am likely to support, because I have not yet been able to make up my mind as to what the various proposals seek to accomplish.

I was particularly interested in the comments made in the very beginning of the Senator's speech. If the Senator from New York and a good many other Senators subscribe to what the Senator said in the first several pages of his presentation, I should like publicly or in any other way to associate myself with those views. I should like to ask one or two questions to see if I understand the Senator from New York correctly.

The Senator from New York has pointed out that during the war approximately 10,000,000 human beings were legislated against or were unfairly, and criminally, in fact, dealt with by the Nazis. Roughly, about 10,000,000 was the number of those to be construed as displaced persons. Is that the opinion of the Senator from New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; the number which I mentioned was 9,000,000. Of course, they were not legislated against. They were taken from the countries of Europe and brought into Germany and put into forced-labor camps. In addition to those, many hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of persons were put into German concentration camps because of their religion or because of their political ideologies.

Mr. CAIN. What I am endeavoring to establish in my mind is this: There appear to have been roughly about 10,000,000 of these persons, of whom about 9,000,000, following the end of the war, were encouraged and permitted to go, and in fact did go back to their countries of origin. That left in the displaced-persons category approximately 1,000,000 men, women, and children.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. Is it the opinion of the Senator from New York that the primary objective we seek to achieve is to offer a refuge among allied democratic nations to those million persons who were not, for obvious reasons, permitted to go back to their countries of origin?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not think the figures the distinguished Senator from Washington has given are quite accurate. What I said was that out of the 9,000,000 persons who were displaced by reason of the war, at the end of the war 8,000,000 returned very promptly to their native countries. That included those who had been taken from France, Belgium, Holland, Greece, and other countries.

Mr. CAIN. I understand.

Mr. LEHMAN. That left, at the close of the war in 1945, about 1,000,000. But I do not wish to give the impression to the Senator that there are 1,000,000 now in the displaced-persons camps.

Mr. CAIN. No. The Senator from New York pointed out, as I was casually following his figures, that approximately one-half of the 1,000,000 have already been returned, or have been taken care of by various countries, including the United States of America.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true.

Mr. CAIN. Then, are we still determined to provide relief for the remaining displaced persons, or approximately one-half million of them?

Mr. LEHMAN. The number today is considerably less than one-half million. I hope that under the substitute bill we will be able to admit into this country approximately 200,000 of these displaced persons. In addition to our contribution to the solution of this problem, I think it is fair to assume that other countries will take a considerable number of persons. There will be left in Germany what is called the hard core—the sick, the very aged, people who cannot leave because of illness or other circumstances in their families. But it is believed that

if the substitute bill is passed the number of those remaining in Germany, Austria, and Italy on June 30, 1951, will be very small.

I wonder whether the Senator realizes that a great many of the people who are now in the displaced persons camps or under the charge of the Displaced Persons Commission in Germany, are people who came from the iron-curtain countries since the end of the war in May 1945? That is why, of course, we have asked for an extension of the cut-off date.

Mr. CAIN. I am very keenly conscious of that as being a fact, because I have personally visited a good many of the displaced persons camps in various places in Europe; and, before that, it was my own responsibility in the Army to handle literally tens of thousands of displaced persons under my own command.

When I began my questions I was leading to the cut-off date. The Senator from New York has said, and I think very properly, that the United States of America and other freedom loving nations, have a concrete responsibility to provide a new home and opportunity for persons, men, women, and children, who as a direct result of enemy action were injured. But I should like to suggest to the Senator from New York that our original definition of a displaced person certainly cannot be accommodated by the new suggested cut-off date of January 1, 1949, because it seems very clear to me that a large number of persons to be admitted under the suggested later cut-off date will not have suffered not at all as the result of enemy action; they never were in a concentration camp or a forced labor establishment. The one item to which I individually object in the proposed legislation is the cut-off date of January 1, 1949, because of my primary desire to give relief, first to those who I think are most deserving of it.

The reason I rose to ask some questions of the Senator from New York is that in the beginning of his very excellent statement he said, "Our job is to take care of a million displaced persons who were displaced persons." I think the Senator from New York has in that sense referred to those who were hurt as a direct result of the war. Then when he and others like-minded recommend a cut-off date 4 years after the war was concluded, if I understand correctly, the Senator from New York is talking about an entirely different subject.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not recall that I said that it is our duty today to take care of 1,000,000 persons, because there are not 1,000,000 persons in the displaced persons' camps.

Mr. CAIN. What I should have said was that the Senator made the statement, which I certainly agree with, that it was our duty to have taken care of the million displaced persons left at the end of the war, and admittedly the United States and other nations have already taken care of half of that load.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct. I did say that. Of course, there are in the displaced persons' camps, or rather under the supervision and control of the IRO, a number of persons who were not in Germany during the war.

Mr. CAIN. That is the point I wish to make clear.

Mr. LEHMAN. But they are persons who have fled from the tyranny of the Communist regime.

Mr. CAIN. And they have fled since the war.

Mr. LEHMAN. In many cases they have fled since the war.

Mr. CAIN Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Some probably had been in Germany as slave laborers during the war, and subsequently went back to Poland or Czechoslovakia, and then, after 1945 again returned to Germany to seek the protection of the occupation forces. But undoubtedly there are among the persons in the camps today a considerable number who fled from Poland or from other of the satellite countries or iron-curtain countries into Germany, in order to escape from the Communist terror which we are fighting, and which we should fight.

Mr. CAIN. Let me suggest in all seriousness to the Senator from New York that, as a result of my own experience, I can agree with him that since the war a number of persons have fled from their own countries, to get into displaced persons' camps; but I wish to say—because I believe it to be a fact—that they have fled for a good many reasons, not the least of which is that in many instances they seek to come to the United States of America. Presumably it will be made possible for them to do so by means of changing the cut-off date from December 27, 1945, the date which was designed to take care of persons who actually were hurt by the war, to January 1, 1949. That change clearly will permit a number of persons to come into our country—and perhaps we shall determine that we wish to make that provision—although these persons were not injured during the war and did not spend 5 minutes under duress by anyone, but of their own free will decided that they could not make a living where they were, or that they were not very much impressed by their then neighbors, and that they wished to go to the United States of America.

It concerns me, because as we extend the cut-off date, we shall be just that much less likely to take care of some of those who were included under the original purpose of the legislation, as we understood it to be, when it was first approved by the Congress.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it may be that there are certain few who have entered the German zones for the purpose the Senator from Washington has outlined. However, I think the number is small. But, quite aside from that, I think it is fair for me to point out that while the IRO and the Displaced Persons Commission have to be guided, and undoubtedly are guided, by the present definition of a displaced person, the mere fact that they certify a person does not mean that he or she will get into the United States.

Mr. CAIN. I understand that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Such individuals still have to pass the very, very careful scrutiny of the consular service and of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. So we really have four checks on these people now, whereas under normal immigration procedure there are only two checks.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

I appreciate the friendly way in which the Senator from New York has answered my questions, Mr. President. I should like to make only this observation: I think all of us should clearly tell the American people that in the proposed legislation now pending before the Senate we seek to do two things. Most of us say we intend to do only one thing; to take care of those who, as displaced persons, were hurt and displaced as a result of enemy action during the war. A good many people throughout the country have thought that is all we are attempting to do in this measure. But obviously that no longer is the case, for by means of an extension of the cut-off date—and those who believe in doing so certainly can fight for the adoption of such a measure, and certainly they seek to justify it—it is sought, by means of this legislation, to take care of persons who were not adversely affected by the last war, but who now seek to enter this country because of political developments in their home lands, following the end of the war.

I have a deep feeling that we should make that situation very clear to the American people, so that they will know precisely the purpose of this proposed legislation.

I am in favor of the first great purpose of the proposed legislation; to see that anyone who was hurt by the last war, as a slave laborer or as one who lived in a concentration camp, is given a new home and a new opportunity. But I shall have to make up my mind in respect to the question of determining how far we should go in extending the cut-off date.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator that there is included in the substitute bill authority for former citizens of Czechoslovakia, who, in fleeing from the scourge of communism, entered Germany, to come to this country. I do not know whether those persons suffered directly from the war. I think probably they did, because their country was occupied.

I know very well that there were no more loyal, no more democratic people on the face of the earth than the Czechoslovaks, while Thomas G. Masaryk and Eduard Benes were the Presidents of that country.

Mr. CAIN. I quite agree.

Mr. LEHMAN. I want them to have an opportunity to come to the United States; I refer to those who have fled from the terror and the danger of Communist tyranny.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. They are fighting our battles, and I am glad that we are helping to a certain extent to fight their battles.

Mr. CAIN. I beg the Senator's indulgence for a moment further, as I try to clarify my thinking on these matters.

I should like to see my country solve the displaced persons problem on the basis of the original definition of a dis-

placed person. Under that definition, a man, woman, or child was a displaced person if he or she had been adversely or seriously harmed or affected as a result of enemy action. However, enemy action was over in 1945; and the then cut-off date of December 27, 1945, permitted all the persons who came within the definition to use seven months in going less than 100 miles in a single direction in getting into a displaced persons camp.

First I should like to see my country solve and conclude that problem, by extending relief and refuge to the few of those persons who remain to be cared for.

Furthermore, of course, the world is faced with a much larger problem, than that of displaced persons. There are millions of political refugees and expellees. From my point of view, if it is the wish of the people of America, and the wish of the Congress, to take care of the refugee and expellee problem, I should like to see us face that as an immigration problem, and do so directly. I think the problem of the citizens of Czechoslovakia to whom the Senator from New York has referred belongs in the field of immigration, rather than in the field of displaced persons. I am frightened that the Congress seeks to do by indirection, through an amended displaced persons bill, what it will not take action on directly by facing the larger immigration question.

I wish only to make my position clear.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. First, I should like to compliment the Senator from New York for his very comprehensive statement on this subject.

Apropos of a comment just made by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], let me inquire whether it is true that, actually, great numbers of the persons who would be admitted under this measure are presently under IRO supervision, and already have been considered as coming within the definition of IRO displaced persons nomenclature.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is quite true.

Mr. O'CONOR. So, actually, if we are to increase the numbers along the lines which have been suggested, we shall not be making any radical change or we shall not be guilty of any radical departure from the understanding already had as to those who come within IRO supervision.

If the Senator will permit, I wish to say that I have in mind not only the great numbers from Czechoslovakia, to whom the Senator properly referred, but also those from Yugoslavia—Croatians and others—who fled from Communist oppression, some of whom found their way to the IRO camps, and others who have never been heard from; people who we believe—and I ask the Senator if he agrees as to this—would make very worthy citizens of our country, have been forced by communism to flee from their native country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I feel that way. I feel now, and I have felt so for a long time, that people who have suffered from oppression, from totalitarianism, who have been deprived of their freedom, and have gone through great agony, are likely to appreciate the blessings of democracy and of liberty as much as anyone in the world possibly could.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is very true.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have seen that happen often.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. The Senator made reference to the "hard core" that will have remained after there have been drawn off large numbers under the present system. May I ask the Senator whether he is familiar, as I am sure he is, with the experience already had in regard to the attitude of Israel in taking the lead in opening its doors to great numbers of the so-called hard-core group? In my humble opinion, it should be said to the everlasting credit of Israel that it has initiated a movement which certainly, from the standpoint of humanitarianism, is one of the brightest pages of history. I ask the Senator, does he not feel that Israel inaugurated a new policy?

Mr. LEHMAN. It did. I think I can speak with some authority, because Mrs. Lehman and I visited Israel last year. As the Senator knows, I have been deeply interested in the question of refugees for as many years as I can remember. There, we found that there have been, I believe, approximately 200,000 persons taken from the camps and brought to Israel, where they have been received. As I pointed out in my remarks, the whole question of displaced persons is no longer one which involves, to a major extent, persons of the Jewish faith. There are only, in the total number of persons populating the displaced persons' camps, or among the people who are under the control of the IRO, about 35,000 members of my faith. The others have gone to other countries. A substantial number have come to the United States although the far greater number have gone to Israel. I think it is also important to point out that the Republic of Israel has accepted and taken into that country a considerable number of the sick, the disabled, and the incapacitated who would otherwise have constituted a part of that "hard core" to which the good Senator from Maryland has just referred. That was enabled to be done in large measure as a result of the support given by that great American relief organization, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator. It occurred to me it was a very commendable thing that this new Nation should open its doors to such a group, who otherwise might possibly be discarded by all other nations of the world, or for whom, at least, under present circumstances, no solution has yet been found. I thank the Senator very much for his observation.

THE ECONOMIC YALTA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, foreign trade should be promoted on a basis of fair and reasonable competition—providing Americans the same access to American markets as the foreign producers.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT BETRAYED THE WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

In 1934 Congress passed the Trade Agreements Act transferring its constitutional responsibility for the regulation of the national economy to the President. The act constituted a betrayal of the workingmen and investors of the United States of America—it was an economic Yalta.

REMOVES THE FLOOR UNDER WAGES AND INVESTMENTS

The act as extended gives the President the right to reduce import fees and tariffs virtually 75 percent from the 1934 rates—thus effectively removing the floor under wages and investments.

EVERY JOB AND EVERY INVESTMENT IN JEOPARDY

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as amended, thus placed the fate of every workingman's job and every investment in this Nation in the hands of an industrially inexperienced State Department—with the power to direct which of the American jobs and industries shall survive and which shall be sacrificed on the "one economic world" altar.

Mr. President, if any doubt could be expressed that this is exactly what has happened in the past 15 years, then one would only need to read the testimony of the distinguished Secretary of State Mr. Acheson, and of the distinguished ECA Director, Mr. Hoffman, during the last week.

ABANDONMENT OF AMERICAN WORKINGMEN AND INVESTMENTS

The statement by the Secretary of State Dean Acheson several weeks ago in New York that "We must want to devote our time and energy to discovering and bringing in imports," marked the final abandonment of the American workingmen and investors.

The only point of disagreement now between Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hoffman, according to the recent testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, is whether the Congress should pay the industrialists of our Nation, displaced by low-living-standard foreign labor, a subsidy, or whether we should set up a school where tutors, probably furnished by the ECA, would teach the displaced workers a new trade.

TUTORS FOR WORKERS

Mr. President, tutors are people who are not generally able to make a living at the trade, but who teach it in a school, in lieu of working at it.

ADOPT "BUY EUROPEAN"—DROP "BUY AMERICAN"

Both Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hoffman agreed that the old "Buy American" slogan should be dropped in the face of increased unemployment and that the new slogan of "Buy European" should be adopted and a real drive begun, assisted by Government appropriations to make it effective.

ACHESON-HOFFMAN FREE TRADE SHOULD BE CONTINUED

"Buy European" with approximately 6,000,000 unemployed in this country today and probably 12,000,000 partially unemployed at the present time, and with the number increasing each day in the textile, crockery, precision instruments,

lumber and wood products, mining, agriculture, petroleum, and other vital industries, Mr. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, and Mr. Paul Hoffman, Director of ECA, had the effrontery to tell the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the State Departments "Free Trade" program should be continued.

DIRECT RELIEF TO DISPLACED WORKERS

I shall quote from the New York Journal of Commerce of February 23 relative to a suggestion made by Mr. Hoffman. During his initial testimony on Tuesday, Mr. Hoffman had merely stated that, "if there must be some relief in this situation, I suggest that it be given directly."

They had disagreed slightly on how to support the unemployed in this country, and to reimburse industrialists with their stockholders whose investments have gone bad as a result of the imports, fostered by ECA.

THE HOFFMAN THREE-PART UNEMPLOYMENT SOLUTION

Taking the highly problematical case of the one-industry town, with a plant which could not shift its products to some other line, the ECA Chief said he saw three possible types of relief:

First. Unemployment compensation insurance;

Second. A program of job training; and

Third. Possibly management training, to try and bring new industry into the area.

ALICE IN WONDERLAND SOLUTION

Mr. President, this, to my mind, reached the *n*th degree of some kind of Alice in Wonderland theories. In other words, here is a man, a supposed industrialist, drawn into this great job of directing the expenditure of from $5,500,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 each year, who apparently has never found until now that for a hundred years the nations of the earth have been competing for markets. So, after financing industries in ECA countries to the extent that they cannot, through their own quotas, embargoes, and the manipulation of their foreign currencies and other stoppages of trade among themselves, sell what they produce, he suddenly finds out there is a great solution on their doorstep. What is it? It is to allow them to take the market we have protected and built up the hard way for 75 years in the United States.

Mr. President, it is a great solution. In my opinion, it is comparable to two great armies facing each other, such as you and I and many other Senators on this floor have seen twice within the last 30 years. The armies face each other. So, one of the generals suddenly determines how to stop the war—he surrenders to the other. A wonderful solution, Mr. President. It seems almost a miracle that men of the experience of these two men should think of such a solution on the verge of the most critical period the United States has ever experienced. So, in the case of a plant which could not shift its produce to some other line, the ECA chief said he saw three possible types of relief; the first of which was unemployment compensation insurance.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

That is new. It is a little difficult to see, busy as the Director is with the work of such an important agency as the ECA, how he would have the time to think of such a thing—that the unemployed could go on relief. We, in the United States, for the past 25 or 30 years, have provided industrial accident insurance and unemployment insurance, but we did not anticipate that Congress would cooperate with foreign nations in bringing about the necessity for it, nor did we anticipate that these great men would think of this kind of a solution in such an emergency.

TUTORS—JOB TRAINING

Second, a program of job training. Mr. President, in towns such as those in New England, where the industries, including textile business, the watch industry, and the precision-instrument companies, are to a certain extent displaced or cut down—we know, of course, that it would be very easy for the tutors to come in, with their college educations, to teach the unemployed a new job. Of course, the question of what kind of job is immaterial, because, as any person, even a 10-year-old schoolboy in New England knows, an unemployed worker taught a new job in any industry could be displaced in the same manner the next day. Of course, that probably did not occur to the Secretary of State and to the ECA Director, Mr. Hoffman

TUTORS TO TRAIN BUSINESS-MANAGEMENT FOR NEW INDUSTRIES

The third is a business-management training, to draw new industry into the area.

In other words, we will have the same tutors, college graduates, available to teach hard-boiled industrialists, who have grown up in the business and who have spent their life in it, for 20, 30, 40, or 50 years. We are going to have tutors, who, of course, understand all these things, to teach the industrialists who want to save their investments in the business how to coordinate industry, develop, and set up a new industry in their area.

One would suppose, Mr. President, that no one had ever thought about the type of industry adaptable to certain areas of the United States until it is time to displace the industries which have grown up naturally—with what? With products provided by the low-wage and slave-labor nations of the earth. The question is displacing high-wage living standards with low-wage living standards, Mr. President. That is what we are talking about today.

CONSPIRACY TO LOWER THE WORKINGMEN'S WAGE STANDARD OF LIVING

This is a conspiracy to lower the wage and living standards of American workmen and to displace and destroy investments in this country to such a point that, of course, the Government will have to step in and provide full employment. That has been the bill of goods sold to this country for the past 18 years. Whenever private industry cannot provide full employment, the Government must step in. Of course some persons agreed to that theory, knowing it was wrong, but never understanding that the Government itself was going to finance the industry which displaced the private industry.

AMERICAN WORKERS DISPLACED

When men and women are working for 40 or 50 cents a day, as they are in the Far East, in Africa, and in some parts of Asia, and when men are working for $1.50 to $2.40, as they are in Europe and in South America, with the great Congress of the United States providing the investment money for industries in the low-wage countries, providing for the establishment of refineries for crude oil, providing for drilling rigs and other machinery to drill for oil, providing for factories, providing the raw materials, and furnishing money to pay help, and to hold working people down to low wages, using our machinery and our know-how, then, Mr. President, when we have displaced the workingmen of America through our free-trade policies and have ruined investments which have been made over a period of years through private sources, we find Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Acheson disagreeing only as to method of relief—both agreeing that we must continue to import the low-wage and slave-labor goods.

One of them thinks there should be subsidies granted to industry. Mr. Acheson suggested that method. Mr. Hoffman thinks of the workingman—and it is about time—but not with reference to saving his job; he is simply thinking of teaching him, through educated tutors, to take a new job and of educating industrialists, possibly ECA-trained, to try to bring new industry into certain areas. Mr. President, I can picture that. It seems to me it is quite the *n*th degree of an Alice in Wonderland suggestion.

RETRAIN GOLD MINERS

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator remember that during the war an effort was made to put the gold miners out of business in order that they might be retrained to become copper miners? But nothing happened. The gold miners would not be retrained. The Senator will remember that there was a fantastic Utopia which Professor Tugwell established in order to retrain persons in agricultural pursuits who had been coal miners. It is a dislocated part of plans which have been tried and which have failed in the past.

Mr. MALONE. It is not a dislocated part of a plan tried in the past; it is a continuation of the plan begun 18 years ago—all of the parts of it are now fitting together to establish a Socialist government in this country.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think many of these retraining plans violate the dignity of the workingman. If he started out to make a gold miner of himself, he is entitled to be a gold miner. If he started

out to make a machinist of himself, he is entitled to be a machinist. Some "double-dome" in Washington is not entitled to make plans for him to change his vocation and to be retrained for other things as if he were a robot.

ONE ECONOMIC WORLD

Mr. MALONE. I take it the Senator from Colorado does not agree with the great plan which has been worked out for the one economic world. In other words, the effort is made to lower the standard of living in this country to the level of the average living standard of the world. When that has been accomplished, it is said that we shall have perpetual peace. What does the Senator say to that?

Mr. MILLIKIN. My only objection to what the distinguished Senator from Nevada has said is that he is dealing in terms of understatement which the rules of politeness of the Senate require. I could not fully express myself on that subject and still keep within the rules.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado very much. I am somewhat handicapped myself in that connection.

WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS DOWN THE DRAIN

Mr. President, the things suggested are so silly that it seems there is no need to try to improve on the language used by the Secretary of State and the Director of ECA so that the American people, the workingmen and the investors, may know just what kind of a "drain" they are going down and who is at the head of the movement.

CONGRESS ARROGATED CONSTITUTIONAL CONTROL OVER NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. President, I want to come back to one thing which was stated a while ago. The Congress of the United States passed the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. It has since been extended every 3 years. In September 1949, it was extended for another 3 years.

In that act, Mr. President, the Congress of the United States abrogated its constitutional authority to regulate the economy of the United States and placed it in the hands of an industrially inexperienced State Department whose eyes were focused 3,000 miles or 10,000 miles away from the American shores, with no idea of preserving our own industry, or wage standard of living, but simply of arriving at the one economic world.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

The Congress of the United States must take responsibility for that. I suggest that Congress take back its constitutional authority to regulate the national economy—especially before there is an opportunity for the administration to bring to the floor of the Senate—and it is coming, Mr. President, soon after we dispose of the ECA question—the International Trade Organization.

While the Congress of the United States transferred to the State Department the control of the economy of this country, a constitutional authority with which it was charged, and gave the State Department the right to lower tariffs and import fees on nearly every product as much as 75 percent, the International Trade Organization, which for the past 2 years has been sold to this country through State Department propaganda.

This organization would simply transfer the authority to regulate the national economy from the State Department to 57 foreign nations.

58 NATIONS—58 VOTES

In other words, the International Trade Organization would be composed of 57 nations, including America. We would have one vote, just as Siam has. Many of those people are living on canals in the rice fields, in sampans on the rivers. I visited Bangkok and saw persons living in sampans, drinking the water from the river, bathing in it, and cooking with it. They weigh around 110 pounds, wringing wet. One company of United States Marines could take over the whole nation in a week, and the people would not know that the authority had been changed. But they would have one vote in the International Trade Organization even as the United States of America.

TINKER TO EVERS TO CHANCE

I say it is a case of Tinker to Evers to Chance. In 1934 Congress gave its constitutional authority to the State Department, which has no knowledge of industry in this country.

The International Trade Organization would transfer the authority from the State Department to the control of the foreign nations to which I have referred. When we have read the plan and digested it we find that there are two things uppermost.

TRANSFER RIGHT TO FIX IMPORT FEES AND QUOTAS TO ITO

One of them is that we transfer all the authority and the right to fix tariffs and import fees to the member nations.

It is complicated, but adds up to that. Just as the distinguished Senator from Colorado explained in such a masterful manner last September when the 1934 Trade Agreements Act was before us for extension, they have an escape clause. It is hedged about with so many conditions that it is impossible to invoke the escape clause. That is the way with the International Trade Organization—they end with the authority to fix import fees and quotas of production for the member nations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The escape clause is simply a recognition that the International Trade Organization has escaped from a planner's "bughouse." It is a document inflicting cruel and unusual punishment on anyone required to read it. No one has read it who has not had to read it. No one will read it. It paralyzes the human mind because of its conflicts and because it is utterly loaded with nonsensicalities. I cannot believe that the opposition will be foolish enough to bring that idiotic thing to the floor of the Senate. They have had it since 1948 and have not been able to screw up their courage sufficiently to bring it in. If it is brought in, I venture to say that we shall beat the stuffing out of it, because we are not yet ready completely to give away the sovereignty of this Nation.

FOLLOWING HITLER'S SELLING TECHNIQUE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I should like to point out, however, that it has been the policy of the administration for the past 15 years to follow what might seem to us to be idiotic and nonsensical practices. Does the distinguished Senator from Colorado remember what Hitler said on that subject? He said that no matter how preposterous a thing is, if it is said often enough and positively enough, many people will believe it. The administration advances things like the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and the ECA, which is to make up the trade-balance deficits of the 16 Marshall plan countries each year in cash until such time as they can divide the markets under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, averaging the living standards of the nations of the world, including our own.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

Take the International Trade Organization, which they have attempted to sell to this country for a year and a half—I would say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that the administration has followed a deliberate policy of selling an idea through propaganda; then when they think it is sufficiently sold to the people of the United States, no Senator will have the guts to stand up and debate it and vote against it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I may make a suggestion, I should like to say that when they think they have sufficiently sold it, they will find it is sufficiently unsold on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his contribution, but I will say to him that the ITO is not any sillier than many things which have already been sold to them by the administration.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, I would not debate that with the distinguished Senator. However, it is almost the silliest.

Mr. MALONE. I will agree with the distinguished Senator that it approaches the ultimate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would challenge the distinguished Senator to state something that is sillier.

Mr. MALONE. I would have to bow in ignorance, Mr. President, to the distinguished Senator's challenge.

To continue with the suggestions of Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Acheson, the article in the Journal of Commerce of February 23, 1950, goes on to say, speaking of Mr. Hoffman:

> He rejected suggestions that such industries should be subsidized.

That was the suggestion of the distinguished Secretary of State. Apparently there is some disagreement among the people who are dividing our markets with foreign nations. They agree that we must give up our markets but disagree as to how the losers, our workingmen and investors, will be paid off.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Did the Secretary of State or Mr. Hoffman indicate which particular industries in the Nation would be put out of business and given a subsidy?

Mr. MALONE. They did not indicate which industries, but as I have said heretofore and am saying again now, the imports coming into the United States indicate which industries will be affected. I have named those industries. They are the wood and wood products industries, the textile industry, petroleum fuels, the mining industry, the watch industry, agricultural products, and many other manufactured and processed materials. Incidentally, at this time 75 percent of all watch movements, on our wrists and in our pockets, come from Switzerland, because of the fact that a Swiss watchmaker earns in wages about one-third of what our American workers earn—that is, what our workers earned before they were thrown out of work. A large part of our watchmakers are now petitioning the President of the United States to save their jobs.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Secretary of State or Mr. Hoffman indicate approximately when they are going to put this program of help into operation?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; immediately. Of course, it may take congressional action—additional appropriations.

Mr. WATKINS. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, because there are some mines in Utah which have been closed down, and several thousand miners have been thrown out of work and need help. The program must go into operation immediately, if we are to save the United States.

CONGRESS CAUSING UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the Senator from Utah that it might take special legislation in Nevada, Utah, Maine, Massachusetts, and in various other States, to increase their appropriations for State unemployment insurance, because at the time these funds were established it was not thought that the Congress of the United States would deliberately cooperate to bring about unemployment. We assumed that we were taking care of the normal unemployment ups and downs and that we were planning to withstand only the natural buffeting to which a free economic system is subject. We never thought that the great Congress of the United States would conspire with the executive department of the United States, with the ECA, and with the Secretary of State, to bring about unemployment. So I believe it would require special sessions of many State legislatures, to provide more money and higher contributions from employers and employees for some period of time, to withstand the effects of this Government-created unemployment.

"ONE ECONOMIC WORLD"

I might say, in continuing to answer the distinguished Senator from Utah, that what the Senate and the House did in passing the 1934 Trade Agreements Act was to put into the hands of our inexperienced State Department the right to say what industries should survive and what industries should be sacrificed in the interest of this great "one economic world"—averaging the living standards of the nations of the world, including our own, in the interest of perpetual peace.

Let us look at the last Geneva agreement. By the way, another conference is about to be held within the next few months. The purpose of it is to still further lower tariffs and import fees, with a view to further directing which industries are to survive and which industries are to be sacrificed in this country.

RESPONSIBILITY TO LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

Reading again from the February 23, 1950, issue of the Journal of Commerce, I continue with the article referring to Mr. Hoffman, as follows:

> Placing his whole reliance on competition and efficient management, in this respect he may be in conflict with Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who yesterday in general terms said the Government has the responsibility to businesses which suffer from increased imports.
>
> Acheson is speaking of responsibility to management, while Hoffman is talking about responsibility to labor.

Well, now, could we not have continued responsibility to both, inasmuch as we have an economy built up by the cooperation of labor and management during the past 150 years? Could we not continue that responsibility to both labor and management by continuing to fix fair rules and regulations under which they could all operate, instead of putting into the hands of an industrially inexperienced State Department the management and the control of the national economy of this country, to the end that they can say which of the groups of workers, all over the United States, and which of the groups of investors in our industries shall be protected and which shall be sacrified—on the "one economic world" altar. So, here we have the spectacle of the State Department being allowed to say which of the industries will be sacrificed, and the investments wiped out.

UNITED SENATORS BEG FOR THEIR INDUSTRIES

What is an investment in the Waltham Watch Co. worth? It was my privilege to stand on this floor on February 6 and hear the distinguished junior Senator from Masachusetts [Mr. LODGE], almost with tears in his eyes, read a telegram which the head of the watchmakers labor union, or the president of the Waltham Watch Co., had sent to President Truman begging him to intercede with the RFC to save that great industry.

I said at that time that it had been my privilege on a previous occasion to hear a great Senator, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], beg a committee not to sacrifice a national industry. It was a committee set up by the State Department to hear objections to the lowering of tariffs and import fees which they were contemplating in the matter of tungsten.

As I said in the debate before in this, I took a good look at this board of seven, sitting up there like the Supreme Court of the United States. There was not one of them I would have hired in my private engineering business. This was back in 1942, when I was special consultant to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs—not in the United States Senate.

It came out later that this board had no authority to pass on what the Senator from Colorado was discussing. The matter was passed on to another board for final decision. Nothing happened. The great Senator from Colorado begged there, with his hat in his hand, looking up at the men who made up this board, whom I would call, the least I could say, undistinguished persons. Then he walked away, and they abolished the tungsten industry, just as they are going to abolish or reduce other great industries of this Nation.

That was quite a long time ago, but they still might find enough of the tungsten miners to take their subsidy.

We find this wide difference of opinion between the great Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, and the Director of the ECA, Paul Hoffman, differing on the question of how they should assist the workingmen and industries destroyed through free trade.

If these two great men disagree on how this help is to be rendered, could it not be that there would be no help rendered?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Did the plan embody any help for the employers as well as the employees?

Mr. MALONE. Oh, yes. Dean Acheson suggests, in his big-heartedness, how by his own actions he is causing the wiping out of the investors' money and the destruction of industries and workingmen's jobs. He said the Government, meaning the Secretary of State, has a responsibility to business not to repay the investments but to lend money probably out of the RFC to establish a new industry—after the tutors have retained the workingmen for the new jobs—and the industrialists have been shown by the tutors how to establish a new industry.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator know whether they have taken any practical steps to help the mines now closed down because of the importation of metals and minerals from Yugoslavia and other countries?

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Utah that there is no indication in any of the dispatches that any of them know what they are doing whatever, or what industries are suffering. They have merely been told, and through questioning by the committee it has been developed that many workers are unemployed and that certain industries are suffering and losing money and probably will be closed down or severely curtailed.

Mr. WATKINS. Has it occurred to the Senator that this is possibly one way of making one world, by putting us on the same trade level with Siam, and so on?

Mr. MALONE. I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that I have been a Member of this distinguished body for only 3 years. Every time I can obtain

the floor I say that that has been their objective from the very beginning. This great three-part, free-trade program has no other objective.

THE SENATE BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Complete "free trade" was the objective of the great bipartisan policy on the Senate floor. It never was anything else. I refer to the bipartisan policy agreed to by this distinguished body in the form of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which put into the hands of the State Department the right to say what industries shall survive and what shall not survive. I quoted the Secretary of State's own words. He said we must search for more products to be imported into the United States of America, which obviously would displace our own workers. He did not say to displace them. Those are my words. But he suggested we must search for more products to bring into the United States. The Congress of the United States put that weapon into his hands and walked off and left him—plus the Marshall plan, now ECA—to make up the trade-balance deficits until such time as the markets of this country could be divided to wipe out the deficits. That was the bipartisan foreign policy. It ruined the Republican Party for 18 years, and is in a fair way to ruin the United States of America.

The second step, which never had for its purpose anything else in the world, was the Marshall plan, which in reality was the Bevin plan. Marshall made a remark, a paragraph in length, at Harvard on the subject, and Mr. Bevin caught it on the first bounce beyond the Atlantic and told us in 30 days what amount of money we should appropriate to make up the trade-balance deficits.

TRADE-BALANCE DEFICITS VERSUS "FURNISH MARKETS FOR AMERICAN GOODS"

I said on the floor of the Senate on March 5 and 6, in 1948, that the purpose was to make up the trade-balance deficits. Many of my distinguished colleagues on the Senate floor stood up and said, "This proposal is supposed to create markets all over the world for the businessmen and workingmen of the United States. This increased foreign trade will create markets. Naturally, if we are going to sell, we must furnish some money to others to buy our products."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not mean, does he, by his observation that Senators rose all over the Senate floor and said the Marshall plan would create great markets for American businessmen all over the world; that the Senator from Nebraska joined in saying that?

Mr. MALONE. I did not mean to indicate that all Senators joined in that statement. There were a number, however.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in total sympathy with what the distinguished Senator from Nevada is saying. He will recall that in the debate we had a year ago on ECA the junior Senator from Nebraska discussed for nearly one whole afternoon the question of making up the British trade-balance deficits, and the effect it would have on the petroleum industry of the United States. As a member of the Small Business Committee I have discovered that more than 600,000 barrels of petroleum a day was being imported into the United States. I pointed out then, and it was also pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Texas and others, that the time would come when those interested in the production of petroleum would cry for relief, because in balancing the British economy we were providing $500,000,000 to be spent in exploration to bring in wells in backward areas, the oil from which would be shipped into the United States so the producers of that oil would receive dollars, which would bolster up the dollar balances of other countries whose oil would be sold in competition with that of the petroleum producers of the United States. Today that has become a reality. Before the Foreign Relations Committee an attempt is now being made to solve the problem by restricting the purchases and sales to the sterling areas, rather than bringing products to the United States, which would have the result of taking away from the American producer the right to sell in sterling areas, on top of what they are doing here in America.

The Senate has just passed a bill relating to the potato problem. Through the State Department we endeavored to have an agreement entered into whereby the producers of potatoes in Canada would temporarily be halted in bringing potatoes into this country. We have a surplus of 60,000,000 bushels. Potatoes which are imported into the United States from other countries receive the benefits of our support price, to the disadvantage of our own potato producers. Potatoes are being imported from countries that have no acreage limitations an no marketing restrictions of any kind whatsoever. Yet 15,000,000 bushels, nearly one-fourth of the entire surplus, are imported.

Mr. President, those who believe in an international agreement whereby the potato farmer of Nebraska is supposed to benefit, are placing him in a strait-jacket with marketing quotas and marketing restrictions, taking his potatoes, if you please, with no support price, and at the same time permitting surplus potatoes to come in from other parts of the world.

I could go on and on and on with illustrations of the same sort.

The Senator from Nevada mentioned watches. Now, however, the worst situation I know of exists in the textile industry. After these industries are ruined, after we come to the point where we cannot help them to survive—and Congress has not even adopted a peril-point provision—when our industries become so sick that they can no longer continue to operate, then application is made to the RFC to bail them out. It is proposed to use thirty or forty million dollars of the taxpayers' money to bail out an industry which is sick, but which, had we followed a proper procedure, had we taken a proper course, would never have become sick in the first place.

When the Senator said that a number of Senators rose on the floor and expressed themselves as being in favor of the international trade agreements, as they were submitted to us by Dean Acheson and some others, at least the junior Senator from Nebraska was not among them. I voted against that proposal. I am proud to say I did so. Today industry and many laboring men in this country are feeling the effects of the international trade agreements which were put into effect against and over the opposition of the entire Republican minority, which voted at least for the adoption of the peril-point provision to protect the industries of the United States.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me so I may ask the Senator from Nebraska a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I ask the Senator from Nebraska if it is not true that the reciprocal-trade agreements and the foreign-trade treaties themselves contain an escape clause which the President is supposed to make use of in the event American industries are threatened?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree that they do. The escape clause, however, has not been used, and it is not in the mind of Mr. Acheson to use it. Mr. Acheson today is not only writing our foreign policy but he more than any one man in the United States is dictating our domestic economy.

The other day I placed in the RECORD a statement respecting Mr. Hoffman—I have not interrogated him on the subject and do not know whether the statement is true—to the effect that Mr. Hoffman now wants further imports to come into the United States on practically a free trade basis, to help countries, and Britain is one of them, whose productivity is even higher than it was in 1939, by 35 percent, even at the expense of further dislocating our industry and increasing our difficulties in the United States. The result would be that Congress would be obliged to pass remedial legislation, to extend unemployment insurance to take care of the workers in America who would become unemployed by reason of the adoption of such a policy. A further result would be that industry in England would take over some of our domestic markets.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska a question. He referred to the fact that the trade treaties had a peril point or escape-clause provision, the enforcement of which was left to the President of the United States. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska a question, in view of that fact. Let us consider the present coal crisis. We have a Federal law known as the Taft-Hartley law. It contains provisions by which threatened national emergencies can be dealt with. But unless the President or the State Department has the interest of America at heart, and has the

will to enforce the law as it is written, what good does it do to have any such kind of law?

Mr. WHERRY. The answer to that question is perfectly obvious. In such event the law would not be of value.

Mr. JENNER. If it is the will of those persons to give away our American markets and destroy American labor no law which the Congress could pass would ever protect American industry and American labor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am in complete agreement with what the Senator from Indiana has said. With respect to the coal situation I should like to say that if the law which now is on the statute books had been thoroughly enforced a month ago when the national emergency began, if there had been a will to enforce it, we would not have experienced the disastrous effects which have resulted because of the failure to enforce it. That result has come about simply because there was not the will to enforce the provisions contained in the National Labor Relations Act. Those provisions could have been enforced.

Congress did not enact a peril-point provision when the trade agreements were entered into. Some of us tried to have such a provision included; we did our level best to have it included. But even the peril-point provisions for which we fought did not go far enough. It simply called for an explanation by the President of why he permitted certain imports to come into the United States after they had destroyed some American industry. That would not be of much aid to a sick industry.

Mr. President, it is time for those who have charge not only of our foreign policy but our domestic policy—because the two cannot be separated—to take to heart America's interest. Certainly they should recognize that unemployment has increased. They should recognize the dislocations in industry which have occurred. Certainly it is not the proper thing to do, after an industry has become so sick it can no longer continue to operate, to attempt to bail it out by making loans to it. Steps should have been taken to see that imports were not permitted to come into the United States in such quantity as to destroy our industries, or lower our standard of living in America and cause unemployment, and in the end wreck our domestic economy.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I do not believe that the distinguished Senator from Nevada has been quite fair with—as I believe the Senator called him—the great Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, and with Mr. Hoffman, because, if I correctly understand their position, it is that, in order to bridge the dollar gap, either we have to give away the American markets or else we have to continue to give away the money of the American taxpayers. In other words, after all, under the theory of the present administration and of Dean Acheson and of Paul Hoffman, I think their argument in favor of giving away the markets of American labor and bringing about the collapse of industry in the United States is sound because they say that we must either do that or else we shall have to continue forever to give away the money of the taxpayers of the United States; and they ask which one we think would be less onerous on the American people—to give away the money of the American taxpayers or to give away the American markets. That is the choice the administration gives to America.

WISHFUL THINKING

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I was going to come to that point a little later, but I am glad the Senator has brought it up at this time.

In reply, let me say that, apparently, in the opinion of those administration stalwarts, the Secretary of State and the Director of ECA, it is necessary that we do either one of the things the Senator from Indiana has just mentioned or continue a combination of both as we have been doing; in the opinion of those in the administration we can simply adopt one of the Alice-in-Wonderland solutions which young children sometimes imagine—namely, that there is no problem, but that all that it is necessary to do is to make a wish, and everything will come out all right. You either give up our markets or give them money.

THE FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE

However, Mr. President, I wish to say there is a means by which we can help the other nations of the world raise their standards of living, and that is through the flexible import-fee system.

Mr. JENNER. I understand that, of course.

CONGRESS WOULD REGAIN ITS CONSTITUTIONAL POWER

Mr. MALONE. Nevertheless, I should like to explain it now, for fear that someone does not even yet understand it. A flexible import-fee system would take the place of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, Mr. President; and by means of the adoption of a flexible import-fee system, the Congress would regain its constitutional power to regulate the economy of the country.

I argued for that in 1948 and 1949, even as late as last September 13; I said that we should substitute such a system for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. I think the Senator from Indiana voted for it at that time. In doing so, we would turn the present long-experienced Tariff Commission into a Trade Agreement Authority—more nearly representing the work it does—and give the Authority the same latitude in determining the import fee on any particular product in order to make up the differential in cost, chiefly due to the difference between the American wage standard of living and the standards of living in other countries. Inasmuch as all the other governments of the world, practically speaking, are operating on a basis of bulk buying, bulk selling, and the subsidization of their industries, so that the costs of production in those countries, available to us, really mean very little, two factors which would be taken into consideration by the Authority, working independently in that field—just as the Interstate Commerce Commission works independently in the field of permitting reasonable returns to be made on the investments in fixing freight rates for the carriers. The Authority would establish a fair and reasonable basis of competition, so that American workingmen and industrialists would have the same access to the American markets as the foreign nations. A floor under wages and investments would be established. Two of the principal factors considered by the Authority would be the declared customs value of the goods coming into this country—and the offered-for-sale price.

These two factors would prevent manipulations by governments being effective in market competition. In other words, no one believes that England's bid of $250,000 below the American firm's bid to supply the generators and other electrical equipment for the city of Seattle was a fair bid. It was really a government bid, because in England industry is being underwritten as a result of the subsidizing of food and the holding down of the prices of food by means of the money and goods we are furnishing to Britain through ECA. As a matter of fact, then, the Senate of the United States itself had a hand in furnishing England the money with which to provide the food subsidies and lower wages for the British workingmen, as a result of which England has endeavored to undersell American workingmen by approximately 30 percent, in the case of the electrical equipment in Seattle, to which I have just referred. The Seattle authorities were smart enough to turn down that British bid; the Seattle engineers understood why they should do so; had the bid been accepted, it would have been necessary in the future to get the repair parts from England. That bid was made possible because of the money we have furnished to England.

So I say we should establish such an import authority and should give it latitude in that field, on the basis of fair and reasonable competition principle. That would only mean that American workmen would again be given the same access to foreign markets that foreign workmen have.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator from Nevada thinks that is the answer, does he?

Mr. MALONE. Absolutely. The flexible import fees would go down as the standards of living of other countries rose, as a result of our help. Whenever the other countries' living standards approximated our own then the common objective of free trade would be the almost automatic and immediate result.

JUMP OFF THE ROOF OR CLIMB UP THE LADDER

But I say to the Senator that the difference between the flexible import fee method of reaching free trade and the method of simply suddenly cutting off all tariffs and import fees and putting the 50-cent-a-day or $1-a-day or $2.50-per-day labor in competition with American $10-a-day or $12-a-day labor is the difference between our jumping off the roof to reach someone on the sidewalk and lowering a ladder by means of which our friends could climb up to the roof and join us there. That is the difference.

Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], let me say

that I am very happy that he called my attention to the fact that, along with the junior Senator from Nevada, he opposed the present program of the administration. I assure the distinguished Senator that I had no idea of implying that he had favored such a silly program. In reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 5, 1948—and let me say that the junior Senator from Nevada stood on the floor of the Senate and spoke for 3 or 4 hours on that day——

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

SAID 2 YEARS AGO THAT "FREE TRADE" WOULD AFFECT ALL INDUSTRIES

Mr. MALONE. We see that the Senator from Nebraska said:

Does the Senator think there is anything in the language of the bill which has anything to do with the schedules or provisions of any trade agreements which now exist, or, if the Trade Agreements Act should not be extended, would the Secretary have any authority under any provision of this bill to have anything to do with trade relations between Switzerland and the United States relative to the importation of watches?

A little later he said:

Does the Senator think it has nothing to do with trade relations between those countries and the United States?

I said then, in answer:

Mr. President, I must agree with my distinguished colleague from Nebraska that this loosely drawn bill may involve every industry in the United States.

Mr. President, in two short years it has done just that.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. It has involved almost every industry in the United States. Automobiles, heavy farm machinery, heavy construction machinery, and some very intricate machinery can be manufactured and processed here in the United States ahead of the foreign nations because they have not yet reached the point where they can compete with us on such items. Nevertheless, within a very few years—3 or 4 years, at the most—they will be able to compete with us on those items. At this time Henry Ford can manufacture a Ford automobile in England and can sell it in Detroit cheaper than a Ford can be manufactured in Detroit and sold there. Why is that so? Is is because of the $2.50 a day labor available in England as against the $10 to $15 per day in Detroit.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the Senator for the observation he has made. It is absolutely in harmony with my own position and, I am satisfied, with the Senator's position, not only in regard to trade agreements, but particularly in regard to the importations made under the ECA. It seems to me that the point which is the burden of the Senator's remarks, and of which all of us should take recognition today, is that unemployment in the United States is increasing and will increase and will cause dislocations.

If the Senator from Nevada will yield further, I should like to state what Paul C. Hoffman said, namely, that the administration's drive to increase imports from Europe to balance international trade would create unemployment in a few localities in this country, necessitating special unemployment programs. His suggestion was that we increase unemployment insurance in order to take care of those who will be forced out of work, so as to permit foreign nations to continue to ship their goods, as imports, into this country, and to sell them in competition with goods produced by American workmen, to sell them in competition with the products of our own economy, to the point where either it will be necessary for many of our laboring men to be discharged, or at least it will be necessary for many of our industries to seriously curtail employment. Then Mr. Hoffman's solution is that the taxpayers of the United States pay, by means of extended rates of unemployment insurance, in order to make good those dislocations.

PLEADED FOR PROTECTION FOR WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

Mr. MALONE. Of course, Mr. President, I heartily agree with the Senator from Nebraska that no other result could be expected, as was shown in our debate of 2 years ago, almost to the day—in 5 days it will be exactly 2 years—when we pleaded with the Senate not to do this thing to the workingmen and to the investors of America.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

ADMINISTRATION SEES NO PROBLEM

Mr. MALONE. Still we have the Alice in Wonderland answers which the administration proposes, almost as a 10-year-old school child would do, namely, that there is no problem. The administration takes that position because it knows of no problem. Of course, it knows nothing about the problem. Therefore, Secretary Acheson sees no problem; and he believes that all we have to do, when a few thousand American workingmen are thrown out of work, perhaps in Nebraska or perhaps in Massachusetts or perhaps in Nevada, is simply to put them on unemployment insurance in that State. He takes the position that that is what unemployment insurance is for.

DID NOT TAKE CONGRESS INTO ACCOUNT

But, as I said a while ago, when I was State engineer of Nevada, when we were still trying to adjust the industrial insurance rates so that when accidents occurred, the men who were injured would be fully cared for, and later when we were trying to figure out the proper rates for unemployment insurance, certainly we did not take into account the possibility that the Government of the United States would be in competition with us and would be sending machinery to low-wage countries, to permit their labor to better compete with ours.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that if the Administrator of ECA would enforce the actual provisions of the ECA Act, namely, that the beneficiary countries remove all trade barriers among themselves and establish free convertibility of currency, in a great measure, that would alleviate the dollar shortages among those countries?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished Senator, let me say that I do not agree with him that the ECA Act provides that the ECA Administrator must do that. The ECA Act does not specifically say anything of that sort, except that the Administrator can spend the money. It does mention that.

RESPECT THE INTEGRITY OF PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

But I would say to the distinguished Senator—and I have made speeches about this matter all over the country, ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, and I have said this many times here on the floor of the Senate—that all we need to do, if we are going to continue ECA—and ECA would be unnecessary if we were to establish the proper rules—is to require, first, that the integrity of private investments in those nations be respected.

RUN MORE MONEY UNDERGROUND THAN ASKING FOR UNDER MARSHALL PLAN

I said in March 1948 that my research had established beyond any doubt the fact, which no one then questioned and which no one has yet questioned, that they had run more money underground in the ECA nations, including England, France, and other nations, through their nationalistic and socialistic policies, by confiscating property—they had run more money of their own citizens underground than what they were asking for under the Marshall plan.

What I say is, we should never give a dime to any country, unless it respects the integrity of the investments of our nationals, of our citizens in their country, in the same manner as we respect the investments of their nationals in this country. If they did that, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, they would not need money from our Government or from anyone else.

BOLD NEW PROGRAM—POINT 4

We now have the great point 4 program of the President, which is coming up, and which I intended to discuss later. This is a good time to discuss it. What is there in the great point 4 program, that great and bold new program, under which we are to provide additional billions to guarantee investments — investments that are gone when they are made; investments that the nationals of their own countries will not make; investments that the English people will not make in their own country because of the nationalization and socialization of property principles adopted by those countries?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like the RECORD to show that what I said was, "Does the Senator not realize the purpose of the act is to provide that these countries shall eliminate trade barriers and establish free convertibility of currency?" I do not mean that it should be spelled out in the act. What I mean is that the Director, in contributing funds to balance an economy, could insist upon those measures being taken. It is a fact that the Director has been advised by the Appropriations Committee that it should be

done. The very fact that the Director, in one of his statements since his return to this country, states that he proposes to withhold $600,000,000 until these matters can be negotiated, shows that the Director can, by withholding funds, enforce the provisions; which I am sure the Senator will agree with me would be most helpful, if the money is to be spent. Is that not true?

FOUR CONDITIONS ON FURTHER AID TO EUROPE

Mr. MALONE. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska, of course it would have been helpful, but this is the third year and nothing has been done.

I addressed the Senate on January 24 of this year and stated that not a dime should ever again be paid out to the ECA nations without four things: First, integrity of private investments; second, a United States of Europe, including Germany; third, free convertibility of currencies, among all those countries, and in terms of the dollar; and, fourth, equal access for our country to the markets of the nations of the world, subject only to the action of that particular nation; not subject to the action particularly of an empire-minded nation, a nation which says we cannot trade in the Far East, which says we cannot trade in Africa, which says we have to buy the materials from that empire-minded country, including the purchase of tin.

I would say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, we do not buy tin from the Malayan people; we buy it from England. At this very moment there is a tin cartel being formed in the State Department, or being formed in Europe with the full knowledge of the State Department, I am informed. A cartel for what? To make us pay through the nose again for the tin which we should buy direct from the Malayan States, Siam, and other Far East countries.

BUY FROM EMPIRE-MINDED NATIONS

We are not buying tin from the Malayan States. Only recently have we been able to buy it in Indonesia. I was in both those countries, I may say to the distinguished Senator, late in 1948, and the way we bought things then from the Indonesians was, if the Indonesian sold a dollar's worth of stuff to us he did not get the dollar in his little hard hands. The dollar went into the exchange pool, run by the Dutch, as it is run now in the Malayan States by the English, and as it is run in Indochina by the French. So what happened to the dollar? It went into the exchange pool, and the Indonesian obtained 2.63 Indonesian guilders for his dollar which could be spent in Indonesia only; on the street the dollar was worth 14 guilders; the Indonesian was getting less than 20 percent from his dollar, to start with. He had been kept bare legged and hungry for 300 years.

THE COLONIAL YOKE

The same thing has been done in Malaya for 100 years. And the same thing is being done in Indo-China. I did not intend to discuss this phase of the subject, having fully discussed it on January 24. We were doing the same thing with the Dutch in Indonesia, with the British in the Malayan States, and with the French in Indo-China. We are furnishing them the money to hold the natives under the colonial yoke.

What is Russia doing? She is promising them relief from the yoke. She recognizes the independent ruler of Indochina. Who does the Senator think is going to win? We are going to lose, and it will not be long, either.

TRADE BALANCE DEFICITS

Mr. President, since the subject has been brought up, I want to say that on March 4, 1948, I discussed this subject. I mentioned a while ago, it will be remembered, that we were making up the trade-balance deficits of the ECA nations. I shall show where we proved it, on the floor of the Senate, only 2 years ago, almost to the day, early in March, 1948:

No doubt it is a coincidence—

I may say to the senior Senator from Nebraska, I am quoting exactly from the record of my own talk, on February 4, 1948—that the money which has been asked for under the bill is $6,800,000,000 for 15 months.

The distinguished Senator will remember we had 15 months lumped together; then, later, when the 3 months was cut off, they cut it down to $5,300,000,000. They made up the difference by cutting off 3 months.

The amount asked for under the bill, $6,800,000,000 for 15 months, corresponds exactly to $5,300,000,000 for 12 months.

In other words, the $6,800,000,000 asked for by the President for 15 months under the Marshall plan corresponds exactly in proportion to the $5,300,000,000 for 12 months, so the trade-balance shortage of the 16 countries from all trade sources in the world for the 12 months exactly balances, by a remarkable coincidence, the amount of the loan or gift. I hope that no one is so naive as to believe that any of it will be repaid.

The exact shortage in the trade balances of all these nations with all the countries of the world in which they trade, adds up, by coincidence, to exactly $6,800,000,000 for 15 months, the exact amount asked for during that period.

I was then answering the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who had suggested that we take minerals in repayment of the loan. I then went on to show that if we took minerals and textiles that it would shut down all the mines in America and textile plants for something like 74 years. I understand that recently the Senator has become interested in textiles since the "free trade" has really started to operate.

FIVE BILLION DOLLARS ADDITIONAL FOR ENGLAND

I may say at this point, as long as this has been brought up, that within a very short time, I understand—the rumor is very strong around Washington—the proposition will be laid before the Congress by the President, that the Congress appropriate an additional $5,000,000,000 for England. This will be in addition to the ECA millions. What will be the proposition? That they are going to specify, then, that we shall get materials, processed and manufactured materials, in payment of the $5,000,000,000 we advance. It will then put us in a position where, in order to collect it, we must all be in favor of importing this $5,000,000,000 worth of material. That will no doubt get into wheat, corn, textiles, minerals, fuels, manufactured products, and so forth, before we get through. I suppose the distinguished Senator from Nebraska understands that we are importing wheat. We are importing steel. We shall have better information by the time the ECA debate comes along. It is my understanding there is going to be something like 8,000,000 to 12,000,000 tons of surplus steel in Europe next year, so they will have to sell it here. That will cause a reduction in the amount manufactured here.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Do not forget we are importing potatoes.

STABILIZING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS OF THE WORLD

Mr. MALONE. It was my privilege to listen to the able argument of the Senator from Nebraska in behalf of his amendment. I voted for the amendment, I am happy to say, because it is silly to import all the agricultural products of the world when we are storing our own here. I refer to such things as dried eggs, potatoes, and so forth. We are storing commodities in this country while we eat those imported, or, as in the matter of potatoes, the Government is buying from the farmer at $2.25 a bushel and selling back to him at 1 cent a bushel to be fed to the hogs. When I was on a farm in Kansas I remember that when we fed potatoes to the hogs, which we did sometimes, we received no pay for the potatoes, but merely got paid for the hogs—and not very much at that, as I remember it.

But if we had had the kind of Congress at that time that we have now, which does all the farming on the Senate floor and the arguing on the farms, I think I would still be on the Kansas farm.

Now, Mr. President, before I leave that subject I wanted to say, at the time the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the junior Senator from Nevada were in a colloquy, on March 5, 1948, I made certain further observations:

NINETY PERCENT OF MINES SHUT DOWN

As a result of the operation of the selective free-trade acts—selective by the State Department, which is supposed to handle foreign affairs and not domestic affairs, just as one example, and it can happen with respect to any industry—90 percent of the mines in the United States have been shut down.

That was 2 years ago.

Two thousand four hundred mines in California have been cut down to 350.

That was 2 years ago, Mr. President. They have still continued to be shut down.

In Nevada the proportion is about the same, and perhaps throughout the country. If the textile industry were treated as the mineral industry has been treated—

And it could be done at any time—

the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] might be very much interested.

I understand now that he is.

JOB LISTING

Mr. President, I have previously said Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hoffman suggested that the unemployed should be put on unemployment compensation insurance, to which a program of job training should be added, to train the unemployed men and women for new work—the unemployed men and women of New York, Massachusetts, Nevada, Nebraska, Virginia, and all other States who are affected—and they will all be affected. I understand that the lemons are being imported from Italy, and there has been considerable complaint in Florida and California about the importation of lemons.

The flexible import-fee principle administered on a basis of fair and reasonable competition would answer the problem.

It would give the California and Florida lemon growers the same access to the United States markets as the Italian growers now have.

FULL-PAGE ADVERTISEMENT—BRITISH INDUSTRIES FAIR

Mr. President, I have here a full-page advertisement which appears in the New York Times of today. It is an advertisement of the British Industries Fair which opens on May 8, and announces that the dollars of United States buyers will be worth 30 percent more, due to deflation and other things. It all goes to show that the United States buyers can purchase necessary products for their stores at much reduced prices. It says:

Leo Martinuzzi, head of R. H Macy's foreign buying offices, to send representatives to British Industries Fair. I understand they have said they may be able to buy one half of their products in Europe under the "free trade" set-up.

We have now withdrawn our "Buy America" slogan and have instituted "Buy European" slogans. I read further:

LONDON.—Beginning May 8, at Earl's Court, London, and Castle Bromwich, Birmingham, the internationally renowned British Industries Fair will exhibit the latest and finest products of British industrial genius. Displays featuring products representative of the major part of British industry will be visited by trade buyers from 63 nations.

In announcing the 1950 fair as the largest and most comprehensive in 29 years of British Industries Fair history, officials stressed the fact that visiting trade buyers will have an opportunity to see and examine the widest variety of consumer and industrial products ever displayed.

* * * * *

SPECIAL FEATURES FOR UNITED STATES BUYERS VISITING BRITISH INDUSTRIES FAIR

Every visiting buyer and purchasing agent will receive on application an advance edition of the British Industries Fair catalog listing every product exhibited at the fair. Final editions will be available at the fair itself.

It will be remembered, Mr. President, that in 1949—I do not at the moment remember the exact date—the junior Senator from Nevada quoted from an article written by Mr. Hoffman, the ECA Director, which appeared in the American magazine. I believe it was in March, during the debate when the ECA Act was extended the first time. Mr. Hoffman advocated operating such a fair train throughout the United States of America and advertising British wares, and also the further lowering of duties and import fees to facilitate the importation of products. We have now arrived at that stage.

I read further:

2. Buyers will receive free membership in the Overseas Buyers Clubs located at all three of the fair's buildings. Refreshments will be served at the clubs, and an advisory staff will be on hand at all times.

3. All United States and overseas buyers will be able to obtain ration-free meals at restaurants, hotels, and cafes throughout the United Kingdom If they are staying in private homes they will be able to obtain ration cards.

4. Overseas buyers will receive buyer's badges upon arrival. Badges will admit them to all sections of the fair free, and entitle them to the use of special buyers' clubrooms which may be used as business offices or social rendezvous

5. Honorary membership in the English-Speaking Union will be given to all visiting buyers. The union's travel, sightseeing, private hospitality, and personal contact facilities will all be available to buyers.

6. Buyers will have opportunities to visit British industrial plants and inspect methods of production and working conditions.

7. Two special British industries fair trains will run daily to transport buyers between the London and Birmingham exhibits, and air-taxi service will be available.

8. Cable, banking, and secretarial services will be available for the asking.

9. Buyers bringing cars can obtain a gasoline allowance for 1,600 miles of travel, and a 90-day tax-free permit.

10. Overseas newspapers will be available and a special guide to recreation and entertainment will be at every buyer's disposal.

The headlines go on to say:

British Industries Fair opens May 8: dollars of United States buyers worth 30 percent more. Largest national industrial fair open London and Birmingham May 8–19, greatest values ever for United States buyers.

1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—FREE TRADE

It will be remembered, Mr. President, that on the floor of the Senate, when we were debating as to whether the 1934 Trade Agreements Act should be extended, early in September 1949, the junior Senator from Nevada stated that at the time of the international conference between England, Canada, and the United States, in Washington, the purpose of the conference was twofold: First, it was to divert attention from the most important debate on the Senate floor in a century—extending the free-trade policy for another 3 years—and to cover up the fact that they meant to devalue their foreign currencies.

There has never been any objective of any foreign nation except to get part of our market from the time they met at San Francisco to form the United Nations Organization. I was present, representing the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

I had been representing it during the war in various parts of the world, and I had the credentials to enable me to attend that Conference.

DIVIDE OUR MARKETS—ONLY PURPOSE

I entertained representatives of most of the Asiatic and South American nations at lunch, dinner, or breakfast to determine what the real objective was. Their only thought was, "How much of our products can we sell, and how soon can we begin?" That was their purpose in being present.

When I was returning after the Conference, at Denver newspaper reporters asked, "What do you think of the great United Nations which has just been organized?" What I said sounded a little facetious, but it was not facetious. I said:

At that Conference there were 49 nations represented. Forty-eight of them had a market basket on each arm and Uncle Sam was the only one who had anything to put into them.

What do you think?

OBJECTIVE—SELL GOODS IN OUR MARKETS

It has required 4 years for it to become plain to every Senator that that is exactly the objective of all foreign nations, to divide the markets of the United States and to sell their goods in this country, not for this country to sell abroad, as was first claimed.

That was what was held out to us in 1948. They spoke of the great markets which would be developed for American businessmen and American workingmen. No markets have been developed. Those nations will not even trade with each other, let alone with us. Our markets have been wide open since 1934 the first date of the Trade Agreements Act—then extended in September 1949. I stated at that time that England would devalue her currency and come under every agreement which had been made. That is exactly what has happened.

Mr. President, at the moment, almost, of their return home, they did devalue their currency, after denying it seven times. Several times during the course of the debate the junior Senator from Nevada said they would so devalue it. Mr. Cripps denied it seven times. However, when he got home, he did devalue the currency, about 30 percent, as it says here. Just as the junior Senator from Nevada said at that time he would, it is now said in the article I hold in my hand, from which I read:

POUND DEVALUATION GIVES MORE FOR DOLLAR

New valuation of pound gives more for dollar. British quality goods now available at low cost. Buyers going to fair advised to make early reservations for hotel and travel. Devaluation of pound makes dollars worth 30 percent more in Britain.

Exhaustive market research conducted in the United States by British manufacturers is now beginning to show results in products specially designed for the American market. Many British manufacturers have developed completely new products and effected radical changes in their prewar packaging and marketing methods.

In consequence, United States buyers and purchasing agents visiting the British Industries Fair on May 8 will see an entirely new line of British merchandise specifically manufactured to create extensive sales in the American market. For the first time in their history, Britain will concentrate on displaying products designed to meet completely non-British needs. The fair will illustrate the extent to which British industries are combining to earn dollars.

In most merchandising circles it is felt that devaluation of the British pound is the

key to greater distribution of British products in the United States. Millions of Americans who have long admired quality British exports have, in the past, been ruled out as customers because of cost considerations. Now, with the dollar worth 30 percent more in Britain, prices have readjusted at a level that will bring British products within the reach of most Americans. Items like china, leather goods, hand woven fabrics, and a host of other products for which Britain has long been famous, will be priced within the range of the average American's pocketbook. There is every indication that the American market for such goods is virtually limited, and American importers can look forward to brisk sales and excellent profits.

POUND DEVALUATION—FREE TRADE

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the full-page advertisement in the New York Times, in order to call attention not only to the products, which, of course, is a very legitimate thing—we have our own fairs—but to the fact that through devaluation of the pound, a benefit of 30 percent in values can be given. That is only half of it, Mr. President. The Secretary of State and Mr. Hoffman say that free trade must be continued. They say we have a choice, if you please, of whether to continue large appropriations to make up the trade-balance deficits, as I just outlined, of $6,800,000,000 for 15 months in 1948, and $5,300,000,000 for the following 12 months, or of dividing the markets of the United States so that our markets could be averaged and there would be no deficit.

LOWER LIVING STANDARDS—PERPETUAL PEACE

In other words, our standard of living is to come down and is to be averaged with the nations of the world, particularly the European nations. Presumably, on that basis, we shall have perpetual peace, because we shall have nothing about which people will be envious. In other words, perpetual peace is what is held up in front of us, while, as a matter of fact, no direct conversations have ever been held with the only nation on earth which could give us battle. We do not work through third parties; we work with third parties. Still, we must lower all our imports and tariff fees, which make up the differential in the standards of living of the 50-cents-a-day slave labor, the dollar-and-a-half-a-day labor in Europe, Africa, and South America, and the eight- or ten-dollar-a-day labor in America. That is what we are asked to do, and that is what is being advocated by the State Department.

ANOTHER TARIFF LOWERING CONFERENCE

Another conference has been called for a further lowering of tariffs and import fees.

Now, Mr. President, a suggestion was made before the Foreign Relations Committee which was very interesting to me.

I quote from an article written by W. M. Jablonski, petroleum editor, which appeared in the New York Journal of Commerce today:

ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman went in for understatement when he told Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE that he knew of no problem with so many complexities as international oil.

And a good illustration of what Mr. Hoffman must have meant was the Senator's own simple solution to the problem.

Senator LODGE proposed that an easy way to eliminate Britain's dollar gap and at the same time end Marshall plan subsidies of American oil companies would be to: (1) Buy and import into the United States a billion dollars' worth of oil from sterling sources, and (2) put an end to ECA's $600,000,000 subsidy of American oil sales to Britain by forcing the British to use their own oil instead.

BUY AT LOW PRICE—SELL AT HIGH PRICE

Mr. President, without discussing the answer given to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts by the ECA Director, I should like to make the observation that all of us desire to sell our own services or goods at a high price, and to buy everything we need to buy at a low price. That principle has been going on for some time. Furthermore, no individual or nation ever buys anything from anyone else if it can conveniently produce it for itself. That is axiomatic. Secondly, when one cannot conveniently produce something for himself, either as an individual or as a nation, he buys it where he can get the quality he wants at the lowest possible price.

That principle, Mr. President, if allowed to operate, would solve many problems. The suggestion by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is merely following out the attitude of nearly everyone in the world, namely, if the onus can be put on the other fellow, and he can be made to bear the brunt of it, it is all right. But do not let it happen to Texas, as the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said the other day, according to an editorial in a local paper this morning. Do not let it happen to Massachusetts. Do not let it happen to Nevada.

GET DOWN TO PRINCIPLES

I say, Mr. President, the time has come to dismiss all those things. Let us get down to principles. Instead of saying we should have free trade in oil, or free trade in textiles, and a high tariff or some other kind of a tariff on some product like wheat, or someone else's product, perhaps potatoes, let us get down to principles and have the Congress of the United States take back its constitutional authority, which it transferred voluntarily to the State Department, to regulate the economy of this Nation through fixing import fees and tariffs on imports.

Let us not transfer it further away to 57 foreign nations, as will be proposed by the International Trade Organization bill, which is now in committee, and is supposed to come out to the floor of the Senate soon after the ECA is disposed of. Let us take the authority back.

THE FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE PRINCIPLE

Let us substitute the flexible import fee principle for the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as extended, and simply transform the long-experienced Trade Commission body and foreign trade authority into a body more nearly representing what it does, and give that body the latitude to fix tariffs and import fees on the basis of a fair and reasonable competition—the differential in costs, due mainly to the standards of living in competitive nations and in this Nation.

FACTORS CONSIDERED BY FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY

Mr. President, how can that be done? Many people dismiss it as impossible. It is not impossible. It is the simplest thing in the world. Many factors would be taken into consideration by the Authority, just as a Railroad Commission in a State may take into account many factors in fixing a freight rate. When the nations, as at present, are subsidizing their industries and bringing in products at fictitious prices, with no consideration at all of the original cost, the controlling factors can be used, under the flexible import-fee principle to neutralize these fictitious values. Let us use the two factors of declared value on imports, and the offered-for-sale price. They are included in the flexible import-fee bill. Those two factors are available to any commission, they are available to any citizen. When there is manipulation, which the commission would certainly know about, let us use those two factors as controlling factors. Britain is subsidizing its industries through food subsidies, by holding prices of food down and making up the difference in cash—our cash, if you please. Let them manipulate their currency and lower it 30 percent, or any other percent, but when they offer it for dollars in this country, at an offered-for-sale price, let the two factors I have mentioned control.

THE RESULT WILL BE HIGHER FOREIGN LIVING STANDARDS

Mr. President, what is the effect? When it is realized that we have adopted a principle, when the Congress of the United States has taken back its constitutional authority to regulate the economy, foreign countries immediately realize there is no advantage gained by all these manipulations and false values for currency, and subsidizing their industries. So what would they do? Instead of paying the money into the United States Treasury, they might go home and decide to raise their own standards of living, which we say is our objective in the first place. Any sensible nation would do that, and I am sure that they would make it to their interest to do what we say we want them to do in the first place.

HELP THEM RAISE THEIR WAGE-LIVING STANDARDS

Then, as they raise their standard of living, the import fee on these products would come down in proportion. It is then to the interest of the foreign countries to raise their standard of living. When they do finally reach approximately our standard, the common objective of free trade which we all want is automatically reached. That is just the difference between jumping off the roof to come down to the level of someone else, as we are doing now, and lowering a ladder to him so he can climb up on it. The latter course would require a little longer time, but in the end we would all be on a higher plane.

STATESMANSHIP HAS REACHED A NEW LOW

Mr. President, I believe we will all agree, if we stop to consider the matter, that when proposals are made by Mr. Acheson, Secretary of State, and Mr. Hoffman, head of the ECA, that we subsidize our own labor, and our own workingmen, who are put out of employment by bringing low-wage labor in direct competition with them, and that we subsidize or pay the investors the losses they incur in a business when that business loses out, and when the stockholders are wiped out through competition permitted by the Senate and the House, American statesmanship has reached a new low even for a socialistically inclined State Department.

CONSPIRACY TO LOWER THE WAGE STANDARDS OF AMERICAN LABOR

The whole three-part free-trade program of the administration amounts to a conspiracy to lower the wage standards of living of the American working man and to sacrifice American investments in the interests of the one economic world, all in the name of perpetual peace.

The administration's three-part free-trade program includes:

First. The 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended, giving the President (State Department) the right to lower import fees and tariffs as much as 75 percent after perfunctory hearings. I have described those hearings, Mr. President. The result of the hearings was to give other countries all the best of it. Congress in effect transferred to the State Department through this act their constitutional responsibility to regulate the national economy of this Nation.

Second. The Marshall plan—now ECA—making up the trade balance deficits of the 16 European nations each year in cash and goods; our chief export is cash.

That is the second part of the three-part, free trade program.

What is that third part? It is the third part, as I have previously described, which has not yet been adopted by the Senate and the House. At first, as I understand, it was intended to bring the International Trade Agreement before the Senate as a treaty, but it was known that the proponents could not muster the two-thirds vote necessary to pass the proposal as a treaty, so now it is going to both Houses, to be passed by a simple majority, and to be signed by the President of the United States. It is on the President's must list along with higher taxes and additional billions of dollars for point 4.

POINT 4 GUARANTEES INTEGRITY OF COLONIAL SYSTEM

Point 4, the great, "Bold new program," is nothing more or less than the guaranty of investments in colonial areas for empire-minded nations. It is proposed to guarantee investments in colonial areas, not for the benefit of the people of those areas, but for the benefit of the colonial-minded empire nations which control those areas. That is point 4.

THREE MUSTS ON PRESIDENT'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

What all was contained in the first speech the President made this year before the United States Senate? This may be a good point at which to sum it all up. After all the nice things he was going to do for all the foreign nations of the world, after all the things he was going to do for all the individuals in the United States, what did the President say? He made three recommendations. First on the must program is the International Trade Organization I am about to describe. Second, billions for point 4, the "Bold new program" and third, higher taxes.

Second was point 4. By that he proposed that billions of dollars were to be used to guarantee investments which are lost when they are made. The nationals of the countries concerned themselves will not invest their own money in their own countries because of the socialistic policies of their governments, which include nationalizing industry, socializing industry, and appropriating capital. It is impossible to get any one of their own people to invest their money in their own country. So we are going to guarantee the investments. That is a little different from the way any bank with which I have done business operates. The borrower from a bank himself guarantees the investment.

JUST DO NOT DO ANY MORE TO ME

Mr. President, we are always doing something for somebody. That reminds me of a letter I received from a constituent in Nevada. He wrote me a letter with a pencil containing three or four paragraphs. First he agreed with an address I had delivered. The last paragraph was the pay-off. He said, "Do not try to do anything more for me. Just do not do anything more to me."

I think it is time the Senate of the United States understands that kind of language and I think they will begin to hear more of it.

Let us now see what the International Trade Organization is. The first two parts of the three-part free-trade program establish the system of free trade through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. They can lower the tariff 75 percent. The Marshall plan would make up the trade-balance deficit until such time as the markets can be divided sufficiently so there are no more deficits.

Third. The International Trade Organization—on the President's must list for passage by Congress early this session—will be 58 nations—57 foreign nations and the United States—each with one vote—the United States will have the same vote as Siam. Fifty-four or 55 nations have already signed up, and the rest will, because they can do nothing but win, and we can do nothing but lose. We are the only nation in the world today in which goods can be sold for which dollars will be given in return unless we have previously given that nation the money to pay for it.

This Organization will be empowered to fix the import fees and tariffs of its member nations, and, Mr. President, note this—to set the quotas of production for the nations on processed and manufactured articles of all kinds, agriculture, fuel, minerals, and all the rest. In other words, the Congress of the United States transferred this constitutional authority to regulate the economy of the United States to the State Department in 1934. In 1950 it is contemplated that the Congress of the United States will then transfer the control of the economy from the State Department to the 57 foreign nations. If we are silly enough to do that I only hope our constituents understand what we are doing and will take note for future reference.

It will make permanent what the first two steps have already established.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. President, I want to say the so-called bipartisan foreign-policy group on the Senate floor has supported the administration's three-part free-trade program, which transferred the authority over the national economy to the State Department. That was the bipartisan policy, and nothing else. We passed the first two parts.

However, the third part of the policy which would transfer control over our national economy from the State Department to the International Trade Organization, now on the President's "must" legislation list, is yet to be passed by the Congress. I am hoping to say that the bipartisan-foreign policy is dead.

FLEXIBLE-IMPORT-FEE PRINCIPLE—CONGRESS REGAINS CONTROL

The flexible-import-fee principle which I have previously mentioned must be substituted for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. Through the flexible-import-fee bill introduced in 1948 and again in 1949, and then offered as a substitute for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act in September 1949 by the junior Senator from Nevada, the Congress would regain control of its national economy and separate the national economy control from the foreign-trade policy. To tie the two together was the effect of what Congress did in 1934. The Constitution of the United States never contemplated anything of the kind. It never contemplated that the State Department with all its interests tied up in foreign affairs would be given the authority to divide the markets of the United States of America with foreign nations, to gain some fancied advantage.

CONGRESS ESTABLISHES THE PRINCIPLE

The bill provides for turning the long-established Tariff Commission into a foreign-trade authority—more nearly representing its work—and giving it the same latitude in fixing import fees and tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, as the Congress has long since given the Interstate Commerce Commission the responsibility of fixing freight rates for the carriers on the basis of reasonable return on the investment.

In other words, it is merely a matter of an established principle by the Congress of the United States to be carried out by a commission already established, that is, the long established and experienced Tariff Commission.

By some who favor free trade the removal of obstructions so as to permit low-cost labor products to come into the United States, which would result in displacing the labor of the United States as well as destroying investments in industry, I have heard it said, "Oh, yes; you want a high tariff."

NO QUESTION OF A HIGH OR LOW TARIFF

No one wants a high tariff. No one wants a low tariff. No one who has studied the subject wants either one. What we want is that differential due to the different standards of living represented by an import fee. There would then be no question of a high or low import fee or tariff, but such an import fee would represent the differential of cost mainly due to the difference between the wage standards of living of workers in our country and in competitive countries on each specific product.

Since manipulation of their currencies, subsidies through food costs and bulk buying and selling by governments is widely practiced by many foreign countries for trade advantage, actual costs of production mean very little. Therefore the two most reliable factors available to the Foreign Trade Authority are the "declared customs value" and the "offered for sale price," both of which can be included in the factors determining the proper import fee or tariff on any specific product.

MAINTAIN WAGE STANDARD OF LIVING

Through this method our own wage standard of living would be maintained while we are assisting the foreign nations to raise their own—as the world wage standards of living were raised, then the flexible import fees would be proportionately reduced—and when their wage standard of living approximates our own then the common objective of free trade would be the almost automatic and immediate result. As the wages and standards of living are raised the flexible import fees would be proportionately reduced. When their wages and standards of living approximate ours, Mr. President, the common objective of free trade will be the almost automatic and immediate result.

Mr. President, the jugular vein of the system is the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended, and the International Trade Organization, which is on the must list of the President's program for early 1950. To cut that jugular vein then, Mr. President, let us reject the proposed International Trade Organization and let us substitute the flexible fee import principle for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to say something which could more properly be presented in connection with foreign-policy matters; but inasmuch as the Congress has made possible the tying together of regulation of the national economy of this country with the foreign policy, I wish to refer to an article appearing in the Washington Star of February 26. The article was written by Constantine Brown. The headline is:

Western Europe swings toward neutral policy—idea of taking sides in war between United States and Russia is more distasteful because of superbomb threats.

Mr. President, on many previous occasions I have pointed out that the interests of the western European countries lie with Russia and with the iron-curtain countries. As proof of that statement, on January 24 of this year I submitted to the Senate 95 trade treaties made between 16 of the ECA nations and Russia and the iron-curtain countries. By means of those trade treaties, those 16 ECA nations will sell to Russia and to the iron-curtain countries everything from monkey wrenches to locomotives, tool steel, ball bearings, heavy industrial equipment, electrical equipment, machinery of all kinds, road machinery, farm machinery—in fact, everything on earth that the Russians need to consolidate their gains in eastern Europe and in Asia and to fight world war III. I say that the interests of western Europe are identical with the interests of Russia and the iron-curtain countries, because Russia and the iron-curtain countries are producers of raw materials, and, just as the United States is, the ECA countries are processors and manufacturers. Trade between them and Russia and the iron-curtain countries is a natural thing.

ECA BUILDING UP COMMUNISM

Incidentally, Mr. President, we in this country say we are stopping communism by means of the ECA; but there never was a greater piece of poppycock in all the world than the statement that we are stopping communism by sending money to the ECA countries. The fact is that, to the contrary, we are building up communism by that means.

Let us consider Britain. I am sorry to have to say that it frequently is said that there are Communists in Britain. Mr. President, why should there be Communists in Britain? Why should there be, when the authorities in Britain are socializing Britain, and already have nationalized most of the British industries. According to their own statements, they will nationalize all the rest of British industry as soon as they are strong enough to do so.

Again, Mr. President, I say there is no difference between socialism and communism, for the ultimate objective of each is the perfect state, with the individual owning nothing. The only difference is that a Communist will shoot you in order to reach that situation, where as the Socialist will spend you into it. That is what we are doing to the people of the United States, Mr. President; right here on the floor of the Senate we are heading toward the same kind of government.

So why should there be a Communist in Britain? That is no place for a Communist, for the Communists have joined with the Socialists.

So, Mr. President, what is a Communist? He is just an impatient Socialist; a Communist will shoot you to get what we will spend our way into.

Mr. President, let me quote from the text of the article to which I have referred, as it appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on February 26:

(By Constantine Brown)

A sentiment in favor of neutrality in case of an east-west war is spreading rapidly throughout western Europe.

In both Britain and France, mainstays of the western European defensive bloc, many in the highest offices as well as many rank-and-file citizens believe that the best policy for their country in this age of atomic and hydrogen bombs is to stay out of any conflict, regardless of the consequences.

Two giants are facing each other; Russia, the ruthless, which will stop at nothing to gain its ends, and America, fearful of engaging its strength except under direct provocation

Europeans say there is nothing for them to do in the presence of this rivalry but to stand aside in an uncomfortable and painful neutrality and await developments.

Until recently there was a widespread belief, not only in western Europe, but also among Russia's satellites, that America had something more than financial and technological strength. Europeans believed that behind the screen of dignified patience, which was due to the realization of what another war would mean, America concealed a real punch.

The disparity between our regular forces and those of the U. S S R were well known. The details had been published in this country and abroad. But in Europe that disparity was considered as a temporary matter.

UNPREPARED BEFORE

America had been militarily unprepared in both World Wars. Yet, within the shortest imaginable time we produced the greatest and most powerful fighting forces in the world Germany and its allies went into both World Wars I and II with most formidably prepared military machines. But those machines collapsed when America made up its mind to replace soft words with hard-hitting physical force.

But that was in the past. Since the end of World War II western Europe, collapsing under the strain of two of the most exhausting wars that continent has ever experienced, has looked to America for the economic and financial help necessary to stem the advance of communism. We responded immediately. But soon it becomes obvious that economic recovery alone was not possible unless the west had the means to fight militant communism with force.

We suggested—or it was suggested to us—that the Atlantic alliance be created and that Europe be rearmed through the military aid program. But neither of these plans could be of any value, Europeans realized, unless America itself proceeded to rebuild its military forces to the point where it could intervene successfully against a Red onslaught.

Europeans knew only too well that the 25 divisions and 2,000 planes which were to compose their rejuvenated military forces would be only a kind of advance guard, which would delay, if possible, the advance of the Russian forces.

RUSSIANS CATCH UP

There can be no strength in such a small force. The French and British and their associates remembered only too well that a force nearly four times that size melted like snow in the spring before a smaller, but determined German military machine.

The reference in the article is to the North Atlantic Pact, by which we say we will give the western European countries a billion or a billion and a half dollars' worth of arms each year.

Mr President, on the occasion of the debate on the North Atlantic Pact, I

quoted a well-known general, who is an authority in France, and other authorities, to the effect that nothing short of $50,000,000,000 would make a dent in that situation; and their estimate was that $100,000,000,000 would be required in order that Europe could resist Russia at all. Otherwise, as anyone well knows, tomorrow or the next day or 6 months from now or at any other time, unless we spend that amount of money, Russia will take Europe in 30 days, along with everything we have given Europe—whenever the notion strikes her.

Further along in the article the following statement is made:

Some top-ranking political men in Europe began having qualms, however, about America's firmness in its policy of containing communism.

HAULING COAL WHILE RUSSIA TAKES ASIA

Mr. President, I should think they would have some qualms by now, so far as concerns our containing communism, when communism already has practically all of Asia, and when we are the ones who, at Yalta, turned over to Russia the bread basket of Europe, and at Yalta we also gave Russia Berlin, without providing any way by which we could either get into it or get out of it. Of course, Mr. President, when the Russians were able to block our access to Berlin by simply posting a sentry or two, armed with rifles, on the highways leading to Berlin, we were forced to haul supplies to Berlin by air, and we even went so far as to haul coal by air, at a cost of $400 to $500 per ton. We were forced to spend tremendous sums of money to take supplies to our personnel in Berlin, whereas Russia did not have to spend any effort at all in order to require us to make that tremendous effort and expenditure.

Of course, Mr. President, one of the great tricks of warfare is to draw the fire of the enemy without at the same time using one's own ammunition or supplies. So the Russians simply posted a sentry or two, armed with rifles, along the highways leading to Berlin, and then we were required to establish the expensive airlift. During that time Russia took Asia, and after Russia took Asia she lifted the Berlin embargo. What great strategists we are, Mr. President.

I read further from the article:

They could not reconcile our forceful statements, for instance, with our policy in China. Politically astute Europeans have always considered us amateurs and novices in the old game of diplomacy.

Mr. President, I certainly agree there with the writer of the article. Was it not Will Rogers who said, facetiously, in the old days—as a matter of fact, it is all too true, Mr. President—that we never lost a war or won a conference. If he were alive today, Mr. President, he certainly would say the same thing again. We have maintained a perfect record, Mr. President, when we get into matters of international trade we are just like neophytes in a professional poker game.

When I participated for 4 or 5 hours in the Senate debate on extension of the Trade Agreements Act in September 1949, Senators on both sides of the aisle said that Britain and the other European nations would not devalue their currencies. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada said they would devalue their currency and would flood the United States with their goods. Mr. Cripps said, seven or eight times, that they would not do that. But he and the other representatives of the western European countries had no more than returned home before the did just that, but only after we had extended the Trade Agreements Act for 3 years and had given them more money. Of course they did not devalue their currencies until we had extended the agreements for 3 years more.

I read further from the article:

But to them China meant more than a diplomatic defeat.

Mr. President, I wish to say that it means more than a diplomatic defeat to those of use who have been in the two world wars

I read further:

It meant a crushing military defeat at the hands of those we were trying to contain in Europe. It meant that the Russians, after so many years of effort, finally had sealed their eastern flank

Mr. President, I think I shall not be violating any confidences if I now quote a great general. In early December 1948 I was talking with a great general in Japan. I asked him, "General, what would be the effect on us if we lost China and Asia?"

I had just left Peking, where we were told that the Communists were only 8 miles out of the city. General Fu had met us with a plane without lights, and we had gone to his camp and had talked to him for several hours. He said: "I want to tell you, Senator, that I was defeated in 1946, when the great General Marshall decided he would not send any American ammunition for the American guns you had already given us, and when he decided that we must let the Communists through the pass, to go into Manchuria, which had already been given to the Communists, to get the ammunition and the guns Japan had left there."

Furthermore, General Fu said he had good information that certain of the ammunition factories had been moved into the edge of Russia and were operating and getting new ammunition to the Communists. He said, "You can take back the word." This was either late in November or early in December 1948—he had held open the railroad to tidewater—"you can take back the word that unless I get substantial help within 30 to 60 days, I am a prisoner of war"—and he was. China and probably the whole Far East henceforth are closed to us militarily. And, of course, it is. School boys know it.

We have been talking about Formosa, Mr. President, and the little islands nearby. We are complaining of a pimple on a man's nose, when he is dying of cancer. We are not touching the real subject.

What did this great American general in Japan say to me when I asked him, "General, what will be the effect, if we lose Asia? Can we hold Japan? Can we hold the Philippines?" The great general, who had spent most of his life in the area, a man whom everyone reveres and respects when it comes to his military knowledge replied, "Yes, we can hold them at least for a long time, but the cost would be terrific. But psychologically and economically, we are doomed." That is what he said.

CONFIDENCE IN A GREAT NAME

Those things are not secrets with the State Department or with the President of the United States. They were not secrets then. What we did, in the humble opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, was to take advantage of a great name, a man who had just won a great war, General Marshall, to put over a preconceived plan to let Asia go into the hands of the Communists. That is what we did, in my opinion, because the people of the United States had confidence in the name, not realizing the general was an old man who had passed his prime, a man who was taking orders from the State Department, and who knew nothing at all about the job and who, apparently, from all appearances and from the effects of his policy, had no idea of retaining anything in Asia.

OPPOSITION TO THE RULE OF RUSSIA

So, what do we get from the great Secretary of State? He says, "Well, we must play the field. We must allow this to take its course." That was because, in his opinion, there would be opposition in all the countries to the rule of Russia. Mr. President, how is opposition to develop in those countries, when we finance the ECA countries to the extent of $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000 annually, and they in turn make 95 trade treaties, up to now, since World War II, with Russia and with Eastern European countries, sending them everything in God Almighty's world necessary to consolidate their gains in Eastern Europe and in China and in Asia and Africa, everything with which to fight World War III.

OUR ERSTWHILE ALLIES RECOGNIZE COMMUNIST CHINA

How is that going to create dissatisfaction in those countries? How will they become dissatisfied when they will be getting along better than ever before?

What do we then find our great ally, England, followed by India, doing? They recognize Communist China and continue to increase their exports through Hong Kong to Communist China, in order to consolidate their gains. How is there going to be dissatisfaction? They will get along better than ever before.

CHINA CLOSED TO US

China, and probably the whole Far East, henceforth will be closed to us militarily. There is no longer any opportunity to use the great eastern part of Asia as a base for air operations against the Soviet Union, and thus threaten the vital industrial portions of the USSR.

ECA NATIONS WILL BE NEUTRAL

Mr. President, I merely bring out these matters to show what I have said before on the Senate floor, that in my opinion the ECA nations, to a large extent, will be neutral when Russia and the United States wage war upon each other—if they do. They will remain neutral, just

as Switzerland, Sweden, Norway remained neutral, and will sell to both sides. I say, Mr. President, and I read from the debate in March 1948, at which time I said:

It was made very clear by Mr. Bevin and Mr. Wilson that they wanted to trade with Russia—

Understand, Mr. President, this was before the passage of the first Marshall Plan—

and they wanted to remain neutral, they wanted to be the "bridgehead," that was the exact word they used—

I stood here on the Senate floor, two seats removed from my present seat, and I said that, 2 years ago, almost to the day—

they wanted to be the "bridgehead," that was the exact word they used, between the Soviet Communist government and the capitalistic government of America. I think perhaps they are in a fair way of doing just that. Their interests primarily are with Russia, since they are primarily processors and manufacturers of goods, as we are in this Nation, while Russia can furnish mainly the necessary raw materials

TRADE TREATY—ENGLAND WITH RUSSIA

Now, Mr. President, at that moment I placed in the RECORD a trade treaty which had been made between England and Russia, prior to the passage of the first Marshall-plan legislation, in March 1948. That trade treaty contained as its first item 1,100 locomotives. It also included tool steel, electrical equipment, and all the other things they need. I was answered by distinguished Senators. Their debate is in this document, Mr. President. "Oh, no; no ECA director would allow that. He would stop it." That is what they said. He not only did not stop it, but there are 95 of those trade treaties in full force and effect now. I listed them in the RECORD in January 1950. I listed the trade treaties, and had the Public Printer reprint part of them, to show the nature of commodities listed in them.

TWO MAJOR POWERS IN THIS WORLD

Mr. President, we have now spent billions of dollars to contain Russia, or so we have loudly announced to the world; but we have never once communicated directly with Russia, or made any attempt to come to an understanding or agreement with her. It could be that Russia is just as scared of the A-bomb and the H-bomb as we profess to be.

There are two major powers in the world today, Mr. President. There are not three, there are not five, as we said at San Francisco. I wrote a dispatch at San Francisco, at that time, which I believe was in April 1945. The United Nations said at that time there were five nations I said in the dispatch there were not five, there were not three, there are but two. Who were they and who are they now? Russia and the United States of America. That is why I say, Mr. President, no other nation in the world can threaten the peace of the world except the United States and Russia; and we have not communicated directly with Russia. There are two major powers in the world today. This is as true today as it was when I made the statement in San Francisco in 1945, upon the organization of the United Nations, when we made such great promises, none of which have we fulfilled.

INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL NATIONS

We said we were going to offer independence to the colonial nations and to the small nations—under whose auspices? Under the auspices of the United Nations. Within four short years, Mr. President, we changed the policy completely around. We are now advocating the great, bold, new program, to guarantee the integrity of the colonial nations, to hold them in bondage. Yet we are dealing with third parties.

DEALING WITH THIRD PARTIES

We are not even dealing through the third parties with Russia; only with second- and third-rate powers. What are we saying? We are going to contain Russia. So while we are containing Russia and hauling the coal at an expense $400 or $500 a ton by airplane into Berlin, because our great ambassadors and our great diplomats had made the treaty at Yalta, giving Berlin to the Russians, without providing any method of getting in or out of Berlin. Russia takes Asia while we haul coal in Europe. She takes China, and everyone knows she will take Asia when she gets around to it, unless we change our policy. So we are containing Russia, are we? Let us see what happened Let us see what it adds up to. We have lost every diplomatic argument we have had since the close of World War II. As the great Will Rogers said, "We never lost a battle, but we have never yet won a conference." We are talking loudly about containing the only other great power, but we have never talked directly with her or in any way discussed the great problem with the only other great power that can do anything about it besides ourselves.

TWO COURSES OPEN

There are only two courses open, Mr. President: First, to come to an agreement with Russia on the only question at issue, that of stopping her expansion, and agreeing upon a term of world peace, or naming the nations whose integrity we consider important to our ultimate peace and safety, in Asia, Africa, and Europe, and extending the long-established Monroe Doctrine, long understood and respected by foreign nations, to include such areas, and to make it plain that any attempt by any nation to extend its form of government into those areas will be considered to be an overt act against the United States, and would mean war.

The traditional respect for the American flag is at its lowest ebb throughout the world today. To regain that respect and to establish a reasonable chance of world peace, we must reestablish the proper principles and stability, at the risk of war, while there is yet time.

Now, Mr. President, I had not intended to mention the International Fund, but I believe it is time, after mentioning some of the regular principles, the regular methods of siphoning the money out of the United States Treasury.

In 1947, Mr. President, I named six methods of siphoning money out of the United States Treasury, all having different names and different approaches, but adding up to the same think. I now want to name eight methods of siphoning money out of the United States Treasury.

EIGHT METHODS OF SIPHONING MONEY OUT OF THE UNITED STATES TREASURY

First, by appropriations for gift loans by the Congress of the United States under the Marshall plan, now the ECA.

Mr. President, this skips the UNRRA; it skips the $3,750,000,000 given to England directly; it skips the financing of several other trick organizations, all of which were going to stop all wars and economic dislocations dead in their tracks. I recall, Mr. President, that no one had ever communicated directly at that time with the only nation which can cause us any serious trouble nor have they yet made a serious attempt to communicate with her.

Second. Financing gift loans through the Export-Import Bank.

Third. Financing gift loans through the World Bank.

In passing, I might say that this is going on continuously, in addition to the sums which have been appropriated by the Congress. Once in a while they call on us to appropriate more money, mostly, however, for permission to sell stock to citizens of the United States or to anyone else who will buy. I predict, Mr. President, that within 5 years there will be a bill brought to the Senate floor to make up to the holders of the stock of the World Bank the money invested in that bank through stocks sold and authorized by the Congress of the United States. It has authorized the officials of the bank to give money away in gift loans No one is naive enough to believe that any considerable percentage of the money will ever be repaid The citizens of this country have purchased the stock in good faith, as they would purchase the stock of any other bank, thinking the cashier would look over the loans. But we do it for another purpose, and these so-called loans are gifts in most cases So there will be a bill introduced to reimburse the stockholders, and the Senate of the United States will vote for it. That is my prediction.

Fourth The division of American markets among foreign nations through the administration's three-part, free-trade program, starting with the 1934 Trade-Agreements Act, as extended. It is now suggested that the ECA Director and the Secretary of State place the resulting unemployed persons on the relief rolls and pay them through a direct subsidy.

Fifth. The International Trade Organization, 58 nations with 58 votes, to which we would virtually transfer the right to fix our import fees and tariffs, and to fix quotas of production, including agriculture, minerals, wood and wood products, fuels, and manufactured and processed products for each of these other nations. That is a fine organization, I would say, with 57 foreign votes against us

Sixth. Point 4, the President's "bold new program," with more billions of dollars in an attempt to guarantee the integrity of the colonial system for the empire-minded nations. Billions of dol-

lars would be loaned in but not to the colonial nations. In other words, the money would be loaned for the development of nations for the benefit of the empire-minded nations, and not for the benefit of the colonial nations themselves. It would guarantee the continuation of a system of slavery. Throughout the Far East and Africa, while Russia is promising the people freedom, we are attempting to revive the old system that is dead.

Seventh. A great organization now proposed by the ECA Director, Mr. Paul Hoffman, an organization within an organization. He calls it the European Payments Union.

A dispatch in the New York Journal of Commerce of this morning says:

When American officials first unveiled EPU a few weeks ago they stressed that it would provide a lever by which European governments that are operating inflationary economies could be forced to mend their fiscal and monetary affairs. Officials of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation who are now in Washington say the same thing in a different way. The Payments Union, they point out, can prevent the situation where a European country may be running excessive deficits in its trade with the other western European nations.

The preventive is to require steadily increasing payments by the debtor country in gold or dollars from its own resources. It is believed that if a European country must "pony" up gold or dollars from the comparatively slim reserves prevalent throughout most of the ECA countries that country will shortly take steps to reduce its imports

This dispatch goes on to say:

The classic method of reducing an important surplus, and of further increasing exports, is a devaluation of the country's currency.

Of course, that was denied on the Senate floor in September when the Senate was debating the extension of 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

When ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman first proposed the outline for European economic integration on October 31, he had this device in mind, although he only referred to it as adjustments in exchange rates which would be worked out through the International Monetary Fund.

The International Monetary Fund is under fire in another dispatch, because it is said that it has established what amounts to a block against any adjustment. I read from an article by Ysabel and Robert Rennie appearing in the Washington Post:

Under the international gold standard there were no dollar shortages, no hard (i. e., undervalued) and soft (overvalued) currencies. The system was in a sense self-corrective.

If France were to buy more from us than she sold, she would have to make up the difference by shipping gold. As gold flowed out, the gold value of the franc would drop, making American cotton, for example, more expensive to Frenchmen, and French wares cheaper to Americans. This would reverse relative demand, cause trade to flow in the other direction, and bring payments back quickly into balance.

But this mechanism was replaced by the sovereign insistence of nations to set arbitrary prices on their own currencies. During the depression, nations undervalued their money to stimulate exports; and, contrariwise, in these postwar years they have overvalued their currencies to make imports cheaper.

LARGELY FICTITIOUS

The low price of the dollar, which was set by the Europeans, has caused sundry embarrassments and distortions. At the official rate, European importers were willing to buy more dollars than the exporters would provide. The result was a persistent, clamorous, and largely fictitious dollar shortage.

Mr. President, I want to point out, in regard to the dollar shortage, that I have several times discussed it on the Senate floor. It is the greatest hoax that was ever sold to the trusting people of the United States of America. All it amounts to is overvalued European currencies in terms of dollars, and when they cannot exchange them, get dollars for their overvaluation of their own currency, they say they have a dollar shortage. Before the British devalued their money it was pegged at $4 03. No one of my acquaintance paid more than $2 60 for it for international exchange. When I was in Hong Kong in 1948, $1 would buy $6.10 of Hong Kong money, and $15 worth of Hong Kong money would buy a British pound. That made a British pound worth $2.80. Only a Senator or some person traveling in Europe would pay more, because he would think he could not afford to take it at any cheaper rate on the market. That currency has now been devalued to $2.80, no one is paying more than $2 50 for it, and most people are getting it for $2. Possibly some persons get it for less than that. No one will buy the British pound valued at $2.80. Anyone would take a British pound at a price which could be exchanged for that amount of dollars on the Washington, New York, or San Francisco Stock Exchange or if our banks could exchange it at that rate. But it is impossible at this time. So, with their artificial devaluation, of course they are short of dollars. They simply want someone to make up the difference and when they will not do it they call it a shortage of dollars. It would be just like a housewife in Washington going down to a grocery store and saying, "I want 40 pounds of sugar for a dollar." She may have been a very good customer at the store, but she would find herself out in the street pretty soon without any sugar. So she would go around the country complaining about the shortage of sugar. That is the same principle which is under discussion here. It is a farce, a hoax, and a form of piracy. That is all it is. However, we in the Senate help to sell it to the American people as a shortage of dollars. The Senate should at least know better.

Now, Mr. President, I have already shown that the international fund is under fire because it has stopped up the only escape from an imbalance in trade conditions. In other words, by setting up this trick organization, we stop up the only escape there is. The only explanation that can possibly be offered for any of it is that the overvaluation is simply an excuse to get someone to pick up the check. To pay the difference in the actual value and the overvaluation. Then, of course, they are making that much money on the transaction.

However, it prevents forever the very thing we say we want, namely, a free interchange of trade among the nations. So if we really want a free interchange of trade among the European nations so that with free valuations in terms of dollars those countries can spend their own money among themselves and in this country, then we must insist upon a free interchange of all European currencies in terms of the dollar.

Mr. President, number seven in this list of eight methods of siphoning money out of the United States Treasury is through the EPU, the European payment union. Mr. Hoffman suggested that $6,000,000,000 would be saved out of the ECA and paid to countries that would meet the conditions. What really happens after all is that while the five and a half billion, or three billion, or whatever the amount is, is making up the over-all trade-balance deficits of the 16 European countries—we are suggesting that we also make up the trade-balance deficits of the individual nations with each other in those countries.

Unless we put a condition on the gift-loan—and everybody knows it is a gift—to the effect that the countries respect the integrity of private enterprise, that they set up a United States of Europe, and that they permit a free valuation of their currencies in terms of each other and in terms of the dollar, none of the trade we are talking so much about can be realized, because with our own money we are building up the ancient feuds and barriers between the countries in Europe and making it impossible.

The European Payments Union, the EPU, is an additional organization set up within the ECA which, in addition to making up the trade-balance deficits generally of the 16 ECA nations, would, in the language of its prompters, "aid the export drive"—exports to the United States—"of the ECA countries to the United States," through "making the currencies of all European countries available in reasonable amounts to all ECA countries." That is a wheel within a wheel, Mr. President.

No. 8 on the list is the International Monetary Fund set up at Bretton Woods, to stabilize the currencies of the world. Of course, Mr. President, all these trick organizations have been set up to end the problems of the world, problems of exchange and trade, and each of them in turn has failed.

I believe it is generally conceded that within a few weeks a request will come from Britain for an appropriation of $5,000,000,000 in exchange for goods which they will later ship to us. In other words, they will put Congress on the side of requesting increased imports into the United States, bringing our own working men and our own investors into direct competition with the low-wage labor of the world and the low standards of living of the world.

ECA MAKES TRADE IMPOSSIBLE BETWEEN EUROPEAN NATIONS

Mr. President, in line with the statement previously made, I say that all we have done with our ECA and Marshall plan to date is to build up more barriers

to trade and build up more of the Old World hatreds and obstacles to imports, and set up additional quotas, embargoes, and other restrictions to prevent trade between the ECA nations, and, rather than promoting trade, we are promoting a condition which makes trade impossible between those nations.

So now we come to the point, being unable to sell between themselves, impossible for Italy to sell oranges to Britain, or Britain to sell anything to Italy, and the same condition prevailing all over Europe, the only outlet possible is to our own market, which comes back to the point I previously made, that there never has been any objective since the formation of the United Nations at San Francisco in 1945, coming right on down through other conferences, the Marshall plan, the ECA, and the other trick organizations, except to divide the markets of the United States with the countries of the world.

IMPORT LICENSES AND EXCHANGE CONTROLS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a summary of import licensing and exchange controls, Western European Branch, dated February 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF IMPORT LICENSING AND EXCHANGE CONTROLS, WESTERN EUROPEAN BRANCH, FEBRUARY 1950

ALBANIA

Licensing requirements: All imports subject to license.

Exchange controls: Government exercises complete control over foreign exchange.

Status of private trade: All foreign trade is nationalized.

AUSTRIA

Licensing requirements: Licenses required for the majority of imports in spite of liberalized and simplified trade regulations as set forth in the new foreign-trade laws effective December 31, 1948. List B specifies all commodities requiring licensing. License does not automatically issue foreign exchange.

Exchange controls: Full control. Permit of Austrian National Bank required for the purchase of foreign exchange to pay for imports.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative. Trade in salt, tobacco, and explosives is reserved to monopolies.

BELGIUM-LUXEMBURG

Licensing requirements: Import licenses are required for items amounting to approximately 30 percent of import trade. Application for import licenses must be made to the Office Central des Contingents et Licenses (O. C. C. L.) by the Belgian importer.

For other items, a "declaration in lieu of license" may be used.

Exchange controls: Banks which have been approved by the Belgo-Luxemburg exchange authorities are authorized to make available the necessary foreign exchange upon presentation of an approved import license.

For the exchange requirements of items imported under a declaration in lieu of license, these same banks generally make available the required foreign exchange upon presentation of the declaration. In certain instances, however, declarations are referred to the licensing authorities by the banks for approval before exchange is granted. No list of these items has been made public.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative within framework of licensing and exchange controls.

BELGIAN CONGO

Licensing requirements: All commodities subject to import license issued by the Exchange Commission valid for a period of 6 months.

Exchange controls: When an import license is granted by the Exchange Commission, this same office also grants an exchange license providing for the required exchange.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative within framework of licensing and exchange.

BULGARIA

Licensing requirements: All imports subject to license. Ministry of Foreign Trade license-issuing authority.

Exchange controls: Government exercises complete control over foreign exchange. License automatically assures foreign exchange.

Status of private trade: All foreign trade is nationalized.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Licensing requirements: Almost all imports are handled by procurement-trade monopolies. Licenses from Ministry of Foreign Trade required for all imports.

Exchange controls: Exchange permits required. Granting of import license automatically provides for allocation of necessary foreign exchange from National Bank of Czechoslovakia.

Status of private trade: Hardly any private trade; all foreign trade is being nationalized.

DENMARK

Licensing requirements: On most commodities. Goods Supply Board is the issuing authority.

Exchange controls: On all import transactions. Application for exchange and import license made simultaneously, when import license is required.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative, within framework of existing licensing system, in principle. Imports of a number of important commodities effected on a centralized basis.

FINLAND

Licensing requirements: On all commercial imports. Import licenses generally issued only for essentials.

Exchange controls: On all import transactions. Exchange becomes automatically available with the issuance of an import license.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative, within the framework of existing licensing and control system, except for monopoly articles, notably alcohol and sugar.

FRANCE

Licensing requirements: All commercial imports (outside Government procurement) are subject to individual import license (Form PRE for ECA imports; form AC for other imports). Licenses must be obtained by the importer from the French Exchange Office (Office des Changes), Paris, before shipment of the merchandise.

Licenses are granted on the basis of essentiality of the product and availability of exchange. They are nontransferable. Licenses for imports from extra-European countries are valid for 6 months at expiration of which the merchandise must have been dispatched in direct shipment to France. Licenses may not be renewed.

Exchange controls: With minor exceptions, all foreign-exchange proceeds and payments are strictly controlled. Import licenses carry with them the right to acquire foreign exchange of the amount and kind shown on the license or indicate that no foreign exchange is required (license "without payment").

Prior authorizations are sometimes issued by the Exchange Office to facilitate placing of orders which require considerable time to fill. These authorizations which are not import licenses and have no value for customs purposes authorize the importer to effect exchange and bank operations, in conformity with exchange regulations, necessary for placing his order. To actually effect the importation an import license must be obtained in the usual manner but it is issued automatically to the extent that it conforms to the currently valid prior authorization against which it is charged.

Status of private trade: While the importation of some products such as coal, fats, and liquid fuels are restricted to special national groups or offices, and the importation of certain other products is restricted to government-sponsored and controlled groupments d'importation (associations of importers and/or manufacturers), the importation of most products is now open to private trade. The number of articles still subject to groupment purchasing is steadily declining.

FRENCH NORTH AFRICA

Licensing requirements: Import licenses required on all products. Granted as a rule for essentials only.

Names of license-issuing organizations:

Algeria: Office Algerien du Commerce Extérieur, 13, rue d'Isly, Alger, Algeria.

Tunisia: Office du Commerce Extérieur de la Tunisie, Tunis, Tunisia.

Fr nch Morocco: Office Cherifien du Commerce Extérieur, Casablanca, French Morocco, or Directorate of Commerce, Rabat.

Exchange controls: Full controls; import license carries the right to foreign exchange.

Status of private trade: According to prewar commodity distribution, about nine-tenths of the trade is restored to private channels; this constitutes the major proportion of the value of the trade with the United States. (This refers to Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco.)

FRENCH WEST AFRICA

Licensing requirements: Import licenses required on all products. Granted as a rule for essentials only. License issuing organization: Office Colonial des Changes, Dakar, French West Africa.

Exchange controls: Full controls; import license carries the right to foreign exchange.

Status of private trade: Only limited list of products (comprising about 10 percent of trade by prewar pattern) not returned to private channels.

GERMANY

Western Germany and western sectors of Berlin

Licensing requirements: Licenses required for all commercial imports. Obtained from German foreign trade banks (Aussenhandelsbanken).

Exchange controls: Control exercised over all foreign exchange transactions. Administered primarily through German foreign trade banks. Import license carries with it release of foreign exchange.

Status of private trade: Most imports handled through private trade channels.

Soviet zone of Germany and Soviet sector of Berlin

Licensing requirements: Almost all imports handled by Government trading monopolies.

Exchange controls: Control exercised over all foreign exchange transactions.

Status of private trade: Contracts may be made only through Government trading companies.

GREECE

Licensing requirements: Import licenses, issued by the Foreign Trade Administration in the Ministry of National Economy, are

required for all products. A pro forma invoice must be submitted by the importer. In general, only commodities listed in the official import program may be imported. Imports are limited to only the most essential products.

Exchange controls: Government exercises control over foreign exchange. The granting of an import license automatically provides authority to open a letter of credit.

Status of private trade: Private trade in operation, within framework of existing licensing system, except for monopoly products, notably kerosene in old provinces, salt, matches, cigarette papers, playing cards, quinine, and saccharine.

GREENLAND

Licensing requirements, exchange controls, and status of private trade: No private trade; trade is a monopoly of Danish Government.

HUNGARY

Licensing requirements: Almost all imports are handled by Government trade monopolies. Licenses required for all imports. Licenses issued by the Hungarian National Bank.

Exchange controls: Full control. Permit of National Bank required for the purchase of foreign exchange to pay for imports. Granting of import license automatically provides for allocation of necessary foreign exchange.

Status of private trade: Foreign trade concentrated largely in Government trading companies.

ICELAND

Licensing requirements: Licenses from Trade Control Board required for all imports. Licenses are issued, at present, only for essentials, such as foodstuffs, grain, fats, sugar, fertilizers, feeds, and machinery.

Exchange controls: Exchange control on all transactions Import licenses constitute foreign-currency permits, unless otherwise stipulated.

Status of private trade: Private-trade operative, within framework of existing licensing system, except for monopoly articles, notably tobacco, artificial fertilizer, alcohol, matches, and cigarette paper.

ITALY

Licensing requirements: Import permit, required to be presented to customs for the importation of nearly all goods, is issued by the Italian Exchange Office upon instructions of Foreign Trade Ministry and after presentation to Exchange Office of authorized bank declaration that payment is made from or earmarked in 50-percent export proceeds account Exception: A few industrial raw materials (list A, as amended) importable upon presentation to customs of simple bank declaration as above.

Exchange controls: Exporters of domestic goods are credited with 50 percent of dollars and other "hard currency" (at present, only free Swiss francs), proceeds left at the disposition of private trade for importation within 60 days from the end of the month in which it became available, subject to the "licensing requirements" outlined above—or for sale at the "export" rate quoted in Milan or Rome exchanges on day before selling. The 50 percent in question may be purchased by importers through banking channels. The remaining 50 percent must be ceded to the Italian Exchange Office at a rate corresponding to the average, as of the day of surrender, of export currency quotations in Rome and Milan.

Status of private trade: Private trade is restricted to imports deemed essential by the Foreign Trade Ministry, and by exclusive government purchase, at the present time, of wheat (also flour), coal and a few other critical goods.

Importation of tobacco (unmanufactured), salt, matches, lighters, quinine, and so forth, is reserved to the monopolies.

NETHERLANDS

Licensing requirements: All imports subject to import licenses, issued by the Central Bureau for Imports and Exports, "Rijksbureaux and monopoly holders. Licenses must be applied for by the Netherlands recipient. Usually granted only for commodities vital to national economy and reconstruction, not for luxury goods, and only if not obtainable from nondollar sources. Applications must be accompanied by proforma invoice in triplicate.

Exchange controls: Payment "attest" required for all payments to a party abroad, usually affixed to the import license. This attest must be obtained from the Nederlandsche Bank, Amsterdam.

Status of private trade: Private import trade mostly resumed, within the framework of existing licensing system. Official purchasing commissions for a few vital commodities still exist in the United States and Canada. Importing for an entire industry group is favored by more easily obtainable licenses.

Full restoration of free trade cannot be expected in the near future.

NORWAY

Licensing requirements: All commodities subject to import license. Licenses granted only for essentials, such as grain, coal, industrial machinery, cars, chemicals, steel, medical supplies.

Licenses for United States goods are hard to get since dollar exchange is scarce.

Exchange controls: Rigid exchange control in effect Import permit allows holder to obtain foreign exchange, but a separate exchange permit from the Bank of Norway must be obtained.

Status of private trade: Except for a few commodities in short supply, foreign trade has been restored to private channels.

Trade in almanacs and calendars, spirits, and grain and flour is reserved to monopolies.

POLAND

Licensing requirements: Almost all imports are handled by government state monopolies; almost all imports are subject to licensing by the Polish Ministry of Industry and Commerce. Existing controls favor imports of basic essentials

Exchange controls: Application for foreign exchange must be made to Foreign Exchange Control Commission after receipt of import license.

Status of private trade. Hardly any private trade; all foreign trade is being nationalized.

PORTUGAL

Licensing requirements. Prior registration, equivalent to import license, required for all imports. Licenses are issued by the Corporative Technical Council.

Exchange controls: Full control. Foreign exchange license required.

Status of private trade. Permitted, subject to control of corporative organizations.

Portuguese colonies (Angola, Mozambique, Cape Verde, Portuguese Guinea, San Tomé, and Principe)

Licensing requirements: Prior registration, equivalent to import license, required for all imports.

Exchange controls. Full control. Foreign exchange license required.

Status of private trade: Permitted, subject to control of corporative organizations.

RUMANIA

Licensing requirements: All imports are handled by Government trading monopolies. Licenses required for all imports.

Exchange controls: Full control.

Status of private trade: Private trade not operative.

SPAIN

Licensing requirements: All imports. Imports largely limited to essential raw materials. Special combined import-export transactions are authorized. (See FCW of October 5 and 12, 1946.)

In applying for import license Spanish importer must furnish a pro forma invoice in quintuplicate, prepared by prospective exporter, giving weights and f. o. b. foreign port and c. i. f. prices.

Import licenses are issued by the Ministry of Industry and Commerce.

Exchange controls: All imports. Exchange must be obtained through Foreign Exchange Institute which usually, but not mandatorily, grants it in accordance with the terms of the import license.

Special exchange rates established for various commodities.

Status of private trade: Permitted, subject to control at all stages by syndical organizations. Trade in tobacco, petroleum, matches, cottonseed, and playing cards is reserved to monopolies.

Spanish possessions in Africa

Licensing requirements: All imports subject to license

Exchange controls: All imports. Exchange must be obtained through Foreign Exchange Institute which usually, but not mandatorily, grants it in accordance with the terms of the import license.

Status of private trade: Permitted, within the framework of existing licensing system, subject to control at all stages by syndical organizations.

SWEDEN

Licensing requirements: Rigid general import license regulations effective March 15, 1947. Special free list exempt from import license. (See free list, available in European Branch and Field Offices, and FCW of March 29 and May 31, 1947.)

Exchange controls: Rigid exchange control. Exchange is made available when license is issued but a separate application must be made

Status of private trade: Import trade is in the hands of private merchants and firms, except for liquors, sugar and tobacco, within framework of existing licensing system.

SWITZERLAND

Licensing requirements: Import licensing requirements have been practically eliminated, with exception of continued restrictions on certain agricultural products. Licenses freely granted on most commodities to established importers. Licensed by Service des Importations et Exportations du Department Federal de l'Economic Publique in almost all cases.

Exchange controls: Imports from dollar countries may be paid for in any currency acceptable to the seller.

Payments to most other countries must be made through clearing accounts.

Status of private trade: Private trade in operation, except for trade in sugar, cereal and fodder grains, coal, oils and fats, which is handled by the State-supervised organizations

In addition, importation of monopoly articles, notably alcohol, salt and gunpowder, is reserved to monopoly holder.

YUGOSLAVIA

Licensing requirements: All imports subject to license.

Ministry of Foreign Trade license issuing authority.

Exchange controls: Government exercises complete control over foreign exchange. License automatically assures foreign exchange. Foreign exchange for payment of imports made available by the National Bank of Yugoslavia.

Status of private trade: All foreign trade is nationalized.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in line with the same argument, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the

RECORD at this point a table from the Foreign Commerce Weekly of February 13, 1950, showing a summary of import license and exchange control regulations in principal foreign countries applying to imports from the United States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF IMPORT LICENSE AND EXCHANGE CONTROL REGULATIONS IN PRINCIPAL FOREIGN COUNTRIES APPLYING TO IMPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES

(Revised as of Jan 20, 1950)

(Prepared in the Areas Division, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce)

In many countries foreign goods may not be imported unless covered by an import license which must be obtained by the importer and in certain cases must have been granted before the order for the goods has been placed Also in many countries, owing to the extreme scarcity of dollar exchange, the authorities require that an exchange permit be obtained before the goods may be paid for Before shipping his goods, the exporter should make certain that the importer has obtained these permits, if required He should insist on being informed as to the identifying number or symbol of the document

The following tabulation of the import and exchange permits required in foreign countries has been prepared as a general guide to exporters These regulations apply primarily to goods of United States origin and/or payable in United States dollars. Necessary detailed information may be obtained by writing the Areas Division, Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce.

Country	Is import license necessary?	Is exchange permit required?
Afghanistan	Yes	Yes.
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	Yes	Yes.
Arabian peninsula areas		
Saudi Arabia	Yes, on almost all commodities	Yes.
Aden, Bahrein, Qata, Trucial Oman	Yes	Yes.
Kuwait Muscat, and Oman, Yemen	No	No
Argentina	No, except for a few commodities [1] Certain products are subject to import quota	Yes, for all imports, granted only for "listed" products. Application should be filed prior to confirmation of purchase order
Australia	Yes	Import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Austria	Yes, except for a small number of commodities.	Yes, approval by Foreign Trade Commission is prerequisite for foreign exchange permit.
Belgium Luxemburg	Yes, except for a large group of commodities that may be imported with "declaration in lieu of license."	Yes
Belgian Congo	Yes	Yes
Bolivia	Yes	No, import license authorizes purchase of exchange, but is not a guaranty that exchange will be granted.
Brazil	Yes; except for a few products. Dollar import permits issued only for specified essentials.[1]	Yes [2]
British Colonies, not specified elsewhere.[3]	Yes	Yes, import license generally assures release of foreign exchange.
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes
Burma	Yes	Yes
Canada	Yes, for many products [1]	Yes, but system is not restrictive for commodities not under control, for controlled commodities, import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Ceylon	Yes	Yes.
Chile	Yes, must be obtained prior to shipment of goods and copy must be sent to exporter.	Yes, in form of notation on import license.
China [4]	Yes	Yes; except for certain Government purchases.
Colombia	Yes	No, but import license necessary to obtain foreign exchange.
Costa Rica	No	Yes, foreign exchange is rationed.
Cuba	No	No
Czechoslovakia	Yes	Import license automatically provides for allocation of necessary foreign exchange.
Denmark	Yes (with exceptions)	Yes. For goods subject to license, copy of license with customs certification of importation takes place of exchange license
Dominican Republic	No	No; but all applications for foreign exchange require Government approval which is granted almost automatically for bona fide commercial transactions
Ecuador	Yes; must be presented in order to obtain the consular invoice. Some luxury imports prohibited	Import license carries the right to foreign exchange (Central Bank of Ecuador)
Egypt	Yes, unlicensed imports are subject to confiscation	Yes
El Salvador	No	No
Ethiopia	No, except on products subject to export license in country of origin.	Yes
Finland	Yes	Yes, import license carries right to foreign exchange.
France	Yes; obtainable for "essentials" only	Issued simultaneously with the import license
French overseas territories not elsewhere specified.	Yes	Import license carries right to foreign exchange
French Indochina	Yes	Do
Germany	Yes	No, the granting of import license automatically provides for the allocation of foreign exchange.
Greece	Yes; license granted only for limited number of essential products [1].	Yes, import permit carries right to open a letter of credit.
Guatemala	No	No.
Haiti	No	No
Hashemite Jordan Kingdom	Yes	Yes.
Honduras	No	Yes.
Hong Kong	No, except for specified commodities in short supply or under international allocation.	No, except where an import license is necessary.
Hungary	Yes	Yes.
Iceland	Yes	Yes, it is usually issued concurrently with import license, but does not guarantee allocation of exchange, which depends on establishment of priority and availability of foreign exchange.
India	Yes	Yes, however foreign exchange automatically released upon presentation of validated import license to exchange bank.
Indonesia, United States of	Yes	Foreign exchange automatically released upon presentation of validated import license to exchange bank.
Iran	No, but prospective imports must come within annual or supplemental quotas.	Yes.
Iraq	Yes, goods exported before license is obtained are confiscated	Yes, permits are obtained through licensed dealers.
Ireland	For a few products only	Yes.
Israel	Yes	Yes, import license usually carries right to foreign exchange.
Italy	Yes from Italian Exchange Office, except "List A" (mostly industrial raw materials which require only bank "benestare").	Yes, combined with import permit in same document.[5]
Japan	Yes	Import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Korea, Republic of	Yes	Yes, except in barter transactions.
Lebanon	Yes	Yes.
Liberia	For arms, ammunition, and rice only	No.
Malayan Federation	Yes	Yes.
Mexico	Long list of products prohibited from importation; another list of commodities requiring import license.[1]	No.
Morocco		
French Zone	Yes	Yes.
Spanish Zone	Yes	Import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Tangier (International Zone)	No	No.
Netherlands	Yes	Yes ("payment attest").
Netherlands West Indies	Yes; except for certain items [1]	Yes.
Newfoundland. (See Canada.)[6]		
New Zealand	Yes	Import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Nicaragua	Yes	No, import license authorizes purchase of exchange; exchange is rationed and imports closely regulated by categories.

See footnotes at end of table.

SUMMARY OF IMPORT LICENSE AND EXCHANGE CONTROL REGULATIONS IN PRINCIPAL FOREIGN COUNTRIES APPLYING TO IMPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES—Continued

Country	Is import license necessary?	Is exchange permit required?
Norway	Yes	An authorization to transfer foreign exchange must be obtained from the Bank of Norway and will usually be noted on the import license.
Pakistan	Yes	Yes, however, foreign exchange automatically released upon presentation of validated import license to exchange bank.
Panama	No	No.
Paraguay	No	Yes.[7]
Peru	No, but importation of many items from the United States is prohibited	No.
Philippine Republic	Yes; for certain articles, for which important license number must appear on consular invoice.	Yes; import license assures issuance of exchange license by authorized agents of Central Bank, exchange is licensed for other payments, but subject to special regulations.
Poland	Yes	Yes.
Portugal (including the Azores and Madeira).	Yes	Yes.
Portuguese colonies	Yes	Yes.
Rumania	Yes	Yes.
Singapore	Yes	Yes.
Spain (including the Canary Islands)	Yes, largely limited to essential raw materials	Exchange to cover import license obtainable only through Exchange Institute, which usually, but not mandatorily, grants it. Special exchange rates fixed for many products.
Spanish colonies	Yes	Import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Surinam	Yes	Yes.
Sweden	Yes, rigid controls A few minor products are exempt from import license [1]	Yes. However, foreign exchange, including dollar exchange, is automatically made available if the import license specifies payment in such currency, and if the license is registered with a foreign exchange bank within 2 months after its issuance.
Switzerland	Yes, for certain products, mainly those under national allocation or those subject to governmental distribution [1]	No difficulty in regard to exchange.
Syria	Yes	Yes
Thailand	Yes; for a limited number of items, including luxury foods, cosmetics, various kinds of essential oils, toys, automobiles, and motorcycles	No.
Turkey	Yes	Yes; special exchange license from the Control Office
Union of South Africa (including South West Africa, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland).	Yes All imports from all countries are subject to license issued by the Director of Imports and Exports in the Union. Imports from all countries of a long list of "unessential" items are prohibited.[5]	The import license carries right to foreign exchange up to amount expressed in local currency in relative import license.[5]
United Kingdom	Yes; except for a few products [1]	Yes.
Uruguay	Yes	No, import license carries right to foreign exchange
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Yes, importing government agencies responsible for securing own permit	Yes, all exchange allocated by Union of Soviet Socialist Republics State Bank upon receipt of import license.
Venezuela	No, except for approximately 20 tariff items [1]	No
Yugoslavia	Yes	Yes.

[1] American exporters may obtain information regarding the import controls on their products by writing the Areas Division or one of the field offices of the Department of Commerce

[2] All exchange transactions amounting to more than 20,000 cruzeiros require an exchange permit from the Banco do Brazil.

[3] Includes Bermuda, British West Indies, British East and West Africa, British Guiana, British Honduras, Northern and Southern Rhodesia, and minor colonies, protectorates, and trusteeship territories

[4] Refers to Chinese National Government regulations At present, most Chinese ports are under Communist control Under the foreign exchange and trade controls announced early in June 1949, for Communist-controlled area, both a special import license and foreign exchange deposit certificate are required for all permitted imports.

[5] The importer buys his dollar exchange on the basis of the daily free market rate.

[6] Since March 1949 Newfoundland has been a Province of Canada

[7] Importers must conclude a contract for purchase of exchange with the Bank of Paraguay before purchasing abroad.

[8] Copies of a memorandum entitled "Summary of Import Controls in the Union of South Africa" are available from the British Commonwealth Branch, Areas Division, or the field offices of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in the same vein, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a Department of Commerce statement, Office of International Trade, British Commonwealth Branch, for August 1948, which is a summary of import licensing and exchange control regulations in British Commonwealth areas, and the list is given, United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, India, Pakistan, Union of South Africa, Canada, Newfoundland, British colonies.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be inserted in the RECORD as follows:

SUMMARY OF IMPORT LICENSING AND EXCHANGE CONTROL REGULATIONS IN BRITISH COMMONWEALTH AREAS [1]

UNITED KINGDOM

Import licenses generally carry with them the right to foreign exchange, and an import license is essential before an exchange permit is issued. The usual validity period of import licenses is 6 months, with 3 months extension (longer periods are allowed only with special authority). The merchandise must be cleared through the United Kingdom customs before the expiration date of the import license. The amount indicated on the license covers the c. i. f. value, port of discharge. No specific percentage of tolerance in value or quantity is allowed on the import license, but the customs officials are understood to exercise their discretion in all cases.

There is no maximum value at which merchandise can be shipped without an import license. Bona fide trade samples, personal or household effects and unsolicited gift packages to United Kingdom residents are exempt from licensing requirements Small list of essential goods may enter under open general license.

Exchange permits are applied for separately from import licenses, and ordinarily, the validity period of the import license determines the validity period of the exchange permit. The merchandise must be cleared through the United Kingdom customs before the expiration date of the exchange permit, and the exchange control copy of the customs entry must be produced. The amount indicated on the exchange permit usually covers the c i. f. value, port of discharge, but as this is normally the condition of the individual contract, the value may be governed to some extent by the amount of exchange called for by the contract. No percentage of tolerance in value is allowed on an exchange permit, but in practice customs officers may make an allowance of up to £5 on imports by parcel post. Apart from gifts, no merchandise can be shipped without an exchange permit, except for the concession mentioned above respecting imports by parcel post, which may be allowed as a matter of customs convenience.

IRELAND

Ireland has not instituted an import licensing regime such as that of the United Kingdom, and most goods, including samples, gifts, and advertising material are not affected by import licensing restrictions. However, a few products are restricted on importation and require covering import licenses, but these regulations were made prior to World War II principally for the protection of domestic industry or agriculture, and not as a result of wartime dislocations in trade or balance of payment. In the few cases where licenses are required, the validity period of the import license varies with the particular product imported, but the usual period is 6 months. The issuance of an import license in no way carries a right to foreign exchange, since the exchange-control system operates entirely apart from the other import restrictions in force. Where goods require licenses, the merchandise must be cleared through the Irish customs before the expiration date shown on the license. The amount indicated on the import license covers the c. i. f. value, port of discharge. No specific percentage of tolerance in value or quantity is allowed on the import license but small deviations may be permitted.

The Irish importer is required to obtain an exchange permit from the Minister for Finance before he can make payment in dollars for imports from the United States. The validity period of the exchange permit varies with the contract of sale, but it is usually from 3 to 6 months' duration. The merchandise must be cleared through the Irish customs before the expiration date shown on the exchange permit. The amount indicated on the exchange permit usually covers the c. i. f. value, port of discharge and no percentage of tolerance in value is provided for. There is no maximum value at which

[1] No major changes have occured in these regulations as of February 1950, except in the case of the Union of South Africa. Data in the latter have not been brought up to date in this publication.

merchandise can be shipped without an exchange permit.

AUSTRALIA

The import license automatically carries the right to the corresponding amount of foreign exchange and there is no need for any exchange permit. The usual validity of the import license is 6 months. The validity period of capital equipment is 12 months and may be extended for the manufacture of heavy machinery often takes considerably longer than 12 months. Import licenses covering the following items also have a validity of 12 months: ball bearings; chrome, copper and alloy cables and wires; cinematograph film, unexposed and component raw materials for processing and packing; electric equipment; electric filament lamps and materials for the manufacture of electric filament lamps; electric motors and replacement parts therefor; felts and wires for papermaking and similar purposes; motor vehicle chassis and parts therefor; raw materials for manufacture of sensitized photographic paper and film (other than cinematograph film); replacement parts for industrial machinery; steel sheet of all kinds; telephone equipment; tinplate; tools of trade, tractors and parts; typewriters, cash registers, adding and computing machines, watches and watch parts. Provision is also made for a period of 3 weeks grace on all licenses.

Import licenses must be obtained by importers for all goods from nonsterling areas in advance of shipment. The application for an import license gives the name of the applicant's bank and that bank is informed by the Import Licensing Branch of the Department of Trade and Customs when the license is granted The holder of the license may then open a letter of credit or may obtain the necessary dollar exchange against documentary drafts. If a remittance is deposited prior to shipment of the goods, an application for foreign currency must be made to the Exchange Control Division of the Commonwealth Bank. This is also true in the case of an application for foreign currency for traveling purposes

The vessel must arrive at the port of discharge before the expiration date of the import license. The amount indicated on the import license covers the value of the goods c. i. f. port of discharge. No specific provision is made by the regulations for any tolerance in the value of quantity stated in an import license. However, an increase due to an increase in ocean freight rates may be granted on application to the Import Licensing Branch of the Department of Trade and Customs.

The maximum value at which merchandise may be shipped without an import license is £1 Australian c. i. f. port of discharge Samples of advertising material are not exempt from import license requirements. Gifts are exempt up to £10 Australian including Australian duty.

NEW ZEALAND

The import license automatically carries the right to the corresponding amount of foreign exchange. The usual validity period of the import license is 12 months. The vessel or other means of conveyance must clear port of shipment before expiration date The amount indicated on the import license covers the value of the goods c. i. f. port of discharge. No specific provision is made by the regulations for any tolerance in the value or quantity stated in an import license. However, an increase due to a rise in ocean freight rates may be granted. Import licenses must be obtained by importers for goods in advance of shipment. No import licenses are required for bona fide gifts.

BRITISH COLONIES

At the present time foreign-trade operations continue to be subject to close governmental control in all British colonial dependencies, inasmuch as dollar exchange must be granted for purchases from the United States and licenses for all imports and most colonial exports are required. Such licenses must be obtained from the competent authorities[2] in the colonies concerned by the local foreign firm proposing to engage in foreign trade.

Owing to the shortage of dollar exchange, relative to demands, licenses to import from the United States are usually granted on the basis of priority of need. Thus, if the Colonial Government concerned considers as unessential the items for which such licenses are requested, or if the items can be obtained from the United Kingdom, import licenses are generally refused. The issuance of an import license, however, generally assures the release of the necessary dollar exchange.

Inasmuch as applications for import licenses may be refused in many cases, United States exporters, before making shipment, should assure themselves that their customers have obtained an appropriate import license and exchange permit. Goods not covered by a valid import license may be refused entry, and even if allowed to enter the respective territory, payment in dollars cannot be remitted

INDIA

The granting of an import license by the Government of India ordinarily carries the right to foreign exchange. The validity period of an import license for most items is 6 months from the last date of the month in which the license is granted. Certain specified categories, however, are valid for 1 year, and licenses for capital goods and heavy electrical plant equipment may be valid for periods up to 3 years. The bill of lading must be dated on or before the expiration date of the import license.

The value of goods for which an import license is granted is based on c i. f., at the port of discharge A tolerance of 10 percent of the value stated in the import license is allowed if there has been an increase in price Although import licenses state both quantity and value, the latter is usually the controlling factor.

Shipments such as samples, advertising matter and gifts which are supplied free of charge may be imported without a license, provided the value of each parcel does not exceed 100 rupees (about $30). Parcel post shipments intended for the personal use of the addressee likewise require no licenses With these exceptions, import licenses are required for all shipments from the United States.

PAKISTAN

The granting of an import license by the Government of Pakistan ordinarily carries the right to foreign exchange. An import license is valid up to the end of the shipment period during which the license is issued. Current shipment periods are January 1 to June 30, and July 1 to December 31. The vessel on which the goods are carried must clear the port of shipment before the expiration date of the license.

The value of goods for which an import license is granted is the actual value of the foreign exchange needed. No specific percentage of tolerance in value or quantity is allowed on the import license, but the value may be raised if conditions warrant.

No import license is necessary for gifts, samples, and advertising matter supplied free of charge. A license is necessary, however, for any item sent as a gift, if it is on the list of items which are prohibited from importation except as gifts. With the exceptions noted above, import licenses are required for all imports from the United States.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

At present very few restrictions are imposed on foreign trade by the Union of South Africa. The information provided below was valid as of August 1, 1948. Should any modifications occur, full details will be published in Foreign Commerce weekly.

Import permits are required on the following items only: cereals, wheat and wheat products, maize and maize products, rice, barley, oats and rye and their products; cocoa; animal and vegetable fats and oils, salted fish; meats, dry beans, peas and lentils; and jute products. All other commodities, including gifts, samples, etc., are exempt from licensing requirements.

Import permits are valid for 90 days, but may be extended if necessary. Merchandise must be cleared through customs before the expiration date of the import license. The value shown on the import permit may be f. o b, f. a. s., or c. i. f., as the importer may request.

Tin and tin plate and leather require certificates of essentiality from the South African Government before they can be imported into the Union, but no import permit is required

At present, dollar exchange is freely available on all imports from the United States. No foreign exchange permit is required. However, before an importer can secure dollar exchange, he must go to one of the local banks designated as an agent for the South African Reserve Bank and present evidence that he has placed a bona fide order in the United States and that the goods are either ready for shipment or have been shipped. If these conditions are met, the local bank will then make the required amount of dollars available in exchange for South African currency. Dollar letters of credit approved by the local banks will be valid for up to 6 months, but may be extended if necessary.

The amount of dollar exchange approved by the local bank will be sufficient to cover the cost of the merchandise plus any additional costs, depending on whether the goods were sold f. o. b vessel, f. a. s. point of shipment, or c. i f. port of discharge

Forward purchases of foreign exchange are not permitted for nonessential consumer goods, but are permitted for producers' goods up to a maximum of 6 months. Dollar and other hard-currency exchange is, however, made available for current purchases of all classes of goods In the case of nonessential consumer goods, dollar exchange is made available at the rate of exchange prevailing at the time the goods are ready for shipment As stated above, evidence of the availability of goods must be presented to the local banks when an application for foreign exchange is made.

The reexport from the Union of goods imported from countries outside the sterling area is prohibited, except with Treasury permission. Permits will be granted if the Union exporter recovers from the importer in the country of destination the same currency and in the same amount as originally paid by the Union importer For example, a Union importer who has obtained dollar exchange to pay for goods from the United States cannot reexport the goods to Southern Rhodesia unless he receives the equivalent amount of dollar exchange in payment from the Rhodesian importer.

Dollar exchange approved by the local bank depends on the amount required to pay for merchandise and other costs covered by the contract.

CANADA

Since November 17, 1947, Canada has had import control for exchange purposes but the control is effected through commodities, a considerable number of which are subject

[2] Each of the colonies has its own control agency or agencies to which various titles are given but which exercise more or less similar functions relating to the licensing of imports and exports, the authorizing of payment for imports, and the handling of exchange proceeds arising from the exportation of colonial products.

to restriction via (a) embargo; or (b) quotas; or (c) individual or project licensing of producers' goods. Goods not subject to embargo may be imported without a permit from any part of the British Empire.

Importers only may obtain import permits or allotments which must be presented to clear customs. This clearance carries the right to exchange on presentation of the port-dated invoice showing receipt of the goods. Prepayment is permitted on special arrangement with local agents of the foreign exchange control board. Acceptance of Canadian dollars by the exporter does not remove the import restrictions. The importer is required to obtain a permit for any payment to a nonresident.

The kind and duration of the permit is determined by the commodity. For quota goods, importers' allotments of exchange are established quarterly, on the basis of a national quota and the importer's participation in trade in the base year. Quota goods now require permits only where the import is from scheduled countries of which the United States is one. These permits cover groups of related items—e. g., food, textiles, etc.—and may be applied at the importer's convenience to any or all of the individual commodities within the group. Some producers' goods imported in large quantity are also on a quota basis but in general these goods are governed by allotments which are issued on a project basis against which individual imports are checked off. The permits are issued through the port at which the importer normally enters goods, but they are transferable to other ports on notice

The import restrictions do not apply to gifts valued at not more than $5. They do not apply to bona fide birthday gifts, and in the Christmas season, Christmas gifts, valued at not more than $25. They do not apply to bona fide wedding gifts of any value.

NEWFOUNDLAND

Import licenses are required only for food, oils and fats, and soap. No license is required for other goods. Exchange must be applied for but is normally available for permitted imports on proof of entry. Prepayment requires arrangement with the foreign exchange control.

UNITED STATES ASKED TO MAKE UP STERLING CREDITS

Mr. MALONE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the proper place in the RECORD several matters which I inadvertently overlooked in the course of the address I delivered this afternoon here in the Senate.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the proper place in the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Journal of Commerce for March 1, 1950. The article relates to the $5,000,000,000 already requested by Great Britain to be appropriated by the Congress of the United States, and for which, perhaps, as rumor has it, Britain will furnish goods at a later date. The dispatch reads as follows:

BRITAIN READIES STERLING DEBT PROGRESS STUDY—REPORT DUE IN 2 TO 3 WEEKS, HOFFMAN SAYS; KEY TO ROLE IN EPU

WASHINGTON, February 28.—The Economic Cooperation Administration expects to receive from the British Government in the next 2 or 3 weeks a report of progress being made toward solving the problem of Britain's sterling debt, ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman said today.

Sterling balances owed by Great Britain to Commonwealth nations, principally as a result of the war, total about £3,200,000,000. These debts are currently the biggest obstacle to British participation in the European Payments Union, which Hoffman is sponsoring as a major step toward European economic integration.

REPLIED TO QUESTIONS

Hoffman's statement was made in reply to questions as he and Dirk U. Stikker, Netherlands Foreign Minister, who was recently appointed political conciliator on the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, left a conference with President Harry S. Truman. W. Averell Harriman, United States special representative in Europe, accompanied Hoffman and Dr. Stikker to the White House.

Both Hoffman and Dr Stikker reaffirmed their optimism that EPU will be adopted. "I think the intent to develop a European Payments Union is there now," Hoffman said, adding that he is optimistic because "Dr. Stikker is on the job."

Stikker pointed out that he has been political conciliator of OEEC for only 25 days, but that since being appointed he has consulted with the principal European countries, and "I am of the opinion that we should go forward as soon as possible" with integration, he declared.

STERLING EARNINGS HIGH

The sterling balances owed by Great Britain may prevent her membership in EPU unless Britain can find some way to slow down the rate at which her creditors are drawing down and spending these pounds. A number of European countries are earning substantial amounts of sterling in trade with Britain's creditors, and if such heavy earnings of sterling continue, Britain would have to start putting up some gold or dollars under the EPU plan.

It is the fear of losing gold or dollars from their present slim reserves that is currently deterring the British from participation in EPU.

Mr. President, it can readily be seen—this is not the first time it has been mentioned—that the Congress of the United States appropriates money to make up the sterling debts incurred by Britain during the war with the members of the sterling bloc, such as India, Pakistan, and other commonwealths. But it seems that the situation in that respect is coming to a head. However, at present it is not made clear whether the £3,250,000,000 is a part of the $5,000,000,000 that will be requested from the United States.

I wish to call attention to the fact that this matter now confronts us. These are war debts incurred by England with her sterling bloc commonwealths during the war; they were incurred in the same way that the $50,000,000,000 of lend-lease was supplied by the United States. Subsequently it was canceled. The canceling of that $50,000,000,000 of lend-lease seems to the junior Senator from Nevada to constitute more than a sufficient reason for the canceling by each of the sterling bloc countries of the sums owed to them by Britain, which totals approximately £3,250,000,000, as stated in the dispatch to which I have just referred. At least it is a far cry to ask us to make it up.

A SILLY SUGGESTION—TRIBUTE MONEY

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the proper point in my remarks, an article entitled "Fifty Billions for Tribute?" appearing in the column entitled "Business Tides," by Henry Hazlitt, and published in the magazine Newsweek for February 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY BILLIONS FOR TRIBUTE?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON'S proposal that our Government contribute $50,000,000,000 over 5 years for a global Marshall plan is the culmination, the reductio ad absurdum, of the befuddlement on foreign economic policy in which Washington has wandered for the last 5 years.

Senator MCMAHON'S proposal is, to put it baldly, a proposal to pay unparalleled tribute. No other word fits. "Tribute" is defined in the dictionary as "a stated sum * * * paid by one sovereign or State to another in acknowledgment of submission or as the price of peace, security, protection, or the like."

When we were small and considered weak, our minister Charles Pinckney, on being told by Talleyrand that a gift to the Directory might avert war with France, made his famous reply. "Millions for defense, sir, but not 1 cent for tribute." Yet today Senator MCMAHON, at a time when we are by far the strongest Nation in the world, proposes that we pay up to $50,000,000,000 as the price of Stalin's promise to stop threatening us with atomic or hydrogen bombs.

This mere proposal, by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, is certain to be taken by the leaders behind the iron curtain as a sign of fear and weakness. The leaders of the iron curtain countries have already found that they can with impunity plant spies in our midst, blockade us at Berlin, beat or imprison our envoys, and insult and vilify us everyday. What further move may they not be encouraged to take by this timorous offer of ransom? Even Secretary Acheson's emphatic rejection cannot fully offset this blow to our prestige.

The MCMAHON proposal obviously lacks sense Would we make ourselves safer by pouring billions of our dollars into Russia, by reducing our economic and military strength to increase hers, by intensifying the problems of our free-enterprise system to mitigate the problems of her Communist system? And if for 4 years Stalin has unswervingly refused to call off the atomic-bomb race, even when we were far ahead of him, and even at the risk of the annihilation of millions of Russians and of his own regime, does it make sense to suppose that he will reverse his stand now for a mere monetary bribe?

It is time we asked ourselves frankly, in fact, whether an atom-bomb agreement might not actually be more dangerous than the present known lack of agreement, by binding us and not the leaders of Russia. They are the same leaders who have broken promise after promise, who believe that the end justifies any means, who live by systematic perfidy. The proposals for international inspection of the vast depths of a totalitarian Russia are not realistic. Even if our inspection finally did catch up with a plant in Russia that had been working on the bomb—after we had poured in our $50,000,000,000 to help finance it—what recourse then?

But the real point of this article is economic. Senator MCMAHON himself calls his proposal a global Marshall plan and casually drops Point Four inside it. It is a super-give-away program. It is not only politically preposterous, but it rests on the same fundamentally false economic assumptions as the Marshall plan and Point Four. It wrongly assumes that the American capital thrown into such schemes is a net addition to the world's capital. It is in fact a mere diversion of such capital. And it is a diversion, in the main, from productive private enterprises into far less productive collectivist projects.

Such schemes do not encourage private lending abroad; they discourage such lending. They do not speed up recovery and development of world resources; they retard that recovery and development. For as long as foreign countries can get easy money, seized from our taxpayers, out of the United States Government, they will neither give the assurances nor make the economic reforms that they would have to make to attract private investment.

It is time we called a halt to the giveaway mania.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S THREE-PART FREE TRADE PROGRAM

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, similarly, I request unanimous consent to have inserted at the proper point in the RECORD a portion of an address delivered by me in the Senate on June 14, 1948, outlining the three-part, long-range plan to redistribute the wealth of the United States.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1948]

Mr. President, I want to again call attention to the long-range plan to redistribute the wealth of this Nation.

The three steps projected by the economic one-worlders for that purpose are:

First. The established policy of exporting American money to make up the annual trade balance deficits—from all sources—of the European, Asiatic, and South American countries. Our chief export is money. The occasion may be the UNRRA, $3,000,000,000; the Greek-Turkey, $400,000,000; the English gift-loan of $3,750,000,000; or the Marshall-Bevin plan of exporting $17,000,000,000 to Europe, but the master-minded policy is the same, the economic equalization and the redistribution of the wealth of the 57 nations of the world, starting with the United States of America. This is a definite part of the international policy as supported in Senate debate, the English and Marshall-Bevin-plan gift loans are simply successive moves in establishing the first step of the policy.

Second. The selective free-trade method of dividing the production of this country with the nations of the world through the Trade Agreements Act, known by the catchword "reciprocal trade," is the second step in the economic one-world plan. Through the Trade Agreements Act industries selected by the State Department are frankly traded to one or more nations for a fancied advantage in furnishing them a market for their goods to secure money—dollar exchange—presumably to buy our processed and manufactured products

Third The International Trade Organization—ITO—through which 57 nations, each with one vote, will meet each year and frankly allocate the production and markets of the world between such nations, presumably finally on a population and cost of production, without regard to the differential of production cost due to the difference in the standards-of-living basis, thereby completing the job of international redistribution of the wealth of this Nation.

This Organization is to be the final leveler of the wage-living standards of the world.

International conferences and world wars are incidents, and even time is unimportant in the plan of the internationally minded "one economic world" group.

The "one economic world" group prematurely launched the "one political world" idea in the 1940 Presidential campaign. The emphasis has now shifted back to economics through the three definite policies; and when the "one economic world" goal is reached, the "one political world" is expected to follow in the natural course of events.

EXTRACT FROM VITAL SPEECHES—AMERICAN WORKERS VERSUS FREE TRADE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, similarly, I request unanimous consent to have printed at the proper place in the RECORD, as a portion of my remarks, an excerpt from an address delivered by me before the American Federation of Labor convention at St. Paul, Minn., on October 3, 1949, the subject of the address being, "American Workers versus Free Trade—Importing Unemployment." The excerpts are properly marked on pages 52, 53, and 54 of the publication in which they appear.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Vital Speeches of the Day for November 1, 1949]

AMERICAN WORKERS VERSUS FREE TRADE

(By GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada)

In a recent issue of Time magazine, I was rather contemptuously quoted as saying that due to the so-called reciprocal trade treaties which the President now has the power to make, America was importing unemployment.

That quotation was accurate.

I did say it, and I mean every word of it.

I am glad for this opportunity to spell out exactly what I mean and why I am correct.

It is particularly fitting that this speech should be made on this occasion before the most important labor group in the entire world.

I want to talk to you about your own future and those of your family and children.

When I say that your standard of living has been put in jeopardy by the State Department's policies, I ask that you not make up your minds that I am wrong until you have heard my reasons.

* * * * *

Now, let's see what happens when we get into foreign trade.

Let's take Joe America who is making watches in Massachusetts.

He gets $1.25 an hour, and he can compete with every other watchmaker who gets $1.25 per hour.

But what happens when he gets into competition with Joe Switzerland who is a watchmaker in Geneva and is getting 50 cents an hour?

The answer to that is what actually happened: Joe America up in Waltham found his plant shut down, and 75 percent of the watch movements sold through other American companies are coming from Switzerland.

Now what can Joe America do?

He has two choices: Go to work for 50 cents an hour and compete with Joe Switzerland, or he can learn a new trade.

Neither is a good choice—he is out of luck simply because the low tariff or import fee on foreign watches pulled the rug out from under him.

Now, let's go back for a minute and see why men join unions.

First of all, they want to be sure of a wage that is in line with the wages of the other workers who make the things they have to buy.

Second, they want job security.

The unions can give the men both of those things as far as the domestic situation is concerned, but what happens when cheap foreign-made products cascade into American markets?

The answer is quick and simple: The floor that has taken 50 years to build under the American workers' standard of living and job security collapses.

The customers find better values in foreign-made goods, and they would not be human if they did not take advantage of them.

And the American workers who would have made those products are out of a job.

That is why I said, and will keep on saying as long as I have breath in my body: "When we import cheap competitive goods, we import unemployment."

Why is it that so many politicians who would not dream of voting for unrestricted immigration of cheap labor go right ahead and vote for the unrestricted importation of the products they make: There are no essential differences between the two policies.

President Truman says he is not going to allow that to happen, even though he has the power to make it happen

Well, it has already happened under the emergency legislation (which emergency, by the way, has been kept alive for 15 years) and can happen again and much more seriously.

Already the pottery workers, the glass workers, bicycle workers, carpet workers, woolen workers, workers who produce silver, zinc, lead, mercury, tungsten, aluminum, paper, chemicals, and textiles are feeling the pinch that has already squeezed the watchmakers.

As I said, Mr. Truman promised that this would never be allowed to become serious, but when my group in the Senate wanted him to give up the power to make it serious, he put the heat on his majority, and we were snowed under.

One of the excuses given by the administration for hamstringing American workers is that the foreign workers are in distress.

Let's look at this argument, not through the confused eyes of our foreign-policy makers, but just plain common sense.

My proposal, known as the flexible import fee, would, for example, put enough tariff on Swiss watch parts to make them competitive with American parts of equal quality.

Nobody wants to squeeze all foreign products from our markets; we just want them to be fair competition.

The bleeding hearts in the State Department believe that this import fee on Swiss parts would have been bad for the Swiss watchmaker.

Let's see if it would.

At present his employers are sweating him to get cheap watches into America.

Suppose his employer could no longer get away with this because the import fee raised his American prices?

Here is what would happen.

Under those conditions there would no longer be any incentive for the employer to sweat the Swiss worker, and his wages could be raised painlessly because, as the cost of the parts went up, due to wages, the equalizing import fee would go down.

The only loser would be the United States Customs.

That point is very important, and I want to explain it in detail.

Suppose a Swiss watch now enters this country for $5 and sells for $7.50, while an equivalent American watch has to sell for $10.

The flexible import fee on this watch would be about $2 50 and each of the two watches would then sell to the public for $10—the largest factor in this differential of cost is, of course, the difference in the wages of $1.25 per hour for the American worker and the 50 cents per day for the Swiss worker.

The Swiss employer would soon see that there was no sense in giving $5 to the United States Customs when he could just as easily give most of it to his own workers and keep a little extra for himself.

That is the best way I know of to really help the Swiss worker raise his standard of living.

And if his employer raised the price and tried to keep the entire $5, the Swiss watch-

makers union would have a perfect set-up for a strike that would get real results.

* * * * *

Of one thing I am sure:

If our program to help the world involves weakening America and destroying the standard of living of the American worker, that program is bad for the entire world, including the people getting the help, because without a strong America, the world is headed straight for the dogs.

I claim that we can be intelligent, honest internationalists without subscribing to the crippling of America's strength and vitality. In fact, it is, to my mind, the essence of constructive internationalism.

* * * * *

Let's look at the subject of tariffs, just as if we knew nothing at all about them.

A tariff is an amount of money that an importer has to pay before he can sell a given product.

Why do we have tariffs?

There are only two legitimate reasons: One, to raise money for the Government, and two, to put a floor under wages—under the price for which the product can be sold.

Any other reason for imposing a tariff is not a legitimate reason.

What is our present tariff policy?

It is being carried on under what is called the Reciprocal Trade Act, which is a misnomer because there is no such act on our statute books.

We do have the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and from that comes the President's authority to give away your shirt if he so decides.

This Reciprocal Trade Act title is really a slogan, and a phoney one, to sell free trade to the American worker.

* * * * *

FREE IMPORTS—FREE IMMIGRATION

There is no effective difference between importing the products of foreign low-wage living standard labor and in importing the labor itself. In either case we are importing unemployment.

It would be very difficult to justify a vote against free immigration if we vote for importing the products of the low-cost foreign labor.

SUMMATION

This Nation is in dire need of an American policy for the American worker.

THE FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE

But before any policy can be effective we must abolish this Trade Agreements Act which is used solely to flood this country with the products of cheap foreign labor—this importation of unemployment must stop. Then Congress can lay down a principle to encourage legitimate foreign trade—by establishing a definite market for the products of all nations, but on a fair and reasonable competitive basis with our own products.

I do not think it unreasonable to demand that American products be protected from unfair, slave labor, foreign competition in our own market. The flexible import fee principle would guarantee fair and reasonable competition since import fees would be fixed on that basis—in the same manner as the Interstate Commerce Commission fixes freight rates for carriers, namely on a basis of a reasonable return on investment.

Under the flexible import fee principle, there would be no consideration of a high or a low tariff or import fee, but the import fee would at all times correctly represent the differential in labor standards between here and abroad.

WELCOMES FAIR, REJECTS UNFAIR COMPETITION

The greatest factor in the cost of almost any imported product is labor. Well—this flexible import fee would continually measure the difference between the cheap foreign labor rates and our own. It would prevent the foreign product from gaining an unfair price advantage over the American product in our own market. The flexible import fee principle would accept and welcome all competition on our wage living standards, but it would automatically reject all unfair competition with American labor standards.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is time that the workingmen and the investors of the United States of America woke up and realized that the real source of danger to their jobs and to their investments is right here in their own Government. It could be that, for the first time in all our history, we shall fully realize just what President Lincoln meant when he said:

If destruction is to be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide.

INTERSTATE RIVER COMPACT BETWEEN WYOMING AND IDAHO

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce at this time, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and myself, a bill requesting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate river compact between Wyoming and Idaho, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the bill being received and considered out of order?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as I understand, the request would involve setting aside temporarily the unfinished business. No quorum call is needed, and I shall not make an objection, but in the event any Senator who is not now present, after he has looked over the compact and understands what has happened, desires reconsideration of the action on the measure, I shall be constrained to make a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have listened to what the majority leader has said, and I should like to ask the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], who is now present, whether he knows of any objection in his State, or whether or not his State is equally in favor of the compact.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I would like merely to make the comment that the State legislatures of Idaho and Wyoming during the past month held special sessions during which approval was given to this compact for a division of water of the Snake River between the two States. Under the bill which is submitted now and the plan which was proposed several months ago, congressional approval is required. It is a mere formality. In view of the fact that both State legislatures are in complete accord, I can see no objection of any kind to this proposals.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming or the Senator from Idaho if the senior Republican minority member of the committee, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] approved the compact?

Mr. HUNT. I should have to say to the Senator——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I will say that I have just received a note that a telephone message states that the Senator from Nebraska approved of the compact.

Mr. HUNT. To the best of my knowledge, there is no opposition from any source. The compact has been approved by the Federal Government, approved by the legislatures of both States, and signed by the Governors of both States, and what is now proposed is merely formal action by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the bill being received at this time?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3159) granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Idaho and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Snake River was received and read the first time by its title and the second time at length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3159) granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Idaho and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Snake River was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent and approval of Congress is hereby given to an interstate compact relating to the waters of the Snake River, signed (after negotiations in which a representative of the United States duly appointed by the President participated) by the Commissioners for the States of Idaho and Wyoming on October 10, 1949, at Cheyenne, Wyo., and thereafter ratified by the legislatures of each of the States aforesaid as provided for by Public Law 580, Eightieth Congress, approved June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 294), which compact reads as follows:

"SNAKE RIVER COMPACT

"The States of Idaho and Wyoming, parties signatory to this compact, have resolved to conclude a compact as authorized by the act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 294), and after negotiations participated in by the following-named State commissioners:

"FOR IDAHO

"Mark R. Kulp, Boise,
"N. V. Sharp, Filer,
"Charles H. Welteroth, Jerome,
"Roy Marquess, Paul,
"Ival V. Goslin, Aberdeen,
"R Willis Walker, Rexburg,
"Alex O Coleman, St. Anthony,
"Leonard E. Graham, Rigby,
"Charles E Anderson, Idaho Falls,
"A. K. Van Orden, Blackfoot.

"FOR WYOMING

"L. C. Bishop, Cheyenne,
"E. B. Hitchcock, Rock Springs,
"J. G. Imeson, Jackson,
"David P. Miller, Rock Springs,
"Carl Robinson, Afton,
"Cirll D. Cranney, Afton,
"Clifford P. Hansen, Jackson,
"Clifford S. Wilson, Driggs, Idaho.
"Lloyd Van Deburg, Jackson,

and by R. J Newell, representative of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles, to-wit:

"Article I

"A. The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the most efficient use of the waters of the Snake River for multiple

purposes; to provide for equitable division of such waters; to remove causes of present and future controversies; to promote interstate comity; to recognize that the most efficient utilization of such waters is required for the development of the drainage area of the Snake River and its tributaries in Wyoming and Idaho; and to promote joint action by the States and the United States in the development and use of such waters and the control of floods.

"B. Either State using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Snake River under the authority of either State shall be subject to the terms of this compact.

"Article II

"As used in this compact:

"A. The waters of the Snake River, exclusive of those from terms such as 'Snake River and its tributaries' shall mean the Snake River from its headwaters to the Wyoming-Idaho boundary and all tributaries flowing into it within the boundaries of Wyoming, and the Salt River and all its tributaries

"B. The terms 'Idaho' and 'Wyoming' shall mean, respectively, the State of Idaho and the State of Wyoming, and, except as otherwise expressly provided, either of those terms or the term 'State' or 'States' used in relation to any right or obligation created or recognized by this compact shall include any person or entity of any nature whatsoever, including the United States.

"C. The term 'domestic use' shall mean the use of water by an individual, or by a family unit or household for drinking, cooking, laundering, sanitation, and other personal comforts and necessities; and for the irrigation of a family garden or orchard not exceeding one-half acre in area.

"D The term 'stock water use' shall mean the use of water for livestock and poultry.

"E The term 'established Wyoming rights' shall mean Snake River water rights that have been validly established of record in Wyoming prior to July 1, 1949, for use in Wyoming.

"Article III

"A. The waters of the Snake River, exclusive of established Wyoming rights and other uses coming within the provisions of C of this article III, are hereby allocated to each State for storage or direct diversion as follows:

	"Percent
"To Idaho	94
"To Wyoming	4

subject to the following stipulations and conditions as to the 4 percent allocated to Wyoming:

"1. One-half may be used in Wyoming by direct diversion or by storage and subsequent diversion without provision being made for replacement storage space.

"2 The other one-half may be diverted for direct use or stored for later diversion and use on the condition that there shall have been provided for reimbursement of Idaho users replacement storage space to the extent of one-third of the maximum annual diversion in acre-feet but not in excess, however, of one-third of half the total hereby allocated to Wyoming Until this total replacement storage space has been made available, provision for meeting its proportionate part of this total shall be a prerequisite to the right to use water in Wyoming for any irrigation project authorized after June 30, 1949, for construction by any Federal agency.

"B. The amount of water subject to allocation as provided in A of this article III shall be determined on an annual water-year basis measured from October 1 of any year through September 30 of the succeeding year. The quantity of water to which the percentage factors in A of this article III shall be applied through a given date in any water year shall be, in acre-feet, equal to the algebraic sum of:

"1. The quantity of water, in acre-feet, that has passed the Wyoming State line in the Snake River to the given date, determined on the basis of gaging stations to be established at such points as are agreed on under the provisions of B of article VI.

"2. The change during that water year to the given date in quantity of water, in acre-feet, in any existing or future reservoirs in Wyoming which water is for use in Idaho.

"3. The quantity of water, in acre-feet, stored in that water year and in storage on the given date for later diversion and use in Wyoming, under rights having a priority later than June 30, 1949.

"4 One-third of the quantity of water, in acre-feet, excluding any storage water held over from prior years, diverted, under rights having a priority later than June 30, 1949, in that water year to the given date:

"(a) from the Snake River for use that year on lands in Wyoming, and

"(b) from tributaries of the Salt River for use that year on lands in Idaho.

"C. There are hereby excluded from the allocations made by this compact:

"1 existing and future domestic and stock-water uses of water, provided, that the capacity of any reservoir for stock water shall not exceed 20 acre-feet;

"2. established Wyoming rights, and

"3 all water rights for use in Idaho on any tributary of the Salt River heading in Idaho which were validly established under the laws of Idaho prior to July 1, 1949,

and all such uses and rights are hereby recognized.

"Article IV

"No water of the Snake River shall be diverted in Wyoming for use outside the drainage area of the Snake River except with the approval of Idaho, and no water of any tributary of the Salt River heading in Idaho shall be diverted in Idaho for use outside the drainage area of said tributary except with the approval of Wyoming.

"Article V

"Subject to the provisions of this compact, waters of the Snake River may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use of such waters for domestic, stock, and irrigation purposes, and shall not interfere with or prevent their use for such preferred purposes. Water impounded or diverted in Wyoming exclusively for the generation of electrical power shall not be charged to the allocation set forth in article III of this compact.

"Article VI

"A. It shall be the duty of the two States to administer this compact through the official in each State who is now or may hereafter be charged with the administration of the public water supplies, and to collect and correlate through such officials the data necessary for the proper administration of the provisions of this compact. Such officials may, by unanimous action, adopt rules and regulations consistent with the provisions of this compact.

"B. The States shall in conjunction with other responsible agencies cause to be established, maintained and operated such suitable water gaging stations as they find necessary to administer this compact. The United States Geological Survey, or whatever Federal agency may succeed to the functions and duties of that agency, so far as this compact is concerned, shall collaborate with officials of the States charged with the administration of this compact in the execution of the duty of such officials in the collection, correlation and publication of information necessary for its proper administration.

"C. In the case of failure of the administrative officials of the two States to agree on any matter necessary to the administration of this compact, the Director of the United States Geological Survey, or whatever official succeeds to his duties, shall be asked to appoint a Federal representative to participate as to the matters in disagreement, and points of disagreement shall be decided by majority vote.

"Article VII

"A. Either State shall have the right to file applications for and receive permits to construct or participate in the construction and use of any dam, storage reservoir or diversion works in the other State for the purpose of conserving and regulating its allocated water and to perfect rights thereto. Either State exercising this right shall comply with the laws of the other States except as to any general requirement for legislative approval that may be applicable to the granting of rights by one State for the diversion or storage of water for use outside of that State.

"B. Each claim or right hereafter initiated for storage or diversion of water in one State for use in the other State shall be filed in the office of the proper official of the State in which the water is to be stored or diverted, and a duplicate copy of the application, including a map showing the character and location of the proposed facilities and the lands to be irrigated, shall be filed in the office of the proper official of the State in which the water is to be used. If a portion or all the lands proposed to be reclaimed are located in a State other than the one in which the water is to be stored or diverted, then, before approval, said application shall be checked against the records of the office of the State in which the water is to be used, and a notation shall be placed thereon by the officer in charge of such records as to whether or not he approves the application. All endorsements shall be placed on both the original and duplicate copies of all such applications and maps filed to the end that the records in both States may be complete and identical.

"Article VIII

"A. Neither State shall deny the right of the United States, and, subject to the conditions hereinafter contained, neither State shall deny the right of the other State to acquire rights to the use of water, or to construct or participate in the construction and use of diversion works and storage reservoirs with appurtenant works, canals and conduits in one State for the purpose of diverting, conveying, storing or regulating water in one State for use in the other State, when such use is within the allocation to such State made by this compact.

"B Either State shall have the right to acquire such property rights as are necessary to the use of water in conformity with this compact in the other State by donation, purchase or through the exercise of the power of eminent domain. Either State, upon the written request of the Governor of the other State, for the benefit of whose water users property is to be acquired in the State to which such written request is made, shall proceed expeditiously to acquire the desired property either by purchase at a price satisfactory to the requesting State, or, if such purchase cannot be made, then through the exercise of its power of eminent domain and shall convey such property to the requesting State or such entity as may be designated by the requesting State: provided, that all costs of acquisition and expenses of every kind and nature whatsoever incurred in obtaining the requested property shall be paid by the requesting State at the time and in the manner prescribed by the State requested to acquire the property.

"C. Should any facility be constructed in either State by and for the benefit of the other State, as above provided, the construction, repair, replacement, maintenance, and operation of such facility shall be subject to the laws of the State in which the facility is located, except that, in the case of a reservoir constructed in either State for the benefit of the other State, the proper officials of the

State in which the facility is located shall permit the storage and release of any water to which the other State is entitled under this compact.

"D. Either State having property rights in the other State acquired as provided in B of this article VIII shall pay to the political subdivisions of the State in which such property rights are located, each and every year during which such rights are held, a sum of money equivalent to the average annual amount of taxes assessed against those rights during the 10 years preceding the acquisition of such rights in reimbursement for the loss of taxes to said political subdivision of the State, except that this provision shall not be applicable to interests in property rights the legal title to which is in the United States Payments so made to a political subdivision shall be in lieu of any and all taxes by that subdivision on the property rights for which the payments are made.

"Article IX

"The provisions of this compact shall not apply to or interfere with the right or power of either State to regulate within its boundaries the appropriation, use, and control of waters allocated to such State by this compact.

"Article X

"The failure of either State to use the waters, or any part thereof, the use of which is allocated to it under the terms of this compact, shall not constitute a relinquishment of the right to such use to the other State, nor shall it constitute a forfeiture or abandonment of the right to such use.

"Article XI

"In case any reservoir is constructed in one State where the water is to be used principally in the other State, sufficient water not to exceed 5 cubic feet per second shall be released at all times, if necessary for stockwater use and conservation of fish and wildlife.

"Article XII

"The provisions of this compact shall remain in full force and effect unless amended or terminated by action of the legislatures of both States and consented to and approved by the Congress of the United States in the same manner as this compact is required to be ratified and approved to become effective; provided, that in the event of such amendment or termination all rights theretofore established hereunder or recognized hereby shall continue to be recognized as valid by both States notwithstanding such amendment or termination.

"Article XIII

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or prevent either State from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal or equitable, for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

"Article XIV

"A Nothing in this compact shall be deemed:

"1. To affect adversely any rights to the use of the waters of the Snake River, including its tributaries entering downstream from the Wyoming-Idaho State line, owned by or for Indians, Indian tribes, and their reservations. The water required to satisfy these rights shall be charged against the allocation made to the State in which the Indians and their lands are located.

"2. To impair or affect any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in and to the use of the waters of the Snake River nor its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters.

"3. To apply to any waters within the Yellowstone National Park or Grand Teton National Park.

"4. To subject any property of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities to taxation by either State or subdivisions thereof, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States, its agents or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payments to any State or political subdivisions thereof, State agency, municipality or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes.

"5. To subject any works of the United States used in connection with the control or use of waters which are the subject of this compact to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent to which these laws would apply without regard to this compact.

"B Notwithstanding the provisions of A of this article, any beneficial uses hereafter made by the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, within either State, of the waters allocated by this compact shall be within the allocations hereinabove made for use in that State and shall be taken into account in determining the extent of use within that State.

"Article XV

"This compact shall become operative when approved by legislative enactment by each of the States, and when consented to by the Congress of the United States.

"Article XVI

"Wyoming hereby relinquishes the right to the allocation of stored water in Grassy Lake Reservoir, as set forth in Wyoming's reservoir permit No 4631 Res. and evidenced by certificate No. R-1, page 318, and all claims predicated thereon.

"In witness whereof the Commissioners have signed this compact in quadruplicate, one of which shall be filed in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the States

"Done at the city of Cheyenne, in the State of Wyoming, this 10th day of October, in the Year of Our Lord, 1949.

"Commissioners for Idaho	Commissioners for Wyoming:
Mark R Kulp,	L C Bishop,
N V Sharp,	E B. Hitchcock,
Charles H Welteroth,	J. G Imeson,
Roy Marquess,	David P. Miller,
Ival V Goslin,	Carl Robinson,
R. Willis Walker,	Cirll D. Cranney,
Alex O. Coleman,	Clifford P. Hansen,
Leonard E. Graham,	Clifford S. Wilson,
Charles E Anderson,	Lloyd Van Deburg.
A K. Van Orden.	

"I have participated in the negotiations of this compact and intend to report favorably thereon to the Congress of the United States.

"R J. NEWELL,
"Representative of the United States of America.

"SEC. 2 The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved "

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I have no further comments to make.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish I could have some bills passed by the Senate as easily as my friend, the Senator from Wyoming, has been able to have his bill passed. I shall confer with him hereafter to see what magic power he uses to have a bill passed.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, it is a matter of timing.

Mr. LUCAS. It is now a quarter after five. There are only four or five Senators present. I think the Senator's statement is a correct one.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, while there are only four Republican Members present on the floor at this time, I will say there has been a very thorough discussion of the bill. I do not want to have the impression go out that the Republicans are not on the job at quarter past 5 in the afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. The Republicans are always on the job——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad the Senator realizes that.

Mr. LUCAS. According to the Senator from Massachusetts. Others may disagree with him at times.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, not very much has been done today about the bill now pending before the Senate. I wish to announce that tomorrow the Senate will remain in session until about 7 o'clock. The senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, in charge of the bill, is very anxious to go to Nevada upon important business. I had hoped we might stay pretty close to the text and debate the amendments and pass the bill, so the Senator from Nevada could get away on Friday night. Apparently the Senate will not be able to conclude action on the bill by that time. It seems that consideration of the bill will run over until next week.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. While I realize that it is a difficult question for him to answer, may I ask the majority leader if, from his statement, I am to gather the implication that there will be no vote on either the bill or amendments on Friday?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I cannot guarantee to my friend from Massachusetts that there will be no votes on Friday on the bill or any amendments thereto. I hope we may have some votes tomorrow on some of the amendments. I certainly hope we may have some votes on Friday, and perhaps pass the bill then. However, I cannot indicate to the Senator at this stage of the proceedings.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I may ask the Senator a further question; does he intend, in his capacity as majority leader, to make any effort tomorrow, which is Thursday, to find a time at which it will be agreeable to Senators to vote, by unanimous consent, on the bill, and amendments thereto?

Mr. LUCAS. I should think so. I made an attempt to find whether unanimous consent could be obtained for a vote, but without success. No one appeared to know exactly when we might be able to vote on all the amendments and the bill, because there are some 13 or 14 amendments to the bill. Very few of them have been thoroughly debated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like very briefly to state my position on House bill 4567, the business pending before the Senate.

I am one of the sponsors of the substitute bill offered by the Senator from West

Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] to H. R. 4567. Two years ago we passed a Displaced Persons Act. I voted in favor of it with some misgivings because I had been in Europe and visited four of the DP camps. I was afraid that it would prove to be impractical. I say impractical rather than inadequate because of the limitations placed upon it. I also felt that the numbers allowed to be admitted under it were not sufficient. I regret that the amendments offered by certain of us at that time were not adopted. I say that because, in substance, the substitute bill now offered contains on a modernized basis the amendments that we offered 2 years ago.

The bill deals with a tremendous human problem. It deals with many individual people who are the sufferers of the world war. Many of their problems will be with us for some years yet, but many of them can be solved if we give these people the opportunity to make new homes, become citizens of new countries, and be permitted to earn their own living in their own way to the best of their capabilities.

I come from Massachusetts. We have, I believe, perhaps a greater diversity of population in Massachusetts than in any other State of the Union. The last census showed that we had just over 4,300,000 people. Of those 2,400,000 were born in another country or are the sons and daughters of parents born in another country. Yet our racial problems have been few. They are few because basically the people want to live together and to understand each other. What is true in Massachusetts is true also of many other sections of this great country of ours. If the amendments contained in the Kilgore substitute bill are adopted, the additional people brought in under it will be comparatively few and those few will be well screened. I feel confident they will make good citizens. From our different heritages we all agree that the United States has been built into the strongest nation in the history of the world today.

Congress passed the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 in order to permit our country to join in carrying out its responsibility in this great international problem. We want to live up to that responsibility. We want to take care of the problem once and for all, as far as we can properly take care of it. We want to do our share.

In the past few weeks I have been sitting on the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the State Department. The United States contribution to the International Refugee Organization, commonly called the IRO, is handled by that Department. The State Department in asking for this appropriation bases it on winding up the IRO by March 31, 1951. It has given the committee a letter in addition to its testimony that this is positively the last appropriation that will be asked for the IRO. It is now expected that that organization will be terminated on March 31, 1951. By that time it is hoped if this and other countries live up to the commitments which they have made the persons who are still listed as displaced persons with the IRO will be settled in one place or another and that the so-called hard core of institutional cases amounting in number to approximately 18,700 will be institutionalized in as satisfactory a manner as is possible. We must remember that if the IRO is disbanded, the people which it now helps will become to an even greater extent the charges of the United States because the United States is still supporting in great part the populations of western Germany and Austria.

The Kilgore substitute bill has a number of amendments to the committee bill. The fundamental ones, as I see it, are four in number:

First. The date of who constitutes a displaced person is changed to January 1, 1949. This is the same as in the committee bill. But, the expellees are limited to 54,744. Thus 8 to 10 million people of German descent are eliminated. This is fundamental if the change of date is to mean anything and the additional number of displaced persons from 205,000 to 337,000 and the 27,000 expellees being increased to 54,000 is to have any significance. Otherwise the bill becomes so watered down with expellees that the present displaced persons will not be benefitted.

Second. The substitute bill eliminates the so-called de facto preference. The 40-percent de facto preference grants an unwarranted advantage to certain groups wholly because of national origin and works to the disfavor of Jewish and Catholic groups. In fact, this provision is merely positive proof that the committee bill requires favoritism because of national origin.

Third. It permits a broader description for the adoption of orphans. Some of the present orphans will make the best of our future citizens if they are adopted into good families. It has seemed to us who favor the substitute bill that there are citizens in the United States outside of members of the armed forces, or Government employees, who can and will make good foster parents.

Fourth. The substitute bill leaves the screening as it now is and does not put the screening exclusively in the Immigration and American Foreign Services. The IRO, as I understand, now determines whether each of the prospective displaced persons can properly be constituted within the province of the IRO as a displaced person. If he passes this test, the further screening is in the hands of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Consular Service.

I, personally, have confidence in Mr. Ugo Carusi. He has a fine record of publice service. I believe he will take every precaution to stop from coming into our country, under the guise of a displaced person, any one of any nationality who in any way has subversive tendencies. His judgment on the questions before him is then checked by the Immigration Service and by American Foreign Service as to the desirability of such persons for admission into this country. This gives a further screening process, which we all consider so vital today.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is not that really more screening than the ordinary quota immigrant receives in the ordinary process of immigration to the United States?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would reply in the affirmative.

I have been sitting on the Appropriations Committee recently, while the committee has been considering the appropriations for the State Department. In the committee we have gone into this matter with a very fine-tooth comb. I understand that a displaced person must thus go through three screenings, first, by the Displaced Persons Commission, which considers the person's eligibility as a displaced person; next, if he passes that test, his name is sent to the Consular office, and there he is screened by the Consular office; next, he is also screened by the Immigration Service. Furthermore, Mr. Miller, of the Immigration Service, I believe, tells us that even after a displaced person gets aboard ship, to sail to the United States, if anything undesirable develops in his case, he is stopped, and a further screening is made.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to inquire whether the Senator believes that the initial screening by the Displaced Persons Commission constitutes an additional guaranty that the displaced person will not become a public charge in the United States, because in the screening the Commission must have assurance of work for him and of a home for him in the United States, without displacing another worker or without displacing from a home a family already in the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding. I thank the Senator for bringing out those two points.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to argue at length on this subject. Let me merely say that in my opinion we must not permit further delay. We are dealing with human beings—men, women, and children. Many of them have been without homes for years. To them, time means everything. I need not tell the Senate of the cruel sufferings and terrible deprivations of the displaced persons who fled into darkness from the Communist terror. To me, there is no doubt that the people of the United States want to do their part in providing opportunities and a new life for their fair share of these displaced persons. We have good ground for doing so, from a practical point of view, because we are now footing so much of the bill. We have good ground for doing our fair share from the point of view of pride in our country and the example we create to other countries who are less able to do their share than is our great country.

I believe that the substitute bill will permit us—and will do so in a more practical way than the committee bill will—to take our fair share, and will establish quotas which will be as fair and as equitable as can be established in determining the proper solution of this most difficult human problem.

Mr. President, I hope the substitute bill will prevail as far as possible in its present form, for it represents the thinking of men who have operated this program, whose judgment is close to it, and who are most intimate with the difficult questions yet unsolved. This great country of ours accepted its responsibility in 1948. Let us try in 1950 to see that it lives up to this responsibility in a practical way, in the light of the experience of the past 2 years. Again I say that I hope the substitute bill prevails when the vote is taken.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—NOTICE OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate, but I am unable to do so this afternoon. I shall leave Washington on official business in the early afternoon tomorrow, and I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Roy Victor Peel, of Indiana, to be Director of the Census.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mary C. Barlow, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader if he knows whether this nomination has been reported by the full committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I believe it is a unanimous report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the confirmation of either of the nominations on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The clerk will state the other nomination on the calendar.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas C. Scalley, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 2, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 1 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Kenneth W. Spencer, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1950.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William Lee Knous, of Colorado, to be United States district judge for the district of Colorado, vice Hon. John Foster Symes, retiring.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the corps indicated:

LINE

Harry B. Jarrett

MEDICAL CORPS

Frederick C. Greaves
John Q Owsley

SUPPLY CORPS

Charles L. Austin
George F. Yoran

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 1 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mary C. Barlow to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to fill a new position.

Thomas C. Scalley to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to fill a new position.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art of all friends the nearest and of all teachers the wisest, grant that during this day we may yield ourselves gladly and unreservedly to the guidance of Thy Spirit.

May we be numbered among those who, in this troubled time, are orienting their lives to the mind and heart of our blessed Lord and learning the secret of His incredible courage and unconquerable hope.

Show us how we may lift and lessen the burdens and sorrows and fears which weigh so heavily on many members of the human family.

Humbly we offer our prayer in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MARCH 1, 1950.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Respectfully,

HERBERT A. MEYER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SHEPPARD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include editorials.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FEIGHAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE LATE R. D. W. CONNOR

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Durham Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of this body the recent death of Dr. R. D. W. Connor, the first Archivist of America. He was a great historian and a scholar, and has contributed much to the learned societies of this country.

DR. CONNOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS AN ENDURING MEMORIAL

The debt of North Carolina to Robert Digges Wimberley Connor will be readily evident to one who read his obituary in this and other newspapers. To the promotion of education and to the preservation of history he devoted a singularly active life which passed the span of threescore years and ten

The degree of his ability and of his success is measured by the high posts which he filled with distinction. The more credit is his because he pioneered in certain fields. In earlier years, when associated with the public schools, he did notable work in promoting these young institutions Teaching and a principalship led to service as secretary of the North Carolina Educational Campaign Committee.

From this work in the interest of schools Dr. Connor launched the Historical Commission. For 14 years he directed the work of the commission, now the department of history and archives, before joining the faculty of the history department of the University of North Carolina. He was also a pioneer in the establishment of another archives department, this time that of the United States, which he directed for 7 years

Dr. Connor wrote much, and his work is of especial importance for North Carolina, for he has made available a great mass of historical information concerning the State's past. In his writing, in his teaching, and in preserving Government documents and making possible their use by researchers, Dr. Connor has made to his State and to his Nation contributions which will be an enduring memorial.

LOYALTY INVESTIGATIONS BY THE FBI

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I think the House should know exactly what it did in the adoption of the Smith amendment yesterday. It ordered the FBI to report to the National Science Foundation that a person investigated is loyal to the United States. The FBI never evaluates an investigative report. The FBI may investigate a person and present evidence for and against that person to the agency that requests the investigation. This is the first time in American history, however, when the FBI has been charged by the Congress to evaluate, report, and certify the loyalty or disloyalty of an individual. This is the OGPU system of Russia, where the OGPU investigates and then comes to a conclusion as the result of its evaluation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the committee accepted the amendment?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am aware of that. I shall vote for the bill with the amendment in it, but if the bill comes back from conference with that amendment in it, I shall vote against the bill. Some of the Members of the House are so jittery on the subject of communism that they seem to have lost their judgment. This is an example of the action of Members who constantly profess their enmity against totalitarian procedures, and here we see them embracing an amendment that would change the FBI from an investigative agency to an agency with power of judgment on the merits of its own evidence. This was the function of Hitler's Gestapo and Stalin's OGPU and MKVD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some resolutions adopted by the Erie County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. NOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Collier's weekly.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, there is chaos in the United States today caused by the coal strike which has closed schools, churches, curtailed hospital service, idled more than 600,000 workers and brought misery and suffering into American homes.

Who is responsible? It was the duty of the President to prevent this chaos by living up to his oath of office, and carry out the mandate of the Constitution "to faithfully execute and enforce the laws." Had he invoked the law months ago when the crisis threatened, there is every reason to believe that the men who were then working would have remained on the job as they did on a similar occurrence 3 years ago.

Had this been done the miners would not have lost $400,000,000 in wages, hundreds of thousands of railroad men and others would not have been thrown out of work, many of whom are now eligible for unemployment insurance at the expense of the Government.

For 2 years the President has made a political issue of the Taft-Hartley law. He has branded it as unfair and unjust to labor and demanded its repeal. He refused to use it in the steel strike, and delayed its use until too late in the coal strike. There is every reason to believe that the miners did not believe he would invoke this law, and hence the general strike.

The President cannot hope great organizations to respect a law which he continues to denounce as being against their best interests. That places the responsibility for the chaotic conditions now existing squarely on the President's failure to act.

Mr. Speaker, his failure to act promptly has cost the economy of the Government over a billion dollars. The President's own Federal Reserve Board reported today "that the industrial production of the Nation went down in February because of the coal strike." The President's own Council of Economic Advisers has reported "that the coal strike has forced the Council to change its previous optimistic prediction for good business in 1950."

ENGLAND

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, on August 22, 1949, a great scholar, the Honorable Tom O'Brien, Labor Party member of the House of Commons from Nottingham Northwest, said at Finchley, England:

We would rather take the risk of civiling communism than be kicked around by the unlettered, pot-bellied money magnates of the United States.

He was apparently dissatisfied with our unwillingness to take an additional part of our standard of living to socialize his country.

Today, it seems that England, with its unwritten constitution and its legislature of one House domination, is apparently emerging from a violent experiment. Free men there are discovering that they must live by laws and not by executive decrees if they are to remain free. Surely free men in America also realize that a continuation of the experiment by us would be even more hazardous. A changed meaning of our written Constitution through demagoguery or incompetence of the judiciary would be permanent in nature. Legislation passed in a two-House legislature by elected weathercocks, who can only indicate the direction of a probable storm, would be more difficult to correct.

So that he may understand, I will say in the vernacular of the Honorable Thomas O'Brien: The British totalitarian sow of Fabian demagogy and corruptive prophecy has been lying in His Majesty's productive trough for 5 years. The claimed prodigies of her infertility are in the mud about her to evidence her presumptive amours. Even though she was forced to move in the elections last Thursday, the gentleman from Northwest Nottingham was able to hang on.

The relations between our countries would have benefited had his constituents told his kind to root for themselves. That would also have contributed something to his edification and might even have added a small amount to the general welfare of England and America.

WORLD COMMITTEE OF PARTISANS OF PEACE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have read with considerable interest press reports concerning the desire of a delegation, appointed by an organization known as the World Committee of the Partisans of Peace, to address an appeal to the United States Congress.

This delegation represents an organization which is almost universally recognized as an instrument of the Soviet Union. The relationship between this committee and the U. S. S. R. has adequately been documented by the hard facts of recent history.

Heretofore, the function of this Soviet front-organization has been manipulation of the peace symbol in ways calculated to exploit for selfish Soviet purposes the sincere longing for peace of hundreds of millions of souls throughout the world. It has shown little genuine concern for peace as that term is understood in the free world, but abundant zeal for the establishment of conditions favorable to extension of totalitarian Soviet power.

This Soviet-Communist agency now wishes, under cover of a peace front to exercise its fraudulent propaganda in these Chambers.

It is interesting that it has announced its decision to do so without reference to the wishes of this sovereign body.

It is significant—and this should carefully be noted—that the appeal which it intends to make is in its essentials identical with the resolution, condemning the United States for preparing a new war of aggression, introduced last fall in the United Nations by Soviet Foreign Minister Vishinsky. I wish to recall that resolution was rejected by the overwhelming majority of the United Nations General Assembly.

It is singularly presumptuous of this Soviet front organization and its sponsor to assume that the legislative branch of this Government, would, for a single moment entertain any fraudulent appeals calling on this body in effect to abandon its principles and disregard its solemn responsibilities to the American people and their allies for the security of the United States and the preservation of democratic institutions throughout the free world.

I am sure the State Department recognizes the situation and will govern itself accordingly in the proper way.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and I hope the State Department will take the proper action and not permit the visit to be made.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

ASSISTANCE TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if Great Britain in her recent election decided that she wants a Socialist Government, that is Great Britain's business. If Great Britain seems to want Atlee as their Prime Minister instead of Churchill, that is Great Britain's business. That does not bother me. But if Great Britain, in her desire to keep a Socialist Government comes here and asks us to contribute a billion and a half to keep that Socialist Government going, that is my business, and it is your business. It is your business not to tax the taxpayers of this country to maintain such a government as that. If our Government went over there and tried to regulate all those governments of Europe, Asia, and Africa, we would only be meddling in somebody else's business. We ought to stay out and attend to our own business. We will not have any business to attend to pretty soon if we do not stay at home.

We have enough to do to run our own country successfully for the benefit of the American people. That's our business. Its a big job, when the President will not enforce our laws. When strikes close down our industries and throw people out of employment. When our homes get cold because they have no coal. Its your business and the miners' business to work for America not some foreign power. Will we ever get awake to our push for socialism in America. God forbid that it happens here. Wake up Congress ere it is too late, wake up America and clean out the Fair Deal ere it is too late. Be nifty and thrifty in fifty for America.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to the secretary of the United Engineering Foundry Co.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New Yorker, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated the extra cost will amount to $271.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "World War III: Is It Closer Than We Think?"

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances, and in each case to include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 10 minutes, following the business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders heretofore entered.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 498) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Armed Services: HERBERT A. MEYER, of Kansas.

Committee on House Administration: WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: WILLIAM H. BATES, of Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAXES ON BREAD AND MILK

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, in reading recent articles in the press, I have been concerned about a statement that there are 78 different kinds of taxes on a loaf of bread and over 100 taxes on a quart of milk. Those are fundamental staffs of life, and the consuming public certainly should not be called upon to pay a number of different taxes, or any tax, for that matter, on those necessities of life. For that reason, apprehensive as I am, I have introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a committee of this House to investigate those taxes. While we are proposing the repeal of a number of taxes this year I think we ought to consider the repeal of all taxes on a loaf of bread and a quart of milk.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the chaos created by the coal situation is well known to all of us. It has been aggravated, however, by failure of the administration to extend title I of the FHA legislation. For example, the city of Grand Rapids, a community of nearly 200,000 citizens, we have at the present time, before the various banks and other loaning institutions, applications for over 500 title I loans for conversion from coal to oil and gas. These families need help, but the Democratic Party leadership in

the Congress continues to roadblock affirmative action for the extension of FHA legislation. One local bank has 104 lapsed title I applications. Another bank cannot act on 260 conversion applications because the Democratic leadership sits tight and lets the American public slowly freeze to death.

Do you want to know what the truth is? Here it is, straight from the shoulder. The administration wants the so-called co-op housing provision included in any new FHA law. It is well known that this $2,000,000,000 co-op housing proposal will not and cannot be approved in the Congress on its merits. In order to put this expensive co-op program over, the administration is blackmailing the Members of Congress by saying "No FHA extension unless you include this new multi-million-dollar housing program." This flagrant bribery by the administration should be vigorously condemned.

The thousands of families who now have gas and oil furnaces because of title I in FHA are fortunate, but those who cannot get the same aid at this time can blame the Democratic congressional leadership and no one else. I ask, when will the Democrats realize that the citizens of the United States are demanding action, not inaction, in attempting to solve the coal crisis? Congress should immediately approve a resolution extending title I and the other proven sections in FHA legislation. The expensive co-op housing proposal should be brought up later and its fate decided strictly on its own merit.

I call upon you to do something today.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1949, Harry S. Truman raised his hand and swore to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The Constitution contains a sweeping direction to the President. It says that "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

It does not say that he shall carry out the execution of some laws. It affords him no choice and he can make no distinction and still meet the constitutional test of his conduct in office.

Mr. Speaker, there is considerable indignation expressed because of the defiance of a court order by the members of the United Mine Workers. Whether they will be held to be in contempt I do not predict. They are not mining coal. The order of the court was meant to bring them back to work.

For weeks upon weeks the coal controversy was forming. Like the plains country "twister" it could be seen far off, gathering and taking form. The basic law for resolving disputes is known as the Taft-Hartley Act. Because of the names attached to it and because it was enacted by the Eightieth Republican Congress, which is the Truman scapegoat for all the White House blunders, waste, and weaknesses, there was a prolonged and contemptuous delay before the President acted under this basic law. Driven into a corner at last by the rising tide of public indignation, he indulged in the amazing performance of applying the law while pretending that it was the decision of someone else.

That was the climate that was created by the President for the court order. Is anyone surprised that the miners, with the example of the President of the United States before them, should begin choosing which court orders to ignore? If the President tries to nullify an act of Congress by refusing to administer it, to execute it, as the Constitution directs, is it surprising that some others should follow the pattern he set?

Defiance of law is the privilege of no one man—even the President.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, the coal crisis in the Cincinnati area is rapidly reaching serious proportions. Hospitals, orphanages, and other institutions are now receiving allocations of coal under the city's emergency program. Under this share-the-coal emergency plan industries are voluntarily sharing their subnormal stock piles of coal. The time is not far off when even these meager supplies will be exhausted.

Now that the country is face to face with an extreme emergency due to lack of coal, there is a tendency in some quarters to shift the blame from those who are responsible. Some have attempted to place the blame on Congress despite the fact that the executive department of the Government, and not Congress, is charged with the responsibility of law enforcement. There can scarcely be any contention that the law is not adequate in view of the far-reaching provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

It is understandable, of course, that those who have been most vociferous in their denunciation of the Taft-Hartley law are prominent among those who now blame Congress for the present deplorable situation.

Notwithstanding the alarming implications of a prolonged coal strike and disappearing coal supplies, the President stated on several occasions during recent weeks that he saw no emergency. The reasons for this position are clear. Admitting the existence of an emergency would have required the President to invoke a law whose repeal he has at all times advocated; a law he has consistently ridiculed although he used it on seven former occasions when the public welfare was threatened. The President inexcusably delayed the use of the Taft-Hartley law, although it is a matter of history that the same law was proven to be adequate on all of the previous occasions when its provisions were invoked.

The disrespect which the miners are today exhibiting toward the Taft-Hartley law is no less than the disrespect so frequently expressed by the President himself. It should now be quite plain to everybody that if the President's demands for repeal of this law had been complied with there would be no law in force today to deal with strikes which imperil the public health, safety, and welfare. The truth of the matter is that the public welfare has been sacrificed for votes. The Nation is paying the bill through hardship and unemployment.

LOYALTY RECORDS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand the President's stubborn refusal to give to the committees of Congress the loyalty records of Federal employees. If there is nothing in those records that would harm anyone, the President owes it to those people to let that be shown. If there is something in those records that would incriminate any Federal employees, the President owes it to the American public and the United States Congress to make such records available.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include editorials.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include excerpts.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOWE (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Reverend Rowland F. Nye.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles.

PLANES IN THE HANDS OF THE CHINESE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, there is still time for us to prevent the transfer to the Chinese Communists of 71 planes largely paid for by the American taxpayers. This is a $100,000,000 prize

which would triple the Communist air force. This ready-made air transport system would probably insure the defeat of the anti-Communist forces on Formosa at a time when we have recognized the Bao-Dai regime in Indochina and they have asked us for a loan of $100,000,000 for economic rehabilitation. Furthermore, while the British court in Hong Kong cedes this valuable equipment to our self-styled enemies, the French military leaders desire American military equipment for the defense of Indochina and the Far East. We cannot win this grim struggle with a policy which calls for doing one thing in one area and which results in doing the opposite in another area.

In spite of the court proceedings denying receivership and vacating two injunctions these planes are not yet registered under Hong Kong laws. Accordingly there is still time for us to take effective action. I believe that this matter should be raised to the level of issuing formal notes to the British Government. We should point out to them that it is hardly sensible for them to ask us for planes under the military-aid legislation while they transfer an important number of American planes to the very forces from which we are seeking to protect western Europe by granting them arms aid. It is time that we and the British acted together in our own interests and in the cause of peace and freedom. For, in the words of Benjamin Franklin, if we do not hang together then assuredly we shall hang separately.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired

LOYALTY INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, to the men and women of the Second Congressional District of Illinois it is unthinkable that there should be given to any police body the power to pass upon the loyalty of citizens. Yesterday in committee I voted against the Smith amendment, and in so voting I was responding to the sentiment of the good, patriotic people of the district I represent

This amendment would go further in the establishment of a police state than anything that has been suggested up to this time by the most rabid advocate of police statism. It does not end with ordering a police investigation of every scientist applying for a scholarship. It goes much further—to hitherto unheard-of lengths. It gives the investigating police the power to exclude the applicant on a police finding, without hearing and without judicial review, that such applicant, in the opinion of the police, is not loyal. I am sure that Mr. Hoover of the FBI would be the first to say that such power—the power both to investigate and to pass judgment—should not be vested in his or any other policing body.

Furthermore, the Smith amendment makes ineligible any applicant who at any time, whether with knowledge and disloyal intent or not, belonged to an organization which the Attorney General later declared subversive.

When hysteria goes to the extreme of making the billy of the policeman the crosier of benediction, it is time that we got back to common sense and the good, old-fashioned sort of American patriotism.

I endorse the position taken by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and I shall follow the pattern he has expressed here.

PLANES IN THE HANDS OF THE CHINESE

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] in protesting the reported attitude of the British officials in Hong Kong in the disposition of 97 war planes to which he has referred.

A Louisiana citizen is involved in this transaction.

I refer to one of our most distinguished citizens. The gentleman to whom I refer is Gen. Claire L. Chennault, from Louisiana, who has a brilliant record in the war in China.

Prior to our entry in World War II General Chennault was at the head of the Flying Tigers, who contributed so much in preventing Japan to conquer China, and the feats performed under his leadership have been the subject of books, moving pictures, and will go down in history as an epoch in and accomplishment of intrepid American fliers, all of whom entered the United States Air Force when our country entered the war.

When China was joined by the United States in World War II, General Chennault continued to direct the operations of the combined air forces in the Asiatic theater, and due to his record and accomplishments was promoted to the high rank of major general.

I understand that after the end of the war General Chennault was engaged by the Nationalist Government to operate a system of air lines in China. General Chennault invested his own funds in the project, together with other American citizens, and purchased the planes and equipment in order to operate this airline in China.

When the Nationalist Government was forced to flee from the area where these planes were based General Chennault was forced to save his property, and under existing circumstances there was no other place available except the International Airport at Hong Kong, China, a British possession.

I am familiar with what has transpired with respect to the battle for possession of these planes, and unless and until the British authorities issue a certificate for the withdrawal of these planes the same cannot be moved out of Hong Kong.

General Chennault and his associates, who claim ownership of these planes, are American citizens, and the rights of our citizens should be protected.

I therefore trust that our Government will take appropriate steps in the premises.

THE ATTACK OF THE WASHINGTON POST ON THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the contemptible attack on the American Legion made by the Washington Post, which ought to be termed the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker now, should not go unnoticed. That publication comes out in defense of what it calls the AVC, which calls itself the American Veterans' Committee. It is not a veterans' committee at all. Half of its members never were in the service at any time. It is literally teeming with Reds and fellow travelers.

The American Legion is one of the great patriotic organizations of America. It does not need any defense at my hands. But I am tired of this scurrilous publication the Washington Post, which has done more to stir up race trouble in the District of Columbia than anything else by attacking the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS and the DAV who are trying to take care of the American veterans.

They know that there are some parts of this Hoover Commission report that will not work.

We are not going to destroy our veterans' hospital system.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, PACE, POAGE, GRANT, HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and MURRAY of Wisconsin.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

FORT RUCKMAN MILITARY RESERVATION

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7477) providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there is a unanimous report by the committee?

Mr. BONNER. That is correct. The subcommittee reported the bill out unanimously as well as the full committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is just a little piece of land that is no longer needed by the Government?

Mr. BONNER. It was an old World War I fort, and it was used in World War II. It is now proposed to turn it over to the city of Nahant for educational and recreational purposes. There will be no great loss to the Government. There is included in the bill reversionary rights to protect the interests of the Government, and should the city of Nahant fail to use the property for the purpose for which it is turned over, then it will again revert to the Government. So, the Government is amply protected, and there will be no loss occasioned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is vitally interested in this matter.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman has expressed great interest in the bill and has thoroughly convinced the committee that it is the proper thing to do. The city of Nahant also is very much interested. Mr. LANE, of Massachusetts introduced the original bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. We had hearings on this bill several times, and the committee is unanimous in its desire to turn this property over to the town of Nahant, believing that it is for the best interest of the country in every way, for educational purposes.

Mr. BONNER. I will say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was most diligent in seeing that the Government was properly protected.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. I may also say to the gentleman that we are very anxious to have some action on this matter at this particular time in order that this bill may go to the other body so that we can take proper action for the town meeting to take place on March 18; in other words, that is the reason for the speed at this particular time.

Mr. BONNER. That is the reason the bill is called up in this manner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Services Administrator is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the town of Nahant, Mass., without monetary consideration, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all lands constituting the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation, together with the buildings and other improvements located thereon: *Provided, however*, That the instrument of conveyance shall contain such terms and conditions which will allow the recapture of the property in the event said property is not used for educational or other public purposes or in the event of a national emergency: *And provided further*, That the instrument of conveyance shall reserve to the United States, for so long as it is necessary for governmental purposes, that certain 15-foot easement for the maintenance, repair, and replacement of a cable and its appurtenances, and at such time as it shall be no longer required for governmental use, said easement may be abandoned and upon such abandonment will automatically terminate, and that certain temporary easement, terminating June 30, 1954, covering one and eight-tenths acres of land used in connection with the Turf Drainage Investigation Program, with right of access thereto, both easements being more particularly described in WAA Form 1005, dated June 22, 1948, Reporting Agency No. WD-1299, as amended by WAA Form 1005, dated December 15, 1948, Reporting Agency No. WD-1299-B, which are filed in the office of the General Services Administration.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO COOPERATIVE FOR AMERICAN REMITTANCES TO EUROPE

Mr. KEE (when the Committee on Foreign Affairs was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5953) to authorize contributions to Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5953, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes the appropriation of certain moneys in the Treasury to CARE, an organization that has been engaged in aiding the peoples of foreign countries suffering from the ravages of the war. The money proposed to be appropriated by this bill is money that was earned by conscientious objectors during the war. About 12,000 young men who were conscientious objectors were not enlisted in the Army, and a great many of them worked on farms, especially on dairy farms in the West. They were paid by their employers, and the money they earned was turned into the United States Treasury and kept in a special account. It has been lying there for a long, long time unused. This bill would authorize the expenditure of that money to supply books, scientific equipment, pamphlets, and educational equipment to the libraries of the ravaged countries of Europe.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. How much does this amount to?

Mr. KEE. It will amount to something like $1,200,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Why did not the committee use this money to buy some potatoes or some eggs and send them to the hungry people over there, who cannot get anything to eat? I think they are getting overeducated and underfed in Europe.

Mr. KEE. The committee, of course, has no authority to use this money. We are now, by this bill, trying to put it to what we think is a good use.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I was very much interested in the question of the gentleman from Mississippi. It seems to me we not only could have used that money to replenish the Treasury, which is now so bare, but we could have given those potatoes to those foreign countries. The potatoes are being destroyed and wasted. It would have been a whole lot more sensible to give them to these countries. Then by putting this $1,200,000 in our Treasury, we would have wiped out that much of our national debt, and would not be going into the red so fast.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, the author of the bill, our colleague from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, will explain the measure.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in 1948, in the Eightieth Congress, our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], introduced a bill which was passed unanimously by the House to allocate these funds to which the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has referred, to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund for use in furnishing better diets, vitamins, medical care, innoculations, and so forth, for children in war-devastated areas. That bill was not acted upon in the other body. In the meantime funds had come from other sources for the International Children's Emergency Fund and besides, its work is being tapered off and may be liquidated at the end of this fiscal year.

So those who earned this money, the conscientious objectors themselves, said they felt that at this stage of recovery the intellectual hungers and the spiritual hungers of the people of the countries involved were even more important than the physical hungers and less has been done to satisfy them. So they are asking that this money which they earned, but which of course they did not receive, because the wages paid by the employers for their services were turned over originally to the Selective Service Board and then placed in a special account in the Treasury of the United States—the men are recommending that this money in which they have at least

a moral equity be used to provide through CARE's book program aid to war-devastated libraries. CARE, as you know, is a cooperative endeavor by 26 educational, charitable, and religious organizations in the United States. It has carried on a great program of providing food and clothing packages contributed by private donors to needy people in Europe and Asia.

It has embarked on an additional program of raising, by voluntary contributions, funds to supply technical, medical, agricultural, forestry, and other scientific and professional books and journals to help rebuild destroyed libraries in many countries. It is already providing such aid in more than 20 countries. This bill would greatly strengthen its work.

I cannot think of anything that could be done with these funds where the benefit would be greater, both from the standpoint of assistance to people who have not had a chance to keep up with the extraordinary developments that have taken place in medicine, biology, physics, chemistry, and the other sciences during the war and postwar years of almost total black-out; and also from the standpoint of the good will that will come to the people of the United States from a gift which has no strings attached, no idea of trying to get something in return, but is an effort to help rebuild the supplies of professional and scientific books and periodicals of these devastated libraries.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think there is some misapprehension as to the source of this money. It is my understanding, according to the bill, that the item in question is now in the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It does not call for an appropriation of money out of the Treasury?

Mr. JUDD. It does require an appropriation. This bill is the authorization for it. This money was held in separate accounts until the spring of 1947. At that time no plan had been worked out and the Selective Service which had received the money turned it over, as was necessary, I suppose, at the end of the fiscal year, into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. So this does require, and the bill authorizes an appropriation of the money which was originally in the special accounts.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. How much would that amount to?

Mr. JUDD. It amounts to between $1,300,000 and $1,400,000. At first we stated about $1,250,000 in the report, because we knew of only one account containing the money which had been paid by certain owners of dairy herds for the work these conscientious objectors had performed, especially in testing the cattle for tuberculosis and other diseases. We found out later that there were several other small accounts, one for about $62,000, one with $10,000 in it, and one with $5,000, where the conscientious objectors had been assigned to do special tasks under other governmental agencies. These special funds were turned in later. The total amount altogether is between $1,300,000 and $1,400,000.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does the State Department administer these funds through CARE?

Mr. JUDD. No. CARE has complete control of disbursing these funds. There is, however, in the bill, and I think it is proper, this provision:

> The Secretary of State is authorized in his discretion to make contributions, subject to the limitation of appropriations, to Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.—

That is CARE—

> for use in the provision of technical, scientific, and professional publications—

And so on. For example if something should happen in or to a country, such as being taken over by Communists, under conditions which would make it inadvisable to carry on the program there, the Secretary of State ought to have the power to stop assistance to that country. So that in his discretion he could interrupt the work that CARE would be doing in that country. But once the funds are turned over to CARE, they are wholly under its control. A committee of distinguished scholars has already been set up and is selecting the books to be sent. They have about 1,300 approved titles from which they will select the books. The Secretary of State will not administer the program.

Mr. RICH. I congratulate you on bringing in a bill to deal with foreign countries and keeping it away from the State Department. I am one of those who has no confidence in him. Whenever a man gets up and defends the Communists in this country, you do not know what he is going to do in foreign countries. From what I learned from the Foreign Affairs Committee today, he is evidently not doing the thing that you and a lot of others would like to have him do in China and in some of these other foreign countries. Is that about right?

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman, as well as the rest of the House, is fully aware of my own views on that subject. But that has nothing to do with the bill that is now before us. This is a bill that I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania will support because it is in line with his charitable and humanitarian instincts.

Mr. RICH. The more we try to help those countries, through the churches and charitable institutions, instead of digging down into our own Treasury for it, the better we will be off. The more we keep it away from the State Department the better this country will be.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman have any information which would answer the question as to why a cooperative organization is selected as a means of purchasing and distributing this material? Might it not be that private industry somewhere in this country could provide these materials and facilities equally as cheap and perhaps more efficiently?

Mr. JUDD. I will say that CARE has already arranged discounts with the various book publishers. They are agreeing to sell these books to CARE without profit for themselves; simply their costs. The reason for choosing CARE is this: it already has a working organization and it has made an excellent record. It has its agencies in the various countries. Its supplying of food packages is gradually tapering off, because the great shortages in that field have about been satisfied. But there is an acute intellectual hunger, the need for information on the developments that have taken place in science, medicine, and so forth, that I feel it is very worthy to try to relieve.

Here is a statement from the chief librarian of the University of the Philippines, which library was 90 percent destroyed. He greeted the announcement of the CARE book program by stating that his most critical needs are for books on agriculture, forestry, medicine, chemistry, sociology, and engineering.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Does this act provide as to who are to be the recipients of this charity? Is it confined to any particular nation, or who is in charge of the placement of the charity?

Mr. JUDD. CARE, this American cooperative organization, will decide on the basis of the needs and the opportunity where the aid shall go. The Secretary of State could interfere with sending books to a given country if he thought that was against the interests of the United States. The book program is already going on in more than twenty countries in Europe and Asia with aid going to the University of Helsinki, the University of Oslo, University of Vienna, Public Library of Milan, the University of Free Berlin, the University of Louvain, to mention a few. You will recall that the University of Louvain was destroyed during World War I, and was rebuilt by the Rockefellers. It was again destroyed in World War II. They need, most of all, new up-to-date books and periodicals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe there will be serious objection to the use of this money for this purpose. There were 12,000 conscientious objectors during the war. They rendered more than 8,000,000 days of service to the United States, and to States and communities, for which no reimbursement was given them. As everybody knows, they did what the Selective Service Act called "work of national importance" in soil conservation, in national parks and forests, in mental hospitals, in hookworm and sanitation control. They served as guinea pigs in malaria, jaundice, louse, semistarvation, and other experiments.

If you figure their wages at $50 a month, which is what a GI received, they contributed something like $20,000,000 voluntarily to the well-being of our country. They received nothing—not even their board and room in most cases.

They were not willing to bear arms. They were willing to give their bodies for experiments in many disease and physiological problems. All the above service rendered is not involved in this bill. It deals only with the funds that were earned by some 1,200 of them who worked for private employers in testing dairy herds and a few other minor projects.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I wish to know what insurance we would have that the recipients would know that these books came from the United States.

Mr. JUDD. This bookplate will go in every book stating that it is a gift from the American people. If individuals send books they can have their own bookplates put in them. As I said, some associations are sending books over. For example, the American Dental Association is raising money for dental books and journals, and in their books they have a bookplate stating that it is a gift from the American people through the American Dental Association.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. I merely wished to answer the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to why potatoes and eggs were not sent over instead of this money.

Mr. RANKIN. That was my question.

Mr. WHITE of California. I believe the gentleman from Mississippi also referred to it.

That question has been kicked around a good deal, and I believe there is a lot of misunderstanding on the part of the American people. The reason potatoes have not been sent is that transportation is too expensive and impractical, and the potatoes sprout on the way. In the case of eggs, transportation would, of course, require refrigerated ships. Both of these products have such a high percentage of moisture that the cost outweighs the food value.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I believe we should state that in the Committee on Foreign Affairs it was the consensus of the veterans of World War II serving on that committee that this was a good and a worth-while project. We know that this is just one example of the sort of work these other fellows did in the war who, because of their conscientious scruples, could not go out on the field of battle but were willing to make their contribution in some other way.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I objected to this bill in the last session of Congress when it came up on the Consent Calendar, because I did not believe that we should be sending these books to foreign countries but rather should keep them here for our own libraries.

I feel that I can assure the gentleman that this will not go to a roll call vote, that the bill will probably pass without difficulty, but I want the RECORD to show that I am still opposed to it because I am not sympathetic with conscientious objectors and I still think we should keep the books for our own libraries.

Mr. JUDD. I respect the gentleman's opinion. I do not know anyone who suggests we should do this as an obligation to the objectors. They do not get any of the assistance in any case.

Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time. I know of no further opposition to the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will state it.

Mr. CHURCH. When will an amendment on the bill be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. When the bill is read for amendment under the five-minute rule.

The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I doubt the wisdom of legislation of this kind. If it does any good in Europe or if there is any gratitude, it will be to the conscientious objectors, and they will get the credit.

But what I object to is pouring American money into the sinkholes of foreign countries and at the same time keeping in the name of the United States Government the billions of eggs and the millions of bushels of potatoes that those people could use.

The rank and file of the people of Europe do not know that the United States has ever supplied them any money. That money has been given to the leaders, to the heads of governments, and many of those heads of government are playing the hand of Esau and the voice of Jacob.

They are taking our money with the one hand but playing with the Communists with the other.

You know that, and every Member of this House knows it. If we are going to send anything at all to Europe, let us relieve the hungry people who are really suffering in Europe, in England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland. These statements that you cannot send potatoes across the ocean is ridiculous, I may say to the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE], because shipments go from here to England inside of a very few days, a week at the outside, and besides our freighters have refrigerator facilities to take care of them just as we have in our warehouses.

We have millions of bushels of potatoes in the hands of the Federal Government that those people could use. Let us send them food, instead of the money that we are sending over there to finance a few top-flight men to run their own governments, and who are keeping from the people the fact that we have attempted to aid them.

Now, I do not know how many bushels of sweetpotatoes we have. You never hear anyone mention sweetpotatoes. But let me say that the sweetpotato comes nearer having all of the food value than anything else that is produced. I repeat that. It has been found that the sweetpotato comes nearer having all of the food values in it than anything else that grows out of the ground.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. The gentleman has come to the very point I wanted to make. There are other products with food values that are superior to Irish potatoes. If we are going to feed hungry people, we ought to give them the maximum benefits.

Mr. RANKIN. Why not send them whatever they need?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What would the gentleman do if one does not happen to like sweetpotatoes?

Mr. RANKIN. I have never seen a man who ate a sweetpotato who did not like it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have.

Mr. RANKIN. You hear that kind of talk from people who do not know a sweetpotato when they see one. I have never seen a man yet who did not like a sweetpotato.

Let us go a step further. So far as eggs are concerned the gentleman knows, if he is familiar with the situation, that powdered eggs have been coming in from China for years and years and years. We are importing eggs. These eggs could be supplied. Do you know how many eggs a man in England gets? An individual gets one and a half eggs a week. Of course he would like sweetpotatoes. Take the gentleman from South Dakota and put him on that kind of a diet and he would eat sweetpotatoes and he would like them. These eggs we have, we can supply to the people in the British Isles, or in those countries where the people are actually suffering, instead of giving aid to a few political manipulators to buy automobiles and tractors over there in countries where they have only about 15 acres to the farm.

It is about time the American Congress gets down to a basis of common sense in our international dealings. We have not made a friend, we have inspired contempt; we have spent untold billions of dollars out of the pockets of the taxpayers of America, not only now, but for generations yet to come. You saw in the paper yesterday a statement that the foreign debt will not be paid before the year 2000 when your grandchildren will be as old as many of you are now.

Are you going to continue this kind of a policy that does not provoke gratitude, that the people do not know anything

about, but on the other hand provokes ingratitude, and continue the financing of a few people who are leading their governments down the road toward communism and socialism?

If we are going to send them anything, let us send them something to eat and let them know where it comes from.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 5953, the bill now under consideration by the House, was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] on August 10, 1949, and it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The chairman of this committee referred the bill to a subcommittee, composed of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], and myself. The subcommittee held a hearing on August 23. We heard several witnesses, and upon the conclusion of the hearing, the subcommittee voted unanimously to recommend H. R. 5953 to the full committee. On August 24, the full committee endorsed the recommendation of the subcommittee and recommended the bill to the House by a unanimous vote.

It is the opinion of the committee that this bill offers an appropriate pattern for handling the money involved. The sums involved represent the wages paid by private employers to the Selective Service System for work done by men assigned by the Selective Service System to types of work which was of national importance and in accordance with the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

Under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, approximately 12,000 young men were assigned to work of a national importance. These men were, in most cases, taken care of in service camps which were operated at the expense of religious groups with which the individuals involved were identified. All of the 12,000 assignees served their country without pay. They contributed a total of 8,237,866 man-days of labor in soil conservation, national parks and forests, mental hospitals, hookworm and sanitation control, and as guinea pigs in malaria, jaundice, semistarvation, and other experiments. Their services, if computed on the basis of an Army private's base pay of $50 a month, amounts to a contribution of $13,729,775 to the United States Government. In addition to this service, the religious agencies paid nearly the entire cost of maintaining and operating the camps which took care of these men from 1941 to 1947; the total cost of which amounted to about $8,000,000. The two items together, thus, contributed to the Government over $21,000,000.

These men, who worked for governmental units on the national or local level, received no pay whatsoever. A group of about 1,200, however, served as dairy farmers and herd testers. Their wages were paid by the dairy farmers and the dairy herd associations employing them. These wages were collected by the National Service Board for Religious Objectors and were turned over to the United States Government. These moneys were kept in a separate deposit account in the Treasury. On March 12, 1947, and May 19, 1947, the Selective Service Board made payments to the Treasury. Other agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, also paid additional sums into the Treasury in this fund during 1947, 1948, and 1949. The total amount of all sums paid into the Treasury is $1,327,641.76. This is the amount of money involved in this legislation.

The legislation here proposed would dispose of this money in keeping with the wishes of those who earned it—that it be devoted to a public and unselfish purpose. H. R. 5953 directs that these funds, under the direction of the Secretary of State, be used to make contributions to Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc., for use in the provisions of technical, scientific, and professional publications and educational and scientific equipment for libraries and institutions of learning abroad.

The moneys involved are, in a legal sense, part of the money resources of this Government. On the other hand, the money came into the Government's possession as a result of the efforts of private individuals, who legally were prohibited from receiving the funds. These moneys have both a public and a private character. This bill recognizes the dual character of the money and provides that the money will be spent by a private agency for a purpose in keeping with the wishes of the individuals, who have a moral equity in it. On the other hand, the money will be released to a private agency under the direction of the Secretary of State, whose responsibility it will be to see that the money is used in a manner compatible with the public interest.

It should be emphasized that the programing of the money will be the responsibility of a private agency, namely, Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.—CARE. Distribution of the books and educational equipment involved will also be in CARE's hands. On the other hand, CARE's programs will be subject to review by the Department of State. This will insure that the plan of governmental supervision will be maintained to the extent of insuring that the money not be used in a manner contrary to the national policy of the United States.

CARE is a private, voluntary, nonprofit agency, which enjoys a high public standing, and it operates with a full sense of public responsibility. It was organized following the close of hostilities in Europe in World War II. Its purpose was, and still is, to bring about coordination of the highest possible degree of efficiency in the overseas relief activities of various private agencies. The organization was formed, as an answer to a need, seen by the President's War Relief Control Board. Its functioning model was a similar organization, organized by Herbert Hoover in the relief work in Europe following World War I. CARE is registered with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the Department of State. Its activities are carefully coordinated with the Department of State and through it with the Economic Cooperation Administration. At the same time, CARE preserves the elements of private judgment and individual impulse which are necessary ingredients to a rounded overseas relief program.

The CARE book program has been developed to meet the depleted library resources of various parts of the world. The program seeks to assist institutional libraries only. It does not assist individuals. Insofar as educational materials other than books may be purchased with funds involved in this bill, they too, will be for institutional use only.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The bill states that "the Secretary of State is hereby authorized in his discretion to make contributions." Does this bill specifically direct the Secretary to make the funds available to Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Yes; at his discretion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Suppose he chooses not to make them available to the Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Then according to the bill they would not be made available.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, he can hold them up?

Mr. CARNAHAN. He can hold them up.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The men who earned this money in the first instance requested that the funds be used for a certain purpose; is that correct?

Mr. CARNAHAN. They have suggested that a certain use would be satisfactory to them, I think would be the correct answer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the bill mandate the Secretary of State to use it for that purpose, or does it give the Secretary of State the privilege of using the funds for some purpose other than what the men who earned the money requested?

Mr. CARNAHAN. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] if he can answer that question?

Mr. JUDD. The Secretary of State can do only two things: He can give the money to CARE or he can withhold it. He cannot use it for any other purpose under the terms of the legislation, and he could not give it to any other organization.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does that meet the request of the men who earned the money?

Mr. JUDD. It does. Their representatives came before our committee and testified they had taken a poll of their own members and they overwhelmingly favored the use for this purpose of the money which they had earned.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Incidentally, this money could not be put in better hands

than the organization known as CARE to see that the best possible application of the funds was made; is that correct?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I think that is correct. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The provision in relation to the Secretary of State enables the State Department to pass upon whether or not the books are going to be used by proper groups abroad, so they will not be used for purposes which would be inconsistent with the best interests of our own country?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized in his discretion to make contributions, subject to the limit of appropriations made in pursuance of the authorization herein, to Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc., for use in the provision of technical, scientific, and professional publications and educational and scientific equipment for libraries and institutions of learning abroad.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHURCH: On page 1, line 3, after the word "That", strike out "the Secretary of State" and insert the words "the President of the United States."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak at length on this amendment. It speaks for itself. I provide by this amendment that the President of the United States instead of "the Secretary of State is hereby authorized in his discretion to make contributions," and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to come here today and vote for a bill that gives to the Secretary of State—unless I knew that he had resigned before this bill becomes law—this discretion, after knowing of his words of yesterday and his words of some time ago with reference to Mr. Hiss. That is all I am going to say on this subject.

I believe for the present at least that this "discretion" can be in the President of the United States. The President of the United States is an elected officer. The present Secretary of State has abused his discretion and I believe the majority of the people of the United States believe that. I hope the amendment will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the discussion on the pending legislation pin points a situation which I believe confronts most of the Members of Congress today. I have on my desk perhaps 100 telegrams and letters asking me to support a piece of legislation intended to authorize an expenditure of a very substantial sum of money to provide extension library services in each of the States of the Union. I believe there is not a Member of the Congress who does not have on his desk the requests and pleas of the library associations and librarians throughout the country that we vote for that bill which would authorize an expenditure of a minimum, I believe, of $40,000 a year in each State for the development of library services in the various States of the Union.

The arguments in connection with that proposed legislation have demonstrated to me at least that there is a tremendous need throughout the country for the dissemination of reading material to our own people which does not presently exist. They are seeking to extend library services through the medium of traveling libraries in the remote areas of the various sections of the country, which are not served by the ordinary free public libraries.

When the representatives of these library associations came to my office and asked me whether or not I would support that legislation, I said to those ladies, just a day or two ago, who by the way were from my own State, "Will you kindly tell me where we are going to get the money to engage in that new project, worth while as it may be?" I said my own humble opinion is, if you want the truth, that even if that legislative authorization were to pass the Congress you could not get through the Committee on Appropriations as it has presently manifested its attitude, any money to implement such a proposal. I think I have stated the truth. There is nothing in the President's budget, as I understand it, to implement such a piece of legislation.

Now, here today is a sum, stated in the report, $1,229,240.61, which has been covered into the Treasury of the United States as "miscellaneous receipts." All of the talk about the source of this fund does not change the fact that this money is money that was paid into the Treasury of the United States and occupies a position no different than any other money, as far as the expenditure thereof is concerned. An appropriation will be necessary out of funds in the Treasury of the United States, in order to make this legislation work. Should I, as a Representative in Congress, deny to my own people library services which people all over this country say are needed, in order that we might buy books, which those libraries could use, and send abroad to replenish the libraries over there? I pose that question to you gentlemen who have talked in the interest of the welfare of your own people. I ask you, when you vote against an appropriation to implement the library services requested for our own people, how you can do so and justify appropriating this money out of the Treasury of the United States to buy books to be shipped to foreign countries.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is entirely correct. This library bill is going to be taken up within the next 2 weeks, and I do not know where we are going to find the money to provide our own libraries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. These bills come here from the Foreign Affairs Committee, and they are just pushed through as a matter of course. I do not think they are given proper consideration. I think it is time the Congress of the United States began to think in terms of what the needs of the people of America are.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. There is enough money in this appropriation to build some 8 or 10 post-office buildings in the United States, and there has not been one built for the past 12 years. We have been trying to get authorization for a public-works program through this House. There is enough money in this bill to take care of 8 or 10 post-office buildings.

Mr. KEEFE. As far as I am concerned, I am going to vote against this, because I cannot consistently vote to sustain the budget of the President and not go beyond it and not provide services that are much needed for our own country, and then stand up here and vote to authorize an appropriation to take money out of this country that could well be spent in providing library services right here at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the organization known as CARE has done one of the greatest services to humanity that I can recollect. This organization has supplemented by many million dollars what the American people have appropriated from taxation for relief in foreign countries. It is an organization which packages food and transmits food and clothing to needy people in all parts of the world, food which is purchased by American individuals and organizations and is delivered directly to the needy. The supplements made by CARE to the relief that the American taxpayers have given to people in foreign countries is a tremendous supplement, and had it not been in operation we would have been called upon to appropriate many more millions of dollars to meet the problem of hunger and malnutrition all over the world. However, the committee of which I am a member, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of State and the Foreign Service, will presently come before you with a bill asking for a tremendous amount of money to be appropriated to one section of our foreign section, USIS, or, as you know it, the Voice of America.

The Voice of America is set up for the purpose of giving the world the true picture of the United States, our aims and our foreign policy. In this operation this organization not only transmits the

written word, the printed word, but also the voice and visual pictures, motion pictures, radio, newspapers, magazines; and it operates an elaborate library system in many foreign countries in which there is a tremendous circulation of books, magazines, and so on. These USIS libraries are visited by thousands of people. In addition to that, we subsidize American magazine-publishing houses, periodicals, and newspapers. We circulate many publications. The program, including libraries, is a coordinated program. The cost annually is heavy. I would like to ask the committee members presenting this bill to transfer a certain amount of money over to CARE, which is fundamentally a food-distribution organization, how they plan to circulate books, periodicals, and magazines, and open libraries in foreign countries when we already have an agency in existence doing that work in a very large library program? Why start a new one?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The answer is that the books and periodicals that are sent over under the Voice of America program are sent to American libraries maintained in these various countries, whereas the books under this bill would go to libraries maintained by the countries or cities of their location.

Mr. STEFAN. I beg to differ with the gentleman. These are American-operated libraries, operated by the State Department's Voice of America. They are for the use of all the people wherever they are located, and the expense of these libraries is borne by direct appropriations made by this Congress each year. We are coming before you very shortly to ask for money to continue and expand those libraries. The annual cost will be over $4,000,000.

Mr. JUDD. That is right; but as I see it, that program does not in the least conflict with the CARE program.

Mr. STEFAN. Why should we embark on another library program when we already have a fine one in existence?

Mr. JUDD. It is a different sort of program. The books and periodicals to be purchased under the program to which the gentleman is referring could not be contributed to various national or city libraries like that of the University of the Philippines in Manila, the University of Rangoon in Burma, the University of Helsinski in Finland, and the University of Oslo in Norway.

Mr. STEFAN. We are expanding the Voice of America program, or USIS; we are expanding our far eastern program. We already have a library program, a very elaborate one. It is going to cost many millions of dollars. Why not use this money rather to buy our surplus food and feed the hungry people. Our libraries are already in operation.

Mr. JUDD. Because personally I think greater good and wider diffusion of assistance will result under the CARE program. It complements the program the gentleman mentions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. STEFAN. You are scattering your shots all over the world in this library program. Let us concentrate on one that is a going concern supplied with sufficient funds. I personally feel that CARE should stay in the field of the distribution of food and clothing. We subsidize CARE on transportation; we give them every encouragement. It is a fine organization. Let us continue our library program through the Voice of America as it is now set up.

Mr. JUDD. I may say to the gentleman that CARE already has its library program in operation with funds that have been raised by voluntary contributions. The bill does not set up a new program. It is the Voice program which is new, and the gentleman knows I was on the committee which established it. This bill merely aids libraries already in existence, many of them for hundreds of years.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say at this point in the discussion that there is a definite need in every section of this country for library services to our own people. These library services are being conducted by trained librarians who are familiar with the needs of the children and patrons served and especially with the needs of the children of those who live in the rural sections of our country. I heartily favor and shall support a measure that will implement and finance this service and carry these books to the people who live in the rural sections of the country. These books are such as will be worth while; they are such books as children will naturally be interested in, and they will contribute to the well-being and education of our own people.

Let us not get away from the Biblical statement of great truth that he who provideth not for his own household has denied the faith and is worse than an infidel.

Do not kid yourselves. You are not fooling the people back home. They know the majority in control of this Congress are throwing the money of our people away with reckless abandon in every quarter of the world. There is no doubt about that.

An effort is being made by this bill to appropriate $1,229,240.61 and scatter it over Europe, nobody knows by whom or in what way. Such efforts as have been made to benefit the people over there have been childish, inane, and insane. For instance, take what is going on in western Germany by the kindergarten methods that have been employed. Some of our soft-headed people are over there undertaking to transform the thinking of the Germans and remake the German character, eradicate from the minds of one of the ablest people in the world their natural desire to have a unified country and to resume their station among the countries of the world as a sovereign people. You might as well pour water on a duck's back or sing a song to a dead horse as to kid yourselves with these childlike ideas that you are going to remake the Germans or any other people by that sort of a naive, childish program. Eastern Germany is under the control of Russia. Western Germany is biding her time. We have not changed their thinking nor the desires of their minds and hearts.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to get this clearly before the House, because I am afraid it will not get before the Members.

Mr. JENNINGS. Do not take all of my time, but go ahead.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to know from the chairman of the committee whether or not there is a budget estimate for this amount in the President's budget?

Mr. KEE. I am unable to answer that.

Mr. KEEFE. I would also like to know whether this matter has been cleared by and has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. KEE. All I know is that this fund is to be authorized and at the discretion of the Secretary of State to be used for the purposes set out.

Mr. KEEFE. This takes money out of the Treasury.

Mr. KEE. The gentleman has asked a question. Let me answer it.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman says he does not know.

Mr. KEE. This amount is in a special fund of the Treasurer of the United States and it is lying there unused for any purpose.

Mr. KEEFE. That is absolutely not true and it is so shown by your own report. That fund has been paid into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Mr. KEE. It is in a special fund.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Now, coming back to the proposal here before us asking us to appropriate this large sum of money. Nobody knows what sort of literature will be purchased with it. In many instances communistic literature has been bought over here and sent over there, literature that is calculated to make the people of America appear ridiculous and asinine in the minds of the people of these European countries.

I think if we have convinced the people of Europe of one thing, it is this: We do not know what it is all about. We are the laughing stock of the people of Europe. The people of Europe are a great people. That is where our ancestors came from. They brought with them to America their literature, their philosophy, their religion, their civilization, and their love of liberty. Our ancestors came here to build a nation of their own. But, listen folks, one way

to completely destroy any nation is to destroy the solvency of that nation. This country is staggering under a debt of $260,000,000,000 and will go in the red this year an additional $10,000,000,000. We know now that you can put a healthy human being on the operating table and the surgeon can make an incision in the veins of such a person and take a quart of his or her blood and us it to strengthen another human being. But you cannot take a half a gallon of blood from such person and you cannot take that quart too often. Uncle Sam has been on the operating table now ever since we got into this last World War, and our financial resources, yes, the blood of our young people, has been dissipated and spilled all over the world. And, where do we stand today? If my friends over on this side of the House and over on that side mean what they say, when they talk in pontifical terms and in threatening predictions of the next world war, then we are in the shadow of the third world war. And, where are we headed? What are we going to fight it with? With whom are we going to fight and for what are we going to fight, and who, pray, will be on our side? Let us stop this wasting of our money. We are weakening the ability of our people to defend themselves.

I wish I knew what it is that is used on some of our distinguished fellow Members here that makes them want to give everything we have away. I have been told and I have read that the savages, who eat human flesh, compound sort of a drug out of a weed that grows in their country, and out of that they make a substance called hashish, and they feed it to their intended victim, so that he will be hale and hardy and have a strong body and a weak mind and get fat by the time when they butcher him for a feast. I wish we knew an antidote against what some people use that makes them lose all restraint and all good judgment when the spending of our money among foreign people is proposed. No one has been able to give us a sensible reason for throwing this $1,229,240.61 down a rat hole. This money belongs to the people of our country. We have no moral nor legal right to squander it. The folks back home wish us to save it for them and for their children. This I propose to do, and I hope a majority joins me in this effort for the folks back home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, any type of foreign-aid proposal has no difficulty in progressing to the floor of this House for the attention of this Congress. As all the other Members, I have several bills that I think are worthy of consideration, but the majority of this body is anxious to give all priority to the foreign-aid program.

I wonder how many of the 435 Members of this House promised reasonable assistance to the disabled of this country due to either age, physical incapacities, or mental deficiencies? In other words, I wonder how many of you assured the old people of your district a reasonable old-age pension? That sounds a little silly now since the campaigns, does it not? But it was not so silly, and you considered the promise necessary, during your campaigns. Now, honestly, how many of you actually promised those old people, the crippled, and the ones without the necessities of life—those without actually enough to eat and wear—that you were going to do something for them when you were elected to Congress? I venture to say that every one of the 435 Members would necessarily need answer my questions in the affirmative. I dare say that as many bills as there are Members of Congress have been introduced to provide reasonable assistance to the needy aged and incapacitated; but none of us are able to progress our proposals on behalf of our own people to the floor of this House because we need give priority to the wishes of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The action of this House conclusively indicates that the majority is more interested in sending money overseas than they are in taking care of our people. How many of you Members have promised to do something to curb the drastic floods in your areas? How many of you have promised to bring some Federal buildings to your districts? To curb the floodwaters and provide public buildings would be doing something for our own people. Appropriations for these purposes are easily cut. There has not been a post-office building constructed in this country in 12 years. We live up to none of our political promises on behalf of our people, but we find it easy to throw away billions of dollars upon foreign soil every day that this Congress meets.

The proponents of the legislation at hand say that this bill amounts to nothing because it only involves some one and one-quarter million dollars. No, to them it does not amount to a thing in the world. But I wonder how many of the old people in this country who actually do not have enough to eat and wear could be fed and clothed if we made this money available to them.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs is to be congratulated for writing the bill before us in such plain language that its purposes and intentions cannot be misunderstood. Most of these foreign-aid bills are so written that a thousand interpretations could be made upon every sentence. Then they are allowed to holler long and loud that the money is being used to feed and clothe the foreign underprivileged. Not more than 40 percent of the funds appropriated for foreign aid are used for the purposes indicated. Most of it is for the purpose of enhancing the wealth of big businesses of this country that are collaborating with foreign businesses, and a great amount is used for foreign political purposes. Not many of the foreign people have any idea of the sacrifices being made by our taxpayers, and less of them give a hoot. But the bill today is to provide libraries throughout the world and to assist the slackers in time of war—the so-called conscientious objectors. Now we are told that we should give the foreigners something to read and to assist all the slackers rather than take care of the needs of our own people.

Mr. Chairman, I know that as a freshman Member of Congress I am supposed to remain silent and just go along and agree with everything that the older Members believe should be done. Well, I have several thousand people to represent, and I fail to understand that my people were sending me up here as a "poll parrot." The vote of a majority of this Congress indicates that they think more of Europe than the United States. I cannot believe that such men are voting the dictates of their conscience.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If we helped the old people of this country we would be aiding the economy of this country instead of depleting it and destroying it, would we not?

Mr. TACKETT. That is absolutely right. In these 1-minute speeches every morning I always hear something said on behalf of our aged, crippled, and needy. What do we do about it? Nothing but allow the Committee on Foreign Affairs to sell some more propaganda on the foreign-aid program. Most of the time of this Congress is spent entertaining the thoughts of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The amount in this bill does not affect the Congress. If it were $15,000,000,000 it would pass without any delay.

Mr. TACKETT. It would pass a lot easier if it were $15,000,000,000 rather than one and one-quarter million; all of us know that. The more money called for in a foreign-aid proposal, the quicker it goes through this Congress. Perhaps this bill can be defeated because it asks for so little in comparison with the usual foreign-aid requests.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. We like the freshman Congressman from Arkansas, but do we understand he is complaining of the inactivity of the Eighty-first Democratic Congress in taking care of the people of this country? Some of us Republicans are complaining about it, too.

Mr. TACKETT. It is not unusual while I am addressing the House for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] to bring to my attention something about what the Democrats are doing or what the Republicans would like for them to do. That has no part in the present debate. The gentleman from Pennsylvania should be satisfied because his Foreign Affairs Committee receives most of the attention of this body.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I want to compliment the gentleman on his usual sound common sense, and say in support of

what he has said that never a day goes by that letters do not come to me from needy people in my district who are appealing for assistance, when at the same time we are giving it to them with a medicine dropper while we dump it abroad with a steam shovel.

Mr. TACKETT. That is right.

Just a few days ago, I pointed out several of the businesses in this country that had sponsored and promoted the Marshall plan; and I brought to your attention the billions of dollars in business that they had received for their efforts. Just yesterday another Member of this House pointed out the fact that this Congress was allowing foreign aiders to carry on propaganda in this country at an expenditure of several million dollars a year to sell our people upon the foreign-aid program. In other words, we are allowing huge sums of money to be used to encourage our people to allow us to send billions overseas to the detriment of our own people at a time when we are denying aid to the underprivileged in our districts. Any time a Member of this Congress seeks national aid for his people, the big businesses, magazines, and newspapers refer to the proposal as "pork barrel" and political pottage; but these same big businesses can never find anything wrong for foreign aid that is used to protect the foreign investments of the big businesses of this country.

Gentlemen, this is serious. Not enough Members of the House will even come over here to listen what is going on when a foreign-program bill is up because they know the bill is going to pass anyway, and they do not care to listen to it. There are not more than half the Members here right now. I tell you right now, this is a serious matter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Arkansas for the opinions he has expressed here today. It is high time for all of us to give consideration to the welfare of our own people.

Mr. TACKETT. Your conclusions are based upon ample proof. Why, just a minute ago the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee said that they had found approximately one and one-quarter million dollars some place not being used, and he thought it should be used to furnish these foreign libraries. They are looking for every loose nickel to send overseas.

Mr. GROSS. I did not know they had any money in the Treasury.

Mr. TACKETT. Well, it seems that they found some that is not being used; therefore, they want to get it in circulation overseas in order that the taxpayers will never have another opportunity to see it.

Mr. JENNINGS. If the gentleman will yield further, our good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] says that the statement that the money is in the Treasury is a mere chimera, that it is not there.

Mr. TACKETT. It does not make any difference whether it is there or not. If it is there they do not want to see it idle; and if it is not there the taxpayers will be called upon to get it there.

Mr. JENNINGS. Anybody knows that if it is there it is part of the common fund.

Mr. TACKETT. The Foreign Affairs Committee seems to believe that every loose penny should for some reason be spent by their committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Anybody knows that this million dollars plus what was put in the Treasury by these people has been spent long ago and that it is not there.

Mr. TACKETT. Of course, it is not there. This Congress is not going to allow anything to stay in the Treasury very long.

Mr. JENSEN. There is an I O U there. I want to say this about the gentleman who is addressing us and who has the floor, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT], that as one Member of Congress who has been here for 12 years I am neither an old Member nor a young Member, but what this country needs today more than anything else is more TACKETTS—more TACKETTS in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TACKETT. I do appreciate those remarks, Mr. JENSEN, and I hope that the people of my district have an opportunity to read or hear them.

Mr. JENSEN. Maybe they will.

Mr. TACKETT. As in my district, every Member of Congress has a great number of good, honest American citizens within their district who, for no fault of their own, do not have the necessities of life. Yet, during my tenure in office not one bill has been brought to the floor of this House in compliance with the political promises of all of us to give some relief to these good people.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Select Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, it was my privilege to look into our overseas administration in Europe and the Near East last fall. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] was also in that group. I want to say to you we looked very carefully into the entire foreign spending program, with particular emphasis upon our so-called USIS, or Information Service. We saw over there very elaborately stocked libraries. They were operating on a basis commensurate with anything which might exist in this country. We saw over there elaborate newspaper-reporting programs which would be comparable with any adequate newspaper in this country.

We saw there phases of information programs, including elaborate movie services. As was brought out by members of the Committee on Appropriations we are spending great sums over there. But listen carefully to this: Here is the point—and it was brought out in the testimony over there—that actually we are only reaching a very minor percentage of the people and that the people we are not reaching are the very people we should reach. Our program has been conceived over there on the theory that those countries operate like we do—that they have an elaborate press and radio system which can be used for propaganda purposes just as easily as ours. But that situation does not exist there. I say to you the entire program has been overemphasized and I think should be scaled down considerably. In my humble judgment a vote for this bill is just another vote for the useless expenditure of money abroad.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEFAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, that there is currently in the proposed budget, the amount of $4,190,842 for the division of libraries and institutes of the information and educational program of the Department of State?

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about it. In addition to that the committee should know something about our investment in these libraries. In addition they should know that we also participate in a $14,000,000 program through the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, the purpose of which is educational.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that there is nothing in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1951 to cover the cost of the authorization proposed in the pending legislation?

Mr. STEFAN. In spite of the fact that this money is in the Federal Treasury presently, there was absolutely nothing in the budget. I confirm what the chairman of my subcommittee said in that regard. This bill needs further study by a committee like ours, which deals with appropriations for international affairs, and that committee should have some knowledge so we can effect economy, efficiency, and eliminate duplication.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that if this pending legislation were to be passed by the House, an appropriation out of the general fund of the Treasury would be required in order to implement the program setting up these libraries?

Mr. STEFAN. I endeavored to say that. You are correct. It is a new request for a new appropriation for new funds that are now in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. And that at the present time when we have libraries in practically all the large cities of all the countries of the world?

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Someone questioned my statement about surplus potatoes and eggs which we have in this country, so I called up the Department of Agriculture and I find that the surplus Irish potatoes amounts to 50,000,000 bushels. The eggs are already dried, I will say to the gentleman from California [Mr.

WHITE], and they amount to 4,000,000,000 eggs. It took 4,000,000,000 eggs to produce the amount of dried eggs which the Department now has on hand.

Mr. STEFAN. What I have to say is in no way derogatory to CARE. I gave considerable assistance to the organization of that organization, which distributed so much food. But I call your attention to the fact that this is a matter that has something to do with that which we are already considering, and for which we are appropriating money.

Mr. RANKIN. Instead of sending them something to read, which the chances are they have already read, we had better send them something to eat when they are hungry.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the learned gentleman from Nebraska yield further?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The report on the pending bill says:

> On the other hand, the money will be released to the private agency at the discretion of the Secretary of State.

Do you not interpret this to mean that the State Department would have, in addition to the $4,190,842, which they ask for libraries and institutes in the coming fiscal year, the amount of $1,229,240.61 proposed to be expended by this legislation?

Mr. STEFAN. They would have an additional $1,229,240.61, in addition to what they are asking us to appropriate for library service abroad.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder if the gentleman knows whether this proposition was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and what their report was. If they did not submit it, why was it not submitted?

Mr. STEFAN. Would the chairman of the committee care to answer that question?

Mr. KEE. I would ask Dr. JUDD to answer that.

Mr. JUDD. To the best of my knowledge, all bills that are introduced are referred automatically to the departments that are involved. A letter or report comes back from that department, either approving or disapproving. It was testified last year that the Administration had no objection to it. The bill was reported out of committee last year. What this year's budget recommends I have not checked.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I feel we are doing something here which interferes with the orderly appropriations for libraries in foreign countries, for which we are already asked to appropriate over $4,000,000. I hope my motion will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, there are three comments I would like to make. First, I cannot believe that these funds should be considered as on a par with the regular funds in the Treasury of the United States raised by taxes for the expenses of government. Viewing it from the moral standpoint, they do not really belong to the Government of the United States. This fund is not money for the services rendered by those conscientious objectors who contributed literally millions of days of public work. For that service which ranged from building privies in Mississippi and Florida, to serving as attendants in mental hospitals and soil-conservation work, they did not receive anything from the people of the United States, but the people of the United States and many communities received great benefit. In fact, they paid for their own support while doing the work. That is, the Mennonites and the Quakers and the Brethren and other religious bodies to which they belonged furnished their clothes and food and lodging while they were doing such work.

In the case of those who were assigned to private employers, like dairy farmers, naturally the employer had to pay the going wage for what he received as labor. It did not, however, go to the men who did the work; it was sent to General Hershey, the Director of the Selective Service, who kept it in a separate account. In 1947 when nothing had been done about it, he naturally turned it over to the Treasury.

This money was earned by men who love their country, although unable because of religious scruples to bear arms, and they believe that the best use of the funds will be to help restock destroyed libraries in order to satisfy spiritual and intellectual hungers through this agency which heretofore has been primarily engaged in satisfying physical hunger.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Very briefly.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman refers to these conscientious objectors as men who love their country?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; certainly I do. I know no reason why conscientious objectors should be considered as loving their country less than any other citizens. That is the status given them in the laws of this land. As I said earlier when the gentleman was not here, these were men whose consciences—I do not agree with them myself, but I respect them—whose consciences did not permit them to go out and kill for their country, but they were willing to give their own lives for their country. A good many did. A group at the University of Minnesota voluntarily underwent a semistarvation experiment under strict controls. More was learned from that experiment over many, many months about what happens to persons when they are systematically deprived of this vitamin, that mineral, a particular fat, protein, carbohydrate, or other food element, than has ever been learned before about starvation and how to handle it. This fund, however, was set up by earnings of those objectors who worked for private employers. They ask nothing from it for themselves or their dependents. They believe that this is the best use that can be made of a fund in which they have at least a great moral equity.

The second thing I would like to say is that similar use of the money has once been authorized by the House. In the Eightieth Congress, by unanimous consent, we passed a bill to authorize use of these same funds, a bill introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]. In his bill the agency named to disburse the funds was the International Children's Emergency Fund. Since then the situation abroad has changed so that it is now thought that they can be used more advantageously through CARE. So this is not a new procedure. This money, in my judgment, does not rightly belong to the Government, in the sense that tax money from all the citizens does. Besides, it has been authorized by the House for similar purposes once before, in the Eightieth Congress.

The third thing is that in my opinion the money that is appropriated under the Voice of America program for setting up American libraries abroad, is not likely to do as much good dollar for dollar, as this program under CARE. From the standpoint of building understanding and good will abroad it has been my experience that funds administered by private agencies are infinitely more effective and are received with less suspicion than funds or programs administered by government agencies. For example, after the great earthquake in Japan in 1923 the Rockefeller Foundation provided money to rebuild the great library of the Imperial University in Tokyo. That one gift did more to build good will among the people of Japan toward our country and to strengthen the antimilitaristic elements in Japan than any other single thing that I know of. It was not supported by enough similar policies to prevent the militarists from eventually running wild with the country. But it showed the pattern which builds good will. Something happens to human beings when other human beings, out of nothing but charity and sympathy for people in need, voluntarily take that which they have earned, and ask that it be sent abroad, through a nongovernmental organization like CARE, as a gift from the American people to help them with one of their most urgent postwar needs. For these several reasons, I hope this motion to kill the bill will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEFAN) there were—ayes 92, noes 27.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KEE and Mr. STEFAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 127, noes 46.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5953) to authorize contributions to Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc., had directed him

to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. So that we may know what we are voting, is it a fact that a vote "yea" means that the enacting clause will be stricken, and a vote "nay" means that it will not be stricken and the bill will pass?

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion to strike out the enactment clause.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 265, nays 102, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—265

Abernethy	Dondero	Kelly, N. Y.
Addonizio	Donohue	Kennedy
Albert	Doughton	Kerr
Allen, Calif.	Durham	Kilburn
Andersen, H Carl	Eberharter	Kilday
	Elston	Kirwan
Andresen, August H.	Engel, Mich	Klein
	Evins	Kruse
Andrews	Fallon	Lane
Arends	Fellows	Lanham
Auchincloss	Fenton	Larcade
Barden	Fernandez	Latham
Baring	Fisher	LeCompte
Barrett, Wyo.	Flood	LeFevre
Bates, Mass.	Forand	Lemke
Beall	Ford	Lichtenwalter
Beckworth	Frazier	Lind
Bennett, Fla.	Gamble	Linehan
Bennett, Mich.	Garmatz	Lovre
Bentsen	Gary	Lucas
Bishop	Gathings	Lynch
Blatnik	Gavin	McCarthy
Bonner	Gillette	McConnell
Bosone	Golden	McCulloch
Bramblett	Goodwin	McDonough
Breen	Gorski	McGregor
Brehm	Gossett	McMillan, S C.
Brown, Ga	Graham	McMillen, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Granahan	McSweeney
Bryson	Grant	Mack, Wash.
Buchanan	Green	Madden
Buckley, Ill.	Gregory	Martin, Iowa
Buckley, N. Y	Gross	Martin, Mass.
Burdick	Hagen	Mason
Burton	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Meyer
Byrnes, Wis.		Michener
Camp	Hand	Miles
Canfield	Harden	Miller, Md.
Carlyle	Hardy	Miller, Nebr.
Case, S Dak.	Hare	Mills
Cavalcante	Harris	Morris
Chelf	Harrison	Moulder
Chesney	Hart	Multer
Chiperfield	Harvey	Murphy
Church	Hays, Ohio	Murray, Tenn.
Clemente	Hébert	Nelson
Clevenger	Heffernan	Nicholson
Cole, Kans.	Heller	Noland
Cole, N. Y.	Herlong	Norblad
Colmer	Hill	Norrell
Cooley	Hoeven	Norton
Cooper	Hoffman, Mich.	O'Brien, Ill.
Corbett	Holmes	O'Brien, Mich.
Cotton	Horan	O'Hara, Ill.
Cox	Hull	O'Hara, Minn.
Crawford	Jenison	O'Konski
Crook	Jenkins	O'Toole
Curtis	Jennings	Passman
Dague	Jensen	Patten
Davies, N. Y.	Johnson	Patterson
Davis, Ga.	Jonas	Pfeiffer, William L.
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Ala.	
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Mo.	Philbin
Delaney	Jones, N. C.	Phillips, Calif.
Denton	Kearney	Phillips, Tenn.
D'Ewart	Kearns	Pickett
Dollinger	Keating	Plumley
Dolliver	Keefe	Potter
Poulson	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Preston	Short	Wagner
Quinn	Sikes	Weichel
Rankin	Simpson, Ill.	Welch
Reed, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.	Werdel
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Kans.	Wheeler
Rees	Smith, Va.	White, Calif.
Rich	Smith, Wis.	Whitten
Richlman	Stanley	Whittington
Rivers	Stefan	Widnall
Rodino	Stigler	Wigglesworth
Rogers, Fla.	Sutton	Williams
Rogers, Mass.	Taber	Willis
Rooney	Tackett	Wilson, Ind.
Sadlak	Talle	Wilson, Okla.
St. George	Tauriello	Winstead
Sanborn	Thomas	Withrow
Sasscer	Thompson	Wolcott
Saylor	Van Zandt	Wood
Scrivner	Velde	Woodruff
Secrest	Vinson	Young
Shafer	Vursell	

NAYS—102

Angell	Holifield	Patman
Aspinall	Hope	Perkins
Bailey	Howell	Peterson
Bates, Ky.	Huber	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Battle	Irving	
Biemiller	Jackson, Wash	Polk
Bolton, Ohio	Jacobs	Powell
Burke	James	Price
Burleson	Javits	Priest
Burnside	Judd	Rabaut
Byrne, N. Y	Karst	Rains
Carnahan	Karsten	Ramsay
Case, N. J.	Kee	Rhodes
Celler	Kelley, Pa.	Ribicoff
Christopher	Keogh	Richards
Combs	King	Scott, Hugh D, Jr
Crosser	Lodge	
Cunningham	McCormack	Sims
Deane	McGuire	Spence
DeGraffenried	McKinnon	Staggers
Dingell	Mack, Ill.	Steed
Doyle	Magee	Sullivan
Elliott	Mahon	Thornberry
Engle Calif	Mansfield	Tollefson
Feighan	Marsalis	Trimble
Fulton	Marshall	Underwood
Gordon	Merrow	Vorys
Granger	Miller, Calif.	Walsh
Gwinn	Mitchell	Walter
Hale	Monroney	Wickersham
Halleck	Morgan	Wier
Havenner	Murdock	Wolverton
Hays, Ark.	Nixon	Worley
Heselton	O'Neill	Yates
Hobbs	O'Sullivan	

NOT VOTING—65

Abbitt	Ellsworth	Murray, Wis.
Allen, Ill.	Fogarty	Pace
Allen, La.	Fugate	Poage
Anderson, Calif.	Furcolo	Redden
Barrett, Pa.	Gilmer	Regan
Blackney	Gore	Roosevelt
Boggs, Del.	Hall, Leonard W	Sabath
Boggs, La.		Sadowski
Bolling	Hedrick	Scott, Hardie
Bolton, Md	Herter	Scudder
Boykin	Hinshaw	Shelley
Brooks	Hoffman, Ill.	Smathers
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Calif.	Smith, Ohio
Cannon	Kean	Stockman
Carroll	Kunkel	Taylor
Chatham	Lesinski	Teague
Chudoff	Lyle	Towe
Coudert	McGrath	Whitaker
Davenport	Macy	White, Idaho
Dawson	Marcantonio	Wilson, Tex.
Douglas	Morrison	Woodhouse
Eaton	Morton	Zablocki

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Wilson of Texas with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Redden with Mr. Towe.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Kean.

Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Herter.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Regan with Mr. Coudert.

Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Bolton of Maryland with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Cannon with Mr. Macy.

Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Scudder.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Teague with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Smathers with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. PHILBIN and Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. HOBBS, DEGRAFFENRIED, ANGELL, and JAMES changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GARY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on February 22, 1950, entitled "The Case for ECA."

DISPENSING WITH FURTHER CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of committees under the Calendar Wednesday rule today be dispensed with.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that further call of the committees under the Calendar Wednesday rule today be dispensed with.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 219, noes 6.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the motion was agreed to.

REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill H. R. 5604, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4846) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4846, with Mr. THOMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: Page 15, line 25, strike out the words "after consultation with" and insert "with the approval of."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I read this amendment. On page 15, line 25, it says:

The authority to cooperate in international scientific research activities as provided in subsection (a) of this section, shall be exercised only after consultation with the Secretary of State.

My amendment would provide that it shall be exercised only after the agreement or the approval of the Secretary of State. As it is set up we can have a disagreement with the Secretary and the course followed will be out of line with the foreign policy of our country.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment which I ask to be read at this time, and I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 20, line 16, strike out the words "after consultation with" and insert "with the approval of."

Mr. FULTON. On page 20, line 15, under subsection (k) it now reads:

The executive committee, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property (having military significance) in connection with scientific research under this act.

My amendment would make it a requirement that the regulations and procedures shall have the approval of the Secretary of Defense. The provision will read, with my amendment, that the executive committee with the approval of the Secretary of Defense shall establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property—having military significance—in connection with scientific research under this act.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say that so far as I am concerned, and I believe so far as the committee is concerned, certainly on this side, we accept both of the gentleman's amendments.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, speaking for the members of the committee on this side, I will say that we are not opposed to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: On page 3, strike out lines 15 to 19, inclusive.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph authorizes the Foundation to maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways provide a central clearing house for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this is the very thing that the National Academy of Sciences has been doing since 1863. One of the duties imposed upon the National Academy of Sciences in its charter, which was granted in 1863, is to respond to requests of any department of Government, to furnish to that department scientific assistance and the names of the scientists who may be of assistance to the Government. They have kept that up for years and years.

It should be remembered that the National Academy of Sciences is not an arm of the Government. When they make up a list of available scientists no influence of Government is felt. To my mind, there is an exceedingly important difference between the present custom under the National Academy of Sciences and the one proposed here, because this National Science Foundation is to be an arm and part of the Government itself and, clothed with that power, the National Science Foundation can make up its own list of eligible scientists and that will become the Government's list.

That, I think, Mr. Chairman, is a power which should not be placed in the hands of a governmental authority. It should be left in the hands of the National Academy of Sciences, which is not a branch or arm of the Government but is an independent organization unswayed by politics or governmental policies.

It is for that reason that I move to strike out that paragraph and allow the present machinery to work as it has been working for years.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Again, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I have the deepest regard and highest respect for the gentleman who has offered this amendment. It so happens that within the hour I have had a telephone conversation with Dr. Merriam E. Trytten, who is director of the office of scientific personnel, National Research Council. He asked me if I would explain to the Members the situation that exists now.

It is a fact that from 1863, when they initiated this effort, they did a pretty good job, but he told me that approximately 3 years ago because of lack of funds and lack of personnel they had to limit themselves to maintaining a register only from the Ph. D. level upward, that that is entirely unsatisfactory, and that they have no information about the existence or qualifications of our younger scientists, who are the ones that we are after all trying to locate and assist.

He asked me to say to you that the council not only does not oppose this provision, but that it hopes it will be kept in this bill. He says we will then have a working list which will be available not only to the Government but to industry, to private research institutions, as well as to our universities and colleges. I assure you that I believe he is giving us excellent advice.

I wish he had called the gentleman from New York. I can assure the gentleman I am giving the exact message that he gave to us. I hope you maintain this list for our own security.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. In establishing this list and by being left off of it, will it more or less be a blacklisting of any individual or would it have any effect on his standing in the scientific community?

Mr. HESELTON. I do not understand there has been any occasion in the past where that has happened while it was in active use. I cannot conceive that any scientist who is qualified would be omitted from this list. The purpose of the listing is so that those who wish to get in touch with qualified scientists will know where they are and will be able to reach them. That is the only purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I also want to call your attention to some dangerous features in this bill. I have read with interest the hearings and I have listened for two days to various statements on the bill. The distinguished majority leader gave his splendid address on the bill, and I find in reading the address in the RECORD on page 2416, third column, third paragraph, he said:

Our scientific world is without national leadership.

My colleagues, I was under the impression that we in the United States had made great progress in scientific and technical leadership. I was under the impression that we led the rest of the world in probing the unknown, for after all, research is nothing more than probing the unknown—asking questions of nature and finding the answers. We have outstripped the rest of the world. We built the atomic bomb. We have made tremendous progress in all fields.

I want to speak specifically about the progress we have made in the medical field and make a comparison with what I saw in Germany and Hungary in the early twenties, and then some 15 years later.

You know those countries adopted socialized medicine. I went over there for some postgraduate work in 1927. It was splendid. Then as the cold, clammy hand of government began to push down upon the scientists and technical men in Germany, scientific training went out the window. I know what happened there because when I went back in the late thirties there was no more good technical and scientific training being given in Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

I do endorse the principles of the measure, but there seems to be many loopholes in the purchase of land, the possibilities of leaks of secrets to foreign

countries, the huge political agency duplicating what is already being done.

We are spending something over a billion dollars in a number of research programs in the United States. Our universities and private groups all over the United States—free men with free minds have made progress which we ought to hold up and point to with pride. Free enterprise unfettered by government regulations have produced tools of production which has made this ratio great. The thing that worries me is when you get the Federal Government in this picture subsidizing universities and scholarships and when the Federal Government reaches out and takes the taxpayers' dollars away from him, in the natural course of events when that dollar is handed back, it is with the iron fist of the dictator. It has always been so and it is so today, and it could be so under this bill. Therefore, I feel we ought to leave our free men with free minds with as little government regulation as possible to let them proceed in developing the scientific and technical knowledge that we have in the world. Great progress has been made. Greater progress has been made in the treatment of medical problems than in any other nation. Frankly I have been concerned how long we as a people, if we continue on the road toward nationalization, step by step, of every little industry that we have, how long are we, as a free people, going to be able to lead our lives as we see fit, under the moderate restraints of the Constitution, or are we going to adopt that theory which says that the Government after all, knows best and will take care of us from the cradle to the grave?

We must leave scientific minds free to bring further blessings to mankind. If minds are shackled by regulations then progress in science stops.

I hope the legislation is amended so I can support what seems to be a step in the right direction—without amendments to protect our scientific progress—I will vote against the measure.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on the pending amendment and amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak briefly for the committee members on this side of the aisle in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. We agree heartily with the expressions of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]. We believe he has brought important information to the committee in regard to the attitude of the National Academy of Science on the maintenance of an official scientific roster.

In addition to that, we would like to call attention to the fact that there is already in existence a Government roster of scientific personnel, a roster that was started during the war by OSRD and is now being continued by the United States Employment Service, which is a part of the Department of Labor.

Section (i) on page 19 transfers that roster from the Department of Labor to the National Science Foundation. I think that is an eminently desirable provision. We hope it will prevail and that the power granted the National Science Foundation on page 3 will be continued.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I may say to the gentleman it is a surprise to me to hear the announcement that the National Academy of Science cannot afford to do this work. I had heard to the contrary from other members of that organization. But assuming that that statement is correct, and the National Academy of Science has not enough money to supply a complete list, would it not be within the power of this proposed Foundation to give it a little money and to still keep the formation of this list out of Government hands?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I would assume that the National Science Foundation, which will have on its board of directors eminent scientists from all parts of the country, would certainly want to cooperate in every reasonable, feasible manner with the National Academy of Science. I think such will be the case. But I repeat, as I said a moment ago, there is already in existence a Government roster. It is very desirable that that roster be transferred to the National Science Foundation and that the National Science Foundation use its good judgment in maintaining the proper roster in the future, to make sure that the United States has a complete catalog of available scientific personnel in the country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENNINGS) there were—ayes 44, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 12, line 18, after the word "and" insert ", with approval of the Secretary of Defense."

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman from South Dakota that we discussed this very briefly in an interchange yesterday, both the gentlemen from California [Mr. HINSHAW] and I. I am willing to accept the amendment, and I believe the other side of the Committee is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may propound a question and proceed for a minute or two if the gentleman will let me use some of his time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would be glad to have the gentleman use some of my time but I should like to have my amendment voted upon before I lose the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. When the gentleman yields the floor the vote will be taken.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I prefer not to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and do so for the purpose not of detaining the Committee unduly, but to ask if it would not be well for the proponents of this bill to describe what is in the mind of the committee or what this bill contemplates in the paragraph beginning in line 13 of page 12, and reading:

The Foundation is authorized to enter into contracts or other arrangements or modifications thereof, for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, of such basic scientific-research activities and such scientific-research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense.

It goes on to state:

Such contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, may be entered into without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes—

And I understand that this last section 3709 refers to the matter of competitive bidding.

What is the purpose of this section in that it authorizes American money, as I read it, to be expended with foreign governments under contract or by individuals of the United States?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I may say that the purpose of this particular provision is to authorize the Foundation, if such circumstances should develop, to enter into negotiations and contracts with a foreign nation for certain work that might be highly restrictive in nature and secret. That, frankly, is the purpose of that provision in the bill. It is the sort of thing that we do not usually discuss too vocally, but I do not mind saying that that is the purpose of the language in the bill, that should the circumstance require it an agreement may be entered into with a foreign nation to carry on some research of a restricted nature.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But this goes a great deal further than that and provides that an individual in the United States may enter into a contract with a foreign government. It is a rather extraordinary provision, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PRIEST. Only after approval by the Secretary of State. I believe the gentleman will find restrictive language on page 15 beginning in line 20:

(b) (1) The authority to enter into contracts or other arrangements with organizations or individuals in foreign countries and with agencies of foreign countries, as provided in section 11 (c), and the authority

to cooperate in international scientific research activities as provided in subsection (a) of this section, shall be exercised only after consultation—

And I believe we have amended that to read "approval"—

with the approval of the Secretary of State.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, would not the gentleman think it wise to strike out the word "individuals"?

Mr. PRIEST. The committee did not so think. The chairman of the subcommittee does not so believe in view of the purpose of the language in the bill. I certainly respect a great deal the opinion of the gentleman from New York, but on this particular point I feel that the language in the bill is proper and should remain as it is.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In my humble opinion, we are advancing on risky ground:

Any organization or any individual of the United States once approved by the Foundation may enter into a contract with a foreign government.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Under the point 4 program, which was introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE], I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question: There is section 5 which states:

The President is authorized to plan, undertake, administer, and execute bilateral technical cooperation programs carried on by any United States Government agency, and in so doing to—

(a) Coordinate and direct existing and new technical operation programs.

In relation to the question of the gentleman from New York, does not this very act cut across that provision in the point 4 program?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, in a speech buried in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A1010, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] made certain statements which have such importance as a lesson for the rest of us and for the country that I call them to the attention of the House. He spoke of "Yiddish Communism versus Christian Civilization" and—I continue to quote:

Our Yiddish Solicitor General has taken it upon himself to go into the Supreme Court and misrepresent the American people by filing a brief in the Henderson case, for the purpose of trying to wipe out all segregation, and destroy our separate schools throughout the country.

He continued:

I understand that every member of the Politburo around Stalin is either Yiddish or married to one, and that includes Stalin himself.

The Russian desk of the State Department informs me that of the 12 members of the Politburo, only 1 is Jewish. He is Kaganovich. The State Department informs me that it is impossible for them to find out anything about the wives of the members, as they do not mix socially. However, they said, there is a rumor—unproven—that Stalin's third wife is Kaganovich's sister.

I call this matter to the House's attention because whether or not the rules would permit the striking out of such material defaming the people of a great faith I do not intend to ask that they be stricken. On the contrary, I believe they should remain in the RECORD as a permanent memorial on two points, critical to the national security of our country about which this same gentleman so often speaks, but which it is my conviction he most seriously jeopardizes. This is first—that it can happen here—that our constitutional democracy is not free from the dangerous propaganda technique, popularized by Hitler, Goebbels, and Stalin, of the sweeping lie constantly reiterated which in a moment of a weakness or national frustration our people might seize on to overturn all the gains of constitutionalism and human decency which have endured so magnificently throughout the life of our Nation and which we are determined to preserve forever.

My second reason for speaking is that I have noted that when the same gentleman who uttered these words utters others of the same character, Members often laugh with indulgence or amusement as if to say, "Isn't that picturesque." It is high time we realized the grim realities involved and the awful hurt that can be inflicted by these words upon a great body of fine American citizens who have contributed so enormously—and I shall not repeat the history of the achievements of Americans of the Jewish faith from Haym Salomon to David Lilienthal as practically every one of the Members knows of them not only from history but from his personal experience—to our national life. I believe rather that these words should remain of record as a constant memorial to the danger which can threaten our essential freedom and domestic peace generally. When we see hatred in action it is not a laughing matter.

I believe the Members will know that it is a very trying ordeal for me to take the floor under circumstances such as these. It would be so much easier to say nothing and to justify it by the unwillingness to repeat the charges in the course of refuting them. But this would be far more a disservice to our country than to Americans of Jewish faith. Let me make it crystal clear that the surest guaranty of the rights of all minorities in our country is the very white Christian majority which the gentleman from Mississippi refers to so often, and that the minorities have complete and permanent faith in the devotion to the great ideals of the constitution of this majority. For Americans of my faith that seek fellowship and brotherhood, recognize that ours is the greatest example of government where all citizens have the capability of equality of opportunity and rights of any in recorded history, and are convinced that the noblest and most successful development of our country is the greatest future there can be for them.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I agree completely with the statements the gentleman has made. I am sure that every Member of this House, other than the gentleman from Mississippi, will agree also. And I think it terribly important that the country as a whole and the world should know that in this sad and sordid departure the gentleman from Mississippi stands alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I heartily join with the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in his sincere plea for brotherhood and fellowship among people of all faiths. No group should be separated from the rest of Americans because of race, creed, or color The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] properly emphasize what we all know to be true: That benefit to our country is at once the benefit to all of our people, including every minority.

From my own knowledge, the Jewish people of our country have made their full contribution to the best phases of our national development, our cultural heritage, and our security and defense.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, once again the gentleman from New York has raised a very pertinent question as to the phraseology and the meaning of the section which he discussed. He wanted to know and I think all Members have a right to know why we are providing for doing business in other countries. I am sure I am not disclosing any security information when I read to you from volume V of the President's Scientific Research Board report dated October 18, 1947, as follows:

TRAVELING FELLOWSHIPS

Several foundations and the United States Department of State have programs of traveling fellowships under which scholars from this country and abroad are sent to other countries for observation and study. The holders of traveling fellowships appropriately spend most of their time visiting research institutions and talking with leading investigators. They seldom spend more than a very short time in investigation in a single laboratory. The promotion of international understanding and the exchange of scientific information are as important as the specific training obtained under such fellowships.

That, in a general way, explains what the Committee is trying to get at. But, more particularly, let me read to you what is reported with reference to the Navy Department:

NAVAL MEDICAL RESEARCH UNIT NO. 8 (CAIRO, EGYPT)

This unit passed to the Navy from the United States Typhus Commission in January 1946. It is engaged in research in local medical problems and diseases of military im-

portance in the Middle East, Africa, Europe, and India. The present program consists of (a) comparative studies of the bacteriology, biochemistry, and physiology of febrile diseases, and (b) preventive medicine studies of the entomology, epidemiology, and mamology of the diseases of the Middle East, Africa, Europe, and India. Specific projects are in collaboration with the Egyptian Government, the United States Public Health Service, the War Department, and Department of Agriculture.

I wish I had had the time to locate other illustrations while the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] was speaking, but I think that may offer at least two specific illustrations of what we want to provide for.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHURCH: On page 2, line 18, after "contracts" strike out "or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance)" ending on line 19.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, the obvious purpose of this amendment is to narrow the authority of the National Science Foundation proposed to be established by this bill.

I call your attention to the broad powers which the Foundation will have under subsection (3) of section 3 (a). The authority is virtually unlimited. Under the terms of this subsection the Foundation can enter into any kind of an arrangement it wishes, by contract, by loans, or even by out-and-out grants of money for scientific research.

There is no limitation as to the amount of money that may be expended by way of loans or by way of contract commitments. Nor is there any limitation as to the kind of research. The only limitation is that the research be "in connection with matters relating to the national defense."

But, Mr. Chairman, what is a matter relating to national defense? That can mean almost anything. It can mean food. It can mean clothing. It can mean medicine. At this very moment our armed services have research contracts with various institutions in these fields which, to the average layman, and I think to most of us, are far removed from national defense.

Research in connection with an improved gun is a matter relating to national defense. No one can question that. But the armed services do not stop there. They point out that the tractor or carriage is essential for the mobility and effectiveness of the gun. Accordingly, they justify Federal assistance for research in this field. As the carriage is important to the gun, the wheels are important to the carriage. Accordingly, they justify Federal expenditures for research in how to improve the wheels as a matter relating to national defense, as well as research on how to improve the axles. And what about the grease or oil that lubricates the axle wheel?

The point I seek to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, is that there is no limitation whatever in what constitutes a matter relating to national defense. The Foundation would have the authority to make unlimited expenditures, if not by direct grants, at least in the form of loans, in practically every field of endeavor. Businesses could be practically set up to compete with existing businesses.

I have no objection whatever to the Federal Government entering into experimental contracts, such as were entered into during the war, for the production of a better submarine or perhaps a better bombsight. Those are contracts for products which have no commercial market. They are for something which industry does not normally produce.

But I strenuously object to giving this new Government agency this broad authority to enter into any kind of an arrangement it may wish for research in unlimited fields. This is something which is now being well done by business itself.

In 1947 industry itself spent around $10,000,000 on basic research, and the amount spent on applied research, in finding new products or improved ones, it has spent many, many times that amount. The high standard of living you and I enjoy is the result of this free competitive enterprise system. We now propose by this bill to compel industry to discontinue its own efforts and look to the Federal Government.

The fundamental question which this bill raises is whether American science must become dependent upon a Government agency for its support, or whether it can look to support from private funds. It is my deep conviction that American science can best be advanced by encouraging through reduced taxes the expenditures of funds on research than by establishing another Government agency to distribute money collected from the people in taxes.

It must be recognized that any organization that has the authority to expend money, to give or withhold, can exercise considerable control over the activities of the individuals or organizations who receive the benefit or the grant or loan. It must also be recognized that it is human nature for people to avoid spending money for some purpose if it can get the Government to do it. And that is particularly true when the available funds in the hands of the people are limited by the burden of taxes.

I hope my amendment will be adopted. It will at least put some limitation on what can be done and how much can be spent under the guise of national defense. It will at least confine the authority to contractual arrangements rather than allowing the Foundation to make loans or some other arrangements, without limitation as to the amount and purpose, and thereby place an additional burden on the people who will have to bear the cost of all this.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. No doubt the gentleman from Illinois is familiar with the section of the bill which provides for a board of 24 members. Does the gentleman understand that the 24 members are to be eminently qualified, scholarly, learned, and distinguished scientists? If they are, then are they working for $25 a day and expenses? Does the gentleman know any scientist of any eminence and distinction, any learned and scholarly scientist who can afford to work for $25 a day?

Mr. CHURCH. I agree with the gentleman. I do not. Let me say that the scientists in America become eminent because they are free from this kind of control by a foundation or control by the Government.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Is the gentleman familiar with that part of the bill which says that of the 24, 9 shall constitute an executive committee and that the executive committee shall be the means through which business shall be done. Will not that stamp the other 15 as mere stuffed shirts and strawmen under that sort of a set-up?

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. If this amendment is adopted will the gentleman vote for this measure?

Mr. CHURCH. No, I want to be perfectly frank, because there are other broad provisions in the bill that the gentleman from New York and others have called attention to, under which this Foundation can compete with industries in your district under contracts without consideration. The bill goes too far in many of its provisions.

Mr. WAGNER. Is that the only objection the gentleman has to the measure?

Mr. CHURCH. Oh, no. There are a number of objections which have been pointed out in the debate.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman will recognize that the word "basic" is omitted only in connection with research for the national defense, at the request and approval of the Secretary of Defense. We feel that if this country faces danger we should utilize every research agency in the country to protect it. It applies only in that case and with that restriction. These are basic only except as it relates to national defense.

Mr. CHURCH. Then how far will you go in the matter relating to national defense? Does not food have to do with that? Does not medicine have to do with that? Does not clothing have to do with that? Does not almost every product that business is struggling to make under the competitive system have to do with or in some measure relate to national defense? You are going to give

some bureaucracy the power to determine it and determine it in peacetime.

Mr. PRIEST. In these far-flung battlefields around the world I am ready to say that everything relates to that which this Nation has.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on the Church amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I object to that.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Church amendment close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment in order that I may have an opportunity to bring to the attention of the committee some facts that seem to me to have been entirely overlooked during this debate.

As far as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is concerned, I do not consider it of sufficient importance to even take the time to reply to the argument he has made.

In the first place, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that yesterday and today Members of this House, with sincerity, have stood in the well of this House and offered amendments. The bill now before us is almost word for word the same as the several other bills that have been before the House for the last 4 years on the same subject. Never once have I heard any Member who is now offering amendments come before the committee and give our committee the benefit of his thought when the committee was seeking to draw legislation that would be appropriate and effective.

I call attention to the fact that this bill is not a partisan bill; this bill is the same in character, practically word for word—and I hope my friends on the left of the aisle will realize what I am saying—as the bill that I introduced, the committee approved and the House passed in the Eightieth Congress. That was the Republican Congress. It was also passed by a Republican Senate. If the bill was good then it is good now. It was vetoed by the President for reasons that he considered sufficient and which at the time I would have been perfectly willing to accede to in order that we might have the legislation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I will yield only for a brief question; my time is very limited.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It seems to me that the situation was different in the Eightieth Congress than it is today. In the Eightieth Congress we balanced the budget, paid off on the national debt, left a surplus, and reduced taxes. Now we will have a deficit in the Eighty-first Congress of nearly $10,000,000,000. It occurs to me that the situation is entirely changed. This may be a very good project but it is a new project; and if we are going to balance the budget again we will have to stop spending money and wait until the country can afford it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I wish that at some time or other some of these individuals who come before the House and make arguments such as has just been made would realize the inconsistency of those arguments There are times, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot decide a question just on the basis of the dollars and cents involved; there are times when we must recognize that there are some things more valuable than dollars and cents. This bill contains a limitation of appropriation of $500,000 this year and at no time to exceed $15,000,000. That is a small amount to pay for the security and helpfulness to our citizens that this bill will provide.

I appreciate the sincerity of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], but I am not in accord with application of the principles he mentions to this particular bill This bill is a necessity in this scientific age. As I have previously said there are times when existing circumstances justify us in expenditures for worth-while programs. I believe this to be such. I am sorry the gentleman, for whose sincerity I have the greatest respect, does not agree with me.

There is no more outstanding advocate of economy and efficiency in Government than former President Hoover, the head of the Commission that so recently made a report to us on reorganization of executive departments. Before reading the Hoover Committee's report let me say that the policy statement of the Republican Party adopted just a few days ago had this to say:

> The achievement of efficiency and economy in Government, especially by adoption of measures along the lines of the Hoover Report

What did the Hoover report have to say about the necessity for an organization in Government such as this bill provides for a National Science Foundation? On pages 49 and 50 of the Hoover report, and I ask unanimous consent to insert the entire portion of the report in my remarks, it is said:

> The Federal Government is now engaged in a wide range of research activities involving tremendous expenditures of funds

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—I do not understand the situation. I wonder why the gentleman on the other side a while ago called attention to the rule limiting the time? I am not attempting to limit the gentleman's time; I hope he gets his time.

Mr. WOLVERTON. This House was liberal enough to give the gentleman from Illinois four additional minutes to speak on an inconsequential amendment, and it would seem to me that the ranking Republican member of the committee ought to have at least two additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman understands I am not objecting but I am calling their attention to an inconsistency.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman referred to my inconsequential amendment. Does the gentleman believe in my sincerity?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I have absolute confidence in the gentleman's sincerity and honesty of purpose even though I do not agree with his judgment in this particular instance. There is no Member of the House for whose sincerity I have a higher regard.

Mr. CHURCH. Nor do I agree with the gentleman's

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, finishing the reading of the report of the Hoover Commission, it goes on to say:

> The Federal Government is now engaged in a wide range of research activities involving tremendous expenditures of funds. In 1947, total Federal expenditures for research excluding atomic energy amounted to $625,000,000 This Commission, while recognizing that effective planning and coordination of research undertaken is of major importance, has not endeavored to make an independent study of organization for research in the Federal Government. This decision was based primarily on a realization that the main aspect of the problem had been recently investigated and reported by the President's Scientific Research Board Nevertheless, the Commission does wish to call attention to the major issues in this field, pointing out progress which has already been achieved and further steps that should be taken
>
> The report of the Scientific Research Board makes it plain that a satisfactory correlated research program for the National Government has not yet been realized. To be effective, an organization which will facilitate the development of research policy for the Government as a whole must have roots in each department with major responsibilities. Every Federal agency with an extensive research program should have a staff organization reporting to the agency head for developing general research policy. A number of such staff groups are now in operation. These groups include the Agricultural Research Administration, the Office of Naval Research, the Office of Research Planning, and Public Health Service, and Research and Development Division of the Department of the Army's General Staff.
>
> While the authority, responsibility, and organizational status of these groups vary widely, they do have a number of common basic characteristics Each is responsible to the agency head, each maintains records of research projects conducted by all units of the agency served, each advises the agency head on such matters of research policy as the fields of which research should be expanded or contracted and whether research should be undertaken directly by the Federal Government or by non-Federal agencies under a grant of contract, and similar matters.
>
> Effort along these lines within individual agencies is not enough. There is need for an organization to facilitate the development of research policy for the Federal Government as a whole. That was recognized in a report of the President's Scientific Research Board. That Board recommended as a first

step the establishment of an interdepartmental committee on scientific research and development. Such a committee was created by Executive order in December of 1947. It was directed to further the most effective administration of scientific research and development activities in the Federal Government and was authorized to submit recommendations on research policy and administration direct to the President.

The full potentialities of this committee have not been realized, since its members have not as yet attacked major problems of research policy for the Federal Government as a whole. This may be due in part to lack of staff and funds. An interdepartmental committee working alone and without staff is seriously limited in achieving adequate coordination and developing over-all plans to completion. This points to the need for a National Science Foundation. The major functions of such a Foundation should be (a) to examine the total scientific research efforts of the Nation, to assess the proper role of the Federal Government in this effort, to evaluate the division of research effort among the scientific disciplines and among fields of applied research, and to evaluate the key factors that impede the development of an effective national research effort. Based upon its investigation, it should advise the President as to the measures necessary to establish a sound scientific research program for the Nation

In addition, the Foundation should be given appropriations for the support of basic research and for research fellowships in fields not adequately covered by the research grants and fellowships of other Federal Government agencies. The Foundation might administer the grant and fellowship program for which it has received funds, or delegate administration to other Federal agencies

In addition, it should advise the President as to the proper balance among research grants and fellowship programs supported by appropriations given to other Federal agencies, and as to major policies that should govern the administration of these programs

The National Science Foundation should consider most carefully the manner in which the national policies with respect to scientific research are related to broader questions of educational policy At present, grants for research purposes are being made on a hit-and-miss basis, making the award of research grants in effect a new form of patronage. The awarding of research grants must be put on a more systematic basis, with due recognition given to their impact on the educational programs of our higher institutions of learning.

Mr. Chairman, that is from the Hoover Commission report. In my opinion it is sound. We should adopt the bill now before us. It will carry out the objectives set forth in the Hoover Commission Report. I believe it will eventually save money. Certainly, I hope so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Church amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment.

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a preferential motion now pending.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make this motion, not that I hope it will be adopted, but for two reasons, first, because I am opposed to the bill and because I want the time. It has been impossible to obtain recognition to offer an amendment. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] seemed to be quite exercised because I called attention to the inconsistency of the gentleman, the very fine, distinguished, lovable, and admirable gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] who is in charge of the debate, in objecting a moment ago to some extensions of time, calling for the enforcement of the rule which had been adopted limiting debate. But when the same question just came up while the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] was speaking and the argument was along the line he approved he did not call attention to the fact debate had been limited. All I was trying to do was to call attention to the inconsistency. I was not objecting to the extension of time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. I do not care if the gentleman talks for an hour. I would listen to him, but I wanted to point to this inconsistency on the majority side. When you talk so much about civil rights, equal privileges, and all that, acts should be compared with words. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] was talking about some of us on the Republican side who did not go along with the platform on FEPC. To me a platform is nothing more or less than a collection of promises to garner votes. As far as I can remember back, no platform has ever been adhered to when it came in conflict with party policy after the election. So, that argument about what is in the Republican national platform does not mean too much to me. Mr. Roosevelt was reelected three times after he repudiated the platform on which he was first elected. That platform promised a 25 percent reduction in Federal expenditures. In 15 years no attempt was ever made to keep that promise.

Another thing, every day we hear that we must do something, we must create a new agency, a new commission, we must spend some more money. What this country needs is relief from excessive Government expenditures and new socialistic legislation. I have been accused many times of being an obstructionist, being against everything, just because I voted against an appropriation or some unsound unneeded legislation. Bless your hearts. When I voted against an appropriation I was voting for economy and efficiency; I was trying to make the administration live within the income that it has or can get. The Government should do the same thing we all try to do—spend no more than we earn. I recall many, many things that we have done as Republicans which have proved to be wrong. I recall this bipartisan foreign policy that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] voted for all along. Now almost everyone admits that it has been a rank failure. If in all the world we have a nation which is friendly—which will not desert us at the first opportunity when it is to its advantage, I cannot name it. I recall the Marshall plan. We voted millions, yes, billions of dollars for foreign aid, and where are we? Have we the good will of any nation in the world? No; we have not. I recall that a Member over in the other body, the head of the great Foreign Affairs Committee over there, is quoted this morning as saying he has gone along with ECA; it was wonderful to spend billions of dollars, but if England continued to discriminate against Texas oil, that was something else again; none of that for Texas or for him. I recall that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] on the Committee on Labor, was dead against the Taft-Hartley Act; he wanted none of it.

The gentleman not so very long ago wanted the Tart-Hartley Act used down in his district so that his constituents could get some coal down there; oh, yes, that was a different story when his people were in need of coal. On page 3, of this bill, down at the bottom, subsection 5, it is provided that this scientific information shall be gathered and disseminated to—and mark this—foreign nations. On the front page of the paper this afternoon is a statement that this scientist, Dr. Fuchs, over there in London pled guilty, and he got 14 years. For doing what? Giving those fellows scientific information. Now, we pave the way to appropriate several millions of dollars, maybe more, to collect this information, and pass it along. Where is the good sense in that? When the next scientist peddles information to the enemy will he plead the passage of this in bar if he be prosecuted?

Now, to save time, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I object, and claim time in opposition to the motion.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. This is a preferential motion to strike out the enacting clause,

and I believe a committee member is entitled to recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from South Dakota was recognized, was he not?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was recognized by the Chair to make an objection, but not to speak.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from South Dakota desires time, I will be glad to yield to him for a minute or so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the bill passed I would like to see it get in shape that it could be supported wholeheartedly. There is room for coordinating our research activities. However, a thing happened within the past 24 hours that does raise a serious question about one provision here, and I think some attention should be drawn to it. On page 15 appears language which refers to section 11, about which questions have been raised.

This morning the radio and the press report that a man who was an enemy agent, who was a known Communist, was admitted to very confidential secrets in the United States. The confession of Fuchs brings out the fact that here was a man who was a known Communist and an enemy agent who was getting secrets and passing them on.

Mr. HINSHAW. I can explain to the gentleman the answer to the question I know he has in mind.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The language on page 15 provides that the authority to enter into contracts with organizations or individuals in foreign countries and with agencies of foreign countries, as provided in section 11 (c)—that is the one to which attention has been drawn—shall be exercised only after consultation with the Secretary of State.

Mr. PRIEST. That has been amended to require the approval of the Secretary of State.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it is limited to the Secretary of State. The question I raise is, Should we not go a bit further there and require consultation also with the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency or some security activity?

Mr. HINSHAW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman, but he has used most of my time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the gentleman will address himself to that.

Mr. HINSHAW. I will do that gladly, but first I want to point out to the House that this bill is one of those bills that are in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report. This is a situation where the bill itself will create considerable economy and efficiency through the correlation of the research projects in all the agencies of the Government. It is directly in line with the Hoover Commission report, which so many of the gentlemen have said they want to support.

In specific answer to the gentleman from South Dakota, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] was on the floor just a few minutes ago—perhaps the gentleman from South Dakota did not hear him—and gave a very fine explanation of why that language is there. As far as Mr. Fuchs is concerned, he was sent here by the British Government, as I know, being a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and was vouched for by the British Government in connection with the atomic energy project. The atomic energy project is eliminated from this bill and has nothing to do with it at all.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say to the gentleman that recently at some hearings of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics it was brought out that we are now exchanging scientific information with certain nations, which I shall not name because we were asked to keep it off the record. In view of the fact that the Secretary of State is the only person to whom we look for clearance under the bill, and he is concerned only with international relations and foreign policy objectives and certain other things that I shall not bring into this discussion, I question whether we ought to permit the contracts to be made with foreign organizations and individuals on the clearance of the Secretary of State alone.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the gentleman will read the story that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has here. I am sure he will be not only enlightened but satisfied with the story.

Mr. Chairman, I rose in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from from Michigan. I hope his motion will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: On page 20, after line 20, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(m) No person a national of a foreign country shall be associated with the Foundation in any capacity whatsoever unless and until the Federal Bureau of Investigation, independent of any investigation made by the government of such person shall have investigated such person and reported to the Foundation that such person is not and has not at any time been a member of any organization that teaches or advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the committee adopted an amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], which had to do with employees of the Foundation. This amendment is expressly directed at the Fuchs situation. There, Fuchs came to the United States but he was cleared only by the British and not by the FBI. This amendment will make it necessary that no matter from which foreign country these persons come they will have to be cleared by the FBI, and the report made to the Foundation. Had this amendment been law when Fuchs came to the United States the FBI would have checked him and would have prevented any incident from arising. The fact that Fuchs had been cleared by the British would not have mattered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 16, line 1, after "Secretary of State", insert "and the Director of Central Intelligence", and in line 3, after "foreign-policy objectives", insert "and security."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this amendment directs itself to the question which I brought up before. It merely provides that in these contracts with organizations or individuals of foreign countries, in addition to getting clearance with the Secretary of State, this would require clearance with the director of Central Intelligence. It seems to me that is clearly in harmony with the best interests of the United States, and I can see no valid objection to the amendment.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I have always been under the impression that CIA was set up for a straight job of intelligence, as the word indicates, and that it was never intended to do any administrative work whatsoever. I doubt very seriously whether CIA itself would welcome the kind of administrative responsibility which the gentleman from South Dakota would endeavor to give it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let us not confuse the foreign intelligence with the administrative work of the FBI at home. The amendment already adopted is to take care of clearance of FBI for students or scientists in this country, but where you have contracts going into other countries it seems to me that we ought to have the Foundation get clearance from the Central Intelligence before they go to individuals and organizations in other countries. The FBI would not have that information. Only Central Intelligence would.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized for a part of the time that has been allotted to me to say that I feel this amendment is very much out of order and it should not be adopted. I do not have the time to discuss it fully, but I feel it is a very inappropriate amendment and should be voted down.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I sat on the committee that drafted the bill in relation to the CIA. The CIA is a special committee. This will put it into administrative field, which would be dangerous. I know the gentleman has the best of intentions, but the amendment would be very harmful, not to this bill, but from the angle of bringing the CIA into a field

that it would be dangerous to bring it into.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota), there were—ayes 50, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after studying the report of the committee and hearing the debate on the issues involved and with the utmost respect for the views of those who differ, I have concluded to support this legislation.

The bill, as now amended, conforms to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, which in its report recognized the need for and advocated the establishment of a National Science Foundation. It seems clear to me that this recommendation was sound.

Not only, however, will the interests of economy be promoted but also the national welfare, prosperity, and security will be furthered by the enactment of this legislation. Our national preeminence in the field of applied research and technology should not blind us to the fact that until very recently we occupied a secondary position as regards basic research.

The remarkable American developmental work on the automobile, airplane, and radio should not obscure the truth that the fundamental discoveries underlying these developments were made in nineteenth-century Europe. Even the atomic bomb, so vital to our national defense, is an outgrowth of basic discoveries made in England, France, Germany, and Italy. In recent years the United States has made progress in pure science, but an examination of our national research efforts in university, industrial, and governmental laboratories reveals that around a billion dollars annually is being spent on applied research. However, such expenditures cannot reap the rich harvest they deserve unless new ideas are forthcoming to nourish and sustain new applications. Basic research is the source of new ideas.

Traditionally, a great deal of pure or basic science has been carried on at institutions of higher learning. In recent years, however, private support of universities has been sharply curtailed through the spending and taxing policies of the Federal Government. Our national security and progress make it essential that we find supplemental means of support for basic research.

In the future we cannot count, as we have in the past, on basic research performed in other countries and on the importation of outstanding scientists trained abroad. The ravages of World War II have been so extensive that Europe is bankrupt and in no position to carry on much of the basic research of the future which requires such complicated and expensive equipment. The United States can no longer be content to borrow its basic knowledge, but rather must make its own fundamental discoveries.

The cost of this program, limited by the commendable amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas to not to exceed $15,000,000 annually is, of course, an important factor to which we cannot close our eyes. In the present state of the Federal purse, any measure involving an expenditure of public funds must be carefully and critically scrutinized. As I have pointed out, however, the Hoover Commission has urged the creation of the Foundation to promote both economy and efficiency. In addition, the figures envisioned in this bill for basic research are infinitesimal compared to the large sums being spent on applied research. If necessary, and certainly it is desirable from the standpoint of economy, I would be prepared to reduce the budget for applied research in various Government departments to the extent necessary to provide for this furtherance of pure science, since I have become completely convinced that it is essential that we make provision to replenish the basic research bank, not only for our prosperity and well-being as a nation, but, very possibly, for our very survival.

The passage of this measure will salvage a critical situation. It is imperative that it pass. My conscience does not permit a negative vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I hate to take the time of the Committee at this late hour. I am a little distressed at the turn of events on what should be a very sound approach to the problem, if we expect to continue what we call the abundant life in America.

Most of us realize that we have got about 94 elements to live off of in this world. Out of that comes a living for all of us. We have been dependent, ever since the Grecian period of culture, to a great extent, on the scientific minds of the world in creating articles of all types that we may use in our daily lives. America is still regarded as one of the countries which has an abundant supply of material for productive science, and that is the objective of this bill. It is of no use for us to fool ourselves.

We are living in a technological era and a period in which scientific research today is more important than it has ever been in the history of the world. All of my life has been spent under the sound of a college bell and I have observed from thousands of students at this institution that most of our young Americans today are eager for an education, but unfortunately here in this great land of ours, a very small percentage have qualified themselves with doctors degrees to carry on all of the basic fundamental and applied research programs that this land of ours offers. Most of our young men when they graduate from college return to our industrial plants or other vocations of life. The group that really needs help are those who take their masters and doctors degree, and I believe that this legislation is designed primarily for the graduates and doctors degree level. This group usually takes on family responsibilities at that age and find themselves with insufficient income to live a normal American life and still continue their studies. We can no longer be dependent on Europe as we have for the past several centuries for our scientific talent. It is true we have made considerable progress here in this country, but even today and at this hour, we have many scientists carrying on important work that came to our country because of the treatment they received from foreign lands, and I am hopeful that we may pass this bill and carry it into conference and remove some of the amendments that we have adopted here which, in my opinion, are detrimental to a program which we desire to have.

Yesterday, I offered an amendment on page 20, line 8, to strike out the word "atomic," and substitute the word "nuclear." This amendment was accepted.

I would like to make one further comment regarding the amendment. You will recall that I stated that it was not very clear from the Science Foundation bill whether the word "atomic" covers the new process of the hydrogen bomb. Unlike the Atomic Energy Act, the bill does not contain any definition of atomic energy. My purpose in offering the amendment was to assure that the language in the Science Foundation bill was as broad as that contained in the Atomic Energy Act to cover the hydrogen bomb process.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENNINGS: On page 12, line 13, strike out subsection (c) as amended

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, this subsection (c) grants the power of this agency to enter into a contract or authorize the entering into of a contract by any agency or individual in this country with any agency or any individual in a foreign country and with reference to the national defense. It is my deliberate opinion that we are surrendering a power here to an unknown agency to do some unknown thing which might wreck the whole future of this country. We have had one instance where Alger Hiss, who sat by President Roosevelt's side at Yalta when the Yalta Agreement was entered into, and who sat at the head table at San Francisco when the United Nations Charter was formed, turned out to be a traitor. How do we know what manner of men, either at home or abroad, we are going to get to represent us in these negotiations? How do we know to whom we are committing the future safety and defense of this country?

Were any member of this House to go out and surrender the right to his security and the security of his family and everything he owned in the way of property to some unknown person, the wife of such a person would be fully warranted in employing a lawyer to take legal steps to have her husband committed to an insane asylum and to have a guardian appointed to handle her husband's property. The vast powers

placed in the hands of this proposed Federal agency and its unknown cost to our people in their treasure and the blood of their sons and daughters staggers the human mind, and is filled with frightful consequences.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized for part of the time at my disposal?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I read to the committee something of the work the Navy is doing in Egypt. May I suggest that if we had had this information during the last war we would not have lost as many lives as we did from not knowing how to combat tengu fever and similar diseases. Medical Research Unit No. 3 at Cairo, Egypt, passed to the Navy from the United States Typhus Commission in January of 1946. It is engaged in research in local medical problems and diseases of military importance in the Middle East, Africa, Europe, and India. Specific projects are in collaboration with the Egyptian Government, the United States Public Health Service, the War Department, and the Department of Agriculture.

Let us not tie our hands in trying to combat military diseases.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and this will be my last on this bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: On page 13, strike out lines 7 to 11 inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof:

"To acquire by loan or gift personal property useful in the exercise of authority granted by this act."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in reading over this bill and in striking out this paragraph I am wondering why it is necessary for this Foundation to acquire real property, to acquire it by purchase and then if it so desires, to sell it. I can understand how they would be glad to accept loans or gifts of personal property, such as scientific equipment; but when we come to the point that we authorize this Foundation to purchase real estate—it may be a plot of bare land or it may be a great office building, and then sell it as it may please, it seems to me we are going beyond the necessities of this Foundation.

Instead of giving them the outright power to purchase real estate I propose that it read:

To acquire by loan or gift personal property useful in the exercise of the authority granted by this act.

It seems to me that covers whatever power this Foundation may need.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, this particular section has been gone into for 4 years by this and other committees. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that there is not likely to be many occasions when it would be necessary to acquire any real estate, but it might be necessary in connection with some project carried on by an industrial laboratory or in a university to acquire a small piece of land and this makes it possible that that be done. Without believing it is likely to be done, and emphasizing that the bill itself prohibits the Foundation from operating a pilot plant or laboratory of its own, the committee has felt all along it would be wise to give them that authority if it is found necessary.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That opens up quite a vista.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WADSWORTH) there were—ayes 46, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 16, line 9, after subsection (2) add a new subsection (3) to read as follows:

"Agreements made by the United States under the authority of this act with other governments and with international organizations shall be registered with the secretariat of the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of article 102 of the United Nations Charter."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make the bill conform to the point 4 program bill. This amendment is section 6 on page 7 of the point 4 program bill. So anyone who does not want Yalta to happen again and does not want to go against Wilson's promises of "open covenants openly arrived at," should vote for this amendment.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure my good friend from Pennsylvania is very sincere in offering this amendment. The only agreements contemplated under this provision in the bill would be agreements that would involve research of a secret nature which we feel should not come under the category of technical agreements under point 4 which has not yet been approved by the Congress. I am sure the gentleman has the best interests of the country at heart in offering the amendment, but the very purpose of the bill is to enter into these agreements if it might be necessary for research of a restrictive nature and it would not be restrictive if all of it were filed with the United Nations or anyone else.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not press my amendment, but may I ask a question? Why does the act give the Government power to hold patents in the name of a nominee, not being named. Also, why does the act permit the Foundation to have agencies run not only pilot plants but possibly plants for the production of materials? In addition, why do they prevent the legislative branch of the Federal Government from holding any office without pay on the divisional committees and special commissions?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be given to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask several questions of the chairman of the committee in order to clarify certain points in the record. I spoke to the chairman about them yesterday. The first is on page 2 of the bill. You will note this language beginning on line 4:

The Foundation is authorized and directed to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences.

That same phrase "and education in the sciences" appears on the next page, in line 23.

What are we to understand by "education in the sciences"? Is that limited to the provision of scholarships and fellowships for individuals as set forth in section 10, or does it go beyond that?

Mr. PRIEST. It is limited to the scholarships ind fellowships set forth in section 10.

Mr. JUDD. Then the Foundation would not be able, under this language, for example, to endow chairs in universities or subsidize colleges or other institutions for carrying on general education in the sciences?

Mr. PRIEST. Without any reservation, I will say to the gentleman, it would not.

Mr. JUDD. Thank you. On page 19, subsection (h), beginning with line 11, it says:

Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Foundation—

Does that mean that they cannot be transferred without the approval of the head of the agency?

Mr. PRIEST. That is what it means.

Mr. JUDD. The Science Foundation cannot go to any other agency and say "This function really belongs to us" and, in effect, seize it?

Mr. PRIEST. They cannot.

Mr. JUDD. Where it says "approval" does that mean approval in writing?

Mr. PRIEST. I would think so. That would be my opinion.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman agrees that it is of sufficient importance that it ought to be approved in writing?

Mr. PRIEST. Surely, I will make that statement of record, that it should be approved in writing.

Mr. JUDD. On line 3 of the same page, it says "aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which, if aided, will advance basic research." What is to be included under the wording "aiding institutions," and so forth, besides giving grants for scholarships and fellowships?

Mr. PRIEST. The only other thing that would be included, in my opinion—and I am sure that is the opinion of the committee—would be a question possibly of some additional equipment; if it is found necessary to carry out a certain research project, that it could be aided somewhat in that particular.

Mr. JUDD. It does not include constructing buildings, for example, or anything of that sort?

Mr. PRIEST. It does not.

Mr. JUDD. I hope I have time for one more question. It concerns the language on page 11 which provides that fellowships and scholarships shall be granted on the basis of giving the widest geographical distribution. What if this should happen? Suppose there is only one applicant from California, and he is a wealthy boy who can get this expensive education without a fellowship. On the other hand there are two applicants from New York. A fellowship had already been granted to one, but the other is so poor he cannot get the training without help. Do you believe that the Foundation would have to give the second fellowship to the California individual who is rich and could provide his own education rather than to the boy who is poor, just because the boy who is poor lives in an area to which other fellowships have already been granted? In short, is it more important to help those who need the help than just to have a wider geographical distribution?

Mr. PRIEST. I would hope, of course, that those who need it, if they have equal ability, might receive consideration. It was thought, however, that there should be some emphasis placed on a geographic distribution, in order to avoid concentration in any one area.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman does not think this language is a mandate that would make it impossible for the Foundation to help the needier boy even though that meant two scholarships in one place and none in another?

Mr. PRIEST. No; I would hope they would do as you have suggested.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to try to complete what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] wanted to tell you during his excellent presentation today, and give you two other pieces of evidence before we reach this vote. He was not able to say that the Hoover Commission recommended that a National Science Foundation be established. I wish you would look at some of the material I put in yesterday's RECORD at page 2520. I call your attention to this: On December 30 the National Defense Department said that they, the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, are also supporting the proposed legislation for a National Science Foundation. That was in December 30. Our committee filed its report favorably June 14.

Does anyone dare suggest that General Bradley, General Collins, Admiral Sherman, General Vandenberg, and General Cates did not know what they were talking about when they made that statement? Are we going to disregard that?

Look at Dr. Bronk's statement:

> I need not remind you that certain potential enemies of this country are fully aware of the power of science in their efforts for military strength and military power.

Then he adds:

> Because of that consideration alone I take it that a National Science Foundation is of the utmost importance to the Nation and to the security of the Nation.

Will you not before you vote look at the short 3½-page statement of Dr. Karl Compton, who was there representing the National Military Establishment, and also as Chairman of the Research and Development Board and as president of MIT? You remember his magnificent war record. Does not his voice count at all with us?

Then read the six-paragraph letter signed by the chairman of the committee on science legislation of the Engineers Joint Council, and scientists from California Institute of Technology, Johns Hopkins University, Carnegie Institute of Technology, University of Illinois, New York University College of Medicine, University of Minnesota, University of Colorado, and by Mr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana.

I have tried my level best to get the evidence as I have it before you, because I know this is a tremendously difficult and a tremendously important decision. I hope no one will approach the vote that is coming now in a few minutes without a full understanding of its significance.

In my considered and mature judgment we are facing now one of the most challenging conditions and one of the most threatening situations we have ever faced in this Nation. The National Defense Department advised me this morning that I was underestimating what they were doing in Russia. Yesterday I said that if they succeeded in their 5-year plan they would turn out by 1952 700,000 scientists. How many will we have if we do not pass this bill? I estimated about 400,000, and that estimate is high. They will have at least twice as many scientists as we have. Can we not understand that while that does not necessarily mean they will win the race, if they have two times as many minds working on this, what can be the result? Twice as many opportunities of success. I plead for your support. Do not chain or cripple the advancement of American science.

I sincerely hope I have been able to help you some in making this tremendous decision. I will be amply repaid if you can make it one to satisfy yourselves in the years to come.

Since the vote was taken and the bill passed by such a satisfactory margin, I received further information and want to place it in the RECORD of today for your consideration when the bill comes back from conference. It has to do with the estimates based on the best available information as to the progress in Soviet Russia. I am sure you will all be interested in this official account that comes to me from the National Research Council.

While the council was unable to prepare all the information I desired in view of the shortness of time between my request and the vote, I was advised as follows:

First, there apparently is a disagreement in the appraisals of the Russian program's progress and I think we can all understand that; however, the best information does indicate that the Russians increased their training facilities during the war. They selected from 1,500 technical institutes, with enrollments even during the war of 425,000, the ablest graduates for full technical scientific training through to the doctorate on federal scholarships. Just contrast that with our unhappy record during the war when we made the mistake of drafting our able technical men and sending them into the armed forces. Four hundred and twenty-five thousand in Russia carrying through to doctorate on federal scholarships. From 1941 through 1945 we graduated with degrees of Ph. D., 7,479 able men and women. Is that not something for us to consider; Soviet Russia graduated more than 56 times as many doctors and scientists as we did even when they were fighting with their backs to the wall.

Next, this 5-year plan was started in 1946 and in 1947, as I understand. So it is four-fifths completed. Even with their pool of trained scientific men, they went ahead with this further plan of intensive training in this area. There is evidence that the number trained in 1950 in the sciences, in technology, will be twice the number graduated 3 years ago in 1947. The number of graduate students receiving research training in the sciences in 1941 was 12,000. In view of the emphasis on this 5-year plan, it seems entirely probable that this number is very considerably greater at the present time although no exact evidence is available to us.

I was advised that with regard to the information I presented to you yesterday it may be said safely that this is the most significant information our technical staffs can bring together. I am told that it indicates clearly that the recent heavy enrollments in engineering and sciences were a temporary situation produced largely by the GI bill of rights and the strong interest produced by the war in technical matters among our veterans. Present enrollment figures in our freshman and sophomore classes in the colleges and universities show quite definitely that the number graduated in these fields in the next 2 or 3 years will be sharply declining below the present level of demand for such personnel.

This law creating this Foundation is the only solution available to us. I am sure that you understand the difficulties

of our trying to obtain exact information for your consideration. I am grateful, and I am sure you are, to the National Research Council for its efforts to assist us. I might add that I understand that the Russians have set up a technical training program under which certain schools and universities teach only a certain subject so that everything relating to that single subject is taught at that one school. Consequently, to get the full information I desire would obviously entail considerable research. However, I know that they and other associations of scientists as well as our governmental services are doing everything possible to develop all of this information and I trust it will be available to our conference committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce both in full committee at certain times and at other times by a subcommittee has had this subject under careful scrutiny and discussion for a period of at least 5 years. We have heard from everyone in the United States who was interested sufficiently to let it be known to the committee and who asked for time to appear or go on record in writing. We have brought this bill to you almost unanimously. I think there are perhaps two or three Members in the committee who may not be wholly satisfied with the bill. We brought it to you in the Eightieth Congress. That Congress passed the bill. There is a slight difference between the bill presented then, which passed both Houses, and this bill. This bill is so drawn to meet the objections, which we did not consider too serious, of the President of the United States. They related to the manner of appointment of the Executive Director.

The Hoover report urges that such a bill as this be passed. The Hoover Commission report urgently recommends the passage of a bill of this kind. I hope the House will pass the bill today by an overwhelming majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4846) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes pursuant to House Resolution 321, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HALE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HALE moves that H. R. 4846 be recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with instructions to devote further study to the problem involved.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 134, nays 240, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

YEAS—134

Abernethy	Gavin	Norblad
Andersen, H Carl	Gillette	Norrell
Andresen, August H	Golden	Passman
Arends	Goodwin	Pfeiffer, William L.
Auchincloss	Graham	Phillips, Calif.
Barden	Gross	Pickett
Barrett, Wyo	Gwinn	Potter
Bates, Ky	Hagen	Rankin
Bates, Mass.	Hale	Reed, Ill
Beall	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Reed, N Y.
Bishop	Harden	Rees
Bonner	Harvey	Rich
Brehm	Hobbs	Richlman
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Rivers
Burleson	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis.	Horan	Sadlak
Camp	James	St George
Carlyle	Jenison	Sanborn
Case, S Dak.	Jennings	Saylor
Chatham	Jensen	Scrivner
Chipperfield	Jonas	Shafer
Church	Jones, N C	Short
Clevenger	Judd	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, Kans.	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, N Y.	Kearns	Smith, Kans.
Colmer	Kilburn	Smith, Va
Cooley	Larcade	Smith, Wis.
Corbett	Latham	Stanley
Cotton	LeCompte	Stockman
Crawford	Lichtenwalter	Taber
Curtis	Lovre	Thomas
Dague	Lucas	Velde
Davis, Ga	McConnell	Vursell
D'Ewart	McCulloch	Wadsworth
Dondero	McGregor	Welchel
Doughton	McMillan, S C	Wheeler
Elston	McMillen, Ill.	Whitten
Fellows	Mack, Wash	Wier
Fenton	Martin, Iowa	Wigglesworth
Fisher	Martin, Mass	Williams
Ford	Mason	Wilson Ind.
Fulton	Meyer	Winstead
Gamble	Miller, Md	Wolcott
Gathings	Morton	Wood
	Nicholson	Woodruff

NAYS—240

Addonizio	Brown, Ga.	Combs
Albert	Bryson	Cooper
Allen, Calif.	Buchanan	Cox
Andrews	Buckley, Ill.	Crook
Angell	Buckley, N. Y	Crosser
Aspinall	Burdick	Cunningham
Bailey	Burke	Davenport
Baring	Burnside	Davies, N. Y.
Barrett, Pa.	Burton	Davis, Wis.
Battle	Byrne, N. Y.	Dawson
Beckworth	Canfield	Deane
Bennett, Fla.	Carnahan	DeGraffenried
Bennett, Mich	Carroll	Delaney
Biemiller	Case, N. J.	Denton
Boggs, La.	Cavalcante	Dingell
Bolling	Celler	Dollinger
Bolton, Ohio	Chelf	Dolliver
Bosone	Chesney	Donohue
Bramblett	Christopher	Doyle
Breen	Clemente	Durham
Eberharter	Keogh	Philbin
Elliott	Kerr	Phillips, Tenn.
Engel, Mich.	Kilday	Polk
Engle, Calif.	Kirwan	Poulson
Evins	Klein	Powell
Fallon	Kruse	Preston
Feighan	Lane	Price
Fernandez	Lanham	Priest
Flood	Lemke	Quinn
Fogarty	Lesinski	Rabaut
Forand	Lind	Rains
Frazier	Linehan	Ramsay
Garmatz	Lodge	Rhodes
Gary	Lynch	Ribicoff
Gordon	McCarthy	Richards
Gorski	McCormack	Rodino
Gossett	McDonough	Rogers, Fla.
Granahan	McGuire	Rooney
Granger	McKinnon	Roosevelt
Grant	McSweeney	Sasscer
Green	Mack, Ill.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr
Gregory	Madden	Scudder
Halleck	Magee	Secrest
Hand	Mahon	Sheppard
Hardy	Mansfield	Sikes
Hare	Marsalis	Sims
Harris	Marshall	Spence
Harrison	Merrow	Staggers
Hart	Michener	Steed
Havenner	Miles	Stefan
Hays, Ark.	Miller, Calif.	Stigler
Hays, Ohio	Miller, Nebr.	Sullivan
Hébert	Mills	Sutton
Heffernan	Mitchell	Tackett
Heller	Monroney	Talle
Herlong	Morgan	Tauriello
Heselton	Morris	Thompson
Hill	Moulder	Thornberry
Hinshaw	Multer	Tollefson
Holifield	Murdock	Trimble
Holmes	Murphy	Underwood
Hope	Murray, Tenn.	Van Zandt
Howell	Nelson	Vinson
Huber	Nixon	Vorys
Hull	Noland	Wagner
Irving	Norton	Walsh
Jackson, Wash	O'Brien, Ill.	Walter
Jacobs	O'Brien, Mich.	Welch
Javits	O'Hara, Ill	Werdel
Jenkins	O'Hara, Minn.	White, Calif.
Johnson	O'Konski	Whittington
Jones, Ala.	O'Neill	Wickersham
Jones, Mo	O'Sullivan	Widnall
Karst	O'Toole	Willis
Karsten	Pace	Wilson, Okla
Keating	Patman	Withrow
Kee	Patten	Wolverton
Keefe	Perkins	Yates
Kelley, Pa	Peterson	Young
Kelly, N Y.	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	
Kennedy		

NOT VOTING—58

Abbitt	Furcolo	Plumley
Allen, Ill.	Gilmer	Poage
Allen, La.	Gore	Redden
Anderson, Calif	Hall, Leonard W.	Regan
Bentsen	Hedrick	Sabath
Blackney	Herter	Sadowski
Blatnik	Hoffman, Ill.	Scott, Hardie
Boggs, Del.	Jackson, Calif	Shelley
Bolton, Md.	Kean	Smathers
Boykin	King	Smith, Ohio
Brooks	Kunkel	Taylor
Bulwinkle	LeFevre	Teague
Cannon	Lyle	Towe
Chudoff	McGrath	Whitaker
Coudert	Macy	White, Idaho
Davis, Tenn	Marcantonio	Wilson, Tex
Douglas	Morrison	Woodhouse
Eaton	Murray, Wis.	Worley
Ellsworth	Patterson	Zablocki
Fugate		

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr Eaton for, with Mr. LeFevre against.

Mr. Wilson of Texas for, with Mr. Blackney against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr Anderson of California against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr Kunkel against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Jackson of California against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr Sabath against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr Morrison against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Shelley against.
Mr. Bulwinkle for, with Mr. McGrath against.
Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Hedrick against.
Mr. Macy for, with Mrs. Douglas against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Chudoff against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Cannon with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. TACKETT, Mr. CHELF, and Mr. POULSON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GILLETTE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 247, nays 126, answered "present" 1, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—247

Addonizio	Engel, Mich	Kirwan
Albert	Evins	Klein
Allen, Calif.	Fallon	Kruse
Angell	Feighan	Lane
Aspinall	Fernandez	Lanham
Bailey	Flood	LeCompte
Baring	Fogarty	Lemke
Barrett, Pa.	Forand	Lesinski
Bates, Mass.	Frazier	Lind
Battle	Garmatz	Linehan
Beall	Gary	Lodge
Beckworth	Gordon	Lynch
Bennett, Fla.	Gorski	McCarthy
Bennett, Mich.	Gossett	McCormack
Biemiller	Granahan	McDonough
Blatnik	Granger	McGuire
Boggs, La.	Grant	McKinnon
Bolling	Green	McMillen, Ill.
Bosone	Gregory	McSweeney
Bramblett	Hall,	Mack, Ill.
Breen	Edwin Arthur	Madden
Brown, Ga.	Halleck	Magee
Bryson	Hand	Mahon
Buchanan	Hardy	Mansfield
Buckley, Ill.	Hare	Marsalis
Buckley, N. Y.	Harris	Marshall
Burdick	Harrison	Merrow
Burke	Hart	Michener
Burnside	Havenner	Miles
Burton	Hays, Ark.	Miller, Calif.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hays, Ohio	Miller, Nebr.
Canfield	Hébert	Mills
Carnahan	Heffernan	Mitchell
Carroll	Heller	Monroney
Case, N J	Herlong	Morgan
Case, S. Dak.	Heselton	Morris
Cavalcante	Hill	Moulder
Celler	Hinshaw	Multer
Chelf	Holifield	Murdock
Chesney	Holmes	Murphy
Christopher	Hope	Murray, Tenn.
Clemente	Horan	Nelson
Combs	Howell	Nixon
Cooper	Huber	Noland
Cox	Hull	Norton
Crook	Irving	O'Brien, Ill.
Crosser	Jackson, Wash.	O'Brien, Mich.
Cunningham	Javits	O'Hara, Ill.
Davenport	Jenkins	O'Hara, Minn.
Davies, N. Y.	Johnson	O'Konski
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	O'Neill
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Mo	O'Sullivan
Dawson	Judd	O'Toole
Deane	Karst	Pace
DeGraffenried	Karsten	Patman
Delaney	Keating	Patten
Denton	Kee	Perkins
Dingell	Keefe	Peterson
Dollinger	Kelley, Pa.	Pfeifer,
Dolliver	Kelly, N. Y.	Joseph L.
Donohue	Kennedy	Philbin
Doyle	Keogh	Phillips, Tenn.
Durham	Kerr	Polk
Eberharter	Kilday	Powell
Elliott	King	Preston
Price	Sikes	Wagner
Priest	Sims	Walsh
Quinn	Spence	Walter
Rabaut	Staggers	Welch
Rains	Steed	White, Calif.
Ramsay	Stefan	Whittington
Rhodes	Stigler	Wickersham
Ribicoff	Sullivan	Widnall
Richards	Sutton	Wigglesworth
Rodino	Tackett	Willis
Rogers, Fla.	Talle	Wilson, Okla.
Rooney	Taurielle	Withrow
Roosevelt	Thomas	Wolcott
Sasscer	Thompson	Wolverton
Scott,	Tollefson	Yates
Hugh D., Jr.	Trimble	Young
Scudder	Van Zandt	Zablocki
Secrest	Vinson	
Sheppard	Vorys	

NAYS—126

Abernethy	Gathings	Patterson
Andersen,	Gavin	Pfeiffer,
H. Carl	Gillette	William L.
Andresen,	Golden	Phillips, Calif.
August H.	Goodwin	Pickett
Andrews	Graham	Potter
Arends	Gross	Rankin
Auchincloss	Gwinn	Reed, Ill
Barden	Hagen	Reed, N Y.
Barrett, Wyo.	Hale	Rees
Bates, Ky.	Harden	Rich
Bishop	Hobbs	Riehlman
Bolton, Ohio	Hoeven	Rivers
Bonner	Hoffman, Mich	Rogers, Mass.
Brehm	James	Sadlak
Brown, Ohio	Jenison	St. George
Burleson	Jennings	Sanborn
Byrnes, Wis	Jensen	Saylor
Camp	Jonas	Scrivner
Carlyle	Jones, N. C.	Shafer
Chatham	Kearney	Short
Chiperfield	Kearns	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Clevenger	Larcade	Smith, Kans.
Cole, Kans.	Latham	Smith, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Lichtenwalter	Smith, Wis.
Colmer	Lovre	Stanley
Cooley	Lucas	Stockman
Corbett	McConnell	Taber
Cotton	McCulloch	Taylor
Crawford	McGregor	Velde
Curtis	McMillan, S C	Vursell
Dague	Mack, Wash	Wadsworth
D'Ewart	Martin, Iowa	Weichel
Dondero	Martin, Mass	Werdel
Doughton	Mason	Wheeler
Elston	Meyer	Whitten
Fellows	Miller, Md.	Wier
Fenton	Morton	Williams
Fisher	Nicholson	Wilson, Ind.
Ford	Norblad	Winstead
Fulton	Norrell	Wood
Gamble	Passman	Woodruff

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Harvey

NOT VOTING—58

Abbitt	Furcolo	Poage
Allen, Ill.	Gilmer	Poulson
Allen, La.	Gore	Redden
Anderson, Calif	Hall,	Regan
Bentsen	Leonard W.	Sabath
Blackney	Hedrick	Sadowski
Boggs, Del	Herter	Scott, Hardie
Bolton, Md.	Hoffman, Ill.	Shelley
Boykin	Jackson, Calif.	Smathers
Brooks	Jacobs	Smith, Ohio
Bulwinkle	Kean	Teague
Cannon	Kunkel	Thornberry
Chudoff	LeFevre	Towe
Coudert	Lyle	Underwood
Davis, Tenn.	McGrath	Whitaker
Douglas	Macy	White, Idaho
Eaton	Marcantonio	Wilson, Tex.
Ellsworth	Morrison	Woodhouse
Engle, Calif.	Murray, Wis.	Worley
Fugate	Plumley	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jacobs for, with Mr. Harvey against.
Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Eaton against.
Mr. Blackney for, with Mr. Wilson of Texas against.
Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.
Mr. Kunkel for, Mr. Boykin against.
Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr Herter for, with Mr. Towe against.
Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.
Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Kean against.
Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.
Mr. Shelly for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. McGrath for, with Mr. Bulwinkle against.
Mrs. Woodhouse for, with Mr. Redden against
Mrs. Douglas for, with Mr. Macy against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Sadowski with Mr Boggs of Delaware.
Mr. Teague with Mr Leonard W Hall.
Mr Engle of California with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr Cannon with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS]. If he were present he would have voted "aye." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 247) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRIEST: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R 4846 as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 4846 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a list of State agencies authorized to approve surplus commodity applications held by Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Des Moines Register.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee today and include statistical information.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

UNJUST REPRISAL AGAINST ADMIRAL DENFELD

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the House Armed Services Committee is today releasing a report of its investigation of unification and strategy together with certain committee action relative to the removal of Admiral Denfeld. This report is a voluminous document and speaks for itself.

I have been particularly interested in that part of the report which relates to Admiral Denfeld because I have been and am of the opinion that his removal was ill-advised, and may well gravely affect the inquisitorial powers of the House.

Let it be remembered that Admiral Denfeld and his colleagues as well as the committee were given express assurances by very highest Defense Department officials, prior to their testimony, that there would be no retaliation. Notwithstanding this fact, a short time after the testimony was given, the admiral was summarily removed. I believe with the majority of the committee that this removal was in the nature of a reprisal and most regrettable.

While it is true that Congress is powerless at this time to rectify the gross injustice which has been done to a great American who has faithfully served our Nation as an outstanding naval officer for more than 38 years, this challenge to the dignity and powers of the House cannot be overlooked or forgotten. Flagrant mistreatment of able, faithful naval officers and disregard for congressional committees is too high a price to pay for unification.

STATE RURAL REHABILITATION CORPORATIONS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 382 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2392) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the final disposition of funds which were granted to the States in the years 1933 through 1935, for the purpose of providing relief and rehabilitation in rural areas. These funds were transferred to and became the property of the several States, or rather, to the corporations which were organized in the several States. Not all the funds were expended at the time when these relief and rehabilitation programs were most active, and the remaining funds—amounting to about $50,000,000 in all—have been held in trust by the Secretary of Agriculture during the past several years under transfer agreements with the State corporations.

These agreements were entered into between the rural rehabilitation corporations of the various States and the United States of America. They are legally binding trust agreements under which specific assets of these State corporations are placed in trust with the Secretary of Agriculture for administration by him within the various States, in conformity with the charters of the various State corporations, and under terms and conditions stipulated in the trust agreements.

In 1946 the Congress directed in the Farmers Home Administration Act that these trusts be liquidated, but the law gave no directions nor established any policy as to the disposition of the funds arising through such liquidation. It is the purpose of this bill to establish a directive and a policy to be followed by the Secretary of Agriculture in liquidating these trusts in conformity with both the terms of the trust agreements themselves and the provisions of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946.

There is no doubt that the assets involved are the property of the several States. A large proportion of the assets are not in money, but are in the form of loans receivable, accounts and notes receivable, and real property which has been acquired by the various corporations in the course of carrying out the purposes for which the funds were established.

The trust agreements were entered into by the various States at the invitation of the Federal Government. The trusts were established at the time when both Federal and State relief organizations were being disbanded, and their specific purpose was to permit the continuation of the rural rehabilitation work being carried on with the funds. Many of the trust agreements provide explicitly that the assets shall be returned to the States at the end of a stated period or upon the failure of the Federal Government to carry out the stated purposes of the trust.

This bill recognizes the validity of the claims of the various States to these trust assets. At the same time, it recognizes that some of the States may desire to have the assets administered through the Federal Government, much in the manner in which they have been handled for the past several years under the trust agreements.

The bill establishes two methods by which these assets may be disposed of in a manner consistent with this policy, and also consistent with the terms of the trust agreements:

First. The outright return of the assets to the State rural rehabilitation corporations or their successor agencies for administration in conformity with the original purpose and powers of the corporations;

Second. The surrender of the assets to the Federal Government for use by the Farmers Home Administration within the respective States in general keeping with the rural rehabilitation purposes of the funds.

The failure of the Federal Government to take decisive action and return the assets to the States would amount, in effect, to a breach of faith on the part of the United States.

The Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 directed the Secretary of Agriculture to liquidate these trusts but gave him no directive or policy to follow in such liquidation. The bill before us today provides such a directive, along lines of principles worked out by the Committee on Agriculture in the course of long consideration of this matter. The bill offers a just and equitable means of disposing of these trusts, and at the same time assuring that the funds will continue to be used for their intended purpose in the manner that offers the most efficient administration in the case of each of the States.

This bill was not reported with the unanimous approval of the committee. It is controversial, and I have every reason to believe that amendments and perhaps even substitutes will be offered. The bill does, however, present an important issue which must be decided, one way or the other. The importance of the measure should commend it to your very careful consideration.

Congress has heretofore directed the Administrator to liquidate these trusts but no direction with regard to the liquidation was given. If the trustee would only follow the specific provisions of the trust agreements there would actually be no necessity for legislation. At the time that we directed liquidation, no question was raised as to the rightful ownership of the funds and property involved. Sometime thereafter, however, someone in the Department of Agriculture hit upon the idea of recapturing the funds, the provisions of the agreement to the contrary notwithstanding. Even

if no legislation is enacted which directs the Administrator to liquidate the trusts in a manner which is not in keeping with the specific provisions of the trust agreements, the several State corporations will still have a cause of action and can still, in my opinion, recover the funds and the property involved.

Some of the State corporations have ceased to exist and by nonuse have forfeited their charters, disbanded, and gone out of business, and are no longer in existence. Even so, the funds and property still do not belong to the Federal Government or any agency thereof.

This bill provides that the corporations now in existence might apply for a return of the property and money, that in States where the corporation has been disbanded or has gone out of existence, another corporation or agency might be created and might apply for a return of the property. The bill further provides that if within 3 years no application is filed for a return of the property, the money and the funds derived from a sale or liquidation of the property will go into the Federal Treasury, to be held in a revolving fund, to be administered by the Farmers Home Corporation and used in that particular State. I understand that an amendment will be offered which will add another provision to the bill, a provision which will authorize the State corporations or agencies, upon a return of the funds and property, to again transfer such funds to the Farmers Home Administration, to the end that that agency might administer and use said property pursuant to such new agreement or contract as might hereafter be executed. I personally have no objection to such an amendment.

The issue here involved is purely a legal issue. To do anything less than to keep faith with the trust agreements which have been executed and are still in existence would be not only an illegal act but an immoral act. I therefore do not believe that we have any alternative other than to keep faith with the provisions of these solemn agreements. We definitely have no right to reclaim or to recapture these funds, or to take advantage of the trust relationship which is now existing between the State corporations and the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman have any opinion from the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture recognizing the legality of these trusts?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not care about the opinion of the Department of Agriculture or any solicitor. I think any lawyer in this House who will sit down and read one of these trust agreements will conclude that we have no alternative other than to return the trust funds as provided for in the trust agreement. I do not care how many solicitors in the Department of Agriculture disagree with me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Department of Agriculture is the agency that entered into the trust.

Mr. COOLEY. The Department of Agriculture entered into the trust and in a laborious effort has tried to justify its position in asking for the return of these funds to the Federal Treasury. The gentleman knows that the representative of the Solicitor's office made a very feeble effort before our committee in trying to justify his opinion.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But feeble as it may have been——

Mr. COOLEY. I agree it was feeble, but he did make the effort.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

A BLOW FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the first sentence of the Constitution carries the following words:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

It is the duty of the Congress to provide for national defense. That, among other things, means that it is the duty of the Congress to provide the funds needed to establish and maintain an efficient Army, Navy, and Air Corps.

To perform that duty, it is necessary that the individual Members of the Congress know the needs of the armed forces. Individual Members of Congress do not know, for example, whether the Navy needs battleships, carriers, cruisers, destroyers, submarines, nor, for that matter, any other type of weapon.

Hence, it is that, in order to enable the Congressmen to vote intelligently, they must seek and have the expert advice of those who have been taught by, served in, the Navy. Congressmen must have the advice of technically trained, experienced men and officers. Otherwise, they are just guessing. They are wasting the people's money, causing it to be spent for weapons which are inefficient, on plans of doubtful value.

Having under consideration the question of the needs of the Navy, how it should be armed, a committee of the House, realizing the necessity for expert testimony, recently called upon certain Navy officers for their opinions.

One of the officers, Admiral Denfeld, in obedience to the request of the House committee, appeared before it, and out of the wealth of his knowledge and experience, honestly and conscientiously, as requested by the committee, expressed his views.

Because those views did not meet with the views of the Secretary of the Navy—a man who never was in the Navy, who never received technical Navy training, who never had had any experience whatever in naval warfare—that Secretary arbitrarily fired him from his job.

The effect of that action was to gag all other officers of the Navy, the Air Force, and the Army who might have views differing from those of the civilian head of the Navy, the Air Force, or the Army, or of the politicians who control armed service thinking.

To one who is not jealous of the right of free speech or who owes allegiance to some political machine within the Navy or the armed services organization, that might not appear to be too serious if one is willing to condone an unjust, arbitrary insult and injury to an officer who has served his country well and faithfully, and who but, in giving testimony, complies with the law of the land.

But there is another and more harmful aspect to such action. The action of Secretary Matthews in removing Admiral Denfeld not only tends to intimidate all officers in every branch of the service from speaking their convictions to a congressional committee, but it deprives the Members of Congress of their most fruitful source of information, and leaves them without compass or rudder when they attempt to chart a course which will determine the strength of any branch of the armed services.

The action of the Secretary of the Navy was a blow at our national defense.

On March 1, the House Committee on Armed Services, after painstaking investigation, released a report. The thirty-third paragraph of its Summary of Committee Views reads as follows:

33 The removal of Admiral Denfeld was a reprisal against him for giving testimony to the House Armed Services Committee. This act is a blow against effective representative government in that it tends to intimidate witnesses and hence discourages the rendering of free and honest testimony to the Congress; it violated promises made to the witnesses by the committee, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Defense; and it violated the Unification Act into which a provision was written specifically to prevent actions of this nature against the Nation's highest military and naval officers.

The removal of Admiral Denfeld, in my opinion, is directly contrary to the terms of the Unification Act, and it demonstrates the intention of the political brass in the armed services to disregard the laws enacted by the Congress, establish themselves as an over-all military government.

With Communists in the State Department, with the armed services disregarding the law as written by the people's representatives, it is imperative that the people awaken to the situation if the Republic is to be saved from destruction.

The removal of Admiral Denfeld is a violation of section 1505 of chapter 73, entitled "Obstruction of Justice" of title 18 of the United States Code. That section reads as follows:

1505. TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, 1948 COMPILATION—OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE

Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, endeavors to influence, intimidate, or impede any witness in any proceeding pending before any department or agency of the United States, or in connection with any inquiry or investigation being had by either House, or any committee of either House, or any joint committee of the Congress; or

Whoever injures any party or witness in his person or property on account of his

attending or having attended such proceeding, inquiry, or investigation, or on account of his testifying or having testified to any matter pending therein; or

Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede the due and proper administration of the law under which such proceeding is being had before such department or agency of the United States, or the due and proper exercise of the power of inquiry under which such inquiry or investigation is being had by either House, or any committee of either House or any joint committee of the Congress—

Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] such time as he may require.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, just so as not to get involved in a controversy with a lot of would-be scientists who were in a hurry to get me here to vote for that bill, I did not get here in time to do it, but I would have voted for H. R. 4846 had I been here.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me today may be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FUGATE, for March 1, 2, and 3, on account of official business.

To Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. HARRISON), for today and the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

To Mr. LEONARD W. HALL (at the request of Mr. GAMBLE), for Wednesday and Thursday, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. BOGGS of Delaware (at the request of Mr. WOODRUFF), for an indefinite period, beginning February 27, 1950, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I renew my point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 2, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and being as follows:

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the Eighty-first Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the Eighteth Congress, entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: WILLIAM H. BATES, Sixth District, Massachusetts; WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Seventh District, New Jersey.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1276. A letter from the Chairman, District Unemployment Compensation Board, transmitting a report covering the administration and operation of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board for the calendar year 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1277. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1278. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the eighth annual financial statement and report of operations, pursuant to provisions of section 13 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774, approved July 19, 1940); to the Committee on Public Lands.

1279 A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of organizations, nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations of material from the Navy Department under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 649, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 212 An act for the relief of John Joseph McKay; with amendment (Rept. No. 1722). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1413. An act for the relief of Maria Margarete Otto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1723). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1552. An act for the relief of Ernest E. Heintz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1724). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1609. A bill for the relief of Arne Gordon Westly; with amendment (Rept. No. 1725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 7488. A bill to provide that the registrant of a trade-mark shall be notified of the time of pending expiration and of the time to file an affidavit of continuing use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 7489. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Kennebec County, Maine, to the town of Chelsea; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 7490. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 7491. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 7492. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 so as to eliminate certain inequities in the provisions relating to the retention of compensation rates in effect prior to such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 7493. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R 7494. A bill to amend Public Law 74 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, with respect to the preparation of statistical and scientific studies and surveys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 7495. A bill to terminate the war excise tax rate on theater tickets and other types of amusement and recreation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H R. 7496. A bill to provide for fuel allocations and priorities during emergencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgage insurance under section 608 of such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H J. Res. 430. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize delivery of surplus farm commodities to the States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 431. Joint resolution to permit certain war-service indefinite employees to acquire competitive civil-service status and permanent tenure by qualifying in noncompetitive examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H Con. Res. 182. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress up to and including the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 7497. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Benjamin H. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 7498. A bill for the relief of Bob Kan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7499. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fourere Kan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 7500. A bill to exempt certain real property in the District of Columbia from taxation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R 7501. A bill for the relief of Antonio Carreri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H R. 7502 A bill for the relief of Oscar (Oszkar) Nemenyi, Marianna Nemenyi (wife), and Thomas John Nemenyi (son); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1940. By Mr CANFIELD: Resolution of the executive committee of the Greater Paterson Council of Churches, Paterson, N. J., for a new crusade of peace which will arouse all people from apathy, fear, and fatalism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1941. By Mr GORSKI: Petition relative to veterans' hospital in Buffalo, N. Y., to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1942 Also, petition relative to the St Lawrence project, to the Committee on Public Works.

1943. By Mr LANE. Petition of the Board of Aldermen, Chelsea, Mass., requesting Congress to enact legislation for the Government to pay one-half of the train fare for enlisted men who have occasion to use trains and busses during furloughs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1944 By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of Somerset County Petroleum Industries Committee, Princess Anne, Md., urging repeal of the Federal gasoline tax, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1945. Also, petition of Worcester County Petroleum Industries Committee, Berlin, Md., urging repeal of the Federal gasoline tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1946. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Prof. Abelardo Bonilla, Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica, San José, Costa Rica, relative to the importance of consolidating the unity of all the nations of the American Continent to strengthen the cultural and political bonds between their people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Bishop Ivan Lee Holt, president, Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, St. Louis, Mo., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who in the former time didst lead our fathers forth into a place of opportunity, give Thy grace, we humbly beseech Thee, to us their children, that we may always approve ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor, and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honest industry, sound learning, and pure religion. Defend our liberties; preserve our unity. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way. Fashion into one happy people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those whom we entrust in Thy name with the authority of governance, to the end that there may be peace at home, and that we may keep a place of influence among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble suffer not our trust in Thee to fail. Grant us peace, Thy most precious gift. O Thou eternal source of peace. Bless our country, that it may ever be a stronghold of peace in the councils of the nations. May contentment reign within its borders, health and happiness within its homes. Strengthen the bonds of friendship and fellowship between all the inhabitants, races, and religions of our land. Plant virtue in every soul; and may the love of Thy name hallow every home and every heart. Praised be Thou, O Lord, giver of peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 1, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 247) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7477) providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Kefauver
Brewster	Ferguson	Kerr
Bricker	Flanders	Kilgore
Bridges	Frear	Knowland
Butler	Fulbright	Langer
Byrd	George	Leahy
Cain	Green	Lehman
Capehart	Gurney	Lodge
Chapman	Hayden	Long
Chavez	Hendrickson	Lucas
Connally	Hill	McCarran
Cordon	Hoey	McCarthy
Darby	Humphrey	McClellan
Donnell	Hunt	McKellar
Douglas	Ives	McMahon
Downey	Jenner	Magnuson
Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.	Malone
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Martin
Ecton	Johnston, S. C.	Maybank
Millikin	Saltonstall	Thomas, Utah
Morse	Schoeppel	Tobey
Mundt	Smith, Maine	Tydings
Murray	Smith, N. J.	Watkins
Myers	Sparkman	Wherry
Neely	Stennis	Wiley
O'Conor	Taft	Williams
Robertson	Taylor	Withers
Russell	Thomas, Okla.	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on yesterday the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] received unanimous consent to obtain the floor on the convening of the Senate today. I ask the Senator from Virginia to yield so I may now make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BYRD I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate may be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate, and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EUGENIO MAISTERRENA BARRENECHE—REENROLLMENT OF BILL

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 204) for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche; that if and when the said bill is returned by the President, the action of the presiding officers of the two Houses in signing the said bill be deemed to be rescinded; and that the secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following correction, namely, on page 1, line 6, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the numerals "1940" and in lieu thereof insert "1946."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

NOMINATION OF DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS

Mr LUCAS. Mr. President, yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], by direction of that committee, reported favorably the nomination of Roy Victor Peel, of Indiana, to be Director of the Census. That nomination is now on the Executive Calendar. The Senator from South Carolina feels that it is necessary that the Senate consider the nomination immediately, and confirm Mr. Peel to be Director of the Census.

I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Roy Victor Peel, of Indiana, to be Director of the Census.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the Senate will proceed to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar, which will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Roy Victor Peel, of Indiana, to be Director of the Census.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee, whether the nomination was reported favorably by the committee. It was; was it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; it was reported unanimously and favorably from the committee yesterday. The only reason we are asking to have it considered now—of course, it is already on the Executive Calendar, and would come up in the regular order—is so that prompt action may be taken.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 491)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, Eightieth Congress, approved June 29, 1948, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The WHITE HOUSE, *March 2, 1950.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

REPORT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Social Security Administration, for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER EOULDER CANYON PROJECT ADJUSTMENT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial statement and report of operations under the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, for the year ended May 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL CEILINGS

A letter from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of personnel ceilings for the quarter ended December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the securing of additional financial aid for the Waltham Watch Co. from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE) on February 16, 1950, p. 1830, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to decreases in the next Federal budget and the Federal debt; to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) on March 1, 1950, p 2535, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

A resolution adopted by General M. Emmet Urell Camp No. 9, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., favoring the continued retention of the United States Soldiers' Home under the Department of the Army, to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Liberty Pension Club No. 8, General Welfare Federation of America, of Buffalo, N. Y., signed by L. W. Lewis and sundry other citizens, praying for the enactment of House bill 6000, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Greek-American Political Club, of Cambridge, Mass., relating to the forcible abduction of certain Greek children; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Daisy D. Wilson, of Wichita, Kans., praying for a redress of grievances (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Daughters of American Revolution, of Cedarville, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter from the Philadelphia Chapter, Pennsylvania Society of Professional Engineers, of Philadelphia, Pa., signed by Thomas E. Bruder, president, embodying a resolution adopted by that society, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by White Motor Local No. 32, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the enactment of the so-called labor extension bill; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mack Local Union No. 343, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, of Plainfield, N. J., signed by Walter T. Pritchard, president, and Stephen Rohlfing, financial secretary-treasurer, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 110, and House bill 1380, providing for the extension of labor education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from J. O. Long, of Thomaston, Ga., relating to the coal strike, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Herman J Bolst, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to the retirement of Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Dover (Tenn.) Chamber of Commerce, signed by Porter Herndon, president, enclosing a resolution adopted by a mass meeting of Stewart County (Tenn.) farmers and businessmen, endorsing the plans of the Corps of Engineers for the development of the Cumberland River (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution 37

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the United States engineers and Congress to open all spillways of the Federal Government to relieve floodwaters of the Mississippi River

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the membership of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi that the United States engineers have opened the Bonnet Carre spillway, in order to relieve the pressure on the levees in the vicinity of the city of New Orleans, thereby protecting the property owners of the State of Louisiana from possible heavy damage in the event of crevasses in the levee; and

"Whereas in 1945 the Government engineers deemed it necessary and advisable to open said Bonnet Carre spillway, which was kept open for approximately 58 days, permitting the waters from the Mississippi River to fan out over the Mississippi Sound in the State of Mississippi and Lake Borgne and vicinity within the State of Louisiana, thereby destroying the oyster reefs both in the State of Mississippi and the State of Louisiana, it having been estimated that 1,700,000 barrels of oysters were destroyed within the territorial waters of the State of Mississippi; and

"Whereas this destruction was brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States in two hearings, one before the Public Works Committee in the House of Representatives in Congress, and one before a subcommittee of the Fish and Wildlife Committee of the House of Representatives in Congress, with a request that the Congress make reparations to the State of Mississippi for the damage done by the opening of said Bonnet Carre spillway in 1945; that although

it has been 5 years since this damage was done, and 4 years since the first hearing was had before the said congressional committees, the Congress has made no move to make reparations except to authorize the appointment of a subcommittee of the Fish and Wildlife Service to make a survey and made an appropriation to finance said survey; and

"Whereas due to the excessive high water in the Mississippi River it has again become necessary to open the Bonnet Carre spillway and in the opening of this spillway to protect property loss in Louisiana, it is an established fact that great loss will come to the oyster industry of Mississippi, in that, first, the State of Mississippi will sustain a great loss in the destruction of the oysters we have cultivated in the Mississippi Sound, and, second, a large number of oyster-canning plants operating in Mississippi depend on oysters from these Mississippi reefs for a supply of oysters to operate their plants. In the operation of these plants a large number of men and women are employed. These men and women, in fact thousands, will be thrown out of employment and the owners of these factories, who have large investments in boats and machinery, will be forced out of business, affecting adversely the entire economy of the Mississippi Gulf coast and southern Mississippi Due to the fact that the Mississippi Legislature has from time to time appropriated money to cultivate these reefs and only the last session appropriated $360,000 to rehabilitate these reefs when they had been practically destroyed by opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway in 1945 and the destruction of the hurricane of 1947, and

"Whereas a large quantity of oysters have been developed through the expenditure of these funds and the cultivation of said reefs by the Sea Food Commission, an agency of the State of Mississippi; and

"Whereas the Government has expended enormous amounts of money in the construction of other spillways to relieve the pressure of floodwaters on the Mississippi levee, and feeling that by the opening of all spillways constructed by the Government, that the floodwaters may be dispersed over a wider area, thereby doing less damage to all oyster reefs on the Gulf coast: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the senate concurring therein), That Gen. Pete Ferringa, United States engineer in charge of flood control in the lower Mississippi Valley, and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to utilize all flood-control spillways in order to lower the water level in the lower Mississippi Valley by dispersing said floodwaters to all sections of the Mississippi Valley, rather than dispersing all floodwaters out into the Mississippi Sound of the Gulf of Mexico and destroying the oyster reefs in Mississippi and east Louisiana; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house be authorized and directed to send a copy of this resolution to Gen. Pete Ferringa, to the Presiding Officer of the lower House of Congress, and to the Vice President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the United States Senators from Mississippi, and to each Member of the delegation in Congress from the State of Mississippi.

"Adopted by the house of representatives February 13, 1950.

"MILTON SIMS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate February 15, 1950.

"SAM LUMPKIN,
"President of the Senate."

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, N. Y., voicing its opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas on May 23, 1947, January 20, 1948, and on various occasions over a period of years prior thereto, this board of supervisors has recorded itself in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; and

Whereas the Public Works Committee of the United States Congress is preparing for a hearing on the St. Lawrence project, to be held during the month of February 1950; and

Whereas it is still self-evident that the proposed seaway, if completed, would threaten the economy of the entire State of New York, and particularly the Niagara frontier; and

Whereas the people of this State have invested large sums of money to provide water transportation from Lake Erie to the port of New York; and

Whereas the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would cause a serious diversion of transportation from the Erie Canal, and particularly the port of Buffalo, such diversion resulting in direct loss of revenues to this locality, and further resulting in the eventual loss of employment to many of our citizens; and

Whereas the people of Erie County would be called upon through additional Federal taxation to meet the staggering cost of the contemplated project; and

Whereas such a project is unsound, unwarranted, and unnecessary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board of supervisors again voice its opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Representatives in Congress and to the Public Works Committee of Congress.

SUPERVISION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a fine communication from George A. MacLachlan, president of the Wisconsin Bankers Association, a splendid organization of leading citizens of my State, and associated with the National Bank of La Crosse, Wis., enclosing a resolution adopted by the association endorsing legislation now pending before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee for the supervision of bank holding companies. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Milwaukee, February 27, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You may recall that some time ago the Wisconsin Bankers Association adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering legislation for the supervision and control of the operation and expansion of bank holding companies; and

"Whereas it is the time-honored custom of commercial banking in the United States to devote its efforts exclusively to the business of banking: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the executive council of the Wisconsin Bankers Association urge the Congress that legislation be enacted to supervise bank holding companies and to regulate creation of new bank holding companies."

We trust that in view of the above Senate bill 2318 now pending in Congress will have your very careful consideration and we would appreciate your putting this letter on record with the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Very truly yours,

GEO. A. MACLACHLAN,
President.

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE—RESOLUTION OF KIMBALL (NEBR.) AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the American Legion Auxiliary of Kimball, Nebr., strongly expressing their opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control. The resolution is in harmony with a similar one adopted at the national convention of the Legion which convened in Philadelphia, Pa., on September 1, 1949. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American veteran in two world wars has defended the American free enterprise system, which has made possible the development in this country of the highest standards of medical care and the finest medical institutions attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas having experienced the shortcomings of impersonal, assembly line medical care inherent in the form of government-controlled medicine necessary in time of war, the veteran understands the dangers of imposing such a system permanently on the entire population; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would impose an unjust tax on the veteran's pay check for medical care to which he is now entitled free of charge as a reward for his service to his country; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would force a tax of 3 percent on the income of the employed veteran, rising to a tax of at least 6 percent within a few years, creating new financial burdens which would increase the costs of necessities of life and lower the standard of living for veterans and other citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion Auxiliary of Kimball, Nebr., does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator from the State of Nebraska and the Representative from our District and that said Senators and Representative be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 3160. A bill to authorize the establishment of an educational agency for surplus property within the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3161. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and orders, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MORSE:

S 3162. A bill for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. TYDINGS·

S 3163. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Honora Redman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 3164. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Rebecca Fire Thunder Galligo; and

S. 3165. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Angelique Fire Thunder, Rebecca Galligo, William Fire Thunder, Peter Fire Thunder, Lydia Bluebird, and Virginia G. Conroy, heirs of Edgar Fire Thunder, deceased, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

By Mr. LANGER:

S 3166 A bill for the relief of certain Latvians and Estonians, and

S. 3167. A bill for the relief of certain Latvians and Estonians; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT).

S. 3168. A bill to amend section 131 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the reference of certain private relief measures to the Court of Claims for recommendation as to the quantum of relief to be granted; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 3169, to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to provide a more effective method of dealing with labor disputes in vital industries which affect the public interest, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and appears under a separate heading.)

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5472, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7477) providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR ANDERSON

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner address delivered by Senator ANDERSON at Boise, Idaho, on February 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS OF SENATOR AIKEN BEFORE EASTERN STATES FARMERS' EXCHANGE ANNUAL MEETING

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator AIKEN before the Eastern States Farmers' Exchange annual meeting, at Springfield, Mass., February 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR TOBEY BEFORE WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB, CLAREMONT, N. H.

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by him to the Women's Republican Club, of Claremont, N. H., on February 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

COMPANY, SEVEN UNIONS AT PEACE FOR 15 YEARS—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Company, Seven Unions at Peace for 15 Years," published in the New York Times, February 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

THE CRUSADE AGAINST GAMBLING—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of combating the influence of interstate gambling and racketeering, which appears in the Appendix]

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN BEFORE SENIOR CLASS OF CONFLUENCE HIGH SCHOOL

[Mr MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address he delivered before the senior class of the Confluence High School at Confluence, Pa., February 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix]

EDUCATION FOR FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY DR. MILTON S. EISENHOWER

[Mr. MARTIN, on behalf of Mr SCHOEPPEL, Mr. DARBY, Mr. MYERS, and himself, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Education for Freedom," delivered by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Pennsylvania State College, at the forty-first annual dinner meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association in Philadelphia, on February 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ROAD AHEAD—CONDENSATION OF BOOK BY JOHN FLYNN

[Mr BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a condensation of the book entitled "The Road Ahead," written by John T. Flynn, published in the February 1950 issue of the Reader's Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY ROBERT M. SEARLS IN OPPOSITION TO EXTENSION OF SOCIAL-SECURITY INSURANCE TO COVER MINE BLOCK LEASERS

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement delivered by Robert M. Searls, of San Francisco, Calif., in opposition to certain sections of House bill 6000, which appears in the Appendix.]

EYEWITNESS REPORT ON COMMUNIST-OCCUPIED GERMANY

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Otto Kundert, of Mound City, S. Dak., as an eyewitness report on Communist-occupied Germany, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further routine matters, under the unanimous-consent agreement the Chair recognizes the Senator from Virginia.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on Friday, February 24, while I was absent from the floor of the Senate because of serious illness in my family, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] attacked the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which I am chairman. He called it the Byrd committee.

I find that in 2,000 words of remarks attributed to the junior Senator from Minnesota, appearing on pages 2328 to 2329 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there are at least nine misstatements which require correction, for accuracy. They are as follows:

Misstatement No. 1: The junior Senator from Minnesota said the committee stands as "the No. 1 example of waste and extravagance" in the Federal Government.

This is not only a misstatement; even in this atomic era of superlatives, it must go down as a superexaggeration. During the committee's existence, Federal expenditure budgets have totaled more than half a trillion dollars. Of this total, $127,500 has been appropriated to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and I deny that any of it has been squandered. But even if there had been no return from the committee's work, to say that the loss of something over $100,000 in 9 years would constitute the No. 1 example of waste and extravagance in the Federal Government is absolutely theatrical, and requires no answer. But it does indicate that the junior Senator from Minnesota discussed this subject in a mood that cannot be regarded as unprejudiced.

In passing, Mr. President, let me say that only yesterday the junior Senator from Minnesota submitted a resolution calling for the appropriation of $250,000 for the examination of the coal situation. That resolution could have no bearing on the pending coal emergency. Yet while condemning the expenditure of $127,000 as "the No. 1 waste and extravagance," although that was expended for the purpose of economy, the junior Senator from Minnesota seeks for his committee—I assume he will wish to head the examination or investigation—an appropriation of $250,000, for what purpose I do not know unless the Senator from Minnesota has in mind the nationalization of the coal industry. That may be; I do not know. The purpose will be developed, I imagine, if the Senator from Minnesota secures the $250,000 appropriation.

Misstatement No. 2: The junior Senator from Minnesota said the report of the committee and its accompanying statement of February 14 "presents a distorted picture of Federal employment."

Mr. President, distortion is to be found only in the manner in which the junior Senator from Minnesota quoted from my February 14 statement. He picked up half of the first paragraph sentence and read it with the third paragraph, and then he picked up the eighth paragraph and read it into paragraph 12. Personnel statistics compiled by the joint committee show trends not only in total Federal civilian employment, but also in the agencies, in categories of activities, such as military and civilian, in types of work, such as industrial and white-collar, and in domestic and overseas service. The committee began compiling personnel reports certified to by the departments and agencies only when by its own experience it found that those otherwise available were inadequate and unreliable. Continued dissemination is in response to requests by Members of both Houses of Congress.

In connection with that misstatement, the junior Senator from Minnesota protested my statements relative to continuing increases in Post Office employment, and cited increased business—presumably in justification. The Hoover Commission's Citizens Committee is authority for the statement that there "has been no basic change in the organizational structure of the Post Office Department since 1836."

And as a result of pressure being put on the Department to reduce its operating costs, postmasters from 50 of the larger offices were called into the Department during the past week to discuss the subject. The postal deficit estimated for the next fiscal year is $555,000,000. Postal deficits have been responsible for a substantial part of the Federal debt.

Misstatement No. 3: The junior Senator from Minnesota said the Eightieth Congress refused to appropriate for the committee.

This statement is not sustained by the facts. No request for funds was made, and there was no act of refusal. The chairman submitted his resignation when the Eightieth Congress was organized by the Republican majority. But he was advised that a proposal to expand the scope of the committee's authority to embrace the functions of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget was under consideration, and that action on his resignation would not be taken pending a decision on this question. Under the circumstances, the chairman recommended no appropriation. When the Eighty-first Congress was organized, the question was no longer active, and funds were appropriated.

Misstatement No. 4: The junior Senator from Minnesota said:

> The only reports which this joint committee has produced are monthly personnel statistics.

Mr. President, the committee does compile monthly statistics, as I have said, on increases and decreases in Federal employment. But in addition to the series of 71 monthly personnel issuances, there have been 26 formal reports by the committee. These are documented in the public records of Congress which are available to all who would choose to have themselves advised as to the facts in this respect.

Misstatement No. 5: The junior Senator from Minnesota said that "without any justification whatsoever the committee has regularly issued general statements calling for blanket reductions in Federal personnel.

To the contrary, the only formula produced to date for orderly reduction in force in periods of transition or otherwise originated with the committee, and took the form of the Byrd-Langer amendment, adopted by Congress in 1944.

Mr. President, I wish again to express my appreciation to the Senator from North Dakota who, as a patron of the amendment, rendered valuable service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service which held long hearings relative to the amendment adopted. That legislation established ceilings under which the Director of the Budget—with full knowledge of funds available and production requirements—can avoid meat-ax slashes, and can apply reductions on the basis of justification. As the Senator from North Dakota knows, it resulted in proper, orderly and substantial reduction in Federal Government personnel. The trouble now, however, is that these ceilings have constantly been chipped away by continual exemptions of pet agencies, over my protests and over the protests of the Senator from North Dakota. Had we retained those ceilings, the economy would have been very much greater; but, as I shall show, later on, it was very substantial, as a result of that action. So if the Senator from Minnesota says we have given neither justification nor plan for reducing the Federal Government personnel, he is making a statement which is not in accord with the record.

The committee many times has directed attention to areas of excess employment, including the postwar situation in the defense establishment prior to the Johnson order of last August, and in the Veterans' Administration prior to the general order of the Administrator a year ago. Reductions in both instances followed committee revelations.

The joint committee has repeatedly called the attention of the Secretary of Defense to excess civilian employment in the armed services, and to the fact that the armed services have had one civilian employee for every two persons in uniform. I think this constant repetition as much as anything resulted in the reduction ordered by Secretary Johnson—and I congratulate him on his courageous action. The Veterans' Administration also ordered reductions. In both instances, facts relative to the subject were revealed by the committee.

Misstatement No. 6: The junior Senator from Minnesota said the committee "deals only in generalities."

The committee has conducted many formal hearings, and in its 26 fully documented formal reports it has made some 75 specific recommendations for Federal economy and efficiency, and they have been followed in more than 50 instances by legislative or administrative action in the fields to which they were directed. As I shall show, savings resulting from this legislation and action have been estimated to involve very large sums of money. But one who does not know about the reports could not be expected to know what was in them.

Misstatement No. 7: The junior Senator from Minnesota said the committee "is a violation of the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act."

The matter of record joint committees was deliberately excluded from application of the Legislative Reorganization Act as it was enacted, with respect to reallocation of functions. And even in the Senate version of the bill, joint committees in existence prior to enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act would have been excluded from its application. This committee was established before the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act. Other such committees in existence then included the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and so forth.

If the junior Senator from Minnesota thinks the committee violates the spirit of the law he is in disagreement with the views of Congress at the time the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed and since it has been in effect, for all these committees have been subject to review by Congress since 1946, whenever it became necessary to obtain additional appropriations.

Misstatement No. 8: The junior Senator from Minnesota said "the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is one of those that has most frequently indulged itself" in one of two "sports," which he described as "persecution and prosecution," and "concealment, containment, evasion, and misrepresentation." That is a pretty big charge; it takes in a great deal of territory. I deny emphatically this allegation, and challenge the junior Senator from Minnesota to produce any evidence whatever that the committee has ever engaged in persecution or prosecution of anyone, or in the concealment, containment, evasion, or misrepresentation of anything.

Members of the committee include some of the most highly esteemed Members of Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Budget. To say that these gentlemen who constitute the committee would engage in or tolerate any of these practices is an irresponsible statement which imputes unworthy conduct and motives on the part of the committee members. Every formal report of this committee has been agreed to by a majority of the members.

Misstatement No. 9: The junior Senator from Minnesota said the committee "is merely used as a publicity medium."

I submit that the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the ranking members of these committees, and the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget

require no medium for publicity. In fact, in these days, no publicity could popularize a committee such as the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, to which are assigned the objectives of economy. If information developed through the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has found its way into publication, it is on merit; it is because those responsible for the publications have found that the information is reliable, authenticated, and documented; it is because the source of the information is the one particle of this vast Government best known for its dedication to keeping both the revenue and the expenditure side of the Federal fiscal situation in true perspective without regard to the vacillation of political expediency.

The committee has naturally made enemies. As chairman of the committee, I have made many enemies in the ranks of those who resent any and all efforts to balance the budget or to retrench and eliminate the waste and extravagance which permeate nearly every agency of the Federal Government. After years of effort, I am fully aware that an economizer has a thankless task in this day, when the one panacea offered for all problems is more and more Government spending. But as chairman of the committee, I take pride in the fact that in all of its many reports during 9 years there has not been a single instance of a factual statement having been successfully contradicted. If the Senator from Minnesota can point to a single inaccurate statement of fact by the committee, he has not done so. It is because of the accuracy of the factual statements of the committee that it has a standing for reliability throughout the country. This may account for the publicity complained of by the Senator from Minnesota, which has been given to the committee's reports and recommendations.

Why does the Senator from Minnesota object to this publicity? Why should he be afraid of it?

In his speech in the Senate he said the committee "serves no useful purpose" and is mainly used as a "publicity medium." As the Senator from Minnesota is a publicity expert himself, his statement, although not intended as such, could be regarded as a compliment from one who welcomes, and has been signally successful in creating, publicity for himself and his objectives. I know of no Senator who has more generously used the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other governmental facilities to promote his publicity. If he has ever hidden his light under a bushel, I am not aware of it. If he has ever run away from publicity, I do not know of it, and no one else does. I am not impressed by any I have observed indicating that he is of the shrinking-violet type evading publicity.

The Senator charges propaganda when the newspapers publish the reports of the committee in its efforts to promote sound fiscal policies. But he continually strives to propagandize himself and those things he advocates as being proper and worthy.

If the Senator desires to pursue the question of propaganda further, it might be interesting to measure on a day-by-day basis the propaganda he has inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since he came to the Senate. Meanwhile, I submit that if the committee is a "publicity medium," it is a piker in comparison with the scores of propaganda mills elsewhere in the Government, which spend a thousand times, or at least many times, the amount this committee is spending—on the average about $12,000 to $14,000 a year. For those who would criticize the committee as a "publicity medium," I quote from an editorial in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, February 27, wherein, speaking of the effort of the Senator from Minnesota to abolish this committee, it is said:

> The relatively small cost of maintaining this congressional "publicity medium" is a profitable investment, the returns on which in terms of administrative savings can be large, indeed.

I have mentioned nine misstatements. There are other statements, incapable of proof, such as the assertion that $250,000 worth of time and effort of the executive branch "have gone into compiling joint committee data" over a period of 9 years. Such a figure is fiction. It might as well have been picked out of the air. Actually, the committee is authorized by law to require such information from executive agencies as it chooses to request.

The information requested should be available to the citizens of the country; it should be available to Congress, and it should be available without extra cost, and Government records should be capable of producing it with no unreasonable cost.

I have analyzed every statement about the committee, made on last Friday by the junior Senator from Minnesota, with respect to the committee. I could go on mentioning more, which should be refuted in the interests of accuracy and fairness, but nine misstatements in 2,000 words on this one subject should be enough. This is an average of a misstatement in less than every 250 words; and the Senator from Minnesota speaks like the wind.

It has been said that "It is an ill wind that blows no good," and for some time I have been hoping for an opportunity to discuss the work of the committee before the Senate, especially for the benefit of the newer Members who have not had occasion to become familiar with it and with the reasons for its establishment, or with its accomplishments to date. It was never intended to accomplish miracles, and none have been wrought. It was not empowered to act legislatively, and it does not. It stands apart from other committees in that it was established by statute, and its membership embraces not only representatives of the legislative branch, but the executive branch as well. The unusual nature of its mission is disclosed by its legislative history. It is directed, however, to investigate activities of the Government with a view to finding and reporting where economy and efficiency may be achieved.

Before discussing other aspects of the committee and its work, I should like to summarize for the RECORD its activity and accomplishments.

During its existence the committee has conducted many hearings, issued 26 formal and fully documented reports, and made some 75 specific recommendations for economy and efficiency.

Aside from its formal reports the committee has compiled a series of 71 committee prints containing certified personnel reports from departments and agencies on a monthly basis. Complementing these monthly personnel reports the committee has compiled 15 additional statistical studies in various categories of Federal personnel reporting.

Among the formal committee reports dealing with specific subjects and activities have been those submitted with respect to Government questionnaires, unofficial use of Government automobiles in general, unofficial use of nonmilitary Government automobiles during the war, duplication among agricultural credit agencies and competitive lending practicles in agriculture, delayed HOLC liquidation, NYA training program, unnecessary travel and communications in the Government. Special reports on the Federal personnel situation during the war effort and postwar readjustment period, Federal ownership of real estate of the Nation.

The committee made an exhaustive report, with great effort, showing the exact amount of Federal ownership of real estate in every State of the Union, as well as other property owned by the Federal Government.

The abuse of official mail privileges, Government corporations, surplus and unexpended balances, reorganization in the executive branch of the Federal Government, the operation of personnel ceilings, Federal subsidies and grants-in-aid to States, assets of wholly owned Government corporations, Federal lending agencies, and United States postwar foreign assistance. The committee recommendations, based on its studies, hearings, and reports have been followed in more than 50 instances by legislative or administrative action resulting in reduction of Federal expenditures. Of course the committee does not and should not claim full credit for this action, but it may properly contend that through its recommendations it has made some contributions toward the reductions which have been effected.

An exhaustive report was made on Government corporations, and, as a result, the Byrd-Butler bill was passed, placing these corporations under the control of the budget, for the first time. Prior to that time, there had been blanket appropriations which were not supervised by the budget. That law is still in existence.

As chairman of the committee, I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] who, as a member of both the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures and as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, has taken the floor frequently in behalf of expenditure reductions recommended by

the committee. I express the same appreciation to other members of the committee. I do not contend that a specific price tag can be placed upon any or all of the committee's recommendations. However, it may be of interest to know that as legislative and administrative action has been taken in fields in which the committee made recommendations, estimates as to savings resulting from such legislative and administrative action were requested from competent authorities.

A summary of legislative and administrative action in which the committee has been interested by virtue of its recommendations, with estimated reductions in each case, as made by competent officials, follows:

First. Abolition of Civilian Conservation Corps, $238,960,000.

Second. Abolition of nondefense activities of NYA, $83,767,000.

Third. Wartime reduction of WPA activities, $540,000,000.

Fourth. Temporary curtailment of non-war-connected activities of Department of Agriculture, $195,731,208.

Fifth. Curtailing of farm-tenant program, $2,270,000.

Sixth. Liquidation of Farm Security Administration, $26,180,000.

Seventh. Emergency deferment of expenditures for Federal highway projects, $50,300,000.

Eighth. Emergency deferment of nondefense public-building construction, $33,148,000.

Ninth. Emergency limitation of Interior Department public works projects under construction already, $56,935,000.

Tenth. Reduction of loan authorizations for farm-tenant program, $17,500,000.

Eleventh. Reduction of loan authorization of Farm Security Administration, $22,500,000.

Twelfth. Deferment of nondefense REA expansion program, $90,000,000.

Thirteenth. Elimination of unnecessary questionnaires, $1,790,000.

The committee was accorded the unusual privilege of having a resolution introduced by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to investigate the matter of questionnaires. Although, under the rules of the Senate, the committee has no right or power, except by special permission, to consider any resolutions, the majority leader was kind enough to agree to have the resolution referred to the committee, and the Senator from Michigan appeared before the committee. That was at a time when the country was being flooded with requests for filling out questionnaires and making reports on every conceivable subject. The committee held extensive hearings and recommended legislation which was enacted and which greatly reduced the number of such reports.

Fourteenth. Reduction of Government vehicle mileage, $383,168.

Fifteen. Leasing instead of purchasing land and utilization of Government-owned land, $2,800,000.

Sixteenth. Cancellation of leasehold interests, $47,907.

Seventeenth. Abolition of NYA, $56,744,000.

Eighteenth. Liquidation of Work Projects Administration, $106,167,499.

Nineteenth. Curtailment of Government publicity, $5,811,199.

Twentieth. Elimination of certain overlapping and duplicating functions, $937,922.

Twenty-first. Deferment of nondefense reclamation projects, $52,719,470.

Twenty-second. Deferment of work on rivers and harbors projects, $181,894,100.

Twenty-third. Reduction in Farm Security Administration following recommendation for its liquidation, $18,022,142.

Twenty-fourth. Curtailment of farm-tenant program, $298,930.

Twenty-fifth. Liquidation of resettlement projects, $78,961.

Twenty-sixth. Reduction in loan authorization of Farm Security Administration, $37,500,000.

Twenty-seventh. Reduction in loan authorization of farm-tenant programs, $2,500,000.

Twenty-eighth. Reduction in Federal personnel under Byrd-Langer amendment, $295,669,000.

The Senator from Minnesota stated that the committee had made no recommendations concerning reductions in personnel. These are official figures.

Twenty-ninth. Suspension of competitive lending activities of Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, $171,700,000.

Thirtieth. Reduction in HOLC administrative expenses, $4,171,506.

Thirty-first. Elimination of unnecessary Government forms and reports, $5,370,000.

Thirty-second. Termination of military leases, $3,080,523.

Thirty-third. Termination of additional military leases, $25,919,477.

Thirty-fourth. Leasing instead of purchasing land for war activities, $2,800,000.

Thirty-fifth. Waste paper contracts, $173,065.

Thirty-sixth. Additional mileage reduction by motor vehicles, $3,466,626.

Thirty-seventh. Further cancellation of leasehold interests, $1,254,184.

Thirty-eighth. Curtailment of regional agricultural credit corporations administrative expenses, $790,007.

As I recall, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] had a part in that.

Thirty-ninth. Further reduction in HOLC funds, $1,883,682.

Fortieth. Reduction in travel and communication costs, $89,833,310.

Forty-first. Further cancellation and renewal of waste paper contracts, $519,195.

Forty-second. Further action on Government leases, $2,800,000.

Forty-third. Further action with respect to maximum utilization of Government property, $1,082,115.

Forty-fourth. Further action with respect to maximum utilization of Government property, $161,352.

Forty-fifth. Enactment of the Government Corporation Control Act.

Forty-sixth. Reorganization in the executive branch.

Forty-seventh. Curtailment of subsidies and grants-in-aid.

Forty-eighth. Liquidation of certain wholly owned Government corporation assets.

Forty-ninth. Curtailment of Federal lending activities.

Fiftieth. Curtailment of Commerce Department publications, $422,923.

After considerable investigation we recommended curtailment of quite a number of publications of the Department of Commerce, at a saving of $422,923.

The total of these estimated reductions resulting from legislative and administrative action in fields toward which attention was directed by committee recommendations is $2,436,000,000. (This total does not include any estimate of savings resulting from postwar personnel reduction.)

Again I emphasize that the committee is not trying to take credit for that saving, but I do say that, in accordance with the law, which directed it to do so, we made these recommendations, after hearings and full documentation, prior to the time the reductions were made.

From this record it is seen that while the committee has performed no miracles, it has made an earnest effort to promote economy. This is one of the toughest obligations confronting Congress at this time, but it is vital if we are to preserve our solvency.

If we continue deficit spending, sooner or later we shall go over the precipice of financial disaster. Every Senator knows we are about to embark on another year of deficit spending—although it is a year of perhaps the highest prosperity the country has ever known—a year when there are no new economic emergencies abroad. The President has recommended in his budget message less foreign assistance money than is to be spent this year. There are no economic emergencies at home except that brought on by the coal strike. With all the earnestness of which I am capable, I ask Senators this question: If we cannot balance our budget now, in God's name when can we balance it? What reason is there to believe that it will be easier to balance it next year, or 5 years from now, or 10 years from now, than it is now?

I should like to say, further, that 2 years ago we expended $34,000,000,000. No worthy object suffered then. The economic crisis abroad was greater than it is now. We spent $34,000,000,000. Now we are spending $43,000,000,000, an increase of $9,000,000,000 in 2 years of peace, with no new emergencies to justify the additional domestic civilian expenditures at home, and $6,000,000,000 of the increase for next year is purely for domestic civilian spending unrelated to past or future defense or foreign assistance. We have nearly doubled our non-war-connected domestic spending in 2 years.

I think the time has come, for us to face the situation squarely, and realize that if we embark now on deficit spending resulting from domestic-civilian increases, under the conditions which now exist, we may never again balance the budget of the United States Government.

I believe that is not too broad a statement to make under the conditions.

What justification is there to believe that the budget can be balanced in later years if we cannot balance it now. Suppose we had a recession in business. It would mean that for every $4 decline in personal income there would be approximately $1 less in Federal revenue. So that if there is a recession of only 10 percent—that is all it would have to be, to go back to the income of 1948 and we were fairly prosperous then—we would lose $5,000,000,000 in Federal income. Where would our Federal deficits be in that event, if we continue the current rate of spending?

So I think that economy deserves a little consideration. We have a great many agencies to promote expenditure of Federal funds and there are many people who are interested in spending public money. There must be a balance. This Nation was established on the principle of checks and balances. It was not intended to be all one way. I do not believe we all have to be economizers. I do think, however, there ought to be a few persons—and I think there are—who realize the danger in the situation which confronts us. There should be some whose job it is to say what should be done to avert financial disaster.

I have often thought and have asked myself, When does a democracy become insolvent? Our national wealth could not be put up for sale. I say a democracy begins to be insolvent when, in the absence of emergency, there is continuing failure to raise sufficient taxes to pay the obligations of the Government for the year. I ask in all seriousness if we have not about reached that point. Does anyone believe that we shall be able to raise five or six or seven billion dollars in new taxes this year? The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Finance Committee, knows how difficult it would be to raise five or six or seven billion dollars.

Some say that we should tax the corporations. Last year we collected $12,000,000,000 from corporations. If we taxed the corporations six to seven billion dollars more, it would mean an increase of about 50 or 60 percent in their taxes, and the corporations would have nothing with which to pay their dividends, and nothing with which to pay for expansion, and nothing with which to pay their debts.

Some say that we should put the extra taxation on individuals. Last year we raised $18,000,000,000 from individual income taxes. If we put six or seven billion dollars of additional taxation on individuals, it would mean an increase of 30 or 40 percent. We cannot raise the needed amount through excise taxes, because many of the excise taxes, when the condition of the Treasury warrants it, should certainly be repealed or reduced.

I say we have reached the point right now where insolvency begins in this country unless we balance our budget. Our forefathers, in their wisdom, established the principle of checks and balances. One of those checks and balances was that excessive spending should be curbed by excessive taxation. When it is passed on in deficit spending it is like an opiate. The people do not realize it until they are burdened with the evils of enormous debt, which might easily become uncontrollable and disastrous.

Could anyone imagine that in time of peace and high prosperity the Government would deliberately indulge in another era of deficit spending resulting from increased domestic civilian expenditures? So I say this year will be one of the most critical years in the destiny of our country, because if we deliberately go into deficit spending, there is no reason to believe that the condition will not continue. No man can predict that conditions will be more conducive to balancing of the budget next year or in future years than they are today.

Let me say, in conclusion, Mr. President that the idea for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures originated in a suggestion by former Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau. He suggested to the Senate Finance Committee that a joint committee composed of the chairmen and ranking members of the congressional Revenue and Appropriations Committees, complemented by the revenue and spending officials in the executive branch, would fill a bad gap in Federal fiscal machinery, and would be helpful in coordinating the Government's income probability with expenditure requirements. It was with this historical background that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures was created by the Revenue Act of 1941.

Mr. President, for the RECORD, I wish now to read from the Revenue Act of 1941 the act which created the committee. It is very short.

> (a) There is hereby established a committee to investigate Federal expenditures * * * to be composed of (1) three members of the Senate Committee on Finance and three members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; (2) three members of the House Committee on Ways and Means and three members of the House Committee on Appropriations, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and (3) the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. * * *
>
> (b) It shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential. The committee shall report to the President and to the Congress the results of its study, together with its recommendations, at the earliest practicable date.

The committee has spent, on the average, $12,000 to $14,000 a year. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] says that is the No. 1 outstanding example of waste and extravagance in the entire Federal Government.

It could profitably spend more, but I am not going to be an example of spending. The committee has done the best it could, and I submit in all candor, and without taking credit to myself or the other members of the joint committee, that committee has done pretty well with appropriations totaling $127,000 over a period of 9 years.

Mr. President, I wish to mention one further matter. I have offered several times to resign. I offered to alternate with the House of Representatives, but Mr. DOUGHTON requested that I remain as chairman. I offered to resign when the Republicans took charge. I am perfectly willing to resign at any time. It would be a great relief to me to be relieved of the responsibility. I have no desire to continue as chairman of the committee, and whenever the Senate wants to change the committee, or abolish it, or do whatever in its judgment it may think proper, it is at perfect liberty to do so, and whatever it did would be entirely satisfactory to me. But I do not want it done as a result of misinformation such as that which has been presented to the Senate.

The committee members include: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON is vice chairman, and he has taken a great interest in the work of the committee.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is the ranking member. The other members from the Senate are the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and myself.

The members from the House are:

Representative CLARENCE CANNON, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the House.

Representative JOHN H. KERR, of North Carolina.

Representative JERE COOPER, of Tennessee.

Representative JOHN TABER, of New York.

Representative DANIEL A. REED, of New York.

The committee has met as often as it could in consideration of the pressure of the work on its members who, as I have said, is composed of the chairmen of the important committees, and others who have extremely burdensome duties. At the last meeting of the committee the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] offered a resolution directing the committee to conduct certain investigations, which it is doing now, and it will report shortly.

Committee meetings are held as promptly as possible, but this spring, for example, Mr. DOUGHTON requested postponement of committee meetings because constant sessions of the House Committee on Ways and Means were to be concluded, and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was confronted with similar schedules by the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, this is not a one-man committee, as some try to charge. Attempt has been made not to take committee chairmen away from their primary responsibilities but they have been fully informed as to all of the activities of the committee, and they have received the reports. Not a single report has been made except with written approval of a majority of the committee. The committee I think is proud of the fact that it is widely regarded as a watchdog for the Federal fiscal situation. It receives literally thousands of letters from all over the country asking for informa-

tion about expenditures in Washington, and they are answered. It receives many complaints about extravagance. The committee takes these complaints up with the departments and in many instances it has been able to accomplish some economy and bring about some changes simply by taking up the bona fide complaints. The value of the committee in that respect is difficult to evaluate. But there is ample evidence of its intangible value.

Mr. President, I will not take up any more time of the Senate. I thank Members of the Senate very much for the attention they have given me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The able Senator from Virginia spoke of balancing the budget this year. As the Senator knows it is estimated that the deficit this year will be about $5,100,000,000. May I inquire from the able Senator whether he has a break-down of that $5,100,000,000, and whether he can state how and where he would save that $5,100,000,000 so far as the President's expenditure budget is concerned?

Mr. BYRD. I will say in reply to the Senator from Illinois that I placed in the RECORD a month ago a detailed breakdown, expenditure budget as proposed by the President along with the expenditure estimates of the current year and the actual figures for 1948. The table also listed suggestions I would make. I did that on my own responsibility because I did not want to involve the committee in recommendations of that kind until it had had a full opportunity to study the subject, and I did it after a very careful consideration. The President's budget provides for spending upward of $43,000,000,000, when the postal deficit is included. My proposals total $36,000,000,000 which would be $2,000,000,000 more than Federal expenditures in fiscal year 1948, 2 years ago.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I was certain the Senator had made such a suggestion.

Mr. BYRD. I shall be glad to furnish it to the Senator with the detail which has been published.

Mr. LUCAS. I assume the Senator would be in a position to come before the Appropriations Committee——

Mr. BYRD. I want to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. And explain to the committee where these budget cuts can be made.

Mr. BYRD. I shall be pleased to present my views with respect to expenditures in each category of items. With the limited facilities at my command, I shall do my best to meet the requirements for detail, but the Senator from Illinois cannot expect me to say exactly, in every instance, where a dollar may be eliminated.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I appreciate that the Senator is perhaps somewhat limited in the budget under which the committee operates. But the Senator says the Federal budget ought to be balanced.

Mr. BYRD. I say absolutely it should be balanced. Beyond question it should be.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the Senator will give his recommendation to any committee.

Mr. BYRD. I will give it to the Senate or I will give it to the Senator from Illinois or give it to anyone in America as to how I think it should be balanced.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is tremendously important, because the Senator has constantly told the American people that the budget ought to be balanced. I agree with him that if it can be it ought to be balanced. I think the Senator from Virginia, with his long experience here in budget matters and financial matters, ought to be in a position at least to give the committee a break-down of exactly where he thinks money can be saved.

Mr. BYRD. Please. The Senator used the word "exactly." His question is a pretty big one when he asks if I can tell precisely where, in a $43,000,000,000 budget, every dollar should be cut off. I can give the Senator the outline which has been submitted in some detail. It has been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since this session of Congress was convened. It has been published twice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am sorry the Senator missed it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr LUCAS. The Senator knows that the expenditures in 1951 are estimated to be $1,000,000,000 less than the President recommended in 1950. The Senator agrees with me on that, does he not?

Mr. BYRD. I do not have the figures immediately available here But I assume the Senator from Illinois knows that 2 years ago the Government spent $34,000,000,000, and now it is spending $43,000,000,000. I should like the Senator from Illinois or someone who can speak for the budget proposed by the administration to justify an increase of $3 000,000,000 to $9,000,000,000 in expenditures in 2 years, when $6,000,000,000 has been added to domestic civilian spending unrelated to war-connected costs or any economic crisis abroad.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois is trying to represent the administration as best he can. If I had a little more cooperation frequently from some of my brothers on this side of the aisle I might do a better job.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Illinois receives cooperation when he is on the right track. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. I am afraid that if I followed my good friend the Senator from Virginia I would not be on any track at all.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator would be on the sound track of a balanced budget if he followed the Senator from Virginia, and that is what this country wants and must have if we are to preserve our solvency.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator this question. I have great affection for my friend from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I reciprocate it, every bit of it.

Mr. LUCAS. I know he is trying to do what he thinks is best for his Government in connection with the great financial problem it confronts.

Mr. MUNDT. Louder.

Mr. WILEY. The debate is being conducted on the other side of the aisle with so much peace and harmony that we cannot hear what is being said.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that Senators cannot hear what is being said. I shall try to talk a little louder. I thought my friend from Wisconsin heard everything that was said on the floor of the Senate, at all times. Perhaps I am mistaken.

I wish to ask the Senator from Virginia another question. The total Government receipts have declined from $42,200,000,000 in 1948 to an estimate of $37,300,000,000 in 1951. Can the Senator give me his reason for that decline in the Government receipts?

Mr. BYRD. I think there are several reasons for it. One reason is that the President, I think it was in 1945, recommended the repeal of the excess profits tax on corporations. That lost to the Treasury $6,000,000,000. He recommended that at a time when we had a $20,000,000,000 annual deficit. I think that is one of the causes of the situation we are in now. The first recommendation for reduction of taxes came from the President of the United States when he recommended that the excess-profits taxes be taken off corporations. This resulted in a loss of $6,000,000,000, and let me emphasize again, that was when we had a $20,000,000,000 annual deficit.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the Senator that we received $42,100,000,000 in 1948 after that tax reduction. I was getting around to the point as to whether or not the last tax reduction did not have something to do with our present situation?

Mr. BYRD. There were two tax reductions. One was made on the recommendation of the President, which cost $6,000,000,000. Another was made by the Eightieth Congress, which cost $5,000,000,000. The Eightieth Congress made the reduction when we had in the Treasury a surplus for the year of $8,000,000,000. The President made his recommendation, and it was adopted, when we had a deficit of $20,000,000,000 for the year. The Senator now can decide which of those reductions is responsible for the present situation, or whether either one of them is.

Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that the present situation is the result of increasing expenditures $9,000,000,000 in 2 years. The situation is not due to tax reduction. We have in 2 years increased expenditures, as can be seen by consulting the budget, from $34,000,000,000 to $43,000,000,000, without any emergency having arisen to justify it.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say in response to that, if I may, on the Senator's time——

Mr. BYRD. Take all the time necessary.

Mr. LUCAS. That the $42,100,000,000 we received in 1948 was the amount collected after we had made the first tax reduction.

Mr. BYRD. I do not know, but the Senator must connect the two tax reductions. If he wants to blame the deficit on tax reductions, then he must consider both reductions. He must consider one for $6,000,000,000 and one for $5,000,000,000; one given to the corporations, and the other given to the individual taxpayers. Both parties might be responsible if tax reductions are the cause of the deficit, as the Senator says. But I say that they are not the cause of the deficit, and all the Senator has to do is to read the figures; all he has to do is to look at the budget. We spent $34,000,000,000 2 years ago, in the fiscal year 1948. We are now spending $43,000,000,000 plus. That is an increase of $9,000,000,000.

I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois this question. What is the justification for now spending $9,000,000,000 more than we spent 2 years ago?

Mr. LUCAS. I will answer the Senator's question as best I can. Part of it is due to the Congress of the United States itself in passing a great number of bills.

Mr. BYRD. Perhaps some part of it is due to that, but there have been recommendations from other sources as well.

Mr. LUCAS. Quite a little money is spent in that way. And such matters will come along in due course. I am for the balancing of the budget, if it can be done, and I want to see the Appropriations Committee go into the matter to determine whether they can cut appropriations, as the Senator from Virginia has suggested, without impairing the national defense of the country or repudiating the international obligations we have entered into. Now, the Senator knows——

Mr. BYRD. Let me answer one of the Senator's questions?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator asked me a question, and I will yield back to him.

Mr. BYRD. I want to make the situation clear. The Senator asked me what program or plan I have presented. I do not have it before me. But that plan provided for spending $100,000,000, for example, more than the President spent in the foreign field. And certainly that plan would not injure the President's program. I think my estimate of the foreign field expenditures was perhaps too high, but it was made before the budget was submitted by the President. I am just as anxious to maintain the national defense as is the Senator from Illinois. But if the Senator from Illinois will examine the items—and it will be a great pleasure for me to send him such detail as I have—he will see that of the $8,000,000,000 to $9,000,000,000 increase in 2 years, $6,000,000,000 is for non-war-connected domestic civilian spending. It is not for foreign defense, it is not for foreign recovery. It is for spending here at home. Spending for domestic civilian purposes has increased in 2 years by $6,000,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is responsible for that?

Mr. BYRD. I think the budget has been followed substantially by the Congress. I do not think the Congress on its own initiative has increased expenditures by $9,000,000,000. I know the Congress did not do that.

Mr. LUCAS. But it did not add that much.

Mr. BYRD. It did not add very much, as a matter of fact.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Congress has control of the purse strings. The Congress could have cut the $6,000,000,000 if it had desired.

Mr. BYRD. It sounds all right for the Senator to say that. But he knows it is difficult for Congress to cut expenditures when the President says "We have a tight budget, from which you cannot take a dollar." He said, "if you reduce this budget $1 you are going to bring disaster to the country, to foreign nations, to our national defense," and so forth. He has made that statement time and again.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I know how difficult it is for Senators who constantly are talking about the great question of economy to vote for their pet projects. I have constantly noticed that when various sections of the country are involved in respect to a proposed direct hand-out, to be made by way of subsidy, or something of the sort, Senators do not get too far with their economy.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is not directing his remarks to me.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I am directing them where the shoe fits.

Mr. BYRD. The shoe does not fit me. I have not voted for any unjustified expenditure for my State, and I am not going to do it.

Mr LUCAS. I am glad the Senator has not.

I repeat that if the budget can be balanced, that is fine; I hope it can.

Mr. BYRD. With the assistance of the Senator from Illinois and his active, earnest support, I believe we could balance the budget.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for that compliment.

Mr. BYRD. I have great confidence in the distinguished Senator from Illinois, when he is on the right track. [Laughter.] When he is on the right track, he is a great leader; one of the greatest.

I said that last fall in connection with the graduated percentages proposed for the farm bill. Unfortunately, the Senator from Illinois did not accomplish anything in that respect, but that was not his fault.

Mr. LUCAS. That was because of my great leadership. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Illinois exercised great leadership in the Senate; that was all he could do. If he were to get behind other reductions in expenditures in the way he got behind certain aspects of the farm bill, we would make great reductions in expenditures.

Mr. LUCAS. I was defeated last week on the potato bill.

Mr. BYRD. I was sorry I could not be here at that time; but my mother met with an accident, and I could not be here.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that. If the Senator from Virginia had been here to help us, no doubt we would have put it across. But I lost that battle.

Mr. President, I wish to make this concluding remark: I have said, and I now repeat, that so far as our country is concerned and so far as our international obligations are concerned, I am not going to vote to cut appropriations if I sincerely believe they involve the safety and security of my country. Senators can talk about deficit financing; but I know that if war were to break out tomorrow, the Congress would, overnight, appropriate any amount of money the military wanted to have appropriated. If the military wanted 100 billion dollars appropriated by the Congress for war, tomorrow, the Congress would appropriate it, in the event of war.

What I am trying to do, as one Member of the Congress, and what I have always tried to do, is this: Every move I make with respect to a piece of legislation affecting the domestic economy, or a piece of legislation affecting international relations is based upon the premise of peace. I know it is a calculated risk; but the alternative, if we do not get peace, is to draw back into our shells and, as Mr. Hoffman has said over and over again, spend from $25,000,000,000 to $30,000,000,000 for defense alone, in a garrison state. I am convinced beyond the peradventure of a doubt that is exactly what would happen.

Mr. President, I hate deficit financing; but I know that if war were to come tomorrow, we would have plenty of deficit financing; and we would not hesitate, as I have said before.

One day during the last war, I saw the Senator from Tennessee [Mr McKELLAR] bring before the Senate a bill calling for $57,000,000,000 for war; and it was passed within one hour's time, without a record vote.

We can appropriate billions of dollars for war and billions of dollars to win a war; but when we talk about appropriating a few billion dollars for the purpose of trying to achieve peace in this world, then we are charged with a give-away program and with wrecking or bankrupting the Government. Mr. President, I simply cannot agree with that.

I say this with all the sincerity I possess: In the event this country does not ultimately achieve the peace for which we all hope, and about which the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and other Senators have been talking during the past few days, all the protestations we hear about deficit financing, balancing the budget, the interest on the national debt, and so forth will be merely so much talk; unless we can have peace, the question then will be one of the self-preservation of our country. We will be in a condition like that which prevailed in the Dark Ages, when it was a matter of dog eat dog.

The prevention of war and the preservation of civilization are what the Senator from Illinois is greatly interested in, as I know the Senator from Virginia is. God knows, if I were convinced we could get peace by deficit financing to the extent of $15,000,000,000, I would be willing to do that tomorrow, and so would

the Senator from Virginia. That is the whole thing back of all of this.

The Senator from Virginia talks about balancing the budget and about deficit financing and about other things as though these were normal times. But, Mr. President, the times we are going through now are the most extraordinary times in the peacetime history of America. I do not believe we can judge the present by what has happened in the past, with respect to some of the things we are doing.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Virginia on some of the things he has done in the way of economy. Certainly the Senator from Illinois believes in economy. Everything I have, I have made myself; and I have always paid my bills promptly, and I propose to do so in the future.

But, Mr. President, the situation our country faces in the world today is peculiar, serious, and extraordinary. We cannot treat it as a normal, peacetime situation, in view of the cold war we are facing and in view of the atomic war we may face. Those are the things that keep running through my mind, I may say to the Senator.

I thank the Senator for permitting me to make this statement.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I wish to make this reply to the Senator from Illinois, in respect to what he has said: I entirely agree that we must have an impregnable national defense. As a member of the Armed Services Committee I have worked diligently to that end. I also wish to say again that I have great affection for the distinguished majority leader. He and I do not always agree; but I have great affection for him; I think he is a man of splendid character and great ability. I wish to say again to him that 2 years ago we spent $6,000,000,000 less for non-war-connected domestic civilian purposes than is proposed now. There is no justification for the Senator from Illinois and other Senators to rise on this floor and say that the deficit comes by reason of increased spending for defense or for foreign aid. That simply is not correct; that is all there is to it. As a matter of fact, it can be shown, item by item, that from 1948, just 2 years ago, we have now traveled to the point where today we are spending $9,000,000,000 more than we were spending 2 years ago, and under pending proposals $6,000,000,000 of that is purely in the field of non-war-connected domestic civilian expenditures which have nothing to do with war, nothing to do with defense, nothing to do with foreign recovery. I think that is a field that could well be explored here. That is about the amount of the deficit. If we do not increase the budget by $6,000,000,000, as compared with domestic-civilian expenditures 2 years ago, we will not have the deficit facing us.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have asked the Senator to yield to me, for the purpose of permitting me to speak of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures of which the senior Senator from Virginia has been chairman since its creation. The Senator from Virginia has correctly pointed out that the joint committee was created by an act of Congress, and on the recommendation of the then Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, Mr. Morgenthau. As I think the Senator from Virginia has stated, it was created in the Revenue Act of 1941. Since the creation of the joint committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia has been chairman of it. But the joint committee has consisted at all times of the chairman of the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses of the Congress, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The joint committee has engaged in many difficult, tedious, and, I think, profitable studies and investigations. From time to time it has held hearings. Evidence was taken. Various recommendations were submitted, as they have been referred to by the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

It is not a question of what has actually been saved by the committee; but I think it may be truthfully said by any honest man that it is a question of what might have happened if there had not been a few men in the House of Representatives, at the other end of this Capitol building, and a few men in this body who insisted upon some curbing and some restriction upon constantly spending beyond the Government's income.

Mr. President, I have nothing to do with the controversy; but I wish to bear testimony to the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia has done a magnificent job as chairman of this joint committee through the years. Without his constant devotion to duty, it is not possible for any man to say what might have happened in the fiscal affairs of the Government.

I know of my own knowledge that it has not been possible to have many meetings of the full joint committee during the first session of this Congress, or any meetings at the present session of Congress, because the chairmen of the House and the Senate Appropriations Committees are always busy and the House Ways and Means Committee last session was engaged for 9 months, or thereabouts, in a careful study of the social-security system. So it was impossible for the distinguished chairman of that committee to attend hearings of the joint committee. The Finance Committee of the Senate was not idle. At the last full session of the Congress, we not only had to deal with such things as the oleomargarine bill, on which we held protracted hearings, but with even longer hearings upon the more important matter of reciprocal trade agreements. At this session of the Congress the Finance Committee has constantly been at work, since the 17th day of January, on the social-security bill. We cannot close the public hearings on that bill before the 24th day of March.

Mr. President, on my own motion, at the last meeting of the joint committee, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia is chairman, I submitted a request for the development of certain matters vitally affecting our financial and fiscal affairs. I know the Senator from Virginia has been constantly engaged in that work, and I think I should make this statement, in justice to the committee. I know of no more valuable committee that has functioned in this body since I have been a Member of it. I say that without any exception. I think it the height of reckless irresponsibility for anyone to suggest otherwise.

I wish to make my position perfectly clear. The committee has functioned well. It has been in the control of some of the best men in the House and Senate—excusing, of course, myself from the category—and certainly under the able direction of the Senator from Virginia since the creation of the committee.

Let me bear this further testimony: In the 1940 act when it had been resolved that we would create this special committee, it was suggested that of course, I, as then chairman of the Finance Committee, would become its chairman. I declined. I said that under no circumstances would I act as chairman; that the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who had first suggested it and who had offered the resolution, following the statement made by the then Secretary of the Treasury, was entitled to the chairmanship; but, more than that, that he was eminently qualified by character and experience to head the committee. The same position was taken by my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, who became vice chairman of the committee, but who himself recognized the peculiar fitness of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia for this important work.

I do not care to go into the question of balancing the budget, or whatnot; that is wholly a different question. But I do want to make this statement, and I make it without fear of contradiction, that World War I was financed through borrowing more than two-thirds of the cost of the war. We paid less than 33 percent of the cost of World War I out of direct taxes. World War II, which reached a total expenditure never before known in the history of mankind, was paid for to the extent of 53 percent out of taxes imposed by the Government upon the American people. With the debt reduced by some 53 percent, and in view of the enormous taxes since exacted from the American people, there is in my judgment—and I should feel myself unworthy of sitting in this body, if I did not say it—no possible excuse for a deficit, now climbing toward $6,000,000,000.

Beyond that, Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss the financial or fiscal affairs of the Government, but I did wish to make this statement regarding the committee of which my distinguished friend from Virginia has been chairman since its creation.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator with all my heart.

Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. MILLIKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. BYRD. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, first I want to endorse every statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the senior Senator from Georgia, so far as I am personally concerned, and I am sure it will go for almost every other Member of the Senate, regardless of the side of the aisle on which he may sit. I especially want to endorse the statement in which the Senator from Georgia speaks of the importance of the work done by the committee. I shall use one illustration. Lindsay Warren, as Comptroller General, made the statement that the act, called the Corporation Control Act, passed entirely on the recommendation of the committee of which the senior Senator from Virginia is chairman, was one of the most important laws that have been passed during the past 25 years. It was the result of the investigatory work and the work which was started in the committee of which the senior Senator from Virginia is chairman.

I also want to mention the fact that, so far as I am concerned, and I think I may say so far as every other Senator on this side of the aisle and perhaps most of the Senators on the other side of the aisle are concerned, I am impressed with the splendid work done by the chairman of the joint committee from a nonpartisan standpoint. There has been no partisanship in the committee, as evidenced by the fact that during the Eightieth Congress, when the Republicans were in control, they decided that there should be no change in the chairmanship of the committee. I simply want to make this statement in support of the work done by the joint committee and its chairman.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr President, I desire to endorse wholeheartedly what the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska have said I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and I know that the work done by the joint committe of which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman has been of enormous benefit and of tremendous help to our committee. There are in the Senate 15 committees which have to do primarily with the expenditure of money. There are in the House 19 committees dealing primarily with the expenditure of money. We have but one committee dealing primarily with nonessential expenditures and the saving of money for the taxpayers.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia has performed a public service of the highest importance. His chairmanship of the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures of the Federal Government, his work and the work of the entire committee, have won the confidence of the American people. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia, enjoys to a marked extent the confidence and respect of the American people. I say his committee is one of the best committees, one of the most beneficial committees in the American Congress.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BYRD. I yield first to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to obtain the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a point of order. I wish to be courteous.

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought the Senator from Virginia had the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Misissippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from Virginia concluded?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia has not concluded, I shall appreciate it very much if I may say just a word about the subject under discussion. If the Senator from Mississippi has the floor, I do not wish to complicate the parliamentary situation.

Mr. STENNIS. I will make the parliamentary inquiry to find out. I understood the Senator from Mississippi had been recognized, but I do not want to cut off the Senator from Virginia, of course. I have been very much interested in his discussion. However, I do not want to be delayed indefinitely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Virginia had not concluded, he would still have the floor.

Mr. STENNIS Very well.

Mr WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to make a very brief observation, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and as one who has worked industriously on that committee, under the leadership in the Eightieth Congress of the chairman, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and before that time and since that time, under the able leadership of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. I merely want to say that time and time again I have used the statistics furnished by the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. They have been very helpful to me. I only wish the committee were larger. The work of the committee is almost identical with the work I had in mind in offering a resolution to increase the legislative personnel in order that we might carry out the provisions of the unified appropriation bill. What we need from the legislative point of view is an enlargement of personnel and facilities for carrying out work such as the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has been doing necessarily in a limited way. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia for the work he has done, and I also wish to thank those who sit with him on the committee for the services they have rendered. They are outstanding men of the Senate. The committee has performed a valuable service not only for the Congress but indirectly for the American people.

Mr. President, it is unusual to see so many Senators, long in the service of the United States, taking such an interest as that which has been demonstrated here this morning in the subject matter under consideration. Time and time again, when I have been making speeches throughout the United States, it has been with a great deal of pride that I have quoted not only the Senator from Virginia but his committee, and have commended them for the work they have done. They have somehow become a symbol of the things for which I stand. When we consider the balancing of the budget and the question of deficit spending, the committee is most helpful to those of us who believe in the purposes of the committee. We have taken that position not only in the Congress but elsewhere throughout the United States. I merely wish to pay my respects to a great chairman for a great work well down. I deeply appreciate it, and I believe I speak the sentiments of the entire membership of the Senate, particularly of Senators who have been associated for a very long time with the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD I thank the Senator

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield the floor.

Mr THOMAS of Oklahoma Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS I understood I did not have the floor, but that the Senator from Virginia had yielded to me.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I have yielded to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Virginia has yielded to the Senator from Mississippi, I understand.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi be good enough to yield to me for an observation?

Mr. STENNIS. I have been waiting for some time, but I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it has been suggested that our budgetary difficulties followed the reduction of taxes by the Eightieth Congress. I simply wish to say that at the time income taxes were reduced the recession which later occurred was in prospect, and one of the reasons for reducing taxes was to plow back the money into the hands of the people, so they could spend it in the most economical and effective way economics knows. We reduced the income taxes. The money was not lost. It went into the hands of the people. The people

spent it and, in my opinion, it was that dynamic spending which kept the recession within bounds and prevented it from catapulting into a depression.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I was among those present——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, I do not have the floor; the Senator from Virginia yielded to me.

Mr. BYRD. I yielded to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I was among those Senators present last Friday when the charges were made on the floor, and a bill was introduced providing for the abolishment of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which the distinguished Senator from Virginia is chairman. At that time there happened to be only a few Senators present. The charges were so amazing, and I thought, in view of what I believe to be the facts, were so reckless, that I felt that some Senator not a member of the committee should at least say a few words on the subject.

Boiled down, the charges made in the speech of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] were that this committee, of all committees, should be abolished on the grounds of economy.

I approach my very few remarks—and I shall be very brief—on that subject, trying to look into the proposal that this committee be abolished on grounds of economy. I had intended to read the names of the members of the committee, but that has already been covered. As a background for this thought, I was reminded of the vast and far-reaching activities of this great Government, which goes into every county and community in the whole Nation, and then I thought of the vast globe-circling activities which go round and round with the sun in the most colossal undertaking, I believe, that has ever been known in the history of the world. It has approached such proportions that there is a budget of more than $42,000,000,000 annually.

As a part of the picture, I found a document prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, which attempts to point out the acts of Congress providing for grants-in-aid to the States.

I am not passing on the merits of those items; I am merely putting it in as a part of the picture. I find that this pamphlet is a regular 8½ by 11 inch pamphlet. It contains three full typewritten pages of index showing the different laws which have been passed and which have been financed, on one subject—grants-in-aid to the States. It lists those laws more or less by title, certainly with no analysis. It requires 45 single-space typewritten pages merely to list the titles of the laws, giving references as to where they may be found. That is only a part of the background.

Against this background to the suggestion to abolish this joint committee, and as against the more than $42,000,000,000 budget figure, which has been mentioned, I found that the cost of the operation of the joint committee had averaged only $14,000 a year for the past 8½ years. Those of us who sit on the Committee on Rules and Administration and pass on the sums requested and obtained for the operation of the standing Senate committees know that this sum is a mere pittance by comparison. What a pittance it is in connection with a $42,000,000,000 budget.

I shall not try to balance the budget this afternoon, Mr. President. I am speaking as one of the newer Members of the Senate, trying to find light in the maze of conflicting and complex problems which confront us. Last year I sat as an ex officio member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. There were 453 witnesses who came before it, and 452 of them wanted their appropriations increased over those of the preceding year. One witness suggested a reduction. That indicates what the newer Members of the Senate have to undergo.

I further found that this joint committee is the single agency established in the congressional machinery whose primary purpose is the elimination of nonessential Federal expenditures The purpose and the work of the joint committee, of course, are altogether different from that of any other committee in that it has representation from the Treasury Department and the Budget Bureau, each an executive branch of the Government.

In view of all these facts, the charge that the continuation of the joint committee violates the Reorganization Act of 1946 and as a move for economy falls flat, without any support whatsoever.

In spite of the very small cost involved in the operation of this important committee, I have found many of its reports very valuable in my own efforts to try to find my way among the mass of work which comes before the Senate.

Further, and of far more importance, it is both a help and a strong assurance to have a committee of the Congress viewing the entire picture and bringing to the attention of the Congress the true situation with reference to the expenditure of funds. I have learned that I need not expect any department to report to the Congress the defects of other departments or its own. These are certainly matters about which the individual Members of the Congress cannot make personal investigations.

I have further found that the work of the joint committee is most valuable in the eyes of the public. I think this is a major point. Extravagances of the Government are often felt, but are frequently hard to prove, especially when it is to the interest of many of the departments to keep such practices from the public eye. To abolish the committee charged with the primary function of exposing inefficiencies and extravagances is to encourage these very practices.

By the very nature of things, the contribution of such a committee is necessarily partly intangible and psychological. The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] stated my point in that respect. It is not a matter of estimating in dollars and cents what this committee, regardless of its personnel, has done. Just think of what might have happened if there had not been some agency of this kind in the Congress, representing the Congress.

I am reminded of what a citizen once told me, when I was a district attorney. He said the grand jury had been a powerful influence in his life. I said, "What has it ever done to you?" He said, "It never has done anything to me, but it has been the thought of what it might do."

Of course, in that connection, there is no suggestion that any of the departments are not acting in good faith. The different agencies of the Government get all the money they can get. We are the ones who have the responsibility of passing on those questions. Who is wise enough to measure the benefits in terms of dollars and cents that flow from a feeling on the part of the taxpayers that the Congress has its own independent committee watching the taxpayers' dollar beyond that dollar's momentary stop in the Federal Treasury?

With the prospective budget for the fiscal year 1951 running well above $40,000,000,000, and with an apparent and almost certain deficit facing us of more than $5,000,000,000, and with virtually all of the trends toward increasing this deficit rather than decreasing it, it is the height of folly and borders on the ridiculous to talk about abolishing this committee that is trying to expose nonessential Federal expenditures and particularly, doing it on the basis of economizing when the annual savings would be only $14,000, a mere pittance in a forty-odd-billion-dollar budget. The psychological effect of abolishing this committee under these circumstances would not only cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars in money but would disappoint and disillusion them and cause the people to seriously question the motives of our actions. The people could charge with much reason that we had abandoned their cause and surrendered to the pressure group for more and more spending.

I have discovered that one of the most pronounced deficiencies in our legislative system here is that, although we usually scrutinize fairly carefully the proposals for the expenditures of funds before appropriations are made, we seldom make much examination of just how the funds were expended or how much was accomplished. So long as funds are spent "within the law," the auditors are satisfied; this should not be enough to satisfy us. We are directly responsible to the people; it is their money.

After looking into this entire picture, I am fully convinced that the powers of the committee ought to be enlarged and strengthened, and the committee members encouraged, rather than to have the committee outlawed and its members abused.

Again, Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the chairman of the joint committee for the complete, the conclusive, the devastating answer and presentation which he has made here this morning for the benefit of Congress and for the benefit of the American people.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, do I not have the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). The Chair is informed that the Senator from Virginia has the floor. The present occupant just came into the Chair.

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If my memory serves me correctly, the Senator from Mississippi was at one time recognized as having the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair was not in the chair at the time and has just come into the chair, and is informed by the Parliamentarian that the Senator from Virginia had not yielded the floor.

Mr. BYRD. I have not yielded the floor at any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Virginia yielded to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BYRD. I yield now to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that under the rules of the Senate if a Senator speaking leaves the floor and resumes his seat he automatically loses the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. A point of order. The Senator from Minnesota is not in order. The Senator from Virginia did not yield for him to propound a parliamentary inquiry, and he refuses to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am honored to associate myself with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and other Members of the Senate in commending the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for the able work which he and the members of his joint committee have done toward informing the country of the unnecessary expenditures in our Government. There is no man in the United States Senate for whom I have a higher regard or greater respect than I have for the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

I know of no greater way to emphasize the irresponsibility of the sources of criticism of the Senator from Virginia for his efforts to balance our budget than to quote a statement which was made by the critic, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], on September 28, 1949, in which he expressed his own opinion of deficit spending. The Senator from Minnesota stated at that time:

> The Senator from Minnesota does not believe in a balanced budget at this hour, nor is he afraid to say so.

I join with the other Members of the Senate in opposition to any effort to abolish his important committee.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. I shall not take the time of the Senate now, but I do wish to ask the distinguished Senator a question. Before doing so, I should like to associate myself with the distinguished Members of this body who have commended the chairman of the joint committee so highly. I know of no one in public life whose utterances are followed more carefully in my own State than those of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia. I should like to ask him a question. From the Senator's experience as a public official, not only as a Senator of the United States, but also as the chief executive of one of our leading States, is he of the opinion that one of the best methods of national defense is a sound fiscal policy and a balanced budget?

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator that it is the greatest security we have.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. From the Senator's experience, does he believe that it is possible for us to fight a third world war, using the free-enterprise system, unless we do balance our budget and begin to reduce our public debt?

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator that our greatest security lies in a balanced budget, sound government, and preservation of the free-enterprise system.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington is generally thought of as being a very sturdy and positive partisan who has great pride in the Republican Party, but because of my tremendous respect, affection, and admiration for the senior Senator from Virginia, I should like to relate a story in just a sentence or two.

On the Pacific coast, long before I came to the Senate, I had heard of a great American, whose name was HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, who sought to help in reeducating the American people to a restoration of financial and fiscal normalcy, integrity, and sanity. When I was privileged to come to the Senate, a little more than 3 years ago, I went first, as a Republican, if you please, to the office of the very distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, a Democrat, and I introduced myself to suggest that if there were any way in which I could ever be of service to the sound programs which he had in mind, I should take advantage of the opportunity to do so. I have continued to try to support what he has advanced to the American people, and my trust in him and my faith in what he proposes for the good of the American people is unlimited. I count myself as being fortunate in being able to say a feeling and sincere word in support of the continuing efforts of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I came into the Chamber just a few minutes ago. I have been busy in the Committee on Appropriations, and have not heard the debate which interests me very much. I should like to associate myself with the Senators who have commended the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia. I have known him ever since he was a little boy, and that was a long time ago. He is one of the finest, ablest, most efficient men, and one of the most competent legislators whom I have known since I have been a Member of the Senate.

I understand a bill has been introduced—and I have sent for it—proposing to abolish the joint committee of which the Senator from Virginia is chairman. I hope that will not be done. I hope the Senate will not permit it to be done. I think his joint committee has done a wonderful work, and I think I can safely say, being a member of the joint committee myself, that the principal work of the joint committee has been done by the distinguished Senator from Virginia I take off my hat to him—I am sorry I do not have my hat on so that I could take it off literally—to indicate how I honor him for the wonderful work he has done in behalf of economy at a time when economy is greatly needed.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will not vote to abolish the joint committee, because it should continue in existence. The Committee on Appropriations, of which I am the chairman, uses the work which has been done by the chairman of this joint committee. We have it before us every year, and it is fine work. I approve of it. I approve of what the joint committee is doing, and I again thank the Senator from Virginia for the outstanding work he has done. He has made a wonderful record in the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President——

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to associate myself wholeheartedly with the fine words of commendation which have been uttered today of the great services of the senior Senator from Virginia and of the joint committee of which he is chairman. I know of no man in public life in America, during the time the Senator from Virginia has been a Member of this body, who has contributed more to the general welfare of the country than has the senior Senator from Virginia; and in that category I include those Presidents of the United States who have been serving as President while he has been serving as a Member of this august body.

I should like to comment very briefly on one aspect of this subject, because there seems to be abroad a rumor, which is completely without foundation, that

because the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] happens to be a member of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments there is a tendency on the part of the members of that committee to try to take over——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. There seems to be abroad a rumor that the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is inclined to take over the work of the Joint Committee. I am sure that the junior Senator from Minnesota had no intention of giving any such impression. I read his remarks very carefully, and I do not see any statement in them that would indicate such an intention. But on behalf of one member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I desire to disclaim here publicly any such desire on our part.

The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has a job to do, which, under the very able and courageous leadership of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who is now on the floor of the Senate, we are endeavoring to accomplish. But we are not in any sense a joint committee, we are not in any sense a committee which includes representatives of the executive departments. We do not have that particular equipment, therefore, by which we can approach the problem of expenditures in the manner in which the joint committee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia can. As one member of the Committee on Expenditures, I will say that we have received a considerable amount of assistance and guidance and help from the Joint Committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to ask the Presiding Officer whether or not it is possible for a Senator to yield for any purpose other than for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not. A Senator can yield only for a question, if a point of order is made.

Mr. MUNDT. I have a question, Mr. President. My question is——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield for a question.

Mr. MUNDT. I will proceed with my question, Mr. President. Since I see my good friend the chairman of our Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on the floor, I ask him whether it is not true that I went to him, after I heard about this controversy and said, "Now this is my attitude respecting this matter, and I wonder whether it is not shared by the chairman of the committee, that I feel that we have so many tasks and so many burdens that we would be the last to insist that the duties which are so well being performed by the chairman and his Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures should be turned over to us"; and is it not true that the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments agreed wholeheartedly that that was the situation?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield if I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). The Senator from Virginia can yield only for a question.

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas for a question.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Virginia may yield to me for a brief statement, without losing the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that he may yield to the Senator from Arkansas for the purpose of making a statement? Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, in answer to the inquiry made by the able Senator from South Dakota I may say that, so far as I can recall there has been no discussion in our committee at any time, since I have been chairman, at least, with reference to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments desiring to take over or in any way to encroach upon the functions and duties of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. I did reply to the able Senator from South Dakota, when he asked me about this matter, that there had been no such purpose on my part, and I knew of no movement or discussion in the committee along that line

I wish to make a further statement, Mr. President, while I am on my feet. If there is any impression or rumor abroad from any source whatsoever that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has designs upon or has given any thought or had any idea, as a committee, of undertaking to have the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures abolished, and take over its functions, it is certainly erroneous, because personally I may say—I cannot speak for the whole committee—that unless facts can be developed that should warrant our committee favoring such action I should certainly oppose a bill to abolish it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield for a question only.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a statement at this time without the Senator from Virginia losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan asks unanimous consent that he may make a statement without the Senator from Virginia losing the floor. Is there ojection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to expedite the proceedings. I wish that Senators be permitted to say as much as they want to say, but I call attention to the fact that I have a reply to make today. I contend that the rules of the Senate are being violated flagrantly. I ask that the Chair try to uphold the rules of the Senate, and when it comes time for me to address the Senate, I shall abide by the same rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia can yield only for a question, unless unanimous consent is given that another Senator may make a statement. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, with respect to whether the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is in conflict with the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I should like to say that during the Eightieth Congress, when we on this side of the aisle were in charge of the joint committee, we did not at that time undertake to abolish the committee, even though its chairman was a Senator on the other side of the aisle. The members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House thought so well of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the way he acted as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures that there was no desire on our part to take away from him the chairmanship of that committee. Even though the Republicans were in control of the Senate at that time, there was no desire on our part to transfer the functions of that committee to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. In all the work the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has done in the way of investigations, in which the junior Senator from Michigan took part, which investigations during the war covered the manpower question, I wish to say to the Senate that we received the full cooperation of the distinguished Senator from Virginia and his committee. There was no time when that committee did not aid the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments by giving it figures and facts. The reports of the joint committee were valuable to us.

Mr. President, I think one of the calamities of this session would come about if we were even to consider the question of abolishing the joint committee.

The Committee on Appropriations, of which the junior Senator from Michigan is a member, receives valuable aid from the joint committee. The distinguished Senator from Virginia, who is an ex officio member of the Appropriations Committee, has at all times at his fingertips answers respecting questions relating to personnel, and on many occasions he has aided the Appropriations Committee in solving problems which have come before it.

Mr. President, I think all we have to do is to look at the personnel of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, whose

chairman is the distinguished Senator from Virginia, and we will realize that it is a committee composed of distinguished Members, a committee which is rendering a real service not only to the Senate but to the people of the United States.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I take it the Senator yields for a question only?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. Here comes the question. It is a double-barreled question. Did the Senator from Virginia ever hear the story of the freshman class in an eastern college to which had been given its assignment of the lesson for the day? Half a dozen of the boys had studied the lesson conscientiously and carefully, and were sharpened up and had full and adequate knowledge of the subjects. They ably recited and answered all questions. There was one boy in the class, however, who had little knowledge of the subject matter. He was an ignoramus. However, he was determined to come under the wire, so he said, when he was called upon to recite, "Mr. Professor, I voice the sentiments of the preceding speakers." Did the Senator from Virginia ever hear that story?

Mr. BYRD. No.

Mr. TOBEY. At this time I wish to say that I voice the sentiments which have today been expressed on the floor of the Senate by all preceding speakers, respecting HARRY BYRD. As a long-time friend of the Senator from Virginia, and a great admirer of him, I join in the sentiments that have just been expressed on the floor. I ask the Senator to please put that in his book.

Mr. BYRD. I will preserve that expression on the part of the Senator from New Hampshire, forevermore.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire, who is a member of the joint committee of which the distinguished Senator from Virginia is chairman, would like to make inquiry of the Senator from Virginia, in view of rumors that have been circulated, concerning dissension in the ranks of the joint committee, and the fact that the joint committee has not been called together for frequent meetings, whether there has been any protest made by any member of the committee to the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Virginia, about any of his activities as chairman of the joint committee.

Mr. BYRD. There have been no protests whatever. There have been no complaints of any character or description that I have heard.

Mr. BRIDGES. And the chairman of the joint committee would be aware if any member of the committee had protested by reason of lack of frequent meetings?

Mr. BYRD. I naturally would be aware, but no such protest of any kind has been made.

Mr. BRIDGES. So far as the Senator from Virginia is aware, there has been, has there not, rather a unanimous opinion of the members of the joint committee respecting the reports which the chairman has from time to time issued?

Mr. BYRD. The committee has been practically entirely harmonious in all its sessions.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator if he recalls a distinguished Democratic Senator from Mississippi, Mr. Pat Harrison? I believe Pat Harrison served in the Senate with the Senator from Virginia, as I did. I wonder if the Senator from Virginia remembers, when the splurge of spending was started in this country, the statement made by the then Senator from Mississippi, which I have always remembered? He said, "This country can no more spend its way to prosperity than a drunken man can drink himself sober."

I think that is a very pat, a very clarifying expression. It always appealed to me as an expression which in a few words clarified the issue of the more-abundant-life spending in this country.

Mr. BYRD. I recall that statement.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the precept is a good one for the joint committee to remember and act upon.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Are there any further questions? [Laughter.] If not, I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to concur in some of the friendly remarks which have been made in reference to the person of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Obviously it was not the intent of the junior Senator from Minnesota to enter into a name-calling match, or to indulge in personalities. There is an issue at stake.

I am happy that the time has arrived when so many of our distinguished colleagues are on the floor. Yesterday the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] delivered a powerful speech on the floor of the Senate. About a month ago he delivered an equally important speech on the floor of the Senate. I hesitate to report for the purposes of the RECORD that there were not a dozen Senators present. I hesitate to report that not more than four or five Senators rose to express their points of view as to the importance of the pronouncements the Senator from Connecticut made.

Yet today, over a proposal to abolish a committee which needs to be abolished, as I shall point out, we have had as great an array of testimony as the Senate of the United States has witnessed for many a year.

It would seem that this was testimonial day. This pleases me, because I believe we should not wait until people pass to their heavenly reward before expressing our feelings about them. I think it is fine, although irrelevant to the issue, that the Senator from Virginia now knows how much some of his colleagues think of him and how much they appreciate him. It should give him a greater sense of warmth and security in his work. To be sure, all these things would probably be said at a later date, but today the Senator from Virginia has been here to hear them.

I remind the Senate, however, that when we discuss the hydrogen bomb we are unable to get anyone in the Senate to say very much about it, except the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who made a masterful statement on this floor, or the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], or the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], or the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. These Members have expressed themselves on the subject, but we never have had such a gathering to hear them as we have today, when we are talking about a nonessential Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures. To the contrary, when we talk about world peace Senators are often too busy to be present to hear the discussion. But when there is an opportunity to attack the administration, through one of the junior members of the administration, then the faithful are rallied, and the reactionary coalition which operates in this Congress is present en masse. Then the big guns are wheeled out, and we hear the thunder of the artillery—the thunder against the President's program and against the budget.

Of course, a convenient decoy was set up by the junior Senator from Minnesota; but as was pointed out, he is no shrinking violet; and before this debate is over, he will not be an apple blossom, either. He will be in there to expose the nonessential activities of a nonessential committee, and why he believes that on the merits of the matter the committee should be abolished.

Mr. President, let me say that I was somewhat disturbed at the comment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], because I hold him in high regard. The senior Senator from Georgia charged that it was reckless irresponsibility for anyone to suggest the abolition of this committee, but I believe the Senator from Georgia will reconsider those words, in the days to come.

Let me read what was said for the RECORD the other day in reference to the Joint Committee, and why I believe it should be abolished.

First of all, the junior Senator from Minnesota said this—and I shall quote now from page 2328 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 24:

Dr. George Galloway—

Who, by the way, is the senior research specialist in American government and public administration for the Library of Congress, holding one of the most responsible jobs in the field of research our Government has to offer. Dr. Galloway was invited to testify before a committee in the Eightieth Congress in reference to the Legislative Reorganization Act. Here is what Dr. George Galloway said, and here is exactly what the junior Senator from Minnesota said, as to why this joint committee should be abolished:

I suggest—

I am quoting now from Dr. Galloway's testimony on legislative reorganization, in February 1946—

that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures be discontinued. This committee was established by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 to make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal

Government with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential.

Dr. Galloway continued, saying that—

Its function—

Namely, the function of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures—

overlaps that of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which, having been rejuvenated by the Legislative Reorganization Act, are now equipped to assume their historic responsibilities in this field.

Mr. President, the issue here is a very simple one. With reference to a very brief bill which was introduced by the junior Senator from Minnesota—and that brief bill is not even one page long—the issue is simply whether—in this year of 1950, or in the year 1951, in view of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, in view of the history of that act, in view of the testimony surrounding the passage of that act, in view of the express language contained in that act—we need the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Let me read the exact language, and I shall leave it to all fair-minded persons, both lay persons and Members of the Congress, to determine the fairness of what I have said in this respect; let me read the exact language, in part, of the Legislation Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session. What does that act say? I read from it:

(g) (1) The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects—

Mr. President, the word "all" is used; not almost all, but all.

It has jurisdiction over the following subjects:

(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations—

All budget and accounting measures—

(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government—

All such reorganization—

(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—

(A) Receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports.

Mr. President, I read this with care and at a tempo that can readily be understood by both the reporter and by the Members of the United States Senate:

It shall also have to do with all matters of—

(B) Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

Mr. President, how does that language stack up with the language of the measure establishing the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, as passed by the Seventy-seventh Congress, Public Law 250? What is the authorization in respect to the so-called Byrd committee in the Seventy-seventh Congress? What did it say?

I read:

It shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential.

Mr. President, I submit in tabular form a comparison of two legislative authorizations establishing the two committees. They clearly show the duplicating nature of the two committees:

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946, PUBLIC LAW 601, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION	PUBLIC LAW 250, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (H. R. 5417)
	TITLE VI—NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES
	SEC. 601. Nonessential Federal Expenditures.
(g) (1) Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:	(a) There is hereby established a committee to investigate Federal expenditures (hereinafter referred to as the "committee"), to be composed of (1) three members of the Senate Committee on Finance and three members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; (2) three members of the House Committee on Ways and Means and three members of the House Committee on Appropriations, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and (3) the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. A vacancy in the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum, and the powers conferred upon them by this section may be exercised by a majority vote.
(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.	
(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.	
(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—	
(A) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;	
(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;	
(C) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;	
(D) studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.	(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential. The committee shall report to the President and to the Congress the results of its study, together with its recommendations, at the earliest practicable date.
	(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to employ such experts and such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena, or to testify when summoned under the authority of this section.
	(d) The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.
	(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, the sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this section.
	(f) All authority conferred by this section shall terminate upon the submission of the committee's final report.
	SEC. 602. Section 1303 of the Revenue Act of 1918, as amended, is amended by striking out "President of the Senate" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "President pro tempore of the Senate."

Mr. President, I do not wish to indulge in a battle of semantics this afternoon, but I submit to all fair-minded and reasonable citizens that the words of these two authorizations are identical in purpose. The language is clear and concise.

Mr. President, when I introduced the bill I knew that I would set loose a hornets' nest. I was advised by wise and prudent men that I should not do so. I was so advised by Members of this body, as well as by persons in other branches of Government. They said, in substance: "Senator HUMPHREY, if you ever try to touch the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, you are going to open up a hornets' nest, and they are going to mow you down."

Well, Mr. President, there has been some lawn mowing going on today, but the shrinking violet still has not been clipped.

Again I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the objective of my proposal. The objective is not to go back and dig up ghosts, or to look into people's closets. Rather it is to quite simply do away with a nonessential committee.

Mr. President, is there any better evidence of the fact that it is not needed than the statement of the Senator from Virginia that it does not meet? I heard much wailing and gnashing of teeth on the floor of the Senate this afternoon about the tremendous Federal budget and about the deficit; but I also hear that all members of the joint committee are too busy to have the committee meet. Mr. President, those facts and statements are simply incompatible. If we have a $42,000,000,000 budget and if we have a $5,000,000,000-plus deficit, no one should tell me that they are too busy to have a meeting of the committee, if the committee can do anything after it meets.

Mr. President, I know why the committee has not met. It has not met because there is no need for it to meet. As to the duties of the committee, I am not here to say that it did not perform them well, from 1941 to 1946. But since 1947, with the Legislative Reorganization Act in existence, the joint committee has had no function, because its function was taken over by a standing committee.

The only function of the joint committee since 1947, I repeat, is to put into the RECORD reports and releases to the press and to talk about the number of employees on the Federal pay roll. I submit that since 1947, even by its own document, which I shall soon produce, the joint committee has made no recommendations. All it has said is that we are spending too much money. Mr. President, it is not necessary to have a committee to know that.

So I repeat, Mr. President, that the statements made this afternoon about the work of the joint committee are irrelevant. The fact is that since 1947 the committee has not functioned as a committee at all. The Director of the Budget did tell me however that he attended one meeting in January 1949. Yet since that time, in the Eighty-first Congress, the committee received a sizable appropriation. The appropriation on the Senate side was $20,000, and still no meetings. Someone may say, "Well, that is not waste," but I submit, Mr. President, to appropriate for a committee which does no work, to appropriate for a committee whose functions have been taken over by another committee, is a waste. Whether it is $1, $2, or $20,000, it is a waste of money. Besides that, it is a denial and a violation of the responsibilities of the Congress of the United States under the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Mr. President, I want to take up systematically each of the nine charges which were leveled at the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Some comment was made about the fact that my friend from Virginia was absent when I spoke and introduced my bill. I apologize for having introduced my bill in the Senator's absence. I can honestly say, Mr. President, I did not know the Senator was absent. I want to offer my sympathy and my condolences upon the illness of his beloved and dear mother. Believe me, under no circumstances would I introduce a bill on this subject if I thought the Senator was not able to be present. But I think that is an extraneous matter, in the sense that the record was made, the word was there, and there was plenty of opportunity for reply.

Now, let me deal with the alleged nine misstatements brought to the floor by the Senator from Virginia.

The first charge was that the junior Senator from Minnesota alleged that the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures was itself wasteful and extravagant. I repeat the charge. It is wasteful and extravagant. I repeat the charge on the basis that since 1946 the committee has received appropriations with which to do the work that another committee has already been established to do, namely, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I submit, Mr. President, that in this instance money is being appropriated to keep alive a committee that has no right to live, unless we wish to abolish the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or at least that function of the Committee on Expenditures which it is delegated to perform under the law. It does not serve well to have members of the committee, like the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the chairman of the committee [Mr. MCCLELLAN], say that no member of the committee has ever asked to take on this job, and that no complaints have been made. The fact is that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is charged by a public law to do this work. If the Senator from Virginia has great knowledge of the budget, and has great and deep devotion to economy, then let him apply for a place on the expenditures committee. The junior Senator from Minnesota would resign from the committee to make room for him. I want the Senator from Virginia to be on a legitimate committee, a committee designated by the Legislative Reorganization Act to perform the function in which he is interested.

Now, Mr. President, going on to what was said about waste and extravagance, I repeat that funds appropriated for a committee whose functions have been taken over by another committee, is a waste. It may not be $1,000,000, but, Mr. President, you know it is the principle of the thing that is important. The Senator from Virginia defends the operation of his committee—which, by the way, is not his committee; it is a committee of Congress; the committee is just as much the committee of the Secretary of the Treasury, who is on it, it is just as much the committee of the Director of the Budget as it is of the Senator from Virginia. It does not belong to any one Member of the Congress. It is a congressional committee.

The Senator from Virginia says that while the junior Senator from Minnesota talks about extravagance and waste, he introduces a bill for a bi-partisan coal commission and suggests an appropriation of approximately $250,000. Then the Senator from Virginia says that there is no need for such a commission. Very well; let us take a look. Is there no need for a bipartisan coal commission to look into the coal business? Ask the people of America today whether there is a need for someone to look at the coal situation, not only for today, but for tomorrow. Is there no need for a sick industry to be studied? Governor Cox, of Ohio, 30 years ago recommended such a commission. After all, the late President Theodore Roosevelt had a coal commission in the anthracite field. There is great need today for such a commission as I propose.

Then the Senator from Virginia intimated that this was going to be my commission—the commission of the junior Senator from Minnesota. In order to make the record clear, let me say that the bill which was introduced to create a bipartisan coal commission would authorize the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and the President of the United States to make equal numbers of appointments to an 18-man commission. There would be three from the Senate, and I say quite honestly, in view of the rules of seniority, the junior Senator from Minnesota, who is low man on the totem pole, undoubtedly would not find himself a member of the bipartisan coal commission.

But I repeat, if some people entertain the idea that it is economy to ignore a basic industry which is sick, then I disagree. I think the $250,000 requested for a bipartisan coal commission is a cheap price to pay in order to find out some of the answers to the major economic labor-management problems which exist in the coal-mining industry.

What is the next point raised by the senior Senator from Virginia? I was supposed to have said in my remarks, in introducing my bill, that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, commonly known as the Byrd committee, presented a distorted picture of Federal employment. The Senator from Virginia then says that it is the only committee that reports to the Congress every month on the number of Federal employees. That is correct. That is one of the reasons why it ought to be abolished, because the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments reports seasonally—every 6 months—and that is quite adequate. I must also point out that the preparation of Byrd committee reports every month by Federal departments and agencies causes undue work, expense, and waste of time, for it is necessary to assign people to make a census every month of every Federal employee. We do not need a census every month of every Federal employee. Is it right, Mr. President, for the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the Byrd committee, to call on every agency, every month, for a head count, and then for the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to call on them every 6 months? Why not get together? Why call on the

same agency through two different committees? That is unadulterated waste.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator from Minnesota been able to figure out an approximation of the cost to the Government departments of making reports each month to the so-called Byrd committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I have. I placed that figure, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, in my report the other day, a figure of approximately $250,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, $250,000 a year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And that is in addition to the expenditures by the committee itself, is it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I was told by the Senator from Virginia that this is a wild guess. Then I ask him to go over to see the wild guesser—the Director of the Budget.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the estimate of an added cost of $250,000 comes from the Director of the Budget?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the estimate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And he has carefully surveyed the situation, and thinks that $250,000 a year, as an extra cost, is occasioned by the making of reports to the Byrd committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to point out that this has also been corroborated by every agency that has been contacted. But I may say, this is considered to be a minimum amount.

Now let me read what Mr. Paul Appleby had to say in the autumn quarterly of the Yale Review of 1949. Mr. Paul Appleby was at one time with the Department of Agriculture. He is considered to be one of our outstanding public administrators.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is this the Paul Appleby who is the director of the school of citizenship at Syracuse University?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A very eminent authority on public administration, who is now separated from Government and has no direct interest in the issues here involved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I so understand. I thank the Senator from Illinois, who knows Mr. Appleby, I am sure, as a fellow worker in the field of public administration and economics.

Mr. Paul Appleby had this to say:

Some idea of the dimensions of constant governmental reorganization may be had from a story of one large governmental department's struggle to comply with a request from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, headed by Senator BYRD. The request was to transmit all memoranda, plans, studies, recommendations, records, and orders involving administrative changes and reorganizations in the preceding half-dozen years. Scores of persons were involved for weeks in the process of locating and assembling such papers. Assembled, they would have filled a dozen trucks, for those papers dealt with a large part of the administration of a very large department during the years of acute social stress.

I bring this forward as testimony that this probing every month for all this information is costing the Government money. If the probing produces results, if the gathering of statistical evidence produces reform, then I want to be the first to commend the procedure, regardless of the time and regardless of the difficulty which it may place upon some of the Departments. But, actually, since 1947, Mr. President, the probing has primarily been about how many people are employed. What is the latest count in the Federal Trade Commission? What is the latest count in the Post Office Department? What is the latest count in the National Military Establishment? Reports are placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and bulletins are sent out, hit and miss, throughout the Nation under bold headlines.

Let us return to the problem of Federal employment. I entered my remarks in the RECORD as of February 24 because of a charge which was made by the Byrd committee with reference to the Post Office Department. I submit that the Post Office Department gives more service per person per hour than does any other department of Government. I submit that the Post Office Department delivers the mail with the kind of efficiency and dispatch which is the envy not only of other Government departments, but of private industry itself. Is it honorable or fair to report that the Post Office Department has an increase in employment, without at the same time pointing to the reasons for that increase?

When the announcement is made that the pay roll of the Post Office Department has increased, the question is asked, "Why?" It is simply because we have given better working conditions to the employees, through the action of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. My friend, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], has been a champion of those employees in improving their working conditions. I am sure the Senator from Virginia is aware of the fact that the business of the Post Office Department has never been greater than in the past 2 or 3 years.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is also aware of the fact that there has been an increase in urban population. Rural mail routes must still be kept up, even though half the farmers move to the towns.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. The population of the city of Los Angeles increases at the rate of 125,000 persons a month, with the result that more post offices must be established and more mail carriers employed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. We have to continue the service even though the man on the route may not serve as many patrons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that because of the fact that parcel-post rates have not been increased, though the cost of express service has, industry, in an increasing measure, is sending its parcels not by express, but through the parcel-post system; and such parcels are being carried at a loss, and, therefore, constitute a subsidy paid by the United States Government to the shippers of the country?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy that my friend the Senator from Illinois is with me this afternoon, because he is absolutely correct. Not only that, but he brings to my mind another thought.

Where are the economy figures? How is it that we do not have a bulletin from the Joint Committee on Nonessential Government Expenditures concerning increasing postal rates for publishers? Why do we not have a recommendation from that committee for the elimination of subsidies for certain classes of mail? Subsidies do not seem to hurt there. They hurt only in connection with the REA or on legislation for some poor working fellow. Subsidies do not seem to hurt when the Government of the United States is paying out fabulous sums to industry in connection with certain types of mail.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota is aware, of course, that the subsidy on second-class mail, newspapers and magazines, amounts to approximately $200,000,000 a year, that the subsidy on direct advertising matter amounts to $120,000,000 a year, and that the subsidy on fourth-class mail, parcel post, amounts to approximately $80,000,000 a year, or a total of $400,000,000. I take it that the Senator from Minnesota is determined to reduce those subsidies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator could not have spoken truer words.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator very much for his effort to save money for the public.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question. I must abide by the rules.

Mr. TYDINGS. My understanding is that if the Post Office Department were operating on a self-sustaining basis, if the subsidies referred to by the two Senators were eliminated—in other words, if those classes of mail were to carry the burden of expense which they should carry—the Post Office budget might be balanced.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I reply to the distinguished Senator by saying that he is substantially correct. If we should eliminate these subsidies we would be able to have a nearly balanced Post Office

budget. It would be approximately $150,000,000 short by the elimination of those special classes.

Mr. TYDINGS. That would wipe out a tentative half-billion-dollar deficit in the budget.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

I bring the subject of the Post Office Department to the attention of the Senate because it appears to me that it is about time the American people clearly understood that if the costs of manufacturing an automobile are up, if the cost of a suit of clothing is up, then certainly the costs of some Government services are up. That is why we have deficits. We have not adequately raised the rates as some merchants have raised their prices.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Along that line, I should like to point out to the Senator that many persons say the dollar of today will purchase only 60 percent of what it would purchase in 1939. That fact alone would indicate that some adjustments are necessary. Another factor in the case is that subsidies themselves are evil. They should be applied only as an emergency measure to accomplish some particular purpose. A perpetual and continuing subsidy is the least justifiable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe strongly that it may be necessary for the Government to underwrite certain deficits in the Post Office Department. A modicum of good sense and reasonableness is required. The Senator from Virginia stated that in my statement I presented a distorted picture of Federal employment. I repeat that my charges are true, because, merely to list the head count of Federal workers is not an adequate statement of fact as to what should be done in terms of Federal employment reduction.

The next charge which has been made against the junior Senator from Minnesota was with reference to his statement that the Eightieth Congress refused to appropriate money for the use of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. I stand partially corrected by the Senator from Virginia.

However, I should like to say that while the distinguished chairman of the committee did not ask for appropriations from the Eightieth Congress, he did ask for a deficiency appropriation from the Eighty-first Congress. It is a small item, Mr. President, but it simply means that this joint committee was doing work which it ought not to have been doing.

The next charge which was leveled at the junior Senator from Minnesota was that he had charged the Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures with dealing only in generalities. I repeat, Mr. President, that since the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act the joint committee has been dealing in generalities. The enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act is one of the reasons for my asking for the discontinuance of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures. Before the enactment of the Reorganization Act the joint committee may have had a legitimate function to perform. It held hearings and issued reports.

The next charge which was leveled against the junior Senator from Minnesota was that he had said, in introducing the bill, that the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures was in existence in violation of the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act. The Senator from Virginia said that joint committees were excluded under the Legislative Reorganization Act. The Senator from Virginia ought to know that joint committees which duplicate the work of standing committees are not excluded. The common sense of the Legislative Reorganization Act calls upon Congress not to have two committees doing the same work, bothering the same agencies, hiring duplicate staffs, and using paper, time, and equipment to do exactly the same job. Any man skilled in economy, or any management specialist, would make a recommendation immediately, if two committees were performing substantially the same work, that one of them ought to be abolished. Perhaps we ought to abolish the committee set up under the Legislative Reorganization Act, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Personally, I do not believe that committee should be abolished. I believe we ought to abolish the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it that the Senator from Minnesota is acquainted with the fact that in biological life there are found vestigial organs which no longer perform any function. The appendix in the human body is such a vestigial organ. When these organs get out of condition they must be operated upon and excised. Does the Senator from Minnesota find any analogy between physical life and congressional life?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say to the doctor from Illinois that he is 100-percent correct in his physiological, psychological, political, social, and economic analyses?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it that what the Senator from Minnesota believes he is doing is performing the useful function of a surgeon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota believes that he is performing the function of just an average citizen who looks into a congressional situation and finds two committees doing the same work. One of the committees, according to the testimony of its chairman, has not met for 2 years. It has not held a meeting for 2 years. However, it still gets money from the Senate. The other committee meets every week.

Mr. President, I do not like to say that it all seems a little nonsensical to me, but it does not make very much sense to me. If the financial dilemma of the country is as the Senator from Virginia has pointed out, and if the financial situation is as he has pointed out, it appears to me that members of the joint committee ought to find time at least once in 2 years to meet—or then close up shop.

Mr. President, I know why the joint committee has not met, and so does everyone else today who is not willing to rally round on the basis of personalities. The reason is that there is no necessity for the joint committee to meet, because the work of the committee has been taken care of, under public law of the land, by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I, for one, am not willing to stand on the floor of the Senate and vote appropriations to keep a committee in business just because I like someone who is a member of the committee, or who is chairman of it.

The next charge which has been leveled against the junior Senator from Minnesota is that he accused the joint committee of being a publicity medium. I was being very moderate when I said that, Mr. President. It is a publicity medium second to none. I submit that every monthly report it makes is headline news in the country. I submit that every monthly report of the committee gets good coverage in the country. I submit that not only does it get good coverage, but that after these monthly reports come out, every Congressman gets thousands of letters about the number of people on the Federal pay roll. I believe this information should be made available. However, it should be made available by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand, then, that it is not the purpose of the Senator from Minnesota to have concealed from the public the figures concerning the total number of persons employed, but it is his purpose to have these figures issued periodically, by the proper committee, so that the public as a whole may know what the situation is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to repeat what the Senator from Illinois has asked me in question form. Of course, the public must know. Of course there should be the fullest publicity. Every day there is something being released from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments as to what is being done in terms of economy. Only a month ago the committee, in its meeting, adopted a resolution that we should have more publicity about the economies we are effecting.

In the matter of Federal properties, which we heard the Senator from Virginia say his committee had looked into the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has made the same survey. One of the reasons why we tightened up the committee system—and when I say "we," I am a part of this honorable body—one of the reasons why the Reorganization Act came into effect, was to take out of existence committees

which were duplicating the work of others, and threatening them with jurisdictional problems.

Now as to one other comment that was made—and I accept this in the spirit in which it was made. It was said the Senator from Minnesota is quite a publicity specialist. I have learned much today. I learned that when one attacks the old-guard coalition in the Senate, through one of its prominent spokesmen a freshman Senator is going to learn something. I have watched the rallying of the old-guard coalition on the floor of the Senate, and I know why it happened.

I recently had a check made into the record, and I found from the Congressional Quarterly that in the Seventy-ninth Congress the distinguished Senator from Virginia supported the administration 37 percent of the time, that he supported the administration in the Eightieth Congress 36 percent of the time, and that he supported the administration in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress 34 percent of the time. The junior Senator from Minnesota, as is shown by the same Congressional Quarterly, supported the administration 94 percent of the time. I submit that the 34 percent recorded for the Senator from Virginia for the first session of the Eighty-first Congress is about the same record that some of our Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle could report. They supported the administration at least one-third of the time, because when the appropriation bills came through, most of them voted "aye." I now understand why all at once I found Senators rising to the defense of the Senator from Virginia. I understand why all at once I was severely challenged by the coalition.

Now let me do a little challenging. The press today attributes to the Senator from Virginia a statement on the floor of the Senate about the fabulous savings which his joint committee is supposed to have made. I have in my hands the report of that joint committee. By the way, it is not a Senate document. There seems to be no Senate document of that sort in existence. It is a Senate committee print, which was made in 1947. It is entitled "An Additional Report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to the Congress of the United States—Economy Progress from 1941 to 1947."

Here we see real exaggeration. Let me read from the report of Economy Progress from 1941 to 1947. I read from the second paragraph on page 1:

> Generally regarded as the spearhead of all congressional economy drives during the period of its existence from 1941 to 1947.

By the way, may I digress for a moment. Note the words "during the period of its existence from 1941 to 1947." The author of this report knew that the committee was living on borrowed time after 1947, that it was a sort of political zombie. I continue reading the second paragraph:

> The joint committee's activity has resulted in direct savings to the Federal Government of more than $6,283,199,545.

"Direct savings" the words are.

> Amazingly enough at the same time the administrative cost of the committee itself in the past 6 years has only been $107,500, representing an expenditure of approximately $17.50 by the committee for each $1,000,000 saved the Federal Government.

I would not say that was patting one's self on the back. I would say that is just twisting one's self up like a pretzel and spinning and announcing to the world the greatness of one's accomplishments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator acquainted with the famous remark which Disraeli is reputed to have made upon the occasion when he was asked how it was that he got along so well with Queen Victoria? He replied that he got along well because he always laid it on with a shovel. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois. I may say in answer to his question that I have not heard that story. I am very grateful for the education I am receiving here, not only during the earlier moments of the day, but during these more delightful moments of the later hour.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator from Minnesota feel that possibly this quotation from Disraeli is appropriate to the debate of this afternoon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota would like to accept the judgment of his distinguished and learned colleague from Illinois.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILEY. Was the last remark by the Senator from Illinois an admission that the Senators who are now engaged in exchanges on the floor are both good shovelers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, that I am not immune from such activities. However, as a result of what I have found out today, I bow in humble inferiority to the experts.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Perhaps the Senator is acquainted with the Caterpillar shovels. Perhaps they would be more suggestive of the ability of the two Senators. Does not the Senator think so?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have never claimed to be an expert in those fields, Mr. President, but I shall be glad to take the word of the Senator from Wisconsin for what he has said, just as I take the word of my friend the Senator from Illinois for what he has said.

Mr. WILEY. Of course, I have always listened with interest to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have never known the Senator from Wisconsin to be anything else but complimentary and gracious, and to be a gentleman at all times. I want to thank him for his gracious words.

However, we were discussing a moment ago something which was not quite so gracious or complimentary. I was referring to the report respecting "so-called" economies. I now wish to read from the Washington Times-Herald. The Washington Times-Herald of recent date, I believe it was of Saturday last, had this to say:

> The committee officially known as the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures stood on its report of 1947.

This is quoting the Senator from Virginia.

> The report said it is saving the taxpayers a $1,000,000 for every $17.50. The committee has since reported that its economy measures accepted by the government agencies since 1941 have saved $6,000,000,000.

Now, Mr. President, what economy measures does the committee take full credit for having inaugurated? Mark my words, Mr. President. The report did not say these economy measures were an "indirect" product of the work of the committee. It did not say that these economy measures came about merely because of the suggestion of the committee. It said that these economy measures were a direct result of the work of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. The Senator from Virginia read all these figures. He started out by saying that in the fiscal year 1943 the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures recommended that the Civilian Conservation Corps be abolished, saving $38,000,000. He said that the committee recommended that the National Youth Administration be abolished and recommended drastic reduction of the Work Projects Administration. The report continues on and on through page 1, page 2, page 3, and page 4. That is up through 1946.

Mr. President, I offer excerpts from the President's budget messages for the RECORD, I shall read part of them and ask unanimous consent to have the remainder incorporated in the RECORD. First of all, what did the late President Franklin Roosevelt say on page 7 of his budget message for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942? He said:

> The increased military expenditures permit a substantial reduction in nondefense expenditures, particularly for those activities which are made less necessary by improved economic conditions.

On page 8 of the budget message we find the following:

> For the items subject to administrative rather than legislative action, I have been able to reduce expenditures by $600,000,000, or 15 percent.

These facts demonstrate that the Byrd committee in taking credit for what the President of the United States is responsible for. The Congress listened to and acted on the advice of the President—not the echoing of the Byrd committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since we have been indulging in literary allusions this afternoon, I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota would pardon me if I asked another literary question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am more than happy to have the Senator from Illinois do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I remember the legend of Chanticleer, which I believe was put into a play by the French playwright, Rostand, Chanticleer, when the dawn approaches, crows. Chanticleer is a glorified literary term for the barnyard rooster. Chanticleer used to crow and still crows as the dawn appears, and crowing a great deal, Chanticleer got the idea that his crowing caused the sun to rise. [Laughter.] Does the Senator from Minnesota think that possibly this literary allusion also has a place in explaining the financial reports made during the past 10 years?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do. I concur with the Senator from Illinois.

What do we find? We find that the President of the United States, in his budget message preceded the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. Today we should pay a word of tribute to the late President Roosevelt for his wisdom in curtailing expenditures, and to our present President, who is one of the finest examples of a President with good management ability and competence. He has really saved the Government of the United States billions of dollars. He has not spent his time in merely issuing reports. He has made recommendations which have been carried out in terms of drastic reduction of Federal employment. The record speaks for itself.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD excerpts from the budget messages of the President for the years 1942 to 1947, respecting savings which were made, the same savings which are now listed in the economy progress report.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1942

PAGE VII. NONDEFENSE EXPENDITURES

The increased military expenditures permit a substantial reduction in nondefense expenditures, particularly for those activities which are made less necessary by improved economic conditions. * * *

PAGE VIII

For the items subject to administrative rather than legislative action, I have been able to reduce expenditures by $600,000,000, or 15 percent.

PAGE IX. PUBLIC WORKS

During this period of national emergency it seems appropriate to defer construction projects that interfere with the defense program by diverting manpower and materials. * * *

With this in mind I am recommending reductions for rivers and harbors and flood control work. Where possible, without placing the project or the water users thereof in jeopardy, reductions are proposed in expenditures for reclamation projects. I have requested that further contracts for the construction of public buildings outside the District of Columbia be held in abeyance for the present. * * *

Throughout the Federal Service other projects are being deferred until a more appropriate time. * * *

PAGE X

I recommend an appropriation of $995,000,000 for work relief for the full fiscal year. This is $400,000,000 less than the amount required for the present fiscal year. It will not be necessary to use this full amount if the defense program should result in a more general reemployment than is presently indicated.

EXCERPTS FROM THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1943

PAGE VII. THE CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT

In a true sense there are no longer nondefense expenditures.

In the preparation of the present budget, expenditures not directly related to the war have been reduced to a minimum or reoriented to the war program.

It is estimated that expenditures for the major Federal assistance programs—farm aid, work relief, youth aid—can be reduced by $600,000,000 from the previous to the current fiscal year, and again by $860,000,000 from the current to the next fiscal year. These programs will require $1,400,000 during the fiscal year 1943, about one-half of the expenditure for these purposes during the fiscal year 1941. By using methods of administrative budget control, $415,000,000 of appropriations for civil purposes have been placed in reserves.

Excluding debt charges and grants under the social-security law, total expenditures for other than direct war purposes have been reduced by slightly more than $1,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year.

PAGE XIII. AGRICULTURAL AID

I propose to continue the soil conservation and use program on a moderately reduced scale.

The remaining expenditures for the agricultural program are being brought into accord with the war effort.

PAGE XIII. WORK PROJECTS

The average number of WPA workers was 2,000,000 in the fiscal year 1940, the year before the defense program started; the average has been cut to 1,000,000 this year. With increasing employment, a further considerable reduction will be possible.

PAGE IX. AID TO YOUTH

Under war conditions there is need and opportunity for youth to serve in many ways. It is, therefore, possible to make a considerable reduction in the programs of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration.

PAGE IX. PUBLIC-WORKS PROGRAM

The public-works program is being fully adjusted to the war effort.

Federal aid for highways will be expended only for construction essential for strategic purposes. Other highway projects will be deferred until the postwar period. For all other Federal construction I am restricting expenditures to those active projects which cannot be discontinued without endangering structural work in progress.

EXCERPTS FROM THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1944

PAGE IX. CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

On the other hand, I am recommending a reduction of $50,000,000 in the appropriation for "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources."

PAGE X. FOOD-STAMP PLAN

For "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities," the budget includes only the permanent annual appropriation of 30 percent of customs revenues provided by law, plus reappropriation of unobligated balances. The food-stamp plan, which is a major item of the current program, will be discontinued shortly. Although other items such as school lunch and school milk projects and the direct distribution of surplus commodities are somewhat expanded, there will be an over-all reduction of about $30,000,000.

PAGE XIV. NONWAR EXPENDITURES

All counted, there are less than 850,000 civilian employees of the Federal Government, including the postal service, who are engaged in these so-called nonwar activities. A few weeks ago I transmitted to the Congress a comprehensive report on nonwar expenditures during the past decade This document demonstrated the important reductions which had been made in these expenditures, especially since the start of the defense program.

"Nonwar" expenditures, fiscal years 1939-44

[Excluding interest and statutory debt retirement]

Fiscal year	Total nonwar expenditures	Reduction below 1939
1939	$6,516,000,000	
1940	6,246,000,000	$270,000,000
1941	5,298,000,000	1,218,000,000
1942	5,125,000,000	1,391,000,000
1943 (estimated)	4,582,000,000	1,934,000,000
1944 (estimated)	4,124,000,000	2,392,000,000

The table shows a reduction of 36.7 percent in nonwar expenditures in the next fiscal year compared with 1939.

The most important reductions recommended for the coming year relate to work relief and general public works. Because of present high levels of employment, I am able to recommend elimination of the Work Projects Administration.

Expenditures for general public works will be greatly curtailed.

PAGE XV

Others have been discontinued as rapidly as this could be done without risking the loss of the investment already made.

I shall be glad to cooperate with the Congress in effecting further reductions in nonwar expenditures through the necessary revision of underlying legislation and in every other way. It should be pointed out to the Congress and to the Nation, however, that we are fast approaching the subsistence level of government, the minimum for sustaining orderly social and economic processes, and that further reductions will necessarily be of much smaller magnitude than those already achieved.

My recommendations contemplate that in the fiscal year 1944, 96 cents of every dollar expended by the Federal Government will be used to pay war costs and interest on the public debt, and only 4 cents for all the so-called nonwar purposes.

EXCERPTS FROM THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1946

PAGE XIV PUBLIC WORKS

Actual construction will continue to be restricted to those projects which contribute to the war effort. Because of the completion of some of this war-related construction, expenditures are estimated to decrease slightly in the next fiscal year.

PAGE XVI. FEDERAL PERSONNEL

The total number of paid Federal employees in the continental United States in November 1944 was slightly under 2,900,000, of whom 2,040,000 were in the War and Navy

Departments and other war agencies and 836,000 in the Post Office and other peacetime establishments. The total has declined 126,000 below the peak of June 1943. There will be further reductions as the course of the war permits.

EXCERPTS FROM THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1947

PAGE XLV. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

The rapid reconversion of the Federal Government from war to peace is reflected in the demobilization of its civilian personnel. The number of these employees in continental United States has been reduced by more than 500,000 from the total of approximately 2,900,000 employed in the final months of the war. I expect that by next June we shall have made a further reduction of equal magnitude and that there will be continuing reductions during the next fiscal year. Of the special wartime agencies now remaining, only a few are expected to continue actively into the next fiscal year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to summarize at this point what I believe to be the case for the bill I have presented. Number 1. That the Legislative Reorganization Act charges the responsibility for the surveillance and for the careful scrutiny of the budget and of expenditures to the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Number two, that the activities of the so-called Byrd committee are a duplication of function, and therefore the joint committee is a violation of the spirit and language of the Legislative Reorganization Act, and is, I repeat, a waste of money. Whether that money be thousands of dollars or millions of dollars, it is still a waste. I think the evidence bears me out, from the very fact that the chairman of the committee has stated on the floor of the Senate that for 2 years the joint committee has not had a meeting. I repeat that if a committee is vital and is performing a service for the Congress of the United States, it should meet and meet regularly. The work of the committee from 1941 to 1946 can stand on its own merits. The junior Senator from Minnesota is not complaining about the work of the committee as it was authorized by public law, and I want the record to clearly show that I am in no way chastising any member of the joint committee for the work he has performed. Distinguished Members of this honorable body are members of the committee. I also respect the administrative members of the committee, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. But, Mr. President, simply because I respect them and hold them in high regard is no reason why I should stand idly by and see continued a committee which apparently has no work to do, no function to perform, and no reason for continued existence.

Mr. President, what is the last charge that is made? It has been made again and again today—that apparently we are not concerned about economy or our national economy or about a balanced budget.

Mr. President, I take exception to those remarks. In fact, there are many remarks which have been made today to which one could take exception. I am concerned with our economy, and I repeat that our economy is not bricks and stones and mortar and bones. Our economy consists of people—flesh and blood, people with souls and spirits, people who want jobs and houses. I am concerned with that kind of an economy, and I am concerned that during the days of the depression they had something to eat, too.

The testimony which has been given today indicates that perhaps they would not have had anything to eat if some persons had had their way.

Today I have heard a great deal said about the carelessness of the fiscal policy of the administration and of the President. The splendid remarks of the majority leader, which were so well stated and so well grounded, should answer this charge. How does the Senator from Virginia propose to balance the budget? He is an expert, so his cohorts say, then what specific proposals does he suggest—what economies—what services to be deleted.

I have heard about the great increase in the cost of government in the last 2 or 3 years. One of the reasons for the increase in the cost of government is that we have had many new problems in the world. The senior Senator from Virginia said—and I have his remarks noted here—that there are no new emergencies. I quote his words:

> If we cannot balance the budget now, when can we? There are no new emergencies. There has been nothing new happen.

Mr. President, perhaps there has not been in Virginia; but I think we had an emergency when the President authorized the construction of the hydrogen bomb. I thought we had an emergency when the Communists took over China. I heard a great deal of talk here on the floor of the Senate about an emergency in Formosa. I thought there was an emergency in Indochina. Almost every day that I sit here in the Senate I hear talk and repeated talk about emergencies.

The Senator from Virginia voted against the Marshall plan. If his vote had governed in this body, to be sure we would not have a deficit. That would be meaningful, of course; but I wish to say for the record, for once and for all, that if my choice as a Member of this honorable body is between a deficit with the kind of economy we have in America and the elimination of the Marshall plan, I will accept the deficit. I submit that the ECA has done a creditable job.

Mr. President, I submit that it does not show too much vision or too great an understanding of the problems of the world to say that we can disregard those fields. We shall not have any chance to balance any budget unless we win the cold war, Mr. President. We shall not have any chance to balance the budget unless we understand the kind of world in which we are living and the kind of world in which we are living has been a changing one.

Back in 1939, in the Seventy-sixth Congress there was a record vote and on that vote the senior Senator from Virginia voted against increasing the number of airplanes in the Air Force to 6,000 planes; but he voted for a naval appropriation bill. Of course, there are great shipyards in a certain area of this country, Mr. President.

I submit to you, Mr. President, that the Air Force bill should have been enacted in 1939, and we should have had that Air Force. The administration was attempting to get that Air Force, but had the judgment of the Senator from Virginia prevailed, we would not have had it.

Mr. President, this afternoon Senators talked about fiscal policy during the war. Of course, a good deal of money was made during the war. During that period we could have increased the social-security taxes so that as of today we would have a greater reserve, and would not have to be moving precipitously now to increase those taxes. We could have moved in easy stages. Mr. President, just consider the profits, after the payment of taxes, of corporate business from 1940 to 1948. Here is the record, Mr. President: The net profits of corporate business from 1940 to 1948 were $106,700,000,000. Does anyone believe it would have bankrupted the country to have made an increased payment of a small amount, 1 percent, into the fund for the payment of old-age pensions? If that had been done, today the people retiring would have a real pension, instead of what they have at the present time—a pension which is almost meaningless in terms of the present need. I would not have regarded it as good economy to have voted against increasing the social-security taxes. I am sorry to say that some persons did not vote to increase those taxes—one being the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, I have here a fairly complete voting record. However, I shall not burden the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by presenting a complete analysis of that record. When we talk about balancing the budget in this country, it is one thing to talk about it, and it is another thing to do it. It is like saying we should cut down the number of Federal Government employees. Yet the Bureau of the Budget points out that for the fiscal year 1951, we will spend only two-tenths of 1 percent more, proportionately, for Federal Government employees, than we spent in the fiscal year 1939. But today the American people are led to believe that almost everyone in the country is working for the Government, and that those who are working for the Government are not doing any real work. Mr. President, I am of the opinion that these Government employees are working, that they justly deserve what they get, and that the Government of the United States is making consistent efforts to reduce the number of nonessential employees in the Government. If the Congress does not think that is so, I suggest that the Members of Congress follow the leadership of my friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. He has suggested again and again on this floor that we can cut down on the number of Federal Government personnel; but he does not get very many votes in his attempts to do so. Referring to the unbalanced budget, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia has inquired, "When does a nation become insolvent?"

Mr. President, I reply that we are not insolvent now. This Nation is not now insolvent, despite all the propaganda and the cries and the charges of insolvency, regimentation, socialism, and collectivism. This Nation today is further from being insolvent than it was 20 years ago—than it was 10 years ago. The state of the Union is good.

Mr. President, the fiscal reports on small business and on corporate business—and I gather today we have in the Senate Senators who have been active in small business; and I am glad that I, too, represent small business—show that both big business and small business have been earning sizable profits.

So, Mr. President, I submit that this country is not insolvent. Although the General Motors Corp. can yield a $600,000,000 net profit after taxes, and although other companies can yield corporate dividends of today, which are unexcelled, now I hear charges made on the floor of the Senate that deficit spending is threatening to result in the insolvency of the United States of America. This is rank propaganda with no basis of evidence or fact.

Mr. President, I say this with a deep sense of humility, but the only time our country was ever threatened by insolvency or socialism—the only time the Communist Party began growing and being a real threat—was when there was some untimely budget balancing going on in Washington. Andrew Mellon and Ogden L. Mills balanced the budget, until the people had unbalanced lives and unfed stomachs. Economy in government was the word, spirit, and letter. But, the Nation suffered, the people were unemployed, business was prostrate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, it is true that from 1930 to 1933 the budget was not balanced, in spite of all that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So not even the budget was balanced during that period of time; but people's lives, as the Senator properly says, were unbalanced.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. President, lest my remarks be misinterpreted, sometimes there is a tendency for some persons to misinterpret remarks, let me make it crystal clear that, over the long run, to be sure, sound fiscal policy demands that we have a balance between expenditures and revenues. That is the objective of the President. He has so stated again and again, and he has presented a plan which will make it possible. That is the objective, Mr. President, of this administration, and of those of us on this side of the aisle who are supporting the administration. But I submit for the RECORD, and I submit for myself and my family, that rather than talk about how we can bring about a little economy by firing a post-office clerk, I am a great deal more concerned about what is going to happen in this world, whether we are going to have a bomb dropped on our heads, whether we have got the defense establishment able to protect us, whether we have the right foreign policy in Europe and Asia, whether we have a dynamic growing economy in America, which can sustain the kind of foreign policy we need, and the sort of domestic program we need.

I have heard again and again charges against the administration. I repeat that the prophets of doom have been wrong every time. They were wrong in 1948, they were wrong in 1946, in 1947, and they were wrong in 1949. Every year the prophets of doom and despair have predicted that the Democratic administration of Mr. Truman is going to lead the country into insolvency, socialism, and bankruptcy, and every year people seem to get along pretty well, and the people who do the most complaining are getting along the best. Those who are getting the big profits, those who are the big coupon clippers, they are the ones who are doing the greatest amount of crying. The little people who cannot get a decent pension because Congress did not elevate the social-security taxes when it should have been done, are the ones who are doing the least crying today. They are the faithful. They are the silent faithful partners in the great crusade of making this world a safe place in which to live. They are not going to make any money off of anything; all they are going to do is die; and yet they are willing to go along with their Government—to support it and their President.

The Senator from Virginia said something about the excess-profits tax. He criticized the President for removing the excess-profits tax. The other day I read an article which was written by a distinguished reporter, the report of an interview with the President. There is one thing I like about our President—he is willing to admit some mistakes. What did he say? He said, in essence, "I made some mistakes—cutting off lend-lease too quickly, for instance. I did some things wrong in respect to the fiscal policy, because, after all, how did we know what things were going to be like after the war?" So the President recommended, I think wrongly, the repeal of the excess-profits tax. But in the Eightieth Congress, in 1948, the Congress had a chance to put the excess-profits tax on the books again. I point out for the record that in 1948, during the life of the Eightieth Congress, corporate business made $20,800,000,000 net profit after taxes. That was $2,500,000,000 more than they made the year before, and $8,000,000,000 more than they made in 1946. There was an attempt on the floor, in the Eightieth Congress, to restore the excess-profits tax. The senior Senator from Virginia voted against it, and yet today on the floor of the Senate he condemns the President for recommending its repeal.

If it was wrong to repeal it in the first place, there is only one way to patch up the mistakes of the past, and that is to have a little searching of the soul and to start living a new life. The searching of the soul was offered, the new life was offered in terms of the excess-profits tax; but the critic of the President's action voted "no."

Mr. President, there is another matter which I do not want to forget. I call the attention of the Senate to a bulletin entitled, "Reform of the Federal Budget," Public Affairs Bulletin No. 80, for 1950, containing a statement by Dr. George B. Galloway, on page 110 of the bulletin. After having made an analysis, through some 15 pages, of the proposals for improving the fiscal policy of the United States, and for improving the budget, he adds the further comment:

> It is suggested that the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures (the Byrd committee) should be discontinued, because its function now falls within the jurisdiction of the standing committee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

On behalf of the people who believe in good government in America, I offered the proposal—and what a storm it has stirred up, a storm of protest not in behalf of the people or good government, but a storm of protest over the fact that anyone should dare touch the vested institutions of the vested coalition. I conclude by thanking my colleagues for the attention they have given me, thanking them for the courteous manner in which they have received my talk this afternoon, and asking them to remember one thing—that while we are here together in a spirit of friendship in the Congress of the United States, and while it is a part of our code of ethics as gentlemen to be friendly and congenial one with another, our major responsibility is not the art of making friends—Dale Carnegie tells us how to do that—our major responsibility is to legislate. Our major responsibility is to improve the machinery of government. To those who are the champions of the Hoover Commission report, a report which I support, to those who have been the champions of legislative reorganization, to those who have talked incessantly about the need of Governmental economy and about efficiency in Government operations, and particularly to those who have been so active in the effort to bring about economy in government, I commend my bill to abolish the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. I commend the bill, because I say the joint committee itself is nonessential. It has outlived its purposes and its usefulness. It is a committee that should have passed along—with great honor, with the testimonials we have had today, and with the showering of words of praise—at the time of the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act. As a new child was born, the old should have been put to sleep. But now we have to wait. It becomes uncomfortable and becomes disturbing; but, disturbing or uncomfortable as it may be, the time to do it is now.

THE NEW DEAL TRIES TO CLIP SOME WINGS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask that an editorial entitled "The New Deal Tries To Clip Some Wings," appearing in today's issue of the Washington Times-Herald, be inserted at the conclusion of the debate on the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW DEAL TRIES TO CLIP SOME WINGS

The National Labor Relations Board has set out to trim the powers of its general counsel, Robert N. Denham. Under the Taft-Hartley Act Mr. Denham is permitted considerable latitude and has discharged his responsibilities with independence and courage. He has done his best to apply the law as it stands on the books, notwithstanding the fact that the Truman administration and its allies, the professional union bosses, are extremely hostile to the act.

DENHAM AT WORK

This has won Mr. Denham the displeasure of Mr. Truman's men on the NLRB. Mr. Denham, however, knew that he was not, as under the old Wagner Act, simply a water boy for the Board, but that his office had been vested by Congress with broad powers.

On January 12 Mr. Denham openly accused the Board members of being "saturated" with the philosophy of the Wagner Act and of being reluctant to conform to the spirit and letter of the Taft-Hartley law.

There were, he said, "many decisions to which I have been unable to subscribe as being consonant with the broad purposes and intent of the law." He said that the Board had been "reversing" the courts in interpreting the law and stated that the reluctance of the members to enforce its provisions stemmed from an expectation that the law would be repealed and his own office abolished.

In response, the Board has now instructed Mr. Denham that the position he must take in court is that which it has dictated, and it has informed him that it will have the last word on hiring or firing chiefs of NLRB regional and subregional offices—a function he has hitherto exercised.

This attempt by the Truman administration to debase the office of general counsel is consistent with Mr. Truman's declared hostility to the Taft-Hartley law.

BYRD COMMITTEE ALSO ATTACKED

The President, by delaying resort to the law in the coal strike until a calamity could not be averted, placed himself in the position of attempting to discredit the law. Unable to prevail upon Congress to repeal it, he exposed the public to hardship in the hope of building up a showing that the law was without effect. Now his board has taken further steps to set the law at nought.

There is a consistent pattern here which has again been manifested by the bill introduced by Senator HUMPHREY, the Minnesota New Dealer, to cut off funds for the Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, headed by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, and then to abolish the committee itself.

The Byrd committee has been relentless in exposing the waste incident to the swollen Federal bureaucracy. The administration's response is to attempt to cut off the committee's head.

That is the process which the NLRB is following in its endeavor to undermine the Taft-Hartley Act. It cannot hope to get rid of the general counsel, but it can do its best to handcuff him.

The political motive is shamelessly transparent. It is what the people can expect as long as Kansas City ward politics is tolerated as a system of National Government.

NOMINATIONS TO THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD AND THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nomination of William Webster, of Massachusetts, to be Chairman of the Research and Development Board; of Rear Adm. John W. Roper, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (personnel); of Vice Adm. John D. Price, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief, Naval Air Training; and Vice Adm. Donald B. Duncan, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be received.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent, that, as in executive session, these nominations be confirmed, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified forthwith.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77) requesting the President to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 204) for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche, and authorizing its reenrollment.

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there is a story told of a Member of Congress who likes to talk a great deal, who was speaking before a particular group, making a very fine impression. In the group to which he was speaking there happened to be a man who was in charge of an adjoining insane asylum. He asked the politician to come over and address his group. The politician accepted the invitation. He was wont to begin his speeches with the question, "What are we here for?" He would repeat it, accentuating it with each repetition—"What are we here for?" He would then pause. He followed his usual custom in addressing the inmates of the insane asylum. One of the inmates said, "Mister, I do not know why you are here, but we are here because we are not there." [Laughter.] But that made no impression upon the speaker. He continued, finally concluding his speech with the question, "Where do we go from here?" Again the inmate spoke up. He said, "I don't know where you're going, but if you keep on talking the way you do you'll be one of us before long." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I ask, What are we of the Senate here for? I am sure someone would answer that we are here, not to be concerned with the smaller things, in this hour of crisis in the world. We should not have any bickerings between ourselves over minor matters. We have big problems which the people ask us to solve. I desire to speak about one of those problems; but let me say, first, that the other problems with which we might concern ourselves are how to improve our cold-war methods, how to improve the impact of world socialism and world communism upon this country, how to solve the serious coal situation.

A man came to my office today and stated that in his little town of Westbend the schools and manufacturing plants had to close because of the lack of coal.

Yes, Mr. President, we might concern ourselves with what has been mentioned today as the question of the national budget running into the red.

We might concern ourselves with the tremendous unemployment problem which is facing America, with approximately 5,000,000 persons idle.

We might concern ourselves with the strike problem which is still a cancerous growth on the economy of America.

We might concern ourselves with racketeers. Who are the racketeers? They are the persons who want to make their own laws and who do not wish to obey the laws of the land. I care not whether they are in Government, or in management or labor, racketeers want to make their own rules, and they do not want to obey the rules of the Nation.

We might concern ourselves, also, with the great crime wave which is depleting much of the treasure and the morality of the Nation.

We might concern ourselves with seeing to it that the American dollar does not depreciate any further, because, if it does, the money invested in insurance, in bonds, and in many of the things we have regarded as solid investments, will simply amount to nothing.

We talk about providing adequate pensions. There will not be any adequate pensions or anything else if we permit our dollar to slide much more. The value of the dollar depends upon who values it. When I came to Washington 11 years ago, I could have bought a house for approximately $15,000 which would sell now at from $50,000 to $60,000. That indicates that we now have approximately a 25-cent dollar.

Mr. President, I wish to speak on an important subject on which a number of Senators have spoken. It relates to the foreign situation. There are pending before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I am a member, numerous resolutions which relate to the ways and means of bringing about a peaceful world. One of the great dangers, as I see it, is that, because of the almost political disease of constantly resolving, our people may think we have found a panacea, a cure, a remedy. But resolutions will not do the job, Mr. President.

Recently great speeches by Members of this body have been centered on the same subject. In the latest issue of the Reader's Digest there is a very thoughtful article by George F. Kennan, counselor of the State Department, who comes from my State of Wisconsin. The article is entitled "Is War With Russia Inevitable?"

Mr. President, if there is one question about which the American people are concerned it is that. Lincoln said that God must have loved the common people, because he made so many of them The common people want peace Mr. Kennan suggests a vigorous and hopeful foreign policy which firmly rejects defeatism about a future war, and aims at keeping alive and pursuing vigorously every possibility of solving international differences, and for bearing them when the solution is not yet possible, without recourse to war.

In his article Mr. Kennan does not particularize as to any plans. He recognizes that "words would still mean different things to Russia than they mean to us," and that any agreement which might be entered into would be worth what the realities of world powers make it worth to any particular movement.

That is nothing new in the world. The Kaiser said that a treaty was a scrap of paper. But we must bear in mind, when we talk about resolutions, that we should put first things first. Let us recognize, I repeat, mere resolutions will not do the job.

Mr Kennan comes to the conclusion that until Russia recognizes that her efforts to maintain or to establish political world power over other peoples are detrimental to her own selfish interests and that it is inadvisable for Russia to pursue her efforts further, the problem cannot be solved.

I do not fully accept that conclusion, but I state that that is the judgment not only of Mr. Kennan, because I heard substantially the same words last night from Mr. Hoffman, the head of the ECA.

Mr. Kennan said that in his judgment mere oral persuasion will not do the job, but that we must create "a situation of fact that brings this home to the Russian leaders." By "a situation of fact" he means to bring out the thought that our security consists in making aggression improbable, if not impossible. He definitely says that we should not be diverted from our task by a morbid preoccupation with what could possibly happen I repeat those words, Mr President. We should not be diverted from our task by a morbid preoccupation with what could possibly happen. He does not say that a conference should not be entered into, but he does say that mere oral persuasion will not do the job. I think that is very important. In this picture, which would create a factual situation, he makes it plain that it is important that our allies know where we stand and that we are solidly behind them. I am glad to note that, among other things, he mentions the need of a strong America at home, a productive America, a harmonious America. To me, that is very significant. He recognizes that we are seriously tackling the problem of whether our own political and economy system will stand.

As I have stated, Mr. President, I am quoting Mr. George F. Kennan, who is a former resident of my State, and who at the present time is in South America. He is counselor of the State Department. He recognizes that we must seriously tackle the problems which confront us at home. That is why I think we should not become engrossed in a lot of minor matters. Let us attend to first things first. Let us recognize, as he so dynamically states, that the economic and political health of America is a great factor in determining whether there shall be peace on this globe.

He impresses upon us that there is needed something more than material prosperity. We must prove our adequacy. I say we do not prove our adequacy when we bicker over details which are picayunish in comparison with the serious challenges which confront America today. What is more, it affects the caliber of our own thinking. The time has come for straight thinking.

We must not permit ourselves, as management and labor sometimes permit themselves, to get all "het up," as the saying is, over minor matters When they permit industries to close down and productivity of plants to stop, management and labor forget their obligations to the general welfare. We must not permit minor matters, small matters, and noncontroversial matters to interfere with our thinking.

Are we keeping America really vital? Are we keeping the American way of life dynamic? That is what I believe, in substance, Mr. Kennan would ask if he could interrogate a Senator. Are we going, not on the beam, but off the beam? We know what happens when an airplane traveling through the air and unable to see ahead goes off the beam.

The world is looking to us to see whether we will keep alert—alert, with all that that word implies—and whether we will be adequate to meet any emergency—emergency, with all that that word implies There is included also the question of whether our approach to the problems of others will be adequate. We must manifest not only good will and cooperation, but the highest type of judgment, which does not come when we permit ourselves to be shoved off on a tangent.

I like this paragraph of Mr. Kennan's article:

> We should not lose ourselves in vain-glorious schemes for changing human nature all over the planet Rather, we should learn to view ourselves with a sense of proportion and Christian humility before the enormous complexity of the world in which it has been given us to live.

Mr. President, I believe this is the greatest period in the world's history. I believe that the age of Columbus, with its geographic discovery, does not hold a candle to this age, with its discoveries in all fields. We have blown the atom to pieces so that we cannot find what matter is. We have reached into the heavens and have found a star so large that the sun is as small in comparison with the star as the earth is in comparison with the sun. The earth is only 10,000 miles in diameter, and the sun is nearly a million miles in diameter. Yes; we have gone into every field. We have engaged in things which the human mind in the days of Columbus never conceived of. We are engaged in trying to find out who we are. Whither are we bound?

Mr. Kennan, in answering the question of whether the Russians are planning to make war on us, reaches the conclusion that it is hardly likely that the Russians are now charting an early military onlaught on the western world. I say "early onslaught on the western world." Last night Mr. Hoffman made the clear-cut statement that it was imperative we win the cold war; that otherwise the Russians, not by an overt act of war, but by using the means they have been so successfully using, would take over Europe and Africa. What would be left for us then? We would face the world. That is the serious problem, Mr. President. Whether or not we abolish a $12,000 committee is not of very great significance. Personally, I have always felt that one of the big things Congress should do for its own health is to create a committee, staffed with sufficient experts, so that it could operate as the Government was conceived of in the first place, as a government of adequate checks and balances. Whether this committee or that committee should do it, is unimportant. However, when the Federal budget mounts up to $42,000,000,000—and there is a big difference between such a budget and that of the days of George Washington—a responsibility is presented to Congress to see to it that it has adequate machinery to check the budget submitted to Congress by the President.

Mr. President, that is no reflection on the President. It merely means that the men who conceived this Government from their knowledge of the history of the ages and forecasting the future realized that the Government could remain in existence only so long as there were adequate checks and balances. God knows there are not adequate checks and balances in the financial branches of our Government now; we accept what is given to us, in large measure. That we should not do.

Mr. President, I say again, first things first, and the first things first here are charting our course so that America will remain safe, and performing our obligations in this age to the world into which we have been precipitated as leaders among the nations.

Mr. Kennan's reasons are cogent, and are worth considering. When it comes to the question as to whether war is possible, he quotes Alexander Hamilton. How true are these words, Mr. President; listen to them:

> We cannot count upon moderation or hope to extinguish the ambition of others; and that war or peace will not always be left to our option.

We all know, as has been stated, that wars can arise by accident, and that states like Russia, where a few men determine the course of war or peace, have in the past gone to war at the dictate of one or of a group, and they have been blind.

We know, too, that sometimes wars have been occasioned by fear that another nation might attack, and at this time, from all the information we can obtain, it is clearly evident that the Russian people are being fed the idea that the outside world is hostile and menacing. That presents a terrific problem to us Americans. So we ask ourselves, what course, under all the circumstances, is open? In other words, where do we go from here?

On February 17, 1950, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, suggesting that he instruct the United States delegates to the United Nations to contact Trygve Lie, the Secretary General of the United Nations, and that Lie proceed to poll the member states to determine whether it would be both desirable and feasible for a new international conference to be called, in which the principal states represented on the highest possible level would discuss, first, proposals for the revision of the United Nations' Charter, with a view to setting up some new form of international organization; and, second, in connection therewith, to consider ways and means of iron-clad international inspection of atomic energy and other weapons, and possible disarmament, so as to halt the armament race now proceeding.

In the letter I also suggested that the Secretary General contact the heads of the various governments, as well as their representatives at the United Nations. Up to date I have received no answer to that letter. Since that time a number of Senators have spoken very dramatically and clearly on the need for action which would result in a conference of some kind. Recently the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] spoke, making such a suggestion on the floor of the Senate, and it was my privilege to hear him.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] suggested that the Atlantic Council created by the North Atlantic Pact, seek the Kremlin's hospitality and there discuss the issue. I am fully in accord with the suggestion that something be done.

There are in Russia some 200,000,000 human beings. One hundred and ninety-five million of them have nothing to say about their own government. If Russia should invite the Atlantic Council to hold sessions there and would open up the ether waves so that her people could become aware of the true situation, it would, indeed, be a consummation devoutly to be wished. We at least can try, Mr. President. Or why not let the Council of the United Nations meet in Moscow? I can hear someone say it would not be invited; but, again I say we have to try something.

I may say parenthetically, Mr. President, that I heard a representative of the United Nations say the other day that one of the foreign representatives while talking with him said, "Why does not the Voice of America give us her great wealth of ideas—give us Washington, give us Lincoln, instead of much worthless stuff?" One of the great Christian gentlemen who is a member of the United Nations made that statement to one of our representatives. I have quoted it in substance as it was given in my presence and in the presence of eight or nine other Members of this body. The people of the world are hungry for the true meaning of America; they are hungry for the meaning of the American way. They ask, "Why do you not give us Lincoln?" I thrilled when I heard this request. I thought I heard a voice in the wilderness calling to us.

I hope the new head of the Voice of America will recognize that this is the hour of decision. I do not say it is later than we think. I am an optimist. I think it is much earlier than some people think. I think there is plenty of time ahead if we only do things, if we keep alert mentally, if we be adequate to facing the demands of the hour.

No, Mr. President, I am not a pessimist. There are many signs indicating that the right ferment is working. That is what is needed, as was so dynamically stated by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in relation to the power of the right idea, when he spoke on the Senate floor the other day.

The other evening I heard a French girl, one of the group of the MRA, a Catholic girl, say how she learned to love her German brothers and sisters, even though two of her own brothers were taken by the Nazis and never returned. I know the problem seems big, but as we read history, we know that men, ordinary men, when challenged with a great idea of service to humanity, have been filled with power and have changed the course of history.

Was it not our own Emerson who said:

> Beware when a thinker is let loose He may turn the flank of any science or knowledge.

Someone else has said:

> A man with an idea may change the course of history.

Two thousand years ago, the ideas enunciated by the lowly Nazarene took hold of men and down through the centuries those ideas have not only changed men but changed the course of nations. John Wesley said:

> Give me 10 men who fear only God and hate only evil and we can change the world.

What a faith. And Wesley changed the course of English history. There are many similar instances.

The Japanese, Kagawa, recently said:

> The heart is an atomic bomb and uranium is repentance.

Mr. President, there was sent to me by a young lady from San Francisco, whom I do not know, a little card with some verses by St. Francis of Assisi on it. She is a total stranger to me. She wrote:

> DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This atomic bomb has shaken us, as we look into the future. Are we to be annihilated by this newly released power or can we build together a new world based on justice and good will?

Then she quotes that great prayer by St. Francis of Assisi:

Lord, make me an instrument of Your Peace!
Where there is hatred, let me sow love,
Where there is injury, pardon;
Where there is doubt, faith;
Where there is despair, hope;
Where there is darkness, light;
Where there is sadness, joy.

O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek
To be consoled, as to console;
To be understood, as to understand;
To be loved, as to love.

For it is in giving that we receive;
It is in pardoning that we are pardoned;
It is in dying unto ourselves that we are born to eternal life.

Mr. President, I have no apology to make for quoting in this great Chamber the words of thinkers, men who sense that this little life does not hold everything.

We have to give up our wishful thinking, our inaction, yes, our fears and our doubts, and move forward. We know that mere conferences by themselves will not do the job unless as a result thereof there is complete understanding, together with the will to keep faith.

Talk is cheap. If we ourselves do not want to talk, we can buy phonograph records and hear plenty of talk or we can turn on the radio. Performance is what is needed.

Easter is around the corner. It is symbolic of something dynamic in the world: of men filled with the holy spirit; of men who learn to live and work together for a noble purpose; of ordinary men who become great by virtue of service; of men who recognize that life is not simply a game for political preferment, for material accomplishment, but that each is accountable to his Maker and that the man lives most who builds best.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has again shown his common sense and judicial approach in commenting on the international situation. He desires America to be strong and steady, yet he, as I am, is not satisfied with defeatism, inaction, and negatism when all reasoning and informed people know that inertia increases hourly the dangers about us. I commend him for his scholarly approach to this great enterprise—peace with honor and justice.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in view of the tremendous work load of the Senate, it is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for every Senator to make an independent study of the facts and issues which are presented by the numerous complicated and controversial bills upon which the Senators are called to vote during any one session of the Congress. It is for this reason, Mr. President, and also for the orderly conduct of the affairs of the Senate that the committees of the Senate have been instituted. As every Senator knows, the major portion of the work, the investigation of the facts, and the preparation of legislation are all done by the committees of the Senate with the assistance of their staffs.

Over the course of the last 3 years, pursuant to a resolution of the Senate, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has been conducting a comprehensive study and investigation of our entire immigration and naturalization system.

One facet of this study and investigation concerning which thousands of pages of testimony have been taken and countless hours of diligent study have been made is the problem of displaced persons. As a member of this subcommittee, may I say that our study and investigation has been objective.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] may yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, without prejudicing his rights to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LONG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Humphrey	Mundt
Butler	Hunt	Murray
Byrd	Ives	Myers
Cain	Jenner	Neely
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Chapman	Johnson, Tex	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Darby	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Smith, N J.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Downey	Leahy	Stennis
Dworshak	Lehman	Taft
Eastland	Lodge	Taylor
Ecton	Long	Thomas, Okla
Ellender	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarran	Tobey
Flanders	McCarthy	Tydings
Frear	McClellan	Watkins
Fulbright	McKellar	Wherry
George	McMahon	Wiley
Green	Magnuson	Williams
Gurney	Malone	Withers
Hayden	Martin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. EASTLAND. We have undertaken to view the problem of displaced persons, not only from the standpoint of the broad humanitarian implications but also from the standpoint of the best interests of the United States of America.

Mr. President, permit me to say at this point that the administration of the present displaced-persons law is shocking, and that in my judgment, after listening to the testimony and after carefully reviewing the record, certain of the officials in Europe who administer the program have manifested a wanton disregard of the welfare of the United States and are guilty of moral treason, because they have set up a system there, as a result of which they know that Communist saboteurs and agents and officers of the Russian secret police have been filtered into the United States. That is a serious charge, and I am absolutely certain that the record of the hearings will support the statement beyond any peradventure of a doubt. It is also supported by a high official in military intelligence, who was stationed in Germany, who said that his organization caught officers of the Russian secret police who were being slipped into this country.

At the conclusion of the work of the subcommittee with reference to the displaced-persons problem and after consideration of some twenty-odd proposed amendments to the present displaced-persons law the subcommittee reported to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary its recommendations in the form of a bill. This bill was thoroughly discussed by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in many sessions and was, with slight modifications, favorably reported to the Senate and is now before this body for consideration. Mr. President, this bill which consists of many amendments to the present displaced-persons law was not hastily conceived. The amendments contained in the bill were prompted by the facts which had been developed in our study and investigation, and the remarks which I shall make today which refer to the various amendments shall also be based exclusively on the facts. May I emphasize this because if the facts were as they have been portrayed by the paid publicists of a lobby which has registered with the Congress expenditures of approximately $1,000,000, then the bill which was reported would be an entirely different bill. But I am confident, Mr. President, that when the Senators are apprised of the facts upon which this bill has been founded, as distinguished from the fiction and propaganda which has been disseminated over the length and breadth of this land, the Senate will manifest its confidence in the committee headed by the able Senator from Nevada [Mr MCCARRAN], and will support the committee bill

Mr. President, for many months I have observed the conduct of the distinguished Senator from Nevada through the hearings, and I say he has gone into the subject thoroughly, impartially, and unselfishly, with the welfare and security of the United States as the paramount consideration. I seriously doubt that the welfare and security of the United States have been paramount in the minds of those who would villify and abuse him, those who have attempted to becloud the whole issue by means of propaganda, because they knew that if the facts were known, the people of the United States would demand that radical reforms be instituted in Europe in the conduct of the Displaced Persons Commission.

Although I shall subsequently discuss in detail the principal provisions of the committee bill and the reason for their existence, may I say in a word, Mr. President, that the committee bill has two principal objectives:

First. The first objective is to broaden the base of our present law so as to encompass certain additional groups of displaced persons who are not embraced by the present law.

Second. The second principal objective is to strengthen the administration of the law so that our displaced persons program will encompass only bona fide displaced persons and so that the security interest of the United States will be safeguarded.

Now, Mr. President, may I invite the attention of the Senate to the scope of the problem of displaced persons:

At the end of the war the Allied armies in central Europe became the guardians of approximately 8,000,000 persons who had been displaced during the war. Within a few months after the war approximately 7,000,000 of these persons were repatriated to their native countries, leaving about 1,000,000 persons, who, because of fear of persecution, refused to return to their homelands. By the expiration date of our present displaced-persons law, June 30, 1950, there will remain only a few thousand such war-displaced persons in central Europe, other than the so-called hard core who because of social or physical disqualifications are ineligible for resettlement.

The constitution of the International Refugee Organization, however, embraces not only displaced persons who were displaced by the war in central Europe, but, in addition, it embraces all persons in the entire world who are, or who may hereafter be out of their country of nationality or former residence and who are unwilling to return. Some year or two after the war in central Europe there began and continues until the present time, a general migration from eastern Europe into the occupied areas of western Europe of hundreds of thousands of persons, who, because of political and economic turmoil, have been leaving their homelands The potential number of persons embraced in this second category has been estimated to be in millions.

Mr. Robert M. Hanes, Chief of the ECA mission to Germany, testified before the Foreign Relations Committee on February 27, 1950, as follows:

Mr. HANES Unemployment has reached the level of 2,000,000 or approximately 10 percent of the labor force. The constant influx of refugees from the Soviet zone and the iron-curtain countries, about 20,000 per month, is a large contributing factor. While refugees constitute about 18 percent of the total western German population, they comprise 35 percent of the unemployed. They increase the pressure on housing and jobs, and they are considered outsiders and intruders by the local population. They bring resentment in their wake—a resentment which poses tremendous social as well as economic problems

Question Of what? Of the German population?

Mr. HANES They are resentful of people coming in and having to be taken care of by the German Government and people, and competing for their jobs.

Question. They are the ones that have the resentment?

Mr. HANES. No, sir; the Germans resent them

Question. Yes; the German people resent the people coming in. I thought you had it the other way around.

Mr. HANES. No, sir; the German people themselves.

Question. If you are speaking of refugees, the DP's are a separate problem, are they not?

Mr. HANES. Well, expellees, refugees, DP's all flowing into the country, the whole lot of them coming in, over 20,000 a month coming into western Germany.

Question. Are they not taken care of in DP camps?

Mr. HANES. Yes, sir.

Question. All in those camps?

Mr. HANES. Yes, sir. Some of these people are coming in, and just working in anywhere they can, as best they can.

Question. What percentage of them are going into the normal German economy and competing with labor and everything else?

Mr. HANES. As many as possibly can. They are gradually, as I say, infiltrating into the whole economy, and where you have 20,000

a month coming in, as fast as they get a few placed, there are more coming over the line, making the problem that much more acute.

Question. Primarily from east Germany?

Mr. HANES. From the whole eastern zone, all those eastern countries.

Question. The Balkans and the rest of them?

Mr. HANES. Yes, sir.

Question. Mr. Hanes, what have you to say about the situation, the one I am going to ask you about now: Is the Soviet zone interfering, or does it interfere, in any way, with western Germany, or are they sending over infiltration groups? What is the attitude, generally, toward us over there? They are discouraging, of course, the development of western Germany?

Mr. HANES. Very definitely, and we don't know, and I do not think there is any way of telling, Senator, the number of people sent over by the Russians in those groups of 20,000 a month that come in. Undoubtedly they are sending over some stooges, getting some information to the Comintern, and to do as much damage as they can in western Germany.

Mr. President, in addition to the displaced persons who are embraced by the International Refugee Organization, there are between 15,000,000 and 20,000,000 persons who are de facto displaced, but who are not at present displaced by the International Refugee Organization. These persons include, first, the German expellees who were forcibly expelled from the countries of eastern Europe pursuant to the Potsdam Agreement of August 1, 1945, and were driven into Germany and Austria. These German expellees number from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000. Under the constitution of the International Refugee Organization the German expellees are specifically excluded from the concern of the International Refugee Organization——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Why were they excluded under the provisions of the IRO?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall explain that in a moment. The International Refugee Organization is not concerned with anyone through whose veins flows German blood, regardless of how innocent he might be, regardless of whether he bore arms for this Nation, regardless of whether he served this country. The charter of the IRO specifically excludes anyone through whose veins flows German blood.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that specifically stated in the charter?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is in the constitution of the International Refugee Organization.

Mr. WHERRY. Such persons do not come within the definition?

Mr. EASTLAND. The constitution of the International Refugee Organization describes and defines who is a displaced person, and it further specifies what classes are not its concern. The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 adopts that definition of a displaced person, who is excluded from the care of the International Refugee Organization, and who is excluded from the provisions of the act

Mr. WHERRY. I understand they do not come within the definition, but I am asking for the justification of such a definition. What is the argument for excluding that group of persons?

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator mean our argument, or the argument of the proponents of the Kilgore substitute?

Mr. WHERRY. Why, when the charter was written, was that definition made? What were the reasons given for excluding persons of German ethnic origin?

Mr. EASTLAND. They were excluded because of hatred of the German people. Let me tell the distinguished Senator from Nebraska something which will shock him. The record will bear me out, without contradiction, that the International Refugee Organization, an international organization whose policy-making employees are not citizens of this country and the rank and file of whose employees are displaced persons, selects the displaced persons who come to this country to become American citizens. According to the testimony of officials in the Immigration Service a condition prevails under which displaced persons are selecting displaced persons to come into this country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask the Senator whether he is aware of the fact that before any displaced person can come to this country he must be screened, first, by the IRO, second, by the Displaced Persons Commission, third, by the Consular Service of the State Department of the United States, and, finally, by the Immigration and Naturalization Service

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask whether the Senator knows that.

Mr. EASTLAND. No. I not only do not know that, but I know that the Senator from New York is incorrect. I deny that that is happening, and I submit that the record will show, without contradiction, that the Senator from New York is mistaken in each of his assumptions.

The IRO compiles a file on Hans Schmidt. The facts regarding him are placed in the file. The IRO is not an American organization; it is an international organization. Its employees are not Americans. No displaced person can come to the United States until this foreign organization sends that file to the Displaced Persons Commission.

The Senator from New York says this man is screened by the Displaced Persons Commission. The testimony of officials of this Government shows that there is no adequate screening of the displaced persons by them and, furthermore, that they are sent to this country when an investigation has shown that they do not meet the qualifications of the act, or that they are criminals or are Communists. The file goes to the Displaced Persons Commission. The Senator from New York says the persons are screened by the Displaced Persons Commission. The facts show that Hans Schmidt's name goes to the provost marshal's office and to the Berlin document center. Senior officials of the Displaced Persons Commission stated that they do not wait for a report from the provost marshal's office or from the Berlin document center. They have deliberately taken a calculated risk, because, to wait for the security report would require 2 or 3 weeks and would delay the program.

That is the testimony of the officials of that Organization, and the testimony of the officials of the Immigration Service. Let me say that when an adverse report has been put in a man's file he is turned down. However, most of the cases have been overruled from above. The adverse report was taken out of the file by orders of the Displaced Persons Commission when it got to the consular service.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to defer to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the distinguished Senator to say that when a name is referred to the Displaced Persons Commission, the displaced person is cleared as a security risk. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. They do not wait for a report from the Berlin document center or from the provost marshal's office, because it would delay the man's entrance into the country. "Therefore," they testified, "we take a calculated risk."

Mr. WHERRY. What happens to the displaced person? Is the displaced person sent right on without waiting for the report from the consular service?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the testimony.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is an adverse report, what happens to the displaced person?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have the testimony of Mr. Tripp. Mr. Tripp is in charge of the immigration detail of the United States which is stationed in Europe. It is the office which passes on the applicants. If the Senator wishes, I shall be glad to read Mr. Tripp's testimony. However, before I do that, let us take the case of a man after he gets to the DP Commission.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. EASTLAND. I believe the Senator from New York said that the man was screened there, and that he was further screened by the consular service and by the Immigration Service.

Mr. LEHMAN. I said, and I repeat, that no man, whether he be a displaced person or an immigrant, can enter the United States without obtaining a visa from the consular service, and that the visa is issued only after careful investigation, with the facilities which are provided by our Government. Further than that——

Mr. EASTLAND Just a minute

Mr. LEHMAN. May I complete the statement?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true of an immigrant.

Mr. LEHMAN. And it is true of a displaced person.

Mr. EASTLAND. No, it is not; because the consular service is bound by the finding on his eligibility, which was made by the Displaced Persons Commission. The consular service cannot go beyond that. The officials testified that men have come before them who they knew were guilty of fraud, and were bad security risks, but that they could not turn them down. The consular service came before the Senate committee and requested authority to veto selections made by the Displaced Persons Commission, in order to protect the United States.

Accordingly, a provision to that effect was put in the bill at the request of the consular service.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that the testimony which was given before the committee?

Mr. EASTLAND. The official came before the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that in the report of the hearing?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. That provision is an innovation in the bill, and is not, as the Senator from New York said, a provision already in the law. The provision gives the consular service and the Immigration Service veto power for any cause. Today a person's application may be vetoed solely under the immigration law. No finding of fact by the Displaced Persons Commission or by the IRO can be vetoed. The consular service is bound by the finding.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask a question which may be a conclusive one. Does not the Senator from Mississippi know that the IRO's function in selection of DP's is simply to certify that the applicant is a displaced person under the regulations and requirements of the IRO? Does not the Senator know that the Displaced Persons Commission then passes on the eligibility of such an applicant under the standards laid down in the Displaced Persons Act, and that approximately 30 percent of the applicants certified by the IRO have been turned down, in the first instance by the Displaced Persons Commission? Does the Senator not know that after that——

Mr. EASTLAND. Just a minute. The Senator is asking me a question and I should like to answer it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask two more questions.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like first to answer the questions which the Senator has asked me. When I have answered the Senator's questions, he may ask me another question.

I know that under the law the application of a displaced person is initiated by a foreign organization. I know that a man's file is made up by other displaced persons. I know that the Displaced Persons Commission cannot go beyond a request initiated by IRO. That is the law. The bill reported by the Senate commitee provides that they can go beyond that. We write out our own definitions, and we provide that only an agency of the United States, whose personnel are American citizens, may select those who are to come to this country under the definition of a displaced person as prescribed by Congress.

The Senator has put his hand on the issue. The great issue before the Senate now is, first, whether we will go on as the Senator from West Virginia, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Michigan desire, with a system in which the proof shows that displaced persons are selecting displaced persons to come to the United States, or whether we as a Congress will define by legislation who are displaced persons, and set up an agency of the American Government to select them. The United States, Mr. President, is the only country in the world receiving displaced persons which does not select them by its own officials and employees. We are faced with a condition in Europe in which displaced persons are selecting displaced persons; and that is not contradicted on the record.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, does not the Senator know that the Displaced Persons Commission is composed exclusively of individuals who are American citizens?

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator mean the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course the Commission is composed of United States citizens.

Mr. LEHMAN. They are the responsible officials.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, they stay in Washington, but that is not true 3,500 miles away, across the Atlantic.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am yielding to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not want to delay the debate.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission testified that a goodly number of their employees were aliens.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator yield for a statement of not more than 20 seconds?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question. That is all I can yield for.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall put it in the form of a question, although again it leads to a conclusion.

Mr. EASTLAND. Very well.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not think that it would serve a very good purpose for me to do as I intend to do tomorrow, to present to this honorable body, the Senate of the United States, a detailed statement of the steps which are involved in screening displaced persons who come in, or who propose to come in, under the Displaced Persons Act? That is my intention.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator from New York. The Senator from Nevada put such a statement in the RECORD several days ago. But regardless of what the statement of the Senator from New York may show, the testimony from which I have quoted is by senior officers of the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe, by the head of the Immigration Service in Europe, who was asked to check this policy, and by representatives of the State Department, the head of the Visa Division of which appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary and stated that in order better to protect this country they wanted a veto. A representative of the consular service says, "A man sits before me; I know his papers are fraudulent; I know he is a bad security risk, but I cannot exclude him. I am bound by the findings of the Displaced Persons Commission." There we have one of the great issues in this controversy, an issue which the Congress must decide.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did I understand the Senator correctly to say that the initiation for bringing a displaced person to the United States is with the IRO?

Mr. EASTLAND. Exclusively.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that before a displaced person comes to this country a request must be made by someone, or some organization such as the Catholic Welfare or the Lutheran Welfare? Is not that the initiation?

Mr. EASTLAND. That was the congressional intent, but as in every other matter we intended when we passed the present law it was circumvented, because there are blanket assurances for hundreds of them from different organizations, and it does not amount to anything.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that groups such as the Catholic Welfare and the Lutheran Welfare have been able to take care of the displaced persons for whom they have asked?

Mr. EASTLAND. What I am talking about is communistic agents, Russian agents, agents of the Russian secret service, and criminals getting into the United States. I am talking about the security angle, and provisions making it possible for us better to protect the United States of America. That is the reason, and the sole reason, why this bill has been amended as it is. About the same number of people would be admitted under both bills. There is no controversy over the number.

Mr. President, I have here the testimony of a colonel stationed in Berlin who was in charge of one phase of Army intelligence.

Mr. LEHMAN. Would the Senator mind disclosing the colonel's name?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I will not. The Senator can identify him himself. The witness appeared before the full committee and testified in person. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] was present and the Senator's colleagues, who sponsor the substitute, were present.

I will say that this distinguished man greatly impressed the whole committee with his sincerity. I read the testimony as follows:

Question. Colonel, do you know of cases in which there were adverse security reports on displaced persons but in which cases they were brought into this country notwithstanding the adverse security reports?

The WITNESS. Yes, sir

Question I do not understand whether the colonel thinks that investigation would disclose that among the persons who have come over as displaced persons, are Communists?

The WITNESS. Why, I am sure of it, sir.

Question. Are a considerable number of Communists included in the displaced persons that have come over, in your opinion?

The WITNESS. Not a considerable number. It does not take a considerable number to be dangerous.

The witness went on to explain that it was his experience that that organization in Berlin had captured agents of the Russian security police and, I believe, if I am not mistaken, but I will not make the statement as being accurate, officers of the Russian Army whom the Communists were attempting to infiltrate through the lines and get them into the United States under this program. When some of those agents, that is, Russian officers, were caught and arrested, Russia retaliated by arresting two American Army officers in Germany.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As a member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary does the Senator recall that any of the Catholic organizations or Lutheran organizations, or Jewish organizations, which are definitely anti-Communist, testified that there were a large number of Communists coming into the country?

Mr. EASTLAND. A church organization would not have that information, and if it had it, a committee of Congress, with due regard to the safety of the United States, would not rely on what it said, but would rely on our own security agency. When we have the consular service, the Immigration Service, and officers from the Intelligence Service of the Army which give us facts, we have relied on them.

Mr. Tripp, who is Chief of Immigration Services' detail in Europe, testified before the committee, his organization can veto the entry of an ordinary emigrant for any purpose. But it cannot do so when it comes to a displaced person—oh no. We have drawn the line there. We are bound by the action of the Displaced Persons Commission. We cannot overrule that action at all.

Mr. Tripp testified last month, February 1950, before the committee. I read from his testimony, as follows:

Question. Now may I invite your attention to the subject of the SS men. I ask you first of all, what was the SS organization?

I hope the Senator from New York will listen. I am going to show how German SS men have been slipped into this country.

Mr. TRIPP. When you say SS, you must differentiate between the real SS, the German SS, which was an elite group of the Nazi Party, and the so-called Waffen SS with whom we are mostly concerned. I believe the Waffen SS means the battle SS. Early in the program it came to my attention that we were receiving a considerable number of applicants who had served in the Waffen SS units. Not only in the Waffen SS, but they had served in * * * the Hungarian Army * * *. My concern was that if we pass those people into the United States at some future time, my service might be criticized for doing that.

Question. Right at that point may I ask this. Did the Displaced Persons Commission process or approve and pass to you the SS men?

Mr. TRIPP. They did. But I think that in many cases they were unaware of the service.

Mr. President, how could they have been aware of the service when they did not even wait for the report from the Berlin document center but stated, "We took a calculated risk."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask the Senator to point out anything in that report or document to show——

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator will permit me to conclude reading from the testimony, I shall yield to him so he may ask his question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I have not. I continue to read:

Question How many cases did you have prior to the time that Senator McCarran got there, of SS men who had been processed by the Displaced Persons Commission and transmitted by way of the necessary routes to your office?

Mr. TRIPP. I would say that we had received cases involving approximately 202 SS men and their families.

They were processed by the Displaced Persons Commission, Mr. President.

Question. They had been processed by the Displaced Persons Commission, approved and transmitted to your office?

Mr. TRIPP That is right. But understand that that was done not always with a knowledge of the Service on the part of the displaced person

Question I understand. But they processed them and they got to your office and you stopped them?

Mr. TRIPP. That is right. In some cases they had knowledge.

Question. How did you get the knowledge if they did not get it?

Mr. TRIPP. Well, usually when we got it and they did not have it we either got it as a result of interrogation or the Berlin document check results caught up with the agent—either one or the other. It was about evenly divided.

Question. Then it would appear that if your investigation disclosed that as to about half of those that you caught, half of those 200, if the Displaced Persons Commission had made a similar careful and thorough investigation it would have detected them also. Is not that right?

Mr. TRIPP. Quite possibly.

Question. But they did not make interrogation. Do they make any interrogation?

Mr. TRIPP. Yes; I believe they do in usual cases.

Question. But the general practice in the Displaced Persons Commission is not to interrogate and not even to see the applicant? Is that not true?

Mr. President, note this. Here is the immigration man who testifies about the practice in the Displaced Persons Commission. I repeat it:

Question. But the general practice in the Displaced Persons Commission is not to interrogate and not even see the applicant? Is that not true?

Mr. TRIPP. Yes, that is true.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I do not want to interrupt and bother the Senator, but I have a very short statement about a very urgent matter which will take only 2 or 3 minutes. I wonder if the Senator will yield for that purpose?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I should like very much to yield for that purpose to my good friend the Senator from Texas, whom I hold in the highest regard.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall not insist upon my request.

Mr. EASTLAND. I refused to yield to the Senator from Nebraska, and he served notice on me that if I yield to the Senator I will have to yield to him.

Mr. WHERRY. I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Texas, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. EASTLAND. I had better not do so, because I refused to yield to the Senator from Michigan and other Senators.

Mr. CONNALLY. They have gone now. I do not see how they can object to the Senator yielding to me.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does not the Senator realize that the very interesting document which he has just read fully bears out the statement I made 15 minutes ago, and which the Senator denied, that these men have to be passed on by the Immigration Service?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. LEHMAN. The man from whose testimony the Senator read, has so testified.

Mr. EASTLAND. Authority did not reside in the immigration officials in Germany. That is exactly the reason why a provision to give them such authority is contained in the bill. The practice is that when the immigration officials detect something like that which has just been referred to they send the file back to the Displaced Persons Commission for consultation, but the authority resides in the Displaced Persons Commission.

Mr. LEHMAN. This man testified that he caught them; that he stopped them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. That bears out what I said 15 minutes ago.

Mr. EASTLAND. It certainly does not. The practice was that such persons were stopped, and the files were sent back to the Displaced Persons Commission. The authority resides in the Displaced Persons Commission. The authority is not in the consular service, nor in the Immigration Service. The authority and power are in the Displaced Persons Commission to overrule them, and that

is what was done. That is why the bill provides that the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the consular service shall also have veto power. Why there should be any argument, any controversy about giving the consular service and the Immigration Service, whose officers and employees are trained in immigration work, the veto power to protect the country, is beyond my comprehension. Yet that is the second of two big issues in the bill.

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WITHERS. The power of the Immigration Service is limited to passing upon matters pertaining to the Immigration Service and the immigration laws, is it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WITHERS. And not to pass upon displaced persons?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true, and all the testimony before the committee bore that out.

I read the rule of the Displaced Persons Commission:

> The report shall be deemed to establish prima facie the applicant's character, history, and eligibility under the act, and shall be deemed to establish as conclusive the existence of all factors relating to eligibility to enter the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator will not agree with me that it is a fact that while the Displaced Persons Commission makes the decision with regard to the applicant's eligibility under the displaced-persons law, no applicant can be admitted to this country except after a scrutiny from the Immigration and Naturalization Service and a visa from the United States consular service?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but the weakness there is that he gets his information from the file prepared by the IRO.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, he gets his information from a file prepared by the displaced persons working for the IRO.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not true that after the file is prepared by the IRO, it is processed by the Displaced Persons Commission, and that in many cases the testimony before the committee showed that no American ever consulted the applicant until he actually appeared at the consular office for a visa to come to this country?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is exactly correct, and I thank the Senator for bringing my attention to that point.

Mr. President, the testimony of the American officials was that an applicant did not see an American citizen until he got to the consular office. He went through the IRO and through the Displaced Persons Commission, and got to the consul for a visa before he looked into the face of a citizen of the United States. That is what we are trying to correct in this bill.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not also true that when the American selector would see a flagrant case of fraud on the face of the papers and when he wished to correct it, the higher authorities of the Displaced Persons Commission actually refused to let the American investigator see the applicant and talk to him?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is absolutely true.

Mr. President, the IRO has a legal division set up to get paroles for criminals, so that they can come to the United States, to be citizens of the United States. Here we are at the mercy of the organization which initiates every application, an organization with aliens working for it and on its staff; and that organization has set up a legal division to get paroles for criminals, so that they may come to the United States.

Mr. JENNER. Have we not also caught persons setting up, even in displaced persons' camps, printing presses with which to print fraudulent documents by means of which fraudulent persons could come into this country as displaced persons?

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator from Indiana says is absolutely true.

The word of the Displaced Persons Commission, when it comes to fraudulent documents and to fraudulent practices by which it determines and fixes the eligibility of an applicant, is final. That is where the trouble is. Any other false statement—for instance, in regard to communism—makes the application subject to veto by the other services; but the fault of the whole thing is that even though they can veto, they must get their information from the file that is compiled and approved by aliens.

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WITHERS. I wish to ask the Senator whether the Immigration Service is sufficiently staffed to make the investigations which now are required to be made by the Displaced Persons Commission.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WITHERS. Is it, without addition of personnel? In other words, under present conditions, as it is presently constituted is it sufficiently staffed for that purpose?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; but if it were given the authority, the testimony showed that it could handle that work, with additional personnel.

Mr. WITHERS. But I mean to inquire whether it has been sufficiently staffed for that purpose up to now?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. WITHERS. So it would be necessary to add additional members to its staff; would it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, a few; so as to permit the obtaining of sufficient information for a veto.

Mr. WITHERS. It has not attempted to exercise the power to investigate that the Displaced Persons Commission has; has it?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true. The Senator will remember that at the hearings we had testimony showing what the people of the United States are up against, when I say that the best interests of the United States have not been protected and that no attempt has been made to protect them. The law written by Congress, as it appears in the act, says that the burden of proof is on the applicant. However, officials of the Immigration Service and officials of the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe testified that that was ignored, and that it is up to them to prove absolutely that a man is a Communist. The investigator may be confronted with facts which would raise a reasonable doubt and facts which would make him believe that the person is a bad security risk, but even then he cannot veto the application, but he has to go further and has to prove that the applicant is a Communist.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Who sets up that procedure?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Displaced Persons Commission does.

Mr. WHERRY. Under what authority does it set it up?

Mr. EASTLAND. On its own authority.

Mr. WHERRY. Such authority was never given to it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course not. The act says the burden of proof is on the applicant. The testimony shows that information derogatory to an applicant was deliberately taken from the files; and, in addition to that, under a directive of Mr. Squadrilli and Mr. Kaplan, the two European managers, as was testified to by selectors who appeared before our committee, when they found derogatory information in the file, they were ordered to ignore it and to write a report which would result in the applicant's admission to the United States. One man testified that in certain cases he had trouble distorting the facts sufficiently to get a favorable report.

Mr. President, let me give an illustration of that situation. I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the attention of the Senator from New York to this matter. Here is a copy of an order issued on April 1 of last year:

> UNITED STATES DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION HEADQUARTERS,
> *Frankfurt, April 1, 1949.*
>
> To: All Staff.
> From: Elliott M. Shirk.
> Subject: False Statements and Falsification of Documents.
>
> 1. You will be interested to know that the consular service has for some time now liberalized its policy toward those persons who may have misrepresented facts prior to or in the course of making application for immigration to the United States. Consular officers have been instructed to advise each candidate as he appears for interview that should he wish to make any correction of previous statements or falsifications on documents, he may do so without necessarily prejudicing his case up to the time he gives sworn testimony which results in the issuing of the visa. This principle does not apply.

of course, where the falsification involves perjury. The reasoning behind this position is well understood. Innumerable displaced persons once made misrepresentations in the sincere effort to protect themselves against retaliation from authorities representing governments from which they had taken refuge

2. It is unlikely, however, in the tense moments which surround the consular interview, that a candidate would alter the position which he had previously taken and which is on record. It is stressed, consequently, that every effort should be made during the early period of documentation to encourage applicants to alter any falsely presented facts in the registration forms or elsewhere and thus protect themselves against conflicting evidence that may adversely affect their later immigration status. It has been suggested in this connection that posters in appropriate languages be utilized throughout resident camps suggesting this as an advisable and authoritative course.

The Senator from Nebraska can see that that speaks for itself.

Mr. President, I cannot comprehend why there is opposition to the bill of the Senate committee. Both bills as reported by the committee and the substitute will admit practically the same number of persons.

The first point is that the Senate bill changes the law, and says that the IRO is removed in that respect; under the bill we set up our own definition of a displaced person. That definition is as broad as the definition now in the existing law. We say that the applicant's file and his entire application must be handled by a citizen of the United States and by an American agency. Whether we believe that Americans should select the displaced persons who come to this country or whether we believe they should be selected by aliens is the first big question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment after I have yielded to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. President, the second question is this: The consular service of the United States says: "We can better protect our country if we are given the veto power." It says that the consular service and the Immigration Service have had authority to veto each other for years, and now they want to have the same power in the field in which the Displaced Persons Commission operates. Mr. President, what is wrong with that? That is the second question.

There is a third question. The substitute of the Senator from West Virginia provides that if a displaced person has left Germany and has settled in another country he can return to Germany, and then can come to this country if he has been in Germany and subsequently settled in some other country.

Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. EASTLAND. I called the name of the Senator from West Virginia, and I yield to him.

Mr. LEHMAN. I merely want to make one observation.

Mr. EASTLAND. I first yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to have the exact language of the bill on which the Senator relies for his statement. The language is different.

Mr. EASTLAND. I read:

A person who, having resided in Germany or Austria, was a victim of persecution by the Nazi government and was detained in, or was obliged to leave from such persecution, and was subsequently returned to one of these countries as a result of enemy action or of war circumstances, and on January 1, 1948, had not been firmly settled therein.

That is the present law. The Senator from West Virginia, in his substitute, would eliminate this language:

As a result of enemy action or of war circumstances and on January 1, 1948, had not been firmly resettled therein.

In other words, the Senator's amendment would mean that a person who, having resided in Germany or Austria, and who was persecuted by the Nazi government, even though he may have gone to Australia, north Africa, south Africa, or England, and had become firmly settled, or had not been firmly settled there——

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct—"had not been firmly settled."

Mr. EASTLAND. Can go back to Germany or Austria and can come in under this bill. I submit the United States should not be made the dumping ground for all the persecutees in the world.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to find the differentiation between the two quotations.

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the present law, included in a definition of a displaced person, is, "Or a person who, having resided in Germany or Austria, was a victim of persecution by the Nazi Government, and was detained in or was obliged to flee from such persecution, and was subsequently returned to one of these countries, as the result of enemy action or of war circumstances, and on January 1, 1948, had not been firmly resettled therein.

Mr. KILGORE. That is the present law, is it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the present law. The Kilgore substitute deletes the language "as a result of enemy action or of war circumstances, and on January 1, 1948." Therefore, under the language of the Kilgore substitute, the persons embraced within this part of the definition of displaced persons can at any time return to Germany or Austria, from any other place in the entire world, and can become eligible for immigration into the United States.

Mr. KILGORE. Within the limitation, however, may I say to the Senator from Mississippi, of the act.

Mr. EASTLAND. But there is no cut-off date.

Mr. KILGORE. There is no cut-off date? They must have returned before the date, January 1, 1948.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator deleted that.

Mr. KILGORE. Oh, no.

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, yes. Here is the Senator's amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by the Senator, for himself and other Senators, referring to page 2, line 3:

or who had temporarily absented himself therefrom for reasons which, in accordance with regulations to be promulgated by the Commission, show special circumstances justifying such absence, and who have not been firmly resettled—

This is a category—

or a person who, having resided in Germany or Austria, was a victim of persecution by the Nazi Government and was detained in, or was obliged to flee from such persecution and subsequently returned to, one of these countries, and who has not been firmly resettled——

Mr. KILGORE. Is that not limited by the date, January 1, 1948?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; not those in this category.

Mr. KILGORE. No one who is not in by January 1, 1948, can take advantage of the act. Is not that correct? I merely want to inquire of the Senator from Mississippi, without being insistent.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have answered it a half a dozen times in the negative. The Senator has deleted the date. Why did the Senator delete it?

Mr. KILGORE. The date is January 1, 1948.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is in the present law, but not in the substitute.

Mr. KILGORE. There are any number of dates specified in the bills, which are not indefinitely repeated, I may say, but the operability of the bill is confined to cut-off date, namely, January 1, 1948. Is that not correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. There is no cut-off date for the category of which the Senator now speaks.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I want first to finish with this question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. EASTLAND. We do not get anywhere by the Senator from West Virginia saying there is and the Senator from Mississippi saying there is not. Any person can read the substitute and determine which of us is right. I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator from Mississippi not know that every single displaced person must be interviewed by the Counter-Intelligence Corps of the United States Army before the Commission ever reaches its decision on eligibility, and that further——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator not know further——

Mr. EASTLAND. That is another question.

Mr. LEHMAN. No; it is the same question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Very well.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does not the Senator know further that the Counter-Intelligence Corps interview includes (a) security, (b) test of authenticity of documents, and (c) test of eligibility factors? Does the Senator not know that that is the rule followed in every case?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, it is not the rule. I know where it came from. I am absolutely certain that that question was written by some members of the Displaced Persons Commission who are in the galleries. It is not correct. That is not the policy followed. Representatives of the Counter-Intelligence Corps testified they did not have time to make security checks, that the whole thing was a matter of rush. There was testimony of one man who gave an adverse report on an applicant seeking to come into this country. Employees of the Displaced Persons Commission put the heat on him, and got him fired.

Mr. JENNER and Mr. KILGORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not true that there was evidence before our committee, the great weight of which was to the effect that the CIC was told that speed, not security, was of the essence; that they had to meet the quota and get these people over here, and did not care about security; is not that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is absolutely correct. The men in charge of fingerprinting in Berlin testified that fingerprints were sent, having been made usually by a displaced person, accompanied by illegible writing of broken English, that could not be read, and that the prints were smeared, they did not get enough of the finger in the print to enable them to identify a man as to whether he was a subversive, a criminal, or one who had been connected with the Nazis during the war. That is what happened as a matter of practice. It all sounds good when the Displaced Persons Commission sends notes to the Senate floor, but when we get the testimony of men who administer it in Europe, I say it stinks to the heavens.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not true that in one particular case in which the security investigation was being made, the Displaced Persons Commission, knowing that the applicant was being investigated for possible criminality, ignored the report of the security investigator, had the displaced person sent to America, and that he is today in America—a man who had stolen 30,000 sheets from the American Government? The Displaced Persons Commission had knowledge of it. Officials were sent from Europe to interview that man. They were denied the opportunity even of interviewing him. He was a displaced person who had stolen 30,000 sheets.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator will exclude the 30,000-sheet man——

Mr. JENNER. I exclude him.

Mr. EASTLAND. He is but one man. Exclude him, and what the Senator says is true in hundreds of cases, as shown by the evidence.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. KILGORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield? If so, to whom?

Mr. EASTLAND. I promised to yield to the Senator from South Carolina. After that, I will yield again to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is there anything in the substitute which would make it possible to deport a displaced person guilty of violating the law of this country?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. KILGORE and Mr. JENNER addressed the Chair.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to answer the question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator from South Carolina the same rules apply to the question of deportation under the substitute that apply with respect to any immigrant coming into the United States under the law.

Mr. MAYBANK. I had understood a while ago that the substitute represented a different interpretation of the law.

Mr. KILGORE. No. May I say——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well. May I inquire, since I am limited to less than 30,000 sheets—rather, since I am between 30,000 sheets—when I have been privileged even to be present at the subcommittee——

Mr. JENNER. The Senator was present.

Mr. KILGORE. Was any other member of the Judiciary Committee——

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Mississippi a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. Let there be order.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Mississippi a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Mississippi yield? Senators will please address the Chair.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have yielded to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator has said there is no limitation with respect to people returning to Germany or Austria. Upon very reliable advice, I ask the Senator how he gets around subsection (c) of section 2 of the substitute bill, reading as follows:

"Eligible displaced person" means a displaced person as defined in subsection (b) above, (1) who on or after September 1, 1939, and on or before January 1, 1949, entered Germany, Austria, or Italy, and who on January 1, 1949, was in Italy or the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna, or in the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria, or who had temporarily absented himself therefrom for reasons which, in accordance with regulations to be promulgated by the Commission, show special circumstances justifying such absence, and who has not been firmly resettled——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, we have gone all over that. The Senator has the dates he read in the first category of subsection (c). The date January 1, 1948, is in category 2. It is something entirely different. The Senator took those dates out of his substitute. We are not gaining anything by disputing it.

Mr. KILGORE. I am asking the Senator to what particular group he is referring?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall answer the Senator's question. It begins at line 7, on page 2, of the Senator's substitute and includes line 11, which is the second category. The date was deleted. The Senator says that is not true. That is a matter which can be determined by the Senator when he reads the substitute.

Mr. President, I was discussing the categories of displaced persons——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator continually refers to some of the cases which are in evidence. I should like to ask the Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has the hearings before him.

Mr. WHERRY. Are hearings still being held on this proposed legislation?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. I have the floor.

Of course, the hearings have been closed. Tomorrow there will come before the subcommittee Mr. Squadrilli, who is the head, in Europe, of the Displaced Persons Commission. As I remember, since the hearings closed, there have been several Government officials from Europe who have testified. Before the debate is concluded, I shall place that testimony in the RECORD. It is startling.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I stated earlier today that I thought officials of the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe were guilty of moral, not legal, treason. I stand by that statement, Mr. President. It is certainly based upon a fair interpretation of the evidence of officials of the United States Government.

I certainly would not impute moral treason to members of the Displaced Persons Commission in Washington. They are 3,500 miles from where the events happened. But I say that the welfare, the security, and the best interests of the United States are not being protected. That is what the committee bill attempts to correct. There is no difference as to the numbers; the controversy is merely over provisions for better screening and the promotion of the security of the United States.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. To what extent have the hearings, both executive and public, been printed for the information of Senators? I should like to see some of the executive hearings. In committee meetings there were certain excerpts read. We did not see the complete hearings.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know what hearings have been printed. I have not examined that question. But I was present at the hearings, and everything I have quoted today was testified to and is a part of the record. I have the testimony and shall read it.

APPLICATIONS FOR VISAS BY DELEGATES OF WORLD CONGRESS OF PARTISANS OF PEACE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes on a very important matter?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be glad to yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator will not lose the floor. It will be given back to him.

Mr. President, there are in the State Department applications for visas from a group of so-called delegates from "The World Congress of Partisans of Peace," the leading over-all Communist-front organization in the world, which has announced that it is sending a delegation of 12 Europeans to the United States on March 3. The announced purpose of the delegation's visit is to present a petition to the Congress of the United States, not through the State Department, not through diplomatic channels, but to the Congress of the United States. Members of the delegation have applied for visas to come to the United States.

The 12 delegates, on the basis of available information, are either known Communists or fellow travelers. Because certain of the individuals are clearly inadmissible under United States immigration laws, due to their open membership in various foreign Communist Parties, and others are probably inadmissible under law, the Department of State has delayed the issuance of the requested visas, and has not yet issued them.

Mr. President, this movement was initiated in the first public announcement of the membership of the delegation to the United States, contained in the February 18, 1950, issue of the Paris Communist newspaper Humanité. The same source, on February 10, had reported on the movement at a February 9 meeting of the Paris Secretariat, at which the decision was made to send delegations to various countries, including the United States.

Mr. President, among other things, this delegation advocates approval, generally, of the Russian foreign policy and of the Cominform. The Cominform states that the tasks of the Partisans of Peace include a campaign to secure refusal by the workers to produce weapons of death, a campaign among western European transport workers to induce them to refuse to handle American arms, agitation for the withdrawal of French troops in French Indochina, the replacement of the "present reactionary governments" in France and Italy in order that their parliaments will stop the arms race and annul the North Atlantic Pact, and so forth. American arms are being sent to Europe under the North Atlantic Pact. Among other things, this organization is in opposition to the governments of France and Italy, and is advocating the restoration of Communist rule.

So, Mr. President, I very much hope that the State Department will not grant the visas which are requested. Many of the members of the delegation are inadmissible under the law and have no right to come to the United States. They are intending to come here to sow dissension. They are planning to come here to infiltrate, to propagandize, to harass, and to annoy the Congress of the United States. We do not receive delegations of this kind or in this form. They must come through their own governments, through diplomatic channels.

Among other items, it is noted that the "red dean," the Dean of Canterbury will accompany the party and demand the right to address the Congress of the United States. With all the material we have here to address the Congress of the United States, we do not have to be addressed by the "red dean."

I very much hope, Mr. President, that the State Department will see fit to refuse these visas and will keep these Communists, agitators, enemies of the United States, enemies of our institutions, out of this country.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi very much for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). According to the standing rules of the Senate, "no petition or memorial or other paper signed by citizens or subjects of a foreign power shall be received, unless the same be transmitted to the Senate by the President."

If, by chance, they arrive here, they must certainly have the proper clearance.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in what he said with respect to the request of the delegation from the World Congress of Partisans of Peace for permission to come to this country to advise the American people on what should be done with respect to peace. The truth of the matter is that such an attempt would be nothing more than propaganda, in my opinion, for world communism. Furthermore, if so-called Communists from various countries are so eager to inform the United States about peace proposals, I suggest to this self-appointed group that they try to arrange with Mr. Stalin in Moscow for permission to go behind the iron curtain to see what they can do with him with respect to world peace, rather than come to a peaceful country which really believes in peace.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. KILGORE and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I understand from the majority leader that I shall get the floor at 12 o'clock tomorrow, and that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], will speak this afternoon. I understand that after the Senators have addressed the Senate, a recess will be taken. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I be accorded the floor at 12 o'clock tomorrow morning to finish my address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. Reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from Mississippi if he will permit me to have incorporated in his remarks section (c), beginning with line 4 on page 1, to and including line 2 on page 3 of the substitute, to be printed as part of his remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the section of the proposed substitute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(c) "Eligible displaced person" means a displaced person as defined in subsection (b) above, (1) who on or after September 1, 1939, and on or before January 1, 1949, entered Germany, Austria, or Italy, and who on January 1, 1949, was in Italy or the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna, or in the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria, or who had temporarily absented himself therefrom for reasons which, in accordance with regulations to be promulgated by the Commission, show special circumstances justifying such absence, and who has not been firmly resettled; or a person who, having resided in Germany or Austria, was a victim of persecution by the Nazi government and was detained in, or was obliged to flee from such persecution and subsequently returned to, one of these countries, and who has not been firmly resettled; and (2) who is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission into the United States for permanent residence; and (3) for whom assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Commission have been given that such person, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment and that such person, and the members of such person's family who shall accompany such person and who propose to live with such person, shall not become public charges and will have housing without displacing some other person from such housing. The spouse and unmarried dependent child or children under 21 years of age, including adopted children and stepchildren of such an eligible displaced person, shall, if otherwise qualified for admission into the United States for permanent residence, also be deemed eligible displaced persons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WHERRY. Do I understand correctly that Senators will be recognized in the order stated by the Senator from Mississippi in his unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not the understanding of the Chair. The Chair will recognize Senators as he sees them rise.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry I was not on the floor when the request was made. Will the Chair explain the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have made no unanimous-consent request, except that I be accorded the floor at 12 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the request of the Senator from Mississippi to be that he be accorded the privilege of the floor at noon tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. I heartily endorse the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECURITY RISKS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senate a paragraph from a letter which I received from Mr. J. E. Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, in answer to an inquiry which I had addressed to him under date of February 20, 1950. In my letter, in paragraph 3, I said:

> Of the 326 cases which are receiving active attention, will you please break them down to show how many of them have been pending for 1 month, 2 months, 3 months, etc., up to 1 year, and how many of them have been pending for over 1 year's time. This relates to the security cases under review by the Department.

In reply to paragraph 3 of my letter, Mr. Peurifoy writes as follows:

> With reference to point 3 of your letter, our records indicate the following breakdown of the 326 cases which are still in process. Since this information applies to persons who were employed by the Department prior to July 1949, they have all been pending at least 8 months:
>
> Twenty-one pending for 8 months.
> Ten pending for 9 months.
> Eighteen pending for 10 months.
> Ten pending for 11 months.
> Ten pending for 12 months.
> Two hundred fifty-seven pending for a period of more than 1 year.

I submit that there is no justification in my judgment, for any security case to be pending for more than a year. After all, we have air transportation to almost every corner of the globe. I have personally flown into many remote areas of the world. I have been to Iran, and other countries which one can reach in a matter of days or even hours. It seems to me that security cases of the State Department should be given the highest type of priority. If the FBI says they would like to have additional information, whether it be fingerprints or other information which they are seeking, the request should be sent in regular courier pouches by air, and the information should be returned immediately. On the basis of the letter written to me by the State Department, I submit there is no justification for any extended period of time such as is indicated.

THE AMERICAN RED CROSS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR CONNALLY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement on the Red Cross prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The month of March has become the traditional period during which the American Red Cross makes its annual appeal to the American people for funds to support its noble work—locally, nationally, and internationally. During the last decade the American people have responded generously. This year I feel sure the response, under the distinguished leadership of General Marshall, again will be generous and immediate.
>
> It is perhaps not unfitting that I should refer to the Red Cross in this Chamber. In this arena where many debates are translated into the laws of the land, we may well pause from time to time to consider matters upon which all of us here, representing the American people, can fully agree.
>
> The American Red Cross symbol stands for service to humanity, all over our own country, and throughout the world. It has 3,746 local chapters, established and working for good in almost every city and hamlet in these United States.
>
> It was in this Chamber, in 1947, by unanimous vote of the Senate, that a revised Federal charter for the Red Cross was approved. This charter is completely democratic in concept. It affords far greater representation to all the units of the organization. With its governmental endorsement, and its essentially volunteer basis of operation, it seems to me to represent to a significant degree democracy in action.
>
> In its great work for our servicemen and their families, for veterans, for the victims of disaster, in its promotion of the general health and welfare through its new national blood program, its nursing services and its splendid work for safety of life and limb, and in its far-reaching mobilization of the youth of the Nation through the Junior Red Cross, it is recognized by men and women of good will everywhere as one of the most intelligent and effective humanitarian movements ever put forth by the people of any nation.
>
> In these days of uncertainty and of tension in wide areas of the civilized world, we have reason to rejoice because there exists in our country this great force for good, upon whose aims and purposes we can all agree, and whose achievement we can view with a full measure of pride and of gratitude.

CONDITIONS IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is time that the American public was fully informed of the significance of events that have taken place and that are now taking place in the Far East. Unless we are prepared to help stabilize the military situation we might as well save the funds for economic assistance because economic aid alone will not save southeast Asia from being taken behind the iron curtain and it is naive to believe that it will.

In Europe we found out that ECA aid alone was not sufficient for economic recovery if the people were living under constant threat of invasion.

The administration found it necessary to recommend the ratification of the North Atlantic Pact and to bolster that with the arms implementation bill.

Since international communism is global in character we need to know just what is planned for the Far East before final legislative action is taken by the Congress on authorization legislation or the appropriations for ECA or arms implementation during the next fiscal year.

The Congress and the Nation are entitled to the whole foreign aid budget and not a piecemeal approach to the problem.

One individual who has played a considerable part in our policy toward China, which resulted in the debacle now confronting the world in that area and who accompanied Henry Wallace on his visit to that nation was Mr. Owen Lattimore.

In the January 19, 1950, issue of the Atlantic Mr. Lattimore has published a news article entitled, "Rebuilding Our Policy in Asia." I believe that it is well for the Congress and the country to know what he is now advocating. Insofar as Japan is concerned he has this to say:

> Japan, though docile in defeat, cannot be made a satisfactory instrument of American policy. There are only two alternatives in Japan. The first is for the United States to keep Japan alive by "blood transfusions" of raw materials and credits. Under heavy enough subsidy—the cost is currently estimate at $500,000,000 a year—Japan can be given the surface appearance of a willing ally; but the reality will be overcommitment of American resources to a distant and vulnerable region.
>
> Under the second alternative, Japan can keep itself alive by coming to terms, economically and politically, with its neighbors in Asia, and especially with Communist-controlled China, which is Japan's natural supplier of iron ore and coking coal. Under this alternative, Japan cannot become a trusted American ally. Its own interest will compel it to balance and bargain between what it can get out of Asia and what it can get out of America. The best that Japan can hope for in the way of true independence is independence of maneuver; and it is the honestly patriotic Japanese who will insist on a national policy of maneuver.

In this he seems to indicate the point of view that Japan must ultimately tie itself in to the Communist orbit on the continent of Asia. Insofar as the Philippines and Korea are concerned, Mr. Lattimore in the same article has this to say:

> Such minor countries as the Philippines and Korea cannot be made major bases of American action. South Korea, especially, is an American liability. It is doubtful how long the present regime in South Korea can be kept alive. The mere effort to keep it alive is a bad advertisement which continually draws attention to a band of little and inferior Chiang Kai-sheks who as a barrier against the Communists have the backing of the hated, Japanese-trained police but not the people and have lost the respect of groups and movements throughout Asia which would like, with American backing, to move toward a future democracy.

Insofar as the recognition of the Communist regime in China and its membership in the United Nations is concerned he comes up with this suggestion:

> For the problem of the recognition of the new government of China, the United Nations offers the ideal avenue to a solution. If, with no pressure against China from the United States, a majority of non-Communist countries in Europe, Latin America, and Asia should vote to seat new Chinese representatives to the United Nations, the United States should not vote against that verdict. Deferment to the majority among

the non-Communist nations would come gracefully from the United States, and would be a blow to the Russian propaganda that the United States seeks to dictate to the bloc that it leads.

Mr. President, I submit this is a line that other groups and publications in this country are following. I believe that is a policy of appeasement and one that if followed will ultimately result in the domination not only of the entire Asiatic land mass by communism but will lead to all of the island nations going into the Communist orbit as well.

In that event the western defenses of the free world will be on the shores of our own Pacific coast.

Much has happened in the Far East since debate opened in the Senate on January 5 relative to our far eastern policy. Since that time the following events of importance have taken place:

First. Mao Tse-tung and his associates have been to Moscow and have agreed upon a 30-year pact with the Soviet Union which may properly be called an alliance. The full provisions of this alliance will be disclosed in due time. It is well to recall that the 1939 Nazi Germany-Soviet Russia treaty of friendship had secret provisions that were not ultimately made public until after the fall of Hitler and the capture of the German archives. However, the full significance of the agreement was recognized at a much earlier date when the Soviet Union invaded Poland from the rear while the Polish Army was engaged in the west against the Nazi invasion.

Second. The Communist rebel leader, Ho Chi-minh, has been recognized by the Soviet Union and some of her satellites, including Red China, as the legal government of Viet Nam in opposition to Bao Dai who heads the legal government of that country and is recognized as such by France, Great Britain, and the United States.

Third. Our roving Ambassador, Mr. Jessup, has met in Siam with American diplomats of the Far East and with the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Mr. Butterworth. Just what decisions were made, if any, have not been disclosed to the people of this country as yet. The strong impression exists that this meeting was one for the exchange of information rather than for the making of decisions.

Fourth. In Hong Kong a British court awarded 71 planes formerly belonging to an air line owned by the Republic of China and disposed of by that air line to a company headed by Claire Chennault and Whiting Willauer, both citizens of the United States, at a time when the national government of China was recognized by both Great Britain and the United States. These 71 planes, if they finally get into Communist hands, will not only furnish the government of Mao Tze-tung with a commercial air transport system but will be of tremendous military value to them in any future operations against southeast Asia, Formosa, and Hainan Islands and other places to which they and their Soviet allies may desire to direct their attention.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad the Senator from California has brought this point out in his remarks. The Senator will perhaps recall that yesterday, as I recall, the junior Senator from Oregon placed in the RECORD some material dealing with the allegations, at least, that an attempt is now going to be made by the Communist government of China to secure American airplane parts for the airplanes which the Chinese Communist government has received through the Hong Kong decision, and that the parts would be obtained through Great Britain, with the use of ECA funds by Great Britain for their purchase in this country. That is the allegation. The probability of it, I think, is also great. Does the Senator from California, who is a colleague of mine from the west coast, agree with me that there is a great deal of concern up and down the west coast as to developments in Asia in respect to the security of the west coast itself?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to my able colleague from Oregon that I believe there is great concern along the entire Pacific coast because of the developments which have taken place in the Far East, and there has been a general realization that while we have helped to close the door to Communists in Europe, we have left the door wide open to communistic Asia.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from California agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that in the event the present cold war in Asia should turn into a hot war, with Russia involved, we might be confronted with the reality of these particular airplanes, which are worth, I understand, a great many millions of dollars, being used against our own forces when they should seek to defend and protect the United States in that hot war?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that, as I have pointed out in the remarks I have made, not only can the airplanes in question be used to transport troops against southeast Asia, against the islands of Formosa and Hinan, but if they were needed they could be used after the initial attack to transport air-borne troops to Alaska, if that became a part of an over-all plan?

Mr. MORSE. As a colleague of the junior Senator from Oregon on the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, does the Senator from California agree that it is of vital importance that the Congress of the United States, and the administration on the executive level, proceed to take immediate steps to make certain that the west coast, including Alaska, are made much more secure than they appear to be at the present time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator, and I speak not only as a member of the Armed Services Committee, of which the junior Senator from Oregon and I are colleagues together, but also as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I will say, however, to the Senator from Oregon, that in this day and age of the airplane and the atom I do not believe we can rely on having our first line of defense in the Pacific coast States of California, Oregon, and Washington, without it being most detrimental to the peace and security of the country as a whole.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from California. If he will permit one more interruption, does the Senator from California agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that one of the defense needs of the United States at the present time is a clear statement on the part of the State Department as to what its foreign policy in all Asia is at the present time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I completely agree with the Senator. And if he will have a bit of patience, I am going to touch on that subject very shortly. It seems to me that while we have had a foreign policy in Europe which the Congress and the American people understand, in the Far East we have had no foreign policy that either the Congress, the American people, or our diplomats in that part of the world can understand.

Mr. MORSE. We simply have not been informed as to what it is, if it exists today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am convinced, from having been in that area of the world, the last time in November and December of 1949, that we do not have up to the present time any over-all foreign policy in the Far East. It is true we have a policy, of course, dealing with Japan, where General MacArthur has done a very outstanding job in his particular sphere. It is true we have to an extent a policy in Korea, in that particular area. But we do not have any over-all foreign policy in Asia such as we have in Europe whereby under the Marshall plan, and the ECA, we were trying to coordinate the effort to maintain a free world of free men, which was followed by the North Atlantic Pact, and in turn by the arms implementation legislation, so people who believe in human freedom might join together and know what the general policy is. There has been no such policy in the Far East.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from California. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to say that at least so far as our policy in Europe is concerned the world knows pretty well what is going to happen if the Communist aggression gets over a certain line, but we do not know, and the people of Asia do not know what is going to happen if communism continues its creeping paralysis over all of Asia, because we have not served clear notice, as we have in Europe, as to what our position is going to be in Asia in case the Russians continue their infiltration tactics of aggression.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. As I pointed out earlier, and as I am going to stress a little further along in my remarks, I do not think it is fair either to the American Congress or to the American people, because without such notice I do not see how we can possibly know as to whether the budget is too large or whether it is too small, and whether the urgent need of the hour is greatly to increase our military strength in order to prevent aggression from running rampant over a large

part of the world. I know the able Senator from Oregon has, just as consistently as I have tried to do, objected to this constant lowering of an iron curtain between the executive branch of the Government and the Congress of the United States, which also has some responsibility. For instance, in the question of the armed services we have a constitutional responsibility which we cannot abdicate to the executive branch of the Government. The Constitution itself says that the Congress is responsible for the raising and supporting of armies and navies. How are we to know just what size the Defense Establishment should be unless we have a foreign policy and know whether a line is going to be drawn at some point in that area of the world.

Mr. President, while the record indicates that the State Department did make representations to the British Government, the strong impression exists that those representations were not as strong as the conditions warranted. Certainly this act on the part of the British Government will receive full attention by the Congress in the months ahead.

Fifth. As of March 1 Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek became President of the Republic of China after 13 months of retirement.

On January 5 I discussed some of the policies followed by this Government which led up to the debacle which has taken place on the continent of Asia and the development of the situation with which we and the non-Communist world are now faced.

Today I desire to outline the basis upon which a policy might be developed that would warrant support in and out of Congress.

In Secretary Acheson's speech before the National Press Club on January 12, with relation to our defense perimeter in the Pacific, he stated the following:

First of all, let's deal with the question of military security. I deal with it first because it is important and because having stated our policy in that regard, we must clearly understand that the military menace is not the most immediate.

What is the situation in regard to the military security of the Pacific area, and what is our policy in regard to it?

In the first place the defeat and the disarmament of Japan have placed upon the United States the necessity of assuming the military defense of Japan so long as that is required, both in interest of our security and in the interests of the security of the entire Pacific area and, in all honor, in the interest of Japanese security.

We have American and there are Australian troops in Japan I am not in a position to speak for the Australians, but I can assure you that there is no intention of any sort of abandoning or weakening the defense of Japan, and that whatever arrangements are to be made either through permanent settlement or otherwise—that defense must and shall be maintained.

This defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus. We hold important defense positions in the Ryukyu Islands, and those we will continue to hold. In the interest of the population of the Ryukyu Islands we will, at an appropriate time, offer to hold these islands under trusteeship of the United Nations. But they are essential parts of the defensive perimeter of the Pacific, and they must and will be held.

The defensive perimeter runs from the Ryukyus to the Philippine Islands. Our relations, our defensive relations with the Philippines, are contained in agreements between us. Those agreements are being loyally carried out and will be loyally carried out. Both peoples have learned by bitter experience the vital connections between our mutual defense requirements We are in no doubt about that and it is hardly necessary for me to say an attack on the Philippines could not and would not be tolerated by the United States But I hasten to add that no one perceives the imminence of any such attack.

Mr. President, if the English language means anything, it means that the Secretary of State on January 12 was announcing that this country was prepared to fight if an invasion should take place against Japan, Okinawa, or the Philippine Islands. Outside of that defense line, were left the Republic of Korea, the non-Communist Republic of China, now primarily occupying the islands of Formosa and Hainan, the Indonesian Republic, and the nations of southeast Asia.

Insofar as these countries are concerned, they were presumably, according to Secretary Acheson's speech, to rely on the United Nations Charter. Without disrespect to the Secretary, this is rather a weak reed to lean on, since the Soviet Union is now in a position to exercise a veto to block any effective United Nations action. Should Communist China succeed the Republic of China in the United Nations, a double veto against effective action would be available to the Communist world. However, Secretary Acheson's statements from his January 12 speech are worth reviewing at this time. He said:

So far as the military security of other areas in the Pacific is concerned, it must be clear that no person can guarantee these areas against military attack. But it must also be clear that such a guarantee is hardly sensible or necessary within the realm of practical relationship

Should an attack occur—one hesitates to say where such an armed attack could come from—the initial reliance must be on the people attacked to resist it, and then upon the commitments of the entire civilized world, under the charter of the United Nations, which so far has not proved a weak reed to lean on by any people who are determined to protect their independence against outside aggression.

But it is a mistake, I think, in considering Pacific and far-eastern problems to become obsessed with military considerations Important as they are, there are other problems that press, and these other problems are not capable of solution through military means.

These other problems arise out of the susceptibility of many areas and many countries in the Pacific area to subversion and penetration. That cannot be stopped by military means.

Mr. President, there has been much discussion in the State Department and elsewhere that point 4 or other economic aid will solve to a considerable extent the problem of Communist encroachment. It must be obvious that economic assistance alone will do no such thing, for there can be no real economic recovery while that area of the world is in imminent danger of overt invasion from the outside or Communist-inspired rebellion from within.

A look at the map and a study of conditions in the Far East clearly indicate that, as against invasion by Communist China, the island nations are better able to defend themselves or to be defended than are the nations on the Asiatic land mass. This is particularly true as long as the potential aggressor is without naval or air power. If these deficiencies should be supplied indirectly by the Soviet Union or directly with the Soviet Union as an active belligerent, the situation would, of course, change.

Therefore, it seems to me that the first step in developing a far-eastern policy should be to unite the Pacific island nations and the United States in a Pacific pact in conformity with the United Nations charter. These nations would include Australia, New Zealand, the Philippine Republic, the United States of Indochina, Japan—as soon as a peace treaty has been completed—and the non-Communist Republic of China, now centered on Formosa and Hainan Islands.

In addition to these island nations, the problem of defense of the nations on the Asiatic continental land mass is more difficult. We have obligations to the Republic of Korea that exceed, in my judgment, any obligations that we have to Viet Nam, Siam, or Burma. While an attack upon the Pacific pact island nations would, as in the case of the Atlantic community, be considered as "an attack against one as an attack against all," our policy in Korea and in southeast Asia would vary in the event they were not included in the first instance in such a Pacific pact.

We should continue to give economic aid and supervised military assistance to the Republic of Korea and should prepare to give similar supervised aid to the southeast Asian non-Communist nations that requested it.

At the same time, we should make it clear that we are not disinterested in those nations in the event they are faced with an overt invasion. Our position should be that in that event and at that time, we and the nations associated with us, will take such action as our national interest and the maintenance of international law and order require.

In no event should they be written off nor should we indicate that their future is of no concern to us. Communism is no less destructive to human freedom in Asia than it is in eastern Europe.

Mr. President, my chief criticism of the statement of the President of the United States on January 5 was not, at the particular time, that he was unwilling to send a mission to Formosa, in the same way that we had sent a mission to Greece and a mission to Korea; but my criticism arose from the fact that in the statement he made, he seemed to indicate that the free people of non-Communist China were being written off, and that the island of Formosa and its people were outside the defense perimeter. It was more or less of an open invitation to the Communist world to come and get them.

Mr. President, I submit that the President need not have gone that far. He could have said that at this particular time we are not prepared to decide whether we shall send a mission, as we did in the case of Korea and in the case

of Greece when they were faced with the problem of a Communist overturn of their governments, but that in the event of an overt invasion, we will take such steps as our national interest may require. That at least might have kept the people on the other side of the iron curtain guessing as to what our position would be, and it would also have left us a flexibility of action which, it seems to me the President did not allow, as a result of his speech.

Mr. President, I think the same statement applies to the Republic of Korea. When the Secretary of State in his speech before the National Press Club drew his line, and left the Republic of Korea on the outside, that was more or less of an open invitation to the Communists in North Korea to come down from the north and absorb the people of the Republic of Korea.

I most vigorously disagree with the analysis made by Mr. Lattimore, who indicated in his speech that the people of the Republic of Korea are not worthy of support. I personally went there, I saw the very high caliber of the public officials there, I saw the caliber of the men in their armed services, I talked with our own representatives in that country. I was told by the American commander, the head of the mission in Korea, that in his judgment there have never been a finer group of soldiers than those who constitute the army of the Republic of Korea; and he was convinced that, as against an indigenous invasion from north Korea, the soldiers of the Republic of Korea would be able to defend their independence.

Inasmuch as we are responsible, in part at least, for the setting up of this republic, I do not believe that they should be left behind the iron curtain, because, if we really mean to have a free world of free men, we cannot draw a color line, Mr. President. Human freedom, as I have previously pointed out, is no less dear to the people of Asia than it is to the people of Europe, and it is of just as much concern to the people of the United States in the long run that we maintain a free and independent Republic of China and a free and independent Republic of Korea, as it is that we maintain a free and independent Greece, Austria, or any other country in the world.

Certainly, Mr. President, in line with the statement made by the Senator from Oregon, I think the time has come when, in the interests of the American people, the administration should set forth clearly just what our policy is to be in the Far East.

WORLD CONGRESS OF PARTISANS OF PEACE—THE ROAD TO PEACE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the World Congress of Partisans of Peace, described by the State Department as the leading Communist-front organization in the world today, has announced, as has already been said by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], that it is sending a delegation of Europeans to the United States on March 3. This has been stated in the press.

The stated purpose of the delegation's visit is to present a petition to Congress to end the armament race and to prohibit atomic weapons.

Members of the delegation have applied to the State Department for visas to come to the United States. The State Department has advised me that some of the delegates are Communists and that the others are fellow travelers.

Mr. President, inasmuch as statements made relative to who is or who is not a Communist, and as to what is a Communist organization, have been challenged on the Senate floor, I asked the State Department, when I found out about this, to send me the personnel of the delegation, and to advise we whether they had a record of them, and if, as they say, they are Communists or fellow travelers, whether that record could not be placed in the RECORD at the time I made this observation.

I have received from the State Department a list of 12 names, and also the information which was furnished to the State Department by the delegates relative to their interest, not only in the Communist Party, but also in front organizations. The information is classified. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the information given me by the State Department relative to these so-called Communists or fellow travelers be made a part of my remarks, because from these records it is the State Department that is making the challenge that they are Communists or fellow travelers.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBERSHIP OF THE DELEGATION TO THE UNITED STATES

Pablo Picasso: World-famous Spanish painter. A member of the French Communist Party since 1914, he has been a leading figure in various Communist front organizations, including the International Committee of the World Partisans of Peace.

Rev. Hewlett Johnson: Dean of Canterbury. Member of the editorial board of the Daily Worker. Delegate to several conferences of the Partisans of Peace and British member of the World Peace Committee.

Ivor Montagu: British film producer, director and scenarist, and active in many phases of motion-picture production. He has been a Communist Party member since 1932 and is a member of the Daily Worker editorial staff.

Dr. Max Cosyns: Belgium's foremost atomic scientist and associate of Professor Piccard since 1932. An avowed Communist sympathizer, Cosyns has been playing a vigorous role in various front organizations.

Eugene Aubel: Professor of chemistry and biology, University of Paris. A member of the French Communist Party. Active in Communist front organizations. Delegate, World Congress of Intellectuals, Wroclaw, Poland, 1948, and a member, National Council Combattants de la Liberte et de la Paix (Fighters for Liberty and Peace).

Hans Erni: Well-known Swiss modernist painter. An ardent fellow traveler, he is a leader of the Swiss-Soviet Friendship Association.

Jean Lurcat: Artist, reportedly a member of the French Communist Party and an active member in numerous Communist front organizations.

Luigi Cacciatore: A parliamentary deputy, Cacciatore is an active leader of the Italian Socialist Party which cooperates with the Italian Communist Party. He was Minister of Posts and Telecommunications in the De Gasperi cabinet in 1947.

Dr. Mario Montesi: Communal councilor of Rome since the liberation. He was at one time active in the Christian Democratic Party but later joined the pro-Communist Christian Movement for Peace.

Giuesppina Palumbo: A Socialist senator and former social worker, she was the first woman given a post in the Italian Government after liberation. She is now active in leftist women's groups.

Prof. Oliviero Mario Olivo: Highly regarded Italian specialist in anatomy and histology and one time Rockefeller fellow in the United States. He took part in the leftist-sponsored Congress of Italian Culture in 1948.

Furio Diaz: Communist mayor of Leghorn since the liberation. Thirty-three years old law graduate; formerly taught at University of Pisa Very popular locally. Member of the Italian Communist Party and its organ, the Friends of Unita.

Mr. WHERRY. The State Department also informs me that the Partisans of Peace movement was organized at Communist-line meetings held in Paris and Prague in April 1949, and that it is the outgrowth of earlier meetings held at Wroclaw, Poland, held in August 1948.

The so-called peace congresses held in various countries under the auspices of this organization have uniformly followed a Communist line.

They spend much of their time attacking the United States with charges of warmongering and imperialism, but they are always very sympathetic to the U. S. S. R. and Soviet foreign policy.

This organization is considered to be a major Soviet instrumentality for propaganda and political pressure.

I am also advised that the Partisans of Peace participate in the campaigns that are conducted by the Cominform.

The Secretary of State would be derelict in his duty if he permitted an invasion of the United States by this group representing the so-called World Congress of Partisans of Peace.

The State Department asserts that some of the members of the delegation are avowed Communists, as I have already mentioned, and that others are active in following the Communist line.

No question of freedom of speech or of tolerance for the other fellow's view is involved in this issue, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nebraska.

The United States would not want to open its ports to the bubonic plague; and to allow these revolutionaries to come into this country to spread their doctrine against our Government would be equally dangerous.

The American taxpayers are paying dearly to maintain American principles in the cold war with Russia.

The State Department says it has abundant evidence that the World Congress of Partisans of Peace is active throughout western Europe, and other parts of the free world, in trying to obstruct the efforts of the United States, to help freedom-loving people establish themselves firmly in prosperity and peace with freedom.

To the junior Senator from Nebraska, it simply does not make sense to spend billions upon billions of dollars to combat communism, while at the same time opening our doors to leaders of Communist forces.

Furthermore, the American people need no instruction from these Communists, and their fellow travelers, of the World Congress of Partisans of Peace, on the way to peace.

The American people have fought two World Wars in order to maintain peace with honor on the earth.

The United States has given abundant evidence of its pure motives, by not asking a cent in reparations, or an inch of territory in payment for its loss in lives and its deep cost in money.

The delegation of Communists, and fellow travelers who seek to enter our gates to spread their propaganda against our republican procedures, would simply add to our difficulties in stamping out revolutionary communism among our own people.

And FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover recently stated that there are more than a half million Communists and fellow travelers already in the United States.

It is said that the delegation of the World Congress of Partisans of Peace want to come here to advocate peace.

The United States is not blocking peace.

Peace is being blocked by Soivet Russia and her agents around the world.

If the delegation has any sincerity of purpose let it go to Moscow and publicly proclaim its demand for peace and an end to the cold war.

I should like to restate that sentence, because I had this speech ready at 4 o'clock this afternoon for release on delivery in the Senate.

If the delegation has any sincerity of purpose, let it go to Moscow and publicly proclaim its demand for peace and an end to the cold war.

Let it carry its message into the walls of the Kremlin and to the throne of Dictator Stalin.

Let it propagandize among the Russian people; hold mass meetings; conduct parades; and flaunt placards before Joseph Stalin wherever he moves.

I am sure the majority leader, who is now presiding over the Senate, will agree with me on that proposition. Let the delegation go to Moscow. Let it propagandize the Russian people. Let it hold mass meetings over there, conduct parades, and flaunt placards before Joseph Stalin, wherever he moves.

Let these delegates picket the Kremlin.

Mr. President, this delegation has no useful purpose to serve.

It is a trouble-making group.

Must we suffer the indignity of having these Communists come to the United States to shout from the steps of the United States Capitol that we are warmongers?

The junior Senator from Nebraska believes it is very doubtful that the delegation would seek admission to the United States unless it had approval of the Russian Government.

In veto after veto, the Soviet Union has thwarted efforts of the United Nations for peace.

And while the agents of Moscow in foreign lands cry for peace, the rulers of Moscow plot new expansions of their empire.

Obviously this delegation from the World Congress of Partisans of Peace seek only to lull our people into a false sense of security, and to spread confusion in order that they may better serve their masters in the Kremlin.

If Dictator Stalin and his group in the Kremlin sincerely want peace and want to halt the cold war, there are recognized avenues for presenting their views.

The United States, in its desire to establish durable peace on earth, would gladly open its doors to an official delegation from Soviet Russia bringing proposals to terminate the cold war. Such a delegation would be welcome.

Indeed, our people pray for adjustments that will end the terrible nightmare of uncertainty over what the morrow will bring.

The junior Senator from Nebraska believes that our own President could be more diligent in exploring possible roads to peace.

The junior Senator from Nebraska believes that all the facts have not been given to the American people, that there is much misunderstanding among them, and that many of them are asking why the diplomats are failing.

It seems to the junior Senator from Nebraska that the cause of peace would be served if the President of the United States were to direct a note to Premier Stalin detailing America's position on the issues in conflict. The note could be two or three thousand words in length. It should present the issues and our position clearly, so that all the world could see and understand. Then, let Premier Stalin answer, and let his statement be open to the world. We have had enough of secret meetings and secret agreements. There must be no more Yaltas, no more Potsdams. The junior Senator from Nebraska has little faith in secret meetings. He believes in what Woodrow Wilson called "open covenants, openly arrived at."

Time and again we are told by persons highly placed in our Administration that it would be futile to have another conference with Soviet Russia.

Argument is made that the United States should build bigger and better weapons of war and strive to win the armament race. The argument is made that we should approach Russia only from strength and not from weakness. It all sounds good, but time is passing—and peace continues to hang in the balance.

It is suggested that the whole matter be referred to the United Nations. We all know that although the United Nations has accomplished some good, and is groping toward adoption of better machinery for the expression of its views, the process through the United Nations woud be, at best, very long drawn out.

There is nothing in the United Nations charter which direct negotiations between the United States and Russia would violate.

In fact, all efforts toward the amicable settlement of disputes, are wholly within the purpose of the United Nations.

So the junior Senator from Nebraska now suggests that the President of the United States get off dead center—get off his treadmill—and make a forthright effort toward resolving the issues between the United States and Soviet Russia.

Certainly nothing would be lost by the President's addressing an open letter to Premier Stalin stating the American position. And if there should be an exchange of two, three, four, or even ten letters, the people all over the world then would have an official record.

The junior Senator from Nebraska believes there is no power on earth that can withstand the pressure of public opinion. Out of the present confusion and all the milling about, ultimately there must come the voice of public opinion.

THE COAL DISPUTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon has deferred all afternoon making this speech on the pending coal case and the introduction of a bill which, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Oregon, would be very helpful in settling the pending coal case.

Today the United States District Court for the District of Columbia handed down a decision holding that the United Mine Workers' Union is not in criminal or civil contempt of an existing temporary restraining order which the same court on February 11 issued in connection with the pending suit.

I accept the finding of the court, Mr. President, as I would have accepted the finding of the court had it been opposite to that which the court reached, because I believe in government by law in America. I believe that when there is a law on the statute books, that law must be enforced and must be administered and interpreted in conformity with impartiality by the great American court system.

Thus, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon made clear many times on the floor of the Senate, while the Taft-Hartley bill was still under debate and before the final vote was taken thereon, that it would always be his position that once a law was passed, even though he voted against the bill when it was pending before the Senate, he would insist that the law be enforced so long as it remained on the statute books. I have always taken the position in regard to the Taft-Hartley law that I would insist that all the force of government necessary to enforce it be used.

I say that by way of preface to my remarks tonight, Mr. President, because I am well aware of the fact that the subject matter of my remarks may be misinterpreted and that a deliberate attempt may be made by my political opponents to misrepresent them.

I believe that a Member of the Senate must always be willing to rise above political expediency, and although political expediency might dictate silence on the part of the junior Senator from Oregon on this subject, nevertheless I consider it my duty as a Member of the United States Senate to make an effort to bring to an end the suffering and the hardship which the pending coal dispute is causing the American people. I feel so deeply about the subject matter, Mr. President, that I believe the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives cannot tarry longer, now that a court decision has been handed down, in doing whatever can be done

within the legislative powers of our Government to come to the relief of the American people in respect to the coal dispute.

While the case was pending before the Federal court, Mr. President, I, along with many of my colleagues in the Senate—and there have been many discussions of the subject matter in the cloakrooms—felt we should await the decision of the court. But that decision having been handed down today, Mr. President, the American people undoubtedly are asking tonight the question, "Now, what?"

I think the Congress of the United States has the obligation of trying to find the answer to the question, "Now, what?"

I wish to offer a suggestion tonight, Mr. President, in the form of a bill which, if it is passed, will, I think, result in a resumption of coal production. The immediate and the emergency problem confronting us in this matter is to get coal, to end the suffering, the misery, and the hardship, to say nothing about the great economic losses that are sweeping this country.

It is true that as we discuss this matter tonight, schools in America are being closed for lack of coal. It is true that as we discuss this subject matter tonight, Mr. President, there is a great shortage of coal in many of the cities of the Nation. So great is that shortage that mayors of those cities all over the country are communicating with the Senators from their States, asking the question, "What does the Congress or the Government of the United States propose to do to get coal to end the great suffering which is gripping the country?"

Mr. President, it has always been the position of the junior Senator from Oregon that whenever a great emergency arises in America which endangers the public welfare and the public interest, or jeopardizes the health or safety of the American people, the Government has the duty—and I emphasize the word "duty"—to take whatever action lies within the power of government to protect the people from the danger which confronts them. We cannot have government, Mr. President, if we do not carry out that principle. We shall have anarchy. We cannot have government by law if our Government ever fails to take every step within its power to protect the health and the safety of the people. That is a very elementary principle of political philosophy. Sometimes I think that even in the Congress we overlook the very simple, elementary principles of government which should be observed if we would keep faith with the great political philosophy which characterizes our constitutional system of government by law.

So I say, as I have said in two or three decisions which I have handed down in my lifetime in the field of labor relations, that no group of employers or no group of workers, under our free system of democratic government, has the license to place their selfish economic interests above the welfare of the American people, to the point that the selfish interests of any group in this country jeopardize the health and the safety of the American people. That applies in this instance, Mr. President, to the coal operators and to the members of the United Mine Workers of America. If this Government ever fails to recognize that principle of government by law, Mr. President, we shall have a breakdown in our democratic system.

I want to say that no group—and that includes the coal operators and the members of the United Mine Workers of America—has any right, if it is to fulfill its patriotic obligations under our system of government by law, to take the position that it can continue to fail to negotiate an agreement for the operation of the coal mines, or that the Government can do nothing while the parties to the dispute fail to negotiate an agreement to provide the coal necessary to protect the health and the safety of our people.

Mr. President, that is one of my major premises. Of course, if I am wrong on that major premise, my bill is unsound. If I am right on my major premise, namely, that it is the duty of our Government, in maintaining a system of government by law, to take whatever action within its power to protect the people against any group or combination of groups which seek to jeopardize the health or safety of the people, simply because they are unable to reach an agreement between themselves over a labor contract, then the Senate should give serious consideration to the proposal which I offer tonight.

It is a seizure proposal, Mr. President. Let me make clear that I do not like seizure. I think it is most unfortunate, in facing the problem of giving serious consideration to the question "What now?" in the coal dispute that we must even turn our attention to seizure. Every employer, including every coal operator, and every labor leader, including the leaders of the United Mine Workers of America, ought to see that they should be willing to make such compromises and concessions as are necessary in their collective-bargaining negotiations to avoid the necessity of Congress even discussing the question of seizure, to say nothing of putting seizure into practice.

Oh, I know, when it goes across the news wires of America that the junior Senator from Oregon has introduced a bill which proposes seizure it is likely to be misunderstood, because someone may get the idea that the junior Senator from Oregon likes the idea of seizure. I do not. I do not like it at all, Mr. President. But I prefer seizure to the suffering which is being imposed upon the American people by the apparent breakdown in coal negotiations and by the fact that we are not getting out of the coal mines the coal needed in these critical hours to prevent the American people from suffering from a lack of coal. The people are entitled to coal so that they will not continue to be subjected to the great hardships from which they are suffering at this hour. It is only because I believe we are being forced into a position where we have no alternative that I offer for discussion and suggest for passage, if necessary, a seizure bill.

I dislike seizure so much, Mr. President, that as a member of the War Labor Board during the war I did everything I could in each specific case to avoid seizure. We seized some plants during the war. In fact, we raised the American flag over the mines of America during the war. Why? Because we were in a war emergency, a life and death struggle for the preservation of freedom itself here and in the world. Had we lost the war, we would not be in the Senate today as representatives of a free people in a representative form of government. So there, too, I was confronted with the very simple and elementary principle of supporting a government by law. The War Labor Board took the position that whenever any group threatens the security of the people as a whole it is the duty of government to use all its force to protect the people.

So, reluctantly, after we had tried every other effort and means to settle some of the major wartime labor cases without seizure, we agreed to seizure. It happened that I had the solemn obligation of being the compliance officer, or enforcement officer of the War Labor Board during the war. Believe me, once the decision to seize had been affirmed by the President of the United States, we used all the forces of Government necessary to enforce a given decision. We succeeded, Mr. President, but it was not a pleasant task. Certainly it is an undesirable pattern to establish for frequent use. Of that I am very well aware. That is why my seizure bill, which in principle is identical with the seizure bill I introduced in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, is surrounded with every safeguard I can conceive. In fact, I have surrounded it with the safeguard of a clear check by Congress. That is how important I think it is to protect us from a hasty or ill-advised or unnecessary use of seizure in any emergency case. Let the record be perfectly clear that the junior Senator from Oregon believes that seizure should never be used in this country except as a matter of last resort; and I mean last resort.

Mr. President, it appears that we have reached that point today in the coal case. We are confronted with the fact that great suffering exists in America tonight as a result of the coal dispute. We are confronted with the fact that workers are saying they will not mine coal in the absence of an agreement. We are confronted with the fact that the court, on the basis of the record, has found that as of this hour there is no contempt of its restraining order.

As I said in the beginning, I accept that decision, because I know something about the judicial process. I know the sense of responsibility and the solemnness of the obligation which men who wear the robes of American judgeships carry on their shoulders when they sit in judgment on a judicial record. We must preserve our policy of accepting, until reversed by a higher court, the decisions of American judges, because unless we maintain an unquestioned respect for and loyalty to this great system of justice, we will lose our freedom.

Mr. President, that is why the junior Senator from Oregon has not been heard

at any time, once a court has spoken or a jury has handed down its verdict, casting reflection on the court or the jury. I may disagree with the legal theory applied by a court or I may express the view that a decision probably will be reversed, but I will insist that it be obeyed until reversed. I recognize they can make their mistakes, but we have an appeal procedure for correcting judicial mistakes. It is of the utmost importance that we not negative our system of government by law through our court system of justice, by taking the position that a decision of a court should not be binding upon us and accepted by us until approved, reversed, or modified by a higher appeal tribunal.

Mr. President, I have the same feeling in regard to carrying out the Taft-Hartley law in all its provisions, now that it is the law of the land. I do not like the Taft-Hartley law. I voted against the bill. I am satisfied I cast the right vote when I voted against it, because our experience under the law has proven what quite a few of us said on the floor of the Senate during the debate about the undesirable features of the bill. I recall so clearly the last afternoon of the debate, when many of us opposed to the bill said it would not accomplish the objectives its supporters had in mind. I was in favor of a labor law that embodied the objectives of the Ives-Morse bill, which was the committee bill of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of 1947. But those objectives were undermined by the Taft-Hartley law. The Morse-Ives bill was based upon one major premise, namely, that the Wagner Act needed to be modified because it put the Government on labor's side of the table, and discriminated unfairly against the employers.

I favored the modification of the Wagner Act because serious labor abuses did develop under the Wagner Act. But I was opposed, Mr. President, to putting the Government on the employers' side of the table, as the Taft-Hartley law does in many particulars. I took the position then, which I repeat tonight, that there is only one place for the Government in a labor dispute, and that is at the head of the table, sitting in judgment of both sides whenever the dispute gets to the point that it becomes necessary for the Government to intervene in that dispute in order to protect the public interest. That is why I want the Taft-Hartley law modified.

Another reason why I want it modified is because I think it is important that we get into the law an emergency dispute procedure that will work, in fairness to employers and to labor. The emergency dispute sections of the Taft-Hartley law are a grand flop. Those sections of the law have a record of dismal failure ever since it was passed.

I do not wish to be interpreted as taking the attitude of "I told you so," because this is so important to the welfare of our people that it does not make any difference now whether some of us failed to convince the Senate in our argument in 1947 when we warned the Senate not to take the steps it took in passing the Taft-Hartley law. What I want to do now is to suggest a constructive and affirmative procedure in respect to emergency disputes, a procedure that will work and that will be fair to all sides.

I want to say one other thing, Mr. President, before I discuss the terms of the bill I seek to offer. I believe the coal dispute has awakened, to a remarkable degree, an understanding among the American people that the coal industry is economically sick. As the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], now presiding, pointed out in the Senate yesterday when he introduced his joint resolution for the creation of a temporary coal commission, about which I shall have something to say in a moment, the labor dispute in the coal industry is but a symptom of that economic illness. To press my figure of speech a bit further, Mr. President, we can take judicial notice that a disease is not cured by treating a symptom. All the symptom does is give warning as to what the basic cause of the illness may be. That is all it does. We must find the causes of the economic illness that characterizes the coal industry today.

I do not claim to know a great deal about the economic problems of the coal industry. I suspect, so far as labor disputes in coal are concerned, that I have as broad a background as anyone in the Congress in regard to the symptom of economic illness in the coal industry, as manifested through labor disputes in the industry. But that does not make me an authority at all on what needs to be done to bring about economic stability in the coal industry. I do not know the answers to that question. But I want to say that by introducing the joint resolution yesterday the Senator from Minnesota performed a great public service. It is important that we set up a commission of experts to tell us, the Members of the Congress and the American people, what the facts are about the economic illness of the coal industry, and what needs to be done in order to bring stability to the industry.

I happen to be one who constantly asks himself the question when a controversial issue is before him: What are the facts? Once I am satisfied I have been fully informed on the facts then I am in a position to weigh and evaluate the suggestions and recommendations made by experts for remedying the situation that is characterized by undesirable facts. The joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Minnesota as to future problems in the coal industry will do just that. But, as the Senator pointed out yesterday when he introduced his joint resolution, it will not be helpful in the immediate pending coal dispute. We must deal with that now.

One more word respecting the joint resolution which the Senator from Minnesota introduced yesterday. We have been advised, as Members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and through other channels in our official work as Members of the Senate, that one of the economic problems in the coal industry that is causing it to be a sick industry is that in much less than a year more coal can be produced than can be consumed in that year. I do not know what the exact time is. We hear from 7 to 8 months; but let us assume for the sake of the argument—and it may be more or it may be less—that what we are advised is true, namely, that because of great technological changes in the mining of coal, because of labor-saving devices developed in recent years, because of conversion from coal to oil, we now can produce in from 7 to 8 months more coal than the economy can use in 12 months. If it is true, Mr. President, that we can produce more coal in 7 to 8 months than we can consume in 12 months, we have a little better understanding of the causes of labor unrest among the miners.

The American people have been told in most of the news which they read about the coal dispute that the miners receive in wages some $14 or between $14 and $15 a day. What is the reaction of the average American when he reads that? He says, "Why, that is a pretty good wage. What right have they to be tying up the economy of the country when they receive a wage of from $14 to $15 a day?"

Of course, Mr. President, I do not think that when we come to an emergency situation which involves the health and the safety of the people of the United States the miners have the right, any more than I think the employers have the right, to take any action which might be found to be bad-faith action so far as negotiating an agreement that would save the American people from suffering for want of coal.

But let us pass over that, Mr. President, and go to the more basic question. Is it not perfectly obvious that if the coal industry can overproduce in 7 or 8 months of operation, the daily wage of the miners then ceases to have any great significance? We have to find answers to some basic questions. I think the commission called for by the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Minnesota will find for us factual answers to the basic questions which deal with the economic illness of the coal industry. For example, what is the answer to these questions:

How many days a year are the miners laid off because individual mines X, Y, and Z have produced more coal than their sales departments have been able to sell at a profit? How frequently do coal operators issue orders to shut down some mines until the overproduced stock piles are disposed of on the market at a profit? I want the coal operators to make a profit, and I want them to make a fair profit, Mr. President. Do not let anyone get the idea that the position of the junior Senator from Oregon is one which would seek to discriminate against the legitimate economic rights and interests of the coal operators. It is not that at all. The coal operators are entitled to a fair profit in the operation of their mines. I think the coal miners, too, are entitled to a good annual wage income.

I do not know, Mr. President, whether part of the answer to this problem is to try to work out some arrangement in coal whereby the miners will be assured

of at least a decent minimum annual wage.

I am not prepared to say whether that is part of the solution. One reason why we should adopt the resolution submitted by the Senator from Minnesota is that the economic experts should be able to tell us whether that is part of the solution, after they have made the type of factual study called for by the Senator's resolution.

Mr. President, I know that coal miners are human beings. I know they are working in the most hazardous occupation in all America; I do not know of any occupation which employs anywhere near the number of men the coal industry employs, in which the risk to life and limb is as great as it is in the coal mines. We, the people, had better take that into consideration when we adjudge the merits of the coal dispute, because the coal miners are working in an industry stamped with a public interest. Let me put that point in a little different way, because I think it is a rather fundamental point in my entire approach to the remedies which should be applied in the coal industry. We are dealing with an industry that is charged with a public interest; and I use that phrase in its technical, legal sense. I take the position that the coal industry of the United States has become, in our modern, economic life, an industry as much charged with the public interest as are the railroads, the public utilities, or the aviation lines. I believe the coal industry should be so treated by the Government of the United States. That is a fundamental point in the approach which I make to our coal problem. If I am wrong in that premise—the second major premise I have laid down in my address this evening—then, again, much of my argument will fall. But I think I am correct, because the stability of the coal industry at any given time in the United States bears a direct relationship to the stability of the American economy as a whole.

Mr. President, let me put that thought in this way: As the economy of the coal industry goes, so goes the economy of the United States. What better exhibit need I offer to prove my point than the present coal dispute and the effects of it on the total economy of the United States?

It may be thought that that is a very obvious observation to make; but it seems to me that many Americans have not yet made it. So many people in this country apparently have not yet recognized the fact that the coal industry is so stamped with a public interest that the status of its stability at any given time has a direct relationship with the stability and the level of prosperity of all the rest of the United States.

Oh, yes; in some industries there have been a great many conversions from coal to oil or to other coal substitutes; but coal is still the primary fuel of America. Coal is still the great energizing force which makes this free economy of ours work. Coal still happens to be the determiner of whether or not the economic wheels of America revolve. Shut down the supply of coal, and this great industrial economy of ours gradually comes to a dead stop, and all the social and economic implications of a break-down in the operation of our economy flow from that stoppage. We are beginning to see some of those implications developing this very night in America, Mr. President.

Whenever any industry bears such a direct relationship to the health and safety and economic welfare of all of us, then all the American people have a direct interest in that industry. They have a right to say to the lawmakers of America, "It is your duty to exercise over that industry the minimum regulations and controls necessary to protect a free economy."

Mr. President, that is what we did in the case of the railroads. That is what we have done in connection with public utilities generally. Our air lines operate under that legal theory. So, Mr. President, I am arguing this evening for the application of a legal theory well known in the law of our country; I am arguing for its application to an industry which in recent years has been subjected to such economic changes within its own operations that now it is legally sound to argue that it should be treated by the Government of the United States as an industry that is stamped with a public interest.

Mr. President, in making an approach to the regulation of the coal industry by the Government, even in the application of the so-called public-interest theory, we need to watch out that we do not play into the hands of those who would nationalize the coal industry. When one talks about any bill, such as the one I am introducing tonight, which even has the word "seizure" connected with it, many persons may get the false idea that the proponents of that bill favor the nationalization of the coal mines of America. But, Mr. President, let us nail that one to the mast right now, so there can be no doubt in the record about the position of the junior Senator from Oregon on that matter: I am unalterably opposed not only to the nationalization of the coal mines but to the nationalization of any basic industry in America. I am opposed to nationalization of industry, because we cannot have a free economy through nationalization. The road to nationalization leads to socialization of our economy, and socialization of our economy leads to the loss of the political and the economic freedoms of every American. If nationalization and socialization of basic industry in this country ever come to pass, then we, the people, will become the servants, not the masters, of our Government. I am introducing a seizure bill tonight, Mr. President, because I think it will act as a backfire, a check, against proposals for nationalization. I happen to be one who believes that if these economic emergencies continue to arise periodically in the coal industry, the Communists and the leftists and the radical agitators in this country will seek to take advantage of that situation to spread their propaganda for the nationalization and socialization of basic industry in this country. I do not want to play into their hands.

I want the Congress of the United States to take some steps which I think will check them in their propaganda, by bringing the coal industry under the same legal theory that we apply to other public utilities in this country.

So, Mr. President, at this time I introduce, and ask to have referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, a bill providing a procedure for seizure of the coal mines. I ask to have the bill printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3169) to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to provide a more effective method of dealing with labor disputes in vital industries which affect the public interest, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 206 and 207 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206. Whenever the President finds that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a stoppage of work has resulted or threatens to result from a labor dispute (including the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect and call upon the parties to the dispute to refrain from a stoppage of work, or if such stoppage has occurred, to resume work and operations in the public interest.

"EMERGENCY BOARDS

"SEC. 207. (a) After issuing such a proclamation the President shall promptly appoint a board to be known as an 'emergency board.'

"(b) Any emergency board appointed under this section shall promptly investigate the dispute, shall seek to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute, and in any event shall, within a period of time to be determined by the President but not more than 30 days after the appointment of the board, make a report to the President, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the board. Such report shall include the findings and recommendations of the board and shall be transmitted to the parties and be made public. The Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions.

"(c) An emergency board shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

"(d) Members of an emergency board shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(e) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C. 19, title 15, secs. 49 and 50, as amended), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

"(f) Each emergency board shall continue in existence after making its report for such time as the national emergency continues for the purpose of mediating the dispute, should the parties request its services. When a

board appointed under this section has been dissolved, its records shall be transferred to the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

"(g) A separate emergency board shall be appointed for each dispute. No member of an emergency board shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or in any employer involved in the dispute."

SEC 2 Sections 208, 209, and 210 of such act are amended to read as follows.

"PROCEDURE FOLLOWING PROCLAMATION

"SEC. 208 (a) At any time after issuing a proclamation pursuant to section 206 the President may submit to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make.

"(b) In any case in which a strike or lockout occurs or continues after the issuance of the proclamation pursuant to section 206 the President shall submit immediately to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case, including the report of the emergency board if such report has been made, and such recommendations as he may see fit to make, including a recommendation that the United States take possession of and operate the business enterprise or enterprises involved in the dispute If the President recommends that the United States shall take possession of and operate such enterprise or enterprises, the President shall have authority to take such action unless the Congress by concurrent resolution within 5 days after the submission of such recommendation to the Congress determines that such action should not be taken or enacts legislation designed to resolve the dispute and terminate the national emergency If Congress finds such an emergency exists: *Provided*, That during the period in which the United States shall have taken possession, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the emergency board shall continue to encourage the settlement of the dispute by the parties concerned, and the agency or department of the United States designated to operate such enterprise or enterprises shall have no authority to enter into negotiations with the employer or with any labor organization for a collective-bargaining contract or to alter the wages, hours, or the conditions of employment existing in such industry prior to the dispute, except in conformity with the recommendations of the emergency board or a concurrent resolution of the Congress If the Congress or either House thereof shall have adjourned sine die or for a period longer than 3 days, the President shall convene the Congress, or such House for the purpose of consideration of an appropriate action pursuant to such statement and recommendations *Provided further*, That the act entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes' (Norris-LaGuardia Act), approved March 24, 1932 (U S C., title 29, secs 101-115), shall be applicable to the United States acting under the provisions of this title unless Congress by concurrent resolution provides otherwise in the particular case.

"SEC. 209 (a) In the event that the Government shall take possession of and operate any business enterprise or enterprises involved in a given dispute, the President shall designate the agency or department of Government which shall take possession of any business enterprise or enterprises including the properties thereof involved in the dispute and all other assets of the enterprise or enterprises necessary to such continued operation thereof as will protect the national health or safety.

"(b) Any enterprise or properties of which possession has been taken under this title shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as (1) such owners have reached an agreement with the representatives of the employees in such enterprise settling the issues in dispute between them, or (2) the President finds that the continued possession and operation of such enterprise by the United States is no longer necessary under the terms of the proclamation provided for in section 206: *Provided*, That possession by the United States shall be terminated not later than 60 days after the issuance of the report of the emergency board unless the period of possession is extended by concurrent resolution of the Congress

"(c) During the period in which possession of any enterprise has been taken under this title, the United States shall hold all income received from the operation thereof in trust for the payment of general operating expenses, just compensation to the owners as hereinafter provided in this subsection, and reimbursement to the United States for expenses incurred by the United States in the operation of the enterprise. Any income remaining shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. In determining just compensation to the owners of the enterprise, due consideration shall be given to the fact that the United States took possession of such enterprise when its operation had been interrupted by a work stoppage or that a work stoppage was imminent, to the fact that the owners or the labor organization, as the case may be, have failed or refused to comply with the recommendations of the emergency board or the conditions determined by the Congress to constitute a just settlement of the dispute; to the fact that the United States would have returned such enterprise to its owners at any time when an agreement was reached settling the issues involved in such work stoppage, and to the value the use of such enterprise would have had to its owners in the light of the labor dispute prevailing, had they remained in possession during the period of Government operation

"(d) Whenever any enterprise is in the possession of the United States under this section, it shall be the duty of any labor organization of which any employees who have been employed in the operation of such enterprise are members, and of the officers of such labor organization, to seek in good faith to induce such employees to refrain from a stoppage of work and not to engage in any strike, slow-down, or other concerted refusal to work, or stoppage of work, and if such stoppage of work has occurred, to seek in good faith to induce such employees to return to work and not to engage in any strike, slow-down, or other concerted refusal to work or stoppage of work while such enterprise is in the possession of the United States.

"(e) During the period in which possession of any enterprise has been taken by the United States under this section, the employer or employers or their duly designated representatives and the representatives of the employees in such enterprise shall be obligated to continue collective bargaining for the purpose of settling the issues in the dispute between them.

"(f) (1) The President may appoint a compensation board to determine the amount to be paid as just compensation under this section to the owner of any enterprise of which possession is taken. For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any such board the provisions relating to the conduct of hearings or inquiries by emergency boards as provided in section 207 of this title are hereby made applicable to any such hearing or inquiry. The members of compensation boards shall be appointed and compensated in accordance with the provisions of section 207 of this title.

"(2) Upon appointing such compensation board the President shall make provision as may be necessary for stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary to enable the compensation board to perform its functions.

"(3) The award of the compensation board shall be final and binding upon the parties, unless within 30 days after the issuance of said award, either party moves to have the said award set aside or modified in the United States Court of Claims in accordance with the rules of said court.

"SEC. 210. When a dispute arising under this title has been finally settled, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of all the proceedings, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make."

SEC 3 (a) The amendment made by the first section of this act shall not apply with respect to any dispute existing on the date of enactment of this act.

(b) The amendment made by section 2 of this act shall apply with respect to any dispute existing on the date of enactment of this act, and for such purposes (1) any reference in such amendment to an emergency board shall be deemed to refer to any existing board of inquiry appointed pursuant to section 206 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and (2) a proclamation authorized to be issued pursuant to section 206 of such act, as amended by this act, shall be deemed to have been issued in any case in which any such board of inquiry has been appointed.

SEC 4 The provisions of this act shall not be applicable with respect to any matter which is subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me enumerate briefly the salient points of the bill:

First, the bill provides for the appointment by the President of an emergency board whenever he finds, and issues a proclamation to that effect, that a dispute exists or threatens in a vital industry affecting the public interest.

Mr. President, you will notice as I read an outline of the major points of the bill, that the principles of the bill are identical in nature with the principles of the amendment I offered in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress for the handling of emergency disputes. We did not adopt the amendment, as the Presiding Officer well knows, but I am satisfied that had we passed it, and if it were the law on the books today, we would not be confronted with the coal crisis which America faces tonight. "Well," someone may say, "what makes you think, if the miners, as individual workers, refuse to work in the mines under an injunction handed down in accordance with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, that they would work under your bill, if the Government seized the coal mines, in accordance with the procedures of your bill? It is a fair question, but my answer is this: I have no question about the patriotism of the mine workers of America. As I have said before, it is quite a different thing to ask free Americans to go into the mines and mine coal for the Government of the United States, with the American flag flying over the mines, from giving them a choice of either mining coal under an injunction in accordance with the instructions and orders of a private employer, on the basis of the wages and hours and conditions of employment that

he would impose upon them, and for his profit dollars, or going to jail for contempt of court.

Mr. President, do not mistake me. I do not condone any failure on the part of any workers in the country to obey the spirit and the intent and letter of the law on the books, or of a court order seeking to carry out the law. I do not condone any violation of the law or violation of an injunction issued thereunder. But I can not remake human nature. The Congress of the United States cannot remake human nature. We must face some of the ugly realities of human nature, and one of those realities appears tonight to be that a great many thousands of coal miners are in effect saying, "We just won't mine coal for a private employer, in the absence of an agreement." They have not said, "We will not mine coal under terms and conditions imposed by the Federal Government through a seizure of the mines." The difference is a great difference in human psychology. If there is anything I learned in my more than 15 years' experience in the field of labor relations, it is that, when all is said and done, the human factor is the controlling factor in most labor disputes. It is necessary in each dispute to get down to an understanding of the human factors that have caused the disagreement which has sprung up between the parties. I am convinced that if we pass a fair seizure law which protects the legitimate rights of both the workers and the employers for the period of government operation of the mines, the coal miners and the operators will rise to their patriotic obligation of supporting the flag that will fly over their properties, and will proceed to work out some agreement satisfactory to the two sides, for the operation of the mines on their return to the owners. I believe that is true, and that is the third major premise I have laid down in this speech, Mr. President. If I am wrong about that, then on that premise, my argument will fall to the floor of the Senate. If I am wrong in my conviction that the miners will dig coal when the flag flies over the mines then, truly, I shall be stumped, Mr. President, because I shall then be hard put to think out any constructive answer to the question, What now?

I think we should try it, and if our seizure bill is fair, I think it will work and work immediately, and proceed to produce immediately the coal necessary to relieve the great suffering which is sweeping across America tonight. I said many of these things during the last session of the Congress when I pleaded on the floor of the Senate for a seizure bill of this type. I am just as convinced tonight that this is a much sounder approach to the problem than the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, which certainly have demonstrated, at least in this instance, that they cannot produce coal. I am afraid that what the Taft-Hartley law is producing, Mr. President, is a deepened resentment in the hearts of miners, which will plague us long after this dispute is finally settled.

That is one of the things that worry me so much, Mr. President. That is why I keep pleading with the Congress, "Let us go to work on this labor law, let us reevaluate it, let us modify it, so that we take out of it those sections which the evidence clearly demonstrates are the breeders of resentment in the hearts of American workers."

The record is overwhelming, Mr. President, that the Taft-Hartley law has become a great cause of growing resentment in the breasts of free workers in this country. They feel so many of its provisions are unfair, unjust, and discriminatory against their legitimate rights. I do not want to see this second session of the Eighty-first Congress go by without our coming to grips with the great problem of passing fair labor legislation. I believe we are so close together, Mr. President, as the result of our experiences under the Taft-Hartley law. I think we can get together, if we have the will as legislators in this second session of the Eighty-first Congress, on those modifications of the Taft-Hartley law necessary to make it a fair law and to remove from the hearts of millions of American workers the feelings of resentment which they now hold toward that law. I do not think we should play politics with it. We should not let it go into the 1950 congressional elections as one of the political issues, because I do not think it should really be considered an issue any longer.

The time has come to operate on the Taft-Hartley law in this session of the Eighty-first Congress. I offer this bill tonight as the first proposal in this session of Congress for a modification of the Taft-Hartley law. It goes to the very vital issue of how to handle emergency disputes.

The second provision of the bill that I would mention is the one which provides that a board is to report to the President with recommendations not later than 30 days after appointment. Third, at any time after issuing a proclamation of a national emergency, the President may report to Congress, making such recommendations as he sees fit. Fourth, in any case where a strike or lock-out continues after issuance of a proclamation, the President is required to submit to Congress a full report and whatever recommendations he sees fit to make, including a recommendation that the United States take possession of the business enterprise involved in the dispute.

I emphasize that provision, Mr. President, as one of the safeguards I have deliberately placed in the bill to avoid some of the dangers of unnecessary seizure, which might be proposed if the Congress did not have a check upon the executive branch of Government, which might want to seize when seizure in fact might not be necessary. Mr. President, we must make this system of checks and balances work in practice, and not merely talk about it. When we pass legislation we must keep in mind the great constitutional principle of our form of government that the legislature should check the executive, and the executive should check the legislative branch. The courts sit to check them both, and we in turn have our checks upon the courts.

Here is one of the checks which I provide specifically in this type of seizure bill in order to avoid some of the dangers of seizure that the junior Senator from Oregon fears very much. He wants to make certain that his bill is one which can be used only as a last resort and one which cannot be used arbitrarily by a President of the United States, but which can be used only after careful consideration has been given to the recommendations of an emergency board both by the President and by the Congress.

If the President recommends the taking of possession, he has the authority under the bill to take such action unless Congress, by concurrent resolution, within 5 days after the submission of such a recommendation, determines that such action should not be taken or enacts legislation to resolve the dispute and terminate the emergency.

During the period of Government operation, which is limited to 60 days, unless the period is extended by concurrent resolution of the Congress—another example of the congressional check I have in my bill, Mr. President—the Federal Mediation Service shall continue to encourage settlement.

The Government agency operating the seized property has no authority to negotiate with the employer or union, or to alter wages or conditions of employment except in conformity with the recommendations of the emergency board or concurrent resolution of Congress.

I do not know whether I can succeed in getting that point across, Mr. President, but that point is basic to the theory of this bill. It carries out a fundamental principle of negotiations for settling any labor dispute. I have said it before, but I want to get it into this speech, too, that the one thing, above all else, that must characterize negotiations for a settlement of a labor dispute when the Government has to intervene—mark what I say, Mr. President—when the Government has to intervene, is the principle of keeping the disputants in doubt about what the final settlement will be. Unless that be done, Mr. President, we play right into the hands of either labor's or the employer's side of the table, which may find it to its advantage to let the procedures of the law run their course. That is one of the difficulties involved in the present dispute. We could take the Taft-Hartley law in its present form and, as counsel for the union or for the employer, tell them with almost complete certainty just what is going to happen, step by step, as the law proceeds to be applied to the dispute. Therefore, Mr. President, either side, under the existing Taft-Hartley law, can determine at the very beginning of the dispute whether it is to its advantage to let the Taft-Hartley law flow in its procedures and be applied to the dispute.

I mean no criticism when I say this, Mr. President. I speak for a moment from a lawyer's standpoint as to what I think has happened, in part, in the coal case. I do not claim to know all the details of what has gone on in this case, but judging from what I have been advised in regard to the case, the attitude of at least one the parties, the operators, has been to sit tight and let the law follow its course

I was interested some time ago in reading an article in the Washington Post in which Cyrus Ching, the head of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, said, in effect—I do not have the article before me, so I not purport to give it verbatim—in answer to a question put to him by a newspaperman, that, for the most part, the negotiations have been characterized by the union making various offers and the employers saying, "No, no, no."

I have seen that happen in many cases, Mr. President. During the war, we sent many cases back to the parties because we became convinced that they were trying to use the board as the determiner of their dispute, rather than try to use the free collective-bargaining table as the medium for settling their differences.

So whenever we became convinced that collective bargaining had broken down because either side thought there would be an advantage in having the case go to the Board for determination, we sent the case back and said:

We shall take jurisdiction over this case only if we are convinced that you have acted in good faith and that you have really tried in all honesty to settle your differences between yourselves but can find no basis or common ground for settlement. Only then will we take jurisdiction.

I am suspicious, Mr. President, that in this particular case there are some persons among the operators who thought it would be to their advantage to let the Taft-Hartley law be applied to the dispute. Therefore, that is at least part of the explanation for the breaking down of negotiations between the parties. If that is true, Mr. President, it is an unfortunate thing. If it is true, I think we should do something about it. If it is not true in this case, Mr. President, it may very well be true in many cases. I think it has been true in many cases since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, because that law does not leave the parties in doubt as to what the legal procedures and legal consequences are going to be if they simply permit a given dispute to reach the point that a national emergency is created and the law has to be applied.

So, Mr. President, in my seizure bill I have left the parties in doubt. I do not propose a law which would allow either side to sit down and figure out in advance whether it will be to its advantage to look out the window when collective bargaining should be going on in good faith, and to say "No, no, no" to offers made by the other side. I have phrased the bill so that both will be in great doubt as to the economic consequences if they permit a situation to develop of such a national emergency that it threatens the health and safety of the country to the extent that the Government has to step in and exercise the arm of the law to protect the public welfare.

How have I done it? I have done it, Mr. President, as I did in my proposed amendment in the first session of this Congress, and which is one of the great differences between my seizure proposal and the other seizure proposals which have been offered on the floor of the Senate, by leaving it to the Government to determine, when seizure has been applied, what the wages, hours, and conditions of employment shall be and what the compensation of the operators shall be.

In other words, Mr. President, mine is a flexible procedure as far as economic compensation to both parties under Government seizure is concerned. It has some weaknesses. I know of no perfect solution. I can see some disadvantages to the economic compensation provision of my bill. But, in contrast to the provisions which last session were offered on the floor of the Senate, I think my provision is far superior, because it leaves the parties in doubt. That is in inducement for them to get together around the free collective bargaining table and keep the Government out of the dispute. I believe that free employers and free workers in America should recognize before it is too late that every time their course of conduct makes it necessary for the Government to enter into a labor dispute they jeopardize economic freedom in this country. After all, economic freedom belongs to us. It belongs to the people. Whether we have it or not is pretty much up to us. If labor and employers lose any degree of economic freedom in this country because of the Government's stepping into a labor dispute to protect the public interest, the fault is theirs, and not the Government's, because Government can do no less, as I said at the beginning of my speech.

So here I have a provision which I think will be an inducement to collective bargaining. It is a provision which keeps the parties in doubt. Here is what is going to happen to them economically if the Government must seize a plant or a mine. The Chair will remember that in some of the other seizure proposals which we had in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress there was a specific requirement to the effect that during the period of Government seizure wages, hours, and conditions of employment had to remain the same as they were at the time the dispute started. What good is that provision?

How much doubt does that create in the mind of an employer as to what is going to happen economically to the industry if Government seizes it? None at all. He might find, under that kind of law, that Government seizure would be a great advantage to him, and therefore he could just "sit tough," as we say in labor cases, and make no offer, make no concessions, and exercise no attempt at all to reach a good-faith agreement with the union.

Likewise, Mr. President, suppose there were a provision like that included in some previous proposals, to the effect, as I have seen recently in the press, that during Government seizure no profits shall go to the employer at all. That is just as unfair to the employer as a provision which states that the Government could not pay what the facts showed to be fair wages, and allow fair hours and fair conditions of employment.

The principle that I apply in labor relations is to make the law work the same way on both sides. I do not believe in applying a procedure in a labor case which benefits only one side to the dispute, or penalizes only one side to the dispute. This matter of fairness in labor disputes is a matter of applying procedures which give equality of procedural rights to both parties. That is why I have said so many times that one of the great weaknesses of the Wagner Act was that it violated the principle of equality of procedural rights of both sides to a dispute. Procedures under the Wagner Act were weighted in favor of labor. Procedural equality was not given to the employers under the Wagner Act.

As I have stated before, the Wagner Act violated a simple rule of the American playground—that the same rules should apply to both sides participating in a game. An umpire in a labor case cannot apply one set of rules to labor and another set to employers. That just is not fair. What I have pleaded for is a fair procedure for the setttlement of labor disputes. I think the procedure which I have just mentioned does exactly that in regard to the economic compensation which shall be allowed to both the workers and the employers under my seizure bill. It keeps both sides in doubt. I think that will prove to be a great inducement to the parties entering into an agreement between themselves, and doing it far in advance of seizure. Let me emphasize that, Mr. President. The great advantage of putting my seizure procedure on the books is that it will prove to be an inducement to the parties to enter into a free collective-bargaining agreement to avoid seizure.

Not because my seizure bill, if we have to apply it, is unfair, because I think it is so worded that neither side can get an advantage from its operation, but knowing that they cannot get an advantage from its operation, I think it will be a great inducement to them to settle their case without letting the conditions in the industry reach a point where the national health and safety are endangered.

The next point is No. 8. During the period of Government operation, all income received shall be held in trust for the payment of general operating expenses, just compensation to the owners—that is, Mr. President, until the decision is made as to what just compensation is, based on the facts of the individual case. For example, if employers are shown by the facts and the decision in the recommendations of the Emergency Board to have been guilty of bad faith, and if it is shown that they should have granted some of the requests of the union, their compensation is not going to be as much as would be the case if the Board finds that the union was at fault. That is the way I propose to keep the parties in doubt as to the economic effects of the bill.

It is a very important procedure. I repeat that point: During the period of Government operation, all income received shall be held in trust for the payment of general operating expenses, just compensation to the owners, as determined by the compensation board set up in the bill, and reimbursement of expenses incurred by the Government. Any income remaining is to be covered into the United States Treasury.

In determining just compensation, the compensation board must give consid-

eration, among other things, to the fact that the owners or the union, as the case may be, have failed or refused to comply with the recommendations of the emergency board, or the conditions determined by Congress to constitute a just settlement.

The bill provides that the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction law shall apply to the Government, unless the Congress by concurrent resolution provides otherwise in the particular case.

And last, provision is made in the bill so that no time will be lost in applying the bill forthwith to the pending coal case.

Mr. President, under the next to the last section of the bill the President does not have to go through all the procedure in the first part of the bill with respect to the appointing of a fact-finding board. That board exists already, and it is specifically provided in this section that the President can proceed right now, on the basis of the procedures already taken in the coal case, to make his recommendations to the Congress of the United States, the day after, or the same day, for that matter, that the bill passes the Congress, including a recommendation for seizure, if he believes that such a recommendation should be made to the Congress. In other words, I have provided in this section of the bill a section which saves every minute of time that can be saved under our legislative process in applying the seizure provisions of the bill to the pending dispute.

I close, Mr. President, by saying that I regret taking this much time at this late hour to discuss this bill, but I know very well from past experience that had I not made a statement as full as the statement I have made, which can be used for future reference, I would find myself confronted with a great many misinterpretations and misunderstandings as to what I actually did propose.

I offer the bill in the belief and hope that it is a constructive suggestion. I am open to any suggestions for modification of the bill which any Senator wishes to offer who can demonstrate that his modification is to be preferred to some particular provision in my bill. I offer it because I am deeply moved by a sense of duty that, as a Member of the Senate of the United States, I owe it to my constituency and I owe it to all the people of this country to make an attempt to find the answer to the question, What now?

Mr. President, I offer my bill as part of the answer to that question, and I plead with the Senate to recognize the great coal emergency which grips this country, I urge the Senate to set aside all other business until we dispose of this, because I think the American people have the right to have the Congress of the United States do all within its power to pass whatever legislation is necessary to meet the great emergency to our economy caused by the pending coal dispute.

RECESS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 3, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 2 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Calvin T. Durgin, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, First Fleet.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Jay S. Anderson	John G. Lewis
Richard K. Anderson	Robert E. Lockwood
George D. Arntz	Albert D. Lucas
Robert P. Beebe	Donald J. MacDonald
Sherman W. Betts	George B. Madden
James O. Biglow	Sanford L. Mead
Charles T. Booth II	Francis B. Merkle
William B. Braun	Alfred B Metsger
John H. Brockway	John O. Miner
Charles B Brooks, Jr.	George W. Molesworth
Elliott M. Brown	Philip W. Mothersill
Bruce L. Carr	Henry Mullins, Jr.
Max L. Catterton	Francis W. McCann
John L. Chew	Francis A. McKee
Charles O Cook, Jr.	Bernard F. McMahon
Richard H. Crane	Ray C. Needham
John D. Crowley	Carl F. Nieberle
Freeman Cutter	George R. Over
Earle V. Dennett	George E. Peckham
Lucian F. Dodson	James M. Peters
John O. F. Dorsett	Lawson P. Ramage
Rudolph J. Fabian	Frank G. Raysbrook
William H. Farmer	Henry A. Renken
John B. Fellows, Jr.	James R. Z. Reynolds
Reid P. Fiala	Robert M. Reynolds
Maxim W. Firth	Berton A. Robbins, Jr.
Robert A. Fitch	Edward L. Robertson, Jr.
John A. Fitzgerald	Anthony C. Roessler
Joseph E. Flynn	Thomas W. Rogers
Joseph F. Foley	Albert K. Romberg
Archie D. Fraser	Emery Roughton
Peter M. Gaviglio	Walter P. Schoeni
Harry M. S. Gimber, Jr.	William B. Sieglaff
Emmanuel T. Goyette	Ronald K. Smith
Myron W. Graybill	Victor H Soucek
Edward H. Guilbert	Richard C. Steere
Byron L. Gurnette	Eugene Tatom
Oscar E. Hagberg	Robert A. Theobald, Jr.
John F. Harper, Jr.	Theodore A. Torgerson
George A. Hatton	Thomas D. Tyra
Claude V. Hawk	Gordon A. Uehling
Richard R. Hay	Schermerhorn Van-Mater
Nelson M Head	Louis F Volk
Paul F. Heerbrandt	Hazlett P. Weatherwax
Robert B. Heilig	John A. Webster
Morris A. Hirsch	Karl R. Wheland
William W. Hollister	Albert F. White
Ernest C. Holtzworth	Donald T. Wilber
Edwin B. Hooper	George K. Williams
Robert E. Hudson	Lowell W. Williams
John N. Hughes	Russell C. Williams
Raymond P. Hunter	Walter C. Wingard, Jr.
Francis J. Johnson	Darwin M. Wisehaupt
Ashton B. Jones, Jr.	James M. Wood
Victor A. King	Edward A. Wright
Charles C. Kirkpatrick	Sinclair B. Wright
Peter R. Lackner	John T. Wulff
Sidney J. Lawrence	
William R. LeFavour	
Bafford E. Lewellen	

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 2 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS

Roy Victor Peel to be Director of the Census.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

William Webster to be Chairman of the Research and Development Board.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. John W. Roper, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Personnel).

Vice Adm. John D. Price, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief, Naval Air Training.

Vice Adm. Donald B. Duncan, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever blessed God, whose treasury of goodness is inexhaustible, we thank Thee for the gift of this new day with its opportunities to serve Thee and our fellow men.

May we sense the sanctity of our high vocation and never be recreant in the performance of any duty.

Emancipate us from those moods of discouragement and defeatism which storm the citadel of our souls when we face difficult problems.

Grant that we may be the messengers and mediators of helpfulness in hastening that glorious time when the forces of evil, which are impeding the progress of the kingdom of brotherhood and good will, shall be supplanted by the kind and gentle spirit of the Prince of Peace.

To Thy name we give the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 21, 1950, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5486. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, for the transfer and redistillation of spirits, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3159. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Idaho and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Snake River.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the

House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SELLING ITS LOCAL MEMBERS DOWN THE RIVER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States Chamber of Commerce is selling its members down the river. This organization, composed of 3,126 chambers of commerce and trade associations, is advocating concentration of industry and is opposing decentralization of industry by advocating the enactment of the so-called basing-point bill, S. 1008.

It is time for the local chambers of commerce to take a look at their parent organization, or I wonder if the local chambers of commerce are quitting their fight for local industry. The basing-point bill is an effort to legalize the old Pittsburgh-plus system, which discriminated against every section of the United States except the highly industrial areas around Pittsburgh, Pa. This system has been outlawed by the Supreme Court, but now an effort is made to legalize it through S. 1008. Local chambers of commerce are frequently voted in this way against the interest of their own localities. I wonder when they will wake up to what is going on.

For more than 20 years, as a Member of this body, I have observed the activities of the United States Chamber of Commerce. I have never known a time when there was a conflict of interest between big-business monopolies and small business that the United States chamber did not take the side of the big monopolistic interests. If I am mistaken in this, I would like for some Member to point out one instance wherein the United States chamber has ever taken the side of small business in opposition to big business.

The conferees, I understand, have agreed on a report on S. 1008. It is my understanding that it will not be taken up until after March 13 on the theory that the Supreme Court of the United States will probably pass on the Standard Oil of Indiana case by that time. This bill, if enacted, will invalidate the decisions of the United States district court and the United States circuit court of appeals holding in favor of independent gasoline dealers and against the Standard Oil of Indiana.

Pennsylvania is a great State. I have great respect and admiration for the Members of Congress in both Houses and on both sides of the aisle from that State, but I cannot vote to favor the industrial areas of Pennsylvania and thereby deprive my own section of Texas of the opportunity of securing industries that cannot be destroyed overnight by the monopolistic powers.

COCA-COLA

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the Empire State of the South, Georgia, and the home of Coca-Cola, I protest the recent action of the French Chamber of Deputies which in effect barred the sale of Coca-Cola throughout France. It is a calculated affront to the people of this country. If the French persist in this arbitrary movement, then I say that we should retaliate by taking proper action against certain French commodities, namely, wine, champagne and perfume. It is more than ridiculous to require the Coca-Cola company to prove that their product is not harmful before being allowed to resume distribution in France. In fact, it is such a healthful drink that doctors prescribe it for babies only a few months old. Mothers have found it to be a very effective colic remedy for their babies.

The French would have a more stable population if they drank more Coca-Cola and less wine and cognac. In my opinion it would do the French a lot of good to drink an abundance of this refreshing beverage for it would give them something they have needed since the war ended and that is a good belch.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by George Sokolsky.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by His Excellency Dr. Dirk Uipko Stikker, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands.

Mr. BARING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

THE WORLD CONGRESS OF PARTISANS OF PEACE

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the Communist-front organization, self-styled "The World Congress of Partisans of Peace," has announced that it is sending a delegation of 12 Europeans to the United States on March 3. It is further announced that the delegation expects to present a petition to this Congress.

The so-called Partisans of Peace, who wish to present a peace petition to the Congress of the United States of America, seem to work in most mysterious ways their wonders of peace to perform. While mouthing their peace talk, the Partisans are actively engaging in a monster campaign directed towards closing European ports to American shipments under the military defense arms program, a program which was hailed in the United States and in Western Europe as one of the bastions of true peace and in complete accordance with United Nations principles. The campaign is not content with limiting itself to propaganda, but makes active use of strikes and actual sabotage.

The second great peace effort of these partisans is to attempt to mobilize world public opinion behind a series of so-called peace proposals which coincide almost identically with those presented recently by the Russian delegation in the United Nations—and rejected promptly by that body. Perhaps we can understand the apparent anomaly between the talk and the actions of the Partisans of Peace when we consider that the best summary of its peace program is to be found in the official organ of the Cominform.

I wonder if the members of this visiting delegation will expect us to roll out a red carpet, decorate the House Chamber with the emblems of their party and remove the statue of Freedom from the Capitol dome?

THE ONE HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF TEXAS INDEPENDENCE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, may I take the time of the House for just a few moments to call attention to the fact that 114 years ago today Texas proclaimed her independence from Mexico with the aid of a handful of good old Southern boys, boys from New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and several other States. As you all know by reading newspapers and through association we Texans are a modest crowd. We do not like to extol what few virtues we may have, but the point is that at this day and time when the world is squeaking with fear and trembling with horror of war and distrust of all nations, some of the people of Europe could look back and emulate the example of Texas and Mexico. We are friends and neighbors. We like each other, and we trust each other. Neither covets anything that the other has. If the remainder of the world did as we do, there would never be any war or disaster.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. May I remind the gentleman of this House that but for a man named Sam Houston, who went from Tennessee to Texas, there would never have been a Texas, and that another distinguished SAM who went from Tennessee to Texas sits in the Speaker's chair in this House at this time.

Mr. THOMAS. We acknowledge with great gratitude the truthfulness of the gentleman's remarks.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, today's headlines deal with coal. It was the same yesterday and it will be the same tomorrow. From day to day we struggle with the surface symptoms of coal strikes and coal shortages, never seeking a permanent solution.

Let us at last face honestly one single fact. The coal industry is a sick industry, diseased and disabled beyond any one symptom such as the current labor-management dispute within the industry.

I think it is time that the Congress recognize the serious economic problem that here exists. What are we to do about an industry which is gradually becoming uneconomic and yet is vital to the Nation's welfare? What are we to do about the technological results of the substitution of other types of fuel for coal? None of us knows the entire answers to these problems.

I am, therefore, introducing a joint resolution calling for creation of a bipartisan coal commission to study the problems and prospects of the American coal industry. The commission is to attempt to determine what policies and programs by Government, business, labor, and others would end the terrible pattern of poverty and disaster in the coal fields and coal shortages in our cities and industries.

The commission would be formed in the same manner as the Hoover Commission; six members to be appointed by the President; six by the Vice President, three to be Senators; and six by the Speaker of the House, three to be Representatives.

The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Labor would be three of the President's six appointees.

The commission would be expected to submit its final report in January 1951. The staff would remain on for 90 days to assist the Congress in any legislative action contemplated. The commission would then go out of existence. The entire cost would be $250,000, a modest sum considering the scope and importance of the industry under study and the millions spent annually in an attempt to bring even an appearance of health to this sick industry.

I want to remind you again that this resolution is not concerned with the present coal situation, except as that situation is another in the long series of crises in the coal fields. We are seeking a long-range solution to a long-range problem of paramount importance.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he delivered on Washington's Birthday.

Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a proclamation issued by Governor Duff, of Pennsylvania, and other extraneous articles on Lithuanian Day.

Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PACKAGE FREIGHT SERVICE ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, today, in conjunction with scores of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I have introduced legislation which will reestablish the package freight service on the Great Lakes. Prior to World War II we had 27 package cargo vessels on the Great Lakes. These vessels were, at the beginning of World War II, converted into war service. Since that time the cost of construction has been such that the operators have not been able to go back into that type of business, and therefore this great inland waterway has been denied the carrying of package freight.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that by reason of the Ship Sales Act, which was passed 4 years ago, the Federal Government has sold to foreign countries 1,100 ships. The operators on the Great Lakes have been able to buy only two little LST's.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this measure will receive the support of all Members of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a statement presented to the Ways and Means Committee on the oil and gas depletion allowance.

THE PRESENT NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, more than 6 weeks ago, coal dealers from all over the Middle West came to Washington for a conference with Members of Congress concerning the serious situation that faced the Nation because of the coal shortage. At that time the miners, under orders from John L. Lewis, were on a 3-day workweek. After pointing out the consequences that might be expected—consequences that are now upon us—those coal dealers asked the Members of Congress who were present at that meeting what Congress could do to head off the suffering and hardship that were bound to come.

My answer to that question was: "The only recourse or action the Congress can take in view of the situation is to bring impeachment proceedings against the President on the grounds that we have passed the Taft-Hartley Act giving him the machinery to use in the coal emergency, and that in spite of his oath to enforce the laws, he refuses to use the machinery the Congress has given him." I say now that his refusal to act constituted a flagrant case of—to paraphrase a well-known quotation—"Truman fiddling while coal piles dwindle and America freezes." The situation at that time called for and justified impeachment proceedings.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we face another national emergency, another threat to our Nation's safety and general welfare, and President Truman not only refuses to do anything about it, but he stubbornly refuses to permit access to the evidence the Congress demands, the loyalty files of those playmates and collaborators of Alger Hiss that are still in the State Department—and he defies Congress to do anything about it.

In the face of the conviction of Alger Hiss for perjury, a conviction that carries with it proof of treasonable acts during war; in the face of the confession of Dr. Fuchs, the British scientist; in the face of the charge made by Senator MCCARTHY concerning playmates of Alger Hiss still holding important positions in the State Department; President Truman locks up the evidence against these traitors in high places, the loyalty files, and defies the Congress to do anything about it.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for treason. Yet our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, still maintains he is a friend of Alger Hiss, the traitor, and President Truman backs him up in his position. When a congressional committee started the investigation in the Alger Hiss case some 2 years ago, President Truman made fun of the investigation, made light of the charges against Hiss, dismissing them as a "red herring"—a red herring that has now come home to roost.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has the responsibility of facing this situation squarely, and of doing something about it. What can or should be done in the light of conditions in the executive department of the Government? I can see only one answer to that question, namely, impeachment proceedings against the President, the man mostly responsible for the present danger within our gates.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT BILL

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that consideration of the conference report on H. R. 4406, the international claims settlement bill, has been put off from today until next Tuesday. I hope the Members in the meantime will examine this utterly unnecessary and unjust bill and the amendments approved in conference, which take away any rights of Americans ever to have their claims for nationalization by Yugoslavia and other countries heard in any court in this country or elsewhere from now on. We are in the ECA law and in the pending point 4 bill urging private investment abroad by promising protection for private investors abroad. This bill goes in exactly the opposite direction by discouraging private investment through encouraging nationalization all over the world. The Yugoslav settlement has already been made. The Secretary of State now has authority to divide the settlement proceeds among American claimants, but their claims should be adjudicated either in the Court of Claims or the War Claims Commission. Instead, this bill sets up a new agency in the State Department, with three new $15,000 jobs. Under the conference report, they need not be lawyers, can write their own rules; a claimant will not need to know the law or evidence, but he will have to know the right people in the State Department. The conference report should be voted down.

RETURN THE GREEK CHILDREN TO THEIR HOMES

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs BOLTON of Ohio Mr. Speaker, I take the floor of this House today to join my voice with that of all the mothers of the free world in protest against the abduction of Greek children—28,000 of them—by the ruthless forces behind the iron curtain.

History tells us that Greece suffered a like tragedy before. Can it be possible that mankind has not advanced beyond the point where little children are torn from their homes to be enslaved, to be trained in every form of degradation?

Mr. Speaker, as I have read the accounts of this outrage and the many protests that have been made against it, I have found no more poignant words than those of the Queen of Greece, the mother of all Greek children, in her broadcast of December 29 and her audience with the press. May I read them into the RECORD?

In the name of the whole Greek nation, especially in the name of the stricken families, I ask the civilized world today: Pray with me for the fate of these 28,000 abducted children. Their mothers have come to me and asked for help. I have seen into their desperate eyes and listened to their heartbreaking sobs. It is with their tortured souls and their empty arms that I turn today to all of you and beg you for God's sake and your children's sake, help me rouse the conscience of the world, add your voice to ours to bring back our children to their mothers' arms. Too long has the civilized world remained silent. Silence in the face of such an outrage can only add to the crime itself and turn all of us into culprits.

Have you forgotten that some years ago the fate of one little boy called Lindbergh shocked humanity as a whole? In Greece we mourn the fate of 28,000 little Lindberghs. Their fate is no less tragic. They have not only been physically torn from their families and beloved surroundings, but their innocent little souls are being systematically poisoned against their parents, their country, and our God.

This Christmas no loving mother has told them the story of the smiling Jesus child. No message of love can come to them in the concentration camps behind the iron curtain But they are waiting to be saved by all of us who still believe and have faith in Christ Jesus when He said.

"Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not. For of such is the Kingdom of God."

The same day the Queen made the following statement in her audience with the foreign correspondents:

I thank you for giving me the opportunity to meet you this evening. I would like to ask you, however, to feel that it was not you who came to me but that I came to you, for this day the whole of Greece will observe as one of deep mourning for the abduction of 28,000 of her children My husband and I made many journeys to villages and have seen and heard stories of parents who had lost their children. We had always great hopes that in international conferences justice would be done. Unfortunately not a single child came back I come to you tonight and I am begging you as a mother and not as a queen—because queens do not beg, but mothers should—to help me rouse the conscience of the enlightened world. Mothers come confidently to me to help them find their children and tell me their grief. Their grief is also my grief. Twenty-eight thousand children have been torn from their mothers' arms and are suffering away from their families, without their mothers and without God.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution expressing it to be the sense of this Congress that the President and the Department of State take all possible action to find these Greek children and return them to their homes.

OTTUMWA, IOWA, SITE FOR UNITED STATES AIR ACADEMY

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable interest in the proposal for the establishment of a West Point of the air, or a United States Air Academy, somewhere in the United States.

Today I am introducing a bill providing for the establishment of such an institution at Ottumwa, Iowa, which I believe presents an ideal location for this school, and perhaps the best location in the State of Iowa and the only one that has any chance of being selected. In the early days of World War II when the Navy was seeking a location for a primary air field, the citizens of Ottumwa, Iowa, a city of about 40,000, secured 1,440 acres in a square tract and comprising as rich and productive land as there is anywhere on earth. This tract is 1½ miles square and is about 6 miles from the city of Ottumwa. The patriotic people of Ottumwa raised the money to purchase this land from the several owners and deeded it to the United States Government for the sum of $1, after paying something like $200 an acre for each of 1,440 acres—a sum approaching $300,000. I have not heard of any other practical example of generosity and patriotic zeal to match that demonstrated by the people of Ottumwa.

The Federal Government spent in the neighborhood of $20,000,000 in preparing a magnificent air base with runways a mile and a half long, and constructed a large number of permanent buildings—dormitories, hospital, and training quarters, and so forth. Among other buildings there is a gymnasium or recreation building in which is located the largest indoor swimming pool in the world

Should the Department of Defense in its plans for a permanent air academy require additional land for the school, it can be obtained at a reasonable price adjoining or adjacent to the present air field which has at the present time all the utilities—water, central heating plant, electricity, sewage disposal, and so forth, and a permanent all-weather highway from Ottumwa to the gate of the air base.

Before any selection of a site is made for a permanent air academy certainly the committee will do well to look into the desirability of this location and facilities offered at this site—already owned and paid for by the Government, with many buildings, worth millions of dollars, already erected.

Many of the splendid flying officers of the Navy of the late war were trained at this base. The Government owns the site, and many of the buildings that would eventually be needed are already erected and ready for use. I know of no comparable site where facilities already are available.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today in the consideration of the bill H. R. 2392 and include excerpts from the hearings as well as other extraneous matter.

EMERGENCY ACTION IN COAL CRISIS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, many railroads have less than

10 days' coal on hand. Schools are closing across the country. Even hospitals are pinched. Over 600,000 men are out of work. Here is a proposal for action:

Let the President name an emergency coal award board consisting of the Director of the United States Public Health Service, the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, and three men chosen to represent labor, business, and the public.

Let this seven-man board in closed session hear the reports of the Federal conciliators in the coal strike. Let the board then make its own recommendations for an award for a 90-day contract subject to extension.

Then let the President call upon both sides in the coal controversy, miners and operators, to get back to work on the basis of the award, and let him protect them, if necessary, in line with the provisions of H. R. 7417, which I introduced a week ago.

Mr. Speaker, national safety and welfare are at stake. It is late now. Further delay means national disaster.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JUDD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make today during the consideration of the bill H. R. 2392, and include some pertinent material relative thereto.

CANADA DOES IT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the article is Canada Does It. They are keeping their industries humming. They are having no strikes. They have cut down their taxes. They have reduced their budget, and they are getting along fine. I congratulate Canada. One of the Members said to me this morning, "After a while we will not only admit some of the provinces, but we will take Canada into our Government."

Let me say to you Congressmen, if you do not do the things like Canada is doing them in a good conservative, honest way, Canada will take over the United States, and you will be mighty glad to come in under Canada's rule, because they are sound and sensible and they are doing the things that are right and honest and just for their own people. This Congress and administration is nothing but a bunch of squanderers; the way we are handling things in the United States, you are going to wreck this Government. If you do not honestly and sincerely rule our country with economy, justice, and sincerity as our Constitution provides, Canada will be strong and we will be bankrupt.

Canada seems to have sense and we will have no cents.

The article I refer to is as follows:

CANADA DOES IT

In Canada industry is humming; there are no strikes, construction of all types is creating records; and an investment boom is developing untapped natural resources. From 1946 through 1949 the Canadian Government not only balanced its budgets but had surpluses in each year. During the same period Canada's national debt was reduced 13 percent, or by $1,620,677,000 At the same time the Dominion Government has carried on a program of broad tax reduction In 1946 a 16-percent cut in personal income taxes went into effect. In 1947 larger cuts averaging about 23 percent of personal incomes went into effect. Income taxes were reduced further in 1948 and the excess-profits tax on partnerships and corporations was terminated January 1, 1948. At the same time the 3-percent tax on gasoline was repealed, along with a number of excise taxes. The Canadian Government says that the cuts in taxes ordered for 1949 meant an increase of more than $250,000,000 in the spending income of about 13,500,000 Canadians The Government also maintains that the tax reductions lowered the cost of purchases by the people by $92,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I had visitors in my office this morning from one of the splendid cities in my district. The city hall has closed for want of fuel. The courthouse has closed for want of fuel. All of the schools of that city are closed for want of fuel.

Now, what are we going to do about it? What can be done about it, and where is the organized effort on the part of the Congress to deal with this problem? The distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has made the only suggestion that I have heard in the well of this House that proposes to deal with this problem. Unless we do deal with it in some manner pretty soon you will face disaster in this country of yours and mine that is unparalleled in its consequences.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a farmer in Illinois.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the coal strike has developed into an insurrection against the Government and cannot be longer tolerated. I would put it down if it called for the use of every soldier in the country. I am confident that the President has done his best in an endeavor to bring about an amicable adjustment. If he has not the power to enable him to deal adequately with the situation, I am confident that the Congress would give it to him for the asking.

Mr. Speaker, this forcible display of opposition against law is creating a bad state of mind. People are beginning to ask embarrassing questions. They want to know where the supreme power resides, whether in the hands of the Government or in the hands of the labor unions. Their faith in the strength and in the purposes of government is beginning to wane

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

SURPLUS COMMODITIES

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, on February 3 I introduced H. R. 7134, to provide for authority for the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture to give to all of the States, on the basis of population, the surplus Irish potatoes and eggs which had been acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation and which they were unable to dispose of as provided by law and which were deteriorating very rapidly and will soon spoil and be a total loss.

Since that time I have learned that the Government has also acquired a surplus of 85,000,000 pounds of butter and that this butter will spoil very shortly unless the same is utilized.

Therefore, on yesterday I introduced House Joint Resolution 430, to include in my suggested legislation, butter as well as all other commodities that are held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and which cannot be disposed of in accordance with law. The bill also provides that the same shall be distributed to the people of the United States gratuitously.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WIER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GREAT LAKES SHIPPING LEGISLATION

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to revive package-freight and passenger shipping on the Great Lakes, and an identical bill has been introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] and by a number of other Congressmen from the States bordering the Great Lakes from Minnesota to New York. This bill has the support of businessmen, shippers, labor unions, port authorities, chambers of commerce, and other Great Lakes groups, who all agree that unless legislation of this type is enacted into law, there is no hope for any possible revival of package-freight and passenger shipping on the Great Lakes.

Package-freight service on the Lakes has always been an integral part of our national transportation system. Dairy products, flour, canned goods, packinghouse products, and many others flowed eastward, while manufactured goods of all types supplemented by automobile traffic were carried northward and westward to vast consuming areas. This freight was carried at substantially lesser cost than offered by other mediums. In 1939 there were 24 ships on the Lakes engaged in package-freight trade, and 19 vessels carrying passengers. Today demand for package-freight and passenger service is greater than ever. But now there are no package-freight vessels on the Lakes and the number of passenger vessels has been reduced to a paltry few, which, with hardly an exception, are outmoded wooden-superstructure type, unfit for modern service requirements as well as unsafe for passenger travel. The recent *Noronic* disaster in Toronto points clearly to our duty to assist in providing modernized, fireproof ships for American service on these great inland waterways. It is impossible for ship operators to build ships for these trades today because of high capital outlay required for new-vessel construction. This has resulted in total destruction of package-freight commerce on the Lakes and stops ship operators, despite urgent public demand in several highly congested traffic areas, from providing greatly needed passenger service.

During the war, the Government built thousands of vessels costing billions of dollars. Almost 700 of these ships have been sold to American owners for ocean operation and over 1,100 have been sold to foreign-flag operators. All were sold under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 at a fraction of today's cost. During the war, the Government requisitioned and removed most of the package freight and passenger carriers from the Lakes. But, while the Ship Sales Act has enabled American and foreign ocean-shipping operators to buy these Government-built ships at a moderate cost, only two small vessels—LST's—have been sold for use on the Lakes.

Great Lakes ship operators have been unable to take advantage of the prices established under the Ship Sales Act because of a technicality in that law. Under that act, allowances up to 99 percent of the sales price of a vessel have been given by the Commission to reconvert ships for use in salt-water trades. But that act does not permit them, under existing legal interpretations, to grant similar allowances to Great Lakes purchasers to convert vessels for use on the Lakes. As ocean vessels require major conversion for use on the Lakes, this has prevented purchase of ships under that act by Lake operators. The primary purpose of this bill is to remedy this situation.

The essential effect of this bill is to authorize the Maritime Commission to make allowances up to 90 percent of the floor price to purchasers of a limited number of vessels for exclusive use on the Great Lakes for:

First. The fair installed value of unnecessary existing ship's equipment, and the cost of removal thereof;

Second. The cost of transfer to the Lakes;

Third. The cost of conversion for Lakes service.

The last sections of this bill merely extend the existing Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance Act to cover purchase of these vessels for Lakes use and restrict time of completion of transfer.

Enactment of this bill would require no appropriation of public funds. On the contrary, the Government will receive money for vessels presently deteriorating in laid-up fleets which annually cost the Government large sums to maintain. It will, moreover, give jobs to thousands of seamen, longshoremen, and shipyard workers on the Great Lakes who are presently unemployed due to the inactivity of package freight and passenger trades. It will revive commerce and trade throughout the vast Great Lakes area. In addition, operation of these ships and the resulting wages will increase tax payments to the Treasury. This is the only piece of legislation I have seen in recent years which will give substantial benefits without cost to the Government.

SMALL-BUSINESS FRONTS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the National Small-Business Men's Association is holding its convention this week here in the Nation's Capital.

The Members of Congress should be under no illusion as to this particular organization.

It is strictly a phony front for big business. It is antilabor and therefore supports the principle of big business, which frequently is the opposite of that which is good for small business.

The organization is chiefly financed by million- and billion-dollar corporations, as proved by the report of the House Committee on Small Business.

PROPAGANDA

BIG BUSINESS MONEY HIDES BEHIND FAKE SMALL-BUSINESS FRONTS

(No. 3 of a series)

This is a story of the way big business puts over its propaganda behind front organizations which claim to represent small business. The story is not told by labor, or any organization of workers, but by a committee of the United States Congress, the House Committee on Small Business, which was organized to look out for the interests of small business throughout the country.

It is the story of four organizations, or rather of two pairs of twin organizations. One member of each twin is supported, more or less openly, by contributions from big business. The other member of each twin claims to be a grass-roots organization of small-business men throughout the country.

In each case, the committee found, the money from big business helped to pay the expenses of the small-business organization. The committee report asks whether such organizations, supported by big-business money, can really be relied upon to support the interests of small business.

Labor unions their chief target

One of the sets of twins is made up of the National Small Business Men's Association and the Small Business Economic Foundation, Inc., both of which are headed by DeWitt Emery of Akron, Ohio. Emery gets a salary of $18,000 a year from the association. The foundation does not register under the Lobbying Act, so its finances are not a matter of public record.

Although both use small business in their names, they avoid specifically small-business issues, the congressional report states. Instead, they concentrate most of their guns on the labor unions.

The association has not made public the source of its funds, but a letter sent out by Emery in 1947 seeking contributions for the foundation disclosed that the foundation's supporters include some of the largest corporations in the country, such as United States Steel and Standard Oil. He listed 70 donors, of which 5 were billion-dollar corporations and another 12 in the $100,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 class.

Took in $129,000 in year

The association is registered as a lobby, listing total receipts in 1948 of $159,291. It has been a particular friend of the Taft-Hartley Act. The foundation confines itself to inserting advertisements in the newspapers and putting out pamphlets.

The foundation even has printed comic books, including a labor sequence. "It ends," the congressional committee report notes, "with a good strike-breaking punch line, 'O. K. Let's go back to work.'"

The other pair of twins is the National Tax Equality Association and National Associated Business Men. Here, as labor disclosed in a report of a committee hearing last fall, the link is the business counselor partnership of Scott & Schuler.

Vernon Scott is executive head of the NTEA and Loring A. Schuler holds a similar post in NAB, but the partnership receives $48,000 a year from the NTEA and only $10,000 from NAB.

The Tax Equality League is the major organization in the country for the spread of propaganda against cooperatives, sup-

ported in large part by private utility companies. NAB, of course, is its small-business front.

In fact, Scott told the committee that NTEA pushed the organization of NAB because it wanted its literature distributed and wanted to gather facts at the local level.

Put up money for local branches

Although it was claimed that the two organizations were entirely separate, the committee found that in many instances they had the same officers, and the NTEA was found to have fostered the growth of local branches of NAB to the tune of $28,000 by payments to the local secretaries.

A study of Lobby Act reports presented the committee staff with one mystery in the form of three different figures as to the retainer paid to Scott & Schuler by NAB for the year 1948. Scott gave the figure as $20,000, Schuler gave it as $9,999.97, while the NAB report put it at $8,333 30.

The report notes that efforts to get further information on financing and other matters met with no success. "Their representatives," the committee says, "have been short on promises, and even shorter on performance."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio debate between Senator BRICKER and Senator TOBEY.

PRONOUNS HAVE GENDER

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of little consequence perhaps to some frustrated individuals who want to do their "big stuff" and impeach President Truman and prosecute Secretary of the Navy Francis P. Matthews, but to all decently chivalrous men the following matter which I am about to refer to is and should be a matter of great moment—great importance and real concern. I now call attention to what our United States Government Printing Office has done to one of our very worthy lady Members. I quote from the calendar of Thursday, March 2, 1950:

On motion of Mrs. ROGERS, and by unanimous consent, ordered: That on Thursday, March 2, 1950, immediately after the address by Mr. MASON, "he" be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

True, old Joe Stalin must get great aid and comfort from reactionaries who demand the impeachment of our President, the prosecution of the Secretary of the Navy, the cries about national chaos and bankruptcy, and the creeping paralysis drift of our Nation toward welfare statism, socialism, and other weird, wild preachments which confirms the lies he, Stalin, has told and is telling, about ineffective, decadent democracies and their over-all unfitness; but what will old pipe-smoking Joe Stalin say about us when we begin to refer to our distinguished Member of Congress the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, as "he"? I think the United States Government Printing Office should be admonished, at least, and I recommend that we give our great impeachers and prosecutors their big chance to do the admonishing, because they excel greatly along that sole line, anyway.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is biting our distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], whom I greatly admire. He says we have not done anything about the strikes. In the first place, we Republicans, his party, my party, is not in power. The President, whose duty it is to enforce the law, refuses to act. Moreover, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] both made suggestions. To my mind both suggestions tended in the same direction, that is, the appointment of a commission, a decision by the commission and acceptance by industry and the labor unions. The end of that type of procedure is Government operation—in the end Government ownership.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] says coal is a sick industry. Sure it is sick. Why is it sick? Because the increased cost of coal is taking away the coal market and that the operators cannot afford to operate. They are losing the market. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], a coal operator, a very successful one—a reasonable man, a friend of the men who work, especially of the miners—and other operators, cannot afford to produce the coal at a price so that it can be sold profitably and in quanties great enough to take all that is produced. That is one thing.

The next thing and the fundamental issue down at the very bottom, I may say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], is that there are plenty of strip mines in this country and enough miners who want to work so that if the local and State authorities would enforce the law or if they fail, if the National Government would protect the men who want to dig coal there would be coal for everyone. Until we get protection, or miners who want to work, our suffering people will not get coal. The failure of local and State authorities to enforce the law is no excuse for the President's failure to protect those who would dig coal if they had protection from violence.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier in the day and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

THE WORLD CONGRESS OF PARTISANS OF PEACE

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] on his remarks in reference to the World Congress of Partisans of Peace. As a matter of fact, the first announcement of the proposed trip of this delegation of 12 people to the United States was made in the Paris Communist newspaper Humanité, February 18 issue.

The trouble with these partisans of peace is that they are simply a propaganda front. If they are really sincere in trying to address the American Congress and promote peace they should likewise certainly try to arrange with Joe Stalin so that 12 Members from this Congress could go over to Russia and address the Supreme Council of the Soviet and explain our point of view.

The State Department should make as a necessary condition that when the right is given to our Congressmen to go and address the Soviets under similar conditions, then the people representing this Communist group should also address us. In all fairness, this group should understand that international cooperation is not a one-way street.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

MEETING OF THE SMALL-BUSINESS MEN'S ORGANIZATION IN WASHINGTON

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take exception to the remarks made by the gentleman from California in which he charged the little-business men who are assembling here in Washington are a front for the big business of the Nation. That same charge was made a year ago. It was denounced as being untrue by the president, Mr. Emery, of the little-business men's organization.

Mr. Speaker, the little-business men of this country are the backbone of this Nation and employ two-thirds of the laboring men of the Nation.

The gentleman from California also states that the little-business men are antilabor. A question has been asked why we cannot do something about these

strikes. The fact is that the Taft-Hartley law was passed by a tremendous majority of both Houses and became law over the veto of the President. Politics has caused the condition nationally that we are in today, with the men refusing to go back to work. It has been caused by politics and nothing else, which is dividing the country today.

The President has never fully supported or executed the law. He has continued to speak against it. It has not had a fair trial, with the result of the present chaos.

KEY DEER

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and exten my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have many serious problems before our country today, problems of great magnitude. The problem I am going to speak to you about in this little talk is not one of great magnitude, but I think of great importance. I have introduced a bill today to provide for the protection of the Key deer, now almost extinct. There are only 25 of them left. Columbus mentioned them on his fourth trip to the New World. Three years ago there were 70 of these deer in existence, and in earlier times they were quite numerous, but there are only 25 left today. They are only 25 inches tall, only about 3 feet long, and weigh about 40 pounds. They are extinct except for this little herd of 25 now on the Florida Keys. People are killing them, both tourists and the people that live there and settlers are gradually destroying their breeding grounds.

The bill authorizes the establishment of a national wildlife management area, primarily on Big Pine Key, north of Key West, Fla. The majority of the deer live on that Key. Although these deer can put up with the hazards of nature, swimming great distances from island to island in search of water and forage, they are becoming extinct because of the encroachments of civilization and on account of their slaughter by residents and tourists.

It was in 1915 that the last of a species of wild parakeets was killed in Florida; and the last passenger pigeon, formerly a native, died in captivity in a zoo in 1914 The preservation of this interesting little deer may some day be of economic value, even if we did not consider the moral obligation which I feel is also present.

The limited area of habitat of this deer is also occupied by the roseat spoonbill—the pink curlew—now approaching local extinction. The reddish egret is staging a limited recovery from near extinction in the same area and the rare great white heron and white-crowned pigeon are also found there. The vanishing manatee, a sea mammal, is found in small numbers in the locality.

It has been a practice of some residents and visitors to put dogs on the Keys to run the deer to the beaches where they are killed from boats. Another method used is fire lighting at night. Also areas of brush are burned to attract concentrations of the deer on new growths of grasses. But the encroaching human uses of the limited land area involved are almost as destructive by eliminating forage.

It will be a nip and tuck fight to save the deer from extinction. I hope these plucky little animals, which survive hurricanes and droughts and the other hazards of this rugged semimarine habitat, can be helped to survive the hazards of civilization. If their rate of decrease continues at the average decrease of the last 3 years there will be none alive by this time next year.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include statements and excerpts.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I measure my words in what I am going to say. Before we adjourned last fall, I called upon the President of the United States to follow the law of the land in order to settle the coal strike. During the past 2 months many of us, in remarks here on the floor of the House, have repeated that call. The President's lack of respect for the law of the land has encouraged others to disrespect the Taft-Hartley Act, the law of the land. Is the President on the side of law and order or not?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues stood in this well this morning and talked about the problems of the coal industry. My good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] referred to me as a coal operator suffering from lack of markets due to the high cost of production. No; I am not suffering from high cost. I am suffering from too much Taft-Hartley. I have the firm conviction that if the Taft-Hartley bill had been repealed we would have had no problem in the coal industry today. We would have had honest-to-goodness, solid collective bargaining, and the coal problem would have been settled over the bargaining table. Now it cannot be done. The Taft-Hartley Act has so restricted collective bargaining and has thrown the balance to one side to the extent that we do not now have free collective bargaining. The quickest way to settle the coal strike would be to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and let the operators and the miners get busy over the bargaining table.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to make some reference to some suggestions that were made about the small business organizations now meeting here In view of these remarks just made, however, let me say this to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that when there was an amendment here in this Eighty-first Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act there were only 37 votes for it on a record vote out of 435.

Secondly, the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to deal directly with national emergency strikes were written after very careful consideration. Those provisions have provided the best possible way yet to be devised by anyone to deal with these national emergency strikes that threaten the safety, health, and welfare of the American people.

The blame is not on the Taft-Hartley Act. The blame is on the President of the United States for not invoking the provisions of the act when he should have invoked them The blame is upon the President of the United States for throwing that act and those provisions into the arena of politics in the last campaign, for constantly criticizing the act, scorning its provisions.

Be it remembered that six times before that conduct took place the act was invoked, with success and without prejudice to the rights of anyone. It could have been successful again had it been invoked in proper time and in proper spirit. The responsibility ought to be where it belongs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made to the Committee on Ways and Means on February 14.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO 491)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, Eightieth Congress, approved June 29, 1948, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 2, 1950.*

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent

resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 204) for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche, and authorizing its reenrollment.

STATE RURAL REHABILITATION CORPORATIONS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 382 for further consideration, and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned yesterday afternoon we had just listened to the explanation of the bill by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. I shall support the rule because I am convinced that some legislation may be in order on the subject of the rural rehabilitation corporations that were set up some years ago. However, I find myself in disagreement on some points with the chairman of the committee and unless amendments are accepted which will meet these objections I cannot support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing here with an extremely important measure. Something like $50,000,000 is involved. Unless we weigh carefully the provisions of this bill we could allow several million dollars to get out of the Treasury to be used in an improvident and unbusinesslike way by revived rural rehabilitation corporations that are now latent, or invite the States to develop new and overlapping plans for the use of this money.

I plead with the House to listen carefully to the discussion of this measure. As I indicated, I will support the rule because I think the House should take a look at the problem.

I have not seen the proposed amendment referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina. I have seen the amendment which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] proposes to offer as a substitute for it. I am very much impressed by the reasons advanced by the gentleman from Kansas for his substitute approach.

I think perhaps I should reserve any further comment until the debate in the Committee of the Whole. My purpose in asking for time in the discussion of the rule is to emphasize the critical importance of this measure.

The Congress can take great pride in what we have done for rural rehabilitation. Beginning with the early relief measures millions of dollars have been spent in a loan program and to some extent in a grant program to help farmers readjust their economic situations and to find their place on the land in a self-sufficient way and not become charges on our relief rolls. I wonder if you know that almost 1,000,000 farmers have been rehabilitated under that program. A great part of the loans have been repaid.

In 1937 Congress adopted what I regard as one of the most significant social programs ever undertaken by any government. Inspired as we were by the famous Bankheads of Alabama, the beloved Speaker at that time, William Bankhead and the Senator from Alabama, John Bankhead, and by Marvin Jones, one of the great men who have served in the House of Representatives, we enacted the Bankhead-Jones program with two titles, one a loan program to help in current farm operations and the other a farm-tenant program to help them acquire land for family-sized farms; both of these programs have worked remarkably well.

After the corporations were set up early in the rehabilitation program it became evident that the money was not being used profitably and in line with the purposes of that legislation. So the relief organizations ordered the return of those funds to the United States, and they have since been administered by the Department of Agriculture. Under the bill in its present form, as advanced by the gentleman from North Carolina, this money would be returned to those corporations with no integrated plan whatever. We stand to lose literally millions of dollars because of the abandonment of a unified plan which the Congress worked out under the Tarver amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act and the various bills relating to the Farmers Home Administration, which under the able leadership of Dillard Lasseter is making good. It is proposed under this bill to turn that money back to 43 States. We do not know what the respective plans will be. We cannot be sure at all it will be used in accordance with the purposes of the original act, and for that reason unless these amendments which are to be offered provide for some protection to the Government, we should not pass this bill

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr MACK of Illinois). The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. COLMER Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who preceded me has had wide experience in connection with this program. I doubt if there is a better informed man in the Halls of Congress. No man could more ably express his views on the provisions of this bill than the gentleman who preceded me. I would like to call the attention of the Members to the importance of this bill. There are a number of Members who have said, "Well, this does not affect us very greatly. Since we do not have any corporations in our State, or since it is of such insignificance anyway, we do not need to pay any attention to it."

I want to impress upon the Members of the House that the bill we are about to consider will provide for the dissipation of about $50,000,000 worth of assets. I think that is very important. If these assets which are now being used in a revolving fund for the furtherance of the work of the Farmers Home Administration are so dissipated so that it will mean adding to the annual appropriation in order to make up that difference, which will amount to between $10,000,000 and $15,000,000 every year, I am sure Members will realize the importance of the situation.

Also, you must remember in the liquidation of this trust it is apt to throw the country into a great state of confusion even to the extent, perhaps, of creating 43 separate agencies to carry on the work which is now being done by one Federal agency. I think that is something we ought to pay a great deal of attention to. I am in favor of the rule which will give the House an opportunity to consider the bill, and I urge the Members who can possibly do so to look into and study the issues involved.

Some of you will recall that in the closing days of the last session I called the attention of the Members to the fact that it would affect some of them in their States. I have not heard any criticism of the way in which the bill is being administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr TALLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr TALLE I want to underscore what the gentleman said just a moment ago. These funds can and should be administered by the Farmers Home Administration, a Federal agency that has done a good job in the field of rural rehabilitation ever since it was created in October 1946 To set up State agencies duplicating the present FHA programs does not make sense to me.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman. I know he has given much consideration to the present measure, and I am hopeful that when some of these amendments are proposed they will clear up the situation. I think as far as the bill is concerned it will be very detrimental to the work of the Farmers Home Administration and the work being done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 76]

Abbitt	Coudert	Holifield
Allen, La.	Davenport	Jackson, Calif
Arends	Dawson	Jacobs
Barrett, Pa.	Dingell	Jennings
Beall	Douglas	Kunkel
Bentsen	Eaton	Latham
Blackney	Ellsworth	Lichtenwalter
Boggs, Del.	Engle, Calif.	Lovre
Boykin	Fellows	Lyle
Brooks	Ford	McConnell
Buckley, Ill.	Fugate	McGrath
Bulwinkle	Gilmer	McKinnon
Burton	Granahan	McMillen, Ill.
Carlyle	Hall, Leonard W.	Macy
Carroll	Hébert	Marcantonio
Cavalcante	Hedrick	Martin, Mass.
Celler	Herter	Meyer
Chatham	Hoffman, Ill.	Miller, Calif.
Christopher		Morrison

Norton	Scott Hardie	Towe
O'Hara, Ill.	Scott,	Whitaker
Powell	Hugh D., Jr	White, Calif.
Redden	Shafer	White, Idaho
Regan	Shelley	Wilson, Texas
Rooney	Sheppard	Woodhouse
Sabath	Smathers	
Sadowski	Smith, Ohio	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

BRASS AND GOLDPLATE—A REPORT ON THE DEMOCRATS $100-A-PLATE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have requested and obtained permission to speak out of order because of a remarkable change which seems to be appearing in American political life and which I believe should be brought to the attention of the House.

For some years now the Democratic Party has been masquerading as the champion of the common people while using the facilities of governmental propaganda to claim that the Republicans were the servants of the vested and special interests. This falsehood, multiplied a millionfold under the Hitler technique of endless repetition, has been repeated so often that many people got to believing that it was a fact. But facts have a strange way of overtaking falsehood. Year after year the number of large contributors to the Democratic Party, contributors who represent the corporate and the special interests of this country, have far exceeded those contributing to the Republican Party. At the same time the number of small contributions, ranging from $1 and up, which have been made to the Republican Party have far exceeded similar contributions made to the Democratic organization.

Even so-called New Deal columnists have noted repeatedly how Wall Street executives moved into high official positions in Government during the past 6 or 7 years, but the oft-told falsehood seemingly persisted.

In recent weeks two events have occurred in Washington which sort of demonstrate to the country the real truth of the situation. I refer to the Lincoln Day box supper held by the Republican Party in the Uline Arena in Washington on February 6, and the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner held in the District of Columbia National Guard Armory 10 days later.

I would like to quote some of the remarks of the well-known nonpartisan radio commentator, Walter Cronkite, Jr., concerning these two events. I quote:

> The Republicans filled Uline Arena. They called it the greatest crowd in the arena's history—and this is possible. Hundreds were turned away. Hundreds sat crossed-legged on the floor, packed in so close that there wasn't even room to stretch a leg.
>
> There were thousands of men and women in their early twenties in that crowd Perhaps a lot of them were Democrats or of no party. They had come because it was the cheapest admission fee they'd ever had to pay to listen and dance to a top name band. * * * Thursday night the Democrats held their party. They could have packed nearly twice as many people into the armory as the Republicans had into the arena. But they chose not to. Instead they invited just a third that number, and they asked them to pay $100 a plate for a steak dinner, complete with wine, instead of one buck for a box supper.
>
> They seated their tuxedoed men and befrocked and bejeweled ladies at lavishly spread tables. They put the distinguished leaders of the party—members of the Cabinet, visiting Governors and their ladies—at a long head table on a raised dais * * *
>
> A half block away from President Truman and another Kansas Citian, the one-time wonder boy and soap king, Charles Luckman—master of ceremonies for the evening a half block away across the hall a local theater-pit orchestra played, the De Marcos danced, and Phil Regan and Lena Horne sang * * *
>
> At 8 30 Luckman began introducing the leaders at the head table This, at a normal democratic function, would call for a long series of resounding ovations Instead, the lack of applause as Cabinet secretaries and congressional leaders were introduced was actually embarrassing Little knots of people applauded for each secretary—seemingly to indicate to the party bosses that the secretary had succeeded in selling that many seats at a hundred per to his employees * * *
>
> Then the President spoke When he was introduced the crowd rose, applauded sedately for just half a minute. * * *
>
> And the evening was over As far as enthusiasm goes, it was a frost.
>
> * * * I had a strong feeling that the leaders who spoke, including the President, weren't fired with the old zeal And I couldn't help but wonder if the whole thing—the type of party selected for the campaign kick-off, and the way it was handled and received—doesn't reflect something which might be called the senility of power

I have some rather interesting printed matter to which I want to call the attention of the House. Here is a beautifully embossed program of the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner staged by the party of the people. I also have the seating arrangement by tables—another beautifully embossed piece of printing. I am engaged in the printing business and I know good and costly printing when I see it.

I even have something which, for a Republican, is very unusual, I might say to my colleagues. It is a special pass for the dinner, a beautifully printed, beautifully embossed, engraved card. Yes, it is in gold. It is the only thing I know of which indicates that gold still stands in our Nation. It has a bright yellow ribbon, not like a girl would wear around her hair; but it is a beautiful golden cord with the seal of the United States embossed on it. This, my colleagues, is a really splendid piece of printing production. Now I show you this smaller booklet which shows the seating arrangements.

These special passes that I mentioned a moment ago were provided so that people who did not have tickets for the dinner could at least get in the armory. That is the way I got it. They were given to the waiters, to the bus boys, the newspapermen, photographers, functionaries of different kinds, and lackeys.

I want to tell you about, and show you, if I can, the contents and the pictures in the wonderfully embossed main program of the dinner. The program of events is displayed in a finely printed page. I notice that one of the principal entertainers was Lena Horne.

I cannot help thinking of Lena Horne's association with so many Communist Party and front organizations and similar activities. I have here, as a matter of record, a list of the organizations she is associated with:

The American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born; Civil Rights Congress of New York; Civil Rights Congress of somewhere else; the Committee for Reelection of Benjamin J. Davis, New York, Communist councilman; the Council of African Affairs; Fighters for New Liberty; Southern Conference for Human Welfare—altogether, I think 10 or 12 Communist-front organizations to which this splendid entertainer belongs. And she had been singularly honored by the Democrats to sing at this great rally.

I also think you will be interested in the menu—and I would like to compare the Republican and Democrat menus. The Republicans had 7,500 box suppers, prepared and ready to sell, but 12,000 persons showed up with tickets. Three thousand more were turned away. They all came voluntarily, bought their own tickets with their own money. Nobody had to hit them over the head to get them to come to the Uline Arena supper. The box supper cost each person $1. The admission was $1, plus 20 cents tax.

You may be interested, if you were not there, in knowing what we had in the box supper. We had a buttered roll; potato salad in a paper container; two pieces of fried chicken—but I got only one—two sweet pickles; one fruit bun; some coffee, a paper napkin; and, believe it or not, a small American flag.

Here is the menu for that $100-per-plate Democrat dinner. It certainly should have been good at that price. I may need some help on this because my French is not as good as it should be. But they had "pink grapefruit, au kirsch" I do not know what kirsch is. Then there was celery with queen olives; French filet mignon, bordelaise; pommes Rissoles. I think that is right. That is French for potatoes. I do not know whether they were actually French potatoes or Canadian potatoes. I have a report that the Democrats actually served Canadian potatoes. Back to the menu. New string beans provencale; Great Western American Burgundy; hearts of lettuce with Roquefort cheese dressing; fancy ice cream, petit fours, and demi tasse.

They do not drink coffee any more. The party of the common people has to have demi tasse.

I would like to especially call attention to the fact that there was no American flag brought along with the dinner as we had in our box supper.

Here is a list of the dinnerware and the cutlery that was used at the Armory: 16,000 salad plates, 5,600 dinner plates, 5,200 demi tasse cups and saucers, 5,200 wine glasses—I wonder what they wanted those for?—1,100 salt shakers, 11,000 teaspoons, 5,200 banquet-plate rings, 11,000

dinner forks, 5,600 dinner knives, and 1,100 ice buckets. What on earth would you want with an ice bucket in a place like that?

Incidentally, just ordinary plain drinking water was not good enough; so mineral water, bottled mineral water, was donated by the B. & O. Railroad. That is an organization, I understand, which is engaged in transportation. That was a donation from the railroad. Their water is not for sale, incidentally.

And along with the special water were sundry numbers of bottles of scotch and bourbon, according to a local paper. I thought this was an American dinner, but here we have scotch and bourbon on each table in addition to the burgundy.

Of course they had the finest of table linen, and I think that fine table linen should be used when you have all the gentlemen in tuxedos or evening dress and when the ladies are all wearing evening gowns and wearing mink coats, sables, ermine, and chinchilla. Fine linen just naturally goes along with a dinner by the party of the common people.

I might point out that there were all sorts of fine vehicles, as compared to the old jalopies that were used to transport the Republicans out to the arena for their box supper.

The President, by the way, chose this occasion to make the first use of his new specially built Lincoln which is said to be the most expensive automobile ever constructed. He rode in this car which has gold-plated door handles, gold-plated door sills, gold-plated cigarette lighters, and gold-plated intercommunication phones to talk to the chauffeur

This automobile is specially designed with tall doors so that people can enter it wearing their high-top hats. It was, incidentally, the first of several Lincolns which will be delivered to the White House.

The President just the day before, on February 15, made a speech to the national law-enforcement officers in which he said:

> I always abide by the traffic regulations, even though I am President; I never go through red lights, despite the prerogatives attached to the Presidency

According to reports I got from the police department, or rather which my staff got from the police department, on the way to the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner the President went through 20 red stop lights. But, then, this was a great big new car, and I presume rather difficult to control. History speaks of the Roman rulers riding to banquets in their chariots, riding over people in high style to get to their sumptuous feasts.

I read in the Washington newspapers that 96 United States District Attorneys had been individually summoned to Washington to attend a conference the day before the Democratic dinner and each official had to dig up enough funds from his own pocket to buy a ticket to this big dinner. The taxpayers, of course, paid the traveling expenses of each official. I do not know whether all 96 bought tickets or not. My staff has been checking on that but we had to stop because of time limitations. We found the names of 36 of these gentlemen and we had only got about one-third the way through the list. I have it here.

Then, I understand that the collectors of internal revenue from all over the country were called to Washington by the Treasury Department for an official conference coinciding with the Democrat dinner. And it seems that approximately 100 regional officials of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture likewise had been called to Washington—just another coincidence, of course, you understand—and that they, too, attended the dinner. The taxpayers, of course, footed the bill for their traveling expenses and hotel bills.

Then, of course, the lobbyists. Well, there are quite a number of these boys and girls that I have heard of. I have been serving on the Lobby Investigating Committee, and I talked to some of them. They insisted that they just had to go to that Democrat dinner They did not say anything about pressure. Of course, we are investigating the pressure of the lobbyists on Congress. I do not know whether there was any pressure put on or not for them to attend the dinner, but we recognize many names on the seating list, and who they represent. I wonder just how many tickets the lobbyists did purchase.

I would like to say something about corporation officials. This is the party of the people's banquet I am talking about. The Republicans are supposed to be the representatives of the special interests. It seems that most of these special interests got to the Democrat dinner. I was not even invited and I resent it.

One of the largest cotton operators in the country was there, a large number of oil operators, many of them you know. The head of the biggest power company was present, the heads of two great steamship companies, the board chairman of a big film company, several beer distributors and several distillers, were present.

Also on hand were the heads of aircraft companies, the president of one of the largest ball-bearing manufacturing companies in the world, and bankers—why, they were a dime a dozen.

There also was a more selected list, a selected list of those who bought entire tables.

Purchaser of an entire table for 10 was the board chairman of one of the biggest watch companies in the country, which does a multi-million-dollar business importing Swiss movements while the American watchmakers go bankrupt. Another table purchaser was the chairman of one of the largest distilling firms in the country and he had quite a number of guests. Another table purchaser was the board chairman of the largest soft drink company.

I could not check all of the names, but I found 30 corporate executives who had spent $1,000 or more for a table each.

I am going to make public the name of only one man who was a guest and a big contributor to the dinner. I am doing this because he is a mystery man. Nobody, including officials of the Democratic National Committee, can identify him. He bought $4,000 worth of tickets. He is listed as C. E. Kaufmann Every check that has been made, including with the Democratic committee, does not tell us who Mr. Kaufmann is. He is not listed in any directory of any kind available in this city or from any of the cities of the East and Middle West. So I just think perhaps he ought to stand up somewhere and identify himself.

There is another gentleman here I see whose name I will not mention because we do know who he is. He bought $5,000 worth of tickets

In case you are worried, I want to tell you right now I am not putting all these names in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I will be glad to show them to anyone who wants to see them, simply because I do not want to practice discrimination. I am afraid I have missed a number of the boys and girls who have contributed to the Democratic Party and, who may, if there is an official record here, want the record to show their names in case there is any question about further consideration in matters in which they may be interested later on. I had no difficulty finding the names of all the big-business men, the executives, the big contributors, on the guest list of the banquet for the party of the people.

But there was one person most conspicuous by his absence. He is the common man. Of course, a lot of us have realized for a long time that the common man is really the forgotten man of this administration, but we never expected the Democratic Party to stage a half-million dollar gold plate feast as a public demonstration to prove that the common man was not good enough to associate with such high and mighty folks

The President's speech was a remarkable document. It was remarkable, in my opinion, because he did not say anything about Communists in the Government, he did not even say anything about potatoes, although he seemed to eat them; he did not say anything about cutting the taxes, except to remark that any talk about a general tax reduction was political hypocrisy.

He did not say anything about anti-lynch legislation, he did not say anything about the poll tax; he did not say anything about the FEPC, and that was a pretty hot issue at that time.

I followed him over television and I rather regretted that he did not say anything about these things. I have given a lot of thought as to why the President was so silent on the issues which he claims to champion. The morning after this dinner I discovered why there was so much silence on civil rights. I quote from the morning paper:

> The Democrats, who preach against segregation, seated almost all of the Negroes in the hall together before the bandstand of Sam Jock Kaufman.

I do not think it necessary for me to comment further on the speech or its lack of coming to grips with political issues which the President says he stands for.

Now, another rather peculiar thing about this dinner There were a number of missing elements. This dinner

was given ostensibly in honor of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. The dinner was outstanding for the fact that nothing connected with it reflected the spirit of those two former Presidents of the United States.

It should be remembered that Andy Jackson took enormous pride in an achievement that is pretty much foreign to the current occupant of the White House. Old Hickory paid off the national debt and accumulated a Treasury surplus. Jefferson also had some ideas about debt. He once said:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers * * * We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they must become happy.

There is a rather peculiar thing about the President's speech at the dinner. He did not say much about labor. I have been given to understand by the President and his associates that they are the exclusive friends of labor. They have trumpeted this claim up and down the country.

Earlier I showed you this gold-embossed program which I hold in my hand. I had a printing and engraving firm make an estimate of the cost of this program and the other two gold-embossed pieces of material which I showed you. They estimated—and they said this was as low a figure as they could reasonably arrive at—that the printing and engraving costs alone, not counting the cost of this very fine paper, would amount to approximately $3,000.

I happened to be glancing through this luxurious program and I noticed in small print on the back page these words: "Produced by Brewood, Washington."

I wanted to see who turned out this beautiful engraving job. Then I started to look for the union label and to my amazement I could find none. I phoned Brewood and they told me the reason that a union label was not on the program was that they were a nonunion shop. My friends, it will undoubtedly come as a surprise to union labor of this country that the gold-embossed program which was the official program of this so-called Jefferson-Jackson Day $100-a-plate dinner was engraved and printed by nonunion labor.

I hope that some of my good friends will take that matter up and see that out of all these thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars that are expended on meetings like this, that perhaps a little of it will go to support the union members, whose cause the administration champions.

I want to say one or two other things, if I may. I have a list of all these big-business and big-interest people who contributed to the dinner—1,000—not all of them, but a great many of them. I will not include their names in my remarks, because I do not want to miss anybody and discriminate against them. I do want to include in the RECORD, however, as a part of my remarks, a statement by Representative LEONARD W. HALL about one guest at the dinner, Edward Lamb. Mr. HALL said:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE LEONARD W. HALL, OF NEW YORK

It should be of interest to the American people that within a few hours after the New York Times had printed President Truman's reaffirmation of his red-herring stand, that the President should receive at the White House one Edward Lamb, a man whose association with Communist fronts and Communist causes is a matter of public record.

The official White House calling list issued today, February 15, reads in part: "12:15: Mayor Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, with Publisher Edward Lamb, of Erie Dispatch."

An hour after Mr. Lamb had visited the White House, the Associated Press carried the following report on the AP wire:

"Edward Lamb, Toledo, Ohio, lawyer and publisher of the Erie (Pa.) Dispatch, told reporters after seeing the President: 'The President said he would wage as aggressive a fight to elect a Democratic Congress this fall as he did to get himself elected in 1948.'

"Another White House visitor, Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, joined Lamb in making the announcement.

"Mr. Truman is expected to go into other States in a speaking tour for Democratic nominees after the primaries are over, White House aides say.

"The President himself has said that he does not expect to participate in any Democratic primaries outside of his own State of Missouri.

"Lamb said Mr. Truman assured him and Lawrence that after the nominees have been chosen he would be 'free to campaign aggressively in Pennsylvania and Ohio for a Democratic, aggressive Congress.'

"He and Lawrence are here to attend tomorrow night's Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner."

Mr Lamb's affinity for Red causes has been the subject of debate on the floor of the House of Representatives on at least five occasions. The discussions are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, page 538; volume 94, part 4, pages 5327-5328; volume 94, part 5, page 6816; volume 94, part 11, page A3653.

In addition, a special House committee to investigate the Federal Communications Commission (80th Cong., 2d sess.) devoted five and one-half pages of its final report to the House to publication of Mr. Lamb's record. This document is known as House Report No. 2479, and the pages cited are pages 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25.

I was a member of the special committee investigating the FCC and signed the final report. Congress interested itself in Mr. Lamb's record because Mr. Lamb, within the space of 2 weeks in 1948, received five operating licenses from the FCC. Congress considered it a proper matter, and perhaps the President might also, to inquire into the Communist associations of a man who would control the airways of five outlets under Government license.

Here is Mr. Lamb's record in part:

Mr. Lamb was executive vice president of International Labor Defense; he was vice chairman of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; he was a member of the executive committee of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. All three of these organizations have been cited in the Attorney General's list, and have been cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Lamb was an executive vice president of the National Lawyer's Guild, which is now seeking an investigation of the FBI; he was a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association; he was a sponsor of the Civil Rights Congress. All three of these organizations have been cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Lamb was the signer of a telegram addressed to the President in 1940 and sent by the Emergency Peace Mobilization condemning military conscription as un-American; he was a signer of the call for the International Action Conference for Civil Rights; he was a signer of a statement addressed to the President of the United States on March 5, 1941, defending the Communist Party; he was a signer of the Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union, in September 1939. Mr. Lamb was twice the author of articles appearing in the magazine of the Friends of the Soviet Union; he was a signer of a letter to President Roosevelt protesting attacks on the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and condemning the "war hysteria being whipped up by the Roosevelt administration."

Mr. Lamb acted as counsel for Mrs. Sarah V. Montgomery when she was a witness before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, and he stated at that time that he was attorney for the American Peace Mobilization; he was an attorney for Alex Balint, a witness called before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, who was a Communist later ordered deported.

Mr. Lamb also is the author of a book called The Planned Economy in Soviet Russia.

The record cited above dates from 1934 into 1948.

Mr Lamb has been mentioned favorably on numerous occasions by the Daily Worker and by New Masses. The records of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities list 21 citations involving Mr. Lamb's name.

This is Mr. Lamb's record and it is appalling that President Truman should summon him to the White House to help make campaign plans for the election of Democratic Congressmen in 1950. In his interview in the New York Times today Mr. Truman asserts that his loyalty board has done much more effective screening of Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers than has Congress through the action of its committees. While this may be questioned by the American public in the light of the Alger Hiss case and numerous other cases, perhaps the American interest would be better served if the President's loyalty board moved over to the White House doorstep and screened the guest list. It is high time that somebody in this administration determined when "herring" ends and "red" begins.

Now I want to conclude by saying this—this Belshazzarian feast was undoubtedly the greatest in the history of American politics, a chapter in the history of a gold-plated Democratic Party riding in luxury, feeding sumptuously, and raking in the sheckles with one hand and embracing the aspirations of the common people with the other.

For the life of me, I cannot believe that the American people are going to be fooled much longer. There is a famous passage from the Rubaiyat which my democratic colleagues may want to read to comfort them in their moment of travail. It reads like this:

The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on: nor all your Piety nor Wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line
Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it.

In my opinion, when the American people learn the true story of this dinner, the moving finger will write once more.

STATE RURAL REHABILITATION CORPORATIONS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], in a moment of sarcasm and ridicule, is usually superb. But, in this latest speech which he has made there is not a single thing that is strong or funny. The gentleman is a giant attacking a mouse. It is more becoming of him when firing a cannon than it is when shooting a popgun.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the remarks of my good friend from Ohio, I think probably his remarks have brought at least some degree of satisfaction to both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. From his remarks, I gather the Republicans had about twice as many people at their dinner, and they are happy about that. And of course we on this side are somewhat happy over the fact that where it counts, right here in the Congress, where the people have chosen their Representatives, we have twice as many people as the Republicans.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time in order to call the attention of yourself and the Members of the House to the decision that has just been handed down by Judge Keech in the contempt actions against the union and leaders of the mine workers. In that decision Judge Keech said:

> It may be the mass strike of union members has been ordered, encouraged, recommended, instructed, induced, or in some wise permitted by means not appearing in the record. But this court may not convict on conjecture, being bound to act only on the evidence before it, which is insufficient to support a finding of either criminal or civil contempt.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the court has found against the Government and has raised the question of the inadequacy of the evidence and inferentially indicated that such evidence should have been produced.

Why was not that evidence produced? Are we to assume that the evidence could not have been produced? As far as I am concerned, I cannot indulge in any such assumption.

I think the history of the past will indicate that when Mr. Lewis and his union leaders really wished to get the men back to work they could get it done. Whenever they have wanted the men to stay out of the mines they have been effective in keeping them out. When they have really wanted the men to go back to work the men have complied.

What other word, then, might have gone out other than the letter and the telegram from Mr. Lewis which are now defied? Why did not the Government produce the evidence referred to by Judge Keech in his decision? For myself, I just cannot believe and I do not think the American people are going to believe that if the great resources of the Federal Government had been properly put to work this evidence to which Judge Keech refers could not have been produced.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2392) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2392, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I made a very brief speech about the bill which is now under consideration. At that time I emphasized the legal issue which is involved in this legislation. I do not think there is anything sacred about the money involved here, but I do attach great importance to the written contract which was executed several years ago between the Rural Rehabilitation Corporations and the Secretary of Agriculture, who was at that time representing the great Government of the United States.

Perhaps some of the Members of the House are not entirely familiar with the matters we have under consideration. I desire to give just a little history. Back in the days of the depression, when there was much distress in the rural areas of America and much unemployment, the Federal Government embarked upon a relief program in an effort to relieve the distress of the rural people. Here in Congress we approved at that time what we might now refer to as a Marshall plan for the rural areas of America. We set up a fund from which we made grants. Agents of the Federal Government, officials of the Department of Agriculture, went into the several States with corporate charters already prepared and presented these charters to the State legislatures, which created corporations, legal entities, which could receive and handle these relief funds. Having encouraged the State to put themselves in a position to accept the grants from Federal funds, the States created the corporations, as I say, at the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture, and started out to do something to relieve distress—and they did relieve distress in many areas of the country.

Then, as time moved on, the Farm Security Administration was created by an Executive order and went into the field of rural rehabilitation. For that agency this Congress has appropriated millions and hundreds of millions of dollars for rural-rehabilitation programs of all kinds. Finally the Secretary of Agriculture communicated with the State corporations again and, in effect, said to them, "You turn back to me these funds. I will accept them as trustee. I will administer the fund and I will take over the problem of relieving distress and bringing about rural rehabilitation."

Another document was prepared here in Washington—many of them were prepared, one of which I hold in my hand. These were trust agreements, legal documents, prepared here and presented to the State corporations; and the boards of directors of those State corporations authorized the execution of those legal documents. This legal document is the monument of the solemn agreement between the State corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture. It is binding and legal in all respects. No man, in good faith, could question the legality of this trust agreement.

The trust property consisted not only of money but of farms, and houses, and buildings, and notes, and choses in action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

The contract to which I want to address myself is the one affecting my own State, which is typical of others. It has a termination date of 12 years. Now we are only about 60 days away from the termination date of this agreement. It provides:

> In the event that the authority of the Secretary or his successor, as provided in article XII, section 1 hereof, shall cease, this agreement shall be forthwith terminated.

We terminated the Secretary's authority in 1946 when we passed the Farmers Home Administration Act, and directed the Secretary to liquidate these trusts. That brought about the automatic termination of the trust agreements containing that provision.

Section 3 provides:

> If neither of the contingencies provided for in section 1 and section 2 of this article shall earlier occur, then this agreement shall in any event terminate at the end of 12 years from its date, unless the same shall be renewed by the mutual agreement of the parties hereto.

That agreement was signed in May or June 1938, and signed by the North Carolina Rural Rehabilitation Corporation; Mrs. Thomas O'Berry, president; and Henry Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, for and on behalf of the United States Government.

When we directed liquidation of these trusts it did not occur to anybody that the Federal Government had any further interest, legal or equitable, in or to any part or parcel of the property involved; but some smart boy down in the Department conceived the idea that here was about $50,000,000 remaining and "we must get our hands on it so that we can hold it and control it." So for the first time we heard the suggestion, "Why, this is Uncle Sam's money. Uncle Sam is broke, and Uncle Sam is in great need,

and we should recapture this money for the Treasury."

So then the suggestion came up to us, "You told us to liquidate but you did not say how. Now we are saying, don't liquidate, but let us take this money back and put it into the Treasury."

So we had two bills proposed in the Eightieth Congress. I introduced one and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] introduced the other. One would provide for putting the money back into the Treasury, and the other one provided for keeping faith with these solemn agreements.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Do I understand from the gentleman's remarks, then, that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, might be opposed to this particular bill, or is it somebody within the Department who is opposed to it; and if so, who is it?

Mr. COOLEY. Frankly, there is difference of opinion in the legal family in the Department of Agriculture. The spokesman for the Solicitor's office, as I pointed out in my remarks yesterday, made a very laborious effort to justify a legal opinion which would support the position that the money should be put back into the Treasury. He did that merely by saying that the depression was over. I asked, "When was it over? Who told you it was over"? The truth is that since this thing occurred in the early 1930's we have continued to recognize the distress of the agricultural sections of this country and have continued to appropriate money, and every single Congress since that time has realized that we needed to do something by way of rural rehabilitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself eight additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for eight additional minutes.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask this further question: Can the gentleman tell us what is Mr. Brannan's personal opinion on this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. I, unfortunately, do not know what his personal opinion is. But we have an issue here, and it is a clear-cut issue.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. On the question as to whether Mr. Brannan expressed a personal opinion, is it not a fact that there is in the hearings a copy of a letter from Mr. Brannan as Secretary of Agriculture reporting adversely upon this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; that is true.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. REES. Do I understand that there is about $50,000,000 included in this legislation. I notice that the report states that it is a comparatively small sum. After all, $50,000,000 is $50,000,000. As I understand the bill before us, it is proposed to divide this money among the States.

Mr. COOLEY. No; we do not propose to do anything of the kind. The money has been divided, was divided when it was granted. The title to it, legal and equitable, is vested in the corporations, and not in the Federal Government. We are not going to divide it; we are not dividing it. We are going to keep faith with this document.

Mr. REES. But the money came from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; that is so.

Mr. REES. If you are going to dissolve the corporatior and get rid of it, that would be a very good solution, would it not?

Mr. COOLEY. We are not getting rid of the corporation. If the gentleman will let me finish, I will tell him that actually no legislation on this subject is needed. The only thing needed is a lawyer in the Department of Agriculture who has enough legal sense to know and to understand a written legal document. If a lawyer should come up and say, "Mr. Secretary, you have no alternative other than to keep faith with this document," we would not be here. Instead of that, we have all this hemming and hawing and dilly-dallying around. My corporation is going to bring a lawsuit—there is no getting around that—whether we pass an act of Congress or not. But they are willing to accept the provisions of this bill which gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to see to it that there is no duplication of effort, that there is no wasting of the moneys, that no foolish un-American program is embarked upon.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Kansas has suggested that this money is in the Treasury. Is it not a fact that this money is in the Treasury only as a trust fund and not as money of the United States?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is exactly right. I just communicated with the Treasury. It is not only there in trust but it is marked "State rural rehabilitation corporation funds."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Surely, neither the gentleman from North Carolina nor the gentleman from Kansas, nor any other Member of Congress would contend that we as Members of Congress have the power to take funds that are the trust funds entrusted to the safekeeping of the United States and divert them from the purpose of the trust, would he?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not see how anybody could suggest it, and I want it thoroughly understood I am not questioning the motives of anybody in this matter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that if that trust fund is not returned to the States it goes into the Federal Treasury and that the Federal deficit will be $50,000,000 less?

Mr. COOLEY. How is it going into the Federal Treasury unless, just by main strength and awkwardness, we take it and put it in the Federal Treasury? As I said a moment ago, I know that my corporation is going to bring suit to recover this property. I do not know of any defense that the Federal Government can have to the suit which will be instituted; and that suit will be followed by a multiplicity of similar suits.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. In reference to these assets that are listed, for instance, there are loans receivable and accounts and notes receivable. Is there any estimate as to how good they are or are they just old notes and accounts receivable that have been standing, due from reliefers, as they are in connection with other activities of the States? In other words, do these figures mean they are worth their face amount?

Mr. COOLEY. That is the face value.

Mr. FULTON. Are they worth that?

Mr. COOLEY. I doubt that they are worth that. I understand there is about $10,000,000 in cash. The rest is in notes and other property.

Mr. FULTON. Has there been any banking estimate of what is collectible of these and what is uncollectible?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not quite certain. We had very lengthy hearings, but it has been some time since we held hearings and I do not recall what was said about the actual value.

Mr. FULTON. Actually, then, the $50,000,000 mentioned is not the correct amount because we do not know what the value is of one of the major portions of the fund?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman tell us what in his judgment would be the result if we passed no bill at all?

Mr. COOLEY. This crowd down there will keep dilly-dallying with the money and force the corporations to bring suit, which will involve us in expensive litigation.

Mr. KEATING. There are many points on which I do not see eye to eye with the Department of Agriculture as it is now administered, but in this case is it not a matter that should be determined in the courts rather than here in the Congress?

Mr. COOLEY. No. The gentleman is a lawyer and if he will look at one of these agreements he must conclude that the Government has no more right to this money than he has.

Mr. KEATING. Well, now, will the gentleman answer another question. I notice under this list of assets in the table on pages 6 and 7 that except for the States of Oregon and Vermont the State of New York got the least money under this of any State in the Union, yet it paid by far the biggest part in taxes. What is the explanation?

Mr. COOLEY. The explanation is that probably the State of New York did not have distressed rural areas like we had in other sections of the country.

This was a relief measure to relieve distressed areas in agriculture. That perhaps is the only answer. It may be that they did not handle the fund properly. I do not know what happened.

Mr. KEATING. I feel sure they probably handled it properly, but I am just worried about the position of one from New York State. As I view this, and I would be glad to be corrected, if this $50,000,000 is not turned over, as the gentleman is suggesting, it will become funds of the Government and, certainly, New York State will reap a benefit in excess of $90,000.

Mr. COOLEY. Here is what New York State can do, and I would like for the Members to know this. The bill provides for a return of the trust property to the State corporations upon application being filed by the State corporation. In the event no application is filed, and in many States applications probably will not be filed, because no agency is in existence, the corporations have ceased to exist. We provide, however, that the corporation may be rehabilitated or another created.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the State corporation may no longer be in business, but we provide that another corporation might be chartered or some other agency set up to handle the funds. Then that agency can apply for it. But if no application is submitted in 3 years the money goes back to the Federal Treasury to be placed in a revolving fund to be used in the State affected. It further provides that any State that is not interested in this program, and I am assuming New York will not be interested because apparently you do not have the same situation that we have in other areas, all that State has to do is to relinquish the money and turn it back to the Federal Government.

Mr. KEATING. But we pay a share, do we not, of the money that goes to these other States?

Mr. COOLEY. Why, the gentleman knows that is not true.

It is not a question of any State paying or contributing. This bill provides only for a return of funds which were taken in trust. If New York made a contribution it was many long years ago when the relief money was made available. I am quite sure that New York got its full share of relief money.

But, to show you the legal situation, here is a fund we had in North Carolina amounting to about $1,100,000. The Secretary of Agriculture induced our corporation to let him have $800,000 of it. We still have $300,000 down there. Our corporation is a going concern. Now they are saying in effect, "We have this $800,000, and we are not going to give it back to you."

Mr. KEATING. But you get 10 times as much as the State of New York.

Mr. COOLEY. My State gets very little. Minnesota, for instance, gets two or three million dollars. I am not concerned about the money involved; I am concerned about the principle and the morals involved in this issue.

Mr. KEATING. I am concerned about the morals, but if the Department of Agriculture takes the position as a legal matter that this fund belongs to the Government and not to the people to whom you want to give it, it seems to me that is an issue that should be tried in the courts.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman has no more respect for the solicitor's opinion than I have, the opinion would not worry him any more than it worries me.

Mr. KEATING. That puts me in a difficult position, because my respect is not as great as that of some people.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not willing to follow his advice on this question, and neither was my committee, because the bill was reported by a substantial majority. Incidently another bill, similar in character, has passed the Senate. When the Honorable CLINTON ANDERSON was the Secretary of Agriculture, he was for the Hope bill, but when Secretary of Agriculture ANDERSON became Senator ANDERSON and could see this thing in its true light, he came out for a bill similar to this bill, and the Senate has already passed it. That just shows you how one in high place might perhaps be influenced by a bad legal opinion.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, it may be influenced by other factors, too.

Mr. COOLEY. I would rather take the opinion of Senator ANDERSON than that of Secretary ANDERSON.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman from New York seems to be concerned about the amount of money. In the State of the gentleman from North Carolina, you get less money than, say, New Mexico, because you gave back to the Government less money. You kept some of it.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Maybe New York kept some of it, too.

Mr. COOLEY. I had not thought of it, but it is possible that the New York corporation did hold back some of its money. Maybe they still have it. I do not know. The hearings will probably show that.

Mr. KEATING. But the schedule would not show that.

Mr. COOLEY. That only shows that in North Carolina, for example, actually if we get $800,000, we will add it to the $300,000 we have now.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I notice that South Dakota gets $3,395,000. The actual giving of this money either back to the States or permitting the people to keep it is not made proportionate on the need within the States at this time for rehabilitation money within that State.

Mr. COOLEY. The genleman is correct. But the fact is that the Farmers Home Administration is operating in Minnesota and all of these other States. so there is a need, or otherwise we would not be lending the money to farmers in poor financial circumstances.

Mr. FULTON. If we go through the ordinary practice that the Federal Government is now pursuing in the States on farm rehabilitation, we will use the regular channels and not this, because this will be extra money in addition to the regular Federal money.

Mr. COOLEY. The need for Federal appropriations will be minimized to the extent that this money is available.

Mr. FULTON. In some instances, under this bill, they will get more than they need.

Mr. COOLEY. No, no. There is a desperate shortage in all places right now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Federal Government waives its claim under the terms of this bill, would the State corporation be free to use the money for research if it wanted to use some of it for research?

Mr. COOLEY. Not unless the programs were approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

While I do not believe that we have any legal right to exercise any degree of control over the money involved, we did put a provision in this bill which requires that the funds be used in the prosecution of projects and programs which have been approved by the Secretary. This is for the purpose of enabling the Secretary to exercise the degree of control over use of the funds which may be necessary to prevent duplication and waste and to make sure that the funds are used for the purposes for which they were originally appropriated.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as has already been stated by the gentleman from North Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, this is a matter which has been hanging fire for some time. I want to go back into the history of these transactions a little bit to preface what I shall say as to what course I think we should follow in connection with this matter.

I think it is important that this question be settled. While I am opposed to the bill which has been reported by the committee, I did not oppose the rule because I believe we should take some action in the matter and dispose of it one way or another.

As has been stated, these funds were set up during the depression and drought days back in 1934 and 1935. They were originally a part of three different appropriations which were made for relief during that period. Part of these funds came from the Emergency Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1935, and the pertinent part of that act which prescribes the use which might be made of the funds reads as follows:

The Administrator is authorized to make grants to the several States to aid in meeting the cost of furnishing relief and work relief and in relieving hardship and suffering caused by unemployment, in the form

of money, service, materials and/or commodities, to provide the necessities of life to persons in need as a result of the present emergency, or to their dependents, whether residents, transients, or homeless.

That, of course, correctly described the situation that existed at that time. It was in the depths of the depression, when we had a bad drought situation, and it was absolutely necessary that these people on the farms in the drought areas and other depressed areas be furnished funds in order to keep body and soul together. That was the sole purpose of the legislation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That act was passed in the early part of 1933; is not that correct?

Mr. HOPE I believe this was the 1934 act It was the Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1935.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Prior to that time funds had been appropriated and turned over to the then President for relief purposes in the respective States, which money was turned over to the Governors in those States.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I think that is correct. There were several acts. The act of February 15, 1934, appropriated the sum of $950,000,000 for carrying out the purpose of the Emergency Relief Act of 1933. That is the act to which I think the gentleman refers. The purposes for which that money might be used are described in this act of February 15, 1934, as follows: "making loans to farmers for and/or the purchase, sale, gift, or other disposition, of seed, feed, freight, summer fallowing, and similar purposes."

Those are the purposes for which these funds are authorized to be used in the first place.

It requires a stretch of the imagination, it seems to me, to say that the purposes for which those funds are authorized to be used still exist. I do not know of any place in the United States where the conditions which prevailed in 1933, 1934, and 1935 still exist or where it is necessary to expend Federal funds for the purposes which are enumerated here. But I will come back to that a little later.

I want to go on with the history of this transaction. After this legislation was passed, State rehabilitation corporations were set up in at least 43 States. It was proposed to administer these funds through these State rehabilitation corporations and the funds which are in question here were granted to these State corporations. Subsequently, it was held by the Comptroller General that these relief funds could not be administered in that way and that they would have to be administered by the relief administration directly from Washington. That being the situation, and the rehabilitation corporation having only this comparatively small amount of funds on hand and being unable to get any further funds, there was an arrangement made whereby all of these State corporations turned these funds over to the Secretary of Agriculture as trust funds to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purposes for which they were originally appropriated.

As I said a while ago those purposes have ceased to exist. But, by action of the Committee on Appropriations from time to time since then, these funds have been appropriated for the use of the Farmers Home Administration and its predecessors in making rehabilitation loans to farmers and they are being used for that purpose at the present time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not being mingled, however, but within the States to which they were allocated, is that not correct?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, I think the provision of the appropriation bill provides that the loans shall be made in the States to which they were allocated. I do not know how much significance there is in that. Whether it simply means that those States get less of other funds, or what. But as I understand it that is the way the funds are being spent at the present time.

When we passed the Farmers Home Administration Act, the law directed that these funds be liquidated, without setting up, however, the method by which it might be done.

It has been the contention of the Department of Agriculture, and I think rightly, that they do not have the authority to liquidate these funds under any existing legislation. That is the situation which prevailed when in the Eightieth Congress the Secretary of Agriculture sent to the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate legislation which would authorize and direct the return of these funds to the Federal Treasury. As is customary in such cases, those communications were transmitted to the appropriate committees and pursuant to that letter I introduced a bill which would provide for the return of these funds to the Treasury.

The gentleman from North Carolina introduced a bill which provided for the return of the funds to the various States, to the rehabilitation corporations, where they exist, and if not, to the governor or some other agency in the respective States.

Hearings were held in the Eightieth Congress, but no disposition was made of the matter. After the convening of the Eighty-first Congress I introduced my bill and the gentleman from North Carolina introduced his bill. Some further hearings were held. The committee reported out the bill of the gentleman from North Carolina, and by a substantial majority they voted down the substitute which I offered, the substitute being my bill.

I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Suppose the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation in the gentleman's State had declined to enter into the trust agreement with the Government, as suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture, would the gentleman's corporation not have those funds in their possession at this time?

Mr. HOPE. Of course, that is supposing a great deal, because we have no corporation in my State.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, in a State which did have such a corporation.

Mr. HOPE. Of course, I do not know what disposition might have been made of them in the last 12 years. That is just speculation.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But the funds would still have been in the possession of those States which refused to enter into such agreements, if they had refused, and there would be no means whatever by which the Government could touch the funds.

Mr. HOPE. If the funds had not been expended in some way authorized by law, it is quite likely they would be in the possession of the rehabilitation corporations of those States, but it is my contention that they would have no authority to spend them for any purpose other than the purpose authorized by law, which has not existed for a number of years, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But the fact remains that the Federal Government could not, by any manner or means, interfere with the State's handling of the funds under those conditions, as it is doing today, inasmuch as it has possession of the funds.

Mr. HOPE I believe, and I have a well-supported brief from the Solicitor's office of the Department of Agriculture, that under those conditions the Department of Agriculture could have questioned the use of those funds, and I think that properly they could have recovered the funds had they desired to do so. I understand there may be some difference of opinion on the legal questions, but this brief, which I expect to make a part of my remarks, under permission already granted, and which I do not have time to go into now, will, I think, furnish an answer that will satisfy every Member of the House who is a lawyer and who has given any study to this question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has stated that the Department could possibly recover the funds held by the States, and to their credit. The reason for that is that the purpose for which the funds were originally appropriated no longer exists. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOPE. That is absolutely correct. The condition under which they were granted no longer exists.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I am particularly interested in the Farmers Home Administration Act. There is not a day passes in which I do not receive letters from farmers wanting a loan under that act. I am wondering how the passage or failure of passage of this act will affect those funds, if any.

Mr. HOPE. If we pass this act, those funds will go, in varying amounts, to 43 States. There may or may not be an organization in that State which can ad-

minister the fund. In most States there will not be, but even assuming there is, if the funds are employed at all they will have to be employed in competition, in 43 States, with the activities of the Farmers Home Administration. In other words, in every State the Farmers Home Administration will be making loans, and this organization in the State, whatever it is, the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, or some new organization to be set up, will also be making loans. That is to say that if we pass this bill, we are going to fritter away this money by putting a little of it into every one of the 43 States. If we want to maintain the integrity of this fund, if we want to do something which will be of some benefit to the farmers of this country who are in need of rural rehabilitation at this time, let us leave it in the hands of the organization that is set up to do that work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman's statement. May I ask if it is not true that in most of the States they do not have these rehabilitation corporations and the money will just go into the general funds of the State instead of the general funds of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. HOPE. No. I think the State will have to set up some organization to administer the fund, that under the provisions of the gentleman's bill that would have to be done. It would be turned over to the governor but he would have to set up some kind of an organization to administer it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that if we do not pass this legislation the funds for the respective States will continue to be administered by the Farmers Home Administration as they have been in the past and funds allocated to each State will be used in the respective State as something of a revolving fund?

Mr. HOPE. That will be dependent upon the action of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. I notice in this opinion, that is, at the table here, there seems to be extremely significant legal language calling attention to the fact that the apportionment rose out of the economic depression of the 1930's and the drought of 1934. The funds were made available for rural rehabilitation as such, as was the case in later appropriations. This distinction is important. As fully developed by the Resettlement Administration and the Farm Security Administration under appropriations made for rural rehabilitation that term was construed to encompass any program which had for its purpose the improvement of the economic status or physical well-being of the low-income groups of our farm population and the need for the program was not required to be based upon a particular drought or depression.

I have read the North Carolina agreement; it seems to me to be an extremely tight one. It is my recollection that if the purposes of the trust have ceased to exist, the courts will not carry out the requirements in such an instrument for the disposition of the assets. I think it is highly important to consider that in the terms of the proper disposition of these funds. Now, I will go further. I call attention to the fact that furthermore, the apportionment of funds under the bill among the States would bear little relation to the need as it exists today. Five States would receive no money at all, whereas three States would receive over $3,000,000. The five States, I understand, are Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Delaware, and Maryland.

It does seem to me that it would be more equitable to let this matter go to the courts for settlement than for us to try to settle it.

Mr. HOPE. In order to clarify the legal questions at issue here, I want to include as a part of my remarks the able opinion of the Associate Solicitor for the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Howard Rooney. It is as follows:

STATEMENT OF HOWARD ROONEY, ASSOCIATE SOLICITOR, OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The report of the Department on H R. 2392 was based on the premise that at this time there is no legal or moral obligation imposed on Congress that would require the return of the assets covered by the transfer agreements to the States or corporations for use in a rural rehabilitation program. The Secretary was so advised by the Solicitor's office of the Department, and as a representative of that office my testimony will be for the purpose of acquainting the committee with the reasons for reaching the foregoing conclusion.

A legal conclusion must always be tested in relation to the facts upon which it is predicated. It is agreed that the assets in question were derived from funds made available under the terms of the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 55); the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat 351), and the act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat 1055). Section 1 of the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933 contains the following language:

"That the Congress hereby declares that the present economic depression has created a serious emergency, due to widespread unemployment and increased inadequacy of State and local relief funds, resulting in the existing or threatened deprivation of a considerable number of families and individuals of the necessities of life, and making it imperative that the Federal Government cooperate more effectively with the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia in furnishing relief to their needy and distressed people."

The act created the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, with a Federal Emergency Relief Administrator at its head. Funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the amount of $500,000,000 were made available for the purposes of the act which were set out in section 4 (a) as follows:

"Out of funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made available by this act, the Administrator is authorized to make grants to several States to aid in meeting the costs of furnishing relief and work relief and in relieving the hardship and suffering caused by unemployment in the form of moneys, services, materials, and/or commodities to provide the necessities of life to persons in need as a result of the present emergency, and/or to their dependents, whether resident, transient, or homeless."

Provision was made for investigation by the Administrator of expenditures made under the act and he could under the rules and regulations prescribed by the President assume control of the administration in any State where, in his judgment, more effective and efficient cooperation between the State and Federal authorities could thereby be secured in carrying out the purchase of the act. The governor in each State was required to make application for the funds and the decision of the Administrator as to the purpose of any expenditure was to be final.

In the act of February 15, 1934, there was appropriated from the Treasury the sum of $950,000,000 to provide additional funds for carrying out the purposes of the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933 and for continuing the civil-works program. This act also permitted the Federal Emergency Relief Administrator to make grants for relief within a State directly to such public agency as he might designate.

In the act of June 19, 1934, $525,000,000 was made available to meet the emergency and necessity for relief in stricken agricultural areas and to supplement appropriations theretofore made for emergency purposes and for making loans to farmers for, and/or the purchase, sale, gift, and other disposition of seed, feed, freight, summer fallowing, and other similar purposes. The legislative history indicates that the additional lending authority was for the purpose of relieving distressed conditions caused by the 1934 drought.

The plain terms of these statutes reveal a congressional intent that funds granted thereunder were for the purpose of relieving distress attributable to the emergencies caused by the depression of the 1930's and the 1934 drought We doubt if anyone will seriously deny that these emergencies are now nonexistent. This fact leads to the conclusion that the funds in question can no longer be used for their original purpose. In this connection, it is significant that the Works Progress Administration was ordered liquidated on December 4, 1942, and on July 12, 1943, in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944 (57 Stat. 392) the Secretary was authorized to use funds administered pursuant to transfer agreements for the same purpose that funds were appropriated under the caption "Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation." This authority was continued in the appropriation acts for the Department for 1945, 1946, and 1947. Moreover, section 2 (c) of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, approved August 14, 1946, provided that funds made available in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1947, were made available for the making and servicing of loans under the Farmers Home Administration Act. Thus, after ordering liquidation of the agency established to administer direct Federal relief during the depression, Congress without undue delay provided new authority for the administration of the funds transferred to the Secretary.

On the basis of the foregoing facts it is our position that the fundamental legal question to be determined by the committee is the extent of the authority of the Congress over the residue of funds granted to a State for a particular purpose when that purpose can no longer be effectuated.

Our answer to the question is that in such a case the authorities clearly uphold the

right of Congress to revest the funds in the Federal Government and to order any disposition thereof consonant with the plenary power of Congress over the property of the United States. Thus in *Ashburner* v. *California* (103 U. S. 575), in construing the act of June 30, 1864 (13 Stat. 325) in which the United States granted the Yosemite Valley to the State of California to be held for public use, resort and recreation (but without a reverter clause) the Court said:

"It [the land] must be kept for the use to which it was, by the terms of the grant, appropriated. If it should be in any respect diverted from this use, the United States may be called on to determine whether proceedings may be instituted in some appropriate form to enforce the performance of the conditions contained in the act of Congress or vacate the grant. So long as the State keeps the property it must abide by the stipulation upon which the transfer of title was made."

And directly in point is the later case of *United States* v. *Michigan* (190 U. S. 379). In that case Congress had granted to the State of Michigan 750,000 acres of public land for the purpose of aiding the State in constructing and maintaining the St. Mary's River Canal. The act contained no reverter clause except with respect to failure to begin or complete the canal within the specified time, a condition which was complied with by the State and not involved in the case. The act provided for rendering an accounting to the Government of the proceeds of the sale of the land and the cost of building and operating the canal. There was no express provision, however, requiring any surplus to be paid over to the United States. The action was instituted on behalf of the United States by Attorney General Knox to recover a surplus of about $68,000. The case was decided in the favor of the United States and in the opinion at page 400 the Court said:

"If there were funds arising from the sale of the lands over and above the cost of construction and other expenses of the canal, it could not, within reason (after a perusal of these two statutes, with the provisions for accounting for sales and net proceeds of lands, and the other provisions of the statutes already mentioned), be supposed the parties understood that Michigan was to have for its own treasury the balance arising beyond such cost, maintenance, etc., of the canal."

Legislative grants must be interpreted, if practicable, so as to effect the intention of the grantor; but if the words are ambiguous, the true rule is to construe them strongly against the grantee. (*Rice* v. *Railroad Co.* (66 U. S 358)) In the light of this rule of law, we do not believe it is possible to construe the language of the granting statutes under consideration as evidencing an intent that it was the will of Congress for the States to keep for their own benefit any funds left over after the emergencies were met. This was the view of the State of Arkansas in *Wiseman* v. *Dyess* (72 S W. 2d. 517), where in the course of its opinion the court said:

"The act of Congress (Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933) under which the apportionments are granted requires this (reports to Administrator) and negates that an absolute grant or gift had been made to the State. If by any possibility any of the funds thus apportioned were not required, the unexpended balance would revert not to the State, but to the Federal Government."

This opinion has been criticized because it was contended that it was based on an erroneous stipulation of facts. However, when this matter was brought to the attention of the court on rehearing (76 S. W. 2d. 979) the court said:

"It is unnecessary to decide the technical question of whether Dyess, the appellant herein, is acting for the State or whether the money with which he carries on the relief work technically belongs to the State. It is certain, however, this money is not administered or used through any of the regular channels of the State government.

"The money is allotted for the relief work in Arkansas and it is used for that purpose. It is a part of the plan and program of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. Its ultimate aim is to relieve from the distress and burdens of unemployment as an aid to the restoration of more nearly normal conditions. These funds appropriated by the National Government for such beneficent purposes should not be directed."

It was contended in the recent hearings on this bill that the cases of *United States* v. *Louisiana* (127 U. S. 182 (1882)); *Cooper* v. *Roberts* (18 How. 173 (1855)); *King County, Washington* v. *Seattle School District No. 1* (263 U. S. 361 (1923)) and *Alabama* v. *Schmidt* (232 U. S. 168 (1914)) require a holding that the grants in question were so absolute that there was no legal power remaining in Congress to question compliance by the States. In other words, that with respect to the United States any obligation assumed by the States as a result of the grants was purely honorary. The cases do not so hold. *Cooper* v. *Roberts* was a case in ejectment. One party claimed title from the State of Michigan which in turn had obtained the land from the United States through a grant for school purposes The other party claimed under a license granted under the Federal mining laws. In the course of its opinion the Court said:

"In the present instance the grant is to the State directly, without limitation of its power, though there is a sacred obligation imposed on its public faith. We think it was competent to Michigan to sell the school reservation without consent of Congress."

This case is authority for two things: (1) an individual cannot question compliance of a State with a Federal grant, and (2) under the school land grant acts it is proper for the States to sell the land. There was no intimation in the case that the State had diverted the proceeds from school use nor was there any discussion of the rights of the United States if the proceeds had been so diverted.

Alabama v. *Schmidt* also involved school land. Schmidt claimed by adverse possession under the laws of Alabama. Alabama defended on the theory that the statute of limitations did not apply, apparently for the reason that if Schmidt recovered the land it would be diverted from school purposes. In the opinion the Court said:

"The gift to the State is absolute, although no doubt as said in *Cooper* v. *Roberts* there is a sacred obligation imposed on its public faith. But that obligation is honorary like the one discussed in *Conley* v. *Ballinger* (216 U. S. 84), and even in honor would not be broken by a sale and substitution of a fund, as in that case; a course we believe that has not been uncommon among the States."

Here the State having the right to sell under the decision of *Cooper* v. *Roberts* was not permitted to enjoy this privilege without assuming the corresponding disadvantages. The Court clearly indicates that if the State would place the value of the land in the school fund, there would be no breach of the grant, and, as in *Cooper* v. *Roberts*, the rights of the United States in the event of breach are not discussed. *Conley* v. *Ballinger*, cited in the opinion, held that an individual member of a tribe of Indians could not enjoin the removal of bodies of relatives buried in a cemetery which was reserved in a quitclaim deed executed by the tribe to the United States pursuant to a treaty. It was said the United States had legislative power over the cemetery before the deed and because of the unusual power resting in the United States with respect to Indian tribes the fulfillment of the treaty rested on the good faith of the United States and could not be questioned by a member of the tribe. The Court further found that the provisions of an act of Congress making the proceeds of the sale of the cemetery available to the tribe was not a breach of that faith.

The pertinent part of the opinion in *United States* v. *Louisiana* is as follows:

"Under the act of 1850 the swamplands are to be conveyed to the State as an absolute gift, with discretion that these proceeds shall be applied exclusively, as far as necessary, to the purpose of reclaiming the lands. The judgment of the State as to the necessity is paramount and any application of the proceeds by the State to any other objective is to be taken as the declaration of its judgment that the application of the proceeds to the reclamation of the lands is not necessary. By the second section of the act of 1855 it is provided that the purchase money received by the United States for the swampland sold by them shall be paid over to the State. There is nothing in these provisions of the character of a property trust and nothing to prevent the application by the State of a swampland fund to the general purposes. If the power exists anywhere to enforce any provision of the grant, it resides in Congress and not in the Court."

The distinction between the grant in this case and in the grants under discussion is obvious, since there is no language in the grants now under consideration which would permit the States to use only so much of the funds granted for relief as they found necessary.

The King County case required a construction of the act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260), which directed that 25 percent of all money received from each forest reserve during any fiscal year should be paid at the end thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which the reserve was situated "to be expended as the State. * * * legislature may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which the forest reserve is situated" The plaintiff school district contended that the receipts should be divided equally for school and road purposes. In the course of the opinion the Court said:

"When turned over to the State, the money belongs to it absolutely. There is no limitation upon the power of the legislature to prescribe how the expenditures shall be made for the purposes stated, though by the act of Congress, 'there is a sacred obligation imposed on its public faith.' *Cooper* v *Roberts* (18 How. 173, 182); *Alabama* v. *Schmidt* (232 U. S. 168, 173); *Mills County* v. *Railroad Companies* (107 U. S. 557, 566); *Hagar* v. *Reclamation District* (111 U. S. 701, 713). No trust for the benefit of appellee is created by the grant. But, assuming the moneys paid over to the State are charged with a trust that there shall be expended annually one-half for schools and one-half for roads, the appellee has no right to enforce the trust. Congress alone can inquire into the manner of its execution by the State. *United States* v. *Louisiana* (127 U S. 182, 185–192); *Mills County* v. *Railroad Companies, supra; Emigrant Co.* v. *County of Adams* (100 U. S. 61, 69); *Barrett* v. *Brooks* (21 Ia. 144, 148). See also *Stearns* v. *Minnesota* (179 U. S. 223, 231). The act does not direct any division of the money between schools and roads. Its language above quoted indicates an intention on the part of Congress that the State in its discretion may prescribe by legislation how the money is to be expended. No distribution to the appellee or any other school district is required. The public schools and public roads are provided and maintained by the State or its subdivisions, and the moneys granted by the United States are assets in the hands of the State to be used for the specified purposes as it deems best."

In none of these cases was it found that a State was violating the terms of the grant under consideration, but in both *United States* v. *Louisiana* and the King County case the court clearly indicates that Congress would not be powerless in the event of a

breach. In *Langer* v. *United States* (76 Fed. 2d 817, 824), all of the foregoing cases were cited by the defendant in support of the contention that money granted to a State under the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933 could be used in any manner the State saw fit. The court flatly refused to sustain the contention.

As has been pointed out to the committee, the Federal Emergency Relief Administrator and the Comptroller General regarded funds after grant as having the status of State funds. These decisions were made at a time when there was no question as to the proper use of funds by the States, and in the final analysis only meant that while being administered for the purposes of the granting acts, the funds would not be subject to the general fiscal laws applicable to Federal agencies. These determinations, of course, are not decisive of the present question any more than would the fact that the Yosemite Valley was not subject to Federal land laws while being properly used by California or that money being used by Michigan to build the St. Mary's Canal was not subject to Federal fiscal laws require a different result in the Ashburner and Michigan cases. These determinations obviously did not purport to cover the status of funds which could not be used pursuant to statutory authority. In this connection, in 1935 the Supreme Court of South Carolina in *Harris* v *Fulp* (183 S. E. 158) held that a State relief administrator could not be sued by an individual in view of the State's immunity against suit. In determining the then status of relief funds, the court relied principally on the Comptroller General's opinion On the other hand, the Supreme Court of Maine in *State* v *Martin* (187 Atl. 710), reversed a bribery conviction under Stat law of a State emergency relief administration employee, saying

"The State—no official, no employee of the State as such—had title to or control of the funds apportioned by the United States or of food, clothing, or other supplies purchased therewith"

And in *Madden* v *United States* (80 Fed 2d 672, 676, cert. den 297 U. S. 710), the Court said:

"Defendant contends that there was a fatal variance between the proof and the indictment His argument is that funds granted by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to the Emergency Finance Board, a State agency, became State funds and thereafter no title thereto existed in any Federal agency, and when the Emergency Finance Board transferred part of its funds to the city of Boston for payment of Boston Public Library employees, title to such funds passed to the city of Boston, and thereafter the power of disposition of such funds was in the city of Boston and no Federal agency had any power over them. This contention is not sound All projects carried on with money derived from the Federal Government had to be approved by the Federal Administrator. Any diversion of such funds from the project to which they were assigned was a diversion of Government money As hereinbefore stated, all funds allotted by the Federal Government for the relief of unemployment even though disbursed by State agencies were earmarked as Federal funds, and if diverted from the use for which they were granted it constituted a fraud upon the Government."

More to the point than the decision of the Comptroller General heretofore cited to the committee is the report of the Comptroller General to the Director of the Budget, dated November 26, 1946 (B-58301). The Comptroller then had under consideration a proposed bill under which the United States would be divested of any interest in the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc. This Corporation was organized under the laws of Tennessee and financed by Federal Emergency Relief Administration money granted to the Governor. It differed from rural-rehabilitation corporations only in the fact that the stock was issued in the name of the Secretary of the Treasury without voting rights, whereas in the case of rural-rehabilitation corporations the stock was taken in the name of the incorporators and pledged with the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to insure compliance with the grants. The pertinent part of the report is as follows:

"Even if it may be conceded that it was not the Federal intent to retain control of the emergency relief funds involved other than as necessary to insure that the purpose for which granted would be carried out, it must be recognized that they have not been fully expended and that in continuing to hold them and in administering their use the Corporation performs basically a Federal governmental function. In an analogous situation involving the Virgin Islands Company, the capital of which likewise was obtained from emergency relief grants, this office has taken the position that whatever portion of such funds has not been dissipated by operating losses represents unexpended relief grants and, as such, will be required to be accounted for to the United States. See General Accounting Office Report on Audit of the Virgin Islands Company, 1945, printed as House Document No. 701, Seventy-ninth Congress.

"In other words, the proposed legislation would divest the United States of a remainder interest of approximately $183,000 in the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., representing an unexpended balance of emergency relief funds granted many years ago to assist in the organization and fostering of cooperative enterprises in the Tennessee Valley, and it would result in turning that sum over to a corporation or other agency disassociated from the Government for further use without limitation as to time. No convincing reason has been advanced to me as to why that should be done and, consequently, I am unable to recommend favorable consideration of the specific proposal submitted"

It has also been suggested to the committee that the transfer agreements require the return of the assets in question to the States or corporations and that any other disposition by Congress would violate these agreements. Of course, this argument could be met by returning the assets pursuant to the agreements and then by congressional mandate require the States to return the funds to the Federal Treasury for such further disposition as the Congress might deem appropriate However, in the event Congress does not desire that the funds be further used by the States, the law does not require the useless and expensive formality of a transfer. In the first place, the parties to the transfer agreements did not purport to contract with respect to the use of funds that cannot be used in compliance with the granting statute, and in the second place neither the Secretary nor any other official of the Government could by contract divest the United States of any interest it might have in the funds unless so authorized by Congress. We are unaware of any such authority having been granted to either the Secretary or the Administrator of the Resettlement Administration. To put it another way, the obligation assumed by the States when the grants were made cannot be discharged by collateral agreements between the States or their agencies and the Secretary. This obligation was aptly stated by the Supreme Court of South Carolina in *Harris* v. *Fulp*, as follows:

"The Governor of the State of South Carolina requests periodically from the Federal Emergency Relief Administrator under the said act of Congress, namely, section 5 and subsection (c) of section 4 of said act, and for the purpose of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act (15 U. S. C. A., secs. 725, 724 (c, a)), funds in the form of grants, using therefor Federal Emergency Relief Administration form 11-B and the Treasurer of the United States sends the United States checks periodically for such funds to the Governor of the State, who, in his application, promises that these funds and the disbursement thereof shall be expended and made in accordance with the said act of Congress and the rulings and regulations prescribed by the Federal Emergency Relief Administrator. It appears, therefore, that the Federal Emergency Relief Administration makes these grants under the said act of Congress to the Governor as the Governor of the State of South Carolina upon the promise that the Governor shall expend the funds so received as the act of Congress intended it to be expended, namely, for the relief of destitution and unemployment."

Finally, it has been contended before the committee that disposition of the assets in question in any manner other than returning them to the States for unrestricted use would be unconstitutional. *Rice* v. *Railroad Company* (supra), which was cited with approval in the case of *United States* v. *Minnesota* (270 U. S 181), was cited in support of the proposition. In the Rice case, Rice, the plaintiff, claimed land by purchase and entry from the United States. The railroad company defended under a grant to Minnesota for railroad-construction purposes. The plaintiff replied that the granting statute was repealed, and the defendant claimed the repealing statute was void. The Court held the repealing statute was valid. The following extracts from the opinion are pertinent here:

"Omitting all such parts of it (the granting statute) as are unimportant in this investigation, it provides 'that there shall be, and is hereby, granted to the Territory of Minnesota, for the purpose of aiding in the construction of a railroad * * * every alternate section of land, designated by odd numbers, for six sections in width on each side of said road within said Territory * * * which land shall be held by the Territory of Minnesota for the use and purpose aforesaid.' Certain words in the clause are omitted, because they are not material to the present inquiry, and if produced, would only serve to embarrass the investigation. Standing alone, the clause furnishes strong evidence to refute the proposition of the defendants, that a beneficial interest passed in presenti to the Territory; because it is distinctly provided that the lands granted shall be held by the Territory for a declared use and purpose, evidently referring to the contemplated railroad, which, when constructed, would be a public improvement of general interest. Resort to construction, however, on this point is wholly unnecessary, because it is expressly declared in the second provisio that the land hereby granted shall be exclusively applied in the construction of that road for which it was granted, and shall be disposed of only as the work progresses; and the same shall be applied to no other purpose whatever. Beyond question, therefore, the lands were to be held by the Territory only for the use and purpose of constructing the railroad described in the act, and they were to be applied to that purpose and no other."

* * * * *

"That rule (strict construction against grantee) is plainly applicable to this case; and when applied, we think it is clear that the Territory acquired nothing under the act of Congress set up in the answer but a mere naked trust or power to dispose of the lands in the manner therein specified, and to apply the same to the use and purpose therein described. Suppose it to be so, then it is not controverted that Congress could at any time repeal the act creating the trust, if not executed, and withdraw the power."

On the other hand, the first syllabus of the opinion states the corresponding rule, as follows:

"If Congress pass an act granting public lands to a Territory to aid in making a railroad, and if, by the true construction of the act, the Territory acquired any beneficial interest in the lands as contradistinguished from a mere naked trust or power to dispose of them for certain specified uses and purposes, the act is irrepealable, and a subsequent act attempting to repeal it is void."

Thus, if the grants in question were not for specified purposes or if the purpose of the grants were being complied with by the States, there would be no contention that Congress could or should revoke the grants. However, under the facts before the committee there is no question of repealing the grant statutes but simply the question of whether Congress has the power to prevent an unauthorized use of grant money since the grant statutes clearly limited the use for which such granted funds could be expended. It is one thing to change the rules after the game has started but an entirely different thing to enforce rules during the game that were in effect when the game started.

In conclusion, it might be appropriate to discuss briefly the possible moral issues involved in the problem before the committee. We do not understand that the State or corporation representatives who have appeared before the committee or expressed an interest in H R 2392 and H R 3244 have contended at any time that the States have a moral right to use the funds in question for any purpose not authorized by the grant statutes. On the other hand, the department certainly does not wish to deny the States any rights they now have to use the funds. If we understand the position of the States and corporations correctly it is that the funds will be used by them for rural rehabilitation purposes and that such use is authorized under the granting acts. The distinction between rural depression relief and 1934 drought relief and the broad concept of rural rehabilitation is discussed in the Department's report. The dilemma of the States and corporations today arises not from any threatened breach of good faith on the part of any branch of the Federal Government but rather from the fact that the grants were not made for use in social welfare programs in times of prosperity, but were made to relieve distress in emergencies induced by the depression and 1934 drought. The grant statutes were based on emergencies found to exist by Congress and did not contain the words "rural rehabilitation"—these are the facts which the department feels permit an objective consideration of the proposed legislation by the Congress free from any supposed legal or moral restraint other than to act for the public welfare.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would like to say to the gentleman who has just addressed the House that the States that will receive nothing have contributed nothing to this trust fund. This is not an appropriation of money. I am just a little surprised at the gentleman, knowing his legal brilliance, that he would suggest that this money could be returned to the Treasury of the United States, because the basis for the trust no longer exists.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it not a fact that the Federal Government appropriated the great bulk of this money for a specific purpose? It came from the Federal Treasury for the purpose of setting up a trust fund. I ask what is to become of the money when the trust is carried out.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is confused because no trust was created when the money was granted to the corporations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes. I do not want to be left out on the legal limb and then have the gentleman run off and leave me.

No trust was created in the original act. The trust is one which was created in my State 12 years ago, and it is not predicated upon the existence or nonexistence of an emergency or upon a need of any particular kind; it is predicated upon a transfer of funds from the State corporation to the Federal Secretary of Agriculture. That is the trust I am trying to enforce.

Mr. HESELTON. Does the gentleman disagree with the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan?

Mr. COOLEY. I disagree with every bit of it.

Mr. HESELTON. That this comes out of the appropriation?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that the original source of these funds was the emergency appropriations passed back in the early thirties during the depression?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. Those were grants made to the States for certain purposes?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. When those grants were made the grant became the property of the States to which the grants were made?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. KEEFE. There was no way of recalling those grants, as we have under the continuous grant programs today, where you can withhold future grants for noncompliance or failure to utilize them as somebody might want. The money became the money of the States?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand that was the opinion of the Comptroller General at that time.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. That that money became the money of the States, vested in the States without any strings tied to it at all. Now, when the thing was transferred back, it was transferred under a trust agreement?

Mr. COOLEY. Exactly.

Mr. KEEFE. An agreement entered into between the Secretary of Agriculture and the various State corporations or organizations operating in the States and utilizing this money?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. That is the trust agreement that has been referred to by which these funds were vested in the Department of Agriculture subject to the condition of those trusts. As I understand the situation, the States are asking that those moneys be returned in accordance with the provisions of those trust agreements?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand the Comptroller has ruled that there is a legal liability resting upon the United States Government as a result of the provisions of those trust agreements to turn this money back to them. Is that not what this proposes to do?

Mr. COOLEY. That is the situation and that is what we propose to do and, further, the funds are in a trust account marked "State Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Fund."

Mr. KEEFE. The corporation in my State is in existence and they are demanding the return of this money pursuant to the terms of the trust agreement entered into.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Some gentlemen have indicated that certain of the States are not going to get back as much as others. Is it not a fact that this money was originally appropriated on a formula, the details of which I am not familiar with, and some of the States spent or squandered or expended their money in some way or other and did not have any money to put in the trust fund?

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. I understand this $50,000,000 is the taxpayers' money appropriated from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is woefully lacking in understanding if that is his understanding.

Mr. REES. No. Was not this money appropriated once from the Federal Treasury?

Mr. COOLEY. It was appropriated out of the Federal Treasury and has never been appropriated back into the Federal Treasury. It is not in the Federal Treasury now. It is in a trust fund.

Mr. REES. But it was appropriated out of the Federal Treasury in the first place?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. REES. It has been said over and over again that the purposes for which the money was appropriated or allocated in the first place has ceased to exist; is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. No; I do not think so, because I think we still have distressed rural areas in America and we still appropriate millions of dollars every year to carry on a rural rehabilitation program.

Mr. FULTON. What States are getting no money?

Mr. COOLEY. The States that put no money in.

Mr. FULTON. Well, what are they?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know. See the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, in the colloquy between the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], the statement was made that the Comptroller General had made a ruling that these funds belonged to the States. Now, I do not recall that any ruling of that kind appeared anywhere in the hearings, and I would like very much to have that ruling pointed out to me.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I referred to page 5 of the report, in which it states:

> Ample evidence was presented to the committee during its hearings on this matter that both the Federal Emergency Relief Administrator and the Comptroller General, at that time Mr. McCarl, regarded the grants to States for rural rehabilitation and relief purposes as outright grants and the assets arising from those grants as the property of the States.

It is in your report.

Mr. HOPE. That is a conclusion on the part of the author of the committee report

Mr KEEFE. I do not know, if you cannot believe what your committee reports.

Mr HOPE. I am inquiring as to what evidence there was in the hearings that there was any formal ruling on that point by the Comptroller General.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, this matter certainly should be resolved one way or the other. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] correctly stated the proposition. This money was appropriated out of the Federal Treasury, given to the States for a specific purpose, and the balance not used is now held in a trust fund for the benefit of some 43 States who participated. Trust agreements were entered into with these various States. They may have varied somewhat in their language, so I will address myself solely to the Iowa contract. It has this provision relating to termination of the trust agreement:

> ART VIII In the event that the authority of the Administrator or his successor (as provided in article IX, section 1 hereof) shall cease, this agreement shall be forthwith terminated and the property remaining of that hereby transferred, together with the remaining proceeds, after the liquidation of any claims then existing against such assets, shall be retransferred to the corporation or to such other corporation, person or agency as shall be prescribed by the Legislature of the State of Iowa.

The Governor of the State of Iowa advised me by telegram on May 17, 1949, in response to my inquiry, that under section 1, chapter 86, Acts of the Forty-eighth General Assembly of Iowa, it is provided that the Iowa State Department of Social Welfare shall receive such funds if they are returned to the State of Iowa.

So, the only question remaining here is whether or not we are going to uphold the sanctity of contracts, and whether or not we believe in State's rights. The State of Iowa has the sum of $1,253,932.55 in the trust fund, with accrued interest of $74,891.77.

During the hearings on this bill I interrogated Mr. Rooney, Assistant Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, regarding the Iowa trust agreement and the sanctity of contracts in general. On page 65 of the hearings you will find the following colloquy:

> Mr. HOEVEN Do you think that the Government should carry out its contractual obligations?
>
> Mr ROONEY I do not think it is necessary or even wise to go through with a useless and expensive procedure
>
> Mr HOEVEN. I am asking you this: Do you think the Government should carry out its contractual obligations?
>
> Mr ROONEY Oh, yes; I do.

So really the only question involved here is whether or not we are going to carry out these contractual obligations with the respective States.

Something has been said about resorting to the courts to determine the issue. This would only mean a multiplicity of suits and would perhaps involve 43 States. Why have the Federal courts resolved this question when it can be resolved here? It is my understanding that a similar bill has already passed the Senate.

There can be no doubt that the trust agreements transferring these assets to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration are legally binding instruments enforceable in the courts, and establishing an unconditional obligation on the part of the United States to return the trust assets to the States. I challenge any one to interpret the provisions of the Iowa agreement in any other way. Ours is an unconditional proposition. So in the opinion of a majority of the committee, the United States is now estopped from questioning the title of the respective States to the trust assets and from making any disposition of said assets other than that directed by the States, if the State choose to exercise its right under the agreement.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. If this bill is passed, do the funds go back to the States?

Mr. HOEVEN. They will go back to the States if it is requested by the Governors or the proper agencies designated by the respective State legislatures.

Mr. DONDERO. If the bill is not passed, the funds remain?

Mr. HOEVEN. If the bill is not passed, the money will remain in status quo, until otherwise disposed of. We should determine what is going to be done with it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. It will remain in status quo only so long as the States refrain from bringing suits, but it is true that there will be a lot of suits instituted.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The suits can be instigated by each one of the 43 States, and the courts will then have to determine what shall be done with the funds that are now held in trust. The passage of the bill will make that all unnecessary.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the enactment of H. R. 2392, because I am convinced it is neither practical nor economical. Last year I introduced an alternate plan, H. R. 5832, which eliminates the wasteful duplication of services by Federal and State agencies provided in H. R. 2392. A detailed analysis of my bill is included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 15, page A5063. Briefly, my bill proposes to create in the United States Treasury a revolving fund for each of the 43 States which transferred assets to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to utilize these revolving funds through the existing facilities of the Farmers Home Administration for extending operating credit to farmers.

I have here a statistical summary showing the loans and collections of the Farmers Home Administration cumulative through June 30, 1949; and the figures make me all the more certain that H. R. 5832 provides the logical answer to the present troublesome question of what to do with the unexpended balances of Federal Emergency Relief Act appropriations. They indicate conclusively what we can expect if the approximately $50,000,000 is made available to the Farmers Home Administration for use in extending credit to deserving farm families. The summary covers the production and subsistence lending activities of Farmers Home since October 31, 1946, when that agency was created, and represents—in my opinion—a true picture of what this agency is now doing and will continue to do. In all, Congress has appropriated, and this agency has lent, to deserving farmers, a total of $196,286,458. Such funds are direct Government loans repayable over a 5-year period, and repayments already maturing have amounted to $97,362,467. Of this sum, the agency has already collected $89,615,094 in principal—92 percent of the amount due. I believe this is comparable with other credit experiences, yet these loans are made to farmers who lack the necessary chattels or other security to make them eligible for private or cooperative credit.

In addition, the agency has collected almost $5,000,000 in interest, so that combined interest and principal amounts to almost 96 percent of the matured debt. While there are some arrears, of course,

the Farmers Home has found it necessary to write off only $34,656 as uncollectible, and has judgments for only $9,306 against persons obviously attempting to avert payments.

Mr. Chairman, I have already been granted unanimous consent to include the table referred to as a part of my remarks, and I urge my colleagues to examine it carefully. I am sure Members will be proud of the borrowing record of our American farmers. In my State, Iowa, for example, FHA borrowers have already repaid more than their matured indebtedness. Of the $3,291,695 which has been loaned since October 31, 1946, maturities have amounted to $1,113,960 and principal repayments to $1,120,209. Even if the $98,973 interest these families have paid is left out of account, the repayment record stands at 100.6 percent of maturities.

Other Midwestern States have equally impressive repayment records, as follows: Wisconsin, 109.3 percent; Minnesota, 104.5 percent; Illinois, 97.4 percent; North Dakota, 94.8 percent; Missouri and Nebraska, 93.3 percent—all above the national average. The conclusion is inescapable that the Farmers Home program, as operated in the Middle West, is bringing good results both in repayment and in providing the means for better farming. The record shows beyond doubt that the Farmers Home Administration is doing a first-rate job in rural rehabilitation. Moreover, the American taxpayer is receiving good returns on his investment in this agency's programs. Under the circumstances, it is only prudent to utilize these existing facilities rather than to create or revive duplicate, competing agencies in 43 States. Furthermore, under my plan, the funds would be protected by FHA safeguards, and the borrowers would receive sound farm-management guidance.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the total value of the assets involved in the legislation under discussion is approximately $50,000,000. The funds were first handled by the State emergency relief administrations; subsequently, they were turned over to the State rural rehabilitation corporations; in 1935, when the Comptroller General of the United States ruled that these State corporations could no longer be financed by Federal funds, the corporations transferred these assets to the Federal Government for use in their respective States. The ultimate disposition of these funds has been hanging in the air for the past 4 years—since passage of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946. As a practical matter, the corporate funds cannot be returned to the State corporations as provided in H. R. 2392, for the simple reason that many of the State corporations have long since ceased to exist.

My bill, unlike H. R. 2392, recognizes the changes that have taken place and proposes to make practical use of the remaining money—within the respective States to which it was granted—for purposes which are already authorized in the Farmers Home Administration Act: that is, for the making of production and subsistence loans to farmers and stockmen who cannot secure the necessary financing elsewhere for livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs.

Under my bill the money would constitute a revolving fund for each of the 43 States which had a rural rehabilitation corporation, and would be added to the amount now available to the States through the annual appropriations for production and subsistence loans under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act as amended by the Farmers Home Administration Act. As the loans are repaid, the principal and interest would be applied to the appropriate revolving funds; and, since title II loans have a maximum maturity period of 5 years, with annual payments thereon, the money would turn over frequently and be in relatively constant use.

Today, Mr. Chairman, there are many farmers seeking operating credit whose needs, for want of adequate collateral, cannot be taken care of by local banks. Among them are thousands of war veterans who have not yet been able to achieve the most efficient agricultural production of which they are capable. Through the Farmers Home Administration some of these young farmer-veterans are being helped to build up their production and, thereby, to provide better homes, improved living conditions, and wider educational opportunities for their families. This program has been working out well indeed; the loans are being paid back; soil conservation is being promoted; rural communities are benefiting because of the increased incomes. But the demand from farmers for this type of credit is far greater than can be met with the funds appropriated annually by the Congress for title II loans. In this connection, I should like to mention that the Congress has generously provided for on-the-farm training of veterans under the so-called GI bill of rights, a program which is being carried on extensively throughout the agricultural areas of the Nation. However, unless we also provide adequate credit facilities which will enable these young veterans to start farming, we will have largely wasted the funds expended in training them.

My bill will help to rectify the situation without requiring additional appropriations. It simply provides that funds already appropriated, and funds from current liquidations, be used for extending operating credit to a greater percentage of farmers who need and who are eligible for this service. It does not set up any new organization but proposes to utilize the existing machinery of the Farmers Home Administration. It can be put into effect without any delay whatever. It can be administered in conjunction with the existing program with virtually no additional expense and without confusion to the farmers. It will bring an end to the uncertainty as to the disposition of Federal funds which obviously cannot now be used for their original purpose. Moreover, I want to emphasize that my bill, H. R. 5832, is in line with grass-roots thinking on the subject. A few months ago the Iowa FHA advisory committee, composed of substantial farmers and other citizens, none of whom is on the Federal pay roll, unanimously recommended that such legislation be enacted. It is practical, economical, and in the best interests of our farming population. If passed, it will remove the necessity of establishing State agencies parallel to the existing Federal agency—with the attendant expense, delay, and duplication of work—as would be required if H. R. 2392 were enacted.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I intend to offer an amendment to strike out everything after the enacting clause in H. R. 2392 and to substitute the general provisions of my bill H. R. 5832. I say "general" provisions because I propose to revise my own bill slightly. A new subsection will be included releasing in favor of the States any claim to the funds or property derived from the grants for rural or drought relief which are now in the possession of the States or the State rural rehabilitation corporations. My reason for including this provision is that two States—namely, North Carolina, the home of the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and North Dakota—did not turn over to the Secretary of Agriculture all of the assets they derived from the emergency relief acts. Several hundred thousand dollars of the $50,000,000 involved in this legislation are still retained by North Carolina and North Dakota. Presumably, these two States have set up adequate organizations to administer that part of the assets they did not turn over to the Secretary of Agriculture, and no good purpose would be served by disturbing the existing arrangements.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I should like to analyze my proposed amendment, section by section.

Section 1 contains a declaration by the Congress that the emergency referred to no longer exists and that the funds granted thereunder for rural or drought relief can no longer be used for the purposes for which they were originally appropriated or made available by the Congress.

Section 2 (a) would terminate the grants made to the States or rural rehabilitation corporations for rural or drought relief with respect to all funds, property, or other assets derived from such grants and actually transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture or Administrator of the Resettlement Administration pursuant to the transfer agreements, and full legal and equitable title to such funds and property would be vested in the United States. In some States, notably Arkansas, the rural rehabilitation corporation for the State-financed subsidiary corporations which in turn have entered into liquidation agreements with the Secretary. Property covered by these liquidation agreements would also be vested in the United States.

Under section 2 (b) the United States would relinquish in favor of the States any claim to the funds or property derived from the grants for rural or drought relief which are now in the possession of the States or rural rehabilitation corporations.

With certain exceptions, section 3 (a) would create a revolving fund out of the property described in section 2 (a). The Secretary would administer the revolving fund in accordance with the provisions of the proposed bill and the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended. All proceeds from the liquidation of real and personal property, including notes and mortgages, would be placed in the fund and would be available, along with the proceeds of loans made from the fund, for the making of loans under title I or title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. A separate account, however, for each State, the rural-rehabilitation corporation of which transferred property to the Secretary would be kept and maintained by the Secretary. With the exception of administrative expenses in Washington and in the area finance offices of the Farmers Home Administration, the funds so earmarked for each State could be used only in that State. Provision is also made in section 3 (a) for the equitable apportionment of joint investments.

Section 3 (b) is designed to cover a number of special situations:

First Property or investments from corporation funds used in labor-supply centers, labor camps, or labor homes would be disposed of under legislation dealing specifically with those projects.

Second. Land that has been transferred for administration to the Forest Service would be held by the Forest Service and have the status of Weeks law land. This would permit the property to be made available for grazing.

Third. With respect to property which is now a part of a water conservation and utilization or Wheeler-Case project, such property would be continued to be held or liquidated in accordance with the authority applicable to such projects. The same procedure would apply to a nursery now being used by the Soil Conservation Service.

Fourth. Administrative property, such as office equipment, could be transferred to the inventory of the Farmers Home Administration upon payment to the revolving fund of the fair appraised value thereof, or could be used by the Secretary in connection with the administration of the proposed bill.

Fifth. With respect to property which has been transferred to other Federal agencies for liquidation or has been granted to other organizations, such as State agricultural colleges, the property would be continued to be held and used in conformity with the applicable transfer agreements. However, if any of the property in the foregoing special categories should be liquidated, the proceeds would be placed in the revolving fund, or, in the case of grants, if under terms of the grants the property should revert to the Secretary it would be returned to the revolving fund.

Section 4 would make the compromise powers presently available to the Farmers Home Administration for most of its programs applicable to the administration of the revolving fund.

Section 5 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Section 6 saves the Secretary of Agriculture harmless from any personal liability he may incur in carrying out the provisions of the act.

Section 7 repeals section 2 (f) of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, which directed the Secretary of Agriculture to liquidate, as expeditiously as possible, the trusts under the transfer agreements with the various State rural rehabilitation corporations, and authorized and directed him to negotiate with responsible State officials to that end.

Mr. Chairman, I realize this is a complicated problem and, in order to clarify it for any of my colleagues who may not have had an opportunity to study it thoroughly, I have prepared a brief question-and-answer summary, as follows:

First. How much money is involved?

Fifty million dollars.

Second. Whence were the funds derived?

From the Federal emergency relief acts passed in the 1930's. Not 1 cent was contributed by the States.

Third. What is the legislative status of the funds?

The funds are held in the United States Treasury by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to trust agreements with the several States. The act which created the Farmers Home Administration in 1946 provided that disposition of the funds should be made as expeditiously as possible—but it did not specify how the liquidation was to be accomplished.

Fourth. What does my amendment propose?

It sets up a revolving fund in the Treasury for each of the 43 States which transferred unexpended relief funds to the Secretary of Agriculture; such funds to be used for extending operating credit to farmers; and each revolving fund to be used only within the particular State for which it is created.

Fifth. How does my amendment propose to extend this credit?

Through the existing facilities of the Farmers Home Administration.

Sixth. Will my amendment aid veterans?

It will provide additional credit to assist young veterans—many of whom are presently enrolled in on-the-farm training under the so-called GI bill of rights—to start farming.

Seventh. Does my amendment have the support of farmers?

Yes, my amendment represents grassroots thinking on the subject. It was, in fact, inspired by and has been endorsed unanimously by the Iowa FHA Advisory Committee, which committee is made up for the most part of actual dirt farmers.

Eighth. If enacted, what will my amendment accomplish?

(a) It will bring an end to the uncertainty as to the disposition of Federal funds which obviously cannot now be used for their original purpose.

(b) It will provide additional operating credit to farmers, including young veterans, without requiring additional appropriations, without creating additional agencies, and without delay.

(c) It will utilize the existing facilities of the Farmers Home Administration—thereby removing the necessity for establishing parallel State agencies with the attendant expense, delay, and duplication of work which will be required if H. R. 2392, as now proposed, is enacted.

Production and subsistence loans, maturities and collections, cumulative through June 30, 1949 [1]

State and Territory	Cumulative advances	Matured principal	Collections			Principal write-offs	Principal judgments	Ratio of principal repayments to matured principal
			Principal repayments	Interest payments	Total			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
United States total	$196,286,458	$97,362,467	$89,615,094	$4,933,681	$94,548,775	$34,656	$9,306	92 0
Alabama	7,042,217	4,342,361	4,086,277	166,941	4,253,218	5,693		94 1
Arizona	503,164	218,868	165,576	12,464	178,040			75 6
Arkansas	9,143,483	5,545,032	5,278,951	238,041	5,516,992	1,251		95 2
California	3,041,141	1,241,726	1,096,698	88,087	1,184,785	45		88 3
Colorado	4,869,203	2,381,130	2,107,210	126,729	2,233,939	20		88 5
Connecticut	98,780	46,660	34,716	3,621	38,337			74 4
Delaware	150,407	50,379	33,174	3,662	36,836			65 8
Florida	2,564,261	1,637,824	1,272,700	55,668	1,328,368	763	170	77 7
Georgia	9,213,872	5,885,984	5,395,884	195,794	5,591,678	5,330		91 7
Idaho	3,789,833	1,493,619	1,401,928	105,524	1,507,452			93 9

[1] Loans made by Farmers Home Administration subsequent to Oct 31, 1946

Production and subsistence loans, maturities and collections, cumulative through June 30, 1949—Continued

State and Territory	Cumulative advances	Matured principal	Collections			Principal write-offs	Principal judgments	Ratio of principal repayments to matured principal
			Principal repayments	Interest payments	Total			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Illinois	$3,425,955	$1,180,320	$1,149,019	$105,386	$1,254,405			97.4
Indiana	2,182,202	745,828	711,030	62,872	773,902	$1		95.4
Iowa	3,291,695	1,113,980	1,120,209	98,973	1,219,182	20		100.6
Kansas	3,477,374	1,226,355	1,080,138	91,958	1,172,096	200		88.1
Kentucky	4,001,832	1,918,095	1,813,428	123,883	1,937,311	176		94.5
Louisiana	7,159,411	4,578,753	4,416,797	168,207	4,585,004	3,254		96.5
Maine	2,842,563	1,692,763	1,612,418	78,900	1,691,318			95.3
Maryland	1,362,868	430,714	331,720	36,269	367,998			77.0
Massachusetts	360,675	177,594	144,493	11,819	156,312			81.4
Michigan	4,142,139	1,081,974	1,003,038	116,918	1,119,956	347		92.7
Minnesota	4,503,805	1,372,838	1,434,745	119,749	1,554,494	255	$419	104.5
Mississippi	9,275,173	5,750,670	5,473,605	230,652	5,704,257	2,254		95.2
Missouri	5,718,075	2,246,527	2,099,693	160,328	2,260,021	260		93.5
Montana	4,883,004	1,986,329	1,734,418	108,989	1,843,407	1		87.3
Nebraska	2,750,743	975,103	909,699	81,587	991,286			93.3
Nevada	334,150	99,951	98,237	11,927	110,164			98.3
New Hampshire	406,877	110,651	96,314	14,135	110,449			87.0
New Jersey	1,327,425	572,551	360,980	35,826	405,806			64.6
New Mexico	2,204,494	974,797	778,641	51,069	829,710	10		79.9
New York	3,420,631	1,052,179	913,778	89,633	1,003,411		1,474	86.8
North Carolina	14,825,528	9,565,402	9,230,476	335,781	9,566,257	4,193	1,391	96.5
North Dakota	3,043,495	1,573,192	1,491,853	71,106	1,562,959			91.8
Ohio	2,059,950	679,546	622,574	59,820	682,394			91.6
Oklahoma	9,765,740	4,150,403	3,730,376	233,013	3,963,389	1,161		89.9
Oregon	1,939,500	799,586	658,266	48,879	707,145			82.3
Pennsylvania	2,971,178	947,294	849,037	77,287	926,324	4	2,772	89.6
Rhode Island	62,350	24,909	21,415	2,183	23,598			86.0
South Carolina	10,136,032	7,161,100	6,609,412	223,912	6,833,354	1,399	1,000	92.3
South Dakota	3,330,214	1,155,321	1,118,453	75,926	1,194,379			96.8
Tennessee	3,499,759	1,790,317	1,708,395	92,322	1,800,717			95.4
Texas	16,351,627	8,970,289	7,679,105	372,798	8,051,903	7,898		85.6
Utah	1,581,850	528,928	473,536	40,610	514,146			89.5
Vermont	699,720	131,815	122,632	19,555	142,187			93.0
Virginia	2,078,995	1,219,186	1,179,111	48,021	1,227,732	19		96.7
Washington	1,942,367	650,874	605,822	47,320	653,142	1		93.1
West Virginia	973,220	285,657	277,212	22,999	300,241			97.1
Wisconsin	4,570,472	1,361,077	1,487,920	152,768	1,640,697			109.3
Wyoming	3,034,139	1,490,299	1,258,968	91,466	1,350,434			84.5
Alaska	63,532	18,579	12,855	1,758	14,613			69.2
Hawaii	277,943	60,666	51,467	5,901	57,368			84.8
Puerto Rico	4,280,860	2,660,869	2,255,617	113,527	2,369,144	141	2,000	81.8
Virgin Islands	44,595	6,132	6,030	488	6,518			98.3

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time remaining.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with a question raised by the gentleman from Kansas with regard to the opinion of the Comptroller General, in an opinion which he handed down concerning certain funds in the Alaska corporation when they asked whether or not they could use the funds in the Alaska corporation to match other Federal funds, the question came up as to whether the funds belonged to the corporation or whether they were Federal funds. The Comptroller General, in his opinion, had this to say:

According to this decision—

Referring to some other decision—

it appears the property and funds held by the corporation have lost their Federal identity and may, in every sense of the word, be considered the property of the corporation.

There is no question in my mind but that these are corporation funds.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. Is it not a fact that there is in existence a clause in the contract between the Federal Government and these separate State corporations to the effect that upon the termination of the contract the residue of funds or property that is in the possession of the States will be returned to the States?

Mr. COOLEY. Returned to the corporations. That is the specific provision in the contract I referred to.

Mr. CHELF. Then if that be the case—this bill ought to be passed. The Federal Government would set a most dangerous precedent if it violated this or any other solemn contract bearing its signature and seal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act"

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: On page 1, line 4, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following: "That for the purposes of this act (a) it is hereby declared by the Congress that the emergency declared in the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 55) and the emergency referred to in an appropriation of $525,000,000 in the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935 (48 Stat. 1021, 1056), under the item 'Emergency Relief' no longer exist and (b) that funds (including assets and proceeds derived therefrom) granted to the several States or the rural rehabilitation corporations thereof for rural or drought relief pursuant to the foregoing acts or the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351) can no longer be used for the purposes for which they were originally appropriated or made available by the Congress.

"SEC. 2. (a) The purposes for which said funds were originally appropriated or made available having been terminated, the grants to the several States or rural rehabilitation corporations thereof for rural or drought relief pursuant to the authorities described in section 1 are hereby terminated with respect to any funds, property, or other assets derived from such grants and heretofore actually transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) or the Administrator of the Resettlement Administration (hereinafter referred to as the Administrator) pursuant to transfer agreements entered into between the several rural rehabilitation corporations and the Secretary or Administrator, including the proceeds of such property and property under control of the Secretary pursuant to liquidation agreements with corporations which derived their property directly or indirectly from the aforesaid grants, and full legal and equitable title to such funds, property, and assets, and the proceeds thereof shall henceforth be vested in the United States for use in accordance with the provisions of this act

"(b) With respect to any funds, property, or other assets, or the proceeds thereof derived from the aforesaid grants for rural or drought relief, which are now in the possession of any State or rural rehabilitation corporation thereof, the interest of the United States therein is hereby relinquished in favor of such State.

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a revolving fund. Except as provided in subsection (b) hereof, the funds, property, and other assets, and the proceeds thereof, described in section 2 (a) are hereby transferred to such fund. Any of such property which at the present time represents a joint investment with other Government funds shall become a part of the revolving fund only in the proportion as determined by the Secretary that the assets acquired by the Secretary or Administrator pursuant to a transfer agreement with a rural rehabilitation corporation contributed to the total joint investment. The Secretary shall administer the revolving fund in accordance with provisions

of this act and the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, not inconsistent herewith. Any assets consisting of notes, mortgages, and the other obligations transferred to the fund shall be held and liquidated in accordance with the tenor of such obligations and the proceeds of such obligations, the proceeds from loans made from the fund, the proceeds from the liquidation of other property transferred to the fund, and the income from property transferred to the fund, shall be deposited in the fund. With respect to each State, the rural rehabilitation corporation of which transferred property to the Secretary or Administrator, the Secretary shall keep and maintain a separate record and account of all funds, property, or other assets, or the proceeds thereof, so transferred and except as provided herein funds and property in the revolving fund required to be reflected in the account for any State may be used only in such State. In addition to other funds available for such purposes, the cash in the revolving fund shall be available to the Secretary for the making of direct loans under title I or title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, for the servicing of outstanding obligations, collecting loans, and the liquidating of property in the fund, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, including printing and binding, personal services and rentals, provided, however, that the Secretary may expend funds at the seat of the Government and in the area finance offices of the Farmers Home Administration for administrative expenses, including personal services, equitably apportioning such expenses among the respective accounts for the several States. Moneys in the fund shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the fund.

"(b) Any property acquired by the Secretary or Administrator under the transfer agreements with the rural-rehabilitation corporations which (1) has been transferred for use in connection with labor-supply centers, labor camps, or labor homes shall continue to be so used until such use terminates or the property is disposed of or liquidated under other law; (2) has been transferred for administration to the Forest Service for forest, forest nursery, grazing, flood control, or other purposes shall continue to be so used and shall be administered in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to lands acquired under the act of March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521); (3) has been transferred to the Soil Conservation Service as a part of a water conservation and utilization or Wheeler-Case project or for a nursery shall continue to be so used until liquidation in accordance with other authority; (4) has been used as administrative property for programs under the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 may be transferred to the inventory of the administrative property of the Farmers Home Administration upon payment to the revolving fund of the fair appraised value thereof as determined by the Secretary or may be used by the Secretary in connection with the administration of this act; or (5) has been transferred for use or liquidation to any other person, organization, State, or Federal agency, shall be continued to be held or disposed of subject to the terms of the transfer, but should any of the property covered by this subsection (b) be liquidated, or under the terms of the transfer revert to the Secretary, then the property, or the proceeds thereof, shall become a part of the revolving fund for use in the State in which such property is located.

"SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to compromise, adjust, or cancel obligations constituting a part of the revolving fund in accordance with the conditions and limitations of the act of December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 836), and the indebtedness of farmers arising from loans or payments made or credits extended by the rural-rehabilitation corporations, the Administrator or the Secretary out of assets subject to the provisions of this act shall be added to the types of indebtedness and property subject to the provisions of the act of December 20, 1944, and title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

"SEC. 5. The Secretary shall have the power to make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary shall be saved harmless against any personal liability he may incur in carrying out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 7. Section 2 (f) of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, approved August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1062) is hereby repealed."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered as a compromise between the conflicting viewpoints which exist on this question. As I stated a while ago, the bill which I originally introduced in the Eightieth Congress and reintroduced in the Eighty-first Congress would have turned all of this money back to the Treasury. The amendment which I am now offering would turn the principal part of this fund, all of it with the exceptions which I will mention, over to the Secretary of Agriculture, to be used by the Farmers' Home Administration in making loans under title I or title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; that is, loans for tenant purchases and for rural rehabilitation, the same type of loans that are now being made by the Farmers Home Administration with the exception of the administrative expense in Washington and in area financial offices, funds derived from the assets transferred by a particular State rural rehabilitation corporation would be earmarked to use in the State. That is, the funds that came from the rural rehabilitation corporation in the State of Minnesota would belong to Minnesota, and so on as to each State.

With reference to the property and funds that have been retained by States and their corporations, those funds would remain in the hands of the States. There are a few instances where that has been done. For instance, the State of North Carolina has retained some funds, I believe about $360,000, if my memory serves me. Those funds would remain in the hands of the States. The United States would relinquish any interest therein to the State.

If enacted, the bill would in effect give legal approval for continuing the way the funds and property have been administered heretofore under the provisions of the appropriation act. There are two or three exceptions that I want to mention.

One is that property or investments of corporation funds used in labor-supply centers, labor camps, or labor homes would be disposed of under legislation dealing specifically with those projects. Another is that land that has been transferred for administration to the Forest Service would be held by the Forest Service and have the status of Weeks law land. This would permit the property to be made available for grazing. That situation applies especially in New Mexico and possibly some other States.

With respect to property which is now a part of a water conservation and utilization or Wheeler-Case project, such property would be continued to be held or liquidated in accordance with the authority applicable to such projects. The same procedure would apply to a nursery now being used by the Soil Conservation Service.

Administrative property, such as office equipment, could be transferred to the inventory of the Farmers Home Administration upon payment to the revolving fund of the fair appraised value thereof, or could be used by the Secretary in connection with the administration of the proposed bill.

With respect to property which has been transferred to other Federal agencies for liquidation or has been granted to other organizations, such as State agricultural colleges, the property would be continued to be held and used in conformity with the applicable transfer agreements.

That in general covers the provisions of this bill. What it does in effect is to maintain in status quo the situation that now prevails under the temporary legislation by which these funds have been administered.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. Do I understand the amendment the gentleman has offered, or his substitute, whichever it is, excludes those States which are not listed in this compilation on page 6 of the committee report?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is correct. The bill would simply provide that the funds shall be allocated to loans in the States based upon the amount that come from the States in the first place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes in order an answer questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Those States, as I understand it, are Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Delaware, and Maryland. I am wondering if the gentleman has any information as to why in 1933 and 1934 no Federal funds were granted to those States for the purposes of this act?

Mr. HOPE. Well, I am unable to say whether there were any funds granted. It is possible funds were granted and were completely exhausted in those States. I do not know what the situation is in that regard. I will be glad to try to get the information for the gentleman. Perhaps those in charge of the relief program in those States did not see fit to organize rehabilitation corporations.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ The gentleman called attention to New Mexico where under this program close to 200,000 acres of land were repurchased for certain communities on which they had based their economy in years past and finally lost. As a result of that they were in great distress. What I want to ask the gentleman is this: Under his amendment those lands would not be required to be liquidated and put on the auction block?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct, they would not be. They would not be affected at all.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Under the gentleman's amendment, if it is desired, arrangements could be made whereby those lands may be put under the Forest Service for permanent administration.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: "That this act may be cited as the 'Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act'

"SEC 2 The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be appropriate and necessary to liquidate, as expeditiously as possible, and within 3 years from the effective date of this act, trusts under the transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall be saved harmless against any personal liability he may incur in carrying out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 3. To effectuate the provisions of section 2 hereof, the Secretary, during the period specified in section 2, shall—

"(a) convert the assets and properties held by him in trust into cash and promptly transmit such cash to the Treasury of the United States for deposit to miscellaneous receipts *Provided*, That obligations which do not mature within such period shall be liquidated at maturity or on default, whichever is the sooner: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may retain and use so much of said funds as he finds will be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this act,

"(b) cause to be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury whatever cash may be in the trust accounts on the date of the approval of this act as he deems is not needed for the purpose of subparagraph (a) of this section.

"SEC 4. The Secretary shall have the power to make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

"SEC 5 Section 2 (f) of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat 1062), is hereby repealed"

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, upstate New York is the forgotten part of the Nation. Ten years ago, in 1939, when I came down here, I appealed to Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace and attempted to get an interview with him for the greatest area of distress that the country has ever known, namely, our dairy areas of upstate New York, which were then unable to get hay. A year ago this House, in a friendly gesture to the West, passed a large emergency loan act and made it possible for several million cattle to be fed out West. In 1940, may I remind my good friend the chairman, who made the point, we were in a distressed area up there. In 1940 the dairy sections of upstate New York were in exactly the same position as they were out West last year in that dairy herd after dairy herd had to be liquidated, and our farmers faced absolute bankruptcy. This substitute of mine will give an opportunity to the State of New York to come in for her just share instead of the $91,000, a paltry sum, which is offered to us.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it will provide that these funds will be held by the Federal Treasury as general funds of the United States Government?

Mr EDWIN ARTHUR HALL So that the State of New York will have a fair share along with the rest of these fellows that are coming in for a tremendous amount of money. Unfortunately we have never been able to have the power down here that many of the other sections have had because we are not a member of the farm bloc We do not command the power that some of these big organizations from the far West and the deep South do. For that reason we have been fighting a lost cause for a long time, for the past 10 years.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, by that amendment and the action of the gentleman taken here today this $50,000,000 that is in question here will be the property of the Federal Government instead of being parceled out to just a few favored States?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. And it will be fairly distributed. New York State will come in for its fair share. I think it is an outrageous situation that year after year the 100,000 dairymen of upstate New York continue to get a raw deal, continue to have their milk prices cut by an unfair outfit down here in Washington.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Does the gentleman maintain that the dairymen of up-State New York are in desperate circumstances now?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We are in such awful circumstances that we are not even able to make cost of production. The gentleman is not familiar with the up-State New York dairying industry or he would not even ask that question.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman's amendment will also have the effect, will it not, of benefiting all the taxpayers of New York State, not alone the dairymen for whom the gentleman is fighting so vigorously?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It will save the taxpayers of New York from a lot of taxes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman mean to say the State of New York has taken the place of the South and is now economic problem No 1?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We are not in line with the cotton kings or the tobacco barons of the South. We are operators of family-size dairies. We milk from 8 to 20 cows in 1 dairy. We do not have an opportunity to make a lot of money, but we are trying to get cost of production and make enough money so that we can keep our heads above water. We are the last vestige of the family-size farm in America, and we want to have an opportunity to be saved.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Can the gentleman inform the House how much money was turned over to the rehabilitation corporation in the State of New York out of the funds that were appropriated in 1933 and 1935 for that purpose?

Mr. KEATING. I asked that question here today and I have not been able to get an answer.

Mr. KEEFE. I should think the diligent Representatives of the State of New York in making the argument that has been made here that the State of New York has been unfairly treated would be able to furnish us with information as to how much they received

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We are fighting with our backs to the wall.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] insist on his point of order?

Mr. COOLEY. No, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. FULTON. It is an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, is it in order to offer an amendment to my substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report the amendment and the Chair will then determine.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr FULTON——

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, it is not a substitute amendment. It is an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON to the substitute: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert——

Mr. FULTON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman,

may I ask that before the amendment is read, a ruling be made as to the parliamentary situation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is a substitute amendment, an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has asked that a ruling be made on his amendment. To accommodate the gentleman I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a substitute amendment and is not in order at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment as an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must submit his amendment in writing.

Mr. FULTON. It is there in writing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment as an amendment to the Hope substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON to the Hope substitute. Strike out all after the enacting clause——

Mr CASE of South Dakota (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that on the face of it it strikes out all of the enacting clause and is a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not take the floor very often, but when I see Massachusetts getting robbed again, I just want to stand up and let you know that we know what is going on.

In 1933 we passed a bill here when the country was in pretty tough shape as a result of dust storms and everything else, and appropriated $950,000,000 of the money of the citizens of the United States. Massachusetts paid its full share, as well as Connecticut, Rhode Island, Delaware, and Maryland. Now, then, you did not use the money and you put it back into the Treasury of the United States Government, where it belongs. The thing to do is to leave it there, or distribute it pro rata to every State in the Union and not pick out 43 States, because we who have tried to get along without any help from anybody do not want to pay the bill twice. There is only $50,000,000 left of the $950,000,000, and you want Massachusetts to pay a part of that $50,000,000 and pass it back here again so that you can spend it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman if he was not here trying to get his share for Massachusetts of that $10,000,000 that we taxpayers in the rest of the States put into the Waltham Watch Co.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not remember that bill coming before the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When did the taxpayers put in money for the Waltham Watch Co.?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I subscribe to what the gentleman is saying. I call his attention to the fact that in this schedule on page 6, Massachusetts does not get one dime out of this.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I know it.

Mr. KEATING. Whereas, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], Massachusetts, and every other State, will get their fair pro rata share of the $50,000,000. I hope the gentleman will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. NICHOLSON. I followed with a great deal of attention the remarks of both of the brilliant gentlemen from New York who just spoke.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think we should have an answer to the question as to when the United States paid money into the Waltham Watch Co. When did they?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I will ask the gentleman from Ohio if he is interested.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is very important. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has left the impression that the State of Massachusetts received benefits through the Waltham Watch Co and got some money from the taxpayers. That casts a reflection on Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. No. I will tell the gentleman that sometimes these questions are asked facetiously and sometimes they are not. But it does not make any difference to me what kind of questions are asked, except that I want to tell you that we in Massachusetts paid our fair share of that $950,000,000 when it was distributed, and now, when you have not been able to use it for 10 or 11 years because there is not any emergency and there is not anything that comes up you can spend it for, you want to take part of that $50,000,000 and use it.

Mr. CANFIELD. How does the gentleman feel about the committee report stating that $50,000,000 is only a small amount of money?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, it is, around here today.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Fifty million dollars put into the United States Treasury will be spent in 4 hours, at the rate they are spending money now.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RIVERS. Is that on butter substitutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] has expired.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I ask unanimous consent to speak for five additional minutes and to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Well, one could almost laugh at the things that have been said here this afternoon—not just recently, but a short time ago. The learned and distinguished gentleman from Ohio stood here at this microphone, and we boys on the right-hand side of the House sat real quiet, unusually quiet. It was a great entertainment. I enjoyed it. I liked it better than going to a comic opera, because it did have its comic side.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Which gentleman from Ohio is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Oh, I am referring to that great big gentleman from Ohio, a bigger man than I am physically, and probably every other way also, (Mr. BROWN). He seemed to be all hot and bothered about that hundred-dollar-a-plate Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner that was held here in Washington. He did not see why we did it. He did not like the way we did it. There were a lot of things about it that did not meet with his approval. I want to tell him, and everybody else—I am sorry he is not here—just why we did that. You know, that was a celebration, boys; that is what we were doing; we were celebrating. I sought this 10 minutes to tell the Members of this House some of the things we were celebrating at that Jefferson-Jackson dinner.

The southern boys were celebrating the fact that they were not taking 6 cents a pound for their cotton, and that is really something to celebrate. Every southern man that was there had a perfect right to be there, and plenty reason to celebrate.

Now, we were celebrating the fact that the boys out in Iowa were not having to sell their corn for 12 cents a bushel. All of us fellows in the central region celebrating the fact that we were not taking 3 cents a pound for our hogs, and 6 cents a dozen for our eggs, and 35 cents a bushel for our wheat.

Maybe it was a Belshazzar carnival, but when you consider the things we were celebrating, it was justified.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. What about the saving of farms and homes, too?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Certainly. We were celebrating the saving of farms and homes. We were celebrating the fact during the past 12 years 9,976 banks had not failed in the United States without any deposit insurance. That was something else we were celebrating.

Mr. DINGELL. And not losing our homes to the sheriff.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Yes; we were not losing our farms at the front doors of courthouses.

We were celebrating the fact that we did not have 12,000,000 unemployed in the United States today but that we did have over 55,000,000 people at work at the best wages they have ever been paid in the history of these United States. That is what we were celebrating over there. Our celebration was justified. There is not a soup kitchen in the United States.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Nobody asked the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to yield. I refuse to yield; I decline to yield because we did not interrupt the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] for the whole 23 minutes that he spoke.

Mr. FULTON. Would not the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. We must remember that we have not got a soup kitchen or bread line in the United States—not one. The old folks in the United States that have spent almost a lifetime in the fields, feed lot, office, factory, or kitchen do not have to go to the poorhouse now to spend their declining days. We have old-age assistance and social security. We were celebrating that, among other things.

We were celebrating the 75-cent minimum wage that I helped pass in this House last year, and I am proud of my action. That ended sweatshops.

We were celebrating the fact that we have REA in this country that has taken electricity to the farms and let the farm woman throw away her coal oil lamp, and have electric light and refrigeration. Why, I venture to say that even up in northern New York, where the gentleman from that State says they are so poor, they have electric lights.

We were celebrating the fact that we have a soil conservation program in the United States, that is helping save the top soil of this land.

What Republican administration since Abe Lincoln has helped an old farmer buy a truckload of lime to spread on his hardpan points so he would get a little more fertility into his soil? What Republican administration ever helped a farmer terrace a field?

We were celebrating the fact that we have price supports in the United States that do not allow agricultural products to sink to the prices that we have just named.

Another thing we were celebrating is the fact that our national income is $250,000,000,000 instead of the $40,000,000,000 to which it had sunk when the Republican party had had us for 12 long, weary, bitter, inactive years. That is another thing we were celebrating. We were also celebrating the fact that ex-GI's had never come to Washington, D. C., hungry, cold, jobless, and in rags and been chased out of the Capital of the Nation that they had fought to defend by the orders of a Democratic Administration.

We were also celebrating the fact that GI's were no longer standing on street corners all over the United States selling apples and pencils in a vain endeavor to keep body and soul together.

The last fact that we were celebrating was the fact that every New Deal measure that has been passed in the United States since Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected President is in force, and there is not a Republican in this House who would introduce a bill to repeal one of them. That is another thing we were celebrating.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Dakota is not a lawyer and he will yield to any good lawyer in the House when a legal question is involved But it is difficult for me to read the very direct language of some of the factual material that appears in the hearings in connection with this matter in 1948 without concluding that it would be impossible for the Congress to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and ever expect it to stand up in the courts.

I have here the hearings in which one of the exhibits is a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States written on July 31, 1935, and signed by J. R McCarl, Comptroller General, replying to an inquiry that was posed by the State of Georgia. I wish you would follow the language very closely, because if this is true it certainly bears upon what we can do here this afternoon. I think there is no question about Mr. McCarl's ability to speak:

> With respect to the corporation funds and properties transferred to the Resettlement Administration as proposed, such funds and the proceeds of the properties will not be required to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts but will be for depositing and covering into the Treasury as a trust fund, available for expenditure by the Resettlement Administration for rural rehabilitation pursuant to the conditions of the transfer, and to be accounted for accordingly.

In other words, Mr. McCarl said if this money is transferred back to the United States, to the Resettlement Administration, it will not go into miscellaneous receipts but will be available only pursuant to the conditions of the transfer.

What were the conditions of the transfer? I have here the testimony where the Chief Justice of the State of North Dakota—that is not my State—brought out that when McCarl made his ruling it required the State of North Dakota through its legislature to pass an act of the State legislature before the money could be retransferred back to the Resettlement Administration. This was part of a law as passed in North Dakota:

> *And provided further,* That if at any time the Federal Government shall cease to carry on the rural rehabilitation program in the State of North Dakota, the remainder of any assets transferred by the corporation to the United States of America together with the proceeds of any assets or property so transferred, shall be returned to the said corporation if it be then in existence, or, in the event the corporation shall have been dissolved in accordance with law, then such assets or property shall be turned over to the State of North Dakota for such disposition as the members of the corporation may have directed prior to the dissolution of the corporation.

In other words, Mr. McCarl first said that if this retransfer is made from the State to the Resettlement Administration it must be under the conditions governing that transfer, in the case of North Dakota, and said that you cannot transfer it back without an act of the legislature. The conditions of that act will govern. In that act they said if the Resettlement Administration fails to function the assets return to the corporation of North Dakota and if the corporation is dissolved, the assets must be turned over to the State of North Dakota.

Further along the same line, in the agreement with the North Carolina Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, section 4, signed by the State of North Carolina Rural Rehabilitation Corporation and by the Secretary of Agriculture for the Federal Government provided:

> SEC 4 Upon the termination of this agreement in any of the manners herein-above set forth, the property remaining of that transferred, together with the remaining proceeds, shall, after the liquidation of any claims then existing against such assets, be retransferred to the corporation if the same be in existence, or, if the corporation be not in existence, then to the general fund of the State treasury of North Carolina.

In the face of that how would the Congress here today have any power to say that we could take this money and put it into the Treasury and make it available for general distribution? The Comptroller General said that if it goes to the Federal Government as a trust it must be handled under the terms of the trust and by the terms of the trust it is provided that when the trust expires it goes back to the State Treasury of North Carolina.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Dakota who preceded me made a very good point, and it is a point that some of the Members, I think, who are thinking in terms of taking back this money and distributing it, ought to pay a good deal of attention to.

I am supporting the Hope amendment. I think the Hope amendment provides a solution to this problem and the one that we want. My State has the largest rural rehabilitation corporation trust fund in the United States. I know very well what went through the minds of the people when the people of that State entered into a trust agreement, and it was this: Before there was a trust agreement, each of these 43 States, or these States that had these funds, had programs which were not being administered in any sort of uniform fashion. The Federal Government set up an organization, the Farm Security Administration, which administered a program which was closely coordinated with the programs of these corporations. That meant that we had a duplicating agency; it meant that we were going through the ridiculous point of having some people in a State administer a program similar to a Fed-

eral program which was being administered, sitting down side by side, with a separate bookkeeping system, with separate pay, if you please. And, we created at that time a lot of duplication and a duplication of agencies. That was the reason that the Secretary of Agriculture and the States entered into these trust agreements.

The people in my State are heartily in favor of the work that is being done by the Farmers Home Administration. I doubt if there is any State where these funds exist, where there is any conflict in connection with the fact that the work that is being done by the Farmers Home Administration is not being done in accordance with the wishes of the people of that State. I think that is true of the people of Wisconsin as well.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Why is it that the gentleman objects to the fund, which belongs to the corporation in his State, being administered by the directors of that corporation in accordance with the provisions of this bill? Why does he dislike the idea of letting the local people in Minnesota administer this fund?

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not object to local people in Minnesota administering this fund.

Mr. COOLEY. The Hope amendment would have it administered from Washington.

Mr. MARSHALL. The Hope amendment proposes that the Farmers Home Administration will continue that fund as they are now administrating it without going through a lot of fuss and furor and detail. I would like to say to the gentleman from North Carolina, I am sure that he fully realizes that all of these corporation trust funds are not entered with the same language. There is considerable difference. The State of Iowa, for example, has a time limit.

Mr. COOLEY. I know, but the point here involved is that under the committee bill and under an amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], the Minnesota corporation can execute a trust agreement and turn this money back to the Farmers Home Administration if it wants to.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman from North Carolina is making a good point, but it does mean that in the State of Minnesota, in order to do what the gentleman says, it would be necessary, very likely—and I am not an attorney; I do not know what the attorney general of the State of Minnesota would rule—but I believe that it would be necessary to reorganize a corporation for the purpose of doing this. I am trying to short cut that, Mr. Chairman, in making it possible for the program to continue just as it is, as provided by the Hope amendment, which would save all this fuss and furor and confusion.

Mr. COOLEY. If the Legislature of Minnesota does not reactivate the old corporation, or create a new corporation, and that corporation fails to file an application for the return of that money, then it will go right back, under our bill, to the revolving fund to be administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. MARSHALL. In the meantime, during the time this program is in a position of flux, is trying to determine what will be done with this reorganization, those funds, the assets of approximately $4,000,000, three and three-fourths million, to be exact, will be frozen so that no use can be made of them.

Mr. COOLEY. No, they are not frozen now. They are being used at the present time. The funds are now being used, are they not?

Mr. MARSHALL. The funds are now being used. The provision of your bill as presented would mean that after this bill becomes law, until that determination is made, the only ones that could use that would be the present, existing borrowers of the corporation, in order to protect the assets of the corporation, frankly. You could not go out and make a loan.

Mr. COOLEY. They are not making long-term loans, they are trying to keep the fund liquid so that they can comply with such mandate as might be given to them by Congress.

Mr. MARSHALL. I cannot see from my standpoint where the gentleman's objection might be to the bill which was proposed by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COOLEY. I object to it because it is an outright, willful, deliberate breach of faith with the legal document executed in good faith by the people of my State.

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not agree with that.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard the statement made that they are seeking an amendment to the committee bill in order to avoid confusion and hocus-pocus, and so on. It is my humble opinion that unless legislation is passed that is compatible with the legal requirements of the trust agreements that have been entered into between the States and the Department of Agriculture you will precipitate a host of expensive lawsuits that will create more hocus-pocus than has been contemplated by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Let us get certain basic facts clearly established. Everyone seems to agree now that the source of these funds was the original relief appropriations made in 1933 and following in 1935. They were appropriations made by this Congress. In the administration of those funds in most of these States corporations were set up to administer the funds granted by the Federal Government for rural rehabilitation.

I make the statement without fear of contradiction as a matter of fact and as a matter of law that whenever the Federal Government made those grants to the States and that money found itself in the State treasury, at that moment those funds became State funds and lost their identity as Federal funds.

Why do I say that? I happen to serve on the Committee on Appropriations that for years has had charge of making appropriations for a vast number of Federal grants-in-aid, unemployment compensation administration running up to $150,000,000 or $160,000,000 a year, vocational rehabilitation, vocational education, and a host of other aids. Once those grants are made and the money is allotted and placed into the State treasury it becomes the money of that State.

The only check we have, despite the fact that we audit their accounts, is to say to the State, if we find they are not disbursing the funds properly, "We will not give you any more money." They do not attempt to collect back the money already granted because they know they cannot. They only have the club to say, "We will not give you any more money under this program, unless you conform to such-and-such standards." That is in recognition of the basic fundamental fact that those funds as these funds, once they passed from the Federal Treasury, lost their Federal identity and became State money. That was recognized by the Government when these trust-fund agreements were entered into. The Federal Government, acting through the Department of Agriculture head, entered into these trust agreements. That money has been administered during the past 12 years pursuant to the terms of the trust agreements. If you propose to say to my State, which has such a trust agreement, "We are going to violate that agreement and it no longer means anything. We are going to take that money and do with it as we please, and turn it over to the State of New York, or some other State," you will find yourselves faced immediately with a lawsuit.

In my humble opinion you will be licked to a frazzle, because no one in good conscience, or in law, can say that the Congress can violate the terms of such a trust agreement.

With respect to the contention made by my friend, the gentleman from New York, I do not know what the facts are; the gentlemen have talked a great deal on this bill and I suggest that the talk would be more effective if they were able to answer the simple question: In the allocation of these original funds of the $950,000,000 and the $500,000,000, how much did the State of New York get?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. How much money did the State of New York get at that time, and what did the State of New York do with its money? Did they use it for agricultural relief and rehabilitation, or did they spend the money for rehabilitation and relief in their cities? We are not favored with the facts with respect to that, but I assume when those funds were allocated to the various States, the State of New York received its money in the proper proportion under the formula which was used for the distribution of the funds, and they spent their money. They spent their money as they saw fit. They disbursed it as they saw fit. The gentlemen from New York are now here asking that my State and your State,

which conservatively managed these grants for the purposes for which they were made for rural rehabilitation shall now be penalized and that the money shall be taken away from them and turn part of it over to the State of New York because the State of New York, as I understand, has spent this money and does not have any money in this trust fund, or at least only a small amount is available for turning back to the State of New York.

Mr. KEATING Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I can well understand the gentleman's fervor in arguing for the State of Wisconsin when Wisconsin gets $1,500,000 out of this fund, instead of $90,000, which New York State gets.

Mr. KEEFE Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further, because that argument is absolutely unconvincing, and it is beneath the dignity of the distinguished gentleman from New York to make such a statement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further so that I may finish my statement?

Mr. KEEFE. The State of Wisconsin is not getting that money out of the Federal Treasury. The State of Wisconsin is merely receiving back from the Federal Government the money and property which it turned over to the Federal Government pursuant to the trust agreement entered into between the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation and the State of Wisconsin and the Secretary of Agriculture, representing the Federal Government.

Mr. KEATING Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr KEATING. Has the gentleman considered, in making the statement that these sums belong to the State of Wisconsin and the other States, rather than to the Federal Treasury, the argument made by the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture to the effect that the grant statute which was passed was based on an emergency condition found to exist by the Congress, which no longer exists?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I understand that. I am thoroughly familiar with that situation. I may say that, although I found myself in disagreement with the distinguished gentleman from New York, who is a great lawyer, I find myself in complete and absolute disagreement as a lawyer with the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture. Does that answer the gentleman? I do not believe the Solicitor knows what the law is when he wrote that opinion. I have seen the opinion. I am in complete disagreement with it as a Member of Congress, and I am in complete disagreement with it as a lawyer. It seems to me that any lawyer who holds a diploma from any school, without any experience in the law, would find difficulty in reaching the conclusion that has been reached by the Solicitor for the Department of Agriculture in this matter.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I recognize the cogency of the gentleman's argument. What need is there for this legislation if, as the gentleman says, the trust agreements are in existence and we are bound, both in fact and in law, by them? Why consider this bill?

Mr. KEEFE. Because it expedites the situation in which there are varying degrees of responsibility arising out of these various and sundry trust funds in the 43 States that have them.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And further because Federal officials have the money and will not turn it loose.

Mr. KEEFE. I imagine perhaps that is the situation, and they will force the States to go into court and precipitate expensive and long-time litigation to force the Federal Government to do a thing which is provided in the very trust agreements by which the Department of Agriculture got hold of these funds.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Does the gentleman feel that according to the amounts listed in this report, $91,000, is fair to the State of New York?

Mr. KEEFE Well, I cannot answer the gentleman. If he does not have the capacity to understand the argument I have just made, any further explanation would be impossible

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chiarman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. If the gentleman from New York will go back to the history of this legislation in 1932, 1933, 1934, and 1935, when this relief money came about, he will find that the State of New York received more than 13 Southern States combined.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is not well informed on that, because we never received a dime.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, should we adopt the amendments proposed to this bill this afternoon we might just as well bid good-by to our social-security program, to our Railroad Retirement Act, and to all these programs of government which are dependent upon the faith of the United States Government to keep its solemn promises, and to return trust funds in keeping with the terms of the trust agreements. The United States Government now has hundreds of millions of dollars in trust funds for various purposes. Should we break faith in this case, there is no reason why we should not break faith in every other trust fund. No trust fund that I know of now in the United States Treasury is more clearly defined than are these 43 trust funds set up by agreements with the respective States. We cannot be guilty of ignoring the obligation of our Government in this case and then claim that we cannot ignore the trust agreement under which trust funds have been established to pay social-security benefits, to pay railroad-retirement benefits, and to pay all of these other obligations in which the Government has taken money either directly from the taxpayers or from other groups.

In this case the United States Government took the money from 43 States, and the United States Government did not say, "We will keep control of these funds and property so long as the Congress or the Federal Government thinks that it is for the best interest of the States." It said, "In the case of North Carolina we will administer this matter for 12 years. At the end of that time we will return these funds to you and we will let you, the owners of this fund, make decision as to how they shall be used." In the case of the other States the agreement said, "In the event the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture or his successor shall cease, this agreement shall be forthwith terminated and the property" shall be "retransferred to the corporation" or such other agency as the State may designate.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I am sorry. I have only a shore time. I want to point out that the authority of the Secretary mentioned has ceased It ceased by act of this Congress The contracts of all of the States have terminated.

If we are to keep faith we have got to return this money, whether it is a good thing or a bad thing. The question of whether the United States Government made a good trade is not involved. The question of whether the United States should have given this money to the States on the terms that it did is not involved; that has been done; the decision has been made. The United States Government pledged its word and the United States Government signed a contract and said, "We will return this money." Now, are we simply Indian givers? Are we simply speaking with forked tongues? Out of one side of our mouth are we saying, "Yes; we will return the money," and out of the other side are we saying, "Well, we know better than you do and we are going to decide for the States as to just how is the best way of running this affair"? I am not taking issue with the gentleman from Minnesota as to whether it is best for the Federal Government or for the States to run it, but I am saying that every State that has got money here has a solemn contract with the United States that it and it alone shall have the right to make this decision. If the State does not want to make any but wants the Federal Government to continue to run it, all it has to do is to do nothing and the Federal Government will continue to run it.

This bill is actually a statute of limitations. It provides that the right of the States to get the money back, as provided in the contracts between the Federal Government and the States shall end in 3 years. The courts have held that we have a right to establish limitation provisions in enforcing contractual obligations. I believe that on that basis

and that alone we can sustain even the Cooley bill, because the Cooley bill limits the rights of the States. The States have greater rights under their contracts than they have under the Cooley bill. The Cooley bill provides that they must apply within 3 years, the contracts leave it wide open.

All we are asking you to do here this afternoon is to put a statute of limitations upon the right of the States to come in and reclaim their property; that is all we are asking you to do, to give the Federal Government the advantage of this thing, to say that after 3 years the States cannot be heard to come in; whereas today they can come in for an unlimited period.

We hope you will not pass something like the Hope bill that repudiates the obligations of our Government and says that the solemn signature of the United States is worth nothing more than a scrap of paper.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment in order to ask a question of the ranking Republican member of the committee.

I may say that I listened to the reading of the amendment which was offered as a substitute by the gentleman from Kansas, and I listened to his comments on it. Earlier today I spoke on what I proposed to offer as a substitute for the committee bill; and I have come to the conclusion that there is no material difference between the Hope amendment and the Talle amendment. Am I right?

Mr. HOPE. I think there is no material difference. I think the gentleman is correct. I want to qualify that by saying that I have not read his amendment recently and that my attention was diverted during part of the time that we were discussing it, so I do not know as to all the details; but substantially I think the purpose and in general the language of the two provisions is quite similar.

Mr. TALLE. That being the situation I wish to state that I shall not offer my amendment, but will support wholeheartedly the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, two amendments, one offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and another offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] are now before the committee.

I certainly do not want to be unkind, neither do I want to be critical, but it does seem to me that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL], a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, would have evidenced his interest in the matter now under consideration in the committee room where he is always accorded every right and privilege. Why did he not present his proposition to the committee? As a member of that committee, he has rights which are always respected, but instead of presenting his views to the committee, he waits until the committee has reported the bill and has presented it to the House for consideration. It does appear that in fairness to his colleagues on the committee he would have given us the benefit of his views in committee rather than to wait until we reached the floor of the House.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL] complains that the farmers of his district, of up-State New York, are woefully neglected and are in great distress. I am certainly not aware of the fact that the farmers of the gentleman's district are neglected; neither am I aware of the fact that they are in distress. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL] says that he is fighting with his "back to the wall." The place for him to fight for the farmers of his district is first in the committee room, 1310 in the New House Office Building. Unfortunately, the gentleman was not present during the consideration of the bill; neither was he present when final action was taken.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman stated that the gentleman from New York was not at our committee meetings. He was there at one time on the oleo bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I am quite certain that the gentleman is correct. Had the gentleman from New York been present he would have had an opportunity to vote on the Hope amendment which was offered by the able and distinguished gentleman from Kansas. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] former chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, in good faith, offered his amendment. The amendment was carefully considered but it was not adopted.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I know that the gentleman wants to be fair and kind about this.

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly do. I shall be fair and I shall try to be very kind.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I deliberated some time over this particular amendment through the hours of the session here today.

Mr. COOLEY. If it just occurred to the gentleman today, of course, that puts an entirely different light upon it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I conferred with several of my colleagues from New York. I am sure that the gentleman does not want to inject a personal vein into this debate because, after all, there is a skeleton in every closet.

Mr. COOLEY. If the people of the gentleman's district have been suffering for so long, it does seem to me that his interest might have been aroused earlier. But, after all, this is not a bill for the relief of the people of the gentleman's district. The question has been asked, "How much is New York going to get out of this?" The answer is, "New York is going to get out of this just what New York put into this trust fund." The gentleman from Wisconsin has just tried to make that perfectly clear and plain to the gentleman from New York, but apparently there is still a lack of understanding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to the Hope amendment. The amendment does not keep faith with these legal documents. It is just as much a breach of faith as the original Hope amendment was. It takes away the rights of the corporation. It puts the money in the Treasury, in a revolving fund, and turns it over to an administrator downtown to administer. It says in effect, and this is just a little sop that was put in there in an effort to appeal, I think to me, and to one or two other Members of the House, that North Carolina retained $300,000 and North Carolina gave up $800,000. The Hope proposal says, "We are going to be kind to the North Carolina corporation and let them keep $300,000 if they will in turn let us keep the $800,000."

That is an insult to our intelligence. We know that we have the $300,000. We know that the Federal Government cannot take it away from us by act of Congress or otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

The was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, coming back to the Hope amendment, let us settle this issue right. Our position is either morally right, or it is evil, wicked, and morally wrong. It is either legally right or legally unsound. Frankly, it is difficult for me to understand how either a layman or a lawyer could read one of these contracts and still be willing to repudiate them and embrace and approve the very weak and absurd opinion of the lawyer in the Solicitor's office who has made such a desperate and feeble effort to support the views which he has expressed.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I want to ask this question for the record. I asked it in the committee and got a satisfactory answer, but I want to ask it for the record today. The gentleman is familiar with the situation in New Mexico where, by the use of these funds certain lands, aggregating close to 200,000 acres, were repurchased for certain local communities which once owned them and had during the years lost these lands, which they used to use in common, and they were repurchased because that was their base for their economy, and would help put them on their feet, because of their plight at that time. Under the gentleman's bill, those lands would not be forced to be placed on the auction block.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is asking the same question he asked the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] I take it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. Under the committee bill those lands and properties and moneys belonging to that corporation will be given back to the corporation, and you can operate it locally and direct it with people in New Mexico in charge of

it. The only requirement is—and I think this is being superimposed on the written terms of these agreements and the law itself—that the Secretary of Agriculture has supervision and has to agree to the program which will be operated by the corporation. I think that the gentleman, if he wants to take care of his people, should stand by the committee bill and give the property back to the corporation.

I ask for the defeat, Mr. Chairman, of both of these amendments.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a considerable amount of discussion of some of the legal issues that are involved in this litigation. I do not pretend to be an authority on those questions. It has been a long time since I practiced law. But, I do think that we can well rely upon the opinion of the able Associate Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture who has given a great deal of study to this question, who has thoroughly briefed the matter, and who has reached the conclusion, which I think is justified after reading the authorities which he has cited, that there is no legal question involved here which would preclude either legally or morally the action which is contemplated by my amendment or the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York?

I want to read from a part of an opinion given the committee by the Associate Solicitor, Mr. Rooney, and I quote:

On the basis of the foregoing facts it is our position that the fundamental legal question to be determined by the committee is the extent of the authority of the Congress over the residue of funds granted to a state for a particular purpose when that purpose can no longer be effectuated.

I think that is a fair statement of the situation, because it must be admitted by everyone, I think, that the conditions which existed when these grants were made and which were expected to be alleviated by the use of the funds, do not now exist. In fact they have long since ceased to exist. In support of that position these cases are cited by Mr. Rooney:

Our answer to the question is that in such a case the authorities clearly uphold the right of Congress to revest the funds in the Federal Government and to order any disposition thereof consonant with the plenary power of Congress over the property of the United States. Thus in *Ashburner* v. *California* (103 U. S. 575), in construing the act of June 30, 1864 (13 Stat. 325), in which the United States granted the Yosemite Valley to the State of California to be held for public use, resort, and recreation (but without a reverter clause) the Court said:

"It [the land] must be kept for the use to which it was by the terms of the grant appropriated. If it should be in any respect diverted from this use, the United States may be called on to determine whether proceedings may be instituted in some appropriate form to enforce the performance of the conditions contained in the act of Congress to vacate the grant. So long as the State keeps the property it must abide by the stipulation upon which the transfer of title was made."

And directly in point is the later case of *United States* v. *Michigan* (190 U. S. 379). In that case Congress had granted to the State of Michigan 750,000 acres of public land for the purpose of aiding the State in constructing and maintaining the St. Mary's River Canal. The act contained no reverter clause except with respect to failure to begin or complete the canal within the specified time, a condition which was complied with by the State and not involved in the case. The act provided for rendering an accounting to the Government of the proceeds of the sale of the land and the cost of building and operating the canal. There was no express provision, however, requiring any surplus to be paid over to the United States. The action was instituted on behalf of the United States by Attorney General Knox to recover a surplus of about $68,000. The case was decided in the favor of the United States, and in the opinion at page 400 the Court said:

"If there were funds arising from the sale of the lands over and above the cost of construction and other expenses of the canal, it could not within reason (after a perusal of these two statutes, with the provisions for accounting for sales and net proceeds of lands, and the other provisions of the statutes already mentioned) be supposed the parties understood that Michigan was to have for its own treasury the balance arising beyond such cost, maintenance, etc., of the canal."

I could go on and read a large number of other cases bearing out the contention of the Department's Solicitor on this point. I am not going to do it now but I am putting them in the RECORD. I am sure anyone who wants to justify his support of either of the two pending amendments can do so from the brief that will be found in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. We have heard a lot of discussion by the lawyers as to the legal status of this trust fund. Apparently both sides seem to be convinced of their own position. Not being a lawyer, I incline usually to listen to people who should be interested in the welfare of the Government, and I am inclined to listen to the Assistant Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture.

I am not in a position to argue the legal point here. The gentleman from North Carolina may be entirely right. But it seems to me the sensible position is the position taken by the gentleman from Kansas. We had an example just a moment ago of what would happen under the Cooley bill from the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]. He said, and I assume they have no corporation in the State of Iowa, that if this money were allowed to remain in the State, they would administer it through an agency of public welfare. Certainly that is not a purpose for which this money was allocated, in the first place. It was allocated for farm rehabilitation. It seems to me the Hope amendment is a fair compromise. It is not going to take anything away from anyone. It would treat all the States fairly in that the Farmers Home Administration would administer it for the very purposes it is administering it today. That would be the logical way to administer this fund.

It is true there was great pressure from the State of North Carolina to have these funds recovered to the State. As a matter of fact, I do not know of any other State in the Union which asked to have this money returned to them except the gentleman's State.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Utah has certainly not looked at the record. He is entirely wrong. We have memorials from the general assemblies of several States, according to my recollection, and did we not have the attorney general of North Carolina, who came to Washington to testify?

Mr. GRANGER. I will take the gentleman's word for it, but the only testimony I remember before the committee was the testimony of the attorney general of the State of North Carolina as the gentleman has just stated.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further, for a question?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman think the directors of his Utah Corp. would have turned this money over to Mr. Wallace in trust if they had known then that they would never get it back without going through all this trouble?

Mr. GRANGER. I think when this money was allocated, it was allocated for a specific purpose, namely, for rehabilitation. I am convinced that that time has passed, and that is not an issue now.

Mr. COOLEY. All right. Then if the gentleman's State does not need the money, they do not have to ask for the return of the money. If you do not have a distressing situation in your State, let it go back to the Treasury, but do not let it go back under the Hope amendment.

Mr. GRANGER. I would sooner have it go back that way as far as I am concerned.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that these funds now are being administered by the Farmers Home Administration in accordance with the trust agreement which the local people entered into.

Mr. GRANGER. That is true, and one of these organizations is now in existence in every State in the Union. If it is not done, it will mean setting up a duplicate corporation to administer the funds.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. I understood the gentleman from Utah to quote me as saying that if this money went back to the State of Iowa, it would be used for public welfare. I said no such thing. I said that money, if returned to the State of Iowa, would go to the State department of social welfare, which is a legally con-

stituted agency of the State of Iowa, which is designated by an act of the legislature to handle these funds.

Mr. GRANGER. If I misquoted the gentleman, I will accept his correction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to explain what happened in the committee.

The distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] introduced his bill. It was brought to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture. After hearings had been held we went into executive session, and the Hope amendment was offered as a substitute. Considerable debate was carried on in the committee over the two bills. The Hope amendment was defeated in the Committee on Agriculture by a vote of 17 to 3.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. That is not the fact.

Mr. SUTTON. According to the minutes of the Committee on Agriculture, it is a fact. June 16, 1949. I do not yield any further. I am quoting from the minutes of the committee.

Mr. GRANGER. The Hope amendment was not this amendment at all.

Mr. SUTTON. Then it was asked by the Chairman of the committee if they wanted a roll call on the Cooley bill. There was no request for a roll call, so it was voted out by a voice vote.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman referred to the Hope amendment. I am not sure whether he identified that or not, but the Hope amendment offered today is not the Hope amendment that was offered in the committee.

Mr. SUTTON. It is substantially the same.

Mr. HOPE. No. The Hope amendment offered in the committee is substantially covered by the amendment offered by Mr. HALL of New York. The amendment which I offered today was never considered by the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman from Kansas is correct. His first amendment would put the money into the Treasury of the United States. This amendment places it in a revolving fund to be utilized by the FHA.

Mr. HOPE. That is true.

Mr. SUTTON. Much has been said about whether this is State funds. I would like to clarify that by testimony found on page 31 of the hearings, when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] asked the question:

> You say the Comptroller General has ruled that these are State funds?
>
> Mr. WEATHERS. Yes. Ruling 56786.

If the Comptroller General has held that they are State funds, then it is a breach of contract and an annulment of the agreement with those States if we take it away from them now. Since someone in the Solicitor's office in the Department of Agriculture has tried to overrule the Comptroller General, it is necessary that legislation be passed to clarify the matter.

Not long ago there was a bill before this House dealing with an agreement with Switzerland. We passed that bill, giving them not only what was in the agreement, but interest thereon. Every time we consider appropriations for foreign countries, as a matter of fact, we always give them the full amount, plus interest, but when we have an agreement between the States and ourselves, we want to cast the States aside. It is time we think about our own people here at home and give back to the States what rightfully belongs to them.

It is true that New York has used up most of their allocation, with due deference to our good friend, but just because New York has used theirs is no reason why Massachusetts or Rhode Island or some of the other States that have not used their share should turn it back to the Treasury to be reallocated to other States on an equal basis, because they have already used their allocation on an equitable basis.

I hope that the Hope amendment and the Hall amendment are both defeated, and that the Cooley bill is passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute, and to speak out of order

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, tomorrow has been set aside by the Committee on Ways and Means to afford the Members of the House an opportunity to appear before the committee and express their views on the subject of taxation, a subject on which our committee has been holding public hearings for some time. We will perhaps close the public hearings tomorrow, and it will be the last opportunity that Members of the House will have. I suggest any Member desiring to appear before the committee should communicate with the clerk of the committee either this afternoon or tomorrow morning so that their names can be placed on the calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the two pending amendments close in 15 minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer after the pending amendments are disposed of.

Mr. COOLEY. I should think we could dispose of it together with the rest of the debate on the bill in an hour's time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendments close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I amend my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on these two amendments close in 20 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina that a matter was spoken of earlier in the day in respect to which I should like to clarify the RECORD and which would require that I speak out of order. It is not a political matter.

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly should have no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. And I should like to get my time now if I could.

Mr. COOLEY. I see no reason why the gentleman could not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on the two pending amendments close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day the gentleman from California made reference to the National Association of Small Businessmen which is presently meeting in Washington. That organization does not need me to plead their cause or their defense. I know many of the individuals who belong to the organization; undoubtedly, many of you have had some of those men calling on you at your offices. There were a couple of statements, however, that I think should be clarified. In the first place, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] said:

> The organization is chiefly financed by million- and billion-dollar corporations, as proven by the report of the House Committee on Small Business.

I am the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Small Business. A report was issued entitled "Small Business Organizations," to which the minority did not subscribe. That report, however, which I assume is the report referred to by the gentleman from California, specifically stated:

> We do not propose to show that the big business money contributed to the foundation flows to the association.

In other words, the report clearly recognized that there was no evidence to establish that any of the money that

might have been contributed by corporations large or small, to the Small Business Foundation had flowed into the coffers of the National Small Businessmen's Association. As I say, the minority members did not concur in that report for reasons which were stated, and some of them we did not go into. But, of course, there is this innuendo in the report in these words:

It is quite possible, of course, that many of the large corporations which contribute to the foundation also contribute to the association.

Clearly it is recognized, however, that no proof of that was established. It therefore seems clear to me that we owe it to these people to have that understood by the membership.

Also in his remarks the gentleman referred to this organization as being antilabor. If his deduction from the majority report in that matter be correct, then the report, if you ever care to look it up, at page 42 and other pages, would clearly and unequivocally imply as against the National Small Businessmen's organization that there is something improper in an organization's pointing out the dangers of communism, or calling for a reduction in Federal taxes and spending, or for approving the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities, or being in favor of free enterprise, or advocating changes in the Wagner Labor Relations Act, or approving the Taft-Hartley Act, or praising business for aid extended by it in the Texas City disaster or being opposed to class legislation or even being in favor of keeping America out of war.

Now, whether the association wants to stand for things like that or not, that is their right. I think I owe it to the association and to my integrity as a member of the Small Business Committee to point out that that is the situation which exists and if the report can be made the basis for condemning the association as being antilabor then it likewise would be the basis for condemning the association for advocating in its programs those things to which I have referred. Possibly that is the reason why some people do not like the association. In any event we should let the facts as established speak for themselves.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the two pending amendments close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 3 minutes of that time be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes out of order in order to answer the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], not to be taken out of the 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

BIG-BUSINESS FRONTS CLAIMING TO BE SMALL-BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Small Business in the early part of last year recognized that there were a lot of front organizations of big-business concerns claiming to represent small business. We asked the staff to look into these organizations and to make a report. The staff spent several months investigating these organizations. We had one public hearing.

On December 17, 1949, a report of 69 pages was made to the whole committee which was immediately dispatched to each member of the Small Business Committee, 9 in all—5 Democrats and 4 Republicans. I personally asked the members to be ready to vote on it early in January, if possible.

Early in January the members said they had not had time to thoroughly examine the report. The Christmas holidays had intervened. So we postponed the meeting until 2 weeks before February 1. I do not recall the exact date of that meeting. Then we had a meeting of the committee.

At that committee meeting the committee endorsed this report on these so-called small-business organizations. We allowed a week for minority view They wanted more time. We allowed them another week. There were 3 weeks in all; plenty of time. The minority members did file their minority views. Then I filed additional views of the chairman in answer thereto.

We gave this matter serious consideration. I shall not attempt to go into the full report, but all I ask any Member is to get that report, read it, and you will be convinced that these four organizations, including the one mentioned by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], are front organizations for big business. What I mean is concerns with billions of dollars are contributing to them.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Would the gentleman agree with the statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]? I called him and told him that I was going to raise this question, and he said that whatever was done, as far as he was concerned, to go ahead. He said this: "The organization"—referring to this association that is meeting here today; not the foundation to which the gentleman refers—"The organization is chiefly financed by million- and billion-dollar corporations, as proven by the report of the House Committee on Small Business."

I ask the gentleman if that statement is correct or incorrect.

Mr. PATMAN. I think it is correct; and I have additional information I will cite to the gentleman from Indiana. I will go back to Business Week of September 17, 1938, when they had a "little man's parley" of this group at Pittsburgh. The headline is "Two hundred and fifty small-business men at convention. Big business pays the bill." That was 12 years ago; that is when they were starting off. And here are the names of some of them: Atlantic Refining Co., National Steel, Remington Rand, Sun Oil Co., the Grundys, and the Pews. They are for this group. Do you think that they would honestly represent small business? Of course they would not.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I am amazed at the gentleman's answer with respect to my inquiry as to the correctness or incorrectness of the statement of the gentleman from California because, as I said, the report definitely and unequivocally says: "We do not propose to show that the big business money contributed to the foundation moves to the association." If that does not say in plain English that there is no proof of it——

Mr. PATMAN. Just a moment. Let me do a little talking. The gentleman did a lot of talking a little while ago; my time is limited. They have the same offices, organized by the same people, the same president, the same counsel, the same board of directors, exactly all the same. There is not one difference in them, and they are organized for the same purpose.

I want to put in the RECORD at the proper time the report from Pittsburgh, when they first met, the report from Business Week that it was a big-business outfit, and a statement from the New York Times. There is no way on earth to get around it. They are just a front for big business. They are paid by big business, they represent big business, and I have never known the time when they took the side of little business in opposition to big business when there was a conflict. Let me ask the gentleman if he knows of the time when they have ever taken the side of little business when there was a conflict between little business and big business?

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman knows that in the report you cite several of those occasions, and as a matter of fact, I insist that it is as much in the interest of small business to cut the cost of government and reduce taxes as it is anybody's business.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from Indiana could not cite one instance.

SMALL-BUSINESS FRONTS—PARTIAL TEXT OF REPORT ON SMALL-BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Chairman, I am including in my remarks the full text of part I and part II of House Report No. 1675, entitled "Small Business Organizations," mentioned by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], filed on February 21 by the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I have the honor to be chairman and the gentleman from Indiana the ranking minority member. The other two parts, part III and part IV, containing detailed evidence on the issue of interconnection, are omitted. I have included, however, the preface, the conclusion, the minority views submitted by Republican members, and the additional remarks of the chairman.

Four organizations purporting to represent small business were selected as case studies for this report.

All four organizations, I regret to say, were found to be fronts for big business. The detailed facts as to the money contributions from big business are given. Mr. DeWitt Emery, head of two of these organizations—the National Small-Business Men's Association and the Small Business Economic Foundation—solicits and receives, in the name of small business, contributions from some of the largest corporations in America. The third organization, National Tax Equality Association, receives regular contributions from various public-utility companies, and in turn divides up a substantial part of its budget with the various secretaries of the State affiliates of the fourth organization, National Associated Businessmen.

Thus we have the outrageous spectacle of purported trustees for small business who do not hesitate to take their money where they may. Let the record speak for itself:

SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS—FOUR CASE STUDIES OF ORGANIZATIONS PURPORTING TO REPRESENT SMALL BUSINESS

PREFACE

This study has been made because of the large number of organizations springing up which claim to represent small business, but which may often merely use small business as a front for other purposes.

It is altogether healthy in our democracy that small-business men should do what comparable groups, such as labor and the farmers, have already done; namely, exercise their American right to organize themselves.

But it is far from healthy if organizations purporting to represent small business do not represent small business, if they are financed by big-business money, for instance, or if they represent only professional promoters trading on the name of small business.

At its preliminary stage, the present study contemplated a general survey and examination of all organizations purporting to represent small business, or at least the more important organizations in this group.

Questionnaires were sent to a selected list of 15 national organizations and also to over 30 State organizations. Despite follow-ups by registered letter and other methods, results in obtaining significant information or even consistent cooperation were disappointing.

This presented two alternatives. One was to conduct committee hearings on all of these organizations, a project which would not only be time consuming for the committee but also burdensome to many of these organizations, particularly if they should be asked to send representatives to testify in Washington. The second was to concentrate on a few organizations on a case-study basis in order to be able to present, through the medium of the study, instructive samples and examples of organizations purporting to represent small business. The second alternative was chosen, or practically chose itself, particularly by reason of the special advantage of obtaining a much more detailed and realistic picture, on a case-study basis, than through an over-all study of many organizations.

This decision necessarily brought on the problem of including, in the case study, organizations which would be sufficiently representative and typical, or at least illustrative. Some of the organizations are quite important and reasonably powerful, while others are relatively much less important or powerful. Some of the organizations are exclusively national in operation; others are also broken down into State or regional organizations or are exclusively local in operation. Some of these organizations purporting to represent small business carry "Small Business" as part of their name; some do not. Some purport to represent not only small business in particular but all business in general. Some concentrate on one particular issue, such as taxation; others are less confined. Some operate as a pair or in a group; others operate individually.

Fortunately, the four case studies presented here—although it is hoped more cases may be added later—are fairly representative of the many varieties of organizations suggested by these differentiations.

The four organizations which are the subject of this case study are the following:

1. National Small Business Men's Association.
2. Small Business Economic Foundation.
3. National Associated Businessmen.
4. National Tax Equality Association.

Although all four of these organizations are fairly important and substantial, as well as national in character, No. 3 has about 35 State affiliates, some of which, at least, are of a modest, as well as local, character. The first two of these organizations, it will be noted, carry the name "Small Business"; the latter two do not. One of these organizations at least, No. 4, despite the free use of the small-business slogan in its literature, claims that it does not purport to represent small business exclusively. The first two organizations have a somewhat general program, despite an anti-labor-union emphasis, while the second two organizations concentrate on the issue of tax equality, which is a slogan directed against cooperatives.

The first two organizations seem to act as a pair, and the second two seem to do so also. Thus, it is true, there is no case in this study involving a "lone wolf" organization. However, each pair, if the two organizations do act as one, is a lone wolf, so to speak. Moreover, by including two such pairs in the case study, it is possible to compare one pair with the other for the purpose of determining whether or not there is a common organizational pattern. The study made here shows that in each pair one is more the grass roots, active, and direct-lobbying organization, backed by honest-to-goodness small-business men, and operating with no direct big-business financial support; while the other acts more as the alleged research organization, accepting and gladly accepting substantial big-business contributions in addition to regular dues from small-business men. The present study also shows a pattern of interlocking officers between the organizations in each pair, as well as other indicia of joint operation.

It is hoped that the readers of the cases presented in this study will read them not only as interesting narratives but also as they would read case studies in a law or medical book. Although certain conclusions or opinions are interspersed throughout these four cases, the most significant contribution is the factual material presented, all of which is relevant on the issue of the good faith of these organizations in purporting to represent small business. The reader may draw his own conclusions and form his own opinions, which need not agree with those stated. The important thing is to obtain a picture from actual cases of how these organizations purporting to represent small business operate.

Needless to say, this study is disconnected in purpose from the merits and demerits of the specific causes or platforms favored by any of the four organizations. The purpose of this study, and of the whole inquiry from which it derives, has been to examine into the question as to whether organizations purporting to represent small business actually do represent small business. It is only as to this question that opinions and conclusions are expressed in each of the four cases made part of this study, which the reader may accept or reject. But the present study in no way takes a position on the anti-labor-union platform or other platforms of one or the other of the first two organizations. And this study in no way takes a position on the anticooperatives tax equality platform of one or the other of the latter two organizations. It may be that small business has a great deal to fear from labor unions unless they are subjected to severe restrictions. It may be that small business has a great deal to fear from coops, with their alleged exemption from certain taxes. On the other hand, it may be that it is big business which is most afraid of labor unions and of the competition of cooperatives. Finally, it may be that the truth lies somewhere between these two positions. With all of this, the present study is not concerned.

However, the study is much concerned with the conclusions stated therein that none of these four organizations truly represent small business, and that big-business money contributions—from United States Steel, Standard Oil, and various public utilities, to cite only examples—encircle these organizations.

PART I

National Small Business Men's Association and Small Business Economic Foundation

The organizations covered by this part of the study are the following:

National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., with executive offices at 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; national headquarters at Akron, Ohio; and also an office in Washington, D. C.

Small Business Economic Foundation, Inc., with headquarters at 122 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

These organizations have been studied together because their operations and activities appear to be closely connected and because both organizations originated with and are headed by the same person or persons.

In addition, this part of the report covers incidentally the leading person in these two organizations: DeWitt Emery, president of both organizations, and also principal of the Monroe Letterhead Corp., Akron, Ohio.

The National Small Business Men's Association, or the association, as we shall now call it, was founded in 1937 by DeWitt Emery. He became its first president and is still its president. J Raymond Tiffany, who has law offices in New York City, was designated as general counsel and still serves in that capacity; the association claims a New York office at his offices. A large part, if not the larger part, of the association's program has related to the demand for restrictions on labor unions. Very little of the association's program has related to distinctively small-business matters. The association's annual statement of objectives ordinarily does not even use the words "small business," but covers a variety of subjects of general business interest and sometimes of a highly political nature. Of course, the description "small business" is prominently displayed in the association's name. The association states that it was formed "to give small-business men a voice in national affairs and to preserve freedom of enterprise"; and, when the association speaks, it purports to be the voice of small business. It has been filing reports under the Lobbying Act. It reports receipts of over $150,000 a year; in 1948 the exact amount was $159,291.95. It pays Mr. Emery a salary of $18,000 a year.

The Small Business Economic Foundation was not formed until November 1946. The foundation, as we shall now call it, was formed, the evidence seems clear, by the

same DeWitt Emery who organized the association. As with the association, Mr. Emery also became its first president, and J. Raymond Tiffany, its general counsel. Both still serve as president and general counsel, respectively, as in the association. In fact, all of the officers and directors of the foundation are officers or directors of the association, including Dr. Alfred P. Haake, economist. The foundation, like the association, claims a New York office at the offices of Mr. Tiffany. The purpose for which the foundation was organized is stated to be "the collection, compilation, interpretation, and dissemination of information, data, and educational material relative to freedom for America and Americans." Like the association, the foundation does not, in its formal program, stress small business as such, although the slogan is prominently carried in its name and the literature carrying its name. The foundation does stay in the background somewhat, unlike the association, which is more the grass-roots organization of the two. The foundation files no reports under the Lobbying Act. However, its receipts, we are advised by it, amount to some $60,000 a year or more—$69,158.24 in 1948 and $62,772.74 in 1947. The amount of these receipts seems small in view of the wealth of its corporate contributors, the names of which came to us from another source. However, it may be, although we do not know, that these corporations also contribute to the association. The foundation, according to its statement, pays no salary to any of its officers, including Mr. Emery.

Mr. DeWitt Emery is apparently in the printing and letter-addressing business, his firm being the Monroe Letterhead Corp., Akron, Ohio. As we have seen, the association has its national headquarters in Akron, Ohio. The association apparently rents space from Mr. Emery's firm and also gives it a substantial amount of business. In addition to the $18,000 salary Mr. Emery receives from the association, his firm receive sizable sums for office rent, letterheads, and membership service; these items have amounted to almost $10,000 in 1949, for the first three quarters.

The above sketch of the two organizations, and the president of both, has, of necessity, been in part a summary of some of the parts developed by the investigation, which will be set forth in detail in this study.

In making this study and report on the association and the foundation, the answers to the following questions have been sought:

1 Do these organizations claim to represent small business?

2. If so, is the claim false or misleading?

There is a third, although subsidiary, question:

3. Are the association and the foundation in reality under one direction?

In order to obtain information and evidence, the following was done:

1. The reports filed by the association under the Lobbying Act have been studied and digested, including the brief reports filed by Lyle W. Jones, the association's Washington representative. Mr. DeWitt Emery, president of both the association and the foundation, files no reports, and the foundation files no reports.

2. Both the association and the foundation have been requested to furnish specified information and material to the committee. They have responded by giving to the committee two fairly elaborate brochures, apparently especially prepared for the committee. Each of the brochures is in the same type of binding, and each is entitled "Narrative History and Exhibits." Each contains a brief narrative history, together with a series of exhibits, consisting mostly of literature issued by the organization covered. However, these brochures do not contain the detailed financial information which was particularly desired by the committee. There are some brief and summary financial statements given for the foundation, but we have had to go to other sources to obtain such further information as could be procured.

3. No hearings have been held in connection with these two organizations. A public hearing was definitely set for the fifth day of October 1949, but at the request of Mr. Emery and to satisfy the convenience of his general counsel, was put off to a Saturday on the 8th day of October 1949. It became impossible to assemble the subcommittee members for that day, and no new date has been set. Mr. Emery was invited to submit a written statement, which he did under general counsel's signature (see pt. IV).

4. No investigators as such were used in making this study. However, the staff was able to obtain a limited amount of additional information from various sources.

The Foundation's Big Business Support

The Small Business Economic Foundation was incorporated as we have seen, in November 1946. Apparently, Mr. DeWitt Emery, J. Raymond Tiffany, and other associates brought over from the association lost no time at all in lining up, as contributors for this new small businuess venture, not merely big business, but the very top big businesses of the country: United States Steel, Standard Oil, Socony-Vacuum, Texas Co., and others.

For on September 15, 1947—according to a photostat we have in our possession—DeWitt Emery, as president of the foundation, was sending out a letter soliciting contributions for the foundation, and this letter enclosed a long list of existing big-business contributors.

Emery stated in this letter that he was sending the list so that contributors might know the company we are keeping. In other words, the president of the small business foundation, as well as of the small business association, was bragging about the big-business company they were keeping.

Moreover, although Mr. Emery did not mention the association by name, as distinguished from the foundation, he did make, in this letter, a pointed reference to the representative small-business group, which seems obviously to mean the association; and to the grass-roots approach originated by it; as explained, he further stated, in his enclosure entitled "Ignorance May Kill Free Enterprise." Mr. Emery's letter reads as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ECONOMIC FOUNDATION, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., September 15, 1947.

DEAR MR. ———: Just about the first thing most executives ask when I discuss the program of this Foundation is, "Who are some of the contributors?"

Of course, all of us like to "know the company we are keeping," so I thought it would be helpful in your case to attach a cross-section list of the better-known companies who have currently subscribed up to the acceptable $2,500 maximum.

All of the many leaders in industry who have been asked their opinion as to the effectiveness of our grass-roots approach to the problem of explaining to workers the advantages of our free competitive system of business, quickly concede that this program, originating with the representative small-business group, is most likely to accomplish the desired result, i. e., public understanding.

It will pay you real dividends to spend the few minutes necessary to understand the approach as explained in the enclosure, Ignorance May Kill Free Enterprise. I feel sure you will then want your company to go along with the many others substantially supporting the work.

This is a tremendously important job and the time remaining in which to do it is rapidly running out. All business, big, medium, small, must join forces to fight effectively, and do it now.

Send us your company check, for whatever amount you decide upon; mail it as soon as you can, and we will put it to work in the most effective way immediately.

Subscriptions are chargeable to business expense or to public relations. I am counting on your support.

Sincerely,

DEWITT EMERY, *President.*

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

The attached list is as follows:

Among prominent corporation contributors: American Rolling Mill Co.; American Screw Co.; Auto Engine Works; Barber-Colman Co.; Bear Mill Manufacturing Co., Inc.; Bibb Manufacturing Co.; Blue Bell, Inc.; Borg-Warner Corp.; Botany Worsted Mills; Brown & Sharpe Manufacturing Co.; The Buckeye Steel Castings Co.; Campbell-Ewald Co., Inc.; Celanese Corp. of America; the Cleveland Graphite Bronze Co.; Chrysler Corp.; De Soto Motor Corp.; Dexter Folder Co.; Dodge Bros. Corp.; Donaldson Baking Co; The Duff-Norton Manufacturing Co.; Electric Boat Co.; Federal Malleable Co.; Federal-Mogul Corp.; Marshall Field & Co.; Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.; First National Stores, Inc.; Fort Pitt Brewing Co.; Furnas Electric Co.; The B. F. Goodrich Co.; The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.; Greenlee Bros. & Co; Gunite Foundries Corp.; The M. A. Hanna Co.; Harnischfeger Corp.; E. F. Houghton & Co.; Inland Steel Co.; The Interstate Co.; Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc.; Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co.; the Lindsay Wire Weaving Co.; Lone Star Cement Corp.; Marshall-Wells Co.; Mathieson Alkali Works, Inc.; The Miller Shoe Co.; Mine Safety Appliances Co.; Mississippi River Fuel Corp.; National Brass Co.; National Machinery Co.; National Oil Products Co.; The Okonite Co.; Peter Paul, Inc.; Pittsburgh Reflector Co.; Plymouth Motor Corp.; Proctor & Schwartz, Inc.; The Pure Oil Co.; Republic Steel Corp.; Sawyer Stores, Inc.; Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Shapleigh Hardware Co.; W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co.; Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.; Standard Oil Co. of Indiana; Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; Stanley Woolen Co.; The Symington-Gould Corp.; The Texas Co.; United States Steel Corp.; Vick Chemical Co.; Hiram Walker-Gooderham & Worts, Ltd.; Western Insulated Wire Co.; Wheeling Steel Corp.; Edwin L. Wiegand Co.; Williamson Candy Co.; Wyandotte Worsted Co.; Wm. H. Ziegler Co., Inc.; and many others.

The letter, together with the list, is identified here as exhibit 1.

Who are these corporations—"the company we are keeping"? Let us discuss these corporations in terms of their total assets. In all, there are 70 of them, and every one is at least a million-dollar concern in total assets—except about 10.

Five of these corporations are billion-dollar concerns, in total assets: Standard Oil of New Jersey, $3,000,000,000; United States Steel, $2,000,000,000; Standard Oil of Indiana, $1,000,000,000; Socony-Vacuum $1,000,000,000; The Texas Co., $1,000,000,000.

Twelve of these corporations are $100,000,000 concerns, excluding the billion-dollar concerns just listed: Sears, Roebuck, $712,000,000; Chrysler Corp., $541,000,000; Republic Steel, $489,000,000; Goodyear Tire & Rubber, $424,000,000; Firestone Tire & Rubber, $344,000,000; American Rolling Mill, $316,000,000; Inland Steel, $292,000,000; B. F. Goodrich, $266,000,000; Celanese Corp., $256,000,000; Hiram Walker, $154,000,000; Borg-Warner, $151,000,000; Marshall Field, $108,000,000.

This is "the company we are keeping," says DeWitt Emery, president of the Small Business Foundation as well as the Small Business Association, who subscribes the foundation letter, as he also subscribes his

association letters: "DeWitt Emery, President, 'Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.'"

Mr. Emery might well be asked: If eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, what is the price of small business, or for small business? Can small business be bought for what big business will pay to use the name of small business as a front?

Tables showing the total assets of the 70 firms referred to by Mr. Emery in his letter, and containing other pertinent information, are identified here as exhibit 2.

The association's connection with big-business support of the foundation

We do not propose to show that the big-business money contributed to the foundation flows to the association, in order to show the association's connection with this big-business support. After all, the foundation is the newer organization and was organized in 1946, while the association was organized in 1937. The foundation collects only some $60,000 to $70,000 a year, according to the figures it gave us, as against over $150,000 collected by the association. It is quite possible, of course, that many of the large corporations which contribute to the foundation also contribute to the association. Their names would not turn up in the reports filed by the association under the Lobbying Act, unless contributions of any corporation exceeded $500 a quarter; that is, at the rate of $2,000 a year; and the association reports there have been no contributions of this size.

Be this as it may, we do not regard it as necessary to show an actual payment of money by the foundation to the association to prove a connection between the association and the big-business contributors to the foundation.

As we have seen, every single officer and director of the foundation is an officer or director of the association; this is shown by the letterhead of Mr. Emery's letter quoted above and current letterheads of the association. The association and the foundation were both founded by the same man, DeWitt Emery, who is president of both. They both have the same general counsel.

DeWitt Emery's powers, as president of the association, are not left to chance; the general counsel, presumably, has seen to that. The association's constitution provides, in article IV, section 2, as follows:

"The president shall be the chief executive and managing officer of the association and shall preside at all meetings of the members, the trustees and executive committee, and shall have general control, management, and supervision of the business of the association and shall perform such other duties as may, from time to time, be delegated to him by the trustees."

To make doubly sure of the powers of the president, the association's constitution provides, in article V, section 1, that the members of the executive committee shall be appointed by the president, although with the approval of the trustees.

It is impossible reasonably to believe that Emery would run the association along lines that would displease the big-business contributors of the foundation. And it is impossible to believe that the men sitting as officers and directors of the foundation would, even when sitting for the association, forget the foundation's big-business contributors. And it is impossible to believe that J. Raymond Tiffany, when acting as general counsel for the association, would disassociate himself from J. Raymond Tiffany, acting as general counsel for the foundation, with its big-business contributors. We may assume that DeWitt Emery, J. Raymond Tiffany, and their associates would run both organizations in what we may term the closest harmony. Certainly the association, by continuing under the leadership of Emery, impliedly represents to the foundation's big-business contributors that the association, too, is all for them. And, if these contributors are also making separate contributions to the association, should that be the case, the association would be tied to them even more closely.

As a matter of fact, our views are fortified by the way the two organizations seem to work. Both use the slogan "Small Business" in their names. Both avoid specifically small-business issues. They both espouse things big business wants, and which small business may or may not want. They both concentrate most of their guns on the labor unions. The one purpose stated in an association money-raising letter dated February 21, 1949, is as follows:

"If the labor bosses and their radical and communistic cohorts can be stopped or slowed down to a walk on labor legislation, then there is a good chance of stopping most if not all of the administration's program of national socialism."

This letter of the association is signed "DeWitt Emery, president. 'Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.'" Finally, we also have the letter by Emery as president of the foundation, quoted above, which seems to be directly referring to the association as "the representative small-business group."

The association, therefore, in our opinion, cannot claim to be a simon-pure small-business organization merely because no contributions received by it, as reported under the Lobbying Act, exceed $500 for any quarter, from any one contributor. As we have already indicated, $500 a quarter is a good-sized contribution in any event, being at the rate of $2,000 a year, and even big concerns could be contributing substantial amounts without having their names divulged. But, secondly and more important, is the close interconnection between the foundation and the association, through DeWitt Emery and his associates and through the similar operations of the foundation and the association. In our opinion, neither association can be disassociated from DeWitt Emery, and he cannot be fish in one and fowl in the other.

Both Organizations Purport To Represent Small Business

Both the foundation and the association carry the small-business slogan right in their names. That they both purport to represent small business is therefore proved beyond any reasonable doubt—just as clearly as if they so stated in so many words. The voluminous literature circulated by both organizations capitalizes on this name "Small Business." The association holds in Washington, D. C., what it calls small-business days. Its Washington representative actually represents small business on the Task Force Committee of the National Security Resources Board, together with representatives of other small-business organizations.

Summary of Above

We therefore believe that we can give fully responsive answers to the two main questions stated at the beginning of this report:

1. Do these organizations claim to represent small business? The answer is "Yes."

2. If so, is the claim false or misleading? The answer is "Yes."

As to the foundation, the evidence is conclusive. For an organization to pretend to be a "small business" research foundation and to live upon, or to even hope to live upon, the dole of the biggest businesses in the country, may well be called an absolute fraud.

As to the association, the answer must be much the same. There is the qualification that no evidence has been adduced directly tracing to the association any foundation moneys received from big business. Nevertheless, the association must stand or fall with DeWitt Emery, and he is in the position of a small-business fiduciary and trustee who is willing to take money from big business. It is no defense for him to say that this is an arbitrary line which is being drawn between big business and small business. He himself has drawn the line by forming not one but two small-business organizations bearing the name. More important, the protection of small business as such has been a special objective of the Congress over a period of years, particularly since the beginning of World War II, and has received bipartisan support, resulting in the creation of special small-business agencies and divisions in the Government set-up, and of small-business committees in both Houses of the Congress.

Although we regard the interconnection of the association and the foundation as amply demonstrated, particularly by Mr. Emery's common position with each, we shall address ourselves in detail to the evidence as to common purposes and common programs demonstrating the closeness of the interrelation between the association and the foundation, and thus connecting the association, at least indirectly, with the foundation's big-business contributors.

Before doing so, however, we shall present the part of our report on two other organizations, the National Tax Equality Association and the National Associated Business Men, which present a duality of small-business organizations with many similarities to the association and the foundation. In that complex, NAB appears to be the grass roots organization for NTEA, which has the big-business contributors, just as the association may be regarded as the grass roots organization working with the foundation. Two gentlemen, Mr. Vernon Scott and Mr. Loring A. Schuler, appear to be the connecting link between NAB and NTEA, a role comparable to that of Mr. Emery in the association and the foundation. Both NTEA and NAB, as will be seen by the facts stated in this study, purport to represent small business.

After completing the NTEA-NAB part of our report—in full, including the interconnection of these two organizations—we shall return to the association and the foundation in order to show the detailed evidence of their interconnections.

PART II

National Tax Equality Association, and National Associated Businessmen, Inc.

The organizations covered by this part are the following:

National Tax Equality Association, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.

National Associated Businessmen, Inc., with offices in Washington, D. C., and affiliated State units in about 35 States.

These organizations have been studied together because their operations and activities appear to be closely connected, and because of allegations that these organizations have had the same leadership and direction.

In addition, this report incidentally covers the following private concern: Scott & Schuler, organizers and counselors, with offices in the Chicago headquarters of NTEA and in the Washington headquarters of NAB. They also list themselves as organization and industry counselors.

The National Tax Equality Association, or NTEA as we shall now call it, was organized in 1943. Mr. Vernon Scott (Scott & Schuler, organization and industry counselors) had a substantial part in organizing it. He became manager and vice president, and his firm of Scott & Schuler was retained by NTEA. Mr. Scott now has the title of executive vice president, and his firm is still in NTEA's employ under a very substantial retainer. NTEA's activities have related almost exclusively to a tax-equality program directed against cooperatives. It stresses the argument that co-ops under present law are a menace to small business. Its program includes no small-business matters apart

from tax equality. Its articles of incorporation state "tax equality" as its objective. NTEA claims to be a sort of research organization and ostensibly remains in the background. It claims that it is not subject to the terms of the Lobbying Act. However, it commenced filing returns under the Lobbying Act in 1949. The returns showed that it has receipts of $500,000 a year. It pays Scott & Schuler $48,000 a year plus substantial expenses, and supplies them with free office space in its own Chicago offices, where Mr. Scott has his headquarters. These returns also showed that most of NTEA's large contributors are public-utility companies.

The National Associated Businessmen, Inc., or NAB as we shall call it, was organized in 1946, first using the name United States Business Organizations, Inc. It has 35 State units or affiliates; the original State units were created prior to NAB, and most of them bore the name "Tax Equality." The National Tax Equality Association (NTEA) and Scott & Schuler had a substantial part in the formation of the State units and of NAB. Mr. Loring A. Schuler, of Scott & Schuler, became executive director of NAB and holds that office today. The stated corporate purposes of NAB are more general than those of NTEA, but tax equality, in respect to co-ops, is the one stressed. NAB likes to emphasize its small-business background and composition. It is direct in its activities. It has been filing regularly under the Lobbying Act. NAB's receipts amount to about $50,000 a year (1948). It pays Scott & Schuler a $10,000-a-year retainer and supplies them with free office space in its Washington office, where Mr. Schuler makes his headquarters. As we shall show, it also develops that officers of NAB State affiliates receive substantial sums of money from NTEA.

Scott & Schuler, although established as a partnership, devote, in Scott's own words, 99 percent of their time to these two organizations, NTEA and NAB, including the State affiliates They have no offices except those furnished by these organizations, the one in Chicago with NTEA, from which Mr. Scott operates, and the other in Washington with NAB, from which Mr. Schuler operates. They receive free telephone service as well as office space. They receive the fees of $48,000 from NTEA and $10,000 from NAB, not in their individual capacities, but as a firm.

The above sketch of NTEA, NAB, and Scott & Schuler has, of necessity, been in part a summary of some of the facts developed by the investigation, which will be set forth in detail in this study.

In making the present study and report, answers to the following questions have been sought, as with the two organizations studied under part 1:

1. Do these organizations claim to represent small business?

2. If so, is the claim false or misleading?

There is the third, although subsidiary, question:

3. Are NTEA and NAB in reality under one direction?

In order to obtain information and evidence, the following was done:

1. Various reports filed under the Lobbying Act were studied and digested. NTEA filed such a report, showing income and expenditures, for the first time this year; the report indicated substantial contributions from wealthy corporations. NAB has been filing reports since 1947, and a large number of the State affiliates have been filing reports.

2. Repeated attempts were made to obtain information from NTEA and NAB by letter and questionnaire. These attempts met with no success, and encountered only evasive tactics.

3. One public hearing was held—on August 22, 1949 The witnesses were Vernon Scott, of the firm of Scott & Schuler, and, for some limited questions, Loring A. Schuler, of the firm. Mr. Scott admitted that NTEA accepted big-business contributions, but defended its right to accept contributions from big business and small business indiscriminately. He denied that NTEA is specifically a small-business organization, but admitted that it claims to represent small business. He denied that NAB was a front for NTEA, but admitted facts showing an intimate connection between NTEA and NAB or its State affiliates. The hearing was adjourned in order to enable Mr. Scott to catch a boat, on which he was leaving for Europe, and no further hearing has been held.

4. No investigators as such were used in making this study. However, the staff was able to obtain a limited amount of additional information from reliable sources.

The testimony of Mr. Vernon Scott, limited in time and in scope as it was, deserves careful scrutiny. He admitted what he could not deny—namely the receipt of big business contributions—in view of NTEA's lobbying reports which it finally filed in 1949. He tried to deny the full closeness of the connections between NTEA and NAB, and to obscure the efforts of these two organizations to pose as simon-pure small-business organizations

NTEA's Financial Support by Big Business

The fact which could not be denied is NTEA's acceptance of contributions from big-business concerns. The acceptance of contributions from big business is, of course, not unlawful, but, on elementary fiduciary principles, it impairs the usefulness of an organization purporting to represent small business.

In its lobbying report for the first quarter of 1949, NTEA showed 43 contributors of over $500 each for the quarter; of these, 16 were public-utility companies. For the third quarter, 14 out of a total of 31, were public-utility companies, as follows:

Public Service Co. of Colorado, Denver, Colo.

Florida Power & Light Co., Miami, Fla.

Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.

Kentucky Utilities Co , Inc., Lexington, Ky.

Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La

The Detroit Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.

Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.

Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Newark, N J

Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Carolina Power & Light Co., Raleigh, N. C.

Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Columbus, Ohio.

Duquesne Light Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Texas Electric Service Co., Fort Worth, Tex.

Utah Power & Light Co., Salt Lake City, Utah.

A complete list of contributors of $500 or more, for the third quarter of 1949, is identified here as exhibit 3. Under the Lobbying Act it is not required that the actual amount of the contribution be stated in the filed report. It is enough if the name and address of the contributor is given.

The first quarter is representative of all three quarters. The filed figures show that public utility companies, at least in number, were the main source of large contributions. No other type of business was represented by more than four contributors. The classified list for the first quarter is as follows:

Public utility companies	16
Public utility information service	1
Grain company	3
Dairy industry	3
Fertilizer	3
Lumber	3
Insurance	3
Hardware	3
Coal	1
Metal products manufacturing	4
Household appliances manufacturing	1
Cord products	1
Livestock exchange	1
Measuring devices	1
Unclassified	1
Total	43

NTEA has failed to give the actual amount contributed by each contributor of $500 or more, in answer to a committee questionnaire sent after the public hearing referred to above.

The lobbying reports filed by NTEA for the second quarter of 1949 and for the third quarter present substantially the same picture as for the first quarter. In the lobbying reports for each of the three quarters of 1949, filed by NTEA, there is a failure to disclose the total of the contributions amounting to $500 or more. The Lobbying Act requires a total of all contributions under $500, without specifying names of contributors. It also requires the names of all contributors of over $500, but without expressly requiring the total. However, the Lobbying Act requires a grand total of all contributions, including those under $500 and those over $500. NTEA in all of its three reports does state a total of contributions under $500 but repeats the very same total as the grand total. Thus the whole is no greater than one of its two parts. By this new kind of arithmetic NTEA avoids telling us the total of its contributions over $500. We do not even know whether the total of large contributions is greater than the total of small contributions. Moreover, NTEA so far has studiously avoided giving the committee this information in response to the committee's questionnaire.

It is true that Mr. Vernon Scott did state at the committee's public hearing that the total contributions of public utility companies is less than 10 percent of the whole (hearing, p. 26[1]). He also stated that two-thirds of the contributions come from small business (hearing, p. 17), which he defined as firms employing less than 500 people, a definition which can include some very large businesses. Only complete frankness on the part of NTEA can clear up this picture.

NAB a Beneficiary of NTEA Big Business Financial Support

The committee staff has also collected evidence indicating that NTEA funds flow into NAB or its State affiliates. Periodical monthly payments of approximately $200 are made to individuals whose names happen to be those of secretaries of NAB State affiliates. These payments alone totaled about $28,000 for 9 months. NTEA also pays $48,000 of the $58,000 Scott & Schuler receive from both NTEA and NAB for their joint and individual services to the organizations. The contributions from public-utility companies can therefore be regarded as offering some financial support to NAB and its affiliates, in spite of Mr. Scott's testimony which indicated, by implication at least, no such intimate connection with NTEA or its contributors.

There can be and there is no denial of these substantial contributions by big business. Far from denying these contributions, Mr. Scott at the public hearing made a virtue out of necessity. Never, so far as we know, had the public been aware of these big business contributions to NTEA until NTEA finally decided to file lobbying reports, commencing January 1949. However, on the stand Mr. Scott testified that he welcomed contributions from big business, and from public utilities in particular (hearing, p. 25). He also stated: "We offer no apology for the public utilities" (hearing, p. 26).

It thus seems sufficiently clear that if these organizations do claim to represent small business, there is at least a prima facie basis

[1] Refers in each case to page number in printed record of hearings.

for regarding the claims as false or at the very least grossly misleading. We have failed to find any evidence, and we doubt that there is any evidence, that these organizations have made any frank disclosure to small business generally or to their own small-business members of the big-business financial support to which we referred above. Let us examine, therefore, the question of whether or not NTEA and NAB do purport to represent small business.

NTEA as a Purported Representative of Small Business

That NTEA does hold itself out as a representative of small business is shown by the following:

1. In a letter to the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of this committee, dated April 18, 1949, Mr. Garner M. Lester, president of NTEA, states, in asking for a personal interview, that the "committee and the National Tax Equality Association have the same purpose—serving the interest of small-business men." This letter was written before the present study was commenced. A copy thereof is identified here as exhibit 4.

2. NTEA's literature, and propaganda generally, is so worded and so devised as to play up and feature its purported representation of small business. An example of this is an impressive red and white circular issued by NTEA, entitled "Sudden Death on Main Street." The circular recites the alleged fate of one John Moore and his family, "just small-business people," who allegedly were put out of business because a cooperative moved into their town. The circular then contains a petition, reading as follows:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This can happen to me or any small-business man because of tax favoritism. Please do something about it."

Copy of this circular reciting the alleged story of these small-business people and containing the small-business man petition is identified here as exhibit 5.

3. Vernon Scott himself made important admissions under oath showing that NTEA does purport to represent small business. We give brief excerpts from his testimony:

"That is our big job, to explain that to small-business men (hearing, p. 22).

"Of course we do, because 95 percent of our members numerically are small-business men (hearing, p. 29, in answer to question as to whether 'you hold yourself out at any time as representing small business').

"I would say it perhaps did and quite properly so (hearing, p. 32, in answer to question: 'Does the NTEA in any way in its publicity or propaganda hold itself out as being a representative of small business particularly?').

"We do. We think and know we are serving the interests of small-business men over this country (hearing, p. 32, in answer to question as to whether you, NTEA, 'hold yourself out as serving the interests of small business')."

Mr. Scott once stated as an explanation:

"We don't try, we never intimated that we were solely a small-business man's organization that I know of (hearing, p. 29)."

4. NTEA's close connection with the NAB organization, which is avowedly "grass roots" (hearing, p. 35), and avowedly small business, is further evidence of NTEA's assumption of the role of shaping the ideas of small business and evidence that NAB, together with its State affiliates, is a special small-business "front" through which NTEA has operated. This is a subject which will be developed in detail under part III.

NAB as the Purported Representative of Small Business

The description "Small Business" does not appear in the name National Associated Businessmen, Inc., any more than in the name National Tax Equality Association. However, even though the committee hearings did not advance to the point of questioning NAB officials about this, there is little doubt that NAB purports to operate exclusively, at least for all practical purposes, as a small-business organization.

1. In the letter to Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of this committee, dated April 18, 1949, Mr. Loring A. Schuler, executive director, stated as follows:

"National Associated Businessmen, Inc., is the coordinator and Washington representative of 35 States and original organizations of Associated Businessmen covering most of the United States. Members of the State associations are politically minded, small-business men."

A copy of this letter is identified here as exhibit 6.

The president of NAB, Mr. Elton Kile, under date of January 22, 1948, wrote to the President of the United States and to others, stating as follows:

"I am president of the National Associated Businessmen, Inc. (formerly United States Business Organizations), which is the national representative of autonomous associations of small-business men in 35 States. I am writing to you on behalf of the millions of small-business-men voters of this Nation with regard to a matter which is of the utmost urgency to them and to every other taxpayer."

A copy of this letter is identified here as exhibit 7.

2. Mr. Vernon Scott, in his sworn testimony at the committee's one hearing, referred to the State units as groups which had spontaneously grown up from the ranks of small-business men (hearing, pp. 35 and 36). The committee sent a simple letter to each one of NAB's State units or affiliates asking about the small-business compositon of its membership. The answer to these letters, as given, are categorical to the effect that practically the entire membership is small business and exclusively small business. The answers from these State units, which also in most instances contain in the letterhead a list of their officers, is identified here as exhibit 8.

Summary of Above

We believe that, from the above, we can give fully responsive answers to the main two questions set forth at the beginning of this study of these organizations.

1. Do these two organizations, NTEA and NAB, including the latter's State affiliates, purport to represent small business? The answer is "Yes." NTEA cannot seriously qualify this answer claiming to represent mostly small business, but not only small business. NAB apparently claims to represent small business exclusively, at least for all practical purposes.

2. Is this claim false or misleading? The answer is "Yes." As to NTEA, the evidence seems to be quite conclusive as to this, inasmuch as it purports to represent small business, and conspicuously holds itself out as representing small business, whereas at the same time it has been receiving large contributions from a group of public utilities in various States. As to NAB and its State units, the answer is the same, except that the evidence has not as yet been fully presented in this study showing the close connection between NTEA and NAB. We have, however, already adverted to the fact that about $28,000 of NTEA money went to secretaries of NAB State units in a period of 9 months during 1949. Moreover, NTEA pays $48,000 of the $58,000 paid to Scott and Schuler jointly by the two organizations. This shows a rather cogent connection between contributions by public-utility companies to NTEA and activities by NAB. This is particularly so when it is borne in mind that NTEA and NAB devote most of their efforts to one subject; namely, taxation of cooperatives.

We shall now address ourselves in much greater detail to the evidence showing that NTEA and NAB are in reality very intimately connected, and that NAB operates as the grass-roots "front" for NTEA.

PART III

Detailed evidence of interconnection between National Tax Equality Association and National Associated Businessmen

(See full report, pp. 17–38.)

PART IV

Detailed evidence of the interconnection between National Small Business Men's Association and Small Business Economic Foundation

(See full report, pp 39–68.)

Conclusion

The pamphlets and other material reviewed above comprise all the material supplied to us by the foundation upon our request for copies of pamphlets and other material issued by it.

It is not intimated here that there is anything essentially wrong about the contents of these pamphlets and other material, any more than we have intimated that there is anything essentially wrong about the contents of the association's literature. The purpose of the present study was in no way to pass on the merits of opinions or causes espoused by the organizations studied The purpose was to determine whether these organizations were representing small business or more truly representing something else. In studying two organizations together, such as the foundation and the association, a supplementary purpose, in examining their literature has been to determine whether or not the two organizations were in reality functioning substantially as one organization.

We feel that it is fair to state that the examination of the literature and published programs of both the foundation and the association fails to indicate that these two organizations are devoting themselves to specifically small-business matters, as would normally be expected of organizations purporting to represent small business.

We also feel that it is fair to state that the examination of the contents of the foundation's pamphlets and other literature shows how clearly they harmonize, despite their more general nature, with the literature issued by the association. The latter is simply the more active organization and the one registered under the Lobbying Act. This is strong evidence of the close interconnection between the association and the foundation, which, added to the other evidence adduced, including the admissions of the association, makes a very clear case. The known big-business contributors to the foundation are connected to the association itself by the total evidence.

It may be felt that we have burdened our argument too much. But the ways of propaganda and the influencing of public opinion are involved and devious, although never altogether new. In showing the interconnection between the other two organizations, NTEA and NAB, we also were compelled to burden our argument. In retrospect, it may well seem that the conclusions in this study could have been reached with a much shorter presentation of the evidence.

However, fortified with all this evidence, even though some of it may have been unnecessary, we state with confidence our considered opinion that none of the four organizations considered in this study are bona fide small-business organizations, and we reaffirm all conclusions reached elsewhere in this study in regard to these four organizations. The four organizations are National Tax Equality Association, Inc., and National Associated Business Men, Inc., in one group,

and National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., and Small Business Economic Foundation, Inc., in the other.

MINORITY VIEWS

The Republican members of the Select Committee on Small Business have refused to concur in the issuance of the report entitled "Report on Small Business Organizations." They have refused for the following reasons:

(1) The committee as such has never considered or weighed any of the evidence purporting to support the statements and charges made in the report, and no meeting of the committee was ever held at which any such evidence was discussed or the terms of the report considered. Hence we are at a loss to understand how the report can be considered as that of the committee.

(2) The Select Committee on Small Business was created by the House for the purpose of helping small business by the development of facts and presenting such facts, together with any fair, accurate, and considered conclusions deemed proper by the committee. We do not believe that the preparation and issuance of this report as proposed by majority members of the committee and in the manner adopted by them is the way to help small business, or a proper way for the committee to meet its responsibilities to the House of Representatives.

CHARLES A. HALLECK,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
R. WALTER RIEHLMAN,
FRANKLIN H. LICHTENWALTER.

FEBRUARY 21, 1950.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE

I have read the minority views presented herein.

In regard to the first point which is raised, it is pertinent to note that a full committee print of the report was sent to each and every member of the committee on December 17, 1949, in the hope that it would be released with the opening of the second session of the Congress in January. On January 18, 1950, the committee held an executive meeting for the purpose of considering this report, and the committee's progress report, whereupon the ranking Republican member, on the ground of lack of time to study the same, requested an adjournment, which was allowed until February 1, as a final date. On February 1 the committee held an executive meeting, attended by members of both parties, and approved the report by a majority vote, with leave to the minority to file views within 1 week; the progress report was also approved.

As to the second point raised by the minority views, I do not understand the point unless it is a generalized variation of a minority claim that the four organizations involved are criticized in the report by reason of the particular doctrines espoused by them—i. e., that they or any of them, are "against" labor unions and "against" cooperatives; or that they, like most Americans, are "for" free enterprise and "for" the curbing of un-American activities, for instance. This minority claim cannot be sustained. The report clearly states in its conclusion, page 68:

"The purpose of the present study was in no way to pass on the merits of opinions or causes espoused by the organizations studied. The purpose was to determine whether these organizations were representing small business or more truly representing something else."

In the preface, page VII, the report states:

"But the present study in no way takes the position on the anti-labor-union platform or other platforms of one or the other of the first two organizations. And this study in no way takes the position on the anticooperatives "tax equality" platform of one or the other of the latter two organizations. It may be that small business has a great deal to fear from labor unions unless they are subjected to severe restrictions. It may be that small business has a great deal to fear from co-ops, with their alleged exemption from certain taxes. On the other hand, it may be that it is big business which is most afraid of labor unions and of the competition of cooperatives.

"* * * With all of this, the present study is not concerned."

In citing examples of the views of the four organizations in this study, the purpose was to show the lack of concern of these organizations for distinctively small business problems (see p 69) and to show that their views, good or bad, are not different from those of avowedly big business organizations. These examples were cited in conjunction with the evidence presented as to big business financial contributions. In citing such examples, it was not intended to imply that committee members, least of all, either approve or disapprove the causes espoused or the opinions expressed by these organizations. On these matters members of the committee will speak for themselves.

WRIGHT PATMAN.

FEBRUARY 21, 1950.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FERNANDEZ moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill out with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I hate to do this, but I have to because I cannot say what I have to say in 2½ minutes, and this is very, very vital to me. I think, in order that the House Members may better understand the situation, a little history should be given.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it

Mr. REES. Does the gentleman have 5 minutes on a preferential motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is so recognized.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, when the Spanish Government ruled in New Mexico, the people of New Mexico were given grants, sometimes to a community and sometimes to an individual to be settled as a community. As the years rolled by, some of them were so settled. When the American Government took over New Mexico it was required that these grants should be confirmed by the Congress. In getting these grants confirmed and in protecting their title, they had to hire lawyers. It was not unusual to find that the lawyers would charge as a fee an undivided half interest in the grants in order to get them confirmed. We did not know either the laws or the language, and that is how we lost them. So when 1933 rolled around there were in northern New Mexico communities which were in much greater distress than in any other part of the State. These funds were used to recover and repurchase some of those community land grants so that the people could use them as a base for raising their little herds of sheep, goats, and cattle. That gave them a measure of rehabilitation. The money so expended was much better utilized than had it been expended on relief.

We have some 200,000 acres in such land grants used by several such communities, for which they pay grazing fees, or make other arrangements. If the Hall amendment is adopted and this land is put on the auction block in order to be liquidated and the money returned to the Federal Government, then we will just undo what we did back in the thirties. That is our situation. So I am opposed to any bill that will force the selling of these lands and the wiping out of the base upon which the small communities are dependent for their economy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. How does the Cooley bill take care of that?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I have not reached that point yet, if the gentleman will be patient a little bit. Under the Cooley bill the State rehabilitation will, I think, continue that arrangement, though one cannot be sure.

If, under the Hall amendment, lands are sold, the money goes back to the Government, and we will then have marched up the hill and marched back down again. Those people will be in distress again through lack of land on which to exist.

Some of these land grants which were purchased by the Government have been turned over to the Forest Service for administration under a temporary arrangement. The Pueblo community in San Miguel County are quite happy about it. That is what I personally would like to see done, ultimately and permanently, because then the people who are grazing them will continue to graze them, under reasonable regulations, and in a businesslike manner. If the Cooley bill is passed, the same arrangement can be made, but it would require further legislation, I am afraid.

The Hope amendment seems to me insofar as this problem in my State is concerned, to fit the pattern much better. As a matter of fact, the two bills are not very different now, for under either, they would not be liquidated by sale. I am glad to see that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has come around to almost the same views entertained by our distinguished committee chairman, that no liquidation by sale need be forced.

If the Hope amendment is adopted, then, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the bill will go to conference, and in conference they can come to an agreement on a bill that will satisfy everybody and that will take care of this situation. I therefore recommend, although I have been for the Cooley bill, that the Hope amendment be adopted and that the bill be sent to conference.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman realize that the Hope amendment is in-

compatible with the trust agreements that were executed?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I fully realize that, legally speaking. That is the only reason I would vote against it, if I did vote against it, because it violates the contracts. But I think that can be worked out in the conference committee and the matter settled. If it goes to conference, I hope they will give the gentleman's State what it wants and give my State definite protection for these people in northern New Mexico.

My question awhile ago to the distinguished chairman of the committee was not quite as satisfactory as it was in the record made in the committee. As the gentleman knows I have been fearful the State corporation might force these lands to be sold on the auction block. It would be under strong pressure by wealthy men who would like to have this land, and the legislature will be under great pressure. I did not get the same assurance from the gentleman awhile ago that I got in the committee. In the committee I asked the distinguished chairman these questions, and got these answers:

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I feel very strongly that I would rather nothing be done about these land grants than that they should be put under the auction block.

The CHAIRMAN. If Congress directs a liquidation of these trusts, the real property owned would have to be sold and converted into cash and the cash turned into the treasury. That would result in your property being subjected to the auction block and sold.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is what you do not want done?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is right because you will undo the very thing you did before. You just march up the hill and march down again. You give these people a little land on which to graze their milk cows and their goats and their sheep. Then you take it away from them and you put them back where they were before.

The CHAIRMAN. On the other hand, if they passed the bill which I have introduced the funds and the property would be turned back to the New Mexico corporation and could be administered?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is correct. I am in favor of it provided the temptation is not given to the State to sell them because they are under tremendous pressure from people who want these lands.

The CHAIRMAN. That cannot be done under my bill without the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I am sure he would not give his consent for this property to be transferred to private ownership.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is the assurance which I have been given and if that is the case, I am unqualifiedly in favor of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I object, and rise in oppositon to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to supplement the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] with regard to the opinion rendered by the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture. There have been many occasions in the past where I differed with the Department of Agriculture and probably with his Solicitor, if he gives them some of the advice on which they apparently have been acting. I do not think, however, in this case it is necessary for us to decide whether or not the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture is right. He is the recognized legal adviser to the Secretary of Agriculture. What is it that he says to us? He says:

There is no legal or moral obligation imposed on Congress that would require the return of the assets covered by the transfer agreements to the States or corporations for use in rural rehabilitation programs.

Whether or not that is correct is not the question before us. The question is whether this Congress, in the face of that solemn declaration by the legal adviser of the Secretary of Agriculture, is going to give away $50,000,000 to certain States that claim to have a prior right to that money by reason of certain trust agreements. The place to decide the claims on these funds as against the Federal Government is a judicial tribunal and not here in the Congress, a legislative tribunal. We have no right as the Congress of the United States to give away $50,000,000 which, if it is not given away, will revert to the Federal Treasury, without a determination by a court that those funds do not belong to the Federal Government and it is legally required to dispose of them in some other manner.

The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture says, and very properly, and certainly this cannot be gainsaid, "that a legal conclusion must always be tested in relation to the facts upon which it is predicated."

The statute under which this fund was originally set up declared as follows:

That the Congress hereby declares that the present economic depression has created a serious emergency, due to widespread unemployment and increased inadequacy of State and local relief funds, resulting in the existing or threatened deprivation of a considerable number of families and individuals of the necessities of life.

Then he goes on to argue, which again cannot be gainsaid, that the distressing condition referred to in the statute which he cited does not today exist, and that the statute must be read into any grant of funds. The fundamental legal question to be determined here is the extent of the authority of Congress over this residue of funds granted to these States for a particular purpose when that purpose can no longer be effectuated. It seems to me that the Congress has the right and, under the decision of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, has the duty to revest these funds in the Federal Government and to order that they stay there until some State can prove in a proper legal action that it is entitled to those funds as against the general taxpayers of the United States. If no State can prove such a legal case, then these funds should be used by the Government for its general purposes, thereby reducing the deficit we are now facing.

It is for that reason I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has given us the right answer to the problem. If his amendment fails, then certainly the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas is preferable to the committee bill. But if any bill emerges which does anything other than to leave these funds right where they are or which seeks to distribute this $50,000,000 to certain favored States, it should be defeated. We are trustees of this $50,000,000 and have no moral or legal right to give it away.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. When did the gentleman become trustee in this trust agreement executed between the Corporation and the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. KEATING. The Congress of the United States is the trustee of the funds of this country. The people are looking to us to protect their money.

Mr. COOLEY. These funds do not belong to the Federal Government, and the Comptroller General has so held.

Mr. KEATING. The Agriculture Department claims they do. That is the legal question which has not been decided. Until it is, we are violating our fiduciary responsibility if we vote this gratuity. The sum may not seem large according to Washington standards but the principle involved is fundamental.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, there were two questions in my mind when I began to study this problem. First, what are the legal and moral requirements; and second, if the Hope amendment is compatible with those standards, is it the most businesslike way to deal with the problem? I agree that if the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] establishes his moral and legal claim, the bill should be passed even though it means millions of dollars thrown into an unwise an ineffectual procedure. In other words, unless we can answer the first questions satisfactorily we would have to do the honorable thing, regardless of cost to the Treasury. But I am unwilling for this trust fund to be dissipated to satisfy the demands unless I am convinced that the gentleman from North Carolina is on sound ground in advancing the moral question. I am not convinced.

In order to get some of the vital facts, let us look at the origin of the fund. This is a Federal fund. In all of the statements that have been made today, not one assertion has been made that a single dollar from a State source went into this fund.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. I would make the statement that every dollar of this is State money. It is true that the Federal Government gave the money to the States at one time, but it ceased to be Federal money the minute it gave it to the States.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. We are not in disagreement on that. It was Federal

relief money every dollar of it in the first place. The point that the gentleman is not answering to my satisfaction is that when it was reconveyed by the State corporations to the Department of Agriculture it became our duty, as policy makers for the Department of Agriculture, to operate that trust fund for the ends that are in that law. There is not any other answer than that.

Now, let me urge this point that has not been brought out yet; the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is right when he says that North Carolina has a claim to that money in 1950. I want his State to have it, according to the trust agreement's terms, but I point out, and it is supported at page 41 of the hearings, that the Attorney General of North Carolina said that his is the only State in which there was a fixed date for the return of the money. In every one of the agreements, as far as the record is concerned—and if I am mistaken, I will yield to be corrected—the money is to revert to the States only when the trust fails. We do not fail in that trust if we make a revolving fund out of this money and make rehabilitation loans to farmers who need the money and who need to buy farms under the Bankhead-Jones Act. And that is what we have been doing. No one will deny that the United States is very much in the business of rehabilitation. If the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] wants a law establishing categories for the States, I will support him, because I am anxious that that agreement be carried out, and let North Carolina get its money, but I must oppose his efforts here to revive the corporations and break up an integrated Federal plan which is carrying out the trust agreements much better than 43 States acting independently would ever do.

Now, my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] does not deny that this fund was originally a Federal fund. The States did not contribute to it. But he insists it should be returned to the States, because the Congress made the mistake later of ordering liquidation. What he says would have weight if the Government were out of the rehabilitation field, or if Mr. HOPE were submitting a formula that denied any State its share. Mr. HOPE's amendment would correct the mistake and at the same time maintain a single program avoiding a return to the chaos we had when the show was run by 43 different corporations. Surely we have learned a lesson from that experience. Although 20 of these corporations have expired, Mr. COOLEY's bill would revive them or invite the States to set up some other State agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the arguments just made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] are completely unanswered, either in law or in morals or in ethics. It is true I happen to represent one of the States that apparently will get nothing from this fund, although I understand a great deal of money was sent in there after the funds were appropriated. However, it never seemed to me that we should sit, as a legislative body, after the purposes of the trust had been carried out, and arrogate to ourselves the power to sit as a court of equity in order to do justice or equity. I agree that that should be done in our courts, and that we should follow out the instructions of the judgments entered by the courts. Certainly if it were to be suggested that we were to take on more judicial functions there would be many a lawyer rising and protesting. I suggest that is exactly the situation we find ourselves in this afternoon, and I hope we will govern ourselves accordingly.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Has any consideration been given to the fact that when these State rehabilitation agencies were established they could be considered merely as an agency of the Government?

Mr. HESELTON. There is not any question It is in the public records that Massachusetts and New Mexico and one other State were so considered in the way they handled their funds I think this is a complex, legal problem, with a great deal of equity woven into it. I want to see North Carolina or any other State treated properly, but there is a place to decide that issue, and that is the courts, not here.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON I yield

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman prefers to have 43 law suits instituted?

Mr. HESELTON. That is not necessary; one law suit could handle the whole thing.

Mr. COOLEY. All right; let me ask one further question. By virtue of what law can these funds possibly under any circumstances revert to the Federal Treasury?

Mr HESELTON. I think the very fact that the purposes of the trust have been completed is sufficient. The money or the assets are in the hands of the Treasury.

Mr. COOLEY. Where did the gentleman get that information?

Mr. HESELTON. From the committee report.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman could not have gotten it from the committee report, because it is not in the committee's report.

Mr. HESELTON. I read Mr. Brannan's statement, and I assume that he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Brannan's statement?

Mr. HESELTON. Certainly.

Mr. COOLEY. The facts are that the money is in a separate trust fund.

Mr. HESELTON. I believe it was the Solicitor who wrote the letter, but the letter as signed by Secretary Brannan, a report on the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How could it possibly revert to the Federal Treasury in the case of North Dakota where under a decision of Comptroller McCarl the State of North Dakota had to pass an act of the legislature in order to turn it over and then require it to come back to the State?

Mr. HESELTON. I do not know. I think that is why we should let it go to the courts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of what is described as the Hall amendment.

The Hall amendment is similar to an amendment that I have on the Clerk's desk, and that amendment is the bill introduced by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], in the Eightieth Congress. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL], I think, has submitted that bill as his amendment except that some rather minor changes have been made. I want you to know that what you have before you in the so-called Hall amendment is really H R 6210 of the Eightieth Congress, introduced by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], upon which hearings were held by the House Committee on Agriculture. I have the hearings before me I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina, who indicated a few minutes ago that no hearings had been held on this proposal and that it came as a surprise to his committee He will recognize that this amendment is practically the same as the Hope proposal of the Eightieth Congress that was proposed, as I understand—and if I am wrong the gentleman from Kansas will contradict—was requested by the Department of Agriculture at that time.

You are talking about approximately $50,000,000 here. Where did that $50,000,000 come from? It came from the Treasury of the United States, the Federal Treasury in the first place; and, as I understand, the only reason these States are making these claims is because they say that it was apportioned, or part of it was allocated, to the States. But it was Federal money all the time. You are not taking anything away from the States, not at all. We are told here this afternoon over and over again that the purpose for which these funds were allocated has long since expired. The thing we were going to use it for or that the States were expected to use it for has not been done. All we are now doing under this amendment is putting $50,000,000 back in the Federal Treasury, the place from whence it came and where it belongs. If this House or the Congress decides at some other time to allocate funds to the various States let it do so in an orderly manner by a direct record vote. Let us not have any manipulation of taxpayers' funds. We were told in 1946 that Congress should see that this money would be returned to the Treasury of the United States. That is, any unused funds.

Here is an opportunity to cover back into the Treasury $50,000,000 of funds that are not yet expended. It is surplus

in so-called trust. You should see it is paid back to the Treasury and then see that it is properly accounted for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I understand it, this money originally went to the States for the purposes recited in the act from the Federal Government under a congressional act?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS. Somebody is trying to inject a moral bugaboo into this thing by saying it is purely Federal money. Where does the Federal Government get its money except from the people of the States?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct, and the money was given to the State corporations. When it was delivered to the State corporations it lost its Federal identity and the Federal Government has no earthly right to it.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. It seems to me that the bulk of the argument that has been made against the gentleman's bill today has been by Members of those States who would receive little or no money back. It is very much like the illustrious DEWEY SHORT, describes communism; if you have not got anything you want, to share it with everybody. If you have got a little something—then you want it. That's democracy. Well, Kentucky has over $600,000 in this fund and we would like to get it, because after having read the clause in question in the contract, I feel that we are morally and legally entitled to the fund.

Mr. REES. That does not apply to the State of Kansas.

Mr. COOLEY. No.

Mr. REES. We have $1,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. It is more than I thought. But if the gentleman wants to breach a contract that Secretary Claude Wickard made with the people of his State, he has a right to do so. This has the great seal of the Republic of America on it and certainly some credit and consideration should be given this contract. I do not think we ought to let the people lose faith in the Federal Government.

Mr. JENNINGS. One other observation. The State of Tennessee has money in this and I have no compunctions whatever about getting what belongs to my people.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman. In reference to the great legal argument we have heard from the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do not know where his information comes from. Everybody familiar with the situation knows that these are continuing trusts. They are actually in operation today and the Farm Home Administration is handling the fund today. Under no law can these funds possibly revert to the Federal Treasury.

I am surprised at the gentleman from Arkansas, great and brilliant lawyer that he is, having so little regard for a legal contract which no doubt was drawn while he was associated with the Solicitor's office. Maybe the gentleman drafted this himself.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Arkansas said that there was a difference between the contract of North Carolina and the other States but all the other States have this provision that in the event the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture or his successor shall cease, then the money goes back to the State. It has ceased in every other State.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. The only difference between the North Carolina agreement and the other agreements is that our people were smart enough to put a definite termination date in it, to wit, May 20, 1950, which is near at hand. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has pointed out, your contract and every other contract has a fixed date of termination.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL) there were—ayes 9, noes 88.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 60, noes 80.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. COOLEY and Mr. HOPE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 63, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be appropriate and necessary to liquidate, as expeditiously as possible but within 5 years from the effective date of this act, trusts under the transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations, and is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate with responsible officials to that end.

(b) The Secretary, insofar as is necessary to protect the interests of the United States and the corporations shall proceed forthwith to the conversion to cash of investments constituting the trust assets by sale of real and personal properties, and by collection of loans and accounts receivable according to the tenor of such obligations.

(c) An application for the return of such properties shall be made to the Secretary by the State rural rehabilitation corporation pursuant to appropriate resolution of its board of directors. The application shall contain a covenant, binding upon the corporation when accepted by the Secretary on behalf of the United States, that the corporation will abide by the determinations and apportionments of the Secretary provided for in this act and the payments made by the Secretary pursuant to this act, that the returned assets and the income therefrom will be used only for such of the rural rehabilitation purposes permissible under the corporation's charter as may from time to time be agreed upon by the corporation and the Secretary; and that not to exceed 3 percent of the book value of the corporation's assets will be expended by the corporation for administrative purposes during any year, without the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the rural rehabilitation corporation of any State has been dissolved and is not revived or reincorporated or, for any other reason, is unable to make such application or to accept and administer such properties, the application and subsequent agreements may be made by such other agency or official of that State as may be designated by the State legislature. The Secretary may transfer the trust funds or properties of such corporation to such successor agency or official if adequate provisions are made by the State legislature for holding the United States and the Secretary free from liability by virtue of the transfer to such successor agency or official.

(d) Except as hereinafter provided, upon receipt of appropriate application meeting the requirements of this act, the Secretary shall do all things necessary to return to each such applicant all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all cash, real and personal property, or the proceeds thereof, held on the date of the approval of this act by the Secretary as trustee for the account of such State corporation, except that the Secretary may deduct from the funds of each such State corporation the expenses incident to completion of such transfer: *Provided*, That such transfer shall, insofar as possible, be accomplished in a manner consistent with the provisions of the trust agreement with each State rural rehabilitation corporation.

(e) In the event no application is made, as provided for in this act, within 5 years from the effective date hereof or disclaimer or release of interest under the trust transfer agreement by any State through its legislature, the Secretary shall cause all proceeds from assets held under or for the account of the transfer agreement with that State to be covered into miscellaneous receipts in the United States Treasury.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall apply also to all properties and assets of State rural rehabilitation corporations held by Federal agencies other than the Department of Agriculture under the provisions of Executive Order No. 9070, or otherwise. For the purposes of this act the assets of other corporations, derived through the use of Federal Emergency Relief Administration funds, and made available to them through State rural rehabilitation corporations or otherwise acquired by them for rural rehabilitation purposes, shall be considered as a part of the trust property of the State rural rehabilitation corporations in their respective States.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this act, the Secretary shall have the power to—

(a) employ on a contract basis (without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, but the contract shall in each case specify what civil service and related laws, if any, shall be applicable to the employment

after it has been made) such appraisers, accountants, attorneys, and other personnel as he may deem necessary, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to aid in the liquidation and transfer of the properties and assets pursuant to this act, and in the entering into of agreements with the corporations, or other agencies or officials designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof, regarding the rural rehabilitation purposes for which the property and assets shall thereafter be used by them, and in determining that such agreed purposes are being carried out. The fees, salaries, and expenses of such appraisers, accountants, attorneys, and other personnel shall be equitably apportioned by the Secretary among the respective corporations and the amount so determined to be applicable to each such corporation shall be paid by the Secretary from the trust fund of such corporation until the trust is liquidated, and thereafter by the corporation or other agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof. Attorneys so employed, and their fees and expenses, shall be subject to the approval and under the supervision of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture,

(b) accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, and with the consent of the agency concerned, utilize the officers, employees, equipment, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, or of any State, Territory, or political subdivision,

(c) make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act

SEC. 5 None of the properties or assets held on the date of the approval of this act by the Secretary as trustee pursuant to trust agreements with the various State rural rehabilitation corporations may be used by the Secretary for any purpose after the effective date of this act, except for the purposes authorized under section 2 (d) of this act, and for loans made prior to July 1, 1949, and to be repaid in full no later than May 1, 1952, but otherwise consistent with the provisions of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U S. C. A. 1007), where necessary to supplement credit already extended to borrowers from corporation trust funds.

SEC. 6 The determination of the Secretary with respect to the assets to be returned to each State rural rehabilitation corporation or other agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof including, but not limited to interests in properties held jointly for such corporation and the United States, the partition of real property, the expenses incident to each transfer, the liabilities applicable to such properties, and all other phases of the transfer shall be final and conclusive upon each State rural rehabilitation corporation or such successor agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof, and upon all officers and agencies of the United States.

(b) The Secretary shall be saved harmless against any personal liability he may incur in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC 7. Section 2 (f) of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1062), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "five" and insert "three."

Page 2, strike out "shall" and insert "may."

Page 4, line 1, strike out "five" and insert "3."

Page 4, line 2, after "or" insert "upon receipt of a"

Page 4, line 6, strike out "miscellaneous receipts in the United States Treasury" and insert "the Treasury of the United States as a revolving fund to be used by the Secretary only within that State for the purposes of and subject to all the provisions of titles I, II, and IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2392) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 332, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr KEATING. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr KEATING moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 50, noes 77.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act."

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be appropriate and necessary to liquidate, as expeditiously as possible but within 5 years from the effective date of this act, trusts under the transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations, and is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate with responsible officials to that end.

(b) The Secretary, insofar as is necessary to protect the interests of the United States, and the corporations shall proceed forthwith to the conversion to cash of investments constituting the trust assets by sale of real and personal properties, and by collection of loans and accounts receivable according to the tenor of such obligations.

(c) An application for the return of such properties shall be made to the Secretary by the State rural rehabilitation corporation pursuant to appropriate resolution of its board of directors. The application shall contain a covenant, binding upon the applicant when accepted by the Secretary on behalf of the United States, that the applicant will abide by the determinations and apportionments of the Secretary provided for in this act and the payments made by the Secretary pursuant to this act, that the returned assets and the income therefrom will be used only for such of the rural rehabilitation purposes permissable under the corporation's charter as may from time to time be agreed upon by the applicant and the Secretary, and that not to exceed 3 percent of the book value of the corporation's assets will be expended by the applicant for administrative purposes during any year, without the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the rural rehabilitation corporation of any State has been dissolved and is not revived or reincorporated or, for any other reason, is unable to make such application or to accept and administer such properties, the application and subsequent agreements (conforming to the second sentence of this section) may be made by such other agency or official of that State as may be designated by the State legislature The Secretary may transfer the trust funds or properties of such corporation to such successor agency or official if adequate provisions are made by the State legislature for holding the United States and the Secretary free from liability by virtue of the transfer to such successor agency or official.

(d) Except as hereinafter provided, upon receipt of appropriate application meeting the requirements of this act, the Secretary shall do all things necessary to return to each such applicant all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all cash, real and personal property, or the proceeds thereof, held on the date of the approval of this act by the Secretary as trustee for the account of such State corporation, except that the Secretary may deduct from the funds of each such State corporation the expenses incident to completion of such transfer: *Provided,* That such transfer shall, insofar as possible, be accomplished in a manner consistent with the provisions of the trust agreement with each State rural rehabilitation corporation.

(e) In the event no application is made, as provided for in this act, within 5 years from the effective date hereof or disclaimer or release of interest under the trust transfer agreement by any State through its legislature, the Secretary shall cause all proceeds from assets held under or for the account of the transfer agreement with that State to be covered into miscellaneous receipts in the United States Treasury.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall apply also to all properties and assets of State rural rehabilitation corporations held by Federal agencies other than the Department of Agriculture under the provisions of Executive Order No. 9070, or otherwise. For the purposes of this act the assets of other corporations, derived through the use of Federal Emergency Relief Administration funds, and

made available to them through State rural rehabilitation corporations or otherwise acquired by them for rural rehabilitation purposes, shall be considered as a part of the trust property of the State rural rehabilitation corporations in their respective States.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this act, the Secretary shall have the power to—

(a) employ on a contract basis (without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, but the contract shall in each case specify what civil-service and related laws, if any, shall be applicable to the employment after it has been made) such appraisers, accountants, attorneys, and other personnel as he may deem necessary, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to aid in the liquidation and transfer of the properties and assets pursuant to this act, and in the entering into of agreements with the corporations, or other agencies or officials, designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof, regarding the rural rehabilitation purposes for which the property and assets shall thereafter be used by them, and in determining that such agreed purposes are being carried out. The fees, salaries, and expenses of such appraisers, accountants, attorneys, and other personnel shall be equitably apportioned by the Secretary among the respective corporations and the amount so determined to be applicable to each such corporation shall be paid by the Secretary from the trust fund of such corporation until the trust is liquidated, and thereafter by the corporation or other agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof. Attorneys so employed, and their fees and expenses, shall be subject to the approval and under the supervision of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture;

(b) Accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, and, with the consent of the agency concerned, utilize the officers, employees, equipment, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, or of any State, Territory, or political subdivision;

(c) Make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 5. None of the properties or assets held on the date of the approval of this act by the Secretary as trustee pursuant to trust agreements with the various State rural rehabilitation corporations may be used by the Secretary for any purpose after the effective date of this act, except for the purposes authorized under section 2 (d) of this act, and for loans made prior to July 1, 1949, and to be repaid in full no later than May 1, 1952, but otherwise consistent with the provisions of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. A. 1007), where necessary to supplement credit already extended to borrowers from corporation trust funds.

SEC. 6. (a) The determination of the Secretary with respect to the assets to be returned to each State rural rehabilitation corporation or other agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof including, but not limited to, interests in properties held jointly for such corporation and the United States, the partition of real property, the expenses incident to each transfer, the liabilities applicable to such properties, and all other phases of the transfer shall be final and conclusive upon each State rural rehabilitation corporation or such successor agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof, and upon all officers and agencies of the United States.

(b) The Secretary shall be saved harmless against any personal liability he may incur in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. Section 2 (f) of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1062), is hereby repealed.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 2392, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 2392, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 2392 was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

EUGENIO MAISTERRENA BARRENECHE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77), which was read by the Clerk:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S 204) for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche; that if and when the said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing the said bill be deemed to be rescinded; and that the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following correction, namely, on page 1, line 6, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the numerals "1940" and in lieu thereof insert "1946."

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was granted permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article, the sixth of a series by Blair Moody, the eminent correspondent of the Detroit News Staff, which appeared in the Detroit News January 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the text of a bill introduced by himself to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, together with a brief explanation of the bill and a statement of its needs.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a newspaper article in each.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous material.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the House meet tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders on tomorrow I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LIQUIDATION OF STATE RURAL REHABILITATION CORPORATION TRUST ASSETS

Mr COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the general objectives of H. R. 2392 are, first, to define the interests of the Federal Government and the various State rural rehabilitation corporations and States in the corporation trust assets; second, to provide for liquidation of the trusts and transfer of the trust assets to the respective corporations or other State agencies in compliance with the provisions of the transfer agreements entered into between the corporations and the United States or agencies thereof, if proper applications for such transfers are made by such corporations or other agencies designated by the State legislatures in cases in which the corporations have been dissolved and are not revived or reincorporated; third, to specify the purposes for which the trust assets and the income therefrom may be used by such corporations or other State agencies in the future; fourth, to provide for protection of the Federal Government's interests in the trust assets and the income therefrom (a) by requiring that such assets and income be hereafter used only for rural rehabilitation purposes, and (b) by providing for a system of continuous checks by the Secretary of Agriculture, over the expenditure of such assets and income, to determine that they are not used for any other purposes.

Unless otherwise indicated, all references in these remarks to the corporations will include any agencies or officials designated by State legislatures to act in place of dissolved corporations which are not revived or reincorporated or, for any other reasons, are unable to make applications for return of their assets as provided for in the bill, which is hereinafter referred to as the act.

Section 2 (a): This section authorizes and directs the Secretary to take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to liquidate the trusts under the transfer agreements as expeditiously as possible, but requires that the liquidation of the trusts—as distinguished from the trust assets—be completed within 3 years from the effective date of the act. It, therefore, imposes a duty on the Secretary to carry on expeditious liquidation of the trusts in the manner prescribed by other sections of the act, but also gives him

leeway to consummate the liquidation in a reasonable and orderly manner. It does, however, require that all of the trusts be liquidated and that all of the trust assets be transferred to the corporations within the 3-year trust liquidation period, if they make proper applications for such transfers. This section also authorizes and directs the Secretary to negotiate with responsible officials regarding liquidation of the trusts. It is, therefore, his responsibility to take the initiative in negotiating with, and in rendering advice and assistance to, officials of the corporations and States and other officials interested in the matter, to the end that liquidation of the trusts will be accomplished in the most expeditious and practicable manner through transfer of the trust assets, in cash or in kind, to the corporations making appropriate applications therefor.

Section 2 (b): This section provides that the Secretary shall convert the trust assets into cash insofar as is necessary to protect the interests of the United States and the corporations. This will necessitate the servicing and collection of loans and accounts receivable by the Secretary, until the trusts are liquidated within the 3-year trust-liquidation period, according to the terms of the obligations, but will not require the Secretary to convert property into cash unless it is necessary to do so in order to effectuate collection or because joint investment or joint security property is involved, or for other equally good and sufficient reasons. Accordingly, until the trust assets have been transferred to the corporations within the 3-year trust-liquidation period, as required by the act, it is assumed that the Secretary will continue service and collect the corporation trust claims through the Farmers Home Administration, and in so doing it would seem appropriate and advantageous for him to administratively adopt and follow, to the extent consistent with the provisions of the act and the best interests of the corporations, the same policies and procedures as are legally applicable to claims administered by the Farmers Home Administration under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended. On the other hand, if proper applications are received, the Secretary will be required to transfer to the corporations, as soon as practicable, within the 3-year trust-liquidation period, cash instruments pertaining to loans, presently owned corporation trust real estate and interests therein, including mineral, reversionary and other rights, and other trust assests. Reserved mineral interests in joint investment property could in many cases be apportioned on a divided or undivided interest basis. Authority to service and collect loans and accounts receivable pending expeditious liquidation of the trusts during the 3-year trust-liquidation period, should enable the Secretary to convert a large percentage of the trust assets into cash, since the great majority of corporation trust loans have been made for a term of 3 years or less.

Section 2 (c): This section provides that each corporation may apply to the Secretary for return of its trust assets pursuant to appropriate resolutions adopted by its board of directors. This section also provides that if any corporation has been dissolved and is not revived or reincorporated, or is for any other reason unable to apply for and accept the return of and administer the trust assets, then the required application and agreements regarding the subsequent use of the assets and income therefrom may be made by such other State agency or official as may be designated by the State legislature. This section further provides that the Secretary may return the trust assets to such other State agency or official pursuant to such application, only if adequate provisions are made by the State legislature for holding the United States and the Secretary free from liability in connection with the transfer. This section authorizes the return of the trust assets to such other agency or official designated by the State legislature, only if the corporation has been dissolved and has not been revived or reincorporated, or is not hereafter revived or reincorporated within a reasonable time after the beginning of the 3-year trust-liquidation period, or is for some other reason unable or unwilling to act.

This section further provides that each application for return of the trust assets must contain a covenant that the corporation will abide by the determinations, apportionments, and payments made by the Secretary. Each application must also contain a covenant that the returned assets and the income therefrom will be used only for such of the rural rehabilitation purposes permissible under the particular corporation's charter as may from time to time be agreed upon by the Secretary and the corporation. Such permissible purposes would include those authorized in titles I, and II, and IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and for the rural rehabilitation purposes specified in the corporation's charter. Since the act limits the use of the returned assets and income therefrom to rural rehabilitation purposes, as distinguished from relief purposes, their use should be confined primarily to the making of loans, acquisition of property, et cetera, rather than to the making of grants. The limitation regarding future use of the assets is designed to prevent their use or dissipation for unauthorized purposes or in an unauthorized manner, as well as to preclude their use for purposes considered by the Secretary to be objectionable because of unnecessary duplication of or conflict with direct Federal programs. The determination of what falls within the scope of authorized rural rehabilitation purposes shall be subject to agreement between individual corporations and the Secretary, provided, however, that such determinations shall be consistent with the provisions of the act.

This section also requires that each application for return of assets contain a convenant that the corporation will not expend more than 3 percent of the book value of its assets for administrative purposes during any 1 year without the written approval of the Secretary. This 3-percent limitation applies to all expenditures of the corporation for carrying on its operations, but does not apply to expenditures by the Secretary under the act in connection with the administration of the trusts in the process of their liquidation or in connection with the transfer of the trust assets or in connection with the exercise of the Secretary's functions required or permitted by the act to be performed thereafter. Such expenditures by the Secretary should, however, be reasonable, and insofar as the liquidation and transfer functions are concerned, such expenditures, other than for special personnel provided for in section 4 (a), should not exceed the rate heretofore charged by the Secretary against the trust assets in connection with his administration thereof through the Farmers Home Administration, and no additional charge should be made against the trust assets for past services or for those covered by congressional appropriations. Each application should be required to contain an additional covenant to the effect that the corporation will not take any action or amend its charter or bylaws in any way which would affect the interests of the Federal Government under the act, without first obtaining the Secretary's written consent.

This section, taken as a whole, affords a basis for protection of the Federal Government's interests in the trust assets by providing against liability or loss by it or the Secretary in connection with the handling, transfer, and disposition of the trust assets, by providing that such assets and the income therefrom shall be used only for rural rehabilitation, and by providing against their improper use or dissipation.

Section 2 (d): This section provides that upon receipt of an appropriate application, meeting the requirements of the act, the Secretary shall do all things necessary to return to the applicant all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all cash, real and personal property, or the proceeds thereof, held on the date of the approval of the act or thereafter acquired by the Secretary as trustee for the account of the particular corporation, except that the Secretary may deduct from the trust funds of each corporation the expenses incident to the transfer. It is further provided that each transfer shall be accomplished, insofar as possible, in a manner consistent with the provisions of the trust agreement with the corporation of the particular State. This last-mentioned proviso requires a return of the trust assets in accordance with the requirements of the applicable transfer agreement, except as otherwise provided in the act.

Section 2 (e): This section as amended by the committee provides that in the event no application is made for the return of the trust assets as provided for in the act within 3 years from the effective date thereof, or if a disclaimer or release of interest under the trust-transfer agreement is made during that period by any State through its legislature, the Secretary shall cause all proceeds from assets held under or for the account of the transfer agreement with that State corporation to be covered into the Treasury of the United States as a revolving fund to be used by the Secre-

tary of Agriculture within the State for the purposes of and subject to all the provisions of titles I, II, and IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended. Although this section does not authorize any delay in the trust liquidation, it will keep the trust relationship alive during the 3-year period in any case in which an appropriate application for return of the trust assets is not received during that period, unless an appropriate disclaimer or release is made before the end of the period; but the trust relationship will terminate automatically at the end of the 3-year trust liquidation period if no such application is received during the period, and the Secretary will thereafter cover the trust assets into the United States Treasury where they will be used to establish a revolving fund.

Section 3: This section makes the provisions of the act applicable to corporation trust assets held by Federal agencies other than the Department of Agriculture. It also makes the provisions of the act applicable to assets of other corporations derived through use of Federal Emergency Relief Administration funds made available for rural rehabilitation and relief purposes and presently considered and administered by the Farmers Home Administration as corporation trust property or receipts, although not specifically covered by the transfer agreements with the particular State rural rehabilitation corporation, thereby providing a solution for the liquidation problems respecting the assets of Dyess Farms, Inc., Dyess Rural Rehabilitation Corp., Cherry Lake, Inc., Georgia Pine Mountain Valley Rural Community Corp., and any other corporations which may be found to fall within the same category.

Section 4 (a): This section authorizes the Secretary to employ such appraisers, accountants, attorneys, and other personnel as he deems necessary to aid in the liquidation and transfer of the trust assets, and in the entering into of agreements from time to time with the corporations regarding the rural rehabilitation purposes for which the returned assets and income therefrom may be used by the corporations, and in checking to determine that the assets and income are being used for such agreed purposes. While it may be necessary for the Secretary to employ certain key personnel to assist him in the performance of his functions and duties under the act, it is believed that the detail work of servicing and collecting outstanding loans, transferring assets, and so forth during the trust liquidation period, can best be performed through the Farmers Home Administration and its service agencies as at present.

While it is realized that considerable work will be involved in carrying on the required negotiations with all interested parties, including representatives of the corporations, States and other Federal agencies, that the actual liquidation of the trusts and transfer of the trust assets will cover a 3-year period, and that many complex problems will be presented for decision, it is believed that a small staff of skilled key personnel should be able to do the job with the assistance of the Farmers Home Administration and regional attorneys of the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture. It is also believed that after the liquidation of the trusts has been completed, a small staff of such skilled personnel should likewise be able to do the actual work in connection with the discharge by the Secretary of his duty of protecting the interests of the Federal Government in the returned assets and the income therefrom, including the entering into of agreements from time to time with the various corporations regarding the purposes for which the returned assets and the income therefrom may be used by the corporations, and the maintaining of a system of checking to determine that such agreed purposes are being carried out. The number of key personnel employed to perform such functions should be kept to a minimum consistent with the job to be done.

Any personnel employed under authority of this section would be employed by the Secretary on a contract basis, fixing their rate of compensation and other terms and conditions of employment. In order to get qualified personnel to serve in such key positions the Secretary is authorized to specify in their contract of employment what civil service and related laws shall be applicable to the employment. The fees, salaries, and expenses of all personnel directly employed under authority of the act would be paid from corporation assets. Likewise, the amounts authorized to be charged under the act for services performed by the Farmers Home Administration would be paid from corporation assets to the agency for use by it as administrative expenses in the manner which it deems most appropriate. Prior to liquidation of the trusts, all such payments would be made by the Secretary out of the existing trust accounts. Thereafter, they would be made by the Secretary out of corporation funds transferred to him in such amounts and at such times as determined by him to be necessary for his use in payment of such fees, salaries, and expenses for the purposes authorized by the act. An appropriate Treasury account or accounts could be established for this purpose.

Section 4 (b): This section authorizes the Secretary to use the voluntary and uncompensated services of the officers, employees, equipment, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, or of any State, Territory, or political subdivision in carrying out his duties under the act. As hereinbefore indicated, it is assumed that he will delegate certain authority and responsibility in the matter to the Farmers Home Administration.

Section 5: This section limits the use of the trust assets by the Secretary after the effective date of the act, first, to use for such expenditures as may be necessary in connection with the liquidation of the trust and transfer of the trust assets; and, second, to use for loans made prior to July 1, 1949, where necessary to supplement credit already extended. It does not, however, preclude use by the Secretary of payments made to him by the corporations to carry out his duties under the act after the trusts have been liquidated.

Section 6: This section provides that all determinations of the Secretary with respect to the liquidation and transfer actions shall be final and conclusive on all interested parties and section (b) thereof saves the Secretary harmless from any personal liability in carrying out the provisions of the act.

Section 7: This section repeals section 2 (f) of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1062). The repealed section requires the Secretary to liquidate, as expeditiously as possible, the trusts under the transfer agreements with the various State rural rehabilitation corporations and to negotiate with responsible officials to that end. Although this same requirement will be reenacted by section 2 (a) of this act, it is also clarified and implemented by the other provisions thereof, and the repeal and reenactment of the provision is considered desirable so as to have all of the pertinent provisions of law with respect to the corporation trust liquidation matter set forth in a single act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain testimony recently given before the Ways and Means Committee with reference to the oil situation.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the time that was granted me today.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and at the conclusion of other special orders, in addition to the time already granted me for that day I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA NEEDS AN AMERICAN ECHO

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this Nation wants peace. Our peace cry of 1950 is not President Wilson's "Peace at any price." The American people have no intention of asking for peace at the cost of their Constitution and their republican form of government. We will not under any conditions lay down our liberties, so dearly won and so valiantly preserved, for even peace. Yet the people of the United States are willing and eager to try any means short of war to attain peace. Our peace cry of 1950 is "Peace, by any good road."

It is no secret that I have long been an advocate of one of the most effective of these roads, psychological warfare; or to be more exact, psychological "peacefare."

At this point it is necessary to answer a number of questions which have already arisen in your minds. Am I not aware that we have in the State Department a Voice of America? Am I not aware that several agencies of the Federal Government are even now exploring the possibilities of this road to peace? Am I not aware that the official exposition of 1950 America is being received by shortwave radio in scores of foreign countries?

My answer is this: I am, indeed, aware that the Voice of America exists and is heard throughout the world. I am, also, aware that interested agencies are carefully studying psychological warfare. But questions beget questions. Are we of the House of Representatives aware of what is being said about the United States by the official radio networks of foreign countries? Are we of the House of Representatives aware of what is being said about the United States by our own Voice of America?

My answer to these last two questions is this: "We of the House of Representatives know little or nothing of what official foreign radio is saying about the United States and we know little or nothing about the opinions expressed on, by and over our own Voice of America."

It is true that every year—at about this time—gentlemen from the State Department appear before the Appropriations Committees with portfolios bulging with exemplary broadcasts. Yes. We are annually introduced to the highlights—and the highlights only—of the State Department's "peacefare" output. We do not know what foreign attitudes or utterances brought about these direct or indirect replies. They are not in those bulging portfolios. We do not know the quality of the day-by-day, week-by-week presentations of the Voice of America. We cannot possibly know the full story of the State Department's efforts until we find out what they are striving to overcome and how they do it.

There have been several glaring—and to my mind, unforgivable—errors made by the Voice of America. Such errors must not be repeated in these days when the threat of the H-bomb and A-bomb are ever present like the mummy at the feast. I mention two of these errors. One: When one of our own broadcasts placed such productive States as Kansas and Nebraska in the midst of the great American desert. I do not know what objectionable foreign attitude this broadcast was intended to combat. I do know that, under the present conditions, such a broadcast would only invite totalitarian aggression. Two: When one of our own broadcasts depicted a foot race between Indian women as a typical cultural activity in one of our great Western States. I do not know what propaganda that particular broadcast was designed to counteract. I do know that it coincided with the party line of the Kremlin—that we are a backward Nation.

The gentlemen from the State Department might well contend that Members of Congress have neither the time nor the experience to examine all broadcasts or even to spot-check them. I reply that Congress is so organized that it could arrange to cope with even the vast amount of material sent out over the microphones of the Voice of America. The resolution which I introduced last October—House Resolution 374—provides for a membership in committee of loyal and interested Members, together with a staff of well-trained assistants.

I have still another recommendation.

Existing commercial radio networks would welcome the idea of broadcasting to the people of the United States a weekly program bringing out what foreign countries said about us and what we did to reply to them. Such a program would capture the attention of the American people. They would like to know what foreign countries said about our shift in our policy toward the Nationalist regime in China and what we did to answer them. They would like to know what Hungary and Bulgaria are saying about the strange and tragic death of Captain Carpe of our Navy, and what Rumania is saying about the imprisonment of Mr. Vogeler who was not allowed to have even counsel when he was tried. I remind the House that imprisonment in those countries and the torture that is given to prisoners, including our own people who are imprisoned in those countries, is very unlike imprisonment in our own country. Imprisonment in our own country is like being in a hotel compared to imprisonment in those countries. Our people would like to know what they are saying in those countries to their neighbors about the United States and how our own Voice is meeting this challenge. The people of this country not only would like to know—they are entitled to know.

I denounce unwarranted secrecy in this free Republic.

The passage of House Resolution 374 would strike at secrecy. A Voice of America hour—like the Army hour or the Air Force hour—would go far toward making the Voice of America edit, weigh, and scrutinize each individual broadcast.

Until we have a domestically broadcast Voice of America hour, until House Resolution 374 is on the statute books—I can only say in the words of a great American whose name I am proud to share, the late Will Rogers, "All I know is what I read in the papers."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ABBITT, for Wednesday and Thursday, March 1 and 2, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3159. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Idaho and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Snake River; to the Committee on Public Lands.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 3, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1280. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed pursuant to section 607 of the act, as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.) for the quarter ending December 31, 1949, as required by the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945 (Public Law 106, 79th Cong.), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report pursuant to House Resolution 44. Resolution to prescribe tolls to be levied for the use of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2084. An act for the relief of Jackson Riley Holland; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1726). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2429. An act for the relief of Henrique Santos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1727). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 7503. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 7504. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 7505. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7506. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CHESNEY:

H R. 7507. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R 7508 A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

By Mr. DAVIES of New York·

H R. 7509. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAWSON.

H R. 7510. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan.

H. R 7511. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GORSKI:

H R 7512. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 7513. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R 7514. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LINEHAN:

H. R. 7515. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 7516. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 7517. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 7518. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 7519. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 7520. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 7521. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H R. 7522. A bill to extend the period during which certain per capita payments shall be made from the trust funds of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands

By Mr BLATNIK:

H. R 7523. A bill to reestablish a Civilian Conservation Corps, to provide for the conservation of natural resources and the development of human resources through the employment of youthful citizens in the performance of useful work, including job training and instruction in good work habits; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida·

H R 7524. A bill to authorize the establishment of a wildlife-management area in the Florida Keys, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H R 7525. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Cincinnati zoo; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 7526. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at or near the Ottumwa Air Base, Ottumwa, Iowa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 7527. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H R 7528. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H R. 7529. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H R. 7530. A bill to remove the limitation on the commencement of prosecutions for offenses arising from espionage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R 7531. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 7532. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 7533. A bill to amend the provisions of section 4 of the act of June 20, 1949 (Public Law 108, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 7534. A bill to amend Veterans Regulations to establish for persons who served in the armed forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 8 years from the date of separation from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 7535. A bill to authorize appropriations for the eradication and control of halogeton on public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 7536. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. J. Res. 432. Joint resolution to establish a Special Bipartisan Coal Commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. Res. 499. Resolution to condemn the abduction of Greek children by Communist guerrilla forces and seek the return of these children to their homes and parents; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, requesting the United States engineers and Congress to open all spillways of the Federal Government to relieve floodwaters of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 7537. A bill for the relief of Edmon Burgher; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 7538. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frank Bridges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7539. A bill for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7540. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 7541. A bill for the relief of Benjamin F. Short; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 7542. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim 5 acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the William Francis Smith Post, No. 235, American Legion; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 7543. A bill for the relief of Petar N. Stojnic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1947. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Bayonne Merchants Board of Trade, Bayonne, N. J., petitioning the Federal Government for a downward revision of the Federal wartime excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1948. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Petition of the Legislature of Mississippi, asking legislation relative to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1949. Also, memorial of the Legislature of Mississippi to Congress and the Corps of Engineers, to open all spillways to relieve floodwaters of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, for another day, for another morning, for another chance to serve this troubled age, we are truly thankful. We beseech Thee this day to free us from fear of the future, from bitterness toward our fellows, from cowardice in face of danger, from failure before opportunity, from weakness when Thy power is available. Fill us with love that knows no barrier of race or class, with courage that cannot be shaken, with faith strong enough for the darkness, with strength sufficient for our tasks, with wisdom to meet life's complexities, with loyalty to Thy kingdom's goal. In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 2, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. LONG, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Classification of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], under a unanimous-consent agreement entered into last night, is entitled to the floor at this time to complete his unfinished remarks of last evening.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I will yield for that purpose, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Martin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Humphrey	Mundt
Butler	Hunt	Neely
Byrd	Ives	O'Conor
Cain	Jenner	Robertson
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kilgore	Sparkman
Darby	Knowland	Stennis
Donnell	Langer	Taft
Douglas	Leahy	Taylor
Downey	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Long	Tobey
Ellender	Lucas	Tydings
Ferguson	McCarran	Watkins
Flanders	McCarthy	Wherry
Frear	McClellan	Wiley
Fulbright	McKellar	Williams
George	McMahon	Withers
Green	Magnuson	
Gurney	Malone	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is entitled to the floor.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me so I may make a unanimous-consent request for consideration of routine business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Washington for that purpose?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, so long as my right to the floor is not jeopardized thereby.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate may present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit matters for the RECORD, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF SENATE (S. DOC. NO. 143)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, which, with the accompanying statement, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL AID TO CITIES UNDER FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the continuation of Federal aid to cities under the Federal Aid Highway Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution requesting Congress to continue the annual aid to cities under the Federal Aid Highway Act

Whereas cities have been receiving $112,500,000 annually under the Federal Aid Highway Act, and

Whereas a bill has just been introduced to continue this aid; and

Whereas relying on this aid, the city of Minneapolis has entered into a program involving the construction and improvement of streets, highways, and bridges in the city of Minneapolis; and

Whereas it is imperative, in order that the city may proceed with this program, that Federal aid be continued; and

Whereas one of the most important projects which is now being undertaken and constructed, relying upon substantial Federal aid, is the grade separation program in south Minneapolis, which involves the condemnation of property and the removal of several grade crossings in said city; and

Whereas this grade separation has been needed for 70 years; and

Whereas this grade separation would never have been undertaken had it not been that the city and the railroad company affected relied upon a continuance of Federal aid; and

Whereas this project is now under way and, if it cannot be completed, the city of Minneapolis and the railroad company will be in a worse position than if it had never been undertaken, and

Whereas this project cannot be continued and completed unless Federal aid under the Federal Aid Highway Act is made continuously available; and

Whereas many other projects in the city of Minneapolis involving the construction and improvement of Federal routes on streets, highways, and bridges, in the city of Minneapolis, which are of critical importance in the proper defense of the United States, are dependent on the continuation of this aid: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That it urgently requests the continuation of this Federal aid in an annual amount of not less than $112,500,000; be it further

Resolved, That the city engineer of the city of Minneapolis be authorized to present this resolution to the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, or any

other committee which may investigate this matter; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of Congress from the city of Minneapolis, or any congressional district of which the city of Minneapolis is a part.

Passed February 24, 1950.

C. L. SWANSON,
President of the Council.

Approved February 27, 1950.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor.

Attest:

CHAS. C. SWANSON,
City Clerk.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—PETITIONS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a telegram from the National Farm Labor Union, A. F. of L., signed by H. L. Mitchell, president, and a letter from Anna Lord Strauss, president of the League of Women Voters, of Washington, D. C., endorsing the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by me on behalf of myself and other Senators, to House bill 4567, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 1, 1950

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

National Farm Labor Union, A. F of L, fully endorses provisions substitute bill offered to liberalize Displaced Persons Act of 1948 in line with policy of American Federation of Labor on this subject.

H. L. MITCHELL,
President, National Farm Labor Union, A. F. of L.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1950.

The Honorable HARLEY M KILGORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE The League of Women Voters has for several years been active in support of legislation which would represent a bona fide effort on the part of the United States in helping to solve the displaced-persons problem.

We are gratified to see that you and a large bipartisan group of Senators have proposed an amendment to H. R. 4567, in the nature of a substitute. In our opinion this amendment is deserving of full support. If adopted, we believe it will result in a constructive step by our country in contributing to the final solution of this issue.

Sincerely yours,

ANNA LORD STRAUSS,
President.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3170. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the construction of a water and sewage disposal system for the village of Sanish, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 3171. A bill for the relief of Mehdi Omana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 3172. A bill for the relief of Warren C. Baggett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3173. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to undertake a project under the Federal Airport Act for the development and improvement of Chatham Field at Savannah, Ga., during the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr McCARTHY:

S. 3174. A bill for the relief of Theodora Dovalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr MURRAY:

S. 3175. A bill to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 3176. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr MORSE:

S. 3177. A bill for the relief of Franco Contanzo (also known as James Scotto), to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced Senate bill 3178, to restore national coal production, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading)

By Mr MAGNUSON:

S. 3179. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr LEAHY (by request):

S. 3180. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. MYERS) introduced Senate bill 3181, to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL RENT CONTROL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by the Senator from Pennsylvania together with a letter and two telegrams be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement, letter, and telegrams, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3181) to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, introduced by Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. MYERS), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory statement, letter, and telegrams referred to are as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS ON BILL TO EXTEND FEDERAL RENT CONTROL TO JULY 1, 1951

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, a bill is being submitted today, jointly sponsored by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and myself, which proposes to continue Federal rent control for a year beyond the present July 1, 1950, expiration date of the rent-control law adopted by the Eighty-first Congress last March.

I am satisfied that every Member of Congress is by now aware of the instant public reaction to the interpretation made February 25 of this year that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate had voted, in effect, only the funds needed to wind up the affairs of the Housing Expediter by the end of this coming June.

In the short time which has elapsed since that announcement I have received a great deal of mail, not only from Pennsylvania, but from people all over the country, telling me that the removal of Federal rent controls in their communities at this time would result in calamity because their housing shortages have not yet been licked.

I am satisfied, Mr. President, that we must continue rent controls at least through the middle of 1951. I'm not happy about this. I am sure no Member of Congress supports rent control simply for the sake of control itself. But, Mr. President, difficult as it is to draw up—and hard as it is to administer—a rent-control law, I honestly believe, that the act we adopted in the last session of Congress has worked well, and with a minimum inconvenience to everybody involved.

I have intended for some time to submit a bill proposing rent-control extension, but frankly, I have refrained from doing so up to now because I realized that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over rent-control legislation, has been extremely busy working on the middle-income housing bill and other important legislation.

So I've been hesitant about interrupting this important work because the real solution to the rent-control problem lies in ending the housing shortage, and the middle-income bill represents the kind of program which will help us tremendously in filling our housing needs.

The rent-control law of 1949 is not due to expire for almost four more months, and I had felt that the Banking and Currency Committee would have found adequate time to study the rent-control problem and come up with the facts after we had completed our work on middle-income housing.

However, in light of the question which has been raised by the action of the Appropriations Committee, I feel now that the Banking and Currency Committee should undertake as soon as possible to get its hearings started on rent control, because I am convinced that the facts will incontestably show that the law must go on beyond the middle of this year. I have consulted with the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senator MAYBANK, and he will take up the whole matter of hearings at the committee meeting next Tuesday, March 7.

I believe that we have a way right now of proving the need for rent-control extension. The rent control law we adopted last year, as you recall, contained a local option provision which permitted people in any particular area to decontrol their rents locally when it was felt that controls were no longer needed. Most communities, most States, have not chosen to lift controls even though the law made it readily possible for them to do so. I am satisfied that this failure to exercise the local-option provision is a convincing demonstration that the housing shortage is still acute in entirely too many places.

We have seen too, I regret to say, what has happened in the communities that have lifted their rent controls prematurely. Rents in those communities have risen. Not all of the rents have gone up, it is true. But there are still landlords—not many landlords, but a few, who spoil things for everyone—who will

sky-rocket their rents and indulge in rent-gouging when they know their tenants can find no other place to live.

I want the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. President, to look into this. I want the committee to give us the facts about the need for rent control. As I say, I am satisfied that the facts produced will show that rent controls will have to go on for a time longer, at least.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to submit at this time just a few of the communications I have received as evidence of the still present need for control.

BALA-CYNWYD, PA., *February 27, 1950.*

Hon. FRANCIS MYERS,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The news, that the Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended the termination of all rent controls on June 30, is alarming.

Recently the results of a housing survey were published. They showed that while much progress has been made in the building of homes and apartments, rentals are far beyond the means of the pensioned and low-income groups. I am an office worker.

In the 4 years I have occupied this apartment my rent has been increased three times, a total of $21. In addition, I was forced to personally replace antiquated and inadequate equipment in order to have constant and satisfactory refrigeration.

Leases are being continued on a month to month basis in anticipation of the lifting of rent controls.

It is desirable to end Government controls as soon as possible, but the indications are that some form of policing is still necessary in this particular field to prevent undue hardship, and I respectfully request your consideration of the two mentioned groups when the committee's action comes up for Senate approval.

Very truly yours,
(Miss) HAZEL MCCREA.

JOHNSTOWN, PA., *February 27, 1950.*

Senator FRANCIS MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully solicit your vote and influence to oppose any legislation designed to remove rent controls.

Respectfully,
L. W. GRAHAM,
Recording Secretary, Local 2632,
United Steel Workers of America.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 28, 1950.*

Hon. FRANCIS MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your reading the following telegram to the Members of the United States Senate to insure inclusion in the record:

"Protest action of Senate Appropriations Committee in eliminating the supplemental appropriation for the Housing Expediter's office. This is legislation by appropriation and was calculated to prejudge and influence future congressional action on rent control. If the reduced appropriation stands, effective enforcement of rent control will end now instead of June 30 as voted by Congress. Neighborhood workers know a crisis in housing still exists for the great mass of wage earners. High rental houses may be available but not shelter for the low-income groups. Members of Congress know the tragic experience in decontrolled areas where rents have been increased nearly 40 percent on housing units priced $30 a month or less. We urge the Senate to make the full supplemental appropriations and continue rent control until American families are in a bargaining position in relation to housing and are assured of a roof over their heads.

"Committee on social education and action, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers. Francis Bosworth, Chairman."

This represents what I know to be true in Philadelphia as well as in settlement neighborhoods throughout Pennsylvania and the Nation.

FRIENDS' NEIGHBORHOOD GUILD.
FRANCIS BOSWORTH.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and other Senators), to House bill 4567, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCREASE IN BORROWING POWER OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I serve notice on the Senate and those interested that on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 2826) to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is substantially the same amendment which I proposed last year to the agricultural bill relating to reciprocal trade agreements and the importation from other countries of agricultural products on which we have price supports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SURVEY OF ECA IN EUROPE BY SENATOR MCCARRAN (S. DOC. NO. 141)

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, I have presented a survey of the ECA in Europe to the joint committee, and am authorized by the joint committee to ask unanimous consent that the survey may be printed as a Senate document. I send the survey to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document. I have conferred with the Parliamentarian respecting it, and I am advised that it complies with the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANALYSIS OF ECA PROGRAM (S. DOC. NO. 142)

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, the staff of the Joint Committee on Economic Cooperation, of which committee I have the honor to be chairman, presented to the committee an analysis of the ECA program, and I am authorized by the joint committee to ask unanimous consent to have it printed as a Senate document. I now ask unanimous consent that the analysis may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WHERE SHOULD ECA GO FROM HERE?—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my own statement of explanation, entitled "Where Should ECA Go From Here?" may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE SHOULD ECA GO FROM HERE?

STATEMENT OF SENATOR M'CARRAN

One of the major problems facing the Senate and the Congress this year is the determination of what action to take with regard to the continuation of our Foreign Assistance Act. Let me hasten to say that it is not a question of whether or not the ECA should continue, and let me express the opinion, also, that it is not simply a question of determining how much money the ECA should get.

The foreign assistance program was inaugurated because there existed certain fundamental problems and maladjustments in Europe which, we believed, if left alone would result in danger to the United States. Statistical evidence, confirmed by my own observation during the 3 months I spent in Europe last fall, indicates that conditions have improved since April 3, 1948, and Europe is a more comfortable place to be in than it was at the end of the war. A report on my trip to Europe has been submitted to the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic cooperation, of which I am the chairman, and is being issued as a Senate document. Nevertheless, I doubt whether anyone today believes that in the case of any of the basic problems and maladjustments with which Europe is confronted, the solution has been found and the work done. The iron curtain still cuts off western Europe from the foodstuffs and raw materials which it formerly obtained from the east and prevents it from selling its manufactures in southeastern Europe. The economy of western Europe has not yet been made over to adjust for these fundamental changes Furthermore, in certain countries, governments friendly to us are still in constant danger of overthrow by the Communists, and there is no question but that the mass of the people of Europe suffer from poverty and deprivation which it is difficult for Americans to realize.

Under the circumstances I am firmly convinced that to stop economic aid now would involve the loss of much that we have gained in Europe so far, and bring on a crisis comparable to that existing when Secretary of State Marshall made his address at Harvard in June 1947.

When I say that we must consider where ECA should go from here, I do not mean that the primary problem is determining the amount of money to be appropriated. Before we can do that, it is necessary for us to consider whether the ECA operation to date is bringing us to the goals we had in mind at its outset and, what is perhaps more important, do we find in 1950 that the job to be done in Europe is somewhat different than we conceived it to be in 1947 and 1948.

Let me emphasize that there has not been before, nor will there be again, so favorable an opportunity for a searching examination of the ECA program. Industrial production

in Europe has passed the prewar levels. Agricultural production is approaching prewar volume. It is no longer necessary to concentrate primarily on keeping the patient alive. We have time now to consider whether our course of treatment is really getting the patient back on his feet.

We should examine the lessons to be learned from the nearly 2 years of experience with ECA operations. We should recognize that since ECA began, our foreign policy has been broadened and our objectives in Europe have been made more concrete by our adherence to the North Atlantic Treaty. It is high time for us to consider where we want to go and what changes in our approach to the problem are desirable.

With this situation in mind, I set the staff of the watchdog committee to work on this problem. I said to them, "You have been studying the ECA operation for nearly 2 years and have visited all of the participating countries. Give me a report indicating the principal things that you feel should be done about the ECA program now." Such a report has been prepared which is passed on to the Members of the Congress by the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, not as an expression of the committee's views, but rather as an informative and provocative document which will be helpful in considering the various aspects of economic assistance to Europe with which we are confronted.

The report does not indicate that the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 should be substantially done over. It concentrates on seven aspects of the ECA program which require detailed study at present, and suggests five legislative changes. I would like to call your attention to some of the large issues that are involved.

Perhaps the first thing we should look at is the economic integration or unification of Europe. The Foreign Assistance Act from the very beginning recognized the advantages to the countries of Europe of making Europe into one big market. No American can question the fact that a Europe in which factories were located in areas of greatest natural advantage, if given the benefits of a vast mass consumers market, would be able to take advantage of mass production methods and would thus increase output far beyond its present potential. The present industrial pattern is based on vertical nationalistic economies with industries propped up and protected to keep them going regardless of their inherent economic disadvantages.

Let us look at the postwar record of one basic industry, for example, the European steel industry. The ECA had at the end of 1949 authorized the expenditure of $167,000,000 on European steel mill projects. No one can question that the European steel industry needs new equipment and that a lot of this equipment can be obtained only in the United States.

I am told that the most revolutionary development in steel manufacturing during the last half century has been the continuous strip mill. This machine originated in the United States and permits the rolling of steel sheets in very large quantities at very low costs, and is used by all of the important American sheet producers today.

In Europe at the beginning of the war there were only two such mills—one in England and one in Germany. The mill in Germany has since been shipped to Russia as reparations. It is pretty generally agreed that no one can compete in the manufacture of steel sheets today without a continuous mill. It is quite natural then that all of the steel-producing countries of Europe showed a great interest in building continuous mills as soon as the war was over.

The ECA has allocated $137,000,000 to seven corporations in six European countries which include such mills in their reconstruction projects. The continuous mills themselves cost less than this amount. None of these mills is yet completed and some will not be in operation for 2 or 3 years.

I call your attention particularly to the places in which these plants are being built with our dollars:

Austria, one plant	$10,000,000
Belgium, one plant	2,000,000
France, two plants	61,000,000
Italy, one plant	12,000,000
Netherlands, one plant	23,000,000
United Kingdom, one plant	27,000,000

Let us see if this distribution of American dollars appears to conform to a policy of promoting the industrial integration of Europe.

We know that steel production is a large-scale operation and that costs of coal and iron ore and the availability of water transportation should be the determining factors in the location of plants. We should expect to see steel production in the new Europe, which we are financing, concentrated in factories of the most economical size in the locations with the greatest natural advantages.

I call your attention particularly to the fact that not one of these continuous mills is being built in Germany, which is generally regarded as having greater natural advantages for steel manufacture than any location in Europe. That means that the Ruhr, where steel sheets could presumably be produced more cheaply than any place else in Europe, will be kept out of this important branch of production because it will be unable to compete without a continuous mill. If European producers of machinery, electrical equipment, and other manufactured goods are to regain their place in the markets of the world, it will be necessary for them to have access to steel sheets at the minimum possible cost. If sheet costs are kept higher than necessary for any reason, not only will the steel industry of Europe suffer, but her technical, engineering, and precision industries generally, in which she has always been preeminent, will be handicapped.

On the other hand, it is necessary to recognize that every major power in Europe regards the possession of steel-manufacturing facilities within its borders as essential to its national defense. Consequently, the fact that Austria, for example, has had a steel industry for 100 years does not prove that Austria is a good place in which to manufacture steel. Her industry got its start under the Hapsburgs, when Austria was still a major military power. Italy expanded her steel-producing capacity under Mussolini for military reasons. It does not follow that Italy's steel plants should be rebuilt with new machinery in an effort to enable them to compete with England, France, and Austria.

It is generally agreed that Europe does not need any additional steel-rolling capacity beyond that already authorized.

We find ourselves, then, at the end of 2 years of ECA operation in a situation where we have invested all the dollars that should be invested in European steel production for the time being, and facing the fact that much of this investment has not advanced the economic unification of Europe. It has, in fact, probably impeded such unification. All of these continuous mills are large, all are being built with Government sanction and most with substantial Government financing. Each gives employment to large numbers of people. It is difficult to conceive that an Austrian Government would permit rolled-steel products to be imported into Austria because they could be bought more cheaply than they could be made at home, while Austrian steel workmen were unemployed and while its fine new factories stood idle. It is inevitable that once these factories are built, the governments which have sponsored them will be driven to imposing trade barriers and providing subsidies to keep them going.

I do not say that the money we have spent for building these rolling mills is wasted or charge the ECA with bad administration because these expenditures have been approved. The reason why these plants have been authorized is that the ECA has been confronted with short-run, national, political situations which had to be given priority over long-run considerations of economic unification. You could not ask a government which was maintaining itself by only a few votes over the Communist opposition to make decisions which would lay it open to charges that it was not doing everything possible to build up an industry which provided employment, was necessary for national defense, and in which national pride and prestige were involved.

My point is that if we are to make substantial progress toward the unification of European industry we will have to make a change in our approach. Consider for a few moments the problem of bringing about a transformation of European industry so that production for the entire market would be concentrated in plants of the most efficient size grouped at the lowest cost locations.

There are two possible alternatives for achieving greater unification. One way would be to formulate a sort of master plan based on detailed engineering studies of cost factors for the major industries for various possible locations. Such a plan should indicate that the steel plants should be here and here, the rayon plants there and there, the automobile factories at certain locations, and so on.

Such a task is a formidable one; many regard it as hopeless; but let me emphasize that if it is to work the factories must ultimately be located at the most efficient locations, regardless of national interests, for otherwise Europe will remain a high-cost producer, unable to compete with the United States and the new manufacturing industries of Latin-America and Asia.

The other and more desirable way of getting the desired integration would be to remove all restrictions on the movement of goods and capital across the national borders of Europe and eliminate all subsidies and supports which governments give to their industries. Then factories would be built by private managers in the lowest-cost places without the necessity for prior development of a master plan.

The important thing is that whichever approach is made there has to be some sort of government for western Europe superior to the individual national governments which can enforce decisions which particular countries will find unpalatable.

Unless this is done I do not believe the economic integration of Europe can ever be brought about. The Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), which is the existing organization of the Marshall plan countries in Europe, will never be able to do this job. Its responsibilities are definitely limited to the economic field and its actions must be unanimous. Issues which involve national security or transcend internal political interests of one of its member governments are not left for it to decide. Moreover, even the issues which it does decide are the result of careful compromises to which unanimous consent can be obtained. Each nation is under strong pressure to vote for every other's projects for fear that its own programs may be blackballed if it is too critical.

In any event, it is clear that the amount of money which the Congress appropriates for the ECA is not the factor which will determine the extent of economic unification that will be achieved during the next fiscal year. The determining factor will be the adoption of an approach designed to accomplish the end desired, and then to take the political and organizational steps that will make the program possible. Unless these things are done, an appropriation of United

States dollars comparable in amount to what we have given in the past 2 years will actually, in my opinion, retard economic integration rather than advance it.

It is necessary to recognize, however, that we should offer an incentive to the countries of Europe to integrate their economies. One way to accomplish this objective would be to set up a corporation comparable to the RFC, with Marshall plan countries represented on its board, but with the United States having the majority control as long as we put up most of the money. Such a corporation could deal directly with European businessmen who wished financial aid for industrial development, but it would establish certain standards to insure that each project would promote the integration of European industry. An appropriation could be made to provide capital to this corporation. The capital would be replenished as the need arose, but there would be no invitation to divide it up among the countries and spend it the first year. It would be used only as satisfactory projects were approved. No factories would be constructed as part of an annual national program. Only propositions which could pass a careful screening as to their soundness from the point of view of the western European economy as a whole would be financed.

It is unlikely that many projects meeting such standards would be ready the first year. This would not retard European recovery for, let me remind you, European industry has already exceeded its prewar level of output and we are justified in extreme caution in the approval of further industrial expansion.

I would like to mention briefly certain other aspects of the ECA program where the results have fallen somewhat short of the hopes that were envisaged at the beginning.

First is the matter of encouraging American private investors to supply capital and managerial assistance to European industry. During the first year of the ECA, $300,000,000 were available to guarantee the convertibility into dollars of private American investments in the participating countries, and for the current fiscal year $150,000,000 are available. Nevertheless, as of last December 31 there had been, during the entire life of the ECA, a total of 15 such guaranties made, amounting to less than $4,000,000. It seems clear that a new and different approach in this field is necessary if private investment is to be encouraged to take its legitimate part in the industrial future of Europe.

The risks encountered in foreign investment during a period of cold war are great. As European recovery becomes less a matter of feeding the hungry and more a problem of building an efficient economic machine, the advantages to be derived from increasing the participation of American private capital becomes more and more apparent. Certainly we should give every careful thought to the possibility of strengthening our guarantee provisions to see if some real progress cannot be made in this direction.

I have a feeling also that not enough thought has yet been given to certain man-made obstacles to private investment, where the principal factor is the decision of the United States as to precisely how far it wants to go. I refer particularly to the situation which exists in several Marshall plan countries where a major, although in most cases not the controlling, political party favors public ownership of basic industries. In such instances, there is strong resistance to any effort to American businessmen to invest in a country for fear that if American owners get a foothold it may handicap the public ownership program. As a result of this situation, there has been some feeling that our own State Department has been reluctant to push American interests aggressively for fear of antagonizing important political groups in participating countries.

We should not obligate the United States Treasury to guarantee private investments abroad until we are sure we want such investments and that the legal obstacles have been cleared away.

I believe the Congress should give further attention to the matter of obtaining strategic materials from the ECA countries. I think we will all agree that the provisions of Public Law 472, as amended, and that the discussions in this Chamber prior to the enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act clearly indicated that the United States Congress expected that as we assisted Europe with our dollars and commodities, Europe would help us to get certain critical materials vital to our security. There was no idea, I think, that these materials would be supplied in sufficient volume to compensate for our aid. It was rather a belief that all of us were contributing to a common cause; that the United States was vulnerable as to certain materials, partly because we had depleted our supplies during the war and partly because we did not possess certain items which are vital to our industry; and that consequently Europe should help us to overcome our most serious weakness.

The ECA itself reports that progress in this field "has been slower than anticipated." Certainly the results are meager. We have obtained a little over $48,000,000 of such materials in nearly 2 years, and we have invested just over $6,000,000 in overseas projects for expanding the production of these materials.

I believe that the major difficulty here lies outside the ECA. It seems to me that the executive branch has never been able to decide just what we wanted to do in this field. Military stock piling is not the entire objective, and there has never been developed a broad, coordinated program which indicated just what ECA should try to obtain.

It is doubtful if our future supplies of certain commodities can be assured if the matter is regarded as strictly a commercial problem. The countries which control strategic material supplies think of them as giving them advantages in international political bargaining. The ECA gives us an unprecedented opportunity to negotiate effectively for what we need. The issues are complex, but the first step is to determine what we really want.

The investigations by the "watchdog committee" staff, as well as a survey by the Department of Commerce, indicate that our control of trade between the ECA countries and the area behind the iron curtain is not satisfactory. The biggest single difficulty is that most of the countries of western Europe which receive our aid have not accepted in its entirety our list of prohibited and restricted commodities. Today American firms are being denied export licenses for shipments to Russia and her satellites which competing firms in Belgium, the United Kingdom, or Germany are free to accept. Certainly, before we embark on a third year of ECA, this situation should be straightened out.

One aspect of the ECA program about which I have always had a sort of uncomfortable feeling is the effect of our present policies on our future exports, particularly our exports of farm products. There can be no question, it seems to me, but that our foreign-aid program has helped American exports and has helped the American farmer. If the imports of western Europe from the United States had been confined during the last 2 years to the quantities that could be paid for by that area with its own money, the volume supplied by us would have, indeed, been small.

I am aware also of the argument that in the long run the ECA program, if it succeeds, will benefit the American farmer and the American exporter, because a prosperous Europe with a high standard of living will be a better customer than a pauperized area living at the subsistence level.

The thing that bothers me, however, is the fact that the way the ECA program operates, it puts constant pressure on the countries of Europe to buy as much of everything outside the United States as possible. Take cotton, for example. During 1949 the ECA allocated $575,000,000 to the purchase of cotton. In justifying its appropriation request, the ECA estimated the requirements of Europe for cotton, wheat, copper, and other commodities. The appropriation is not earmarked, however, to purchase the estimated amounts of these products. Once the country gets its total allocation of United States dollars, it has every incentive to buy everything it can from a nondollar source. If a country can get more cotton from Egypt or India than it originally planned, so that it can use fewer dollars to buy American cotton, it can spend the dollars thus saved to buy something else. Furthermore, stress is continually being laid by the ECA, and by the European countries, too, on the fact that the way to close the dollar gap is to develop nondollar sources for as many of Europe's requirements as is possible.

This puts us in a position with regard to our farm price-support program where we are spending the United States taxpayers' dollars on the one hand to maintain an exportable surplus of cotton, and on the other hand to stimulate cotton production in Egypt and India so that Europe can be supplied from nondollar sources. It does not seem to me that we should be doing both of these things at the same time.

We must take a realistic view of the situation. If it is to be the United States policy in the future to maintain a volume of production of certain agricultural crops which is larger than our home market can absorb, and to hold the prices of these crops above the world-market level, then we should maintain for ourselves an appropriate share of the European market for our exports of these crops Every year that we give Europe a bonus for buying as many agricultural products outside the United States as possible, we add to the future cost and complexity of our farm price-support program.

There is a relatively simple means available for correcting this situation. That is to offer as part of our foreign aid (in the past this has run to somewhere near 50 percent) bales of cotton, pounds of tobacco, bushels of wheat, et cetera, rather than dollars of equivalent amount We could do this by appropriating funds to purchase designated quantities of these commodities in the United States to be apportioned among the countries of Europe in accordance with their requirements. These supplies would be just as helpful to the people of Europe as if they were procured in the old way, and we would eliminate the incentive to expand production of these items in nondollar areas.

Another most difficult problem confronting the Congress in connection with ECA is determining what its relation should be to our military commitments in Europe which have been entered into since the ECA was originally conceived and put into operation.

It seems to me that we cannot escape the conclusion that our relationship with, and our responsibilities toward, the countries of western Europe are substantially different in 1950 than they were in 1948 when the ECA began. Our position when the recovery program was inaugurated was comparable to that of a neighbor helping out some families in the next block who had suffered a disaster. Our objective was to help them get back on their feet. We did not want to interfere in their internal affairs except to make sure that our money was prudently used. We felt that after 5 years we would be glad to have our neighbors go their own way. They were our friends and, on all basic principles, we were confident that we were in agreement.

I cannot escape a feeling that the North Atlantic Treaty changed all of this. We are no longer related merely as friendly neighbors to the countries of western Europe. We are now partners in a common undertaking. This common venture is more serious and more far reaching than any economic project. We have undertaken to develop with our partners a plan for mutual defense, and we expect to fight side by side if that unfortunate occasion should ever arise.

Under these circumstances, we must all face the question of whether or not we can maintain this military partnership and avoid an economic partnership, and whether we can continue our military partnership beyond 1952 and terminate our economic partnership at that time.

If we should conclude that we can keep our military relationships with western Europe and our economic relationships in separate compartments, then we must use extreme care to make sure that the ECA program is not put into a tight compartment. That is, we must not define its objectives so narrowly or impose such restrictions on the disbursement of its funds that it tends to become an end in itself and grinds on like an automaton as long as the money lasts, regardless of how we are getting along with our over-all program of foreign relations.

Our experience with ECA operation in the past does not give us much reassurance on this point. At the present time, there are a number of instances where countries receiving our aid are refusing or delaying action on such matters as negotiating a trade treaty or removing discriminations against American businessmen. When such matters are brought to the attention of the ECA and the Department of State, the reply is generally to the effect that issues which are not definitely part of the recovery program cannot be allowed to interfere with that program.

It seems to me that we should make the adjustments in the ECA operation necessary to insure that a country cannot get money from us when it cooperates in compartment A but refuses to cooperate in compartment B.

Let me emphasize that I think that this new role of the ECA in our foreign relations, although it does not make its job less difficult, does tend to make its job less expensive. The ECA is no longer the whole team; it is now one player on a larger team. In certain cases, economic aid may be less vital to a country if it can be assured of our military backing.

It should be borne in mind that ECA in the beginning, in addition to providing food, fuel, and materials to the countries of western Europe, also made an important psychological contribution. It was the symbol to all that the countries of western Europe were not to be left alone and that the United States was concerned with their future.

Since the North Atlantic Treaty, the performance of this psychological function can be shifted from the shoulders of ECA. Our willingness to participate in a defense program for western Europe gives adequate assurance to our friends that we are behind them and puts potential aggressors on notice as to our objectives.

In more concrete terms, before our adherence to the North Atlantic Treaty, it would have been exceedingly difficult to cut off aid to any participating country even though its economic status was much improved, without causing an antagonistic reaction on the part of the country involved. Now the value of the United States military backing should assure continued cooperation of countries which may become capable of sustaining themselves without United States economic aid.

This discussion is limited to presenting certain fundamental issues with which we are concerned as we prepare to act on the ECA program for next year. The final point I want to make is that we can do much to solve many of the problems currently confronting ECA without writing a lot of specific legislation. This we can do by changing the basis on which the appropriation is authorized.

The two previous appropriations to the ECA have been based on the anticipated dollar deficits of the participating countries. This approach seems to me to have two fundamental disadvantages. First, the bigger a country's deficit, the more money it gets, so that there is a constant pressure on a country to maintain a deficit. Second, an allocation of United States dollars made on the basis of a deficit is necessarily inflexible. Even though the ECA screens a country's requirements very carefully, once an amount has been agreed upon as the necessary deficit, it is very difficult to make adjustments on the basis of the country's performance.

I believe that the ECA would do a better job and that the Congress would protect the interests of the American taxpayer more effectively if a program for spending United States money for foreign aid met the following tests:

1. The allocation of dollars to each country should be linked to specific, constructive courses of action rather than to the country's dollar deficit. A country which is making basic changes in its industrial structure, such as closing out a high-cost industry; which is undertaking a major revision of its tax structure, or which has removed many of its trade controls, might be assured of substantial United States aid as it progresses with these efforts.

2. Aid should be given in such a manner that the standard of living and general well-being of the country are primarily the responsibility of its own government—not of the United States.

The people of a country should feel that the decisions which determine how much they have to eat or how much is spent for road building, power development, or industrial reconstruction are made in Europe and not in Washington. A country should devote itself primarily to constructive, far-seeing action toward solving its basic problems rather than lobbying with OEEC, ECA, and other Government officials for more United States dollars.

One of the major shortcomings of the present method of distributing American aid is that it is too easy to place the blame for a reduction in the standard of living in a country on the United States. As long as appropriations are based on dollar deficits, this danger persists. If, after negotiation with the ECA and action by the United States Congress, a country gets fewer dollars than it had expected, its government will hold the United States responsible. We should make our assistance available in such a way that dollars are available to every country which can qualify for them. Then, the first responsibility is on the Government of each country to initiate a course of action which will entitle it to a share.

3. The aid program should be administered in such a manner as to minimize the incentive for a country to ask for more money than is necessary.

This objective can be approached, at least, if aid is allocated only to countries that undertake a program which involves some internal sacrifice. Under the present system, if a country lacks raw materials and machinery, we provide the money to buy these items and that country has every reason to ask for as much as possible. If, on the other hand, we say to a country which lacks raw materials and machinery that dollar assistance will be provided only if it will remove trade barriers, which protect one of its uneconomical industries, and will develop a program for shifting the laborers involved to other occupations, the Government of this country will have to give very serious study to the matter of its dollar request. To qualify for our money, the Government would have to arouse local antagonism and take political risks. Presumably, it would not ask for money unless the money really was needed and the sacrifices involved were worth while.

I suggest, therefore, that our next appropriation be authorized along the following lines:

Congress should authorize a definite sum to finance a European payments union. Such a union has been sponsored by the ECA and is now under discussion in Europe. I believe that a European clearing union would do more to stimulate intra-European trade than anything which has been tried so far. An appropriation under this authorization should be available only for this purpose.

I suggest also that a definite sum be authorized for the procurement of United States agricultural products to be supplied to Europe. This appropriation authorization would reserve for American farm products a commensurate place in the European market.

In addition, I believe the Congress should authorize a specified amount to provide capital to the international RFC, I have previously mentioned This sum should be big enough to assure the countries of Europe that we are ready to underwrite any project which will really help to bring about an integrated European industry producing at the lowest possible cost. It should recognize also that until a new approach is made to this matter in Europe, very little money can be properly spent Furthermore, the conditions under which this money can be spent should be laid down in the authorization for such a corporation.

I believe that it is essential that the Administrator of the ECA should be given a certain number of dollars to be spent for other programs. These could be economic or political or both. This does not mean that we should set up a $200,000,000 contingency fund, but that there be available to the Administrator a fund on which he could draw to finance such projects as the consummation of the Benelux Union if the United States believes it desirable to do so. At present, it appears that neither Belgium nor Holland is willing to take the final plunge because of the possible repercussions on their respective economies.

I want to emphasize that I am not advocating that the ECA be given a blank check. However, we have reached the stage in our foreign-assistance program where we do not protect the taxpayers' interest adequately if we give most of our attention to scrutinizing procurement programs for the individual participating countries. The thing that will determine whether or not our money is well spent is whether or not the countries that get our help take advantage of it to eliminate their fundamental weaknesses and embark on programs that will permit them to become strong and self-supporting.

I have already indicated that the ECA has already allocated $167,000,000 to rebuilding the European steel industry and that the results do not indicate that Europe will be fundamentally stronger as a result. Each of these expenditures was carefully screened by qualified experts. I am sure that we are getting a dollar's worth of machinery for every dollar we spend. From now on, it is not so much what commodities we buy as what the receiving nations do

The way to protect the American taxpayer is for Congress to ask the ECA, "If we put so many dollars into Italy next year, what are the Italians going to do that will really strengthen their country?" Presumably, Italy needs major industrial, financial, and agricultural reforms if she is ever to pay her own way. She cannot accomplish

them overnight, but let us base our appropriation on a definite program of constructive action along these lines rather than upon a detailed analysis of how many bushels of wheat Italy will eat if we buy them for her.

The United States is playing for enormous stakes today. The threat of war ever hangs over us. We should use our influence, exert pressure, and spend money to strengthen our position and the positions of friendly nations against threatened aggression.

I believe that our Government should have a full kit of economic weapons available to it during the next year for its conduct of foreign affairs, in addition to our military resources. The purpose of the ECA appropriation is to provide our Government with this economic equipment. The first essential is to make sure that the economic devices we provide will really be effective.

The danger is that the ECA program will lack flexibility, that it will not be properly coordinated with our over-all objectives, and that it may persist in following a pattern set in the first 2 years of its operation which, in certain respects, no longer conforms to current realities.

Finally, let me say that I am firmly convinced that the success or failure of our economic-aid program will not be determined by whether we vote $3,000,000,000 or $2,000,000,000 or even $1,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year. We can spend $3,000,000,000 and accomplish little except keep the people of Europe relatively tranquil while they wait for war to come. We can spend $1,000,000,000 to aid countries to carry forward significant programs for strengthening their economic structures and find that at the end of the year real progress will have been accomplished.

The success of the ECA from now on will depend on the wisdom with which the Congress determines what its job is and the skill with which the job is carried out.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

William B. Crawley, of Alabama, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

Knox T. Hutchinson, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

Elmer F. Kruse, of Ohio, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

Rolph S. Trigg, of New Mexico, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and

Frank K. Woolley, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator SMITH of Maine before the Portland Lincoln Club, at Portland, Maine, February 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLISH FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR IVES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Polish freedom, delivered by Senator IVES, on the Justice for Poland program, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN BEFORE DINNER OF SOMERSET COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the annual dinner of the Somerset County Chamber of Commerce, at Somerset, Pa., on February 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOME OWNER AND HONEST MONEY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAIN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the National Association of Home Owners at Chicago, Ill., on February 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CONGRESS AND THE NATION'S HEALTH — ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Congress and the Nation's Health, delivered by him at the legislative conference of the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party in Minneapolis, Minn., February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SECURITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address regarding the place of the United States in the affairs of the world, delivered by Senator JOHNSON of Texas at the breakfast of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N. J., February 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

COOPERATIVE HOUSING LEGISLATION—STATEMENT BY HERMAN T. STICHMAN

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Herman T. Stichman, New York State commissioner of housing, with regard to Senate bill 2246, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSING LEGISLATION—ARTICLE BY GEORGE ERICSON

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Middle Income Group Housing Help Decried," written by George Ericson, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SURPLUS POTATOES—EDITORIAL FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Bigger Hole," from the Wall Street Journal of February 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DOUGLASS BURNETT, OF SPARKS, BALTIMORE COUNTY, MD.

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Jeffersonian, of Towson, Md., of February 24, 1950, relative to Douglass Burnett, of Sparks, Baltimore County, Md., recently elected president of the Edison Pioneers, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIRST SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Hon. Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, with reference to a chapter in his semiannual report which deals with savings and economy. I also ask unanimous consent that chapter IV, Savings, Absorbed Costs, and Reductions, from the first semiannual report of the Secretary of Defense, which accompanies his letter, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and excerpt from the semiannual report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, February 28, 1950.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,[1]
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My first semiannual report to the Congress under the provisions of the National Security Act amendments of 1949 is now at the printer's and should be in your hands in bound-volume form in approximately 3 weeks.

In view of the time lag involved in the printing process, I am taking the liberty of transmitting herewith one of the chapters of the semiannual report—this being the chapter which deals with savings, absorbed costs, and reductions.

I am sending this chapter to you out of context in order to get it into your hands as promptly as possible. Since this is the chapter which deals with savings, its primary emphasis is, of course, upon the subject of economy. You will note that at the outset of the chapter the following statement appears: "Elsewhere in this report I have discussed the strengthening of our national security—for in all that we do security comes first, and economy comes second."

My purpose in quoting this sentence is to call your attention to the fact that the remainder of the report deals in detail with the various measures we have taken, and propose to take, in the interest of strengthening our national security.

The bound volume, which you will receive as soon as printing and binding can be completed, will consist of 10 chapters, together with accompanying reports of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force. For your information the titles of the various chapters are as follows:

Chapter I. Introduction.
Chapter II. Mutual defense.
Chapter III. Unification.
Chapter IV. Savings, absorbed costs, and reductions.
Chapter V. Improvement in fiscal procedures.
Chapter VI. New weapons.
Chapter VII. Military research and development.
Chapter VIII. Industrial preparedness.
Chapter IX. Personnel.
Chapter X. Health.

It is my hope that the entire report will serve a useful purpose in terms of a more widespread knowledge concerning the things which the Department of Defense, with the assistance and cooperation we have received in such bountiful measure from the President and the Congress, is seeking to accomplish.

With warm personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

IV. SAVINGS, ABSORBED COSTS, AND REDUCTIONS

During World War II a speedy victory, even at the expense of efficiency and economy, was the primary concern of the military services. We entered World War II without a unified Military Establishment. The costly

[1] Similar letters were sent to Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman, Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives; Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate; and Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

habits which grew up during that war, however, have no place in today's Military Establishment; nor do they have any place in the unified Military Establishment of the future, whether in peace or war.

The National Military Establishment, as it existed before the Congress created the Department of Defense on August 10, 1949, was still suffering from costly war-born spending habits. It was like a fat man—and, like a fat man, was in poor condition until the fat could be transformed into muscle.

In order that the newly created Department of Defense might be in condition of preparedness to accomplish our basic objective of maintaining the peace, or to fight a war if we should again be the victims of aggression, it was essential for us to eliminate the excess overhead and the unnecessary duplications and overlaps that had existed in the past.

Before the services could make effective use of their money, therefore, it was essential that they get in condition. Even if additional amounts of money had been added to their budget, large percentages of it would have failed to produce added military strength. It is the process of getting in condition which has been going on during the period covered by this report.

So much for preamble and simile. Elsewhere in this report I have discussed the strengthening of our national security, for in all that we do security comes first and economy comes second. In this chapter I shall discuss the vitally important subject of savings. In my view, it is mandatory that we effect savings in the Department of Defense. These are my reasons:

First, it is mandatory because of the urgent necessity of maintaining a healthy national economy—and, in order to maintain such an economy, our expenditures must be held to the lowest level compatible with our national security

Second, it is mandatory because of the equally urgent necessity of making savings wherever possible in order to assure that money which would otherwise go into excessive overhead and waste can be used to increase our combat effectiveness.

In other words, savings are important in and of themselves because each dollar that we refrain from spending means a healthier national economy, but savings are equally important as a source of money with which we can buy more planes, more tanks, and more ships.

A particularly apt illustration of the second factor set out above was the recently announced decision to maintain an additional aircraft carrier during fiscal year 1951, with the cost of maintaining this additional carrier to be met out of savings elsewhere in the Naval Establishment. This is a graphic illustration of our plans for converting fat into muscle.

An illustration of the same general sort, with applicability to the Army, is this: As of the close of the period covered by this report, the Army had 4,400 more men in combat units than it had in such units on July 1, 1949. Much of this increase in combat effectiveness was made possible by savings in the use of undue numbers of personnel for administrative and overhead purposes. This 4,400 increase in the number of men in combat units is even more striking when it is borne in mind that the total number of men in the Army decreased by almost 20,00 men during this period.

Over all, the readiness of the Navy has been improved and the active fleet is ready to go. It is manned at 67 percent of wartime strength with trained personnel who seek to make a career of the Navy. This represents a substantial improvement over the situation 18 months ago when a larger active fleet in number of men and ships was manned at only 61 percent of wartime strength with many of the ships either immobilized or in a reduced operational status because of heavy turn-over of personnel and a serious imbalance in the skills and occupations represented.

In the case of the Air Force it is worth noting that on January 1, 1948, the Finletter Commission recommended 70 groups manned by 401,000 men. On that date the report also noted that the Air Force stood at 337,000 men for 55 programed groups. However, due to requirements for the radar screen, increased function taken over from the Army, and organizational changes in our bomber groups, 502,000 men would be needed today for the 70-group concept or its equivalent—the requirement for an authorized strength of 502,000 men was recognized by Congress in the Selective Service Act of 1948.

These organizational changes bring up a point which is worthy of comment, namely, the fact that the size of a group is subject to change. As President Truman has pointed out, "The number of groups is a somewhat misleading measure of airpower since the character, size, number of aircraft, and other elements of the group are not fixed but constantly change as conditions require." An example of the type of change to which the President referred is the programmed size of each B-36 Heavy Bombardment Group—which stood at 18 planes per group less than a year ago, and which stands at 30 planes per group today. In this connection it should also be noted that the programed size of nine groups which stood at 30 B-29's or B-50's per group 2 years ago, stands at 45 today. In addition, these groups include 20 B-29-type tankers which increase the effective range of each individual bomber.

In our Air Force of today and as planned for 1951, we have 416,000 men manning 48 groups, but due to the organizational changes noted above, these 48 groups, according to Air Force estimates, are equivalent to 52½ groups of the size envisaged in the previous concept of the 70-group program.

With respect to our over-all economy program, I have stated on a number of occasions that within a year after the amendments to the Unification Act, we expect to be effecting savings at the rate of $1,000,000,000 a year. The target date is August 10, 1950. With more than 7 months remaining, I am glad to be able to report that we are already three-quarters of the way to our objective. This report covers not only these savings but in addition also covers absorbed costs and reductions. While the three categories are not always capable of hard and fast lines of delineation, I want to mention at this point that decisions and actions taken account for (1) savings, (2) absorbed costs, and (3) reduction, with the grand total in excess of $1,500,000,000. I shall discuss this at somewhat greater length later in this chapter.

Two different, but complementary, approaches were used to achieve economies in the operations of the Department of Defense.

First, there was established the Management Committee, an action group consisting of one representative of each military department of the rank of Assistant Secretary or higher, with my direct representative as chairman. This committee is exploring seven general areas in its economy program: (1) Curtailment of costly war-born spending habits; (2) elimination of excess facilities; (3) elimination of overlapping and duplication; (4) simplification of procedures; (5) better use of manpower; (6) modernization of organization structure; (7) establishment of better management controls. Specific savings directed by the management committee result from such actions as the elimination of excessive administrative and proficiency flying, elimination of unnecessary printing, reduction in number of administrative motor vehicles, and other economy measures.

Second, it was necessary to get the participation of all hands in the departments, who, because of their intimate knowledge of activities at the working level, could identify economies that could be made without impairing military effectiveness and, in many instances, could actually suggest ways of increasing combat effectiveness with lesser expenditure of our resources.

This all-hands effort, termed "reprograming," was stimulated by the concurrent identification by the Management Committee of specific areas where savings could be made.

The results of our efforts to eliminate waste and inefficiency in the Department of Defense will not be confined to a single year. Indeed, the lasting and tangible benefits of our economy efforts in fiscal 1950 have already been clearly reflected in the fiscal 1951 budget.

The most conservative estimates of the military departments on August 1, 1949, upon which the fiscal year 1951 budget was based, provided for certain forces and major matériel procurement within a $13,000,000,000 total. Because of the savings and economies instituted in fiscal 1950, the plans for 1951 have been modified to provide significantly more powerful military forces within the same dollar requirements. As compared with the estimates made by the military departments on August 1, Navy strength has been increased by three attack carriers, three carrier air groups, one cruiser, and one battleship in reduced commission. There will be two marine divisions instead of six battalion landing teams. The Army will be organized into 10 divisions rather than 9, and will also have 2 additional antiaircraft battalions. The Air Force will increase the number of planes per group in 3 additional bomber groups.

Also, since August 1, 1949, $150,000,000 was added to aircraft procurement for the Air Force and $50,000,000 for the Navy. In addition to a 200-percent increase in the allocation for antisubmarine warfare equipment, 700,000 hours were added for flying in combat-type units in the Navy, and Army civilian-component allocations were increased by $6,000,000 to rebuild and modernize equipment for the National Guard and $16,000,000 for armories for the Organized Reserve. Army matériel procurement was increased by $41,000,000, including $10,000,000 for new type signal equipment for the mobile striking forces of the Army, $17,500,000 for heavy ordnance, including special prime movers, and $7,800,000 for modernized portable bridges and other new engineer equipment.

We will not retreat from our basic objective of maximizing our national security and minimizing its cost. Our watchword must be economy and efficiency in every activity—with the size of our Military Establishment on as stable a basis as possible, subject to such increases or decreases as the international situation may warrant. Our goal continues to be well-trained, well-equipped, ready land, naval, and air forces.

PROCEDURES EMPLOYED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

In the remainder of this chapter, I shall discuss in greater detail just how we have carried out the program which I have outlined above in general terms.

Earlier, I mentioned that what we have actually been engaged in is the reprograming of our budget. The cooperative work that was done by this office and the Committees of the Congress, in the final phases of the enactment of the 1950 budget, were part and parcel of this reprograming process. During September 1949, the Congress was still considering the appropriation for the Department of Defense for the current

fiscal year, and had indicated its expectation of substantial savings. On this basis, in order to assist the Congress and the committees in their efforts to identify these savings, I advised the secretaries of the three military departments to take a number of steps to identify, at an early date, areas where costs might be reduced. These steps included:

1. Reductions in individual items in accordance with the action being taken by the Congress.

2. Reductions to reflect the gradual release of 1-year trainees in compliance with the policy decision being made by the Congress.

3. Reductions to reflect actual and anticipated lower commodity prices.

4. A review and report on all areas of possible savings.

5. The adjustment of military and civilian personnel strength to that required for planned activities in fiscal year 1951.

The Secretaries were advised that "In working out these savings it is expected that each department will make its adjustments in such a manner as to achieve the most efficient and effective military force within the limited funds available."

These initial steps led to identification of specific areas in which economies could be made and the results were made available, by the end of September, to the appropriate congressional committees. The net result of this process was that the 1950 budget, as enacted in October, contained reductions of $425,000,000 below the budget which the President had recommended in January. The principal decreases developed cooperatively by the Congress and the Department of Defense resulted from the curtailment of the 1-year enlistment program (a congressional policy decision), absorption of the cost of the radar fence, reductions in civilian personnel, price declines in subsistence, clothing, and fuel, reduction in administrative and proficiency type flying, and the substitution of commercial for military vehicles where practicable.[2]

[2] Inasmuch as final congressional action on the Department of Defense fiscal 1950 appropriation bill was not taken until the end of October, the results of our review and reprograming efforts have had to be measured in terms of the $14,200,000,000 budget requested by the President. The appropriation bill finally enacted by the Congress provided new obligational authority for fiscal 1950 of $13,900,000,000. This did not provide for approximately $339,000,000 to cover costs of the Career Compensation Act or for $161,000,000 of public works projects included in the President's budget as contingent items. Likewise the congressional appropriation did not allow for a number of other major added costs totaling approximately $260,000,000 not included in the President's budget. Had funds been requested and authorized for the public works contingent item and these absorbed costs, the total Department of Defense appropriation for fiscal 1950 would not have been $13,900,000,000 but approximately $14,700,000,000. This does not include $266,000,000 of savings below the President's budget jointly developed in our reprograming studies and by congressional committees and agreed upon around the end of September. We plan to absorb these added costs within our reprogramed $13,000,000,000 obligational ceiling for fiscal 1950 and we do not currently plan to seek appropriations for the public works items. It should also be pointed out that the final congressional appropriation of $13,900,000,000 included an increase over the President's request of $736,000,000 for aircraft procurement and maintenance in the Department of the Air Force. These funds have been placed in reserve by the President. This increase has not been included in the computation of savings, absorbed costs, and reductions discussed in this report.

Both during the congressional consideration referred to above, and thereafter, we continued our reprograming.

The primary objectives to be achieved in this reprograming were:

1. All possible reduction of overhead costs.

2. The elimination of nonproductive or unessential activities.

3. A channeling of funds into those activities which would strengthen the combat forces and increase their matériel support.

4. The phasing of fiscal 1950 activities to the levels that could be maintained in fiscal 1951.

Meantime, target ceilings for fiscal 1950 were established for each of the departments at restrictive levels to achieve the above objectives, and to insure the most rigorous possible review of plans and programs within each of the military departments. These initial planning ceilings were: Army, $4,050,000,000 (a reduction of $357,000,000); Navy, $3,850,000,000 (a reduction of $376,000,000); and Air Force, $4,400,000,000 (a reduction of $196,000,000). (As is customary, the President had in July established a tentative budget ceiling for the next fiscal year; in this case, $13,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1951.) Each of the military departments was directed to submit a revised program within these tentative ceilings as well as to demonstrate what could be accomplished within the amounts allocated and what significant program deficiencies might exist.

Testifying before the House Armed Services Committee on October 21, 1949, I said: "The strains and stresses upon the national economy which we have with us at the present time make it impossible for any service to get all that it wants, whether in dollars, in manpower strength, or in matériel. * * * But in considering the impact of the budget ceilings on the individual services, it should be borne in mind that the 1950 budget—and the 1951 budget as well—is based on an over-all plan for the defense of this Nation—a plan evolved by the best military minds in this or any other country. * * * The Department of Defense budget ceiling for 1951 has been set at $13,000,000,000. * * * This compares with the fourteen and four tenths billion (President's initial fiscal 1950 planning ceiling) * * * last year. We will have to effect the maximum possible savings within the Department of Defense in order to meet the $13,000,000,000 figure, and we will also have to make those reductions which the Joint Chiefs of Staff feel can best be made with the least impact on our military readiness. * * * Obviously, we are already making plans to shape the military establishment we will have during the remainder of fiscal 1950, in order that we may enter fiscal 1951 with approximately the military establishment we will be able to maintain during that year. * * * The problem of effecting adjustments in the programs of the three services is an extremely difficult one, and must, of course, be tied in directly with the strategic and logistic planning which is the statutory duty of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

At the time of this testimony we were in the process of subjecting the reprograming submitted by the departments for fiscal 1950 to analysis and evaluation. Detailed hearings, lasting well into November, were held at which the top echelons of each service and each major organization in the services participated. These hearings revealed that the revised programs initially submitted by the military departments cut too deeply into the bone and sinew of the organization instead of removing all of the fat.

The Army initially allocated substantial portions of the reduction to its target ceiling to the new modern equipment necessary to the proper arming of its mobile forces. The Navy and the Air Force initially proposed substantial reductions in aircraft procurement. As a result of a critical project by project evaluation headed by members of my staff, recommendations were made covering areas in which additional savings could be effected in overhead and in items of doubtful value, with these savings being applied to reinstate important major procurement items, and to restore funds for maintenance of civilian components and industrial mobilization.

Following this review, 2 days of discussion were held with the Army, Navy, and Air Force Secretaries and their principal military assistants, resulting in concurrence on most recommendations. The major problem areas remaining were discussed at a special meeting of the Armed Forces Policy Council in mid-November. At this meeting the Secretaries of the military departments and their military chiefs expressed their agreement with the adjusted reprograming with the exception of a few minor points. Five days later at another meeting of the Policy Council, these remaining points were resolved.

At each of the various stages of this process, adjustments were made in the amounts allocated as a result of the information presented by the three military departments and members of my staff. Revised budget ceilings have been established for each of the military departments—Army, $4,177,000,000; Navy, $3,985,000,000; and Air Force, $4,501,000,000. In addition to covering the cost of certain classified projects and military public works not included in the original target ceilings, the revised 1950 program provides approximately $165,000,000 more in major military procurement than was contained in the plans of the military departments in October 1949. It also provides for more tactical flying by both the Air Force and the Navy than proposed in October.

The figures set out above do not tell the whole story, of course. To these figures must be added the costs which the Department of Defense has absorbed out of funds appropriated, without asking for supplemental appropriations as might have been done. We have absorbed a cost of $339,000,000 for pay increases of military personnel, which was included in the President's 1950 budget as a contingent item. In addition, $257,000,000 of major costs, not included in the President's budget, are being absorbed by the Department of Defense. The principal items of absorbed costs in this latter category are:

Costs added by Classification Act of 1949	$29,000,000
Costs added by wage board actions	84,000,000
Costs added by higher freight and passenger rates	14,000,000
Direct costs of operating Berlin Airlift in July and August and its subsequent roll-up	49,000,000
One-time inactivation costs of installations and ships	71,000,000
Cost of additional classified project	10,000,000

The reduction in overhead and the elimination of nonessential items in fiscal 1950 establish a pattern which, carried forward into fiscal 1951, permits the maintenance of more effective forces and the procurement of substantially increased quantities of modern equipment within the $13,000,000,000 ceiling for that year.

SUMMARY OF SAVINGS AND REDUCTIONS

All of the above decisions and actions account for a total of $1,592,000,000 in savings, absorbed costs and reductions. This picture is shown below in terms of the major most elements of the Department of Defense.

Department of Defense—Summary of savings and reductions, fiscal year 1950—Estimate of Dec. 31, 1949, on basis of decisions and actions already taken

[Based on new obligational authority—millions of dollars]

Cost category	President's budget (1)	Absorbed costs not included in President's budget (2)	Total budget including absorbed costs (3)	Revised Department of Defense program (4)	Savings, absorbed costs and reductions (5)
Total, Department of Defense	14,218	257	14,475	13,000	−1,592
1 Military personnel costs	4,828	26	4,854	4,577	−377
2. Maintenance and operation	3,687	221	3,908	3,400	−508
3 Major procurement	2,964		2,964	2,529	−435
4 Public works construction	486		486	244	−242
5 Reserve forces	821		821	765	−56
6 Other military requirements	1,029	10	1,039	965	−74
7 Establishment-wide activities	403		403	403	
Reserve for emergencies				117	

A brief explanation of the above items is as follows

1. Military personnel costs· The $377,000,000 net decrease in this category results from a number of actions, principally the phasing out in this fiscal year of the 1-year enlistees (in line with the policy decision of the Congress, expressed in the report on the fiscal 1950 appropriation bill), phasing of military personnel strength to the level that could be supported in fiscal 1951, lower costs of subsistence and clothing, the extension of monetary allowance system to all military services in lieu of issue of clothing in kind, adjustment of enlisted rating structure, and reduction of unnecessary travel and transportation through closer control Approximately $26,000,000 of added costs not included in the President's budget have been absorbed in this category to allow for increased rail transportation rates and for the phasing out of military personnel connected with the Berlin airlift

2 Maintenance and operation costs: The bulk of the $508,000,000 net decrease in this category arises from the dismissal of over 155,000 civilian employees [3] and the elimination of their housekeeping costs, and the closing or reduction in status of 51 military installations surplus to our peacetime needs The annual rate of savings from the reduction of pay roll and housekeeping costs of these employees will be well in excess of half a billion dollars The savings directly realizable in fiscal 1950 are less than this amount, because most of the reductions apply for only a portion of the year and because of accrued annual leave payments.

Part of the savings which have been effected in the maintenance and operation costs of the Department of Defense have been used to absorb approximately $220,000,000 of additional costs arising from the Classification Act of 1949, Wage Board increases in commercial and industrial-type installations, increases in freight rates, roll up of the Berlin airlift, and certain one-time added costs involved in the inactivation or reduction in status of installations.

3 Major procurement· Net decreases of approximately $435,000,000 have been made in major procurement programs from the amounts initially proposed in the President's budget. These have been determined after careful consideration of equipment requirements for balanced peacetime forces. No reductions have been made in the Army's major matériel procurement programs. In connection with the Army's requirements, the revised program provides for continued emphasis on modern antiaircraft equipment, tanks, electronic equipment, guided missiles, and tactical vehicles.

In the shipbuilding field a substantial number of naval prototypes, conversions, and new units are under way from prior year authorizations. Expenditures on this work will approximate $300,000,000 in the current year Increased emphasis has been placed on antisubmarine warfare equipment and techniques.

[3] By January 31, 1950, this figure increased to 157,000.

The revised fiscal 1950 program provides for procurement of over 2,000 modern aircraft and continuance of a procurement program at approximately a $2,000,000,000 annual level

In order to maintain a level rate of aircraft procurement at a $2,000,000,000 figure, our program reflects a reduction of $306,000,000 below the President's budget—a reduction of $180,000,000 for the Air Force, and $126,000,000 for the Navy One of the considerations that entered into this action was the existing backlog of orders in this field, a backlog that will stand at $3,400,000,000 at the end of the current fiscal year This $3,400,000,000 backlog, when added to the $2,000,000,000 presently before the Congress in the 1951 budget, will give a grand total, as of July 1, 1950, of approximately $5,500,000,000 of unexpended aircraft procurement authority.

4 Public works construction· Of the $242,000,000 reduction in military public works activities, $161,000,000 results from a decision to refrain from requesting financing during the current fiscal year. The remaining projects have been deferred, have been eliminated because of changed circumstances, or are being critically reviewed by the Department of Defense.

5. Reserve forces· Savings of $56,000,000 have been realized by utilizing existing stocks of equipment and material in lieu of new procurement and by reflecting decreased costs of clothing, fuel, subsistence, etc These budgetary levels still permit the National Guard to increase its strength and the Organized Reserve Corps to increase participation in paid drills.

6. Other military requirements: Savings of approximately $64,000,000 are indicated in the area of other military requirements. The research and development program is being maintained at the same level as planned, in line with our continued emphasis on these activities. The principal decrease is reflected in a reduced allocation for plant studies and maintenance of stand-by plants and facilities where we believe substantial economies can be made.

7. Establishment-wide activities: These activities are being maintained at the same level proposed in the President's budget although in many cases new functions are being performed without increased costs.

The figures described above, if constructed on a project basis instead of on the major category basis outlined in the preceding pages, can be listed in the following form:

Derivation of savings and reductions [1]

[Rounded off to the nearest thousand]

	Fiscal year 1950 total
Phase out of 1-year enlistee program	[2] $78,827,000
Lowered cost of recruiting program	[2] 2,255,000
Price declines in fuel	[2] 26,360,000
Price declines in subsistence and clothing	[2] 44,863,000
Phasing of military personnel to fiscal year 1951 level	[2] 80,495,000
Lowered cost of printing and binding	[2] 2,281,000
Inactivation of administrative vehicles and substitution of civilian-type vehicles for heavy military-type vehicles	[2] 11,390,000
Inactivation of facilities surplus to peacetime needs	[2] 169,195,000
Lowered cost of petroleum reserves	[2] 500,000
Lowered cost of classified project	[2] 2,134,000
Restrictions on civilian travel	[2] 393,000
Bringing the rating structure of enlisted men into line with actual distribution and the structure plan for fiscal year 1951	9,940,000
Institution of the monetary maintenance allowance system in lieu of issue in kind	13,797,000
Reduced requirement for Air Force subsistence	3,683,000
Lower requirement for feeding indigenous persons overseas	3,172,000
Curtailing and closely examining requirements for issuance of change-of-station travel orders	3,653,000
Lowered cost of quarters allowances for enlisted personnel resulting from adjustments in the rating structures	1,900,000
Savings in flight pay through decreased number of pilots	1,978,000
Early discharges, releases of CAD officers, and lower requirements for recruit outfits	9,466,000
Reduced requirement for operation of aircraft	4,962,000
Decrease in depot and base supply and maintenance	4,226,000
Lower fuel requirements from reduction in steaming hours of the active fleet and operation of a smaller fleet	2,600,000
Curtailment of the use of chartered tankers	2,000,000
Rescheduling and combining cargo shipments	7,960,000
Lowered operating expenses of ships other than fuel	8,000,000
Adjusting schedules for ship overhauls, reevaluation of scope of work required for individual ships, and accomplishment of increased self-maintenance by ships' crews	10,000,000
Decrease in the total communications requirements for the Department of Defense including those resulting from the operation of AFSA	6,640,000
Reduced procurement of organizational clothing, motor transport spare parts, general supply items, signal supply items, and curtailment of repairs, upkeep, and improvements for Marine Corps	1,000,000
Lower level of support for courts martial, chaplain supplies, miscellaneous schools, etc	709,000
Curtailment of major repairs and replacements and general maintenance of naval facilities	7,621,000
Lower procurement in major categories as follows:	
Aircraft	306,795,000
Ships	34,430,000
Weapons	4,672,000
Ammunition	9,500,000
Guided missiles	4,200,000

See footnotes at end of table.

See footnote at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1950 total
Lower procurement in major categories as follows—Con.	
Vehicles (including purchase of civilian type instead of heavy military types)	$36,000,000
Advance base components	20,099,000
Miscellaneous major procurement	86,400,000
Reduced or deferred public works construction	[1] 256,437,000
Savings through consolidation of reserve training facilities, joint use of facilities and inactivation of some smaller training vessels while at the same time extending the training schedules of some of the larger vessels which will accommodate greater numbers of reserve personnel for training	13,488,000
Reevaluation of research and development projects	17,187,000
Cancellation of the quinquennial overhauls of reserve fleet vessels and reduced preservation and maintenance of other war reserves	13,472,000
Curtailment of information and education activities	330,000
Employment of better traffic policies and procedures in the operation of a central military land traffic office	1,610,000
Reduction in cost of Air National Guard, ROTC, and Reserve	8,813,000
Reduction of leased space after consolidation of activities	74,000
Reduction and unification of military attaché office staffs	1,436,000
Lower cost of planned field exercises	500,000
Savings in maintenance and operation of hospital facilities	5,321,000
General appropriation reprograming by deferred maintenance, personnel reductions or turn-over, lower level of operation in order to absorb wage board and other pay increases	156,535,000
Flying hours	57,662,000
Reevaluation of industrial mobilization	25,928,000
Price declines in miscellaneous supplies	2,694,000
Portion of contingency item for Career Compensation Act not required	61,000,000
Total	1,592,093,000

[1] Does not include a large number of items which will lead to future savings, including, for example, savings in fiscal 1950 resulting from the inactivation or change in status of 18 military medical hospitals, directed on February 1, 1950. This step will alleviate the acute shortage of physicians in the armed services and effect recurring annual savings, of about $25,000,000 (permitting this saving in dollars or a transfer of effort to combat support, or both) without affecting the quality of medical services available to military personnel and their dependents. For a general discussion of items that will lead to future savings, of which this hospital illustration is an example, see below.

[2] Reduction partially reflected in appropriation act.

NOTE.—Most projects listed are affected by the civilian personnel reduction. Civilian personnel savings in fiscal year 1950 will total $200,000,000—and $500,000,000 in terms of the annual rate of savings.

A large number of the items outlined above clearly represent savings, many of which will continue in future years. A number of other items clearly represent reductions. Many items, however, cannot be categorized solely as either savings or reductions, since they contain elements of both. An examination of the project-by-project list set out above shows many areas of major savings—savings which, in the aggregate, represent an annual rate of $750,000,000,000 Examples of the items that enter into this total are our savings in the field of civilian personnel (aggregating $500,000,000, in terms of the annual rate of savings, and spread across substantially every item on the foregoing list), our savings through consolidation of the military attaché systems, savings in printing and binding, in clothing-allowance systems, in the use of administrative vehicles, in administrative and proficiency flying, and similar measures.

In reviewing the items listed above, it should be borne in mind that there are many items that could be carried at specific dollar figures, if we were willing to proceed on a basis of conjecture, instead of on a basis of fact. We have preferred, however, to err on the side of conservatism in preparing this list—and have therefore included only those items which can be identified as of the present time. If we already had the performance budget in effect throughout the Department of Defense—as authorized by act of Congress on August 10, 1949—it would be incomparably easier to prepare a full and detailed list—but converting long-standing budgetary procedures into a performance budget is a complex and time-consuming process. It will be more than a year before we can identify all areas of savings in a manner which I consider adequate—but I do want to mention at this point that there are many items which are not specifically identified on the foregoing list, for the reason I have just mentioned.

In addition to the items I have just been discussing, we have in process of study or implementation many other items which will yield substantial savings in future years. Among these items may be enumerated the following: The consolidation of oceangoing shipping; the results of our cataloging project; savings in the medical field in addition to those covered by the announcement of February 1 concerning general hospitals; further streamlining of the supply systems of the Department of Defense; further savings in the field of land transportation, including improved traffic management, and further savings in the operation of the consolidated Military Air Transport Service; further savings through more effective utilization of military and civilian personnel; savings from improved joint utilization of research and technical facilities; savings through library consolidations; further savings in the communications field, and major savings that should result from work now under way in training and educational programs.

In my opinion, the best evidence of the continuing character of the savings which have already been achieved is the over-all comparison of the military program for fiscal year 1951 with the military program for fiscal year 1950. I summarized this to the House Appropriations Committee on January 12, when I said:

"In the course of your hearings at this session your committee will find reflected in the detailed estimates reduced dollar requirements for many functions and activities of the Department of Defense. These reduced requests reflect what we have already done and what we confidently feel we can do in the coming year in providing support for an effective military force at a lesser cost.

"In closing I would like to sketch in broad outline the results of our efforts to achieve our common objectives. This budget contemplates, as stated in the President's message:

"That 'total personnel assigned to combat forces will be the greatest since the completion of demobilization following World War II.'

"That $2,000,000,000 will be available for aircraft procurment—about the same as the volume of orders placed under fiscal year 1949 authority and planned for use in fiscal year 1950.

"That, military personnel will be slightly less in total number than in 1950—but requiring almost the same allocation of funds.

"That the National Guard and the Air National Guard will be continued throughout fiscal year 1951 on a level program at the strengths attained during the current fiscal year—and that the Organized and Volunteer Reserve forces will be continued at approximately the current level.

"That with the exception of shipbuilding—and aircraft procurement mentioned above—other major procurement will be increased.

"That research and development and industrial mobilization will be continued at about the same level as in fiscal year 1950.

"This is the defense structure for which we request $13,000,000,000 this year as compared with the $14,200,000,000 which was requested for last year."

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, yesterday I stated that the record shows, without serious conflict, that subversives and Communist agents are coming into the United States, and that the administration of the act by officials of the Displaced Persons Commission stationed in Europe is not in the best interests of the country, but that the welfare of the Nation is a secondary consideration.

I expect today to read from the testimony of officials of the United States Government, which will substantiate in toto every statement I have made. Before going into that phase of the matter, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary was ordered by the Senate to conduct a thorough and full investigation of the question of displaced persons. A large sum of money was appropriated by the Senate to conduct the investigation. The committee held exhaustive hearings over a period of many months. We worked zealously and conscientiously to draft and report the best possible bill, under the circumstances, with due regard to the interests of displaced persons and with due regard to the safety and security of our country. We divorced ourselves from the propaganda disseminated by the million-dollar lobby, which has attempted to mislead and deceive the American people into favoring the passage of a measure which, I state candidly, would endanger the safety and security of every family in the United States. We have reported to the Senate the best bill we know how to write.

Mr. President, the question is not whether displaced persons will be admitted into the United States. The question is not whether we shall accept our share of the displaced persons. Each of the two measures—the bill reported by the committee and the sub-

stitute—will result in the admission of approximately the same number of displaced persons. The controversy, as between the committee bill and the substitute sponsored by the Senator from West Virginia, the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from New York, and other Senators, is not on the question of the admission of displaced persons. It solely and exclusively is on the question of screening, the question of better administration, the question of better protecting the United States.

The Senate bill is anchored on the rock of the testimony of officials of the United States Government who have to do with the matter involved. The Senate bill is not based on hearsay or rumor or misinformation, but it is based on the testimony of officials of the Displaced Persons Commission, on the testimony of officials of the Immigration Service, and on the direct request of the consular officials of the United States, who say they must have authority, from the Congress, to veto the applications of displaced persons on the ground that they do not qualify, because they are being selected, in the first place, by displaced persons themselves, by aliens in an alien organization; and because, as one official of the Displaced Persons Commission says, the documents of the IRO are a scandal, the whole thing is a racket, and they are not worthy of belief. Mr. President, that report went to the head of the Displaced Persons Commission in Washington. Yet to this day no effort has been made to correct the situation.

So I say that the issue here is not whether displaced persons will be admitted to the United States. The issue here is solely what is best for the protection of the United States, which is the best method for the admission of 320,000 displaced persons to the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does the Senator care to yield before he concludes his speech?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In a colloquy yesterday afternoon in which several Senators, including the Senator from Mississippi, engaged, the statement which has just been made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi was made relative to the work of the IRO and the evidence which was submitted by officials of the Displaced Persons Commission and by the immigration authorities as to the actual practice of the IRO organization.

It seems to me that in determining a definition, which I understand is now the burden of the committee, Senators must resolve that issue on the basis of whether the definition in the present law permits the IRO to do what the Senator from Mississippi says it is doing in actual practice, and whether it is necessary for us to adopt a new definition which will prescribe standards under which the IRO, the Displaced Persons Commission, and the immigration authorities will act in this matter by authorization of Congress. Am I correct in that?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course. It is simply a question of whether the IRO is going to exercise executive and legislative authority in the United States, or whether the Congress will exercise its authority in the premises.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the issue, is it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; that is the issue.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will permit, I should like to ask five or six questions, because I wish to clear up this matter in my own mind.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be glad to have the Senator ask his questions, and I shall be glad to answer them; but if the Senator will permit, first I should like to read the testimony of an official of the Displaced Persons Commission. Then, in the light of that testimony, I shall welcome questions from the Senator from Nebraska. I think he will like to have that information before him.

Mr. WHERRY. First I was going to ask what the Senator meant by his observations. Then I was going to ask for supporting testimony.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. This is the question: Will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a short statement clarifying this entire situation with regard to the unquestioned authority of the State Deparment, through its consular service, and of the Immigration and Naturalization Service?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, of course I have the floor. The Senator from New York can take the floor in his own time and can speak and can present his own memorandum and can speak in his own time. That is the usual parliamentary procedure.

But I say to the Senator from New York that, so far as the consular service is concerned, the Senate Judiciary Committee simply carried out the request of the consular service of the United States, the head of which appeared before the entire Judiciary Committee on two occasions.

So I say to the Senator from New York that I will yield for a question, but I will not yield for him to make a speech in my time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course I shall not attempt to make a speech in the Senator's time, without the Senator's consent. I thought the short clarifying statement I desired to make possibly would obviate the necessity for the five or six questions the Senator from Nebraska has indicated he is about to ask.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is all I have the right to yield for, under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have asked whether the Senator does not think it would save time if I were to read this clarifying statement?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have the clarifying statement here, Mr. President, and as I told the Senator, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, in the bill itself, carried out solely and exclusively the request of the head of the consular service. I now read——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator has stated, has he not, it was a specific request of the consular service?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia was present at the committee meetings when the head of the consular service, Mr. L'Heureux, came before the committee and made the request. He told the committee of conditions in Germany, and made the request, which is carried forward in the committee bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Then the Senator from Mississippi is stating to the Senate that the head of the consular service is requesting the right to pass upon the eligibility of people, to determine whether they are displaced persons. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator knows——

Mr. KILGORE. May I say to the Senator from Mississippi——

Mr. EASTLAND. I am answering a question.

Mr. KILGORE. It is not a question of whether I was present; it is a question of the Senator's——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I can answer a question in any way I desire. The Senator from West Virginia certainly cannot ask me a question and then put the words in my mouth and dictate the form in which I shall answer it. I stated that Mr. L'Heureux—and I am now informed he is not the head of the consular service, but head of the Visa Division in the State Department—who had been in Europe, appeared before the committee. I was present and other committee members were present. As I remember, my distinguished friend from West Virginia was present. Mr. L'Heureux stated that they must have the veto power, and therefore we placed it in the bill at his request. He appeared before the subcommittee. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia made some complaint that he did not know what was happening in the subcommittee, so we got Mr. L'Heureux to appear before the full committee, and the same request was repeated. Let me state further that, the same afternoon, if I remember correctly, my friend from West Virginia attempted to secure the adoption by the committee of a substitute adopted which would not give Mr. L'Heureux the authority he had requested.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask the Senator from Mississippi whether the testimony of Mr. L'Heureux on this point has been printed?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I do not know whether it has been printed. I am not in charge——

Mr. KILGORE. May I say to the Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute. The Senator asked me a question, and I

will answer it. I am not in charge of printing testimony in the committee. The Senator from West Virginia is senior to me on the committee. If it was not printed, I am certain the Senator could have caused it to be printed, had he requested it; but I do not know. The Senator was present when Mr. L'Heureux was there; the Senator heard everything I heard from Mr. L'Heureux, and I am sure the Senator can verify the accuracy of the statement I have made.

Mr. KILGORE. May I say to the Senator that the verification——

Mr. EASTLAND. I am now informed that the testimony was not reported; that it was an informal meeting at which Mr. L'Heureux appeared before the committee. He made the request, and, of course, there was no point in taking down the request in writing.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that I felt sure, because the chief consultant of the Judiciary Committee on this matter was sitting beside the Senator, that he would find that out. It is a question of interpretation of Mr. L'Heureux's statement. One interpretation might be placed upon it by, shall I say, Mr. Arens——

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. KILGORE. Another by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]——

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. KILGORE. Another by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]——

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. KILGORE. And another by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, no, Mr. President. Any person who can hear and understand the English language could not place two interpretations on what Mr. L'Heureux said. Let me tell my friend from West Virginia, I was present on two or three occasions. I heard Mr. L'Heureux; I have made my own interpretation, and I think my interpretation is in line with the interpretation of every other member of the committee. It was a simple request.

Mr. KILGORE. May I again ask the indulgence of the Senator from Mississippi, to state that the recollection of the Senator from Mississippi as to the interpretation, and that of the Senator from West Virginia, are entirely different? So I cannot accept the statement of the Senator from Mississippi that it was the opinion of all members of the committee. Certainly it was not the opinion of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr President, may I ask——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me state, Mr. President, in fairness to Mr. L'Heureux, that he did not come before the committee on his own initiative. He was requested by the committee to come for the purpose of giving information and of answering questions. At those meetings he asked for the authority the committee bill gives him, which authority the Senator from West Virginia would deny. The consular service can veto the Immigration Service: the Immigration Service, in a matter pertaining to an immigrant, can veto the consular service. Why cannot the consular service veto the Displaced Persons Commission on all matters? Why cannot the Immigration Service veto the Displaced Persons Commission on all matters? Why should the Displaced Persons Commission be placed on a pedestal? Why should it be said that on questions of eligibility under the act, its word is final and conclusive? If the consul, because of the evidence before him, knows that a so-called displaced person was not in the zones in Germany on the date in question, and knows the documents are false and fraudulent, why should he not be in a position to object. In the name of all fairness, what is to be lost by giving the power of veto to the consular service and to the Immigration Service?

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. KILGORE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not possible today for the Immigration Service to declare that the statement was false, and therefore to exclude the applicant because of false statements?

Mr. EASTLAND. Solely if it comes within the terms of a violation of the immigration law, but not under the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why would not a false statement relative to residents be such a fraud on the Immigration Service as to warrant its exclusion of the applicant?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator asks why would it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. But is it not a fact that the Immigration Service can exclude displaced persons?

Mr. EASTLAND No.

Mr. JENNER. No

Mr. EASTLAND. All the testimony shows they cannot.

Mr. FERGUSON. I did not so understand the testimony at the hearing.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am going to read it to the Senator. The Senator will understand, in a minute, if he will accord me the courtesy of listening to the reading of the testimony.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator certainly is entitled to courtesy.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is a question. Does the Senator not realize that the statements he has made and the statement he has attributed to Mr. L'Heureux, of the State Department, refer to the entry of persons who are connected with affiliates of international organizations, or with other nations, or with the United Nations Organization, UNESCO, the Soviet Government, and so on. Does the Senator not know that?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; and that is not true, Mr President.

Mr. LEHMAN. Could the Senator point——

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from New York is in good faith. Under no condition would I attribute bad faith to the Senator in making the statement he has made. The testimony which the Senator has in mind was taken in connection with the bill of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] having to do with subversives. It has nothing in the world to do with the appearances of Mr. L'Heureux before the subcommittee on the displaced-persons bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Did not the Senator from Mississippi, a few minutes ago, attribute a statement to Mr. L'Heureux? Would the Senator have any objection to pointing out the exact part of the testimony to which he made reference?

Mr. EASTLAND. The testimony on another bill is entirely distinct from and foreign to the bill now under consideration by the Senate. The Senator from New York speaks of other testimony. If my veracity is challenged, there are many members of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the floor of the Senate who heard the testimony and heard the request, not once, but several times.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I want to ask a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question, and that is all.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the Senator from Mississippi, in all fairness, trying to get all the members of the Judiciary Committee to acquiesce in his interpretation of a statement which was made, but not recorded, according to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I was not following the Senator from West Virginia. The Senator from New York was pulling a green book on me, and I wanted to see what it was. I shall first answer the Senator from New York. The book which the Senator from New York has is with reference to hearings on Senate bill 1832. The bill now under consideration is House bill 4567. The Senator from New York was waving an entirely different book of hearings held by the subcommittee, and, of course, he could not find anything regarding the displaced persons bill in testimony taken on another bill.

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that the same subcommittees handled both hearings and that the same staff was used in connection with those hearings?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. There were two separate subcommittees.

Mr. KILGORE. Not being a member of either of the subcommittees, I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi to tell me the membership of the subcommittee to which he refers.

Mr. EASTLAND. There were two separate subcommittees.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask as to the membership?

Mr. EASTLAND. My friend from West Virginia has given a demonstration of the fact that Senators have not gone into the subject thoroughly and do not understand it. If they had, there would not be any question about this bill. My friend from West Virginia has proved my point. The difficulty is the lack of understand of the bill. Senators are so busy that they have not had time to go into the question.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to ask if members of the committee as a whole were advised when subcommittee hearings were being held?

Mr. EASTLAND. Many of them were advised. I am advised that my friend from West Virginia was invited and that he attended a number of hearings. He attended the meeting at which the testimony of Mr. Donald W. Main was given. Mr. Main was an officer of the Displaced Persons Commission at the time he testified, and the Senator from West Virginia heard his testimony.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that that committee meeting was a meeting of the entire Judiciary Committee?

Mr EASTLAND. No. My information is that it was a subcommittee meeting to which the entire Judiciary Committee was invited. The Senator from West Virginia had raised the point that the entire committee did not know what was happening at the hearings, and, therefore, to meet his objection, which I think was well taken, the entire committee was invited, and the Senator from West Virginia attended.

I desire to read the testimony given by Mr Main——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask a further question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that while the entire committee was invited, some of the testimony which is being produced here was never produced before the full committee?

Mr. EASTLAND. There were public hearings. Which meetings the Senator attended I do not know, but they were all public hearings, or most of them at least, where testimony was taken. I know the Senator from West Virginia was present when the testimony of the former officer who had been in charge of certain phases of intelligence work in Germany was given, and the Senator complimented the gentleman on his fine appearance and his sincerity.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that it was at the request of the Senator from West Virginia that Mr. L'Heureux, and the head of the Immigration Service, and others were called to the public hearing?

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot answer that question, because I was not present when the Senator made such a request. However, if the Senator says it was done, of course his statement satisfies me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. It seems to me that it does not make any difference whether the witness testified before a subcommittee or before the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator from New York is of one opinion, in all sincerity, and the Senator from West Virginia is of another opinion. I am sure that the Senator from Mississippi is also sincere in his opinion. I should like to hear the testimony. Is the Senator about to read the testimony?

Mr. EASTLAND. I intend to read it when my colleagues permit me to continue. I desire to be courteous. Of course, I think I should be asked questions, for I want this matter to come to light in full

Mr. WHERRY. We should hear the testimony.

Mr. EASTLAND. If Senators will permit me to read the testimony, I shall gladly do so. I am about to read the testimony of Mr. Donald W. Main.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator made reference to testimony given by Mr. L'Heureux, of the State Department. That is the testimony which I believe Senators are interested in. I understood the Senator to say that the hearings were public. If they were public, certainly every member of the Judiciary Committee and every Member of the Senate is entitled to the record.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let us be fair. The Senator from New York certainly heard me say on several occasions that the testimony of Mr. L'Heureux was not taken down. We asked him to give us some information in an informal consultation. He gave us the information, and the provision he requested was put in the bill. My friend from New York heard me say that. Let us be absolutely fair and square. I know men can differ, but I say, Mr. President, that when the facts in this controversy are known, as far as the rank and file of the Senate are concerned, there cannot be much conflict.

I shall refer now to the testimony of Mr. Donald W. Main, who is the senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission in charge of the office at Munich, Germany. He testified on February 14 of this year, approximately 2 weeks ago. Let us see what Mr. Main said. He is talking about IRO, which the Senator from Nebraska asked me about. That is the international organization which initiates everything and plays a most important part in the program.

Mr. MAIN. They [the IRO] prepare documentation in the names of these persons. They certify to us—

He is talking about the Displaced Persons Commission—

that the person is a displaced person within the meaning of the IRO's constitution, and the concern of IRO.

In addition to that, they certify that their records show that the individual entered Germany, Austria, or Italy on a particular date and that they were in one of the western zones or sectors on January 1, 1948, or otherwise, if that is the case.

Let me say there that I shall shortly put into the RECORD exhibits consisting of Government documents which show the fraud and bribery used to create fictitious dates so as to enable criminals to come into the United States.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be glad to yield when I have finished reading this testimony. He testified that the records and certifications by the IRO were prepared by displaced persons employed by the International Refugee Organization.

Mr. President, how can there be objection to providing that the files must be initiated and compiled by American citizens and by an American organization? Who can object to that?

I read further from Mr. Main's testimony:

Mr. MAIN. I think that these decisions as to eligibility under the act * * * which is an interpretation of IRO's constitution, that decision should be made by citizens of the United States.

I invite the attention of Senators to that statement. Here is a senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission who says that the decisions as to eligibility should be initiated by citizens of the United States. He is the only senior officer with immigration experience. The others were put there by UNRRA and are former employees of UNRRA and former employees of voluntary agencies whose duty it was to rush immigrants in here, law or no law.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The answer to the question which I asked the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, if I interpret correctly his observation, as well as the evidence which he has presented, is that the issue here in the first place is whether or not an applicant is the concern of IRO, or whether he is the concern of Congress acting through an authorized agency.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is exactly correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The evidence which the Senator is now offering was given by the senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission, who testified that a subdivision of the American Government ought to be the one to make the final test of the definition.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; and he is the only senior officer who has had immigration experience.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that testimony available?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is available.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it on the desks of Senators?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know whether it is in the hearings or not.

Mr. WHERRY. Is testimony being taken daily now, as we debate the question?

Mr. EASTLAND. Testimony is being taken daily. In fact, the bill was reported while the testimony was being taken. We were rushed to get the bill out under an order of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. It is unfortunate that we do not have the testimony available.

Mr. EASTLAND. By the way, we are to hold a hearing tonight. Now let me continue. The Senator has not heard anything yet.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not read the testimony because it is not available. It is not the fault of any Senator that we do not have the testimony which is being read now. I am not blaming the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is the fault of the Senate. I shall state where the blame lies. The Senate said the bill had to be reported to the Senate by the 30th day of January, and we could not get these gentlemen to come here from Europe before that time.

Mr. WHERRY. It is very difficult for Senators to make up their minds when one Senator's statement is in complete contradiction with the statement of another Senator on a question of fact, and we do not even have the evidence before us. Now let me read further.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may give a brief answer to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, but I ask the Senator to be brief.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that it is difficult for Senators to form an opinion when statements are made with regard to testimony given before committees of the Senate of which no record has been kept, and those officials who are alleged to have given the testimony are quoted as giving testimony entirely contradictory to the plain facts, which I shall submit to the Senate a little later.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the testimony I was reading was taken at a public hearing of a Senate committee. As to Mr. L'Heureux's statement, as I have said, that was not testimony. No one knows better than does the Senator from New York that it was not testimony. It was a statement at an informal meeting, and the present Presiding Officer [Mr. WITHERS in the chair] was present at that meeting, and knows exactly what happened.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me ask the Senator whether it was off-the-record testimony.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, it was not off the record. We asked Mr. L'Heureux to come up to the Capitol. He was here three times. He was before the subcommittee, he was before the full committee. We all heard what he said. We wrote into the bill the language he requested to have inserted. We certainly would not have put it in the bill if he had not asked us to do it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thought the able Senator from Mississippi said it was at a public hearing.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yield for a question only.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York understands that this was a public hearing, and is it not a fact——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute. What I have stated time and time again to the Senator was that Mr. L'Heureux was called up for an informal consultation. We went over the bill with him. He requested that they could better protect this country if they were given the veto power. Information was given us. He gave us information about different zones in Germany, and acting on his requests, we put provisions in the bill.

It is unheard of in the Senate, when an officer of the Government comes up to the Capitol to confer with Senators on a bill and make suggestions, to take down his testimony and write it out and pass it around to everybody. What he suggested is in the bill. We scrupulously did what we said we would do.

Now, Mr. President, I shall read further. I want to finish Mr. Main's testimony, then I shall yield to any questions any Senator desires to ask.

Question Mr. Main, are these people in IRO who make their determination on those points in some instances citizens of countries other than the United States?

Mr MAIN I think in most instances.

Note that, Mr. President. There was the senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission stating that the determination of eligibility for people to come to this country to become citizens is by people who are not citizens of the United States.

Question What countries are these citizens of, for the most part?

Mr MAIN. They are what they call class 1 employees of IRO, which includes English, Dutch Canadian, and all participants of the IRO, I think

Question To what extent are the records of the IRO, which you receive, prepared by Displaced Persons themselves?

I call special attention to this, Mr. President. The Senator from New York and the Senator from West Virginia want to retain a system under which displaced persons are selecting displaced persons to come to the United States. That is the desire, to have a system like that in existence today, under which displaced persons are selecting displaced persons to come here. Listen to what this man says:

Almost all of the records, the documentation received, is prepared by displaced persons employed by IRO

Mr. TYDINGS Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS Not being a member of the committee, I am not so familiar with the subject under discussion as are some other Senators, and I should like to ask, for enlightenment, whether these initial papers which are prepared, as alleged, by displaced persons themselves, are then scrutinized and processed to the same effect as if they had not been prepared by displaced persons.

Mr. EASTLAND. No. I will say to the Senator that the record shows, I think the proof is, that practically the entire information on which action is taken is prepared by an international organization, and that organization has a legal division set up to get paroles for criminals so that they can come to this country as displaced persons.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many parolees have come?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have the figures in the records in my possession. I will have to take that matter up in its turn. I cannot put my hand on it at the moment. I will say to the Senator that the testimony of a former Army officer, who came before the full Committee on the Judiciary, an officer who had been in charge of certain phases of military intelligence in Germany, was that they had caught Russian agents, Russian Army officers, whom the Russians were attempting to get through as displaced persons.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator mean, to plant them in the displaced persons' camps?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, ultimately; so as to get them into this country. And when they caught some Russian Army officers—I repeat, army officers, Mr. President—and arrested them, the Russians arrested two American officers in retaliation, and held them for several months. The officer in question testified that beyond any peradventure of a doubt Communist agents had gotten into this country by reason of lax screening.

I want to tell the Senator from Maryland something else about screening. I will say this to begin with: The McCarran bill and the substitute would let into this country about an equal number of displaced persons. There can be no question about that

Mr. TYDINGS. There is a difference of only 9,000 between the two measures, as I understand.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is substantially correct.

Listen to this testimony:

Question. Do you know of any instances in which the Displaced Persons Commission or its employees have solicited pardons for convicted displaced persons, in order to make them eligible under the law?

This question was asked of Mr. Tripp. Mr. Tripp is a United States official in charge of the immigration detail in Europe.

Answer. I know that IRO does that IRO, in fact, maintains a legal division just to try to get pardons for displaced persons.

Mr. TYDINGS. What are the offenses with which these persons are charged? What kind of offenses are they?

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot answer that question. One of them is murder. I will tell the Senator this about screening——

Mr. TYDINGS. Before the Senator leaves that point. Have we admitted anyone who has been paroled after conviction on the charge of murder—knowingly, I mean?

Mr. EASTLAND. Thirty-four. Not murder alone, but for serious crimes.

Mr. TYDINGS. What are the serious crimes?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not remember.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator could remember one other, say, I would have some kind of a yardstick.

Mr. EASTLAND. I would not attempt to make that statement, because it might be inaccurate. But I want to make this point to the Senator respecting the system of screening that is practiced. What I say is not hearsay. It comes from witnesses. The Government maintains the Berlin Document Center, as the Senator knows, to find out the political affiliations of persons who have been interned. The Provost Marshal General of the Army maintains lists of those who have been convicted. The record shows that the Displaced Persons Commission have testified, "We have taken a deliberate and calculated risk." When the IRO file

comes to them they send it to the Berlin Document Center and to the Provost Marshal's office to obtain the information about the man in question. They do not wait for the report, however, but rush him on into this country. They say, "We have taken a calculated risk."

Mr. TYDINGS. If persons are to be permitted to enter under this bill, I should think there would be plenty of deserving ones over there, persons who would certainly have no criminal record, who would be preferable for us to bring in, without taking in those who have criminal records.

Mr. EASTLAND. Now, the distinguished Senator from Maryland, with his razor-sharp mind, has put his finger in a second on the issue here. It is just as the Senator says. What we are trying to do is to improve the system, for bringing desirable persons here.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think there should be, of course, a large element of humanitarianism in this program, but at the same time it ought to be applied to the deserving in preference to the undeserving. I am considerably shocked to learn that persons who have been charged with heinous offenses are paroled and admitted to the United States. It seems to me the Senator has made a rather serious charge, and I know he is not given to reckless statements.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am reading the record of the testimony of officials of the Government.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I want to answer the question of the Senator from Maryland. The Senator from Maryland says he is shocked. I want the Senator to listen to this letter:

HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES
DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION,
Frankfurt, July 28, 1949.

To: Mr. Donald W. Main, senior officer, area 6.
From: Alex E. Squadrilli, Coordinator.
Subject: Kohn, Josef.

Listen to this:

The above-captioned file is returned herewith for reprocessing as directed below.

As far as the Commission is concerned, rejections under section 10 of the act in document and perjury cases must be based upon proof—either the record of a court conviction, or a confession in writing—

The law says the burden of proof is upon the applicant; that he must bear the burden to show that he is of good moral character. I continue to read—

either the record of a court conviction, or a confession in writing, or a signed consular statement to the effect that the applicant committed perjury, or was previously denied a visa because of the submission of false documents.

If the applicant is otherwise acceptable, you will, therefore, write a favorable report with appropriate reference therein to the allegation of record and the Commission findings in the premises.

Now listen:

Please withdraw from the file all previous Commission reports and notifications before forwarding same to the consul.

This letter may be incorporated in the file in support of the directed action.

ALEX E. SQUADRILLI,
Coordinator.

When there was an unfavorable report on the man it was ordered withdrawn from the file.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator attribute the condition he describes to the law, or to the incapacity of those who are administering the law?

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator be good enough to repeat his question? There was some talking going on behind me and I did not hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. There is sufficient disturbance so the Senator from Mississippi cannot hear the question addressed to him

Mr TYDINGS Does the Senator attribute the conditions he has described to (a) a fault in the law itself, or (b) to the lack of capacity of the administrators, or (c) to a policy which the administrators themselves have assumed which is not permissible under the law?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not think the fault lies with the law; in fact, I know it does not. It is a deliberate evasion of the act. The Displaced Persons Commission, under the law, is not supposed to direct the selections and operations in Europe. It was the congressional intent that that aspect of the matter should be handled by the Immigration Service and the consular service. But the Displaced Persons Commission has assumed control there under Executive order. We are solely and simply attempting to tighten up the law.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the case the Senator used as an illustration does not represent a prevalent condition, but rather that the case is an isolated one. But even assuming that it is isolated——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I read an order from the headquarters in Europe to withdraw the unfavorable matter from the files.

Mr. TYDINGS That is what I am coming to. What authority had the American administrator to issue a letter of that kind which would seem to present an applicant for admission into this country in a more favorable light than the record indicates would be warranted?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think that is pretty general practice. The law says that the burden is on the applicant to prove that he is not a Communist; to prove that he was in the camps at certain dates. The counterintelligence representatives say that they must absolutely prove by court records, or a confession in writing, that a man was a Communist or that he was a Russian agent, and that even though they have information which leads them to believe it, yet the person is processed and sent here anyway, unless there is absolute proof that he is a Communist agent. They further state that it is practically impossible in Germany to get court records because the system there now is largely informal.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator this final question, because I do not want to interrupt his speech at great length. Outside the difference between the two propositions of numbers, one bill providing roughly for about 350,000 persons, and the other for about 359,000 persons, is the principal remaining difference between the two propositions that on the one hand the system which the Senator has described is retained more or less intact, and on the other hand there is additional screening to take care of the situation he has described?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, here is the principal difference——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). The Senator will suspend for a moment, please. There are in the Chamber Senators who persist in talking to one another while in their seats. Their voices are stronger than they realize, and the carrying power of their voices is much greater than they think it is. If they wish to continue their conversations they should retire to the cloakrooms, rather than to carry on conversations in the Senate Chamber and prevent other Senators from hearing the Senator who has been recognized to speak or Senators who wish to ask questions of the Senator who has the floor. There must be order.

The Chair asks the Senator who has the floor to remain silent until the conversations in the Chamber cease. [A pause.] The Senator from Mississippi may now proceed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, here is the difference: Both the House bill and the substitute retain the same system, whereby an international organization, the IRO, whose personnel in policy-making positions are French, Dutch, English, and Canadian; and the persons who do the work under them are displaced persons—initiates the file and puts in it the necessary information, and sends it to the Displaced Persons Commission, and says, for instance, that "Hans Schmidt is in our care, and is a displaced person." The Displaced Persons Commission cannot say that Hans Schmidt is eligible to come to this country as a displaced person, under the law passed by the Congress, because the Displaced Persons Commission is bound by the file initiated by the IRO.

The law now in effect adopted as the definition of a displaced person, the definition which is found in the IRO constitution In the committee bill, we attempt to change that definition. First, we define a displaced person. The definition we use is as broad as that contained in the constitution of the IRO. We say, however, that no foreign organization shall have the power to define who is a displaced person for admission into the United States. So in the bill we draw up the definition.

Then we say the entire subject matter shall be initiated by American citizens; and the applicants shall be investigated and handled by American citizens; and only an American organization, a branch of our Government, shall participate in the selection of the displaced persons who shall come to the United States.

The testimony of one of the officials—I have forgotten whether he was an official of the consular service or of some other agency—was that an applicant for admission to the United States as a displaced person did not see an American citizen until he got to the consul; in other words, not until after he had

cleared the IRO and the Displaced Persons Commission.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, does not the United States have some representatives on the IRO?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is not in the proof. We put up a part of the money.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should think we would have some representatives on the IRO

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I should judge so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Likewise, I should think that if a displaced person is to come to this country, he should be processed by our representatives on the IRO

Mr. EASTLAND. But the IRO is not our organization. Why should not a displaced person be processed by a branch of our own Government?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not take issue with the Senator's statement; but it seems to me that in the case of such persons who apply for admission into the United States, American officials in the IRO should be used from the beginning

If the Senator will bear with me, let me state my reason in that connection: Let us assume that the four of us are, respectively, English, French, Canadian, and American; let us assume that there are four displaced persons who are applying for admission to one or another of our countries If I had the right of selection as between those four persons, it would be very easy for me to take the best one of them for admission into my own country, and to assign the questionable ones to the other countries.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. But the present practice is worse than that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly the system should be arranged in such a way that the burden is equal and the caliber of the persons admitted to the various countries is more or less equal.

I am afraid that if an American in the IRO organization does not have contacts with applicants for admission into the United States the United States may get the dregs. That assumption may be unfounded, but it is a natural assumption.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is not unfounded; it is mild, when compared to the present situation.

In the committee bill we have adopted the procedure which is used by the French, the Australians, and almost all other countries, namely, that our own citizens shall have the right to determine who shall be admitted into our country.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has asked me to state the differences between the two bills. The next great difference is as follows: After an application for admission to the United States clears the Displaced Persons Commission, to which it goes first, it then goes to the Immigration Service and to the consular service. The consular service and the Immigration Service have the right to veto each other in the case of the applications of ordinary immigrants; if either one of them thinks the applicant does not meet the test, either one of them can veto the other. However, in the case of applications for admission to the United States as displaced persons, the consular service and the Immigration Service are bound by the findings of the Displaced Persons Commission and of the IRO. Mr. L'Heureux, who is in charge of the Visa Division—I understand that the Senator from New York denies that Mr. L'Heureux did it; I do not know—came before the committee several times and said that he could veto the Immigration Commission and the Immigration Commission could veto him or his organization. He said that in many cases when a displaced person who is an applicant for admission into the United States appears before one of our consuls, although the consul knows that the applicant's documents are forged, and knows that the applicant was not in Germany on the cut-off date stated in the law, nevertheless, the consul is helpless. He may send the file back to the Displaced Persons Commission, but the findings of the Displaced Persons Commission are final.

Under the bill we gave the consul the exact authority he has relative to the Immigration Service, namely, that he can veto such an application if he does not think the applicant meets the test

Third, in the case of agricultural preferences, there is a difference between the two bills.

The fourth difference between the two bills—and I think this one is the subject of the controversy—it is as follows: Under the Kilgore-Lehman-Ferguson substitute, if a displaced person was persecuted in Germany, and therefore went to another country and settled there, although not permanently, that person could return to Germany, and then could come into the United States as a displaced person. That provision is not included in the committee bill, for the reason that if such person is in another country and has his home there, he is taken care of; and there are in Germany now too many deserving persons who do not have homes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am glad to yield, but I have already agreed to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to defer to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi has been discussing with the Senator from Maryland, as I understand, existing conditions in Europe in respect to the institution of the proceedings by which a displaced person makes application for admission to the United States. I understand that all the troubles we have had in that connection arise under the present law. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. EASTLAND. The troubles are due to direct violations of the present law.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. In any event, those who are operating the organization in Europe are operating it under the law the Congress passed last year. Is that not correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. They are operating under the guise of that law; yes.

Mr. LUCAS. How would the Senator's bill protect us from these troubles?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have outlined how the committee bill protects in that situation.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry that I did not hear all the Senator's statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the bill, the authority is retained in the Displaced Persons Commission. But under the law which we passed, it was not contemplated—and the debate so shows—that the Displaced Persons Commission would administer the program in Europe. The Displaced Persons Commission was limited to finding houses and jobs for those persons and places where they would stay. But the Displaced Persons Commission has been given this authority by Executive order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me say that the only point I am trying to make is that if the Displaced Persons Commission is operating illegally in Europe and is not following the intent of Congress, that is one thing, of course.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is right; that is what is happening.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator says that is correct, I understand.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; it is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator says it is, of course, I accept his statement.

I regret to have to ask these questions; I regret that I did not hear all the Senator's statement.

How does this bill correct that situation? let me ask the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. It corrects it by screening It provides that no one but an American citizen shall process the applicants or shall have anything to do with the admission of such persons into the United States. It gives the consular service and the Immigration Service an additional veto. It takes the IRO entirely out of the matter. It takes care of one of the big sources of fraud, because under the two bills the cut-off date is the same.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. It occurred to me, from what I had heard informally about the Displaced Persons Act, that the present act itself is fairly satisfactory, and that what the Senator from Mississippi and other Senators who take his viewpoint are attempting to do is to defeat the substitute which has been offered by the Senator from West Virginia and other Senators.

Of course, the Senator knows how difficult a time we have had during the past year in trying to get any action of any kind in the way of securing the adoption of an amendment to the Displaced Persons Act. I wonder whether the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Nevada would have come in with this kind of an amendment to the pending bill if the House had not passed the bill it did pass.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, a year ago I announced that I favored a reasonable Displaced Persons Act. Certainly we have gone into the matter in a judicial way, to try to work out the very best bill it is possible to devise to

protect this country. In my State there are a great many families of displaced persons, and they are doing well. They are good people. A family of displaced persons is working as servants where I live, and they are satisfied.

I want a bill that is fair to every type and class and every religious group. Certainly religion should not have anything to do with this matter. Every form of discrimination has been eliminated. But we should protect this country from Communist agents.

Mr. LUCAS. I am all for that.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know the Senator is. I tell him that when he carefully goes over—as I know he will—the substitute and the committee bill, he will be startled at the similarity between the two bills. In their main features, with respect to bringing in displaced persons, they are the same.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator was discussing with the Senator from Maryland a certain individual who is in charge of a displaced persons camp in Germany. Will the Senator give me the name of that individual?

Mr. EASTLAND. Donald W. Main, the senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission in the Munich area of Germany.

Mr. LUCAS. Was he appointed by the Displaced Persons Commission in America?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. He is in charge. Is he the individual who is responsible for the failure of the committee to carry out the law in Germany?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. Others have testified—I do not know whether he was one of those who testified—that in an office employing nine people, seven of them went to the coordinator, Mr. Squadrilli, to protest that they were being made to do something contrary to the law, that the security of this country was not being protected, and that the matter was outrageous.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is Mr. Squadrilli?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Squadrilli is a coordinator. He is the head man in Europe, transferred from UNRRA.

Mr. LUCAS. From what country does he come?

Mr. EASTLAND. The United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Is he an American citizen?

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, yes. But he told them to do as they were told. It shows that, the way the thing is there administered, the selectors never even see the persons they select to come here. They have protested that they could neither see them nor interview them, and that they were told, "If you don't like what we are doing, get out."

Mr. LUCAS. It seems very strange to the Senator from Illinois to find Americans in this zone deliberately ignoring the files of individuals making application to enter this country, applicants whom they know to be Communists or to have been associated with subversive elements, or who have some sort of criminal record. Can the Senator tell me why those who are presumed to be good Americans permit a thing of that kind?

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot tell what is in a man's mind, of course, but the testimony respecting Russian agents and saboteurs, of course, does not come from those men. It came in one instance from the head of certain phases of military intelligence in Germany. They raise these questions; they tell us what is happening. We have done the best we could, in our feeble way, to correct the situation.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator has. I know the Senator is most sincere in what he is trying to do with respect to the Displaced Persons Act. But in view of the fact that the Senator has said the military agency in Germany has given information to the committee with respect to this matter let me ask the further question: Did the military agency give similar information to the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot answer that question, but I will give the Senator a sample of what has happened. I hold in my hand an intelligence file which was approved by General Clay. It was sent to Washington. A high official who read the file stated that, if it were made public, there would be serious repercussions in the Halls of Congress. Here is the file. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for weeks, has asked that he be permitted to make the file public. He has been told it could not be made public. If the Senator from Illinois desires to read this confidential file, I think his eyes would be opened as to what is happening in the administration of the law. There it is

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois will try to read the secret file a little later on, in order that he may have his eyes opened. I had thought his eyes were open all the time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Here is something else.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask a question on that matter?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. But I have not finished answering the previous question.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry.

Mr. EASTLAND. Here is an officer in charge of military intelligence in Germany, who formerly had been stationed in Berlin. He was questioned:

> Question. Colonel, do you know of cases where there were adverse security reports on displaced persons, but in which cases they were brought to this country, notwithstanding the adverse security reports?
>
> The WITNESS. Yes, sir.
>
> Question. I did not understand whether the Colonel thinks that investigation would disclose that, among the persons who have come over as displaced persons, are Communists.
>
> The WITNESS. I am sure of it, sir.

That is a sample. This man testified that, through his organization in Berlin, he caught Russian officers and Communist agents who were trying to slip into this country as displaced persons, and that when those Russian officers were arrested, the Russians, by way of retaliation, arrested two American officers, whom they held for 6 months.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Kilgore substitute take care of that situation?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; it does not.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the Senator said there was practically no difference between the two proposals.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will state the difference in that respect. The thing is initiated by the International Refugee Organization. The file is compiled by the Displaced Persons Commission. It goes to a senior officer there, who is a Canadian, a Dutchman, or a Frenchman. This country would be better protected under the committee bill, because our own agency would do the selecting, an American citizen would compile the pertinent information, and furthermore, the consul, in case he did not think a person qualified under the act, could veto the application. That is the difference.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understood the Senator a moment ago, he stated that so far as discrimination in the matter of restrictions was concerned—a thing about which many Senators have become somewhat alarmed—the committee bill and the substitute bill are practically the same, but, so far as——

Mr. EASTLAND. In regard to the admission of displaced persons, I said they would both admit about the same number.

Mr. LUCAS. I see.

Mr. EASTLAND. I said the question was not whether we were for displaced persons or against them.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the Senator from Mississippi that the Senator from Illinois wants the best type of processing and screening the Government of the United States can devise, so far as displaced persons are concerned.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course the Senator from Illinois does. He is then confronted with this proposition. It is not a rumor, it is not hearsay. It is what witnesses have testified. This is the way the applicants are screened: When the file gets to the Displaced Persons Commission, a man's name is sent to the Berlin document center and to the provost marshal's office, to see what they have got on him. His fingerprints are sent to the fingerprint section in Berlin. But the Displaced Persons Commission does not even wait until the security report gets back. The officials testified, if the Senator will bear with me, that they took a calculated risk in order to hurry the entry of displaced persons into this country.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish the Senator would point out in the debate which one of the committee amendments will take care of the situation. I am very much interested in tightening up on all applications for entry to this country. Assuming the Senator's statement is correct with respect to the apparent manner in which they are being screened at the present

time, I think he should identify the amendment which will take care of the situation, and, when the amendent comes up on the floor of the Senate, I think the Senator again should identify it.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is the very first amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. EASTLAND. By the very first amendment, as I told the Senator, we would take the matter out of the hands of a foreign organization, out of the hands of displaced persons, and out of the hands of aliens. If I can find it, I should like to read to the Senator a report given to the Displaced Persons Commission about the bribery that was taking place in the International Refugee Organization.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can read all of that. The Senator has now read enough, assuming all the facts to be as he has stated them, so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator wanted me to state exactly how we were remedying the situation.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. This is the way we fix it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator need not read a report on bribery. I merely want to know how it is proposed to proceed, assuming bribery to exist.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Edward W. Glazek, in a report addressed to the Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission under date of May 11, 1949, among other things, said:

The issuance of documents from IRO has become a complete racket, and is unworthy of reliability. Individuals who normally could not qualify present false documents which are readily accepted, and often such individuals are coached by the IRO interviewers as to their fitness. If the prospective candidates do not possess documents, IRO has the authority to issue such on the mere statement of the individual under oath. The applicants are interviewed by clerks, and these documents are certified by IRO officers without direct contact with the candidates. This procedure offers an opportunity for widespread bribery and corruption.

Mr. LUCAS. That is merely a conclusion upon his part, is it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the reason we have taken IRO out of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to read the remainder of it. Mr. Cutler is employed by the Displaced Persons Commission in Germany, and he testified on the 6th of February, of this year. He said:

You must remember that the job of the International Refugee Organization is to get rid of displaced persons, as many and as soon as possible, no matter how. That is their job. The people who do the actual work are all displaced persons, practically all of them. There is an IRO eligibility officer. He accepts the work done by displaced persons, and he simply signs his signature.

Question. When the American consular officer gets a file on a displaced person, does the American consular officer, in addition, make an ascertainment as to whether or not the displaced person is eligible under the immigration law, and also make an ascertainment as to whether or not the applicant is an eligible displaced person?

Answer. No, sir.

Question. By whom is that done?

Answer. It is done by the IRO entirely.

Question. The IRO makes that determination through employees who are themselves displaced persons?

Answer. Yes, sir.

He testified further as follows:

The International Refugee Organization maintains a legal division to solicit pardons for convicted displaced persons so they may become eligible for immigration to the United States under the law.

We made a terrific improvement when we took IRO out of this picture. No other nation in the world uses it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator not know that, in addition to the screening by the IRO, which is simply on the question of whether the displaced persons meet the definition of the constitution of the IRO, there is a further check of every DP by the United States Army's Counter-Intelligence Corps, by the State Department, through its consular service, and by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States, and that no DP can enter this country without such a check and without authority given by these agencies?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as I have shown, the IRO is shot through, so we have been told, with bribery and corruption, and I do not think the great United States of America, the greatest Nation on which God's sun ever shone, should be bound by a security report made by a foreign organization. Good American blood flows through my veins, and I cannot think that this country should be bound by a security report made by an international organization and that the files in Europe should be compiled by displaced persons who want to rush each other to this country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. No better American blood flows through the veins of the Senator from Mississippi than that which flows through the veins of the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, I meant nothing personal by my statement, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. I accept the explanation.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from New York is a great American, and I have the highest confidence in his integrity and ability.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The consular service and the Immigration Service do not have facilities abroad to make a widespread check. It has been testified that they are bound largely by the files sent them which have been compiled by displaced persons, and they largely act on that basis.

The Senator has mentioned a security check and security screening by the Displaced Persons Commission, and yet employees of that Commission say, "We do not even wait for security reports. We do not even wait for a security report from the provost marshal's office."

The man in charge of the fingerprint bureau says:

They send me fingerprints that are not even written in the English language. I cannot tell anything about them. Many of them are illegible.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. In a moment.

Here is a letter to the chairman of the committee from the fingerprint division, and I shall read the letter at this point:

The reason I am writing you is that I saw the enclosed clipping of an article which appeared in an Army newspaper, the Stars and Stripes, on Friday, the 13th of January. There is one particular sentence that interests me most:

"They are putting pressure on everybody and every single organization to pass everything."

In that connection, let me say that a high official of the Displaced Persons Commission testified he got a transfer because he had given adverse reports on DP's.

Let us see what is happening at the fingerprint center:

Since 1948 our section has been charged with processing the fingerprints of every DP requesting entry into the United States under the DP Act of 1948.

This is the man who fingerprints every applicant who comes in.

We have been under constant pressure to speed up the work. Many of the fingerprints we receive for processing are taken in such a haphazard manner as to render them useless to us.

Mr. President, there is the screening of which the Senator from New York speaks of.

Many of the fingerprints we receive for processing are taken in such a haphazard manner as to render them useless to us. It is therefore practically impossible to check these for any previous conviction. The signature of the person taking the prints is invariably that of a displaced person.

That bears out what one official said, that an applicant does not even see an American citizen until he gets down to the consul. That is the first time he looks into the eyes of an American citizen.

Any notations made as to missing fingers, scars in the pattern area, etc., is usually in such poor English that it is incomprehensible. When for some reason one of the fingers is not printed, a notation should be made as to the reason. This is hardly ever done. Despite this, I don't believe there are ever any prints returned by our office to the contributors for retaking.

When they are illegible, Mr. President, and are sent back with the statement, "They are illegible; send me some more prints which have been taken again," they are never sent back.

Our office has concentrated almost solely on DP prints. Therefore, the fingerprints

of any person arrested for a criminal offense stand a very good chance of not even being in file.

In spite of my repeated protests, it has been made clear to me and to the other members of our section by our section chief that what mattered was production rather than accuracy.

Please note that. The section chief says that accuracy does not matter. It is production that counts. He tells them they need not even be accurate. There, Mr. President, is the screening. There is the security check. That is what is being done to protect our country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be happy to yield when I have finished reading the letter.

However, I feel that the American people are entitled to know that the DP's are not receiving the security screening (as far as fingerprints are concerned) that the American public may think.

There is a man who says the DP's are not receiving the screening which the American public may think they are receiving. Oh, no, there is no propaganda machine, with a lobby to spend millions of dollars, talking about screening displaced persons to protect the country!

Mr. President, the testimony of the men who administer the program shows that they agree almost unanimously that the United States is not being protected. That bears out the statements of numerous Senators who have been in Europe and have seen at first hand conditions in this field.

I read further:

I should like to make it clear that I am not against the DP Act itself. I am against the abuse of it. I hope that some day I may have the pleasure of meeting you in person.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. In view of the fact that the able Senator from Mississippi has denied the accuracy of my statement that these people are screened by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and by the State Department, I made inquiry as late as this morning——

Mr. EASTLAND. Right there, Mr. President, I may say this is not a personal matter of my word against the word of the Senator from New York, or of the Senator's word against anyone else's word. I have simply read the statements made by officers who administer the program, and those statements speak for themselves. If the Senator from New York has some statements which deny the truth of the statements which I have read, the Senator may refer to them in his own time. He may put that information in the RECORD if he wishes. It is certainly proper to do so in this debate, and it should by all means be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the junior Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator object to my reading the result of my inquiry from the Commissioner of Immigration of the United States and from the Chief of the Visa Division of the United States at this time, in order to clarify the situation?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator may read that a little later, when I have finished reading the testimony. I should like to get in the RECORD all the testimony that bears on the question.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. IVES. The senior Senator from New York would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi if he does not believe that in all fairness, in order that the RECORD may be as complete and full as possible, he should accede to the request of the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. EASTLAND. The senior Senator from New York evidently does not understand what has happened, when he challenges anyone's fairness. I stated that I had the testimony of a number of witnesses on the point I was discussing and that I desired to put all the testimony in the RECORD. I said that I would yield to the Senator from New York after I had put the testimony in the RECORD. I think I am being most fair. I should like to get the testimony in, and then I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from New York, so that he may make a speech in my time, if he wishes. I believe fairness lies in that suggestion. I do not believe it is fair to jump up in the middle of the reading of testimony, when only part of the testimony has been read, and ask me to yield for another purpose.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again to the senior Senator from New York?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. IVES. The senior Senator from New York understood that the junior Senator from New York was endeavoring to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a statement which he said would clarify the situation to a considerable extent.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is what he said. As the senior Senator from New York well knows, I stated that I had other testimony which bore on the point, and that when I had placed that testimony in the RECORD, I would permit the junior Senator from New York to place his material in the RECORD.

Mr. IVES. The senior Senator from New York is very grateful to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is nothing to be grateful about. I did not agree to do it because the senior Senator from New York requested it. I had agreed to do it before the senior Senator from New York rose to make the request.

I now read further from the testimony of Mr. Main:

Question. Are these people in the IRO who make their determinations on those two points in some instances citizens of countries other than the United States?

Mr. MAIN. I think in most instances.

Question. What countries are they citizens of, for the most part?

Mr. MAIN. They are what they class "I" employees of IRO, which includes English, Dutch, Canadian, and all participants of IRO, I think.

Question. To what extent are the records of IRO, which you receive, prepared by displaced persons themselves?

Mr. MAIN. Almost all of the records, the documentation received, is prepared by displaced persons employed by IRO.

Question. In connection with the documentation that you receive from IRO, on which it makes determinations and decisions binding upon the Commission, the records are prepared by displaced persons themselves, is that correct?

Mr. MAIN. The records themselves are usually prepared by displaced persons.

The certifications, however, are in the names of class I employees, not displaced persons.

Mr. Almanza Tripp, whom I have previously identified as the officer in charge of the immigration detail stationed in Europe to examine displaced persons, testified in public session before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on February 15, 1950, as follows:

Question. Now, Mr Tripp, to continue: Who prepares the IRO records which are certified to the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr. TRIPP. Do you mean the resettlement form and similar documents?

Question. Yes.

Mr. TRIPP. They are prepared by displaced persons employed by the IRO.

Question. In other words, is it true that the certifications which go from the International Refugee Organization to the Displaced Persons Commission are prepared, that is, the files are prepared, by displaced persons themselves?

Mr. TRIPP. Yes; they are. But the certification is by one of their international employees.

Question. But he just signs his name to a document which has been prepared by other displaced persons; is that true?

Mr. TRIPP. I believe so, in most cases.

Question. Now, when the displaced persons have prepared this document which has been certified by their officer and transmitted to the Displaced Persons Commission, does the Displaced Persons Commission, in the usual run of cases, accept the certification of this document which was prepared by the displaced persons themselves?

Mr. TRIPP. To the best of my knowledge, they do.

Mr. President, there is the testimony of the man who is at the head of the immigration detail stationed in Europe. The Senator from New York says that the displaced persons are screened, actually screened, by the Displaced Persons Commission. This gentleman says that that certification is usually accepted by the Displaced Persons Commission without question. He says a certification and file made up by displaced persons and certified to by an alien, is accepted when it gets to the Displaced Persons Commission. I read further:

Question. In other words, we have a situation where displaced persons are preparing documents which, as the practice is, are

binding upon the representatives of the Government?

Mr. TRIPP. Yes.

I call that to the attention of the Senate, Mr. President. Here are representatives of a foreign organization who in practice make documents which are binding on the representatives of our Government.

Now here is the testimony of Mr. Edward M. Glasek, who was formerly employed by the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe. This is a report dated May 11, 1949, addressed to the Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission. The Senator from New York says that the displaced persons are screened by IRO. Here is a report to the President of the Displaced Persons Commission. Listen to this:

Issuance of documents by IRO has become a complete racket and is unworthy of reliability

"A complete racket and is unworthy of reliability." Where is the screening? Where is the security check?

Individuals who normally could not qualify present false documents which are readily accepted and often such individuals are coached by the IRO interviewers as to their answers. If the prospective candidates do not possess documents, IRO has the authority to issue such on the mere statement of the individual under oath. The applicants are interviewed by indigenous clerks and these documents are certified by IRO officers without a direct contact with the candidates. This procedure offers an opportunity for widespread bribery and corruption.

Mr. President, there is a report made nearly a year ago, and no steps have been taken by the Displaced Persons Commission to remedy that situation.

I quote further from Mr. Tripp:

Question. I want to get this crystal clear for the record. On the basis of your observations and experience and the work over there as chief of the immigration service in Europe, is it not a fact that the administration of the Displaced Persons Commission, or the people in key position over there, are people who have been formerly associated with UNRRA or with voluntary agencies?

Mr. TRIPP. The majority of them.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] said in 1948, when the present law was under consideration, that if UNRRA employees would have anything to do with this administration, he would be opposed to it, yet many such UNRRA employees were transferred to key positions in the Displaced Persons Commission.

Question. Which voluntary agencies are those trying to get displaced persons over here in this country? Is that correct?

Mr. TRIPP. That is correct.

Mr. President, testimony before the committee by field employees of the Displaced Persons Commission and by the officer in charge of the immigration detail in Europe described numerous instances of pressure by officers of the Displaced Persons Commission in every phase of the operation. This pressure is exerted not only on the employees of the Commission, but upon the United States consuls and upon the immigration officers. Seven out of nine employees in the office under one area director, who had formerly been associated with a voluntary agency, went to the European theater to protest, but they were transferred.

Note, Mr. President, that seven out of nine employees in the office of one area director who had formerly been associated with a voluntary agency went to the European headquarters to protest what had been done. But no attempt was made to protect our country, Mr. President. These men were transferred because they attempted to do so.

One field employee of the Displaced Persons Commission testified with respect to the action of a senior officer of the Commission who had sought a pardon for a convicted displaced person in order to make him eligible for immigration to the United States. Think of that—a senior officer of the Commission obtaining a pardon for a criminal so he could make him eligible to come here.

Another field employee testified that approximately 50 percent of his rejections of ineligible displaced persons were overruled. Think of that. There is a field employee who said that in 50 percent of the cases which he had rejected as being ineligible, he was overruled by others higher up.

Another field employee of the Displaced Persons Commission presented to the committee numerous files of cases in which he had been directed to whitewash ineligible displaced persons. Think of that, Mr. President. Another employee brought before the committee numerous files to show that he had been directed to whitewash ineligible displaced persons so they could come to this country.

The officer in charge of the immigration detail in Europe, Mr. Tripp, testified that the officers of the Displaced Persons Commission requested him to refrain from interrogating applicants concerning their eligibility under the displaced-persons law so that there would be fewer cases for investigation.

Another one said he went to interview certain persons to ascertain their eligibility, but was directed not to do so, in order that they would not have so many cases to investigate. There is a sample of the screening, Mr. President.

I desire to apologize to the Senator from New York. I told him that when I had finished the reading of the testimony I would let him place a memorandum in the RECORD. I am not through with the testimony, but in my prepared text I have found some arguments in which I do not quote from testimony.

Mr. President, provided I do not lose the floor, I shall now be glad to yield to the Senator from New York to place in the RECORD the memorandum to which he referred, and then I shall return to a reading of the testimony of other witnesses.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his courtesy and consideration. I believe my statement will serve to clarify the question of the authority and the effectiveness of screening.

The Senator from Mississippi stated yesterday, and again today, that the Immigration Service and the consular service do not have a veto on the entry of displaced persons into the United States.

I have made inquiry of the Commissioner of Immigration, Mr. Watson B. Miller, an able and outstanding public servant, and he has advised me that the Commissioner of Immigration, through his agents and employees in Europe and through his agents and employees at Ellis Island, has and exercises final jurisdiction on the admission into the United States of displaced persons insofar as these persons qualify or fail to qualify under the immigration laws of the United States. This includes the provisions of the law on moral turpitude, political background, health, and many other restrictions placed upon all immigrants seeking to enter the United States. After the Displaced Persons Commission has forwarded the files of an individual eligible under the standards of the Displaced Persons Commission, the Commissioner of Immigration has the authority, which he exercises, to bar people from entering the United States who do not have the qualifications which are called for under the immigration laws. The Immigration Commissioner may even inquire into and investigate—and does—the facts of eligibility under the displaced-persons law, and may remand to the Displaced Persons Commission such cases regarding which the Immigration Commissioner has doubt as to qualification under the current construction of the Displaced Persons Act. It is true that the Displaced Persons Commission, under the terms of a gentleman's agreement with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, has the final word on this field of eligibility and may determine, after further investigation, that the applicant does actually qualify under the definition of a displaced person. But in regard to all other aspects of immigration eligibility, the Commissioner of Immigration has the final word. In practice, the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Immigration is exercised after the issuance of the visa by the consular service. All this, of course, is set forth in section 10 of the Displaced Persons Act, which I urge the Members of the Senate to read. I should like the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert that section into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I object to it being placed in the RECORD at this point. I do not object to the Senator having it placed in the RECORD following the conclusion of my speech.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say that I am entirely agreeable to the suggestion by the Senator from Mississippi that I place the section in the RECORD at the conclusion of the Senator's speech.

Mr. EASTLAND. Has the Senator concluded his statement respecting what Mr. Watson B. Miller advised him?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I have not entirely completed it. I shall conclude it in a moment.

The Commissioner of Immigration has 20 employees and agents engaged in this work in Europe. In addition to these, there are the regular immigration officials at Ellis Island and other points of

entry where displaced persons may be refused entry—and sometimes are—on the basis of facts not originally known which would bar these displaced persons from entry into the United States under the immigration laws of the United States.

Mr. President, this statement has been read to the Commissioner of Immigration, and he has advised me that what I have said is in accord with the facts.

Mr. President, with the further indulgence of the able Senator from Mississippi——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a moment, please. Has the Senator concluded his statement respecting what Mr. Miller advised him?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. I have not stated what Mr. L'Heureux advised me.

Mr. EASTLAND. I want to answer Mr. Miller's statement, and then the Senator from New York can place Mr. L'Heureux's statement in the RECORD.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is quite agreeable to me.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, what I said yesterday, and what I have said today, which I am quite confident the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will bear out, is that on matters of eligibility or cut-off date the findings of the Displaced Persons Commission are final; that matters under the general immigration law, whether a person qualifies under the immigration law or not, can be vetoed by the Immigration Service. I said yesterday and I have said today, and I am absolutely sure the RECORD will bear me out, that when the consular service or the Immigration Service have information which leads them to believe a man has come fraudulently into the zones he is not eligible to come into, that that file goes back to the Displaced Persons Commission, but that the decision of the Displaced Persons Commission is final; that it cannot be overruled by the consul and cannot be overruled by the immigration officials. For that reason we placed in the bill the provision that the Displaced Persons Commission could be overruled by the consular service. I emphasize what I said yesterday, and what I have said today, which the RECORD will certainly verify, that that is the system which is used.

Yesterday I placed in the RECORD the rule promulgated by the Displaced Persons Commission, and I shall read it again:

> The report shall be deemed to establish prima facie the applicant's history and eligibility under the act and shall be deemed to establish as conclusive—
>
> "As conclusive," Mr. President—
>
> the existence of all factors relating to eligibility to enter the United States, except existence of those factors required in applicable immigration laws other than the act.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am perfectly willing to allow the record to speak for itself, in view of the fact that the statement I have just read definitely refutes the claim made—not once, but many times—by the senior Senator from Mississippi that the final word with regard to the admission of displaced persons and all other would-be immigrants to the United States does not lie with the Immigration Service, under the immigration law.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course it does, under the immigration law. But under the Displaced Persons Act, the Displaced Persons Commission has the final authority and decision.

Mr. LEHMAN. But it is perfectly clear, from the statement I have presented, that it does not.

Mr. President, with the further indulgence of the able Senator from Mississippi, I should like to state that I have also made inquiry of Mr. L'Heureux, the Chief of the Visa Division, who affirms, without question, that the consular service has, and exercises, final jurisdiction over the issuance of visas to displaced persons, insofar as the laws applicable to the issuance of visas are concerned. The consuls may and do reject displaced persons who do not qualify under the laws governing admissibility of immigrants, where the Foreign Service is given, by law, jurisdiction over such admissibility. All this is set forth in title 8 of the United States Code, where it may be read by all Senators who desire clarification on this point.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will pardon me, let me say that he misinterprets his own documents and letters in that respect. Of course, under the Immigration Act and the administration of that act in connection with the general immigration laws, the Immigration Service is responsible, and has authority. We have not changed that situation. In that respect, the word of the consul and the word of the immigration official are final; and they can veto each other, if they wish to do so.

But in regard to the question of who is a displaced person, and whether an applicant for admission into the United States as a displaced person was in Germany on the cut-off date, and whether he comes within the IRO categories, neither the consular official nor the immigration official can veto the findings of the officials of the Displaced Persons Commission. The findings of the officials of the Displaced Persons Commission are final.

That is why Mr. L'Heureux asked the Judiciary Committee to give to the consular service and to the Immigration Service that additional authority. His statements are in the record. If those Services now have that authority, as the Senator from New York says they have, then why does he object to having such a provision included in this bill?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Mississippi has asked me the question, let me say that the entire thesis of his argument, since yesterday afternoon, has been that subversives are coming into this country because of the complacency, or worse, of the Displaced Persons Commission. I have maintained, and the Senator from Mississippi has denied, that the final decision with regard to the admissibility of displaced persons and all other immigrants, as far as their political background is concerned and on many other factors rests in the Immigration and Naturalization Service and in the State Department.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, either the distinguished Senator from New York misunderstood me or I misunderstood him. I said that if a person is a Communist, the Immigration Service and the consular service can veto his application, when it reaches them. But, as a matter of practice, it does not work out that way, because the consul has before him only the file for that person. The consul cannot act intelligently on a file that is prepared by displaced persons. Especially is that true when there was an order to remove adverse reports from the file, before the file reached the consular service. That is the whole purport of what I said.

If I told the Senate that the consular service could not veto the application of a displaced person whom it knew to be a Communist, I was certainly in error, because the consular service can veto such applications. But my point was that it does not have facilities with which to make the necessary investigations, and the Displaced Persons Commission has taken what it calls a calculated risk. It sends the file on before it receives a report from the Berlin document center or from the Provost Marshal's office; and it takes what it describes as a calculated risk that the man is not a bad character.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator that it is perfectly possible that he may have misunderstood me or that I may have misunderstood him. In order not to continue the colloquy, let me say that I am perfectly content to rest on the RECORD as it now stands.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if I said the consular service could not veto the application of a person known to be a Communist, I was certainly in error. I do not think I said that. I said that, as the procedure works out, the consul is bound by the file, because all the information he has is contained in the file, and there has been no screening as to it. The whole purpose is to avoid screening and to rush the displaced persons into the United States. That is the situation which the consular service is attempting to rectify.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New York will listen to this: For violations of the Displaced Persons Act, the consul and the Immigration Service have no veto power at all, except under the general immigration law.

Mr. President, Mr. Tripp further testified, with reference to representations which had been made to him, that the European coordinator of the Displaced Persons Commission, who formerly was with UNRRA, had solicited certain persons to complain of Mr. Tripp's administration of the Immigration Service in Germany. A field employee of the Displaced Persons Commission testified that a senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission, who was formerly with one of the voluntary agencies, stated at a staff meeting to the field employees that if they could not reconcile certain irregularities with their consciences, they should quit the job.

Just think of that, Mr. President. A senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission told the men working under him, "If you cannot reconcile irregularities with your conscience, quit your job."

Then will Senators tell me that we should not tighten up the procedure in this matter? Will they tell me that we should not take steps to protect the United States?

Mr. President, another field employee of the Displaced Persons Commission testified before the committee with reference to a senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission who formerly had been with a voluntary agency. He was asked:

Did Mr Bashien indicate in this staff conference that he was the moving force which caused the transfer of the Counter-Intelligence Corps man who had been giving derogatory reports?

Just think of that, Mr. President. There was an intelligence officer, an officer of the American Secret Service, who is in the front line in the fight against Communist infiltration into the United States, a senior officer in the Army Intelligence Service, now stationed in Europe, a man who seeks to protect this country from infiltration by Russian agents who are attempting to get into the United States. That man gave some derogatory reports; and, as a result, the Displaced Persons Commission officials in Europe tried to have him transferred. In the face of that situation, Mr. President, how much importance should we attach to statements about screening and about security reports and about attempts to protect this country?

Mr. President, I shall repeat the question I previously read from the testimony:

Did Mr. Bashien indicate in this staff conference that he was the moving force which caused the transfer of the Counter-Intelligence Corps man who had been giving derogatory reports?

Mr. CRAIG. He did.

Question. What did he say on that point specifically, as you recall?

Mr CRAIG. He said that the individual who had been giving these derogatory reports, that he had put pressure on, and that the individual who had been giving these derogatory reports had been transferred.

So, Mr. President, a man in the Counter-Intelligence Corps who had given derogatory reports on displaced persons was transferred, under pressure from a man named Bashien, employed by the Displaced Persons Commission. Mr. Bashien was an area director.

I read further from the testimony:

Question. He had put the pressure on whom?

Mr. CRAIG. On the Counter Intelligence Corps.

Mr. President, the testimony before the committee by field employees of the Displaced Persons Commission was to the effect that they had been ordered by the European headquarters of the Displaced Persons Commission to withdraw adverse reports from the files on cases which had been rejected, and that although in one area a letter indicating that the adverse reports had been withdrawn was inserted in the file, this was not the practice in other areas.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. As soon as I finish emphasizing this point, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, in all the areas but one, the employees of the Displaced Persons Commission were told to remove from the files the derogatory reports, so that the Consular officials or the Immigration officials would be fooled, when the files and reports got down the line. In only one area was a notation to the effect that such reports had been removed from the files included in the file. In all the other areas, no such notation was included in the files.

Mr. President, in all fairness, let me state that when Mr. Carusi reached Europe and found that that had been done, he exploded, and ordered that that should be changed.

But I submit that this country is being morally betrayed, and that we should not leave in charge, in Europe, a man who would try to put over such a system as that.

Now I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator, is it not a fact that the letter directing the withdrawal of those statements from the files stated, "This letter shall be included in the file"?

Mr. EASTLAND. My information is that that was true in one of the areas, as I said.

Mr. KILGORE. But did not the letter from the Frankfurt central office in one paragraph advise the area director to rewrite the report and to include the letter from the Frankfurt office as a part of the file?

Mr. EASTLAND. As I told the Senator, my information on this point, which may be in error, is that the letter went into the file in one of the areas, but it did not go into the files in other areas. That was my statement.

Mr. KILGORE. May I refresh the Senator's recollection?

Mr. EASTLAND. Very well.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is speaking about the Munich area, I am confident. That is Mr. Main's area, in which Mr. Main, rewriting the report under the direction of the Frankfurt office, included in the report the fact that he had turned down the application. That is not the question I asked the Senator. It is true that Main did that, and that in the other areas it was not done. Is it not also a fact that the letter from the Frankfurt office directing withdrawal of the papers, also directed that the letter ordering the withdrawal of papers be included in the file, in order to give notice?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. Mr. Tripp who, as the Senator knows, was head of the immigration detail in Europe, testified it was put in the file in one of the areas, but that in the other areas he did not think the letter was placed in the files. That is as I remember the testimony. I am advised that that is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask the Senator whether he will not include the full letter as a part of his remarks today?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has not been in the Chamber all the time. The letter in full was placed in the RECORD yesterday, and it has again been placed in the RECORD today.

Mr. KILGORE. That is fine. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND But, as I said——

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. In a moment. But, as I said in justice to Mr. Carusi, when he got to Europe, he stopped the practice. Mr. President, permit me to say I think Mr. Carusi is a good man. I have confidence in him. But I do not think he knows what is happening in Europe. I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished Senator from Mississippi said there was certainly moral deceit on the part of certain of the Displaced Persons Commission officials.

Mr. EASTLAND. In Europe.

Mr. JENNER. In Europe.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not impute any bad motive to any member of the Displaced Persons Commission, and I do not want anything I have said to be a reflection upon the integrity of any member of the Commission. I do not want to make that statement so far as the European theater is concerned. The best I can say, based on the testimony before me, is that there is gross negligence there.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator from Mississippi know of the moral deceit in connection with an IRO interoffice communication or memorandum dated November 8, 1949?

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to have it

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an air-mail envelope sent from IRO headquarters in Europe, addressed to "Senator P. MCCARRAN, Senator from Nevada, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., United States of America." It is from the International Refugee Organization. Enclosed in this envelope is a communication reading as follows:

Interoffice memorandum.

Addressed to: Mr. C. C K.—Grierson-Rickford.

Date: November 8, 1949

Subject: Public information release plans for United States program reduction.

Without taking the Senator's time, I may say this long memorandum contains a résumé of facts, namely, that when Congress adjourned last year without amending the Displaced Persons Act, the International Refugee Organization had thrown upon it the burden of beginning to process agricultural displaced persons, as it should have done under the law, but which it had failed to do, selecting only such displaced persons as they wanted, without regard to the law of the United States, and that when the displaced-persons bill was amended during the last session, they were then up against it, because they were away behind in their agricultural quotas. That is the gist of the memorandum. For the Senator's information, let me read the salient points:

(1) At a meeting between the Displaced Persons Commission and public information

officers this afternoon, the following plans were agreed to for the release of information about the production of United States shipping, visaing, etc., during the coming months.

(a) On or about the 20th day of December, a straight-faced announcement to be made on shipping schedule planned for the month of January;

(b) On the 24th day of December, Mr. Rosenfield will arrive in New York with the bad news, making appropriate comment as to the reasons for the reduction in production and transportation of persons for the United States;

(c) Early an January, the IRO, on the basis of stimulus, either natural or arranged, will release more detailed information as to—

(i) Why the shipping schedule has been cut

(ii) What effect this cut will have on the total program.

(iii) The number of persons being held up who might otherwise depart had not these agricultural percentages been applied.

This referred to a law of the United States. They are planning and scheming to smear that law, and to explain why they have not lived up to it. Note the climax:

(2) It was mutually decided that it was to our best interests not to release the information too early, but felt impact could best be felt when Congress reconvenes on January 3, and when the Congressmen are more sensitive to the New York and Washington press.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is a powerful document.

Mr. JENNER. I emphasized the statement I just read. It is signed by Mr. Warren G. Fuller, Assistant Director of Resettlement, with a copy to Miss Wilson.

Mr. EASTLAND. In other words, Mr. President, the organization is to bring pressure on Congress. I may say, had the organization spent as much time attempting to enforce the program and to get desirable persons into this country as they have spent in schemes to break the law, we would be in much better shape.

Mr. JENNER. But here is the Displaced Persons Commission conniving with the information officers of the IRO to bring pressure on the Congress at the strategic time, so that they can sell their program.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is conniving with the outfit which has its lawyers in this country soliciting pardons for criminals.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct. I want to bring out the fact that, in addition to moral deceit on the part of the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe, certainly there is moral deceit on the part of displaced persons in the IRO, who are selecting persons who are to become the future citizens of this country.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator. I think that should go in the RECORD in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at this point for an inquiry addressed to the Senator from Indiana, did the Senator from Indiana place the entire letter in the RECORD?

Mr. JENNER. No; I have not put the entire letter in the RECORD yet.

Mr. EASTLAND. I stated I thought the entire letter should be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. JENNER. If I do not put it in the RECORD today, I should like to put it in after I have an opportunity of saying a few things about the program referred to in the letter.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have just read the testimony to the effect that officials of the Displaced Persons Commission had an officer of the Central Intelligence Corps transferred, because he gave derogatory information in connection with the entrance of displaced persons.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Counter Intelligence Corps is an arm of the military government in Germany, is it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is.

Mr. KILGORE. Therefore, it is not under the direction of the Displaced Persons Commission, is it?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. It is under the direction of the head of the military government of Germany, is it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. But that does not change the situation, when senior officers put heat on the Counter-Intelligence Corps to get a man transferred who was giving adverse security reports.

Mr. President, the testimony given before our committee by field representatives of the Displaced Persons Commission was to the effect that they had been ordered by the European headquarters of the Displaced Persons Commission to withdraw adverse reports from the files on cases which had been rejected, and we have have, as to one area, a letter indicating that an adverse report had been withdrawn. The letter was inserted in the file. Mr. John W. Cutler, Jr., who was a field employee of the Displaced Persons Commission, testified before the committee as follows:

Mr. CUTLER. What I want to say is that the reason I have come over here and jeopardized my position—and I want to say now that I have a very good job, as far as salary is concerned, I make more money than I made before in my position and my wife and I are perfectly happy in Germany, but the fact is that things like this and the steady pressure on everybody to pass everyone, pass him, no matter how—if you cannot prove it, pass it—it has been that way in every bit of the whole organization. That is not only in the DP organization, but it spreads down to the lowest DP clerk, the selector, the analyst, and even the senior officer. The reason I say that is that originally, in Butzbach, four of us had gone to Butzbach to complain—

Butzbach is the location of the head of one of the area organizations—

before this thing took place, before the VVN, and we had been told that we had no right to question what our superior officer told us and we had no right to reject anybody—

They went to complain about the VVN, which, as I shall show, is a Communist organization—

that if we wanted to reject somebody, we had to hand the case over to him, and he could overrule us at any time.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENNER. Something has been brought up regarding the CIC, and I should like the Senator to explain to the Members of the Senate what security checks there are for the protection of this Nation as to a displaced person who tells the American officials or the IRO that he came from some other address in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, or some other nation of that kind.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is really no adequate check, as the Senator knows.

Mr. JENNER. There is no way such persons can be checked, is there?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. JENNER. So long as the IRO and the Displaced Persons Commission say these people are qualified as displaced persons, there is nothing the Immigration Service or the Consular Service can do about it in protecting the American Government. They have to let them come in. Is not that a fact?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is what is happening.

Mr. Tripp testified that approximately 30,000 persons who had come in thus far were of doubtful eligibility. That is a startling figure to come from the Immigration Service.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. Tripp testified that more than 30,000 had already entered. I ask the Senator how many have already come in?

Mr. EASTLAND. I should judge, from 130,000 to 135,000.

Mr. JENNER. Then, under the present law, if that same percentage prevails, of the 205,000 there will be approximately 40,000 to 50,000 displaced persons in this country who are doubtful security risks, according to Mr. Tripp, who is the head of the Immigration Service detail in Europe. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Who are of doubtful security risk and who are ineligible under the law.

Mr. JENNER. There is no difference, I believe the Senator has stated, between the two bills in regard to numbers. One provides for 339,000 and the other for approximately 330,000. Unless the Senate does something to tighten up the security risk we shall project the same percentage of doubtful risks into an additional 120,000 persons over the 205,000 under the present law, which means that, under the same percentage of operation, we would have approximately 70,000 or 80,000 displaced persons in America who, according to Mr. Tripp, who is an authority in this field, are doubtful security risks.

Mr. EASTLAND. I say to my distinguished friend from Indiana that if this is not changed—and the committee bill is the only pending change—we had just as well junk any attempts to pass security legislation. It would amount to nothing, when an official in charge of phases of military intelligence says that Russian officers are being smuggled into

this country. If we cannot stop that, we might as well junk any attempt to pass security legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has passed the point to which I wanted to refer. He stated that no one checked any person from Poland or Czechoslovakia, for instance, to see whether the person had resided at an address behind the iron curtain in previous years. I ask the Senator whether the Immigration Service could check behind the iron curtain.

Mr. EASTLAND. That point is reached very simply in the committee bill. I have here the official Counter-Intelligence Corps reports, three of them, which show fraud in admitting persons to this country, which the Counter-Intelligence Corps found in spot checks. The way that is reached is that the cut-off date was in 1945. One town was checked, and it was found that the people were lining up at night to see the registrar, and it was proved that he was admitting great numbers of persons who had settled there the previous year. It could be proved by check that those people were not in Germany at the time of the cut-off date. Therefore we reach great numbers of frauds by taking IRO out of the picture. As the Senator knows, officials of the Displaced Persons Commission say that IRO's reports are unreliable and that bribery is widespread. Why should they not be taken out?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not think the Senator has answered my question. Even though the change would place the Immigration Service in absolute charge of determining who is a displaced person, who is a qualified displaced person—"eligible displaced person" are the words used—how would they go behind the iron curtain to check up on residences, dates, and so forth?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry I did not make myself clear. Of course they cannot go behind the iron curtain. But here is a man who says he had registered in Butzbach in September 1945. Investigation shows that he registered there in 1948. We do not have to go behind the iron curtain. The information can be obtained largely in Germany.

Mr. FERGUSON. The act says that is a fraud and that the person is not an eligible displaced person. The Immigration Service could deny his entry into this country. If the law were followed, there would be a denial of his entry.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, the whole controversy, as has been stated time and again, is a question of screening. Proper investigations are not being made. There is no adequate system of screening. That is exactly what the committee bill attempts to remedy, and that is all. The consular officers and the immigration officers have a file prepared by IRO. It is information compiled for displaced persons, and of course they cannot act on it.

I refer further to Mr. Cutler's testimony.

Question. Who would overrule you?

Mr. CUTLER. The senior officer.

Mr. President, he had just testified that if they wanted to reject someone, they were to send the file to him, and he could overrule them.

Mr. Cutler continues:

Shortly after this, that is, four of us from our organization at Butzbach—and there were about six there at the time, at the same time, or shortly thereafter——

Question. Where did you four go, the four that you make reference to? You said you went somewhere

Mr CUTLER. We went to Frankfurt.

Question. To do what?

Mr. CUTLER. To complain about the existing situation. At that time we were concerned with the fact that we were not allowed to see the displaced persons we selected.

Mr. President, should not a displaced-person selector see the people whom he selects? They went to complain because they were not permitted to do that.

I quote further from his testimony:

In doubtful cases we wished to be able to interview the applicant to see if by a personal investigation, interview, we could determine certain facts: and we were told we could not. Now, in the Munich area, for instance, that is the one area that I know, you have always been allowed to interview applicants of doubtful character.

But they would not let him do that in his area.

Shortly thereafter, seven people, seven members of the Ludwigsburg mission, went to Frankfurt for more or less the same reason, to the best of my knowledge.

Question. What did your group of four do when they went to Frankfurt?

Mr. CUTLER. We asked Mr. Squadrilli—

He is the chief man in Europe—

if we would not be permitted to see certain DP applicants about which questions had been raised regarding their eligibility.

Question. Was that their eligibility or their loyalty?

Mr. CUTLER. That was at that time their eligibility. That was very early in the program. Two months after the commencement of the program. In Ludwigsburg seven members of the team, out of a total membership of nine, went to Frankfurt for the same reason, or more or less the same reason.

Question. What were you told in Frankfurt?

Mr. CUTLER. We were told we had no right to question the orders of the senior officer and that he had given us those instructions, we were to follow them out.

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States gives a humble citizen of this country the right to petition. Here a majority of the employees of an agency say, "This thing is being run wrong. Disloyal persons are getting to the United States. We want to correct that. We want to interview these people." They are told, "Oh, no. You follow our orders or get out."

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENNER. I was called off the floor during the debate, and I have just returned. When I came into the Chamber I heard the Senator mention Mr. Cutler's name. Will the Senator tell us who Mr. Cutler is?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Cutler's full name is John Wilson Cutler, Jr. Here is his record: In 1940 he was with the American Field Service in France and in the Middle East. Later he served with the Royal Air Force. He was in the RAF in 1941. From 1941 to 1945 he was in the United States Air Force. He was shot down over Yugoslavia, where he was made a prisoner of war during the last year of the war. My information is that he was recently promoted. I should like to give the Senator, if he will permit me, the remainder of Mr. Cutler's testimony.

Question. Who are the senior officers? Could you tell us about them?

Mr. CUTLER. There are Mr. Bashein. There are seven senior officers in Germany.

Question. Are they located in seven different places?

Mr. CUTLER. Yes. When I first went there, there were 11 senior officers in Germany. I can give you their names. Mr. Bashein, Miss Ruskin, Mr. Myerson, Mr. Hoexter, Mr. Main, Mr. Dervan, and Mr. Conan.

Question. How many of these senior officers were formerly affiliated with one of the groups which is active in expediting the work of aliens in their emigration to the United States?

Mr CUTLER At least three of those.

Question. Who are they?

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Bashein, Miss Ruskin, Mr. Myerson, and Mr. Kaplan. Well, he is not a senior officer.

Question. Wnat is Mr. Kaplan's function?

Mr. CUTLER. He is Mr. Squadrilli's executive assistant.

Question. What is Mr. Kaplan's background?

Mr CUTLER. He was formerly employed by the American Joint Distribution Committee.

Nothwithstanding the Counter Intelligence Corps reports, which were presented to the committee, indicating several thousand cases of fraud and false documents by persons who had applications pending as displaced persons, there is a letter which Mr. Bashein of the Displaced Persons Commission wrote. I am not going to read it at this time, but I ask that it be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION,
Butzbach/Hesse, April 11, 1949.

To: All members of the staff and voluntary agencies.

From: M. D. Bashein, senior officer, Are- 1.

Subject: False statements and falsification of documents by applicants.

The following is quoted from a memorandum from U. S. D. P. C. Headquarters, Frankfurt, dated April 1, 1949, for your information and you are urged to implement this directly in any case which comes to your personal attention.

"1. You will be interested to know that the Consular Service has for some time now liberalized its policy toward those persons who may have misrepresented facts prior to or in the course of making application for immigration to the United States. Consular officers have been instructed to advise each candidate as he appears for interview that should he wish to make any correction of previous statements or falsification of documents, he may do so without necessarily prejudicing his case up to the time he gives

sworn testimony which results in the issuing of the visa. This principle does not apply, of course, where the falsification involves perjury. The reasoning behind this position is well understood. Innumerable displaced persons once made misrepresentations in the sincere effort to protect themselves against retaliation from authorities representing governments from which they have taken refuge.

"2. It is unlikely, however, in the tense moments which surround the consular interview, that a candidate would alter the position which he has previously taken and which is on record. It is stressed, consequently, that every effort should be made during the early period of documentation to encourage applicants to alter any falsely presented facts in the registration forms or elsewhere and thus protect themselves against conflicting evidence that may adversely affect their later immigration status. It has been suggested in this connection that posters in appropriate languages be utilized throughout resident camps suggesting this as an advisable and authoritative course."

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the Displaced Persons Act, the burden of proof is placed upon the applicant. Section 10 provides:

The burden of proof shall be upon the person who seeks to establish his eligibility under the act.

Previously I have quoted excerpts from the testimony of Mr. Alamanza Tripp, who is in charge of the immigration detail in Europe under this phase of the matter, to show how the act and the will of Congress are being circumvented at this time.

I read further from the testimony of Mr. Tripp:

Question. Mr. Tripp, let me ask a question right there. Under the law the burden of proof is on the applicant. As a matter of practice where does the burden of proof rest insofar as the Displaced Persons Commission is concerned?

Mr. TRIPP. Well, as a matter of practice, I believe the Commission is inclined in some cases to almost require proof a person is subversive before they will reject him.

The law says the burden is on the applicant, yet Tripp says that the Displaced Persons Commission requires almost absolute proof.

Mr. John Wilson Cutler, Jr., testified, and I give excerpts from his testimony, which was given on February 6. I quote from Mr. Cutler:

This is a case I will read you about withdrawing applicants from the file. This is Mr. Donald Main, senior officer, area 6, from Mr. Alec Squadrilli.

Mr. President, that is the letter Mr. Squadrilli sent out, which was placed in the RECORD earlier today. What Mr. Cutler was testifying about was the pardon of a convicted criminal, to make him eligible to come to the United States.

Question. For what was he on parole?

Mr. CUTLER. A crime he had committed. There are many similar cases.

Question. Am I to understand that they had directed—

That is, the Displaced Persons Commission—

a favorable report to be written on a man who was then on parole?

Mr. CUTLER. Oh, yes. There are several of that. This happens to be one of them.

Mr. President, we have a case of a convicted criminal out on parole, and the selectors were asked to write a favorable report, regardless of his conviction, regardless of the fact that he was a former convict, so that his entry into the United States would be expedited.

I quote further:

If this is not forthcoming, you cannot finalize the case until the time of parole has expired. I have handled several like that personally.

Mr. Cutler gives another case, that of Joseph Kohn. He presented the file to the committee.

The above-captioned file is returned herewith for reprocessing as directed below. As far as the Commission is concerned, rejection under section 10 of the act in document and perjury cases must be based upon proof.

Mr. President, there was a man as to whom they had evidence that he was ineligible because his documents were false, or because of perjury. The burden was on his shoulders to prove that his documents were not forged, and that he had not been guilty of perjury. Yet the Commission sent the file back and said a rejection must be based upon proof, that it must be proved.

Mr. Cutler says and Mr. Main says that that is almost impossible in Germany. It is impossible in Germany because, of course, in those cases the proceedings are informal.

I read further:

Question. Would you elaborate on that? How difficult is it to obtain proof that would stand up in court?

Mr. CUTLER. It is practically impossible in Germany to obtain proof in a court of perjury. It is very, very difficult. These cases are almost all informal.

Question. If a Counter Intelligence Corps examiner comes along and says that it is alleged on information which the Counter Intelligence Corps has to the effect that a man is a Communist, is that sufficient to bar a man as far as the Displaced Persons Commission is concerned?

Mr. CUTLER. Then the question is, if the Counter Intelligence Corps can prove it. That is the question, can they prove it? Time and time again the things come up.

Not following the law, Mr. President, not placing the burden upon the applicant. The Counter Intelligence Corps says, "We have this information," yet they cannot reject a man on the information. It must be proved, and in Germany, because the courts are more or less informal, due to the chaotic condition, it cannot be proved, and through that loophole ineligibles and subversives are coming into the United States.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Then it is a fact that the way the Displaced Persons Commission is operating, the burden of proof is on the CIC to prove that a man is a perjurer or a Communist? Is that what I am to understand the situation to be?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct, and that is an impossible condition, in violation of the law.

Mr. JENNER. Does not the Senator know that the Government of the United States just got through spending—and the case is not complete yet—a million dollars to prove that Alger Hiss was a perjurer?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is absolutely true. And let me say that I seriously doubt that, due to the friends Mr. Hiss has in high places, he will ever serve a day.

Question. If the Counter Intelligence Corps examiner comes along and says that it is alleged on information, that the Counter Intelligence Corps has it to the effect that a man is a Communist, is that sufficient to bar him as far as the Displaced Persons Commission is concerned?

Mr. CUTLER. Then the subject is, if the Counter Intelligence Corps can prove it. That is the question. Can they prove it?

Time and again the same thing comes up.

The Counter Intelligence Corps says, "We have information that John Jones is a Communist." The law puts the burden on John Jones, who wants to come to the United States, to prove that he is not. The Displaced Persons Commission says "Prove it," and that cannot be done, because the trials in Germany are informal.

I ask, Mr. President, why in the name of all fairness is there objection to the committee bill, which simply improves the screening so as to protect this country by allowing only good people to come into this country? Of course, under the present act many good people have come here. The subversives, those who are ineligible, are in the minority. But I say that the Congress of the United States must do all within its power to keep out subversives, to keep out those who are ineligible. That is all the Committee on the Judiciary is attempting to do.

I quote further from Mr. Cutler:

Question. What do you mean by saying the same thing has come up?

Mr CUTLER. Everybody must prove. If this man is a Communist you must prove it. If he is a perjurer you must prove it, and so on in many instances.

Question. The law says the burden of proof is on the applicant, does it not?

Mr. CUTLER Yes, the law says that.

Question. But is it your testimony in effect that the Counter Intelligence Corps has to prove the man is a Communist before the man is rejected?

Mr. CUTLER. In many cases, yes.

Then he read the letter to the committee from Mr. Squadrilli.

Mr. Alamanza Tripp on this point testified further:

Question. Do then the Counter Intelligence Corps make any rejections as to the date lines and as to whether he was there December 22, 1945, or rather on or before December 22, 1945?

Mr. TRIPP. No.

Question. And as to whether he was there on January 1, 1948?

Mr. TRIPP. No.

Question. Do they ask the Counter Intelligence Corps to look into that?

Now there is the screening the Senator from New York said we had. There is the vital question: Was the man in Germany on the cut-off date? Yet the proof shows that the Counter Intelligence Corps was not even contacted nor asked for a report, nor asked for an investigation to see if the individual could qualify as a displaced person.

Mr. TRIPP. No. In fact, early in the program the CIC reports were indicating on many occasions that their investigation indicates a later entry in certain cases. The

information was usually ignored, those that I saw, anyway, and the IRO certificates were accepted.

There is the screening, Mr. President. The Displaced Persons Commission ignored the reports of the Counter Intelligence Corps, and took the certificates compiled by displaced persons themselves in IRO. Those conditions are shocking.

Question. Am I correct in understanding your statement to be then, Mr. Tripp, that in cases in which IRO had certified to the Displaced Persons Commission that XYZ, to take the specimen case, had come to the area on or before December 22, 1945, and was there on January 1, 1948, the matter was transmitted by the Displaced Persons Commission to the CIC, and then the Counter Intelligence Corps found the man really was not there on December 22, 1945, that the Displaced Persons Commission ignored that finding and accepted the initial report on the resettlement form from IRO instead of taking the Counter Intelligence Corps finding? Is that correct?

Mr. TRIPP. Not exactly.

Question. Tell me what is right.

Mr. TRIPP. The Counter Intelligence Corps does not exactly establish that he was not in one of the areas, but they found evidence which indicated that he was not.

Question. Did the CIC report that evidence back to the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr. TRIPP. Yes.

Question. What did the Displaced Persons Commission do with that evidence?

Mr. TRIPP. In the cases that I got, they processed them. They may have rejected some, but I did not see if they did. The ones that I saw had been processed all the way through.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Can the Senator from Mississippi think of a better way for a Russian spy to get into America than the way the Senator has just read from the evidence?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course not. They have come in that way, and they are coming in now in that way. But the question is that of screening. There is a smokescreen put up everywhere. It is said, "Why, the Displaced Persons Commission screens them. The Counter Intelligence Corps screens them. The IRO screens them. The Immigration Service screens them. The Consular Service screens them."

I digress to say, Mr. President, that the information I have been reciting is not the propaganda of paid publicists but is the testimony of American citizens who are intimately familiar with the day-by-day operations of our displaced-persons program. I shall subsequently discuss these provisions of the committee bill which the committee recommends for enactment so as to strengthen the administration of the law, but since I am presently engaged in presenting the factual material to the Senate, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to another area, and that is the IRO.

Mr. President, the present displaced-persons law defines a displaced person by incorporating by reference the definitions contained in the constitution of the International Refugee Organization. The definition which is contained in the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, in addition to defining a displaced person or refugee, sets forth who shall be the concern and who shall not be the concern of the International Refugee Organization. It was clearly the congressional intent that the definition contained in the constitution of the International Refugee Organization would be a formula to be applied to administering the law by the Immigration and Naturalization Services and by the consular officers. However, under the administrative practice which has been followed in administering the law, the certifications which are made by the International Refugee Organization are accepted as binding not only upon the Displaced Persons Commission, but upon our immigration officers, and consular officers as well.

That, Mr. President, is the practice in vogue. These certifications by the International Refugee Organization are not only with reference to whether or not the applicant is a displaced person, but also with reference to other elements of the applicant's eligibility under the law, such as the date of his arrival in the occupied areas, and whether or not he was in the areas prescribed by the law.

Mr. President, as I have stated, in this whole set-up the International Refugee Organization is the most important cog in the machine. It initiates the files. Our own Government cannot go beyond the scope of those that it says are in its care and are displaced persons as defined by it. It is the main cog in this machine, and the main source of bribery and corruption, and the main source by which saboteurs and Communist agents are getting into this country. That is why it is necessary that it be deleted from this program, and that every step in connection with a displaced person getting into the United States be administered and controlled by an American agency, and supervised by citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to certain factual material which is merely typical of a great volume of information which the committee has accumulated with reference to fraudulent and false documents under the displaced persons program.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand copies of three or four reports by the Counter Intelligence Corps which are typical of numerous reports of this character by the investigative agency of the United States Army. One of them is a Counter Intelligence Corps report dated December 14, 1949, only 2½ months ago. The heading of the report is: "Possible issuance of false statements of residence, Schnaitsee, Germany."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, REGION IV,
SIXTY-SIXTH CIC DETACHMENT,
VISA SECTION,
APO 407-A, UNITED STATES ARMY,
December 14, 1949.

Subject: Possible issuance of false statements of residence, Schnaitsee, Gemany

1. On November 19, 1949, this agent attempted to determine the validity of the enclosed list of registered residents of the community of Schnaitsee.

2. The burgomaster of Schnaitsee was interviewed and stated to this agent that he thinks that certain irregularities had occurred in his office concerning the issuance of residence slips to DP's and the recording of names in the community registration book. He claimed that this had probably been done by the secretary of the community, Mayor, Georg. The burgomaster stated that numerous people reported Mayer as having numerous visitors nightly. These visitors contacted Mayer in order to establish residence in Schnaitsee as of a past date.

3. This agent interviewed Kommissar Mueller, Bernhard, of the Land Polizei of Schnaitsee and it was determined that at the present time only one (1) person on the enclosed list was still residing in the community and who had also been in the community since May 1945, namely, Glitman, Henry, born September 20, 1922, No. 71 on enclosed list.

4. Georg Mayer, born April 21, 1879, in Mindelheim, of the office of the community Schnaitsee, was interviewed in the presence of Kommissar Mueller of the Land Polizei and stated that the majority of the names on the enclosed list are not correct as to their registration date within the community. Specifically, Mayer stated that the following persons registered in Schnaitsee on dates shown.

Leber, Najtali, born June 20, 1916, number 144, reported as having registered August 20, 1945, actually registered in June 1946.

Zynger, Szmul, born May 5, 1912, number 302, reported as having registered November 22, 1945, actually registered in September 1949 Zynger had with him two witnesses, who claimed they remembered Zynger having been in Schnaitsee in 1945. A check revealed that one of these witnesses, Lang, Josef, himself arrived in Schnaitsee on July 3, 1947, initially

Goldstein, Marcho, born October 18, 1910, number 79, reported as having registered October 10, 1945, actually registered July 1946.

Krein, Abraham, born March 1, 1924, number 130, reported as having registered September 22, 1945, actually registered August 1946.

Mayer refused to state why he had falsely registered the people.

H. FISCHER.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the report shows that the registrar in that town, Mr. Georg Mayer, when interviewed by the Counter Intelligence Corps, in the presence of the mayor of the town, stated that his records were being doctored; that people who came there after 1945 and settled there were being certified as having come there before that date, so as to make them eligible for admission into the United States

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Why was that done? Who initiated the doctoring of such papers and documents? Would the organization that passes on the applicants, to begin with, be interested in doing that?

Mr. EASTLAND. They were doing it for money.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean to say that they were accepting money to falsify documents, so as to permit those persons to enter the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. Various persons were going to Mr. Mayer at night, and he was doctoring the records of the town so as to show that those persons settled in the town earlier than they actually

had; he was doing that so as to make them eligible for admission into the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the falsification been done by interested IRO personnel? What persons or what organization have attempted to do that?

Mr. EASTLAND. Part of it is done in the IRO. Of course, the particular case to which I have just referred did not involve the IRO. But how can such matters be caught if there is no proper system of screening?

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. The report shows that at the request of Bernhard Mueller, Kommissar of the Land Polizei, Mayer wrote and signed a statement in which he admitted having falsified the registry of numerous displaced persons. A signed copy of the statement is on file at the headquarters.

Mr. WHERRY. In connection with the testimony to which the Senator has just referred, let me inquire whether any applicants whose records were falsified, or for the benefit of whom other records were falsified, have been admitted into the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. Even Mr. Squadrilli admits that.

Mr. WHERRY. Have they come into the United States after the documents have been falsified?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. What organization found that out? Did the Displaced Persons Commission attempt to find out about it, or did the consular service or the immigration authorities attempt to find out about it? By what organization did the applicant have to be cleared, after his application was initiated by the IRO?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Tripp, the head of the immigration detail in Europe, instituted that inquiry. I am sorry to have to tell the Senator that my information is that Mr. Squadrilli attempted to get him fired; I am informed that Mr. Tripp says that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator will recall that in the colloquy earlier today the Senator from Michigan asked if it were true that the immigration officials had authority to screen displaced persons as well as immigrants. Does the Senator recall that question by the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I am quite satisfied that question was asked during the colloquy earlier today.

Under the present law, would the immigration authorities have authority to screen an applicant who came through with a falsified record, as the Senator has just disclosed?

Mr. EASTLAND. They do not know whether it is false, because they accept the certification by the IRO.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I make. They accept the certification by the IRO; therefore, they do not have knowledge as to the applicant or the screening which has gone on in Europe; is not that true?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, as I understand, that is the position the Senator from Mississippi takes, namely, that in the absence of such screening by the immigration authorities, there is no American agency or subdivision of our Government which screens the applicants after the IRO has initiated the applications and after the Displaced Persons Commission authorizes the applicants to come to the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

On that point, let me read the testimony of Mr. Tripp:

> There became available to me recently copies of the results of a fingerprint check made by the provost marshal's office in a number of cases. The first group of cases in which the information became available to me related to ninety-odd individuals. Immediately I checked the camp registration records, Camp Grohn in Bremen, to determine if any of the persons named had proceeded to the United States. I found that 33 of the people had already sailed to the United States. Examining the nature of the report in each case, I concluded without investigation that 11 of the individuals were probably deportable on criminal charges.

Yet, they are in this country now.

Mr. WHERRY. They are in this country now?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is an extremely important message. I ask unanimous consent that the debate which is proceeding be interrupted long enough for the message to be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent is requested that the Senator from Mississippi may yield without losing the floor, to have the message from the President of the United States read. The Chair assumes that in that connection there may be a request for a quorum call.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Kerr
Anderson	Ferguson	Kilgore
Brewster	Flanders	Knowland
Bricker	Frear	Langer
Bridges	Fulbright	Leahy
Butler	George	Lehman
Byrd	Green	Lodge
Cain	Gurney	Long
Capehart	Hayden	Lucas
Chapman	Hendrickson	McCarran
Chavez	Hill	McCarthy
Connally	Hoey	McClellan
Cordon	Humphrey	McKellar
Darby	Hunt	McMahon
Donnell	Ives	Magnuson
Douglas	Jenner	Malone
Downey	Johnson, Tex	Martin
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Maybank
Eastland	Kefauver	Millikin
Morse	Smith, Maine	Tobey
Mundt	Smith, N. J.	Tydings
Murray	Sparkman	Watkins
Neely	Stennis	Wherry
O'Conor	Taft	Wiley
Robertson	Taylor	Williams
Russell	Thomas, Okla	Withers
Schoeppel	Thomas, Utah	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

RESTORATION OF NATIONAL COAL PRODUCTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 492)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on pp. 2774–2775.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message will be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to carry out the recommendations of the President, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3178) to restore national coal production, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to remove impediments or obstructions to trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, to protect the national health or safety, or to meet the needs of national defense or of a national emergency, the President, in time of national emergency heretofore or hereafter declared, is empowered and authorized to take possession and assume control of and to operate any plant, mine, or facility engaged in or suitable for the mining, production, or distribution of coal (including any real or personal property, franchise, right, fund or other asset, or any record, pertaining to or used in connection with the operation of any or all such plants, mines, or facilities), and to take such action as he deems necessary in his discretion to carry out the authority herein conferred.

SEC. 2. Whenever an agreement concerning the terms and conditions of employment shall have been reached between the representatives of the employees and the representatives of the operators with respect to any plant, mine, or facility taken over under this Act, or whenever in the judgment of the President it is no longer necessary to continue possession, control, and operation of any such plant, mine, or facility, the President shall return possession, control, and operation of such plant, mine, or facility to the person lawfully entitled thereto.

SEC. 3. (a) In administering this act:

(1) The President is authorized to determine fair terms and conditions of employment of the employees of any mine, plant, or facility taken over under this act, but he shall not enter into any contract governing such terms and conditions with the representatives of such employees.

(2) The President is authorized to determine just compensation to be paid by the United States for the use of each mine, plant, or facility taken over under this act.

(b) The President may appoint and compensate such persons or boards as he deems necessary to assist him in making the determinations required by subsection (a).

SEC. 4. The personnel of plants, mines, or facilities taken over under this act shall be subject to the laws relating to Federal officers and employees only to the extent specified by the President. Personnel appointed for the

purpose of administering this act may be employed without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949.

SEC. 5. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall advance to the President such sums as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and for use as working capital in the operation of mines, plants, or facilities under this act. The revenues derived from the operation of any plant, mine, or facility taken over under this act may be used to defray the expenses of its operation, and to repay Reconstruction Finance Corporation advances with interest at the rate charged the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by the Treasury Department.

(b) Such revenues and Reconstruction Finance Corporation advances may be expended without regard to any laws governing the expenditure of Government funds, other than laws relating to fraud, embezzlement, and other criminal acts.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, or to deny to any person whose property has been taken over by the Government under this act the right to a judicial determination of just compensation.

SEC. 8. (a) The authority conferred by this act upon the President may be exercised through any officers of the Government designated by the President.

(b) The President shall not take possession of or operate any plant, mine, or other facility under this act after June 30, 1951.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I should like to say that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was in session this morning and will be in session tomorrow morning, beginning at 9:30, but because of the message from the President and the bill which I have just introduced, I shall ask the committee to meet in the committee room this afternoon at 4:15 o'clock.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the emergency message, and the bill which has just been introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it seems to me that the calling of a meeting of the committee for today is proper. Furthermore, I hope that the committee will act with all convenient speed, believing that perhaps it may be able to report a bill tomorrow. The majority leader now advises the Senate that we shall hold a session tomorrow. We cannot afford, under the circumstances, not to act as expeditiously as may be possible, because of the seriousness of the situation as expressed in the President's message, as well as because of the psychological effect it may have upon the people of America who are watching developments with tremendous interest.

Mr. EASTLAND rose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I addressed the Chair. I did not know the Senator from Mississippi was standing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Mississippi is entitled to the floor.

Mr. TAFT. I did not understand. I was not present at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I only wanted to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that last year the Senate passed a bill which contained the power of seizure, which bill has been pending in the House of Representatives since the first of last July.

That bill dealt with seizure in a somewhat different manner from that which is proposed in the President's bill. I wish to invite attention to the fact that under the bill as presented, it seems to me that the President's right to pay any wages he sees fit to pay will in effect fasten a wage scale on the operators without their consent. The power requested by the President is very much broader than that which is contained in any seizure bill we have heretofore had under consideration, and therefore, it seems to me to be practically a complete capitulation to the miners who have refused arbitration when the employers have agreed to arbitration.

I merely want to invite attention to the fact that I shall move to substitute the bill which the Senate recently passed by a substantial vote for the bill which has been suggested by the President, when that bill is reported from the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for just 2 minutes?

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the same conditions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Mississippi yielding to the Senator from Oregon, with the understanding that he shall not lose the floor? The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, apparently we shall have a series of substitutes, although I desire to say, having read the President's bill, that we should keep in mind that what we seek in this emergency hour is coal for the suffering American people. I am satisfied that the President's bill will give us coal. I am satisfied that the President's bill is fair in principle, and I am further satisfied that the President's bill is not subject to the criticism which my very good and able friend from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] makes of it. I do not think it is wrong for the Government of the United States, when it is in possession of an industry in this country under Government seizure, to pay the workers what an emergency board believes to be fair wages and to grant them fair working conditions on the basis of the merits of the case as the emergency board finds them, because unless that principle is adopted, all that will be done under Government seizure is to impose upon the men working conditions, irrespective of the facts and the merits, which the employers have sought to impose upon them and which gave rise to the dispute in the first instance.

There is an area, it seems to me, of possible compromise with the Senator from Ohio, and I shall suggest it in committee this afternoon, namely, that we give consideration to a so-called retroactive principle that might be applied as a possible amendment to the President's bill.

I wish to make one further comment, and I am through.

It is true that we passed a bill at the last session of the Congress which included a seizure provision as recommended by the Senator from Ohio. Although we voted on it as a separate amendment, each one of us knew when we voted that it was a part of a larger bill, and we did not, in my judgment, vote upon it without taking into account the other provisions of the bill which would go along with it.

Mr. President, we are here met with a message which requires us to vote on a separate seizure bill without any relation whatsoever to any other proposal for an amendment to the Taft-Hartley law.

My first reaction to the President's bill is that the President has risen to heights of statesmanship in this critical hour; and I hope I shall always be nonpartisan enough to place what I feel is the welfare of the American people above any question of political expediency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further, under the same conditions?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, under the same conditions.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to point out one thing further which I intended to indicate. There is absolutely not the slightest assurance that if the bill recommended by the President shall be passed the men will go back to work. Far from that, the United Mine Workers, under the same leadership in 1946, struck against the Government when the Government had full possession of the mines. They did not return to work until an injunction had been sought, until a petition for contempt had been filed, and until the union had been found guilty of criminal and civil contempt, Mr. Lewis had been fined $10,000, and the union had been fined $3,500,000. The next day they went back to work.

So, Mr. President, so far as seizure is concerned, there is not the slightest guarantee that seizure will solve the current problem. I think we should certainly remember that there should be the power of injunction in any bill that is passed, as well as the power of seizure, because otherwise the precedent set shows that the Government is completely at the mercy of the miners who refuse to work.

Mr. JENNER and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Indiana, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, it seems to me that in the present great emergency, in which the people of the country

are suffering from a lack of coal, an emergency which has been brought about because the laws which are on the statute books were not followed or enforced as they should have been—a fact which every thinking American knows—it is a kind of delaying tactics to come to the Congress today asking for the introduction and reference to a committee of a bill, which subsequently will reach the floor, at which time the various ideas which we can see this body is going to have will be debated.

The distinguished junior Senator from Oregon sounds very much like a candidate, for we discussed a seizure bill in this body last year for 3 weeks, and I believe the record will show that the junior Senator from Oregon was opposed to it. That seizure bill anticipated the very situation which confronts the Nation tonight, and that seizure bill also provided for injunction.

Therefore it seems to me that we should act in order to help the people of the country who are cold—not cold tomorrow, not the day after tomorrow, or not next week, but who are cold now. In my State the school systems are closed. In view of that condition it seems to me that in this hour of emergency, rather than have new legislation, with all these prima donna statemen having their two-bits to say about it, we might as well take a bill which passed this body a year ago, and which is pending in the House of Representatives, a bill on which the administration has kept its foot. Let it take its foot off; let the House pass that bill, which they can do in 1 hour, and then the President can sign it, and it can become a law.

I am tired of people playing politics with crises and emergencies. This very legislation passed this body a year ago, so why pass it again?

Let us take up the idea of seizure and injunction, which we would all like to see, and debate it next June or July or August. But the people are cold now.

One body of the Congress acted almost a year ago. Let the President take his foot off the bill passed last year, let it go to conference, let the differences be ironed out, and it can be a law in an hour's time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for half a minute?

Mr. EASTLAND. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and to commend him on his very cogent and statesmanlike attitude. He presented a measure last year which to my mind would have met the situation.

I also wish to bring to the attention of the Senate, in view of the President's message, the second portion of the message, which I realize is not so vital as the first part. He calls the attention of the Congress to the necessity of establishing a commission of inquiry, composed of Members of Congress, members of the executive branch, and of the public, to make a thorough study of the coal industry.

As of March 1, the junior Senator from Minnesota, the junior Senator from Oregon, and the junior Senator from Illinois, introduced a bill for the establishment of a bipartisan national coal commission. I understand the bill has been referred to the Committee of Territories and Insular Affairs, and in view of the statement of the President, and the facts of the present situation, I hope the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs will hold hearings on such a bill, report it and have it acted upon, so that we may proceed as expeditiously as possible to get at the root of the difficulty which now faces the country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield first to the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may yield to the Senator from Oregon, who wishes to make merely a remark or two.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend from Indiana, in complete good nature, that I am perfectly willing to let the record speak for itself as to who has made a partisan political speech on this subject this afternoon.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Indiana under the same conditions.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon is going to be a big peacemaker. He is going to work out, possibly, an amendment to the bill which will satisfy and help everybody. The bill the junior Senator from Oregon has introduced, and which he proposes as a compromise, was voted on by this body last year. It was defeated by a vote of 77 to 9.

Mr. President, I am not playing politics; I am trying to get coal. My point is that this body has passed a bill which provided for seizure and injunction. It is pending in the other House of the Congress. It could be brought out of committee and passed, the differences could be ironed out in conference, it could be signed, and it could be the law of the land before the sum comes up tomorrow. Why introduce a bill and send it to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and let the great statesmen of this great deliberative body have their say, when the Senate has already spoken on the bill of the Senator from Oregon and said "No" by a vote of 77 to 9? That is my point. Let us have action. We are in an emergency. Let gentlemen quit playing politics.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Illinois, under the same conditions?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to read a sentence or two from the message from the President of the United States which has just been read at the desk. I read from the second paragraph:

> Since February 6, 1950, the production of bituminous coal has been dangerously curtailed. By now stocks of coal are almost exhausted, and many parts of our country face crisis conditions.
>
> * * * * * * * Within a very few days we shall be virtually out of soft coal. The danger to the national health and safety is real and immediate. It requires action at once.

I read further a portion of the message, where the President said:

> I recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing the Government to take over the coal mines and operate them temporarily as a public service.
>
> The parties are continuing their negotiations, and I earnestly hope that they will reach agreement before it actually becomes necessary for the Government to take possession of the mines. But we can wait no longer to prepare ourselves with the necessary legislative authority.
>
> I am submitting at this time a draft of legislation to accomplish this purpose. I earnestly request that the Congress consider this proposal and enact the needed legislation as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I merely wish to make one or two comments with respect to what my distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle have said.

I sincerely hope that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who was one of the authors of the Taft-Hartley law, which is now on the statute books, will not press the amendment he proposes to offer before the committee. My reason for that statement is one of the reasons that has been advanced by the distinguished Senator from Indiana. The present emergency is real and it is serious. There can be no question about that. We have to assume that the facts as stated in the message of the President are true and correct. If the emergency is a real one, it seems to me there is no point becoming involved in a long and continued controversy in the Senate and the House of Representatives over another so-called Taft-Hartley bill.

Knowing the good judgment the Senator from Ohio has about all matters, I am sure that after he duly considers the message, he will not proceed to precipitate a long debate, thereby perhaps keeping coal from coming out of the ground.

I agree with the Senator from Ohio that the very fact that we pass a seizure bill will not put shovels into the hands of the coal miners. They do not have to go back to work unless they want to. But I am convinced that when the Government seizes the mines, the men in the mines, because of their patriotism and loyalty to their country, will not continue to strike against their Government.

I may be wrong about that. Time alone will tell. But I believe that to be beyond any question of doubt. Certainly this is probably the last legal resort Congress will have to consider, and I am satisfied that we should act upon the proposed bill as an emergency measure, and not attempt to substitute this kind of provision or that kind of

bill for the one the President has said he seeks.

I do not object, of course, to some amendments which may be in the best interests of the country and the public as a whole. But for us to become involved in a long-continued controversy and battle over what a proper labor law should be, in the midst of a national emergency, seems to me to be the height of folly. I sincerely hope that those on this side of the aisle who have heretofore been strongly in favor of the Taft-Hartley law will give every consideration to the President's message in the light of the existing national emergency, which affects the public health and safety.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, Mr. President, under the same conditions as previously.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not going to make any observations respecting the proposed labor legislation. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader, in view of the announcement he made, whether the Senate will convene tomorrow at noon regardless of what action the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare might make with respect to reporting legislation to the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. So that whether the report is made or not, the Senate will convene, and if the labor legislation is not brought forth, the pending business, of course, will be the displaced persons bill?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. There is another good reason for the Senate being in session tomorrow. The Senator from Nebraska knows that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, is very anxious to leave for Nevada on Monday night. It had not originally been intended that a session of the Senate be held tomorrow, but in view of the President's emergency message, I think it is proper that we should hold a session tomorrow. It may be that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare can agree upon reporting a bill.

I sincerely hope they can report a bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest that several Senators have understood that there would not be a vote upon the displaced-persons legislation tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. I can assure the Senator that there will be no vote on the displaced-persons legislation tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to hold up action on the bill, but as the majority leader knows, some Senators will not be here tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope we can vote not later than Monday night on the displaced-persons bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yield on the same condition that I have yielded previously.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I hope the majority leader is correct in his belief that the miners will go back if the Congress passes the seizure bill the President has sent to us. But I wish to call to his attention as the able Senator from Ohio did, that in 1946 the same miners did strike against the Government, and that it was necessary to go into Federal Court and file charges of contempt against the miners, and they were fined $3,500,000.

I hope that in this instance the miners will go back to work, but I do not think we have any assurance that they will. I think we are up against the same condition we were in 1946.

One other thing, Mr. President. I hope that if we pass the legislation he has asked us to pass, the President of the United States will not call it a "slave-labor act;" that he will not educate the 400,000 miners to violate the law as he has been doing for the past 2 years since the Taft-Hartley law was enacted.

In my opinion, the President of the United States has taught the miners that the Taft-Hartley Act, the act under which they were working, was a "slave" act.

Mr. President, I ask this question: Is it any wonder that the miners violated the court injunction? Is it any wonder that they refused to go back to work, when the head of the Nation, over a period of months and months, has called the attention, not only of the miners, but of all other wage earners in the United States, and the people, that the only legislation under which he could deal with such crises and such situations was, in his own words, a "slave-labor act"; that it was no good, and should be repealed? He educated the workers to disobey the law, which they did when the time came that he himself was called upon to invoke it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, Mr. President, I do not yield at this time. I yielded to the Senator from Indiana for the purpose, as I thought, of placing something in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me to make a unanimous consent request, if by so doing he does not lose the floor?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield under those conditions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to report its findings upon the bill introduced this afternoon by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] during the recess of the Senate, if it is necessary that it be done, and I further ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill when it comes before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the first request the Senator made, because I think that will expedite procedure. But I ask the majority leader to withhold the second portion of his unanimous consent request for immediate consideration of the bill until the bill comes before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I serve notice on the Senate now that when the bill is reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I shall then ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration, and if I cannot secure unanimous consent, I shall move that the bill be taken up for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized to report on the proposed coal legislation during the recess of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for another inquiry of the majority leader?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield on the same basis as before.

Mr. WHERRY. What I have in mind is to expedite the program, so I presume it has some priority. I should like to know what is the intention of the majority leader respecting the length of the session tonight and tomorrow night? Does the Senator expect the Senate to sit later than usual?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senate will remain in session until around 6 o'clock.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] may address the Senate at this time without prejudice to my rights to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me a few minutes for the purpose of explaining an amendment which I have submitted and which is printed and lies on the table, to H. R. 4567, the bill which is now pending before the Senate.

The amendment I have submitted is in the interest of both the displaced person and the sponsor, or the employer of a displaced person. The amendment has no bearing or effect of any nature on who shall be admitted, or how, or when displaced persons shall be admitted to this country, but deals in its entirety with the handling of a displaced person after he has been received into this country and has been accepted and taken in charge by the sponsor.

Mr. President, I think we are all familiar with the fact that in some sections of the United States considerable difficulty is experienced with some displaced persons after they have been received into the United States and are in the employ of their sponsors. We are all familiar, I believe, with the fact that in some cases the sponsor has not lived up to his responsibility with reference to the displaced person. My amendment is intended to equalize the situation and to see to it that both the displaced person

and the sponsor receive fair treatment after the displaced person is placed.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 20, which referred to many instances of displaced persons who, after having been received into the country, made no sincere efforts to stay with the sponsors with whom they had been placed

In other words, after a displaced person had gotten into this country, sometimes almost immediately, and sometimes within a few days, he left the sponsor and sought other employment. Under such conditions it is apparent that the displaced person has come into this country with the avowed intention of not living up to his agreement to work at the assigned work for the performance of which he was admitted. My amendment provides that under such conditions the displaced person shall be turned over to the immigration authorities, who shall handle the case and take the displaced person back to the country from which he came.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. President, the difficulty, to my way of thinking, does not always lie with the displaced person. There are sponsors who had in mind to bring displaced persons to the United States and to make literally slaves or serfs of them, and who have made conditions intolerable for displaced persons so that they actually have had to leave the employment of their sponsors. My amendment provides for the resettlement of such displaced persons.

Mr. President, my amendment makes a workable plan out of this humanitarian idea, this humanitarian program of bringing displaced persons to the United States. I know of my own knowledge cases of displaced persons who have found their working conditions to be intolerable, which has necessitated their leaving their employers. They have more or less been turned out upon the highway, without friends, without resources, in a strange country, unable to speak the English language, and we find them in great difficulty. My amendment takes care of such cases.

I am aware of the fact that the amendment will call for some additional expense, but it should not be great, for the only requirement in connection with the handling of displaced persons under the conditions I have set forth would be the addition of a few examiners. I cannot see the need for any large number of additional personnel. Of course, I know that some bureaus or departments or other agencies of Government attempt to increase their work, to make themselves a considerable amount of unnecessary work and to employ a considerable number of unnecessary personnel. But, under the amendment, if the Commission handles the situation in the way it should be handled, the additional expense will be very small.

So, Mr. President, I sincerely hope the chairman of the committee and the Senate will accept my amendment. I repeat that the amendment should have been in the original act. If it is made a part of the present law it will make for a far more acceptable, a much fairer, and a far more workable displaced persons law.

Again I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for the time he has yielded to me.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I think that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has a very meritorious amendment. I shall certainly vote for it. I should like to say a few words in support of it, to show that the amendment would improve the operation of the displaced persons program, so far as the United States is concerned.

The present displaced persons law requires, as a prerequisite to eligibility, that the displaced persons shall have assurance of a job and of housing in the United States, without displacing from a job or from housing a person already in the United States. Mr. President, between 80 and 90 percent of the assurances are blanket assurances submitted by voluntary agencies. The Displaced Persons Commission has even validated assurances of employment and housing which have been made by other displaced persons. Just think of that, Mr. President. The Displaced Persons Commission has accepted assurances to that effect by former displaced persons, who made such assurances in behalf of other displaced persons who were seeking admission into the United States. Such assurances were given by displaced persons who only recently were admitted to the United States. The Displaced Persons Commission accepts such assurances without any independent investigation to ascertain whether, in fact, houses and jobs are available for the displaced persons covered by the assurances.

The Displaced Persons Commission has issued a regulation reading in part, as follows:

> Assurances of suitable employment and safe and sanitary housing provided by a public agency or a voluntary agency recognized by the Commission for this purpose need not be assurances of a specifically identified job or housing accommodations.

Mr. Ugo Carusi testified before the Immigration Subcommittee, with reference to assurances, in part, as follows:

> Question. What investigation is made by the Commission or by any agency of the Government of the United States with reference to a particular applicant, to ascertain whether or not there is a specified job or a specified house available without displacing some other person from that job or from his home?

Mr. Carusi's answer was "None."

Yet, Mr. President, that was their primary duty, under the law. That is merely another instance of the congressional intent being ignored, as a result of such loose operation. Is it any wonder that although the law provides for the admission of 205,000 displaced persons, yet as of December 31, 1949, the Displaced Persons Commission already had issued valid assurances for an estimated 345,000 persons?

Mr. President, let me say in passing that although the present law and the Senate committee bill contain a job and housing assurance provision with respect to all displaced persons, the substitute bill sponsored by the Senator from West Virginia and other Senators does not contain such a provision with reference to the 18,000 Poles, the 10,000 Greeks, and the 4,000 former residents of Shanghai who are covered by the substitute bill. This is one of the areas in which the substitute bill would remove the safeguards of the present law which were designed to protect the best interests of the United States. It was the judgment of the Judiciary Committee, however, that in view of the housing shortage and rising unemployment, coupled with the progressive increase of admissions under our general immigration laws, these safeguards must be maintained.

Mr. President, before the message from the President of the United States was received, I had placed in the RECORD exhibit A, being a report from the Counter Intelligence Corps of the United States Army.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report of the Counter Intelligence Corps dated December 21, 1949, entitled "Fraudulent Residence Certificates in Schnaitsee, Germany."

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, REGION IV,
SIXTY-SIXTH CIC DETACHMENT,
VISA SECTION,
APO 407-A, UNITED STATES ARMY,
December 21, 1949.

To: Commanding Officer, Sixty-sixth CIC Detachment, USAREUR, APO 154, United States Army.

Attention: Major Abraham.

Subject: Fraudulent residence certificates from Schnaitsee, Germany.

1. Enclosed is photostatic copy of foreign-residents register of Gemeinde Schnaitsee with cover letter signed by Mayer, secretary of the Gemeinde and addressed to Miss Gertrude Ruskin, United States DP Commission (exhibit I). This list which alleges residence of DP's in Schnaitsee has been established as fraudulent. The following facts have been uncovered:

(a) Many of the alleged residents show the date of registration to be on a Sunday or a German legal holiday. The registration office for Schnaitsee revealed that the office is closed on Sundays and German legal holidays. Thus a person arriving in Schnaitsee on Sunday, November 25, 1945, would be registered on Monday, November 26, 1945. Person would not be permitted to back-date his registration. An inspection of list (exhibit I) reveals 28 persons showing date of registration on a Sunday or German legal holiday. These names are encircled in ink.

2. Bernhard Mueller, kommissar of landpolizei, Schnaitsee, and Georg Mayer, secretary of Gemeinde Schnaitsee, were interviewed at which time Mayer admitted irregularities in maintenance of his registration records (exhibit II).

3. At the request of Bernhard Mueller, kommissar of landpolizei, Schnaitsee, Mayer wrote and signed a statement admitting having falsely registered numerous DP's (exhibit III). A signed copy of this statement is on file at this headquarters.

4. A list of foreign residents of Schnaitsee during various months, which was submitted to the landrat treasury, is enclosed as exhibit IV. These rosters were submitted in order to draw monetary allowances from the treasury. During the period November 1945 to March 1946 the highest number of foreign

residents reported was eight. Alleged list of residents (exhibit I) has more than 200 foreign residents in Schnaitsee during the period of November 1945 to March 1946.

5. Individual cards showing monetary compensation to foreign residents are enclosed (exhibit V).

6. Photostatic copy of the actual Schnaitsee register is inclosed as exhibit VIII. The register reveals numerous irregularities.

(a) Registrations do not follow in order by date Person number 30d is registered on January 10, 1946. Person number 32 is registered on August 1, 1945.

(b) Numerous changes, erasures and additions are evident.

7. Exhibit VII is a photostatic copy of a card file retained in the office of Georg Mayer and allegedly established date of residence of Zynger, Szmul Leib in Schnaitsee as of November 22, 1945. Zynger came to Schnaitsee in September 1949 and stated to Mayer that he, Zynger, had been in Schnaitsee in November 1945 and requested that his name be entered on the registry to reflect this date. Zynger produced a notarized statement and two witnesses who attested that they had seen Zynger in Schnaitsee in November 1945. A check of the Schnaitsee registry revealed that one of these witnesses, Josef Land, himself arrived in Schnaitsee initially on July 3, 1947.

8 Bernhard Mueller, kommissar of landpolizei, Schnaitsee, was interviewed on December 9, 1949, at which time he stated that he has initiated legal proceedings against Georg Mayer for falsification of official records.

9. As a result of this investigation, a list of all DP's concerned has been compiled. This list showing which DP's were actually present in Schnaitsee during 1945 is inclosed as exhibit VI.

B J ROLAK,
Captain, CMP, Chief, Visa Section
(For the Commanding Officer).

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, exhibit C, being a Counter Intelligence Corps report dated December 8, 1949, relative to false identity documents at Kaufbeuren, Germany.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, REGION IV,
SIXTY-SIXTH CIC DETACHMENT,
VISA SECTION, APO 407-A,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
December 27, 1949.

Subject: False Identity Documents, Kaufbeuren, Germany

To: Mr. D W Main, Senior Officer, DP Commission, APO 407, United States Army.

1. Attached is report of this Section in regard to issuance of false documents in Kaufbeuren, Germany

B J ROLAK,
Captain, CMP, Chief, Visa Section
(For the Commanding Officer).

FALSE IDENTITY DOCUMENTS, KAUFBEUREN, GERMANY

1. On December 8, 1949, an agent of this Section interviewed Mr. Schindele, custodian and recorder of the Einwohnermeldeamt of Stadt Kaufbeuren and Kreis Kaufbeuren, located in the Rathaus, Kaufbeuren, Germany. Mr. Schindele stated in substance that this Einwohnermeldeamt was formerly in the custody of one Joseph Glueck and that on April 1, 1949, the land police in Kaufbeuren found that Glueck, in conspiracy with a Polish DP named Wilhelm Grau, was issuing false residence certificates and Kennkarte certification to DP's upon their application. Mr. Schindele stated that he has had reason to check his records against various lists of DP's claiming residence in Kaufbeuren and has found a large number to be false registrations. Mr. Schindele stated that any Kennkarte or residence certificate signed by Glueck prior to April 1, 1949, are to be considered as probably false if made out in the name of DP's. Glueck is presently under investigation and criminal charges are being placed against him by the German authorities of Kaufbeuren

2. Mr. Schindele stated that his records reveal that Glueck's accomplice, Wilhelm Grau was born August 2, 1919, in Stanislaw, Poland, and that he came from Stanislaw, Poland to Kaufbeuren and registered January 21, 1946. Information on Grau's registration card reveals that he has left Kaufbeuren for immigration to the United States.

3 Mr. Schindele stated that he was present in Kaufbeuren at the time the Concentration Camp of Steinholz in Kaufbeuren was liberated. From his personal knowledge he states that all inmates of Polish nationality left by train for Poland immediately after liberation, and that to the best of his knowledge, none of them stayed in Kaufbeuren nor returned at a later date Mr. Schindele has the Anmeldungen on all inmates of the Steinholz Concentration Camp in his possession at the present time These records, examined by an agent of this Section, show the name of all inmates, their date of birth, date of internment, date of arrival in Steinholz, where they came from prior to transfer to Steinholz, and the date of their death or release. These records are available for further reference.

4. Mr Schindele stated that Glueck issued residence certificates to DP's without first consulting any of the records available in his office. After a cursory examination Schindele gave the following names as having false Kennkarten issued by Glueck prior to April 1, 1949

Hoger, Joseph, born December 20, 1901, at Kieling, Poland.

Hoger, Sara, born March 15, 1893, at Kieling, Poland.

Lieber, Schalom, born March 6, 1920, at Rzeszow, Poland.

Lieber, Miriam, born August 4, 1928, at Czernowicz, Poland.

Thaler, Majer, born June 4, 1910, at Stanislaw, Poland.

Thaler, Ada, born June 23, 1922, at Kiesseniow, Poland.

Sojcher, Aba, born May 20, 1918, at Kolomea, Poland.

Schulmann, Gitl, born June 24, 1906, at Pinsk, Poland.

Brodski, Joseph, born July 22, 1913, at Tararlije, Rumania.

Brodski, Chochak, born November 15, 1915, at Tararlije, Rumania.

Brodski, Dawid, born July 2, 1886, at Tararlije, Rumania.

Brodski, Rywa, born February 21, 1895, at Tararlije, Rumania.

Mr Schindele stated that he would further search his record for more false documents and that he would have the names for further reference

B. J ROLAK,
Captain, CMP, Chief, Visa Section.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, those reports show specific cases, with names, of the use of fraudulent documents in the case of persons who were permitted to enter the United States.

Here, again, Mr. President, let me say that these reports are not fiction; they are not propaganda. They are routine reports of the Counter-Intelligence Corps of the United States Army. These reports bear out exactly the testimony of officials of the United States Government in regard to fraud, bribery, and corruption.

Some few weeks ago there appeared in executive session before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary a witness who, as I have previously shown, was formerly director of certain phases of Army intelligence work in Germany, and who has intimate knowledge of security problems in connection with the displaced persons program. He testified, in part, as follows:

Question. Now, would you express yourself on the false and fraudulent document situation?

The WITNESS We had numerous instances of people who passed through our screening centers being found with false and fraudulent documents or no documentation at all. I had linguists, young men, officers, and enlisted men, attached to me, of incredible ability, and we broke one large ring in Berlin of agents attempting to pass through because this young man could tell when somebody spoke Polish with a Russian accent.

Mr. President, I submit that the word of that former high official of the United States Army Counter Intelligence Corps is entitled to at least the fleeting consideration of the Congress.

I read further from his testimony:

He found at that time a number of members of the Soviet Intelligence Service trying to be filtered through as bona fide political persecutees.

Think of that, Mr. President. Members of the Soviet Intelligence Service whom the Russians were attempting to filter through as political persecutees.

I read further from his testimony:

They included both men and women. The entire ring, I believe, was broken up and it caused quite an international incident because in the process of breaking it up we arrested several Russian officers in the act of engaging in espionage in the American forces and that finally got into the newspapers, and you recall that the Soviets in return arrested two of our officers and held them for 6 weeks.

Now, Mr. President, let me invite the attention of the Senate to the unassailable facts respecting the loose security check system which is presently in operation in the administration of our displaced persons program. Contrary to what the Senator from New York has said, there is not adequate screening.

Mr. Almanza Tripp, whom I have previously identified, testified as follows:

Mr. TRIPP. There became available to me recently copies of the results of a fingerprint check made by the provost marshal's office in a number of cases. The first group of cases in which the information became available to me related to ninety-odd individuals. Immediately I checked the camp registration records, Camp Grohn in Bremen, to determine if any of the persons named had proceeded to the United States. I found that 33 of the people had already sailed to the United States. Examining the nature of the report in each case, I concluded without investigation that 11 of the individuals were probably deportable on criminal charges.

Question. Has it not been the policy of the Displaced Persons Commission to avoid BDC checks or provost marshal checks in the processing of displaced persons on the basis of this calculated risk theory of the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr TRIPP. I do not know whether I would say they did it to avoid, but what they have

done is process practically all cases without receiving the returns from the Berlin Document Center or from the provost marshal.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. JENNER. Has there not been evidence before the committee that those in charge of operating the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe are not concerned primarily with the security of the country, but that their entire objective is to meet quotas, to rush them through, to get displaced persons into America and, so they say, "Let's get the job done, let's get the 205,000 displaced persons here; we don't care whether they are subversives or Communists, or criminals or thugs, or black marketeers?" Has not that been the whole premise of the operation of the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is the result. It is the result of what has happened, because the man in charge of the immigration detail in Europe, an American official, says the displaced persons have been processed without receiving the returns from the Berlin document center or from the provost marshal—the two places in Germany where the information is assembled.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. I continue reading the testimony of Mr. Tripp:

Question Those are centers where there would be criminal records on individuals?

Mr TRIPP The Berlin Document Center records would indicate Nazi affiliations and the provost marshal records would indicate arrest and convictions, possibly by the American authorities, in criminal cases and in some cases convictions in German courts.

Question It was because of your check into the BDC records and the provost marshal records that you found these one hundred-odd cases of criminal conviction, 33 of which had already come to the United States, is that right?

Mr. TRIPP That is right.

Question. What expression was made to you by the Displaced Persons Commission with reference to why the Displaced Persons Commission would not make BDC checks or provost marshal checks to ascertain whether or not the displaced persons had criminal records?

Mr. TRIPP. I was told earlier in the program that if a case was held until the BDC checked——

Question What is BDC?

Mr TRIPP Berlin Document Center—and provost marshal checked, it would materially slow down the program.

Question. Who made that statement?

Mr. TRIPP. I believe the first person I spoke to about it was Mr. Kaplan. That was one of the first things I discussed on arrival in Germany.

Mr. Kaplan is Mr. Squadrilli's executive assistant. Continuing:

Question. He is Mr. Squadrilli's right-hand man?

Mr. TRIPP Yes; I believe he is the executive assistant.

Question. You had nevertheless on your own volition been making in some instances BDC checks and provost marshal checks?

Mr. TRIPP. We had been making BDC checks, but I had not been making provost marshal checks, but recently, as I say, two groups of reports became available to me, and I have now filed a written request with the provost marshal's office that I be supplied with the result of every fingerprint check.

Question. The Displaced Persons Commission decided, as you understand it, that they would take the calculated risk of not waiting until they received this answer from the Berlin Document Center?

Mr. TRIPP Yes; and also from the provost marshal.

Question. Does CIC send a letter to the provost marshal asking for information?

Mr. TRIPP. That is in regard to fingerprinting.

Question. Does the Displaced Persons Commission cause the Counter Intelligence Corps to give the Commission a report before the final fingerprint records come back from the provost marshal?

Mr. TRIPP. I have not been able to find out just what those procedures are on the fingerprints.

Question. Well, at any rate, as I understand it, leaving out the fingerprints for a moment, your information is that, although the Displaced Persons Commission requests the CIC to make this report as to the applicant's character and history and all that, the CIC sends over a communication to the Berlin Document Center asking what their records show, yet the Displaced Persons Commission has told the CIC to get word back to the Commission about this application without waiting for a response from the Berlin Document Center; is that right?

Mr. TRIPP. That is right.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In connection with applicants who have been admitted as displaced persons under the definition now used, has the Displaced Persons Commission vetoed or overruled any of the applications which have been affirmatively approved by the IRO, referring especially to cases in which the records were falsified?

Mr. EASTLAND. In some instances it has.

Mr. WHERRY. Have there been many instances of it, percentagewise?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know the answer to that.

Mr. WHERRY. Did they do it voluntarily, or was the matter brought to their attention by the consular agent or the immigration authorities?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know. My judgment is that they act voluntarily.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not correct that, although the law does not provide that tests of eligibility made by the employees of the IRO must be accepted by the Displaced Persons Commission, they are nevertheless actually accepted?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. They are actually accepted. Then, there is no authority, is there, on the part of the consular agent or the immigration authorities to veto the procedure now being followed by the IRO?

Mr. EASTLAND. Except under the general immigration law.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. EASTLAND. But not under the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the question asked this morning by the Senator from Michigan. It seems to me, so far as the junior Senator from Nebraska is concerned, it is the big issue in connection with the pending subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. WHERRY. The question of quotas is another matter. I should like to ask the Senator further, is ours the only country which allows foreigners to sit on a board, such as the board of the IRO, to pass on the applications of persons seeking admission to this country?

Mr. EASTLAND. Ours is the only country which permits a foreign international organization to have anything to do with the admittance of displaced persons for the purpose of becoming citizens.

Mr. WHERRY. The burden of the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, if I understand correctly, is to the effect that what the committee proposes through the amendments offered by it is to prescribe a definition. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is to prescribe a definition as broad as the IRO definition—but it is to be our definition.

Mr. WHERRY. What does it define?

Mr. EASTLAND. It defines a displaced person.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, the administration of the law shall be adjusted to provide for a board or agency of the United States Government which is to approve or veto finally the applications of displaced persons to enter the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. Furthermore, it is to initiate the application; that is, the United States representatives will select those who are to be permitted to enter the country.

Mr. WHERRY. Who is opposing it?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not understand why it should be opposed; but it is not so provided in the substitute which is to be offered.

Mr. WHERRY. What does the substitute provide which is in contradiction of that?

Mr. EASTLAND. In that respect it carries forward the present law.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, the present definition of a displaced person, under IRO?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the substitute bill in any way modify it?

Mr. EASTLAND. It carries forward the system that is in vogue now.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the substitute provide that a Government agency, such as the Immigration Service, may veto the application of a displaced person desiring to enter the United States who has been certified by the IRO and the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think a fair interpretation of existing law is that it could be done, but it is not the present practice.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, without a new definition, such as the committee proposes, even though technically the result which I mentioned might be brought about, yet there is not the will to do it. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is entirely correct. The administrative policy in the

field of qualifying a person as a displaced person has been that the decision of the Displaced Persons Commission shall be final.

Mr. WHERRY. If it is provided under existing law, and if the substitute also contains the provision, why should there be objection to the committee bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. The substitute does not so provide; the committee bill does.

Mr. WHERRY. I know the committee bill contains the provision; but, even technically, if the present law provides what we are here attempting to do, what objection is there to the committee bill as amended, the purpose of which is to accomplish a proper administration of the act?

Mr. EASTLAND. There should be no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. EASTLAND. There should be none.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator another question. I am not sure the Senator knows, because I am not certain the testimony is here. Early in the debate, the distinguished Senator said certain records were falsified, according to the testimony of a man named Main, if I am not mistaken. There was a case in which a man went into a town, contacted the official, whoever he is, who makes the record, and persuaded him to falsify the record so that applicant would become eligible under IRO.

Mr. EASTLAND. It was not one case. There is testimony as to 3,500 such cases in one area.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked why it was, and the answer from the distinguished Senator was that they received money for it. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether these applicants have any money?

Mr. EASTLAND. There is plenty of money in black-market operations. Many of them have money.

Mr. WHERRY. Many of the applicants have money?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not true that the committee had evidence that there was in the black market plenty of 50- and 100-dollar bills, "green money," as it is called, which is American money, which displaced persons have been handling?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The matter is becoming more involved.

Mr. JENNER. It was New York money.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not suppose the Senator has evidence as to where that money came from.

Mr. EASTLAND. I would judge that it came from New York, but I do not know.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. It is Series B money, from the New York district. I do not know how it got to Europe.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will yield here, without prejudicing my right to the floor, to the distinguished Senator from Indiana, who heard the testimony on that point.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Indiana has already answered the question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to see if he can answer it to the satisfaction of the majority leader.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I intend to go into the subject in detail when I speak on the bill, but, in order to make it clear to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, there is an organized black market. The heads of it are displaced persons. They not only have plenty of money, but it is American money, series B, from the New York district, 50- and 100-dollar bills. We had evidence that they are using American ambulances, driven by displaced persons, which are filled with cigarettes and things of that kind. Some of the displaced persons have plenty of money.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is a report from a senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission to the Commission itself referring to corruption in the IRO, which initiates all the applications.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the very point I was trying to get from the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. What I am trying to do is to justify the definition we are attempting to establish in section 3 of the bill. With the evidence which has been submitted, which has not been available to Members of the Senate, and knowing the distinguished Senator from Mississippi as I do—I am satisfied that he is a man of not only high integrity, but of honor—it causes one who is trying to make up his mind in voting on a definition, to think very seriously. I cannot, for the life of me, see why there should be any objection to some Government agency, whether it be the consular service or some other agency, having the last word in vetoing the application of a displaced person if there is any reason to believe that the applicant should not be admitted. I cannot see why there should be any objection to that.

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot, either. I thank the distinguished Senator for his personal reference and compliment. It is not a question of veracity on my part. I have simply read the testimony of officers of the Government. The Senate can make up its own mind whether the testimoney is correct. Frankly, I think it is.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the definition which is proposed by the committee in any way discriminate against any displaced person?

Mr. EASTLAND. There is no semblance of discrimination in the committee bill against any racial or religious group as to the definition of a displaced person. There is tremendous discrimination in the substitute bill. In fact, the substitute bill is a slander against every individual in the United States through whose veins flows Germanic blood.

Mr. WHERRY. One more question, if the Senator will yield further.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no discrimination as to the numbers involved, is there?

Mr. EASTLAND. In that respect the committee bill and the substitute are about the same.

Mr. WHERRY. So that the big issue is the definition that is proposed to be established by the committee, through its amendment, as opposed to the present law and what is contained in the substitute. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Whether we shall take in persons who have suffered and who are of German ethnic origin.

Mr. WHERRY. And that runs to the date and to the ethnic origin of the applicant. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. Some of the finest citizens in this country are people of Germanic origin. I think many displaced persons in that category would be an asset to the United States. I hope that under any bill we shall take a fair proportion of those persons and not discriminate against them as is attempted to be done in the substitute proposed by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. So long as the question I asked has brought out the answer from the distinguished Senator from Mississippi relative to the persons excluded because of German ethnic origin, I should like to say that in my own State there is a considerable population of the very type of persons the Senator has mentioned. They do not need to have anyone carry a brief for them. They have established themselves as very fine citizens; they are exceptional; they make excellent citizens and are helping to build up not only our citizenship, but our American institutions. It seems to me there should be no discrimination against them.

Mr. EASTLAND. The white population of my State is of as pure Anglo-Saxon blood as can be found in the United States, and I am proud of it. I know the German people are fine people; I know that people of Germanic origin are among the best people of the country. One of the great aims is to remove the stigma of discrimination against them. That is why the Senate committee has provided for the admission of persons of German ethnic origin. The IRO discriminates against them and says, "They are not our concern. Let us kick them out, even though they suffered, even though they supported the Allies. They can starve to death. We care nothing about them. We shall not help them. They are not eligible to come to the United States."

We ratified that in the law in 1948, but to rectify a great wrong, the Senate committee desires to admit persons of

German ethnic origin, if they are otherwise eligible. Such a provision is not in the substitute bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator has a question about it——

Mr. KILGORE. I was not going to ask a question on this point.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not true that unless some provision is made to take care of persons of German ethnic origin who have been run away from their homes because of the Potsdam agreement, unless we make it possible for them to come in, there is no reason at all for increasing the number of displaced persons to 339,000? Is it not a fact that if the present law, which provides for 205,000, were permitted to run out, there would be only a very few war-displaced persons left in Europe?

Mr. EASTLAND. It would be only the "hard core" of criminals and misfits who could not qualify.

Mr. JENNER. So, if we are going to increase the number, as is proposed in both the committee bill and the substitute, we must permit persons of German ethnic origin to come in, or we shall not have any displaced persons at all. Is not that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. One of the greatest crimes in all history was the uprooting from their homes, where their people had lived for centuries, of men, women, and children, whose only offense was that through their veins flowed Germanic blood and that a thousand years ago their ancestors had been of German stock. They were turned out into the cold and snow, driven like cattle across eastern and central Europe into Germany, where many of them died on the march like flies. I say that is one of the greatest crimes in all human history, a crime to which the United States was a party. In this bill we have attempted, in a meager way, to permit some of those persons to come into the United States. They are the real sufferers. That is the real immigration problem in Europe today. I say "immigration" because, in the last analysis, this is an immigration bill. This is not a displaced persons bill. The real displaced persons have been taken care of.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. KILGORE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Nevada have, on the floor, quoted from a report of the Inspector General about certain improper practices by persons trying to come here as displaced persons. While it is true that I have not seen the report, because the report is of a confidential nature, and has been classified as secret——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute. Mr. President——

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder if the Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute. Mr. President, the Senator is misquoting me. I have not quoted from any confidential report.

Mr. KILGORE. I believe so.

Mr. EASTLAND. No, I have not.

Mr. KILGORE. Has not the Senator quoted from a report of the Inspector General on the subject of fraud?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have not quoted from a confidential report. I have refused to do so. I said I had refused to do so. I told the distinguished majority leader that he could read the report. The report is here.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator from Mississippi give the date of the report?

Mr. EASTLAND. It would be a breach of faith, Mr. President, if I quoted from the report, even though to do so would prove my case conclusively. We tried to get it released so that we could quote from it.

Mr. KILGORE. I asked the Senator if he would give the date of the report.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I am not going to put anything in the RECORD from that report.

Mr. KILGORE. Merely the date. There is no secret about the date.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator will get the consent of the State Department I will put the date in the RECORD, or I will put a part of the report in the RECORD.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask the distinguished Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute, please. If the Senator gets consent, I shall do so. They have declined to permit the use of any part of that report. However, to be absolutely fair and square, I say to the Senator that, regardless of the date in the report the facts set forth in the report prove my case. If the Senator will read the report, he will realize that my conclusion is accurate.

Mr. KILGORE. If I may, I should like to ask the Senator another question: Is it not true that the report was written in 1947?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, sir; that is not correct. That is incorrect.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator state the year in which it was written?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I would be guilty of breach of faith if I used any part of the report.

Mr. KILGORE. The reason for my question is that my information indicates the report was written prior to the passage of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Then may I ask why questions of fraud in the report are being used to attack the Displaced Persons Commission? At that time the program was operating under the Immigration Service and State Department.

Mr. EASTLAND. As I told the Senator, we have used no part of the report. The Senator heard me tell him that. We have not quoted from it. The Senator heard me tell him that. I stated that if we had used the report it would have proved our case. If the Senator would read it, he would know that to be the fact.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I cannot see how a report written before a governmental agency had been created could prove a case of malfeasance against that agency.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. KILGORE. I say, I cannot see how a report can impute misconduct to a governmental agency which was not in existence at the time the report was written.

Mr. EASTLAND. Who said it did? Will the Senator answer that question? Who said it did?

Mr. KILGORE. Not by direct statement, but by inference.

Mr. EASTLAND. Who by inference said it did?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, I should like to have an answer to my question.

Mr. KILGORE. I have heard the report quoted frequently, but I have never been able to see it, or to find the date of the report. It has always been used in committee, and I heard it used on the floor by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] to impute misconduct to the employees of the Displaced Persons Commission.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Nevada can speak for himself. The Senator from West Virginia has not heard me refer to any information in the report, directly or indirectly, or attack any man named in the report because of anything contained in it. I am informed that a portion of the report was read in a meeting of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KILGORE. One paragraph.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator heard that. He knows as much about the report as I do.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. No one has seen the report in committee, except one paragraph. The Senator has not quoted from it. Just what is the reason for referring to this very mysterious document here in front of Senators?

Mr. EASTLAND. I know pretty well what is in the report.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator ought to be able to tell the Senate and the country something about the report if he is going to use it to bolster his case.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished majority leader is an influential man in the administration. The Senator from Nevada has been unable to get the report released. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Illinois could get it released. If he does, if it will destroy the chance of the substitute bill, in my judgment, or of any similar bill at this time. We have tried to get it released. We want to make it available. I know pretty well what is in the report, but I cannot use it. I am going to read from a letter which the chairman of the committee

wrote under date of January 10, 1950. I am authorized to do so. When the chairman of the committee gave me the report, he gave it to me with the admonition that it would be a breach of faith to use any information in the report, and we have been careful about that.

Mr. LUCAS. The able Senator is very fair and impartial.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. He knows what good conduct and good ethics are in the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator if he thinks it is a legitimate argument for him to bring in a report, pass it about in front of all Senators, talk about it, and tell the country and the world that if he could have this report made public, it would blow everything out of the water so far as the substitute bill or any other bill was concerned, yet he knows he cannot disclose it to the Senate. Why does the Senator do that?

Mr. EASTLAND. Because the people of the United States are entitled to protection, and because I know that people who have a special interest in the passage of a displaced-persons bill are deliberately sitting on that report, which is a shame. The report should be released, and I think some publicity on the report and its contents, if we could use it, would result in it being released. I am informed tha a high official has stated that security would not be violated if it were released.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I still maintain that the argument is not quite fair. The Senator of course, thinks differently.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois would never bring in a report of that kind and stand before the Senate and tell the Senate of the United States, "Here is the report which, if I could get it released, would stop the bill."

Mr. EASTLAND. It certainly would, and the people of this country are entitled to information as to what is in the report; and their interests are paramount. Anything that could be legitimately done to get that report released, to shed the blessed sunlight of publicity on the facts which are being held back, would be wholesome.

Mr. President, I should like to read the letter which the chairman of the committee today has specifically authorized me to read, which he wrote the Secretary of the Army, at the Pentagon Building, attention Colonel Finn, on January 10, 1950. The letter reads:

DEAR MR SECRETARY: In the course of the last month there has been transmitted to me, pursuant to my request of December 5, 1949, a voluminous and detailed report of an investigation which was conducted in 1948 by a certain branch of the Army respecting security screenings and investigations of persons applying for immigration to the United States as displaced persons.

This report was transmitted to me with the condition that the contents thereof be confidential to the members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. In my opinion, it is vital to the security of the United States of America that the information contained in the report be made available to the people of this country.

I should be obliged to you if you will, as soon as possible, advise me under what conditions or circumstances I may be permitted to release any or all of the information contained in the report.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

Mr. President, the report is pertinent to the present inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire where the Senator got the report?

Mr. EASTLAND I got it from the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know where the Senator from Nevada got it?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know. He says that it was transmitted to him. I do not know where he got it. It was transmitted to him through channels of the Government.

Mr. LUCAS Can any Senator see the report?

Mr. EASTLAND. Not under the restrictions that were given. I broke faith when I said the Senator could see it. The restriction was that it would be available to the Committee on the Judiciary. It was made available, and a portion of it was read. The Senator from West Virginia said one paragraph was read. I think the report by all means should be released, without releasing, of course, the sources of information on which it is based. I believe the people of the country are entitled to it.

Mr. President, it is a startling thing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I am intensely interested in the observations made respecting the eligibility requirements of displaced persons. Awhile ago it was disclosed on the floor that many displaced persons had considerable sums of money. Is not the whole theory of the Displaced Persons Act our desire to provide homes for those who are destitute and poverty stricken? I do not say that all displaced persons are, but in the main we must secure jobs for them and locate them when they come to this country. How does it happen that those who carry money in huge amounts, as has been stated here, are considered to be eligible, so that we have to provide homes for them?

Mr. EASTLAND. The testimony is that some of them come to this country to secure American passports in order that they may return and engage in black-market operations.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that they do not want to stay in the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a moment, please. I want to be fair about this matter. Such cases should not be charged to the whole program. Many good persons have come to the United States under the program.

Mr. WHERRY. I am simply trying to obtain the facts. It was shown by the evidence that some persons who possessed much money came in as displaced persons.

Mr. EASTLAND. I want to qualify that.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Mississippi heard the observations made by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. When I heard his remarks it struck me that we are trying to provide jobs for such persons. I have heard the argument made that it is cheaper to take care of them on the other side than it is in this country; but if they are good people and are entitled to citizenship, we need them. That is the argument which is made. Now we find that some of those who have come here are apparently not in need, so it would make no difference whether they would have a job or not; but they are coming here, according to the Senator from Mississippi, for entirely different purposes. Is not all that screened when the persons make application? Is not investigation made as to how much money such persons have, and as to their personal situation, when they make application?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Tripp said there are 30,000 of doubtful eligibility.

Mr. WHERRY. Thirty thousand of doubtful eligibility have come into the United States under the present law?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; out of 100 000.

Mr O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I ask the Senator from Mississippi, apropos of the questions asked by the Senator from Nebraska, if it is not true that it does not necessarily follow that displaced persons are impecunious or penniless?

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. O'CONOR. They might very well have savings as the result of hard work. They may be very hard-working and self-respecting and outstanding persons who have been uprooted, and of course, require a new home. Some of them may be possessed of funds which they have obtained through hard work, and they are coming to the United States to procure a new home, after proper assurances are given that they will not displace any workingmen here.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true. But I do not see how they can get out of the iron-curtain countries within a month. The majority are good people. Those whom I know are hard-working people and have made good citizens.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Nebraska spoke of persons who when they came here had considerable sums of money. Were not those who were referred to by the Senator the persons who were testified about by the mysterious Witness X? He said that 100 persons had been mixed up in the coffee smuggling in Germany, but he cited just four cases, one of whom was in this country. Is that not correct? But there were about a hundred persons mixed up in that coffee smuggling.

Mr. EASTLAND. The whole program should not be condemned because some bad actors have come to the United States. The controversy now does not concern itself with condemnation of the program. The commitee bill would result in practically as many persons being brought here as the substitute. What we are trying to do is to root out the bad actors. The committee bill provides a better method for doing that than does the substitute.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator stated a little while ago that Mr. Tripp of the Immigration Service said about 30,000 ineligibles had come to the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. "Of doubtful eligibility," was his statement.

Mr. KILGORE. What does he mean by "doubtful eligibility"?

Mr. EASTLAND. Persons who were ineligible to come here under the displaced-persons law.

Mr. KILGORE. Does he mean ineligible as displaced persons or ineligible for immigration?

Mr. EASTLAND. He means ineligible as displaced persons; that is, persons who have come here under the displaced-persons law.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not remember that he testified to a number of 30,000. There was some question about whether they really were displaced persons. Is that not correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Within the meaning of our displaced-persons law.

Mr. KILGORE. Does not that go largely to the question of whether great numbers of them said they were agriculturists, who had not followed a plow for a long time?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, it does not.

Mr. KILGORE. And the big question was not the date of entry.

Mr. EASTLAND. No. Let us not put words in Mr. Tripp's mouth. Mr. Tripp testified that under the law they were of doubtful eligibility as displaced persons.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before the Senator leave that point, will he yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose a foreigner in Germany wanted to come to this country as an immigrant, not as a displaced person. Now suppose a refugee from Latvia is in Germany and wants to come to this country as a displaced person. Are the requirements for the latter the same as for the former?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, sir.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it easier, or is it more difficult for the refugee to come here than it is for the citizen who comes in on the quota basis?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is much easier for the refugee to come here.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the procedure the Senator is recommending for the refugee the same procedure that an immigrant has to go through in coming to this country?

Mr. EASTLAND. Substantially the same.

Mr. TYDINGS. In what respect is it more severe and in what respect is it less severe.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is no more severe.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it practically the same.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is practically the same.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is however, I would take it, this difference, that the refugee would have to be funneled through more boards than an immigrant would have to be funneled through, because he must begin with a displaced persons organization.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; he must begin with IRO.

Mr. TYDINGS. In my opinion, the International Refugee Organization is a displaced persons organization.

Mr. EASTLAND. But it is a separate agency. By the committee bill we take the IRO out of the picture.

Mr. TYDINGS. What the Senator is advocating, and what an immigrant coming to this country would have to go through by way of screening is that in the case of the refugee he must be accredited by the IRO in addition to what the immigrant has to go through.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. In all other respects the committee bill provides for screening with the same machinery in essence, and with the same procedures in essence, that an immigrant would have to go through if he were coming from one of the western European countries?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is substantially correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Under the committee bill, is it a fact that the Displaced Persons Commission may be reversed by the State Department?

Mr. EASTLAND. Not as to eligibility under the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. KILGORE. I call attention to the use of the word "final" in an amendment placed in the bill by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I placed in the RECORD today the order of the Displaced Persons Commission which has been adhered to, and that adjudication is final.

Mr. President, I quote further from Mr. Tripp, who speaks of screening and fingerprinting:

> Mr TRIPP. I have not been able to find out just what those procedures are, on the fingerprint check.
>
> Question. Well, at any rate, as I understand it, leaving out the fingerprints for the moment, your information is that, although the Displaced Persons Commission requests the CIC to make this report as to the applicant's character and history and all that, the CIC sends over a communication to the Berlin Document Center asking what their records show, yet the Displaced Persons Commission has told the CIC to get work back to the Commission about this applicant without waiting for a response from the Berlin Document Center; is that right?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. That is right.
>
> Question. And they have also said the same thing to the CIC with regard to the reports from the provost marshall; is that right?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. That is right.

Mr. President, I shall digress from that testimony for a moment. The distinguished senior Senator from Maryland asked me about the difference in the bills and I inadvertently forgot to tell one principal difference.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senator comes to that, and while he is on the subject I formerly questioned him concerning, let me say that this is a very comprehensive proposition in both the committee bill and the substitute. Only those members who have served on the committee and have had the good fortune to know all the facts can form the kind of judgment on it that we would all like to form. But it seems to me that the proposition of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], on the one hand, and that of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], on the other, are not so far apart but that reasonable men can get together and with a little give and take provide adequate screening without going too far and requiring too-rigid screening on the one hand or leaving the door wide open on the other. Either extreme is bad.

Mr. EASTLAND. But there is this feature: The committee bill removes the discrimination against persons of German ethnic origin. There are millions of good people who are of German ethnic origin; in fact, the real displaced persons problem is in connection with persons of German ethnic origin.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the committee bill allow them to be classified as displaced persons?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; and the committee bill would permit a reasonable number of them to be admitted into the United States. But that provision is not to be found in the substitute of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Maryland is totally presumptuous in trying to tell the members of the Judiciay Committee, who have spent weeks in studying this matter, how to deal with it. The suggestion I put forth sprang from very good motives, because after having taken part in the debate on several occasions, for the purpose of obtaining information, it is somewhat difficult for me to understand why there is not a reasonable ground for an agreement which will accomplish the objective of the bill and at the same time will protect the United States. I am a little uncertain as to why that cannot be accomplished. I do not wish anyone to surrender his principles; I do not advocate that. But it seems to me that both sides are so close together that, with a little give and take, we could have a very good bill which would not greatly alter the point of view of the Senator from Mississippi or the point of view of the Senator from West Virginia. I do not see why the matter the Senator from Mississippi has just pointed out could not be taken into consideration in that connection.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, Mr. President, I am not in charge of the bill. The Senator from Nevada is in charge of the bill.

Aside from the provision for persons of German ethnic origin, I cannot see much difference between the two bills. Aside from that question, how in the world there could be dispute over the provisions of the Senate committee bill

is something I cannot understand. There is a fuss because Mr. L'Heureux, of the State Department, requested authority for the consular service to veto an applicant on the ground that he did not qualify under the act. Some of the gentlemen associated with my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, say that authority already is provided. If so, then I cannot understand why Senators hesitate to have it provided in the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the position taken by the Senator from Mississippi in his last remark shows that the door is wide open for constructive and reasonable and sensible agreement in respect to the points in conflict. The Senator himself has said that the points are not so far apart that reasonable men cannot agree.

It seems to me that the differences regarding the German ethnic origin phase of the matter, which is in dispute, are such that they could be adjusted.

Mr. EASTLAND. That question could not be compromised.

Mr. TYDINGS. No doubt it would be possible to reach agreement on the other points separately. Many of us who are not on the committee are confused about the situation.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have stated time and time again that there are questions which certainly should be compromised. But there cannot be any compromise on the question of the admission of persons of German ethnic origin.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many of them would there be?

Mr. EASTLAND. The committee provision was a very reasonable one, but is was immediately ignored.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many would it provide for?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from West Virginia has the same provisions, as I understand, in his substitute; but it is meaningless, because the authorities will not enforce it. So it does not mean anything.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say a word, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor, I should like to reply to the question asked by the Senator from Maryland. The primary difference arises over a question of interpretation in respect to the IRO. Regardless of whether persons come to the United States or do not come to the United States, the United States will still have to take care of them, under the agreement.

The substitute provides for preference for approximately 54,000 persons of German ethnic origin, based upon the proposition of mortgaging the German and Austrian quotas, and still leaves the total number of displaced persons within the IRO classification, in order to carry out the agreement which the United States has through the United Nations. The committee bill throws the whole German-ethnic group in with the IRO, making, instead of, let us say, 300,000 persons with whom we must deal, 8,300,000 persons. That is the primary difference.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, to be frank, we must agree that the hard core of war displaced persons have already been taken care of.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not wish to prolong the discussion. I apologize for again injecting myself into it. But knowing the capacity of the Senator from West Virginia for constructive thinking and achievement, and likewise the talents of the able Senator from Mississippi, I would hope that those of us who have not acquired the familiarity with this problem that these two eminent members of the Judiciary Committee have, might meet tonight or at some other time between now and Monday and might ascertain whether an area of agreement can be reached, so that those of us who wish to do the right thing will be able to do so.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Mississippi and I have discussed such a modus operandi frequently in the past. Is not that true?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but we cannot have any agreement on the question of whether a foreign agency, an international agency, staffed with aliens, can have anything to do with the selection of the persons who are to become citizens of the United States; and I do not believe my friend, the Senator from Maryland, would vote for such a proposition.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot believe that the two Senators can fail to reach agreement regarding these things; and it would be most helpful to those of us who do not know much about these matters, to have the two Senators sit down and do that, between now and Monday. I earnestly hope they will.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I should like the Senator to permit me to read a proposed amendment which was drafted at the time when the bill was before the Senate in October, and which could be offered now. I had it drafted at that time, and had it ready for submission. It provides:

> Nor shall any displaced person be accepted for admission into the United States until he shall have been personally examined by representatives of the Displaced Persons Commission, the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice, the Consular Service of the Department of State, and appropriate intelligence agencies of the Government of the United States, each of whom—

And they are not international or foreign organizations, Mr. President—

> shall certify that each such displaced person has been personally interviewed for security and other purposes; and each such report shall indicate by whom such person has been interviewed and the disposition which has been made on the basis of the interviews, field investigations, and all information developed from pertinent and relevant sources.

Mr. EASTLAND. That amendment would be all right, provided the Immigration and Naturalization Service would have authority to veto an application if the applicant did not meet those tests.

Mr. O'CONOR. Of course, they would not certify that the applicant did qualify under the tests for those purposes, unless he did.

Mr. EASTLAND. I think the Senator's amendment includes the provision I have in mind, with reference to a veto by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Of course, with that provision included, the amendment would be a very constructive one.

I read further from the testimony of Mr. Tripp:

> Question. Well, at any rate, as I understand it, leaving out the fingerprints for the moment, your information is that, although the Displaced Persons Commission requests the CIC to make this report as to the applicant's character and history and all that, the CIC sends over a communication to the Berlin Document Center asking what their records show, yet the Displaced Persons Commission has told the CIC to get word back to the Commission about this applicant without waiting for a response from the Berlin Document Center; is that right?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. That is right.
>
> Question. And they have also said the same thing to the CIC with regard to the reports from the provost marshal; is that right?
>
> Mr TRIPP. That is right.
>
> Question. In other words, the Displaced Persons Commission, in order to expedite the handling of these displaced persons, has said, "We will take the calculated risk that may result from the failure to get those two reports"; is that right?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. That is right.
>
> Question. Who is it that issued that kind of statement, do you know?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. I do not know who may have issued the instruction.
>
> Question. I mean the statement to the effect that they were willing to take the calculated risk.
>
> Mr. TRIPP Mr. Kaplan told me that.
>
> Question. He is Mr. Squadrilli's right-hand man?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. Yes.
>
> Question. He is the man that really runs Mr. Squadrilli's office affairs?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. He is the executive assistant.
>
> Question. Where was he when he made that statement—in whose presence, and when?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. That was at Frankfurt on the day I arrived in Germany. I believe I discussed it with him again in the first month I was there.
>
> Question. Now that calculated risk that they have taken in at least the cases you have told us about was quite a risk in the 96 cases, the criminal cases, was it not?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. Yes.
>
> Question. Well, how many cases have come to you from the Displaced Persons Commission since your conversation with Mr. Kaplan in which he told you of this determination that they would accept the calculated risk?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. Around 125,000.

Mr. President, there are 125,000 cases on which the security check was not finished, and in connection with which the Displaced Persons Commission said it would take a calculated risk that such persons would not harm the United States.

I read further from the testimony:

> Question. On those 125,000 cases, am I correct in my understanding that it is your belief that there has been followed this plan of taking the calculated risk by not waiting for the Berlin Document Center, and by not

waiting for the Provost Marshal's report; is that right?

Mr. TRIPP. That is right.

Question. Now, do you think, Mr. Tripp, from your knowledge over this long period of years, that a calculated risk of that kind is a pretty serious thing for the security of our Nation.

Mr. TRIPP. I think it is dangerous.

With reference to the security investigations, Mr. Edward M. Glezek, who was formerly employed with the Displaced Persons Commission in Germany, in a report dated May 11, 1949, addressed to the Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission in Washington, stated among other things:

There is hardly an effort made to screen applicants and the burden of this activity is left to CIC, United States consulate, and law-enforcement agencies at the port of embarkation

Mr President, think of that. Here is a former employee of the Displaced Persons Commission saying there is hardly an effort made to screen applicants, and that the burden is borne by the CIC and the consulate at the port of embarkation. I continue:

The attitude of the Commission has been to critize the CIC agency's restricted reports as being a deterrent favor in the processing of required quota of applicants

It appears that the Commission is more interested in filling the quota than in the quality of the processed applicants. Consequently, people who have falsified documents and who have much to hide in their personal-history records have their cases pushed along without an investigation to ascertain the validity of their documents. Thus many persons are finding their way with completely false information about themselves.

The senior officer of the Commission in the field for whom I worked has repeatedly refused to grant me permission to call the applicants for interview in order to determine their eligibility. The reason given was that this procedure would hold up the cases from 2 to 3 weeks.

Similarly, documentation which appeared incorrect could not be sent to the IRO for correction because this organization refused to correct any statement it has once certified.

In practice, there were many such incorrect certifications, and it was the duty of the Commission personnel to pass these on for further processing. Restricted CIC reports which contained derogatory information about applicants were also dealt with in the same manner, by refusal to call the applicant in for clarification.

I have in my possession copies of analyst reports of such restricted cases where I had to use an ingenious method of explaining away the remarks which were included in the CIC report, in order that these applicants may qualify.

Mr. Donald W. Main, who is a senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission in charge of the Munich area in Germany testified before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on February 15, 1950, that although the displaced persons law requires a thorough investigation, the central intelligence agency is not given sufficient time in which to make their investigations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the able Senator from Mississippi how long he had expected to speak?

Mr. EASTLAND. How long is the Senate expected to sit today?

Mr. LUCAS. I had hoped to adjourn probably by 6 o'clock.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have considerably more to say, but I should rather speak tomorrow, or, if the pending bill is displaced, to speak for a few minutes on another feature of the bill when it is resumed. I think the Senate can save time in that way, because I think I could cut it down to 15 or 20 minutes when we reconvene tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. I was merely inquiring. I do not want to detain the Senator another hour and a half, unless he desires to continue.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the majority leader. I should rather continue tomorrow. It would not take long. If we were to recess at this time, I think I could conclude in 15 or 30 minutes tomorrow—30 minutes at the most.

Mr. LUCAS. It is agreeable to me, if it is agreeable to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I have no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi may resume the floor tomorrow at 12 o'clock, when the Senate reconvenes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, March 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, humbly and confidently we are again turning to Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer, beseeching Thee to inspire us with a reassuring sense of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

Grant that with increasing tenacity of faith we may lay hold upon the glorious promise that they who wait upon the Lord shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint.

May we count it our highest calling to incarnate and emulate the life of our Lord and our highest wisdom to commit our baffled minds and burdened hearts to the discipline and leading of His spirit.

In His name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday next for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

COAL MINES SEIZURE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, words need not be wasted as to the critical character of the emergency in coal. There are indications from administration sources that the President believes he has inherent powers to seize the coal mines and may do so. I ask that the President do not act except with the Congress. The Congress is in session and seizure under such conditions as the Executive alone may impose may well defeat itself in view of recent history in the coal situation, while seizure under conditions established by the Congress will insure the support of the country.

My own National Emergency Seizure Act of 1949 (H. R. 5006), giving a practical and, indeed, a liberal plan for dealing immediately and realistically with the emergency is one plan—there are other plans.

The President should immediately announce to the country that if the United Mine Workers and the mine owners have not agreed on a contract by Monday noon he will at that time present his recommendations to the Congress requesting seizure legislation or other means to deal with the crisis. The grave questions involved demand nothing less than the whole effort of Government—not just the Executive effort.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered last night by Franklyn B. Snyder, president emeritus of Northwestern University.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio talk by R. K. Bliss entitled "Abraham Lincoln, Great Friend of Agriculture."

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in two instances and include in one a letter sent to him and in the other an editorial that appeared in the Boston Globe.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Mr. Klutz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a dangerous rider that has been placed on the oleo bill in conference modifying the Federal Trade Commission Act. I do this by inserting a copy of a telegram addressed to me pertaining to this dangerous rider. The telegram from Edward A. Zimmerman, of Chicago, Ill., reads as follows:

Hon. NOAH M. MASON,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives:

Oleomargarine bill, H. R. 2023, to be reported by conference committee by Monday contains sinister addition to Trade Commission Act not confined to oleomargarine. Addition to section 5-L of Trade Commission Act in section 4-C of H. R. 2023 makes $5,000 penalty apply to each separate day of violation of Trade Commission orders which are always so general as to confuse the average businessman. This could bankrupt small business. Please investigate and take action to prevent this dangerous increase in bureaucratic police power.

AMUSEMENT TAX

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, more than 6,000 residents of my district have recently written me urging that relief be accorded taxpayers still compelled to pay a 20-percent tax on theater admissions and other forms of amusement.

The 11 Democratic members of the Paterson, N. J., Board of Aldermen have resolved that this tax is a real burden upon ordinary citizens seeking entertainment and they plead for relief.

I agree with my people and I am glad to see them exercising their right of petition in this way. More than a year ago when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] introduced his excise-tax relief bill, I announced publicly my support. Last year I signed the discharge petition to force this measure to the floor. I am sorry that the President in his recent tax message failed to suggest any relief from this tax. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I hope administration forces in the House will soon report out a bill. All I want is a chance to vote.

DISLOYAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I picked up this morning's paper and saw an article by Bert Andrews in the Washington Post to the effect that President Truman said yesterday that he is the only one in the Government who has taken concrete action to rid Federal agencies of disloyal persons.

Since I have been a Member of Congress I have been watching the work that has been done by the Dies committee and the Un-American Activities Committee, and then have seen the statements made by the Chief Executive about drawing a red herring across the trail in the case of Communists they have brought to light. It just does not make sense that a man who has the high office of President of the United States would make a statement of that kind. It is repugnant and repulsive to the average American citizen, when he knows that that is not the condition. Oh, for honest men in high office.

FEDERAL AMUSEMENT EXCISE TAX

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have received thousands of communications from my congressional district urging the repeal of the Federal amusement excise tax which was imposed during the war. I follow the practice of answering so far as possible every letter I receive from a resident of my congressional district. However, so many thousands of letters are coming in to me daily urging the repeal of the wartime nuisance excise taxes that I find it impossible with the staff available to me to make personal answers to these letters. I issued a news release some time ago announcing that I favor the repeal of these taxes as I believe we should keep the promise we made when the taxes were imposed that they would be repealed when the war ended.

Furthermore, the continuation of these nuisance taxes is impeding business, adding to the unemployed rolls and in the long run will not bring in as large revenues to the Federal Government as would be the case if they are repealed.

I introduced H. R. 7382 which has for its purpose the repeal of these excise taxes and I have also signed Discharge Petition No. 5 to bring out H. R. 2100, Representative MARTIN's bill having the same purpose and I have urged the Ways and Means Committee of the House to report the bill out so that we may act on it without further delay.

I hope all of my correspondents in my congressional district whose letters I have not been able to answer will note my position on this legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain resolutions passed by the Georgia Legislature.

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Tax Review, written by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some material from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include an editorial.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of February 20.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Pope Pius XII Living Symbol of Peace."

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include an editorial.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ORDER WIPING OUT SEGREGATION IN OUR ARMED FORCES SHOULD BE REVOKED AT ONCE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest blunders that could possibly have been made at this time was the President's order wiping out segregation in our armed forces.

If we should get into another conflict, it would do more to cripple our national defense than anything else that has taken place since Pearl Harbor.

I am appealing to the President through this record to revoke that order at once and not let it cripple our national defense in this critical hour.

The country has just witnessed a tragic example when a bomber plane was turned over to a Bolivian Negro who could not pass the examination for a pilot's license in this country. The result was one of the most disastrous airplane crashes this country ever saw, in which he killed 56 of the finest Americans who ever lived, including a distinguished Member of the Congress of the United States.

I do not know who advised the President to issue this order, but I sincerely

hope that he will realize its dangers and revoke it at once, and not permit it to cripple our armed forces or to injure our program of national defense at this critical time.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME STUDY COMMITTEE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee To Investigate Crime and Criminal Conditions of the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL and Mr. JOHNSON asked and were given permission to revise and extend the remarks they expect to make today in Committee of the Whole on the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills and include extraneous matter.

EXECUTIVE ORDER OF THE PRESIDENT ABOLISHING SEGREGATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take exception to the comments which the gentleman from Mississippi made in regard to the President's executive order. I think if there ever was a time in the history of the world when we should subscribe to democratic principles and when we should forget the differences in color, the differences in race, and the differences in religion, it is today. There is no distinction in the eyes of God of any human being. We know that from the study of the Holy Scriptures. We realize that a human being, regardless of his race, his color, or his creed, is a child of God in the eyes of God. Our founding fathers made provisions that all men should be equal and have an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Certainly, as long as discrimination exists in our Nation we are not fully democratic, and as long as discrimination is extant in the most famous and leading democracy in the world, we cannot set an example to the millions of people of other races and creeds, to whom we extol the virtues of democracy and upon whom we seek to impress the fact that we do believe in the real principles of democracy. The President's executive order against race discrimination in our armed services is, in my opinion, a long overdue extension of the principle of democracy. If a colored man is worthy to serve in our armed services and offer his life in the service of his country, he is worthy of equality of treatment and the full privileges of our democracy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take exception to the remarks of the gentleman from California who preceded me. Further, I wish to interpose an objection to an order issued by the Secretary of Defense and approved by the President which abolishes segregation in the armed forces of the United States.

I believe that I can speak with some authority on this subject because I served in the armed forces for over 5 years. Following 2 years of continuous service in the south Pacific theater of war, I returned to the United States and was assigned duty at the United States Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex. In addition to my regular duties at Corpus Christi I was assigned special duty during the month of March or April 1944 as officer of the day at the station. I served in such capacity, subject only to the orders of the commanding officer of the station, from 8 o'clock in the evening until 8 o'clock in the morning. I well recall one incident which timely illustrates specifically what the results of the nonsegregation order will mean. On this particular occasion I was notified by the officer in charge of the station dispensary that three men had just been admitted and were suffering from multiple abrasions and lacerations. I was further informed that a fight was taking place near the barracks area. Upon investigation, I found approximately one hundred and fifty or two hundred men of the white and colored races in what is commonly called "a race riot or free for all." To dispel this unfortunate situation it was necessary for me to call out both the seamen guard and marine detachment assigned to the base. After due time, order was restored but not until after twenty-five to fifty men had been injured.

Proper investigation was made by the commanding officer and others responsible for the good order and discipline of the base. As a result of such investigation, it was the conclusion of all concerned that the primary cause of the altercation was the effort to impose and require compulsory integration of the two races.

The compulsory nonsegregation order will injure and endanger our national defense system and organization more than the Communist Party. It will cause an untold amount of dissension and insurrection among the ranks of our fighting men. That is true regardless of what anyone has to say about civil rights.

The racial problem is without doubt one of the greatest this country faces. However, that problem cannot be cured or solved by legislative fight or executive order or proclamation. It can only be solved by education, tolerance, understanding, religious teaching, and time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] has expired.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH, SCIENCE, AND COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Health, Science, and Commerce may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, for a number of months, dispatches from the Associated Press have reported statements appearing in newspapers of the Arab countries which indicate they are looking to the next round of their war with the Israeli. They assert that the conflict temporarily concluded was but a preliminary skirmish and that there will be no doubt of the outcome of the next engagement. The receipt of vast quantities of arms from England adds fuel to their flame and gives substance to their threat.

The situation to preserve peace in the Middle East has deteriorated steadily. The arming of the Arabs has continued at a steady pace. Apparently, Egypt has made available to other Arab nations a portion of the weapons she received from Britain. In the meantime our State Department has steadfastly looked in other directions, making no protest to England and totally ignoring the alarming developments in the Middle East.

If our aim is to preserve peace by furnishing assistance to the people of all democratic nations so they may live free from the theat of aggression by outside powers, as has been stated on many occasions by our Secretary of State, then we must use our influence before it is too late. Permitting the flow of jet planes and Sherman tanks to one of the parties to a temporary armistice rather than to both on an equal basis, is not calculated to bring an eventual peaceful and equitable adjustment of an emotional dispute, which is still far from settled. The argument by the State Department that the cold war requires the present flow of arms to the Arab countries is difficult indeed to accept without a corresponding opportunity being given to Israel to participate in the same program, particularly in view of the fact that the Israeli have already proved themselves against overwhelming odds much more accomplished in defending their land than have the aggressors.

Mr. Speaker, the time for preventive action by this Government is not after the shooting has started. It is urgent that the State Department act to check the flow of arms to the Arab countries now.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article on the case for home rule in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KENNEDY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISM

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] frequently berate the President because he says the President has not done anything about communism, and then beat his breast about Communists and tell what great things are being done in the House about communism. Frankly, the House has not done much about communism, except talk about it.

I have a bill pending before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to bar the Communist Party from using the mails to disseminate their propaganda. My colleague from Ohio [Mr. SECREST] has a bill pending to bar the Communist Party from the Federal ballot. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] would like to do something about the Communists, there is a chance for him, and those who talk so much about communism to get behind those two bills and bring them out and pass them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

LEW DESCHLER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that under the Constitution the final voice on judicial matters and the final decision of legal questions of a constitutional nature and other legal questions is the Supreme Court of the United States. We who have served in the House of Representatives, and those who have served in the past, know that the final voice in the House on parliamentary questions is the Speaker; the House, of course, really having the final voice on appeal but rarely exercising it. We are all proud of the employees of the House organization, and particularly are we proud of its unofficial supreme court on parliamentary law, if I may use that expression, the Parliamentarian of the House, Lew Deschler. Today is his birthday, and I extend to him my congratulations and the congratulations of all the other Members of the House. A fine family man, a fine husband, a fine father, a fine character, these are a few of his other qualities that endear him to us.

We are all proud to know Lew Deschler, and we are all proud of the great capacity that is his and the great contributions that he makes to the proceedings of this great body of the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I wish to join the gentleman from Massachusetts in extending felicitations to our genial Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. The longer I serve here the more I am convinced that those critics of the House of Representatives who on occasion assail us because of our so-called antiquated methods, do not really understand or comprehend the work that is done here. The rules of the House of Representatives have grown up through the years. The remarkable thing about these rules is that operating under them a body such as this, comprising 435 Members, is able to move expeditiously, wisely, and effectively in accomplishing the legislation that comes before it. I may add also that the longer I serve here the more I realize the supreme importance of the correct application of the rules of the House, for they are so all-important. As the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, it is, of course, the responsibility of the Speaker to make the rulings on questions that arise from day to day as we carry on our labors, but we also realize that back of the Speaker we find the Parliamentarian.

I have watched the work of Lew Deschler. I know from my experience here that if the rules are to be properly applied and if our work is to go forward as it should, the man who advises the Speaker must be, first of all, completely familiar with the rules and all of the precedents that go with those rules; and, furthermore, he must be a man of complete objectivity, whose decisions are never colored or flavored with personal friendship or partisanship. We have that in our Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. I wish for him many, many more years of continuing life and happiness; and, yes, may I say, service with us here in the House of Representatives. While, of course, we will never admit that any one man is indispensable, yet if any one man does approach indispensability, that man is Lew Deschler in his service here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend from Indiana.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As a Representative from the State of Ohio, I am especially appreciative of the words spoken by the gentleman from Massachusetts and by the gentleman from Indiana about a great Ohioan, Lew Deschler. The great Buckeye State has given many men to the public service and we are proud of the record that our contributions in the way of manhood and womanhood to the Nation have made to its welfare. Lew Deschler is one of the men of whom Ohio can justly be proud and the State of Ohio, not only its Representatives in the Congress but every citizen in my State, joins in felicitations to Lew Deschler on this his natal day.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Probably no man in this House has engaged in more parliamentary battles than I have since I have been a Member of this body.

I have closely followed and scrutinized the work of our distinguished Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler.

I have never known any man in that position who served better, more diligently, and more wisely than Lew Deschler. In his position he wields a tremondous power, because invariably legislation of the most vital importance turns upon a question of parliamentary procedure. I endorse all that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has said and all the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has said about Mr. Deschler, and I want to add my years of experience here in which, as I stated, I have engaged in many parliamentary battles.

I do not believe there is a finer parliamentarian on earth than Lew Deschler.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, all of these words are very nice, but, when I was chairman of the Legislative Committee, we did something about it. Our committee raised his pay.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I say that back of Lew Deschler is that faithful and that charming girl who is his wife, and also his dear mother. Everything that every Member has said on this occasion in relation to Lew Deschler is also addressed to Mrs. Deschler and to his mother.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H R 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 331, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the speakers who follow me will bring to the attention of the Committee many of the economic facts in reference to Alaska. We will try to make our arguments as brief as possible, yet present to the membership facts that we feel are pertinent and will give them information on this important subject.

A long series of hearings have been held from time to time on this matter. The hearings which you now have are not the only ones. This is the result of

many other hearings, resolutions, and endorsements over a period of years that have come to the attention of the committee, showing a gradual upward growth of this great area in fitting itself for statehood.

Shortly after the purchase of Alaska, which was criticized at that time, it was found that within a single year many, many times more than the entire purchase price found its way to the United States.

As early as August 1869 Secretary of State Seward, at Sitka, Alaska, made this statement:

> Fellow citizens of the United States, within the period of my own recollection I have seen 20 new States added to the 18 which before that time constituted the American Union, and I now see, besides Alaska, 10 territories in a forward condition of preparation for entering into the same great political family. These citizens of Sitka are the guaranties not only that Alaska has a future, but that future has already begun, first as a Territory and ultimately as a State—

Showing very clearly that the United States Government recognized at that time that the ultimate destiny of this great area was to become a member of the Sisterhood of States to which he referred at that time. Each in their turn has become a valuable member to this Union.

With reference to population: Nevada, among the States to which he refers, had less population at the time it came into the Union, and many others had considerably less population at the time they came into the Union, and many others had considerably less than has Alaska at the present time.

Nevada, when she came into the Union, had a population of 42,491. Vermont was one of the larger ones when she came into the Union with 85,000 My own State of Florida only had 72,000, less than two-thirds of the present population of Alaska. California had 92,000; that was one of the larger ones. Oregon only had 52,000. So, on a population basis Alaska has shown that she does have the population, but in addition to that, if she can secure statehood, there will be the chance for still further orderly development of that area.

Both platforms of the two major political parties definitely pledged statehood for Alaska. The President, in his address to the Congress, again reiterated that pledge at the beginning of this session.

I shall attempt to give you some of the high spots but, as I said before, I leave much of that to those who will succeed me.

Alaska's commercial ties with continental United States by the end of 1944, that is the volume of trade between these two areas since 1906, had a value of almost $4,000,000,000. Some $2,500,000 represented the value of Alaska's shipment to the United States of fish products, fish and frozen fish, canned and preserved animal products, mineral products, wood and lumber; a vast storehouse of minerals.

Oftentimes we talk about bureaucracy; oftentimes we also talk about absentee landlordism. This is one of the States which, if we will grant statehood to Alaska, will be the means whereby we will divest bureaucracy of what might be a bureaucrat's dream with those vast forests, those vast fur farms, those vast fisheries, and that sort of thing. Alaska, if not taken into the sisterhood of States, could be actually a bureaucrat's dream, and we are trying to divest that, and the Bureau and Department approves this bill.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. I think we are all fully aware of the fact that Alaska has a substantial population and has all of these resources and assets that the distinguished gentleman from Florida is setting forth here. But, what facilities are there in Alaska, along the line of roads and means of transportation, that will permit the people in the backward areas to avail themselves of the opportunity to go to the polls to vote when they have to elect their Senators and Representatives?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 77]

Abbitt	Gilmer	Murphy
Albert	Granahan	Norrell
Allen, La	Green	O'Neill
Auchincloss	Gwinn	Patten
Barrett, Pa.	Hardy	Pfeiffer,
Beall	Hart	William L.
Bennett, Fla	Havenner	Plumley
Bentsen	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Biemiller	Hedrick	Quinn
Blackney	Heffernan	Redden
Blatnik	Heller	Rich
Boggs, Del	Herter	Roosevelt
Bolton, Md	Hoffman, Ill	Sabath
Brooks	Holifield	Sadowski
Buchanan	Huber	Sasscer
Buckley, N Y	Jackson, Calif	Scott, Hardie
Bulwinkle	Jacobs	Scott,
Burdick	James	Hugh D. Jr.
Burton	Kelley, Pa	Shafer
Byrne, N Y	Kelly, N Y.	Shelley
Cannon	Keogh	Smathers
Carroll	Klein	Smith, Ohio
Cavalcante	Kunkel	Stanley
Celler	Latham	Steed
Chatham	Lichtenwalter	Stigler
Chudoff	Lyle	Taylor
Clemente	Lynch	Towe
Clevenger	McGrath	Vorys
Coudert	Mack, Ill.	Vursell
Davenport	Macy	Wadsworth
Davies, N. Y.	Marcantonio	Whitaker
Dawson	Martin, Mass.	White, Calif.
Douglas	Miles	White, Idaho
Eaton	Miller, Calif.	Widnall
Eberharter	Monroney	Wilson, Okla.
Ellsworth	Morgan	Wilson, Tex.
Engle, Calif	Morris	Withrow
Fogarty	Morrison	Woodhouse
Gavin	Moulder	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 331) and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 318 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, at the time the call came one of my colleagues had asked with reference to the people getting to the communities for the purpose of voting and the improvements in those areas. I may say that the public works bill which we passed during the last session of the present Congress will be of material assistance in their public improvements. In addition to that, if they get statehood, then they can, as many other States have, provide for farm-to-market roads and other local roads and may participate under the regular Federal highway system.

Even aside from that, under the situation we are in today, in the elections which they had they already polled a greater percentage of votes than they did in many of the States of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. How many registered voters do they have in the entire Territory?

Mr. PETERSON. I do not know the number of registered voters offhand, but about 34 percent participated in the last election, and there is about 100,000 or more population.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there anything in the hearings that would indicate how many registered voters there are in the Territory?

Mr. PETERSON. In several of the hearings, yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that there are only about 21,000 or 22,000 registered voters?

Mr. PETERSON. The Delegate from Alaska can give us exact figures. Thirty-four percent of the registered voters participated.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not talking about that; I am talking about the number of people involved. The gentleman said that the percentage is large, but I am inquiring as to the number.

Mr. PETERSON. I will yield to the Delegate from Alaska to give us the exact number of votes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Twenty-two thousand people voted in the last election.

Mr. COOLEY. Twenty-two thousand in the whole Territory.

Mr. BARTLETT. Which is, of course, larger than the votes in several of the congressional districts.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the percentage of natives of the total population?

Mr. BARTLETT. About one-third.

Mr. PETERSON. That is in the hearings.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman know how many Federal employees are now employed in Alaska?

Mr. PETERSON. I do not have it offhand, but it was in some of the hearings.

Mr. COOLEY. About 20,000, is it not?

Mr. PETERSON. It varies from time to time as certain activities there increase.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not about 20,000?

Mr. BARTLETT. The number of civil-service employees last year was somewhere between four and five thousand. There were, of course, other employees on defense projects.

Mr. PETERSON. That does not include the armed services.

Mr. COOLEY. One-fourth of the population of Alaska is on the Federal pay roll at the present time.

Mr. PETERSON. If we get statehood, we can change the picture; we can divest ourselves of bureaucratic control. I am not criticizing control as such, but if we can give them statehood instead of trying to administer it here by Federal employees, the picture will change.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman one additional question. How can the people of Alaska make more progress as a State than they are now making as a Territory?

Mr. PETERSON. History shows that every Territory, after it acquired statehood, made progress thereafter. Alaska today has a very good economic showing; a better economic showing than one-fourth of the States of the Union when they came into statehood.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, that is just a hope. In other words, the gentleman's committee hopes that by virtue of being a State the people will be attracted to Alaska who are not now attracted.

Mr. PETERSON. History shows that that is the case. History shows that that is the situation, and local government can work and develop much further than you can by having it administered from Washington.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that no single instance that he has cited is comparable with the situation that we are now dealing with. We are dealing with a Territory that is twice the size of the great State of Texas, with a population spread over a vast area clear beyond the Arctic Circle.

Mr. PETERSON. Yes, but at the time other States came into the Union their populations were scattered, too.

Mr. COOLEY. But you did not have such a wide area and you did not have any such terrific variety of climate as we are now dealing with.

Mr. PETERSON. Well, there is some very good climate in this area.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina if he is contending that during the past two decades the people of this country have lost all spirit of adventure, all spirit of initiative, all spirit of enterprise, and that they will no longer go to a vast empire like Alaska because they are afraid to go there, when he ought to know that Alaska has what is known as a Banana Belt where the climate is as acceptable to the people as Seattle, Wash.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman does not know any such thing.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The gentleman knows I have been very friendly toward Alaska and very much interested in Alaska.

Mr. PETERSON. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. My information has been that there are about 90,000 people in Alaska.

Mr. PETERSON. We estimate about 100,000. It is estimated from 95,000 to 105,000.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. There are about 20,000 Government employees and 40,000 Indians, and they are very high-type Indians and Eskimos. The other 30,000 are whites. That is about right; is it not?

Mr. PETERSON. They are different figures from what we had. We do not have that many Federal employees.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Less than 100,000 altogether. I cannot reconcile myself to give two United States Senators and a Congressman and three electoral votes to a group of people who have less than one-third of the population of my own district, although I am for Alaska and I want to help Alaska if I can.

Mr. PETERSON. I represent a large district, but history would show that Alaska has a population greater than 12 of the States when they came into the Union.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us see if we cannot straighten this out. Who is there on this floor that is contending that Federal employees who have their voting rights in the continental United States go to Alaska and vote in the elections to which the Delegate has referred? Let me ask the Delegate from Alaska, who did the voting up there?

Mr. BARTLETT. The permanent residents of Alaska, in a number we estimate at about 100,000, not these seasonal workers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They own property there and live there?

Mr. BARTLETT. Alaska is their home.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am really surprised that the gentleman from Michigan, who is on the Committee on Appropriations, with all the detailed study he has made of Alaska, made the argument he did.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman if it is a fact or not a fact that Federal employees in the Territory are allowed to vote and do vote there?

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course, if they live there all the time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope you will all give me very close attention, because I believe I can answer some of the questions that have been raised here in this debate.

I have a very high regard for the Delegate from Alaska, but I have a greater regard for the welfare of the United States of America and for my people in California. I think the passage of this bill would be the greatest distortion of representative government we have ever had in America.

The last speaker mentioned the fact that 12 States of the Union came in with populations less than Alaska now has, and that is true. However, the ratio of the population of Alaska to the total population is 1 to 1,582. The ratio of Florida, for instance, one of the States the chairman mentioned, and also his home State, at the time it came into the Union, was 1 to 264. All those States had a far greater ratio of their population to the total population, so the argument that 12 other States came in with a smaller population does not have the slightest validity. It points up graphically one weakness in Alaska's plea for statehood. Over half the States when they came into the Union had less than 25 percent of the divergence in population ratio that we have in Alaska today.

Just think what this means for a moment. In my State last year we cast over 4,000,000 votes. In Alaska they cast 22,309. Two Senators from that State could nullify the votes of two Senators from our State, who were sent here by over 4,000,000 voters. In a treaty fight, which might be vital to the security of the United States, two Senators from this new State, very small in population, could nullify the votes of Senators representing 10,000,000 voters in California and 15,000,000 in New York, or 25,000,000 altogether. Here are some facts and figures, which the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress prepared at my request that graphically illustrate the argument I have made and will make in opposition to this bill. They should convince any biased person that statehood for Alaska is absolutely impractical now as the Territory is not yet ready for it.

ALASKA: SELECTED DATA CONCERNING POPULATION, ASSESSABLE PROPERTY, PROBLEMS OF STATEHOOD

I. COMPARISON OF ALASKAN POPULATION AND VOTING WITH SELECTED STATES

State	Population (1949 estimate)	Times greater than Alaskan population	Vote cast for President in 1948	Times greater than Alaskan vote for Delegate
New York	14,392,000	153.1	6,111,580	273.9
California	10,665,000	113.5	4,081,538	180.7
Pennsylvania	10,633,000	113.1	3,735,087	167.4
Illinois	8,449,000	89.9	3,984,046	178.6
Ohio	7,989,000	85.0	2,936,071	131.6
Texas	7,522,000	80.1	1,147,245	51.4
Washington	2,582,000	27.5	878,875	39.4
Florida	2,494,000	26.5	578,358	25.9
Oklahoma	2,302,000	24.5	721,599	32.3
Maryland	2,175,000	23.1	596,748	26.7
Mississippi	2,130,000	22.7	192,190	8.6
Connecticut	2,019,000	21.5	883,518	39.6
New Hampshire	544,000	5.8	231,440	10.4
Montana	521,000	5.5	219,051	9.8
Vermont	369,000	3.9	123,382	5.5
Delaware	311,000	3.3	139,073	6.2
Wyoming	284,000	3.0	101,425	4.5
Nevada	174,000	1.9	62,117	2.8

II. VALUE OF ASSESSABLE PROPERTY IN ALASKA

Municipalities in Alaska are permitted to levy a 3 percent property tax. According to the 1948 Annual Report of the Governor of Alaska, Alaska had 26 incorporated towns whose assessed valuation totaled $91,611,126, an increase of $19,491,881 over 1947. Moody's

1950 Governments and Municipals gives the following figures for Alaska:

Assessed value

Unit	All property	Real	Year	Basis
Anchorage independent school district	$38,751,545		1949–50	Pct 55
Fairbanks	16,060,624		1949	80
Fairbanks school district	22,082,560		1948 [1]	
Juneau	12,931,575	$12,191,914	1948	100
Ketchikan	15,191,635	11,023,240	1947	75
Petersburg	1,440,000		1944	100
Sitka	2,751,525		1949	100
	110,109,464			

[1] Jan 1.

A general property tax was passed by the territorial legislature during its 1949 session. A complete valuation has not yet been made on the basis of this new tax. Estimates, however, place the valuation of property outside municipalities at approximately $150,000,000 and for municipalities at $105,000,000

III

A. Population data concerning States having same or less population than Alaska at date of admission

State	Year of admission	Population at admission [1]	Total United States population [2]	Ratio of State to National population
Delaware	1787	59,096	3,929,214	1.66
Georgia	1788	82,548	3,929,214	1.47
Rhode Island	1790	68,825	3,929,214	1 57
Vermont	1791	85,425	3,929,214	1 46
Kentucky	1792	73,677	3,929,214	1 53
Tennessee	1796	105,602	5,308,483	1 50
Ohio	1803	45,365	5,308,483	1 117
Louisiana	1812	76,556	7,239,881	1 94
Indiana	1816	63,897	9,638,453	1 150
Mississippi	1817	75,448	9,638,453	1 127
Illinois	1818	55,211	9,638,453	1 174
Missouri	1821	66,586	9,638,453	1 144
Arkansas	1836	97,574	17,069,453	1 174
Florida	1845	87,445	24,191,876	1·265
California	1850	92,597	23,191,876	1 250
Oregon	1859	52,465	31,443,321	1 590
Nevada	1864	42,491	35,558,371	1 836
Nebraska	1865	188,530	[3]35,700,678	1·493
Wyoming	1890	62,555	62,947,714	1 1006
Idaho	1890	88,548	62,947,714	1 710
Alaska		94,000	148,720,000	1 1582

[1] Closest census year, except in the case of Indiana and Nebraska which are approximate figures at dates of admission. First Annual Report of the Indiana Department of Statistics and Geology, 1879, and the Congressional Globe, Dec 14, 1866

[2] Closest census year, except for Nebraska which is estimated continental population figure for 1865, taken from Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1948, p 9

B. Population increases of selected States for 10-year period before admission, in comparison with Alaskan gain, 1940–49

State	Year admitted	Population		Percent gain
Arkansas	1836	(1820) 14,273	(1830) 30,388	113
Indiana	1816	(1800) 5,641	(1810) 24,520	335
Maine	1820	(1810) 228,705	(1820) 298,335	30
Arizona	1912	(1900) 122,931	(1910) 204,354	66
Utah	1896	(1880) 143,963	(1890) 210,779	46
Alaska		(1940) 72,524	(1949) 94,000	30

C. Lands under Federal jurisdiction

State or Territory	Total area [1]	Total area under Federal jurisdiction [2]	Percent
	Acres	Acres	
Alaska	365,481,600	[4] 365,000,000	99
Alabama	32,689,920	1,099,722	3
Arizona	72,691,200	50,471,090	69
Arkansas	33,744,000	3,031,431	9

See footnotes at end of table.

C. Lands under Federal jurisdiction—Con.

State or Territory	Total area [1]	Total area under Federal jurisdiction [2]	Per cent
	Acres	Acres	
California	100,453,920	45,900,157	46
Colorado	66,536,880	24,551,005	37
Connecticut	3,135,360	15,714	(4)
Delaware	1,265,920	40,603	3
Florida	31,727,680	2,851,207	8
Georgia	37,451,520	1,831,193	5
Idaho	52,997,120	34,285,600	65
Illinois	35,806,080	448,992	1
Indiana	23,171,200	336,952	1
Iowa	35,831,040	105,310	(4)
Kansas	52,552,320	324,118	(4)
Kentucky	25,669,760	946,131	4
Louisiana	28,913,280	1,053,161	4
Maine	19,865,600	143 131	(4)
Maryland	6,327,680	229,392	4
Massachusetts	5,060,480	52,671	1
Michigan	36,494,080	2,709,428	7
Minnesota	51,205,760	3,819,665	7
Mississippi	30,348,800	1,484,713	5
Missouri	44,332,800	1,641,502	4
Montana	93,042,240	34,213,875	37
Nebraska	49,057,920	735,224	1
Nevada	70,273,280	59,526,950	85
New Hampshire	5,775,360	682,600	12
New Jersey	4,814,080	96,462	2
New Mexico	77,767,040	35,479,713	46
New York	30,674,560	358,214	(4)
North Carolina	31,450,880	1,027,562	6
North Dakota	44,854,560	2,651,898	6
Ohio	26,318,080	259,156	1
Oklahoma	44,341,120	3,891,209	9
Oregon	61,664,000	32,510,870	53
Pennsylvania	28,828,800	590,522	2
Rhode Island	677,120	18,917	3
South Carolina	19,580,160	912,702	5
South Dakota	48,983,040	8,610,766	18
Tennessee	26,855,040	1,646,281	6
Texas	168,732,160	2,246,572	1
Utah	52,701,440	37,502,044	71
Vermont	5,937,920	694,184	12
Virginia	25,535,360	2,078,615	8
Washington	42,865,280	14,998,067	35
West Virginia	15,417,600	1,289,062	8
Wisconsin	35,017,600	2,214,003	6
Wyoming	62,403,840	32,207,086	52

[1] Figures from Statistical Abstract of the United States 1948, p. 160

[2] Figures for State compiled by John Jackson, Legislative Reference Service, October 1949

[3] Estimate given by Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior

[4] Less than 1 percent

D Comments on problems presented by Alaskan statehood

Congressional Digest, volume 26, No. 11, November 1947

"But the question of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska today is somewhat different from the situations which faced Congress in respect to admission of the existing States.

"Here, for the first time, Congress is faced with two entirely new facts of the problem.

"One of these is the matter of distance and contiguity. As the history of the formation of the United States will show every new State that has been added to the Union has been located in such a manner that it borders upon existing States or existing Territories of the United States at the time of its admission. But between Hawaii and the nearest point of United States mainland lie 2,400 miles of Pacific Ocean. And between Alaska and the United States lie 870 miles of Canadian land.

"The second point involves a racial question. The populations of existing States, at the time of their admission to the Union, were made up largely of third-, fourth-, or fifth-generation Americans plus some American Indians and Caucasion immigrants from Europe, whose characteristics and background were well known and understood. Both Hawaii and Alaska present populations that are decidedly racial mixtures. Hawaii's people are one-third Japanese, one-third native, and one-third Caucasian; Alaska's people are about half Caucasian and half Eskimo or Indian.

"These conditions are the source of considerable speculation as to the wisdom of bringing the two Territories into the Union. And as pointed out, the problems they pose to Congress are unique."

Hearings before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Possessions of the Committee on Public Lands, House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, first session, pursuant to House Resolution 93:

Testimony of Mr. W. C. Arnold, managing director of the Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., page 155 and following: "I do not think that this Territory can develop until some stable transportation system is effected where goods can move into and out of this Territory on a stable basis at a reasonable rate. We do not have such a system now and I fail to see how the Territory can develop, how it can arrive at a status where statehood would be desirable, until that problem can be solved. * * *

* * * * *

"There has been much said about the ability of the Territory to support statehood. I make no particular comment upon that, but to judge by the past, and the past demonstrates conclusively that whether the people are able to support statehood or not, they certainly are not willing to support it, because they have not been willing to support the Territorial institutions either and have not contributed anything of consequence by way of taxation themselves but have been content to have the revenue such as could be extracted from the nonresident sources."

Eighty-first Congress, first session, House of Representatives, Report No. 255, to accompany H R 331, providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union: "The chief argument of those opposed to statehood now was that Alaska could not support the cost of statehood. This cost, over and above what Alaska now pays for its Territorial government, was estimated at $1,645,000 by the proponents of statehood, and at $5,857,500 by the opponents. Among the additional expenses which Alaska would have to bear are the salaries of the Governor and the Secretary of Alaska, all, instead of part of, the cost of the legislature, the State court system, the fishery administration, and the care of the insane."

Annual report of the Governor of Alaska, 1947, page 1: "At the first referendum ever devoted in the Territory to the question of statehood, the people voted in favor of it by 9,630 to 6,822. This referendum had been provided by the seventeenth Territorial legislature meeting in the late winter of 1945, to take place at the following general election on October 8, 1946. The 1946, as well as the 1947, legislature, likewise passed memorials to Congress asking for statehood. The more populous divisions, the first and third, gave substantial majorities, the first by 3,872 for to 1,953 against; the third by 3,427 for to 2,257 against. The two northern divisions, however, which together cast less than one-third of the total vote in the Territory, reported slight majorities against statehood, the second by 191 votes, the fourth by 90 votes. However, both their principal cities, Nome and Fairbanks, voted for statehood."

Those are the things we have to think about when we think about the situation in Alaska.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it the gentleman's argument, then, that small States like Nevada and other such States with small population should withdraw from the Union?

Mr. JOHNSON. Not at all, sir.

Mr. ANGELL. They are in identically the same position as Alaska.

Mr. JOHNSON. No; the situation is not the same. I am confident when the Constitution was drawn, giving equality

of representation in the Senate, the founding fathers never had in mind that there would be such a wide divergence in the population of the various States. It is true that Nevada has only 1.2 percent of the population of California. I am not criticizing that situation. The situation is there, but I do not want to carry that principle still further, and further distort the situation as it would be in the upper Chamber, if Alaska, with its 22,309 voters, were admitted.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it contemplated within a short period of time, I do not know how long a time, after this bill becomes law—if it does become law—the membership of the House will revert to its present number, that is 435, and that such representation as is given to Alaska in the House will be taken from some State within the continental limits of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSON. That would have to happen in the nature of things, unless the membership of the House was increased.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course, it would.

Mr. JOHNSON. There would have to be a reapportionment, unless some other provision were made for this new Member. There will be a reapportionment in 1950 by virtue of a law now on the books.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In other words, some Member of the House of Representatives is going to be retired as the result of this legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON. That may be true.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, I want to point out that the history has been that every time a new State was admitted to the Union, an increase was made in the number of Representatives. Today we have 435 Members and 2 Delegates. The Delegates do not vote, but they get the same emoluments. It is contemplated, therefore, in the Eighty-second Congress that they can take care of that situation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Under the 1950 census the State of Pennsylvania will lose one seat, and perhaps two. Can the gentleman assure us that the two seats which will be given to Hawaii or Alaska will not come from the Pennsylvania representation?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not know where they will come from. They will come from somewhere, but I do not know just where.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the first statement that I want to make on this bill is that I personally am not so selfish and so anxious to stay in the House of Representatives as a Member, that I would deny citizens of the United States their constitutional rights. If I ever get to the point where I am in that frame of mind, I hope that my people will take me from this body forever and keep me out of it.

Did our forefathers take the position that our minority groups should not be permitted to come into the Union as a State? If they did, then why were the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska incorporated into the Union by previous Congresses when we know that having been incorporated as Territories they might eventually become States of the Union?

I wish some bright, brilliant mind would answer that question, if the argument is going to be made that these minority people are not entitled to statehood.

Thirdly, I point this out. The two Senators from the State I have the honor to represent can neutralize the votes of the two Senators from any other State in the other body, and you do not need to make the argument that only the two Senators from Alaska or the two Senators from Hawaii can neutralize the votes of the two Senators of other States.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman will recall that Senator Borah, from the little State of Idaho, exercised perhaps more influence in the Congress of the United States than any other one man down through the years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, and perhaps more than any other 15 men.

Here is a proposition. Some people may criticize me from my State for saying this, but suppose my State becomes extremely radical and suppose we elect two Senators who are as far to the left as men could go. What are you going to do about it? Why, you will let them sit in the other body. That is exactly what you would do about it. With the kind of bloc voting that we have in this country today such might be possible. Such a representation from any State could do as much damage in the other body as any other group could do if they were elected from the Territory of Hawaii or Alaska. We are supposed to be fairly literate. I am going to try to follow logical reasoning. If I cannot win on that basis, I will take my medicine in defeat.

You have really got two bills before you. You have got the Alaskan statehood bill and you have got the Hawaiian statehood bill. These two areas, the Territory of Alaska and the Territory of Hawaii, are two pivot areas in the defense of the whole world, outside of Russia.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not now. These are pivot points. Who is to be attacked first, according to the present philosophy? Those two areas. Those are the first points to be attacked, and those were the two points attacked by Japan in December of 1941; and they took this one, Hawaii, and destroyed practically everything we had there. Today, if we can accept the statement of our chiefs of staff, and other responsible men, what have you got up here in Alaska to prevent Russia from coming down to 26 miles in Alaska and setting down her ducks and using that whole area against us.

These are key points, key areas, in our cold war against communism. As Territories they are weak. As States they would be strong. Japan struck at both Territories in World War II. Hawaii and Alaska are prime targets under the American flag. Statehood would vastly strengthen America's position in the economic conflict now being waged by Russia throughout the Pacific. If we have any chance of survival on earth, the National Defense Committee of this body ought to know that here in Alaska and Hawaii is your vital area.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not now.

Since 1945 we have pushed billions of dollars over here in western Europe. We have neglected that area. We have let the Far East slide into oblivion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself seven additional minutes.

Nobody knows what we can do or what we are likely to do.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I think the distinguished gentleman has touched upon something that is the crux of this situation, and that is the strategic position that Alaska plays in this picture, from a military standpoint. My question is this: Is it the opinion of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that Alaska is of more benefit to us, from a military standpoint, as a State than it is now as a Territory?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Emphatically so. I have personally held hearings all over this Territory, in most every community of importance. I have studied the Territory and restudied it. I am not kidding about this situation. If it were within my power, I would make Alaska a State before the sun sets tonight. Those people up there are financially able to finance a budget for a State.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. You do not know about the banana belt down in this panhandle of Alaska.

Mr. COOLEY. I have been in the banana belt, if there is one there.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then the gentleman should not have made the statement he did about the rigorous climate in Alaska. There is a rigorous climate in Alaska, and there is one in Michigan, and there is one in North Dakota, but there is some very mild climate area in the Territory of Alaska, and that is where we ought to be settling; we ought to be homesteading there.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have been studying security problems for 8 years, and in my opinion the defense of States or Territories is a national problem, and a State government will have no effect on it whatever.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, wait a minute. The State of Michigan contributes to

national defense, and so does the State of Pennsylvania, and the State of California, and the State of New York, and of all men in this House who should be for statehood for Alaska, it is the delegation from California Any man who has studied national defense ought to know that

Mr. CANFIELD. First, I wish to compliment the gentleman for supporting the Republican national platform plank on statehood for Alaska.

Did not the late Billy Mitchell say that the nation that controlled Alaska by air controlled the world?

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is no doubt about that at all.

Mr KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE I am interested, in view of the extensive knowledge of the gentleman from Michigan with respect to this subject, for him to tell the House specifically why statehood for Alaska would better provide for the national defense than to have it operated as it is presently operating as a Territory.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me answer the gentleman categorically. At the present time this Alaska area is without a spokesman in the other body and is without a voting spokesman in this body. That is No. 1.

No. 2: This area, the Territory of Alaska, is under what we would term monopolistic control from the standpoint of transportation and communication.

No. 3: Until these barriers are removed, who with sagacious business judgment is going to put his private funds into this Alaskan territory to develop it in the absence of statehood? I say that because Mr. Harry Bridges and his gang can at any time they please, cut off the transportation of goods. As an illustration of the necessity for transportation let me repeat a conversation I had with a lady in Fairbanks. She was pushing a baby buggy with a child in it. I asked her what the baby buggy cost. She said it cost $29. That was the catalog price. "What was the freight?" She answered: "$39." Who wants to go to Alaska other than those who have an extreme desire for adventure? Why? Because there is no representation in the House and in the Senate that can vote to defend these people against the present monopolistic powers that are primarily oppressing this area. I refer particularly to the commercial fisheries and the big ship operators. They have a very specific interest in opposing this bill.

Why did we convert our western territory into States? Because we wanted to give them strength, to unite them, and to obtain the benefits which flow from ties of transportation, communication, manufacture of goods, the production of raw primary goods, and the movement and trade of those goods in between. Why have a United States? Why did you now discuss a United States of Europe? Why did you just discuss and sanction a United States of Indonesia? Why do you want to tie them together? You want to tie them together for strength. Anybody who ever studied the old McGuffey's Reader and Speller ought to know that if you take six boys, or six States, or six sticks and tie them together, you strengthen all.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Who owns and operates the Alaska Railroad at the present time?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Alaska Railroad does not run from Seattle to Alaska.

Mr. COOLEY. I asked who owns it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It runs within Alaska, and it is no good unless material comes from the south to carry over it. The United States owns it, of course.

Mr. COOLEY. And operates it now?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why, sure.

Mr. COOLEY. Under the Interior Department?

Mr. CRAWFORD Certainly.

Mr. COOLEY. If we should turn that railroad over to Alaska now they could not run it for 24 hours.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly, because what they need up there is highways and air transportation to get to the land.

Mr. COOLEY. And the gentleman says they do not need any railroad?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The railroad would be an imposition upon them if they had to finance it. I have discussed this with people all over Alaska. The railroad is a strictly national defense asset and must be financed by the Federal Government.

Mr. COOLEY. Do I understand the gentleman to say that we do not need it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. As one interested in national defense the gentleman should know the paramount need of the Alaskan people is for air and highway transportation. The railroad is for national benefit and defense.

Mr. COOLEY. It is being operated by the Government of the United States at the present time, but the gentleman advocates its abandonment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do nothing of the kind.

Mr. COOLEY. Those were the gentleman's words.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I advocate nothing of the kind, not at all; the gentleman is not going to put those words in my mouth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY].

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, this is an important piece of legislation; in my opinion, it is the most important single piece of legislation that has come before the House at this session. This measure is unlike other bills. If we make an error in passing the ordinary type of bill we can correct the error; we can amend it, or we can repeal it. But we are entering now into a contractual relationship between the Territory of Alaska and the United States of America, and it is binding. Someone brought up the point a while ago about one of our Western States that has approximately 90,000 people and it is a part of the Union There is no way I know of, whereby we could, even if we wanted to, change that status.

Before we go further we must be sure of the steps we are taking. Coming from the great State of New York, I cannot consent to watering down the voting representation of the people of that State. Alaska has approximately 90,000 people. When we speak of admission of Alaska we have a double package. If we admit Alaska, we must also admit the Hawaiian Islands. There will be four additional United States Senators, not two, but four, additional United States Senators.

Just to get down to figures for a moment, we in New York State have approximately 16,000,000 people. Alaska has 90,000, which means that in the United States Senate, the people in Alaska will have nearly 200 times as much representation as the people who come from my district and every other district in the great State of New York. Speaking of my own congressional district, the Alaskans will have four times the representation in this House as the people who reside in my district.

Mr. JOHNSON. The ratio in New York is 273.9. In other words, one voter in Alaska will have 273.9 times as much power as the individual voter in the gentleman's district.

Mr. DELANEY. I thank the gentleman. If we admit Alaska, we admit Hawaii. We must admit also every other Territory or every other possession that we have which seeks admission. We have Puerto Rico in the Caribbean area. Upon application we must admit Puerto Rico. We also have the Virgin Islands and the very committee which reports this bill has asked that they have a Representative sit here in the Congress with the same rights as every Member except the right to vote.

I say if you admit Alaska the people in the Virgin Islands just as much citizens of the United States as those people who are in Alaska and upon application and qualification must be admitted to statehood.

What is the test? The test has never been population, wealth, or the number of people. It has merely been the ability of the applicant area to govern itself. I think it has been demonstrated to us that the people of the Virgin Islands are capable of governing themselves. In the 1940 census the people of those islands numbered just a few less than 25,000. Do you realize how disproportionate the representation would then be?

There is one State—Texas—that made a reservation 105 years ago. When Texas came into the Union it reserved the right to itself to divide into four additional States. I say if this representation is as disproportionate as it would be under the circumstances of admitting these various areas into the Union, Texas would assert its rights and divide into five States. We would have North Texas, South Texas, Central Texas, East and West Texas. Texas would have 10 Members in the Senate instead of the 2 it now has.

Mr. Chairman, I say in all sincerity this is something we must at this time guard against.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

Upon what ground does the gentleman make the statement that the Virgin Islands can apply for statehood or that Puerto Rico can apply for statehood?

Mr. DELANEY. There is no restriction under article IV of the Constitution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not talking about article IV of the Constitution.

Mr. DELANEY. The gentleman asked me a question. I will answer him.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am talking about the fact that the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska were incorporated into the Union. The gentleman knows good and well those other two areas were not so incorporated.

Mr. DELANEY. That is not necessary. You can come into this Union without that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I ask the gentleman to submit a brief and put it in the RECORD, and if he is correct, I will make an apology. I have studied this question for 15 years, going on 16, on this one committee, and I defy the gentleman to sustain his argument.

Mr. DELANEY. I would advise the gentleman to study the question just a little bit more and maybe he will understand it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will take the word of the experts who have lived with it down through the territorial history.

Mr. DELANEY. If the gentleman is desirous of obtaining information, let me read to him just what the Constitution of the United States says, and what the method is.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Go ahead and read it.

Mr. DELANEY. The gentleman asked the question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Go ahead and read it. I am yielding the gentleman time.

Mr. DELANEY. Article IV, section 3, of the Constitution of the United States, provides:

> New States may be admitted by the Congress into the Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

Let me point out to the gentleman——

Mr. CRAWFORD. I decline to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes. Here is the proposition the gentleman lays down.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Michigan yielded to the gentleman from New York and took his seat, and he has no right to take the gentleman off his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan had expired, and he yielded himself two additional minutes.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DELANEY. I was recognized for two additional minutes for the purpose of being interrogated by the gentleman from Michigan; I therefore have the time. I yielded to the gentleman for a question and that question was answered, and I have the remainder of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The 2 minutes that the gentleman refers to have expired. The gentleman from Michigan yielded himself two additional minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States does have the power. The Congress of the United States exercised that power in making agreements between the Territory of Hawaii and the Territory of Alaska. The Congress did not exercise such power in connection with the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. I assume that the people of this country, acting through the Congress, have the power to take in the 20 republics to the south of us and make States out of them, if we desire to do so. I would assume that the Congress of the United States, through its people, by amendment to the Constitution or otherwise, could take in the 3,000,000 ocean mile area that now constitutes the trust territory delegated to this country by the trust agreement of the United Nations and take in all those islands as separate States if we desired to do so. I would assume that the Congress of the United States and its people, under our Constitution, could take in American Samoa and make it a State of the Union, and American Guam, and make it a State of the Union, and so on ad infinitum, and when the proposition is put before the Congress it will act on those things. But, why submit the specious argument here today that as the situation now stands, the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico could come in as States. Of course, that does not hold.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, according to the explanation made by the gentleman from Michigan, here is the situation. A long historic basis shows this, that when we contemplate statehood we first take them in as an incorporated Territory and then look forward to the time when they can live up to statehood. In Alaska that was done. It became an incorporated Territory.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell us how many years that has been on trial and how many years Hawaii has been on trial building themselves up to the position of statehood?

Mr. PETERSON. They have been on trial since the admission of the Territory. Hawaii since 1900, Alaska since 1912. But, the promise was made prior to that time. The promise was implied in the treaty that they could get all of the rights of citizenship. Very shortly after that Mr. Seward went to Alaska and spoke to them and virtually promised them territoryship and statehood, and we have made a distinction between incorporated Territories and unincorporated Territories. Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the other areas in their organic acts and some of the organic acts that are now being prepared are treated entirely differently. Hawaii came in by reason of a resolution which recited the ties between the United States and Hawaii. Hawaii was a sovereign nation, a republic, at that time. It was virtually the same procedure that was used with reference to the Republic of Texas. That is to show that historically we have treated them first as Territories and then as States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, much as I dislike to, I find myself in disagreement with the arguments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], but I subscribe wholeheartedly to the arguments advanced by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. I think that if we subscribe to the arguments advanced by the gentleman from New York we would disregard precedent and history. If our predecessors in this body had subscribed to such arguments, the western boundary of this great country of ours would not have extended beyond the Mississippi River. We must remember that many great States in the Union, stars represented in that blue field up there, would not have been admitted to the Union if we had subscribed to the kind of arguments made here a short time ago by the gentleman from New York.

Under the conditions laid down by the gentleman, my own great State of Illinois would not have been admitted to statehood back in 1818. I have read the debate in Congress on the question of admission of Illinois. The opponents talked then as the opponents of Alaska's statehood talk today. Fortunately their arguments did not prevail. You may say that in time Illinois would have been admitted anyway—but how can we be certain it would have. Had the opponents of statehood of the many States which have been admitted to the Union subsequent to the founding of our Nation by the original 13 been in majority we might well have a dozen or more independent nations where today we have one nation united. Our predecessors showed great wisdom in rejecting negative arguments in the cases of Illinois and the others and I predict the judgment of the House membership will be just as sound here this afternoon.

The granting of territorial status to Alaska more than 80 years ago carried with it a guaranty that someday this area would be admitted into the Union. Its people are entitled to full status of American citizenship. They must be

growing impatient in their present position as wards of the Nation. They cannot be expected to endure such a status much longer. They have served the necessary period of tutelage. We could not blame them if they became tired of being half citizens and demanded statehood or independence.

Now, in effect, they are living under circumstances strongly reminiscent of those which compelled our forefathers to revolt against British rule. Subject to all Federal taxes imposed generally, they have no right to express an effective voice in the making of the tax or other laws.

For these reasons I favor statehood for Alaska, but there is to me an even greater reason why I will vote to admit Alaska to the Union, and that is because the history of the United States shows that real development of an area has started only when Territorial status was changed to statehood.

Yes, and for selfish reasons as an American, I want this great Territory as a State of the Union. It abounds in untold natural resources. I want these preserved for the United States. You say we can preserve them as well by holding Alaska as a Territory. I refer you back to my previous remarks; people grow impatient as second-class citizens and they are prone to do something about it in time. It would be far better to grant statehood now than to ferment a condition that would lead to a demand for independence that could embarrass the United States in the family of nations. The Alaskans make no such threat—have not even advanced a hint in that direction—but we may very well be creating such a hazard by rejecting this measure today.

Since statehood will accelerate the development of the area, it is of the utmost importance from a military standpoint. Recently the commanding general of the Alaskan Department stated that military defense of Alaska could not be effective unless there is a growth in the civilian population and civilian industry. Statehood would aid materially in bringing this about.

Alaska has a population of about 100,000 today, exceeding the population of 12 States at the time of their admission into the Union. Few States can match her in resources. Her tremendous resources have barely been touched. Her timber, minerals, and her water power have not been tapped. All these things make her a necessary factor in the defense of the United States.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE].

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, I have learned today that some of my colleagues believe that if one comes from a small population he may be a crook or unpatriotic; but that if he comes from the big, populous centers and the big States of the Union, that carry the big club, he is the only patriotic one. I am amazed.

Someone said there is one State in the Union that has 90,000 population. My colleague must refer, of course, to Nevada. I think in the 1940 census Nevada had a population of 105,000. We can expect, of course, that that will be greatly increased by the thousands by 1950.

If you had not admitted Nevada, what in the world would you have done over the past 100 years without the great wealth poured into this country out of Virginia City and all of the rest of the gold, silver, lead, zinc, and copper camps of that small-populated State of Nevada?

I happen to come from the small State of Utah. We had a population in 1940 of 500,000, I believe. I think we shall go to almost 1,000,000 in this next census. What would you do without all the copper that comes from the richest copper camp in the world, that is in the State of Utah?

I just do not like to find that because we belong to the smaller States and the smaller groups we cannot be patriotic. Who am I to say that the people who would be elected as Senators and Representatives from Alaska or Hawaii would not give us as good representation as I give and as any of you give?

I would be the last one to say Alaska would fail to send to this Congress qualified and patriotic delegates.

Alaska needs and wants statehood, but that is not the only reason for my support of the enabling legislation. Statehood for Alaska will be of immeasurable value to the United States as a whole.

Alaska's resources are tremendous, and as yet relatively undeveloped. The Territory's riches of furs, timber, fisheries, water-power potential, as well as gold and possibly oil, provide the States with a vast and much-needed reserve. New methods of processing and packing fish are being developed. There is a potentially enormous newsprint and paper supply, as well as lumber for construction purposes. Hydroelectric power has not been tapped. The soil and climate offer possibilities for experimentation with new fruits and vegetable species. It is essential that private enterprise be encouraged and enabled to develop these resources in the interests of the Nation, and it is a prerequisite to private investments that the settlement of the Territory be facilitated. Since the war, Alaska's population has rapidly increased, as ex-servicemen who found during their wartime tours of duty in Alaska that the Territory had much to offer, are returning there with their families. But it cannot be expected that the privileges enjoyed in the States will be lightly relinquished in exchange for the undoubted pioneer way of life in Alaska. It cannot be expected that the population of Alaska will reach its peak unless statehood is granted. There has frequently been advanced as an argument against statehood that there are not enough people in the Territory. The answer is that almost half of the States were permitted to enter the Union with smaller populations than Alaska has now. Moreover, experience has shown that very soon after admission into the Union, the populations of the former Territories increased rapidly. Alaska is our last frontier, and every possible encouragement must be given to its development. We must also consider the importance to the Nation of a strong Alaska, well-defended, and closely linked to the United States. The military and the Governor of Alaska have in recent weeks called our attention anew to the strategic importance of Alaska to our defense plans, citing the fact that Siberia may be viewed with the naked eye from Alaska, that Alaska was the only portion of the American Continent to be invaded during the last war, that it is the only part of the continent which reaches into the Eastern Hemisphere, and that its Pacific coast line is longer than that of the three Pacific coast States, and that it lies on the great circle route to the Orient. Because Alaska was not fully developed and well populated at the time of the last war, we spent for defense purposes alone about 25 times the amount originally paid for the Territory.

I therefore urge the enactment of enabling legislation for Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Utah has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOSONE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentlewoman from Utah will agree with me in this statement that if these Territories became States, both Alaska and Hawaii could protect the interests of their citizens and their economic operations to a greater degree than they can now or were able to during the recent strangling strikes on both Territories.

Mrs. BOSONE Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do you also agree that statehood for these two areas is as important to the United States as it is to those Territories?

Mrs. BOSONE Absolutely.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And that these two Territories play a crucial role in our national destiny, in that they are our western bastions of defense, and that they represent to the peoples of Asia, the Orient, and the Pacific one example of unity and equality among free, great racial groups; whereas we are spending billions of dollars to convince the world that we are for the little people, these two Territories give a first-class example of Jeffersonian doctrine.

Mrs. BOSONE. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan entirely.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOSONE. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. How can we justify statehood for a few thousand of Alaskan people while denying the right of franchise to the hundreds of thousands in the District of Columbia?

Mrs. BOSONE. I believe the gentleman from Ohio has a point.

The CHAIRMAN The time of the gentlewoman from Utah has again expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, those of us in the State of Washington have a particular kinship for the people of Alaska. My district happens to be in the northwest corner of the United States, the closest to Alaska, and the jumping-off point to Alaska. I know that the people of our area are vitally interested in statehood for the people of that great Territory.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the question of statehood for Alaska, I believe we should ask ourselves what the criteria for statehood have been or should be, and then see if Alaska meets the standard.

Is population a criterion? If it is, then Alaska certainly meets the standard. One-quarter of our 48 States had populations smaller than Alaska when admitted.

Is importance to the United States a factor? Alaska meets that test, too. It is not only of the highest military and strategic importance, but it contains valuable resources for which new uses and new demands are constantly being found. Statehood will, in my opinion, attract the people and the capital that are now the only missing factors in the full development and use of these resources.

Is desire for statehood a test? Then Alaska meets it. The people of the Territory formerly voted in favor of statehood 3 to 2, and a recent poll showed 68 percent of Alaskans desiring the change.

If political maturity is a factor, then there is ample evidence that Alaska qualifies as a State. Within the restrictions imposed upon it by the organic act, Alaska has enacted modern, progressive legislation, and in some cases has even led the United States. As the committee report points out, Alaska permitted its women to vote 6 years before we in America did.

The Territory has an active two-party system, as evidenced by the fact that in every Presidential election year Alaska has chosen, a few weeks before we held our elections here, a Delegate of the same party as the American President.

If a Territory should be required to serve some sort of apprenticeship before achieving full statehood, then Alaska has served its period longer than all but four of our own States.

The United States stands as a leader in the eyes of the world, striving to create the world over conditions under which peoples may guide their own destinies. Yet, the United States has denied to a politically mature people, prepared and anxious to make their own decision, the full right of self-government, and the right to a voice in the affairs of the Nation to which they are so closely tied.

I urge that we correct that situation. I hope, and I am sure that the House will vote, in favor of statehood for Alaska today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I want to try and bring to the members of the committee some information about Alaska. I have been on this committee for 8 years. I was a little astonished how the membership has changed since 1945 when the committee made a trip to Alaska to look over the territory. I find that only two Members who were on the committee at that time are still members of the committee today, the gentleman now addressing you, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAYLOR]. Even the present ranking majority and minority members of the committee today were not members in 1945. The change was brought about through the reorganization of Congress. So perhaps my few years of experience may warrant my taking a few minutes of your time to tell you some of the things learned by the committee that went to Alaska.

First let me say that at the proper time I propose to offer an amendment at page 6 of the bill, section 5 providing that if the Territory is admitted as a State they will have the opportunity of having more than four sections of land out of a township. The Federal Government now controls 98 percent of the land in Alaska. It is difficult to understand the thinking of the Interior Department. The first statehood bill introduced for Alaska, in 1945, proposed to give the new State two sections out of each township. A township is 36 sections. We finally got them to grant two additional sections, or four sections out of each township. I propose to offer an amendment which will give them every even-numbered section. I think this is necessary if we expect the new State to survive as a State.

How large is Alaska? Alaska is 586,400 square miles in area. Compared to the 3,022,387 square miles of the United States. Alaska is one-fifth the size of the United States.

Something has been said about the population of Alaska. The 1940 census of Alaska showed a population of 72,400. Our report made in 1945 estimated the population at about 80,000, of which some 45,000 was composed of native Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos; and about 55 percent white. I understand that the estimated population at the present time is 100,000. I presume it is growing and that it will continue to grow. But I want to point out that the Federal Government today controls 98 percent of the land in Alaska in the form of national parks, national forests, Indian reservations, and public domain.

Something was said about the plebiscite taken in Alaska for statehood. I have had a number of letters from people in Alaska. If in that plebiscite they had been asked "If you are given statehood would you expect to have two sections of land out of each township?" They would have said "No." If they had been asked: "How much do you think Alaska ought to have?" they would have said "At least one-half; we ought to have all of it, but at least one-half." I dare say that if you had placed on the ballot in the plebiscite that their coming in as a new State would be predicated on having only four sections out of each township that they would have rejected statehood because it would have been so unfair.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to rumors spread by the Foreign Affairs Committee that it was not the intention of the Government to defend Alaska I do not know if the State Department takes the same attitude about Alaska as they do about China and other areas of the world; but if they do they will act like an amoeba and start to pull away when the irritation comes. I do not know whether they are going to do that or not but I think it is worth exploring. Personally, I voted for statehood for Alaska. Sometimes I question whether the area of the State should embrace the whole Territory or that area where the population is heaviest and the land most usable, the southern and southeastern part of Alaska. But to go way over to the west, clear to the end of Alaska, and way up above the Arctic Circle and clear down to British Columbia we take in a tremendous extent of area. I am satisfied in my own mind that the new State cannot exist if we are only going to offer it four sections out of each township, then let the Interior Department control the rest of the land.

Our committee in 1945 found that the application of the statute on public land has proven burdensome, and I refer to the act of March 3, 1903 (32 Stat. 1128).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the section to which I have just referred reads as follows:

> The application of this statute has proven burdensome, Alaskans contended at the hearings, particularly in the southeastern portion. The Department of the Interior, it was charged, only infrequently granted waivers of the shore-space requirement, thus making settlement more difficult since choice settlement opportunities are often to be found along the water courses. Further, that the Department takes an unreasonably long time to process such share-space applications.
>
> The committee recognizes the basic importance of the policy underlying the act of March 3, 1903, namely, the preservation for general public use of the desirable shore areas suitable for wharves and like uses. However, to assume that whenever a settlement is made on the shore of a navigable water that a quarter mile of free space must separate it from the next settler, is to overlook the realities of Alaska. The committee urges the Department of the Interior to adopt a more liberal attitude, one based on the true values for shore-space purposes as intended by the policy of Congress, thus facilitating greatly the development of the Territory.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot get access to the water line in Alaska under this bill. The Department of the Interior will take the land for a quarter of a mile back. So that has held up the development of Alaska. If statehood would overcome that situation I would be for it, but I do not think it will. I think the Department of the Interior is holding too much land and the new State cannot exist with only four sections out of 36.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Irrespective of whether Alaska is a Territory or State.

it is our national duty to defend Alaska against attack?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. What would statehood add to that defense, if anything?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not know. The gentleman's opinion is as good as mine.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not think it would add anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I happen to have served on the Committee on the Territories for a number of years during my service here in the Congress. In fact, I was the ranking member on the Republican side at the time the Reorganization Act was put into effect, at which time the Committee on Territories was combined with the Committee on Public Lands.

During my service as a member of the committee I have had occasion to go to Alaska twice. We traveled extensively over the entire Territory. Coming as I do from the State of Oregon, which is very close to Alaska, outside of Washington the nearest point in continental United States, I have had during all of my life an opportunity to observe the great Territory of Alaska and also the Hawaiian Islands.

The people in my area believe very strongly that both Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands should be admitted into the Union as States. First of all, we believe it would be for the best interests of those two great communities to whom we pledged our word a long, long time ago that when they attained the population, the commercial activity and the other qualifications of statehood they would be admitted.

Further than that, Mr. Chairman, it would be in the best interests of the United States, certainly in these troublesome times when war is threatened. We only hop from one war to another. We have not got through with the last war. We have not signed the treaties ending the last war, yet we are preparing for another war at this time. We have $13,000,000,000 in the budget this year for another war. We spend three-quarters of the money in our Federal budget for war purposes—past wars, present wars, and future wars.

In the very next war we engage in, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii will be two of the most strategic places in the world for the defense of continental United States. I want to tell my good friends who come from the populous areas in these United States, great States like New York, if they want their territory defended, they should not be penny-wise and pound-foolish in national defense. They should look beyond their noses and realize that these great strategic areas in the Pacific are the very keystone to the defense of our Nation in the next world war.

When I was in Alaska the war was on. There great flights of planes were landing on Ladd Field, Alaska, coming in like flies, hundreds of them. Do you know where they were going? They were turned over to the Russians at Ladd Field. The Russians put their pilots in those planes—incidentally, these pilots could not speak English and I interviewed a number of them through an interpreter—and within a day or two those planes were on the battlefronts of Europe fighting in that great war. Thousands of our war planes went to those battlefronts to fly the Russian flag. If our planes can go from the United States to Russia, their planes can come over here. You must remember that the first place of attack in the next war would be on the Pacific coast, Alaska, California, Washington, and Oregon. You know that the Japanese in their war program contemplated taking that area, taking over all of the area up to the Continental Divide, and that we would never again, they hoped, be able to repossess the great States along the Pacific slope.

It is unwise to try to determine this question along State lines. Are we not all Americans? Are not the people, who live in Oregon or Nevada or Alaska Americans just the same as the citizens in New York, Illinois, and Indiana? Are we not all Americans? Are we not trying to do what is best for the country as a whole and not for any individual State? When you say that because a State is small it should not have the influence in the United States Senate that a larger State has in this great country of ours, the founding fathers settled that question when they adopted the Constitution. Let me call your attention to the fact, as I noted a moment ago, that Senator Borah came from the little State of Idaho, with only a few hundred thousand population, and he had, perhaps, greater influence in the Senate of the United States than any other man who sat there during his generation. His statue now adorns Statuary Hall. Only a few Senators have that distinction. There on the wall in this Chamber above the Speaker's desk you will see the remarks of Daniel Webster. Perhaps no man who ever sat in the United States Senate had such a commanding influence upon this great country of ours. He was the greatest statesman of his generation in the United States Senate. But, where did he come from? He came from the little State of New Hampshire. New Hampshire has only two Representatives today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. My good friends who now are arguing against the admission of these Territories because they are small would have denied Daniel Webster an opportunity to sit in the United States Senate. They would have denied the right to Senator Borah to sit in the United States Senate. Even our own Senator, Senator McNary, who was the head of our party in the Senate for many, many years, having served there for over 20 years, would not have been admitted into that great body.

My observation is from my travels over Alaska, and the experience I have gained by living in an area that is very close to Alaska, that in every respect, where we catalog the requirements for statehood, Alaska will meet the test, and that we should, not only in the interest of Alaska itself and the residents who happen to be living there at this time, but also for the best interests of the 48 States, this great country of ours, and particularly for the defense of this Nation, let us keep our word with Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands as well, and admit them into statehood.

As has been called to your attention here on the floor today, after statehood is once granted, the population will increase rapidly. Take my own little State of Oregon. We have increased 49 percent since the last war; a greater percentage of increase than any other State in the Union. The Pacific coast is now enjoying the greatest percentage of increase in population than any part of the United States. It is still true, westward the course of empire takes its way.

One of our colleagues just inquired whether by granting statehood to Alaska his State would lose a Member of Congress, and who would get it Well, I will tell him who would get it. Oregon will get it, California will get, Washington will get it, other western States will get it where the population is moving, and that same answer applies to Alaska. The important fact is what is best for these American citizens and the United States as a whole.

My colleagues, let us not decide this question on the question of narrow partisanship or State lines. Let us decide it on the merits.

Mr. Chairman, I introduced in the Eightieth Congress H. R. 1808 which provides for the admission of the Territory of Alaska into the Union as a State on an equality with the other 48 States of the Union, and I have reintroduced the same bill in the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 25. I will discuss briefly my purpose in sponsoring this legislation.

As I have already said as the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Territories in the Seventy-ninth Congress, I made trips through Alaska on two separate occasions, the first one in the summer of 1943. As a lone member of the committee, I covered a considerable portion of Alaska and traveled on a bus over the entire length of the Alaska Highway from Whitehorse to the southern terminus. The remainder of the road to Fairbanks at that time had not been completed.

In August of 1945 as a member of the subcommittee of the Territories Committee I had occasion again to visit the Territory, at which time the committee traversed much of the Territory by railroad, bus, and airplane supplemented by water transportation. We went as far north as Point Barrow on the Arctic Ocean, covering the Nome area on our return. We not only held hearings in the major cities we visited but we interviewed many Alaska citizens everywhere throughout our entire trip. On our return the hearings were transcribed and transmitted, together with a report, to the full Committee on Territories, for its consideration. It is now available for use by the Eighty-first Congress.

The purpose of the trip of the subcommittee to the Territory was to see for ourselves and to obtain on the ground first-hand information by the members of the committee the conditions existing in this great Territory and to discuss the problems facing it with Alaskan residents in order to acquaint the committee with the needs of the Territory and the legislation required to protect its interests, including the proposal for admission of Alaska into the Union as a State. The committee in concluding its report said:

The committee is not in a position to make definite recommendations at this time on all the several matters which have been brought to its attention Many of these proposals deserve careful thought and study. It is the spirit and desire of the committee to give careful attention and consideration to all proposals which have been presented to it, whether now in the form of specific legislative proposals or whether at the stage of discussion. We hope to work with the citizens of Alaska in a continuing effort to recommend and enact legislation which is in the best interests of the Territory and which will aid to open up and develop this great section of our country.

The committee did not make a specific recommendation on the question of statehood by reason of the fact that the citizens of Alaska at that time were contemplating holding a plebiscite to determine whether or not the majority of the residents of Alaska desired statehood. Since that time, as is well known, the vote has been taken and the statehood proposal was approved by a heavy majority.

On August 24, 1912, the Congress created the Territory of Alaska by an act which provided for the creation of a legislative assembly and defined its powers and duties. The organic act has had no major revision since its adoption. The fundamental powers granted the legislature were sharply restricted and are now outmoded and the Territory is hampered thereby in its desire to govern itself. The citizens of Alaska, including the Indians and Eskimos, are citizens of the United States and, of course, are subject to the duties and obligations of citizenship, including service in the armed forces and the payment of Federal income taxes. The Territory is not permitted to participate in the making of the Federal laws which govern it nor in the determination of taxes which its citizens have to pay. It is a striking example of taxation without representation. Furthermore the major portion of the land area of Alaska is owned by the Federal Government, aggregating 98 percent of the total of 586,400 square miles. These federally owned lands consist of national parks, national forests, Indian reservations and public domain. Restrictive laws and regulations governing these federally owned lands are such that it is difficult for residents of Alaska to obtain title to land within the Territory which, to a large extent, has hampered the development of the Territory. If the Territory were admitted into the Union as a State it should and no doubt would receive parity treatment with other States of the Union and these restrictions which have hampered its development and growth would be removed. Under statehood the old organic act which is outmoded and ineffective would give way to a modern constitution and State laws of Alaska's own making.

Alaska is the last great frontier remaining in the United States for settlement and development. Its vast area, reaching from the mild climate of its southern coastal areas to the frozen northlands of the Arctic contain great natural resources capable of development and use. First of all, the fishing industry of Alaska is one of the great resources and has added many millions of dollars to the economy of our Nation, providing it with food products of inestimable value. It is true the Territory itself has not profited to the full extent possible from this valuable industry by reason of outside controls and imported labor and withdrawal of the fishery products and cash returns therefrom from the Territory.

Forestry is an Alaskan asset of large value. There are vast stretches of timbered areas, particularly in the southern portion, which are awaiting use. Much of this is suitable for commercial saw timber. Extensive portions are valuable for pulp for the manufacture of paper, an adequate supply of which is coming to be a serious problem in continental United States.

Since the gold rush to Alaska in 1898 mining has continued to be one of the great enterprises of the Territory. Between 1880 and 1939 Alaska produced gold valued at $779,592,777, which is more than 108 times the purchase price of the Territory. Seward's folly has turned to gold. Gold, however, is accountable for only 81 percent of the mineral production. There are many known coal deposits in Alaska, but only two are commercially developed fields, which are located along the Alaska Railroad. There is reason to believe that there are extensive oil deposits underlying Alaska. Extensive development has already taken place in adjacent Canadian oil fields. Our own Government is now actively engaged in tapping these deposits in Alaska, and the outcome is most promising. The mining industry will continue to be through the years a major one in this great frontier land. Alaska, from the days of Russian control, has been the source of much of our fur supply, and it continues to be a heavy producer of furs of great economic value to Alaska.

Our committee was particularly interested in the development of agriculture in the Territory. Many of our people do not appreciate that many portions of Alaska are especially adapted to agricultural use. Much has been written about the Matanuska project developed by the Federal Government. While it is true that excessive sums of Federal money were expended, if not squandered, in the development of this project, it is also true that it has demonstrated the fact that the lands in the Matanuska Valley will produce exceptionally fine crops and when properly managed will successfully support many families. This valley lies at the head of Cooks Inlet. The winters are comparatively mild, the climate being influenced by the warm waters of the Pacific Ocean, and it enjoys a heavy rainfall. Hardy vegetables thrive in the area. Grass suitable for grazing abounds and the dairy industry is carried on extensively. Fortunately there is a heavy demand and ready market for all agricultural products raised in the Territory and in spite of the agricultural developments in the Territory large shipments from the outside are required to meet local demands. Agricultural development is also carried on extensively in other parts of Alaska. The University of Alaska at Fairbanks maintains two agricultural experimental farms which are performing a real service in determining the kind and type of agricultural products and animal industry suitable for the various areas of the Territory.

The great hinterland extending back from the mild southern coast line over the great interior plateaus and mountain ranges and across McKinley National Park and on to the Arctic Ocean, makes Alaska indeed a land of wonders. An asset of great value to the Territory is its tourist possibilities. It is a hunter's and tourist's paradise. The grandeur of its scenery and the beauty of its coastal areas on the inside passage are unsurpassed. Alaska abounds with large game, Kodiak, grizzly and polar bear, mountain sheep and goats, reindeer, moose and caribou, and will continue to be the mecca for sportsmen and other tourists who are interested in the wildlife of our country.

The greatest need in Alaska is adequate transportation facilities. Its development has been held back by lack of adequate low-priced transportation to continental United States, as well as transportation within its borders. Before the war it could only be reached by air or water. No land transportation was available and air transportation was crude. As a war project the great Alaska highway was forged through the wilderness some 1,600 miles, terminating in Fairbanks. While the major portion of this highway lies in Canadian territory and has now been turned back to the Canadian Government, it has demonstrated the fact that an adequate highway can be maintained, giving Alaska land transportation to the outside world. As the Territory develops under statehood in the years that lie ahead, this great artery should be improved and maintained with lateral extensions as a permanent land transportation system servicing this great north country.

The war further demonstrated the need of permanent first-class air service connecting the United States via Alaska with Asia, Europe, and the Far East. The great circle route from our mainland via Alaska is the shortest and most serviceable skyway to the Old World. The 9,000 war planes we delivered to Russia at Ladd Field, Alaska, to fly this route to the battlefields of Europe and Asia, demonstrated the worth of the great circle approach via Alaska to the Old World. If these sky engines of death can fly from the United States, others can fly back to the United States the same way. Alaska may no longer be the back door but the front door to America. Alaska may be the Pearl Harbor of world war III. It is only a few hours flying time from our mainland and is within bombing range

of Tokyo and Vladivostok as well as other European and Asiatic centers. Perishable air cargo now leaves Portland, Oreg., in midafternoon, arriving in Anchorage about midnight. Alaska holds the key to the national defense of the United States mainland in the event of a third world war. Our air and land defenses in Alaska should be made impregnable. Immense sums have been expanded by our Government during the war in charting airways and building airfields and air facilities throughout the Territory and there should be no slackening of our efforts to develop and maintain Alaskan air facilities to full strength not alone for peacetime use but for our national security.

The welfare and development of Alaska requires that the whole transportation field receive early attention to the end that this strategic area of our Nation will be provided with adequate transportation by land, water, and air. Such transportation service should not only be adequate to its needs but should be reasonable in cost so as to obviate the high charges now being exacted in every field of transportation to and within the Territory, a bottleneck impeding the development of Alaska.

Alaska has one railroad, Government-owned and operated, leading from the coast into Fairbanks. The rates are excessively high. It is old and worn out through age and excessive use during the war servicing Ladd Field at Fairbanks. It should be rehabilitated and restored to full effectiveness not alone for local services in Alaska but as a part of the program to keep Alaska impregnable for national security. The highway system in Alaska should also be extended and improved to permit its full development. Alaska needs settlers and it can only secure settlers by having adequate highways and other transportation to enable its settlers to reach markets. New settlers bring new industries. Statehood will afford the people of Alaska the opportunity to solve these and many other problems in the American way by local State government.

The schools of Alaska are maintained in part by the Federal Government and in part by the Territory. If statehood were granted, the whole school problem could be revamped and coordinated under local State control so as to provide an integrated school system, providing adequate education for all the children within the Territory.

Proponents of statehood for Alaska realize that it will involve increased local taxation. Self-government means State budgets which must be met out of taxes. However, with the citizens of Alaska in control of their own affairs they will be in a position to meet this problem by practicing strict economy in government operations and capturing tax funds from all of its citizens and from all of the industries and commercial operations in Alaska. The tax load may in this manner be equalized and spread fairly upon those who should bear the burdens of government.

The people of Alaska have now maintained a territorial government for 36 years, and the period of pupilage should be ended. Alaska has grown up and should discard its knee pants. Territorial government has outlived its usefulness. Alaska has developed an economy with ample resources justifying statehood; its citizenship has advanced socially and educationally in keeping with the standards of continental United States. The residents of the Territory have voted by a large majority in favor of statehood, and the best interests of the Territory and its people, as well as the welfare of the United States itself, require that statehood be granted.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the bill (H. R. 331) receive the support of this Congress so that the Territory of Alaska may be admitted to full statehood in our Union of States.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support to the pending measure providing for the entry of Alaska into the Union. I do that because I am quite sure that the people of my great State of Minnesota would want me to do just that. I can remind you that among other reasons I have in mind for supporting this bill is this: A few years ago several hundred citizens of the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota formed a colony and moved up into the Matanuska Valley of Alaska as an experiment to find security on new land. Most of them have remained there and are slowly succeeding. I am sure those people in their communications to the folks back home have asked for this very bill we are considering today.

The thing that irks me most in this debate this afternoon is the question raised by some Members of this House as to how many civil-service employees or Government employees are involved up there. What difference does that make? I think the civil-service employees and the Government employees are beginning to find themselves in a state of serfdom, because everywhere the bars are being drawn against their rights as free American citizens and to exercise their franchise of government. The first question asked here today is, How many Government employees are up there? I have found Government employees to be very loyal citizens of this country and very good judges of those whom they want to select as their Representatives.

Another question that comes up here is the question of the number of Members of Congress there shall be. Four hundred thirty-five. By granting to Alaska statehood we may have to take in one or two more Members. I find plenty of seats here and I have not yet realized that we were operating a closed shop here as against any further membership in this House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am conscious that from present indications there is a strong possibility that this House will vote statehood for Alaska. If such favorable action is taken it will in my opinion be largely due to the fine personality of the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. His manner is always charming, his attitude friendly and his ability of a high order. Recognizing as I do these personal elements it is difficult for me to vote against this bill. However, I believe it is my duty to give consideration to the subject, divorced from the personalities involved, and consider it from the standpoint of national welfare and necessity. As I do so, I am unable to agree with the proponents of the measure that it is either necessary or will promote our national welfare at this time. Consequently, I will vote against the bill.

There are many reasons that bring me to the conclusion I have reached. Uppermost is the fact that giving statehood to Alaska will enable it to have two United States Senators for a voting population of approximately 20,000 voters, a population that is far less than any State of the Union. This would give to a territory thousands of miles away, with an exceedingly small population, the same voting strength in the United States Senate that New York and many other populous States with millions of voters in each, including our own State of New Jersey, now have. This is my opinion, especially if Hawaii and Puerto Rico should hereafter be recognized and thereby obtain two Senators each, is an undue representation for the number of people involved.

Furthermore it is reported that the total assessed value of property subject to taxation in all of Alaska amounts to only $110,000,000. This in my judgment is not sufficient to produce sufficient tax revenue to sustain a State government and the local governments necessary to carry out the responsibilities and obligations of statehood.

It is difficult to understand why the administration leaders should press at this time for representation for the people of Alaska, and, at the same time ignore the hundreds of thousands of citizens residing in the District of Columbia. The latter are without any direct representation in either House or Senate. They do not even have the right to cast their votes for President of the United States. It seems to me that this presents a case where justice should commence nearer home.

An argument has been made for statehood for Alaska on the theory that it is a very strategic area from a military standpoint. I agree that it is but it does not require statehood to strengthen our security in that respect. This security has and will continue to be a national obligation. The strategic character of this territory has and will continue to be recognized by our military forces. They have and will continue to make our defenses in that area impregnable against foreign attacks against the United States by way of Alaska. There is nothing that statehood could provide any more than has been done in the past with Alaska a Territory of the United States.

The people of Alaska have no basis of complaint against the treatment it has had as a Territory. Congress has always been ready and willing to give every

consideration to its needs, and provide the facilities that would promote the welfare of its people. It has been my privilege as a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to assist in the passage of legislation that would promote the transportation facilities of the Territory, both land and air, advance its health, and in all other ways that come within the jurisdiction of our committee. The same can be said with reference to all the other committees of the House and Senate, and, both bodies have ever been ready and willing to pass all such legislation, and the President to approve the same.

For these and many other reasons I cannot see my way clear to vote for the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking minority member of the committee for giving me this extra time.

Mr. Chairman, I have grave doubts as to whether or not Alaska is at the present time capable of handling statehood. They have an assessed value of all private property of only $110,000,000. With the tremendous extent of their territory, I doubt if that is enough of a tax base on which to raise enough revenue to run a State government with all the ramifications and different things it has to do. My home city of Stockton, Calif., which approaches 100,000 in population now, has an assessable base of only $80,000,000, and it has a very difficult time running that town with that assessable tax base.

I do not want anybody that listens to me to think I have anything against the people of Alaska or against the small States or against States with small populations. I just believe that Alaska today is not ready for statehood. It does not have a sufficient population to handle the situation.

With reference to the national defense, statehood would not make one single contribution to national defense. That is a Federal responsibility exclusively. We all look to the National Government for our defense and security. I am on the border of the country in California, where we could be attacked. We look to the National Government to take care of our national-defense problems, although we furnish great numbers of National Guard troops and Reserves. When war comes they are promptly federalized.

Concerning population increases, we cannot be sure that the population will increase, so we had better wait until Alaska has the requisite population. If they had a half million people I would be the first one to help them get statehood, but they have only between 95,000 and 105,000 population, and that is not adequate at this time.

Capital will be attracted to Alaska if it gives investments a chance. Statehood would not help that one bit. The opportunities are there and the resources are there. If it is attractive enough, capital will go into Alaska. It will not go into Alaska simply because the people have statehood. Everybody knows that. Another thing, the plebiscite showed that only 3 out of 5 voters went for statehood in a vote of 16,384 people who voted on the question. I doubt as a matter of morals or fairness whether we should force upon 40 percent of the population of Alaska statehood, which they do not now want. I believe ultimately Alaska should have statehood when she has demonstrated that she can handle it and that she has the population to warrant statehood and can take care of the responsibilities that come with statehood. This she does not now have.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK Mr. Chairman, because I believe that the admission of these two Territories, Alaska and Hawaii, into the Union is a part of the historical westward movement of our star of empire, I favor this measure. I have a practical reason for favoring it, also. I recognize the strategic place that these Territories occupy as has already been pointed out. The Pacific Ocean from now on will be the ocean of commerce and of history to be written just as the Atlantic Ocean has been historically the ocean of commerce and great achievement. Alaska occupies a strategic place of increasing importance and for that reason she ought to have the dignity and standing of statehood.

Every phase of colonial policy may be found in the history of various colonizing peoples. Some good colonial policies may be cited and some unwise colonial policies might be given as illustrations. The United States of America—meaning the Old Thirteen as the mother country—has had a successful and wise colonial policy. Under that policy, the original 13 States have grown to a vast Nation of 48 States. In that process of growth, we have maintained strong ties of union and have written across this continent and throughout American history the phrase "E Pluribus Unum" which we see on the coin of the Nation and read on the ceiling above our heads. That is one of the most significant facts of American political history.

What was it in the policy of the original 13 States that has brought about this great and splendid result? It was our policy of encouragement, kindly consideration, and guaranty of equality to the children who have moved into the West—into an ever-expanding West—to build new commonwealths, establishing there the institutions which they brought with them from the older States. This encouragement helped to settle the West, built up its new States, and cemented those new communities to the older communities into an indissoluble Union. As we look back over the past, we are grateful that the founders of the Nation took a wise and unselfish view of the West and provided in the basic law that "new States may be admitted to this Union on terms of equality." Thirty-five States have thus far been added to the original 13 and forged into one strong Nation because of that wise policy. The admission of Alaska and Hawaii will, in my judgment, be a carrying out of that policy.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MILES].

Mr. MILES. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of statehood for Alaska, believing it to be in the best interests of the welfare of the Nation. I sincerely trust the bill passes.

Mr. Chairman, recently, upon my return from an extended tour of the Pacific Ocean area, I joined with my colleagues of a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Lands in recommending immediate statehood for Hawaii. A bill to enable Hawaii to become a State, H. R. 49, had already been favorably reported by the full committee, and on January 23 the House agreed to its consideration.

Statehood for Hawaii is not new. It was not dreamed up yesterday.

Statehood for Hawaii goes back 100 years into the history of our Republic and its earliest interest in the Pacific.

The need for tying Hawaii to the United States was first advocated in the Congress of the United States in 1852. In that year, a Democratic Congressman from the State of California demanded that the Hawaiian Islands be annexed on the ground that they were necessary for the protection of California and the Pacific coast and essential in carrying on American trade with Asia and the Pacific islands. The Whigs, the then opposition party, were opposed to further expansion and did not look with favor on annexation proposals in general. The expansion question went to the people in the 1852 national elections.

In the fall of 1852, a Democrat, Franklin Pierce, was elected President of the United States. In his inauguration address, President Pierce declared that his administration would not be controlled by "any timid forebodings of evil from expansion."

In 1853 President Pierce appointed a new United States Commissioner to the Kingdom of Hawaii, David L. Gregg of Illinois. The first instructions to Commissioner Gregg pointed out the increased importance of Hawaii to the United States because of the acquisition of California and the Oregon Territory and the developments in eastern Asia which was then being opened to trade. Mr. Gregg's first instructions contained nothing on annexation.

On his arrival in Hawaii, however, Mr. Gregg found annexation to be the subject of the day and no little source of trouble in the community. The official representatives of the Governments of France and Great Britain in Hawaii were busy doing everything in their power to stem the proannexation tide. In a sharply worded note, the King of Hawaii was advised that—

> Any attempt to annex the Sandwich Islands to any foreign power whatever, would be in contravention of existing treaties, and could not be looked upon with indifference by either the British or the French Government.

The American Commissioner, when informed of this action by his British and French counterparts in Hawaii, re-

minded the King that the United States, unlike Britain and France, has so far not made any attempts on the independence and sovereignty of the islands and that none was now intended. He pointed out, however, that it was not surprising that Hawaii's people, especially the merchants and landed proprietors, should see the great commercial and other advantages to be derived from union with the United States. In an unveiled reference to the evils of colonialism, he pointedly advised the King of Hawaii that "the Government of the United States can have no colonies" and that "whatever territory is added is an integral part of the whole, and subject to the same national constitution and laws."

The British and French Ministers in Washington, acting under instructions from their home governments, made representations to the Secretary of State. Secretary of State Marcy politely informed the British, and through them the French, that the United States had the same desire as the British and the French in regard to the continued independence of the Hawaiian Islands. He pointed out, however, that if independence became impractical and the Hawaiian Government might be in danger of falling into other hands, it was highly probable that the United States would be disposed to admit the Hawaiian Islands to the Union. The Secretary of State made it plain that the United States would resist strenuously any attempt by any other power to obtain possession of the islands.

The United States, although fully cognizant of the value of the Hawaiian Islands to American security and commerce in the Pacific, nevertheless did not press for annexation. It was not until after the Hawaiian King, faced with trouble and revolution, had ordered his Minister of Foreign Relations to ascertain the views of the United States in relation to annexation, that the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands received serious consideration by our Government.

In May 1854 our Commissioner in Hawaii requested and received instructions from the Secretary of State to open discussions with representatives of the King on the matter of annexation. Three months later, on August 7, 1854, the American Commissioner to the Kingdom of Hawaii advised the Secretary of State:

I have succeeded in arranging the terms of a treaty of annexation with the Minister of Foreign Relations, which meets the approval of the crown prince and cabinet. But it is not yet signed, and I am unable to give you assurance that it will be immediately completed. * * *

The great difficulty I had to encounter was the inveterate prejudice of the Hawaiian authorities against a territorial form of government, which could not be overcome. Finding it impossible to provide otherwise, I finally consented to agree to the admission of the islands as a State, as soon as it could be done in conformity with the principles and requirements of the Federal Constitution, leaving the laws, so far as they are republican and consistent with such Constitution, in full force and effect in the meantime.

Article II of the treaty which was finally agreed upon on August 19, 1854, in Hawaii, provides as follows:

The Kingdom of the Hawaiian Islands shall be incorporated into the American Union as a State, enjoying the same degree of sovereignty as other States, and admitted as such as soon as can be done in consistency with the principles and requirements of the Federal Constitution, to all rights, privileges, and immunities of a State as aforesaid, on a perfect equality with the other States of the Union.

I cite this incident of history to show that statehood for Hawaii is not new. It goes back 100 years to the earliest days of organized government in Hawaii and to the very infancy of our own Republic.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico in order that I may ask him a question.

The distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, who was formerly Governor of New Mexico, is chairman of the subcommittee which recently conducted hearings extending over a period of about 6 or 7 weeks throughout the Southwest Pacific, including the trust territories. I wish to ask the gentleman this question, for the benefit of the Members: In all of the contacts that the gentleman made in the Hawaiian Islands, in American Samoa, the trust territory, American Guam, the Philippines, and in conference with our officials and Chinese officials in Hong Kong, and in conference with the general staff in Tokyo, including conferences with General MacArthur, and all the points between Tokyo back to San Francisco, did the gentleman from New Mexico get the distinct impression from the standpoint of national defense and from the standpoint of the defense of our international relationships and of opposing the Russian philosophy that the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska should be granted statehood at this time?

Mr. MILES. Yes, I did.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I have listened to all these "Me, too" endorsements to this proposal. I listened to the remarks of the gentlewoman which I thought ought to be stricken from the record because I know that nobody feels that way concerning the citizenship of the American people who live in Alaska. I would like somebody to explain this "me, too" business. What benefits will they enjoy more than they are enjoying today, other than having two Senators and Representatives in the House? We have not kept anything from them, have we?

Mr. MARSHALL. If the gentleman will permit me, I will attempt to answer some of these things in part. It seems to me, after listening to the debate that some Members are concerned as to what we, ourselves, might be giving up in our own particular districts if we grant statehood to Alaska so that Alaska can have representation in both bodies of the Congress.

I want to point out to the Members of the House that my State will be giving up a distinction, if Alaska comes into the Union as a sister State. We are now the most northern State in the United States. When Alaska comes into the Union we will be giving up that particular distinction.

Our State came into the Union in 1858. The Territory of Alaska has great resources, more known resources than our State had at that time. The Territory of Alaska has more people than our State had at that time. The Territory of Alaska is closer to Washington than Minnesota was at that time.

The gentleman has asked me what benefits would accrue to Alaska by coming into the United States. One of the things that we are doing is to provide for a unified country. We are providing for citizenship that will put their shoulders to the wheel and become a part of this great Nation. As a matter of defense, the figures of history show that no country is stronger than their civilian population in time of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan very much.

The people of France are more guilty of the failure of France in the last war than the armies of France were. The people of Alaska will put up resistance in Alaska to invasion, as a matter of national defense, when they can feel that they are a part of this great country.

We are talking about the development of the country. I am sure most of the Members of this House are believers in the fact that local subdivisions have a greater knowledge of their problems than we do here in Washington. This will put in their hands the means whereby they can develop their country to a greater extent than we can hope to do from here.

Now, we were talking about Government bureaus awhile ago. We have some very fine Government people. They are shifted around. It is natural that they are. The people in Alaska, in setting up their government, provide a stable government. They provide a government whereby they will have their representative and that they will have a way of coming to Washington.

Right here I would like to pay a compliment to the Delegate from Alaska. He is an excellent gentleman. It has been a pleasure to know him and to work with him. I would like to see him, when he sits in that chair, have a right to cast his vote the same as any other individual Member of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, over the years the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and I have almost always voted the same way.

It just breaks my heart to desert him at this particular time.

We all have our hobbies, and we all have our foolish moments. I get up sometimes in the morning at 3 o'clock and come back at 8 o'clock, just to go up the river and throw a little chunk of lead and a little piece of bright metal tied on a line into the river to see if some fish is foolish enough to hit it. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] said he had traveled up and down across and all over Alaska. With all due respect, I would make the same remark about him that my good wife makes about me: "You are just nuts about fishing." Now he may be just nuts about this Territory stuff. He is very excited about it and very enthusiastic about it. I cannot understand why, though I know he is a great sugar man. Hawaii is a sugar territory. He has always been, as I have been, an isolationist. Now he wants to take in Alaska and Hawaii. He has been against United Nations; is he now for One World? We are pledged by the Republican platform to make Puerto Rico a State. The next thing he will want the Virgin Islands and possibly Guam made States. That will give us 10 additional Senators from the 5 new States. Those 5 new States, comparatively speaking, will have 10 Senators out of 106, or one-tenth of the voting strength of the Senate. That ratio would be all out of proportion if we consider the population of the other States.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for me to take seriously distinguished gentlemen who take this floor and advocate statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. In listening to them I wonder whether I am a simpleton or just being taken for one.

The fundamental objection, Mr. Chairman, to the admission of Alaska or any of the other like possessions to statehood is that they are not contiguous territory. Alaska and Hawaii have been tied together. To admit one means to admit the other, which means the ultimate admission of every island in the world over which the American flag flies.

Mr. Chairman, I am told that if there is a strictly controlled Communist community in any part of the world, it is Hawaii. Harry Bridges holds the whole island in the palm of his hand, and the admission of Hawaii would mean the admission of a Communist State, and the putting of two followers of Stalin in the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] such time as he may require, to the extent of the time left at my disposal, to answer the statement just made by the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Delegate from Hawaii is recognized for 17 minutes.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the statement just made by the gentleman from Georgia is completely and absolutely false. The record of the people of Hawaii during World War II, the record of our own Government, the record of the last election, the record of the last legislature, and particularly the special session which was called to save the people of Hawaii in that crisis when you here refused to do anything, is the complete answer to the gentleman's statement. I want to say to you that the welfare of this country is in just as safe hands when it is in the hands of the people of Hawaii as it is when it is in the hands of the people of Georgia, and I think in many respects their regard for the Constitution and the Bill of Rights is a lot more serious and more effective than is that of the people of Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to participate in the debate on the question of whether Alaska should be admitted to the Union as a State, but I do want you to know that I am sincerely in favor of it. I know that the vote on this question is going to have a vital and important bearing on whether we admit Hawaii into the Union as a State. I recognize that many of the arguments that have been made against Alaska will be made against Hawaii.

The gentlemen from the large States say to you that if you admit Hawaii and Alaska into the Union we will each have 2 Members in the United States Senate. Now, Alaska and Hawaii did not ask for 2 Members in the United States Senate. That is determined by the form of government under which we live. You know from reading your American history that that determination was made by the founders of this country. Those gentlemen, particularly the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from California, have not told you that New York has 10 percent of the membership of this House, some 45 Members, and that California has some 23. That is the complete and final answer to that.

Let me point out to you also that in this country today there are 13 States with 2 or less Representatives in the House—7 of the Mountain States, 2 Middle Western States, North and South Dakota, and 4 Eastern States—Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Delaware. We are in approximately the same category as those people. If it is wrong to give Alaska and Hawaii representation on the basis of area or as a particular community, why do you not cut down their representation or why do you not increase the representation of New York, California, and those States in the Senate of the United States?

You cannot measure the importance of this problem in terms of the East or the Middle West or the West alone. You have to look at it from the standpoint of its influence on the people of the Pacific. I regret it is impossible for me to charter the Lurline and take the whole membership of the House to Hawaii tomorrow because I know if it were possible for me to do that 90 percent of the membership would come back roaring in favor of the admission of Hawaii into the Union. We have done it repeatedly, and even the gentleman from New York, who participated in the inquiry under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE], came back with the committee and recommended immediate consideration for statehood for Hawaii. Is not that true?

Mr. DELANEY. I did not recommend that Hawaii be admitted, merely that this body have an opportunity to pass on it.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Of course, the gentleman did. He saw it was a question that was going to have to be settled.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Have there not been many times during recent months that the people of Hawaii have felt that they were absolutely forsaken by the President of the United States and the American Congress and the people on the mainland.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I may say that the people of Hawaii have a wholesome respect for the right to vote. If we had a vote for President, if we had voting representation in the United States Senate and voting representation in the House, we would many, many times be better off. I do not know anyone in this House who would trade his status as the Representative of a State for that of a representative of a Territory.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman referred to the opposition that was heard from California and New York State. I do not think the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] had any intention of expressing the sentiment of the whole California delegation, and I do not think he did. As a matter of fact, I want the gentleman from Hawaii to know that I am supporting admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union. I think that is true of other Members of the California delegation. I wish the gentleman would clarify the point when he mentions California.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I am aware of that, and I am delighted to know that the Representative from Stockton does not speak for the rest of the State.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman pointed out words to this effect: In granting statehood to these Territories "we will be assuming some new obligations with these people coming back on us." Will the gentleman tell this body the contribution the Territory of Hawaii makes to the Federal Treasury?

Mr. FARRINGTON. The people of the Territory of Hawaii have been paying the same taxes that the people of the States have been paying since 1900. On June 30, 1940, they had paid a total of more than $1,000,000,000 into the Federal Treasury. Hawaii normally pays more than 10 or 15 States into the Federal Treasury, and we make no complaint about it. On a per capita basis our payments run higher than do that of something like 30 or 36 States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the whole eco-

nomic fabric of Hawaii from A to Z is just as sound as the economic fabric of the United States, and anybody who will study the question should be willing to admit it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. When Hawaii became a part of the Union, it was an independent republic, was it not?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. And we had a general agreement with them, when they came under our flag, that as soon as they became sufficiently identified with our institutions we would make them a State of this Union.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is absolutely right, and I am glad the gentleman pointed that out, because that is at the core of this whole argument. We have been led to believe for years that when we met the qualification for statehood, we would be given statehood. Now, all of these islands that you talk about in all parts of the world are not in that status. They have got to be integrated into the country first; possibly given a period of tutelage as a Territory. We are not voting for that at the present time. We are voting on the question whether two Territories, promised statehood by implication, at least, should be taken into the Union at this time. In the face of the situation that confronts us in the Pacific today, how can we follow any course other than that recommended by the gentleman from Michigan, to integrate all parts of our country as tightly as possibly by admitting Alaska and Hawaii to the Union as States.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Obviously, a Territory that has over 535,000 people is entirely in a different status than a community of only 100,000 people. You have 10 times the assessable property in Hawaii that you have in Alaska.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Let me say that my opinion is that as soon as Alaska is released from the shackles of Territorial government it will begin to prosper and its population will begin to increase. That is the point of this whole thing. We want to open up this area, this great empire, to American enterprise. How can you Republicans justify your opposition to this, in the face of your attacks on bureaucracy? We are not taking anything away from the States; we are trying to take something onto ourselves.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the Delegate yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I do not know a finer man in the House of Representatives, and I do not think that I have enjoyed the company of a finer man than the Delegate from Hawaii. I likewise think the same of the Delegate from Alaska. The gentleman just made a statement that interests me. By opening up and becoming a State, take Alaska, for instance, just what does that do toward developing it? Do you not have the same privileges, other than voting that the States have? Do you not have the same benefits that we prescribe to the States with respect to roads and with respect to other Federal aid? Do they not enjoy that now?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to have the Delegate from Alaska answer that question, because that applies particularly to his Territory.

Mr. BONNER. I had the pleasure of being in Hawaii with the Delegate from Hawaii. They are grand, fine people there. But, it really personally hurts me to feel as I do about taking Hawaii in as a State, and I want this to go into the RECORD to show my position and my feeling toward the Delegate from Hawaii, whom I greatly admire.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, if the Delegate will yield, I would like to say to the gentleman from North Carolina it is precisely because we do not have the same benefits as the people in the States, by reason of acts of omission and commission, that the people outside have. We think statehood is the only answer. For instance, we are not under the Federal Highway Aid Act.

Mr. BONNER Wait a minute. We spent a tremendous amount of money when I was on the Roads Committee of the House appropriating money to build the Alcan Highway.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was a war measure, together with a great many other military appurtenances that were built during the war. But, I am talking year in and year out. The only highway aid acts extended to Alaska are those that apply to the national forests. Public domain roads are built under the auspices of the Department of the Interior. Uniformly through the years we had only maintenance money. We are receiving somewhat more money now, merely because of military needs.

Mr. BONNER. Do we not apply it in public works funds, road construction? Do not the same divisions apply in Alaska as would apply to the States?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; they do not.

Mr. BONNER Just what is the difference?

Mr. BARTLETT. The acts simply do not apply to us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I dare say that many previous Congresses have heard the same arguments when other Territories were being considered for admission into the Union. I should like to speak today in behalf of the admission of Alaska, because, coming from the Northwest, we have close ties with the Territory, and we are well aware of the problems which confront the people of that area. I do not want to see the citizens of Alaska or Hawaii continue to occupy a second-rate status. I want to see them become full-fledged American citizens and have all the rights and privileges and the representation the rest of us in the Union have. I want to see Alaska become a State, because then I think something definite will really be done about the defense of that huge territory.

If you will look at the map, you will see that it is possible on a clear day to look across the Bering Strait for 54 miles and see Siberia. If you will look at the map you will notice the close proximity of Little Diomede and Big Diomede Islands. You will see two islands owned respectively by this country and the U. S. S. R., less than 3 miles apart. If you think the U. S. S. R. is not looking into the Territory of Alaska, you are mistaken.

I think the best thing we could possibly do in our own national security would be to give Alaska statehood and full representation in the House and Senate, to the end that its defenses can be brought up to date and the security of this Nation become more secure as a result. The time to give Alaska a fair deal is now; the way to do it is to admit Alaska to the Union.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative from the great State of New York, from this side of the aisle, I favor heartily the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood.

Mr. Chairman, all we are really doing is recognizing the modern effectiveness of the air age, which puts Hawaii and Alaska within reach of the eastern seaboard of the United States about as easily as the golden coast of California. We are just being modern in finally admitting these two Territories as States. The period of tutelage should now be ended for these two Territories, and they should be given an equality of status with the sister States of the United States.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the distinguished Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] went to the heart of all this when he said that if the kind of argument made here today against Alaska statehood had prevailed in the past our western border would be at the Mississippi. That is right, because every argument used here today against Alaska has been precisely the same kind of argument used against the Western Territories. Those arguments did not prevail. Those Territories became States. They prospered and they grew. I cannot prove to you that the population of those areas is greater now than it would have been under territorial status. I cannot prove to you that business is better in the West than it would have been if we had not admitted those areas as States. I cannot prove to you that industrial development there has been because of statehood.

But one thing is sure, and that is that those developments did come and that growth of population did come. I submit that was so because it is in harmony with the American genius of government to govern best when all local controls are applied that can be applied under our system of government. That was

done in the case of the West. The West has grown and prospered to the glory and benefit of the Union. Those benefits will accrue likewise if you admit Alaska as a State. Those benefits will accrue not only to Alaska, but to the entire Union.

It was said a while ago that there is doubt whether there is an intention to defend Alaska. I believe there is. I would say there had better be, because once these air fields in Alaska are seized by an enemy, the entire United States will be endangered

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman tell the Members of this body just how far it is by air from Fairbanks to Chicago?

Mr. BARTLETT. The distance, as I recall it, is just under 2,000 miles.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And from Chicago to Washington is about 600 miles more, so that in effect from Fairbanks to Washington it is something in the vicinity of 2,600 or 2,700 miles, which is just nothing at all in this day and age.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct. Bombing planes from airfields in Alaska could reach any industrial point of consequence in the United States, bomb that city and return to the airport in Alaska.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am terribly concerned about the apparent failure of our Nation's peace efforts, and over what some people describe as the inevitability of war. I am concerned about our defenses in Alaska. I wonder if perchance the Delegate from Alaska has discussed the question of statehood with the top echelons of our defense establishments.

Has he perhaps some word from the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, on this very issue?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad that point has been raised. Yes, of course I have; most recently in a telephone conversation with Secretary Johnson. I asked him to express to me the attitude of the Department of National Defense on statehood. His reply, as well as I can recall it, was that the Department of National Defense stands squarely behind the administration's program with respect to statehood for Alaska.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Did anybody from the War Department come before the committee and give that as an official report?

Mr. BARTLETT. No.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not rather strange that the committee did not call upon the National Defense arm of Government to give an opinion concerning a matter which now seems to be of very vital importance, so far as our national defense is concerned?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I point out to the gentleman from North Carolina that the commander in chief of the armed services has come out for statehood for Alaska as well as both parties.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; and he has done so repeatedly.

Mr. COOLEY. Commander in Chief of what?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of the armed services—the President of the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman will recall that in connection with the hearings on statehood for Hawaii my primary approach was on that very point, and they did so state, and it is shown in the record.

Mr. BARTLETT. In that connection I want to say that I had no knowledge whatsoever on the question of statehood for Hawaii until the hearings, and I must say that I was converted to that proposition within 15 minutes after Admiral Nimitz testified.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman was very easily converted, was he not?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, after Admiral Nimitz had spoken, I think anybody would have been.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman a question which I think is a fair one. Does not the gentleman believe that Members of Congress could make every single, solitary argument in favor of statehood for Puerto Rico that you can make in favor of statehood for Alaska?

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course not, of course not

Mr. COOLEY. What argument can be made in favor of statehood for Alaska that cannot be made for Puerto Rico?

Mr. PETERSON. But the organic act is different.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to call to the attention of the House a statement by Gen. H. H. Arnold:

> Upon Alaska our future may well rest What, then, would be better, what would insure greater provision for our future than to recognize that most important area and make it a State equal to our other 48 States?

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. One of the most potent arguments that I have not heard raised in behalf of the gentleman's position ought to be presented in this RECORD. That is that this vast Territory of Alaska was purchased for about $7,200,000 in 1867, and that the claim was made by Mr. Molotov at the San Francisco Conference that that was a fraud perpetrated by the Czarist Government of Russia, and he indicated that the present authorities of Russia considered that that purchase, then made of Czarist Russia, would ultimately be attacked as being a fraud; and the argument is made by very sound people that the surest way to defeat any such contention would be to place Alaska squarely within the circle of the other 48 States.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am grateful to the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that I have had the privilege of visiting in Alaska. I found there a very patriotic people—just as patriotic as any people in the United States.

The thing that I want to bring to the attention of the House is this one fact: That today Alaska is the Achilles heel of our national-defense program. I think all will admit that. We have got warmongers running loose all over the world, including warmongers right here in our own Nation, who would like to see another war. The folks who are so opposed to making a State of Alaska will be mighty happy, if war comes, and God forbid, that the people of Alaska will hold the enemy off until we on the mainland can get a little better prepared. I am satisfied that sometime war is coming. It may not be for years and years, and I hope never; but, without doubt, it will come, and we on the mainland are going to thank God that the people of Alaska feel that they are well enough thought of by the people of the United States that they will fight to the last minute to keep the war away from the mainland.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say, in connection with national defense, that I cannot prove that national defense would be improved by statehood for Alaska, but I know it is the case. I could not prove that the one Representative and two Senators would vote for defense measures, but of course they would This House should know that one postwar building season in Alaska was entirely lost because of lack of attention to these matters The House should know that it was only in the closing hours of the last session that provision was made for military construction in Alaska. If we had two voting Senators and one voting Representative in this House, certainly the defense picture would have been materially changed.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am in favor of this bill. I went to Alaska on a mission some months ago. My cousin had the privilege of being the delegate from Alaska for many years. I believe Alaska will make one of the outstanding States of the Nation.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in the history of Alaska, already long, this is a day which will be remembered. We Alaskans now and for the first time are given opportunity to seek our rightful place in the Union to which we owe allegiance through birth and conviction.

Alaska statehood aspirations are not new. They reach back through the years, but never before has there been opportunity for this House to pass upon the granting of statehood. It is a proposition not only of local but of national sig-

nificance. As such, it has deserved and has received, I know, your closest attention and most earnest consideration. The other day I addressed a letter to each Member of the House in forwarding a pamphlet giving information about statehood for Alaska. In that letter I was so bold as to state that I cannot believe there is any objection to statehood of sufficient merit to influence any Member of this House to vote against statehood. That statement was made out of a profound belief that it constitutes no more or no less than the simple truth.

Alaska comes before this House today seeking statehood under the same terms and the same conditions which applied to the western territories entering the Union before us. We ask for no special favors.

Give us statehood, and we will give you—and before long—a mighty State whose population will grow constantly, whose business and industry will develop in harmony with the resources upon which they will be based. And those resources, I do not have to remind you, constitute a vital addition to the real wealth of this country.

If in its wisdom the House today should reject this bill—something I do not for one moment believe will occur—Alaska will struggle on, will continue to exist as an American Territory in one fashion or another. But let me say here, and emphatically, that it will remain dormant and the great day of awakening will only be again postponed.

If, on the other hand, the House today should pass H. R. 331 and the other body should act similarly, the road will have been cleared of the windfalls which now block it and at long last Alaska will be able to shift to high gear.

We Alaska statehood advocates do not try to represent to you or to anyone else that statehood would be a cure-all. Certainly we do not maintain that under statehood all vexing problems would immediately disappear and that all would be sweetness and light. No, indeed. We realize that there would be difficulties ahead, as there have been in every new State—and perhaps in some of the older States as well. But we do submit that statehood would help more than any other one thing and, above all other things, would enable us to take our rightful place under the American system of government. We do not so assert merely out of a hopeful belief and without evidence to support our view. We call upon American history for confirmation. That history shows that almost uniformly progress of all types reached a certain point under Territorial status and then stopped almost completely. Under the stimulus of statehood the existing impediments were removed and development came. There is no reason whatsoever why that should not be so in the case of Alaska. In fact, the record tends to indicate that the handcuffs which were placed on Alaska, governmentally speaking, were locked much tighter than in the case of other Territories. And the opening of those handcuffs, which can only be brought about by statehood, ought to, and in fact would, enable the pioneer hands of those in Alaska now and those who will go there to carve a mighty new State for this Union from our last western frontier.

Next month—on March 30 to be exact—it will be 83 years since the treaty of purchase of Alaska from Russia was concluded. It is significant to note that in a speech ratifying the treaty, Senator Charles Sumner specifically dedicated Alaska to future statehood in the Union.

I have said that Alaska, above all other Territories in the history of the United States, has been hampered by the type of government it has suffered from rather than enjoyed. Let the record speak:

Purchase from Russia was made in 1867.

Seventeen years passed before there was any legal government whatsoever.

At one time the might and power and dignity of the United States in Alaska was represented in the person of a Treasury Department official who was supplied with a rowboat to visit different sections of the district, none of which could be reached by means other than water

Sixteen more years were to elapse before Congress enacted a code of laws applicable to the Territory.

It was not until 1906 that the people of Alaska were permitted to send a Delegate to Congress.

Six additional years were to pass before the organic act became effective. Judge Wickersham—then Delegate Wickersham—was the author of the organic act. When it was finally signed by President Taft in August of 1912 he was far from satisfied with the results of his authorship. For the bill, in its progress through the two Houses of Congress, had been so cruelly mauled, so savagely set upon that it had become merely a caricature of what was intended to be a document of home rule grants to a Territory of the United States of America.

Believe me, these omissions with respect to granting Alaska the rights which should have been hers as a Territory, plus some very deliberate commissions, have joined to make it almost incredibly difficult for the American citizens there to fashion a real homeland, American style. If there is one principle we are all ready to agree upon it is that American democracy thrives only under a situation where local government is given every last grant of self-rule constitutionally permissible—but in Alaska that rule has been uniformly violated. We have been set upon by the very Government to which we hold allegiance, and we have been fair prey for predatory interests against whom we had no proper protection.

So discouraged was Delegate Wickersham with the organic act which was taken from his hands in clay so soft that it had been broken and shattered on its subsequent journey that he immediately realized that it would not suffice.

His conclusions on this issue, after some preliminary and fruitless attempts to secure correction, resulted in his introducing the first statehood bill in the Congress of the United States in March 1916. That was not the date marking the first statehood aspirations within Alaska, but it was the date those aspirations first had formal expression.

The laments of Alaskans, always fighting against discriminations imposed upon them, were long ago given expression by a rhymester when he wrote:

Sitting on my coldest glacier, with my feet in Bering Sea,
I am thinking cold and lonely, of the way you've treated me.
Three and thirty years of silence! Through ten thousand sleeping nights
I've been praying for your coming, for the dawn of civil rights
When you took me, young and trusting, from the growling Russian bear,
Loud you swore before the Nation I should have the Eagle's care.
Never yet has wing of Eagle cast a shadow on my peaks,
But I've watched the flight of buzzards, and I've felt their busy beaks

The 10,000 nights referred to in the rhyme have now become almost 30,000 nights We are still waiting. Our long vigil will be over if H. R. 331 should pass this House now and should be accepted by the other body

We have been often told in the past—we are told now—Why don't you wait with your statehood plea until you are really ready for statehood? Why don't you let the Federal Government do things for you which you need before attempting to support a State government? You need many things. We will give them to you and then it will be time to ask for statehood.

There was a time when we used to go along with that theory. There was a time, we believed, that if we only waited all good things would come to pass. We were rather naive in that belief because the record was quite clear and showed conclusively that it was all a dream of a never-never land that was not to be.

To do part of the job, it would have been necessary for the Federal Government to have liberalized existing legislation relating to Alaska. It would have been necessary to allow Alaskans to have more and more local autonomy. That has never been done. There has not been one major amendment to the organic act since 1912 in the direction of increased home rule. Every Delegate in Congress since then, Republican and Democrat alike, has sought to enlarge in necessary ways, the boundaries of self-rule, but uniformly without success. Even comparatively minor amendments have been difficult to secure. A first-class illustration of this is to be found in the organic act's language relating to taxing powers vested in the Territorial government. The organic act provided that tax assessments shall be according to the actual value thereof. Largely as a consequence of that language, no general property-tax law was enacted by the Territorial legislature until last year. That was principally because the mind of man was not agile enough to devise a means whereby all the huge acreage of mining land in Alaska could be assessed at its actual value. In 1948—36 years after the organic act became law—the Congress passed a revisionary bill permitting the Territorial legislature to tax mining

land at a flat value per acre. If 36 years is required for amendment of that character, how long will be needed for a real home-rule amendment?

Another example: Back in 1899, before there was any Territorial government, the Congress empowered clerks of the district court in Alaska to collect certain taxes from business enterprises. That was done simply because there were no Territorial officials to collect what were, in effect, local taxes. The money so raised was deposited in the Treasury of the United States and annually appropriated by Congress, according to a percentage formula, for roads, schools, and care of the indigent. Obviously, this temporary expedient should have been abandoned with the establishment of the Territorial government in 1913. After all, these were purely local taxes which were being collected, and a judicial officer such as a clerk of the court should scarcely have been burdened with tax-collecting duties, nor should the judges of the district court have been required to pass upon indigent claims. One would believe it would be simple, indeed, to change this. But it was not. Even with reference to such a small matter, one regarding which there was very little controversy, it was not until 1949 that the law was changed.

Alaska, with its 586,000 square miles, has at this time less than 3,000 miles of roads. Alaska has never been under any of the Federal Highway Aid Acts except those pertaining to roads within national forest The vast public domain is almost without roads.

Until recently, practically nothing was done in the way of agricultural experimentation to match that which is proceeding across Bering Strait in Soviet Asia. Let me admit—freely and gratefully—that now and for several years past, the appropriations for and in behalf of Alaska have been substantial as compared with years gone by. In some categories—particularly for defense—they have been too small. But judged against the past, they have been almost astronomical. However—and this must be underlined—they are being made solely because of national defense requirements and are, in my opinion at least, altogether unrelated to what might be termed normal development of the area

You should know, if you already do not have the information that in Alaska the Federal Government, in ordinary times, has adopted a policy certainly not in harmony with a sound development program. Up until the time the war started, Federal expenditures in Alaska were in the aggregate so small as to serve no useful purpose whatsoever in creating industry and expanding population. The services performed by the National Government were by way of being on a caretaker basis. The aggregate expenditure in the Territory each year was not enormously larger than the amount produced from Alaska each year in income taxes. Obviously, a frontier land can never develop under such a policy. And Alaska did not develop. The stimulus which now is being felt there comes about admittedly by reason of the substantially larger expenditures which are being made on account of the world situation. It is probably safe to say that 95 cents out of each Federal dollar spent in Alaska now is, if not directly for military purposes, so closely related as to be part and parcel of the general plan. Of course, this has brought people into Alaska. Of course, it has caused business to expand. Of course, it has started some industrial development, even if on a very small scale. But—and this is of vital importance—if the need for making defense expenditures were to end tomorrow, would there be any more hope of securing development funds for Alaska than there was in years gone by? He who would answer that question in the affirmative would be a brave soul, indeed, and his reply would run counter to the experience of history and the practices of men. If Alaska were to remain under territorial status it would return once more to the seat of central government in a beggar's role and in beggar's clothes. In such a state it would remain as neglect and indifference reasserted themselves.

It was because Alaskans, who have long studied all of these things, realized they could never obtain true home rule as a Territory and could never hope for needed Federal appropriations as a matter of right that the move for statehood crystallized in the early part of the last decade. That movement found as its leader a man whose name will always occupy a shining chapter in Alaska history—Anthony J. Dimond, then Delegate in Congress and now a judge of the District Court in Alaska. It was he who started anew the long fight to achieve for Alaska the status of a State and it was around him that informed and growing public opinion lodged. It has expanded mightily since then. In 1946 the first statehood referendum was conducted, and statehood was endorsed.

So, Alaskans want statehood. They have so said in a democratic way through the casting of secret ballots. They have thereby asserted their willingness to pay whatever increased taxes statehood might demand. They are willing to do so for the benefits which would accrue to them and thus to Alaska through the possession of sovereign rights now denied them.

Another question then arises: Even if Alaskans want statehood, even if they are ready to assume its obligations and responsibilities along with its benefits, would the Nation enjoy benefits equal to those of Alaska, or are there objections from the national viewpoint so serious that the demands from the Territory should be ignored? First, let us examine the situation from the purely materialistic point of view. No one would be prepared to say in 1950 that the United States made any mistake whatsoever in purchasing Alaska. It has proved to be an exceedingly good bargain. The price paid to Russia was $7,200,000. Since then, natural resources valued at approximately $3,000,000,000 have been shipped from Alaska to the United States as increments to the national wealth of this country. And those who are not impressed by the number of residents in Alaska cannot say that Alaskans have not been good customers. Since 1867 they have purchased from the United States proper goods valued in excess of $2,000,000,000. If we Alaskans under State government could manage our own affairs as do the people of the several States, we can—again relying upon historical records which prove what happened in similar instances in other places—look forward to a notable gain in this two-way and mutually profitable trade. Give us the key—and that key is statehood—to unlock our treasures, and we shall make this rich and great country of ours even richer and greater. Objections can never be made to Alaska's claim to statehood on the basis that it is a land without resources, of barren Arctic wastes. Three-fourths of the Territory lies in the Temperate Zone. It has the last great timber stands in the United States. It has land suitable for agriculture and for grazing. It has mineral deposits, already discovered and potential, of unknown worth. It has hydroelectric possibilities which American industry will have to resort to. It has all these things and more. It has that which is needed to make a prosperous State of the Union.

But it is noncontiguous. That has been cited as a reason for not granting statehood. It is said, and correctly, that no border of Alaska touches upon any State When Louisiana was admitted, it likewise was noncontiguous. It was 210 miles from Louisiana to Tennessee, the nearest State. And when California was admitted, the next State was Texas, 470 miles distant. The airplane of today, flying at 250 or 300 miles an hour, covers the distance from any point in Alaska to Washington, D. C., in a mere fraction of the time it was required to go from Louisiana or California to the closest State by then existing means of transportation at the time they were admitted. So noncontiguity certainly cannot be claimed to be valid with respect to Alaska if it were not considered valid in earlier times in our history. If it had so been considered, Louisiana and California would never have been admitted when they were. The argument then for contiguity was infinitely stronger and more persuasive than it ought to be in 1950 when man's ingenuity and inventive skill have shattered distance.

It has been said that if Alaska and Hawaii were to become States now the bars would be taken down and the way would be paved for statehood for Puerto Rico, Guam, and, in fact, all the islands of the sea. This contention is singularly lacking in merit. So far as Alaska is concerned, the answer is that in adopting the Organic Act of 1912—deficient though it may be—the Congress then and there evaluated the political future of Alaska and determined that after serving an appropriate period in school it should receive its diploma and become a full-fledged State. Hawaii was likewise singled out for future statehood. Both Alaska and Hawaii are organized Territories. As such, they are integral parts of the Union. They have been incorporated. That is to say, long ago their future status was passed upon and the decision made Not so with respect to the unincorporated territory of Puerto Rico and to Guam and other possessions. The

act of incorporation means that the Territory becomes an integral part of the Union. That, Puerto Rico is not at this time. Nor is any area except Alaska and Hawaii. So we do not establish any precedent with these two Territories. We merely move to carry out a policy which in the case of Alaska was expressed in 1912, the date of incorporation.

There is additional evidence on this score. Even before Congress acted, the Supreme Court had found Alaska to be a part of the United States. This is set forth in that very admirable volume, Alaska Under Rule of the United States, by Jeannette Paddock Nichols:

In the first place, the legal status of Alaska among the noncontiguous possessions of the United States had been finally settled by the Supreme Court in 1905. Since 1900 that body had been delivering a series of opinions, popularly termed the "insular cases," which developed certain distinctions as between the legal status of Hawaii and of the possessions acquired from Spain (Puerto Rico and the Philippines) and that of the older Territories on the continent, Alaska, Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico. The new possessions were declared to be unincorporated Territories, appurtenant to, and dependencies of, the United States, but not a part of the United States; in legislating for them Congress was declared to be bound only by the fundamental parts of the Constitution which automatically extend to all Territories of the United States as soon as they cease to be foreign territories: The formal portions of the Constitution, on the other hand, were to apply to them only when Congress so directed. The older Territories were declared to be incorporated Territories; in legislating for them Congress was bound by all the limitations in the Constitution which were not clearly inapplicable. In this connection the Supreme Court reserved the right to determine from time to time what parts of the Constitution are fundamental and what formal: and in the latter class were placed, one after another, provisions involving the interpretation of the term "United States" in reference to uniformity in taxation, clauses concerned with citizenship, and the requirements of the sixth amendment to the Constitution regarding the use of grand and petit juries in the prosecution of crime.

In every Alaska case the Court placed that region in the class of incorporated Territories. For example, although taxes imposed in Puerto Rico need not be uniform with those imposed throughout the United States (decision of May 27, 1901, in *Downes* v. *Bidwell* (182 U. S, 244) those imposed in Alaska must share in that uniformity. For by a decision of May 31, 1904, in *Binns* v. *United States* (194 U S., 486) the Supreme Court decided that although the rule of uniformity of taxes applied to Alaska, license fees imposed on certain lines of business by the Alaska penal code must be deemed local taxes, imposed under the plenary power of Congress over the Territories, for the purpose of defraying the expense of the territorial government. And again, although the provisions of the sixth amendment did not apply to Hawaii or the Philippines (decisions of June 1, 1903, and May 31, 1904) in the cases of *Hawaii* v. *Mankichi* (190 U. S., 197) and *Dorr* v. *United States* (195 U. S., 138) they did apply to Alaska. For, by a decision of April 10, 1905, in *Rasmussen* v. *United States* (197 U. S., 516) the Supreme Court declared that section 171 of the Alaska Code (31 Stat. L., 358) insofar as it provided that in trials for misdemeanors six persons should constitute a legal jury, was unconstitutional and void, under the fifth and sixth amendments.

The reasons for these differences in classification were given by the Supreme Court, as follows: The treaty with Russia, concerning Alaska, instead of exhibiting, as did that with Spain concerning the Philippine Islands, the determination to reserve the question of the status of the acquired Territory for ulterior action by Congress, manifested a contrary intention to admit the inhabitants of the ceded Territory to the enjoyment of citizenship, and expressed the purpose to incorporate the Territory into the United States. Therefore, under the treaty with Russia ceding Alaska and the subsequent legislation of Congress, Alaska had been incorporated into the United States and the Constitution was applicable to her.

These decisions gave Alaska the proud title of Territory in the place of the name of district with which she had been burdened since 1884; and they took her, though a noncontiguous area, out of her association with the dependencies acquired from the Spanish War, into a class again peculiar to herself. Like Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, she was to bear thhe name of Territory and bask in the effulgence of the Constitution; but unlike them, she yet remained destitute of delegate and local legislature.

So, it becomes apparent that to act affirmatively with reference to the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills would not be to open the statehood gate to any other area anywhere.

There is another argument which has been urged against Alaska statehood. It is said that 100,000 people ought not to have the same voice in the Senate of the United States as the people of such great and populous States as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California. I can give no more effective answer to this than by quoting the Chicago Journal of Commerce, which editorially commented upon the opposition of the City Club of Chicago to statehood, because of Senate representation. Said the Chicago Journal of Commerce:

In view of the existing disparity proportional representation in the Senate is already precluded. It was never intended by the founding fathers. Way back in 1790, for example, Virginia, with a population of 747,610, was granted the same senatorial representation as Delaware with 59,096, and Tennessee with 35,691. It is the House, not the Senate, which is intended as the Chamber with proportional representation.

Alaska's population has now passed 92,000. That of Nevada is 174,000. New York's is 14,393,000. Both numerically and percentagewise, the gap between the State of New York and Nevada is many times greater than between the State of Nevada and the Territory of Alaska.

The potential population of Alaska is considerable. It boasts of more than a half million square miles, rich with timber, furs, and gold. Its fisheries and canning industries are extremely important. With the increase in air transport, Alaska will move ever closer to the present 48 States, in hours and economic ties.

Certain well-entrenched business interests also oppose Alaska statehood. They're doing nicely right now, thank you, and they don't want things changed. But, from the standpoint of over-all economic welfare and of common justice, Alaska (and Hawaii) statehood should be conferred by Congress. And the sooner the better.

Frankly, I think the debate on this issue comes a bit too late to be used against Alaska. As the Journal of Commerce says, proportional representation in the Senate is not possible under the Constitution. If it is desired to amend the Constitution, that is something else again. But no one to my knowledge has seriously urged it. In view of what has happened in the United States in the last 160 years, one is entitled to suggest that the founding fathers did not do too badly in setting up our governmental structure. It would seem that some rather praiseworthy accomplishments have occurred under that Government, and that lack of proportional representation in the Senate of the United States has never been detrimental to the best interests of our Nation.

That is an old, old story. It is discussed and debated and worried over almost every time a new State is created. Oklahoma is the only State which came into the Union in recent history with a rather sizable population. It had around one and one-half million people upon admission. Hawaii is the only other Territory having a substantial population before gaining statehood.

It might be contended that the only tried and true means of increasing population in a Territory is to grant statehood. That could be said, for example, in the case of Illinois itself. If those who represented the more populous States in that day took the same attitude the city club of Chicago does now, surely statehood would not have come to Illinois when it did. Illinois at the time of admission had 53,211 people. Some historians suggest the census takers at that moment were unusually active and to swell the figures to the greatest possible extent counted in those immigrants who were merely passing through Illinois for the West. Virginia then had 1,065,366 citizens, Pennsylvania 1,049,458, and New York 1,372,812. So it might be suggested that a considerable disparity existed between the population of Illinois and all of the other great States named. Notwithstanding, Illinois was admitted, and he would be a hazardous soul, indeed, who would claim now that that action was unwise. The population of California today ranks it as one of the greatest of the States. But it was not so in 1850 when California first came into the Union as a State. Then each of its citizens, through having two Senators, had what the proponents of proportional representation in the upper body would describe as a voice out of all proportion to their numbers. California then had 92,527 residents. But Virginia's population was 1,421,661, Pennsylvania's 2,311,786, and New York's 3,097,394. Even so, with two Senators representing only 92,527 people from California, the Union maintained itself. Oregon's population was only 52,465 when it achieved statehood in 1859. By that time Virginia's population had increased to 1,596,318, Pennsylvania's to 2,906,215, and New York's to 3,880,735. But Oregon's plea for admission was just; Oregon was admitted, and Oregon has become a substantial and a great State of these United States. So it goes The argument of population lack ought not to be used against Alaska now. If ours was the first Territory numerically inferior, then it would be different. Instead, in that respect we occupy not a unique position but one that is, in fact, massive with tradition and in conformity with the experiences of our past. Here again the

question might be asked, "What comes first, the chicken or the egg?" Generally speaking, history demonstrates in conclusive fashion that the granting of statehood itself is the one great and significant act which makes for growth and population.

In asking you to pass H. R. 331, the Alaskans who are for statehood desire to remind you that their Territory with a population of 100,000—an increase of 39 percent over the 1940 population—at this time has more citizens than did 16 previous territories. They were Vermont, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Louisiana, Indiana, Mississippi, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, Florida, California, Oregon, Nevada, Idaho, and Wyoming.

If proportional representation would have prevailed in the Senate, it certainly would have prevailed when our Government was founded, when the Thirteen Original States joined to organize the Union. There were wide disparities in population even then. Virginia had 747,610 people as against only 68,825 for Rhode Island and only 59,094 for Delaware. Pennsylvania with 434,373 people was given the same voice in the Senate as New Hampshire with 141,885.

It was away back in 1905 when in debating admission of Oklahoma Senator Bate quoted President Washington as having written:

> Among the privileges, benefits and advantages thus secured to the inhabitants of the territory south of the river Ohio appears to be the right of forming a permanent constitution and state government and of admission as a state by its delegates into the Congress of the United States on an equal footing with the original states in all respects whatever, when it should have therein 60,000 free inhabitants, provided the constitution and government so to be formed shall be Republican and in conformity with the principles contained in the articles of said ordinance.

Elaborating, Senator Bate added:

> That is, President Washington says that all that is necessary is to conform to the Ordinance of 1787 but he went further and recognized the right of forming a permanent constitution and admission into the union as something that must be done but being done gave to the people of the territory the right to be put on an equal footing with the original states in all respects whatsoever.

The question of statehood should not be settled upon a political basis. Politics should not be allowed to count in a decision in which national interests are involved. The platforms of both great political parties of this country have statehood planks.

At the moment Alaska happens to be Democratic. It has had a Democratic administration since 1932. From 1908 until 1932 it had Republican Delegates and Governors. It is not fixed in allegiance to any political party but maintains a healthy two-party system.

Advocates of Alaska statehood are certainly not confined to either party. For example, the Alaska Statehood Committee, created by action of the last Territorial legislature, has, as its chairman, Robert B. Atwood, prominent Republican and a newspaper publisher of Anchorage. The committee's secretary is Mrs. Mildred R. Hermann, a practicing attorney and a Republican of Juneau. Still another Republican member is the Reverend Percy Ipalook, an Eskimo from Wales in northwestern Alaska. A distinguished Democratic member is Frank Peratrovich, well-known businessman of Klawock and a member of the Territorial senate. An advisory member of the committee is Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, who, despite his presence on the Federal bench, remains an earnest and effective advocate of statehood. Still another advisory member is Alaska's Governor, Hon. Ernest Gruening. Appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, Governor Gruening is foremost in the ranks of the champions of statehood and very probably is one of the few men in the history of American Government who is doing his very best to talk himself out of a job by making it possible for Alaskans to elect their own Governor under statehood.

Other members of the Alaska Statehood Committee are: William L. Baker, editor and publisher of Ketchikan; Victor C. Rivers, Anchorage engineer and architect and a member of the Territorial senate; Stanley J. McCutcheon, Anchorage attorney, head of an air line and member of the Territorial house of representatives; Warren A. Taylor, Fairbanks attorney and member of the Territorial house of representatives; Andrew Nerland, member of the Territorial senate and a leading businessman of Fairbanks; Howard Lyng of Nome, member of the Territorial senate, and Lee Bettinger, mayor of Kodiak and a leading businessman there.

At this critical juncture of human events it might well be urged that even if Alaskans were entirely disinterested in statehood now, statehood should be granted them nonetheless for compelling national reasons having to do with security.

I have never heard a clearer exposition of why Alaska statehood should be granted for national reasons, as contrasted with local ones, than was given from the well of this House last Thursday by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. He said what needed to be said on this subject when he declared:

> But why is it to our interest in the continental United States that statehood for Alaska be granted as soon as possible? Because only through statehood can Alaska be developed to the point that it can support economically the subsidiary measures of the defense mechanism which is necessary in this area for the protection of the whole United States. Only through statehood can Alaska develop the conditions necessary for sound logistics to supply our defense bastions.
>
> The saying that "in union there is strength" is not so trite as to be without meaning The very nature of union is such that common advantage is derived. It would be a mistake for those of us here in the States to consider only the advantages we can give to Alaska out of our beneficence. There are mutual advantages to be gained, and not the least of these is that the security of Alaska, dependent largely on statehood, is vital to the security of the entire Nation.

The main Alaska coast at its closest point to Asia is less than 60 miles from Siberia. Little Diomede Island, under the American flag, is less than 3 miles from Soviet Big Diomede Island. No point in the world today is of more strategic significance than is Alaska. If Alaska had two United States Senators and a Representative in the Congress there would be a voting strength in behalf of adequate security measures for that region, and thus for the United States, that simply does not exist now. To build up Alaska so its population will increase, so that its business will expand, and so its industry will grow, will be to strengthen our defensive position. Then, and only then, will it be unnecessary for our armed forces to ship from the United States proper practically everything they need. There will be a local economy upon which they could depend to a greater extent and they no longer will be forced to exist in a sort of vacuum, as has unhappily been the case. Only a few days ago the Secretary of National Defense, the Honorable Louis Johnson, said to me, when I queried him about statehood, that the Department of National Defense stands squarely behind the administration's program.

At other times in the past statehood has been granted primarily not because of local desires or needs but because the Nation's interests demanded such action. I submit that that is the case in Alaska now. I submit further that the case we in Alaska have made for statehood is compelling and ought to be accepted; but even if that were not so, our defense needs, insofar as they relate to Alaska, can be properly realized only with the granting of statehood.

The prospect of granting statehood to Alaska does not frighten the New York Times published in the biggest city in the biggest State, numerically, in the Union. On the contrary, the Times specifically endorsed Alaska and Hawaii statehood in an editorial which appeared in that newspaper last Sunday:

> FIFTY STATES
>
> The question of Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood is due to come before the House again this week. A bill to give statehood to Hawaii passed the House in 1947, and ever since then there has been considerable talk, but no action. It seems to be indisputable that the bulk of the population of both territories wishes them to becomes States; the platforms of both major parties endorse the idea, differing only in degree of immediacy; and the historical development of the United States assuredly leads in this direction.
>
> Although Alaska's population is only about 100,000 (of whom approximately two-thirds were born in the United States), there are more people in the area today than there were in at least a dozen of the continental Territories at the time they became States of the Union. As for Hawaii, its 520,000 inhabitants are far more heterogeneous than those of Alaska; but even at that, almost 90 percent are American citizens, and the House report accompanying the statehood bill observes: "Certainly there is no area under United States jurisdiction where a greater complexity of races lives so harmoniously."
>
> The major objection in recent years to bringing either of these areas into the Union is the fact that they are not contiguous to the continental United States. Alaska is separated from this country by 870 miles of Canadian territory; Hawaii is 2,400 miles distant from the nearest point on the American mainland. This consideration would surely have been important in another era. But both Territories are less than 24 hours'

flight from New York today; and thus, they are actually far nearer in travel time than New York was to Boston when the Union was founded. With the annihilation of distance there has likewise been annihilated the argument, based on distance, against statehood for these two areas otherwise fully qualified to be integral parts of the Union.

Likewise, the Washington Post on February 28 endorsed Alaska statehood in a most persuasive editorial:

ALASKA'S CHANCE

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is at last scheduled for a vote in the House in two bills to be called up this week This newspaper has commented several times on the eminent justification for bringing Hawaii into the Union, the case has in no way diminished. Alaska's petition seems to us equally justified. If anything, the importance of statehood of Alaska has been increased by the Territory's strategic position in the national defense.

Alaska's military significance is as an air base—for the United States or for an invading enemy. Let troops defending airfields there amount to only a corporal's guard. Although Congress has voted money for the military housing necessary to increase troop strength, it still has not appropriated funds for the vital radar-warning screen. Much of this neglect may be attributed to the fact that Alaska has only one nonvoting Delegate in Congress. The Territory is still thought of as a remote and icy wilderness instead of as the strategic prize it is.

If Alaska is to become a really stable bastion of defense, then it must be settled and developed. There is much reason to believe that absentee Federal direction has hindered rather than helped economic and population growth. For example, Alaska's fisheries have been dangerously depleted under Federal control. Also, Alaska's road development has been slow because she has not received help under the Federal Highway Aid Act.

Yet Alaska has continued to grow to the point where her population now exceeds 100,000. This is more than the population of 12 States at the time they entered the Union. Even considering Alaska's great area, her population per square mile is greater than that of such States as Nevada, Minnesota, and Oregon at the time they were admitted. Moreover, she is closely linked with the remainder of the United States by air and the Alaska highway. She has had 35 years' experience in self-government as a Territory. Her educational system is well established. The House Public Lands Committee, after broad investigation, has concluded that she should be able to support herself financially under statehood.

Alaska has been a United States possession for 83 years. During this period her tremendous resources—timber, minerals, power—and her great capacity for settling Americans in new homes have scarcely been tapped. On these grounds alone statehood for Alaska would be a wise and just investment. Much more than this, it has now become a necessary factor in the defense of the United States.

Today 100,000 Americans in Alaska await your verdict on H. R. 331. Our fate is in your hands. But it is not altogether alone our fate which you are considering. It is a fate which is intertwined with the welfare of the entire Nation.

The American citizens who live in Alaska come from every State in the Union. They seek justice at your hands. They are tired and weary of discrimination, hurt, and neglect. They do not think it proper for them to live under the American flag and to have all general laws, including those relating to taxes, apply to them without having any right to join in the making of those laws. They are weary of being stepchildren. They want to come home. They ask that you open the door to receive them so that they may live in this Union mansion of ours on terms of complete equality and trust.

They inform you through me that they, as America's last pioneers, need a new tool in the fashioning of the great northwestern peninsula. They need statehood.

They need it for their own sakes.

They need it for the children who will come after them.

They need it for the other Americans who will join them.

They need it so Alaska may be set up as a great defense bastion against any enemy from Asia.

They need it so all the people of the world may know that American democracy practices what it preaches, that it is positive, not negative.

They need it particularly so that the hundreds of millions who live in the area bordering the Pacific Ocean will be told as they could be in no other fashion that our form of government is dynamic, vigorous, and the best form of government yet devised by man.

Percentage of votes cast in 1948 election as compared with 1940 census—by States and Territories, votes for Senators and Delegates

State	Population 1940	Votes cast 1948	Percent
Colorado	1,123,296	510,121	45
Delaware	266,505	141,362	53
Georgia	3,123,723	362,504	12
Illinois	7,897,241	3,900,285	49
Maine	847,226	223,256	26
Massachusetts	4,316,721	2,055,798	48
Michigan	5,256,106	2,062,097	39
Minnesota	2,792,300	1,220,250	44
Mississippi	2,183,796	151,478	7
Montana	559,456	221,003	40
New Jersey	4,160,165	1,869,882	45
North Carolina	3,571,623	764,550	21
Oregon	1,089,684	498,570	46
South Dakota	642,961	242,833	38
Virginia	2,677,773	386,998	14
Texas	6,414,824	1,061,563	17
Alaska	72,524	22,309	31
Hawaii	423,330	100,645	24

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I think I have had quite an experience with Territories. The State which I have the honor of representing today, North Dakota, has in its time belonged to 22 States and Territories of this Union. When Patrick Henry made his speech, "Give me liberty or give me death," North Dakota belonged to Virginia, and we had an awful time getting away from her. It was not until 1787, when Virginia gave up its rights to the Northwest Territory. We then belonged to the Northwest Territory, the area north of the Ohio River. In turn, we belonged to Ohio, with its capital at Chillicothe; and then Vincennes, Ind.; and then Dearborn, Ill.; and then Detroit, Mich.; and then Madison, Wis.; and then St. Paul, Minn.; and during this entire progress of North Dakota across the continent the same arguments were made when it was proposed that she be admitted as a State that are made here this afternoon. The same arguments were used against us in 1787 that are used here this afternoon against Alaska.

Then, when you get through with the eastern side of North Dakota, you have to start on the west side of the Missouri River. There we belonged to all those States from Louisiana clear through to the Dominion of Canada. Up to the time of our statehood in 1889 it was always said, on the occasion of every move we made to seek admission to the Union, that we were not ready for statehood, that we had everything under Territorial status that we could have as a State. You have seen here this afternoon Alaska represented by a brilliant man, Hawaii represented by an equally brilliant man. They are allowed to take part in the debate, but vote they may not. Is that a free government? Would statehood change that? It certainly would.

If the argument used here against the admission of Alaska had prevailed in the past, we would have no great Western States today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] a while ago made an observation to the effect that either he was fooled or those advocating the approval of this measure were fooled. I wish to ask the gentleman from Georgia, if he is on the floor, what he thinks about the great public-opinion polls that have been taken on this question throughout the United States. Perhaps all of the people of this country are fooled on this question; perhaps all of the people making up the vast majority of the affirmative side in those polls were fooled. Can any man argue that the people, those out through the hinterland down to the grass roots, would deny these rights to these great people of Hawaii and Alaska?

There is such a thing as public opinion in this country; and, thank God, now and then it operates. That public opinion, according to the information that comes to this Nation's Capital, which, incidentally, has become the capital of the world, shows that our people are not only willing but anxious for these two Territories to have statehood.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I decline to yield to the gentleman.

People ask, "What could you have under statehood that you do not have under a Territorial status?" Let me ask the other 434 Members of this House, "Would you have your State revert to a Territorial status?" Of course, you would not, because you know good and well that under a Territorial status the people do not have the protections that they have with their voting representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the arguments in debate both pro and con on this matter and have studied the subject considerably. I am firmly convinced that the time has come when we should admit Alaska into the Union. The question of statehood for Alaska has been pending for a considerable period of time—a time which has permitted every Member of the Congress to become thoroughly acquainted with the factors involved in extending the status of statehood to one of our largest and certainly one of our most strategic Territories.

It is not my purpose to look at the question that is before us today from the point of view of what statehood would mean to the people of Alaska. However, I wish to confine my remarks to a much more important aspect of this question—the question of providing defenses for our Nation and the unquestionably and undeniable strategic position which Alaska occupies in relation to our global defenses and outposts. In other words, what statehood for Alaska would mean to the United States. We should make Alaska a fortification of defense for America.

In this connection, I beg the indulgence of the membership of the House to repeat two statements of two of our most able military leaders and pioneers in air power.

Many years ago the late Billy Mitchell, one of the greatest pioneers in air power that this country has ever produced, stated: "He who holds Alaska holds the world."

At a later time and following the complete fulfillment of the prophesies and predictions of General Mitchell, the late General Arnold said, "Upon Alaska our future may well rest."

Yes, in our world today Alaska is of great importance. What could insure greater provision for our future than to recognize the truth of the facts as stated by these eminent military men?

Let us fortify Alaska against any possible aggression. Alaska may well hold the key to our future security and we should thus make of this Territory an arsenal and a bulwark of democracy. This can truly be accomplished through statehood, and I fear only through statehood.

The question properly arises as to whether we can adequately prepare our defenses—which are acknowledgedly so vital in Alaska—unless we admit the Territory into the constitutional Union as a State. I repeat, I believe that we cannot.

Resettlement will not materially grow further for Alaska as a Territory. As a State, Alaska will be settled, developed, and grow into a bulwark of defense. GI's and others will settle there under the incentive of American statehood.

Alaska, Mr. Chairman, constitutes so vital a bulwark in the defense of our country that I hesitate to dwell upon the possibilities or the consequences of our failure to insure its complete and impregnable defense.

The Territory of Alaska is the closest point under the United States flag to Soviet Russia. It is strategically located in relation to the island of Formosa which now has become so critical in the light of recent global disturbances. I do not have the figures to quote at this point—and I think they may be somewhat unnecessary because they are so well known to all of us—but the air hours lying between Alaska and Soviet Russia and its satellite territories are virtually negligible—certainly, they cannot afford any degree of comfort.

Alaska today can readily be reached by all means of transportation—land, sea and air. We have already built the Alcan Highway to Alaska—a needed network of defense. The presence of this highway and the expense to which we went in effecting its construction certainly indicates that road transportation to Alaska was and is of the utmost importance.

Thus we have already made the Territory of Alaska as contiguous, in a sense, to our country as California is contiguous to my own State of Tennessee—by highway. By air, Alaska is only a negligible number of hours distance. Therefore, we cannot longer argue that Alaska is isolated—having a foreign point of view and lacking in a common interest with the 48 States. That is no longer true.

The people of Alaska have proved themselves through 87 years in the status of a possession of the United States—39 of which years have been in the status of Territory—to be loyal American citizens. They enjoy, shall we say, the same penalties as continental American citizens—income taxes, excise taxes and such. The citizens of Alaska have fought through three wars of this country.

The population of Alaska while still small—totaling approximately 100,000 today—has been swelled by many loyal and pioneering citizens of continental United States who have settled there and who have helped to promote its economic interest—and therefore the economic interest of the entire United States.

The last territories to be admitted into the Union were Arizona and New Mexico—in the year 1912, I believe. It was argued at that time that the populations of those Territories were too small for the granting of complete and full statehood. But how does that argument stand now? Statehood has been a major factor in the growth and development of those former Territories—I think no one will gainsay that statement. Alaska with a population of approximately 100,000 today is every bit as important and vital—vital and important to the defense of our country.

Mr. Chairman, under the conditions prevailing today in our international relations we are called upon to exercise foresight in our national interest and safety—and bring Alaska into full statehood.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that Alaska will become the forty-ninth State of our Union. I will vote in favor of this resolution and I hope it will pass well nigh unanimously.

Mr. Chairman, purchase of the vast Territory of Alaska from Russia in 1867 for only $7,200,000, was termed by the then opponents of Government spending, as Seward's folly." William H. Seward was United States Secretary of State, who negotiated the purchase. Russia, during the darkest days of our Civil War, was friendly to the Union, and opposed contemplated recognition of the confederacy by the Emperor Louis Bonaparte, of France, and by the English Government.

To emphasize that friendship, and as a belligerent gesture against Great Britain and France, whose governments threatened to intervene in the War Between the States on the side of the South, the Czar sent his war fleet to New York and up the Potomac to our Capital. Britain and France backed down. The purchase price for Alaska was considered liberal at that time by our officials to compensate Russia for the expense of the long voyage and prolonged stay in American waters of its war fleet.

The wheel of fortune has revolved. Czarist Russia proved our mightiest friend at a time of threatened national disunity. Communist Russia is presently our bitterest, most feared, enemy, and is preparing to wage war against us.

With the Soviet Union threatening the peace of the world as an aggressor nation, the fact that Alaska is but a few miles from Soviet territory and only minutes away as war planes travel, is an important argument for the admission of Alaska into statehood now. We must keep in mind that two world wars are two too many. We must do all things within our power to prevent war and maintain peace for all time.

Very thorough plans should be made to rebuild Alaskan defenses and to man World War II air bases in Alaska by additional ground forces. In fact, admission of Alaska to statehood will serve notice upon the Communists of Russia that we realize the importance of Alaska in the defense of this Nation against dictatorship aggression, that we propose to build our defenses in Alaska to a strength sufficient to repel any attack from the Soviet Union and that this forty-ninth State will no longer be a vulnerable spot for the defense of the United States. A dictator fears and respects force.

To the argument that admission of Alaska to statehood would give two votes in the United States Senate for a population of somewhat more than 100,000, those of us who favor immediate admission of this frontier Territory assert that a glance back over the years will demonstrate that some of our greatest Senators have come from States of small populations. One example would be Senator Norris, of Nebraska; others could be Senators McNary, of Oregon; and Key Pittman, of Nevada. There are many others. A present example would be Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming. Truly, one cannot say that the votes of Senators from States such as Ohio have been more noticeably in the Nation's interest than have those from Nebraska, Nevada, Colorado, and other States of small population.

It is my earnest hope that during the present session of this Congress both branches of this Congress will vote affirmatively for admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States in the Union.

The Soviet press describes Alaska as "Soviet territory in the hands of an alien power." The article states that "This Territory was sold without authority by the corrupt Czarist regime."

This is just another item indicative that President Truman's strong foreign policy is sound. Furthermore, it gives force to arguments advanced by many Congressmen that we must strengthen our Army and Air Force in Alaska. Also, while on the subject, would not granting Alaska statehood be a good answer to the absurd Russian claims?

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana Mr. Chairman, I reiterate the statements made by the gentlemen who have just preceded me. I trust that both Alaska and Hawaii will be admitted to the great community of States of the United States.

Mr. PETERSON Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr Chairman, having pioneered in the West, I am sure that Alaska is just as capable of supporting its population as Sweden, Norway, and Finland. I shall vote for this bill.

Mr. PETERSON Mr Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, due to the fact I have so many problems confronting my district and State, I try to refrain from appearing on the floor very often on legislation other than that affecting my district and State; however, in this instance I find that I have a duty to perform due to the fact I was a member of both of the committees which had to do with making the investigation for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that Alaska is our last and our first frontier. Billy Mitchell said: "He who holds Alaska holds the world." If Billy Mitchell had not been court-martialed the United States would have been 25 years ahead in air power.

I think that there are issues that are most important in this matter which have been lost sight of. One is that brought out by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], which is a threat to our national defense and that has been alluded to by those who have preceded me

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that apparently very few Members of the House have read the Life magazine issue of February 27, 1950, wherein the national defense story of Alaska is more vividly given than can be translated into words at this time. As has been pointed out, Soviet Russia is only 54 miles across the Bering Strait from Alaska. Bombers can cross that distance in 10 or 15 minutes, and a photograph in Life magazine shows the location of nine Russian air bases directly opposite Alaska.

If you should be able to secure a copy of this Life magazine I invite your attention to a comparison of the military strength of the Soviet Union and that of the United States. The national income of the Soviet Union is $65,000,000,000, and of the United States $222,000,000,000. The military share of that income in Russia is 25 percent, in the United States 6 percent.

Comparing our Air Force with Russia's air force, combat planes, Russia, 9,000; United States, 3,300. Transport and others, Russia, 8,000; United States, 5,600. Annual production of planes, 7,000 in Russia; 1,200 in the United States.

The Army: Russia 2,600,000, United States 640,000. Russia, infantry and airborne divisions, 125; United States, 9. Armored divisions: Russia, 30; United States, 1.

Navy: Submarines, Russia, 270; United States, 74.

Surface vessels: Russia, 127; United States, 104

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL Mr. Chairman, it has sometimes been said that Alaska should not ever be admitted to the Union because it is noncontiguous territory, separated from the United States by foreign land and foreign waters. There is nothing in the Constitution which limits Territories eligible for statehood to those within the continental limits, as that phrase is customarily used. There was a time when an objection of noncontiguity might have had some merits as being in reality an objection to remoteness, but even on that basis, the objection now lacks substance. The major cities of Alaska are now linked to the States by air, road, and radio, so that they are for practical purposes closer to the States than New York or Boston were to the Capital in the early days of the United States.

Alaska is linked to the United States by three regularly scheduled air carriers operating through the gateways of Minneapolis, Chicago, and Seattle. Additional service is under consideration by the Civil Aeronautics Board at the present time. Alaskans are asking that an Alaskan carrier be given a certificate to fly between the States and Alaska, pointing to the demonstrated success of local carriers within the Territory. Much of Alaska's development is directly due to the activities of the bush pilots, civilian fliers operating their own private planes, who carry passengers and cargo to all parts of the Territory in all kinds of weather, and reaching areas otherwise inaccessible during the winter. Per capita, Alaskans fly 30 times as much as continental Americans.

Alaska is also linked to the United States by overland route, via the Alaska Highway. It is now possible to drive from Washington, D. C., and to reach Fairbanks or Anchorage in a few days. Motorist facilities in the form of accommodations, gas stations, and so forth, are being built along the highway and some 7,000 or 8,000 cars traveled along it last year. With the granting of statehood thousands more will move along the highway, and this is no reason why the large motor caravans now moving goods by truck for East and West along the central highways, should not in few years be moving north to the metropolitan of Alaska, growing larger year by year. There is now a good system of highways in the Territory, it is improving annually. The Alaska Railroad furnishes a modern service along 500 miles through the heart of the Territory from Seward and Whittier through Anchorage to Fairbanks. With enactment of statehood a very serious restraint upon Alaska's development, which now exists, should be removed. It is a provision in the Jones Act, enacted in 1920, under which merchandise originating in the States cannot be shipped to a port in Alaska from the States via Canadian rail and Canadian vessel nor from a port in Alaska to the States via Canadian vessel and Canadian rail, although merchandise traveling from a point in the States to another point in the States may be carried on a Canadian vessel and rail as part of a through haul. This discriminatory provision applies to Alaska alone. It would disappear upon statehood, leaving Alaska subject to the coastwise shipping laws only, which are likewise applicable to the States. A great impetus would be given to the development of Alaskan industry as a consequence of the application of the automatic removal of this discriminatory provision to Alaska.

It thus appears that although Alaska is linked adequately to the United States to demonstrate the lack of merit of any objection to statehood on the grounds of distance, Alaska does suffer from discriminatory treatment and inadequacy of transportation facilities in terms of their potential contribution to Alaska's development. These evils can be cured only by statehood.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak my fidelity to the pledge of the Democratic Party in the national platform upon which I was elected, the pledge to give to the people of Alaska the dignity of statehood. Many States have been admitted into the Union during the span of my lifetime. Many new stars have come to add new beauty to that field of blue in the flag of our country. The admission of each new State has added to the strength of our Republic. The debate in the Congress in opposition to statehood bills may have been waged in sincerity and with heated ardor, but I do not know of anyone now who would turn the legislative clock back and take from any of the States admitted in my lifetime the statehood given them and which they have justified by their good deeds and the service in this Congress of able Representatives and Senators. It will be the same with Alaska, and it is a very happy day in my life that I am here to cast my vote for Alaskan statehood. As I have sat here in this Chamber during the course of the brilliant debate which has been going on I have been thinking of the many fine young men and women, representing all the States of the Union, who went to Alaska and the Aleutian Islands in the period of the recent war. Many of our young men were killed or died of exposure in those days of peril and of

hardship. In voting for this bill I am voting to make the land where rest their bodies a sovereign State of the Republic for which they gave their lives.

My vote for statehood for Alaska I cast with the thought that it is something in the spirit, if not indeed the nature, of a memorial to these young heroes; some of whom were the comrades and the warm friends of my own son Lorence in the rugged and perilous months before the Jap attack on Dutch Harbor and until the islands had been cleared of the enemy and all Alaska girded for any hostile onslaught. The bodies of many of our flyers, lost in the icy waters or in the crevasses of the mountains, were never recovered. With the passage of this bill, and its enactment, the place where their unfound bodies repose will be part of a sovereign State of the Union. It may be only a sentiment, Mr. Chairman, but to me when Alaska is admitted, her star on that field of blue will stand as a vital memorial to the Unknown Soldier of the Alaska-Aleutian campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all that part of the United States now embraced within the Territory of Alaska, including a distance of one marine league from the line of coast, shall become the State of Alaska as hereinafter provided, but not beyond the international boundary of the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on account of my great admiration of and affection for the two delegates from the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and I do hold them both in very high esteem, and likewise on account of my admiration and great respect for the Governors of Alaska and Hawaii, I am somewhat reluctant to oppose them on the issue here involved, that of granting statehood to the Territories which they have so well and faithfully served.

Mr. Chairman, I shall always remember the warm and cordial reception which was accorded me on the occasion of my visits both to Alaska and to Hawaii. The friendliness and the genuine hospitality of the people of both Territories made a great and lasting impression upon me.

I frankly do not believe that either Alaska or Hawaii is now ready for statehood. If the pending measures are finally approved, Alaska and Hawaii will become States of the American Union. It is easy to see, if this is done, that by the same persuasive arguments we may next month or next year be called upon to grant statehood to Puerto Rico and even perhaps to the Virgin Islands, or we might even be asked to grant statehood to the Islands of Guam and Okinawa. If we could shuffle around the populations of the world to suit our own selves, we might be able to solve the perplexing problems which now confront us. Alaska is a vast area, twice the size of the great State of Texas; it is sparsely settled; it is tough and rugged country; and its population is perhaps only eighty or eighty-five thousand people. Approximately 30 percent of the population are Indians or Eskimos, living on the Yukon, and in the frigid North, beyond the Arctic Circle and on the shores of the Arctic Ocean. There in that cold Territory Mount McKinley lifts its snow-capped head 20,000 feet into the air and above the clouds. It is the largest peak in this part of the world, and its beauty is superb, but it stands in loneliness, far removed from the noises of a modern civilization

Puerto Rico, on the other hand, presents an entirely different picture. If all of the people of this world were brought into the United States, and all of the factories and mines of this great country were taken out, we would then have a situation here comparable with that which exists in Puerto Rico. More than 650 persons per square mile and all depend almost entirely upon the products of agriculture. I mention Puerto Rico because it has been mentioned along with Alaska and Hawaii in connection with local self-government and ultimate statehood. All three were mentioned in the Democratic platform of 1940. This bill which provides statehood for Alaska is only the beginning. On more than one occasion political platforms have contained pious pronouncements about self-government and statehood for the Territories, including Puerto Rico. We are now playing politics; yes, perhaps we are playing with the very destiny of our Nation and with the future of this great Union. Both political parties have been playing politics with this issue and they have magnified it out of all proportion. Why should we play politics with an issue so important? Where on earth has there ever been a situation comparable with the situation now presented? Imagine forty or fifty thousand white men, women, and thirty or forty thousand Eskimos or Indians in a Territory twice the size of Texas, asking for all of the privileges and blessings of statehood, and asking for the privilege of equal representation with the great States of this Union in the Senate of the United States. Those of you who are now advocating and urging statehood for Alaska are unwilling to say on the floor of this House that you would vote to give statehood to Puerto Rico or to the Virgin Islands, or to others who are today living under our flag. Puerto Rico is under the Stars and Stripes, and in Puerto Rico they sing "The Star-Spangled Banner." Yes, Puerto Rico, too, is standing in line for statehood. Are you willing to go all the way or do you want just what you are asking for and no more? Look at the Democratic platform of 1940 and then explain why Puerto Rico has been left out. Look at both party platforms in 1944 and give us the reasons for making the distinction.

In the 1944 Republican platform is this language about Puerto Rico:

Statehood is a logical aspiration of the people of Puerto Rico, who were made citizens of the United States by Congress in 1917. Legislation affecting Puerto Rico, insofar as feasible, should be in harmony with the realization of that aspiration.

There you have it, two great political parties putting platform planks before the people of the country, holding out the hope of statehood to the crowded people of Puerto Rico, where they have more than 650 human beings per square mile and are restricted in their economy to that of an agricultural state. How can we be consistent if we deny statehood to Puerto Rico? They are distressed. They need the help of this great country. They are entitled to the same consideration because they are under the same flag and subjected to the same burdens as are the people of Alaska and Hawaii.

If you vote for this, just bear in mind that this is the opening wedge. You will fill the United States Senate with Senators from Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, or the other islands of the Pacific.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it the gentleman's contention that Puerto Rico should be added to Hawaii and Alaska?

Mr. COOLEY. No, my contention is clearly not that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman is against them all?

Mr. COOLEY. My contention is that they should remain in the same status they are now. I am unwilling to grant statehood to Alaska or Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman recognize this difference, that Hawaii was annexed on the basis of a voluntary movement on the part of the Hawaiians, that we bought Alaska, and that Puerto Rico was conquered?

Mr. COOLEY. I know all about that history. We bought and paid for Alaska. If we were to withdraw our men and our employees from Alaska today they could not carry on. If we were to turn over to them now the Alaskan Railroad and give it to them free of charge, they could not operate it 1 week. It is the most expensive railroad in the world to operate. The maintenance is exorbitant.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Was the gentleman from North Carolina a member of the platform committee of the Democratic Party in 1948?

Mr. COOLEY. No; I was not.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to state that the gentleman from Colorado was a member. I dislike the statements the gentleman makes regarding the political situation.

Mr. COOLEY. What is it that the gentleman objects to? I read the words from the platform. I reiterate, regardless of what the gentleman says, this is a political proposition. Nobody can justify granting statehood to Alaska on any basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that he and I get along fine, generally speaking.

Mr. COOLEY. Absolutely.

Mr. JENSEN. We do differ in matters of great importance, and we have on several occasions. May I ask the gentleman if he does not feel the conditions we face today should not have bearing on this matter regardless of whether it was in the Democratic or the Republican platform?

Mr. COOLEY. From the national defense standpoint?

Mr. JENSEN Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. No.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman tell the House whether or not any type of defense has been requested by the Department of Defense for Alaska which has been denied or has not been provided?

Mr. JENSEN. That is not the question.

Mr. COOLEY. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Mississippi I can only say that I am not aware of the fact that any type of defense which has been requested has been denied. Certainly every man and woman in this House appreciates the great importance of Alaska in the defense program of this Nation. In providing adequate defense and in our great desire to protect the integrity of our Territory, we are usually influenced and guided by those in charge of our defense program. Pray tell me why our defense would be improved by merely granting statehood to Alaska? Would statehood give strength to Alaska and make the Territory stronger? Would statehood improve the economy of the Territory or increase its population? The gentleman from Iowa made a statement here a moment ago to the effect that Alaska, if granted statehood, would fight for America; that its manhood would stand and defend the great mainland and afford us opportunity to prepare for another gigantic war. Alaska, without the aid of the Federal Government does not have manpower, machinery, or military equipment enough to defend this mainland even for 1 hour.

Mr. JENSEN. That is the reason for statehood.

Mr. COOLEY. Giving them statehood and the dignity of two Senators and a Congressman will not strengthen our military defenses in that great Territory.

Mr. JENSEN. We would get more people up there if we passed this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. What is it about statehood which has an inherent attraction for people? The Territory has been under the flag for about 83 years and now it has the population of only about 83,000 people. At that rate it will take about 200 more years before they will have as many people in Alaska as I now have in my own congressional district.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. May I point out that during the entire time from 1940 to 1946 Alaska gave 3,564 inductees to the service? They have two National Guard units there. It is very well known they could not possibly defend Alaska. Furthermore the problem is strictly a national problem. We will defend any of our Territories whether they are States or not.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, we will defend Alaska with all the might of this great Nation and with all of the military forces at our command. All of this talk about adding strength to our military might and to our national defense by passing a Federal law which grants statehood to Alaska is nothing more nor less than "tommyrot." Where our flag is there we shall be also, and the world certainly should now know that the great might and power and all of the rich resources of America will protect the people that live under our flag. Have we, for the moment, forgotten Pearl Harbor? Hawaii was not then a State, but when the attack came at Pearl Harbor the might and power of this gigantic Nation were aroused and boys from every State rallied to the flag and to the defense of that outpost. Why do not we look this issue square in the face and settle it on its merits? Let us forget the silly and sentimental appeals and stand forthright in behalf of our own thinking?

I know a little something about the Territory of Alaska. I have traveled in every part of that great Territory. I accompanied Mr. Krug, the Secretary of the Interior, on his first inspection trip in 1946 and I went from one part of it to the other, even to Point Barrow on the Arctic Ocean. I ate bear meat with the Eskimos and I saw the caribou and the reindeer; the snowdrifts and the landslides; and I visited the fertile valleys and lofty peaks. I met genial and friendly people and I tried to learn something about their problems. I know that from Ladd Field, in Fairbanks; more than 9,000 American planes piloted by Russian pilots took off under secret orders for destinations unknown to us—but across the Bering Sea, and I know full well that some day some of those same planes might come back again to Fairbanks. If they do, I do not want them to be met by the National Guard of Alaska but rather by all of the might and force which our military men may muster.

Alaska is not ready for statehood. We are told that of its entire population only about 22,000 are eligible to vote. In the plebiscite only about 16,000 did vote and of the 16,000 voting, 40 percent did not want statehood for the Territory. But, even if all of them wanted it, is that a sound argument why the Representatives of these 48 great States should grant it? In the acquisition of Alaska maybe Russia does think we perpetrated a fraud and bought it for a song. What do we care about what Russia thinks. We know that Russia knows that we will defend every inch of that Territory with every instrumentality at our command.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be defeated.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. All citizens of the United States who are qualified to vote for representatives of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska are hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates, having the same qualifications, to form a constitutional convention in said Territory. The convention shall consist of 26 delegates apportioned among the several judicial divisions of Alaska as follows: First judicial division, 8 delegates; second judicial division, 4 delegates; third judicial division, 8 delegates, fourth judicial division, 5 delegates; and 1 delegate to be chosen at large from the entire Territory.

The Governor of Alaska shall, within 30 days after the approval of this act, issue a proclamation ordering an election of such delegates to be held at a time designated in the proclamation within 8 months after the approval of this act, and providing also for preceding primary election and for filings by independent or nonparty candidates, which proclamation shall be issued at least 2 months prior to the time of holding said primary election and 5 months before the date of election of such delegates. The nomination, filing, and election of such delegates shall be conducted, the returns made, the results ascertained, and the certificates of persons elected to such convention issued in the same manner, as nearly as is practicable as is prescribed by the laws regulating nominations and elections of members of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska.

SEC. 3 The delegates to the convention so elected shall meet at the capital of said Territory on the first Tuesday following the ninetieth day after their election, for a session of not to exceed 75 days, and after organization shall declare on behalf of the people of the proposed State that they adopt the Constitution of the United States, whereupon the said convention shall form a constitution and State government for the proposed State

The constitution shall be republican in form, shall make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, and shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence. Said convention shall provide, by ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of said State:

First. That perfect freedom of religious worship shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

Second. That said State and its people do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to any lands or other property, the title to which is retained in or ceded to the United States by the provisions of this act and to all lands lying within its boundaries owned or held by any Indians, Aleuts, or Eskimos hereinafter called natives, the right or title to which shall have been acquired through or from the United States or any prior sovereignty, and that until the title of the United States or of such natives shall have been disposed of or extinguished the same shall be and remain subject to the

disposition and under the absolute jurisdiction and control of the Congress of the United States; that no taxes shall be imposed by the State upon lands or property therein belonging to or which may hereafter be acquired by the United States or reserved for its use; but nothing herein, or in the ordinance herein provided for, shall preclude the said State from taxing, as other lands and other property are taxed, any lands and other property owned or held by any native outside of a native reservation unless otherwise prohibited by Congress.

Third. That the debts and liabilities of said Territory of Alaska shall be assumed and paid by said State and all debts owed to said Territory of Alaska shall be collected by said State.

Fourth That provision shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all children of said State and free from sectarian control.

Fifth. That all provisions of this act reserving rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grants of lands or other property herein made to said State, are consented to fully by said State and its people

Sixth. That the lands and other property belonging to citizens of the United States residing without said State shall never be taxed at a higher rate than the lands and other property belonging to residents thereof.

SEC. 4. The State of Alaska and its political subdivisions, respectively, shall have and retain title to all property, real and personal, title to which is now in the Territory of Alaska or any of the subdivisions. The United States shall retain title to all property, real and personal, to which it now has title, including public lands, except as provided in section 5 hereof.

SEC. 5. Sections Nos. 2, 16, 32, and 36 in each township in the State of Alaska are hereby granted to the said State for the support of its common schools, and section 33 in each township in the Tanana Valley between parallels 64 and 65 north latitude and between the one hundred and forty-fifth and one hundred and fifty-second degrees of west longitude (meridian of Greenwich) are granted to said State for the support of an agricultural college and school of mines: *Provided*, That where settlement with a view to homestead entry has been made upon any part of the sections granted hereby before the survey thereof in the field, or where the same may have been sold or otherwise appropriated by or under the authority of any act of Congress, or are subject to any unextinguished native rights, or are wanting or fractional in quality, other lands may be selected and appropriated in lieu thereof in the manner provided by the act of February 28, 1891 (26 Stat. 796; 43 U. S C, sec. 851). The right of lieu selection under the act of February 28, 1891, supra, shall be applicable only to lands within the same land district as the sections granted hereby: *Provided further*, That the State may not select in any one township land which together with land previously acquired under this section will exceed 50 percent of the surveyed area of such township. The grant of sections 2, 16, 32, 36, and 33 made above shall be subject to the act of January 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1026), as amended May 2, 1932 (47 Stat. 140; 43 U. S. C., sec. 870). Subsection (c) of section 1 of the said act of January 25, 1927, as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting the words "and all lands in the Territory of Alaska are excluded from the provisions of this Act".

The grants of sections 2, 16, 32, and 36 to said State, within national forests now existing or proclaimed, shall not vest the title to said sections in said State until the part of said national forests embracing any of said sections is restored to the public domain; but said granted sections shall be administered as a part of said forest. At the close of each fiscal year there shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State such proportion of the moneys received during the fiscal year from said national forests as the area of the lands granted by this section, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, bears to the total area of said national forests, the areas of said sections when unsurveyed to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior by protraction or otherwise.

Block 32, and the structures and improvements thereon, in the city of Juneau are granted to the State of Alaska to use for a dwelling for the Governor, for a State museum, and for park and recreational purposes: *Provided*, That if at any time for a period of 3 years none of the said block is used for any of the specified purposes, the block shall revert to the United States as a part of the public domain.

The following grants of land are hereby made for internal improvements:

For legislative, executive, and judicial public buildings heretofore erected in said Territory or to be hereafter erected in the proposed State, 300,000 acres; for insane asylums, 100,000 acres; for penitentiaries, 100,000 acres, for schools and asylums for the deaf, dumb, and the blind, 100,000 acres, for normal schools, 200,000 acres; for State charitable, penal, and reformatory institutions, 100,000 acres; for homes for pioneer residents, 100,000 acres.

All the property of the United States situated in the Territory of Alaska used in connection with the conservation and protection of the fisheries and of the fur and game of Alaska is hereby transferred and conveyed to the State of Alaska. The State of Alaska shall possess and exercise the same jurisdiction and control over the fisheries and the fur and game of Alaska as are possessed and exercised by the several States within their respective territorial limits, including adjacent waters.

Grants previously made to the Territory of Alaska are hereby confirmed and transferred to the State of Alaska, upon its admission. No grants, other than those specified in this act, shall be made to the State of Alaska by reason of its becoming or being a State, except by subsequent legislation.

The schools and colleges provided for in this section shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands granted herein for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university

Five percent of the proceeds of sales of public lands lying within said State which shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to such sales, shall be paid to the said State to be used for the support of the common schools within said State.

SEC. 6 After a constitution and State government have been formed in compliance with the provisions of this act, the convention forming the same shall provide by ordinance for submitting said constitution, for ratification or rejection, to the people of said proposed State at an election to be held at a date to be fixed by said convention, which shall be not less than 75 nor more than 100 days from the date of its adjournment, at which election the citizens of said proposed State who are qualified to vote for members of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska shall vote directly for or against the proposed constitution and for or against any provisions separately submitted. The returns of said election shall be made to the Governor of Alaska, who shall cause the same to be canvassed by the canvassing board of the Territory of Alaska in the manner now provided by law for the canvass of votes cast in general Territorial elections, and if a majority of the votes cast on that question shall be for the constitution, the Governor of the Territory of Alaska shall certify the result to the President of the United States, together with a statement of the votes cast thereon and upon separate articles and propositions, together with a copy of said constitution, articles, propositions, and ordinances. If the constitution and government of said proposed State are republican in form, and if all the provisions of the act have been complied with in the formation thereof, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to certify said facts to the Governor of said Territory, who shall within 30 days after receipt of such notification from the President of the United States issue a proclamation for the election of all State and other officers provided for in said constitution including members of State legislature, said election to take place not earlier than 2 months nor later than 6 months after the date of issuance of said proclamation by the Governor.

SEC. 7. (a) The constitutional convention shall by ordinance provide that in case of ratification of the constitution by the people and in case the President of the United States approves the same, an election shall be held at the time named in the proclamation of the Governor of said Territory hereinbefore provided, at which election officers for a full State government, including a Governor, members of the State legislature, one Representative and two Senators in the Congress of the United States to be elected at large from said State, and such other officers as the constitution shall prescribe, shall be chosen by the qualified voters of Alaska. Unless the constitutional convention shall by ordinance otherwise provide, such election, and an antecedent primary election, shall be held, and the returns thereof made, canvassed, and certified by the canvassing board, in the same manner, as nearly as practicable, as is now prescribed by law for the nomination, filing, and election, and canvass and certification of election of Territorial officers and members of the Territorial legislature. When such State and other officers and members of the State legislature and a Representative and Senators in the Congress of the United States shall be so elected and the returns thereof made, canvassed, and certified as herein provided, the Governor of said Territory shall certify the result of said election to the President of the United States, who shall thereupon immediately issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election so ascertained, and upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States the State of Alaska shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with each of the other States of the Union, and the Representative and Senators from said State in the Congress of the United States so elected and certified shall thereupon be entitled to seats in the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States and to all of the rights and privileges of Representatives and Senators therein. Until the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and until said State is so admitted into the Union and said officers are elected and qualified under the provisions of the Constitution, all of the officers of said Territory, including the Delegate in Congress from said Territory, shall continue to discharge the duties of said respective offices in and for said Territory.

Upon admission of Alaska as a State as herein provided and upon election and qualification of the officers of the State government formed in pursuance of and in accordance with the provisions of said constitution, said officers shall forthwith proceed to exercise all of the duties and functions of their respective offices; and all of the laws in force in the Territory of Alaska at the time of admission of said State into

the Union shall be and continue in full force and effect throughout said State except as modified or changed by this act, or by the constitution of the State, or as thereafter modified or changed by the legislature of the State. All of the laws of the United States not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within said State as elsewhere within the United States.

(b) Subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 761, 762), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Each State other than Alaska shall be entitled, in the Seventy-eighth and in each Congress thereafter until the taking effect of a reapportionment under a subsequent statute or such section 22, as amended by this act, to the number of Representatives shown in the statement transmitted to the Congress on January 8, 1941, based upon the method known as the method of equal proportions, no State to receive less than one Member; and the State of Alaska shall be entitled to one Representative from the time of its admission into the Union until the taking effect of such a reapportionment."

SEC 8. The sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for defraying the expenses of the elections provided for in this act and of the convention, and for the payment of the members and officers and employees thereof under the same rules and regulations and at the same rates as are now provided by law for the payment of the Territorial Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, and the disbursements of the money appropriated by this section shall be made by the secretary of the Territory of Alaska

SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall affect the establishment, or the right, ownership, and authority of the United States in Mount McKinley National Park, as now or hereafter constituted; but exclusive jurisdiction, in all cases, shall be exercised by the United States for the national park, as now or hereafter constituted; saving, however, to the State of Alaska the right to serve civil or criminal process within the limits of the aforesaid park in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed in said State, but outside of said park; and saving further to the said State the right to tax persons and corporations, their franchises and property on the lands included in said park; and saving also to the persons residing now or hereafter in such area the right to vote at all elections held within the respective political subdivisions of their residence in which the park is situated.

SEC 10 Said State when admitted as provided herein shall constitute one judicial district, to be known as the "district of Alaska" Mount McKinley National Park shall also constitute a part of said judicial district, and the district court in and for said district shall have jurisdiction over all offenses committed within the boundaries of said park. All fugitives from justice taking refuge in said park shall be subject to the same laws as refugees from justice found in the State of Alaska. The United States District Court for the District of Alaska shall hold one term at Juneau, one term at Anchorage, one term at Fairbanks, and one term at Nome each year, and special terms may be held at such times and places in said district as the judge thereof may deem expedient. The said district shall, for judicial purposes, until otherwise provided, be attached to the ninth judicial circuit There shall be appointed for said district one district judge, one United States attorney, and such assistant United States attorneys, not exceeding four in number, as the Attorney General of the United States may determine, and one United States marshal with such number of deputies as may be designated by the Attorney General of the United States. There shall be appointed one clerk for said district, who shall keep offices at Juneau, Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Nome, and at such other places as may be designated by the district court, and such number of deputies and assistants and other employees as may be designated by the Attorney General of the United States. The regular and special terms of said court shall be held at the times designated by the judge thereof, and the judge is authorized to summon grand juries whenever the public business shall require. The district court for said district, and the judge thereof, shall possess the same powers and jurisdiction and perform the same duties as are held, exercised, and performed by other district courts and judges of district courts of the United States, and shall be governed by the same laws and regulations.

The United States attorney and assistant United States attorneys, the United States marshal and the deputy United States marshals, the clerk and his deputies, assistants and employees, the stenographers of the district court of said district, and all other officers and persons performing duties in the administration of justice therein, shall severally possess the powers and perform the duties lawfully required to be performed by similar officers in other districts of the United States, and shall, for the services they may perform, receive the same fees and compensation with allowances now prescribed by law for the officers performing similar service for the United States in other districts of the United States

No person shall be eligible for appointment as United States district judge, United States attorney, United States marshal, or clerk of the District Court for the District of Alaska unless such person shall have been a bona fide resident of Alaska at least 3 years immediately prior to date of appointment.

SEC. 11. No writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding pending in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska on the date when said Territory shall become a State, and no case pending in an appellate court upon appeal from the District Court for the Territory of Alaska at the time said Territory shall become a State, shall abate by the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, but the same shall be transferred and proceeded with as hereinafter provided.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no suit, action, or prosecution shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said courts had been established prior to the accrual of said causes of action or the commission of such offenses; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska.

SEC. 12 All appeals and writs of error taken from the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to the Supreme Court of the United States or the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, previous to the admission of Alaska as a State, shall be prosecuted to final determination as though this act had been passed. All cases in which final judgment has been rendered in such district court, and in which appeals or writs of error might be had except for the admission of such State, may still be sued out, taken and prosecuted to the Supreme Court of the United States or the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit under the provisions of then existing law, and there held and determined in like manner; and in either case, the Supreme Court of the United States, or the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in the event of reversal, shall remand the said cause to either the State supreme court or other final appellate court of said State, or the United States district court for said district, as the case may require: *Provided*, That the time allowed by existing law for appeals and writs of error from the district court for said Territory shall not be enlarged thereby, and all appeals and writs of error not sued out from the final judgments of said court at the time of the admission of such State shall be taken within 6 months from such time.

SEC. 13 All causes pending in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska at the time of the admission of Alaska as a State which are of such nature as to be within the jurisdiction of a district court of the United States shall be transferred to the United States District Court for the District of Alaska for final disposition All other causes pending in the district for the Territory of Alaska at the time of the admission of Alaska as a State shall be transferred to the appropriate State court of Alaska. All final judgments and decrees rendered upon such transferred cases in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska may be reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States or by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the same manner as is now provided by law with reference to the judgments and decrees in existing United States district courts.

SEC 14 Jurisdiction of all cases pending or determined in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska not transferred to the United States District Court for the District of Alaska shall devolve upon and be exercised by the courts of original jurisdiction created by said State, which shall be deemed to be the successor of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska with respect to cases not so transferred and, as such, shall take and retain custody of all records, dockets, journals, and files of such courts pertaining to such cases. The files and papers in all cases so transferred to the United States district court, together with a transcript of all book entries to complete the record in such particular cases so transferred, shall be in like manner transferred to said district court.

SEC. 15. All cases pending in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska at the time said Territory becomes a State not transferred to the United States District Court for the District of Alaska shall be proceeded with and determined by the courts created by said State, with the right to prosecute appeals or writs of error to the appellate courts created by said State, and also with the same right to prosecute appeals or writs of error from the final determination in said causes made by the court of last resort created by such State to the Supreme Court of the United States, as now provided by law for appeals and writs of error from the court of last resort of a State to the Supreme Court of the United States.

SEC. 16. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment Page 4, after line 10, insert a new paragraph, reading as follows

"Third. That authority is granted to and acknowledged in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as are now owned by the United States

and held for military, air, naval, or coast guard purposes, whether reserved or acquired by purchase, condemnation, donation, or exchange; saving, however, to the State of Alaska the right to serve civil or criminal process within the limits of the aforesaid reservations in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed in said State, but outside of said reservation; and the Legislative Assembly is authorized and directed to enact any law necessary and proper to give effect to this article; and."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to enter into this debate. I am going to vote for the bill granting statehood to Alaska, as well as for the bill granting statehood to Hawaii.

But in view of the argument made by my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, I could not restrain myself when he said there were absolutely no grounds at all for admitting either of these possessions of ours into the Union, possessions where American citizens live.

As my friend was arguing, my mind went back to the early days of our constitutional government, when the United States of America was composed of 13 States.

Of course they were members by sovereign choice, because they had sovereignty before the Union itself was established. As my friend argued further I saw in my mind's eye this great Nation of ours of 48 States extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. The question arose in my mind: How were all these States admitted to the Union? If my memory serves me correctly, the answer is that it had to be by act of Congress. I went back in memory to the debates when those territories were being admitted to the Union as States, when bills were pending in this body. In those bygone decades, the very same arguments were made then as was made by my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. Every argument in favor of the admission of those territories to the Union as States applied then as it does now. American citizens lived in those territories. They progressed to the point where they could be admitted as States into the Union. You can go right down the line of States and name any one of the States which were admitted after the Thirteen Orginal States formed the Union and substantially the same arguments were made then as are being made now.

And if those arguments had prevailed, such as are being made here today, not one of them would be States in the Union today.

So it seems to me the argument of my friend falls to the ground.

Now, he says this is just politics. Why, the conduct of government itself is politics. Ours is a political institution. It is a school of political science. When the Republican Party and the Democratic Party put into their platforms the statement that they stand for admission into the Union of these Territories, it is politics in its wholesome sense and in its constructive sense, and not in any way in a sinister sense.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, I intended to remain silent, except for my vote on this proposition.

But my conscience would not permit me to remain silent in view of the argument that my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, made when he said that there is no reason at all why these Territories should be admitted into the Union as States.

My mind went back, thinking of the debates in bygone days against the admission of States into the Union, when the same kind of arguments were made as my distinguished friend from North Carolina has made.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] said that Alaska could not defend itself. Could any State in the Union standing alone defend itself?

Mr. COOLEY. I did not make that statement, except in answer to a statement which had been made to show how ridiculous the question was.

Mr. McCORMACK. One of the provisions of the Constitution is that the Federal Government has to guarantee to every State a republican form of government. That is in the Constitution. I think that answers that question.

On the question of national defense, you look over a map of the world, and Alaska today and for many generations to come, if an emergency should arise, is probably the most important place in the world, and is certainly of vital importance to the United States of America.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The founders of this Government in 1787 wrote the fundamental law, and they provided that the great West should grow into commonwealths, and when they were of sufficient growth they should be admitted on terms of equality with the Original Thirteen States. That generous policy made America the greatest colonizing power in the world. What we are doing today to admit Alaska is to carry out the historic policy of this Government, so that when our children and our children's children shall move to the West they will have new States on terms of equality with the old Original Thirteen.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Furthermore, the smoke screen of Puerto Rico should not be used for inflammatory purposes. We are considering these two Territories upon their merits today. Puerto Rico is a question of tomorrow, and some future Congress will have to meet that problem.

As I listened to my very dear friend, my mind went back to yesterday when he was fighting to put through a bill, when there was a great deal of opposition on this floor. As chairman of this committee he expected us to support him, and I did support him, and others did. There is no more able man in this House, and I commend him, and I admire him very much. I value his friendship, but I reserve the right to disagree with him when he makes arguments like he did today; but yesterday, when he was fighting with his back to the wall, expecting defeat as a matter of fact, those of us rallied to his support and helped him put through his bill. I wonder how he would feel if the chairman of the committee had taken the floor yesterday in opposition to his bill. He probably would not like it.

Mr. COOLEY. The effect of the gentleman's argument is that, regardless of my convictions, I should follow the leadership of the chairman of this committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the argument you made in your own time you should have done so, because you failed to recognize any merit in either of these cases. You said there was no right. I think my friend has gone to the extreme, made the most weak and fallacious argument that, as chairman of a responsible committee, he could make. And rather than to take the floor in opposition to this bill he should either have remained silent or he should have followed the leadership of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

I hope this bill will pass, and I hope the Hawaiian statehood bill will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has again expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the able and well-intentioned gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is just as much in error about this statehood bill this afternoon as he was when he led the fight to jam through the potato bill last year.

I am for this bill, first, because I think the people of Alaska want and have earned statehood; and also because I believe a resounding and preponderating vote for the bill this afternoon will cause the Kremlin to take pause.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that I have done a very sinful thing. On yesterday I had a very pleasant argument with the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina. He made some very fine arguments defending the premise that promises of the United States were sacred and should be fulfilled. He has changed his mind, apparently, because he is not holding to the same line of argument in debate today which he used on yesterday so effectively. I am, therefore, afraid that perhaps in my own ambition to protect the interests of my State I may have tripped somewhere along the line and said some things which took him off of the great statesmanlike manner in which he usually acquits himself.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that the platform did contain Puerto Rico. Is the gentleman willing to state on the floor as a Member of Congress that he will vote to carry out the platform pledge and give statehood to Puerto Rico?

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman is doing as he did yesterday, attempting to put words in my mouth. We are discussing statehood for Alaska now, not Puerto Rico.

Mr. COOLEY. I know, but statehood for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico were all contained in the 1940 platform.

Mr. MARSHALL. But the point brought out and emphasized so forcefully by the gentleman yesterday when we were talking about the responsibilities of the Federal Government and the Congress was that each should live up to its promises. We certainly have promised time and time again to the Territory of Alaska that it would be considered for statehood.

Mr. COOLEY. But the gentleman from North Carolina has never made any such promise.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad the gentleman from Iowa brought to the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina the argument that he made yesterday. If the Government should keep its promise in a situation like that under discussion yesterday, certainly it should keep its promise made in its Constitution.

Mr. MARSHALL. Of course, the program under consideration today does not involve any question of pork barrel.

Mr. COOLEY. Yesterday we were dealing with signed contracts.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask someone who happens to have the RECORD in his pocket to read the language showing that the platform of either the major parties stated that they stood for statehood for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. COOLEY. I just sent the platform back to the cloak room. I read the section. I can get it again if the gentleman wants it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They stated that they advocated improvement for the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico in the matter of their own local government.

What did the Congress do? The Congress provided that the Puerto Ricans could elect their own governor and the Honorable Muñoz Marin, who is now visiting in this city, is the first governor elected by the Puerto Ricans. You did carry out your platform pledge. I still challenge anyone to read from the platform of either party where either the Virgin Islands or Puerto Rico were promised statehood under the platform commitments.

This is a smoke screen thrown up here for the purpose of defeating this bill. When we get to the proposition of giving other areas statehood, the bills will have to come to this floor according to the constitutional provision. We might as well get this fact fixed in our minds.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. I take this time in order to suggest a method of procedure. The bill has been considered read for amendment and is open to amendment at any point. There are several committee amendments pending. I suggest that it would be good procedure to dispose of the committee amendments first in an orderly fashion. We will know then how the bill stands and other amendments can be offered accordingly. I believe that by following this procedure we will get through more quickly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, the next committee amendments are on pages 4, 5, 6, and 7, and are merely corrective of section numbers. I ask that they be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 3, change the word "third" to the word "fourth."

Page 5, line 8, change the word "fourth" to the word "fifth."

Page 5, line 12, change the word "fifth" to the word "sixth."

Page 5, line 17, change the word "sixth" to the word "seventh."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 15, after the word "sold", insert "or may be included in a military or other reservation of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 8, after the word "of", insert "vacated, unappropriated, unreserved public."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice the Clerk is reading an amendment on page 8. I have an amendment to offer on page 6. When will my amendment be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state to the gentleman from Nebraska that the bill has been considered as read and open to amendment at any point, with the committee amendments to be acted on first.

The gentleman will be recognized to offer his amendment after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 20, after the word "acres." insert "Lands granted for the foregoing purposes will not be taken from lands included within a military or other reservation of the United States. The selections provided for in this paragraph shall be made in accordance with the procedure prescribed in Revised Statutes 2379 (43 U. S. C. 857)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other committee amendments?

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have two committee amendments which I offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON: Page 13, lines 19 through 25, and on page 14, lines 1 through 7, delete all existing language and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Upon admission of the proposed State into the Union the House of Representatives shall be composed of 436 Members until the expiration of the Eighty-second Congress."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. You are increasing the number of Members of Congress now?

Mr. PETERSON. By one. The Delegate from Alaska becomes a Member until the Eighty-second Congress when this statehood proposition takes effect and until the next apportionment. That is what has been done in times past.

Mr. RICH. What does the committee expect to do when we come to Hawaii? Does it expect to increase the number again?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes; the membership will be increased by two.

Mr. RICH. And when we come to the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico?

Mr. PETERSON. We have not come to them.

Mr. RICH. You are starting out to increase the membership. The first thing you know you are going to get 500 or 600 Members in here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON: Page 16, strike out lines 8 to 12 inclusive and the words "the United States." in line 13.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, this has been unanimously approved by the committee and was done at the suggestion of the United States Court so that the clerk might come under the general code. When we started working on this bill the code made certain changes. This will make the clerk for that area come under the general code.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 6, line 4, strike out "Sections numbered 2, 16, 32, and 36" and insert "Even numbered sections."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, may I offer the other amendments at this time and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

On page 7, line 4, strike out "sections 2, 16, 32, 36" and insert "even numbered sections."

On page 7, line 11, strike out "sections 2, 16, 32, and 36" and insert "even numbered sections."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, my amendments are quite clear. In the bill we have before us we propose to give the sections numbered 2, 16, 32, and 36 in each township to the new State. That is 4 sections out of each 36. Today the Federal Government owns and controls 98 percent of the Territory of Alaska. My amendment gives half of the land to the State.

I offered this amendment in the Committee and it was turned down, partly because, I think, our good friend, the Delegate from Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT, had felt that it would not be approved by the Department of the Interior, and I understand it does not have their approval.

But, I submit to you, my colleagues, that if a new State is to be formed, it ought to be granted sufficient territory in order to conduct its affairs. The average amount of land owned in the 12 Western States by the Federal Government is about 50 percent. In one or two States they own up to 80 percent of the land. Here we have a new State. Of course, it is vast in territory, one-fifth the size of the United States that we propose to take in as a new State. But, if we are going to bring it in, let us not make it a hollow mockery and give them something which they think they are going to have and yet we do not give to them. I submit that they at least should have half of the land, the even numbered sections, in each township. There are 36 sections in a township. Let us give them half of that land so that they may be able to endure and grow. At the present time the Department of the Interior so tightens down the Territory that they are unable to develop.

I know, Mr. Chairman, there is probably a message to be delivered to the House at this time, and I presume the Committee will rise temporarily. I submit to my colleagues that the legislation that is going to be presented to us in the message will be of some assistance to Alaska, because Alaska's steamship line may be tied up in strikes and absolutely paralyze this great Territory. I hope that when the legislation does come before us, that is now to be presented in a message from the President, that my colleagues will be men and not mice. This House has had a bill before it that provides for seizure but the leadership has not brought it up for consideration. The times demand courageous action

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawkes, one of his secretaries.

THE COAL SHORTAGE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 492)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I wish to report to the Congress on the emergency confronting the Nation as a result of a shortage of coal, and to recommend legislative action.

Since February 6, 1950, the production of bituminous coal has been dangerously curtailed. By now, stocks of coal are almost exhausted, and many parts of our country face crisis conditions. The anthracite coal which is being produced, and the trickle of soft coal output, together have been enough to stave off human suffering. But the lack of normal production of soft coal is bringing many basic industries to a halt.

A variety of emergency measures have been taken in recent days and weeks. Transportation and utility services have been cut down. Available supplies in many localities have been redistributed in order to meet the most urgent needs. Other steps have been taken by States and cities, by industries and by suppliers, to conserve the dwindling stocks of coal. These efforts have stretched our national stock pile, but they cannot add to it. Within a very few days we shall be virtually out of soft coal. The danger to the national health and safety is real and immediate. It requires action at once.

The immediate reason for the curtailment of bituminous coal production is a dispute between most of the mine operators and the principal union of mine workers, the United Mine Workers of America, over the terms and conditions of employment in the mines.

The previous contract between the union and the operators expired June 30, 1949. In subsequent months, the mines operated intermittently, while negotiations for a new contract were under way. But these negotiations failed to produce agreement, and the miners went on strike on February 6, 1950.

On January 31, in an effort to avert this situation, I asked the operators and the union to agree to continue production, in the national interest, for 70 days, while a fact-finding board reviewed the issues and recommended fair and reasonable terms for settlement of the dispute. While this request was accepted by the operators, it was rejected by the union.

Thereafter, when negotiations were broken off and the strike occurred, I established a board of inquiry under the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947. It was this board's duty, under the law, to find the facts and to report them, but not to make recommendations.

The board reported to me on February 11. It found that during all the months of negotiation, neither side had bargained freely and effectively on the essential issues in dispute. The board also expressed a conviction which deserves emphasis today. The board concluded that—

> The obligation entrusted to the operators and to the union, as the agent of the employees, to serve in a joint stewardship of these vital resources must be met. The health and safety of the Nation demand this.

On the basis of the board's findings, along with the other evidence available, the Attorney General on February 11, at my direction, requested the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to enjoin the union from continuing the strike and to order both parties to bargain in good faith. That same day, the court issued a temporary restraining order to accomplish these purposes.

As a result, the parties renewed bargaining negotiations on February 15. The Board of Inquiry was reconvened and met repeatedly with the parties, in cooperation with the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, in an effort to bring about agreement.

But while negotiations have continued, the miners have not returned to work. On February 20, the Attorney General started proceedings against the union, charging that it had not obeyed the order enjoining the continuance of the strike, and that it was therefore in contempt of court. This action was taken in light of the fact that the work stoppage was still under way 9 days after the court's order. On March 2, the court found that the union was not in contempt.

It is evident that the order of the court has not brought forth production. The mines are still shut down. Events since the issuance of the court's order on February 11 give us no assurance that court action under present law can, in fact, end the work stoppage in time to avert exhaustion of our coal supplies.

The Nation's welfare requires that soft-coal production be resumed at once, in order to prevent human suffering and disastrous economic dislocation. Since the union and the operators have failed to resume production, and since recourse to the court has so far proved ineffective, it is now my plain duty to propose further action. Therefore, I recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing the Government to take over the coal mines and operate them temporarily as a public service.

The parties are continuing their negotiations, and I earnestly hope that they will reach agreement before it actually becomes necessary for the Government to take possession of the mines. But we can wait no longer to prepare ourselves with the necessary legislative authority.

I am submitting at this time a draft of legislation to accomplish this purpose. I earnestly request that the Congress consider this proposal and enact the needed legislation as quickly as possible.

In requesting this legislation, it is my purpose and intention to restore the production of badly needed coal. During the period of Government possession of the mines, the owners should receive fair and just compensation for the use of their property, and the miners should receive fair and just compensation for their work. The proposed legislation would

authorize the establishment of impartial boards to make recommendations concerning fair and just compensation for the use of the property of the mine owners and for the work of the mine employees.

I am not requesting this legislation as a means of settling the issues in dispute between the operators and the union. They will have to settle their differences through their own collective bargaining, just as though Government operation were not in effect. I do not propose to substitute the Government's representatives for the private operators at the bargaining table. It will not be our purpose to establish wages, hours, or working conditions which would bind either the operators or the miners upon resumption of private operations.

When the country can be assured of sufficient supplies of coal, the Government will have no need to continue public operation and the mines will be promptly returned to private hands.

I have stressed these essential elements in the plan for Government operation, so that there will be no misunderstanding of the legislation I am recommending. The draft bill which I propose for consideration is necessarily quite general, so that the Government may adapt the details of its operations to changing circumstances. But while the legislative language can best be framed in general terms, there should be no mistaking the contemplated relationships of the Government with the operators and the miners during the period of public operation.

There are other issues in this emergency than the Nation's urgent need for coal This crisis raises vital questions for the future of the coal industry.

We have arrived at the present impasse because both the operators and the union have failed, month after month, to make the efforts in genuine bargaining which could result in a mutually satisfactory settlement. They have been unwilling or unable to lay aside their charges and countercharges, moderate their fixed positions and undertake serious negotiation in a spirit of accommodation and mutual understanding.

They have been unwilling or unable to do so despite the country's desperate need, despite the growing distress of the idle miners and their families and the economic losses incurred by idle facilities, despite the competitive advantage which their long dispute is giving to other fuels

Fortunately, this dangerous breakdown in the normal course of labor-management relations does not characterize most industries in this country. On the contrary, collective bargaining has generally produced sustained production and mutual benefits, without these serious consequences for the public and this need for extreme governmental action.

But the coal industry has failed signally to solve its own problems in the field of labor-management relations. The current failure is only the latest of a series which stretches back over many years, recurring with disheartening regularity. We can only assume that if this industry continues as it has been going, we shall be faced repeatedly with situations of this kind. We shall be forced every so often into governmental action of one kind or another—action which cannot solve the underlying problems or remedy the failures of the private parties, but which is necessary to shield the public from their consequences.

These recurrent break-downs between labor and management in the coal industry are only symptoms of profound and long-standing economic and social difficulties in which the industry has become involved. We can hope to work toward real solutions of the unstable relations between labor and management in the coal mines, only if we come to grips with the problems which foster instability.

I further recommend, therefore, that the Congress establish a commission of inquiry, including members from the Congress, the executive branch, and the public, to make a thorough study of the coal industry, in terms of economic, social, and national security objectives. The draft of legislation which I am submitting at this time does not include provisions for establishing such a commission. However, I expect to submit a draft of legislation for that purpose to the Congress at an early date.

Management in this industry is confronted by declining markets, severe competition, and the high cost of efficient, modern equipment Labor faces arduous work, a harsh physical environment, an uncertain work year, and the prospect of fewer jobs The Nation needs an assured supply of coal at all times, and readily available reserves to buttress our national security.

It is essential that the Commission examine carefully and factually each one of these conditions, probing the realities behind them and taking stock of our national needs and resources, human, and material. We should then be able to determine what kinds of actions and what sorts of policies on the part of Government, management, and labor, will restore the coal industry to economic health and provide a stable environment for constructive relationships between the operators and their employees.

This is the real challenge of the present situation. It is a test of our ability to find a way to achieve adequate production of a raw material basic to our national life, while preserving the fundamental values of our free institutions. Both our friends and our detractors in the rest of the world are watching to see how our democratic society will meet this challenge.

The coal industry is a sick industry. Temporary seizure by the Government, though it may be necessary under present circumstances, cannot produce a cure. I am recommending seizure authority because I believe we now have no alternative. But I urge that it be accompanied by a positive and constructive effort to get at the root of the trouble. This is in the interest of the men who work the mines. It is equally in the interest of their employers. Above all, it is in the interest of the American people.

I urge the Congress, therefore, to act immediately on legislation to authorize the Government to take possession of and operate the mines, and then to turn its attention to legislation looking toward a solution of the basic difficulties of the coal industry.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 3, 1950.*

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R 331, with Mr. SIKES in the chair

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

With reference to that amendment, I have no feeling one way or the other, but the amendment was proposed in the committee and the committee voted not to include it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it the considered judgment of the chairman of the committee that the new State of Alaska can carry on the function of a State with only 12 percent of the land allocated to her as a State?

Mr. PETERSON. Primarily, we are concerned with what we have done for other States. Whether we should do more than that would be for the Congress to determine.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There were several States that came in which got all of their land. None of it was retained by the Federal Government. Now we have the Interior Department, which will strangle the new State of Alaska by retaining control of all but 12 percent of the land.

Mr. PETERSON. I agree with the gentleman that much of the land should pass into private ownership. But permit me to state that the only States which retained their public land were the Republic, later the State of Texas, and the Original Thirteen Colonies. Personally, I do not care one way or the other.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have had a number of letters from people in Alaska indicating that the citizens there thought that when they came in as a new State they would get all of the land. In fact, they would not have voted for Statehood if they had understood we were only going to allow them to have 12 percent of their land.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the distinguished Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I have a very sympathetic interest in the amendment which he proposes Actually, Alaska would like to get half of the public land. I was in Alaska last summer and no one talked to me about this particular provision in the statehood bill. As the gentleman knows, there were strong representations made that the executive branch of Government would

oppose this provision strongly. Therefore, because I thought the new State could subsist on four sections, I agreed to go along with that provision.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman this question: Does not the language in the bill, as the committee has reported it, treat Alaska just like other western States when they were taken in?

Mr. BARTLETT. The language of the bill treats Alaska as the last three Territories admitted were treated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Oh, I take exception to that. All of the land was given to the State of Nebraska, and the State itself put that land out to homestead.

Mr. BARTLETT. I said the last three western States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That may be true of the last three, but it is the general history of the admission of western States that when they came in they had all the land to use for homestead purposes. That is one reason why the States grew and prospered, and their population increased.

Mr. ANGELL. When the State of Oregon was admitted in 1859, she had only two sections of land, 16 and 36. We have got along fairly well, we have increased our population rapidly, more so than any State in the Union since the war.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman from Nebraska remembers, I am sure, the great celebration in his own State of the first homestead patent obtained under the homestead patent law. That was in his State of Nebraska. Was it held by the State of Nebraska or by the Federal Government?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; the State held it.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Was not the celebration of the signing of that famous homestead in the gentleman's State a Federal celebration?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; it was a State celebration.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the Delegate from Alaska whether he wants the people of Alaska to administer the land of their own State?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think we ought to have a part of it and I think the Federal Government ought to retain a part to use for future settlement.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MARCH 6

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week, in view of the fact that a very considerable number of Members are here and many questions have arisen in their minds as to the program, particularly in view of the message that was just received from the White House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should be very glad to announce the program for next week at this time.

Monday: This is Consent Calendar day. There is strong probability that mine-seizure legislation may come up under suspension. I have received information that the Senate committee might meet this afternoon to consider legislation, and that the Senate might meet tomorrow. I do not want any inference to be drawn that I know what will happen for I do not; but the information I have received is that the other body is going to try to give it immediate consideration. Monday, of course, being Consent Calendar day is the only day that legislation could be considered under a suspension of the rules, and such a measure could not come up for 2 weeks unless by unanimous consent or by a rule from the Committee on Rules. So the probability is that that legislation may be considered on Monday, and I use the word "probability" because that is the strongest that I can use at the present time.

Then there will be the Hawaiian statehood bill, assuming, of course, that the Alaskan bill passes. That will be the next order of business under the rules of the House.

Tuesday: Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called and we will call up for consideration the conference report on the bill H. R. 4406, the Yugoslavia claims bill. The conference report is ready also on the oleomargarine bill, and on H. R. 87, the postal service military bill.

Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday.

On Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday we will consider the following bills: H. R. 3105, dealing with vocational education in the Virgin Islands; H. R. 874, the library service demonstration bill; and H. R. 7058, amending the laws relating to the United States Military and Naval Academies.

Any further program will be announced later. If there is any change, it will be announced as early as possible to advise the leadership on the other side of the House. Conference reports, of course, other than those I have mentioned, are in order for consideration at any time. These announcements are always made as early as possible for the benefit of the leadership of the House as well as the membership.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand that it is the purpose of the majority leader to adjourn over to Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; it is my purpose to ask that when we adjourn today we adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Do I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts to mean that if the Alaska statehood bill does not pass that the Hawaiian statehood bill will not come before the House? Why, I prefer to proceed upon the assumption that the House is going to pass the Alaska statehood bill.

In the event it does not pass the Alaska statehood bill, what then?

Mr. PETERSON. We do not want to assume that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am asking the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would prefer not to cross that bridge at the present time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It might make some difference as to votes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not mean that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would consider it as holding a club over us—either pass the Alaskan bill or the Hawaiian bill is not to be considered.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has diligently kept an agreement that he made, and the House has been very kind and has enabled me to do it. I am keeping my agreements.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman always does.

Mr. McCORMACK. No matter how uncomfortable or embarrassing it might be. We will cross that bridge when we come to it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman does not want to state whether the Hawaii statehood bill will come up if the Alaska statehood bill is defeated?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have every confidence that the majority of the House will pass the Alaska bill. The gentleman heard my speech today in which my position was very clearly stated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman realizes he has not answered the question.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts has not answered the question, I state that frankly, because I have not come to that bridge as yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I shall oppose Alaska statehood, even though I have a warm personal friendship with Delegate BARTLETT and others. One of the things that particularly interested me during debate on this measure was the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] when he said that war with Russia is inevitable. Now, I hope and pray that war with Russia or any other country is not inevitable and the United States will never engage in another war with any country. Certainly irresponsible statements of that kind made on the floor of this House will not prevent war but will lead to war.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think possibly I was repeating the words of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] who has made that remark on several occasions. My remarks, may I say, were contingent upon whether we stop these warmongers who are traveling all over the world, in our country as well as in other parts of the world.

Mr. HUBER. I hope that no committee chairman or any Member of the House will ever again get up on the floor

and make the statement that war is inevitable. Certainly if we say it is inevitable it is bound to happen. Thought is persuasion.

I cannot see why we should go thousands of miles to Alaska and worry about statehood for those good Americans when we leave hundreds of thousands of good Americans right in our own back yard, in the District of Columbia, without the right of franchise. I think we ought to start at home before we begin somewhere else.

I am also concerned about the minerals and other valuable deposits in Alaska and whether it might be again like the tideland oil situation in California and Texas. I believe these deposits should be held in trust for the American people.

Referring to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I do not agree with him on a great many occasions, but if the majority leader is going to muzzle him, I wonder how he can muzzle the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and a few other chairmen of committees.

Why should we not be concerned more with the citizens of the District of Columbia and give them all the rights of citizenship. If we are going to do it, let us do it in the District of Columbia; let us do it right here at home. Let us not continue to disenfranchise these people in the American Capital, and at the same time grant statehood to other remote sections.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment points up one of the weaknesses in this bill. In other words, there is not enough taxable property in the Territory of Alaska so that they can raise enough money to operate a State government. Let us think what we are doing here. I want to emphasize, like my colleague from New York did, that when we once take this step we cannot rescind it. Here we have a proposed State that from one end to the other is as far as from here to Los Angeles, or as far as from here to Seattle. The total value of assessable property in Alaska, according to Moody's 1950 Government Municipals Book on this problem, is $110,000,000. It must be obvious to anybody who will think that that is not enough of a basis to conduct a State government, in an area as expansive and as diversified as Alaska is.

I am confident that if we grant statehood to Alaska they will be back in 5 years and ask the Federal Government to subsidize their State government.

Now, I want to make another point, and that is this: As far as I am concerned, I am passing on this bill as the facts are today, not on the hopes for the future. Today there are only 22,309 voters in that area. It was said here several times by various speakers that we have had this debate or one like it many times in the historic past. We have not had a situation that compares to this, and I make that statement advisedly. For every Alaskan voter there are 1,582 people in the United States. That small a proportion of people asking for statehood never occurred in any other case in United States history. The nearest to it was when Wyoming came in. That ratio was 1 to 1,006. Most of them were down way below a ratio of 1 to 265, as between the population of the Territory under consideration and the Union. Here we are giving this small group containing only 22,309 voters the greatest power we ever gave to a proportionate group in the history of the United States. You all know the serious implications that could have in a treaty proposal and in many other situations.

I have tried to emphasize, as others have, and I think everybody in the room must know it, that we have no animus toward Alaska or its people or its Delegate. I want to see them come into the Union when they prove that they are big enough and strong enough to run a State government.

National defense has nothing to do with statehood in Alaska. We will always defend Territories, whether incorporated or unincorporated, no matter what part of the world they are in, and we will do the same for Alaska. When Hawaii was attacked at Pearl Harbor, everyone said "We have been attacked." I emphasize "we." Whether they have a State government or local government would not add one iota to the defense to what we, who have the responsibility of appropriating the money, will give to Alaska. An attack on Alaska is an attack on the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. If statehood will bring so many blessings to Alaska, is it not rather strange that 40 percent of the Alaskans are not willing to accept statehood?

Mr. JOHNSON. That is a very good point, a point that we should emphasize. We would certainly force down the throats of 40 percent of the population something that they do not want, especially when they have not enough population, considering the great area they have to administer, to run a State government. To get the statehood asked for Alaska's people should have more unity on the issue than the plebiscite showed. I believe honestly that that small tax base is entirely too small to support a State government.

Let us try to decide this matter on the basis of what is best for the United States of America, what is best for us and for Alaska. I am confident that, if you approach it from that point of view and eliminate politics of every kind and sit down by yourself, you will realize that Alaska is not yet today fit for statehood. That is the way I hope you will vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman believes in democratic procedures, does he not?

Mr. JOHNSON. Of course. What does that have to do with this?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman is talking about the fact that 40 percent of the people are against statehood.

Mr. JOHNSON. Let me point out to the gentleman that one voter in Alaska has 180 times as much influence as one voter in California. That clearly is an undemocratic situation. When a small group of 95,000 people can nullify the influence of 10,000,000 people—California's population—that certainly cannot be described as a democratic process. It is whittling away representative government to the extent that States—if Alaska comes in—with 5 percent of the national population could nullify a treaty which all the other States might want. Do not try to tell me that is a democratic process. It might be a Democratic—Party—process.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I make on this bill this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that events during the past 30 minutes have done much to discount the idea that the Taft-Hartley law is the slave-labor law which it has been espoused to be. If the Taft-Hartley law were a slave-labor law the miners—thank God they are not—would be in the mines chained to their machines. However, it so happens that they could not even get a contempt citation under the Taft-Hartley law. The President has now asked for a seizure bill. It seems to me that is the most potent argument for repealing the Taft-Hartley Act, not because it is a slave-labor law but because it is so ineffective that at a time when the health, safety, and welfare of the United States is at stake this law will not work to get one lump of coal out of the ground. This incident should stop all talk about the Taft-Hartley Act being a slave-labor law. In a time of crisis it was ineffective. Some argue that if it had been enforced sooner it would have proved effective. In my opinion it would work any time, late or early, if it were effective.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the committee gave long and serious consideration to the amount of land which should be granted to Alaska under this statehood bill. It was certainly the judgment of the committee by a majority that the sections stated in the bill would be ample and sufficient for the new State. Therefore, I shall not support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska. At some future time, if the Congress and the people of Alaska find that the language should be changed, provision can be made for additional acreage, which no doubt will be made.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to address some remarks specifically to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. He has argued the great disproportion in the number of voters in Alaska as compared with the United States. At the same time he would leave the thought in the minds of the listeners that he is in favor of statehood at some future time.

The speciousness of his argument is the fact that the population of the

United States continually moves on very rapidly. The longer you delay statehood the more facts he would have to support his argument. I think that is conclusive evidence that he is fundamentally opposed to statehood for Alaska, which is certainly his privilege just as it is mine to be in favor of statehood.

The gentleman from North Carolina pointed out that 40 percent of the people of Alaska were opposed to statehood, or something to that effect. I should like to have him submit figures to show that 40 percent of the population of Alaska are opposed to statehood. That is just some more of this argument that is thrown in here as sheer wind, you might say.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Alaska can give us that information.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am asking the gentleman about his statement that 40 percent of the population of Alaska oppose statehood

Mr. COOLEY. Forty percent of those voting in the election.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is not what I am talking about.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman agree that 40 percent of those who went to the ballot box and voted did vote against this proposition?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is not what I am talking about.

Mr. COOLEY. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am talking about the total population of Alaska.

It ties in with another specious argument made this afternoon where it was said that Alaska supplied only so many hundred people, a few hundred people, under selective service. Those who claim to be informed on the defenses of this country had better keep in mind the most extraordinary valuable defense services rendered to the people of the United States by the Aleuts and the Eskimos of Alaska during the war, who were the smartest fellows that we have on our defense lines anywhere under the American flag. You did not play any marches for them. They are the boys who know what happens up and down those cold waters between Alaska and Russia. They are the boys who pass the word back to the so-called big brass. But you did not say anything about the contribution those fellows made in your remarks with respect to the few people who were put into the selective service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this is another case where we are trying to drive something down the throats of a lot of people who do not seem to want legislation of this kind. You and I know that we are interested in Alaska. We want to take care of Alaska. But if we leave all the land, except 12 percent, in the hands of the Department of the Interior, then that Department is going to run Alaska, and you can just count on that. The people of Alaska are not going to have very much to say on what they do if they ever get to become a State.

The Interior Department would have such influence on the people, and if, as was said, 40 percent of them do not want the Federal Government to grant them statehood, it seems to me you are doing wrong by going ahead and passing this bill today. This country is in danger. It is in terrible danger when the President of the United States comes, as he did via his message 15 minutes ago, and asks us to seize the coal mines of the country.

How soon is it going to be when he is going to ask you to seize the railroads and ask you to seize the telephone companies? You are going into socialism when you get to that point. Then you will have the President of the United States dealing with all these conditions which we are facing. That is just what Hitler did a few years ago. Look what happened to Germany.

Are you going to start doing the same thing here? It looks that way to me. I do not want any part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman the answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is that in this bill, passed out of our committee, there are four sections in every township reserved to Alaska. That is two more sections than were reserved to the Western States. In the State of Idaho, sections 16 and 36 out of every township were reserved for schools. Alaska gets two more. They get four out of every township.

I want to say to the committee that Alaska, Finland, Norway, and Sweden are in the same latitude, almost the same kind of country, with the same kind of climate.

Many years ago, before this issue ever came up, I read where the Department of Agriculture had investigated conditions in Alaska and had reported that it was just as capable of supporting a population and industries as Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. I am wondering if this opposition to statehood for Alaska would be in favor of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark being territories of the Russian Empire. They are great countries. They are an inspiration to the rest of the world with their liberal laws and their independence. Why not give Alaska statehood and let her work out her destiny. There is everything in Alaska to make a great State. Let us use it. Let us vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized.

Mr O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, it is rather painful to me to have to resist the eloquent arguments which are made for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. I have a very high regard for both the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON], and I hope that if these two Territories become States they will both go to the Senate.

I took a trip through Alaska in 1944. I flew up the inside passage, through Edmonton, most of the way following the Alcan Highway to Fairbanks. From Fairbanks to Nome, and from Nome up the coast to Anchorage, and then from Anchorage down to Juneau and back the outside route. I do not pretend to be an expert on Alaska, but I did see a great deal of it.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is of great interest to me, because it means the allocation of the land they have up there.

When you see that country, the really fruitful part of it is along the west coast. That which is inland is subject to the terrific winter temperatures of 60 and 70 below zero in the wintertime. Some of it is impassable as far as getting the timber out, because of muskeg and other conditions. A vast area of Alaska is mountainous and a wilderness practically incapable of useful production.

I am wondering how Alaska, if it ever became a State, is ever going to finance itself. No matter if you double the amount of land which is to go to Alaska under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], I think it would be perfectly impossible, for it to be self-supporting.

Fundamentally, I am opposed to these bills, because I cannot get over the difficulty which I have of territory outside the limits of the United States, being transferred to statehood. I think the moment we do that we involve ourselves in a number of questions that have been developed today. I wish I could get over that handicap. Perhaps I am wrong in my thinking, but the way I feel, with all of the other problems which we have to face in this country, to take on the additional problems, which, if you pass this bill, you are going to have to take on, I think is more than we should be asked to do under the present world conditions today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LARCADE. I was unable to complete my statement when I addressed you a few minutes ago making a comparison between the war machines of the United States and Russia. I pointed out what a terrific difference there was between the armament programs of the two countries. I am just wondering what the members of this Committee think Russia is building this tremendous war machine for. Their intentions certainly cannot be assumed to be peaceful. How defenseless Alaska was during the last war is indicated by statements made to our committee by the citizens of Nome who told us that when the Japanese occupied the Aleutians they fled to the hills, and all that they had to defend themselves and their families was shark spears and shotguns. Fortunately, the Japs did not advance further north.

I also stated that there were other issues in this matter which had not been pointed out. Since then the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] mentioned one of them. But there are others to which I wish to refer. The first refers to the obligations and precedents set when

Alaska and Hawaii and other Territories were voted statehood. I was a member of both of the committees which held extensive hearings and studied this question, and besides examining the situation on the ground I read the hearings and debate both in the Senate and House on the legislation admitting both these areas as Territories of the United States. Every question was covered at the time they were granted Territorial status, including the question of their right eventually to enter the Union as States, and it was admitted and understood that by giving them the status of Territories there was an obligation and precedents which established the obligation, precedent, right, and expectancy that both would be admitted to the Union when they met the requirements.

Another issue involved is that of taxation without representation, the same issue that caused the conflict of the war between this country and England. While it is admitted that both Territories have Delegates in the Congress, they do not have any vote.

The report of the committee, in my opinion, shows that the Territory of Alaska certainly is in a position in every way, economically and otherwise, to assume statehood.

Both of these Territories pay tremendous amounts of taxes into our Federal Treasury, just as other States, and, as a matter of fact, Hawaii has paid, since 1900, income taxes more than a billion dollars.

Another matter to which I wish to refer is that raised by some Members with regard to the apportionment of the membership in the House of Representatives. Some Members were afraid their States would lose the memberships that would be assigned to these Territories when admitted as States. I remind these gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, that there have been a number of reapportionments of this House. The membership has been increased from time to time. As a matter of fact, there is a forced redistribution of the membership due to changes in population. We all know that as a result of the census to be taken this year changes will be made in State representations in the Congress, especially in the cases of California and some of the other States. California will gain nine seats in the House of Representatives, and others will lose and gain membership, and certainly with the increased population of the United States, regardless of the admission of Alaska and Hawaii, there will be a reapportionment in the House of Representatives, and when Alaska and Hawaii are admitted into the Union this matter will be taken care of as it has in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that even in the last war Alaska played an important part in the winning of the war. Its airfields and location was of strategic value. One of the best breaks we had was that just before the war there had been established a weather-reporting station at Juneau, and as a result thousands of lives of Americans were saved and our success, in the Pacific was due to this station being able to report the weather for our naval operations in the entire Pacific.

Mr. Chairman, with the completion of the Alcan Highway to Alaska I predict a tourist trade to Alaska comparable to that of California and Yellowstone Park amounting to millions of dollars. Very few of our citizens have seen Alaska, and when this highway is opened it will contribute to thousands migrating there, and the tourist trade will add to the income and economy of Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, in order to give the Members of the House an insight of the importance, economy, scenic beauty, resources, and other facts about Alaska, I wish to read from a letter addressed to me by Mr. Baker, publisher of the Gazette, in Wrangell, Alaska. I quote:

The Territory of Alaska, which is 2½ times the size of Texas and stretches across the one hundred and eightieth meridian into the Old World, is America's last frontier

Alaska, while admittedly still a land of enchanting scenery, of high, snow-capped mountains, Indian-made totem poles, and vast glaciers—one of them bigger than the State of Rhode Island—also is suprisingly modern. Alaskans tell us they have more refrigerators, radios, books, magazines, and other material things of life than the average citizens of the 48 States. They have more air lines too, because the plane is the accepted way of getting around in a hurry where islands make highways impossible, and steamers stop in only once or twice a week.

Petersburg, a Norwegian fishing community just south of Juneau, claims the highest per capita wealth under the American flag. Its population of 1,200 consists mostly of fishermen with a few fur farmers. But a halibut fisherman or even a salmon troller who doesn't make from $5,000 to $10,000 in a year's time is disappointed with himself. Hence Petersburg's banker, Ed Lokken, told us his nearly $2,000,000 in deposits made his per capita wealth the highest in America.

Alaska's economy is, however, admittedly one-sided, devoted to fishing and gold mining with trapping and tourist trade next in importance. In the four cities and towns, citizens have declared that the way to make jobs for returning GI's and newcomers who have read much of Alaska since the bombing of Dutch Harbor and the Battle of Attu is to open up the forests and develop the two dozen or more known species of fish of commercial value that aren't being harvested at present. Also, Commissioner B. D. Stewart of the Alaska department of mines gave us recently published booklets on metallic and nonmetallic minerals that show a vast field of possible development in marbles, clays, limestones, granites and similar products. Even the sawing of logs for log-cabin-type homes, of which Alaska has many, would seem to offer many jobs.

Southeastern Alaska is nearly all national forest land while much of the mainland or interior is public domain, good for grazing reindeer, dredging of gold and lumbering where there is timber. Out in the Aleutian Islands, where the Government recently returned the Aleuts, America's only war refugees, from temporary camps near Juneau, the chief occupations are fishing and fur farming. The natives, only about 1,100 in number all told, live a subsistence type of existence although fox fur farming and sheep grazing show some promise. The Aleutians, of course, extend to within 650 miles of Japan's Kurile Islands and house some big army and navy bases since the Japanese tried to seize Aleutian bases early in the war.

Alaska is interesting to visit in many ways. Its Matanuska Valley, where Uncle Sam has a farm colony, now is apparently out of the experimental stage and some farmers grow 15 to 20 tons of potatoes per acre on the best sandy loam soil. War prices bring them up to $98 per ton and 7 to 7½ cents per pound for the new crop which is dug by mid-July. Like any other place, Alaska farming demands hard work, much building up of soil and constant experimentation to adapt crops to the short growing season. Even rainy southeastern Alaska has some successful farmers producing garden stuffs, berries, poultry, rabbits and dairy products.

Alaska is the scene of many interesting developments. Major airlines are fighting for permits to fly through Alaska to Siberia, China, Japan, India and the Netherlands East Indies. Some day soon it may be possible to fly around the rim of the Pacific through the Orient, Australia, New Zealand, South America and back to the States. Several lines already cover inland Alaska.

The Navy is drilling for oil in a vast area of the oil seepages where the Eskimos live along the Arctic Sea. Several paper companies, newspapers and magazines are studying pulpwood prospects in southeastern Alaska where the regional forester says there is enough spruce and hemlock to supply one-fifth of America's prewar needs on a perpetual yield basis. Several mining companies have field engineers in Alaska getting ready to resume gold mining or open up in new products, some of which have been made profitable by war prices or war-caused shortages.

The Territories committee has heard many appeals both for statehood in the near future for Alaska and for liberalization of the organic act which limits Alaska's legislature to certain local matters. They also want to elect their governor in the near future. There are problems of finances to be worked out but Alaskans seem ready to get to work on these matters. They have set up a development board to help bring new settlers and new industries to Alaska. Its office is in Juneau.

Alaskans are friendly to meet. They like to take you trout and grayling fishing, to show you the scenery and to discuss their problems. Most of them say that if granted statehood, Alaska can grow rapidly and absorb thousands of newcomers. But considerable study and research may be needed before the vast wealth of Alaska can be unlocked for the benefit of the entire Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the defense of Alaska. I hope, regardless of whether this area remains a territory or becomes a State, that we will defend Alaska. I would remind my colleagues, however, that the Governor of Alaska, Mr. Gruening, within the last few months made the statement that Russia could take Alaska with just a few airborne divisions. If we admitted Alaska as a State, it would be far more embarrassing to give up a State than it would be to give up a Territory. I do not believe that this is going to happen under any circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I am very serious about this amendment. I am trying to give Alaska at least 50 percent of the land in order that she may conduct herself as a new State. The bill would give her about 12 percent of the land. I just do not believe that a new State can grow and prosper without sufficient land areas in which to do so. We all know that growth and wealth come from the soil. Our committee reported in 1945 that there were some 80,000,000,000 board-feet of lumber in Alaska that could be

removed. I want to see the new State prosper through the processes of homesteading, development of land, and getting access to the water line, which they do not now have. Under Interior Department rule, it is almost impossible for any settler to get to the water line. I believe this amendment of mine would cure that It would give the new State enough to exist on so that it could grow and prosper and it would not have to come to the United States for help every year.

Outside of the last three States that came into the Union, all of the States did have their land granted to them so that they could develop and grow as homestead States. That is one reason why those States in our country became great.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not the view of the gentleman, who has been up to Alaska, that it is so big the ordinary cost of a State government would be higher in Alaska than anywhere else?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Oh, yes. The cost would be much higher. It is about one-fifth the size of the United States. Most of the good land up there is along the southwestern coast, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. JOHNSON. So that you would have to have more property on which to assess taxes?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; and they must have more land or they cannot exist as a State. It is a hollow mockery to say, "We will make you a State, but we will give you only about 12 percent of the land to exist on." I think that is wrong. I think we ought to give them at least half of the land, and that is what my amendment proposes to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, you have heard the debate more or less in detail. With reference to the particular amendment now before us, as I stated before, I do not feel keenly one way or the other about it. The amendment was offered in committee and the committee voted it down. It is a different rule from what was generally in effect when other States were admitted into the Union.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I merely rise to ask what is the estimated revenue that the State of Alaska would get from its tax values? Or what are the tax values?

Mr. PETERSON. We have that in the RECORD.

Mr. BONNER. That is a very important question, whether the State would be able to sustain itself.

Mr. PETERSON. Yes; the State will be able to sustain itself.

Mr. BONNER. Well, what is the estimated taxable property that the State would be able to tax? Is it not true it has been stated that it is about $100.000?

Mr. PETERSON. No, it runs more than that. The Delegate from Alaska will give us the figures.

Mr. BONNER. That is a very important question.

Mr. BARTLETT. While a figure was quoted a while ago, that related only to municipalities.

Mr. BONNER. We do not want to create a pauper State and that is evidently what you are doing because the State would not get sufficient taxes.

Mr. PETERSON. Five million seven hundred fifty-three thousand five hundred and twenty-eight dollars.

Mr. BONNER. Five million dollars. Now what tax would you raise on $5,000,000?

Mr. PETERSON It is set forth in the RECORD and in the report clearly that they could step up the amount which the Territory is now raising and there is the further statement that the income tax would pay a great portion of it. Income taxes are paid on the processing that occurs in the United States on the fish pack, lumber, and so forth.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman from Florida is a very intelligent man. Now basically we have got to get down to facts. What in the world would you be able to raise in revenue on $5,000 000 worth of valuation? You could not run the State government.

Mr BARTLETT. Mr Chairman, the Territory of Alaska now has a gross production annually of over $200,000,000. From that production, taxes to support the State would be raised. It is done everywhere else, of course. The last legislature appropriated about a million dollars. A State government would not be so costly there because we do not have to duplicate the uneconomic units that have been started and cannot be stopped.

Mr. BONNER The State of Alaska would be kept in step with the other States.

Mr. BARTLETT. We do not have to have a lot of small and expensive counties and we can avoid other mistakes that have been made.

Mr. PETERSON. They can step up the taxes to support the government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The hearings which were held all over the Territory show from the mouth of the people who will pay these taxes that they have ample resources there, that they are ready to tax themselves whatever is necessary to pay the State budget and they even go so far as to claim they are sufficiently intelligent to design the type of government which they can themselves finance.

Thank God we still have people in the world who take that attitude. May I add, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] stood here and argued, if you please, that we should withhold full citizenship from the people of Alaska and Hawaii; that we should not permit them, for instance, to elect their Governors; that they should be taxed without representative votes in the House and the Senate of the United States. That is 1812 stuff; it is no good. It is not in keeping with the principles of this Government at the present time. It defies the fact that we fought two world wars to extend rights to the little people, and for me I certainly will never follow that course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr MILLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 30, noes 58.

So the amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, pursuant to House Resolution 217, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON) there were—ayes 87, noes 67.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 186, nays 146, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—186

Addonizio	Carnahan	Forand
Albert	Case, S. Dak.	Ford
Allen, Calif	Chelf	Fugate
Anderson, Calif	Chesney	Fulton
Angell	Christopher	Furcolo
Aspinall	Cole, Kans	Garmatz
Bailey	Combs	Gordon
Baring	Corbett	Gorski
Barrett, Wyo	Crawford	Granger
Bates, Ky.	Crook	Gross
Beckworth	Crosser	Hagen
Blemiller	Cunningham	Hall,
Boggs, La.	Davenport	Edwin Arthur
Bolling	Davis, Ga.	Havenner
Bosone	D'Ewart	Hays, Ohio
Bramblett	Dingell	Herlong
Breen	Dolliver	Heselton
Bryson	Eberharter	Hinshaw
Buchanan	Elliott	Holifield
Buckley, Ill.	Elston	Holmes
Burdick	Engle, Calif.	Hope
Burke	Evins	Horan
Burnside	Fallon	Howell
Byrnes, Wis.	Feighan	Irving
Camp	Fernandez	Jackson, Wash.
Canfield	Flood	Javits

Jenison	Miles	Sasscer
Jensen	Miller, Calif.	Saylor
Karst	Mitchell	Scudder
Karsten	Morris	Secrest
Kearney	Morton	Shelley
Kearns	Multer	Sikes
Kee	Murdock	Simpson, Ill.
Keefe	Murphy	Sims
Kennedy	Murray, Wis.	Spence
Kerr	Nixon	Staggers
King	Norblad	Stigler
Kirwan	Norton	Stockman
Kruse	O'Brien, Ill.	Sullivan
Lane	O'Brien, Mich.	Talle
Lanham	O'Hara, Ill.	Taurlello
Larcade	O'Konski	Thompson
LeCompte	O'Neill	Tollefson
LeFevre	O'Sullivan	Underwood
Lemke	O'Toole	Velde
Lind	Passman	Vorys
Linehan	Patman	Wagner
Lovre	Perkins	Walsh
McCarthy	Peterson	Welch
McCormack	Phillips, Tenn	Werdel
McDonough	Polk	White, Calif.
McGuire	Poulson	White, Idaho
McKinnon	Price	Wickersham
McSweeney	Priest	Wier
Mack, Wash	Rabaut	Willis
Madden	Rees	Wilson, Okla.
Magoe	Ribicoff	Withrow
Mansfield	Rodino	Woodhouse
Marsalis	Rogers, Fla.	Yates
Marshall	Rogers, Mass	Young
Martin, Iowa	Rooney	Zablocki
Merrow	Sabath	
Meyer	Sanborn	

NAYS—146

Abernethy	Goodwin	O'Hara, Minn.
Allen, Ill	Gore	Pace
Andersen, H Carl	Gossett	Patterson
	Graham	Philbin
Andresen, August H.	Grant	Phillips, Calif
	Hale	Pickett
Andrews	Halleck	Poage
Arends	Hand	Potter
Barden	Harden	Preston
Bates, Mass.	Hardy	Rains
Battle	Hare	Rankin
Bennett, Mich.	Harris	Reed, Ill.
Bishop	Harrison	Reed, N Y.
Bolton, Ohio	Harvey	Rich
Bonner	Hays, Ark.	Richards
Boykin	Hill	Riehlman
Brehm	Hobbs	Sadlak
Brown, Ga.	Hoeven	St George
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich	Scrivner
Burleson	Huber	Shafer
Cannon	Hull	Short
Carlyle	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Chipperfield	Jennings	Smith, Kans.
Church	Johnson	Smith, Va
Clevenger	Jonas	Smith, Wis.
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Ala.	Stanley
Colmer	Jones, Mo	Steed
Cooley	Jones, N C.	Stefan
Cooper	Kean	Sutton
Cotton	Keating	Tabei
Cox	Kilburn	Tackett
Curtis	Kilday	Teague
Dague	Lodge	Thomas
Davis, Tenn.	Lucas	Thornberry
Davis, Wis	McConnell	Trimble
DeGraffenried	McCulloch	Van Zandt
Delaney	McGregor	Weichel
Dondero	McMillan, S C.	Wheeler
Donohue	McMillen, Ill.	Whitten
Doughton	Mahon	Whittington
Engel, Mich.	Mason	Wigglesworth
Fellows	Michener	Williams
Fenton	Miller, Md	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Miller, Nebr.	Winstead
Frazier	Mills	Wolcott
Gamble	Monroney	Wolverton
Gathings	Murray, Tenn.	Wood
Gavin	Nelson	Woodruff
Gillette	Nicholson	
Golden	Norrell	

NOT VCTING—100

Abbitt	Bulwinkle	Deane
Allen, La.	Burton	Denton
Auchincloss	Byrne, N. Y.	Dollinger
Barrett, Pa.	Carroll	Douglas
Beall	Case, N. J.	Doyle
Bennett, Fla.	Cavalcante	Durham
Bentsen	Celler	Eaton
Blackney	Chatham	Ellsworth
Blatnik	Chudoff	Fogarty
Boggs, Del.	Clemente	Gary
Bolton, Md.	Coudert	Gilmer
Brooks	Davies, N. Y.	Granahan
Buckley, N Y	Dawson	Green
Gregory	Leonard W	Regan
Gwinn	Lyle	Rhodes
Hall,	Lynch	Rivers
Hart	McGrath	Roosevelt
Hébert	Mack, Ill.	Sadowski
Hedrick	Macy	Scott, Hardie
Heffernan	Marcantonio	Scott,
Heller	Martin, Mass	Hugh D., Jr.
Herter	Morgan	Sheppard
Hoffman, Ill.	Morrison	Smathers
Jackson, Calif	Moulder	Smith, Ohio
Jacobs	Noland	Taylor
James	Patten	Towe
Judd	Pfeifer,	Vinson
Kelley, Pa.	Joseph L.	Vursell
Kelly, N. Y.	Pfeiffer,	Wadsworth
Keogh	William L.	Walter
Klein	Plumley	Whitaker
Kunkel	Powell	Widnall
Latham	Quinn	Wilson, Tex.
Lesinski	Ramsay	Worley
Lichtenwalter	Redden	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against.

Mr Auchincloss for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. William L. Pfeiffer for, with Mr. Hugh D Scott, Jr., against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr Widnall against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Jackson of California against.

Mr. Carroll for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Clemente against.

Mr Denton for, with Mr. Wilson of Texas against

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Noland for, with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Abbitt against.

Mr Hébert for, with Mr. Burton against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Quinn against.

Mr. Leonard W Hall for, with Mr. Gary against.

Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Redden against.

Mr. Marcantonio for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. James against.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Bulwinkle against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr Chatham against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Lichtenwalter against

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Beall against.

Mr. Granahan for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Chudoff for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Kunkel.

Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Vursell.

Mr Worley with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr Vinson with Mr Case of New Jersey.

Mr Smathers with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Green with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. McCARTHY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CHURCH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what can the majority leader say as to the plan for taking up the legislation proposed by the President to restore national coal production?

Mr. McCORMACK. I announced the program earlier, in which I said that it probably would be considered under suspension of the rules.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that would have to be on Monday. I cannot make a definite statement to the House. That is the strongest I can go at the present time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the President in his message said that this requires action at once. If it is to be taken at face value, I do not understand the reason why we should wait until Monday to consider it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I told the House that the only way the bill could be considered would be by unanimous consent. The gentleman from South Dakota knows that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the gentleman asked for unanimous consent?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday a motion to suspend the rules and pass on the bill would be in order. I stated that I had information that the Senate committee might consider it this afternoon, and if they reported it out, the Senate might consider it tomorrow. Certainly Monday is as early as anyone could reasonably expect the House to pass on the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman recalls that when the railroad strike was on a bill was presented here and driven through on the same day.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand it, the majority leader had information that objection would be made and he could not get unanimous consent anyway.

Mr. McCORMACK. I could not say that. I will be frank. I doubt if unanimous consent could be obtained, but on Monday, anyway, a motion to suspend the rules will be in order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yesterday I was conferring with the head of the Interstate Commerce Commission on this situation, the shortage of coal, and I was informed that there are many railroads today that have less than 10 days' supply of coal on hand, and that is going to have its repercussions throughout the general economy. If that is the situation, action 3 days earlier means coal 3 days earlier, if this will produce coal. I do not know that it will, but if it will, if this is the thing to do, then this ought to be done at the earliest possible time, it seems to me, and the majority leader should seek to

bring it up under unanimous consent. If he cannot, then of course the procedure he suggested about waiting until Monday would be in order. Under the circumstances, until an attempt is made tomorrow, I shall be constrained to object to going over until Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am somewhat surprised at the statement of my friend. Nobody has really had an opportunity to examine the bill that has been introduced.

Mr. COOLEY. Has the bill even been printed and made available to the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the majority leader is doing everything possible for as early consideration as anybody could expect on the part of the House, when we have an opportunity to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill on Monday. If that day were 2 weeks off or 10 days off a different situation would present itself.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When you are dealing with a coal strike?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly. The bill has been referred to the House committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The House committee may meet tomorrow morning.

Mr. McCORMACK. The House committee is going to meet tomorrow morning, I understand. There is going to be a Senate committee meeting. I do not know if they met this afternoon or not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly I would not want to admit that the other body could consider this legislation more quickly than we. As the gentleman has suggested, the Senate is going to take it up tomorrow, and I do not know why an attempt at least should not be made to bring it up in the House tomorrow. Until that request is made, I will object to going over to Monday.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the Alaska statehood bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the committee of conference, and I do not know of any member of the committee on the minority side that has had an opportunity to examine the conference report or the statement of the conferees. I feel we should at least have the opportunity to examine the report before it is filed, because it is 10 days since the conferees apparently agreed. Until we have a chance to see the report, I will object to filing it tonight.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1008

Mr. MICHENER (on behalf of Mr. CELLER) submitted a conference report and statement on the bill S. 1008, an act to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 49, with Mr. HARDY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we want to make as much progress as we can toward statehood for Hawaii, and we thought we might utilize this time. I want to place in the RECORD certain figures for your consideration before we vote. You will have these figures available to you, so that you can analyze them and see just what the situation is.

Bear in mind the fact that the Territory of Hawaii was annexed by the United States originally as a result of a treaty. At that time Hawaii was an independent republic. The people hoped and aspired at that time to ultimately obtain statehood. They acquired Territorial status at that time and since then they have managed their financial affairs in fine shape. They paid more into the Federal Treasury in 1949 than 11 other States. They paid $90,824,693. This exceeds the amount paid by 11 States: Arizona, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

So they have grown up financially and in addition the population consists of more than half a million people. The estimated population is 533,000 as of July 1948.

In view of the fact that later on I will discuss this matter again, I shall not go into it further at this time, but I did want to show clearly in my opening remarks that this bill was reported out of the committee with only one dissenting vote which was more in the nature of a resolution than it was actually a vote against it. I sincerely hope we may pass this bill granting statehood to Hawaii by a fine vote.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late and I realize that all Members are anxious to conclude these proceedings and return to their offices and homes.

But before you do so, I would like to introduce you briefly to some of the issues involved in the question of admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State.

The bill before us is almost identical with the bill passed on June 30, 1947, by a vote of 196 to 133. The only changes that have been made in it are minor, and have been made necessary by the passing of time.

There is no legislation that has come before the House in recent years that has received as extensive consideration as statehood for Hawaii. There is available to you hearings that cover more than 3,000 pages. More than 700 witnesses have been heard. Eighty or ninety Members of Congress have served on committees which have considered this issue, and something like 50 of them have visited the Territory itself to examine the problems at first-hand.

The people of the Territory of Hawaii are overwhelmingly in favor of statehood for Hawaii. A plebiscite in 1940 showed them 2 to 1 in favor of it, but a vote today would show them at least 4 or 5 to 1 in favor of statehood for Hawaii. I do not think there can be the slightest doubt about that.

In addition to that, the people of the country support the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State. A poll of public opinion taken in recent years was concluded on February 22, and it showed the people 4 to 1 in favor of statehood for Hawaii.

Every patriotic organization of any consequence in the country has come out in favor of it. The American Legion last fall went on record as favoring statehood for Alaska and for Hawaii for defense reasons. I could cite organizations in practically every field of human activity who have recorded themselves in favor of the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State.

The people of Hawaii have lived for many years in the belief that they were promised statehood for Hawaii. They have been encouraged in that belief, and they feel now they have demonstrated their qualifications for it.

I will not undertake to review what those qualifications are, as many committees have already found that we are qualified. The record supports that. I do not think there is anybody who will dispute it.

Finally, I think there can be no question that the time has come for the country to fulfill the promise of statehood for the people of Hawaii for reasons that have been very well presented to the House earlier in the day. So many of the issues involved have already been given consideration by the House that I see no point in prolonging the debate on this

question. I believe the House is thoroughly informed on the issues involved, and ready to vote.

I think you know that the population of Hawaii is well over 500,000. The arguments against Alaskan statehood on that account do not apply to Hawaii. We have been so well developed from an economic standpoint that we are able to discharge all the financial obligations of statehood. In fact, it would save the Federal Government a little money to give Hawaii statehood, in the executive and judicial branches.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I voted against statehood for Alaska, but I am particularly impressed with the argument the gentleman is now making. I feel that Hawaii is in quite a different category from Alaska, and I expect to support the gentleman in the splendid fight he has been making to have statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman.

I have nothing further to add at this time, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I favor H. R. 49. Congress must grant Hawaii and Alaska statehood—now.

The reasons are imperative.

They are key areas of our strategic defense against Russia.

They are key areas in our cold war against the world spread of communism.

As Territories they are weak.

As States they would be strong.

Japan struck at both Territories in World War II.

Hawaii and Alaska today are the prime targets under the American flag of the most powerful enemy that has ever threatened the United States.

Statehood would strengthen them internally.

And statehood would vastly strengthen America's position in the ideological and economic conflict now being waged by Russia throughout the Pacific.

Proof of that was given me on my recent tour of all our island possessions in the Pacific, Japan, the Philippines, Okinawa, Hong Kong, and other parts of the Orient.

It substantiated completely earlier impressions I had gained on visits to Alaska and other Territorial possessions.

The actions of our Government toward its Territories speak louder to the peoples of the Orient and the Pacific than all the flossy double talk emanating from our State Department.

We will be on the losing end of the cold war in the Pacific as long as we limit the peoples of Hawaii and Alaska to a mere territorial status.

Today Communists everywhere can and do make capital of these admittedly unfortunate facts:

First. Hawaii, an area with a population greater than that of 11 of our sovereign States, has no vote in Congress and no voice in the Senate of the United States.

Second. Alaska, with an area one-third as large as our entire continental United States, likewise has no vote in Congress or voice in the Senate.

Third. They are excluded from even discussions of foreign relations within the appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

Fourth. Their citizens contribute richly in taxes to the Federal Treasury—without representation.

Fifth. Their people, their business enterprises, and their investments in recent years have been denied even Federal protection.

As Territories, both Hawaii and Alaska have been powerless to deal with paralyzing strikes which Harry Bridges' Pacific longshoremen's union either engineered or in which his union has been actively involved.

Bridges is now on trial in the United States District Court in San Francisco on perjury charges that he swore falsely at a naturalization hearing in 1945 that he never was a Communist.

There is voluminous testimony before that trial that he is or was a Communist and a leader among Communists.

As Territories, Hawaii and Alaska are helpless to deal with such types.

CRUCIAL ROLE

As States they could protect the interests of their citizens and their economy at least to a greater degree than they can now or have been unable to during recent strangling strikes.

Statehood is important to Hawaii and Alaska.

It is even more important to the United States that Hawaii and Alaska become States.

Theirs is a crucial role in our national destiny.

They are our western bastions of defense.

They represent to the peoples of Asia, the Orient, and the Pacific the one example of unity and equality among the three great Pacific racial groups.

In their territorial activities Hawaiians and Alaskans have long demonstrated the highest qualities of citizenship and abilities for self-government under the free American system.

Hawaii and Alaska are entitled to statehood and statehood will enable them to more effectively fill their vital role.

Consider these roles separately.

Alaska is a vast territory of very great, yet unmeasured resources.

We are spending money up there as if we intended to use Alaska as a buffer between the United States and Russia, which lies only across a narrow strip of water where the two countries almost touch.

CANNOT CONTINUE

The United States has set itself up as a buffer between Russia and the rest of the world.

Unless Alaska does serve as a strong buffer between Russia and ourselves, the United States cannot continue indefinitely as a buffer between Russia and the rest of the world.

It is as simple as that.

The United States needs Alaska as a State.

It needs Alaska much more than Alaska needs the United States.

It needs Alaska's space, her strategic geographic position, her industry, her resources, and her potential products.

We need everything Alaska has—fish, timber, minerals, oil—and everything that Alaska can develop and produce.

We need them in relation to our industrial and economic position, and in relation to the international obligations we have assumed throughout the world.

NEEDS PEOPLE

Alaska needs people, lots of people, in addition to its present population which today is larger than that of a third of our States when they were admitted to the Union.

She needs people to develop her vast resources.

Alaska needs transportation so that tonnage to build industries and defenses can move to Alaska, and the products and raw materials of Alaska can move to us.

To Alaskans this means a railroad, and it should mean the same thing to us.

A railroad is the only safe and economic method of transportation that can be provided.

Ocean transportation to Alaska has been shut off repeatedly by maritime union strikes.

POWERFUL INFLUENCE

Every strike has impaired our defense program in Alaska.

Russian submarines would menace our sea lanes in event of war.

The Alcan Highway is a dusty road that starts far north of Edmonton and is connected with closer highways only by an unimproved dirt road constantly in bad condition.

In the face of Russia's huge submarine program and her vast construction program across the Bering Straits from Alaska, a railway to Alaska is a must.

What does this have to do with statehood?

This:

Alaska needs—and we need—two Alaskans in the United States Senate who can inform us about Alaska and her needs, both economic and for defense. We need their voice, their action, and their vote.

Alaska needs—and we need—a Representative in the House who has a vote.

BENEFIT TO ALASKA

Alaska would benefit, the United States would benefit, and, I believe, our international relations in view of the obligations we have assumed to help most of the world, would benefit as well.

Hawaii is in a somewhat different position, but is just as much entitled to statehood as Alaska, although for somewhat different reasons.

Militarily, Hawaii stands at one corner of our inner Pacific defense triangle that extends from Alaska's mainland down to Hawaii and across to our Pacific coast.

Hawaii also is a pivot for our outer Pacific defense triangle that extends southward to encompass the Pacific islands now under our trusteeship, Samoa and Guam; extends westward to Okinawa, and extends north to the tip of the Aleutians.

Hawaii has almost reached the zenith of her agricultural development and resources.

LOYAL POPULATION

Her population is large and relatively stable. Her people are industrious and loyal. Hawaii is American. In every way Hawaii is the equivalent of States with similar populations—except that she is not a State.

Hawaii has met all qualifications of statehood ordinarily required by Congress and definitely should be a State.

Statehood for Hawaii would have priceless value to the United States in the Pacific and in our international relations with the world.

Only in Hawaii have the cultures of the Orient, of Micronesia and Polynesia, become completely absorbed within the American concept of human dignity and government under law.

The mere knowledge that Hawaii has been granted statehood would have dynamic effect throughout Oceania and the Orient.

It would be the greatest blow to Stalin and communism in the Orient that America could deliver, for it would prove this:

Where Russia can only offer slavery, starvation, and loss of face, the United States has offered to a population that includes their racial strains full partnership as a State.

Let us achieve this victory in the cold war in the Pacific now.

Make Hawaii a State.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, not too often do I come to the well of this House to speak for or against proposed legislation, but to me the bill under consideration, which has for its purpose statehood for Hawaii, is one of merit. Therefore, it is a privilege for me to support H. R. 49.

Unless I have been misinformed—and I do not believe that I have been—there is no sound reason or logic why Hawaii should not be granted statehood. It would appear to me the plain truth is that, through neglect, the Congress of the United States is guilty of imposing taxation without representation on half a million American citizens, the people of Hawaii.

In considering the bill before us, if we were to consider only facts, in all probability this bill would have the unanimous support of this body. It is my understanding that Hawaiian status has never been that of a colony or a possession; instead its people have always understood that, when qualified, they were to be accorded the privileges of statehood. They feel that on the basis of their accomplishments their period of apprenticeship should have been terminated years ago. It has been directed to my attention that Hawaii was neither purchased from a foreign government nor was it a prize of war. In 1897, then an independent republic, Hawaii voluntarily offered itself for annexation to the United States in much the same manner as did the Republic of Texas in 1845. Thus, in 1898, by resolutions of Congresses of this country and Hawaii, the island republic became an integral part of the United States.

I think it would be well for us to consider Hawaii's war record. No doubt many of you in pondering this question will recall to mind the stories about sabotage which came to us over the air and through the press that fateful Sunday in December 1941. We heard that Japanese laborers had cut huge arrows in the cane fields, pointing the direction of Pearl Harbor. You will recall another story to the effect that other saboteurs drove trucks upon the runways of our military airfields and wrecked them, thereby preventing our fighter planes from taking off to repel the invader.

These are but two of the many stories given wide circulation on and immediately after December 7, 1941. How many of them were true? Well, the government departments in charge of our Nation's safety who should know are the Army, Navy, and the FBI. All three, through their spokesmen, in reporting to Congress on these stories stated that neither before, during, nor after the attack on Pearl Harbor was there any evidence of a single act of sabotage in Hawaii. Instead of their loyalty being open to question, it would probably be more accurate to say that nowhere did Americans labor as hard to win the war—and under more difficult circumstances than did our citizens in Hawaii. Moreover, the people of Hawaii bought more war bonds, per capita, than did the people of any of the 48 mainland States.

Those who were inclined to be dubious about the loyalty of part of our Hawaiian citizens invariably have in mind that segment of 32 percent of the Islands' population which is of Japanese extraction. Perhaps the best single index of the loyalty of our Americans of Japanese parentage lies in the fact that although they represent 32 percent of the population, due to their large number of volunteers, their racial group supplied 52 percent of Hawaii's World War II fighting men.

It is difficult to grasp—even from this astounding fact—the full measure of the devotion of these men. For it should be borne in mind that because of their racial background, they were looked upon with suspicion and were subjected to uncalled for abuse and indignities. The Navy, for example—in which I was privileged to serve—refused to accept them even as volunteers.

And what sort of soldiers did they make? About 13,000 of them bore arms in World War II and the bulk of these men were assigned to the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442nd Combat Team. Except for some top officers, both of these outfits were composed entirely of Americans of Japanese ancestry, and their exploits make up one of the most glorious chapters in America's military history.

In the entire course of the Italian and European campaigns these men did not give up so much as one yard—only two of them were captured by the enemy, and then only after both men had been severely wounded. For their courage and accomplishments these superb fighting men came out of the war the most highly decorated unit in the history of the United States Army. They were awarded:

Five Presidential unit citations;

Fifty Army commendations;

Eighty-two Division commendations;

Sixty-five Distinguished Service Crosses;

Two hundred ninety Silver Stars; and

Seven hundred eight-two Bronze Stars.

All of this was not accomplished without suffering and sacrifice. So many of these men were casualties that throughout Europe the 100th Infantry was known as the "Purple Heart Battalion." Six hundred forty-eight of them made the supreme sacrifice. Thus did those splendid men demonstrate a fact some of us are, at times, prone to forget, namely that good Americanism is determined by what one has in his heart. If any further evidence of the quality of their citizenship is desired, it can be found in the records of the Hawaii Police Department, which show a lower rate of crime, per capita, among our Americans of Japanese ancestry than for any other racial group, including the Caucasian.

It may surprise you, as it did me, to learn that the educational system of Hawaii is such as to invite the envy of many of us on the mainland. The record discloses that compulsory education for all children six and older became mandatory in Hawaii as early as 1835. I need not tell you that this was many, many years before it became law in some States. The salary scale and other benefits for Hawaii's teachers are higher than prevail in any States except New York and Louisiana. The fact that all teachers, both rural and urban, are paid on the same wage scale makes it possible for rural children to be taught by teachers of identical qualifications to those who teach the children in Honolulu with its quarter of a million people. A congressional committee investigating Hawaii's qualifications for statehood reported that in 1945 rural teachers in the continental United States were paid an average annual salary of $1,018 as compared with $2,014 in Hawaii. Today's compensation, of course, is even higher. Their high schools, for example, require four full years of English—incidentally, only 15 States have such a requirement.

Contrary to the popular mainland conception, Hawaii's economy does not

rest upon her tourist trade. It is basically dependent upon her agriculture. Here is a good example of what Hawaii has accomplished in agriculture:

Because the land is mostly mountainous, only about 7 percent is in cultivation on all crops. This total acreage in cultivation is, roughly, 420 square miles. Hawaii produces annually:

First. Twice as much sugar as the total combined yields of Louisiana and Florida, with a value of $100,000,000;

Second. Ninety percent of the world's pack of pineapples, valued at more than $60,000,000;

Third. Six and one-half million pounds of coffee; and

Fourth. Diversified crops valued at about $12,000,000.

Hawaii has a very high annual income; yet the income is not confined to any one segment of her people. The record will disclose that even her field workers receive an hourly wage in excess of 75 cents. I am sure it would interest you to learn that in 1948 Hawaii paid into the Federal Treasury more tax money than did 12 of our States. By way of example, 2,000,000 people of Mississippi paid Uncle Sam $106,000,000, or $53 per capita—the half million people of Hawaii paid Uncle Sam $108,000,000, or $216 per capita.

It has been my privilege to visit Hawaii and I have profound respect for and confidence in the loyalty, devotion, and patriotism of this segment of Americans. I might say that I spent many hours checking into Hawaii's background and economy, and I have been unable to develop what, in my mind, is one sound reason why Hawaii should not be granted statehood.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair [Mr. HARDY], Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. If the House meets tomorrow will the unfinished business be further consideration of the Hawaiian statehood bill?

The SPEAKER. If the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House for that purpose, yes; whether or not it will, I do not know.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I not state to the gentleman in all frankness so that the House will be advised, that if the House meets tomorrow it is my intention after unanimous-consent requests are made and 1-minute speeches are disposed of, to move that the House adjourn.

I am keeping my agreement. We have done everything we can. It is rather difficult for me to understand why the situation is not completely appreciated.

The first time the House could act would be Monday under suspension.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman intend to submit his request again?

Mr. McCORMACK. When a gentleman objects, unless he himself tells me he has withdrawn his objection, I will not renew a request. I simply wish to advise the membership what I intend to do so that they can govern themselves accordingly. We are doing everything we can.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The majority leader is always seductive when he starts out with such flattery, and it makes it very difficult to maintain a position in opposition to his views.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; it is the truth; it is not flattery.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Massachusetts states, if I understand him correctly, that he will move that the House adjourn tomorrow following consent requests and 1-minute speeches.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; because the earliest we can consider any coal legislation is Monday.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman, then, is taking upon himself the responsibility of saying that the House would not consider this coal emergency tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is not taking that responsibility. The gentleman from South Dakota should not take that position, because it is not fair. The gentleman from Massachusetts takes the position that the earliest that the House can consider it is Monday.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The House could consider it tomorrow by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Such action is an impossibility.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. It is my understanding that the only way in which the House could consider this legislation tomorrow would be by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is right.

Mr. TACKETT. That is the reason why we should adjourn over until Monday now. If consent is asked to consider such legislation tomorrow I will object to its consideration. I say this hoping it may help clarify the situation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman from Arkansas wishes to take the responsibility of saying it is impossible to consider the legislation tomorrow because he will object——

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think that is fair.

Mr. TACKETT. I will take it.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; the gentleman stepped in. I think the fair position is that Monday is the earliest date on which it could possibly be expected to bring up the legislation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I do this in my responsibility here today on the minority side. I feel constrained to say that I discussed this matter, or rather the Speaker and the majority leader discussed the matter with me as to the earliest date this coal legislation could be considered, and it was understood among us that it would very definitely appear that the earliest time would be on Monday. It was on that basis that I inquired of the majority leader earlier this evening in my over-all question as to the program, whether or not he expected to seek permission to adjourn the House over until Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman. I made no such observation, because it was the general opinion that Monday was the earliest that it could be considered. I stated I had received information, and it is purely information—I cannot say anything reliable—that the Senate committee might be called to consider it this afternoon and if reported out the Senate would pass it.

Monday is the earliest date that any responsible Member could expect the House to act. Fortunately it is Consent Calendar Day, otherwise we would have to get unanimous consent or a special rule out of the Rules Committee making it in order. It cannot be brought up except by those two methods.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POLK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Committee on Ways and Means on the subject of revision of our tax laws.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TAURIELLO (at the request of Mr. HOWELL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter notwithstanding that it exceeded two pages of the RECORD and, according to the Public Printer, cost $191.24 to print.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of Louis Johnson.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an interesting article appearing in the Evening Tribune, of Lawrence, Mass.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD

THIS IS AMERICA'S HOUR

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to speak at this time in order to call the attention of the Members of the House to a very informative and impressive sermon delivered at the National Presbyterian Church in Washington on Sunday, February 19, by Rev. Louis H. Evans, D. D., LL. D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Hollywood, Calif.

The sermon is a masterpiece. In my opinion, it should be made available insofar as possible to every thinking citizen in this country. I am submitting it for the RECORD in the hope that it may receive the wide recognition to which I feel it is entitled.

The sermon reads as follows:

"Blessed is that nation, whose God is the Lord and the people whom He hath chosen for his inheritance." (Psalms 33: 12.)

It is evident by this text that God has a philosophy of history—that He chooses what nations He will for His cosmic plan.

Deity has undoubtedly smiled at the many sacred anthropomorphisms, figures, similes, and pictures that we have put together in our endeavor to describe Him and His attributes. We have pictured God as a Ruler upon a throne; as a Father which art in the heavens providing for His little brood; as the Lord of Hosts leading His forces to battle; as the Judge upon the universal bench ever doing righteously; in Genesis He is pictured as the Holy Spirit, as a Mother bending over the cradle of the universe and crooning over the young child humanity. Yet the most touching picture I have seen of God was one in which He was sitting at the table of the universe playing chess, and the nations and the men were His pawns. He was playing a great game of strategy and His aim was to build a Kingdom of Righteousness. The free will of man, as He chose to give it, seemed at times to allow such moves on the part of evil men and nations as to retard His progress and thwart His victory. Yet one was conscious always that God would win in the end and that the last maps would always be made in heaven. In the moves on the chessboard of history "careless seemed the Great Avenger, yet behind the great unknown stood God keeping watch o'er His own."

As nations served His divine purpose, they remained on the chessboard of history but when they got in His way, or in the way of the good of mankind, He removed them from the board. Nineteen civilizations had already been moved from the chessboard of history, for this strategic game was played with many men A study of history has shown that nations have been His pawns and His pieces and this has been His strategy with knights and castles and kings and queens and bishops and pawns.

Benjamin Franklin at the framing of the Constitution, when he was 81, spoke these words

"I have lived, sir, a long time; and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And, if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this, and I also believe that, without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel."

Let us glance now hastily at the way in which God has moved and used various nations in the over-all strategy in this game of the spirit and the kingdom.

Israel was to be used as His chosen people to convey His truth and His oracles to the nations with whom this people should come in contact But first of all Israel must be tutored—she must learn obedience to God, humility, and dependability upon Jehovah. This she must learn in the throes of captivity.

Thus Babylon is raised up and a part of these people is carried captive and under Babylonian yoke God's people learned obedience and a reaching out of hand and heart to Jehovah's guidance. The ministry of Babylon is done and she is soon to be removed from the chessboard of nations.

Persia now rises to power and by the prophets Cyrus is called the "tool of Jehovah" and God maneuvers this knight of history into such position as will enable him with his armies to knock with his mailed fists on the brass gates of Babylon and Babylon falls. God is done with Persia in its might.

Greece must now be born. A light of hope is soon to break. Immanuel, "God is with us," is soon to be born in Bethlehem and such speech will be His, such magnitude of thought and hope, that somewhere must be found a language that will rightly frame this message. It must contain fine shades of philology and meaning and be a fit vehicle for the expression of this new gospel. Thus Greece is born. God sets in the fanatical mind of young Alexander the determination that the whole world will think Greek, live Greek, and speak Greek. On the emory wheel of Greek education, Paul the Apostle will polish the facets of His mind and fill up the evangelist, will receive his forensic powers. Much of the world will speak Greek and this will give God speech. Greece with her naked intellect will lack certain spiritual qualities and Greece will succumb.

The Romans now will come to power and they will make two definite contributions in preparation for the Christian era. Rome will give to the world a sense of world empire and kingdom sweep until the expression, "Jesus Emperator" will seem reasonable and the world will be ready for a cosmic king. Rome will also furnish means of communication and the Roman roads will make way for the dispersal of this new message to the far corners of the earth. Paul desires to "preach the gospel to them that are at Rome also," knowing that a gospel heard at Rome would soon be heard around the world. Having made these two contributions to God's strategy, Rome dies, as Papini, noted Italian historian and scholar says, for three reasons: "Because the temple, the bank, and the academy were against Jesus of Nazareth" Such triple inadequacy would mean the ruin and death of any nation.

The Goths and Huns now come to power. Beneath the barbarian skins of these Germanic peoples lie the potentials of philosophy and spiritual insight. The German mind builds up the German university and the Christian clergy swarm to the German classroom to receive their higher degrees in Christian philosophy. Then came the decay of the German mind, in the psyche of materialism. A great German philosopher, when asked why Germany collapsed so suddenly, replied, "Germany did not collapse suddenly, they pushed God out of the universities in Germany 50 years ago and that was the beginning of the death sentence for the empire." That could happen here. The great Germany died.

Now came the Anglo-Saxons and how vital they became The Druids put aside their human sacrifices and sang hymns and Gaelic peoples held high banners with crosses on them. Britain became the greatest colonizing empire in the world and with her often went the emissaries of the cross. Her most illustrious queen held in her hand a Bible and said, "England is the land of the Book" Now someone has said that approximately only fifteen out of every hundred Britons are active in any Christian church. We agree with Churchill that we would not wish to see the disintegration of the British Empire Will England pass out of the picture in our day? May these warning words of Kipling, one of Britain's great sons never come to fruition within the pale of your memory and mine:

"Far flung our navies melt away,
On dune and headland sinks the fire;
All of our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet
Lest we forget, lest we forget!"

Now America is placed on the board of history—so definitely held in the hand of God. There was no question in the minds of our early fathers that the express purpose of America's history must be to play the game in furthering this kingdom of God's righteousness

Our pilgrim fathers, by the light of the smoking lamp on the *Mayflower*, before landing at Plymouth, inserted these words into the Mayflower Compact.

"We whose names are underwritten have undertaken for the glory of God to establish in Virginia the first colony for the advancement of the Christian faith."

Ten years later, in 1630, other Pilgrims said in the New England Federation Compact agreement, "We all have come into these parts of America with one and the same end, namely to advance the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ." America was established as an experiment station to show what would happen to any people who cared and dared to follow Jesus Christ.

We received our Constitution from the church. John Witherspoon, a clergyman who signed the Declaration of Independence, was a Presbyterian elder and a professor in Princeton University. At his feet sat a young

man named James Madison with a mind keen as a rapier imbibing from his professor the principles of the church of the old country—the sovereignty of God, the freedom of the individual, and the form of representative government borrowed from the church of which he had been and was a part. Then, in the same era in which John Witherspoon drew up the constitution of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, James Madison, his pupil, was instrumental in drawing up the Constitution of the United States of America which was borrowed from the idealism and representative government propounded by his professor and the church. So definite and great was this source and this contribution that Green, famous historian of the English people, said that the Constitution of the United States was the gift of the Presbyterian Church. Our history has been inseparable from Christianity.

The Pilgrims landed in Plymouth in the name of Christ. The Huguenots took New England in the name of God. William Penn settled Pennsylvania in the name of the Nazarene, and the padres landed on the shores of California with a crucifix in their hand. The kiss of God has been upon our face as we have grown from national babyhood to what we trust is but our young manhood.

Scanning history we have never expected to do anything compelling without the leadership of God in Christ and without the kingly guidance of the Nazarene, we seem to do nothing well. Washington is on his knees at Valley Forge and so vital is the contribution of the church in revolutionary love for liberty that the Revolutionary War was called a church rebellion. Lincoln rises from his knees, his eyes bloodshot with praying, and exclaims "I know that liberty is right because Christ teaches it and Christ is God, and if there is a place for me to be offered I am ready now" How often did the pew of a certain church find Honest Abe sitting before the challenge of the Christian emancipation? Thus from the beginning of our free sovereignty we have had no human king Ours has been a nation in which every man was royal but no man cared to wear a crown, yet conscious always that in the deeper chambers of our souls we had a king—

"Our fathers' God to Thee, author of liberty
To Thee we sing. Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light, protect us by Thy might
Great God, our King."

This is America's hour—an hour in which the world is watching her and demanding that she answer a question, the question is this, "Has your Hebraic Christian religion worked with you? Will your Christian ethics suffice? Is Christ sufficient? Or shall we look for another? A Swedish prince gripping me by the hand said some time ago, 'Dr. Evans, you Americans must not let God fall within your midst. He is the only One the world has left and the world is watching you. You must not fail us.' "

The world knows our background and our history has forced them to demand this. Contend as you and I will that America has never been thoroughly Christian and that there have never been 20 minutes when all Americans have followed Jesus Christ and yet they will say, "God has been there; we have seen his footprints on the pages of your history." They will not excuse our religious inadequacy; they will permit us no feeling of irresponsibility and will grant us no satisfaction or excuse for spiritual inferiority.

This question is hurled at us now, "What is the result of the cross in operation?" In this hour of fluid decision the world is getting ready to decide. This is a world of logic and the spirit of the times is pragmatic, experimental, practical, and utilitarian. Mankind wil' keep consistently asking, "Does it work for you?" This will be the genius of our world leadership—not what we say but what we are; it will not lie in our profession but in our performance. This is the logistics of the spirit—the foreign-missionary enterprise abroad will depend to a great degree upon the success of national missions at home Our answer as to whether or not we will use God's program will have a great deal to do with whether or not America remains on the chessboard of His divine strategy.

America needs a rebirth of the spirit if she is to maintain her world leadership

We could spend considerable time here reiterating the virtues and the greatness that have made us unwilling to trade her for any other land under the sun. God bless America, land that we love.

Yet our consciousness of her inadequacies is not an antonym of love The doctor's alertness to his patient's disease is a token of his concern The nurse's sensitivity is a sign of her usefulness. The church's honest appraisal of a nation's need is lovingly to the end of its cure. J. B Priestly once said:

"We should behave toward our country as women behave toward the men they love. A loving wife will do anything for her husband except stop criticizing and trying to improve him.

"We should cast the same affectionate but sharp glance at our country. We should love it, but also insist on telling it all its faults. The noisy, empty patriot, not the critic, is the dangerous citizen."

No form of national betrayal might be worse than a blind, complete satisfaction with one's own land Jesus loved Jerusalem, and wept over it

In America we are facing a tragic malnutrition of the spirit. The head of one of our great national missions boards said that, "More people numerically (not precentagewise) are without God in America now than ever before in our history," and that "a greater number of Americans are out of touch with spirituality according to our standards than ever before in our national history." It is estimated that there are some 27,000,000 youths in America who have no definite religious instruction, and are as spiritually illiterate as though they had been born on the South Sea islands.

It has been estimated that 40 percent of our grammar school children have no connection with any religious organization; that 80 percent of our high school students have no definite affiliation with organized religion; that 90 percent of our university students "slept in" last Sunday morning

What are the results of this spiritual malnutrition in our land? A crime problem, which is probably the worst in all our history, with a rape in America every 52 minutes, though we have applied to this problem our finest and our keenest brains Insobriety and alcoholism strike at 3,500,000 persons annually, and 100,000 women and girls are in institutions for inebriates, 60 percent of them, the doctors say, as condemned to death as though they had cancer. Between one-third and one-fourth of our American homes are destroyed by divorce. And the newspapers reek with the records of our moral failures.

This is the hour for the church. From her hearthside have come the missionary statesmen of the world. From her cupboard comes the spiritual food by which multitudes are fed. Her tables yield the vitamins of the spirit. From her wardrobe men must be clothed with the "garments of righteousness." Minds must be lighted by the spiritual fuel within her lamps. And the milk of her human kindness must feed a slowly starving flock of worldlings.

America is in the grip of a gnawing sense of loneliness that has seized the American people. Seventy million Americans have moved their residences since the war. Stephen Laird has pictured for us these people torn from home, toil, kindred, community church and community responsibility and for the most part these ties have not been renewed People are frustrated, not so much about taxes, the high cost of living, jobs, but about friendships "Nobody seems to care" What has happened? America has become a nation of migrants. Going to camps, pouring in and out of war plants, fleeing from dust bowls, pouring into the city from the country and back into the country from the city. GI's are looking around trying to settle down, but the average veteran knows more about his bus ticket than he does about his Bible Nobody seems to care what is happening to them He goes on to relate that a certain writer in New York was asked the question, "Have you written anything since I last saw you?" "No, I just don't seem able to sit in an apartment and write. Almost every evening I find myself walking along the streets, dropping into bars, sitting opposite a man or girl my age in a restaurant, hoping to start a conversation, to make a friend or meet someone worth talking to" "Any luck?" "No," he said, "Everybody seems to be busy with himself I get so lonesome I hate to go home any more."

Thus America, with plenty on her table, goes home hungry for companionship and God and for someone who cares. Along the crowded dogged streets, the lonely streets, men need that old hymn "What a fellowship, what a joy divine leaning on the everlasting arms."

The church must invite these lonely souls to the firesides of the spirit We must pursue these migrants of body and soul into every hamlet, Middlesex village, farm, and metropolis, remembering that:

"Across the crowded ways of life,
Where sounds the cry of race and clan,
Above the noise of selfish strife
They need Thy voice, O Son of Man."

It is the spirit of God that we need in this hour—the upward pull of God.

Should you attempt on a pool table, with ball and cue, to herd together in close proximity the other balls on the table you would probably end up with a total result of the several balls being farther away from each other than they were when you began your attempt. This horizontal effort would prove somewhat fruitless. If, on the other hand, you would with scotch tape affix to each ball separately a strand of string, and taking these several strings in your hand exert an upward pull, you would find that automatically the balls would nestle together in a compact, orderly way.

Our efforts at brotherhood and world fraternity have for the most part been unsuccessful because the effort has been on the horizontal. We have tried with the cue and ball of laws, treaties, wars, leagues, regimentation, and other mechanistic means to drive or herd men together into a fraternity. Over-all the result has been rather to separate them. If, on the other hand, we could subject individuals and groups to the upward tug of the spirit and allow God to exert the uplifting tug on the hearts of men we should find them nestling together in the collective fraternity that we all so earnestly desire. But this deeper fraternity and sorority must be of the spirit.

It is quite evident that the horizontal force of war has failed to do this A Boy Scout leader suggested that three members of his troop who had failed to do a good deed for

that day be dismissed from the Scout meeting for a half hour in order to go out and perform it. They came back shortly and stood before him in a state of very bad repair. One had his face scratched, another had a bloody nose and a torn neckerchief, and the third Scout had lost both his hat and his equilibrium. The Scoutmaster asked, "What in the world have you boys been doing?" "We were doing our good turn, sir, and helping an old lady across the street." "But why all the fuss and trouble?" asked the Scoutmaster. The spokesman said with due solemnity, "Well you see, sir, she didn't want to go." In the spirit of true Boy Scouts, you and I might wish to do our good turn by forcing humanity across the street from hatred to love and from war to brotherhood, but if humanity does not wish to go humanity will not go, and the sum total result will probably be bloody noses, torn neckerchiefs, lost hats and equilibrium, chaos and war.

In the realm of business, America needs the baptism of the spirit. A financial expert, this one not defined as "a man who has a Tau Kappa Alpha key at one end of his chain and no watch at the other," was asked to examine both personnel and program of a large factory to ascertain why it was going to pieces. After thorough investigation he called them together from the president to the board of directors to managers of personnel and labor on to the last man who worked at the lathe. Calmly and decisively he said, "This factory needs conversion immediately." The president remonstrated, "But we are in the process of converting our machinery." The expert replied, "I am not talking about the conversion of machines. I am talking about the conversion of men. From the chairman of the board of directors to the last man who works at the lathe, you are all rotten with selfishness. Unless you convert the hearts of this firm from selfishness to unselfishness you will suffer nothing but disaster." Why not get at the root of the matter—self? You and I know, in our best moments, that the passing of the Taft-Hartley bill or the repealing of it will be little more than treating the pimples on the skin, when deeper down the blood stream is bad.

Sociologically America needs a new birth It is one thing to have good building plans as the sociologists do for a new society, but where will they find the new materials? One clergyman has stated, "No clever arrangement of bad eggs will ever give you a good omelet." No clever sociological collective arrangement of bad persons is going to give you a good society, as much as we believe in organization. The soul of improvement will always be in the improvement of the soul. You cannot have a new deal with the same old people nor a fair deal with unfair individuals. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature," then come these words, "Behold all things are becoming new." It is difficult to change things externally without changing people internally. Social reconstruction will rest upon individual regeneration.

So far as our racial differences and prejudices are concerned, we deal here with an equilateral triangle. Our God-man relationship is the altitude which determines our man-to-man relationship which is the base. It is an adequate sense of the fatherhood of God on the perpendicular that will force us to an adequate brotherhood of man on the horizontal and it has been proven that it is difficult to have an adequate sociology and love for man unless you have an adequate theology and love for God. Until then, our Nation will be broken up into brittle little bits on the basis of blood and ethnological conceits.

American education needs a baptism of the spirit. When Horace Mann claimed that if we would send people to school, we would cut down crime nine-tenths, it was a hundred years ago in the State of Massachusetts. We have tried to experiment and greatly increased our educational facilities but in that time crime has increased 800 percent. It is quite evident that all our problems do not revolve around a cranium and naked intellect alone is not enough to see us through. Educators are not so much interested now in the size as in the sort of our pupils. Education is no longer merely about information but about formation of character. It is no longer merely a matter of what our young people know but, more important still, of how they feel.

Speaking to one of our great American writers an alumnus of Yale said, "You know, sir, Yale has added another branch of research to its curriculum. Yale now has all the branches." The great scholar and writer wistfully replied, "Yes, Yale has all the branches, but Yale has none of the roots." That is an unfair thing to say about Yale. I lunched with its great professor, William Lyon Phelps, shortly before his death and that conversation was along the line of a previous statement of his: "Jesus knew more about political economy than all the professors in all of the colleges of the world. He knew more about the human heart than Shakespeare. While I am not sure of many things, I am as sure as I stand here that Jesus is the greatest leader, the most absolutely right person the world has ever known. The leadership of Jesus Christ in our lives ought to be made constant in everything. * * * But I am not out of my mind when I say that the only way the world can be saved today is by following Jesus Christ." What the commentator on that university wished to portend and to say was probably this—that if we build up a colossal system of secular education as a gigantic tree with all the branches of research, the twigs of knowledge and a massive trunk of secular content, and fail to ground education in the roots of spiritual purpose, merciful motivation, and religious aim, we shall see this thing topple over on us and crush us in a scientific age.

A great nostalgia for God is sweeping the universities of America along with the realization of the insufficiency of humanism and the mere factual. Both faculty and students are begining to realize that unless the "soul catches up with the brain" the degree B. A. will again, in the next era of chaos, stand for "Builder of Alibis."

Our homes need saving and the sides of the triangle—husband and wife—will be best held together by the extrovert base, God and His Kingdom and their unselfish purposes. While one out of every three or four homes are broken by divorce in America, someone has stated that only one out of every 57 church homes suffer this decay. There is evidently something then in Christianity and the presence of God at the hearthside which gives the home 15 times the chance of standing and surviving with religion than it would have without its benefits.

America is not leading the nations in law abidingness. We shall never attain that leadership until in the realm of law men feel the guilt more than the punishment. J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, has reminded us of how difficult it is to reform the adult criminal and how vital it is that youth receive the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount and the Ten Commandments. He reminded us not to forget that the Sunday school and the church were the greatest moral forces in our Nation. Until we set up in the tribunal of the human heart a love for the laws of God and society we shall go on for another generation "making new laws for old sinners to cheat by."

America has won the war—but only on paper. We do not conquer the Japanese when we merely take the guns out of their hands. Not until we have taken wrong goals out of their hearts have we won a lasting victory. A personal friend of mine reported that MacArthur had made a request for 18,000,000 bibles for Japan and wanted 3,000 missionaries in order that Japan might be properly exposed to Christian teachings. He felt that this war was "a theological war" and that unless the bad theology of Amaterasu, the Sun goddess, loving only the slant-eyed people, could be changed to the universal fatherhood of God through Jesus Christ and that high concept, Japan would never have a sociology and a brotherhood that would enable her to make her contribution to a lasting peace. As one GI said, "America with her rich spiritual heritage should remember that it will never do for her merely to give her enemies 'a licking,' she must also give her enemies 'a light'."

Communism is challenging us to outlive it with Christianity.

John Foster Dulles claims that communism enters a nation as a Trojan horse. In clever disguise it enters the gates of a city or a nation and only after its entrance do people realize what lurks inside. Communism thrives on the failures of others. It makes its garments out of the holes and frets in others. Communism builds its ship of state out of the driftwood of the wreckage of other systems that lies along the shores of contemporary failures. Communism does not work. It only thrives on the supposition that other ideologies have not worked. It is the question of the cross as over against the sickle. They will whisper to the African in Africa, "How do you like the way black men are treated by Christians in America?" They will say to those in Mexico, "Are you pleased with the treatment received by Mexicans in the American Southwest?" To those of China they may make the query, "Are the 28,000 Chinese of the San Francisco area impressed by the Americans who live under the sign of the cross?" Of labor they inquire, "Has Christianity taken the crown of thorns from your brow?" Of those of great possessions, they do ask, "Along with your property do you possess peace?" The line is down now and the question is inescapable. Will the cross out-demonstrate the sickle? Our own type of democracy at its best was born in the Christian concept and democracy will not "democ" without Christ, as somcone contended. America will not be able to stand, any more than Rome was able to stand, if her banks—her economic system; her academy—her educational system; and her temple—her religious system are against Jesus of Nazareth.

It will be difficult to match the propaganda of communism but we must outmatch her performance. We must not only "out-promise" them, we must also "outpassion" them. We must teach our youth the concepts of the Kingdom of God with greater earnestness and thoroughness than they teach their youth of the Kremlin. The open hand of democracy must prove itself more potent than the clenched fist of communism. We will find it difficult to outlaw communism; we must outlive communism. And this is the hour of dynamic demonstration.

I am not advocating a narrow nationalism when I say, "God bless America and give us success." In this I am pleading for a supranationalism. I want to see her continued on the chessboard of history because she makes her contribution to this strategic game of righteousness among the nations that God

is playing. I want to see her continue to be a tool in the hand of Jehovah.

This is a personal equation. U. S. spells "us." America fulfills her spiritual Christian destiny only as God possesses our individual purses, powers, and persons. Each must do his and her part for the collective righteousness.

A student at Penn State College said to me sometime ago, "Dr. Evans, I prayed a great prayer last night—the bravest I have prayed." "What was it?" I said. He replied, "I prayed, 'O God, may I always be honest enough never to ask Thee to do for the world collectively what I have not first allowed Thee to do for me personally'."

Let us not expect of the nations any more ready forgiveness of their enemies collectively than our forgiveness of our enemies personally. Let us never expect the nations of the UNO to be any less selfish than we are in our personal relationships.

"We who are Americans must be too big for shame.
We are the guardians of a faith from which our glory came.
Ours is a splendor truly won, in us all people trust.
We face this world as men who are great hearted, kind, and just.
And he who fails to play his part in high or little place
Shames not alone himself but brings disgrace upon his race."

The light that shines brightest at home shines farthest abroad. The light will shine farthest when we wash the lamp chimney or cleanse the lens through which it shines.

We do pray "America first"—first in usefulness to God. First in her availability to the spiritual kingdom enterprise. First in power that she may bend over the weak and suffering. First in wealth that she may share it with others in mercy. First in light if she be a lamp in the darkness. First in strength that she may bear the infirmities of the weak. First in purity that others may sup from our cleansed wells. Let us couch our national concern for our Nation and our flag, in this strategic hour, in the words of G. Ashton Oldham:

"America first, not only in things material,
But in things of the spirit.
Not merely in science, invention, motors, skyscrapers,
But also in ideals, principles, character.
Not merely in the calm assertion of rights,
But in the glad assumption of duties.
Not flouting your strength as a giant,
But bending in helpfulness over a sick and wounded world like a good Samaritan.
Not in splendid isolation,
But in courageous cooperation.
Not in pride-arrogance, and disdain of other races and peoples,
But in sympathy, love and understanding.
Not in treading again the old, worn bloody pathway
Which ends inevitably in chaos and disaster,
But blazing a new trail, along which, please God,
Other nations will follow into the new Jerusalem
Where war shall be no more.
Someday, some nation must take that path—
Unless we are to lapse into utter barbarism—
And that honor I cover for my beloved America.
And so in that spirit, and with these hopes,
I say with all my heart and soul, 'America first.'"

(Mr. REES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a sermon by Rev. Louis H. Evans.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DEANE, for March 3 at 1 p. m., through Wednesday, March 8, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, March 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1281. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation, involving an increase of $60,600, for the fiscal year 1951 for the legislative branch, Library of Congress, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 493); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1282. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Gorgas Memorial Laboratory and Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H Doc. No. 494); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1283. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting final financial statement of the American Legion up to and including December 31, 1949, pursuant to the Act of Incorporation of the American Legion, Public Law 47, Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1284. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of the Interior"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1285. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Johannes Akk or John Ackly, file No. A-1374775 CR 26427, requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1286. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of $10,748,500 for the Department of Agriculture, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 495); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 1746. An act to authorize the transfer to the Attorney General of the United States of a portion of the Vigo ordnance plant, near Terre Haute, Ind., for use in connection with the United States Penitentiary at Terre Haute; without amendment (Rept. No. 1729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference. S. 1008. An act to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices (Rept. No. 1730). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 7544. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of Wyoming over offenses committed on that portion of United States Highway No. 30 lying within the Francis E. Warren Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 7545. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, approved June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H R 7546 A bill to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraints by labor organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H R. 7547. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to motor carriers excepted from certain provisions of part II of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 7548. A bill to exempt from tax admissions to moving-picture theaters, and to restore the prewar exemptions from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H R 7549 A bill to amend section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr CELLER:

H. R. 7550. A bill to amend section 1404 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the transfer of certain civil actions from one district to another; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr GORDON:

H. R. 7551. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H R 7552 A bill to restore national coal production; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R 7553. A bill to stabilize income of herring fishermen in Alaska and prices of products of the Alaska herring industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:

H R. 7554. A bill to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto; to the Committee on Expenditures of the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R 7555. A bill to provide for the allotment of certain lands to Indian veterans of World War II who are members of tribes located on Indian reservations in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 7556. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 7557. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate and improvements thereon owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. Res. 500. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 7402, a bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families; to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. H. 7558. A bill for the relief of William W. Tant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 7559. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Honora Redman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7560. A bill for the relief of Mary Frances Yoshinaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 7561. A bill for the relief of Dr. George Peter Petropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 7562. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Southern States Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEFEVRE:

H. R. 7563. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nicola Di Palma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1950. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Homer L. Clough and other citizens of Halltown, Mo., urging the passage of H. R. 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1951. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. L. G. Patrick and many other citizens of Howell County, Mo., urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1952. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. B. R. Tatom and many other citizens of Webb City, Mo., urging the passage of H. R. 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1953. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Horace W. Cope and other citizens of Noel, Mo., urging the passage of the Townsend bills, H. R. 2135 and 2136; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1954. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Peter Frost Muller and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1955. Also, petition of J. F. Anstett and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1956. Also, petition of B. W. Kellogg and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1957. Also, petition of W. F. Lewis and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1958. Also, petition of J. H. Richmond and others, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who puttest down the mighty from their seat and exalteth the humble and the meek, look with compassion upon our Nation as we strive to mend its flaws and make it the fit instrument of Thy will in these troubled days. History's tragic pages but remind us that Thy providence knows no favorites, that none can bend Thy justice and none can break Thy laws that shall not themselves be broken. Facing duties and decisions that far outweigh our own strength and our own wisdom, we ask for the guidance of the Kindly Light to lead us on o'er crag and torrent till the night be passed. Help us this and every day to live more nearly as we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 3, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is entitled to the floor.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, several weeks ago the Secretary of Defense urged all members of the Subcommittee on Armed Forces of the Committee on Appropriations to accompany him to the Caribbean area to observe naval maneuvers which, he said, would be the largest peacetime maneuvers in which the Navy had engaged. Feeling that I should acquire all the information I could concerning our defense equipment and the skill with which it can be used, I desire to accompany the Secretary of Defense on the trip next week. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from March 6 to March 9, inclusive.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the leave is granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MUNDT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week.

EUGENIO MAISTERRENA BARRENECHE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, ordered to lie on the table:

To the Senate:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), I return herewith Senate bill 204, entitled "An act for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 4, 1950.*

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches, and without taking the Senator from Mississippi from the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DREDGING OF CHANNEL AND MOORING BASIN IN WELLFLEET HARBOR, MASS.—PETITION

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition embodying a resolution adopted by the citizens of Wellfleet Harbor, Mass., and signed by Beatrix Faust, Martha C. Porch, and Lynne P. Townsend, favoring the enactment of legislation providing funds necessary for the dredging of a channel and mooring basin in the harbor of Wellfleet.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

By unanimous vote of the town of Wellfleet at the regular town meeting February 13, 1950, the committee whose signatures are attached to this petition were instructed to address the following memorial to the Congress of the United States relative to an approved project for dredging a channel and mooring basin in Wellfleet Harbor. The

committee was also instructed to petition the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to concur with the town of Wellfleet in presenting this petition.

"To the Congress of the United States:

"We, the citizens of the town of Wellfleet, Mass., respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to now appropriate the funds necessary to complete the dredging of a channel and mooring basin in Wellfleet Harbor and thus bring to completion a project to which the town has addressed itself, for which it has already provided its share of the funds, and which it believes to be essential to its welfare, to the welfare of the State, and to shipping passing through Cape Cod Bay.

"Whereas the gradual filling in of Wellfleet Harbor has been and is detrimental to the town of Wellfleet and particularly to the fishermen of the town; and

"Whereas this project was approved by the Army engineers in 1939 and by the Massachusetts Legislature in 1941; and

"Whereas the town of Wellfleet has appropriated and set aside its share of the necessary funds; and

"Whereas with each year that passes the cost of said project will increase because of the continual filling in of the harbor and consequent increase in dredging cost, and

"Whereas the dredging of the harbor would both greatly benefit the fishermen and bring in additional revenue to the merchants of the town from sports fishermen and visiting yachts; and

"Whereas the dredging of the harbor will enable the fishermen to increase production, which is important to the economy of the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas Wellfleet Harbor is a natural harbor of refuge for vessels in distress in these waters; and

"Whereas the rivers and harbors bill is now under consideration in Congress·

"Therefore, we, the citizens of the town of Wellfleet hereby petition the Congress of the United States to now appropriate the funds necessary to the dredging of a channel and mooring basin in the harbor of Wellfleet, and we direct that copies of this petition be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to our representatives therein from this Commonwealth.

"BEATRIX FAUST
"MARTHA C. PORCH.
"LYNNE P. TOWNSEND."

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the June 1949 Convention of the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs adopted a fine resolution in opposition to Federal compulsory health insurance. Since then, it has been my pleasure to hear from many splendid women's organizations throughout Wisconsin in endorsement of the action taken at their State convention. These women are the ones primarily responsible for health in the American homes. It is they who have to look out for the well being of their youngsters, of their husbands, and of themselves.

But these clear-sighted women realistically recognize that government control of medicine is not the answer to America's health needs. As a matter of fact, government control of medicine will result in a lowering of America's health standards and in a further move down the road to state socialism in the United States. Government control of medicine will mean more national deficits because uncounted billions of dollars will be squandered by bureaucrats.

The people of Wisconsin, like the people of every other State in the Union, do not want Federal bureaucrats to be poking their noses into the private health records of individual citizens. They do not want to have to ask the approval of bureaucrats for an operation or for an examination. The people of Wisconsin and of all America want the Federal Government to assist our great private medical profession to improve our already high health standards, but this assistance must come in the true American way, of voluntary encouragement, rather than in the European way of dictatorship.

The State Medical Society of Wisconsin has been in the forefront of advancing America's medical frontiers. It has constantly pioneered for finer health services, particularly to folks in the lower and middle income brackets who cannot afford too heavy medical expenditures.

I ask unanimous consent now to have printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, the text of two of the many fine resolutions received from grass-roots women's organizations in my State, in this instance a message from the Rhinelander Woman's Club, as forwarded to me by Mrs. T. E. Chaffee, and the text of a resolution by another women's organization, the Women's Civic Club of Gays Mills, Wis.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RHINELANDER, WIS., *February 28, 1950.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As you no doubt know, the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs at its 1949 convention went on record as opposed to Government control of health services by passing the following resolution:

"Whereas needed medical and health services should be placed within reach of every individual within the United States; and

"Whereas we believe the most effective approach to the national health problem lies in the extension and development of voluntary health insurance; and

"Whereas we believe the extent of Federal grants necessary to aid the various States in providing care for the medically indigent can be determined by Nation-wide governmental supported surveys made by State agencies: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, June 1949, goes on record against Government control of health services which would jeopardize free enterprise, establish heavy new tax burdens and unprecedented national deficits, and infringe upon the powers of the individual States; and

"Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be sent to the proper authorities and to the Members of Congress."

At its last meeting on February 14, 1950, the Rhinelander Woman's Club voted to go on record in support of the above resolution and notify our district's Representative and Senators in Congress, and the State Medical Society of Wisconsin, of the club's reaffirmation of that resolution. It is the club's desire that our Congressmen will use their every effort to prevent the enactment of compulsory health service legislation.

Respectfully yours,
(MRS. T. E.) ELIZABETH CHAFFEE,
President, Rhinelander Woman's Club.

Whereas the American family has received the finest quality of medical care available in any country in the world, developed under our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has caused a decline in national health and deterioration of medical standards and facilities, to the detriment of family welfare; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has taken away the family's right to choosing its own family physician; and

Whereas invasion of family privacy and violation of the sanctity of the patient-physician relationship have proved to be one of the most objectionable features of compulsory health insurance, wherever tried; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would result immediately in a tax of 3 percent on the income of the American workingman, rising within a few years to 6 percent and higher, creating a new tax burden which would reduce household budgets and bring down family standards of living; and

Whereas Government control of medical services, by gradually undermining free enterprise and establishing heavy new tax burdens and unprecedented national deficits, would threaten national bankruptcy and encourage the spread of socialism, which would endanger the rights of our children to the individual freedoms which have been the American heritage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Women's Civic Club of Gays Mills, Wis., does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control;

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of Wisconsin, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

MRS JOHN YOUNG,
President.
MRS. WILLIAM YOUNG,
Secretary.

Gays Mills, Wis., dated this 28th day of February 1950.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6670. A bill to incorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1321).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3182. A bill for the relief of Bairs Romba;

S. 3183. A bill for the relief of Zdenek Marek; and

S. 3184. A bill for the relief of Talop Bin Padoh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr FERGUSON:

S 3185. A bill for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury; and

S. 3186. A bill for the relief of Ann Arbor Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3187. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, to eliminate the distinction between commercial and noncommercial corn-producing areas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 3188. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. EASTLAND submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. O'CONOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4567, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FERGUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (for himself and Mr. KERR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 5472, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ERADICATION AND CONTROL OF HALOGETON ON PUBLIC LANDS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry Senate bill 3106, to authorize appropriations for the eradication and control of halogeton on public lands, which was introduced by the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. The junior Senator from Idaho requests that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF IRVING R. KAUFMAN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Saturday, April 1, 1950, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Irving R. Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. Judge Kaufman is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GEORGE THOMAS WASHINGTON TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Saturday, April 1, 1950, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. George Thomas Washington, of the District of Columbia, to be a judge of the United States Court of Appeals, for the District of Columbia Circuit. Judge Washington is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BURNITA SHELTON MATTHEWS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Comittee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Saturday, April 1, 1950, at 10.30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Burnita Shelton Matthews, of the District of Columbia, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. Judge Matthews is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM HENRY HASTIE TO BE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD CIRCUIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Saturday, April 1, 1950, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. William Henry Hastie, of the Virgin Islands, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. Judge Hastie is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Eugene Worley, of Texas, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, vice Charles S. Hatfield, deceased;

James R. Kirkland, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia;

Delmas C Hill, of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas;

J Skelly Wright, of Louisiana, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana;

John F. X McGohey, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York;

Thomas J. Clary, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; and

Owen McIntosh Burns, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert L. Taylor, of Tennessee, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee.

SPECIFICATIONS FOR A REPUBLICAN PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Modernize the GOP—Specifications for a Republican Program," written by Senator LODGE, and published in the Atlantic Monthly, which appears in the Appendix]

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement broadcast by him on February 27, 1950, on the subject of war-created excise taxes, which appears in the Appendix.]

A FRANK REVIEW OF THE HOOVER REPORT—ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Frank Review of the Hoover Report," delivered by former Postmaster General James A. Farley at the convention banquet of the New York Press Association, held at Syracuse, N. Y, on February 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DANGER FROM SOCIALISM—ADDRESS BY JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the danger of socialism, delivered by John Temple Graves, before the National Automobile Dealers' Association, in Atlantic City, N. J., February 8, 1950, which appears in the Append.x.]

JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—EDITORIAL FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS MORNING TRIBUNE

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of February 27, 1950, discussing recent attacks on the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which appears in the Appendix.]

1949 PROGRESS IN THE TENNESSEE VALLEY—ADDRESS BY JAMES P. POPE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by James P. Pope, Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, before the Athens Kiwanis Club, at Athens, Tenn., on February 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL UNION FOR WORLD PEACE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEAN

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Time Has Come," published in a recent issue of the Nashville Tennessean, which appears in the Appendix]

VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY DELEGATION FROM WORLD CONGRESS OF PARTISANS OF PEACE

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a State Department release relative to the proposed visit to the United States by a delegation from the World Congress of Partisans of Peace, which appears in the Appendix]

EXPRESSIONS OF VIEWS BY SERVICE OFFICERS—EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Can't a General Speak to a Senator, Even in the Strictest Confidence?" from the Saturday Evening Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE—RADIO BROADCAST BY JACK BEALL

[Mr. DWORSHAK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast by Jack Beall, on March 2, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PURCHASING VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

[Mr. DWORSHAK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the purchasing value of the dollar as measured by the Consumers' Price Index, prepared by the Institute of Life Insurance, which appears in the Appendix]

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a communication addressed by Mr. Matt Meehan, international representative of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, to the members of the Oregon delegation in Congress, relative to the unemployment situation in the Pacific Northwest, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF MINERAL LEASING ACT OF 1920—STATEMENT OF SENATOR WATKINS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have received so many inquiries regarding the effect of S. 3124, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, that I deemed it advisable to prepare a statement setting forth both the purpose and effect of the bill. I ask unanimous consent to have this statement inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

The various public-land States are to receive title in fee, that is, title to all surface and subsurface rights, to a certain number of sections—from two to four—out of each township. The income from these lands is to be used for the support of the common schools.

I shall refer specifically to Utah, since that is my home State and I am familiar with the situation there, but S. 3124 will apply equally to the advantage of all other public-land States where title to large areas of unsurveyed land still remains with the Government.

In Utah, for example, four sections out of each township of 36 sections are reserved to the State by the enabling act and by confirmation of such act by act of Congress set forth in title 43, United States Code, section 853.

Under Utah's enabling act, and by Federal statute, passed in 1902 (43 U. S. C. 853) the State was to receive title to these aforementioned four sections of land, but not until the townships involved had been surveyed. In Utah today, there are more than 10,500,000 acres of unsurveyed land, the portion to which the State should receive fee title being more than 1,000,000 acres.

All public-lands States are entitled to 37½ percent of all income from the public domain, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, received by the Federal Government from royalty, leases, or any other income on such public domain (30 U. S. C. 191). If they are entitled to the ownership of four sections out of each township and are getting only 37½ percent revenue from the entire township, they are being deprived of substantial revenue because of the failure of the Government to complete the survey of the public domain. In other words they are entitled to 100 percent of the revenue from four sections, or one-ninth of the area, and in addition thereto, the prevailing 37½ percent of the royalties, leases, or other income from the remaining eight-ninths of the unsurveyed area.

If this computation were used, Utah would receive 44 4 percent return on royalties, leases, or other income from the public domain instead of the present 37½ percent, computed as follows:

One hundred percent of revenue from one-ninth or 0.111 percent of area equals 11.1 percent revenue.

Thirty-seven and five-tenths percent of revenue from eight-ninths or 0 889 percent of area equals 33.3 percent revenue.

Adjusted percentage is 44.4 percent from 100 percent of area.

The other public-land States would likewise benefit. It should be remembered, however, that this applies only to unsurveyed lands because when surveyed, the title to these reserved sections would go to the various States anyway and they would receive all of the revenue therefrom.

All that S. 3124 would do, therefore, is to give to the public-land States their equitable share of public-land receipts and thus carry out the directly expressed intent of Congress, despite the fact that the Federal-State contract for passing title to the lands cannot be consummated until the lands are surveyed.

It might be advisable at this point to mention that I have also introduced a bill, S. 2989, to provide for the orderly and accelerated program of surveying and mapping of the unsurveyed area of not only the public-land States, but the Nation, its off-shore areas, and Territories. But until such a survey is completed, it seems only logical to me to have the intent of Congress carried out by apportioning the income from public lands to the States on the basis of the formula which I have set forth in S. 1324.

DEMOCRATIC PROCEDURE IN MUNICH, GERMANY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a statement which deals with democratic processes being placed in operation in Munich, Germany. The resident manager, or the American mayor, I might say, of Munich, Germany, is a very able Oregonian by the name of George Godfrey. The statement which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD shows, I think, very clearly, that democratic processes can be put to work in Germany. I commend the statement to the reading of the Senate, and I commend Mr. Godfrey for what I think is a fine example of American leadership in Germany.

I think the Town Hall Meeting program which Mr. Godfrey has developed in Munich is a clear demonstration that democratic process can work in Germany, and that the German people can be led to an understanding of the values of self-government.

In the fall of 1946 I visited Munich, and I was satisfied then that the people of that area of Germany were anxious to put into practice the principles of democracy, if they received from the United States the instruction, information, and leadership which they needed in order to lead them away from a Fascist type of government to a democratic one. Mr. Godfrey, as the American mayor of Munich, is apparently doing a grand job in helping democratize the governmental processes of Munich. I am sure the same results can be obtained elsewhere in Germany.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Democratization activities in the city and county of Munich, sponsored by or participated in by State Department resident officers, amassed an attendance total of more than 600,000 for the year just ended, according to figures compiled by George H. Godfrey, senior resident officer, who is in charge of the office for United States State Department.

Actual events, such as town meetings, forums, film showings, youth meetings, discussion groups, and other affairs, totaled more than 4,500 for the period.

Assuming that half of this total attendance figure represents duplications, this still means that approximately one-third of the 900,000 citizens residing in the city and county of Munich were reached by the democratization program, Mr. Godfrey pointed out.

The town meeting program, initiated early last year, has been amazingly successful, and can now be regarded as a permanent part of the life of the citizens. Not only have the citizens themselves taken an active interest, but members of the city council and State and county officials are enthusiastic in the support of the meetings.

During the year 118 town meetings were held, with a total attendance of approximately 35,000. The attendance was often limited by the size of the meeting places, many of which were so filled that people were turned away

The most promising feature of the town meeting program is the attitude of the officials, it is pointed out. Citizens are often severe and occasionally unfair in their criticism, and at some of the early meetings officials would show considerable resentment. Now, they have not only learned to take it, but to dish it out as well. In nearly every case when the official explained his side, and outlined his problems, he found the audience sympathetic and often won the enthusiastic support of the citizens. Criticism from the floor at the meetings has often led to changes and improvements on the part of the officials and their offices.

The people have found the town meeting a place to get together and plan projects for the betterment of their communities. Munich, for example, planned and carried out a gigantic clean-up day in which more than 12,000 people participated. A number of home building projects were also organized, and frequently residents of districts joined together in improving their streets, parks, and schools, doing much of the work themselves in their spare time.

For the purpose of town meetings the city was divided into 41 districts The county also has 29 towns All districts and towns held at least one town meeting during the past year

The largest attendance was achieved by the film program, a project that provides free showings to schools, clubs, and communities. A total of 2,313 showings reached a total attendance of 375,000. These films acquaint the people with democratic activities in the United States and elsewhere.

Other outstanding features of the State Department program in Munich included promotion of a youth forum, which held 46 meetings with an attendance of 1,860; junior chamber of commerce, 16 meetings, 485 attendance, traffic safety board, composed of leading city officials and transportation executives, 12 meetings, 250 attendance; other forums of various types, 56 meetings and 12,225 attendance.

The Munich office also cooperated with the Munich Amerika Haus, the State Department information center, in promoting forums and other events, which during the year totaled approximately 1,700 with an attendance of more than 150,000.

United States resident officers attended nearly all of the town meetings, and many of the other events. In nearly every case, however, actual organization and conduct of the meetings was left to the Germans. Americans appeared on the programs only when requested, or when encouragement was needed.

"Munich was the birthplace of the Nazi party, but it was also here that the Nazi regime was most actively opposed," Mr. Godfrey observes. "I am convinced that there is a basic desire on the part of an increasingly large number of citizens to seek what we term the democratic way of life. The enthusiasm which they have shown for the democratization program indicates that they are determined to make participation in their government and cooperation in community welfare a definite part of their lives in the future."

THE LOYALTY PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD correspondence which I have had with the Department of State relative to security risks and the loyalty program.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 1, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR KNOWLAND: I refer to your letter of February 20, 1950, in which you request additional information and clarification of certain points in my letter of February 16, 1950, concerning the processing of employees under the loyalty program.

In answer to point (1) of your letter, a total of 27 individuals resigned and 11 were removed by administrative action, i. e., reduction in force, completion of assignment, etc, prior to final adjudication under the President's loyalty program. This, of course, does not mean that these employees were disloyal or were security risks as the investigations had not been completed when they left the department

With regard to point (2), when an employee resigns while under investigation or is removed as a result of the investigation, that information appears in the record of the employee. The Department of State is not in a position to prevent his employment by another Government agency. However, the security files of the Department of State are available to authorized representatives of all agencies of the executive branch of the Government. In addition to making the files available to other agencies, the Department has advised the Civil Service Commission of the names of all individuals who have been investigated by the Department since September 1, 1939, and this information is on file in the Commission's master index file which is available for checking by other Government agencies.

In those cases where an individual resigns while under investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for loyalty reasons, a determination as to his loyalty has not as yet been made The Civil Service Commission is advised of the resignation by the Department. In the event the individual is employed by another agency the Civil Service Commission loyalty review board forwards the FBI investigative reports to the employing agency for processing under the loyalty program.

With reference to point 3 of your letter, our records indicate the following breakdown of the 326 cases which are still in process. Since this information applies to persons who were employed by the Department prior to July 1949, they have all been pending at least 8 months: 21 pending for 8 months, 10 pending for 9 months, 18 pending for 10 months, 10 pending for 11 months, 10 pending for 12 months, 257 pending for a period of more than 1 year.

The preponderance of those cases on which final results have not been achieved are those whose forms had been returned by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for clearer fingerprints, inaccuracies, and for incompleteness.

It should be understood that the Department and its 291 field posts throughout the world initiate several thousand personnel transfers in a single year. Due to distances and time required to recontact employees, a considerable time lag necessarily develops between the initial submission of a loyalty form and the resubmission of a corrected form.

As I pointed out in my letter to you of February 16, 1950, all persons proposed for employment in the Department and the Foreign Service are carefully investigated for security and suitability prior to appointment.

I trust that this information will be helpful to you

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. PEURIFOY,
Deputy Under Secretary.

FEBRUARY 20, 1950.

Hon JOHN E PEURIFOY,
Deputy Under Secretary, Department of State, Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. PEURIFOY: Your letter of February 16 has been received in reply to mine of January 26. I wish to thank you for sending me the information and would like clarification on the following points:

1. In addition to the three hundred and twenty-six who are now receiving active attention, how many (a) resigned during the course of the investigation, or (b) were removed by administrative action?

2. When an employee resigns while under investigation or is removed as a result of the investigation, does such a notation show on his record or is he free to go to some other Government department and gain a position of responsibility without the previous facts being known to the employing agency?

3. Of the 326 cases which are receiving active attention will you please break them down to show how many of them have been pending for 1 month, 2 months, 3 months, etc., up to 1 year and how many of them have been pending for over 1 year's time?

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F KNOWLAND.

JANUARY 26, 1950.

Hon DEAN G ACHESON,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On March 21, 1947, the President issued Executive Order 9835 which established a procedure for the investigation of the loyalty of Government employees. This order was issued 34 months ago and it seems reasonable to assume that a final decision should have been rendered as to the loyalty of employees who were employed by the Department of State prior to July 1949.

I would appreciate it if you would advise me whether there are any individual cases where a final decision has not been made as to whether the employee is considered loyal as set out in Executive Order 9835. If a final determination has not been made, I would appreciate knowing the total number of cases not yet cleared for loyalty and the number of those who have assignments in the Far Eastern Division.

I will be pleased to receive the above information as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 3, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I refer to your letter of January 26, 1950, in which you request certain information with regard to the progress of the loyalty program in the Department of State.

The material requested by you is being gathered and will be forwarded to you as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. PEURIFOY,
Deputy Under Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 16, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I refer to your letter of January 26, 1950, and to my acknowledgment of February 3, 1950, with regard to the progress of the loyalty program in the Department of State.

As of June 30, 1949, the Department and the Foreign Service had a combined total of 13,917 American employees on its rolls. Of this number, all of those who are presently employed have been completely processed under Executive Order 9835, except 326 which are receiving active attention. Two of these individuals are employed in the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs. A careful analysis of the administrative operations of the Department's participation in the loyalty program indicates that the preponderance of those cases on whom final results have not been achieved are those whose forms had been returned by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for clearer fingerprints, inaccuracies, and for incompleteness. The Department and its 291 field posts throughout the world initiate several thousand personnel transfers in a single year. Due to distances and time required to recontact employees, it has been established that a considerable time lag necessarily develops between the initial submission of a loyalty form and the resubmission of the corrected form which is acceptable to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its loyalty-checking purposes.

I should like to emphasize that in addition to the Department's participation in the President's loyalty program all persons proposed for employment in the Department and the Foreign Service are investigated for security and suitability prior to appointment. During these preappointment investigations available sources which would indicate subversive activities are checked and persons are appointed only after the Department is satisfied as to their security.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E PEURIFOY,
Deputy Under Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

CONGRESSIONAL ACCESS TO INVESTIGATIVE REPORTS AND FILES OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Mexico be permitted to address the Senate at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico may address the Senate without taking the Senator from Mississippi off the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to interrupt debate on the displaced persons bill; but I should like to make a short statement, which will not take more than 5 minutes, with reference to Senate Resolution 231. First, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at this point, an opinion by the Attorney General with reference to access to executive reports and files in the possession of the executive departments.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSITION OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT REGARDING INVESTIGATIVE REPORTS

It is the position of the Department of Justice, restated now with the approval and at the direction of the President, that all investigative reports are confidential documents of the executive department and that congressional or public access thereto would not be in the public interest.

This accords with the conclusions reached by a long line of predecessors in the office of Attorney General and with the position taken by the President from time to time since Washington's administration, and this discretion in the executive branch has been upheld and respected by the judiciary.

APRIL 30, 1941.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman,
House Committee on Naval Affairs.

MY DEAR MR. VINSON: I have your letter of April 23, requesting that your committee be furnished with all Federal Bureau of Investigation reports since June 1939, together with all future reports, memoranda, and correspondence of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or the Department of Justice, in connection with "investigations made by the Department of Justice arising out of strikes, subversive activities in connection with labor disputes, or labor disturbances of any kind in industrial establishments which have naval contracts, either as prime contractors or subcontractors."

Your request to be furnished reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is one of the many made by congressional committees. I have on my desk at this time two other such requests for access to Federal Bureau of Investigation files The number of these requests would alone make compliance impracticable, particularly where the requests are of so comprehensive a character as those contained in your letter. In view of the increasing frequency of these requests, I desire to restate our policy at some length, together with the reasons which require it.

It is the position of this Department, restated now with the approval of and at the direction of the President, that all investigative reports are confidential documents of the executive department of the Government, to aid in the duty laid upon the President by the Constitution to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed," and that congressional or public access to them would not be in the public interest.

Disclosure of the reports could not do otherwise than seriously prejudice law enforcement. Counsel for a defendant or prospective defendant, could have no greater help than to know how much or how little information the Government has, and what witnesses or sources of information it can rely upon. This is exactly what these reports are intended to contain.

Disclosure of the reports at this particular time would also prejudice the national defense and be of aid and comfort to the very subversive elements against which you wish to protect the country. For this reason we have made extraordinary efforts to see that the results of counter-espionage activities and intelligence activities of this Department involving those elements are kept within the fewest possible hands. A catalog of persons under investigation or suspicion, and what we know about them, would be of estimable service to foreign agencies; and information which could be so used cannot be too closely guarded.

Moreover, disclosure of the reports would be of serious prejudice to the future usefulness of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As you probably know, much of this information is given in confidence and can only be obtained upon pledge not to disclose its sources. A disclosure of the sources would embarrass informants; sometimes in their employment, sometimes in their social relations, and in extreme cases might even endanger their lives. We regard the keeping of faith with confidential informants as an indispensable condition of future efficiency.

Disclosure of information contained in the reports might also be the grossest kind of injustice to innocent individuals. Investigative reports include leads and suspicions, and sometimes even the statements of malicious or misinformed people. Even though later and more complete reports exonerate the individuals, the use of particular or selected reports might constitute the grossest injustice, and we all know that a correction never catches up with an accusation.

In concluding that the public interest does not permit general access to Federal Bureau of Investigation reports for information by the many congressional committees who from time to time ask it, I am following the conclusions reached by a long line of distinguished predecessors in this office who have uniformly taken the same view. Examples of this are to be found in the following letters, among others.

Letter of Attorney General Knox to the Speaker of the House, dated April 27, 1904, declining to comply with a resolution of the House requesting the Attorney General to furnish the House with all papers and documents and other information concerning the investigation of the Northern Securities case.

Letter of Attorney General Bonaparte to the Speaker of the House, dated April 13, 1908, declining to comply with a resolution of the House requesting the Attorney General to furnish to the House information concerning the investigation of certain corporations engaged in the manufacture of wood pulp for print paper.

Letter of Attorney General Wickersham to the Speaker of the House, dated March 18, 1912, declining to comply with a resolution of the House directing the Attorney General to furnish to the House information concerning an investigation of the smelter trust.

Letter of Attorney General McReynolds to the secretary to the President, dated August 28, 1914, stating that it would be incompatible with the public interest to send to the Senate in response to its resolution reports made to the Attorney General by his associates regarding violations of law by the Standard Oil Co.

Letter of Attorney General Gregory to the President of the Senate, dated February 23, 1915, declining to comply with a resolution of the Senate requesting the Attorney General to report to the Senate his findings and conclusions in the investigation of the smelting industry.

Letter of Attorney General Sargent to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, dated June 8, 1926, declining to comply with his request to turn over to the committee all papers in the files of the Department relating to the merger of certain oil companies.

In taking this position my predecessors in this office have followed eminent examples.

Since the beginning of the Government, the executive branch has from time to time been confronted with the unpleasant duty of declining to furnish to the Congress and to the courts information which it has acquired and which is necessary to it in the administration of statutes. As early as 1796, the House of Representatives requested President Washington to lay before the House a copy of the instructions to ministers of the United States who negotiated a treaty with Great Britain, together with the correspondence and other documents relating to the treaty. In declining to comply with the request, President Washington said:

"As it is essential to the due administration of the Government that the boundaries

fixed by the Constitution between the different departments should be preserved, a just regard to the Constitution and to the duty of my office * * * forbids a compliance with your request." (See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 1, pp. 194, 196.)

In 1825, the House of Representatives requested President Monroe to transmit certain documents relating to the conduct of the officers of the Navy of the United States on the Pacific Ocean, and of other public agents in South America. In his reply, President Monroe refused to comply with the request, stating that to do so might subject individuals to unjust criticism; that the individuals involved should not be censured without just cause, which could not be ascertained until after a thorough and impartial investigation of their conduct; and that under those circumstances it was thought that communication of the documents would not comport with the public interest nor with what was due to the parties concerned. (See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 2, p. 278.)

In 1833 the Senate requested President Jackson to communicate to that body a copy of a paper purporting to have been read by him to the heads of the executive departments, dated September 18, 1833, relating to the removal of the deposits of the public money from the Bank of the United States. President Jackson declined. (See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 3, p. 36.)

In 1835 the Senate passed a resolution requesting President Jackson to communicate copies of the charges, if any, which might have been made to him against the official conduct of Gideon Fitz, late surveyor general south of the State of Tennessee, which caused his removal from office. In reply President Jackson again declined to comply. (See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 3, pp. 132, 133.)

This discretion in the executive branch has been upheld and respected by the judiciary. The courts have repeatedly held that they will not and cannot require the Executive to produce such papers when in the opinion of the Executive their production is contrary to the public interests. The courts have also held that the question whether the production of the papers would be against the public interest is one for the Executive and not for the courts to determine. (*Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137, 169); *Totten* v. *United States* (92 U. S. 195); *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (103 U. S. 168, 190); *Vogel* v. *Gruaz* (110 U. S. 311); *In re Quarles and Butler* (158 U. S. 532); *Boske* v. *Comingore* (177 U. S. 459); *In re Huttman* (70 Fed 699); *In re Lamberton* (124 Fed. 446); *In re Valecia Condensed Milk Co.* (240 Fed. 310); *Elrod* v. *Moss* (278 Fed. 123); *Arnstein* v. *United States* (296 Fed. 946); *Gray* v. *Pentland* (2 Sergeant & Rawle's (Pa.) 23, 28); *Thompson* v. *German Valley R. Co.* (22 N. J. Equity 111); *Worthington* v. *Scribner* (109 Mass 487); *Appeal of Hartranft* (85 Pa. 433, 445); *2 Burr Trials* (533–536); see also 25 Op A. G 326.)

In *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson*, supra, the Court said:

"It is believed to be one of the chief merits of the American system of written constitutional law, that all the powers entrusted to government, whether State of National, are divided into the three grand departments—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. That the functions appropriate to each of these branches of Government shall be vested in a separate body of public servants, and that the perfection of the system requires that the lines which separate and divide these departments shall be broadly and clearly defined. It is also essential to the successful working of this system that the persons entrusted with power in any one of these branches shall not be permitted to encroach upon the powers confided to the others, but that each shall by the law of its creation be limited to the exercise of the powers appropriate to its own department and no other."

In appeal of Hartranft, supra, the Court said:

"We had better at the outstart recognize the fact that the executive department is a coordinate branch of the Government, with power to judge what should or should not be done, within its own department, and what of its own doings and communications should or should not be kept secret, and that with it, in the exercise of these constitutional powers, the courts have no more right to interfere, than has the executive, under like conditions, to interfere with the courts."

The information here involved was collected, and is chiefly valuable, for use by the executive branch of the Government in the execution of the laws. It can be of little, if any, value in connection with the framing of legislation or the performance of any other constitutional duty of the Congress. We do not undertake to investigate strikes as to their justification or the lack of it, but confine investigation to alleged violations of law, including, of course, violation of statutes designed to suppress subversive activity, and to general intelligence to guide executive policy. Certainly, the evil which would necessarily flow from its untimely publication would far outweigh any possible good.

I am not unmindful of your conditional suggestion that your counsel will keep this information "inviolate until such time as the committee determines its disposition." I have no doubt that this pledge would be kept and that you would weigh every consideration before making any matter public. Unfortunately, however, a policy cannot be made anew because of personal confidence of the Attorney General in the integrity and good faith of a particular committee chairman. We cannot be put in the position of discriminating between committees or of attempting to judge between them, and their individual members, each of whom has access to information once placed in the hands of the committee.

Of course, where the public interest has seemed to justify it, information as to particular situations has been supplied to congressional committees by me and by former Attorneys General. For example, I have taken the position that committees called upon to pass on the confirmation of persons recommended for appointment by the Attorney General would be afforded confidential access to any information that we have—because no candidate's name is submitted without his knowledge and the Department does not intend to submit the name of any person whose entire history will not stand light. By way of further illustration, I may mention that pertinent information would be supplied in impeachment proceedings, usually instituted at the suggestion of the Department for the good of the administration of justice.

It is for the reasons given that I feel it my duty to decline your request, believing that in them you will find justification for my refusal.

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. JACKSON.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Members of the Senate, especially Senators who were members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Eightieth Congress, first session, will recall that on December 17, 1947, during the time I was serving as Secretary of Agriculture, I received from the committee a subpena directing me to produce all records in the custody or control of the Department of Agriculture for 1946 and 1947, giving the names of traders on boards of trade. This was in connection with the hearings on speculation in commodity markets.

As I indicated at that time in my testimony, I believe it was the first time that a congressional committee had sought to do what Congress itself had not tried to do, and my position on the matter was in accordance with well-established precedent.

So, perhaps as the only Member of the Senate who has been served by a Senate committee with a subpena to produce records, I have read with exceptional interest the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 21 and 22 with reference to Senate Resolution 231, which was considered while I was absent from the Senate on public business. More particularly, I am interested in the procedure which is to be followed under Senate Resolution 231 for the production of files and records. Had I been in the Chamber at the time the resolution was under consideration, I believe I would have joined in the discussion, which was precipitated by the majority leader when he raised a question as to how much privacy generally results from executive sessions of committees and the desirability of insuring protection to confidential information.

As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I served as a member of the subcommittee appointed by the Speaker to consider charges made by the Dies committee against hundreds of Government employees. Five members of the Appropriations Committee heard charges on the question of whether it was desirable to continue on the pay roll of the Government a great many people against whom the charge had been made that they belonged to subversive organizations and were not fit persons to be on the pay roll. We investigated literally hundreds of charges.

It is out of that experience, Mr. President, that I suggest to the Senate that possibly the Senate may find the Chief Executive may refuse to honor the subpena. I know that I found it necessary to decline a subpena of the United States Senate when it demanded that I produce a list of names. The Congress of the United States recognized the correctness of that decision by passing the supplementary legislation releasing me from the secrecy under which I was then operating, and making it possible for me to release the names.

The material which I have just inserted in the RECORD is material which was called to my attention by the Solicitor for the Department of Agriculture at that time, and it quite clearly indicates, I believe, that the conflict between the legislative and the executive departments has been going on for a long time, and that it has never been resolved by

one group trying to subpena another group.

I need only to call attention to the fact that in the recent Christoffel case, on three different occasions when the judge insisted upon records being produced from a committee of the House of Representatives, the House, I think properly within its rights, refused to produce the records. At that time I did not hear a single Member of the United States Senate protest against the action of the House, nor have I seen in any newspaper a protest by any Member of the Senate against the action of the House. It strikes me that if the legislative branch can refuse the subpena of the judicial branch, it confirms the view long held by the executive branch that it in turn may refuse the subpena of the legislative branch.

I am not trying to indicate what I think the duty of the President may be, or what he may do, or anything of that nature. I merely wish the Senate to realize that there are people who feel quite strongly on this question, and who believe it is well within the province of the executive branch to determine the conditions under which its files may be made available.

I had intended, Mr. President to request the insertion in my remarks of a letter which I wrote to the committee which had subpenaed the records from me. I find however, that it is carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in volume 93, part 9, Eightieth Congress, first session, December 18, 1947, on page 11616. But I call the attention of the Senate to a document entitled "Speculation in Commodity Markets," which reviewed the procedure had at that time, and the discussion by the Senate committee when I was before it under subpena and under oath. In that discussion there were a great many things to which I think attention might be directed. Some suggestions were made as to the files of the FBI in subversive cases.

As one who has gone carefully through the files of the FBI on a great many subversive cases when they were submitted to the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on which I served, I wish to say that I do not believe the FBI will be enthusiastic about the procedure outlined before the Senate. Any time it is suggested to the FBI that their witnesses be called in one by one, A, B, C, and D, as mentioned as a possible result of Senate Resolution 231 by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and that those witnesses be required to reveal who they are, and the basis upon which they are trying to observe the activities of other government officials, the same thing will be done that the FBI objected to in the Coplon case.

When we tried, in the House, by direction of the House Appropriations Committee, to examine such witnesses, we did not do it in open hearings. That resulted in comment by the witnesses that they had been unfairly treated, in that they were not confronted with their accusers. I regretted that. I still believe that we treated them fairly. I still believe that nearly all the persons whose names were before that committee would concede to this day that we treated them fairly, but that we did not give them what many people regard, and perhaps properly so, to be their sacred right, the right to be confronted with their accusers. The reason we did not confront them with their accusers was that it would have been necessary to reveal who was employed by th FBI, and who perhaps was working in a clerical capacity next to a whole group of persons, and who was in reality an FBI agent. I thought, and many others thought, that it would be unfortunate to reveal who these people were who had been long trained by the FBI, and were well directed by the FBI.

While I am sure all Members of the Senate are trying now to work this matter out on a proper basis, I regret my absence from the Senate at the time the debate took place. There are many matters I would have liked to comment upon.

I do, however, wish to suggest that if the House of Representatives can say to the judiciary, "There are three branches of this Government, and the legislative will not surrender to the judiciary its files, no matter if three times subpenaed by a judge," then by the same token it strikes me that the executive may say to the legislative, "I will not surrender my files, no matter how many times they may be subpenaed."

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to House bill 4567 and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. EASTLAND. The amendment provides that no person shall be employed by the Displaced Persons Commission who has been a member of one of the voluntary agencies whose duty it is to expedite the entry of immigrants into the United States. Mr. President, in my judgment, one of the great shortcomings of the present displaced-persons program is that the employees of the Displaced Persons Commission are not trained immigration men. They have had no experience in that line of activity. A great part of its employees were members of voluntary agencies whose duty it was to pick up displaced persons and get them into this country. As a result, there has been a total lack of screening in the program, so far as the protection of this country is concerned; and in my judgment, the screening in Europe has all but broken down.

Mr. President, I do not want anything I have said in the past 2 days to reflect upon the honesty or the integrity of the members of the Displaced Persons Commission in the city of Washington. However, they did make a grave mistake in establishing a system by which a foreign agency would initiate the applications of displaced persons to enter this country. I think it has resulted in a great number of persons being admitted who otherwise would not have gotten into the United States.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to yield to my friend the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. When the Senator from North Dakota has concluded, I shall yield the floor.

NORTH DAKOTA STATE BONDING FUND

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me. I call the attention of Senators, particularly those who wish to save some money for the Government of the United States, to the great success of the State bonding fund in the State of North Dakota. The law providing that the State of North Dakota itself shall write all the bonds for the men and women who hold fiduciary positions with any North Dakota municipality has been in effect in North Dakota for 30 years.

Mr. President, there appeared in the February 28 issue of the Fargo Forum, one of the leading newspapers in North Dakota, a newspaper which fought the enactment of that measure, and called it socialism, an article entitled "Bonded Unit Making Money While Giving Services Free." I have the article before me now. I particularly regret that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is not now upon the floor, because a few days ago he made the statement that the various State industries in North Dakota were losing money. I hope every Member who now is on the floor of the Senate will listen to the reading of this article from the Fargo Forum:

BONDING UNIT MAKING MONEY WHILE GIVING SERVICES FREE

BISMARCK, N. DAK.—The North Dakota State Bonding Department is making money while giving its services away.

For the past 2 years the department has written bonds for State, county, and municipal officials which called for fees of more than $176,000.

All but $292 of the fees were waived, but the department fund still has more money now than at the beginning of 1948.

During the 2 years the department's fund has gained more than $55,000, almost all of it from interest on investments.

The 1947 legislature passed a law providing that premiums for bonding State and local government officials could be waived as long as there was more than $1,000,000 in the fund.

State Insurance Commissioner Otto Krueger points out that last year's operations cost only about 24 percent of the interest earned from the department's investments.

The department now carries bonds, he said, totaling more than $33,470,000, with its assets at the end of 1949 amounting to $1,424,863.

I may say, Mr. President, that 30 years ago, as attorney general of the State, I found that a bonding company which had insured my predecessor as attorney general in the sum of $5,000, after that official had embezzled $35,000, refused to

pay without a lawsuit. It took the people of North Dakota a year and a half in which to collect on a $5,000 bond, following a $35,000 embezzlement. It so disgusted the Legislature of North Dakota and certain of the State officials that, without appropriating one thin dime, we passed a law by which the State of North Dakota automatically insured all State, county, and municipal officials. We practically said, "At the end of the year we will send bills to each municipality representing its proportionate share of the cost." I repeat, that was 30 years ago. I want every Senator to know that for a time the amount paid by the municipalities was about one-third as much as an old-line company would have charged for writing the same fidelity insurance. It later decreased to approximately one-tenth as much, and finally North Dakota had so much money on hand that the legislature substantially said, "Do not send out any notices as long as we have $1,000,000 on hand." In 1947 the State legislature passed the law I have already mentioned.

In the United States Government what do we find? Only a short time ago I attended a meeting of the so-called Five Percent Committee. I listened to testimony given before a committee of which the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] was chairman, which showed that one company had insured some ships, the premium for them amounting to over $100,000. Why should the Government of the United States have any of its officials insured by a private company and pay a big premium, when as a matter of fact it can carry its own insurance in a manner similar to that followed in the State of North Dakota?

I mention this particularly because I am entirely satisfied that the Government of the United States can save hundreds of millions of dollars a year. I am delighted to see sitting upon the Senate floor the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Finance Committee. We can save hundreds of millions of dollars a year by enacting a law similar to the one which has been in effect for 30 years in North Dakota, which has proved to be very effective, and which, as I say, has saved the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars.

I might add, Mr. President, that I intend to introduce a bill which will carry out the purposes which I have described and which may be referred to the Committee on Finance. At that time I shall ask permission to appear personally in behalf of the bill. In the meantime, I suggest to the distinguished chairman of that committee that if he wants any information as to the economies which may be effected by the passage of such a measure, I shall be glad to furnish it to him, based upon 30 years' experience of the sovereign State of North Dakota.

PROGRAM FOR THE DAY—RESTORATION OF NATIONAL COAL PRODUCTION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the primary reason why the Senate is in session today is because the President sent a message to the Congress yesterday involving the acute crisis in the coal situation throughout the Nation. Otherwise, the Senate would have taken a recess until Monday. Some Members of the Senate have asked me whether there will be a vote this afternoon upon any amendment or any part of the pending measure, and I have assured them that there will not be such a vote. The Senator from Illinois hopes to have the Senate recess at approximately 4 o'clock this afternoon.

While I am on my feet, I desire to commend members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the diligence pursued by each and every one of them in dealing with the bill which was introduced yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I am advised that the committee is still working on the bill and that, with the exception of a few minor details, it will soon be perfected. The coal strike is virtually settled. Apparently, there remains now only the question of the lawyers representing the operators as well as those representing the union drawing up appropriate contracts. If that be true, and I have every reason to believe that it is, I will say to the Senate that, so far as the majority is concerned, there will be no pressing for the emergency legislation, a draft of which was sent to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare yesterday.

I thought I should make this announcement, in view of the fact that Senators have returned to the Chamber today, primarily to ascertain whether there would be any action upon that bill. I said yesterday that if the bill were reported and if the differences between the operators and the miners were not settled, we would take up the bill at the session this afternoon.

I should like to read one paragraph of the President's message with respect to the present coal situation. Among other things, he said:

> I am not requesting this legislation as a means of settling the issues in dispute between the operators and the union. They will have to settle their differences through their own collective bargaining, just as though Government operation were not in effect. I do not propose to substitute the Government's representatives for the private operators at the bargaining table. It will not be our purpose to establish wages, hours, or working conditions which would bind either the operators or the miners upon resumption of private operations.
>
> When the country can be assured of sufficient supplies of coal, the Government will have no need to continue public operation and the mines will be promptly returned to private hands.
>
> I have stressed these essential elements in the plan for Government operation, so that there will be no misunderstanding of the legislation I am recommending.

Mr. President, I am certain that that statement contributed greatly to the settlement which has been made between the union members and the operators in the coal industry.

I wish to add a further word, which I have not been able to say heretofore; and the Vice President, who now occupies the chair, knows that what I shall say now is true. At the White House meetings which have been held every Monday morning with the leaders of the House and the leaders of the Senate, whenever the coal situation has been discussed—and that has been many, many times—the President of the United States has repeatedly said, "I have not wanted, and do not want, the Government of the United States to seize the mines." It was only in the last extremity that he sent the seizure bill to the Congress yesterday. I simply mention that to tell the Senate and the country of the position of the President of the United States in respect to his theory regarding seizure of the mines. It was the last thing he desired to do, and he said so many times.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I suspect that my State of Indiana has been hit as hard by the strike in the coal industry as any of the other States, or perhaps even harder. I urge that the United States Senate and the entire Congress pass legislation which will avoid any similar situation in the future, and will put a stop, once and for all, to the kind of situation we have had in the United States during the past 30 days. I do not think we should stop now, as a result of the coal strike settlement; I think we should pass legislation giving the President of the United States, whoever he may be in the future, the power to deal with such situations.

We should go further, and pass legislation which will permanently avoid in the future such a situation as we have had during the last 30 days. I think we will be derelict in our duty as Senators if we do not do so.

I strongly urge that within the next 60 days the Congress of the United States once and for all time put a stop to any recurrence of such situations as we have had in the United States during the past 30 days.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in reply to the able Senator from Indiana, let me say that I do not think any Member of the Senate desires to see exist in this country chaotic conditions or serious trouble in any Nation-wide industry, affecting the health and safety of the Nation. I agree with the Senator from Indiana that if there can be devised some plan of legislation which will definitely have the effect of preventing a national emergency of this kind, it certainly ought to be considered. But the best minds in the country and the best minds in the Senate have worked upon this problem innumerable times. Of course, we realize that in a free country such as ours, it is rather difficult to frame legislation which will do the job the Senator from Indiana would like to have done. So long as we have free men and free women in this country, a person who enjoys the privileges of the Government of the United States has the right to work

where he pleases and when he pleases, and no one can tell him to do otherwise.

I say that advisedly, Mr. President. I said on yesterday that neither the Taft-Hartley law nor the emergency measure now contemplated, involving seizure of the mines, would put shovels into the hands of the miners if they did not want to work. I believe they would have worked if our Government had seized the mines; I believe that as a patriotic duty the miners would have gone back to work. But I repeat that it is a difficult piece of legislation to draft.

A number of persons—some who live in my State and some who live in other sections of the country—have written to me, expressing the opinion that the Taft-Hartley law is the solution to the problem. Of course, Mr. President, everyone know now that it is not the solution to the problem. It utterly failed in the present crisis as a result of the court decision of Judge Keech. Neither is seizure the solution to the problem, and that it is a most difficult matter to enact legislation which will be effective in such an emergency as the one we have faced until practically today. A serious study must be made by the Congress to ascertain, if possible, a workable solution which will give fair and equitable treatment to the laboring man as well as management.

THE SITUATION IN CHINA

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield, to permit me to make an insertion in the RECORD, and to make a statement not exceeding 5 minutes in length?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield, provided I may have unanimous consent for that purpose, without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mao Returns to China," appearing in this morning's New York Times

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAO RETURNS TO CHINA

Mao Tze-tung, chieftain of the Chinese Communists, is now back in his native land after his extended pilgrimage to Moscow. Because of the fact that he went there to negotiate a treaty most of the emphasis upon his return has been placed, so far, on the question: What did he come back with? It is equally pertinent to ask. What did he come back to?

It is not so easy to make an appraisal of the exact situation, but plainly Mao comes back to an inflation of the same sort as that which undermined the Nationalist Government of China. The promise of $60,000,000 a year for five years that he received from the Russians won't help much to halt the already downward spiral of Communist currency. Apparently the policy of forced loans was not enough. The tactics used in forced rice collections and return of these "loans" to get moral credit apparently won't work when it comes to money.

A factor in the deteriorating economy, of course, is Nationalist bombardment and blockade. Whatever its cost in other respects, it is apparently proving to be more effective in the economic field than many persons had supposed it could have been. Chiang, who was upbraided for the lack of will to resist on the part of his armies, is showing more than a little ability to resist and to do real damage with his Navy and his Air Force. At the moment he is forcing the Communists to lose ground economically.

This is a curious and fateful reversal of roles. It is easy to see that the effectiveness of the Chinese Communist movement derived to a very considerable extent from the fact that its attack over a long period was not on the field forces of the Nationalist Army but on the basic economy of the Government of China itself. The Communists boasted that when that viable economy had been sufficiently undermined the resistance of the Government would fall of its own weight, and events justified their boast. The situation has now swung around and it is the Communists who must try to establish and sustain a working economy for China. Their present outlook is not bright.

At the same time the character of Nationalist resistance has improved. Chiang, in resuming the Presidency, is simply responding to the logic of forces and events. He has rehabilitated resistance on both Hainan and Formosa. He has at last put the real "liberals" and "reformers" into key positions. In place of some of the "liberal" followers of Li Tsung-jen, who came into office on the theory that it was possible to make an honorable peace with the Communists and wound up in Peiping, he has put authority into the hands of such acknowledged leaders as Wang Shih-chieh, K C. Wu, George Yeh, C K. Yen and O. K. Yu. In the military field he has the services of skilled and imaginative commanders such as Chen Cheng, Hsueh Yueh and Sun Li-jen.

Mao's return, in this light, must be viewed as something short of triumphal. He has won some of his battles in China He may or may not have won his battle in Moscow. He still has an economic and political and military war on his hands.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to read, for the information of the Senate, a letter I have received from the State Department. The letter is dated March 3, 1950, and reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 3, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM F KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND The following information is sent to you in response to your letter of February 18'

1. The Chinese Communists are still detaining Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender incommunicado, without explanation. As indicated in previous correspondence on this subject, the United States Government has sent five written requests for their release to Communist authorities at Peiping. In addition, oral and written representations to local Communist authorities have been made by United States diplomatic and consular representatives at Nanking, Tsingtao, Tientsin, and Shanghai. These representations have been ignored by the Communist authorities on the pretext that United States representatives in China have no official status. To fully explore every possible means of effecting their release the Department requested Capt. David Jones, master of the *Flying Arrow*, to approach Communist authorities at Tsingtao on an unofficial basis, requesting that the men be allowed to return to the United States aboard his ship. This approach was also unsuccessful in obtaining their release, although additional information regarding their welfare was obtained. This information was transmitted to you in a memorandum on the Smith-Bender case dated January 31, 1950. The Department has requested the assistance of the British Foreign Office and the International Red Cross in establishing a channel of communications with Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender and effecting their release, and is in the meantime investigating other avenues of approach to the Chinese Communist authorities.

2. General Soule and his staff are still at Shanghai, awaiting transportation to the United States. The Chinese Communist authorities granted them exit permits in December, but these authorities have generally refused permission to foreigners in the Shanghai and Nanking areas to depart from China via ports other than Shanghai. Their departure from Shanghai has been delayed indefinitely due to the Chinese National Government's endeavor to close that port.

3. All American personnel of the Consulate General in Peiping have not yet applied for exit permits, according to the Department's latest information. The Consul General in Peiping has reported that local regulations stipulate that an application for an exit permit debars the applicant from requesting passes for local travel. Therefore, in view of the importance of maintaining contact with the Consulate General in Tientsin, especially during this period when the two Consulates General are finalizing their plans for withdrawal, only a limited number of the official personnel at Peiping have applied for exit permits. The remainder of the personnel will apply shortly before the estimated date of departure. It might be noted, in this connection, that four official Americans, including the assistant military attaché, have already received their exit permit and have left Peiping.

As requested by you, there is given below the text of the shop guaranty used by official personnel in Ambassador Stuart's party when they left Nanking This shop guaranty was executed by Second Secretary Bacon, of the Embassy, as a personal act.

"I hereby execute this bond to guarantee that (blank) is in truth not involved in any unsettled civil or criminal actions nor disputes involving payment of rents, taxes, or other debts, and that while he is waiting for exit (blank) will definitely not commit any unlawful act, otherwise, the executor of this bond is willing to be subject to the reserved punishment."

Sincerely yours,

JACK K MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. President, I merely wish at this time to say that so far as I know it is the only time in the history of United States diplomatic relations with other countries that our diplomatic officials have either been required to sign or have signed a bond of this kind in order to leave a country. I think it a most unprecented action that American officials should have been required to sign such a bond. I think it a most unusual action that they should have consented to the signing of a bond in that manner. When the camel once gets his nose under the tent, we may find that additional pressure will be put on our people in the future. I shall have more to say about this at a later date.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. IVES addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New York will not yield for the making of any statements at this time. He will yield to unanimous-consent requests for the introduction of bills or the insertion of material in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for the purpose I have indicated.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from New York whether he does not believe it fair, inasmuch as the Senator has yielded for several statements, that those who might like to answer some of those statements should have the same privilege? I should like to have unanimous consent to make a statement relative to the history of the coal crisis, and I ask the Senator now for that privilege.

Mr. LEHMAN. For how long a time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York and all other Senators have control of the floor when they occupy it. They cannot yield——

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to make a statement that will require not to exceed 10 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair finish his statement, please. The Senator from New York can yield, or not yield, as it suits his pleasure or convenience, for any purpose. He cannot yield even for the insertion of matters in the RECORD or for the introduction of bills, except by unanimous consent. He can only yield for a question. After yielding to other Senators, he may discontinue the yielding, if he sees fit to do so. The Senator from New York and all other Senators have complete control of the Senate floor while they occupy it. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LEHMAN. The junior Senator has yielded, with the understanding, of course, in every instance, that it was based upon a request for unanimous consent, to permit the insertion of certain material in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is perfectly obvious that that has not been observed.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. If it is understood that the junior Senator from New York does not lose his place in connection with the debate on the pending question, I shall of course be very glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator from New Mexico rise?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thought the Senator from Nebraska requested unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. I did.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent that he may yield to the Senator from Nebraska to make a statement, without losing the floor. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I think it unfair to a Senator who is speaking, whether it be the Senator from New York or any other Senator, for another Senator to seek to insert something in the RECORD, and thereby interrupt the Senator having the floor. I say this, not for the sake of any particular Senator, but for the sake of all Senators. I do not object to the request.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. MUNDT addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York may yield to me in order to permit me to make a statement, without prejudice to his rights to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator from South Dakota rise?

Mr. MUNDT. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Only one unanimous-consent request can be pending at a time. The question is, is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York that he be allowed to yield to the Senator from Nebraska for the purpose indicated? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. The junior Senator from New York, of course, yields.

HISTORY OF THE COAL CRISIS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his sportsmanship and for the fair play he has accorded the Senator from Nebraska.

A few moments ago, I heard from the lips of the majority leader a defense of the inaction of the President in regard to solving the coal strike. I repeat what I said yesterday that, in my humble opinion, had there been a will to settle the strike 2 or 3 months ago, as much could have been accomplished then as was accomplished yesterday, without even suggesting seizure legislation or a great many other kinds of legislation which are now being advocated. I want the RECORD to show that. I also want the RECORD to show the history of the coal crisis, about which Senators have been talking.

May 25, 1949, nearly a year ago, at the southern wage conference, the United Mine Workers began a bargaining conference at Bluefield, W. Va.

June 8, 1949, a "brief stabilizing period of inaction" was proposed for the week of June 13 to 20.

June 13, 1949, the captives and the United Mine Workers began a bargaining conference at Philadelphia.

June 22, 1949, at the northern wage conference, the United Mine Workers began a bargaining conference at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.

June 30, 1949, nearly a year ago, the 1948 contracts expired.

July 5, 1949, the 3-day workweek began. Just think of it, Mr. President, nearly a year ago, 9 months ago, the 3-day workweek began, limiting the production of soft coal.

From September 19 to November 9, 1949, a general cessation of work took place.

October 7, 1949, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service entered the situation at a conference of all parties.

October 27, 1949, Truman delays. The Baltimore Sun said:

President Truman said today that he would invoke the Taft-Hartley law in the steel and coal disputes if either or both created what he regarded as a national emergency.

"There is no national emergency as yet," the Chief Executive told his weekly news conference, "and until there is, the national emergencies provision of the law is inapplicable."

The Baltimore Sun, on October 27, 1949, said further:

The President made it clear that it would be he who would make the determination as to when and if a national emergency had been created by shortages of coal and steel.

October 27, 1949. The coal strike is in its thirty-ninth day.

November 17, 1949. Truman delays. The New York Times said:

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service turned over the coal case to the White House yesterday. The dispute has a history of nearly 6 months, including a 52-day strike, and seems no nearer solution than ever.

Mr. Truman implied he was in no hurry to get into the case. He was asked whether he was giving John L. Lewis a chance to work out a settlement before using the Taft-Hartley law.

The President replied that the emergency for the Taft-Hartley law had not arrived, and that when he got to that bridge he would cross it

December 3, 1949. United Mine Workers announce signing of contracts with a few operators.

December 5, 1949. Three-day week again instituted.

December 22, 1949. Truman delays. The Baltimore Sun said:

President Truman said today that he would take necessary action if the coal strike shortage reached the emergency stage.

However, the President would not venture an opinion on whether the 3-day week John L. Lewis is permitting in most of the coal industry is providing enough coal.

Even then, Mr. President, requests were coming in that coal be furnished in different sections of the Nation.

I proceed with article from the Baltimore Sun:

He also would not say whether he considered the short week a sufficiently serious threat to bring the situation within the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The next date is December 28. The junior Senator from Nebraska, having gone from one end of the country to the other, realized the seriousness of the national emergency which then existed by reason of the coal strike, and the junior Senator from Nebraska is quoted in the Washington Star as saying:

"It is obvious," said Senator WHERRY, "that the industrial productivity of this country cannot long continue in high gear on the meager trickle of soft coal that is now being mined

"Unless the President acts, and acts forthrightly, there will be a very serious industrial crisis within a few weeks."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all of the Washington Star item of December 28 be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERRY CALLS TRUMAN NEGLIGENT IN HANDLING OF COAL SITUATION—SENATE GOP LEADER HITS BIPARTISAN POLICY, DEMANDS ECA SLASH

President Truman was charged with "deplorable negligence" in his handling of the coal situation by Senate Republican Leader WHERRY on his return to Washington for the coming session of Congress.

Senator WHERRY said yesterday the President had not used his full power to restore full-time production of coal; that he had refused to invoke the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, apparently for political reasons.

Senator WHERRY also struck at the present bipartisan foreign policy, and demanded that ECA appropriations at the coming session of Congress be cut at least $1,500,000,000 below the appropriations made by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

He challenged the administration forces to bring the antilynching bill before the Senate during the first week of the session, asserting that of all the civil-rights bills it was the easiest to get through the Upper House.

SEES INDUSTRIAL EMERGENCY

"All the administration and its lieutenants in Congress have done on civil-rights legislation," said WHERRY, "is just to talk about it, promise, promise, and promise"

Going further into the coal situation, Senator WHERRY said the President's statement that there is no emergency does not square with statements that have come to him

"It is obvious," said Senator WHERRY, "that the industrial productivity of this country cannot long continue in high gear on the meager trickle of soft coal that is now being mined.

"Unless the President acts, and acts forthrightly, there will be a very serious industrial crisis within a few weeks."

Senator WHERRY also demanded that the Federal tax structure be given a thorough overhauling, and that the wartime excise taxes be repealed.

URGES BALANCED BUDGET

"The people want the cost of Government cut drastically," he said. "And they want the budget balanced. Instead of talking about increasing taxes, to give the spendthrift Socialists more money to squander, Congress should bring the budget into balance by cutting expenditures to fit the cloth of revenue"

The foreign policy of the United States, Senator WHERRY said, should spring from the will of the people.

"Before any line of policy is adopted by the administration," he declared, "it should be presented to the people. The people must have the facts, and, given the facts, they will make the right answer.

"In foreign policy the Truman administration has bypassed the people and Congress, and especially the Senate. The Constitution makes the Senate an integral part of our country's foreign policy making."

POLICY SHOULD BE DEBATED

"Too frequently the administration has gone ahead and made commitments to foreign governments. Congress has been put in the position of approving these agreements or causing great damage to our prestige abroad by repudiating them.

"Of course, every thinking person wants the United States to present a united national front to the world. But before the President commits this country to a policy, Congress and the people should have ample opportunity to debate it and thresh it out. The end result will be a united front"

A similar view was expressed recently by Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, Republican leader in foreign affairs

"Every foreign policy must be totally debated," Senator VANDENBERG said, "and the loyal opposition is under special obligation to see that this occurs." He told reporters there should be an "unpartisan" foreign policy in which neither party sought political advantage. He said this would call for frank cooperation and free debate in reaching a united front.

WANTS FULL ACCOUNTING

Senator WHERRY insisted, too, that the people must have a full accounting for every dollar spent "in the billions upon billions of their money that has been scattered over the world."

"There has not been enough nonpartisan approach in our foreign policy," he continued. "Neither Congress nor the American people were consulted in the administration's betrayal of China into the hands of the Moscow Communists of China Some day our country and the world may pay dearly for this tragic blunder, this coddling of the Communists.

"Congress should take a firm hold on ECA. We should be thinking of procedures for the transformation from the present gifts and grants policy out of the pockets of the American taxpayer to resumption of private enterprise."

URGES JOINT COMMITTEE

"Productivity of the ECA countries is now above prewar levels. The economic problems that confront these countries can be solved only by themselves. A reduction of $1,500,000,000 in the ECA appropriation for the next fiscal year is amply warranted by conditions in the ECA countries and by the deficit of the United States budget."

Senator WHERRY called for the creation of a Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Government Expenditures similar to the present Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, with an ample staff At present, he said, Congress is badly equipped to do an efficient job on appropriations. He approved the idea of a single omnibus appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on January 11, 1950, Senate Concurrent Resolution 68, calling upon the President to use the emergency powers of the Taft-Hartley Act, was introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

On January 12, 1950, Truman delayed while 90,000 workers were out of the pits entirely in spontaneous strikes.

I read now from the New York Herald Tribune:

Despite an industry estimate that coal stocks at the end of this week will be at their lowest point in 15 years, President Truman insisted today that there is still no national emergency in the coal situation.

His statement, in reply to a reporter's press conference question, rejected for the time being demands by coal industry leaders and Members of Congress, including some leading Democrats, that he invoke the Taft-Hartley law's 80-day injunction provisions for handling national-emergency strikes or strike threats.

The President was asked: "Have you reached any new decision whether there is an emergency in coal that would warrant using the Taft-Hartley Act?"

"There is no national emergency in coal at the present time," he replied.

On January 18, 1950, counsel for the NLRB moved in court to end work stoppages in support of alleged illegal demands in bargaining.

January 20, 1950, Truman delays. The Washington Post said:

The Chief Executive told a White House press conference that he, and he alone, will decide if and when there is an [coal] emergency.

When the time comes, he will declare an emergency and take whatever action necessary, Mr. Truman said.

The President also said yesterday that he had nothing whatever to do with the injunction suit filed against Lewis and the UMW by an executive arm of the Government.

On January 25, 1950, James Boyd, Director of the Bureau of Mines, told the Senate Labor Committee

Unless there is an immediate resumption of substantially increased coal production, the national economy, health, and welfare is now or soon will be imperiled.

On January 27, 1950, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare postponed indefinitely the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 68 asking the President to invoke the Taft-Hartley law.

January 31, 1950, Truman delays. The New York Times said:

President Truman moved into the soft-coal dispute today with a proposal that John L. Lewis and the operators call a 70-day truce and submit their arguments to a fact-finding board. He asked for an answer by 5 p. m. Saturday.

Under the truce "normal" production of coal would be resumed. This was understood to mean a return to the 5-day workweek by the members of the United Mine Workers, headed by Mr. Lewis. The wage scale of the expired union contract would be paid. A board of three would make recommendations in 60 days, but the recommendations would not be binding.

On February 4, 1950, a 70-day truce was rejected by Lewis.

On February 6, 1950, Mr. Truman invoked the Taft-Hartley law and 370,000 workers began a Nation-wide work stoppage.

In my opinion, Mr. President, if that law had been invoked 3 months prior to the time it was invoked, and there had been a will to enforce it, we would not have had the emergency which now exists. I think the American people, to a man, believe that statement.

On February 9, 1950, acting on charges brought by counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, the court directed the union to bargain in good faith.

On February 11, 1950, the Taft-Hartley fact-finding board submitted its report. The court issued a temporary restraining order for 370,000 miners to return to work forthwith.

On March 2, 1950, the court cleared the United Mine Workers of civil and criminal contempt charges in failing to return to work following the February 11 restraining order.

On March 3, 1950, the President sent a message to Congress requesting mine-seizure authority.

On the same day, March 3, the contract terms were reported as agreed to.

Mr. President, in concluding my remarks I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 4, 1950. I first want to point out one or two paragraphs to which I should like to invite the attention of the Senate. They read as follows:

WHERE THE BLAME LIES

Whatever the outcome of the coal dispute, the American people will long remember the grim period when they shoveled the last few lumps of coal into their dwindling fires, and President Truman's attitude toward the law which was designed to protect the Nation against that predicament The President's request for new legislation in the dangerous field of government operation was dramatic, and it was necessary as a last resort But that the Government should be driven to such a step is an admission of weakness, the effects of which will plague future labor relations in the United States. There is a law on the statute books calling for a delay in any strike which imperils the national health or safety—a delay which, under present circumstances, might well have averted the crisis. There is a President and an administration, all of whose members have sworn to uphold the laws Yet the strike went on in the teeth of the law, and there was no punishment, while the country stood on the brink of catastrophe.

I should like to read the two concluding paragraphs:

But the indictment of the Administration goes deeper In season and out of season, President Truman has condemned the Taft-Hartley act. He has promised its repeal and prevented its modification. Even after his efforts to dispose of the law failed in a Congress dominated by his own party, he continued to denounce the statute and moved only slowly to enforce it, despite the urgency of the coal threat. In so doing he has given aid, comfort, and actual leadership to those who hated the law because it interfered with their power. That this weakened the law and rendered its enforcement more difficult is obvious.

Mr. Truman may believe that he has proved the Taft-Hartley law unworkable. What he has proved is that he was unwilling or unable to use it to protect the Nation from its gravest industrial crisis in many years, and that he thereby bears a heavy share of responsibility for the mass unemployment, discomfort, and danger which have afflicted the American people. And the people will not forget.

There being no objection, the entire editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THE BLAME LIES

Whatever the outcome of the coal dispute, the American people will long remember the grim period when they shoveled the last few lumps of coal into their dwindling fires, and President Truman's attitude toward the law which was designed to protect the Nation against that predicament. The President's request for new legislation in the dangerous field of Government operation was dramatic, and it was necessary as a last resort But that the Government should be driven to such a step is an admission of weakness, the effects of which will plague future labor relations in the United States. There is a law on the statute books calling for a delay in any strike which imperils the national health or safety—a delay which, under present circumstances might well have averted the crisis. There is a President and an administration, all of whose members have sworn to uphold the laws. Yet the strike went on in the teeth of the law and there was no punishment, while the country stood on the brink of catastrophe.

Mr. Truman's plan for seizing the mines, with its proposal for "impartial boards" to determine "fair and just compensation" for owners and miners—but not to settle the dispute itself—represents an attempt to evade the plain implications of his action. How there could be an interim settlement of wages and conditions under Government operation which would not prejudice collective bargaining, the President did not state. Instead, he went on to recommend a commission to study the long-term needs of the mines, thus placing them in a special category as a "sick industry," and, by inference, attempting to justify his reluctant and bungling use of the Taft-Hartley machinery.

Senator TAFT charges that the Government's case against the UMW was mishandled, that evidence which would have satisfied the court was withheld. Affidavits to the effect that local union officials told the strikers that the telegrams of the top leaders did not mean the men must return to work, and others testifying to the use of union goon squads to make the strike effective were, according to the Ohio Senator, not placed before Judge Keech. Whether this was an error of judgment, or deliberate, is not important The Government did not make out the best possible case for a contempt citation, and it is responsible to the people for its failure.

But the indictment of the administration goes deeper. In season and out of season, President Truman has condemned the Taft-Hartley Act. He has promised its repeal and prevented its modification Even after his efforts to dispose of the law failed in a Congress dominated by his own party, he continued to denounce the statute and moved only slowly to enforce it, despite the urgency of the coal threat. In so doing he has given aid, comfort and actual leadership to those who hated the law because it interfered with their power. That this weakened the law and rendered its enforcement more difficult is obvious.

Mr. Truman may believe that he has proved the Taft-Hartley law unworkable. What he has proved is that he was unwilling or unable to use it to protect the Nation from its gravest industrial crisis in many years, and that he thereby bears a heavy share of responsibility for the mass unemployment, discomfort and danger which have afflicted the American people. And the people will not forget.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall continue to show every consideration to my colleagues on the floor of the Senate, but I have been waiting 45 minutes while various statements have been made by other Senators, and I cannot yield for any further statement at this time. If any Senator wishes to introduce a bill, which will not take more than 2 or 3 minutes, or to insert matters in the RECORD, or to make a correction the junior Senator from New York will yield, but for no other purpose. He makes that statement with great regret, because he wishes to continue to show every consideration to his colleagues.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. For what purpose?

Mr. EASTLAND. To offer two amendments to the bill, and to have them printed and lie on the table.

Mr. LEHMAN Is the Senator going to speak on the amendments?

Mr. EASTLAND. Not at this time. I will say to the Senator also that I am informed that yesterday I made an inaccurate statement and I should like to have about half a minute to correct it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. EASTLAND. I offer two amendments to H. R. 4567, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am informed that yesterday I stated, during the debate, that Mr. L'Heureux, Chief of the Visa Division of the State Department, came of his own volition before the Committee on the Judiciary and requested veto power over certain phases of the pending bill. If I made such a statement, it was erroneous. The committee sent for Mr. L'Heureux, and at the request of the committee, Mr. L'Heureux appeared before the committee, gave us his views on the bill, and those views were incorporated in the committee bill.

THE COAL CRISIS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. For what purpose?

Mr. IVES. The senior Senator from New York does not like to interrupt his colleague, but he has an important engagement, and has a very brief statement he would like to make for the RECORD, if his distinguished colleague would be willing to grant him that courtesy, with the understanding, of course,

that the junior Senator from New York will retain his right to the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. The junior Senator from New York is very glad to yield to his colleague.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, it seems to me that the critical emergency which now besets the country because of the serious dispute between the workers and operators in the coal industry has been occasioned by a combination of circumstances and not exclusively by any single factor or influence. I cite some of these factors and influences:

First. The inadequacy of the so-called national-emergency provision in the Taft-Hartley Act.

Second. The injection of partisan politics into the midst of efforts to correct the Taft-Hartley Act's defects by formulating new and sound and equitable labor relations legislation.

Third. The sick coal industry.

Fourth. The refusal of both workers and operators to bargain collectively in a spirit of mutual understanding and with a common purpose, not only to resolve their differences in a friendly manner, but also to recognize and accept their share of responsibility for the general welfare.

Fifth. The failure of the Chief Executive, either because of a lack of foresight or because of political expediency, to act promptly in the national interest and to take such measures as have been available to him, which obviously were necessary if the present emergency were to be avoided.

The lessons to be derived from this unhappy experience are costly, but they should be profitable. Millions of people, rank and file Americans, have suffered and are suffering and will still suffer not only inconvenience, but hardship. A sick industry has been made sicker. Our beleaguered economy, which is beset by increasing problems both at home and abroad, has received a serious blow. The national defense itself has been jeopardized. The quality of labor relations in the United States has sunk to a new low.

And yet, out of this maelstrom of conflicting interests and emotions, as Americans we should be able to build better than at any time in the past. If we take to heart the lessons we should have learned, we should be able to discover a remedy for the ills of the coal industry and we should be able to formulate the kind of labor-relations legislation which is essential to sound labor-management relations.

The President has recommended the creation of "a commission of inquiry to make a thorough study of the coal industry, in terms of economic, social, and national security objectives." I commend this proposal by the President, and I commend also the distinguished junior Senators from Oregon and Illinois and Minnesota who earlier had the foresight to make a similar proposal which is already before the Senate in the form of legislation.

But these measures are not enough. If this tragic experience has taught us one thing above all others, it has demonstrated the utter futility of attempting to formulate sound and equitable labor-relations legislation when in its formulation partisan politics is a major factor. It has demonstrated, moreover, that in the administration of labor-relations law, no matter how high its quality, partisanship or partisan politics should never be a consideration. It has demonstrated, finally, that in any labor-relations law, no matter how justifiable its purpose, there is a limit to legal compulsion.

I close these brief remarks by repeating what I have said many times before: The most satisfactory and happiest human relationships are the product not of legal compulsion, but rather of voluntary determination among human beings to cooperate with one another. Though we may legislate to the end of time, there will never be industrial peace and harmony without good faith, integrity, a high degree of responsibility, and a real desire to cooperate on the part of all parties concerned. Without this spirit of good will all of the social, economic, and labor laws of man will prove eventually to be in vain.

Mr. President, in thanking my distinguished colleague for his great courtesy, I wish to pay tribute to him for what he did as Governor of the State of New York in working with a Republican legislature, regardless of politics, in an attempt to solve the great problems which are inherent in the difficulty with which we are now confronted. I thank him again.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, one of the anxieties which some Members of the Senate and the public at large have in regard to the pending displaced-persons legislation is the question of our national security. The allegation has been made repeatedly that the displaced-persons legislation, as it is presently operating and as it is proposed that it operate under the minority substitute, would permit large numbers of subversive individuals to enter the United States under the guise of displaced persons. Of course, if this were true—which it is not and which I propose to show that it is not—we would all have reason for concern. In the present world situation, we must guard ourselves against the introduction into our country of persons bent on destroying our form of government or subverting our way of life. This would apply to all individuals of undemocratic mind, all individuals whose preference is totalitarianism, authoritarianism, or tyranny. Of course, the top place on this list of undesirables would be occupied by actual agents of foreign governments seeking to ferret out our national secrets or to weaken our national strength.

Mr. President, I have no doubt that some individuals have entered into our country during the past 10 years who fall into one of the several categories I have described. But individuals bent or assigned to such a course of action would succeed and do succeed in entering our country whether we have displaced-persons legislation or not. Even if we surround our country with barriers of steel and fire, some such individuals would doubtless succeed in entering the United States, just as some of our agents are—thank God—penetrating behind the iron curtain and encouraging the forces of resistance there.

But, Mr. President, these circumstances and dangers were well recognized when the original displaced-persons legislation was drafted. It was recognized by the supporters of the pending liberalized legislation. It was recognized and is recognized by those officials who have been and are in charge of administering the displaced-persons program.

The Displaced Persons Commission's security screening system is the most rigorous ever applied in any immigration program in American history. In addition to all the security protections employed under the normal immigration laws, there are at least seven more and new security protections by American governmental agencies rigorously protecting the security of the United States. They are as follows:

First. The FBI makes an individual check on each displaced person before he is admitted to the United States.

Second. The Counter Intelligence Corps of the United States Army conducts an extensive personal interview and field investigation of every displaced person, using all the intelligence resources of the United States Army.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York will yield to the Senator from Indiana when he has completed reading the seven categories of unusual protective measures that are taken.

Mr. JENNER. Very well.

Mr. LEHMAN. Third, Immigration and Naturalization Service conducts two—rather than the normal one—inspections of each displaced person, one a preexamination overseas and the other upon arrival. Under the displaced persons law, the Immigration Service not only has a double check, here and overseas, but the immigration inspector has the full and complete file which is not the case in normal immigration. In this way, the immigration inspector and the consul each make a completely independent judgment on security.

Fourth. The Displaced Persons Commission maintains the closest watch on security problems throughout the entire process. The Commission has issued an inflexible instruction that no one who was ever a member of the Communist, Nazi, or Fascist Parties, or of related parties, is admissible into the United States under the DP program. This is a more stringent rule than that followed under the normal immigration laws.

Fifth. There is a special additional investigation in connection with displaced persons whose country of origin has been overrun by the Communists.

Sixth There are special laboratories set up for the examination of documents of doubtful authenticity.

Seventh. Under the pending bill, an additional protection is provided: Upon arrival, each displaced person must take an oath that he has never been a member of the Communist Party or of any organization on the Attorney General's list

The Senator from New York will now yield to the Senator from Indiana for a question.

Mr. JENNER Mr. President, I know the Senator from New York wants to be fair, but does he not know that there never was a Communist who would make an affidavit that he was a member of the Communist Party? The Senator from New York stands on the floor and tells the Senate and the American people that the FBI makes a check of displaced persons. The FBI is a highly respected organization, and the people of America may really be led to believe by what the Senator from New York says, that the FBI makes a check. But why does not the Senator tell the Senate and the American people that all the FBI does is to make a name check, that is, to see if any of the names of displaced persons seeking to come into the United States are on the FBI's list? The FBI makes no investigation other than the name check.

When the Senator from New York says that the Consular Service and immigration authorities prepare the files on displaced persons, does he not know that those files are, in fact, prepared by the International Refugee Organization, prepared by displaced persons themselves; that they are shot through with fraud, and that the immigration authorities and the consular officers have no right to go back of such files?

Does not the Senator from New York know that the officials the Senator says are trying to protect the Nation's security do not even wait for a check from the Berlin Document Center or a check from the Provost Marshal's Office to see whether any of the displaced persons who are coming to this country, and who are being processed, are Communists?

Does not the Senator from New York know that the head of the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe testified last night before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary that the Commission is following a calculated risk program, and that he admitted to the members of the Senate committee last night that subversives and criminals were coming into this country, and that he knew that to be so? The witness said, however, "Don't worry about that. Such persons can be deported."

Does not the Senator from New York know that, although known criminals have been brought in under the processing by the Displaced Persons Commission, there has not been a single deportation?

I know the Senator from New York wants to be fair. That, at least, is something which must be brought out.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator from New York is very safe in saying that he wishes to be at least as fair in this matter as the Senator from Indiana. The Senator from New York agrees with the Senator from Indiana that an affidavit by a Communist does not carry much weight.

Mr. JENNER. None whatever.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe that members of the Communist Party, for the purpose of gaining their ends and the ends of their party, would be willing to commit many crimes, including the one outlined by the Senator from Indiana. But I want to make it very clear to the Senator from Indiana that every displaced person, before entering this country, is checked by the Counter Intelligence Corps of the United States Army and by the FBI. The Senator from New York apparently has much more confidence in the great organization known as the FBI than has the Senator from Indiana.

In addition to that, no person can come into this country, whether he is a displaced person or qualifies under the normal immigration laws, without a check being made by the consular service of the United States of America and by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. Not at the moment. Was the Senator from Indiana in the Senate Chamber yesterday when the Senator from New York read into the RECORD statements by the head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Chief of the Visa Bureau of the State Department? If he was in this room then he would not question in any way the statements which I have made or the degree of screening which has been made.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LEHMAN. For a question. Not for a speech or a statement, but for a question which I will answer.

Mr. JENNER. Very well. Does the CIC, when the name of a displaced person is referred to it for investigation, wait for the report from the Berlin Document Center or from the provost marshal's office?

Mr. LEHMAN. In reply to that question, I can say that of 134,000 immigrants admitted thus far to this country under the displaced persons law, only in the case of 70 were the papers representing the investigation of the CIC not appended at the time of the arrival of the immigrant into this country.

Let me further state to the Senator—and he should know this—that there have been only three cases out of the 134,000 in which the immigrant has been accused of fraud or moral turpitude and in which proceedings have been taken for his deportation to his native country. If those cases are as the Senator claims they are, then certainly the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the State Department or the FBI could have taken action and would have taken action against them.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENNER. It is not what the Senator from Indiana thinks. The Senator from New York was on the floor yesterday, and he heard the evidence submitted, as given by Mr. Alamanza Tripp, the head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in Europe, who said, as a matter of public record, that of the 134,000 displaced persons who have been brought into this country, at least 30,000 are doubtful security risks.

Let me ask a question in regard to the checks. The Senator from New York states that the Counter Intelligence Corps investigates. I ask the Senator, what could the CIC do in the way of investigation, and what does it do, when an applicant comes from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, or some other country in a similar situation? Representatives of the CIC cannot go into those countries to make checks, and they have no police records to check. So what does the CIC check amount to? Yet those who come from behind the iron curtain may include persons who will threaten the security of our nation.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to reply to that inquiry. The Senator from New York was on the floor yesterday; and he heard more misstatements and more inaccuracies than he ever thought it possible to be made on the floor of this great deliberative body, the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Not at the moment.

Statement after statement was read and reread. But when the Senator from New York asked the authority for those statements, he was told that one man or another man came to a hearing and made an informal statement or whispered into the ear of this Senator or that Senator; but there was no proof. I asked time and time again, "Give me the proof of this"

Mr. JENNER. Mr. Tripp testified at a public hearing, and his testimony is a matter of public record. He is the one who said there are 30,000 doubtful displaced persons in this country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me point out to the Senator from Indiana that a great point was made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] that the chief of the Visa Division of the State Department, Mr. L'Heureux, had made certain statements and asked that certain provisions be included in the bill. I asked, "Where is the record of that?" Oh, no, Mr. President; the Senator did not give it.

Mr. JENNER. But I have here the record of Mr. Tripp's testimony, if the Senator from New York wishes to have it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to have it, because time after time the Senator from Mississippi told the Senate that no

record of that was kept, but that the witness came to the committee and the committee members talked informally. I even pointed out that it was an unusual procedure for a committee which was supposed to be holding a public hearing.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from New York has expressed his own amazement at what he considered to be the staggering number of misstatements made on the floor of the United States Senate yesterday. Because a considerable number of the Members of this body, of whom the Senator from Washington is one, are endeavoring to understand and appreciate every facet of this extremely difficult, delicate, and complicated question, I ask the Senator from New York whether he will be so kind as to state for the benefit of the RECORD, which a number of us will study in considering this case, and to outline precisely, in detail, his charges of misinformation and inaccurate statements or inaccurate examples which, according to what the Senator from New York has said in the past few minutes, were given by so many other Senators on the floor of this body yesterday.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York will be very glad, indeed, to inform the Senator from Washington. The statement was made by the Senator from Mississippi and, I think, by other Senators who have spoken, that the sole authority for the admission of the displaced persons into this country rested with the IRO, the International Refugee Organization, and with the Displaced Persons Commission. When I suggested the inaccuracy of that statement, and pointed out that the final authority and power rested with the Immigration and Naturalization Service and with the consular service of the State Department, my assertions were denied. I had the greatest difficulty, as some of my colleagues may recall, in obtaining permission from the Senator from Mississippi to insert into the RECORD statements made on the authority of the head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Chief of the Visa Division of the State Department. I finally obtained that permission, and I inserted that statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where any Senator or any member of the public who has access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can read it.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENNER. I think this is one of the points that is really confusing to all Members of the Senate who have not followed this subject closely: Is it not correct that the Immigration officials and those in charge of the issuance of visas, for the State Department, have jurisdiction over the immigration laws, but not over the Displaced Persons Commission? There is the conflict, it seems to me.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well; that is a fair question, and it deserves an answer.

Mr. JENNER. I think it should be cleared up.

Mr. LEHMAN. I will answer that in my speech within the next 10 minutes.

Mr. JENNER. Very well.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. CAIN. I simply wish to know whether the reference the Senator from New York has just made to a given example of what he considers to be an inaccurate statement made yesterday, constitutes his résumé of the many inaccurate statements made yesterday, as he has stated.

Mr. LEHMAN. By no means.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. But that was the most important one, because it was the thesis of the Senator from Mississippi, namely, that there was not sufficient security. I propose to show in my own words that, in addition to what I have read, displaced persons are going through the most rigorous inspection and check that have ever been carried on in immigration matters in this country.

In addition to the seven rigid and new procedures carried on, and to which I have already referred, it is not conceivable that the Catholic Church, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the Synagogue Council of America, and all the other major religious groups in the United States would be strongly supporting a program which would permit the infiltration of Communists into the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have just returned to the floor, and I am informed that the Senator from New York has stated that the Senator from Mississippi made numerous inaccurate statements yesterday. I should like to have the Senator from New York list the statements which he says are inaccurate.

Mr. LEHMAN. The able Senator from Mississippi will recall that yesterday I refuted beyond any question or beyond any argument his statements that the displaced persons coming into the United States under the Displaced Persons Act were not screened, first, by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and, second, by the consular service. I put that into the RECORD. The Senator from Mississippi may go through the RECORD. I said yesterday, in the presence of the Senator from Mississippi and other Senators, that I was willing to rest my case and his case on the RECORD, and that is what I propose to do.

I intend now to develop the evidence which will show the extent and the thoroughness with which the inspection is carried on.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York will not yield until he has read more of his statement. The Senator from New York is doing exactly what the Senator from Mississippi did yesterday. He wishes to develop his case.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the Senator from New York has used my name.

Mr. LEHMAN. I certainly used the Senator's name, and I am perfectly willing to rest on the record which was made. That is what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is for. I have already told the Senator that there were inaccuracies time and time again in the statements made by the Senator in denying that the screening was carried on by the consular service and by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and claiming that the full authority and sole authority rested in the hands of the Displaced Persons Commission.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then the Senator from New York desires to rest on a misquotation; is that correct. He misquoted me, and I now understand that he wishes to rest on a misquotation. Is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Mississippi can take the floor at the conclusion of my remarks and can point out where the Senator from New York misquoted the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from New York, if that is an indication of his fairness.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator from Mississippi wish the Senator from New York to read the statement he put into the RECORD yesterday? It will take time to do so, and of course it is quite available to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have read the statement, but the Senator from New York has just stated that I said the Immigration and Naturalization Service did no screening. What I said was that there was no adequate screening by them; and that they were bound, under the elements that qualify under the Displaced Persons Act, by the decision of the Displaced Persons Commission. I submit that that statement is accurate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well. It is in the RECORD, and our colleagues can form their own judgment from what is in the RECORD. As I said yesterday, I am very willing to rest my case on it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Where are the numerous statements which the Senator from New York says are inaccurrate?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senate can form its own judgment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is my understanding correct that the Senator will comply with the answer he gave to the Senator from Washington and will place in the RECORD the inaccuracies in detail?

Mr LEHMAN. No, the Senator from New York did not say that.

Mr. WHERRY. What did the Senator say?

Mr. LEHMAN. The junior Senator said he would outline and sketch and describe the procedure that is being followed from the time an application is made by a displaced person for admission to this country, until he arrives here. The Senator from New York intends to do that at this moment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further, that I may ask a clarifying question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether he does not feel that it is imperative, inasmuch as some of the hearings are not available, and in view of the fact that he made the charge that there were inaccuracies in the statements not only of the Senator from Mississippi but of other Senators, that he should state what those inaccuracies are? If we are to make up our minds on what the issue is, it would be most helpful to have the complete viewpoint of the Senator from New York, as well as that of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York has already stated the basic and main inaccuracies, and he put the statement in the RECORD yesterday. I refer to the denial by the Senator from Mississippi that the screening was done by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and by the consular service, and his further statement that full authority over displaced persons rested in the hands of the Displaced Persons Commission and the IRO. Those are inaccuracies, which I pointed out. I put the proof of those inaccuracies into the RECORD. Beyond that, the RECORD is complete, and every Senator can read it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand the distinguished Senator from New York, the inaccuracy which is really basic is the one he has just discussed. I think I understand the Senator's viewpoint on that particular issue. Will the Senator say it is the main point with respect to which misrepresentation has been made, or is there something else that is as vital as that, which the Senator has in his mind at this time?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York will answer the Senator from Nebraska by saying that the inaccuracies which have just been pointed out are extremely important, and that they go to the heart of the matter.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. In a moment. The Senator from New York will not characterize the importance of various statements made on the floor, which are in the RECORD. Every Senator has a right to read the RECORD and may reach his own conclusions.

Mr. President, if I may answer the question of the Senator from Washington, who asked me about secret methods pursued and the checks that are made, I intend to cover that in my address.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; if the Senator will permit, I shall not yield at this time. I want to put this material in the RECORD, after which I shall be glad, indeed, to yield for as long a time and as frequently as the Senator from Mississippi may wish.

Mr. EASTLAND. Very well.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is not conceivable that the Catholic Church, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the Synagogue Council, and all the major religious groups in the United States would be supporting a program which would permit the infiltration of Communists into the United States.

After careful study of the whole problem, the special subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, in a document known as No. 1507, issued only last month, reported as follows:

> The number of screening agencies, screening sessions, interrogations, investigations, and checks that a displaced person must pass before reaching the United States is so extensive that the chances of a fraudulent statement or a forged document to slip through is practically nil.

Two specific charges were made on this floor Wednesday. The first is that the CIC's security screening is curtailed to exclude investigation as to the authenticity of documents, with particular reference to alleged date-line frauds. This is not so. I again direct the attention of the Senate to the report of the House Judiciary Subcommittee, where there is reprinted testimony of the CIC's supervising officer overseas. On page 73 of this report you will find a copy of a CIC work sheet, which includes this line:

> 3. Interrogation of subject.
> (a) Discrepancies from information listed on registration forms.

The testimony shows that the CIC interviews every single displaced person and conducts a neighborhood check on every single displaced person.

In order to learn just exactly what this interview encompasses, I have taken the trouble to study the CIC's procedure for investigation of immigrants, which was instituted on November of 1948, at the outset of this program. Since this document is classified and I have not had enough time to request that it be declassified, I will not put it in the RECORD. However, I am authoritatively informed that the CIC has instructed its agents that in interviewing a displaced person—

A. The interrogation must include inquiry as to items of personal history listed on the registration form. As indicated in the above-indicated testimony, the purpose in part is to determine the truth or falsity of such statements, including, of course, such statements as relate to date lines and entry into the areas in question; and

B. The displaced person's documents must be checked to determine whether they are fraudulent or authentic.

This CIC procedure should dispose, once and for all, of any claims that no American official checks on the authenticity of documents. Certainly no one is better equipped in these two fields than the Counter Intelligence Corps of the United States Army, the so-called CIC.

There has crept into these debates the innuendo, if not the assertion, that the Displaced Persons Commission ignores the security findings of the CIC. I am advised that this is completely untrue. The fact is this: Where the CIC reports that it appears that a person is a member of or has participated in a movement hostile to the United States or the form of government of the United States, such finding is regarded by the Displaced Persons Commission as conclusive. Apart from human errors, the Displaced Persons Commission has always rejected every person whom the CIC found to be a possible security risk. This is the Displaced Persons Commission's rule, and has been the instruction to all Displaced Persons Commission employees.

Mr. President, we all have been hearing and speaking at great length about this displaced-persons program and the displaced-persons legislation. Allegations were made before the Senate Judiciary Committee about the calculated risks to our national security that we are taking with these displaced persons, and the allegedly loose way in which the program has been administered by the Displaced Persons Commission.

I think we may have become lost in a forest of words and symbols. We have heard so much about the DP Commission, the IRO, the INS, and the many other alphabetical agencies that we may have lost sight of the actual individuals involved. We may have lost sight of the physical process—the long and almost endless process, which has been established to evaluate, screen, and process these displaced persons.

It is a long process, and to the individuals involved, no doubt a heartbreaking one. If we Americans were subjected to any such procedure in order to get a visa to go abroad, or to get anything, we would complain—as many of us do anyway—that here is bureaucracy raised to its most maddening degree. Yet we have heard in the Senate, in the course of this debate, that there is not enough bureaucracy, the process is not long or careful enough, that not enough caution and delay are involved.

I have prepared a skeleton description of the various steps which an individual in Germany, Austria or Italy has to take in order to come to the United States as a displaced person, and the processes to which his application is subjected.

I should like to describe this process to the Senate, so that my colleagues and the country may judge whether the screening process is perfunctory or inadequate—and please remember that this is a skeletonized description:

First. The DP makes known that he is a candidate for emigration to the United States and requires an assurance by—

(a) Registering with a United States voluntary agency;

(b) Communicating directly with friends or relatives in the United States; or

(c) Registering with IRO for eventual interview by the selection unit of the DP Commission.

Second. The DP awaits nomination on an assurance or selection by DP Commission.

Third. After the necessary assurance is given, the DP is called into the IRO resettlement office for the preparation of his documentation.

Fourth. Complete fingerprints of the DP and his family are taken on official provost marshal forms, in duplicate.

Fifth. Photographs are prepared for each family member.

Sixth. The DP and his family are given preliminary medical examination by IRO doctors.

Seventh. A resettlement registration form is prepared, showing vital statistics, date of first entry into one of required areas, employment history, data of displacement on persecution, educational background, documents available, dates of first registration with Army, UNRRA or IRO. This is signed by the DP.

Eighth. The DP returns to his camp or other place of residence to await further call. Meanwhile he is assisted by IRO legal officers in preparing affidavits and translations of documents on vital statistics and civil status required by United States consuls.

Ninth. The resettlement registration form is checked by the IRO against his original care and maintenance form at the IRO control center, containing information gathered at the time of his original registration. Any discrepancies are noted on the registration form. Certification of IRO eligibility is then added by the IRO international officer.

Tenth. The DP must procure a good-conduct certificate from the camp police chief or, if he is an out-of-camp resident, from the German or Italian or Austrian police authorities.

Eleventh. The IRO forwards the registration form, fingerprints, photographs, good-conduct certificate, medical-examination report, documents on vital statistics, affidavits, and any other pertinent papers, to the DP Commission area office.

Twelfth. The DP Commission officer reviews the entire documentation to determine existence of basic qualifications for preliminary determination of eligibility. If considered necessary, the DP and his family are called into DP Commission area office for interview.

Thirteenth. If all documents and facts comply with the law, the regulations and directives, the DP Commission officer makes a notation of preliminary eligibility and the file is forwarded to the Counter Intelligence Corps of the United States Army.

Fourteenth. Simultaneously, pertinent data on the DP is forwarded by the DP Commission to the United States consul for checking against lookout records and other information for special sources.

Fifteenth. Simultaneously, a form containing complete data on the DP and his family is forwarded to Washington for submission to and check by the FBI.

Sixteenth. In the case of Czechoslovakian refugees being considered under section 2 (d) of the act, a similar form is forwarded to the United States consul for an additional special and confidential investigation.

Seventeenth. The CIC initiates its investigation, which includes—

(a) Check against CIC central registry files for security and other information.

(b) Check against CIC area registry files for security and other information.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that what I am now reading, starting with (a), which will continue to (j) involves checks which CIC, a highly important branch of the United States Army, makes routinely and intensively on all displaced persons.

(c) Check against Berlin Document Center records for information relating to German citizenship, Nazi Party affiliations, or miscellaneous Nazi group activities.

(d) Check against military government court records for information on arrests and convictions.

(e) Check against German police records for information on arrests and convictions.

(f) Provost marshal analysis of fingerprints for establishing identities against previous applications for visas on criminal records.

(g) Check against IRO local camp records for information relating to identity and behavior.

(h) Interview by United States Army CIC agent with the DP agent with the DP and his family, covering information contained in registration form, establishment of identity, examination of documents, comparison of fingerprints, and any other information that may be adduced.

(i) Interview by United States Army CIC agent with at least three neighbors of the DP, covering identity, behavior, and general reputation of applicant.

(j) Investigation of any leads which may develop.

Those are all parts of the CIC procedure.

Eighteenth. The case file is returned to the DP Commission by the CIC with the report of the investigation.

Nineteenth. The DP Commission officer, other than the one who determined preliminary eligibility, reviews the entire file, including basic eligibility and investigative report. If all factors are favorable, he writes a report accordingly.

Twentieth. The Commission's report and entire case file is forwarded to the United States consul for consideration in the DP's application for a visa.

Twenty-first. Simultaneously, the DP and his family are called for and from the camp or other place of residence to the resettlement center.

Twenty-second. The DP and his family are given thorough medical examinations by the United States Public Health Service, including chest X-rays and serology tests.

Twenty-third. The DP and his family are called in by a United States vice consul for a preliminary examination with respect to existence of appropriate and necessary documents.

Twenty-fourth. The DP and his family are scheduled to reappear before the vice consul when full consular examination is made for admissibility under normal immigration laws; the application is signed at this time, and the DP must swear as to the veracity of statements contained in his file. If all is in order, the visa is made out.

Twenty-fifth. The DP and his family are scheduled for examination by an inspector of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to whom the visa and entire case file are passed.

Twenty-sixth. The Immigration and Naturalization Service inspector reviews the case file and examines applicants for admissibility under normal immigration laws and accuracy of all other factors relating to his immigration under Public Law 774. When approved, the visa is endorsed by the examining inspector.

Twenty-seventh. The DP and his family are scheduled for transport to the port of embarkation and are placed on the shipping list for departure.

Twenty-eighth. Prior to embarkation, the DP and his family are given a further, last minute medical examination by IRO doctors.

Twenty-ninth. Upon arrival at United States port, the DP receives a United States Public Health Service debarkation check.

Thirtieth. Upon arrival at a United States port, the DP receives an Immigration and Naturalization debarkation check.

I must emphasize that these 30 steps are those which occur when no—I repeat, no—disqualifying, contradictory, or derogatory factors or information emerges. When unfavorable evidence does develop, further investigative steps are taken and the case is not concluded until all questions are satisfactorily resolved. If any doubt remains, the case is disqualified and the applicant is rejected.

I have described the process in areas where the United States Army CIC operates. Similar sources of information are used in other areas and, with minor differences in procedures, the same process applies.

Now, Mr. President, it would be my judgment that I have disposed of the argument that insufficient security screening is provided in the admission of these displaced persons. I would say that every possible effort is being made to screen these applicants and to reject the unworthy or even those regarding whom doubt existed. I would not want

to tear down this machinery and build new and different machinery. If there are any loopholes in the machinery I have described, they are invisible to the eye of the junior Senator from New York. Of course, Government officials and employees are human, and all of us are fallible. Some few mistakes may have been made not only in admitting one or two or three individuals, but in hiring one or two or three employees of the Displaced Persons Commission, just as mistakes are made in hiring employees of any Government agency. But let us not confuse this circumstance with any large-scale condemnation of the DP program or of the DP Commission. Let us see this entire program and undertaking in perspective. Let us get on with it.

Mr. President, we have testimony from virtually every responsible and reputable relief and civic organization favoring the liberalization of the old law through the adoption of the minority substitute. The head of the CIO and the president of the American Federation of Labor have testified that the small number of additional persons who may be admitted under the substitute will in no way adversely affect the labor market in our country. We have their testimony and the testimony of thousands of intelligent and high-minded people that displaced persons, carefully, rigidly, and exhaustively screened, will be a great asset to our country.

Mr. President, I know this situation at first hand. I have visited displaced-persons camps. I have met many of these people. I have met them in the camps. I have met them at embarkation and debarkation centers. I have met them in this country, where they have taken their places in the economic and social life of our land. A few months ago I was one of the reviewing officers of a great Polish parade, held in New York City. There was in the parade a detachment of approximately 1,000 Polish displaced persons, led by their priests, since they were all Catholics. I had seen some of those people in the displaced-persons camps. If I had not seen the same persons, I had seen their fellows, men like them. When I saw them in displaced-persons camps they were cowed; they were fearful; they had hatred in their hearts; they were hopeless. A few months later I saw these men marching up Fifth Avenue in New York, men who had taken their rightful place in the life of their new community and in the life of their church. I cannot describe the difference. Instead of frightened, hopeless, bitter men, these men strode up the avenue with confidence, with hope, and with a dignity which anyone could envy, either here or in any other part of the world.

These men were proud of being on the road to American citizenship. They were eager to take their place in the community life of their adopted country.

When I see these men, and many thousands of others like them, who have come to us from displaced persons camps, and have been transformed into good, sound, loyal, hard-working Americans, Mr. President, I am proud beyond words for the part which I have been privileged to play in the administration of the displaced persons program. I want to see it made possible that others in the category of displaced persons may also have the chance of becoming loyal, hard-working citizens of our country.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has spoken very movingly of his feeling for displaced persons, for whom I also have the same feeling. I wonder if the Senator's compassion extends to people of German ethnic origin, who also meet the qualifications prescribed in the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. I can answer the Senator's question very readily. My parents were German. My father came to this country 102 years ago.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the Senator——

Mr. LEHMAN. May I answer the Senator's question?

Mr. EASTLAND. The bill does not include German nationals.

Mr. LEHMAN. My father left Germany, together with other rebels against tyranny and oppression, like Carl Schurz and other eminent Germans, because they hated and feared the German regime, which at that time was an autocratic, repressive, and militaristic regime. I would have no objection to the admission of anyone who qualifies under the displaced persons law, and who actively and sincerely fought nazism, just as I fought it, and as I am fighting communism and every other form of totalitarianism.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator adds "and those who fought nazism."

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator refer to persons who have been called "expellees"?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know the identity of all of them. Under the terms of the bill, as the Senator knows, many expellees will be admitted into the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. But not under the substitute.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator knows that a great number of expellees were responsible, at least in part, for the hostilities which commenced in 1939. I refer particularly to what are known as Sudeten Germans.

Mr. EASTLAND. They are not eligible under the committee bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I answer the question? I refer particularly to the Sudeten Germans, who tried to destroy Czechoslovakia, a great democracy, of which they were citizens. They fought against the country of which they were citizens. They were the ones who helped Hitler overrun and conquer Czechoslovakia.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the Senator——

Mr. LEHMAN. I am answering the Senator's question. At the end of the war, when Czechoslovakia again became a free country, with the help it received from democratic nations of the world, these people were expelled from Czechoslovakia. They are among the expellees. Frankly, I have no sympathy for them. They were disloyal to their country. They wanted to be a part of Germany. They supported Hitler and all the beasts who surrounded Hitler. No, I have no sympathy for them.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the Senator does not mean to infer, does he, that those people would be eligible under the bill which the committee reported?

Mr. LEHMAN. There are 8,000,000 of them, and I think that some of them would be eligible in the number of 54,000 which has been mentioned. I think some of them, under the definition of the committee bill, would be eligible in competition with the officially defined displaced persons.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator please point to the provisions of the committee bill which would let in people who cooperated with Hitler, as the Senator describes? If it does contain such a provision, we will certainly amend it, but it was not my understanding that it did. Does not the Senator know that many of these persons were in concentration camps established by Hitler before the war was over?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly the Senator from New York knows that, and certainly such persons would qualify.

Mr. EASTLAND. People of German ethnic origin? Then who besides that class are eligible under the committee bill?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course they would be eligible. The Senator from Mississippi refers to people of German ethnic origin; he himself has used that term. I do not believe the Senator claims that under the committee bill people of German ethnic origin, some of the 8,000,000 would not come into competition with those we know as displaced persons.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course they would come into competition, but no man of German ethnic origin would be disqualified under the committee bill because of his race, as he is now disqualified under the IRO constitution.

Mr. LEHMAN. These people were displaced persons.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senate committee bill further provides that no one who cooperated with Hitler, or with the Nazi movement, is eligible.

Mr. LEHMAN. The people whom I have described, from Czechoslovakia, who are among the 8,000,000 we have been discussing, are of German ethnic origin, and under the committee bill I think some of them would qualify.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator mean to tell me that the ones who cooperated with Hitler, and were pro-Nazi——

Mr. LEHMAN. They were all pro-Nazi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator mean that women and children, little children, who were 5 or 6 years old at the time, were pro-Nazi?

Mr. LEHMAN. I cannot believe that the Senator does not recall the history

of the rape of Czechoslovakia. It happened only 10 years ago.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, I do.

Mr. LEHMAN. And the Sudeten Germans, who now are in Germany and who compose part of the 8,000,000 expellees.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the committee bill provides, as the Senator knows, that any individual who was a member of the Nazi party, or who was pro-Nazi, who cooperated with the Nazis, is not eligible for admission into this country as a displaced person. If some persons of Germanic blood, who were pro-Nazis, as the Senator said, could get in here, I should like to know under what provisions of the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. I point out to the Senator from Mississippi that he is certainly entitled to his own views and his own preferences. If he thinks the Sudeten Germans and many other persons who were sympathetic and helpful to Hitler and the Nazi cause, and who were harmful to the cause of Czechoslovakia and other countries to which they owed allegiance, should be put on the same plane as the actual displaced persons, that is certainly within his right. But that is where we differ.

Mr. EASTLAND. I could charge the Senator, as he did me, with making a misstatement, but I shall not do so. The Senator well knows that there is no provision in the Senate committee bill under which any Sudeten German or anyone else who cooperated with the Nazis could come into this country.

Mr. LEHMAN. I cannot prove it, that is perfectly obvious, and the Senator certainly has a right to his own opinion and to his own sympathies, but I believe that the Sudeten Germans of Czechoslovakia were in the main or almost wholly pro-Nazi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Show me a provision in the bill under which they could come into this country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Because they are expellees. The bill, by its definition, places expellees in virtually the same categories as the others.

Mr. EASTLAND. Even the substitute permits them to use half the German quota.

Mr. LEHMAN. We let them use half the German quota after very, very careful screening. But the committee bill permits them to come in under two categories. It permits them to come in under the category we have just discussed, and also under the category in competition with the regular displaced persons, as defined in the substitute.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Permit me to continue.

Mr. CAIN. Very well.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator from New York point out to me any provision in the committee bill under which a pro-Nazi or any individual who has cooperated with Hitler can get into this country?

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not understand the question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the Senator point out a provision of the committee bill under which a pro-Nazi or one who cooperated with Hitler can get into this country?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not thing the Senator will question that an expellee of German ethnic origin could be admitted into this country under his bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator spoke of the system of screening, which he said was adequate. Has the Senator attended any of the meetings of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary before which testimony was taken from Government employees respecting the system of screening in Europe?

Mr. LEHMAN. Meetings of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. No, the Senator from New York was never invited to attend any meetings of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. EASTLAND. As a matter of fact, was not most of that testimony taken before the Senator from New York was a Member of this body?

Mr. LEHMAN. I assume that a great deal was taken before that time, yes. I asked the Senator whether it has all been made a matter of public record, and I understood the Senator to say no, that it has not all been a matter of public record.

Mr. EASTLAND That is another inaccuracy, Mr. President. I did not make such a statement. I stated I did not know, and I do not know. I am not in charge of the bill, nor am I chairman of the subcommitee. But what I should like to ask the Senator is this: Has he ever attended a meeting of the Immigration Subcommittee at any time when testimony was taken respecting the system of screening used in the admission of displaced persons to the United States?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York, of course, has not attended any of those meetings. He could not have attended the meetings which were closed, and he never was invited.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator does not mean to say that the Senate committee meetings were closed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly, executive sessions were held.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, that is another inaccuracy. It is well known that the Senate committee meetings at which testimony was taken, were open, and newspaper men were present.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator claim there were no meetings held in executive session?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, there were meetings in executive session.

Mr. LEHMAN. Then, why should the Senator presume to accuse me of making an inaccurate statement?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I did not accuse the Senator of making an inaccurate statement. I said I had been accused of making such a statement. I would not accuse the Senator from New York of deliberately having made misstatements.

Mr. LEHMAN. I point out to the Senator from Mississippi that yesterday, in the debate, he made a number of statements which he attributed to Mr. L'Heureux, the head of Visa Division of the State Department. The Senator from Mississippi made persuasive statements.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to discuss that feature. But before doing so I should like to have an answer to the previous question I propounded to the Senator from New York. The information I want is this. The Senator has described the screening system, and he has said it is adequate at every phase. The Senator stated that he had never been to a meeting of any committee, anywhere, which took testimony bearing on screening of applicants to enter this country as displaced persons. That was the question I asked the Senator. Is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly I have not attended those hearings.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator——

Mr. LEHMAN. May I answer in my own way?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly I have not. I could not attend the meetings until I took my seat in the Senate on the 3d of January. Since then I certainly have never been invited to attend any of the meetings. As I understand, some of the meetings at least—and I make the statement based on what the Senator from Mississippi has said—some of the meetings at which it is alleged that very important testimony was taken were executive in character.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; the testimony I read, with one exception, that of a former Army colonel, was testimony taken in open hearings which the Senator could have attended. But that is beside the point. Will the Senator tell me where he has made a study of the system of screening used in Europe to screen applicants who desired to enter this country as displaced persons?

Mr. LEHMAN. I can tell the Senator that very easily. I visited the camps.

Mr. EASTLAND. When was that?

Mr. LEHMAN. In June 1949, 7 months ago. I was at the chief resettlement center at Butzbach, and I was in Frankfurt and Kassel. I visited other points there and spoke to representatives of the IRO, which is an international organization, as the Senator pointed out. I spoke to representatives of the Displaced Persons Commission, which is an American organization, as the Senator knows. I spoke to representatives of our consular service and I spoke to representatives of our Immigration and Naturalization Service. Their desks were almost adjacent. One could hand a paper from one desk to another. Of course, I know about that.

Mr. EASTLAND. Did the Senator study the system of screening? That was the question. Did the Senator study over there the system of screening?

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not examine each, or any, of the applicants myself.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, the Senator did not; but I did not ask the Senator that question. I asked him if he studied there the system of screening.

Mr. LEHMAN. I hope the Senator will understand that what I have read today into the RECORD—and I trust that it will be convincing—was a statement of the methods, of the procedure followed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Did the Senator——

Mr. LEHMAN. May I answer? I described the great care with which the CIC undertook to screen these people. Now, if some individual member of the CIC fell down on his job, or if some individual member of the consular service fell down on his job, I greatly regret it. But, as I pointed out, Government officials, like other people, are human, and undoubtedly some mistakes have been made. That, however, does not affect the rigidity or the soundness of the screening process, which, in my opinion, goes further than any similar process ever undertaken by this country.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York has not answered my question. I asked him if he studied the system used in Europe to screen applicants?

Mr. LEHMAN. I told the Senator that, of course, I studied it. And, what is more, I have also studied the system used by our consular officers and by our Immigration Service.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is the information which the distinguished Senator has given to the Senate today based on his study there? Is that information the Senator acquired in Europe as the result of his studies?

Mr. LEHMAN. It is certainly based on my knowledge of the system. I cannot give the Senator any assurance that of the many hundreds of officers employed in the various agencies everyone has done his duty, nor can I give the Senator any assurance that every one of 134,000 displaced persons who have been admitted to this country is going to be a worthy citizen.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course the Senator cannot. But my question was: Is the information which the Senator from New York gave the Senate today based on knowledge he acquired as the result of his study in Europe, or is it based on information received from the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr. LEHMAN. It is based on both, of course, and on information from other agencies. It goes back further than that, because I wish to state with great pride that for 3 years I was Director General of UNRRA, the greatest relief organization in the history of the world, an organization that saved millions of lives, and, by the way, an organization which made more friends for the United States than has any other organization.

Mr. EASTLAND. I voted for the UNRRA legislation.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator spoke of the screening at the Berlin Document Center.

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I did not; that is to say, I did not say I had observed it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Where did the Senator from New York get the information about the Berlin Document Center?

Mr. LEHMAN. I get a great deal of information. I think I try to keep fairly well abreast of the times.

Mr. EASTLAND. Where did the Senator from New York get the information about the Berlin Document Center?

Mr. LEHMAN. Where did the Senator from New York get the information that George Washington was born on February 22?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I repeat, where did the Senator from New York get the information about the screening by the Berlin Document Center?

Mr. LEHMAN. I said the papers came from the Berlin Document Center.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator from New York know that the officials did not wait for a report from the Berlin Document Center?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York does not know that.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then does the Senator from New York say that the testimony of the officials of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in that respect is inaccurate?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know to what testimony the Senator from Mississippi refers. The Senator may have the statement of some person stating a conclusion.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would the Senator from New York believe Mr. Squadrilli?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think Mr. Squadrilli is a reliable man. When was he examined?

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator from New York know that Mr. Squadrilli testified last night that they took a calculated risk in rushing the applicants on, and in not waiting for a report?

Mr. LEHMAN. But were not all those papers then forwarded to the CIC and to the consular service and to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, as I stated? That does not mean that they were not processed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator from New York know that many persons in this category have come into the United States?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am inclined to doubt that the Senator from Mississippi can show that many of these persons have been admitted into the United States without screening by the Immigration Service.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the testimony.

Mr. President, did the Senator from New York speak of fingerprinting?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly I did.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator from New York know that the man in charge of the fingerprinting in Berlin has testified that it was a joke and that applicants were not getting proper screening?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not recall that. But as I say, no matter what system is used, there may be men who will fall down on their jobs; it is impossible to prevent that. Furthermore, in every large organization there may be persons who are unworthy of the trust which is reposed in them. Unfortunately we had many cases of that sort in our armed forces and in the Government services.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, while I was absent from the floor the distinguished Senator from New York told the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] that I made numerous misstatements and inaccurate statements on yesterday, and I am informed that the Senator from New York said he would list them in the RECORD.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to correct that; I did not say that. The Senator from Washington asked me, "Will the Senator list the steps that are taken to screen these people?" My answer was, "Yes; I will."

I further said, and I said it several times—and if the Senator misunderstood me or if I misspoke, of course, I wish that corrected—that the statements and representations made by the Senator from Mississippi and the representations and replies made by the junior Senator from New York are in the RECORD; they are a matter of the record which is before the Senate and may be read.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make an observation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANGER in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I wish to make an observation only for the reason that the name of the junior Senator from Washington has been brought into this colloquy.

Shortly after the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] began his statement earlier today, he said, as I recall, that he was literally amazed by the number of inaccurate bits of misinformation which had been offered on the floor of the United States Senate yesterday——

Mr. LEHMAN. And Wednesday.

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington merely rose to ask the junior Senator from New York if he would list, in as much detail as possible, the instances which he considered to be either misinformation or inaccurate statements, for the benefit of the other Members of the Senate.

As I recall, I had no colloquy of any kind with the junior Senator from New York in regard to the steps leading to the screening of such persons overseas.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understood the Senator from Washington to ask that question.

However, since the question has been raised, I repeat what I have said before, namely, that I think I have pointed out many misstatements and many inaccuracies in statements made on this floor.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator point out those inaccuracies?

Mr. LEHMAN. They are also in the RECORD.

I said, and I do not think it can be denied, that on several occasions the

Senator from Mississippi baldly made the statement that the screening of the applicants was inadequate and ineffective and was based on a desire to get as many relief cases into this country as possible.

Mr. EASTLAND. I made that statement.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator again made the statement—not once, but a number of times——

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator from New York yield right at this point, to permit me to say that I plead guilty to having made that statement, and I supported it.

Mr. LEHMAN. But I contend it to be an inaccuracy.

May I continue, inasmuch as the Senator has asked me to state——

Mr. CAIN. I hope the Senator will continue

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say that the Senator from Mississippi has made the statement several times that the complete authority and power connected with the admission of displaced persons into the United States rested with the IRO, which he dubbed an international organization, as it is, of course, and with the Displaced Persons Commission, which was manned by persons in whom the Senator from Mississippi said he had no confidence; and he said that they had the full authority.

The junior Senator from New York questioned him, and asked, "Is it not a fact that the final authority for the admission of these persons rests with the Immigration and Naturalization Service and with the consular service?"

Mr EASTLAND. Under the immigration laws

Mr. LEHMAN. Under the immigration laws Then I read a statement, as the Senator may recall. I am not sure whether the Senator from Washington was on the floor at the time.

Mr. CAIN Yes; I was on the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. I read a statement from the head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and another statement from the head of the Visa Division of the State Department, saying that they not only had authority but that they exercised their authority to pass on these cases; that they never had surrendered it and would not surrender it, and that the only thing they had assigned to the Displaced Persons Commission was a determination and definition as to whether a particular displaced person qualified under the displaced-persons law.

So I have pointed out what I think are those gross inaccuracies. Beyond that, I refer the Senators to the RECORD.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, at this point let me say that if the Senator from New York will examine the RECORD, I think he will find that what he said is exactly what the Senator from Mississippi has said, namely, that under the immigration law, the determination of eligibility by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and by the consular service is final, and they can veto; but the determination of the factors under the Displaced Persons Act is made by the Displaced Persons Commission and is final. Is not that an accurate statement?

Mr. LEHMAN No; it is not an accurate statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. It certainly is accurate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me point out that the Immigration Service has control, and has authority to exclude anyone on the grounds of moral turpitude, subversive qualities, or ill health.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator from New York know that that is under the general immigration law?

Mr. LEHMAN. It makes no difference; these people are screened under the provisions of the general immigration law.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the factors the distinguished Senator from New York has just mentioned are grounds for exclusion, under the general immigration law; and the Senator from Mississippi has always said the Immigration Service has that power.

But in regard to eligibility under the displaced persons law, let me ask the Senator whose decision is final.

Mr. LEHMAN. What is the question?

Mr. EASTLAND. On questions of eligibility under the Displaced Persons Act, whose decision is final?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me point out to the Senator from Mississippi that his whole thesis in this debate and the thesis of some of my other distinguished colleagues——

Mr. JENNER. The Senator from Indiana is one of them——

Mr. LEHMAN. Is that this bill permits subversives to enter this country.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. And that they are not properly screened; that they are persons who would become a subversive danger to this country; or that persons who suffer from moral turpitude will be admitted into this country.

I say there is less likelihood, I believe, that such persons will come into this country under the Displaced Persons Act than there is that such persons will come into the United States under the old immigration law, because under the Displaced Persons Act there are not only the same standards of admission, but very much greater standards of admission, since the persons are screened by two additional organizations.

Mr. EASTLAND. Now, Mr. President, will the Senator from New York answer my question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly.

Mr. EASTLAND. I ask the Senator, was not the final determination of eligibility under the Displaced Persons Act with the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr. LEHMAN. Only the question of whether the applicants were eligible to be considered as displaced persons.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is exactly correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I beg the Senator's pardon. I think the Senator will find the RECORD will show that he claimed the determination with regard to eligibility, propriety, and safety of allowing the people to come into this country rests with the Displaced Persons Commission, or with IRO.

Mr. JENNER. What is the difference?

Mr. LEHMAN. All the difference in the world.

Mr. EASTLAND. Did not the Senator from Mississippi say, to be perfectly frank and fair, that the consular service and the Immigration Service had the power to veto the application of a subversive, but that they did not have the facilities at hand with which to investigate the large number of people making application, and that they were bound by a file sent to them, a file which originated in IRO, a file made up largely by displaced persons, and that it went down the line to the consul, and that he was bound largely by the information contained in the file?

On that point, the Senator from New York certainly remembers, if he desires to be fair, that the Senator from Mississippi placed in the RECORD the order or regulation promulgated by the Displaced Persons Commission, which gave that power. I placed it in the RECORD yesterday, or the day before If there is a misstatement, it is bound to be based on the order I placed in the RECORD.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York may say to the Senator from Mississippi, I am glad to have his acknowledgment again that the determination with regard to the eligibility of displaced persons to enter this country rests with the Immigration Service.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is under the immigration law.

Mr. LEHMAN. It rests with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and with the consular officers.

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the general immigration law.

Mr. LEHMAN. What difference does it make? I fear I have not made myself clear.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is not a question of that, as I understand. It is a question of the misstatement or inaccuracy for which I was indicted. I should like to know where it is.

Mr. LEHMAN. I pointed it out, but I should like to point out another thing, which apparently the Senator does not realize, namely, that the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe makes a determination with regard to the status of the applicant as a displaced person, but makes no determination whatever with regard to his eligibility to enter this country. That is a pretty definite statement, which I am perfectly willing to stand on.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from New York, as I understand, says it is done by the consular service. How can the consular service intelligently pass on an applicant, when adverse reports have been taken from the files?

Mr. KILGORE and Mr. JENNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from New York it seems to me we are dwelling on matters of no consequence. It is true that for a short time, and in a few cases, an adverse report was withdrawn, but a copy of the report directing its withdrawal was included. I wish to refresh the Senator's mind on that point.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is quite right.

Mr. KILGORE. The practice of withdrawing adverse reports was discontinued after a short time. I am reminded of the statement that it applied to many people. The question I ask is, how many? When it is said there were many, I ask, how many?

Mr. EASTLAND. The head of the Immigration Service estimated 30,000.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Thirty thousand have come into the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is, persons who are ineligible. That is the estimate. I do not want to be charged with inaccuracy or misstatement. That is the testimony given by Mr. Tripp, who is at the head of the Immigration Bureau in Europe.

Mr KILGORE. May I inqure whether his statement was, that he was not sure as to their eligibility?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct—"of doubtful eligibility," is what he said.

Mr. KILGORE He had his doubts.

Mr EASTLAND. "Of doubtful eligibility," he said

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not also a fact that it was admitted last night that because of fraud with respect to the determination of eligibility status, Mr. Tripp and his staff could turn down an applicant and that the consular service could also do so? A great deal was said about fraud, but the final determination of the question of fraud rests with the Immigration and Naturalization Service and with the consular service.

Mr. EASTLAND. The displaced person's status?

Mr. KILGORE. I refer to fraud on the part of a man in obtaining for himself a false status

Mr EASTLAND. The Senator means as a displaced person?

Mr. KILGORE Yes

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, they can determine it.

Mr. KILGORE Is that the Senator's expert legal opinion?

Mr EASTLAND. Yes, it is my expert legal opinion. It is a correct opinion. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, what about IRO, which maintains a legal division for the purpose of getting paroles for convicts, so they can come to the United States as displaced persons? In all the discussion of screening, I have not heard that mentioned.

Mr. JENNER Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN I yield

Mr. JENNER. I think it might throw some light on the subject to refer to the statement of Alex E. Squadrilli, the European coordinator of the Displaced Persons Commission, who testified respecting the calculated risk policy of the Displaced Persons Commission. He stated that although reports on applicants are requested from the Berlin Document Center and the provost marshal's office, the displaced persons are sent to this country without first receiving the reports. Squadrilli commented that the Displaced Persons Commission did not wait for the reports before sending the displaced persons to the United States, because to do so would slow down the program. He admitted he knew of a number of cases of displaced persons being admitted to the United States on the calculated risk policy, although the files from the Berlin Document Center and the provost marshal's office showed they had criminal records. He justified the calculated risk policy on the ground that after the criminals had been admitted to the United States, they would be subject to deportation when the reports were received. The fact is, however, that not a single displaced person has as yet been cited for deportation.

Mr LEHMAN. Whose statement is that?

Mr. JENNER. That is the statement of Mr Alex E Squadrilli, the European Coordinator of the Displaced Persons Commission.

Mr. LEHMAN. If the Senator from New York may inqure of the Senator from Indiana, whose duty does the Senator think it is? Is it not the duty of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the consular service?

Mr. JENNER. Of course, it is their duty. But why admit criminals as displaced persons, in the first place?

Mr. LEHMAN. What justification has the Senator for saying they are criminals? If they are criminals, would they not have been stopped by the Immigration Service? The Immigration Service has a right to stop them.

Mr. JENNER. Of course. They would not have been stopped, because the Immigration Service must have the records of the BDC, although the BDC has no interest in even checking them The Berlin Document Center has no interest in checking the provost marshal's records. All they would have had to do was to send notice here, and it would have been found that those persons were criminals. But they were not interested in that. The whole idea is to rush them over to America, to get 205,000 displaced persons into America before the law expires. That is why the Immigration Service and the consular service cannot find fraud, because the fraud was perpetrated by the IRO, and because there is a lack of interest on the part of the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe, in trying to screen out criminals and subversives.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The Senator from New York has the floor. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr KILGORE. Is it not a fact that the duty is specifically cast by the act in force upon the Foreign Service and the Immigration Service to enforce compliance with our immigration laws, and that the duty of the Displaced Persons Commission is to determine whether, according to the records they have, a man comes within the category of a displaced person, within the meaning of the definition, and there the responsibility and the power of the Commission end? Then, if the man has a criminal record, and the fact is ascertained by the State Department—and the Immigration and Naturalization Service have the same right—they are the ones who have the power to refuse an application on the ground of a criminal record. Is not that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator. He has expressed it and explained it very lucidly. I would only add one sentence, that not only have they the power, but they also have the duty.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I wish to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York yields the floor. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington.

HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as every Member of the Senate undoubtedly knows, the Housing and Rent Act of 1949, Public Law 31, expires on June 30, 1950. The question of whether that law shall be continued for an indefinite period in the future will presumably come before the Senate at some time between now and June 30. Yesterday the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the majority whip, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], introduced a bill which would extend Federal rent controls until June 30, 1951. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Everyone knows that there are members of this body who believe sincerely that Federal rent controls have served their purpose and outlived their usefulness, and that there is no good or sound reason for permitting the Federal Government to engage further in the management of private property. Those Senators believe that their case will prevail, and they are prepared and willing to test the question on the floor of the Senate at any time.

It is deserving of note that the bill to continue Federal rent controls beyond June 30, 1950, has been offered, not by administration spokesmen within the Banking and Currency Committee, but by the majority leader and the majority whip. One would have expected that the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], or the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Rents, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], would have in-

troduced the bill to continue Federal rent controls, but they did no such thing. The Senator from South Carolina has publicly stated that he had no intention of introducing such a bill, and so far as I know, the Senator from Alabama has said nothing. The State of Alabama, by the way, is to be decontrolled on May 31, 1950, as a result of action taken by its State government. All of this is to suggest that the administration is faced with another awkward situation. In his state of the Union message the President of the United States promised continuing Federal rent controls and its leaders in the Senate must make some pretense of fulfilling this political promise. Thoughtful persons everywhere, Mr. President, will be interested to observe that the administration has been unable to get its representatives on the Banking and Currency Committee to offer a proposal to continue Federal controls. The members of the Banking and Currency Committee are students of this question of Federal property management. Many Senators on the committee voted most reluctantly a year ago to continue Federal rent controls It is obvious that some of them can see no present reasons of any kind to continue the Federal rent law. The administration, however, possesses no such hesitancy. It is clearly much less interested in economics and facts than it is in politics. I have never heard it said that either the majority leader or the majority whip is an authority or student of the rent-control question. What they do know is what every other American knows, and that is that there are many more tenants than there are landlords. This knowledge, in my opinion, will not result in continuing Federal rent controls as it did a year ago

I have made this observation, Mr. President, because of my desire to assist in focusing public attention on this question of the management of private property by political procedures and agents of the Federal Government.

On Saturday, February 25, the Senate Appropriations Committee thought it proper to deny a large part of a deficiency appropriations request by the Housing Expediter. I have no desire to argue the merits of this action at the moment, but I do want to suggest that the action was taken, at least in part, because the Housing Expediter and those of his staff who were with him when he testified did not accurately or objectively provide the committee with the results of decontrol in various communities and States throughout the Nation. From reading the testimony offered by the Housing Expediter and his associates I gained the impression that those who testified assumed that the Senators who listened knew almost nothing about the operation of the Office of the Housing Expediter or about the Federal rent-control problem. Any impartial and reasonably intelligent reader of the testimony will begin to become convinced that the Housing Expediter and his office have a far greater regard for maintaining their jobs in perpetuity than they have for removing the Federal Government from the control of private property at the earliest possible moment. The Housing Expediter is now feverishly rushing around the corridors of our Congress in an effort to find those who will support his request for additional deficiency sums. If, finally, he does not secure from the Congress what he might reasonably need to operate his office until the rent law expires on June 30 of this year, he will have only himself to blame. He saw fit, when before the Appropriations Committee, not to be factual and accurate, when accuracy and a disclosure of the complete truth would have better served his own purpose.

I want to press this point of prejudice, self-interest, and perpetuating Federal controls a bit further.

In this morning's Times-Herald I read the following news item on page 3. Its title is "Round Table To Debate Rent Control in District of Columbia." The item is brief, and states:

> Whether rent control should be continued in the District will be discussed on the District Round Table on radio station WWDC at 10 p m Sunday Participants in the forum will be Representative Miller, Republican, of Nebraska; William Barr, deputy administrator of the national office of the expediter of rent control, and Rufus Lusk, president of the Washington Taxpayers Association.

As soon as I read this article I immediately began to telephone throughout the District to have someone tell me why an agent of the Office of the Housing Expediter was going to discuss whether rent controls should or should not be continued in the District of Columbia. Every Senator knows that the District has it own rent-control law, and this law, like the Federal law, has a termination date of June 30, 1950. I was told by those who sponsor the program, the junior bar section of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, that Mr. Barr, the Federal rent agent, would appear on the program to explain what had taken place in those areas throughout the land which have been decontrolled in recent months. Has one any right, Mr. President, to expect that an agent of the Housing Expediter will be any more factual or accurate than was the Housing Expediter when he so successfully defeated his own purpose when he recently appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of a deficiency request? One can only conclude that Mr. Barr will only use the inaccurate information which was employed by his superior.

I want someone to tell me what conceivable interest the Office of the Housing Expediter can have in whether or not rent controls are continued in the District of Columbia. The Housing Expediter and his staff are Federal agents. The administrator of rent control in the District of Columbia can be accurately thought of as being a local agent in the sense that he administers and has jurisdiction over a local or municipal situation.

If anyone is qualified to know what is taking place within the District of Columbia, it ought to be Mr. Robert Cogswell, the District of Columbia rent administrator. One would think that Mr. Cogswell, rather than a Federal agent, should be on that program tomorrow night. Was he invited, and if he was, why did he reject the invitation?

Fortunately, Mr President, it happens that Mr. Cogswell is a man who understands his job and its responsibilities, and he is a man of principle and character Mr. Cogswell was invited to take part in the program, but he rejected the invitation, as he ought to have done. He said that his job was to administer the law and not to lobby for or against its continuance unless or until he was called to offer his views to the appropriate committees of the Congress We can well afford to compliment Mr. Cogswell for his understanding of the true relationship between executive agents and legislative bodies.

Without prejudice, as a person, to Mr. William G. Barr, special assistant to the Housing Expediter, I want to point out and make very clear that he has no right of any kind to participate in the radio program to which I have referred. If he does so he will be completely guilty, to my mind at least, of coming under the provisions of title 18, Public Law 772, of the Eightieth Congress, second session, section 1913. This law provides that "no member of the executive branch shall attempt to influence in any manner a Member of the Congress to favor or oppose by vote or otherwise any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation."

Mr. President, I should like at this time, or at any time in the future, to have any Member of this body or of the House of Representatives stand up and deny that that is the law of the land and that it should be observed. It is being broken, as we all know, by agents of the executive branch of the Government, 365 days out of every year.

If Mr. Barr takes part in the radio program tomorrow night, he will simply be lobbying for the continuation of the Federal rent law and the District of Columbia rent law. He will use the prestige of what ought to be a high office, at least an office which our people could respect, to influence legislation which is the concern, not of the Office of the Housing Expediter, but of the Congress of the United States. If Mr. Barr understood his responsibility, as Mr. Cogswell, the local agent, understands his, Mr. Barr would have been the first to appreciate and then decline the invitation to talk about a question which is none of his official business.

Mr. President, as an individual Senator I am far too busy to worry further at this time about whether Mr. Barr does or does not appear on tomorrow night's program. As an individual I expect to listen to that program; I want to go to hear it, if time permits me to do so; and I hope that any statements made by

anyone on the program will be accurate. If the statements are taken out of official Government documents, they had better be accurate. If Mr. Barr, an administrative assistant to the Housing Expediter, is on the program, and if he uses the information which the Housing Expediter used before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate last week, which resulted in the Housing Expediter not getting what he asked for, I shall be privileged to draw that to the attention of this body. Should Mr. Barr, however, see fit to relate what obviously are the facts, which the Housing Expediter, Mr. Barr's employer and superior, did not use, I shall likewise be pleased to call the contradictions to the attention of the Senate of the United States.

It would hardly be proper, but under these circumstances it might be considered to be absolutely necessary, for the Housing Expediter to say one thing before the Senate Committee on Appropriations and for the Housing Expediter's special assistant to say quite another thing on the same subject to those who listen to this local radio program tomorrow night.

Mr. President, the Office of the Housing Expediter has been charged by the past several Congresses, at least by the several in which I have been privileged to sit, with removing the Federal Government from the management of private property just as soon as that is possible. All their energy, their concentration, their loyalty, and their efforts should be directed to this end. Until their mission has been achieved, it seems to me there is neither time, excuse, nor reason for any agent of the Housing Expediter addressing himself to a District of Columbia problem, with which the Office of the Federal Housing Expediter has no remote connection or legitimate interest.

CONGRESS MUST ACT TO PREVENT RECURRENCE OF STRIKE PARALYSIS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, with the announcement of the agreement between the coal negotiators, the Nation has heaved a sigh of relief. Thus, once again, by the mere whim of one labor-union big shot and a few men across the conference table, America has been spared a complete national paralysis.

Now, the Democratic administration will undoubtedly urge everybody to forget the whole thing until the next big national crisis looms. In my 11¼ years in the Senate, I have seen these off-again, on-again national stoppages, but never has the Democratic administration had the guts to come forward with permanent legislation for the statute books to prevent the public welfare from being crucified time and again. The administration hopes that the public will sit back in complacency and will not remember how close it came to economic disaster. But, Mr. President, I, for one, will do everything I can in order to seek a permanent solution to this problem—a solution that will be fair to the interests of both labor, management, and, most important of all, the general public.

It is quite clear that the Taft-Hartley law, far from being a decisive weapon against strikes such as this, can be sabotaged by those who maladminister it. Thus, the President invoked the Taft-Hartley law too late to do any real good. Then when the contempt case was presented in the courts, Department of Justice attorneys miserably failed in their responsibility to present the affidavits about the union complacency. In other words, Mr. President, the basic problem that we face is: No single law which the Congress has written thus far is foolproof against a national paralysis because the administration can and has maladministered the statute.

I submit, therefore, that those of my colleagues on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should consider amendments to the Taft-Hartley law in connection with the injunction provision, to tighten that provision and to make it more foolproof against those who want to violate it in letter and in spirit.

America will no longer tolerate these off-again, on-again lynchings of the public welfare. We are sick of being thrown from the frying pan into the fire. We demand a permanent solution to strikes in key industries in which the national health, welfare, and safety is involved.

Let not our people forget the closing of their schools, the shutting down of their factories, the reduction of railroad operations, the shivering patients in the hospitals. Let not our people forget that five times the Government has seized the coal mines. Let not our people forget that the President has used the Taft-Hartley law eight times, although he has repeatedly asked that this vital law be repealed.

The administration wants the people to forget these facts, but it is the job of the Republican Party and all independent-minded citizens to repeat them again and again so that the national interests will not again be endangered.

John L. Lewis pulled off his strikes at will during the Second World War. Dare we allow this situation to recur in the event of world war III with atomic bombs falling on America? Has any individual in the administration thought of the terrible possibilities of national suicide by allowing this sort of situation to occur again?

The master minds in the Communist Kremlin must be rubbing their hands with glee. How delightful they must think it would be for them to begin an atomic war on America when, let us say, another coal strike is on, our railroads are shut down, and 1 or 2 days' fuel is left in our factories. Do not the administration leaders recognize that even if such a strike were called off in the event of an atomic attack, it takes literally weeks and weeks before the fuel stock piles in our factories can be replenished and before the railroads can resume full operations. The administration has been tampering with national suicide, and I say it is time for the Congress—for members of both political parties—to have the guts to end this deplorable tottering on the brink of disaster.

TRIBUTES TO THE VICE PRESIDENT ON THE THIRTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS SERVICE IN THE CONGRESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senate has been discussing a very controversial issue, namely, the question of displaced persons. As usual, on both sides of the aisle there have been some very forceful arguments presented on an issue which is far reaching. We have such issues before us very often. During my service here we have debated some questions which to my mind have meant much to the future life of America and the world.

The question of displaced persons, although it is a very serious one, brings to my mind one who now is in our midst and who is anything but a displaced person. I refer to our distinguished and beloved Vice President, ALBEN W. BARKLEY. He became a Member of Congress 37 years ago today. He has served in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, and is now serving as Vice President.

I should like to say, in a very serious, but also humorous vein, that he was pretty well screened when he came from the State of Kentucky, and certainly he has been screened many times since then. I believe no one gets a more thorough screening than a man in public life, particularly in the legislative branch of the Government. Every time he has made an invasion, first, as a Representative from his district in Kentucky, then as a Senator of long years of service, and finally as Vice President of the United States, he has been well received. Not only has he been successful in his legislative invasion but he has been most successful in his invasion recently of the State of Missouri in his domestic relations, when he brought a little of the spirit of St. Louis back to Washington.

So, Mr. President, on this thirty-seventh anniversary, to the day, of the Vice President's arrival here, first as a Representative and then as a Senator, I wish to extend to him, having served with him when he was majority leader in the Senate and since he has been Vice President, my wholehearted felicitations and congratulations on his 37 years of very valuable service, and I know that in that statement I speak the sentiments of every Senator on both sides of the aisle.

In concluding, Mr. President, I should like to say that I am glad there has been long continuity in the service of the distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate and when 1952 rolls around, if the next Vice President must be a Democrat, we would prefer to have ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, return in that capacity. [Applause.]

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the years since March 4, 1913, have covered a long period as we measure time. It was in 1913 that we laid the foundations of all estimates of property values so far as income-tax purposes were concerned. That made that year peculiarly significant in my mind.

But there is a happy side to the picture. During these 37 years there has served in the two Chambers of the Congress a man who has always been a most loyal partisan, yet without bitterness and without guile, an upstanding American in public service.

Many things have happened since March 4, 1913. Two great wars have been fought. The soldiers of this Nation have marched away to fight in foreign lands, and in the Second World War in almost all the areas of the earth where men were called upon to fight. The distinguished Vice President of the United States lived through those wars as a public servant. He knew all the heartaches which men in public life were called upon to hear in those eventful years, and all the difficult decisions they had to make in 1917 and again in 1941.

Mr. President, it is a happy circumstance that this distinguished public servant has lived to enjoy the good will, the confidence, the esteem, and the love of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, in all parties, during this long period of his distinguished service.

There were in this body on March 4, 1927, when the distinguished Vice President became a Member of the Senate, only two men who are here today, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the senior Senator from Georgia, the present speaker. Time and politics have taken a great toll of the Members of this body since March 4, 1927. Particularly has that been true of both parties in the Congress since March 4, 1913.

Many things have occurred in the world. It is doubtful whether in all the history of mankind so many great events, so many world-shaking events, have occurred as have taken place within that period of time.

Yet, here is the Vice President, in good health, and, as always, in a happy frame of mind, because he has never borne malice against anyone in or out of public life. He has disagreed, but disagreements do not always amount to a division or dispute upon any essential or controlling principle. He has differed, of course, in politics, because that has been the history of American politics, and properly so; but always without malice and always without guile the distinguished Vice President, who now has the honor to preside over this body, during all this long period of time has lived a life worthy of a great American statesman and public servant.

I am very happy to be here now—and I hope the Vice President will be here many years after I have departed this scene—to attest not only my own personal feeling but what I believe to be the feeling of all Americans everywhere, regardless of party. Certainly no one entertains for the Vice President anything but that profound respect which is due to a good public servant who has borne his part in many a hard battle, but without malice, and always relying upon the worthiness and justice of his cause.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would not want this day to pass without adding a word to what has already so ably been said by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I believe I am the only Member of this body who is a second generation Member, who has served in either the House or the Senate with the distinguished Presiding Officer. It so happened that my father served in the House of Representatives with the distinguished Vice President of the United States. One of my earliest recollections is of the very high regard in which my father held the distinguished Vice President during the years he served with him in the House of Representatives.

When I came to the Senate I had already formed a very high regard for our distinguished Presiding Officer. He was then occupying the position of majority leader. I know of no majority leader who carried a heavier burden than he did in the months immediately following the close of the great World War, when a change had taken place in the national administration. While debates on the floor of the Senate were sometimes tense, always at the close of the discussion Senator BARKLEY, by some appropriate story or some felicitous remark, relieved the tenseness, so that when the time for adjournment came the Members of the Senate left the Chamber with that sense of fellowship for which this body has been known throughout the years.

Mr. President, I wanted to make these few remarks in paying my own high personal respects to one who I think is not only an outstanding public servant but one of the great Americans of this period.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I cannot recall the day when the Vice President came to Congress. I was born 5 years thereafter. I can say, however, that during the brief period of my service in the Senate I have had some occasion to observe the great qualities of leadership of the present Vice President of the United States.

I recall well that when the statue of my father was dedicated in the Capitol building the then majority leader, now the Vice President of the United States, delivered an address in which he bespoke his admiration for a man with whom he had frequently disagreed, but who stood forth and fought for what he believed was a righteous cause. The fairness and impartiality of the Vice President have always been typified by such events, and over the years, long before I came to the United States Senate, in my estimation he had reached the highest possible stature.

As one who was born after the Vice President of the United States commenced his service in the Congress, I certainly hope that those of us who follow after him may be able to live up to the great traditions he has developed and the fine example of American statesmanship he has established.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is a historic day in the Congress of the United States. Over the long period of time this Republic has been in existence, few men have served continuously for 37 years in the Congress of the United States. Few men, if any, have given more of their time and effort in the promotion of the ideals of the Republic than has the distinguished Vice President, to whom we do honor upon this occasion.

When I first came to the Senate some 11 years ago, the present Vice President of the United States was then the majority leader of this deliberative body. Like all neophytes who come here and do not have a clear understanding of parliamentary procedure and the various questions which come before the Senate from time to time, it was necessary for me to seek advice and counsel. I sought that advice and counsel from the then majority leader, Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky No one was ever more charitable, more kind, more constructive than was he.

As I stand here today as the majority leader of this great deliberative body, the only one of its kind now in existence in the world, I believe I am more conscious of the burdensome problems which were on Senator BARKLEY'S shoulders than I realized when I was simply a Member without any particular responsibilities on the floor of the Senate. To one sitting on the side lines, he seemed to perform his work rather easily. It was, of course, easy for him to carry the heavy burden of work that rested upon him, because of his familiarity with parliamentary procedure, because of his vast experience in legislative work, and because of his profound knowledge of the rich traditions of America from the time of the founding fathers.

Mr. President, I have always looked upon the Vice President as one who was the champion of oppressed humanity, as one who believed that this Government of ours was a moving thing, not one that was static but one that constantly kept pace with the march of events.

Mr. President, it has been my great privilege and pleasure to serve with the Vice President since I have been in the Senate. He has been of great inspiration to me, and I know he has been of great inspiration to other Senators who have served with him, whether they were Democrats or Republicans. He has been and is eminently fair. He has attempted to mete out justice, both as majority leader and as Vice President, believing, as the great Senator from Georgia said, in charity for all and malice toward none.

Mr. President, in the years to come may you continue to work for justice and peace, may you preserve faith in your country, may you continue to have good health, may you live long and enjoy unbounded prosperity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will ask the indulgence of the Members of the Senate to make a brief response to the very generous remarks which somewhat took the Chair by surprise. I had not recalled today that this was the thirty-seventh anniversary of my

entrance into the House of Representatives until our thoughtful, efficient, and beloved Secretary, Leslie Biffle, reminded me of it a while ago.

When the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] began his remarks, I was really in truth and in fact physically a displaced person, because I was seated on the floor of the Senate, where I so frequently sit, and which I enjoy doing. But I was not the possessor even at that time of a displaced heart, because I always enjoy reminiscing about events which took place during my service on the floor as a Member of the Senate. I really love to resume a seat there now and then and sit down by Members of the Senate on both sides and talk about anything that comes into our minds. Sometimes I perpetrate a story upon them. Which reminds me of the fact that Abraham Lincoln was the greatest story teller who ever held public office in the history of the United States.

There is a very amusing and lovable story about him when he was practicing law in Springfield, Ill. Judge David Davis, whom he later appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States, was the presiding judge of the court. Mr. Lincoln was not engaged in the trial of the case that was pending, but was seated over in one corner of the courtroom telling stories to a group of lawyers and friends. They were so amused at the stories that they were disturbing the court. Finally Judge Davis rapped on the bench, and said, "Mr. Lincoln, there can be only one court held in this courthouse, and I think I am going to hold it."

Whereupon the group disbanded, and quiet was restored.

A few minutes later Judge Davis called up to the bench one of the participants in the previous disorder in the courtroom, and leaned over and whispered to him, "What was that story Lincoln was telling?" [Laughter.]

Since the Members of the Senate have been so generous and kind as to recall that this is the thirty-seventh anniversary of the beginning of my service in the Congress, I have been thinking of what has happened since I entered the Congress of the United States as a young man. When I entered the House of Representatives, I was approximately the same age that the Senator from Louisiana was when he entered the Senate. Today there is in the House of Representatives only one man who entered the House with me at that time, and that is the Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. Only two Members of the House who were there when I came, are still in the House. One is the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina; the other is the Honorable ADOLPH SABATH, of Illinois.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has said, many things have transpired during those 37 years, which constitute approximately a generation. Two world wars, into which we were unwillingly drawn, have been fought. Tragic aftermaths of those two wars followed, as of course frequently happens after wars. Our position in the world has changed. During that period our Nation has grown in population by almost 300 percent. Our wealth has increased by about 400 percent. During those 37 years, our position and influence and responsibility among the other nations of the world have increased to an extent far greater than it would have been possible to have foretold at the beginning of that period. Political parties have changed. Administrations have changed.

I have served, in one capacity or another, under every President from Woodrow Wilson to Harry S. Truman. I had the pleasure, of course, while serving in either the House or the Senate, of engaging in many controversies affecting our domestic affairs and our international relationships. Many changes in viewpoint and in many of the basic conceptions of the relationship of the Government to the people and of the people to the Government have taken place during those 37 years. I am happy to say that, without regard to the political party in power or the identity of the administration in control of the Government at any particular time, nothing which has taken place has weakened my faith in the fundamental honesty of the American people and the basic foundations of the sort of democracy and the sort of Government under which we live.

I do not believe that any economic changes, any political changes, or any social changes which may take place in this great Republic, either in the near future or in the distant future, will operate to change the high regard and respect which the American people have for their Government and for their political and social institutions. Not only during another 37 years, but during the centuries that are to come, I believe we shall continue as a democratic Nation, a Nation in which Lincoln called a government of, by, and for the people, and what Jefferson referred to as a government in which there should be equal rights to all and exclusive privileges to none, will be maintained. It is my fervent and profound hope and prayer that the influence of our country and of our Government and of our people upon the other nations and peoples of the world will be so effective and so profound that before any of us here have "shuffled off this mortal coil," we may see all over the world democracy, freedom, liberty, and self-government in which all the people, without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin, may not only be permitted to participate, but which they may control for their own welfare. That is real democracy, that is real self-government, that is real liberty, and in my judgment democracy and liberty are interchangeable terms.

Let me thank all the Senators who have been so gracious as to remember this anniversary and to speak so kindly about me in relation to it. I feel a deep sense of humility. I have an abiding affection for every Member of the Senate, and always have had, without regard to any political differences, without regard to geographical locations, without regard to our economic views, without regard to our religious affiliations. Regardless of any differences we may have along any of these lines, I am sure the respect, admiration, and affection I now have for the Members of the Senate will never diminish, and that statement applies with equal force to the entire Government of the United States and all its branches.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before today's session closes, I wish to say that I am sure all Members of the Senate deeply appreciate what the distinguished Vice President has just said, and all of us know what affection he has for all Members of the Senate.

I am very happy that this is the thirty-seventh anniversary of the distinguished Vice President's coming to the Congress. I am happy about it for many reasons. The last one I happened to think of while I was listening just now to the Vice President is that the observance of this anniversary gives him an opportunity to make a speech in the Senate. Frequently he has told me that he would like to leave the rostrum and come down to the floor of the Senate and address the Members of the Senate and the country. I know that as he presides over the Senate he frequently observes the majority leader and other Members of the Senate miss points which he always caught so ably when he was serving as majority leader of the Senate.

So I am glad the Vice President has had this opportunity to make a speech. I am sure he appreciates the opportunity, too, because up until this time he has not made a speech in the Senate since he has been Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his reference to me; but, in reply, I wish to say that I have never observed the Senator from Illinois miss any points. To the contrary, he thinks of points that I never thought of during the time when I served in the position in which he now serves so ably.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may say a word at this time, I should like to point out that I try to help the majority leader think of those points. I do so as often as I can, for I do not want him to miss any of them. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. Of course the Senator from Nebraska is always very cooperative.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course whenever either the majority leader or the minority leader wishes to confer with the Chair on such matters, he is always at liberty to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. That happens frequently, so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MORRIS, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. WHITE of Idaho, Mr. LEMKE, and Mr. D'EWART were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 204) for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche, and it was signed by the Vice President.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.), under the order previously entered, the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 6, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST

John B Blandford, Jr., of Virginia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Advisory Commission of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Russell S. Berkey, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief of Information, Navy Department.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following two officers of the United States Coast Guard for promotion to the rank of rear admiral:

Capt. Arthur G Hall
Capt. Norman H. Leslie

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite and eternal God, in whom we find the meaning and majesty of life, we are again approaching Thy throne compelled by many needs which Thou alone canst supply.

We pray that we may be men of vision and of valor, richly endowed with clarity of mind and courage of heart to meet and match the challenge of difficult problems, great responsibilities, and glorious opportunities.

May we bear testimony to men and nations everywhere that, as citizens of this Republic, we are mindful of one another's welfare and that in our common remembrance we are eager to carry one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ.

May Thy name be glorified. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIANS

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORRIS, MURDOCK, WHITE of Idaho, LEMKE, and D'EWART.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

EXPLAINS MISSING ROLL CALL

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday when the roll call was had on the Alaska statehood bill, I was recorded as not voting. That is correct. However, I wish to state that had I been here, I would have voted "aye." My reason for not being here was that I was making a public service radio platter in the radio room in another building, and I received no notice of the roll call. This is one of a very few number of times that I was absent on roll call in my 4 years in the House. It was certainly not intentional or deliberate.

The radio station platter which I was making was on a public service program of the radio station. I wish to make it perfectly clear, therefore, that it was not a political radio speech nor a partisan speech, and it was essential that it be made on yesterday. If, however, I had known or had any reason to believe that there would be a roll-call vote at about the same hour, I would have made arrangements for some other hour during the day.

Frankly, I would rather have missed the privilege of making the public service radio talk at all than to have missed the roll-call vote. For, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I believe my record of votes in the almost 4 years I have been here representing the great Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California will reveal my vigilant attitude toward being present here on the floor at least when any voting is called for.

CONGRATULATES PRESIDENT TRUMAN ON COAL STRIKE SETTLEMENT AND AGAINST NATIONALIZATION OF MINES

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to compliment the President of the United States upon the valiant, tenacious, and considerate, and yet firm, manner in which he and his distinguished associates handled the Federal Government portion of the miserable coal strike which was this morning announced as settled.

More than once in this House I have made it clear that I favor the use of Government controls and compulsory regulations as little as possible in the field of labor-management or, Mr. Speaker, in most any field of human relationships or endeavor. It is as clear as crystal to me that there is the most possible freedom of speech, of action, of thinking, of enterprise, where there is the least need for Government control or regulation.

Certainly the message from the President of the United States to us yesterday, which was read to us, should have made it clear to us and to the Nation that he as our President, representing all the people of the Nation, did not ask for congressional action until it became clear to him that the Nation's welfare required that soft-coal production should be resumed at once. In fact, he said as much. And he said that it should be resumed at once "in order to prevent human suffering and disastrous economic dislocation."

Furthermore, he told us frankly in his message:

> Since the union and the operators have failed to resume production and since recourse to the courts has so far proved ineffective, it is now my plain duty to propose further action Therefore, I recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing the Government to take over the coal mines and operate them as a public service.

But, Mr. Speaker, taking such step, as necessary as the President says it is, would again mean Government control of the production of a natural resource. I am not criticizing the President, Mr. Speaker. I say again I compliment him on the settlement. Collective bargaining and good faith is the very basis of enduring, constructive, and lasting labor relationships between labor and management. Apparently the President had evidence that constrained him to also say in his message to us:

> We have arrived at the present impasse because both the operators and the union have failed, month after month, to make the efforts in genuine bargaining which could result in a mutually satisfactory settlement. They have been unwilling or unable to lay aside their charges and countercharges, moderate their fixed positions, and undertake serious negotiation in a spirit of accommodation and mutual understanding.

And, then, further quoting the President's message, he made it clear to those critics of his and of the political party of which he is the leader that the Federal Government was not desirous, either directly or indirectly, of getting into the field which is called nationalization by the critics of the Democratic Party. The President said:

> I am not requesting this legislation as a means of settling the issues in dispute between the operators and the union. They will have to settle their differences through their own collective bargaining, just as though Government operation were not in effect. I do not propose to substitute the Government's representatives for the private operators at the bargaining table. It will not be our purpose to establish wages, hours, or working conditions which would bind either the operators or the miners upon resumption of private operations.

And, finally, he said:

> This is the real challenge of the present situation. It is a test of our ability to find a way to achieve adequate production of a raw material basic to our national life, while preserving the fundamental values of our free

institutions. Both our friends and our detractors in the rest of the world are watching to see how our democratic society will meet this challenge.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today at the conclusion of the regular order of business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an article by Hal Boyle, of the Associated Press, and in the other a statement by George Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, made before the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report by Gerald Bogan at the National Farm Institute convention at Des Moines, Iowa, recently.

THE BRITISH CABINET

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, while it is directly no concern of the United States as to the manner in which the British Cabinet is selected or the members thereof, for many reasons too numerous to mention in less than 1 minute, we have material indirect concern. To discover that the War Minister of the British Cabinet, John Strachey, made this statement in the British press yesterday, is sufficient to alarm and prompt me to at least direct attention to it. I quote:

> It has always been public knowledge that I supported the Communist doctrine in the years which preceded the last war.

Mr. Attlee and Mr. Strachey disclose this belief has been recanted in recent years.

Mr. Strachey is to have charge of the tightening up of British security as a result of the Fuchs incident. The fact that the British have a "red face" because of the Fuchs scandal is no reason to substitute a Red War Minister. I have consistently supported all aid to Britain; yes, and fought for it in committee and on the floor. Under our procedure Mr. Strachey would be declared a security risk. The British make it difficult to help them.

MINE OPERATORS PROLONGED STRIKE BY USING TAFT-HARTLEY ACT AS CLUB OVER MINERS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] in extending sincere congratulations and compliments to the President of the United States upon the dignified, sensible, courageous, and intelligent manner in which he acted in the recent coal situation. In my personal opinion, that situation was prolonged for several months due to the Taft-Hartley Act. I have been of the opinion since the start that the mine operators of this country used this act, conceived as it was in the Eightieth Congress, as a punitive measure against labor, as a club in the hope that they could drive the miners back into the pits and back to work. The coal miners sought negotiations last summer for a new contract, but as a result of the Taft-Hartley Act there has been no honest collective bargaining on the part of the operators in this situation. There can be no question that the Taft-Hartley Act has been the cause of chaos and confusion in the coal industry as in other industries. It should be repealed.

I commend the President for refusing to be stampeded by the Republican creators of the Taft-Hartley Act.

TREATMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES OF FOREIGN NATIONS

Mr. RIVERS Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will make it a penal offense for anybody in the State Department, the Department of Defense, or any other department of the Government to give to the representatives of foreign nations any more rights, privileges, or autonomies than our representatives get. I think what we ought to do to these babies is give them a little tit for tat. You let them have their phones tapped and have an FBI agent shadow them everywhere they go, just as they are doing to our people. When we have given them a little taste of this medicine, as they are doing to our boys in the curtain countries and in the Cominform countries, they may have a little change of heart. When they throw one of our Navy captains off a fast-moving train, let us toss a few of theirs off. Let us give them a little dose of the Rivers medicine. This world would be a much better place in which to live.

THE POLICY PAID OFF

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, everyone has heard of the Irishman who said he would give $10,000 if he knew the place he was going to die. When he was asked why he said, "Well, because I would never go near the place."

I have an Irish friend who, at the end of a year, when his accident insurance policy ran out, said, "If I had only known I was not going to have any accident during the year, I would never have spent the money on that insurance policy."

Personally I never waste any time regretting the money I pay for insurance, and I am sure the Members of the House will have no regrets over the inconvenience that may have been caused them by having the insurance that the House would be in session today so that if it had been necessary for us to take action in connection with the coal strike, the country would know that we were here on the job, ready and available.

We kept the pressure on, and the policy paid off.

APOLOGY ACCEPTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to note the apology that the gentleman from South Dakota makes to the House. That is the sum and substance of his remarks. He is apologizing for the arbitrary position he took yesterday when he knew that Monday was the earliest anything could be done in the House, and insisted on his position even after being served notice by the leadership that there would be no business today. He insisted on the House meeting today. The apology is completely in order. Although the gentleman should have thought of that and he had all the evidence to realize the situation last night—as I say, he should have thought of that yesterday, instead of thinking of it today. Nevertheless, when one makes an apology, all decent-minded people accept it in the spirit in which it is made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Dakota stands on what he did, and personally, I believe that the membership of the House, generally, is glad of the fact that the RECORD will show the Congress was in session today, on this Saturday, ready to act if the efforts to con-

clude the coal strike had not been successful.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman means if we had a chance to do that—and you were not apologizing, were you?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, not in the least; by being in position to act, we kept the pressure on.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not think you were, and did not so understand it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the New York State Housing Commissioner, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing, and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $191.34.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

MEMBERS COMPLETING 25 YEARS OF SERVICE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have had long, distinguished careers as Members of the House of Representatives. My attention was called to the fact that in the earlier days the new Congress convened on the 4th of March, and that some Members have today completed exactly 25 years of useful service. The Sixty-ninth Congress convened on the fourth day of March, 1925. Of the group who came to that Congress six are here today. I want to mention the names of those who today have served their country exactly 25 years, and I shall read them in alphabetical order.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] came to the Congress just a few weeks later, as the result of a vacancy.

These folks all have served their country well.

Mr. Speaker, of course, the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and others, have served many years longer, but I mention those Members who happen to have exactly 25 years of service today and I hope they will put in many more years of equally useful service in the House of Representatives, where they are all loved and respected by their colleagues.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON asked and was granted permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

WASTE AT RATE OF $100 A MINUTE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include some statistical matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1950, I reported on the official commodity inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation of 10 items which apparently could be utilized as surplus edible food. This was as of December 31, 1949. The total amount approximated 277,480 tons of surplus food commodities at a total cost of about $265,000,000. It was exclusive of the 50,000,000 bushels of surplus edible potatoes involved in the order of destruction which fortunately appears not to have been carried out to any substantial degree.

There are some very significant statistics in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture which have been released this week.

This afternoon I want to call your particular attention to the table beginning at page 1418 of those hearings starting with average monthly storage rates paid on commodities owned and, more especially the carrying charges on price-support commodities, fiscal year 1949 and first half of fiscal year 1950. There is a notation explaining that—

Carrying charges include transportation costs, warehouse charges, and other costs associated with the commodity including cost of sacks used, sacking charges, cooperage, weighing and inspection fees, reconsignment costs, etc., which are charged to inventory. Storage charges paid or accrued on loan collateral while under loan is charged to the cost of the commodities so acquired and any costs incurred directly pursuant to purchase arrangements are included in the purchase cost.

I have taken the carrying charges for the list of commodities I previously reported on so that we might have before us the total cost of those charges, with the exception of canned Mexican meat and I do not find the carrying charges on that item listed in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations. Then I call your attention to the statistics in the same hearings as to the use made of these and other products in the school-lunch program which we find at pages 1499 and 1500. While many other surplus food products are used, there is no indication that butter, edible dried beans, edible pried peas, rice, or turkeys have been distributed under that program. I do not know the reason for this but shall attempt to locate it.

For my present purpose I want to emphasize that in the first half of this fiscal year we have apparently paid a total of $10,786,209 for carrying charges on these commodities. Judging by some of the startling increases over the cost of these carrying charges for the full year fiscal 1948, the total for fiscal 1949 will run very substantially in excess of the totals for fiscal 1948.

This should focus attention on the resolutions introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.], and myself on February 2, 1950, and supported by 24 others of our colleagues. May I refer to the RECORD on February 20, 1950, at page 2000.

Let me quote the last sentence from those resolutions:

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation may advance as against handling and transportation costs in making delivery up to the equivalent of 6 months' storage costs on any such commodities turned over.

If these carrying charges on these items have continued at that rate during the first half of the fiscal year, they are running in excess of approximately $60,000 a day for a completely useless waste of public funds. From the date of the introduction of these resolutions, there is an accumulated waste which I am convinced will finally be in the order of $2,000,000. For every day lost in trying to get action on these resolutions the taxpayers will foot the bill to the tune of better than $60,000. Putting it another way, every hour's delay means a complete waste of Federal funds at the rate of better than $2,700 an hour, or more than $100 each minute.

I anticipate that someone will most certainly come forward with the argument that there have been net gains over the entire period of substantial amounts. For instance, that since October 17, 1933, when the price-support program for domestic cotton began, there is a net gain of $236,359,485, or, again, that on the price-support program on basic commodities that there has been a net gain in that period of $69,993,162. Of course it will be hoped by such an argument to indicate that a $100-a-minute loss in these specific carrying charges is a minor item and undoubtedly will be absorbed by net gains. However, it will overlook the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation's own analysis of the program shows net losses from October 17, 1933, through December 31, 1949, including the wartime consumer subsidy program, of $2,101,850,443 for $2,242,642,877.

And of even more importance any such argument entirely overlooks the fact that these carrying charges are a completely unwarranted and unnecessary cost to the taxpayer even though other parts of the program may well be justified upon further examination of the facts. I am glad to report that I have received an encouraging letter from the chairman on

the House Committee on Agriculture under date of March 2 reading as follows:

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Your letter of February 27, with regard to the various bills relating to surplus commodities has been received.

I have already requested a report from the Department of Agriculture, and I hope that hearings may be held at some time in the near future.

Cordially yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY.

I am today sending a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture which I am quoting for the information of my colleagues:

Hon CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR SECRETARY: I am enclosing a copy of the remarks which I have placed in today's RECORD Chairman COOLEY's letter refers to H R 7135, H R 7136, H R. 7137, and H R 7138. These were identical resolutions filed on February 2, 1950, and, as you will note, were supported by 24 others of our colleagues.

In view of the very substantial apparent accumulated and continuing waste of public funds involved in this procedure, I am sure that you will see to it personally that the report of the Department is promptly filed with the House Committee on Agriculture. I would appreciate the courtesy of having you send to each of the authors of these resolutions copies of that report.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. HESELTON.

I was much interested in the memorandum from the Administrator of Production and Marketing to Members of Congress which I received Thursday. I think it would be useful to have it, the statement on domestic availability of commodities dated February 27, 1950, and the very simple order form which can be used for requesting section 416 commodities in the RECORD. This is in sharp and pleasant contrast to the involved mass of red tape which surrounded the distribution of section 32 commodities, and which I placed in the RECORD February 20 at page 2000.

I have written Mr. Trigg today to inquire when other food commodities in surplus may be declared available and hope to have his advice early next week. I have also asked him if anything is being done to simplify the procedure under section 32 commodities.

Again I wish to point out the very obvious inequities so far as a great many communities are concerned in requiring them to pay transportation and other incidental costs from points of storage located some distance away. I submit that only through the enactment of the resolutions I have mentioned can this inequity be eliminated.

The statement and enclosures are as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1950.

To: Members of Congress of the United States.

From: Administrator.

Subject: Domestic availability of commodities under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

To assist you in answering the many inquiries you are undoubtedly receiving concerning the donations of food as authorized by section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 we have prepared the enclosed statement for your use.

Irish potatoes, dried eggs, and nonfat dry milk solids are, as of this date, available for distribution under section 416. The enclosed statement describes the groups eligible to receive these foods, how eligible recipients may order them, and the costs which must be borne by the recipient.

Eligible groups which request your assistance in placing orders for commodities should be referred to the area office of our Food Distribution Programs Branch serving your State. The area offices are in daily communication with the State agencies handling the distribution of section 416 commodities and thus can be of maximum assistance to groups wishing to participate in the program. The addresses of these area offices are shown at the close of the attached statement.

RALPH S. TRIGG.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
February 27, 1950.

STATEMENT ON DOMESTIC AVAILABILITY OF COMMODITIES UNDER SECTION 416 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 provides the United States Department of Agriculture with authority to donate to needy groups in this country certain food products acquired by the Department under its price-support operations.

This statement summarizes what commodities are available, who may obtain them, how they may be obtained, minimum conditions to be met by the receiving agency, and where additional inquiries may be directed.

COMMODITIES AVAILABLE

Food stocks that may be made available are those for which no market outlet in normal trade channels is foreseen during their storable life, thus exposing them to the danger of deterioration and spoilage. Such commodities will be donated at the point of storage, and beyond that point, all expenses incidental to handling, transportation, and repackaging must be borne by the receiving organization.

As of this date, February 27, 1950, three commodities—potatoes, dried eggs, and nonfat dry milk solids—have been declared available to designated groups. Potatoes were so declared on January 17, and are obtainable at purchase points in approximately 20 States. The other two items were announced February 8 as obtainable at storage points in a large number of cities throughout the country.

WHO MAY OBTAIN THESE FOODS

All three of the foods announced to date are available to schools for lunch programs, and to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and State and local public welfare agencies for the assistance of needy Indians and other needy persons. In addition, private welfare organizations engaged exclusively in welfare work are eligible to receive potatoes for the needy families assisted by them.

Patriotic and fraternal or service organizations, which are not basically devoted to welfare work, even though they maintain well established welfare units, are not in themselves eligible for section 416 foods. However, the groups or individuals normally assisted by the organization may become eligible upon certification as needy persons by the accredited public welfare agency. Such regulations on the receipt and distribution of commodities by private welfare groups are necessary in order to assure that commodities reach only needy persons as specified in the act, and in order that duplicate distribution be avoided in any city or local area.

State Departments of Public Welfare can in most cases clear up questions of eligibility concerning needy groups or families. Inquiries also may be directed to the appropriate area offices of the Food Distribution Programs Branch of the Department's Production and Marketing Administration. Addresses of the latter offices are listed at the close of this statement.

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

Foods offered under section 416 are announced through the press and radio services, by field offices of the Department's Production and Marketing Administration, and by cooperating State agencies.

Each official announcement describes the food offered, discloses its location, indicates the size and type of containers, and gives other pertinent details. Each announcement also indicates the minimum and maximum quantities which may be ordered, and whether the commodity will be available for an extended period of time

Available commodities will be located in warehouses or other storage places in various parts of the United States. The foods offered will have been thoroughly inspected by authorized USDA personnel and will be in good condition. The Department's inspection will assure wholesomeness of all products offered.

HOW TO OBTAIN AVAILABLE FOODS

Any agency or organization wishing to obtain foods available under the program may make application to the State agency acting as distributing agent for section 416 foods, or to the area office of the Food Distribution Programs Branch. No special forms are needed for the application. The applying organization, if eligible, will receive a single-sheet "Order Form" This is the only form required It is all-inclusive and covers all matters relating to the order and acceptance of the foods.

Only a few conditions need be met to obtain these foods. The applying agency must agree to limit its distribution of the foods obtained to eligible persons, and to see that all necessary precautions are taken to keep the donated food from entering normal channels of trade Also the agency must agree not to reduce its expenditures for food because of the receipt of the donated commodities.

Each order which includes these provisions covers only a single delivery of a specific quantity of a commodity. When an agency is informed that a commodity is available on a continuous basis, the agency may reorder this food item without subsequent notice of its availability.

SHIPPING CHARGES

The receiving agency, as specified in the act, must pay handling and transportation charges, including special charges for heating or refrigeration, if needed, from the point of storage or availability. Information concerning the cost of transporting commodities may be obtained from local transportation companies.

Receiving agencies having their own trucks may, in most cases, pick up and transport section 416 foods if they wish to do so.

PACKAGING

Most section 416 commodities will be available only in large containers. Any repackaging that is necessary must be done by the receiving agency. Repackaging, of course, must be carried out in full compliance with State and local sanitation laws.

AREA OFFICES, FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS BRANCH, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Northeast area, 641 Washington Street, N Y; Connecticut, District of Columbia, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, Maryland,

New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia. For metropolitan area, New York City, 90 Church Street.

Midwest area, 623 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Nebraska, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

Western area, 30 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco: Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

Southwest area, 101 Norman Building, Dallas: Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas.

Southeast area, 449 West Peachtree Street NE, Atlanta: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia.

Honolulu, T. H., 418 Dillingham Building: Hawaii.

San Juan, P. R., P. O. Box 4349: Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

ORDER FOR SECTION 416 COMMODITY

1 State | 3 Name of commodity

2. Agency order No. | 4 Quantity (number and size units):

5. Origin of commodity

6. Consignee

7. Via

8. Send collect wire notice of shipment to (Fill in only if desired)

(Name)

(Street and number)

(City) (State)

9. Number of persons and quantity for commodities requested

	Number persons	Quantity
Schools		
Institutions		
Indians		
Welfare		

The undersigned, being duly authorized to act for and on behalf of the below-named agency, hereby requests and agrees to accept the commodity under the terms and conditions on the reverse hereof, and in the quantity and at the origin shown above under the terms and conditions of allocation No. ____

10. Name of agency ____

11. Agency representative's signature ____ 12 Date ____

THIS SPACE FOR USDA—CCC ONLY

13 Approved for USDA—CCC. | 14 Date. | 15 Order void if undelivered by:

The agency ordering the commodity specified on the face hereof agrees to the following terms and conditions regarding its receipt, handling, distribution, and/or use.

1. Expenditures for food will not be reduced because of receipt of such food commodities.

2. The commodity will only be distributed to eligible participants for their consumption and will not be sold, traded, or otherwise disposed of.

3. All costs incurred subsequent to the transfer of title at the CCC point of storage will be promptly paid upon proper presentation by claimants. Such costs will include, but are not necessarily limited to the cost of transportation, special protective services, and handling charges.

4. Assumes entire responsibility for the adequate handling, storing, repackaging, distribution, and/or use of the commodity so that it will, insofar as practicable, be consumed by eligible participants.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, personally I am glad that the House is meeting today. We folks from the Midwest, 1,500 miles from Washington, like to stay here at work. The work completed to date is not very imposing. I listened very intently to the colloquy between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I must confess it reminded me of a patient I was treating at one time for cancer of the stomach, and he came to me complaining about a pimple on his nose. We ought to hold a meeting. There is work to be done. Let the leadership hasten the job so Members of Congress can go home and give the country a rest.

HON. FRANCIS CASE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, although I am here today at considerable personal sacrifice, I am extremely glad that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] insisted that we come here. The feeling has been so very intense because nothing was done about the coal strike that I, for one, am very glad to be here in case something could have been done. There has not only been great discomfort because of lack of coal but illness and real suffering. I understand the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] a week or more ago had introduced a bill that might have settled the coal strike if action had been taken. I would like to commend him for his tireless work since he has become a Member of this Congress. I was a Member when he first came here. Step by step he has progressed in usefulness until he has reached great stature in the House. He spent endless time in studying parliamentary procedure until he has become an expert parliamentarian, and he has been a very valuable member of the Committee on Appropriations. He is highly respected for his great integrity and sincerity, and he has been very helpful whenever he could be. He has been deeply interested in all veterans' and other problems in which I am especially concerned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I also congratulate, not only those who have served here for 25 years, but also those who have served longer—among them, as I recollect, ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, our beloved Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, CARL VINSON, ROBERT CROSSER, DAN REED, ROY WOODRUFF, EARL MICHENER, CLARENCE CANNON, EMANUEL CELLER, JOHN KERR, ALFRED BULWINKLE, E. E. COX, CHARLES EATON, JOE MARTIN, Mrs. MARY NORTON, and Mrs. EDITH ROGERS, and these who are now in their twenty-fifth year of service—CLIFFORD HOPE, our majority leader, JOHN MCCORMACK, RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH, CHARLES WOLVERTON, and AUGUST ANDRESEN.

But above all else, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the President of the United States for the splendid judgment he has exercised in the extremely trying conditions that confronted him and the country; that he did not permit himself to be forced one way or to act the other way. I think his action was that of the prudent and courageous man that he is.

I realize that the President has been subjected to tremendous pressure from both sides. Even his greatest critics, including my Republican friends who were trying to make political capital out of the coal strike must concede that when it became necessary for him to act, he did not hesitate, but acted. I am pleased to see he has brought about a satisfactory solution to this vexing problem, and that in the years to come I know the historians will credit him with extraordinary resourcefulness and sound judgment.

I wish to again congratulate him and the country upon the splendid judgment he has used.

Mr. Speaker, I have been here 44 years. If the Constitution had not been changed, setting a new date for the termination of the old Congress and the convening of the new, I now would have completed 44 years of service. Notwithstanding the Taft-Hartley Act that tried to enslave American labor, it has not affected me in my position in this body. I have been enslaved here for 44 years.

I am sometimes asked how it is that I can come back, and come back, and come back. I tell these friends who ask me, "Do right by the people, and you can come back as many times as you desire as long as you honestly represent your people." That is my advice, "Do right and fear nothing."

I know that most of those who have served here a quarter century or more have, at all times, had the interest of the people at heart, and I hope some who have not will follow their course in the future. To these right-thinking colleagues of mine I extend the hope and wish for many more years of continuous service, and that they may equal or surpass my length of service which now has reached the forty-fourth year.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I think our President deserves the commendation of every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle, and of all the people of the United States individually and collectively. He has shown that he has great patience, a thing a man at the head of this the greatest nation in the world must have. I think he has demonstrated that he has force of character. He has handled this coal situation in a firm and dignified manner.

In my opinion the Taft-Hartley law is the reason for this strike, and the Taft-Hartley law has worked a lot of harm in the United States; but the greatest harm it has worked is to the Republican Party. In my opinion the Taft-Hartley law is one reason the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is not Speaker of the House today, and one reason that Mr. Dewey is still in New York

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SIKES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I should like for some of these hilarious speakers boasting about the settlement of the coal strike to tell us just how it was settled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated?

There was no objection.

COMMISSION TO STUDY THE COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I introduced a joint resolution calling for the creation of a bipartisan commission to make a study of the long-range problems of the coal industry and to report in January 1951 to the Congress with its recommendations. I was delighted to note that yesterday the President included a similar recommendation as part of his message to the Congress.

All of us must recognize, I believe, that part of the difficulty we are in today is because the coal industry is in economic distress. The workers in the coal industry frequently get less than 200 days work a year. The mine owners, in many instances, find they have grave problems caused by the inroad of other types of fuel. These developments are having grave effects on this great basic industry.

I hope the Congress will proceed to consider this proposal forthwith and set up a commission similar to the Hoover Commission, a truly bipartisan commission which will bring to the Congress recommendations that may do away with the misery and distress which exist in the coal fields, eliminate the recurring crises in production, and prevent future dislocation of our economic life.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel rather favorable toward the adoption by Congress of the bill which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has introduced. I believe you must fight fire with fire. I believe that one must always in any real fight give back as good and, if possible, better than one receives. I do not believe you can kill a skunk by kissing him to death.

Here is another thing I want to mention: I can probably tell Dr. MILLER, my good colleague from Nebraska, just why that man came to him to have a pimple on his nose treated when he was dying of cancer. The man told me that he thought Dr MILLER was more capable of curing the pimple than in handling a cancer.

THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a wonderful and inspiring thing to contemplate the record of public service rendered by our distinguished and able Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. It was 37 years ago today that he entered upon his first term in the Congress of the United States.

That period of time spans a substantial and eventful portion of the modern history of our Nation, and in the making of that history Mr. RAYBURN has played a significant and influential part.

But, with the true modesty that is the hallmark of his greatness, his accomplishments in the field of statecraft have not been shouted from the housetops. That he attained the position that President Truman himself describes as "the second most powerful office in the United States" without fanfare, without publicity seeking, and without self-glorification, is evidence that his progress was due to work and not to words.

Speaker RAYBURN is a doer and not a talker.

The people of the Fourth Congressional District of Texas must have realized that long ago, because they have returned him to Washington every 2 years for 19 consecutive elections. And, in doing so, they have not only assured themselves of faithful representation of their affairs at the National Capital, but have given to the Nation a public servant of the highest order.

It is a little difficult today to reorient ourselves to March 4, 1913, the day that SAM RAYBURN first took the oath of office as a Member of the House of Representatives. But let us glance backward a moment.

Through the Mexican border incidents, through the First World War, through the so-called era of normalcy which followed it, through the dark days of depression in the early thirties, through the period of relief, reform and recovery, through the crisis of Pearl Harbor and the momentous national effort and ultimate victory of World War II, and now through the postwar problem period—through all of this SAM RAYBURN has served his country; served it faithfully, effectively, and modestly.

A whole panorama of national events, of political upheavals, of personalities appearing and disappearing from the scene could be recalled in connection with the period of Speaker RAYBURN'S career.

It embraces the term of Woodrow Wilson, his creation of the Federal Reserve System and other notable domestic contributions, as well as the tragic failure of America to accept the League of Nations.

It covers the era of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, the calm before the storm of economic disaster.

It includes the thrilling and active days of the early and later New Deal under President Franklin D Roosevelt, the close and daily application to vital problems of war and war production on which the fate of the Nation itself hung in balance.

Thus five Presidents have come and gone since Mr. RAYBURN first came to Washington, and, in the House of Representatives, his term of service has encompassed the regimes of seven Speakers before him, none of whom served longer continuously in that office

Only two Members in the House today—the venerable dean, ADOLPH SABATH, of Illinois, and our friend BOB DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, have been here longer than Mr. RAYBURN.

Even before his elevation to the speakership, Mr. RAYBURN left a solid imprint on the pages of legislative history of this country. He was for long the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and later majority leader. He was responsible for the enactment of a number of major laws having a basic effect upon the welfare and economy of the Nation; among them the Rural Electrification Act which brought to the farmers of America the benefits of the electrical age, the War Risk Insurance Act which gave protection to the servicemen and their kin, the Utility Holding Company Act, the Federal Securities Act, and the Stock Exchange Regulation Act, which for the first time imposed safeguards for the public investors in stocks and bonds, and a host of other measures I could mention.

The years he has spent in Washington have been years of accomplishment, of increasing responsibilities and burdens of office, and of growing influence in the councils of the Nation.

Yet Mr. RAYBURN, with all his success, with all his high position, with all the high respect and esteem in which he is held, still is unchanged in character from the young man sent here by his neighbors and friends in Bonham and the surrounding area.

He is straightforward and honest in his dealings with his fellowman, just as in his personal life he is simple in his tastes, without affectation or pomp.

The greatness of this man is in his plain dignity, the restraint with which he exercises power, the respect he holds for an opponent's views, the humility with which he carries his responsibilities, and, in his deep and abiding faith in our democratic processes and in the collective wisdom of the Congress as the direct representatives of the people.

Mr. RAYBURN comes of pioneer stock. As a boy he labored in the fields. We can be thankful that this sturdiness and strength maintains him in good health to be with us to observe this anniversary today, and this also makes us hopeful that we can continue every year to celebrate many more such occasions.

I believe it was Alexander Hamilton who said:

> The amelioration of the condition of mankind and the increase of human happiness ought to be the leading objects of every political institution, and the aim of every individual according to the measure of his power, in the situation he occupies.

SAM RAYBURN has always acted toward those noble ends.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short statement

ACCUMULATION OF STORAGE CHARGES ON COMMODITIES

Mr WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] as to the storage charges accumulating on commodities which are being held by the Department of Agriculture, may I point out that these charges are accumulating mainly on the so-called basic or nonperishable commodities such as cotton and wheat Those commodities have never cost the taxpayer of this Nation one red cent in the final analysis. Very few people seem to realize that. I have before me the statement of the Commodity Credit Corporation from October 1933 through November 1949. The program to date on those basic commodities shows a net profit of $83,000,000 to the Government. So this pimple the gentleman has been talking about really is not a pimple after all. It is simply part of a constructive program which has worked out with a profit to the Government of the United States. This program has provided a stabilization of American agriculture, and in turn, has produced a large measure of prosperity for the entire Nation in addition to helping us win the war and the postwar peace up to now.

WORKERS DEFENSE LEAGUE LIES ABOUT THE SOUTH

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Communist advocates of a world government are using mysterious ways their wonders to perform.

Yesterday the Associated Press carried a story of a representative of the so-called Workers Defense League who went to the United Nations, that communistic set-up in New York that wants to dominate the American people and the people of every State, and told them that in the South the share croppers, cotton pickers, and others were reduced to a state of slavery.

A more miserable lie could not have been uttered at any time.

He went on to say that the turpentine workers are in the same predicament, and that the fruit gatherers in the Southwest and in California are in the same predicament. Then he went so far away as the Pribilof Islands and said that they are reducing the Eskimos who help to gather the sealskins on the Pribilof Islands to slavery.

Now, that is just one of the few Communist fronts that are trying to use this set-up in New York to take over the Government of the United States and dominate the people of every State of this Union It is time the American people knew the truth about that would-be world government and that Congress woke up and withdrew from it.

The American people are capable of conducting their own affairs under the Constitution, without any help from people who have shown that they are incapable of governing themselves.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate President Truman on his masterly settlement of the coal strike.

The devastating coal strike is now 99 percent settled. Informed sources say that the miners will be back to work Monday.

This unnecessary tie-up of coal production and its repercussions on other industry should be classified by a military term as "Operations Taft-Hartley."

Cyrus S. Ching, Federal Mediator and former rubber executive, publicly stated several weeks ago that there had not been

any honest effort at collective bargaining since contract discussions started last summer. The response of the coal operators to all collective bargaining proposals was an emphatic "No." The American people were compelled to endure the inconvenience of a coal crisis because powerful interests in this country insisted that President Truman be compelled to use the injunction provision of the Taft-Hartley Act. At a terrible cost, a crisis developed wherein the President was compelled to use the Taft-Hartley injunction. This un-American provision in the Taft-Hartley Act proved to be a 100-percent failure. Approximately 450,000 miners refused to go back to work in spite of the injunction. As soon as the operators discovered the monumental failure of the Taft-Hartley law injunction they quickly proceeded to collective bargain with the union and coal production should be back to normal in a short time.

During the last 18 months there have been more serious strikes, labor disputes, and work stoppages than any year in our history. The only exception might be the first year after the war, when thousands of labor contracts that had been status quo for 5 years during the war period came up for renewal.

Had the Thomas-Lesinski bill been substituted for the Taft-Hartley Act a year ago, 90 percent of our labor troubles in the last 12 months would not have taken place.

Every Member of Congress should review President Truman's veto message of the Taft-Hartley Act which was read on this floor, June 20, 1947. I hereby quote just a few sentences from that prophetic message:

> The Taft-Hartley Act will prove unworkable, create chaos in industry, and lead to bitterness between management and labor * * * Its provisions would cause more strikes, not fewer. * * * I find that this bill is completely contrary to our national policy of economic freedom. It would require the Government to become an unwanted participant at every bargaining table. * * * Cooperation cannot be achieved by force of law. We cannot create mutual respect and confidence by legislative flat. * * * I have concluded that the bill is a clear threat to the successful working of our democratic society. * * * By raising barriers between labor and management, it would invite them to gain their ends through direct political action.

The President, in that veto message, made numerous other statements and predictions that have come true. The Taft-Hartley Act has already proved the greatest legislative mistake since the Volstead prohibition law.

This Congress must immediately reconsider legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and substitute therefor the Thomas-Lesinski bill which was up for consideration last April. The great majority of the American public, and, I firmly believe, of this Congress, are now convinced that the Taft-Hartley law is a monumental flop.

On next Monday I am filing a bill asking that a special committee be set up by the Congress to hold hearings and completely investigate the extent of good-faith collective bargaining which has taken place during the recent coal-strike dispute. This committee should also investigate the extent of the good-faith collective bargaining in other labor disputes which have tied up our economy since the Taft-Hartley Act has been in force.

I am satisfied that the report of an investigation of this kind will reveal the necessity for the immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Our American economy cannot afford to wait for the Eighty-second Congress to repeal this unworkable law.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. While many of his critics and opponents were talking and creating straw men for the purpose of knocking them down, President Truman, the only man whose constituency is the entire country, was thinking and acting and not talking. This is evidenced by the settlement of the coal strike and also by the settlement months ago of the steel strike. We remember when the steel strike existed how many of the opponents, and our Republican friends, condemned President Truman, but he was acting in the interest of the entire people. He insisted upon collective bargaining with individual companies. That is what prevailed.

Under the present situation, the President recognized that if the mines were taken over again it might be difficult to get the mines back into private hands. Many of the opponents of nationalization of industry, which both parties oppose, in their desire to get political advantage were urging the President to take this premature action. There are many mine owners who have high-cost producing mines who would like to unload them onto the Government. They do not care so long as their pocketbooks are taken care of. It is just the same as 20 years ago, when the railroads had a drive to try to have the Government take them over. They did not think about nationalization of industry when their pocketbook was involved. They were against it academically then, but from a practical angle if the Government took them over it would have meant the nationalization of industry. The President knew that, and anybody with common sense knew that. He hesitated to take the final step.

The one thing, in my opinion, that contributed more in the final stages of the consideration toward the solution of the coal situation was the provision of the bill that the President sent up and which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] introduced, that while the President might make terms with the workers, if the Government had to take the mines over the President could not make a contract. They knew that there could not be any contract made by the President or any one of his representatives, by the Government, and that, more than anything else, in my opinion, in the final hours of the negotiations was the powerful factor that brought about the successful conclusion.

The President of the United States is entitled to the commendation of the people of America for the outstanding manner in which he met the situation and contributed toward its solution.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the majority leader for his constructive remarks.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 2023.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

REPEALING THE TAXES ON OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. COOLEY, from the committee of conference, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2023).

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that some of the gentlemen who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act—two-thirds of the Members of the House voted for the act—will stick around today, or take occasion Monday to reply to statements which have been made today criticizing the act.

I listened to the gentleman from Nebraska, Dr. MILLER, tell his little story about the pimple and the cancer, and to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] comment on that story. It occurs to me that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] is a little lacking in medical knowledge. I understand a pimple is sometimes a symptom of a cancer. That is to say, sometimes a pimple will develop into a cancer. Is that not right, Dr. MILLER?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. While the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] I thought was perhaps reflecting on my ability, I am a life member of the American College of Surgeons, and have treated cancer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What I want to know is whether sometimes a pimple may possibly develop into a cancer?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure, that is right. So I say to my good friend, and he is my good friend I hope, the gentleman from Nebraska, you want to watch those pimples, the first thing you know you may have a cancer where first you only saw a pimple. So do not ridicule the doctor. He knows what he is talking about.

In our national life, what may seem to be just a little pimple—oh, so very small a one—may turn out to be a cancer.

The refusal, in a comparatively little matter, to enforce the law of the land may lead to insurrection and civil strife.

The President, by his conduct, has condoned in labor disputes violations of the law. In the coal dispute, he refused to use the law available; then asked for law to seize private property.

Seizure of private property without authority of law—and what right has the Congress to take either the right to work or the right to do business—may result in socialism, a cancerous growth in any free society.

It is rather strange and disturbing to me to hear from the well of the House praise of an executive officer whose duty it is to enforce the law—praised because he did not enforce the law.

I recall the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] was telling us about the things they celebrated at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner. I will comment on that at a later date.

Now, I learned this morning that to the list of events which on the same theory might be celebrated by the Democratic Party is added this failure of the President to enforce a law of the land—the Taft-Hartley Act, which it is his sworn duty to enforce.

You say the law is a failure. One even said it is the cause of the strike in the coal industry. That statement is ridiculous.

If the law has failed, it is because of the lack of enforcement. The court did find that the men, according to the evidence produced before it, were not on strike. Now, you go out in the sticks and tell that to the people who lack coal. Tell them that the miners were not on strike, and that the failure was due to the Taft-Hartley Act.

The failure of the law, you say? It was not a failure of the law. There was a failure of the enforcement officers of the Department of Justice.

Did the law of the land against extortion fail because five gangsters were turned loose on the public by a parole agency of the Government? Oh, no; it was a corruption of justice. That is what is the matter.

You might just as well say that there is no virtue in the law against assault and battery because while two or three fellows were beating me up on one corner, the policeman who was standing over on the other corner could not see them do it because he was blinded by some politician.

The President, for political reasons, did not want the Taft-Hartley Act on the books. The President, for the same reasons, vetoed that law. More than two-thirds of the Members of each House, at the demand of their constituents, enacted that law over his veto.

He did not want the law; hence he has done many things to prevent its being successfully applied. He has openly and publicly condemned it, even though he took oath to uphold the law.

One of his campaign promises was that he would have it repealed. That he was not able to do. Since then, in the coal strike, he has followed a course until, from a practical standpoint, the effect is somewhat similar to a repeal.

Although he was forced to use the law some six times, and although in each case it served the purpose for which it was written, contributed to the solution of a labor dispute, in this particular case the President, by permitting either inefficient or dishonest enforcement officers to ignore the facts, has made that law ineffective.

The President waited. He knew there would be suffering because he waited, but he waited so that he might create a situation where he could ask the Congress for authority to seize the mines; when it would be embarrassing for Congressmen to refuse him that arbitrary, to my mind, unconstitutional, power.

The President is a clever machine political maneuverer, and, while his cleverness may be of advantage to him from a political standpoint, it places upon him the responsibility for a great deal of unemployment, for suffering and for hardship endured by our people while he has been playing politics.

You know very well that if the President had proceeded under the Taft-Hartley Act, if the Justice Department had been worth its salt, you would have had a case of a violation of the injunction. While it is true that you cannot dig coal with bayonets, the use of bayonets may enable others to dig coal.

I will tell you what is the basic fault in this situation. This situation grows out of the fact that we granted certain privileges and benefits, special in their nature, to organized labor. Organized labor took advantage of the things we gave them, these special benefits and privileges, and, ignoring the rights of other citizens, ignoring the rights of the public and endangering by their acts the public health, safety, and welfare, they worked themselves into a position where they had a monopoly of production in the coal industry.

To work their will they deprived citizens of the country of a necessity, and the situation had developed so that factories were closing. There was unemployment.

So what do you do? You praise a man who refuses to enforce a law which is on the books, the enforcement of which would have given relief. How long do you think you can get away with that? You will create in this country the same sort of sentiment that was back of the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act.

People eventually are going to say to all these organized-labor groups, "Yes, you can have the right to bargain collectively; you can have your jobs under certain conditions; you can have a minimum wage; you can have overtime, and all these other beneficial things, but when you go so far as to say that any group"—I do not care whether it is A. F. of L., CIO, or the machinists' union, I do not care which group it is—"can threaten the public health," finally the people are going to say, "Now you fellows are playing in a game, but you are going to abide by the rules of the game. You are not going to be permitted at your will to take possession of plants and destroy property. You are not going to be permitted by mob violence to walk into my town or the other town and say, 'We take over'," as they did in the sit-down strikes and as they did in other instances in the last 2 years.

"You are not going to be permitted to come in, as you did in Kalamazoo with 200 people, blockade the streets and grab innocent people and beat them, burn cars and trucks of men and women whose only offense was that they wanted to work." Eventually the people will say, "That is going to stop."

Now, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] if that is the sort of procedure you are going to advocate, you will be met by laws which will use lawful forces to meet the unlawful force.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Long before the Taft-Hartley Act, long before the Wagner Act, we always had a remedy where hoodlums who beat up anybody were taken into the courts and prosecuted. It does not require the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; that is correct. But then the laws were enforced. I want to answer that right there. That remedy has been lost. Why? Because of its voting power, organized labor has either intimidated or converted a sufficient number of congressional representatives in both branches of the Congress, so that they will not insist upon enforcement of the law.

I will say it goes further back than that. It goes back to the cities and towns. Violence and destruction of property by organized labor is not punished the way violence and property damage by other citizens is punished. If I am on the picket line—and I can cite hundreds of instances—if I am on the picket line I can crack another man's head and I will not be prosecuted. A citizen doing the same thing in his own behalf will land in the jug.

I know you will say that in years gone by it was the employer who instigated the violence. But that was outlawed, and it was stopped, and now the unions and their representatives do it and they escape prosecution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. In Gary, Ind., we had a steel strike that lasted 3 weeks. There was only one case where some hoodlums beat up somebody and they were taken up and prosecuted. That was the only instance during that 3 weeks' strike.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, the daily press is full of accounts of violence and destruction of property in connection with strikes. Down in Indiana the union did pull some people off a bus when they were going to work. The union did have to pay $76,000 in civil damages. You know the suit. And Murray, as head of the international, sent a check of that international for $46,000—$46,000—to apply on those judgments. The gentleman knows that; does he not?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; yes. Now, the trouble is that the law is a little bit different in Indiana than it is in Michigan. In Michigan I cannot sue the international in a local court, I cannot get them into court. In Indiana they can be brought into court. If all the States had that kind of a statute, there probably would be some relief from unlawful activities.

The situation which we have before us today is this:

The power to legislate is vested in the Congress. So reads the Constitution.

The Congress, lawfully assembled, its Members having been duly elected and sworn as the people's representatives, passed a bill. The President of the United States, under the Constitution, had the power to veto that bill—the Taft-Hartley Act. Mr. Truman, as President, disliking the law, vetoed the bill.

As provided by the Constitution, it went back to the people's representatives. The people's representatives in the Congress assembled passed it over the President's veto, and it became the law of the land.

Mr. Truman, elected as President, took the oath to perform his duties as President. Under the Constitution he is the executive head of this Government, and it is his duty to enforce the law.

Disliking the law—the Taft-Hartley Act—the President has ridiculed it; in his campaign called for its repeal; done much to discredit it.

At the first session of the E ghty-first Congress the people's representatives again refused to accept his views, refused to repeal the law.

The coal strike came on. The President refused to publicly declare that a national emergency existed. He sat idly by until coal was a scarcity. He refused to act until he had created a situation which he thought would enable him to either force mine owners to agree to a settlement with the union's representatives or give him an opportunity to ask for authority to seize the mines.

The President may or he may not be using this situation to give us a socialized Government. He may or he may not have in his mind a plan to seize and operate the mines; to let the threatened strike in the telephone industry develop into a situation where he can ask for power to seize it.

In the back of his mind there may or there may not be a plan to let the dispute between management and labor in the transportation industry develop into a situation which will threaten the welfare of our people and then ask for the power to seize and operate the railroads.

With the coal industry, the telephone systems, the transportation system, under his control and management, himself in a position to increase wages and benefits for millions of employees in those three great industries, the President will be a dictator, and not such a little one either.

Whatever may be his plan and purpose, one thing is beyond dispute. Charged with the duty of enforcing the law, having sworn to perform that duty, he nevertheless has miserably failed, neglected, and refused to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act.

His refusal to act must be encouraging to all those who have an inclination to violate any law. Each and every law violator can, as justification for his own violation, hereafter point to this example set by the Chief Executive of the Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, everyone, of course, must be happy, as I am, that the coal strike which has paralyzed this country and brought the Nation to the brink of disaster has been settled, or at least is in the process of settlement. Certainly, we should be very happy, in view of the fact that the settlement is being made, that the Congress of the United States is not being called upon today or next Monday to enact legislation for Federal seizure of the mines, a process which Mr. Truman himself labeled as extreme legislation. Of course, it is extreme legislation, because seizure in peacetime carried on time after time could well result in nationalization of industry, or of major segments of industry; and that, certainly is not a thing to yield much comfort to anyone other than the commies and the fellow travelers, and the folks who would like to make the country over in that pattern.

I have been just a little astonished at some of the statements that have been made by some of my good friends on the Democratic side of the aisle Their statements have been completely defensive and apologetic. They must know, as I know, that the people of this country who have been suffering because of the long-continued work stoppage in coal production are holding the administration liable for its mishandling of the whole affair. Defensive and apologetic? Yes. Seeking to escape that responsibility? Yes. The people of this country who have seen their schools closed, their hospitals threatened, their libraries closed, who have seen their trains stopped, all of the other functions of their communities stopped, who have themselves been cold, who have been robbed of their jobs, are not going to be misled by any such defensive, apologetic statements here today.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. No; I refuse to yield at this point. Out in my State months ago when the governor was talking about rationing coal, the President was still saying there was no emergency. The President of the United States should have known a long time ago that not only was the crisis, the emergency, threatening, it had actually arrived. In spite of all that, he procrastinated. Why did he procrastinate? Because starting in the last campaign he threw the whole problem of labor management relations into the arena of partisan politics.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lesson to be drawn. What sort of example is set, for instance, for observance by union leaders of the processes of the courts of the land—what example for respect for our courts?

What sort of example was set by the President of the United States in his attitude toward the law, in his constant criticism of the law, in his excoriation and scorn of the law, yes; and in his failure to obey the dictates of the law and the Constitution in respect to his responsibility under the law and invoke its processes a long time ago when they should have been invoked?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the people who have spoken here in this defensive and apologetic manner want to see governmental seizure made the method by which we deal with national-emergency strikes. If you do, stand up in your place and say so, because you prate about collective bargaining. I believe in collective bargaining as the very cornerstone of our competitive-enterprise economy; but, Mr. Speaker, whenever the day comes that these strikes are handled by Government seizure, collective bargaining is out the window and governmental decision is substituted for free agreement. If any man is a true friend of labor, that ought to be the last thing he would want.

We have struggled here in the Congress through the years to try to find the answers to these propositions that constantly confront us. Quite some time ago the Railway Labor Act was put on the books. What has been the history of that? And may I say parenthetically that the national-emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are modeled on the Railway Labor Act.

The Railway Labor Act was regarded as the model for handling labor-management relations and it worked successfully until the very Government itself, time after time, went out against the findings of the emergency fact-finding boards and in that process the Government itself destroyed the effectiveness of the law. No one can deny that. And, in like manner, the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, insofar as the processes for dealing with national-emergency strikes are concerned, worked effectively and well for 2 years, having at different times been invoked by the President of the United States and with effect. They, too, worked well until their effectiveness was destroyed—and I say deliberately destroyed—by the Government itself.

Why, who are you to complain about the injunctive processes of the Taft-Hartley Act? Have you forgotten, you who have spoken here, that in the substitute you offered in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress when the matter of repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act was up, in the Sims substitute for which you all voted, you included the very provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in respect to injunctive processes? Of course you ought to remember that. Your memories are not quite that short, and you know why you voted that way. You did not dare to leave the country without some method by which these great national emergency strikes might be

dealt with. That is the truth of the matter.

So, why all this talk here today? The plain fact of the matter is, may I say again, and you know it, and everyone else knows it, is that this coal situation was deliberately allowed, yes, even encouraged, to go from bad to worse. Editorial comment all over the country, the statements of enlightened and fair news commenators and radio commentators should be and is almost universally to this effect, allowed to go from bad to worse until, even with the settlement now being effected, tremendous damage has been done this country, and to the individual people of this country, and to our economy as a whole, the extent of which damage no one can at this moment determine.

Now, of course, you folks have undertaken to throw this matter into the arena of partisan politics again. And may I say at that point that a lot of us have struggled here in recent weeks and months putting the welfare of our country above any partisan advantage to try to avert the disaster into which the country was plunged. Well, in that same manner, if you are going to talk about what we ought to do with this problem, if you are right about that and the Taft-Hartley Act is all wrong, and the problem is yet unsolved, I do not believe a one of you would get up here and say that the Government ought to seize private property in peacetime and operate it as a governmental operation. You know under the provisions of the bill that the President sent up here, if the demands of either side had continued to be so unreasonable that no agreement could be reached, the Government would have operated the mines for a period of 16 months, to June 30, 1951. And if an agreement had not been reached, what would you have done?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. So, I assume that no one would throw his hat in the air and stand up and say that we want seizure as the answer.

Now, here is the problem that confronts us. I said the other day on the floor, and I say it again, that the approach set up in the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, by which we undertook to maintain the status quo while the process of mediation was being carried forward, is the best method that has yet been devised. It is the best of anything I have seen up to date. It certainly is a lot better than a continual resort to seizure.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to have the gentleman tell the membership of this House what provision there is in the Taft-Hartley law that would require management to bargain in good faith.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, I was here when the Wagner Act was enacted. When the Wagner Act was passed, its primary requirement was that the employer should bargain collectively with his employees. The burden, the responsibility, the requirement, was put on the employer to bargain, and the Taft-Hartley Act did not make one single change in that responsibility and that requirement. Now, then, if you heard the President's message it was something of a plague on both your Houses again, was it not, in respect to the current coal strike? Did he hold the unions free? Did he say the unions had all along demonstrated a willingness to bargain collectively in good faith? Of course he did not; he said exactly the opposite. The Taft-Hartley Act also put upon the labor organizations a requirement, since we were guaranteeing the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively, that they, too, must bargain in good faith. I do not see how anyone can challenge the rightness of that position.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It seems to me, and a great many Members feel just as I do, that there has been somewhat of a conspiracy between the owners and the miners to try to unload these coal mines on the Government of the United States. They found they had to face Congress, and probably that accounted for reaching some kind of an agreement last night.

Mr. HALLECK. I referred earlier to what I believe was a maladministration of the law of the land, the failure to invoke its processes at a time when they should have been invoked. I spoke the other day and had something to say about the manner of the presentation of the evidence in the court here in the District of Columbia. Since I made that statement I see that in the other body a definite charge was made, which I have never seen refuted, that there were sixty-some affidavits that might have been presented there in evidence, or the people who made the affidavits might have been called to establish very definitely the fact that there was contempt of the court's order. So up to date, you see, you cannot be very sure about how those processes will operate except, let me say again, that six times the processes were invoked and with success.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana may proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is always very kind to me. I do not know whether he is getting me more time in order to try to chop me down or not, but if that is it, it is perfectly all right, because he and I may disagree but certainly there is no personal difference between us.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that I made that unanimous-consent request with the purest motives?

Mr. HALLECK. I am very sure of that.

I want to take just a moment to discuss the matter of national emergency strikes as the issue appears to me, but before I do that I want to pay my respects to one other contention that has been made here, particularly by my very dear friend from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], whose friend I am, and I am quite sure he is my friend. He talked about how the Taft-Hartley Act had done so much to generate strikes and trouble. If the gentleman will look at the figures he will discover that in 1946 there were 5,000 strikes in this country, and in the first year of operation of the Taft-Hartley Act that number was reduced to about 3,600. The fact of the matter is that a better climate for collective bargaining was created and the processes of collective bargaining went forward much better. Work stoppages were reduced. The country benefited by the production we so badly needed. That continued until the leadership in the gentleman's party undertook to destroy the law, undertook to create in the country a disrespect for the law that could do nothing other than to lead to more strife and to more trouble.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. In answer to that statement from my good friend south of me in Indiana, in 1949 we had more strikes than any year in our history with the exception of 1946, and that condition in 1946 was due to the fact that all the labor unions in the country postponed contract negotiations during the war. Immediately following the war thousands upon thousands of labor contracts were up for negotiation. That accounts for the fact that we had numerous strikes in 1946. Eliminating 1946, however, the Taft-Hartley Act in 1949 has brought about more strikes and work stoppages than any year in our history.

Mr. HALLECK. That reminds me of the fellow at home who said he caught a 5-pound bass. If you did not believe it, he would show you the hook.

May I say to my good friend from Indiana that it is not just coincidental, in my opinion, that in the year 1949 controversy continued to increase and strikes to increase. It is not coincidental that that year followed the coming about of the very things I have been talking about.

Do you not understand what you have just said proves I am right?

Now, let us consider philosophically this matter of national emergency strikes. First of all there is a provision in the Constitution that no man can be forced to involuntary servitude.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says, "Let us discuss this philosophically." Does he mean by that he is now getting into the field of statesmanship?

Mr. HALLECK. Well, you know, out in Indiana everybody is supposed to be a poet or a politician. I have always claimed to be a statesman, but there

seems to be some question about that in some quarters.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was not raising that question.

Mr HALLECK. I appreciate that.

Mr McCORMACK. But once you start discussing a thing philosophically that is when you are approaching the problem in an attempt to arrive at the truth.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, before I get to this philosophical discussion—I shall be very happy to accept the gentleman's definition, because, whether or not it is philosophical or worth anything, I shall leave to the good judgment of my friends here in the House and the Speaker of the House.

For a long time you have called the Taft-Hartley Act a slave-labor act. We have denied it. As a matter of fact, the undeniable fact is that you have a million more men in labor unions today than you had when the act was passed, and wages of factory workers have jumped from $1 21 an hour to $1 46 an hour.

I started out to say here, philosophically, that on the one side is the right of an individual to quit if he wants to. On the other side, in an enlightened civilization in a complex society such as ours, I think it is recognized by everyone that society just cannot be brought to complete disaster by organized and concerted work stoppages in essential industries.

As I pointed out, in the Railway Labor Act, and in the Taft-Hartley Act, the Members of Congress have struggled for the answer. In my opinion there must be some answer. There must be. I do not know of any responsible Member of the Congress who would say that every method by which the country might protect itself when these great crises arise should be taken off the books. I remember one time when there was a work stoppage on the railroads, and there was a demand for immediate action The President of the United States, Mr. Truman, rushed up to the Congress with a bill to draft the workers in the Army and make them work at the point of a bayonet. A lot of the people who today complain of the fair processes of existing law try to bring about peaceful adjustment voted for that iniquitous measure.

Mr. WHITE of California Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California That was during the war emergency. The fighting was not still going on, but the emergency was still on.

Mr. HALLECK. You know you had Mr Lewis on strike once during the war when the Government had the mines.

Mr MADDEN Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN It did not take long to settle Mr. Lewis' strike when the Eightieth Congress was in session. I remember they brought him up to the Capitol in an automobile and the then Speaker of the House and two distinguished Senators in the other body settled it in 10 minutes—or 5 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Whatever the motivating factors may have been, it was settled a lot quicker than this strike.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would like for him to tell us what he would have done in the instant case, since I interpret what the gentleman says to mean that he would compel men to mine coal with bayonets.

Mr. HALLECK. I never said or even intimated that I would be for using bayonets to make men mine coal. I will tell you what I would have done. First of all, a long time ago when everyone in the country apparently, except Mr. Truman, knew that not only did the crisis threaten, but that it was actually here—I would have invoked the processes of the law. Even before that, I would not have gone around criticizing the law and inferentially indicating that no citizen was under any obligation to obey the law or respect the processes of the courts under it. Then I would have gone into court and presented evidence. You know, I hesitate to criticize the Department of Justice, or anyone, but there come times once in a while when you just goad an easy-going, peaceful person like myself to the point where we get up and say what we believe. So that is what I am doing If I had tried that case, I would have had the evidence there that would have sustained the court; that would not have made it necessary for Judge Keech to say that possibly there might be some evidence that is not in the record about inducing, or instructing, or permitting, or advising, but he could not decide the case on conjecture. I would like to have seen those processes tried, and tried fairly. I would like to see the Government so handled that they would be given a fair trial.

Let me say to you, if you advocate leaving the country in the grip of one of these work stoppages which, if carried on, can become national disaster and even mass murder, if that is what you advocate, get up and say so. If you do not believe in that, then you come in here with your ideas as to what you think ought to be done as a substitute for what we now have. Up to date you have not brought it in.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

YOU CANNOT MINE COAL WITH GUNS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I do not come here to apologize, but I would like to answer a few of the remarks made by the two preceding gentlemen, and I would like to recite a little history to them about the business of mining coal with bayonets.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] reminds me a little, in some of his dissertations, of an old Quaker in my home town who one time went home to his wife and said: "Sarah, you know I think practically everybody in this country is wrong except thee and me, and sometimes I am a little doubtful about thee."

I represent 75 percent of the coal production in the State of Ohio, which is the fourth largest coal-producing State in the Union. I have lived all my life in the coal fields, and I have seen coal mined at the point of a bayonet. As a matter of fact, the last time the Republican Party was in power was the last experience we had mining coal at the point of a bayonet. When the Jacksonville agreement expired, back in the late twenties, the operators and the unions were unable to come to an agreement, and a strike ensued. Finally, after a period of time, the operators brought in some outsiders to operate their mines, and they brought in troops to protect them. The coal was mined, such as was mined, under the eyes of soldiers. What happened? The men had been getting $7 a day before that time. The people who were brought in from the outside were working in the mines under the protection of bayonets and machine guns. I saw them every morning on my way to school and on my way home. The men who went down into those pits had no safety inspection, no protection, and worked for $1.50 a day. Subsequently the strike was broken.

I will tell you a few more things that happened then. If you will pardon me for being personal, I personally know about it. My father happened to be in the grocery business in a mining town. Prior to the strike he had sold to the coal miners. Many of them were his customers. At that time he had a wholesale and retail outlet for Pillsbury flour. After the union was broken the operators set up company stores. They would not permit any employee of theirs to buy any place but at the company store. In his retail store my father was selling flour at that time at 95 or 93 cents, or somewhere thereabouts, at retail. However the employees of the coal companies were no longer allowed to patronize him. He was selling flour at wholesale, about 10 cents less on the 25 pounds. He sold to this company store at wholesale for about 85 cents, and they were selling it to the miners and compelling them to buy at their store for $2. They were compelling them to live in company houses, and they were compelling them to pay whatever arbitrary rents they had set upon this property. What happened? Many and many and many a pay day a miner would get a slip which told him how much he owed the company more than he had made for working 10 and 12 hours, 6 days a week, under the earth.

Before bringing you up to date a little, let me refer to the early twenties for a moment. My first experience with death was one day when I was dismissed from school in the first grade to attend the funeral of the fathers of two boys who were in the first grade with me; men who were killed in a stone fall in a coal mine. In 1940 and 1941, in my county, Belmont County, Ohio, there were three major disasters which wiped out the lives of 72 people, 38 people, and 90 people, all within seconds. Those people were all heads of families; they were fathers;

they were husbands, and their lives were taken. Coal mining is not a pleasant occupation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. And all of them were human beings.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes; I thank the majority leader; I was coming to that. Some people apparently forget in this discussion that coal miners are human beings. Coal miners are people, and some of those who advocate mining coal by injunction are willing to seize physical human beings and force them to work at the point of a gun, but they get a little perturbed when it is suggested that the properties of the coal operators be seized

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD I think the gentleman from Ohio made a very pertinent point in his last sentence. The Taft-Hartley Act provides for injunctions to force the men back to work; in other words, it seizes their personal liberty and forces them into involuntary servitude through an injunctive process; but when the legal process of seizing the mine owners and confiscating any of their property is suggested, it then becomes a matter of great and deep concern to the proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio I thank the gentleman; he is exactly right

During debate on the FEPC legislation, we heard the statement reiterated time and time again that you could not enforce fair-employment practices by legislation; that it must be done by education, by arbitration, and by persuasion. I believe there is some substance to that argument. I have always maintained that persuasion and education is better than force. But, for the life of me, I cannot understand why those same people who make that argument about FEPC argue that you can enforce labor relations with troops and guns. Either they act inconsistently, deliberately, or they fail to see the inconsistency of their arguments

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe the RECORD will show that the majority of the Members on the gentleman's side, including the gentleman now speaking, voted for the Sims amendment, which included injunctive procedure.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. All that I can say about that is that the gentleman had better recheck the RECORD

I do not like an injunction to try to force people to work, because the very fact that when an injunction is obtained it causes resentment, bitterness, and ill-feeling, and stops any genuine good will toward an agreement.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I asked the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] a question a while ago, and want to ask you. I am serious about it. Watching this thing from the side lines I have come to the very definite conclusion that somewhere there was an undercurrent of understanding between the miners and the owners of these coal mines to try to unload them on the United States Government at an exorbitant price. But when they found they had to come to Congress, and that the pitiless sunlight of merciless publicity would be turned onto them, they arrived at this temporary agreement. Has the gentleman any comment on that suggestion?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes, I will be glad to comment on that. I want to say to the gentleman that I do not know of any such agreement, but I do feel that some of the marginal operators, and I have heard it said, would like to unload their property on the Government. I do not know that the miners were a party to that. I do not think they were I have no evidence one way or the other. I do not think that owners of the more profitable coal operations wanted to unload their property on the Government I think the gentleman is partially correct, and this is merely my own opinion, that some mine owners would like to get rid of their property because some of the submarginal operations are not profitable.

I would like to agree with what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] said—that the coal business is sick. I would like to endorse the idea of setting up a commission to examine how this Congress dispassionately, without trying to hurt either side, can do something to put this basic industry in a position where it can operate under the American free-enterprise system at decent wages for the men who go down into those dirty, dangerous pits to bring the coal to the surface

Mr. MADDEN. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] asked a question a while ago, Who settled the coal strike? What brought about the settlement? I believe the answer to that is in conjunction with the statement of Cyrus Ching a few weeks ago when he stated no effort on the part of the operators was made towards collective bargaining since last summer and, furthermore, that they were trying to press President Truman into the Taft-Hartley injunction. Immediately when the operators saw that the Taft-Hartley injunction failed and that they could not put 450,000 miners in jail, they sat down and collective bargaining settled the coal strike

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct, the operators did not bargain in good faith because they were trying to force the President to use the Taft-Hartley law to put the miners over a barrel. When they found that the Taft-Hartley law was a complete failure because the miners refused to be coerced and would not go back to work at gun-point, they got together and bargained in good faith.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. If the Taft-Hartley Act had not been on the books, does the gentleman think that an agreement would have been reached months ago between the union and operators?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do. I think an agreement would have been reached a long time ago.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here at this extraordinary Saturday session of the House for the last hour and a half listening to this nonpolitical discussion. I had thought I would not get into it, but I have come to the conclusion, after hearing the amazing statements made by my good friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], who I note from the Congressional Directory was born on May 13, 1911, and who, by the time he was 10 or 12 years old, had become a great expert on labor relations, that I should add my 2 cents worth to this discussion.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Well, I was talking about 1929.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman referred to the early twenties. I believe 1929 was in the late twenties.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The Jacksonville scale was put in at that time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure I know the gentleman's district perhaps as well as he does. For many years I served in State office. I served in the State house most of the time from 1915 to 1933. I was elected to State office with and served under more Democratic Governors than Republican Governors. I have known personally and well every Ohio Governor of the last 35 years, and I arise to defend their records and their good names, regardless of their party affiliation.

In all friendliness let me say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] that never once in his lifetime have the armed

troops in our State ever been used to force any citizen to work at the point of a bayonet.

The gentleman's statement reflects upon the State of Ohio, and I do not believe the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] really wants to make it. I hope he will correct his remarks.

I can remember when a great Democratic Governor of Ohio, James M. Cox, whom the Democratic Party honored by nominating him for the Presidency, did protect private property from vandalism and from destruction by lawless persons. I can remember when another great Democratic Governor, Governor White, of Ohio, who served in this body, and who was the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, protected private property from damage, just as it was his duty as a public official to do. I can remember when another Democratic Governor, Martin L. Davey, used the National Guard to protect citizens and private property from mob violence. But none of these men ever used armed force to compel any citizen to work. In their names I protest such an unfair and untruthful charge. Neither do I recall, and I think I can remember as far back as yesterday, that President Truman blamed only the mine operators for failing to settle the present coal dispute. If you will turn back to the message the President sent to the Congress yesterday, you will find he gave both the operators and the representatives of the mine workers' union equal blame. He held them both equally responsible. He charged them both with failure to bargain in good faith. And, of course, I think I know the reason why.

I hope that we have reached the end of this nonpolitical discussion, of which should be a very nonpolitical problem. Somehow or other we are seemingly forgetting that there are a great many people in America who do not care so much about politics as they do about keeping warm and employment so they can earn their livelihood.

Like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], whom I want to compliment upon a great speech—and it was an honest speech—I agree we should all be grateful that this great and tragic coal dispute has at least been solved, at least temporarily, and, I hope, permanently. I am not so much interested as to who does or does not get the credit as I am in the fact that once more we have met a great emergency and solved it.

From the remarks of my Democratic friends—and the only thing I can assume and accept from their statements—they seemingly feel the Taft-Hartley Act was so weak that it did not work and must be strengthened. I presume, therefore, they will immediately introduce legislation to strengthen Taft-Hartley so as to make it more powerful and effective, so as to meet——

Mr. MADDEN. To repeal it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]. I look for him to introduce a bill Monday morning for that purpose. I will join with him in the Committee on Rules in reporting his bill out promptly so that he can get the relief he seeks by strengthening the Taft-Hartley Act. I hope in the meantime we may all join in taking a little more interest in the welfare of our country rather than just in political parties.

WITHOUT SEIZURE AND WITHOUT INQUIRY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a bill which I introduced more than a week ago proposing emergency action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission just granted, I place in the RECORD at this point the text of H. R. 7417, which I introduced Thursday, February 23, as one approach to solving the coal emergency.

It may or may not have worked—but the point will be clear, I think, to those who read the text of the bill, that it recognized the emergency, that it recognized that miners are human beings, that it gave both miners and operators credit for being patriotic Americans who would respond to the country's urgent needs, that it did not require or propose seizure, and finally that it did propose to have a study made of the underlying causes of the sickness in this industry, and to have that study result in recommendations in time for this Congress to take remedial action.

I might add that the bill had been called to the attention of the responsible leadership of the House and I feel certain that it would have been among the possibilities considered, had the House found it necessary to proceed with legislative action. I mention this and insert the bill at this time, simply to keep the record clear on the point that Congress has not been indifferent to the developing crisis.

The text of the bill follows:

H. R. 7417

A bill to declare an emergency and to create the National Coal Emergency Act of 1950

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress finds a stoppage of coal production and a shortage of fuel at this time of the year have seriously and adversely affected the flow of commerce between the States and have created a national emergency seriously endangering the national welfare, public health, and safety.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to call upon all persons normally engaged in the production of coal immediately to resume their normal duties and to make a special effort to produce the coal needed to alleviate the dangers to public health and safety now existing and to restore the normal flow of interstate commerce.

SEC. 3. The President is further requested to ask the governors of the several States to employ such components of the National Guard as may be necessary to afford full protection to those workers, mine owners, and operators who seek to comply with the requests made pursuant to section 2 of this act.

SEC. 4. The President is further requested to direct the Attorney General immediately to institute efforts to determine whether there is any concerted effort on the part of any persons or organizations to interfere with the production of coal in this emergency and to take such legal steps as may be necessary to end such interference.

SEC. 5. The President is authorized and directed to name a Coal Mine Inquiry Board of five persons to look into all phases of conditions affecting the production or nonproduction of coal and to make a report of findings with recommendations to the Congress not later than June 1, 1950.

SEC. 6. The President is authorized and directed to utilize such facilities and personnel of the executive agencies of the Government as may be needed to carry out purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. The President is hereby authorized as the agent of the Congress to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided, however*, That the emergency declared and the powers and duties created by this act shall expire not later than May 31, 1950, unless as otherwise provided herein, or unless Congress by joint resolution shall otherwise direct.

SEC. 8. This act may be cited as the "National Coal Emergency Act of 1950."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. IRVING asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 204. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 6, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. H. R. 2023. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1731). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. RIVERS introduced a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 433) to provide that the United States shall withhold from representatives of foreign nations privileges which such nations withhold from representatives of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. WICKERSHAM introduced a bill (H. R. 7564) for the relief of Maria Margareta Ries and Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1959. The SPEAKER presented a petition of M. W. Clark and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PROPERTY OF UNIVERSITY
OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES
GRADUATE READING ROOM
NON-CIRCULATING

W
3380